Logophoric speech is not indirect:

Towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions

The distinction between direct and indirect speech has long been known not to reflect the cross-linguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies. Yet prominent typological approaches have been firmly grounded in that traditional distinction as they look to place language-specific strategies on a *continuum*, treating them as deviations from the "direct" and "indirect" *ideals*. We argue that despite their methodological attractiveness, the continuum approaches do not provide a solid basis for cross-linguistic comparison. We aim at complementing them by exploring the syntax of *logophoric* speech, which has been commonly treated as representative of "semi-direct" discourse. Based on data from two unrelated languages, Wan (Mande) and Ainu (isolate), we show that some 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* in fact follow from its syntactically subordinate status. Constructions involving direct and logophoric speech, on the other hand, qualify for a separate, universal type of structure. Our findings suggest that the alleged indirect/direct continuum conflates two independent aspects of speech reporting: the syntactic structure in which the report is integrated, and the language-specific meaning of indexical elements.

Keywords: reported speech, logophoricity, pronominal deixis, perspective shift, indexical shift, Mande, Ainu.

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

1. Introduction: Perspective-based approaches to reported speech

The distinction between direct and indirect speech has long been known not to capture the cross-linguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies (Coulmas 1986; Aikhenvald 2008, 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 the European models as *deviations* from the *ideals* of direct and indirect speech. The following quotes illustrate the assumptions of prominent continuum-based approaches formulated, apparently independently, by different authors within the last decade:

> "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), Roeck (1994) and others, I will conceive of RD [Reported Discourse]-categories as constituting a cross-linguistic 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 cross-linguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies onto a bipolar scale based on the European distinction testifies to its intuitive appeal. The approach has methodological merits: 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 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 the continuum approaches reveals a number of problematic issues. First, conceptually, the 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*, undefined and shaped by the way the distinction is manifested in European languages. As a result, the approach presupposes that language-specific choices of a reporting strategy are based on the same underlying principles – the principles underlying the choice between direct and indirect speech in a European language. Despite all the attention reported discourse receives from typologists, this idea 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 the disregard for syntax leads to missed generalizations and sometimes results in misunderstanding of the basic differences between speech reporting strategies. Our goal is to complement the dominant perspective-based approach to reported speech with a systematic study of the constructions' 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 reporting. We argue that a syntactic approach helps us describe different types of logophoric speech much more accurately than the vague notion of perspective underlying the idea of a direct-indirect continuum.

2. Logophoricity in Ainu and in Wan

We analyze and compare the use of logophoric speech reports 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 strategy in these languages is relatively well-described, and sufficient corpus data are available to explore its 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 is isolating, with very rigid word order (SOV-X), 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 rule out the possibility that parallels in the way logophoricity functions are epiphenomenal, i.e. that they derive from similarities at other structural levels. While we do not claim that all logophoric languages pattern alike, we believe that Ainu and Wan are representative of a rather common yet little discussed type of logophoric language, and the fact that their properties cannot be easily accommodated by the sweeping continuum-based accounts presents a problem for widely accepted typologies of reported speech constructions.

Both languages make use of special logophoric pronouns for marking co-reference with the reported speaker. Wan is representative of the characteristic African type of logophoric language as originally described by Hagège (1974). Ainu offers a rare example of at least partial *pure* logophoricity that is attested outside Africa (see Nau 2006 for examples of logophoricity from Europe).[1] Logophoric 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,b) and (2a,b) illustrate their use as subjects and objects, respectively.

(1) a. ɓé à nɔ̀ gé **ɓā** ɓé gòmɔ̄ [Wan]

then 3SG wife said LOG.SG that.one understood

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

b. **asinuma** arpa-**an** kusu ne sekor Ø-hawean [Ainu]

LOG.SG go.SG-LOG.S intention COP QUOT 3.S-say.SG

'(S)he$_i$ said (s)he$_i$ would go.' (Tamura 2000/1988: 74)

[1] *Pure* logophoric languages make use of a *dedicated* logophoric pronoun, which only occurs in the context of 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 (Culy 1994: 1059-60). Both in Ainu and in Wan, plural logophoric pronouns are non-specialized, i.e. 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 pronouns are specialized. Hence, in Wan, pure logophoricity is attested with singular pronouns (which are always free-standing), and in Ainu, it is attested with singular free-standing (but not with bound) pronouns.

