DENYS TEPTIUK (Tartu)

SELF-QUOTATIVE MARKERS IN PERMIC AND HUNGARIAN

Abstract. In this paper, I discuss the use of self-quotative markers in new media texts in two Permic languages, Komi and Udmurt, and in the more distantly related Hungarian. I focus on the use of the grammaticalized self-quotative particles (Komi *мися*, Udmurt *пöй*) in Permic, and the lexical self-quotative markers *mondom* 'I say (it)' and *mondok* 'I say' in Hungarian. I look at their use with different types of reported discourse — quotations of speech and thought, intended discourse, purpose reports, expression of the reporter's current stance, and mimetic expressions. By contrasting lexical and grammaticalized elements, I show how their morphosyntactic status and structural use allow them, on the one hand, to frame different types of reported discourse or, on the other hand, restrict them to particular types only.

Keywords: Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian, self-quotative markers, self-quotations, reported discourse.

1. Introduction

1.1. Reported discourse (RD) and self-quotations (SQs)

Despite the variety of the available terminology proposed to define the notion of reported speech and thought, in my investigation on self-quotative markers in three Finno-Ugric languages I turn to Güldemann's framework of r e p o r t e d   d i s c o u r s e (henceforth also: RD), defined as follows:

> Reported discourse is 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 in a pragmatic and deictic setting that is different from that of the immediate discourse (Güldemann 2008 : 6).

From the above definition, one can conclude that the notion *discourse* as "the representation of spoken or mental text", chosen by Güldemann instead of the more traditional *speech*, is more accurate[1]. In practice, RD "is not restricted

---

[1] The label *discourse* has its own drawbacks, since it may also invoke a connotation of discourse as a stretch of speech (Spronck, Nikitina 2019 : 122), this way excluding one-word reported utterances and thoughts. In this study, I follow Güldemann's (2008 : 6) definition of RD as a text ranging "from a long discourse through complex or simple sentential forms to a one-word utterance", which balances the downside of the term.

to real instances of speech" and may also include "texts that were never actually uttered like so-called internal speech, or in general any representation of cognitive acts or states" (Güldemann 2008 : 7). Hence, besides reports of previously produced speech acts, RD may also include words that might not have been uttered before: not everything that was said can be reported, and what can be reported may not have been said before (Romaine, Lange 1991 : 244).

RD can include a whole range of representations of factual and fictional discourse. To orient better in the choice of the material that can fall under the category of RD, I propose a few classifications that will narrow down this notion. First, I distinguish between three basic types of RD a c c o r d i n g t o t h e q u o t e d i n f o r m a t i o n and put forward three cover terms: *quotations of speech*, *quotations of thought*, and *hypothetical quotations*. I use the label *quotation* as an umbrella term for (re)presentation of different types of RD in the immediate (ongoing) discourse. The term *quotation of speech* involves different representations of factual speech acts, as in (1a). The term *quotation of thought* covers factual representations of cognitive acts and states, as in (1b). This term subsumes such mental processes as e.g. thinking, considering, guessing, concluding, and mental conditions as, e.g., knowing, remembering, etc. By *hypothetical quotations*, I mean such a type of discourse that in the quotative domain formally represents canonical quotations but does not derive from the previously produced non-immediate discourse in the form of speech or thought. Although entirely fictional, hypothetical quotations as in (1c, 1d) are presented by the reporter as those that could possibly occur in the immediate discourse.

(1) a. *He said that <u>we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon</u>*
    b. *He thought that <u>we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon</u>*
    c. *He would have said that <u>we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon</u>*
    d. *He would have thought that <u>we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon</u>*[2]

As examples in (1) imply, RD can further be split based on the factuality/fictionality scale where (1a) and (1b) would denote representations of f a c t u a l speech and thought, while (1c) and (1d) would exemplify f i c t i o n a l ones. However, one should take into account that the framing of factual and fictional RD does not necessarily have to differ. Thus, one can think of situations where the reporter attempts to present fictional RD to the audience as factual,[3] and *vice versa*. In such cases, markers that are typically used with factual quotes can serve to frame fictional RD.

Furthermore, based on the source of RD, two different types of RD can be distinguished — quotations and self-quotations (henceforth also: SQs), as in (2).[4]

---

[2] I have constructed the examples in (1) based on the original utterance *I think he would have said that finally we have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon* (https://www.quora.com/profile/Bob-Grueneberg).
[3] Cf. (15a).
[4] Where quotations and self-quotations coincide within one text, I mark the boundaries of ordinary quotations with one underline and the boundaries of self-quotations with double underline in the translation line. Otherwise, the default marking of the boundaries of RD is one underline.

(2) *and he goes* <u>*I am the police bitch*</u> *and starts touching the register I'm like* <u>*oh this mf'er didn't just do that*</u> (https://twitter.com/allthingsmollie/status/690042054936772608).

Güldemann (2008 : 7) suggests that in self-quotations, where the reporter and the original speaker coincide, two sources of consciousness "differing from each other at least on the time dimension" can still be distinguished. In this study, I propose to consider SQs a genuine subclass of RD where the reporter has n o t   o n l y   w i t n e s s e d streams of the non-immediate discourse but i s   a l s o   t h e i r (original) a u t h o r. However, this distinction does not imply any influence on the epistemic commitment in presentations of self-quotations. As one can expect, similarly to ordinary quotations, SQs can be presented with either strong or weak commitment (see Michael 2012 on self-quotations in Nanti).

1.2. Quotative indexes (QIs) and self-quotative markers (SQMs)

According to Güldemann (2008 : 10), RD together with elements introducing it form the whole of a construction labeled as *RD-construction*. RD-constructions canonically consist of two major constituents — an RD and a quotative index (henceforth also: QI) that form a complex whole. In (1a), repeated here as (3), the clause *he said that* represents a QI introducing the RD *we finally have found*…:

(3) *H e   s a i d   t h a t*[5] <u>*we finally have found someone more dishonest than Richard Nixon*</u>

The notion *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 segmentally discrete linguistic expression, the QI can be formed by structures of different complexities, ranging from a gram bound to the RD or an independent function word to a clause with more than one predicate (Güldemann 2008 : 11). In some contexts, QIs can remain verbally unexpressed, and thus different suprasegmental features of intonation, pitch and dynamics can be used as a means of differentiating a quote from its surrounding context.[6] Taking into account the nature of the material used in this study (see Section 2) and the focus on self-quotative markers, I exclude verbally unexpressed QIs from the current investigation.

Coming back to the structural features of QIs, one can note that the QI in (3) represents rather a canonical type of the quotative construction formed by the nominal encoding the original speaker (*he*), the speech verb (*said*) describing the event behind the RD (i.e., the quoted utterance represents a speech-event), and the functional word (*that*) necessary for marking the boundary between the QI and indirect RD. However, among the world's languages it is quite typical that the whole syntagma as in (3) can be

---

[5] Emphasized word-forms are expanded.
[6] On combinations of prosodic features as a means of differentiating a quote from its surrounding context, see, e.g., Couper-Kuhlen 1998; Klewitz, Couper-Kuhlen 1999 (for English), Günthner 1999 (for German conversational discourse), and Malibert, Vanhove 2015 (for Afroasiatic languages).

substituted by a functional word carrying an identical quotative function.[7] Consider two examples from Japanese in (4), where the QI in (4a) roughly corresponds to the English QI in (3), while the QI in (4b) is merely formed by the quotative/complementizer *to*.

