Coding Strategies of Indirect Reported Speech in Typological Perspective

ANDREAS JÄGER
University of Manchester
a16d@gmx.de

The purpose of this paper is to provide a cross-linguistic survey of the variation of coding strategies that are available for the grammatical distinction between direct and indirect speech representation with a particular focus on the expression of indirect reported speech. Cross-linguistic data from a sample of 42 languages will be provided to illustrate the range of available grammatical coding strategies.

1. Introduction

This paper does not claim to be exhaustive study of the cross-linguistic expression of indirect reported speech. Rather it intends to give a new impulse to further investigate cross-linguistic patterns of indirect speech marking. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 defines the notion of reported speech and outlines a functional domain that serves as a basis for typological investigation. Section 3 describes the sample and possible variation of strategies. A discussion of the variation of coding strategies found in the sample follows in section 4. Section 5 provides typological generalisations and directions for further research.

2. Definition of indirect speech: formal and functional dimensions

Theoretical accounts of the functional domain of indirect speech and its relation to direct speech can be found, for instance, in Von Roncador (1986) Coulmas (1986) and Lucy (1993). Janssen & Van der Wurff (1996: 1-2) note the abundance of articles on the various theoretical approaches to the phenomenon as such, but at the same time remark that it has not been studied widely from a cross-linguistic perspective. They propose the need for further research on language-specific grammatical features that serve as conditions for particular marking of indirect speech. This paper attempts to follow along these lines.

Before discussing typological variation, I will first clarify a number of key terms. The terms "reported speech" and "indirect speech" are often used interchangeably and perceived as standing in opposition to direct speech or citation. In order to avoid confusion in this paper the term "indirect speech" is defined as a grammatical construction for the purpose of expressing information about an utterance as reported by another speaker, where the reported utterance is not a direct quotation, i.e. an exact replication of the originally perceived linguistic form. More specifically it is not understood as a construction that describes the semantic or pragmatic content of the original utterance freely but as one that preserves the meaning as well as a close approximation of the original form (cf. Lucy 1993: 95). Grammatical modifications of the reported text are understood as a necessary consequence of integration into a larger structure.

Indirect speech is functionally similar to direct speech in that it likewise provides a report about a speech event. The term reported speech (construction) can thus be used as a cover term for any linguistic structure that represents a report about the utterance or thought of another individual (cf. Janssen & Van der Wurff 1996). Direct speech representation, i.e. word by word repetition of another speaker's utterance entails that this repetition can display any degree of grammatical complexity. It may be a single word as well as a complex clausal

structure. For the sake of cross-linguistic generalisations I focus on indirect speech constructions that represent the reporting of an event encoded in a clausal structure. The main points of interest are thus to find out what happens when a clause that has originally been uttered by speaker B is integrated into a larger reportative structure by speaker A. The object of investigation is therefore a sentential construction that has the reporter as its matrix subject and a verb of saying (uttering discourse) as its main predicator. This essentially involves the encoding of two events, that of making a statement about reporter and the reported event itself. Consequently a minimum of two subjects are involved, which implies a multi-clausal structure. In order to narrow down the object of investigation in this paper I will mainly deal with multi-clausal constructions with a matrix verb of saying. The prototypical indirect speech construction consists of a matrix reportative clause and a (subordinated) reported clause.

In many cases it is true of both direct and indirect speech constructions that the clause that encodes the main proposition of a speaker about the reporter and the clause that encodes the reported proposition are in a grammatical dependency relation, i.e. the former is the matrix clause and the latter is a clausal complement. Also of interest for this paper is the question of whether those languages that distinguish between direct and indirect speech, but do not have specifically marked indirect speech constructions, use grammatical means to mark direct speech constructions. If this is the case, a speech representation construction in a given language that, for instance, lacks a quotative morpheme, would be marked for indirect speech by default. As will be pointed out in this paper, the specific morphosyntactic means to convey an event as described by another speaker beyond verbatim repetition show cross-linguistic parallels.

There are a number of formal as well as functional differences between the construction types that need to be addressed before any cross-linguistic comparison. In the following paragraphs I will discuss some differences and similarities between direct and indirect speech constructions and point out cross-linguistically valid identification strategies. Whereas direct speech constructions necessarily include a word by word rendition of the reported utterance, reported speech constructions typically come with certain morphosyntactic effects. That is to say, once the original utterance is integrated into the reportative construction, it is grammatically altered, even though its propositional content is retained. The most crucial difference between direct and indirect speech is the perspective of speakers involved in a speech report construction. The following schema gives an overview of the logically necessary participants involved in any speech representation construction, direct or indirect:

Figure 1. A template for reported speech constructions

SPEAKER:
　　　[X(REPORTER) V(reportative)
　　　　　[Y(REPORTEE) V complement]]

The SPEAKER is the utterer of the construction and thus outside the immediate domain of investigation. The REPORTER typically functions as the subject of a matrix reportative clause. The REPORTEE typically functions as the subject of the reported clause. In a direct speech construction the spatio-temporal perspective of the reporter is retained.

The main characteristic of the indirect speech construction on the other hand is a change of perspective from reporter to the speaker. In languages that distinguish between the types of speech reports this is usually manifested formally in pronominal, deictic and tense shifts. If this is the case, items that pertain to these functional domains must be adjusted in

indirect speech constructions so as to reflect the perspective of the speaker. The schema of necessarily encoded actants shown above implies a variety of reference scenarios that may occur in reported speech constructions. In an indirect speech construction X and Y are often co-referent. However, the reported participant (Y) may as well be 1Sg, i.e. co-referent with the speaker, i.e. the individual who utters the construction. Consider the English example below, where in (1a) the reporter is also the speaker of the reported utterance and in (1b) speaker and reportee are co-referent:

(1)   a.   SPEAKER: *She$_{(i)}$ said she$_{(i)}$ had been playing before.*
        b.   SPEAKER$_{(i)}$: *She said I$_{(i)}$ had been playing before*
        c.   SPEAKER: *She$_{(i)}$ said: "I$_{(i)}$ had been playing before".*

The co-reference scenario in (1b) only allows it to be interpreted as an indirect speech construction. Note that there is a grammatically identical direct speech construction (1c). If the subject of the reported clause is 1Sg, grammatical differences between the constructions are neutralised and reference must be either retrieved from context or marked phonologically, as will be discussed in due course.

