

## Reported Discourse and Logophoricity in Southern Hokkaido Dialects of Ainu

ANNA BUGAEVA

*Chiba University and La Trobe University, RCLT*

**Abstract:** This paper attempts to provide a systematic description of reported discourse (RD) categories in Southern Hokkaido dialects of Ainu from syntactic, discourse-functional, historical and typological perspectives. While RD has been analysed in the previous literature either as “quotations” or as direct vs. indirect discourse, I argue, based on a continuum approach, that Ainu has three main RD-constructions distinguished by person deixis as a core principle in determining the orientation of RD: (i) *direct discourse* (DRD) with the author’s perspective, (ii) *indirect discourse* (IRD) with the reporter’s perspective, and (iii) *semi-direct discourse* (SRD) with the combined perspective of the author and reporter. In the case of SRD, use of the so-called “indefinite person” in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in the quote indicates a consistent reporter-oriented shift in pronominal reference, while the other references occur as they would have been used in the original discourse. I propose to identify Tamura’s (2000: 74) ‘first person in quotes’ usage of the indefinite person as *logophoric* in the sense of Hagège (1974). In this analysis SRD, DRD, and IRD are regarded as stylistic and *discourse-organizing* options, though some of them have been conventionalized as primary styles in certain folklore genres.\*

**Key words:** Ainu, direct/semi-direct/indirect discourse, logophoricity, discourse prominence

### 1. Introduction

This paper aims at describing reported discourse in Ainu (primarily in Southern Hokkaido dialects) which has not received special attention so far. Following

---

\* An early version of this paper was presented at the International Symposium LENCA-3, Tomsk, Russia, 27–30 June 2006. This study was funded by the Japanese Ministry of Education and by the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (UK). I would like to thank A. Aikhenvald, E. Geniušienė, T. Güldemann, M. Daniel, H. Nakagawa, S. Tida, S. Overall, two anonymous referees, and one editor for valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper, and the LENCA 3 participants who have discussed with me the problems of ‘logophoricity’ (B. Comrie, O. Miyaoka, and V. Plungjan). None of them necessarily shares my views expressed here or is responsible for any errors. I am very grateful to A. Aikhenvald for sending to me her manuscripts (2005 and forthcoming), and to T. Güldemann for sending his Habilitationsschrift (2001/2008). My deepest heartfelt thanks go to my late Ainu consultant Mrs. I. Oda and to my former supervisor T. Satoo.

Aikhenvald (forthcoming) and others (Kamada 2000, Güldemann 2001/2008, Güldemann and Roncador (eds.) 2002, and Roncador 1988), I adopt a *continuum approach* based on the universal scale of directness which ranges from direct to indirect speech defined mainly in terms of semantics and functions. I argue that what has been previously treated under the label “direct discourse” in Ainu actually comprises two distinct reported discourse categories, viz. direct discourse proper and semi-direct discourse, the latter occupying a middle ground between direct and indirect discourse.

Ainu is a polysynthetic, agglutinating language and is predominantly head-marking (nouns and personal pronouns do not inflect for case), with only a few elements of dependent marking. It is practically extinct at present, as only a couple of people on the Island of Hokkaido in Northern Japan remember their native language. Its dialects are primarily divided into the Sakhalin, Hokkaido and Kurile groups. The Hokkaido dialects can be roughly divided into Northeastern (Northern, Eastern, and Central) and Southwestern (Southern and Southwestern) groups, which are further subdivided into local sub-dialectal forms (for details see Hattori 1964: 18).

The basic constituent order of Ainu is AOV/SV. The syntactic and morphological distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is very important. The system of grammatical relations in affirmative clauses in Ainu is basically organized as a tripartite system: A, S and O<sup>1</sup> are distinct in 1PL verbal agreement, viz. the prefix *ci=* marks A, the suffix *=as* S, and *un=* O for the first person exclusive, and *a=* A, *=an* S, and *i=* O for inclusive. However, there are some elements of neutral system, i.e. there is no inflectional difference between second and third person verbal agreement, where A, S and O are marked by *e=* in 2SG and by *eci=* in 2PL, and third person is always zero-marked. Personal pronouns in object and subject position are often omitted because the person and number of both subject and object are obligatorily marked on predicates by means of cross-reference affixes. There is also one feature of nominative/accusative system: A=S, and O are distinct in the 1SG verbal agreement, viz. 1SG *ku=* marks A, S, and *en=* O.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Theoretical Preliminaries for the Analysis of Reported Discourse

### 2.1. Reported discourse

Presumably, all languages have means of reporting what has been said by someone else or by the reporter himself. Reported discourse, also referred to as reported speech, may be characterized as “speech within speech” (Jakobson 1990: 130), since it always implies at least two discourse situations differing in deictic characteristics:

<sup>1</sup> Here I use the abbreviations of S for intransitive subject, A for transitive subject, and O for object of transitives, as in Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000: 2); none of them indicate any particular semantic role.

<sup>2</sup> The data without reference to a dialect belongs to the Chitose dialect (Southern Hokkaido) I have been working on since 1997.

- the *current discourse situation* with its speaker (henceforth *reporter*), addressee, the time of speaking and the location of the speaker, and
- the *original discourse situation* with its own speaker (henceforth *author*), addressee, the time of speaking and the location of the speaker.

Each of these discourse situations has its own reference point, or its speaker's perspective. Consider the following definition of reported discourse proposed by Gldemann (2008: 6):

Reported discourse is the representation of a spoken or mental text from which the reporter distances him/herself by indicating that it is produced by a source of consciousness in a pragmatic and deictic setting [=situation] that is different from that of the immediate discourse.

Thus, the term 'reported discourse', as it is seen here, is a broad definition of reported speech in that it also includes thought (so-called "internal awareness", or "internal speech" which has never been actually uttered).

Initially, linguistic research recognized that discourse may be reported only from one of the above-mentioned perspectives. Hence the dichotomous distinction: *direct* vs. *indirect reported discourse categories* (henceforth DRD- and IRD-categories).

- Prototypical DRD is reported from the perspective of the *author* of discourse, just as it was originally told, including all the references to the original discourse situation (1).
- Prototypical IRD is reported from the perspective of the *reporter*, hence we have the corresponding adjustment (=shift) of personal, temporal and spatial deixis of the original discourse situation to fit in with the perspective of the reporter in his current discourse situation, as follows.

- |     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| (1) | <i>Jane said, 'I shall bring you here tomorrow.'</i>                             | DRD |
| (2) | <i>Jane said that she would bring him/me<sup>3</sup> there on the next day."</i> | IRD |

Direct discourse is aimed at close, if not fully verbatim, reproduction of what has been said; "direct discourse is 'show' as well as speech, indirect discourse is speech only" (Wierzbicka 1974: 272). This is the basis for functional differences between DRD and IRD (Aikhenvald 2005: 4).

However, later research has revealed that there are discourse reports in which some references refer to the perspective of the author and others to the perspective of the reporter (so-called combined perspective). This resulted in the recognition of the existence of intermediate categories between DRD and IRD. One such category concerns the case of the so-called "incomplete" pronoun shift which was first documented in African languages (Perrin 1974, Hedinger 1984, Schaub 1985, Hill

<sup>3</sup> Note that the reporter or addressee of the current speech discourse may be coreferential with the author or addressee of the original discourse situation, which influences personal adjustment in the indirect speech; cf. the two possibilities for person shift in (2) depending on the coreferentiality/non-coreferentiality of the reporter with the original addressee.

1995) and labelled “combined speech” or “semi-direct speech [=discourse]”. Here is an example of *semi-direct reported discourse* (henceforth SRD) from Babungo, a Grassfields Bantu language spoken in Cameroon. In (3), the logophoric third person singular pronoun *yĩ* (the phenomenon of logophoricity will be discussed at length in section 4) is used to refer to the author of discourse (the tortoise), which looks like a kind of IRD, while second person reference to the addressee of the original discourse situation is left unchanged, which looks like DRD; subscript ‘i’ is employed to mark the coreferentiality of the author and a participant in the quote (for the definition of ‘quote’ refer to section 2.3).

- (3) *f̂káy gi’... lāa síi kà’ v̂iŋ \_\_\_\_\_ yĩ*  
 tortoise say-impf that doubt can you-pl:DRD he-logoph:IRD  
*yĩ k̂*  
 do-impf what  
 ‘Tortoise said (to Leopard), “What can we do?” lit. ‘Tortoise<sub>i</sub> said (to Leopard), ‘What can you and he<sub>i</sub> do?’ (Schaub 1985: 2) Babungo

Similar (but not exactly the same) examples of semi-direct speech have been recorded in colloquial British English (Aikhenvald: forthcoming). The reporter (NP with the subscript ‘<sub>CS</sub>’) is talking about an administrator who has told the reporter to come and see him.

- (4) *I<sub>CS</sub> rang up Paul<sub>i</sub>, and Paul<sub>i</sub> said ‘Come<sub>CS</sub> and see him<sub>i</sub>’* SRD

What Paul had said was *Come and see me*. In the quote, the second person imperative form *come* is kept just as Paul had uttered it. The reporter (‘I’) is the addressee. This lack of person shift is a token of direct speech. But the free pronominal form of the addressee, *me*, has been changed to *him* to fit in with the perspective of the reporter. This is a token of indirect speech. Compare straightforward direct and indirect speech reports corresponding to (4).

- (5) *I rang up Paul, and Paul said ‘Come and see me’.* DRD  
 (6) *I rang Paul, and Paul said that I should come and see him.* IRD

The SRD in (4) shares another feature with direct speech reports—its ‘theatrical effect’. In fact, the reporter mimicked the administrator’s high-pitched voice and his broad Australian accent. This mimicking is perfectly possible with DRD—as in (5), but not with IRD, as in (6) (Aikhenvald: forthcoming). The SRD examples in English reported by Aikhenvald are considered ungrammatical by many speakers; however, they are common enough in everyday varieties of English.

In a number of languages, semi-direct speech has been reported to be a stylistic or discourse-organizing alternative to either direct or indirect report, as in Manambu (Aikhenvald: forthcoming) or other languages of the Papua New Guinea and Africa. Or it can be obligatory under certain conditions, as in the languages Dom (Tida 2006) and Gahuku (Deibler 1971) of the Papua New Guinea area. Note that the SRD attested in a number of languages of New Guinea is structurally different from the above-described type. In fact, the SRD in (3) and

(4) is triggered by the coreference of the author and a participant in the quote, but in the languages of New Guinea, it is driven by the coreference of the reporter and a participant in the quote. I suggest that the latter is somewhat like *Mummy says: 'Sam<sub>CS</sub>, wash<sub>CS=addressee</sub> my<sub>CS</sub> hands'* (Aikhenvald: forthcoming), as uttered by the toddler *Sam* who is reporting his mother's original discourse: *Sam, wash your hands* (the *hands* belong to *Sam*).

## 2.2. Continuum approach

As mentioned in the introduction, in line with Aikhenvald (forthcoming) as well as Kamada (2000), Güldemann (2001/2008), Güldemann and Roncador, eds. (2002), and Roncador (1988), I will regard reported discourse categories as constituting a domain with a scalar organization between the two extreme ideal poles of direct and indirect discourse. DRD is viewed here as “the extreme pole on the above scale that ideally lacks *any* kind of reporter interference and thus least integrated into his/her perspective”, and IRD as “the extreme opposite of DRD” (Güldemann 2008: 8–9).

In the present study, the shift in pronominal reference is regarded as the most important criterion for identifying different RD-categories, since a language may lack other types of adjustment, as in (3).

## 2.3. The structure of reported discourse construction

The linguistic form expressing reported discourse is called an *RD-construction*, which, in the elaborate case, consists of the non-immediate [=original] reported discourse called the *quote* and the *quotative index* (henceforth *QI*) which indexes the presence of such a quote within the ongoing [=current] discourse (Güldemann 2008: 10–11).

In typical cases, a speech report construction consists of a complex sentence with (a) the matrix reporting clause which is a *QI*, and (b) the embedded clause which is a quote. In Ainu, *QI* almost always contains a grammaticalized function word which will be referred to here as a *quotative marker* and interpreted either as an adverbial conjunction (abbreviated as *QUOT*) or as a complementizer (*COMP*) depending on the syntactic function of the quote clause.

Distinct RD-categories are not necessarily marked by distinct *QIs*, as in (1) and (2). Many languages have *QIs* which can be employed for discourse-embedding of several RD-categories, and, on the other hand, a language may commonly employ several *QIs* to mark a certain RD-category.

## 3. Preliminaries for the Analysis of Reported Discourse in Ainu

### 3.1. Goal and data of this study

The goal of this paper is to identify RD-categories in Ainu and their encoding constructions and thereby analyse them in discourse-functional, historical and typological perspectives. Since this work is primarily concerned with a systematic description of RD in Southern Hokkaido (SH) Ainu dialects, i.e. Chitose and Saru, the term “Ainu” refers to this particular group of dialects, unless otherwise

specified.

For the Chitose dialect, I use my own field data (B: Bugaeva 2004), and also the data collected by H. Nakagawa (N1: 1995, N2: 2001, N3: 2002). For the Saru dialect, I use texts with attached audio tapes collected by S. Tamura (T2: 1984, T3: 1985, T4: 1986, T5: 1989) and T. Sato (S2: 1998, S1: 2002), and also by other researchers (HY: Honda, Yasuda 1997). Data from specialist literature are also used (T1: Tamura 1972, T6: Tamura 2000; C1: Chiri 1942). Additionally, data from Southwestern (SWH) and Central Hokkaido (CH) dialects are occasionally cited for a cross-dialectal comparison (CY: Y. Chiri 1978; C2 Chiri 1981 and SK: Sunazawa 1983). All examples are specified for the source either as COL (colloquial), or as U; Y; KY (*urwepeker*, *yukar*, *kamuy yukar*) folklore genres.

### 3.2. Previous research on reported discourse in Ainu

Reported discourse in Ainu dialects is only briefly mentioned in grammars, specialist literature, and dictionaries. Whenever previously mentioned, reported discourse has been analysed either as (i) “quotations”, without the linguistic categorization of RD—see Kindaichi (1931: 188) and Batchelor (1938: 279) for the Saru dialect; Refsing (1986: 265–267), Okuda (1999: 3, 77, 170) for the Shizunai dialect; Murasaki (1979: 143) for the Sakhalin dialect, or as (ii) *direct* vs. *indirect discourse* Chiri (1942/1973: 572–573), Tamura (1972/2001: 373; 1977/2001: 136–139; 1988: 31, 39, 47; 2000: 74–5, 104, 128–29) for the Saru dialect; Nakagawa (1995: 165, 234, 393) for the Chitose dialect.

#### 3.2.1. Chiri (1942)

Chiri (Chiri 1942/1973: 572–573) was the first to suggest that there were DRD and IRD categories in Ainu encoded by two distinct construction types. He criticizes Kindaichi (1931: 188) and Batchelor (1938: 279) for making no distinction between RD-constructions marked by *sekor* (QUOT) in Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects (or *ani*, *ari* in Southwestern dialects) and those marked by *kunak*, *yak*, *kuni* (COMP), and suggests treating the former as DRD constructions (*oratio recta*) and the latter as IRD (*oratio obliqua*). His argumentation is based on the respective structures of quotes: in the case of DRD marked by *sekor*, the quote does not necessarily consist of a full clause—it may contain part of a clause, for instance, just a vocative, as in (7), or it may consist of many clauses—while in the case of IRD, the quote is co-extensive with a full clause with a predicate (8).

