

Reported speech

A typological questionnaire

stef.spronck@helsinki.fi

Version: 1 June 2020

Contents

Introduction	1
1 An initial inventory	2
1.1 Exemplifying reported speech types	2
2 Ranking strategies	5
3 Qualifying structure	6
3.1 Matrix and Report as separate units	6
3.2 Relations between Matrix and Report	6
3.3 Lexical observations	8
4 Specific features	9
4.1 Matrix features	9
4.2 Report features	10
5 Semantic observations	11
5.1 Grounding events	11
5.2 Semiotic status	14
5.3 Modality and attitudinal meanings	14
6 Defenestration	17
7 Extended use	18
8 Additional information, discussion, comments	20
Appendix A	21
References	23

Introduction

Thank you for your collaboration in this typological survey! After completion, we would like to ask you to return this questionnaire either as a scanned pdf or edited .docx/.odt/.txt/.rtf or .md file to *questionnaire@participationgrammar.net* (Stef Spronck and Daniela Casartelli). You may, of course, also contact us anytime with queries, comments and suggestions regarding this project. Note that we will never publish answers or data you have contributed without consulting you prior or without acknowledging you.

This questionnaire is *not* an elicitation tool. It is intended to guide the classification and identification of different types of reported speech and relevant phenomena in a data corpus of, preferably, spontaneous discourse and/or narratives. An assumption behind the approach taken in this questionnaire is that talking about language is a common feature of spontaneous or (semi-)prompted speech. For this reason, any corpus of narratives or spontaneous speech of about an hour or more could serve as data for the answers below. Although the questionnaire can be filled out on the basis of any corpus of sufficient length, we expect speech by a single speaker (a narrative of monologue) to be slightly more effective data than conversation.

This questionnaire consists of seven sections. You will be asked to revisit section 1 at several stages of completing this questionnaire and to copy cross-references to examples introduced in section 1 in several of the later sections.

Note that all questions in this questionnaire are optional. If answering a particular question is too time-consuming or otherwise problematic please ~~strike it out~~. If a question is simply not relevant for your language or if you lack sufficient data to answer it, please place an X after it.

Author name: ...

Email address: ...

Language name and glottolog code: ...

1 An initial inventory

For the purposes of this survey we adopt Vološinov (1973)'s broad definition of reported speech as 'speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also, speech about speech, utterance about utterance' (Vološinov 1973: 115). Any structure or strategy in the subject language that meets this description is of interest for the purposes of this questionnaire.

1.1 Exemplifying reported speech types

In this first section we would like to ask you to provide examples of as many *structurally* different ways of expressing reported speech in the subject language as possible.

For the purposes of this questionnaire we will distinguish between two broad classes of reported speech: multi-clausal and (sub-)clausal. (We do not suggest any definition for clausehood, please use your own judgement in distinguishing between these two classes.)

If in previous work (either published or unpublished) you have given a label to any of the exemplified types, e.g ‘direct speech’, ‘reportative’ etc., please provide it in the field ‘Suggested name’. Otherwise, please leave this field empty. You will be asked to return to the field ‘Type’ later on in the questionnaire; please leave this field empty for now. We suggest that for the purposes of this questionnaire it is beneficial that your selection of examples is as inclusive as possible and is not concerned with pre-conceived categories, but in case it may be useful appendix A illustrates some considerations that may guide the selection.

If, in your estimation, the examples illustrate all attested relevant types of multi-clausal, clausal or sub-clausal reported speech, please tick the box at the end of the respective section. If the subject language has *no* examples in either of the categories below (i.e. multi-clausal, clausal or sub-clausal reported speech) please place a cross anywhere in the section and leave it empty.

1.1.1 Multi-clausal examples ...

...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: P...

...
...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: P...

...
...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: P...

...
...

...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: P...

[Please add extra lines as required]

- These examples are exhaustive of all multi-clausal types of reported speech occurring in the language.

1.1.2 Clausal or sub-clausal reported speech In this section, please cite examples of reported speech that consist of a single clause or, if relevant, a clause fragment and in which the reported speech meaning is signalled by one or more morphemes (in section 1.1.2.1) or without any morphosyntactic marking (1.1.2.2).

1.1.2.1 With specific morphological marking ...

...

...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

...

...

...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

...

