Reported speech in earthquake narratives from six Tibeto-Burman languages

Lauren Gawne[1] & Kristine A. Holdebrandt[2]
(l.gawne@latrobe.edu.au, khildeb@siue.edu)
[1]La Trobe University, [2]Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Abstract

This paper is an analysis of the use of reported speech in six Tibeto-Burman languages from two closely-related sub-branches (Tamangic and Tibetic). The data come from a set of interview narratives about people's experiences of the 2015 earthquakes in Nepal. The analysis begins with an examination of the relationship between reported speech, overt subjects and ergativity. We also look at reported speech and evidentiality, including grammatical reported speech evidentials. Structural features discussed include hybrid reported speech and multiple clause relationality. Interactional features discussed include the use of deictic shift, prominent subordination, and the multiple functions of reported speech forms, as well as zero-marked reported speech events. This analysis highlights the benefits of studying linguistic features such as reported speech in narrative context. We conclude with the implications of this usage-based analysis in the coverage of reported speech in descriptive grammars.

Key words: Reported speech, grammar, syntax, pragmatics, evidentiality, Tibeto-Burman

1. Introduction

In his analysis of reported speech in Gooniyandi (Bunaban, Australia), McGregor remarks with dismay that "[r]eported speech tends to be regarded as an isolated phenomenon, and one which is relatively marginal to the concerns of mainstream theoretical linguistics" (1994: 64). Reported speech has received increased attention from linguists working from a variety of perspectives, including aerial/family groupings (Saxena 1988, Tournadre 2008 in Tibeto-Burman), typology (Aikhenvald 2004, Güldemann 2008, San Roque & Loughnane 2012), and discourse studies (Mathis & Yule 1994, Michael 2012). We are concerned that the compartmentalized nature of the linguistic descriptive process means that reported speech in grammatical descriptive work is still not examined in its full range of uses. In this article, we look at what elements and formal strategies typically occur in the context of reported speech in a sample of Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal.

Reported speech as a discourse feature is the report of a prior utterance. As a grammatical construction, reported speech is often marked with a lexical or grammatical

device (i.e. particle or affix). In descriptive and reference grammars it is often presented with overt, morphosyntactically indexed/marked arguments, and clearly observable boundaries between reported and non-reported content. Take example (1) from a detailed exploration of grammatical relations in Tamang (Tamangic, Owen-Smith 2014). While there is no subject, there is a recipient of the verb [2]*paŋ* 'say', marked with a dative enclitic.

1) [1]*ŋa=**ta***   [*[2]*arku* [2]*satta=i*   [1]*kho]*   [3]*paŋsi* **[2]*paŋ-ci***
   1SG**=DAT**   [other week=LOC   come.HORT]   COMP   **say-PFV**
   '(He) told me to come next week.'
   (Literally: '(He) told me "come next week".')
   (Owen-Smith 2014: 337 ex 7.71)[1]

Example (2) is of reported speech in Standard Tibetan, a language with a long literary tradition, and an abundance of published grammatical descriptions. We see the verb of saying *zer*, and also an overt, ergative-marked subject in the frame that can be cross-referenced with an overt embedded subject in the reported speech content.

2) ***khos*** *[**kho*** *bod=pa*   yin]*   ***zer-gyis***
   he.ERG [**he**   Tibet=NMLZ   COP]   **say-IMPF**
   'He$_i$ says that he$_i$ is a Tibetan.'
   (Tournadre 2008: 286, ex. 5)

We do not want to cast aspersions on any of our colleagues who have written descriptive grammars of languages of this area; after all, we count ourselves amongst them (Gawne 2016a, Hildebrandt 2004). Descriptive grammars aim to provide exemplars to illustrate particular phenomena, which may not capture the types of reported speech structures or functions that we find in a corpus-based approach (see for example Noonan 2006 on the structure and organization of sketch and reference grammars). This disjuncture is partly a result of the fact that grammars rarely cite back to the original data on which they are based, and rarely make the underlying data available to the reader (Gawne et al. 2017).

In contrast to the examples from Tamang and Tibetan above, the uses of reported speech in corpora of closely related languages show very different structures. As we demonstrate in this paper, our own narrative data of Tamangic languages are more in line with this utterance from Nar in (3). In this example, the verb of saying is *bhi*, but there is neither an overt speaker or recipient, and it is not immediately clear who the original speaker (the original reporter of the earthquake) is.

3) *[saŋle*   khae   mo   khae   mo]*   **bhi**   *mo*
   [earthquake   come   COP   come   COP]   **say**   COP
   '(Everyone) was saying an earthquake occurred.'
   (Nar_RiteChoepelLama 8)[2]

---

[1] All examples in this paper have been interlinearised using the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Bickel et al. 2008)

Similarly, reported speech in the Tibetic language Syuba (4) more often resembles Nar (3) than Standard Tibetan (2), with both the speaker and the relevant topic unexpressed lexically, and needing to be recovered from the narrative context.

4) *[òŋ-goi]*   **là-koi**
    [come-NON.PST]   **SAY-NON.PST**
    '(They) say (the earthquake) will come.'
    (Syuba_NingmarTamang 149)

As well as these lexical verbs of saying, reported speech evidential particles are often mentioned in descriptive grammars of these language groups (we discuss these in §5.1.1). When we look at narrative speech data, we also see examples of 'zero quotatives', where it is apparent from context that the speaker is reporting a prior utterance, but with no overt marking as such (§6.4). We can tell the second part of this utterance is reported speech, because the first half frames it as such by identifying it as a phone call, and the deictic temporal shift with the use of *ḍa* 'now' even though there is no reported speech verb.

5) *ḍene*   *ɕjuɣ-la*   *ha-la*   *tsʰu-la*   *pʰon*   *ṭaŋa*
    then   later-LOC   that.side-LOC this.side-LOC phone(Eng) do

    raŋ   *ḍene* *jambu*   *ni*   *pʰon*   *wõ̰-ji*
    time   then   Kathmandu   PART   phone(Eng)   come-PST

    [ḍa   *gomo*   *tsʰemo* *hami* *tɕʰjab* *tɕʰɛja* *woŋ-gu*   *rạk* *ni*
    [now   evening   night   a.lot   size   big   come-INF   COP   PART

    kʰaŋbɤ   *ṇaŋ-ḍu*   *ma-ɲa*   *ni]*
    house.POSS   inside-LOC   NEG-sleep   PART]
    'We started to phone other people; then, they phoned us from Kathmandu. They said that a very big earthquake was going to hit at night; don't sleep in the house!'
    (Lowa_ChinyiAngmo 106-107[3])

These examples of reported speech are not the kind that typically make it into descriptive grammars of Tibeto-Burman languages, but as we demonstrate in our discussion of corpora of six Tibetic, Tamangic and Ghale languages, such examples make up the overwhelming majority of reported speech and thought in spontaneous conversational narratives. While exemplars will always be a central feature of descriptive grammars, we return to McGregor's observations and encourage researchers to provide analysis of reported speech as a phenomenon that is not so isolated from other grammatical features,

---

[2] All original data in this paper are cited to the archive. For more details about the corpora and citation codes see §3 and Appendix A.

[3] We only had access to this one transcript for Lowa at the time of data analysis. Lowa does not feature in the rest of the analysis, but this example is included for illustration of zero reported speech.

or from interactional effects. While descriptive grammars are often limited for reasons of space, we take a broader approach here. This is in keeping with Tibet-Burman literature on other interactionally-complex phenomena in Bodic (and Tibeto-Burman languages more broadly), including nominalization, which also has TAM and clause structure functions (DeLancey 2002; Noonan 2008), and Genetti's (2005, 2007, 2011) treatment of clause chaining in Dolakha Newar, which has a number of clause combining and discourse functions.

We begin with an outline of the corpora that form the basis of this analysis (§3). We then introduce some features relevant to reported speech in Tibeto-Burman languages, including ergativity and referential density (§4). We then turn to structural features of reported speech. We begin by looking at reported speech and evidentiality (§5.1), before turning to 'hybrid' reported speech (§5.2) and multiple clause relationally (§5.3). In the final section, we turn to the pragmatic and interactional features of reported speech that we observed, including deictic shift (§6.1), prominent subordination (§6.2), the "polyfunctionality" of reported speech forms (§6.3) and zero-marked reported speech (§6.4).

2. Background

McGregor's (1994) analysis of reported speech in Gooniyandi takes the position that reported speech in some languages does not involve the usual kinds of coordination (parataxis) or subordination (hypotaxis) as is assumed in earlier analyses of reported speech for other languages (e.g. Lyons 1968: 253; Halliday 1985: 197; Li 1986: 34; Hengeveld 1989: 145-146). Instead, he argues, it involves a particular kind of clausal relationship he calls 'framing' (following Rumsey 1982, see also McGregor 1997, 2008). His approach demonstrates that a single reported speech verb can scope over multiple clauses. It also accounts for the fact that reported speech in narratives is often a strategy for presenting prominent information in the narrative, while subordination is often not used for this discourse function (McGregor 1994: 67, see also Verstraete 2011). This position is reflected in Genetti's analysis of Dolakha Newar (Tibeto-Burman), where she observes that the proposed discreteness of subordinating or coordinating syntactic functions do not hold up so well in languages outside of the set of Indo-European in which they were originally assumed 2005: 58).

Spronck (2017: 106-107) takes McGregor's (1994: 66-68) discussion of features of reported speech, as well as other literature on the topic, to enumerate 14 'idiosyncratic properties' of reported speech. This is one of the most comprehensive surveys of the different properties that can be seen in relation to reported speech. Spronck's features include syntactic properties, as well as semantic and pragmatic features. This fits with the current literature, that sees reported speech as difficult to capture based exclusively on syntactic features (Buchstaller 2014; D'Arcy 2015). The features of reported speech we explore are included in Spronck's list. Interestingly, we found little, or no, evidence for some of the other 'idiosyncratic properties' of reported speech Spronck discusses. Some of this is a result of the way these specific languages do reported speech, for example, we observe no conventional gestures that regularly co-occur with reported speech (Spronck category 'semi-conventional multimodality'), and while transitivity in reported speech in these languages

involves variation in the use of ergative case, this is something that is common across all transitive clauses in these languages, and is not a typical pattern particular to reported speech verbs (Spronck category 'atypical transitivity patterns'). There are also other reasons that some features would not turn up in our study; no widely embraced tradition of research with Tibeto-Burman languages focuses on a model that includes 'island constraints' (Spronck category 'island constraint violations'). Finally, some categories do not turn up very strongly in our data, even though we have every reason to believe that they are available resources to speakers of these languages, such as sub-clausal quotes (Spronck category 'subclausal quotes'). Spronck does not say that all languages are anticipated to show all of these 'idiosyncratic properties', but this appears to be an underlying assumption. A more systematic approach to Spronck's (2017) list of features was the basis of an earlier workshop presentation of our study (Gawne & Hildebrandt 2017), however in this paper we choose to focus specifically on features of reported speech relevant to the data that we are working with.