- (7) “*acapo*” *sekor* Ø=*hotuye*  
uncle QUOT 3.S=call  
‘He cried, “Uncle!”’
- (8) [Ø=*ek* *kun-i*]<sub>o</sub> *ku*=Ø=*ramu*  
3.S=come.SG going.to-COMP 1SG.A=3.O=think  
‘I think he will come.’  
(C1 572); the glossing is mine - A.B.

Chiri (1942/1973: 572) also notes that the two RD-constructions employ dif-

ferent sets of reporting verbs: DRD marked by *sekor* employs intransitive reporting verbs in QI, and IRD marked *kuni* etc. employs transitive reporting verbs in QI, which allows us to put different interpretations on the syntactic functions of their respective quotes. In this paper, the quote of *sekor*-marked construction qualified by Chiri as DRD is interpreted as a kind of *adverbial clause* and that of IRD is interpreted as a *complement clause* functioning as an object argument of the main predicate, i.e. the reporting verb.

Chiri does not go into the details of person deixis in these RD-constructions, which is, as mentioned above, ranked in this paper as a core principle in determining the orientation of reported discourse.

### 3.2.2. Tamura (1972; 1988/2000)

The issues of quote-internal person marking and, more generally the grammatical category of person in Southern Hokkaido Ainu (Saru dialect) have been fully discussed by Tamura (1972; 1988/English version 2000). Tamura's greatest discovery concerning the *sekor*-marked RD-construction was that, in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in the quote, the first person is changed to the so-called *indefinite person* (9a), since the unshifted first person may be ambiguous with the person of the current speaker (9b):

When other people's [the third or second persons'] words are quoted, [the author's] words spoken in the first person are changed to the *indefinite person* in quoted speech [(9a), (10)]. The first person indicates the person who is actually speaking [=reporter], and the first person is not used in quoting the speech of others [(9b)], [i.e. the first person is used only in so-called self-reporting contexts, as in (11)]. This is because the quoted person is not the one speaking [the reporter is not coreferential with the author]. (Tamura 2000: 74)

"Indefinite" is a general label employed by Tamura for a set of markers, viz. *aoka* (PL), *a=* for PL.A, *=an* for PL.S, and *i=* for PL.O, which are used not only in their proper function to refer to a generalized or indefinite subject and object, but also have a number of special usages: '1PL in quotes' under consideration, 1PL inclusive and 2SG/PL honorific. Southern Hokkaido dialects (Saru, Chitose) differ from other Ainu dialects with respect to the function '1SG in quotes', since they have developed a special singular pronoun *asinuma* 'one, someone' (Tamura 1988: 22–24), which is cross-referenced on verbs by the above-mentioned originally non-singular indefinite affixes, cf. (9a) and (12); for the details of my interpretation of *asinuma* 'oneself, self' (henceforth [*self*] in translations) refer to the end of section 4.2.2.

- (9) a. *asinuma arpa=an kusu ne" sekor Ø=hawean.*  
 INDEF.SG go.SG=INDEF.S intention COP QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 'She said, "I [lit. self] will go."  
 (T6 74); the glossing is mine - A.B.

- b. ?*“káni k=arpa kusu ne” sekor Ø=ha<sup>w</sup>wean.*  
 1SG 1SG.S=go.SG intention COP QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘She said, “I’ll go.”’ (constructed example - A.B.)
- (10) *eci<sup>4</sup>=kasuy kusu ne akusu “Ø=pirka wa.*  
 1SG.A+2SG.O=help intention COP when 3.S=be.fine FIN  
*yaykata a=Ø=kar kusu ne wa.” sekor*  
 on.one’s.own INDEF.A=3.O=make intention COP FIN QUOT  
*e=ha<sup>w</sup>wean...*  
 2.S=say.SG  
 ‘When I was going to help you, you said, “It is fine. I [lit. self] will do it myself [herself].”’ (T1 375; COL); Saru, SH.
- (11) *“káni k=arpa wa eci=kor-e kusu ne*  
 1SG 1SG.S=go.SG and 1SG.A+2SG.O=have-CAUS intention COP  
*na” sekor ku=ha<sup>w</sup>wean...*  
 FIN QUOT 1SG.S=say.SG  
 ‘I said, “I’ll go for your sake.”’ (T1 377; COL); Saru, SH.

It is worth mentioning that, in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in the quote, it is not only the first person singular but plural as well that is changed to the indefinite person.

- (12) *“[aoka] oya-pa suy arki=an kusu ne na!”*  
 [INDEF.PL] next-year again come.PL=INDEF.S intention COP FIN  
*sekor Ø=ha<sup>w</sup>weoka kor Ø=paye wa orano*  
 QUOT 3.S=say.PL while 3.S=go.PL and then  
*k=Ø=okaramotte-pa*  
 1SG.A=3.O=feel.reluctant.to.part.with-PL  
 ‘They left while saying, “we [lit. selves] will come again next year”, and I felt reluctant to part with them.’ (T6 75)

Tamura (2000: 75) further notes that the use of the indefinite person pronouns and affixes instead of the first person in the quote (9a) “*is not a so-called indirect narration* [italics mine]. For the example above [(9a)], ...[the example (13)] would correspond to indirect narration.”

- (13) *“Ø=arpa kun-i Ø=Ø=yē*  
 3.S=go.SG going.to-COMP 3.A=3.O=say  
 ‘She said she would go.’

According to Tamura’s (2000: 74–75) dichotomous analysis, this will be classified as direct discourse. Tamura herself does not use this term but “quoted speech” instead, since there separately exists a more indirect, genuine IRD-construction

<sup>4</sup> Note that Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects have several so-called portmanteau personal affixes which combine cross-referencing for both A and O. In section 1, *eci-* was mentioned as 2PL for A, S, and O, however it may also render the following meanings: <1SG.A+2SG.O>, <1SG.A+2PL.O>, <1PL.A+2SG.O>, <1PL.A+2PL.O>.



(13). However, under the continuum approach to the RD-domain adopted in this paper, the use of the indefinite person in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in the quote indicates a certain degree of *indirectness* of the RD-construction under consideration.

It is clear from Tamura's description that the so-called indefinite reference in (9a), (10), (12) belongs to the perspective of the reporter, as in IRD. Consider the following explanation for (9a): "For example, if Haruko [=the author] says *Káni k=arpa kusu ne* 'I'll go', *káni* <1SG> is Haruko herself. If Akio [=the reporter] quotes this and says it to another person, if he says *káni*, then it becomes Akio himself who will go. Because the person[s] who said they would go is a different person, it is not *káni*. Here *káni* is converted to the indefinite person, see (9a)" (Tamura 2000: 74).

With respect to (9a), it is obvious that the author in her original speech—let us assume it had really existed—would have never referred to herself with the indefinite pronoun *asinuma*: it is the reporter who uses *asinuma* to refer to the author of the embedded discourse to adjust the report to his own perspective, as in IRD.

The '1SG/PL in quotes' usage of the indefinite person is of great importance in all Ainu dialects, because it is used in folklore texts of most genres (e.g. *urwepeker* 'prosaic folktales', *yukar* 'heroic epics' of Southern Hokkaido) to refer to the person of the protagonist (=author) in the quote. Ainu folklore texts commonly have the structure of the RC-construction in question: the whole story is in fact a single quote, as in (14) and (9a).

- (14) "...*cis=an*,                    *cis=an*                    *kor patek an=an*                    *ayne*,...  
           cry=INDEFS cry=INDEFS and only be.SG=INDEFS finally  
           *ray=an ma Ø=isam ruwe ne" sekor*,  
           die=INDEFS and 3.S=not.exist INFR.EV COP QUOT  
           *sine menoko Ø=itak*  
           one woman 3.S=tell  
           "...I [lit. self] cried and cried. I [self] was always crying. Finally,...I [self]  
           died". One woman told.' (B 200; U), Chitose, SH.

Thus, the presence of embedded discourse becomes a prerequisite for the occurrence of the pronouns *asinuma* (SG) and *aoka* (PL) and their corresponding verbal affixes, which strongly reminds us of the phenomenon generally known as *logophoricity*.

## 4. Logophoricity

### 4.1. The notion of logophoricity

The term "logophoric" ('turning to the discourse') was proposed by Hagège (1974: 287) in a paper discussing data from the African languages Mundang, Ewe, Tubiri, and Ubangi languages. He wrote (p. 287; based on Curnow's translation (2002: 2)):

The term 'logophoric' is here proposed to designate a particular category of substitution elements (*substitutes*), personal and possessive, which refer to the

author of the discourse or to a participant whose thoughts are reported.

A clear example of logophoric pronouns occurs in Igbo (Stirling 1993: 254, with reference to Hyman & Comrie 1981), as exemplified by

- (15) a.  $\acute{o}$      $s\grave{ɪ}r\grave{ɪ}$      $n\grave{a}$      $\acute{o}$      $by\grave{a}r\grave{a}$   
           he<sub>i</sub>    said    that    he<sub>j</sub>    came  
       b.  $\acute{o}$      $s\grave{ɪ}r\grave{ɪ}$      $n\grave{a}$      $y\acute{a}$      $by\grave{a}r\grave{a}$   
           he<sub>i</sub>    said    that    he<sub>i</sub>    came

(15b) involves the logophoric pronoun *yá*, which contrasts with the normal person singular subject form *ó* in (15a). This logophoric pronoun is used to indicate necessary coreference between the subjects of two clauses, where one clause contains a verb of communication such as ‘say’, and the other is an embedded clause in which the content of the discourse is reported. In such a context, the use of the ordinary third person as in (15a) is normally taken to indicate disjoint reference: *he* in the quote is not coreferential with *he* of the QI; cf. the ambiguity of the English translation which may allow both coreferential and non-coreferential interpretations.

Hagège (1974: 305-8) was also the first to compare the logophoric pronouns of African languages with long-distance reflexives by analogy with the data from Latin and Japanese. In Japanese, there are no morphologically distinct logophoric pronouns, but the regular clause-bound reflexive pronoun *zibun* (transliterated as *jibun* in Hepburn romanization system employed in this paper) can be additionally used in this function, as in (16).

- (16) *Takahashi<sub>i</sub> wa Taroo ni [Yoshiko ga zibun<sub>i</sub> o*  
       Takahashi<sub>i</sub> TOP Taroo Dat Yoshiko Sbj self<sub>i</sub> Obj  
       *nikundeiru koto] o hanashita*  
       be-hating Comp Obj told  
       ‘Takahashi<sub>i</sub> told Taroo that Yoshiko hated him<sub>i</sub>.’  
       (Stirling 1993: 258) Japanese; the glossing is original.

In the following, I will describe how logophoricity is realized in Ainu.

## 4.2. Logophoricity in Ainu

### 4.2.1. ‘Logophoric’ instead of ‘first person in quotes’

I propose that Tamura’s ‘first person in quotes’ usage of the indefinite person in Southern Hokkaido dialects, viz. *asinuma* (SG), *aoka* (PL), and the corresponding verbal affixes *a=* for SG/PL.A; SG/PL.POSS, *=an* for SG/PL.S, and *i=* for SG/PL.O, should be regarded as a special set of *logophoric* markers existing in addition to the normal set of personal markers, since they fit with Hagège’s definition of logophoricity. The characterization of the indefinite person as ‘first person in quotes’ is considered inappropriate for the following reasons. First, the label ‘first person in quotes’ is hardly intelligible for non-Ainologists, and may be easily mistaken for a kind of “genuine” first person that the speaker uses to refer to himself. Second, the employment of the term “indefinite person” (i.e. a non-referential indefinite usage)

as a common label for a number of synchronically separate referential usages may hamper their unified diachronic analysis: the indefinite semantics would require a lot of reanalysis to acquire all the referential usages, and that would be, as pointed out by Satoo (2004: 179), typologically unusual.

#### 4.2.2. From inclusive to logophoric: a grammaticalization scenario

If we are to provide a unified diachronic analysis for the functions ‘logophoric’ (*asinuma* (SG), *aoka* (PL), *a=*, *=an*, *i=*), ‘indefinite’ (*a=*), ‘inclusive’ (*aoka*, *a=*, *=an*, *i=*), and ‘second person honorific’ (*aoka*, *a=*, *=an*, *i=*) with partly overlapping marking (see section 4.3.2), the central meaning would certainly be ‘inclusive’ which I suggest to use in ainology instead of the commonly used ‘first person inclusive’. Recent research on clusivity (Cysouw 2003, Daniel 2005: 3)—a newly coined term for the inclusive-exclusive distinction—shows that unlike exclusive, inclusive *is not* a kind of *first person*, but a person on its own right, which is coordinate with the first, second and third person categories. As the referential area of inclusive comprises the speaker (first person) and the addressee (second person) in the case of minimal inclusive, and also the speaker (first person), the addressee (second person) and other person(s) (third person), as in the case of augmented inclusive (both meanings may be expressed by the same set of markers in Ainu)<sup>5</sup>, it is very flexible for reanalysis and appears to be extremely versatile cross-linguistically (Cysouw 2005: 213-30).

The logophoric system of Ainu has clearly arisen from the grammaticalization of the non-singular inclusive markers, which are, in Eastern and Central Hokkaido Ainu dialects, used invariably in the logophoric sense to refer to plural and singular participants (*anokay* (SG/PL); *an=* (SG/PL.A), *=an* (SG/PL.S), *i=* (SG/PL.O))<sup>6</sup> which are coreferential with third/second person author(s) functioning as the subject of the matrix clause (=QI). The verbal stems they attach to also invariably appear in plural forms, and the latter distinction is particularly relevant for suppletive verbs, e.g. *oman* ‘go.SG’ – *paye* ‘go.PL’ (17).

- (17) *acapo*  $\emptyset$ =*cinita* *a* *wa* *ne* *eper* *ene*  $\emptyset$ =*itak* *i*,  
uncle 3.S=dream PERF and this bear like.this 3.S=say NR  
“*anokay* ...*kamuy* *mosir* *ine* *paye*=*an*...” *sekor*  $\emptyset$ =*ne*  
LOG.PL god land to go.PL=LOG.S QUOT 3.A=COP  
‘The uncle had a dream. The bear said: “I [lit. self] will go to the land of gods (=die)”.’ (SK 57–58; COL); Asahikawa, CH.

The pre-final stage of the grammaticalization process has been documented in

<sup>5</sup> The conception of ‘inclusive’ accepted in this paper seems to be similar to Kirikae’s *ippan-shoo* ‘common person’ (1983 (MS); quoted in Nakagawa (1987/2001: 8) since both imply an overarching referential area which is, however, by no means indefinite, as was suggested by Refsing (1986: 94, 218–219) and Nakagawa (1997: 220), and later supported by Bugaeva (2004: 25–28).

<sup>6</sup> The same forms appear, with slight differences, in all three dialect groups in this section.

one of the Southwestern Ainu dialects (Horobetsu) which, in the logophoric contexts, employs the plural pronoun *aokay* and verbal affixes *an=*, *=an*, *i=* to refer to singular participants, but the verbal stems they attach to appear in singular forms (Nakagawa 1987/2001: 9).

