

## Chapter 11

# Manner deictics in quotative indexes of Finno-Ugric

Denys Teptiuk

University of Tartu

This chapter discusses the quotative use of manner deictics in computer-mediated communications of five languages representing three Finno-Ugric branches: Finnic, Permic and Hungarian. The aim of the study is to (i) define the functional properties of manner deictics in quotative indexes (QIs) of the languages in focus, (ii) demonstrate in what types of QIs they appear, and (iii) determine possible functional similarities in the distribution of the markers between the languages. It is shown that manner deictics can be employed as cataphoric (Finnish *näin*, *niin*, *sillee(n)*; Estonian *nii*; Hungarian *úgy*; Udmurt *tažy*) and anaphoric (Udmurt *ožy*) markers, or can function as both (Komi *tadž(i)*, *sidž*; Hungarian *így*). Furthermore, some manner deictics (Finnish *sillee(n)*, Hungarian *így*) introduce mimetic expressions that can be interpreted as quasi-quotations. In the conclusion, cross-linguistic parallels in the use of manner deictics in quotative constructions are pointed out.

## 1 Introduction

Recent cross-linguistic studies have shown that comparative/simulative *like*, demonstrative deictic *so* and quantifying elements *just* and *all*, as well as motion (*go*) and action (*do*) verbs, can grammaticalise into quotative markers (see Buchstaller & van Alphen 2012: xii–xiv; Güldemann 2008: §5.1.2–§5.1.5). Quotative markers with demonstrative semantics are found in many typologically diverse languages. Manner deictics are either used in quotative constructions together with reportative verbs, i.e. speech or epistemic verbs, or they are used alone to point out the presence of a quote (Güldemann 2008: 321, 350). Their use is explained by the function of quotations as a type of demonstration embedded in language use, i.e. “a mimetic reenactment of a non-immediate state of affairs”



(Güldemann 2008: 320). By producing an utterance from a different temporal or spatial situation, the reporter demonstrates the situation to an audience (Clark & Gerrig 1990: 802; see Clark 2016 on speech acts as demonstrations). The endophoric use of demonstratives in quotative constructions is usually associated with a cataphoric reference, which “relate[s] to stretches of following discourse” (König & Umbach 2018: 297; see also Güldemann 2008). Although cataphoric reference seems to be the most commonly attested extended use of manner deictics in the world’s languages, this statement might be too general. Consider, for example, (1) from Hungarian, in which the manner deictic *így* ‘so’ is used anaphorically, pointing at the just-produced quote.

- (1) Hungarian (MNSz)<sup>1</sup>  
 ||“Nagy pénz, kis foci.”||<sub>RD</sub> – vagy mégsem így mondtá  
 big money small football or still.also.NEG SO say.PST.3SG.DEF  
**volna** Puskás?  
 be.COND.3SG PN  
 ‘||“Big money, small football.”||<sub>RD</sub> – as Puskás would have said (lit. or  
**wouldn’t have Puskás said so?)**’<sup>2</sup>

Hence, there is a reason to look more closely at the direction of endophoric reference of manner deictics in quotative constructions. For this purpose, I conducted a contrastive study on the quotative use of manner deictics in computer-mediated communications of five distantly related Finno-Ugric languages. The choice of languages is not accidental. They belong to three different branches of the language family, i.e. Finnic (represented by Finnish and Estonian), Permic (Komi and Udmurt), and Hungarian, and to three different geographical areas: Northern Europe (Finnish and Estonian), Central Europe (Hungarian) and Russia (Komi and Udmurt). Despite their relatedness and typological closeness, the languages did not have contact with each other for centuries, with the exception of Finnish and Estonian, and they possess individual features that developed independently or through contact with languages in their respective areas. Hence, I suspect these languages represent different typological patterns in the use of manner deictics in quotative constructions which can be determined and further applied cross-linguistically. By taking a closer look at the distribution of

<sup>1</sup>See §3 for details on the type of data used in the study. The abbreviated sources in parentheses in the first line of every example are references to the list of electronic resources given in the appendix.

<sup>2</sup>In the examples, quotative indexes are marked in bold, and reported discourse is enclosed in double vertical bars.

manner deictics in the five Finno-Ugric languages, I aim to determine their functional properties in quotative constructions, e.g. do manner deictics introduce only particular types of reported speech and thought or can they function as general mimetic markers? Do structural features have an impact on their functions? Is there any correspondence between their use inside and outside of quotative constructions? Although descriptive grammars (e.g. Ereht & Metslang 2017 on Estonian; Hakulinen et al. 2004 on Finnish) and previous studies provide basic descriptions of manner deictics in individual languages and even touch upon their quotative use (e.g. Keevallik 2005 on Estonian; Kiefer 2016 on Hungarian), these and other questions in relation to their quotative use still remain unexplored.

The chapter is organised as follows. In §2, I provide the terminological framework for this study. In §3, my methodology and database are described. §4 presents the results of the study of Finnish and Estonian (§4.1), Komi and Udmurt (§4.2), and Hungarian (§4.3). Finally, §5 summarises the main findings and highlights cross-linguistic similarities in the quotative use of manner deictics based on the determined typological patterns.

## 2 Terminological framework

In my investigation on manner deictics in five Finno-Ugric languages, I adapt Güldemann's framework of reported discourse (henceforth RD), which is 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).

Güldemann prefers “discourse” as “the representation of spoken or mental text” over the more traditional “speech”, since RD “is not restricted 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).

According to Güldemann (2008: 10), RD together with the elements introducing it form a complex whole labelled as an “RD-construction”. RD-constructions canonically consist of two major constituents: RD and “quotative index” (henceforth QI). In (2), the clause *I said to him* is a QI followed by the RD “*Your party won't be pleased ...*”.

(2) English (Daily Mail)

**I said to him** ||“Your party won’t be pleased ...”||<sub>RD</sub>

Güldemann (2008: 11) defines a QI 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”, QIs can represent structures of different complexities, consisting of “just a gram (...), an independent function word, a phrase, a full sentential syntagm (...), or even a clause with more than one predicate” (Güldemann 2008: 11).<sup>3</sup> Example (2) contains only one of various possible QI forms, namely a speech verb (*said*) describing the event behind the RD (the quotation of speech), and NPs encoding participants, i.e. the original speaker (*I*) and an addressee (*to him*). However, although these constituents are probable and relatively frequent they are not indispensable elements of the QI. Even speech verbs are not universal components of QIs per se. Consider (3), for instance, where instead of a speech or epistemic verb (henceforth labelled reportative verb), the reporter uses the motion verb *go* and the combination of the equational verb *be* with the similative marker *like* for the presentation of RD.

(3) English (Twitter)

... and **he goes** ||I am the police bitch||<sub>RD</sub> and starts touching the register  
**I’m like** ||oh this mf’er didn’t just do that.||<sub>RD</sub>

Manner deictics as non-reportative elements are expected to co-occur primarily with reportative elements in QIs, as in (1). However, their co-occurrence with other (grammaticalised) elements is also investigated here. Furthermore, it is also of interest to see whether they undergo changes in the quotative domain and grammaticalise into genuine quotative markers that are not bound to reportative elements. Therefore, I pay attention to the use of manner deictics in different constructions and point out additional meanings and functions that can be observed in their use in less or more complex QIs.

---

<sup>3</sup>In some situations, QIs can remain verbally unexpressed. Instead, suprasegmental features of intonation, dynamics and pitch can be used as the sole means to contrast a quote with its surrounding contexts. Since I use non-standard written texts as a corpus for this study (see §3) and focus on the use of manner deictics in quotative constructions, I exclude verbally unexpressed QIs from the current investigation.