...

...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

...

...

...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

[Please add as required]

- These examples are exhaustive of all clausal types of reported speech with specific marking occurring in the language.

1.1.2.2 Without specific morphological marking ...

...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

...
...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

...
...
...

Suggested name (can be empty):...

Type: L...

[Please add as required]

- These examples are exhaustive of all clausal types of reported speech without specific marking occurring in the language.

2 Ranking strategies

Please rank the examples in the previous section according to type and relative frequency. If a speaker in the subject language expresses reported speech, which of the examples would you expect to be the most common, which one after that, and so on? While you may support this ranking with frequency counts in your corpus, the ranking can be impressionistic. Please use the line marked 'Type' underneath each example to add a number indicating their relative ranking.

If you consider two examples variants of the same strategy give, please give them the same number. If you consider multiple strategies equally frequent, please number them from top to bottom in the order you have introduced the examples above. Please *only* give the same number to examples that you consider structurally equivalent.

Please provide any comments you find necessary on your ranking below:

Comments: ...

...

...

3 Qualifying structure

In this section we would like to ask you to classify the examples in section 1 into types according to various features. Please use the line marked ‘Type’ underneath each example to add letter codes according to the criteria below.

3.1 Matrix and Report as separate units

For each example in section 1, please consider whether it can be segmented into (at least) two separate units, specifically, one segment indicating a speech event and one segment indicating ‘what-was-said’. We will refer to these segments as the Matrix and Report, respectively.

- Are the Matrix and Report segmentable into two clearly identifiable units?
 - Yes, please add **A** after the example in the field ‘Type’
 - No, please add **B** after the example in the field ‘Type’
 - There are two identifiable elements that could be considered Matrix and Report elements but they are not segmentable into two separate units (e.g. because the Matrix constitutes a morphological/inflectional element), please add **C** after the example in the field ‘Type’
 - There is no M-element, please add **D** after the example in the field ‘Type’
 - There is no R-element, please add **E** after the example in the field ‘Type’

Comments: ...

...

...

3.2 Relations between Matrix and Report

Please consider for each example in section 1 whether a dependency exists between the Matrix and Report units with respect to the features below. For the purposes of this questionnaire we define a dependency as a case in which a specific value appears in the Report and *is affected by* the presence of (values in) the Matrix, or the other way around. For each of the features below please indicate if, in your judgement, the value in the respective unit shows some dependency on (a value in) the adjacent unit.

Examples marked with D or E in the previous section do not need to be considered in this section.

- Tense
 - The tense form in the Report in this example does not show dependency on the Matrix.
 - The tense form in the Report in this example shows dependency on the Matrix, please add **T** after the example in the field 'Type'.
 - The tense form in the Matrix in this example does not show dependency on the Report.
 - The tense form in the Matrix in this example shows dependency on the Report, please add **R** after the example in the field 'Type'.

Comments: ...

...
...

- Mood
 - Moods appearing in the Report in this example do not show dependency on the Matrix.
 - One or more mood forms appearing in the Report in this example show dependency on the Matrix, please add **M** after the example in the field 'Type'.
 - Moods appearing in the Matrix in this example do not show dependency on the Report.
 - One or more mood forms appearing in the Matrix in this example show dependency on the Report, please add (another) **R** after the example in the field 'Type'.

Comments: ...

...
...

- Pronouns
 - The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Report in this example do not show dependency on the Matrix.
 - The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Report in this example show dependency on the Matrix, please add **N** after the example in the field 'Type'.
 - The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Matrix in this example do not show dependency on the Report.

- The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Matrix in this example show dependency on the Report, please add (another) **R** after the example in the field ‘Type’.

Comments: ...

...
...

- Other deictics

- The type or morphological form of one or more deictics other than pronouns in the Report in this example does not show dependency on the Matrix.
- The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Report in this example shows dependency on the Matrix, please add **I** after the example in the field ‘Type’.
- The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Matrix in this example does not show dependency on the Report.
- The type or morphological form of one or more bound or free pronouns in the Matrix in this example shows dependency on the Report, please add (another) **R** after the example in the field ‘Type’.

Comments: ...

...
...

3.3 Lexical observations

- What verbs can be used as main verb in each example? If a Matrix is present in the example, please answer this question for the Matrix. If no Matrix is present, please answer this for the Report. (Please also answer this question for examples marked with D and E in the second section.)

