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1 The problems*

The assumption that a category pronoun, with cross-linguistically homogeneous features exists does not explain the very significant differences in the properties of pronouns across languages. The first problem is that the pronominal subjects of embedded clauses have different binding properties. Consider complements of verbs of saying. In English (1), the pronoun *she* is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause.

(1) because *Sall 'said sh'd 'like a "!!Guinness you s/ee# (LL corpus)*

* I would like to thank Aaron Broadwell for comments and constructive criticism of the previous version of this paper. Work on this paper was supported by an NSF grant Grammars of Gidar, Mina, Lele, and East Donga. Data on Lele were gathered as part of an NEH supported work on Complex Sentence in Chadic.

1 Whenever possible the data for analyses are drawn from corpora of natural discourse. In case of less familiar languages, elicited sentences are sometimes used in order to facilitate the understanding of the phenomena involved.

In certain cases, corpus data may contradict the *elicited* judgments of speakers. In such cases the corpus data are taken to represent the usage. The study of why the elicited judgment of speakers differs from their usage is beyond the scope of the present paper. What the speakers say they do with respect to language is quite often different from what they actually do. Such contradictions are of course not limited to language alone.

The quoted material is given in the transcription used in the source. The material quoted later from Nitsch (1961) is given in slightly modified transcription.
In Polish the situation is quite different. The pronoun \textit{wuni} ‘3MPL’ in the embedded clause of (2) encodes switch reference with respect to the subject of the matrix clause.

(2)  
\begin{verbatim}
A: CONJ 3PL say:PAST:3PL COMP 3PL have:PRES:3PL
dosydyż żywności kedy xlebam stśyłaju
enough food when bread:INSTR shoot:PRES:3PL
\end{verbatim}

‘And they\textsubscript{1} said that they\textsubscript{2} have enough food if they\textsubscript{2} use bread for shooting.’ (Nitsch 1960:245)

In Mupun in example (3) the pronominal subjects of the embedded clauses can only be coreferential:

(3)  
\begin{verbatim}
wu/wa/mo sat na d'i/d'e/d'u d'ee n-jos
he/she/they say COMP stop he/she/they stay PREP-Jos
‘He\textsubscript{1}/She\textsubscript{1}/They\textsubscript{1} said that he\textsubscript{2}/she\textsubscript{2}/they\textsubscript{2} stopped over in Jos.’
\end{verbatim}

(Mupun, Frajzyngier 1993:108)

In Mupun in example (4) the pronominal subjects of the embedded clause can only be switch reference:

(4)  
\begin{verbatim}
wu/wa/mo sat na wu/wa/mo wu d'ee n-jos
he/she/they say COMP he/she/they stop stay PREP-Jos
‘He\textsubscript{1}/She\textsubscript{1}/They\textsubscript{1} said that he\textsubscript{2}/she\textsubscript{2}/they\textsubscript{2} stopped over in Jos.’
\end{verbatim}

(Frajzyngier 1993:108)

The morpheme \textit{she} in the embedded clause of (1) is considered a pronoun. Sentences (2) through (4) have exactly the same structure, hence there is no syntactic reason to consider the forms occurring there to be anything but pronouns as well. All of these pronouns, and also those that occupy the position of the subject of the matrix clause, share the property of coding person, gender, and number, but they vary in their binding properties. Thus instead of postulating a homogeneous grammatical category ‘pronoun’, it is necessary to differentiate among several categories of pronouns.
The traditional approach to pronouns cannot explain the differences in the interpretation of sentences (5) and (6):

(5) yâ-dû nâ bô-yâ-dû kô-jô kô-tô
say-3F COMP break-3F hoe GEN-3F
'She1 said that she2 broke her1/2 hoe.'

(6) yâ-dû nâ dû bô yô kô jô kô-tô
say-3F COMP 3F breakhoe GEN-3F
'She1 said that she1 broke her1/2 hoe.'
(Lefe, East Chadic, Frajzyngier in progress)

The second problem is that the traditional approach to pronouns cannot explain why in the following sentence the second person masculine pronoun is used despite the fact that the language has a choice between second person masculine and second person feminine:

(7) guskiya, get kadan ka ka aak be
truly (H.) past if (H.) 2M with pregnancy CONS
ba da mo pa bal d'ik n-ka
NEG PAST 3PL PREP marry PREP-2m
'Truly, in the past if you were pregnant they wouldn't marry you.'
(Mapun, Central Chadic, Frajzyngier 1993:88)

The third problem is whether there is a connection between the binding properties of pronouns and (a) the type of constructions in which they occur and (b) other reference coding means available in the language.

