Tatiana Nikitina* and Anna Bugaeva

Logophoric speech is not indirect: towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions

https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2021-0067
Received February 13, 2019; accepted April 8, 2020; published online April 21, 2021

Abstract: The distinction between direct and indirect speech has long been known not to reflect the crosslinguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies. Yet prominent typological approaches remain firmly grounded in that traditional distinction and look to place language-specific strategies on a universal *continuum*, treating them as deviations from the "direct" and "indirect" *ideals*. We argue that despite their methodological attractiveness, continuum approaches do not provide a solid basis for crosslinguistic comparison. We aim to present an alternative by exploring the syntax of *logophoric* speech, which has been commonly treated in the literature as representative of "semi-direct" discourse. Based on data from two unrelated languages, Wan (Mande) and Ainu (isolate), we show that certain varieties of logophoric speech share a number of syntactic properties with direct speech, and none with indirect speech. Many of the properties of indirect speech that are traditionally described in terms of *perspective* follow from its syntactically subordinate status. Constructions involving direct and logophoric speech, on the other hand, belong to a separate, universal type of structure. Our findings suggest that the alleged direct/indirect continuum conflates two independent aspects of speech reporting: the syntactic configuration in which the report is integrated, and language-specific meaning of indexical elements.

Keywords: Ainu; logophoricity; Mande; pronominal deixis; reported speech

***Corresponding author: Tatiana Nikitina**, CNRS-LLACAN & INALCO, LLACAN, UMR 8135 du CNRS, 7, rue Guy Môquet - BP 8, Villejuif, 94801, France, E-mail: tatiana.nikitina@cnrs.fr
Anna Bugaeva, Institute of Arts and Sciences, Kagurazaka Division, Tokyo University of Science, Tokyo, Japan, E-mail: bugaeva@rs.tus.ac.jp

1 Introduction: perspective-based approaches to reported speech

The distinction between direct and indirect speech has long been known not to capture the crosslinguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies (Aikhenvald 2008; Coulmas 1986; inter alia). While recognizing the limitations of that distinction, prominent typological approaches to speech reporting have nevertheless remained firmly grounded in the same traditional dichotomy. A number of continuum-based approaches, in particular, position themselves as capable of describing non-European speech reporting strategies, yet rely on the same Eurocentric distinction, and treat strategies that do not fit well into the European models as *deviations* from the *ideals* of direct and indirect speech. The following quotes illustrate the assumptions of prominent continuum-based approaches as formulated by different authors within the last dozen years:

> To account for such *intermediate* cases, we suggest that the difference between speech reports, from verbatim quote to indirect speech, be considered as a *continuum*. (Aikhenvald 2008: 416 [emphasis ours])

> In keeping with Roncador (1988), De Roeck (1994) and others, I will conceive of RD [Reported Discourse]-categories as constituting a crosslinguistic domain with a *scalar organization* between two *idealized polar opposites*, DRD [Direct Reported Discourse] and "maximal" IRD [Indirect Reported Discourse]. (Güldemann 2008: 9 [emphasis ours])

> The typology of quoted speech has long been a disorderly and unsatisfying area because of the huge number of ways that languages can *deviate* from the *traditional ideals* of 'direct' and 'indirect' speech. (Evans 2013: 67 [emphasis ours])

The mere popularity of the idea of mapping the crosslinguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies onto a scale based on the European distinction testifies to its intuitive appeal. The approach has methodological merit: it prepares researchers to describe the exotic expression types they may encounter in newly documented languages. Indeed, once European-style direct and indirect speech are postulated as idealized opposites on a scale, their characteristic properties can be treated as diagnostics for placing all other imaginable speech reporting constructions on the same universal scale of (in)directness. Hence, on a first approximation, continuum approaches provide both a useful methodological tool for describing data from individual languages and a universally applicable conceptual basis for typologizing the formal means for representing reported discourse.

Yet a closer look at continuum approaches reveals a number of problematic issues. First, conceptually, continuum approaches *assume* an allegedly universal

dichotomy, without offering a method for *falsifying* this assumption. The assumption, however, has no empirical foundation. In practice, the continuum of (in)directness is organized according to an intuitive notion of *perspective*, ill-defined and shaped solely by the way the distinction is manifested in European languages. As a result, the approach presupposes that language-specific choices among different reporting strategies are based on the same principles – the principles underlying the choice between direct and indirect speech in a European language. Despite being repeatedly referred to in the literature, these principles are rarely made precise; descriptions commonly rely on notions such as degree of commitment to faithful rendition of form vs. content of the reported utterance (Coulmas 1985: 42), degree of "distancing of the proposition from the speaker" (McGregor 1994: 82), or various notions related to demonstratedness ("[d]irect discourse is 'show' as well as speech, indirect discourse is speech only", Wierzbicka 1974: 300, see also the discussion in Spronck and Nikitina 2019a: 143–144). The idea that underlying the choice between direct and indirect speech is a single parameter or a uniform set thereof has never been seriously questioned or subjected to systematic testing. Second, methodologically, approaches based on the notion of perspective focus disproportionately on describing language-specific choices of deictic elements within speech reports, and pay little to no attention to the syntactic properties of the corresponding constructions.

In this study, we argue that a systematic disregard for syntax leads to missed generalizations and sometimes results in a misunderstanding of the basic differences between speech reporting strategies. Our goal is to present an alternative to the sweeping perspective-based approach to reported speech; the alternative consists of separating the study of the functioning of indexicals from the study of the construction's syntactic properties. To illustrate the usefulness of this approach, we take a closer look at a strategy that is commonly described as "semi-indirect" and is traditionally placed in the middle of the direct-indirect continuum: the *logophoric* speech. We argue that a syntactic approach helps us describe different types of logophoric speech more accurately than the vague notion of perspective underlying continuum approaches.

2 Logophoric speech in Ainu and in Wan

For the purposes of this study, we define logophoric speech as a speech reporting strategy that involves the use of a specialized marker (usually a pronoun) to refer to the reported speaker, distinguishing it both from the current speaker and from non-

participants of the reported speech act.[1] We analyze and compare the use of logophoric speech in two languages: Wan (a Mande language spoken in Cote d'Ivoire, Nikitina 2012b), and Ainu (an isolate spoken in Northern Japan, Bugaeva 2008). Our language choice is determined by two factors. First, the logophoric speech constructions in these languages are relatively well-described, and sufficient corpus data are available to explore their use in discourse. Second, the languages are not related, and are spoken in culturally unrelated areas. Any parallels between them are therefore likely to reflect something deeper than common inheritance or a history of contact.