Beyond the general literature on reported speech, there is also a specific literature on reported speech within Tibeto-Burman that is relevant to this paper. This includes the features of evidentiality and hybrid reported speech. We discuss each of these in more detail in the relevant section below (§5), but provide a broad outline here. We leave discussion of the relationship between reported speech, overt subjects and ergativity to Section 4.

Evidentiality is the grammatical encoding of the source of evidence for an utterance (Aikhenvald 2004). Tibetic and Tamangic languages are known for having grammatical evidential distinctions. In Tibetic languages common categories include direct sensory perception, inference, factual, reported and 'personal' or 'egophoric' categories (Tournadre 2017). Evidentiality in Tibetic languages is discussed in more detail in Tournadre & LaPolla (2014), Tournadre (2017) and Gawne & Hill (2017). Evidentiality in Tamangic languages is, comparatively, typologically less-well documented, but is known to occur (see Owen-Smith 2014, Hildebrandt & Bond 2017, Mazaudon 2017, Noonan & Hildebrandt 2017). Reported speech is a commonly noted category in typologies of grammatical evidentiality (Aikhenvald 2004; Willett 1988; San Roque & Loughnane 2012). A reported evidential particle is very common in languages of the Tibeto-Burman family, and particularly so in documented Tibetic and Tamangic languages (Gawne 2016b).

Evidentiality in languages of this area is increasingly discussed in terms of not only the source of evidence, but also 'access' to information (Tournadre & LaPolla 2014, but see also Garrett 2001, Tournadre 2008 and DeLancey 2018). That is to say, there are some sources of evidence that only a particular person has access to; evidentials of direct sensory experience are not available when talking about the internal state of another person. The parameter of 'access' limits what evidentials can be used in particular interactional contexts.

Reported speech and thought fall under the umbrella of epistemics, essentially how speakers encode knowledge and source of information, including knowledge of prior utterances or thoughts. They provide at least one lexical way to distinguish the source of information uttered by the speaker (or by another referent) as reported, even in languages without grammatical evidential strategies. Many have observed that lexical reported speech strategies can have an evidential function (including, but by no means limited to, Mushin

2001: 73; Haßler 2002; Ameka 2004: 8; Spronck 2017: 107). Some discussions of evidentiality seek to separate it from any epistemic effect that it may produce (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004). In the languages that we work with, evidentiality is closely integrated with any epistemic effect of (un)certainty it may produce (see Garrett 2001, Gawne 2013).

In the Tibeto-Burman literature, we see a discussion of 'hybrid' reported speech structure, which for Tibetic languages is in part based on evidential value. The hybrid structure involves a verb inside embedded reported speech, with tense, aspect, mood and evidential reflecting the view of the original speaker, and the pronoun reflecting the view of the current speaker (6) (Tournadre 2008). Person marking is not a feature of verbs in many of the languages in this corpus, or in many of the languages in which hybrid reported speech is observed, meaning that the TAME-marking on the verb is what does most of the work.[4]

6)   *[kho   bod.pa   yin]   zer-gyis*
     [he   Tibetan   COP.EGO]   say-IMPF.SENS
    'He$_i$ says that he$_i$ is Tibetan.' (lit. 'He be Tibetan, says.')
    (Tournadre 2008: 286, ex. 5, glossing and translation amended)

This structure is commonly observed in Tibetic languages, including Standard Tibetan (Tournadre 2008), Yolmo (Gawne 2015) and Purik (Zemp 2017), as well as in the Tibeto-Burman family more generally, including Japhug (Jacques 2016), and Bunan (Widmer 2014).

Although there is not space for a detailed introduction to the morphosyntactic structure of these languages, there are a few typological notes that can be made before looking specifically at reported speech. Like the majority of Tibeto-Burman languages, these are Subject Object Verb order languages. The Tibetic languages (Nubri, Syuba and Tsum) have a past/non-past tense distinction, as does Nar and Kutang. Mananage does not mark tense, but does have perfective/imperfective marking on verbs. Evidentiality is a commonly marked feature across these languages, as discussed above. Negation takes the form of a verb prefix, and is the only prefix in these languages. Nominalization is used for tense marking (past tense) and interrogative structure functions, as has been noted in other Tibeto-Burman languages (DeLancey 2002; Noonan 2008). Rather than subordination, we tend to find more clause chaining structures as per other Tibeto-Burman languages (Genetti 2011), which is true for reported speech. The only language in this paper with a detailed descriptive grammar is Manange (Hildebrandt 2004), Syuba has a dictionary (SIL International & HIS Nepal 2015) is very similar to Yolmo, for which there are two descriptive grammars (Gawne 2016a; Hari 2010). There is a brief introduction to Nar (Noonan & Hildebrandt 2017) and lexicons for Tsum (Donohue & Dhakal 2016) and Nubri (2018) and a brief wordlist for Kutang (Webster 1992). This paper therefore represents some of the first analysis of these languages.

---

[4] Although the languages in this paper, and many Tibetic and Tamangic languages, do not have person marking, more distantly related languages like Japhug (Qiangic) and Bunan (West Himalayish) do have at least partial person agreement systems, where hybrid reported speech is supported by person marking as well as TAME marking (Jacques 2016).

3. Corpora and methods

The reported speech data in this paper come from audio and video recordings of speakers of six Tibeto-Burman languages sharing their experiences of the major earthquakes of April and May 2015, specifically in the Gorkha, Mustang, Manang and Ramechhap districts, and also from residents of these areas who happened to be in Kathmandu at that time. Earthquakes are not uncommon phenomena along the Himalaya, which have been formed through the ongoing collision of the Indian and Eurasian tectonic plates, however the 2015 earthquakes were the largest in Nepal since the 1934 Bihar quake (magnitude 8.1) (Prakash et al. 2016), with the April quake measuring a magnitude of 7.8 (Adhikari et al. 2017). Only the oldest community members recall a major earthquake of this nature. Across these six communities, houses were badly damaged, and many residents were injured, although there were fewer fatalities than what might have otherwise been, as the quakes happened during the day, and on a weekend, when few people were inside their homes or at school. As described in Hildebrandt, Burge-Buckley & Sebok (2019), and as relevant to the narratives in the corpora we are working with here, villages in the Gorkha District suffered the most severe impacts, with the most loss of life, while communities in the other districts were less severely affected.

Many of the recordings in this corpus are in audio and video formats, and are available open access online. Three of the languages are from the Tibetic branch of the Tibeto-Burman family (Tournadre 2014), two are from the Tamangic branch and one (Kutang) is still unclassified but appears to be Ghale, closely related to Tamangic. We give a brief outline of the corpora and methods here, more information on accessing the materials can be found in Appendix A. All examples in this article state the participant and language and include a citation code. This code allows the interested reader to examine the original materials.

The focus on a particular narrative genre (survivor narratives or memoirs) for linguistic analysis is a deliberate methodological choice. As Hyland (2012: 1) observes, genres, including this one, represent "typified acts of communication based on the form and purpose of texts". Genre-focused analyses are therefore interested in examining clusters of register, style, lexis, and other features, which (may) distinguish (or be prevalent in) particular genres. Our methods are therefore positioned from the perspective that the nature of earthquake survivor narratives allow us to observe strategies not otherwise available in formal elicitation, including the grammar of epistemic-type utterances, and to more fruitfully investigate the form-function relationships observed in a wide range of reported speech structures in comparable narrative contexts. Instances of reported speech are particularly abundant in our corpus because speakers are processing these events in their lives by constantly referring to information that has been reported to them, as well as discussing events that they directly witnessed, or that they guessed/assumed has happened without direct observation.

A subset of recordings in each language were selected for this paper. Table one gives information about each language, including language name, ISO 639-3 code, and family sub-group. The number of recordings and totally duration are also listed. A list of the individual recordings used in this paper is given in Appendix A.

Language	ISO 639-3	Branch	Recordings	Minutes	Utterances
Nar	npa	Tamangic	3	24	533
Manange	nmm	Tamangic	3	23	778
Kutang	ght	(Ghale)	5	35	761
Tsum	ttz	Tibetic	5	49	1291
Nubri	kte	Tibetic	5	35	854
Syuba	syw	Tibetic	5	31	789

Table 1: Overview of language data

Recordings were made as narrative interviews; one participant was prompted by an interviewer to share their experience. As these are small communities, all of the interview participants knew the interviewees, although the degree of familiarity varied between contexts. This is an unavoidable constraint of working in small communities. We have controlled for this to an extent by ensuring the recording sessions include people who were very familiar with the interviewer, and those less familiar with them. We draw data from both the narrator and interviewer in this paper.[5] We also give the number of minutes of recordings for each language, and the number of utterances, which is an approximate measure based on the number of segments in the transcription of each narrative, which are broadly analogous to intonation units.

The majority of transcriptions were generated via interaction between the interviewers, who are native speakers of the corpus languages and also fluently bilingual in Nepali (the national lingua franca) with trained linguists, who are native Nepali speakers and who do not speak the corpus languages. Segmenting, transcription and interlinearization was done using ELAN (Lausberg & Sloetjes 2009)[6]. Translations were also made into English and/or Nepali. Confirmation of interlinearization in some passages was further assisted by existing wordlist publications for some of the languages, including Nubri (Dhakal 2018), Tsum (Donohue & Dhakal 2016) and Syuba (SIL International & HIS Nepal). For more information on the transcription process see Childs et al. (2017).

Table 2 gives an overview of the number of reported speech and thought tokens tagged in the corpora.

---

[5] The Syuba recordings were also conducted by a native speaker interviewer, but they did not work to a scripted set of interview questions. Regardless, similar topics were discussed and reported speech and thought at a similar rate of frequency to that in related languages.

[6] http://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Language	Speakers	Minutes	Utterances	RS/RT tokens
Nar	3	24	533	35
Manange	3	23	778	32
Kutang	5	35	761	87
Tsum	5	49	1291	123
Nubri	5	35	854	164
Syuba	5	31	789	142

Table 2: Number of reported speech and thought tokens observed

The tagging was done by the two authors, on the basis of the transcripts supplied and their knowledge of these languages. While we have left our definition of 'reported speech' somewhat underspecified above, in the sections below we will demonstrate that these tokens include a number of different functions for the reported speech lexical marker, as well as a number of other strategies that are used to mark reported speech, and also zero-marked quotatives. We also coded for reported thought, although we focus on it less in the final analysis. There was some variation in the number of reported speech and thought tokens across the languages. It is not clear to us if this is because of the way the interviews were set up, or if it indicates discourse preferences across the language communities. Importantly, strategies for expressing reported speech and thought do occur in all of the narratives at a minimum rate of around once every 45 seconds across languages.