The main inflecting verb in this example

- is *not* variable, it can *only* be the lexical verb shown in the example. Please add **S** after the example in the field ‘Type’.
- is variable within a limited semantic domain (e.g. speech or cognitive verbs). Please add **Y** after the example in the field ‘Type’ (and please provide a few acceptable verbs in under ‘Comments’ below).
- Is completely unrestricted, it could be any verb. Please add **Z** after the example in the field ‘Type’.
- It is unknown if , please add **X** after the example in the field ‘Type’.

Comments: ...

...
...

After this question you will no longer be asked to add letter codes to the field ‘Type’ in section 1, but you will be asked to cite the codes now appearing in these fields in the questions below. If a code is *not* unique, please add a number at the end of the code to distinguish codes that are otherwise the same. For example, if you have two codes **P3ATINS**, please label them **P3ATINS1** and **P3ATINS2**, etc.

Should you have any further, general comments on dependencies between Matrices and Reports in the subject language, please add them below.

General comments: . . .

...
...

4 Specific features

4.1 Matrix features

- In your estimation, can all possible referential values of pronouns be used in the Matrix of each example in section 1?

Please add the code and the referential value that is *not* attested for each example below. If restrictions only apply to some syntactic functions (e.g. subjects or objects) please indicate this as well.¹

Code: . . .

Not attested referential values in the Matrix: . . .

Code: . . .

Not attested referential values in the Matrix: . . .

- In your estimation, can all possible aspect, tense and mood (including evidential) (TAME) values be used in the Matrix of each example in section 1?

Please add the code and the TAME value that is *not* attested for each example below. If restrictions only apply to some syntactic functions (e.g. subjects or objects) please indicate this as well.

¹For example, if in examples 1TP1, 1TP2 and 1TP3 second person reference for subjects is not attested, please indicate:
Code: 1TP1, 1TP2 and 1TP3

Not attested referential values in M: second person subjects

Code: . . .
Not attested TAME values in the Matrix: . . .

Code: . . .
Not attested TAME values in the Matrix: . . .

[Please add as required]

Comments: . . .
...

Should you have any further, general comments about values and categories (not) appearing in Matrices in the subject language, please add them below.

General comments: . . .
...
...

4.2 Report features

- In your estimation, can all possible referential values of pronouns be used in the Report of each example in section 1?

Please add the code and the referential value that is *not* attested for each example below. If restrictions only apply to some syntactic functions (e.g. subjects or objects) please indicate this as well.

Code: . . .
Not attested referential values in the Report: . . .

Code: . . .
Not attested referential values in the Report: . . .

- In your estimation, can all possible aspect, tense and mood (including evidential) (TAME) values be used in the Report of each example in section 1?

Please add the code and the TAME value that is *not* attested for each example below. If restrictions only apply to some syntactic functions (e.g. subjects or objects) please indicate this as well.

Code: . . .
Not attested TAME values in the Report: . . .

Code: . . .
Not attested TAME values in the Report: . . .

[Please add as required]

Comments: . . .
...

Should you have any further, general comments about values and categories (not) appearing in Reports in the subject language, please add them below.

General comments: . . .
...
...

5 Semantic observations

In this section we would like to ask you to reflect on three aspects of reported speech in the subject language: the way in which the distinction between (alleged) reported speech event and the current speech event is presented (section 5.1), the means the subject language uses to make the Report stand out in the current speech situation (section 5.2) and the types of attitudes that can be signalled towards the content of the Report (section 5.2).

5.1 Grounding events

Typically, reported speech indexes of two separate events: a reported speech event, of which the content is allegedly reflected in the Report and the current speech event, the moment at which the reported speech is uttered.

Languages have and allow different grammatical means to signal the relation between these two events, such as tense marking and using distinct referential means to refer to persons participating in the reported and current speech events.

Among the classified examples in section 1, are there any examples in which the reported speech event and the current speech event are *concurrent*, i.e. in which there is no clear semantic difference between the moment at which the content of the Report is said/conceived and the moment at which it is uttered? If yes, please add the code of the specific example below.

Code: . . .
Comments: . . .
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language *dedicated* to reported speech with concurrent reported speech/current speech events?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
...
...