- (18) *“aokay anak-ne okkay Ø=Ø=koyki p sino*  
 LOG.PL TOP-COP man 3.A=3.O=kill NR really  
*a=Ø=ikoytupa na. e=Ø=koyki p... opittano*  
 LOG.A=3.O=be.jealous FIN 2.SG.A=3.O=kill NR all  
*a=Ø=uk easkay ruwe ne” ari<sup>7</sup> Ø=itak*  
 3.A=3.O=take.SG be.able INFR.EV COP QUOT 3.S=say  
 ‘(The younger sister of the Water goddess said): “I am [lit. self is] jealous of men game [lit. ‘things men kill’]. I [self] can take all of your game, (if)...”  
 (C2 56; U); Horobetsu, SWH.

In Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects, the grammaticalization process has reached its final stage. No change has occurred in marking coreferentiality of the third/second plural participants with the subject of the matrix clause (=author); they employ the same set of plural markers, viz. *aoka* (PL); *a=* (PL.A, PL.POSS), *=an* (PL.S), *i=* (PL.O) and the verbal stems appear in plural forms (12). However, to refer to singular participants in logophoric contexts, Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects employ a special “dedicated” pronoun *asinuma* (SG), and the same originally non-singular verbal markers, viz. the affixes *a=* (SG.A), *=an* (SG.S) and *i=* (SG.O), but the verbal stems appear in singular forms. According to Nakagawa (1988: 246), *asinuma* has appeared as a response to the reanalysis of verbs with the non-singular affixation as singular forms, as seen from the contrast of the data of a Southwestern Hokkaido dialect in (18) with that of a Southern Hokkaido dialect in (19).

- (19) *“asinuma arpa=an kusu ne na hani!” sekor*  
 LOG.SG go.SG=LOG.S intention COP FIN EX QUOT  
*Ø=hawean.*  
 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(She) said, “I [lit. self] will go!”’ (T1 373;COL); Saru, SH.

The etymology of *asinuma* is rather transparent: it consists of the originally inclusive marker *a=* (INCL.A/POSS), followed by the third person singular pronoun *sinuma* ‘(s)he’, which, in my view, suggests something like ‘self’, lit. ‘the (s)he’ of you and me’ with the implication ‘the one you [the addressee] and I [the reporter] know [=are talking about]’; cf. Tamura’s early interpretation of *asinuma* as “a speaker, a person in question” (1972: 376). It is also noteworthy that, in Japanese translations of Ainu folktales, the late Ainu speaker of the Chitose dialect Mrs. Ito Oda (1908–2000) always translated *asinuma* as the Japanese *jibun* ‘one-self’ (recall the discussion on long-distance reflexives in Japanese (16)), but never

<sup>7</sup> *Ari* is a functional equivalent of *sekor* in the respective dialects, see 7.1.1.1.

as the Japanese *watashi* ‘I’. However, this was not evident for the Ainologists of the first generation: Kindaichi (1931), Chiri (1936, 1942), and Kubodera (1977) correlated *asinuma* (SG) with its plural counterpart *aoka* (PL) “first person inclusive” (a truly misleading label!), and considered both to be genuine first person pronouns. Their regular occurrence in Classical Ainu (*yukar* ‘heroic epic’) was attributed to the elegant style of this genre, and all Ainu literature was presented as ‘first person literature’, i.e. direct style narration (cf. 5.3).

It was Tamura who first documented this form in logophoric contexts in colloquial Ainu of the Southern Hokkaido dialect of Saru, rejecting the stylistic interpretation of Kindaichi et al. So far, due to the lack of relevant descriptive data, the use of logophoric markers in colloquial Ainu has not been attested in other dialects. However, my own research has revealed their employment in one of the Central Hokkaido dialects (Asahikawa), as already shown in (17), which additionally proves that, just like in Southern Hokkaido dialects, the use of these markers in folktales is triggered by logophoric contexts, since folktales are also a kind of reported speech (see (14)).

#### 4.2.3. Ainu logophoricity in typological perspective

Hyman and Comrie (1981) (quoted in Curnow 2002) have proposed the logophoric hierarchy in (a).

(a) singular > plural

If a language has a logophoric marking system, the logophoric term is always used with singular referents, but may (e.g. in Moru) or may not (e.g. in Logo) be used with plural reference. Additionally, if a language has a logophoric marking system, the logophoric term is always used with third person referents, but may (e.g. in Akɔɔse) or may not (e.g. in Kaliko) be used with second person referents. In general, logophoric terms do not occur with first person referents. This is formulated as the hierarchy in (b).

(b) 3 > 2 > (1)

Ainu logophoricity perfectly agrees with both generalizations: logophoric markers may be used with third/second person singular, as in (9a), (17–19), (10), (21), or plural referents, as in (12), but are not used with first person referents, as in (11).

Another parameter of cross-linguistic variation is the syntactic function of the participant within the quote coreferential with the author. According to Hagege’s definition, logophoric marking may show the coreference of the S/A, O, or possessor in the embedded clause (=the quote) with an argument, mostly a subject, in the matrix clause (QI). In many languages, logophoric marking is restricted to the S/A function, but there are also languages in which the marked participant can have a plethora of syntactic functions within a quote. For instance, in Mundang (Adamawa-Ubangian, Niger-Congo; Chad), the logophoric pronoun *zi* marks the participant within the quote coreferential with a third person singular author for

S/A and O, while the logophoric pronoun *mini* marks it for the function of possessor (Elders 2000: 564).

Logophoric marking in Ainu is remarkable for its pervasiveness since it may be used to mark the respective participants with the functions of S/A, O, and possessor. The logophoric marking of the participant in S/A function has been shown in (9a), (10), (12), (14), (17), and (19); now consider examples of the logophoric marking of the participant in O (20), (21) and possessor functions (21).

- (20) *“nep isoytak ne yak-ka i=y-epakasnu” sekor kane,*  
 what story COP if-even LOG.O=EP-teach QUOT like.this  
*Ø=harwean...*  
 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(The young lady) said like, “Tell me [lit. self] any story.”’  
 (T2 52; COL); Saru, SH.
- (21) *“a=ekas-i tap-ne tap-ne Ø=itak wa*  
 LOG.POSS=grandfather-POSS this-COP this-COP 3.S=say and  
*Ø=i=hoppa ruwe ne” sekor e=itak kusu*  
 3.A=LOG.O=leave INFR.EV COP QUOT 2SG.S=say should  
*ne na*  
 COP FIN  
 ‘You should say: “My [lit. Self’s] grandfather said this and that and left me [self].”’  
 (B 214; KY); Chitose, SH.

Unlike other languages, Ainu does not employ logophoric markers to mark the coreferentiality of the author with a participant in the quote in IRD (cf. (66)), but does so in SRD, as discussed in the ensuing section.

## 5. Semi-direct Reported Discourse in Ainu

Semi-direct discourse reports are very frequent and are not limited to any specific speech act, i.e. they cover reported statements, commands, and questions.

### 5.1. Formal properties of semi-direct reported discourse

Cross-linguistically, logophoric pronouns (and affixes) always receive their referential interpretation from the reporter’s perspective, so the RD-constructions they occur in are non-DRDs by definition. However, logophoric contexts in many languages behave exactly like direct reported discourse, i.e. they may include exclamations, vocatives, attitude markers, imperatives, and they do not show the adjustment of other personal, spatial, and temporal deictic elements to the perspective of the reporter—all of them, and sometimes the intonation patterns as well, occur as they would have been used in the original discourse, which results in the emergence of so-called semi-direct reported discourse discussed in example (3). And that is exactly what we observe in Ainu.

### 5.1.1. Properties shared with direct reported discourse

Here is a list of properties which SRD in Ainu shares with DRD.

I. No shift in second person reference.

- (22) *iwan pa Ø=ek yak, a=e=ekano kus ne*  
 six year 3.S=come.SG if LOG.A=2SG.O=meet intention COP  
*na” sekor, a<sup>8</sup>=antehoku Ø=harwean*  
 FIN QUOT LOG.POSS=husband.POSS 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘‘I’ll [lit. Self’II] meet you when six years pass’’, said my husband.’  
 (B 145; KY); Chitose, SH.

II. Use of imperatives and negative imperatives (=prohibitatives).

- (23) ‘‘...*iteki i=ray-ke yan*  
 PROH LOG.O=die-CAUS IMP.POL  
*i=siknu-re yan” sekor Ø=harwean*  
 LOG.O=be.alive-CAUS IMP.POL QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(The village chief) said, ‘‘...Please don’t kill me [lit. self]! Please leave me  
 [self] alive!’’ (B 408; U); Chitose, SH.

Note that in the imperative mood, the verb is unmarked for the person and number of the subject, but it is marked for the person and number of the object if it is transitive (here, *i=*); *yan* is an optional polite imperative particle.

III. Use of sentence final particles with modal meanings, viz. *na* ‘you see, (...so you must do so and so)’ in (12), (21), (22), and (26), *hani* ‘don’t forget it and do it well’ in (19), *wa* in (10), *yan* ‘command to more than one [also a polite imperative – A.B.]’ in (23) and (26), and probably some other; the interpretations of the particles are those of Tamura (1961/2001: 88).

IV. The use of interjections.

- (24) *easir ne aynu “baa, ene-an wen irenka Ø=an kor*  
 finally that man ah! like.this-be be.bad will 3.S=be.SG and  
*an=an hi ka a=Ø=eramiskari no*  
 be.SG=LOG.S COMP even LOG.A=3.O=not.know and  
*an=an ruwe ne,” sekor Ø=harwean*  
 be.SG=LOG.S INFR.EV COP QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘Finally, that man (said): ‘‘Ah! I [lit. Self] didn’t know that I [self] lived  
 guided by ill will...’’, said (that man).’ (B 407-8; U); Chitose, SH.

<sup>8</sup>The occurrence of logophoric marker in the matrix clause is triggered by the fact that it is also embedded under a further discourse introducer; the example is from a folktale, so the whole story consists of a quote.

## V. Use of vocatives.

- (25) *néa pon menoko* “*hawe ne yak-un, a=Ø=kor*  
 that young woman REP.EV COP if-EMP LOG.A=3.O=have  
*katkemat, asinuma ka, a=Ø=tura kusu ne ne*  
 lady LOG.SG also LOG.A=3.O=follow intention COP COP  
*ne<sup>9</sup>” sekor Ø=hawean*  
 COP QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘That young woman said, “If you say so, my lady, I [lit. self] will also follow you.”’  
 (T3 20–22; U); Saru, SH.
- (26) “*taan bekaci, itak=an ciki pirka-no e=Ø=nu*  
 this boy speak=LOG.S if be.good-ADV 2SG.A=3.O=listen  
*kus ne na<sup>10</sup>...” sekor Ø=hawean*  
 intention COP FIN QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(My grandfather said), “Hey, boy, if I [lit. self] speak, you should listen well!..”’  
 (B 204–205, 214; U); Chitose, SH.

It is noteworthy that vocative phrases in Ainu may contain demonstratives as their modifiers (26), viz. the proximal demonstrative *tan* ‘this: right in front of the speaker’, the proximal demonstrative *taan* ‘this: close to the speaker’, and occasionally the medial demonstrative *toan* ‘that: close to the addressee’; however, the distal demonstrative *toon* ‘that: far from both the speaker and the addressee’ lacks this usage. The distinction between the unmarked vocative phrases and those marked with demonstratives is not quite clear. Examples in my corpus suggest that the latter are a less polite form of address which is used to refer to an addressee with a lower social status than that of the speaker (hence the use of *hey* in translation in (26)), cf. a plain vocative in (25)—the younger wife addresses the older wife, and a vocative with the demonstrative in (26)—the grandfather addresses his adopted grandson. The use of demonstratives in vocative phrases in Ainu bears some resemblance to the so-called interjectional usage of demonstratives in Japanese and Korean (Kim 2006: 779–783; this fact was pointed out to me by S. Tida). In these languages, demonstratives can modify “abusive words” (e.g. *kono baka* ‘what a fool!’ in Japanese), and distal demonstratives in particular are chosen to emphasize a greater psychological, though not physical, distance between the speaker and the referent.

## VI. No shift in spatial deixis.

Neither locative adverbs (27), nor demonstratives (28) show any shift.

<sup>9</sup> It is unclear why in this context the copula *ne* should occur three times in sequence. The actual pronunciation on Tamura’s audio tape (1985: tape n. 2–2) is not clear, but I suggest that the intended form was *kusu ne na*, cf. (26).

<sup>10</sup> This is a periphrastic imperative expression which is formed in the declarative mood; cf. the imperative mood in (23).



- (27) *tan-ukuran te ta i=rewsi-[re] wa*  
 this-evening here at LOG.O=stay.overnight-CAUS and  
*i=kor-e<sup>11</sup> yan sekor Ø=harwean*  
 LOG.O=have-CAUS IMP.POL QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(The man) said, “Please let me [lit. self] stay here tonight.” (B 246; U); Chitose, SH.
- (28) *tan otcike a=Ø=kor pe Ø=ne ruwe ne.”*  
 this tray LOG.A=3.O=have thing 3.A=COP INFR.EV COP  
*sekor Ø=harweoka*  
 QUOT 3.S=say.PL  
 ‘They said, “These trays belong to us [lit. selves].” (N3:135; U); Chitose, SH.

#### VII. No shift in temporal deixis.

- (29) *aoka anak tane hosip-pa=an kusu ne na”*  
 LOG.PL TOP now return-PL=LOG.S intention COP FIN  
*sekor Ø=harweoka*  
 QUOT 3.S=say.PL  
 ‘“Now, we [lit. selves] will return”, they said.’ (T1 376; COL); Saru, SH.

Tense is not a grammatical category in Ainu, but, as we can see, lexical means do not seem to be involved in deictic shift: in example (29), *tane* ‘now’ is not shifted to ‘then’; see also *tanukuran* ‘tonight’ in (27). The issue requires further consideration.

#### VIII. A pause between the quote and QI.

Just like in DRD sentences, in SRD sentences there is a pause between the quote and QI; there is no such a pause in IS sentences.

#### 5.1.2. Properties shared with indirect reported discourse

Here is a list of properties which SRD in Ainu shares with IRD:

- I. A consistent reporter-oriented shift in pronominal reference to the author of discourse marked by logophoric markers (see 4.2.3).
- II. Special intonation patterns (not necessarily).

Intonation in those traditional folktales which are narrated in the SRD style is rather monotonous and is close to that of IRD. However, according to Tamura (1988/2000: 75), analogous SRD reports in colloquial language may reproduce original intonation patterns and even the tone of the author’s voice, cf. (4).

#### 5.2. Functions of semi-direct reported discourse in colloquial Ainu

According to Tamura (1988/2000:74), in Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects, the use of ‘first person in quotes’ (here, referred to as the logophoric marking of SRD) in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in

<sup>11</sup> This is an analytical benefactive construction: lit. ‘Make self stay here tonight and give (it) to self.’

the quote is obligatory, as in examples (9a), (10), and (12). In this paper, I argue that SRD and DRD (and also IRD) should be regarded as stylistic options. However, if the context is not sufficient, the use of the first person may be ambiguous with the person of the reporter, and SRD becomes a preferable option.