(4) a. Japanese (Oshima, Sano 2012 : 147)
Y u m i w a   anataga sukida   t o   i t t a
PN.TOP   you.NOM fond.be.PRS COMP say.PST
'Y u m i   s a i d   t h a t   (she) liked you'

b. Japanese (Ian Joo, p.c.)
oishii   t o   tabeta
delicious COMP/QUOT eat.PST
'I/(s)he ate   s a y i n g / t h i n k i n g   t h a t   it is delicious' (lit. '(I/(s)he) ate, (saying/thinking)   t h a t   (it is) delicious')

Besides structural differences, similarly to RD, QIs can be split into quotative and self-quotative markers. In the world's languages, self-quotative markers (henceforth also: SQMs) can remain indistinct from the rest of the quotative markers, i.e. the same marker is applied for both quotations and self-quotations,[8] as, e.g., the English motion verb *go* in (5a). Alternatively, one marker/strategy is reserved for SQs, another — for ordinary quotations, as, e.g., the Komi self-quotative particle *мися* (self-quotations only) vs. the quotative particle *nö* (ordinary quotations only)[9] in (5b).

(5) a. English (https://orionsmethod.com/transcripts/loren-slocum-lahav/)
T h e   g u y   g o e s, "When can you move?" and I   g o, "I don't know,"...

b. Komi (http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_9.html)
Триньöбтöны   зонъяс. Ми п ö   Колялöн öтуволанінас   [–––]
ring.out.PRS.3PL boy.PL   1PL QUOT PN.GEN   dormitory.INE3SG
М и с я,   но   петöй,   ме тіянсянь матын нин
QUOT:SELF PTCL come.out.IMP.PL 1SG 2PL.EGR   close.INE already
'The boys called me.   S o   t h e y, we are in Kolya's dorm [–––] S o   I, well, come out, I'm already close to you'

SQMs, as QIs in general, can be divided into l e x i c a l SQMs, canonically formed by speech (or epistemic) verbs and defining the event behind the RD, e.g., *mondok* 'I say' in Hungarian in (6a) or the epistemic verb

---

[7] Of course, the orientation of a QI in such cases may shift from the event to the quote. Here, I will not discuss in detail the orientation of QIs. The reader interested in this topic is referred to Güldemann 2008 and Güldemann 2012 for a broader typological discussion and to Teptiuk 2019 for results from five Finno-Ugric languages.

[8] This seems to be the case in the majority of so-far described languages and their quotative systems. As an exception, in addition to Finno-Ugric languages discussed here, one can name Nanti, which is an Arawakan language (Michael 2012), two African languages: Laal (isolate, Chad) (Lionnet 2019) and Mundabli (Niger-Congo, Southern Bantoid) (Voll 2019a; 2019b), and three Kartvelian languages: Georgian, Svan and Mingrelian (see Boeder 2002 : 13, 21, 41), where dedicated self-quotative markers are found. Apparently, a dedicated self-quotative particle *reku* 'I say' not found in contemporary Russian was in use in Old Russian (Зализняк 2008 : 44—45). I owe the knowledge about the last one to Rebecca Voll (p.c.).

[9] The presentation of quotations in Komi is also carried out by other markers besides *nö* (see e.g. Teptiuk 2019; 2021 for more details on QIs in colloquial written Komi).

малпасько 'I think' in Udmurt in (6b), and g r a m m a t i c a l i z e d SQMs, e.g. the particle *nöü* in Udmurt in (6b).

(6) a. Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)
No, m o n d o k, biztos ez a kemping neve, vagy mi
PTCL say.PRS.1SG certainly DEM DEF camping 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"] <u>Well</u>, I s a y [~ t h i n k], <u>this is certainly the name of the camping site, or what</u>'

b. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)
... м а л п а с ь к о: оло-а, п ö й, та вань улонэлы сыче
think.PRS.1SG maybe-PTCL QUOT:SELF i.e. life.1SG.DAT such
ишан возьматскылӥз мыным
ghost appear.PST.3SG 1SG.DAT
'... I t h i n k: <u>maybe such a ghost appears to me</u>'

The results of my previous study (Teptiuk 2019) have shown that both lexical (Hungarian) and grammaticalized (Komi and Udmurt) SQMs frame besides SQs of speech also SQs of thought, as is partially demonstrated in (6) (further discussed here in 3.1). The concrete type of an RD is often retrievable from the context. Thus, SQs of speech are usually (a) presented as the reporter's answer to an utterance produced by another speaker or (b) parts of a reproduced discourse between another speaker and the reporter. Quotations of thought, however, are n o t addressed to a concrete person, neither explicitly in the QI (e.g. 'I say/said to him/her/John, etc.') nor based on the context (e.g. 'X says: …, I say: …', or 'I say: …, X says: …').

A question arises if there are any other functional differences between the use of lexical and grammaticalized SQMs cross-linguistically. Michael's (2012) study on self-quotations in Nanti (Arawakan) has shown that Nanti lexical self-quotative strategies "are used to report utterances with significant illocutionary force, such as commands, demands, prohibitions, invitations, and utterances that express a stance on matters that are epistemically or morally contentious" (Michael 2012 : 329). Furthermore, they also take part in c o n c u r r e n t q u o t a t i v e f r a m i n g (CQF), that is "the use of quotative resources to frame utterances that arise at a particular moment in the ongoing interaction as 'reported speech'" (Michael 2012 : 335), whereas grammaticalized SQMs merely indicate that "the quoted party is an informational source of the quoted utterance" (Michael 2012 : 348).

These findings have led me to the central question of this study: Is there a difference similar to the one found in Nanti in the use of the two different self-quotative strategies of the Finno-Ugric languages in focus, namely, the grammaticalized (Permic) and the lexical one (basic in Hungarian, but also used in Permic)? Furthermore, a separate interest arises in the role of SQs in discourse. Thus, by looking into the use of the two different self-quotative strategies, I aim at confronting the following questions:
(a) Do self-quotations contain nothing but reports of previous utterances and thoughts, or may they also represent some other types of discourse, e.g., decision-making (cf. Golato 2002), assertions, immediate expression of opinion, presentation of fictional discourse, *inter alia*?
(b) Are there any differences in framing different types of self-quotations?

The paper is organized as follows. Before presenting the results in Section 3, I briefly describe the methodology and data used in the study in Section 2. The results in Section 3 are presented in accordance with the different types of RD introduced by the SQMs in the languages in focus. In Section 4, I summarize the main results and discuss the relationship between the morphosyntactic characteristics of the markers and their functional distribution.