The languages are also very different in terms of their morphosyntax. Wan has very rigid word order (the typologically unusual SOV-X, Nikitina 2009, 2019), no pro-drop, and virtually no morphology. Ainu is agglutinative and polysynthetic; its word order is largely SOV; pro-drop is allowed, and head marking is abundant. The structural differences suggest to us that parallels in the way logophoric speech functions are unlikely to be epiphenomenal, i.e., that they are unlikely to derive in a straightforward way from similarities in basic syntactic features. While we do not claim that all types of logophoric speech in all languages pattern alike, we believe that logophoric speech in Ainu and Wan is representative of a rather common yet little discussed type of speech reporting strategy, and the fact that its properties cannot be easily accommodated by the sweeping continuum-based accounts presents a problem for widely accepted typologies of speech reporting constructions.

Both languages make use of special logophoric pronouns for marking co-reference with the reported speaker. The logophoric speech construction of Wan is representative of the characteristic African type originally described by Hagège (1974). Ainu offers a rare example of a non-African language with at least partially specialized logophoric pronouns (see Nau 2006 for examples of logophoric speech from Europe, not necessarily involving specialized pronouns).[2] Logophoric

1 This definition allows us to focus on indisputable cases that have been traditionally placed at the center of studies of the phenomenon of logophoricity, leaving aside constructions that are only recognized as involving logophoric speech by some authors, such as the use of non-specialized, third person pronouns in a logophoric function (see Nikitina 2020, inter alia, for a recent discussion).

2 Culy (1994: 1059–1060) classifies languages where logophoric speech is attested as pure and mixed logophoric languages. Pure logophoric languages make use of a *dedicated* logophoric pronoun, which only occurs in the context of reported speech, thought, etc. In mixed logophoric languages the function of logophoric markers is carried out by *multifunctional* pronouns, e.g., by pronouns that also have reflexive uses. Both in Ainu and in Wan, plural logophoric pronouns are non-specialized, i.e., they are attested in other, non-logophoric functions. Singular logophoric pronouns are specialized for the expression of logophoric meanings in Wan; in Ainu, the pronouns can be free-standing or bound, and only the free-standing singular pronoun is specialized. Hence, Wan and Ainu can be classified as pure logophoric languages, on the basis of all (in Wan) or just free-standing (in Ainu) singular pronouns.

pronouns are always independent in Wan (1a), but they can be independent or bound in Ainu (1b). They can appear in a variety of structural positions: the examples in (1a)–(1b) and (2a)–(2b) illustrate their use as subjects and objects, respectively.

(1) a. Wan

ɓé	*à*	*nɔ̀*	*gé*	***ɓā***	*ɓé*	*gòmɔ̄*
then	3SG	wife	said	LOG.SG	that.one	understood

'Then his wife$_i$ said she$_i$ had understood that.'
(Nikitina 2012b: 283)

b. Ainu

asinuma	*arpa-**an***	*kusu*	*ne*	*sekor*	*Ø-hawean*
LOG.SG	go.SG-LOG.S	intention	COP	QUOT	3.S-say.SG

'(S)he$_i$ said: I$_i$ will go.'
(Tamura 2000 [1988]: 74)

(2) a. Wan

è	*gé*	*ɓā*	*lāā*	*sí*		*é*	*lɔ̄*
3SG	said	LOG.SG	2SG.POSS	palm.tree.seed		DEF	ate
ké	lā	**ɓā**	bīō	ó	bèbè	ē	ō
CNJ	2SG	LOG.SG	beat	PRT	much	Q	PRT

'He$_i$ said: I$_i$ ate your palm tree seed, for which you beat me$_i$ so much!'

b. Ainu

kameyasi	*ene*	*Ø-**i**-otke*	*humi*	*itasasa-an*	*sekor*
monster	like.this	3.A-LOG.O-prick	NONVIS.EV	hurt-LOG.S	QUOT

Ø-hawean
3.S-say.SG
'He said: It hurts as if the monster has pricked me$_i$ like this.'
(Tamura 1984: 20)

Logophoric speech has received considerable attention in discussions of the distinction between direct and indirect speech. Logophoric pronouns have been widely used to support the continuum approach; their use interpreted as straightforward evidence for the existence of types that must be placed in intermediate positions on the scale of (in)directness. One of the reasons behind this has to do with the way logophoric pronouns combine with other pronouns within the same speech report: in many (but not all) languages where reported speakers are coded by special logophoric pronouns, reported addressees are referred to in the second person (Roncador 1988: 290–293, 1992; Stirling 1993: 256–257). This unusual, from a European perspective, mixture of "direct" and "indirect" pronouns is illustrated below: the logophoric pronoun belongs, intuitively, with indirect

speech, since it is substituted for the "direct" first person pronoun of the original utterance – but the addressee is in the second person, as in direct speech.

(3) a. Wan

ɓé	*è*	*gé*	*ɓā*	*dè*	***lāā***	*kɛ̄*	*ɓāā*	*má*
then	3SG	said	LOG.SG	father	2SG+3SG	gave	LOG.SG:INDP	to
mɔ̄ɔ̄	*ɓā*	*wò*	*yɛ̱ɛ̱?*					
PRT	LOG.SG	do	how					

'He said: My father, now that you gave it to me, how shall I act?'

b. Ainu

iwan	*pa*	*Ø-ek*	*yak,*	*a-**e**-ekanok*	*kus*
six	year	3.S-come.SG	if	LOG.A-2SG.O-meet	intention
ne	*na*	*sekor*	*Ø-hawean*		
COP	FIN	QUOT	3.S-say.SG		

'He said: I'll meet you if six years pass.'
(Bugaeva 2004: 145)

Examples of this sort have led researchers to draw parallels between logophoric and *semi-direct* speech (Aikhenvald 2008) or to characterize logophoric speech as *semi-indirect* (Thomas 1978), *combined/neutralized* (Boyeldieu 2004a), *hybrid* (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2019: 173), and *bi-perspectival* (Evans 2013). The different characterizations reflect the same intuition: logophoric speech is an intermediate type attesting to the gradient nature of the direct-indirect distinction.

In what follows, we challenge this view by exploring a number of little-studied syntactic properties of logophoric speech. By syntax we understand here the way speech reports are structurally integrated into their context, as manifested, most importantly, in their combinatorial potential, ordering restrictions, and restrictions on the use of certain syntactic types of elements within the report. We argue that in terms of their syntax, logophoric speech constructions of Ainu and Wan pattern with direct speech. They do not behave as intermediate syntactic types, suggesting that it is misleading to draw parallels, in these two languages, between logophoric and indirect speech. We propose instead to treat logophoric speech as a lexical phenomenon, in line with the proposals by Schlenker (2003a) and Nikitina (2012a, 2020).

