

DENYS TEPTIUK

Quotative Indexes in Finno-Ugric  
(Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian,  
Finnish and Estonian)





**DENYS TEPTIUK**

Quotative Indexes in Finno-Ugric  
(Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian)



Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,  
University of Tartu

Dissertation accepted for the commencement of the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019 by the Committee of the Institute of Estonian  
and General Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Tartu

Supervisors: Professor Gerson Klumpp, University of Tartu  
Associate Professor Anne Tamm, Károli Gáspár University of  
the Reformed Church in Hungary

Opponent: PhD habil. Petar Kehayov, Leibniz Institute for East and  
Southeast European Studies

Commencement: Senate Room of the University of Tartu, Ülikooli St. 18, Tartu  
on December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019, at 14.15

This study has been supported by the Graduate School of Linguistics, Philosophy  
and Semiotics; funded by the European Regional Development Fund (University  
of Tartu ASTRA Project PER ASPERA).



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund



Investing  
in your future

ISSN 1406-2631  
ISBN 978-9949-03-221-1 (print)  
ISBN 978-9949-03-222-8 (pdf)

Copyright: Denys Teptiuk, 2019

University of Tartu Press  
[www.tyk.ee](http://www.tyk.ee)

## PREFACE

My scientific path started seven years ago back in 2012 when almost as a fresh graduate of the BA program in Finnish language and literature of Kyiv National Linguistic University, I decided to apply to the University of Tartu and pursue my studies in Finno-Ugric linguistics. This choice was not accidental. I was lucky to get this recommendation from my Finnish teacher at that moment Viivi Halme, for which I am grateful now. I am always happy to mention Viivi when I am asked about my background, how I had happened to end up in Estonia and why.

The two people I could never thank enough are my parents, Serhii and Valentyna Teptiuk, who were always supportive, both morally and financially during my MA times. No words will ever be enough to express my gratitude for their help and inspiration to pursue my academic career. I can only hope that my modest achievements make them proud of me. Also, I cannot forget my brother Valerii and his wife Yuliia who were always there for me and will always be a special part of my family. Дякую гарно!

The same words of eternal gratitude go to one of my supervisors, Gerson Klumpp, for being not only a perfect teacher and an amazing guide through my first steps as a researcher, but also a person who inspired me back in 2013 to research the topic that resulted first in an MA thesis and later on in a dissertation. Literally, this study could not have been written without Gerson's idea that quotative indexes could be an interesting field of study in Finno-Ugric linguistics and a good topic for an MA thesis. I am also grateful to Gerson for supporting the idea to continue this study and expand to other Finno-Ugric languages in the dissertation, caring about my needs and resources, teaching me the principles and peculiarities of scientific work, and helping out in times of need. I cannot thank him enough for reading a great amount of my drafts, tirelessly looking through my materials, correcting mistakes and giving helpful feedback on my abstracts and presentations, believing in my potential and involving me in scientific projects, which largely contributed to the beginning of my academic career. Vielen Dank für alles!

I would like to sincerely thank my second supervisor Anne Tamm for joining this project in 2016 and being a guide and teacher since then. Anne has brought a lot of new ideas into this study, largely helped with my drafts and proposals and always encouraged me to be an active member of the academic community. I was lucky to learn through co-operation with her. Anne's expertise in other fields helped me shape the directions of this study. She provided me an enormous support during my stay in Budapest, caring day and night about my academic and daily life needs. I am immensely grateful for all the help, contacts, feedback and counsel I have received during our work together.

I wish to thank the two independent reviewers of the dissertation – Petar Kehayov and Stef Spronck for their extensive and critical feedback. Their comments, suggestions and corrections helped me enormously in improving the manuscript of this dissertation. The responsibility for all remaining shortcomings

is, of course, entirely mine. I would also like to thank Stef for sharing his scientific contribution and insights into studies on reported speech during the initial and medial stages of writing this dissertation. They helped a lot to shape ideas implemented in this study and broadened my views on the entire phenomenon of reported speech and thought in human language.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to all the colleagues at the Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics. My special thanks go to all the professors, teaching staff and fellow doctoral students who provided their useful feedbacks throughout the four years of my doctoral research. I would especially like to thank Helle Metslang, Renate Pajusalu, Liina Lindström, Karl Pajusalu and Ann Veismann for guiding the seminars where I had a chance to present my findings, for giving me valuable feedback and helping with other issues. I am also grateful to Marili Tomingas, Helle Metslang and Eva Velsker for helping out with the Estonian summary. My sincere gratitude goes to Patrick O'Rourke for giving counsel on some peculiarities of academic English writing. I wish to thank Niina Aasmäe for the moral support starting from my first years as an MA student and henceforth. Also, many thanks to Nikolay Anisimov, Pavel Kutergin and Anastasiia Shumilova for their help with Udmurt when the counsel of native speakers was needed. In addition, I would like to thank Eri Miyano for spending her time and giving me useful comments on the Japanese examples.

During autumn 2016, I was lucky to spend an exchange period as a visiting PhD student at the University of Helsinki. I am grateful to the Finnish National Agency for Education a.k.a. CIMO for providing me with a grant for my stay and Svetlana Edygarova for hosting me and being always there not only during my stay but also later on. I also wish to thank Sveta for her help with Udmurt and providing her insights into different aspects of the language. In addition, I wish to thank Jyrki Kalliokoski and Riho Grünthal for the possibility to present the topic of my research at scientific seminars; local lecturers and doctoral students for the valuable feedback and possibility to learn from you.

Between February and May 2018, I had the opportunity to be a visiting PhD student also at the Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, for which I am grateful first to my second supervisor Anne Tamm for making it happen and second to the Archimedes Foundation for providing me a scholarship. I am also thankful to Archimedes and Graduate School of Linguistics, Philosophy and Semiotics at the University of Tartu for multiple travel grants to cover my trips to conferences and workshops, participation in which has enormously improved this research.

I would like to thank the colleagues at the KGU, Eötvös Loránd University and HAS Research Institute for Linguistics in Budapest for being very helpful and friendly. Separately, I would like to thank Katalin Kubínyi for her insights into Hungarian quotatives and for always being a very friendly and caring colleague. Also, I would like to thank Csilla Ilona Dér, Adrienne Dömötör, Beáta Gyuris, Tamás Váradi, Nóra Csontos, Péter Furkó and Ferenc Kiefer for their time, help and valuable insights into Hungarian quotative constructions. I am also grateful to Rebeka Kubitsch and Ágnes Kollár for their help with Hungarian

examples and their expertise as native Hungarian speakers. Many thanks go to all my local friends in Hungary and Finland for spending a wonderful time together and for all the help.

My gratitude goes to all the authors of replies to my queries in the *lingtyp*-list. Your comments were largely included in this dissertation. I would like to thank David Gil, Timur Maisak and Ian Joo for examples of different quotative constructions in the languages of their expertise, Elena Bashir, Cliff Goddard and Ekkehard König for their valuable ideas and scientific contributions that they kindly shared with me. If I happened to forget somebody, I apologize in advance.

Last but not least, I was lucky to be accompanied in my toughest and happiest moments by Alessandra Dezi, who will always be an inspiration, support, true friend and a partner wherever I may roam.





# CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES AND SCHEMES .....   | 13  |
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....   | 15  |
| 1.1. Main goals of the study.....  | 15  |
| 1.2. Background.....   | 17  |
| 1.3. Methodological framework and data .....   | 18  |
| 1.4. The structure of the dissertation.....  | 25  |
| 1.5. The notion of <i>reported discourse</i> .....   | 28  |
| 1.5.1. Reported discourse vs. reported speech (and thought).....   | 28  |
| 1.5.2. Types of reported discourse.....  | 30  |
| 1.5.3. Relationship with the domain of reported evidentiality.....   | 33  |
| 1.6. Quotative indexes as markers of the presence of reported discourse .....                                  | 38  |
| 1.6.1. New (innovative) quotatives: what is new about them? .....  | 39  |
| 1.6.2. Main semantic sources of (new) quotatives.....  | 44  |
| 1.6.2.1. Speech and non-speech verbs.....  | 44  |
| 1.6.2.2. NPs encoding the source of reported discourse.....  | 48  |
| 1.6.2.3. Complementizers.....  | 48  |
| 1.6.2.4. Quotative particles.....  | 53  |
| 1.6.2.5. Similitive markers.....   | 54  |
| 1.6.2.6. Demonstratives.....   | 57  |
| 1.6.2.7. Quantifiers.....  | 59  |
| 1.6.3. Presentational quotative constructions.....   | 60  |
| 1.6.4. The orientation of quotative indexes: event-, quote- and<br>participant-oriented quotative indexes..... | 62  |
| 1.6.5. Syntactic possibilities in quotative indexes .....  | 65  |
| 1.6.5.1. Clausality in quotative indexes: monoclausal vs.<br>bipartite vs. non-clausal quotative indexes.....  | 65  |
| 1.6.5.2. Order patterns.....   | 67  |
| 1.6.6. Epistemic meanings and evaluative connotations expressed<br>by quotative indexes .....                  | 69  |
| 2. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN PERMIC LANGUAGES .....   | 74  |
| 2.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Permic.....  | 74  |
| 2.2. Insights into the sociolinguistic situation of Komi and Udmurt .....                                      | 77  |
| 2.3. Communications on the internet among Udmurts and Komi and<br>their peculiarities.....                     | 80  |
| 2.4. General remarks on Russian (new) quotative strategies .....   | 87  |
| 2.4.1. The complementizers <i>čto</i> and <i>budto</i> in quotative<br>constructions .....                     | 87  |
| 2.4.2. The quotative particles <i>mol</i> and <i>deskat'</i> in Russian.....                                   | 92  |
| 2.4.3. New quotative strategies in Russian .....   | 97  |
| 2.4.4. Quotative indexes in Russian: summary.....  | 101 |
| 2.5. Quotative indexes in Udmurt.....  | 102 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 2.5.1. Complementizer strategies in Udmurt internet communications .....   | 102 |
| 2.5.1.1. The autochthonous complementizer strategy in Udmurt .....   | 103 |
| 2.5.1.2. The complementizers <i>čto</i> and <i>budto</i> in Udmurt .....   | 105 |
| 2.5.1.2.1. The Russian epistemically neutral complementizer <i>čto</i> as part of the complementizer strategy in Udmurt .. | 105 |
| 2.5.1.2.2. The Russian epistemic complementizer <i>budto</i> as part of the complementizer strategy in Udmurt .....        | 108 |
| 2.5.2. Quotative particles in Udmurt .....   | 110 |
| 2.5.2.1. Autochthonous quotative particles in Udmurt .....   | 110 |
| 2.5.2.1.1. The quotative particle <i>pe</i> in Udmurt .....  | 111 |
| 2.5.2.1.1.1. The quotative particle <i>pe</i> as a quotative index .....   | 112 |
| 2.5.2.1.1.2. The quotative particle <i>pe</i> as a marker of reported evidentiality .....                                  | 116 |
| 2.5.2.1.1.3. The quotative particle <i>pe</i> as a marker of inferred (visual) evidentiality .....                         | 117 |
| 2.5.2.1.1.4. The quotative particle <i>pe</i> as a discourse marker with hedging function .....                            | 118 |
| 2.5.2.1.2. The self-quotative particle <i>pöj</i> in Udmurt ..   | 120 |
| 2.5.2.2. Quotative particles replicated from Russian .....   | 122 |
| 2.5.2.2.1. The quotative particle <i>mol</i> in Udmurt .....   | 122 |
| 2.5.2.2.2. The quotative particle <i>d'eskat'</i> in Udmurt ..   | 126 |
| 2.5.3. Similitive markers as quotative indexes in Udmurt .....   | 126 |
| 2.5.3.1. The similitive marker <i>kad'</i> as part of quotative index clauses in Udmurt .....                              | 127 |
| 2.5.3.2. The new quotative <i>i'ipa</i> in Udmurt .....  | 129 |
| 2.5.4. Deictic elements as parts of quotative index clauses in Udmurt .....  | 134 |
| 2.5.4.1. The manner deictics <i>ožy</i> and <i>tažy</i> as parts of quotative index clauses .....                          | 134 |
| 2.5.4.2. The type deictics <i>tače</i> and <i>syče</i> as parts of quotative index clauses .....                           | 138 |
| 2.5.5. Quotative indexes in Udmurt: summary .....  | 140 |
| 2.6. Quotative indexes in Komi .....   | 144 |
| 2.6.1. The complementizer strategy in Komi internet communications .....   | 144 |
| 2.6.2. Quotative particles in Komi .....   | 146 |
| 2.6.2.1. The quotative particle <i>pö</i> in Komi .....  | 147 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 2.6.2.1.1. The quotative particle <i>pö</i> as a quotative index .....   | 147 |
| 2.6.2.1.2. The quotative particle <i>pö</i> as a marker of reported evidentiality .....                        | 150 |
| 2.6.2.2. The self-quotative particle <i>miša</i> in Komi .....   | 152 |
| 2.6.3. Deictics as parts of quotative index clauses in Komi.....   | 156 |
| 2.6.4. Quotative indexes in Komi: summary .....  | 159 |
| 2.7. Quotative indexes in Permic: summary .....  | 162 |
| 3. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN HUNGARIAN .....  | 165 |
| 3.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Hungarian .....  | 165 |
| 3.2. The complementizer strategy in Hungarian .....  | 167 |
| 3.3. The manner deictics <i>így</i> and <i>úgy</i> in quotative constructions.....                             | 175 |
| 3.4. Quotative markers deriving from speech verbs .....  | 180 |
| 3.4.1. The self-quotative marker <i>mondom/mondok</i> .....  | 180 |
| 3.4.2. The quotative marker <i>a(s)zongya</i> .....  | 183 |
| 3.4.3. The quotative marker <i>mondván</i> .....   | 193 |
| 3.4.4. The quotative particle <i>úgymond</i> .....   | 198 |
| 3.4.5. The quasi-quotative marker <i>állítólag</i> .....   | 205 |
| 3.5. The turn-taking quotative constructions in Hungarian .....  | 211 |
| 3.5.1. <i>Erre + Speaker</i> as a turn-taking quotative construction.....                                      | 212 |
| 3.5.2. <i>Speaker + meg</i> as a turn-taking quotative construction.....                                       | 216 |
| 3.6. The quote-presentational quotative construction in Hungarian .....  | 218 |
| 3.7. Quotative indexes in Hungarian: summary.....  | 226 |
| 4. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN FINNISH AND ESTONIAN .....   | 233 |
| 4.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Finnish and Estonian.....  | 233 |
| 4.2. Simulative markers as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian.....                  | 235 |
| 4.2.1. The simulative markers <i>niin kuin (niinku)</i> and <i>tyylí(n)</i> as new quotatives in Finnish ..... | 235 |
| 4.2.2. The simulative markers <i>nagu</i> and <i>a la</i> as new quotatives in Estonian .....                  | 241 |
| 4.3. Quantifiers as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian.....                         | 245 |
| 4.3.1. The quantifier <i>vaa(n)</i> and <i>ihan</i> as new quotatives in Finnish ....                          | 245 |
| 4.3.2. The quantifiers <i>täiega</i> , <i>vapsee</i> and <i>lihtsalt</i> as new quotatives in Estonian .....   | 250 |
| 4.4. Complementizers in the quotative domain of Finnish and Estonian .....                                     | 256 |
| 4.4.1. The complementizer <i>et(tä)</i> in the quotative domain in Finnish .....                               | 257 |
| 4.4.2. The complementizer <i>et</i> in the quotative domain in Estonian.....                                   | 260 |
| 4.5. Deictics as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian .....                           | 264 |
| 4.5.1. The manner deictic <i>sillee(n)</i> as a new quotative in Finnish....                                   | 264 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.5.2. The manner deictic <i>nii (et)</i> as a new quotative<br>in Estonian .....                             | 267 |
| 4.6. Quotative index clauses with motion verbs in Finnish and Estonian .....                                  | 271 |
| 4.7. Quotative indexes in Finnish and Estonian: summary .....   | 273 |
| 5. RESULTS .....  | 278 |
| 5.1. Semantic classes employed in quotative indexes.....  | 278 |
| 5.1.1. Semantic sources of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric<br>languages .....                                | 278 |
| 5.1.1.1. Speech and epistemic verbs in quotative indexes.....   | 278 |
| 5.1.1.2. Non-speech verbs in quotative indexes .....  | 279 |
| 5.1.1.3. NPs encoding the source of reported discourse in<br>quotative indexes.....                           | 282 |
| 5.1.1.4. Complementizers in quotative indexes.....  | 283 |
| 5.1.1.5. Quotative particles in quotative indexes .....   | 285 |
| 5.1.1.6. Similitative markers in quotative indexes .....  | 290 |
| 5.1.1.7. Demonstratives in quotative indexes.....   | 292 |
| 5.1.1.8. Quantifiers in quotative indexes.....  | 297 |
| 5.1.2. Semantic sources of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric<br>languages: summary.....                        | 299 |
| 5.2. Structural images of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages ....                                     | 303 |
| 5.2.1. Monoclausal (non-partite) quotative indexes<br>in Finno-Ugric languages.....                           | 304 |
| 5.2.2. Bipartite quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages.....  | 309 |
| 5.2.3. Non-clausal quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages .....   | 316 |
| 5.2.4. Structural complexities and orientation of quotative indexes<br>in Finno-Ugric languages: summary..... | 318 |
| 5.3. Order patterns in reported discourse constructions.....  | 321 |
| 5.4. The impact of language contact on the employment<br>of quotative markers in Finno-Ugric.....             | 323 |
| 5.5. Quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric: an outlook.....  | 325 |
| SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN .....   | 334 |
| APPENDIX .....  | 350 |
| Grammatical abbreviations .....   | 350 |
| Other symbols and fonts.....  | 351 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES .....  | 352 |
| LIST OF DATA SOURCES .....  | 364 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE .....  | 372 |
| ELULOOKIRJELDUS.....  | 373 |

## LIST OF TABLES AND SCHEMES

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| Table 1.  | The main data sources (grammars, corpora and text collections).....   | 20  |
| Table 2.  | The number of the collected material in total and used for description and illustration in the study.....       | 25  |
| Table 3.  | Distinctions between reported discourse and reported evidence..   | 37  |
| Table 4.  | (New) quotatives and their semantic sources (quoted from Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIV).....               | 40  |
| Table 5.  | Degrees and meanings of epistemic support according to Boye (2012).....   | 70  |
| Table 6.  | Quotative markers in Russian.....   | 101 |
| Table 7.  | Quotative markers in Udmurt.....  | 140 |
| Table 8.  | Quotative markers in Komi .....   | 159 |
| Table 9.  | QI-clauses with the endophoric demonstratives in Hungarian complementizer strategy.....                         | 226 |
| Table 10. | The use of manner deictics in Hungarian quotative constructions....   | 227 |
| Table 11. | The use of the quotative indexes deriving from speech verbs in Hungarian .....                                  | 230 |
| Table 12. | The turn-taking quotative constructions in Hungarian .....  | 231 |
| Table 13. | The quote-presentational quotative construction in Hungarian....  | 232 |
| Table 14. | Finnish and Estonian NQs in various QIs .....   | 274 |
| Table 15. | Non-speech verbs in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....  | 281 |
| Table 16. | Complementizers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....   | 285 |
| Table 17. | Quotative particles in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....   | 290 |
| Table 18. | Simulative markers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....  | 292 |
| Table 19. | Demonstratives in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....  | 296 |
| Table 20. | Quantifiers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages .....   | 299 |
| Table 21. | Semantic classes and their appearance in different structural complexities in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages..... | 300 |
| Table 22. | Monoclausal event-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages.....  | 304 |
| Table 23. | Monoclausal quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages.....  | 306 |
| Table 24. | Bipartite (monoclausal) quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages .....                                       | 310 |
| Table 25. | Non-clausal participant-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages..   | 316 |
| Table 26. | Non-clausal quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages .....   | 317 |
| Table 27. | Structural complexity and orientation of QIs in Finno-Ugric languages .....                                     | 318 |
| Table 28. | Positions of QIs in Finno-Ugric languages.....  | 321 |
| Scheme 1. | Immediate vs. non-immediate discourse .....   | 30  |



# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Main goals of the study

This study focuses from a descriptive and comparative perspective on the typological category of *quotative index* (henceforth also: QI), which is used as a segmentally discrete linguistic expression indicating the occurrence of “an adjacent representation of reported discourse” (Güldemann 2008: 11). For now, reported discourse (henceforth also: RD) can be provisionally defined as a “representation of a spoken or mental text” (ibid.: 6). Consider the illustrative example in (1.1) where the QI consists of the clause *my friend said to me* introducing the reported discourse “*Do you want to hear...*”.

(1.1) ***My friend said to me, “Do you want to hear a really good Batman impression!?”***<sup>1</sup> (reddit.com).

In this study, I concentrate on this and other types of quotative expressions ranging from a gram and an independent function word bound to the RD to a clause with more than one predicate. Although various grammatical means can function as markers of reported information, I make a clear distinction between QIs and other means signaling reported information, such as grammatical moods, tenses, epistemic modal phrases, etc., covered e.g. in Aikhenvald (2004, 2018), Diewald & Smirnova (2010), Guentchéva (2018) *inter alia*.

The object of description and comparison is the contemporary use of QIs in five different Finno-Ugric languages: Finnish and Estonian in North-East Europe, Komi and Udmurt in Russia, and Hungarian in Central Europe. It follows my thesis on new quotatives in Finnish and Estonian (Teptiuk 2015). The current study contributes to a complete picture of QIs in these languages, which have received relatively little attention both language-wise, as well as in Finno-Ugric linguistics in general. Filling the gap of systematic description of the QIs in these languages makes my research important primarily for Finno-Ugric linguistics, but since a number of both typologically similar and different languages tend to use structurally similar QIs, this study also contributes to comparative linguistics and typology. In addition to broadening the knowledge about QIs used in the languages in focus, I show how structural complexities of QI-constructions and semantic classes that form these constructions, previously attested among other languages of the world, occupy a niche in the quotative domain of five Finno-

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the following conventions in examples: **bold** – an emphasized form; ‘...’ – boundaries of the translation of an example; underline – boundaries of reported discourse in the translation of an example; double underline – boundaries of self-quotations in the translation of an example if another reported discourse belonging to a source of consciousness different from the current reporter is present within one text (see 1.5.2 for more details); (source) – a shortened reference to the source of an example. The list of glossing abbreviations is presented in Appendix.

Ugric languages. With this, I enrich the typology of QIs by providing accounts for languages where this category has not been systematically described. Furthermore, I pay attention to cross-linguistic similarities in the use of QIs and concentrate on the functions of reported discourse as a universal phenomenon of human language<sup>2</sup> in new media texts. Last but not least, this study also provides some new insights into substandard language use in internet communications of the languages in question (see Section 1.3 on the methodology and data employed in the research).

The main focus of this dissertation lies on (i) the description of the contemporary quotative strategies in these languages, (ii) the definition of the functional properties of quotative markers used in these strategies and (iii) determination of possible similarities within one language and between the five Finno-Ugric languages. Since quotative indexes are linguistic forms that tend to develop from elements with non-reportative semantics, referred to as *new* (or *innovative*) *quotatives* in Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012), and often are affected by language contact, several research questions must be addressed simultaneously.

First, it is important to define whether elements with originally non-reportative semantics, i.e. semantically not referring to human vocal behavior or epistemic processes (see 1.5.1 for more details on the latter), occur as new quotative indexes in Permic, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian. In the case of occurrence, the question of how new quotatives develop in these languages arises. One way of development assumes the use of autochthonous markers, triggering new functions in the elements, being previously employed mainly, or exclusively in the non-reportative domain. For example, consider the new quotative *like* in (1.2), depicting the English quotative construction *X is/was like*.

(1.2) ...*i was like hey i have no tears left to cry...* (twitter.com)

Another way of development implies the influence of more prestigious language(s) in the linguistic area on the choice of new quotatives. Previous studies have shown that even typologically different languages tend to share similar markers that are often considered functional correspondents when they are not used as quotative markers (see Table 3 in 1.6.1). Since diglossia and unidirectional bilingualism are characteristics of the sociolinguistic situation of the speakers of Finno-Ugric languages of Russia, Russian influence is highly expected for the choice of QIs or core elements for QI-strategies in the Permic languages. Moreover, the influence of contact languages (German and Slavic languages in Hungarian; Swedish, German and Russian in Finnish and Estonian) on the choice of (new) quotatives and the strategies these quotatives occur in is also examined.

---

<sup>2</sup> As previous research suggests, no language has been attested that would be devoid of reported discourse. Therefore, the phenomenon of reported discourse *per se* can be considered universal for human languages. (cf. Güldemann 2008: 9)



Second, it is relevant to define how new quotative strategies co-occur with those that are already conventionalized. As some previous results show, the latter types of quotative indexes are used more often in standard varieties but frequently substituted by the “newcomers” in vernacular speech (e.g. *I said* vs. *I’m like* in English). A third interest is the comparison of functional correspondents between the languages from three different Finno-Ugric areas which are not in contact with each other.

## 1.2. Background

The concept *quotative index* was first introduced in Güldemann’s (2008) synchronic and diachronic survey of African languages. Since Güldemann describes the notion of *reported discourse* (RD) and the main constituents of reported discourse construction from a typological perspective, his terminology can be applied to typologically different languages.

In addition, cross-linguistic studies have investigated the so-called *new (innovative) quotatives* (henceforth also: NQs), i.e. non-reportative material used as RD-introducers in the world’s languages. For example, NQs comprise similative or comparative markers, demonstrative deictics, quantifiers, motion verbs, etc. Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012) discuss the notion of NQs as evidence of cross-linguistic development and material for potential language change. For European languages, this topic has been studied extensively for different variants of English (e.g. Buchstaller 2006; Romaine & Lange 1991 *inter alia*), for German (Golato 2000), Scandinavian languages (Eriksson 1995; Hasund *et al.* 2012 *inter alia*), and Dutch (e.g. Foolen *et al.* 2006, Mazeland 2006, Coppens & Foolen 2012 *inter alia*). NQs became a subject of interest for sociolinguists as a feature appearing in teen-talk and in the speech of adolescents. For many scholars the purpose of the research was to define why these elements appear as quote-introducers (Buchstaller 2013). Consequently, correlations between the functions of these elements inside and outside the quotative domain were found, which became a basic explanation for their role in reported discourse constructions. By *quotative domain*, I mean the functional domain in which the presentation of reported discourse occurs.

A number of studies on this topic were carried out also for Finno-Ugric languages, mostly focusing on quotative systems in the major languages Estonian, Finnish, and Hungarian. Basic descriptions of RD and RD-constructions can be found in descriptive grammars of these languages (Estonian – Eesti Keele Grammatika, henceforth: EKG 1993; Finnish – Iso Suomen Kielioppi, henceforth: ISK 2004; Hungarian – Kenesei *et al.* 1998; for more details on the previous studies, see Section 2.1 for Permic, Section 3.1 for Hungarian, and Section 4.1 for Finnish and Estonian). Moreover, research on different forms and aspects of RD in Standard Hungarian has been carried out by Kiefer (1986, 2015) and Fónagy (1986). As far as Permic languages are concerned, RD and main quotative strategies are briefly discussed for Komi by Fedjunëva (1998) and for Udmurt by

Winkler (2001, 2011). Quotative particles of Udmurt are also a relevant topic in contemporary linguistic studies (Arkhangelskiy 2014); however, this research rather concentrates on the categorical characteristics of particles in general than on their quotative functions. Moreover, the same category has been briefly discussed as a means of semantic expression of evidentiality in Komi (Leinonen 2000, also Fedjunëva 1998), and epistemic modality in Udmurt (Kibardina 2012). On the relationship between RD and evidentiality see 1.5.3; on epistemic connotations arising in quotative constructions see 1.6.6.

Even though previous studies in Finno-Ugric linguistics do not directly address QIs and RD, their results provide useful background knowledge for further investigations. Furthermore, information provided in descriptive grammars illustrates quotative strategies that are frequently used in literary standards. Hence, I use them as a starting point for comparison with contemporary processes occurring in colloquial speech.

In addition, I take into account the cross-linguistic studies on reported discourse, e.g. Evans (2013), Goddard & Wierzbicka (2018), Spronck (2012), and more precisely on QIs, e.g. Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012), Güldemann (2012). Güldemann's terminology and previous cross-linguistic studies in my previous research allowed me to define the functional properties of NQs in Finnish and Estonian, to classify them according to their orientation (event vs. quote) and to understand the motivation for their use inside the QI-clause. For example, the motivation for the use of similative or comparative markers both in Finnish and Estonian lies behind the approximative evaluation with which these markers present a quote (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIV–XV) and their foregrounding functions (Güldemann 2008: 361). I use the terms *quote* and *quotation* as synonyms to the notion RD, both direct and indirect (see 1.5.2 on distinctions between direct and indirect RD).

### **1.3. Methodological framework and data**

The current research is a descriptive qualitative study, and it does not aim at providing quantitative outcomes. Since one objective of the investigation are NQs that have been developing in various languages for decades but have not yet reached most standard variants, the material selected for this dissertation is characterized predominantly by features typical for colloquial speech. I set the objective to analyze substandard written text materials freely available on the internet. Taking the objectives of this study into account, the collected data are meant to depict colloquial written speech that is considered the closest written variant to spontaneous linguistic communication.

The material used in the study is restricted neither to any specific dialect(s) nor to any specific sociological factors of the speakers, e.g. gender, social status, or age. As for the latter, some age groups, e.g. children or elders, might not be represented equally online. However, my experience shows that different age groups are present among online communities consisting nowadays, besides

young people, also of a certain number of elderly speakers. Thus, also tendencies observed in the speech of different age groups can be partially reflected in the collected data. In addition, this research is also a contribution to the study of contemporary vernacular varieties of Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian.

Although the use of different unstandardized shortenings and abbreviations, various orthographic symbols and emoticons make internet language different from both standardized written variants and colloquial speech (Tagliamonte & Denis 2008: 4ff.), the general aim of a speaker is to maintain the text understandable for the audience (Sepp 2010: 13). Furthermore, similarly to everyday oral communication, online speakers tend to mix different registers and styles. Their choice largely depends on contextual and speakers' motivations. Therefore, it is of no surprise that on one webpage it is possible to find postings that largely resemble either edited writing or spontaneous colloquial speech. The language use *per se* stays in between the two varieties (written and oral), as internet communication is basically a combination of both, standard writing and colloquial speech, within one text (Helasvuo *et al.* 2014: 13; Tagliamonte & Denis: 7, 23, 26–27, *inter alia*).

My primary task was to observe the comments and discussion on different online forums, newspapers, magazines, blogs, etc. I looked for quotations, in general, and in comments left about previous publications. I have used this approach in my MA study (Teptiuk 2015) on Finnish and Estonian, which was also adopted for Hungarian and the Permic languages. I consulted native speakers of the languages in focus and based on the information acquired from them, I compiled a list of sources online that are or were popular during the last two decades among the language communities. I preferred those web-sites that gathered a larger audience and had a relatively significant number of entries. As is mentioned above, sources that contained substandard written texts, typically limited to unofficial pages consisting of live conversations in comment sections and unedited blog entries, were favored over official pages of media resources, NGOs and governmental organizations, etc. I present the list of used web pages in List of data sources at the end of the dissertation.

The decision to exclude sources outside new media was primarily motivated by the focus of this study, which is on QIs that are mainly used in colloquial speech. Furthermore, QIs used in colloquial speech typically exceed the limited number of quotative constructions used in standardized texts. That said, substandard written texts were considered a source that could contain strategies, previously not attested or excluded from the grammars describing literary standards. As for the minority languages Komi and Udmurt, “the relaxed atmosphere on SNS [social network sites] allows language use which is typical for oral communication and otherwise frowned upon in other (especially written) contexts by language purists” (Pischlöger 2014: 144). Thus, Komi and Udmurt speakers use online not only variants that are naturally mixed with the dominant Russian language but also a mixture of dialects and styles that are found in colloquial speech (see Pischlöger 2016; Edygarova, 2013, 2014). Hence, it was

expected that data from the new media genre will contain not only quotative constructions used in substandard speech where the influence of Russian was expected, but also those that appear only in some dialects of Komi and Udmurt.

The initial stage of my investigation was carried out prior to and independently of executing any queries. For Permic, before investigating new media texts, I have also checked available text collections – Uotila (1985, 1989) for Komi, Kel'makov (1981, 1990) for Udmurt, which allowed me to acquire a deeper understanding of the available quote-introducing strategies used among the speakers of various dialects of the languages. Furthermore, I used available grammars of the languages in focus (see Section 1.2) that provide basic knowledge about already described quotative strategies and served as a background to my investigation. Where necessary, I have also consulted native speakers and colleagues working with the languages in focus which allowed me to expand my investigation to quotative markers and constructions appearing only in colloquial speech or some dialects. The list of the main data sources including grammars, corpora and text collections are summarized in Table 1. The corpora and other data sources used for every language are reviewed below and presented in List of data sources at the end of the dissertation.

*Table 1. The main data sources (grammars, corpora and text collections)*

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Udmurt    |   |
| i.        | Grammars: Vaxrušev <i>et al.</i> 1974; Winkler 2001, 2011;                              |
| ii.       | Corpora: Udmurt Corpus, Blog & Press subcorpora;  |
| iii.      | Text collections: Kel'makov 1981, 1990.   |
| Komi      |   |
| i.        | Grammars: Bubrix 1949; Sel'kov 1967; Fedjunëva 1998;                                    |
| ii.       | Corpora: The Corpora of the Komi language;  |
| iii.      | Text collections: Uotila 1985, 1989.  |
| Hungarian |   |
| i.        | Grammars: Szabó 1958; SMN 1992; Kenesei <i>et al.</i> 1998; Keszler 2000;               |
| ii.       | Corpora: Hungarian National Corpus, Personal subcorpus;<br>Hungarian historical corpus. |
| Finnish   |   |
| i.        | Grammars: ISK 2004.   |
| Estonian  |   |
| i.        | Grammars: EKG 1993; EKK 2007; EKS 2017;   |
| ii.       | Corpora: The Mixed Corpora of Estonian, New media subcorpus.                            |

Based on my initial investigations, I made a list of markers that appeared in contexts where RD was introduced. This list was supplemented by markers described in previous studies, or reported to me by native speakers or colleagues working with the languages in focus. I also included other possible semantic sources that have not been accounted for the languages in focus but were

frequently observed in the quotative domain cross-linguistically. This list was never considered a complete and exhaustive inventory of quotative markers and was always supplemented by new markers on the further stages of investigation and data collection if such were later observed, or reported by colleagues or native speakers.

First, during the data collection, the use of semantically reportative markers denoting human vocal behavior or epistemic processes were checked. These markers were considered the primary source for quotative markers. Second, the use of non-reportative markers was investigated. Since the appearance of quotative markers in different structures were one of the main interests of this study, I checked reportative and non-reportative markers for the possibility of combining within one structural unit (cf. Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIII). Main types of such combinations were predicted based on the primary investigation and attested co-occurrences of quotative markers in previous research on the languages in focus and other cross-linguistic and typological studies (see Section 1.2). Non-clausal uses of elements, if they occurred, were treated here as a case for the further development of the elements into independent quotative markers. As far as NQs were concerned, the possibility of their co-occurrence with already conventionalized strategies used in standard varieties was the object of examination here. Furthermore, I paid attention to additional functions of quotatives both inside and outside the domain of reported discourse, e.g. evidential and epistemic, further addressed here in Sections 1.5–6.

The previously collected material of Finnish and Estonian used in my MA thesis was also employed in this study. The Estonian material derives mostly from the New media subcorpus of the Mixed Corpora of Estonian language (henceforth: New media subcorpus)<sup>3</sup>. This subcorpus contains new media texts taken from miscellaneous internet sources, i.e. (i) chat rooms, (ii) newsgroups, (iii) forums, (iv) comments. It consists of totally 25 million words (7 million from chat rooms, 8 million from newsgroups, 8 and 2 million from forums and comments, respectively). In addition, I also used independently collected material browsed with the search engine Google Search (see below). For Finnish, written data were independently collected either by using Google Search or by browsing online forums, magazines, newspapers, blogs etc.

A reasonable amount of listed pages were checked for quotative markers. By using Google Search, I checked the first ten pages of a search result (containing on average 10 links with browsed material of different qualitative extent) for the presence of material suitable for this study. Equivalently, I studied the same amount of pages (or approximate amount of possible occurrences) for every forum, blog, chat room and comment line. Web-pages that did not fall under the category of computer-mediated communications (CMC) or new media texts (on features and classification of CMC and new media texts, see e.g. Oja 2006: 259–266; Crystal 2001 *inter alia*), e.g. science fiction texts, scientific publications, or

---

<sup>3</sup> See List of Data Sources at the end of the study for more details on corpora and other materials used in this study.

edited newspaper articles, were primarily excluded as a potential source for examples (see above for motivations). Nonetheless, in rare occasions if no search results appeared among primarily suitable sources, I used material from (edited) texts outside new media to illustrate some specific use of the QIs investigated here.

By using Google Search, for Finnish and Estonian I checked various possible co-occurrences of non-reportative quotative markers with different types of predicates. The main strategies were already identified in my MA thesis (Teptiuk 2015). In addition to those, I checked other constructions that have been overlooked before. I placed the studied quotative marker in quotation marks together with a predicate in finite form to control whether the co-occurrence was possible in general. For speech verbs, I preferred generic speech verbs (e.g. ‘say’, ‘tell’) to specific (e.g. ‘answer’, ‘ask’, or ‘whisper’) (Güldemann 2008: 12) since I assume that their use is more frequent. If the query did not yield any results for the co-occurrence of the pair “says like”, I used another verb to investigate the possibility (e.g. “asks/replies like”). I searched for various finite tense forms (e.g. “said like” vs. “says like”) and persons (e.g. “I said like” vs. “(s)he said like”). As follows, I executed similar queries several times. I also checked previously attested and described collocations of NQs with the equational verb ‘be’ (see e.g. Haakana 2005, 2006; Routarinne 2005). To enable a more effective search in forums, blogs, chat rooms, and comment lines, I only searched and further analyzed lexical material that had previously been assumed to appear in the quotative function (see above). Thus, the co-occurrences of non-speech verbs with NQs or their non-clausal use could also be controlled and analyzed. Also, I carefully studied the surrounding context for a deeper understanding of the collected examples. A similar approach was applied for the other languages, if Google Search or corpora available online were used.

As for the newly collected material for Hungarian, I primarily used the Hungarian national corpus (*A Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár*, henceforth: MNSz). Since the present study describes the contemporary state of the substandard written language, I analyzed the Personal subcorpora of the corpus (*személyes alkörpusz*), containing discussions from the forums of the biggest and oldest Hungarian internet portal *index.hu* and several forums from Subcarpathia. This subcorpus consists of a total of 18,6 million words (17,8 million from Hungary, 0,4 million from Subcarpathia and Transylvania, and 0,1 million from the Vojvodina region). Additionally, I also used independently collected data, mainly browsed by using Google Search engine (see above for the method). For the diachronic checks on the use of some quotative constructions, I turned to the Hungarian historical corpus (*A Magyar történeti szövegtár*, henceforth also: MTK)<sup>4</sup>, containing a collection of texts written in different genres between 1772 and 1997.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.nytud.hu/hhc/> (October 1, 2019). The corpus contains ca. 27 million tokens. The texts represent different genres from printed works. A relative majority (40%) of the texts are from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

For the Permic languages, I analyzed independently collected data from the internet. For Udmurt, I also used the Blog subcorpus of the Udmurt Corpus (henceforth: Blog subcorpus). For a more detailed description, in several cases, I also turned to the Press subcorpus of the Udmurt corpus (henceforth: Press subcorpus). Although the Press subcorpus contains texts that do not belong to new media texts, they still preserve colloquial features and mostly depict substandard language use in written form. Taking into account the lack of suitable corpora depicting Komi internet communications<sup>5</sup>, I had to rely almost exclusively on the independently collected material. Only in one occasion when the number of examples online was at stake (see 2.6.3), I turned to the Corpora of the Komi language (henceforth also: Komi corpus)<sup>6</sup> for additional examples. The corpus contains oral and written texts representing various genres outside the new media genre (fiction, journalist texts, educational and science literature, official correspondence, etc.). Its major drawback is the lack of accessibility of the context. Thus, by executing queries in the corpus, one can get only the sentence with the queried form provided without the surrounding context. Since in this study I focus on substandard written texts and rely largely on the context in some parts of my analysis, this corpus was used only once during this study.

The main material for the Permic languages derives from the social network *Vkontakte* (henceforth: *vk.com*)<sup>7</sup>. *Vk.com* concentrates the major part of internet communications and other social media activities among the internet users from Russia and in some parts of the post-Soviet states<sup>8</sup>. According to Habeck (1998: 279–280), already at the end of the 1990s, the internet became a means for groups, communities, and organizations of indigenous people of Russia to set up various kinds of cooperation. Similarly, a considerable number of newspapers became available online. Thus, *vk.com* became convenient for communities, organizations and private users. Like the social network Facebook that is widely used in the West, it does not require any fees for registration or maintaining the user account active. As for Komi and Udmurt, based on my observation, a significant part of newspapers, magazines, event groups and bloggers have active accounts on *vk.com*, where the major part of active speakers or indigenous language activists gather for purposes of communication, e.g. KOMI BLOGJAS<sup>9</sup> or JUMŠAN57

---

<sup>5</sup> In meanwhile, the new media subcorpus of Komi-Zyrian became available online. <http://komi-zyrian.web-corpora.net> (October 1, 2019). The data from this corpus were not included in this study. However, some markers that did not appear in my material were independently investigated in the corpus. Similarly to the independently collected material used in this study, the corpus did not show any relevant results.

<sup>6</sup> The Corpora of the Komi language (Rus. Korpus komi jazyka), <http://komicorpora.ru> (October 1, 2019). The exact amount of tokens in the corpus is not specified.

<sup>7</sup> <https://vk.com/> (accessed through the period: September 1, 2015 – September 1, 2019).

<sup>8</sup> According to The eBusiness Guide (eBizMBA), *vk.com* was ranked as the 7<sup>th</sup> most popular social network in the world with an estimated 120 million unique monthly visitors (<http://www.ebizmba.com/articles/social-networking-websites>, May 15, 2019).

<sup>9</sup> <https://vk.com/komiblogjas> (accessed through the period: September 1, 2016 – September 1, 2018).

(18+)<sup>10</sup> (on Udmurt activist movements on the internet, see Pischlöger 2014b, 2016). One of the advantages of the material obtained from such pages is to have access to informal ways of communication depicted as a written form of substandard language use (Pischlöger 2014b: 144; Pischlöger 2016: 108; also see Sections 2.2–3), which also includes typical features of contemporary vernacular variants of Komi and Udmurt, e.g. code-mixing, code-switching, etc. (on code-copying and code-switching in Komi, see Nekrasova 2013: 74, Leinonen 2006: 243; on code-copying in spoken variants of Udmurt, see Salánki 2015: 256–262).

Two characteristics seem to play an important role in the internet communications of Komi and Udmurt. First, a significant number of even semi-active speakers are inclined to use Russian as a *lingua franca*. This feature of internet communications consistently reflects the bilingualism of the indigenous Finno-Ugric peoples of Russia, and Russian being a more prestigious language in the region (on Komi, see Leinonen 2006: 243; on Udmurt, see Salánki 2007b: 6–10). Second, separating a native Komi or Udmurt speaker from those with a limited command of the language is sometimes challenging<sup>11</sup>. This problem was usually resolved by checking their other postings and possibly by investigating their personal profiles if they were accessible. Thus, I gathered basic information about their background and language proficiency, which helped me in decision-making whether their language use can be included into further investigation or shall be ignored as not entirely relevant for the aims of the current study.

The overall amount of collected material contains a corpus of approximately 1050 examples of constructions containing RD. For Udmurt, I have collected 285 examples of RD-constructions both on the social network sites and among suitable corpus data (see above for the corpora used in the study), and 284 examples for Komi. Furthermore, by using Russian National Corpus and the Google Search engine I have collected approximately 50 examples of Russian reported discourse constructions which are relevant for the description of Permic languages (see Section 2.4). For Hungarian, 275 examples were collected by using Google Search and suitable corpus material. Finnish and Estonian data consisted of 94 examples previously used in my MA thesis and 93 additional examples collected for the current research. The figures depicting the number of collected examples serve as a basic justification that the collected material is quantitatively representative of a qualitative study. In the current description, I illustrate only a part of the collected material, avoiding unnecessary repetitions of identical strategies within one language. The number of studied webpages and the amount of collected material and examples used in the dissertation are reflected in Table 2.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://vk.com/yumshan57> (September 1, 2016), the page is not available anymore under this link; data archives can be reached on the following address: <https://vk.com/knyazpozdey> (accessed through the period: September 1, 2016 – September 1, 2018).

<sup>11</sup> This aspect is also present among the other languages discussed here. However, compared to Komi and Udmurt, it is less prominent in Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian, probably, due to a more numerous representativity of native speakers of these languages in different segments of the internet.



Table 2. The number of the collected material in total and used for description and illustration in the study

| <b>Languages</b> | <b>Number of studied web-pages (ca.)</b> | <b>Amount of collected material</b> | <b>Amount of illustrated material</b> |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Udmurt           | 15                                       | 285                                 | 76                                    |
| Komi             | 15                                       | 284                                 | 33                                    |
| Hungarian        | 60                                       | 275                                 | 128                                   |
| Finnish          | 30                                       | 92                                  | 48                                    |
| Estonian         | 30                                       | 105                                 | 43                                    |

All the examples presented in this dissertation are glossed and translated into English. Examples from previous studies are also presented with my own glossing and translation if they were missing in the original sources. In this case, there is a note in the translation line, specifying that the glossing and translation are mine, signaled by the initials “DT”. In some cases, I adjust existing glosses to the purposes of this research, if needed. Minor mistakes appearing in the original texts are corrected, excluding inter-punctuation in order to avoid the impact of interpretations. Among those mistakes, only the most obvious typos and lack of diacritics over vowels where it was necessary in Hungarian (e.g. *a* instead of *á*, *e* instead of *é*, etc.) were corrected to avoid misunderstanding of the data provided here.

Russian examples are presented in transliteration without the original text in Cyrillic. In contrast to the Russian examples, the material depicting quotative markers in Permian is presented in transcription without the original text in Cyrillic. The motivation to use transcription over transliteration for Permian is explained through differences in the orthographies of Komi and Udmurt: different graphemes or digraphs are used to mark identical sounds in these languages. These differences are leveled out in the transcription. Functional words replicated from Russian and used in the quotative domain are also presented in transcription. In contrast, Russian lexical material that does not belong to functional words is presented here in transliterated form, in the way it appears in Russian. Such cases are not presented in italics in the examples, to create a contrast with the autochthonous word forms and functional words replicated from Russian that are set in italics.

## 1.4. The structure of the dissertation

Chapter 2 is dedicated to the Permian languages. Section 2.1 provides a general overview on the previous studies on the topic of the RD and QIs in Permian languages. Since in the current study I use new media texts which greatly reflect natural language use in written form, several features peculiar to vernacular variants of Komi and Udmurt shall be addressed in Section 2.2. I also provide background information on the contemporary sociolinguistic situation of Komi and Udmurt speakers for a discussion on the main linguistic features (e.g. *code-*

*switching*) of internet communications among Udmurt and Komi speakers in Section 2.3.

As hypothesized in Section 1.1, and further discussed in Sections 2.2–3, Russian is the main source language for matter and pattern replications of quotative indexes for Permic languages. Hence, in Section 2.4 I provide a brief description of QIs in contemporary (colloquial) Russian. I take only those quotative indexes into account which are later encountered in Komi and Udmurt. In 2.4.1, I describe the complementizer strategies in Russian and cover basic quotative constructions consisting mainly of speech verbs and the complementizers *čto* and *budto*; 2.4.2 is on the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'*, 2.4.3. on NQs involving the similitive marker *tipa* and the type-demonstrative *takoj*. In 2.4.4, I summarize the information on QIs in Russian.

Section 2.5 discusses the use of the QIs in Udmurt. I treat the two Permic languages separately. The main reason for such treatment is the different extent of Russian influence that can be observed in the quotative strategies of Udmurt and Komi written communications. For Udmurt, Russian influence was observed, which justifies a split of subsections into those that treat autochthonous markers and those which discuss the material replicated from Russian: in 2.5.1.1–2 I cover the complementizer strategies in 2.5.2.1–2 quotative particles, in 2.5.3.1–2 I discuss similitive markers and 2.5.4 covers deictic elements as parts of QI-clauses in Udmurt; Russian elements were not observed in this domain. Finally, in 2.5.5 I summarize the main findings on Udmurt quotative constructions.

Section 2.6 is dedicated to the QIs of Komi. Since in colloquial written Komi I have observed only a limited amount of pattern replications from Russian, these instances are not treated in separate subsections. The order is the same as in the Udmurt section with the difference that no similitives were observed: 2.6.1 on complementizer strategies, 2.6.2 on quotative particles, 2.6.3 on demonstratives as parts of QI-clauses. Finally, 2.6.4 provides a summary on the QIs in Komi. The findings from the two Permic languages are compared in the final section of the chapter.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the QIs of Hungarian. After a review of previous studies on RD and QIs in Hungarian in 3.1, I first discuss the relatively well-described Hungarian quotative constructions, namely the complementizer strategy in Section 3.2, and the use of manner deictics *így* and *úgy* in Hungarian quotative constructions in Section 3.3. I add relevant data from internet communications and point out aspects that were previously overlooked or misinterpreted without taking the recent findings into account. Section 3.4 is dedicated to the use of quotative markers deriving from speech verbs: the self-quotative particle *mondom/mondok* in Subsection 3.4.1, the quotative particle *a(s)zongya* in Subsection 3.4.2, which despite its relatively long history of use is currently developing new functions; 3.4.3 is on another relatively old quotative marker, *mondván*, which, unlike *a(s)zongya*, does not show any significant development in the quotative domain, although it develops new functions outside of it. Further, the quotative particle *úgymond* is described in 3.4.4, its parallel development of various functions throughout the history of its use and correlation of these functions with

its originally quotative use in contemporary Hungarian. The last subsection of this section 3.4.5 is dedicated to the use of the quasi-quotative particle *állítólag*. Despite its reportative semantics, I show that this particle can be classified as only quasi-quotative, largely preserving its original reported evidential function in contemporary Hungarian. Section 3.5 is dedicated to turn-taking quotative constructions: *erre* + *Speaker* (Subsection 3.5.1) and *Speaker* + *meg* (Subsection 3.5.2); I demonstrate how the two quotative strategies form a subclass of speaker-presentational quotative constructions (see 1.6.3) in Hungarian. I pay attention to the use of different predicates in these constructions. Section 3.6 covers the quote-presentational construction consisting of the element in the comitative case. I pay attention to the use of different predicates in this quotative construction, and point similarities and differences between them. Finally, Section 3.7 provides a summary on the QIs in Hungarian.

In Chapter 4, I present the updated results of my previous studies (Teptiuk 2015, 2019) on QIs in Finnish and Estonian. This chapter also serves as a basis for the comparison of quotative constructions in the five languages. Since both languages show a relatively large degree of similarity both in choice of the markers and structures of the QI-constructions, I provide the results on the two languages parallel to one another. In Section 4.1, I revise previous studies on the RD and the QIs in these languages. Section 4.2 covers the use of simulative markers. Section 4.3 is on quantifiers in QIs. In Sections 4.4–5 I discuss the use of complementizers and manner deictics in the quotative domain of the languages. I show how these markers, despite a number of similarities, behave differently in event-neutralized quotative constructions in Estonian compared to their correspondents in Finnish. Section 4.6 treats the use of the QI-clauses with motion verbs in internet communications of the two languages. Finally, Section 4.7 provides a summary on the QIs in Finnish and Estonian.

Chapter 5 serves as a conclusion, providing a general summary of the QIs in the five Finno-Ugric languages. In Section 5.1, I summarize the main semantic classes employed in QIs. Attention is paid to (i) what connotations they express as QIs (e.g. epistemic support, subjectivity, epistemic hedging function, etc.), (ii) do they show a different qualitative degree in grammaticalization in the quotative domain, and (iii) whether autochthonous markers behave differently compared with replicated elements. Section 5.2 reviews the structure of QIs in the five languages. I pay attention to the syntactic possibilities with respect to the main constituents and orientation of QIs. In Sections 5.3–4, I review order patterns in RD-constructions and the impact of contact languages on the quotative markers in Finno-Ugric languages. Section 5.5 discusses some typological perspectives in the light of the findings in the earlier chapters and provides the general outlook of the dissertation.

A short summary in Estonian follows the main text. The appendix includes the following items: a list of grammatical abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses and within the text and other conventions used in the study.

## 1.5. The notion of *reported discourse*

### 1.5.1. Reported discourse vs. reported speech (and thought)

Research on *reported speech (and thought)* constructions has a relatively long tradition involving different perspectives brought by researchers from various fields of studies (see Spronck & Nikitina 2019: 121–123, for a short overview). Relatively recently, a number of studies concentrated on *reported speech and thought* (RST) constructions in typologically different languages, e.g. Güldemann (2008) and Nikitina (2012a, 2012b) on African languages *inter alia*; Knight (2008), McGregor (1994, 2014), Rumsey (1990), Spronck (2015) on Australian languages *inter alia*. The term *RST construction* can be understood as the construction containing representation of speech or thought. The term RST refers to the same phenomenon that was previously described under the term *reported speech* in the translation of Vološinov (1973). Although Vološinov's term *reported speech* does not explicitly point to the inclusion of reported thought in the concept *per se*, in principle, it does contain it. Vološinov (1973) refers to reported thought under the term *inner speech* that is subsumed under the notion of reported speech<sup>12</sup>.

Previous studies have shown that functions of RST constructions differ across languages. For example, besides a plain representation of someone's (previous) speech and/or thought, RST constructions can be used in expressions of volition and intention, causation, or describing inchoative processes (see Spronck 2017). Hence, even the term RST cannot always be used to cover all processes that formally resemble reporting of speech and thought, but functionally expand beyond the primary goals of these constructions. As a result, several alternative suggestions were proposed. Following Rumsey (1982, 1990) and McGregor (1994), Spronck (2017: 109ff.) uses the term *frame-in relation* that is meant to cover “the syntactic relation involved in reported speech constructions” and *frame-in construction*<sup>13</sup> for the whole structure involving RST (in Güldemann's terminology, *reported discourse construction*). What follows from the *frame-in construction* theory, used by McGregor *et al.*, is that RST forms a dedicated syntactic class in itself. The arguments for acknowledging RST as a dedicated syntactic domain were recently described in detail in Spronck & Nikitina (2019) and are largely applied in the current study. I refer to some of those arguments further in 1.6.2.3 where I discuss the syntactic relationship between the QI and the RD. For now, these arguments are not separately reviewed here, since they mainly relate to peculiarities among syntactic features of the whole construction with RD. Furthermore, not all of those arguments are equally relevant in light of the aims of the current study.

---

<sup>12</sup> I am grateful to Stef Spronck for pointing out this to me in his review.

<sup>13</sup> Rumsey (1982, 1990) and McGregor (1994) refer to this phenomenon as *framing construction*. To avoid the confusion with non-syntactic interpretations of *framing*, Spronck (2017) uses the term *frame-in*.

In this study, I mainly concentrate on the category of QIs as a formal means signaling the presence of RST that does not exceed (real or fictive) reports. Therefore, among all possible terminological frameworks in studies on RST, I give preference to Güldemann's (2008, 2012) framework that uses the term *reported discourse (RD)*. McGregor's notion of *framing* and Spronck's *frame-in-relation* are, nonetheless, discussed in 1.6.2.3, where I return to differences between Güldemann's framework and the one followed by McGregor *et al.* With this, I wish to acknowledge that in the current study I mainly follow Güldemann's framework of reported discourse. However, some considerations from other connecting studies are taken into account and applied here, if necessary.

The term *reported discourse* is defined in Güldemann's (2008: 6) study as the "representation of a spoken or mental text from which the reporter distances him-/herself by indicating that it is produced by a source of consciousness<sup>14</sup> in a pragmatic and deictic setting that is different from that of immediate discourse". Güldemann specifies RD as spoken or mental text; hence, the notion "is not restricted to real instance of speech" (ibid.: 7). RD may also include "texts that were never actually uttered like so-called 'internal speech', or in general any representation of cognitive acts or states" (ibid.). Although undefined by Güldemann, by cognitive acts and states one can subsume such mental processes as e.g. *thinking, considering, guessing, concluding* and mental conditions as e.g. *knowing, remembering*, etc. I use the proposed approach and subsume under the term *cognitive acts and states* different mental processes that can be further presented as produced "in a pragmatic and deictic setting that is different from that of immediate discourse" (ibid.: 6). See below on the differences between immediate and non-immediate discourse. As is pointed out by Palmer (1986: 135), "[t]here is usually very little formal difference between constructions with epistemic verbs and those with verbs of saying". Hence, similar types of RD can be introduced by verbs of saying (e.g. *say, conclude*) and epistemic verbs (e.g. *think, know, guess*), as in (1.3).

(1.3) *John said/ thought/ knew/ guessed/ concluded that Mary would come* (Palmer 1986: 135, bold and underline are mine, DT).

RD is meant to cover texts that "can range from long discourse through complex or simple sentential forms to a one-word utterance" and "retain the morpho-syntactic form of an independent utterance" (Güldemann 2008: 6). This parameter distinguishes RD from "the mere mention of non-immediate speech or cognition events", including the complete syntactic incorporation and cross-linguistically frequently represented by non-finite elements, e.g. *she gave us the*

---

<sup>14</sup> Here, I use the notion *source of consciousness* in a broader sense. While using internet communications as a basic data source, one can frequently encounter quotations of texts previously verbalized or typed by machines. However, one can consider the fact that these texts are the outcomes of oral or written human verbal behavior which is only transferred through machines. Thus, even this type of text does not contradict the definition of reported discourse, proposed by Güldemann (2008).

*advice to search on the internet* or *the idea to leave her husband* (ibid.; high-lights are mine, DT). In contrast to these instances, *she gave us the advice that we/you must search on the internet* and *the idea that I/she should leave my/her husband* are considered here to contain RD (in bold), since the parts in bold on their own can form independent utterances. In fact, this distinction holds also for Finno-Ugric languages discussed here. Compare the two Finnish sentences:

- (i) *hän kieltäytyi ostamasta minulle omaa pesukonetta* ‘he refused **buying me my own washing machine**’;
- (ii) *hän kieltäytyi, että ei halua sellaista* ‘he refused (saying) that **he doesn’t want this**’,

where (i) represents the case of syntactic incorporation of the infinitive construction into a preceding clause, while (ii) contains the clause (in bold) that can function as an independent utterance without the part preceding it.

Furthermore, Güldemann (2008: 7) distinguishes the ongoing from the reported discourse by the terms *immediate* vs. *non-immediate*. The deictic orientation in RD is determined by the reporter. In the immediate discourse, the participants of the speech event who produce and witness the RD are labeled as *reporter* and *audience*. In the non-immediate (reported) discourse, they are referred to as *speaker* and *addressee*, respectively. Even in self-quotations (see 1.5.2) where the reporter and the speaker coincide, two different sources of consciousness “differing from each other at least on the time dimension” can be distinguished (ibid.). Scheme 1 serves as a schematic representation of the immediate and non-immediate discourse and the roles of participants in them.

*Scheme 1. Immediate vs. non-immediate discourse*

NON-IMMEDIATE DISCOURSE: SPEAKER → ADDRESSEE  
[reported speech situation]

IMMEDIATE DISCOURSE: REPORTER → AUDIENCE  
[current speech situation]

### 1.5.2. Types of reported discourse

As far as distinctions of different types of RD are concerned, traditionally two formal categories are recognized: direct and indirect RD. They are distinguished by their referential orientation. I call the referential orientation an indication of the location of the anchor for the deictic (I, here, today, etc.) and expressive (admiration, anger, aggressiveness, etc.) elements. The location is the immediate or non-immediate discourse. In *direct RD*, all deictic and expressive elements referentially correspond to non-immediate discourse. In other words, the deictic and expressive material is referentially anchored to the non-immediate discourse, cf. (1.4a). In contrast, *indirect RD* adjusts the deictic and expressive elements to

the immediate discourse, cf. (1.4b). In addition, an intermediate category between direct and indirect RD can be distinguished<sup>15</sup>. Here, I refer to it as free indirect reported discourse. *Free indirect reported discourse* represents a text where pragmatic orientation is mixed, so a stable pragmatic orientation is missing. Some deictic and expressive elements are anchored in the immediate and others in the non-immediate discourse, cf. (1.4c) (for more details, see e.g. a brief overview in Coulmas 1986: 6–10; see also Vološinov 1973, Eckhardt 2012, *inter alia*). Often free indirect RD can be encountered in the literature as a result of the merge of “the narrator’s and hero’s points of view” (Coulmas 1986: 9).

(1.4a) *She was tired. She thought: “I will leave here tomorrow”.*

(1.4b) *She was tired. She thought (that) she’d leave that place the next day.*

(1.4c) *She was tired. She’d leave here tomorrow.*

It is worth mentioning that the traditional types of RD merely represent different “stylistic devices for conveying messages” and have little if nothing to do with the faithfulness of representation of the quoted information (Coulmas 1986: 6). Nonetheless, some researchers (e.g. Wierzbicka 1974; Kiefer 2015) establish a correlation between direct RD and verbatim rendering of reported discourse. However, as Coulmas (1986: 6) has pointed out, direct RD “is used *as if* the words being used were those of another, which are therefore pivoted to a deictic center different from the speech situation of the report” (original emphasis), while indirect RD “in contrast, has its deictic center in the report situation and is variable with respect to the extent that faithfulness to the linguistic form of what was said is being claimed”. Evans (2013) indicates that some semantic dimensions, e.g. tense, person, location, mood, honorificity and emotional evaluation, become sensitive in the presentation of RD and are governed by perspectives of the immediate (in Evans’ study: *primary speech event*) or non-immediate (*reported speech event*) discourse. Nonetheless, one can only count on the formal differences between types of RD. As for exactness or proximity of the produced RD in respect to the original utterance, each case of RD should be approached separately. The use and the mode of representation of RD are primarily governed by a reporter’s intentions and the communicative conditions of the situation (Güldemann 2008: 7).

Internally, RD may include words that might have or might not have been previously produced. Even if marked by speech verbs, RD is not always a representation of someone’s words. Hence, what can be reported may actually not have been said before, and not everything that was said before can actually be reported (Romaine & Lange 1991: 244). In my research, I distinguish three main types of RD based on the source of non-immediate discourse. Two basic types of

---

<sup>15</sup> As was pointed out by Stef Spronck in his review, in fact, other intermediate categories of RD are currently distinguished, such as semi-direct, semi-indirect & mixed quotations, *inter alia*. A reader is referred to the studies by Aikhenvald (2008) and Evans (2013) for more details on intermediate categories of RD, not discussed here.

RD include representation of someone's previously produced speech, and cognitive states. Here, I label these two types of RD as *quotation of speech* (1.5a) and *quotation of thought* (1.5b), respectively. Furthermore, one can encounter constructions that contain stretches of hypothetical fictional discourse. By *hypothetical fictional discourse* (henceforth: *hypothetical quotation*), I mean a type of discourse that in the quotative frame formally represents a canonical quote, but does not originate from a previously produced non-immediate discourse in the form of a speech or a thought and instead is presented by the reporter as such in the immediate discourse. Under this category, one can frequently encounter stretches of intended speech that in reality have not been uttered, or insertion of fictional quotes, as if the quoted speaker could have said it in the described circumstances (1.5c).

(1.5a) *he said that we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon.*

(1.5b) *he thought that we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon.*

(1.5c) *he would have said/thought that we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon.*<sup>16</sup>

A division of RD according to the quoted information into three distinct types is a bit puzzling in the following. One can raise a question of how to distinguish quotations of thoughts, logically fictional but presented as factive (cf. Evans 2013: 70) from practically fictional quotations of thought. Consider two types of canonical QIs:

- (i) ***X thought: RD*** (i.e. X's thoughts are not verbalized; therefore a reporter can only assume what X could have thought), and
- (ii) ***X might/could have thought: RD*** (i.e. X did not think anything like this, and instead a reporter can only assume X's thoughts).

In the current study, I have taken the approach to distinguish these two types of reports. In contrast to the formally fictional presentation of the state of affairs in the QI in (ii), the quotative construction in (i) is presented as factive. Therefore, someone's thoughts can, in principle, become available to a reporter through first-hand reports, i.e. X said what X thought, and now Y reports on X's thoughts. As a result, they are discussed as a presentation of someone's thought and not a hypothetical quotation containing only assumed thoughts.

An interpretation of different types of RD can frequently remain ambiguous without a context. Consider (1.6) where the second stretch of RD can be interpreted as a quotation of speech, thought or as a hypothetical quotation containing only intended parts of discourse that in reality remain fictional. If the latter reading is applied, there is reason to assume that the reporter has produced

---

<sup>16</sup> I have constructed (1.5a, b, c) based on the original utterance *I think he would have said that we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon* (quora.com).



the RD only in the immediate discourse presenting it *as if* it had occurred in the non-immediate discourse.

(1.6) *and he goes I am the police bitch and starts touching the register I'm like oh this mf'er didn't just do that (twitter.com)*<sup>17</sup>.

As (1.6) shows, the RD can also be split according to the source of consciousness to whom the RD belongs. Thus, one can distinguish *self-quotations* and all the rest, i.e. RD that belongs to a source of consciousness different from the reporter (henceforth: *quotations*). Even though one can differentiate two sources of consciousness from each other at least on the time dimension in self-quotations (Güldemann 2008: 7), they represent a genuine subclass of RD where the reporter has not only witnessed streams of the non-immediate discourse but is also their original author. However, as was mentioned above, the use and mode of representation of RD in both cases, i.e. quotations and self-quotations, is primarily governed by the reporter's intentions and communicative conditions (see 1.6.6 on additional connotations which may appear in self-quotations).

### 1.5.3. Relationship with the domain of reported evidentiality

As defined by Aikhenvald (2004: 3), *evidentiality* “is a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information”. Among the world's languages, expression of evidentiality can be obligatory or optional. Thus, one can find languages that obligatorily indicate the source of information – encountered visibly, through hearing or smelling, as a report, or as a result of an inference based on some facts, etc. Other languages leave the possibility of indicating an information source as an available option without requiring an obligatory markedness.

As a linguistic category, evidentiality can be expressed in a number of ways – through dedicated morphemes or fused with another category, e.g. tense (ibid.: 10). Although in her typological study on evidentiality Aikhenvald concentrates on its grammatical coding, the researcher acknowledges that besides grammatical means of expressing evidentiality, also lexical means can be used to encode the source of information. Lexical strategies for optional coding of evidentiality (e.g. the inferential clause ‘I guess’, reported ‘they say’ or auditive ‘I hear that’) are probably even universal in the world's languages compared to grammatical strategies, mostly unfamiliar to European languages. (ibid.: 10)

One of the most common ways of expressing lexically or grammatically encoded evidentiality in the world's languages is through reports of other's words. Such a type of evidentiality is referred to as *reported evidentiality*, which encodes the presence of communicated information. Together with inferred evidence,

---

<sup>17</sup> I use double underline to mark the boundaries of self-quotations if another RD belonging to a source of consciousness different from the current reporter is present within one text. The latter is marked by default with an underline.

reported evidence forms the domain of *non-direct evidence*. Reported evidence typically subsumes two subtypes: (i) second- or third-hand evidence, e.g. indirect reports and hearsays, and (ii) evidence from folklore, i.e. the described situation is a part of established oral history (Willett 1988: 96, quoted from Güldemann 2008: 406).

RD as a representation of what has been said can be considered an evidential strategy on its own. However, what is referred to here by the term RD does not entirely correspond to the notion which is typically covered by the term reported evidentiality. In principle, the domain of reported evidentiality is quite close to reported discourse – both tend to report what someone else said (Aikhenvald 2004: 1, 135). However, there are few nuances that make the two domains distinct from each. Since in this study I primarily concentrate on lexical means used for indexing the RD but not strictly reported evidence (except the markers that can carry out both functions), there are reasons to review these nuances distinguishing the two domains. First, let's take a look at semantic issues.

Unlike RD, reported evidence is restricted to reproduction of speech acts (Aikhenvald 2004: 138; Wiemer 2010: 101–103; Holvoet 2018: 248). As for the source of reported information, reported evidence remains restricted to information acquired from a third party. As Aikhenvald (2004: 4) points out, reported evidentials can be paraphrased with the clause 'they told me' and are typically presented "without any claim about the exact authorship or the speaker's commitment to the truth of the statement" (ibid.: 176–177). Thus, reported evidence is typically a hearsay without actual authorship and most likely is not (initially) delivered to a concrete addressee. In contrast, RD is not restricted to these aspects in general. A reporter can either produce reported information belonging to some other sources of consciousness (labeled here as *quotations*), possibly uttered in non-immediate discourse to a concrete addressee, or reproduce his/her previous and hypothetical utterances, thoughts, etc. (i.e. *self-quotations*) (Wiemer 2010: 101–103; also Holvoet 2018: 248). A similar distinction between reported evidential and quotative meaning has been previously applied in Aikhenvald (2004: 177) with the terms *reported*, i.e. stating what someone else has said without specifying the exact authorship, and *quotative*, i.e. introducing the exact author of the quoted report. Also Matic & Pakendorf (2013: 377) make a similar distinction in the research on the use of the generic speech verb 'say' in Siberian languages: "if it is possible to determine who said/thought the proposition denoted by the clause, we classified it as Qu\_NoV [quotative]; if not, it was counted as evidential". These two distinctions come close to my own, between RD and reported evidence, with a difference in one minor remark concerning the source of RD. In my study, I recognize the presence of the reporter him-/herself among the possible sources of the reported information found in the quotative domain but not in the domain of reported evidence. As far as I am aware, this point, although subsumed in the above distinctions, was not directly addressed in previous studies as one of the distinguishing characteristics between the two domains.

Besides semantic differences between the RD and reported evidence, Holvoet (2018: 248) distinguishes them based on the propositional content of an utterance: reported evidence represents the propositional content, while the RD does not entail it. For example, compare (1.7a) and (1.7b).

(1.7a) *And she's like wow!*

(1.7b) *\*Reportedly/\*Allegedly wow!* (Holvoet 2018: 247)<sup>18</sup>.

As a result of the propositionality of its content, “hearsay marking is (...) typically found in affirmative clauses whose content is asserted rather than presupposed”, but the RD “shows no such preference” (ibid.). Compare (1.8a) and (1.8b) in Hungarian.

Hungarian

(1.8a) *soha*                      *nem*      *mondtam,*              *hogy*      *adjunk*  
 never                      NEG      say.PST.1SG              COMP      give.IMP.1PL  
*fegyvereket*              *a*              *tanároknak*  
 weapon.PL.ACC      DEF      teacher.PL.DAT  
 ‘**I never said** [lit. **never I didn't say**<sup>19</sup>] **(that)** let's give weapons to teachers’  
 (eduline.hu).

(1.8b) *?Nem*              *állítólag*              *MH*      *tesztautója*              *volt*  
 NEG              allegedly              PN      test.car.3SG              be.PST.3SG  
 ‘<sup>20</sup>**Not allegedly** he had an MH testing car’<sup>20,21</sup>

The affirmative status of the reported information or the opposite scenario can serve as an additional index distinguishing the two domains in contexts where they seem ambiguous. However, one must acknowledge that both, the propositional and affirmative status of the reported information, often remain indistinct in RD. For example, in (1.9), both meanings (reported evidential and quotative) can equally be assigned for reported information without taking the context into account.

<sup>18</sup> (1.7b) is quoted from Holvoet (2018: 247); (1.7a) is independently constructed to demonstrate an occurrence of non-propositional expressions in RD.

<sup>19</sup> Double-negation is entirely grammatical in Hungarian and is the only way to express that ‘something never happened’, which is realized as ‘something did not never happen’.

<sup>20</sup> (1.8b) is based on the initially affirmative sentence *Állítólag MH tesztautója volt* ‘Allegedly he had an MH testing car’ (MNSz).

<sup>21</sup> In general, this type of sentence would have been possible in Hungarian, if it had been constructed the following way: *Nem állítólag, hanem tényleg MH tesztautója volt* ‘Not allegedly, **but really** he had an MH testing car’, where the negation would be attributed not to a proposition, introduced by the reported evidential *állítólag*, but to the reported evidential *per se* for a contrast with another evidential marker (Kubitsch, p.c.). However, in this case, the negation attributed to the reported evidential should be followed by the confirmative clause with the epistemic adverbial *tényleg* ‘truly, in reality, really’, thus contrasting two evidential possibilities with epistemic overtones ‘allegedly, but I am not entirely sure’ and ‘it was really like this and I am sure’.

- (1.9) Udmurt  
*Čukaže* “linejka” *pe* *luoz*  
 tomorrow meeting QUOT be.FUT.3SG  
 ‘Tomorrow, it is said, will be a school meeting’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

This ambiguity also arises due to the fact that the same marker (e.g. Udm. *pe*) can be used in the language as either a general hearsay particle or a quotative pointing to the presence of RD deriving from a source specified in the context or elsewhere (cf. Winkler 2011: 137). In principle, the use of quotative markers as reported evidentials or *vice versa* is quite widespread among the world’s languages and can be observed in the languages from different families and continents (see Chappell 2008 on Sinitic; Güldemann 2008 on African languages; Matic’ & Pakendorf 2013 on languages of Siberia; Saxena 1988 on Tibeto-Burman, *inter alia*). However, such an ambiguity can be resolved based on the available context. For example, if one studies it for (1.9), the context will show that the report derives from an unspecified source since no concrete source of reported information is indicated in the surrounding text. Hence, the reported information is interpreted as hearsay, but not as RD. Therefore, along with Holvoet’s argumentation about propositionality and the affirmative status of reported information, I use the above distinctions, i.e. source of reported information and types of RD, in order to distinguish the two types of reports. The surrounding context is used to retrieve the information about the source and types of RD in situations where the two interpretations seem plausible, as in (1.9).

Furthermore, Güldemann (2008: 407) suggests distinguishing reported evidence from RD “in terms of a reversed focus on (...) the immediate discourse”. According to him, RD represents non-immediate discourse as “a relatively minor part of a larger text that constitutes the immediate discourse” and “is a fairly well-determined intrusion into the main text” (ibid.), whereas in case of reported evidence “the text in the scope of the evidential (technically speaking the quote) belongs to the main body of the ongoing immediate discourse” and the reported evidence “‘expands’ to actually become the main text” (ibid.). This statement, however, can be argued against, since what Güldemann labels as “the main text” can be formed merely by stretches of non-immediate discourse. Consider narratives where reproduced conversations between characters often form the main body of the text. For example, Ainu (isolate, East Asia) folklore texts have a structure of the RD-construction where “the whole story is in fact a single quote” (Bugaeva 2008: 39). At the same time, in internet communications one can often encounter situations where the main text consists of one sentence containing RD, as e.g. a tweet presented in (1.6). In cases similar to (1.6), it is impossible to distinguish ‘the main text’ from ‘the intrusion’. Reasoning from this, I take Güldemann’s statement into minor consideration when I distinguish reported evidence from RD. The main features characterizing reported discourse and reported evidence are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Distinctions between reported discourse and reported evidence

| Features  | Reported discourse                                | Reported evidence            |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| Source of information   | reporter him-/herself,<br>other (specified) party | third (unspecified)<br>party |
| Report  | speech, thought,<br>hypothetical                  | speech                       |
| Propositional status of reported information                      | not obligatory                                    | obligatory                   |
| Affirmative status of the syntagm containing reported information | not obligatory                                    | obligatory                   |

In the further descriptions, I primarily differentiate the two meanings from each other based on two features – the source of the information and the type of RD (speech/thought/hypothetical). I address reported evidence in cases where reported information is not supported with a clause specifying a source and, in general, can be attributed to an indefinite (group of) speaker(s). Furthermore, reported evidence can only be a result of speech reports, but not of cognitive processes or fictional discourse. Thus, reported information is presented by the reporter as general hearsay and is assigned the status of reported evidence. In other cases, reported information falls under the category of RD, restricted neither to the source of information nor to one type of RD. Holvoet’s (2018) argumentation about the propositional and affirmative status of reported evidence is also taken into account in further distinctions between the two meanings, if the two main distinguishing factors do not aid in separating the two domains.

Finally, I would like to point out that the separation of the two domains is not only theoretically motivated. There is reason to suppose that the use of markers that are simultaneously used in both domains (e.g. the Udm. particle *pe* in example 1.9), might differ on the structural and functional level. Reported evidence is typically marked by less complex constructions where the source of information and addressees are not specified, and the event, i.e. undetermined speech situation, is presupposed. With RD, this feature where the participants remain implicit and the event behind RD is presupposed is one of the possible options but not a characteristic one. Furthermore, if RD can contain quotations of thoughts, hypothetical quotations and self-quotations, it is reasonable to expect that the constructions used in RD will be structurally more diverse and probably show tendencies regarding different types of RD. For example, self-quotations might be framed by exclusively self-quotative markers not found in other contexts (see 1.6.2.4). Similar tendencies can appear in respect to quotations of thought and hypothetical quotations. Therefore, a wider structural and functional diversity is expected where the marker is introducing RD but not reported evidence, motivated by the above theoretical implications.

Despite the separation of these two domains, I emphasize the relatedness between them, and further, I pay great attention to individual quotative markers that are also used as reported evidentials. Contrarily to Aikhenvald’s (2004) study,

I take into consideration lexical expressions only. Grammatical means of coding reported evidentiality, e.g. grammatical moods, tenses, modal phrases, or other means, covered in e.g. Aikhenvald (2004, 2018), Aikhenvald & Dixon (2014), Boye (2012), Diewald & Smirnova (2010), Guentchéva (2018), de Haan (2005) *inter alia*, are left beyond the scope of this study. Secondary epistemic meanings observed in the use of constructions containing RD are separately covered here in 1.6.6.

## 1.6. Quotative indexes as markers of the presence of reported discourse

Following Güldemann’s concept of RD, “the entire linguistic form serving the expression of RD” is labeled as an *RD-construction* (Güldemann 2008: 10). The RD-construction forms a complex whole typically consisting of two major constituents – the RD and the quotative index (QI). In (1.10), a QI is formed by the clause *Ville sanoi* ‘Ville said’, and the RD *Moi* ‘hi’ precedes the QI.

- (1.10) Finnish  
 “*Moi*” *Ville sanoi ja istuutui pöytään.*  
 hi PN say.PST.3SG and sit.down.PST.3SG table.ILL  
 “‘Hi’ said Ville and sat down at the table.’ (keskustelu.suomi25.fi).

The notion of *quotative index* is defined by Güldemann (2008: 11) as “a segmentally discrete linguistic expression which is used by the reporter for the orientation of the audience to signal in his/her discourse the occurrence of an adjacent representation of reported discourse”. As “a linguistic expression”, the notion *quotative index* covers structures of different complexities which may consist “of just a gram bound to the quote, an independent function word, a phrase, a full sentential syntagm with its nominal participants, or even a clause with more than one predicate” (ibid.). In the current study, I do not take suprasegmental features of intonation, pitch and dynamics into account, which, in principle, can also be used as a means of differentiating a quote from its surrounding context<sup>22</sup>. This consideration is primarily based on the nature of my data and the aims of the study, excluding non-verbal means of marking the presence of the RD.

Generally, the QI would likely consist of (i) a verb that denotes the speech event and functions as a predicate nucleus, (ii) an NP referring to a speaker and, additionally, (iii) an NP, marking the addressee, as in (1.11).

<sup>22</sup> On the role of combinations of prosodic features as a means of differentiating a quote from its surrounding context, see e.g. Couper-Kuhlen (1998) and Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen (1999) in English and Günthner (1999) in German conversational discourse.

- (1.11) Komi
- |              |              |                    |                 |                     |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>Me</i>    | <i>juási</i> | <i>ekskursovod</i> | <i>L'udmila</i> | <i>Kočerganlyś,</i> |
| 1SG          | ask.PST.1SG  | guide              | PN              | PN.ABL              |
| <i>myjla</i> | <i>sylön</i> | <i>ta</i>          | <i>mynda</i>    | <i>vičkoys?</i>     |
| why          | 3SG.GEN      | DEM                | amount          | church.3SG          |
- 'I asked guide Lyudmila Kochergan, why (s)he has that many churches?'  
(vk.com/club77947813).

This type represents an event-oriented QI (see 1.6.4 for more details), formally expressed by a clause indicating a state of affairs expressed by a verbal predicate, which is the nucleus element in the event-oriented QI (see 1.6.1). In descriptive grammars, e.g. EKG (1993), ISK (2004), Kenesei *et al.* (1998), this type of QI-clause is often classified as a default pattern of a QI in its canonical structure. The Finnish grammar (ISK 2004), in contrast to the Estonian (EKG 1993) and the Hungarian (Kenesei *et al.* 1998) grammars, also includes a brief presentation of semantically non-reportative quotatives used in colloquial Finnish (ISK 2004: §1486–87).

In principle, verbs are considered possible, but not indispensable elements of a QI. There is hardly a universal structural explanation for governing the occurrence or absence of a verb in a QI. Often, verbless QIs occur due to the pragmatic issue of speech or text style. The omission of a verb can also be explained by a tendency to reduce the complexity of the QI in certain discourse environments (Güldemann 2008: 12–13, 53ff.). For example, consider (1.12), where the omission of QI predicates ('you to her/him' vs. 'you **say/reply/suggest**/etc. to her/him') occurs in a representation of a fictional dialogue.

- (1.12) Udmurt
- |            |              |              |                |                 |
|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <i>ton</i> | <i>soly:</i> | <i>ojdo</i>  | <i>čoś</i>     | <i>luom,</i>    |
| 2SG        | 3SG.DAT      | PTCL:INCH    | together       | be.FUT.1PL      |
| <i>noś</i> | <i>so:</i>   | <i>kule</i>  | <i>trosges</i> | <i>zar'ni!!</i> |
| and        | 3SG          | must.PRS.3SG | more           | gold            |
- '**You** [would say] **to her/him**: Let's be together, **and (s)he** [would reply]: I need more gold!!' (vk.com/udmurt\_apt).

### 1.6.1. New (innovative) quotatives: what is new about them?

The notion *new (innovative) quotative* has been suggested and described by Isabelle Buchstaller (2004, 2006), both in her study on the topic in English and cross-linguistically (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012). Cross-linguistic evidence shows that both typologically similar and different languages are currently undergoing a process of parallel development in the quotative domain, characterized by the implementation of lexical material with initially non-reportative semantics as an instrument introducing RD (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XII). Table 4, quoted from Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XIV), summarizes main semantic

sources of initially non-reportative markers used as QIs in some of the world's languages.

Table 4. (New) quotatives and their semantic sources (quoted from Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIV)

i. *Comparative (similarity/approximation):*

Afrikaans *soos* 'so + as', Czech [sic!] *jako (že)* 'as', Buang (*na*) *be* 'like', Danish *ligesom* 'like + as', Dutch *van* 'like', English *like*, Estonian *nagu* 'like', Finnish *niinku (niin kuin)* 'as if', *ihan et* 'like', French *comme* 'like', *genre* 'kind (of)', *style* 'style', Frisian *fan* 'like', Greek *tipou* 'type', Hebrew *ke'ilu* 'as if', *kaze* 'like + this', Italian *tipo* 'like', *stile* 'style', *genere* 'kind', Japanese *mitai-na* 'like', Croatian *kao* 'like', *tipa* 'type', Swedish *typ* 'type', *liksom* 'like + as', Norwegian *typ* 'type', *liksom* 'like + as', Polish *typu* 'type', Portuguese *tipo* 'type', Brazilian Portuguese *tipo + assim* 'type + so', Russian *tipa* 'type', Spanish *como* 'like, as', Thai *bæ:p* 'like'.

ii. *Demonstrative deictic:*

Afrikaans *soos* 'so + as', Czech [sic!] *na to* 'on this', Danish *sådan* 'such + like + this', Dutch *zo* 'so', Estonian *nii et* 'so that', London English *this/here is NP*, Finnish *et(tä)* 'that', German *so* 'so', Hebrew *kaze* 'like + this', Croatian *ono* 'that', *ono kao* 'that + like', (Brazilian) Portuguese (*tipo+*) *assim* '(type+) so', Russian *takoj* [sic!] 'such + like + this/that', Spanish *asi* 'so', Norwegian *sånn* 'such + like + this/that', Swedish *såhär (sär)* 'such + like + this/that'.

iii. *Quantifiers:*

Danish *bare* 'just, only', Dutch *helemaal* 'all', English *all*, Estonian *täiega* 'totally', Finnish *vaa(n)* 'just', Icelandic *bara* 'just, only', Norwegian *bare* 'just, only', Swedish *ba(ra)* 'just, only'.

iv. *Generic verbs of motion and action:*

English *go*, Dutch *komen* 'to come', Greek *kano* 'do', Puerto Rican Spanish *hacer* 'do, make'.

These elements also became a subject of interest for sociolinguists, as the correlation between the use of NQs and the speaker's social status or gender was often pointed out (e.g. Eng. quotative *go* as a feature characteristic of a lower class male speech style, cf. Ferrara & Bell 1995; Eng. quotative *like* in teenage girls' speech, cf. Romaine & Lange 1991).

However, the term "new quotative" can be argued against, since time-wise new quotatives cannot always be considered new, which is acknowledged by Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XII). For example, the Dutch quotative *van* 'like' has been used already in the 1970's (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XII; see also Van Alphen 2006, 2008 *inter alia*). Likewise, the English variant *be like* became trendy in colloquial speech over twenty years ago (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy 2004: 495). However, these developments can be considered relatively recent compared to those that some canonical quotative strategies have undergone. As Güldemann (2008: 521) points out, some canonical *old quotatives* can similarly be considered an outcome of grammaticalization processes, employed initially for other processes, e.g. indexing of mimesis (among other possible



functions), and later used in the domain of RD. Güldemann (2008: 287) uses the term *mimesis*<sup>23</sup> to refer to the domain that subsumes the discourse-insertion of representational gestures, ideophones, non-linguistic sounds and direct reported discourse<sup>24</sup>. As for the term *new quotative*, in this study I use it to refer to originally non-reportative material that appeared or became reactivated during the last couple of decades in order to differentiate it from so-called old canonical ways of quote-introduction, highly used in standard varieties of languages.

In general, two features seem to play an essential role in characterizing NQs as a category of QIs. Firstly, both typologically similar and different languages tend to share similar markers (see Table 4 above). Though language contact does play an important role in the choice of new quotatives, often this explanation cannot be applied to the emergence of similar elements in entirely distant languages. Thus, a correlation between the functions of these elements inside and outside the quotative domain was suggested by authors investigating this question (see e.g. Güldemann 2008; Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012). If one considers that the equivalent of a comparative marker has become a discourse introducer in a number of languages, one can already indicate cross-linguistic evidence for “a functional correspondence between the functions of this linguistic item” (Buchstaller 2001: 3). Secondly, elements which have recently taken quotative functions derive from a limited number of source constructions, belonging originally to the categories of simulative/comparative markers, demonstrative deictics, quantifiers, and verbs of action or motion. Relying on cross-linguistic evidence, one can state that this lexical material is in general “notoriously polyfunctional outside the quotative frame” (ibid.: 1). In distinguishing new from canonical old quotatives, I first rely on the cross-linguistic correspondence in the use of originally non-reportative markers in the quotative domain. Also, I take into consideration the starting point of the use of a concrete marker in the quotative domain as a secondary feature distinguishing old from new ways of quote introduction.

As for the choice of the source for NQs, it is not accidental. Their functions outside the quotative domain mostly correlate with mimetic enactments, marking of epistemicity, or speaker role demarcation. In addition to those, Güldemann (2008: 522–23) mentions the functions summarized in List 1.

---

<sup>23</sup> An overview of the term *mimesis* and its use in the previous literature is provided in Güldemann (2008: 287ff.).

<sup>24</sup> The term *mimesis* can be more familiar to the reader as the concept *demonstration* used in the study by Clark & Gerrig (1990).

*List 1. Functions of QI-elements outside the RD-domain according to Güldemann (2008)*

- i. Naming
- ii. Reported evidence
- iii. Illocution reinforcement
- iv. Simile
- v. Proximative
- vi. Deontic modality
- vii. Indirect causation
- viii. Purpose-clause linkage
- ix. Reason-clause linkage
- x. Condition-clause linkage
- xi. Multipurpose subordination

Additionally, the author indicates two functional complexes: (i) an expression of internal awareness and its specialized variants like intention etc.; (ii) proposition-type linkage associated with the complement-taking predicate (*ibid.*: 523). In this study, I devote close attention to the functions related to reported evidence, similativity/proximity and proposition-type linkage. The rest of the functions, although acknowledged, seem to remain of only marginal relevance to the languages in focus, as is further discussed. However, some of the listed functions, e.g. reason-clause linkage, are also observed among markers discussed in this study (see e.g. 3.4.3 on additional functions expressed by the quotative particle *mondván* ‘saying’ in Hungarian).

Among the elements used in QIs and bearing initially or complementarily the above functions, the following material summarized in List 2 is observed being used cross-linguistically (Güldemann 2008: 372, 521; also Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIV).

*List 2. Semantic sources of quotative indexes according to Güldemann (2008)*

- i. Verbs of action
- ii. Markers of similarity and manner
- iii. Quote-referring pronominals
- iv. Markers of focus and presentation
- v. Speaker-referring pronominals
- vi. Quantifying markers

The semantically generic character that these elements possess suggests that these elements in general obtain immense potential for grammaticalization. Hence, through cognitive processes such as metonymy, metaphor or context-induced interpretation, these items undergo a grammaticalization process and are employed as quote-introducing elements (Buchstaller 2001: 2–3).

In addition, NQs are often easily combined into chains of quote-introduction (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XIII), which was also attested in my previous research (Teptiuk 2015, 2019), e.g. in Estonian (1.13a) and Finnish (1.13b).

## (1.13a) Estonian

|                |                |                 |               |                 |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <i>...isa</i>  | <i>oli</i>     | <i>kõrval</i>   | <i>nii et</i> | <i>nagu</i>     |
| father         | be.PST.3SG     | nearby          | so.COMP/thus  | like            |
| <i>mis</i>     | <i>sa</i>      | <i>siis</i>     | <i>ikka</i>   | <i>kihutad,</i> |
| what           | 2SG            | then            | still         | rush.PRS.2SG    |
| <i>pealegi</i> | <i>milleks</i> | <i>kihutada</i> |               |                 |
| at.PTCL        | what.TRANSL    | rush.INF        |               |                 |

‘...father was next to me **so that/thus like** why are you rushing, no need to rush’  
(New media subcorpus).

## (1.13b) Finnish

|               |             |             |                |                 |              |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <i>mä</i>     | <i>olin</i> | <i>ihan</i> | <i>silleen</i> | <i>et</i>       | <i>“mitä</i> |
| 1SG           | be.PST.1SG  | quite       | thus           | COMP            | what.PAR     |
| <i>vittuu</i> | <i>sä</i>   | <i>nyt</i>  | <i>oikein</i>  | <i>selität</i>  |              |
| cunt.PAR      | 2SG         | now         | really         | explain.PRS.2SG |              |

‘...I was **quite thus (that)** what the hell are you really explaining now’  
(apulanta.net).

In Estonian (1.13a), both the manner deictic *nii et* ‘so that/thus’ and the similitive marker *nagu* ‘like’ fulfill a quote-introducing function in an adjacent position to the quote. The manner deictic fulfills a cataphoric pointing function and focuses the audience on the presence of the RD, while the similitive marker indicates that the ongoing RD is approximately reproduced. Thus, the reporter does not aim to reproduce someone’s previous utterance word-for-word (see 1.6.2.5 and 1.6.2.6 on the use of similitive markers and demonstratives as QIs). In Finnish (1.13b), the quantifier *ihan* ‘quite’ shows reporter’s emotional involvement, while the manner deictic *silleen* ‘thus’ points to the following stretches of RD. The complementizer *et(tä)* typically takes an adjacent position to the quote indicating the border between a QI and RD. Hence, one can see how functions of these elements, e.g. pointing and approximative evaluation, are transferred from outside the quotative domain into the domain of reported discourse. As a result, these elements are conveniently employed as QIs. In addition, the above examples demonstrate that QIs besides their primary function – indicating the presence of the quote, i.e. an alien textual entity within the immediate discourse, fulfill auxiliary functions of evaluating the quote (Spronck 2012: 72), and expressing subjective and interpersonal opinion (Hasund *et al.* 2012: 38). These auxiliary modal functions of QIs and their evaluative connotations are also investigated in this study, and discussed in details in 1.6.6. In the following subsection 1.6.2, I present the main semantic sources in new and more conventionalized QIs which can be expected to appear in the quotative domain of the five Finno-Ugric languages.

## 1.6.2. Main semantic sources of (new) quotatives

### 1.6.2.1. *Speech and non-speech verbs*

A basic quotative construction in the majority of the so-far described languages would likely consist of a strategy primarily involving a speech verb (henceforth also: SV). As Güldemann (2008: 12) indicates, “[t]he unmarked way of encoding the QI-predicate would seem to be the use of a lexical item that belongs to the category verb (as defined in the given language) and that conveys the semantic feature of ‘utterance’”. He divides SVs into semantically *generic speech verbs*, e.g. *say, tell, speak*, and *specific speech verbs*, e.g. *respond, ask, refuse*, etc. SVs refer semantically to an utterance inside and outside the quotative domain (ibid.).

It is worth pointing out that in some of the world’s languages, a basic SV, meaning ‘say’, can be used in the quotative domain to mark quotations of both speech and thought. For example, Chappell (2008: 58) provides an account on the SAY verbs in Sinitic, specifying that besides generic and specific meanings of an SV, they can possess “extended cognitive senses including ‘mean’, ‘think’, ‘realise’ and ‘know’”. In some languages of Siberia, “the denotation of generic SAY covers not only the voluntary production of sounds, but also internal monologues” (Matić & Pakendorf 2013: 372). Among several other languages, a basic SV ‘say’ functions similarly in e.g. Erzya *meřems* (Aasmäe, p.c.), the West Sumatran variety of Indonesian *kata* (Gil, p.c.), Agul (Lezgetic, Nakh-Daghestanian) *awas* (Maisak, p.c.), etc. In a number of Australian languages, a basic SV ‘say’ can also be interpreted as ‘think’ or ‘do’ (see Knight 2008 on Bunuba; McGregor 1990, 1994 on Gooniyandi; McGregor 2014 on Nyulnyulan languages; Rumsey 1990 and Spronck 2016, 2017 on Ungarinyin). Based on the evidence from typologically different languages representing various parts of the world, a basic generalization can be made that SVs can be used to depict quotations of thoughts, but an opposite scenario has not been attested so far.

As for non-speech verbs (henceforth also: NSVs), there is reason to distinguish between epistemic verbs (henceforth also: EVs), e.g. *think, know, remember*, etc., and other non-speech verbs. As it has been indicated by Palmer (1986: 135–136) and brought to attention above in (1.3), lexically EVs can be used in RD-constructions where typically SVs occur, since both can function as indexes pointing to the presence of non-immediate discourse, represented as reproduced speech-events or cognitive processes, in case of EVs. Furthermore, if outside the quotative domain SVs semantically refer to an utterance, in identical manner EVs refer to the cognitive processes they denote.

Italian  
(1.14a) *e*      *questa*      *mi*      *fa:*      “*il*      *primo*      *giugno*”  
and    DEM.F    1SG.DAT    do.PRS.3SG    DEF    first.M    June  
‘And she tells me [lit. does to me]: “the 1<sup>st</sup> of June”’.

(1.14b) *lei fa un lavoro*  
 she do.PRS.3SG INDEF job  
 ‘She works [lit. **does** a job]’. (Alessandra Dezi, p.c.)

Other NSVs, sometimes used in quotative constructions, e.g. action, motion or inchoative verbs, encode their primary meanings outside the quotative domain, if they have yet not grammaticalized into genuine quotative markers and still preserve their original non-quotative functions, e.g. the action verb *fare* ‘do’ in Italian in (1.14). Thus, in further descriptions, these two types of NSVs are treated separately: EVs preserve the label *epistemic verb* and the label *non-speech verbs* is reserved for other verbs which refer semantically neither to human vocal behavior nor to epistemic processes. However, I pay attention to both types, since EVs are mainly used as QIs with quotations of thoughts and other NSVs have already demonstrated their potential to grammaticalize into genuine quotative markers in individual languages. For example, consider the English quotative *go* in (1.6), Italian *fare* in (1.14a), or the Hungarian motion verb *előáll* ‘lit. step forward’ in (1.15).

(1.15) Hungarian  
*Szóval, azzal álltam elő, hogy*  
 word.COM DEM.D.COM stand.PST.1SG forward COMP  
*ha nem megy este, szaunázzunk*  
 if NEG come.PRS.3SG evening go.to.sauna.IMP1PL  
*reggel.*  
 morning  
 ‘In one word, with that **I came forward** that if we don’t manage with it in the evening, let’s have sauna in the morning.’ (facebook.com).

The already grammaticalized NSVs can form a subclass of their own labeled by Güldemann (2008: 13) as *quotative verbs* (henceforth also: *QVs*). As the author specifies, these verbs “occur very frequently in QIs and have in this context the same reading as a generic SV, but whose semantic analysis is far less straightforward” (ibid.: 12). Outside the quotative domain, this type of verbs misses the utterance meaning partially or completely, or they are not used at all in non-quotative contexts. For example, in contemporary Hungarian the motion verb *előáll* (consisting of the prefix *elő* ‘forth, forward’ and *áll* ‘stand’, lit. meaning ‘step forward, come up with something’) in (1.15) carries out functions of a specific SV meaning ‘claim, present’ (Dömötör, p.c.; Gyuris, p.c.). Outside the quotative domain, *előáll* can still function as a motion verb, e.g. *a kamion előáll* ‘the truck **moves forward**’, *parancsra a katona előáll* ‘the soldier **steps out** to an order’ (Kubitsch. p.c.). Even though in quotative contexts a specific SV-meaning is typically assigned to this verb, my observations show that in some of the attested contexts it can also be interpreted as a generic SV, meaning ‘say’. Therefore, it can already be labeled as a quotative verb (see Section 3.6 for more details on the use of *előáll* in Hungarian).

As for the proper motion verbs (henceforth also: MVs), their appearance in the quotative domain is explained via metaphors. A basic explanation is found through Lakoff's (1987, cited from Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XVI) metaphor 'a conversation is a journey'. Thus, the RD is interpreted as a message that travels from a sender, i.e. a reporter/speaker, to an addressee. As a result, in some languages, verbs used in expressions of telicity, ablativity and allativity appear as (new) QIs (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XVIII). A direct example of such instances can be observed in the use of the MV *tulla* in Finnish, as in (1.16)<sup>25</sup>. The MV basically depicts the process of the transition of a message, encoding the source of RD, to the reporter<sup>26</sup>.

- (1.16) *Tuli viesti et TonoSlono vs. TantrSlangrr*  
 come.PST.3SG message COMP PN  
*levy on ollut vuoden Spotifyyssä*  
 disc be.PRS.3SG be.PP year.GEN PN.INE  
 'The message came that the CD TonoSlono vs. TantrSlangrr has been for a year on Spotify' (facebook.com).

Among the well-known uses of the MVs as quotative indexes, one can mention Eng. *go*, cf. (1.17). Besides being used as a QI, *go* may also appear in mimetic expressions, presenting onomatopoeia and non-linguistic sound imitations, which historically depicts an earlier use of the marker (Güldemann 2008: 315; see also Buchstaller 2013).

- (1.17) *The guy goes, "When can you move?" and I go, "I don't know"*  
 (orionsmethod.com).

According to Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XVIII), there is not much evidence for the recruitment of MVs as QIs outside the Germanic languages, e.g. Dutch *komen* 'come', German *gehen* 'go' and *go* in the English example above. Among the attested cases in non-European languages, only Dongala (Nubian) employs the MV *án* 'go' which also has an inchoative meaning 'become X' (Güldemann 2008: 316).

In addition, one can observe the use of the equational verbs in quotative constructions where NQs like similitive markers, or quantifiers appear, cf. (1.18a)–(1.18c). In this type of QI-constructions, equational verbs function as *dummy verbs*, which merely establish a predicative structure in the QI-clause. Thus, their role in the QI-clause is rather syntactic than quote-introducing, as some authors have falsely assumed. For example, Routarinne (2005) in her study concentrates on the appearance of the equational verbs *olla* 'be' in QI-clauses in Finnish, rather than takes into account other non-reportative elements combining with *olla*. Thus, instead of looking at the construction 'equational verb + non-

<sup>25</sup> Also see (1.19b) for a similar example in Estonian.

<sup>26</sup> Motion verbs in these types of constructions in Finnish and Estonian are discussed in details in Section 4.6.

reportative element’, the author acknowledges the presence of the verb as a core-element in Finnish NQ-constructions with *olla*. In this study, equational verbs in QI-clauses are analyzed as dummy verbs and the main focus is on the elements accompanying them. The appearance of equational verbs can be expected in languages that require the presence of a verb for establishing a predicative structure, e.g. English (1.18a), Finnish (1.18b) or Estonian (1.18c). Other languages, e.g. Russian (1.18d), Hungarian (1.18e), German (1.33)<sup>27</sup>, turn to ellipsis of a verb from the QI-clause, and the presence of a dummy verb would make a QI even ungrammatical in such languages.

(1.18a) English

*All of them are like “Daaaammn” and he’s like “F\*CK...”* (reddit.com).

(1.18b) Finnish

|              |                 |             |                   |                 |               |           |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|
| <i>...ja</i> | <i>sit</i>      | <i>opet</i> | <b><i>oli</i></b> | <i>tottakai</i> | <i>sillai</i> | <i>et</i> |
| and          | then            | teacher     | be.PST.3SG        | really          | thus          | COMP      |
| <i>voi</i>   | <i>ompa</i>     |             | <i>ihana</i>      | <i>oppilas</i>  |               |           |
| INTERJ       | be.PRS.3SG.PTCL |             | amazing           | student         |               |           |

‘...and then the teacher **was** really like that (that) oh a nice student indeed’ (demi.fi).

(1.18c) Estonian

|              |             |                    |              |           |           |           |               |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| <i>...ja</i> | <i>mina</i> | <b><i>olin</i></b> | <i>nagu,</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>no</i> | <i>ei</i> | <i>noh...</i> |
| and          | 1SG         | be.PST.1SG         | like         | COMP      | INTERJ    | NEG       | INTERJ        |

‘...and I **was** like (that) well no well...’ (wordpress.com).

(1.18d) Hungarian

|                       |                  |                         |                   |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| <b><i>...erre</i></b> | <b><i>én</i></b> | <i>(*vagyok/voltam)</i> | <b><i>meg</i></b> |
| DEM.P.SUBL            | 1SG              | be.PRS.1SG/be.PST.1SG   | also              |
| <i>“basszus,</i>      | <i>ezt</i>       | <i>akkor</i>            | <i>ki</i>         |
| fuck                  | DEM.P.ACC        | then                    | PRE               |
| <i>kell</i>           | <i>dobnom...</i> |                         |                   |
| must.PRS.3SG          | throw.INF.1SG    |                         |                   |

‘**upon that I** (\*am/was) **also** “damn, then I must throw this out...”’ (phenomenon.hu).

(1.18e) Russian

|               |           |               |                    |              |           |             |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|
| <i>...i</i>   | <i>on</i> | <i>(*byl)</i> | <b><i>mol,</i></b> | <i>davaj</i> | <i>ja</i> | <i>tebe</i> |
| and           | he        | be.PST.M      | QUOT               | give.IMP2SG  | 1SG       | 2SG.DAT     |
| <i>pomogu</i> |           |               |                    |              |           |             |
| help.PRS.1SG  |           |               |                    |              |           |             |

‘...and he (\*was) **like/says** let me help’ (baby.ru).

<sup>27</sup> As Stef Spronck points out in his review, similar instances of verb elision from the QI can be observed in other Germanic languages, e.g. in Dutch.

### 1.6.2.2. NPs encoding the source of reported discourse

In addition to various speech and non-speech verbs, in a QI one could expect the appearance of NPs encoding the source of RD. This type of QIs typically consists of nominals referring to speech or mental processes, e.g. (*someone's*) *words*, *thoughts*, or as it frequently occurs in internet communications, an original source of the RD is usually represented by nouns like *message*, *notification*, etc. Of course, such NPs are typically accompanied by various verbs. However, in such cases, I suggest ignoring the semantics of the verbs and their functional role in the QIs since the presence of the RD is predominantly indicated by an NP encoding the source of the RD, but not by the verb accompanying it. For example, consider (1.19a), where the verb *saama* ‘get’ does not take part in marking the presence of the RD, and this function is exclusively carried out by the noun *sõnum* ‘message’ and the complementizer, indicating the border between the QI and the RD (on complementizers see the following subsection 1.6.2.3). Only in cases, where an NP encoding the source of the RD is accompanied by an MV, I take the verb into consideration, since MVs in such types of QIs encode technical transition processes of information from the source to its addressee; hence, they remain relevant elements of the QI, as in (1.19b).

Estonian

|         |  |              |                |              |              |
|---------|--|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| (1.19a) | <i>Tere,</i>   | <i>sain</i>  | <i>sõnumi,</i> | <i>et</i>    | <i>homme</i> |
|         | hello  | get.PST.1SG  | message.GEN    | COMP         | tomorrow     |
|         | <i>alates</i>  | <i>14.00</i> | <i>saan</i>    | <i>järgi</i> | <i>tulla</i> |
|         | start.INF.INE  | 14.00        | can.PRS.1SG    | after        | come.INF     |
|         | <i>jookidele</i>   |              |                |              |              |
|         | drink.PL.ALL   |              |                |              |              |
|         | ‘Hello, I’ve got <b>the message that tomorrow starting from 14.00 I can come to pick the drinks up</b> ’ (facebook.com). |              |                |              |              |

|         |   |              |               |           |           |
|---------|---|--------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| (1.19b) | <i>Üleeile</i>  | <i>tuli</i>  | <i>sõnum,</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>mu</i> |
|         | over.yesterday  | come.PST.3SG | message       | COMP      | 1SG.GEN   |
|         | <i>pakk</i>   | <i>on</i>    | <i>kohal</i>  |           |           |
|         | package   | be.PRS.3SG   | place.ADE     |           |           |
|         | ‘The day before yesterday <b>the message came that my package has arrived</b> ’ (facebook.com). |              |               |           |           |

### 1.6.2.3. Complementizers

As mentioned in the previous subsection, elements that are typically referred to as *complementizers*, can easily become valuable constituents of QIs, typically taking the adjacent position to the RD, and thus marking its boundaries by preceding or following it.

Traditionally, RD-constructions were viewed as a special case of complement-clause linkage. The most problematic point of this view is the principle portraying



the relationship between the verb in the matrix clause (QI) and the RD (cf. Güldemann 2008, Vandelanotte 2012). As Dixon (2006: 1) points out, “[i]n many languages, certain verbs – notably ‘see’, ‘hear’, ‘**know**’, ‘**believe**’, ‘like’ and often also ‘**tell**’ and ‘**want**’ – can take a clause [i.e. a complement clause] (...) as a core argument [i.e. object argument]” (bold marking of the verbs which can appear in RD-constructions is mine, DT). Thus, traditionally RD is viewed as a clause behaving like a syntactically subordinate object (“[a] complement clause (...) functions as a core argument of a higher clause” – Dixon 2006: 4) of the core predicate in the QI.

In RD-studies, however, there is debate on whether RD in general can be considered a type of a complement, or whether it forms a separate cross-domain. Spronck (2017: 107–108) lists a number of syntactic, pragmatic, lexico-semantic and general structural properties, firstly mentioned by McGregor (1994), showing that RD-constructions “do not involve a regular type of coordination/parataxis or subordination/hypotaxis” (Spronck 2017: 107; also see the most recent overview in Spronck & Nikitina 2019: 124–126). I will point some syntactic properties relevant for the current chapter that cast some doubt on the traditional views, mentioned above.

First, it is not entirely clear whether RD is dependent on the main clause that is introducing it. As Vandelanotte (2012: 180) demonstrates, the RD can remain “unframed”, as in (1.20), whereas the QI is “grammatically incomplete without its quote”, e.g. *\*everybody was going, \*I was like*<sup>28</sup> (ibid.).

(1.20) *He was furious. “I’m going to get all of you fired!”* (Vandelanotte 2012: 180; underline is mine, DT).

Second, there is a stable semantic relationship between the QI and the RD. In general, changes in word order between direct RD and the QI introducing it do not affect the semantic relationship between these constituents of an RD-construction, whereas this is not typical for coordination. In cases of indirect RD, the word order is predominantly rigid, which, in turn, is not typical for subordination. At the same time, in some languages, a QI can be inserted inside the RD, or in other words, interpolated within the reported clause. In subordination, such interpolations are impossible. Third, a QI can present RD, which may consist of a set of complex sentences or be smaller than a clause, which can be considered idiosyncratic only for RD-constructions and can hardly, if ever, be observed in canonical hypotactic constructions. (Spronck 2017: 107)

Another question concerns the core-predicate in the QI and its transitivity. For example, some English verbs, like *think*, *realize*, can be accompanied by the complementizer *that* and take proposition-like clauses, but at the same time cannot occur with a direct object NP. Thus, if one takes the principle ‘complement-as-object’ for granted, the above verbs would be less transitive in simple sentences than in subordinating constructions. (Güldemann 2008: 242) Furthermore,

---

<sup>28</sup> The author refers to the new quotatives *go* and *be like* in contemporary English.

Vandelanotte (2012: 179) points out that “indisputably intransitive verbs can also be used in quotative constructions”, as in (1.21b):

(1.21a) \**He sighed it.*

(1.21b) “No.” *he **sighed**.* (Vandelanotte 2012: 179; bold and underline are mine, DT)

As a result, instead of a subordinating relationship between the verb in the QI and the RD, researchers in RD-studies proposed several alternative suggestions, concentrating on the relationship between the QI as a whole and the RD. McGregor (1994: 77) labels this relationship as *framing* which is modeled “as the relationship between a picture and its frame” where the RD “is to be viewed and evaluated (...) as demonstration, rather than depiction”. Güldemann (2008: 237) proposed a similar suggestion where the relationship between the two constituents of an RD-construction functions as a tag model. In his idea, QIs “behave in the complex structure like comment clauses regarding order variation, pause behavior, etc. and are functionally close allies of tag-like sentential adverbs” (ibid.). For example, consider (1.22), portraying this relationship:

(1.22) a. *And then **people shout**, ‘He’s the thief!’.*

b. ***People say (that) he is the thief.***

c. *He is the thief, **they say**.*

d. ***Purportedly**, he is the thief.* (Güldemann 2008: 237; bold and underline are mine, DT).

Despite some similarities between the ideas about the relationship between the QI and the RD proposed by McGregor (1994) on one hand and Güldemann (2008) on the other, there is a difference between their frameworks. In their analysis of the relationship between two elements, McGregor *et al.* follow the consideration that the *frame* (alias QI) is a functional element within the framing/frame-in<sup>29</sup> construction (alias RD-construction). Therefore, in RD-constructions without a QI, the syntactic relation between elements still exists, but the structural element signaling the presence of RD is missing. (see the most recent overview in Spronck & Nikitina 2019: 124–129, concentrating on these issues) This phenomenon is defined in Spronck’s (2017) study by the term *defenestration*. Güldemann’s approach, however, does not make explicit whether there is a stable syntactic relation between the two elements. As a result, in his framework the QI remains an optional element in the RD-construction. Although the task of this study remains far from resolving particularly this debate (also due to the fact that I do not take into account “QI-less” RD-constructions of the languages in focus into

---

<sup>29</sup> To avoid confusion with non-syntactic interpretations of *framing*, Spronck (2017) uses the term *frame-in*.

my analysis<sup>30</sup>), I presume that the analysis of the stable relationship between the two elements is more accurate even in the QI-less clauses. As reviewed in Spronck & Nikitina (2019: 126–129), even QI-less RD-constructions or those introduced by non-canonical structures lacking elements indexing the presence of RD show a tendency of preserving the syntax of the RD. Therefore, the framework followed by McGregor *et al.* seems to be more accurate in these terms.

Despite the proposed solutions resolving the question of the relationship between the constituents in the RD-construction, the following question remains unsolved: how to treat traditional “complementizers” in RD-constructions like (1.22b). The most recently accepted definition of complementizers states that they are “conjunctions that have the functions of identifying clauses as complements” (Kehayov & Boye 2016: 1; also see Crystal 2008: 93, Noonan 2007: 55). However, as the above arguments show, one cannot treat RD as a complement clause in RD-constructions. Therefore, I employ the term *complementizer* merely for convenience and use it to refer to grammaticalized function words which are adjacent to the quote and are used *outside the quotative domain* “in contexts (...) subsumed under sentential complementation” (Güldemann 2008: 14). I analyze complementizers in RD-constructions as elements of the QI, which initially occur with speech and epistemic verbs (but are not limited to them) and indicate that what follows is in the quotative domain (Frajzyngier 1995: 486). Complementizers in RD-constructions link two units of such a construction and are typically placed in the adjacent position to the quote. This position allows complementizers to function in a broader sense as QIs. Basically, they signal the beginning or the end of the RD. For example, consider the double-marking complementizer use in Udmurt in (1.23), where the Russian clause-initial complementizer *čto* ‘that’ indicates the beginning of the RD, and autochthonous clause-final *šuyša* ‘lit. saying; that’ marks the border between two RDs.

(1.23) Udmurt

|                      |                |                       |                   |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| I                    | srazu          | <i>lue</i>            | <i>val</i>        |
| and                  | already        | be.PRS.3SG            | be.PST.3SG        |
| <i>kutyny</i>        | <i>soosyz,</i> | <b><i>valany</i></b>  | <b><i>što</i></b> |
| take.INF             | 3PL.ACC        | understand.INF        | COMP              |
| <i>mon</i>           | <i>öj</i>      | <i>gožty</i>          | <i>soje</i>       |
| 1SG                  | NEG.PST.1SG    | write.CN              | DEM.ACC           |
| <b><i>šuyša,</i></b> | <i>mone</i>    | <i>vzlomat'ill'am</i> | <i>vylem</i>      |
| COMP                 | 1SG.ACC        | break.into.PTCP.3PL   | be.PRF            |
| <b><i>šuyša</i></b>  |                |                       |                   |
| COMP                 |                |                       |                   |

‘And right away it was possible to catch them, **understand that I did not write it that I was obviously hacked**’ (vk.com/yumshan57).

<sup>30</sup> The realization of defenestration among the languages in focus could be a compelling topic for future studies, DT.

Furthermore, a number of languages uses complementizers deriving from SVs (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 261–265; see also Bashir 1996, Chappell 2008, Greed 2014, Güldemann 2001, Matić & Pakendorf 2013, *inter alia*), such as the above autochthonous complementizer *šuy* in Udmurt, primary functioning as a converb (*šuy-sa* ‘say-CV’) of an SV *šuy* ‘say’ (Klumpp 2016: 534)<sup>31</sup>. Even though in some languages these types of complementizers (e.g. Jap. *to*) are primarily used with SVs (1.24a) or EVs (1.24b), they can also grammaticalize into independent quote introducers, cf. (1.24c).

Japanese

(1.24a) *Yumiwa anataga sukida to itta*  
 PN.TOP you.NOM fond.be.PRS COMP say.PST  
 ‘Yumi **said that** [she] liked you’ (Oshima & Sano 2012: 147).

(1.24b) “*Watashiga saisensareru bekida*” *to Torampuwa omotteiru*  
 1SG.NOM reelect.PASS should COMP PN.TOP think.PROG  
 “‘I should be elected again’ **thinks** Trump’ (Ian Joo, p.c.).

(1.24c) *oishii to tabeta*  
 delicious COMP/QUOT eat.PST  
 ‘(S)he ate **saying/thinking that** it is delicious’ (Ian Joo, p.c.)<sup>32</sup>.

An opposite scenario is also attested, where complementizers with non-reportative semantics are primarily used with speech (1.25a) or epistemic verbs, but later on develop their quotative capacities in RD-constructions. For example, in Finnish (1.25b) the complementizer *et(tä)* is used together with the equational verb *olla* ‘be’, functioning as a dummy verb in the QI-clause (see 1.6.2.1).

Finnish

(1.25a) *se sanoi et voi kestää*  
 DEM say.PST.3SG COMP can.PRS.3SG last.INF  
*pari viikkoa et tulee pahaa*  
 couple week.PAR COMP come.PRS.3SG bad.PAR  
*makua suuhun*  
 taste.PAR mouth.ILL  
 ‘(s)he **said that** it can last for a couple of weeks **that** there will be a bad taste inside the mouth’ (meidanperhe.fi).

(1.25b) *sit se oli et ei koska en oo*  
 then DEM be.PST.3SG COMP NEG never NEG.1SG be.CN  
 ‘[(she) asks that: “I’m just asking... is she your girlfriend?”] then **she was that** no, never, I’m not’ (demi.fi).

<sup>31</sup> See 2.5.1 on the use of *šuy* and the Russian complementizer *čto* in Udmurt.

<sup>32</sup> (1.24c) can be literally translated as ‘ate, [saying/thinking] **that** [it is] delicious’. In principle, the elliptic subject in the QI can be interpreted as the first or the third singular, i.e. ‘I/(s)he ate’. I would like to thank Miyano (p.c.) for pointing out the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular interpretation in this example as a more plausible option.

Furthermore, complementizers can express modal functions, e.g. indicating a degree of certainty (Kehayov & Boye 2016: 1; also see Frajzyngier 1995). For example, in Russian one can contrast the use of the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* ‘that’, cf. (1.26a), with the epistemic complementizer *budto* ‘as if, like’ (see Hansen *et al.* 2016), cf. (1.26b). In cases of *čto*, a quote is produced without any additional epistemic overtones. Additional epistemic meaning is typically indicated by other external means, e.g. modal verbs and adverbs, inflectional modality markers, choice of verbs in the QI, *inter alia* (see Frajzyngier 1995 on modal meanings expressed in constructions with complementizers). In contrast to *čto*, *budto* expresses the epistemic meaning of uncertainty. Hence, the reporter expresses doubt in the content of the reproduced quote<sup>33</sup>. In further descriptions, epistemic overtones expressed by complementizers and other quotative markers are also taken under investigation.

Russian

(1.26a) ...*no*     **on**     *skazal*,     **čto**     *bylo*     *vkusno*  
 but     he     say.PST.M     COMP     be.PST.N     tasty.N  
 ‘...but **he said that** it was tasty’ (tripadvisor.ru).

(1.26b) *A*     *ešče*     **on**     *skazal*,     ***budto***     *u*     *Rossii*  
 and     more     he     say.PST.M     as.if/like     at     Russia.GEN  
 2     *sojuznika* – *eto*     *armija*     *i*     *flot*  
 two     ally.GEN     DEM     army     and     navy  
 ‘And in addition, **he said like** Russia has 2 allies, this is the army and the navy’  
 (twitter.com).

#### 1.6.2.4. Quotative particles

The category of quotative particles forms another type of quotative markers. Quotative particles represent grammaticalized function words marking the presence of RD. Etymologically, quotative particles are likely to derive from SVs, e.g. Rus. *mol* (< *molvit* ‘utter’), *deskat*’ (*skazat* ‘say’), Sp. and Port. *dizque* (< Sp. *decir*; Port. *dizer*, both meaning ‘say’) (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2002: 267–268), or they can develop a quotative meaning, having originally non-reportative semantics, e.g. Rus. *jakoby*, initially meaning ‘as if’ (cf. Wiemer 2008: 369). Some of the quotative particles have already grammaticalized into conventionalized quote-introducers and are sometimes used simultaneously as reported evidentials (on the difference between two domains, see 1.5.3), e.g. Udm. *pe*, Ko. *pö*. Thus, unlike NQs that are still undergoing grammaticalization in the majority of languages, quotative particles show the endpoint of this grammaticalization since they are often used not only in substandard varieties but also in literary standards.

<sup>33</sup> Russian complementizers are described in more details in 2.4.1.

In addition to their etymological division, quotative particles can also be functionally divided into self-quotative particles, exclusively used with self-quotations, and mere quotative particles, used with RD belonging to a source of consciousness different from that of the current reporter. So far, the category of self-quotative particles is attested only in some languages, while the majority of languages does not make this distinction. For example, compare the use of the self-quotative particle (1.27a) and the quotative particle (1.27b) in Komi<sup>34</sup> with Russian (1.28a, b), which does not have a distinction between the two subtypes of quotative particles.

Komi

(1.27a) *Čajti, tajö, miša, kučömkö ydžyd da važnöj*  
 think.PRS.1SG DEM QUOT:SELF some big and important  
*mort.*

person

‘I thought, this is some big and important person.’ (tuvsojva.blogspot.com).

(1.27b) *Kydžy šuö Mikol Ölöš (kodi*  
 how say.PRS.3SG PN PN who  
*taj čajtö, stavys pö loas*  
 PTCL think.PRS.3SG all.3SG QUOT be.FUT.3SG  
*bur), povoddja – drañ*  
 good rein.PL lathwork

‘How Mikol Ölöš says (who **thinks**, everything will be alright), reins are lathwork’ (vk.com/biarmian).

Russian

(1.28a) *Nu ja podumal, mol čto èta*  
 well 1SG think.PST.M QUOT what DEM.F  
*žiruxa sebe pozvoljaet*  
 fatty.F self.DAT allow.PRS.3SG

‘Well I thought, what does this fatty allow herself’ (dota2.ru).

(1.28b) *a ona podumala mol zaplaču deneg*  
 and she think.PST.F QUOT pay.PRS.1SG money.GEN  
 ‘and she thought I will pay some money’ (forums.drom.ru).