2. Methodology and data

In this study, I use data originating from social network sites (SNS) as a database. My choice of SNS data is motivated by the following factors. First, I concentrate on the use of QIs in substandard varieties of the languages in focus, which typically exceed the limited amount of QIs used in standardized texts. Second, previous studies have already shown that "... informal characteristics of SNS enables the usage of generally oral forms such as slang and dialects in a written context" (Pischlöger 2014 : 144). This argument is especially valuable while studying minority languages, since "the relaxed atmosphere on SNS allows language use which is typical for oral communication and otherwise frowned upon in other (especially written) contexts by language purists" (Pischlöger 2014 : 144). In principle, Komi and Udmurt online speakers use not only variants mixed with Russian but also a mixture of dialects and styles, typical for colloquial speech (see Pischlöger 2016; Едыгарова 2013; Edygarova 2014). As for a largely represented language like Hungarian, one can investigate the use of SQs in substandard vernacular speech, which has not yet been thoroughly studied, and concentrate on markers not present in standard writing and official speech contexts. Given this, despite the presence of different orthographic symbols, unstandardized shortenings, emoticons, etc., the language on SNS can be seriously considered the closest written variant of spoken language, combining the features of standard writing and colloquial speech within one text.

For data collection, I have studied the occurrence of SQs in different new media sources, paying attention to all means used in framing this subcategory of RD with special attention to the SQMs in focus. Since Udmurt and Komi are endangered languages with a more limited amount of online material, for these languages I have also studied some available text collections (Кельмаков 1981; 1990 for Udmurt, and Uotila 1985; 1989 for Komi). These collections provide transcribed oral narratives produced by speakers from various dialectal groups in the 20th century and they were used as a background for further data collection on SNS.

Since I do not intend to provide any quantitative outcomes in this study, for each language I checked a reasonable number of pages online and in the available online corpora. For Udmurt, my material derives exclusively from the Press and Blog subcorpora of the Udmurt corpus (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/) and contains ca. 100 examples of self-quotations. For Komi, I have used exclusively independently collected material (ca. 110 examples of self-quotations) deriving from the SNS https://vk.com and http://blogspot.com/, since similar online corpus containing material from new media sites was not available at the moment of the data collection.[10]

---

[10] In meanwhile, the new media subcorpus http://komi-zyrian.web-corpora.net became available online. The data from this corpus were not included in this study.

For Hungarian, I used the Personal subcorpus of the Hungarian National corpus (http://mnsz.nytud.hu) and collected ca. 140 examples of self-quotations.

Examples presented in the paper are provided with translation and glossing. Minor spelling mistakes are corrected in order to avoid misinterpretation of the presented examples. In correcting mistakes, I avoided interpunctuation, which might otherwise have influenced the interpretation of examples. Code-switching into Russian is marked with capitalized non-italics

3. Results

3.1. Self-quotative markers introducing factual speech and thought

In Permic, introduction of factual SQs of speech and thought is typically carried out by means of b i p a r t i t e QIs that are structurally realized as a combination of preposed and intraposed QIs. The core element of the preposed QI is a speech or epistemic verb specifying the event behind the RD as a quotation of speech (7a—7b) or thought (8a—8b). In both cases, the self-quotative particles are inserted into the RD.

(7) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Blog subcorpus)
В а с я л ы   ш у и с ь к о,   солы,   п ö й,   инстаграм
PN.DAT   say.PRS.1SG   DEM.DAT QUOT:SELF Instagram
телефоназ   пуктоно
telephone.ILL3SG install.PTCP:NEC
'I s a y t o V a s y a <u>he has to install Instagram on his phone</u>'

b. Komi (http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2015/02/blog-post_18.html)
Ш м о н и т ы ш т і весиг,   м и с я,   локтан воö
joke.PST.1SG   even   QUOT:SELF upcoming year.ILL
диктант бöрын колö   öтвылысь тшай юны
dictation after   must.PRS.3SG together   tea   drink.INF
'I e v e n m a d e a j o k e, (that) <u>next year after a dictation (we) should drink tea together</u>'

(8) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)
М о н н о о з ь ы и к   м а л п а й: кыед   гу,
1SG   and thus   PTCL:REPET think.PST.1SG manure pit
п ö й,   пöрмытӥзы
QUOT:SELF reorganize.PST.3PL
'And I t h o u g h t a l s o t h i s w a y: <u>they reorganized a manure pit</u>'

b. Komi (http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_6.html)
Ч а й т і,   тайö,   м и с я,   кутшöмкö ыджыд да важнöй   морт
think.PST.1SG DEM   QUOT:SELF some   big   and important person
'I t h o u g h t, <u>this is some big and important person</u>'

In Hungarian, the lexical SQM *mondok/mondom* 'I say' by default (i.e., without taking the context into account) indicates the presence of a quotation of speech since *mondok/mondom* is represented by the 1st person singular present tense forms of the generic speech verb *mond* 'say'. However, in contexts where a self-quote is not addressed to a concrete person, neither explicitly in the QI nor in the context (see 1.2), the self-quote most likely

represents an SQ of thought.[11] Consider the difference between two types of SQs in the use of *mondok* in (9). In (9a), the speaker reacts to another speaker's cue, previously presented in the discourse ('they also inquire: …'), while in (9b), the SQ is inserted into the discourse out of the blue without any other participants being explicitly specified in the context. Hence, the most natural interpretation of the self-quote in (9a) is representation of speech, while in (9b) thought is represented.[12]

(9) a. Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

... *k é r d i k i s*: *hogy élsz?*   *m o n d o k*: *békesség, nyugalom*
  ask.PRS.3PL also how live.PRS.2SG say.PRS.1SG peace   tranquility
mint szanatórium
like sanatorium
'... t h e y a l s o i n q u i r e: <u>how do you live?</u> I s a y: <u>peace, tran-</u>
<u>quility, like sanatorium</u>'

b. Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)
No, m o n d o k, biztos ez a kemping neve,   vagy mi
PTCL say.PRS.1SG certainly DEM DEF camping name.3SG or   what
'[When I was looking for the beach, I saw in the village a sign made from wood, which said "Robinson 3 km".] <u>Well</u>, I s a y [i.e. t h i n k], <u>this is certainly the name of the camping site, or what</u>'

A similar ambiguity between representations of speech and thought can also be observed in the use of Permic self-quotative particles as single quote-introducers. The QI reduced to a single element introducing the quote leads to n e u t r a l i z a t i o n o f t h e e v e n t behind the RD. The event-neutralization allows different interpretations for the presented quote, which out of the context, similarly to the above Hungarian cases, would most likely be interpreted by a native Komi or Udmurt speaker as an SQ of speech. However, contexts where the speaker does not address his/her utterance to a concrete person, physically not present in the quoted situation, show that interpretations of a self-quote as a reproduced thought are also possible, as in (10).

(10) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Blog subcorpus)
Мон но витисько,   мар, п ö й,   таос чалмизы?
1SG and wait.PRS.1SG what QUOT:SELF DEM.PL get.silent.PST.3PL
'[<USER>, one needs to spend too much time on the data processing — they've sent 600 words.] I wait, (t h i n k i n g) <u>why did they get silent?</u>'

b. Komi (https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809_3623)
М и с я, ковмас   кö, кыдз бара-й   нетшкыны найöс
QUOT:SELF need.FUT.3SG COND how again-PTCL take.out.INF 3PL.ACC
кутан?
start.PRS.2SG

---

[11] It is worth pointing out that SQs of thought can also be presented with the collocation *mondok/mondom magamban*, lit. 'I say inside myself'.
[12] A tendency where a basic speech verb with the meaning 'say' functions as a quotative marker presenting quotations of thought is not unique for Hungarian. For a similar functional extension among generic speech verbs in the world's languages, see e.g. Chappell 2008 (on Sinitic), Matić, Pakendorf 2013 (on Siberian languages), McGregor 1994; 2014; Spronck 2016; 2017 (on the languages of Australia), *inter alia*.