Comments: ...
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language do *not* allow reported speech with concurrent reported speech/current speech events at all?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
...
...

Comments: ...
...

Among the classified examples in section 1, are there any examples in which the speaking participant in the reported speech event and the current speech event is the same referential entity? (I.e. instances in which the speaker reports his/her own words) If yes, please add the code of the specific example below.

Code: ...
Comments: ...
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language *dedicated* to reported speech with the same speaker in the reported speech/current speech events?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
...
...

Comments: ...
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language that do *not* allow reported speech with the same speaker in the reported speech/current speech events at all?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
- ...
- ...

Comments: ...
...

Among the classified examples in section 1, are there any examples in which the addressed participant in the reported speech event and the current speech event is the same referential entity? (I.e. instances in which the hearer is told a Report s/he allegedly has heard before) If yes, please add the code of the specific example below.

Code: ...
Comments: ...
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language *dedicated* to reported speech with the same hearer in the reported speech/current speech events?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
- ...
- ...

Comments: ...
...

In your estimation, are there any constructions/strategies in the subject language do *not* allow reported speech with the same hearer in the reported speech/current speech events at all?

- No
- Yes (please add example or code of an example from section 1): ...
- ...
- ...

Should you have any further, general comments about the relation between the reported speech and current speech events in the subject language, please add them below.

General comments: ...

...
...

5.2 Semiotic status

Crosslinguistically, reported speech seems to show a tendency to treat the reported message expressed in the Report as its most salient element. As Clark & Gerrig (1990) suggest, the Report seems to be ‘demonstrated’: it stands out in relation to adjacent descriptive discourse and allows for a degree of expressivity that is uncommon in regular descriptive sentences. In semiotic terms, the Report could be qualified as an icon (Recanati 2001), i.e. it ‘stands for’ its semantic content rather than (only) describes it (as a regular symbol does) or ‘point’ to it (as an indexical element does). Linguistic signals associated with the distinctive semiotic status of the Report are prosodic and voicing effects, i.e. ‘theatrical’ (Wierzbicka 1974) or imitating (Güldemann 2008), ‘funny’ voices, greater use of expressive elements, such as interjections or evaluative modifiers and speech accompanying (or even speech replacing) gestures (Clark 2016).

Please only answer this question for the reported speech strategy you have ranked as 1 in section 1 (i.e. in which ‘1’ appears as the first number in the field ‘Type’). In your estimation, does the reported speech strategy you ranked as 1 show ‘demonstrated’ features in the way suggested in the previous paragraph?

- No
- Yes (please specify and, where relevant, please refer to examples from section 1): ...
...
...
...

Should you have any further comments about the semiotic status of Reports in the subject language, please add them below. Specifically, if your strategy ranked as 1 does not show properties of demonstratedness, but another strategy does, please comment on it below.

General comments: ...

...
...

5.3 Modality and attitudinal meanings

The content of reported speech typically reflects the words, judgements and intentions of someone other than the current speaker. This means that responsibility for the content of the Report typically does not reside with the speaker. The Report in reported speech constitutes, in terms of Goffman (1981), an ‘unserious’ speech act, it does not reflect a proposition the speaker really ‘means’.

The semantic consequences of this general characterisation in individual languages varies.

For this question, please only consider the strategies you ranked between 1-3 in section one. If you have only two strategies, please fill out this question for the strategies ranked 1 and 2. If you have only one strategy, please skip this question.

For examples with a code starting with P1 or L1: in your estimation, do these reflect the Report without qualification by the current speaker, i.e. does the current speaker convey the content of the Report without any doubt or disagreement?

- Yes
- No (please specify the speaker attitude (doubt, calling the report a lie etc.). Where relevant, please refer to examples from section 1 or cite an example below in which the speaker attitude is particularly apparent): ...
...
...
...

In your estimation, can examples with a code starting with P1 or L1 be used to signal strong *agreement* with the content of the report or to highlight its credibility? Specifically, if you apply an emphasizing strategy, such as repetition or a clausal intensifying marker (depending on the target language): does this strategy *raise* the authority/credibility of the speaker? (If you have insufficient data to answer this question, please place a cross next to this question.)

- No
- Yes (please add an example or contextual observation supporting your judgement): ...
...
...
...