### 3 Methodology and data

In this study, data originating from social network sites (SNS) is used as a database. My choice of SNS data is motivated by the following factors. First, the focus is on QIs that are mainly used in non-standard varieties of the studied languages, which typically exceed the limited amount of QIs used in standardised texts. Second, previous studies show that “[t]he informal characteristics of SNS enables the usage of generally oral forms such as slang and dialects in a written context” (Pischlöger 2014: 144). As for the minority languages Komi and Udmurt, “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). Thus, Komi and Udmurt speakers use language online that not only includes variants that are commonly mixed with the dominant Russian language, but also a mixture of dialects and styles that are peculiar to colloquial speech (see Pischlöger 2016; Edygarova 2013, 2014). Thus, despite the presence of emoticons, different orthographic symbols and nonstandard shortenings, the language on SNS can be considered a written approximation of spoken language, combining the features of colloquial speech and standard writing in one text (Helasvuo et al. 2014).

For data collection, I studied the occurrence of quotations in different new media sources. Since Komi and Udmurt are endangered languages with a smaller amount of online material compared to Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian, I also investigated available text collections for the Permic languages, i.e. Uotila (1985; 1989) for Komi and Kel'makov (1981; 1990) for Udmurt. The collections provide transcribed oral narratives by Komi and Udmurt speakers from various dialectal groups. This material supplemented the data from new media sources if the latter did not provide sufficient evidence. For Udmurt, the material predominantly originates from the group *Jumshan57*<sup>4</sup> on the Russian SNS *vk.com*. I studied approximately 100 of the 249 pages (ca. 200 blog posts) of the material available. In addition, I used the blog page *KYLZY Jopte*<sup>5</sup> (containing 35 pages and 696 blog posts at the time of investigation) as well as other groups and pages. The choice of groups was motivated by four factors: (i) the number of entries, (ii) the number of group members, (iii) the use of Udmurt (exclusive or parallel to Russian), and (iv) the dominance of unedited texts. Thus, I preferred unofficial pages consisting of live conversations in comment sections and unedited blog entries to official pages of media resources, non- and governmental organisations, etc. As a result,

<sup>4</sup><https://vk.com/knyazpozdey> (last accessed August 1, 2019).

<sup>5</sup>[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept) (last accessed August 1, 2019).

I could also trace the systematic appearance of vernacular variants mixed with Russian in live discussions in comment sections, which would have been impossible with standardised texts. Where additional material was required, data from the Blog subcorpus of the Udmurt corpus (henceforth Blog subcorpus)<sup>6</sup> was used to further investigate the use of manner deictics in QIs.<sup>7</sup> The Blog subcorpus contains approximately 160 examples of the proximal manner deictic *tažy* and approximately 1400 examples of the distal manner deictic *ožy* (see §4.2 on the use of Udmurt manner deictics). Where the number of examples was fairly low (as in the case of *tažy*), I checked every instance separately. In the case of a higher number of examples, I checked the collocation of this marker with the reportative verbs *šuny* ‘say’ and *malpany* ‘think’ in different finite forms, e.g. ‘(I) say/said thus’, ‘(she/he) thinks/thought so’, etc. With the combination of the new media sources and the online corpora I collected approximately 40 examples of manner deictics in quotative constructions and 20 examples of their use outside the quotative domain.

Taking the amount and quality of Udmurt data as a reference point, I studied a similar number and type of pages on *vk.com* and *blogspot.com* for Komi. However, at the end of the investigation, my corpus contained only three examples of the manner deictic *tadž(i)* in quotative constructions. Therefore, I used the corpus of the Komi language (henceforth Komi corpus)<sup>8</sup> as a supplementary source to make generalisations about the use of manner deictics in QIs. The corpus contains oral and written texts of various genres (fiction, journalistic texts, educational and scientific literature, official correspondence, etc.), excluding new media texts.

For Finnish, I used the Corpus of Internet Communications,<sup>9</sup> consisting of data from the forums *Suomi24* and *Ylilauta*,<sup>10</sup> as my main material. I browsed the corpus for collocations of the manner deictics *näin*, *niin*, *noin*, *tälläin* (~ *tälläi*), *t(u)olloin* (~ *tollai*) and *sillee(n)* (~ *sillai*) with the reportative verbs *sanoa* ‘say’ and *ajatella* ‘think’, and the equational verb *olla* ‘be’. Based on my previous investigations (Teptiuk 2019), these verbs were expected to be the most probable

---

<sup>6</sup><http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus> (last accessed August 1, 2019). The Blog subcorpus consists of ca. 6% of the whole corpus (7.3 million tokens).

<sup>7</sup>At the time of data collection, the Volga-Kama Udmurt corpora containing the new media subcorpus (<http://volgakama.web-corpora.net>, last accessed August 1, 2019) were not available.

<sup>8</sup>The corpus of the Komi language (Russian: *Korpus komi jazyka*) is available at: <http://komicorpora.ru> (last accessed July 1, 2019). An exact number of tokens in the corpus is not specified.

<sup>9</sup>Finnish: *Internet-keskusteluaineistoja*.

<sup>10</sup><https://korp.csc.fi> (last accessed July 1, 2019). The corpus consists of ca. 6.9 billion tokens.

components of Finnish QIs. I checked the first 100 examples of every query for the quotative use of these collocations when the number of queries was too high.

In addition, I used the Google search engine, which allowed me to test these collocations on web pages outside the digital corpus when the number of collocations was low. I checked the first ten pages of the Google search results, with each page containing ten links. Since the search results are less accurate the further one proceeds, I considered this amount to be enough to investigate the use of manner deictics in QIs (ca. 100 search results for one tested variant of a construction). In order to make the search more effective, I placed the studied material into quotation marks and checked the different collocations of reportative verbs and manner deictics in their different grammatical forms. Pages that did not fall under the category of computer-mediated communications (CMC), e.g. edited newspaper articles or science fiction texts (see Crystal 2001), were not taken into account as primary sources of examples. I used data outside CMC only when primarily suitable sources did not yield any relevant results. In all, I collected approximately 50 examples of Finnish manner deictics in quotative constructions.

For Estonian and Hungarian, I used both suitable corpus data (Estonian: New media subcorpus of the Estonian Reference Corpus,<sup>11</sup> henceforth NMS; Hungarian: Personal subcorpus of the Hungarian National Corpus,<sup>12</sup> henceforth MNSz) and the independently collected material obtained through Google searches. I checked for the collocations of manner deictics with reportative verbs within the corpora and Google searches. For Estonian, collocations with the equational verb *olema* 'be' were also considered (see Teptiuk 2019 for more details on Estonian QIs). Altogether, I collected approximately 20 examples for Estonian and approximately 30 examples for Hungarian.

All examples are provided here with translations and glosses. Minor spelling mistakes are corrected, but punctuation errors are not. Since Komi and Udmurt use different symbols to mark identical sounds, I present these in the transcriptions to avoid confusion while transliterating the Permic examples. Russian code-switches are presented in transliteration and enclosed in curly brackets { } in the glosses.

---

<sup>11</sup><http://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/> (last accessed July 1, 2019); the subcorpus contains ca. 21 million words.

<sup>12</sup><http://corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz> (last accessed July 1, 2019); the subcorpus contains 18.6 million words of discussion on internet forums, mainly deriving from the Hungarian internet portal, *index.hu*, and several forums from *Subcarpathia* (RO, UA).