### 1.6.2.5. Similitive markers

The quotative functions of items denoting comparison, similarity or approximation (henceforth: similitive markers, SIMs), e.g. Eng. *like* (Romaine & Lange 1991, Buchstaller 2001, 2013 *inter alia*), Rus. *tipa* ‘like’ (Daiber 2010), Nor. *liksom* (Hasund *et al.* 2012 *inter alia*), have been of interest to various scholars for the last couple of decades. As cross-linguistic evidence shows, their occurrence in

<sup>34</sup> See 2.6.2 on quotative particles in Komi.

the quotative domain is not accidental. The use of SIMs in the quotative domain is explained mainly by the consideration that word-for-word, verbatim reproduction of someone’s utterance rarely happens in everyday conversations (for more arguments see e.g. Clark & Gerrig 1990: 795ff.). Even if it happens, in oral speech it is still “inevitably compromised by the reporter’s accent, style, prosody and, importantly, memory, and is thus nothing more than an approximation of the original speech act” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XV). In addition, different speakers follow different intentions and beliefs while reproducing someone’s previous utterance (Clark & Gerrig 1990: 798). Consequently, it is expected that there is often “something lost in translation”. Furthermore, there is basically no restriction on the referring expressions. As a result, speakers often insert into a quote “additional information from their own point of view” (Romaine & Lange 1991: 230).

By using SIMs, the reporter signals to the audience that there is a possible non-equivalence between the contents of the original and the reported utterances. Thus, the reporter expresses lower commitment towards the representation of a quote, depicting it as produced approximately (Buchstaller 2001: 4). In addition, one can observe epistemic hedging function in the use of these markers, which is realized in distancing by a reporter from the original utterance (Güldemann 2008: 320).

SIMs are also used in constructions where subjectivity, i.e. the externalization of the speaker’s own point of view, is expressed through depicting someone’s attitude, feelings, point of view, or opinion. By doing so, the reporter in a way demonstrates them to the audience by producing a quote. Hence, it is of no surprise that SIMs often appear in RD-constructions, where a quote is not meant to depict “an individual speech act of a particular situation”, but rather “a typification of a situation, a group of people, or an individual” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XV). Consider (1.29) from Estonian where the reporter only assumes what the speakers in the described circumstance might have thought about him, typifying the situation by producing a hypothetical quotation.

- (1.29) Estonian
- |                       |                     |               |             |                 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <i>Inimesed</i>       | <i>näitasisid</i>   | <i>näpuga</i> | <i>ning</i> | <i>rääkisid</i> |
| human.PL              | show.PST.3PL        | finger.COM    | and         | talk.PST.3PL    |
| <i>sosinal</i>        | <i>„näe,</i>        | <i>see</i>    | <i>on</i>   | <i>see</i>      |
| whispering            | see.IMP.2SG         | DEM           | be.PRS.3SG  | DEM             |
| <i>arvutifriik</i> “. | <b><i>Nagu,</i></b> | <i>fakk</i>   | <i>ju!</i>  |                 |
| computer.freak        | like                | fuck          | you         |                 |
- ‘People pointed fingers and talked whispering “look, this here is this computer freak”. **Like, fuck you!**’ (New media subcorpus).

In addition, Güldemann (2008: 320) points out that SIMs help “to focus on the non-propositional, paralinguistic aspects of the non-immediate speech or cognition event”. This point goes back to the analysis of the quoted material as a demonstration, proposed by Clark & Gerrig (1990). The quote in such cases functions as an illustration of someone’s attitudes in a particular situation. In the above

example (1.29), the quote summarizes and demonstrates the quoted speakers' attitudes towards the reporter.

Furthermore, if the SIMs are adjacent to the quote, “they function as convenient discourse signals serving to draw the attention of the audience directly to the presence of this constituent [i.e. a quote]” (Güldemann 2008: 320). As a result, one should take into consideration the foregrounding function of SIMs in the quotative domain. As Güldemann (ibid.: 322) indicates, the focusing nature of some SIMs probably plays an important role in their employment as quotative markers in a number of languages (see Table 4).

It is also quite interesting that SIMs often grammaticalize into independent quotative markers. Güldemann (2008: 321) states that “such markers [i.e. similitive markers and manner deictics] can become conventionalized in a QI and subsequently develop into a complementizer and still other derived gram types”. Such instances are observed e.g. in Russian with two SIMs – *tipa* ‘like, of a type’<sup>35</sup> and *jakoby* ‘as if’ (cf. Wiemer 2008). The latter marker *jakoby* has already lost its original function of a similitive marker, and in contemporary Russian is used exclusively in contexts where reported information is presented (ibid.: 369). Furthermore, another marker with approximative semantics, *budto* ‘as if’, is used as an epistemic complementizer, and appears as a constituent of different QI-clauses originally in Russian (see 2.4.2), but also in Udmurt (see 2.5.1.2.1). While Rus. *tipa* has already grammaticalized into a genuine quotative marker and can be used as a single quote-introducer (1.30), the epistemic complementizer *budto* is still restricted to co-occurrence with speech or epistemic verbs for the presentation of the RD. Compare (1.31a) and (1.31b). Ellipsis of the verb from the QI-clause as in (1.31b) would make the whole RD-construction ungrammatical<sup>36</sup>, while in (1.30) it is entirely possible. Thus, in quotative constructions, SIMs can also demonstrate different qualitative degrees in grammaticalization.

Russian

(1.30) *Tipa*            *ne*                    *nado*    *nam*            *vtirat'*    *pro*  
 like                NEG                    need    1PL.DAT    tell.INF    about  
*prirodu,*        *romantiku*        *i*            *svežij*        *vozdux.*  
 nature.ACC      romance.ACC      and        fresh        air  
 ‘Like/saying, no need to tell us about nature, romance and fresh air.’ (Russian National Corpus).

(1.31a) ...*no kto-to skazal, budto* rock-n-roll –        *èto on*  
 but somebody say.PST.M as.if/like rock-n-roll (Eng.) DEM he  
 ‘...but somebody said like rock-n-roll – it’s him’ (fontanka.ru).

<sup>35</sup> On the use of *tipa* in Russian and Udmurt, see 2.4.3 and 2.5.3.2, respectively.

<sup>36</sup> In contexts where two RD-constructions contrast each other, e.g. ‘X said like..., but Y (said) like...’, the ellipsis of the verb from the second QI-clause could be possible only if the condition is followed that an SV or an EV is overtly expressed in the first QI-clause.



- (1.31b) ...*no kto-to* \**(skazal)*, *budto* rock-n-roll – *èto on*  
 but somebody say.PST.M as.if/like rock-n-roll (Eng.) DEM he  
 ‘...but **somebody** \*(said) like rock-n-roll – it’s him’ (fontanka.ru).

Epistemic overtones that are observed in the use of SIMs are discussed for each marker separately, reasoning from the fact that they mainly depend on the functional properties of individual markers and on the pragmatic setting in which they are used in the individual languages (see 1.6.6 for more details on epistemic meanings and evaluative connotations expressed by QIs).

### 1.6.2.6. Demonstratives

The use of elements with demonstrative and deictic functions inside the quotative domain is often explained by the consideration that quotations are a type of demonstrations that are embedded in language use – “a mimetic reenactment of a non-immediate state of affairs” (Güldemann 2008: 320). By producing an utterance that belongs to another temporal and spatial situation, the reporter demonstrates this situation to the audience (Clark & Gerrig 1990: 802; on the general concept of speech acts as demonstrations see Clark 2016).

In the quotative domain, deictic elements are primarily used as elements pointing to the presence of RD (Güldemann 2008: 350; Hasund *et al.* 2012: 55). At the same time, deictics allow “the performative aspects of the enactment to take center stage” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XV). Consequently, one should take into consideration referential, i.e. cataphoric/anaphoric, and foregrounding functions of deictic elements in QIs. For example, in Hungarian, a basic quotative construction involves the use of the demonstratives *ez* ‘this’ or *az* ‘that’ that function as syntactic objects of a speech or an epistemic verb. While the proximal demonstrative *ez* can be used both cataphorically and anaphorically (1.32a, b), the distal demonstrative *az* is restricted to cataphoric reference (1.32c) (Kiefer 2015: 82). Thus, there is reason to investigate different deictic dimensions, if several demonstratives are simultaneously employed systematically in the quotative domain, as in Hungarian.

Hungarian

- (1.32a) *Péter ezt monda:* “*Ma otthon dolgozom*”  
 PN DEM.P.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF today at.home work.PRS.1SG  
 ‘Peter said **this**: “Today I am working at home” (Kiefer 2015: 82; translation and glossing are mine, DT).

- (1.32b) “*Ma otthon dolgozom*” – *ezt monda Péter*  
 today at.home work.PRS.1SG DEM.P.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF PN  
 ““Today I am working at home” – **this** said Peter’ (Kiefer 2015: 82; translation and glossing are mine, DT).

(1.32c) *Péter azt mondta: “Ma otthon dolgozom”*  
 PN DEM.D.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF today at.home work.PRS.1SG  
 ‘Peter said **that**: “Today I am working at home” (Kiefer 2015: 82; translation and glossing are mine, DT).

A separate category of deictics that are used in the quotative domain is formed by manner deictics (henceforth also: MDs) that are reported to be widely used in the world’s languages. Güldemann (2008) discusses the motivation to use manner deictics together with the category of similitive markers. According to his consideration, both types of markers are employed in the quotative domain as elements that focus on the “non-propositional, paralinguistic aspects of the non-immediate speech or cognition event” (ibid.: 320). According to König (2015: 161), the use of MDs in the quotative domain can be associated not only “with pointing gestures, but above all with mimicking gestures with the voice used as instruments in most cases”. In internet communications, MDs sometimes appear in quasi-quotative constructions with mimetic expression. For example, the German manner deictic *so* ‘so’ is used to present either RD consisting of interjection (1.33a) or a mimetic expression (1.33b). In (1.33b), instead of verbal means, the reporter uses the emoticon with the mirative meaning, depicting eyes wide open interpreted as the reporter’s surprised facial expression.

German

(1.33a) *Und ich so: Häh?!*  
 and 1SG so INTERJ  
 ‘And I **so**: Eh?!’ (blogspot.com).

(1.33b) *Ich so... 0.o...*  
 1SG so EMOT:MIR  
 ‘I **so**... 0.o...’ (extreme.pcgameshardware.de).

In general, MDs can be used as constituents of a QI-clause co-occurring with different types of predicates, organizing thus a bipartite QI-clause<sup>37</sup> (Güldemann 2008: 320ff., 350). Like similitive markers, they are likely to grammaticalize into independent quote-introducers or complementizers that are used in the position adjacent to the RD (ibid.: 321–322), e.g. Sanskrit *iti* ‘thus’ and Old Georgian (*rame*)*tu* and *vitarmed*, both meaning ‘thus’ (ibid.: 321), or more familiar cases in Germanic, e.g. Eng. *that* and Ger. *daß* (ibid.: 350). Thus, similarly to SIMs, MDs can also demonstrate different degrees of grammaticalization in the quotative domain.

<sup>37</sup> See 1.6.5 on syntactic possibilities in QIs.

### 1.6.2.7. Quantifiers

Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XVI) indicate that quantifiers that are used in the quotative domain have either a maximum (e.g. Eng. *all*, Est. *täiega* ‘totally’) or a minimum (e.g. Nor. *bare* ‘just’) quantificational meaning. According to the authors, these markers “bear on the epistemic stance and attitudinal position speakers tend to take towards the quotation” (ibid.).

(1.34a) English

*And he’s all, “Abby, put that away.”* (phdessay.com).

(1.34b) Norwegian

|             |                   |                  |                    |                  |                  |            |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|
| <i>Men</i>  | <b><i>hun</i></b> | <b><i>sa</i></b> | <b><i>bare</i></b> | <b><i>at</i></b> | <i>sånn</i>      | <i>var</i> |
| but         | she               | say.PST          | just               | COMP             | so               | be.PST     |
| <i>det,</i> | <i>det</i>        | <i>er</i>        | <i>sim-kortet</i>  | <i>man</i>       | <i>forsikrer</i> | <i>og</i>  |
| DEM.N       | DEM.N             | be.PRS           | SIM-card.DEF       | INDEF            | insure.PRS       | and        |
| <i>ikke</i> | <i>telefonen</i>  | <i>man</i>       | <i>har</i>         | <i>kjøpt</i>     |                  |            |
| NEG         | phone.DEF         | INDEF            | have.PRS           | buy.PP           |                  |            |

‘But **she said just (that)** so it was, it’s the SIM-card one is insuring and not the phone one has bought’ (facebook.com).

By using markers with the maximum quantificational meaning, reporters upgrade the evidential value, presenting the reported information as obtained from a ‘first hand’. Contrarily to SIMs, by using quantifiers of maximum degree reporters indicate that they are “fully committed to the accuracy or the appropriateness of the quotation, or as emotionally involved” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XVI). Markers with the minimum quantificational meaning indicate reporter’s “minimal commitment to the form or occurrence of the quote” (ibid.). They can also mark a quote as a “habitual occurrence” rather than hot news (ibid.).

The meaning that is expressed by quantifiers in the quotative domain, however, should not be taken for granted as universal across languages that employ these elements in QIs. For example, the new quotative *bare* ‘just’ in Norwegian (1.34b), despite its minimal quantificational meaning, both inside and outside the quotative domain acquires the meaning of “an evaluative intensifier, associated with narrative peaks and hyperbolic assessments” (Hasund *et al.* 2012: 46). Obviously, such a meaning would be rather expected from a quantifier with opposite semantics, e.g. Eng. NQ *all*, cf. (1.34a). At the same time, the authors report cases where *bare* loses this meaning and is used instead as “a more or less neutral device for the portrayal of direct speech in discourse” (ibid.). Consequently, one should take the evidence from the previous cross-linguistic findings into account; however, the meaning that quantifiers denote in the quotative domain should be separately studied for individual markers with originally quantificational meaning.

In addition, Güldemann (2008: 362) suggests that quantifiers may be employed in the quotative domain due to their foregrounding function that can be observed in the use of markers from both ends of the quantificational scale. According to his consideration, quantifiers are often used marking the presence of direct RD.

If direct quotes are often presented as a foregrounded information in the discourse, it is logical that the elements that introduce quotations “will often employ formal means which express this foregrounding overtly” (ibid.). Consequently, one can consider the relationship between the use of the markers with similar semantics outside the quotative domain and their employment in QIs of various languages. In his study, Güldemann refers to the Swedish restrictive quantifier *ba(ra)* ‘just’ and English universal quantifier *all* (ibid.: 361–62). Besides marking RD, the Swedish quantifier *ba(ra)* can also introduce mimetic expressions (ibid.). In (1.33b), I have already demonstrated how the German MD *so* is used in such a function as a quotative/mimetic marker. As for the use of the quantifiers with mimetic expressions, this functional capacity is also taken into consideration for quantifiers in addition to quotative functions, since there is a tight correlation between the use of QIs with RD and with other mimetic expressions.

### 1.6.3. Presentational quotative constructions

Besides the use of elements that can be identified as core elements in the QI and are described in the previous subsection, one can encounter complex quotative constructions consisting of several elements. None of these elements takes the quote-introducing function on its own. Hence, the construction *per se* can be recognized as a QI only in its complexity. Here I label such QIs as *presentational quotative constructions* (henceforth also: PQC). Among PQCs, one can point out two subtypes relevant for the current description<sup>38</sup>: *speaker-presentational*, cf. (1.35)–(1.36), and *quote-presentational constructions*, cf. (1.37). This distinction is applied to cases where a quotative construction can primarily be analyzed only in its complexity and none of the elements can be pointed out as a fundamental element of such a construction. As for the quote- and speaker-presentational constructions, they are typically distinguished based on the orientation in the QI, i.e. what is primarily introduced in the QI – a quote or to whom it belongs (see 1.6.4 for QI-orientation). For example, consider the QI *this is* + *SPEAKER* in (1.35), attested in London adolescent speech (Fox 2012), which falls under the category of speaker-presentational quotative constructions.

(1.35) ***This is me*** “*what..what’s your..what’s your problem?*” (Fox 2012: 232; bold and underline are mine, DT).

The QI in (1.35) represents a QI where the reporter indicates to whom the RD belongs. The combination of the elements, albeit peculiar to one variety of English, forms a dedicated QI. If one hypothetically removed an element from the QI, it would primarily lose its canonical form, but such a hypothetical

---

<sup>38</sup> It goes without saying that another type with a focus on another participant of the quoted situation, i.e. addressee-presentational construction, can logically be distinguished in languages not discussed here.

deformation of the QI might also lead to the loss of its performative quote-introducing capacities.

Among similar types of QIs, one can encounter *turn-taking* (alias *speaker-presentational*) *quotative constructions*, where the combination of elements signals the beginning of the cue by a concrete speaker and at the same time indicates the presence of the RD, as in (1.36) in Hungarian.

(1.36) Hungarian

|                    |                   |                    |             |              |           |                 |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
| <b><i>Erre</i></b> | <b><i>ő,</i></b>  | <b><i>hogy</i></b> | <i>ez</i>   | <i>aztán</i> | <i>a</i>  | <i>kultúra,</i> |
| DEM.P.SUBL         | 3SG               | COMP               | DEM.P       | then         | DEF       | culture         |
| <b><i>mire</i></b> | <b><i>én,</i></b> | <b><i>hogy</i></b> | <i>nem,</i> | <i>nem</i>   | <i>ez</i> |                 |
| what.SUBL          | 1SG               | COMP               | NEG         | NEG          | DEM.P     |                 |

‘**Upon this he (that) this is then the culture, whereupon I (that) no, not this**’  
(wmn.hu).

The demonstrative *ez* in the sublative case (*erre* ‘upon this’) functions as an element encoding the reaction of the speaker to the previously described situation or someone’s previous utterance. In cases where two RD-constructions follow each other, as in (1.36), the demonstrative in the second RD-construction can be substituted by the conjunction (*a*)*mire* ‘whereupon’. The following element in the QI-clause encodes the speaker(s), while the complementizer indicates the border between the QI and the RD. Of course, (1.36) depicts two event-neutralized QIs where some of the elements, i.e. a verb describing an event behind the RD and an NP encoding the addressee, are elliptic. However, none of the elements *per se* can be pointed out as a core-constituent of the QI, and this construction ideally functions as quotative only in its whole. Only in rare occasions, this quotative construction can pragmatically be reduced to one element (*erre* ‘upon this’) with the rest of the constituents remaining elliptic<sup>39</sup>.

Furthermore, in Hungarian one can observe a type of QI where a specific SV (e.g. *answer*; *reject*, etc.), an inchoative verb or two initially motion verbs (*előáll* ‘lit. step forward; claim’ and *jön* ‘come’) can combine with the distal demonstrative *az* in the comitative case – *azzal* ‘with that’ (or an NP encoding the original source of the RD where inchoative or motion verbs appear, e.g. *azzal az ötlettel* ‘with this idea’) – to mark the presence of the RD, as in (1.37).

Hungarian

(1.37a)

|                  |                    |                 |                     |                     |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <b><i>én</i></b> | <b><i>erre</i></b> | <i>mindig</i>   | <b><i>azzal</i></b> | <i>válaszoltam,</i> | <b><i>hogy</i></b> |
| 1SG              | DEM.P.SUBL         | always          | DEM.D.COM           | answer.PST.1SG      | COMP               |
| <i>igen,</i>     | <i>azt</i>         | <i>hiszem</i>   |                     |                     |                    |
| yes              | DEM.D.ACC          | believe.PRS.1SG |                     |                     |                    |

‘**Upon this I always answered with that (that) yes, I believe it**’ (24.hu).

<sup>39</sup> See Section 3.5 on turn-taking quotative constructions in Hungarian.

- (1.37b) *azzal kezdtem, hogy jó csapat a TF*  
 DEM.D.COM start.PST.1SG COMP good team DEF PN  
 ‘I started with that (that) TF is a good team’ (bbl.hu).
- (1.37c) *mindig azzal jöttem, hogy nekem*  
 always DEM.D.COM come.PST.1SG COMP 1SG.DAT  
*lesz bajom az ő sérülései*  
 be.FUT.1SG trouble.1SG DEM.D 3SG injury.PL.3SG  
*miatt*  
 because.of  
 ‘...I always **come with that (that)** I will have troubles because of his/her injuries’  
 (blogspot.com).

With specific SVs (1.37a) the situation in this type of a presentational quotative construction is slightly different than with inchoative (1.37b) or motion (1.37c) verbs. Specific SVs can only optionally be accompanied by the demonstrative in the comitative case. Furthermore, they co-occur with NPs indicating the source of the RD relatively rarely, since there is no requirement for such an over-specification of an event behind the RD, as SV *per se* describe it. However, inchoative and motion verbs require the presence of the demonstrative and *vice versa*, since only in combination these elements form a complete quotative construction. If one omits one of the elements from the QI, it will become ungrammatical, and the whole RD-construction will lose its reportative status.

Consequently, for complex quotative constructions, I adopt the following approach. I take the elements of such a QI and their functions into account. However, at the same time, I pay greater attention to the whole construction than to its separate elements.

#### 1.6.4. The orientation of quotative indexes: event-, quote- and participant-oriented quotative indexes

The structural complexity of a QI-clause is often defined by the orientation of the QI-clause. According to their orientation, QIs can be broadly divided into event-, quote- and participant-oriented (Güldemann 2012: 117–118). For example, (1.38) depicts an event-oriented QI, where the main focus lies on the SV, representing the state of affairs in which the RD occurred.

- (1.38) Hungarian  
*...ő mondta: “Én csak egy átlagos*  
 3SG say.PST.3SG.DEF 1SG only INDEF average  
*zene kedvelő srác vagyok.”*  
 music like.PTCP guy be.PRS.1SG  
 ‘...he said: “I’m just an average music loving guy.”’ (starity.hu).

The presence of the verb, however, cannot be considered the main feature of an event-oriented QI. Rather the speech verb defines the event-orientation of a clause, since these types of verbs have a semantic content representing an event behind the RD. For example, substitution of an SV with the equational verb (‘be’) often triggers a shift of orientation from the event to the quote (Teptiuk 2015, 2019), as e.g. in Finnish (1.39).

(1.39) Finnish

|  |               |                |           |              |                 |
|--|---------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| <i>Mä</i>  | <i>olin</i>   | <i>tyyliin</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>“ei</i>   | <i>saatana</i>  |
| 1SG  | be.PST.1SG    | style.ILL/like | COMP      | NEG          | Satan           |
| <i>en</i>  | <i>vitus,</i> | <i>en</i>      | <i>oo</i> | <i>ikinä</i> | <i>pelannut</i> |
| NEG.1SG  | cunt.INE      | NEG.1SG        | be.CN     | never        | play.PP         |
| <i>koko</i>  | <i>peleä”</i> |                |           |              |                 |
| whole  | game.PAR      |                |           |              |                 |
| ‘I was like (that) <u>“hell no, fuck no, I have never even played that game”</u> |               |                |           |              |                 |
| (hiphei.com).  |               |                |           |              |                 |

Event-orientation cannot be expressed by the equational verb because it does not bear any information about the speech act *per se* (compare the clause *I was like* with *I said*). Thus, the orientation is shifted to the quote. According to Güldemann (2012: 120), a clause then has as its nucleus a simple verbal clause (e.g. Fin. *olin tyyliin et* ‘I was like that’). Outside the quotative domain, such a clause does not have any reportative semantics, but in the quotative domain is paraphrasable by a speech or an epistemic verb with no apparent change in referential meaning. This subtype refers to a grammaticalized quotative marker.

Often, substitution of a speech or an epistemic verb with a predicate without reportative capacities or the ellipsis of such a verb from the QI leads to *event-neutralization* (henceforth also: *neutralization*) of a QI-clause, leaving equal possibilities for interpretations of the presented quote as different types of RD (quotation of speech, thought, hypothetical quotation). In previous studies, *neutralization* is often described by the traditional term *bleaching*, i.e. the process in which “a sense becomes more general by losing feature” (Sweetser 1988: 390). In this study, I prefer the term “neutralization” over “bleaching” since the former acquires less of the general character and is applied to the processes in QIs, which (i) lead to unspecification of the event behind the RD, and (ii) result in the emergence of different interpretations for RD with the main basic types (quotation of speech vs. quotation of thought vs. hypothetical quotation). Contrarily to neutralization, bleaching can refer to other processes not strictly resulting in the emergence of different interpretations for RD. For example, in any given language with a great range of speech verbs, the use of a generic speech verb (e.g. ‘say’) instead of a specific (e.g. ‘whisper’) can be considered a bleaching strategy. Thus, a sense indeed becomes more general and such features as a manner of verbalization expressed by ‘whisper’ and not by ‘say’ will be lost. However, the interpretation of the speech event for the RD introduced by either of these verbs will remain. As a result, bleaching in QIs would not necessarily lead to unspecification of the event behind the RD and emergence of different

interpretations for the RD without a specific pragmatic setting<sup>40</sup>, but event-neutralization as a proposed term does imply it. For example, in (1.39), the quote can be interpreted as a quotation of either speech or thought, since the equational verb functions as a dummy verb (see 1.6.2.1). An exact interpretation of the event behind the RD can be retrieved from the context only. In (1.40), any verb depicting such an event is elided from the QI-clause. The demonstrative *ez* in the sublative case (*erre* ‘upon this’) can refer to either previously produced speech or even to any other circumstances, occurring in the context. Thus, the RD can be interpreted as a self-quotation of speech, i.e. a response to someone else’s utterance, or as thought, i.e. the reporter’s mental reaction to (unexpected) circumstances.

(1.40) Hungarian

**Erre**            **én:**        “*meg lehet ezt tanulni?*”  
 DEM.P.SUBL 1SG PRE    be.POT.3SG    DEM.P.ACC study.INF  
 ‘**Upon this I:** “Is it possible to study this?”’ (ma.hu).

As for participant-oriented QIs, they are likely to consist of elements exclusively encoding the speaker and/or the addressee of the quote. Participant-oriented quotatives can be further divided into speaker- or addressee-oriented QIs, which is defined by which of the elements is highlighted more (Güldemann 2012: 120). For example, in (1.41a), a speaker-oriented QI occurs, concentrating the interlocutor’s attention to whom the RD belongs to. In contrast, in (1.41b), the reporter highlights the addressee of the RD.

(1.41a) Finnish

*Heh.*            ***Minä,***            ***että***                            *mitä*            *väliä*  
 INTERJ        1SG                    COMP                            what.PAR    difference.PAR  
*sillä*            *on*                            *minkäväriseen*            *pussiin*        *minä*  
 DEM.ADE    be.PRS.3SG            what.color.ADJ.ILL    bag.ILL        1SG  
*roskani*        *laitan?*  
 trash.1SG    put.PRS.1SG

‘[My husband came there and said that have you seen that there were also other colors of the same bags.] **Heh. I, that what difference does the color of the bag in which I put my garbage make?**’ (etlehti.fi).

<sup>40</sup> Despite this claim, I fully acknowledge the grammaticalization of generic speech verbs and their further use with quotations of thought, observed in a number of the world’s languages, which was previously addressed here in 1.6.2.1. In fact, the cross-linguistic grammaticalization of generic speech verbs into general quotative markers (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2002: 267–268) might be tightly connected to bleaching processes. See e.g. 3.4.1 similar processes observed in the use of the self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’ in Hungarian.



(1.41b) Udmurt

*Noš* *soľy* “*Da* *kyče* *ton* *mužik*,  
 and 3SG.DAT and which 2SG man  
*esli* *ud* *šiišky* *ke* *sil*, *ťfu!* *ŠIIIIII!*”  
 if NEG.PRS.2SG eat.FRQ.CN if meat INTERJ meat  
 ‘[And he’s like, “Look now, I don’t eat meat and I’m okay!”] And **to him** “What  
kind of man are you, if you don’t eat meat, br! MEAAAAAAT!’”  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

## 1.6.5. Syntactic possibilities in quotative indexes

### 1.6.5.1. Clausality in quotative indexes: monoclausal vs. bipartite vs. non-clausal quotative indexes

The rientation of QIs has a tight relationship with their syntactic structure. Based on his investigation, Güldemann (2008: 150) provides a typological account on syntactic properties of QIs, suggesting a three-way classification of QIs: (i) *monoclausal*, (ii) *bipartite*, and (iii) *non-clausal QIs*, which can be illustrated with (1.42) from Hungarian.

Hungarian

(1.42a) Monoclausal QI

...*de* *Ő* *azt* *mondta:* *nem*  
 but 3SG DEM.D.ACC say.PST.3SG.DEF NEG  
 ‘...but **he said that: no**’ (oszk.hu).

(1.42b) Bipartite QI

...*mondta* *az* *egyik* *riporterünk*,  
 say.PST.3SG:DEF DEF one.of reporter.1PL  
*az* *egyik* *körkapcsoláson,* *Zalaegerszeg-MTK*  
 DEF one.of circular.SUPE PN-PN  
*találkozón,* *aszongya:* “*Kedves* *hallgatóink...*”  
 meeting.SUPE QUOT.PRS.3SG:DEF dear listener.PL.1PL  
 ‘**One of our reporters said**, during one of the circular games, in the meeting  
 between Zalaegerszeg and MTK, **said**: “Dear listeners...” (weebly.com).

(1.42c) Non-clausal QI

*Erre* *a* *gyerek:* – *Egy* *kicsit* *fáztam*  
 DEM.P.SUBL DEF child INDEF little.ACC freeze.PST.1SG  
 ‘**The child upon it: – I was cold a bit**’ (megyekezerrel.blogspot.com).

In (1.42a), a simple QI-clause consisting of a speaker- and event-reference is used to present the RD. Güldemann (2008: 154) defines a monoclausal QI as “constituted by a single predicate, possibly accompanied by nominal participants”. His findings show that a monoclausal QI is likely to consist of either an SV or a grammaticalized QV (see 1.6.2.1 for more details). SVs are used in event-oriented QIs describing the state of affairs, while grammaticalized QVs are elements in

quote-oriented QIs, primarily pointing to the presence of a quote and leaving the interpretation of an event open for discussion (ibid.: 154ff.).

In (1.42b), the bipartite QI is formed by two quote-introducing elements– the SV *mondta* ‘((s)he said (it)’ and the quotative particle *a(s)zongya*. The former element (*mondta*) is used to describe the event behind the RD, while the latter (*aszongya*) functions as a quote-orienter. In some cases, a quote-orienter can be represented by either a simple element (e.g. a complementizer, a similitive marker, a quotative particle, etc. adjacent to the quote), as in (1.42b), or can form a clause on its own. In the latter case, a bipartite QI can in fact represent “a complex of two monoclausal QIs” (ibid.: 157). Thus, bipartite QIs can be split into (i) biclausal bipartite (1.43a), and (ii) monoclausal bipartite QIs (1.43b).

(1.43a) *then Peter tells him, he says (...)*<sup>41</sup>

(1.43b) *then Peter tells him like (...)* (Güldemann 2012: 120).

In (1.42c), a simple non-predicative construction is used referring only to a speaker (*a gyerek* ‘the child’) who produces an original utterance. Similarly to monoclausal QIs, non-clausal QIs can be split according to their orientation into (i) participant-oriented non-clausal, cf. (1.42c), or quote oriented non-clausal QIs, cf. (1.44). Participant-oriented non-clausal QIs, in principle, can be formed “by any kind of nominal syntagm”, while quote-oriented non-clausal QIs largely depend on the available grammaticalized quotative markers in the language (Güldemann 2008: 160).

(1.44) Hungarian

|                 |                 |                  |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>Nem tud</i>  | <i>belépni,</i> | <i>aszongya.</i> |
| NEG can.PRS.3SG | log.in.INF      | QUOT.PRS.3SG:DEF |

‘Can’t log-in, says.’ (MNSz).

In general, monoclausal QIs consisting of a QV and quote-oriented non-clausal QIs can form a functionally identical subclass of the quote-oriented QIs (Güldemann 2008: 161), in opposition to the participant- and event-oriented QIs (see a basic deviation of QIs according their orientation in 1.6.4). As a result, a fundamental relationship between the elements in the QI, the syntactic structure of QIs and the primary meanings and functions of QIs can be pointed out, which I use in the following description and classification of the QIs attested in the languages in focus.

<sup>41</sup> Güldemann (2008: 157) indicates that occasionally a bipartite QI can involve more than two clauses, as in Hausa (Chadic, Afroasiatic).

### 1.6.5.2. Order patterns

As for the basic order patterns of the QIs vis-à-vis the quote, two different scenarios can be expected. Where “the QI is coherent and uninterrupted by other material”, the QI can be placed before (*preposed QI*), after (*postposed QI*) or within (*intraposed QI*) the RD (Güldemann 2008: 191). In the case where the QI consists of separated segments, one can expect the combination of the three basic patterns. Among them, one can logically expect, the combination of (i) preposed and postposed QIs (*circumposed QI*), (ii) pre- and intraposed QIs, (iii) intra- and postposed QIs, and (iv) pre-, intra- and postposed QIs (ibid.: 191–192)<sup>42</sup>.

For example, in contemporary Udmurt one can observe all of the above basic order patterns, cf. (1.45a)–(1.45c), with all possible combinations of basic ones, cf. (1.45d)–(1.45g). Naturally, one can expect different frequencies for the various patterns, which in some cases depend on text style and also contextual motivations. Among the majority of the languages, combinations of different positions are either rare or even unlikely, due to fixed word order or to preference for one position of the QI within the RD-construction.

Udmurt

(1.45a) Preposed QI

|              |               |                |             |                |                 |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|
| ...noš       | <i>sobere</i> | <i>korka</i>   | <i>tros</i> | <i>gurdžem</i> | <i>no</i>       |
| and          | then          | house          | full        | burb.PTCP      | and             |
| <b>juške</b> | <b>pe....</b> | ( <i>anaj,</i> | <i>noš</i>  | <i>kytyn</i>   | desert???)..... |
| ask.PRS.3SG  | QUOT          | mother         | and         | where          | dessert         |

‘And then having burbed the house full, **he asks, saying...** (mom, so where is the dessert???)’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

(1.45b) Postposed QI

|     |          |       |      |                |           |
|-----|----------|-------|------|----------------|-----------|
| “a  | vdrug    | vojna | s    | udmurtiej”     | <b>pe</b> |
| and | suddenly | war   | with | Udmurtia.INSTR | QUOT      |

“And what if there’s suddenly a war with Udmurtia” **he said**’  
(vk.com/wall-62098651\_13).

(1.45c) Intraposed QI

|                |                |                  |              |           |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|
| <i>Pershal</i> | <i>Val’aez</i> | <i>ö’o,</i>      | <b>pöj –</b> | <i>so</i> |
| PN             | PN.ACC         | call.FUT.1SG     | QUOT:SELF    | 3SG       |
| <i>vañze</i>   | <i>radyzja</i> | <i>valektoz.</i> |              |           |
| everything.ACC | in.order       | explain.FUT.3SG  |              |           |

‘[A little bit (s)he calms down.] I will call Valya Pershal, I said – she will explain you everything’ (Press subcorpus).

<sup>42</sup> As Güldemann (2008: 192) indicates, specific terms are not available and have not been suggested for the latter three combinations of basic patterns.

(1.45d) Circumposed QI

|               |                 |                  |                       |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Nyljos</i> | <i>šuízy,</i>   | <i>čapak</i>     | <i>soku</i>           |
| girl.PL       | say.PST.3PL     | right            | when                  |
| <i>ik</i>     | <i>konkurse</i> | <i>pyriškiš</i>  | <i>finno-ugorkaos</i> |
| PTCL          | competition.ILL | participate.PTCP | Finno-Ugrian.F.PL     |
| <i>no</i>     | <i>koškízy</i>  | <i>šúysa.</i>    |                       |
| PTCL          | go.away.PST.3PL | COMP             |                       |

‘The girls said that right at that time the Finno-Ugrian girls who participated in the competition went away.’ (Blog subcorpus).

(1.45e) Combination of pre- and intraposed QIs

|                    |                 |             |                  |              |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|
| I                  | <i>tatyn</i>    | <i>odig</i> | <i>kyšnomurt</i> | <i>mynym</i> |
| and                | here            | one         | woman            | 1SG.DAT      |
| <b>zajavljaet,</b> | <i>mon</i>      | <i>pe</i>   | <i>tuž</i>       | xitryj       |
| declare.PRS.3SG    | 1SG             | QUOT        | very             | sly          |
| <i>ađami,</i>      | <i>olokytyš</i> | <i>pe</i>   | <i>vui</i>       | <i>no,</i>   |
| person             | somewhere.ABL   | QUOT        | come.PST.1SG     | and          |
| <i>očered’e</i>    | <i>sulti.</i>   |             |                  |              |
| queue.ILL          | stand.PST.1SG   |             |                  |              |

‘And here **one woman declares to me that I am a very sly person, I appeared from somewhere and joined the queue.**’ (vk.udmurt\_ept).

(1.45f) Combination of intra- and postposed QIs

|                 |                    |             |              |                 |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <i>Školayš,</i> | <i>pe,</i>         | <i>ili</i>  | <i>srazu</i> | <i>koškono</i>  |
| school.ELA      | QUOT               | or          | right.away   | leave.PTCP:PASS |
| <i>ili</i>      | <i>zatjagivaet</i> | <i>šuo</i>  | <i>mynym</i> |                 |
| or              | drag.into.PRS.3SG  | say.PRS.3PL | 1SG.DAT      |                 |

‘One has to leave the school right away or you will get dragged into studies, they say to me’ (Blog subcorpus).

(1.45g) Combination of pre-, intra- and postposed QIs

|                    |              |                     |             |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|
| <i>Pajmiz,</i>     | <i>java,</i> | <i>ug</i>           | <i>pe</i>   |
| surprise.PST.3SG   | PTCL         | NEG.PRS.3SG         | QUOT        |
| <i>tody</i>        | <i>vylem</i> | <i>udmurtjoslen</i> | <i>syče</i> |
| know.CN            | be.PRF       | Udmurt.PL.GEN       | such        |
| <i>prazdníkisy</i> | <i>vań</i>   | <i>šúysa</i>        |             |
| holiday.3PL        | be.PRS.3SG   | COMP                |             |

‘**She was surprised I obviously didn’t know that Udmurts have such a holiday**’ (vk.com/jumshan57).

For Finnish and Estonian, I have observed the preposed position of a QI as the default pattern, and only in rare occasions postposed or intraposed QIs occurred (Teptiuk 2015, 2019). Also Güldemann (2008: 517) concludes that “there is a general crosslinguistic preference for preposed QIs, irrespective of a language’s constituent order elsewhere”. Reasoning from these findings, I treat the preposed position as the default one (with possible combinations with intra- and postposed orders within one QI) for the majority of the languages in focus, additionally taking language-specific features (e.g. preference in word order, etc.) into account.

As Güldemann (ibid.) points out, basic word order can be used “as a predictor of the likelihood that a language may deviate from the general trend to place the QI before the quote – a phenomenon which is especially important for head-final languages”. For example, the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša* in Udmurt takes a clause-final position; therefore circumposed QIs can often be observed in Udmurt basic bipartite QIs consisting of an SV (preposed) and complementizer (postposed). Canonical circumposed QIs can often be observed in languages with OV order, e.g. Ganhuku, Telefol, Kombai (all Papuan), Turkish, Georgian, Abkhaz, etc. (ibid.: 199–200). Furthermore, grammaticalized quotative particles, available in Udmurt, show a cross-linguistic preference to be inserted into the RD (ibid.: 199; see also 2.4.2–2.4.3, 2.5.2, 2.5.3.2, and 2.6.2, treating grammaticalized quotative markers in Russian, Udmurt and Komi, showing a similar preference). Therefore, intraposed QIs consisting of quotative particles are of no surprise in this language.

In general, I pay only minor attention to different QI-positions among the majority of the described QIs and point out different possibilities out only where it is necessary, e.g. in cases where the position of a QI plays a crucial referential function, i.e. anaphoric or cataphoric, or where an unexpected position of a marker can be observed, e.g. the circumposed QI (1.46) in colloquial Finnish that otherwise has the default preference for the preposed QI-pattern.

(1.46) Finnish

|  |                  |                      |                            |                                 |
|--|------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b><i>Tiina</i></b>  | <b><i>ja</i></b> | <b><i>Netta</i></b>  | <b><i>Helsingissä:</i></b> | <b><i>“Tämä</i></b>             |
| PN   | and              | PN                   | Helsinki.INE               | DEM                             |
| <i>vaikuttaa</i>   | <i>aivan</i>     | <i>hyvältä</i>       | <i>suunnalta</i>           | <i>kulkea</i> ”,                |
| seem.PRS.3SG   | precisely        | good.ABL             | direction.ABL              | walk.INF                        |
| <b><i>sanoivat</i></b>   | <b><i>he</i></b> | <b><i>hetkeä</i></b> | <b><i>ennen</i></b>        | <b><i>paloittelumurhaa.</i></b> |
| say.PST.3PL  | 3PL              | moment.PAR           | before                     | cut.up.murder.PAR               |
| <b>‘Tiina and Netta in Helsinki: <u>“This seems to be a good direction for walking”</u>, they said a moment before the cut up murder.’</b> (facebook.com). |                  |                      |                            |                                 |

### 1.6.6. Epistemic meanings and evaluative connotations expressed by quotative indexes

QIs need not obligatorily express epistemic meanings. However, several descriptions illustrate that a reporter can use the same QI to mark the presence of RD and additionally reporter’s *degree of certainty* (also *epistemic commitment* or *epistemic support*) about the content of the RD. So e.g. in QI-expressions in Cavineña (Tacanan), Tariana (Arawakan), and perhaps Teribe (Chibchan) (Boye 2012: 32). Spronck (2012: 97–98) provides some account from Lezgian and Aguaruna (Jivaroan) “which combine first person framing clauses [i.e. QI-clauses] with adverbs meaning ‘true’” for indicating higher epistemic commitment<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> Such means as conjunct/disjunct pronoun systems, honorific grammatical marking and some other grammaticalized forms serving for the expression of truth value in RD-

In his study, Boye (2012: 1, 15) proposes a descriptive category of *epistemicity* with two subcategories: *epistemic support* (i.e. epistemic modality), and *epistemic justification* (i.e. *evidentiality*). In the current study, I employ the term *epistemic support*, but in case of epistemic justification, for the sake of convenience, I employ the traditional term *evidentiality* (see 1.5.3). Boye (2012) investigates epistemic support as a *crosslinguistic descriptive category*, presenting simple generalizations over a coherent set of linguistic phenomena. Thus, languages employing different systems for expression of epistemic support, e.g. West Greenlandic system of affixes or Lega-Shabunda particles, “can be described in terms of the notion of justificatory support” (ibid.: 10). As a result, both lexical and grammatical expressions are investigated under the same subcategory. Also, Boye does not make a distinction between the situation-dependent, i.e. *pragmatic*, and conventional, i.e. *semantic*, modal meanings. The notion of epistemic support is considered equivalent to the previously employed notions of degree of certainty, degree of commitment and degree of confidence (ibid.: 21).

Epistemic support covers a quantitative scale (cf. Horn 2001, quoted from Boye 2012: 21) – an *epistemic modal scale*, consisting of three major degrees of epistemic support: full, partial and neutral (ibid.: 21, 23, 31, 36). The epistemic notion of *full support* represents the endpoint of the scale and covers meanings typically referred to in the previous literature as “certainty (that not)”, “emphatic certainty”, “knowledge”, “contrafactive”, “epistemic impossibility”. *Neutral support*, in turn, represents the opposite of full support on the scale and expresses the following meanings: “epistemic possibility”, “agnostic”, and “(complete) uncertainty” (ibid.: 20–21, 31, 36). The notion of *partial support* is situated in between neutral and full support and covers meanings like “probability”, “likelihood”, “doubt”, “dubitative”, “(relatively weak) uncertainty”, “unlikely”, “likely not” and “epistemic necessity” (ibid.: 22, 31, 36). The degrees of epistemic support and their meanings are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Degrees and meanings of epistemic support according to Boye (2012)

| Degree of epistemic support | Meanings   |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Full support                | “certainty (that not)”, “emphatic certainty”, “knowledge”, “contrafactive”, “epistemic impossibility”                                |
| Neutral support             | “epistemic possibility”, “agnostic”, “(complete) uncertainty”  |
| Partial support             | “probability”, “likelihood”, “doubt”, “dubitative”, “(relatively weak) uncertainty”, “unlikely”, “likely not”, “epistemic necessity” |

constructions, touched upon by Spronck (2012: 96–101) are not discussed here, since these categories remain mostly irrelevant for the described QIs in Finno-Ugric.

Partial and neutral support can be grouped under the category of *less than full support*, and following the same principle, full and partial support can be grouped into *more than neutral support*. In addition, Boye makes the distinction between *strong* and *weak support*. Strong support covers full and strong partial support, and weak – neutral and weak partial support. (Boye 2012: 22, 36) Only occasionally I will turn to the intermediate degrees mentioned in this paragraph, where epistemic meanings between the three basic degrees of epistemic support can be suspected in the use of QIs.

As is indicated above, epistemic support, in general and expressed by independent QIs, can be either situation-dependent (pragmatic) or conventional (semantic). My previous findings (Teptiuk 2015, Teptiuk forthcoming) show that in Finno-Ugric languages, epistemic support has rather a pragmatic realization in the use of QIs (see e.g. 2.5.2 on the quotative particles in Udmurt). However, independently from this aspect, in general one can expect that a reporter can produce a quote, additionally conveying different degrees of epistemic support, such as:

- (i) ‘what X said, I am certain about it’ (corresponding to Boye’s *full support*);
- (ii) ‘what X said, I doubt it/might have been like this/it’s unlikely’ (corresponding to Boye’s *partial support*);
- (iii) ‘what X said, I don’t know/I am completely uncertain whether it’s true or not’ (corresponding to Boye’s *neutral support*).

However, it is worth pointing out that epistemic meaning can be applied only to propositions (Boye 2012: 195ff.). Consequently, epistemic support can be applied to quotes expressing propositional content only (see 1.5.3), which is not always the case with RD, as in (1.47a).

(1.47a) Non-propositional RD  
*he’s like WHAT?!* (pinterest.com).

(1.47b) Propositional RD  
*he’s like “I’m going home, it’s over”* (spokesman.com).

Furthermore, besides epistemic support other evaluational connotations can also be observed in the use of QIs. For example, SIMs, as in (1.47a, b), can be used to present the RD as reproduced approximately. Hence, the difference between original and reported discourse does not necessarily indicate the reporter’s doubt about the *content* of the reproduced proposition. However, lack of commitment to the truth value of the proposition, i.e. *epistemic hedging function* (henceforth also: *EHF*), can be frequently observed in the use of the SIMs and other markers, presenting a quote as reproduced approximately, see e.g. (1.26b).

Partial support should not be automatically assigned to all examples with QIs presenting a quote as approximately produced. Firstly, approximative evaluation of a quote can also be applied to non-propositional RDs, as in (1.48) where the

Finnish SIM *niinku* ‘like’ is used to present non-propositional RD. Secondly, individual capacities of cognate equivalent QIs (e.g. SIMs) may still differ across languages. Even if they show almost identical functional correspondence, pragmatically these QIs can be used differently, largely depending also on the reporter’s intentions and communicative goals. Thus, there is reason to keep the degree of precision (approximate/verbatim reproduction of a quote) separate from the degree of epistemic support, despite the fact that these meanings can be expressed by the same marker and overlap in some contexts.

(1.48) Finnish

|                      |               |             |                 |           |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|
| <i>Ekaks</i>         | <i>mä</i>     | <i>olin</i> | <i>niinku</i>   | <i>et</i> |
| first.TRANSL         | 1SG           | be.PRS.1SG  | like            | COMP      |
| <i>ei</i>            | <i>vittu,</i> | <i>mut</i>  | <i>sit</i>      | <i>mä</i> |
| NEG                  | cunt          | but         | then            | 1SG       |
| <i>olinki</i>        | <i>et</i>     | <i>ei</i>   | <i>saatana!</i> |           |
| be.PRS.1SG.PTCL:CNTR | COMP          | NEG         | Satan           |           |

‘First **I was like (that) no fucking way**, but then I was that **no, god damn it!**’  
(muusikoiden.net).

Contrarily to SIMs and other markers presenting the quote as produced approximately, some QIs can (pragmatically) indicate the verbatim rendering of the quote or that the reporter witnessed the original utterance ‘first hand’. Such a meaning is sometimes attested among quantifiers of maximum degree in QIs (see 1.6.2.7).

Plungjan in his article on quotative particles in Russian (2008), provides some evidence showing that Russian quotative particles, i.e. *de*, *deskat’* and *mol*, form a hierarchy as far as the difference between the quoted and the original discourse is concerned. By using *mol*, the reporter preserves the quoted context closer to the original one, while in the use of *de* and *deskat’*, one can expect more significant difference (ibid.: 291). Hence, one can also expect a difference in the use of the quotative particles. For example, the quotative particle *mol* is mainly used in the context where the reporter aims to preserve important information and less important facts may be left unspecified. Thus, in the use of *mol* the reporter’s subjectivity, or in other words – reporter’s point of view, is present the least (ibid.: 292). The quotative particle *deskat’* appears more often in situations where the reporter interprets someone’s words and the quoted material is not presented verbatim (ibid.: 294). *De*, in turn, presents the quote with ironic evaluation (ibid.: 295). According to Plungjan (ibid.), irony presupposes the distance between the speaker and the quoted text which may be realized through the reporter’s uncertainty about the content of the quoted material<sup>44</sup>.

Furthermore, the category of subjectivity, i.e. the externalization of the speaker’s own point of view, can be observed in self-quotations and reporting

<sup>44</sup> See 2.4.2 on the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat’* in Russian. The quotative particle *de* is not discussed in the current study. A reader interested in this particle is referred to the article by Plungjan (2008).



mental processes in quotations. In both cases, one can suspect that the reporter's choice in the reported material relies largely on him-/herself. Thus, while quoting someone's thoughts, the reporter basically only assumes the possible content of the quoted material. Of course, reporter's subjective overtones can also be present in quotations of speech. However, in quotations of thoughts, the reporter can hardly rely on the original content, while in quotations of speech the content can be available or easier disputed by the original speaker (also see 1.5.2).

In self-quotations, the choice of the reported content is also governed merely by the reporter, who is not obliged to provide verbatim quotations of their speech and thoughts. The content of self-quotations can also be determined by current conversational motivations, in this way influencing the choice of the quoted material. Notably, in some languages self-quoting expressions are presented by QIs, vaguely specifying or not specifying at all the event behind the RD. For example, the SIMs *like* in English and *niinku* in Finnish, accompanied by dummy equational verbs, are frequently used in self-quotations of speech and thought without explicitly pointing to one type of RD (cf. Buchstaller 2001 on English; Haakana 2006 on Finnish). Thus, even intended stretches of discourse can be presented as if they were actually uttered, since the means to present hypothetical self-quotations may not differ from the QIs presenting previously produced speech acts (*I'm like*), as in (1.6), repeated here as (1.49).

(1.49) *and he goes I am the police bitch and starts touching the register **I'm like** oh this mf'er didn't just do that (twitter.com).*

## 2. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN PERMIC LANGUAGES

### 2.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Permic

As mentioned in Section 1.2, the notion of RD was previously covered in descriptive grammars of Komi and Udmurt. Udmurt RD-constructions were described in Vaxrušev *et al.* (1974: 131–133, 135, 138–141) and more recent descriptive grammars (Winkler 2001: 75–76; Winkler 2011: 169). The main attention is paid to the strategies that are used in Standard Udmurt, presenting both direct and indirect RD. Descriptions of Komi RD are found in Sel’kov (1967: 253–258) and in Fedjunëva (1998: 398–399, 202–203). The authors mainly concentrate on the use of *verba dicendi* (alias SVs) and quotative particles (see below) for indicating both direct and indirect RD. To mark indirect RD, complementizers (*myj* in Komi and *šuyša* in Udmurt) are typically used (2.1a–b).

(2.1a) Udmurt

|              |               |           |               |              |              |               |
|--------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| <b>Pedor</b> | <b>veraz,</b> | <i>so</i> | <i>vañmyz</i> | <i>šaryś</i> | <i>todiz</i> | <b>šuyša.</b> |
| PN           | say.PST.3SG   | 3SG       | all           | about        | know.PST.3SG | COMP          |

‘**Pedor said that he knows about it all.**’ (Winkler 2001: 74; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

(2.1b) Komi

|                 |               |                    |                  |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Hutorkov</b> | <b>vokjas</b> | <b>vištalisny,</b> | <b>myj</b>       |
| PN              | brother.PL    | tell.PST.3PL       | COMP             |
| <i>najö</i>     | <i>veśig</i>  | <i>kylömaöś</i>    | <i>lyjöm</i>     |
| 3PL             | even          | hear.PTCP.PL       | shot             |
| <i>šysö</i>     | <i>i</i>      | <i>ošlyś</i>       | <i>gorzömsö.</i> |
| sound.ACC3SG    | and           | bear.ABL           | roar.ACC3SG      |

‘**Hutorkov brothers told that they have even heard the sound of the shot and bear’s roar.**’ (Fedjunëva 1998: 202; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

Additionally, other predicates may occur in quoting someone’s thoughts (Fedjunëva 1998: 398–399; Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 132–133). In Udmurt, the possibility of the occurrence of NPs indicating the original source of RD in QI-constructions is also described (Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 133–134), which for Komi is not specified. Attention is paid to the function of the clause-final complementizer *šuyša* ‘that’ that may also appear as a converb form of the SV *šuyny* ‘say’, lit. meaning ‘saying’ (Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 134, 139; Winkler 2001: 75–76; Winkler 2011: 138). Winkler (2011: 137) refers to it as an *Evidentialisierer*, i.e. evidential marker, although the description of its evidential functions is missing. In Vaxrušev *et al.* (1974: 134), the authors mention that the participle form *šuyša* is functionally close to a modal particle that signals the presence of reported speech and marks the source of the reported speech. The latter, however, can be questioned, since quotative particles by their function indeed indicate the presence of RD, but they usually do not mark the source, i.e. an

original speaker. Their main function lies beyond indicating the presence or continuation of RD, which is also mentioned in Vaxrušev *et al.* (1974: 139). The authors specify that if the RD is divided into several independent sentences, the complementizer *šuyša* is often inserted as an index of the continuation of reported speech. Winkler (2001: 75) also mentions the occurrence of the Russian complementizer *čto* in colloquial Udmurt. The detailed description of the functions and structural use of *šuyša* in RD-constructions is provided here in 2.5.1.1.

Separate attention is paid in descriptive studies to Komi and Udmurt quotative particles. In Komi, the quotative particle *pö* indicates RD that belongs to a source of consciousness different from the reporter, the particle *meša* (with dialectal variants *miša*, *myša*, *meša*) is used to mark the current speaker's own reported speech (here: *self-quotative particle*) (Bubrix 1949: 194; Lytkin 1955: 279; Sel'kov 1967: 257; Fedjunëva 1998: 550; Bartens 2000: 321), as in (2.2).

- (2.2) Komi
- |                 |                             |                      |                     |          |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|
| <i>Pyri</i>     | <i>revkomö</i> ,            | <b><i>miša</i></b> , | <i>sid'ž</i>        | <i>i</i> |
| enter.PST.1SG   | revkom <sup>45</sup> .ILL   | QUOT:SELF            | thus                | and      |
| <i>sid'ž:</i>   | <i>komsomolö</i>            | <i>menö</i>          | <i>primitinnyd?</i> |          |
| thus            | Komsomol <sup>46</sup> .ILL | 1SG.ACC              | accept.PST.2PL      |          |
| <i>Primitim</i> | <b><i>pö</i></b> .          |                      |                     |          |
| accept.PST.1PL  | QUOT                        |                      |                     |          |
- 'I entered the revkom and **said**, so and so: did you accept me to the Komsomol? We accepted, they said.' (Lytkin 1955: 279; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In Standard Udmurt, both of these functions are covered by the quotative particle *pe* (Bartens 2000: 321; Winkler 2011: 137), but according to Edygarova (p.c.), several dialects use the self-quotative particle *pöj*, distinct from the quotative particle *pe* (see 1.6.2.4). The self-quotative particle *pöj* is reviewed here in 2.5.2.1.2. Recently the self-quotative particle *pi* in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt found attention (Arkhangelskiy 2014: 5, 11–12), although this study concentrates more on the characteristics of *pi* as a particle than on its quotative functions. To my knowledge, the use of the self-quotative particle *pöj* in other dialects of Udmurt has not been previously studied.

The quotative particles (2.3a–b) indicate that the information was acquired from the third party and “represents another linguistic act: a citation [here: RD] or general hearsay” (Leinonen 2006: 420). Thus, the quotative particles also

<sup>45</sup> Revkom or a revolutionary committee (Rus. *Revolucionnyj komitet*, *revkom*) was a chain of Bolshevik-led organizations in Soviet Russia and other Soviet republics established to serve as provisional governments in 1918–1920.

<sup>46</sup> Komsomol or the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League (Rus. *Vsesojuznyj leninskij kommunističeskij sojuz molodëži* (VLKSM), *komsomol*) was a political youth organization in the USSR.

bear an epistemic hedging function (EHF) (see 1.6.6) which helps the speaker to distance him-/herself from the ongoing RD (ibid.).

(2.3a) Udmurt

|                    |                  |                |                  |                 |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>gožtetezlen</i> | <i>pumaz</i>     | <i>atajez</i>  | <i>ivorte,</i>   | <i>tolon,</i>   |
| letter.3SG.GEN     | end.INE3SG       | father.3SG     | announce.PRS.3SG | yesterday       |
| <i>pe,</i>         | <i>samołoten</i> | <i>jetinly</i> | <i>podkormka</i> | <i>leštizy.</i> |
| QUOT               | plane.INSTR      | flax.DAT       | fertilization    | do.PST.3PL      |

‘At the end of the letter, **her father announced** [that] yesterday flax fertilization was done with the help of a plane.’ (Bartens 2000: 321; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

(2.3b) Komi

|                |           |             |              |             |             |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>vetlöny</i> | <i>pö</i> | <i>seni</i> | <i>ydžyd</i> | <i>ćeri</i> | <i>una.</i> |
| go.PRS.3PL     | QUOT      | there       | big          | fish        | a.lot       |

‘**Allegedly,** there is a lot of big fish.’ (Bartens 2000: 321; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

Evidential characteristics of the quotative particles used in standard languages are briefly mentioned in Leinonen (2000) and in Winkler (2011). However, the difference between the reported evidential meaning that the particle bears and its quotative functions is not specified in the above-mentioned studies. As a result, it causes problems of understanding the limits of their functional properties. The possibility of the co-occurrence of quotative particles with different types of predicates is also left unspecified. Consequently, it is not really clear whether quotative particles are used exclusively as markers of reported evidentiality and reported speech, or whether they can also be used to quote someone’s thoughts, intended utterances or hypothetical quotations, etc. In order to check these possibilities, in this study I investigate the appearance of these markers with different types of RD, introduced by more complex QIs consisting of not only speech but also epistemic verbs for the presentation of quotations of thoughts. In addition, I check the context in order to see whether these markers can introduce, besides quotations of speech and thought, also hypothetical quotations.

One of the studies that concentrates on modal particles in Udmurt also covers the use of the grammaticalized quotative marker *šuo*, lit. meaning ‘they say’, comparing its functions with the Russian quotative particles *de*, *deskat’* and *mol* (Kibardina 2012: 124–128). However, this comparison is exceedingly generalized, since even the studies on quotative particles in Russian typically show that the Russian quotatives *de*, *deskat’* and *mol* are functionally quite different, and cannot be considered complete correspondents (Plungjan 2008: 292–295). More detailed information on the functions and use of the quotative particles in Russian is provided in 2.4.2.

To conclude, the topic of RD and QIs has only been generally described for Permic languages. There are still a number of unstudied issues that concern expressing and marking of RD in Komi and Udmurt. For example, attention

was paid neither to substandard use nor to dialectal variations that might appear in the use of QIs. The description of modal or evidential functions of quotative particles is quite vague. Neither the possibility of different co-occurrences of quotative particles nor the appearance of new ways of quote-introduction in colloquial speech is described. The role of Russian as a potential source for new quotative strategies in substandard variants of Komi and Udmurt was also neglected in previous studies. Thus, one of the aims of the current chapter lies beyond covering the gaps in previous studies.

The current chapter has the following structure. First, I provide some insights into the sociolinguistic situation of Komi and Udmurt speakers in Section 2.2 and discuss the peculiarities of the language used in communications on the internet in Section 2.3. In Section 2.4, I describe quotative strategies in Russian relevant for the further description of quotative indexes in contemporary Udmurt (Section 2.5) and Komi (Section 2.6). The last section of the chapter provides a general summary on the quotative strategies in Permic.

## **2.2. Insights into the sociolinguistic situation of Komi and Udmurt**

In this chapter, I concentrate on the sociolinguistic characteristics of Komi and Udmurt. It is important to define the situation in which Permic languages occur nowadays, since it has a great impact on the language use in general, and particularly on the internet, which will be specified in the following Section 2.3.

According to the All-Russia National Census from 2010, there are approximately 552000 Udmurts, 228000 Komi-Zyrians, and 94000 Komi-Permyaks residing on the territory of Russian Federation<sup>47</sup>. Klumpp (2016: 529) provides the following approximate numbers for the speakers of Permic languages dating to the year 2010: 220000 Komi-Zyrian, 63000 Komi-Permyak and 360000 Udmurt speakers. Previous studies on sociolinguistic characteristics of Permic speakers show that Komi and Udmurt people, similarly to other Finno-Ugrians on the territory of the Russian Federation, mainly have become bilingual in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Salánki 2015: 240). Nowadays, it might almost be taken for granted that all native Komi and Udmurt speakers are bilingual. Thus, only some Udmurt speakers older than 60 might consider their knowledge of mother tongue superior to their knowledge of Russian. Middle-aged people mostly recognize themselves as balanced bilinguals with almost equal knowledge of both languages. As for the younger generation, their command of Russian is superior to Udmurt in both oral and written form (Salánki 2007b: 6).

In Komi, already in the end of 1980s, 40% of the Komi population did not use their mother tongue in written form. The amount of native Komi speakers

---

<sup>47</sup> [http://www.gks.ru/free\\_doc/new\\_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol4/pub-04-01.pdf](http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol4/pub-04-01.pdf) (June 1, 2019).

regularly decreased and more people start to use only Russian. Among young people, one of the surveys showed that “only 13.9% within the age group of 18–34 had Komi as their mother tongue” (Leinonen 2006: 239). As for the command of languages, Nekrasova (2013: 74) mentions that there is a difference between the knowledge of Komi and Russian among the inhabitants of rural and urban areas: Komi people residing in the cities usually are able to use Russian better than Komi, while the rural inhabitants are still able to use Komi as the language of intercommunications. Also, the Russian inhabitants sometimes show interest towards the language. The following bilingual comment on the internet describes the interest that the Russian population sometimes expresses towards the Komi language: *Me roč mort, no xoču uexat’ i žyt’ v komi* ‘I am Russian (in Komi), but I want to go and live in Komi [Republic] (in Russian)’ (vk.com/komination).

An important role in the decreasing amount of native speakers<sup>48</sup> and the general preference of Russian is also tightly connected to the language beliefs of Komi and Udmurt speakers. Language beliefs are, in turn, connected with the present-day situation characterized by the limited sphere of applicability of Permic languages in everyday life. According to Salánki (2015: 238), “Russian traditionally enjoys high prestige as the language of culture and civilization, whereas Udmurt is seen as useless and unnecessary, the language of underdeveloped villagers”. In general, this stereotype can also be applied to the language beliefs about Komi. A lower acceptance of the Permic languages in society “does not help individual mobility, it does not offer useful knowledge in the areas of economy and trade” (Salánki 2007b: 7; on similar issues for Komi see Kuznetsov 2010: 88). The amount of periodical publications is statistically low and infrequent, the languages are almost not represented by governmental institutions. More frequent language use can mainly be observed among philologists who study Komi and Udmurt, and are still able to use these languages in educational institutions (on Komi, see Kuznetsov 2010: 89–91; on Udmurt, see Edygarova 2013: 15).

This leads to diglossia as the second significant characteristic feature of the speakers of Permic. The dominance of Russian makes it the first choice as a tool of communication, while Komi and Udmurt are mainly used among small communities of people who are still able or are willing to maintain language vitality. Consequently, a significant part of native speakers does not believe that the knowledge of more than one language or the possibility to study their mother tongue will be a practical skill in life (Salánki 2007b: 7).

As far as the language *per se* is concerned, due to the daily use of both languages the vernacular variants of Komi and Udmurt are characterized by such

---

<sup>48</sup> Compare the numbers in the All-Russia National Census with the approximate number of speakers, provided at the beginning of this subsection.

features as code-mixing, code-switching and code-copying<sup>49</sup> (for Komi, see Nekrasova 2013: 74, also Leinonen 2006: 243; for Udmurt, see Salánki 2015: 256–262). Code-switching can happen on the border of the sentence, between complete phrases, or in the frame of one sentence. It is also often realized by the insertion of separate Russian words into the sentence. According to Salánki (2007a: 74, quoted from Shirobokova 2011: 40), the topic of the conversation can often be a crucial motivating factor for code-switching. In simple daily conversations, the speakers can easily maintain the separation of linguistic repertoires; although when it comes to more sophisticated or specific topics, the gaps in terminology in Komi and Udmurt are often filled in or substituted by Russian terms.

The language variety where code-switching appears is always stigmatized and has low acceptance both in Udmurt- and Russian-speaking society (Edygarova 2013: 13). According to Salánki (2015: 252) “[m]ixing Russian with Udmurt is generally believed to be the result of an imperfect knowledge of the language and of language related laziness: those who continuously switch between the two languages are thought to be not fully proficient in Udmurt”. In contrast, Edygarova (2013: 11, also 2014) suggests that such language use is not simply a result of imperfect knowledge of language, but rather a new city slang that is born among young Udmurts as an attempt to oppose recent puristic tendencies occurring among philologists and language planners. The realization of the city slang in interent communications is further discussed in the following Section 2.3.

As for Komi, vernacular varieties do not seem to have such a stigmatizing effect and are rather explained by the lasting language contact between Komi and Russian (Nekrasova 2013: 74; also Leinonen 2015: 93). Consequently, it is often realized by “favouring structures [but also linguistic matter: see e.g. Leinonen 2015] that are common to both languages” (Leinonen 2006: 243). According to Leinonen (2009: 315), calquing (alias *pattern replication*, see Section 2.3) is used as a typical strategy – “a construction modeled on Russian may be used instead of the indigenous Komi [construction]”. However, Leinonen (2009: 309) also mentions that “for some [Komi], its [Russian language’s] ‘enriching role’ has now an opposite [negative] value, and calquing from Russian is noted with disapproval”. Such an attitude is also observed among the Komi speakers who tend to use the language for professional purposes or maintain the language on a daily communicational level.

---

<sup>49</sup> Despite the possible distinction in sociolinguistics between the terms *code-switching* and *code-mixing*, in the absence of a general consensus on this terminology, in the current study I give preference to the term *code-switching*. The notion of *code-copying* used to describe “cross-linguistic influences (that is borrowing, loan translations, calques, etc.)” (Johanson 1993, quoted from Kovács 2001: 62) is covered here with the term *replication*, i.e. “activity of employing item [of one language system into another]” (Matras 2009: 146).

### 2.3. Communications on the internet among Udmurts and Komi and their peculiarities

In this section, I provide the characteristic features of internet communications among Udmurt and Komi speakers. It is meant to depict the impact of the socio-linguistic situation, which Komi and Udmurt face nowadays, on the substandard language use on the internet. Partially, I bring some justification why this material is suitable for the conducted research. An attempt is also made to contribute to the knowledge about substandard variants of Komi and Udmurt. Several previous studies paid attention to the growing role of the internet in the Udmurt community. Unfortunately, similar research on Komi used online is unknown to me. Thus, information about internet communications in Komi is given here from the standpoint of my own experience.

According to Shirobokova (2011: 68), Udmurt was first used on the internet in 2001. Through the period of 2001–2008, a number of pages appeared online mainly covering topics connected to Udmurt culture, language and literature. During this period, first blogs in Udmurt also appeared. After the creation of the Facebook analogue on Post-Soviet space *vk.com*, a number of groups were opened, gathering both active Udmurt speakers and people interested in or sympathizing with Udmurt language and culture. Thus, typically not only native Udmurt speakers or those who identify themselves as Udmurts are among the participants. The growing presence on *vk.com* also motivated the development of an Udmurt blogosphere (Shirobokova 2011: 67–68; Pischlöger 2016: 116–117). Nowadays, it can be seriously considered one of the most active Uralic languages of Russia on the internet (Pischlöger 2016: 110, 115).

The role of social network sites in language activism among young Udmurts was previously studied by Pischlöger (2013; 2014a; 2014b; 2016)<sup>50</sup>. The author indicates that the growing amount of internet communications among Udmurts greatly helps to maintain language vitality, taking into account that Udmurt is considered definitely endangered by UNESCO (Pischlöger 2014b: 144; Pischlöger 2016: 108). Pischlöger (2014b: 144) claims that “[t]he informal characteristic of SNS [social network sites] enables the usage of generally oral forms such as slang and dialects in a written context”. According to him, “the relaxed atmosphere on SNS allows language use which is typical for oral communication and otherwise frowned upon in other (especially written) contexts by

---

<sup>50</sup> In one of his articles, Pischlöger (2013) also pays attention to the use of internet among Besermans, who identify themselves as a separate nation, although they speak an Udmurt dialect, often referred to as the Beserman dialect of Udmurt (e.g. Arkhangelskiy 2014; Usačeva & Birjuk 2016). I have separately studied groups that are mentioned by the author in his article (Pischlöger 2013: 217). Some of not the most numerous of groups on *vk.com* are nowadays either semi-active or closed (November 1, 2016). Most of the postings are made either in Russian, or in Standard Udmurt (also see Pischlöger 2013: 217). Taking into account the extremely low frequency of Udmurt in these groups and the lack of the contribution that these data can provide for the main topic of this dissertation, the Beserman material is not used here.



language purists” (ibid.: 144). Participants are able to use in conversations not only variants mixed with Russian (Udm. *суро пожо* ‘mixture, blending’), but also mixture of dialects and styles, typical for colloquial speech (Pischlöger 2016: 108; cf. Edygarova 2013, 2014). Thus, a space free of puristic tendencies is created, which in turn can be helpful considering the status of endangered language that was assigned to Udmurt, and the stigmatizing effect of purism that is often an obstacle for daily use of language in written form.

Despite the fact that the Udmurt internet community develops fast, the major part of Udmurts active on the internet is mainly represented by residents of urban areas (Shirobokova 2011: 50; Pischlöger 2014b: 145). Hence, the assumption can be made that the language on social network sites largely reflects the language used daily by Udmurt urban youth. As it has been mentioned briefly in Section 2.2, some authors claim that this way a new variety appears, referred to as a *city slang* (Edygarova 2013: 11). I will come back to the general characteristics of this variety and its realization online after the description of Komi on the internet.

As it has been mentioned above, I am not aware of any studies on Komi on the internet. However, the development of the Komi blogosphere was briefly described in one of the articles published on the web page *Uralistica*, a portal that concentrates on various topics connected to Finno-Ugric languages, cultures, and people<sup>51</sup>. Despite the non-academic characteristics of the web-page, I still refer to the article due to the lack of more thorough academic descriptions or studies on the topic. In the article, the author provides a general description of the Komi blogosphere and refers to the most popular blogs in Komi, a major part of which were used as a material for the current dissertation. As some bloggers mention, the idea to start a blog was largely motivated by the success of Udmurt bloggers. Others pursue personal reasons, e.g. expression of personal opinion on various topics, opportunity to use the mother tongue, creative work, etc. Besides blogs, there are also a number of pages on vk.com in Komi<sup>52</sup>. Some of them are represented by institutions or mass media, e.g. the newspaper *Komi mu* (Komi land)<sup>53</sup>, *Centr razvitija ètnokul’turnogo obrazovanija* (Center for the development of ethnocultural education)<sup>54</sup>, etc. Similarly to the Udmurt internet community, there are also a number of pages that gather language and cultural activists, and those who are interested in or sympathize with the Komi language and culture.

As follows, several similarities can be pointed out between Udmurt and Komi on the internet. One of them is the motivation to participate, as well as

---

<sup>51</sup> [http://uralistica.com/profiles/blogs/anbur-blogosfera?xg\\_source=activity](http://uralistica.com/profiles/blogs/anbur-blogosfera?xg_source=activity) (November 1, 2016).

<sup>52</sup> Previously, the list of Komi blogs, groups on vk.com and other materials available in Komi on the internet were systematically listed on the portal FU-LAB (<http://fu-lab.ru>, September 1, 2015). However, now this information is not available due to reasons unknown to me.

<sup>53</sup> <https://vk.com/komimy1> (November 1, 2016).

<sup>54</sup> <https://vk.com/club79630928> (November 1, 2016).

the participants. Besides native speakers, there is also a significant presence of Russian-speaking participants or those who prefer to use Russian as *lingua franca* in communications. Thus, language use on the internet reflects diglossia of Komi and Udmurt speakers which tend to give preference to different languages in certain domains. Sometimes a motivating factor not to use Komi and Udmurt is the fact that some users might not understand it. Furthermore, even on the internet, Russian enjoys the prestige status and acts as the language of the state. Therefore, most of the institutional pages on social network sites are either completely in Russian, or they prefer Russian over Komi and Udmurt.

Nevertheless, there are also a number of groups where participants use both languages simultaneously, and even the lack of understanding is not an obstacle for using Komi or Udmurt. Thus, the bilingual environment is also naturally reflected in internet communications. The following example (2.4) illustrates the situation well. The same person, replying in comments to different speakers, uses first Russian (2.4a) and then Udmurt (2.4b):

(2.4a) Russian  
 N.M.<sup>55</sup>  
*Stebno polučilos'*  
 funny.N happen.PST.N  
 'It came out funny' (vk.com/jumshan57).

(2.4b) Udmurt  
 N.M. [answers to L.]  
*L., tau kritikalj)...*  
 PN thanks criticism.DAT  
 'L., thanks for the criticism)...' (vk.com/jumshan57).

(2.4a) and (2.4b) illustrate the situation, typical for one of the most popular groups in the Udmurt community *Jumshan57* that was used as a primary source for Udmurt data illustrated in this dissertation (see Section 1.3). It was recently closed, although the group archives are still available on *vk.com*<sup>56</sup>. The group was meant to cover news in the Udmurt community in an informal way by moderators who used exclusively Russian. Even though Russian was used by the moderators as a main language, Udmurt was not pushed into the background. A significant number of active participants were still using Udmurt as the first language in their communications. Taking into account the preservation of bilingual environment not only in the above-mentioned group, but in internet communications in general, the use of Udmurt is largely characterized by such features as code-switching (2.5) and code-copying (2.6). In the following examples, I distinguish the terms since they describe different embedding processes of Russian elements into a sentence. In further discussion, code-copying strategies are discussed under the cover term *replication*, adopted from

<sup>55</sup> For reasons of confidentiality, only initials are used in (2.4) to mark speakers.

<sup>56</sup> <https://vk.com/knyazpozdey> (November 1, 2018).

Matras (2009). Matras (ibid.) distinguishes two types of replication that appear as an outcome of language contact, namely matter and pattern replications. *Matter replication* means the adaptation of complex units that have “a phonological form, a meaning (whether lexical or grammatical) and a distinct status as an item in the lexicon” from the matrix language into the recipient language (ibid.: 148). The term *pattern replication* stands for the “mode of organizing units [i.e. matter-items]” (ibid.), i.e. “a mental procedure that involves a meaningful combination of items at various possible levels: the association of a word-form with its semantic meaning, the mode of combining word-forms and the retrieval of new meaning from such combinations, and the ordering of word-forms” (ibid.: 235).

In (2.5), I assume that the speaker uses Russian words as gap-fillers for the colloquial expression “to become successful” (*vyjexat*, lit. ‘to drive out’) and “as a result” (*ščitaj*, lit. ‘count.IMP2SG’). In (2.6), the speaker uses Russian conjunctions as replications from Russian. Thus, different motivations for the insertion of Russian code can be distinguished. In (2.5), the speaker mixes two codes for stylistic purposes. His speech reflects colloquial Udmurt speech where non-standard Russian expressions are replicated into Udmurt and used instead of standard Udmurt constructions, peculiar to formal register<sup>57</sup>. In (2.6), matter replications of elements that are typically placed at the top of the borrowability hierarchies (see Matras 2009), i.e. the connective conjunction *i* ‘and’ and the focus particle *ved* ‘even’, are inserted into the sentence for organization of discourse by connecting two sentences.

(2.5) *Bikužin* *vylyn* *kl’ip* **vyexal** **ščitaj**  
 PN on.INE video drive.out.PST.M count.IMP2SG  
 ‘Say, the music video became successful basically because of Bikuzin’  
 (vk.com/jumshan57).

(2.6) *Kl’ip* *čeber.* **I** **ved’** *nyljiosyn* *no* *solgaš.*  
 video beautiful and PTCL girl.PL.INE PTCL agree  
 ‘The music video is nice. Although I agree with the girls.’ (vk.com/jumshan57).

Quite typical is also the occurrence of so-called *embedded language (EL) islands*, i.e. “portions that are entirely made up of EL [embedded language] material” (Matras 2009: 131), which are approached here as code-switching strategies that can be considered syntactic complete entities and can be retrieved as independent clauses, e.g. as in (2.7).

<sup>57</sup> A hypothetical pattern replication strategy calquing the Russian expression in this case would, of course, be possible. However, this strategy would face a high risk of being misinterpreted by other Udmurt speakers. Therefore, idiomatic chunks are usually transferred directly from Russian into Udmurt without attempts of adopting them.

- (2.7) **Ničto ne večno šuo kad'**  
 nothing NEG eternal say.PRS.3PL like  
 'Nothing is eternal, they say like' (Blog subcorpora).

The use of mixed code on social network sites is quite typical not only for Udmurt. For example, Welsh internet communications reflect a language variety that largely includes code mixing – ‘Wenglish’. The internet environment allows speakers with imperfect knowledge or lack of communicational experience to use the language without fear of being judged by purists (cf. Cunliffe *et al.* 2013, quoted from Pischlöger 2016: 121, 126). As Pischlöger (2016: 126) reports, one Udmurt blogger uses the mixed code and colloquial speech as a means of making writing more emotional and easy to comprehend by her readers. Another blogger, often attacked by purists for the mix of Udmurt with Russian and “the unsophisticated choice of words”, says that her language use on the internet reflects the way she speaks. The blogger mentions also that in this way her writing is also easy to read (*ibid.*).

In Komi, the situation is slightly different, although it is not homogenous. Differences in language use can be pointed out between two standard varieties, Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak. Such features as code-switching or matter and pattern replications can be observed in both varieties, although their quality and frequency are different. In written form on the internet, Komi-Zyrian is characterized by more puristic variants. Of course, it does not exclude the above-mentioned code-switching strategies, but the latter does not happen *ad arbitrium*. Instead, code-switching is motivated by discourse or pragmatic factors<sup>58</sup>, e.g. the verbatim quotation in (2.8).

- (2.8) *A* *Gleb* *Žeglov* *kydž* *šulis*  
 and PN PN how say.PST.3SG  
 “Mesto vstreči izmenit’ nel’zja” *kinoyś:*  
 place meeting.GEN change.INF impossible movie.ELA  
 “**Vor dolžen sidet’ v tjurme**”  
 thief obliged.M sit.INF in prison.PREP  
 ‘But how said Gleb Zheglov from the movie “Impossible to change the meeting spot”: **“A thief should be in prison”**’ (vk.com/wall-78645075).

Contrarily to direct code-switching, speakers typically use strategies in which Russian elements are adjusted to Komi. It is quite a common strategy, taking into account that in Komi “[so far] all the levels of the language have been penetrated by Russian, except inflection” (Leinonen 2009: 316). Thus, speakers avoid direct code-switching and by doing so stick to language loyalty, as in (2.9).

<sup>58</sup> Among the typical discourse functions of code-switching Auer (1995: 121) mentions the following: “1) reported speech, 2) change of participant constellation, 3) parentheses or side comments, 4) reiteration, 5) change of activity type, 6) topic shift, 7) puns, language play, shift of ‘key’ and 8) topicalisation, topic/comment structure” (quoted from Kovács 2001: 113). On pragmatic functions of code-switching see e.g. Barredo (1997).

|       |  |                                  |                                  |
|-------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| (2.9) | <i>A</i>   | <i>zavod'itö</i>                 | <i>tad'zi:</i>                   |
|       | and  | begin.PRS.3SG                    | thus                             |
|       | <b>“Sövetsköj</b>  | <b><i>obščestvennost'</i></b>    | <b><i>posledovat'el'nöja</i></b> |
|       | Soviet   | community                        | consequently.ADV                 |
|       | <b><i>razoblačajtö</i></b>   | <b><i>kosmopol'it'izmys'</i></b> | <b><i>vredonosnöj,</i></b>       |
|       | denounce.PRS.3SG   | cosmopolitanism.ABL              | harmful                          |
|       | <b><i>razlagajtyś</i></b>  | <b><i>idejassö,</i></b>          | <b><i>köt'</i></b>               |
|       | rotting.PTCP   | idea.PL.ACC3SG                   | even.though                      |
|       | <i>köni</i>  | <i>najö</i>                      | <i>ez</i>                        |
|       | where  | 3PL                              | NEG.PST.3PL                      |
|       | <i>petködcyny.</i> ”   |                                  |                                  |
|       | appear.CN  |                                  |                                  |
|       | ‘And it begins thus: “The Soviet community consequently denounces the harmful, rotting ideas of cosmopolitanism, even where they don’t appear.”’ |                                  |                                  |
|       | (vk.com/biarmian).   |                                  |                                  |

The part of the sentence in bold shows how Komi adjusts Russian embedded island (“*Sovetskaja obščestvennost' posledovatel'no razoblačaet vredonosnye, razlagajuščiesja idei kosmopolitizma*”) by adding Komi inflectional suffixes to the Russian roots and adjusting phonetically and graphically Russian words to Komi, i.e. substituting the vowel *o* with *ö* – a strategy that usually occurs in Russian loans, e.g. Ko. *vöžži* ‘rein’ from Rus. *vožži* ‘rein’ (BKRD 2000)<sup>59</sup>. The same strategy takes place in oral speech with less common matter replications (for more details on the adjustment of Russian loans in Komi, see e.g. Leinonen 2009, 2015)<sup>60</sup>.

Even though the material that was collected for Komi in general reflects colloquial language use, several sociological factors might have influenced the language use of Komi-Zyrian speakers. The majority of the bloggers that were mentioned in the article in *Uralistica* (see above) are active speakers of Komi with either a linguistic background or higher education. Most of them are also active users on *vk.com* where they keep active personal profiles and participate in groups connected to Komi language, culture, Komi-speaking regions and smaller communities. Some speakers are currently employed in linguistic research activities or are using the language in their professional career. The age of the speakers is slightly higher than the age of the average user of the Udmurt internet community. Hence, the following hypotheses can be proposed. First, Komi-Zyrian material might differ from Udmurt due to a difference in strategies that the speakers use to adjust embedded language material to the matrix

<sup>59</sup> Komi-Russian Dictionary: <http://dict.fu-lab.ru/index.php/index/4.xhtml> (November 1, 2016).

<sup>60</sup> Poplack *et al.* (1988) use the term *nonce borrowing*, i.e. “on-the-spot borrowings that are structurally integrated but have not necessarily reached a wide level of propagation within the speech community or even within a corpus” (quoted from Matras 2009: 106).

language. Second, the language use of Komi-Zyrian on the internet differs from Udmurt due to the sociological differences between the speakers<sup>61</sup>.

In Komi-Permyak, code-switching strategies occur more frequently and speakers keep less control over the separation of different linguistic repertoires. Thus, Komi-Permyak rather resembles the more or less free language use of Udmurt with frequent code-switching than more “puristic” language use of Komi-Zyrian. However, the motivating factors might differ between Udmurt and Komi-Permyak. One of the hypotheses why this happens in Komi-Permyak, but not standard written forms of Komi-Zyrian, is the more intensive contact with Russian that Komi-Permyak speakers had, comparing to Komi-Zyrian. Leinonen (2009: 316) mentions that the development of Russian penetration into Komi-Permyak has gone even further when compared to Komi-Zyrian. Hence, code-switching strategies might already be accepted in Komi-Permyak, although in Komi-Zyrian this has not happened yet (at least, in written speech), or it is realized in different strategies, e.g. as in (2.9) above. (2.10) shows how EL islands are inserted into Komi-Permyak preserving grammatical features of the embedded language and are not adjusted to the grammar of the matrix language.

|        |                                   |                                   |  |                               |
|--------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| (2.10) | <i>Sija</i><br>PN                 | <i>munis</i><br>go.PST.3SG        | <i>ZAGSö</i><br>registry.office.ILL    | <i>gižny</i><br>write.INF     |
|        | <b>zajavlenie</b><br>statement    | <b>na</b><br>for                  | <b>razvod,</b><br>divorce.ACC          | <i>no</i><br>and              |
|        | <i>kör</i><br>when                | <i>sija</i><br>3SG                | <i>tödis,</i><br>get.to.know.PST.3SG   | <i>što</i><br>COMP            |
|        | <i>razvodys</i><br>divorce.3SG    | <i>öni</i><br>now                 | <i>sulalö</i><br>stand.PRS.3SG         | <i>30</i><br>30               |
|        | <b>tysjač,</b><br>thousand.GEN.PL | <i>sija</i><br>3SG                | <i>vežörtis,</i><br>understand.PST.3SG | <b>što</b><br>COMP            |
|        | <b>ljubov –</b><br>love           | <b>dorože</b><br>expensive.COMPAR | <b>vsjakix</b><br>any.GEN.PL           | <b>deneg.</b><br>money.GEN.PL |

‘She went to the registry office to write the statement for divorce and when she got to know that her divorce now costs 30 thousands, she understood that love is more valuable than any money.’ (vk.com/tupi\_tap).

Thus, one can observe a difference between the two standard varieties of Komi on the internet. In the section on Komi, it is shown that sometimes this difference might be a motivating factor for the appearance of some functional element from Russian in one variety, but not in the other. However, in the current study, standard varieties of Komi are not described separately from each other. Only specific features are pointed out with reference to the characteristics of the variety if such may occur.

<sup>61</sup> This applies to all Komi-Zyrian examples cited in Section 2.6. The examples were mostly retrieved from the blogs and social network sites where the community consisting of active educated speakers usually post online.

## 2.4. General remarks on Russian (new) quotative strategies

In this section, a brief description of Russian quotative constructions, including also new quotative strategies, is provided. Such a description is necessary here because of the Russian influence on the quotative strategies in Permic. The choice of the strategies that are described here is based on my personal observations as a native speaker of Russian, their frequency, and the observed corresponding strategies in Permic languages. Thus, this chapter does not aim to provide a complete picture of QIs used in Russian, but takes into account constructions interesting for the Permic languages. Previous studies and descriptions available in Russian Grammar (Švedova 1980) are used as the theoretical background. As the source for examples, the Russian National Corpus<sup>62</sup> is mainly used along examples taken from previous studies and independently collected material. First, the use of the factual complementizer *čto* ‘that’ and the non-factual complementizer *budto* ‘as if’ in quotative constructions is described. Further, Russian quotative particles are illustrated, and finally, the description of the NQs *tipa* ‘like’ and *takoj* ‘such’ is provided.

### 2.4.1. The complementizers *čto* and *budto* in quotative constructions

In Russian, like in many Standard Average European languages, the most typical quotative construction consists of an SV (e.g. *say*), or an EV (e.g. *think*), and a complementizer which is placed on the border position between the quote and the QI-clause (henceforth: *the complementizer strategy*). Russian has a developed system of complementizers that occur in the QI-constructions. Among them, the complementizers *čto*, *čtoby*, and *budto* are listed. As the most neutral complementizer, *čto* appear in various types of constructions as a “universal connector” between the QI-clause and RD (Švedova 1980: §2806). *Čtoby* appears in RD-constructions where indirect RD contains clauses expressing orders, wishes, expectations, as in (2.11). *Budto*, in turn, is used as an epistemic complementizer (see below). In addition, the question particle *li* occurs in the RD-constructions including clauses with indirect questions (Švedova 1980: §2804–05), as in (2.12). According to the rules of literary standard Russian, complementizers are exclusively used in constructions depicting indirect RD.

- (2.11) *Učitel’ skazal, čtoby deti ne šumeli.*  
teacher say.PST.M COMP:OPT child.PL NEG make.noise.PST.3PL  
‘The teacher told the children not to make noise.’ (Švedova 1980: §2805;  
transliteration, glossing and translation are mine, DT).

---

<sup>62</sup> See the list of data sources at the end of the study.

- (2.12) *Gončarenko* *dumaet*, *ne* *pojti* *li* *emu* *na*  
 PN think.PRS.3SG NEG go.INF Q he.DAT on  
*mesto* *Saakašvili*.  
 place.ACC PN.GEN  
 ‘**Goncharenko** thinks whether he should take Saakashvili’s place.’  
 (politnavigator.net).

However, this tendency can be observed mainly in literary written speech, and in vernacular variants, the use of complementizer *čto* can be observed already in constructions with direct RD – direct questions (2.13) and imperative clauses (2.14). The interchangeability of the complementizers in the colloquial speech mentioned here should not be considered universal. See e.g. Hansen *et al.* (2016) for more details on the differences between the use of complementizers in Russian.

- (2.13) *...xotja* *podumal*, *čto* *počemu* *by* *i*  
 although think.PST.M COMP why PTCL:COND and  
*mne* *s* *Surkoj* *ne* *pooxotit’sja*.  
 1SG.DAT with PN.INSTR NEG go.hunting.INF  
 ‘...although [I] **thought that** why don’t I go hunting together with Surka.’  
 (Švedova 1980: §2806; transliteration, glossing and translation are mine, DT).

- (2.14) *Ja* *dumaju*, *čto* *stupaj* *ty* *spat’...*  
 1SG think.PRS.1SG COMP step.IMP2SG 2SG sleep.INF  
 ‘**I think that** go to sleep...’ (Švedova 1980: §2805; transliteration, glossing and translation are mine, DT).

The complementizer *čto* is epistemically neutral. It typically co-occurs in quotative constructions with a wide range of predicates, signaling both weak and strong epistemic support (Švedova 1980: §2276, Hansen *et al.* 2016: 179; see 1.6.6 on the epistemic modal scale). Despite the fact that epistemically neutral complementizers are usually omitted from descriptions of QIs (in contrast to epistemic complementizers), I, nonetheless, provide here a description of its use in QI-clauses. This decision is primarily motivated by the fact that I do not concentrate on the complementizer as a potential QI-nucleus, i.e. the core element of the QI, but rather take into consideration constructions in which it typically occurs as a whole. Since *čto* also appears with direct RD expressed in different ways (question- or imperative-clause), its use is interesting for the current study. Furthermore, as the results of my study on NQs in Finnish and Estonian (Teptiuk 2015) show, even epistemically neutral complementizers tend to change their functions in the quotative domain and appear as QI-nuclei (for more details, see 1.6.2.3, 4.4.1 and 4.4.2).

Contrarily to *čto*, the complementizer *budto* expresses partial support indicating uncertainty of the speaker (see 1.6.6). The epistemic support that the complementizer expresses derives from its comparative semantics, lit. meaning ‘as if, like’. Thus, by using it, “the speaker compares two situations (...)”



implying that the situation described in the embedded clause is not true (the embedded situation only resembles another, true situation)” (Hansen *et al.* 2016: 203). Furthermore, as Hansen *et al.* (2016: 194) specify, when *budto* appears in the initial position of a proposition, it indicates that the proposition “is based on the inference or on what other people have said (reportative)”. Thus, one can also notice an indirect evidential meaning that the complementizer expresses. Consequently, it hardly appears in QI-clauses with factive EVs expressing knowledge, understanding, memory. In addition, its co-occurrence with SVs in self-quoting constructions remains quite rare if they express positive attitudes and belong to the present tense, e.g. *ja ne somnevajus* ‘I have no doubt (that)’, *garantiruju* ‘I guarantee’, *utverždaju* ‘I claim (that)’ (Švedova 1980: §2277–79; Letučij 2008: 229–30). Of course, these predicates can combine with the complementizer *čto*. Although, the proposition *per se* remains then epistemically neutral – the reporter indicates this way that the RD has happened before and is reproduced without additional overtones<sup>63</sup>. Hence, *budto* usually appears with non-factive predicates expressing subjectivity, doubt, disagreement, judgment, thus indicating the difference between points of views of the reporter and the original speaker, as in (2.15).

- (2.15) *Byl*                      *oklevetan,*              *budto*    *ukral,*              *i*              *postradal*  
 be.PST.M              slander.PTCP.M    COMP    steal.PST.M    and    suffer.PST.M  
*nevinno.*  
 innocent.ADV  
 ‘He was **slandered like he stole [it]**, and he suffered while being innocent.’  
 (Švedova 1980: §2277; transliteration, glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In addition, it can be used in contexts where “the speaker apparently knows that the proposition is not true” (Hansen *et al.* 2016: 194), as in (2.16). The complementizer *kak budto* is considered here a variant of the complementizer *budto* due to its appearance in synonymous constructions. Besides *kak budto*, the complementizer *budto* has a chain of other synonyms that can function as its equal substitutes, e.g. *budto by*, *kak by*, *jakoby*, etc. The use of these synonyms is not described here further since they do not occur in the studied Permic languages.

- (2.16) *Pokazalos’*,              *kak budto*    *ves’*    *gorod*    *ušel*              *pod*  
 seem.PST.SG.N.REF    as.though    all    city    go.PST.M    under  
*vodu.*  
 water.ACC.SG  
 ‘It seemed **as if** the entire city drowned [lit. went under the water].’ (Hansen *et al.* 2016: 194; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

<sup>63</sup> Boye (2012: 137) reports a similar system of complementizers in Jacalteco: “the two complementizers (...) cover different degrees of epistemic support”. The choice between them “indicates a difference in the degree of reliability of the reportive justification at hand” (ibid.; emphasis is mine, DT).

Further, *budto* (*by*) can be used also in the function of an epistemic particle inserted into RD. It is used as a means of indicating a reporter's low credibility in the authenticity of the information provided in the RD, as in (2.17).

- (2.17) *Po utverženiju samogo Ruslana Auševa,*  
 on claim.DAT self.GEN PN.GEN PN.GEN  
*rešenie uji s vojennoj služby*  
 decision go.INF from military.GEN service.GEN  
*on budto by prinjal v*  
 he like PTCL:COND take.PST.M in  
*oktjabre...*  
 October.PREP  
 'According to **the claim** of Ruslan Aushev himself, **he kinda** decided to leave the military service in October...' (Letučij 2008: 225; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

*Budto* is quite often inserted into RD, although it has not yet fully grammaticalized into quotative particle. Instead, it is used in quotative constructions as an auxiliary element, expressing epistemic support, lowering the credibility of the proposition from the reporter's point of view (Wiemer 2008: 353). Contrarily to *budto*, the particle *jakoby*, which was previously used simultaneously with *budto*, has already switched its functions to the quotative, and it is no longer used in the original function of a complementizer or comparative marker (ibid.: 369). Hence, it can be pointed out that on their own, complementizers in Russian have not yet grammaticalized into genuine quote-introducers. As a result, speech and epistemic verbs (henceforth also: SEVs) or NPs depicting the original source of the RD are necessary components of a QI-clause with complementizers, since they primarily point to the occurrence of a quote.

In my material, both *čto* and *budto* appear in QI-clauses consisting of NPs indicating the speaker/reporter, SVs signaling the presence of RD, and complementizer that is placed on the border position between the RD and a QI-clause. Additionally, an addressee can be specified, although this component is often optional, as in (2.18) and (2.19).

- (2.18) *Roma Sambul včera skazal, čto*  
 PN PN yesterday say.PST.M COMP  
*vosxiščaetsja moim umeniem, ne primykaja*  
 admire.PRS.3SG my.INSTR ability.INSTR NEG join.CV  
*ni k odnoj tusovke, organizovyvat'*  
 NEG to one.DAT party.DAT organize.INF  
*kakie-to tusovki vokrug sebja.*  
 which-INDEF party.PL around self.GEN  
 'Roma Sambul yesterday said that he admires my ability of organizing parties around myself by not joining any party.' (Russian National Corpus).

- (2.19) ...v samom načale ja skazal,  
 in very.PREP beginning.PREP 1SG say.PST.M  
**budto** mne ponravilas' mašina  
 like 1SG.DAT appeal.PST.F car  
 '...in the very beginning, **I said like I liked the car**' (autonavigator.ru).

Besides SVs, also NSVs may occur in QI-clauses, e.g. predicates that express questioning, uncertainty, wonder and suspicion (and which do not have any original reportative semantics), and those expressing epistemic processes, e.g. *think*, *remember*, *know*, cf. (2.20a)–(2.20b). Note that *budto* is used in (2.20b) with a hypothetical quotation (see 1.5.2 on different types of RD). Thus, in (2.20b), a reporter assumes potential thoughts that belong to another speaker on the basis of the described situation. Hence, it can be suggested that besides expressing partial support, the epistemic complementizer *budto* may also express neutral support indicating the epistemic possibility for an occurrence of a hypothetical quotation.

- (2.20a) Uže togda on podumal, što skorost' i  
 already then he think.PST.M COMP speed and  
 brošok u nego na urovne NHL.  
 shot at he.GEN on level.PREP NHL  
 'Already then **he thought that his speed and shot are on the level of NHL**.'  
 (nhl.com).

- (2.20b) t.e. ty podumal, budto ja nadevaju masku  
 i.e. 2SG think.PST.M COMP 1SG put.PRS.1SG mask.ACC  
 kepa?  
 captain.GEN  
 'i.e. **you thought like I put on the mask of captain obvious?**' (lukemore.to).

Both complementizers can also appear together with NPs indicating the original source of RD. In such use, *budto* preserves its epistemic functions, indicating either the reporter's doubt in the credibility of the information or a negative attitude to a proposition in general, cf. (2.21b). *Čto* (2.21a) remains epistemically neutral.

- (2.21a) ja polučaju soobščenie, što login nepravil'nyj  
 1SG receive.PRS.1SG message COMP login incorrect.M  
 I receive **a message that the login is incorrect**' (buka.ru).

- (2.21b) prišlo soobščenie budto ona na sajte  
 come.PST.3SG.N message like she on website.PREP  
 zakazala kosmetiku...  
 order.PST.F cosmetics.ACC  
 'came a message like she ordered cosmetics on the website...'  
 (galya.ru).

On the basis of the above description, one can point out that there is a difference between the use of complementizers in Russian. The main difference is realized in the epistemic support that complementizers express. *Čto* as an epistemically neutral complementizer appears together with a wide range of predicates and NPs indicating the original source of RD. The proposition expressed as RD is typically marked as such that took place and further it is reproduced without special epistemic overtones. As for the epistemic counterpart *budto*, a reporter typically marks a quote as reproduced approximately, at the same time expressing different degrees of epistemic distancing. As a result, *budto* typically appears with predicates expressing less than full epistemic support, or if it co-occurs with epistemically neutral predicates, it expresses less than full support (see 1.6.6) towards reported discourse when compared to similar instances where *čto* appears.

#### 2.4.2. The quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'* in Russian

In this subsection, the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'* are described. Other quotative particles that are used in Russian (e.g. *de*, *jakoby* – cf. Plungjan 2008) are not covered here since they do not appear in Permic languages. The functions of the particles are briefly described in the descriptive grammar of Russian (Švedova 1980: §2212). It is mentioned that these particles are used as markers signaling the presence of RD. The quotative particle *deskat'* is marked as peculiar to vernacular Russian. Both of the particles derive from SVs: *mol* from the verb *molvit'* 'utter' and *deskat'* – from *skazat'* 'say'. Quotative particles may express epistemic support that shows a reporter's incredibility in the content of the RD, often described as a given characteristic of these markers. Consequently, they sometimes appear in contexts where the speaker/reporter is obviously considering the content of the RD incorrect, or estimates it negatively (see the summary on the previous studies and examples in Plungjan 2008: 286–88). However, as Plungjan shows in his study (2008: 288), quotative particles in Russian may also appear in contexts where a negative evaluation of RD is absent. The author claims that the main function of quotative particles (in Plungjan's study *ksenopokazateli* 'xenomarkers', the term adopted from Arutjunova 2000) is to indicate the difference between reported and original text. This difference is usually stronger where *deskat'* is used, and weaker where *mol* appears. In cases where *mol* is used, the reporter aims at preserving important information, and less important facts are presented vaguely. In other words, a summarizing function of the quotative particle can be observed, i.e. the quote is usually presented as a short narration of someone's previous utterance or thought. In several instances, the reporter chooses the parts of the utterances and presents them as a quote. For example, in (2.22), the reporter presents only general information on the context of a book. In addition, it can be pointed out that in cases where *mol* is used, the reporter's subjectivity is present the least (Plungjan 2008: 292).

- (2.22) ...*v* *gildii* *vorov* *ležit* *knižka-spravočnik*  
in guild.PREP thief.PL.GEN lie.PRS.3SG book-guideline  
*po* *etim* *simvolam,* *mol,* *kogo*  
on these.PREP symbol.PL.PREP QUOT who.ACC  
*možno* *grabit'*, *kogo* *nel'zja,* *kto*  
allowed rob.INF who.ACC prohibited who  
*pod* *zaščitoj.*  
under protection.INSTR  
‘In the guild of thieves, there is **a guideline book** on these symbols, **telling/like**, whom it is allowed to rob, whom not, and who is under protection.’ (Russian National Corpus).

In contrast to *mol*, *deskat'* is used mostly in contexts where the reporter intends to interpret RD with a note of subjectivity. It occurs quite frequently in RD-constructions with hypothetical quotation, or where movements and gestures are verbalized and presented as quotes (Plungjan 2008: 293). In my material, both quotative particles appeared in constructions depicting quotations of speech and hypothetical quotations. The findings of the previous studies are mostly confirmed on the basis of my material. The quotative particle *deskat'*, despite the possibility of its appearance with quotations of speech (2.23), is more often used with hypothetical quotations, cf. (2.24b).

- (2.23) ...*govoril,* *čto* *ego,* *deskat'*, “*ne* *smogli*  
say.PST.M COMP he.ACC QUOT NEG can.PST.PL  
*razbudit'* *ni* *Romancev,* *ni* *Sëmin*”.  
wake.up.INF NEG PN NEG PN  
‘[The score equalized football player, about whom Andrey Kobelev who soon after that had come to “Dinamo” as the main coach,] **said that like**, “neither Romantsev, nor Syomin could wake him up”.’ (Russian National Corpus).

The quotative particle *mol* more typically appears in constructions with real quotes. It presents quotes with approximative evaluation, cf. (2.24a). In case of *deskat'*, the RD is either very approximate, or it did not happen at all, as in (2.24b), where the reporter presents a hypothetical quotation of what others might potentially say in response to his/her previous claim.

- (2.24a) ...*stala* *bodro* *rasskazyvat'* *prepodavatelju,* *čto*  
become.PST.F cheerfully tell.INF teacher.DAT COMP  
*vot,* *mol,* *est'* *takoj* *Egor*  
PTCL QUOT be.PRS such PN  
*Bulyčov...*  
PN  
‘...she **started** cheerfully **telling** the teacher **like** there is like such Egor Bulyčov...’ (Russian National Corpus).

- (2.24b) *Mne mogut vozrazit' – deskat', brat'ja*  
 I SG.DAT can.PRS.3PL object.INF QUOT brother.PL  
*Strugackie sami pisali scenarij k*  
 PN.PL self.PL write.PST.3PL screenplay to  
 “*Stalkeru*”!  
 PN.DAT  
 ‘Some **might object** my point of view, **saying/like** the Strugatski brothers wrote the screenplay for “Stalker”!’ (Russian National Corpus).

Structurally, quotative particles are used in various ways. They appear with a range of different predicates – speech and non-speech verbs. It is interesting that quotative particles may appear as part of a QI-clause, or they may be inserted into RD. While being part of a QI-clause, its main function is to indicate the presence of RD. When the quotative particle is placed into RD, the reporter emphasizes the approximative evaluation of the RD (compare (2.23) and (2.24b) with *deskat'*, and (2.24a) and (2.25) with *mol*)<sup>64</sup>. An individual epistemic meaning is only emphasized and not upgraded. Thus, the use of *deskat'* still indicates a more approximative quality of a quote than the use of *mol*.

- (2.25) ...*a Serëga emu pokazyvaet mol “idi dal'se”*  
 and PN he.DAT show.PRS.3SG QUOT go.IMP2SG further  
 ‘...and **Seryoga shows him, like** “Go further”’ (anekdotov.net).

As for their appearance in different constructions, *deskat'* and *mol* are used together with speech (2.24a, b) and epistemic verbs (2.26a, b).

- (2.26a) ...*i on podumal mol, vse*  
 and he think.PST.M QUOT all  
*ne ponimajut smysla repa i roka...*  
 NEG understand.PRS.3PL meaning.GEN rap.GEN and rock.GEN  
 ‘...and **he thought like** all don't understand the meaning of rap and rock...’ (pikabu.ru).

- (2.26b) *On podumal, deskat', vot xodjat sluxi*  
 he think.PST.M QUOT PTCL go.PRS.3PL rumor.PL  
*ob igre...*  
 about game.PREP  
 ‘**He thought like** there are rumors about the game...’ (gamer.ru).

In my material, they are also in constructions with an elliptic verb depicting the event behind RD, as in (2.27a, b):

<sup>64</sup> This is a typologically very common phenomenon. For example, a similar case was previously described by Aikhenvald and Dixon (2014: 18): the marker *nana* in “Tsou (Tsouic, Formosan, Austronesian) indicates that information was acquired through hearsay or a speech report if the marker appears before the verb of speech”, and “if the marker *nana* occurs within the reported clause, the implication is that the speaker is not certain of the information in the speech report”.

(2.27a) ...*i on mol, davaj ja tebe pomogu*  
 and he QUOT give.IMP2SG 1SG 2SG.DAT help.PRS.1SG  
 ‘...and he [was] like let me help’ (baby.ru).

(2.27b) *A on: deskat’, ničego ne zametil,*  
 and he QUOT nothing.GEN NEG notice.PST.M  
*dumal, čto sobaku sbil*  
 think.PST.M COMP dog.ACC hit.PST.M  
 ‘And he [was] like [I] haven’t noticed anything, [I] thought I hit the dog [with the car]’ (rus.delfi.lv).

Ellipsis of the verb and lack of a predicate can be considered quite typical for Russian. For example, in Finnic languages, in similar types of constructions, the equational verb ‘to be’ is used to cover the ellipsis of an SV or an EV (see 1.6.2.1, Sections 4.2–5). Furthermore, in RD-constructions where quotative particles are present, the use of SVs is not obligatory since the markers alone already have a potential to indicate the presence of RD. Consider (2.28a) and (2.28b) where both particles appear in non-clausal use:

(2.28a) *Deskat’, ne pora li razobrat’sja s*  
 QUOT NEG time Q take.care.of.INF with  
*ètim kem-to.*  
 this.INSTR somebody.DAT-INDEF  
 ‘[In the end, authors asked the question: “Obviously, somebody chooses such movies and allows them to be shown on our screens?”] **Saying/like, isn’t it the right time to take care of this somebody.**’ (Russian National Corpus).

(2.28b) *Mol, u Britanii i*  
 QUOT at Britain.GEN and  
*Francii armija byla vooružena*  
 France.GEN army be.PST.F armed.F  
*nareznyimi ružjami, a russkie*  
 rifled.INSTR.PL rifle.INSTR.PL but Russian.PL  
*soldaty – ustarevšimi gladkostvol’nymi.*  
 soldier.PL old-fashioned.INSTR.PL smooth-bore.INSTR.PL  
 ‘**They say, the British and French army was armed with rifled guns, but Russian soldiers – with old-fashioned smooth-bore ones.**’ (Russian National Corpus).

In addition, both particles appear in constructions with NPs indicating the original source of RD. Quotative particles downgrade the accuracy of RD that they present or are inserted into.

(2.29a) *prišlo soobščenie, mol igrok s*  
 come.PST.N message QUOT player with  
*plexoj statistikoj xočet prodat’ akkaunt...*  
 bad.INSTR.F rating.INSTR.F want.PRS.3SG sell.INF account  
 ‘**came a message, like/saying [that] a player with bad rating wants to sell an account...**’ (worldoftanks.ru).

|         |                  |                |                  |                 |                |
|---------|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| (2.29b) | <i>Kogda</i>     | <i>stavili</i> | <i>očen'</i>     | <i>bojalas'</i> | <i>groxota</i> |
|         | when             | place.PST.1PL  | very             | fear.PST.F      | noise.GEN      |
|         | <i>naružnogo</i> | <i>bloka,</i>  | <i>počitav</i>   | <i>otzyvy,</i>  | <i>deskat'</i> |
|         | outside.GEN      | part.GEN       | read.CV          | feedback.PL     | QUOT           |
|         | <i>oč</i>        | <i>šumnyj,</i> | <i>vibracija</i> | <i>i</i>        | <i>vsjakoe</i> |
|         | very             | noisy.M        | vibration        | and             | all.kind.N     |
|         | <i>takoe</i>     |                |                  |                 |                |
|         | such.N           |                |                  |                 |                |

‘When we were placing it, I was very afraid of noise from the outside part after reading **feedbacks, saying/like** [the machine] is very noisy, vibration and all kind of such stuff’ (Russian National Corpus).

Finally, the appearance of *mol* in non-quotative constructions can also be observed. *Deskat'* in such functions does not appear in my material, although another quotative particle *de* is also used as a discourse marker. *Mol* (2.30a) and *de* (2.30b) are used as hedging particles that make sentences less straightforward<sup>65</sup>. For example, in (2.30a), the speaker makes his/her proposition less obvious. Hence, (s)he does not take responsibility for the success of his/her suggestion. Note that the speaker uses also the imperative mood that might be used in suggestions in Russian in general, although by using the particle *mol*, the order acquires the meaning of a suggestion. In (2.30b), *de* functions in the same way and turns the whole statement (‘sad, but not that sad, as it could be’) into a less direct claim.

|         |   |                |                |            |                   |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|
| (2.30a) | <i>Davaj,</i>   | <i>slušaj,</i> | <i>sxodite</i> | <i>v</i>   | Dixie outlet      |
|         | PTCL  | listen.IMP2SG  | go.IMP2PL      | in         | PN (Eng.)         |
|         | <i>mol,</i>   | <i>možet</i>   | <i>tam</i>     | <i>čto</i> | <i>podberete.</i> |
|         | PTCL  | maybe          | there          | something  | pick.up.PRS.2PL   |
|         | ‘Okay, listen, you should <b>kinda</b> go to the Dixie outlet, maybe you will find something there.’ (Russian National Corpus). |                |                |            |                   |

|         |  |              |               |             |           |                   |
|---------|--|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|
| (2.30b) | <i>Pečal'no,</i>   | <i>no</i>    | <i>opjat'</i> | <i>de</i>   | <i>ne</i> | <i>nastol'ko,</i> |
|         | sad  | but          | again         | PTCL        | NEG       | as.such           |
|         | <i>naskol'ko</i>   | <i>moglo</i> | <i>by</i>     | <i>byt'</i> |           |                   |
|         | as.much  | can.PST.N    | PTCL:COND     | be.INF      |           |                   |
|         | ‘Sad, but again, <b>kinda</b> , not that sad, as it could be’ (Russian National Corpus). |              |               |             |           |                   |

In general, it is important to observe uses of quotative particles in non-quotative constructions, since there is a tight correlation between the functions that quotative particles fulfill in general. Thus, a similar tendency where additional functions expressed by quotative particles in the quotative domain become also prominent in non-quotative contexts may also be expected in the use of quotative particles in Permic.

<sup>65</sup> Note that a similar use can be observed with the new quotative *nagu* ‘like’ in Estonian. In non-quotative use, the originally SIM *nagu* is used to modify the average probability or potentiality of the sentence (EKG 1993: §726).



### 2.4.3. New quotative strategies in Russian

Two NQ strategies are described in this subchapter that appear in different extent also in one of the Permic languages. One of the strategies implies the use of the originally similative marker *tipa* ‘of a type, like’, the original functions of which can be observed in (2.31).

- (2.31) ...*čto-to tipa 100 rublej v mesjac za predmet...*  
 something like 100 Ruble.PL.GEN in month for subject  
 ‘[But they have also payable services – “virtual school”.] something **like** 100 rubles per month for a subject [but we don’t use it.]’ (Russian National Corpus).

The use of the NQ *tipa* is briefly mentioned in Plungjan (2008: 300). The author brings examples where this NQ co-occurs with the conventionalized quotative particle *mol*. Daiber (2010) provides examples of two different orthographic variants *tipa* and *tipo* (most likely, the unstressed *a* is spelled *o* here). Both of the variants depict the use of the noun *tip* ‘type’ in the genitive case – *tipa* ‘of a type’. I do not pay attention to the use of *tipo* here since this orthographic variant does not appear in the Permic material.

The justification for the use of SIMs as QIs cross-linguistically is provided here in details in 1.6.2.5. In quotative constructions, the SIM *tipa* is used variously. Besides quotations of speech (2.33), the marker can be used in quoting someone’s thoughts or gestures. This can be clearly observed in the co-occurrence of *tipa* with verbs depicting thinking and mimetic expressions, as in (2.32a) and (2.32b).

- (2.32a) *Snačala podumal, tipa kolekcija, no net*  
 first think.PST.M like collection but no  
 ‘First [I] **thought like** collection, but no’ (логотрад.рф).

- (2.32b) *Pokazyvaet tipa – pošel na kuj<sup>66</sup>...*  
 show.PRS.3SG like go.PST.2SG on dick  
 ‘(S)he **shows like** – fuck off...’ (caricatura.ru).

While appearing with SVs, epistemic functions of *tipa* become salient. The reporter aims at signaling that the ongoing quote is represented from the standpoint of the current speaker, cf. (2.33).

- (2.33) *On govorit, tipa nado rasstat’sja*  
 he say.PRS.3SG like need break.up.INF  
 ‘**He says like** we need to break up’ (risovach.ru).

<sup>66</sup> The variant *kuj* is used as a euphemism of the noun *xuj* ‘dick’.

The appearance of *tipa* in constructions with an elliptic verb leaves various scenarios for interpretation, cf. (2.34). Any verb that can be used to signal the presence of RD hypothetically could be placed here. Hence, the presence of RD is marked exclusively by *tipa*.

- (2.34) ...*i on tipa – da ja s detstva akrobat*  
 and he like yes 1SG from childhood.GEN acrobat  
 ‘...and **he** [is/was] **like – yes, I am an acrobat since my childhood**’ (dalas.ru).

The co-occurrence of *tipa* with NPs indicating the source of RD is also quite typical. In (2.35), the reporter presents a hypothetical quotation. This can be observed in the presence of the indefinite adverbs of place (*tam-to* ‘there somewhere’) and time (*togda-to* ‘at that (unspecified) time’). The speaker shows the capacity of a local server at his/her working place by providing an example that these types of messages can be send over to colleagues. In Kuiri’s (1984: 115) study on RD in the Eastern dialects of Finnish, such RD is referred to as *reduced reported discourse* (*redusoitunut referointi*; the term borrowed from Harweg 1968 – *reduzierte Rede*).

- (2.35) ...*soobščeniya posylat’, tipa èto ležit tam-to,*  
 message.PL send.INF like DEM.N lie.PRS.3SG there-INDEF  
*togda-to vyklučat svet i t.d...*  
 then-INDEF turn.off.PRS.3PL light and etc.  
 ‘[one can send from the server to all the computers that are turned on] **messages, like this lies there somewhere, the electricity will be turned off at that time, and so on...**’ (Russian National Corpus).

By using *tipa* in RD-constructions where hypothetical quotations appear, the reporter shows that the following RD is not “the exact depiction of an individual speech act of a particular situation, but rather [...] a typification of a situation, a group of people or an individual” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XV). At the same time, it indicates the start of the RD.

RD acquires similar characteristics when it is introduced by non-clausal *tipa*. In such occurrences, the quotative marker is typically preceding the RD. Since all the possible elements depicting an event or participants are omitted from the RD-construction, the event following the original utterance becomes vague, and similarly to clauses with an elliptic verb (2.34), various interpretations are possible. The speaker/reporter can be recovered only from the context.

- (2.36) *pričem soznatel’no uže, tipa “A čto*  
 at.that consciously already like and what  
*mne ot odnoj budet”.. i “Vse*  
 1SG.DAT from one.GEN be.FUT.3SG and all  
*kurjat”..*  
 smoke.PRS.3PL  
 ‘Even consciously already, **like/saying “And what will happen from one [cigarette]?”** and **“Everybody smokes”..**’ (Russian National Corpus).

Among the non-quotative uses of *tipa*, its appearance in the function of a discourse particle can be noted. It is quite similar to the use of *mol* in such function (see 2.4.2). *Tipa* is used to indicate the speaker's uncertainty about his/her own words and basically functions as a hedging particle. The simulative marker indicates that the information expressed in a proposition is the speaker's own interpretation of previously acquired information, and it is not produced as a given fact, in accuracy and truthfulness of which (s)he can be entirely certain.

- (2.37) *tipa naberut v zobiki meda, ix*  
 like pick.up.FUT.3PL in goiter.ACC honey.GEN 3PL.ACC  
*potom pustjat v ljubuju semju*  
 then let.in.FUT.3PL in any.ACC family.ACC  
 'Like/kinda they will pick up the honey into their goiters, and the other bees will let them in any family' (Russian National Corpus).

Another NQ strategy implies the use of the type deictic *takoj* 'such'. This deictic along with functional correspondents in other languages was also mentioned in "Table 1 (New) quotatives and their semantic sources" in Buchstaller and Van Alphen (2012: XIV), presented here as Table 4 in 1.6.1. The use of deictics in quotative constructions is also mentioned in Daiber (2010: 70). The author reports an appearance of the deictic *tako* 'thus' in Old Russian, e.g. *rekli tako* 'they said thus' (ibid.: 70). The justification of the use of deictics as QIs in the world's languages provided here in 1.6.2.6. (2.38) illustrates the typical use of *takoj* outside the quotative domain when the deictic is adjusted to a noun:

- (2.38) *Èto takoj bag, po-moemu, v 1.8 patče*  
 DEM such.M bug according.to.me in NUM patch  
*ego ispravili.*  
 he.GEN correct.PST.3PL  
 'It is **such a bug**, according to me, it was corrected in patch 1.8.'  
 (gamerinside.ru).

In my material, the NQ *takoj* appears with SVs (2.39a), EVs (2.39b) and with NPs indicating the original source of RD (2.39c). Quite typical for the colloquial speech is ellipsis of the verb from the QI-clause (2.39d), which was already demonstrated above in uses of the quotative particle *mol* and the new quotative *tipa*.

- (2.39a) *On takoj otvetil – xorošo, no ničego*  
 he such.M respond.PST.M alright but nothing.GEN  
*delat' ne stal*  
 do.INF NEG begin.PST.3SG  
 'He responded **such – alright**, but didn't set about to do anything' (pikabu.ru).

(2.39b) *A on takoj podumal "čet zaebalo*  
 and he such.M think.PST.M somehow fuck.PST.N  
*mne byt' tupym..."*  
 1SG.DAT be.INF stupid.INSTR  
 'And he thought such "somehow I am fucking tired of being stupid..."'  
 (vk.com).

(2.39c) *Est' takaja zamečatel'naja fraza: vsě*  
 be.PRS such.F great.F phrase all  
*čto s vami proisxodit, začem-to*  
 COMP with 2PL.INSTR happen.PRS.3SG why-INDEF  
*vam nužno*  
 2PL.DAT necessary  
 'There is such a great phrase: all that happens to you, somehow is necessary  
 for you' (Russian National Corpus).

(2.39d) *...i ja emu takoj – Čakki, Čakki spokojnee*  
 and 1SG he.DAT such.M PN PN calm.COMPAR  
 '...and I [was] to him such Chucky, Chucky – calm down' (demotivation.me).

In addition, the NQ *takoj* is also used in non-clausal constructions as a single quote-introducer. However, such an occurrence remains quite rare. The non-clausal use of the marker can be still considered an outcome of further neutralization of the QI-clause, like the one presented in (2.39d). It is realized by the ellipsis of the main components from a QI-clause, such as reporter/speaker, speech or another verb depicting an event behind RD. Hence, only the deictic *takoj* is used as a quote-introducer.

(2.40) *...i on takoj pokazyvaet mne*  
 and he such show.PRS.3SG 1SG.DAT  
*na dve ogromnye kanistry bljat'*  
 on two huge.PL jerrican.PL fuck  
*s normal'noj vodoj, i takoj:*  
 with normal.INSTR water.INSTR and such  
*Tak vot že*  
 here PTCL PTCL  
 'and he points for me such on two huge jerricans with fucking normal water,  
 and such: Here you go' (Russian National Corpus).

#### 2.4.4. Quotative indexes in Russian: summary

Table 6 summarizes the use of different quotative markers in Russian.

Table 6. Quotative markers in Russian

| Markers                 | QI-clauses with SVs | QI-clauses with EVs | QI-clauses with NSVs | QI-clauses with elliptic verbs | QI-clauses with NPs | Single QI |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| I. Complementizers      |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>čto</i>              | +                   | +                   | –                    | –                              | +                   | –         |
| <i>budto</i>            | +                   | +                   | –                    | –                              | +                   | –         |
| II. Quotative particles |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>mol</i>              | +                   | +                   | +                    | +                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>deskat'</i>          | +                   | +                   | +                    | +                              | +                   | +         |
| III. New quotatives     |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>tipa</i>             | +                   | +                   | +                    | +                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>takoj</i>            | +                   | +                   | –                    | +                              | +                   | +         |

In Russian, a basic QI-clause construction involves the use of SEVs and NPs with the complementizers *čto* and *budto*. These complementizers differ in their epistemic meaning. The complementizer *čto* is epistemically neutral. By using the epistemically neutral complementizer, the reporter aims at depicting RD close to an original utterance. While using the complementizer *budto*, the reporter shows that the RD is depicted approximately and with subjective overtones. Thus, *budto* typically occurs in a QI-clause with verbs depicting doubt, uncertainty or supposition. With NSVs, in constructions with elliptic verbs and as single quote-introducers, *čto* and *budto* typically do not appear. For this, they would require specific pragmatic setting where the verb depicting the event behind RD or NP indicating its source could be retrievable from the context.