For examples with a code starting with P2 or L2: in your estimation, do these reflect the Report without qualification by the current speaker, i.e. does the current speaker convey the content of the Report without any doubt or disagreement?

- Yes
- No (please specify the speaker attitude (doubt, calling the report a lie etc.). Where relevant, please refer to examples from section 1 or cite an example below in which the speaker attitude is particularly apparent): ...
 - ...
 - ...
 - ...

In your estimation, can examples with a code starting with P2 or L2 be used to signal strong *agreement* with the content of the report or to highlight its credibility? Specifically, if you apply an emphasizing strategy, such as repetition or a clausal intensifying marker (depending on the target language): does this strategy *raise* the authority/credibility of the speaker? (If you have insufficient data to answer this question, please place a cross next to this question.)

- No
- Yes (please add an example or contextual observation supporting your judgement): ...
 - ...
 - ...
 - ...

For examples with a code starting with P3 or L3: in your estimation, do these reflect the Report without qualification by the current speaker, i.e. does the current speaker convey the content of the Report without any doubt or disagreement?

- Yes
- No (please specify the speaker attitude (doubt, calling the report a lie etc.). Where relevant, please refer to examples from section 1 or cite an example below in which the speaker attitude is particularly apparent): ...
 - ...
 - ...
 - ...

In your estimation, can examples with a code starting with P3 or L3 be used to signal strong *agreement* with the content of the report or to highlight its credibility? Specifically, if you apply an emphasizing strategy, such as repetition or a clausal intensifying marker (depending on the target language): does this strategy *raise* the authority/credibility of the speaker? (If you have insufficient data to answer this question, please place a cross next to this question.)

- No
- Yes (please add an example or contextual observation supporting your judgement): ...
 - ...
 - ...

...

In your estimation, are the strategies 1-3 all equally 'objective', i.e. do they equally imply that the Report represents the words of the reported speaker as faithfully as possible, both in terms of form and content? (In the literature, implicatures of objectivity in reported speech are also often referred to as 'verbatim' representation.)

- None of the strategies suggest objectivity on the part of the current speaker with respect to the form and content of the Report.
- The strategies suggest some degree of objectivity on the part of the current speaker with respect to the form and content of the Report, but the data do not support a specific ranking between the strategies in this respect.
- The strategies suggest different degrees of objectivity on the part of the current speaker with respect to the form and content of the Report, and the data support a specific ranking between the strategies from more to less 'objective'. Please provide this ranking below by ordering the codes of the respective strategies from more to less objective below. If possible, please also add a contextual observation supporting your judgement.²

Ranking of strategies P/L1-P/L3 from more to less objective:...

Comments:...

...
...

Should you have any further, general comments about the attitude of the current speaker in relation to the content of the Report in the subject language, please add them below.

General comments: ...

...
...

6 Defenestration

It appears that in many languages clausal (and perhaps even morphological elements) that constitute a Matrix can be optionally left unexpressed. Since the Report, which is typically 'framed' by the Matrix, in terms of McGregor (1994),

²For example, if a strategy strongly implies objectivity it is *more likely* to occur with modifying elements such as 'approximately' or to be followed by qualifications such as '...or something like that' than strategies that do not carry an expectation of accurately/faithfully reflecting a the words of a reported speaker.

has hence become ‘unframed’, we refer to this case with the slightly playful term ‘defenestration’.

Are there examples in section 1 that you have given a code with a ‘D’? If so, please copy the code of this example/these examples below:

Code(s):...

Comments: ...

...

In your estimation are any examples referred to with the code(s) immediately above, a product of defenestration, i.e. is it *possible* to add a Matrix to each of these examples without changing the semantics of the example?

No

Yes, for the following code(s): ...

...

...

Please indicate the code(s) of examples in section 1 for which you believe that they *cannot* undergo defenestration, i.e. they are examples in which the Matrix cannot be left out without rendering the example ungrammatical:

Code:

...

Should you have any further, general comments about defenestration, please add them below.

General comments: ...

...

...

The analytical choice to recognise defenestration as a relevant process in the subject language can have important consequences. For example, if there are elements that typically only occur in reported speech, but can also figure in reported speech constructions without a Matrix, such as logophorics, invoking defenestration can help to treat these occurrences within a unified account (cf. Nikitina 2020). Another possible explanation for elements that predominantly occur in fully marked reported speech, but can also occur in other contexts could be that reported speech constructions can have *other* functions in addition to representing ‘the words of others’. This possibility is addressed in the final section of this questionnaire.