## 4 Manner deictics as quotatives in Finno-Ugric languages

### 4.1 Manner deictics in quotative indexes in Finnish and Estonian

Finnish has a tripartite system of manner deictics: (i) speaker-proximal *näin*, (ii) hearer-proximal *noin*, and (iii) distal *niin* (König 2017: 147; also see Hakulinen et al. 2004: §668). The manner deictics historically derive from the instructive case forms of the plural demonstratives *nämä*, *nuo* and *ne*. Besides their basic functions as manner deictics, they are used as intensifiers (Hakulinen et al. 2004: §792), or, in the case of *niin*, as a correlative pronoun (Hakulinen et al. 2004: §1160, §1172).

In addition, one can find another set of manner deictics used in colloquial Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2004: §721) with the same distinction in the deictic domain: *tällee(n)*, *t(u)ollee(n)* and *sillee(n)*. These forms historically derive from the singular demonstratives *tämä*, *tuo* and *se* in the allative case (*-lle*) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> singular possessive suffix (*-Vn*). *Tällee(n)* and *t(u)ollee(n)* are rarely mentioned in previous descriptions and probably are used less often in contemporary Finnish. *Sillee(n)* has the same basic demonstrative functions as *niin* (Hakulinen et al. 2004: §1160). Additionally, it is used as a discourse particle in self-repairs and during speech planning (Hakulinen et al. 2004: §861). Table 1 summarises manner deictics in Finnish.

Table 1: Manner deictics in Finnish

Deictic differentiation	Standard	Colloquial
Speaker-proximal	<i>näin</i>	<i>tällee(n)</i> ~ <i>tällai</i>
Hearer-proximal	<i>noin</i>	<i>t(u)ollee(n)</i> ~ <i>tollai</i>
Distal	<i>niin</i>	<i>sillee(n)</i> ~ <i>sillai</i>

In quotative constructions, only *näin*, *niin* and *sillee(n)* appear systematically. Hearer-proximal *noin* is not observed in the quotative domain in 100 randomly selected examples testing its collocation with the reportative verbs *sanoa* ‘say’ and *ajatella* ‘think’ or the equational verb *olla* ‘be’ (see §3). As for the manner deictics *tällee(n)* or *t(u)ollee(n)*, their quotative use is marginal, accounting for only a couple of occurrences in the Finnish new media corpus. Therefore, I exclude them from further discussion and concentrate on *näin*, *niin* and *sillee(n)*.

In standard Estonian, in turn, only *ni*, the cognate of Finnish distal *niin*, is used regularly in quotative constructions. Outside the quotative domain, the manner



deictic *nii* also serves as an intensifier, a causal conjunction and a correlative word (Keevallik 2005: 109). The deictic distinctions of manner and other demonstratives are neutralised at the level of the literary standard. Other manner deictics, e.g. the synonymous adverbs *nõnda*, *sedamoodi*, *selliselt*, meaning ‘this way, so’, appear infrequently as synonyms to *nii* in quotative constructions. The contrastive manner deictic *naa* ‘that (other) way’ does not appear in QIs at all. Therefore, only *nii* is included in the discussion.

Finnish and Estonian manner deictics are used with cataphoric reference. They are part of the proposed QI, which includes reportative verbs. The manner deictic points at a following stretch of RD, as in (4) and (5). In constructions with reportative verbs, manner deictics are not necessary parts of the QI, and even if one omits them from the QI-clause, the RD is still understood as such. Hence, the main quotative function is carried out by reportative verbs, while the manner deictic is secondary.

## (4) Finnish

## a. (Internet-keskusteluaineistoja)

... **sanoi**      **näin** ||“tykkään    susta    paljon, mutta en  
say.PST.3SG so<sup>13</sup>    like.PRS.1SG 2SG.ELA a.lot    but    NEG.1SG  
sillai.”||<sub>RD</sub>  
thus

‘... he said (lit. **said so**) ||“I like you a lot, but not that way.”||<sub>RD</sub>’

## b. (Internet-keskusteluaineistoja)

Hän **ajatteli**      **niin, että** ||aika on      neljäs  
3SG think.PST.3SG thus COMP time be.PRS.3SG four.ORD  
ulottuvuus ...||<sub>RD</sub>  
dimension

‘He thought (lit. **thought thus**) that ||time is the fourth dimension ...||<sub>RD</sub>’

## c. (Demi)

... **sain**      **sille et**    ||sä tykkäät    must    ...||<sub>RD</sub>  
say.PST.1SG thus COMP 2SG like.PRS.2SG 1SG.ELA

‘... I said (lit. **said thus that**) ||you like me ...||<sub>RD</sub>’

<sup>13</sup>For the sake of convenience, here and in the glosses of other examples, I translate the proximal manner deictics as ‘so’ and the distal as ‘thus’, even though this does not reflect the actual usage of these terms in English.

(5) Estonian (Eestimaa Loomakaitse Liit)

Kaija ise **ütles** **nii**: ||“Sellist hirmu pole enam ammu  
 PN self say.PST.3SG so such.PTV fear.PTV NEG more long.ago  
 ühegi kassi silmis näinud ...”||<sub>RD</sub>  
 one.GEN.PTCL cat.GEN eye.PL.INE see.PP

‘Kaija herself said (lit. **said so**): ||“I haven’t seen such fear in the eyes of a single cat for a long time ...”||<sub>RD</sub>’

Besides reportative verbs, Finnish *sillee(n)* and Estonian *nii* are also used with the equational verbs *olla* ‘be’ (6) and *olema* ‘be’ (7), respectively. Finnish *näin* appears in such constructions in only a few instances, and *niin* not at all. Since the use of equational verbs in QIs is a typical strategy in colloquial speech, the more colloquial *sillee(n)* is preferred over other manner deictics in such a construction. The same seems to be the case in Estonian. Whereas one can find examples in which *nõnda* co-occurs with a reportative verb, combinations with *olema* ‘be’ are unattested.

(6) Finnish

a. (lansiuusimaa.fi)

... se **oli** **sillee et** ||ou nou||<sub>RD</sub>, ja minä **olin** **sillee**  
 DEM be.PST.3SG thus COMP oh no and 1SG be.PST.1SG thus  
**tyyliin**, ||onks pakko||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 style.ILL/like be.PRS.3SG.QP obligatory

‘... (s)he was like (lit. **was thus that**) ||oh, no||<sub>RD</sub>, and I was like (lit. **was thus like**) ||is it obligatory||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

b. (ask.fm)

Aa **olin** **sillee et** ||WATAFAK||<sub>RD</sub>.  
 INTERJ be.PST.1SG thus COMP what.a.fuck

‘Aa, I was like (lit. **was thus that**) ||WATAFAK||<sub>RD</sub>.’

(7) Estonian

a. (NMS)

... isa **oli** kõrval **nii et** **nagu** ||mis sa siis ikka  
 father be.PST.3SG nearby so COMP like what 2SG then still  
 kihutad||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 rush.PRS.2SG

‘... father **was** next to me like (lit. **so that like**) ||why are you still rushing||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

b. (Müürileht)

... ma **olin**        **nii, et**    ||“oh    my god, päriselt!”||<sub>RD</sub>  
           1SG be.PST.1SG so    COMP    INTERJ my god seriously  
 ‘... I was like (lit. **was so that**) ||“oh my god, seriously!”||<sub>RD</sub>’

The substitution of a reportative verb with a ‘be’-verb frequently leads to the loss of difference between quotations of speech and thought. The equational verb does not specify the type of event behind the RD and only establishes a predicative structure in the QI. I label this process as “event-neutralisation”, i.e. a process which permits different interpretations of the presented quote. In (6a) from Finnish, the type of reported event behind the RD can be deduced from the sequence of two quotes belonging to two different speakers. It is unlikely that the reporter first quotes another speaker’s thoughts and then his/her own thoughts. Instead, (s)he is most likely to represent a dialogue between him-/herself and another speaker. In (7a) from Estonian, the reporter represents the words his father addressed to him, i.e. a quotation of speech. In contrast, (6b) and (7b) illustrate self-quotations that are not explicitly assigned to a concrete addressee. Here the supporting context does not help to distinguish between a quotation of speech or thought.