'[While walking home, I overtook an old "seven".[13] On a poor lad's rare window, there's hardly an empty space — all over it there are stickers.] I t h o u g h t, <u>if necessary, how will you start taking them off?</u>'

In (10a), the reporter receives a request to process some data containing 600 words. Based on the context, one can expect that (s)he has inquired about the task and now awaits further instructions, which are, however, not coming. In the presented sentence, (s)he quotes his/her thoughts questioning why the inquired party is not answering. In (10b), while driving the reporter overtook a car covered with stickers. Further, he presents an utterance framed by the self-quotative particle *мися*. The context shows that most probably the reporter did not stop to present the quoted utterance to the driver of the car covered with stickers. Instead, he presents a rhetorical question to himself. Hence, I suggest interpreting the quoted utterance in (10b) as a self-quotation of thought. Of course, under similar structural conditions where event-neutralization is present, *мися* and *пӧй* can also introduce a quotation of speech. One can think of similar examples, although presented in a situation where the quoted utterances are responses to somebody else's cues, as in (11).

(11) Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)

Ма, п е, Перепечкинъёсты уд   тодӥськы-а мар-а?
what QUOT PN.PL.ACC   NEG.PRS.2SG know.CN-PTCL what-Q

Бен, п ӧ й, телевизорысь гинэ адӟылӥ   ук
okay QUOT:SELF TV.ELA   only see.PST.1SG PTCL

<u>'What</u>, (s)h e s a y s, <u>you don't know Perepechkins?</u> <u>Well</u>, I s a y, <u>I have seen them only on TV</u>'

3.2. Self-quotative markers in concurrent quotative framing

Besides the most typical use of the SQMs in the above three languages with SQs of factual speech and thought, I have observed their use in constructions where they take part in framing the parts of immediate discourse in order to express the current speaker's stance. For such use of quotative markers, Michael (2012 : 335) has proposed the term *concurrent quotative framing* (henceforth also: CQF) (see also 1.2).

Among the markers in focus, one can point out the lexical *mondok/mondom* as the most natural candidates for such a function. Both markers are present tense forms of the speech verb *mond* 'say'. Thus, they refer more to immediate discourse happening in the same time setting as the current speech situation than to non-immediate discourse, which has mostly taken place in the past or is hypothetically related to some other timeframe. Hence, *mondok/mondom* can frame the speaker's current stance quite conveniently as in (12):

(12) a. (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

M o n d o m,   ne   kérj   elnézést,   IGAZAD VAN!
say.PRS1SG:DEF NEG.IMP ask.IMP.2SG forgiveness.ACC right.2SG be.PRS3SG

'I s a y, don't ask forgiveness, YOU ARE RIGHT!'

b. (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

M o n d o k, szerintem   sokkal jobb,   ha   az ember
say.PRS1SG   according.1SG more good.COMPAR when DEF person

---

[13] Lada 2107 or VAZ-2107 is a car often referred to by Russian speakers as *семёрка*, i.e. 'seven'.

megmondja   a   másiknak, ha   valami   baja   van
PRF.say.PRS3SG:DEF DEF other.DAT   when something problem.3SG be.PRS3SG
vele
COM.3SG

'[Answer: how can I claim that I love you when this is my opinion about him/her.] I   s a y,   in my opinion, it's better when a person speaks up to the other one, whenever there is a problem with him/her.'

Note that in both cases the expression of stance is presented with an illocutionary force. In (12a), the speaker's stance contains the command 'don't ask forgiveness'. In (12b), the speaker enhances the presence of his stance and emphasizes its subjectivity, also expressed with the stance marker *szerintem* 'in my opinion'. Such a use of *mondok/mondom* can be roughly compared with similar instances in English where the speech verb *tell* in the present tense is used as a "stance enhancer", e.g. *I'm t e l l i n g y o u, you don't need that guy*. As discussed by Güldemann (2008 : 411ff.), illocution reinforcement along with other related discourse functions are quite universal among the elements used as QIs cross-linguistically, especially those with the 1st person subject.[14]

In Udmurt, the use of the self-quotative particle *nöü* can also be observed in contexts where the framed discourse resembles parts of the immediate discourse rather than belongs to the non-immediate RD, as in (13). The example in (13) can be interpreted in two ways. One way suggests that the speakers quote their own thoughts, and we end up with the ordinary quotative use similar to the one presented in 3.1. Another way suggests that the speakers do not quote themselves but actually present their stance in the current speech situation. Thus, if the latter interpretation is correct, the self-quotative particle is used as a subjectivity marker, the main function of which is externalization of the speaker's own point of view in the discourse.[15] Let's now take a closer look at (13).

(13) Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)
Абдранэ   но, шумпотонэ   но   вуттӥськоды   туж ӵем: кызьы
surprise.ILL and happiness.ILL and manage.PRS.2PL very often how
тодады,   п ö й,   лыктэ   сыӵе удысэз   усьтыны,
memory.ILL2PL QUOT:SELF come.PRS3SG such domain.ACC open.INF
кытысь шедьтӥськоды сыӵе гажано адямиосты,   кыле-а
where.from find.PRS.2PL such respected person.PL.ACC be.left.PRS3SG-Q
дырды семьяеныды улыны?
time.2PL family.INSTR.2PL be.INF

'You very often manage to surprise and make people happy: I   s a y,   how do you come up with opening such a domain, where from do you find such respected people, is there any time left for you to be with your families?'

In (13), the speaker praises his favorite newspaper "Udmurt dunne". (S)he says that the editorial team often surprises readers and makes them happy. After that, he goes on praising the editors by asking them and the journalists where they find such interesting topics to discuss and if they have any

---

[14] Voll (2019a) reports an identical function in the use of the grammaticalized Mundabli self-quotative *mɔ́*.
[15] The native speakers in whose dialects the marker is used (Pavel Kutergin, p.c) also point out the subjective meaning in the use of *nöü*.

time left to spend with their families since they are dedicated, hard-working professionals. Of course, one could expect that the speaker merely quotes his previous thoughts containing all these questions. However, such an interpretation would be more natural in discussions of past events than in contexts where the whole speech situation does not go beyond the immediate discourse. Hence, I propose to interpret *пӧй* in such contexts as a stance rather than a quotative marker.

As for Komi, the self-quotative particle *мися* was not observed in CQF online. However, a couple of examples of its use in such a function can be observed in oral speech. Example (14) is drawn from the recordings of the Family Problems picture task (see Evans, Barth 2017). Two Komi speakers discuss the situation illustrated in the pictures and form a narrative based on these pictures. One of the main characters (the tourist in Ex. 14) eventually gets drunk and beats his wife and kid, suspecting the former in cheating. One of the speakers assumes that the protagonist behaved this way because he was drunk. The assumption is framed by *меся* (a dialectal variant of *мися*, cf. Bartens 2000 : 321) indicating that it is her subjective interpretation of the situation arisen in the immediate discourse.

