

**Reported illocution:  
data from several Daghestanian languages**

Michael Daniel  
Moscow State University  
[daniel@qub.com](mailto:daniel@qub.com)

## 1. GENERALITIES

### Direct vs. indirect reported speech

Direct RS ‘impersonates’ the reported speaker; indirect RS re-tells the speech act from the actual viewpoint. Functional background behind switching from direct to indirect RS might be making it less energy-consuming for the hearer to analyze the information.

### Reference tracking

The most salient feature is the shift of deictic viewpoint to that of the speech act participant (change of pronouns).

(1) English/Russian

*He said, I am sorry. -> He said that he was sorry*

### Subordination

Direct RS in English / Russian looks like parataxis a juxtaposition of two clauses, one introducing the speech act, the other its content:

(2) English/Russian

*He said, I will wait*

In indirect RS in English/Russian, the speech act is introduced by the main clause to which the content is subordinate:

(3) English/Russian

*He said that he would wait.*

### Categories unavailable in indirect RS

Categories impossible (at least in their primary function) in indirect reporting In English/Russian: e.g. imperatives, addresses (vocatives), invectives...

(4) English/Russian

*He said, forgive me. -> He asked (me) to forgive him*

(but not \**He said that forgive me*)

(5) English/Russian

*He said, go away. -> He told me to go away. He said that I should go away.*

(but not \**He said that go away*)

Here, switching to indirect RS requires switching to a different speech verb and/or syntactic construction indicating the manipulative character of the reported speech act. Note, however, that in oral Russian discourse the constraints are not the same as in the literary norm.

Another non-reportable category is address.

(6) English/Russian

*He said, John, come and help me out -> He called John by name and asked him to come and help him out.*

(But not \**He said that John, come to help me*)

(7) English/Russian

*He said, you bastard, you robbed my house -> He called him names and said he robbed his house.*

(\**He said that bastard! he robbed his house*)

(Paducheva 1996 more or less identifies this property with insubordinatability)

## 2. OVERVIEW OF RS STRATEGIES IN SEVERAL DAGESTANIAN L-S.

Languages and sources – Archi (Kibrik et al. 1977; corpus of glossed texts; elicitations with Bulbul Musaeva), Agul (Merdanova with Daniel and Ganenkov 2006), Cahur (Kibrik et al. 1999), Bagvalal (Kibrik et al. 2001), Godoberi (Kibrik et al. 1996).

Competition of several strategies:

➤ zero-strategy, similar to direct speech in European, paratactical (juxtaposition of two clauses)

(8) Archi: zero strategy (parataxis)

jaša	wež	l'annu-t	a	bo-li
now	you.pl.DAT	beloved-4	4.do(IMP)	say.PF-EVID

*Now do what you want to do, he said.*

(9) Agul: zero strategy

dada	pu-ne	zun	hika-se	mašin
father(ERG)	say.PFV-PF	I	drive.IPFV-FUT	car

*Father said he'd drive the car.*

(10) Bagvalal: zero strategy

hē iši-r hel'i o-ṣ̌a: "iši ongiri ek'a-b  
then we.excl-ERG say this-OBL.M.SUP.LAT we.excl(NOM) there be-PTCP.N

b-as-imi-še-æ ʕali ʕalije ič-ṣ̌ā  
N-tell-?-PRH-RPRT name name-OBL.M.SUP.LAT

*Then we told him: don't tell Ali Alijevich that we were here.*

Clitic strategy: The other (clitic strategy below) uses a reportative clitic, often transparently derived from the basic speech verb. Some properties of the clitic strategy (in at least some languages):

- does not require any matrix speech verb (although may combine with it) – as in Bagvalal ex. above:
- in some cases, excludes the presence of matrix speech verb, as in Archi or in Agul:

(11) Agul: reportative clitic bans lexical speech verb

\*dada pu-ne Hüni bawa uza-se-ʕaj  
father(ERG) say.PFV-PF cow mother(ERG) milk.IPF-FUT-REPORTED  
*Dad said mom will milk the cow (i.e. don't worry about it)*

- Is a predicative head of the sentence, licensing its own arguments (ergative for the Speaker, a lative form for the Addressee), as in Archi

(12) Agul: two ergatives

dada Hüni bawa uza-se-ʕaj  
father(ERG) cow mother(ERG) milk.IPF-FUT-REPORTED  
*Dad said mom will milk the cow (i.e. don't worry about it)*

or even has its own (partial) paradigm, as in Archi:

(13) Archi: an auxiliary depending on the reportative clitic

jamu abaj k<sup>w</sup>alē-r-ši e < b > di-li  
that parents.ERG die-EVID-REPORTED-CVB <III>be.PF-EVID  
*Parents said he had died*

Note: Archi reportative is a clitic which forms phonological unity with its host (normally, the verb of the RS), but may have morphosyntactic links outside its phonological host – as in the example above).