An even higher degree of event-neutralisation can be observed in Estonian, which allows for the ellipsis of the NP encoding the original speaker, as in (8). Thus, instead of an actual utterance produced by some speaker in a different setting, the reporter presents a quote that (s)he considers emblematic for the described circumstances. The omission of the NP expressing the author of the RD makes this reading the most obvious one.

(8) Estonian (NMS)

Tegelt    pärnus **on**            **nii et**    ||vabandust aga ma unustasin  
 basically PN.INE be.PRS.3SG so    COMP    sorry        but 1SG forget.PST.1SG  
 oma pileti    koju||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 own ticket.PTV home.ILL  
 ‘Basically, in Pärnu it’s (lit. **it’s so that**) ||sorry, but I forgot my ticket at  
 home||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

Even though homomorphic constructions do not appear in Finnish, hypothetical quotes can also be introduced by *sillee(n)*. In (9), *sillee(n)* co-occurs with the noun *viesti* ‘message’, encoding the source of the RD. Despite the structural differences between (8) and (9), in both cases the reporters enact fictional discourse through a demonstration for dramatic purposes.

(9) Finnish (Kaksplus)

... laittaa kavereille viestin sillee et ||by the way mulle  
 put.PRS.3SG friend.PL.ALL message.GEN thus COMP by the way 1SG.ALL  
 synty viime yönä tyttö / poika mitoilla se ja  
 be.born.PST.3SG last night.ESS girl boy measure.PL.ADE DEM and  
 se||<sub>RD</sub> jne.  
 DEM etc.

‘... sends **the message** to friends saying (lit. **thus that**) ||by the way last night I gave birth to a girl/boy who measures this and that,||<sub>RD</sub> etc.’

In addition to representations of factual and fictional quotes depicting verbal or mental processes, *sillee(n)* introduces a mimetic expression (10). Besides the representation of enacted human verbal behavior, QIs can also introduce non-linguistic sound imitations, representational gestures or ideophones (Güldemann 2008: 275–295); see §4.3 for a similar instance in Hungarian. The mimetic expression in (10) can be interpreted as a quasi-quotation, where instead of using verbal means, the reporter expresses his/her surprise with the emoticon *0.o* depicting eyes wide open and two question marks.

(10) Finnish (Demi)

Mä olin silleen et ||0.o??||<sub>RD</sub>  
 1SG be.PST.1SG thus COMP MIM.MIR  
 ‘I was (lit. **was thus that**) ||0.o??||<sub>RD</sub>’

Notably, similar functions can be observed online for manner deictics in other languages. See, for example, the German manner deictic *so* in (11), which is used with the same emoticon expressing the reporter’s surprise.

(11) German (XHardware)

Ich so ... ||0.o||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 1SG so MIM.MIR  
 ‘I was (lit. I **so**) ... ||0.o||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

To sum up, although the Finnish manner deictics can appear in constructions where their Estonian counterpart *nii* is not observed, and vice versa, all function as cataphoric markers. The Finnish manner deictic *niin* is particularly interesting in this regard since it was previously reported to be anaphoric (König 2017: 160). My data shows, however, that *niin* is exclusively attested as a cataphoric quotative marker, and in this it does not differ from the other Finnish manner deictics used in homomorphic constructions.

Although the majority of the examples given here clearly point to a preference for the use of QIs with manner deictics in direct RD, they can also introduce indirect RD. In the non-standard written data considered here, direct RD is usually preferred over indirect. Speakers online often attempt to demonstrate their own or someone else's previously produced or fictional speech and thought rather than to simply describe them. However, as shown for Hungarian in §4.3, the preference for direct or indirect RD can be a crucial factor in the choice of manner deictics in quotative constructions. Table 2 summarises the use of manner deictics in quotative constructions in Finnish and Estonian.

Table 2: Manner deictics in QIs in Finnish and Estonian

	Reference	Introduction of MIM expression	Event neutralisation
<b>Finnish</b>			
<i>näin</i>	cataphoric	no	+ equational verb (marginal)
<i>niin</i>	cataphoric	no	no
<i>sillee(n)</i>	cataphoric	yes	+ equational verb
<b>Estonian</b>			
<i>nii</i>	cataphoric	no	+ equational verb

#### 4.2 Manner deictics in quotative indexes in Permic

Komi and Udmurt have a basic bipartite system of manner deictics: proximal vs. distal. In Udmurt, proximal *tažy* and distal *ožy* do not only indicate a spatial contrast in exophoric function but also have a specific anaphoric function. According to Svetlana Edygarova (p.c.), proximal *tažy* in Udmurt discourse is associated with new information and occupies a pre-focused position. In contrast, distal *ožy* mainly refers to already known or previously mentioned information. In addition, it appears in several idiomatic constructions, e.g. the anaphoric expression *vot ožy* 'so it is, so it goes', or as a confirmative particle meaning 'yes'. Hence, a similar functional division in the quotative domain is expected.

As for Komi, proximal *tadž(i)*<sup>14</sup> and distal *sidž* are formally distinguished and based on the same stems as other demonstratives, e.g. *tajö* 'this', *sijö* 'that, (s)he'. However, they preserve little functional difference in contemporary language, if

<sup>14</sup>According to the Komi-Russian dictionary (Beznosikova et al. 2000), the form *tadž* is a shortened variant of *tadži*.

any at all, aside from their distribution in several lexicalised expressions, e.g. *sidž boštny* ‘to take for free (lit. thus)’, *kydž tadž* ‘why did it happen this way (lit. how so)’.<sup>15</sup> Previously, there seemed to be a dialectal difference in the distribution of manner deictics among Komi dialects. In Uotila’s text collections depicting language use from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, proximal *tadž(i)* does not appear at all in dialects of the Komi-Permyak literary standard (Uotila 1985); all recorded speakers only use the distal counterpart *sidž*. In dialects of the Komi-Zyrian literary standard (Uotila 1989), one can similarly observe a preference for distal *sidž*. It is used predominantly anaphorically, referring to the manner or events previously described in discourse. Proximal *tadž(i)* is used only once cataphorically; in all other instances, although they are not numerous, it appears in the anaphoric function, similarly to distal *sidž*. Besides these basic manner deictics, Komi also has focused markers that are formed with the prefixed particle *e-* attached to the basic stem of manner deictics: *etadž*, *esidž*. Fedjunëva (2009) argues that focused manner deictics appeared in the language as a relatively recent innovation under the influence of Russian, e.g. *tot* ‘that one’ vs. *è-tot* ‘this one’, *tak* ‘so’ vs. *è-tak* ‘thus (in contrast to so)’. This claim is supported by the lack of corresponding markers in Udmurt and by similarities in the use of demonstratives with the *e*-element in Russian and Komi (Fedjunëva 2009: 95–96).

In quotative constructions of both Udmurt and Komi, manner deictics are used as additional elements in combination with reportative verbs. The focused deictics of Komi are not used in QIs.