While in direct speech constructions the reported proposition is attributed to the reporter and the speaker remains in a neutral relation to this proposition the indirect speech construction may convey additional shades of meaning such as the speaker's attitude towards the reported proposition and its source (cf. Li 1986). Since this is essentially a grammatical representation of the relation between the speaker and the propositional information, reported speech constructions fall into the domain of evidentiality. By means of direct citation of another speaker's utterance the speaker deems himself irresponsible for the truth of the reported information, since all responsibilities lie with the reporter, whose exact words are repeated. The use of an indirect speech construction in the same context, however, indicates that the speaker has evaluated the reported situation to some extent and is no longer neutral, i.e. he perceives himself in a relation to the reported situation or its truth value. Numerous languages have obligatory evidential markers such as HEARSAY or VISUAL, which indicate that the speaker has obtained the information expressed in a clause through verbal communication or as an eyewitness (cf. Papafragou & Li, 2001). The contrast between clauses thus marked can be similar to the contrast between direct speech and indirect speech in a given language. Particularly HEARSAY evidential constructions must be regarded as functionally related to indirect speech reports, since sentences thus marked often indicate an indefinite source of uttering, which makes an exact verbatim rendering of an original utterance impossible. The formal and functional distinctions discussed so far serve as the basis for cross-linguistic identification of reported speech constructions.

It can be assumed that every language has some mechanism for direct speech report, i.e. mimicking a verbal message exactly as perceived. This is not necessarily the case for indirect speech reports. As will become clear in due course, in some languages it seems as if no grammatical strategy is available for the purpose of conveying someone else's utterance other than in that person's own words (cf. Li 1986: 30). There are also languages with a rather fuzzy grammatical distinction between direct and indirect speech, since reported speech constructions share properties of both types. Generally speaking, if the perspective parameter outlined above is taken as the basis for a direct/indirect distinction, it can be typologized according to how clearly it is marked in the report construction, if at all. Hence, even if a reported clause seems to be a verbatim rendition of the perceived clause at first sight, this leaves open the possibility of marking indirectness outside the reported clause, namely on the matrix clause level. Languages that allow no alteration of the reported material thus may still

have a construction that is marked for indirect speech. Indeed this can be observed across languages and I will return to this later.

The following examples from English illustrate a range of grammatical differences between the construction types:

(2)   a.   *Martin said: "I went to the library."*
        b.   *Martin said he had gone to the library.*
        c.   *Martin said that he had gone to the library.*
        d.   *Martin said: "He will go to the library."*

In both sentences (2a and b) the clause that represents the reported proposition is a complement of the clause that encodes the proposition of the speaker. However, the reported speech construction is marked as such by a change of tense as well as pronominal subject. Example (2c) represents the most obvious indicator for indirect speech representation in English, namely encoding of the reported utterance as a clause subordinated to the verb of saying with a complementizer (*that*). In English a construction that contains this complementizer cannot be interpreted as direct speech. Consider the contrast between the next two sentences:

(3)   a.   *Martin said: "He went to the library."*
        b.   *Martin said he had gone to the library.*

The above contrast shows that tense difference is a more reliable indicator for the grammatical status of a construction as a reported speech construction, since the pronominal subject of the subordinate clause is identical in (3a) and (3b). Here examples (2) and (3) furthermore reveal the ambiguity of indirect speech constructions in English. Even though (2b) and (3b) are grammatically identical, they may nevertheless represent reports of different propositions, more specifically propositions that contain different referents.

So far it seems as if morphosyntactic marking of the subject that represents the reportee as well as marking of the reported verb are not wholly reliable strategies to mark a sentential structure as an indirect speech construction. An alternative direct speech interpretation is always possible. English uses intonation as a disambiguation strategy in such cases. Even though the two sentences in (4) below are identical morphosyntactically, a different intonation contour distinguishes between direct and indirect speech and consequently provides information about reference. In contrast to (4b) in example (4a) there is a short pause between the two clauses:

(4)   a.   *Martin said: "I had gone to the library."*
        b.   *Martin said I had gone to the library.*

There is no tense shift between the two clauses in either (4a) or (4b). The indirect speech construction (4b) necessarily involves that reporter (*Martin*) and reportee (1Sg) are not co-referent. The fact that the subject of the complement clause is a first person singular pronoun indicates its co-reference with the speaker. In this example stress assignment not only provides information about reference between the two subjects, but functions as a distinction strategy between direct and indirect speech. The above examples show that in English it is the interplay of several grammatical and prosodic means that distinguish direct from indirect speech constructions if a complementizer is absent. Prosodic means are a common alternative for the distinction between direct and indirect speech. That is to say, whenever the distinction is relevant and grammatical means are absent, the distinction is brought about by a difference

in intonation. Here the prosodic means of stress is used to disambiguate in a fashion akin to focalization or topicalization in otherwise grammatically identical clauses. The complementizer construction on the other hand can only be interpreted as indirect speech, reference ambiguities are ruled out. In example (5) below the 1Sg subject of the reported clause, i.e. the reportee, can thus only be interpreted as co-referent with the speaker (the utterer of (5)) and not the reporter (Tim), regardless of intonation structure:

(5)   Tim says that I am a trumpeter.

It appears as if the most reliable *grammatical* strategy for indirect speech so far is clausal subordination by means of complementizers. The fact that a complementizer appears in the sentence suggests a considerable degree of syntactic processing of the original verbatim speech, since it leaves no doubt about the complement status of the reported clause. This in turn suggests alteration of the reported utterance. Consequently it can be hypothesized that the use of complementizes in reported speech construction is a cross-linguistically valid criterion for a construction to be classified as indirect speech construction. In English the complementizer construction such as (2c) is the only indirect speech construction that disallows a direct report reading. It remains to be investigated whether this is also the case in the majority of languages. The appearance of a complementizer entails that the originally uttered (reported) clause has been entirely integrated into the matrix clause by means of subordination. Other grammatical effects are not unlikely. Consider the following German examples:

(6)   a.   *Er   sagte: "Es   gibt   keine   Gespenster."*
               3Sg.M say.PAST   3Sg.NEU   give   no   ghosts
               'He said: "There are no ghosts.".'

        b.   *Er   sagte   es   gebe   keine   Gespenster.*
               3Sg.M say.PAST   3Sg.NEU   give.SUBJ   no   ghosts
               'He said there were no ghosts.'

        c.   *Er   sagte, daß   es   keine   Gespenster   gibt.*
               3Sg.M say   that   3Sg.NEU   no   ghosts   give
               'He said that there are no ghosts.'

        d.   *Man   sagt,   es   gebe   keine   Gespenster.*
               NEU   say   3Sg.NEU   give SUBJ   no   ghosts
               'They(people) say that there are no ghosts.'

        e.   *Man   sagt: "Es   gibt   keine   Gespenster."*
               NEU   say   3Sg.NEU   give   no   ghosts
               'They(people) say: "There are no ghosts.".'