**verb=[REPORTED AUXILIARY]**

- Third strategy is complementizer, but it is rare. Archi and Bagvalal lack speech verb complementizer; Cahur grammar suggests Cahur has one,

but it is not obvious how different it is from the Bagvalal case; probably,

Agul has one:

(14) Agul: complementizer strategy

dada pu-ne uč jaŋa mič quŋa-se puna

father (ERG) say.PFV-PF REFL today here.to come.back.IPFV-FUT CMPL

*Father said that he would come (back) here today.*

➤ All strategies use finite predicates in reported speech clauses

Finally, two points irrelevant for the purposes of this presentation – just for general information

➤ The strategies cover a wide range of usages, including mental processes and purposive clauses (in all languages considered) or hearsay evidential:

(15) Agul: outside speech verbs proper

gadaji meŋni q'u-ne uči-s me ruš k:ande-a puna

boy (ERG) song (ERG) make.PFV-PF refl-DAT this girl want-PRS CMPL

*The boy sang that he loved the girl.*

(16) Agul: hearsay evidential

dad bagah quŋ<sub>w</sub>a-se-ŋaj

father tomorrow come.back.IPFV-FUT-RPRT

*Father is coming back tomorrow, they say.*

(17) Archi: 'X-called person'

haži nust'apa:-r-ši ɫ:aɪma-t:u bošor e<w>di

Hazhi Mustapa-RPRT-CVB rich-ATTR man <I>be.PST

*There was a rich man called Hazhi-Nustapa*

(18) Archi: purposive subordination

χīta ju-w-mu jašul adam i-r-kus bo-li š̌it' + bo-li

then this-1-OBL.1(ERG) inside person(NOM) 8.be-INTRG-VERIF say.PF-CVB whistle SAY.PF-EVID  
*He wistled in order to know whether there was anybody inside the palace. (lit. to know whether anybody is inside, having said)*

[The first idea that comes to mind is that zero strategy corresponds to zero strategy in English/Russian, and the clitic strategy corresponds to subordinative indirect strategy in English/Russian.]

### 3. REFERENCE ISSUES

Daghestanian languages may use direct ~ indirect ~ logophoric mode of reference in the same morphosyntactic strategy (clitic strategy). Cf. Archi:

(19) Archi: first person refers to the reported speaker (direct reference)

l'eIr-t:ib      olo              ik<sup>w</sup>-mul-če-s  
hot-ATTR-PL   we.excl.GEN   heart-PL-OBL.PL-DAT  
š:ax<sup>w</sup>-du-t    wi-t              tapanči-li-n    gulla    b-ežd-ē-t'o-r.  
rusty-ATTR-IV   your.SG-IV    gun-OBL-GEN   bullet   III-enter.PF-POT.NEG-NEG-REPORTED  
*The bullet of your rusty gun will not enter our hot hearts, they say.*

(20) Archi clitic strategy: first person refers to the actual speaker (indirect reference)

to-w-mu      ašba-r,              žu              ez      ow-qe-r  
that-I-ERG    caution-RPRT   LOG.ERG      I.DAT   do.IV.PF-POT-REPORTED  
*Just wait, he says, he will show it to me (he will teach me a lesson), he says.*

(21) Archi clitic strategy: logophoric marking

to-w-mu    zon    žu-ł:u              ł:<sup>w</sup>a              cili-ši              č'eba:-r  
that-I-ERG   I      LOG.OBL-COMIT   together      Azerbaijan-ALL   go.IIMP-REPORTED  
*He tells me, let's go to Azerbaijan together (with him).*

The same RS clause may combine two different modes of reference (cf. also the last Archi example):