Logophoric speech is not the only type of reported speech that has been traditionally assigned an intermediate status. Another prominent construction that is commonly treated in these terms is *discours indirect libre*, or free indirect discourse, which allows for combinations of indexicals with different reference points (Banfield 1973; Plank 1986). Since our goal is to show that logophoric speech cannot be fully understood as a type of report intermediate between direct and indirect speech, we focus here on prototypical direct and indirect speech and leave

aside free indirect discourse. In this sense we rely in our argumentation on *reductio ad impossibile*: if we assume a continuum approach and compare different speech reporting constructions of our two languages to the direct and indirect prototypes, we should expect logophoric speech to share some properties with direct, and others with indirect speech – yet as we show, both in Ainu and in Wan, logophoric speech patterns with prototypical direct speech in its syntax and does not seem to share any syntactic properties with indirect speech. We conclude that if logophoric speech, at least of the type attested in Ainu and Wan (as well as in a number of other West African languages), is to be treated as intermediate between the direct and indirect prototypes, such a treatment does not extend to the construction's syntax, or the way the speech report is incorporated structurally into its context. This still leaves us with the possibility of claiming for logophoric speech an intermediate status in terms of some other parameter, which so far has not been clearly identified, but this parameter would have to be disassociated from syntax on principled grounds (as we discuss in the Conclusion).

We follow Nikitina (2012a) in assuming that the free indirect discourse of European novel differs in fundamental ways from other types of reported speech, and does not constitute a separate type on par with direct, indirect or logophoric speech: it is strictly optional, restricted to particular genres, and flexible in assigning deictic values to different types of indexicals. In this respect, free indirect speech is merely a stylistic device that derives its effect from artful exploitation of the distinction between direct and indirect prototypes, not a syntactic type of its own. While the syntax of free indirect discourse is an important and underexplored issue, we leave it aside in this study, as nothing hinges on it in our argumentation.

3 Little-explored syntactic properties of logophoric speech

3.1 Lexical restrictions

European direct and indirect speech differ in the way they are licensed. Indirect speech can only be introduced by a restricted set of predicates. Direct speech does not impose such a restriction, and can even appear on its own, without a specific licensor (for example, in the context of a dialogue). In (4a), the direct speech construction is used to report an attitude associated with a gesture. The report is not licensed by any particular verb normally associated with direct speech; it is introduced instead by the noun *gesture*, which refers to a nonverbal way of transferring information. Crucially, in (4b), the same noun is not allowed to license

an indirect speech construction reporting on the same attitude. This suggests that the distribution of the two constructions differs: restrictions on the use of indirect reports are stricter than those on the use of direct reports.

(4) a. *Everyone noticed his "I don't care" gesture.*
b. ?? *Everyone noticed his gesture that he didn't care.*

With respect to licensing, logophoric speech behaves like direct speech in Ainu and Wan: it need not be licensed by any specific predicate.

In Ainu, indirect speech is licensed by a restricted set of verbs, which take it as its direct object ("transitivity to speech", cf. Güldemann 2008). Logophoric speech appears with a larger set of speech and cognition verbs, which are either intransitive or transitive with the addressee as their object (Bugaeva 2008). Crucially, logophoric speech – like direct speech – also appears with verbs that do not describe speech or mental events, such as verbs with a very general meaning, e.g., *an* 'exist', *ne* 'be', and *iki* 'do'. It can also be introduced by a quotative marker without any verb present, cf. (5a) and (5b).

(5) a. Ainu
a, kono Ø-sikrap-u sekor sekor Ø-iki hi
ah this(Jap.) 3.A-eyelid-POSS QUOT QUOT 3.S-do NMLZ
'moving your eyelids like this (=blinking)' (Lit., 'doing this way: Oh, these, eyelids')
(Tamura 1984: 56)

b. Ainu
mak ki a-ossike Ø-arka pekor hum-as
how do LOG.A-inside.POSS 3.S-hurt as.if sound/feeling-stand.SG
wa ne sekor
and COP QUOT
'My stomach hurts for some reason, [he replied].'
(Nakagawa et al. 2020: K7708242UP.189–90)

In Wan, instances of "canonical" indirect speech are exceedingly rare, yet they support the same generalization: they are all licensed by the verb *gé* 'say'. Direct and logophoric speech, on the other hand, appear with a very wide range of predicates, and in fact need not be introduced by any predicate associated with speech.

In (6), logophoric speech is not licensed by any transfer of information verb; instead, it directly follows the verb 'started'. It is understood from the previous context that the speaker is the hyena who discovers, at daylight, that what he killed was not the hare:

(6) Wan

élì	*kɔ́nā*	*wéɲ́*	*à*	*gè*	*ɓóŋ́glò*	*é*	*blą̀*	*é*
day	started	in.clear.light	3SG	POSS	head	DEF	watch	DEF
mɔ̄								
at.that.time								
yīí-yīí-yīí-yīí,	*ɛ̀ɛ̀ɛ̀*	***ɓāá***	***ɓāā***		*né*	*tɛ̄*	*má*	*ą̀?*
INTJ	INTJ	LOG.SG. INDP	LOG.SG:POSS		child	killed	FOC	EXCL

'When the daybreak shone upon him: Yi-yi-yi-yi! Did I kill my own child?'

In (7), logophoric speech appears in the context of a dialogue. Not only is it not introduced by any verb associated with speech – it is not introduced by anything at all. This suggests that logophoric speech need not be licensed overtly (Boyeldieu 2004b; Culy 1994; Dimmendaal 2001; Hagège 1974), and that it cannot be directly related to a specific type of subordinate clause.

(7) Wan

è	*gé*	*èè*	*sīē*	*kɛ́*	*cóò*	–
3SG	said	3SG+3SG	another	give	INTJ	
ɛ̀ɛ̀ɛ̀	*ɓé*	***ɓāá***	*wò*	*á*	*yą̄*	*ē?*
eh!	then	LOG.SG+3SG	make	FOC	how	Q

'And she said he should give back another [nut]! – Eh! But how shall I do it?'