Examples (6b) and (6c) show two types of indirect speech construction marking: the use of a subjunctive verb form in the subordinate reported clause and subordination with a complementizer, respectively. The latter strategy furthermore involves a change of the original word order in the reported clause. Both strategies can be used also if the reporter, i.e. the matrix subject, is indefinite, as in (6d). The ungrammaticality of (6e) shows that the direct speech construction is not possible with an indefinite matrix subject. Semantically this is quite

straightforward, since an indefinite subject cannot produce actual speech[1]. It might be assumed that if a given language allows no alteration of the reported clause, certain marking of the matrix clause will identify the resulting sentence as an indirect speech construction. Example (6e) shows HEARSAY evidentiality expressed in a regular finite matrix clause. This function is associated with special elements in other languages.

3. Possible variation

The present study is based on a small sample of 42 genetically and typologically diverse languages. These are classified according to which strategies they employ for the distinction between direct and indirect reported speech. It will be investigated whether the means that are made available for this purpose are in complimentary distribution.

In the availability of some morphosyntactic means to represent direct speech can be safely regarded as universal, this is not the case with indirect speech (cf. Lucy 1993: 95). Coulmas (1986: 21) points out that some languages employ special morphosyntactic marking to establish co-reference of reporter and reportee. Those languages that do have strategies for such encoding vary as to which strategy or combination of strategies is used for this purpose. Quite commonly languages make available a number of parallel strategies for the same function, such as in English and German. As has become clear from the previous section in contrast to direct speech reported speech necessarily involves some degree of semantic modification of the reported utterance. Considering this observation it appears likely that a language utilizes different reported speech constructions depending on which facet of modification is to be conveyed or, in other words, particular modifications show particular morphosyntactic effects.

4. Typological findings

Languages commonly employ either one or several morphosyntactic marking strategies to express indirect speech distinct from direct speech. Those languages that do not distinguish the two grammatically presumably allow for direct and indirect interpretation of a reported clause through either contextual or prosodic information. Since the main concern of this paper is morphosyntactic marking, I will leave these issues open for future research. The following list gives an overview of grammatical properties associated with indirect speech constructions that could be found in the sample.

Figure 2. Grammatical properties of indirect reported speech constructions

NECESSARY CONDITION:
- change of perspective from reporter to speaker

MORPHOSYNTACTIC CODING STRATEGIES:
- use of special pronouns
- constraints on matrix verb report complements
- morphological markers in the reported clause
- clause linkage differences/complementizers
- special verb forms/paradigms

---

[1] This example is only grammatical when interpreted not as a direct speech construction in the narrow sense, i.e. repetition of a received spoken utterance, but as an instruction to utter a particular linguistic form correctly, as in *One says he went, not he goed*.

LIKELY EFFECTS ON THE REPORTED CLAUSE:
- perspective shift reflected by different selection of items from the following domains:
    - tense/time adverbial system
        - pronominal system
        - deictic system
- word order change
- nominalization

Grammatical distinction between direct and indirect speech as such is not universal. Chantyal (Tibeto-Burman) provides an example for a language that does not allow indirect discourse representation (Noonan 2001). Marked indirect speech constructions therefore do not exist. It should be noted, however, that the direct speech construction has a rather broad functional range. Direct reported discourse complements subordinated to a verb of saying, for instance, may function as modifiers in larger constructions. No grammatical distinction between the two types of reported speech can furthermore be found in Apalai (Carib) (Koehn & Koehn 1986), Hakha Lai (Tibeto-Burman) (Peterson 2003) and Nez Perce (Penutian) (Cash Cash to appear). In all these languages any reported discourse is necessarily a verbatim rendition of the source utterance. In Coatlán Loxicha-Zapotec (Oto-Manguean) direct and indirect speech constructions are distinguished by means of semantic context and reference of the matrix clause pronominal forms (but not their form) instead of grammatical alterations of the reported clause. Indirect encoding of a report does not result in expected grammatical effects such as deictic or tense shifts in the reported clause (Beam de Ascona 2005: 6-7). On the other hand, I have not found a language in which direct quotation is impossible. The above suggests that verbatim representation of speech is the default case if there is no grammatical strategy available for the distinction between speech representation types and consequently that specific encoding of indirect speech through morphosyntax as such is marked cross-linguistically.

The most obvious effect of indirect speech are shifts in the pronominal, tense and deictic systems. One might argue that these should be counted as morphosyntactic coding strategies in their own right. I chose the term 'effect' to indicate that these shifts involve only elements that are also present in the source utterance. As shown in section 2 these effects obtain in English and German, where the perspective shift is necessarily reflected in different selection of pronouns. However, as the data in this section will show, these effects do not always obtain in all languages that have distinctive marking of indirect speech constructions. Comrie (1986: 20) notes that Russian does not have tense backshifting in indirect speech construction, i.e. a subordinated indirect reported clause is marked for the same tense as its direct counterpart. The same obtains, for instance, in Noon (Niger-Congo) (Soukka 2000: 313). Also, as pointed out in section 2 above pronominal subject encoding may lead to reference ambiguity with respect to the distinction between direct and indirect speech, particularly where the subject of the reported clause is marked for other than first person in direct speech.

The most significant cross-linguistic grammatical distinction that can be observed is that between languages that use a complementizer to introduce a subordinate indirect reported clause and those that do not. A construction may also be marked for indirect speech by particular modifications of either the matrix clause or the subordinate reported clause. In the former scenario certain reportative verbs are constrained to co-occurrence with indirect reported speech complements. Indeed this strategy can be attested and consequently a number of languages distinguish between classes of reportative matrix verbs. Resulting indirect speech constructions in such languages are marked as such by selection of matrix verb of saying. With respect to Paez (Chibchan-Paezan) Li (1986: 39) points out that the language has

no formal marking of indirect speech. At the same time he remarks that "indirect quotation sentences" are characterised by their exclusive use of a particular subclass of verbs. I therefore argue that the choice of matrix verb itself counts as formal marking of indirectness in reportative constructions in fashion similar to Yoruba (Niger-Congo).Yoruba has a closed class of verbs of saying, including three synonyms for 'say', *ní*, *wí* and *şo*. These matrix verbs almost always occur with indirect speech complements so that they can safely be understood as markers of indirect speech. The expected grammatical effect of pronominal shift occurs in the complement clauses (Bamgboşe 1986: 96). Some of the reportative verbs furthermore require a complementizer, such as in the example below:

(7)   *ó*   *bèrè*   *pè*   *ni*   *oùn*   *máa*   *je.*
   3   ask   COMP   what.FOC   3   will   eat
   'He asked what he was going to eat.'   (Bamgboşe 1986: 79)

The complementizer *pè* is not used in direct speech constructions.