2 The goal and scope

The main goal of the present paper is to reanalyze the category pronoun as commonly understood in most syntactic theories. As a result of this reanalysis several types of pronouns are proposed for a taxonomy of pronouns. The paper presents two main hypotheses and several auxiliary ones: (1) The category pronoun in cross-linguistic typology consists of different types of morphemes, varying in their binding properties and in their functions. (2) The category pronoun is just one of several means of
encoding reference in language. The various coding means are complementary in that
the functions encoded by one system are different from the functions encoded by
another system.

The analysis is limited to four types of languages: languages without a system of
coding arguments on the verb (agreement) and with only one set of pronouns, such as
English; languages without an agreement system but with several sets of pronouns,
such as Mapun; languages with one set of pronouns but with a rich agreement system
(Polish); and languages with one set of pronouns, with a split agreement system, and in
which the agreement system and some pronouns are mutually exclusive within the same
clause, such as Lelo. The core of the argumentation is an analysis of the means of
coding switch reference and coreference for third person arguments in complements of
verbs of saying and in discourse. These two syntactic environments have been chosen
because potentially they are the most opaque with respect to the reference of pronominal
participants. In order to draw generalizations, it will be necessary to examine also other
grammatical constructions.

The system of coding coreference and switch reference interacts in an interesting
way with other functions performed by reference system. In the present paper I discuss
the interaction with the coding of the de dicto domain.

The auxiliary hypotheses are as follows: (1) With respect to complements of verbs
of saying, though not necessarily other constructions, which are potentially less
opaque. I propose that if a language encodes the distinction between coreference and
switch reference through a system of pronouns, the following principle holds in
complements of verbs of saying: If a language has a pronominal form encoding
antecedent, the same form in the same syntactic position is deployed to code switch
reference. A different form examples (2-4) or a different syntactic position examples (5-
6) are deployed to code coreference. The importance of this hypothesis is that it
provides a partial account for two elements of the taxonomy of pronouns: pronouns
that are bound within a sentence and pronouns that are not bound within a sentence. It
also provides an explanation for difference between sentences (5) and (6). This
hypothesis contradicts the central intuition of Fiengo & May (1994) according to which
‘if an expression is repeated, it follows that the two occurrences have the same semantic
value, in the cases at hand, its reference, (Fiengo & May 1995:704).

2 Languages may encode the distinction between cross-reference and switch reference through means
other than pronouns. In Haa (Mapun) the means of encoding switch reference is through affixes to the
verb (cf. Haiman 1983, cf. also Broadwell (this volume). The present paper is not concerned with
these other mechanisms that languages may deploy.
There is a hierarchy of structures where the means of coding switch reference and coreference are deployed: first in clausal complements of verbs of saying, then in complements of cognitive verbs, and finally in conjoined sentences. Consistent with the proposed hypothesis, simple sentences in discourse may also be marked for switch reference.

The second hypothesis has to do with other coding means available in language: (2) If the verb encodes the subject of the clause (agreement), there exists a functional differentiation between the pronouns and the argument coding on the verb. Determination of which coding means carries which functions must be made for individual languages. In some languages pronouns carry pragmatic functions, one of which is switch reference (cf. (2)). The coding of the subject (and other arguments) on the verb indicates referentiality, definiteness, and possibly other functions in the general domain of pragmatics. But it is theoretically possible that the distribution of functions between the coding on the verb and pronouns is different, and that pronouns encode coreferentiality within a sentence whereas coding on the verb encodes switch reference as in (3-6). Hence in addition to the taxonomy of pronouns we must have a taxonomy of head coding, in particular, a taxonomy of argument coding on the verb. Therefore, both taxonomies are proposed in the present paper.

The following are case studies organized according to the various functions the pronouns have with respect to cross-reference and disjoint reference coding.

3 Nondifferentiated pronouns

English has only one set of pronouns. Subject coreference is indicated in many constructions through the omission of subject pronouns, e.g.:

\[ (8) \quad 4_{7,0} \text{<765 b> and his 'woman' ran away.} \]
\[ 4_{7,0} \text{<766 b> and 'had a 'child by another bloke'.} \]

The agreement system is limited to only one tense and one person. Sentential complements of verbs of saying must always have a subject; hence subject omission is not a viable means of encoding coreference. Omitting the embedded subject from the following sentence would result in an ungrammatical construction:

\[ \text{3 The fact that pronouns in such languages carry a pragmatic function was already noted by Meillet (1937). Cf. also Dk (1989).} \]
There have been some claims that pronominal subjects of an embedded clause are potentially ambiguous and could refer to the subject of the matrix clause, the addressee of the matrix clause, or a non-participant in the conversation, and the distinction between various types of binding is coded through prosodic means. Clements (1975:147) quoting work of Cantrall (1975) and Cooper (1976) points out that stress is not a reliable indicator of coreference, but that duration may be.