For each recording, we made a database of all observed tokens of reported speech and thought using a spread sheet. We began with a general categorization of whether they were reported speech, reported thought or some associated phenomenon such as lexical terms like 'recite' or 'know', which relate to 'speak' and 'think' respectively, but are not the same. We then categorized the tokens based on their function; as we discuss in Section 6.3, the reported speech lexical verbs have a range of functions, including the marking of reported thought, and grammaticalization into forms such as the conditional, a process frequently observed in Tibeto-Burman languages (Saxena 1988), and indeed more generally (Hopper & Closs Traugott 2003: 13-15, 115; Deutscher 2011; Chappel 2012). Data were also coded for a number of features of each token, including whether there was an overt speaker, and if so, the grammatical person, number and any case-marking, which is the strategy for grammatical relations encoding in these languages. We also tracked whether the utterances had the structure of direct quotations of a previous speech event, and whether the reported content occurred as part of an interrogative, which is relevant to the discussion of hybrid reported speech (§5.2). These features allowed us to address the structure and functions of reported speech in the larger discourse context.

4. Overt subjects, ergativity, and the relevance to reported speech in Tibeto-Burman languages

Understanding the structure of reported speech, as it occurs in narratives in our data, requires a discussion of several key related grammatical phenomena. We begin with a discussion of a topic that has received much attention in recent literature: overt subject marking, or–rather–the stark lack of it in narrative discourse. Reporting speech requires not only that we track the reported content, but that we also track the person(s) who said the original content, and the person(s) to whom the reported content is directed. Therefore, understanding reported speech structures requires an understanding of argument structure in a language. In neat data, overt arguments with case markers help to disambiguate argument roles in these languages (see examples 1 and 3). In the narrative data here, we do not find quite the same clarity of 'sayer' and 'sayee'.

Ergative-absolutive case marking is the pattern for almost all Tibeto-Burman languages. Additionally, in a number of languages, animate objects receive patient marking that is syncretic with dative or locative cases. This is shown here with elicitation-based examples from Manange and Nar. Examples (7) and (8) illustrate ergative-marked agents, while (9) and (10) illustrate dative/locative marked patients. Examples were elicited by the second author, with more examples of such constructions available in Manange (Hildebrandt & Bond 2017) and Nar (Noonan & Hildebrandt 2017).

7) *ŋa-tse* *tele*   *taŋ-ko-ri*   *kju*   *lu-tsi*
   1-ERG yesterday   pot-DEF-LOC   water pour-PFV
   'I poured water into the pot yesterday.'
   (Manange, elicited)

8) *ŋa-tse* *tile*   *khyaŋ* *tsa-tsi*
   1-ERG yesterday   bread   eat-PFV
   'I ate the bread yesterday.'
   (Nar, elicited)

9) *ŋa-tse* *tele*   ***Dolma-ri***   *mwe*   *tshaŋ-tsi*
   1-ERG   yesterday **Dolma-DAT**   money   give-PFV
   'I gave money to Dolma yesterday.'
   (Manange, elicited)

10) *mhi-se*   *tile*   ***mriŋ-re***   *tho-čin*
    person-ERG   yesterday   **woman-DAT/LOC**   meet-PST
    'Yesterday the man met the woman.'
    (Nar, elicited)

Reported speech is known cross-linguistically to potentially trigger unusual argument-structure marking patterns (Spronck 2017: 106). Discussion of this is complicated by the frequency optional argument expression (referred to by Bickel 2003 as 'low referential

density'), and also optional ergative marking (Tournadre 1996, Chelliah & Hyslop 2011) in many Tibeto-Burman languages. In running discourse, speakers often omit overt marking of core grammatical arguments. In Tamangic and Tibetan languages, there is no person agreement on verbs, although there is the tendency for evidential marking to distribute in relation to access to information (Bond et al. 2015; Bond & Hildebrandt 2013). Unsurprisingly, this can complicate the task for someone not participating in the context of the narrative (such as a researcher returning to the transcripts) to confirm the original speaker of a reported utterance in a narrative.

In our corpus, we see examples of reported speech with overt verbs of saying (e.g. Manange *pi* in examples (11) and (12)), but no clear referent for who said what in the original utterance; it must be gleaned from the larger context.

11) *utseli*   *[siŋsoŋ*   *la]*   ***pi***   ***a-pi-pa***   *ta*
     up.to.now   [Gompa   do]   **say**   **NEG-say-NMLZ**   DM
     '(They) have not yet said when they will repair the Gompa.'
     (Manange_KarmaDolma 178)[7]

12) *[suŋɣudze-tse]*   ***pi-pa***   *ta*   *pim-pa*
     [assist-cc]   **say-NMLZ**   what   give-NMLZ
     '(They) say they will give, but what will they give?'
     (Manange_KanchaGurung 381)

These translations indicate that even without overt references to the original speaker, people listening to these narratives are able to make informed assessments of who the original speaker is. It appears that an unexpressed speaker might be understood to be, by default, an indeterminate third person ('those people' or 'that group'), where specificity in reporter identity is less important than the message being reported. An unmarked subject is not always a third person, in (19) and (48) below unmarked is used for first person subjects.

In our corpus, in the handful of instances where we have an overtly marked original speaker, not all demonstrate ergative marking. Table 3 gives the counts for the number of overt subjects for reported speech and thought across the languages, and the number of times these overt subjects were marked with an ergative case marker.

---

[7] Manange, like many other languages of this family, has a nominalizer with a broad range of functions, including marking past tense, see DeLancey (2002) and Noonan (2008) for more on this in Bodic languages.

Language	Reported speech	Overt subject	Ergative marking
Nar	35	0	0
Manange	32	8	3
Kutang	87	12	0
Tsum	123	0	0
Nubri	164	32	0
Syuba	142	14	7

Table 3 Distribution of overt subject and ergative marking

Although ergativity in these languages is often discussed as 'optional', in a wider typological discussion of optional ergativity McGregor (2010) observed that the motivation behind ergative marking in languages where it is not obligatory tends to be pragmatically motivated, for example it is more likely to be used with a reference with a higher degree of agency or animacy. This is an analysis common for Bodic languages (see DeLancey 1991, Tournadre 1996 for Standard Tibetan, LaPolla 1995 for Tibeto-Burman more broadly). It might be tempting to see the low frequency of ergative marking on reported speech as evidence that 'saying' verbs are not always considered to be unambiguously transitive (Rumsey 2010), however this frequency of ergative marking is similar to that seen in declarative utterances in a study of Manange and Nar, along with Gurung (Tamangic) and Gyalsumdo (Tibetic) (Bond et al. 2015; Bond & Hildebrandt 2013).

Bond et al. (2015) found that the best explanation for the presence of ergativity in their declarative data was in contexts where a 'new topic' was introduced. We tested this hypothesis with our own data. Table 4 expands on Table 3, to look at how many of the tokens with an overt subject occur as a new topic, and how many specifically ergative marked ones do. We take a broad definition of 'new topic' as the first time a referent is introduced into the narrative, or returned to after a long stretch to the discourse. We included both when a new person was speaking, and when a new topic was included in the reported content. Nar and Tsum are excluded from this analysis, as there is no reported speech with an overt subject.

Language	Reported speech	Overt subject	Overt subject new topic	Ergative marking	Ergative marking new topic
Manange	32	8	3	3	1
Kutang	87	12	10	0	n/a
Nubri	164	32	23	0	n/a
Syuba	142	14	10	7	5

Table 4 Distribution of overt subject marked 'new information'

The numbers are presented raw here, rather than as percentages, since the figures are so low. With the most broad definition of 'new topic', there is a strong tendency across all of the languages, other than Manange, for an overt subject to be used for a new topic, but this do not necessitate the use of an ergative. Beyond the newness of the topic there appears to be some consistency within a language; overt subject with ergative marking appears in Kutang mostly when reporting speech from engineers and government. The data in Table 4 support the analysis that there is some link between overt subjects and new information however there are many examples in the corpus of new topics introduced with no overt subjects, as is indeed the case for all tokens in both Nar and Sum. This expands Bond et al.'s probabilistic model of ergative marking to suggest that the probability of ergative marking is lower for reported speech utterances than for other declaratives.

5. Structural features of reported speech

In this section, we discuss some of the key structural features of reported speech. We begin by situating reported speech in relation to the grammatical evidential strategies in these languages (§5.1). We then look at 'hybrid' reported speech (§5.2), a reported speech structure commonly attested in languages of the area. Finally, we look at the capacity for reported speech verbs to scope over multiple clauses, and even extended passages of narrative (§5.3).

5.1. Reported speech as part of the evidential system

Evidentiality is the grammatical encoding of the speaker's source of information. The role of evidentiality in Tibetic and Tamangic languages was outlined in the background (§2). In this section, we begin with a discussion of the reported speech evidential particle (§5.1.1.), and then look at the relationship between evidential forms and lexical verbs of reporting speech (§5.1.2.). Although we distinguish grammatical evidentiality from lexical strategies, we also look at what kinds of evidential implications are observable for lexical reported speech use in these narratives (§5.1.3.)

5.1.1. Reported evidential particle

Use of a lexical verb to report a prior utterance is a strategy for reporting the source of information that is available to speakers of all languages. A number of the languages in this corpus have an additional grammaticalized reported speech particle as well as a lexical verb for reporting speech. The majority of evidential distinctions in these languages occur as copular verbs and verbal auxiliaries, except for the reported category, which is often encoded in a different grammatical slot to the other evidential forms as a final particle. This 'scattered' coding of evidentiality (Aikhenvald 2018) is common across the world's languages, including in the Tibeto-Burman family (Gawne 2016b). The status of reported speech evidentiality as a particle allows it to co-occur with anther evidential, which then indicates the evidence of the original speaker.

Table 5 gives the reported speech form in Manage, Nubri, Tsum and Syuba, and the frequency with which these forms occur in the narratives we analysed. Kutang and Tsum are not known to have reported speech particles, and no tokens of any possible reported speech evidential form were observed in the recordings. Nar is said to have a reported speech particle *ro* (Noonan & Hildebrandt 2017: 551) however no examples were observed in the data.