In Udmurt quotative constructions, the above-mentioned distinction between the proximal and distal form can also be observed. Most commonly, proximal *tažy* is used cataphorically (12a) in QIs preceding RD, while *ožy* appears as an anaphoric marker following the quote (12b).

(12) Udmurt

a. (vk.com/udmurt\_ept)

**Veraške tažy** čömyš: ||“Ešli ty ne na Internete ...”||<sub>RD</sub>  
say.PRS.3SG so often {if} {2SG} {NEG} {on} {internet.PREP}

‘He often says (lit. **says so**): ||“If you are not on the internet ...”||<sub>RD</sub>’<sup>16</sup>

b. (Blog subcorpus)

||“Mon pićiges!”||<sub>RD</sub> – aćiz śaryś ožy vera.  
1SG small.COMPAR self.3SG about thus say.PRS.3SG

||“I am smaller!”||<sub>RD</sub> – she says (lit. **thus she says**) about herself.’

<sup>15</sup>An identical idiomatic expression is found in Russian, *kak tak*, which is probably the source of the Komi expression.

<sup>16</sup>The quote depicts Russian speech produced by a non-native speaker.

However, one can also find instances where the manner deictics are used in the opposite way; consider the anaphoric use of proximal *tažy* in (13).

- (13) Udmurt (vk.com/udmurt\_ept)  
 ||“Anaj, nu eščë čut’-čut’ ...”||<sub>RD</sub> – **tažy šuysal** dyr mon ...  
 mom {PTCL} {more} {a.bit} so say.COND.1SG maybe 1SG  
 ‘||“Mom, give me a bit of time [and I will get up, put a kettle on the stove, please]”||<sub>RD</sub> – that’s what I would probably say (lit. **so I would say** maybe) [if I was at home].’

Example (13) reflects a less systematic use of manner deictics. An investigation of the speech of the blogger on *vk.com/udmurt\_ept* also shows that he deviates from the established use of markers outside the quotative domain. In his speech (and that of few other speakers), proximal *tažy* (rather than distal *ožy*) appears in anaphoric reference (14). Furthermore, proximal *tažy* is used instead of distal *ožy* in the anaphoric expression *vot ožy* ‘so it goes’, which is actually a fixed idiomatic expression in contemporary Udmurt.

- (14) Udmurt (vk.com/udmurt\_ept)  
 mon ebašil školae 11 ar i **tažy** mon  
 1SG {fucking.go.PST.M} school.ILL 11 year {and} so 1SG  
 otmečaju soje bydtemme!!!!  
 {celebrate.PRS.1SG} DEM.ACC end.PTCP.ACC1SG  
 ‘[We were sitting and drinking tea with classmates. Walked around a bit. We were watching movies all night. (...)] I was fucking going to the school for 11 years and **so** I celebrate it, my graduation!!!!’

Similarly, the distal *ožy* is attested as a cataphoric marker pointing at the following quote (15).

- (15) Udmurt (Blog subcorpus)  
 a. Vyny tužo maly ke **ožy šuiz:** ||“Oh, mar  
 younger.brother.1SG also why INDEF thus say.PST.3SG INTERJ what  
 ke so tuž kurdyt ...”||<sub>RD</sub>  
 INDEF DEM very scary  
 ‘My younger brother also for some reason said (lit. **said thus**): ||“Wow, she’s somewhat very scary ...”||<sub>RD</sub>’

- b. Vitalij Agabajev šaryś ožy šuysal: ‖so odigez geńiaľnoj  
 PN PN about thus say.COND.1SG 3SG one.3SG genius.ADJ  
 artist val.‖<sub>RD</sub>  
 artist be.PST.3SG

‘I could say this (lit. say thus) about Vitaliy Agabaev: ‖he was one of the genius artists.‖<sub>RD</sub>’

Two different explanations can be proposed for the appearance of *ožy* in preposed QIs instead of in the postposed position, which can be considered more common. One scenario suggests that *ožy* is still anaphoric and refers to information previously mentioned in the context and later repeated as a quote. In (15a), this claim may be supported by the presence of the adverb *tužo* ‘also’. Thus, one could assume that the reporter quotes her brother, anaphorically referring to an identical utterance that has been previously produced by another speaker in a different context, i.e. ‘my brother made an utterance identical/similar to someone else’s’; see (16) for the collocation of *ožy* and the focus particle *ik* in a similar context. With respect to (15b), one could assume that the reporter refers to an already familiar opinion about the famous artist. However, in both cases the context does not explicitly support this explanation. Alternatively, (15) may simply present a less systematic use of *ožy*. Thus, similar to proximal *tažy* (13), some idioms may reflect asymmetry with its more conventionalised use as an anaphoric marker.

Separately, one can also observe the collocation of *ožy* with the particle *ik* in preposed QIs (16). The particle *ik* functions as a focus particle or as a marker signalling the repetition of an element of a situation; cf. the label *marker povtora elementa situacii* in Zubova (2016: 445) and the translation ‘the same’ in Arkhangel'skiy (2014). According to Zubova (2016: 445–446), in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt, the particle *ik* is frequently in collocation with anaphoric elements. In QIs, the collocation of *ožy* and *ik* is used to present RDs already mentioned in a different form in discourse. Thus, in (16) the reporter confirms that somebody was indeed chased away.

- (16) Udmurt (vk.com/knyazpozdey)  
 Ožy ik šuizy: ‖“Myn tatyś!”‖<sub>RD</sub>  
 thus PTCL say.PST.3PL go.IMP.2SG here.ELA  
 ‘They also said (lit. said thus): ‖“Go away from here!”‖<sub>RD</sub>’

In sum, in contemporary Udmurt, the manner deictics are used in quotative constructions as follows: proximal *tažy* is primarily a cataphoric marker, refer-



ring to following quotes; distal *ožy* is mainly used anaphorically following quotes. The appearance of the distal manner deictic *ožy* as a part of a preposed QI is quite common when *ožy* collocates with the additive particle *ik*. Thus, *ožy ik* serves as a reference to a previously described event repeated as a quote.

Some less frequent uses of the manner deictics that do not fall under the above rules may reflect the decreasing linguistic intuition of Udmurt speakers under the influence of Russian, which uses the proximal manner deictic *tak* both for anaphoric and cataphoric reference (17). The distal (*sjak*) and contrastive manner deictic (*ětak*) do not appear systematically in Russian QIs.

(17) Russian

a. (Woman.ru)

Èto on **tak** skazal, čto ||žit' vmeste budete||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 DEM he so say.PST.M COMP live.INF together be.FUT.2PL

'This is him who said (lit. **said so that**) ||you will live together||<sub>RD</sub> ...'

b. (Vremja Novostej Online)

||"Neobxodimo doždat'sja kopii protokola ..."||<sub>RD</sub> **tak**  
 necessary wait.INF copy.GEN record.GEN so

**otvetil** na vopros ... Geral'd [sic!] Jaroš.  
 answer.PST.M on question PN PN

'||"It's necessary to wait for the copy of the record [and then conduct corresponding steps]"||<sub>RD</sub> – **so answered** Gerald [sic!] Jarosch to a question ...'

In Komi quotative constructions with manner deictics, it is observed that only the proximal marker *tadž(i)* 'so' appears with reportative verbs, (18a) and (18c), and inchoative verbs (18b) in forming QIs. In the data, such combinations are not frequent and account for only three instances. However, this figure should not be taken as definitive and may only show less frequent quotative use of manner deictics in Komi new media texts. It is noteworthy that the proximal marker only appears in Komi QIs in internet communications, whereas distal *sidž* 'thus' can be used in quotative constructions outside the new media genre (19).