My own perusal of the London-Lund corpus of spoken English shows that in all cases where the third person pronominal subject of the embedded clause shares the features gender and number with the subject of the matrix clause, coreference is the norm. Here are some of the examples drawn from that corpus:

(10) the *president said she had *g*athered *from my - - *some of my remarks over *l*unch that [@m] *wouldn’t want to *l ive - - in the *c*ollege#

In most cases the pronominal subject of the embedded clause is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause if they agree in gender and number, e.g.:

(11) 1.4.0<1094 B> but *"half of them had read it#
1.4.0<1095 B> and the *others *said they *wanted *me to *talk *about it#
(12) 1.4.0<1112 B> *((yeah)) at the *"last *"faculty of *arts *meeting#
1.4.0<1113 B> they *said they’d *ask the *provost#
(13) 1.5.0<919 A> *and my parents were *so fed *up with me#
1.5.0<920 A> that they said *"they were *fed up of *supervising *you#
(14) 1.6.0<725 B> *i *didn’t *see him ((enough#))
1.6.0<726 B> but *Gloria said she saw . was *talking to *him#
(15) 1.6.0<1136 B> *said to *me *once#.
1.6.0<1137 B> that he *"felt#
1.6.0<1138 B> that *"if *"Doc . Middleton#.
1.6.0<1139 B> *"was) *"coming *"down the *stairs#
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16 1.8.0 <373 A> ^well^ ^well^ *hés just Bef [ ^skirtin board^ ]
 - when he ^finished|^ #
1.8.0 <374 A> he ^said he ^couldnt ^do an ^other ^five ^hours -
 - which is ^all it ^n/need|^ # -
1.9.0 <952 A> (laughs - ) ^they ^said they ^werent ^[ ^sure^ ] of
18 6.8.0 <117 B> +yes+ well ((the girl)) said that she was very
 - worried about his *(several sylls)* ^ the ^find ^spot# .
19 well ^Nightingale^ ^said that he ^might want to/
 - get a way from . Lower Netherhall you ^see
20 5.8.0 <570 b> and [@m] - she ^just said ^well she just .
 - ^didn't ^think she could ^make it on ^friday ^night#
21 6.8.0 <107 B> they said that this they do [*] ^anyway they have a
 - lot of time together and they always have all their /
 - meals together - and they talk about all sorts of ^things -
22 8.4.9 <586 A> and ^they ^said they'd ^written it ^down ^but#
23 9.2.2 <173 A> ^does he (kn/ow) ^Doctor Slowerbarn^ -
 - 9.2.2 <174 B> ^[ ^f @ ^w ^y] ^yes#
 - 9.2.2 <175 B> ^he ^said he ^did#

The third person embedded clause subject pronoun that shares the features gender
and number with the matrix clause subject encodes switch reference only if it is in direct
speech, which may be signaled by a number of prosodic or syntactic devices. Here is
an example:

24 4.7.0 <541 a> so the ^man said ^well# .
 - 4.7.0 <542 a> he was ^digging ^up ^my ^noses#

A perusal of the Brown corpus of written English indicates virtually the same
property. The third person pronoun of the embedded clause is coreferential with the
subject of the matrix clause if they agree in gender and number, e.g.:

25 The jury said it did find that many of Georgia's registration . .
26 The jurors said they realize 'a proportionate distribution
of these funds might disable this program in our less populous counties'.
27 Ratcliff said he expects to tell home folks in Dallas why he thinks
Berry's proposed constitutional amendment should be rejected.
Based on this sample only, one could say that the pronoun subject of the main clause always has a specific reference. In the whole LL corpus, there are very few examples where the accented

\[10^\circ 0^\circ > 75^\circ C \text{ and } \text{pred} \text{ the \;family \;in \;the \;land}\]

"Playtime break."

\[10^\circ 0^\circ > 75^\circ C \text{ and } \text{pred} \text{ the \;family \;in \;the \;land}\]

and the main clause proceeds to a question

"One is where the pronoun of the embedded clause encodes the topic of the prepositional phrase. The main subject of the embedded clause must be understood as disjunct reference."

In the whole LL corpus, there are very few examples where the accented

\[6^\circ 7^\circ > 67^\circ 8^\circ \text{ (remember Blackjack had said that French fries made}

\[\text{Ooh! well, you know it would be a good thing if I would be a good thing and some-}

\[\text{I mean, this, it was something... and somehow}

\[\text{couple of days... will be black... in no way...}

\[\text{and the stuff he \;preached \;to \;me} \text{ was \;away \;for \;a}

\[\text{he didn't \;find \;me} \text{ his \;communication.}]"
PRONOUNS AND AGREEMENT

(32) As an archer he was without equal. My grandfather said he could hit a moving buck at 150 yards, adding that he would not have liked to expose any part of himself in battle to a Bushman archer under 150 yard’s range. But he not only hunted with bow and arrow.
(van der Post 1986:10)

The conclusion for English is that there is no differentiation in the pronominal system or in the coding on the verb for encoding the distinction between switch reference and coreference. The absence of differentiation in the pronominal system and the absence of other means of coding reference explains the very frequent usage of direct speech to assure proper interpretation in conversational English, as represented by the LL corpus.