Language	RS/RT	RS particle used	RS particle form
Manange	32	2	ro
Nubri	164	14	lo
Tsum	123	2	lo
Syuba	142	5	lo

Table 5 Number of reported speech evidential particles used, by language

These numbers may seem rather lower than one would expect if speakers have access to a grammaticalized form that allows them to indicate that the content is reported. In order to further explore this why this feature is used comparatively little in discourse with so much reported content, we look at the uses we do find in the corpus.

These narratives may show a genre effect. Hildebrandt (2004: 94) observed that the Manange reported speech particle occurs frequently in folktales, but can also occur in non-folktale contents, while Nubri and Syuba may be more like Yolmo (Gawne 2015), where we see less use of the reported speech particle in the folktale genre, and more use of it tied to specific speech events.

The reported speech particle in Nubri is used to mark speech that does not appear to be reporting a specific speech act, the reported speech particle allows the speaker to quote an unspecified source. Example (13) indicates this hearsay value:

13) [tsʰewa   ɕi-la   wo̯ŋ-ge   re]   **lo**
    [date   four-LOC   come-NON.PST   COP]   **REP**
    'Some people said that it (earthquake) will hit on fourth day (of this month).'
    (Nubri_DawaDolma 164)

Uses like this occur four times in Nubri texts.[8] Three tokens of the reported speech particle occur while people explain how earthquakes happen, drawing on knowledge they have learned from other people. This is more similar to Aikhenvald's (2018) 'reported' evidential category rather than the 'quotative', which is used to report the specific speech event of a specific individual.

In Manange, Karma Dolma uses a reported speech particle to mark information she has heard from her parents about their life before she was born, and events from her childhood that she does not recall herself. The lines in (14) are all about the time before she was born, and when she was a child.

14) *[phoe-ri   papa ama-ko   lo   tʃuŋŋi ʈu   ta-tsi]*   **ro**
    [Tibet-LOC   father mother-DEF   year twelve stay become-PFV]   **REP**
    'My mother and father stayed for 12 years in Tibet.'

    [ŋa   tsile   ju-pa-ko-ni   lo   santi-ti   ju-tsi]   **ro**
    [1SG   PROX   arrive-NMLZ-EVID-ADV   year   three-CLS   arrive-PFV] **REP**
    'I was almost 3 years of age, arrived (in Manang).'
    (Manange_KarmaDolma 18-20)

Karma Dolma does not use the reported speech form for all events before her birth. In an earlier line of the story (15), she introduces her parents travel to Tibet using the *mi* non-first person evidential form. This is not a reported speech form, but the speaker alternates it with the reported evidential in the discourse.

15) *phoe-ri   ŋi-la   papa ama   phoe-ri   ja   **mi**
    Tibet-LOC   1SG-GEN   father mother   Tibet-LOC   go   **EVID**
    'My mother and father went to Tibet.'
    (Manange_KarmaDolma 11)

---

[8] Three tokens of the reported speech particle occur while people explain how earthquakes happen, drawing on knowledge they have learned from other people. Three tokens occur in the phrase *re lo* 'what to say?' or 'what do you say?' Two of those uses are by the interviewer trying to prompt the speaker to say more. The other use is a speaker deciding what part of the story to tell next. This is the same as three uses of the equivalent *tɕí ló* in Syuba. These examples are not as directly relevant to the discussion of reported speech, and indicate that even something that is usually considered to be fairly easy to describe a reported function for does not always function within the strictest interpretation of reported speech.

The evidential marker here, which is used when referring to non-first-person referents, encodes knowledge assumed by the speaker, but not personally witnessed. This accords with the fact that this knowledge is reported to her by her family.

Although it appears that this genre is not an interactional context where we see a wealth of reported evidential particle use, it does offer some examples that have previously not been observed. In (16) Ningmar Tamang reports a person's speech directly, which includes a reported speech evidential. This use of the reported speech evidential particle is not attested in the closely related Yolmo language, where speakers actively avoid embedding multiply reported events and instead use only a single reported evidential regardless of how many times the original information is reported (Gawne 2015), nor in the literature on Tibeto-Burman languages more generally (Gawne 2016b).

16) *tíŋla*   *yàmba*   *gìk-le-ni*   *phárlea*   *òŋ-goi*
     after   moment   one-ALL-FOC   that.side   come-NON.PST

     [darahara-ŋ   *ròm*   *dù*   ***ló]***   *là-koi*
     [Darahara-alsobreak   COP.SENS   **REP]**   say-NON.PST
     'A moment later, (they) came on the otherside, "Darahara is also (reportedly) broken" (they) said.'
     (Syuba_NingmarTamang 42)

The majority of reference works we have on reported speech evidentiality provide a brief mention of the form as part of a descriptive grammar. Looking at the contribution it makes to discourse in specific genres allows us to better understand the communicative function of this form, as well as its relationship to other reported speech strategies.

5.1.2. Reported speech, evidence, access to information

The reported particle is not the only evidential option in these languages. The other evidential forms in each of these languages can be included in reported frames, and reflect the evidential status of the original speaker. Reported speech and thought are central to discussion of evidentiality in the Tibetic literature (and are likely as important to Tamangic languages, but these languages remain, to date, under-analysed). These narratives provide an opportunity to explore the distribution of evidence in relation to access to information. In (17) Karsang Chesang uses the Nar past declarative indirect evidential copula *-me* to discuss his relative, as he does not have direct access to this person's internal state.

17) *nuŋ-sɛ*   *tsa*   *lo*   *ʈhaŋ*   *te-se-**me***
     3SG-ERG   bit   fierce   more   become-CVB-**EVID**
     'He (my relative) is a bit more unafraid.' (fierce = confident)
     (Nar_KarsangChesangLama 32)[9]

---

[9] As mentioned in Section 3.1. ergativity is 'optional' in these language, not only can it be omitted from transitive utterances, but it can be used to mark higher agentivity in some transitive contexts, as in (17).

Access to information about internal states is complex and context dependent. In (18) we see Nubri speaker Dawa Dolma use the sensory evidential *duk* when talking about other people's fear. Dawa Dolma can use this evidential because *dʑi* 'fear' is a kind of emotion that can be observed by way of visual evidence, and additionally she has direct access to the speech of these individuals, which indicates their internal state.

18) *[gani   dʑe-tɕi lɛ̃   wo̥raŋ   ɣiri   ɕi-ke   re   ai]*
[what.kind do-INF PART   1PL   all   die-NON.PAST COP   PART]

*wo̥ne   lap-di   jaŋ   dʑi-ken   **duk***
this.way say-CVB   again fear-NMLZ **COP**
'They say, "We all may die; what can we do!" They get scared a lot.'
(Nubri_DawaDolma 184)

In interrogative structures, including reported interrogatives, the evidential reflects what the speaker anticipates will be the most likely source of evidence their interlocutor would use to satisfactorily answer (Tournadre & LaPolla 2014: 245-246).[10] Again, this holds true for the data we see in these narratives. In (19) the interviewer asks Lhamu Lama about her fear, using the egophoric copula form in the reported speech clause. That is, they are framing the question with the evidential orientation of the person who will be answering. This is not because the interviewer has personal information about her state of fear, but because the interviewer anticipates that Lhamu will answer with the egophoric.

19) *[òole   daŋ   tìŋsaŋ dʑiba làŋ-goi-ba*
[and.then   yesterday today fear fall-NON.PST-Q

*ki   mè-laŋ   **èpa***] *là-ti   ʈì-kyok*
or   NEG-fall **COP.Q**] say-IPFV   ask-PFV
'and these days you say you feel fear or you don't feel, (I) ask.'
(Syuba_LhamuLama 177, interviewer)

Lexical reporting strategies appear to show a similar sensitivity to access to information across declarative and interrogative structures. We specifically consider Nubri to illustrate this, as it has the highest number of relevant tokens. For those where there is a clear grammatical person (see §4 on overt subject), we broke the distribution down by person and utterance type. This distribution is presented in Table 6. While a speaker can refer to both their own actions of 'saying' and 'thinking', there are no examples of discussion of third person thoughts, and second person thoughts are only addressed in interrogatives, giving the addressee the chance to answer.

---

[10] The distribution of grammatical marking to indicate speaker access to information has also been discussed as egophoricity (Floyd et al., 2018).

Person	Type	'say'	'think'
1	Decl.	14	15
	Interrog.	7	0
2	Decl.	2	0
	Interrog.	1	13
3	Decl.	10	0
	Interrog.	32	0

Table 6 Distribution of 'say' and 'think' in Nubri by person and utterance type

This distribution is, of course, shaped by the interview structure of these narratives. It does, however, illustrate that it is not just evidentiality that shows this sensitivity to 'access to information'. Grammatical evidentiality is an important, and still understudied, grammatical phenomenon in this area, but it should not be studied in isolation from lexical ways of indicating source of information.

5.1.3. Evidential and modal effects of lexical reported speech
Although we acknowledge that grammatical evidentiality has a particular focus on marking source of information, in keeping with our belief that it should not be studied in isolation, we examine the evidential and epistemic value of lexical reported speech utterances.

Reporting speech is an evidential action, in that the speaker is demonstrating that the source of their evidence is the speech of another person. Reporting speech can have an epistemic effect; indicating that information comes from a report can either strengthen or weaken an assertion. The literature, both within Tibeto-Burman specifically, and more broadly has attested that reported speech can be used to weaken epistemic stance towards the reported content (Aikhenvald 2004: 135 cross-linguistically; Ding 2014: 211 for Southern Pumi; So-Hartmann 2009: 297 for Daai Chin). There is also a growing body of literature that demonstrates reported strategies are used to strengthen the speaker's epistemic stance by drawing on the authority of the original speaker (Michael 2012 for Nanti, Arawakan; Gawne 2015: 314 for Yolmo).

Example (20) demonstrates that it is possible to use reported speech to distance one's self from the content of the utterance. Ningmar Tamang juxtaposes the reports of other people with an acknowledgement that is is not possible to know if the reported speech is factual.

20) *[òŋ-goi]* **là-koi** *tɕor-aŋ* *mè-tɕor* *è*
   [come-NON.PST] **say-NON.PST** know-also NEG-know COP
   '(They) say it will come, we don't know.'
   (Syuba_NingmarTamang 149)

We also see softening of epistemic stance in reported speech conveyed in the translations given by native speakers as they work through the text. In (21) the speaker uses the lexical verb *lap* 'say', but the translation is 'rumors'. In (22) the translator has included a parenthesis, indicating much like Ningmar did in (20) above, that these reports are not used to indicate greater support for the uttearnce.