(2) a. 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! [Wan]

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. kameyasi ene **i**-otke humi itasasa-an sekor Ø-hawean [Ainu]

monster like.this LOG.O-prick NONVIS.EV hurt-LOG.S QUOT 3.S-say.SG

'He said: It hurts as if the monster has pricked me$_i$ like this.' (Tamura 1984: 20)

Logophoricity has received considerable attention in the context of the distinction between direct and indirect speech. Data from logophoric languages has been widely used to support the continuum approach, and it has been 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 other pronouns are used in logophoric speech: in many (but not all) logophoric languages, where reported speakers are coded by special logophoric pronouns, reported addressees are referred to in the second person (Roncador 1988: 290-93, 1992; Stirling 1993: 256-57). 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. ɓé è gé ɓā dè **lāā** kɛ̄ ɓāā má

then 3SG said LOG.SG father 2SG gave LOG.SG:INDP to

mɔ̄ɔ̄ ɓā wò yɛ̱ɛ̱? [Wan]

PRT LOG.SG do how

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

b. 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 [Ainu]

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 logophoricity and *semi-direct* speech (Aikhenvald 2008) or to characterize logophoric reports as *semi-indirect* (Thomas 1978), *combined*/*neutralized* (Boyeldieu 2004), and *bi-perspectival* speech (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. We argue that in terms of their syntax, logophoric reports of Ainu and Wan pattern with direct speech. They do not behave as intermediate syntactic types, and their proper analysis should avoid drawing on misleading parallels between logophoricity and indirect speech, at least in the languages we focus on. We propose instead to treat logophoricity as a lexical phenomenon, in line with the proposals by Schlenker (1999, 2003) and Nikitina (2012a).

Logophoric speech is not the only type of reported speech that has been traditionally assigned an intermediate status in typological studies. Another prominent construction that is commonly treated in the same 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 continuum treatments of logophoric speech are unmotivated, we focus here on prototypical direct and indirect speech and leave aside the free indirect discourse. 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 a 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 the 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 non-verbal 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 in Ainu and in Wan like direct speech: 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 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,b):

(5) a. a, kono Ø-sikrap-u sekor sekor Ø-iki hi [Ainu]
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. mak ki a-ossike Ø-arka pekor hum-as
how do LOG.A-inside.POSS 3.S-hurt as.if feeling-stand.SG
wa ne sekor [Ainu]
and COP QUOT
'My stomach hurts for some reason, [he replied].'

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 follows directly the verb 'shine'. It is understood from previous context that the speaker is the hyena who discovers, at daylight, that what he killed is not the hare:

(6) élì kɔ́nā wéŋ́ à gè ɓóŋ́glò é blą̰ é mɔ̄
day started in.clear.light 3SG POSS head DEF watch DEF at.that.time
yīí-yīí-yīí-yīí, èɛ̀ɛ̀ **ɓāá** **ɓāā** né tɛ̄ má ą̰? [Wan]
INTJ INTJ LOG.SG. INDP LOG.SG:POSS child killed FOC EXCL
'When the daybreak shone at his head: 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 reports need not be licensed overtly, and that logophoricity cannot be accounted for in terms of sentential syntax.

(7) è gé èè sīē kɛ́ cóò –
3SG said 3SG+3SG another give INTJ
èɛ̀ɛ̀ ɓé **ɓāá** wò á yą̰ ē? [Wan]
eh! then LOG.SG make FOC how Q
'And she said he should give back another one. – Eh! But how shall I do it?'