7 Extended use

In this final section we would like to ask you about uses of the strategies exemplified in section 1 for functions other than reported speech. Examples as intended here have the same *form* as any of the examples in section 1, but are not interpreted as representing an utterance. Not all subject languages will show this kind of extended use (or to a very limited degree), but in some other languages this use of reported speech expressions is prominent, e.g. in the Maale examples in (1) and (2).

- (1) Maale (North Omotic)
ʔúúní tíis'-ó-na gel-á-ne geʔ-í ʔangútsi-na c'arg-ínt-é-ne
3MS:NOM fence-ABS-INST enter-IPF-A:DCL say-CNV1 thorn:ABS-INST
stab-PAS-PFV-A:DCL
'He got stabbed by thorns while trying to enter through the shrub fence.'
(Amha 2001: 103) [lit. Saying "I am entering though the fence" he was
stabbed by the thorns]
- (2) *gém-átsí maatt-ó múʔ-á-ne geʔ-í mágg-ó ʔáá-é-n*
ox-M:NOM grass-ABS eat-IPF-A:DCL say-CNV1 cliff-ABS go-IPF-A:DCL
'The ox fell off the cliff when it was trying to eat the grass' (Amha 2001:
149) [lit. Saying "I am eating the grass" he fell off the cliff]

As its literal translation indicates, in (1) the intention of entering through the fence is cast as a Report. While it would be possible that the human subject referent in (1) actually uttered this intention, the idiomatic translation does not reflect this and the interpretation is not likely in the structurally and functionally similar example (2), where the speech/intention is attributed to an ox. Instances in which a construction that is structurally similar to any of the constructions in section 1 can be used for functions *other* than representing speech, we qualify as carrying an 'extended meanings'.

Can any of the types of reported speech illustrated in section 1 be used to express the meanings indicated below? Please indicate the specific code(s) of the example(s).

- THINK, code(s): ...
- WANT, code(s): ...
- TRY, code(s): ...
- CAUSE, code(s): ...
- LEST / *p* MIGHT HAPPEN, code(s): ...
- BE ABOUT TO / *p* BEGINS, code(s): ...

Can any of the types of reported speech illustrated in section 1 be used to express extended meanings not indicated above? Please indicate the specify the meaning(s) and code(s) of the example(s).

Meaning: ...

Code: ...

...
...
...

Meaning: ...
Code: ...

...
...
...

Meaning: ...
Code: ...

...
...
...

Please provide one or two examples reported speech with an extended meaning as indicated above.

...
...
...
...
...
...

Further comments: ...

...
...

8 Additional information, discussion, comments

Please discuss add any remaining comments below.

...
...
...

End of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your participation!

Appendix A

For the examples introduced in section 1 it will be beneficial to take a splitting rather than a lumping approach: e.g., if there is a multi-clausal way to express reported speech with a linking element and one without it, please provide examples of both, even if you consider them variants (you will be able to specify this later on in this questionnaire). Whether you find an expression of reported speech structurally distinctive is entirely up to you, but the comments on the English sentences (3) - (16) below may illustrate some considerations that could guide your classification. (For the purposes of illustration punctuation has been left out in the examples below, but please use any type of punctuation in your transcriptions you find necessary.)

- (3) she said I will come
- (4) I will come she said

Examples (3) and (4) show a different clausal order between the elements ‘she said’ and ‘I will come’. Irrespective of whether this order corresponds to a semantic distinction between (3) and (4) (as, e.g., van Duijn & Verhagen 2019 argue), it is an apparent structural difference. We would like to ask you to be maximally inclusive in representing structural variation. For examples like (3) and (4) we would suggest to include both in your answer. (If one example is more frequent or more unmarked on other grounds you will be able to specify this later on in the questionnaire.)

Examples (5 - 6) use a different matrix verb than (3 - 4) but otherwise seem to have the same syntactic structure.