21) *[sa   gurdiŋ   lok-woŋ   wo̥ne]*   ***lap-di***   *jaŋ*
    [land   upside.down   return-come   this.way]   **say-CVB**   again

   mi   ɣiri   dʑi-di   dẽ
   man   all   fear-CVB   after.that
   'The earth will turn over; with such rumors, all people being scared…'
   (Nubri_DawaDolma 171)

22) *tikə*   *nə*   *mi-ko*   *[kʰə-tsi]*   ***pi-tsi***
    right.exact(Nep)   DM   person-DEF   [come-PFV]   **say-PFV**
    'Actually, sometimes people say it (a tremor) comes (they are so soft we don't feel them).'
    (Manange_KanchaGurung 336)

This does not mean that weakened epistemic force is the only use of reported speech. In (23) Bumchung does not appear to have firsthand knowledge, invoking reported evidence that they have of the damage, but without any of the hedging either in the following turn or translation. In fact, we added 'they say' to the translation to better reflect what is in the utterance, but the native-speaker translator omitted them all together.

23) *[rahri   rahri   siɣ   ɣoŋ]*   ***ŋɛ-oŋ***
    [little   little   fall.down   COP.PST]   **say-PST**
    'It's fallen down a little bit (they) said.'
    (Kutang_Bumchung 138)

Similarly, Rite Choepel Lama, a Nar speaker in Manang District has not personally been to Gorkha, but invokes reports of fatalities in the region as part of an extended passage that reflects speaker observations of others' feelings and experiences (24).

24) *[gorkha-tsuke-re   bhukəmpə   ŋi-tse mhi   hosor si-tse]*   ***bhi***   *mo*
    [Gorkha-PL-LOC   earthquake   go-CVB person like.this die-CVB] **say**   COP
    'People have died in Gorkha due to this earthquake (they) say.'
    (Nar_RiteChoepelLama 75)

Speakers can draw on reported speech to disavow certainty, or strengthen it, even drawing on both effects in individual narratives. In (25) Kunsang Dhondrup talks about events he did not witness, using a report strategy. The translator used 'hear' in English, and the effect is that the speaker is not avowing any certainty about this information. In

comparison, in (26) he is evoking the authority of his forefathers in discussing the origins of earthquakes.

25) *[semtsen-di*   *kʰjui*   *kira-di* *tzjambo*   *da*   *luŋ*   *tra-ba*
    [livestock-PL   3PL   cow-PL generally   PART   stone   hit-PST

    si   *uso]*   **ŋɛ-oŋ**
    die   like.this]   **say-PST**
    'I heard that some livestock, cows, died by the falling stones.'
    (Kutang_KunsangDhondrup 107)

26) *ŋja*   *un*   *mom*   *meme*   *tsã*   *uni*   **ŋɛ-ba** *sa*
    1PL   this   grandmother grandfather   PART   3   **say-PST** land

    [ħwag-ne   *uso*   *da*   *jɛ*   *uso*   *uso*   *jɛ]*
    [down-LOC   like.this   PART   COP   like.this   like.this   COP]
    'Our forefathers said there were many reasons for earthquakes.'
    (lit. 'Our grandmothers and grandfathers used to say that under the ground it is like this, or it is like this, or like this')
    (Kutang_KunsangDhondrup 129)

Spronck (2017: 106-107) in his discussion of the features of reported speech separates 'recurrent modal shift' and 'recurrent evidential shift' as features of reported speech. In the Tamangic and Tibetic languages the same morphological category is used to cover both functions, with the lexical item providing source, but also used to distance or align the speaker with the reported content.

5.2. Hybrid Reported Speech

We looked for examples of hybrid reported speech across all six of the languages in our corpus. The lack of overtly marked subjects (§4) means that there are very few examples of hybrid reported speech. In fact, we could only find one example of an utterance with both an overtly referenced speaker and a verb with clearly marked copula. This utterance (27) is also a question, which adds an additional feature, in that the TAME is referencing the original speakers, but this is framed as a question to the addressee. It is the question structure, and the speaker wishing to disambiguate a question about other people from one about the speaker that means we have the referent overtly included. We see the overt third person pronoun, and the copular *jọ,* which is used by a person in relation to her own state. Here, they are being asked to report the original utterance, which would have been constructed using the *jọ* form.

27) *[kʰuŋ*   *tɕjapta*   *tʰaŋbo*   *jọ]*   **ne**   *nu*   *wɛ*
    [3PL   all   fine   COP]   **say**   AUX   PART.Q
    'Did they say that they were all well?'
    (Nubri_TseringDekey 73)

We know from (27) that Nubri speakers can use 'hybrid' reported speech structures like (6) but when we find very little evidence of what is observed to be, in closely related varieties, "the most common construction for reported speech" (Tournadre 2008: 301 on Standard Tibetan). It is not that we see an absence of hybrid reported speech because of a preponderance of other structures (although we discuss direct reported speech below). Rather, we do not see many instances because the overwhelming majority of reported speech events in these narratives have either no overt speaker, no overt TAME marked verb, or neither.

We have translated examples like (3) and (4), which lack both overt referents and any deictic element that could indicate in/direct or hybrid speech as indirect. The possibility of hybrid reported speech does not exclude the presence of direct reported speech (also observed by Tournadre 2008: 301). We see more examples of direct reported speech, like (28), in the data.

28) *[wǫraŋ*   *nam*   *çi*   *na*   *çi-ke*   *re]*
    [**1PL**   when   die   COND   die-NON.PST   COP]

    wǫne   *sã*   *lap*   *duk*   *jʉl-naŋ*   ***mi-kja***
    this.way   only   say   COP   village-inside **man-PL**

    dana *wǫne*   ***lap***   *duk*
    now   this.way   **say**   COP
    '"It does not matter; it is sure that we die." Now, the men in the village talk like this.'
    (Nubri_DawaDolma 240-241)

The frequency of use of direct reported speech forms is too low to say anything about their distribution, but we see that they often occur in the immediacy of the quake events themselves (29) and people's belief that death was imminent at that time (30).

29) *[ŋìni*   *èdʑule*   *phíla-ka*   *tèti* *è*   *lé]*   ***la-kena***
    [1PL-also   like.that   outside-EMPH   sit-IPFV COP   PART]   **say-CONC**
    '"We are also sitting outside,"' (they) said.'
    (Syuba_NingmarTamang 61)

30) *[tà*   *sigen*   *dùba]*   *làsi*
    [now   die.NON.PST   COP.EMPH]   say.PST
    '"Now we die," said (everyone).'
    (Syuba_NirmayaTamang 29)

As well as reported speech structures that appear to be more 'indirect' and examples like those above that are more like traditional 'direct' reported speech, we also see that it is possible to use zero-marked reported speech structures (Ex. 5, also §6.4). While hybrid

reported speech has been attested in the literature on related languages, we find that it is very infrequent in this corpus of spontaneous narrative use.

5.3. Multiple Clause Relationality

McGregor's (1994: 68) approach of 'framing' can explain why reported speech can expand over multiple clauses. In (31) we see multiple clauses, with the reported speech at the end of the second utterance. This is possible because 'framing' does not suppose subordination.

31) *[kʰamdi   hlop   krwaba   bəp   pãdze*
    [Khamdi   ox   Krwaba   fall.down   Pandzet

   mo   bəp-ba   si-ba   kira   tjak   dzen   nale   da   kira
   down   fall.down-PST   die-PST cow   one   PART   Nale   PART   cow

   kamma   si]   ŋɛ-oŋ
   more   die]   **say-PST**
   'Khamdi's ox died falling down from Krwaba to Pandzet. Many bulls of Nale were killed... (they) said' (Kutang_Bumchung 108-109)

In these narratives, we see just how well reported speech is able to scope over multiple clauses. In (32) Mingmar Tsering Lama begins an extended passage (177-205) talking about the failure of the government to provide support. In example (33), Tashi (Ebi) uses this utterance at the end of a passage discussing the origins of earthquakes as a device to frame that section of the narrative passage (lines 144-155).

32) *ŋa-se   bhi-pa-tsɛ   khɛtsu   bhi   mi*
    1SG-ERG   say-NMLZ-CVB   how(Nep. *kasto*)   **say**   EVID
    'What I want to say is...'
    (Nar_MingmarTseringLama 177)

33) *hone   tʃik   lap   du*
    like   this.one   **say**   COP
    '(They) say like this.'
    (Nubri_Tashi(Ebi) 156-159)

These examples can be taken together to illustrate how the scope effect can be generated with the reported speech at the beginning of multiple clauses, or afterwards. This shows that reported speech has a more flexible structure for framing than verbs with subordinating structures demonstrate. We use the framing approach to reported speech, rather than a syntactic analysis that involves parataxis or hypotaxis, because multiple clauses included in the scope of reported speech do not fit a model of either co-ordination or subordination. While the verb of saying scopes over large sections of dialog, each of these sections of the narrative are also able to stand alone (McGregor 1994: 65). While framing is the most obviously preferred analysis for reported speech that scopes over

dozens of intonation units, we also see it as the most relevant analysis for all of the reported speech presented in this study, including both reported speech framed by a lexical verb, and reported speech framed by an evidential particle.

5.4. Structural features of Reported Speech: A summary

Reported speech can be represented by a lexical verb in all of these languages, and there is evidence of a reported evidential particle in Manange, Nubri, Tsum and Syuba. While the reported evidential has the clear function of an evidential, the lexical form also demonstrates use as an evidential strategy, and has some epistemic function as well, both to weaken and strengthen assertion. There is no strong evidence for 'hybrid reported speech' as a strategy in these languages, with 'indirect' reported speech being common, and zero-marked reported speech structures also occurring in the data. Reported speech verbs can also scope over multiple clauses.

6. Pragmatic and interactional features of reported speech

In this section, we discuss pragmatic and interactional features of reported speech that we observed in these narratives. Recurring features of interest, discussed below, are deictic shift (§6.1), and prominent subordination (§6.2). We also discuss the range of pragmatic and grammatical functions that reported speech structures have beyond being used to report speech (§6.3). Finally, we look at the use of zero-marked reported speech, where information is intended to be understood as reported even though no lexical or evidential reported speech strategies are used (§6.4.).

6.1. Deictic Shift

One commonly observed feature of reported speech is that it is a device by which the narrator can deictically orient towards the original speaker of another utterance (Hengeveld 1989: 145; McGregor 1994: 68; Vandelanotte 2004; Spronck 2017: 106; Nikitina 2012; Evans 2012). We observed that this can happen in these languages in our discussion of hybrid reported speech (§5.2). In (34), Dawa Dolma is using reported speech to directly quote other people, note the use of the first person pronoun in the reported speech, but the use of the sensory copular *duk* indicates that it is other people's fear she is observing.