As in Ainu, indirect speech is associated in Wan with rigid lexical restrictions, but direct and logophoric speech are much more flexible. This suggests that syntactically, indirect speech is more closely integrated with its licensor, but direct and logophoric speech stand in a relatively loose, apposition-like relation to the clause that introduces them.[3]

3.2 Ordering restrictions

In European languages, indirect speech is associated with more rigid ordering restrictions than direct speech. Consider the examples in (8a)–(8c) and (9a)–(9b). Direct speech in (8a) and (8b) can freely precede or follow the clause that describes the reported speech event, and it can even be interrupted by that clause (8c). Prototypical indirect speech, however, must follow its licensing clause (rare

3 This conclusion is further supported by the fact that in Ainu, indirect speech behaves as if it were the verb's direct object, while direct and logophoric speech are not marked as the verb's argument in any way (see Section 3.2).

instances of reordering are normally associated with emphatic intonation and focus interpretation):[4]

(8) a. *"I don't like it," – he said.*
b. *He said: "I don't like it."*
c. *"John" he said "doesn't like it."*

(9) a. *He said that he didn't like it.*
b. *??That he didn't like it, he said.*
c. * That John, he said, doesn't like it.

Logophoric speech patterns, in Wan and Ainu, with direct speech in that it allows for more ordering flexibility than indirect speech. In Ainu, word order is SOV with occasional OSV, and indirect speech functions as a direct object. In the overwhelming majority of cases, indirect speech reports appear before the verb (10a), with only a few attested examples of the OSV word order, such as that shown in (10b):

(10) a. Ainu
nea okkay-po ka ***neno*** ***Ø-wentarap*** ***yak*** *Ø-Ø-ye*
that man-DIM even same.as 3.S-have.a.dream COMP 3.A-3.O-say
'The young man$_i$ said that he$_{i/j}$ also saw the same dream.'[5]
(Nakagawa et al. 2020: K7708242UP.251)

b. Ainu
somo ***a-i-oskoni*** ***pe*** ***ne*** ***wa*** ***an***
NEG LOG.A-LOG.O-catch.up.with NMLZ COP and exist.SG
ne ***yak*** *a-ona-ha* *ye*
COP COMP LOG.A-father-POSS say
'Father said that no one can overtake him.'
(Nakagawa et al. 2020: K7708241UP.041)

Logophoric speech, on the other hand, is not associated with any ordering restrictions: in (11a), it appears before the clause that introduces it, and in (11b), it is inserted inside the speech-introducing clause.

4 Omission of the complementizer seems to make reordering possible: *He$_i$ didn't like it, he$_i$ said*. This is consistent with the view that the construction without a complementizer does not display the entire set of properties associated with prototypical indirect speech; for the sake of our argument, we only treat prototypical instances.

5 Here, third person reference in the speech report is ambiguous, since no overt pronoun is used. In the case of overt reference within the speech report, the choice of a pronoun (logophoric vs. third person) would resolve the ambiguity.

(11) a. Ainu
onne-an ***pe*** ***ne*** ***kusu*** ***a-Ø-e-isoytak***
be.old-LOG.S NMLZ COP because LOG.A-3.O-about.APPL-talk
sekor *sino* *nispa* *Ø-hawean*
QUOT true rich.man 3.S-say.SG
'I told it because I was old, said a grand elder.'
(Nakagawa et al. 2020: K7908051UP.377)

b. Ainu
a-matnepo-ho ***a-i-tura*** ***wa,*** ***okkay-po***
LOG.A-daughter-POSS IMPERS-LOG.O-take.along and man-DIM
Ø-par-o ***a-Ø-o-suke*** ***rusuy*** ***sekor*** *Ø-hawean*
3.A-mouth-POSS LOG.A-3.O-at.APPL-cook DESID QUOT 3.S-say.SG
'My daughter said: If I am taken along I would like to cook for the young man.' (Lit., 'cook at the mouth of the young man')
(Bugaeva 2004: 414)

The contrast between (12a) and (12b) shows that logophoric – but not indirect – speech freely appears before the noun phrase encoding the addressee:

(12) a. Ainu
nea *Ø-i-siknu-re* *okkay-po* *a-Ø-tura* *wa*
that 3.A-LOG.O-be.alive-CAUS man-DIM LOG.A-3.O-take.along and
ek-an *sekor* ***Ø-ona-utar-i*** ***eun*** *Ø-hawean*
come.SG-LOG.S QUOT 3.A-father-PL-POSS ALL 3.S-say.SG
'I have brought the youngster who revived me – she told her parents.'
(Nakagawa et al. 2020: K8106233UP.217)

b. Ainu
?? neno *Ø-wentarap* *yak* ***Ø-ona-utar-i*** ***eun*** *Ø-Ø-ye*
same.as 3.S-have.a.dream COMP 3.A-father-PL-POSS ALL 3.A-3.O-say
'The young man$_i$ said to his parents that he$_{i/j}$ saw the same dream.'

In Wan, too, logophoric speech displays ordering flexibility that is characteristic of direct speech. In (13a), the report is interrupted by the clause that introduces it. The elicited example in (13b) shows that the same ordering is accepted with logophoric speech (the logophoric pronoun is substituted in this example for the first person pronoun). Indirect speech, on the other hand, always follows the clause introducing the speech event.

(13) a. Wan
nàà *nɛ́* *ē* *yí* *tɛ̀* *nɛ̀* ***è*** ***gé*** ***lɛ̀ŋ̀***
1SG:POSS child IMPER sleep kill there 3SG said to
lā *gōō* *nɛ̀* *pí* *wà* *ō*
2SG leave+3SG place more NEG PRT
'My child, sleep there, hyena told him, don't you leave from here anymore.'

b. Wan
ɓāā *nɛ́* *ē* *yí* *tɛ̀* *nɛ̀* ***è*** ***gé*** ***lɛ̀ŋ̀***
LOG.SG:POSS child IMPER sleep kill there 3SG said to
lā *gōō* *nɛ̀* *pí* *wà* *ō*
2SG leave+3SG place more NEG PRT
'My child, sleep there, hyena told him, don't you leave from here anymore.'

3.3 Extrasentential and loosely integrated elements

Another property that distinguishes indirect speech from both direct and logophoric speech is the ability to accommodate extrasentential elements and elements loosely integrated into the clause structure. European indirect speech does not normally accommodate such clause-peripheral elements as interjections and terms of address. The direct speech in (14) has no indirect speech equivalent (cf. 15); the closest rendering must either omit both the interjection and the term of address (16a) or split the speech report into two portions, as in (16b):

(14) *He said: Hey, brother, I don't like it.*

(15) *?? He said that hey, brother, he didn't like it.*

(16) a. *He said that he didn't like it.*
b. *He addressed him: Hey brother… then told him he didn't like it.*

Like direct speech, logophoric speech freely accommodates all kinds of extrasentential and loosely integrated material. The examples in (17) and (18) feature interjections.