- (5) she whispered I will come
- (6) I will come she whispered

We would suggest that it is *not necessary* to include examples like (5) and (6) if your assessment is that they have the same structure as (3 - 4). Section # will ask you to illustrate some lexical variation within reported speech, including different verbs of speech, so if in your assessment an expression represents a purely *lexical* variant it is not necessary to include it here. However, you are certainly welcome to include more examples representing the same structure and specify that the examples represent the same type of structure later on in the questionnaire.

- (7) she said that she would come
- (8) she said she would come

Examples (7) and (8) show a minimal contrast in the presence/absence of the complementiser *that*. While the distinction has also been claimed to have a semantic basis in English (e.g. Dor 2005), you may consider (7) and (8) variants. Again, for the purposes of this questionnaire we would suggest, however, to include both in section # and specify their (possible) status as variants in section #.

Examples (10 - 11) are of a slightly different type.

- (9) she spoke about going
- (10) she spoke about buying a horse
- (11) she spoke about chess

Under Vološinov (1973)'s semantic definition (10 - 11) can be qualified as 'speech about speech'. But it would be questionable if these examples also truly represent the second part of the definition: 'a message about about a message', because do 'about going' or 'about chess' constitute 'messages'? (We would suggest, however, that in reported speech many other non-propositional elements may appear that could lead to similar questions. For example, is the interjection 'hey' as in *They said: "hey"* really a message?) Examples (10 - 11) would not normally be discussed in accounts of quotation or direct/indirect speech.

For the purposes of this questionnaire we would suggest including at least one example like (10) - (11) because reported speech seems to be a scalar phenomenon. If this is indeed the case, examples that are reported speech under some interpretation of the Vološinovian definition, but not others are important for gaining insight into the grammatical context of reported speech. Also, in some languages the syntactic status of the 'reported object' is not clearly distinguishable between, e.g. nominal and clausal elements. We do suggest that for examples like (10 - 11) a lumping approach is advisable, however: if your assessment is that (10 - 11) represent equivalent structures (e.g. NP VP NP, or *speaking (pro)nominal subject - speech verb - nominal speech object*) we would suggest you would limit illustrating these examples to one or two.

Please also include strategies with non-clausal introductions of the report, such as adverbial expressions (e.g. 12) and, if relevant, morphologically marked expressions of reportativity/hearsay (e.g. 13).

- (12) allegedly she will come
- (13) Darai (Indic)
ihəi madzə-j̃ə ʊth-lə-hun dulha tə rati
this middle-LOC get up-PST-HS husband PART night
'The husband woke up at about midnight (they say)' (Dhakal 2012: 79)

Finally, please also include examples for which there is no (obvious) marking of reported speech. This may include examples in which an entity is presented as a speaking subject even though it is not literally able to speak (Pascual 2014), such as in (16).

- (14) John walked into the room. What am I doing here
- (15) John walked into the room. What was he doing here
- (16) (written on a button) Please, press me

References

- Amha, Azeb. 2001. *The Maale language* (CNWS Publications). Vol. 99. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African; Amerindian Studies, University of Leiden.
- Clark, Herbert H. 2016. Depicting as a method of communication. *Psychological Review*. Clark, Herbert H.: Stanford University, Jordan Hall, Building 420, Stanford, CA, US, 94305-2130, clark@stanford.edu: American Psychological Association 123(3). 324–347. (doi:10.1037/rev0000026)
- Clark, Herbert H. & Gerrig, Richard J. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66. 764–805.
- Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2012. *Darai grammar*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Dor, Daniel. 2005. Toward a semantic account of *that*-deletion in english. *Linguistics* 43(2). 345–382.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McGregor, William B. 1994. The grammar of reported speech and thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 14(1). 63–92.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2020. Logophoricity and shifts of perspective: New facts and a new account. *Functions of Language* 27(1). 78–99. (doi:10.1075/fol.20001.nik)
- Pascual, Esther. 2014. *Fictive interaction: The conversation frame in thought, language, and discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Recanati, François. 2001. Open quotation. *Mind* 110(439). 637–687.
- van Duijn, Max & Verhagen, Arie. 2019. Recursive embedding of viewpoints, irregularity, and the role for a flexible framework. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company 29(2). 198–225. (doi:10.1075/prag.18049.van)
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York/London: Seminar Press. (Ed. Matejka, Ladislav & Titunik, I. R.)
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1974. The function of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7(3). 267–307.