   In Kashmiri (Indo-Iranian) the choice of reportative verbs facilitates the interpretation of a reported clause as either direct or indirect speech. Direct and indirect speech constructions alike involve subordination of the grammatically unaltered reported clause. Consider the following example:

(8)   ja:ve:d -an   von   (zi/ki)   su   pari   akhba:r.
   Javed -ERG   say.PAST   (COMP)   3Sg   read.FUT   newspaper
   'Javed said that he (Javed or someone else) will read
   the newspaper.'   (Wali & Koul 1997: 2)

Here both direct and indirect speech interpretation is possible. Kashmiri, however, allows for reported clauses that contain a 1Sg pronominal subject to be interpreted as indirect speech constructions. With certain reportative matrix verbs such as 'mention' and 'remark' first person pronouns in the reported clause are always co-referent with the speaker and not with the reporter, as would be expected in a direct speech construction. With reportative matrix verbs such as 'shout', 'yell' and 'exclaim' on the other hand first person pronouns indicate co-reference with the reporter and must be regarded as restricted to direct speech constructions. The complementizer is no reliable indicator of either direct or indirect speech as it is optional in reported speech constructions. Consider also the case of Noon (Niger-Congo). Here a complementizer *an* generally introduce speech reports. In direct speech reports, however, the reportative matrix verb may be omitted, which would be ungrammatical in indirect speech reports. The distinction is thus marked by the contrast V(reportative) + *an* (COMP) vs. ø + *an* (COMP) (cf. Soukka 2000: 313).

   Navajo (Athapaskan) reveals some degree of ambiguity between direct and indirect reported speech representation. At first sight one difference between direct and indirect discourse seems to be the configuration of pronouns in a given reported speech construction. Interestingly, if the subject of the embedded reported clause is 1Sg and co-referent with a 3Sg matrix verb, the construction may represent an indirect speech construction (Speas 1999), such as in the example below:

(9)   *ndeeshnish*   *ní.*
   1Sg.S.work   3Sg.S.say
   'He says he will work.'/ 'He says: "I will work."'   (Speas 1999: 3)

Complementizers may optionally appear before indirect discourse complements. Indirect speech constructions must be regarded as the standard strategy for the representation of discourse, since direct speech complements are subject to a number of constraints and verbatim rendition is not always possible (Speas 1999: 9). Tense (temporal modifiers) and spatial deictic elements, for instance, undergo the expected shift towards the speaker's perspective in what seems to be direct speech reports. It is therefore impossible to draw a clear morphosyntactic distinction between direct and indirect reported speech, constructions often share typical properties of both. In Chinese (Chinese) speakers indicate indirect reported speech by choice of pronoun in the reported clause, as in the following example:

(10) *Zhangsan shuo wo   lei   le.*
      Zhangsan says 1Sg   be.tired   PERF
      'Zhangsan says that I (≠ Zhangsan) am tired.'   (Li   1986:   33)

Pronominal shift is the only indicator for indirect speech, there is no specific grammatical marking of the construction. Similarly in Supyire (Niger-Congo) only the expected change perspective is reflected, in this case by pronominal, deictic and time adverb shifts:

(11) a.   u   à   jwo   mìì   sí   ŋ̀-   kàrà   àní   nùmpagnŋa.
           3Sg   PERF   say   1Sg   FUT   FUT-   go   there tomorrow
           'He/She said: "I'll go there tomorrow."'

      b.   u   à   jwo   uru   sí   m̀-   pà   náhá   táɲjáà.
           3Sg   PERF   say   3Sg   FUT   FUT-   come   here   yesterday
           'He/She said he/she'd come here yesterday'   (Carlson 1994: 444)

In some languages reference ambiguities are resolved by means of logophoric pronouns. These are special pronominal forms that mark the speaker, i.e. the subject of the matrix verb of saying, and the reported or cited speaker as co-referent, as in the following example from Ewe (Niger-Congo):

(12) a.   *Kofi   be   yè-   dzo.*
           Kofi   say   LOG-   go
           'Kofi(i) said he(i) left.'

      b.   *Kofi   be   é-   dzo.*
           Kofi   say   3Sg.S- go
           'Kofi said he/she left.'   (Von Roncador 1988: 243)

The fact that in case of co-reference of reporter and speaker the latter is encoded as a logophoric third person singular morpheme and not as first person singular marks the contrast between indirect and direct speech. Logophoric pronouns can be described as a type of pronominal marking of indirect reported speech. Complementizers or other syntactic means to mark indirect speech may seem superfluous in the presence of logophoric pronouns. Nevertheless they do occur, as in the example below from Babungo (Niger-Congo):

(13) ŋwə́   gì   lāa   yì   táa   jwî
      3Sg   say.PFV   COMP   LOG   FUT   come
      'He(i) said that he(i) will come.'   (Bickel to appear: 84)

I will now turn to another cross-linguistically common coding strategy that applies to the reported clause in an indirect speech construction. This is the use of verbal affixes, particles or clitics on some element of the reported clause. In Kathmandu Newar (Tibeto-Burman) the reported clause is followed by en evidential particle *hā*. This evidential particle is functionally similar to the reportative matrix clause with a verb of saying, which can be used alternatively in indirect speech constructions. Also logophoric suffixes on the reported verb indicate whether or not its subject is co-referent with the reporter, as in (14) below:

(14) a.   syām -ā   a:pwa twan -ā   -hā.
              Syam -ERG much drink -PAST.CONJUNCT -EVID
              'Syam said that he(Syam) drank too much.'

       b.   syām -ā   a:pwa twan -a   -hā.
              Syam -ERG much drink -PAST.DISJUNCT -EVID
              'It is said that Syam drank too much.'   (Hargreaves 2005: 16)

Hargreaves (2005: 16) notes that certain verb classes disallow logophoric marking, such as control verbs. Somewhat similar phenomena can be observed in Svan (Kartvelian), where a clitic occurs in the reported clause if reporter and reportee are co-referent. If another speaker's utterance is reported, special indirect pronouns are used instead of the 1Sg and 2Sg pronouns of the original utterance (Tuite 1995: 20). This marking strategy can also be found in Lak (Caucasian), where a particle *tar* following a clause marks this as reported speech. This element must be seen as a reportative particle or auxiliary because in contrast to reportative verbs found elsewhere it is invariant (cf. Friedman 1984).