(17) Wan
ɓé *è* *gé* ***àà*** ***ɛ̀ɛ̀ɛ̀*** *ɓā* *yí* *kū̱* *gɛ̄* *ō*
then 3SG said ah! eh! LOG.SG dream caught PRT PRT
'And he said: Ah, well, I saw a dream…'

(18) Ainu

haa,	*ene-an*	*wen*	*irenka*	*Ø-an*	*kor*	*an-an*	
ah	like.this-exist.SG	bad	will	3.S-exist.SG	and	exist.SG-LOG.S	
hi	*ka*	*a-Ø-eramiskari*	*no*	*an-an*	*ruwe*	*ne,*	
NMLZ	even	LOG.A-3.O-not.know	and	exist.SG-LOG.S	INFR.EV	COP	
sekor	*Ø-hawean*						
QUOT	3.S-say.SG						

'Ah! I didn't know that I lived guided by ill will, said [that man].'
(Bugaeva 2004: 407–8)

The examples in (19)–(20) feature logophoric speech constructions with terms of address which are normally excluded from indirect speech:

(19) Wan

ɓé	*è*	*gé*	*ĩ*	***ɓā***	***dè***	*ɓā*	*zòŋ̀*	*pà-ŋ̀*
then	3SG	said	INTJ	LOG.SG	father	LOG.SG	PROSP	be.able-PROSP
à	*lé*	*wà*						
3SG	at	NEG						

'And he said: No, my father, I won't be able to do it.'

(20) Ainu

pet	***put***	***Ø-Ø-kor***	***katkemat!***	*Pon-no*	*sini*	*yan*	
river	river.mouth	3.A-3.O-have	lady	little-ADV	rest	IMP.POL	
a-e-komuy		*ki*	*na*	*sekor*	*Ø-hawean*		
LOG.A-2SG.O-pick.out.lice.from		do	FIN	QUOT	3.S-say.SG		

'He said: Mistress of the river mouth! Have some rest! I'll pick out lice from you.'
(Kubodera 1977: 206)

3.4 Multiple strategies

European direct and indirect speech tend to be used separately and rarely combine. While the same report can feature multiple utterances that are either direct or indirect (21a)–(21b), it is uncommon for direct speech to alternate with indirect speech, no matter which comes first (22a)–(22b).

(21) a. *He said: "I don't like it, I'll do it better."*
b. *He said that he didn't like it, that he would do it better.*

(22) a. *?? He said "I don't like it", that he would do it better.*
b. *?? He said that he didn't like it, "I'll do it better."*

In the rare examples of mixed quotation, indirect speech tends to be followed by a significant pause or a prosodic break. A reviewer observes that (22b) can be improved by changing the punctuation and adding an expressive element with a characteristic intonation contour, as in (23). This suggests that while direct and indirect speech can sometimes combine, they tend to be treated as separate instances of reported speech, i.e., as an indirect quotation followed by a direct quotation with an omitted framing element.

(23) *He said that he didn't like it. "Hell, I'll do it better!"*

Logophoric speech behaves differently. It freely combines with direct speech, not just within the same report (which is uncommon but possible under certain conditions in English), but also – remarkably – within the same clause (Nikitina 2020). In example (24), the report starts as logophoric speech, then switches to direct (first person) reporting. The "switch" happens in the middle of the reported utterance. In (25), the same kind of switch is illustrated for Ainu; this time it occurs in between two coordinated clauses.

(24) Wan
ɓé *è* *gé* *ēé!* ***ɓāā*** *kɛ̄* *é* *lā* *nɔ̀nì-ǵ*
then 3SG said yeah LOG.SG:EMPH that DEF 2SG lose-STAT.PERF
ŋ̀ *mì*
1SG at
'Then he said: Yeah, as for myself, you won't be able to recognize me.'
(Nikitina 2012b: 294)

(25) Ainu
naici *ot* *ta* *anak-ne,* *ne* *citensa* *ka,* ***a-****Ø-o*
Honshu place LOC TOP-COP this bicycle even LOG.A-3.O-ride
ka *somo* *ki…* *tane-po* *ene* *hanke-ko* *citensa* *ani…*
even NEG do now-EMPH like.this close-NEG bicycle INST
k-*ek* *neya* ***ku-****san* *neya* *ki* *kor,*
1SG.S-come.SG and 1SG.S-return.SG and do when
kes-to *Ø-an* *kor* ***k-****an…* *sekor* *Ø-hawean*
every-day 3.S-exist.SG when 1SG.S-exist.SG QUOT 3.S-say.SG
'He said: In Honshu, I_{LOG} do not ride this bicycle…, but now [in Hokkaido], when I ride a long way by bicycle to come (here) and go back, and keep doing it every day, (I finally do get a suntan).'
(Satō 2002: 59)

Examples of this sort differ from (23), which can be easily interpreted, due to intonational cues, as involving two separate speech reports. They also differ from instances of free indirect discourse attested in European literary genres or occasionally in colloquial speech in some languages (cf. Haberland's (1986) observation that mixed reports seem to be relatively common in colloquial Danish). While examples of free indirect discourse typically involve a mixture of different grammatical features (e.g., "indirect" pronominal deixis co-occurring with interjections), our examples from Wan and Ainu involve conflicting values for the same deictic feature (the same participant is referred to by logophoric or first person pronouns).

The fact that the same utterance can be reported as logophoric and direct speech at the same time is hard to reconcile with the view that logophoric speech is a reporting strategy in its own right. On such a view, logophoric speech would have to be treated as a unique type of report that can alternate with another strategy, and the question why it only alternates with direct speech would be left unanswered.

4 Towards a syntactic account

4.1 Direct and logophoric speech involve a special type of syntactic relation

In the previous section we saw that in two unrelated languages, logophoric speech behaves syntactically in very similar ways. The syntax of logophoric speech shows close affinity with the syntax of direct speech, and differs strikingly from the syntax of indirect speech. First, lexical restrictions are typical of indirect speech but are normally not relevant for direct and logophoric speech. Second, ordering restrictions are more rigid in the case of indirect speech than in the case of direct and logophoric speech. Third, extrasentential and clause-peripheral elements can be embedded in direct and logophoric speech, but are normally excluded from indirect speech. Finally, combinations of different strategies are possible for direct and logophoric speech but not for indirect speech. The relevant properties are summarized below in Table 1.

We interpret the syntactic evidence summarized in Table 1 as suggesting that direct and logophoric speech are, in Ainu and in Wan, instances of the same syntactic structure. This conclusion is rather striking given that the phenomenon of logophoric speech has been traditionally treated in semantic terms, not in terms of its special syntax – and is commonly assumed to be a subtype of indirect speech

Table 1: Syntactic properties of "canonical" direct, canonical indirect, and logophoric speech.