### 5.3. Functions of semi-direct reported discourse in Ainu oral literature

The famous Ainu folklore genres, namely *yukar* and *uwepeker*, are traditionally narrated in SRD style, i.e. the protagonist (an Ainu hero, as in *yukar*, or a man as in *uwepeker*) is referred to from the reporter's perspective with the respective logophoric markers but the other properties are similar to DRD, as seen from (14) and the discussion that precedes.

*Yukar* epics are very long rhythmically organized texts which were usually recited by Ainu men who would sit by the hearth in the company of relatives and friends. However, Ainu people were not the only audience to be entertained by *yukar*-epics; equally or more importantly, *yukar* were intended for entertaining Ainu gods through the mediation of the Fire goddess. I assume that the narrator (reporter) uses the logophoric markers with reference to the protagonist because he wants to dissociate himself from the protagonist, to avoid being mistaken for him by the invisible audience of the Ainu gods.

*Yukar* and *uwepeker* often contain multiply embedded discourse events, i.e. the discourse of non-protagonist participants which is usually encoded by the same SRD-construction (47); cf. a few exceptions of the DRD employment in 6.3.2. On the other hand, in the genre of *kamuy yukar* 'songs of gods', which is traditionally narrated in the DRD style, there is a tendency to cast the discourse of non-protagonist characters as SRD.

## 6. Direct Reported Discourse in Ainu

According to Tamura (1988/2000: 74), as was already discussed in 3.2.2, "the first person is not used in quoting the speech of others", which means that prototypical direct reported discourse (see (9b)) is not possible in Ainu. However, that would be a somewhat unusual case cross-linguistically.

As Haiman (1989) and Güldemann (2008: 9) pointed out, DRD can be expected to exist in every language and is thus a universal phenomenon while RD-categories incorporating partly [i.e. SRD] or completely [IRD] the perspective of the reporter have been found of a number of languages to be missing or to be extremely restricted. The question is: how grammatical is genuine DRD, as in (9b), in Ainu? In fact, examples of DRD, although not included in the latest description of Ainu by Tamura (1988/2000), have been discussed as grammatically possible options in Tamura's earlier work (1972) based on her fieldwork data. Such examples have been also documented by other researchers in colloquial Ainu and occasionally in folklore.

In the examples below (Tamura 1972), it is the first person that is used to refer to a participant in the quote in the case of his/her coreference with the third/second person singular, as in (30) and (31), or plural author, as in (32) and (33). This

is exactly the context where, according to Tamura (1988/2000), we would expect ‘indefinite person marking’ (here referred to as ‘logophoric’).

- (30) *k=arpa wa eci=kor-e kusu ne na*  
 1SG.S=go and 1SG.S+2SG.O=have-CAUS intention COP FIN  
*sekor Ø=hawean...*  
 QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(S)he said, “I’ll go for your sake.” (T1 377; COL); Saru, SH. Cf. (9a) and (11).
- (31) *eci=kasuy kusu ne akusu Ø=pirka wa. káni*  
 1SG.A+2SG.O=help intention COP when 3.S=be.good FIN I  
*ku=Ø=kar kusu ne wa sekor e=hawean a*  
 1SG.A=3.O=make intention COP FIN QUOT 2.S=say.SG PERF  
*p oraun hñta kusu ene e=Ø=kar ka somo ki no*  
 but then what reason like.this 3.SG.A=3.O=make also NEG do and  
 ‘When I was going to help, you said, “It’s fine. I’ll do it myself, but after that why didn’t you do like this?” (T1 378; COL); Saru, SH. Cf. (10).
- (32) *paye=as wa arki=as na. sekor eci=haweoaka a*  
 go.PL=1PL.S and come.PL=1PL.S FIN QUOT 2PL.S=say.PL PERF  
*p oraun na eci=paye ka somo ki ruwe?*  
 but then yet 2PL.S=go.PL even NEG do INFR.EV  
 ‘You said, “I’ll be gone”, but why haven’t you left yet?” (T1 378; COL); Saru, SH.

In (30)–(33), no single pronoun or pronominal affix shows a reporter-oriented shift, and none of the other properties do, which proves that Ainu does have a DRD-construction.

However, Tamura (1972) does not comment on the status of those genuine DRD reports within the whole system of RD-constructions in Ainu; the reports with ‘indefinite person’ in quotes (here, SRD) are regarded as DRD by Tamura (1972: 373), just like in her later work (Tamura 1988/2000). If we accept Tamura’s view that reports with ‘indefinite person’ are DRD, we would either end up having in Ainu two DRD constructions with distinct person marking, or having to demote the existing genuine DRD construction, as in examples (30)–(33), to some marginal status (a kind of slip of the tongue). The latter decision is implicitly accepted in Tamura’s latest grammar of Ainu (1988/2000), since, as was mentioned, examples of genuine DRD have not been included in the discussion. My claim is that it is only a continuum approach to RD that can account for these two RD-constructions. That is, the RD-constructions in question should be identified as DRD and SRD, which differ in degrees of directness.

### 6.1. Formal properties of direct reported discourse

DRD reports are frequent and are not limited to any specific speech act. The quote of DRD expressing a statement, a command or a question is perfectly acceptable when used as a matrix clause on its own.

DRD in Ainu has the following properties of prototypical DRD which is described in detail by Aikhenvald (2005 and forthcoming).

- I. No shift in personal, spatial, and temporal reference.
- II. The quote is not necessarily coextensive with a clause: it may be longer or shorter than a clause, or it may even consist of a non-linguistic expression, e.g. the song of a bird.
- III. The use of imperatives and negative imperatives (=prohibitatives).
- IV. The use of sentence final particles with modal meanings.
- V. The use of interjections, vocatives, and exclamations.
- VI. A pause between the quote and QI.
- VII. Intonation patterns, possibly a ‘theatrical effect’.

## 6.2. Functions of direct reported discourse in colloquial Ainu

Generally, both DRD and SRD may be regarded as stylistic options. As in many other languages, DRD in Ainu often has so-called “theatrical effect”. As Clark and Gerrig (1990: 772) put it, quotations are “demonstrations”, and often convey not just the words but the intonation, gestures and so on; “the internal structure of quotation is really the structure of what is being depicted, and that can range from the raging of a person to the racket of a machine” (quoted in Aikhenvald: forthcoming). DRD as in (33), is described by Tamura (1972: 379) as an actual reproduction of the author’s discourse accompanied by the mimicking of the author’s original voice and manner of speaking.

Further, Tamura (1972: 379) describes the functional difference between (33) and (34), the respective DRD and SRD versions of the same discourse in the following way. Example (34) (here, SRD) is likely to occur when “the author(s) had an intention to go out and not to come back for a while”, and example (33) (here, DRD) is likely to occur when “the author(s) had an intention to go out and to come back in a minute”. It remains unclear for what particular reason the above-mentioned semantic difference occurs.

- (33) *paye=as wa arki=as na.” sekor Ø=harweoka*  
 go.PL=1PL.S and come.PL=1PL.S FIN QUOT 3.S=say.PL  
 ‘They said, “We will be gone!” (T1 379; COL); Saru, SH.
- (34) *paye=an wa arki=an na.” sekor Ø=harweoka kor*  
 go.PL=LOG.S and come.PL=LOG.S FIN QUOT 3.S=say.PL then  
 Ø=*paye*  
 3.S=go.PL  
 ‘They said, “We [lit. selves] will be gone!” and left.’ (T1 379; COL); Saru, SH.

Some colloquial Ainu texts exhibit an interplay between DRD and IRD, which may be regarded as a discourse-organizing device. As many other languages (e.g. Cerma (Gur); see Lowe and Hurlimann 2002), Ainu seems to comply with the discourse prominence hierarchy of RD-categories implying that DRD repre-

sents foregrounded information, and IRD—backgrounded information; SRD may correlate with either of the polar categories depending on the language. Consider the following personal narrative from one of the Central Hokkaido dialects (Asahikawa), which is a good example of the interplay between SRD and DRD.

- (35) *ne ukuran acapo Ø=sirepa, Ø=ikopepka*  
 this evening uncle 3.S=arrive 3.S=talk.about.one's.experience  
*hawē ene an i, "a=yup-i<sub>SRD</sub>"<sup>12</sup> tura*  
 REPEV like.this be.SG NR LOG.POSS=elder.brother-POSS with  
*kim un kuca ot ta okay=an<sub>SRD</sub> a wa*  
 mountains be hunting.hut place at be.PL=LOG.S PERF and  
*kunnano ku=yup-i<sub>DRD</sub>"<sup>13</sup> ene Ø=itak i,*  
 in.the.morning 1SG.POSS=elder.brother-POSS like.this 3.S=say NR  
*"ukuran utar-pa patek kunne kosonte Ø=Ø=mi wa Ø=rimsē,*  
 evening people-head only black dress 3.A=3.O=wear and 3.S=dance  
*ne i ta hure sarampe ku=Ø=mi<sub>DRD</sub> wa aynu kut*  
 this time at red silk.dress 1SG.A=3.O=wear and Ainu belt  
*ku=Ø=e-kut-kor<sub>DRD</sub> wa so-us-i ta*  
 1SG.A=3.O=with.APPL-belt-have and seating.mat-adhere.to-place at  
*sinen ne ku=an<sub>DRD</sub>" sekor ku=wen-tarap<sub>DRD</sub>" sekor Ø=itak*  
 alone as 1SG.S=be.SG QUOT 1SG.S=be.bad-dream QUOT 3.S=say  
*kusu... ...nan ne manu p ka a=Ø=wen-te<sub>SRD</sub>*  
 because face as call.AUX NR even PASS=3.O=be.bad-CAUS  
*sir an an=Ø=nukar<sub>SRD</sub> ka eaykap kusu...*  
 VIS.EV be.SG LOG.A=3.O=look even be.unable because  
*sap=an<sub>SRD</sub> ru ne" sekor Ø=itak kor*  
 return.PL=LOG.S INFR.EV COP QUOT 3.S=say and  
*Ø=ciskoyoyse*  
 3.S=break.into.tears

'In the evening, the uncle arrived and talked about his experience as follows: "I [self] stayed at the hunting hut in the mountains together with my [self's] brother (=the reporter's father). In the morning, my brother said as follows: "I had a bad dream: In the evening, only the chiefs were wearing black dresses and dancing. At that time, I was wearing a red dress and had a red Ainu belt. I was sitting alone in the corner", he said. {"What a bad dream! Today, it is better not to go to inspect snares," I/self<sup>14</sup> said. However, he said, "All this time everything went fine!" and went out. After that I [self] stayed in bed. It

<sup>12</sup> *A-yup-i* lit. 'self's older brother' does not necessarily refer to a relative, it may be used as a polite address.

<sup>13</sup> The co-occurrence of logophoric markers and first person markers in the same quote with the reference to the same participant is regarded as a mixed report which is discussed in 6.2.1; see (38) and the discussion that follows.

<sup>14</sup> "I/self" indicates Mrs. Sunazawa's hesitation: she wrote =an 'self' first but then corrected it for *ku*= 'I', which is, however, less preferable in the light of my discussion.

was growing dark, but he didn't come back. When night fell, he didn't come back either. I [self] didn't sleep that night. Early in the morning, I [self] cooked some food and put it on (my) back. Since I [self] knew that stream called Nisaman where the snare was fixed, I [self] went (there). I [self] looked into the stream—the bottom of the stream was muddy, a bent gun stuck in the mud. Everything looked like there had been a battle, so I walked upstream. Then from the grass at the bottom of the stream a big bear jumped at me with its mouth open. I [self] made a shot in the middle of its mouth. The bear twisted in the opposite direction. I [self] aimed at the middle of the (bear's) body and made a shot. The bear fell down, then I [self] made three more shots, and it died. After that I searched for my [self's] brother. At the bottom of the stream (I saw)} something that used to be a face (and now) looked like a mess. I [self] could not look at it and returned {without having looked well at it}." Said (the uncle) and broke into tears.' (SK 49; COL); Asahikawa, CH.

In (35), I present only a fragment of the Ainu text but provide a full English translation (curly brackets are used to show those parts in the translation for which the corresponding Ainu text has not been included). The reporter is an Ainu lady who is recalling a tragic episode from her childhood, i.e. her father's death. The reporter's father went hunting with a friend and was killed by a bear. The friend who is politely referred to as *acapo* 'uncle' survived and came to the author's house to tell the tragedy (by that moment the reporter had already learned about her father's death). In (35), the lady is reporting the discourse of her father's friend which also contains the embedded discourse of her father. I assume that the father's discourse is cast as DRD (the use of first person markers: 'I') because it is of more importance for the reporter, and the friend's discourse, with few exceptions (see footnote 14), is cast as SRD (the use of logophoric markers: 'self') because it is of less importance.

There are many cases where the reporter has a choice of foregrounding a discourse event by using DRD or backgrounding it by using SRD, I claim that the choices can be explained in terms of relative salience of discourse events and material events, relative salience of different discourse participants [=authors], and the patterning of multiply embedded discourse events.

### 6.2.1. Restrictions on the use of direct reported discourse in colloquial Ainu

DRD seems to be less preferable in those colloquial contexts where the use of the first person pronouns and affixes may be ambiguous with the person of the reporter. The present research has additionally revealed that in some Ainu dialects, e.g. in Central Hokkaido (Asahikawa), the *sekor*-marked QI may be employed to introduce not only SRD and DRD, as in Southern Hokkaido dialects, but IRD<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> In Sunazawa (1983) which is a rare collection of colloquial Ainu (Asahikawa) texts, I have registered eight instances of the *sekor*-marked IRD construction.

as well, which results in a grammatical ambiguity of the above-described type. Compare the respective interpretations in (36) and (37).

- (36) *sisam kurmat utar asinru ku=Ø=icakkere*  
 Japanese Japanese.woman PL toilet 1SG.S=3.O=make.dirty  
*sekor Ø=itak kor Ø=en=ko-iruska*  
 QUOT 3.S=say then 3.A=1SG.O=at.APPL-be.angry  
 i. 'The Japanese women said that I had dirtied the toilet and got mad at me.'  
 (intended interpretation) IRD  
 ii. '(Each of) the Japanese women said: "I dirtied the toilet", and got mad at me.'  
 (possible interpretation) DRD (SK 190; COL); Asahikawa, CH.
- (37) *te ta ku=an yak Ø=pirka sekor Ø=itak*  
 here at 1SG.S=be.SG if 3.S=be.good QUOT 3.S=say  
 i. '(My husband) said that I could stay there.' (intended interpretation) IRD  
 ii. '(My husband) said: "I may stay here."' (possible interpretation) DRD  
 (SK 142; COL); Asahikawa, CH.

Although in the Southern Hokkaido dialects *sekor* has not been attested as a quotation marker of IRD constructions, we should bear in mind that the respective QIs often occur postpositionally, which means that at the moment of uttering a quote, if the context is not sufficient, the authorship of the quote may still be unclear to the addressee. To avoid such an ambiguity in colloquial Ainu, the reporter may choose to use unambiguous logophoric markers of SRD (34), instead of the ambiguous first person markers of DRD. This also explains why it is unknown in Ainu and in the world's languages in general for a first-person logophoric pronoun to occur, cf. (11).