34) [gani   dʑe-tɕi   lɛ̃   ***woraŋ***   ɣiri   ɕi-ke   re   ai]
    [what   do-INF   PART   **1PL**   all   die-NON.PST   COP   PART]

    woːne   ***lap*-di**   *jaŋ*   *dʑi-ken*   *duk*
    this.way   **say**-CVB   again   fear-NMLZ   COP
    'They say "we all may die; what can we do!", they get scared a lot.'
    (Nubri_DawaDolma 184)

A subtle form of deictic shift occurs in example (35). The subtlety comes from the fact that the direct speech is reported in Nepali (the bolded portion), breaking the continuous use of Nubri throughout the narrative so far to indicate that the speech is from another person. This is reinforced by the use of the sensory evidential copula as an auxiliary, indicating even without an overtly marked speaker that this is speech that the narrator heard, not something they said.

35) *[tshiṭo   au   tshiṭo au]*   *lap-duk*
    [**quickly   come.IMP   quicklycome**] say-COP
    '(He) said, "come, come, fast."'
    (Nubri_LakpaDhiki 44)

6.2. Prominent Information

Indirect speech does not generally show signs of reduced discourse status (encoding backgrounded, given, presupposed information), which makes it unlikely that these structures should be analyzed as dependent clauses (which commonly do have a lower discourse status). This fits with the 'framing' analysis of reported speech, which allows it to serve as a structure to mark prominent information (McGregor 1994: 67; Verstraete 2011). Spronck (2017:106) refers to this as 'prominent subordination', but we do not as we are using the framing analysis.

In (36), the status of the information regarding the occurrence of an earthquake is highly relevant to the narrative, and is new information at this point in the story. So far, Rite Choepel Lama has only introduced himself, and said that he was in his field, when people began to say there was an earthquake.

36) *[saŋle   khae mo   khae mo]*   **bhi**   *mo*
    [earthquake   come COP   come COP]   **say**   COP
    '(Everyone) was saying an earthquake occurred.'
    (Nar_RiteChoepelLama 8)

Rite Choepel does not mention what he experienced, only what other people have said. This means that the report is the first major even in the narrative, and is presented as prominent information rather than background.

Similarly, in (37), Nirmaya Tamang introduces her reaction to the earthquake as a reported event at the same time as introducing the event of the earthquake. The utterance occurs at one of the peak events in the narrative, and is marked with an emphatically sensory evidential -*duba*, which demonstrates the prominence of the information reported.

37) *bukampa*   *òŋ-ga*   *sùna*   *ŋà-di*   *tà*

     earthquake   come-EMPH   at.the.time   1SG-FOC   PART

     [tsii   *yòŋ-**duba**]*   ***là-si***   *yòŋ-suna*

     [what come-**EVID.SENS.EMPH**]   **say-PST**   come-at.the.time

     'When the earthquake came I said "What is that shaking?" while shaking.'

     (Syuba_NirmayaTamang 6)

6.3 Polyfunctionality

Reported speech verbs in these narratives are not used exclusively for reporting the spoken utterances of other people. Reported speech verbs are often observed to be 'polyfunctional' (as per Spronck 2017: 107) cross-linguistically. Spronck's category of polyfunctionality contains quite varied phenomena, ranging from lexically specified semantic functions, to grammaticalized meanings. We looked at all the functions in these narratives and divide them into semantic (§6.3.1) and grammatical (§6.3.2) categories. This is by no means a novel segmentation, as reported speech has been observed to be used for complex clauses expressing thought and desire (Reesink 1993; Spronck 2016, 2017), and in a variety of grammatical functions (van der Voort 2002, Güldemann 2008: Ch. 6). Our survey is purely synchronic in our observation of the distribution of reported speech forms. We acknowledge that some functions follow well-established grammaticalization pathways (Chappel 2012). The variation in different functions across the closely-related languages in this study is striking (§6.3.3).

6.3.1. Semantic functions

The reported speech verb can be to express reported thought. We have observed this with examples where the reported speech verb is used to represent the semantic concepts of 'think' and 'know'.

    There are several examples across the Nubri corpus where native speakers have translated the original utterance with a verb of saying *(lap)* with the internal predicate 'think'. In (38) the speaker introduces a third person participant (Norbu Gyaltsen), who she is watching walk uphill. As the earthquake hits, the way he moves changes. Lakpa Dhiki ascribes intention to the change of movement through use of the verb 'say'. The transcribers use the verb 'think' as a closer analogue for English (in the Nepali translation 'say' is used, as the Nepali verb also shows this functionality).

38) *kaŋba* *aŋe*   *ɖo-hoŋ*   ***lap-di***   *kho*   *ŋarme*   *soŋ*

     leg   injury go-come   **say-PFV**   he   forcefully   go.PST

     'He went forcefully having thought that his leg would be wounded.'

     (Nubri_LakpaDhiki 33)

    Nubri has a verb that denotes 'think' *(sam)* (Dhakal 2018) but can still extend the reported speech verb in this way.

We also see the use of 'say' for internal predicate 'think' in Kutang in a question structure (39). This is functionally similar to asking in English 'what would you say an earthquake is?'.

39) ada   ŋja   samlo-ne   tsã   saŋgul   **ŋɛ-ba** tsa   na
    elder.brother 1PL   opinion-LOC   PART   earthquake   **say-PST** what   COP
    'Then, brother! In your opinion what is an earthquake?'
    (Kutang_KunsangDhondrup 127-128)

We see some examples of reported speech extended to include the reporting of the sounds made by inanimate objects. We have included these tokens as 'pragmatic' rather than 'semantic', as they all relate to the sound the earthquake made. Therefore, it is quite possible that this was a creative context-specific extension of the reported speech verb in the narrative to increase the animacy of the earthquake and heighten immediacy. In (40) the speaker uses the very *ŋe* 'say', for the onomatopoeia that represents the sound of the earthquake shaking.

40) saŋgul   mane uso   kim-dI   ṇda   [sjararak   ṇda
    earthquake   always like.this   house-PL   here   [ONOM   here

    sjararak]   **ŋe**-ba   so-ba
    ONOM]   **say**-PST   like.this-PST
    'The earthquake was like this, and the houses here said 'boom boom' like this.'
    (Kutang_Bumchung 50)

This is a similar function to that reported in Saxena (1988: 381-382) for other Tibeto-Burman languages including Sherpa, Newar, Jirel and Magar.

6.3.2. Grammatical functions

Reported speech verbs have been grammaticalized into a variety of functions across Tibeto-Burman family, including as a complementizer, conditional and causative marker, as well as in place of the verb 'called' (Saxena 1988). We found a number of these functions across the narratives in our corpus.

The reported speech verb can be used for constructions that in English would use verbs such as 'called' or 'named'. We see this function in Kutang, Tsum and Nubri. The two examples below demonstrate that this is a way to for the interviewers to ask people their names at the beginning of the interviews, in both Kutang (41) and Nubri (42). A more literal translation would be 'what do you say your name is?'

41) mom   mom   na   miŋ   tsa   **ŋɛ**   jaŋ
    grandmother grandmother 2   name what   **say**   COP
    'Grandmother, grandmother, what is your name?'
    (Kutang_LhenzanBhuti 3, interviewer)

42) *ibi*   *miŋ*   *tɕi*   ***lap***   *jø*
grandmother   name   what   **say**   AUX
'What is (your) name, Grandma?'
(Nubri_NyimaChoden 3, interviewer)

All of the examples form Kutang use the above formulation, while in the Nubri recordings there are examples of the interviewer asking for the narrator's name without the 'say' verb (43).

43) *jetsi*   *miŋ*   *tɕi*   ***re***
elder.sister   name   what   **COP**
'What is (your) name, sister?'
(Nubri_DawaDolma_4, interviewer)

The use of the reported speech verb for 'called' functions is also found in declaratives, for animate human (44) and animate non-human (45) references in the narratives.

44) *talomo*   ***ŋɛ***   *jaŋ*
Talomo   **say**   COP
'Her name is Talomo.'
(Kutang_LhenzanBhuti_40)

45) *satak tawatʃhe*   *lap-ken*   *di*
king.of.land   say-NMLZ   DEF
 'it is called Satak Tawache.'
(Nubri_LakpaDhiki_118)

This is a common function across the Tibeto-Burman family, and was observed by Saxena (1988: 380-381) in a number of languages both closely related to the languages in this corpus, and more broadly.

The same verb of saying that acts as the reported speech verb can also act as the verb for 'speak'. In Syuba, and marginally in Kutang, the same very for 'say' is used for 'speak'. In example (46) we see the interviewer use the phrase *tam là-tera* 'language speak-IPFV'.

46) *ló*   *tsìtsi* *ŋì-ni* *ènɖaba-ra* ***tám***   *là-tera*
PART   aunt   1PL-FOC this.way-EMPH **language**   **speak**-IPFV

òŋ-kyok   *òole*
come-PFV   and.then
'Oh, auntie we came to speak with you in this way, and now.'
(Syuba_LhamuLama 174, interviewer)

The verb of saying is also used frequently in Syuba in conditional constructions (47).

47) *ma-lo*   ***là-na**-ni*   *u:*   *mi-si-ge*
NEG-return   **say-COND**-FOC   1PL.EX   NEG-die-NON.PST
'if it does not return, we will not die.'
(Syuba_SomMaya 864)

This use of the reported verb in conditional constructions is also attested in the related Yolmo language (Gawne 2016a: 130), and in the Tibeto-Burman family more broadly (Saxena 1988).

6.3.3. Summary of polyfunctionality

Above, we have described some of the different functions that reported speech exhibits within the genre of earthquake survivor narratives. Although frequency counts are quite low across all these functions the different functions of the reported speech verb are across our sample of languages vary in frequency. Even in closely related languages we observe different distributions. For example, 'say' used as a verb of calling/naming is fairly frequent in Nubri (used 8 times), but not so in Tsum (used twice). Similarly, 'say' as a verb of cognition is found in the Manange narratives, but not in Nar. Syuba is the only language where the verb for 'say' is also used regularly in the narratives for the intransitive verb 'to speak' (11 times, the only other example is once in Kutang), and along with Nar is one of the only languages where we see the reported speech verb grammaticalized into a conditional. There is no clear split of functions by family groupings of Tibetic and Tamangic, which suggests to us that variation in function may be innovative and recent across languages. It is also possible that larger corpora would turn up these functions in more of the languages. There are also likely attested uses of reported speech verb forms that include functions that we did not encounter in our survey, such as use as a 'purposive' to indicate intention of action, which Saxena (1988: 377) notes is a function of 'say' in Lisu. Just as we have seen diversity across this small group of languages, some of which are very closely related, we expect that more analysis of reported speech in Tibeto-Burman languages that is interactionally-focused will lead to other functions that are not attested in our survey. This reinforces that 'polyfunctionality' is not a single 'idiosyncratic property' of reported speech as per Spronck (2017), but a cluster of semantic, pragmatic and grammatical possibilities for the use of reported speech forms that can vary, even between closely related languages.

