

**Reported Illocution in Daghestanian:
 An Overview of the Data**

The distinction between indirect vs. direct speech reporting may informally be defined as distinction between what was said and how it was said. An indirectly reported speech act introduces structural changes, such as – and most importantly - deictic shift from the reported speech situation to the reporting speech situation. The change of shifters such as ‘I’, ‘you’ or ‘he’ seems to be explainable in terms of discourse-tracking economy, a bonus for the addressee on behalf of the speaker. Indirect speech is less energy-consuming for the addressee, because (s)he does not have to replace shifters to understand the message; the speaker substitutes the shifters himself. The same motivation lies behind the use of logophoric pronouns, widespread in Daghestanian.

Another structural phenomenon correlating with shifter substitution is the impossibility of using some verbal categories, such as imperatives. Indeed, in various European languages, any construction involving deictic shift excludes the use of imperative. Cf.

English

+He told me: go to the market!	no deictic shift, imperative reported
*He said that go to the market!	deictic shift, imperative is not allowed
+He told me to go to the market.	

Russian

+On skazal mne: idi na rynok.	direct construction, imperative reported
he say:PST I.DAT go:IMP on market:ACC	
*On skazal mne, chto idi na rynok.	indirect construction, imperative is not allowed,
he say:PST I.DAT COMP go:IMP on market:ACC	
+On skazal mne, chtoby ja shel na rynok.	and is substituted by a purpose clause
he say:PST I.DAT COMPI go:PST on market:ACC	

It is slightly less obvious why imperatives should not be reported indirectly; various reasons can be suggested, varying from person shift to the specific nature of illocution. However, the important fact is that imperative (and other volitional illocutions such as cohortative or jussive) may well be reported alongside with deictic shift in at least several Daghestanian languages. Cf. Kalinina (2001: 531) on Bagvalal, Andic, indirectly reporting imperatives and prohibitives or the following example from Agul (Merdanova, Daniel, Ganenkov 2006) and Archi (Kibrik 1977), both Lezgiic:

Agul

naq’	dada	pu-ne	za-s	jaŋa	mič	qišaw	puna
yesterday	father (ERG)	say.PFV-PF	I-DAT	today	here.to	come.back(IMP)	REPORTED

Father told me yesterday that he would come (back) here today.
 (Note the ‘shifted’ reference of here and today, indicative of indirect reporting)

Archi

to-w-mu zon žu-l:u l:wa cili-ši č'eba:-r
that-I-ERG I LOG.OBL-COMIT together Azerbaijan-ALL go.1 IMP-
REPORTED

He tells me, let's go to Azerbaijan together (with him).

(Note the use of the logophoric pronoun, indicative of indirect reporting.)

Reporting imperatives in Daghestanian languages proves at least that the nature of volitional illocution is not fundamentally incompatible with indirect speech strategies, as the data from the European languages may suggest. However, another type of illocution is probably unreportable even in Daghestanian languages. Vocatives may not be used in indirect reported speech in Agul (Merdanova, Daniel, Ganenkov 2006), and there are no examples available of reported address forms in the Bagvalal corpus (though there is not enough data to make any general conclusions for this language). In Agul at least, the use of a vocative particle or other address is an unambiguous indication of direct reporting, with all the respective rules applied to shifter interpretation. Cf. the following two constructions:

Agul

dependent ɤaj: indirect strategy, vocative is irreportable

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

Dad says to the boy, sonny, come here.

autonomous ɤaj: direct strategy (logophorics are impossible), vocative is reportable

dada_i gadaji-s ɤaj ja žan k'irk' ze_i (*uči-n_i) bugu-s šaw
father (ERG) son-DAT REPORTED? VOC dear son my (*REFL-GEN) side-DAT
come. IMP

Dad says to the boy, sonny, come to me.

The paper overviews the data on direct and indirect reporting of imperative and vocative illocutions in several Daghestanian languages, attempts to explain them and describes what structural change the illocution undergoes when it is reported, in functional terms.

References:

1. Kalinina 2001: Kalinina, Elena. Aktantnye predlozhenija. In: Kibrik et al. (eds). Bagvalinskij jazyk: grammatika, teksty, slovari. Moscow.
2. Kibrik 1977: Kibrik, Aleksandr, Sandro Kodzasov, Irina Olovjannikova and Dzhilil Samedov. Opyt strukturnogo opisaniya archinskogo jazyka. Moscow, 1977.
3. Merdanova et al. 2006: Merdanova, Solmaz, Michael Daniel and Dmitry Ganenkov. Reported Speech in Agul. A paper read at the INALCO colloquium in Paris, December 2006.