Some Ainu speakers have been attested using mixed reports (38) where logophoric markers and first person markers occur in the same quote and refer to the same participant.

- (38) "naici ot ta anak-ne, ne citensa ka, a=Ø=o ka  
 Honshu place at TOP-COP this bicycle even LOG.A=3.O=ride even  
*somo ki kuruma ani patek apkas=an wa kusu... sir-sesek*  
 NEG do car INST only walk=LOG.S and because land-be.hot  
*yak-ka, sukuscire=an ka somo ki p ene, tane-po*  
 if-even get.a.suntan=LOG.S even NEG do but like.this now-EMP  
*ene hanke-ko citensa ani.. k=ek neya*  
 like.this be.close-NG bicycle INST 1SG.S=come.SG and  
*ku=san neya ki kor, kes-to an kor k=an*  
 1SG.S=return.SG and do when every-day be.SG when 1SG.S=be.SG  
*ayne... sukuscire ku=Ø=ki hi ne wa" sekor*  
 finally get.a.suntan 1SG.S=3.O=do ASS.NR COP FIN QUOT  
 Ø=harwean  
 3.S=say.SG  
 'He said, "On Honshu, I [lit. self] do not ride this bicycle, I [self] only go by

car, so even if it is hot, I [self] do not get a suntan, but like this, just like now, when I ride a long way by bicycle to come (here) and go back, and keep doing it every day, I finally do get a suntan.” (S1 59; COL); Saru, SH.

In (38), an Ainu speaker is reporting to a researcher her previous conversation with another researcher who had come from Honshu and was using a bicycle to commute to working sessions from a town he stayed in. The quote starts as SRD, which implies that the reporter is not coreferential with the author, then in the middle of the report, at the point when there is no more ambiguity, the quote is shifted to DRD to make it more vivid and real, just as it was told by the author.

### 6.3. Functions of direct reported discourse in Ainu oral literature

#### 6.3.1. Direct reported discourse as a token of *Kamuy Yukar* ‘Songs of Gods’

As was mentioned in 5.3, a number of Ainu folklore genres are narrated in SRD style. However, DRD has become conventionalized as a primary style in one of the major folklore genres, namely *kamuy yukar* ‘songs of gods’. *Kamuy yukar* is a rhythmically organized story which is narrated from the protagonist’s perspective, and the protagonist is one of the Ainu gods: the Fire goddess, the Water goddess, the Bear god, or any other venerated object or creature, which is not necessarily a positive character.

In *kamuy yukar* folktales, the protagonist (=author) uses first person plural (exclusive) markers to refer to himself, viz. *coka* (PRN); *ci*= (1PL.A), =*as* (1PL.S), *un*= (1PL.O). I regard this usage as a kind of so-called *pluralis majestatis* because it has usually been restricted to august personages. The idea behind the *pluralis majestatis* is that a monarch or other high official always speaks for his or her people.<sup>16</sup> Similarly in the case of *kamuy yukar* ‘songs of gods’, a particular god, e.g. the Owl god, speaks for his fellows, i.e. other owl gods.

Unlike the use of logophoric markers in SRD, the stylistic use of 1PL (exclusive) has nothing to do with the shift to the reporter’s perspective: *kamuy yukar* folktales are narrated from the perspective of the author (god) who refers to himself in the plural for certain pragmatic reasons. It should be also noted that, as an additional feature of DRD, each *kamuy yukar* contains a fixed refrain (*sakebe*) which is associated with a non-linguistic utterance (song) of a certain god: e.g., *hankirikiri* is a refrain imitating the chirping of a sparrow, and *ritunna* an onomatopoeic imitation of the sound of thunder.

The discourse of non-protagonist characters in *kamuy yukar* is often cast as SRD, where they are referred to with logophoric markers from the reporter’s perspective. Consider the following example from the Central Hokkaido dialect of Horobetsu.

<sup>16</sup> This stylistic usage of the 1PL pronoun with reference to the 1SG is also observed in Russian, in ceremonial addresses of the Russian *tsars* (=emperors): *My, Nikolaj Vtoroj... ‘We, Nickolaj II...’*.



- (39) *teeta wen kur tane nispa p Ø=po-utar-i*  
 past be.poor man now be.rich NR 3.POSS=child-PL-POSS  
*Ø=Ø=e-u-mina-re ene Ø=hawokay:...*  
 3.A=3.O=at.APPL-SOC-laugh-SOC like.this 3.S=say.PL  
*“toan cikap-po kamuy cikap-po aokay utar a=Ø=kor*  
 that bird-DIM god bird-DIM 1PL PL LOG.A=3.O=have  
*kon-kani ay ka somo Ø=Ø=uk...” Ø=hawokay*  
 gold-metal arrow even NEG 3.A=3.O=take.SG 3.S=say.PL

‘At this the children of those who were poor in the past but now rich laughed all together and said: “...That bird, the sacred bird, did not accept even our [lit. selves] golden arrows. ...” They said.’ (In this story, the protagonist is a bird.)

(CY 12; KY); Horobetsu, SWH.

In the recent period, especially in Southern Hokkaido dialects, there appeared a tendency to narrate the entire body of *kamuy yukar* in the SRD style, just like in the other folklore genres (cf. 5.3), or to recite in the DRD style only the beginning of the story and then switch into SRD, as in (40) (cf. the structurally opposite phenomenon in colloquial Ainu (38)).

- (40) “{*rittunna*} *aynu kotan {rittunna} ci=Ø=nukan rusuy {rittunna}*  
 refrain Ainu village refrain 1PL.A=3.O=see DESID refrain  
*tan-pe kusu {rittunna}, punkar sinta {rittunna}*  
 this-NR reason refrain vine vehicle refrain  
*a=Ø=yay-ko-sina {rittunna}*  
 LOG.A=3.O=REFL-to.APPL-tie refrain  
*a=Ø=yay-ko-yupu... sekor, kanna kamuy*  
 LOG.A=3.O=REFL-to.APPL-fasten QUOT thunder God  
*Ø=isoytak ruwe ne*  
 3.S=tell.story INFR.EV COP  
 “I wanted to see an Ainu village. For this reason, I [lit. self] tied myself to a vine vehicle. I [self] fastened myself [himself] tight to (the vine vehicle)...”  
 That is the story told by the Thunder God.’ (B 114, 119; KY); Chitose, SH.

### 6.3.2. Occasional use of direct reported discourse in *uwepeker* ‘prosaic folktales’

Relatively short DRD reports may occasionally appear in typical SRD-style folktales (namely in *uwepeker*) and refer to the discourse of participants other than the protagonist, as in (41)–(43).

- (41) “*eci=ekano k kus ne na*”, *sekor Ø=hawean*  
 1SG.A+2PL.O=meet going.to COP FIN QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(The uncle) said, “I’ll come and meet you.”’ (B 124; U); Chitose, SH.
- (42) *katkemat-utar “kani ka k=arpa rusuy*  
 housewife-PL 1SG also 1SG.S=go.SG DESID

- k=arpa rusuy" sekor Ø=harweokay*  
 1SG.S=go.SG DESID QUOT 3.S=say.PL  
 ‘The housewives said, “I also want to go, (and) I want to go (to dig up *turep*-  
*lily roots*)!” (B 293; U); Chitose, SH.
- (43) *“tan-pe ku=Ø=kor pe tan-pe somo a p” sekor*  
 this-NR 1SG.S=3.O=have NR this-NR NEG PERF NR QUOT  
*Ø=harweoka*  
 3.S=say.PL  
 ‘(The villages) said, “This was mine and that was not!” (B 274; U); Chitose,  
 SH.

Note that, in (42) and (43), the subject of the main clause is plural but the participant in the quote is marked as the first person singular. This may be attributed to the fact that DRD aims at a close reproduction of original discourse (see 6.2), which, in this case, was probably not a kind of chorus or organized mass speaking, but a series of utterances made by each participant separately.

A part of *uwepeker*-folktales, namely “*Penampe* ‘a guy from the upper reaches of the river’ and *Panampe* ‘a guy from the lower reaches of the river’ stories”, and children’s folktales, are commonly narrated in the third person and have as a rule two or more protagonists. In addition to a sequence of conversational turns in the SRD style, the former may contain a key phrase in DRD style uttered by one of the guys, and the latter may contain either a key phrase or a few conversational turns of different characters in DRD style (on *ari* <QUOT> see footnote 7).

- (44) *“hai ku=ci-ye, hai ta ku=ci-ye”*  
 ouch 1SG.POSS=penis-POSS ouch EMP 1SG.POSS=penis-POSS  
*ari Ø=nurwap*  
 QUOT 3.S=groan  
 ‘(Penanpe) groaned (with pain), “Ouch! My penis! Ouch! My penis (hurts!)”  
 (C2 38; U); Horobetsu, SWH.
- (45) *“mak ku=iki wa eci=tura harwe?” sekor*  
 how 1SG.S=do and 1SG.A+2SG.O=follow REP.EV QUOT  
*saru Ø=harwean akusu “...en=ka ta a yak*  
 monkey 3.S=say.SG then 1SG.O=above at sit if  
*eci=tura kusu ne na” sekor Ø=harwean*  
 2SG.A+1SG.O=follow intention COP FIN QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘The monkey said, “How can I follow you?” (The tortoise) said: “If (you) sit on  
 me, you will follow me.” (T4 28; U); Saru, SH.

The above-mentioned use of DRD makes the folklore texts polyphonous and the description more vivid.

## 7. The Syntax of SRD- and DRD-constructions

As was mentioned in 2.3, an RD-construction consists of a quote and a quotative index (QI). SRD- and DRD-constructions in Ainu are differentiated by their

respective quotes (non-identical person marking), but employ the same QIs.

An elaborate obligatory QI in Ainu is likely to have a predicative structure and consist of: (i) a discourse verb functioning as the predicative nucleus and semantically encoding the event, (ii) a nominal referring to the speaker to whom this event is attributed [=author], possibly also (iii) a nominal referring to the addressee [original addressee], and (4) a quotative marker or a complementizer. In Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects, the QIs which are employed in SRD and DRD-constructions are invariably marked with the quotative *sekor*, and henceforth will be called *sekor*-marked QIs. *Sekor*-marked QIs are regarded as obligatory. In addition to them, there is a range of optional QIs which may be proposed to the quote.

In the next section, I will describe different configurations of QI constituents in order to try to establish possible arrays of *sekor*-marked QIs in Ainu.

## 7.1. Obligatory quotative indexes

### 7.1.1. Main constituents

#### 7.1.1.1. Quotative marker *sekor* in a cross-dialectal perspective

*Se-kor* (QUOT) is a semantically transparent adverbial conjunction consisting of the mimetic root *se* which is used as a verbalizer to derive verbs with onomatopoeic meanings (e.g., *hum-se* ‘to grunt/growl’ (OI), *toktok-se* ‘to beat, as the pulse’ (Batchelor 1938: 503), *wó-se* ‘(of a wolf, dog) to howl’ (OI)) and of the temporal/conditional conjunction *kor* ‘then, when, if’ (Kindaichi 1931/1993: 321). Different groups of dialects employ different quotative markers, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: *Dialectal distribution of quotative markers in Ainu* (based on Hattori 1964: 321)

| DIALECTS                             | QUOTATIVE MARKERS                       |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Southern Hokkaido                    | <i>sekor</i>                            |
| Central Hokkaido                     | <i>sekor</i> (occasionally <i>ari</i> ) |
| Northeastern & Southwestern Hokkaido | <i>ari</i>                              |
| Sakhalin                             | <i>nab</i>                              |

All these quotation markers display a certain degree of previous grammaticalization, but what is common to them is that they are related to the more general ‘domain of mimesis’, which as defined by Guldemann (2008: 288), unifies the discourse-embedding of world-referring bodily gestures, ideophones, non-linguistic sound, and the mimesis of human speech, i.e. DRD. While *sekor* in Southern and Central Hokkaido dialects has originated in the mimesis marker indexing non-linguistic sounds, *ari* and *nab* in the respective dialects have originated in the subtype of the domain of mimesis which is associated with demonstrating gestures and actions, i.e. in manner deictics ‘thus, in this way’. The use of quotation markers in other functional domains via further grammaticalization processes will be discussed in 7.3.

### 7.1.1.2. Verbal predicates and the syntactic status of quotes

On the basis of Güldemann's (2001: 62–74) typology, I have classified all Ainu verbal predicates occurring in the *sekor*-marked QIs into the following semantic groups.

- I. speech verbs
  - a. generic speech verbs (*harwean* 'say', *itak* 'speak');
  - b. specific speech verbs (*koyki* 'to scold sb', *cis* 'weep').
- II. non-speech verbs
  - a. verbs of auditory perception (*inu* 'hear');
  - b. verbs of cognition and internalized perception (*yaynu* 'think', *ramuan* 'think, feel');
  - c. general event-referring verbs which lack the inherent feature of utterance (*an* 'exist', *ne* 'be').

Note that so-called quotative verbs which have no use outside RD have not been attested in Ainu so far.

Now, I would like to comment on transitivity values of the verbs employed in QIs and on syntactic relations between the quote and QI. The present research has shown that *sekor*-marked QI may contain not only intransitive verbs, as has been argued in previous research (Chiri 1942: 487), but transitive verbs as well. Thus, in the data of Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects, I found 14 transitive verbs, which comprise 44% of the total number of 32 verbs used in *sekor*-marked QIs.

However, it should be noted that most transitive verbs which occur in *sekor*-marked QIs lack the property called "transitivity to speech" (a term due to Güldemann (2001: 130)), i.e. they do not have a valency slot for a direct object referring to speech in general and the quote in particular, but have a valency slot only for a direct object referring to addressee, as in (46). Therefore, in the case of transitive verbs, the nature of the syntactic relation between *sekor*-marked QI and quote is the same as that in the case of intransitive verbs: the quote is not a complement of the predicate of the QI, but is interpreted here as an oblique construction which differs from any other clausal constituent but bears a slight resemblance to an adverbial clause of manner (see the discussion on the semantics of *sekor* in section 7.1.2.1. and footnote 8 on the logophoric marking in the matrix clauses of (46)–(49)).

- (46) "...*e=Ø=ko-poy-ke* *e=Ø=ki*  
 2SG.A=3.O=with.APPL-mix-ACAUS 2SG.A=3.O=do  
*e-aykap na" sekor, Ø=i=ko-caranke wa...*  
 of.APPL-be.unable FIN QUOT 3.A=LOG.O=with.APPL-argue and  
 "(If you don't return now), you won't be able to mix with (the gods)", (the  
 cuckoo) argued argued with me [lit. self]. (B 143, 144; KY); Chitose, SH.

### 7.1.1.3. Nominals referring to the author and addressee

The NP encoding the author always has the syntactic function of the main clause subject; therefore, it is obligatorily cross-referenced by a bound affix on the verbal

predicate and may, as in (40) and (42), or may not, as in (41) and (43), be additionally encoded by a noun or pronoun.

In the case of intransitive verbs, the addressee usually has no overt reference and must be recovered from the context. In exceptional cases, when the context is insufficient, the addressee may be referred to with an oblique noun phrase, as in (47).