6.4. Zero-marked reported speech

In Section 4 we discussed the prevalence of reported speech without overt subjects. In this section we discuss examples that appear to be reported information, but the report is not overtly encoded via any lexical or evidential strategy. This is an established phenomenon cross-linguistically known as 'zero quotatives' (Mathis & Yule 1994; see Spronck 2017: 105 for more), also known as 'free indirect discourse' (Banfield 1973:10-13; Eckhardt 2012; Maier 2015). Zero-marked speech is worth studying, as it demonstrates that it is possible to make a report that does not rely on overtly marked grammatical or lexical strategies.

Sometimes it is possible to identify reported speech because of prosodic and grammatical features. In the first line of (48) we see a prohibitive *tshoŋ-dzimja* 'don't run',

and in the second line we see an imperative *bhjakpa the* 'sit down!' This along with the emphatic prosody, and a subtle headshake[11] from the narrator that co-occurs with the prohibitive indicate that this segment is distinct from the rest of the narrative.

48) *tshoŋ-dzimja*   *tshoŋ-dzimja*   *di*
run-PROHIB   run-PROHIB   there

saŋgul   *him*   *saŋgul*   *la*
earthquake   COP   earthquake   DM

tshoŋla   *kaŋba* *tʃhakaŋ*   *himdi* *sawela*   *bhjakpa*   *the*
run   leg   squat(Nep)   COP   break   deteriorate   sit.IPFV
'Then we should not run (I said). It's an earthquake. If we run, (our) leg(s) will break, sit down!'
(Tsum_TsewangRigzin 33-35)

This example, with the speaker reporting their own extended passage of speech at a key point in the story where the earthquake is in process, supports Mathis and Yule's (1994: 74) observation that zero-marked speech can be used as a strategy to heighten immediacy in a narrative.

We are aware that it can be difficult to ascertain in a corpus of spontaneous narratives like this whether such zero-marked reported speech does occur. We discuss several examples of information in narratives that appear to be derived from knowledge that was reported. We find them to be of interest because they indicate that even when speakers have lexical and grammatical strategies to mark source of information, they are not compelled to do so for all information across a narrative.

A common theme across the narratives is narrator discussion of how there is rampant speculation about when the next earthquake will be. We see examples of this kind of rumor, discussed with no overt marking with either a particle or a lexical verb (49).

---

[11] We do not consider this headshake to be a 'marker' of reported speech as per mentioned in Spronck (2017) in the way that we consider grammatical or lexical strategies to be, as modified prosody and gestures of these kind can be used for a number of functions, and do not independently consistently mark reported speech, in contrast to, say, other recurrent 'pragmatic' gestures, which consistently correlate with particular grammatical structures (Kendon 2018).

49) *pʰalam* *dan* *mi-kja* *[pʰalam* *ŋaro* *naŋmaŋ*
  again now person-PL [again tomorrow after.tomorrow

  ɲimu *di* *tsʰewa* *tɕilo* *woraŋ* *aũsi-la* *wo̞* *ɲimu* *di*
  day this date that 1PL thirtieth-LOC DEM day PART

  jaŋ *lep-woŋ* *gokpo* *samdʑi* *lep-woŋ]*
  again arrive-come bad like arrive-come]
  'The people are (saying), again…tomorrow… the day after tomorrow, that is, we…on
  Aunsi… It will hit again in that day. The very bad one (earthquake) will hit.'
  (Nubri_DawaDolma 168-170)

6.5. Pragmatic and interactional features of reported speech: A summary

Deictic shift in these languages is seen with pronouns reorienting, but the evidential form remains that of the original speaker. Within the narrative reported speech can be a way to mark high discourse status of key information in the narrative. Reported speech forms can have a variety of semantic and grammatical functions. Semantic functions include reporting speech, thought and the noise made by inanimate objects. Grammatical functions include 'named/called' and 'speak' constructions and conditionals. These narratives also include examples of 'zero-marked reported speech', where the report does not include any overt verbal marking.

7. Conclusion

This article has presented an exploration of the nature of reported speech in thematically consistent narratives across six Tibetic, Tamangic and Ghale languages. Our aim has been to understand what pragmatic or lexico-grammatical strategies or elements can be observed in the context of reported speech in these languages, given the observations of robust, productive reported speech strategies in closely related languages.

  We have demonstrated that an analysis of reported speech in all of these languages is complicated by low referential density and optional ergative marking. Hybrid reported speech, a feature commonly observed in Tibetic languages, is not frequent in these narratives.

  Structurally, we found that speakers make relatively little use of grammaticalized evidential structures for reported speech, but that lexical reported speech also demonstrates evidential effects, and an effect of the restrictions on 'access to knowledge' that are usually discussed in relation to the evidential system. Additionally, we looked at how reported speech can scope over a number of clauses in a narrative, showing a flexibility not demonstrated by other embedding-type grammatical phenomena.

  Pragmatically, reported speech serves a variety of discourse-interactional functions, including deictic shift, as well as epistemic and evidential shifts. We also examined how reported speech demonstrates 'prominent subordination', providing key information at

critical points in the narrative. Finally, we examined what Spronck (2017) terms the 'polyfunctionality' of reported speech. We demonstrated that in these narratives reported speech can have semantic, pragmatic and grammatical functions, but not all languages in the corpus showed the same range of types or functions.

These findings, and the discourse structures from which we make our observations, hopefully will clear pathways for research and reporting on the nature of reported speech in other languages of the region. What is most apparent is that descriptive work on reported speech would benefit from a focus on corpora of spontaneous language use, to best understand the structural and interactional properties of reported speech in a particular language. Reported speech cannot be considered in isolation, but must be accounted for in relation to other grammatical phenomena, as well as in regard to the variation in reported speech.

Abbreviations

1 first person	DEM demonstrative	NMLZ nominalizer
2 second person	DM discourse marker	NON.PST non-past
3 third person	EGO egophoric evidential	ONOM onomatopoeia
ADV adverbial	EMPH emphatic	PART particle
ALL allative	ERG ergative	PFV perfective
AUX auxiliary	EVID evidential	PL plural
CC clause chain	EX exclusive	POSS possessive
CLS classifier	FOC focus	POSB possibility
COP copular	GEN genitive	PROHIB prohibitive
COMP complementizer	HORT hortative	PROX proximal
COND conditional	IMP imperative	PST past tense
CONC concommitive	INF infinitive	Q question
CVB converb	IPFV imperfective	REP reported evidential
DAT dative	LOC locative	SENS sensory evidential
DEF definite	NEG negation	SG singular

1 References

2 Adhikari, Sujan Raj, Gopi Baysal, Amod Dixit, Stacey S. Martin, Mattieu Landes, Remy Bossu,
3   & Susan E. Hough. 2017. Toward a unified near-field intensity map of the 2015 Mw 7.8
4   Gorkha, Nepal, earthquake. *Earthquake Spectra* 33(S1). S21-S34.
5 Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6 Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. Evidentiality: The Basics. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.),
7   *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 1-41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8 Ameka, Felix. K. 2004. Grammar and cultural practices: The grammaticalization of triadic
9   communication in West African languages. *Journal of West African Languages* 30(2).
10   5-28.
11 Banfield, Anne. 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech.
12   *Foundations of Language* 10(1). 1-39.
13 Bickel, Balthasar. 2003. Referential density in discourse and syntactic typology. *Language*
14   79(4). 708-736.

Bickel, Balthasar, Bernard Comrie & Martin Haspelmath. 2008. *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme by morpheme glosses.* www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules

Bond, Oliver, Kristine Hildebrandt & Dubi N. Dhakal. 2015. *Conditions on Differential Ergative Case Marking.* Poster presented at the 89th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Portland, OR, January 8-11, 2015.

Bond, Oliver & Kristine Hildebrandt. 2013. *Optional ergative case marking: what can be expressed by its absence?* Presentation at the 10th biennial Meeting of Association for Linguistic Typology, Leipzig, August 15-18, 2013.

Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. *Quotatives: New trends and sociolinguistic implications*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chappel, Hilary. 2012. Say in Sinitic: from Verba Dicendi to attitudinal discourse markers. In Johan van der Auwera & Jan Nuyts (eds), *Grammaticalization and (inter-)subjectification*, 81-110. Wetteren: Universa Press.

Chelliah, Shobhana & Gwendolyn Hyslop. 2011. Introduction to special issue on optional case marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 34(2). 1-7.

Childs, Geoff, Sienna Craig, Duni Nanda Dhakal, Mark Donohue & Kristine Hildebrandt. 2017. Narrating disaster through participatory research: Perspectives from post-earthquake Nepal. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 10(1). 207-236.

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

DeLancey, Scott. 1991. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(3). 289-322.

DeLancey, Scott. 2002. Relativization and nominalization in Bodic. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 28(2). 55-72.

DeLancey, Scott. 2018. Evidentiality in Tibetic. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 580-594. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Deutscher, Guy. 2011. The grammaticalization of quotatives. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 646-655. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dhakal, Dubi Nanda. 2018. *A Nubri lexicon*. Munich: Lincom.

Ding, Picus. 2014. *A grammar of Prinmi*. Leiden: Brill.

Donohue, Mark & Dubi Nanda Dhakal. 2016. *A Tsum lexicon*. Munich: Lincom.

Eckhardt, Regine. 2012. Particles as speaker indexicals in free indirect discourse. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 35-36. 99-109.

Evans, Nicholas. 2012. Some problems in the typology of quotation: a canonical approach. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 66-98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Floyd, Simeon, Elisabeth Norcliffe & Lila San Roque (2018). *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Garrett, Edward. 2001. *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan*. PhD Thesis. Los Angeles: University of. California Los Angeles

Gawne, Lauren (collector). 2009. *Kagate (Nepal)* (SUY1). Digital collection managed by PARADISEC [Open Access]. DOI: 10.4225/72/56E976A071650

Gawne, Lauren. 2013. *Lamjung Yolmo copulas in use: evidentiality, reported speech and questions*. PhD Thesis. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne.

Gawne, Lauren. 2015. The reported speech evidential particle in Lamjung Yolmo. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 38(2). 292-318.

Gawne, Lauren. 2016a. *A sketch grammar of Lamjung Yolmo*. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.