Another strategy involves the use of the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'*, divided according to the meanings that they express (cf. Plungjan 2008). *Mol* is considered epistemically more neutral. The reporter preserves only the main facts, and unnecessary information is depicted vaguely or left unspecified. The quotative particle *deskat'* shows even a smaller commitment of the reporter towards the accuracy of the RD. Quite often the quotative particle *deskat'* introduces hypothetical quotations. Two different uses of quotative particles with predicates can be observed. Namely, they may appear either as part of the QI-clause or they are inserted into RD. As part of a QI-clause, the primary function of the quotative particle is to indicate the presence of RD (although the quotative particle preserves its epistemic meaning). When it is placed into the RD, the epistemic meaning becomes more salient – the reporter aims at

emphasizing that the RD is produced approximately and (s)he does not take responsibility for the accuracy of its content. Besides SEVs, NPs and NSVs, *mol* and *deskat* also appear in QI-clauses with elliptic predicates. It is quite a typical construction in colloquial Russian. An event behind RD becomes unspecified, and thus the reporter blurs the distinction between quoting speech, thought, or even putting someone's actions into words and presenting hypothetical quotations. They may also appear as single quote-introducers in non-clausal use. Thus, information about the reporter and event during which the RD was originally produced is unspecified.

Among NQ constructions, the use of the originally SIM *tipa* 'like, of a type' and the type deictic *takoj* 'such' were described. By using *tipa*, the reporter specifies that the RD is depicted approximately and quite subjectively. Deictics employed in the quotative domain typically point to the presence of RD. Both NQs are used in constructions with SEVs and NPs indicating the original source of RD. Quite typical for colloquial speech is the neutralization of a QI-clause which happens when the reporter omits a predicate from a QI-clause. Further neutralization can be observed in non-clausal use of the NQs *takoj* and *tipa*, where both appear as single quote-introducers.

## 2.5. Quotative indexes in Udmurt

In this section, the QI used in Udmurt internet communications are presented. The section is divided according to the category to which a concrete quotative marker belongs. First, the use of complementizers in QI-clauses with different types of predicates are depicted. Further, the quotative particles, both autochthonous and borrowed from Russian, are illustrated. Finally, the role of simulative markers and deictics as potential sources for new quotative strategies are investigated. Similarly to the description of the quotative particles, attention is paid both to autochthonous and borrowed strategies. At the end of subsection, short summary is presented.

### 2.5.1. Complementizer strategies in Udmurt internet communications

In substandard written Udmurt, the complementizer strategy primarily implies the use of complementizers with SVs. Among them, one can find the use of the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša*, the Russian complementizers *čto* and *budto*, and the parallel use of replicated and autochthonous complementizers. By *autochthonous*, I mean those strategies that do not show a relatively recent influence of contact languages. Obviously, they are not intended to cover strategies that could be considered primordially of Uralic or Finno-Ugric origin. First, the use of the autochthonous complementizer is covered. Second, borrowed complementizers are described, including the parallel use of autochthonous and borrowed complementizers.

### 2.5.1.1. The autochthonous complementizer strategy in Udmurt

The autochthonous complementizer strategy primarily involves the use of the clause-final complementizer *šuyša* with *verba dicendi* (Winkler 2011: 169). Besides SVs the complementizer *šuyša* may combine with epistemic verbs (Klumpp 2016: 541). Additionally to its function as a complementizer, it can be used as a simple converb of the SV *šuyny*, lit. meaning ‘saying’ (Klumpp 2016: 534). As it appears further, this function becomes important in indicating the presence of RD where the marker appears with NSVs. Analogical formations of complementizers are found in other languages spoken in the area, e.g. in Mari (*manən*), Tatar (*dip*), and Chuvash (*tese*). In Udmurt, the influence of Tatar can be noticed in the formation of complementizer – “*šuy-sa* ‘say-CV’ is a calque from Tatar *di-p* ‘say-CV’” (ibid.: 538).

As far as QI-clauses with SVs are concerned, the presence of the complementizer is not obligatory, and consequently, it is often omitted. The criteria for the use of the complementizer are contextual rather than grammatical. As it was pointed out in previous studies on the use of complementizers in Finnic, the omission of the complementizer often happens with those complementizers that can be, in general, characterized as epistemically neutral, i.e. do not contribute to the evaluation of the complement proposition (Kehayov 2016: 471). This consideration, in general, can also be taken into account for the use of the complementizer *šuyša*, as it does not reflect epistemic meaning. Consequently, it may be assumed that epistemically, the complementizer *šuyša* can be considered a close correspondent to the Russian complementizer *čto*. Thus, where necessary, the expression of epistemic support is produced through the choice of a predicate. If such meaning is not expressed, then a quote can be considered to be produced without additional meanings. Pragmatically, the complementizer *šuyša* is often elliptic from clauses where the SV *šuyny* ‘say’ appears, from which the complementizer derives (Winkler 2011: 169)<sup>67</sup>. However, in colloquial speech it often cannot be applied as a rule since there are examples that show the opposite, cf. (2.41).

As part of a QI-clause, *šuyša* typically appears with SEVs. As already mentioned above, *šuyša* typically appears in clause-final position; however, in the collected material, one example shows its use in the position preceding the RD, cf. (2.42). In general, such a position of *šuyša* can be considered marginal. The motivation for clause-initial position might be due to the influence of Russian that exclusively uses clause-initial complementizers (see 2.4.1). Clause-initial use of the complementizer should be investigated more thoroughly on the

---

<sup>67</sup> A similar instance is reported in Frajzygier (1996: 164–165, quoted from Güldemann 2008: 451) for contemporary Chadic languages where the complementizer derives also from the speech verb ‘to say’: “in many contemporary Chadic languages there is complementarity between the verb ‘to say’ and the complementizer. If one occurs, the other does not. If the complementizer is derived from sources other than the verb ‘to say’ (...) the complementizer is not omitted”.

basis of a broader corpus including also oral communications, which, however, remains beyond the scope of the current research.

- (2.41) *Nyljos* *šuizy,* *ćapak* *soku*  
 girl.PL say.PST.3PL right when  
*ik* *konkurse* *pyriškiś* *finno-ugorkaos*  
 PTCL competition.ILL participate.PTCP Finno-Ugrian.F.PL  
*no* *koškizy* *šuyśa.*  
 PTCL go.away.PST.3PL COMP  
 ‘Girls said that right at that time the Finno-Ugrian girls who participated in the competition went away.’ (Blog subcorpus).

- (2.42) *na* *otyn* *tažy* *gožtemyn* *val* *šuyśa:*  
 PTCL here so write.PTCP.INE be.PRS.3SG COMP  
*ne* *vkľjučat’...*  
 NEG turn.on.INF  
 ‘...here was **written so that don’t turn on...**’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

In the use of *šuyśa* with NSVs, I observe two different functions which mainly depend on the quality of a predicate with which the marker occurs. If a verb that appears in a QI-clause is an EV, cf. (2.43), then the marker functions as a marker signaling the end of RD, similarly to its appearance with SVs, as e.g. in (2.41). In such cases, it does not fulfill primary quote-introducing functions that are carried out rather by an SEV. In the cases, where the verb is an NSV (see 1.6.2.1), *šuyśa* is used as a simple converb, meaning ‘saying’, as in (2.44). In such cases, it is the main quote-introducer in the QI-clause since NSVs do not have functional properties, necessary for indicating the presence of the RD.

- (2.43) *A* *eššo* *kuddyrja* *malpaško,* *umoj* primer  
 and more sometimes think.PRS.1SG good example  
*šotiško* *šuyśa.*  
 give.PRS.1SG COMP  
 ‘And sometimes **I think that I give good example.**’ (Blog subcorpus).

- (2.44) *No* *so* *dyre* *ik* *kule* *övöl,*  
 and DEM time.ILL PTCL need NEG  
*dyr,* *“mon* *udmurt”* *šuyśa* *gad’e* *myžgany*  
 maybe 1SG Udmurt say.CV breast.ILL beat.INF  
 ‘but at the same time, there is no need, maybe to **beat one’s chest and say**  
 ‘I am Udmurt’” (vk.com/yumshan57).

In addition to co-occurrence with speech and non-speech verbs, the complementizer may also appear in a QI-clause where an NP indicates the original source of RD. I do not consider the main predicate(s) of a clause in such types of constructions relevant since they do not participate in marking the presence of RD (see 1.6.2.2). In such cases, I rather concentrate on characteristics of an NP as besides typically marking the original source of RD, it also



indicates that such a construction, in general, does contain one (Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 133–34).

|        |  |                    |                    |                    |
|--------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (2.45) | <i>...i</i>  | <i>soobščenioš</i> | <i>taratill'am</i> | <i>ešjosly</i>     |
|        | and  | message.PL         | send.out.PTCP.3PL  | friend.PL.DAT      |
|        | <i>mynam,</i>  | VYRUČAJ,           | DAJ                | NOMER              |
|        | 1SG.GEN  | help.IMP2SG        | give.IMP2SG        | number             |
|        | TELEFONA   | MTS                | <i>šuyša,</i>      | <i>mošeňnikjos</i> |
|        | telephone.GEN  | PN                 | COMP               | rascal.PL          |
|        | '...and sent <b>messages</b> to <b>my friends</b> that <u>HELP, GIVE ME YOUR MTS TELEPHONE NUMBER</u> , rascals' (vk.com/yumshan57). |                    |                    |                    |

Based on the examples presented in this subsection, it might be concluded that the complementizer *šuyša* combining with speech- and non-speech verbs is usually used in RD-constructions where direct RD occurs. The use of complementizers with direct RD mainly occurs in colloquial speech, whereas on the level of standard language complementizers are typically used only in constructions with indirect RD (Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 135, 139) (see also 2.4.1 on Russian, or 4.4 on Finnic). But there might be another motivation for its use with direct RD: *šuyša* derives from the SV *šuyny*, and it still appears as an SV co-occurring with a range of non-speech verbs (Vaxrušev *et al.* 1974: 133–34). For such types of QIs, Güldemann (2008) suggests the term *quotative/complementizer*: “while a quotative tends to be associated with the indexing of a string of DRD, a complementizer is viewed as a more general linker between a complement-taking verb and a clause-like unit” (Güldemann 2008: 454). Consequently, in the Udmurt quotative domain, *šuyša* falls under this category.

### 2.5.1.2. The complementizers *čto* and *budto* in Udmurt

In colloquial Udmurt, besides the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša*, both the Russian epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* and the epistemic complementizer *budto* appear. As a separate subtype, the combination of the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša* and the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* is recognized here and its description is included in the subsection on the use of *čto*.

#### 2.5.1.2.1. The Russian epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* as part of the complementizer strategy in Udmurt

The appearance of the clause-initial complementizer *čto* in substandard Udmurt is recognized here as a case of matter and pattern replication. Thus, the complementizer *čto* in QI-clauses not only substitutes *šuyša* in homomorphic constructions, but also appears in a similar type of construction as in the matrix language. Consequently, besides SVs, we observe EVs (2.46), and with NPs,

indicating the original source of RD (2.47). According to Tánczos (2013: 95), the appearance of the clause-initial complementizer is tightly connected to the change of Udmurt word order from SOV to SVO under the influence of Russian. In addition, the author mentions that the use of *čto* remains preferable among the speakers of Udmurt in constructions where SVs of the ‘say’-type appear (*generic speech verbs*). Among the motivations for such a preference, she mentions semantic reasons – the complementizer *šuyša* is identical to the converb form of the SV *šuyny* ‘say’. (Tánczos 2013: 102)

(2.46) *Kyt'ijaz*            *daže*            *malpaško,*            *što*            *Ižyn*  
 sometimes            even            think.PRS.1SG            COMP            Izhevsk.INE  
*šuldyrges*            *huyśal*            *dyr*  
 funny.COMPAR            be.COND            probably  
 ‘Sometimes I even **think that in Izhevsk I would be probably happier**’  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

(2.47) *Mama*            *ad'džem*            *gazetyś*            *jalon,*  
 mom            see.PRF.3SG            newspaper.ELA            notification  
*što*            *Ižkaryn*            *putylemyn*            *žagkujanjos*  
 COMP            Izhevsk.INE            put.PTCP.INE            trash.bin.PL  
*juri*            *batarejkaosly*            *no*            *lampočkaosly*  
 specially            battery.PL.DAT            and            light.bulb.PL.DAT  
 ‘Mom saw a **notification in the newspaper that in Izhevsk special trash bins for batteries and light bulbs were placed**’ (Blog subcorpus).

In addition, identically to its use in Russian, the complementizer *čto* remains epistemically neutral, and potential epistemic support may be expressed exclusively through the choice of a predicate, either epistemically upgrading or downgrading the proposition, or by using extra means, e.g. a quantifier preceding the predicate as in (2.48). where the replicated Russian quantifier *voobščě* ‘completely’ expresses full support (on the epistemic modal scale, see 1.6.6; on the epistemic upgrading function of quantifiers with maximal quantificational meaning see 1.6.2.7).

(2.48) *Kin*            *ke*            *voobščě*            *veraz,*            *što*            *gađukaos*  
 who            INDEF            completely            say.PST.3SG            COMP            viper.PL  
*no*            *vañ*  
 PTCL            be.PRS.3SG  
 ‘**Somebody completely said that there are vipers**’ (Blog subcorpus).

It is interesting that the autochthonous corresponding marker *oglom* ‘completely; in general’ does not fulfill this function, and where it appears together with SVs in a QI-clause it indicates that the RD is presented in a summarized form, cf. (2.49). Thus, one can consider the borrowed quantifier as a potential gap-filler in colloquial written Udmurt, and a new case of matter replication can be observed.

- (2.49) *Oglom šuizy, mon tuž vizmo nylaš*  
 in.general say.PST.3PL 1SG very clever girl  
 ‘In general, they said [that] I am a very clever girl’ (Blog subcorpus).

Furthermore, a combination of the clause-initial *čto* with the clause-final complementizer *šuyša* can be observed. This strategy is recognized here as an outcome of contact between the languages and it is realized in a typical double-marking strategy that implies the use of both autochthonous and borrowed markers. It was first reported to be used already in the 1940–50s in Udmurt (Šutov 1999, quoted from Tánčzos 2013: 99)<sup>68</sup>. Thus, the borrowed complementizer marks the beginning of RD, while the autochthonous complementizer fulfills the closing function. Such an instance is not restricted to the use of the epistemically neutral complementizers *čto* and *šuyša*. Also cases with other conjunctions can be encountered in Udmurt, e.g. *jesli ... ke* ‘if ... if’, *hot’a ... ke no* ‘although ... although’, etc. (Winkler 2011, quoted from Tánčzos 2013: 100).

According to Tánčzos (2013: 96, 111), such a double-marking strategy is an intermediate stage that appears due to the change of the basic word order in Udmurt from SOV to SVO. Besides Udmurt, it also appears in other Finno-Ugric languages of Russia, e.g. in Ižma Komi and Mari (Tánčzos 2013: 100)<sup>69</sup>. Such a strategy is recognized as grammatical among the speakers of Udmurt (ibid.: 101), and it appears most often in constructions where an SV or an EV appears, as in (2.50).

- (2.50) *Marija, vot sobere žalet’ karo, što*  
 PN PTCL then pity.INF do.FUT.1SG COMP  
*ožy kari, jake nomyr öj kary šuyša*  
 thus do.PST.1SG or nothing NEG.PST.1SG do.CN COMP  
 ‘Maria, then I will regret that I have done it thus, or haven’t done anything.’  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

In (2.51), *šuyša* is placed at the end of a multi-part RD. The first time the speaker marks the continuation of the RD, while at the end of the second clause, it is indicated that the RD is finished. This function of *šuyša* was previously reported in Vaxrušev *et al.* (1974: 139). Namely, the authors indicate that *šuyša* can be placed at the end of multi-part RD, if each part of it consists of an independent clause, as in (2.51):

<sup>68</sup> In closely related Komi (or its dialects), the double-marking complementizer strategy was used already in Bible translations from the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Leinonen 2002, quoted from Tánčzos 2013: 99).

<sup>69</sup> It is interesting that in Mari a similar strategy appears. As it has been mentioned above, similarly to Udmurt, Mari uses as the complementizer the converb form *manən* that derives from the SV *manaš* ‘to say’ (see Tolodova & Serdobol’skaja 2014 for more details).

|        |                      |                |                      |                   |                     |
|--------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| (2.51) | I                    | srazu          | <i>lue</i>           | <i>val</i>        |                     |
|        | and                  | already        | be.PRS.3SG           | be.PST.3SG        |                     |
|        | <i>kutyny</i>        | <i>soosyz,</i> | <b><i>valany</i></b> | <b><i>što</i></b> |                     |
|        | take.INF             | 3PL.ACC        | understand.INF       | COMP              |                     |
|        | <i>mon</i>           | <i>öj</i>      | <i>gožty</i>         | <i>soje</i>       |                     |
|        | 1SG                  | NEG.PST.1SG    | write.CN             | DEM.ACC           |                     |
|        | <b><i>šuyša,</i></b> | <i>mone</i>    | <i>vzloმაt'illam</i> | <i>vylem</i>      | <b><i>šuyša</i></b> |
|        | COMP                 | 1SG.ACC        | break.into.PTCP.3PL  | be.PRF            | COMP                |

‘And right away it was possible to catch them, **understand that I did not write it that I was obviously hacked**’ (vk.com/yumshan57).

In contrast to the use of the complementizer *šuyša*, the Russian complementizer *čto* appears in Udmurt mainly in constructions with indirect RD, despite the fact that in Russian the occurrence of *čto* preceding direct RD is possible. Moreover, in Russian the complementizer *čto* is favored over the purpose-complementizer *čtoby* in constructions where an imperative clause appears as part of direct RD, or the question particle *li* marking the question in direct RD (for more details see 2.4.1). Thus, despite the wide distribution of the complementizer *čto* in Udmurt and its frequent appearance in colloquial speech due to the intensive unidirectional influence of Russian, which eventually realizes in the structural similarities that can be encountered in the substandard use, there are still some differences that can be encountered between its use in the matrix and the recipient language. Such a difference might be partially explained by the fact that the complementizer *čto*, due to its semantics and lack of epistemic meaning, is perceived by Udmurt speakers exclusively as a linker between a QI-clause and a quote, expressed as indirect RD.

Furthermore, some differences can be observed between the constructions with *šuyša* and *čto*. Since *šuyša* derives from the SV *šuyny* ‘say’ and can function as both a complementizer and a converb of the SV, the marker can co-occur, besides SEVs, with NSVs (with originally non-reportative semantics). Similar uses are not observed in constructions with *čto*, since *čto* does not have any reportative semantics and in quotative constructions obligatorily requires the presence of some elements marking the presence of a quote, i.e. SEVs.

### 2.5.1.2.2. The Russian epistemic complementizer *budto* as part of the complementizer strategy in Udmurt

Similarly to the above-described appearance of the complementizer *čto* in Udmurt, the use of the complementizer *budto* is also recognized here as a case of matter and pattern replication. Structurally, the epistemic complementizer *budto* may appear in constructions with SVs (2.52), EVs (2.53) and NPs indicating the original source of RD (2.54). Typically, the complementizer marks RD as produced approximatively. Naturally, RD is produced from the standpoint of the reporter. Thus, the reporter’s subjectivity can also be observed. In (2.52), the reporter reproduces her own utterance. *Budto* gives an untrustworthy reading to

the quote: the speaker quotes herself saying that she will dress up, although, in practice, she does not have such intention. Such a use can be likewise encountered in Russian, cf. (2.15). In (2.15) from Russian, the reporter evaluates another speaker's utterance as untrustworthy, thus expressing his own subjective evaluation of the presented quote. In addition to subjective overtones observed in the use of *budto*, in both cases, (2.15) in Russian and (2.52) in Udmurt, a summarizing function of the marker can be noted – important information is summarized into a short utterance produced as a quote.

- (2.52) *Veraškysa budto dišaško.*  
 tell.CV like dress.up.PRS.1SG  
 ‘**Saying, like I dress up.**’ (Blog subcorpus).

The reporter's subjectivity can also be observed in the use of the epistemic complementizer with hypothetical quotations. (2.53) shows how the reporter makes the assumption concerning somebody else's thoughts. It is interesting that simultaneously, the reporter tries to distance him-/herself from the ongoing RD, thus avoiding responsibility for the accuracy of its content. Consequently, it might be assumed that the marker expresses the epistemic meaning of neutral support. The reporter assumes what another speaker might have thought; therefore, (s)he only indicates the epistemic possibility for the occurrence of such a quote in the described situation. Note that a similar instance is observed also in Russian, cf. (2.20b), where the reporter also assumes other person's thoughts and presents them as a quote.

- (2.53) *Kožaškod, budto mon ug todišky*  
 suppose.PRS.2SG like 1SG NEG.PRS.1SG know.CN  
*val, što ton vañze umoj šotod?*  
 be.PST.3SG COMP 2SG all.ACC3SG correctly give.FUT.2SG  
 ‘**You suppose like I wouldn't know that you will hand out everything correctly?**’ (Blog subcorpus).

The reporter's subjectivity is also preserved in combination of the complementizer with NPs indicating the source of RD. Basically, in (2.54), the reporter quotes his/her own thoughts based on the subjective interpretation of the situation. The RD is produced then as an outcome of a hypothetical situation, constructed by the reporter.

- (2.54) *Ato syče malpan kylde, budto*  
 but such thought appear.PRS.3SG like  
*redaktorjos vokščo ug učkylo*  
 editor.PL completely NEG.PRS.3SG watch.CN.PL  
*tuala žurnaljosyz no gažetjosyz*  
 contemporary magazine.PL.ACC and journal.PL.ACC  
 ‘**But such a thought appears like editors wouldn't look through contemporary magazines and journals at all**’ (Blog subcorpus).

It is quite interesting that in my material, *budto* is exclusively used in the quotative domain marking the reporter's subjectivity. It can be found in all 7 examples in the Blog subcorpus where the RD is introduced by the QI with *budto*. It is used quoting either a reporter's own previous utterances, thoughts, or assumptions on someone else's potential utterances. In Russian, the use of the epistemic complementizer is either wider or, at least, the subjectivity remains less straightforward (see 2.5.1 on *budto* in Russian). At present, the lack of a bigger amount of examples does not allow for a concrete conclusion about the functional capacities of this marker in colloquial Udmurt. However, on the basis of the above examples, the hypothesis can be proposed that in Udmurt, the epistemic complementizer *budto* not only marks RD as produced approximately, but also indicates the reporter's subjective interpretation. In addition, the epistemic support that the marker expresses in Russian is also reflected in Udmurt.

## **2.5.2. Quotative particles in Udmurt**

In this subsection, I pay attention to the use of quotative particles as a means of indicating the presence of RD. In the collected material, two major subclasses of quotative particles appear – autochthonous and replicated from Russian. First, I cover the use of autochthonous quotative particles. Second, I discuss the elements replicated from Russian. In both cases, I pay attention to evidential and epistemic modal meanings that the particles may bear. In case of elements replicated from Russian, it is interesting to see whether meanings reflected in the matrix language (see 2.4.2) can also be traced in the recipient language.

### **2.5.2.1. Autochthonous quotative particles in Udmurt**

Among autochthonous particles, the use of the quotative particle *pe* and the self-quotative particle *pöj* is recognized here. In standard Udmurt, the self-quotative particle *pöj* does not appear. Consequently, the use of the self-quotative particle in Udmurt can be considered either strictly dialectal or colloquial since it was used in blogs by some speakers. The majority of the examples used in the description of the self-quotative particle derive from the Press subcorpus of Udmurt corpus. Despite the fact that the Press subcorpus does not contain texts from the new media genre, it still preserves features peculiar to colloquial oral speech. The self-quotative particle *pi* that is used in the Beserman dialect and was described by Arkhangelskiy (2014) does not appear in my material. However, I assume that the self-quotative particles *pöj* and *pi* are equivalent markers appearing in different form in different dialectal areas. Since I am not

aware of previous studies on the use of the self-quotative particle *pöj*<sup>70</sup>, and the specificity of the collected material does not really give the sociological background of the speakers, it is hard to point out the contemporary distribution of this particle and to which dialectal areas it is peculiar. The appearance of *pöj* can be observed in Kel'makov's (1981: 40) examples of text collections describing northern dialects of Udmurt. In addition, Karpova (2013: 403–404) provides a list of settlements belonging to northern dialects of Udmurt, where the distribution of *pöj* (with the dialectal variant *pyj*) is observed. However, it is early to exclude the appearance of this particle in idiolects of speakers representing other dialects of Udmurt, and further investigations on the topic are necessary.

### 2.5.2.1.1. The quotative particle *pe* in Udmurt

In the collected material, besides the appearance of *pe* as a QI, several non-quotative functions of the particle were observed. Among them, I differentiate reported evidential meaning (marking of general hearsay), inferred (visual) evidential meaning (Aikhenvald 2004: 4), and the use of *pe* as a discourse particle with hedging function. Besides the semantic and functional distinctions between the domains of reported evidentiality and the RD specified in 1.5.3, the distinction of the functions in the use of the quotative particle *pe* is relevant for the description and classification of the structural units in which the marker appears while indicating the presence of the RD and the reported evidence. As specified in 1.5.3, the reported evidence typically derives from an unspecified source. Therefore, one can observe the mere use of the marker more frequently in the reported evidential function than in the quotative. Furthermore, also the use of *pe* with different types of RD sometimes requires the presence of different types of verbs that are not observed in cases where the marker functions as reported evidential, as is illustrated in the following subsections 2.5.2.1.1.1–2. Despite the separation of these meanings, I emphasize the correlation between them, and further, I pay great attention to how they influence each other inside the quotative domain.

As for the inferred (visual) evidential meaning that was observed in the use of *pe*, it is interesting to point out an independent development of the quotative particle and see whether similar instances have been observed in previous cross-linguistic studies (e.g. in Aikhenvald 2004; Wiemer 2010, 2018). Finally, the use of *pe* as a discourse marker with hedging function is an interesting phenomenon since discourse and quotative markers tend to share similar functions

---

<sup>70</sup> The self-quotative particle *pöj* is briefly mentioned in Kibardina (2012: 126–127) and Karpova (2012: 403–404). The former study only mentions that *pöj* is a self-quotative particle fulfilling similar functions to the SV *šuyņy* ‘say’ in the first person singular. The latter contains a basic dictionary entry including the distribution of the marker in northern dialects of Udmurt and provides a couple of examples. Further descriptions of its functions and structural use are missing.

outside the quotative domain, and as evidence from previous studies shows (cf. Hasund *et al.* 2012; Kunelius 1998), discourse particles often appear in the quotative function, and *vice versa*. Such instances were already pointed out in the use of the quotative particle *mol* and NQ *tipa* in Russian (for more details see 2.4.2 and 2.4.3). I presume that additional overtones of these markers become salient in the contexts outside the quotative domain. Among those one can point out the EHF function. As a result, one can find quotative particles, initially used only in the quotative domain, also in non-quotative contexts where the proposition is presented as less straightforward, which is the case discussed for *pe*.

The current subsection is divided the following way. First, quotative functions of *pe* are described paying great attention to (i) its appearance in different type of constructions, and (ii) potential evidential or epistemic modal meanings the particle may express. Further, non-quotative functions of *pe* are described with respect to the previous description of its use as a QI.

### 2.5.2.1.1.1. The quotative particle *pe* as a quotative index

Etymologically, the quotative particle *pe* goes back to the Proto-Permic particle *\*pε* (Lytkin & Guljaev 1970: 227). The equivalent marker *pö* can be observed in Komi<sup>71</sup> (ibid.). Bartens (2000: 321) suggests that quotative functions of the particle *\*pε* have already developed on the stage of the Proto-Permic language. This assumption can be supported by the fact that the related Finnish language uses the emphatic clitic *-pA* which, according to Lytkin & Guljaev (1970: 227), is etymologically related to the quotative particles in Komi and Udmurt. In contrast to Permic, the Finnish clitic *-pA* has not developed the quotative function. Consequently, the quotative functions of the particle might have developed already in Permic after the split from Finno-Permic.

According to Bartens (2000: 321), the quotative particle *pe* is used in Udmurt to mark the presence of RD that belongs to a source of consciousness, different from the actual reporter. However, several examples show that even though *pe* typically marks someone else's RD, there are also cases where it is used to mark the reporter's own previous utterance, as in (2.55).

(2.55) *Mamaly zvonit' kariško, tožo pe syče ik užpum*  
 mom.DAT call.INF do.PRS.1SG also QUOT such PTCL case  
 'I call to mom, there is also such a case' (Blog subcorpus).

The investigation of available text collections (Kel'makov 1981, 1990) show that the quotative particle has not been previously used to mark RD that belongs to a reporter. Thus, the assumption can be made that the appearance of *pe* in self-quotative constructions is rather a recent development. The suggestion can

<sup>71</sup> On the use of the quotative particle *pö* in Komi see 2.6.2.1.



be made that this development might happen under the influence of Russian since quotative particles in Russian can be used to mark the reporter's own RD. However, I do not exclude the idea of independent development since Standard Udmurt does not use the self-quotative particle(s). Therefore, there might be an obvious requirement for such a function which, eventually, might happen by the means of the quotative particle, available in the standard variety. Another motivation to use the quotative particle with self-quotations might derive from the approximative evaluation that the RD acquires when the quotative particle is used. Thus, the reporter marks RD as produced in the summarized version preserving important information and leaving out unnecessary facts. This meaning expressed by the means of *pe* is discussed here below.

According to Winkler (2011: 104), as a rule, *pe* is placed at the end of RD, as in (2.57). This position of the particle can be explained by the general preference of the language to use clause-final constructions. Hence, the particle placed at the end of the clause marks it as such that bears RD in it. However, as several examples from the collected material show, more sufficient nowadays are the following positions of the marker: it is either placed on the border position between a QI-clause and a reported discourse (2.56), or it is inserted into the RD, cf. (2.55) and (2.58). It can be reasonably assumed that as part of a QI-clause, the primary function of the quotative particle lies in the scope of indicating the presence of RD. It is also explained by the position of the quotative particle adjacent to the RD. When it is placed into RD, the meaning of the approximative evaluation towards the accuracy of a quote becomes more salient and emphasized. The particle occupies either the second position in the RD, as in (2.58), (2.59), (2.61), or at the end of the RD, as in (2.57), (2.60), (2.62).

(2.56) ...noš            sobere    korka    tros    gurdžem    no  
 and            then    house    full    burb.PTCP    and  
**juške**            **pe**....    (anaj,    noš    kytyn    desert???).....  
 ask.PRS.3SG    QUOT    mother    and    where    dessert  
 ‘And then having burbed the house full, **he asks**.... (mom, so where is the dessert???)’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

(2.57) **Kud-og**    **ad’amios**    **šuo,**            **avatarka**            **akyl’tiz**            **pe**  
 some    person.PL    say.PRS.3PL    profile.picture    bore.PST.3SG    QUOT  
 ‘**Some people say** the profile picture is boring’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

I assume that the approximative evaluation of the quotative particle derives from its reported evidential meaning. Since it is also used to mark information produced by a third party (and usually unspecified, e.g. expressing the meaning ‘they/someone say(s)/said’), it is quite possible that the information is produced according to intentions and considerations of a speaker who delivers it. Thus, it might be expected that some information is always lost or left unspecified. Consequently, the summarizing function of the particle can be also pointed out, as in (2.57). The most important facts (“people consider the profile picture to be boring”) are represented, although it cannot be expected that several speakers

produced verbatim identical phrases (“the profile picture is boring”). Furthermore, by marking the information acquired from a third party, the EHF of the particle can also be observed – a speaker intends to distance him-/herself from the ongoing discourse. In (2.57), it can be noticed through the marking of original speakers as unspecified (“some people”). The reporter tries to avoid responsibility by not pointing concrete speakers out as quoted, in case someone tries to refute this information. By providing indefinite information about the speakers, the risk that someone would hold him responsible for the quote is reduced to minimum.

As for the structural use of the quotative particle *pe*, it appears in QI-clauses besides SVs (examples 2.56 and 2.57) also with EVs (2.58) or NSVs (2.59). In (2.58), the QI is formed by the mirative verb *pajmyny* ‘surprise’ and the quotative particle inserted into RD. Among the uses of *pe* with NSVs, an SV is elliptic from the QI and the quotative functions are expressed by the means of *pe*, as in (2.59).

- (2.58) *Pajmiz,*                    *java,*                    *ug*                    *pe*                    *tody*  
 surprise.PST.3SG    PTCL                    NEG.PRS.3SG    QUOT                    know.CN  
*vylem*                    *udmurtjoslen*                    *syče*                    *prazdniksy*  
 be.PRF                    Udmurt.PL.GEN                    such                    holiday.3PL  
*vań*                    *šuysa*  
 be.PRS.3SG                    COMP  
 ‘**She was surprised (saying) I obviously didn’t know that Udmurts have such a holiday**’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

- (2.59) *Sobere*    *mar*    *ke*                    *čork*                    *šoramy*                    *učkiz*  
 after                    what    INDEF                    suddenly                    on.ILL.1PL                    look.PST.3SG  
*no,*                    *ti*                    *pe,*                    *tolon,*                    *kontsertyn*                    *val*  
 and                    2PL                    QUOT                    yesterday                    concert.INE                    be.PST.3SG  
*kad’*  
 like  
 ‘[(S)he did not answer (to us), or looked (at us) grumpily.] Then **looked** straight at us and [**says**], it seems, you were yesterday on the concert.’  
 (vk.com/jumshan57).

In addition to the occurrence with NSVs, *pe* may be found with NPs indicating the original source of RD, cf. (2.60). In such use, *pe* appears only once in the collected material; hence, it can be assumed that such a combination remains, in general, quite marginal in Udmurt. However, the question of how often *pe* is used together with NPs lies outside the scope of the current research and should be separately studied in the future.

|        |               |  |               |                     |                    |
|--------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| (2.60) | <i>Tunne,</i> | <i>ksta,</i>   | <i>Udmurt</i> | <i>tradicionnyj</i> | <i>kal'endarja</i> |
|        | today         | btw  | Udmurt        | traditional         | calender.ADV       |
|        | <i>Šolyke</i> | <i>kušton.</i>   | <i>Obyda</i>  | <i>koške"</i>       | <i>nunal,</i>      |
|        | sin.ACC       | dispense.AN  | bad.spirit    | leave.PRS.3SG       | day                |
|        | <i>pe:</i>    | <i><a href="https://vk.com/app4820625">https://vk.com/app4820625</a></i> |               |                     |                    |

QUOT

‘Btw, today **according to the Udmurt traditional calendar** it is Dispension of Sins. The day “of letting the bad spirits go”: <https://vk.com/app4820625>’ (vk.com/jumshan57).

In non-clausal use, the quotative particle quite often appears as a single QI. Thus, a QI-clause is reduced to a single element introducing a quote. In general, the reduction of a QI-clause to one element frequently leads to the blurring of the difference between quoting someone’s utterances and thoughts. As for the quotative particle *pe*, its use remains restricted to quotations of either utterances or thoughts that were previously produced. The quotative particle is not observed with hypothetical quotations, probably due to its reported evidential meaning, since reported evidentials typically refer to hearsay, previously produced by an unspecified source. Hence, the quoted information introduced by *pe* is likely to be associated with the representation of factive rather than fictional discourse, excluding different pragmatic settings where reported evidentials mark ‘pretend’ and ‘make-believe’ situations (cf. Aikhenvald 2004: 182). Even if the latter appears among the functions of reported evidentials, it can be considered only their secondary functional extension than hinting to the opposite scenario where a ‘pretend’ and ‘make-believe’ marker develops the reported evidential function. As far as I am aware, the latter scenario has not been accounted so far for the described cases of reported evidentials in the world’s languages. Thus, it appears to be quite natural that *pe* systematically marks the previously produced parts of discourse as quoted but is not used with hypothetical quotations that are entirely fictional. As I illustrate further, an identical restriction can also be observed in the use of the cognate-equivalent quotative particle *pö* in Komi (see 2.6.2.1). To further identify what type of RD is depicted by the means of the quotative particle *pe*, i.e. quotation of speech or thought, the context must be studied.

Appearing as a single QI, the quotative particle still marks a quote as produced approximatively and preserves its summarizing function leaving out unnecessary information and depicting only important facts. In some cases, it may also express the reporter’s low credibility in the truthfulness of the reproduced information, or general disagreement. Consider (2.61), where the reporter while hitch-hiking was given a ride by a driver of a BMW. In the conversation, the reporter gets to know that the driver is actually a student. From one point of view, the reporter expresses complete uncertainty whether a student can actually afford a car like a BMW. From another, it can also be foreseen that the information is perceived by the reporter as highly doubtful. Thus, it indicates that the quotative particle besides marking the presence of RD, expresses also an epistemic modal meaning between partial and neutral support.

- (2.61) *Pijaš* *pe* *student*  
 boy QUOT student  
 ‘[The next car was a BMW]. The guy is, as he says, a student’  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_apt).

However, the epistemic support described above cannot be equally assigned to all the examples, and it rather depends on the context and the quality of RD. In case of *pe*, I would rather point out epistemic overtones that the marker can additionally express. Thus, the partial support can be observed in cases like (2.57), where the quote is produced approximately and is attributed to (an) unspecified speaker(s). Besides that, examples like (2.61) show that it can also express a meaning between reporter’s doubt and complete uncertainty. However, in such cases, the context should be separately studied to indicate such meaning.

A quite rare and rather a new function of the quotative particle is its use with verbatim quotations. The hypothesis about the novelty of such function is proposed from the standpoint that *pe* is used as a general marker of reported information. Hence, it typically indicates that there is a difference between the original discourse and one that is reproduced as a quote or hearsay. In addition, the reporter’s intentions to leave some information unmentioned or unspecified may lead to differences between discourses. Thus, despite the fact that the quotative particle occurs regularly with enacted direct speech, the RD in such cases can hardly be considered a verbatim quote of someone’s previous utterance. However, (2.62) shows that the use of *pe* with verbatim quotes is possible.

- (2.62) “a vdrug vojna s udmurtiej” *pe*  
 and suddenly war with Udmurtia.INSTR QUOT  
 “And what if there’s suddenly a war with Udmurtia”  
 (vk.com/wall-62098651\_13).

In (2.62), the reporter comments a video in which the original utterance was produced by reproducing verbatim a phrase appearing in the video. It seems that such a function of *pe* is not very frequent. However, the development of a new function of the quotative particle can be observed. I leave the possibility to test the frequency of such use of the particle to future studies. In my material, it appears only in few instances where the quoted utterance are copied and pasted from the original source into comment lines. It is interesting whether such uses can be observed only in internet communications or also in oral speech, e.g. when notorious quotes are reproduced verbatim.

#### **2.5.2.1.1.2. The quotative particle *pe* as a marker of reported evidentiality**

In the current subsection, I describe the reported evidential meanings that the quotative particle adds to the quotative functions described in the previous subsection (see 1.5.3 on the distinction between the two notions).

A clause modified by the reported evidential particle *pe* acquires an approximative evaluation if the basic aim of the speaker is not to produce an accurate depiction of someone else's previous utterance, but rather to depict the general idea of information reported by a third party. In addition, the EHF can be observed which can be also noted in the attempt of the speaker to make the source of the reported information indefinite. Thus, the speaker can distance him-/herself from reported information and avoid in this way the responsibility for its content, as in (2.63).

- (2.63) *Babe*                      *jegitdyrjaz*                      *balalajkajen,*                      *pe,*                      *džeč*  
 grandma.1SG    youth.years.INE3SG    balalayka.INSTR    QUOT    very  
*šude*                      *val*  
 play.PRS.3SG    be.PST.3SG  
 ‘They say my grandma played the balalayka quite well in her youth years’  
 (vk.com/yumshan57).

In (2.63), the speaker mentions the information that his grandmother used to play the balalayka. However, he does not attempt to confirm this information, in case there might be someone able to refute it. Such an overtone is, in general, present in most of the examples where *pe* functions as a reported evidentiality marker. Nevertheless, there are also cases where no EHF is applied due to the quality of the reported information. If the reported information is of a general character, then there is no requirement to take the responsibility for the accuracy of produced hearsay. In (2.64), the reporter provides critique about the youths who stare all the time in their phones, instead of involving oneself in a useful way of spending time or making live conversations between each others. Since such an opinion can be characterized as the general opinion of the masses, and it lacks information that could be refuted, the reporter does not aim to distance herself from the reported information.

- (2.64) *No*                      *mar*                      *pe*                      *so*                      *syče*                      *luoz*                      *veš*  
 and                      what                      QUOT    DEM    such                      be.FUT.3SG    always  
*telefonyn*                      *pukysa?!*  
 phone.INE    sit.CV  
 ‘And, as they say, what is going to be if one sits all the time staring into the phone?!’ (vk.com/yumshan57).

### 2.5.2.1.1.3. The quotative particle *pe* as a marker of inferred (visual) evidentiality

The appearance of the quotative particle *pe* as a marker of inferred (visual) evidentiality is interesting here since it shows an independent development of the particle, the starting points of which are the reported evidentiality and the quotative functions. Wiemer (2010: 78) reports a development of similar extensions for most of the Romance languages, where the conditional mood,

typically used to mark reported evidentiality (see 1.5.3 on the expression of evidentiality in the world’s languages), in some languages has developed inferential meanings.

In her description of evidential systems, Aikhenvald (2004: 2) differentiates inferred visual evidential meanings from assumed ones. Such a difference is realized “in access to visual evidence of something happening and to the degree of ‘reasoning’ involved” (Aikhenvald 2004: 2). When the speaker relies more on common sense or reasoning, the assumed evidential is used; in cases where the obvious evidence is present, the inferred evidential is used (Aikhenvald 2004: 2–3).

The first case can be observed in Udmurt in ambiguous cases between the quotative and visual evidential meanings. For example, in (2.65), both readings are equally possible. The first suggests that the impression the (Russian) skiers had from an event is presented as a summarized quote, potentially produced by one of them. In the second, an assumption is made based on the visually accessible upset expressions on the faces of skiers. The exact meaning expressed by *pe* here cannot be retrieved from the context. Hence, both readings are equally possible. Reasoning from this, I refer to such an example as an ambiguous case. The reduction of a QI-clause to the mere quotative particle plays an important role in blurring the difference between different readings of constructions in which *pe* appears.

- (2.65) *Öz*                      *keľšy*              *pe.*  
 NEG.PST.3SG    like.CN              QUOT  
 ‘[Our skiers and coaches went to the opening ceremony. After some time returned upset.] [We] did not like it.’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

Where inferred visual evidence is present, the reading becomes more obvious and straightforward. Speakers reason from the visually accessible context of the depicted situation. In (2.66), the speaker makes a comment based on the visual evidence that her friend is attending an event on Facebook. She infers that her friend is likely to be partying during that time based on the notification about the attendance.

- (2.66) *tusovat’sja*    *kariškyny*    *mynod-a,*              *pe*  
 party.INF              do.FRQ.INF    go.FUT.2SG-Q              QUOT  
 ‘You’re going to party, ha?’ (facebook.com).

#### **2.5.2.1.1.4. The quotative particle *pe* as a discourse marker with hedging function**

In the collected material, besides the above-mentioned functions, *pe* is also observed as a discourse marker with hedging function. As previous studies show, discourse markers are quite notorious for acquiring quotative functions (see e.g. Hasund *et al.* 2012 on Norwegian discourse markers in quotative functions; also

Kunelius 1998 on the SIM *niinku* as a discourse marker and NQ in Finnish). In case of *pe*, the opposite development can be observed in instances where *pe* appears as a discourse marker. As it has been mentioned above, similar occurrences have been already described for the Russian quotative particle *mol* and the NQ *t'ipa*. It is realized, in general, either in the vagueness of the statement modified by the discourse marker or in the distancing function which makes a proposition less straightforward. The latter meaning is often employed for maintaining the positive politeness (on politeness and vagueness as functions of discourse particles see e.g. Fraser 2010). Similarly, in colloquial written Udmurt, the distancing effect of the particle can be observed. The distancing gives a chance to the speaker to make any produced statement less straightforward. Such a function can in general be observed also in the use of the particle in the quotative domain typical to it. However, the difference lies in the fact that when the particle appears as a discourse marker, it does not point to the presence of RD.

Consider (2.67) where the speaker who produced the utterance tries to contradict the statement of a previous speaker. By placing *pe* inside the discourse, the current speaker does not aim to quote general rules of a competition between bloggers about which there was a dispute, but rather makes a statement about her own ideas about the main point of the competition. Thus, the contradiction sounds less straightforward and the speaker preserves a polite manner while disagreeing with the previous statement.

- (2.67) *Marija, smyslez, pe, ne v tom*  
 PN sense.SG QUOT not in DEM.PREP  
*kin pervojges nunal kuspyn opublikuetsja.*  
 who first.COMPAR day in.INE publish.FUT.3SG  
 'Maria, the sense is **kinda** not in that who will be the first to be published.'  
 (vk.com/jumshan57).

As for the role of Russian in acquiring such a function, it is too early to judge that there might be some influence. However, one should take into account that Udmurt native speakers often take for granted the correspondence between the particles and use the quotative particles *mol*, *deskat'* and *de* as equal substitutes to the quotative particle *pe*. Since both *mol* (2.30a) and *de* (2.30b) can appear as discourse markers without quotative meaning in Russian, it might be assumed that the discourse marker function could be assigned to *pe* similarly to Russian markers. However, in case of *pe*, independent development can be considered equally possible since the epistemic hedging overtones can already be observed in its use as a quotative particle.

### 2.5.2.1.2. The self-quotative particle *pöj* in Udmurt

As has been illustrated in 2.5.2.1.1.1, in Standard Udmurt, the same quotative particle *pe* is used to mark someone else’s previous utterance and self-quoting instances. However, in some dialects of Udmurt, the use of the self-quotative particle *pöj* (*pi* in the Beserman dialect, cf. Arkhangelskiy 2014) can be observed (see 1.5.2 on distinctions of different types of RD). Thus, *pöj* appears exclusively in self-quotative constructions, while quotations of utterances and thoughts belonging to a source of consciousness different from the current reporter are marked by means of the quotative particle *pe*. Besides the short description of the self-quotative particle in Beserman (Arkhangelskiy 2014) and the brief mention of *pöj* by Kibardina (2012: 126–127), descriptions or studies on the use of self-quotative particle(s) in Udmurt are missing.

As for the etymology of the particle, I can only speculate that its form might derive from the merge of the quotative particle *pe* and the first person singular marker *-j*, which appears e.g. with the negation verb in the simple past tense: *ö-j myny* ‘NEG.PST-1SG go.CN’. Structurally, *pöj* is used in similar types of constructions as the quotative particle *pe*. It is typically found with SVs (2.68), EVs (2.69) or NSVs without reportative semantics (2.70).

(2.68) *Vaşaly*                      *šuiško,*                      *soly,*                      *pöj,*                      *instagram*  
 PN.DAT                      say.PRS.1SG                      3SG.DAT                      QUOT:SELF                      Instagram  
*telefonaz*                      *puktono*  
 telephone.ILL3SG                      install.PTCP:NEC  
 ‘I say to Vasya (s)he has to install Instagram on his/her phone’ (Blog subcorpus).

(2.69) *Noš*                      *kuddyr*                      *tažy*                      *no*                      *malpaško:*  
 but                      sometimes                      so                      PTCL                      think.PRS.1SG  
*olo-a,*                      *pöj,*                      *ta vañ*                      *ulonely*                      *syče*  
 maybe-PTCL                      QUOT:SELF                      i.e.                      life.1SG.DAT                      such  
*išan*                      *vožmatskyliz*                      *mynym*  
 ghost                      appear.PST.3SG                      1SG.DAT  
 ‘But sometimes I think so: maybe such a ghost appears to me’ (Press subcorpus).

(2.70) *Kiynym*                      *šonti* –                      *puktom,*                      *pöj!*  
 hand.INSTR.1SG                      wave.PST.1SG                      sit.FUT.1PL                      QUOT:SELF  
 ‘I waved my hand – let’s sit!’ (Press subcorpus).

In cases with *pöj* (since the original speaker and the reporter are the same person), the responsibility for the choice of quoted material lies exclusively with the reporter and author of the original utterance, thought, or intended speech. Thus, a reporter decides what to insert into RD and what can be left unmentioned. Consequently, in such cases the reporter’s subjectivity is usually present the most. For example, in (2.70), the reporter provides the quotation of a mimetic expression. However, it cannot be taken for granted that the addressee(s)





some other speaker (*pe*)<sup>72</sup>. The difference between quoting the reporter's previous utterance, thoughts or intended speech is likewise minimized, similarly to (2.72). Reduction of QI-clauses brings also a dramatic effect of a reproduced dialogue similarly to instances where the lack of a QI can be observed (on such instances see e.g. Güldemann 2008: 46):

- (2.73) *Ma, pe, Perepečkinjosty ud todišky-a*  
 what QUOT PN.PL.ACC NEG.PRS.2SG know.CN-PTCL  
*mar-a? Ben, pøj, televizoryś gine*  
 what-PTCL okay QUOT:SELF TV.ELA only  
*ad'džyli uk.*  
 see.PST.1SG PTCL  
 'What, (s)he says, you don't know Perepechkins? Well, I say/though/  
 intended to say, I have seen them only on TV.' (Press subcorpus).

### 2.5.2.2. Quotative particles replicated from Russian

In the current subsection, the use of the quotative particles *mol*<sup>73</sup> and *deskat*' replicated from Russian is illustrated. As it has been mentioned in 2.5.2, besides the structural use of the replicated material, I also pay attention to the meanings that these particles express in Russian, and whether these meanings can also be traced in Udmurt.

#### 2.5.2.2.1. The quotative particle *mol* in Udmurt

Similarly to the instances with Russian complementizers in QI-clauses in Udmurt (see 2.5.1.2), a case of matter and pattern replication can be observed in the use of the quotative particle *mol* in colloquial written Udmurt which is discussed further in the subchapter.

As the starting point of the description, I provide a case where the quotative particle *mol* appears introducing RD entirely consisting of Russian, i.e. an embedded language island:

- (2.74) *Spisokte eskerysa, d'ekanatyn pečat' no*  
 list.ACC2SG examine.CV dean's.office.INE stamp and  
*podpis' pukto (mol, ne protiv,*  
 signature place.PRS.3PL QUOT NEG against  
*puskaj učitsja).*  
 let study.PRS.3SG.REF  
 'Looking through your list, in the dean's office they put stamp and signature  
 on it (**like/saying**, we don't oppose, let her study).' (Blog subcorpus).

<sup>72</sup> Besides the quotative particle *pe*, an SV in finite form may also be used, e.g. *šue* 'say.PRS.3SG'.

<sup>73</sup> It is quite compelling that the Russian quotative particle *mol* is also replicated into another Uralic language spoken in Russia. Urmančieva (2014: 74) provides an example with *mol* in Selkup, a Southern Samoyedic language.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, it is interesting that the quotative particle *mol* appears in the instance where the discourse originally was most likely produced in Russian, and further also reproduced in the same language. As Auer (1995: 121) indicates, often one of the motivating factors for code-switching is the appearance of RD. However, online Udmurt speakers often quote Russian speech rendered into Udmurt, as in (2.75). The current example (2.74) can also be approached from another perspective. The appearance of the quotative particle from Russian may play the role of a motivating factor for the code-switching into Russian during the production of RD. However, such a motivation is not always observed which is illustrated later, and in the major part of cases, *mol* is used as an exclusively colloquial means of indicating the presence of RD. Hence, it can be considered a stylistic gap-filler in this register. Namely, the speakers turn to Russian as the means in finding an appropriate NQ that can be filled into colloquial Udmurt instead of using the autochthonous markers for such purposes.

|        |  |                        |                       |                     |
|--------|--|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| (2.75) | <i>Odigaz</i>  | “ <i>Arlen</i>         | <i>kyrd’žanez</i> ”   | <i>kontsert</i>     |
|        | once   | year.GEN               | song.3SG              | concert             |
|        | <i>bere</i>  | <i>Gennadij</i>        | <i>Korepanov</i>      | <i>dory</i>         |
|        | after  | PN                     | PN                    | to.ILL              |
|        | <b><i>vožomem</i></b>  | <b><i>učkišjos</i></b> | <b><i>vuizy</i></b> – | <b><i>maly,</i></b> |
|        | get.provoked.PTCP  | spectator.PL           | come.PST.3SG          | why                 |
|        | <b><i>pe,</i></b>  | <i>kontsertez</i>      | <i>nuišjos</i>        | <i>udmurt</i>       |
|        | QUOT   | concert.3SG            | leader.PL             | Udmurt              |
|        | <i>kylyn</i>   | <i>gine</i>            | <i>veraskizy,</i>     | <i>mi,</i>          |
|        | language.INE   | only                   | talk.PST.3PL          | 1PL                 |
|        | <b><i>pe,</i></b>  | <i>nomyrze</i>         | <i>öm</i>             | <i>valale!</i>      |
|        | QUOT   | nothing.ACC            | NEG.PST.1PL           | understand.CN       |
|        | ‘Once after the concert “Song of the year” <b>upset spectators came</b> to Gennadij Korepanov [ <b>saying</b> ] <u>why did the concert hosts talk only in Udmurt, we didn’t understand anything!</u> ’ (vk.com/yumshan57). |                        |                       |                     |

One of the factors why I consider the appearance of *mol* in Udmurt as a case of not only matter, but also pattern replication is the fact that it appears structurally in similar types of constructions as in Russian. Not only does it co-occur in QI-clauses with the same semantic classes, i.e. speech, non-speech verbs and NPs, but it can also be found in the non-clausal use similar to Russian (see 2.4.2). In addition, one can observe the same position of the marker in RD-constructions – either as part of a QI-clause preceding the RD or inserted into the RD. Furthermore, expression of partial support can also be observed, similarly to the meanings of the particle in Russian, which is separately illustrated and discussed below.

In Udmurt, *mol* typically appears together with speech (2.76)–(2.77) verbs. Besides the occurrence with similar types of predicates, also a similar position of the particle can be observed. Similarly to Russian, in Udmurt it may either be placed into RD (2.76), or it can remain a part of the QI-clause (2.77). It has been suggested that while being placed inside the RD the epistemic support that

the particle expresses is emphasized, while appearing as part of a QI-clause, the quote-introducing functions are rather primary, although epistemic support is also expressed.

- (2.76) *Kin ke šue, što mol obščagayštymy*  
 who INDEF say.PRS.3SG COMP QUOT dormitory.ELA.1PL  
*kyče ke mužik tetčem*  
 which INDEF man jump.PTCP  
 ‘**Somebody says that like** some man jumped out of our dormitory’  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

- (2.77) *Nu tatyn izvinjat’sja kari, mol jangyšaj.*  
 well here apologize.INF do.PST.1SG QUOT be.mistaken.PST.1SG  
 ‘**Well, I apologized** here **like I was wrong.**’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

As one can see, in both examples the RD is produced approximately. In (2.76), an epistemic hedging overtone with which RD is produced can also be observed. The reporter marks the speaker as undefined using the indefinite pronoun *kin=ke* ‘somebody’. Thus, he does not take responsibility for the accuracy of the produced quote and distances himself from it. Besides that, partial support can also be observed. The reporter doubts the fact that somebody jumped out of the dormitory. The doubt of the speaker is mainly expressed through the use of the quotative particle. The same example without the quotative particle would rather sound like a statement without a definite author, than a quote produced with the reporter’s primary doubt in the information inside it. Similarly, in (2.77) an approximative evaluation of a quote can be observed. The reporter preserves the most important facts (“I was wrong”), although he does not depict his previous utterance verbatim. Thus, only a general idea of the original utterance is depicted, while unnecessary information is left unspecified.

The quotative particle marking partial quotations in which quoted information is produced in a summarized way was already observed in Russian in (2.22). (2.78) is an equivalent from Udmurt. The reporter discusses how sad he is without his friends from school. The possibility of finding new friends does not seem appealing to him, since he does not believe he will manage to find equally good friends. After that he makes a reference to the groups and provides a partial quotation from those groups, fragmentally illustrating the thoughts and ideas of others.

- (2.78) *Ne syče eš, kyžy gožjalo vsakoj*  
 NEG such friend how write.PRS.3PL different  
*pablikjosyn, mol kudze možno poslat’, noš*  
 group.PL.INE QUOT which.ACC possible send.INF and  
*so tone no poslat’ karoz.*  
 3SG 2SG.ACC and send.INF do.FUT.3SG  
 ‘[And I am a bit empty without them. “I will find new ones!” But such (friends)? Such (friends) I won’t find.] Not such a friend, how **they write** in different groups, **like, which one can send [to hell], and he will send you [there] to.**’  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

Besides occurrences of *mol* with different verbs, it may also appear together with NPs indicating the original source of RD. In contrast to the majority of the above examples, (2.79) shows how a quote is most likely produced quite close to an original utterance. It is well supported by the fact that the RD consists entirely of Russian in which most likely an original utterance was produced. The instance where a quote consisted entirely of embedded language material was already illustrated in (2.74). Similarly to (2.74), in (2.79) it is hard to judge whether the presence of the Russian quotative particle motivates the code-switching or the code-switching appears due to the discourse motivations, i.e. presence of the quoted material. However, despite the fact that the entire quote is produced quite close to the original utterance, the summarizing function of the quotative particle can still be observed. Note that a noun phrase indicating the original source of RD appears in plural ('speeches'), although the reporter produces only one quote. Thus, he aims to show that the rest of the speeches were produced in the same manner, but not that all the speeches contained the phrase "welcome to KFU...".

|        |   |  |   |   |
|--------|---|--|---|---|
| (2.79) | <i>Syliškom,</i><br>stand.PRS.1PL<br><b><i>kyljosses,</i></b><br>speech.PL.ACC3PL<br>KFU.<br>PN<br>Edinstvennyj<br>single<br>Kazanskij<br>Kazan.ADJ | <i>kylziškiškom</i><br>listen.PRS.1PL<br><b><i>mol</i></b><br>QUOT<br>I<br>and<br>i<br>and<br>Federal'nyj."<br>Federal | <i>bad'džym</i><br>big<br>"dobro požalovat'<br>welcome<br>naš<br>our<br>unikal'nyj,<br>unique | <i>ad'amiosleś</i><br>person.PL.ABL<br>v<br>in<br>deviz:<br>motto<br>naš<br>our |
|--------|---|--|---|---|

'We stand and listen to great people's **speeches**, like "welcome to KFU. And our motto is: The only one and unique, our Kazan Federal."  
(vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

In non-clausal use, the quotative particle may appear as a single quote-introducer. In the following example (2.80), *mol* presents hypothetical discourse. As it has been illustrated for the use of the genuine quotative particles in Udmurt, a quote introduced by a single quotative particle can acquire a hypothetical reading since other constituents, i.e. speaker(s), event, and possible addressee(s), are omitted and thus left unspecified. Furthermore, the RD can be considered less a depiction of someone's previous utterance, but rather as discourse, typical for the villagers who are not willing to give their kids to a school where children are obliged to study Udmurt:

- (2.80) *Mol,* “*otyn* *udmurt* *kylez* *ug* *dyšeto,*  
 QUOT there Udmurt language.ACC NEG.PRS.3PL teach.CN  
 ved’ *so* *syče* *šekyt...*”  
 after.all DEM so difficult  
 ‘[Now in our village for some reason people try to give their kids to my second school.] **Like,** “there they don’t teach Udmurt, after all it is so hard...”  
 (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

### 2.5.2.2.2. The quotative particle *d’eskat’* in Udmurt

The quotative particle *d’eskat’* appears only once in the collected material used as a single quote-introducer. This example is retrieved from the Blog subcorpus and does not count any other instances<sup>74</sup>. Hence, it is impossible to judge its structural and functional capacities in Udmurt. It is also impossible to point out how well integrated this quotative particle is, in general, based on its appearance in internet communications. Thus, further investigation on the basis of spoken language material is necessary to see whether the quotative particle is, in general, used in Udmurt, or its appearance depicts rather single instances of occurrence in the speech of individual speakers.

In the existing example, some correspondence between its use in Udmurt and Russian can be pointed out. *D’eskat’* is used introducing the hypothetical quotation. Such a use was already observed in Russian in (2.24b). However, besides presenting hypothetical quotations, in Russian *d’eskat’* can be also used to present real utterances, cf. (2.27b), which in Udmurt was not noted. In (2.81), a reporter produces a potential quote which could have occurred in the described situation.

- (2.81) A *podvale* *pyrtazy.* ***D’eskat’,*** *učke,*  
 and cellar.ILL bring.in.PST.3PL QUOT look.IMP2PL  
*mele,* *tihi* *vu* *puke.*  
 chalk.ILL there water sit.PRS.3SG  
 ‘They brought [us] to the cellar. **Saying,** look, at the chalk, here is water.’ (Blog subcorpus).

### 2.5.3. Similative markers as quotative indexes in Udmurt

In the current subsection, I pay attention to the use of similative markers (SIMs) (see 1.6.2.5) as a means of introducing RD in Udmurt. Namely, two strategies are described here – the use of the autochthonous SIM *kad’* ‘like’ and the appearance of the new quotative (NQ) *tipa* ‘like’ from Russian (for the use of *tipa* in Russian see 2.4.3). In the first case, attention is paid to the epistemic

<sup>74</sup> Even after expanding the search to other subcorpora available on the web-site of the Udmurt Corpus, the search did not show any more matches besides the one presented in this subsection.

overtones that *kad'* expresses since SIMs (may) bear additional meanings (consider e.g. the use of the Rus. complementizer *budto* and its similative/comparative meaning). As far as the use of *l'ipa* is concerned, the question arises whether the meanings that the NQ expresses in Russian can also be traced in Udmurt.

### 2.5.3.1. The similative marker *kad'* as part of quotative index clauses in Udmurt

The use of the SIM *kad'* in quotative constructions in Udmurt was briefly mentioned in Kibardina (2012). Namely, the author mentions that the grammaticalized evidential particle (in Kibardina (2012) – *modal'noe slovo* ‘modal word’) *šuo*, lit. ‘say.PRS.3PL’ (according to Kibardina (2012: 124), in general, paraphrasable with the quotative particle *pe* as a marker of general hearsay), is often followed by different particles either downgrading or upgrading the epistemic support. Among such particles, Kibardina (2012: 125) mentions *kad'* ‘like’ providing the following example:

- (2.82) *Džogen potody ni, šuo kad'*  
 soon sign.out.FUT.2PL already say.PRS.3PL like  
 ‘Soon you will get signed off [from the hospital], they say like’ (Kibardina 2012: 125; glosses and translation are mine, DT).

In addition, the use of SIMs in a QI-clause is briefly mentioned in Vaxrušev *et al.* (1974). The authors mention that SVs in Udmurt quite rarely combine with other markers, although, the co-occurrence with SIMs (*kad'* ‘like’ and *vyl'l'em* ‘similarly, like, likewise’) is, in general, possible. The use of *vyl'l'em* with SVs or NPs indicating the original source of RD was observed only in a construction where *vyl'l'em* was used as a postposition with the demonstrative pronoun *ta* ‘this’, as in (2.83).

- (2.83) *...čemyś ad'džiško ta vyl'l'em gožtemjosty:*  
 often see.PRS.1SG DEM similar writing.PL.ACC  
 “S 1 oktjabrja...”  
 from first October.GEN  
 ‘I often see the **writings like this**: “From 1<sup>st</sup> October [till 10<sup>th</sup> November in the National museum of Kuzebay Gerd the unique exhibition “Planet of apes” is held”]’ (Blog subcorpus).

It is interesting whether *vyl'l'em* can also be observed in QI-constructions without a demonstrative preceding it. On the basis of the Blog subcorpus, such a use was not encountered, which suggests that *vyl'l'em* cannot yet be taken into account as an independent quotative marker, although the construction as such remains interesting for the current research.

As for the use of *kad'* 'like', in the collected material I observed two different functions of the marker in QI-clauses. One of the uses shows that by using SIMs a reporter aims to signal the possible non-equivalence between the original and reproduced utterances. In some cases, the EHF can be likewise observed in the attempt of the speaker to distance him-/herself from ongoing discourse (see 1.6.2.5).

In quotative constructions, *kad'* can be observed co-occurring with both speech (2.84) and epistemic verbs (2.85). In both examples, an original utterance (a line from a poem) in (2.84) and a thought in (2.85) are reproduced approximately which is mainly indicated by the presence of *kad'*. If one, hypothetically, omits the SIM from a QI-clause, the meaning of a quote loses the approximative quality, and can be interpreted as such that is reproduced if not verbatim, than at least quite close to an original utterance.

(2.84) *Taze odno gožty šuiz, kad':*  
 DEM.ACC one line.ACC say.PST.3SG like  
 stydno za parnej, pioslen övöl  
 shame for guys.GEN.PL boy.PL.GEN NEG  
*koñdonzy: nyljoslen vañ*  
 money.3PL girl.PL.GEN be.PRS.3SG  
 'This was **said** by one line, **like**: I am ashamed of the boys, boys don't have money, girls do have' (Blog subcorpus)<sup>75</sup>.

(2.85) *Nyryś malpaj kad', miľemyz vormiśjosyz*  
 first think.PST.1SG like 1PL.ACC winner.PL.ACC  
*budetyny dyšeto šuysa.*  
 educate.INF teach.PRS.3PL COMP  
 'I first **thought like (that) they teach us to educate winners.**' (Blog subcorpus).

In (2.84), a distancing effect can also be observed. The reporter provides a quote of the poem written by a poet, famous in Udmurt circles. The reporter quotes this poem approximately and signals it by the presence of the SIM *kad'*. At the same time, the distancing effect is achieved in case someone will notice the non-equivalence between the quoted and the original line. In (2.85), the reporter merely quotes his thoughts approximately. Also, note the presence of the complementizer *šuysa* in (2.85). Similarly to (2.43) where *šuysa* appears together with the same EV *malpany* 'think', the complementizer does not contribute to the expression of epistemic meaning and merely indicates the end of the RD.

As for the second function, such an instance has not been previously reported, although it involves a similarly structured QI-clause (SEV and *kad'*) which functionally, nonetheless, presents RD consisting of a hypothetical quotation. In contrast to (2.84)–(2.85), I suggest that in (2.86) *kad'* modifies an SV introducing

<sup>75</sup> In the current example, the presence of a comma before *kad'* does not separate it from the QI-clause. According to Edygarova (p.c.), the punctuation here follows the rules of literary standard Russian where modal particles are usually separated from a clause with commas.



a quote. The event depicted by the SV is then presented as hypothetical which derives from the semantics of the SIM *kad'* – ‘as if say(s)/tell(s)/ask(s)/etc.’. Consequently, the quote *per se* acquires hypothetical evaluation. Moreover, a subjective overtone is assigned to the RD since a reporter, basically, suggests the interpretation of someone’s behavior with a hypothetical quotation. As a result, the hypothetical reading of the RD becomes the only possible option.

- (2.86) *Noš soiz šoraz učke no jua*  
 and DEM.3SG at.ILL3SG stare.PRS3SG PTCL ask.PRS.3SG  
*kad'*: “*Kytyn bon Mańi?*”  
 like where PTCL PN  
 ‘And (s)he stares at him/her and asks like: “Where is Mani?”’  
 (Blog subcorpus).

Both clauses, i.e. the one previously presented, as in (2.84) and (2.85), and the one with a hypothetical quotation, as in (2.86), are structurally identical. In case of a hypothetical quotation, one gets the reading from the context in which the original utterance does not happen and rather the reporter presents a quote that is most likely to appear in the described situation. Such uses of SIMs as quotatives were already described in the study by Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XV). They specify that a clause presented by a similitive marker may acquire the reading in which the RD is not a representation of someone’s utterance or thought, but rather “a typification of a situation, a group of people or an individual” (ibid.).

The following conclusions can be drawn about the meanings expressed by *kad'* in QI-constructions. When the SIM appears in QI-constructions where the previous utterances or thoughts are quoted, the reporter indicates that the quoted part is reproduced approximately. In some cases, the reporter’s distancing can be observed, if such utterances or thoughts can be refuted by other speakers, as in (2.84). In cases where the similitive marker presents a hypothetical quotation, a reporter speculates on whether such a quote is appropriate in the depicted situation and thus expresses the general possibility of the appearance of such an utterance in the given moment.

### 2.5.3.2. The new quotative *tipa* in Udmurt

In addition to the use of the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'* (see 2.5.2.2.1 and 2.5.2.2.2, respectively), in colloquial written Udmurt the NQ *tipa* from Russian is observed. Similarly to the previously described cases, in the use of *tipa* in Udmurt one can note not only plain matter, but also pattern replication which is realized in the appearance of the marker in the recipient language in constructions homomorphic to the matrix language. The only construction that does not appear in Udmurt systematically is the use of *tipa* in QI-clauses with elliptic verb. At this point, it may be concluded that despite the fact that verbless QI-clauses are, in general, possible in Udmurt, cf. (1.12), such a strategy does

not appear systematically, at least, in written colloquial Udmurt neither with *t'ipa* nor with the quotative particles *mol* and *d'eskat'*<sup>76</sup>. As follows in this subsection, only once I have observed the use of the verbless QI consisting of *t'ipa* in the written colloquial Udmurt, cf. (2.89).

Additional meanings that the marker bears in QI-constructions in Russian can be also observed in Udmurt. By using *t'ipa*, the reporter indicates that RD is (re)produced approximately. In addition, it may signal that the reporter does not take responsibility for the content of the RD. The epistemic overtones that the particle expresses are discussed further in the subsection.

As it has been already mentioned, structurally the NQ *t'ipa* appears in similar type of constructions as in Russian. As part of a QI-clause, *t'ipa* can equally be found with speech (2.87) and non-speech verbs (2.88).

- (2.87) *Bogdan* dlja prikola *šuiž,* *što*  
 PN for fun say.PST.3SG COMP  
*mone* *kuasen* *snimat'* *karyny,* *t'ipa*  
 1SG.ACC ski.INSTR take.picture.INF do.INF like  
*mynym* *keše* *tolalte.*  
 1SG.DAT like.PRS.3SG winter  
 'Bogdan said for fun that he should take pictures of me with skis, like I like winter.' (Blog subcorpus).

- (2.88) *Noš* *mon* *so* *šory* *učkiško*  
 and 1SG 3SG center.ILL stare.PRS.1SG  
*nomyr* *veratek,* *t'ipa,* *davaj,* *ačid*  
 nothing say.NEG.CV like PTCL self.2SG  
*vera,* *mon* *treñer* *övöl,* *ton*  
 tell.IMP2SG 1SG coach NEG 2SG  
*mil'am* *tatyn* *car'* *i* *bog.*  
 1PL.GEN here.INE tzar and god  
 'And I stare at him without saying anything, like, come on, tell yourself, I am not a coach, you are here our Tzar and God.' (Blog subcorpus).

In (2.87), *t'ipa* introduces RD that has previously occurred. In this case, the reporter reproduces someone's previous utterance approximately. Note the difference in framing of the first ('he should take pictures of me with skis') and the second part of the RD ('I like winter'). The first part is presented without additional epistemic support, although the second part is presented with additional overtones. The reporter most likely rephrases the words of the original speaker concerning herself. By placing *t'ipa* in front of the second part of the RD, she tries to distance herself from the original utterance. In (2.88), one can notice that *t'ipa* may also introduce hypothetical quotations. Such uses of *t'ipa* can be likewise observed in Russian, cf. (2.35). Thus, the SIM *t'ipa* besides

<sup>76</sup> I would rather hold back from making robust conclusions about *d'eskat'* since it appears only once in the collected material; the assumption is made rather on the basis of constructions with *mol*.

representing previous utterances or thoughts, may also introduce hypothetical quotations including utterances typical of a situation, an individual, or a group. A similar instance is also discussed below where the collocation of *t'ipa* with NPs indicating the original source of RD is illustrated, cf. (2.90).

In addition to the co-occurrence of the marker with speech and non-speech verbs, I have observed the use of *t'ipa* in the construction where any kind of the verb depicting the event is elliptic. As it has been mentioned in 2.4.3, such a strategy is quite typical in colloquial Russian and has been most likely replicated from it into Udmurt together with the marker. Since this strategy appears in my material only once in the discourse of one speaker, it is too early to judge whether it has a broader distribution in contemporary Udmurt. Consequently, here I present this example only for illustrative purposes. At the current stage, it can be considered somewhat marginal, and further studies on the basis of broader corpus material (ideally including also data depicting oral communications) should be carried out in the future to see whether this strategy is used at all by other speakers and if yes, what markers can be involved in it, besides *t'ipa*.

- (2.89) *No*                    *so,*                    *t'ipa*                    “*Učke*                    *al'i,*                    *mon*  
 and                    3SG                    like                    look.IMP2PL                    PTCL                    1SG  
*ug*                    *šiišky*                    *sil',*                    *i*                    *mynym*                    *umoj!*”  
 NEG.PRS.1SG                    eat.FRQ.CN                    meat                    and                    1SG.DAT                    good  
 ‘And (s)he [is/was] like “Look, I don’t eat meat, and I feel good [lit. to me good!]”’ (vk.com/udmurt\_ept).

The appearance of *t'ipa* with different types of RD (quotations of speech/thought and hypothetical quotations) brings us to the same conclusion as the one made about the use of *kad'* in RD-constructions. While appearing with quotations of speech and thought, *t'ipa* indicates that the quote is produced approximately, as in (2.89). In cases where a hypothetical quotation is introduced by *t'ipa*, the reporter indicates that (s)he perceives RD as generally possible in the described context. For example, in (2.90) the reporter presents typical questions that a person living in the Alnash region would ask during a quiz, although it does not mean that such a question should have been asked.

- (2.90) *...ta*                    *juanez*                    *t'ipa,*                    *dogadajsja,*                    *što*  
 DEM                    question.ACC                    like                    guess.IMP.2SG                    what  
*Čumol'e,*                    *Muvaži*                    *no*                    *Šöd Ošmes*                    *Alnaš*  
 PN                    PN                    and                    PN                    PN  
*jorosyn?*  
 region.INE  
 ‘[Only from you, the boy from Alnash region, managed to come out] **this question, like, guess, what are the Chumole, Muvazhi and Söd Oshmes in the Alnash region?**’ (Blog subcorpus).

In addition to the appearance in the above constructions, *tīpa* also occurs as a single quote-introducer in non-clausal usage. (2.91) depicts its appearance preceding an embedded language island consisting of Russian text. In such cases, it is hard to judge whether *tīpa* should be already perceived as an Udmurt QI, or it is still part of an RD-construction made up entirely of the Russian repertoire. On the basis of written material, it is hard to point out which of the mentioned cases better describes the situation. Since many Udmurt speakers on the internet use both languages interchangeably inside one text, it comes quite natural that switches from one language to another happen either on the border of one clause or between clauses. Thus, it might be a motivating factor for transferring a Russian NQ strategy into Udmurt. I will come back to this topic in the general discussion about the adaptation and the motivation for the adaptation of the Russian NQ into colloquial Udmurt at the end of this subsection.

|        |             |               |                   |                      |                |
|--------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| (2.91) | I           | <i>tatyn</i>  | <i>solen</i>      | <i>śinmyz</i>        | <i>uśe</i>     |
|        | and         | here          | 3SG.GEN           | eye.3SG              | fall.PRS.3SG   |
|        | <i>mon</i>  | <i>vyle,</i>  | <i>valatek</i>    | <i>uće</i>           | <i>dal’še,</i> |
|        | 1SG         | up.ILL        | understand.CV:CAR | look.PRS.3SG         | further        |
|        | <i>a</i>    | <i>sobere</i> | <i>rezko</i>      | <i>opjat’</i>        | <i>mon</i>     |
|        | and         | then          | suddenly          | again                | 1SG            |
|        | <i>śory</i> | <i>uće</i>    | <i>pajmysa.</i>   | <b><i>T’īpa,</i></b> | <i>čo</i>      |
|        | center.ILL  | look.PRS.3SG  | wonder.CV         | like                 | what           |
|        | <i>za</i>   | <i>xren’?</i> |                   |                      |                |
|        | for         | bullshit      |                   |                      |                |

‘And there his eyes fell on me, not understanding he looked on, and then suddenly he again looked at me wondering. **Like, what the hell?**’ (Blog subcorpus).

In (2.92), *tīpa* appears in an RD-construction with the autochthonous quotative particle *pe*. Functionally, both particles express synonymous meaning indicating that RD is produced approximately. The use of *tīpa* supports the colloquial characteristics of the presented quote. For example, note the presence of the adverbial *vopšče* pro Rus. *voobščē* ‘completely’ following *tīpa*. Both markers, as replicated from Russian, are typical for colloquial spoken Udmurt. Even in Russian, the use of *tīpa* is characteristic of substandard variants<sup>77</sup>. (2.92) represents quite an interesting case as well since the reporter provides an original utterance from Hungarian, followed by the representation of the same phrase in Udmurt. The reporter slightly changes the meaning of the utterance by emphasizing the lack of knowledge of Hungarian (“I don’t speak it at all”) which does not show in the neutrally expressed original utterance (“I don’t speak Hungarian”). Thus, the subjectivity can also be observed in the reinterpretation of the RD by the reporter.

<sup>77</sup> Based on my personal experience, in Russian, *tīpa* can even be considered nonnormative by language purists.

|        |  |   |  |
|--------|--|---|--|
| (2.92) | “Nem<br>NEG (Hung.)<br><i>myrdem</i><br>somehow<br><i>(’t)ipa</i><br>like<br><i>veraškišky,</i><br>talk.CN | beszélek<br>talk.PRS.1SG (Hung.)<br><i>potti</i><br>produce.PST.1SG<br>vopšče<br>completely<br><i>pe)</i><br>QUOT | magyarul” –<br>Hungarian.EMOD (Hung.)<br><i>mon</i><br>1SG<br><i>ug</i><br>NEG.PRS.3SG |
|--------|--|---|--|

“I don’t speak Hungarian” – somehow I managed (**like**, I don’t speak it at all)’  
(Blog subcorpus).

As far as the adaptation of the NQ strategy from Russian into Udmurt is concerned, I present the following assumption. The use of QIs in a bilingual setting can be observed from the standpoint that this category is often treated by speakers as non-genuine word forms. Consequently, they can be used by the speakers as a “paralinguistic inventory of gesture-like devices” (Matras 2009: 193). Thus, the pragmatic role of markers becomes more important in conversational routines. As a result, it leads to the difficulty in maintaining “control over the language processing mechanism that enables selection of context-appropriate structures within the repertoire and inhibition of those that are not appropriate” (Matras 2009: 159). Such instances of mixing NQ strategies were already observed on the example of Croatian bilinguals that use both the autochthonous NQ *kao* ‘like’ and the NQ *like* that is adopted from English (Hlavac 2006: 1892).

Furthermore, as previous studies show, there might be another motivation for the employment of Russian code inside Udmurt. As Edygarova (2013, 2014) suggests in her studies, the use of mixed code often indicates special features of the colloquial speech among Udmurt urban youth. In addition, Russian, as a language of prestige, becomes the source for new strategies that acquire colloquial overtone through their foreign origin, despite the fact whether it is exclusively colloquial or also used on the level of standard language in Russian, as in the cases with the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat’* in Udmurt. Furthermore, the employment of strategies already accepted among the speakers of Russian reduces the risk of being misunderstood or that such strategy will not be accepted in Udmurt due to syntactic or some other linguistic reasons. As a result, speakers of Udmurt turn to the use of *t’ipa* in non-clausal constructions (and with elliptic verb in one case) without any obstacles while the same use of the SIM *kad’* might lead to misunderstanding or misinterpretation of an RD-construction. Consequently, instead of using exclusively autochthonous means, speakers also turn to the use of Russian quotatives – the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat’* (see 2.5.2.2), and the NQ *t’ipa*.

## 2.5.4. Deictic elements as parts of quotative index clauses in Udmurt

In the current subsection, elements with deictic meanings are described. Among them, the use of the MDs *ožy* and *tažy*, and the type deictics *tače* and *syče* are recognized here. The difference between the meaning of the deictics can be expressed the following way: *tače* ‘such (in this way)’, *syče* ‘such (in that way)’, and *tažy* ‘so (in this way)’, *ožy* ‘thus (in that way)’. Thus, a basic division into proximal (*tažy* and *tače*) and distal (*ožy* and *syče*) markers can be suggested. For the sake of convenience, in both glossing and translation I refer to the proximal MD *tažy* as ‘so’ and to the distal MD *ožy* as ‘thus’, neglecting a possible lack of difference between *so* and *thus* in English. Both pairs of deictics appear as auxiliary elements in QI-clauses. This statement is supported primarily by the fact that they typically co-occur either with speech and epistemic verbs or with NPs indicating the original source of RD, which appear as nuclear elements of QI-clauses. Consequently, I conclude that these elements have not yet grammaticalized into independent quotative markers, as it happened in some European languages, e.g. in Russian *takoj* (see 2.4.3) or German *so* ‘thus, so’ in constructions like *ich so* ‘I (am) so/thus’, cf. (1.33) (also see Golato 2000). Despite the fact that the elements discussed in this subsection have not (yet) developed into independent quotative markers, the appearance of deictics remains interesting for the aims of the current research since cross-linguistically deictics are often used as a source for NQ strategies (cf. Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012). Consequently, a future development of constructions with SEVs and NPs might be expected. The following subsection is divided into two parts: the first part is dedicated to the use of the MDs *tažy* and *ožy*, the second part – to the use of the type deictics *tače* and *syče*.

### 2.5.4.1. The manner deictics *ožy* and *tažy* as parts of quotative index clauses

Structurally, both MDs *ožy* and *tažy* appear in Udmurt in homomorphic constructions. Primarily, they occur with speech, (2.93)–(2.94), or non-speech verbs, (2.95)–(2.96), that have a potential to mark the presence of RD. The use of deictics is recognized here as auxiliary since both elements typically co-occur with predicates that mark the presence of RD.

|        |  |               |               |       |             |                        |
|--------|--|---------------|---------------|-------|-------------|------------------------|
| (2.93) | <i>Veraške</i>   | <i>tažy</i>   | <i>čömys:</i> | “Ešli | ty          | ne                     |
|        | say.PRS.3SG  | so            | often         | if    | 2SG         | NEG                    |
|        | na   | Internete     | togda         | ja    | буду        | poigrat’ <sup>78</sup> |
|        | on   | internet.PREP | then          | 1SG   | FUT.AUX.1SG | play.INF               |
|        | ‘He often says so: “If you are not on the internet, then I will play”’ |               |               |       |             |                        |
|        | (vk.com/udmurt_ept).   |               |               |       |             |                        |

<sup>78</sup> The quote is meant to depict Russian speech produced by a non-native speaker.

- (2.94) *Mon no tunne Vital'ij Agabajev šarys*  
 1SG PTCL today PN PN about  
*ožy šuysal: so odigez genial'noj artist*  
 thus say.COND.1SG 3SG one.3SG prodigy artist  
*val.*  
 be.PST.3SG  
 ‘Today **I would say** about Vitaliy Agabaev **thus**: he was a prodigy artist.’ (Blog subcorpus).
- (2.95) *Kylšarys, tažy no gožtyny luysal: “Borddorys*  
 for.example so and write.INF be.COND wall.ELA  
*sured tuž jöspörtem uk!”*  
 picture very strange PTCL  
 ‘For example, **I could write thus**: “The picture on the wall is very strange!”’  
 (vk.com/vanmondyr).
- (2.96) *Ožy malpaj: puktono jurtjos.*  
 thus think.PST.1SG build.PTCP house.PL  
 ‘**I thought thus**: houses need to be build.’ (Blog subcorpora).

At first glance, both markers are used cataphorically pointing at the following stretches of RD, as in (2.93)–(2.96). However, their distribution outside the quotative domain suggests that there is a difference between the use of the proximal and the distal MDs. According to Edygarova (p.c.), the use of the proximal MD *tažy* is associated with new information and the marker is typically used in the pre-focused position, as in (2.97).

- (2.97) *Mynym tače vyl'em šituatsijos ad'džiško*  
 1SG.DAT such like situation.PL be.seen.PRS.3PL  
*tažy: mon ug gažašky asleštym*  
 so 1SG NEG.PRS.1SG respect.CN own.ABL1SG  
*kalykme...*  
 folk.ACC1SG  
 ‘I see the situations like this **the following way**: I don’t respect my own folk...’  
 (Blog subcorpus).

The distal counterpart *ožy*, in turn, refers to already known or previously mentioned information, as in (2.98). In addition, it also appears in few idiomatic constructions, e.g. the anaphoric phrase *vot ožy* ‘so it is’, and as a confirmative particle meaning ‘yes’ (Edygarova, p.c.).

- (2.98) *Ug todyšky малы so ožy šue.*  
 NEG.1SG know.PRS.CN why 3SG thus say.PRS.3SG  
 ‘[“Tyš-dydyš” – this is the Udmurt language”, – says my classmate.] I don’t know why **he says thus**.’ (udmurto4ka.blogspot.com).

In the quotative domain, the default distribution of the markers follows a similar consideration. While proximal *tažy* is used mainly as a cataphoric marker pointing to the following stretches of RD (2.99), distal *ožy* is mainly used as an anaphoric marker referring to the quote just produced (2.100):

- (2.99) *Press-služba soje tažy valektiz:*  
 press.office 3SG.ACC so explain.PST.3SG  
 “*Pe’a d’eputat luiz ke...*”  
 PN MP become.PST.3SG COND  
 ‘**The press-office explained this so:** “If Petya becomes an MP...”’  
 ([https://vk.com/wall-84766181\\_53](https://vk.com/wall-84766181_53)).

- (2.100) *Mon pičiges!’ – ačiz šaryš ožy vera.*  
 1SG small.COMPAR self.3SG about thus say.PRS.3SG  
 ‘“I am smaller!” – about herself **thus she says.**’ (Blog subcorpora).

Despite the established distribution of the MDs in the quotative domain, one can observe an unsystematic use of the markers in the idiolects of some speakers, where the MDs can appear interchangeably, cf. (2.101)–(2.102), in contexts where only one of the variants, i.e. proximal for cataphoric reference or distal for anaphoric, would have been expected.

- (2.101) “*Anaj, nu ešče čut’-čut’, i mon*  
 mom PTCL more a.bit and 1SG  
*sulto, pukty požalujsta čajnik – tažy*  
 get.up.FUT.1SG put.IMP2SG please kettle so  
*šuyisal dyr mon...*  
 say.COND.1SG maybe 1SG  
 ‘“Mom, give me a bit of time and I will get up, put a kettle on the stove, please”  
 – **so I would say** maybe [if I was at home.]’ ([vk.com/udmurt\\_ept](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept)).

- (2.102) *Vyny tužo maly ke, ožy šuiž:*  
 younger.brother.1SG also why INDEF thus say.PST.3SG  
 “*Oh, mar ke so tuž*  
 INTERJ what INDEF 3SG very  
*kurdyt...*”  
 scary  
 ‘**My younger brother also** for some reason **said thus:** “Wow, somewhat she’s very scary...”’ (Blog subcorpus).

In (2.101), the reporter uses the proximal MD instead of the distal counterpart that would have been more frequent in the presented context. After studying the use of the MDs in the idiolect of the blogger from the page [vk.com/udm\\_ept](https://vk.com/udm_ept), I have reached the conclusion that this speaker uses the MDs relatively interchangeably. Even outside the quotative domain, one can observe a similar situation. For example, the blogger uses the proximal variant in the idiomatic expressions, e.g. *vot tažy* in lieu of the idiomatic phrase *vot ožy*. Note a similar situation in a couple of other idiolects, as in (2.94) and (2.96) above. The less



systematic use of the MDs in quotative constructions and beyond can be considered an outcome of the decrease in linguistic competence of the Udmurt speakers that find themselves under Russian influence. Consequently, some speakers do not feel a difference in meaning expressed by different types of MDs and tend to use both in similar situations. Compare the use of MDs and type deictics in quotative constructions described here in the next subsection where the difference between proximal and distal demonstratives is not reflected (anymore).

In (2.102), however, the use of the distal counterpart can be justified. The reporter presents the utterance produced by her younger brother in a similar way as another speaker had done it before, which is indicated by the presence of the adverb *tužo* ‘also’. Taking into account the distribution of the markers outside the quotative domain, one can consider the appearance of the distal MD natural here since *ožy* refers to the previously produced or already known information.

In addition, one can also observe the collocation of the distal MD *ožy* with the emphatic particle *ik* in the quotative domain. Similarly to the bare use of the MD *ožy*, this collocation presents RD that has already been mentioned in the discourse in different form. Consequently, one can expect the cataphoric use of the collocation *ožy ik* in quotative constructions that function as a reference to the previously described situation which later on occurred in the form of RD, as in (2.103a) and (2.103b) with quotations of speech and thought, respectively.

(2.103a) *Ožy ik šuizy:* “*Myn tatyś!*”  
 thus PTCL say.PST.3PL go.IMP2SG here.ELA  
 ‘**Thus they did say:** “Go away from here!”’ (vk.com/yumshan57).

(2.103b) *Ožy ik malpaj, kine ke*  
 thus PTCL think.PST.1SG who.ACC INDEF  
*todytek kełti šuysa*  
 know.CV:CAR miss.PST.1SG COMP  
 ‘**Thus I did think that** whom I missed without knowing’  
 (vk.com/yumshan57).

An interesting case presents an example where *tažy* collocates with a form of the SV, *š uom* lit. meaning ‘say.FUT.1PL’, which has lexicalized as a discourse particle with the meaning ‘let’s say/let’s assume/for instance’ in contemporary Udmurt (Kibardina 2012: 128). Such a collocation is used as a QI to indicate the presence of a hypothetical RD which is primarily done through the semantics of the discourse particle *š uom*. However, as one can notice the MD takes the bounding position to the RD. Here the quotation basically appears as a demonstration embedded in the language use. Thus, the reporter demonstrates the situation by presenting a hypothetical utterance concerning his/her philological affiliation.

- (2.104) *Šuom*, *tažy* “*Mon* *tunne*  
 say.FUT.1PL/PTCL so 1SG today  
*Džejn* *Ost’inleš* “*Gordost’* i  
 Jane Austen.ABL pride and  
 predubeždenie” *knigaze* *lyd’dži.* *Mynym*  
 prejudice book.ACC3SG read.PST.1SG 1SG.DAT  
*tuž* *kel’siz*”.  
 very like.PST.3SG  
 ‘[Nataliya, thanks for underlining that I am a philologist.] **Say, so:** “I read today Jane Austen’s book “Pride and Prejudice”. I liked it a lot”.’  
 (vk.com/jumshan57).

#### 2.5.4.2. The type deictics *tače* and *syče* as parts of quotative index clauses

In contrast to the above MDs, the type deictics *tače* and *syče* primarily appear with NPs indicating an original source of RD, cf. (2.105)–(2.106). The distribution of deictic elements as parts of different QI-clauses seems to be motivated: MDs as adverbial markers co-occur with predicates modifying thus the meaning of the VP which is a nucleus element of a QI-clause, while adnominal deictics are attached to NPs, i.e. a natural collocation of these elements outside RD-constructions. Although as is shown further in the use of *syče* as part of a QI-clause, this is not always the case.

The two deictics seems to be interchangeable in quotative constructions and their semantic difference does not play a significant role in their choice. Both elements tend to point to the source of RD specifying thus that exactly or nearly exactly such a type of discourse appeared originally which is motivated by the semantics of these elements.

- (2.105) *Mynym* *tuž* *ćem* *šotjalo* *tače*  
 1SG.DAT very often give.PRS.3PL such  
*juan:* *maly* *ton* *ud* *kyskišky,*  
 question why 2SG NEG.PRS.2SG pull.CN  
*vañmyz* *tamakalo* *uk?*  
 all.3SG smoke.PRS.3PL PTCL  
 ‘To me they address very often **such a question:** why don’t you smoke [lit. pull], everyone’s smoking?’ (vk.com/udmurtdunne).

|         |   |   |   |   |
|---------|---|---|---|---|
| (2.106) | <i>Aśmeos</i><br>self.1PL<br><i>aśme</i><br>self.1PL<br><i>kule-a</i><br>must.PRS.3SG-Q<br><i>kyly?</i><br>language.DAT | <i>Udmurtiyn</i><br>Udmurtia.INE<br><i>aže</i><br>in.front<br><i>nylpijez</i><br>children.ACC | <i>ulyša</i><br>live.CV<br><b><i>syče</i></b><br>such<br><i>dyšetyny</i><br>teach.INF | <i>puktiškom</i><br>put.PRS.1PL<br><b><i>juan:</i></b><br>question<br><i>udmurt</i><br>Udmurt |
|---------|---|---|---|---|

‘We living in Udmurtia ask ourselves **such question**: should we teach the children Udmurt?’ (Press subcorpus)<sup>79</sup>.

As it has been mentioned above, an interesting example illustrating the use of *syče* in the collected material was encountered in which the adnominal deictic co-occurs with an SV instead of a more typical NP. Compare (2.107) with the use of *takoj* in Russian, cf. (2.39a).

|         |   |  |  |   |  |
|---------|---|--|--|---|--|
| (2.107) | <b><i>Komnatayś</i></b><br>room.ELA<br><i>mil'amjos</i><br>our.GEN.PL<br><i>karo.</i><br>do.PRS.3PL | <b><i>eše</i></b><br>friend.1SG<br><i>aryś</i><br>year.ELA | <b><i>syče</i></b><br>such<br><i>are</i><br>year.ILL | <b><i>šue:</i></b><br>say.PRS.3SG<br><i>vormišjosleś</i><br>winner.PL.ABL | “Vot<br>PTCL<br><i>ad'džem</i><br>see.PTCP |
|---------|---|--|--|---|--|

‘**My roommate such says**: “From year to year our people are taking an example from winners.”’ (Blog subcorpus).

Thus, my primary hypothesis suggests that there might be Russian influence on the use of *syče* in Udmurt, and a case of pattern replication can be observed. However, the possibility of independent development should not be excluded since there are a number of languages that use deictics as quotatives, and the appearance of this element in quotative strategies of these languages as such can hardly be considered Russian influence (cf. Table 4). So far, a correspondence can only be observed between the use of *takoj* and *syče* with SVs and NPs. In Udmurt, at least on the basis of the available written material, the deictic does not appear in other constructions as the corresponding element does in Russian. Thus, it slightly weakens the hypothesis about Russian influence. Consequently, further studies are necessary to investigate its distribution more thoroughly which would help to understand whether there is Russian influence in this strategy or not. Up till now, I suggest marking the use of *syče* with SVs as an ambiguous case and leave the question about its origin to further studies.

<sup>79</sup> To illustrate the possibility of such co-occurrences in Udmurt, due to the lack of examples of *syče* appearing with NPs neither in the collected material nor in Blog subcorpus, I partially turn once again to the use of the Press subcorpus of Udmurt corpus.

### 2.5.5. Quotative indexes in Udmurt: summary

The use of different quotative elements in Udmurt are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Quotative markers in Udmurt

| Markers                 | QI-clauses with SVs | QI-clauses with EVs | QI-clauses with NSVs | QI-clauses with elliptic verbs | QI-clauses with NPs | Single QI |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| I. Complementizers      |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>šuyša</i>            | +                   | +                   | +                    | -                              | +/-                 | -         |
| <i>čto</i>              | +                   | +                   | -                    | -                              | +                   | -         |
| <i>čto...šuyša</i>      | +                   | +                   | -                    | -                              | +                   | -         |
| <i>budto</i>            | +                   | +                   | -                    | -                              | +                   | -         |
| II. Quotative particles |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>pe</i>               | +                   | +                   | +                    | -                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>päj</i>              | +                   | +                   | +                    | -                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>mol</i>              | +                   | -/?                 | +                    | -                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>d'eskat'</i>         | -/?                 | -/?                 | -/?                  | -/?                            | -/?                 | +         |
| III. Similitive markers |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>kad'</i>             | +                   | +                   | -                    | -                              | -                   | -         |
| <i>t'ipa</i>            | +                   | -/?                 | +                    | +/-                            | +                   | +         |
| IV. Demonstratives      |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>tažy</i>             | +                   | -/?                 | -                    | -                              | -                   | -         |
| <i>ožy</i>              | +                   | +                   | -                    | -                              | -                   | -         |
| <i>tače</i>             | -                   | -                   | -                    | -                              | +                   | -         |
| <i>syče</i>             | +                   | -                   | -                    | -                              | +                   | -         |

In colloquial written Udmurt, both autochthonous markers and those borrowed from Russian can be observed. The strategy, mentioned most often in descriptive grammars, involves the use of SEVs with the autochthonous clause-final complementizer *šuyša*. Since *šuyša* is a converb of the SV *šuyny*, literally meaning 'saying', it also appears in RD-constructions with NSVs. In such cases, the function of *šuyša* as a converb becomes relevant, and it is basically used as only a quotative marker signaling the presence of RD. As for the occurrence with NPs, the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša* can also be noted in a few examples with NPs, although such a use remains if not marginal, then at least quite rare in Udmurt.

Besides autochthonous markers, the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* and the epistemic complementizer *budto* replicated from Russian can be observed in Udmurt. In terms of epistemic meaning, *čto* remains a quite close

correspondent to the autochthonous *šuyša. Budto*, however, marks the quote as approximately (re)produced. In addition, the reporter's subjectivity is present in all attested examples. Structurally, both markers are used in Udmurt, corresponding to their use in Russian. They appear with SEVs and NPs indicating the original source of RD. In addition, a construction that includes both the autochthonous clause-final complementizer *šuyša* and the borrowed complementizer *čto* is noted in Udmurt. This strategy appears in Udmurt as the outcome of Russian influence, which is realized in the change of basic word order in the language from SOV to SVO (cf. Tánčzos 2013). Thus, *čto* marks the beginning of RD, while *šuyša* fulfills a closing function. In multi-part RD-constructions containing several clauses with RD, *šuyša* is placed at the end of each part, separating them from one another. The use of a double-marking strategy is most typical with SEVs. Sometimes constructions with SVs prefer to use the complementizer *čto* instead of the double-marking strategy or the autochthonous complementizer. In such cases, *čto* mainly precedes indirect RD, while the autochthonous marker appears more often with direct RD.

Similarly to the complementizers, in colloquial written Udmurt one may find both autochthonous and Russian quotative particles. In Standard Udmurt, among the autochthonous quotative particles only the quotative particle *pe* is used. In colloquial Udmurt, however, there is also the dialectal self-quotative particle *pöj* that is used exclusively in self-quotations. Structurally, both particles appear in similar types of constructions, either occurring together with different types of predicates or appearing as single quote-introducers in non-clausal usage. The quotative particle *pe* may also be found with NPs indicating the original source of RD. A similar use is not noted among examples with *pöj* since functionally it is restricted to constructions with RD that were produced directly by the reporter. In addition, the parallel use of both quotative particles can be observed within one text in non-clausal use. Thus, the reporter creates a dramatic effect of the reproduced dialogue, by marking cues belonging to different speakers with either the quotative particle *pe* (produced by a different person than the reporter) or with the self-quotative particle *pöj* (produced by the reporter).

The quotative particle *pe* was observed marking various types of RD – from approximate representations of someone's utterances or thoughts to verbatim quotations. The latter is recognized here as the latest functional development of the quotative particle. Furthermore, besides marking someone's previous utterance and thought, it may be used as a marker of reported and inferred evidentiality and as a discourse marker with hedging function. These functions remain quite close to its quotative functions and mainly derive from different aspects of its use in the quotative domain.

Among borrowed quotative particles, one can find *mol* and *deskat'*. The quotative particle *deskat'* appears only once in the collected material in non-clausal use marking a hypothetical quotation. Thus, only partial correspondence with the use in Russian can be pointed out. In contrast to *deskat'*, *mol* is quite well-integrated into Udmurt. Besides the structural correspondence with its use

in the matrix language, also additional meanings that the particle expresses can be observed. Thus, *mol* marks RD as approximate. In addition, it may indicate the reporter's partial support towards the content of a quote. Structurally, it appears in similar types of constructions as in Russian. The only two constructions that the marker does not appear in my material, are (i) a QI-clause with an elliptic predicate, consisting of an NP indicating the speaker and the quotative particle – a strategy that quite often appears in Russian not only with *mol*, but also with the new quotative *tīpa*, and (ii) the co-occurrence with EVs in a QI-clause. As far as the second case is concerned, previous instances show that in QI-clauses, EVs behave relatively similarly to SVs. Since *mol* is used in my Udmurt material in constructions with SVs, one can expect that its use with EVs is entirely possible. Therefore, lack of examples among my data does not exclude this possibility e.g. in oral speech.

Among NQ strategies with SIMs, the use of the autochthonous marker *kad'* and the Russian NQ *tīpa* were observed. The SIM *kad'* appears with previously produced reported utterances and thoughts, as well as with hypothetical quotations. In both cases, the marker co-occurs with SEVs indicating the presence of RD. It is interesting that *kad'* does not appear in more neutralized constructions that are quite typical for the use of NQs, i.e. with elliptic and equational verbs, or in non-clausal use, more natural for colloquial Udmurt. The basic explanation for this lies in the fact that *kad'* has not yet fully grammaticalized into a quotative particle in the quotative domain, as it has happened with SIMs across some languages, e.g. in Russian with the NQ *tīpa*. Thus, a hypothetical non-clausal use of *kad'* for the purposes of marking the presence of RD might lead to misunderstanding between speakers. Consequently, such a use is not observed in Udmurt.

In contrast to the aforementioned, the replication from Russian *tīpa* appears both as part of a QI-clause, co-occurring with speech or non-speech verbs and NPs indicating the original source of RD, and as a single quote-introducer. In addition, in the discourse of one speaker the use of the marker in the construction with the elliptic verb, depicting an event, is also observed. However, due to the unclear distribution of this strategy among other Udmurt speakers, at the current stage it is considered marginal. Similarly to *mol*, in my material there are no examples where *tīpa* is used together with EVs. However, as it is stated above, the co-occurrence of the marker with SVs suggest that its use with EVs is entirely possible. The appearance of the marker in quotative constructions of different complexity happens mainly due to the fact that such a use is already massively accepted among the speakers of Russian and *tīpa* has already become a canonical NQ in Russian. Consequently, there is no risk among Udmurt speakers that by using *tīpa* as a quotative marker in different structural complexities, they might be misunderstood or misinterpreted. Furthermore, it might lead to the point when *tīpa* will supersede *kad'* completely in the quotative domain, although it is likely only on the level of colloquial speech due to the exclusively colloquial features that *tīpa* bears and partially due to puristic tendencies among Udmurt speakers.

Finally, the last group of markers appearing in QI-clauses in Udmurt are deictics: the MDs *ožy* and *tažy*, and the type deictics *syče* and *tače*. The MDs are typically attached to predicates marking the presence of RD, while the pair of type deictics – to NPs indicating the original source of RD. However, untypical use of *syče* with an SV was also observed. This leads to the suggestion that in this type of co-occurrence Russian influence might be noted since this strategy is suspiciously alike to the combination of Rus. *takoj* ‘such’ with SVs. However, since similarity between the use of deictics in Russian and Udmurt can only be observed with SVs and NPs, it is too early to judge whether there is Russian influence. In my material, both *tažy* and *syče* appear together with SVs only. However, their use with EVs is not excluded, since the two types of verbs behave relatively similarly in the quotative domain and attract similar types of non-reportative markers.

The proximal MD *tažy* is primarily used in Udmurt quotative constructions as a cataphoric marker pointing to the following stretches of RD, while distal *ožy* appears as an anaphoric marker referring to the quote just produced. Despite the established distribution of the markers, one can observe the less systematic use of MDs in a couple of idiolects, where the speakers use both markers interchangeably also outside the quotative domain. Hence, one could expect that in the future either one MD will supersede the other and will be used for both anaphoric and cataphoric reference, or both MDs will appear in quotative constructions relatively interchangeably neglecting the original distribution that derives from the use of the markers outside the quotative domain. For example, a similar spread of functions between the distal and the proximal type deictics in quotative constructions has not been observed. As a result, one can expect that both markers are used as relatively close synonyms.

To conclude, one can observe diversity among quotative strategies in Udmurt. The main distinction can be made between the use of autochthonous and borrowed elements, although the markers often show similarities both structurally and functionally. The epistemic complementizer *budto* can be considered a gap-filler in colloquial Udmurt due to the lack of a corresponding autochthonous marker. Some elements are used parallel to each other, e.g. the SIMs *kad'* and *t'ipa* and the quotative particles *pe*, *mol* and *deskat'*. However, there are still either structural differences, as in the case with the SIMs, or functional differences, e.g. the epistemic meaning of the quotative particles, that brings the motivation for the use of these markers in the recipient language. The epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* is borrowed into Udmurt due to the language change that is happening in the basic word order. As a result, besides matter and pattern replication of the epistemically neutral complementizer, a double-marking strategy can also be observed. The difference is pointed out between the types of predicates that are likely to use one complementizer strategy, but avoid another. However, as a result, in colloquial written speech such preferences are not always realized and depend rather on the immediate choice of the speaker.

## 2.6. Quotative indexes in Komi

In this section, the QIs used in Komi internet communications are presented. Similarly to the description of the Udmurt quotatives, this section is divided according to the category to which a concrete quotative marker belongs. First, the use of complementizers in QI-clauses with different types of predicates (SEVs) and NPs indicating the original source of RD are presented. Further, the use of quotative particles are described. Finally, the role of deictic elements appearing as auxiliary elements in QI-clauses are illustrated. At the end of the section, a short summary is presented.

### 2.6.1. The complementizer strategy in Komi internet communications

In Komi, the complementizer strategy primarily involves the use of SEVs with the epistemically neutral complementizers *myj* (with the dialectal variant *möj*) in Komi-Zyrian, and *čto* (with the dialectal variant *što*) in Komi-Permyak. They can be considered either a calque from Russian in the case of Komi-Zyrian, or a direct loan in the case of Komi-Permyak. The influence of Russian on the use of complementizers in Komi is not recent. Some reports on the use of the initially interrogative pronoun *myj* as a complementizer, based on the model from Russian (the initially interrogative pronoun *čto* is used as a complementizer, see 2.4.1), date back to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Bartens 2000: 312). In Komi-Permyak, the influence can be expected to go even further since this literary standard uses the complementizer *čto* in the form of a direct loan already in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The use of the complementizer *čto* may be encountered e.g. in the translation of Pushkin's "Dubrovskiy" (Kudymkar, 1941)<sup>80</sup>:

(2.108) ...*šuis*,            *što*            *sija*            *nadejtčö*            *zaslužitny*            *uvaženie*  
say.PST.3SG    COMP            3SG            hope.PRS.3SG            gain.INF            respect  
'(S)he said that (s)he hopes to gain respect' (arch.permculture.ru).

Klumpp (2016: 539–540) mentions that the complementizer *čto* also appears in varieties of Komi-Zyrian. However, in the collected material Komi-Zyrian speakers avoid the use of the Russian complementizer directly and prefer the use of the calque *myj*. The direct loan on SNS appears primarily in Komi-Permyak only. The avoidance of *čto* in Komi-Zyrian might be motivated by the fact that in written variants, speakers maintain control over the separation of linguistic repertoire and thus express language loyalty. Furthermore, the epistemic complementizer *byt'čö* that was previously reported to be used in Komi (Klumpp 2016: 549–551), in my material does not appear in the complementizer

<sup>80</sup> Such cases are encountered also in Komi-Permyak newspapers from 1930-40's (e.g. newspaper "Tom Boľševik" from February 5, 1939), available here: [https://fennougrica.kansalliskirjasto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/68566/Tom%20Bolshevik\\_1939\\_n\\_10.pdf?sequence=1](https://fennougrica.kansalliskirjasto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/68566/Tom%20Bolshevik_1939_n_10.pdf?sequence=1) (May 1, 2017).



strategy<sup>81</sup>. Consequently, it might be concluded that several elements either do not appear in written colloquial Komi-Zyrian (and sometimes in Komi-Permyak) at all, or the use of autochthonous markers is preferred over the use of Russian counterparts which, however, may be encountered (also in Komi-Zyrian), e.g., in oral speech (for more details on the specifics of internet communications in Permic see Section 2.3).

Besides the influence of Russian on Komi complementizers, a similarity between the predicates that appear in quotative construction can be observed. As with the complementizer strategies in Russian and Udmurt, in Komi the complementizers typically co-occur with SVs, cf. (2.109)–(2.110), or EVs, as in (2.111)–(2.112).

(2.109) Komi-Zyrian

|                 |               |                       |                       |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Dokladas</i> | <i>šuis</i>   | <i>ministerstvosa</i> | <i>jortys,</i>        |
| report.INE3SG   | say.PST.3SG   | ministry.ADJ          | friend.3SG            |
| <i>myj</i>      | <i>ob</i>     | <i>izučenii</i>       | <i>komi</i>           |
| COMP            | about         | learning.PREP         | Komi                  |
| <i>jazyka</i>   | <i>vopros</i> | <i>ne</i>             | <i>obsuždaetsja –</i> |
| language.GEN    | question      | NEG                   | discuss.PRS.3SG.REF   |
| <i>učit’.</i>   |               |                       |                       |
| learn.INF       |               |                       |                       |

‘In his/her report **the friend from the ministry said that** the question of whether to learn Komi [or not] is not being discussed – you have to learn it.’ (vk.com/biarmian).

(2.110) Komi-Permyak

|                  |                    |                  |                   |
|------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <i>...šuis,</i>  | <i>što</i>         | <i>kolö</i>      | <i>šeravny,</i>   |
| say.PST.3SG      | COMP               | must.PRS.3SG     | laugh.INF         |
| <i>vežny</i>     | <i>kö</i>          | <i>kyk</i>       | <i>šypas</i>      |
| change.INF       | PTCL:COND          | two              | letter            |
| ( <i>bukva</i> ) | <i>mestaeznas,</i> | <i>petas</i>     | “ <i>Šerav</i> ”. |
| letter           | place.PL.INE3SG    | come.out.FUT.3SG | laugh.IMP2SG      |

‘...**said that** they must laugh and if they change two letters’ places, then will come out “Šerav [laugh]”.’ (газетапарма.рф).

(2.111) Komi-Zyrian

|                      |                |                    |                      |               |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| <i>...öni</i>        | <i>ola</i>     | <i>Helsinkiyn,</i> | <i>ćajta,</i>        | <i>myj</i>    |
| now                  | live.PRS.1SG   | Helsinki.INE       | think.PRS.1SG        | COMP          |
| <i>korkö</i>         | <i>dorja</i>   | <i>Helsinkiisa</i> | <i>universitetyn</i> | <i>doktor</i> |
| once                 | defend.PRS.1SG | Helsinki.ADJ       | university.INE       | doctoral      |
| <i>diššertatsija</i> |                |                    |                      |               |
| dissertation         |                |                    |                      |               |

‘Now **I** live in Helsinki and **think that** once I will defend my doctoral dissertation in the University of Helsinki’ (vk.com/club31384440).

<sup>81</sup> In the new media subcorpus of Komi-Zyrian that have recently become available online (<http://komi-zyrian.web-corpora.net>, October 1, 2019), the epistemic complementizer *byl’ö* and direct replication *budto* do not appear at all.

(2.112) Komi-Permyak

|                 |                  |                     |              |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| <i>Sija</i>     | <i>munis</i>     | <i>ZAGSö</i>        | <i>gižny</i> |
| 3SG             | go.PST.3SG       | registry.office.ILL | write.INF    |
| zajavlenie      | na               | razvod,             | <i>no</i>    |
| statement       | for              | divorce             | and          |
| <i>kör</i>      | <i>sija</i>      | <i>tödis,</i>       | <i>što</i>   |
| when            | 3SG              | get.to.know.PST.3SG | COMP         |
| <i>razvodys</i> | <i>öni</i>       | <i>sulalö</i>       | <i>30</i>    |
| divorce.3SG     | now              | stand.PRS.3SG       | 30           |
| tysjač,         | <i>sija</i>      | <i>vežörtis,</i>    | <i>što</i>   |
| thousand        | 3SG              | understand.PST.3SG  | COMP         |
| ljubov’–        | dorože           | vsjakix             | deneg.       |
| love            | expensive.COMPAR | any.PL.GEN          | money.PL.GEN |

‘She went to the registry office to write the statement for divorce and when **she got to know that her divorce now costs 30 thousands, she understood that love is more valuable than any money.**’ (vk.com/tupi\_tap).

Despite the fact that in my material the complementizers do not appear in constructions where they co-occur with NPs indicating the original source of RD, such a co-occurrence is, in general, possible, cf. (2.113). To illustrate it, I provide an example from a Komi-Zyrian newspaper. Even though newspaper texts, in general, do not correspond genre-wise to the rest of the material deriving from SNS, I use this example to illustrate that such a co-occurrence is still possible. I assume that in Komi-Permyak the complementizer *čto* can appear with NPs indicating the original source of RD, similarly to *myj* in Komi-Zyrian, as in (2.113).

(2.113) Komi-Zyrian

|                  |              |                  |            |             |                    |
|------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|-------------|--------------------|
| <i>Em</i>        | <i>vešig</i> | <i>vištalöm,</i> | <i>myj</i> | <i>tani</i> | <i>ovmödcylöma</i> |
| be.PRS.3SG       | even         | notification     | COMP       | here        | locate.PRF.3SG     |
| <i>frantsuz.</i> |              |                  |            |             |                    |
| frenchman        |              |                  |            |             |                    |

‘There is even **a notification that here a Frenchman was residing.**’ (komimu.com).

## 2.6.2. Quotative particles in Komi

In Komi, in contrast to Udmurt, already on the level of the literary standard a distinction is made between the quotative particle *pö* and the self-quotative particle *miša* (Bartens 2000: 321). Hence, the current subsection is divided into two parts: firstly, the use of the quotative particle *pö* is described; secondly, the description of the self-quotative particle *miša* is provided. As it is shown and discussed further, in the use of the quotative particles, no influence of Russian is observed. The reasons why some quotative particles from Russian appear in Udmurt, but are not encountered in Komi, may be explained through the language loyalty that speakers of Komi express while writing in Komi. Also, I

do not exclude a possible difference in sociological characteristics of speakers between the languages since as was mentioned in Section 2.3, speakers of Komi sometimes differ from their Udmurt counterparts mainly in linguistic background and more frequent language use (for professional purposes) which in colloquial written speech is characterized by a more puristic language use. Furthermore, the use of the quotative particles in colloquial written Komi might differ from spontaneous oral communications, which might show different results from the ones presented in the current subsection.

In general, the use of quotative particles appears to be quite a substantial strategy in the quotative system of Komi since in addition to their quotative functions these elements are used to mark the reporter's subjectivity (Fedjunëva 1998: 550). This and other characteristics are portrayed in details in the description, presented in the current subsection.

### **2.6.2.1. The quotative particle *pö* in Komi**

Similarly to the description of the equivalent quotative particle *pe* in Udmurt, the quotative particle *pö* in Komi is noted in two different functions: as a quotative marker indicating the presence of RD, and as a reported evidential particle. Since I differentiate these two meanings due to the reasons provided in 1.5.3, I concentrate on these functions separately (also see 2.5.2.1.1 for additional motivations, specified for the Udmurt cognate *pe*, which are also relevant for Komi *pö*). Firstly, the use of *pö* as a QI is illustrated. Secondly, *pö* as a marker of reported evidentiality is described.

#### **2.6.2.1.1. The quotative particle *pö* as a quotative index**

The quotative particle *pö* is used to mark the presence of RD that belongs to a source of consciousness different from a reporter due to the presence of the self-quotative particle *miša* that is used to mark reporter's own previous utterances, thoughts or hypothetical quotations. Etymologically, the quotative particle derives from the Proto-Permic particle *\*pe* (Bartens 2000: 321). *Pö* is reported to take the non-initial position in an RD-construction, and it is typically placed after the first constituent of the clause consisting of RD (Leinonen 2000: 420). My data confirm this syntactic property of the particle with one exception presented in (2.116) (see the discussion below).

Structurally, the quotative particle *pö* can co-occur with speech and non-speech verbs. In (2.114), the reporter puts the action of a bear into words and provides a hypothetical quotation which, obviously, could not be uttered by a bear. A hypothetical reading of the RD is acquired mainly by the presence of the SIM *byttö* 'as if' (borrowed from Russian *budto*) that modifies the described situation as imaginary. The quotative particle itself simply indicates that the clause contains RD. If one would omit *byttö* from the QI-clause, the RD would



(2.116) Komi-Permyak

|                |                    |                |               |              |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| <i>A</i>       | <i>sija</i>        | <i>pö</i>      | <i>šuö:</i>   | <i>“Von</i>  |
| and            | 3SG                | QUOT           | say.PRS.3SG   | DEM          |
| <i>taj</i>     | <i>kol'idoras</i>  | <i>suvavö</i>  | <i>čočköm</i> | <i>škap,</i> |
| PTCL           | corridor.INE3SG    | stand.PRS.3SG  | white         | cupboard     |
| <i>set'cin</i> | <i>ša-a-a-aköj</i> | <i>šojanys</i> | <i>tyr</i>    | <i>i</i>     |
| there.INE      | different          | food.3SG       | full          | and          |
| <i>tyr!”</i>   |                    |                |               |              |
| full           |                    |                |               |              |

‘And he says like: “Here in the corridor stands a white cupboard, it is full of aaaaaall kinds of different food!”’ (vk.com/tupi\_tap).

As it can be seen in (2.116), the quotative particle may appear also as part of a QI-clause. In the previous examples (2.114) and (2.115), the quotative particle is inserted into the RD. Based on the observations in Udmurt (see 2.5.2.1.1), one may conclude that the position might either emphasize the quotative function of the particle, or the approximate reproduction of the quote. Thus, in the first case, the reporter aims to signal to an audience that a quote will follow; therefore, the particle occupies the position in the QI preceding the quote. In the second case, a quote is previously introduced by a QI-clause (most likely consisting of a speech or non-speech verb) and the quotative particle indicates that it is reproduced approximately. As part of a QI-clause, the quotative particle usually takes a bound position to a quote, which can be observed both in Russian and Udmurt. In (2.116), however, the quotative particle precedes an SV. Such a position of *pö* was observed in my material only once and in Komi-Permyak only. In Komi-Zyrian, the most preferable place for *pö* is inside RD either on the second position in a clause or at its end – the position previously described in Leinonen (2000: 420) and mentioned here above. Based on investigations in available text collections (Uotila 1985, 1989), I can conclude that this position of the quotative particle is rather marginal if not merely accidental since it appears neither in Komi-Zyrian (Uotila 1989) and Komi-Permyak (Uotila 1985) texts nor elsewhere in my material.

Besides SVs, *pö* also appears in constructions with EVs and NSVs. In the first case, the EVs, as in (2.117), have a potential to mark the presence of RD. In the second case, a proper NSV appears which suggests that an SV just remains elliptic in such a construction. Thus, the quote-introducing function is carried out by the quotative particle entirely, as in (2.118). Note the position of the quotative particle in both cases.

|                      |               |              |              |              |                 |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| (2.117) <i>Kydžy</i> | <i>šuö</i>    | <i>Mikol</i> | <i>Öl'öš</i> | <i>(kodi</i> | <i>taj</i>      |
| how                  | say.PRS.3SG   | PN           | PN           | who          | PTCL            |
| <i>čajtö,</i>        | <i>stavys</i> | <i>pö</i>    | <i>loas</i>  | <i>bur),</i> | <i>povoddja</i> |
| think.PRS.3SG        | all.3SG       | QUOT         | be.FUT.3SG   | good         | rein.PL         |
| –                    | <i>drañ</i>   |              |              |              |                 |
|                      | lathwork      |              |              |              |                 |

‘How Mikol Öl’öš says (who **thinks**, everything will be alright), reins are lath-work’ (vk.com/biarmian).

- (2.118) *Aľekšej* *Gennad'jevič* *zumyšä* *vid'žödö,* *me*  
 PN PN gloomily look.PRS.3SG 1SG  
*pö* *čajti,* *kol'čcin* *karad.*  
 QUOT think.PST.1SG remain.PST.2SG city.INE2SG  
 'Aleksey Gennadievich gloomily looks, I thought that you stayed in your city.'  
 (tuvsovja.blogspot.com).

As Leinonen (2000: 420) points out, the presence of a predicate is not obligatory, which leads to cases where a quotative particle is preceded by an NP indicating the original source of RD (2.119) or appears as an independent quote-introducer (2.120). (2.120) shows that the quotative particle has the potential to indicate the presence of RD on its own where the interaction between the reporter and other speakers is presented. The response of the speakers is marked with *pö* placed at the end of the RD.

- (2.119) *As* *olöm* *javlys* *pyrdžyk* *öti* *šorñikuža,* *menam*  
 own life about always.COMPAR one sentence 1SG.GEN  
*pö* *stavys* *bur,* *važ* *moz,* *lovja.*  
 QUOT all.3SG good old like alive  
 'There is always one **sentence** about [his] own life, all is good in my life,  
everything is as before, [I'm] alive.' (tusjuk.blogspot.com).

- (2.120) *Vol'sköjys* *pö.*  
 PN.ELA QUOT  
 '[I asked them then, I didn't understand what they had said.] **They said, from**  
Vol'sköj.' (vk.com/club79630928).

### 2.6.2.1.2. The quotative particle *pö* as a marker of reported evidentiality

The quotative particle *pö*, similarly to its Udmurt counterpart *pe* (see 2.5.2.1.1.2), also fulfills functions of a reported evidential marker (Leinonen 2000: 420). For the motivation to differentiate quotative and reported evidential meanings see 1.5.3.