- (47) *a=Ø=kor nispa matnepo-po-ho*  
 LOG.A=3.O=have rich.man daughter-child-POSS  
*a=Ø=etun kusu ek=an ruwe*  
 LOG.A=3.O=get.as.a.bride because come.SG=LOG.S INFR.EV  
*ne” sekor a=hoku-hu eun Ø=hawean*  
 COP QUOT LOG.POSS=husband-POSS to 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘(The man) said to my [lit. self’s, i.e. the female protagonist’s] husband, “My [self’s] lord! I [self] came to get (your) daughter as a bride.” (S2 63; U); Saru, SH.

In the case of transitive verbs with a valency slot for a direct object referring to the addressee, the addressee must be obligatorily marked by a bound cross-reference object prefix (recall that the third person is zero-marked), and may be optionally encoded by a noun or pronoun, as in (48).

- (48) *ney wa omanan kur a=ne ruwe ne ya?”*  
 where from travel man INC.A=COP INFR.EV COP Q  
*sekor, nérok okkaypo utar, onaba Ø=Ø=ko-wepekennu akusu*  
 QUOT that man PL father 3.A=3.O=APPL-ask then  
 ‘Those men asked father, “Where have you travelled from?” (T5 38; U); Saru, SH.

### 7.1.2. Morphosyntactic types

In this section, I will make an attempt to classify obligatory QIs in Ainu on the basis of the morphosyntactic types established by Güldemann in his study of African languages (2001: 107): simple, bisected, and reduced.

#### 7.1.2.1. Simple structure

According to Güldemann (2001: 110), a simple QI is constituted by a predicate which is possibly accompanied by nominal participants and it is not viewed as derived from a bisected QI (cf. 7.1.2.2) via omission or deletion of a quotative (here, *sekor*).

Simple QIs are not common in Ainu. They are documented either with reported questions (49), or in rhythmically organized folklore texts (4–5 syllables in a line) of the genres *yukar* and *kamuy yukar* (50).

- (49) *hunak wa omanan kur ene ruwe ne ya?”*  
 where from travel man like.this INFR.EV COP Q  
*Ø=i=ko-pisi*  
 3.A=LOG.O=to.APPL-ask.about

(‘This old man) asked me, “Where have you travelled from?” (T5 38; U); Saru, SH.

- (50) *tane anak-ne/ aynu kotan/ Ø=hanke ruwe ne/*  
 already TOP-COP Ainu village 3.S=be.close INFR.EV COP  
*nankor na"/ yay-nu=an ki/*  
 probably FIN REFL-hear=LOG.S do  
 ‘I thought, “There was probably an Ainu village already nearby.”’  
 (Nakagawa (p.c); KY); Chitose, SH.

Note that substitutes of speech verbs which lack the inherent feature of utterance (subtype (2c), 7.1.1.2) do not occur in this structure, cf. (53).

### 7.1.2.2. Bisected structure

A bisected QI consists of an event predicate and a quotative marker. This is the most frequent type of QIs in Ainu. An event predicate is usually encoded by a speech verb, as in (51), but if the context is sufficient, general event-referring verbs which lack the inherent feature of utterance, viz. *an* ‘exist’ (vi), *ne* ‘be sth/sb’ <COP> (vt), can also be used instead of speech verbs, as in (52).

- (51) *ayapo-oyoyo!" sekor Ø=harwean*  
 (an.utterance.of.surprise) QUOT 3.S=say.SG  
 “‘Oh!’ he said (in surprise).’ (N1 19; U); Chitose, SH.
- (52) *kotan epitta icar-pa=an ma*  
 village all.over scatter-PL=LOG.S and  
*hosip-pa=an kusu ne" sekor Ø=ne*  
 return-PL=LOG.S intention COP QUOT 3.A=COP  
 “‘We [lit. selves] are going to perform the memorial rites all over the village and go back”, they [Ponyaunpe and his sister] said.’ (lit. ‘it was...’) (B 224; KY); Chitose, SH.

### 7.1.2.3. Reduced structure

Non-predicative QIs are called here reduced because they appear truncated vis-à-vis a canonical verbal clause. The term does not imply that such a QI is derived within an individual language from a simple predicative QI; it simply means that the QI is morphologically less elaborated than normal clauses of the language (Güldemann 2001: 114).

- (53) *isenram" sekor,*  
 again QUOT  
 “‘(He is at it) again!’ (she said).’ (B 124; U); Chitose, SH.

Such reduced QIs marked by the quotative *sekor* are less frequent than bisected QIs (7.1.2.2), but are more frequent than simple QIs (7.1.2.1).

### 7.1.3. Order patterns

This section is concerned with the relative position of quotative index and quote.

Güldemann (2001: 139) gives a list of cross-linguistically possible orders: (i) preposed QI, (ii) postposed QI, (iii) circumposed QI, and (iv) intraposed QI. In Ainu, obligatory QIs may be either postposed (type i) or circumposed (type iii) to the quote. Most examples in this paper are of the postposed QI type, but circumposed QIs, though less frequent in texts, are still a rather common phenomenon. In the case of circumposed QIs, the subject, as in (25) and (42), and the adjunct of the QI, as in (24), are preposed to the quote, and the rest of the QI including the quotative *sekor* and predicate are postposed to the quote.

## 7.2. Optional quotative indexes

Ainu has a range of optional QIs which may be used in addition to the obligatory QIs discussed in section 7.1. They may occur only prepositionally in collocation with postposed obligatory QIs; note that obligatory circumposed QIs, as (24), (25), and (42), do not co-occur with optional QIs.

An optional QI is usually a kind of NP consisting of a nominal referring to the author, a similarity marker *ene* ‘like this’, a speech verb (e.g. *hawean* ‘say’), and a nominalizer (*h*)*i* ‘thing’, as in (54): lit. ‘such saying of (him)’.

- (54) *cise*  $\emptyset=\emptyset=kor$  *kur* *ene*  $\emptyset=hawean$  *i*  
 house 3.A=3.O=have person like.this 3.S=say.SG NR  
 “*okkaypo*, *makanak* *e=yay-nu* *ruwe* *an...*” *sekor*  
 young.man what 2SG.S=REFL-hear INFR.EV be QUOT  
 $\emptyset=hawean$   
 3.S=say.SG  
 ‘Then the master of the house said as follows, “Young man, what do you think?...” He said.’ (lit. Such saying of the master of the house. “...” He said.)  
 (B 281–282; U); Chitose, SH.

The above-mentioned pattern of an optional QI is not the only one attested. There is another common pattern of QI which contains a nominal referring to the author, a speech verb (SV), and an evidential particle (or other grammaticalized word, as in (55c)) which is followed by a similarity marker *ene* ‘like this’, an existential verb *an* ‘be’, or a nominalizer (*h*)*i* ‘thing’, as in (55).

- (55) a. *SV hawee* *ene* *an/oka* (*h*)*i*  
 REP.EV (lit. ‘voice’) like.this be.SG/be.PL NR  
 ‘(his) saying was like this (heard)’  
 b. *SV humi* *ene* *an/oka* (*h*)*i*  
 NONVIS.EV (lit. ‘sound’) like.this be.SG/be.PL NR  
 ‘(his) saying was like this (felt)’  
 c. *SV katu-hu* *ene* *an/oka* (*h*)*i*  
 content-POSS like.this be.SG/be.PL NR  
 ‘the content of (his) saying was like this’.

A speech verb employed in an optional QI may be the same one as in the co-occurring obligatory QI, as in (39) and (53), or a different one, as in (17) and (35).

### 7.3. Polyfunctionality of quotative indexes

As in other languages, QIs or their constituents in Ainu have additional functions besides the RD-domain proper. Whenever previously exemplified in grammars, such polyfunctional usages have never been distinguished from proper usages (see Tamura (1988: 39) and Kindaichi (1931: 188)). The expression of “internal awareness” (Güldemann 2001: 342), often referred to as “internal/inner speech” or “thought”, is an integral part of RD in the broad definition adopted in this paper (see 2.1) and thus does not need to be conceptualized as a different functional domain (e.g. (50)).

#### 7.3.1. Perception

As an extension from “internal awareness”, the QIs in question may be occasionally employed to express auditory (56) and possibly other sensory perception (57); the latter function has not been registered in Southern Hokkaido dialects (see footnote 8 on the logophoric marking in the matrix clauses of (56) and (57)).

- (56) *kamuy haru*  $\emptyset=\emptyset=uk$  *wa*  $\emptyset=\emptyset=e$  *kor*  $\emptyset=an$ ,  
 bear meat 3.A=3.O=take.SG and 3.A=3.O=eat and 3.S=be.SG  
*sekor inu=an*  
 QUOT hear=LOG.S  
 ‘I heard that (the evil village chief) took the bear meat from (the young men) and was eating (it).’ (B 387; U); Chitose, SH.
- (57) *nep*  $\emptyset=uhuy$  *hum* *an* *sekor ibunar=an*  
 something 3.S=burn NONVIS.EV be.SG QUOT search=LOG.S  
 ‘We were searching (here: smelling around) whether something was burning.’  
 (SK 27; COL); Asahikawa, SH.

#### 7.3.2. Explaining human actions

The QIs in Ainu may also be used for explaining human actions, which seems to be a cross-linguistically common extension of the function (Aikhenvald 2005: 32).

When used with reference to human actions, the QI is slightly changed: the quotative *sekor* is stated twice after actual demonstrations of actions, and the predicate renders the meaning of these implied actions (see footnote 8 on the logophoric marking in the matrix clauses of (58) and (59)).

- (58) *a=tasiro-ho* *a*= $\emptyset=etaye$  *hine*  
 LOG.POSS=large.knife-POSS LOG.S=3.O=pull.out and  
*or-o-wa-no* *si-osmak* *un* {...} *sekor sekor*  
 there-POSS-from-ADV REFL-behind to QUOT QUOT  
*a*= $\emptyset=tawki-tawki$  *kor hoyupu=an*  
 LOG.A=3.O=chop-chop and jump=LOG.S  
 ‘I [lit. self] pulled out my [self’s] large knife and then I [self] jumped and chopped and chopped them {the demonstration of action} like this like this behind myself.’  
 (N2 86; Y); Chitose, SH.



### 7.3.3. Naming

It is rather common cross-linguistically that expressions with the semantic notion ‘name, call, label’ contain a QI-element, since RD in the narrow sense and naming/labelling is based on the fact that both exploit the so-called self-reflexive function of language, i.e. both involve linguistic signs which identify or “mention” entities of the linguistic world instead of referring to phenomena in the object world (Güldemann 2001: 222).

- (59) *kapatcir sekor a=Ø=ye, cikap kamuy a=ne*  
 eagle QUOT INC.A=3.O=say bird god LOG.A=COP  
*ruwe ne*  
 INFR.EV COP  
 ‘I am [lit. self is] a Bird god called Eagle.’ (B 205; KY); Chitose, SH.

The naming construction always has an impersonal subject encoded by the inclusive prefix *a=* on the verb *ye* ‘say sth/to sb’ (vt).

### 7.3.4. Hearsay evidential

The *sekor*-marked QI is frequently employed for marking reported evidence which is a subdomain of the domain of evidentiality referring to different sources of communicated information. Reported evidence expressed by QIs or their elements may be of two types: (1) the situation is described as a general hearsay report, or (ii) the situation is described as a part of established oral history.

The first type is encoded by the quotative *sekor* followed by the so-called complete verb *haw-as* ‘voice-stand’, which has a zero valency and can take no arguments.

- (60) *nispa-utar nisat-ta Ø=ekimne sekor*  
 rich.man-PL dawn-at 3.S=go.to.the.mountains.to.hunt QUOT  
*haw-as*  
 voice-stand  
 ‘It was said that the rich men would go to the mountains to hunt on the next day.’  
 (B 377; U); Chitose, SH.

The second type of reported evidence is encoded by the quotative *sekor* which occurs in folklore texts after a regular postposed QI as a final remark implying that the story-teller (reporter) has heard the story from another story-teller, not directly from the author (here, ‘one rich man’).

- (61) *sekor, sino nispa Ø=isoytak sekor*  
 QUOT one rich.man 3.S=tell.story QUOT  
 ‘...’, one rich man told, [reported].’ (T5 54; U); Saru, SH.

It is worth mentioning that Ainu has also a specialized reportive evidential, viz. a grammaticalized function word *hawwe* (etymologically, ‘voice’; Southern

Hokkaido) which is commonly used in combination with the copula *ne*<sup>17</sup> ‘to be sth/sb’ (vt) to form a multiclausal hearsay-reportive evidential construction: ‘*hawwe*+embedded clause’ is embedded as an object argument of the *ne* ‘be sth/sb’ (vt) clause (62), see footnote 8 on the logophoric marking in (62).

- (62) [[*asinuma somo a=Ø=ray-ke yak-ka*  
 LOG.SG NEG LOG.A=3.O=die-CAUS if-even  
*e=Ø=ray-ke...*] *hawwe*]<sub>O</sub> *ne*  
 2SG.S=3.O=die-CAUS REP.EV COP  
 ‘It was said that even if I don’t kill them (the enemies), you would kill them.’  
 lit. ‘It was the voice (that)...’ (N2 115; Y); Chitose, SH.

Note that elements of this evidential construction are additionally employed within the RD-domain proper in optional QIs (cf. (55a)).

## 8. An Outline of Indirect Reported Discourse in Ainu

For lack of space, I will provide only a brief outline of IRD-constructions in Southern Hokkaido Ainu dialects, concentrating on those aspects which are particularly important for the study of the RD-domain as a whole. The actual frequency of IRD encoding reported speech proper is very low with all types of speech acts; yet, IRD tokens of reported commands are more numerous than those of reported statements and questions.

### 8.1. Formal properties of indirect reported discourse

Ainu IRD Ainu has the following properties of prototypical IRD which is described in detail by Aikhenvald (2005 and forthcoming):

- I. A consistent reporter-oriented shift in all pronominal references. See (63a) and (64)–(66).
- II. The quote is necessarily coextensive with a clause (or a sentence consisting of two clauses (65)); it may not contain non-linguistic expressions, e.g. the song of a bird.
- III. No use of proper imperatives and negative imperatives.
- IV. No use of sentence final particles with modal meanings.
- V. No use of interjections, vocatives, and exclamations.
- VI. No pause between the quote and QI.
- VII. No ‘theatrical effect’ (cf. 6.2).

As we can see, IRD-constructions in Ainu show a typical shift in personal deixis to fit in with the perspective of the reporter: in (63a), (64)–(66), the words spoken in the first person in the original discourse are accordingly changed to the third person in indirect discourse (63a), except for the case of coreferentiality between the author and reporter (cf. (63b)); the words spoken in the second person in original discourse are changed to the first person, if the reporter is core-

<sup>17</sup> In some cases, the existential verb *an* ‘to be’ may be used as a substitute of the copula *ne*.

ferential with original addressee, as in (64) and (65), and to the third person, if not coreferential.