(18) Komi

a. (Alëna Tuvsova)

... **mövpyšti** **tadž:** ||"Metög na udžalyšjas šuröny ..."||<sub>RD</sub>  
 think.PST.1SG so 1SG.ABE PTCL worker.PL get.found.PRS.3PL

'[Like most of the people,] I thought (lit. **thought so**): ||"The workers will be found without me ..."||<sub>RD</sub>'

b. (vk.com/biarmian)

A **zavoditcö** **tadži**: ||“Sövetsköj obščestvennost’ ...”||<sub>RD</sub>  
 and begin.PRS.3SG so Soviet {community}

‘And it begins (lit. **begins so**): ||“The Soviet community ...”||<sub>RD</sub>’

c. (Tuś)

||“Nevažno v kakom krutom vuze  
 {unimportant.ADV} {in} {which.PREP} {cool.PREP} {university.PREP}

ty učiš’sja, važno sumet’ sebja  
 {2SG} {study.PRS.2SG} {important.ADV} {manage.INF} {self.ACC}

realizovat’||<sub>RD</sub> 11-öd klassyn velödčigön **tadži menym**  
 {fulfill.INF} 11-ORD class.INE study.CV.INSTR so 1SG.DAT

**vištalis** gimnazijasa radejtana velödyšjasyś öfi Alla  
 tell.PST.3SG gymnasium.ADJ favorite teacher.PL.ELA one PN

Aleksandrovna Taskajeva.

PN PN

||“It isn’t important what kind of cool university you are studying at, it is important to manage to fulfil yourself,”||<sub>RD</sub> so I was told (lit. **so told me**) when I studied in the 11<sup>th</sup> class of one of the gymnasium’s favourite teachers, [the one (called)] Alla Aleksandrovna Taskajeva.’

Since *tadž(i)* is only rarely employed in my data, I turned to the available text collections (Uotila 1985; 1989) and the digital corpus that assembles texts not belonging to the new media genre (see §3) to see whether they show different results. As mentioned at the beginning of this subsection, in Komi-Permyak dialects (Uotila 1985), only distal *sidž* is used. It also appears in quotative constructions referring cataphorically to the following quote (19). In Komi-Zyrian texts (Uotila 1989), both markers are used but neither appears in quotative constructions.

(19) Komi-Permyak (Uotila 1985: 40; glossing and translation mine)

a sar’ **vištalis** **sidž**: ||“on-kö adžzy ćuńkyčlö, me  
 and tzar tell.PST.3SG thus NEG.2SG-PTCL.COND see.CN ring.DAT 1SG

tenö vija.”||<sub>RD</sub>

2SG.ACC kill.PRS.1SG

‘And the tzar said (lit. **said thus**): ||“If you don’t find the ring, I will kill you.”||<sub>RD</sub>’

Available texts from the digital corpus show that both manner deictics are used in QIs. However, distal *sidž* is more frequent than proximal *tadž(i)*. As for the

referential function, both markers can be used either anaphorically or cataphorically, as in (20). Distal *sidž* is more common in cataphoric functions (20a); it is only attested twice in anaphoric functions (20b). In contrast, proximal *tadž(i)* is predominantly used anaphorically (20c); only some instances reflect a cataphoric use (20d).

(20) Komi (Komi corpus)

- a. ... i **sidž** šuoňy: ||byťfökö seni sijö götyr pydđi olö.||<sub>RD</sub>  
 and thus say.PRS.3PL as.if there 3SG wife instead live.PRS.3SG  
 ‘... they say (lit. say thus): ||as if she lives there instead of the wife.||<sub>RD</sub>’
- b. ||A menym kolö koršny arlyda nin  
 but 1SG.DAT must.PRS.3SG find.INF in.years.ADJ already  
 mortös||<sub>RD</sub> – **sidž dumajtis** Nikolaj ...  
 person.ACC1SG thus think.PST.3SG PN  
 ‘||But I have to find a person who is already elderly,||<sub>RD</sub> – thought (lit. thus thought) Nikolaj ...’
- c. ||“Bur olömsö oškyšta, (...)”||<sub>RD</sub> – **tadži šuö** poet.  
 good life.ACC.3SG praise.PRS.1SG so say.PRS.3SG poet  
 ‘||“Good life I praise, [bad life I wipe away],”||<sub>RD</sub> – so said the poet.’
- d. Tajö sijö **tadži šuö**: ||“Nyvka, a komandovajtö!”||<sub>RD</sub>  
 DEM.PROX 3SG so say.PRS.3SG girl but give.orders.PRS.3SG  
 ‘He said (lit. said it so): ||“A girl, but she gives orders!”||<sub>RD</sub>’

Despite the lack of a representative number of examples in my corpus, other materials show that manner deictics can refer indiscriminately to preceding and following RDs in contemporary Komi QIs. This use of manner deictics resembles the use of *tak* in Russian and could be motivated by Russian influence. Different Komi speakers may associate different autochthonous markers with Russian *tak* (17) and use them according to the Russian model. Such pattern replications are frequently observed in contemporary Komi as a way to preserve Komi language use through the choice of autochthonous markers in constructions modelled on Russian, or of language features that could be common to both languages (see Leinonen 2006; 2009). Thus, Komi-Permyak speakers may turn to the distal marker as the closest equivalent to Russian *tak*, while in Komi-Zyrian one can observe the use of distal *sidž* more frequently; note, however, that proximal *tadž(i)* also appears as the only option in several idiolects, as reflected in my data (18).

The use of Udmurt and Komi manner deictics is summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Manner deictics in QIs in Udmurt and Komi

	Primary endophoric meaning	Reference	Position of QIs
<b>Udmurt</b>			
<i>tažy</i>	new information	primarily cataphoric	pre- and post-posed
<i>ožy</i>	known information	primarily anaphoric	pre- and post-posed
<b>Komi</b>			
<i>tadž(i)</i>	no specialisation	cata- and anaphoric	pre- and post-posed
<i>sidž</i>	no specialisation	cata- and anaphoric	pre- and post-posed

### 4.3 Manner deictics in quotative indexes in Hungarian

Hungarian has a bipartite system of manner deictics, contrasting proximal *így* (1) and distal *úgy*. These markers have adopted distinct functions in the quotative domain. Proximal *így* is used as a general mimetic marker introducing a demonstration into discourse (Beáta Gyuris, p.c.) (21a). In turn, distal *úgy* functions as a marker pointing at the manner of action. Hence, instead of demonstrations, the marker is usually followed by a comparison with another action (Beáta Gyuris, p.c.), as in (21b).<sup>17</sup>

(21) Hungarian

- a. (Beáta Gyuris, p.c.)  
**Így csinálom:** {demonstration}.  
 so do.PRS.1SG.DEF  
 ‘I do it like this: {demonstration}.’
- b. (gyakorikerdesek.hu)  
 Én is **úgy** csinálom **mint te**.  
 1SG also thus do.PRS.1SG.DEF like 2SG  
 ‘I also do it like you.’

Similarly to Udmurt, the functions of the manner deictics outside the quotative domain affect their use in quotative constructions. This effect is reflected in

<sup>17</sup>I am not aware of studies addressing this functional division of manner deictics in contemporary Hungarian.

two aspects: (i) the types of RD, and (ii) the position of the QI within the RD-construction.