Despite the functional difference between the two domains, epistemic support can be observed in both cases. The reporter, by using the particle, "may distance himself from the content [or reported information]" (Leinonen 2000: 420). Thus, (s)he does not take responsibility for the content of the reported information. At the same time, the reporter's doubt might be observed concerning the information presented as hearsay. Such a requirement naturally appears since a reporter depicts rather a general idea of information reported by a third party, than accurately reproducing someone's previous utterance. In (2.121), despite the presence of a QI-clause, the source of information remains unspecified ('they say'). Thus, the speaker distances him-/herself from such an opinion, in case there will be an attempt to refute the information presented as a report (since there might be naturally advocates for the opposite point of view).

|         |  |              |             |                  |                   |
|---------|--|--------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
| (2.121) | <i>Šuöny,</i>  | <i>Iyl'</i>  | <i>vo</i>   | <i>kežlö</i>     | <i>pö</i>         |
|         | say.PRS.3PL  | new          | year        | for              | QUOT              |
|         | <i>byt'</i>  | <i>kolö</i>  | <i>stav</i> | <i>udžjözšyd</i> | <i>myntödčyny</i> |
|         | inevitably   | must.PRS.3SG | all         | worker.ELA2SG    | get.free.INF      |
|         | ' <u>They say, at New Year, all the worker should be inevitably free</u> ' |              |             |                  |                   |
|         | (vk.com/club42898809).   |              |             |                  |                   |

As follows, the quotative particle marking general hearsay may also appear in non-clausal use, as in (2.122). Furthermore, (2.122) is also interesting since the clause actually does not contain reported information, but the speaker uses *pö* for humorous purposes. As Aikhenvald (2004: 182) points out, reported evidentials often cover 'pretend' and 'make-believe' situations. Thus, the information that cleaner-ladies from Belayevo were taken into the Russian national curling team acquires a form of reported information, although it was most likely produced for the first time.

|         |  |                      |                |               |                  |
|---------|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| (2.122) | Komi-Permyak   |                      |                |               |                  |
|         | <i>Belejeyavn</i>  | <i>uborščitsaesz</i> | <i>pö</i>      | <i>sečöm</i>  | <i>bura</i>      |
|         | PN.INE   | cleaner.PL           | QUOT           | thus          | well             |
|         | <i>džodžšö</i>   | <i>zyrtöny,</i>      | <i>što</i>     | <i>nijö</i>   | <i>boštömas'</i> |
|         | floor.ACC3SG   | polish.PRS.3PL       | COMP           | 3PL           | take.PTCP.PL     |
|         | <i>v</i>   | <i>sbornuju</i>      | <i>komandu</i> | <i>Rossii</i> | <i>po</i>        |
|         | in   | national.ACC         | team.ACC       | Russia.GEN    | on               |
|         | <i>kërlingu.</i>   |                      |                |               |                  |
|         | curling.DAT  |                      |                |               |                  |
|         | ' <u>In Belayevo cleaner-ladies polish the floor so well that they were taken into the Russian national curling team.</u> ' (vk.com/tupi_tap). |                      |                |               |                  |

Similarly to some cases in Udmurt, e.g. in (2.64), it is worth mentioning that the EHF should not be assigned equally to all the cases where the particle marks reported information. In several cases, the marker is used to present proverbs or information that might be accounted as generally accepted and irrefutable. In such cases, there is no need for a speaker to distance oneself from the reported information. Consequently, the EHF remains rather pragmatic than universal for the use of the quotative particle. Consider (2.123) where the reporter presents the proverb marked as reported information.

|         |  |           |                   |                 |
|---------|--|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|
| (2.123) | <i>Kužömlunyd</i>  | <i>pö</i> | <i>ozyrlunys'</i> | <i>burdžyk.</i> |
|         | skill.2SG  | QUOT      | wealth.ELA        | good.COMPAR     |
|         | ' <u>They say the skill is better than wealth.</u> ' (vk.com/komiradio). |           |                   |                 |

Even though similarity in the use of quotative particles can, in general, be observed in both Permic languages, in contrast to Udmurt, in Komi *pö* is not used in other functions in the internet communications besides the above-described. However, the use of *pö* in other evidential contexts and as a discourse particle with hedging function is not excluded. It should be mentioned that on the basis of a brief investigation of the texts in Uotila (1989), a couple of

ambiguous cases can be observed where the quotative particle has a meaning between epistemic hedging and marking of hearsay, as in (2.124).

|         |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|---|---|--|
| (2.124) | <i>sija</i><br>3SG<br><i>pukalö</i><br>sit.PRS.3SG<br><i>juršisö-pö</i><br>hair.ACC3SG-QUOT | <i>munaz</i> [sic!]<br>go.FUT.3SG<br><i>berög</i><br>bank<br><i>synalö.</i><br>comb.PRS.3SG | <i>da</i><br>and<br><i>doras</i><br>on.INE3SG | <i>kot-kö-pö</i><br>who-INDEF-QUOT<br><i>kuž-juršija,</i><br>long-hair.ADJ |
|---------|---|---|---|--|

‘he goes and **as if** somebody with a long hair sits on the bank, **as if** combing his/her hair.’ (Uotila 1989: 290; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In (2.124), the quotative particle is used in the narrative describing the story involving the narrator’s grandfather. From one point of view, the quotative particle can be interpreted as reported evidential, signaling that this story is acquired from the report of an unspecified source. However, when this function is observed in narratives, the use of the quotative particle is usually consistent through the whole narrative (see e.g. narrative 123 in Uotila 1989: 194). Otherwise, its uses are restricted to the presentation of the RD (see e.g. narrative 122 *ibid.*). In the narrative from which (2.124) derives, the use of *pö* can be observed in one sentence in the beginning of the story and in the presentation of the RD only. It seems a bit strange that the quotative particle does not appear in the continuation of the narrative later on. In other texts produced by the same speaker, the use of *pö* is also consistent with the above observation. Therefore, the case described in (2.124) seems to fit the idea that the particle can also be used outside the quotative domain. I assign to it the meaning of discourse particle with the EHF. However, other interpretations are open for discussion in connecting studies taking under investigation the non-quotative use of *pö*. The development of other evidential meanings (besides reported evidential ones) on the basis of the studied text collections was not indicated. Hence, further studies should be conducted on the basis of oral speech to see whether such uses can be more accurately indicated and described.

### 2.6.2.2. *The self-quotative particle miša in Komi*

As has been mentioned above, *miša* (with its dialectal variants *meša*, *myša* and *meša* in Komi-Permyak) appears exclusively in self-quoting contexts. The etymology of the self-quotative particle *miša* is not completely clear. According to Bartens (2000: 321), in previous descriptions on Komi-Permyak the particle *myša* was also used as an interrogative pronoun, and in other dialects of Komi, there is another interrogative pronoun form *myjša*. The connection between the quotative particle and the interrogative pronoun, however, remains unclear. According to my assumption, the most natural explanation for the etymology of the particle is the following: the element *-ša-* is the comparative case marker that is adjusted to the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular pronoun *me – meša*, lit. ‘according to me’.



Parallels between the functions of the self-quotative particles in Udmurt and Komi can be pointed out. In both cases, the reporter's subjectivity is present (Fedjunëva 1998: 550). Fedjunëva (1998) does not provide an explanation for the claim about the subjectivity overtones that the particle bears. However, I assume that the reporter's personal intentions governed by different contextual motivations might influence the choice of the quoted material<sup>82</sup>. As a result, the content of the quoted utterance might differ from the original utterance. In (2.125), the RD framed by *miša* and the SV *šmoñitštyny* 'to joke' is interpreted as an approximate reproduction of the reporter's previous utterance rather than a verbatim self-quotation.

- (2.125) *Šmoñitšti*      *vešig,*      *miša,*      *loktan*      *voö*  
 joke.PST.1SG      even      QUOT:SELF      upcoming      year.ILL  
*diktant*      *böryn*      *kolö*      *övylyš*      *čaj*  
 dictation      after      must.PRS.3SG      together      tea  
*juny.*  
 drink.INF  
 'I even **made a joke**, [that] next year after a dictation [we] should drink tea together.' (tusjuk.blogspot.com).

Besides SVs, *miša* may also co-occur with EVs and NSVs. As has been mentioned above, also contexts in which the reporter presents intended speech are noted. Compare the following examples where in (2.126), the reporter quotes his/her own thoughts, and in (2.127), presents intended speech:

- (2.126) *Čajti,*      *tajö,*      *miša,*      *kučömkö*      *yžyd*      *da*      *važnoj*  
 think.PRS.1SG      DEM      QUOT:SELF      some      big      and      important  
*mort.*  
 person  
 'I **thought**, this is some big and important person.' (tuvsojva.blogspot.com).

- (2.127) *Kösjj*      *sömyñ*      *sodtyñy,*      *miša*      *tom*  
 want.PST.1SG      only      add.INF      QUOT:SELF      young  
*jözysly*      *kolö*      *boštčyny*      *i*      *komi*  
 people.3SG.DAT      must.PRS.3SG      undertake.INF      PTCL      Komi  
*kyv*      *infrastrukturaö...*  
 language      infrastructure.ILL  
 'I **wanted** only to **add** [that] young people must also tackle the infrastructure of the Komi language...' (svaik.blogspot.com).

Representation of the reporter's previous thoughts and the intended discourse is not restricted to the structural co-occurrence of the particle with NSVs and the

<sup>82</sup> As reasonably noted by Stef Spronck in his review, different contextual motivations might have an influence on subjectivity. For example, if the reporter addresses the quote to a speaker who actually witnessed the non-immediate discourse, it is unlikely that subjectivity will be expressed.

particle can be used as a single quote-introducer in non-clausal use. Naturally, in non-clausal use *miša* does not co-occur with NPs indicating the original source of RD. One may logically expect a context where the reporter points to some source containing their own words, e.g. *I sent him a message like “I’m ready”*. However, my observations show that the self-quotative particles in Permic languages do not occur in similar contexts. Taking into consideration the proposed etymology of the particle and its functional restrictions to contexts where the reporter and the source of RD are the same person, such a restriction seems to be quite obvious.

As examples of non-clausal use show, the reduction of a QI-clause by the self-quotative particle blurs the difference between quoting the reporter’s previous utterance (2.128), thought (2.129), or intended discourse (2.130). As was shown above in Udmurt, cf. (2.72)–(2.73), similar instances can also be observed where the marker appears as a single quote-introducer.

(2.128) *Miša,*            *kučöm*        *kanal?*  
 QUOT:SELF    which        channel  
 ‘[I asked how they are, and (s)he: “We were watching you on TV all evening long!” I was surprised... How...] Which channel?’ (tusjuk.blogspot.com).

(2.129) *Miša,*            *no*        *i*            *modnikjas*    *mijan*        *Šolybyn.*  
 QUOT:SELF    but        and        dandy.PL    1PL.GEN    PN.INE  
 ‘[I listened to the story and smiled.] They are dandies in our Sjolyb.’ (tusjuk.blogspot.com).

(2.130) *Miša,*            *kyd’žy*        *šuöny*        *dad’uvsä*            *körjassö?*  
 QUOT:SELF    how        call.PST.3PL    sledge.harness.ADJ    deer.PL.ACC  
 ‘[I have prepared silently a question to the listeners.] How do you call sleigh reindeer?’ (rassykhaev.blogspot.com).

As one can notice, in all the cases presented above any of the previously mentioned readings are possible. It happens mainly due to the fact that the event behind the RD remains neutralized. The marker introducing the RD directs the audience’s attention to the presence of the RD but does not provide any information on the event. Only a careful study of the context can more exactly point out which of the reading, i.e. quotation of speech, thought or hypothetical quotation, is the most accurate. Note also that in all examples presented so far, *miša* appears most often on the border position between a QI-clause and RD (less often in the beginning of a reported discourse, not further than the second position), or in non-clausal use – in correspondence to its initial position. Thus, reporters most likely try to signal right away the presence of RD that belongs to them. Further, it is also shown that such a position is important in contexts where pairs of RDs that belong to different speakers coincide in one text. Thus, the reporter indicates which cue belongs to which speaker.

The possibility of leaving the event behind the RD unspecified in self-quotations sometimes shows the following tendency. The reporter’s thoughts

consisting of emotionally loaded content and strong assertions are sometimes presented *as if* they have been uttered to the addressee, which gives the reporter authority in discourse situations, such as complaints (see Haakana 2006: 153ff. on Finnish complaint stories), morally contentious discussions, etc. Therefore, the choice to leave the event behind the RD unspecified can also be used as a dedicated discourse strategy enforcing the reporter’s authority status in the (re)presented situation containing RD. Consider (2.131) where *miša* frames the reporter’s complaint that can be interpreted as if it was uttered. However, the context also hints that the intended addressees (‘road worker’) are out of the reporter’s reach and he only silently resents the whole situation of closing the road for renovation.

|         |                     |                  |                      |               |
|---------|---------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| (2.131) | <i>Murtsa</i>       | <i>tuj</i>       | <i>vöčýsydly</i>     | <i>panyd</i>  |
|         | barely              | road             | worker.2SG.DAT       | towards       |
|         | <i>mašynajs</i>     | <i>eg</i>        | <i>pet:</i>          | <i>kučöm,</i> |
|         | car.ELA             | NEG.PST.1SG      | come.out.CN          | which         |
|         | <b><i>miša,</i></b> | „remontom“,      | <i>kol’om</i>        | <i>vo</i>     |
|         | QUOT:SELF           | renovation.INSTR | last                 | year          |
|         | <i>na</i>           | <i>tani</i>      | <i>d’žontašinnyd</i> | <i>da?!</i>   |
|         | already             | here             | renovate.PST.2PL     | yes           |

‘[Today in the morning while going to work, a writing on the post blocked the road: “The road is blocked because of the major renovation...”] I did not get out of the car towards the road worker: which renovation, I intended to say, last year you’ve already renovated here [the road], didn’t you?! [And then I looked around better and calmed down: everywhere there are holes, in such place one would not dare to drive – you will remain without wheels and suspension.]’ (vk.com/club42898809).

Finally, one more similarity between the use of self-quotative particles in Komi and Udmurt may be pointed out. Namely, both the quotative and self-quotative particle may appear inside one text marking the cues that belong to a reporter (*miša*) and some other speaker (*pö*). The reduction of the QI to a single element helps to create a dramatic effect of a reproduced dialogue. However, as it was already pointed out in the previous examples, a QI reduced to a single element creates more possibilities for different readings – from quoting someone’s previous speech to the intended discourse. Hence, in (2.132), the reporter’s reply may naturally acquire such readings, and only out of context the most appropriate interpretation can be retrieved.

|         |                           |                     |           |                  |                 |
|---------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|
| (2.132) | <i>riňöbtöny</i>          | <i>zonjas.</i>      | <i>Mi</i> | <b><i>pö</i></b> | <i>Kol’alön</i> |
|         | ring.out.PRS.3PL          | boy.PL              | 1PL       | QUOT             | PN.GEN          |
|         | <i>ötuvolaninas (...)</i> | <b><i>Miša,</i></b> | <i>no</i> | <i>me</i>        | <i>tijanšaň</i> |
|         | dormitory.INE3SG          | QUOT:SELF           | but       | 1SG              | 2PL.EGR         |
|         | <i>matyn</i>              | <i>ňin.</i>         |           |                  |                 |
|         | close.INE                 | already             |           |                  |                 |

‘The boys called me. We are in Kolya’s dorm (...) **I said/thought/intended to say, but I am already close to you.**’ (tusjuk.blogspot.com).

Note that in addition to event-neutralized QIs where *miša* appears as a single quote-introducer, one can observe it introducing different types of RD also as part of a more complex QI, as in (2.126) with the self-quotation of thought and (2.127) with the hypothetical self-quotation. Similar types of RD are also introduced by the Udmurt self-quotative particle *pöj*, discussed in 2.5.2.1.2. Small-scale cross-linguistic similarities between the self-quotative particles in Permic languages hint at the conclusion that self-quotations introduced by such markers are prone to containing different types of RD without any restriction, compared to the quotative particles that are systematically used only with factive quotes of speech and thought, as illustrated in the previous subsections on Udm. *pe* and Ko. *pö*. Furthermore, one can expect that reporters quote their thoughts and intended discourse more systematically than thoughts or hypothetical quotations belonging to other speakers, which, in turn, would require specific contextual motivations or, at least, availability of the other speakers' thoughts, otherwise not (always) necessary with self-quotations. For example, the reporter's own thoughts are typically available to him/her without being verbalized or shared with other speakers. However, this point requires further research and shall be separately addressed in further connecting studies.

### 2.6.3. Deictics as parts of quotative index clauses in Komi

Also in Komi QI-clauses, deictic elements appear as auxiliary elements co-occurring with SEVs. In the collected internet communication material, this strategy is not numerous, counting only a few examples. These consist mainly of co-occurrences of speech (2.133) and epistemic verbs (2.134) with the MD *tadž(i)* 'so, this way'<sup>83</sup>. Here, in contrast to Udmurt MDs, the Komi MD *tadž(i)* is used as both an anaphoric (2.133) and a cataphoric (2.134) marker. Notably, the distal counterpart *sidž* 'thus, that way' is not observed in Komi quotative constructions in my material. Furthermore, as my findings from Udmurt show, one could expect that the cataphoric use of the proximal MD is more natural for this marker among Permic languages. Hence, one can also suspect that in contemporary Komi, the proximal MD has superseded the distal counterpart or at least that the proximal MD has developed additional functions and is used as both a cataphoric and an anaphoric marker.

---

<sup>83</sup> According to the Komi-Russian dictionary, the variant of the same MD (<http://dict.fu-lab.ru/index.php/index/4.xhtml>, May 1, 2017; the Web version originates from Beznosikova *et al.* 2000).

- (2.133) “Nevažno v kakom krutom  
 unimportant.ADV in which.PREP cool.PREP  
 vuze ty učiš’sja, važno  
 university.PREP 2SG study.PRS.2SG important.ADV  
 sumet’ sebja realizovat’” *11-öd*  
 manage.INF self.ACC fulfill.INF 11-ORD  
*klassyn velöd’igön tad’zi menym*  
 class.INE study.CV.INSTR so 1SG.DAT  
*vištalis gimnazijasa radejtana velödyšjasý*  
 tell.PST.3SG gymnasium.ADJ favorite teacher.PL.ELA  
*öt’i Alla A’leksandrovna Taskajeva.*  
 one PN PN PN  
 “‘It isn’t important what kind of cool university you are studying in, it is important to manage to fulfill yourself’ so told me when I learned in 11<sup>th</sup> class one of the gymnasium’s favorite teachers one Alla Aleksandrovna Taskajeva.’ (tusjuk.blogspot.com).”

- (2.134) *Kydž i undžyk jözys, mövpyšti*  
 how and more people.3SG think.PST.1SG  
*tad’ž: “Metög na udžalyšjas šuröny,*  
 so 1SG.ABE PTCL worker.PL get.found.PRS.3PL  
*a men nekor tajö vöčny...”*  
 and 1SG.DAT never DEM do.INF  
 ‘Like most of the people, **I thought so**: “the workers will be found without me, I don’t have time to deal with this...”’ (tuvsovja.blogspot.com).”

A look at available text collections (Uotila 1985, 1989) and the Komi corpus from outside the new media genre shows different results. Uotila’s (1985) Komi-Permyak materials contain only examples with the distal MD *sid’ž*, both inside and outside the quotative domain, while the proximal MD *tad’ž(i)* does not appear at all. The distal MD is used in quotative constructions as a cataphoric marker only, cf. (2.135). In Komi-Zyrian dialects (Uotila 1989), the distal MD is used more frequently than the proximal one. Outside the quotative domain, distal *sid’ž* is used predominantly as an anaphoric marker, referring to previously described events. The proximal MD *tad’ž(i)* is also used mostly anaphorically and only once appears as a cataphoric marker outside the quotative domain. These findings, however, do not tell much about the use of the markers inside the quotative constructions.

- (2.135) Komi-Permyak  
*a sar’ vištalis sid’ž: “on-kö*  
 and tzar tell.PST.3SG thus NEG.2SG-PTCL:COND  
*ad’džy čuňkyčlö, me tenö vija”*  
 see.CN ring.DAT 1SG 2SG.ACC kill.PRS.1SG  
 ‘and the **tzar said thus**: “if you don’t find the ring, I will kill you”.’ (Uotila 1985: 40; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

The digital corpus shows that both MDs are used in quotative constructions with a preference to the use of the distal MD *sid'ž*, as in the Komi-Permyak example above and in contrast to (2.133) and (2.134) from my corpus. In the Komi corpus, both MDs are used either anaphorically following the quote (2.136a, b), or cataphorically preceding it (2.137a, b). The distal MD *sid'ž* is used more frequently in cataphoric QI-clauses, as in (2.137a), and only in two examples out of 30 instances of RD accounting for the collocation of the SV *šuyny* 'say' with the MD *sid'ž* in the corpus is the MD used in an anaphoric function, as in (2.136a). In contrast to this, the proximal MD *tad'ž(i)* is used more in anaphoric QI-clauses, as in (2.136b). However, as far as the choice of the MD is concerned, one can hardly make any generalizations on the use of the markers in this corpus, since both markers are still used in similar contexts with similar referential functions.

Anaphoric

(2.136a) *A*            *menym*            *kolö*            *koršny*            *arlyda*  
 but            1SG.DAT            must.PRS.3SG<sup>~</sup>            find.INF            in.years.ADJ  
*ñin*            *mortös* –            *sid'ž*            *dumajtis*            *Ñikolaj...*  
 already    person.ACC1SG    thus            think.PST.3SG PN  
 ‘But I have to find an elderly person already, – **thus thought Nikolay...**’  
 (Komi corpus).

(2.136b) “*Bur*                            *olömsö*            *oškyšta,*            *l'ok*            *olömsö*  
 good                            life.ACC3SG            praise.PRS.1SG            bad            life.ACC3SG  
*vuštyšta*”, –            *tad'ži*            *šuö*            *poet*  
 wipe.away.PRS.1SG    so            say.PRS.3SG            poet  
 ““Good life I praise, bad life I wipe away”, – **so said the poet**’ (Komi corpus).

Cataphoric

(2.137a) ...a            to            i            *sid'ž*            *šuöny:*            *byř'ökö*  
 but            DEM.D            and            thus            say.PRS.3PL            as.if  
*seni*            *sijö*            *götyr*            *pyd'd'i*            *olö*  
 there            3SG            wife            instead            live.PRS.3SG  
 ‘**They say even thus:** as if she lives there instead of the wife’ (Komi corpus).

(2.137b) *Tajö*                            *sijö*            *tad'ži*            *šuö:*            “*Nyvka,*            *a*  
 DEM.P                            3SG            so            say.PRS.3SG            girl            but  
*komandovajtö!*”  
 give.orders.PRS.3SG  
 ‘**He said this so:** “A girl, but she gives orders!”’ (Komi corpus).

So far I could conclude that the use of MDs is accidental and depends on the preference of the concrete speaker rather than it following a principled system of distribution as in Udmurt (see 2.5.4). This hypothesis, however, should be tested on the basis of a wider corpus material, possibly depicting also the context in which the examples appear, which, unfortunately, is not available in the Komi corpus. Thus, one cannot make robust conclusions about additional functions of MDs in the quotative domain, e.g. the expression of epistemic support, approximate/exact reproduction of the quote, etc.

Furthermore, besides the MD *tadž(i)*, in my material also the type deictic *tačõm* ‘such’ is noted co-occurring with a noun phrase in a QI-clause, cf. (2.138). Note that direct RD is present in this example. By using the type deictic before the NP indicating the original source of RD, the reporter quite possibly aims at pointing that the RD is presented as the (nearly) verbatim quotation of the motto. However, based on rare examples one can hardly make robust conclusions about its use in quotative constructions, and further investigations are necessary.

(2.138) “*Jurkaryn bara na töv*” – *tačõm*  
capital.INE again PTCL winter such  
*šurõs ulyn d’ekabr das kykõdõ*  
motto under.INE December ten two.ORD  
*munis “Okťabr” ñima kino petkõdlan*  
go.PST.3SG October name.ADJ movie demonstrate.PTCP  
*da šojćcan šörinyñ karsa KVN*  
and rest.PTCP center.INE city.ADJ KVN<sup>84</sup>  
“‘In the capital there is winter again’ – under such a motto went on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December the city KVN that was happening in the cinema “Oktyabr” in the exhibition and entertaining center.’ (vk.com/komiradio).

#### 2.6.4. Quotative indexes in Komi: summary

The use of different quotative markers is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Quotative markers in Komi

| Markers                  | QI-clauses with SVs | QI-clauses with EVs | QI-clauses with NSVs | QI-clauses with elliptic verbs | QI-clauses with NPs | Single QI |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| I. Complementizers       |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| Komi-Zyrian: <i>myj</i>  | +                   | +                   | –                    | –                              | +                   | –         |
| Komi-Permyak: <i>čto</i> | +                   | +                   | –                    | –                              | –/?                 | –         |
| II. Quotative particles  |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>põ</i>                | +                   | +                   | +                    | –                              | +                   | +         |
| <i>miša</i>              | +                   | +                   | +                    | –                              | –                   | +         |
| III. Demonstratives      |                     |                     |                      |                                |                     |           |
| <i>tadži</i>             | +                   | +                   | +                    | –                              | –                   | –         |
| <i>tačõm</i>             | –                   | –                   | –                    | –                              | +                   | –         |

<sup>84</sup> Club of funny and inventive people (Rus. Klub Vesëlyx i Naxodčivyx, abbr. KVN)

In colloquial written Komi, unlike in colloquial written Udmurt, quotative strategies are less numerous and less diverse. Furthermore, recent Russian influence on quotative strategies is not noted<sup>85</sup>. The lack of Russian influence and the smaller diversity in the quotative strategies is mainly explained by two factors. First, despite the fact that the material was picked up in accordance with the previously collected Udmurt corpus and attention was mainly paid to sources depicting colloquial speech in written form, the language use in the Internet is characterized by an attempt of the speakers to stick to a purer language variant, avoiding replications from Russian without pragmatic or contextual motivations (in more details discussed in Section 2.3). Second, the sociological features of Komi speakers sometimes differ from Udmurt (where a larger sociological diversity of speakers was noted) since the majority of the active speakers use Komi for professional purposes, or manage to maintain active language use on a daily basis. Consequently, these factors might also influence the choice of the strategies in quotations. Among the encountered strategies the most common are the uses of SEVs with epistemically neutral complementizers (*myj* in Komi-Zyrian and *čto* in Komi-Permyak) and quotative particles (*pö* and *miša*). Additionally, the use of deictic elements in QI-clauses was also observed.

A difference in the choice of complementizers is noted in the two literary standards. In Komi-Zyrian, the calque *myj* of the Russian complementizer *čto* is encountered. In QI-clauses, both complementizers typically co-occur with SEVs that have the potential to mark the presence of RD. Naturally, the complementizer is placed on the border position between a QI-clause and RD. In addition, the complementizer *myj* might also be found with NPs indicating the original source of RD – this strategy was not encountered in the collected material, but illustrated on the basis of an example from press. A similar co-occurrence of the complementizer *čto* is encountered neither in the collected material nor in other text collections; however, such a possibility is not excluded since in Russian the collocation of *čto* with NPs is possible. The use of epistemic complementizer *byt'čö*, mentioned in previous studies (e.g. in Klumpp 2016), is not noted in written colloquial Komi in such a function.

Quotative particles are observed in various structural complexities. Unlike in Udmurt, in Komi already on the level of the literary standard, the quotative particle and the self-quotative particle are differentiated. The quotative particle *pö* is used to mark the presence of RD that belongs to a source of consciousness different from the current reporter. In the self-quoting instances, the self-quotative particle *miša* is used. The quotative particle *pö* is used both as a quotative and a reported evidential marker. As a quotative marker, it co-occurs with different speech and non-speech verbs and with NPs indicating the original source of RD. In non-clausal use, *pö* appears as a single quote-introducer. In both cases, the quotative particle may mark the presence of different types of RD – quotations

---

<sup>85</sup> The new media subcorpus of Komi-Zyrian that has recently become available online (<http://komi-zyrian.web-corpora.net>, October 1, 2019) confirms the current findings.



of someone's previous utterance(s) and thought(s). With hypothetical quotation(s), *pö* is used quite rarely, since mainly it is functionally restricted to quotations of discourse that has previously taken place. Hypothetical quotations as entirely fictional material can only be introduced by the particle in a specific setting. In the case of quoting previous utterances or thoughts, the quotative particle expresses the reporter's subjectivity (cf. Fedjunëva 1998). It is also interesting that the quotative particle does not appear in contexts where verbatim quotations are present – a feature noted in the use of *pe* in Udmurt.

The self-quotative particle *miša* appears in RD-constructions together with speech and non-speech verbs. In non-clausal use, it appears as a single quote-introducer only. Functionally its use is restricted to instances where the source of RD and the reporter are the same person. In clausal use, *miša* is typically placed on the border position between a QI-clause and RD and more rarely on the second position inside RD. In non-clausal use, the reporter usually starts the RD by marking it with *miša*. Thus, the reporter right away indicates to the audience that self-quoted material will follow. Similarly to *pö*, *miša* may mark different types of RD: quotations of one's own previous utterances, thoughts or intended discourses. In non-clausal use, the difference between different types of RD is usually neutralized. Thus, the reporter can mark both own previous utterances, thoughts or intended discourse. In some cases, it is possible to understand from the context what type of RD appears, although structurally, all the above-mentioned cases look identically.

Finally, the use of deictic elements is also noted in Komi quotative constructions. Deictics appear mainly as auxiliary elements in QI-clauses co-occurring with speech or non-speech verbs. On the basis of the collected material, it might be briefly concluded that such a strategy is not frequent in internet communications. Most typically, it is realized in the appearance of the MD *tadž(i)* 'thus' with speech and epistemic verbs. Furthermore, the type deictic *tačöm* 'such, so' co-occurs with NPs to mark the presence of RD.

To conclude, one can see that the quotative strategies in Komi internet communications are carried out mainly by means of autochthonous markers. Additional connotations appearing with some types of quotations are expressed mainly by the quotative particles. The complementizer strategy depicts a more or less neutral reproduction of someone's previous utterance(s) or thought(s). If the requirement arises to mark RD with additional connotations, reporters turn to the use of quotative particles. Recent influence of Russian is not noted in contemporary quotative strategies. Thus, only complementizers are more or less frequent components that appear in quotative strategies and were previously replicated from Russian.

## 2.7. Quotative indexes in Permic: summary

In contemporary Permic languages, the choice of quotative markers and the strategies in which these markers appear are quite diverse. They involve structures of various complexity. In Udmurt, the variation is expanded also through matter and pattern replications from Russian. In the quotative strategies of colloquial written speech in Komi, recent Russian influence is not observed and the use of autochthonous strategies is preferred. This is an interesting finding since Komi has been under Russian influence for centuries, whereas Udmurt has been exposed to extensive contact with Russian only during the last century. As reasons for such differences in quotative strategies between the languages, it is suggested that in written form, the speakers of Komi tend to maintain the language use with a minimum amount of Russian influence which, of course, can turn out differently in oral speech. Furthermore, the use of the Udmurt mixed code (Udm. *suro požo*) is usually associated with the urban Udmurt youth who tend to maintain the language vital, and pay less attention to language purism, especially in internet communications (cf. Pischlöger 2014b; Pischlöger 2016). As a result, Udmurt speakers tend to use both autochthonous and Russian quotatives parallel to each other, although either structural or functional differences can still be observed between autochthonous and replicated markers.

Similarities in the strategies in Permic languages are mainly observed in the use of autochthonous quotative particles and complementizer strategy where Russian (or influenced by Russian, e.g. *myj* in Komi-Zyrian) complementizers appear. Furthermore, both languages tend to use deictic markers as auxiliary elements inside QI-clauses with SEVs as core elements.

As for the quotative particles, in both languages two different markers are used. One particle (Udm. *pe*, Ko. *pö*) is used to mark RD that belongs to the source of consciousness different from the current reporter. Another particle (Udm. *pöj* (*pi*), Ko. *miša* (*meša*, *myša*)) is used to mark RD that belongs to the reporter him-/herself. In Udmurt, the use of the self-quotative particle is observed only on the level of colloquial language since the marker is dialectal and does not appear in the literary standard. In Komi, these functions are carried out by two different quotative particles already on the level of the literary standard.

Structurally, both markers appear in homomorphic constructions co-occurring either with different types of predicates and NPs indicating the original source of RD (the latter is not noted with the self-quotative particles), or appear in non-clausal use as single quote-introducers. A difference in additional connotations can be observed in the use of quotative particles between the languages. In Udmurt, the quotative particle *pe* primarily indicates the difference between the quoted and the original discourse. The former is presented as an approximate reproduction of the latter. In addition, *pe* may appear in contexts (i) where the reporter expresses doubt about the content of a quote (partial support) and (ii) where the reporter doubts the information presented as a quote, although accepts it as epistemically possible (between neutral and partial support). Also,

the quotative particle *pe* in Udmurt is used in contexts where a verbatim quotation is present. In Komi, the correspondent marker *pö* typically marks the quote as approximately reproduced. Where a hypothetical quotation is present, the reporter indicates a general possibility for the occurrence of a quote in described circumstances. The latter use in Komi, however, remains rather pragmatic in what appears as one of the functions of the quotative particle *pö*. With verbatim quotations, the Komi quotative particle is not noted. As far as the use of self-quotative particles is concerned, structural and functional accordance is observed. Both markers tend to express the reporter's subjectivity since the choice of the quoted information and its quality depend exclusively on the reporter him-/herself.

In the use of complementizers, similarity is observed between the strategies where the complementizer *čto* from Russian (or its calque) appears both in Komi and Udmurt. In such cases, matter and/or pattern replication can be observed: the complementizer is replicated from Russian (and appearing as either a direct loan or a calque) and appears in homomorphic constructions as in Russian.

While in Komi one can observe the use of only a calque or direct loan from Russian in the role of a complementizer, in Udmurt, besides the Russian complementizer, the use of the autochthonous clause-final complementizer *šuyša* can also be observed. This marker is also interesting for this study since besides its role as a complementizer, it can appear as a converb of the SV *šuyny* 'say'. When *šuyša* co-occurs with SEVs, it is used as a complementizer; in cases where the marker appears with proper NSVs, it is used as a converb. Thus, according to the terminology presented in Güldemann (2008), *šuyša* is labeled here as a 'quotative/complementizer'.

Besides the use of the autochthonous and borrowed complementizers, both markers may appear in Udmurt simultaneously – *čto* marks the beginning of a quote and *šuyša* fulfills a closing function, or it is placed at the end of parts of a multi-part complement clause. This strategy appears in the language due to Russian unidirectional influence on Udmurt basic word order, which in time changes from SOV to SVO. The use of this strategy and the complementizer *čto* in Udmurt is nowadays considered grammatical by Udmurt speakers, and the choice of the complementizer(s) depends largely on the type of the predicate in the QI (cf. Tánčzos 2013).

Furthermore, in both languages MDs appear as auxiliary elements co-occurring in QI-clauses with speech or non-speech verbs that can mark the presence of RD. In Udmurt, the use of MDs is primarily motivated by the referential meaning these markers express: the proximal MD is predominantly used cataphorically, while the distal MD fulfills anaphoric function. In Komi, a similar system was either not established, or the MDs have undergone some changes and are used unsystematically in quotative constructions nowadays, since both of them can be used in a similar context and fulfill similar referential functions.

The use of the SIM *kad'* was observed in the quotative domain in Udmurt, although a corresponding marker is not noticed in Komi internet communications. I assume that the reason for such a lack is the attempt to use the autochthonous markers instead, e.g. the quotative particle *pö* and the self-quotative particle *miša*, which, in principle, can carry out similar functions in the quotative domain, i.e. present the quote as approximately reproduced.

In Udmurt, the SIM appears with two different types of RD which can be characterized as (i) quotations of speech/thought and (ii) hypothetical quotations. Presenting quotations of speech/thought, the marker indicates that the quote is reproduced approximately. The reporter may also express doubt in the content of the quote (partial support). While it appears in constructions with hypothetical quotations, the quote is presented as typical to a person, situation, or described context. In both cases, the marker functions as an auxiliary element, where main quote-introducing functions are carried out by means of SEVs.

As for the Russian influence in Udmurt, it can be observed in three different strategies. One of them involves the use of the epistemic complementizer *budto* 'as if, like'. The complementizer, besides appearing in homomorphic constructions as in Russian, expresses the same function as in the matrix language, marking the quote as produced approximately or as hypothetical. Furthermore, besides autochthonous quotative particles, the use of the quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'*, replicated from Russian, can be also observed in Udmurt. In the use of *deskat'*, only partial correspondence is noted with the matrix language – the marker presents a hypothetical quotation. In cases with *mol*, both structural and functional correspondence with the matrix language is observed.

Finally, the NQ *tipa* is also used in Udmurt. Similarly to the previously described cases, correspondence with the uses in Russian can be noted. The only strategy in which the above-described quotative particles do not appear, is a QI-clause with an elliptic predicate. Only once such a strategy was attested in the use of *tipa*. However, at the current stage I suggest considering it marginal since it does not appear in the use of other markers and in such form appeared in the collected material only once in one idiolect. Despite the fact that verbless QI-clauses are possible in the language, it seems that this structure has not yet gained its distribution among the speakers of Udmurt, at least in colloquial written speech.

### 3. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN HUNGARIAN

#### 3.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Hungarian

Research on Hungarian RD-constructions has already started in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. One of the pioneers to describe the peculiarities of Hungarian indirect speech constructions was Klemm (1938). In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, several studies appeared concentrating on different aspects of RD. For example, Sipka (1966) described the forms of RD in a novel by László Németh. Murvai (1976) focused on the stylistic effects of free indirect RD in literary texts. Dömötör (1983) studied the relation between direct quotations and proposition units of reporting in Hungarian. She provides a brief description of quotative constructions, introducing direct RD and the functions of the latter in the discourse on the basis of written literary texts. In her following studies, Dömötör also concentrated on RD-constructions in Hungarian from a diachronic perspective, mainly investigating the development of quotative constructions in texts from Old Hungarian (Dömötör 2001) and the first decades of Middle Hungarian (Dömötör 1985, 1988a, 1988b). Among her later research, one can also find studies on the quotative particles *úgymond* ‘so to say/speak’ (Dömötör 2008, 2015) and *mondván* ‘saying’ (Dömötör 2015). Although the author touches upon the quotative functions of these markers, her research mainly concentrates on the use of these elements (i) inside the quotative domain from a diachronic perspective, and (ii) outside the quotative domain of contemporary Hungarian as pragmatic and discourse markers with various functions from a synchronic perspective.

Following the research by Dömötör (1983, 1985), in the mid-1980’s Kiefer (1986) and Fónagy (1986) also provided some insights into Hungarian RD-constructions. Both authors concentrated on RD-constructions with different types of speech and non-speech verbs. Fónagy (1986) briefly touched upon the strategies that may involve the quotative particle *a(s)zongya* (ibid.: 259) and *úgymond* (ibid.: 262), constructions with elliptic predicates (ibid.: 278ff.), and the use of hypothetical and partial quotes in Hungarian literature (ibid.: 279ff.). Kiefer (1986), in turn, focused on the use of speech and non-speech verbs and the expressions of epistemic support and factivity in RD-constructions. His relatively recent study (Kiefer 2015) continued research in this direction, investigating the use of direct and indirect quotes and their correlation with expression of epistemic stance. However, concerning this study, there are several issues with the definitions of RD that Kiefer uses and some considerations that might require a revision. Namely, Kiefer (2015: 77–78) equates *direct speech* (alias direct RD) with *citations* (alias verbatim quotations), neglecting the fact that direct RD is only one form of presentation of RD, which has little to do in its realization with verbatim quotations, or in other words – citations (on the realization of verbatim quotes in oral speech see e.g. Clark & Gerrig 1990: 796ff.). Hence, citations as verbatim representations of RD indeed belong to the broader category of direct RD, but not all presentations of direct RD are citations (see e.g. Coulmas 1986: 6ff.). Consequently, there is

reason to revise Kiefer’s (2015) findings and make some alternative suggestions, which is attempted in the following sections of this chapter.

Hungarian descriptive grammars also mention the constructions involving quotations (Szabó 1958: 367–369, Bencédy *et al.* 1976: 376–379). In the Syntax volume of the Structural Hungarian Grammar (Strukturális Magyar Nyelvtan. I. Mondattan, henceforth: SMN 1992: ch. 4–6), there are some sections dedicated to the syntactic features of constructions with the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’, which somewhat also cover RD-constructions with SEVs and their peculiarities in Hungarian.

In the English edition of the Hungarian grammar (Kenesei *et al.* 1998: 1, 30–32), direct and indirect RD-constructions are briefly described. Furthermore, the authors mention the use of the quotative particle *úgymond*, cf. (3.1), stating that its use in contemporary Hungarian can be considered “somewhat archaic” (Kenesei *et al.* 1998: 1). Surprisingly, the authors mention that “except (...) *úgymond* ‘thus speaks’, there is no marker of quoted statements”, which, as I show further, contradicts the findings of this chapter, since the authors meant to restrict themselves to the literary standard. But also this argument can be revised, since the quotative particle *mondván* ‘saying’ (see 3.4.3) and the quasi-quotative reported evidential marker *állítólag* ‘allegedly, reportedly’ (see 3.4.5) *inter alia* can easily fall under the category of “marker of the quoted statement”, despite the only quasi-quotative status of the latter that I describe further in 3.4.5.

- (3.1) *Péter, úgymond, beteg volt.*  
 PN QUOT sick be.PST.3SG  
 ‘It is said that Peter was sick.’ (Kenesei *et al.* 1998: 1; glossing is mine, DT).

In the most recent Hungarian Grammar *Magyar Grammatika* (Keszler 2000: 487–93), different types of RD-constructions are described, covering direct, indirect and free indirect RD-constructions from the standpoint of syntax. Gärtner & Gyuris (2014) discuss quotative inversions in Hungarian RD-constructions. Like Keszler (2000), the authors focus on RD-constructions from the syntactic perspective, investigating the optionality and the possibility of different positions of QI-clauses in RD-constructions.

Despite the evidence that the notion of *reported discourse*, in general, and *quotative indexes*, in particular, are not unheard of in linguistic studies on Hungarian, the descriptions available in grammars and previous research by various scholars hardly describe strategies that appear in contemporary colloquial Hungarian, nor fully specify the role and functional capacities of quotative particles and other means of presenting quotes (e.g. NQ strategies). Consequently, the primary aim of this chapter is to cover strategies that were neglected in previous studies. Furthermore, as mentioned above, a couple of findings should be revised and possibly reconsidered. Thus, the general aims of this chapter are also obtained by providing a systematic synchronic description of quotative strategies in contemporary Hungarian.

The current chapter has the following structure. First, the complementizer strategies that appear in the Hungarian quotative domain are covered in Section 3.2. After that, the use of MDs in relatively similar QI-clauses is described in Section 3.3. Further, the quotative markers deriving from SVs are illustrated (Section 3.4), followed by the depiction of turn-taking quotative strategies and those that involve the endophoric demonstrative and NPs in the comitative case (Sections 3.5 and 3.6, respectively). Finally, in the last Section 3.7, the peculiarities of Hungarian quotative strategies are summarized.

### 3.2. The complementizer strategy in Hungarian

It is of no surprise that the complementizer strategy, primarily involving SVs and the basic complementizer *hogy* ‘that’, cf. (3.2)–(3.3), is frequently depicted in Hungarian descriptive grammars as the basic and most thoroughly described quotative strategy in the language (Kenesei *et al.* 1998: 1, 30–33; Keszler 2000: 487ff.). I hardly provide any new insights into the complementizer strategy. Instead, I summarize previous descriptions from various sources, nonetheless, based on examples of the complementizer strategies encountered in contemporary colloquial Hungarian. In addition, some alternative suggestions are proposed to the conclusions drawn in previous studies.

According to Juhász (1992: 477, quoted from Dömötör 2001: 337), the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ “has developed in the middle of the Ancient Hungarian era”. Complex sentences involving both forms of direct and indirect RD have also emerged in the same period (Dömötör 2001: 337). Similarly to all the attested world’s languages with both types of RD, direct RD is known to be prior to indirect forms that emerged later on. According to Dömötör (2001: 337–338), beginning from Late Old Hungarian, both types of RD can already be equally encountered.

(3.2) *Soha senki nem mondta hogy “fiam ez  
never nobody NEG say.PST.3SG:DEF COMP son.1SG DEM.P  
ferfi munka...”  
man job*

‘**Nobody has ever said (that)** “My son, this is man’s job...”’ (MNSz).

(3.3) *Egy tévés vitaműsor végén azt  
INDEF TV talk.show end.3SG.SUPE DEM.D.ACC  
mondta hogy V betűt mutatott  
say.PST.3SG:DEF COMP V letter.ACC show.PST.3SG*

‘At the end of a TV talk show **(s)he said that (s)he had shown the V letter**’ (MNSz).

Despite the relative similarity of the complementizer strategy in Hungarian with comparable strategies encountered in other European languages, there are some peculiarities that should be pointed out. As it can be seen in (3.2)–(3.3), in Hungarian already on the level of the literary standard, the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ can be attached to constructions with both direct (3.2) and indirect (3.3) RD

(Kiefer 1986: 201–202). The position of the complementizer is fixed, and it is placed in the leftmost position of the RD (Körtvély 2016: 589). Furthermore, the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ can appear with declarative, interrogative or imperative clauses (Kiefer 2015: 80). In this respect, Hungarian contrasts with Finnish, as discussed in 4.5.1, where a complementizer in similar constructions is accepted only in colloquial speech. Furthermore, in Hungarian, the SV is usually preceded by the endophoric demonstrative which functions as a definite object of the SEV, which, in turn, explains the definite conjugation of the latter (e.g. *azt mondja* ‘says this’). In (3.2), the endophoric demonstrative is elliptic and it can be only visible from the definite conjugation of the SV. The use of the endophoric pronoun can be associated with the fact that usually predicates that are used to present quotes become highly transitive and require the presence of the object. Even originally intransitive verbs like *sohajt* ‘sigh’ can be used in the quotative constructions as transitive – ‘sigh (it)’, as in (3.4) (see e.g. Dömötör 1983: 475–476 and Fónagy 1986: 264–267 on the different classes of NSVs that can be used in quotative constructions of Hungarian).

(3.4)

|             |                        |                    |             |                |
|-------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <i>Meg</i>  | <i>mutadtam</i> [sic!] | <i>austinnak</i>   | <i>is,</i>  | <i>ő</i>       |
| PRE:PRF     | show.PST.1SG           | PN.DAT             | also        | 3SG            |
| <i>csak</i> | <i>rá</i>              | <i>sohajtotta,</i> | <i>hogy</i> | <i>szarjak</i> |
| only        | SUBL.3SG               | sigh.PST.3SG:DEF   | COMP        | shit.IMP1SG    |
| <i>rá,</i>  | <i>így</i>             | <i>azt</i>         | <i>is</i>   | <i>tettem</i>  |
| SUBL.3SG    | so                     | DEM.D.ACC          | also        | do.PST.1SG     |

‘And I showed it also to Austin, **he just sighed upon it that don’t give a shit** [lit. I should shit upon it], so this is what I did’ (4resz.blogspot.hu).

Fónagy (1986: 273) suggests that the use of initially intransitive NSVs without functional capacity of marking RD in the quotative domain might have originated from constructions where an SV accompanied such a verb, e.g., *sohajtott és mondta* ‘sighed and said (it)’. Later on, the SV remained elliptic, which influenced the transitivity of the originally intransitive verb. As a result, the use of different NSVs became possible in the quotative constructions<sup>86</sup>. Also, the most frequently used SV *mond* ‘say’ might have been intransitive in the Early Old and Late Old Hungarian periods, lit. meaning ‘begin to speak, talk’ (Dömötör 2001: 355). Traces of intransitivity of this predicate can be observed in the quotative particle *úgymond* which became fossilized from the collocation of the MD *úgy* ‘thus, that way’ and the SV *mond* ‘say’. As this collocation shows, the SV was used with indefinite conjugation and only later on it displays use with definite conjugation (see 3.4.4 on the use of *úgymond* in contemporary Hungarian).

<sup>86</sup> Klaudy (1986) has compared the use of verbs in quotative constructions in various novels of Russian and Hungarian authors. Her findings show that Hungarian authors tend to use a wider arsenal of speech and non-speech verbs for marking direct quotes, compared to their Russian counterparts. Also translations of Russian novels into Hungarian show greater variety in the choice of verbs denoting speech acts, in contrast to the Russian originals.



In addition to the distal demonstrative *az-t* ‘DEM.D-ACC’, cf. (3.3), the proximal demonstrative *ez-t* ‘DEM.P-ACC’ can be used. Despite the fact that both demonstratives appear in quotative constructions more or less equally frequently in the period of Late Old Hungarian, used relatively unsystematically with both types of RD (direct and indirect) (Dömötör 2001: 364), in contemporary Hungarian, a more systematic distribution of these markers in the quotative domain has developed.

A primary difference in the distribution of *ezt* and *azt* concerns the type of RD that they can introduce. The proximal demonstrative *ez* ‘this’ is restricted to the presentation of direct reports only (Kiefer 1986: 201), cf. (3.5). It can occasionally appear with indirect RD; however, such a use can be considered rather marginal and arguably accidental. According to Kiefer (2015: 78), besides its referential function, the proximal demonstrative *ez* ‘this’ has also a foregrounding function – “it emphasizes the verbatim rendering of the original utterance”. However, as I mentioned in Section 3.1, there is reason to be careful with Kiefer’s claims about verbatim rendering and direct quotes, as he tends to equate verbatim quotes with direct RDs. Consequently, there is reason to revise his statement about the verbatim rendering. Consider (3.5)–(3.7) where *ez* is used co-occurring with the basic SV *mond* ‘say’ for the presentation of direct RD.

|       |                |                      |                      |                  |              |
|-------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| (3.5) | <i>Darwin</i>  | <i>ezt</i>           | <i>mondta</i>        | <i>(sajnos</i>   | <i>szó</i>   |
|       | PN             | DEM.P.ACC            | say.PST.3SG:DEF      | unfortunately    | word         |
|       | <i>szerint</i> | <i>idézni</i>        | <i>nem</i>           | <i>tudok,</i>    | <i>mert</i>  |
|       | according      | quote.INF            | NEG                  | can.PRS.1SG      | because      |
|       | <i>nincs</i>   | <i>kéznel</i>        | <i>a</i>             | <i>könyv,</i>    | <i>de</i>    |
|       | NEG:EXIST      | hand.ADE             | DEF                  | book             | but          |
|       | <i>azért</i>   | <i>igyekszem</i>     | <i>pontos</i>        | <i>lenni):</i>   | -----        |
|       | therefore      | try.PRS.1SG          | exact                | be.INF           |              |
|       | <i>Ahogy</i>   | <i>rájöttem,</i>     | <i>hogy</i>          | <i>evolúció</i>  | <i>igaz,</i> |
|       | how            | discover.PST.1SG     | COMP                 | evolution        | true         |
|       | <i>úgy</i>     | <i>lett</i>          | <i>nyilvánvalóva</i> | <i>számomra,</i> | <i>hogy</i>  |
|       | thus           | be.PST.3SG           | obvious.TRANSL       | number.1SG.SUBL  | COMP         |
|       | <i>a</i>       | <i>kereszténység</i> | <i>nem</i>           | <i>igáz</i>      |              |
|       | DEF            | Christianity         | NEG                  | true             |              |

‘**Darwin said this (unfortunately, I cannot quote verbatim, because I don’t have the book at hand, but therefore I will try to be exact): When I discovered that evolution is true, it became obvious to me that Christianity is not true**’ (MNSz).

- (3.6) *valaki* *ezt* *mondta* *az*  
 somebody DEM.P.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF DEF  
*ilyen* *kérdésekről* *(szabadon):* “Az  
 such question.PL.DELA freely DEM.D  
*ritkán* *fordul* *elő,* *hogy*  
 rarely turn.PRS.3SG affront COMP  
*egy* *nézet,* *amiatt* *válik*  
 INDEF view thereat turn.into.PRS.3SG  
*elfogadottá,* *mert* *a* *támogatói*  
 accepted.TRANSL because DEF supporter.PL.3SG  
*meggyőzik* *az* *ellenzőit*  
 convince.PRS.3SG DEF opposition.PL.3SG.ACC  
*arról,* *hogy* *az* *jó”*  
 DEM.D.DELA COMP DEM.D good  
 ‘**Somebody said this** about such questions (**freely**): “It rarely happens that one viewpoint thereat changes into acceptable because its supporters convince those opposing it in the fact that it is good”’ (MNSz).
- (3.7) *Ha* *Illésre* *reagálva* *pl.* *ezt*  
 if PN.SUBBL react.PTCP e.g. DEM.P.ACC  
*mondta* *volna* *Széll* *Bernadett:* *Tisztelt*  
 say.PST.3SG:DEF be.COND PN PN respected  
*Államtitkár* *úr!* *Bár* *a* *férfiassága*  
 under-secretary sir although DEF masculinity.3SG  
*nem* *nagy,* *de* *az* *esze*  
 NEG big NEG DEF mind.3SG  
*még* *kisebb.*  
 more small.COMPAR  
 ‘If reacting to Illés, **Bernadett Széll could have said e.g. this**: Dear sir Under-Secretary! Although your masculinity is not big, your brains are even smaller.’ (MNSz).

As one can see, in (3.5) the reporter him-/herself makes a metalinguistic comment (‘unfortunately, I cannot quote verbatim, because I don’t have the book at hand’) stating that (s)he cannot provide a verbatim quote. In (3.6), the reporter quotes an utterance the original author of which (s)he cannot recall. Hence, it can be somewhat doubtful that the quote was produced verbatim. Note also that the reporter mentions him-/herself that the quote is produced freely (*szabadon* ‘freely’). As it was confirmed by a native speaker of Hungarian (Kollár, p.c.), the reporter aims at pointing that the quote is produced in free form without relying much on the correspondence between the quoted and original utterance. In (3.7), a hypothetical quotation is produced, the verbatim status of which is even more doubtful, if not impossible. Consequently, I suggest correlating the use of the proximal demonstrative *ez* in the complementizer strategy with *directness of the quote* instead of its exactness. By *directness*, I mean the preservation of referential correspondence of all deictic and expressive elements to non-immediate discourse. However, in such constructions, verbatim quotes are not impossible and can still be encountered. In order to resolve the problem between directness and verbatim

status of the quote, I suggest to take the results of the research by Clark & Liittschwager (quoted from Clark & Gerrig 1990: 796) into account which show that direct quotes are rarely verbatim (“[o]f 720 reports collected, none was precisely verbatim”). Even when speakers are committed to producing a quote close to an original utterance, they mostly fail to reproduce it verbatim even under ideal circumstances: “[e]mpirical research shows that people can’t recall an utterance word for word, even after a few seconds, without taking special pains to rehearse and memorize it” (ibid.: 796). Furthermore, as they account for the results of unpublished study by Wade & Clark, “[s]peakers sometimes don’t reproduce an utterance verbatim even when they could”, instead they tend to “accommodate their quotations to their ongoing narratives, to their idiom or style, even if that meant violating verbatim reproduction” (ibid.: 797).

Of course, it can be taken into account that by their nature direct quotes tend to be closer to the original utterance than indirect ones, especially in those languages that in the latter case require changes like, e.g. deictic shift, temporal adjustment, etc. In Hungarian, among those, only basic deictic (personal, temporal and spatial) shift is, in general, required. As a result, it can be a motivating factor to choose direct quotes over indirect ones that would, otherwise, require in some cases more cognitive pressure on speakers. In contrast to this argument, Kiefer (2015: 79) states that direct reports tend to be “cognitively more expensive to use”. Kiefer’s argument is based on the equation of direct quotations with citations, and it can be indeed counted, but only in this framework. However, given the above argument, the verbatim rendering of direct quotations is possible but hardly happens in live conversations. Furthermore, as most of the attested languages in the world show, direct RD is prior to indirect one. The latter can be counted instead as an outcome of the spread of literacy, characteristic, in particular, of modern European societies (see more in Coulmas 1986; Nikitina 2012a, 2012b, *inter alia*). Hence, I would rather suggest taking the opposite argument into account and considering indirect RD “cognitively more expensive to use”, taking into account referential changes the reported clause has to undergo in Hungarian, to result in a canonical indirect RD.

As far as the position of the QI-clause with proximal *ez* is concerned, it can be placed both preceding (as in the above examples) and following RD (Kiefer 2015: 82), cf. (3.8)<sup>87</sup>. Consequently, the endophoric demonstrative *ez* in the quotative domain can be used both cataphorically and anaphorically. Its distal counterpart *az* slightly differs in this aspect, as I demonstrate further.

- (3.8) “*Ma otthon dolgozom*” – *ezt mondta Péter.*  
 today at.home work.PRS.1SG DEM.P.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF PN  
 “‘Today I am working at home’ – **this said Peter.**” (Kiefer 2015: 82; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

<sup>87</sup> See 1.6.5.2 on typology of order patterns in RD-constructions.

In contrast to its proximal counterpart, the distal demonstrative *az* ‘that’ in contemporary Hungarian may appear with both direct (3.9) and indirect (3.10) RD. The position of a QI-clause with *az* is typically fixed. Unlike *ez*, QI-clauses with *az* show tendency towards appearing preposed to the quote. Accidental examples showing different order may be considered marginal and motivated by various reasons that are outside the scope of the current research, if they do not remain accidental.

- (3.9) *azt* DEM.D.ACC *mondta:* say.PST.3SG:DEF “*úgy* thus *kell* must.PRS.3SG *érezniünk,* feel.INF.1PL  
*hogy* COMP *aki* who *ezt* DEM.P.ACC *mondta,* say.PST.3SG:DEF *lélekben* soul.INE  
*is* also *tízmillió* ten.million *magyar* Hungarian *miniszterelnöke* prime-minister.3SG  
*kiván* wish.PRS.3SG *lenni* be.INF  
‘(S)he said that: “We must feel the way as the one who said it, deep inside [lit. in soul] ten million Hungarians also want to be a prime-minister”’ (MNSz).

- (3.10) *azt* DEM.D.ACC *mondta,* say.PST.3SG:DEF *hogy* COMP *szerinte* according.3SG *KEVESEBBEN* few.COMPAR.ADV  
*voltak* be.PST.3PL  
‘...(s)he said that (that) in his/her opinion there were FEWER of them’ (MNSz).

As in previous descriptions, I am neglecting the prosodic and other phonetic peculiarities in the use of the quotative indexes due to (i) the material I am using here and (ii) aims of this research (see Sections 1.1 and 1.3). However, in addition to the above description, I leave the comment by Fónagy (1986: 261) about the prosodic differences between QI-clauses with the proximal and distal demonstratives: “the tone [where *azt mondta* is used] only slightly descends, in contrast to *ezt mondta* followed by a pause or juncture marked by a low fall in the last syllable”.

As some of the above examples show, both endophoric pronouns and the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ are possible components of the complementizer strategy, although they are not obligatory. As a result, they can be elided from the QI-clause under few conditions. The omission of the endophoric demonstratives follow conditions assigned primarily by information structure. If the focus is placed on the NP, encoding the speaker, or on the speech or non-speech verb, depicting the event behind the RD, the presence of an endophoric demonstrative is not obligatory (Kiefer 2015: 81). Similarly, in the case where the RD precedes the QI-clause, as in (3.8), proximal *ez* could also remain elliptic (ibid.: 82). The complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ can be elided when it introduces the RD consisting of declarative and interrogative clauses (ibid.: 80–81; for more details on the ellipsis of the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ in Hungarian, see SMN 1992: 673–679; also Körtvély 2016: 610ff.).

After summarizing conditions and peculiarities of the Hungarian complementizer strategies, let's take a look at structural units that can occur in these types of constructions. Besides the above SVs, also EVs can be used to mark RD, depicting quotations of thoughts, as in (3.11).

- (3.11) ...*gondolta*                    *hogy*    *inkább*            *az*                    *autójában*  
 think.PST.3SG:DEF            COMP    nanny            DEF                    car.3SG:INE  
*várja*  
 wait.PRS.3SG:DEF            PRE            DEF                    friend.PL.3SG:ACC  
 '...**he thought that** he'd better wait for his friends in his car...' (MNSz).

As Körtvély (2016: 595) points out, EVs, e.g., *gondol* 'think' (3.11) or *hisz* 'believe', may additionally express epistemic meaning of partial support, mainly indicating the reporter's doubt in the truthfulness of the proposition in the RD. In such cases, the conditional mood is obligatory in the RD. For example, the RD in (3.11) would be expressed as *gondolta hogy (...) várjaná* 'thought that he **would wait...**'. If there is no overt expression of the conditional mood in the RD, it has a neutral reading, i.e. non-epistemic or unmarked. In such cases, additional epistemic markers are not allowed in the QI-clause (ibid.: 596).

As I have mentioned above, besides EVs, a range of NSVs can equally be used in Hungarian to present RD. Quite an exciting case represent the verbs denoting facial mimetics, cf. (3.12). Fónagy (1986: 274–275) mentions that "[v]erbs denoting facial mimetics or gestures are [mainly]<sup>88</sup> limited to direct quotations in Hungarian". Note the presence of the discourse particle *hát* at the beginning of the RD in (3.12), which indicates the direct status of the RD.

- (3.12) *Ők*                    *meg*            *ostobán*            *mosolyogtak,*            *hogy*  
 3PL                    also            stupidly            smile.PST.3PL            COMP  
*hát,*  
 PTCL                    then            DEM.P            *van,*                    *és*  
*hogy*                    *de*            *kár,*                    *hogy*                    *nem*  
 COMP                    but            pity                    COMP                    NEG  
*tetszett*  
 like.PST.3SG            DEF            other                    *szálloda.*  
 hotel  
 'And **they** stupidly **smiled that well, then we have this [option]** and **that what a pity that you did not like the other hotel.**' (ongo.hu).

Furthermore, relatively rarely are examples encountered where a speech or epistemic verb is utterly elliptic from the QI-clause with the complementizer. Two different scenarios of such use can be pointed out. Either the event behind the RD is still described and an SV, denoting the speech act, is just left out, cf. (3.13), or the speech or epistemic verb can be retrieved from the previous sentence, cf. (3.14).

<sup>88</sup> As the researcher specifies further, some of the verbs can be observed with both direct and indirect RD (Fónagy 1986: 275). Different use of the same semantic class of verbs might be connected with the frequency of their appearance in the quotative domain and further acceptability of different uses among Hungarian speakers, DT.

The latter case has been previously attested by Fónagy (1986: 284): “the conjunction which outlived the deletion of the reporting clause, figures as an unequivocal indicator of a speech act: TO SAY *that p* → 0 *that p*”. Based on my observations, such cases are not frequent in written contexts and appear only accidentally in my data where the reporter represents a dialogue between two speakers with the following structure: ‘And X said what? – **That** {RD}. – And Y replied...? – **That** {RD}’. Consequently, it can be assumed that such a strategy is more common in oral, than in written communications, and may appear in oral speech more frequently.

- (3.13)
- |                    |                  |                       |                        |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| <i>...amikor</i>   | <i>a</i>         | <i>8</i>              | <i>éves</i>            |
| when               | DEF              | 8                     | year.ADJ               |
| <i>kocsimat</i>    | <i>vittem</i>    | <i>a</i>              | <i>magánszervizbe,</i> |
| car.1SG.ACC        | take.PST.1SG     | DEF                   | private.service.ILL    |
| <b>hogy</b>        | <i>“na</i>       | <i>akkor</i>          | <i>cseréljük</i>       |
| COMP               | PTCL             | then                  | change.PRS.1PL:DEF     |
| <i>ki</i>          | <i>a</i>         | <i>hűtőfolyadékot</i> | <i>is,</i>             |
| PRE                | DEF              | coolant               | also                   |
| <i>mert</i>        | <i>ártani</i>    | <i>nem</i>            | <i>árt,</i>            |
| because            | harm.INF         | NEG                   | harm.PRS.3SG           |
| <i>és</i>          | <i>szerintem</i> | <i>még</i>            | <i>sose</i>            |
| and                | opinion.1SG      | yet                   | never                  |
| <i>volt”...</i>    | <i>akkor</i>     | <i>az</i>             | <i>egyik</i>           |
| be.PST.3SG         | then             | DEM.D                 | one.of                 |
| <i>alkalmazott</i> | <i>furán</i>     | <i>nézett</i>         | <i>rám...</i>          |
| employee           | strangely        | look.PST.3SG          | SUBL.1SG               |
| <b>hogy</b>        | <i>azt</i>       | <i>meg</i>            | <i>minek.</i>          |
| COMP               | DEM.D.ACC        | also                  | what.DAT               |
- ‘...when I took my 8-year-old car to the private service [saying] **that** “well, then we will also exchange the coolant, because it does not harm, and in my opinion it has never been done”, then one of the employees looked at me strangely [saying] **that** what’s that for.’ (bmwfanatics.hu).

- (3.14)
- |               |                 |             |               |                |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| – <i>Na</i>   | <i>mondjad</i>  | <i>már,</i> | <i>mit</i>    | <b>mondott</b> |
| PTCL          | say.IMP.2SG:DEF | yet         | what.ACC      | say.PST.3SG    |
| <b>rá?</b>    | – <i>Ja,</i>    | <i>hát</i>  | <b>hogy</b>   | <i>addig</i>   |
| SUBL.3SG      | PTCL            | PTCL        | COMP          | DEM.D.TRMN     |
| <i>nem...</i> | <i>Vagyis</i>   | <b>hogy</b> | <i>vigyem</i> | <i>ki</i>      |
| NEG           | namely          | COMP        | take.IMP.1SG  | out            |
- végre.*  
end.SUBL
- ‘– Well, tell me yet what **(s)he said upon this?**  
– Yeah, well **that** so far not... Namely **that** I have to take it out in the end.’  
(kreativ-iras.hu).

Besides different speech and non-speech verbs (both present and elliptic), the complementizer *hogy* can co-occur with NPs, encoding an original source of RD (3.15) – a strategy naturally encountered in a number of languages (for similar

strategies in Russian – see 2.4.1, in Udmurt – 2.5.1, in Komi – 2.6.1, in Finnish – 4.4.1, and in Estonian – 4.4.2).

(3.15)

|                      |                   |                     |                       |            |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| <i>Nők</i>           | <i>esetében</i>   | <i>viszont</i>      | <i>az</i>             | <i>a</i>   |
| woman.PL             | case.3SG.INE      | PTCL                | DEM.D                 | DEF        |
| <i>kimondatlan</i>   | <i>üzenet,</i>    | <i>hogy</i>         | <i>“Most</i>          | <i>itt</i> |
| unsaid               | message           | COMP                | now                   | here       |
| <i>vagy,</i>         | <i>kisanyám,</i>  | <i>de</i>           | <i>mindeközben</i>    | <i>a</i>   |
| be.PRS.2SG           | little.mother.1SG | but                 | meantime.INE          | DEF        |
| <i>legfontosabb</i>  |                   | <i>küldetésedet</i> | <i>hanyagolod...”</i> |            |
| SUP.important.COMPAR |                   | mission.2SG.ACC     | neglect.PRS.2SG:DEF   |            |

‘For women, it is the unspoken **message that** “Now you are here, my lass, but in the meantime, you are neglecting your most important mission...”” (she.hu).

To sum up, some peculiarities of the complementizer strategy in Hungarian can be pointed out. Primarily, the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’, despite its non-obligatory status, can be used equally with both direct and indirect RD. Furthermore, the QI-clause with SEVs is usually accompanied by the endophoric demonstratives *ez* and *az* in the accusative case that function as syntactic objects of the highly transitive verb of the QI-clause. The proximal demonstrative *ez* is restricted to direct RD; it can be used both cataphorically and anaphorically, which depends on the position of the QI-clause to the quote. The distal demonstrative *az*, in turn, is not restricted to one type of RD and can appear with both direct and indirect RD. Nonetheless, it is restricted to the cataphoric use, i.e. the QI-clause in which it occurs obligatorily precedes the quote. Hence, the use of demonstratives follows an already established system even in colloquial speech. Finally, quite interestingly the reduction of the QI-clause to the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ can also be observed. However, in such cases, the event that is not described in the RD-construction due to the ellipsis of the predicate can be still retrieved from the context. Consequently, the use of *hogy* as a single quote-introducer usually happens where RD represents quotations of speech, previously described by SVs that appear in the context.

### 3.3. The manner deictics *így* and *úgy* in quotative constructions

In addition to the endophoric demonstratives, described above in Section 3.2, the use of the proximal MD *így* ‘like this, so’ and the distal MD *úgy* ‘like that, thus’ can be observed co-occurring with speech and non-speech verbs. For convenience, in the translation of MDs, I will refer to *így* as ‘so’ and to *úgy* as ‘thus’ both in the text and in the glossing of the examples<sup>89</sup>.

<sup>89</sup> I also use this convention in the subsections treating MDs in Permic languages and Finnish.

At first glance, both markers seem to appear in relatively similar RD-constructions, as in (3.16) and (3.17). However, as I show further, similarly to the epenthic demonstratives, also the MDs are distributed systematically.

(3.16) *Így* *szólt:* “*Ember; bűneid bocsánatot nyertek.*”  
 so say.PST.3SG man sin.PL.2SG forgiveness.ACC win.PST.3PL  
 ‘**Thus He said:** “Human, your sins were forgiven.”’ (emmausz.blog.hu).

(3.17) *...úgy* *mondta:* *látom nagyon istenfélők*  
 thus say.PST.3SG:DEF see.PRS.1SG very God.fearing.PL  
*vagytok...*  
 be.PRS.2PL  
 ‘**...said it thus:** I see you are very God-fearing...’ (MNSz).

So what is the difference between the use of the proximal and the distal MDs in the quotative domain of the language? Kiefer (2015: 83) mentioned that “[i]f the exact wording of the reported utterance is at stake, the reported utterance is repeated but the reporting clause contains the adverbial particle *így* ‘so, thus’”. For the distal MD *úgy* it has been stated that “[n]ative speakers of Hungarians estimate both versions [of RD-constructions with and without *úgy*] as quasi equivalent in their meaning; however, some of them consider the contents of *úgy* type as *less certain*” (Körtvély 2016: 607; italics are mine, DT). Consequently, it can be primarily assumed that behind the use of different MDs one can expect expression of different degrees of epistemic support: full in QI-clauses with proximal *így*, and partial with distal *úgy*. However, as my material shows, there is reason to revise this claim and take a closer look at the distribution of these adverbials in the quotative domain. Furthermore, one of the reasons to do so is the somehow vague statement by Körtvély (2016: 607), and the methodological problem in Kiefer’s (2015) study, addressed here in more details in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

As my investigation shows, the primary difference in the distribution of the MDs in the quotative domain lies in the functions that they fulfill and the meanings they express as part of QI-clause. Let’s take a closer look at these functions and meanings starting from the proximal MD *így*. According to Gyuris (p.c.), the use of the MD *így* ‘so’ in the quotative domain is closely connected with its use with demonstrations of actions, cf. (3.18). In the quotative domain, RD can be considered a demonstration of someone’s (previous) words (3.19) or mental activities (3.20), produced in the form of discourse (see more in Clark & Gerrig 1990 on quotations as demonstrations). The fact that by producing a quote, the reporter demonstrates a situation in which it was produced, is also supported by the fact that *így* in Hungarian is used only in RD-constructions with direct RD, which “both reports and demonstrates what has been uttered” (Dömötör 2001: 338).

(3.18) *Így csinálom:* {demonstration}  
 so do.PRS.1SG:DEF  
 ‘**I do it like this:** {demonstration}’ (Gyuris, p.c.).



- (3.19) *a rapper rövid beszédében így mutatta*  
 DEF rapper short talk.3SG:INE so show.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*be magát: "cigány vagyok, zsidó vagyok,*  
 into self.ACC Gypsy be.PRS.1SG Jew be.PRS.1SG  
*árja vagyok, magyar vagyok"*  
 Aryan be.PRS.1SG Hungarian be.PRS.1SG  
 ‘**The rapper introduced himself** in his short talk **like this**: “I am Gypsy, I am Jew, I am Aryan, I am Hungarian” (MNSz).

- (3.20) *Én is így gondoltam hogy nem túl jó*  
 1SG also so think.PST.1SG COMP NEG very good  
*választás nekem a 29er...*  
 choice DAT.1SG DEF 29er  
 ‘**I also thought it so that** the 29er is not a very good choice for me...’ (MNSz).

In addition to the presentation of someone’s words or thoughts, the MD *így* can be used in quasi-quotative constructions where the quoted person’s actions are verbalized. In such cases, the reporter reinterprets someone’s gestures or moves, putting them into words, as in (3.21).

- (3.21) *...és azt mondta, hogy: München,*  
 and DEM.D.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF COMP PN  
*mutatott az ujjával, és a*  
 show.PST.3SG DEF finger.3SG.COM and DEF  
*kezevel így mutatta, hogy ha*  
 hand.3SG.COM so show.PST.3SG:DEF COMP if  
*nem, akkor ez a táská*  
 NEG then DEM.P DEF bag  
*bumm*  
 IDEO  
 ‘...and said that München, showed with his finger, and **with his hand showed so (that) if not, then this bag will boom**’ (MNSz).

Furthermore, the co-occurrence of *így* with SVs can be used to present hypothetical quotations. In such cases, an SV is likely to be in the form of the past conditional, as in (3.22). Thus, the use of the marker with hypothetical quotations suggests reconsidering Kiefer’s (2015: 83) claim about the connection between the use of the proximal MD and exactness of the quote, since one can hardly talk about the exactness of a quote that is entirely fictional. Also take (3.21) into consideration, where the reporter rather suggests a possible reading for the moves of the hijacker than presenting an exact interpretation of his/her moves. In (3.22), the reporter presents a quote by Ferenc Puskás, a world-famous Hungarian football player from the 1950s–60s. However, the original quote (*Kis pénz – kis foci, nagy pénz – nagy foci* ‘Small money – small football, big money – big football’) differs from the one presented by the reporter (‘Big money, small football’). Hence, the reporter reinterprets the quote according to his/her aims. Furthermore, even though this utterance is frequently attributed to Ferenc Puskás, it is rather alleged, and there is actually no proof that he has ever said it.

- (3.22) “*Nagy pénz, kis foci.*” – *vagy*  
 big money small football or  
*mégsem így mondta volna Puskás?*  
 still.also.NEG so say.PST.3SG:DEF be.COND.3SG PN  
 “‘Big money, small football’ – or **wouldn’t have Puskás said so?**” (MNSz).

Hence, I suggest associating the use of the proximal MD *így* in the quotative domain rather with the directness of the quote, than with the exactness of its content. However, as with the previously discussed demonstratives *ez* and *az* in Section 3.2, direct RD can still be considered a closer representation of someone’s utterance and thoughts than indirect one since it does not require the change of referential points from the current discourse to the reported one. Nonetheless, despite these conditions, one can find direct reports that cannot be characterized by exactness, as in (3.21) and (3.22).

Syntactically, QI-clauses with *így* are not restricted to positions preceding RD, cf. (3.19)–(3.21), and can appear also following it, as in (3.22). Thus, besides cataphoric uses of the MD, one can also observe anaphoric ones. Quite compelling is the use of the marker in QI-clauses, where a speech or epistemic verb stays elliptic. I have encountered only three cases where *így* appears without SEVs in quotative constructions. An example of a similar QI-clause with an elliptic predicate (*Ő erre megint így* ‘(S)he upon this again so’), cf. (3.91), can also be found in older texts, retrieved from the political writings by István Széchenyi dating back to the year 1831 (browsed through the Hungarian historical corpus<sup>90</sup>). Hence, based on this brief investigation it can be concluded that this type of a QI-clause is not new in contemporary Hungarian and not very typical in written speech. However, one can expect a more frequent use of this strategy in oral speech, from which such constructions are likely to be replicated into written speech.

Despite the ellipsis of the predicate, such a neutralization of the event does not lead to the emergence of different readings for RD, attested in other Finno-Ugric languages. For example, see a similar neutralized Hungarian quotative construction in Section 3.5, where ellipsis of the predicate leads to the emergence of different readings between quotations of speech and thought. In case of *így*, the event-neutralized QI-clause is predominantly (if not exclusively) used to present only quotations of speech events. In addition to the anaphoric use, where the QI-clause with *így* follows the RD (3.23), I have also encountered an example where it is placed in intraposition, splitting the RD into two parts (3.24). Similarly, the QI-clause, consisting of the MD *így* and an NP, encoding the speaker, presents a real speech event.

- (3.23) *De egy tehénnel tette. – így a riporter*  
 but INDEF cow.COM do.PRS.3SG:DEF so DEF reporter  
 ‘But he did it with a cow, – **so the reporter**’ (MNSz).

<sup>90</sup> See Section 1.3 for more details and the list of data sources at the end of the study.

- (3.24) *Á nem, (így ő), hisz mi*  
 INTERJ NEG thus 3SG believe.PRS.3SG 1PL  
*immár kétezer éve imádkozunk Jeruzsálemért.*  
 now two.thousand year.3SG pray.PRS.1PL Jerusalem.CAUS  
 ‘Ah no, (so he), we pray for Jerusalem already for two thousand years.’ (MNSz).

Let’s take a look at the distal MD *úgy* now. Unlike the mimetic expressions with the proximal MD *így* in (3.18), distal *úgy* can only be used to compare someone’s actions or utterance with others. Hence, it can be used in comparative constructions (3.25), in which *így* does not occur due to its restriction to demonstrations.

- (3.25) *Én is úgy csinálom mint te*  
 1SG also thus do.PRS.1SG.DEF like 2SG  
 ‘I also do it **like you**’ (gyakorikerdesek.hu).

Similarly to the distal demonstrative *az* in the quotative domain, *úgy* can be used with both types of RD, direct and indirect. Functionally, *úgy* is used to present the content of the proposition expressed as a quote, rather than demonstrating it. In (3.26) the reporter aims to present only the content of someone’s utterance, the original words of which might have been different from the ones presented in the quote, e.g., ‘I need 100 Forint’ (a quote without a change of the referential point), ‘Give me, please, hundred Forint’, etc. As Dömötör (2001: 338) points out, “[w]hile direct speech both reports and demonstrates what has been uttered, indirect speech renounces this demonstration (...) [showing] that the author has understood the utterance and based on this, he reformulates its content”.

- (3.26) *Úgy mondta, hogy kell neki a*  
 thus say.PRS.3SG:DEF COMP need.PRS.3SG DAT.3SG DEF  
*száz forint...*  
 100 Forint  
 ‘**He said thus that he needs the one hundred forints...**’ (nepmese.hu).

The difference in the meaning and functions that *úgy* fulfills in the quotative domain leads to a couple of syntactic differences between QI-clauses with *így* and *úgy*. Unlike *így*, *úgy* is restricted to precede a quote and cannot appear elsewhere in RD-constructions. Thus, the functions of *úgy* are strictly associated with cataphora, pointing at the following stretches of RD. In Old Hungarian, however, its position was not that fixed, and it could appear also intraposed and postposed to the quote. It can be observed as a free element of the not yet fossilized collocation of *úgy* with the SV *mond* that served as a basis for the quotative/discourse particle *úgymond* ‘so to say/speak’ (Dömötör 2001: 359ff.; Dömötör 2008: 38ff.). Furthermore, *úgy* is restricted to QI-clauses where a reportative verb is obligatorily present. As a result, it does not appear in structurally event-neutralized QI-clauses like *így* in (3.23)–(3.24). In addition to SVs, in QI-clauses with *úgy* also EVs can be used, as in (3.27).

- (3.27) *Na, akkor is úgy gondoltam, hogy*  
 PTCL then also thus think.PST.1SG COMP  
*most minden meg fog változni.*  
 now everything PRE FUT.AUX.3SG change.INF  
 ‘Well, then I also **thought thus that** now everything will change.’ (MNSz).

To sum up, it is quite natural that the use of the distal MD is associated with epistemic overtones of partial support since *úgy* is used rather in the reporter’s reinterpretation of someone else’s previous utterance than in its demonstration. Consequently, the audience might consider such a reinterpretation as a less exact depiction of someone’s previous utterance or thought and through that it might acquire a secondary meaning of the quote produced with epistemic overtones of uncertainty. However, as Körtvély (2015: 607) points out, nowadays Hungarian speakers hardly notice the difference between QI-clauses with and without *úgy*. According to Dér (p.c.) and Gyúris (p.c.), in contemporary Hungarian the syntactic differences and the meanings that these markers fulfill in the quotative domain are more relevant, than the association between their use and the epistemic overtones, allegedly expressed by the MDs in the quotative domain.

### 3.4. Quotative markers deriving from speech verbs

In this subsection, I discuss the use of quotative markers, predominantly deriving from the basic SV *mond* ‘say’. First, I illustrate the use of the quotative markers *a(s)zongya*, *mondván* ‘saying’ and *úgymond* ‘so to say/speak’. In addition, I examine the use of the quasi-quotative particle *állítólag* ‘allegedly, reportedly’ that derives from the generic SV *állít* ‘declare, claim’.

#### 3.4.1. The self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok*

The self-quotative marker *mondom* ‘I say’ represents a basic self-quoting strategy, consisting of the generic SV *mond* ‘say’ in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular of the present (or non-past) tense in the definite conjugation. As I show in this subchapter, besides introducing self-quotations of speech, *mondom/mondok* can also be used with self-quotations of thoughts, which is one of the reasons why I prefer referring to *mondom* as a self-quotative marker.

In contemporary colloquial Hungarian, the marker has two forms of realization – *mondom* and *mondok*. The latter variant *mondok* represents the indefinite conjugation form of the first person singular present tense, in contrast to the definite conjugation in *mondom*. Quite compelling is the fact that both markers have forms of the present tense, although in the quotative domain they are used to refer to the discourse, belonging to a different temporal setting, which has typically occurred in the past. Both forms are used as parentheticals inserted into the RD, cf. (3.28)–

(3.29). As Kiefer (2015: 86) indicates, parentheticals in Hungarian RD-constructions can occur only with direct RD. Hence, RD is not syntactically embedded into the QI, and the markers are used similarly to quotative particles, indicating the presence of the self-quoting instances.

(3.28) *Csak azé', mondom, mer a*  
 just therefore say.PRS.1SG:DEF because DEF  
*régi 1,20 volt, azért meg*  
 old 1,20 be.PST.3SG therefore also  
*25-öt tetszett beütni!*  
 25-ACC like.PST.3SG stave.in.INF  
 '[But why? – (s)he asks.] Only therefore, I say, because the old one was 1,20; therefore it felt like staving in 25 more!' (MNSz).

(3.29) *...kerdik is: hogy elsz? mondok:*  
 ask.PRS.3PL also how live.PRS.2SG say.PRS.1SG:INDEF  
*bekesség, nyugalom mint szanatórium*  
 peace tranquility like sanatorium  
 '...they also inquire: how do you live? I say: peace, tranquility, like a sanatorium' (MNSz).

Despite more or less general interchangeability between these markers in most of the self-quoting contexts, there are stylistic difference between them. According to Kubinyi (p.c.), the form in definite conjugation *mondom* is common to Standard Hungarian, while *mondok* pertains to vernacular speech and is often stigmatized by language purists as an incorrect form.

Besides quotations of speech, both markers can also be used to present quotations of thoughts. Such a use of the marker is quite interesting since semantically *mondom/mondok* refers to a speech event. However, such functional broadening is not untypical for quotatives deriving from SVs (see e.g. Bashir 1996 on the languages from Dardic region, Matic & Pakendorf 2013 on the languages in Siberia, *inter alia*). In addition, a similar functional broadening can also be observed among self-quotative particles used in Permic (see 2.5.2.1.2 and 2.6.2.2 on the self-quotative particles in Udmurt and Komi respectively). The difference between quotations of speech and thought, nonetheless, can be clarified mainly by the context or grammatical conditions. For instance, if the self-quotative marker co-occurs with an NP, referring to the addressee, e.g. *mondok neki* 'I say to him/her', such a collocation obviously refers to a speech act. Similarly, in parts of discourse where one RD-construction accompanies another and the RD in them belong to different speakers, the reading of the speech event is the most probable one, as in (3.28) and (3.29). In contrast to these cases, in contexts where RD is not directed to a concrete addressee and is inserted into the discourse out of the blue, as in (3.30)–(3.31), the most probable interpretation for RD is the quotation of thoughts. Of course, it is quite possible that the speaker might have also produced an utterance which is not attributed to a concrete addressee. However, I suggest considering this interpretation as less probable, since there are no communicational

goals to pursue by the speaker in such instances. Even if one assumes this scenario possible for most of the contexts, such an utterance is likely to be primarily built on the epistemic processes, like thoughts, which are further verbalized. A similar situation has been described for some Australian languages where the basic SV is extremely polysemic and can mean, besides ‘say’, also ‘think’ and ‘do’ (cf. Knight 2008 on Bunuba; McGregor 2014 on Nyulnyul; Spronck 2016, 2017 on Ungarinyin). Spronck (2017: 12) also mentions briefly that in Aboriginal Australian English, the verb *reckon* is frequently used in the meaning ‘say’, ‘think’ and ‘want’. In these languages, two probable readings – ‘say’ and ‘think’ – are further distinguished by the encoding of an addressee – if the addressee is encoded, the most natural reading is then ‘say’, if not – both interpretations of the verb are, in general, possible.

- (3.30) *Na mondom, akkor ezt meg kell*  
 PTCL say.PRS.1SG:DEF then DEM.P.ACC also must.PRS.3SG  
*nézni*  
 see.INF  
 ‘[...I hear that tomorrow, i.e. on the 15<sup>th</sup>, the fella will step up again, namely in the synagogue.] Well I say [~ **think**], then one should see this’ (MNSz).

- (3.31) *No, mondok, biztos ez a kemping*  
 PTCL say.PRS.1SG:INDEF certainly DEM.P DEF camping  
*neve, vagy mi.*  
 name.3SG or what  
 ‘[When I was looking for the beach, I saw in the village a sign, made from wood, that said “Robinson 3 km”] Well, I say [~ **think**], this is certainly the name of the camping site, or what.’ (MNSz).

In addition, *mondom/mondok* has developed a specific distribution in the quotative domain. Namely, it is used in contexts where the reporter instantly quotes him-/herself verbatim to emphasize the content of the quote, as in (3.32a) and (3.32b).

- (3.32a) *Nem egymást kéne ütni,*  
 NEG one.another.ACC must.COND.3SG hit.INF  
*van ellenség elég.*  
 be.PRS.3SG enemy enough enemy  
*mondom, és nem ellenfél.*  
 say.PRS.1SG:DEF and NEG opponent  
 ‘No need hit one another, there’s enough *enemies*. Enemies, I say, and not opponents.’ (MNSz).

|         |                               |                         |                   |
|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| (3.32b) | <i>...de</i>                  | <i>Colesseumtól</i>     | <i>szerintem</i>  |
|         | but                           | PN.ABL                  | according.1SG     |
|         | <i>a</i>                      | <i>következők</i>       | <i>a</i>          |
|         | DEF                           | following.PL            | DEF               |
|         | <i>legjobbak:</i>             | <i>Valentyne Suite,</i> | <i>Live,</i>      |
|         | SUP.good.COMPAR.PL            | PN                      | PN                |
|         | <i>Those who are about...</i> | <i>és</i>               | <i>a</i>          |
|         | PN                            | and                     | DEF               |
|         | <i>Daughter of Time.</i>      | <i>Mondok,</i>          | <i>szerintem.</i> |
|         | PN                            | say.PRS.1SG:INDEF       | according.1SG     |

‘...but from Colesseum, **according to me** the following [albums] are the best: Valentyne Suite, Live, Those who are about..., and the Daughter of Time. **I say, according to me.**’ (MNSz).

Based on the above examples, it is reasonable to refer to *mondom/mondok* as a self-quotative marker, rather than a simple form of the SV in the first person singular. As it has been shown, the marker is used as a parenthetical inserted into RD. Morphosyntactically, it is a functional word which occurs only with direct RD. The claim can be supported by the fact that the self-quotative marker usually refers to discourse that has taken place in the past, despite the present tense form of the marker. In addition, besides its basic use with quotations of speech, *mondom/mondok* may also mark quotations of thoughts. Such a use is not unique among quotative markers deriving from SVs in general and self-quotative particles in particular; however, it depicts quite a compelling case in Hungarian. Both the syntactic role and the functional capacities of the self-quotative *mondom/mondok* show that the marker has already developed into a multifunctional independent QI in contemporary Hungarian.

### 3.4.2. The quotative marker *a(s)zongya*

In this subsection, I discuss the use of the quotative marker *a(s)zongya*, which formally represents a fossilized merge of the correlative pronoun *az-t* ‘DEM.D-ACC’ and the SV *mond-ja* ‘say-PRS-3SG:DEF’. In colloquial Hungarian, two basic variants of the marker can be observed – *aszongya* and *azongya*. The variant with *s* can be considered more “conventionalized”. I have made an investigation in the Hungarian historical corpus (see Section 1.3 and List of data sources at the end of the study) and observed the form *aszongya* in older texts, e.g. Hungarian literature from the end of 19<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. István Tömörkény, Géza Gárdonyi, Zsigmond Móricz, etc.). In total, there are 106 examples of the use of the marker in the historical corpus. The earliest mention dates back to 1848. However, it is reasonable to assume that it is even older in oral speech. The form *azongya* was not spotted in the corpus, which leads to the conclusion that it is more colloquial, and even probably a new way of spelling, possibly corresponding to its phonological realization in contemporary colloquial Hungarian or some dialect(s) of the language. Furthermore, based on my experience, the form of spelling

*azongya* is sometimes even surprising to native Hungarian speakers. Nonetheless, in the current study, I consider both variants as equivalent and do not take possible stylistic differences between them into account, since both variants are used in colloquial written texts on the internet. Further, I indicate the possibility of both forms by placing the sometimes elliptic *s* into the parentheses – *a(s)zongya*.

I refer to *a(s)zongya* as a quotative marker here, since it is quite polyfunctional in the quotative domain and besides the appearance in different structural complexities, it may also fulfill various functions. Consequently, there is reason to look at the marker beyond the plain contraction of two independent elements and investigate the broadening of its functions as a quotative marker.

Despite its polyfunctionality, in general, the quotative *a(s)zongya* is frequently interchangeable with the QI-clause *azt mondja* ‘DEM.D-ACC say.PRS.3SG:DEF’, previously discussed in different forms in Section 3.2, and merely represents a contracted colloquial form of this QI-clause, cf. (3.34)–(3.35). Note that *a(s)zongya* can also be used in such function outside the quotative domain, simply contracting the clause *azt mondja* without a reportative function, cf. (3.33). Such a use can be considered natural in the colloquial speech where speakers tend to be economical and shorten different forms, collocations, phrases, etc. For example, similarly to *a(s)zongya*, in colloquial Hungarian one can observe the merge of the demonstrative *az-t* ‘DEM-ACC’ and the EV *hisz-em* ‘believe.PRS-1SG’ → *asszem* ‘I believe so’ (cf. Veszelszki 2010)<sup>91</sup>.

- (3.33) *Ha az egyik cigány azongya*  
 if DEF one.of Gypsy DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*a másíknak, az éppen úgy...*  
 DEF another.DAT DEF just thus  
 If **one Gypsy says that** to another then it’s just like that...’ (MNSz).

- (3.34) *...és most az OEM Win98 azongya,*  
 and now DEF OEM.Win98 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*hogy: Ez a CD nem*  
 COMP DEM.P DEF CD NEG  
*ehhez a vashoz való...*  
 this.ALL DEF iron.ALL suitable  
 ‘...and now **the OEM Win98 says that**: This CD is not suitable to this computer [lit. this iron]...’ (hsw.hu).

- (3.35) *Azongya az RTL Klub, hogy Rejtélyek városa.*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF RTL.club COMP secret.PL city.3SG  
 ‘**The RTL club says that** [it’s] a City of secrets.’ (sorozatjunkie.hu).

<sup>91</sup> Fónagy (1986: 262) also compares the French shortened form [kimdi] of the QI-clause *qu’il me dit* ‘that he says to me’. In some variants of Portuguese and Spanish, one can also find the contracted form of the SV and the complementizer *dizque* ‘((s)he) says that’ (Aikhenvald 2004: 141; also Olbertz 2007 on Mexican Spanish, *inter alia*).



In the above cases, despite the contraction, the marker preserves its grammatical features. For example, there is agreement in person and number between the NP encoding the speaker and the contracted form. Also, the marker is still conjugated, forming thus a partial paradigm of a verb form. Similarly to the non-contracted QI, it can be used both with direct (3.34) and indirect (3.35) RD. Note also the position of the marker which in such a use precedes the quote, corresponding to the position of the non-contracted QI with the cataphoric pronoun *az* (see Section 3.2). Besides its form in the present tense 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, it can be observed in other persons, and also in the past tense, e.g. *a(s)zondom* ‘I say’, *a(s)zontam* ‘I said’, *a(s)zondod* ‘you say’, *a(s)zontad* ‘you said’, etc. Consequently, in such a use the marker represents a new verb form with a partial verbal paradigm. Among the attested forms, I have observed the full paradigm of the verb form in the definite conjugation of the present and past tenses, and the past conditional forms that represent the conjugated past tense form attached to the conditional copula *volna* ‘would’, e.g., *aszontam volna* ‘I would have said’, *aszontad volna* ‘you would have said’, etc. Other forms, e.g. in the conditional or potential mood, are not observed with the contracted form. Here I provide some examples in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural in both present (3.36) and past (3.37) tense, which are, in general, interchangeable with the non-contracted forms, forming a QI-clause, i.e. *azt mondjátok* ‘you (pl.) say’ in (3.36), *azt mondtátok* ‘you (pl.) said’ in (3.37).

(3.36) ...*aszonyátok*            *hülye*    *vagyok*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF    idiot    be.PRS.1SG  
 ‘...**you say I’m an idiot**’ (belsőseg.blog.hu).

(3.37) *aszontátok,*            *hogy*    *fél*    *9-kor*    *már*    *a*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF    COMP    half    NUM-TEMP    already    DEF  
*Lurdyban????*  
 PN.INE  
 ‘...**you said that at 8:30 already at Lurdy????**’ (opelforum.hu).

A functional difference can be observed in the use of the marker in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural. Both the present (*a(s)zongyák*) and the past tense (*a(s)zonták*) can be used either as a QI or as a lexicalized reported evidential marker. I draw the difference between these two functions the following way. If *a(s)zongyák/a(s)zonták* marks an utterance produced by the speaker that either is explicitly expressed or can be traced from the context, then the marker fulfills the quotative function. In cases where it is paraphrasable with the clause ‘they (unknown) say/said, it is/was said’ and the original author of the utterance is not retrieved from the context, then the marker is used as a reported evidential. I do not exclude the similar distribution of the quotative and reported evidential functions in the use of the non-contracted forms of the same QI. Here, I provide the examples (3.38) and (3.39) merely to draw the difference in the meanings of the marker, identical in its form, in similar contexts.

- (3.38) *Szóva* *azongyák* *a* *tűlem*  
word.COM DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF ABL.1SG  
*okosabbak* *hogy* *az* *egész*  
clever.COMPAR.3PL COMP DEM.D whole  
*valójába* *arrú* *szól,* *hogy*  
true.3SG:INE DEM.D:DELA tell.PRS.3SG COMP  
*lessz* *e* *második* *kör*  
FUT.AUX.3SG DEF second round  
*vagy* *nem* *lessz*  
or NEG FUT.AUX.3SG  
‘In one word, **the people who are more clever than me say that all this actually**  
**talks about whether there will be a second round or not**’ (becejski-mozaik.co.rs).

- (3.39) *Aszongyák,* *ilyen* *időbe* *a* *kutyát*  
DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF such weather.ILL DEF dog.ACC  
*se* *ki* *a* *házból!*  
NEG.IMP out DEF house.ELA  
‘**They say, on such weather one won’t [let] the dog out of the house!**’ (csepel.info).

Besides the cases where the contracted quotative is interchangeable with the full QI *azt mondja*, there are also cases where the marker functions differently. Below I present a couple of individual subclasses of QIs formed by *a(s)zongya*. Additionally, I point out the similarities and differences between the use of the contracted and the non-contracted forms.

A separate use of the contracted form *a(s)zongya* can be observed where it co-occurs with an independent QI-clause which consists of an SV as its QI-nucleus. According to Güldemann’s (2012: 120) terminology, this way *a bipartite QI* is formed, consisting of two parts signaling the presence of RD, as in (3.40) (see 1.6.5 on syntactic possibilities in QIs). Most typically, the contracted form *a(s)zongya* is placed on the position adjacent to the quote, immediately indicating the presence of RD. Note the lack of temporal agreement between *a(s)zongya* that preserves the form of the present tense and the verb in the matrix clause, expressed in the past tense. Such a use of the marker frequently becomes a convenient strategy to activate attention of the audience towards RD, especially in the contexts, where the SV, primarily signaling the presence of the quote, is mentioned at the beginning of a RD-construction, as in (3.40).

- (3.40) *...mondta* *az* *egyik*  
say.PST.3SG:DEF DEF one.of  
*riporterünk,* *az* *egyik*  
reporter.1PL DEF one.of  
*körkapcsoláson,* *Zalaegerszeg-MTK* *találkozó,*  
circular.SUPE PN-PN meeting.SUPE  
*aszongya:* *“Kedves* *hallgatóink,*  
DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF dear listener.PL.1PL  
*a* *két* *MTK-játékos*  
DEF 2 MTK-player

|                 |                     |          |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------|
| <i>egymást</i>  | <i>zavarta</i>      | <i>a</i> |
| one.another.ACC | trouble.PST.3SG:DEF | DEF      |
| <i>kapu</i>     | <i>elrúgásában</i>  |          |
| gate            | kicking.3SG:INE     |          |

‘**One of our reporters**, during one of the circular games, in the meeting between Zalaegerszeg and MTK, **said**: “Dear listeners, 2 MTK players impede each other while kicking at the gate”.’ (weebly.com).

In constructions with NSVs, *a(s)zongya* is the only quotative marker. Consequently, if in (3.40) *a(s)zongya* is a supplementary marker, merely activating the attention of the audience, in (3.41)–(3.43), *a(s)zongya* is the only element with the quotative function. Basically, the marker signals the presence of the quote, although semantically it does not necessarily refer to the speech event. For example, in (3.41) and (3.42) the RD can be interpreted as a quotation of speech, although in (3.43) the marker is merely indicating the presence of the quote which is unlikely to be interpreted as quotation of speech; rather the general meaning of quoted information can be assigned for the RD there.

|        |                     |                    |                   |                 |
|--------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| (3.41) | <i>A</i>            | <i>végén</i>       | <i>már</i>        | <i>a</i>        |
|        | DEF                 | end.3SG.SUPE       | already           | DEF             |
|        | <i>szpiker</i>      | <i>is</i>          | <i>alázott</i>    | <i>kicsit,</i>  |
|        | speaker             | also               | humiliate.PST.3SG | a.bit           |
|        | <i>azongya</i>      | <i>Mihajlovics</i> | <i>a</i>          | <i>4.</i>       |
|        | DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF | PN                 | DEF               | fourth          |
|        | <i>negyedben</i>    | <i>már</i>         | <i>a</i>          | <i>Partizan</i> |
|        | quarter:INE         | already            | DEF               | PN              |
|        | <i>elleni</i>       | <i>meccsre</i>     | <i>melegít</i>    |                 |
|        | against.ADJ         | match.SUBL         | warm.up.PRS.3SG   |                 |

‘In the end, already **the speaker** also **humiliated** a bit, **says** Mihajlovics in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter is already warming up for the match against Partizan’ (bb1.hu).

|        |                          |               |                                   |
|--------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| (3.42) | <i>Miniszterelnökünk</i> | <i>kissé</i>  | <i>megettévt:</i>                 |
|        | prime-minister.1PL       | little.TRANSL | mistake.PST.3SG                   |
|        | <i>azongya:</i>          | <i>úgy</i>    | <i>tudja,</i>                     |
|        | DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF      | thus          | know.PRS.3SG:DEF                  |
|        | <i>hogy</i>              | <i>Kovács</i> | <i>László</i>                     |
|        | COMP                     | PN            | PN                                |
|        | <i>az</i>                | <i>MSZP</i>   | <i>miniszterelnök-jelöltje...</i> |
|        | DEF                      | PN            | prime-minister-candidate.3SG      |

‘**Our prime-minister has mistaken** a bit, **saying**: as far as he knows László Kovács is the MSZP’s<sup>92</sup> prime-minister candidate...’ (MNSz).

<sup>92</sup> Magyar Szocialista Párt or MSZP is the Hungarian Socialist Party.

- (3.43) *Progi indul, aszongya: No*  
 program start.PRS.3SG DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF no  
*Transcend SSD – anyád*  
 PN SSD mother.2SG  
 ‘A program starts, saying: No Transcend SSD – goddammit’ (MNSz).

In my material, I have encountered only rare occurrences where the contracted form co-occurs with proper NSVs without being separated from each other, as in (3.42) and (3.43). In the Hungarian National Corpus, of the ca. 880 instances (with possible repetitions) where the particle is used, only in six of them *a(s)zongya* co-occurs with NSVs right away following them. More frequently the speakers tend to use the quotative *a(s)zongya* separated from the NSVs with the connective conjunction *és* ‘and’ or *meg* ‘and, but’, as in (3.44). Hence, one can interpret the punctuation in (3.43) interchangeable with connective conjunctions, fulfilling identical function. As a result, the co-occurrence of the clauses with NSVs and *a(s)zongya*, as in (3.43), hardly form a separate subclass on its own and instead depict a basic use of the marker, paraphrasable with the non-contracted QI *azt mondja*.

- (3.44) *Aztán hameg [sic!] hazajön és*  
 then when.and come.home.PRS.3SG and  
*aszongya, hogy nem úgy*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF COMP NEG thus  
*van az...*  
 be.PRS.3SG DEM.D  
 ‘Then when (s)he comes home and says that it’s not like that...’ (MNSz).

In contrast, (3.41) and (3.42) can be considered a subclass of the bipartite QI presented in (3.40). The motivation behind this claim lies in the fact that the NSVs in the matrix clauses do not show agreement in tense with the quotative *a(s)zongya*. Consequently, it is hardly interchangeable with the QI-clause with the form of the SV in the present tense, while the verb in the matrix clause is in the past tense. Nonetheless, in similar contexts, *a(s)zongya* appears relatively rarely, and the pattern of its occurrence with proper NSVs, as in (3.43)–(3.44), is more frequent, compared with examples as in (3.41)–(3.42).

A separate subclass of a bipartite QI formed with *a(s)zongya* can be observed where the marker is preceded by the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ – *hogy aszongya* ‘that says’ – in the preposed position to the quote. Unlike the less frequent subtype of a bipartite QI as in (3.40)–(3.41), the bipartite QI formed with *hogy a(s)zongya* shows more diversity in its use and can occur with speech (3.45) and epistemic (3.46) verbs, and with NPs, encoding the original source of RD and indicating its presence, as in (3.47).

- (3.45) ...*amelyen* *nem* *figyelmeztetnek*  
 which.SUPE NEG warn.PST.3PL  
*előzetesen,* *hogy* *aszongya*  
 in.advance COMP DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*“a* *rendezvényről* *kép*  
 DEF event.DELA picture  
*és* *hangfelvételek* *készülnek,*  
 and sound.recording.PL be.produce.PRS.3PL  
*az* *ezeken* *szereplő*  
 DEF DEM.P.PL.SUPE act.PTCP  
*személyek...* *ésatöbbi,* *ésatöbbi.”*  
 person.PL etc. etc.  
 ‘[Just imagine that you go to whatever event,] where **they didn’t warn** in advance that, **say** “the event and people taking part in it will be video- and sound-recorded... etc., etc.”’ (MNSz).

- (3.46) *Ahogy* *azt* *az*  
 how DEM.D.ACC DEF  
*átlagsofőr* *gondolja,* *hogy*  
 regular.driver think.PRS.3SG:DEF COMP  
*aszongya* *ott* *kívülről*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF here outside.DELA  
*beteszem,* *aztán* *tolom*  
 insert.PRS.1SG:DEF then push.PRS.1SG:DEF  
*neki,* *ami* *a*  
 3SG.DAT what DEF  
*csövön* *kifér,* *aztán...*  
 pipe.SUPE fit.into.PRS.3SG then  
 ‘How **the average driver thinks it, say, that** here I insert it from the outside, then push it to that, what fits into the tube, then...’ (life.hu).

- (3.47) ...*még* *nyomtatni* *is* *lehet*  
 yet print.INF also be.POT.3SG  
*hozzá* *papírt* *hogy* *aszongya*  
 PRE paper.ACC COMP DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*bocsi* *meg* *minden* *nem*  
 sorry and every NEG  
*vagyok* *udvarias* *hogy* *használok,*  
 be.PRS.1SG polite COMP use.PRS.1SG:DEF  
*de* *hát* *nagyok* *a*  
 but PTCL big.PL DEF  
*lábaim.*  
 foot.PL.1PL  
 ‘...it is yet possible to print and add a **paper that, say, sorry and I am not polite at all that I use it, but my feet are big.**’ (utazas.com).

There are several motivations to distinguish this type of a QI as a separate subclass. Firstly, it is interesting that *hogy a(s)zongya* takes the closest position to the quote, despite the fact that the complementizer *hogy*, if it is expressed in a QI-clause, is usually the leftmost element from the complement clause (Körtvély 2016: 589), i.e. in our case the quote<sup>93</sup>. Despite the ellipsis of the complementizer in (3.40)–(3.43), one could naturally expect it to be following *a(s)zongya* and not preceding it, as the complementizer in (3.44) does. Secondly, in (3.40)–(3.44) one can observe agreement in number between the verbs used in the matrix clause and *a(s)zongya*. In investigating ca. 880 occurrences with possible repetitions of examples in the Personal subcorpus of the Hungarian National corpus, I have not found any example where there would not be agreement in number between the verb in the matrix clause and the quotative *a(s)zongya* in structures like (3.40)–(3.43). However, in clauses where *a(s)zongya* is preceded by the complementizer *hogy*, I have observed cases where the marker shows disagreement in number between the verb in the matrix clause or an NP, marking the presence of RD, and *a(s)zongya* adjacent to the quote. Note that in (3.45) also the aforementioned disagreement in tense of the matrix verb and *a(s)zongya* can be observed. Thus, I conclude that in a bipartite QI preceded by the complementizer *hogy*, *a(s)zongya* loses its verbal features, preserving merely its quotative functions. As a result, it starts to be used as a quotative marker, functionally and structurally resembling more a quotative particle, than a quotative verb.

Lack of agreement in number between the verb in the matrix clause and *a(s)zongya* in this type of a bipartite QI is not entirely new for Hungarian<sup>94</sup>, it can be encountered in the Hungarian historical corpus in the texts from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century on. Before this period in such clauses *a(s)zongya* was used exclusively with singular matrix clause predicates. One example shows agreement between the predicate of the matrix clause in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural and the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural form *a(s)zongyák*. Consequently, it gives additional support to my above claim that the marker loses its verbal features as one could reasonably expect in examples (3.45), (3.48) and (3.49) the same plural form *a(s)zongyák* showing agreement in number with verbs or NPs in the matrix clause.

- (3.48) *Brüsszelben*                      *1*                      *millióan*                      *tiltaloznak,*                      *hogy*  
 Brussels.INE                      1                      million.SUPE                      protest.PRS.3PL                      COMP  
*azongya:*                      “*Nem leszünk*                      *gyarmat*”  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF                      NEG                      become.PRS.1PL                      colony  
 ‘In Brussels **1 million people protest that, say, “We won’t become a colony”**’  
 (nepszava.hu).

<sup>93</sup> See the discussion in 1.6.2.3 on the RD and (the lack of) complementation in RD-constructions.

<sup>94</sup> The earliest written form of the same bipartite QI dates back to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the Hungarian historical corpus. It appears as early as the year 1901 in the novel by Géza Gárdonyi “Slave of the Huns” (Hu. *A láthatatlan ember*, lit. ‘The Invisible Man’) (Gárdonyi 1907: 365). Consequently, it is not new for the language either.

- (3.49) ...*szerencsétlen* *kínai* *csaj* *előregyártott*  
 unfortunate Chinese girl prefabricated  
*klisé* *szövegeket* *nyomat,* ***hogy***  
 cliché text.PL.ACC produce.PRS.3SG COMP  
***azongya*** *így* *kell* *az*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF so must.PRS.3SG DEF  
*XP-n(!!!!)* *elindítanom* *a*  
 XP.SUPE set.up.INF.1SG DEF  
*Hyper Terminált.*  
 Hyper.Terminál.ACC  
 ‘Unfortunate Chinese girl produces a prefabricated cliché **text that, say I must set up the Hyper Terminal on XP like this.**’ (hup.hu).

Quite naturally, *a(s)zongya*, like the non-contracted QI-clause *azt mondja*, may introduce both real and fictional quotations of speech. Fictional RD can occur in RD-constructions where the contracted QI is interchangeable with the QI-clause *azt mondja*, as in (3.50), or it forms a bipartite QI, as in (3.51). The presence of fictional RD is governed exclusively by intentions and discourse motivations of the reporter and cannot be considered a typical functional feature of this marker. Consequently, one cannot expect a systematic use of the marker with this type of RD.

- (3.50) *ha* *bemegy* *a* *stúdióba* *a*  
 if come.in.PRS.3SG DEF studio.ILL DEF  
*Pető* *Iván,* *és* *százszor* *egymás*  
 PN PN and hundred.times one.another  
*után* ***azongya,*** ***hogy*** *“Orbán* *Viktor*  
 after DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF COMP PN PN  
*így...”* *meg* *“Orbán* *Viktor* *úgy...”*  
 so and PN PN thus  
 ‘If Iván Pető comes into the studio and hundred times one after another **he says that “Viktor Orbán this way...”** and **“Viktor Orbán that way...”**’ (MNSz).

- (3.51) *Egy* *címfestett* ***tábla,*** ***hogy*** ***azongya***  
 INDEF sign-paint.PTCP board COMP DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
*“hősök* *fasora”,* *az* *meg* *nem.*  
 hero.PL alley.3SG DEF also NEG  
 ‘A sign-painted board **saying (that) “heroes’ alley”, that not yet.**’  
 (wikipedia.com).

In contrast to both factive and fictional presentations of someone’s speech, more systematically the marker occurs with quotations of thoughts where it forms a bipartite QI-clause. In such cases, the quotation of thoughts is primarily marked by the EV in the matrix clause, cf. (3.46), (3.52). Note once again the lack of agreement in tense and number between the verb in the matrix clause and quotative *a(s)zongya* in (3.52). In RD-constructions consisting of quotations of thoughts, *a(s)zongya* functions merely as a QI marking the presence of RD, rather than indicating that the RD would represent a speech act. In such contexts, it cannot be substituted by the non-contracted form. Hence, this shows one more difference between the quotative *a(s)zongya* and the QI-clause *azt mondja*.

- (3.52) *Szóval, ott tartottunk, hogy aszongya:*  
 word.COM there hold.PST.1PL COMP DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
 “nyugodt vagyok, nyugodt vagyok...”  
 calm be.PRS.1SG calm be.PRS.1SG  
 ‘In short, we **thought saying** “I am calm, I am calm...”’ (tusarokesporaz.hu).

In addition to the above uses of *a(s)zongya* in bipartite QI-clauses, the quotative marker may appear as a single quote-introducer. In some cases, it is used to refer to someone’s previous utterance or to information quoted from some other source, since online *a(s)zongya* frequently occurs in forums where speakers discuss different computer software- or hardware-related issues, cf. (3.53), (3.54). It is hardly referring to any concrete speaker, and instead marks the information as quoted without specifying the source. The original meaning of the marker denoting previously produced utterances becomes blurred. Instead, it is used as a marker merely indicating the presence of RD without specifying its subtype and giving no information about the event behind the RD.

- (3.53) *aszongya a megoldás: BIOS verzió F10C*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF solution BIOS version F10C  
 ‘**says:** the solution is BIOS version F10C’ (blog.hu).

- (3.54) *Azongya: “please purge and reinstall apache2.2.-common”*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF QUOTE  
 ‘**Says:** “please purge and reinstall apache2.2.-common”’ (ubuntu.hu).

Interestingly, the position of *a(s)zongya* as a single quote-introducer is not always fixed. Based on my observations, the position of the marker preposed to the quote, as in (3.53) and (3.54), remains the most common one. However, in some cases, *a(s)zongya* can appear postposed to the quote, as in (3.55) and (3.56). (3.55) depicts quite a compelling case, since graphically the reporter has indicated the presence of the quote by placing the colon and quotation marks, despite the fact that the verb indicating the presence of the quote was initially omitted from the matrix clause. Most likely, later on the reporter intended to additionally mark the appearance of the quote, and put *a(s)zongya* at the end of the RD.

- (3.55) *Azt viszont nem fogadom*  
 DEM.D.ACC however NEG receive.PRS.1SG:DEF  
*el a Demszkytól, hogy*  
 PRE DEF PN COMP  
*át akar nevelni: “Meggzoksz,*  
 PRE want.PRS.3SG educate.INF get.used.PRS.2SG  
*megszökös, vagy átszökös!” aszongya*  
 escape.PRS.2SG or adopt.PRS.2SG DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
 ‘That, however, I won’t accept from Demszky that he wants to re-educate [us]:  
“You will get used, flee or adopt!”, **says**’ (MNSz).



- (3.56) *Nem tud belépni, aszongya.*  
 NEG can.PRS.3SG log.in.INF DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF  
 ‘Can’t log-in, says.’ (MNSz).

Furthermore, in more rare occurrences, *a(s)zongya* appears in the intraposed position where it splits the RD into parts, as in (3.57). Note that the non-contracted QI *azt mondja* is exclusively placed in the preposed position to the quote (see Section 3.2). Consequently, also on the syntactic level the marker becomes more independent and can be used in various positions to the quote. Fónagy (1986: 262) has briefly indicated that the contracted forms of the quotative markers *a(s)zongya* and *úgymond* (see 3.4.4) have lost their referential functions, in comparison to the non-contracted forms<sup>95</sup>. Consequently, the position of non-contracted QIs to the quote is motivated by the cataphoric functions of the distal demonstratives *az* and *úgy*. When the contracted forms appear, the cataphoric reference is not bounded to the use of the markers and their general quotative functions become foregrounded instead.

- (3.57) *Várjál – aszongya – felhívom az*  
 wait.IMP2SG DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF call.up.PRS.1SG DEF  
*ofőmet és megkérdezem.*  
 head.of.department.1SG.ACC and PRF.ask.PRS.1SG  
 ‘Wait – she says – I will call the head of my department and ask.’ (MNSz).

To sum up, as far as the above uses of *a(s)zongya* show, in cases where it cannot be interchangeable with the non-contracted form, it functions as an independent quotative marker that has acquired its own less strict distribution in the quotative domain. Its functions broaden because the marker in the contracted forms loses its SV-semantics. The loss of the referential meaning of the distal demonstrative *az* leads to the use of the marker in less strict position inside RD-constructions where it can appear as a postposed or intraposed QI. As part of a bipartite QI or as a single quote-introducer, *a(s)zongya* has acquired the broader meaning of a quotative marker, indicating the presence of RD as such, rather than quotations of speech only.

### 3.4.3. The quotative marker *mondván*

The quotative marker *mondván* dates back to the Old Hungarian period (Dömötör 2001, 2015). It represents a converb form, deriving from the basic SV *mond* ‘say’ in the form of the participle in the superessive case and lit. meaning ‘saying’. Excellent descriptions of *mondván* from the diachronic perspective can be found in Dömötör (2001, 2015), which I refer to here, adding insights into the use of the marker in the quotative domain of contemporary colloquial Hungarian.

<sup>95</sup> It remains still slightly unclear what Fónagy (1986: 262) means by “have hardly any referential meaning”. My interpretation is open to discussion and can be further argued.

A starting point for the use of the marker was a bipartite QI, consisting most likely of an SV or an NP, depicting the original source of RD (Dömötör 2015: 22ff.). As Dömötör (2001: 252) points out, “[i]n these double reporting expressions [i.e. bipartite QIs, DT] the first verb signals the speech act, identifies the role played by the utterance in the communication, or highlights one of the aspects of the utterance, while the quotation itself is inserted into the structure by *mond(ván)*”. As the author points out, *mondván* could attach to any SV, used in that period, and NP, denoting a speech act, e.g. *imádság* ‘prayer’, *ének* ‘song’, etc. (ibid.).

The use of *mondván* as part of a bipartite QI in Old Hungarian is not accidental, and is claimed to be a pattern replication from Latin, where the converb form of the SV *dicens* ‘saying’ was used to introduce quotations (Dömötör 2001: 252). In Latin, the use of *dicens* in quotative constructions is not autochthonous and represents, in turn, a pattern replication from the Hebrew quotative marker *lémor*, frequently used in RD-constructions in Biblical texts (Dömötör 2001: 252; Dömötör 2015: 25; for more details on functions of *lémor* in Hebrew Biblical texts see e.g. Sandler & Pascual 2019). Consequently, in this period the marker was used most frequently in Biblical translations from Latin. Nonetheless, in contemporary Hungarian, one can still observe a similar use of the marker, and without surprise, also in contexts where speakers quote religious texts, most probably preserving more archaic structures, as in (3.58).

|        |   |                                      |                                      |                                    |
|--------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (3.58) | <i>És</i><br>and  | <i>ő</i><br>3SG                      | <i>válaszolt,</i><br>answer.PST.3SG  | <i>mondván:</i><br>say.PTCP.SUPE   |
|        | <i>Szomorúságtokban</i><br>sorrow.2PL.INE   | <i>és</i><br>and                     | <i>szükségtekben</i><br>need.2PL.INE | <i>imádkoztok;</i><br>pray.PRS.2PL |
|        | <i>vajha</i><br>though  | <i>imádkoznátok</i><br>pray.COND.2PL | <i>örömetek</i><br>joy.2PL           | <i>és</i><br>and                   |
|        | <i>bőségetek</i><br>abundance.2PL   | <i>teljében</i><br>fullness.INE      | <i>is.</i><br>also                   |                                    |
|        | ‘And <b>he answered, and said:</b> <u>Thou wilt pray in the sorrow, and in need; though you would pray in the fullness of your joy and abundance.</u> ’ (MNSz). |                                      |                                      |                                    |

It is entirely possible though that the whole RD-construction in (3.58) represents a quote from the Bible. Nonetheless, I have attested a non-biblical example where the marker co-occurs in a bipartite QI with the QV *előáll*, cf. (3.59). Despite the original non-reportative semantics of the QV in (3.59), lit. meaning ‘step forward’, in contemporary Hungarian *előáll* carries out functions of a specific SV, meaning ‘claim, present’ (Dömötör, p.c., Gyuris, p.c.). The peculiarity about its use lies in the possibility of being accompanied either by the cataphoric *az* or an NP in the comitative case, encoding the original source of RD, as in (3.59) (see Section 3.6 for the further discussion of the functions and structural use of *előáll* in contemporary Hungarian quotative constructions). Consequently, the reporter in (3.59) specifies the source of the claim, i.e. ‘a more pessimistic estimation’, accompanying the lexicalized SV. *Mondván* appears as an additional marker, intensifying the quotative function of the previously mentioned SV, and indicating that now the quote will follow by being placed in the adjacent position to RD. As it was pointed

out in Keszler (2000: 468), word forms like *mondván* and *úgymond* (see the following subsection 3.4.4) carry out a foregrounding function. Hence, they focus the attention of the audience on the presence of RD.

|        |                      |                   |                    |              |
|--------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| (3.59) | <b>Süsübü</b>        | <i>nekem</i>      | <i>személyesen</i> | <i>még</i>   |
|        | PN                   | DAT.1SG           | personally         | already      |
|        | <i>pesszimistább</i> | <b>becsléssel</b> | <b>állt</b>        | <b>elő,</b>  |
|        | pessimistic.COMPAR   | estimation.COM    | stand.PST.3SG      | PRE          |
|        | <b>mondván:</b>      | <i>250</i>        | <i>ezer</i>        | <i>volna</i> |
|        | say.PTCP.SUPE        | NUM               | thousand           | be.COND.3SG  |
|        | <i>Székelyföldön</i> | <i>a</i>          | <i>számuk.</i>     |              |
|        | PN.SUPE              | DEF               | number.3PL         |              |

‘**Süsübü drew up** to me personally with an even more pessimistic **estimation**, **saying**: their number in Székely Land would be 250 thousand.’ (MNSz).

The use of *mondván* with SVs can be considered high style, since (3.59) was the only occasion I managed to encounter where *mondván* accompanies a proper SV and which appears in non-biblical contexts. As Dömötör (2015: 29) points out, in the later stages of Hungarian, *mondván* appears less frequently co-occurring with other SVs, since different genres henceforth started to play a more important role among the literary texts. Consequently, the less frequent use of the marker co-occurring with proper SVs in other contexts than Biblical ones might be connected to the fact that this quotative construction has not become conventionalized in different genres of Hungarian literature, and later on has not been carried out to other styles and genres of Hungarian from the Biblical texts.

Nonetheless, the marker can be frequently encountered with NSVs that lack reportative semantics and quotative functions. Thus, *mondván* appears as the only quotative marker indicating the presence of RD. Consider (3.60) and (3.61) depicting the co-occurrence of *mondván* with proper NSVs.

|        |              |                     |                    |                    |
|--------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (3.60) | <i>Aztán</i> | <i>nyolcadik</i>    | <i>körül</i>       | <b>az</b>          |
|        | then         | eighth              | around             | DEF                |
|        | <b>eladó</b> | <i>már</i>          | <i>rezignáltan</i> | <b>legyintett</b>  |
|        | seller       | already             | resignedly         | wave.aside.PST.3SG |
|        | <i>az</i>    | <i>engedélyre,</i>  | <b>mondván</b>     | ‘‘Hányat           |
|        | DEF          | permit/license.SUBL | say.PTCP.SUPE      | how.much.ACC       |

*adjak?’’*  
give.IMP.1SG  
‘Then around the 8<sup>th</sup> **the seller** already resignedly **waved aside** to the permit **saying** ‘‘How much should I give?’’’ (MNSz).