- (63) a. [ $\emptyset$ =ar<sub>i</sub>pa kusu ne yak]o  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =ye  
 3.S=go intention COP COMP 3.A=3.O=say  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i,j</sub> would go.’ (T1: 377; COL); Saru, SH.
- b. [iosi ku=oman kun-i]o ku= $\emptyset$ =ye  
 afterwards 1SG.S=go.SG going.to-COMP 1SG.S=3.O=say  
 ‘I said I would go later.’ (SK 57-58; COL); Asahikawa, CH.
- (64) muka un katkemat  $\emptyset$ =ek akusu,  
 Mukawa from woman 3.S=come.SG then  
 [ku= $\emptyset$ =kor ka...  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =hok, yak]o  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =ye  
 1SG.A=3.O=have thread 3.A=3.O=buy COMP 3.A=3.O=say  
 ‘A woman<sub>i</sub> from Mukawa came and said that she<sub>i,j</sub> would buy my threads.’  
 (S1 72; COL); Saru, SH.
- (65) [ku=ru-pa-ye-ani wa, ku= $\emptyset$ =ye kor, pon  
 1SG.S=frozen-mouth-say-hold and 1SG.A=3.O=say and be.young  
 kurmat  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =eraman yak]o  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =ye  
 Japanese.lady 3.A=3.O=understand COMP 3.A=3.O=say  
 ‘(The young lady)<sub>i</sub> said that if I told (the story) in the plain style (i.e. without refrain and verse), the young lady<sub>i,j</sub> would understand it.’ (T2 28; COL); Saru, SH.

As mentioned in 4.2.3, Ainu IRD-constructions, just like English ones, do not employ logophoric markers to mark the coreferentiality of the author with a participant in the quote. As a consequence, any third person within the quote (see (63)–(66)) may, in principle, refer either to the author, as in interpretation (66i), or to a third party, as in interpretation (66ii). It is only the context that can help to resolve the ambiguity.

- (66) [ $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =uko-eramiskari yak]o  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =ye-pa  
 3.A=3.O=SOC-not.know COMP 3.A=3.O=say-PL  
 i. ‘They<sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>i</sub> did not know it.’ (intended interpretation)  
 ii. ‘They<sub>i</sub> said that they [other people]<sub>j</sub> did not know it.’ (possible interpretation)  
 (HY 19; U); Saru, SH.

## 8.2. Functions of indirect reported discourse in colloquial and folklore Ainu

IRD referring to speech proper is extremely rare in folklore texts of the poetic genres *yukar* and *kamuy yukar*; we can find there only hearsay reportive expressions marked by *yak a= $\emptyset$ =ye*<sup>18</sup> ‘It was said that...’ which are not proper IRD reports (cf. 8.3.4). There are a few more instances of IRD in prosaic narratives *uvvepeker* and

<sup>18</sup> This hearsay reportive construction always has an impersonal subject encoded by the inclusive prefix on the verb *ye* ‘say sth/to sb’ (vt).

in poorly documented colloquial Ainu. But even there we observe a strong preference for SRD and DRD over IRD. On the contrary, IRD referring to ‘internal awareness’ (thought) is rather common in folklore and colloquial Ainu. However, in many cases, expressions which designate ‘internal awareness’ are hardly distinguishable from expressions of intention and emotion because they are expressed by complement clauses of the same type.

Due to the lack of data, it is hard to give a precise answer to the question of how to use IRD in Ainu. I assume that IRD might have a stylistic and discourse-organizing backgrounding function, since it commonly occurs in the discourse of non-protagonist participants which always have less discourse salience than the protagonist. Consider the following passage in the IRD style.

- (67) [*tane*  $\emptyset$ =*pirka* *ruwe* *ne* **yak**]<sub>o</sub>  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =*ye-pa* *kor*  
 now 3.S=be.good INFR.EV COP COMP 3.A=3.O=say-PL and  
*kotan* *or* *un*  $\emptyset$ =*sap-pa* *ruwe* *ne* *akusu*,  
 village place to 3.S=come.down.PL-PL INFR.EV COP then  
 [ $\emptyset$ =*uko-etorotur-pa* *kor*  $\emptyset$ =*oka* *ruwe* *ne* **yak**]<sub>o</sub>  
 3.S=SOC-snore-PL and 3.S=be.PL INFR.EV COP COMP  
 $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =*ye-pa* *orano*  $\emptyset$ =*sewri*  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =*tuye-pa* *kor...*  
 3.A=3.O=say-PL then 3.POSS=throat.POSS 3.A=3.O=cut-PL and  
 [*opitta...* *a*= $\emptyset$ =*ray-ke* *ruwe* *ne* **yak**]<sub>o</sub>  
 everyone PASS=3.O=die-CAUS INFR.EV COP COMP  
 $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =*ye-pa*  
 3.A=3.O=say-PL

‘They said that it was time to go then (lit. ‘now, it is good’) and came down to the village and then they said that (the enemies) were snoring all together and then they cut the (enemies’) throats and said that everyone was killed.’ (HY 69-70; U); Saru, SH.

The quote in (67) belongs to non-protagonist characters; recall that the whole *uwepeker* is told in the SRD style. Unlike SRD or DRD, the QI of IRD (here, **yak ye-pa**) is repeated after each clause (cf. (38)).

## 9. The Syntax of IRD-constructions

IRD has special ways of reporting commands (9.2) and questions (9.3) which differ from those of SRD and DRD (and therefore from those of matrix clauses), and from reported IRD statements (9.1) as well. IRD statements are a subtype of complement clauses which are commonly employed for embedding expression of thought, knowledge, emotion, and intention (see footnote 8 on the logophoric marking in the matrix clauses of (68)–(76)).

### 9.1. Reported statements

The IRD-construction employed for reported statements consists of the quote and QI. Syntactically, the quote is interpreted as a typical embedded complement clause which functions as an object of the main verbal predicate of the QI, since

it may be followed by transitive verbs only. The subject of the QI is placed before the quote, as in (68), or omitted, as in (69) and (70) (third person is zero, but other persons are obligatorily cross-referenced on the main predicate), and the predicate always follows the quote which conforms with basic word order in Ainu, viz. AOV/SV. Thus, in the case of IRD, QIs may be either circumposed with an overt subject, or postposed with a covert subject.

- (68) *a=utari* [Ø=*sini-pa kun-ak*]<sub>o</sub> Ø=Ø=*ye-pa*  
 LOG.POSS=people-POSS 3.S=rest-PL going.to-COMP 3.A=3.O=say-PL  
 ‘Our [lit. selves] people said they would have rest.’ (S2 132; U); Saru, SH.

The syntactic link between the quote and the QI is marked by one of three complementizers, *yak*, *kunak* and *kuni*, which cannot be omitted. These complementizers belong to the quote, not to the QI, as quotative markers in the case of SRD and DRD-constructions. *Kun-ak* and *kun-i* are not ‘pure’ complementizers in the sense that *yak* is. Each of them consists of two morphemes: the latter (*-(y)ak*, *-(h)i*) are proper complementizers and the former (*kun-*) may add to the proposition in the quote the meaning of intention ‘going to, is about to’, as in (63b), (68) and (69), or one of the following modal meanings:

- (i) ‘maybe, probably’ (dubitative) – epistemic modality for possibility;
- (ii) ‘must be, surely’ (assertion) – epistemic modality for necessity (70).
- (iii) ‘should, must’ (obligation) – situational modality for necessity (71).

- (69) [*a=hoku-hu ka Ø=tepa-ha ka*  
 LOG.POSS=husband-POSS also 3.POSS=loincloth-POSS also  
*Ø=mi-p-ibi ka a=Ø=ko-sos-o*  
 3.A=wear-NR-POSS also LOG.A=3.O=from.APPL-take.off-TR  
*kun-i*]<sub>o</sub> ...*a=Ø=e-rek*  
 going.to-COMP LOG.A=3.O=APPL-sing  
 ‘I [lit. Self] sang that I would also take off my husband his loincloth and clothes.’

(B 158; KY); Chitose, SH.

- (70) [*kamuy Ø=ne kun-i*]<sub>o</sub> *a=Ø=ramu*  
 god 3.A=COP surely-COMP LOG.A=3.O=think  
 ‘I [lit. Self] thought **that** was **surely** a god.’ (B 139; KY); Chitose, SH.

As suggested by Tamura (1977/2001: 137), *kuni* occurs in IRD reports describing future events, which is something that the intentional and dubitative meanings suggest (see (63b), (69), and (8)), whereas *yak* has a tendency to occur in IRD reports describing past events (1977/2001: 136–137), as in (67). However there are many examples where *yak* occurs in IRD reports describing current, as in (66), or future events, as in (63a), (64), and (66).

In IRD-constructions, *kun-i* is primarily used for encoding ‘internal awareness’ (see (70) and (8)) and only occasionally for reported speech proper, as in (63b) and (69), because it contains a multifunctional complementizer (*(h)i*), which is commonly employed for embedding expression of thought, knowledge, emotion, and

intention. *Yak* and *kun-ak* are not used for marking other types of complement clauses, only for IRD including ‘internal awareness’.

*Kunak* (<*kun-yak* (Kindaichi 1931: 188)) is a semantically transparent complementizer which consists of the above-mentioned morpheme *kun-* (with all its possible meanings) and of the complementizer *yak*. The latter has probably acquired the function of IRD marker as a result of semantic reinterpretation of its Sakhalin cognate, namely the DRD/SRD marker *nab* (with the original meaning ‘thus’, see 7.1.1.1).

I assume that IRD is a relatively new construction in Ainu which has appeared through an extension of functions of the existing *bi*-complementation strategies, on the one hand, and through the emergence of a new *yak*-complementation strategy restricted to speech, on the other.

## 9.2. Reported commands

Use of proper imperatives is restricted to direct speech and main clauses in general. Ainu has devised two strategies of reporting commands in IRD; both are mentioned in Tamura’s work (1977/2001: 136–139).

In the first case, the complementizer *kuni*, which among others has the function of obligation (iii. ‘should, must’) may be used in a construction similar to English *that+should* (cf. the English translation in (71)).

- (71) *pon menoko... Ø=i=pirma wa,*  
 young woman 3.A=LOG.O=secretly.warn.of.danger and  
 [*asur-kor=an kun-i*]<sub>O</sub> Ø=i=ye  
 rumor-hold=LOG.S should-COMP 3.A=LOG.O=say  
 ‘The young woman has secretly warned me of danger and said **that I should**  
 warn [everyone].’ (S2 43; U); Saru, SH.  
 Cf. the corresponding DRD: “*asur-kor!*” ‘Warn!’

In the second case, instead of a complement clause, an *adverbial purposive clause* marked by the conjunction *kusu* ‘in order (that), for’ and the causative verb may be used as a functional equivalent of IRD reported commands. Note that the subject of the main clause is always coreferential with the subject of the subordinate clause: lit. ‘he said in order (that) he (would) make me come in’, as in (72).

- (72) Ø=i=y-*ahun-ke kusu Ø=Ø=ye*  
 3.A=LOG.O=EP-enter-CAUS in.order 3.A=3.O=say  
 ‘(The old man) said in order to make me [lit. self] come in.’ (S1 94; U); Saru, SH.  
 Cf. the corresponding DS: “*ahun!*” ‘Enter!’

## 9.3. Reported questions

There is no prior research on the strategies of reporting questions in IRD, probably due to the fact that ‘indirect questions’ are very uncommon though not impossible in texts. The main property signaling that a question is cast as IRD is the adjust-

ment of personal deixis. For instance, in (73), which is a content question, we would expect the second person subject marker on the verb (*e=ek* ‘you came’), if it were in DRD, but here we have the third person subject zero-marker ( $\emptyset$ =*ek* ‘she came’), which means that a person shift has taken place. In other respects, ‘indirect questions’ look rather similar to DRD questions encoded by simple QIs (i.e. without *sekor*, cf. (49)). However, I suggest that in the case of ‘indirect questions’, the particle *ya* should be rather regarded as a complementizer ‘whether’ (i.e. not as a question marker as in DRD questions and main clause questions in general) and the quote with an ‘indirect question’ as a complement of the main predicate.

- (73) [*ney wa*  $\emptyset$ =*ek* *ya*]<sub>O</sub> *a*= $\emptyset$ =*ko-pisi*...  
 where from 3.S=come.SG COMP LOG.A=3.O=to.APPL-ask.about  
 ‘They asked (Aswahotesu) where **she** had come from.’ (N2: 136; Y); Chitose, SH.

Cf. the corresponding DRD: *ney wa e=ek ya?* ‘Where have you come from?’

The same strategy is used with alternative (74) and yes-no questions; note the person shift.

- (74) [ $\emptyset$ =*hoku-kor* *kusu ne ya* *somo ya*]<sub>O</sub>  
 3.S=husband-have intention COP Q NEG Q  
*a*= $\emptyset$ =*ko-pisi yak*  $\emptyset$ =*pirka*  
 LOG.A=3.O=APPL-ask.about if 3.S=be.good  
 ‘Let’s (lit. it would be good if) ask her if she is going to marry or not.’  
 (N2 136; Y); Chitose, SH. Cf. the corresponding DRD:  
*e=hoku-kor kusu ne ya* *somo ya?* ‘Are you going to marry or not?’

Alternatively, ‘indirect questions’ of the content type may be rendered by periphrastic expressions. Thus, in (75), instead of the question word *bemanta* ‘why’, a word of Japanese origin *moto-ho* (reason-POSS) ‘the reason of’ occurs as the head of the possessive phrase with *katu* ‘shape, here: behavior’: ‘the reason of behavior’; and the verb of the quote is used as an attribute in pre-position to *katu*: lit. ‘the reason of her crying behavior’.

- (75) [[ $\emptyset$ =*cis kor*  $\emptyset$ = $\emptyset$ =*ki*] *katu*  $\emptyset$ =*moto-ho*]<sub>O</sub>  
 3.S=cry and 3.A=3.O=do behavior 3.POSS=reason-POSS  
*a*= $\emptyset$ =*nu*  
 LOG.A=3.O=ask.about  
 ‘I asked about the reason **of** her crying (behavior).’  
 (N1 382; KY); Chitose, SH.

Cf. the corresponding DRD: *bemanta e=cis kor e=ki ya?* ‘Why are you crying?’

Another periphrastic strategy (76) is encoded by a relative clause with its head (here, *kotan* ‘village’) as the object of the speech verb (here, *kopisi* ‘ask sb about sth’): ‘He asked her about **the village** [*she had come from*], instead of ‘He asked *where she had come from*’ (73); cf. the underlying clause in (77).

- (76)  $\emptyset=or-o$                       *wa*  $\emptyset=ek$                       *kotan*  $a=\emptyset=ko-pisi$   
 3.O=place-POSS from 3.S=come.SG village LOG.S=3.O=APPL-ask.about  
 ‘He asked her about the village she had come from’.  
 (N2 113; Y); Chitose, SH.
- (77) *kotan*    *or*            *wa*             $\emptyset=ek$   
 village place from 3.S=come.SG  
 ‘He came from the village.’ (constructed example)

## 10. Summary

This paper is the first attempt to provide a systematic description of RD-categories in Ainu (primarily in Southern Hokkaido dialects) from syntactic, discourse-functional, historical and typological perspectives. Whenever previously mentioned, reported discourse has been analysed either as “quotations” or as direct vs. indirect discourse, whereas the present work is based on a continuum approach. I have shown that there are three main RD-constructions in Ainu. These are distinguished by person deixis, which is a core principle in determining the orientation of reported discourse:

- *direct discourse* (DRD) with the author’s perspective;
- *indirect discourse* (IRD) with the reporter’s perspective;
- *semi-direct discourse* (SRD) with the combined perspective of the author and reporter.