        Cholón (Hibito-Cholon) has a clear morphological distinction between direct and indirect reported speech. There are three markers with distinct morphological properties. The reportative marker *-(a)č* is a nominal suffix that attaches to the subject of the reported clause. The suffix *-he* can either attach to the verb of the reported clause, in which case it exclusively marks indirect speech, or a nominal complex including the first reportative marker *-(a)č* (Alexander-Bakkerus: 2005). As a verb suffix it may be followed by a quotative marker *-na*. This morpheme affixed by itself encodes direct citation. An example of indirect speech marking with *-he* is given below:

(15) *fiscal*   *-tu*   *-p*   *-č*   *i-*   *k-*   *šayš* *-t*   *-aŋ*   *-he*
       public.prosecutor   -AD -ABL -REP 3Sg- 1Pl- whip -FUT -IA   -IS
       estevan   *ki*   *-aŋ.*
       Estevan   say   -IA
       'Estevan says that the public prosecutor will
       whip us.'   (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005: 303)

Likewise Turkish (Turkic) clearly marks the distinction between direct and indirect speech constructions morphologically. Here case suffixes are attached to the reported verb and thus the indirect complement clause is nominalized. The difference is shown in (16):

(16) a.   *Ahmet (ben) dun   sinema-ya git   -ti   -m   de   -di.*
              Ahmet (1Sg) yest. cinema-DAT go   -PAST -1Sg say   -PAST
              'Ahmet said: "I went to the movies yesterday."'

b. *Ahmet dun   sinema -ya   git   -tiğ -in   -i   söyle -di.*
   Ahmet yest. cinema-DAT go   -NOM -3Sg -ACC say   -PAST
   'Ahmet said he went to the movies yesterday.'   (Kornfilt 1997: 1)

West Greenlandic (Eskimo-Aleut) has several types of indirect speech construction. The reported clause is expressed as the complement of a verb of saying and it is morphologically different from the original clause. This indicates the difference between indirect and otherwise similarly expressed direct speech reports. Alternatively a verb of saying is suffixed to the reported utterance. This bound verb form specifically marks indirect speech and has a corresponding form for the expression of direct speech. West Greenlandic thus makes a sharp distinction between these types of reportative constructions. A third type uses a reportative clitic and is limited to the expression of an indefinite reporter. The two regular indirect speech strategies are exemplified below:

(17) a. *Nuka oqar -voq   qasu -qi   -luni.*
            Nuka say   -3Sg.IND   be.tired-INT -4Sg.CONTEMPORATIVE
            'Nuka said that she is/was very tired.'

     b. *pitsaar   -nerar   -vaat.*
            be.good   -say.that   -3Pl..S/3Sg.O.IND
            'They say that it is good.'   (Berge 2002: 146)

West Greenlandic therefore either marks indirect speech constructions by means of selection of reportative verb or by morphological cues in the reported clause.

     A reported speech clitic is found, for instance, in Belhare (Tibeto-Burman): The element *-phu/pu* attaches to a host in a clause to mark the clause as reported. The host can be any element in that clause (Bickel to appear).

     Hungarian (Finno-Ugric) uses the unusual strategy of demonstratives as markers of distinction between reportative constructions alongside complementizers. This is to say, that an indirect speech clause can be introduced by a demonstrative *azt* (that), which contrasts with its direct speech counterpart *ezt* (this). An example is given below:

(18) a. *Péter azt   mondta   hogy János elmegy.*
            Peter that   say.PAST   COMP John leave.PROG
            'Peter said that John is leaving.'

     b. *Péter ezt   mondta   János elmegy.*
            Peter this   say.PAST   John leave.PROG
            'Peter said: "John is leaving."'   (Kiefer 1986: 201)

However, the indirect speech construction also contains a complementizer *hogy*, which is disallowed in the direct speech counterpart, so that marking of indirect speech is achieved by a combination of parallel strategies similar to case of Yoruba above.

     Indirect speech constructions are sometimes marked as such primarily by means of verb morphology in the reported clause. As shown in (6) above the use of a subjunctive verb form in a reported clause in German indicates indirect speech. In Latin (Italic) indirect speech involves a subordinate reported clause that contains a non-finite verb and an accusative subject. These features specifically mark indirect speech. The same obtains in Greek (Greek), albeit not as the sole strategy. However, as in German also subordination of the reported clause with a complementizer may indicate indirect speech (Coulmas 1986: 19). Specifically

marked verb forms indicate indirect speech in the Slavic languages Bulgarian and Macedonian as well as in Old French and Spanish (see Van der Wurff (ed.) 1996). In these languages reported verb marking is the primary strategy for indirect speech, the reportative clause and the reported clause are juxtaposed without a complementizer.

Indirect speech constructions commonly involve subordination with a complementizer. Often it is the only morphosyntactic marking strategy for this function in some languages, but it likewise occurs as an alternative strategy in languages that make available other means. As we have seen already, this strategy is used, for instance, in English and German, albeit not exclusively. Considering that we have encountered a number of languages that regularly mark indirect speech constructions morphologically but allow subordination of the reported clause by means of a complementizer as a valid alternative the latter must be regarded as a cross-linguistically common default strategy. In the following paragraphs I will discuss a few languages in which a complementizer is the standard indicator for indirect speech constructions.

Finnish (Finno-Ugric) basically uses two indirect reported speech constructions, one in which the speech report is subordinated to the reportative clause with the complementizer *että* and one in which the reported clause is simply juxtaposed to the matrix clause. In the latter case the verb is a participle. Consider the following examples:

(19) a. *ystäväni kertoi: ölen tyytyväinen lomamatkaani.*
friend.1.POSS tell.IMPF.3Sg be.1Sg content vacation.IL.1.POSS
'My friend told me: "I am content with my vacation.".'

b. *ystäväni kertoi: että*
friend.1.POSS tell.IMPF.3Sg COMP
hän oli tyytyväinen lomamatkaansa.
3Sg be.IMPF.3Sg content vacation.IL.3.POSS
'My friend told me that he/she was content with his/ her vacation.'

c. *ystäväni kertoi: olevansa tyytyväinen lomamatkaansa.*
friend.1. POSS tell.IMPF.3Sg be.PARTcontent vacation.IL.3.POSS
'My friend told me that he/she was content
with his/ her vacation.' (Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992: 3-5)

The regular subordination strategy may optionally show perspective effects. The participial strategy is constrained in that certain categories cannot be expressed (Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992: 7). If the source utterance is marked for negative polarity or mood in general, this cannot be conveyed in a speech report, if the participial strategy is chosen. The complementizer strategy is thus not only a default strategy in Finnish for this function, it has far greater applicability.

Tarifit (Berber) shows a behaviour similar to English in that indirect reported clauses must be minimally marked as such by pronominal adjustment, but may optionally be subordinated with a complementizer, as shown in the following examples:

(20) a. *i- nna Heddu nesh th- argaz.*
3Sg- say Heddu 1Sg NOM.COP- man
'Heddu said: "I am the/a man.".'

b. *i-   nna   Heddu netta   th-   argaz.*
    3Sg- say   Heddu 3Sg   COP.NOM-   man
    'Heddu said he is the/a man.'

c. *i-   nna   Heddu qa   nesh   th-   argaz.*
    3Sg- say   Heddu COMP 1Sg   COP.NOM-   man
    'Heddu says that I (speaker) am
    a man.'   (Abdelhak El-Hankari personal communication)

The presence of a complementizer in (20c) thus ensures that the 1Sg pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the speaker, i.e. co-reference between reportee and speaker. Unlike English verb morphology remains unaffected in indirect reported speech in Tarifit.

