

Reported speech in Archi some new observations

Michael Daniel
Moscow State University

In Archi, rich morphology accompanies almost any occurrence of reported speech. A readily recognized category is that of the reportative, or commentative (*kommentativ*) in terms of the Grammar (Kibrik et al. 1977). The category in question, *-er*, is explained as the result of grammaticalization (morphologization or cliticization) of *war*, the suppletive imperfective base of *bo(s)* ‘say, tell’. The paper discusses the category, summarizing the observations made in the grammar, adding some new points and tackling new problems arising from the recent corpus of Archi texts (collected in 2004-2006), as well as providing an overview of the data from some other Daghestanian languages.

The Grammar states a rather free distribution of the reportative, which is combinable with various internal (i.e. reported) and external (i.e. referring to the speech act, or reporting) TAM categories. Reportative is also capable of having its own ergative argument encoding the author of the reported speech act and a cont-lative argument, coding its addressee. Thus, TAM categories and ergative A-role may be repeated twice in what is analysed by the Grammar to be one single clause. In other words, although the combination of the verb with the reportative marker seems to be rather close-knit from the morphophonological viewpoint, the reportative marker preserves some of its original verbal properties. Cf:

(1) TAM doubling in reported speech constructions

to-r to-w tukan-n-a w-irx_win-er-ši e <r> di
this-II that-I shop-OBL-IN I-work.IPFV-REPORTED-CVB <II>be.PFV
She said he works in the shop. (Grammar 233)

(2) Argument doubling in reported speech constructions

to-w-mu ja-t ari žu ow-q-er
this-I-ERG that-IV work LOGOPH.ERG do-POT-REPORTED
He says he will do that (job) (Grammar 233)

According to the grammar (Grammar: 98), a notable exception is incompatibility of the quotative with volitional moods, including imperative, optative and prohibitive; which is very much in accordance with inreportability phenomenon (cf. e.g. Paducheva 1996: 297), predicting that dialogical moods may be impossible to report. However, another section (the Grammar: 238) provides examples of the presumably irreportable imperatives exactly in reported speech, including plain imperative and the so-called imperative converb:

(3) Reported imperative

za:rši marči-maj naL' oq'-er
I.CONT.LAT all-ERG milk give.IMP-REPORTED
They told me to give away all the milk (Grammar 233)

(4) Reported mild imperative

to-w-mu za:rši w-ak:i-s-or
this-I-ERG I.CONT.LAT I-go.IMP-MILD-REPORTED
He told me to go (Grammar 233)

The paper will observe the validity of inreportability hypothesis in various Archi texts.

The Grammar (238) describes what may be considered as transcategorial properties of the reportative marker, including its ability to be attached to nouns rather than verbs in ellyptical (verbless) clauses as well as to occur in spontaneous (not normalized) oral speech on several groups in the same clause; this is very much in accordance with my observations on the modern corpus.

(5) Reportative in ellyptic clauses

w-irx_w-mu-s t'o-r, kino-li-ti-k-er
I-work-LV-INF no-REPORTED movies-OBL-SUP-LAT-REPORTED
[Did he say he came to work?]
He says, not to work, he says, to the movies. (Grammar 233)

(6) Reportative in spontaneous speech

k'an jat:i-š e < b > k'u-tu-b-er č'an-er b-ola-ll-er,
most on-EL III-choose-ATR-III-REPORTED sheep-REPORTED III-sell-CVB.IMP-REPORTED

 arso-wu sa-r
 money-AND take.IMP-REPORTED

Sell the uppermost chosen sheep, he said, and take the money, he said.

Transcategorial behavior seems to suggest that reportative drifts from a full-fledged grammatical category to a reportative particle. On the other hand, the fact that the reportative marker, in other contexts, may introduce its own argument, the author of the reported speech act, and possess its own TAM markers, seems to indicate that, on the contrary, the category is verb-like. One solution would be to posit two synchronically different, though historically cognate, elements, a reportative particle with a rather free transcategorial distribution and a grammaticalized verb of saying preserving some predicative properties. This solution seems plausible also because the transcategorial 'version' of the reportative apparently tends to occur in its plain form -er, devoid of any further verbal morphology.

One problem not dealt with in the Grammar is another strategy of reported speech marking, i.e. the frequent use of *bo*, the perfective stem of *bos* 'say':

(7) Reported speech introduced by 'said'

xita buw-o: bo nent'u kara-s-er bo
then mother-VOC say.PFV we.incl bring-INF-REPORTED say.PFV
maxač w-eqI-er bo
Maxač I-come.POT-REPORTED say.PFV

Then: Mother – I said – Maxač will come, he said – I said - to bring us (down to the city) with him, he said – I said. (new corpus)

[the story is told by P., who reports her conversation with her mother (“I said”); in this conversation P. often refers to what her brother told her in their last phone talk (“he said”)]

Just as reportative, *bo* tends to be repeated in spontaneous speech which indicates a certain degree of grammaticalization. There seem to be a strong tendency towards using *bo* for marking non-third person reported speech as opposed to *-er* that mostly mark third person reported speech: cf. the interplay of the two markers in the last example, where the third person reported speech introduced by the reportative *-er* is ‘inserted’ into the first person reported speech frame introduced by *bo* ‘said’. Notably, *bo* and the assumed source of the reportative marker *-er* (i.e. *war*) are originally forms of the same verb *bos* ‘say, tell’. The former its perfective base and the latter its imperfective base, and thus seem to have no inherent properties motivating their development into secondary means of person marking.

The Archi data will be compared with data available from some other Daghestanian languages. Thus, some formal and functional properties of the reportative *-er* and *bo* are amazingly close to the reported speech constructions in Agul, also Lezgif, yet a fairly distant relative to Archi.

References:

The Grammar 1977: Aleksandr Kibrik, Sandro Kodzasov, Irina Olovjannikova and Jalil Samedov. Opyt strukturnogo opisanija archinskogo jazyka. Tom II. Moscow: MGU.

Paducheva 1996: Elena Paducheva. Semanticheskije issledovanija. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.