- (3.61) ...*Bukarest* *mégis* *elutasította* *a* *pártként*  
 PN after.all reject.PST.3SG:DEF DEF party.ESS1  
*való* *bejegyzésüket,* *mondván,* *hogy* *akkor*  
 worth registration.3PL.ACC say.PTCP.SUPE COMP then  
*Koszovó* *lesz* *Erdélyből.*  
 PN be.FUT.3SG PN.ELA  
 ‘...after all **Bucharest rejected** their registration as a party, **saying** (that) then Transylvania will turn into some Kosovo.’ (MNSz).

The functions of *mondván* remain restricted to the representation of speech events. Hence, unlike *a(s)zongya*, the quotative marker *mondván* has not developed broader functions of a general QI, marking different types of RD, and has preserved the semantics of the SV *mond* in the quotative domain of the language. As my observations show, even where *mondván* co-occurs with the EV *gondol* ‘think’, it is used rather as a marker, signaling the representation of the speech act, than appearing as a quote-introducer of someone’s previous thoughts. Consider (3.62) where the clause with the EV *gondol* is separated by *mondván* from the RD, marking quotation of speech rather than embedding RD into a clause with the epistemic verb and forming thus an RD-construction. This claim is mainly supported by the fact that both parts of the sentence are independent of each other, and can form two separate sentences. Also, take into consideration the fact that *mondván* can be used as a single QI introducing RD, as I describe below, cf. (3.63).

- (3.62) *A* *meghívást* *hosszú* *távra*  
 DEF invitation.ACC long term.SUBL  
*gondolta,* *mondván* *ott* *jobb*  
 think.PST.3SG:DEF say.PTCP.SUPE there good.COMPAR  
*lenne* *az* *idős* *férfinak.*  
 be.COND.3SG DEF elderly guy.DAT  
 ‘He thought the invitation is for a long term, **saying** it will be better there for an elderly guy.’ (origo.hu).

As (3.63) and (3.64) below show, structurally *mondván* can also appear as a single-quote introducer without being accompanied by a matrix clause with speech or non-speech verbs. As Dömötör (2015: 22) points out, such a use is not new for the marker. Quite rarely *mondván* can be encountered as a single quote-introducer already in the Old Hungarian period (10<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> century).

- (3.63) ...*újra-újra* *próbáltál* *Laci* *ellen*  
 again-again try.PST.2SG PN against  
*uszítani* *hogy* *győzzem* *meg*  
 instigate.INF COMP convince.IMP.1SG PRF  
*a* *többieket* *a* *megfűrásának*  
 DEF other.PL.ACC DEF drill.3SG.DAT  
*szükségességéről.* *Mondván:* *Toroczkai* *már*  
 necessity.3SG.DELA say.PTCP.SUPE PN already

|                 |                    |                     |               |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| <i>úgyis</i>    | <i>tönkretette</i> | <i>az</i>           | <i>életét</i> |
| anyway          | ruin.PST.3SG:DEF   | DEF                 | life.3SG.ACC  |
| <i>azzal,</i>   | <i>hogy</i>        | <i>a</i>            |               |
| DEM.D.COM       | COMP               | DEF                 |               |
| <i>peredet</i>  | <i>nyakába</i>     | <i>zúdította...</i> |               |
| lawsuit.2SG.ACC | neck.3SG.ILL       | volley.PST.3SG:DEF  |               |

‘...again and again, you tried to instigate against Laci that I have to convince the others of the necessity of the drill. **Saying:** Toroczkai has already ruined his life by volleying your lawsuit on his own neck...’ (MNSz).

- (3.64) *Lukács 24:7*      **Mondván:**      *Szükség*      *az*  
 Luke 24:7      say.PTCP.SUPE      need      DEF  
*ember*      *Fiának*      *átadatni*      *a*  
 man      son.3SG.DAT      deliver.INF      DEF  
*bűnös*      *emberek*      *kezébe,*      *és*  
 sinful      person.PL      hand.3PL.ILL      and  
*megfeszítetteti,*      *és*      *harmadnapon*      *feltámadni.*  
 crucifixion.INF      and      third.day.SUPE      resurrect.INF  
 ‘Luke 24:7 **Saying:** The Son of Man must be delivered over to the hands of sinners, be crucified and on the third day be raised again.’ (MNSz).

In addition, one can also encounter cases where *mondván* can be found with NPs, indicating the original source of RD, as in (3.65). According to Dömötör (2001: 252), the co-occurrence of an NP and *mondván* can already be encountered in early Biblical translations. In contemporary Hungarian, unlike the strategies where the marker co-occurs with SVs, this type of a quotative construction is encountered more frequently in different contexts.

- (3.65) *Mint*      *legutóbb*      *is*      *láthattuk*      *fognak*  
 like      recently      also      see.POT.1PL:DEF      receive.PRS.3PL  
*egy*      *ezeréves*      *szar*      *szalagot,*      ***mondván***  
 INDEF      thousand.year.ADJ      shit      ribbon.ACC      say.PTCP.SUPE  
 “jó”      *és*      *a*      *sok*      *hülyének”*  
 good      and      DEF      lot      idiot.DAT  
 ‘Like we could see it recently, they take a thousand-year-old shitty **ribbon saying** “good and for the many idiots”’ (MNSz).

Despite the lack of drastic changes in the use of *mondván* in RD-constructions, Dömötör (2015: 33) has pointed out a development of the marker outside the quotative domain. She noticed that the marker is becoming reanalyzed as a conjunction meaning ‘because’. A couple of ambiguous cases are also observed in internet communications, as in (3.66). I consider such a use of the marker an ambiguous case since both readings are equally possible – quotative, meaning ‘saying’, and non-quotative, meaning ‘because’.

- (3.66) ...*amiről*            *édesapám*            *mindig*            *lebeszél,*  
 what.DELA            father.1SG            always            talk.out.PST.3SG  
*mondván*            *úgyisincs*            *hozzá*            *tehetségem...*  
 say.PTCP.SUPE      thus.also.NEG:EXIST    ALL.3SG            gift.1SG  
 ‘...from which my father always talked me out, **saying/because** I don’t have gift for it anyway...’ (MNSz).

I will not additionally describe the functional extension carried out by *mondván* outside the quotative domain, since it neither plays a role in the use of the marker in the quotative domain nor illustrates functional extensions interesting for this research, e.g. epistemic or evidential. However, as Güldemann (2008: 465) points out, the development of quotative indexes, especially verbal ones (a non-finite converb or participle<sup>96</sup>), into reason conjunctions is a quite widespread phenomenon cross-linguistically. Among the world’s languages, Güldemann points out those from the South Asian region, e.g. Dravidian, Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman, where such a phenomenon is especially widespread and probably represents an areal feature. In addition, he refers to some other languages where it can be encountered and provides several accounts for African languages (ibid.: 465–467)<sup>97</sup>. The reader interested in similar functional extensions in the use of *mondván* is referred to the study by Dömötör (2015) and examples of *mondván* as a reason conjunction there (ibid.: 33).

#### 3.4.4. The quotative particle *úgymond*

Like *mondván*, the quotative particle *úgymond* can already be encountered in older Hungarian texts (Dömötör 2001: 358). The particle itself derives from the collocation of the distal MD *úgy* ‘thus’ and the basic SV *mond* ‘say’ which in time merged into a quotative particle. Since *úgymond* has a long history in Hungarian and is characterized by various structural and functional uses in different periods, before discussing its peculiarities in contemporary Hungarian, I first provide a short diachronic overview, based on previous findings by Dömötör (2001, 2008, 2015).

In old Hungarian texts, the particle appears similarly to *mondván* in bipartite QIs, usually consisting of SVs or NPs, encoding the source of RD (Dömötör 2008: 39ff.; Dömötör 2015: 22). In the Old Hungarian period (10<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> century), bipartite QIs with *úgymond* were quite rare; although beginning from the Middle Hungarian period (first half of 16<sup>th</sup> – second half of 18<sup>th</sup> century), the particle is more frequently used as part of a bipartite QI (Dömötör 2015: 26), usually to emphasize the occurrence of RD in the text, taking the adjacent position to the quote. In such cases, *úgymond* is either embedded into the matrix clause or is separated from it with the conjunction *és* ‘and’. In earlier texts, it is used predominantly with direct RD, but

<sup>96</sup> Note that *mondván* presents a converb form of the SV *mond* ‘say’.

<sup>97</sup> See also Heine & Kuteva (2002: 261) for examples of the grammaticalization of speech verbs into reason conjunctions among the world’s languages.

already during the further stages of the Old Hungarian period, it can introduce equally direct and indirect RD (Dömötör 2008: 38).

During the later periods, the collocation of the MD and the SV started to merge which can be seen from (i) the frequent spelling of the collocation as one word, and (ii) the preservation of the collocation in contexts where the MD along with other endophoric demonstratives was usually left out from the QI-clause, e.g. VS word order in the QI-clause (Dömötör 2001: 358, 361). The majority of the authors of that period also prefer the use of the distal MD over its proximal counterpart; however, the proximal variant *így* in the QI-clauses is not unheard of, and it also appears in the identical collocation with some speakers, although less systematically (Dömötör 2001: 364; Dömötör 2015: 22). As a result, only the collocation of distal *úgy* and *mond* merged into one word and grammaticalized into a quotative particle.

In later stages, between the Old and Middle Hungarian period, the position of the particle is not fixed anymore. It is frequently inserted into RD, thus splitting the quote into several parts. In the cases where long stretches of RD occur, it signals that the quotation is still going on (Dömötör 2001: 359; Dömötör 2008: 40). Its reporting capacities start increasing which can be observed in constructions where *úgymond* can appear as a single quote-introducer without being preceded by the matrix clause with a reporting VP or NP (Dömötör 2001: 360), as in (3.67).

- (3.67) *Tinektek, úgymond, papoknak és pispékeknek...*  
 2PL.DAT.2PL QUOT priest.PL.DAT and bishop.PL.DAT  
 ‘To you, said, to priests and bishops...’ (Dömötör 2008: 40; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In later stages between the 17<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the marker is already used as an independent quote-introducer, signaling the shift from regular to reported discourse, or is accompanied by an NP, encoding the speaker (Dömötör 2008: 41–42), as in (3.68).

- (3.68) *Nemsokára – úgymond Szű – kiszabadulok*  
 soon QUOT PN escape.PRS1SG  
 ‘Soon – said Szű – I will escape’ (Dömötör 2008: 41; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, development of non-quotative functions carried out by *úgymond* can be observed. Despite this development, *úgymond* is, nonetheless, used predominantly as a single quote-introducer, usually appearing without a QI-clause, preceding the quote. Alternatively, the quotative particle is likely to be inserted into RD and thus indicates that the sentence or part of the text consists of quoted material, as in (3.69).

|        |  |            |                    |                   |                |
|--------|--|------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| (3.69) | ... <i>az</i>  | <i>Pál</i> | <i>uram</i>        | <i>elkezdte</i>   | <i>az</i>      |
|        | DEF  | Paul       | master.1SG         | start.PST.3SG:DEF | DEF            |
|        | <i>felelést:</i>   | <i>Én,</i> | <i>úgymond,</i>    | <i>így</i>        | <i>felelek</i> |
|        | answer.ACC   | 1SG        | QUOT               | so                | answer.PRS.1SG |
|        | <i>rá,</i>   | <i>nem</i> | <i>temagadhoz,</i> | <i>hanem</i>      | <i>az</i>      |
|        | SUBL.3SG   | NEG        | 2SG.self.2SG.ALL   | but               | DEF            |
|        | <i>fiadhoz...</i>  |            |                    |                   |                |
|        | son.2SG.ALL  |            |                    |                   |                |
|        | ‘ <u>My master Paul started the response: I, said, will answer to this so, not to you, but to your son...</u> ’ (Dömötör 2008: 42; glossing and translation are mine, DT). |            |                    |                   |                |

Outside the quotative domain, the particle starts to be used as a discourse marker, signaling that the presented information derives from some unspecified source, and does not belong to either of the participants in the current discourse. *Úgymond* can also mark parts of the clause or whole clauses that can be classified as general knowledge. Thus, functionally it appears as a hedge, paraphrasable with clauses like *mint mondják* ‘as (they/people) say’ and *mint szokták mondani* ‘as (they/people) used to say’ (Dömötör 2008: 42–43).

In the later stages, beginning from the 80’s of the previous century, the particle undergoes changes both in quotative and non-quotative use (Dömötör 2008: 43–44). In the quotative domain, *úgymond* appears less frequently as a single quote-introducer, and most likely it has to be preceded by some quotative element, either consisting of a VP or NP, specifying the event behind the RD or encoding its source (*ibid.*), cf. (3.70). In its non-quotative use, *úgymond* starts functioning predominantly as a discourse marker, paraphrasable by expressions like *idézőjelben* ‘in quotation marks’, *idézőjelbe téve* ‘putting (it) into quotation marks’, *idézőjelben mondva* ‘saying (it) in quotation marks’. Thus, outside the quotative domain, it is still used predominantly as a discourse marker with hedging function, typically referring to common knowledge or to information taken from outside the current discourse (Dömötör 2015: 29–30). If one thoroughly considers the definition of RD, the information taken from outside the current discourse broadly falls under the definition of RD that I use here, i.e. “representation of a spoken or mental text (...) produced by the source of consciousness in a pragmatic and deictic setting that is different from that of the immediate discourse”. As I show below, this type of discourse is frequently equivalent to the category of hypothetical quotations. Consequently, there is reason to see how this function, usually considered non-quotative, occupies a niche along with other quotative functions, still fulfilled by *úgymond*.

Among the newer functions, one can observe the particle showing non-equivalence between the use of the word or a phrase in the current context and the definition or classification, acceptable by the current speaker. Thus, the speaker indicates that (s)he uses a word or a phrase but does not find it entirely accurate or suitable for the current context. Furthermore, *úgymond* can also be used as a discourse marker with different stylistic overtones, marking irony or (quite frequently inappropriate) context-dependent use of a word or phrase, or it merely carries out the focusing function (Dömötör 2008: 43–46). For more detailed descriptions of



the non-quotative functions of *úgymond*, I refer the reader interested in this topic to overviews in Dömötör (2008: 44ff.) and Dömötör (2015: 29–30).

As one could have noticed, in the last couple of decades, the marker has developed a large number of non-quotative functions, while its quotative functions have slightly faded into the background. Nonetheless, in contemporary Hungarian, *úgymond* can be still used as a quotative index that indicates various types of RD – from quotations of speech and thoughts to hypothetical quotations. Quite compelling is the fact that the functions *úgymond* developed outside the quotative domain have an impact on its use in RD-constructions, which I attempt to show further in this subsection.

As Dömötör (2008: 43–44) has pointed out, nowadays *úgymond* is likely to be used co-occurring with a QI-clause, consisting of SEVs. Based on my observations, however, the co-occurrence of EVs and *úgymond* are quite rare. I will come back to this topic a bit below. Now let’s take a look at the use of the marker together with SVs.

|        |  |                  |                     |                    |             |
|--------|--|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| (3.70) | <b>Berlusconi</b>  | <b>hosszasan</b> | <b>beszélt</b>      | <b>arról,</b>      | <b>hogy</b> |
|        | PN   | long.ADV         | speak.PST.3SG       | DEM.D.DELA         | COMP        |
|        | <b>úgymond</b>   | <b>a</b>         | <b>baloldal</b>     | <b>uralja</b>      | <b>az</b>   |
|        | QUOT   | DEF              | left.side           | govern.PRS.3SG:DEF | DEF         |
|        | <b>iskolákat,</b>  | <b>az</b>        | <b>egyetemeket,</b> | <b>így</b>         | <b>a</b>    |
|        | school.PL.ACC  | DEF              | university.PL.ACC   | thus               | DEF         |
|        | <b>bíróságokat</b>   | <b>is...</b>     |                     |                    |             |
|        | court.PL.ACC   | also             |                     |                    |             |
|        | <b>‘Berlusconi spoke for long about that, that, so to speak, the left wing governs the schools, the universities, and so also courts...’ (MNSz).</b> |                  |                     |                    |             |

In (3.70), *úgymond* forms a bipartite QI together with the matrix clause consisting of an SV that specifies the event behind the RD. As a quotative marker, in such a construction *úgymond* remains a supplementary element since the SV *beszél*, the endophoric pronoun in the delative case *arról* ‘about that’ and the complementizer *hogy* already indicate that a quote will follow. Consequently, one could naturally expect that besides secondarily marking the presence of a quote, *úgymond* may fulfill some additional meaning. As one can see, the quote *per se* represents rather a summarized version of what Berlusconi was long talking about. Hence, one can reasonably assume that the quote represents approximately reproduced statements in one sentence. As a result, one can foresee the hedging function in the use of the marker inside the quotative domain. The reporter emphasizes that the quoted part might show some non-equivalence between what is presented here as a quote and what Berlusconi was actually talking about. Hence, the quote should be considered instead nothing more than an approximate representation of his words. Note that outside the quotative domain, *úgymond* quite frequently expresses the same meaning of non-equivalence between the use of a word or a phrase inside and outside the conversation. This function of *úgymond* can be compared to the use of the SIMs in other languages. Since the Hungarian quotative system does not employ SIMs, it is quite natural that another semantic class can be used to fulfill

these functions. One can also note that the opposite direction of the grammaticalization process is not unheard of. Namely, SVs frequently grammaticalize in the world's languages into comparative/similative markers, as some findings by Chappell (2008: 50) show. Consequently, a niche of marking the quote as produced approximately with potential non-equivalence between the quoted and original discourse can be observed in the use of the quotative particle *úgymond*, deriving from a SV.

The same hedging meaning can also be observed where *úgymond* co-occurs with EVs. According to my observations, such co-occurrences are not frequent in general, and only in a couple of occurrences, I have observed *úgymond* forming a bipartite QI with an EV. I assume that this tendency can be explained by the semantics of the particle and the connections between its meaning and functions. One can also notice that even outside the quotative domain as a discourse marker, *úgymond* preserves the semantics of the SV and has the meanings 'so to speak', 'so it is/could be said', 'so-called', etc. In addition, speakers often prefer to put the parts of the discourse, modified by *úgymond*, in quotation marks, even if the modified part does not represent RD. Hence, one can notice that despite the decline of its use in the quotative domain, the marker preserves some quotative features even in non-quotative use. As a result, the co-occurrence of the marker with SVs might sound more natural than with EVs. Alternatively, the low frequency with EVs can also be explained by the general decline of the use of *úgymond* in the quotative domain, and the foregrounding of its use as a discourse particle.

- (3.71) ...*ő*                    *is*                    *így*                    *gondolta*                    *hogy*  
 3SG                    also                    so                    think.PST.3SG:DEF    COMP  
*úgymond*                    *férjhez*                    *kell*                    *mennie!!!*  
 QUOT                    husband.ALL                    must.PRS.3SG                    go.INF.3SG  
 '...**she** also **thought so that, so to speak, she has to get married!!!**'  
 (miabonyunk.hu).

Besides co-occurrences with SEVs, the particle can form a bipartite QI together with NPs, encoding the original source of RD, as in (3.72). Note that in this example the reporter presents a quote with an ironic overtone (e.g. reference to the original speaker as 'my modesty'). Consequently, the choice of the words forming the content of the quote can be considered rather subjectively chosen, than representing László Kövér's statement close to his original utterance.

- (3.72) ...*a*                    *valótlan*                    *tényállítással*                    *hozakodik*                    *elő,*  
 DEF                    unrealistic                    fact.statement.COM                    come.PRS.3SG                    forward  
*hogy*                    *úgymond*                    *szereénységem*                    *azért*                    *távozott*  
 COMP                    QUOT                    modesty.1SG                    therefore                    exit.PST.3SG  
*a*                    *Jobbikból,*                    *mert*                    *rasszista...*  
 DEF                    PN.ELA                    because                    racist  
 '[...when László Kövér] comes up with the unrealistic **statement that so to speak my modesty drew away from the Jobbik party because it's racist...**' (MNSz).

Additionally, the particle may appear as a single quote-introducer. In such cases, several different functions of *úgymond* can be observed. It can refer to some statement as common knowledge or some well-known utterance, cf. (3.73)–(3.74), that, however, does not belong to the current discourse and thus derives from outside of it. Consequently, parts of discourse modified by *úgymond* can be considered subtypes of RD in a broader sense. They are likely to represent a discourse that formally resembles a quote, although it does not originate from an utterance, attributed to a concrete speaker or produced in a concrete situation. For example, in (3.73), the reporter provides a standard statement that most likely does not have an author. Note the presence of another hedge (*legalábbis szerintem* ‘at least according to me’) along with the hedging function, carried out by *úgymond*.

|        |   |  |  |  |
|--------|---|--|--|--|
| (3.73) | <i>Annyi</i><br>so.much<br><b><i>legalábbis</i></b><br>at.least<br><i>a</i><br>DEF<br><i>élvez</i><br>enjoy.PRS.3SG<br><i>tudja</i><br>know.PRS.3SG:DEF<br><i>a</i><br>DEF<br><i>örömm</i><br>joy.1SG | <i>tennék</i><br>add.COND.1SG<br><b><i>szerintem</i></b> –<br>according.1SG<br><i>lány</i><br>girl<br><i>a</i><br>DEF<br><i>remekül</i><br>wonderfully<br><i>lányöröme</i><br>girl.joy.3SG<br><i>is.</i><br>also | <i>hozzá,</i><br>ALL.3SG<br><i>azt,</i><br>DEM.D.ACC<br><b><i>úgymond</i></b><br>QUOT<br><i>szexből,</i><br>sex.ELA<br><i>ellensúlyozni,</i><br>compensate.INF<br><i>az</i><br>DEM.D | <i>hogy</i> –<br>COMP<br><i>hogy</i><br>COMP<br><i>többet</i><br>more.ACC<br><i>az</i><br>DEM.D<br><i>hogy</i><br>COMP<br><i>én</i><br>1SG |
|--------|---|--|--|--|

‘I would add so much that – **at least in my opinion** – the girl so to say/speak enjoys sex more, this can compensate wonderfully that the girl’s joy is also my joy.’ (MNSz).

In (3.74), the reporter presents a fragmental quote of an idiomatic expression, stylistically most likely resembling the pathos of Biblical texts (e.g. *az ember fia* ‘the Son of Man’). After conducting a brief investigation online, I have not managed to find the same utterance in other contexts, and the utterance *per se* is slightly modified by the reporter, the original version of which (e.g. *saját bőrén tapasztal/tanul* ‘experience/learn on one’s own skin’) has a broader distribution. Consequently, *úgymond* is likely to mark also the non-equivalence between reported discourse and commonly more familiar idiomatic expression.

- (3.74) *Szerintem* *a* *tapasztalat* *azért* *tapasztalat,*  
 according.1SG DEF experience therefore experience  
*mert* ***úgymond*** “*a* *saját* *bőrén*  
 because QUOT DEF own skin.3SG.SUPE  
*érzi* *az* *ember* *fia* *(lánya)”*  
 feel.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF human son.3SG daughter.3SG  
*a* *dolgokat* *és* *azok* *így*  
 DEF thing.PL.ACC and DEM.D.PL thus  
*ténnyé* *válnak.*  
 reality.TRANSL change.PRS.3PL  
 ‘In my opinion an experience is, therefore, an experience, because so to say/speak the things “are felt on their own skin by the Son (Daughter) of Man” and so, they turn into reality.’ (MNSz).

In addition, I have also encountered cases where *úgymond* is used to present hypothetical quotations that remain entirely fictional, as in (3.75)–(3.76). Structurally, the use of the marker as a single quote-introducer makes it convenient for the reporter to present a quote without specifying its source or attributing it to a concrete speaker. Hypothetical quotations in such contexts serve as a suitable means to depict thus a situation, presented in the context, or express the reporter’s attitudes towards the described state of affairs.

- (3.75) *Miért* *érezem* *azt* *a*  
 why feel.PRS.1SG:DEF DEM.D.ACC DEF  
 “*hivatalos*” (*értsd:* *kormánypárti*) *médiából,*  
 official understand.IMP2SG:DEF ruling.party.ADJ media.ELA  
*hogy* ***úgymond*** “*örüljön* *Európa,*  
 COMP QUOT rejoice.IMP3SG Europe  
*hogy* *tagja* *leszünk...”*  
 COMP member.3SG become.PRS.1PL  
 ‘Why do I have the feeling from the “official” (read: ruling party’s) media that so to speak “Europe shall rejoice in us becoming a member...”’ (MNSz).
- (3.76) *Azonkívül* *felháborítónak* *tartom,* *hogy*  
 in.addition upsetting.DAT hold.PRS.1SG:DEF COMP  
***úgymond*** “*az* *interneten* *található*  
 QUOT DEF internet.SUPE findable  
*információk* *szerint...”*  
 information.PL according  
 ‘In addition, I consider it upsetting that, so to speak “according to the information on the internet...”’ (MNSz).

To sum up, despite the decline of the quotative use of *úgymond* in contemporary Hungarian, the particle still appears in various structural complexities and presents different types of RD. The particle *per se* preserves the meaning of the SV, encoded in the element, and thus is more frequently used with quotations of speech, both factive or fictional. Most typically, *úgymond* is used as an additional element, pointing to the non-equivalence between reported and original discourse. As a

single quote-introducer, *úgymond* becomes a convenient tool to present fictional discourse or utterances that can be considered general knowledge or represent well-known expressions. The latter types of discourse are usually referred to as non-reported, however, if one applies a broader definition of RD, general knowledge and representation of idiomatic expressions can be considered a type of RD, since they belong to the discourse different from the immediate one. Most likely, this type of RD does not have an original source and is not attributed to a concrete speaker. Consequently, one can observe these types of RD mostly with *úgymond* in non-clausal use where the particle appears as a single quote-introducer. Thus, different meanings regularly expressed by *úgymond* outside the quotative domain are conveyed by the particle in RD-constructions depending on the speakers' intentions and contextual motivations.

### 3.4.5. The quasi-quotative marker *állítólag*

Unlike the quotative markers previously presented in this section, the quasi-quotative marker *állítólag* derives from another, specific speech verb *állít* 'declare, claim' (Majtinskaja 1983: 135). There are several motivations to refer to *állítólag* only as a quasi-quotative marker, which I aim to clarify in this subsection by describing its functions in the quotative domain.

In general, *állítólag* represents a reported evidential marker with the meaning 'allegedly, reportedly' (Majtinskaja 1983: 135; Keszler 2000: 288; Kugler 2010: 77–78, 80). It is quite commonly used in contexts where the speaker presents reported information that derives from an unspecified source, as in (3.77). Additionally, it conveys partial support, indicating that the speaker has all the reason to doubt the content of the reported information. Based on my observations, the particle expresses this epistemic meaning in all of the attested examples. My corpus of *állítólag* uses consists of approximately 40 examples, mainly retrieved by browsing with Google Search. It includes examples from randomly selected sources, the majority of which represent new media texts; however, a few examples appearing in journalist text and literature were taken also into account for comparison. Note that in (3.77), the reporter additionally indicates his doubt by specifying that the reported information might be further refuted ('if it's true...').

- (3.77) *Szani állítólag megsérült edzésen.*  
 PN allegedly injure.PST.3SG training.SUPE  
 'Szani **allegedly got injured during the training.** [If it's true, it's definitely a big problem.]' (ulloi129.hu).

To support my claim about the presence of epistemic support in the use of *állítólag*, let's take a look at its use in some examples from the texts outside the new media genre. For example, in (3.78b), *állítólag* is used in the translation of Kafka's novel from German into Hungarian, where the original text in (3.78a) consists of the verb in the subjunctive I mood. The subjunctives in German are known for developing a hearsay meaning from irrealis. Furthermore, they can have a secondary epistemic

meaning of partial support (cf. Mortelmans 2000 on the epistemic meanings expressed by moods in German; also see Wiemer 2010 *inter alia* on the hearsay meaning expressed by the subjunctive moods in German). The epistemic functions carried out by the grammatical mood in the German original (3.78a) are reflected through the presence of *állítólag* in the Hungarian translation (3.78b).

(3.78a) German

|              |             |             |                |           |              |              |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| ...aber      | <i>A</i>    | <i>habe</i> | <i>gesagt,</i> | <i>er</i> | <i>hätte</i> | <i>jetzt</i> |
| but          | A           | have.SBJV1  | say.PP         | he        | have.SBJV2   | now          |
| <i>keine</i> | <i>Zeit</i> |             |                |           |              |              |
| NEG.F        | time        |             |                |           |              |              |

(3.78b) Hungarian

|             |                |               |                 |                   |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <i>A</i>    | <i>azonban</i> | <i>azt</i>    | <i>mondta</i>   | <i>állítólag,</i> |
| A           | however        | DEM.D.ACC     | say.PST.3SG:DEF | allegedly         |
| <i>hogy</i> | <i>nem</i>     | <i>ér</i>     | <i>rá</i>       |                   |
| COMP        | NEG            | reach.PRS.3SG | SUBL.3SG        |                   |

‘...but **A** **has allegedly said** that he doesn’t have time’ (magyarulbabelben.net).

An interesting example is observed in the Hungarian press where the online news portal *atv.hu* quotes verbatim the words of the Hungarian prime-minister, retrieved from the news portal *index.hu* where they were initially published, cf. (3.79). Despite the verbatim quotation of the prime-minister’s words, the author inserts *állítólag* into the QI-clause. Since the article contains the hyperlink to the original source, practically indicating the source of the report, the reported evidential meaning of the particle remains backgrounded. Consequently, one can expect that this way *állítólag* functions merely as an epistemic marker, indicating the current speaker’s doubt in the content of the quoted words than marking the information as a report from an unspecified source<sup>98</sup>. Based on my observations, *állítólag* is quite frequently used in newspaper texts also carrying the hedging function: by inserting the particle in the text, the reporter distances him-/herself from the reported information without vouching for the truthfulness of its content.

(3.79)

|                |                 |                    |             |                      |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| ... <i>azt</i> | <i>mondta</i>   | <i>állítólag,</i>  | <i>hogy</i> | <i>szerencsétlen</i> |
| DEM.D.ACC      | say.PST.3SG:DEF | allegedly          | COMP        | unfortunately        |
| <i>éppen</i>   | <i>a</i>        | <i>választások</i> | <i>elé</i>  | <i>időzíteni</i>     |
| just           | DEF             | election.PL        | before      | time.INF             |
| <i>egy</i>     | <i>ilyet.</i>   |                    |             |                      |
| INDEF          | such.ACC        |                    |             |                      |

‘...**he allegedly said that** it was just unfortunate to plan such a thing right before the elections.’ (atv.hu).

<sup>98</sup> Note the similarity in use of the quotative mood in Estonian, usually marking information acquired through reports. In cases where the report marked by the quotative mood is supported by the QI-clause indicating the source of the reported information, the epistemic support expressed by the mood becomes foregrounded, while the reported evidential overtones become meaningless since the source of the report is already specified (cf. EKS 2017: 176–180).

As a result, based on the above examples, two primary meanings of *állítólag* can be pointed out – reported evidential and partial epistemic support. As follows, both of these meanings play an important role in the use of the particle in the quotative domain. The position of *állítólag* within the RD-construction plays a crucial role in defining which meaning is foregrounded – reported evidential or epistemic, that I show further.

Structurally *állítólag* may co-occur with speech or non-speech verbs, defining the event behind RD, as in (3.79)–(3.83), and NPs, indicating the original source of RD, as in (3.84)–(3.85). Furthermore, *állítólag* can either be used as part of a QI-clause, cf. (3.80), or be inserted into the RD, cf. (3.81).

- (3.80) *Ő* *mondta* *állítólag,* *hogy* *mostmár*  
 3SG say.PST.3SG:DEF allegedly COMP now.already  
*folytathatják* *magyarul* *is*  
 continue.POT.3PL:DEF Hungarian.ADV also  
 ‘**He said allegedly that** they can go on in Hungarian now’ (prog.hu).

As (3.80) shows, at first glance the scope of the particle is over the QI-clause (‘he said’), showing that event behind the RD has allegedly taken place in the past. Since the whole event behind the RD has only allegedly taken place, the quoted material is also presented as only alleged. Hence, the scope of the reported evidential exceeds the primarily observed scope over the QI and expands on the whole RD-construction. By placing *állítólag* in the QI, the reporter distances him-/herself from the presented RD and indicates that (s)he is not entirely sure about the content of the quote following *állítólag*. Following the basic information structure rules of Hungarian, one can point out that in RD-constructions where the QI-clause precedes the quote, the latter is in the focus of the audience, while the QI stays backgrounded. Also, note that an almost identical QI-clause appears in (3.79) where *állítólag* hardly expresses any reported evidential meaning. Consequently, in this type of RD-construction, partial support expressed by *állítólag* can be considered functionally primary over its reported evidential meaning.

In contrast, where the particle is inserted into RD, its evidential meaning takes the scope over the RD only. The position of the particle is usually fixed on the first place in RD, as in (3.81). Thus, the reporter signals to the audience right away that the information in the RD is acquired from a third party, i.e. the quote contains a report by someone else – ‘X says/said that someone said that Y’. The reporter can use this strategy as a convenient mechanism to indicate low trustworthiness of the presented information.

- (3.81) *...azt* *mondja,* *hogy* *állítólag* *lebukott*  
 DEM.D.ACC say.PRS.3SG:DEF COMP allegedly break.down.PST.3SG  
*egy* *iráni* *kamion.*  
 INDEF Iranian truck  
 ‘...(s)he said that allegedly an Iranian truck had broken down.’ (MNSz).

The same distribution of the meanings, expressed by *állítólag*, can be observed in the co-occurrence of the marker with QI-clauses consisting of NSVs, as in (3.82) and (3.83), or with NPs, encoding the source of RD, as in (3.84) and (3.85). In (3.82) and (3.84), *állítólag* is part of a QI-clause and thus mainly expresses partial support, while in (3.83) and (3.85) it is meant to indicate that the RD consists of information acquired through reporting.

(3.82) *Az önkormányzat azt írta állítólag!*  
 DEF municipality DEM.D.ACC write.PST.3SG:DEF allegedly  
*hogy* *ők minden rendben találtak*  
 COMP 3PL all order.INE find.PST.3PL  
 ‘The municipal government allegedly! wrote that they find everything to be in order’ (jogiforum.hu).

(3.83) *...de olvastuk is a*  
 but read.PST.1PL:DEF also DEF  
*sajtóban, hogy állítólag a*  
 press.INE COMP allegedly DEF  
*koalíció létrejöttek első feltétele*  
 coalition formation.3SG.DAT first condition.3SG  
*volt az, hogy a*  
 be.PST.3SG DEM.D COMP DEF  
*világkiállítást le kell mondani.*  
 world.exhibition.ACC off must.PRS.3SG say.INF  
 ‘...but we also read in the press that allegedly the first condition for the formation of the coalition was to cancel the world exhibition.’ (MNSz).

(3.84) *Valami olyasmi statisztika van állítólag,*  
 some such statistics be.PRS.3SG allegedly  
*hogy forgalmin elsőre a vizsgázók*  
 COMP traffic.ADJ.SUPE first.SUBL DEF examinee.PL  
*60 %-a bukik...*  
 60 percent-3SG dive.PRS.3SG  
 ‘There is allegedly some such statistics that on the first driving license exam 60% of the examinees fail...’ (mamami.hu).

(3.85) *A napokban jelent meg a*  
 DEF day.PL.INE appear.PST.3SG PRE DEF  
*sajtóban az a hír, hogy*  
 press.INE DEM.D DEF news COMP  
*állítólag szűkíteni kívánják a családi*  
 allegedly constrict.INF wish.PRS.3PL:DEF DEF family.ADJ  
*pótlékra jogosultak számát*  
 allowance.SUBL entitled.PL number.3PL.ACC  
 ‘In those days that news appeared in the press that allegedly they want to constrict the number of people entitled for family allowance’ (MNSz).

Quite compelling is the fact that among NSVs, the particle co-occurs very rarely with EVs, marking quotations of thoughts. I have encountered only a few examples



where *állítólag* is used as part of a QI-clause, and only one instance where it is inserted into RD. Consequently, I suggest considering the etymology of the particle, deriving from the generic SV *állít* ‘claim, declare’, and its reported evidential meaning as motivating factors for the low frequency of its use with quotations of thoughts. Note that a similar tendency is observed in the use of the quotative particle *úgymond* and the quotative marker *mondván*, which appear only rarely or do not appear at all with this type of RD. Among the quotative markers deriving from SVs, only *a(s)zongya* is more or less systematically used with quotations of thoughts, and only during the condition where an EV specifies the event.

- (3.86) *úgy*                      *gondolta* –                      *állítólag* –                      *hogy,*    *ha*  
 thus                      think.PST.3SG:DEF                      allegedly                      COMP    if  
*emberi*                      *vért*                      *iszik,*                      *akkor*    *nem*  
 human.ADJ                      blood.ACC                      drink.PRS.3SG                      then    NEG  
*fog*                      *öregedni...*  
 FUT.AUX.PRS.3SG                      age.INF  
 ‘he **allegedly thought thus that** if he drinks human blood, then he won’t get old...’  
 (gyakorikerdesek.hu).

- (3.87) *...komolyan*                      *is*                      *gondolta,*                      *hogy*                      *állítólag*  
 seriously                      also                      think.PST.3SG:DEF                      COMP                      allegedly  
*a*                      *világ*                      *összes*                      *Ferrero*                      *üzemében*  
 DEF                      world                      complete                      PN                      factory.3SG:INE  
*megtalálható*                      *a*                      *jelenésekben*                      *látott*                      *“fehér*  
 findable                      DEF                      advertisement.PL:INE                      see.PTCP                      white  
*hölgy”...*  
 lady  
 ‘...seriously also **thought that allegedly on all Ferrero factories in the world one can find** “a white lady”, seen in the advertisements...’ (cafeblog.hu).

Finally, besides taking part in the quotative constructions of various structural complexities, *állítólag* is also frequently used as a single element, taking the scope over the syntactic construction containing either a report from an unspecified source or a quote deriving from the source mentioned previously or further in the discourse. The first function lies under the scope of reported evidential meaning expressed by the particle. For the discussion on distinguishing between quotatives and reported evidentials, see 1.5.3. Consider (3.88) and previously presented (3.77), where *állítólag* is merely used as reported evidential with the epistemic overtones of partial support.

- (3.88) *S*                      *állítólag*                      *Brüsszelben*                      *haljanak*                      *arra,*  
 and                      allegedly                      PN:INE                      tend.PRS.3SG                      DEM.D.SUBL  
*hogy*                      *beleegyezzenek*                      *a*                      *szlovákok*                      *kívánságába.*  
 COMP                      concede.IMP3PL                      DEF                      Slovak.PL                      request.3PL:ILL  
 ‘And **reportedly in Brussels they lean on the point that they should concede to the request made by the Slovaks.**’ (MNSz).

The use of *állítólag* as a QI is distinguishable from its reported evidential meaning since the source of the quote is specified in the context. In this function, *állítólag* usually introduces quotes presented approximately and generally in a summarized form. For example, consider (3.89) where the reporter him-/herself specifies the source of the reported information and additionally indicates that the quote derives from different authors and represents a summarized form of utterances produced by several different speakers. Also, note that the reporter specifies the event, by indicating that the reports represent a speech act ('every doc **says** different stuff').

- (3.89) *Állítólag* *fülkürt,* *vagy* *az* *orrom*  
 allegedly eustachian.tube or DEF nose.1SG  
*okozza,* *minden* *doki* *mást* ***mond...***  
 cause.PRS.3SG:DEF every doc other.ACC say.PRS.3SG  
 'Allegedly, the Eustachian tube or my nose causes it, every doc **says** different stuff...' (utazas.com).

In (3.90), a similar quotative function of *állítólag* can be observed, where the reporter presents the summarized version of the quote, deriving from the RD-construction, presented further on as a quote from a newspaper.

- (3.90) *Még* *egy* *dolog*  
 still INDEF thing  
*ezzel* *kapcsolatban,* ***állítólag***  
 DEM.P.COM connection.INE allegedly  
*kitolják* *a* *határidőt:*  
 postpone.PRS.3PL:DEF DEF deadline.ACC  
 "A *Napi* *Gazdaságnak*  
 DEF daily economy.DAT  
*az* *Építési* *Vállalkozók*  
 DEF structural contractor.PL  
*Országos* *Szakszövetségének* *alelnöke*  
 national trade.union.3SG.DAT vice-chairman.3SG  
*azt* *mondta,* *hogy*  
 DEM.D.ACC say.PST.3SG:DEF COMP  
*az* *októberi* *határidőt*  
 DEF October.ADJ deadline.ACC  
*legalább* *jövő* *év*  
 at.least coming year  
*elejéig* *ki* *kellene*  
 beginning.3SG.TERM PRE must.COND.3SG  
*tolni*"  
 postpone.INF  
 'One more thing connected to this, **reportedly** the deadline will be postponed: "the vice-chairman of the Building Contractors of the National trade-union said to the "Daily Economy" that the October deadline should be postponed at least till the beginning of the next year"' (MNSz).

Based on my observations, as a QI *állítólag* functions only in those contexts where it is further supported by the clause, depicting the event behind RD. Notably, the part of the discourse modified by *állítólag* is usually not embedded into the part where the event is specified, and both can function as independent syntactic constructions. Reasoning from the fact that the particle as a QI shows only limited distribution in specific contexts, I suggest considering *állítólag* only a quasi-quotative marker, i.e. a marker with a limited distribution in the quotative domain, despite its reportative semantics and general use as a reported evidential particle.

To sum up, I suggest the following split of the functions, carried out by *állítólag*. Where the marker appears as a single quote-introducer referring to the utterances produced before by a concrete speaker specified in the context, it functions as a quasi-quotative marker. In such cases, the quote is produced approximately and in a summarized form. The contextual reference to the speaker is crucial in differentiating it from the reported evidential marker, which remains the initial and primary function of *állítólag*. As a reported evidential, *állítólag* marks general hearsay which does not have a specific author or source. In such a use, *állítólag* can also be observed inserted into the RD, where it usually takes an initial position and signals that the current quote derives from the report by an unspecified speaker. In contrast to this use, where *állítólag* is inserted into a QI-clause, it functions mainly as an epistemic marker expressing the reporter's doubt in the content of the presented quote. Based on my observations, the scale of the reporter's doubt might differ depending on the content of the presented quote, expressing partial support from a more stronger uncertainty to a slight doubt.

### 3.5. The turn-taking quotative constructions in Hungarian

In this section, I discuss two turn-taking quotative constructions that appear in contemporary Hungarian. Turn-taking quotative constructions are attested in a number of the world's languages and can be considered to form a typological subclass of QIs of their own. Broadly these types of quotative constructions fall under the category of participant-oriented QIs which highlight either the author of the quoted utterance or its addressee(s), depending on the language and contextual motivations of the speakers. In 1.6.3, I have proposed to define these types of QIs as a presentational quotative constructions, since they typically consist of several elements, none of which takes the quote-introducing function on its own and can be recognized as a QI in its complexity. In the following subsections, I describe the use of two *speaker-presentational* quotative constructions in Hungarian. First, I pay attention to the construction, consisting of the turn-taking demonstrative *erre* 'upon this' and an NP, encoding the speaker. Second, I discuss the collocation of an NP encoding the speaker with the conjunction *meg* 'and' as another turn-taking quotative construction attested in the language. *Quote-presentational* quotative constructions are covered in Section 3.6.

### 3.5.1. *Erre* + *Speaker* as a turn-taking quotative construction

The main constituents of this turn-taking quotative construction are the turn-taking demonstrative (henceforth also: TTD) *erre* ‘DEM.P.SUBL’ and NPs, encoding the speaker. The first component *erre* ‘DEM.P.SUBL’ may refer either to a previously described situation, or to a previous utterance by another speaker. Notably, similar types of construction can be observed in other European languages, e.g. German *darauf* ‘upon this’ + SP(eaker), Czech *na to* ‘upon this’, Polish and Ukrainian SP(eaker) + *na to* ‘upon this’.

In the Hungarian historical corpus, I have encountered this quotative construction with different frequency in the literature from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onward, presented here in (3.91). The example dates to the year 1831.

|        |   |             |               |                  |                   |             |
|--------|---|-------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| (3.91) | <i>Ő</i>  | <i>erre</i> | <i>megint</i> | <i>igy:</i>      | <i>“Nincsenek</i> | <i>még</i>  |
|        | 3SG   | DEM.P.SUBL  | again         | so               | NEG:EXIST.PL      | yet         |
|        | <i>kifejtve</i>   | <i>a’</i>   | <i>hitel</i>  | <i>törvényei</i> | <i>az</i>         | <i>Urak</i> |
|        | expound.PTCP  | DEF         | credit        | law.3PL.PL       | DEF               | lord.PL     |
|        | <i>közt?”</i>   |             |               |                  |                   |             |
|        | between   |             |               |                  |                   |             |
|        | ‘ <b>He upon this</b> [said] <b>so</b> : “ <u>Are not the laws of credit yet expounded between the Lords?</u> ”’ (MTK <sup>99</sup> ; glossing and translation are mine, DT). |             |               |                  |                   |             |

The grammatical conditions of this quotative construction allow equally the presence of a speech (3.92) or an epistemic verb (3.93), which are generally possible components of this clause, but are not obligatory, as I show further. Hence, the quotative construction can be used to introduce RD, representing quotations of either previously produced speech or thoughts. Where the SV is present, additionally an NP encoding the addressee can appear, as in (3.92). Obviously, the quotations of thoughts are not attributed to a concrete addressee, and this component is not present in RD-constructions containing this type of RD.

|        |  |              |            |                |                |
|--------|--|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| (3.92) | <i>Én</i>  | <i>erre</i>  | <i>azt</i> | <i>mondtam</i> | <i>neki,</i>   |
|        | 1SG  | DEM.P.SUBL   | DEM.D.ACC  | say.PST.1SG    | DAT.3SG        |
|        | <i>hogy</i>  | <i>ebben</i> | <i>nem</i> | <i>akarok</i>  | <i>partner</i> |
|        | COMP   | DEM.P.INE    | NEG        | want.PRS.1SG   | partner        |
|        | <i>lenni</i>   |              |            |                |                |
|        | be.INF   |              |            |                |                |
|        | ‘ <b>Upon this I said to him, that</b> <u>I don’t want to be a partner in this</u> ’ (forum.portfolio.hu). |              |            |                |                |

<sup>99</sup> See the list of data sources at the end of the study.

- (3.93) *Erre* *azt* *gondoltam,* “*ha* *ők*  
 DEM.P.SUBL DEM.D.ACC think.PST.1SG if 3PL  
*kövérenek tartják magukat,* *és én*  
 fat.DAT keep.PRS.3PL:DEF self.3PL.ACC and 1SG  
*nehézebb vagyok náluk, akkor milyen*  
 heavy.COMPAR be.PRS.1SG ADE.3PL then how  
*kövér lehetek!*”  
 fat be.POT.PRS.1SG  
 ‘Upon this I thought “if they consider themselves fat, and I am heavier than they are, then how fat may I be!”’ (elsolepesek.hu).

Similarly, instead of SEVs, a QI-clause with the demonstrative *erre* ‘upon this’ may contain an NP, encoding the original source of RD. Usually, the main component of an NP is a derivative from the SV, as e.g. *válasz* ‘answer’ in (3.94).

- (3.94) *Erre a válasz, hogy az a gyártási idő.*  
 DEM.P.SUBL DEF answer COMP DEM.D DEF manufacturing time  
 ‘Upon this the answer is that this is the manufacturing time.’  
 (gyakorikerdesek.hu).

As for hypothetical quotations, the construction *erre* + *SP* can also be used. However, a basic requirement is the presence of SEVs in the form of the conditional past, as in (3.96) and (3.97). Otherwise, the quote is likely to be interpreted as a representation of a real utterance or thought, instead of acquiring a hypothetical reading. More rare is the case where a neutralized QI merely consisting of *erre* presents a hypothetical quotation, cf. (3.95). However, a neutralized construction of this type requires a specific context to present a hypothetical quotation, as in (3.95), rather than this form of a QI being used in Hungarian as a typical construction, systematically introducing this type of RD.

As one can notice, in (3.95) the whole situation presented by the reporter is hypothetical, which can be primarily seen from the first RD-construction (‘you are guilty. Because of this and that’). The following response by the government is also hypothetical, which is introduced by the quotative particle *aszongya*. Finally, in the last RD-construction where the RD is introduced by *erre* ‘upon this’, another hypothetical quotation follows.

- (3.95) *Aszongya az ellen: “Sáros*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF against guilty  
*vagy. Ezért és ezért.”*  
 be.PRS.2SG DEM.P.CAUS and DEM.P.CAUS  
*Aszongya a kormány: “Nem*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF government NEG  
*igaz.” Erre: “Bizonyítsd be,*  
 true DEM.P.SUBL prove.IMP2SG:DEF PRE  
*hogy nem vagy sáros!”*  
 COMP NEG be.PRS.2SG dirty  
 ‘The one against says: “you’re guilty. Because of this and that.” The government says: “Not true.” Upon this: “Prove that you are not dirty!”’ (MNSz).

In contrast to (3.95), cases like (3.96) and (3.97) are interpreted in any given context as containing a hypothetical quotation, since the verb in a QI-clause indicates that the utterance has not taken place. In (3.96), the author presents a quote in its original form, previously produced by Fouché as an utterance. However, the quote acquires a hypothetical reading, taking into consideration that it is produced in a different setting and in a different context without Fouché directly participating in it. In (3.97), a hypothetical quotation depicts the reporter’s potential thoughts, after having acquired a piece of necessary information.

(3.96) *hát erre mondta volna Fouché,*  
 PTCL DEM.P.SUBL say.PST.3SG:DEF be.COND.3SG PN  
*h[ogy] “ez több mint bűn,*  
 COMP DEM.P more than sin  
*ez hiba”.*  
 DEM.P mistake  
 ‘well, **upon this Fouché would have said (that) “it’s more than a sin, it’s a mistake”.**’ (MNSz).

(3.97) *Ja én is erre gondoltam*  
 and 1SG also DEM.P.SUBL think.PST.1SG  
*volna hogy a swapfile-t tenni*  
 be.COND.3SG COMP DEF swapfile-ACC put.INF  
*a kártyára...*  
 DEF card.SUBL  
 ‘And **upon this I would also have thought (that) to put the swapfile on the card...**’  
 (prohardver.hu).

As I have briefly mentioned and it was shown in (3.91) and (3.95), in addition to the co-occurrences of *erre* with different types of verbs and NPs in turn-taking quotative constructions, an event-neutralized QI-clause may be formed, merely consisting of *erre* ‘upon this’ and an NP encoding the speaker. Depending on the context, the neutralized QI-clause can be interpreted either as a representation of someone’s previous utterance or as a quote, where both readings – quotation of speech or thought – might be equally possible. Quotations of speech are usually distinguishable from quotations of thoughts in contexts where several RD-constructions appear, as in (3.97) and (3.98). Consequently, here the QI-clauses with *erre* are most likely missing an SV.

(3.97) *Azongya az apa: -Nem fáztál?*  
 DEM.say.PRS.3SG:DEF DEF father NEG freeze.PST.2SG  
*Erre a gyerek: -Egy kicsit*  
 DEM.P.SUBL DEF child INDEF little.ACC  
*fáztam*  
 freeze.PST.1SG  
 ‘**The father says: – Were you not cold? Upon this the child: – I was cold a bit**’  
 (megyekezerrel.blogspot.com).

- (3.98) *Erre* *ő,* *hogy* *ez* *aztán* *a*  
 DEM.P.SUBL 3SG COMP DEM.P then DEF  
*kultúra,* *mire* *én,* *hogy* *nem,* *nem* *ez*  
 culture what.SUBL 1SG COMP NEG NEG DEM.P  
 ‘Upon this he that what a culture, whereupon I that no, not this’ (wmn.hu).

Additional information, inserted in the QI-clause, can also serve as a good indicator that the reporter aims to present a quotation of speech, and not of thought, as in (3.99). Here the reporter indicates that the utterance was produced as a response (‘into her shoulder’) to the addressee who produced the previous utterance. Hence, this information would not make any sense (e.g. ‘I thought into her shoulder’) if the reporter intended to produce a quotation of thoughts.

- (3.99) *...barátnőm* *meg* *erre,* *hogy*  
 friend.F.1SG also DEM.P.SUBL COMP  
*“de* *hisz* *ő* *volt*  
 but trust.IMP2SG 3SG be.PST.3SG  
*a* *gonosz”,* *erre* *én*  
 DEF felon DEM.P.SUBL 1SG  
*meg* *a* *vállába* *“dehogyan,*  
 also DEF shoulder.3SG.ILL nope  
*te* *ezt* *amúgy* *se*  
 2SG DEM.P.ACC anyway also.NEG  
*értheted,* *ő* *volt* *az*  
 understand.POT.PRS.2SG 3SG be.PST.3SG DEF  
*életem* *brühühü”.*  
 life.1SG IDEO  
 ‘...my friend thereupon “but trust, he was the evil”, whereupon I into her shoulder “nope, you can’t understand this anyway, he was my life [sobbing]”.’ (starity.hu).

In contrast to (3.97)–(3.99), in contexts where an RD-construction appears out of the blue and is not attributed to a concrete addressee, both types of RD, i.e. quotation of speech and thought, are equally possible. Note that the demonstrative in the sublative case *erre* ‘upon this’ may refer both to a previously produced utterance and to the situation, described in the context. The likelihood of the second reading, i.e. quotation of thoughts, increases in self-quoting contexts. As several previously described self-quotative markers showed (e.g. *mondok* ‘say.PRS.1SG’ in the meaning ‘I said/thought’, see 3.4.1), in contexts where the self-quotation is not addressed to a concrete speaker, specified in the QI-clause, the self-quotative marker can introduce quotations of both speech and thought. Consider (3.100) and (3.101), in which most likely both quotes present the reporters’ thoughts rather than previously produced utterances since they are inserted into the discourse where other speakers do not participate.

(3.100) *Erre én: “meg lehet ezt tanulni?”*  
 DEM.P.SUBL 1SG PRE be.POT.3SG DEM.ACC study.INF  
 ‘Upon this I [thought/said]: “Is it possible to study this?”’ (ma.hu).

(3.101) *...erre én meg “basszus, ezt akkor ki kell dobnom, és újrakezdenem előről”.*  
 DEM.P.SUBL 1SG also fuck DEM.P.ACC  
 then PRE must.PRS.3SG throw.INF.1SG and  
 start.again.INF.1SG before.DELA  
 ‘[I thought a lot, but the text did not flow together with the song,] **whereupon I also [thought/said]** “damn, then I must throw this out and start afresh”.’  
 (phenomenon.hu).

To sum up, the turn-taking quotative construction with the TTD *erre* is used in various RD-constructions in contemporary Hungarian. Since the construction may contain both speech and epistemic verbs equally, it is frequently used with quotes of previous utterances and thoughts. With hypothetical quotations, the construction is systematically used only in the cases where SEVs appear in the conditional past, thus indicating that the RD acquires a fictional state. In contrast, in cases where a verb is elided from the QI-clause, the difference between quoting speech or thought becomes vague, if the RD-construction is not preceded or followed by another RD-construction or if some other grammatical or pragmatic conditions do not assign only one reading over another. In self-quoting instances, where an RD-construction appears out of the blue, the construction with an elliptic verb most likely presents a quotation of thoughts. However, one should study the context to clarify which reading is still more accurate.

### 3.5.2. *Speaker + meg* as a turn-taking quotative construction

In contrast to the above turn-taking construction, the co-occurrence of an NP, encoding the speaker, and the turn-taking conjunction (henceforth also: TTC) *meg* ‘and, also’ can be considered relatively new in contemporary Hungarian (see below). Despite the fact that the conjunction *meg* can be used in Hungarian as both connective with the meaning ‘and’ and contrastive with the meaning ‘but’, the contrastive meaning is not observed in quotative constructions. Hence, in the further examples, I assign to it the meaning ‘and’.

The aforementioned claim about the novelty of this construction is primarily supported by a brief investigation in the Hungarian historical corpus which did not yield any examples of this, or a similar type of co-occurrence consisting of these elements. Consequently, it might have emerged relatively recently. Another scenario would suggest that this construction is a context-dependent strategy or that it merely appears in a particular register, and therefore, its examples are not observed in the Hungarian historical corpus containing data exclusively from published



sources (see Section 1.3). However, my data do not confirm the possibility of appearance of this strategy in only one particular register or illustrate some context dependency. In addition, one can point out that a similar construction can also be observed in one of the contact languages, that is, German. In German, the TTC *und* ‘and’ co-occurs in the QI-clause with NPs encoding the speaker, thus forming a turn-taking QI. However, the similarity between the two constructions might be accidental and it remains yet to define the origin of this type of a turn-taking QI in Hungarian, looking more thoroughly into Hungarian data from the diachronic perspective, which, however, stays outside the scope of the current research.

Despite this difference, the turn-taking quotative construction *SP + meg* is quite similar to *erre + SP*. Both constructions can be equally used with SEVs, as (3.102) and (3.103) show.

(3.102) *Ő*            *meg*                                    *azt*            *mondta,*                                    *hogy*  
 3SG    also    DEM.D.ACC    say.PST.3SG:DEF                    COMP  
*nem*    *hinné,*    *hogy*            *volna*                                    *ilyen*  
 NEG    believe.COND.3SG:DEF                                    COMP            be.COND.3SG                                    such  
 ‘**And (s)he said that (s)he would not believe that such a thing would exist**’  
 (MNSz).

(3.103) *Ő*            *meg*                                    *úgy*            *gondolta,*                                    *hogy*  
 3SG    also    thus            think.PST.3SG:DEF                    COMP  
*akkó* [sic!]    *bevezet*    *a*            *rejtelmekbe*  
 then    introduce.PRS.3SG                                    DEF            mystery.PL.ILL  
 ‘**(S)he thought thus that then (s)he will introduce [me/you] to the mysteries**’  
 (MNSz).

Similarly to *erre + SP*, hypothetical quotations can be introduced by *SP + meg*-construction mainly where a QI-clause contains SEVs in the conditional past, cf. (3.104)–(3.105). Without this condition, the QI-clause is most likely interpreted as a representation of a real speech event or a quotation of thoughts.

(3.104) *Hát*                                    *én*            *meg*            *mondtam*                                    *volna*  
 PTCL    1SG            and            say.PST.1SG                                    be.COND  
*neki,*                                    *hogy*            *neki*            *az*            *agya*  
 DAT.3SG                                    COMP            DAT.3SG            DEF            brain.3SG  
*helyén*                                    *meg*            *víz*            *van*  
 place.3SG.SUPE                                    also            water            be.PRS.3SG  
 ‘**Well, I could have said to him/her that (s)he has water instead of the brain**’  
 (gyakorikerdes.hu).

(3.105) ...*talán*                                    *kétszer*            *is*            *meg*            *gondolta*  
 maybe                                    two.time            also            also            think.PST.3SG:DEF  
*volna,*                                    *hogy*            *ezzel*            *viccelődjön*  
 be.COND.3SG                                    COMP            DEM.P.COM            joke.IMP3SG  
 ‘...maybe **he would have thought twice that he should joke with that**’  
 (blogspot.com).

Furthermore, event-neutralization can also be observed in the *SP + meg*-construction. Similarly to *erre + SP*, in some contexts, the ellipsis of an SEV leads to the lack of difference between quotations of speech and thought. The context works as a predominant indicator specifying the event that the quote is denoting. As in the previous turn-taking construction, the reading of quotations of thoughts is the most probable in self-quoting instances, as in (3.106). Alternatively, in contexts where one RD-construction follows another, the reading of quotation of speech is the most accurate one, as in (3.107).

(3.106) *én meg, hogy mivaaaaaaaaaan?*  
 1SG also COMP what.be.PRS.3SG  
 ‘I was that whaaaaaaaaaat?’ (nlcafe.hu).

(3.107) *és azt mondom, hogy bocs, ő meg,*  
 and DEM.D.ACC say.PRS.1SG:DEF COMP sorry 3SG also  
*hogy á semmi.*  
 COMP DEM.D nothing  
 ‘And I say that sorry, and (s)he that it’s nothing.’ (pim.hu).

To sum up, significant similarity between the two turn-taking constructions can be pointed out. Both constructions are equally used with quotations of speech and thought, and structurally can also acquire event-neutralization through which the quote can be interpreted in some contexts as a quotation of both speech and thought. Both constructions represent participant-oriented quotative constructions. Participant-orientation is realized in the emphasis by the reporters on speakers to whom the quote belongs. Consequently, the depiction of the event remains somewhat unnecessary where several RD-constructions, attributed to different speakers, are presented one after another, or if the reporter considers the difference between the two types of RD unnecessary to specify. Hypothetical quotations are mainly presented where the QI-clause in both constructions contains a verb in the conditional mood. Consequently, the reporter aims at highlighting that the quote is merely a presentation of fictional discourse.

### 3.6. The quote-presentational quotative construction in Hungarian

In addition to the two speaker-presentational quotative constructions, in contemporary Hungarian one can observe the use of a quote-presentational quotative construction. Despite the fact that this strategy is quite common to contemporary Hungarian, it has not received any attention in previous studies. Primarily, the strategy involves an endophoric pronoun *ezzel* or *azzal* (or sometimes an NP encoding the source of RD) in the comitative case. The endophoric pronoun functions as a relative pronoun which connects the QI containing a speech or non-speech verb of a certain type with the RD. Alternatively, instead of the relative

pronoun, some verbs may also be accompanied by NPs in the comitative case, referring to the source of RD. The choice of verbs is not accidental. According to my observations, only a limited group of semantic classes is used in this type of construction. Among NSVs, one can observe the originally motion verbs *jön* ‘come’ and *előáll* ‘lit. step forward; claim, present’, or inchoative verbs, e.g. *indít* ‘start’, *kezd* ‘start’. As for SVs, only specific SVs are used, e.g. *válaszol* ‘answer’, *utasít* ‘reject’. According to Dömötör (p.c.), basically any specific SV can be used in this type of construction. Despite the difference between the verbs used in the construction, I cover them in one subsection due to the functional and structural similarities between the QIs formed with these verbs.

First, let’s take a look at the MVs *jön* ‘come’ and *előáll* ‘lit. step forward; claim, present’. I have already provided an example, cf. (3.59), where *előáll* has been used together with the quotative marker *mondván* ‘saying’. As I have mentioned before, in quotative constructions *előáll* carries out functions of a specific SV, meaning ‘claim, present’. Similarly, the use of the MV *jön* in the quotative domain can hardly be associated with the action of motion *per se*. Instead, the marker functions as a lexicalized SV in this type of construction, preserving the meaning of motion only as an inchoative action denoting the start of the speech. Hence, in contemporary Hungarian both verbs occupy a niche in the quotative domain as already lexicalized SVs with the specific meaning, presenting typically RD consisting of new information.

Alternatively, they can be labeled as QVs (see 1.6.2.1) according to Gülde-mann’s (2008) terminology. In the majority of cases, the MVs become paraphrasable with specific SVs, meaning ‘claim’, ‘declare’, ‘present’. As a result, one can also detect cases where the co-occurrence of the demonstrative pronoun and *jön* is used outside the quotative domain with the meaning of the SV, as in (3.108). However, as I specify below, in the quotative construction of this type, the MVs can be paraphrasable differently. Hence, one should take into consideration the context and the type of RD, presented by these motion verbs, while assigning an accurate reading for the event.

(3.108) *Ne gyere<sup>100</sup> ezzel megint*  
 NEG.IMP come.IMP.2SG DEM.P.COM again  
 ‘Don’t come up with this [~ start talking/speaking about this] again’ (moly.hu).

There is reason to assume that the use of the motion verbs in quotative constructions has received its impetus from the first Biblical texts. Dömötör (2001: 357) mentions the co-occurrence of these particular MVs in constructions with the SV *mond* ‘say’ – *előáll és mond* ‘step forward and say’, *jön és mond* ‘come and say’. Consequently, it can be assumed that these verbs started to develop in the quotative domain and with time became used independently from the SV *mond*. In the Hungarian historical corpus, the verb *előáll* in the quotative function is already attested in texts from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. Tóvölgyi 1872: 50).

<sup>100</sup> The motion verb *jön* has the suppletive stem *gyer-* in the imperative mood.

As far as one can rely on the Hungarian historical corpus, the verb *jön* in this quotative construction dates back to approximately the same period, see e.g. Szathmáry (1882: 19). I provide these data merely to show that the quotative constructions with MVs are not new in the language. At the same time, I do not aim at supporting this claim with robust historical data, as far as the starting point of the use of MVs in the quotative domain is concerned.

In contemporary Hungarian, the basic quotative strategy with *előáll* and *jön* consists of the endophoric demonstrative in the comitative case. The endophoric demonstrative refers to the following stretches of RD, as in (3.109) and (3.110). The complementizer *hogy* is inserted in the majority of the attested cases and marks the border between the QI-clause and the beginning of RD. In some rare occasions, I have observed the use of all the main classes of the verbs used in this construction without the complementizer *hogy*. I bring some examples mainly from outside the new media genre to illustrate the possibility of the omission of *hogy* from QI-clauses. For example, compare the QI-clauses with the MV *jön* in (3.109a–b) and with *előáll* in (3.110a–b). The presence of the endophoric pronoun is obligatory since it functions as a relative pronoun connecting the QI-clause with the RD. Hence, if one omits *azzal* from the clause (e.g. *\*utána jöttem, hogy*), it loses its reportative meaning and becomes meaningless.

(3.109a) *Utána azzal jöttem, hogy pont*  
 after.3SG DEM.D.COM come.PST.1SG COMP point  
*az az érzésem vele kapcsolatban*  
 DEM.D DEF feeling.1SG COM.3SG connection.INE  
 ‘Then **I came up with that that** exactly that is my feeling in regard to him/her’  
 (vaskarika.hu).

(3.109b) *s már este azzal jött,*  
 and already evening DEM.D.COM come.PST.3SG  
 ‘no nem haltok már meg’  
 PTCL NEG dead.2PL already PRE  
 ‘And already in the evening [my father] **came up with that** “well, you are not on your deathbed yet”’ (mek.oszk.hu).

(3.110a) *Szóval, azzal álltam elő,*  
 word.COM DEM.D.COM stand.PST.1SG forward  
*hogy ha nem megy*  
 COMP if NEG come.PRS.3SG  
*este, szaunázzunk reggel.*  
 evening go.to.sauna.IMP1PL morning  
 ‘In one word, **I came forward with that (that)** if we don’t manage it in the evening, let’s have sauna in the morning.’ (facebook.com).

|          |                  |                  |               |                    |               |
|----------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| (3.110b) | <i>A</i>         | <i>11</i>        | <i>éves</i>   | <i>lányom</i>      | <i>a</i>      |
|          | DEF              | NUM              | year.ADJ      | daughter.1SG       | DEF           |
|          | <i>múltkor</i>   | <i>azzal</i>     | <i>állt</i>   | <i>elő:</i>        | <i>- Apu,</i> |
|          | past.TEMP        | DEM.D.COM        | stand.PST.3SG | forward            | father.VOC    |
|          | <i>ha</i>        | <i>felnövök,</i> | <i>a</i>      | <i>Hadseregben</i> | <i>akarok</i> |
|          | when             | up.grow.PRS.1SG  | DEF           | army.INE           | want.PRS.1SG  |
|          | <i>szolgálni</i> |                  |               |                    |               |
|          | serve.INF        |                  |               |                    |               |

‘My 11 y.o. daughter the other day **came forward with that**: – Daddy, when I grow up, I want to serve in the Army’ (viccek24.hu).

As I have mentioned above and demonstrated with (3.59) for *előáll*, the MVs *jön* and *előáll* can be accompanied not only by the endophoric pronouns as in (3.109), but also by NPs indicating the presence and original source of RD (3.111). Despite the reportative meaning that they acquire in RD-constructions, the MVs as such only partially demonstrate the event that the quote denotes. As the presented examples show, the meaning of the verb can preferably be defined from the context and the content of RD than can be assigned universally to all cases where *jön* and *előáll* appear. I follow the same consideration in the translation line of the examples.

|         |               |              |             |                   |                     |               |
|---------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| (3.111) | <i>Na,</i>    | <i>aztán</i> | <i>a</i>    | <i>sajtó</i>      | <i>még</i>          | <i>másnap</i> |
|         | PTCL          | then         | DEF         | press             | still               | other.day     |
|         | <i>reggel</i> | <i>jön</i>   | <i>a</i>    | <i>szöveggel,</i> | <i>hogy:</i>        | <i>“Ez</i>    |
|         | morning       | come.PRS.3SG | DEF         | text.COM          | COMP                | DEM.P         |
|         | <i>az!</i>    | <i>A</i>     | <i>fiúk</i> | <i>mindent</i>    | <i>megtettek..”</i> |               |
|         | DEM.D         | DEF          | boy.PL      | everything.ACC    | do.PST.3PL          |               |

‘Then **the press** still the other day in the morning **comes up with the text that** “That’s it! The boys did everything..”’ (weebly.com).

Both MVs primarily indicate that the RD represents a quotation of speech. Similarly to the previously attested cases, hypothetical quotations are mainly introduced by speech or non-speech verbs in the conditional past. Similarly, one can observe these types of RD where the QI-clause consists of *jön* and *előáll* in the same form. Thus, the reporter indicates the unreality of the situation and that the quote remains entirely fictional, as in (3.112) and (3.113).

|         |              |              |                |                  |             |            |
|---------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| (3.112) | <i>...ha</i> | <i>azzal</i> | <i>jöttem</i>  | <i>volna</i>     | <i>hogy</i> | <i>nem</i> |
|         | if           | DEM.D.COM    | come.PST.1SG   | be.COND.3SG      | COMP        | more       |
|         | <i>jó</i>    | <i>a</i>     | <i>bűnözős</i> | <i>hasonlata</i> |             |            |
|         | good         | DEF          | criminal       | comparison.3SG   |             |            |

‘...if **I would have said that** the comparison with a criminal isn’t good’ (forum.portfolio.hu).

|         |  |            |                      |                 |                |
|---------|--|------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| (3.113) | ...és  | <i>nem</i> | <i>volt</i>          | <i>egyetlen</i> | <i>személy</i> |
|         | and  | NEG        | be.PST.3SG           | sole            | person         |
|         | <i>sem,</i>  | <i>aki</i> | <i>előállt</i>       | <i>volna,</i>   | <i>hogy</i>    |
|         | also.NEG   | who        | step.forward.PST.3SG | be.COND.3SG     | COMP           |
|         | <i>megvédje</i>  |            |                      |                 |                |
|         | protect.PRS.3SG:DEF  |            |                      |                 |                |
|         | ‘...and there wasn’t one person, who <b>would have come up that (s)he will protect him</b> ’ (napiremeny.blog.hu). |            |                      |                 |                |

Similarly to Finnish and Estonian (see Section 4.7), the MV *jön* can also be used in the quotative domain with its primary MV-meaning. In such contexts, it co-occurs with an NP in the nominative case encoding the source of RD. The MV is merely indicating the transition of RD to its addressee, i.e. the reporter. Compare (3.114) and (3.115) with (3.111) where *jön* forms a complex QI with an NP, and the original speaker is still expressed in the QI-clause.

|         |   |                 |                |               |                 |
|---------|---|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| (3.114) | <i>Rá</i>   | <i>kerestem</i> | <i>aztán</i>   | <i>meg</i>    | <i>jött</i>     |
|         | SUBL.3SG  | search.PST.1SG  | then           | also          | come.PST.3SG    |
|         | <i>a</i>  | <i>“Ja,</i>     | <i>ezt</i>     | <i>a</i>      | <i>krapekot</i> |
|         | DEF   | PTCL            | DEM.P.ACC      | DEF           | dude.ACC        |
|         | <i>ismerem.</i>   | <i>CSori</i>    | <i>kopasz”</i> | <i>szöveg</i> | <i>xDD</i>      |
|         | know.PRS.1SG:DEF  | PN              | bold           | text          | EMOT            |
|         | ‘I searched for it, then <b>came the “Yeah, I know this dude. Bold Csori” text</b> xDD’ (indavideo.hu). |                 |                |               |                 |

|         |  |              |            |                 |                |
|---------|--|--------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| (3.115) | ...erre  | <i>jött</i>  | <i>a</i>   | <i>szöveg,</i>  | <i>hogy</i>    |
|         | DEM.P.SUBL   | come.PST.3SG | DEF        | text            | COMP           |
|         | <i>ők</i>  | <i>csak</i>  | <i>egy</i> | customer        | support        |
|         | 3SG  | only         | INDEF      | customer (Eng.) | support (Eng.) |
|         | ‘... <b>upon this came the text, that they are only a customer support</b> ’ (gyoznijottem.blog.hu). |              |            |                 |                |

Example (3.114) represents a somewhat less conventional case, since the RD is placed in front of the noun *szöveg* ‘article’, encoding the original source of RD, and functions as an attribute to it. Thus, it slightly differs from a more typical QI-clause, as in (3.115). In a more conventional QI-clause with *jön* of this type, the complementizer is still present and is placed on the border position between the QI-clause and the quote. However, in both cases *jön* fulfills the same function, encoding the transition of the text from the source to the reporters. *Előáll* is not observed in the same function, which may happen due to the further lexicalization of the marker in the quotative domain and its less frequent use as a regular MV outside the quotative domain.

As for inchoative verbs, they behave predominantly similarly to the MVs. Inchoative verbs logically indicate the start of the speech act which is frequently embedded in the main clause with the complementizer *hogy*, as in (3.116). In (3.117), the reported clause is not embedded into the main clause, as it consists of direct RD. As it has been previously specified, the presence of the complementizer

*hogy* with direct reports is not obligatory, and the complementizer can often remain elliptic. Furthermore, the reporter specifies that RD will follow by using the conventionalized symbols used to indicate the presence of the quote. Based on my observations, inchoative verbs are typically accompanied by the endophoric pronoun and do not form a QI-clause with NPs specifying the source of RD. In one of the cases, I have observed the inchoative verb *kezd* ‘start’ followed by the noun *beszéd* ‘talk’ which I provide here merely for illustrative purposes in (3.118).

- (3.116) *Ők*                    *azok,*                    *akik*                    *mindig*                    *azzal*                    *indítanak,*  
 3PL                    DEM.D.PL                    who.PL                    always                    DEM.D.COM                    start.PRS.3PL  
*hogy*                    *jaj,*                    *csak*                    *egy*                    *kis*                    *leves*  
 COMP                    INTERJ                    only                    INDEF                    little                    soup  
*van*                    *itthon...*  
 be.PRS.3SG                    at.home  
 ‘They are those who always **start with that (that) oh, there’s only a bit of soup at home...**’ (nlcafe.hu).

- (3.117) *...akkor*                    *ő*                    *azzal*                    *kezdte:*  
 then                    3SG                    DEM.D.COM                    start.PST.3SG:DEF  
 “*maga*                    *is*                    *segédoperatőr*                    *akar*  
 self                    also                    assistant.operator                    want.PRS.3SG  
*lenni,*                    *azért*                    *jön*                    *ide*  
 be.INF                    DEM.D.CAUS                    come.PRS.3SG                    here.ILL  
*világosítónak*”  
 lighting.technician.DAT  
 ‘then **he started with that: “you too want to be an assistant operator, that is why you come here to work as a lighting technician”**’ (dunavolgyipeter.hu).

- (3.118) *a*                    *Momentum*                    *elnöke*                    *rögtön*                    *azzal*  
 DEF                    PN                    chairman.3SG                    straightaway                    DEM.D.COM  
*kezdte*                    *beszédét,*                    *hogy*                    *nem*                    *lehet*  
 start.PST.3SG:DEF                    talk.3SG.ACC                    COMP                    NEG                    be.POT.3SG  
*nem*                    *beszélni*                    *a*                    *tegnap*                    *elfogadott*  
 NEG                    talk.INF                    DEF                    yesterday                    adopted  
*lex*                    *CEU-ról*  
 law                    PN-DELA  
 ‘**The chairman of Momentum started his talk straightaway with that (that) it is impossible not to talk about the CEU law adopted yesterday**’ (hvg.hu).

Similarly, the SVs that are used in this quotative construction are usually accompanied by the endophoric pronoun *azzal* only, and do not contain any other additional elements, e.g. NPs specifying the source of RD. It can be explained in the following way. A specific SV already provides enough information about the event behind the report. Consequently, there is no need to specify additionally what type of RD is presented in the RD-construction. However, opposite scenarios are not excluded. Thus, my claim should be interpreted as merely reporting a tendency of the use of SVs in these types of quotative constructions. For example, in (3.121), the specific SV *válaszol* ‘answer’ is accompanied by the NP *mondatt* ‘sentence’. In

both types of constructions, the QI-clause is typically accompanied by the complementizer *hogy* placed on the border position between the QI-clause and the quote, as in (3.119) with the verb *visszautasít* ‘reject’ and in (3.120)–(3.121) with *válaszol* ‘respond’.

(3.119) ...*azzal*                    *utasította*                    *vissza,*                    *hogy*                    “*majd*  
 DEM.D.COM                    direct.PST.3SG:DEF                    back                    COMP                    then  
*ha*                    *megérik*                    *megeszem,*                    *jó?*”  
 if                    mature.PRS.3SG                    eat.up.PRS.1SG                    good  
 ‘(s)he rejected it by [saying] **that** “I’ll eat it up once it has ripened, okay?”’  
 (nlcafe.hu).

(3.120) ...*mire*                    *Bombera*                    *azzal*                    *válaszolt,*                    *hogy*  
 what.SUBL                    PN                    DEM.D.COM                    answer.PST.3SG                    COMP  
*most*                    *már*                    *lejárt*                    *a*                    *moratórium.*  
 now                    already                    expire.PST.3SG                    DEF                    moratorium  
 ‘...upon what **Bombera** answered by [saying] **that** the moratorium has already expired by now.’ (blogstar.hu).

(3.121) ...*mindig*                    *csak*                    *azzal*                    *a*                    *mondattal*  
 always                    just                    DEM.D.COM                    DEF                    sentence.COM  
*válaszolt,*                    *hogy:*                    “*Az*                    *úr*                    *pokolban*  
 answer.PST.3SG                    COMP                    DEF                    gentleman                    hell.INE  
*is*                    *úr!*”  
 also                    gentleman  
 ‘...he always **answered** just **with the sentence that:** “A gentleman is a gentleman even in hell!”’ (books.google.com)<sup>101</sup>.

(3.122) *Egy*                    *fiatal*                    *munkavállaló*  
 INDEF                    young                    employee  
*vagy*                    *még*                    *tanuló*  
 or                    still                    study.PTCP  
*a*                    *szakszervezetekről*                    *szóló*  
 DEF                    working.union.DELA                    say.PTCP  
*kérdésre*                    *leggyakrabban*                    *azzal*  
 question.SUBL                    SUP.often.COMPAR.ADV                    DEM.D.COM  
*válaszolt:*                    “*miért,*                    *van*  
 answer.PST.3SG                    why                    be.PRS.3SG  
*még*                    *ilyen?*”  
 still                    such  
 ‘A young employee or a still a student most often **answered** the question about working unions **with that:** “why, do they still exist?”’ (veledvagyunk.blog.hu).

Both inchoative and speech verbs can also present hypothetical quotations. However, as in the above strategies, the verb in the QI-clause is used in the

<sup>101</sup> This example is taken outside the new media genre and is provided here with merely illustrative purposes.



conditional past mood, indicating that the event in the QI-clause is entirely fictional. Consequently, the RD also acquires a fictional state, as in (3.123)–(3.124).

- (3.123) *És akkor még én is*  
 and then already 1SG also  
*azzal kezdtem volna, hogy: “miaf@szom,*  
 DEM.D.COM start.PST.1SG be.COND COMP what.DEF.dick.1SG  
*miért nem veszik már fel*  
 why NEG receive.PRS.3SG already up  
*a telefon?!”*  
 DEF telephone.ACC  
 ‘And then **I could** already **have started with that that**: “whatthef@ck, why don’t they pick up the phone already?!” (logout.hu).

- (3.124) *...azzal válaszoltam volna, hogy nem létezik*  
 DEM.D.COM answer.PST.1SG be.COND COMP NEG exist.PRS.3SG  
 ‘**I would have answered with that (that) it doesn’t exist**’ (tkbe.hu).

To sum up, this quote-presentational quotative construction accommodates a number of different verbs. Among the presented cases, one can differentiate the subclasses (i) with the motion verbs *jön* and *előáll*, (ii) inchoative verbs, and (iii) specific SVs. Despite the differences in the subclasses of verbs that are used in this strategy, they follow the same principle using the endophoric pronoun as a correlative element of the clause, combining the RD with the QI-clause.

Most likely due to their frequent use in the quotative domain, the MVs *előáll* and *jön* can be paraphrasable with a number of different specific SVs. The interpretation of the MV predominantly depends on the context and the type of RD that is presented. Consequently, despite the fact that they semantically resemble MVs used as QIs in other languages of the world, *jön* and *előáll* form a slightly different subclass of QIs deriving from this category. The MV *jön* is also observed in constructions that appear in Finnish and Estonian. Namely, *jön* accompanies an NP encoding the original source of RD, thus preserving its semantics as an MV and denoting the transition of RD from its source to the reporter. *Előáll* in such a function is not observed, which is mainly explained by the lexicalization of this element in the quotative domain into a completely functioning specific SV, although without a very concrete meaning.

The inchoative verbs in this type of construction merely mark the beginning of the clause consisting of the (previously produced) speech act. In most of the cases, they are accompanied by the endophoric pronoun *azzal* and do not appear with NPs encoding the original source of RD. More rarely they can be followed by such an NP as an object in the matrix clause, e.g. ‘start a talk’, ‘start a speech’, etc. However, the possibility of such a use depends mainly on the inchoative verb, since only some of them can be used transitively and take a similar type of object. Equivalently, specific SVs are also accompanied mainly by *azzal*. Since specific SVs typically describe the event behind RD in details, there is no need to overspecify it by additionally inserting an NP marking the source of RD in the QI-clause.

### 3.7. Quotative indexes in Hungarian: summary

In colloquial written Hungarian, the majority of the contemporary quotative strategies are not new and mainly derive from constructions or involve markers that were present in the language in previous periods. Only a few strategies can be considered relatively new in the language and have not been in use before. Some of the quotative markers have changed both functionally and structurally; others have established a more restricted distribution compared to their use during previous periods.

The most typical strategy, mentioned most often in the descriptive grammars, involves the use of SEVs and the complementizer *hogy*. In addition to SEVs and the complementizer *hogy*, the Hungarian complementizer strategy usually includes the endophoric demonstratives *ez* and *az* in the accusative case (*ez-t* ‘DEM.P-ACC’, *az-t* ‘DEM.D-ACC’) which function as objects of the core-predicate in the QI-clause. Hence, the verbs that appear in this type of construction are usually highly transitive and are used in the form of the definite conjugation. The endophoric demonstratives follow a particular pattern of distribution. The proximal demonstrative *ez* is used exclusively with direct types of RD, while the distal demonstrative *az* can appear with both direct and indirect RDs. The proximal demonstrative *ez* is not bound to a fixed position in the RD-construction and can be used in the QI-clause either preposed or postposed to the quote. In contrast, the distal demonstrative *az* is bound to the preposed position to the quote. Unlike in many other European languages, according to the rules of the literary standard, the complementizer *hogy* can be used with both direct and indirect types of RD. Table 9 summarizes the main properties of the use of the endophoric demonstratives in QI-clauses with the complementizer *hogy*.

Table 9. QI-clauses with the endophoric demonstratives in Hungarian complementizer strategy

| QI-clause                        | Types of RD |          | Position to RD |           |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|-----------|
|                                  | direct      | indirect | preposed       | postposed |
| <i>ez-t</i> ‘DEM.P-ACC’ + SEVs   | +           | –        | +              | +         |
| <i>az-t</i> + ‘DEM.D-ACC’ + SEVs | +           | +        | +              | –         |

A similar quotative construction is formed where the MDs *így* ‘like this, so’, or *úgy* ‘like that, thus’ are used in the QI-clause. The distribution of the MDs follows a principle similar to what the above endophoric demonstratives do. The proximal MD *így* is exclusively used with direct types of RD, while distal *úgy* can introduce both direct and indirect RDs. At the same time, proximal *így* is not bound to one position in relation to the quote. It can be used in a pre-, intra- or postposed QI-clause. The distal MD *úgy*, however, can appear only in a QI-clause preceding the quote. Consequently, *így* can function as both a cataphoric and an anaphoric marker, while *úgy* is used exclusively cataphorically. Functionally, the proximal deictic *így* is a marker demonstrating the following or preceding stretches of RD. Contrarily

to it, distal *úgy* functions as a marker, indicating that instead of the demonstration the reporter presents or reinterprets the content of a (previously produced) utterance or thought. The proximal MD *így* can also appear in formally neutralized QI-clauses from which the core-predicate depicting the event is elided. The neutralized QI-clause still contains an NP encoding the original speaker. Such a QI-clause is used only to introduce real speech events. Thus, the event-neutralization is more formal than functionally expanding to other types of RD, observed in other strategies (see below on turn-taking constructions). I have observed the use of such a QI-clause in RD-constructions where the QI-clause with *így* is either postposed to the quote or is inserted into it, thus splitting the RD into several parts. The distal counterpart was not observed in such a QI-clause. Table 10 summarizes the main properties of the use of the MDs *így* and *úgy* in quotative constructions.

Table 10. The use of manner deictics in Hungarian quotative constructions

| Manner deictic              | Types of RD |          | Position to RD |             |            | Event-neutralization in the QI-clause (ellipsis of the verb) |
|-----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|-------------|------------|--|
|                             | direct      | indirect | pre-posed      | intra-posed | post-posed |  |
| <i>így</i> ‘so, this way’   | +           | –        | +              | +           | +          | +  |
| <i>úgy</i> ‘thus, that way’ | +           | +        | +              | –           | –          | –  |

Another subclass of quotative indexes is formed by markers derived from SVs. Four markers of this subclass derive from the basic SV *mond* ‘say’: (i) *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’, (ii) *a(s)zongya* ‘says this’, (iii) *mondván* ‘saying’, and (iv) *úgymond* ‘so to say/speak’. One more marker is formed from the specific SV *állít* ‘claim, declare’ – *állítólag* ‘allegedly, reportedly’.

The self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok* represents a basic self-quoting strategy, simply consisting of the SV *mond* ‘say’ in the form of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular (‘I say’). The marker takes the form of the present tense despite the fact that it is used to refer to the discourse, previously produced in the form of an utterance or thought. Hence, despite its form, the marker can be paraphrased not only by the clause ‘I said’, but also by ‘I thought’. A stylistic and functional difference can be observed between the two forms of the self-quotative marker. The form of the definite conjugation *mond-om* ‘say.PRS-1SG:DEF’ represents a more conventionalized form of the marker, while the indefinite form *mond-ok* ‘say.PRS-1SG:INDEF’ is typical of vernacular speech and is often stigmatized by language purists as “incorrect”. In addition, *mondom/mondok* has one more functional extension: it is used by the reporter when (s)he aims to emphasize the verbatim rendering of the quote based on a recently produced utterance.

The quotative particle *a(s)zongya* represents a merged form of the demonstrative *az-t* ‘DEM.D-ACC’ and the SV *mond-ja* ‘say.PRS-3SG:DEF’. The quotative particle *a(s)zongya* dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century (if not earlier), where it can be observed in the Hungarian literature of that period. In contemporary Hungarian,

the marker can still be conjugated and has a partial paradigm of the verb in all persons and both the present and past tense. Furthermore, it is sometimes used in the form of the past conditional. In some contexts, the quotative particle *a(s)zongya* is paraphrasable with the QI-clause *azt mondja* ‘DEM.D-ACC say.PRS.3SG’, and represents rather a contracted form of the QI-clause. In such a function, the marker preserves its position within the RD-construction and shows a correspondence with the use of the non-contracted QI. When the quotative particle is paraphrasable with the QI-clause *azt mondja*, it appears as a single quotative element in the QI-clause.

In cases where *a(s)zongya* is used without an NP, encoding the original speaker, the particle can function as a merely contracted form of the QI *azt mondja*, or it may acquire a broader meaning of the quotative marker with the possibility of marking different types of RD. In the latter use, the marker already starts losing the semantics of the SV, encoded in it, and merely functions as an element, indicating that the following information is the RD. Furthermore, the marker is not bound to one position within an RD-construction, and it can appear either as a pre-, intra-, or postposed QI, which otherwise is not possible with the non-contracted QI *azt mondja*.

As part of a bipartite QI, *a(s)zongya* co-occurs with speech, epistemic, non-speech verbs and NPs in the QI-clause. It introduces, besides quotations of speech, also quotations of thought. As far as hypothetical quotations are concerned, *a(s)zongya* can be observed with this type of RD. However, the use of the particle with hypothetical quotations depends on the contextual and the reporter’s motivations, rather than being a universal feature of this marker. A separate subclass of the bipartite QI with *a(s)zongya* can be observed where the marker is preceded by the complementizer *hogy* – QI-clause + *hogy a(s)zongya*. In such a use, *a(s)zongya* shows disagreement in tense and person with the main verb in the QI-clause. Lack of tense agreement can also be observed in cases where *hogy* does not precede *a(s)zongya*. However, lack of personal agreement is observed only in cases where *a(s)zongya* is following the complementizer *hogy*.

The quotative marker *mondván* ‘saying’ is a participle form of the SV *mond* in the superessive case. This marker is also not new in contemporary Hungarian and dates back to the first written Biblical translations. In these types of texts, the marker is mostly used as part of a bipartite QI, adjacent to a QI-clause consisting of an SV. In contemporary Hungarian, such a use of the marker can also be observed mostly in quotations from the Bible. Outside of this genre, *mondván* rarely co-occurs with proper SVs and is used more frequently with verbs that lack reportative semantics and NPs, or as a single quote-introducer. Usually, it presents quotations of speech. The non-clausal use of *mondván* derives from the old use of the marker in the Biblical texts, which can also be seen in some contexts in contemporary Hungarian, where Biblical quotes appear. Based on the collected material, it is not used with quotations of thoughts, since the marker preserves the semantics of the SV and is merely used to present a previously produced speech.

The quotative particle *úgymond* ‘so to say/speak’ also dates back to the period of the first Biblical translations into Hungarian and derives from the merge of the MD *úgy* with the SV *mond* ‘say’. In the old Hungarian texts, the marker tends to

co-occur with other SVs, thus forming a bipartite QI. Over time, it started to be used as an independent quote introducer, either appearing as a single quotative element in the RD-construction or co-occurring with NPs, encoding original speakers. Starting from the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the particle has also developed non-quotative functions of a discourse particle with different meanings. As a discourse particle, most typically *úgymond* marks information that derives from outside the current discourse or refers to common knowledge. In addition, it may indicate that a current speaker uses a word or a phrase non-equivalently to their conventional use or meanings. In the quotative domain, *úgymond* also undergoes changes. The particle shows a relatively strong decline of its original quotative function since its use as a discourse marker becomes more salient. In RD-constructions, it is used more frequently as part of a bipartite QI, co-occurring with SEVs and NPs. The marker indicates that the quote is produced in a summarized form and might show some non-equivalence between the quoted and original material. Its use with quotations of thought is relatively rare, which indicates that the particle still preserves the meaning of the SV *mond* ‘say’, encoded in it. In the quotative domain, *úgymond* is relatively frequently used with parts of discourse that represent hypothetical quotations, consisting of either information that can be classified as common knowledge, or some well-known expressions. In such cases, the marker is most likely used without any additional elements.

As for *állítólag* ‘allegedly, reportedly’, in the quotative domain it functions only rarely as a quotative marker, restricted to one type of quotative construction following pragmatic conditions where the event behind the RD is revealed in the surrounding context. In such cases, it is used as a single quote-introducer. The reference to the original speaker is crucial in distinguishing its uses as a QI from the reported evidential meaning of the marker which remains its main function. Since the functional capacities of *állítólag* as a QI are restricted to one type of construction and follow special conditions in distinguishing it from a reported evidential marker, I suggest considering it as merely a quasi-quotative marker. In addition to its reportative meaning, *állítólag* expresses partial epistemic support that I have observed in all of the cases where it appeared in my material. The scale of the partial support might differ depending on the content of presented quote, expressing epistemic overtones from a stronger uncertainty to a slight doubt. Similarly to the above quotative markers deriving from the SV *mond* (excluding *a(s)zongya*), *állítólag* is not used with reports deriving from quotations of thoughts. Since reported evidentials are semantically restricted to reports deriving from parts of the discourse that have previously taken place, one cannot expect *állítólag* to be used with hypothetical quotations. Table 11 summarizes the main peculiarities of the use of the QIs deriving from SVs.

Table 11. The use of the quotative indexes deriving from speech verbs in Hungarian

| QIs                  | Types of RD |          |                         | Structural use      |                           |                     |                             |
|----------------------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
|                      | real speech | thoughts | hypothetical quotations | Occurrence with SVs | Occurrence with EVs/NS Vs | Occurrence with NPs | Non-clausal use (single QI) |
| <i>mondom/mondok</i> | +           | +        | –                       | –                   | –                         | –                   | –                           |
| <i>a(s)zongya</i>    | +           | +        | +                       | +                   | +/+                       | +                   | +                           |
| <i>mondván</i>       | +           | –        | –                       | +/-                 | ?/+                       | +                   | +                           |
| <i>úgymond</i>       | +           | +/-      | +                       | +                   | +/-                       | +                   | +                           |
| <i>állítólag</i>     | +           | –        | –                       | +                   | +/+                       | +                   | +                           |

In addition to the markers that form Hungarian quotative constructions, two strategies form genuine subclasses of QIs in Hungarian: speaker- and quote-presentational quotative constructions. A speaker-presentational quotative construction is also labeled here as a turn-taking quotative construction. A quote-presentational construction involves the use of different verbs with elements in the comitative case.

In fact, there are two different turn-taking constructions. They involve different elements, but, in general, function similarly. One of the turn-taking constructions consists of an NP, encoding the speaker, and the TTD demonstrative *ez* in the sublative case – *erre* ‘upon this’. *Erre* can equally refer to previously presented RD or to the situation described in the context in general. In Hungarian this construction is not new and similarly to most of the quotative constructions in the language, it can already be encountered in the literature from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The *erre* + *SP*-construction may contain both speech and epistemic verbs. In addition, it can be used together with NPs encoding the original source of RD. Most typically such an NP contains a noun deriving from SVs, e.g. *erre a válasz* ‘to this the answer’. Consequently, it can be used to present quotes of both speech and thoughts. The event-neutralized form of the same QI can also be observed that mainly happens through the ellipsis of the verb from the clause. In some cases an NP encoding the original speaker can also be elided. However, this type of neutralization stays context-specific, and usually, the original speaker can still be retrieved from the context. The same QI can also introduce hypothetical quotations. For these purposes, the QI-clause would likely consist of an SV in the conditional past mood, indicating that the event behind the quote acquires a fictional reading.

Another turn-taking construction is formed by the collocation of an NP encoding the original speaker and the TTC *meg* ‘and’. Unlike *erre* + *SP*, the *SP* + *meg*-construction can be considered relatively new in the language. However, structurally the two turn-taking constructions behave similarly. The only observed difference is the lack of use of this construction with NPs encoding the original source of RD. In other cases, *SP* + *meg* follows the same principles. Table 12 summarizes the main properties of the turn-taking quotative constructions in contemporary Hungarian.

Table 12. The turn-taking quotative constructions in Hungarian

| QIs                               | Types of RD |          |              | Event-neutralization |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|
|                                   | real speech | thoughts | hypothetical |                      |
| <i>erre</i> ‘upon this’ + Speaker | +           | +        | +/-          | +                    |
| Speaker + <i>meg</i> ‘and’        | +           | +        | +/-          | +                    |

The last strategy is a quote-presentational quotative construction. It mainly involves the use of the endophoric demonstrative *az* in the comitative case – *azzal* ‘with this’ with different types of verbs. In addition, with some verbs instead of the endophoric demonstrative *azzal* one can encounter NPs in the comitative case encoding the source of RD. A QI-clause in this type of RD-construction is mainly separated from the RD by the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’.

This strategy may involve a range of different speech and non-speech verbs in the QI-clause. Among the SVs, only specific SVs can be encountered, e.g. *válaszol* ‘answer’, *visszautasít* ‘reject’, etc. As for NSVs, two different subclasses were observed. Among them, one is represented by the MVs *jön* ‘come’ and *előáll* ‘lit. step forward; claim, present’. Since both verbs are intransitive, instead of taking a direct object represented by the endophoric demonstrative (e.g. *az-t* ‘DEM-ACC’), they might have started being used with the endophoric demonstrative in the comitative case. Besides the endophoric demonstrative, both verbs can be accompanied by NPs indicating the original source of RD. In contrast to MVs, specific SVs are usually accompanied only by the endophoric pronouns, since they do not require additional specification of the event behind RD.

The originally motion verb *előáll* has further lexicalized in the quotative domain and nowadays it acquires the meaning of a specific SV. Outside the quotative domain it is used more rarely as an MV compared to *jön* that remains one of the basic MVs in the language. In the quotative domain, *jön* can also be used as a basic MV when it co-occurs with NPs in the nominative case encoding the original source of RD and functions as a predicate depicting the process of transition of the RD from its source to the reporter. In contrast, *előáll* has not been observed in such a function.

The other subclass of NSVs used in this quote-presentational construction is formed by inchoative verbs, e.g. *kezd* ‘start’, *indít* ‘start’ encoding the start of the speech act. As with specific SVs, an NP in the comitative case does not accompany an inchoative verb. However, some inchoative verbs (e.g. *kezd* ‘start’) can be used together with such NPs syntactically functioning as an object in the QI-clause, e.g. *kezdte beszédét* ‘started his/her speech’. However, my observations show that inchoative verbs are used more frequently with the endophoric pronoun *azzal* than with NPs functioning as objects.

All of the described verbs are used in this type of construction to present only speech events, both factive and fictional. Similarly to the previously summarized strategies, with fictional quotes, the verb in the QI-clause is presented in the conditional past mood thus indicating the irrealis state of the described event. None of the verbs used in this strategy has been encountered in the contexts where they

could be used with quotations of thoughts. As a result, this strategy is used exclusively with quotations of speech. Table 13 summarizes the use of different verbs in the quotative strategy with the endophoric demonstrative *az* in the comitative case.

Table 13. The quote-presentational quotative construction in Hungarian

| QIs  | Structural use               |               |             | Types of RD |                         |  |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|--|
|  | <i>az-zal</i><br>'DEM.D-COM' | NP-COM/NP-ACC | real speech | thoughts    | hypothetical quotations |  |
| Specific SVs   | +                            | ?/-           | +           | -           | +                       |  |
| NSVs motion verbs <i>jön</i> 'come' and <i>előáll</i> 'step forward' | +                            | +/-           | +           | -           | +                       |  |
| inchoative verbs   | +                            | -/+           | +           | -           | +                       |  |

To sum up, in contemporary Hungarian, the quotative strategies mainly used already in the previous periods are active. The majority of the QIs has already been used in the period of Old Hungarian and through the development of the language has undergone some changes. Thus, some of the markers have nowadays acquired a broader meaning of a quotative marker presenting different types of RD, while others became restricted to quotations of speech only, both fictional and factive. Among the quotative markers deriving from SVs, the quotative particle *úgymond* and the quotative marker *mondván* have shown development towards new functions outside the quotative domain. The use of endophoric demonstratives and MDs has established a specific pattern. As for language contact as a motivating factor to the appearance of new quotative strategies, only the two turn-taking constructions show a significant correspondence with identical quotative constructions in the contact languages, namely neighboring Slavic and German. However, further studies should be conducted to clarify the origin of these quotative constructions in Hungarian. As a result, unlike Udmurt, Hungarian mostly relies on autochthonous means in the quotative domain, showing only little similarity in the use of QIs with the related languages.

As far as the different types of RD are concerned, with the majority of the markers, fictional quotes are systematically introduced by the main verb of the QI-clause in the form of the conditional past. In a relatively small amount of constructions event-neutralization has been encountered, which leads to the blurring of the difference between quotations of speech and thought. Alternatively, quotations of thoughts are more frequently introduced by constructions where EVs appear, depicting the event necessary for marking this type of RD, or where the self-quotative *mondom/mondok* has independently established the distribution, also to quotations of thoughts, despite the SV meaning encoded in the marker.



## 4. QUOTATIVE INDEXES IN FINNISH AND ESTONIAN

### 4.1. Previous studies on quotative indexes in Finnish and Estonian

In Finnish, the research on RD started in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Penttilä (1948), who was the pioneer in the study of this topic, first introduced the definition of RD into Finnish linguistics. Later, RD has been studied by Ikola (1961), Kurkkio (1978), Kuiri (1984), and Koski (1985). Both Penttilä (1948) and Ikola (1961) concentrated on the description of RD-constructions using the corpora of Finnish literature and dialects. Kurkkio's (1978) study described quotations within different styles of contemporary Finnish, while Koski (1985) concentrated on RD in written texts. Kuiri (1984) provided a detailed description of QIs used in the colloquial speech of the dialects of Northern Karelia and Kainuu. A brief diachronic overview of the first studies on RD in Finnish linguistics is presented by Kalliokoski (2005) in Haakana & Kalliokoski (2005). A significant part of this overview is dedicated to a summary of (new) QIs that appear both in literary standard and colloquial Finnish.

In Estonian, the first descriptions of RD are found in Admann's studies (1975, 1976, 1983) where the author primarily concentrates on the peculiarities of indirect RD-constructions in Estonian. Furthermore, RD was studied by Kerge (1979). Quite a vast amount of research interest by Estonian linguists is paid to the grammatical means of marking the presence of reported material, i.e. the quotative mood or *modus obliquus* (Est. *kaudne kõneviis*). The notion as an evidential category was studied by various scholars, e.g. Rätsep (1971), Klaas (1997), Kehayov (2002, 2004), Erelt *et al.* (2006), and Sepper (2007). The most recent description on the expression of evidentiality in Estonian can be found in the Syntax of Estonian (Eesti Keele Süntaks 2017: 155–159, henceforth: EKS 2017), including also a separate section on the quotative mood (*ibid.*: 176–180).

Some of the latest descriptions of RD-constructions are found in the descriptive grammars Iso Suomen Kielioppi (ISK 2004) and Eesti keele grammatika (EKG 1993) and Eesti keele süntaks (EKS 2017). They concentrate mainly on the strategies that are primarily used in the standard variants of the languages (for Finnish see ISK 2004: §1457–60; for Estonian see EKG 1993: §716, EKS 2017: 687–694). In addition, Estonian RD-constructions are briefly described in the Handbook of the Estonian language (Eesti Keele Käsiraamat, henceforth: EKK 2007). In contrast to EKG (1993: §716), EKS (2017: 687–694) and EKK (2007: §127–28), ISK also provides a brief description of a few NQ strategies that appear in colloquial Finnish (ISK 2004: §1486–87). Namely, the co-occurrence of the equational verb *olla* 'to be' with different particles and adverbials is reported to be used in colloquial Finnish to introduce the presence of RD, cf. (4.1). However, the strategies are illustrated only superficially. They do not mention homomorphic constructions that appear parallel to the described strategies, or define functional properties of NQs that are used in these strategies. For example, it is

not specified whether there is a difference in the choice of the element that follows the equational verb or not (e.g. *sillee(n)* ‘like that, thus’ vs. *et(tä)* ‘that’), and what are the functional capacities of the markers used in the quotative domain.

- (4.1) *ni*            ***ma***    ***olin***            *just*    ***sillee***    *mutsi*    *hei*    ***mutsi***  
 so            1SG    be.PST.1SG    just    thus    mom    hi    mom  
***oli***            ***et***    *lähetää*  
 be.PST.3SG    COMP    go.PASS  
 ‘So **I was** just **like** mom hi, **mom was that** let’s go’ (ISK 2004: §1487; glossing, translation and bold marking are mine, DT).

More detailed information on NQs in colloquial Finnish is found in the handbook on RD edited by Haakana & Kalliokoski (2005). For example, the article by Routarinne (2005) analyzes the use of the equational verb *olla* ‘to be’ with the fact-type complementizer *että* ‘that’ and the SIM *niinku* ‘like’. Haakana (2005) investigates the use of different NQ strategies while quoting real utterances and thoughts. Additionally, Haakana (2006) has studied the use of quotations of thought in complaint stories. His study touches upon several peculiarities of NQ strategies, in addition to a broader description of the functions carried out by quotations of thought in discourse. Finally, Lappalainen (2005) describes the variation in the use of particles with non-reportative semantics as QIs from the standpoint of sociolinguistic research. In her study, the author discusses the use of (new) ways of quote-introduction in the speech of Finnish youth and points out the relationship with gender and age of the speakers. Similar studies on the use of NQs in Estonian are unknown to me.

As mentioned in Section 1.1, in my previous studies (Teptiuk 2015, 2019), I attempted to systematically describe the use of NQs in Finnish and Estonian. One of the aims of the research was to investigate the use of NQs in the languages previously mentioned in Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012). Since the provided list of NQs used in the various languages (presented here in 1.6.1. in Table 4) was neither followed by any description of the functional capacities of the concrete markers, nor was evidence of their use in the quotative domain provided, the goal was to define whether the mentioned elements do actually qualify as NQs in Finnish and Estonian. Furthermore, I paid attention to the use of markers that have not been previously mentioned. I also compared the use of NQs between the two languages. As a result, the current chapter predominantly relies on the outcomes of my previous research citing them with respect to the aims of the present study. I also provide some updates and adjustments that appeared during further investigations on the topic in these languages.

Unlike the chapter on Permic, the current one is not divided into subchapters on each language. The rationale lies in the significant similarities between the markers of these languages. First, I describe the use of SIMs as NQs (Section 4.2), followed by Section 4.3 dedicated to the use of quantifiers in the quotative domain. After that, I investigate the use of conventional complementizer strategies and the complementizer in NQ-strategies in Section 4.4. Furthermore, I pay

attention to deictic elements (Section 4.5) and MVs (Section 4.6) in the quotative domain. Finally, in Section 4.7, the peculiarities of Finnish and Estonian NQ-strategies are summarized. Each section starts with the description of Finnish, followed by the comparison with Estonian, excluding Section 4.6, where both languages are presented within one section without a split into subsections.

## 4.2. Similitive markers as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian

In the current section, I investigate the use of SIMs (see 1.6.2.5) in the quotative domain. I describe the quotative use of the Finnish SIMs *niin kuin (niinku)* ‘like, as if’ and *tyylillä(n)* ‘in the style (of), like’, followed by a comparison with the Estonian counterparts *nagu* ‘like’ and *a la* ‘like, in the style (of)’. I pay attention to co-occurrences of the markers with different types of verbs and NPs indicating the original source of RD, and to their non-clausal use as single quote-introducers. Taking into consideration the cross-linguistic correspondence in the use of SIMs in the quotative domain (see 1.6.2.5), epistemic overtones and other connotations that the markers might express are of particular interest here. Furthermore, I also concentrate on the use of SIMs with different types of RD.

### 4.2.1. The similitive markers *niin kuin (niinku)* and *tyylillä(n)* as new quotatives in Finnish

In previous studies, the SIMs *niin kuin (niinku)* and *tyylillä(n)* received research attention to varying extent. While the functions of *niin kuin (niinku)* both inside and outside the quotative domain were briefly described in both ISK (2004: §861, 1176, 1486) and independent studies by various scholars (see e.g. Kunelius 1998, Routarinne 2005), there is a lack of descriptions of the functions carried out by *tyylillä(n)*. Before discussing the use of both markers as NQs, I provide a brief description of *niin kuin* and *tyylillä(n)* outside the quotative domain.

The SIM *niin kuin* is a compound conjunction, which consists of the comparative conjunction *kuin* ‘as’ and the manner deictic *niin* ‘thus’. In colloquial Finnish, the shortened version *niinku* is often used (Kunelius 1998: 2). Outside the quotative domain, it is used in comparative/similitive constructions, where the compared elements are somehow similar, equivalent or identical (*ibid.*). In addition, it can be used as an approximative marker (ISK 2004: §1176). Consider the following examples where *niin kuin (niinku)* is used to point to the approximativity of two actions (4.2), or describes the similarity of manners of action (4.3).

- (4.2) *Vanha*                    *mies*    *kompuroi,*                    ***niin kuin***    *olisi*  
 old                            man    stumble.PST.3SG    as.if/like    be.COND.3SG  
*kaatumaisillaan.*  
 fall.AN.ADE.3SG  
 ‘The old man stumbled **as if** he was about to fall.’ (wiktionary.org; translation is original, glossing is mine, DT).

- (4.3) *Mikkeliläinen*    *Niina,*                    *33,*                    *teki*  
 PN                            PN                            NUM                    do.PST.3SG  
***niin kuin***                    *monet*                    *äidit*                    *tekevät*  
 as.if/like                    many.PL                    mother.PL                    do.PRS.3PL  
*ja*                            *unohti*                    *huolehtia*                    *itsestään*  
 and                            forget.PST.3SG    take.care.INF    self.ELA.3SG  
 ‘Niina Mikkeliläinen, 33, did **like** many mothers do and forgot to take care of herself’ (lansi-savo.fi).

*Niin kuin* is also often used as a discourse particle in self-repairing constructions and as a rhetorical particle (see Kunelius 1998). I do not concentrate separately on these functions of the marker here, although one should take into consideration that discourse particles are often used in various languages as QIs. For example, the English correspondent *like* is used in colloquial speech as a discourse marker with and without a reportative meaning (see Schourup 1985; Romaine & Lange 1991).

Since there is a lack of previous studies on the use of *tyylii(n)*, I provide a short description of its functions outside the quotative domain. *Tyyliin* derives from the noun *tyyli* ‘style’ in the singular illative form meaning ‘in the style (of)’:

- (4.4) *Haluatko*                    *hautajaiset*                    ***drive-in***                    ***tyyliin?***  
 want.PRS.2SG.Q    burial                    drive-in                    style.ILL  
 ‘Do you want the burial **in the drive-in style?**’ (etlehti.fi).

In colloquial Finnish, the illative case marker is usually expressed with a shortened version, which preserves the lengthened stem-final vowel but omits the final *n* – *tyylii*. In the following, the possibility of both the full and shortened version is expressed by the final *n* in parentheses – *tyylii(n)*. I treat both variants of the marker as equivalents by default.

Similarly to *niin kuin* (*niinku*), *tyylii(n)* is typically used in Finnish as a marker expressing approximativity:

- (4.5) *Olen*                    *lihonut*                    ***tyyliin***                    *40*                    *kiloa*  
 be.PRS.1SG    fatten.PP    style.ILL/like    NUM    kilo.PAR  
 ‘I’ve gained **like** 40 kilos’ (kotus.fi).

In my previous research (Teptiuk 2015: 36), I suggest that the source for the contemporary use of *tyyliin* can be expressions with *typ* ‘like’ in Swedish that is also used as a quotative marker in colloquial Swedish, cf. (4.6). As I show further, correspondence in the choice of quotative markers between Swedish and Finnish

can also be observed in the use of quantifiers as a source for NQ strategies (see 4.3.1). However, the origin of the construction should be separately studied from a diachronic perspective, which lies beyond the aims of the current research.

- (4.6) Swedish  
*När jag säger typ -Meh! så säger han -Jag*  
 when 1SG say.PRS like meh then say.PRS he 1SG  
*skojar bara.*  
 joke.PRS only  
 ‘When I say like -Meh! then he says -I’m just kidding.’ (familjeliv.se).

As far as the use of the SIMs in the quotative domain is concerned, according to ISK (2004: §1486), *niin kuin (niinku)* is often used in the quotative domain as part of a QI-clause, consisting of an NP, marking the reporter/speaker, *niinku* and the complementizer *että* ‘that’, as in (4.7).

- (4.7) *ja just se niinku sit*  
 and exactly DEM like then  
*viimesenä et tiedätkö sinä mistä*  
 last.ESS COMP know.2SG.Q 2SG what.ELL  
*sinun miestäsi törkeästä ryöstöstä tai*  
 2SG.GEN husband.PAR.2SG aggravated robbery.ELA or  
*törkeästä varkaudesta*  
 aggravated theft.ELA  
 ‘And exactly **that one** [was] then at last **like that do you know what [they took] your husband for: aggravated robbery or aggravated theft**’ (ISK 2004: §1486; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

Some of the examples from ISK show that *niin kuin* can also be used as a single quote-introducer. In such cases, it either separates the RD from a QI-clause (4.8), or differentiates speech turn-taking between speakers (4.9).

- (4.8) *Siis Alma niinku lähe ostamaan sitte*  
 then PN like go.IMP2SG buy.INF.ILL then  
 ‘Then **Alma** [is/was] **like go buy then**’ (ISK 2004: §861; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

- (4.9) *Siinä sitten kysyttiin että mistä oot*  
 there then ask.PASS COMP where.ELA be.PRS.2SG  
*kotoisin niinku Kelkamäeltä ni sit siinä*  
 originated like PN.ABL so then there  
*oli jotain kauheaa*  
 be.PST.3SG something horrible.PAR  
 ‘Then, at that point, it was **asked that where are you from? like from Kelkamäki**, as if there was something horrible’ (ISK 2004: §861; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

However, it should be mentioned that the structural image of the quotative constructions with *niin kuin* presented in ISK (2004: § 861, 1486) is somewhat generalized and does not cover all the possible strategies in which the marker can be used. Besides being used in QI-clauses with an elliptic predicate, as in (4.7)–(4.8), or as a single element of a quotative construction, as in (4.9), the marker can appear together with different types of predicates. It may be found with speech (4.10) and epistemic verbs (4.11) describing the event behind the RD. The function of introducing a quote is carried out mainly by a predicate, while the SIM presents the RD as produced approximately, cf. (4.10). Note that the reporter in (4.10) additionally indicates the approximate rendering of the quote by adding to the RD the indefinite clause ‘or something’.

- (4.10) *Ja            kultikin            yks      päivä            kysyi            niinku*  
 and      sweety.PTCL      one      day              ask.PST.3SG      like  
*et            “ootko            vähä      pyöristynyt”      tai            jotain...*  
 COMP    be.PRS.2SG.PTCL    little    get.rounded.PP    or            something  
 ‘And **sweety too** one day **asked like that** “have you put on weight” **or something...**’ (cosmopolitan.fi).

In (4.11), the SIM presents the quote as typical for the described situation. *Niin kuin* points out that the produced RD is not “the exact depiction of an individual speech act of a particular situation, but rather (...) a typification of a situation, a group of people or an individual” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XV).

- (4.11) *Ajattelin            niinku      et            WTF!*  
 think.PST.1SG    like      COMP      wtf  
 ‘**I thought like (that) WTF!**’ (ilotulite.net).

Structurally, similar types of predicates may also co-occur with *tyyl(i)n*, cf. (4.12)–(4.13). In (4.12), the reporter presents a quote produced approximately. Such a representation of real utterances can be considered the reporter’s attempt to signal the approximate rendering of the produced quote. In contrast to the previously described cases, the reporter in (4.13) presents a hypothetical quotation that can be considered typical in the given context. However, contrarily to (4.11), where the reporter quotes his/her own reaction to the situation, the quote in (4.13) is entirely fictional since it represents hypothetical thoughts of a dog in the described circumstances. Introduction of hypothetical quotations can also be observed in the use of *niinku*, cf. (4.18). Such a functional capacity is also noted in the use of NQs deriving from SIMs in Russian and Udmurt (*tšipa* ‘like’, *kad* ‘like’, see 2.5.3). Thus, cross-linguistic correspondence in the use of quotative markers with simulative semantics can be pointed out.

|        |                |              |                |             |           |
|--------|----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| (4.12) | <i>...äiti</i> | <i>sanoo</i> | <i>tyyliin</i> | <i>„jaa</i> | <i>ei</i> |
|        | mother         | say.PRS.3SG  | style.ILL/like | INTERJ      | NEG       |
|        | <i>noin</i>    | <i>saa</i>   | <i>tehä</i> ”  |             |           |
|        | thus           | can.CN       | do.INF         |             |           |

‘...mother says like: “You can’t do like that”’ (demi.fi).

|        |                 |                |             |              |                     |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|
| (4.13) | <i>ajatteli</i> | <i>tyyliin</i> | <i>et</i>   | <i>meen</i>  | <i>leikkaukseen</i> |
|        | think.PST.3SG   | style.ILL/like | COMP        | go.GEN       | cut.ILL             |
|        | <i>ja</i>       | <i>pim</i>     | <i>nään</i> | <i>hyvin</i> |                     |
|        | and             | IDEO           | see.PRS.1SG | well         |                     |

‘(s)he thought like (that) I will go to have a haircut and voilà I see well’ (koirat.com).

Furthermore, both markers co-occur with the equational verb *olla* ‘be’. In my previous study (Teptiuk 2015, 2019) and here, the use of equational verbs in a QI-clause is considered an outcome of the neutralization of an event behind RD (see 1.6.4). Thus, the equational verb, ambiguous for the depiction of an event, can theoretically be substituted with a number of different (speech or epistemic) verbs. Often, reporters can use this strategy to represent the way an utterance could appear in a concrete situation, rather than depict a specific utterance (Routarinne 2005: 102). Consider the use of *niinku* (4.14) and *tyyli(n)* (4.15) with the equational verb. In (4.14), the equational verb is likely to refer to epistemic processes like thoughts, while in (4.15), *olla* can be substituted by different SVs, generic (e.g. *say*) or specific (e.g. *convince*).

|        |            |           |             |               |           |                 |              |
|--------|------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------|
| (4.14) | <i>Sit</i> | <i>mä</i> | <i>olin</i> | <i>niinku</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>Rap?</i>     | <i>Ja</i>    |
|        | then       | 1SG       | be.PST.1SG  | like          | COMP      | rap             | and          |
|        | <i>sit</i> | <i>mä</i> | <i>oli</i>  | <i>niinku</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>Clackin’</i> | <i>Rap?!</i> |
|        | then       | 1SG       | be.PST.3SG  | like          | COMP      | clacking        | rap          |

‘Then I was like Rap? And then I was like Clackin’ Rap?!’ (kireitasiimoja.fi).

|        |            |            |                 |                |              |
|--------|------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| (4.15) | <i>ne</i>  | <i>oli</i> | <i>sielä</i>    | <i>tyylii</i>  | <i>“joo</i>  |
|        | DEM.PL     | be.PST.3SG | there           | style.ILL/like | yes          |
|        | <i>ei</i>  | <i>se</i>  | <i>mitään</i>   | <i>koita</i>   | <i>vielä</i> |
|        | NEG        | DEM.D      | nothing         | start.IMP      | yet          |
|        | <i>nyt</i> | <i>tän</i> | <i>kerran</i> ” |                |              |
|        | now        | DEM.P.GEN  | time.GEN        |                |              |

‘They were there like “yeah, it’s nothing, try just one more time”’ (blogspot.com).

Besides the co-occurrence with SVs, both markers can be adjusted to NPs, referring to the original source of RD, e.g. ‘message’, ‘notification’, etc. In my data, only *tyyliin* appeared co-occurring with NPs, cf. (4.17), while similar examples with *niin kuin* did not appear in my corpus. Nonetheless, with the help of Google Search, one example with *niin kuin* and an NP in the quotative function was retrieved from a paper by Koivisto (2016) which cites interviews depicting colloquial spoken Finnish. This example is presented in (4.16) for illustrative

purposes to show that such a combination of the elements is possible in general. It is worth mentioning that both in (4.16) and (4.17), RD is presented approximately, as in cases with real quotes. Here, the EHF of the marker becomes salient. In (4.16), the reporter provides a hypothetical quotation containing a possible content of the message. The midwife’s utterance is presented with epistemic overtones of doubt – she is not sure whether one shall invite the guest or not. Note also the presence of the conditional mood on the verb in the RD (*tulis* ‘(s)he’d come’), confirming this interpretation. In (4.17), observed online, the reporter wants to indicate that (s)he does not recall the content of the original message and thus cannot take responsibility for the content of the produced quote. Thus, a distancing effect in the use of the SIM *tyylii(n)* can be observed.

(4.16) *Sit*                      *se*                      *kätilö*                      *sanos,*                      *et*  
 then                      DEM                      midwife                      say.PST.3SG                      COMP  
*lähettäisiksä*                      *sille*                      *jo*                      ***viestin***                      ***niinku***  
 send.COND.Q.2SG                      DEM.ILL                      already                      message.GEN                      like  
***et***                      *se*                      *tulis...*  
 COMP                      DEM                      come.COND.3SG  
 ‘Then the midwife said that why don’t you send him/her already **the message like that (s)he’d come...**’ (Koivisto 2016: 38; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

(4.17) *Miten*                      *meni*                      *se*                      ***joulutekstari***  
 how                      go.PST.3SG                      DEM.D                      Christmas.message  
***tyyliin***                      *et*                      *hauskaa*                      *joulua*  
 style.ILL/like                      COMP                      funny.PAR                      Christmas.PAR  
*muistakaa*                      *heitä*                      *jotka*                      *viettävät*  
 remember.IMP                      3PL.PAR                      that.PL                      spend.PRS.3PL  
*tämän*                      *joulu*                      *turussa*  
 DEM.P.GEN                      Christmas                      Turku.INE  
 ‘How went **this Christmas message like (that) merry christmas remember those who spend this Christmas in Turku**’ (meidanperhe.fi).

In addition to the above structural complexities, both markers are also used as non-clausal single QIs. Such a use of the markers can be considered a complete neutralization of the event. Details concerning the participant(s) and the event are typically retrievable from the context, although in current conditions, speaker(s) and the event during which RD was originally produced are underspecified. It is worth taking into account that in (4.18) and (4.19) both markers introduce hypothetical RD. The structural simplification of a QI to a single element makes such a QI a convenient tool in the presentation of fictional RD because the RD is not attributed to a concrete author and the event behind it is unspecified (or at least both aspects are not explicitly expressed in the quotative construction). Consequently, the produced RD can be considered appropriate in several different contexts, both real and fictional ones.