(14) Komi (Family Problem picture task recordings, FULAB, 06:49 — 06:54)[16]

Вобсем	ЗА	ИЗ-ЗА	АЛКОГОЛЯ	*м е с я*	*кыдзикӧ*	*сія*
in.general	behind	because.of	alcohol.GEN	QUOT:SELF	somehow	3SG

лоис	*татшӧм*	*турист*
be.PST.3SG	such	tourist

'In general, because-because of alcohol, I s a y / t h i n k, somehow he was such, the tourist' (FULAB, 06:49—06:54)

3.3. Self-quotative markers framing intended discourse

Besides representations of factual speech and thought, both Permic SQMs can be observed in contexts where they frame parts of intended discourse. Most typically, the RD is realized as either a silent thought or as a general intention that has not succeeded for some reason. Consider the two examples in (15).

(15) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)

Кӧня	*ке*	*час*	*ортчыса,*	*ж и н г ы р т о н о*	*к а р и с ь к и,*
how.much	INDEF	hour	pass.CV	call.PTCP	do.PST1SG

резюмеме	*учкиды*	*ни-а,*	*п ӧ й*
CV.ACC1SG	look.PST.2SG	already-Q	QUOT:SELF

'After some hours had passed, I c a l l e d, <u>have you already looked at my CV?</u> [A f t e r c a l l i n g 2-3 t i m e s, Gulnara Rafikovna picked up the phone. — What's Your name, surname and patronymic name? — digging through the papers, apparently. — Ah, here it is, Your application]'

b. Komi (https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809_3600%2Fall)

К ы в й ӧ й	*эськӧ*	*ёна*	*л у д і с*	*в о ч а в и д з н ы,*	*м и с я,*
tongue.1SG	PTCL	very	itch.PST.3SG	answer.INF	QUOT:SELF

м ы й	*асьныд*	*инданныд,*	*сійӧс*	*и*	*йӧзӧдам*
COMP	yourself.2PL	appoint.PRS2PL	3SG.ACC	and	announce.PRS.1PL

’M y t o n g u e w a s v e r y i t c h i n g t o a n s w e r t h a t <u>You yourself appoint and we announced</u> [B u t I d i d n o t m a n a g e]’

In (15a), the reporter presents a quote as if it was a representation of factual speech. However, the context shows that the utterance framed by the QI consisting of *nöй* is only intended and (s)he managed to reach the addressee only after calling a couple of times. The intended discourse demonstrates the purpose behind the call to the addressee (also see on purpose reports in Section 3.4). In (15b), the reporter hints in the first part of the bipartite QI that the quote was intended and contains the reporter's silent thoughts that were meant as a response to an addressee. The next sentence specifies that he actually did not manage to answer and preferred to remain silent.

Besides bipartite quotative constructions, one can observe similar types of discourse framed merely by self-quotative particles as in (16). Since the event behind the RD remains neutralized and the context does not show either what type of RD is present, interpretation of the RD as an intended one is one of the possible options. Such an RD can also be interpreted as a quotation of factual speech or thought.

(16) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)

Першал Валяез öтё   n ö й — со ваньзэ   радызъя
PN   PN.ACC call.FUT1SG QUOT:SELF 3SG everything.ACC in.order
валэктоз
explain.FUT.3SG
’[A little bit (s)he calms down]. <u>I will call Valya Pershal</u> — (I s a i d/ t h o u g h t/i n t e n d e d t o s a y) — <u>she will explain everything</u>’

b. Komi (https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809_1212%2Fall)
Муртса туй вöчысьыдлы   паныд   машинаысь
barely   road worker.2SG.DAT towards car.ELA
эг   пет: кутшöм, м и с я, ”РЕМОНТОМ”,
NEG.PST1SG come.out.CN which   QUOT:SELF renovation.INSTR
кольöм во   на тані дзоньтасинныд да?!
last   year yet here renovate.PST.2PL indeed
’[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: <u>what ”renovation”</u>, I s a i d/t h o u g h t/i n t e n d e d t o s a y, <u>last year you did already renovations, didn't you?!</u> [And then I looked around better and calmed down: Holes everywhere! In such a place one would not even dare to drive or you will lose both wheels and suspension]’

In (16a), the reporter presents a self-quote that can be interpreted variously based on the available context. The interpretation as an intended discourse is proposed here rather as a possible option, since the context does not contradict such a reading. In (16b), the quoted part represents the reporter's silent thoughts rather than representation of his speech. Based on the context, one can suspect that the intended addressee is out of the reporter's reach and he resents the whole situation of the road being closed for renovation only silently. Other interpretations are not excluded; however, I consider my interpretation of the quote as intended the most plausible option in the current situation.

3.4. Self-quotative markers introducing purpose reports

Among the attested types of self-quotations, framed by the SQMs in focus, a separate subtype of RD can be pointed out which I label here as *purpose reports*. Under this category, I place the reports that besides their general semiotic, evidential and epistemic meaning peculiar to RD (see Spronck, Nikitina 2019 : 143 ff. for a detailed discussion) include a purpose component explaining the reporter's motivation for an action (or its lack). Note the overtones of purpose in (15a), previously presented here, where the reporter explains the purpose behind his/her call with RD. Such types of reports framed by self-quotative particles can be observed in both Permic languages.

(17) a. Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)

Огнуналэ   потӥ   Ижкарысь центре, Николай
daytime.ILL go.out.PST1SG Iževsk.ELA   center.ILL PN

Постниковлэсь книгазэ   басьто   ай, п ö й
PN.ABL   book.ACC3SG buy.FUT1SG PTCL QUOT:SELF

'During the daytime I went out to the center of Izhevsk, s a y i n g/
t h i n k i n g, <u>I will buy</u> <u>Nikolay Postnikov's book</u>'

b. Komi (https://vk.com/club42898809?w=wall-42898809_3729%2Fall)

Служба бöрын тöвзи   войвыв юркарö,   м и с я,
service after   rush.PST1SG north   capital.ILL QUOT:SELF

студенталан ёртъяскöд   аддзысьла
be.student.PTCP friend.PL.COM meet.PRS1SG

'After the (military) service I rushed to the northern capital, s a y i n g/
t h i n k i n g <u>I will meet with my university friends</u>'

In (17a), the reporter says that he went out to the city center of Izhevsk. The purpose for going out is explained by an RD, which is likely to be an SQ of the reporter's thoughts. Similarly, in (17b) in Komi, the self-quotative particle frames a part of the discourse explaining the purpose behind the trip to the northern capital, i.e., Saint Petersburg.

Such a development of quotative elements into purpose-clause linkers are not unique for Permic and can be observed in other world's languages (see Güldemann 2008 : 460—464). Güldemann (2008 : 461) suggests that the grammaticalization of quotatives into purpose markers "is closely linked to the internal awareness function of RD". Thus, RD-constructions become ambiguous with respect to expressions of intention or volition in some languages: the elements initially used as quotative markers only develop parallel functions and begin framing intentional/volitional, purpose or reason clauses. As for the Permic self-quotative particles, this function seems to be only at the beginning stage of development and can be observed in but a few instances of the analyzed material. However, note that such a grammaticalization path has been attested in other world's languages. Hence, Permic self-quotatives have a potential to follow a similar scenario and conventionalize such functions in the future.