In Malayalam (Dravidian) indirect reported clauses are integrated into a report construction by means of a complementizer, whereas direct reports are juxtaposed:

(21) a. uɲɲi paraɲɲu   ɲaan   varaam.
          Unni   say.PAST   1Sg   come.FUT
          'Unni said: "I'll come.".'

      b. uɲɲi varaam   ennə   paraɲɲu
          Unni   come.FUT   COMP   say.PAST
          'Unni said he'd come.'(Unni)

      c. raamanparaɲɲu   avan   varum   ennə
          Raman say.PAST   3Sg   come.FUT   COMP
          'Raman said he'd come.'(Raman or someone else)   (Asher & Kumari 1997: 3)

The contrast between (21b) and (21c) furthermore shows an interesting reference disambiguation strategy. In (21c) the subordinate subject that encodes the reportee has unspecified reference. In (21b) on the other hand co-reference between reporter and reportee is obvious, since there is only one subject. This shows that in such cases of co-reference there is a far greater degree of fusion of matrix clause and reported clause in Malayalam.

Tagalog (Malayo-Polynesian) is an example for a language in which a set of obligatory complementizers mark the indirect reported clause as subordinate to the matrix verb of saying. The complementizer *kung* is used if the reported clause is interrogative, otherwise *na* is used. The thus integrated reported clauses show likely grammatical effects such as tense backshifting and deictic perspective modifications. Interestingly the indirect speech construction is syntactically more complex than the direct speech construction, even though direct speech has a significantly lower frequency of usage in Tagalog (La Polla & Poa 2005: 8).

(22) a. *sinabi ni   Michael na   a-   alis   na   siya.*
          say   SPEC Michael COMP   REDUP-   leave   MOD 3Sg
          'Michael said he's leaving.'
          (La Polla & Poa 2005: 9)

      c. *sinabi ni   Michael a-   alis   na   ako*
          say   SPEC Michael REDUP-   leave   MOD 1Sg
          'Michael said: "I'm leaving."'   (La Polla & Poa 2005: 6)

As shown in section 2 the complementizer used in English and German indirect speech constructions is invariant in both languages, *that* and *daß*, respectively. The same marking strategy can be observed in Swahili (Niger-Congo) with the crucial difference that instead of one complementizer the language employs a closed class of complementizers. While the appearance of a member of this class as such indicates indirect reported speech, the elements vary as to the degree of doubt about the proposition encoded in the reported clause on the part of the reporter. Consider the following contrast:

(23) a. *amina akasema*   *nitakwenda   mjini kesho.*
          Amina 3Sg.PAST.say   1Sg.FUT.go   town   tomorrow
          'Amina said: "I'll go to town tomorrow.".'

      b. *magesa   alisema   kuwa*
          Magesa   3Sg,PAST.say   COMP
          alitaka   kwenda   kenya.
          3Sg.PAST.want   go   Kenya
          'Magesa said that he wanted to go to Kenya.'

      c. *john alisema   sijui atakwja*   *kesho.*
          John 3Sg.PAST.say COMP 3Sg.FUT.come   tomorrow
          'John said that(I don't know) he would (maybe)
          come tomorrow. '   (Massamba 1986: 99-103)

The first sentence is a direct speech construction, i.e. the standard structure for the representation of verbatim quotation in Swahili. Sentences (23b) and (23c) are structurally similar. The fact that the complementizer *sijui* is used instead of *kuwa* in (23c), however, provides additional evidential information, more particularly it expresses that the reporter is not convinced of what the reportee has said. A complementizer introduces indirect speech complements also in Tlapanec (Subtiaba-Tlapanec), as exemplified in (24):

(24) ni-   ʔt   -un   di
      PFV- tell   -3Sg/3Sg.GIVENTOPIC   COMP
      na-   nd   -o   yah   -unʔ.
      PFV- want   -DAT.3Sg.NEWTOPIC   work -ERG.3Sg.NEU
      'He told him that he wanted to work.'   (Wichmann to appear: 21)

The topic marker on the subordinated reported verb indicates that reporter and reportee are not co-referent. The occurrence of the NEWTOPIC marker excludes direct speech interpretation. This referential disambiguation strategy is akin to the use of logophoric pronouns in indirect speech constructions elsewhere.

So far complementizers seem to occur in indirect speech constructions exclusively. This is, however, not always the case. For instance in Buru (Malayo-Polynesian) a complementizer *fen* introduces all complements that represent speech reports. In contrast to most other languages that use complementizers in speech report constructions in Buru this strategy is not restricted to indirect speech, so that there is no morphosyntactic distinction between direct and indirect speech reports. Since here it is no reliable indicator for an indirect speech report and also no other morphological cues are available, prosodic cues are used to mark the direct/indirect distinction in cases where no pronominal shift occurs:

(25) a. *da   prepa fen   sira   rua   kaduk.*
          3Sg   say   COMP   3Pl   two   arrive
          'She said: "The two of them came.".'

      b. *da   prepa fen   sira   rua   kaduk.*
          3Sg   say   COMP   3Pl   two   arrive
          'She said that the two of them came.'   (Klamer 2000: 82)

An intonation break between the reportative and the reported clauses (in (25a)) indicates an direct speech report. The same is true of the related language Tukang Besi (Klamer 2000).

In Canela Krahó (Ge-Kaingang) indirect and direct reports are subordinated to the reportative clause by means of the complementizers *na* and *hane/hajyr*, respectively. In contrast to Buru and Tukang Besi, however, the choice of complementizer thus depends on the speech representation type. Direct speech constructions furthermore are introduced by a formulaeic reportative clause, which is underlined in the following example:

(26) a. <u>*cu   -te ĩ-   ma   harkwa   ton*</u>
          3   -PAST 1-   to   word   make
          ĩ   -ma   a-   kĩn   hane.
          1   -TEMPORARYSTATE   2-   like COMP
          'He said: "I like you.".'

      b. *cu   -te   ĩ-   mã   amji   jaren*
          3   -PAST 1-   TEMPORARYSTATE   self   told
          cu   -ma   a-   kĩn   na.
          3   -TEMPORAL 2- like COMP
          'He told me that he likes you.'   (Popjes & Popjes 1986: 165)

Even though the direct speech construction is the preferred option for speech representation in Canela Krahó (Popjes & Popjes 1986: 165), the indirect speech construction appears to be more economical. Tümpisa (Uto-Aztecan) shows similar behaviour. Here reported clauses, direct or indirect, are followed by a quotative particle *mii* and a finite reportative verb. This particle seems to function as a complementizer for the subordination of a speech report. The direct/indirect-distinction is reduced to pronominal reference effects (cf. Dayley 1989: 380).