4 Logophoric pronouns: the sentence as a binding domain

The following terms are necessary for understanding the argumentation: A pronominal antecedent is a pronoun that occurs in the matrix clause in a complex sentence or in a preceding clause in discourse. A logophoric pronoun is a pronoun that is bound by an argument of the matrix verb of saying (this formulation is more restrictive than the one found in Hagege 1974). This argument may be the subject or the addressee of the matrix clause; hence a clause may contain a logophoric subject or a logophoric addressee (Frajzyngier 1985, 1989).

In many languages from different families the logophoric pronouns have a different form from that of the matrix pronouns. The pronouns identical with the matrix pronouns are used to encode switch reference. Compare the following data from Ubangi languages spoken in the Central African Republic (data from Cloarec-Heiss 1969:61ff) with terminology as presently understood:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Matrix pronoun</th>
<th>Logophoric</th>
<th>Switch reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banda</td>
<td>áé</td>
<td>ᵰné</td>
<td>øé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngbaka</td>
<td>xé</td>
<td>xf</td>
<td>xé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbandili</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>xa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Ewe (Kwa branch, Niger-Congo) the antecedent third person pronoun is e. The
logophoric pronoun is ye (Clements 1975:142).

In Igbo (Niger-Congo) the antecedent third person is o5 and the logophoric is ye.
In Gokana (Cross-River, Benue-Congo, Niger-Congo) the antecedent is a preceding
the verb, and the logophoric marker is E suffixed to the verb (Hyman & Comrie

Mupun (West Chadic), an SVO language, does not have a system of argument
coding on the verb. In Mupun there exist two series of logophoric pronouns, one
bound by the subject of the matrix clause and the other by the addressee of the matrix
clause. Both types of logophoric pronouns have different forms from that of
antecedents. If the complement clause pronouns are identical with the antecedent, they
are not bound by the antecedent. The following table gives the form of logophoric and
switch reference pronouns in Mupun:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Log.</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Log.</th>
<th>Switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>addressee</td>
<td>addressee</td>
<td>reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>wù</td>
<td>d'ì</td>
<td>wùr</td>
<td>gwàr</td>
<td>wù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>wà</td>
<td>d'è</td>
<td>wàr</td>
<td>pàà</td>
<td>wà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>mò</td>
<td>d'ù</td>
<td>mò</td>
<td>nùwà</td>
<td>mò</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples (tones unmarked):

(33)  \texttt{wu/wa/mo sat na ta d'ù/dé/dù d'è n-jos}
\texttt{he/she/they say COMP stop he/she/they stay PREP-Jos}
\texttt{'He/She/They\_1 said that he/she/they\_1 stopped over in Jos.'}

(34)  \texttt{wu/wa/mo sat na wù/wù/mù ta d'è n-jos}
\texttt{he/she/they say COMP he/she/they stop stay PREP-Jos}
\texttt{'He/She/They\_1 said that he/she/they\_2 stopped over in Jos.'}
(Frajzyngier 1993:108)

Examples of coding logophoric and switch reference addressees:
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(35) n-sat n-wur no gwar ji
1SG-say PREP-3SG COMP 3SG come
'I told him that he should come.'

(36) n-sat n-wur no wur ji
1SG-say PREP-3SG COMP 3SG come
'I told him that he should come.' (Frajzyngier 1993:112)

The two sets of pronouns in Mupun are deployed mainly in complements of verbs of saying. In other environments, including complements of other verbs, only the pronouns from the antecedent set are used and consequently the grammatical system allows for ambiguous interpretation. The ambiguity must be resolved by the context, as in the following sentences:

(37) amma kat ba me mat ta tok kō mo kas
but (H.) when NEG QUANT woman fall greet CONJ 3PL NEG
dūŋ no see jaar ḅe no n-dam ter a ḅil
then 3PL depart just CONS 3PL FUT-go spend the night PREP bush
'But if there is no woman who comes across and greets them they will just
go and spend the night in the bush.' (Frajzyngier 1993:509)

(38) kat wur naa nga də ba wur ḅai kas
when 3M see man REL NEG 3M strong NEG
ṭe wur dam pe mana kə wur put ḅi
CONS 3M go place ANAPH COMP 3M leave COMP
'When it [the leopard] sees a man who is not strong then it goes in that
direction so that it can get out.' (Frajzyngier 1993:511)

The facts presented by languages with logophoric pronouns indicate that two types of pronouns exist, one bound within a sentence and the other not and that the antecedent is bound within the discourse.

5 Switch reference pronouns and the function of agreement

Polish has subject pronouns differentiated for three persons and three genders in the singular and three persons and two genders in the plural. The past tense of the verb
differentiates among three persons and three genders in the singular and three persons and two genders in the plural. The present and the future forms encode person and number but not gender. Because there is such a rich system of coding on the verb, subject pronouns can be deployed for other functions. I propose that one of these functions is switch reference. Here is an illustration and the evidence for the hypothesis.