As in Ainu, indirect speech is associated in Wan with rigid lexical restrictions, while direct and logophoric speech are much more flexible. This suggests that syntactically, indirect speech is more closely integrated with its licensor, while direct and logophoric speech stand in a relatively loose, apposition-like relation to the clause that introduces it.[2]

3.2. Ordering restrictions

In European languages, indirect speech is associated with more rigid ordering restrictions than direct speech. Consider the examples in (8a-c) and (9a,b). Direct speech in (8a,b) 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

[2] 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 is not marked as a verb's argument in any way (see 3.2).

licensing clause (rare instances of reordering are normally associated with emphatic intonation and focus interpretation):[3]

(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 in Ainu, with direct speech in that it allows for significant ordering flexibility. In Ainu, the word order is SOV, and indirect speech functions as a direct object. It must appear before the verb:

(10) a. nea okkay-po ka **neno wentarap yak** ye [Ainu]
that man-DIM even same.as have.a.dream COMP say
'The young man$_i$ said that he$_{i/j}$ also saw the same dream.'[4]

b. ??**neno wentarap yak** nea okkay-po ye [Ainu]
same.as have.a.dream COMP that man-DIM say
'The young man$_i$ said that he$_{i/j}$ also saw the same dream.'

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

(11) a. **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 [Ainu]
QUOT true rich.man 3.S-say.SG
'I told it because I was old, said a grand elder.'

[3] Omission of the complementizer seems to make reordering possible: *He$_i$ didn't like it, he$_i$ said*. This is consistent with a view that the construction without a complementizer does not display all of the properties of prototypical indirect speech; we only treat here prototypical instances.

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

b. 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 [Ainu]
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 can appear before the noun phrase encoding the addressee:

(12) a. 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 [Ainu]
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.'

b. ??neno wentarap yak Ø-**ona-utar-i** **eun** Ø-ye [Ainu]
same.as have.a.dream COMP 3.A-father-PL-POSS ALL 3.A-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 reports (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. 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 [Wan]
2SG leave+3SG place more NEG PRT
'My child, sleep there, hyena told him, don't you leave from here no more.'

b. 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 [Wan]
2SG leave+3SG place more NEG PRT
'My child, sleep there, hyena told him, don't you leave from here no more.'

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 accommodates freely all kinds of extrasentential and loosely integrated material. The examples in (17) and (18) feature interjections:

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

(18) **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 [Ainu]
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 reports with terms of address which are normally excluded from indirect speech:

(19) ɓé è gé íì **ɓā** **dè** ɓā zòŋ̀ pà-ŋ̀
then 3SG said INTJ LOG.SG father LOG.SG PROSP be.able-PROSP
à lé wà [Wan]
3SG at NEG
'And he said: No, my father, I won't be able to do it.'

(20) **pet** **put** **kor** **katkemat**! Pon-no sini yan
river river.mouth have lady little-ADV rest IMP.POL
a-e-komuy ki na sekor Ø-hawean [Ainu]
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,b), it is uncommon for direct speech to alternate with indirect speech, no matter which comes first (22a,b).

(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."*

When examples of mixed quotation do occur, they tend to involve indirect speech followed by a significant pause or a prosodic break. An editor 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 speech report, 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 combines freely 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. In example (24), the report starts as logophoric speech, then switches to direct (first person) reporting. The "switch" happens in the middle of a reported utterance. In (25), the same kind of switch is illustrated for Ainu, this time it occurs in between two coordinated clauses.

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

(25) 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-EMP 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 an kor **k**-an… sekor Ø-hawean [Ainu]
every-day 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 (2011) 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, the logophoric strategy 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.

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

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 logophoricity has been traditionally treated in semantic terms, not in terms of its special syntax – and it is commonly assumed to be a subtype of indirect speech (Sells 1987: 475; Culy 1997; Schlenker 2003a, among many others).[5] The similarities are also remarkable in light of the major morphosyntactic differences between

[5] It is also often taken for granted, accordingly, that logophoric speech appears in syntactically subordinate clauses – contrary to what our data shows (Hagège 1974; Culy 1994: 1057, inter alia).

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 normally 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 (Stirling 1994; Dimmendaal 2001), but it has largely escaped the typologists' attention. 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 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 combine easily within the same utterance or the same clause: being 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 logophoricity and control observed by Culy (1994): logophoric domains and control domains are mutually exclusive. Control relations are associated with non-finite subordinate clauses, but logophoric reports 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 and direct (as well as logophoric) speech that were traditionally explained in terms of perspective follow naturally from their different syntactic status.