**3.5. Self-quotative markers introducing (almost) instant (verbatim) self-
       quotations of speech**

Among the functional extensions framing the two basic types of RD introduced in 3.1, the Hungarian lexical SQMs also frame (almost) instant (verbatim) self-

quotations of speech. I put *almost* and *verbatim* into parentheses, since besides the predominant practice of using instant verbatim self-quotations right away after the initially produced speech, in some contexts the quoted utterances can be presented relatively distantly (2—3 sentences away) from the original utterance.[17] The quote can undergo a slight change in content, although preserving its main meaning. However, in the majority of the observed cases, the reporter aims to emphasize the content of the quoted utterance, typically reduced to a word or a simple phrase, and therefore does not face a cognitive pressure of memorizing word for word the entire utterance previously produced in the discourse (see Clark, Gerrig 1990 : 796 ff. on problems with verbatim quotations in everyday speech). By quoting only a part of the previous utterance, the reporter aims at highlighting its most prominent points as in (18).

(18) a. Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

Nem egymást   kéne   ütni, van   e l l e n s é g
NEG one.another.ACC must.COND.3SG hit.INF be.PRS3SG enemy

elég.   Ellenség, m o n d o m, és   nem ellenfél
enough enemy   say.PRS1SG:DEF and NEG opponent

'No need hit one another, there's enough e n e m i e s. <u>Enemies</u>, I s a y, and not opponents'

b. Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

... de Colosseumtól s z e r i n t e m a   következők a
   but PN.ABL   according.1SG   DEF following.PL DEF

legjobbak: Valentyne Suite, Live, Those who are about…,
SUP.good.COMPAR.PL PN   PN   PN

és   a   Daughter of Time. M o n d o k, s z e r i n t e m
and DEF PN   say.PRS1SG   according.1SG

'... but from Colosseum, a c c o r d i n g t o m e the following (albums) are the best: Valentyne Suite, Live, Those who are about…, and the Daughter of Time. I s a y, <u>according to me</u>'

In (18a), the reporter first expresses his/her opinion on the described issue and right away stresses the most prominent part ('enemies') by partially quoting him-/herself. Similarly, in (18b) the reporter names his/her favorite Colosseum's albums and further emphasizes the subjectivity of such a stance by self-quoting a part of the previous utterance ('in my opinion').

Quite interesting that outside the quotative domain I have observed several instances where *mondom* is used as an emphasizing device. In (19), the reporter discusses the pros and cons of a car brand. He specifies that the car is sold with a three-year plant guarantee. Further, he wants to emphasize that his stance is based on visual evidence. Hence, he inserts *mondom* as an emphasizer bringing the evidential value of his stance into foreground.

(19) Hungarian (http://mnsz.nytud.hu)

... 3   év   gyári   garanciával, és, m o n d o m, közelről
   NUM year plant.ADJ guarantee.COM and say.PRS1SG:DEF close.DELA

láttam,   hosszabb   használatot tekintetbe véve   is...
see.PST.1SG long.COMPAR usage.ACC regard.ILL take.CV also

---

[17] According to Balázs Surányi (p.c.), such a use of *mondom* can happen when the original and the quoted utterances have even a broader distance, e.g., in conversations happening between the same speakers during different parts of the day.

'... with 3 years plant guarantee and, I s a y, I've seen it from close, taking into account also a longer usage...'

Such a use of *mondom* can be considered functionally close to the illocution reinforcement of the stance, discussed here in 3.2. For instance, consider a close situational equivalent in English in (20), where the speaker enhances the evidential value with the speech verb *tell*.

(20) English (abirdscalling.com)
Where did you see the river dragon uncle?
Does it really matter where? *I a m t e l l i n g y o u I've seen it*

3.6. Self-quotative markers framing verbalized demonstrations

Among the SQMs in focus, the Udmurt *pöj* has also been observed in constructions framing gestures whose meaning is verbalized by the reporters. Such expressions, in principle, can be considered quasi-quotations. In addition to representations of enacted human verbal behavior, QIs can also mark non-linguistic sound imitations, representational gestures and ideophones (Güldemann 2008 : 275ff.).[18] Therefore, it is quite natural that some of the SQMs frame quasi-quotations depicting reporter's movements and gestures as in (21), in addition to the more conventional types of RD such as quotations of speech and thought.

(21) Udmurt (http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/. Press subcorpus)
К и ы н ы м   гинэ ш о н т й: *ваньмыз,   п ö й*,
hand.INSTR.1SG only wave.PST1SG everything.3SG QUOT:SELF

умой, о'кей
good okay

'I only w a v e d m y h a n d: <u>everything is good, okay</u>.'

Verbalized gestures as in (21) are typically framed by a bipartite QI, where the first part describes the event behind the RD, i.e., a gestural movement ('I waved my hand'), and the self-quotative particle is inserted into the RD.

As for closely related Komi, the self-quotative *мися* has not (yet) been observed in an identical function. Based on my investigations among other Komi sources (Uotila 1985, 1989), a similar use has not been observed either. However, the lack of evidence does not exclude such a possibility and further investigations shall be conducted to see whether it is possible or not. As for the Hungarian *mondok/mondom*, it seems that this function is not characteristic of the marker due to its lexical status and meaning. As a result, the RD introduced by *mondok/mondom* can subsume real utterances and thoughts but does not include demonstrations of verbalized gestures or bodily movements.

4. Summary and discussion

The self-quotative markers investigated here and the types of RD that these markers introduce are summarized in Table 1.

---

[18] Güldemann (2008 : 287) uses the term *mimesis* referring to the domain that subsumes these notions. In addition, he includes direct reported discourse as one of the mimetic subcategories.

Table 1
Self-quotative markers introducing different types of reported discourse

Types of RD	
Quotations of speech (factual)	Udm. *nöü*, Komi *мися*, Hung. *mondok/mondom*
Quotations of thought (factual)	Udm. *nöü*, Komi *мися*, Hung. *mondok/mondom*
Expression of stance (CQF)	Udm. *nöü*, Komi *мися*, Hung. *mondok/mondom*
Intended speech	Udm. *nöü*, Komi *мися*
Purpose reports	Udm. *nöü*, Komi *мися*
Immediate verbatim self-quotations	Hung. *mondok/mondom*
Verbalized gestures	Udm. *nöü*

As one can see, the Permic results show that the grammaticalized self-quotative particles behave somewhat differently compared to Michael's (2012) findings from Nanti (Arawakan), where the grammaticalized elements function as indexes signaling merely that "the quoted party is an informational source of the quoted utterance" (Michael 2012 : 348). In Permic, besides quotations of speech and thought, the grammaticalized elements can frame expressions of stance, intended speech, purpose reports and mimetic expressions (the latter being observed in Udmurt only). Also, the grammaticalized self-quotatives functionally surpass their lexical counterparts in Hungarian, which besides factual self-quotations of speech and thought may also introduce immediate verbatim self-quotations and expressions of stance. This yields quite an interesting comparison between primarily functionally identical, but morphosyntactically different markers. One can also highlight a functional correspondence between the markers from the two closely related Permic languages. Taking into account a difference in the origin of the markers and lack of close recent contact between the languages, one can suspect that these functions might be observed in the use of self-quoting p a r t i c l e s among other languages beyond Finno-Ugric. Thus, it might even be possible to find a broader cross-linguistic correspondence between morphosyntactically and functionally similar markers, which is a direction for future research.