The use of a complementizer in English clearly marks speech representation as indirect, as evident in the ungrammaticality of (27b) below. However, reference ambiguities remain and require the same disambiguation strategies:

(27) a. *Martin said that he had gone to the library.*
      b. *[Martin said that: "He had gone to the library.".]sentence

In contrast too this it has been argued that Japanese (Isolate) has no grammatical distinction between direct and indirect speech. Indeed both variants of reported speech are expressed by means of a multi-clausal structure consisting of a matrix clause that contains a verb of saying and a reported clause that is marked as subordinate by a complementizer. What is problematic is that the same complementizer *to* is used as both a quotative particle and a marker of a subordinate indirect speech clause. Coulmas (1986b: 163) points out, however, that diachronically this morpheme has acquired a broader functional range, more specifically it has developed from a reportative particle, a marker of indirect speech, to a complementizer that is used in direct as well as indirect representation of speech. An example is given below

(28)   a.   *ashita*   *maduni*   *kono*   *shigoto-o*   *yatte*   *kudasai to*
            tomorrow   until   this   work -ACC   do   please COMP
            kare   *wa*   *iinashita.*
            3Sg   TOP   say.PAST
            'He said: "Please finish this work by tomorrow".'

       b.   *ashita*   *maduni*   *kono*   *shigoto-o*   *yaru*   *yoni*   *to*
            tomorrow   until   this   work -ACC   do   thus   COMP
            kare   *wa*   *iinashita.*
            3Sg   TOP   say.PAST
            'He told me to finish this work by tomorrow.'   (Coulmas 1986: 168)

The difference lies in the verb form of the subordinate clause that represents the reported utterance.

In the vast majority of cases subordination of the reported clause with a complementizer indicates indirect speech and contrasts with other forms of clause integration that represent direct speech. While there are languages that subordinate all reported clauses with a complementizer regardless of the direct/indirect distinction, I have found only one language in the sample in which the reverse obtains: In Tikar (Niger-Congo) it is the direct speech construction that involves subordination with a complementizer. In contrast to most other languages that mark the direct/indirect distinction in reported speech constructions a reported clause subordinated with a complementizer indicates direct rather than indirect speech, as shown in the following contrast:

(29)   a.   à   shὲ   lὲ   kpulu   lε   kpulu   wù   yibâ   mũ   ndεm.
            3Sg   say   to   turtle COMP turtle 2Sg   stole   me   field
            'He said to the turtle: "You stole my field."'

       b.   nũ   nũ   nywœimε   ǹjè.
            3Sg   3Sg   escape   starvation
            'He said he has escaped.'   (Li 1986: 35-36)

The indirect speech construction shows the expected pronominal shift.
The preceding paragraphs have shown that cross-linguistically subordination of the reported clause with a complementizer is the most common and most reliable indicator of indirect speech.

4. Concluding remarks

The distribution of coding strategies for indirect speech reports found in the sample is listed in the following table:

Table 1. Morphosyntactic marking of indirect speech in reported speech constructions

language	genetic affiliation	no marking	matrix verb	specific marking of reported clause				COMP (optional use indicated by brackets)		
				LOG	REP	verb form	WO change, nominalization., demonstratives.	in all RSC	DRSC	IRSC
Apalai	Carib	+								
Babungo	Niger-Congo			+						+
Belhare	Tibeto-Burman				+					
Bulgarian	Slavic					+				
Buru	Malayo-Polynesian							+		
Canela-Krahó	Ge-Kaingang							+		
Chantyal	Tibeto-Burman	+								
Chinese	Chinese	+								
Cholón	Hibito-Cholon				+					
Coatlán Loxicha-Zapotec	Oto-Manguean	+								
English	Germanic									(+)
Ewe	Niger-Congo			+						
Finnish	Finno-Ugric					+				+
German	Germanic					+	(+)			(+)
Greek	Greek					+				(+)
Hakha Lai	Tibeto-Burman	+								
Hungarian	Finno-Ugric						+			+
Japanese	Isolate					+		+		
Kashmiri	Indo-Iranian		+							(+)
Kathmandu Newar	Tibeto-Burman				+					
Lak	Caucasian				+					
Latin	Italic					+	+			
Macedonian	Slavic					+				
Malayalam	Dravidian									+
Navajo	Athapaskan									(+)
Nez Perce	Penutian	+								
Noon	Niger-Congo		+					+		
Old French	Italic					+				
Paez	Chibchan-Paezan		+							
Spanish	Italic					+				
Supyire	Nuger-Congo	+								
Svan	Kartvelian				+					
Swahili	Niger-Congo									+
Tagalog	Malayo-Polynesian									+
Tarifit	Berber									(+)
Tikar	Niger.Congo								+	
Tlapanec	Subtiaba-Tlapanec				+					+
Tümpisa	Uto-Aztecan							+		
Tukang Besi	Malayo-Polynesian							+		
Turkish	Turkic						+			
West Greenlandic	Eskimo-Aleut		+		+					
Yoruba	Niger-Congo		+							(+)
Number of languages (Total: 42)		7	5	2 20	7	9	4	6 21	1	14

The paper has shown that while there are cross-linguistic differences in the representation of reported speech, there are considerable similarities. As the data in the sample clearly shows, indirect speech representation as such is impossible in some languages, at least on the

sentential level. The question of whether the general possibility of indirect speech representation exists in these languages perhaps on the discourse level will be left open for future research. Most languages, however, make available some morphosyntactic strategy for the clear separation between the speech representation types on the sentential level. The cross-linguistically most common type of indirect speech construction is one in which the originally uttered clausal structure is subordinated to the matrix clause that contains the verb of saying. Usually this clause integration goes hand in hand with grammatical alterations of the reported clause such as special verb forms or pronouns. However, as the Navajo case illustrates, some languages do not have a clear-cut grammatical distinction between direct and indirect reported speech constructions. Instead all speech reports undergo grammatical alteration to some extent and may be regarded as located on various points on a nevertheless gradual "spectrum" of speech/discourse representation. For those languages that do have a clear separation of speech report types the most common indicator of indirect speech is a complementizer. While a complementizer may introduce reported speech regardless of the feature [± direct] in most cases this strategy is restricted to indirect speech marking or else a language makes available a set of complementizers, where each one specifically marks one of the speech representation types. Only one language could be attested in which a complementizer introduces direct reported speech exclusively. Likewise the use of complementizers is a cross-linguistically frequent alternative strategy for the marking of indirect speech where other forms of marking obtain. Another cross-linguistically common strategy for the expression of indirect speech is the use of special verb forms in the reported clause. Marking of speech representation type on the reportative matrix verb could be attested in only a small number of cases. Although some languages do in fact allow a combination of strategies for the function of indirect speech marking, in the majority of cases they are in complimentary distribution.