	Direct speech	Indirect speech	Logophoric speech
Lexical restrictions	–	Licensed by specific predicates	–
Ordering restrictions	–	Fixed with respect to the matrix clause	–
Extrasentential and loosely integrated elements	Interjections, terms of address	–	Interjections, terms of address
Multiple strategies within the same sentence	Combines with logophoric speech	–	Combines with direct speech

(Culy 1997; Schlenker 2003a; Sells 1987: 475, among many others).[6] The similarities are also remarkable in light of the major morphosyntactic differences between Ainu and Wan (see Section 2), which make them *a priori* unlikely to converge on the syntactic treatment of any particular expression type.

The syntactic evidence further suggests that while canonical indirect speech is associated with syntactic subordination, direct and logophoric speech involve a different kind of syntactic relation. This conclusion may not seem surprising in light of earlier observations that logophoric pronouns are neither clause nor sentence bound (Dimmendaal 2001; Stirling 1993). The high degree of syntactic integration of indirect speech with the matrix clause explains why it must be licensed by a specific predicate and why its position is subject to rigid ordering restrictions. It also explains why certain elements cannot be accommodated within indirect speech: interjections and terms of address are only loosely integrated with the rest of the clause (Ameka 1992), meaning that they appear very high in the constituent structure and are licensed by projections that may be present in finite clauses but are lacking in structurally reduced subordinate clauses. Finally, the different syntactic status of direct/logophoric vs. indirect speech explains why they do not easily combine within the same utterance or the same clause: as they are integrated in different structures, they are normally introduced by different predicates.

The syntactic account provides a plausible explanation for other characteristic properties of "canonical" indirect speech, including the fact that arguments can be raised from a speech report to the matrix clause, and the integrated intonation contour (Evans 2013). It could also explain the curious relationship between logophoric speech and control observed by Culy (1994): logophoric domains and control domains are mutually exclusive. Control relations are associated with

6 It is also often taken for granted, accordingly, that logophoric speech appears in syntactically subordinate clauses (Culy 1994: 1,057; Hagège 1974, inter alia) – contrary to what our data shows.

nonfinite subordinate clauses, but logophoric speech constructions are finite clauses involving higher syntactic projections – hence the two do not easily combine within the same structure. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss in detail all the relevant properties, but we believe that many of the differences between indirect vs. direct (and logophoric) speech that were traditionally explained in terms of perspective naturally follow from their different syntactic status.

4.2 Explaining the differences between direct and logophoric speech

The differences summarized in Table 1 show that the distinction between the *ideal types* of direct and indirect speech does not boil down to a difference in perspective, however broadly construed. The two types have radically different syntactic properties: indirect speech involves subordination, whereas direct speech stands in a loose apposition-like relation to the surrounding discourse. In fact, many properties traditionally described in terms of perspective naturally follow from that syntactic difference. This includes, most importantly, differences in the way deictic expressions are anchored to different reference points: those of the matrix clause in the case of indirect speech, but independent ones in the case of direct and logophoric speech. Despite deictic shifts having been at the center of much typological and formal semantic research, they have not been, to the best of our knowledge, systematically related to clausal syntax.

The reason canonical indirect speech is not a good starting point for a cross-linguistic comparison is not merely methodological. The European direct-indirect distinction actually involves two independent dimensions. One is purely structural: it has to do with the way the report is integrated syntactically with the matrix clause. No language seems to rely exclusively on a canonical indirect speech strategy, associated with syntactic subordination (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2019). The apparently universal alternative involves a special apposition-like relation commonly dedicated to speech reporting and related functions. We will refer to it as the *Demonstration* relation, to highlight the fact that the same construction is used, across languages, for all sorts of communication events involving what Clark and Gerrig (1990) define in terms of *demonstration*: it can be used, across languages, to introduce ideophones, verbal and gestural imitation as in (5a) from Ainu, as well as various kinds of constructed action. The Demonstration construction subsumes, in languages like Ainu and Wan, both direct and logophoric speech.

The differences between direct and indirect speech along the syntactic dimension are summarized in Table 2, where we classify expressions used for encoding reported speech based on their structural properties. We are only

Table 2: Syntactic relations involved in the expression of reported speech.

Subordination relation	**Apposition-like *Demonstration* relation**
European indirect speech	European direct speech
Indirect speech in Ainu and Wan	Logophoric and direct speech in Ainu and Wan

concerned here with two types of syntactic relation between the speech report and the speech-introducing *framing* element: subordination, and the special apposition-like Demonstration structure. Other relations are also attested in this function across languages, but we leave them aside as less relevant for this study. Syntactic differences between European direct and indirect speech reflect the difference between subordination and apposition-like Demonstration, as do differences between indirect and logophoric speech in Ainu and Wan.

The idea that direct and logophoric speech involve a special dedicated type of syntactic structure resonates well with the crosslinguistic evidence systematized in Spronck and Nikitina (2019a). This structure differs from both subordination and coordination, and is probably universal. Most importantly for this study, in languages like Ainu and Wan, the same structure is associated with both logophoric and direct speech.

The question of precise syntactic analysis of the remarkably loose, at the structural level, relation between direct and logophoric speech, on the one hand, and the clause that introduces it (if any such clause is present), on the other, is an important and theoretically interesting issue. The answer depends on one's theoretical position on what syntax is and how syntactic restrictions should be described (see, for example, the contrasting views presented in D'Arcy 2015 vs. Spronck and Nikitina 2019b). Not being committed to the assumptions of generative transformational models, we believe that syntax may encompass, at some level, relations that go beyond the sentence, as allowed by constraint-based frameworks such as LFG and HPSG; we cannot, however, pursue this issue further here. Hence, the presence of an element introducing a speech report is crucial to the interpretation of reported speech as such, yet the ways that element is represented at the clause-structural level may vary, and in some cases its presence may be inferred from context, and not encoded overtly.

The other dimension on which reporting strategies may differ is lexical. It defines the way indexicals are used to refer to participants and situations.[7]

7 We leave aside the effects produced by the interaction of deictic expressions with syntactic operators as postulated in "monster" accounts of person shifts in some languages (Anand and Nevins 2004; Schlenker 2003b, inter alia), as this issue is theory-internal and orthogonal to our proposal.