In the following discussion, I would like to pay special attention to the relationship between the morphosyntactic features of the markers and their functional distribution. Both Permic languages have shown that the use of self-quotative particles as part of more complex bipartite QIs typically leads to the introduction of self-quotes of speech or thought. The reporters specify the event and it is only in special pragmatic settings that different meanings might arise as, e.g., in (15a), where the QI describing quotation of factual speech is used to present intended discourse with a meaning of purpose.

The event-neutralization in the QI, which leads to the use of SQMs as single quote-introducers, often leaves a space for interpretation that can be narrowed down only by the available context. Thus, in addition to quotations of speech and thought, a part of discourse framed by a mere SQM particle can contain (a) words that were never uttered (i.e. intended discourse), (b) purpose reports, and (c) expression of the reporter's stance. For the first two types of RD, the following explanations can be proposed. Reporters sometimes prefer to present intended discourse without additionally specifying its fictional status. Thus, it leaves a possibility for a factual interpretation of a fictional quote by the audience. Unuttered emotionally loaded utterances and strong assertions can be presented as if they have taken place, which gives a reporter authority in discourse situ-

ations such as complaints,[19] morally contentious discussions, etc. As for purpose reports, this type of RD does not require an event specification. The reporter aims to present his/her motivation for an action or its lack, which becomes a foregrounded function of the RD. Therefore, there is no actual need to specify whether the quoted discourse was previously uttered, just thought, or came as an after-thought in the immediate discourse. As for framing the reporter's stance, it can be considered a functional extension from the quotative to the subjectivity marker such as, e.g., Eng. *in my* (*humble*) *opionion* / *im*(*h*)*o*. However, it is yet unclear what distancing effect the Permic SQMs acquire in such a function: Do the reporters reinforce the subjectivity of their stance or use the self-quotative particles as epistemic hedges as, e.g., in the use of the above English *im*(*h*)*o*? This question, however, shall be confronted in future studies.

Based on the results from Hungarian, the following conclusions can be drawn. The use of finite present tense markers in framing previously produced utterances and thoughts seems to develop from narratives where the immediate and non-immediate discourses happen in the same period. Thus, the reporters not only refer to a previously produced utterance and thoughts in the present tense but also keep the whole narrative corresponding (tense-wise) to the current speech situation, similarly to the use of the historical present in narratives. As present tense forms, *mondok*/*mondom* can frame parts of the immediate discourse quite naturally. Given this, their use in framing instant verbatim quotations and expressions of stance is not surprising. While framing instant verbatim quotations, the reporter repeats a part of the immediate discourse. Hence, the choice of the present over the past tense form seems to be self-explanatory since the margins between the immediate and non-immediate discourse are almost non-existent. Similarly, expressions of stance happen within the immediate discourse. Therefore, reporters use self-quotatives as devices that can reinforce the reporter's subjectivity and present stance with illocutionary force. Similar findings about the use of self-quotative lexical strategies have been reported for Nanti (see Michael 2012). A task for future studies is to trace the difference between several basic expressions of stance (e.g. *szerintem* 'in my opinion', *azt gondolom* 'I think that') and the use of self-quotatives in expressions of stance. My current hypothesis proposes that the former would differ from the latter in the lack of illocutionary force in the expression of stance, which has already been observed in such expressions framed by *mondok*/*mondom*. However, this hypothesis shall be checked in future.

It is quite interesting, although hardly surprising, that Hungarian SQMs are not used in framing purpose reports, intended discourse or mimetic expression. The lack of examples portraying purpose reports can, however, be accidental as such examples just do not appear in the random selection used in my analysis.[20] However, the lack of intended discourse and mimetic expressions framed by *mondok*/*mondom* can be explained through the lexical status of the SQMs. According to the results of my previous study (Teptiuk 2019, Ch. 3), fictional discourse in Hungarian is typically framed by QIs containing speech or epistemic verbs in the past conditional. As the current forms represent the

---

[19] See Haakana 2006 for similarities in Finnish complaint stories.
[20] It is worth mentioning that another Hungarian quotative marker *mondván* 'saying' has developed the function of a reason-clause linker. The reader interested is referred to the study by Dömötör (2015). See Teptiuk 2019 : 193—198 on the quotative functions of *mondván* in contemporary Hungarian.

indicative present tense forms, by default they are likely to be used with factual reports. Similarly, the fact that the markers consist of a speech verb shows that it can present either expressed or inner utterances but not mimetic expressions that are rather depicted than said. Given that, *mondok/mondom* is not used as a broader mimetic marker (see Güldemann 2008 : 275—295), in contrast to some quotatives. As for the use with SQs of thought, such a function most likely derives from the quotative expression *mondok/mondom magamban* 'I say (it) inside myself' reduced to single *mondok/mondom*.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that the use of lexical SQMs in framing expressions of stance and instant verbatim self-quotations is more frequent with the standard *mondom* than with its vernacular counterpart *mondok*. Such a tendency is most likely based on the general frequency of use of the markers, which is much higher for *mondom* (11 182 matches in the Personal subcorpus of the Hungarian National Corpus) than for *mondok* (2128 matches[21]).

Address

Denys Teptiuk
University of Tartu
E-mail: denys.teptiuk@gmail.com

Abbreviations

ADJ — adjective; **ABL** — ablative case; **CN** — connegative; **COM** — comitative case; **COMP** — complementizer; **COMPAR** — comparative; **COND** — conditional; **CV** — converb; **DAT** — dative case; **DEF** — definite; **DELA** — delative case; **DEM** — demonstrative; **ELA** — elative case; **EGR** — egressive case; **FUT** — future tense; **GEN** — genitive case; **ILL** — illative case; **INDEF** — indefinite; **INE** — inessive case; **INF** — infinitive; **INSTR** — instrumental case; **IMP** — imperative; **NEC** — necessitative; **NEG** — negative; **NOM** — nominative case; **NUM** — numeral; **PL** — plural; **PN** — proper noun; **PRF** — perfective; **PRS** — present tense; **PST** — past tense; **PTCL** — particle; **PTCP** — participle; **QI** — quotative index; **Q** — question particle; **QUOT** — quotative particle; **QUOT:SELF** — self-quotative particle; **RD** — reported discourse; **REPET** — repetitive; **SG** — singular; **SQ** — self-quotation; **SQM** — self-quotative marker; **SUP** — superlative; **TOP** — topic.

R E F E R E N C E S

B a r t e n s, R. 2000, Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys, Helsinki (MSFOu 238).
B o e d e r, W. 2002, Speech and Thought Representation in the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) Languages. — Reported Discourse. A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Typological Studies in Language 52), 3—49.
C h a p p e l l, H. 2008, Variation in the Grammaticalization of Complementizers from *verba dicendi* in Sinitic Languages. — Linguistic Typology 12, 45—98.

---

[21] This figure contains possible repetitions of the examples in both cases.

C l a r k, H., G e r r i g, R. 1990, Quotations as Demonstrations. — Language 66, 764—805.