(22) Archi: direct + logophoric

χīta šařat      os-mi-n      rigi-li-t              wār-ši              i<w>ti  
then    time(NOM)   one-OBL-GEN   time.span-OBL-SUP(ESS)   say.IPF-CVB.AUXDEP   <I>become.PF  
žu-n-er              žip-l-a              jašul aInš      ed-er  
LOGOPH.1.OBL-GEN-RPRT   pocket-OBL-IN(ESS)   inside   apple(NOM)   4.be.PF-RPRT  
wa-s              l'an-ši      χo-mč'iš-er  
you.sg.OBL-DAT   want-CVB   4.find.PF-COND-RPRT

*At 1 AM my husband tells me that he has an apple in his (jacket) pocket, if you (i.e. I) want one.*

(23) Bagvalal: direct + logophoric

in-š:<sup>w</sup>a              bišdi-b              as              q'oča-m-o      weč'e-ɬala  
log-OBL.M.DAT   you.PL-GEN.N   money   want-N-CVB   not.be-RPRT  
<...> *I don't want your money – he said <...>*

Possible mode of reference combinations are direct + logophoric or indirect + logophoric < apparently not direct + indirect.

Previously, I have argued that these are cases of inconsistent direct ~ indirect opposition. However, now I note that there are no examples where direct and indirect modes of reference are combined; either of them may combine with logophoric reference, but not with each other (at least in my examples and in the examples quoted in grammars). Thus, if we admit that logophoric reference has a different nature from direct / indirect RS distinction, the utterances quote above become consistent – at least they obviously do not

place the hearer in an awkward situation trying to decipher which of the ‘I’ and ‘you’ pronouns has been used in the same clause with direct or indirect mode of reference.

- zero strategy: using direct reference and no logophorics
- clitic strategy: using direct and indirect modes of reference and combines them with logophoric (when applicable); logophoric reference may be obligatory (Archi, Agul)
- complementizer strategy (Agul) requires logophorics and indirect reference

#### 4. RE-ARRANGED MAPPING

(The explanation that I present below, may be in slightly my own terms, in fact is suggested by Svetlana Toldova in a small paper of 1999 – or at least one may come to these conclusions following her lines)

It follows from (Toldova 1999) that the two main strategies of reporting speech in Daghestanian should be paralleled typologically not with the typical direct vs. indirect speech means in English/Russian, but with weaker indirect reportative means like the Russian *дежкать, мол* (while Agul complementizer strategy may well be a closer parallel to English/Russian *that/что* subordinative strategies).

(24) Russian: the case of *мол* and *дежкать*

(a) *Он<sub>i</sub> говорит, он<sub>j</sub> мол, болен, ты<sub>hearer</sub> сходи.*  
 he:NOM say:PRS:3SG he:NOM RPRT ill:M:NOM:SG you.sg:NOM go:IMP

*He says that he is sick and that you should go.*

(b) *Он<sub>i</sub> говорит, я<sub>j</sub> мол, болен, ты<sub>speaker</sub> сходи.*  
 he:NOM say:PRS:3SG I:NOM RPRT ill:M:NOM:SG you.sg:NOM go:IMP

*He says that he is sick and that I should go.*

As I said before, these utterances may be ambiguous (just as Daghestanian utterances discussed above) in the sense that there are no formal signals which mode of reference is used – however, they are either consistently direct or consistently indirect) Either direct or indirect, but consistent.

The parallel is not only good for reference tracking issues: *мол* typologically matches Daghestanian reportative clitics in that it:

- originates from a speech verb (*молвить*)
- allows both direct and indirect reference of personal pronouns
- is not a subordination strategy
- has strong evidential (hearsay) connotations

In other words, the correct mapping of reporting strategies is not the one that on the left of the figure but that on the right of the figure. The problem is that one first attempts the left side of the table, trying to compare the two central strategies in English/European on the one hand and in Daghestanian, on the other.

Table 1 – Correspondance between major strategies

	European	Daghestanian	European	Daghestanian	
direct	zero	↔ zero	zero	↔ zero	↑ direct ↓ indirect
			<i>МОЛ</i>	↔ clitic	
indirect	subordinative	↔ clitic	subordinative ↔	subordinative	
	<i>(wrong approach)</i>		<i>(more efficient approach)</i>		

## 5. REPORTING IMPERATIVES

Imperatives are readily reported not only in the zero strategy, but also in the clitic strategy, and even in complementizer strategy in Agul.