As a mimetic marker, *így* is used only with direct RD that “reports and demonstrates what has been uttered” (Dömötör 2001: 338). In mimetic expressions, demonstrations are carried out by movements and gestures. In quotative constructions, RD is a demonstration of somebody’s words (22a) or mental activities (22b) (see Clark & Gerrig 1990 on quotations as demonstrations). Note that, in Hungarian, even direct RD can be preceded by the complementiser *hogy* (22c). Thus, unlike in many SAE languages, the presence of the complementiser (22b) is not a sufficient criterion for distinguishing between indirect and direct RD.

(22) Hungarian

a. (MNSz)

a rapper rövid beszédében **így mutatta** **be** magát:  
 DEF rapper short talk.3SG.INE so show.PRS.3SG.DEF into self.ACC  
 ‖“cigány vagyok, zsidó vagyok ...”‖<sub>RD</sub>  
 Gypsy be.PRS.1SG Jew be.PRS.1SG

‘The rapper **introduced** himself in his short speech by saying (lit. **so**):  
 ‖“I am Gypsy, I am Jew ...”‖<sub>RD</sub>’

b. (MNSz)

Én is **így gondoltam** **hogy** ‖nem túl jó választás nekem  
 1SG also so think.PST.1SG COMP NEG very good choice DAT.1SG  
 a 29er ...‖<sub>RD</sub>  
 DEF 29er

‘I also thought (lit. **thought it so that**) ‖the 29er is not a very good  
 choice for me ...‖<sub>RD</sub>’

c. (Google books)

... azt **mondta**, **hogy** ‖szeretlek, drága  
 DEM.ACC say.PST.3SG.DEF COMP love.PRS.1SG.DEF.2SG expensive  
 csillagom.‖<sub>RD</sub>  
 star.1SG

‘... (he) said (lit. **said that**) ‖I love you, my dear star.‖<sub>RD</sub>’

As in Finnish (10), some of the Hungarian mimetic expressions introduced by a QI with *így* can be interpreted as quasi-quotations. In (23), the reporter puts a person’s moves and gestures into words.

(23) Hungarian (MNSz)

... a kezével **így mutatta**, **hogy** ||ha nem, akkor ez a  
 DEF hand.3sg.COM so show.PST.3SG.DEF COMP if NEG then DEM DEF  
 táska bumm.||<sub>RD</sub>  
 bag IDEO  
 ‘... with his hand he showed (lit. **showed so**) **that** ||if not, then this bag will  
 go *boom*.||<sub>RD</sub>’

Functionally, distal *úgy* introduces the content of a proposition expressed as a quote, rather than a mimetic quote. Thus, QIs with *úgy* do not show any restriction to one type of RD and can be used with either direct (24a) or indirect (24b) quotations.

(24) Hungarian

a. (MNSz)

... **úgy mondta**: ||látom nagyon istenfélők  
 thus say.PST.3SG.DEF see.PRS.1SG.DEF very God.fearing.PL  
 vagytok||<sub>RD</sub> ...  
 be.PRS.2PL  
 ‘... said (lit. **said it thus**): ||I see you are very God-fearing||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

b. (nepmese.hu)

**Úgy mondta**, **hogy** ||kell neki a száz  
 thus say.PRS.3SG.DEF COMP need.PRS.3SG DAT.3SG DEF 100  
 forint ...||<sub>RD</sub>  
 forint  
 ‘[He] **thus said that** ||he needs the one hundred forints||<sub>RD</sub> ...’

In principle, indirect quotations as in (24b) do not contradict the statement that *úgy* introduces only the content of a quote, differing from the original utterance at least in deictic orientation, i.e. ‘he needs the one hundred forints’ vs. ‘I need the one hundred forints’. In addition, one can expect that the choice of original words might have differed from those reported, e.g. ‘Give me, please, one hundred forints’ or ‘Could you lend me the one hundred forints’. As Dömötör (2001: 338) points out, “[w]hile direct speech [equivalent to direct RD] reports and demonstrates what has been uttered, indirect speech [equivalent to indirect RD] renounces this demonstration (...) [indicating] that the author has understood the utterance and based on this, he reformulates its content”. Yet, this

statement is problematic with direct quotations such as (24a), which resemble a demonstration of a person's utterance rather than a mere depiction of its content. A closer look at the syntactic distribution of the manner deictics reveals that the proximal *így* is not restricted to one position within the RD-construction: it can appear preceding (22)–(23) or following (25a) the RD, or it can split the RD into parts (25b). In contrast, QIs with the distal *úgy* are restricted to the pre-RD position.

(25) Hungarian (MNSz)

- a. ||De egy tehénnel tette||<sub>RD</sub> – **így** a **riporter**.  
 but INDEF COW.COM do.PRS.3SG.DEF so DEF reporter  
 ‘||But he did it with a cow||<sub>RD</sub> – **so** [said] **the reporter**.’
- b. ||Á nem,||<sub>RD</sub> (**így ő**), ||hisz mi immár kétezer  
 INTERJ NEG so 3SG believe.PRS.3SG 1PL now two.thousand  
 éve imádkozunk Jeruzsálemért.||<sub>RD</sub>  
 year.3SG pray.PRS.1PL Jerusalem.CAUS  
 ‘||Ah no,||<sub>RD</sub> (**so he** [said]), ||we have already prayed for Jerusalem for  
 two thousand years.||<sub>RD</sub>’

As shown in (25), QIs with the proximal *így* do not always contain a speech or epistemic verb. Event-neutralised QIs (§4.1) consist merely of an NP referring to the original speaker and the manner deictic, as in (25a) and (25b). In contrast, QIs with the distal *úgy* must contain reportative verbs, otherwise the whole construction is considered ungrammatical. Hence, in the case of proximal *így*, the RD-construction can be considered a subtype of mimetic construction, i.e. ‘X is/was like this: {demonstration}’, while in the case of distal *úgy*, the RD-construction is a reproduction of somebody's words or thoughts: ‘X says/thinks something like that: {quote}’.

Previous studies have already pointed out the additional meanings expressed by the manner deictics in Hungarian quotative constructions. Kiefer (2016: 83) indicates that “if the exact wording of the reported utterance is at stake, the reported utterance is repeated but the reporting clause contains the [proximal] adverbial particle *így* ‘so, thus’”. Körtvély (2016: 607), in turn, mentions that “[n]ative speakers of Hungarian estimate both versions [of constructions with and without the distal *úgy*] as quasi equivalent in their meaning; however, some of them consider the contents of the *úgy*-type as less certain”.

To complement Kiefer's statement, my investigation shows that QIs with *így* can also introduce hypothetical quotes, as in (26), where the reporter presents a

quote purportedly said by the world-famous Hungarian football player, Ferenc Puskás.

(26) Hungarian (MNSz)

‖“Nagy pénz, kis foci.”‖<sub>RD</sub> – vagy mégsem így mondta  
 big money small football or still.also.NEG SO say.PST.3SG.DEF  
**volna** Puskás?  
 be.COND.3SG PN

‘‖“Big money, small football.”‖<sub>RD</sub> – as Puskás would have said (lit. or wouldn’t have Puskás said so)?’

Note that Puskás’s actual utterance *Kis pénz – kis foci, nagy pénz – nagy foci* ‘Small money – small football, big money – big football’,<sup>18</sup> differs from the one presented in (26). Thus, instead of presenting the original utterance, the reporter modifies it according to his/her aims. Since *így* can introduce hypothetical quotes, I suggest revising Kiefer’s claim: instead of associating the use of the proximal manner deictic *így* with the exactness of the presented quote, I propose associating it with the directness of the quote. Of course, direct quotes introduced by the proximal manner deictic may be represented by verbatim quotations. However, this condition is not necessarily true for the whole category of direct RD.

