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1. Bound anaphora in Northern Pomo

In Northern Pomo, there are two classes of bound anaphors, similar in the binding constraints which determine their distribution, and different in form class. I will describe the syntactic constraints on their distribution first, and then will argue that at least one of these two anaphor types is functioning logophorically (Clements, 1975). I will show that the discourse pragmatics associated with logophoricity are not only associated with these anaphors, but also motivate certain other grammatical phenomena.

2. The ti- anaphors

These are third person independent pronouns inflected for number and case. I have found a few examples of ti- forms with second person antecedents, but these were all second person used as a generic in fixed expressions. The table below gives the inflected forms, all of which are formed on the stem ti-. For comparison the 3rd person singular feminine pronoun is also given. Northern Pomo possesses three productive cases, Agent (AG), Patient (PT) and Oblique (OBL) [1].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 sg. REF</td>
<td>tiyi</td>
<td>titi</td>
<td>ti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pl. REF</td>
<td>tiya</td>
<td>tiyal</td>
<td>tiya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg.f.</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>mado</td>
<td>madal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because these forms require an antecedent in the
syntactic context, I will call them reflexives. Forms with similar distribution in other languages have been called "cross-clause reflexives" (Nichols, 1984), or "Non-clause bounded reflexives" (NCBRs) (Maling, 1984). Some NCBRs are homophonous with the clause-bound reflexive, but in Northern Pomo this is not the case. The simple reflexive, which is not limited to third person antecedents, is morphologically unrelated to the ti- forms, and does not inflect for number or case. The first example below is the clause-bound reflexive.

(1) mów k'aye čaxá -?a
3sm-AG REFL cut-REFL
"He cut himself"

(2) mów ti-čaxá ( -?a)
3sREFL-PT
"He cut himself"

In fact, the simple reflexive and the non-clause-bounded form can occur together in the same clause, in which case the ti- anaphor has an emphatic function.

(3) ti? k'aye khe mow ma?a -dode
3REFL-OBL REFL prep:ps. 3m-Ag food - prep:ps:re
"For himself alone he cooked"

(4) ti-í k'aye mow kučiyá - wi phatolé-?e
3REFL-AG REFL 3sm-AG knife INST stab -REFL
"He stabbed HIMSELF with a knife"

There are two constraints on the appearance of these anaphoric forms. They obey the widely observed constraint on bound anaphora (Maling, 1984; Reinhart, 1983); they must be c-commanded by their antecedent [2]. Example (5) demonstrates this. In addition, their antecedent must be a subject [3][4].

(5) mów k'ótam-da ti-í ma:al yadí
3sm-AG swim-AdvCOMP 3REFL-AG 3sf-PT see
* "He saw her as he was swimming"
J J

The ti- anaphor can occur in the same clause with its antecedent, but it may not appear as a direct or indirect object, only as an oblique argument with a subject antecedent.
Examples (6) and (7) show that both the c-command condition and the subject condition are independently necessary. As the ungrammatical readings indicate, the syntactic direct objects (which c-command the second object in (6) and the postpositional phrase in (7)) cannot serve as antecedent for the *ti? reflexive. (Goal arguments of verbs like *tell* and *give* in Northern Pomo are always direct objects.)

3. Kinship term possessive prefixes

The second type of anaphoric element I will describe is a prefix which is only found on kinship term stems, and which indicates that the individual denoted by the kinship term bears the relevant kin relation to the individual denoted by the antecedent of the pronominal prefix. The anaphoric prefix *mi-* is a third person form, and is the only member of the paradigm described below to require an antecedent.

McLendon 1976 lists a second person possessive prefix, *mi-*, for most of the Pomo daughter languages, a form of the first person pronoun *?a:* for first person possessive prefix (although she does not list this for Northern Pomo) and various forms for third person singular possessive prefixes. She does not report whether there are any restrictions on the distribution of these prefixes. None of the languages are described as having an alternation between two forms in the third person. The table below contrasts the three prefixes of this class for N. Pomo. I have chosen to analyze the first, *mi-*, as a form that signals that the possessor is a speech act participant (either 1st or 2nd person), since the division between the deictic first and second person pronouns, as opposed to the third person
(Benveniste's 'non-person'), is central to the description of the discourse pragmatics associated with these pronominal elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>1st/2nd p.</th>
<th>mi-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mi-phane duhú</td>
<td></td>
<td>2poss-daught. leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Your daughter left.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            | ?o-mi-phane duhú   |            | 1poss-daught. leave  |
|            | 'My daughter left.' |          |                      |