(25) Godoberi (Haspelmath in Kibrik et al ed., 1996: 185)

im-u-di t'alab ĩhi waš-u-č'u-ru in-š-o k'aχati  
 father-OBL-ERG demand do.PST son-OBL-CONT-EL self.OBL-OBL.M-ERG letter(NOM)

q<sub>o</sub>ard-ā-l'u  
 write-IMP-CIT

*Father demanded of his son that he writes a letter.*

(26) Bagvalal (Kalinina in Kibrik et al ed, 2001: 518)

hē iši-r heL'i o-š<sub>o</sub>a: "iši onğiri  
 then we.excl-ERG say this-OBL.M.SUP.LAT we.excl(NOM) there

ek'a-b b-as-imi-še-ke řali řalije ič-š<sub>o</sub>ā  
 be-PTCP.N N-tell-?-PRH-RPRT name name-OBL.M.SUP.LAT

*Then we told him: don't tell Ali Alijevich that we were here.*

(27) Archi (Kibrik 1977, examples)

za:r-ši          marči-maj    naL'    oq'e-r  
I.CONT-ALL    every-PL.ERG    milk    give.IMP-REPORTED  
*Everybody tell me to give milk.*

(28) Agul (Merdanova et al. 2006)

naq'          dada          pu-ne          za-s          jaša          mič          qišaw          puna  
yesterday    father (ERG)    say.PFV-PF    I-DAT    today    here.to    come.back(IMP)    CMPL  
*Father told me yesterday that he would come (back) here today.*

In terms of the Table above, imperative reporting has an Almost complete match between Daghestanian and English/Russian (except for Agul complementizer strategy). But the more important question is:

Are imperatives reported in strategies other than zero strategy indicators of direct speech? On one hand, they have very good reasons to be non-reportable indirectly and are not reported in indirect speech in English/Russian. They are as strongly attached to the speech act as deictics are, and even stronger:

- imperatives require a speaker and a hearer, and if something happens with the speaker ~ hearer reference, why should imperatives be left untouched?
- imperatives require presence of the hearer-addressee because they include a manipulative component

These are arguments in favor of saying that imperatives are intrinsically direct speech category.

However:

- unlike direct reference of personal pronouns, imperatives are combined with indirect reference items, as in (the examples like that are not unique):

(29) Archi: imperative combines with indirect reference

šal-a          bo-li          parčaḥ-li-s    melle-tu-t lo          ow-li  
fox-OBL(ERG)    say.PF-EVID    king-OBL-DAT    male-ATR-4    child(NOM)    4.do.PF-EVID  
bo-li,—          zon          c'or          oci-s          zaba-r-ši          i",—    bo-li.  
say.PF-EVID    I.NOM    name(NOM)    4.stand-INF    come.IMP-RPRT-CVB.AUX    4.AUX    say.PF-EVID  
*The fox said: a child was born to the king, I am being summoned to give him a name*  
(lit. I to give the name come they say)

- Probably, morphosyntactic factors there – ban on subordinated imperatives? (Paduceva 1996) – accounts for the fact that English/Russian do not allow imperatives in indirect speech while Daghestanian allow with clitic strategy – the latter is clearly less subordinative (but, again, why Agul with the complementizer strategy then?) (we are ready to say that it all boils down to subordination, as Paduceva who largely identifies the non-quotability and non-subordinatability)



➤ another explanation – reporting imperatives by imperatives is just a typological option substituting for special lexical and subordination strategies used in English/Russian (cf. ex. 4 and 5 above – but then it follows that imperatives are no problem for indirect reporting, contrary to what has just been discussed, and it is unclear why English invents special strategies to report them indirectly in the first place)

## 6. REPORTING ADDRESSES

Addresses are irreportable indirectly:

Addresses, on the contrary, are just as irreportable in indirect contexts as in Russian/English, or almost. If we come back to the previous context, the primary reaction to its version with the pronoun substituted by a vocative form was firmly rejected:

(30) Archi: clitic strategy bans vocatives

a. \*s̄ōl,                      c'or                      oci-s                      zaba-r  
fox(NOM).EXCL name(NOM) 4.stand-INF come.IMP