- (4.18) *Vähän niinkuin “kassatäti on moikannut*  
 a.bit like cashier-lady be.PRS.3SG greet.PP  
*minulle jo kahden vuoden ajan,*  
 1SG.ALL already two.GEN year.GEN time.GEN  
*onko hän kiinnostunut minusta”*  
 be.PRS.3SG.Q 3SG to.be.interested.PP 1SG.ELA  
 ‘A bit **like** “cashier-lady has been saying hi to me already for two years, is she interested in me”’ (ylilauta.org).

- (4.19) *Siinä saattaa tulla äitiä ikävä, tyliin*  
 there can.PRS.3SG come.INF mother.PAR pity style.ILL/like  
 “*et v\*tussa nyt auto p\*rkele ala*  
 NEG.2SG cunt.INE now car damn start.CN  
*itse kyllä jarrutella”*  
 self PTCL brake.INF  
 ‘There one might feel pity about the mother, **like** “don’t you fucking start to break on your own car, goddammit”’ (keskustelu.suomi24.fi).

#### 4.2.2. The similative markers *nagu* and *a la* as new quotatives in Estonian

In Estonian, the use of SIMs in the quotative domain has not been previously described. Functional capacities of the SIM *a la*, due to the colloquial characteristics of the marker and its unclear distribution in Estonian, have not received any previous research attention. In contrast to it, some evidential and epistemic values of the SIM *nagu* are provided in Metslang (1985) and EKG (1993: §624, 627). Depending on the context in which the marker appears, it may express evaluation of the described situation as either unreal or of an average probability. The average probability of the situation expressed by *nagu* derives from its comparative semantics (EKG 1993: §624). Consider (4.20), in which the speaker sees something that resembles a train from afar. (S)he assumes that it might be a train that approaches. If *nagu* is omitted from the sentence, the modality of the situation changes (compare with *Rong paistab* ‘A train appears’) (ibid.: §627).

- (4.20) *Rong nagu paistab*  
 train like be.seen.PRS.3SG  
 ‘A train, **as** it appears’ (EKG 1993: §627; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In addition to its modal meaning, *nagu* may also fulfill the EHF, making any utterance less straightforward (EKG 1993: §627). In some contexts, it can be used as a focus particle which highlights elements that are important and should not be left unclear to the addressee. As it is shown further, these functions of the marker are quite important for the current description since besides marking the presence of RD, *nagu* bears different epistemic overtones, previously noticed cross-linguistically in the use of SIMs in the quotative domain.

The origin of the SIM *a la* is not clear. It is either borrowed from French *à la* ‘in the given style; in the given manner’, or it is borrowed into Estonian via the Russian *a-lja/a lja* ‘like’, the source of which is French *à la* reinterpreted as a similative marker with the meaning ‘like’. The Russian scenario seems to be more plausible, as the function of *a la* in Estonian corresponds more to the Russian ones than to the French. Consider the following examples with *a la* from Russian (4.21) and Estonian (4.22):

(4.21) Russian  
*Kartočnye igry a-lja* „Djeco”  
 card.ADJ.PL game.PL like PN (Eng.)  
 ‘Card games **like** “Djeco”’ (facebook.com).

(4.22) Estonian  
*...küpsemas on plaan, mis välistaks*  
 ripen.INF.INE be.PRS.3SG plan which exclude.COND  
*supermängud a la Eesti – Brasiilia*  
 super.game.PL like PN PN  
 ‘The plan is ripening which would exclude super games **like** Estonia – Brasil’  
 (ohtuleht.ee).

It is quite interesting that *a la* in Russian is also used as a quotative marker, cf. (4.23). This fact is used here as a crucial argument in defense of my hypothesis that *a la* is most likely replicated into Estonian not from French, but from Russian since the markers in these languages show closer functional correspondence. I also take into account the lack of close contact between French and Estonian.

(4.23) Russian  
*Vtoroj raz zaletel, no uže “drugoj”*  
 second time fly.in.PST.M but already second  
*sapport mne otvetil a-lja “Skrin ključa*  
 support 1 SG.DAT answer.PST.M like screen key.GEN  
*i staroe mylo”*  
 and old mail  
 ‘I logged in the second time, but already **“another” support** [i.e. administrator] **answered me like** “Screen of the key and old e-mail”’ (zhyk.ru).

*Nagu* and *a la* are structurally used in quotative constructions similar to the Finnish ones. As part of a QI-clause, they either co-occur with different speech (4.24)–(4.25), or epistemic verbs (4.26)–(4.27), or NPs (4.28)–(4.29). As one can see in (4.24)–(4.29), in the use of SIMs in Estonian, similar overtones can be observed as in Finnish. RD is introduced either approximately or as a generalized quote typically produced in described circumstances, as in (4.27).

- (4.24) *See ütles nagu, et minge*  
 DEM say.PST.3SG like COMP go.IMP.2PL  
*sinna tahapoole, seal on kraanikauss...*  
 DEM.ILL backside.ILL there be.PRS.3SG sink  
 ‘**This (one) said like (that)** go there to the backside, there’s a sink...’  
 (memokraat.ee).
- (4.25) *...ta ütles a la, et*  
 3SG say.PST.3SG like COMP  
*ainult need, kes suudavad*  
 only DEM.PL who manage.PRS.3PL  
*midagi asjalikku tänu silmaringile*  
 something.PAR practical.PAR due.to mental.outlook.ALL  
*kirjutada, saavad viie*  
 write.INF get.PRS.3PL five.GEN  
 ‘[I got for the workbook A, about what] **she said like (that)** only those who manage something practical due to mental outlook write will get A’  
 (paulajohanna.com).
- (4.26) *Ta mõtles nagu et Fääride vastu kaotasime*  
 3SG think.PST.3SG like COMP PN against lose.PST.1PL  
*3 punni...*  
 three point.PAR  
 ‘**He thought like (that)** we’ve lost three points against Faroe Islands...’  
 (forum.soccer.net.ee).
- (4.27) *Ma mõtlesin a la „mismõttes?!”*  
 1SG think.PST.1SG like in.what.sense  
 ‘**I thought like** “in what sense?!”’ (gekukas.blogspot.com).
- (4.28) *leidsin kuskil sellise targa rea*  
 find.PST.1SG somewhere such.GEN clever.GEN line.GEN  
*nagu: Software caused connection abort – This means one or more*  
 like QUOTE  
*programs/applications running in your system get crashed with your IRC client*  
 QUOTE  
*application.*  
 QUOTE  
 ‘I found somewhere **such a clever line like:** Software caused connection abort – This means one or more programs/applications running in your system get crashed with your IRC client application.’ (New media subcorpus).

- (4.29) *ära* *seletada* *Pühakirja* *vastuoksusi*  
 PRE explain.INF Holy.scripture.GEN contradiction.PAR.PL  
*ja* *lamedusi* *a la* „*Jumal*  
 and platitude.PAR.PL like god  
*on* *üks* *ja* *tal*  
 be.PRS.3SG one and 3SG.ADE  
*on* *kolm* *hüpostaasi*  
 be.PRS.3SG three hypostasis.PAR  
 ‘[Not only this, that they did not manage] to explain to the world the Holy Scripture’s **contradictions** and **plattitudes like** “There is one God, and he has three hypostases”’ (New media subcorpus).

In some contexts, besides the approximate rendering of the quote, one can observe epistemic overtones in the use of the markers, similar to the ones illustrated for Finnish (see examples 4.16–4.17). For example, in (4.28), the reporter presents the solution to a software problem quoted probably from a different web-page; however, the reporter does not intend to take responsibility for the plausibility of the content of the quote.

Similarly to Finnish, also the equational verb *olema* ‘be’ may appear with SIMs in a QI-clause. Such co-occurrence is also considered here an outcome of the neutralization of an event, leaving a number of possible interpretations for the RD, if it is not retrievable from the context. For example, in (4.30) and (4.31), the RD can be equally interpreted as a produced utterance or thought.

- (4.30) *Mina* *olin* *nagu,* *et*  
 1SG be.PST.1SG like COMP  
 “*Ärge* *ajage,* *väikesed* *söövad*  
 NEG.IMP2PL ride.CN small.PL eat.PRS.3PL  
*võibolla* *ritsikaid* *või* *hiirepoeg*  
 maybe cricket.PL.PAR or small.mouse  
*aga* *suureks* *saades* *tuleb*  
 but big.TRANSL get.INF.INE have.to.PRS.3SG  
*neile* *kindlasti* *hiiri* *anda*  
 3PL.ALL for.sure mouse.PAR.PL give.INF  
 ‘**I was like (that)** “Don’t talk things, small ones maybe eat crickets or small mice, but when they grow big, one has to give them mice for sure”’ (blogspot.com).

- (4.31) *Siis* *ma* *olin* *a la* *et* *wtf* *lõbus*  
 then 1SG be.PST.1SG like COMP wtf funny  
*on* *kaotada?*<sup>102</sup>  
 be.PRS.3SG lose.INF  
 ‘Then **I was like (that)** wtf is it funny to lose?’ (pokkeriprod.com).

<sup>102</sup> The original spelling in this example was *siis ma olin a la et wtf lbu son kaotada*. On the basis of context, the assumption was made that *lbu son* here means *lõbus on* ‘is funny’, DT.

In addition to the above structural complexities with *nagu* and *a la*, both markers are also used as single quote-introducers. The QI is reduced to a single SIM presenting RD. The event and its possible participant(s) can be retrieved only from the context. Note that in (4.32), similarly to (4.18)–(4.19) in Finnish, a hypothetical RD is produced as typical for the described situation. In reality, the RD remains entirely fictional since such a phrase was not uttered out in the provided circumstances. In (4.33), a real utterance is presented as a quote, produced approximately. The meaning of the quote is retrieved from the context.

(4.32) *Inimesed*            *näitased*            *näpuga*            *ning*            *rääkisid*  
 human.PL            show.PST.3PL            finger.COM            and            talk.PST.3PL  
*sosinal*            „*näe*,            *see*            *on*            *see*  
 whispering            see.IMP.2SG            DEM            be.PRS.3SG            DEM  
*arvutifriik*“.  
*Nagu*,            *fakk*            *ju!*  
 computer.freak            like            fuck            you  
 ‘People pointed fingers and talked whispering “look, here is this computer freak”.  
**Like, fuck you!**’ (New media subcorpus).

(4.33) *A la*            “*emme*            *peseb*            *käsi*”  
 like            mommy            wash.PRS.3SG            hand  
 ‘[And (the child) talks a lot. Tends to comment everything]. **Like** “mommy’s washing hands”’ (forum.perekool.ee).

### 4.3. Quantifiers as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian

In the current subsection, I provide a description of the Finnish quantifiers *vaa(n)* ‘just’ and *ihan* ‘totally, completely’ in the quotative domain, followed by a comparison with the Estonian quantifiers *täiega* ‘totally, completely’, *vapsee* ‘completely’ and *lihtsalt* ‘simply, just’. As one can notice, there is a difference on the quantificational scale (maximalistic vs. minimalistic) between the markers that are used in the languages. Consequently, I also pay attention to the overtones expressed by the markers with different semantics, and the structural complexities in which they are employed.

#### 4.3.1. The quantifier *vaa(n)* and *ihan* as new quotatives in Finnish

In colloquial Finnish, one can find quantifiers with both maximalistic and minimalistic meaning that are both used as NQs. Let’s take a look first at the minimalistic quantifier *vaa(n)* ‘just’ which has a relatively broad distribution if compared to its maximalistic counterpart.

The quantifier *vain* ‘just’ is often used in the form of *vaa(n)* which makes the marker homonymic to the conjunction *vaan*, meaning ‘but, also’. The conjunction

*vaan* is typically used in corrective clauses that start after the clause with negation (ISK 2004: §1106), as in (4.34).

- (4.34) *Se ei ole loppu vaan alku!*  
 DEM NEG.3SG be.CN finish but beginning  
 ‘It is not the end, **but** the beginning!’ (ISK 2004: §1106; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

According to my observations, the original function of *vaa(n)* is not applied in quotative constructions. Instead, the marker is used as a colloquial variant of the quantifier *vain* ‘just, only’, homonymic to the conjunction *vaan*, as in (4.35).

- (4.35) *Minulla on vaan viisi markkaa*  
 ISG.ADE be.PRS.3SG just five mark.PAR  
 ‘I have **just** five marks’ (ISK 2004: §839; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

Outside the quotative domain, the quantifier *vaa(n)* (~*vain*) is quite polyfunctional. It is used as a stress particle (ISK 2004: §821) and an exclusive (restrictive) focus particle, cf. (4.35) (ibid.: §839, 844). As a focus particle, it may fulfill a foregrounding function to a word, clause or even the whole sentence. Most typically it highlights the element that follows it (ibid.: §839). The focusing functions of the quantifier are also quite relevant in the quotative domain and might be seriously considered one of the reasons why quantifiers are often used in various languages as quotative markers.

As mentioned in 1.6.2.7, by using the quantifiers with minimum quantificational evaluation (e.g. quantifiers meaning ‘just’, ‘only’) the reporter shows “minimum commitment to the form of occurrence of the quote or point out the habitual occurrences (rather than hot news)” (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XVI). Consequently, some parallels between the use of quantifiers with minimalistic meaning and SIMs can be pointed out in the quotative domain. Namely, both markers tend to indicate that the produced RD is not an exact depiction of a previous utterance, but rather an approximate reproduction or a quote that can be considered typical for the described situation.

Structurally, the quantifier *vaa(n)* may co-occur with speech (4.36) and epistemic verbs (4.37) denoting the event behind RD. In (4.36), the reporter presents a quote produced approximately, while in (4.37), a typification of the situation can be observed, and the quote instead acquires general meaning or may actually derive from a well-known phrase that can be produced as a quote in the described circumstances.

- (4.36) *mä sanoin vaan “jäbät ton kaa mä meen himaan” go.PRS.1SG home.ILL*  
 ISG say.PST.1SG just dude.PL DEM.GEN with ISG  
 ‘I said **just** “dudes, with that one I will go home”’ (irc-galleria.net).

- (4.37) *Mä*            *mietin*            *vaan*            *et*            *mit*            *se*  
 1SG            think.PST.1SG            just            COMP            what.PAR            DEM  
*oikeesti*            *haluaa*            *koska*            *toi*            *on*            *niin*  
 really            want.PRS.3SG            because            that            be.PRS.3SG            so  
*epäselvä*  
 unclear  
 ‘**I thought just (that) what does he really want because that is so unclear**’  
 (demi.fi).

In addition, the quantifier *vaa(n)* can also co-occur with the equational verb *olla* ‘be’. Similarly to the previously described cases with *niinku* and *tyyl(ii)(n)*, the event is neutralized leaving a number of possible interpretations for *olla*. For example, in (4.38), the equational verb can be substituted by an SV (e.g. ‘say’) or an EV (e.g. ‘think’) with equal possibility for both interpretations.

- (4.38) *Olin*            *vaan,*            *etkö*            *jumalauta*  
 be.PST.1SG            just            NEG.2SG.Q            for.God’s.sake  
*vois*            *pitää*            *suutas*            *kiinni?!!*  
 can.COND.3SG            keep.INF            mouth.PAR.2SG            shut  
 ‘**I was just can’t you for God’s sake keep your mouth shut?!!**’ (omablogi.fi).

Instances where the quantifier co-occurs with NPs referring to the original source of RD are also encountered in the collected material. Such a co-occurrence typically happens in a QI-clause which consists of the equational verb, as in (4.38) above, although instead of the speaker, the NP refers to the source of RD, as in (4.39).

- (4.39) *Viesti*            *oli*            *vaan*            *että*            *maanantaina*            *lähtevät*  
 message            be.PST.3SG            just            COMP            Monday.ESS            leave.PRS.3PL  
*Bulgariasta*  
 Bulgaria.ELA  
 ‘**The message was just (that) on Monday they will leave Bulgaria**’  
 (aarremaanalla.com).

Quite rarely *vaa(n)* appears in non-clausal use as a single quote-introducer. In my material, such an instance was encountered only once. The reporter presents a quote which, similarly to (4.37), can be considered typical for the described situation. The omission of the predicate from the QI-clause can be viewed as an attempt to bring a dramatic effect to the quotation.

- (4.40) *Vähän*            *vaan*            *don’t get your hopes up feelsit*  
 little            just            QUOTE  
 ‘[I’ve said that we may go at some point to the game night to watch what is going on and whether it’s funny to play with others.] A bit **just don’t get your hopes up feelsit**’ (ylilauta.org).

It is important to point out that despite the significant similarity between the RD-constructions in which the quantifier *vaa(n)* and the SIMs *niinku* and *tyyl(ii)(n)* are

used, a difference can still be observed. Unlike the SIMs, *vaa(n)* is not systematically used for introducing hypothetical quotations which can be explained by the semantics of the marker. Whereas SIMs can present fictional quotes due to the meaning ‘as if X said/thought that’, the marker with the meaning ‘just, only’ is usually restricted to the reproduction of real quotes of a discourse that were previously uttered and produced as a thought.

Now let’s take a look at the quantifier *ihan* ‘totally, completely’. The particle *ihan* belongs to the category of intensifying particles with an upgrading quantificational meaning (ISK 2004: §664, 853, 854), as in (4.41).

- (4.41) *Kaikki oli ihan hyvin*  
 all be.PST.3SG totally well  
 ‘Everything was **totally** fine’ (ISK 2004: §456; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

The quotative use of the quantifier *ihan* ‘totally, completely’ is briefly mentioned in ISK (2004: §1487) and Buchstaller & Van Alphen’s (2012: XIV) introductory description of new/innovative quotatives in the world’s languages<sup>103</sup>. In ISK (2004: §1487), it is briefly stated that the quantifier may co-occur with the equational verb *olla* (and possibly with other NQs, e.g. *niinku* ‘like’), thus forming a QI. As I show further, the use of *ihan* is not restricted to the co-occurrence with *olla* and other NQs. Furthermore, several peculiarities about the use of this quantifier need to be mentioned.

In the quotative domain, unlike the quantifiers with minimalistic meaning, their maximalistic counterparts usually add an epistemic upgrading meaning to a quote, marking it as close to an original utterance or indicate the reporter’s emotional involvement (see 1.6.2.7). Quite compelling is the fact that the use of the marker is more peculiar to self-quoting instances than to contexts where the reporter quotes other speakers. Thus, the use of the marker is felicitous in contexts where reporters can vouch for the words that they reproduce. Consequently, the quantifier with maximalistic meaning can be used as a convenient signal that the quote is produced with an epistemic upgrading meaning.

Structurally, *ihan* may appear as part of a QI-clause, co-occurring with speech (4.42)–(4.43) and non-speech verbs. Among non-speech verbs, one can observe EVs (4.44) or the equational verb *olla*, cf. (4.45)–(4.46). Where the marker co-occurs with EVs, it is exclusively used in self-quoting contexts and does not co-occur with EVs that are meant to depict the event behind RD belonging to another speaker. In all attested cases, the marker was followed by the complementizer *et(tä)* and does not appear in the quotative constructions without the complementizer following it. Consequently, the beginning of the quote is typically

---

<sup>103</sup> In his review, Petar Kehayov has pointed out that besides the quantifier *ihan* also the maximalistic quantifier *aivan* ‘exactly, totally’ can be used in Finnish NQ-constructions. Questions concerning the use of *aivan* in NQ-constructions and its similarity or correspondence to *ihan*, however, stay beyond the scope of this study for now and shall be resolved in the future.



signaled by the complementizer. *Ihan* is used only as an additional marker expressing epistemic upgrading, which otherwise is not expressed where *ihan* is absent.

- (4.42) *sanoin*                    *ihan*                    *et*                    *hei,*                    *sun*  
 say.PST.1SG                    totally                    COMP                    INTERJ                    2SG.GEN  
*nenästä*                    *vuotaa*                    *verta*  
 nose.ELA                    bleed.PRS.3SG                    blood.PAR  
 ‘**I said totally that** hey, your nose bleeds’ (keskustelu.suomi24.fi).

- (4.43) *Joku*                    *nainen*                    *sanoi*                    *ihan*                    *et*  
 some                    woman                    say.PST.3SG                    totally                    COMP  
*sitä*                    *villinä*                    *kinnostaa*                    *roikkopalliset*                    *miehet*  
 DEM.PAR                    wild.ESS                    interest.PRS.3SG                    hanging.ball.ADJ.PL                    man.PL  
 ‘**Some woman said totally (that)** she’s wildly interested in men with hanging balls’ (vauva.fi).

- (4.44) *Tuntui*                    *oudolta*                    *kulkea*                    *kaupungilla*                    *ilman*  
 feel.PST.3SG                    weird.ABL                    walk.INF                    city.ADE                    without  
*vauvaa,*                    *mietin*                    *ihan*                    *et*                    *tämmöstäks*  
 baby.PAR                    think.PST.1SG                    totally                    COMP                    such.PAR.Q  
*tää*                    *olikin*  
 DEM                    be.PST.3SG.PTCL  
 ‘It felt weird to walk in the city without a baby, **I thought totally (that)** so it is like this’ (meidanperhe.fi).

The same tendency is observed in the use of the marker as a quotative marker co-occurring with the equational verb *olla*. Similarly to the above cases, *ihan* quite frequently appears in self-quoting instances where the speaker is encoded with the pronouns in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular (4.45) or plural (4.46). Also, note that in (4.45) and (4.46), the reporters present quotes containing emotional expressions. In (4.45), the reporter expresses his anger by producing the quote, while in (4.46), the quote denotes the speakers’ surprise in the non-immediate situation. Relatively rarely *ihan* is used with other persons. I have conducted a brief investigation with the help of Google Search, where I have looked into the collocation of the equational verb *olla* in the past tense in different persons and the combination *ihan* and *et(tä)*. As a result, I have encountered only one occurrence with 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and two occurrences with 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular. A similar search with the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular forms of *olla* yields more than 100 results and the 1<sup>st</sup> person plural – 70 results of RD-constructions in total.

- (4.45) *mä*                    *olin*                    *ihan*                    *et*                    *mitä*                    *helvettiä*  
 1SG                    be.PST.1SG                    totally                    COMP                    what.PAR                    hell.PAR  
 ‘**I was totally (that)** what a hell’ (xracing.fi).

- (4.46) *me*                    *oltiin*                    *ihan*                    *et*                    *omg*                    *miten*                    *tä*  
 1SG                    be.PST.PASS                    totally                    COMP                    omg                    how                    DEM  
*on*                    *mahdollista*  
 be.PRS.3SG                    possible.PAR  
 ‘We were completely (that) omg how is this possible’ (demi.fi).

To sum up, the above cases show that the minimalistic quantifier *vaa(n)* is used more diversely than its maximalistic counterpart *ihan*. This difference may be due to the more frequent appearance of one quotative and a relatively rare appearance of the other that has been attested also in the use of NQs in American English (Rickford *et al.* 2007: 22), also discussed in the following subsection 4.3.2. However, my hypothesis starts from the meaning that the markers express. Taking the environment into account in which humans naturally quote each other, one can point out the frequent need of the reporters to distance themselves from the ongoing quote (the task of the minimalistic quantifier). The use of the maximalistic quantifier, on the other hand, requires a more specific context situation where the reporter would vouch for a produced quote. Nonetheless, despite the difference in distribution and meaning that the quantifiers express, it is quite exciting that within one language one can find quantifiers opposite in meaning which are both used as NQs.

#### 4.3.2. The quantifiers *täiega*, *vapsee* and *lihtsalt* as new quotatives in Estonian

Similarly to Finnish, in colloquial Estonian one can find quantifiers of opposite meaning used as NQs. The quantifiers *täiega* ‘totally, completely’, *vapsee* ‘completely’ and *lihtsalt* ‘simply, just’ have not been described in previous studies. As far as I am aware, their characteristics and functions inside and outside the quotative domain are provided neither in the descriptive grammars of Estonian nor in other studies.

First, let’s look at the maximalistic quantifiers *täiega* ‘totally, completely’ and *vapsee* ‘totally, completely’. Outside the quotative domain, the quantifier *täiega* is typically used to upgrade the quality of the element to which it is adjusted, as in (4.47).

- (4.47) *Eesti Energia*                    *imeb*                    *täiega*  
 PN                    suck.PRS.3SG                    completely  
 ‘Eesti Energia **completely** sucks’ (saarlane.ee).

The use of *täiega* as a quotative marker in written speech is relatively infrequent. In the collected material, I have encountered only two instances of its use in the quotative domain. Among the collected examples, structurally *täiega* co-occurs with the speech and the equational verb. In (4.48), *täiega* is used as an additional element in the QI-clause modifying the SV *üttelema* ‘say’ rather than entirely

carrying a quotative function. Hence, the quantifier cannot be counted as an independent quote-introducer in this example.

- (4.48) ...*kellele ma täiega ütlesin, et ei maga*  
 who.ALL 1SG completely say.PST.1SG COMP NEG sleep.CN  
 :D  
 EMOT  
 ‘[At 11 o’clock Zaku woke me up,] **to whom I completely said (that) I don’t sleep** :D’ (yks-elu.blogspot.com).

In contrast to (4.48), given the non-reportative nature of the equational verb *olema* ‘be’ in (4.49), the quantifier is the only element in the QI-clause that carries out the quotative function. Similarly to the previously described examples with the equational verb, the neutralization of an event occurs. Thus, the RD can be interpreted as the quotation of both speech and thoughts.

- (4.49) *ma olin täiega “wtf noes, ma*  
 1SG be.PST.1SG completely wtf no.PL 1SG  
*tahan korra harjutada veel”*  
 want.PRS.1SG time.GEN practice.INF again  
 ‘**I was completely** “wtf no<sup>104</sup>, I want to practice one more time”’ (New media subcorpus).

As specified in 1.6.2.7, quotatives deriving from the quantifiers with maximalistic meaning often express either additional epistemic upgrading meanings or present the quotes with emotional involvement. In (4.48), the reporter’s epistemic commitment can be observed. In order to demonstrate this, the context will be provided. The reporter describes a Sunday morning. At 9:30 a.m., his mother woke him up asking him to help her with household work. The reporter helped her out and then went back to sleep. Already at 11 a.m. another character (Zaku) came to wake up the reporter to which he said that he is not sleeping. Since Zaku expected that the reporter is still sleeping, the reporter presents the quote that breaks this expectation. At the same time, the reporter wants to emphasize that unlike Zaku, his authority in this context is more prominent and that he is committed to the fact that he was not actually sleeping. Consequently, based on (4.48) and previous cross-linguistic observations (cf. Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012), one can conclude that also *täiega* can upgrade the evidential value of reproduced utterances or thoughts. In (4.49), however, the quote is merely presented with the emotional involvement of the reporter. This can be observed in the first part of the quote – “wtf noes”, meant to describe the reporter’s despair.

The infrequent use of *täiega* as a quotative marker in my materials might represent “a classic case of retraction, where newcomer variants are picked up to a certain extent by the community but then rejected in favor of a more dominant variant” (Rickford *et al.* 2007: 22). Consider, for instance, cases with NQs *all* and *be like* in American English, and the low distribution of *all* comparing to the *be*

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Internet slang *oh noes* ‘Oh no!’

*like*-construction (ibid.). However, it is slightly early to draw any conclusions about the distribution of *täiega*, and studies on its use on the basis of the Estonian oral data should be separately conducted to confirm this hypothesis.

Furthermore, in colloquial Estonian one can encounter the use of the quantifier *vabsee* (~ *vapsee*) in the quotative constructions, replicated from Russian *voobšče* ‘completely’ (see example 2.47 in Section 2.5.2.1 for *voobšče* in an Udmurt quotative construction). According to Todesk (p.c.) and a bilingual native speaker of Estonian and Russian residing in Estonia (Ivanova, p.c.), the quantifier *vabsee/vapsee* can be encountered in quotative constructions of colloquial Estonian and Estonian Russian. Based on my investigation, in internet communications *vapsee* is used only as part of a QI-clause, co-occurring mainly with SEVs and in a few instances with proper NSVs. The spelling variant *vabsee* is not encountered in quotative constructions in online texts. Based on the available data, it can be concluded that the distribution of *vapsee* as part of the QI is rather restricted and does not show any qualitative degrees in grammaticalization of the element towards becoming an independent quote-introducer. However, one should acknowledge the fact that online communications do not always depict a complete distribution of the marker in this function, and more investigations should be conducted on the basis of oral communications.

Among the available material, *vapsee* is used primarily in the epistemic upgrading function pointing at the (nearly) exact depiction of the quote. In some cases it may express also additional connotations of the reporter’s emotion involvement, as in (4.50)–(4.51), where the reporter disagrees with the quoted statement. In both cases the disagreement is based on a reproduced utterance close to the original.

(4.50) *Ebuddys*            *ütleb*            *vapsee,*            *et*            *vale*            *parool*  
 PN.INE            say.PRS.3SG            completely            COMP            wrong            password  
*on,*            *kuigi*            *pole*  
 be.PRS.3SG            however            NEG.be.PRS  
 ‘In Ebuddy **it says completely (that) it’s a wrong password,** however it isn’t’  
 (neonet.ee).

(4.51) *Mul*            *näitab*            *vapsee*            *et*            *video*            *mälu*  
 1SG.ADE            show.PRS.3SG            completely            COMP            video.GEN            memory  
*1.1*            *GB..*            *kuigi*            *tegelt*            *512*  
 NUM            GB            although            really            NUM  
 ‘**It shows me completely (that) video memory [is] 1.1 Gb.,** however in reality [it’s] 512 [Mb]’ (vahvel.net).

In (4.52), *vapsee* co-occurs with the EV *arvama* ‘think’ for the presentation of a hypothetical quotation which is meant to depict the behavior of bicycle drivers. The reporter uses the quote as a means to provide a subjective generalization rather than depicting stream of individual thoughts or even thoughts of the group of people, no matter how arguably impossible it is. Thus, one cannot point an epistemic upgrading function of the marker out in this RD-construction, since

hypothetical quotations are impossible to present either with upgrading or downgrading function as they are entirely fictional. Thus, only the reporter’s emotional involvement can be observed in the use of the quantifier – the reporter is obviously annoyed by the cyclists’ presence on the road. Note the slightly pejorative comment in the beginning of the RD-construction – *need retuusides baikerid* ‘these bikers in tights’.

- (4.52) *Need retuusides baikerid arvavad vapsee*  
 DEM.PL tight.PL.INE biker.PL think.PRS.3PL completely  
*et nad on autod*  
 COMP 3PL be.PRS.3 car.PL  
 ‘These bikers in tights think completely (that) they are cars’ (online.le.ee).

Based on the above examples, one can state that at least in online communications *vapsee* is used only as an additional element of the QI-clause consisting of a verb pointing at the presence of RD, but not yet as an independent quote-introducer. In order to judge its quotative potential, additional studies on the basis of oral text collections should be conducted. For now, I consider it an additional element of the QI-clause consisting primarily of SEVs and the complementizer placed on the border position between the QI and the RD – SEV + *vapsee* + complementizer. In internet communications, SEVs can be sometimes substituted by the proper NSV, e.g. *näitama* ‘show’ in (4.51). Such NSV typically refer to the information reflected on the screen, further quoted by the reporters and presented with the structure NSV + *vapsee* + complementizer. As for additional meanings arising in quotative constructions, in some contexts *vapsee* points to the close correspondence between the quoted material and the original discourse. At the same time, it may also depict the reporter’s emotional involvement, e.g. a disagreement with the quoted statement.

The quantifier *lihtsalt* ‘simply, just’ belongs to quantifiers with minimalistic quantificational meaning. Outside the quotative domain, *lihtsalt* can be used to both upgrade and downgrade the quality of the element to which it is adjusted (EKSS 2009<sup>105</sup>). Consider (4.53) where *lihtsalt* upgrades the quality and (4.54) where it is used to downgrade and restrict the meaning of the element to which it is adjusted.

- (4.53) *Ülesanne oli lihtsalt üle mõistuse raske*  
 task be.PST.3SG simply over sense.GEN hard  
 ‘The task was **simply** too hard’ (EKSS 2009; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

- (4.54) *Ta on lihtsalt loll, mitte pahatahtlik*  
 3SG be.PRS.3SG simply stupid NEG ill-natured  
 ‘He’s **just** stupid, but not ill-natured’ (EKSS 2009; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

<sup>105</sup> EKSS 2009 – *Eesti keele seletav sõnaraamat* [The explanatory dictionary of Estonian], available at: <http://eki.ee/dict/ekss> (June 1, 2018).

Quite compelling is the fact that both of the above meanings can be observed in the quotative domain. Note that a similar situation can be observed in the use of the minimalistic quantifier *ba(ra)* ‘just’ in Norwegian which can express both the downgrading and upgrading meaning in the quotative domain (cf. Hasund *et al.* 2012). In Estonian, at least in written speech, the downgrading meaning is still prevalent. The downgrading meaning can be observed either in the approximate reproduction of a quote or in a distancing effect – the reporter indicates that (s)he cannot vouch for the content of the quote. The upgrading meaning is expressed only in a couple of examples that I point out below.

Structurally, the marker is observed co-occurring with speech (4.55) and epistemic (4.56) verbs. The complementizer *et* is usually present in the use of the quantifier in the quotative domain. Thus, it marks the border between the QI-clause with *lihtsalt* and the quote.

- (4.55) *Siis lõpuks ma ikkagi rääkisin*  
 then end.TRANSL 1SG still say.PST.1SG  
*selle asja talle ära ja*  
 DEM.GEN thing.GEN 3SG.ALL PRE and  
***ta ütles lihtsalt et enam***  
 3SG say.PST.3SG simply COMP more  
*tal polnud vaja tal seda*  
 3SG.ADE NEG.be.PP need 3SG.ADE DEM.ACC  
*teada vms.*  
 know.CN or.something.like.that  
 ‘Then, in the end, I still told him about this thing and **he said just (that) he** doesn’t need to know about it anymore or so’ (delfi.ee).

- (4.56) ***Võimalik, et ta mõtles lihtsalt,***  
 possible COMP 3SG think.PST.3SG simply  
***et teeb viimase heateo, või***  
 COMP do.PRS.3SG last.GEN favor.GEN or  
*algas tal ärasaatmispidu*  
 start.PST.3SG 3SG.ADE waveoffs.party  
 ‘**It’s possible** that **he thought simply (that)** he will do the last favor, or his waveoffs party started’ (va.ee).

Note that in (4.55), the reporter indicates that the quote is produced approximately by separately marking it after the RD – *vms.*, i.e., *või muud sellist, või muu see-sugune* ‘or something like that’. Consequently, the quote should be understood by the audience as an approximate reproduction of the original words. In (4.56), the reporter presents RD containing a hypothetical quotation of thoughts. Before the beginning of the RD-construction, the reporter indicates with the adjective *võimalik* ‘possible’ that it is only possible that the original speaker has produced such thoughts. Consequently, the presence of the quantifier in the QI-clause emphasizes the distancing effect.

Among NSVs, one can observe the equational verb *olema* (4.57), involved in the event-neutralization in the QI-clause. QI-clauses with *olema* and *lihtsalt* are used in written speech only in self-quoting instances. After conducting a brief

check, I have not encountered the use of the same QI-clause with other subjects, beside the pronoun in 1<sup>st</sup> singular. Consequently, its use with this verb can be restricted to self-quotations. The difference between quotations of speech and thought becomes quite vague when the equational verb is used. In addition, the use of the structure in self-quoting instances makes this difference even more vague, since the reporters tend to quote their own thoughts more frequently than thoughts that belong to other speakers. In (4.57), the self-quoting instance can be interpreted in both ways – as the quotation of speech or thought. The context does not really point to only one reading of RD, even despite the presence of another RD-construction, preceding self-quotation.

- (4.57) *ja* *ämmakas* *ütles,* *et* *ta*  
 and midwife say.PST.3SG COMP 3SG  
*katsub,* *siis* ***ma*** ***olin*** ***lihtsalt,***  
 try.PRS.3SG then 1SG be.PST.1SG simply  
***et*** *mhm,* *okei* (*mingil* *põhjusel*  
 COMP INTERJ okay some.ADE reason.ADE  
*ma* *arvasin,* *et* *seda* *ongi*  
 1SG think.PST.3SG COMP DEM.PAR be.PRS.3SG.PTCL  
*naistearst* *iga* *visiit* *katsunud*)...  
 female.doctor every visit try.PP  
 ‘and the midwife said that she would try, then **I was just (that) mhm, okay** (for some reason I thought that the female doctor did try it during every visit)...’  
 (lipsuke.com).

As mentioned above, in some instances the upgrading meaning of the quantifier can also be noted. The marker is present in cases where the reporter produces the quote with emotional involvement. The difference between a quotation of speech or thought is similarly vague. Consider (4.58) and (4.59) where the reporters most likely quote their own thoughts. In (4.58), the reporter presents his/her complete disagreement with the statement made by another speaker. Additionally, emotional rendering is indicated with the capital letters marking the quote and double question mark. In (4.59), the reporter depicts his/her own excitement by presenting a quote.

- (4.58) ***Ma*** ***olin*** ***lihtsalt,*** ***et*** ***TÕSISELT***  
 1SG be.PST.1SG simply COMP seriously  
***RÄÄGID*** ***VÕI??*** ***Sa*** ***nagu*** ***elad***  
 speak.PRS.2SG or 2SG like live.PRS.2SG  
***Euroopas*** ***ja*** ***Sa*** ***ei*** ***tea***  
 Europe.INE and 2SG NEG know.PRS.CN  
***isegi*** ***seda,*** ***et*** ***tegemist*** ***on***  
 self.PTCL DEM.PAR COMP do.AN.PAR be.PRS.3SG  
***Euroopa*** ***riigiga?***  
 Europe country.COM  
 ‘**I was just (that) ARE YOU SERIOUSLY SAYIN THIS, OR WHAT??** You kinda live in Europe and You don’t know yourself that you deal with a European country??’ (blogspot.com).

- (4.59) *Ma olin lihtsalt, et wowwww. :D*  
 1SG be.PST.1SG simply COMP INTERJ EMOT  
 ‘I was just that wowwww. :D’ (blogspot.com).

On one occasion, I have observed the use of the quantifier *lihtsalt* in a QI where even the equational verb *olema* ‘be’ is elliptic, cf (4.60). Note also that in (4.60), quotative *lihtsalt* collocates with another NQ *nagu*. Instances where any kind of verb is elliptic from the QI might be more typical for oral speech. In written colloquial Estonian, such constructions are rarely observed among the NQs.

- (4.60) ...*soovitativ on vaadata, et hinnata,*  
 advisable be.PRS.3SG look.INF COMP value.INF  
*siis kohtusse minna leti, me*  
 then court.ILL go.INF counter.ILL 1PL  
*lihtsalt, nagu, et ei sobi...*  
 simply like COMP NEG fit.PRS.CN  
 ‘...it’s advisable to see in order to value, then go to the court, to the counter, **we just like (that) it’s not suitable...**’ (et.globals-10.trade).

It is quite interesting that in both Finnish and Estonian, two types of quantifiers are employed in quotative constructions. Based on the presented examples, one can point out that both languages tend to prefer one quantifier over the other in the quotative domain that can be observed in the broader distribution of quantifiers with minimalistic meaning compared to their maximalistic counterparts in both languages. Notably, cross-linguistically quantifiers with minimalistic meaning tend to develop both upgrading and downgrading meaning in the quotative domain, which can serve as the primary explanation why these quantifiers are preferred over their maximalistic counterparts, mainly associated in their use with the epistemic upgrading meaning.

#### 4.4. Complementizers in the quotative domain of Finnish and Estonian

In the current section, I pay attention to the use of complementizers in the quotative domain in Finnish and Estonian. As previous studies show (in general, see Güldemann 2008; on Finnish see e.g. Routarinne 2005, ISK 2004: §1486), besides the appearance in the conventional strategies with SEVs, complementizers often tend to grammaticalize into quotative markers or *vice versa* (see 1.6.2.3). Consequently, the use of complementizers in the quotative domain of Finnish and Estonian is primarily interesting from this perspective. In addition, the whole construction in which complementizers appear is taken under investigation.



#### 4.4.1. The complementizer *et(tä)* in the quotative domain in Finnish

In Finnish, the complementizer *et(tä)* ‘that’ is most typically used as a subordinating conjunction (Vilkuna 1996: 68; ISK 2004: §819). In addition, it can also be used as a particle in paraphrasing clauses (ISK 2004: §1032). Since in this study I follow the framework excluding the possibility of analyzing RD as a subordinated element of the QI and reject the traditional idea of RD as a complement-clause, the complementizer *et(tä)* is discussed here as a linking element of the QI with an adjacent quote.

In standard Finnish, the full variant of *että* is used. In colloquial speech, both the full form *että* and the shortened variant *et* appear. A potential difference between these variants is not taken into account here, and they are treated by default as equivalents. To indicate the possibility of both variants the shortened part is put in parentheses – *et(tä)*. Most typically, the complementizer is used in constructions with indirect RD. However, in colloquial Finnish, it is also used preceding direct RD, e.g. in quotations of direct orders or questions, cf. (4.61). One can consider relevant the origin of the complementizer *että*, that would explain this violation of the rules of standard Finnish. According to Hakulinen (1979: 6), initially *et(tä)* was used as a demonstrative adverb, meaning ‘thus, in this way’. Dixon (2006: 24) mentions that “complementizers have often developed from a demonstrative, or from a verb such as ‘be like’ or ‘say’”. Hence, the appearance of *et(tä)* in constructions with direct RD might be motivated by its original meaning and older functions rather than its use nowadays as a subordinating conjunction/complementizer outside the quotative domain. One can assume that originally *et(tä)* was used only in clauses followed by direct RD, and later its use has also spread to constructions with indirect RD. From RD-constructions, *et(tä)* might have spread to other clauses and gained functions of a discourse marker or a particle in paraphrasing clauses. (Seppänen & Laury 2007: 557) According to Dixon (2006: 24), complementizers as a category are poly-functional cross-linguistically. For example, the English complementizer *that* is still used as a nominal demonstrative.

- (4.61) ..*ja kysyi että maistuuko varmasti*  
and ask.PST.3SG COMP taste.PRS.3SG.Q definitely  
‘[The waiter next to the table put his/her hands together, sloped his/her head,]  
and **asked that it surely did taste well**’ (ISK 2004: §1465; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In colloquial Finnish, besides cases where *et(tä)* precedes direct RD, the complementizer can be used to indicate either turn-takings by different speakers or switches from story-telling to RD. Consider (4.62) where turn-takings are separated by *et(tä)*.

|        |                  |                       |                      |                  |
|--------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| (4.62) | <i>Siis</i>      | <i>se</i>             | <i>oli</i>           | <i>ihan</i>      |
|        | then             | DEM.D                 | be.PST.3SG           | exactly          |
|        | <i>mieleetön</i> | <i>sano</i>           | <i>et</i>            | <i>ei</i>        |
|        | unreasonable     | say.INF               | COMP                 | NEG.3SG          |
|        | <i>sulle</i>     | <i>mitää</i>          | <i>tehä</i>          | <i>voi</i>       |
|        | 2SG.ALL          | nothing               | do.INF               | can.CN           |
|        | <i>sun</i>       | <i>on</i>             | <i>vietävä</i>       | <i>pois</i>      |
|        | 2SG.GEN          | be.PRS.3SG            | bring.away.PASS.PRSP | away             |
|        | <i>täältä</i>    | <i>että</i>           | <i>rauhotu</i>       | <i>rauhotu</i>   |
|        | DEM.P.ABL        | COMP                  | calm.down.IMP2SG     | calm.down.IMP2SG |
|        | <i>hyvä</i>      | <i>mies</i>           | <i>et</i>            | <i>ei</i>        |
|        | good             | man                   | COMP                 | NEG.3SG          |
|        | <i>se</i>        | <i>nii</i>            | <i>kauhesti</i>      | <i>satu</i>      |
|        | DEM.D            | so                    | dreadfully           | hurt.CN          |
|        | <i>et</i>        | <i>sä</i>             | <i>rupeet</i>        | <i>ittees</i>    |
|        | COMP             | 2SG                   | begin.PRS.2SG        | self.PAR.2SG     |
|        | <i>tappaa</i>    | <i>verenpaineella</i> |                      |                  |
|        | kill.INF         | blood.pressure.ADE    |                      |                  |

‘Then it was totally unreasonable to **say that nothing can be done to you, you will be brought away from here that calm down good man that it doesn’t hurt that bad that you have to start to kill yourself with the blood pressure**’ (ISK 2004: §1486; glossing and translation is mine, DT).

Moreover, besides marking different turn-takings, in cases with a multi-part RD, *et(tä)* indicates that RD continues, and the addressee can ensure that a deictic setting is currently different from that of the previous discourse (ISK 2004: §1486), as in (4.63).

|        |                |                  |                 |              |                 |
|--------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| (4.63) | <i>...ja</i>   | <i>sit</i>       | <i>mun</i>      | <i>tuli</i>  | <i>semmonen</i> |
|        | and            | then             | 1SG.GEN         | come.PST.3SG | such            |
|        | <i>olo</i>     | <i>et</i>        | <i>mitäs</i>    | <i>mä</i>    | <i>tässä</i>    |
|        | feeling        | COMP             | what.PAR.PTCL   | 1SG          | here            |
|        | <i>ny</i>      | <i>yksistäni</i> | <i>kattelen</i> | <i>että,</i> | <i>miäpä</i>    |
|        | now            | alone.1SG        | watch.PRS.1SG   | COMP         | 1SG.PTCL        |
|        | <i>kuttun</i>  | <i>ystäviä</i>   | <i>tykö.</i>    |              |                 |
|        | invite.PRS.1SG | friend.PL.PAR    | to              |              |                 |

‘[I was just alone at home and started to watch our wedding movies from our youth times] and then I had **such feeling that why I am watching here now alone that I will invite my friends**’ (ISK 2004: §1486; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

In the collected material, the previously described co-occurrences of *et(tä)* are encountered with various predicates. For example, *et(tä)* is typically found with speech and epistemic verbs and the equational verb *olla* ‘be’. In addition, the marker may also co-occur with NPs, referring to the original source of RD. As for constructions with different types of predicates, it must be mentioned that the complementizer itself is not an obligatory element. Sometimes it can remain elliptic from a QI-clause. According to Kehayov (2016: 473), the ellipsis of *et(tä)*

happens because the complementizer *per se* is epistemically neutral. Consequently, it does not contribute to the evaluation of a complement proposition. However, as it has been shown above, the complementizer is still often present to indicate the beginning of a quote, although a quote-introducing function in such clauses is carried out mainly by a predicate which describes an event behind the RD. Since the complementizer does not bring any additional epistemic support to a quote, such overtones can be expressed only through a predicate or with the help of additional means, such as epistemic particles or other markers, discussed above. For example, consider the collocation of *et(tä)* with the SIMs *niinku* and *tyyl(ii)(n)* (see 4.2.1), or the quantifiers *vaa(n)* or *ihan* (see 4.3.1).

Structurally, a QI-clause typically consists of an NP, encoding the speaker/reporter, a speech (4.64) or epistemic verb (4.65) and *et(tä)*. The presence of an NP, encoding the addressee, is optional and can be elliptic. The complementizer is always placed adjacent to a quote.

- (4.64) *...muussa tapauksessa omalääkäri ilmoittelee minulle,*  
 other.INE situation.INE family.doctor inform.PRS.3SG 1SG.ALL  
*että tämä oli nyt tässä.*  
 COMP DEM be.PST.3SG now here  
 ‘In other cases, **the family doctor informs me that this was all.**’ (blogspot.com).

The following example (4.65) is interesting since it depicts a case when a multi-part RD is presented first by co-occurrence of an EV with *et(tä)* and later merely by *et(tä)*, where the predicate is elliptic.

- (4.65) *ajattelet, että „minä olen nainen*  
 think.PRS.2PL COMP 1SG be.PRS.1SG woman  
*ja aloitteen teko ei kuulu*  
 and initiative.GEN act NEG.3SG belong.CN  
*minulle” tai että „kyllä hän*  
 1SG.ALL or COMP sure 3SG  
*tulisi minulle juttelemaan jos hän*  
 come.COND.3SG 1SG.ALL talk.INF.ILL if 3SG  
*olisi minusta kiinnostunut”*  
 be.COND.3SG 1SG.ELA interested  
 ‘...**you think that “I am woman and initiative actions are not my responsibility!”**  
 or **that “of course he would come to talk to me if he was interested in me”**’  
 (ylilauta.org).

Besides different types of predicates, also NPs referring to the source of an original discourse can co-occur with *et(tä)* in quotative constructions, as in (4.66).

- (4.66) *Sain vastauksen et on liian nuori*  
 receive.PST.1SG answer.GEN COMP be.PRS.3SG too young  
 ‘I received **an answer that (s)he is too young**’ (twitter.com).

In cases where *et(tä)* co-occurs with the equational verb *olla* ‘to be’, the neutralization of the event occurs, which blurs the borders between quoting thoughts, intention or previous utterances (Haakana 2005: 124, 136–142, 145–146; Haakana 2006: 172ff.). Taking into consideration the fact that the equational verb does not function as a semantically reportative verb, the whole clause with *olla + et(tä)* is interpreted as a QI indicating the presence of the following quote. Note that the RD preceding the self-quotation in (4.67) is framed by the QI-clause consisting of an NP (‘comment’) and the MV *tulla* ‘come’. Such types of QIs observed in internet communications in Finnish and Estonian are discussed in this chapter in Section 4.6.

|        |  |              |                  |                  |           |
|--------|--|--------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|
| (4.67) | <i>Siltä</i>   | <i>tuli</i>  | <i>kommentti</i> | „ <i>aijaa</i> ” | <i>ja</i> |
|        | DEM.ABL  | come.PST.3SG | comment          | INTERJ           | and       |
|        | <i>mä</i>  | <i>olin</i>  | <i>että</i>      | <i>no</i> ,      | <i>se</i> |
|        | 1SG  | be.PST.1SG   | COMP             | PTCL             | DEM       |
|        | <i>oliki</i>   | <i>sitte</i> | <i>helppoa</i>   |                  |           |
|        | be.PST.3SG.PTCL  | then         | easy.PAR         |                  |           |
|        | ‘From him/her <b>came the comment</b> „ <u><i>aijaa</i></u> ”, and <b>I was that</b> <u>well, this was after all easy</u> ’ (sukupuolenaihminen.fi). |              |                  |                  |           |

#### 4.4.2. The complementizer *et* in the quotative domain in Estonian

Similarly to its Finnish equivalent, the complementizer *et* in Estonian is quite polyfunctional outside the quotative domain. Its functions as a clause-linker and a discourse marker are of interest for the current research. As a clause-linker, it is used following a correlative word that is often omitted (EKG 1993: §704; also Keevallik 2008: 127), e.g. the demonstrative *see* ‘this’ in (4.68).

|        |  |                |                 |           |           |             |              |
|--------|--|----------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| (4.68) | <i>Ma</i>  | <i>kuulsin</i> | <i>(seda)</i> , | <i>et</i> | <i>sa</i> | <i>olid</i> | <i>haige</i> |
|        | 1SG  | hear.PST.1SG   | DEM.PAR         | COMP      | 2SG       | be.PST.2SG  | ill          |
|        | ‘ <b>I heard (this), that</b> <u>you were ill</u> ’ (EKG 1993: §704; glossing and translation are mine, DT). |                |                 |           |           |             |              |

The complementizer is often elided from clauses since it is epistemically neutral and does not contribute to the evaluation of a proposition. Various epistemic meanings are typically expressed through predicates or utilizing epistemic adverbials or particles. Consider e.g. (4.69), where the SIM *nagu* ‘like’ turns the factive RD hypothetical. By presenting a hypothetical quotation, the reporter compares someone’s behavior with a showing off of a similar type without intention to depict someone’s previous speech. If one removes *nagu* from the QI-clause, the quote will be interpreted as a factive quotation of someone’s showing off.

- (4.69) *See*                    *juba*                    ***nagu***                    *teiste*                    *ees*  
 DEM                    already                    like                    other.GEN.PL                    in.front  
***kekutamine,***                    ***et***                    “*teie*                    *ei*                    *saa*  
 show.off.AN                    COMP                    2PL                    NEG                    can.CN  
*lubada*                    *nii*                    *kalleid*                    *jopesid,*                    *mina*  
 afford.INF                    so                    expensive.PAR.PL                    jacket.PAR.PL                    1SG  
*saan*”  
 can.PRS.1SG  
 ‘It’s already **as if showing off** in front of others, **that** “You cannot afford such expensive jackets, I can”’ (New media subcorpus).

As a discourse particle, *et* is typically used in turn-initial positions starting interpretations or making conclusions, “drawn from the immediately preceding speaker’s speech” (Keevallik 2008: 129). Clauses initiated by *et* (4.70) are “semantically paraphrases, formulations or expansions, (...) and when they form a turn on their own, they paraphrase, formulate or expand what the interlocutor has just been saying” (ibid.: 133). There is reason to assume that such a use of the marker might derive from a clause like ‘X said/meant that’. Consequently, the use of *et* as a discourse marker tightly correlates with its use in RD-constructions as a quote-introducer. According to Keevallik (ibid.: 141, 146, 148), its use in RD-constructions and its similar use with elliptic SVs has effected the appearance of new functions as a discourse particle. Namely, *et* gained independence from the predicate in the matrix clause and started to be used as a starter of evidential initiating paraphrases (ibid.: 144).

- (4.70) [M has asked K whether she has any complaints about the newspaper.]  
 1K: *ei oska praegu midagi öelda*  
 ‘At the moment (I) cannot say anything.’  
 2M: ***et*** *liiga vähe veel käind jah?*  
 ‘**Et** (you’ve) had (it) too short (a time).’  
 3K: *jaa.*  
 ‘Yeah.’ (Keevallik 2008: 129; translation is original; bold is mine, DT)<sup>106</sup>.

In the collected material, *et* is used in QI-clauses with speech (4.71) and epistemic verbs (4.72). Note that in (4.71) the complementizer also appears before a clause consisting of direct RD, as it is case also in Finnish (see the example 4.65 above). The position of the complementizer is always adjacent to a quote.

- (4.71) ***ta***                    ***ütles,***                    ***et***                    “*ma*                    *tahan*                    *kõik*  
 3SG                    say.PST.3SG                    COMP                    1SG                    want.PRS.1SG                    all  
*raha*                    *saada*                    *enda*                    *hoole*                    *alla*”  
 money                    get.INF                    self.GEN                    care.GEN                    under  
 ‘(S)he said that “I want to take all money under my care”’ (delfi.ee).

<sup>106</sup> The example is cited without any special prosodic markings, present in the original source.

- (4.72) *Ju nad mõtlesid, et tahavad end ära peita*  
 PTCL 3PL think.PST.3PL COMP want.PRS.3PL self.PAR PRE  
 hide.INF  
 ‘they must have thought that they want to hide’ (bitiblogi.ee).

Furthermore, its co-occurrence with the event-neutralizing equational verb *olema* ‘be’ is also encountered, cf. (4.73). Similarly to the Finnish case with *et(tä)*, *et* is used in such quotative constructions as a marker indicating the beginning of RD.

- (4.73) *Kohe tõsimeeli mina olin, et vsjo*  
 right.away in.earnest 1SG be.PST.1SG COMP all (Rus.)  
*mina Eestisse ei jää*  
 1SG Estonia.ILL NEG stay.CN  
 ‘Right away, in my earnest, **I was that** [that’s] all I’m not gonna stay in Estonia’  
 (wordpress.com).

Despite the fact that Estonian belongs to those languages where the QI-clause most likely would require some predicate, – even if it does not contribute to the description of the event during which the RD was produced, as in (4.73), – in colloquial speech one can observe constructions where the complete omission of a verb from the QI-clause happens (also see the example 4.60 with the quantifier *lihtsalt* in the QI). Such a scenario can be most likely expected in contexts where the reporter presents several RD-constructions in a row. An SV or some other verb, describing the event, is likely to appear in one of the RD-constructions, which allows the reporter to elide this predicate from the following RD-constructions without the risk of being misunderstood. Note that in such cases, the complementizer *et* indicates the beginning of RD. It can be expected that this type of quotative constructions appears more naturally in oral speech where reporters mark turn-takings in the most economical way, avoiding repetitions. As (4.74) shows, this type of construction can further appear also in colloquial written speech.

- (4.74) *läksin küsima teenindajalt, kas need on ikka taimsed, ega muna ja piima pole, teenindaja siis et – On ikka, siin hapukoor...*  
 go.PST.1SG ask.INF personnel.ABL Q DEM.PL  
 be.PRS.3SG still vegetarian.PL NEG egg.PAR  
 and milk.PAR NEG:EXIST personnel then  
 COMP be.PRS.3SG still there sour.cream  
 ‘**I went to ask the personnel** are they really vegan and do not contain egg and milk, the personnel then that – Yes, they are, there [is] sour cream...’  
 (facebook.com).

As it has been mentioned above, besides different types of predicates, in RD-constructions *et* may also co-occur with NPs referring to the original source of RD. Note that in (4.69), repeated here as (4.75), the presence of the SIM *nagu* in

the QI-clause provides a hypothetical reading to RD. As mentioned above, if one hypothetically omits *nagu* from the clause, the quote will acquire the meaning of a discourse that was previously produced.

- (4.75) *See*                    *juba*                    *nagu*                    *teiste*                    *ees*  
 DEM                    already                    like                    other.GEN.PL                    in.front  
*kekutamine,*                    *et*                    “*teie*                    *ei*                    *saa*  
 show.off.AN                    COMP                    2PL                    NEG                    can.CN  
*lubada*                    *nii*                    *kalleid*                    *jopesid,*                    *mina*  
 afford.INF                    so                    expensive.PAR.PL                    jacket.PAR.PL                    1SG  
*saan*”  
 can.PRS.1SG  
 ‘It’s already **like showing off** in front of others, **that** “You cannot afford such expensive jackets, I can” (New media subcorpus).

In addition, cases are encountered where *et* can be considered an independent quote-introducer, cf. (4.76)–(4.78). According to Keevallik (2008), non-clausal use of *et* derives from constructions with SVs, as in (4.71). In oral speech, it is realized the following way: “[t]he repetitive use of *et* (...) allows the first instance to become latched onto the preceding reporting verb while the consecutive ones may become more closely connected to the subsequent clause” (Keevallik 2008: 146). Further, *et* develops into an independent marker that does not require any longer the presence of a preceding predicate.

- (4.76) *Siis*                    *saanuks*                    *öelda,*                    *et*                    *oli*                    *ja*  
 then                    can.PST.COND                    say.INF                    COMP                    be.PST.3SG                    and  
*tuleb.*                    ***Et***                    *üks*                    *sünnipäev*                    *eile*                    *ja*  
 come.PRS.3SG                    COMP                    one                    birthday                    yesterday                    and  
*teine*                    *homme*  
 another                    tomorrow  
 ‘Then one could have said that it was and it will be. **That** one birthday yesterday and another tomorrow’ (blogspot.com).

In some cases, the simplification of a QI-clause to a single element, represented by *et*, allows the reporter to produce a quote with hypothetical reading. Keevallik (2008: 137) provides an example where a journalist produces “a question and a suggestion, as if they came from the audience” (4.77). The non-clausal *et* is used “as strategic means of dramatization in her writing” (ibid.).

- (4.77) ***Et***                    *mis*                    *siis*                    *teha?*                    ***Et***  
 COMP                    what                    then                    do.INF                    COMP  
*muudame*                    8.                    *märtsi*                    *meeste-*                    *ja*  
 change.PRS.1PL                    8.ORD                    March.GEN                    man.PL.GEN                    and  
*naiste*                    *päevaks?*  
 woman.PL.GEN                    day.TRANSL  
 ‘***Et*** what can (we) do? ***Et*** let’s turn the 8<sup>th</sup> of March into a men’s and women’s day?’ (Keevallik 2008: 138; translation and emphasis are original, underline and glossing are mine, DT).

In addition to (4.77), in my material, there is an instance where *et* collocates with the SIM *nagu* in non-clausal use, cf. (4.78). The presence of the SIM motivates the reading in which the quote is considered a typical phrase produced by the reporter in the described circumstance (for more details see 4.3.2).

- (4.78) *mul*        *nii*        *et*        *kui*        *tunnis*        *aru*        *ei*  
 1SG.ADE    so        COMP    when        lesson.INE    understanding    NEG  
*saa*        *siis*        *ka*        ***nagu***        ***et***        *WTF???*  
 get.CN    then    also    like        COMP        wtf  
 ‘To me happens like that when in class I don’t understand then also **like that WTF???**’ (New media subcorpus).

To sum up, in both languages, the complementizers have undergone similar changes and in the quotative domain started being used as genuine quote-introducers. The complementizers *et(tä)* and *et* are frequently used with different types of verbs. In Finnish, the marker is also used with the equational verb which shows that in the quotative domain its functions broadened and it cannot be associated with its function of a subordinate conjunction/complementizer outside the quotative domain. In Estonian, the development went further, and besides co-occurrences with the equational verb *olema*, the complementizer *et* can be used in contemporary colloquial speech as a single quote-introducer. Both markers remain epistemically neutral and require the presence of some other markers (e.g. similative or quantifiers) to indicate epistemic overtones or other characteristics that the quote may acquire.

## 4.5. Deictics as a source for new quotative strategies in Finnish and Estonian

In the current section, I pay attention to the use of deictics as NQs in Finnish and Estonian. First, the use of the MD *sillee(n)* ‘thus, in the way’ is described, followed by the presentation of the MD *nii (et)* ‘so (that), thus’ in Estonian. For the general motivation of the use of MDs in the quotative domain see 1.6.2.6.

### 4.5.1. The manner deictic *sillee(n)* as a new quotative in Finnish

Like the previously described elements, the MD *sillee(n)* ‘thus, in the way’ is polyfunctional outside the quotative domain. Depending on the context in which it appears, it may have different meanings. Most common are the meanings ‘in the way’, ‘thus’, ‘as such’, ‘like this’<sup>107</sup>. The most typical use of the marker as an MD is illustrated in (4.79). In colloquial speech, the shortening of the deictic often happens by dropping the final *n* – *sillee*, *sillei*. I indicate the possibility of both version by putting sometimes elliptic *n* in the parentheses – *sillee(n)*.

<sup>107</sup> www.kielitoimistonsanakirja.fi (September 1, 2017).



- (4.79) *Asiaa ei voi jättää silleen*  
 thing.PAR NEG.3SG can.PRS.CN leave.INF such  
 ‘The matter can’t be left **like this**’ (kielitoimistonsanakirja.fi; glossing and translation are mine, DT).

Similarly to some NQs, *sillee(n)* is also used as a discourse particle. In such a function, the marker expresses a meaning peculiar to discourse markers with hedging function. Consider (4.80) where *sillee(n)* is combined with *niinku* to fulfill such a function.

- (4.80) *#IRC on muuten ainoa sosiaalinen media jota silleen niinkuin oikeesti seuraan.*  
 PN be.PRS.3SG by.the.way only social media  
 which.PAR in.a.way like really follow.PRS.1SG  
 ‘#IRC is by the way the only social media which I am **in a way kinda** really follow’ (twitter.com).

In colloquial speech, some of its collocations have already acquired a special idiomatic meaning, e.g. *olla sillee(n)* ‘be in sexual contact’<sup>108</sup>. A homonymic construction is used in the quotative domain and it is mentioned in the chapter describing colloquial quotative constructions in Finnish (ISK 2004: §1487). It is pointed out that *sillee(n)* in the quotative domain often collocates with other NQs, e.g. *niinku*, *vaa(n)*, etc. (ibid.). As for the collocations of several NQs in one QI-clause, according to Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012: XII), such a tendency is observed cross-linguistically. However, the structural image of QIs consisting of *sillee(n)* is not restricted to the co-occurrence with the equational verb. Similarly to the previously presented quotatives in Finnish, *sillee(n)* may co-occur in a QI-clause with different types of predicates. Among those, the most frequent are speech (4.81) and epistemic (4.82) verbs referring to an event behind RD. Similarly to the previously described NQs, in a neutralized QI-clause, instead of an SEV, the equational verb (4.83) is used. Note that the reporter in (4.83) uses different co-occurrences of NQs to quote first another speaker and then him-/herself. In the self-quotative construction, the occurrence of the MD *sillee(n)* with the NQ *tyylillä(n)* can be observed, which, according to ISK (2004: §1487), is quite typical for the use of *sillee(n)* in the quotative domain.

- (4.81) *Oma isä ei oo koskaan ollut katsomassa, mut sanoi silleen, et nuorelle miehelle tää on hyvä homma...*  
 own father NEG.3SG be.PRS.CN never be.PP  
 watch.INF.INE but say.PST.3SG thus COMP young.ALL  
 man.ALL DEM.P be.PRS.3SG good stuff  
 ‘My own father has never watched [it], but **he said thus (that) this is good stuff for a young man...**’ (mantsalanuutiset.fi).

<sup>108</sup> <https://www.urbaanisanakirja.com/word/sillee/> (September 1, 2017).

|        |                  |               |                 |                |                 |
|--------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| (4.82) | <i>Ajattelin</i> | <i>sillee</i> | <i>et</i>       | <i>yhtäkki</i> | <i>joku</i>     |
|        | think.PST.1SG    | thus          | COMP            | suddenly       | some            |
|        | <i>päivä</i>     | <i>vaa</i>    | <i>sä</i>       | <i>oot</i>     | <i>raskaan,</i> |
|        | day              | only          | 2SG             | be.PRS.2SG     | pregnant.ESS    |
|        | <i>et</i>        | <i>ku</i>     | <i>heräät</i>   | <i>aamul</i>   | <i>ni</i>       |
|        | COMP             | when          | wake.up.PRS.2SG | morning.ADE    | so              |
|        | <i>puffff</i>    | <i>sul</i>    | <i>on</i>       | <i>iso</i>     | <i>maha</i>     |
|        | IDEO             | 2SG.ADE       | be.PRS.3SG      | big            | belly           |
|        | <i>ja</i>        | <i>oot</i>    | <i>raskaan.</i> |                |                 |
|        | and              | be.PRS.2SG    | pregnant.ESS    |                |                 |

‘I thought thus (that) suddenly some day you are pregnant, and when you wake up in the morning, then puffff, and you have big belly and you’re pregnant’ (demi.fi).

|        |               |                 |              |               |             |
|--------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| (4.83) | <i>Sit</i>    | <i>se</i>       | <i>oli</i>   | <i>sillee</i> | <i>et</i>   |
|        | then          | DEM             | be.PST.3SG   | thus          | COMP        |
|        | <i>ou</i>     | <i>nou,</i>     | <i>ja</i>    | <i>minä</i>   | <i>olin</i> |
|        | oh            | no              | and          | 1SG           | be.PST.1SG  |
|        | <i>sillee</i> | <i>tyyliin,</i> | <i>onks</i>  | <i>pakko,</i> | <i>mä</i>   |
|        | thus          | like            | be.PRS.3SG.Q | obligatory    | 1SG         |
|        | <i>en</i>     | <i>kestä...</i> |              |               |             |
|        | NEG.1SG       | manage.PRS.CN   |              |               |             |

‘Then (s)he was thus (that) oh, no, and I was thus like is it obligatory, I won’t manage...’ (lansi-uusimaa.fi).

In addition to its use with quotations of speech and thought, *sillee(n)* can also appear with demonstrations, as in (4.84). The emoticon *0.o* is used online as a marker with mirative meaning (compare with a similar use of the MD *so* ‘so’ in German in (1.33b)). Besides representing enacted human verbal behavior, QIs are also frequently observed marking non-linguistic sound imitations, ideophones and representational gestures (for more details see Güldemann 2008: 275–295). Consequently, it is of no surprise that some of the quotatives, especially those with demonstrative semantics, are also used in this function in Finnish. Thus, the use of an emoticon in the demonstration can be considered a quasi-quotation, as in (4.84), where the reporter instead of verbalizing his/her surprise presents it with the symbol used online in expressions of mirativity.

|        |   |             |                |           |              |
|--------|---|-------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| (4.84) | <i>Mä</i>                                   | <i>olin</i> | <i>silleen</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>0.o??</i> |
|        | 1SG   | be.PST.1SG  | thus           | COMP      | EMOT:MIR     |
|        | <u>‘I was thus (that) 0.o??’</u> (demi.fi). |             |                |           |              |

In addition to co-occurrences with speech and non-speech verbs, *sillee(n)* also appears with NPs referring to the original source of reported discourse, cf. (4.85). Note that the RD in (4.85) is hypothetical: it was not previously produced, but is depicted as typical for the described circumstances. Consequently, besides depicting real quotes, typical for the category of MDs inside the quotative domain (see 1.6.2.6), *sillee(n)* can be used to present hypothetical quotations. Such a use

can be motivated by the semantics of the marker, which helps the speakers to enact a fictional discourse for dramatical purposes while describing a situation.

- (4.85) ...*laittaa kavereille viestin sillee et*  
 put.PRS.3SG friend.PL.ALL message.GEN thus COMP  
*by the way mulle synty viime yönä*  
 by.the.way 1SG.ALL be.born.PST.3SG last night.ESS  
*tyttö / poika mitoilla se ja*  
 girl boy measure.PL.ADE DEM and  
*se jne.*  
 DEM etc.  
 ‘she sends a message to the friends thus (that) by the way last night I gave birth to a girl/boy with measures this and that, etc.’ (kaksplus.fi).

Cases, where *sillee(n)* is used as a single quote-introducer, are not encountered in my material, although such a possibility, in general, is not excluded and might not be used only in written form. Connecting studies on the basis of oral speech are required.

#### 4.5.2. The manner deictic *nii (et)* as a new quotative in Estonian

According to EKG (1993: §566, 568), *nii et* is a correlative conjunction. It is a combination of the endophoric deictic *nii* ‘so’ and the complementizer *et* ‘that’. The correlative adverb *nii* as part of the conjunction often loses its independence. It results in the appearance of a new marker that functions as a linker between clauses of one sentence. In oral speech, the new marker is often realized phonologically as a single word, which can be written *niiet* or *niet* (Keevallik 2000: 346). In colloquial speech, similarly to *et*, this marker is also used as a discourse particle starting paraphrases or reformulation of thoughts (Keevallik 2000: 346; Pajusalu 1996: 154). An excellent example of the marker in this function is retrieved from Pajusalu (1996: 154). *Nii et*, in this case, can be paraphrasable with the clause like ‘it can be said/it can be concluded’ that points to the correlation between the functions of the marker inside and outside the quotative domain.

- (4.86) (a) V: *ma elan oma emaga koos ühes korteris. Ja oma vennaga*  
 V: I share a flat with my mother. And my brother  
 (b) K: *kas sul lapsi on?*  
 K: Do you have any children?  
 (c) V: *ei. vähemalt ma ei tea et oleks. mul on ristitütar*  
 V: No. At least I don’t know of any. I’ve got a goddaughter.  
 (d) K: *aja (.) selge (.) ja ni=et erilist jõukust sinu majapidamises ei ole. sul ei ole autot?*  
 K: Well (.) OK (.) **and=so** you are not too well off, are you? You haven’t got a car? (Pajusalu 1996: 154).

Here, I do not discuss this function of *nii et* thoroughly. However, one can mention that often items that outside the quotative domain belong to the category of discourse particles are also used cross-linguistically in quotative constructions as QIs (see e.g. Hasund *et al.* 2012: 38–39, on discourse markers in Norwegian used as QIs).

In some examples presented here, *nii et* can clearly be treated as already grammaticalized into a single element, which in oral speech would be phonologically realized as a single word *niiet/niet* [ni:.et]/[ni.et]. Although in a couple of cases, it can be read both as the MD *niiet/niet* ‘thus’, or as a combination of the endophoric deictic *nii* ‘so’ and the complementizer *et* ‘that’, which, in standard written Estonian, would be distinguished by a comma after *nii*. Since my material derives from internet communications, it cannot be confirmed that the lack of a comma can be treated as a clear motivation by the speakers to mark the use of the grammaticalized MD, and not as a combination of two independent elements. Nonetheless, in the quotative domain, both uses are actually relevant. The demonstrative *nii* ‘so’ remains in the focus of the investigation as the element that is used mainly cataphorically to point to the presence of RD. Furthermore, the use of *nii* without the complementizer *et* in the quotative domain is not unheard of in Estonian (EKS 2017: 691), cf. (4.87). However, as my observations show, at least in quotative constructions in written speech, the endophoric demonstrative *nii* is more frequently accompanied by the complementizer *et* than it appears without it. The collocation of *nii* and *et* also shows a broader distribution in quotative constructions, co-occurring with a bigger number of different verbs and appearing as a single quote-introducer, which otherwise is not observed in the use of bare *nii*. In my material, I have attested the use of *nii* alone only with SEVs, as in (4.87), but not with the equational verb, as in (4.91) and (4.92), or as a single quote-introducer, as in (4.93). Consequently, here I focus merely on the use of *nii* accompanied by *et*.

- (4.87) *Kaija*      *ise*              *ütles*              *nii:*              „*Sellist*  
 PN              self              say.PST.3SG      so              such.PAR  
*hirmu*      *pole*              *enam*              *ammu*              *ühegi*  
 fear.PAR      NEG              more              long.ago      one.GEN.PTCL  
*kassi*      *silmis*              *näinud...*”  
 cat.GEN      eye. PL.INE      see.PP  
 ‘**Kaija herself said so:** “I haven’t seen such fear in the eyes of a cat for a long time...”’ (loomakaitse.eu).

As part of a QI, structurally *nii et* is used with different types of predicates – speech (4.88)–(4.89) and epistemic (4.90) verbs. The co-occurrence of the combination *nii et* with this type of predicates may be used to present equally direct (4.88) and indirect (4.89) RD. In QI-clauses, *nii et* stands adjacent to the RD. Thus, its position resembles the use of complementizers with similar types of predicates.

- (4.88) *Ta ütles nii et “mul on vist rohkem närvid läbi kui sul”.*  
 3SG say.PST.3SG so.COMP 1 SG.ADE be.PRS.3SG probably  
 more nerve.PL through than 2SG.ADE  
 ‘(S)he said so (that)/thus “My nerves are probably more shot than yours”.’  
 (naistekas.delfi.ee).

- (4.89) *üks dvd kutt ütles nii et  
 one DVD chap say.PST.3SG so.COMP  
 ta rääkis stuudiovendadega ning nood  
 3SG talk.PST.3SG studio.brother.PL.GEN and DEM.D.PL  
 ei tea midagi et sügisel  
 NEG know.CN something COMP autumn.ADE  
 Kill Bill peaks tulema  
 PN have.to.COND come.INF*  
 ‘One dvd guy said so that/thus he talked with buddies from the studio and they don’t know anything about the coming out of Kill Bill in autumn’  
 (forumcinemas.ee).

- (4.90) *Ma mõtlesin nii et mina võtan  
 1SG think.PST.1SG so.COMP 1SG take.PRS.1SG  
 laenu aga koos maksame tagasi  
 credit.GEN but together pay.PRS.1PL back*  
 ‘I thought so (that)/thus I take the credit, but we pay it back together’  
 (foorumcinemas.ee).

Among NSVs, *nii et* co-occurs with the equational verb *olema* in neutralized QI-clauses. Two types of the neutralized QI-clause are encountered in the collected material. The first type (4.91) is identical to the previously presented clauses, consisting of an NP, encoding the speaker/reporter, and the combination of the equational verb with the new quotative. In (4.91), the reporter describes one of his driving experiences when he was accompanied by his father. The quote depicts the complaint made by the father concerning the quick pace of the car at that moment, i.e. 120 km/h. In the second type (4.92), further neutralization of a QI-clause happens which leads to the omission of the speaker/reporter from the clause. Thus, the reporter presents a quote typical for the described circumstance, which in reality remains fictional. The omission of an NP referring to a concrete speaker makes this reading the most obvious since the quote can be equally attributed to any speaker who occurs in the depicted circumstances, i.e. using public transport in Pärnu without a ticket.

- (4.91) *Omal*                    *siis*                    *roolis*                    *olles*                    *rekord*  
 own.ADE                    then                    steering.wheel.INE                    be.INF.INE                    record  
*120,*                    *isa*                    *oli*                    *kõrval*                    *nii et*  
 NUM                    father                    be.PST.3SG                    nearby                    so.COMP  
*nagu*                    *mis*                    *sa*                    *siis*                    *ikka*  
 like                    what                    2SG                    then                    still  
*kihutad,*                    *pealegi*                    *milleks*                    *kihutada.*  
 rush.PRS.2SG                    at.PTCL                    what.TRANSL                    rush.INF  
 ‘My own record while driving was 120, **father was** nearby **so (that)/thus like why are you still rushing, no need to rush.**’ (New media subcorpus).

- (4.92) *tegelt*                    *pärnus*                    *on*                    *nii et*                    *vabandust*  
 basically                    PN.INE                    be.PRS.3SG                    so.COMP                    sorry  
*aga*                    *ma*                    *unustasin*                    *oma*                    *pileti*  
 but                    1SG                    forget.PST.1SG                    own                    ticket.PAR  
*koju...*  
 home.ILL  
 ‘Basically in Pärnu **it’s so (that)/thus sorry, but I forgot my ticket at home...**’  
 (New media subcorpus).

Furthermore, *nii et* can also appear as a single quote-introducer in non-clausal use. Such use suggests that the marker is in the process of development towards becoming an independent quote-introducer. A QI-clause in such cases is reduced to a single element that takes quote-introducing functions. Since the QI lacks elements encoding the reporter(s) and the event behind the RD, the quote itself acquires various interpretations – from a real utterance reproduced as a quote to a hypothetical utterance produced firstly as a quote in the current discourse and which can be considered typical for the described circumstances.

- (4.93) *Mitte*                    *nii et =*                    *saan*                    *isa*                    *süles*  
 NEG                    so.COMP                    can.PRS.1SG                    father.GEN                    lap.INE  
*pühapäeviti*                    *külateel*                    *sõita.*  
 on.Sundays                    village.road.ADE                    ride.INF  
 ‘Not **so (that)/thus I get to drive on the village road [sitting] on my father’s lap.**’  
 (New media subcorpus).

To sum up, in both languages, MDs are used relatively similarly. They can co-occur with a number of different verbs. Similarly to the above cases, the event-neutralization in the QI-clause happens predominantly by substituting the verb denoting an event behind the RD with the equational verb. In contrast to Finnish, in Estonian, two different scenarios of event-neutralization involving the equational verb are observed. One of the scenarios also occurs in Finnish and implies the substitution of an SEV with the equational verb. In another, observed only in Estonian, in addition to the substitution of an SEV with the equational verb, an NP encoding the speaker is elided from the QI-clause. Thus, the quote remains unattributed to a concrete speaker and it becomes hypothetical. As one of the examples with *sillee(n)* in Finnish shows, hypothetical quotations can also be

introduced by this marker. However, structurally the example with *sillee(n)* introducing a hypothetical quotation is different from the Estonian one. Finally, *nii et* in Estonian can also be used as a single quote-introducer, which is not observed among the uses of Fin. *sillee(n)*. However, the lack of examples in written speech does not exclude this possibility in oral communications; hence, this aspect should be studied further on the basis of oral corpus data.

#### 4.6. Quotative index clauses with motion verbs in Finnish and Estonian

In this section, I pay attention to QI-clauses consisting of MVs. The motivation for the use of MVs as NQs cross-linguistically is described in 1.6.2.1. In colloquial Finnish and Estonian, MVs are used for encoding technical transition processes of information. While the QIs discussed in 1.6.2.1 typically depict a usage often derived from oral communications (compare the MV *jön* ‘come’ in Hungarian in Section 3.6), the use of MVs in Finnish and Estonian cannot be treated similarly. Their use as part of QIs outside written communications should be separately studied, which lies beyond the aims of the current research. Since QI-clauses in which the MVs appear are relatively similar between the two languages, this subsection is not split into parts, and the constructions are depicted parallel to each other.

In the collected data, the MVs *tulla* ‘come’ in Finnish and *tulema* ‘come’ in Estonian are used encoding the basic transition of messages, announcements or notifications. Therefore, a QI-clause in which they are used typically consists of an NP, encoding the original source of RD, and the MV, depicting the process of transition of RD from an original source to the reporter, as in (4.94)–(4.95).

- (4.94) Finnish
- |   |                              |                      |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Kun</i>                                  | <i>yhtä</i>                  | <i>kuvaa</i>         |
| when  | one.PAR                      | picture.PAR          |
| <i>koittaa</i>                              | <i>avata</i>                 | <i>suoraan</i>       |
| try.PRS.3SG                                 | open.INF                     | straight.ILL         |
| <b><i>tulee</i></b>                         | <b><i>virheilmoitus:</i></b> | <b><i>"Kuvaa</i></b> |
| come.PRS.3SG                                | mistake.notification         | picture.PAR          |
| <i>http://...../images/poewerer_by.png"</i> | <i>ei</i>                    | <i>voida</i>         |
| link  | NEG                          | can.PASS.CN          |
| <i>näyttää,</i>                             | <i>koska</i>                 | <i>se</i>            |
| show.INF                                    | because                      | DEM                  |
| <i>sisältää</i>                             | <i>virheitä"</i>             |                      |
| contain.PRS.3SG                             | mistake.PL.PAR               |                      |
- ‘When one tries to open straightly one picture, **an error notification comes:** “Picture [http://...../images/poewerer by.png](http://...../images/poewerer_by.png)” cannot be shown, because it contains mistakes” (joomla.fi).

- (4.95) Estonian  
*Tiiger15, anna teada, kui sõnum tuleb,*  
 PN give.IMP2SG know.INF when message come.PRS.3SG  
*et maht täis*  
 COMP volume full  
 ‘Tiiger15, let me know when **the message comes that** the volume is full’  
 (hinnavaatlus.ee).

As in (4.95), the complementizer is usually present as part of the QI-clause and takes an adjacent position to the quote. As was mentioned before, the presence of the complementizer is optional since it does not contribute to the epistemic evaluation of the quote. Similarly to the clauses with different types of SEVs, in standard varieties, its use is primarily motivated by the type of RD – indirect. Note that in (4.94), where direct RD is depicted the complementizer is not present. However, in colloquial speech, this is not always the case, and often the complementizer is also present in RD-constructions with direct RD.

In addition, in both languages, a neutralized variant of the above QI-clauses is encountered. Neutralization of a QI-clause presumes the ellipsis of an NP encoding an actual source of RD which is not relevant or assumed as evident by the reporter. As a result, the orientation shifts from the event to the RD. Note that despite the omission of an NP, the presence of the complementizer can be still observed. According to my consideration, the complementizer is used as a marker signaling the border between the QI and the RD.

- (4.96) Finnish  
*mitä helvettiä, googletin jotain*  
 what.PAR hell.PAR google.PST.1SG something  
*ja päädyin kaksplussan sivulle*  
 and end.up.PST.1SG PN.GEN page.ALL  
*ja tuli et IP-OSOITTEESI*  
 and come.PST.3SG COMP IP-address.2SG  
*ON BANATTU*  
 be.PRS.3SG ban.PASS.PP  
 ‘What the hell, I was googling something and ended up on the page of kaksplussa and a message **comes that** YOUR IP-ADDRESS IS BANNED’ (demi.fi).



(4.97) Estonian

|                  |   |                  |                     |
|------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Nüüd</i>      | <i>läheb</i>  | <i>pilt</i>      | <i>nii</i>          |
| now              | go. PRS.3SG   | picture          | so                  |
| <i>kaugele</i>   | <i>et</i>   | <i>esimene</i>   | <i>musta</i>        |
| far.ALL          | COMP  | first            | black.GEN           |
| <i>tausta</i>    | <i>ja</i>   | <i>kirjadega</i> | <i>pilt</i>         |
| background.GEN   | and   | letter.PL.COM    | picture             |
| <i>läheb</i>     | <i>eest</i>   | <i>ja</i>        | <b><i>tuleb</i></b> |
| go.PRS.3SG       | in.front.ELA  | and              | come. PRS.3SG       |
| <b><i>et</i></b> | <i>start windows normally, start windows in safe mode</i> |                  |                     |
| COMP             | QUOTE   |                  |                     |
| <i>jne.</i>      |   |                  |                     |
| etc.             |   |                  |                     |

‘Now the picture goes so far that the first picture with a black background and letters disappears [lit. goes from affront] and **comes that** start windows normally, start windows in safe mode etc.’ (elfaforum.ee).

The MVs presented in this subsection, however, cannot be considered entirely independent quotative markers. Their use is restricted to contexts which depict technical processes behind the transition of RD and based on my data, outside this context, they are not used as grammaticalized independent quotative markers. As a result, their use is also restricted to QI-clauses where the source of RD is typically mentioned. Despite the ellipsis of an NP encoding the source, it does not lead to misunderstanding of the RD-construction by the addressee. In such cases, the shift of the orientation from an event to a quote happens.

Despite the fact that MVs are not used in the broader scale in the quotative domain in the languages as e.g. the Eng. new quotative *go* (Buchstaller 2004), their use, especially in the neutralized form, is quite interesting and in the future it can lead to a potential grammaticalization of the markers into independent quote-introducers in other contexts than in internet communications.

#### 4.7. Quotative indexes in Finnish and Estonian: summary

In contemporary Finnish and Estonian, the choice of quotative markers and the strategies in which these markers are used are quite diverse, involving the use of structures of different complexity. In both languages, correspondent semantic classes are used as a source for NQ strategies. The choice of the markers also corresponds to various languages across the world. Namely, similitive markers, quantifiers, complementizers, manner deictics and motion verbs are used in quotative strategies of both languages. All of the mentioned markers, besides MVs, appear in similar quotative strategies – they either co-occur with different types of verbs and NPs, encoding the original source of RD, or appear in non-clausal use as single quote-introducers. Non-clausal use shows that the markers are in the process of development into independent QIs. Table 14 summarizes the structural use of the markers in Finnish and Estonian.

Table 14. Finnish and Estonian NQs in various QIs

| Markers  | QI-clauses with SVs | QI-clauses with EVs | QI-clauses with equational verb | QI-clauses with NPs | As a single QI |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| I. SIMs  |                     |                     |                                 |                     |                |
| Fin. <i>niin kuin (niinku)</i> ‘like’            | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| Fin. <i>tyyl(i)(n)</i> ‘in the style (of), like’ | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| Est. <i>nagu</i> ‘like’                          | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| Est. <i>a la</i> ‘in the style (of), like’       | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| II. Quantifiers                                  |                     |                     |                                 |                     |                |
| Fin. <i>vaan</i> ‘just’                          | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| Fin. <i>ihan</i> ‘totally, completely’           | +                   | +                   | +                               | –                   | –              |
| Est. <i>täiega</i> ‘completely’                  | +                   | –                   | +                               | –                   | –              |
| Est. <i>lihtsalt</i> ‘simply, just’              | +                   | +                   | +                               | –                   | –              |
| III. Complementizers                             |                     |                     |                                 |                     |                |
| Fin. <i>et(tä)</i> ‘that’                        | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| Est. <i>et</i> ‘that’                            | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | +              |
| IV. Manner deictics                              |                     |                     |                                 |                     |                |
| Fin. <i>sillee(n)</i> ‘thus, in the way’         | +                   | +                   | +                               | +                   | –              |
| Est. <i>nii et</i> ‘so that, thus’               | +                   | +                   | +                               | –                   | +              |

In my previous research (Teptiuk 2015, 2019), I have suggested that the variety of structural complexities in which they appear might show the diachronic process of their development towards independent QIs, the starting point of which are strategies involving SEVs. According to Güldemann’s (2008, 2012) classification, such QIs are event-oriented. Thus, they depict the event behind RD, specifying whether the quote derives from a previously produced speech act, thought or other mental processes. As the next step of the development, the use of the markers with equational verbs (Fin. *olla*, Est. *olema*, both meaning ‘be’) can be encountered. This way, the reporter neutralizes the event-orientation, and the orientation shifts from the event to the quote. Consequently, in the majority of the contexts, the difference between quoting someone’s previous speech, thoughts, or a hypothetical discourse is vague and requires additional study of the context for clarifying what event is denoted with the quote. Unlike in Finnish, in Estonian, a further neutralization of such QI-clauses can be observed where the omission of an NP encoding the speaker/reporter happens. Thus, the quote remains unattributed to a concrete speaker and can be considered merely typical for the described circumstances. As a further step of neutralization, in both languages, the simplification of a QI-clause to a single quote-introducer can be observed. As

a result, the above markers are used as single QIs adjacent to a quote. Quite naturally, this structural type of QI is used in constructions where a hypothetical quotation is produced since both the original speaker(s) and the event behind RD remain unspecified by the reporter. Consequently, the quote can be assigned to a number of speakers and contexts, but it remains entirely fictional.

In both Finnish and Estonian, NQs sometimes combine into a chain. Such collocations quite often involve SIMs that bring approximate evaluation to a quote. A difference between the markers on the structural level can be observed only in constructions where they co-occur with NPs or are used as independent quotative markers. However, since such use of the QIs requires rather a specific context and is encountered in my material rarely even with those markers that do show the possibility of such use, I explain this difference mainly by the lack of those examples in written speech, than by the impossibility of a specific co-occurrence or non-clausal use of the markers. Further connecting studies on the basis of data depicting oral communications are required to clarify whether the marker can be used this way at all or not.

Apart from the structural similarities between the markers in the languages, a difference between the meanings that NQs express is observed. SIMs and the quantifiers with minimalistic meaning (Fin. *vaa(n)* ‘just’, Est. *lihtsalt* ‘simply’) typically mark the quote as produced approximately. They might also indicate the quote as typical for a person, a group of people or some situation. However, while SIMs are also used systematically in such contexts with hypothetical quotations, the Finnish quantifier *vaa(n)* is not systematically used with such type of RD, and the Est. quantifier *lihtsalt* ‘simply, just’ only sometimes. This use can be considered rather pragmatic and quite depending on the context and the reporter’s motivation, rather than a typical function of the quantifiers with minimalistic meaning. The lack of this function of the quantifiers is explained primarily by the original meaning of the marker. While SIMs semantically can depict quotes *as if* they have previously occurred in the described circumstances, *vaa(n)* and *lihtsalt*, in general, lack such a functional capacity.

The Fin. quantifier *ihan* ‘totally, completely’ and the Est. quantifier *täiega* ‘completely’, unlike their minimalistic counterparts, express the opposite epistemic support, depicting a quote as information acquired first hand. In addition, one can encounter the quantifier *vapsee* in Estonian, replicated from the Rus. quantifier *voobšče*. However, unlike most of the quantifiers, *vapsee* does not show any qualitative degree of grammaticalization in the quotative domain. Hence, I made a decision to consider it a supplementary element of the QI-clause with SEVs, rather than an independent quote-introducer. Therefore, its functions are excluded from the discussion in this section and elsewhere.

On the basis of my material, the maximalistic quantifiers are used more frequently (or exclusively as in the case of *täiega*) in self-quoting contexts where the reporters express full support towards the quote or mark it as produced with emotional involvement. It is also interesting that both languages simultaneously employ both types of quantifiers (maximalistic and minimalistic) as QIs. Nonetheless, quantifiers with minimalistic meaning tend to be used more broadly.

I propose an explanation suggesting that the quantifiers with minimalistic meaning as markers indicating the approximate rendering of the quote become more prominent in the quotative domain due to the overtones that they express. Their maximalistic counterparts remain restricted in their use to specific contexts where the reporters aim at vouching for the content of produced quotes or show emotional involvement. As a result, minimalistic quantifiers can be simply used in speech more systematically than their maximalistic counterparts, as their functions become more systematically required in discourse.

In both languages, the complementizers (Fin. *et(tä)*, Est. *et*) are used in various structural complexities. Where they co-occur with SEVs they merely indicate the beginning of RD, but in event-neutralized QI-clauses they already function as genuine quote-introducers. Despite their use in the quotative domain, the complementizers are epistemically neutral and depict produced quotes as such that have previously occurred, either as real utterances or epistemic processes. A contribution to the epistemic meanings in such cases is carried out by some additional means, e.g. epistemic particles or adverbials, among other possible options.

MDs (Fin. *sillee(n)* ‘in a way, thus’, Est. *nii et* ‘so that, thus’) in the quotative domain of Finnish and Estonian are used to point to the presence of RD. Different structural complexities, in which the markers appear, influence the meanings of the quote. In more neutralized QI-clauses, they may present a quote as completely hypothetical. Alternatively, specific context might motivate the use of the markers with different types of RD.

The MVs (Fin. *tulla*, Est. *tulema*, both meaning ‘come’) are used in the quotative domain in QI-clauses consisting of an NP, encoding the original source of RD. In internet communications, the MVs are used as elements depicting the process of transition of RD from the original source to the addressee. Unlike previously illustrated cases where MVs are used in various RD-constructions (Buchstaller 2004, 2013; Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012), the MVs *tulla* and *tulema* are restricted to the above contexts, and outside them, on the basis of my material, they do not appear in the quotative domain. The neutralized variant of such a QI-clause can also be observed. The neutralization process happens with the omission of an NP encoding the original source of RD. In cases where an NP is present, the use of the complementizers is optional and depends on the motivation of the concrete speaker either to stick to a more standard variant of the language (the complementizer is present only with indirect RD), or turn to more colloquial language use (the complementizer can be present with direct and indirect RD). Where the neutralization happens, the complementizer is typically present and indicates the beginning of a quote. Its position is always adjacent to a quote.

To sum up, the quotative constructions in Finnish and Estonian employ not only the same semantic classes as new quotative markers but also show almost exact similarity in the patterns employed in the quotative constructions. Relatively similar markers can be observed in different extent in other distant related languages previously discussed here. Despite the fact that the patterns of their use in Finnish and Estonian are distinctly different from previously presented Permian

and Hungarian, they show considerable similarity with other SAE languages in their choice of markers, e.g. SIMs, quantifiers, MDs, etc., and in structural complexities, e.g. employing equational verbs in event-neutralized QIs.

In this study, I have also reviewed my previous findings and corrected misjudgments and mistakes I made in my previous studies (Teptiuk 2015, 2019). Namely, in my previous research I have overlooked the parallel use of maximalistic and minimalistic quantifiers in each language. Attention was not paid to the use of the Finnish manner deictic *sillee(n)* and the Estonian motion verb *tulema* in QIs. These markers were described in this study. Since some of the markers were not included in my previous studies, it led me to the wrong assumption about the role of the contact languages on the choice of quantifiers (Fin. *vaa(n)*, Est. *täiega*). As follows, this assumption appears to be quite doubtful, since as shown here, both languages employ minimalistic and maximalistic quantifiers for different purposes. Consequently, it is rather unlikely that their use was caused by the influence of different contact languages, typically employing only one quantifier. An alternative point of view suggest an independent development of quotative functions by these markers, which at the current stage is considered a more plausible explanation, until proven otherwise.

## 5. RESULTS

In the final chapter, I provide a summary of the general findings of my study on QIs in five Finno-Ugric languages. Section 5.1 deals with the semantics of the elements in QIs. In particular, I concentrate on various connotations evoked by the QIs, e.g. epistemic support, subjectivity, approximate or exact reproduction of the quote, and EHF (*epistemic hedging function*, see 1.6.6). As some of the languages employ quotative markers that are replicated from contact languages, I focus on how these elements function compared to their autochthonous counterparts. Furthermore, several semantic classes show different qualitative degrees of grammaticalization in the quotative domain. This point is also reviewed providing correlations between the semantics, functions and employment of such quotatives in various structural complexities. In Section 5.2, I give a summary of the structural images of QIs. I pay attention to the orientation of QIs, and the relationships between orientation and structural complexity. In Sections 5.3–4, I summarize the attested order patterns and discuss the impact of language contact. Finally, in Section 5.5, I address some typological perspectives based on the findings from the Finno-Ugric languages and the contribution of this study to a cross-linguistically oriented framework for synchronic studies on QIs.

### 5.1. Semantic classes employed in quotative indexes

In 5.1.1, I present the elements in QIs in terms of their semantics in accordance with Subsection 1.6.2 in the introduction of the dissertation. In addition to the revision of the attested elements and their semantic classification, I point out the various connotations that can be observed. Thus, I show the regularities in the semantics and functions of these markers in quotative constructions. Furthermore, where elements replicated from contact languages double the autochthonous counterparts, I revise the main differences between the replicated and autochthonous markers. A general summary is presented in 5.1.2.

#### 5.1.1. Semantic sources of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages

##### 5.1.1.1. *Speech and epistemic verbs in quotative indexes*

Naturally, speech and epistemic verbs are frequent constituents of QIs. In principle, SVs function relatively similarly to EVs, as it has been already pointed out by Palmer (1986), and further emphasized by Güldemann (2008, 2012). To be more precise in my conclusions, it should be mentioned that EVs, mostly used together with quotations of thought, indeed show similarity with SVs, but mainly with generic SVs. As some of the languages show, sometimes EVs are not employed in the same constructions where specific SVs usually appear. For example, recall the Hungarian quote-presentational construction with the relative pronoun *az*

‘that’ or NPs in the comitative case, where specific SVs can be observed, but not generic SVs or EVs. Therefore, I suggest pointing out similarities between the subclass of generic SVs and EVs only.

That said, in constructions where generic SVs appear, one could also expect EVs. This observation holds for the majority of quotative constructions, and only in some occasions, EVs were not observed in quotative constructions where generic SVs were used. For example, the Hungarian quotative marker *mondván* ‘saying’, preserving the SV-semantics, did not appear in constructions where EVs are used and was not observed at all presenting quotations of thought. Similarly, another Hungarian quotative marker *úgymond* appeared together with EVs only rarely. As for rest of constructions, a general tendency can be observed that if a generic SV appears with one type of a marker, one can also expect the use of this marker in a QI-clause with an EV. Therefore, in some contexts, the lack of examples was explained by the peculiarity of the data used in this study or was considered accidental.

Specific SVs, in turn, appear in the majority of constructions, parallel to generic SVs. As I have mentioned above, only one quote-presentational construction in Hungarian can be filled in by specific SVs; however, generic SVs and EVs do not appear in it. There is one more difference between two types of SVs. As evidence from other languages of the world and Hungarian shows, a basic SV with the meaning ‘say’ can also grammaticalize into a broader quote-introducer, denoting not only speech events but rather functioning as a general quotative marker pointing to the presence of RD. In various contexts, RD introduced by such a grammaticalized generic SV can be interpreted in two ways: as a quotation of speech or thought. Thus, a basic self-quotative construction in Hungarian involving the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular present form *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’ can be used with quotations of both, speech and thought. This also holds for SAY-verbs in some Siberian languages (cf. Matic & Pakendorf 2013) or languages spoken in Australia (cf. McGregor 1994, 2014; Spronck 2017, *inter alia*). As far as I am aware, similar tendencies are not observed among specific SVs so far. That said, one can expect such a grammaticalization path for generic SVs, rather than for specific SVs, or at least, this tendency can be observed more frequently among the former than among the latter subclass of SVs. This also holds for the alternative development among EVs. Thus, generic SVs can, in general, introduce quotations of thought, but EVs introducing quotations of speech have yet not been attested, as far as I am aware.

### **5.1.1.2. Non-speech verbs in quotative indexes**

Non-speech verbs used in QIs can be further divided into semantically proper NSVs, in the case that they preserve their original non-quotative functions, and grammaticalized QVs, in the case when they are not used in non-quotative contexts. Among the attested NSVs, three different subclasses were pointed out – motion, inchoative and equational verbs. MVs are used in a limited amount of

quotative constructions in three of the five languages, namely in Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian. In Finnish and Estonian, the motion verbs *tulla* and *tulema*, both meaning ‘come’, are mainly used together with NPs encoding the original source of RD. In principle, one could exclude these verbs as they appear with semantically loaded quote-introducers in the QI. However, motion verbs are interesting in these types of constructions, since they encode a technical transition processes of information from the source to its addressee. Hence, in this type of construction, motion verbs are most likely expected since they take a functional niche in denoting transition processes. Thus, in Finnish and Estonian the MVs are restricted to one type of construction, and in other quotative contexts, they have not been observed. Where ellipsis of an NP from the QI-clause happens (‘comes that’ vs. ‘a message/notification/etc. comes that’), event-neutralization can be observed in this construction. The whole QI becomes quote-oriented since a motion verb *per se* does not contribute to the depiction of the event behind RD.

In Hungarian, the MVs *előáll* ‘stand forth’ and *jön* ‘come’ are used in quote-presentational quotative constructions. Both verbs appear in one and the same type of QI-clause, consisting of elements pointing to the following quote like the endophoric pronoun *azzal* ‘DEM.D-COM’, or NPs encoding the source of RD in the comitative case, e.g. *a szöveggel* ‘with the text’. Thus, NPs contribute to the depiction of the event behind the RD, which often remains vague without the context. MVs are usually interpreted in the QI-clause as specific SVs with meaning ‘claim, present’ and the RD is depicted as new information. Nonetheless, the precise meaning of the verb can be defined mainly from the context and the content of RD, more than it can be assigned universally to all cases where *jön* and *előáll* are used in the quotative domain. Nonetheless, strong support for paraphrasing these verbs in quotative constructions with SVs can be proposed from the standpoint that QI-clauses with *előáll* and *jön* introduce quotations of speech only, both real and fictional. These verbs do not occur with quotations of thought.

Furthermore, outside the quotative domain, the two MVs can also be used with the meaning acquired in quotative constructions, if they are accompanied, similarly to their use in QI-clauses, by the endophoric pronoun or NPs in the comitative case. Therefore, they can be basically defined as quasi-QVs. Even though they are restricted to a limited number of quotative constructions, their use outside the quotative domain shows that within the current structure they have already acquired the SV-meaning not only in RD-constructions but also outside of them.

In addition to this type of construction, the MV *jön* can also be used in similar QIs as in Finnish and Estonian. In such a QI, *jön* appears with NPs in the nominative case and simply depicts the transition process of RD from its source to the addressee. *Előáll* seems to be restricted to the use with animate NPs encoding the speaker.

Inchoative verbs are observed in more or less systematic use in Hungarian quotative constructions only. They are used in an identical structure as the above MVs *előáll* and *jön*, accompanied by the endophoric pronoun *azzal* ‘DEM.D.COM’ or NPs in the comitative case. They function as elements indicating the start of



the speech act. Outside this type of construction, they are not observed in systematic use.

The category of equational verbs is attested in Finnish and Estonian QIs only. In quotative constructions, the equational verbs (Fin. *olla*, Est. *olema*, both meaning ‘be’) function as dummy verbs, establishing a predicative structure in the QI-clause. As such, they do not function as quote-introducers, but they acquire this meaning in co-occurrence with originally non-reportative elements that have already grammaticalized into quotative markers. Semantically, equational verbs remain meaningless for the depiction of the event behind RD; therefore, the whole QI with equational verbs is quote-oriented. Additional overtones, e.g. EHF, epistemic support, etc., are expressed exclusively by non-reportative elements accompanying equational verbs. The verb *per se* only contributes to event-neutralization in the QI, which without context leads to the lack of difference between different types of RD.

NSVs occurring in QIs among the languages are summarized in Table 15. Already grammaticalized verbs are accompanied by the index “1”, while the index “2” stands for elements not yet grammaticalized. The stages of grammaticalization are differentiated according to the following principle. If the verb has already acquired a quotative meaning and is no longer associated with its original function in QIs, then it was considered already grammaticalized, and therefore it is accompanied by the index “1”. If the meaning and functions of the verb are still relevant in quotative constructions, then it is not yet grammaticalized, and the index “2” is therefore used. The tag MV stands for motion verbs; IV is used for inchoative verb; EQV is reserved for equational verbs.

Table 15. Non-speech verbs in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages

| Languages | Non-speech verbs                                       |
|-----------|--|
| Hungarian | 1. MV1: <i>előáll, jön</i><br>2. –<br>3. IV2           |
| Finnish   | 1. MV2: <i>tulla</i><br>2. EQV1: <i>olla</i><br>3. –   |
| Estonian  | 1. MV2: <i>tulema</i><br>2. EQV1: <i>olema</i><br>3. – |

To sum up, the above subclasses of NSVs used as quotative markers are not unique for Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian. NSVs denoting motion and inchoative processes are sometimes employed in QIs cross-linguistically as a summary in Buchstaller & Van Alphen (2012) shows. Semantically, such verbs can either remain functionally transparent or lose their meaning and grammaticalize into genuine quote-introducers that are not used outside the quotative domain. Among the three languages, all NSVs are still used outside the quotative domain; however,

all of them occupy a niche in quotative constructions and appear in QIs where their original meanings become conveniently employed. MVs can encode either transition processes of RD, or acquire new meanings as markers reporting new information, as *jön* and *előáll* in Hungarian. Even though the two Hungarian MVs are still used outside the quotative domain, in quotative constructions they acquire specific meaning and can even be used outside reportative contexts with SV-meanings. Inchoative verbs, in turn, transparently depict inchoative processes in the production of original utterances presented as reported.

As for equational verbs, these markers are employed for syntactic reasons, rather than for quote-introducing. Thus, they appear in the languages that require the presence of a verb for establishing a predicative structure in a QI. The use of equational verbs in QIs is also not unique. One can think of languages like English, which employs the equational verb *be* with some NQs, e.g. *like*, *all*. Similarly, in Finnish and Estonian, equational verbs are accompanied by NQs in event-neutralized constructions, where in some languages (e.g. Russian or Hungarian) one could expect a mere ellipsis of the speech or epistemic verb from the QI-clause, not occupied by any other dummy verb.

#### **5.1.1.3. NPs encoding the source of reported discourse in quotative indexes**

Similarly to SEVs, NPs encoding the source of RD (e.g. ‘text’, ‘message’, ‘notification’, ‘idea’, etc.) are used in QIs as elements either depicting the event behind RD or encoding the original speaker (in self-quotations also the reporter). A semantic motivation for employment of the first subclass of NPs in QIs is transparent, and I can hardly contribute anything to the description of these elements as quote-introducers. Structurally, these elements are prone to co-occurring with different types of semantically reportative and non-reportative markers. In Finnish and Estonian, they are used together with motion verbs, complementizers and some NQs. In Hungarian, instead of NQs, grammaticalized quotative markers and the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ are used with such NPs. In Permic, type demonstratives, complementizers and grammaticalized quotative markers form QIs with the NPs.

As for NPs encoding the speaker/reporter, these elements are quite interesting in participant-oriented non-clausal QIs. In the rest of the quotative constructions, they are either explicitly expressed, or can remain elliptic, since the speaker is also marked on the verb by personal endings. In Hungarian, besides non-clausal use of these elements, in general, one can observe them in turn-taking quotative constructions, syntactically either more complex (e.g. ‘upon this I said/thought’) or reduced to the presentation of participants (‘upon this I: ..., whereupon (s)he: ...’). Turn-taking quotative constructions indicate the reported speaker and separate turns with RD belonging to different quoted speakers if such appear within one text. In principle, such turn-taking constructions are not unique in Hungarian, and can also be observed among the rest of the languages. However,

in Hungarian, they appear more or less systematically, while in other languages, they might be peculiar to either specific registers or context, e.g. narratives containing reported dialogues.

#### 5.1.1.4. Complementizers in quotative indexes

As specified in 1.6.2.3, in this study, I concentrate on the relationship between the QI as a whole and the RD and therefore do not consider RD as an object argument of a core-predicate in the QI. The term *complementizer* is employed merely for convenience and refers to grammaticalized function words which are adjacent to the quote and are used outside the quotative domain in contexts subsumed under sentential complementation.

Among the five languages, complementizers are mainly used as parts of a bipartite QI placed on the border position between QI and RD. Most typically, the first part of a bipartite QI consists of SEVs, or NPs indicating the original source of RD. Only in Udmurt, where the complementizer *šuyša* ‘that’ is used in its original function as a converb of the SV meaning ‘saying’, the marker can appear with various kinds of proper NSVs, contributing nothing to the depiction of the event behind the RD or introduction of the RD. Thus, *šuyša* appears as a non-finite element exclusively carrying out quotative functions. In other languages, complementizers are typically bound to reportative elements, and therefore, are often complementary elements in QIs.

Furthermore, in Udmurt and Komi, besides autochthonous complementizers, replicated Russian complementizers are also used in quotative constructions. In Komi, only the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* ‘that’ is replicated into Komi-Permyak. In Komi-Zyrian, preference is given to the form *myj* ‘that’. *Myj* is a pattern replication from the Russian complementizer *čto* ‘that’, i.e. Russian *čto* and Komi *myj* are originally interrogative pronouns meaning ‘what’ and employed as complementizers. In Udmurt, both the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* ‘that’ and the epistemic complementizer *budto* ‘as if, like’ are used in quotative constructions. Thus, the epistemic complementizer *budto*, besides marking the border between QI and RD, also contributes to the epistemic evaluation of the quote. Most frequently, it marks the quote as reproduced approximately; in other cases, it can also present the quote as hypothetical. Both connotations appear in the use of the marker due to its originally similitive meaning. Framed by the QI with *budto*, the RD is presented either as *resembling* the original utterance or thought (approximately reproduced quotations), or *as if* it occurred in the described circumstances (hypothetical quotations). As for the epistemically neutral complementizer *čto*, it is used similarly to the autochthonous epistemically neutral complementizers. The only structural difference can be observed in Udmurt, where the autochthonous complementizer has the broadest distribution due to its originally reportative meaning, while the replicated complementizer *čto* and the combination of Russian *čto* and autochthonous *šuyša*

are restricted to some of the constructions, showing preference to one or several types of verbs.

Furthermore, a syntactic difference can be observed between the autochthonous and the replicated complementizers. *Šuysa* is a clause-final complementizer, while *čto* appears in the position preceding the RD. Therefore, in addition to the mere use of either the autochthonous or the replicated marker, one can observe the constructions where both markers coincide within one RD-construction. *Čto* opens the clause containing RD, while *šuyasa* marks its end or splits the multi-part RD into parts. This construction is used as an intermediate strategy appearing due to the change of basic word order in Udmurt from SOV to SVO, the endpoint of which is the mere use of the clause-initial complementizer *čto* instead of clause-final *šuyasa* (see summary in 5.2.1.2).

In Finnish and Estonian, besides SEVs, the complementizers can be used with equational verbs in event-neutralized QIs (see 5.1.1.2). Moreover, in Estonian the complementizer *et* can appear as a single quote-introducer. Thus, in both languages, the complementizers have been involved in grammaticalization processes in the quotative domain. As a result, they now show development towards genuine quote-introducers. Although they do not contribute semantically to different evaluative processes (e.g. epistemic support, approximate reproduction of the quote, etc.), their structural appearance shows that the complementizers can be used with various types of RD.

In Hungarian, the complementizer *hogy* does not show a significant qualitative degree in grammaticalization; however, it can still be used as a single quote-introducer in limited contexts. Thus, where an SV and an NP encoding original speaker can be retrieved from the context, *hogy* can appear as the only element in the QI. Besides the structural simplification of the QI, *hogy* is used in a majority of the bipartite QIs attested in this language, functioning as a quote-orienter placed on the border position between QI and RD. Specific evaluational connotations potentially expressed by the marker have not been observed in its use in the quotative domain.

Table 16 summarizes the complementizers used in the QIs of the languages. The following tags are applied to show different degrees in grammaticalization and reflect their functional capacities: COMP is applied to basic quote-orienters used with reportative elements only; QUOT/COMP is applied to the markers that can be used as quote-orienters in constructions with and without reportative elements; SIM2 reflects the simulative semantics of the marker and its low degree in grammaticalization (further also used for SIMs in 5.1.1.6).

Table 16. Complementizers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages

| Languages | Complementizers   |
|-----------|---|
| Udmurt    | 1. COMP: <i>čto</i><br>2. QUOT/COMP: <i>šuyša</i><br>3. COMP.SIM2: <i>budto</i> |
| Komi      | 1. COMP: <i>čto, myj</i><br>2. –<br>3. –  |
| Hungarian | 1. COMP(/ <sup>o</sup> QUOT <sup>109</sup> ): <i>hogy</i><br>2. –<br>3. –       |
| Finnish   | 1. –<br>2. QUOT/COMP: <i>et(tä)</i><br>3. –                                     |
| Estonian  | 1. –<br>2. QUOT/COMP: <i>et</i><br>3. –   |

To sum up, among the five languages, only the Finnish and Estonian complementizers show a significant development in the quotative domain. In Permic, the complementizers are only used as basic quote-orienters in constructions with reportative elements. The only exception is the Udmurt complementizer *šuyša*, which parallel to its use as a complementizer, preserves its original functions as the converb of the SV *šuyŋy* ‘say’, meaning ‘saying’. That said, *šuyša* can be used in constructions with non-reportative elements; however, it does not lead to the use of the marker as a single quote-introducer in non-clausal constructions. As for Hungarian, the complementizer *hogy* is also typically bound to reportative elements. Only in rare occasions can it be used as a non-clausal QI. All attested complementizers, besides the Russian epistemic complementizer *budto* in Udmurt, do not express any additional connotations in the quotative domain and present the quote without additional meanings. The complementizer *budto* functions similarly to Russian, and due to its similitive semantics, it can present quotes as either approximately reproduced or hypothetical in Udmurt.

#### 5.1.1.5. Quotative particles in quotative indexes

By the term *quotative particles*, I discuss grammaticalized markers indicating the presence of RD. Therefore, here I review not only proper particles, i.e. morphemes without word status (often clitic), but also originally adverbial markers that, similarly to particles, appear in the quotative domain as a noninflectional part of

<sup>109</sup> A mere quotative function is observed only in restricted context and does not show general tendency.

speech carrying out quotative functions (on the characteristics and functional aspects of particles, see e.g. Zwicky 1985). For convenience, the term particle is applied to all elements discussed in this subsection.

Among the five languages, the category of quotative particles is observed in Permic languages and Hungarian only. Of course, one can find reported evidential markers in both Finnish (e.g. *kuulemma* ‘allegedly, reportedly’) and Estonian (e.g. *väidetavalt* ‘allegedly’) which might be subsumed under the category of quotative particles. However, in this study I differentiate the quotative and the reported evidential domains (see 1.5.3); therefore, these markers are not included in this study. Only the originally reported evidential marker *állítólag* ‘allegedly’ in Hungarian is discussed here, since it can still be used as a quasi-quotative marker, restricted to one type of quotative construction.

As pointed out in 1.6.2.4, quotative particles can be divided into semantically reportative, i.e. historically deriving from SVs mainly, and originally non-reportative grammaticalized quotative markers. A clear-cut between the two different types can be observed on the basis of the Finno-Ugric languages. Namely, Hungarian employs quotative particles that derive from SVs, while in Udmurt and Komi, semantically non-reportative quotative particles are primarily used. In addition, in Udmurt one can observe the use of Russian quotative particles, historically deriving from SVs.

Furthermore, in Permic one can differentiate quotative particles from self-quotative ones. Thus, in Udmurt and Komi the particles *pöj* and *miša*, exclusively used in self-quotative constructions, can be functionally distinguished from the particles *pe* and *pö*, used to present quotations produced by a source of consciousness different from the current reporter. In Komi, this distinction is made on the level of literary standards; in Udmurt, however, the self-quotative particle *pöj* is used in some dialects only and on the level of literary standard it is not employed. In standard Udmurt, its functions are carried out by the quotative particle *pe*, introducing both self-quotations and quotations (see 1.5.2). In Hungarian, one can also observe the use of the self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’. Although I prefer to refer to *mondom/mondok* as a self-quotative marker, in principle, it represents an inflected SV with broader functions, rather than a quotative particle. Therefore, I do not discuss it in this subsection (for more details, see 5.1.1.1).

Structurally, the majority of the quotative markers are used in more complex constructions, as well as in non-clausal QIs. That said, the latter use shows that the quotative particles are functionally capable of introducing RD on their own without being accompanied by other reportative elements, i.e. SEVs or NPs indicating the original source of RD. However, the latter is not excluded. In this respect, the Hungarian quasi-quotative particle *állítólag* ‘allegedly’ should be discussed separately from the rest, since in the quotative domain it is used as a quasi-quotative particle only as a non-clausal QI.

In principle, *állítólag* can also co-occur with QI-clauses consisting of SEVs, and NPs indicating the original source of RD. However, in such constructions, *állítólag* is used as an epistemic particle or as a reported evidential marker but

not as a quotative marker. Therefore, I do not take into account the use of the marker in more complex quotative constructions. In its use as a quasi-quotative, *állítólag* is usually followed by a separate syntagm, specifying the event behind the RD. Without this contextual specification, *állítólag* can function as a reported evidential only. Thus, it presents hearsay, which differs from usual quotes at least on the level of the source of the report that remains unspecified in the case of reported evidential meaning (see 1.5.3). In contrast to it, in its quasi-quotative use, the event behind RD is specified, although *állítólag* still preserves the partial support as a reported evidential or epistemic marker. Thus, the reporter distances themselves from the presented quote and indicates that (s)he doubts the truthfulness of its content. As for different types of RD, the quasi-quotative *állítólag* is observed introducing speech reports only. Functional restrictions to one type of RD can be explained from the standpoint of its original reported evidential meaning. Thus, as a quasi-quotative and reported evidential marker, *állítólag* frames parts of the discourse that derive from previously produced speech, but not epistemic processes or hypothetical quotations. Similar functional restrictions can be observed in the use of the quotative particles *pe* and *pöj* in Permian, discussed below. However, in contrast to *állítólag*, the Permian quotative particles can still introduce quotations of thought.

The rest of the Hungarian quotative particles are prone to co-occurrence with other reportative elements. Only the quotative particle *a(s)zongya* co-occurs with different elements without any restriction, since it has grammaticalized into a general quotative marker, pointing to the presence of different types of RD. However, the use of the marker with different types of RD is inclined by the reporter's and contextual motivations, rather than considered peculiar to this marker. Thus, if the reporter aims to depict a hypothetical quotation, *a(s)zongya*, in general, can be used, although it does not mark the quote *per se* as hypothetical. Same goes for quotations of thoughts. In principle, if any other (reportative) element in the QI does not explicitly point to one type of RD, the context can be used as only a robust index specifying the type of RD by providing information about the situation in which the RD is produced and its participants. In turn, this might provide additional information whether the quote was actually produced as an utterance, thought or entirely fictional; however, the opposite scenario where the RD remains open to various interpretations is not excluded either.

Furthermore, *a(s)zongya* can be used with both approximately and exactly reproduced RD. The latter can be observed in contexts where the reporter presents verbatim quotes, which might have been copied from the original source and pasted into the immediate discourse. Thus, *a(s)zongya* merely indicates the presence of RD, without specifying the event behind RD. The original semantics of the marker deriving from the SV does not contribute much to the event where the SV-reading could be relevant only functionally. Thus, the marker is used as a quote-oriented QI, making the presence of a quote but not specifying the event behind it. Note that a similar situation can be observed in the use of the quotative particle *pe* in Udmurt, discussed further below. As for approximately reproduced quotes, the marker indicates that the quoted material might differ from the original

discourse. However, these meanings should be separately studied for each example where *a(s)zongya* is used, since, similarly to the presentation of different types of RD, additional meanings depend on the reporter's and contextual motivations.

The quotative particles *úgymond* and *mondván*, in turn, preserve SV-semantics and are likely to be used mainly introducing quotations of speech. As for the quotative particle *úgymond*, it has undergone several grammaticalization stages, and in contemporary Hungarian is mainly used as a discourse marker without reportative functions, meaning 'so to say/speak', 'it can be said'. In the quotative domain, it still presents quotations of speech, both real and fictional. In its use with real quotes, one can observe approximative evaluation of the presented quote. Thus, by using *úgymond* the reporter points to some inconsistency between the quoted and the original discourse. As for hypothetical quotations, the reporter usually frames parts of discourse as reported, although they are unlikely to originate from real utterances, and are rather presented as such in the given contexts. The quotative particle *mondván* differs from the above Hungarian quotative particles since structurally it is primarily used with non-reportative verbs or as a single quote-introducer. It refers only to speech events and presents them without additional connotations.

In Udmurt and Komi, a functional restriction can be observed in the use of the quotative particles *pe* and *pö*. The quotative particles can introduce quotations of both speech and thought, although with hypothetical quotations they are used rather rarely and in pragmatically specific contexts. I have proposed a hypothesis that this functional restriction occurs due to the reported evidential function also carried out by these markers (compare with *állítólag* above). Thus, it seems that *pe* and *pö* are restricted to the presentation of speech and thought that has previously occurred, but not hypothetical quotations that are fictional. A similar restriction can be observed in the use of reported evidentials that can primarily report previously produced, but not fictional discourse. The latter is pragmatically realized mainly during specific context-motivated circumstances, e.g. make-believe reports, imitations, etc. (see e.g. Aikhenvald 2004: 178ff.).

Framed by the quotative particles *pe* and *pö*, the quoted material is usually presented in summarized form. Therefore, the quotative particle points to some inconsistency between the quoted material and the original discourse. In addition, the quotative particle *pe* in Udmurt can pragmatically express epistemic support. Thus, *pe* can be used with quotations containing doubtful information from the reporter's standpoint. Furthermore, in some contexts, it can also frame verbatim quotations. Such a use of the marker can be peculiar to internet communications where the reporter tends to quote each other by merely copying and pasting the quoted material (see above on the similar use of *a(s)zongya* in Hungarian). Therefore, it would be interesting to see whether the marker can be used with verbatim quotations also in other genres outside new media texts, which yet remains to be studied. Based on my investigations in Komi text collections (Uotila 1985, 1989), such a function has not been noted in the use of the marker in various dialects of Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak. The Komi functional



correspondent *pö*, in turn, has not been observed with verbatim quotes either. Based on my investigations in Komi text collections (Uotila 1985, 1989), such function has not been noted among the use of the marker in various dialects of Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak. Usually, *pö* frames the quote and indicates that it is produced approximately. Only the reporter's slight doubt in the content of the quoted material can be observed where *pö* appears. Since non-reportative markers usually marking the quote as produced approximately or indicating epistemic support are not employed in Komi internet communications, such a function might be considered peculiar to the quotative particle *pö* in this text genre.