The following sentence has a subject pronoun before the embedded clause verb in the future tense. If the pronoun were omitted, the subject of the embedded clause would be identical with the subject of the matrix clause:

(39) Očeć móvi, ze ič vé,
father say:3SG:PRES COMP NEG know:3SG:PRES
cy uona přystačé.
whether 3F agree:3SG:FUT
'The father] says that he[ does not know whether she will agree.'
(Nitsch 1960:138)

In the following sentence, the third person subject in the apodosis clause is marked by the third person plural pronoun wuni. The context clearly indicates that this pronoun encodes a subject different from the third person plural subject of the protasis clause:

(40) To bylo tutaj jak Šfudy vojovali,
it was here when Swede:PL fight:3PL:PAST
to wuni tam šańec wusypali
DEM 3PL there rampart pour:PAST:3PL:M
'It was here, when Swedes (1) were fighting, they (2) built a rampart over there.'

In the following sentence, all clauses except the last one have the same subject. The nominal subject is present in the first clause but is coded on the verb in the remaining clauses, except for the relative clause, where the subject is different and is marked by the noun Šfudy 'Swedes':
The above sentence is followed in the text by the following sentences whose third person subject is the pronoun wuni. The use of this pronoun is motivated by the fact that there is again a change of subject from the preceding sentence. The embedded clause also has the third person plural wuni because again there is a change of subject. In the third clause there is no pronoun because the subject is coreferential with the subject of the preceding clause:

(42) A wuni muvjili, že wuni maju
A.CONJ 3PL say:FAST:3PL COMP 3PL have:PRES:3PL
dosydž živnosti kedy xlebaš stýlajú
enough food when bread:INSTR shoot:PRES:3PL
‘And they1 said that they2 have enough food if they2 use bread for
shooting.’ (Nitsch 1960:245)

In the following fragment, the first sentence has third person plural subject. In the second sentence there is a switch of subject to third person masculine singular, and accordingly this is done with the third person pronoun:

---

4 Demonstratives (DEM) in this and other non-literary texts mark previous mention in discourse, the function similar to that of the English definite marker.
(43) Se drudzy napili ji zaro posnyli.
COMP nothing about nothing NEG know:PAST:PL:M
'Those others drank, and soon fell asleep, not knowing anything around them.'

(44) A wun cisnaw te košycysko, ...
A:CONJ 3M throw:PAST:3M DEM basket
'And he threw away that basket ...' (Nitsch 1960:242)

Consider now a fragment of text consisting of two sentences. The first sentence has three clauses, each with different subject. The subject of the first clauses is coded only on the verb, and it is coreferential with a preceding subject. The second clause has the subject batog 'whip'. The third clause has the subject xtož 'somebody'. The second sentence has the subject identical with the subject of the first clause. But since there was another subject in between, the subject of the third clause is marked by the pronoun on: '3M,SG':

(45) I jak vyšoł s košča juž
CONJ when leave:PAST:3MSG from church already
batoga ni bylo, xtož ukraš.
whip:GEN NEG he:3M somebody steal:PAST:3MSG
'When he left the church, the whip was not there. Somebody stole it.'
I on zaklon.
CONJ 3M curse:PAST:3MSG
'And he cursed.' (Nitsch 1960:145)

Omission of on in the above sentence would result in an interpretation whereby the person who stole the whip was also the person who cursed. The interpretation resulting from the omission of the pronoun is the evidence for the switch reference function of the pronoun.

A perusal of spoken texts in Nitsch (1960) shows that every usage of third person pronouns on '3MSG', one '3FPL' and one '3MPL' before a verb is a case of subject switch reference. The same switch reference function of pronouns can be observed in contemporary literary Polish:
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(46) tak zrobiłby każdy z nas, ale to jest
so do:3M:HYP each PREP:1PL but this is
za proste. On wolał stanąć do raportu.
too simple. 3SG:M prefer:PAST:3SG:M stand:INF to report
‘Each of us would have behaved like that. But that is too simple. He
preferred to report for reprimand’ (Sources)

(47) kiedy ja stąd wyjadę, on będzie miał ...
when 1SG from:here leave:FUT:1SG 3SGM FUT:3SG have:3SG:M
‘When I leave, he will have .’ (Sources)

(48) Wy mówcie, a on będzie słuchał
2PL speak CONJ 3MSG FUT:3SG listen:3SG:M
‘you speak, and he will listen’ (Szpoński, Poemat o Szymaiku)

The third person pronoun does not necessarily encode switch reference with respect to the subject of the preceding clause. It may encode switch reference with respect to the potential antecedent. Thus the pronoun may be used to disambiguate between the third person masculine and the third person feminine antecedent, as in the following example:

---

5 Literary Polish examples are taken from samples used in preparation of Kurcz et al. (1990), *Słownik frekwencyjny polskiego współczesnym*. The electronic media through which I had access to the material, courtesy of Zygmunt Saloni, do not allow identification of the source of every sample. These examples are later identified as Sources. I had access to Szpoński’s poem also through the electronic media, hence no publisher or page references are indicated. Because of understandable space limitations the number of examples is kept to a bare minimum.
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(49) odkąd jednak kierownik skupu Bolek Domagała since however manager acquisition:GEN B. D.
został oficjalnym narzeczonym Stasi Rosłoń poczuł become:3M:PAST formal fiancé S. R.-GEN feel:PAST:3MSG się tak pewnie, że jawnie przewielał się się REFL so sure COMP overly boast:PAST:3MSG REFL
przed ludźmi, jak on to nabiera in front people:INSTR how 3M DEM cheat:PRES:3SG głupich urzędników.
stupid:PL:ACC clerk:PL:ACC

'When the manager of acquisitions B.D. became the formal fiancé of S.R., he openly boasted of how he hoodwinks stupid clerks.' (Sources)

We can now compare the English and the Polish coding systems with respect to reference in the same syntactic constructions. In Polish, argument coding on the verb indicates coreference with the preceding subject. The subject pronoun preceding the verb encodes switch reference. In spoken English the subject pronoun preceding the verb encodes coreference. Switch reference in spoken English is coded through the use of a full noun or through the deployment of direct speech. The use of pronouns in English corresponds thus to the coding on the verb in Polish rather than to the use of pronouns in Polish.

6 Split-agreement system and syntactic coding of logophoricity

Lele is an East Chadic, SVO language spoken in the Kelo district, Chad Republic. The language has an interesting split-pronominal system whereby the first and second person pronouns in matrix or independent clauses occur before the verb but the third person masculine, feminine, and plural pronouns occur after the verb. The following table illustrates pronominal marking on the verb 'go':

---

6 All data on Lele are from my own fieldnotes and work in progress. The published work on Lele (Weibeque 1992 and Weibeque & Pahver 1982) does not address the problems of the binding of pronouns.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>si INCL</td>
<td>ni-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gi-e</td>
<td>ngu</td>
<td>ngu-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me-e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>-di</td>
<td>-di</td>
<td>-gé</td>
<td>-gé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>-du</td>
<td>-du</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>ge- ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>human ge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the verb begins with a consonant, the first and second person pronouns are not prefixed to the verb but occur as separate words. The pronouns following the verb are suffixes and therefore can be considered to be a system of coding on the verb, 'agreement' in traditional terminology. The interest of Lele is first, that it provides evidence that the pronominal coding on the verb is not an agreement system in the sense of an element in the clause triggering the presence of some formal characteristics on another element, and second, it encodes logophoricity through syntactic and not morphological means.

6.1 Coding on the verb is not an agreement system

Natural discourse in Lele provides evidence that the coding on the verb is not an agreement system. The third person singular pronouns are not used in the same clause in which an overt nominal subject is used, e.g.:

(50) gilkinin è sük lìndà
Gilkinin go market yesterday
‘Gilkinin went to the market yesterday.’

In the texts gathered there is no single third person subject suffix occurring in the same clause in which there is an overt nominal subject. Attempts to insert a pronominal subject in clauses occurring in natural discourse resulted in ungrammatical constructions. In the following sentence, taken from a narrative, there is no third person subject pronoun:
(51) kurnabolo ne be ge kiyâ maâni tu
ing do BEN 3PL thing so all (Fr)
The king made things so for them.’ (i.e. as they asked)

(52) kurnabolo né-dî be ge kâya maâni tu
king do-3M BEN 3PL thing so all (Fr)
The king made things so for them.’ (i.e. as they asked)

Even when an elicited sentence was situated within a natural discourse, it was not acceptable with a nominal subject and with a subject pronoun:

(53) têrên-dî ne bê-gê kâya maâni tu
daughter-3M do BEN-3PL thing so all (Fr)
‘His daughter made things so for them.’ (i.e. as they asked)

(54) têrê-n-dî nê-dû bê-gê kâya maâni tu
daughter-3M do-3F BEN 3PL thing so all (Fr)
‘His daughter made things so for them.’ (i.e. as they asked)

So the coding on the verb of the third person singular masculine and feminine subject in Lele provides powerful evidence for the independence of this coding means. It is not triggered in any way by the nominal subject present in the clause. So the coding on the verb is not an agreement system. This poses a natural question about the function of the coding on the verb. We have already seen in Polish that the subject marking on the verb encodes coreference with the immediately preceding subject, either within the same clause or in a preceding clause. Given this fact and similar facts in other IE languages, one would expect that marking of the subject on the verb also encodes coreference. But that is not the case for third person singular subjects. The

7 In data obtained through elicitation, a clause with a nominal subject may optionally also have the third person subject suffix added to the verb, e.g.:

- gâkôma sîbân-dî roqiba
carpe domenstrate 3M horse
‘Carpe broke a horse’

- gâkôma nîsî harâ na tohlâ
Galkova go-3F market decab yesterday
‘Galkova went to the market yesterday.’