Differences on this dimension boil down to crosslinguistic differences in inventories and meaning of deictic expressions. For example, languages clearly differ in the meaning they assign to their pronouns, just as they differ in the meaning of other lexical items. These differences are independent of the way reported speech is integrated syntactically with the surrounding discourse (Nikitina and Vydrina 2020).

Crucially, some languages make use of pronouns that European languages lack: for example, they may have pronouns that refer to additional participants in a speech situation, such as logophoric pronouns referring to a reported speaker (Nikitina 2012a; Schlenker 2003a; cf. an early proposal by Sells 1987).[8] Sensitivity to such roles explains why logophoric pronouns get used in otherwise "direct" reports: they are lexically specified as referring to a reported speaker, yet they may appear in the same structures as instances of direct speech, and have no impact on the way other pronouns are used to refer to the situation's participants.

In disassociating syntactic configuration from the lexical meaning of indexicals, our approach differs radically from earlier syntactic approaches to logophoric speech such as the one advocated by Koopman and Sportiche (1989) or the one introduced by Speas (2004). Koopman and Sportiche (1989) treat logophoric pronouns as variables bound by a Point of View operator, which can be in turn controlled by a matrix subject. This account heavily depends on the incorporation into the syntactic representation of the discourse role of "Point of View", yet it does not contribute much to identifying and explaining syntactic differences between logophoric and indirect speech. Similarly, Speas (2004) follows Cinque (1999) in integrating into the syntactic representation a number of pragmatic features relevant to logophoricity and evidentiality, in the form of Epistemological Phrase, Speech Act Phrase, etc. While this move opens up the possibility of configurationally representing a number of relations traditionally treated in pragmatic terms, it does not contribute much to identifying syntactic differences between distinct kinds of speech reports, and it predicts a configurational difference between direct and logophoric speech, for which we find no evidence in our data. We believe that in using the same type of representation for structural and semantic information transformational accounts miss the observation that is at the center of this study: structural properties of speech reports are to a great extent independent of their deixis.

8 Some languages may of course lack some of the European pronouns or they may draw person distinctions differently; for example, only one of the interlocutors of a reported speech act may be treated in the same way as an interlocutor of the current speech act, resulting in an asymmetric person distinction in reported speech (Nikitina 2012a).

5 Conclusion

While continuum approaches to speech reporting provide a useful methodological tool and a first approximation to a meaningful typology, they fall short of describing the syntax of reported speech outside European languages. Many phenomena that have been traditionally attributed to largely intuitive differences in perspective are in fact rooted in syntax. Such differences fall into one of two categories: variation in the degree of syntactic integration of the speech report, and disparities in the language-specific inventories of deictic expressions.

Differences in the way speech reports are integrated syntactically into surrounding discourse are reflected in such "perspective-related" phenomena as the use of different points of reference. The deixis of subordinate clauses, including that of indirect speech reports, is normally anchored to the reference point of the matrix clause: pronouns and other indexicals are defined with respect to the current speech situation (like pronouns in the matrix clause). It also follows that subordinate clauses may feature special verb forms relating the reported event to the event of the matrix clause (such as relative tense forms). In the special kind of structure we described as the Demonstration construction, the speech report is only loosely related to the clause that introduces it. Pronouns and other indexicals are defined in such reports with respect to the reported speech situation, not the current one, and the same verb forms tend to be used in the report as in independent clauses.

Differences in inventories and meanings of deictic expressions account for the fact that more than one type of report may be associated with the Demonstration construction, both crosslinguistically and in a particular language. In Ainu and in Wan, logophoric speech behaves like direct speech with respect to its syntax, suggesting that they are instances of the same Demonstration structure. Yet direct speech differs from logophoric speech in the way pronouns are used to refer to speech act participants. In direct speech, the reported speaker is indexed by first person pronouns, like the actual speaker in independent clauses. In logophoric speech, the reported speaker is indexed by a special logophoric pronoun: a pronoun sensitive to the discourse role of non-narrator.[9]

The use of logophoric pronouns is optional: the same participant may be referred to by logophoric or first person pronouns, even within the same clause. This optionality reflects the subtle lexical distinction between logophoric and first person pronouns, which can be explored by storytellers for the purposes of effective differentiation of their own speech from the speech of their characters, at

9 Logophoric pronouns are normally not used when the narrator refers to him/herself (Roncador 1988).

moments where the two roles come dangerously close (Nikitina 2012b, 2018). The storyteller may choose not to mark that distinction overtly at times where reported speech has already been attributed to a particular character and no longer needs to be detached from the narrator's speech.

Crucially, the choice between first person and logophoric pronouns has no impact on the interpretation of other indexicals, as discussed in Section 2 above. Other participants are referred to, in Ainu and in Wan, in the same way as in direct speech. This fact seems surprising on a perspective-based approach to speech reporting, but it follows naturally from our treatment and is in fact predicted by it.

More generally, our findings suggest that research on reported discourse needs to pay closer attention to its syntactic aspects. The syntax of the relevant constructions varies across languages, and we only addressed here one type of logophoric speech construction which has been largely ignored in theoretical studies. Not all languages with logophoric speech constructions behave in the same way as Ainu and Wan; they are known to vary, for example, in the way pronominal values are assigned in logophoric speech (cf. Bamgboṣe [1986]; Clements [1975]; Hellwig [2011]; Nikitina [2012a], inter alia, for systems that are clearly based on different principles, including systems with dedicated addressee logophoric pronouns). Yet we believe that Ainu and Wan represent a robust type of logophoric speech construction that does not fit well with previously proposed continuum-based descriptions. Languages of this type should be taken into account in speech reporting typologies.

We steer away in this study from formalizing the difference between indirect and direct/logophoric speech in any theory-specific way, but we believe that it can be easily captured within constraint-based syntactic frameworks, which are especially well-equipped, compared to traditional transformational ones, to handle the two-dimensional nature of our proposal: the fact that the behavior of indexicals is to a large extent independent of the syntactic configuration in which reported speech appears. We leave the framework-specific implementation of this account to future work.

We conclude that a comprehensive typology of speech reporting strategies should take into account both configurational properties of speech reports and their deixis, and these two aspects of discourse reporting should be treated independently. Further explorations in this direction will lead to a more constrained and more structured view of the crosslinguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies than the one currently offered by perspective-based continuum approaches.