| 3rd        | ba-                |            | ba-phane duhú        |
|            | 3poss-daught. leave |          | 'His/her/their daughter. left.' |

| 3rd        | ma-                |            | *ma-phane duhú       |
|            | Reflex. poss-daught. leave |          | 'His/her/their daughter. left.' |

As the ungrammaticality of the final example sentence demonstrates, of these three prefixes, ma- is the only one which requires an antecedent in the syntactic context; mi- is interpreted as a deictic linked to either speaker or addressee depending on the presence of the clitic first person pronoun; and ba- may either have a third person antecedent in the syntactic environment, or else may be pragmatically controlled.

Two additional constraints exist on the use of the anaphor ma-: like the ti- forms, its antecedent must be a subject and must c-command the anaphor. (9) shows that if the intended antecedent is not a subject, the use of ma- is ruled out and ba- must be used, as in example (10).

(9) mow ma-phane-1 ba?o:1-ye 3sa-AG Reflex. poss-daught-PT call-PAST
'He called his daughter'

(10) *mow-3pl ma-phane ba?o:1-ye 3sa-DAT Reflex. poss-daught. AG call-PAST
"His daughter called him"
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(11) mow-əl bə- phənə bəʔoːl-yə
3sm-PT 3poss-daught.-AG call-past
'(his, her, their) daughter called him.'
J/ K

If the speaker uses the ba- form in a context like (9),
where the bound anaphor must be used if coreference is
intended, it obligatorily carries the reading of
disjoint reference, as we can see in (12):

(12) mow bə- phənə -l bəʔoːl-yə
3sm-AG 3poss-daught.-PT call-past
J P=J
'He called (someone else's) daughter'
J K

Example (13) shows that the anaphoric prefix, ma-,
can be sanctioned by a WH-phrase which has been moved
to the left-most position in the sentence, just in case
that WH-phrase is a subject.

(13) ciba tə ma- t'i -l səp'ən-do
who-AG QprT REFLposs-sib-PT kiss-evid
'Who was kissing their own younger sibling?'

If the question word is not a subject, as in (15), it
cannot sanction the use of the ma- prefix, even though
it is presumably in the same structural position as the
WH-subject.

(14) ciba-l tə ba- t'i səp'ən-do
who-PT QprT 3poss-sib.-AG kiss evid.
'Who was being kissed by their own younger sibling?'

This subject antecedent can be in the same clause as
the anaphor, as shown above, or it can be in a clause
dominating the clause which contains the anaphor.
Example (15) shows the antecedent controlling into a
complement clause. Example (16) demonstrates the same
thing with an adjunct.

(15) phowo mow-əl bayiʔ -muʔu
Spl-AG 3sm-PT promise-pl.act
J K

[ [ ma-phənə -o mow-əl k'əiʔ -khe - hin ]
REFLposs-daught.-AG 3sm-PT leave-fut-COMP
J/*K K
'They promised him that their daughter would leave him.'
J K J/*K
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(16) man ŋa-kaneːn-ka
3sf-AG fish-bite-cause.

{ [ma-phane ʈiti kɔtɔm deʔ-da ]
REFLpess-daught 3REFL-PT swim take-advCOMP

'When her daughter took her swimming, she fished'

J  J

As we would expect, given the c-command condition, the
ma- form is not acceptable in coordinate structures.

(17) mov ma- suʔ -ul phiŋa dikā naŋ
3ass-AG REFLpess-aunt-PT basket give 3Conj.

{ "ma-

( ba-) suʔ-0 mov-al phiŋa dikā-mi
3pess-aunt-AG 3ass-PT basket give-contrastive

'He gave his aunt a basket and his aunt gave him a basket'

J  J  J/P  J

(Of course both of the independent pronouns in (17)
could refer to different individuals, but the reading
intended by the speaker was one in which all pronouns
and anaphors denoted the same individual.) If the
order of conjuncts is reversed, the judgments remain
the same.