These two sentences are examples of elicited data being different from the ones found in a corpus.
third person plural suffix on the verb may, however, co-occur with the third person nominal subject. This fact will be explained later in this paper.

6.2 Logophoricity in Lele

Complements of verbs of saying in Lele provide the evidence that the third person singular pronoun when coded on the verb cannot be bound within a sentence. That is most clearly evident when the subjects of the matrix and the embedded clause are different, e.g.:

(55) ọ-yàa ná bọy-dú kójọ kọ-tó
    1SG-say COMP break-3F hoe GEN-3F
    'I said that she broke her hoe.'
(56) ọ-yàa ná bọy-dí kójọ kà-i
    1SG-say COMP break -3M hoe GEN-3M
    'I said that he broke his hoe.'

When the subject pronouns of the complement of the verb of saying follow the verb, i.e., when they have the same syntactic position as pronominal antecedents, they encode switch reference as in (5). If the pronominal subjects of the complement clause precede the verb, they encode coreference as in (6). Thus the coding in Lele supports the hypothesis that different means are deployed to code coreference and the same means are deployed to code switch reference. In addition to examples (5-6), which were elicited, compare the following examples, taken from natural discourse:

(57) tɔrmʊq ná dú ìdè ná bà-tó dè
    girl-DEF COMP 3F go CONJ father-3F NEG
    sè kàl è-gè ná kàmdà sùbù
    got up pass go-3PL CONJ wives three
    'The girl said that she would not go with her father, she passed [from her father to the man] and he went with three wives.'
    (lit. 'they went with three wives'.)

8 In Lele, as in many Chadic languages (cf. Haiman 1996) the verb of saying is most often omitted in natural discourse. The complementizer or an auxiliary is the evidence that the predicate of the clause is a verb of saying.
The third person pronoun may not occur before the verb except to code logophoricity. The position before the verb results in an ungrammatical sentence if logophoricity is ruled out:

(59) *ḡ-yā̀̀ nà dū́ bóy kojó kō-tó
1SG-say COMP 3F break hoe GEN-3F
'I said that she broke her hoe.'

(60) *ḡ-yā̀̀ nà dī bóy kojó kē-i
1SG-say COMP 3M break hoe GEN-3M
'I said that he broke his hoe.'

The third person masculine logophoric pronoun is i rather than di and like the third feminine it precedes the verb, it is clitified to the preceding complementizer, e.g.:

(61) dā̀ le gṑl kāmā̀̀̀̀ sū̀̀̀ tu né̀ go láȳ wà̀
3M also see wives-3M three all COP REL beautiful very
nà-i bḕ-i tāmā̀ mànf pīnā̀ dḕ
COMP-3M give,FUT-3M(DAT) wife ANAPH one NEGI
'He himself saw that all his three wives were very beautiful, and said that he would not give one of them to him.'

7 Reference system in the de dicto domain

The purpose of the present section is to demonstrate (1) that there exists a connection between logophoricity and hypothetical mood and (2) that languages make a systematic distinction between de re and dicto addressees (cf. Frajzyngier 1991). Taken together the two hypotheses indicate that one must also take into consideration, whether the
reference is in the domain de re or domain de dicto, as well as the syntactic and discourse domains of binding. The evidence for (1) is provided by the fact that in languages in which there exists a formal distinction between logophoric and nonlogophoric coding, the means deployed for logophoric reference are also deployed for the coding of hypothetical. The explanation for this fact is that if a reference is logophoric, it is to an entity that exists in the domain of discourse, not necessarily in the domain of reality. The hypothetical modality is never in the domain of reality. I illustrate the connection between the means of encoding logophoricity and hypothetical coding in two languages in which the means are formally different: Mupun and Lele.

7.1 Logophoricity and the hypothetical in Mupun

Although most of the logophoric pronouns in Mupun occur in the embedded clause when the main clause has a verb of saying, there are examples of sentences in which the main verb is not a verb of saying but that have logophoric pronouns in the embedded clause:

(62) kat puun la reep na mo cin ko d’un mbo sin
    when parent girl DEF 3PL do as 3PL.L Fut give
    la reep na n-kenken kas
girl DEF PREP-very fast NEG
    'If the parents of the girl act as if they will not give away the girl fast...'