*Hey fox, come to give a name (to the child)! – they said.*

b. s̄ōl,                      c'or                      oci-s                      zaba                      bo-li  
fox(NOM).EXCL name(NOM) 4.stand-INF come.IMP say.PF-EVID

*Hey fox, come to give a name (to the child)! – they said.*

(31) Archi: vocative requires ‘external’ interpretation

buwo,                      zaba-r  
mother.EXCL come.IMP-RPRT

*Mom, he’s calling (me or you or someone else)*

(lit. ‘Mom (speaker<sub>i</sub>’s mother), come, he<sub>j=1</sub> says’ - not the mother of the reported speaker but of the actual speaker)

(32) Agul: vocatives irreportable in complementizer strategy

\*naq’      dada                      pune                      za-s      žan      k’irk’      mič      qišaw                      puna  
yesterday father (ERG) say.PFV-PF I-DAT dear sonny here.to come.back(IMP) CMPL

*Father told me: sonny, come back here.*

(33) Agul: vocatives irreportable in the clitic strategy

\*dada      gadaji-s      ja      žan      k’irk’      mič      šaw-ɣaj  
father (ERG) son-DAT VOC dear son here.to come (IMP)-REPORTED

*Dad says to the boy, sonny, come here.*

Just to be totally frank – here is the only example I found of reporting an address in combination with reportative particle (according to Cahur grammar, even in subordinative context)

(34) Cahur (Ljutikova, Bonch-Osmolovskaya in Kibrik ed. 1999: 525) – possible counterexample

ič-ē        iwho-jn:    gade,    dal    hil-e-wi  
 girl-ERG   say.PF-A   boy    stick   4.give-IMP-RPRT  
*The girl said, hey boy, give me the stick.*

But on the whole, vocatives clearly tend to be limited to zero strategies. The possible reason might be the same as one of the reasons for imperatives:

➤ address requires presence of the hearer-addressee because it includes a manipulative component (in this case, manipulating the addressee’s communicative behavior)

This is similar to imperatives; however, the imperatives are reported in all strategies, while vocatives are reported with zero strategy only.

➤ possibly, some morphosyntactic factors such as vocatives being morphosyntactically independent clauses, ‘satellite utterances’

(close to Paducheva’s approach; what about reporting utterances with fronted topic? but that would not explain why imperatives are not reported in English/Russian) Anyway, here is the final version of the table \_ above is as follows:

**Table 1 - updated**

	<u>European</u>	<u>Daghestanian</u>
direct reference reporting imperatives reporting vocatives	zero  <i>МОП</i>	zero  clitic
		reporting vocatives reporting imperatives reference direct logophoric reference

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

- One of the main strategy of reporting speech in Daghestanian, the use of reportative clitics, is not parallel to subordinative indirect speech in English/Russian but to the strategy attested in European only peripherally - мол- strategy in Russian (Toldova 1999 and consequences)
- By and large, reporting vocatives belongs to the prototypical direct speech domain
- Imperatives are however easily reported in any strategy in Daghestanian
- The reason why imperatives and vocatives should behave differently is unclear (it is even unclear whether this happens because the table \_ is wrong, or because imperatives behave differently, or the division of labour between direct and indirect is different in different languages.

## REFERENCES

- Kibrik 1977: Кибрик А.Е. и др. Опыт структурного описания арчинского языка. МГУ. М., 1977.
- Kibrik et al. (eds) 1996: Godoberi. Lincom Europa.
- Kibrik et al. (eds) 1999: Элементы цахурского языка в типологическом освещении. Москва.
- Kibrik et al. (eds) 2001: Багвалинский язык. Грамматика, тексты, словари. Москва.
- Kibrik, in prep.: e-corpus of Archi: A.E. Kibrik, A. Arkhipov, M. Daniel, S. Kodzasov (supported by the NSF grant ‘Five languages of Eurasia’, with software support by A.D. Nakhimovski and Tom Myers)
- Merdanova, Daniel, Ganenkov 2006: Reported speech in Agul (a paper read at the Paris Caucasian Morphosyntax Workshop in December of 2006)
- Paducheva 1996: Падучева Е.В. Семантические исследования. Москва.

Toldova 1999: Толдова С.Ю. Особенности местоименной референции при передаче чужой речи (между дейксисом и анафорой). Труды международного семинара Диалог'99