C o u p e r - K u h l e n, E. 1998, Coherent Voicing. On Prosody in Conversational Reported Speech. — Interaction and Linguistic Structures, Konstanz (InLiSt No. 1), 1—26.

D ö m ö t ö r A. 2015, A *mondván* és az *úgymond*: diskurzusjelölő elemek keletkezése idéző szerkezetekből. — MNy, 21—37.

E d y g a r o v a, S. 2014, The Varieties of the Modern Udmurt Language. — FUF 62, 376—398.

E v a n s, N., B a r t h, D. 2017, SCOPIC Design and Overview. — The Social Cognition Parallax Interview Corpus (SCOPIC): A Cross-linguistic Resource, Honolulu (Language Documentation & Conservation Special Publication No. 12), 1—21.

G o l a t o, A. 2002, Self-quotation in German. Reporting on Past Decisions. — Reported Discourse. A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Typological Studies in Language 52), 49—70.

G ü l d e m a n n, T. 2008, Quotative Indexes in African Languages. A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey, Berlin (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34).

—— 2012, Thetic Speaker-instantiating Quotative Indexes as a Cross-linguistic Type. — Quotatives. Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives, Amsterdam (Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research 15), 117—142.

G ü n t h n e r, S. 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, 685—708.

H a a k a n a, M. 2006, Reported Thought in Complaint Stories. — Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 24), Cambridge, 150—178.

K l e w i t z, G., C o u p e r - K u h l e n, E. 1999, Quote — Unquote? The Role of Prosody in the Contextualization of Reported Speech Sequences. — Pragmatics 9, 459—485.

L i o n n e t, F. 2019, Evidentiality and Modality in Laal Reported Discourse. Paper presented at the Reported Discourse across Languages and Cultures Workshop. CNRS-LLACAN, Paris, May 22—23, 2019.

M a l i b e r t, I., V a n h o v e, M. 2015, Quotative Constructions and Prosody in Some Afroasiatic Languages: Towards a Typology. — Corpus-based Studies of Lesser-described Languages. The CorpAfroAs Corpus of Spoken Afroasiatic, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Studies in Corpus Linguistics 68), 117—169.

M a t i ć, D., P a k e n d o r f, B. 2013, Non-canonical SAY in Siberia. Areal and Genealogical Patterns. — Studies in Language 37, 356—412.

M c G r e g o r, W. B. 1994, The Grammar of Reported Speech and Thought in Gooniyandi. — Australian Journal of Linguistics 14, 63—92.

—— 2014, The 'say, do' Verb in Nyulnyul, Warrwa, and other Nyulnyulan Languages Is Monosemic. — Events, Arguments, and Aspects. Topics in the Semantics of Verbs, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Studies in Language Companion Series 152), 301—329.

M i c h a e l, L. 2012, Nanti Self-quotation. Implications for the Pragmatics of Reported Speech and Evidentiality. — Pragmatics and Society 3, 321—357.

O s h i m a, D. Y., S a n o, S. 2012, On the Characteristics of Japanese Reported Discourse. A Study with Special Reference to Elliptic Quotation. — Quotatives. Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives, Amsterdam (Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research 15), 145—173.

P i s c h l ö g e r, C. 2014, Udmurtness in Web 2.0. Urban Udmurts Resisting Language Shift. — Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen 38, 143—162.

—— 2016, Udmurt on Social Network Sites: A Comparison with the Welsh Case. — Linguistic Genocide or Superdiversity?, Bristol—Buffalo—Toronto (Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights 14), 108—132.

R o m a i n e, S., L a n g e, D. 1991, The Use of *like* as a Marker of Reported Speech and Thought: A Case of Grammaticalization in Progress. — American Speech 66, 227—279.

S p r o n c k, S. 2016, Evidential Fictive Interaction (in Ungarinyin and Russian). — The Conversation Frame. Forms and Functions of Fictive Interaction, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Human Cognitive Processing 55), 255—277.

—— 2017, Defenestration: Deconstructing the Frame-in Relation in Ungarinyin. — Journal of Pragmatics 114, 104—133.

S p r o n c k, S., N i k i t i n a, T. 2019, Reported Speech Forms a Dedicated Syntactic Domain. — Linguistic Typology 23, 119—159.

T e p t i u k, D. 2019, Quotative Indexes in Finno-Ugric (Udmurt, Komi, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian), Tartu.

—— 2021, Quotative Indexes in Permic. Between the Original Strategies and Russian. — Language Contact in the Territory of the Former Soviet Union, Amsterdam (Impact. Studies in Language, Culture and Society 50), 217—259.

U o t i l a, T. E. 1985, Syrjänische Texte I. Komi-Permjakisch, Helsinki (MSFOu 186).

—— 1989, Syrjänische Texte III. Komi-Syrjänisch: Luza-Letka-, Ober-Sysola, Mittel-Sysola, Prisyktyvkar-, Unter-Vyčegda- und Udora-Dialekte, Helsinki (MSFOu 202).

V o l l, R. 2019a, Mundabli Quotative Markers. New Insights into Self-quotation. Paper presented at the Reported Discourse across Languages and Cultures Workshop. CNRS-LLACAN, Paris, May 22—23, 2019.

—— 2019b, Self-quotation and Logophoricity (in West-Africa) — Geared to the Same End. Paper presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Leipzig, August 21—24, 2019.

Е д ы г а р о в а С. 2013, Об основных разновидностях современного удмуртского языка. — Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований. Вып. 3, Ижевск, 7—18.

З а л и з н я к А. А. 2008, Древнерусские энклитики, Москва (Языки славянских культур).

К е л ь м а к о в В. 1981, Образцы удмуртской речи. Северное наречие и срединные говоры, Ижевск.

—— 1990, Образцы удмуртской речи II. Срединные говоры, Ижевск.

ДЕНИС ТЕПТЮК (Тарту)

САМОЦИТАТИВНЫЕ МАРКЕРЫ В ПЕРМСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ И В ВЕНГЕРСКОМ

В статье анализируется использование в интернет-дискурсе пермских грамматикализованных самоцитативных частиц (коми *мися*, удм. *пӧй*) и венгерских лексических самоцитативных маркеров *mondom* 'я говорю (это)' и *mondok* 'я говорю' с различными проявлениями чужой речи. Сопоставление лексических и грамматических маркеров показывает, что морфосинтаксический статус и структурное использование самоцитативов влияет на их возможность представлять различные типы чужой речи, однако, создавая некоторые ограничения в их использовании: некоторые самоцитативы могут использоваться только с определенными типами чужой речи.

DENÕS TEPTJUK (Tartu)

PERMI KEELTE JA UNGARI KEELE ENESELE VIITAVAD MARKERID

Artiklis vaadeldakse internetimeedia põhjal permi keelte grammatikaliseerunud enesele viitavate partiklite (komi *мися*, udmurdi *пӧй*) ning ungari leksikaalsete enesele viitavate markerite *mondom* 'ütlen (seda)' ja *mondok* 'ütlen' kasutamist vahendatud kõne puhul. Vastandades leksikaalseid ja grammatikaliseerunud markereid, näitab autor, et nende abil on võimalik edasi anda erinevat tüüpi vahendatud kõnet, aga esineb ka piiranguid: mõnel juhul saab neid tarvitada ainult teatavat tüüpi vahendatud kõne puhul.