Abbreviations

1/2/3	1st/2nd/3rd person
Ø	zero-marked 3rd person
A	transitive subject
ADV	adverbial
ALL	allative
APPL	applicative
CAUS	causative
CNJ	conjunction
COMP	complementizer
COP	copula
DEF	definite marker
DESID	desiderative
DIM	diminutive
EMPH	emphatic
EXCL	exclamative particle
FIN	final particle
FOC	focus
IMPER	imperative subject
IMPERS	impersonal
IMP.POL	imperative polite
INDP	independent form of pronoun
INFR.EV	inferential evidential
INTJ	interjection
LOC	locative
LOG	logophoric
NEG	negation
NMLZ	nominalizer
NONVIS.EV	nonvisual evidential
O	object
PL	plural
POSS	possessor/possessive
PROSP	prospective
PRT	particle
Q	question marker
QUOT	quotative marker
S	intransitive subject
SG	singular
STAT.PERF	stative perfect
TOP	topic

Acknowledgments: This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 758232, PI Tatiana Nikitina). It was also supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture,

International Scientific Grant-in-Aid Research Program, project "Towards understanding dynamics of language change in Ainu" (#17K02743; 2017–2021) (Kiban C, Principal Investigator: Anna Bugaeva) and NINJAL, Endangered Languages and Dialects in Japan project (Prof. Nobuko Kibe).

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2008. Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Sciences* 30(4). 383–422.

Ameka, Felix. 1992. Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18. 101–118.

Anand, Pranav & Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 14. 20–37.

Bamgboṣe, Ayọ. 1986. Reported speech in Yoruba. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), 77–97.

Banfield, Ann. 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language* 10. 1–39.

Boyeldieu, Pascal. 2004a. A qui s'addresse le logophorique yakoma. In Pascal Boyeldieu & Pierre Nougayrol (eds.), *Langues et cultures: Terrains d'Afrique. Hommage à France Cloarec-Heiss*, 185–191. Leuven: Peeters.

Boyeldieu, Pascal. 2004b. Les pronoms logophoriques dans les langues d'Afrique centrale. In Dymitr Ibriszimow & Guillaume Segerer (eds.), *Systèmes de marques personnelles en Afrique*, 11–22. Leuven: Peeters.

Bugaeva, Anna. 2004. *Grammar and folklore texts of the Chitose dialect of Ainu (Idiolect of Ito Oda)*. + 1 audio CD. (ELPR A2-045). Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.

Bugaeva, Anna. 2008. Reported discourse and logophoricity in Southern Hokkaido dialects of Ainu. *Gengo Kenkyū* 133. 31–75.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66. 764–805.

Clements, George N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *The Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141–177.

Coulmas, Florian. 1985. Direct and indirect speech: General problems and problems of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9(1). 41–63.

Coulmas, Florian (ed.). 1986. *Direct and indirect speech*. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 31), 77–97. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

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

D'Arcy, Alexandra. 2015. Quotation and advances in understanding syntactic systems. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1(1). 43–61.

De Roeck, Marijke. 1994. A functional typology of speech reports. In Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen, Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen & Lone Schack Rasmussen (eds.), *Function and expression in Functional Grammar*, 331–351. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. 2001. Logophoric marking and represented speech in African languages as evidential hedging strategies. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21(1). 131–157.

Evans, Nicholas. 2013. Some problems in the typology of quotation: a canonical approach. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 66–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka. 2019. Direct and indirect speech revisited: Semantic universals and semantic diversity. In Alessandro Capone, Manuel García-Carpintero & Alessandra Falzone (eds.), *Indirect reports and pragmatics in the world languages*, 173–199. Cham & Heidelberg: Springer.

Haberland, Hartmut. 1986. Reported speech in Danish. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*, 219–254. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 69(1). 287–310.

Hellwig, Birgit. 2011. *A grammar of Goemai*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, logical variables and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(4). 555–588.

Kubodera, Itsuhiko. 1977. *Ainu jojishi shin'yō seiden-no kenkyū* [The study of Ainu heroic epics and songs of gods]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

McGregor, William B. 1994. The grammar of reported speech and thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 14(1). 63–92.

Nakagawa, Hiroshi, Anna Bugaeva, Miki Kobayashi & Yoshimi Yoshikawa. 2020. *A glossed audio corpus of Ainu folklore*. Tokyo: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics. https://ainucorpus.ninjal.ac.jp/corpus/en/ (accessed 9 April 2020).

Nau, Nicole. 2006. Out of Africa: Logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 2006. 55–87.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2009. The syntax of PPs in Wan, an "SOVX" language. *Studies in Language* 33(4). 907–930.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012a. Personal deixis and reported discourse: Towards a typology of person alignment. *Linguistic Typology* 16(2). 233–263.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012b. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). *Anthropological Linguistics* 54(3). 280–301.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2018. When linguists and speakers do not agree: The endangered grammar of verbal art in West Africa. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 28(2). 197–220.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2019. Verb phrase external arguments in Mande: New evidence for obligatory extraposition. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37(2). 693–734.

Nikitina, Tatiana. 2020. Logophoricity and shifts of perspective: New facts and a new account. *Functions of Language* 27(1). 78–99.

Nikitina, Tatiana & Alexandra Vydrina. 2020. Reported speech in Kakabe: Loose syntax with flexible indexicality. *Folia Linguistica* 54(1). 133–166.

Plank, Frans. 1986. Über den Personenwechsel und den anderer deiktischer Kategorien in der wiedergegebenen Rede. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 14. 284–308.

Satō, Tomomi (ed.). 2002. *Ainugo shohōgen chōsa hōkoku (1)* [A fieldwork report on Ainu dialects]. ELPR A2-014. Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2003a. Indexicality, logophoricity, and plural pronouns. In Jacqueline Lecarme (ed.), *Research in Afroasiatic grammar II: Selected papers from the Fifth*

Conference on Afroasiatic Languages, 409–428. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Schlenker, Philippe. 2003b. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26. 29–120.
Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 445–479.
Speas, Margaret. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114. 255–276.
Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019a. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain: Typological arguments and observations. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1). 119–159.
Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019b. M and R as elements of a syntactic unit: Where would the relation between M and R come from, if not from syntax? *Linguistic Typology* 23(1). 245–254.
Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tamura, Suzuko. 1984. *Ainugo onseishiryō 1* [Ainu Audio Materials 1]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyōiku kenkyūjo.
Tamura, Suzuko. 2000 [1988]. Ainugo [The Ainu language]. *Gengogaku daijiten* 1. 6–94. [English version (2000): The Ainu language. ICHEL Linguistic Studies v. 2, Tokyo: Sanseidō].
Thomas, Elaine. 1978. *A grammatical description of the Engenni language*. Dallas, TX: SIL & The University of Texas at Arlington.
von Roncador, Manfred. 1988. *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
von Roncador, Manfred. 1992. Types of logophoric marking in African languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13. 163–182.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1974. The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7(3/4). 267–307.