4. Logophoricity and NCBRs

So far I have demonstrated that the ti- forms and the
ma- possessive prefix must have a subject binder that
c-commands them; in order to fully appreciate the use
of these forms, the description of these syntactic
constraints must be augmented by a description of their
semantics and pragmatics. I will argue below that the
ti- anaphors are instances of what have been called
logophoric pronouns (Clements, 1975; Hyman and Conrie,
1981; Maling, 1984) and that their syntactic and
semantic behavior is very similar to that described for
certain West African languages, and modern Icelandic.

In Clements, 1975, we are offered a description of a
set of pronominal forms found in Ewe that "distinguish reference to the individual whose speech, thoughts, or feelings are reported or reflected in a given linguistic context..." (p. 141). Like the NCBRs of Northern Pomo, these forms are morphologically distinct from reflexive and personal pronouns, and behave syntactically as third person forms.

(18) Kofi be ye-dzo
     say LOG-leave
     'Kofi said that he left'
     J  J/#K

Kofi be e-dzo
     say Pro-leave
     'Kofi said that he/she left'
     J   J (Clements, p.142)

Clements reports that the use of these forms is obligatory when coreference is intended between the subject of a verb of speech or thought (or propositional attitude in general) and an actant in the complement clause. The same is generally true in Northern Pomo:

(19) [ma-phane ti-ti ba?o:1-khe hin] mow he
     REFLpos-daught/REFL-PT call-fut COMP 3am-AG say
     'He said his daughter would call him'
     J   J

As one would expect, the choice not to use the bound anaphoric forms results in a judgement of disjoint reference:

(20) ba-phane mowal ba?o:1-khe hin mow he
     3poss-daught. 3am-PT call-fut COMP 3am-AG say
     'He said his/her/their daughter would call him'
     J   J/K

The ti- anaphors are obligatory in the complement clauses of the verbs 'know', 'surprise', 'forget', 'want', 'tell', 'say' and others (but seem to be optional within the complement of 'think'). The same sorts of predicates require the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. In both Ewe and Northern Pomo there exists the option of using direct quotation in which the logophoric forms do not appear, and instead we find use of the first person pronoun in the quoted complement, linked to the subject of the verb of speech or
thought.

There are non-complement constructions in both Ewe and Northern Pomo where the use of logophoric NCBRs does not seem to be obligatory.

(21) ḍevi-a xo tohehe be (ya/a)-a-ga-da
child-D receive punishment so that (LOG/pro)-T-P-tell lie again NEG
'The child received punishment so that he wouldn’t tell lies again’

(22) eee- ba -phane mowal phaši:l-kan mow ya:ta
excl.3poss-daughter 3sm-PT poison-advCOMP 3sm-AG vomit
'Hey! Because his daughter poisoned him, he vomited.'

(23) ma -phane ti:pi phaši:l-kan mowal ya:ta
Refl-poss-daughter NCBR-PT poison-advCOMP 3sm-PT vomit
'Because his daughter poisoned him, he vomited.'

In these constructions there is no verb of speech or thought to trigger the logophoric context. How can we describe these as representing the speech or thought of a third person? If we look closely at the interpretation of these sentences, and at other grammatical phenomena within them, we can see that the same discourse pragmatic situation obtains here: the speaker is not the center of deixis and point of view, as is usual. Instead, the speaker has given that spot to a third person, the logophoric source. The third person’s point of view and internal experience (cf Banfield, 1982) are being represented in the sentence containing logophoric pronouns, whether or not a verb of speech or thought is present. (Cf. also Lyons 1982)

First let us look at the interpretation of sentences with these anaphors and no logophoric verb. In terms of truth conditions, sentences with the logophoric pronouns and with regular pronouns are equivalent. However, they differ in the presuppositions held about the propositional content. Placing the third person in the deictic center, as source of point of view, seems to motivate a presupposition that that third person was aware of the events depicted in the sentence, and perhaps even that he would report them as they are reported in the sentence. For example, according to Clements, if (21) is uttered using a logophoric pronoun, the interpretation given is that the child "voluntarily received punishment, in the belief that it would cure him of his untruthfulness" (Clements, 1975, p.161). When the regular independent pronoun is used, the inference is that the child was punished against his will. This should not be taken to mean that the
logophoric pronoun indicates volition or control—rather it indicates a central conscious role for the third person logophoric subject, which, depending on context, may be translated into control or volition. In any case, the contents of the sentence reflect the internal experience of the individual represented by the logophoric subject.