Gawne, Lauren. 2016b. Reported speech evidentiality in Tibeto-Burman languages. *Workshop on typological profiles of language families of South Asia*. Uppsala: September 15-16.

Gawne, Lauren, Barbara F. Kelly, Andrea L. Berez- Kroeker & Tyler Heston. 2017. Putting practice into words: The state of data and methods transparency in grammatical descriptions. L*anguage Documentation & Conservation* 11: 157-189.

Gawne, Lauren & Kristine A . Hildebrandt. 2017. Reported speech evidentiality in corpora of earthquake narratives in Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal. *Association for Linguistic Typology 12*. Canberra: December 11-15.

Gawne, Lauren. & Nathan W. Hill (eds). 2017. *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*. Berlin/Boston: Mouton.

Genetti, Carol. 2005. The participial construction of Dolakhā Newar: syntactic implications of an Asian converb. *Studies in Language* 29(1). 35-87.

Genetti, Carol. 2007. *A grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Genetti, Carol. 2011. The tapestry of Dolakha Newar: Chaining, embedding, and the complexity of sentences. *Linguistic Typology* 15(1): 5-24.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Hari, Anna Maria. 2010. *Yohlmo Sketch Grammar*. Kathmandu: Ekta books.

Haßler, Gerda. 2002. Evidentiality and reported speech in Romance languages. In: Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds), *Reported discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains,* 143-172. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1989. Layers and operators in functional grammar. *Journal of Linguistics* 25. 127-57.

Hildebrandt, Kristine A. 2004. A grammar and glossary of the Manange language. In Carol Genetti (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: Manange and Sherpa,* 1-192*.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Hildebrandt, Kristine A. & Oliver Bond. 2017. Manange. In Randy J. LaPolla & Graham Thurgood (eds), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages* (2nd edn), 516-533. London: Routledge.

Hildebrandt, Kristine A., Tanner Burge-Beckley, & Jacob Sebok. 2019. Language documentation in the aftermath of the 2015 Nepal earthquakes: A guide to two archives and a web exhibit. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13. 618-651.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Close Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, Ken. 2012. Genre and discourse analysis in language for specific purposes. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Wiley. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0452

Jacques, Guillaume. 2016. Complementation in Japhug. *Linguistics of the Tibeto Burman Area* 39(2). 222-281.

Kendon, Adam. 2018. Pragmatic functions of gestures: Some observations on the history of their study and their nature. *Gesture* 16(2): 157-175.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. "Ergative" marking in Tibeto-Burman. In Yoshio Nishi, James A. Matisoff & Yasuhiko Nagano (eds), *New horizons in Tibeto-Burman morphosyntax,* 189-228. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Lausberg, Hedda & Hans Sloetjes. 2009. Coding gestural behavior with the NEUROGES-ELAN system. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 41(3). 841-849. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.3.591.

Li, Charles N. 1986. Direct and indirect speech: A functional study. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech,* 29-45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lyons, John. 1968. *Theoretical linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maier, Emar. 2015. Quotation and unquotation in free indirect discourse. *Mind & Language* 30(3). 345-373.

Mathis, Terrie & George Yule. 1994. Zero quotatives. *Discourse Processes* 18(1). 63-76.

Mazaudon, Martine. 2017. Tamang. In Randy J. LaPolla & Graham Thurgood (eds), *The Sino-Tibetan languages* (2nd edn), 468-493. London: Routledge.

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

McGregor, William B. 1997. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McGregor, William B. 2008. Complementation as interpersonal grammar. *WORD* 59(1-2). 25-53.

McGregor, William B. 2010. Optional ergative case marking systems in a typological-semiotic perspective. *Lingua* 120. 1610-1636.

Michael, Lev. 2012. Nanti self-quotation: Implications for the pragmatics of reported speech and evidentiality. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2). 321-357.

Mushin, Ilana. 2001. *Evidentiality and epistemological stance: Narrative retelling*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Noonan, Michael. 2006. Grammar writing for a grammar-reading audience. *Studies in Language* 30(2). 351-365.

Noonan, Michael. 2008. Nominalization in Bodic languages. In María José Lópes-Couso & Elena Seoane (eds), *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives*, 219-273. Amsterdam: Bemjamins.

Noonan, Michael & Kristine A. Hildebrandt. 2017. Nar-Phu. In Randy J. LaPolla & Graham Thurgood (eds), *The Sino-Tibetan languages* (2nd edn), 534-556. London: Routledge.

Owen-Smith, Thomas. 2014. *Grammatical Relations in Tamang, a Tibeto-Burman Language of Nepal*. PhD Thesis. London: SOAS.

Prakash, Rajesh, Ravi Kant Singh & H.N. Srivastava. 2016. Nepal earthquake 25 April 2015: source parameters, precursory pattern and hazard assessment. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk* 7(6). 1769-1784.

Reesink, Ger P. 1993. "Inner speech" in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24. 217-25

Rumsey, Alan, 1982. An intra-sentence grammar of Ungarinjin, North-Western Australia. Canberra: *Pacific Linguistics*.

Rumsey, Alan. 2010. 'Optional' ergativity and the framing of reported speech. *Lingua* 120(7). 1652-1676.

San Roque, Lila & Robin Loughnane. 2012. The New Guinea Highlands evidentiality area. *Linguistic Typology* 16. 111-167.

Saxena, Anju. 1988. On syntactic convergence: the case of the verb "say" in Tibeto-Burman. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1988)*, 375-388.

SIL International & HIS Nepal (eds.). 2016. *Syuba - Nepali - English dictionary*. Kathmandu: SIL International and HIS Nepal.

So-Hartmann, Helga. 2009. *A Descriptive Grammar of Daai Chin*. PhD Thesis. Berkely: University of California.

Spronck, Stef. 2016. Evidential fictive interaction (in Ungarinyin and Russian). In Esther Pascual & Sergeiy Sandler (eds), *The Conversation Frame: Forms and Functions of Fictive Interaction,* 255-275. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Spronck, Stef. 2017. Defenestration: deconstructing the frame-in relation in Ungarinyin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 114. 104-133.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 1996. *L'Ergativite en tibetain: approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlee.* Paris: Peeters.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2008. Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan In Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart, Paul Widmer & Peter Schwieger (eds), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek, Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier*, 281-308. Saale: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2014. The Tibetic languages and their classification. In Thomas Owen-Smith & Nathan W. Hill (eds), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics, historical and descriptive linguistics of the Himalayan area,* 105-130. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2017. A typological sketch of evidential/epistemic categories in the Tibetic languages. In Lauren Gawne & Nathan W. Hill (eds), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 95-130. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Tournadre, Nicolas & Randy J. LaPolla. 2014. Towards a new approach to evidentiality: Issues and directions for research. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(2). 240-263.

Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2004. Deixis and grounding in speech and thought representation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(3). 489-520.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2011. The functions of represented speech and thought in Umpithamu narratives. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 31(4). 491-517.

Voort, Hein van der. 2002. The quotative construction in Kwaza and its (de-) grammaticalisation. In Mily Crevels, Simon van de Kerke, Sérgio Meira & Hein van der Voort (eds), *Current studies on South American languages Indigenous languages of Latin America* 3, pp. 307-328.

Webster, Jeff. 1992. *A Socio-linguistic Survey of the Tibeto-Burman Dialects of North Gorkha District, Nepa*l. Ms.

Widmer, Manuel. 2014. *A descriptive grammar of Bunan*. PhD dissertation. Bern: University of Bern.

Willett, Thomas. 1988. 'A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality.' *Studies in Language* 12. 51-97.

Zemp, Marius. 2017. Evidentiality in Purik Tibetan. In Lauren Gawne & Nathan W. Hill (eds), *Evidential systems of Tibetan languages*, 261-296. Berlin: Mouton.

Appendix A

Data for five of the six languages are drawn from the Open Access corpus "Narrating Disaster (Nepal)" (Childs et al. 2017), data from Syuba is part of the larger Open Access "Corpus of Syuba (Kagate)" materials (Gawne 2009). The data include the original recordings and ELAN transcription files. Those files include, minimally, transcription of the original speech and translation into Nepali and/or English. Many of the transcriptions also include interlinear glossing. All materials referenced in this article clearly state the language and include a citation code. This code allows the interested reader to examine the original materials.

The table below lists all of the recordings used in this analysis. Locations of all archives are given in §3. The Syuba recordings have an additional code, which links them to the digital archive they are housed in.

Recording	Language	Family	Participant	Lines	Minutes
Kutang_Bumchung			Bumchung	147	6.8
Kutang_KarmaChoekyi			Karma Choekyi	232	8.2
Kutang_KunsangDekey	Kutang	Ghale	Kunsang Dekey	114	6.5
Kutang_KunsangDhondrup			Kunsang Dhondrup	154	7.6
Kutang_LhenzanBhuti			Lhenzan Bhuti	114	6.5
Nar_KarsangChesangLama			Karsang Chesang Lama	112	4.9
Nar_MingmarTseringLama	Nar		Mingmar Tsering Lama	261	12.3
Nar_RiteChoepelLama		Tamangic	Rite Choepel Lama	160	6.8
Manange_AniChomoLama			Ani Chomo Lama	80	3.5
Manange_KarmaDolma	Manange		Karma Dolma	205	9.1
Manange_KanchaGurung			Kancha Gurung	493	10.9
Tsum_ChoezinDolmaLama			Choezin Dolma Lama	341	11.3
Tsum_SherapChoezom	Tsum		Sherap Choezom	252	11.3
Tsum_SonamDolma			Sonam Dolma	231	8.3
Tsum_TsewangRigzin			Tsewang Rigzin	276	10.8
Syuba_DathseringTamang (SUY1-160429-03)			Datshering Tamang	75	2.9
Syuba_LhamuLama (SUY1-160428-06)			Lhamu Lama	193	6.2
Syuba_NingmarTamang (SUY1-160417-02)	Syuba		Ningmar Tamang	154	8.6
Syuba_NirmayaTamang (SUY1-160425-11)		Tibetic	Nirmaya Tamang	151	4.6
Syuba_SomMaya (SUY1-160420-07)			Som Maya Tamang	216	8.8
Nubri_DawaDolma			Dawa Dolma	259	10.8
Nubri_LakpaDhiki			Lakpa Dhiki	134	6.2
Nubri_NyimaChoden	Nubri		Nyima Choden	127	4.5
Nubri_Tashi(Ebi)			Tashi (Ebi)	237	11.2
Nubri_TseringDekey			Tsering Dekey	97	2.4
Lowa_ChinyiAngmo	Lowa		Chinyi Angmo	270	9.5

1