In the case of SRD, the use of so-called “indefinite person” in the case of coreference of the third/second person author with a participant in the quote indicates a consistent reporter-oriented shift in pronominal reference, while other references occur as they would have been used in the original discourse.

I propose to identify Tamura’s ‘first person in quotes’ usage of the indefinite person in Southern Hokkaido dialects, viz. *asinuma* (SG), *aoka* (PL), and the corresponding verbal affixes *a=* for SG/PL.A, *=an* for SG/PL.S, and *i=* for SG/PL.O, as a special set of *logophoric* markers which exists in addition to the normal set of personal markers and is employed to refer to the person whose words or thoughts are being reported in a stretch of discourse, since they fit in with Hagége’s (1974: 287) definition of logophoricity.

It has been emphasized that SRD cannot be analyzed as a kind of DRD, contrary to Tamura (1988/2000). In that kind of analysis, we would either end up having in Ainu two DRD constructions with distinct person marking, which contradicts the DRD universality principles (Haiman (1989) and Güldemann (2008: 9), or having to demote the existing genuine DRD construction to some marginal half-grammatical status; the latter decision is implicitly accepted in Tamura’s Ainu grammar (1988 (2000: 74–76)), since examples of genuine DRD have not been included in the discussion. I have shown that genuine DRD reports exist in colloquial and folklore Ainu, and therefore that DRD is a full-fledged RD-category.

To summarise, I have argued that SRD, DRD, and IRD should be rather regarded as stylistic and discourse-organizing (in terms of foregrounding and backgrounding information) options; some of them, however, have been conven-



tionalized as primary styles in certain folklore genres. SRD and DRD reports are frequent in colloquial and folklore Ainu. IRD reports referring to speech proper are rare anywhere, but those referring to thought are rather common. I assume that IRD has emerged rather recently as an extension of the complementation strategy which is commonly employed for embedding expression of thought, knowledge, emotion, and intention. SRD and DRD reports are much older; they have originated in a wider domain of mimesis including the discourse-embedding of world-referring bodily gestures, ideophones, and non-linguistic sounds.

### Abbreviations

1/2/3=1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> person, Ø=zero-marked 3<sup>rd</sup> person, = = inflectional boundary in the morphemic line, -=morphological boundary in the morphemic line, [ ]=embedded clauses, my comments, A=transitive subject, A.B.=Anna Bugaeva, ACAUS=anticausative, ADV=adverbial, APPL=applicative, AUX=auxiliary verb, CAUS=causative, CH=Central Hokkaido dialects, COL=colloquial, COMP=complementizer, COP=copula, CS=current speaker, dat=dative marker, DESID=desiderative, DRD=direct reported discourse, EMP=emphatic, EP=epenthetic consonant, EX=exclamatory particle, FIN=final particle, impf=imperfective, INC=inclusive, INDEF=indefinite, INFR.EV=inferential evidential, INST=instrumental, INTR=intransitive, IRD=indirect reported discourse, LOG=logophoric, KY=*kamuy yukar* ‘songs of gods’, MS=manuscript, NG=negative (suffix), NEG=negation, NONVIS.EV=nonvisual evidential, NR=nominalizer, O=object, Obj=object (accusative marker), PASS=passive, PERF=perfect, PL=plural, POSS=possessive, PRN=pronoun, Q=question marker, QI=quotative index, QUOT=quotation marker, RD=reported discourse, REC=reciprocal, REFL=reflexive, REP.EV=reportive evidential, S=intransitive subject, sb=somebody, Sbj=subject (nominative marker), SH=Southern Hokkaido dialects, SG=singular, SOC=sociative, SRD=semi-direct reported discourse, sth=something, SV=speech verb, SWH=Southwestern Hokkaido dialects, TOP=topic, U=*uwepeker* ‘prosaic folktales’, vi=verb intransitive, VIS.EV=visual evidential, vt=verb transitive, Y=*yukar* ‘heroic epics’.

### Sources

- B Bugaeva, Anna (2004).  
 C1 Chiri, Mashihō (1942).  
 C2 Chiri, Mashihō (1981) *Ainu Mintanshuu* [Ainu folktales]. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.  
 CY Chiri, Yukie (1978) *Ainu shin'yooshuu* [Ainu songs of gods]. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.  
 HY Honda, Yuuko and Chika Yasuda (1997) *Ueda Toshi no uepeker* [Folktales by Ueda Toshi]. Shirai: Zaidan hoojin ainu minzoku hakubutsukan.  
 N1 Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1995).  
 N2 Nakagawa, Hiroshi (2001) Tumunci pencay okokko pencay. Ainu Chitose hoojen jojishi tekisuto [Tumunci pencay okokko pencay. Epic texts of the

- Chitose dialect of Ainu]. In: S. Miura (ed.) *Jojishi no gakusaiteki kenkyuu*, 91–146. Chiba: Chiba University.
- N3 Nakagawa, Hiroshi (2002) Ainugo kooshoobungei tekisuto 3 [Ainu Folklore Text 3]. *Chiba daigaku yuurashia bunka ronshuu* 5: 111–143.
- OI Ito Oda (1908–2000), consultant of the Chitose dialect of Ainu (fieldnotes)
- S1 Satoo, Tomomi (ed.) (2002) *Ainugo shoboogen choosa hookoku* (1) [A fieldwork report on Ainu dialects]. ELPR Publication Series A2-014, Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.
- S2 Satoo, Tomomi, Hitoshi Watanabe, Minoru Ooshima, and Hideo Kirikae (1998) *Ainu minzoku bunkazai choosa hookokusho. Ainu minzoku choosa* [Urgent field research on ethnography of the Ainu. Report on Ainu culture and folklore] v. XVIII, Sapporo: Hokkaido kyooiku iinkai.
- SK Sunazawa, Kura (1983) *Watashi no ichidai no omoide. Ku sukup opuspe* [My life story]. Sapporo: Miyama Shoboo.
- T1 Tamura, Suzuko (1972/2001).
- T2 Tamura, Suzuko (1984) *Ainugo onseishiryoo 1* [Ainu Audio Materials 1]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyooiku kenkyuujo.
- T3 Tamura, Suzuko (1985) *Ainugo onseishiryoo 2* [Ainu Audio Materials 2]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyooiku kenkyuujo.
- T4 Tamura, Suzuko (1986) *Ainugo onseishiryoo 3* [Ainu Audio Materials 3]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyooiku kenkyuujo.
- T5 Tamura, Suzuko (1989) *Ainugo onseishiryoo 6* [Ainu Audio Materials 6]. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku gogaku kyooiku kenkyuujo.
- T6 Tamura, Suzuko (1988/2000).

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2005) *Direct and indirect speech in typological perspective*. Position paper for RCLT local workshop (MS).
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra (forthcoming: 2008) Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Sciences* 30.
- Batchelor, John (1938) *An Ainu-English-Japanese dictionary*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2004) *A grammar and folklore texts of the Chitose dialect of Ainu (Idiolect of Ito Oda)*. ELPR Publication Series A-045. Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.
- Chiri, Mashiho (1942/1973) Ainu gohoo kenkyuu—karafuto hoogen o chuushin to shite [Studies in Ainu grammar—with an emphasis on the Sakhalin dialect]. In: *Chiri Mashiho chosakushuu* 3, 455–586. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Chiri, Mashiho and Kyoosuke Kindaichi (1936/1974) Ainu gohoo gaisetsu [An outline of Ainu grammar]. In: *Chiri Mashiho chosakushuu* 4, 3–197. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Clark, Herbert and Richard Gerrig (1990). Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66: 764–805.
- Curnow, Tim (2002) The three types of verbal logophoricity in African languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31: 1–25.
- Cysouw, Michael (2003) *The paradigmatic structure of person marking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cysouw, Michael (2005) A typology of honorific uses of clusivity. In: Filimonova (ed.),

213–230.

- Daniel, Mikhael (2005) Understanding inclusions. In: Filimonova (ed.), 3–48.
- Deibler, Ellis (1971) Uses of the verb ‘to say’ in Gahuku. *Kivung* 4: 101–110.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and Alexandra Aikhenvald (2000) *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elders, Stefan (2000) *Grammarie Mundang*. CNWS Publications 97. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Filimonova, Elena (ed.) (2005) *Clusivity: Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction*, TSL 63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Güldemann, Tom (2001) Quotative constructions in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey. Habilitationsschrift (MS). Leipzig University.
- Güldemann, Tom (2008) *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Güldemann, Tom and Manfred von Roncador (eds.) (2002) *Reported discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*, TSL 52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hagège, Claude (1974) Les pronoms logophoriques, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69: 287–310.
- Haiman, John (1989) Alienation in grammar. *Studies in Language* 13: 129–170.
- Hattori, Shiroo (ed.) (1964) *An Ainu dialect dictionary*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Hedinger, Robert (1984) Reported speech in Akose. *Journal of West African Languages* XIV: 81–102.
- Hill, Harriet (1995) Pronouns and reported discourse in Adioukrou. *Journal of West African Languages* 25: 87–106.
- Hyman, Larry and Bernard Comrie (1981) Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African languages and Linguistics* 3: 19–37.
- Jakobson, Roman (1990) Shifters, categories, and Russian verb. In: *Selected writings: Word and language*, 130–153. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kamada, Osamu (2000) *Nihongo no in'yo* [Quoting in Japanese]. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.
- Kim, Sunmi (2006) *ko/so/a* to *i/ku/ce* no kanjooteki chokujji yoofoo to kantooshiteki yoofoo ni tsuite [Emotive and interjectional uses of demonstratives *ko/so/a* in Japanese and *i/ku/ce* in Korean]. *Gengobunka* 8: 761–790. Kyoto: Doshisha Daigaku Gengobunka gakkai.
- Kindaichi, Kyoosuke (1931/1993) Ainu yuukara gohoo tekiyoo [An outline grammar of the Ainu epic poetry]. In: *Ainu jojishi yuukara no kenkyuu* 2, 1–233. Tokyo: Tooyoo Bunko. Reprint in: *Ainugogaku koogi* 2 [Lectures on Ainu studies 2]. *Kindaichi Kyoosuke zenshuu. Ainugo I*. v. 5, 145–366. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Kirikae, Hideo (1983) Ainugo dooshi ron [A study of Ainu verbs]. Unpublished Master's thesis, Hokkaido University.
- Kubodera, Itsuhiko (1977) *Ainu bungaku* [Ainu literature]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Lowe, Ivan and Ruth Hurlimann (2002) Direct and indirect speech in Cerma narrative. In: Güldemann, Tom and Manfred von Roncador (eds.), 91–108.
- Murasaki, Kyooko (1979) *Karafuto ainugo: Bunpoo-ben* [Sakhalin Ainu: Grammar]. Tokyo: Kokushokankokai.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1987/2001) Ainugo no ninshoo setsuji (toku ni *a-* o megutte) [Personal affixes in Ainu (with a focus on *a-*)]. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshoo* 52. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-ko, Bunpoo II*, v. 5, 4–10. Tokyo: Yumani Shobo.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1988) Ainugo Chitose hoogen no ninshoo daimeishi to sono rekishi-teki ichi [Personal pronouns in the Chitose dialect of Ainu and their historical posi-

- tion]. *Tokyo Daigaku gengogaku ronshuu* '88: 239–253.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1995) *Ainugo Chitose hoogen jiten* [A dictionary of the Chitose dialect of Ainu]. Tokyo: Soofuukan.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1997) *Ainu mukashibanashi no sekai* [The world of Ainu fairy tales]. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Okuda, Osami (1999) *Ainugo shizunai hoogen bunmyaku-tsuki goi-shuu (CD-ROM-tsuki)* [Ainu Shizunai dialect lexicon in a context (with CD-ROM)]. Sapporo: Sapporo Gakuin University.
- Perrin, Mona (1974) Direct and indirect speech in Mambila. *Journal of Linguistics* 10: 27–37.
- Refsing, Kirsten (1986) *The Ainu language: The morphology and syntax of the Shizunai dialect*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Roncador, Manfred von (1988) *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: Nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes*. Linguistische Arbeiten 192. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Satoo, Tomomi (2004) Ainu bungaku ni okeru ichininshootai no mondai [Some problems with the first person narration in Ainu]. *Hokudai bungaku kenkyuuka kiyoo* 112: 171–185.
- Schaub, William (1985) *Babungo*. London: Croom Helm.
- Stirling, Lesley (1993) *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1961/2001) Ainugo Saru hoogen no fukujoshi to syuujoshi [The adverbial and final particles in the Saru Dialect of Ainu]. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 39. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-ko, Bunpoo I*, v. 4, 89–106. Tokyo: Yumani Shobo.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1972/2001) Ainugo Saru hoogen no ninshoo no shurui [Types of grammatical person in the Saru dialect of Ainu]. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 61: 17–39. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-ko, Bunpoo I*, v. 4, 370–392. Tokyo: Yumani Shobo.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1977/2001) Ainugo Saru hoogen no meirei hyoogen [Imperative expressions in the Saru Dialect of Ainu]. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 5. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-ko, Bunpoo II*, v. 5, 22–141. Tokyo: Yumani Shobo.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1988/2000) Ainugo [The Ainu language]. In: Takashi Kamei, Rokuroo Koono and Eiichi Chino (eds.) *Gengogaku daijiten*, 6–94. Tokyo: Sanseido. English version: *The Ainu language*. ICHL Linguistic Studies v. 2, Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Tida, Shuntaroo (2006) A grammar of the Dom language, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kyoto University.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1974) The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in linguistics* 7: 267–307.

*Author's contact information:*  
 Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities  
 Chiba University  
 1-33, Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba 263-8522, Japan  
 e-mail: bugaeva@japan.email.ne.jp

[Received 11 September 2007;  
 Accepted 25 December 2007]

## [要 旨]

## アイヌ語南北海道方言における引用とロゴフォリック性

ブガエワ・アンナ

千葉大学／LA TROBE UNIVERSITY, RCLT

本論文はアイヌ語の南北海道方言における引用という文法範疇を統語的、談話機能的、歴史的、類型論的視点から体系的に記述する。先行研究においては発話の報告は単に「引用」として、あるいは直接・間接話法の対立として分析されてきた。本論文では引用の位置付けを決定する中核的原理としての人称直示形式によって区別されるアイヌ語の引用構文には3つの主要なタイプがあることを示す。

(1) 直接話法：元の発話者の視点；(2) 間接話法：引用者の視点；(3) 準直接話法：元の発話者と引用者の視点の組み合わせ。

準直接話法においては、二・三人称の元発話者を指示する際にいわゆる「不定人称」が使われる点で引用者の視点への代名詞の調整がおこっているにもかかわらず他の指示対象は元の発話で使用されたはずの形式がそのまま現われる。このような「不定人称」の用法（田村2000: 74の「引用の一人称」）はロゴフォリックなもの（つまり、ある種の引用構文において引用者を指示する特別の形式）であると提案する。これは Hagege (1974: 287) がアフリカの諸言語の例によってはじめて示したロゴフォリック性の定義に適合する。

重要なのは、準直接話法はさまざまな点で直接話法の一つと分析できないということであり、上の3つの構文は文体、あるいは談話構成上の都合で選ばれていると考えられる。ただし、民話のジャンルによっては主要なスタイルとして慣用化されているものもある。