In the Northern Pomo examples (22) and (23), we see several grammatical features attributable to the discourse modes in which the sentence is uttered. Because (22) is in the normal discourse mode of speaker-centered experience, the exclamative in (22) is attributable to the speaker, not the third person. The speaker is the source of subjective expression. An exclamative in (23) would be infelicitous. It would not be attributable to the speaker, since logophoric sentences express the subjective experience of third persons. It might be attributable to the third person subject if the sentence were a direct quotation, but the logophoric mode is distinct from direct quotation.

In (23), we see an example of a case-marking pattern which expresses subjective internal experience. In Northern Pomo, there is an alternation between the use of 'Agent' and 'Patient' case marking when the subject of a certain class of verbs is a first person. The verbs by and large are of the type that has been called unaccusative (Perlmutter, 1978) and use of the PT case can indicate a variety of things about the speaker—that she has no control over the event, that the predicate expresses a heightened internal experience, etc. In their semantics and in their limitation to first person subject, these verbs are like the sensation predicates described by Kuroda (1973) for Japanese. He argued that the epistemologically privileged status of first person with respect to subjective experience motivated the limitation of the 'expressive' adjectival form of these predicates to first person. However, there is one instance in which the sensation adjectives can be used with third person subjects: this is in what Kuroda calls the 'non-reportive mode'. This is essentially the same as what I have been calling the logophoric mode—the usual epistemological restrictions are lifted and the speaker represents some subjective experience on the part of a third person.

In (23), we see that the subject of the main clause is in the PT case. The verb 'vomit' is a member of the class of verbs that allows this alternation in the first person. Here, its use for third person reflects
the fact that the speaker is expressing subjective experience on the part of the third person.

It is interesting to consider the relationship of this discourse pragmatic mode with that of ordinary 'reportive' speech. In Northern Pomo there is a fairly large set of evidential suffixes. In ordinary discourse we can see these as indicating something about the relationship of the speaker to the hearer. The speaker is reporting on an event while providing the source of evidence for the report. In the logophoric mode, such evidence is not relevant. The speaker is going beyond the bounds of regular discourse and is allowing herself the liberty of representing the subjective experience of someone else. In the example below we see that the logophoric pronouns are disfavored in sentences with an evidential. The mismatch in discourse pragmatic mode of the two elements can explain this, whereas no syntactic or semantic explanation suggests itself.

(24) * ti-yi xale-yo: čiś-da aad'y-man khebe:di-nhe
   Refl-AG tree-beneath sit-COMP 3sf-AG sing -EVID.
   *? 'I heard her singing as she sat beneath the tree.'

Notes

*I gratefully acknowledge the support of the Phillips fund of the American Philosophical Society, and of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages at U.C. Berkeley. I would like to express thanks, once again, to Mrs. Edna Guerrero, my Northern Pomo consultant and teacher, for her patience, and generosity in sharing with me her knowledge of the Northern Pomo language and her insights into it.

[1] Transcriptions of Northern Pomo data in this paper should be considered essentially orthographic. In sentences, accent marks indicate stress as produced in those particular sentences.

[2] A node A c-commands a node B if the first branching node dominating A dominates B.

[3] Subject control is the term I choose to describe the constraint on anaphor-antecedent relations. I will not consider in this paper whether a semantic notion of 'Agent' or a morphological category (e.g. 'AG' case-marking) would do as well or better. I will also
not consider whether there is some way to reduce the subject constraint to a further constraint on configurational relations between antecedent and anaphor.

[4] Northern Pomo is a verb-final language, with free order of subjects, objects and oblique arguments. Adjuncts generally appear to the left of the main verb and its core arguments, although occasionally some adjuncts appear to be extraposed to the right. Throughout this paper, readers should assume that linear order of arguments has been investigated and found to be irrelevant to questions of antecedency.
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