As for the self-quotative particles *pöj* and *miša*, restriction to one type of RD is not observed. In contexts where an event is not explicitly specified, i.e. the self-quotative particles appear as single quote-introducers, RD can be interpreted variously: from quotations of speech and thought to hypothetical discourse. Furthermore, subjectivity can be observed in the use of self-quotative particles, since the choice of reported content is governed merely by the reporter him-/herself. Thus, the quoted material may be rephrased, presented in summarized form, or reinterpreted merely according to immediate conversational or the current reporter's motivations.

Furthermore, in Udmurt, besides the autochthonous quotative particles, one can observe the use of the Russian quotative particles *mol* and *deskat'*. Both markers historically derive from SVs, i.e. *mol* < *molvit'* 'utter', *deskat'* < *skazat'* 'say'. *Deskat'* shows a restricted use in Udmurt written speech, since it has been observed only once in the idiolect of one speaker. However, even on the basis of this example, similarities between its use in Russian and Udmurt can be pointed out. Namely, the marker was used as a single quote-introducer presenting a hypothetical quotation. In Russian, *deskat'* is frequently used in similar structural conditions where the reporter rather assumes what the quoted speaker could have said/thought than presenting quotations close to their originals (see 2.4.2). As for the quotative particle *mol*, it is better integrated into Udmurt and can be observed in various structural complexities among several idiolects. Similarly to Russian, in Udmurt, *mol* is used with quotations reproduced more or less close to an original utterance, although in a summarized form, and with hypothetical quotations, not attributed to a concrete speaker. Thus, the quotative particle preserves the additional connotations in the recipient language, i.e. presents approximately reproduced quotes or marks them as hypothetical.

Table 17 summarizes the quotative particles used in QIs of the five Finno-Ugric languages. In the table, I apply the tag QUOT to the quotative particles without original reportative semantics and the tag QUOT.SAY to the quotative particles historically deriving from SVs. Furthermore, the additional tag SELF is used for the exclusively self-quotative particles.

Table 17. Quotative particles in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages

| Languages | Quotative particles   |
|-----------|---|
| Udmurt    | 1. QUOT.SAY: <i>mol, d'eskat'</i><br>2. QUOT: <i>pe</i><br>3. QUOT.SELF: <i>pöj</i> |
| Komi      | 1. –<br>2. QUOT: <i>pe</i><br>3. QUOT.SELF: <i>miša</i>                             |
| Hungarian | 1. QUOT.SAY: <i>a(s)zongya, mondván, úgymond, állítólag</i><br>2. –<br>3. –         |

To sum up, in the five languages, quotative particles may express different additional connotations, which derive from their use in various quotative constructions. It is quite compelling that some quotative particles seem to acquire new functions in internet communications, such as verbatim reproduction of original utterances, probably entirely copied from the original source and pasted into the immediate discourse. Others tend to preserve additional meanings also expressed by them outside the new media genre, e.g. point to inconsistency between the reported and the original discourse. Furthermore, quotative particles, also used as reported evidentials, are usually restricted to the presentation of speech reports. Their use is typically associated with partial support, or in other words, the reporter's doubt in the content of the reproduced quote. As for the category of self-quotative particles, they can be used with various types of RD, usually representing it with subjectivity overtones, since the reporter quotes his/her previous utterances or thoughts and is not obliged to depict them verbatim or close to the original utterance. Furthermore, it can lead to rephrasing, summarizing or reinterpretation of the quoted material according to the immediate discourse motivations.

#### 5.1.1.6. Similitive markers in quotative indexes

The use of SIMs in the quotative domain has been observed only in three of the five languages, namely in Finnish, Estonian and Udmurt. In all three languages, a pair of SIMs either is used identically, as in Finnish (*niinku* 'like, as if' and *tyyl(ii)(n)* 'in a style, like') and Estonian (*nagu* 'like' and *a la* 'in a style, like'), or show different degrees of grammaticalization, as in Udmurt (autochthonous *kad'* 'like' vs. Russian *t'ipa* 'of a type, like'), and are therefore employed in different quotative constructions. Despite differences between the languages, SIMs, in general, function relatively similarly and express identical connotations. The semantics of the markers, similarly to the above epistemic complementizer *budto* (see 5.1.1.4), allows them to produce the quote either as approximately reproduced or as hypothetical. In addition, the reporter may additionally express

lower commitment towards the content of the quote. Thus, in such contexts, SIMs carry out the EHF that is realized in distancing by the reporter from the original utterance. Hypothetical quotations, in turn, can function in discourse as a means to depict habitual circumstances, typifying a group of people or an individual, rather than quoting a concrete speaker in a particular situation.

The Finnish and Estonian SIMs, as well as the Russian SIM *tipa* in Udmurt can appear as parts of more complex QIs and as single quote-introducers. The latter shows that in colloquial speech, the markers have already established quotative functions and they do not require the presence of semantically reportative markers. When the SIMs co-occur with reportative elements, they highlight that (i) the quote is produced approximately, (ii) it is a hypothetical quotation, or (iii) rather a habitual depiction of someone's feelings, attitude, point of view, etc. The latter can be observed more or less frequently in the use of the markers with non-propositional RD.

As single quote-introducers or, as in the case of Finnish and Estonian event-neutralized QIs, the difference between types of RD becomes vague. Only based on the context one can point out an exact type of RD. In Finnish and Estonian, event-neutralized QIs with equational verbs are sometimes used intentionally. Thus, the reporter leaves the event behind RD unspecified and can frame the RD as if it was uttered in the non-immediate discourse, although in reality it was just intended and actually never said. Similarly, the use of the markers as single quote-introducers becomes a convenient tool in framing hypothetical quotations, not attributed to a concrete speaker.

In principle, the autochthonous SIM *kad'* 'like' in Udmurt carries out similar functions, as the SIM *tipa*, replicated from Russian, or its Finnish and Estonian counterparts. Thus, *kad'* frames the RD as approximately reproduced or hypothetical. A difference, however, is observed in the structural use of *kad'* which is obligatorily bound to SEVs. Therefore, one can conclude that in contrast to its counterparts, it has not yet grammaticalized into a genuine quote-introducer. This might also serve as an explanation of the replication of the Russian SIM *tipa* into Udmurt. *Tipa* has already become conventionalized in colloquial Russian. In Udmurt, it is also used as a more conventionalized NQ with a broader structural distribution, compared to its autochthonous counterpart. The use of *kad'* in similar structural complexities might lead to misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the RD-construction, while *tipa*, frequently used with and without reportative elements in the quotative domain, is already associated with quote-introduction in Russian. As a result, this function of the SIM is carried from Russian into colloquial Udmurt.

The SIMs used in QIs are summarized in Table 18. I use the tag SIM1 for already grammaticalized SIMs and SIM2 for the markers that have not yet grammaticalized into genuine quote-introducers and are accompanied by semantically reportative markers.

Table 18. Similitive markers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages

| Language | Similitive markers                            |
|----------|---|
| Udmurt   | 1. SIM1: <i>t'ipa</i><br>2. SIM2: <i>kad'</i> |
| Finnish  | 1. SIM1: <i>niinku, tyyl(i)n</i><br>2. –      |
| Estonian | 1. SIM1: <i>nagu, a la</i><br>2. –            |

To sum up, two different types of SIMs can be observed. Despite the difference of grammaticalization degrees between them, SIMs function similarly presenting either real quotes reproduced approximately or hypothetical quotations. Separately from this function, by using SIMs the reporter may distance him-/herself from the original utterance and expresses lower commitment towards the content of a quote. Hypothetical quotations, in turn, are used in discourse as a means to depict a situation, a group of speakers or an individual.

#### 5.1.1.7. Demonstratives in quotative indexes

As is indicated in 1.6.2.6, elements with demonstrative semantics are quite typical for quotative constructions. Such a tendency is usually explained through the connection between quotations and demonstrations where they share the semiotic structure, and the theory that quotations are demonstrations embedded in language use (cf. Clark & Gerrig 1990). Among demonstratives, the category of MDs is even considered if not universal, then at least quite widely used in QIs of the world's languages. Therefore, it is of no surprise that demonstratives are observed in QIs of all of the five languages. Among them, three subclasses of demonstratives can be differentiated: (i) demonstrative pronouns (Hung. *ez* 'this' and *az* 'that'), (ii) type deictics (Udm. *tače* 'such.P', *syče* 'such.D'; Ko. *tačöm* 'such.P'), and (iii) MDs (Udm. *tažy* 'so', *ožy* 'thus'; Ko. *tadž(i)* 'so', *sidž* 'thus'; Hung. *így* 'so', *úgy* 'thus'; Fin. *sillee(n)* 'thus'; Est. *nii* 'so').

As one can see, demonstrative pronouns are systematically employed only in Hungarian. In contrast to other languages, Hungarian uses rather a complex quotative construction where SEVs appear as highly transitive. Therefore, demonstrative pronouns are primarily employed as syntactic objects of the core-predicates in quotative constructions. However, as I discuss further, their functions are not restricted to the role of the object in quotative constructions, and both demonstratives also carry out referential functions pointing to the presence of RD. In addition, demonstrative pronouns operate as additional elements in speaker- and quote-presentational constructions that are also briefly reviewed here. Type deictics, in turn, appear with NPs indicating the original source of RD in Udmurt and Komi only. In Udmurt, both proximal and distal elements can be observed, while in Komi, at least in internet communications, only a proximal type deictic

appears in QIs. As for MDs, this category is observed among all of the five languages. As adverbial markers, MDs are mainly accompanied by SEVs. Similarly to the demonstrative pronouns, in all of the languages, they carry out referential functions pointing at the presence of RD. Now, let's take a closer look at each category of demonstratives in QIs.

The Hungarian demonstrative pronouns *ez* and *az* in the accusative case (*ezt*, *azt*) function as syntactic objects of SEVs in QIs. Therefore, their use is primarily restricted to constructions where reportative verbs appear. Besides SEVs, sometimes proper NSVs, e.g. 'sigh', 'laugh', 'sob', etc. (cf. Fónagy 1986), can be re-interpreted in Hungarian quotative constructions as SVs. For this, NSVs usually become highly transitive and require the forms of definite conjugation, meaning 'sighed (it)', 'laughed (it)', etc. The demonstrative pronouns, however, are not interchangeable and follow a specific distribution, established in contemporary Hungarian. The proximal demonstrative *ez* 'this' is used with direct RD only, although referentially it can function as a cataphoric or an anaphoric marker. In contrast, distal *az* 'that' can be used with direct and indirect RDs, although it is restricted to the appearance in preposed QIs only, i.e. carries out cataphoric function only.

Furthermore, the distal demonstrative *az* is also employed as a referential marker in the quote-presentational quotative construction, where usually specific SVs, the two MVs *jön* 'come' and *előáll* 'stand forth', or inchoative verbs are used (see 5.1.1.2 on NSVs and 5.2.1.2 on structural complexities). In contrast to the above QIs, in this type of construction, the demonstrative *az* is predominantly used, and the proximal counterpart appears in it rather marginally. Furthermore, the demonstrative *per se* is not used as a syntactic object, and appears in comitative case – *azzal*, meaning 'with that'. *Azzal* functions as a linking element between the QI and the RD. Referentially, the demonstrative points to the following stretches of RD.

The proximal demonstrative *ez* 'this' is also used in one more quotative construction as a turn-taking demonstrative – *erre*, meaning 'upon this'. This element appears in turn-taking quotative constructions, where the demonstrative expresses reaction of the speaker either to a previously produced utterance or to the previously described situation as a whole. This element can form a QI-clause together with SEVs. Therefore, it can introduce quotations of both speech and thought. Furthermore, it is also observed in non-clausal use either as a participant- or a quote-oriented QI. As a participant-oriented QI, *erre* is accompanied by an NP encoding the speaker. In a non-clausal quote-oriented QI, *erre* is used as a single quote-introducer. In such QIs, the event behind the RD remains under-specified, and various interpretations for the RD can naturally appear.

Type deictics observed in both Permic languages as adnominal markers are adjacent to NPs indicating the original source of RD. Structurally, type deictics are prone to appearing in monoclausal QIs introducing direct RD. Referentially, they point to the presence of RD. As for their use in internet communications, specific preference to either cataphoric or anaphoric reference was not observed. As a result, they can point to the presence of a quote either cata- or anaphorically.

Furthermore, an interesting use of the Udmurt distal type deictic *syče* has been observed. Namely, adnominal *syče* ‘such’ was used in one instance co-occurring together with an SV in a QI-clause. I have proposed that this use of the marker can be a case of pattern replication from Russian, which employs the type deictic *takoj* ‘such.P’ together with SEVs in quotative constructions (see 2.4.3). However, due to the lack of more examples of a similar use of Udmurt type deictics, I have not reached a robust conclusion about the origin of *syče* in this type of construction. As a result, it was marked as an ambiguous case between pattern replication from Russian and an independent development of new functions in the quotative domain of contemporary Udmurt.

The category of MDs in QIs shows four different distributions of these markers in QIs. Primarily, all attested MDs are used as adverbial markers together with SEVs in QIs. However, their referential functions and distributions in various structural complexities differ across languages. For example, in Udmurt, the pair of MDs is distributed according to their use outside the quotative domain. The proximal MD *tažy* is predominantly used pointing at new information. Therefore, it appears more naturally in preposed QIs introducing a following quote. In contrast, the distal MD *ožy* refers to a quote just produced and therefore appears in postposed QIs mainly. However, due to the unidirectional Russian influence on Udmurt, in several idiolects, a less systematic use of MDs can be observed inside and outside the quotative domain. Hence, the markers are used rather interchangeably losing their referential features. As a result, some speakers use the proximal MD where the distal one could have been expected and *vice versa*.

In Komi, a similar distribution of MDs has not been observed. As for internet communications, only the proximal MD *tadž(i)* was observed in QIs either preceding or following the quote. Therefore, at least in this genre, *tadž(i)* is used as the only available option without any restrictions in referential functions. On the basis of the broader corpus material, both the distal and the proximal MDs can be observed in QIs. However, even in a broader corpus, both markers are used without following special distribution in the quotative domain. Only a slight preference to an anaphoric reference in the use of proximal *tadž(i)* and a cataphoric reference in the use of distal *sidž* can be observed on the basis of available examples from outside the new media genre. However, the opposite use (anaphoric for *sidž* and cataphoric for *tadž(i)*) is not excluded. Therefore, I would suggest studying this aspect further on the basis of a broader corpus depicting contemporary spoken Komi or conducting experiments, testing whether MDs show any preference in referential functions or not, which, however, lies outside the scope of the current research.

In Hungarian, the MDs are distributed according to the functions that the markers carry out in contemporary language, which similarly yields a specific preference in referential use of the markers. The use of the proximal MD *így* is interconnected with the use of the marker in mimetic expressions. Thus, when a Hungarian speaker tends to demonstrate something, the proximal MD can be used to point to the demonstration. Consequently, in quotative constructions *így* is used introducing direct RD only. However, QIs with *így* are not restricted to one position

in an RD-construction and can appear in pre-, post- or intraposition to the quote. Furthermore, demonstrative capacities of *így* allow the marker to be used in quasi-quotative constructions, where the reporter interprets someone's gestures or moves with words. In addition, *így* appears in QIs where an SEV is elliptic. Ellipsis of a verb from a QI does not lead to the use of the marker with different types of RD, and in such a structural complexity it is observed introducing speech reports only. The distal MD *úgy*, in turn, appears in RD-constructions where the content of a quote is described rather than demonstrated. Thus, it can be used with both direct and indirect RD. The restriction can be observed in the position of a QI-clause with *úgy*, which can be used only as a preposed QI. Note the similarity between the pair of demonstrative pronouns (see above) and MDs in Hungarian quotative constructions: proximal elements are used with direct RD but are not restricted to one position within the RD-construction, while distal elements introduce direct and indirect RD but are restricted to preposed QIs.

In Finnish and Estonian, a different distribution of MDs (Fin. *sillee(n)* 'thus', Est. *nii (et)* 'so (that)') in quotative constructions can be observed. Namely, both MDs are predominantly used as cataphoric markers in preposed QIs only. Besides SEVs, similarly to other NQs in these languages, MDs form a QI-clause together with equational verbs. In Estonian, two further stages of event-neutralization can be observed. In one stage, the MD *nii* is accompanied by the complementizer *et* in structural complexities with the equational verb where the speaker is not specified at all, e.g. '(it) is so that X'. Furthermore, the collocation *nii et* is used as a single quote-introducing element, e.g. 'so that X'. These structures are conveniently employed in RD-constructions with hypothetical quotations since the quotes are not attributed to concrete speakers. The Finnish MD *sillee(n)* has not been observed in such structural complexities; however, similarly to *nii (et)*, it can also introduce hypothetical quotations. Thus, I do not exclude the possibility of its appearance in further neutralized QIs, since such structural complexities, in general, require a rather specific context that is not always frequent in discourse and is not obviously retrievable in internet communications. In addition, the MD *sillee(n)* was observed in constructions containing mimetic expressions, realized online with the use of emoticons. This type of constructions was considered quasi-quotative, since similarly to RD-constructions, they demonstrate the non-immediate discourse situation (see 1.5.1). Difference between two types of constructions can only be observed on the level of means, used in two types of demonstrations. If in quotations, verbal means are used to demonstrate someone's previous utterances, mimetic expressions rely on non-verbal instruments, e.g. gestures, moves, or in internet communications – emoticons, memes, gifs<sup>110</sup>, etc.

Table 19 summarizes the demonstrative elements used in QIs of the five languages. The tag DEM is reserved for demonstrative pronouns. The tag TD is employed for type deictics, while the tag MD is used for manner deictics. Similarly to the glossing abbreviations in previous chapters, the tags P and D are employed

---

<sup>110</sup> Gif (Graphic Interchange Format) is "a type of computer file that contains a still or moving image" (dictionary.cambridge.org).

to show whether a demonstrative is proximal or distal, respectively. As in some of the tables above, the index “1” is used for already grammaticalized QIs, while “2” is employed for markers not yet grammaticalized.

Table 19. Demonstratives in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages

| <b>Languages</b> | <b>Demonstratives</b>   |
|------------------|---|
| Udmurt           | 1. –<br>2. Manner deictics:<br>a. MD2.P: <i>tažy</i><br>b. MD2.D: <i>ožy</i><br>3. Type deictics:<br>a. TD2.P: <i>tače</i><br>b. TD2.D: <i>syče</i>       |
| Komi             | 1. –<br>2. Manner deictics:<br>a. MD2.P: <i>tadž(i)</i><br>b. MD2.D: <i>sidž</i><br>3. Type deictics:<br>a. TD2.P: <i>tačõm</i><br>b. –                   |
| Hungarian        | 1. Demonstrative pronouns:<br>a. DEM2.P: <i>ez</i><br>b. DEM2.D: <i>az</i><br>2. Manner deictics:<br>a. MD1.P: <i>így</i><br>b. MD2.D: <i>úgy</i><br>3. – |
| Finnish          | 1. –<br>2. Manner deictics:<br>a. –<br>b. MD1.D: <i>sillee(n)</i><br>3. –   |
| Estonian         | 1. –<br>2. Manner deictics:<br>a. MD1.P: <i>nii</i><br>b. –<br>3. –   |



To sum up, despite the differences in the types of demonstratives used in quotative constructions of the languages, in principle, one can notice that the use of the markers is connected to the referential functions that these markers carry out in the quotative domain. Thus, demonstratives primarily point to the presence of the quote, either anaphorically or cataphorically. In Komi, special distribution according to referential functions has not been observed. In Udmurt, only MDs are governed by the meanings and functions expressed by the markers outside the quotative domain. In Hungarian, both types of demonstratives follow similar considerations and are distributed according to the types of RD and the position within RD-constructions. As for Finnish and Estonian, similarly to other NQs, MDs are used as parts of preposed QIs, co-occurring with different types of verbs – speech, epistemic and equational. In non-clausal use, they are likely to be used with hypothetical quotations, not attributed to concrete speakers.

#### 5.1.1.8. Quantifiers in quotative indexes

Similarly to the elements with similitive or demonstrative semantics, quantifiers are employed as NQs in the world's languages. Among the five languages, only in Finnish and Estonian, systematic use of quantifiers has been observed in quotative constructions. It is quite interesting that quantifiers from both ends of the quantificational scale can be observed in both languages simultaneously. Thus, in Finnish the maximalistic quantifier *ihan* 'totally' and minimalistic *vaa(n)* 'just' are used as parts of QIs, while in Estonian the maximalistic quantifier *täiega* 'completely' appears parallel to the minimalistic *lihtsalt* 'simply'. A hypothesis proposed in my previous research (Teptiuk 2015, 2019) about the influence of different languages on the choice of different quantifiers in two Finnic languages seems to be rather doubtful and most likely will not be confirmed. Previously, I have assumed that only the minimalistic quantifier is used in Finnish similarly to the Swedish quantifier *ba(ra)* 'just', employed as a quotative marker in colloquial Swedish. In Estonian, in turn, the maximalistic quantifier *täiega* might have appeared under the influence of German or English, employing maximalistic quantifiers (Ger. *voll* 'fully', Eng. *all*) in quotative constructions. However, since both Finnish and Estonian simultaneously employ the pair of quantifiers in the quotative domain, their appearance in quotative constructions can be explained as independent development rather than contact-induced change, leaving the use of semantically opposite counterparts, i.e. Fin. *ihan* 'totally' and Est. *lihtsalt* 'simply', unnoticed.

As for maximalistic quantifiers, in both languages, a restricted use of the markers was observed. In Finnish, the quantifier *ihan* still can be observed in QI-clauses with main types of verbs, i.e. speech, epistemic and equational. In Estonian, however, the quantifier *täiega* is used as a proper quote-introducer only in one example together with the equational verb *olema* 'be'. In one more example, it functions as a modifier of an SV, rather than exclusively carrying out quote-introducing functions. Its relatively rare use can be explained by a general decline

of its appearance in quotative constructions or its rare use in the quotative domain in new media texts. Further studies using different type of data should be carried out to provide a more exact explanation for its occasional use in quotative constructions on SNS.

In both languages, maximalistic quantifiers are likely to be used in contexts where the reporter presents the quote as first-hand information. Therefore, the appearance of both markers is likely to be observed introducing self-quotations. Furthermore, in colloquial Estonian the quantifier *vapsee/vabsee*, replicated from Russian *vobščē* ‘completely’, is sometimes used in quotative constructions. However, based on the available examples from the new media genre, it can be concluded that the marker is used as an additional element of a QI-clause, expressing overtones of commitment or emotional involvement, rather than functions as a proper quote-introducer. Thus, since *vabsee/vapsee* shows quite a restricted distribution in the quotative domain, I did not pay extra attention to its use. The quantifier *voobščē* was also noted in similar use in colloquial Udmurt. However, similarly to Estonian, its broader distribution has not been observed. Therefore, it was excluded from further discussions, although the possibility of its occurrence was, nonetheless, acknowledged.

Minimalistic quantifiers, in turn, are used in broader contexts. Besides the presentation of quotes with a minimal commitment towards their accuracy and content, which was observed in previous studies (Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012: XVI; also see 1.6.2.7), the minimalistic quantifiers *vaa(n)* ‘just’ and *lihtsalt* ‘simply’ can introduce a quote with emotional involvement. Thus, by using such quantifiers the reporter highlights the conversational peak after which the quote follows. Similar instances are also observed among these types of markers in other languages (see e.g. Hasund *et al.* 2012 for the description of the minimalistic quantifier *bare* ‘just, only’ in Norwegian quotative constructions). Structurally, both minimalistic quantifiers are also used with different types of verbs. In addition, in more rare contexts Finnish *vaa(n)* can be used as a single quote-introducer. Event-neutralization can be employed as a convenient tool in emotionally-charged contexts where the reporter leaves the distinction between different types of RD underspecified. Thus, RD can be interpreted as something that was said or thought, simultaneously. Furthermore, the reporter can present RD containing quotation of thoughts or hypothetical quotations as if they were actually uttered.

Table 20 summarizes the quantifiers used in QIs. In addition to the indexes “1” and “2” marking already and not yet grammaticalized quantifiers, respectively, I employ the tags MAX for quantifiers with maximal quantificational meaning and MIN for quantifiers with minimal quantificational meaning.

Table 20. *Quantifiers in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages*

| <b>Languages</b> | <b>Quantifiers</b>   |
|------------------|--|
| Finnish          | 1. QUANT1.MAX: <i>ihan</i> ;<br>2. QUANT1.MIN: <i>vaa(n)</i> .     |
| Estonian         | 1. QUANT1.MAX: <i>täiega</i> ;<br>2. QUANT1.MIN: <i>lihtsalt</i> . |

To sum up, it can be pointed out that quantifiers with minimal quantificational meanings seem to be employed in more contexts than their maximalistic counterparts. As I have suggested in 4.3.2, the development of both upgrading and downgrading meanings by minimalistic quantifiers might serve as a primary explanation why these markers are more frequently used as parts of QIs or more genuine quote-introducers in the world's languages, when compared to their maximalistic counterparts, mainly employed with the epistemic upgrading meaning. Pragmatically, epistemic downgrading and focusing functions expressed by minimalistic quantifiers can also be considered more salient in quotative constructions compared with the epistemic upgrading meaning, appearing only in some contexts where quotations are depicted.

### **5.1.2. Semantic sources of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages: summary**

In this subsection, the main semantic sources employed in QIs of the five languages are summarized. Table 21 serves as an illustrative summary demonstrating eight semantic classes observed in the languages and their appearance in different structural complexities. In the table, I use the previously proposed tags for the categories. The dash (–) stands for the lack of semantically similar markers used in the quotative domain of the language. In addition, I indicate structural complexities in which these semantic classes appear and which are discussed in detail in 5.2. Where necessary, I specify the type of a QI according to its orientation: the tag EvO is used for event-oriented, QuO for quote-oriented and PartO for participant-oriented QIs. Where orientation is not mentioned, it means that the marker can appear in different types of either monoclausal (event- and quote-oriented) or non-clausal (quote- or participant-oriented) QIs. Bipartite QIs are by default quote-oriented.

Table 21. *Semantic classes and their appearance in different structural complexities in QIs of Finno-Ugric languages*

| Language<br>Semantic source        | Udmurt  | Komi                                | Hungarian   | Finnish  | Estonian   |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Speech and epistemic verbs         | monoclausal, bipartite                              | monoclausal, bipartite              | monoclausal, bipartite  | monoclausal, bipartite   | monoclausal, bipartite   |
| Non-speech verbs                   | –   | –                                   | a) MV1 <i>előáll, jön</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite                      | a) MV2 <i>tulla</i> : monoclausal EvO, bipartite                               | a) MV2 <i>tulema</i> : monoclausal EvO, bipartite                |
|                                    | –   | –                                   | b) –  | b) EQV1 <i>olla</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite                               | b) EQV1 <i>olema</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite                |
|                                    | –   | –                                   | c) IV2: monoclausal QuO, bipartite  | c) –   | c) –   |
| NP's encoding the source of the RD | monoclausal, bipartite                              | monoclausal, bipartite              | monoclausal, bipartite, non-clausal PartO                                   | monoclausal, bipartite, non-clausal PartO                                      | monoclausal, bipartite, non-clausal PartO                        |
| Complementizers                    | a) COMP <i>čto</i> : bipartite                      | a) COMP <i>myj, čto</i> : bipartite | a) COMP <i>hogy</i> : bipartite, non-clausal                                | a) –   | a) –   |
|                                    | b) QUOT/COMP <i>štyša</i> : bipartite               | b) –                                | b) –  | b) QUOT/COMP <i>et(tä)</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite QIs, non-clausal PartO | b) QUOT/COMP <i>et</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal |
|                                    | c) COMP.SIM2 <i>budto</i> : bipartite               | c) –                                | c) –  | c) –   | c) –   |
| Quotative particles                | a) QUOT.SAY <i>mol</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO | a) –                                | a) QUOT.SAY <i>a(s)zongya</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal QuO | –  | –  |
|                                    | b) QUOT.SAY <i>deskat</i> : non-clausal QuO         | b) –                                | b) QUOT.SAY <i>mondván, úgymond</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO            | –  | –  |
|                                    | c) –  | c) –                                | c) QUOT.SAY <i>állítólóg</i> : non-clausal QuO                              | –  | –  |

Table 21. Continuation

| Language<br>Semantic<br>source | Udmurt   | Komi  | Hungarian   | Finnish   | Estonian  |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Quotative particles            | d) QUOT <i>pe</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO       | d) QUOT <i>pö</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO        | d) –  |   |   |
|                                | e) QUOT.SELF <i>pöj</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO | e) QUOT.SELF <i>mísa</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO | e) –  |   |   |
| Similitive markers             | a) SIM1 <i>típa</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO     | –   | –   | a) SIM1 <i>niinku, tyylti(n)</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO             | a) SIM1 <i>nagu, a la</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO          |
|                                | b) SIM2 <i>kad'</i> : bipartite                      | –   | –   | b) –  | b) –  |
| Demonstratives                 | a) –   | a) –  | a) DEM2 <i>az</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite                    | a) –  | a) –  |
|                                | b) –   | b) –  | b) DEM2 <i>ez</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal       | b) –  | b) –  |
|                                | c) MD2 <i>tažy</i> : monoclausal QuO                 | c) MD2 <i>tađž(i)</i> : monoclausal QuO               | c) MD1 <i>így</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal PartO | c) MD1 <i>sillee(n)</i> : bipartite                                       | c) MD1 <i>nii</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal QuO |
|                                | d) MD2 <i>ožy</i> : monoclausal QuO                  | d) –  | d) MD2 <i>úgy</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite                    | d) –  | d) –  |
|                                | e) TD2 <i>taće, syće</i> : monoclausal QuO           | e) TD2 <i>tačóm</i> : monoclausal QuO                 | e) –  | e) –  | e) –  |
| Quantifiers                    | –  | –   | –   | a) QUANT1.MIN <i>vaa(n)</i> : monoclausal QuO, bipartite, non-clausal QuO | a) QUANT1.MIN <i>lihsalt</i> : bipartite, non-clausal QuO       |
|                                |  |   |   | b) QUANT1.MAX <i>ihan</i> : bipartite                                     | b) QUANT1.MAX <i>ítaega</i> : monoclausal QuO                   |

To conclude, among the attested semantic classes, only SEVs, NPs indicating the source of RD in a broader sense, i.e. covering animate and inanimate NPs, complementizers and demonstratives are found in QIs of all five languages. Nevertheless, their use in different structural complexities is not homogenous and mostly relies on internal grammaticalization processes and preferences in use with different semantically reportative and non-reportative markers (see Section 5.2 for more details). The same principle also holds for the use of other semantic classes, i.e. non-speech verbs, quotative particles, similitive markers, and quantifiers. Thus, each language relies on internal processes that lead to the use of either several originally non-reportative categories or grammaticalized quotative markers that eventually carry out quote-introducing functions.

More or less direct correspondence can be observed among closely related languages. Thus, in Finnish and Estonian, not only similar classes of elements can be observed in quotative constructions, but they are also used in almost identical structural complexities. As for Komi and Udmurt, a significant amount of similarities can be observed in the use of autochthonous quotative particles and some in the choice of demonstrative elements. Only the choice of non-reportative elements and Russian influence makes the Udmurt arsenal of quotative markers larger compared to Komi. However, so far this difference has been observed only in substandard written Komi. Among similar registers in spontaneous oral speech, this situation may be quite different. Hungarian, in turn, as a distantly related language, relies on its own means of quotative constructions, showing only slight similarities with other Finno-Ugric languages, which, of course, can be explained by the lack of contact between them for centuries, and more independent developments in the quotative domain that are still suitable for cross-linguistic comparison between related languages from three different areas.

Although the semantic classes presented in this subsection behave based on their individual development in the languages and similarities are pointed out between closely related languages mainly, one generalisation can still be made. It can be noticed that all markers take part in quote-oriented quotative constructions, either more complex bipartite or non-clausal among several markers. In contrast, event-orientation is mainly carried out by reportative elements and participant-orientation by NPs encoding the original speaker or addressee. More complex quote-oriented bipartite constructions are typically formed by the combination of semantically reportative elements and non-reportative markers that function as quote-orienters. As for the non-clausal quote-oriented markers, only already grammaticalized elements systematically appear in such use. Typically, grammaticalization of such markers is supported by their semantic complexity and polyfunctionality outside the quotative domain. Thus, their meanings and functions outside the quotative domain become prominent in quotative constructions and lead to their systematic use first with reportative elements, further with non-reportative elements, and on the final stage – in non-clausal QIs. Thus, grammaticalisation of the elements in quotative constructions can be observed unidirectionally – from their structural appearance from more to less complex constructions, which, in turn, reflects the shift of the orientation from the event to the

quote among the majority of the markers. The opposite development, i.e. from less complex to more complex and the shift of orientation from quote to event, is not observed.

## **5.2. Structural images of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages**

The main focus of the current research is the description of contemporary quotative strategies in five Finno-Ugric languages. My investigation includes the use of different quotative strategies with three main types of RD, i.e. quotations of speech, thought and hypothetical discourse, as they are defined in 1.5.2. As a starting point of the investigation, I paid attention to basic quotative constructions involving SEVs, semantically denoting speech and epistemic processes. In RD-constructions, these types of verbs signal the presence of quotations of speech and thought, respectively. Furthermore, NPs, indicating an original source of RD, were considered a second category of the probable QIs in basic types of quotative constructions. In principle, such a category already consists of elements semantically loaded as quote-introducers.

Even though semantically reportative elements can already indicate the presence of RD, cross-linguistically they are prone to appearing in more complex quotative constructions, combining with elements with originally non-reportative semantics or other (already grammaticalized) quote-introducers. Thus, I came to the idea to investigate the co-occurrence of originally non-reportative elements and grammaticalized quotative markers with three basic sources for quote-introducers, i.e. speech and epistemic verbs, and NPs indicating the original source of RD.

As is shown in 5.1.1.2, in addition to SEVs, also originally non-reportative verbs fulfill quote-introducing functions in RD-constructions. That said, it appeared logical to consider also QIs where instead of a speech or epistemic verb, one can observe the co-occurrence of proper NSVs or grammaticalized QVs with additional elements, with or without reportative semantics.

One of the further stages in establishing quotative functions typically involves the use of quotative markers as single quote-introducers, i.e. a quotative marker has the potential to indicate the presence of RD without additional elements. Hence, one of the research interests was to track some of the additional elements of complex quotative strategies in non-clausal use. As a result, in addition to basic quotative constructions, I investigated the use of additional elements in the QI with and without reportative semantics in constructions together with (i) SEVs, (ii) NSVs and QVs (both categories with originally non-reportative semantics), and (iii) NPs indicating the original source of RD. Additionally, I investigated their appearance in non-clausal usage where they appear as single quote-introducers.

Besides the above co-occurrences of semantically reportative and non-reportative elements in QI-clauses, in some languages, one can also expect (typically) fossilized quotative constructions that follow a limited number of specific patterns and consist of the quote- or speaker-introducing elements. In 1.6.3, they were introduced by the term *presentational quotative constructions* (PQCs). Although PQCs usually consist of elements encoding the participants and the event behind RD, they mostly depend on internal processes in languages. Therefore, the choice of the elements in these constructions is hardly predictable. However, some common features or tendencies can be observed between two classes of QIs within one language (and sometimes even between typologically different languages without proper language contact): these are presentational quotative constructions together with the co-occurrence of different elements within a QI-clause and uses of semantically non-reportative and grammaticalized quotative markers as single quote-introducers.

In the following, I review the syntactic possibilities in RD-constructions and how they influence the orientation of QIs.

### 5.2.1. Monoclausal (non-partite) quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages

As specified in 1.6.5.1, monoclausal QIs are typically “constituted by a single predicate, possibly accompanied by nominal participants” (Güldemann 2008: 154). They are treated here separately from monoclausal bipartite constructions, and only monoclausal non-partite QIs are discussed in this subsection. Monoclausal bipartite QIs are discussed in 5.2.2. According to their orientation, monoclausal QIs are either event- or quote-oriented. First, let’s revise monoclausal event-oriented QIs, summarized in Table 22. In the tables of the summary, I use the tag *Speaker* to refer to the original speaker. In the self-quoting context, the tag *Reporter* is applied. In case of *Speaker* and *Reporter*, I mention these constituents even in constructions where they can be elliptic from the QI-clause to illustrate a canonical structure of the QI. Only in cases where they are systematically unmarked (e.g. point 3 of the Table 22), I will not apply this tag. The tag NP refers to inanimate NPs encoding the original source of the RD.

Table 22. Monoclausal event-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages

| Structures                   | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 1. Speaker + SEV             | +   | +   | +  | +   | +  |
| 2. NP + ‘come’               | +   | +   | –  | –   | –  |
| 3. ‘say.PRS.1SG(.DEF)’       | –   | –   | –  | –   | +  |
| 4. Turn-taking constructions |     |     |    |     |    |
| 4a. Speaker + TTC + SEV      | –   | –   | –  | –   | +  |
| 4b. TTD + Speaker + SEV      | –   | –   | –  | –   | +  |



The predicate in monoclausal event-oriented QIs is either a speech or epistemic verb denoting the event behind the RD. In all five languages, event-oriented monoclausal QIs are typically defined as basic quotative constructions, mainly introducing direct RD. As it is shown in point 1 of Table 22, the QI-clause is formed by an NP, encoding the source of RD, i.e. the original speaker or a physical source (e.g. ‘message’, ‘notification’, ‘sentence’, etc.), a speech or epistemic verb, and possibly the addressee (logically applied for speech-events only). In principle, I have not paid significant attention to these types of QIs, since they have been previously illustrated in descriptive grammars of the languages and there is little to contribute to the already existing descriptions of these constructions, which are simple in their structural complexity and functionally transparent. In this subsection, I merely mention them without paying separate attention to their individual appearance in the five languages.

Notably, besides this type of QIs, several other event-oriented monoclausal QIs can also be observed. For example, in Hungarian, a basic self-quotative construction involves the use of the SV *mond* in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular present tense (point 3). Unlike the most frequently used quotative construction with SVs, which contains an endophoric demonstrative anaphorically or cataphorically pointing to the presence of the quote (see 5.2.2), the self-quotative construction typically consists of a mere predicate signaling the presence of the quote and denoting the speech event behind the quote. Furthermore, in contrast to the majority of QIs in Hungarian that appear as either preposed or postposed QIs, endophoric elements that typically restrict the position of a QI to pre- or postposition are not adjusted to *mondom/mondok*. Thus, the self-quotative *mondom/mondok* is frequently inserted into RD and functions as an intraposed QI. However, I come back to this point further in Section 5.3. Of course, one can argue whether it is worth separating the self-quotative *mondom/mondok* from other constructions with SEVs in point 1. The motivation behind it lies in the fact that (i) *mondom/mondok* is functionally restricted to self-quoting instances as it logically depicts quotations belonging to the reporters themselves, but (ii) it is not restricted to the depiction of speech events only. Thus, in some contexts, the marker clearly shows a development of new functions and besides its use as a basic event-oriented QI, it can occur as a broader quote-oriented QI, indicating merely the source of a report, namely the reporters themselves. This function is touched upon in the description of the monoclausal quote-oriented QIs further in this subsection.

In addition, the two Hungarian turn-taking constructions can appear as event-orienting QIs (point 4). As I show further, different structural images of the two constructions influence a shift of orientation from the event to the quote (bipartite QIs, see 5.2.2) and participants (non-clausal QIs, see 5.2.3). However, in their basic forms, both QIs are usually formed with SEVs, indicating the event behind the RD. Similarly to the quotative constructions in point 1 of the above table, as monoclausal event-oriented QIs, they are predominantly used with direct RD.

As for Finnish and Estonian, one can also encounter monoclausal QIs with the MV ‘come’ (Fin. *tulla*, Est. *tulema*) that co-occur with NPs encoding the source of RD (point 2). Thus, instead of a verb in the QI-clause denoting the event behind

the RD, the NP carries out this function in the QI-clause. This type of QIs co-occurs with the complementizer *et(tä)*, which is placed on the border position between the QI-clause and the RD. This realization of QI is considered here a *monoclausal bipartite quote-oriented QI* where the second part of the construction is formed by the epistemically neutral complementizer. It is reviewed later together with other bipartite QIs in 5.2.2.

Now let's take a look at monoclausal quote-oriented QIs, summarized here in Table 23.

Table 23. *Monoclausal quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages*

| Structures                                       | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|--|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 1. Speaker + SEV + manner deictic                | +   | -   | +  | +   | +  |
| 2. Speaker + SV + 'such'                         | -   | -   | -  | +   | -  |
| 3. 'such' + NP                                   | -   | -   | +  | +   | -  |
| 4. Speaker + SEV + demonstrative pronoun         | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 5. Equational verb construction                  |     |     |    |     |    |
| 5a. Speaker + equational verb + SIM              | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 5b. Speaker + equational verb + quantifier       | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 5c. Speaker + equational verb + manner deictic   | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 5d. Speaker + equational verb + complementizer   | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 6. 'say.PRS.1SG(.DEF)'                           | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 7. Speaker/NP + 'DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF'            | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 8. Quote-presentational construction             |     |     |    |     |    |
| 8a. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + specific SV     | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 8b. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + 'come'          | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 8c. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + 'stand forth'   | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 8d. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + inchoative verb | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |

The above monoclausal quote-oriented QIs in Table 23 form a single QI-clause consisting of different elements that co-occur with other non-reportative markers or already grammaticalized quote-introducers. Furthermore, the majority of the constructions prefer direct RD over indirect RD. In principle, they can also form a bipartite QI where they are followed by the complementizer which is placed on the border position between the QI-clause and the RD. In contrast to monoclausal quote-oriented QIs, bipartite quote-oriented QIs can accompany both direct and indirect RD. However, I discuss the bipartite QIs further below.

It is quite compelling that in all five languages, monoclausal quote-oriented QIs can be formed with the help of demonstratives pointing to the presence of the RD. Thus, in Udmurt, Komi, Hungarian and Estonian, SEVs are accompanied by MDs that endophorically point at the presence of RD (point 1). In my Komi material, only the proximal MD *tad'z(i)* appears in quotative constructions. How-

ever, data outside the new media genre show that the co-occurrence of this MD with SEVs is, in general, possible.

Furthermore, besides MDs, in Udmurt, I have encountered one instance where the type deictic *syče* ‘such’ was used with an SV, even though type deictics are prone to co-occurring with nominal elements only (point 2). In Udmurt and Komi, NPs marking the source of the RD are used with type deictics (point 3). In Udmurt, both proximal and distal markers co-occur with such NPs, while in Komi only the proximal deictic *tačöm* ‘such (like this)’ was observed. In such constructions, NPs are usually only parts of predicative clauses (e.g. ‘I have such a question’, ‘she received such a notification’, etc.). Due to the irrelevance of verbs in marking RD and their more or less random choice in such constructions, I avoid listing different possible combinations and only concentrate on NPs.

In colloquial Finnish, the MD *sillee(n)* ‘thus’ is also used; however, instead of SEVs, in monoclausal quote-oriented QIs it co-occurs with the equational verb (point 5c). In Finnish and Estonian, this and other co-occurrences of equational verbs with non-reportative elements form an event-neutralized QI-clause (“Equational verb constructions” in Table 23), where the equational verb functions as a dummy verb, establishing a predicative construction (point 5). Since equational verbs are pointless for the depiction of the event behind RD, QI-clauses with equational verbs are considered quote-oriented here. Based on my material, in Finnish and Estonian only some of the encountered non-reportative elements are prone to being used with equational verbs in monoclausal quote-oriented constructions. Others, revised here in 5.2.2, are likely to form a bipartite quotative construction with the complementizers. Thus, besides the MD *sillee(n)*, in Finnish also the SIMs *niinku* ‘like’ and *tyyl(ii)(n)* ‘in a style; like’ (point 5a), the quantifier *vaa(n)* ‘just’ (point 5b), and the complementizer *et(tä)* ‘that’ are used in monoclausal quote-oriented QIs (point 5d). In Estonian, the SIM *nagu* ‘like’ (point 5a), the quantifier *täiega* ‘totally’ (point 5b) and the complementizer *et* ‘that’ (point 5d) are spotted in identical constructions. In my material, only the SIM *nagu* appears in such constructions. In contrast to it, the SIM *a la* is not observed without the complementizer *et*. However, based on some evidence of the use of *a la* without the complementizer in non-clausal construction, I can expect the appearance of the marker in such type of a monoclausal quote-oriented QI.

Notably, in both languages complementizers co-occurring with the equational verb can construct monoclausal quote-oriented QIs. However, this type of construction still differs from bipartite QI-clauses where the complementizer is merely placed on the border position and functions as an additional element pointing to the beginning of the RD. In monoclausal QIs, the complementizer is basically the only quote-indicator, since the equational verb *per se* is not used as the sole element of the QI and does not have functional capacities of the QI.

In Hungarian, besides MDs, also the endophoric demonstratives *az* and *ez* are used in QI-clauses with SEVs (point 4). Syntactically, the demonstratives are used as objects of the core-predicates of the QI-clause. But this role is not that relevant for the presentation of RD. Instead, what is important is that as parts of QIs functionally they endophorically point to the presence of RD, either both

anaphorically and cataphorically as with proximal *ez*, or only cataphorically as with distal *az*. As mentioned above, a similar structure, but involving the complementizer *hogy*, can be observed among the bipartite QIs in Hungarian (see 5.2.2).

Furthermore, two quotative elements deriving from the SV *mond* ‘say’ can be used as quote-oriented QIs in Hungarian. The self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’ was already revised above among the category of event-oriented QIs. As a quote-oriented QI, *mondom/mondok* is used as an element marking the source of the RD, i.e. the reporters themselves (point 6). However, it does not contribute much to the depiction of the event, as it can be used to indicate quotations of both speech and thought. Similar functional extensions are not surprising for basic SVs cross-linguistically. In 1.6.2.1, I have mentioned several languages from across the world, where SAY-verbs are used similarly. As for the grammaticalized quotative *as(z)ongya* (point 7), it is used as part of a monoclausal quote-oriented QI where it co-occurs with NPs marking the source of the RD, i.e. the original speaker or an inanimate NP (e.g. ‘message’, ‘sign’, etc.). The marker *per se* contributes little to the description of the event behind the RD and can be considered a grammaticalized quote-oriented QI since it merely indicates the presence of different types of RD.

In addition, one quote-presentational construction is used in Hungarian as a monoclausal quote-oriented QI (point 8). This construction may consist of different verbs, which can, however, be arranged into three groups: (i) specific SVs, e.g. ‘answer’, ‘reject’, etc. (point 8a), (ii) the two originally motion verbs *jön* ‘come’ and *előáll* ‘stand forth’ (points 8b and 8c, respectively), and (iii) inchoative verbs (point 8d). Even though the construction can consist of specific SVs, also used in event-oriented QIs, the whole construction is considered quote-oriented. A relative pronoun or an NP encoding the source of RD, which are obligatorily present in this type of construction, focus the audience’s attention on the presence of the quote. As a result, besides specific SVs, also originally NSVs, i.e. the motion and inchoative verbs above, may appear in similar QI-clauses gaining reportative function and being as a whole interpreted as a QI. Without the relative pronoun or an NP encoding the source of RD, the NSVs above are not used in quotative constructions. Therefore, the choice of the verbs shows that event-orientation is not that salient in this QI, and rather the presence of the quote *per se* is foregrounded.

To sum up, one can see that only at the level of the most basic monoclausal event-oriented QIs, one can encounter almost identical quotative constructions consisting of the NP, encoding the speaker (and possibly the addressee), and SEVs. The choice of other quotative constructions depends mainly on each language individually, its arsenal in the quotative domain, and the relative frequency of the appearance of a concrete construction with quotations. Monoclausal event-oriented QIs mainly consist of SEVs depicting the event (Table 22, points 1, 3–4). Otherwise, NPs encoding the source of RD can take part in providing information about the event behind the RD, as one can see in constructions with motion verbs in Finnish and Estonian (Table 22, point 2).

As for quote-oriented QIs, in a majority of the languages, demonstrative elements are used as additional markers shifting orientation from the event to the presence of the quote. All of the QIs with demonstrative elements are also used as bipartite QIs where they co-occur with the complementizers placed on the border position between the QI-clause and the RD. Furthermore, grammaticalized quotative elements can also occur in simple monoclausal constructions. They form a basic predicative construction which, however, does not provide information about the event behind the RD. Therefore, a shift from event- to quote-orientation happens. Thus, in Hungarian, two constructions, grammaticalized from the basic SV *mond* ‘say’, can be observed (Table 23, points 6–7), while in Finnish and Estonian, non-reportative elements co-occur with equational verbs, forming a simple predicative clause, interpreted as a QI (Table 23, point 5).

### 5.2.2. Bipartite quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages

As illustrated in 1.6.5.1, bipartite QIs can be either (i) monoclausal bipartite or (ii) biclausal bipartite QIs. Both types of bipartite QIs are defined by Güldemann (2008: 157; 2012: 119–120) as quote-oriented QIs where typically the first part of the QI describes the event behind the RD, while the second functions as a quote-orienter. However, as I show further, the first part of a bipartite QIs can also be already quote-oriented and might not always contribute to the description of the event behind the RD.

Among the five languages, I have observed monoclausal bipartite QIs only, while biclausal QIs, at least in the collected material, do not appear at all. As I have already brought to attention above, some of the already introduced monoclausal non-partite QIs can acquire the form of a bipartite QI. Thus, they can be accompanied by complementizers or other quote-orienting elements, resulting in a bipartite structure. Table 24 summarizes the bipartite QIs in the five languages. In this table, I use the subscript indexes <sub>1</sub> and <sub>2</sub> to mark the two parts of the QI. Where necessary, I apply square brackets for convenience to mark several elements forming one part of the QI. In addition, I also indicate the origin of the markers (autochthonous vs. replicated) together with other characteristics, e.g. epistemically neutral vs. epistemic complementizers, where a difference in the use between markers with different origin and meanings is observed within one (sub)structure. In places where it is unspecified, the whole category, e.g. both epistemically neutral and epistemic complementizers (if such appear in the language), is subsumed to appear in a structural complexity.

Table 24. Bipartite (monoclausal) quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages

| Structures  | EST | FIN | KO | UDM              | HU |
|---|-----|-----|----|------------------|----|
| 1. Complementizer strategy  |     |     |    |                  |    |
| 1a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + complementizer <sub>2</sub>  | +   | +   | +  | +                | +  |
| 1b. NP <sub>1</sub> + complementizer <sub>2</sub>   | +   | +   | +  | +                | +  |
| 1c. [Speaker + NSV] <sub>1</sub> + autochthonous epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>  | -   | -   | -  | +                | -  |
| 1d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + replicated epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> + autochthonous epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> | -   | -   | -  | +                | -  |
| 1e. [Speaker + SEV + demonstrative pronoun (proximal/distal)] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                                    | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 1f. [Speaker + SEV + manner demonstrative (proximal/distal)] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                                     | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 2. Quotative particle strategies  |     |     |    |                  |    |
| 2a. [Speaker + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + quotative particle <sub>2</sub>  | -   | -   | +  | +                | -  |
| 2b. NP <sub>1</sub> + quotative particle <sub>2</sub>   | -   | -   | +  | +                | +  |
| 2c. [Speaker + SV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’ / ‘saying’ <sub>2</sub>   | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 2d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + ‘so to speak/say’ <sub>2</sub>   | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 2e. [Speaker + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + [epistemically neutral complementizer + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’] <sub>2</sub>  | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 2f. NPs <sub>1</sub> + [epistemically neutral complementizer + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’] <sub>2</sub>  | -   | -   | -  | -                | +  |
| 3. [Reporter + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + self-quotative particle <sub>2</sub>   | -   | -   | +  | +                | -  |
| 4. NQ-strategies  |     |     |    |                  |    |
| 4.1. SIM-strategies   |     |     |    |                  |    |
| 4.1a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + autochthonous SIM <sub>2</sub>   | +   | +   | -  | +                | -  |
| 4.1b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + replicated SIM <sub>2</sub>  | +   | -   | -  | +                | -  |
| 4.1c. NP <sub>1</sub> + SIM <sub>2</sub>  | +   | +   | -  | + <sup>111</sup> | -  |
| 4.1d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [SIM + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>  | +   | +   | -  | -                | -  |
| 4.1e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [SIM + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>   | +   | +   | -  | -                | -  |
| 4.1f. [Speaker + equational verb + SIM] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>  | +   | +   | -  | -                | -  |
| 4.2. Quantifier strategies  |     |     |    |                  |    |
| 4.2a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + quantifier <sub>2</sub>  | +   | +   | -  | -                | -  |

<sup>111</sup> Replicated only.

Table 24. Continuation

| Structures   | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|--|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 4.2b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [quantifier + complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                    | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.2c. [Speaker + equational verb + quantifier] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>    | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.2d. NP <sub>1</sub> + minimalistic quantifier <sub>2</sub>   | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.2e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [minimalistic quantifier + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>              | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.3. MD-strategies   |     |     |    |     |    |
| 4.3a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + MD <sub>2</sub>   | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.3b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [quantifier + complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                    | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.3c. [Speaker + equational verb + MD] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>            | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.3d. NP <sub>1</sub> + MD <sub>2</sub>  | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.3e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [MD + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                   | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 4.4. MV-strategies   |     |     |    |     |    |
| 4.4a. [NP + ‘come’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                               | +   | +   | -  | -   | +  |
| 4.4b. ‘come’ <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                                      | +   | +   | -  | -   | -  |
| 5. Turn-taking constructions   |     |     |    |     |    |
| 5.1a. [TTD + Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                       | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 5.1b. [TTD + Speaker/NP] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                          | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 5.2a. [Speaker + ‘also’ + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                    | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 5.2b. [Speaker + ‘also’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                          | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 6. Quote-presentational constructions  |     |     |    |     |    |
| 6a. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + specific SV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>      | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 6b. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + ‘come’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>           | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 6c. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + ‘stand forth’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>    | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 6d. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + inchoative verbs] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |

In all languages, basic event-oriented monoclausal QIs, consisting of NPs encoding the speaker (and addressee) and SEVs denoting the event behind RD can combine with complementizers and form a bipartite QI (Table 24, point 1). Here, I summarize this category by the label “Complementizer strategy” already familiar to the reader from the previous chapters.

Unlike in other languages, in Udmurt, due to SV-semantics preserved in the autochthonous complementizer *šuyša* ‘that; saying’, the complementizer may also co-occur with proper NSVs without reportative semantics (point 1c). In all other languages, the complementizer functions only as an indicator of the border between the QI and the RD. Furthermore, in Udmurt and Komi, complementizers replicated from Russian may also appear. In Komi, the replicated complementizer *čto* functions identically to autochthonous *myj*, which, in turn, is pattern replication from Russian. Both Russian and Komi complementizers derive from the interrogative pronoun ‘what’. In Udmurt, a double-marking strategy can be observed where SEVs co-occur with two complementizers, Russian *čto* and autochthonous *šuyša* (point 1d). Furthermore, besides *čto*, epistemic *budto* is also replicated from Russian into Udmurt. Both autochthonous and Russian complementizers, besides SEVs, can co-occur with NPs, indicating the source of RD (subsumed under points 1a–b). Similar use is observed among complementizers in other languages. Thus, the clause with SEVs and NPs forms a part of the RD depicting the event behind RD, while complementizers indicate the end of the QI and the beginning (or the end in case of the clause-final complementizer *šuyša* in Udmurt) of the RD. In my material, only the autochthonous Komi complementizer *myj* appears together with NPs. Examples of the QI with NPs and the replicated complementizer *čto* are not observed. However, such a co-occurrence is, in general, expected due to the possibility of the similar use of *čto* in Russian and no restrictions on the combination of such elements within a QI.

Besides complementizers, the second part of the QI can be occupied by grammaticalized quote-introducers. Two different subclasses can be determined in bipartite QIs: (i) grammaticalized quotative markers with reportative semantics/functions, and (ii) originally non-reportative elements. First, let’s take a look at grammaticalized quotative markers (points 2–3). Such markers are observed in both Permic languages and Hungarian. In Udmurt, the arsenal of the grammaticalized quotative markers is filled by both autochthonous, i.e. *pe* and *pöj*, and Russian quotative particles, i.e. *mol*. All three quotative particles can co-occur with SEVs. In addition, they can also co-occur with proper NSVs, since functionally they can introduce RD on their own (point 2a). Thus, the first part of the QI is typically describing the event, while quotative particles indicate the presence of RD. The quotative particles *pe* and *mol* are functionally not restricted to one source of RD, and therefore can appear together with NPs (point 2b). The self-quotative particle *pöj* is not observed in such constructions. It was assumed that this restriction is due to the occurrence of the marker in QIs where the source of RD can exclusively be marked by the reporters themselves, but not by NPs, semantically indicating a separate source of RD, different from the original speaker/reporter. In Komi, the autochthonous quotative particle *pö* and self-



quotative particle *miša* appear in identical QIs as their Udmurt counterparts *pe* and *pöj* (points 2–3). On the basis of the collected material, non-autochthonous quotative particles do not appear in colloquial written Komi.

In Hungarian, quotative markers deriving from the SV *mond* form the second part of bipartite QIs. The attested markers are not new in the language and represent already grammaticalized quote-introducers with a relatively long history of use. Similarly to the Permic languages, they can co-occur with QI-clauses consisting of an SV or NPs denoting the source of RD. As far as the choice of the verb in the first part of the QI is concerned, the quotative particles are not homogenous. Only *a(s)zongya* can relatively frequently co-occur with SEVs and proper NSVs (points 2c and 2e), while *mondván* prefers either speech or proper non-speech verbs (point 2c) and *úgymond* – SEVs (point 2d). The choice of the verbs in the first part of the bipartite QI largely depends on the functions and semantics of the markers. *A(s)zongya*, in general, shows a development of new functions and can be considered losing its SV-semantics and moving towards developing general functions of a quote-introducer, independent of the type of RD. Therefore, it is quite natural that one can observe the use of the marker with different verbs introducing different types of RD. Even in constructions where the marker is used as a contracted form of the QI-clause *azt mondja*, *a(s)zongya* is not always denoting speech events and can be recognized as a broader quote-introducer (Table 23, point 7). Consider, for instance, cases where *a(s)zongya* co-occurs with inanimate NPs indicating the original source of RD, which can only metaphorically “produce utterances”, e.g. ‘a message/notification/webpage says’. However, as for the co-occurrences with NPs, both *mondván* and *úgymond* can accompany these types of quote-introducers (point 2b), even though these markers do not show a similar preference to different types of verbs and are likely to present quotations of speech, real or fictional.

Coming back to *a(s)zongya*, it is quite interesting that this marker can form two types of a bipartite QI-clause. It can either be placed on the border position between the QI and the RD (point 2c), or be accompanied by the epistemically neutral complementizer *hogy*, preceding *a(s)zongya* (points 2e and 2f). The position of the complementizer is slightly unexpected if one considers the fact that complementizers in Hungarian usually take the border position between two combined clauses and are not followed by any other functional words linking two parts of a complex syntagm. Therefore, one could expect that *hogy a(s)zongya* functions as a monoclausal QI, thus forming a biclausal bipartite QI. However, the majority of examples, presented here, show that *a(s)zongya* in this construction can be characterized as a quotative particle, rather than a finite grammaticalized QV, since usually it does not show agreement in tense or a bit more rarely in person with the verb in the first part of the bipartite QIs, usually denoting an event behind the RD (see 3.4.2 for a more detailed discussion). Therefore, I decided to consider this construction a bipartite monoclausal QI, rather than a bipartite biclausal, sometimes observed among other world’s languages.

Let’s turn now to the elements with originally non-reportative semantics and functions, summarized in the table under the category “NQ-strategies”. In Udmurt,

among such elements, two SIMs are used, brought together under the structural subcategory “SIM-strategies”. One of them is the autochthonous SIM *kad* ‘like’ (point 4.1a). This marker has not yet fully grammaticalized into an independent quote-introducer. Therefore, structurally it can combine with elements with reportative semantics only, i.e. SEVs. Another element is the Russian SIM *tipa* ‘of a type, like’ which has already developed into a new quotative marker in colloquial Russian (point 4.1b–c). Therefore, similarly to Russian, this element can co-occur with semantically reportative elements, i.e. SVs and NPs indicating the original source of RD, or with proper NSVs without reportative functions. In my material, the replicated SIM *t’ipa* does not appear together with EVs. However, such use is, in general, expected, based on its appearance with EVs in the matrix language. The two SIMs in Udmurt show different qualitative degrees of grammaticalization (see 5.1.1.6).

In Finnish and Estonian, non-reportative elements form different types of bipartite QIs. Even though one can count four different distinct structural subcategories, namely “SIM-strategies”, “Quantifier strategies”, “MD-strategies” and “MV-strategies”, in principle the three first subcategories follow similar structural patterns. Originally non-reportative markers can form a bipartite QI with clauses consisting of SEVs (points 4.1a, 4.2a, 4.3a) or equational verbs followed by complementizers placed on the border position between a monoclausal QI and RD (points 4.1f, 4.2c, 4.3c). In the first case, non-reportative markers can also be followed by complementizers (points 4.1d, 4.2b, 4.3b). Thus, a combination of a non-reportative element and the complementizer forms the second part of a bipartite QI and functions as a quote-orienter. In the second case, the quote-orienting function is primarily carried out by the complementizer, while a combination of equational verbs and non-reportative elements forms a predicative construction paraphrased as a QI in the quotative domain (points 4.1f, 4.2c, 4.3c). The two structures differ in respect to their original orientation. In the case of equational verbs, the first part of the QI contributes little to the depiction of the event behind RD. Thus, the orientation of the original monoclausal QI (see 5.2.1) does not change, and the whole bipartite construction remains quote-oriented, unlike in cases where the first part of the bipartite QI consists of SEVs or NPs. As a result, a shift of orientation from the event to the quote occurs. As for the co-occurrence of these elements with NPs indicating the source of RD, in Finnish, the amount of such markers is larger and exceeds the SIMs (points 4.1c and 4.1e), present in such constructions in Estonian. Hence, also the minimalistic quantifier *vaa(n)* ‘just’ (points 4.2d–e) and the MD *sillee(n)* ‘thus’ (points 4.3d–e) are used in combination with NPs forming the second part of bipartite QIs. The complementizers are usually present forming a chain of quotative markers functioning as quote-orienters (points 4.2e and 4.3e).

In addition, in Finnish and Estonian, identical bipartite QIs consisting of the motion verbs, both meaning ‘come’, can be observed, summarized under the subcategory “MV-strategy”. Originally, QI-clauses with MVs in Finnish and Estonian function as monoclausal event-oriented QIs, where event-depiction is mainly carried out by an NP indicating the original source of RD (see 5.2.1).

When the complementizer accompanies such a monoclausal QI, a bipartite construction is formed (point 4.4a). Besides Finnish and Estonian, such a strategy can also be observed in Hungarian with the MV *jön* ‘come’ that frequently appears in the quote-presentational constructions (point 6b). In addition, in Finnish and Estonian one can also observe an event-neutralized QI where the omission of an NP from the first part of the bipartite QI happens (point 4.4b). Thus, the complementizer functions as a convenient quote-orienter, since the motion verb *per se* contributes nothing to the depiction of the event behind RD and is not used in other quotative constructions, besides the depicted one.

In Hungarian, besides the above constructions with complementizers and quotative markers, complementizers can also occur in two other structural categories, previously depicted here among non-partite structures (see 5.2.1). Here, I summarize them under the labels “Turn-taking constructions” and “Quote-presentational constructions” (points 5 and 6, respectively). Similarly to the non-partite clauses above (Table 22, point 4 – turn-taking constructions; Table 23, point 8 – quote-presentational constructions), they are merely accompanied by the complementizer placed on the border position between QI and RD. However, several remarks should be made about turn-taking quotative constructions. Besides the co-occurrence of complementizers with canonical images of the corresponding monoclausal QI (points 5.1a and 5.2a), one can observe the use of the complementizer *hogy* together with the event-neutralized QIs (points 5.1b and 5.2b). In Hungarian, event-neutralization is typically carried out by ellipsis of the verb from the QI-clause. As for the TTD-construction, both speaker and source of RD can be equally inserted in the first part of the QI. The TTC-construction, however, can be accompanied by NPs encoding the speaker only and inanimate NPs are not encountered in such a QI. In the first part of a bipartite QI, a predicative clause is not fully established. As I show further in 5.2.3, this construction on its own represents non-clausal QIs.

To sum up, among bipartite quote-oriented QIs, a significant part of constructions consists of the already presented monoclausal QIs to which the complementizers can be adjusted. The complementizers function as basic quote-orienters signaling the beginning of the quote. Furthermore, besides the complementizers, grammaticalized quotative markers and originally non-reportative elements can also be used instead of or together with the complementizers. Depending on the semantics of the markers and grammaticalization processes within the each language, different quotative and originally non-reportative markers can either occur with various types of verbs in the first part of a bipartite construction or be restricted to particular subtypes. A similar remark can be made about their use together with NPs indicating the original source of RD. The possibility of co-occurrence of the different elements depends on the language *per se*, and similar tendencies can be observed only to a weak degree between languages.

### 5.2.3. Non-clausal quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages

As pointed out in 1.6.5.1, non-clausal QIs typically involve a simple non-predicative construction which refers either to the participants, and therefore is a participant-oriented QI, or to the quote, i.e. a quote-oriented QI. Both types of QIs can be observed in the five languages. However, as it was pointed out before, in principle non-clausal participant-oriented QIs can be formed “by any kind of nominal syntagm” (Güldemann 2008: 160), while the arsenal of quote-oriented non-clausal QIs largely depends on the available grammaticalized quotative markers in each language (*ibid.*). Since participant-oriented QIs can pragmatically appear in various forms, I exclude different non-systematic uses of separate QIs, and concentrate on participant-oriented constructions that appeared in the languages more or less systematically. Therefore, only for Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian, this type of non-clausal QIs can be summarized in Table 25. As for Permic, I have encountered such QIs only rarely in written contexts. Hence, they can be considered rather peculiar to oral speech and as a result are not mentioned in the following table.

Table 25. *Non-clausal participant-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages*

| Structures  | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|---|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 1. Proximal manner deictic + Speaker              | –   | –   | –  | –   | +  |
| 2. TTD + Speaker                                  | –   | –   | –  | –   | +  |
| 3. Speaker + epistemically neutral complementizer | +   | +   | –  | –   | –  |

In Hungarian, one of the strategies involves the use of an event-neutralized QI deriving from the co-occurrence of the proximal MD *így* with SEVs in the quotative domain. Basically, this strategy is only formally event-neutralized, which does not lead to the occurrence of this collocation with different types of RD as one could naturally expect from the event-neutralized quotative construction since hypothetically any relevant SEV can be inserted instead of the elliptic one. As a result, this type of QI is observed with quotations of speech only. In contrast to this, the event-neutralized QI in point 2 can be interpreted in some contexts as introducing both quotation of speech or thought. In both cases, the presentation of the speaker to whom the quote is attributed becomes salient, since other constituents are elided from the QIs.

In Finnish and Estonian, the collocation of an NP encoding the reported speaker and the complementizer functions similarly (point 3). In all three languages, the difference between the two types of RD can be clarified from the context only. Thus, if one RD-construction follows another, and each of them is attributed to different speakers, the reading of the quotation of speech becomes more natural. In cases where an RD-construction is inserted into the discourse out of the blue and is not attributed to a concrete addressee, most likely a quotation of thought is produced, or at least, both interpretations are equally possible.

As for non-clausal quote-oriented QIs, the majority of the previously introduced markers appear as single quote-introducers. Similarly to the above biclausal QIs, they consist of elements that can be divided into two groups: (i) those with reportative semantics/functions, and (ii) originally non-reportative markers. In contrast to the above participant-oriented QIs, non-clausal quote-oriented QIs can be observed in all five languages more systematically, as the summary in Table 26 shows.

Table 26. Non-clausal quote-oriented QIs in Finno-Ugric languages

| Structures   | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|--|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 1. Quotative particle                                    | -   | -   | +  | +   | +  |
| 2. SIM   | +   | +   | -  | +   | -  |
| 3. TTD   | -   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 4. Epistemically neutral complementizer                  | +   | -   | -  | -   | +  |
| 5. Manner decitic + epistemically neutral complementizer | +   | -   | -  | -   | -  |
| 6. Quantifier ( <i>vaa(n)</i> ‘just’)                    | -   | +   | -  | -   | -  |

First, let’s take a closer look at QIs with reportative semantics/functions. In the Permic languages and Hungarian, one can observe the use of elements with reportative semantics (or functions in the case of Permic) as single quote-introducers (quotative particles in point 1). The markers accompany the RD and frame it as containing a quote. Since neither the event nor the author to whom the quote is attributed are specified, sometimes the RD can be interpreted variously: from quotations of speech and thought to hypothetical quotations. Furthermore, grammaticalized quotative markers can express different connotations, observed in their use also in other types of constructions, besides non-clausal ones (see 5.1.1.5).

Among the quotative particles, the reported evidential *állítólag* can also function as a QI. Usually, it introduces RD in a summarized form, after which the specification of an event behind RD follows. Thus, its quotative functions become more transparent. In other cases, it merely indicates the presence of general hearsay (see 1.5.3 on differences between the two domains quotative and reported evidential and 3.4.5 for an in-depth discussion on the functions of *állítólag*).

The markers with originally non-reportative semantics were not noticed only in Komi QIs. In Udmurt, Finnish and Estonian, one can observe the use of NQs as single quote-introducers. In all three languages, SIMs can introduce RD (point 2). In Finnish and Estonian, other NQs are also used. In Estonian, the complementizer *et* (point 4) and the collocation of the MD *nii* and the complementizer *et* (point 5) is used as a non-clausal QI. In Finnish, the minimalistic quantifier *vaa(n)* ‘just’ was noticed in rare instances as a single QI (point 6).

In Hungarian, besides the non-clausal QIs with reportative semantics, two further neutralized constructions can be observed. One of them involves the use

of the complementizer *hogy* that introduces RD on its own (point 4). All other elements, usually specified in the context, are elided from the QI and only the complementizer functions as a quote-introducer. However, the elided elements are usually recoverable from the context. Thus, it is rather unlikely that the use of *hogy* as a single QI leads to the broadening of its quotative functions and use with different types of RD. Furthermore, the participant-oriented QI with TTD *erre* can be reduced to a single element signaling the presence of RD in some rare instances (point 3). Since all other elements are elided from the QI, *erre* can only point to the presence of a quote. Therefore, the reduction of a QI to a single element leads to a shift of orientation from the participants to the quote.

To sum up, among the non-clausal QIs two subclasses were observed. Non-clausal participant-oriented QIs are not restricted to one pattern and can appear in languages in various forms. However, more systematically attested constructions were observed only in three of the five languages. All of them involve the use of QIs reduced to elements making the presentation of the participants salient in this type of a QI. Among the majority of them, the reduction of the QI to a single element blurs the difference between different types of RD, which can be recovered then from the context only. Non-clausal quote-oriented QIs involve the use of two different subclasses of grammaticalized QIs – with and without reportative semantics/functions. Both are used as single quote-introducers focusing the audience’s attention on the presence of RD. In a similar manner, since the event and the author of the quote remain unspecified, RD can acquire various interpretations, recoverable from the context.

#### 5.2.4. Structural complexities and orientation of quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric languages: summary

In this subsection, I summarize the structural complexities observed in the languages in Table 27.

*Table 27. Structural complexity and orientation of QIs in Finno-Ugric languages*

| Structures                        |                   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| I. Monoclausal event-oriented QIs |                   |
| 1. Speaker + SEV                  | EST FIN KO UDM HU |
| 2. NP + ‘come’                    | EST FIN           |
| 3. ‘say.PRS.1SG(.DEF)’            | HU                |
| 4. Turn-taking constructions      |                   |
| 4a. Speaker + TTC + SEV           | HU                |
| 4b. TTD + Speaker + SEV           | HU                |

Table 27. Continuation

| <b>Structures</b>  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| <b>II. Monoclausal quote-oriented QIs</b>  |                   |
| 1. Speaker + SEV + manner deictic  | EST KO UDM HU     |
| 2. Speaker + SV + ‘such’   | UDM               |
| 3. ‘such’ + NP   | KO UDM            |
| 4. Speaker + SEV + demonstrative pronoun   | HU                |
| 5. Equational verb construction  |                   |
| 5a. Speaker + equational verb + SIM  | EST FIN           |
| 5b. Speaker + equational verb + quantifier   | EST FIN           |
| 5c. Speaker + equational verb + manner deictic   | FIN               |
| 5d. Speaker + equational verb + complementizer   | EST FIN           |
| 6. ‘say.PRS.1SG(.DEF)’   | HU                |
| 7. Speaker/NP + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’  | HU                |
| 8. Quote-presentational construction   |                   |
| 8a. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + specific SV   | HU                |
| 8b. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + ‘come’  | HU                |
| 8c. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + ‘stand forth’   | HU                |
| 8d. Speaker + DEM.D.COM/NP.COM + inchoative verb   | HU                |
| <b>III. Bipartite (monoclausal) quote-oriented QIs</b>   |                   |
| 1. Complementizer strategy   |                   |
| 1a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + complementizer <sub>2</sub>   | EST FIN KO UDM HU |
| 1b. NP <sub>1</sub> + complementizer <sub>2</sub>  | EST FIN KO UDM HU |
| 1c. [Speaker + NSV] <sub>1</sub> + autochthonous epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>   | UDM               |
| 1d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + replicated epistemically neutral complementizer + autochthonous epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> | UDM               |
| 1e. [Speaker + SEV + demonstrative pronoun (proximal/distal)] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                       | HU                |
| 1f. [Speaker + SEV + manner demonstrative (proximal/distal)] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                        | HU                |
| 2. Quotative particle strategies   |                   |
| 2a. [Speaker + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + quotative particle <sub>2</sub>   | KO UDM            |
| 2b. NP <sub>1</sub> + quotative particle <sub>2</sub>  | KO UDM HU         |
| 2c. [Speaker + SV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’ / ‘saying’ <sub>2</sub>  | HU                |
| 2d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + ‘so to speak/say’ <sub>2</sub>  | HU                |
| 2e. [Speaker + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + [epistemically neutral complementizer + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’] <sub>2</sub>                                   | HU                |
| 2f. NPs <sub>1</sub> + [epistemically neutral complementizer + ‘DEM.say.PRS.3SG.DEF’] <sub>2</sub>   | HU                |

Table 27. Continuation

| <b>Structures</b>   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 3. [Reporter + SEV/NSV] <sub>1</sub> + self-quotative particle <sub>2</sub>                                     | KO UDM      |
| 4. NQ-strategies  |             |
| 4.1. SIM-strategies   |             |
| 4.1a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + autochthonous SIM <sub>2</sub>   | EST FIN UDM |
| 4.1b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + replicated SIM <sub>2</sub>  | EST UDM     |
| 4.1c. NP <sub>1</sub> + SIM <sub>2</sub>  | EST FIN UDM |
| 4.1d. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [SIM + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                  | EST FIN     |
| 4.1e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [SIM + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                               | EST FIN     |
| 4.1f. [Speaker + equational verb + SIM] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>        | EST FIN     |
| 4.2. Quantifier strategies  |             |
| 4.2a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + quantifier <sub>2</sub>  | EST FIN     |
| 4.2b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [quantifier + complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                 | EST FIN     |
| 4.2c. [Speaker + equational verb + quantifier] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> | EST FIN     |
| 4.2d. NP <sub>1</sub> + minimalistic quantifier <sub>2</sub>  | FIN         |
| 4.2e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [minimalistic quantifier + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>           | FIN         |
| 4.3. MD-strategies  |             |
| 4.3a. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + MD <sub>2</sub>  | EST FIN     |
| 4.3b. [Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + [quantifier + complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                 | EST FIN     |
| 4.3c. [Speaker + equational verb + MD] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>         | EST FIN     |
| 4.3d. NP <sub>1</sub> + MD <sub>2</sub>   | FIN         |
| 4.3e. NP <sub>1</sub> + [MD + epistemically neutral complementizer] <sub>2</sub>                                | FIN         |
| 4.4. MV-strategies  |             |
| 4.4a. [NP + ‘come’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                            | EST FIN HU  |
| 4.4b. ‘come’ <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                                   | EST FIN     |
| 5. Turn-taking strategies   |             |
| 5.1a. [TTD + Speaker + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                    | HU          |
| 5.1b. [TTD + Speaker/NP] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                       | HU          |
| 5.2a. [Speaker + ‘also’ + SEV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                 | HU          |
| 5.2b. [Speaker + ‘also’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>                       | HU          |
| 6. Quote-presentational constructions   |             |



Table 27. Continuation

| <b>Structures</b>  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 6a. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + specific SV] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>      | HU          |
| 6b. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + ‘come’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>           | HU          |
| 6c. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + ‘stand forth’] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub>    | HU          |
| 6d. [Speaker + DEM.COM/NP.COM + inchoative verbs] <sub>1</sub> + epistemically neutral complementizer <sub>2</sub> | HU          |
| IV Non-clausal participant-oriented QIs  |             |
| 1. Proximal manner deictic + Speaker   | HU          |
| 2. TTD + Speaker   | HU          |
| 3. Speaker + epistemically neutral complementizer  | EST FIN     |
| V Non-clausal quote-oriented QIs   |             |
| 1. Quotative particles   | KO UDM HU   |
| 2. SIM   | EST FIN UDM |
| 3. TTD   | HU          |
| 4. epistemically neutral complementizer  | EST HU      |
| 5. Manner deictic + epistemically neutral complementizer   | EST         |
| 6. Quantifier ( <i>vaa(n)</i> ‘just’)  | FIN         |

### 5.3. Order patterns in reported discourse constructions

A typology of the order patterns in RD-constructions was revised in 1.6.5.2. In the chapters dealing with languages I have pointed out several order possibilities among the markers that showed different possibilities of appearance in RD-constructions. The attested positions of QIs are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28. Positions of QIs in Finno-Ugric languages

| <b>Structures</b>                                | EST | FIN | KO | UDM | HU |
|--|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 1. Preposed QIs                                  | +   | +   | +  | +   | +  |
| 2. Postposed QIs                                 | -   | -   | +  | +   | +  |
| 3. Intraposed QIs                                | -   | -   | +  | +   | +  |
| 4. Circumposed QIs                               | -   | -   | -  | +   | +  |
| 5. Combination of pre- and intraposed QIs        | -   | -   | +  | +   | -  |
| 6. Combination of intra- and postposed QIs       | -   | -   | -  | +   | -  |
| 7. Combination of pre-, intra- and postposed QIs | -   | -   | -  | +   | -  |

Udmurt is the only of the studied Finno-Ugric languages in which all possible positions can be attested to varying extent. This happens due to the co-existence of the old canonical (SOV) and new (SVO) word order that appears under the influence of Russian, and clause-final function words that are used in quotative constructions. Furthermore, in both Udmurt and Komi, quotative particles are likely to be inserted into RD. Thus, it is of no surprise that one can encounter either intraposed QIs (point 3) or a combination of pre- and intraposed QIs to a relatively significant extent (point 5). In Udmurt, due to the clause-final position of function words and sometimes whole QI-clauses, this combination can exceed preposed and intraposed position, and combinations of intraposed and postposed (point 6), circumposed and intraposed QIs (point 7) can also be observed. In the case of combinations, intraposition is typical for quotative particles inserted into the RD, while QI-clauses with speech and epistemic verbs take the pre- or post-position. Furthermore, Udmurt QIs with MDs still follow a specific distribution that influences the appearance of the proximal MD predominantly as part of the preposed QI, while the distal MD is mainly observed in postposed QIs.

In Komi, intraposed QIs and combinations of pre- and intraposed QIs (points 3 and 5, respectively) are mainly noticed among constructions with quotative particles. Among other markers, pre- or postposed QIs are still the most frequent. QIs with MDs do not seem to follow a particular distribution in colloquial Komi; therefore, similar preferences to certain positions in the use of QIs with MDs as in Udmurt are not observed.

As for Hungarian, variation between pre- and postposed QIs can be observed, with preference to preposed QIs that can appear among all attested QIs. Postposed QIs can appear among several QIs, involving proximal demonstratives and the grammaticalized QI *a(s)zongya* used as a single quote-introducer. Distal demonstratives appearing in QIs are, in turn, restricted to preposed QIs. Intraposed QIs are also not that frequent and can be observed among the QIs with proximal demonstratives, the self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok*, and the grammaticalized quotative particle *úgymond* (point 3). As for *mondom/mondok*, the marker is usually not accompanied by demonstratives functioning as syntactic objects of the SV in other constructions. Therefore, the self-quotative marker is not restricted to one position. As for *úgymond*, the demonstrative part of the marker *úgy* has lost its referential functions and did not lead to the restriction of the QI to one position. Nevertheless, *úgymond* is more frequently observed as part of a preposed QI, than in other positions. In one instance, I have also observed a circumposed QI with the motion verb *jön* ‘come’ and an NP indicating the source of RD, cf. (3.114). However, such a position seems to be rare, if not accidental.

In Finnish and Estonian, a significant preference to preposed QIs can be observed. Only in some rare cases, different positions can pragmatically appear, as I have already illustrated in 1.6.5.2. However, since such a use of QIs is rather infrequent and depends on the reporter’s and contextual motivations, I excluded them from the above table.

To sum up, one can see that language-specific features play a significant role in the position of different QIs within RD-constructions of the five languages.

#### 5.4. The impact of language contact on the employment of quotative markers in Finno-Ugric

Among the five languages, outcomes of language contact on the quotative systems can be observed either directly in the matter replication of single elements from the contact languages as in Udmurt, Komi or Estonian, or periphrastically in the use of similar elements and structures, as in Hungarian and Finnish. Here I summarize the main outcomes of language contact on the quotative domains of the languages. Among the respective contact languages, the following languages can be pointed out: Russian – for Komi, Udmurt and Estonian, German – for Estonian and Hungarian, Swedish – for Finnish, neighboring Slavic languages (Slovak, Serbo-Croatian<sup>112</sup>, Ukrainian) – for Hungarian.

In Udmurt, replications from Russian were observed among the categories of complementizers, simulative markers and quotative particles. Several explanations for the employment of these categories can be provided. For example, the use of the Russian epistemically neutral complementizer *čto* can be explained by the change of basic word order from SOV to SVO under the unidirectional influence of Russian. This leads to the use of the Russian clause-initial complementizer *čto* instead of autochthonous clause-final *šuyša*. Thus, primarily syntactic reasons motivate the replication of the epistemically neutral complementizer. As for the epistemic complementizer *budto*, it is employed as a gap-filler since an autochthonous marker with identical functions and meaning is not found in Udmurt.

The NQ *t'ipa* and Russian quotative particles have functional counterparts among autochthonous markers. However, the replicated elements correspond to the autochthonous ones only to a certain extent. Therefore, they partially function as gap-fillers. Concerning the use of *t'ipa*, it is conveniently employed within structures of different complexities in Udmurt as an already conventionalized NQ in Russian. As a result, besides reportative markers it is also used with non-reportative verbs or as a single quote-introducer, where the autochthonous NQ *kad'* is not employed.

The Russian quotative particles show structural similarities with autochthonous markers, although functionally they convey slightly different meanings presenting quotes with different degrees of epistemic support or introducing different types of RD. The quotative particle *deskat'* is likely to be used with hypothetical quotations where autochthonous *pe* is used relatively rarely. Russian *mol*, in turn, presents quotes as reproduced closely to their originals. The autochthonous quotative *pe* can express a wider range of different overtones in this respect, and pragmatically was observed together with verbatim and approximately reproduced quotes, the content of which the reporter might doubt. Therefore, I considered the meanings of the quotative particles crucial in their employment parallel to the autochthonous markers.

---

<sup>112</sup> I would like to thank Petar Kehayov for pointing out Serbo-Croatian as one of the contact languages that might have had impact on the turn-taking quotative construction in Hungarian.

In addition, the categories of quotative particles and NQs might also be treated by Udmurt bilingual speakers as non-genuine word forms. Hence, they can be employed in Udmurt as “a paralinguistic inventory of gesture-like devices” (Matras 2009: 193). Even though Udmurt speakers are likely to accept and be aware of the fact that these markers belong to another language, the pragmatic role of these quotatives becomes more important in conversational routines. For bilingual speakers, it may be also challenging to maintain control “over the language processing mechanism that enables selection of context-appropriate structures within the repertoire and inhibition of those that are not appropriate” (ibid.: 159). As a result, two languages frequently converge inside one text. In addition, as already conventionalized quote-introducers in Russian, they occupy a niche among the markers peculiar to colloquial speech since as foreign elements they are not employed on the level of literary standard. Thus, the use of both autochthonous and Russian quotatives within one text can be considered typical for the code used by young urban Udmurts in particular.

In contrast to Udmurt, in colloquial written Komi a minimum amount of Russian influence can be noted in quotative constructions, despite Russian influence observed in other domains of the language. Even the attested replications are not recent and have emerged in the language during the last century under a long-lasting contact with Russian. In other instances, Komi speakers prefer avoiding replications without intrinsic motivations. Obviously, such results can be considered only in the context of written speech. In spontaneous oral communications, one can possibly achieve different outcomes. This problem is further discussed in 5.5, where I review some challenges of the current study.

In Estonian, only one obvious replication was observed in the use of the SIM *a la*, most likely borrowed from Russian where this marker is also used as an NQ. The use of *a la* might have spread among Estonian speakers due to contact with the Russian-speaking population of Estonia alongside other replications of Russian slang into vernacular Estonian. Since the distribution of *a la* is a bit more random compared to the autochthonous correspondent *nagu*, it is hard to judge whether this element can be considered peculiar to one particular register or sociolect, or it is merely used as a synonym of autochthonous *nagu* in colloquial Estonian.

In Finnish, a pattern replication from the Swedish SIM *typ* might be expected in the use of the SIM *tyyllii(n)*. However, the use of the marker might actually be a result of independent development, since only partial correspondence can be observed between the SIMs in the quotative domains of the languages. Furthermore, results from typologically different and geographically distant languages show that SIMs are often employed as quotative markers without language contact. Similarly, a slight correspondence to Swedish can be observed in the use of the quantifier *vaa(n)* ‘just’ in quotative constructions, since Swedish also employs the minimalistic quantifier *ba(ra)* ‘just’ as a quotative marker. However, like in the case of *tyyllii(n)*, the employment of minimalistic quantifiers in the quotative domain of the languages might have happened independently of language contact. Therefore, in order to clarify the origin of the use of *tyyllii(n)* and *vaan* in the quotative domain, further diachronic studies are necessary.

As for Hungarian, the two turn-taking constructions share similarities with corresponding strategies in contact languages. For example, a TTD-construction of an identical type can be found in the neighboring Slavic languages, namely Slovak, Serbo-Croatian, and, probably, Ukrainian that possesses a structurally identical speaker-presentational construction. A similar strategy is also present in German. As for the TTC-construction with the conjunction *meg* ‘also’, a similar structure is also found in German consisting of the conjunction *und* ‘and’ and the NP encoding the quoted speaker. In principle, it will not be surprising if identical constructions are also found in other languages, since the strategy *per se* quite naturally depicts the turn-taking processes, where several speakers are quoted within one stream of text. According to the objectives of this study I avoided thorough diachronic investigation of their origin. Therefore, it is as of yet unclear whether these similarities should be treated as accidental, or one can indeed consider them outcomes of language contact. However, such a similarity can, nonetheless, be acknowledged.

To sum up, one can see that language contact plays an important role in the employment of various markers in colloquial written Udmurt only. In the other languages, its impact on quotative systems can be observed to a weak degree only, counting only minor matter or pattern replications. As for similarities in some patterns between the studied and their contact languages, this issue still remains unsolved and further diachronic research should be conducted to see whether these strategies have emerged on their own or they are actually a result of language contact.

## 5.5. Quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric: an outlook

As final remarks on this study, I would like to concentrate on what the current findings contribute to the general knowledge of reported discourse and reported discourse constructions, the role and functions of quotative indexes and their structural images. Hence, I would like to briefly review the current findings in light of previous cross-linguistic studies and research on the topic in individual languages. Obviously, all relevant studies cannot be addressed here. Therefore, I concentrate on the research that demonstrates similar findings in the use of QIs and provide my observations that might be relevant for future studies. In addition, it is of interest to contribute to a cross-linguistically oriented framework for the future synchronic studies on QIs. Therefore, I address some of the challenges that were faced throughout this study, as well as some positive experiences in working with colloquial written speech in general and the new media genre in particular.

As I have reviewed in the introductory chapter and the chapters dedicated to individual languages, previous studies have contributed a notable background to the current study. Even dealing with languages that have a limited amount of studies on reported discourse and quotative indexes, and provide only basic descriptions on these topics, one can always rely on previous cross-linguistic findings and orient through the descriptions of individual quotatives even in

typologically different and geographically distant languages. Similarly to other topics, one can find many similarities in the use of quotative indexes, employing either individual quote-introducers belonging to the same categories, or using more complex structural complexities that can be compared between languages. Furthermore, some correspondences can be observed on the functional scale, even if particular languages are typologically different and rely on incomparable constructions at first glance. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the current findings may also contribute to future studies of typologically similar or different languages.

To start with, let's turn to some advantages of the terminology used in the current study. Even though previous studies provide a significant amount of valuable information that could be later compared to the research on the topic among other languages, a distinction between different types of reported discourse is either not pointed out explicitly or not brought into the foreground. Among previous studies, a correlation between quotations of speech and thought is often mentioned (e.g. Palmer 1986). This is covered either by the term *reported speech and thought (RST)* (e.g. Evans 2013; Spronck 2016, 2017 *inter alia*) or the more traditional term *reported speech* that includes also quotations of thought as 'inner speech' (Vološinov 1973). However, only in rare occasions, besides these types of RD, researchers make a distinction on the scale of factiveness and further distinguish hypothetical quotations from reports deriving from previously produced speech or thought. Among such studies, one can mention research by Haakana (2006) on quotations in Finnish complaint stories. In his study, the author focuses not only on the role of quotations of thought but also provides an account on the use of hypothetical quotations in discourse. However, such distinctions between different types of RD are not frequent and are usually attested only in studies concentrating on discourse functions of quotations. As for research on quotative markers *per se*, the presentation of different types of quotations is frequently left unnoticed, and only quotations of speech are usually brought into the foreground representing the whole range of different reports by default.

By employing Güldemann's (2008) terminology in this study, this bias was evened up by focusing on the category of reported discourse in a broad sense, including various types of non-immediate discourse. To somehow narrow it down, I proposed three main distinct types of RD, similarly to the distinctions made before by Haakana (2006). *Quotations of speech*, restricted to the presentation of speech reports, were distinguished from *quotations of thought* used as a cover term for different cognitive acts and states. Furthermore, quotations of speech and thought as factive reports were distinguished from *hypothetical quotations* that could include both types of quotations, although fictional only.

Furthermore, I have also distinguished quotations (of others) from self-quotations. Although Güldemann (2008: 7) has suggested that even in self-quotations the reporter and the speaker that coincide can be distinguished "at least on the time dimension", in the study on the QIs this distinction was considered less prominent, and instead I paid attention to the arsenal of available exclusively self-quotative markers in contrast to the rest of the markers used with both

quotations and self-quotations. On the basis of the five languages, this distinction allowed to show that a language can employ either exclusively self-quotative markers (Permic, Hungarian), or rely on the markers used in quotations and self-quotations (Finnish and Estonian). Even though Finnish and Estonian do not possess exclusively self-quotative markers, the following tendency was observed. Namely, the markers expressing epistemically upgrading overtones (Fin. *ihan*, Est. *täiega*) were prone to appearing in self-quotations, i.e. in contexts where quoted material is available for the reporter as first-hand information. Epistemically upgrading overtones can also be observed in the use of the self-quotative marker *mondom/mondok* in Hungarian. In one type of self-quotation, this marker can be used to point to the verbatim rendering of the produced quote.

Hungarian *mondom/mondok* and other self-quotative markers were also observed in constructions with different types of RD. Although it remains yet to be tested in further studies, a tendency was observed showing that exclusively self-quotative markers are, in general, not restricted to the presentation of one type of RD, and in some occasions they can be interpreted as presenting quotations of speech, thought or even hypothetical discourse, if the context does not assign one concrete reading for the RD. In regard to *mondom/mondok* ‘I say’ in particular, such a functional extension seems to be natural for SAY-verbs in many typologically different and geographically distant languages even outside self-quotations (e.g. Chappell 2008, Matic & Pakendorf 2013, Spronck 2017, *inter alia*). Therefore, one can take into account similar functional extensions even in studies of SVs, at first glance functionally transparent.

In contrast to the findings on self-quotations, quotative markers with reported evidential functions seem to be restricted to quotations of speech (and thought in Permic). This tendency has already been pointed out for reported evidential markers e.g. in Aikhenvald (2004) and Wiemer (2010), *inter alia*. However, as for quotative markers with similar functional extensions, this point can be further tested in cross-linguistic studies taking under investigation a more substantial amount of typologically diverse languages.

Also, one can find some functional parallels in the use of QIs with similitive semantics. Among the five languages, these markers were found in three languages, demonstrating functional capacities comparable with their counterparts not only within a language family but also outside of it. It was previously suggested that markers denoting similarity might be conveniently employed presenting approximately reproduced quotations, or depict habitual occurrences of some utterances, peculiar to an individual, a group of people, or merely a situation (e.g. Buchstaller 2001, Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012, Romaine & Lange 1991, *inter alia*). Similarly, among the languages in focus, these types of quotations are introduced by SIMs, further grammaticalized or not. Thus, as I have pointed out above, even in different structural complexities SIMs fulfill identical functions. Similarly to Buchstaller (2001), I proposed to consider two meanings crucial in the use of the SIMs with such types of RD. Namely, approximately produced quotations are presented *resembling* original parts of the discourse, while hypothetical quotations are described *as if* they have taken place. Both meanings can be considered

entirely natural for the markers denoting similarity and comparison. Therefore, in future studies, one can test whether SIMs are, in general, employed in QIs and if yes, whether they present similar types of quotations.

Furthermore, the distribution of the markers with demonstrative semantics in quotative constructions of the five languages is also quite interesting. In particular, MDs employed in QIs can be either restricted to a specific referential function and, as a result, appear in one position vis-à-vis a quote or behave more freely in these aspects. As for non-restricted MDs (Komi), such can be found in other typologically different languages, e.g. Rus. *tak*, Ger. *so* or Fr. *ainsi*, all meaning 'so' (see König 2015 on German and French; Karssenbergh & Lahousse 2018 on French). Among non-European languages, Reesink (1993: 218) reports similar characteristics of the Usan (Papuan) MD *ende* 'this/here + given/a particular one + postposition -*t* 'for/at/on/etc. + this/here' in quotative constructions which can be used either cataphorically or anaphorically pointing to the quote. Functional restriction to the cataphoric use (Finnish, Estonian) can also be found in Usan: "the quote introduction has the cataphoric adverbial *ete* [*e-t-e* 'this/here + postposition -*t* 'for/at/on/etc.' + this/here]: *wo ete qamar* 'he said thus'" (ibid.). As for the patterns found in Hungarian and Udmurt, similar cases are either unknown to me or they have not yet been observed among the already described languages. Namely, Hungarian employs the pair of proximal and distal manner deictics according to their functions outside the quotative domain, while Udmurt relies on the meanings associated with the use of each MD in non-reportative contexts. However, despite the lack of a similar evidence among other languages, this point can be taken into account while investigating the use of MDs in QIs. In addition, MDs can also introduce demonstrations of gestures, movements and emotions, that acquire a quasi-quotative meaning in discourse. Such a use can be considered quite natural for demonstratives if one takes into account the semiotic structure shared between quotations and demonstrations (cf. Clark & Gerrig 1990). In future studies, one should consider the correlation between the two functions and observe whether demonstrative markers are also employed in quotative constructions.

Moreover, as complementizers in the five languages have shown, one should separate their use in syntactically subordinating clauses outside the quotative domain from their functions in the quotative domain. In particular, their use in grammaticalized quotative constructions (Finnish and Estonian) demonstrates that the markers are employed as quote-orienters framing a quote rather than functioning as syntactic subordinators. Where the markers have not yet grammaticalized into genuine quote-introducers (Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian), functionally they behave similarly, although their use is mainly restricted to co-occurrences with semantically reportative markers. In the case of their grammaticalization into genuine quote-introducers, they can be accompanied by either reportative or non-reportative markers, or even carry out quote-introducing functions on their own. Furthermore, among the attested complementizers, one can also observe a marker originating from an SV (Udmurt). As a result, initially reportative complementizers can still preserve their original meanings and function as genuine



quote-introducers in QI-clauses consisting of non-reportative elements. Similar tendencies in grammaticalization of SVs are quite frequent in the world's languages (e.g. Turkic, Sinitic, Japanese, *inter alia*). Thus, by conducting studies on the use of similar types of complementizers, one can test whether they are prone to co-occurring with non-reportative elements in quotative constructions, or their use is already restricted to reportative elements only and they have lost their original meaning completely. Furthermore, a language can have in its arsenal complementizers that express additional meanings, e.g. epistemic support, EHF, etc., in contrast to epistemically neutral complementizers functioning as plain quote-orienters (Udmurt). Thus, one can test meanings and functions of such complementizers and what tendencies one can observe in their use in the quotative domain. For example, the results from Udmurt have shown that the complementizer *budto* replicated from Russian behaves like a SIM and introduces similar types of RD. Such a functional correspondence is explained from the standpoint that the epistemic complementizer in Russian is also used as a SIM. Thus, functions outside the quotative domain may influence the use of the markers in quotative constructions not only among the category of complementizers but also among other markers.

Finally, besides similarities and general remarks on the use of individual categories employed in QIs, one can also point out some tendencies on the structural level. For example, structural simplification of QIs often leads to the event-neutralization of QIs and can result in the lack of differences between main types of RD. The lack of participants to whom the quote is attributed, in turn, might lead to the non-distinction between factive and fictional reports. The latter are often presented in the world's languages without being attributed to a concrete speaker, which has been pointed out by Spronck (2016) in his study on Ungarinyin (Worroran, Australia) and Russian. I have indicated similar findings in the use of different quotative markers among Finno-Ugric languages in non-clausal QIs where the markers are merely introducing RD without specifying its type. Furthermore, speakers tend to choose deliberately non-clausal QIs in the presentation of hypothetical quotations or where they prefer to leave the distinction between various types of reports underspecified. Thus, this point can be taken into account for studies on QIs in other languages.

Now, I would like to address some challenges that were faced throughout this study and reflect on some positive experiences. A primary target of the current study was to examine the synchronic use of QIs in five languages representing three Finno-Ugric branches and geographical areas, Permic, Finnic and Hungarian. As the basic material, I have employed substandard written data from the new media genre because they are meant to depict colloquial speech in written form, preserving features typical for oral communication. Since new media texts belong to the genre where speakers tend to refer to each other's previous postings and, similarly to oral communications, quote other speakers in order to provide background information, it was considered a suitable material for the current research. In addition, previous studies have shown that smaller language communities use online communications as a platform free from puristic tendencies (Pischlöger

2014b, 2016). This aspect was of a particular value for the studied Finno-Ugric languages spoken in Russia, which under the influence of Russian find themselves nowadays in a setting of standard language ideology (cf. Edygarova 2013, 2014) including negative attitudes towards natural mixtures of codes in a bilingual environment seen as imperfect or even incorrect language use (Salánki 2007b, 2015). In particular for Udmurt, natural communications involving mixtures of codes and parallel use of Russian and Udmurt were easily accessible online. Besides autochthonous quote-introducers used on the level of the literary standard, this material allows also to study markers peculiar to colloquial speech, both autochthonous and replicated from Russian. As for Komi, due to a long-lasting contact between Komi and Russian, I expected to get similar findings. However, the current results did not live up to my expectations, and mainly autochthonous language forms were observed in the quotative domain. Thus, it led me to the conclusion that online Komi speakers tend to separate the two repertoires and rely on autochthonous markers for quote-introduction, in contrast to Udmurt. Of course, as I have already pointed out in Section 2.3, it might have happened due to the bias of the studied new media texts mainly produced by active Komi speakers. Thus, it is entirely possible that spontaneous oral speech might show different results, which is strongly encouraged as a possible topic for future research work. Even though the received results did not show much diversity in the choice of quotative markers, tendencies observed in Komi are, in principle, interesting. As for the collected material, it still allowed me to study the use of autochthonous quotative markers that were previously described only to a limited extent.

For Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian, it was necessary to depict those strategies that have not yet been touched upon or were only briefly described in previous studies. Thus, online communications have provided a reasonable amount of data depicting new processes in the quotative domains of these languages. Even in Hungarian, which relies mainly on the strategies used in the language before, one could observe new tendencies in the use of the quotative markers that differ from previous periods. Furthermore, I was able to revise some previous findings which were considered doubtful or misleading in the light of the most recent cross-linguistic studies on reported discourse and quotative indexes.

Despite a generally positive experience of employing the data collected from new media sites, several challenges were faced throughout this study. First, it should be pointed out that while working with less represented languages online, i.e. Komi and Udmurt, one can rely only on a limited amount of sources. In case of Udmurt, I was lucky to be able to use the Blog subcorpus which was checked in case of an insufficient amount of data for a concrete strategy or marker. However, even the available corpus is not numerous, compared to similar corpora for languages more represented online. Such corpora usually consist of the data retrieved from similar new media sites that were primarily investigated before and during my data collection. In case of Komi, even a smaller corpus containing new media texts was not available. As for the corpus of the Komi language available online, it does not contain new media texts and, in general, could be

used for individual queries without context. Since in the current study I greatly rely on surrounding contexts, I used these corpora only rarely for checking some specific use, unavailable in other sources.

Moreover, among the smaller communities, one can always find a number of groups, chats and pages with restricted access. I have faced this problem while collecting my material for Komi and Udmurt. During the initial investigation of online sources I was not granted access to some groups where younger active speakers gather for communications and discussions, which could have possibly provided even more diverse data. As for individual profiles, even though they were mainly accessible, many speakers preferred Russian over their mother tongues as a means to make their personal content available not only to Komi and Udmurt speakers but also for their monolingual Russian followers. Even though one can hardly consider this situation a drawback as it reflects a natural diglossic setting where different languages occupy certain domains, data from such profiles were mainly useless for the current research. Moreover, on a few occasions, it was hard to judge whether a particular person represented a native Komi or Udmurt speaker, or merely has learned the language to a certain extent and has limited ability in speaking the language. This problem could be resolved only by carefully studying the context and personal profiles if they were accessible; sometimes such investigations could aid in revealing the background of a concrete speaker.

For the better represented languages Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian, problems with additional examples were often resolved by using Google Search which allowed to browse necessary types of quotatives or quotative constructions without restriction to one source and further narrowing the search down to new media sites. Even if new media sites did not contain necessary queries, but they could have been retrieved from other text genres, I provided such examples for illustrative purposes. By employing similar methods for Komi and Udmurt, I almost always failed to find the required queries or was merely redirected to the web-pages where groups in Komi and Udmurt can be accessed. However, for the better represented languages, such a method was suitable only for queries of more complex constructions, e.g. co-occurrence of an SV and a SIM within a QI. Nonetheless, if it was necessary to check whether a SIM can appear as a single QI, either one had to study all the possible matches from a simple query of this marker in a corpus or Google, or to just rely on some random chat, group or forum, and check the possible uses of this marker within different topics and pages. I gave preference to the latter method and simply studied the presence of quotes and the means of quote-introduction on various new media sites, which was considered more effective and less time-consuming.

Furthermore, for Hungarian and Estonian, I could always employ suitable corpus collections, which were not available for Finnish. Thus, corpus data were checked as a supportive source for examples, if such did not occur in the previously employed data sources from SNS. Nonetheless, one should acknowledge that the available corpora have only a limited amount of data, collected probably a decade ago. Therefore, despite the minor difference in time, Google Search may sometimes contain a larger amount of examples which are also more up-to-date. Never-

theless, among disadvantages of the Google Search method, one can point out the larger amount of data of different quality content (e.g. repetitions, unavailable pages, collocations on the level of different syntagms, etc.), which should be first sorted out and then investigated.

Moreover, one should keep in mind that an available online source can be temporary, especially on larger SNS, e.g. Facebook or *vk.com*. Thus, previously saved sources might not be available at a later point, which sometimes leads to the loss of the surrounding context and might influence the interpretation of examples. Obviously, in the current study, I excluded such examples; however, in some cases, it might lead to a loss of possibly valuable data.

As for the methodological part, in this study, I aimed to investigate the use of different semantically reportative and non-reportative markers in QIs. Obviously, the employed data largely correspond to the processes happening in oral communications and also depict quotative strategies used in colloquial oral speech. However, in some cases, the results can be considered only for written speech and further studies on the basis of oral data should be conducted. Thus, some markers have shown that they can appear with verbatim quotes online resembling copying and pasting processes in internet communications. Furthermore, several QIs were used to depict the transition of messages from the source to the addressee, which is peculiar for online communications, and in oral speech can be considered not that sufficient. Therefore, not all the strategies can be treated as appearing equally online and in oral speech.

As I have mentioned above, it was also relatively easy to check the use of separate markers in more complex quotative constructions. However, as for their use in non-clausal constructions or in co-occurrence with NPs indicating the source of report, it was not always effortless. Therefore, some markers were not observed in less complex constructions, e.g. non-clausal QIs. I have stated before that some tendencies can, in principle, be expected and the lack of examples should be interpreted as a mere lack of evidence in a particular text genre and register, rather than a general impossibility.

Finally, in my descriptions I have pointed out some additional connotations expressed by the markers appearing in QIs. These meanings, however, should be interpreted as general tendencies which, nonetheless, largely depend on the reporters' and contextual motivations than can be considered universal for quote-introducers. Only a limited number of quotatives are tightly connected to the presentation of concrete types of RD with specific overtones, e.g. the quasi-quotative *állítólag* in Hungarian. The rest of the markers show variation in this respect and the contexts should be separately checked to point to a concrete meaning expressed by these markers. Thus, there is an obvious requirement of further studies taking concrete markers under a more in-depth investigation and check how the meanings pointed out are expressed in different text genres and idiolects of individual speakers, and how these meanings relate to different pragmatic settings. The same holds for different functional extensions of individual quotatives, e.g. marking mimetic expressions, evidential meaning, etc.

To conclude, it is clear from the results that this research is far from being an exhaustive study on QIs in the five Finno-Ugric languages. Nonetheless, I hope that the descriptions yield valuable insights into their quote-introducing strategies and can be integrated as a basis for future research among other Finno-Ugric languages not considered so far and beyond. Furthermore, there is enough ground for further research on the topic among the languages studied here. As a final remark, I present some possible research directions that are encouraged for future studies on the topic in the (five) Finno-Ugric languages:

- i. use of quotative markers on the basis of oral corpus data; comparison with results obtained in the new media genre;
- ii. role of prosody as a means of differentiating a quote from its surrounding context and expressing evaluational connotations in RD-constructions (see Günthner 1999);
- iii. quantitative research on the distribution and use of quotative indexes in internet communications (or other genres);
- iv. diachronic investigations on the origin of quotative strategies and the role of language contact on the use of quotative markers;
- v. expression of epistemic meanings by quotative markers in different genres and their relation to various pragmatic settings;
- vi. non-quotative use of quotative particles in Komi and Udmurt;
- vii. defenestration (see Spronck 2017), i.e. unframed RD;

## SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

### Kvotatiivsused indeksid soome-ugri keeltes (komi, udmurdi, ungari, soome ja eesti keeles)

**Sissejuhatus.** Käesolev väitekiri keskendub tüpoloogilisele kategooriale kvotatiivsused indeksile (ingl *quotative index*, edaspidi ka: QI), mida kasutatakse vahendatud diskursuse (ingl *reported discourse*, edaspidi ka: RD) olemasolu formaalse märgina (Güldemann 2008: 11), nt QI *ta ütles, et* näites (1):

(1) *ta ütles, et* „ma tahan kõik raha saada enda hoole alla” (delfi.ee).

Doktoritöö on minu eelmise uurimistöö „Soome ja eesti keele uued kvotatiivid“ (Teptiuk 2015) edasiarendus, mis keskendub QI-de tänapäevasele kasutusele viies soome-ugri keeles: udmurdi, komi, ungari, soome ja eesti keeles.

Kuigi QI-de kirjeldusi leidub ka varasemates uurimustes, pole seda teemat veel põhjalikult käsitletud ühegi siin uuritud keele puhul ega soome-ugri keeleteaduses üldisemalt. Niisiis on kvotatiivkonstruktsioonide süstemaatiliste kirjelduste puudumine selle uurimuse esmane põhjendus. Lisaks on varasemad uurimused (nt Buchstaller ja Van Alphen 2012) näidanud, et mõned tüpoloogiliselt sarnased ja erinevad keeled kasutavad QI-dena nii eri grammatilisi kategooriaid kui ka võrreldavaid kompleksseid konstruktsioone. Järelikult panustan selle uurimusega ka komparatiivsesse keeleteadusesse ja tüpoloogilistesse uuringutesse samas valdkonnas. Peale selle pöoran tähelepanu ka vahendatud diskursuse funktsioonidele uue meedia tekstides (vt 6.3). Seepärast suurendab see uurimus üldist teadmust vahendatud diskursusest ja ebastandardsest keelekasutusest internetis.

Uurimusel on kolm eesmärki:

- a) kirjeldada kvotatiivsused indeksid, mis esinevad tänapäevases keelekasutuses;
- b) defineerida kvotatiivsused indeksite funktsionaalseid omadusi;
- c) leida ühisjooni eri kvotatiivsused strateegiatega vahel ühe keele sees ja uuritavate keelte vahel.

Kuna QI-d on keelendid, mis pärinevad tihti semantiliselt mitterefereerivatest (ingl *non-reportative*) elementidest (nt sarnasust väljendav kvotatiivsused marker *nagu* eesti keeles näites (2)) ja ka keelekontakt on mõnede kvotatiivsused markerite kasutuse põhjuseks (nt sarnasust väljendav kvotatiivne marker *a la* eesti keeles näites (3)), uurin kõigepealt seda, missuguseid kategooriaid on üldse uuritavates keeltes kvotatiivsused markeritena kasutatud ja kas nende kategooriate kasutus on mõjutanud keelekontaktid. Kui lisaks oma keeles kujunenud kvotatiividele esinevad keeles ka teistest keeltest kopeeritud (ingl *replicated*) elemendid (nt *nagu* vs. *a la* eesti keeles), on järgmiseks sammuks uurida, kuidas on selles keeles omakeelseid ja kopeeritud elemente kasutatud. Mitterefereerivatest kategooriatest pärinevate QI-de kohta on vaja uurida, kuidas need elemendid esinevad koos

teiste, juba tavakohaseks muutnud elementidega ja kas nende kasutuses võib märgata erinevusi.

- (2) *See ütles nagu, et minge sinna tahapoole, seal on kraanikauss...* (memokraat.ee).
- (3) *...ta ütles a la, et ainult need, kes suudavad midagi asjalikku tänu silmaringile kirjutada, saavad viie* (paulajohanna.com).

Töö koosneb kolmest põhipeatükist, mis käsitlevad iga keelerühma kvotatiivsuseindekseid eraldi. Põhipeatükkidele eelneb sissejuhatus ja järgneb kokkuvõte. Sissejuhatav peatükk annab ülevaate uurimuse teemast, terminoloogiast ja teoreetilisest taustast. Teine peatükk on pühendatud permi keeltele. Enne permi keelte kvotatiivsuseindeksite kirjeldust käsitlen permi keelte varasemaid uurimusi samas valdkonnas, tänapäevast permi keelte kõnelejate sotsiolingvistilist olukorda ja keelekasutust internetis. Järgneb vene QI-de lühikirjeldus, mis on taustaks seesuguste permi keeltes esinevate QI-de kirjeldustele, kus esinevad keeleainese ja malli kopeerimised (ingl *matter and pattern replication*, vt Matras 2009) vene keelest. Permi keeli on käsitletud eraldi. Peatüki lõpuosas on esitatud võrdlev kokkuvõte.

Kolmas peatükk on pühendatud ungari keelele. Esmalt käsitlen sama valdkonna varasemaid uurimusi ja osutan aspektidele, mida varem ei ole uuritud või mida oleks vaja teistsuguse lähenemise kaudu põhjalikumalt uurida. Kirjelduses keskendun erinevatele strateegiatele, mis esinevad tänapäeva keeles, peatükk lõpeb kokkuvõttega.

Neljas peatükk keskendub soome ja eesti keelele. Selleski peatükis annan kõigepealt lühikese ülevaate varasematest uurimustest ning esitan uuendatud andmed koos oma varasema uurimuse (Teptiuk 2015) tulemustega. Peatüki lõpus esitan kokkuvõtte.

Viimane, kokkuvõttev peatükk võrdleb viie keele uurimistulemusi. Esiteks käsitlen varem kirjeldatud kvotatiivsustrateegiate semantilisi klasse, seejärel vaatlen süntaktilisi malle, mida on kasutatud QI-dena. Peatüki viimases osas annan tulemuste ülevaate tüpoloogilisest vaatenurgast ning osutan positiivsetele kogemustele ja uurimistöö jooksul ilmnunud probleemidele.

**Teoreetiline taust.** Käesolevas uurimuses kirjeldatakse erinevate kvotatiivsustrateegiate kasutust vahendatud diskursuse kolmes peatüübis: kõne refereeringus (ingl *quotation of speech*), mõtte refereeringus (*quotation of thought*) ja hüpoteetilises refereeringus (ingl *hypothetical quotation*). Uurimuse lähtekohaks oli uurida kõigepealt kvotatiivkonstruktsioone, mis koosnevad kõnelemisverbidest (nt *ütleva*) või episteemilistest verbidest (nt *mõtleva*), mis semantiliselt väljendavad kõne- ja tunnetusprotsesse. Nagu varasemad uurimused on juba demonstreerinud (nt Güldemann 2008, 2012), näitavad semantiliselt refereerivad (ingl *reportative*) verbid (kõne- ja episteemilised verbid) kvotatiivsuse domeenis kõne ja mõtte refereeringu olemasolu. Lisaks olen nende hulka lisanud refereeringu allikale viitavaid nimisõnafraase (edaspidi: nimisõnafraasid), kuna see kategooria

koosneb tavaliselt semantilisel refereeriva sisuga elementidest (nt *sõnum, vastus*). Neid kolme kategooriat – kõnelemisverbe, episteemilisi verbid ning nimisõna-fraase – on selles uurimuses peetud kvotatiivsusmarkerite võimalikeks põhi-allikateks.

Kuigi kõnelemisverbid, episteemilised verbid ja refereeringule viitavad nimi-sõnafraasid osutavad niigi vahendatud diskursuse olemasolule, näitavad keeltevahelised uurimused (Güldemann 2008, 2012), et need kategooriad võivad ilmne da komplekssemates kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides, kombineerudes algselt mitterefe-reeriva semantikaga markerite või juba grammatiseerunud kvotatiivsuselmenti-dega, vt nt (2) ja (3). Semantilisel mitterefeerivad QI-d tulenevad enamasti mitterefeerivate kategooriate piiratud hulgast, mille võib jagada kolmeks rühmaks: (i) sarnasust väljendavad elemendid (nt ingl *like*, soome *niin kuin*, eesti *nagu, a la*), (ii) demonstratiivsed elemendid (nt saksa *so*) ja (iii) kvantorid (nt inglise *all*, rootsi *ba(ra)*). Varasemates uurimustes on neid kategooriaid tihti nimetatud uuteks (innovatiivseteks) kvotatiivideks (ingl *new (innovative) quotatives*) (vt Buchstaller 2001, 2004; Buchstaller & Van Alphen 2012; Rickford *et al.* 2007).

Grammatiseerunud kvotatiivsuselendid on tavaliselt refereeriva semantika või funktsiooniga kvotatiivsuspartiklid. Lisaks esinevad kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides tihti teatud grammatilised kategooriad, tavaliselt märkides kvota-tiivsusindeksi lõppu ja refereeringu algust, nt komplementlause sidesõna *et* eesti keeles, vt nt (2) ja (3). Seega on järgmise sammuna uuritud grammatiseerunud kvotatiivsusmarkerite ja algselt mitterefeerivate elementide koosinemist kolme kvotatiivsusmarkeri põhiallikaga (vt eespool).

Varasemates uurimustes (nt Buchstaller ja Van Alphen 2012; Spronck 2012) on toodud esile kõrvaltähendused, mida grammatiseerunud ja mitterefeeriva semantikaga markerid kvotatiivsuse domeenis väljendavad ning mis olid ka selle uurimuse fookuses. Pöörasin niisiis tähelepanu sellele, kuidas need markerid esitavad kaudset kõnet ja mõtet ning millise kõrvaltähendusega refereering on tavaliselt kuulajaskonnale esitatud (nt sõnasõnaline või umbkaudne refereering jne) ja kontrollisin seega ka kvotatiivsusindeksite episteemilisi kõrvaltähendusi. Samuti uurisin, kas sellised markerid esinevad ainult ühe refereeringu tüübiga või lubab nende semantika kasutada neid erinevates kontekstides.

Lisaks grammatiseerunud kvotatiivsuselentidele kasutatakse mõnes maa- ilma keeles kõnelemisverbide ja episteemiliste verbide kõrval kaudse kõne konstruktsioonides kvotatiivses funktsioonis ka algselt mitterefeerivaid verbe. Uurimuses olen seega arvesse võtnud ka need kvotatiivsusindeksid, kus on kasu- tatud mitterefeerivaid verbe (nt liikumisverbe: ingl *go* näites (4)) ja grammati- seerunud kvotatiivverbe koos lisaelementidega.

- (4) **The guy goes**, *“When can you move?”* and **I go**, *“I don’t know”* (orionsmethod.com).



Kvotatiivsete funktsioonide arenedes on hakatud mõningaid juba grammatiseerunud ja tavapäraseks muutnud kvotatiivsusindekseid kasutama ka ainsa refereeringumarkerina:

(5) *A la* "emme peseb käsi" (forum.perekool.ee).

Seesugune kvotatiivsusmarker võib niisiis näidata refereeringu olemasolu ka ilma teiste elementideta. Seega oli üks uurimuse huvisid jälgida ka neid lisa-elemente, mida kasutatakse iseseisva QI-na.

Tihti võib kõnelemisverbi või episteemilise verbi asendamine mitterefereeriva verbiga või kvotatiivsusmarkeri kasutus ainsa QI-na kaasa tuua kaudset kõnet kirjeldava sündmuse neutraliseerimise. Sündmuse neutraliseerimise (ingl *event-neutralization*) all pean silmas protsesse QI-s, mis võimaldavad kaudset kõnet erinevalt tõlgendada. Niisiis võib mõnes kontekstis kaudset kõnet tõlgendada nii kõne kui ka mõtte refereeringuna, aga ka hüpoteetilise kaudse kõnena, nt (6). Kui QI-s toimub sündmuse neutraliseerimine, siis uurisin kas esile tõuseb kaudse kõne, mõtte või hüpoteetilise kaudse kõne tõlgendused.

(6) *ma olin tüiega* "wtf noes, ma tahan korra harjutada veel" (Uue meedia allkorpus).

Peale nende strateegiate võib mõnedes maailma keeltes leida ka n-ö kivistunud kvotatiivsusstrateegiaid, mis järgivad eriomaste muustrite piiratud hulka. Käesolevas uurimuses on neid konstruktsioone defineeritud nimetatud esitavateks kvotatiivseteks konstruktsioonideks (ingl *presentational quotative constructions*). Kuigi need konstruktsioonid koosnevad teatud kindlatest ja loogilistest elementidest, ei ole neid elemente võimalik hästi ennustada. Sellest hoolimata võib näha mõningaid ühisjooni esitavate kvotatiivsete konstruktsioonide ja teiste konstruktsioonide vahel nii ühe keele sees kui ka uuritavate keelte vahel.

Lisaks võib QI-de valik mõnikord sõltuda keelekontaktist. Kvotatiivsusindeks võib esineda keeles keelekontakti tulemusena: (i) otse kopeerituna keelest A keelde B ehk keeleainese kopeerimise tulemusena (Matras'i (2009) *matter replication*) või (ii) mustrikooperimise (Matras'i *pattern replication*) tulemusena (nt keel A kasutab demonstratiivi kvotatiivsusindeksina, keel B hakkab vastavat markerit kasutama samas funktsioonis keelekontakti mõjul). Siiski ei ole olukord (ii) alati niisama läbipaistev kui olukord (i), kuna mõned tüpoloogiliselt erinevad ja geograafiliselt kauged keeled kasutavad QI-na tihti samasuguseid markereid (vt Buchstaller ja Van Alphen 2012). Keelekontakt on seega alati võimalik stsenaarium, kuid seda peab kontrollima diakrooniliselt, mõnel juhul oli see ka võimalik, kuigi päritolu küsimus jääb enamjaolt selle uurimuse piiridest välja.

**Materjal ja meetod.** Uurimuses kasutasin mitternormingulise kirjaliku keele materjali, mis pärineb uue meedia veebilehtedelt. Kasutatud materjal annab pildi kõnekeele kirjalikust vormist, kus on säilinud suulise kõne jooned. Ühtlasi on uus meedia selline žanr, kus kõnelejad viitavad enda varasematele postitustele ja tsiteerivad teisi kõnelejad selleks, et anda taustainfot, nii nagu tehakse ka suulises

kõnes. Käesoleva uurimuse jaoks on selline materjal asjakohane. Lisaks on varasemad uuringud (Pischlöger 2014b, 2016) näidanud, et internetisuhtlus loob purismist vaba keskkonna. See aspekt on väga tähtis just Venemaa Föderatsioonis räägitavate soome-ugri keelte puhul, kuna neid keeli iseloomustab normikeele ideoloogia (vt nt Edygarova 2013, 2014) ja negatiivne hoiak kakskeelses keskkonnas toimuva loomuliku koodivahetuse suhtes (Salánki 2007a, 2007b, 2015). Kogutud materjal võimaldas jälgida nii loomulikku koodivahetust kui ka murrete ja registrite segu ühe teksti sees. Rohkem esindatud keelte jaoks valitud materjal andis võimaluse uurida neid (kõnekeelseid) strateegiaid, mida on varem vähe kirjeldatud.