The idea that direct and logophoric speech involve a special dedicated type of syntactic structure resonates well with the cross-linguistic evidence systematized in Spronck & Nikitina (2019). 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.

4.2. Explaining 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, and direct speech stands in a loose apposition-like relation to the surrounding discourse. In fact, many properties traditionally described in terms of perspective fall out naturally 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, no attempt has been made to relate them systematically 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 & 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 & 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 different kinds of constructed action. The Demonstration construction subsumes, in some logophoric languages such as 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 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.

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

The other dimension on which reporting strategies may differ is lexical. It defines the way indexicals are used to refer to participants and situations.[6] Differences on this dimension boil down to cross-linguistic 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.

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 (Schlenker 2003a, Nikitina 2012a, cf. an early proposal by Sells 1987).[7] 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 dissociating syntactic configuration from the lexical meaning of indexicals, our approach differs radically from earlier syntactic approaches to logophoricity such as the one advocated by Koopman & Sportiche (1989) or the one introduced by Speas (2004). Koopman & 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 representing configurationally a number of relations traditionally

[6] 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 (Schlenker 2003b; Anand & Nevins 2004, inter alia), as this issue is theory-internal and orthogonal to our proposal.

[7] 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 for reported speech (Nikitina 2012a).

treated in pragmatic terms, it does not contribute much to identifying syntactic differences between different 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 by 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.

5. Conclusion

While continuum approaches to speech reporting seem to 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: differences in the degree of syntactic integration of the speech report, and differences 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 such reports and 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 cross-linguistically and in a particular language. In Ainu and in Wan, logophoric speech behaves like direct speech with respect to its syntax, suggesting that they both are instances of the same Demonstration structure. Yet direct speech differs from logophoric speech in the way pronouns are used to refer to the 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 (Author forthc.).[8]

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 speech of their characters, at moments where these two roles come dangerously close. 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 makes 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 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 system which has been largely ignored in theoretical studies. Not all logophoric languages 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 reports (cf. Clements 1975; Bamgbose 1986; 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 system that does not fit into the description widely accepted in the typological literature. 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. Recently developed constraint-based syntactic models 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

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

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 cross-linguistic diversity of speech reporting strategies than the one currently offered by perspective-based continuum approaches.

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 Coulmas (ed.) 1986, 77-97.

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

Boyeldieu, Pascal. 2004. A qui s'addresse le logophorique yakoma. In Pascal Boyeldieu & Pierre Nougayrol (eds.) *Langues et cultures: Terrains d'Afrique. Hommage à France Cloarec-Heiss*. Leuven: Peeters, 185-91.

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, Herb H., & R. J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66: 764-805.

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

Coulmas Florian (ed.) 1986. *Direct and Indirect Speech.* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 31). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32: 1055-94.

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

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 D. Brown, M. Chumakina, and G. G. Corbett (eds.) *Canonical Morphology and Syntax.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 66-98.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34). Berlin: 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*. Springer, 173-199.

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

Haberland, Hartmut. 2011. Reported speech in Danish. In Florian Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and Indirect Speech.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 219-254.

Hellwig, Birgit. 2011. *A Grammar of Goemai*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

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

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.

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

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

Roncador, Manfred von. 1988. *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Roncador, Manfred von. 1992. Types of logophoric marking in African languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13: 163–182.

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*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 409-428.

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. 2019. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain: Typological arguments and observations. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1).

Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-Reference and Discourse Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tamura, Suzuko. 1984. *Ainugo onseishiryoo* 1 [Ainu Audio Materials 1]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyooiku kenkyuujo.

Tamura, Suzuko. 1988/2000. Ainugo [The Ainu language]. *Gengogaku daijiten* 1: 6-94. English version (2000): The Ainu language. ICHEL Linguistic Studies v. 2, Tokyo: Sanseid.

Thomas, Elaine. 1978. *A Grammatical Description of the Engenni Language*. Dallas: SIL & The University of Texas at Arlington.