Often languages show a strong tendency in favour of one or the other type of speech representation. In regards to this one would expect a markedness pattern that reflects frequency of usage, i.e. the preferred construction type in a given language is grammatically less complex and thus unmarked. Interestingly, languages could be attested in which the opposite obtains. Here the standard type of speech representation is the marked or less economical construction. Also, if a language does not provide grammatical strategies for a distinction between speech representation types, it is most likely to use direct discourse, i.e. a verbatim copy of a perceived original utterance in all cases. This allows for the tentative assumption that indirect speech constructions generally involve a greater degree of integration of the reported clause into the matrix clause with the reportative verb than are found in direct speech representation. The fact that this integration has grammatical effects on the internal grammar of the original clause in indirect speech, whereas in direct speech the reported utterance is treated as a more or less atomic unit, further supports this assumption.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in this paper are: ABL, ablative; ACC, accusative; AD, adessive; COMP, complementizer; COP, copula; DAT, dative; DRSC, direct reported speech clause; ERG, ergative; EVID, evidential; F, feminine; FOC, focus; FUT, future; IA, incompletive aspect; IL, illative; IMPF, imperfect; IND, indicative; INT, intensifier; IS, indirect reported speech; IRSC, indirect reported speech clause; LOG, logophoric; M, masculine; MOD, modal; NEU, neuter; NOM, nominative; O, object; PERF, perfect; PFV, perfective; Pl, plural; POSS, possessive; PROG, progressive; RSC, reported speech clause; REDUP, reduplication; REP, reportative marker; S, subject; Sg, singular; SUBJ, subjunctive; SPEC, specifier; TOP, topic; V, verb; WO, word order

References

Alexander-Bakkerus A (2005) *Eighteenth-century Cholón* Lot Utrecht.

Asher RE & Kumari TC (1997) *Malayalam* Routledge London.

Bamgboşe A (1986) Reported speech in Yoruba in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 77-97.

Beam de Ascona R (2005) *Direct and indirect speech in Coatlán-Loxicha-Zapotec* Paper presented at the RCLT local workshop 09.03.2005 La Trobe University Melbourne.

Berge A (2002) Syntactic constructions involving verbs of elocution in West Greenlandic *Études/Inuit/Studies 26*: 143-166.

Bickel B (to appear) Inflectional morphology in Shopen T (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* Cambridge University Press Cambridge. (available from http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~bickel/research/papers/infl.pdf (accessed 04/06))

Cash Cash P (to appear) *Reported speech in Nez Perce* Ms. University of Arizona.

Carlson R (1994) *A grammar of Supyire* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin.

Comrie B (1986) Tense in indirect speech *Folia Linguistica 20*: 265-296.

Coulmas F (1986) 'Reported speech: some general issues' in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 1-28.

Coulmas F (1986b) 'Direct and indirect speech in Japanese' in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 161-178.

Dayley JP (1989) *Tümpisa (Panamint) Shoshone grammar* University of California Press Berkeley.

Friedman VA (1984) Status in the Lak verbal system and its typological significance *Folia Slavica 7*: 135-149.

Hargreaves D (2005) Agency and in intentional action in Kathmandu Newar *Himalayan Linguistics 5*: 1-48.

Janssen TAJM & Van der Wurff W (1996) 'Introductory remarks on reported speech and thought' in Van der Wurff W (ed.) *Reported speech - forms and functions of the verb* John Benjamins Amsterdam

Kiefer F (1986) Some semantic aspects of indirect speech in Hungarian in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech Mouton* de Gruyter Berlin: 201-217.

Klamer M (2000) 'How report verbs become quote markers and complementizers' *Lingua 110*: 69-98.

Koehn E & Koehn S (1986) Apalai in Derbyshire DC, Pullum GK (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages Volume 1* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 33-127.

Kornfilt J (1997) *Turkish* Routlegde London.

Kvavik KH (1986) 'Direct and reported speech prosody' in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 333-260.

La Polla R & Poa D (2005) *Direct and Indirect speech in Tagalog* Paper presented at the workshop on direct and indirect speech Research Centre for Linguistic Typology La Trobe University 8. June 2005.

Li CL (1986) 'Direct and indirect speech' in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 29-45.

Lucy JA (1993) Metapragmatic presentationals: reporting speech with quotatives in Yucatec Maya in LUCY JA (ed.) *Reflexive language-reported speech and metapragmatics* Cambridge University Press Cambridge: 91-124.

Massamba DPB 'Reported speech in Swahili' in Coulmas F (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 99-119.

Noonan M (1999) *Direct speech as a rhetorical style in Chantyal* Paper presented at the

workshop on Tibeto-Burman languages University of California Santa Barbara 27.07.2001. (available from www.uwm.edu/~noonan/RS%20paper.pdf (accessed 12/05))

Papafragou A & LI P (2001) 'Evidential morphology and theory of mind' *Proceedings from the 26th annual Boston conference on language development* Cascadilla Press Cambridge MA.

Peterson DA (2003) Hakha Lai in La Polla R, Thurgood G (eds.) *The Sino-Tibetan languages* Richmond Curzon Press: 409-426.

Popjes J & Popjes J (1986) Canela Krahó in Derbyshire DC, Pullum GK (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages Volume 1* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin: 128-199.

Rennison JR (1997) *Koromfe* Routledge London.

Schuh RG (1998) *A grammar of Miya* University of California Press Berkeley.

Soukka M (2000) *A descriptive grammar of Noon: a Cangin language of Senegal* Lincom Europa München.

Speas M (1999) 'Person and point of view in Navajo direct discourse complements' Ms. University of Amherst. (available from www.umass.edu/linguist/people/faculty/speas/wccfl99.pdf (accessed 12/05))

Sulkala H & Karjalainen M (1992) *Finnish* Routledge London.

Tuite K (1995) *Svan and its speakers* Ms. Université de Montreal. (available from http://mapageweb.umontreal.ca/tuitekj/publications/Tuite-1997-SvanSpeakers.pdf (accessed 12/05))

Van der Wurff W (ed.) (1996) *Reported speech: forms and functions of the verb* John Benjamins Amsterdam.

Von Roncador M (1988) *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede, nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes* Niemeyer Tübingen

Wali K and Koul ON (1997) *Kashmiri: a cognitive - descriptive grammar* Routledge London.

Wichmann S (to appear) The reference-tracking system of Tlapanec: between obviation and switch-reference *Studies in Language*.