Materjali kogumiseks olen läbi vaadanud mitmesuguseid uue meedia allikaid, eesmärgiks oli uurida refereeringute olemasolu ja seda, kuidas kõnelejad vahendatud diskursust tähistavad. Permi keelte jaoks olen kasutanud ka olemasolevaid tekstikogumikke (Uotila (1985, 1989) komi keele kogumikku ja Kel'makovi (1981, 1990) udmurdi keele kogumikku), mis annab võimaluse uurida QI-de kasutust keelte erinevates murretes. Taustaks on kasutatud ka olemasolevaid grammatikaid.

Kuna väitekiri on minu varasema uurimistöö edasiarendus, kasutasin ka varem kogutud soome ja eesti keele materjali. Eesti materjal pärineb enamasti eesti keele koondkorpuse uue meedia allkorpusest<sup>113</sup>, lisaks on osa materjali kogutud Google'i päringu abiga (vt allpool). Samasugust kogumisviisi (nii korpuse- kui ka veebiotsingut) olen kasutanud ka udmurdi ja ungari keele puhul. Udmurdi keele jaoks kasutasin udmurdi keele korpuse blogide ja ajakirjanduse allkorpust<sup>114</sup> ning kogusin materjali juurde peamiselt sotsiaalvõrgustikust vk.com. Ungari keele jaoks kasutasin ungari keele riikliku korpuse isiklikku allkorpust (*A Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár*)<sup>115</sup>, mis sisaldab inimeste vestlusi internetis, ning Google'i päringut. Komi ja soome materjal pärineb ainult iseseisvalt kogutud andmetest, kuna sobivat korpusmaterjali ei olnud uurimuse ajal saadaval. Komi materjal pärineb erinevates gruppides vk.com-is ja blogidest blogspotis. Soome materjal on kogutud peamiselt Google'i päringu abil.

Kuna käesolev uurimus on kvalitatiivne, on Google'i päringut kasutades läbi vaadatud vajalik ja piisav hulk materjali. Tavaliselt vaatasin läbi ainult otsingu esimesed 10 lehte (10 linki ühel lehel). Allikad, mis ei pärinenud uuest meediast, jäid esialgu materjali hulgast välja. Siiski, harvadel juhtudel, kui vajalikke vasteid esmajoones sobivate allikate hulgas ei leidunud, kuid need esinesid teistes allikates, kasutasin materjali toimetatud tekstidest selleks, et ilmestada mõnd konkreetset kvotatiivsuseindeksi kasutamiseviisi.

Google'i päringut kasutades kontrollisin erinevate refererivate ja mitterefererivate elementide võimalikku koosinemist (vt 1.2). Koosinemise kontrollimiseks oli uuritud kvotatiivsusemarker koos finiiitses vormis verbiga pandud jutumärkidesse (nt “*ütles nii et*”). Kõnelemisverbidest olid üldised kõnelemisverbid

---

<sup>113</sup> <http://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/uusmeedia/> (15. mai, 2019).

<sup>114</sup> <http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/> (15. mai, 2019).

<sup>115</sup> <http://clara.nyud.hu/mnsz2-dev/index.html> (15. mai, 2019).

(ingl *generic speech verbs*, nt *ütleva*) eelistatud võrreldes spetsiifiliste kõnelemisverbidega (ingl *specific speech verbs*, nt *vastama, küsima, sosistama*) (vt Guldemann 2008: 12) seetõttu, et neid kasutatakse kõnes tavaliselt sagedamini. Kui päring ühe koosesinemise kohta (nt *ütleb nagu*) tulemusi ei andnud, kontrolliti teist võimalikku koosesinemise varianti (nt *vastab/küsib nagu*). Mõistagi kasutasin päringuid tehes erinevaid finitiseid vorme erinevas ajas (nt *ütles nagu* ja *ütleb nagu*) ja pöördes (nt *mina ütlesin nagu* ja *tema ütles nagu*). Päringuid korraldati mitu korda.

Selleks, et teha oma päringuid foorumites, blogides ning jututubades tõhusamaks, otsisin ja analüüsisin ainult leksikaalset materjali, millelt võis eeldada kvotatiivses funktsioonis kasutamist. Sel moel oli võimalik kontrollida ja analüüsida uute kvotatiivide koosesinemist koos teiste mitterefereerivate verbidega. Et kogutud näidetest paremini aru saada, on tähelepanelikult uuritud ka ümbritsevat konteksti.

Kogutud materjali maht on 1050 näidet. Udmurdi keelest on kogutud 285 näidet, ligikaudu sama palju (284 näidet) komi keelest. Ungari keelest on kogutud 275 näidet. Soome ja eesti keele jaoks oli kasutatud varem kogutud materjali ja koos uute näidetega on näiteid kokku umbes 200. Väitekirjas on kasutatud ainult osa kogutud materjali, välja on jäetud tarbetuid kordusi ning ühe ja sama strateegia samasuguseid näiteid. Kõik näited on esitatud glosside ja tõlgetega inglise keelde. Vene keele näited on esitatud translitereeringus ilma originaalita. Permi keelte materjal on enamasti esitatud transkriptsioonis. Ainult koodivahetused vene keelde on eraldi esitatud translitereeringus ilma kursiivita, funktsionaalsed koodikopeeringud vene keelest on esitatud aga transkriptsioonis ja kursiivis.

## Tulemused

### A. Kvotatiivsusindeksid permi keeltes

Permi keeltes on tänapäeval kvotatiivsusmarkerite ja -strateegiate valik küllalt mitmekülgne. Mõlemas keeles võib näha erineva keerukusega struktuure. Udmurdi keeles on mitmekülgsus suurenenud ka vene keele mõju tõttu, mis realiseerub kvotatiivsusmarkerite ja -strateegiate mustrite kopeerimise kaudu mittestandardises kirjalikus keeles. Komi keele kvotatiivsuse domeenis seevastu pole hiljutist vene keele mõju märgatud. Sellised tulemused on päris huvitavad seda arvesse võttes, et komi keel on vene keele mõju all olnud kauem kui udmurdi keel, mis on vene keele mõju all olnud ainult viimase sajandi jooksul.

Vene keele mõju puudumist olen selgitanud eelkõige kahe teguriga. Esiteks, kogutud materjal näitab, et komi kõnelejad püüavad internetis kasutada puristlikumat keelevarianti, kus ei esine vene laene ega motiveerimata koodivahetusi. Leksikaalsete koodikopeeringute motivatsiooniks on niisiis esmajoones nende sõnade omakeelsete variantide puudumine või harv kasutus idiolektides. Neil põhjustel esinevad säärased koodikopeeringud keeles päris tihti. Kvotatiivsus-elementide hulgast eelistatakse aga omakeelseid markereid või neid konstruktsioone, mis on vene keelest kopeeritud juba ammu, nt komplementlause side-

sõnade kasutust (vt allpool). Udmurdi kõnelejad aga kasutavad keelt internetis niimoodi, nagu nad seda räägivadki, valitsevatest puristlikest keelehoiakutest hoolimata. Niisiis võib udmurdi keeles peale omakeelsete markerite näha ka vene keelest kopeeritud kvotatiivse tähenduse ja funktsiooniga markereid. Teiseks, komi internetikasutajate sotsioloogilised tunnused erinevad mõnevõrra udmurdi kasutajate omadest, kelle seas sotsioloogiline mitmekesisus on suurem. Nii kasutab enamik komi kõnelejaid internetis komi keelt elukutse tõttu või räägib seda igapäevases elus. Need faktorid võivad kirjalikus vormis kaasa tuua puristlikuma keelekasutuse, mis omakorda võiks selgitada vene keele mõju puudumist komi kõnekeele kirjaliku variandi kvotatiivsuse domeenis. See aspekt võib aga erineda suulises kõnekeeles. Tulevikus vajaks see lähemat uurimist.

Sarnasusi permi keelte kvotatiivsusstrateegiate vahel võib näha omakeelsete kvotatiivsuspartiklite ja komplementlause sidesõna strateegiate kasutuses. Lisaks kasutavad mõlemad keeled abielementidena deiktikuid koos kõnelemis- ja episteemiliste verbidega.

Mõlemas keeles leidub kaht tüüpi kvotatiivsuspartikleid. Üks partikkel (udm *pe*, komi *pö*) on kasutusel selleks, et märkida kaudset kõnet, mille puhul algne kõneleja on kõne refereerijast erinev. Teine partikkel (udm *pöj* (*pi*), komi *miša* (*meša*, *myša*, *meša*)) on kasutusel selleks, et märkida kõneleja enda teksti refereeringut. Udmurdi keeles on enesele viitavat partiklit kasutatud ainult kõnekeeles ja mõnedes murretes. Komi keeles esinevad aga mõlemad partiklid juba ka kirjakeeles.

Mõlemad markerid on kasutusel sarnastes konstruktsioonides koos kõne- ja episteemiliste verbidega või esinevad iseseisva QI-na. Kvotatiivsed partiklid *pe* ja *pö* võivad esineda ka koos nimisõnafrasidega. Keelte vahel on erinevusi episteemilises tähenduses, mida kvotatiivsed partiklid väljendavad. Udmurdi keeles võib kvotatiivne partikkel *pe* esineda kontekstides, kus (i) refereerija esitab refereeringut umbkaudselt ja väljendab niimoodi oma kahtlust refereeringu sisu kohta (osaline toetus, ingl *partial support* Boye (2012) järgi) ja (ii) refereerija kahtleb refereeringus esitatud infos, kuid tunnistab seda episteemiliselt võimalikuna (neutraalse ja osalise toetuse vahel, ingl *between neutral and partial support*). Lisaks, esineb *pe* ka kontekstides, kus on esitatud sõnasõnaline refereering. Komi kvotatiivne partikkel *pö* esineb kontekstides, kus (i) refereerija esitab refereeringut umbkaudselt ja väljendab kahtlust refereeringu sisu kohta (osaline toetus) või (ii) kus on esitatud hüpoteetiline refereering. Viimane kasutus on aga komi keeles pigem pragmaatiline ja sõltub kontekstist. Sõnasõnalise refereeringuga ei ole komi partiklit *pö* täheldatud. Enesele viitavate partiklite kasutuses võib keelte vahel märgata struktuurilist ja funktsionaalset vastavust. Mõlemad enesele viitavad partiklid väljendavad refereerija subjektiivsust ning eneserefereeringu kvaliteet sõltub eelkõige refereerijast ja tema motivatsioonist.

Komplementlause sidesõna strateegia kasutuses on sarnasusi nendes strateegiates, kus esineb vene keelest kopeeritud komplementlause sidesõna *čto*. Nendel juhtudel on tegu keeleainese ja/või malli kopeerimisega: komplementlause sidesõna on kopeeritud vene keelest ja see esineb samasugustes konstruktsioonides nagu vene keeles.

Komi keeles aga esineb ainult vene keelest kopeeritud (otseselt: *čto*, või tõlke-laenuna: *myj*) komplementlause sidesõnu. Udmurdi keeles esineb lisaks vene keelest laenatud sidesõnale ka omakeelne lauselõpuline sidesõna *šuyša*. *Šuyša* on selle uurimuse kontekstis huvitav seetõttu, et see esineb ka *ütleva*-verbi konverbi funktsioonis. Juhtudel, kui *šuyša* esineb koos kõnelemisverbidega, markeerib see lihtsalt refereeringu lõppu; kui marker esineb koos mitterefereerivate verbidega, on seda kasutatud algupärasel konverbi funktsioonis. Samuti võib udmurdi keeles jälgida omakeelse sidesõna ja vene komplementlause sidesõna samaaegset kasutust ühe lause sees. Sel juhul näitab vene sidesõna refereeringu algust ja omakeelne sidesõna selle lõppu.

Peale episteemilisuse suhtes neutraalse sidesõna *čto* kasutatakse udmurdi keeles ka episteemilist sidesõna *budto*. Varasemad uurimused (nt Klumpp 2016) on näidanud, et sama sidesõna esineb ka komi keeles *by't'ö* vormis. Minu materjalis ei olnud aga sidesõna *budto/by't'ö* komi kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides kasutatud, mida võiks selgitada kõnelejate puristlikuma keelekasutusega (vt eespool). Episteemilist sidesõna *budto* kasutatakse udmurdi keeles samamoodi nagu vene keeles ja see esineb kontekstides, kus kõneleja esitab refereeringut umbkaudselt või on refereering lihtsalt hüpoteetiline.

Lisaks esinevad mõlemas keeles viisideiktikud abielementidena koos kõne- või episteemiliste verbidega. Udmurdi keeles on viisideiktikuid kasutatud nende referentsiaalse tähenduse järgi: lähedale viitavat (ingl *proximal*) viisideiktikut on enamasti kasutatud katafoorselt, samal ajal kui kaugemale viitavat (ingl *distal*) viisideiktikut on kasutatud enamasti anafoorselt. Komi keeles aga sama süsteemi ei leidu või siis on viisideiktikud teinud läbi muudatusi ja neid kasutatakse tänapäeva kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides ebasüsteemiliselt. Seda võib järeltada asjaolust, et deiktikuid kasutatakse sarnastes kontekstides ja nad täidavad sarnaseid referentsiaalseid funktsioone. Samasugust kasutust võib näha ka udmurdi keeles tüübideiktikutega nimisõnafraasides, mis esitavad refereeringuid. Komi keeles oli tüübideiktikutest kasutatud ainult lähedase tüübi deiktik ühes näites.

Udmurdi keeles on kvotatiivsuse domeenis kasutusel ka omakeelne sarnasusmarker *kad'* ja vene keelest kopeeritud sarnasusmarker *t'ipa*. Komi keeles pole seesugust markerit täheldatud. Udmurdi keeles esinevad *kad'* ja *t'ipa* koos umbkaudselt esitatud refereeringute ja hüpoteetiliste refereeringutega. Kuigi markerid on funktsiooni poolest sarnased, on vene *t'ipa* kasutusel niihästi koos refereerivate elementidega kui ka iseseisva QI-na, omakeelne *kad'* aga on kasutusel ainult refereerivate elementidega ja pole veel täielikult grammatikaliseerunud.

Lisaks markerile *t'ipa* kasutatakse udmurdi keeles on ka vene kvotatiivsustartikleid *mol* ja *deskat'*. Partikli *deskat'* kasutuses oli märgata ainult osalist vastavust vene keelega, kus marker esitab hüpoteetilist refereeringut. Tuleb aga osutada, et minu materjalis oli seda kasutatud ainult üks kord. Partikli *mol* kasutuses oli märgata aga struktuurilist ja funktsionaalset vastavust seetõttu, et markerit on rohkem kasutatud tänapäeva udmurdi keeles paralleelselt omakeelsete markeritega.

## B. Kvotatiivsusindeksid ungari keeles

Ungari mittestandardises kirjalikus keeles pole enamik kaasaegseid kvotatiivsusstrateegiaid uued. Need pärinevad konstruktsioonidest või sisaldavaid neid markereid, mis olid kasutusel ka varasematel ajavahemikel. Ainult mõned markerit võib pidada suhteliselt uueks. Mõne varasemal ajajärgul kasutatud kvotatiivi funktsioon ja struktuur on tänapäeval muutunud, teiste distributsioon on võrreldes varasema ajaga piiratud.

Kõige tüüpilisem strateegia, mida on hästi kirjeldatud deskriptiivsetes grammatikates, sisaldab kõne- või episteemilisi verbe ja komplementlause sidesõna *hogy*. Lisaks nendele elementidele sisaldab ungari komplementlause sidesõna strateegia endofoorilisi demonstratiive *ez* ja *az* akusatiivis, need toimivad kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides objektidena. Neis konstruktsioonides esinevad verbid on transitiivsed ja kasutatud määratud pööramises. Endofoorilised demonstratiivid on funktsionaalselt jaotatud. Lähedust väljendavat demonstratiivi *ez* on kasutatud ainult koos otsekõnega (ingl *direct reported discourse*), see võib paikneda QI-des nii vahendatud kõne ees kui ka järel. Kaugust väljendav demonstratiiv *az* võib esineda otsese ja kaudse kõnega (ingl *indirect reported discourse*), struktuuriliselt on *az* aga piiratud ja esineb ainult kaudse kõne ees paiknevates QI-des. Niisiis toimib lähedust väljendav *ez* nii katafoorse kui ka anafoorsena; kaugust väljendav *az* on aga ainult katafoorne.

Komplementlause sidesõna *hogy* võib esineda koos kaudse ja otsese kõnega, erinevalt teistest Euroopa keeltest, kus samalaadne sidesõna esineb ainult koos kaudse kõnega. Tegelikult võivad *hogy* ja endofoorilised demonstratiivid jääda elliptiliseks, tavaliselt on need välja jäetud konstruktsioonidest, kus kaudne kõne koosneb väit- või küsilausest. Endofooriliste demonstratiivide ellips toimub infostruktuuri tingimuste järgi: kui fookus on kõnelejal või kõnesündmusel, siis ei ole endofooriliste demonstratiivide olemasolu vajalik.

Peale endofooriliste demonstratiivide esinevad kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides koos refereerivate verbidega ka viisideiktikud *így* ja *úgy*. Viisideiktikute distributsioon on samasugune nagu demonstratiividel: lähedusele viitav *így* esineb ainult koos otsekõnega ja võib olla QI-s otsekõne ees, keskel või selle järel; kaugule viitav *úgy* esineb koos otsese ja kaudse kõnega, ent selle positsioon on piiratud ees asuvate QI-dega. Seega võib kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides lähedane *így* olla nii katafoorne kui ka anafoorne, kaugule viitav *úgy* on ainult katafoorne. Lisaks sellele on viisideiktikud funktsionaalselt erinevad. Lähedust väljendav *így* kvotatiivsuse domeenis tähistab otsekõnet, kuna kaugust väljendav *úgy* pigem kirjeldab kaudse kõne sisu. Lisaks võib lähedane viisideiktik esineda kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides, kus kõnelemisverb või episteemiline verb on elliptiline ja ainult nimisõnafraas, mis kirjeldab esialgset kõnelejat, on olemas. Kuigi sündmust kirjeldav verb on elliptiline ja toimub sündmuse neutralisatsioon, mis toob tavaliselt kaasa erinevad tõlgendused, on selline QI kasutatud ainult kõne refereeringuga. Samasugustes konstruktsioonides kaugule viitavat demonstratiivi *úgy* ei esinenud.

Järgmise kvotatiivsusmarkerite alarühma moodustavad kõnelemisverbidest pärinevad markerid. Enamik neist pärineb kõnelemisverbist *mond* 'ütlemata': (i) *mondom/mondok* 'mina ütlen', (ii) *a(s)zongya* (vt allpool), (iii) *mondván* 'öeldes', ja (iv) *úgymond* 'nii öeldud'. Üks marker pärineb spetsiifilisest verbist *állit* 'kuulutama, väitma' – *állítólag* 'väidetavalt'.

Enesele viitav *mondom/mondok* on huvitav eelkõige seetõttu, et marker esindab verbivormi olevikus, kuigi viitab minevikusündmusele. Lisaks sellele võib enesele viitav marker esitada nii kõne kui ka mõtte refereeringuid, vaatamata oma kõnelemisverbi semantikale. Mõnes kontekstis on refereeringule võimalik kohaldada mõlemaid tähendusi. Ainult olukordades, kus kaks erinevate kõnelejate produtseeritud refereeringut esinevad ühes kontekstis või QI-s on eksplitsiitselt esile toodud algupärase kõne vastuvõtja, on võimalik kohaldada ainult kõne refereeringu tähendust. Teistel juhtudel (kui näiteks refereering on esitatud täiesti ilma kontekstita) on võimalikud mõlemad tähendused (nii kõne kui ka mõtte refereering). Vormide vahel on näha stiili- ja funktsioonide erinevusi. Määramata pööramise vormi *mondok* on puristid tihti pidanud ebakorrektses. Määratud pööramise vormi *mondom* on kasutatud ka olukordades, kus raporteerija esitab sõnasõnalise eneserefereeringu ja tahab sõnasõnalisust rõhutada, viidates äsja produtseeritud lausungile.

Kvotatiivsuspartikkel *a(s)zongya* esindab kokku sulanud vormi, mis sisaldab demonstratiivi *az* akusatiivivormi *azt* ja kõnelemisverbi 3. isiku määratud pööramise vormi *mondja* 'ütleb seda'. *A(s)zongya* pole kaasaegses ungari keeles uus ja ulatub tagasi 19. sajandisse (kui mitte veel varasemasse ajavahemikku). Tänapäevases ungari keeles on sõna *a(s)zongya* veel võimalik pöörata ja sellel on osaline verbiparadigma kõikides isikutes olevikus ja minevikus. Lisaks kasutatakse seda ka mineviku tingivas kõneviisi vormis, mis sisaldab minevikuvormis verbi ja koopulaverbi tingivas kõneviisis 3. isikus ainsuses *volna*, nt *a(s)zontam volna* 'oleksin võinud (seda) öelda'. Niisiis on mõnes kontekstis kvotatiivsuspartikkel *a(s)zongya* vahetatav kvotatiivse osalausega (ingl *quotative index clause*, edaspidi ka: KO) *azt mondja* ja esindab selle kvotatiivse osalause kokku tõmbunud vormi. Selles funktsioonis säilitab *a(s)zongya* oma positsiooni RD-konstruktsioonides ja näitab vastavust kokku tõmbumata QI-ga *azt mondja*, mis võib esineda ainult kaudse kõne ees (vt. üleval). Sel juhul, kui *a(s)zongya* on vahetatav KO-ga *azt mondja*, esineb see kaudse kõne konstruktsioonides ainsa kvotatiivsus- elemendina.

Lisaks seesugusele kasutusele võib *a(s)zongya* esineda ainsa kvotatiivsus- elemendina ilma algupärasele kõneleajale viitava nimisõnafraasita või osaleda komplekssemates kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides koos teiste kvotatiivsus- elementidega (kõnelemisverbide jm verbidega või nimisõnafrasidega), moodustades niimoodi kaheosalised QI-d (ingl *bipartite QIs* Güldemanni (2008, 2012) järgi). Nendes konstruktsioonides on *a(s)zongya* kasutatud kvotatiivsuspartiklina, mitte kokku tõmbunud verbivormina. Sellisena ei ole see vahetatav KO-ga *azt mondja*. Selles funktsioonis kaotab partikkel oma kõnelemisverbi semantika ja on kasutusel pigem üldise kvotatiivsusmarkerina, mis näitab refereeringu olemasolu ega viita ainult kõne refereeringule. Esinedes epistemiiliste verbidega, märgib

*a(s)zongya* mõtte refereeringut. Mitterefereerivate verbidega esineb see marker ainsa kvotatiivsuselemendina ja näitab kaudse kõne esinemist. Partiklit *a(s)zongya* kasutatakse ka hüpoteetiliste refereeringutega, kuigi selle tüübi puhul sõltub markeri kasutus pigem kontekstist ja refereerija motivatsioonist. Seesugust kasutust ei saa niisiis pidada tüüpiliseks.

Eraldi alamkategooriat, kaheosalisi kvotatiivsusedekseid koos partikliga *a(s)zongya* on kasutatud juhul, kui partiklile *a(s)zongya* eelneb komplementlause sidesõna *hogy* (KO + *hogy a(s)zongya*). Selles funktsioonis kaotab *a(s)zongya* oma verbaalsed omadused ja mõnikord ilmutab ühildumatust ajas ja isikus KO peaverbiga. Ühildumatust ajas esineb ka nendes kaheosalistes kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides, kus *a(s)zongya*'le ei eelne *hogy*. Järelikult ka kaheosalise kvotatiivindeksi osana ilma *hogy*'ita on *a(s)zongya* kasutatud üldise kvotatiivsusemarkerina, mis näitab erinevate vahendatud diskursuse tüüpide olemasolu, seevastu kokku tõmbumata vormi *azt mondja* kasutatakse peamiselt koos kõne refereeringutega.

Kvotatiivsusemarker *mondván* 'õeldes' esindab kõnelemisverbi *mond* 'ütlemata' partitsiibi vormi superessiivis. Ka see marker pole kaasaegses ungari keeles uus ja ulatub tagasi esimeste piiblitõlgete aega. Varasemates uurimustes (vt Dömötör 2015) on väidetud, et see marker on mustrite kopeerimine ladina keelest (*dicens* 'õeldes'), kus see on omakorda kopeeritud heebreakeelest (*lémor*). Varasemates tekstides on markerit kasutatud kaheosalise QI osana kõnelemisverbi sisaldava KO kõrval. Kaasaegses ungari keeles võib sellist kasutust näha peamiselt piiblitõlgetes. Muudes žanrites esineb *mondván* koos kõnelemisverbidega harva ja seda kasutatakse rohkem mitterefereerivate verbide või nimisõnafraasidega. Lisaks võib see esineda ainsa kvotatiivsuselemendina. *Mondván* esineb koos kõne refereeringutega, teiste refereeringu tüüpidega ei ole seda märgatud.

Ka kvotatiivsusepartikkel *úgymond* ulatub tagasi esimeste piiblitõlgete aega, see pärineb viisideiktiku *úgy* ja kõnelemisverbi *mond* kokkusulamisest. Varasemates ungari tekstides esineb marker koos kõnelemisverbidega, moodustades niimoodi kaheosalise QI. Aja jooksul hakati seda kasutama iseseisva refereeringu esitajana, mis võis esineda üheainsa QI-na või koos algsele kõnelejale viitava nimisõnafraasiga. Alates 20. sajandist tekkis partiklile mitterefereerivaid funktsioone ja seda hakati kasutama erinevate tähendustega diskursusepartiklina. Diskursusepartiklina märgib *úgymond* tavaliselt infot, mis pärineb väljastpoolt käibivat diskursust või viitab ühisele teadmusele. Lisaks sellele võib marker näidata, et kõneleja kasutab sõna või fraasi tavapärasest erinevalt.

Kvotatiivsuse domeenis on *úgymond* läbinud muudatusi. Seda kasutatakse kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides varasemast vähem, kõige sagedamini koos esineb see koos verbidega, mis viitavad kõnesündmustele – nii faktuaalsetele kui ka fiktiivsetele. Lisaks võib *úgymond* esineda koos nimisõnafraasidega. Faktuaalsete kõnesündmuste korral näitab marker, et refereering on produtseeritud kokkuvõttes vormis ja see võib näidata vastuolu refereeritud ja algupärase materjali vahel. Kasutus koos mõtte refereeringutega on haruldane, mis näitab omalt poolt, et marker säilitab oma kõnelemisverbi semantika. Ka väljaspool kvotatiivsuse domeeni on markeril kõnelemisverbi tähendus ('nii õeldes', 'nii võib öelda').



*Úgymond* esineb üsna tihti koos fiktiivsete refereeringutega. Tavaliselt viitab see ütlustele, mis sisaldavad üldist teadmust või tuntud väljendeid. Hüpoteetilist refereeringut on tavaliselt kasutatud vahendina, millega kirjeldatakse mingit olukorda. Harilikult esineb *úgymond* sellistel juhtudel üheainsa QI-na. Sel juhul ei lisa refereerija täiendavat infot, nt täpset sündmust, mille ajal see lausung esitati, või lausungi algset esitajat.

Partiklit *állítólag* on kvotatiivsuse domeenis QI-na kasutatud harva. Lisaks refereerivale tähendusele väljendab *állítólag* ka osalist episteemilist toetust, mida olen täheldanud kõikides näidetes, kus partiklit *állítólag* oli kasutatud. Osalise toetuse ulatus võib sõltuda kontekstist, kus refereering esineb, väljendades episteemilisi varjundeid tugevast ebakindlusest vähese kahtluseni.

*Állítólag*'i kasutus kvotatiivsusindeksina on piiratud ühe konstruktsioonitüübiga, kus marker esineb ainsa QI-na. Ehkki sellisena ei anna marker infot sündmuse kohta, kaasneb konstruktsiooniga tavaliselt diskursuse osa, mis täpsustab RD sisu ja sündmust. Niimoodi viitab see diskursuse osa algupärasele kõnelejalale, mis on otsustav selleks, et eristada kasutust QI-na selle algupärasest kasutusest refereeriva evidentsiaalsuse (ingl *reported evidential*) markerina, mis kaasaeelses ungari keeles jääb selle põhifunktsiooniks. Kuna partiklit *állítólag* kasutatakse ainult üht tüüpi konstruktsioonis ja see vajab kvotatiivse kasutuse ja refereeriva evidentsiaalsuse kasutuse eristamiseks eritingimusi, võiks pidada seda kõigest kvaasikvotatiivmarkeriks.

Ehkki partiklit *állítólag* on kasutatud QI-na ainult ühes konstruktsiooni tüübis, on selle refereeriva evidentsiaalsuse tähendus asjakohane teistes kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides. Selle positsioon kvotatiivkonstruktsioonis määrab tema funktsiooni. Kui *állítólag* paikneb kvotatiivse fraasi sees, muudab see terve sündmust kirjeldava fraasi refereeringuks. See tähendus jääb siiski tagaplaanile ja esile tõuseb episteemiline tähendus. Kuna kaudse kõne sündmust on kirjeldatud kui midagi, mis "olevat juhtunud", on terve kaudse kõne konstruktsioon väidetav. Refereerija tahab seega näidata, et ta pole täiesti kindel kaudse kõne sisus, mis on ainult väidetavalt juhtunud. Niisiis väljendab *állítólag* osalist toetust, mis näitab refereerija kahtlust. Kui seevastu *állítólag* on paigutatud kaudse kõne sisse, osutab refereerija, et esitatud refereering pärineb kelleltki teiselt, on kolmanda osapoole info. Sarnaselt teiste kvotatiivsusmarkeritega, mis pärinevad kõnelemisverbidest (välja arvatud *a(s)zongya*) on *állítólag* kasutusel ainult faktuaalse kõne refereeringutega. Kuna refereeriva evidentsiaalsuse markerid on tavaliselt semantiliselt piiritletud refereeringutega, mis pärinevad varasemast diskursusest, ei kasutata seda hüpoteetiliste refereeringutega, mis jäävad semantiliselt fiktiivseteks.

Lisaks nendele markeritele võib ungari kvotatiivsuse domeenis jälgida veel kahte konstruktsioonitüüpi: kõnelejat ja refereeringut esitavaid kvotatiivkonstruktsioone. Kõnelejat esitavaid konstruktsioone on nimetatud siin ka vooruvahtuse kvotatiivkonstruktsioonideks (ingl *turn-taking quotative constructions*). Refereeringut esitavad konstruktsioonid sisaldavad mitmesuguseid verbe, mis esinevad koos komitatiivsete elementidega.

Tegelikult on tänapäevases ungari keeles kaks vooruvahetuse konstruktsiooni. Need sisaldavad erinevaid elemente, aga toimivad sarnaselt. Üks vooruvahetuse konstruktsioon sisaldab kõnelejat väjendavat nimisõnafraasi ja vooruvahetuse demonstratiivi *ez* sublatiivis – *erre* ‘selle peale’. *Erre* võib kodeerida nii varasemalt esitatud kaudset kõnet kui ka üldist kontekstis kirjeldatud olukorda. Selle konstruktsiooniga sarnased strateegiad on olemas ka teistes Euroopa keeltes, nt saksa, ukraina, tšehhi ja poola keeles. Saksa ja ukraina keeled on ungari keele kontaktkeeled, kuigi ungari konstruktsiooni päritolu ei ole päris selge ja see võib esineda keeles ilma keelekontaktita. Päritolu küsimus jääb siiski selle uurimuse käsitlusalast välja. Üldiselt võib mainida, et see konstruktsioon ungari keeles ei ole uus ja seda võib kohata ka 19. sajandi ungari kirjanduses.

*Erre + kõneleja*-konstruktsioon võib sisaldada nii kõnelemis- kui ka epis-teemilisi verbe, niisiis kasutatakse seda nii kõne kui ka mõtte refereeringutega. Lisaks võivad konstruktsioonis esineda ka kaudse kõne allikat tähistavad nimi-sõnafraasid, mis pärinevad kõnelemisverbidest, nt *erre a válasz* ‘selle peale vastus (on)’. Selles konstruktsioonis võib mõnel juhul toimuda ka sündmuse neutrali-seerimine verbi ellipsi kaudu. Neutralisatsioon võib mõnikord toimuda ka kõne-lejat tähistava nimisõnafraasi ellipsi kaudu, kuigi see neutralisatsiooni tüüp sõltub pigem kontekstist. Kui üks kaudse kõne konstruktsioon esineb koos teis(t)ega, ja ühes neist on kasutatud konstruktsiooni *erre + kõneleja*, siis esitab selline kvotatiivsusindeks kõne refereeringut. Sarnaselt on selline tähendus ootuspärane ka kontekstides, kus saaja on QI-s eraldi esile toodud. Vastupidi, kui kaudse kõne konstruktsioon on koos kvotatiivsusindeksiga *erre + kõneleja* esitatud ilma kontekstita, on kõige tõenäolisem see, et esitatud on mõtte refereering. Selline stsenaarium on väga sage eneserefereeringute puhul, kuna kõnelejad esitavad oma mõtte refereeringuid sagedamini kui teiste kõnelejade omasid. Sama strateegiat on kasutatud ka hüpoteetiliste refereeringutega, kuigi sel puhul on kõnelemisverb või episteemiline verb tavaliselt mineviku tingivas kõneviisis, mis omalt poolt näitab, et sündmus refereeringu taga on fiktiivne.

Teine vooruvahetuse kvotatiivkonstruktsioon on moodustatud kõnelejat tähis-tava nimisõnafraasi ja vooruvahetuse sidesõna *meg* ‘ja’ abil. Vastupidiselt *erre + kõneleja*-strateegiale võib *kõneleja + meg*-strateegiat pidada ungari keeles üsna uueks, kuna seda tüüpi konstruktsiooni ungari ajaloolises korpuses ei esine. Siiski on mõlemad vooruvahetuse konstruktsioonid struktuurilt sarnased. Ainus erinevus on, et *meg*-konstruktsioonis ei esine kaudse kõne allikat tähistavaid nimisõna-fraase. Muus osas toimib *meg*-konstruktsioon sarnaselt *erre*-konstruktsiooniga. Sündmuse neutralisatsioon verbi ellipsi kaudu hägustab mõnes kontekstis erine-vusi kõne ja mõtte refereeringu vahel. Hüpoteetilised refereeringud on esitatud peamiselt mineviku tingivas kõneviisis verbiga.

Referereeringut esitav konstruktsioon sisaldab tavaliselt endofoorilist demonst-ratiivi *az* või allikat tähistavat nimisõnafraasi komitatiivis koos erinevate verbi-tüüpidega. Selline QI on tavaliselt kaudsest kõnest eraldatud komplementlause sidesõna *hogy* abil. Selles konstruktsioonis esinevad verbid võib jagada kolme rühma: (i) spetsiifilised kõneverbid, nt *válaszol* ‘vastama’, *visszautasít* ‘tagasi lükkama’, (ii) liikumisverbid *jön* ‘tulema’ ja *előáll* ‘edasi astuma, ka: väitma,

esitama' ja (iii) inhoatiivsed verbid, nt *kezd* 'alustama', *indít* 'alustama, hakkama'. Erinevad verbirühmad tähistavad erinevaid protsesse, kuigi toimivad struktuuraalselt sarnaselt. Kõnelemisverbid tähistavad mõistagi kõneprotsesse. Liikumisverbid esinevad tavaliselt kontekstis, kus refereeringus on esitatud uut infot. Nende tähendus sõltub tavaliselt refereeringust ja kontekstist, seetõttu pole neid alati võimalik ümber sõnastada ühe kõneverbiga. Inhoatiivsed verbid omakorda tähistavad kõne alguprotsesse. Kui endofoorilise demonstratiivi asemel esineb kaudse kõne allikat tähistav nimisõnafraas, täpsustab see kaudse kõne sündmust.

Need verbirühmad ei saa esineda koos mõtte refereeringutega, seega võib väita, et kõik selles konstruktsioonis esinevad verbid esitavad ainult kõne refereeringuid. Fiktiivsed kõne refereeringud on esitatud mineviku tingivas kõneviisis ja näitavad seega kirjeldatud sündmuse irrealsusest.

### **C. Kvotatiivsusindeksid soome ja eesti keeles**

Tänapäeva soome ja eesti keeles on mitmesuguseid kvotatiivsusmarkereid ja strateegiaid, mis omakorda toob kaasa erineva kompleksusega struktuure. Mõlemas keeles kasutatakse uute kvotatiivide allikateana sarnaseid kategooriaid. Markerite valik on samasugune kui paljudes teistes maailma keeltes: mõlemas keeles on kvotatiivsusstrateegiates kasutusel sarnasust väljendavad markerid, kvantorid, komplementlause sidesõnad, viisideiktikud ja liikumisverbid. Kõik nimetatud markerid peale liikumisverbide on kasutatud sarnastes strateegiates – nad esinevad koos erinevate verbitüüpidega ja RD allikat kodeerivate nimisõnafraasidega või ilmnevad üheainsa QI-na.

Nimetatud markerid esinevad koos refereerivate verbidega, kvotatiivkonstruktsioonis, kus sündmus on neutraliseeritud, võib refereeriva verbi asemel esineda koopulaverb (sm *olla*, ee *olema*). Niisiis võib neutraliseeritud kvotatiivkonstruktsioon edasi anda nii kõnet kui ka mõtet, sest koopulaverbi asemel võivad teoreetiliselt esineda nii kõnelemisverbid kui ka epistemiilised verbid. Mõnel puhul on need tähendused hägusad ja täpsemale tähendusele võib osutada ainult kontekst. Peale selle võivad need refereeringud olla faktuaalsed või fiktiivsed. Niisiis võib refereerija esitada fiktiivse refereeringu seda täpsustamata. Erinevalt soome keelest, kus esineb ainult üht tüüpi neutraliseeritud konstruktsioon (koopulaverbiga), areneb eesti keeles neutralisatsioon edasi ning ka kõnelejat tähistav nimisõnafraas võib jääda elliptiliseks. Niisiis esitab refereerija hüpoteetilise refereeringu, mis võib hüpoteetiliselt esineda kirjeldatud kontekstis, aga mida ei ole esitanud konkreetne kõneleja.

Mõlemas keeles on neutraliseeringu järgmine samm QI redutseerimine ühele elemendile. Eespool kirjeldatud markerid võivad seega esineda QI-na ka üksi. Loomulikult on sellist QI-d tihti kasutatud kontekstides, kus on esitatud hüpoteetiline refereering, kuna täpsustatud ei ole ei algupärane kõneleja ega refereeringut kirjeldav sündmus. Järelikult võib refereering olla produtseeritud erinevate kõnelejate poolt erinevates kontekstides.

Nii eesti kui ka soome keeles võivad uued kvotatiivid kombineeruda üheks konstruktsiooniks. Sellised koosinemised sisaldavad mõnikord sarnasust väljendavaid markereid, mis märgivad umbkaudselt esitatuid refereeringuid. Erinevust markerite vahel võib näha nendes konstruktsioonides, kus markerid esinevad koos nimisõnafraasidega või kus need on ainsad QI-d. Kuna selline kasutus vajab tavaliselt spetsiifilist konteksti ja minu materjalis esineb seda harva, selgitan ma näidete puudumisel seda erinevust ainult kirjaliku keele põhjal. Võimalik, et suulises kõnes seesugust kasutust siiski esineb, see vajaks aga edasist uurimist.

Markerite struktuurilisele sarnasusele vaatamata (sm *niin kuin, tyyl(i)n*), ee *nagu, a la*) väljendavad need erinevaid tähendusi. Sarnasusmarkerid näitavad, et refereering on esitatud umbkaudselt või on hüpoteetiline. Ka minimaalsuse tähendusega kvantorid (sm *vaa(n)*, ee *lihtsalt*) võivad esitada umbkaudseid refereeringuid, kuigi koos hüpoteetiliste refereeringutega need süstemaatiliselt ei esine. Seda võib seletada markerite semantika kaudu. Sarnasusmarkerid esitavad refereeringuid sellisena, nagu need võiksid olla juhtunud, minimaalsust väljendaval kvantoritel samasugust tähendust ei ole. Maksimaalsuse kvantorid (sm *ihan*, ee *täiega*) esitavad seevastu refereeringuid kui esmaallikast saadud infot. Lisaks nendele kvantoritele võib eesti keeles kohata ka maksimaalsust väljendavat kvantorit *vapsee*, kopeeritud vene keele kvantorist *voobšče*. Analüüsitud materjalis on kvantorit *vapsee* kasutatud ainult koos refereerivate verbidega. Niisiis esineb see element kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides ainult täiendava elemendina, iseseisva QI-na seda ei kasutata.

Mõlemas keeles on komplementlause sidesõnu (sm *et(tä)*, ee *et*) kasutatud peamiselt koos refereerivate verbidega ja need näitavad refereeringu algust. Kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides, kus sündmus on neutraliseeritud, toimivad need aga kvotatiivsusmarkeritena. Mõlemad komplementlause sidesõnad on episteemiliselt neutraalsed. Kui refereerijal on vaja väljendada täiendavat episteemilist toetust, võib ta lisada kvotatiivsele osalausele episteemilisi partikleid või adverbiaale. Ka verbi valikuga on võimalik väljendada episteemilist toetust, nt *kahtlema, üllatuma* jne.

Viisideiktikuid (sm *sillee(n)*, ee *nii (et)*) on kasutatud ainult katafoorselt ja need osutavad refereeringu olemasolule. Kvotatiivsuse domeenis, nagu ka sellest väljaspool, on neil esile tõstev funktsioon ja need keskendavad vastuvõtja tähelepanu kaudse kõne olemasolule. RD tähendusi mõjutavad mitmesugused struktuuri eripärad. Rohkem neutraliseeritud KO-des esitavad nad refereeringut täielikult hüpoteetilisena. Teisalt võib spetsiifiline kasutus mõjutada markerite kasutust erinevates vahendatud kõne tüüpides.

Liikumisverbe (sm *tulla*, ee *tulema*) on kasutatud kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides, mis sisaldavad kaudse kõne allikat väljendavaid nimisõnafraase. Netisuhtlustes kirjeldatakse nende kaudu sõnumi kulgemist algupäraselt allikalt saajale. Erinevalt teiste keelte liikumisverbidest, mis võivad esineda mitmesugustes RD-konstruktsioonides (nt ingl *go*, vt ka Buchstaller ja Van Alphen 2012), on soome ja eesti liikumisverbid piiratud eespool mainitud kontekstidega ja minu materjalis neid teistes konstruktsioonides kvotatiivsuse domeenis ei esine. Sellel konstruktsioonil

on siiski ka olemas ka neutraliseeritud variant, kus kaudse kõne allikat tähistav nimisõna fraas on elliptiline. Sel juhul näitavad kaudse kõne olemasolu ainult liikumisverb ja komplementlause sidesõna, mis paikneb QI ja kaudse kõne vahel.

**Järeldused.** Uuritud keelte põhjal võib kokku võtta, et semantilistest klassidest ainult kõne- ja episteemilised verbid, kaudse kõne allikat kodeerivad nimisõna fraasid (mis võivad tähistada nii elusaid kui ka elutuid referente), komplementlause sidesõnad ja demonstratiivid esinevad kõikide uuritud keelte QI-des. Nende elementide kasutus ei ole siiski ühtlane, see toetub eelkõige sisemistele grammatiseerumisprotsessidele ja QI-s erinevate semantiliselt refereerivate ja mitte-refereerivate markerite kasutuse eelistusele. Sarnast põhimõtet võib näha ka erinevate grammatiliste kategooriate (nt mitterefereerivate verbide, kvotatiivsuspargilite, sarnasusmarkerite ja kvantorite) kasutuses. Iga keele kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides toimuvad niisiis sisemised protsessid, mille tõttu hakatakse kasutama mitmesuguseid algselt mitterefererivaid kategooriad või grammatiseerunud kvotatiivmarkereid, mis hakkavad viimaks täitma kvotatiivseid funktsioone.

Otsesemat vastavust keelte vahel võib näha keelte puhul, mis on tihedalt seotud. Niisiis võib soome ja eesti keeles näha kvotatiivsuse domeenis sama tüüpi elemente ja neid kasutatakse kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides sarnaselt. Komi ja udmurdi keeles võib näha märgatavaid sarnasusi omakeelsete kvotatiivsuspargilite kasutuses ja demonstratiivide valikus. Vaid mitterefereerivate elementide valiku ja vene keele mõju tõttu on udmurdi keele kvotatiivsusmarkerite arsenal suurem kui komi keele oma. Selline erinevus tuli siiski esile ainult mittestandardises kirjalikus keeles, teistes registrites või sarnastes registrites spontaanses suulises kõnes võib see puududa. Ungari keel kui kaugem sugulaskeel, kasutab kvotatiivkonstruktsioonides omakorda rohkem omapärasteid vahendeid ja ilmub vaid vähest sarnasust teiste soome-ugri keeltega. Seda võib seletada keeltevahelise kontakti puudumisega pika aja jooksul ja iseseisvate arengutega kvotatiivsuse domeenis, seejuures on siiski võimalik soome-ugri keelte kvotatiivkonstruktsioone võrrelda.

# APPENDIX

## Grammatical abbreviations

|        |                                  |           |   |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|
| ABL    | ablative case                    | INTERJ    | interjection                              |
| ACC    | accusative case                  | IV        | inchoative verb                           |
| ADE    | adessive case                    | M         | masculine                                 |
| ADJ    | adjective                        | MAX       | maximalistic (quantifier)                 |
| ADV    | adverb                           | MD        | manner deictic                            |
| ALL    | allative case                    | MIN       | minimalistic (quantifier)                 |
| AN     | action noun                      | MIR       | mirative                                  |
| AUX    | auxiliary                        | MV        | motion verb                               |
| CAR    | caritive                         | N         | neuter                                    |
| CAUS   | causal-final case                | NEC       | necessitative                             |
| CN     | connegative                      | NEG       | negative                                  |
| CNTR   | contrastive                      | NOM       | nominative                                |
| COM    | comitative case                  | NQ        | new quotative                             |
| COMP   | complementizer                   | NSV       | non-speech verb                           |
| COMPAR | comparative                      | NUM       | numeral                                   |
| COND   | conditional                      | OPT       | optative                                  |
| CV     | converb                          | ORD       | ordinal                                   |
| D      | distal                           | P         | proximal                                  |
| DAT    | dative case                      | PAR       | partitive case                            |
| DEF    | definite                         | PartO     | participant-oriented<br>(quotative index) |
| DELA   | delative case                    | PASS      | passive                                   |
| DEM    | demonstrative pronoun            | PL        | plural                                    |
| EGR    | egressive case                   | PN        | proper noun                               |
| ELA    | elative case                     | POT       | potential mood                            |
| EMOD   | essive-modal case                | PP        | past participle                           |
| EMOT   | emoticon                         | PQC       | presentational quotative<br>constructions |
| EQV    | equational verb                  | PRE       | preverb                                   |
| ESS    | essive case                      | PREP      | prepositional case                        |
| ESS1   | essive-formal case               | PRF       | perfective                                |
| EV     | epistemic verb                   | PROG      | progressive                               |
| EvO    | event-oriented (quotative index) | PRSP      | present participle                        |
| EXIST  | existential                      | PST       | past tense                                |
| F      | feminine                         | PTCL      | particle                                  |
| FRQ    | frequentative                    | PTCP      | participle                                |
| FUT    | future tense                     | Q         | question particle                         |
| GEN    | genitive case                    | QUANT     | quantifier                                |
| IDEO   | ideophone                        | QuO       | quote-oriented (quotative index)          |
| ILL    | illative case                    | QUOT      | quotative particle                        |
| IMP    | imperative mood                  | QUOT:SELF | self-quotative particle                   |
| INCH   | inchoative                       | QV        | quotative verb                            |
| INDEF  | indefinite                       | REF       | reflexive                                 |
| INE    | inessive case                    | RD        | reported discourse                        |
| INF    | infinitive                       |           |   |
| INSTR  | instrumental case                |           |   |

|      |                              |        |                           |
|------|------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|
| SBJV | subjunctive                  | TD     | type deictic              |
| SEV  | speech and/or epistemic verb | TEMP   | temporal case             |
| SIM  | similative marker            | TOP    | topic                     |
| SG   | singular                     | TRANSL | translative case          |
| SUBL | sublative case               | TRMN   | terminative case          |
| SUP  | superlative                  | TTC    | turn-taking conjunction   |
| SUPE | superessive case             | TTD    | turn-taking demonstrative |
| SV   | speech verb                  | VOC    | vocative case             |

## Other symbols and fonts

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>bold</b>                    | an emphasized word-form  |
| '...'                          | boundaries of the translation of an example  |
| <u>underline</u>               | boundaries of reported discourse in the translation of an example  |
| <u><u>double underline</u></u> | boundaries of self-quotations in the translation of an example if another RD belonging to a source of consciousness different from the current reporter is present within one text |
| (source)                       | a shortened reference to the source of an example  |

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Admann, Aino. 1975. Otsene kõne ja saatelause [Direct speech and quotative clause]. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat*, 63–71.
- Admann, Aino. 1976. Otsese ja kaudse kõne segavormidest eesti kirjakeeles [On the mixed forms of direct and indirect speech in the Estonian literary language]. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat*, 71–79.
- Admann, Aino. 1983. Otsekõnele lähedastest juhtudest kirjakeeles [On the cases close to direct speech in the literary standard]. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat*, 22–26.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2008. Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Sciences* 30. 383–422.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. Evidentiality: the framework. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, 1–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Robert M.W. Dixon (eds.). 2014. *The Grammar of Knowledge: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alphen, Ingrid van. 2006. Ik had zoiets van “doei”. Interactioneel sociolinguïstische aspecten van *van*-citaties [I felt like “bye”. Interactional sociolinguistic aspects of *van*-quotations]. In: Koole, Tom, Jacomine Nortier & Bert Tahitu (eds.), *Artikelen voorde 5 e Sociolinguïstische Conferentie*, 29–42. Delft: Oburon.
- Alphen, Ingrid van. 2008. Het zijn niet mijn woorden hoor. Gender and (pseudo-)citaten [These are not my words hey. Gender and (pseudo-)quotes]. *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies* 11, 37–52.
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey. 2014. Clitics in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt. *Basic Research Working Papers. Series: Linguistics*. National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of Philology, 1–20.
- Arutjunova, Nina D. 2000. Pokazateli čužoj reči *de, deskat', mol.* K probleme interpretacii rečepovedenčeskix aktov [Reported speech markers *de, deskat', mol.* Towards the problems in interpretation of behavioral speech acts]. In: Arutjunova, Nina D. (ed.), *Jazyk o jazyke*, 437–453. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The Pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In: Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barredo, Inma Muñoa. 1997. Pragmatic functions of code-switching mong Basque-Spanish bilinguals, 528–541. Available at: <http://ssl.webs.uvigo.es/actas1997/04/Munhoa.pdf> (February 1, 2019).
- Bartens, Raija. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys* [Structure and development of Permic languages]. SUST 238. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bashir, Elena. 1996. Mosaic of Tongues: Quotatives and Complementizers in Northwest Indo-Aryan, Burushaski, and Balti. In: Hanaway, William L. & Wilma Heston (eds.), *Studies in Pakistani Popular Culture*, 187–286. Lahore: Lok Virsa.
- Bencédy, József, Pál Fábrián, Endre Rácz & Márton Velcsov (eds.). 1976. *A mai magyar nyelv* [Contemporary Hungarian]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic meaning: A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Boye, Kasper. 2018. Evidentiality: The notion and the term. In: Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, 261–272. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Boye, Kasper & Petar Kehayov. 2016. Complementizer semantics – an introduction. In: Boye, Kasper & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. (= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 57), 1–15. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bubrix, Dmitrij V. 1949. *Grammatika literaturnogo komi jazyka* [Grammar of literary Komi]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2001. He goes and I'm like: The new quotatives revisited. *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (NWAYE)* 30, 1–20.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2004. Newcomers to the pool of quotatives: *Like* and *go*. In: Pilar Garcés Conejos, Reyes Gómez Moron, Lucia Fernández Amaya & Manuel Padilla Cruz (eds.), *Current Trends in Intercultural, Cognitive and Social Pragmatics*, 219–240. Sevilla: University of Sevilla Press.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2006. Social stereotypes, personality traits and regional perceptions displaced: Attitudes towards the 'new' quotatives in the UK. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(3): 362–381.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2013. *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. Introductory Remarks on New and Old Quotatives. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, XII–XXX. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bugaeva, Anna. 2008. Reported Discourse and Logophoricity in Southern Hokkaido Dialects of Ainu. *Gengo Kenkyu* 133, 31–75.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from *verba dicendi* in Sinitic languages. *Linguistic Typology* 12, 45–98.
- Clark, Herbert H. 2016. Depicting as a Method of Communication. *Psychological Review* 123(3), 324–347.
- Coppen, Peter-Arno & Ad Foolen. 2012. Dutch quotative *van*: Past and present. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 259–281. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Coulmas, Florian (ed.). 1986. *Direct and indirect speech*. (= *Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs* 31). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1986. Reported speech: Some general issues. In: Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, 1–28. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clark, Herbert & Richard Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language* 66, 764–805.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 1998. Coherent voicing: On prosody in conversational reported speech. *LiSt. Interaction and Linguistic Structures* 1, 1–26.
- Crystal, David. 2001. *Language and the Internet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cunliffe, Daniel, Delyth Morris & Cynog Prys. 2013. Investigation the Differential Use of Welsh in Young Speakers' Social Networks: A Comparison of Communication in Face-to-Face Setting. In: Gruffydd Jones, Elin Haf & Enrique Uribe-Jongbloed (eds.), *Social Media and Minority Languages: Convergence and the Creative Industries*, 75–86. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Daiber, Thomas. 2010. Quotativmarker im Russischen (*tipo/tipa*) [Quotative marker in Russian (*tipo/tipa*)]. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 55(1), 69–89.

- Diewald, Gabriele & Elena Smirnova (eds.). 2010. *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European languages*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. 2006. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In: Dixon, Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 1983. A magyar nyelvi egyenes idézeteinek és idéző mondat-egységeinek kapcsolatáról [On the relationship between direct quotations and quotative constructions in Hungarian]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 107, 472–481.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 1985. Az idézés grammatikai módjai Heltai Gáspár nyelvében [The grammatical expression of quotation in Gáspár Heltai's language]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 109, 337–348.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 1988a. A grammatikailag jelölt idézések a könyvnyomtatás első évtizedeiben I. Az egyenes idézés [Grammatically marked quotations in the first decades of letter-press printing I. Direct quotations]. *Magyar Nyelv* 84, 283–295.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 1988b. A grammatikailag jelölt idézések a könyvnyomtatás első évtizedeiben II. A függő idézés és az átmeneti idézési módok [Grammatically marked quotations in the first decades of letter-press printing II. Indirect quotations and transitional ways of quotation]. *Magyar Nyelv* 84, 415–425.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 2001. Tendencies in the development of Late Old Hungarian and Early Middle Hungarian main clauses of reported speech. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48(4), 337–369.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 2008. Az *úgy mond*-tól az *úgymond*-ig. Egy diskurzusjelölő elem története az ómagyar kortól napjainkig [From *úgy mond* to *úgymond*. The history of a discourse marker from Old Hungarian to the present]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 37–52.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 2015. A *mondván* és az *úgymond*: diskurzusjelölő elemek keletkezése idéző szerkezetekből [*Mondván* and *úgymond*: formation of the discourse markers from quotative constructions]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 21–37.
- Eckhardt, Regine. 2012. Particles as speaker indexicals in free indirect discourse. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 35, 99–119.
- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2013. Ob osnovnyx raznovidnostjax sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka. [On the fundamental varieties of the modern Udmurt language]. *Ežegodnik finno-ugorskix issledovanij* (3), 7–18.
- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2014. The varieties of the modern Udmurt language. *FUF* 62, 376–398.
- EKG 1993 = Erelt, Mati, Reet Kasik, Helle Metslang, Henno Rajandi, Kristiina Ross, Henn Saari, Kaja Tael, Silvi Vare (eds.). *Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks* [The Grammar of Estonian II. Syntax]. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- EKK 2007 = Erelt, Mati, Tiiu Erelt, Kristiina Ross (eds.). *Eesti keele käsiraamat* [The Handbook of Estonian]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- EKS 2017 = Erelt, Mati & Helle Metslang (eds.). *Eesti keele süntaks* [The Syntax of Estonian]. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.
- Erelt, Mati, Helle Metslang, Karl Pajusalu. 2006. Tense and Evidentiality in Estonian. In: Cornillie, Bert & Nicole Delbecque (eds.), *Topics in Subjectification and Modalization*, 125–136. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eriksson, Mats. 1995. A case of grammaticalization in Modern Swedish: The Use of *ba* in Adolescent Speech. *Language Sciences* 17, 19–48.

- Evans, Nicholas. 2013. Some problems in the typology of quotation: a canonical approach. In: Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*, 66–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fedjunëva, Galina V. (ed.). 1998. *Komi jazyk. Ėnciklopedija* [The Komi language. Encyclopedia]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ferrara, Kathleen & Barbara Bell. 1995. Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: The case of *be + like*. *American Speech* 70(3): 265–290.
- Fónagy, Ivan. 1986. Reported speech in French and Hungarian. In: Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*, 250–310. Berlin, New York & Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Foolen, Ad, Ingrid van Alphen, Erik Hoekstra, Henk Lammers, Harrie Mazeland & Esther Pascual. 2006. Het quotatieve *van*. Vorm, functie en sociolinguïstische variatie [Quotative *van*. Form, function and sociolinguistic variation]. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* 76. *Thema's en trends in de sociolinguïstiek* 5(2): 137–149.
- Fox, Sue. 2012. Performed narrative: The pragmatic function of *this is + speaker* and other quotatives in London adolescent speech. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 231–259.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1995. A functional theory of complementizers. In: Bybee, Joan & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, 453–502. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1996. *Grammaticalization of the complex sentence: a case study in Chadic*. (= Studies in Language Companion Series 32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fraser, Bruce. 2010. Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Hedging. In: Kaltenböck, Gunther, Wiltrud Mihatsch & Stefan Schneider (eds.), *New Approaches to Hedging*, 15–35. UK, North America, Japan, India, Malaysia, China: Brill.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Beáta Gyuris. 2014. A Note on Quotative Inversion in Hungarian. *FULL* 3, 2–30.
- Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka. 2018. Direct and indirect speech revisited: Semantic universals and semantic diversity. In: Capone, Alessandro, Manuel Garcia-Carpintero & Alessandra Falzone (eds.), *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics in the World Languages*, 173–199. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Golato, Andrea. 2000. An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions: *Und ich so/und er so* ‘and I’m like/and he’s like’. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 29–54.
- Greed, Teija. 2014. The expression of knowledge in Tatar. In: Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. & Robert M.W. Dixon (eds.), *The Grammar of Knowledge: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 69–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.). 2018. *Epistemic Modalities and Evidentiality in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2001. *Quotative Constructions in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Habilitation Thesis: Institute für Afrikanistik, Universität Leipzig.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: a synchronic and diachronic survey*. (= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 34). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2012. Thetic speaker-instantiating quotative indexes as a cross-linguistic type. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives*:

- Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 117–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Günthner, Susanne. 1999. Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(5), 685–708.
- Haakana, Markku. 2005. Sanottua, ajateltua ja melkein sanottua: puheen ja ajatusten referointi valituskertomuksissa [Said, thought and almost said: quotations of speech and thought in complaint stories]. In: Haakana, Markku & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.), *Referointi ja moniäänisyys*, 114–149. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Haakana, Markku. 2006. Reported thought in complaint stories. In: Holt, Elizabeth & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, 150–178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haakana, Markku & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.). 2005. *Referointi ja moniäänisyys* [Reporting and polyphony]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Haan, Ferdinand de. 2005. Semantic distinctions of evidentiality. In: Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*, 314–317. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habeck, Joachim Otto. 1998. The Existing and Potential Role of the Internet for Indigenous Communities in the Russian Federation. In: Kasten, Erich (ed.), *Bicultural Education in the North: Ways of Preserving and Enhancing Indigenous Peoples’ Languages and Traditional Knowledge*, 275–289. Münster, New York, München & Berlin: Waxmann.
- Hasund, Ingrid Kristine, Toril Opsahl & Jan Svennevig. 2012. By three means: The pragmatic functions of three Norwegian quotatives. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, 37–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1979. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* [The structure and development of Finnish]. Helsinki: Otava.
- Hansen, Björn, Alexander Letuchiy & Izabela Błaszczuk. 2016. Complementizers in Slavonic. In: Boye, Kasper & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages. (= Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 57)*, 175–225. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernard & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa, Marjut Johansson ja Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen. 2014. Johdatus digitaalisen vuorovaikutukseen [Introduction to the digital interaction]. In: Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa, Marjut Johansson, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (eds.), *Kieli verkossa: Näkökulmia digitaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen*, 9–29. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hlavac, Jim. 2006. Bilingual discourse markers: Evidence from Croatian-English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(11), 1870–1900.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2018. Epistemic modality, evidentiality, quotativity and echoic use. In: Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.), *Epistemic Modalities and Evidentiality in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 242–259. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2001. *A Natural History of Negation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Ikola, Osmo. 1961. *Das Referat in der finnischen Sprache. Syntaktisch-stilistische Untersuchungen* [Reporting in Finnish. Syntactic and stylistic investigations]. Helsinki: Suomen tiedekatemia.

- ISK 2004 = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja-Riitta Heinonen, Irja Alho (eds.). *Iso Suomen Kielioppi* [Descriptive Grammar of Finnish]. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 950. – 3. painos 2005. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Johanson, Lars. 1993. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, Guus & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Immigrant languages in Europe*, 197–221. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Juhász, Dezső. 1992. A kötőszók [Conjunctions]. In: Benkő, Loránd (ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/t.: A kései ómagyar kor: Morfematika*, 772–814. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kalliokoski, Jyrki. 2005. Referointi ja moniäänisyys kielenkäytön ilmiönä [Reporting and polyphony as a phenomenon in a language use]. In: Haakana, Markku & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.), *Referointi ja moniäänisyys*, 9–42. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Karpova, Ljudmila L. (ed.). 2013. *Leksika severnogo narečija udmurtskogo jazyka. Srednečepckij dialekt* [Vocabulary of northern dialect of Udmurt. Middle Čepce dialect]. Iževsk: UrO RAN i NISO UrO RAN.
- Karsenberg, Lars & Karen Lahousse. 2018. On the different interpretations of sentence-initial *ainsi* ‘so’ and the competition between three types of Verb-Subject order. *Folia Linguistica* 52(1), 1–38.
- Keevalik, Leelo. 2000. Keelendid *et* ja *nii et* vestluses [The linguistic forms *et* and *nii et* in the conversation]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 5, 344–358.
- Keevalik, Leelo. 2008. Clause combining and sequenced actions: the Estonian complementizer and pragmatic particle *et*. In Laury, Ritva (ed.): *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, 125–152. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kehayov, Petar. 2002. Typology of Grammaticalized Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 38(2), 126–144.
- Kehayov, Petar. 2004. Eesti keele evidentsiaalsussüsteem mõne teise keele taustal [The Estonian evidential system in the background of another language]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 47(12), 895–914.
- Kehayov, Petar. 2016. Complementation marker semantics in Finnic (Estonian, Finnish, Karelian). In: Boye, Kasper & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. (= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 57), 449–499. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kel'makov, Valentin. 1981. *Obrazcy udmurtskoj reči. Severnoe narečie i sredinnye govory* [Examples of Udmurt speech. Northern dialect and central varieties]. Iževsk: Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut pri sovete ministrov Udmurtskoj ASSR.
- Kel'makov, Valentin. 1990. *Obrazcy udmurtskoj reči II: Sredinnye govory* [Examples of Udmurt speech II. Central varieties]. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Kenesei, István, Robert M. Vago & Anna Fenyvesi (eds.). 1998. *Hungarian*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kerge, Krista. 1979. *Refereering tänapäeva eesti keeles* [Reported speech in contemporary Estonian]. Diploma thesis. Tartu: University of Tartu.
- Keszler, Borbála (ed.). 2000. *Magyar grammatika* [Hungarian Grammar]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Kibardina, Tatiana. 2012. *Sredstva vyraženiija modal'nosti v udmurtskom jazyke* [The means of expressing modality in Udmurt]. Iževsk: Udmurtskij universitet.

- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1986. Some semantic aspects of indirect speech in Hungarian. In: Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, 201–217. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 2015. Indirect and Direct Reports in Hungarian. In: Capone, Alessandro, Ferenc Kiefer & Franco Lo Piparo (eds.), *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics*, 77–93. New York, Dordrecht & London: Springer.
- Klaas, Birute. 1997. The Quotative mood in the Baltic Sea Areal. *Typological Studies II*. Tartu Ülikooli Eesti Keele Õppetooli Toimetised 7, 73–97.
- Klaudy, Kinga. Az idéző mondategység igéiről [On the verbs in the quotative constructions]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 110, 214–222.
- Klemm, Antal. 1938. Die indirekte Rede (*oratio obliqua*) im Ungarischen [Indirect speech (*oratio obliqua*) in Hungarian]. *Verhandlungen der gelehrten estnischen Gesellschaft* 30, 254–263.
- Klewitz, Gabriele & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 1999. Quote – Unquote? The role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences. *Pragmatics* 9(4), 459–485.
- Klumpp, Gerson. 2016. Semantic functions of complementizers in Permic languages. In: Boye, Kasper & Petar, Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. (= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 57), 529–586. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Knight, Emily. 2008. Hyperpolsemy in Bunuba, a polysynthetic language of the Kimberley, Western Australia. In: Goddard, Cliff (ed.), *Cross-Linguistic Semantics*, 205–225. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Koivisto, Venla. 2016. *Voimaannuttava kävely: Identiteettiä, vertaisuutta ja muisteluälyä vahvistava menetelmä* [A method of identity, peer and remembrance work reinforcement]. Master thesis. Turku: University of Applied Sciences. Available at: <http://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/104972> (September 1, 2017).
- König, Ekkehard. 2015. The deictic identification of similarity. In: Treis, Yvonne & Martine Vanhoeve (eds.), *Similitive and Equative Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, 143–167. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koski, Mauno. 1985. Toisen tekstiin viittaaminen nykyisessä kirjasuomessa [Reference to another text in contemporary literary Finnish]. *Fennisistica* 5, 70–179.
- Kovács, Magdolna. 2001. *Code-switching and language shift: In Australian Finnish in comparison with Australian Hungarian*. PhD dissertation. Åbo: Åbo akademis förlag.
- Körtvély, Erika. 2016. Modal functions of the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ in Hungarian. In: Boye, Kasper & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. (= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 57), 587–619. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kuiri, Kaija. 1984. *Referointi Kainuun ja Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa* [Reporting in Kainuu and Northern Karelian dialects]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kunelius, Sirja. 1998. *Niinku*-partikkeli keskustelussa [*Niinku*-particle in conversation]. BA thesis. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Kurkkio, Markku. 1978. *Referaatti 1960-luvun suomen yleiskielessä*. [Reporting in Finnish general language in the 1960’s]. Oulun yliopiston suomen ja saamen kielen laitoksen tutkimusraportteja 16. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.
- Kuznetsov, Nikolaj. 2010. Komi keelest. Mitte eriti optimistlikult [About the Komi language. Not very optimistically]. *Oma keel* 1, 86–93.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Langemets, Margit, Mait Tiits, Tiia Valdre, Leidi Veskis, Ülle Viks & Piret Voll (eds.). 2009. *Eesti keele seletav sõnaraamat*. Eesti kirjakeele seletussõnaraamatu 2., täiendatud ja parandatud trükk [Explanatory Dictionary of Estonian. Explanatory Dictionary of the Estonian standard language 2, supplemented and amended]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus. Available at: <http://www.eki.ee/dict/ekss/index.cgi> (December 1, 2018).
- Lappalainen, Hanna. 2005. Referointi ja variaatio. Sitaatit yksilöllisen variaation kuvastimina ja resursseina [Reporting and variation. Quotations as examples and sources of individual variables]. In: Haakana, Markku & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.), *Referointi ja moniäänisyys*, 150–186. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Leinonen, Marja. 2000. Evidentiality in Komi Zyryan. In: Johanson, Lars & Bo Utas (eds.), *Evidentials: Turcic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, 419–440. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Leinonen, Marja. 2002. Influence of Russian on the syntax of Komi. *FUF* 57, 195–358.
- Leinonen, Marja. 2006. The Russification of Komi. *Slavica Helsingiensia* 27, 234–245.
- Leinonen, Marja. 2009. Russian influence on the Ižma Komi dialect. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13(3), 309–329.
- Leinonen, Marja. 2015. Borrowability of Function and Discourse Words: The Komi Case. *Izvestija Komi naučnogo centra UrO RAN* 22(2), 90–94.
- Letučij, Aleksandr. 2008. Sravnitel'nye konstrukcii, irrealis i èvidencial'nost' [Comparative constructions, irrealis and evidentiality]. In Wiemer, Björn & Vladimir A. Plungjan (eds.) *Lexikalische Evidenzialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen*, 215–238. München: Sagner.
- Lytkin, Vasilij I. (ed.). 1955. *Sovremennyj komi jazyk* [The contemporary Komi language]. Syktyvkar: Komi Knižnoe Izdatel'stvo.
- Lytkin, Vasilij I. & Evgenij S. Guljaev. 1970. *Kratkij etimologičeskij slovar' komi jazyka* [Short etymological dictionary of the Komi language]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Matić, Dejan & Brigitte Pakendorf. 2013. Non-canonical SAY in Siberia. Areal and genealogical patterns. *Studies in Language* 37(2), 356–412.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazeland, Harrie. 2006. 'VAN' as a quotative in Dutch: Marking quotations as a typification. In: Koole, Tom, Jacomine Nortier & Bert Tahitu (eds.), *Artikelen van de Vijfde Sociolinguïstische Conferentie*, 354–365. Delft: Eburon.
- McGregor, William B. 1990. *A functional grammar of Gooniyandi*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McGregor, William B. 1994. The grammar of reported speech and thought in Gooniyandi. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 14(1), 63–92.
- McGregor, William B. 2014. The 'say, do' verb in Nyulnyul, Warrwa, and other Nyulnyulan languages is monosemic. In: Robering, Klaus (ed.), *Events, Arguments, and Aspects: Topics in the Semantics of Verbs*, 301–329. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Metslang, Helle. 1985. Sisukas ja sisutu nagu [Meaningful and meaningless *nagu*]. *Ars grammatica* 1985, 48–61.
- Mortelmans, Tanja. 2000. On the 'Evidential' Nature of the 'Epistemic' Use of the German Modals *müssen* and *sollen*. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 14(1), 131–148.
- Murvai, Olga. 1976. A szabad függő beszéd stilushatásának kérdéséhez [The stylistic effects of free indirect discourse]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 100: 289–296.
- Nekrasova, Galina A. 2013. Dublirovanie v televizionnoj reči komi bilingva [Duplications in a television speech of bilingual Komi]. *Jazyk i kul'tura* 3(23), 73–81.

- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012a. Personal deixis and reported discourse. Towards a typology of person alignment. *Linguistic Typology* 16(2), 233–263.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012b. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). *Anthropological Linguistics* 54(3), 280–301.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Volume II: Complex constructions (2nd edn.), 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oja, Anni. 2006. Eesti keel internetis [Estonian on the internet]. *Keel ja arvuti*, 259–268.
- Olbertz, Hella. 2007. *Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: the subjectification of reportative meaning. *Rivista di linguistica* 19(1), 151–172.
- Oravecz, Csaba, Tamás Váradi & Bálint Sass. 2014. The Hungarian Gigaword Corpus. *Proceeding of LREC 2014*, 1719–1723.
- Oshima, David Y. & Shin-ichiro Sano. 2012. On the characteristics of Japanese reported discourse: A study with special reference to elliptic quotation. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 145–173. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pajusalu, Renate. 1996. Regulative Utterances in Estonian Literary Dialogues and Radio Interviews. In: Õim, Haldur (ed.): *Estonian in the Changing World*, 133–162. Tartu: University of Tartu, Department of General Linguistics.
- Palmer, Frank. 1986. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1948. Referaatista 1. selosteesta [On first-hand reports]. *Virittäjä* 52, 48–69.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2013. Udmurtskij i besermjanskij jazyki v social'nyx setjax [Udmurt and Besermyan on social networking sites]. *Materialy Meždunarodnoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferentsii, posvyjaščennoj 160-letnemu jubileju V.G. Korolenko*. Glazov: OOO “Glazovskaja tipografija”.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2014a. Zapis(k)i iz *Murdžol Underground*: Super udmurty v *Cyberspace* [Notes/records from underground: Super Udmurts in cyberspace]. *Tvorčestvo Flora Vasiljeva i voprosy jazyka, literatury, obrazovanija v globalizirujuščemsja mire: Materialy IV Meždunarodnoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferentsii “Florovskie čtenija”*. Glazov: Glazovskij Gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2014b. Udmurtness in Web 2.0: Urban Udmurts resisting language shift. *FUM* 38, 143–162.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2016. Udmurt on Social Network Sites: A Comparison with the Welsh Case. In: Toivanen, Reetta & Janne Saarikivi (eds.), *Linguistic Genocide or Superdiversity?* (= *Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights* 14), 108–132. Bristol, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Plungjan, Vladimir. 2008. O pokazateljax čužoj reči i nedostovernosti v russkom jazyke [On markers of reported speech and uncertainty in Russian]. In: Wiemer, Björn & Vladimir Plungjan (eds.), *Lexikalische Evidentialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen*, 285–311. München: Sagner.
- Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff & Christopher Miller. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26, 47–104.
- Rätsep, Huno. 1971. Kas kaudne kõneviis on kõneviis? [Is the reportative mood a mood?]. *Keel ja struktuur* 5, 45–69.
- Reesink Ger, P. 1993. Inner speech in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24, 217–225.



- Rickford, John R., Thomas Wasow, Arnold Zwicky & Isabelle Buchstaller. 2007. Intensive and quotative ALL: Something old, something new. *American Speech* 82(1), 3–31.
- Romaine, Suzanne & Deborah Lange. 1991. The Use of like as a Marker of Reported Speech and Thought: A Case of Grammaticalization in Progress. *American Speech* 66(3), 227–279.
- Routarinne, Sara. 2005. Keskustelupuheen johtolauseiden kielioppia [On the grammar of quotative clauses in conversation]. In: Haakana, Markku & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.), *Referointi ja moniäänisyys*, 83–113. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1982. *An Intra-Sentence Grammar of Ungarinjin, North-Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1990. Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92(2), 346–361.
- Salánki, Zsuzsa. 2007a. *Az udmurt nyelv mai helyezete* [The present-day situation of the Udmurt language]. PhD thesis. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Salánki, Zsuzsa. 2007b. *The present-day situation of the Udmurt language*. Theses of PhD dissertation. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Salánki, Zsuzsa. 2015. The bilingualism of Finno-Ugric language speakers in the Volga Federal district. In: Stolz, Christel (ed.), *Language Empires in Comparative Perspective*, 237–265. Berlin, München & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sandler, Sergei & Esther Pascual. 2019. In the Beginning There Was Conversation: Fictive Direct Speech in the Hebrew Bible. *Pragmatics* 29(2), 250–276.
- Sass, Bálint. 2008. The Verb Argument Browser. *Proceedings of TSD 2008*, 187–192.
- Schourup, Lawrence. 1985. *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. New York: Garland.
- Sel’kov, Nikolaj N. 1967. *Sovremennyj komi jazyk. Učebnoe posobie dlja vysšyx učebnyx zavedenij. Č. 2: sintaksis* [Contemporary Komi. Study materials for higher educational establishments. Volume 2: syntax]. Syktyvkar: Komi knižnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Sepp, Pille. 2010. *Pronoomeni kasutus MSN-vestluses* [The use of pronouns in MSN-conversations]. Bachelor’s thesis. Tartu: University of Tartu. Available at: [http://www.murre.ut.ee/arhiiv/naita\\_pilt.php?materjal=kasikiri&materjal\\_id=D1617&sari=D](http://www.murre.ut.ee/arhiiv/naita_pilt.php?materjal=kasikiri&materjal_id=D1617&sari=D) (September 1, 2017).
- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena & Ritva Laury. 2007. Complement clauses as turn continuations: the Finnish *et(tä)*-clause. *Pragmatics* 17(4), 553–572.
- Sepper, Maria-Maren. 2007. Indirectal in Literary Estonian. *TRAMES: A Journal of the Humanities & Social Sciences* 11(3), 299–323.
- Shirobokova, Larisa. 2011. *Az udmurt-orosz kétnyelvűség (Udmurt Köztársaság, Sarkan járás, Muvyr község)* [Udmurt-Russian bilingualism (Udmurt Republic, Šarkan region, Muvyr village)]. PhD thesis. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Švedova, Natalija. 1980. *Russkaja grammatika. V dvux tomax* [Russian grammar. In two volumes]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Sipka, Sándor. 1966. Az idézés formái Németh László ‘Irgalom’ c. regényben [The forms of quotation in the novel ‘Mercy’ by László Németh]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 90, 256–268.
- SMN 1992 = Kenesei, István (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete* [Structural grammar of Hungarian. Structure of subordinate sentences]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Spronck, Stef. 2012. Minds divided: Speaker attitudes in quotatives. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 71–117. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Spronck, Stef. 2015. Refracting views: How to construct complex perspective in reported speech and thought in Ungarinyin. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 68(2), 165–185.
- Spronck, Stef. 2016. Evidential fictive interaction (in Ungarinyin and Russian). In: Pascual, Esther & Sergei Sandler (eds.), *The Conversation Frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction*, 255–277. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Spronck, Stef. 2017. Defenestration: deconstructing the frame-in relation in Ungarinyin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 114, 104–133.
- Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic typology* 23(1), 119–159.
- Sweetser, Eve E. 1988. Grammaticalization and Semantic Bleaching. *Proceedings of Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 389–405.
- Šutov, Aleksandr F. 1999. *Gipotaksis v udmurtskom jazyke. Posobie dlja studentov po sintaksisu*. [Hypotaxis in Udmurt. Study aid on syntax]. Iževsk: Udmurtskij universitet.
- Szabó, Dénes. 1958. *A mai magyar nyelv* [Contemporary Hungarian]. Budapest: Jegyzetellátó.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. & Alex D’Arcy. 2004. He’s like, she’s like: The quotative system in Canadian youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(4), 493–514.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. & Derek Denis. 2008. Linguistic ruin? LOL! Instant messaging and teen language. *American Speech* 83(1), 3–34.
- Tánczos, Orsolya. 2013. Hogy ... hogy?: Kettős kötőszók az udmurt mondatban [That ... that?: Double conjunctions in Udmurt sentence]. In: Agyagási, Klára, Attila Hegedűs & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és Kontaktológia* 2, 95–112. Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék & Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék.
- Teptiuk, Denys. 2015. *New quotatives in Finnish and Estonian*. Master thesis, University of Tartu.
- Teptiuk, Denys. 2019. New quotatives in Finnish and Estonian. *FUM* 42, 207–249.
- Teptiuk, Denys, forthcoming. Quotative indexes in Permic: between the original strategies and Russian. To appear in: Forker, Diana & Lenore Grenoble (eds.), *Language contact in the territory of the former Soviet Union*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tolodova, Svetlana Ju. & Natalija V. Serdobol’skaja. 2014. Glagol reči *manaš* v marijskom jazyke: osobennosti grammaticalizacii [The speech verb *manaš* in Mari: particularities of grammaticalization]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6, 109–134.
- Uotila, Toivo E. 1985. *Syrjänische Texte I. Komi-Permjakisch* [Zyrian texts I. Komi-Permyak]. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 186. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Uotila, Toivo E. 1989. *Syrjänische Texte III. Komi-Syrjänisch: Luza-Letka-, Ober-Sysola-, Mittel-Sysola, Prisyktyvkar-, Unter-Vyčegda- und Udora-Dialekte* [Zyrian Texts III. Komi-Zyrian: Luza-Letka, Upper Sysola, Middle Sysola, Prisyktyvkar, Lower Vyčegda and Udora dialects]. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 202. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Urmančieva, Anna Ju. 2014. Èvidencial’nye pokazateli sel’kupsckogo jazyka: sootnošenie semantiki i pragmatiki v opisanii glagol’nyx grammem [Evidential markers of Selkup: correlation between semantics and pragmatics in description of the verbal grams]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4, 66–86.
- Usačeva, Maria & Olga Birjuk. 2016. Russian in Beserman Oral Discourse: Code-Mixing and Borrowing. *Dialectologia* 17, 123–150.

- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2012. Quotative *go* and *be like*: Grammar and grammaticalization. In: Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, 174–202. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vaxrušev, Vasilij M., Vasilij N. Zaxarov & L.I. Kalinina (eds.) 1974. *Grammatika sovremenogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Sintaksis složnogo predloženiya* [Grammar of contemporary Udmurt. Syntax of the complex sentence]. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Váradi, Tamás. 2002. The Hungarian National Corpus. *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> LREC Conference*, 385–389.
- Veszelszki, Ágnes. 2010. Grammatikalizáció – különös tekintettel az *asszem*-re [Grammaticalization of the discourse marker ‘asszem’]. In: Bárdosi, Vilmos (ed.), *Világkép a nyelvben és a nyelvhasználatban*, 249–265. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet* [The basics of Finnish syntax]. Helsinki: Edita.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge & Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2008. Pokazateli s citativnoj i inferentivnoj funkcijami v rusckom i pol’sckom jazykax – kommunikativnye mexanizmy semantičeskogo sdviga [Reportative and inferential markers in Russian and Polish – communicative triggers of a semantic shift]. In: Wiemer, Björn & Vladimir Plungjan (eds.), *Lexikalische Evidentialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen*, 335–377. München: Sagner.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2010. Hearsay in European languages: toward an integrative account of grammatical and lexical marking. In: Diewald, Gabriele & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European languages*, 59–131. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2018. Evidentials and Epistemic Modality. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, 85–109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1974. The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 7, 267–307.
- Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12(1), 51–97.
- Winkler, E. 2001. *Udmurt*. Languages of the World/Materials 212. München: Lincom Europa.
- Winkler, E. 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik* [The Udmurt Grammar]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

## LIST OF DATA SOURCES

- Udmurt:

- 1) Electronic corpora:

Udmurt corpus, Blogs & Press subcorpora, <http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus> (May 15, 2019);

- 2) Text collections:

Kel'makov, Valentin. 1981. *Obrazcy udmurtskoj reči. Severnoe narečie i sredinnye govory* [Examples of Udmurt speech. Northern dialect and central varieties]. Iževsk: Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut pri sovete ministrov Udmurtskoj ASSR.

Kel'makov, Valentin. 1990. *Obrazcy udmurtskoj reči II: Sredinnye govory* [Examples of Udmurt speech II. Central varieties]. Iževsk: Udmurtija.

- 3) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

[https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=%22линейка%22&w=wall-74979691\\_719](https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=%22линейка%22&w=wall-74979691_719)

[https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=зарни&w=wall-74979691\\_169](https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=зарни&w=wall-74979691_169)

[https://vk.com/wall-1966810?q=валаны%2C%20что&w=wall-1966810\\_23380\\_r23419](https://vk.com/wall-1966810?q=валаны%2C%20что&w=wall-1966810_23380_r23419)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_1218](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_1218)

[https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=нош%20собере%20корка&w=wall-74979691\\_377\\_r379](https://vk.com/wall-74979691?q=нош%20собере%20корка&w=wall-74979691_377_r379)

[https://vk.com/wall-62098651\\_13](https://vk.com/wall-62098651_13)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_707](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_707)

[https://vk.com/wall-1966810\\_23591?reply=23606](https://vk.com/wall-1966810_23591?reply=23606)

<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey>

[https://vk.com/wall-1966810\\_24892?offset=0](https://vk.com/wall-1966810_24892?offset=0)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_530](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_530)

<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey:%20мон%20удмурт%20шуыса%20гаде%20мыжганы>

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_760](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_760)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_760](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_760)

<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey:%20и%20сразу%20луэ%20вал%20кутыны>

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_685](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_685)

<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey:%20собере%20мар%20ке%20чорк>

<https://vk.com/wall-1966810?offset=840>

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_743](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_743)

<https://vk.com/wall-1966810?offset=1100>

<https://vk.com/wall-1966810?offset=320>

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_449](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_449)

<https://www.facebook.com/shumilova1:тусоваться%20кариськыны%20мынод-а,%20пе>

[https://vk.com/wall-1966810\\_23849](https://vk.com/wall-1966810_23849)

<https://vk.com/search?c%5Bq%5D=малы%2C%20пе%2C%20концертэз%20нуисьёс%20удмурт%20кылын%20гине&c%5Bsection%5D=auto>

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_789](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_789)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_790](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_790)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_784](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_784)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_788](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_788)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_1218](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_1218)

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_1238](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_1238)

<https://vk.com/vanmondуг:%20кылсярысь,%20тазы%20но%20гожтыны%20луысал>

<http://udmurto4ka.blogspot.com/2017/>  
[https://vk.com/wall-84766181\\_53](https://vk.com/wall-84766181_53)  
[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept?w=wall-74979691\\_757](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept?w=wall-74979691_757)  
[https://vk.com/knyazpozdey?w=wall-1966810\\_21973](https://vk.com/knyazpozdey?w=wall-1966810_21973)  
<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey:озыы%20ик%20малпай>  
[https://vk.com/wall-1966810\\_21343?&offset=20](https://vk.com/wall-1966810_21343?&offset=20)  
<https://udmdunne.ru/page/34/?cat=8>

- Komi:

- 1) Electronic corpora:

Komi corpus = Korpus komi jazyka [The Corpora of the Komi language],  
<http://komicorpora.ru> (May 15, 2019);

- 2) Text collections:

Uotila, Toivo E. 1985. *Syrjänische Texte I. Komi-Permjakisch* [Zyrian texts I. Komi-Permyak]. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 186. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Uotila, Toivo E. 1989. *Syrjänische Texte III. Komi-Syrjänisch: Luza-Letka-, Ober-Sysola-, Mittel-Sysola, Prisyktyvkar-, Unter-Vyčegda- und Udora-Dialekte* [Zyrian Texts III. Komi-Zyrian: Luza-Letka, Upper Sysola, Middle Sysola, Prisyktyvkar, Lower Vyčegda and Udora dialects]. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 202. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- 3) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

<https://vk.com/club77947813>  
[http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post\\_6.html](http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_6.html)  
[https://vk.com/biarmian?w=wall81733444\\_548%2Fall](https://vk.com/biarmian?w=wall81733444_548%2Fall)  
[https://vk.com/wall-78645075?q=глеб%20жеглов&w=wall-78645075\\_441\\_r443](https://vk.com/wall-78645075?q=глеб%20жеглов&w=wall-78645075_441_r443)  
<https://vk.com/biarmian:%20a%20заводитчö%20гадзи>  
[https://vk.com/tupi\\_tap?w=wall-36271563\\_3894](https://vk.com/tupi_tap?w=wall-36271563_3894)  
<http://arch.permculture.ru/handle/permculture/617>  
[https://vk.com/wall81733444\\_473?offset=last&f=replies](https://vk.com/wall81733444_473?offset=last&f=replies)  
<http://газетапарма.рф/?p=63752>  
[https://vk.com/topic-31384440\\_25265953](https://vk.com/topic-31384440_25265953)  
<http://www.komimu.com/old/komi-mu/180--oe-oe>  
<https://vk.com/wall81733444?own=1&offset=360>  
<https://vk.com/club42898809:%20гашкö,%20шуас,%20кутшöм%20пö%20тайö%20юöп>  
[https://vk.com/tupi\\_tap:%20a%20сия%20пö%20шүö](https://vk.com/tupi_tap:%20a%20сия%20пö%20шүö)  
[http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/07/blog-post\\_25.html](http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/07/blog-post_25.html)  
<http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2014/11/blog-post.html>  
[https://vk.com/wall-79630928\\_116](https://vk.com/wall-79630928_116)  
<https://vk.com/club42898809:вьль%20во%20кежлö%20пö>  
[https://vk.com/tupi\\_tap?w=wall-36271563\\_3872](https://vk.com/tupi_tap?w=wall-36271563_3872)  
<https://vk.com/wall-34866078?own=1&offset=440>  
[http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2015\\_02\\_01\\_archive.html](http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2015_02_01_archive.html)  
<https://svaik.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2014-12-13T09:30:00%2B03:00>  
<http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2016-09-10T13:15:00-07:00&max-results=7&start=12&by-date=false>

<http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2015-08-29T11:38:00-07:00&max-results=7&start=19&by-date=false>  
[http://rassykhaev.blogspot.com/2015/04/blog-post\\_26.html](http://rassykhaev.blogspot.com/2015/04/blog-post_26.html)  
[https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809\\_1212%2Fall](https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809_1212%2Fall)  
[http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post\\_9.html](http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_9.html)  
<http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2015/>  
[http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post\\_6.html](http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_6.html)  
[https://vk.com/komiradio?w=wall-34866078\\_1008%2Fall](https://vk.com/komiradio?w=wall-34866078_1008%2Fall)

- Hungarian:

- 1) Electronic corpora:

MNSz = Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár, személyes alkorpus [Hungarian National Corpus, personal subcorpus], <http://mnsz.nytud.hu> (May 15, 2019);

MTK = Magyar történeti szövegtár [Hungarian historical corpus], <http://www.nytud.hu/hhc/> (May 15, 2019);

- 2) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

<http://eduline.hu/cimke/iskolai%20ámokfutás/2?ver=1>  
<https://www.facebook.com/FinnországFeleFeluton/posts/inari-4-hónapos-ez-alatt-a-rövidke-idő-alatt-rengeteg-mindent-tan%C3%ADtott-már-nekün/692500157577518/>  
<https://phenomenon.hu/eleg-nehez-vidam-dalszoveget-irni-az-valahogy-nem-termeszetes-kensington-interju/>  
<https://wmn.hu/elet/40627-kormos-anett-a-kurtos-kalacs-es-a-dodzsem>  
<https://24.hu/elet-stilus/2016/07/30/ugy-nem-lehet-leelni-egy-eletet-hogy-az-ember-beul-egy-sarokba-es-sir/>  
[https://www.bb1.hu/tartalom/cikk/42800\\_beak\\_gabor](https://www.bb1.hu/tartalom/cikk/42800_beak_gabor)  
<http://csiguszkpop.blogspot.com/2017/04/i-see-you-4-resz.html>  
<https://starity.hu/sztarok/matthew-mdot-finley/eletrajz/>  
<http://www.ma.hu/tart/rcikk/j/0/139259/1>  
[http://epa.oszk.hu/03000/03055/00022/pdf/EPA03055\\_lelkipasztori\\_level\\_2018\\_01\\_nagybojt.pdf](http://epa.oszk.hu/03000/03055/00022/pdf/EPA03055_lelkipasztori_level_2018_01_nagybojt.pdf)  
<http://misogakazimir.weebly.com/hofi-geacuteza/hofi-gza-msodik-menet-albumrl-rszletek>  
<http://megyekezerrel.blogspot.com/2012/01/>  
<http://4resz.blogspot.com>  
<http://www.ongo.hu/elmenybeszamolok/2678>  
<http://www.bmwfanatics.hu/bmw-forum/hutoviz.html?p=19&hozzaszolas=148229>  
<https://kreativ-iras.hu/duh-attila-parbeszed/>  
<http://www.she.hu/herself/20180213-nogyulolo-mondatok-noktol-noknek-barok-eszter.html>  
[https://emmausz.blog.hu/plugins/feedback.php?href=http%3A%2F%2Femmausz.blog.hu%2F2014%2F08%2F17%2Fegy\\_espace\\_viszontagsagai&\\_fb\\_noscript=1&page=48](https://emmausz.blog.hu/plugins/feedback.php?href=http%3A%2F%2Femmausz.blog.hu%2F2014%2F08%2F17%2Fegy_espace_viszontagsagai&_fb_noscript=1&page=48)  
[https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/gyerekvallalas-neveles\\_\\_babak\\_\\_1253137-halozsak-es-rugdalozo-illetve-halozsak-vagy-rugdalozo](https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/gyerekvallalas-neveles__babak__1253137-halozsak-es-rugdalozo-illetve-halozsak-vagy-rugdalozo)  
<https://www.nepmese.hu/index.php/mesetar/mesek/adj-uram-isten-szaz-forintot>  
<https://www.sorozatjunkie.hu/tag/invasion/>  
<https://forum.hsw.hu/topic/14048-alaplapot-kene-kikodolni/>  
[https://belsőseg.blog.hu/2008/09/19/egyeb\\_golf\\_kettes\\_golf](https://belsőseg.blog.hu/2008/09/19/egyeb_golf_kettes_golf)  
<https://www.opelforum.hu/topic/1069-turbo-sokk-feltöltés/?page=55>

<http://becejski-mozaik.co.rs/component/k2/8758-betsey-mariska-naploja-karikazas>  
<http://csepel.info/?p=49451>  
<http://misogakazimir.weebly.com/hofi-geacuteza/hofi-gza-msodik-menet-albuml-rszletek>  
[http://www.bb1.hu/tartalom/cikk/12187\\_elo\\_kozvetitesek](http://www.bb1.hu/tartalom/cikk/12187_elo_kozvetitesek)  
<http://www.life.hu/print/auto/gyorsasagi/astra/20050718kantor.html>  
<https://utazas.com/utazas-forumok/utazas-forum-temakor/fogtomes-vs-repulo/>  
<http://nepszava.hu/cikk/1057528-a-cof-elnok-megfenyegette-az-europai-parlamentet>  
<https://hup.hu/node/114201>  
[https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fájlvita:ASP150\\_KT080601.jpg](https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fájlvita:ASP150_KT080601.jpg)  
<https://www.tusarokesporaz.hu/author/admin/>  
[http://homar.blog.hu/2014/01/07/az\\_idonkent\\_nem\\_hasznalhato\\_40\\_ezres\\_logitech\\_billentyuzet](http://homar.blog.hu/2014/01/07/az_idonkent_nem_hasznalhato_40_ezres_logitech_billentyuzet)  
<http://ubuntu.hu/node/2010>  
<http://www.origo.hu/itthon/20180117-teljes-koru-gondozast-jobb-eletminoseget-szeretet-es-torodest-igerve-ferkozott-egy-maganyosan-elo.html>  
<http://www.miabonyunk.hu/?kereses=gondolta+hogy+ugymond>  
<http://ulloi129.hu/2017/04/01/a-kohasz-ellen-juthatunk-be-az-mk-dontobe/>  
[https://www.magyarulbabelben.net/works/de/Kafka%2C\\_Franz-1883/Eine\\_alltagliche\\_Verwirrung](https://www.magyarulbabelben.net/works/de/Kafka%2C_Franz-1883/Eine_alltagliche_Verwirrung)  
<http://www.atv.hu/belfold/20140109-orban-nem-ad-kozpenzt-a-magyar-kronikara>  
<https://prog.hu/tarsalgo/177103/ki-a-projektmenedzser>  
<http://www.jogiforum.hu/forum/26/8193.0.0.1.1>  
<https://mamami.hu/forum/forum/mamami-témák/minden-más/20499-jogsi-muszájából-hogy-sikerült>  
[https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/tudomanyok\\_egyeb-kerdesek\\_\\_251302-hogy-nez-ki-egy-vampir-hogyan-viselkedik](https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/tudomanyok_egyeb-kerdesek__251302-hogy-nez-ki-egy-vampir-hogyan-viselkedik)  
<https://ezegychopper.cafeblog.hu/2018/03/26/ezt-soha-nem-gondoltad-volna-a-ferrero-rocher-rol>  
<https://utazas.com/utazas-forumok/utazas-forum-temakor/fogtomes-vs-repulo/>  
<https://forum.portfolio.hu/topics/egyszerre-mondott-fel-hat-jobboldali-mediavezer/21676?oldal=3&limit=40>  
<https://www.elselepések.hu/a/jobba.html>  
[https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/egyeb-kerdesek\\_\\_egyeb-kerdesek\\_\\_7863542-az-ukran-elelmiszereken-hogy-van-feltuntetve-a-szavatossagi-ido-talalkoztam-oly](https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/egyeb-kerdesek__egyeb-kerdesek__7863542-az-ukran-elelmiszereken-hogy-van-feltuntetve-a-szavatossagi-ido-talalkoztam-oly)  
[https://prohardver.hu/tema/re\\_a\\_szuper\\_readyboost\\_projekt\\_i/hsz\\_1-50.html](https://prohardver.hu/tema/re_a_szuper_readyboost_projekt_i/hsz_1-50.html)  
<http://megyekezettel.blogspot.com/2012/01/nyenyecék.html>  
<https://wmn.hu/elet/40627-kormos-anett-a-kurtos-kalacs-es-a-dodzsem>  
<https://starity.hu/sztarok/tom-hiddleston/velemenyek/>  
<http://www.ma.hu/tart/rcikk/j/0/139259/1>  
<https://phenomenon.hu/eleg-nehez-vidam-dalszoveget-irni-az-valahogy-nem-termeszetes-kensington-interju/>  
[https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/csaladi-kapcsolatok\\_egyeb-kerdesek\\_\\_2046257-normalis-az-ilyen-tanar-hogy-mer-ilyet-mondani](https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/csaladi-kapcsolatok_egyeb-kerdesek__2046257-normalis-az-ilyen-tanar-hogy-mer-ilyet-mondani)  
<http://thequeenbeefhighschool.blogspot.com/2018/03/31-fejezet-talan-semmi-sincs-jol.html>  
<https://www.nlcafe.hu/forum/?fid=441&csatid=&topicid=199589>  
<https://pim.hu/hu/media/kez>  
<https://moly.hu/enciklopedia/thomas?page=27>

[http://vaskarika.hu/hirek/reszletek/11974/pocsosok\\_csajok\\_szabadok\\_vagyunk-szall\\_a\\_kakukk\\_feszkeres\\_az\\_orla/nyomtatasi/](http://vaskarika.hu/hirek/reszletek/11974/pocsosok_csajok_szabadok_vagyunk-szall_a_kakukk_feszkeres_az_orla/nyomtatasi/)  
<http://mek.oszk.hu/adatbazis/magyar-nyelv-ertelmezo-szotara/kereses.php?csakcimben=&szo=ELŐLEG&offset=9&kereses=Paraszt>  
<https://www.facebook.com/FinnországFeleFeluton/posts/inari-4-hónapos-ez-alatt-a-rövidke-idő-alatt-rengeteg-mindent-tan%C3%ADtott-már-nekün/692500157577518/>  
[https://viccek24.hu/viccek/agressz\\_v\\_biztonsagi\\_or](https://viccek24.hu/viccek/agressz_v_biztonsagi_or)  
<http://misogakazimir.weebly.com/hofi-geacuteza/hofi-gza-msodik-menet-albuml-rszletek>  
<https://forum.portfolio.hu/topics/ceu-rektor-ha-a-kormany-beken-hagy-minket-mi-is-beken-hagyjuk-oket/25547?order=1>  
[https://napiremeny.blog.hu/2013/11/10/a\\_keseruseg\\_allandova\\_teszi\\_a\\_maganyt](https://napiremeny.blog.hu/2013/11/10/a_keseruseg_allandova_teszi_a_maganyt)  
[https://indavideo.hu/video/Sabertooth-Bolond\\_szerelem\\_4\\_resz](https://indavideo.hu/video/Sabertooth-Bolond_szerelem_4_resz)  
[https://gyoznijottem.blog.hu/2018/02/24/a\\_vendeg\\_aki\\_taxival\\_jott\\_es\\_mentovel\\_tavozott](https://gyoznijottem.blog.hu/2018/02/24/a_vendeg_aki_taxival_jott_es_mentovel_tavozott)  
<https://fuszereslelek.nlcafe.hu/2016/07/15/baratnoimnek-akik-nem-tudnak-fozni/>  
[https://www.dunavolgyipeter.hu/televizio\\_torteneti\\_interjuk/interjuk/vitezy\\_laszlo:\\_a\\_mai\\_tvtelevizios\\_rendezonek\\_a\\_tavvezerlo\\_gommbal\\_kell\\_versenybe\\_allnia](https://www.dunavolgyipeter.hu/televizio_torteneti_interjuk/interjuk/vitezy_laszlo:_a_mai_tvtelevizios_rendezonek_a_tavvezerlo_gommbal_kell_versenybe_allnia)  
[https://hvg.hu/itthon/20170405\\_momentum\\_mozgalom\\_ceu\\_nepszavazas\\_corvinus\\_egyetem](https://hvg.hu/itthon/20170405_momentum_mozgalom_ceu_nepszavazas_corvinus_egyetem)  
<https://www.nlcafe.hu/forum/?fid=441&topicid=172538&step=&page=4&bw=1>  
<https://leander.blogstar.hu/2017/03/23/sorkocintas/36440/>  
[https://books.google.ee/books?id=Ny5JDQAAQBAJ&pg=PT15&pg=PT15&dq=aazzal+++a+++mondattal+++valaszolt,+hogya+Az+++ur+++pokolban+is+++ur!&source=bl&ots=i\\_HZeGsmxz&sig=JXp3ENFTBostng9CQfGap8mz6F8&hl=et&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwif9KiguN7fAhVCCSsWKHShyB\\_wQ6AEwA3oECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q=aazzal%20%20%20a%20%20mondattal%20%20valaszolt%20%20hogya%20Az%20%20ur%20%20%20pokolban%20is%20%20%20ur!&f=false](https://books.google.ee/books?id=Ny5JDQAAQBAJ&pg=PT15&pg=PT15&dq=aazzal+++a+++mondattal+++valaszolt,+hogya+Az+++ur+++pokolban+is+++ur!&source=bl&ots=i_HZeGsmxz&sig=JXp3ENFTBostng9CQfGap8mz6F8&hl=et&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwif9KiguN7fAhVCCSsWKHShyB_wQ6AEwA3oECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q=aazzal%20%20%20a%20%20mondattal%20%20valaszolt%20%20hogya%20Az%20%20ur%20%20%20pokolban%20is%20%20%20ur!&f=false)  
[https://veledvagyunk.blog.hu/2018/08/27/a\\_fiatalok\\_jelentos\\_resze\\_azt\\_sem\\_tudja\\_van\\_e\\_meg\\_egyaltalan\\_szakszervezet](https://veledvagyunk.blog.hu/2018/08/27/a_fiatalok_jelentos_resze_azt_sem_tudja_van_e_meg_egyaltalan_szakszervezet)  
[https://m.logout.hu/tema/tarr\\_kft\\_s\\_infok/hsz\\_11781-11800.html](https://m.logout.hu/tema/tarr_kft_s_infok/hsz_11781-11800.html)  
[http://tkbszk.tkbe.hu/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/diged\\_A\\_Buddha\\_tanitasi.pdf](http://tkbszk.tkbe.hu/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/diged_A_Buddha_tanitasi.pdf)

- Finnish:

1) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):  
<https://keskustelu.suomi24.fi/t/1905188/tarinaosa2>  
<https://apulanta.net/keskustelu/index.php?topic=275.0>  
<https://www.facebook.com/TonoSlono/photos/a.517602628277816.1073741825.496523833719029/1540844282620307/?type=3>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-pitaako-opettajiin-olla-kaverilliset-suhteet-lue-avautuminen-kaveristani>  
[https://www.meidanperhe.fi/keskustelu/115975/ketju/soitin\\_hammaslaakarille\\_ja\\_on\\_viissiin\\_normaaliala\\_et](https://www.meidanperhe.fi/keskustelu/115975/ketju/soitin_hammaslaakarille_ja_on_viissiin_normaaliala_et)  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-omg-xd-hapeen-mun-perhetta-d>  
<https://www.hiphei.com/forum/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=7&start=1940>  
<https://www.etehti.fi/comment/145502>  
<https://www.facebook.com/tiina.lampen.%20tiina%20ja%20netta>  
<https://muusikoiden.net/keskustelu/posts.php?c=31&t=182918>  
[https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/niin\\_kuin](https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/niin_kuin)



<https://lansi-savo.fi/teemat/kaupallinen-yhteistyö/91cd449c-9096-4776-a9d2-1c08474e6ba5>  
<https://hsinyulin.info/mitä-hautajaiset-maksavat.jsp>  
[https://www.kotus.fi/nyt/uutistekstit/kieliasiaa\\_mediassa/olen\\_lihonut\\_tyyliin\\_40\\_kiloa.21989.news](https://www.kotus.fi/nyt/uutistekstit/kieliasiaa_mediassa/olen_lihonut_tyyliin_40_kiloa.21989.news)  
<http://forum.cosmopolitan.fi/index.php?threads/huono-itsetunto-mennyt-joliiallisuuksiin-parisuhteet.5032/>  
<http://www.ilotulite.org/index.php?topic=5486.0>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/keho-mita-teijan-vanhemmat-yleensa-sanooi-ku-jaattekiinni-juomisesta-tai-polttamisesta>  
[http://www.koirat.com/keskustelu/aikuisten+palsta/kukkujat\\_36\\_517582?sivu=46](http://www.koirat.com/keskustelu/aikuisten+palsta/kukkujat_36_517582?sivu=46)  
<http://kireitasiimoja.fi/tarina/niinku-et-clack>  
<http://letsfake-it.blogspot.com/2012/05/terveyskeskusvitutus.html>  
<http://www.meidanperhe.fi/keskustelu/837469/ketju/>  
<https://ylilauta.org/suhteet/31765232>  
<https://keskustelu.suomi24.fi/t/15010878/aeb-hatajarrutusjarjestelman-toimivuus>  
<https://irc-galleria.net/user/saiGGu/blog/34586973-something-like-that>  
<https://www.mantsalanuutiset.fi/artikkeli/507866-kerrankin-nakee-komeita-miehia>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/onko-tamakin-jatka-pelkka-fuckboy>  
<http://tahdonpois.omablogi.fi/page/3/>  
<https://www.aarremaanalla.com/foorumi/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=2398&start=475>  
<https://ylilauta.org/suhteet/31164721>  
<https://keskustelu.suomi24.fi/t/8450274/tanaan-nain>  
<https://www.vauva.fi/comment/14259008>  
[https://www.meidanperhe.fi/keskustelu/274835/ketju/\\_marrasten\\_tiistai\\_tiima\\_welovehelsinki.blogspot.com/2009/01/lempown-levyvalinta-king-tubbys-meets.html](https://www.meidanperhe.fi/keskustelu/274835/ketju/_marrasten_tiistai_tiima_welovehelsinki.blogspot.com/2009/01/lempown-levyvalinta-king-tubbys-meets.html)  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/syvalliset-omg-hyva-kaveri-paljastui-myos-heteroksi-d>  
<https://twitter.com/jkekalainen/status/686992218675097601>  
<https://www.sukupuolenaihmien.fi/jaana-46-turku-2015>  
<https://www.suomisanakirja.fi/silleen>  
<https://twitter.com/vhautaka/status/900997445362098176>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-miten-unohan-jatkan>  
<https://www.brookends.gq/comment/190173>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-aaah-mita-ma-teen>  
<https://kaksplus.fi/threads/alkionsiirroista-plussanneet.245885?page=11>  
<http://forum.joomla.org/viewtopic.php?t=42290>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/tekniikka-ja-netti-mita-helvettia-googlestin-jotain-ja-paadyin-kaksplussan-sivuille-ja>

- Estonian:

- 1) Electronic corpora:

New media subcorpus = Estonian Reference corpus, New media subcorpus,

<https://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/uusmeedia/> (May 15, 2019);

- 2) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

<https://boodiblogi.wordpress.com/2018/01/08/ty-siin-ja-ty-seal-ty-iga-nurga-peal/>

<https://www.facebook.com/dynamiit/posts/tere-sain-sõnumi-et-homme-alates-1400-saan-järgi-tulla-jookidele-pärnu-party-fac/10151160804809545/>

<https://www.facebook.com/omniva.ee/posts/üleeeile-tuli-sõnum-et-mu-pakk-on-kohal-eile-pakile-järgi-minnes-otsiti-hulk-aega/1061588383861922/>  
<https://margotkask.blogspot.com/2012/01/joonistuste-naitus-napp-parnu.html>  
<https://www.ohtuleht.ee/549593/ott-jarvela-hoiatus-kupsemas-on-plaan-mis-valistaks-supermangud-a-la-eesti-brasiilia>  
<http://memokraat.ee/memokraat.ee/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Praktikaaruanne-Daniel-Vaarik.pdf>  
<http://www.paulajohanna.com/2012/01/if-i-go-crazy-will-you-still-call-me.html>  
<https://foorum.soccernet.ee/showthread.php?913-Eesti-koondis/page31>  
[http://gekukas.blogspot.com/2007\\_11\\_01\\_archive.html](http://gekukas.blogspot.com/2007_11_01_archive.html)  
<http://emoclio.blogspot.com/2009/04/>  
<http://foorum.pokkeriprod.com/archive/index.php/t-3415.html>  
<https://foorum.perekool.ee/teema/1a9k-raagib-palju-ja-korrutab/>  
<https://saarlane.ee/foorum/foorum.asp?kat=1&fid=1&days=all&offset=520>  
<http://yks-elu.blogspot.com/2008/11/>  
<https://www.neonet.ee/topic/68378-msni-ei-saa-sisse-logida/>  
<http://www.vahvel.net/archive/index.php/t-144988.html>  
<https://online.le.ee/2016/08/12/politsei-uuemoisas-jai-jalgrattur-ulekaigurajal-auto-alla/>  
<http://eki.ee/dict/ekss/index.cgi?Q=lihtsalt>  
<http://noortehaal.delfi.ee/foorum/read.php?57,14349>  
<https://va.ee/12-proosa/96-piret-jaaks-koolibri-lend>  
<http://lipsuke.com/elu/ammaemanda-ja-arsti-visit-vol-milon- eviction-note-pahklike-kobi-valja/>  
<http://gerliusas.blogspot.com/2013/03/loputud-filmid-soogid-peod-ja-fun-ehk.html>  
<http://liisa-ameerikas.blogspot.com/2013/05/graduation-parties.html>  
<http://et.globals-10.trade/item.html?id=tb43119518291>  
<http://laiskis.blogspot.com/2014/05/perhosia-rinnassa.html>  
<http://epl.delfi.ee/news/eesti/bendreus-estonia-ohvrite-raha-sulas-kaest?id=50804221>  
<http://britiblogi.ee/vlog-sunnipaev-ja-london/>  
<https://estonianwithadream.wordpress.com/2016/08/11/kuidas-ma-norra-sattusin/>  
<http://kummut-tegelinski.blogspot.com/2011/01/kaks-titat.html>  
<http://loomakaitse.eu/lapsed-kui-te-seda-kassipoega-ei-vota-siis-ma-tapan-ta-ara/>  
<http://naistekas.delfi.ee/suhted/pulmad/peigmehel-olid-pisarad-silmas-kui-nagi-mind-altari-poole-kondimas?id=68750131>  
[https://foorum.hinnavaatlus.ee/wap/thread.php?topic\\_id=81162&&start=240](https://foorum.hinnavaatlus.ee/wap/thread.php?topic_id=81162&&start=240)  
<https://foorum.hinnavaatlus.ee/viewtopic.php?t=463612&start=1525&sid=5eac7dd02c345d9107e741448cb6e18f>  
<https://www.elfafoorum.ee/threads/35911-windows-xp-ei-lahe-toole>

- Russian:

- 1) Electronic corpora:

Russian National Corpus, <http://ruscorpora.ru/en/index.html> (May 15, 2019);

- 2) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

<https://www.baby.ru/blogs/post/49866972-30550230/>

[https://www.tripadvisor.ru/LocationPhotoDirectLink-g298497-d6196302-i168695361-Opera-Yuzhno\\_Sakhalinsk\\_Sakhalin\\_Oblast\\_Far\\_Eastern\\_District.html](https://www.tripadvisor.ru/LocationPhotoDirectLink-g298497-d6196302-i168695361-Opera-Yuzhno_Sakhalinsk_Sakhalin_Oblast_Far_Eastern_District.html)

[https://twitter.com/diletant\\_media/status/960169312827867136](https://twitter.com/diletant_media/status/960169312827867136)

<https://dota2.ru/forum/threads/zhiruxa-nanosit-otvetnyj-udar.958162/>

<https://forums.drom.ru/vladivostok/t1151221817-p10.html>  
<https://www.fontanka.ru/2007/02/10/004/>  
<https://www.politnavigator.net/goncharenko-dumaet-ne-pojiti-li-emu-na-mesto-saakashvili.html>  
<http://www.autonavigator.ru/guides/test-drive/Chery/M11/25430.html>  
<http://www.nhl.com/ice/ru/news.htm?id=883347>  
[http://lurkmore.to/Обсуждение:Год\\_молодёжи](http://lurkmore.to/Обсуждение:Год_молодёжи)  
<https://www.buka.ru/cgi-bin/show.pl?id=166&type=faq>  
<https://www.galya.ru/clubs/show.php?id=790453>  
<http://www.anekdotov.net/story/all/tskrbkknftmfks.htm>  
[https://pikabu.ru/story/kak\\_meynstrim\\_vliyaet\\_na\\_mnenie\\_lyudey\\_2185919](https://pikabu.ru/story/kak_meynstrim_vliyaet_na_mnenie_lyudey_2185919)  
<http://www.gamer.ru/everything/ezhenedelnyy-obzor-igrovoy-industrii-i-vsego-soprichastnogo-52>  
<https://rus.delfi.lv/archive/blagoe-delo-nakazuemo.d?id=6644624&all=true>  
<http://forum.worldoftanks.ru/index.php?/topic/1871164-сообщение-которое-пришло-в-лс/>  
[http://www.логорград.рф/konkurs/tvoe\\_rabochee\\_mesto/300\\_tretiya\\_sotnya/282\\_Oleg/oleg\\_01.htm](http://www.логорград.рф/konkurs/tvoe_rabochee_mesto/300_tretiya_sotnya/282_Oleg/oleg_01.htm)  
<https://caricatura.ru/top/week/url/parad/busagin/26687/>  
<http://risovach.ru/kartinka/942270>  
<http://dalas.ru/archive/index.php?t-16877.html>  
<http://gamerinside.ru/hints-and-cheats/tes-5-skyrim-karta-mira/>  
[https://pikabu.ru/story/zakazchik\\_vyizval\\_militsiyu\\_3964995](https://pikabu.ru/story/zakazchik_vyizval_militsiyu_3964995)  
[https://vk.com/wall-42923159\\_851736](https://vk.com/wall-42923159_851736)  
<http://demotivation.me/lfdpgvg86arqpic.html>  
<http://zhyk.ru/forum/archive/index.php?t-886713.html>

- Other languages:

1) Web-pages (accessed through the period 01.09.2014 – 01.02.2019):

[https://www.reddit.com/r/Jokes/comments/8ap5ci/my\\_friend\\_said\\_to\\_me\\_do\\_you\\_want\\_to\\_hear\\_a\\_really/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Jokes/comments/8ap5ci/my_friend_said_to_me_do_you_want_to_hear_a_really/)  
[https://twitter.com/arianagrande/status/1060361765140160513?fbclid=IwAR09SwXGedMIdkOuTWf\\_IQgtGMMvGYmsC\\_Oh-52C-W6z8267LO7GUEzSBsc](https://twitter.com/arianagrande/status/1060361765140160513?fbclid=IwAR09SwXGedMIdkOuTWf_IQgtGMMvGYmsC_Oh-52C-W6z8267LO7GUEzSBsc)  
<https://www.quora.com/profile/Bob-Grueneberg>  
<https://twitter.com/allthingsmollie/status/690042054936772608>  
<https://orionsmethod.com/transcripts/loren-slocum-lahav/>  
[https://www.reddit.com/r/AnimalsBeingDerps/comments/7oxnku/all\\_of\\_them\\_are\\_like\\_daaaammn\\_and\\_hes\\_like\\_fck/](https://www.reddit.com/r/AnimalsBeingDerps/comments/7oxnku/all_of_them_are_like_daaaammn_and_hes_like_fck/)  
<https://marys-buecherwelten.blogspot.com/2016/04/seiten-der-welt-ii.html>  
<http://extreme.pcgameshardware.de/mainboards-und-arbeitsspeicher/257287-ram-speed.html>  
<https://phdessay.com/bite-me-a-love-story-chapter-19/>  
<https://www.facebook.com/telenornorge/posts/jeg-har-stort-sett-alltid-vært-telenorkunde-i-hele-min-mobilkarriere-som-er-ca-/10153443280034803/>  
<https://www.pinterest.fr/pin/542120873886245329/>  
<http://www.spokesman.com/stories/1998/jan/31/bulldog-thrives-out-of-doghouse-gonzagas-quentin/>  
<http://www.familjeliv.se/forum/thread/46711871-han-sager-elaka-saker-men-skojar-bort-det>

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Name:** Denys Teptiuk  
**Date of birth:** 29.05.1992  
**Citizenship:** Ukraine  
**Address:** Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics,  
University of Tartu  
Jakobi 2, 51014 Tartu  
**E-mail:** denys@ut.ee

### Education:

2015–2019 University of Tartu, PhD student (Estonian and Finno-Ugric linguistics)  
2012–2015 University of Tartu, MA (Estonian and Finno-Ugric linguistics), *cum laude*  
2008–2012 Kyiv National Linguistic University, BA (Finnish language and literature)  
2006–2008 Kyiv Aerospace lyceum, Kyiv, Ukraine  
1998–2006 Kyiv middle general educational school #314, Kyiv, Ukraine

### Professional experience:

2017– University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, junior researcher  
2016–2017 BITEXT INNOVATIONS, S.L., consultant of the Ukrainian language  
2016–2016 University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, specialist of the Kamass language  
2015–2015 KLS Translation Agency, translator  
2014–2015 Paul Ariste Centre for Indigenous Finno-Ugric Peoples, translator of the Erzya language textbook

## ELULOOKIRJELDUS

**Nimi:** Denys Teptiuk  
**Sünniaeg:** 29.05.1992  
**Kodakondsus:** Ukraina  
**Address:** Tartu Ülikooli eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut  
Jakobi 2, 51014 Tartu  
**E-mail:** denys@ut.ee

### Haridustee:

2015–2019 Tartu Ülikool, doktorantuur (eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteadus)  
2012–2015 Tartu Ülikool, MA (eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteadus), *cum laude*  
2008–2012 Kiievi Riiklik Lingvistiline Ülikool, BA (soome keel ja kirjandus)  
2006–2008 Kiievi lennunduse lütseum, Kiiev, Ukraina  
1998–2006 Kiievi üldine keskkool #314, Kiiev, Ukraina

### Teenistuskäik:

2017– Tartu Ülikool, eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, nooremteadur  
2016–2017 BITEXT INNOVATIONS, S.L., ukraina keele konsultant  
2016–2016 Tartu Ülikool, eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, kamassi keele spetsialist  
2015–2015 KLS Translation Agency, tõlk  
2014–2015 Paul Ariste soome-ugri põlisrahvaste keskus, ersa keele õpiku tõlk

## DISSERTATIONES PHILOLOGIAE URALICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Ольга Ерина.** Частицы в мордовских языках. Тарту, 1997, 150 с.
2. **Людмила Карпова.** Фонетика и морфология среднечепецкого диалекта удмуртского языка. Тарту, 1997, 224 с.
3. **Инна Тимиряева.** Лексика одежды в марийском языке. Тарту, 1997, 136 с.
4. **Софья Чеснакова.** Марийская поэма. Тарту, 1998, 162 с.
5. **Triinu Ojamaa.** Glissando nganassaani muusikas. Morfoloogiline, süntaktiline ja semantiline tasand. Tartu, 2000, 176 lk.
6. **Niina Aasmäe.** Stress and quantity in Erzya. Tartu, 2006, 205 p.
7. **Светлана Едыгарова.** Категория посессивности в удмуртском языке. Тарту, 2010, 288 с.
8. **Valts Ernštreits.** Liivi kirjakeele kujunemine. Tartu, 2010, 224 p.
9. **Florian Siegl.** Materials on Forest Enets, an indigenous language of Northern Siberia. Tartu, 2011, 456 p.
10. **Александр Пустяков.** Названия исчезнувших селений Республики Марий Эл (структурно-семантический и историко-этимологический анализ). Тарту, 2011, 281 с.
11. **Елена Рябина.** Основные цветообозначения в пермских языках. Тарту, 2011, 262 с.
12. **Николай Кузнецов.** Пространственная семантика местных падежей коми языка (когнитивный анализ). Тарту, 2012, 244 с.
13. **Tiina Rüütmaa.** Kontrastiivne ülevaade kõneviisisüsteemist ungari ja eesti kõrvallauses. Tartu, 2014, 240 lk.
14. **Николай Ракин.** «Калевала» на коми языке в контексте некоторых аспектов теории и практики художественного перевода. Тарту, 2014, 340 с.
15. **Tuuli Tuisk.** Livonian word prosody. Tartu. 2015, 164 p.
16. **Кристина Юзиева.** Марийская орнитонимическая лексика в этнолингвистическом освещении. Тарту, 2016, 250 с.
17. **Елена Ласточкина.** Лексико-семантические особенности омонимов в марийском языке. Тарту, 2016, 207 с.
18. **Валентина Булыгина.** Речевой этикет в социолингвистическом аспекте (на материале марийской и эстонской коммуникативных культур). Тарту, 2017, 136 с.
19. **Eva Saar.** Isuri keele Soikkola murde sõnamuutmissüsteem. Tartu, 2017, 224 lk.
20. **Елена Воронина.** Ихтионимы в марийском языке (историко-этимологический анализ). Тарту, 2019, 147 с.