(63) kat la reep beer am kaa la mis be la mis na man no
    if girl pour water on boy CONS boy DEF know COMP
    paa po dem d’in mana
    3PL.PREP like 3M.L then
    'If a girl pours water on the young man, then he knows that she loves him.'
    (Frajzyngier 1993:117)

In the two examples above, and in other similar ones, the main clause represents a hypothetical event. And the hypothetical event is treated as an event that belongs to the domain de dicto rather than de re; hence the participants are referred to through logophoric pronouns.
7.2 Logophoricity and the hypothetical in Lele

Coding of the third person plural subject on the verb through suffixation in Lele indicates a known, referential subject, e.g.:

(64) han è-gé dàwù-gè ná kàmdà sò
    when go-3PL gather-3PL CONJ women two
    'When they went it was a group with two wives.'

Third person plural is coded by the suffix ge. In the second verb in the sentence the subject marker is omitted, e.g.:

(65) déenà n'oju-tó kínyé sè òm'ge tó go bál
    then relative-3F DEM-PL INCEPT catch-3PL goat REL castrated
    nè òb ná kàrà
    HABIT ask ASSOC people
    'Then, her relatives caught a large castrated goat and challenged the people.'

(66) dà-túgu tòn ní kàrà kòndè kòs-gè sòóbù
    LOC village certain LOC people young men body-3PL three
    'In a village there were three young men.'

(67) yà-gè nà
    say-3PL COMP
    'They said thus:'

(68) è-gé cásànà banyà-dà-g kàlò sè yìrì
    go-3PL bush man-DEF snake got up bite-3M
    'When they went into the bush, a snake bit him.' (the man)

The presence of the two types of configuration in Lele allows the encoding of the indefinite human subject (Frażyngier 1982), equivalent of English they, French on, German man, and Spanish third person plural coding on the verb. The coding of the hypothetical is achieved through the position of the third person plural pronoun ge before the verb, e.g.
Pronouns and Agreement

(69) dài lū-ŋ hà nà ge bë-ŋ kürmbâlô tamâ-1
3M DEM CONTR COMP INDEF give-3M chief wife-3M
hà na-1 wel ni ñdô hà kür na wel
CONJ COMP-3M sleep CONJ 3F till place COMP day
na ge digr-1 nà kolo tâmadà-1 nà dårinì mì fô
COMP INDEF kill-3M CONJ reason death-3M CONJ anger-3M NEG
'The first one said that if he is given the chief's wife to sleep with till the
daybreak, then he can be killed, because death does not worry him.'

(70) gë yà bë kürmbâlô
INDEF tell BEN chief
'The chief was informed.'

(71) gë digrì-gë sò
INDEF kill-3PL two
'Two were killed.'

(72) dài gô sùbû ge digrë-1 è wel ni kürmbâlô tamâ-1
3M REL three INDEF kill:FUT-3M go sleep CONJ chief wife-3M
'The third one, who was going to be killed, went to sleep with the chief's
wife.'

The logophoric reference and the hypothetical are both elements of the de dicto
domain (Franzyngier 1991). Compared to the domain of reality, the de dicto domain has
often fewer semantic distinctions. Thus if a language has a gender distinction in the
domain of reality it might not have a gender distinction in the domain de dicto. This is
the case in Polish and Lele, and it explains why in example (7) in Mupun, where
instead of the biologically expected second person feminine, the narrator (who was a
woman) used the second person masculine.

8 Implications

The proposed analyses reveal that the category pronoun has different binding
properties across languages. These properties are in a complementary relationship with
other coding means available in the language. The proposed analyses call for a
taxonomy of pronouns based on their binding domains. Along with a taxonomy of
pronouns we must have a taxonomy of other means of coding reference in the
language. Case studies in the present paper suggest a taxonomy that contains the
following elements: pronouns that are bound within a sentence but not within a clause (logophoric pronouns); switch reference pronouns, which are bound by an antecedent in discourse but not by the immediately preceding antecedent (spoken, nonliterary Polish); and pronouns that may be bound either within the same sentence or by an immediately preceding antecedent in discourse (English).

Another major implication of the analyses is that what is commonly called 'agreement' is a coding means with a number of functions. One of these functions is the coding of coreference with the immediately preceding subject. But there are also split 'agreement' systems, in which some pronouns encode coreference and others encode switch reference.

In order to fully understand the binding of pronouns or lack thereof, one must take into consideration the semantic modalities encoded in the grammatical structure of the language. In the present paper only two modalities have been discussed, the de dicto and de re modality. But it is conceivable that some languages may have other distinctions.
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List of abbreviations

ANAPH  Anaphor
COMP   Complementizer (morpheme)
A.CONJ  Counterexpectation conjunction
CONS   Consecutive
CONTR  Contrastive focus marker
FUT    Future
GEN    Genitive
H.     Hausa
INDEF  Indefinite human subject
INSTR  Instrumental
LLC    London-Lund (corpus)
LOG    Logophoric
NEG    Negative
PAST   Past tense
PL     Plural
PREP   Preposition
PRES   Present