As for Körtvély’s claim, it is to be expected that indirect quotes introduced by QIs with *úgy* can be perceived as approximately reproduced and signal the reporter’s lack of commitment to the content of quote. First, *úgy* introduces the content of quote only, which leads to the difference between the original utterance and its reproduction. Second, several features of RD might be blurred due to syntactic adjustment, while presenting indirect RD. Although both conditions are found in the use of *úgy*, the reporter’s lack of commitment is hardly foregrounded in all RD-constructions where the distal manner deictic is used. As a result, I step back from the analysis proposed above and propose considering both meanings assigned for the manner deictics secondary, rather than universally applicable to their use in the quotative domain.

The main features drawing differences between proximal *így* and distal *úgy* are summarised in Table 4.

---

<sup>18</sup>This utterance is frequently attributed to Puskás, although there is no actual proof that he has ever said it.



Table 4: Features of manner deictics in Hungarian QIs

	Proximal <i>így</i>	Distal <i>úgy</i>
Primary meaning	demonstration of RD	representation of content of RD
RD type	direct	direct, indirect
Reference	cata- and anaphoric	cataphoric
Position of QIs	pre-, intra- and postposed	preposed
Event-neutralisation	ellipsis of the verb	does not occur

## 5 Summary and discussion

This chapter has shown that manner deictics follow different patterns of distribution in QIs in related languages. According to their referential function, three main types of manner deictics are distinguished: (i) cataphoric, (ii) anaphoric, and (iii) both cataphoric and anaphoric deictics; cf. the summary in Table 5. In addition to their referential function, manner deictics show preferences for the direct or indirect types of RD and for the pre-, intra- or postposed position in the RD-construction.

Table 5: Referential functions of manner deictics in quotative constructions of selected Finno-Ugric languages

Referential functions	Manner deictics
Cataphoric	Finnish <i>näin, niin, sillee(n)</i> Estonian <i>nii</i> Hungarian <i>úgy</i> Udmurt <i>tažy</i>
Anaphoric	Udmurt <i>ožy</i>
Cata- and anaphoric	Komi <i>tadž(i), sidž</i> Hungarian <i>így</i>

Among the five Finno-Ugric languages, several patterns of distribution can be identified based on the above criteria. In languages with a proximal/distal pair of manner deictics, their meanings and functions outside the quotative domain

predetermine their use in QIs. Thus, the Hungarian proximal manner deictic *így* as a general mimetic marker introduces direct RD only. Distal *úgy*, which outside the quotative domain can only refer to the manner of action but not demonstrate it, is used as a marker pointing at the representation of the content of a person's words or thoughts. Therefore, it can introduce both direct and indirect RD.

In Udmurt, the distribution follows from the meanings of the manner deictics. Proximal *tažy* introduces new information and, in RD-constructions, typically appears in preposed QIs. Distal *ožy*, in turn, refers to already-known information and is used in postposed QIs.

In contrast, in Komi, the proximal and distal manner deictics are interchangeable outside the quotative domain. In the quotative domain, their use seems influenced by the genre in which they are used: distal *sidž* is used more frequently in conventional written texts, while in my new media material only proximal *tadž(i)* is attested in quotative constructions.

In Finnish, proximal and distal manner deictics are exclusively used with cataphoric reference in quotative constructions. This is all the more interesting as the distal manner deictic *niin* is also used as an anaphoric marker outside the quotative domain (König 2017: 160). The Estonian cognate *nii* has been shown to be used only as a cataphoric marker, which confirms Keevallik's (2005: 116–117) earlier findings. In colloquial speech, Finnish *sillee(n)* and Estonian *nii* co-occur with reportative verbs or with equational verbs in QIs. QIs with equational verbs can equally introduce quotations of speech and thought, while speech or epistemic verbs restrict the interpretation to one type of RD. Manner deictics can appear in contexts where the RD is not attributed to a concrete speaker and is therefore hypothetical. Usually, the QI introducing hypothetical quotes is structurally less complex.

In addition, two manner deictics, Finnish *sillee(n)* and Hungarian *így*, are also observed introducing mimetic expressions that can be interpreted as quasi-quotations. It is not surprising that the demonstratives are employed as quotatives with mimetic expressions. Güldemann (2008: 521) mentions that many quotative markers have been initially used in indexing mimesis and later on were grammaticalised into exclusively quotative markers or are still employed in their initial function parallel to their relatively new quotative use.

The observations made for Finno-Ugric languages have parallels in other languages of the world. For example, an exclusively cataphoric manner deictic is found in Usan (Papuan), where “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’” (Reesink 1993: 218). Among the markers that can be used

both cataphorically and anaphorically in QIs, I have already mentioned the Russian manner deictic *tak*. Similarities can be pointed out in the use of German *so* and French *ainsi*, both meaning ‘so’, that appear preceding and following the RD (König 2017: 160; Karssenbergh & Lahousse 2018; also see König this volume and Diessel & Breunese this volume). Similarly, in Usan QIs, the manner deictic *ende* ‘this/here’ + ‘given/a particular one’ + postposition *-t* ‘for/at/on/etc.’ + ‘this/here’ can be used both cata- and anaphorically (Reesink 1993: 218).

I am not aware of other languages in which the proximal form of a proximal/distal manner deictics pair is used for direct RD/new information, while the distal form is used for indirect RD/old information, as has been shown for Hungarian and Udmurt, respectively. However, one could expect to find similar patterns in quotative systems of languages not considered here, which is a direction for future research.

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Gerson Klumpp for his insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and Yvonne Treis for their comments and suggestions, which have greatly improved this chapter. The responsibility for all remaining shortcomings is entirely mine.

## Abbreviations

ABE	abessive case	DAT	dative case
ACC	accusative case	DEF	definite
ADE	adessive case	DEM	demonstrative
ADJ	adjective	ELA	elative case
ADV	adverb	ESS	essive case
ALL	allative case	FUT	future tense
CAUS	causative case	GEN	genitive case
CMC	computer-mediated communication	IDEO	ideophone
CN	connegative	ILL	illative case
COM	comitative case	IMP	imperative mood
COMP	complementiser	INDEF	indefinite
COMPAR	comparative	INE	inessive case
COND	conditional mood	INF	infinitive
CV	converb	INSTR	instrumental case
		INTERJ	interjection

M	masculine gender	PRS	present tense
MIM	mimetic	PST	past tense
MIR	mirative	PTCL	particle
NEG	negative	PTCP	participle
ORD	ordinal	PTV	partitive case
PROX	proximal	QI	quotative index
PL	plural	QP	question particle
PN	proper noun	RD	reported discourse
PP	past participle	SG	singular
PREP	prepositional case	SNS	social network sites

## Data sources

The data sources were last accessed in the period from 1 February to 1 August 2019.

### Electronic corpora

*Blog subcorpus* = *Blog subcorpus of Udmurt corpus*:

<http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/>

*Internet-keskusteluinestoja* [The databases of internet communications]:

<https://korp.csc.fi>

*Komi corpus* = *Korpus komi jazyka* [The corpus of the Komi language]:

<http://komicorpora.ru>

*MNSz* = *Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár. Személyes alkorpusz* [The Hungarian National Corpus. Personal Subcorpus]:

<http://corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz/>

*NMS* = *Eesti keele koondkorpus. Uus media* [Estonian Reference Corpus. New media subcorpus]:

<https://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/uusmeedia/>

### Internet sources

*Alëna Tuvsovja*:

[http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post\\_6.html](http://tuvsovja.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_6.html)

*ask.fm*

[https://ask.fm/Joonas\\_Tuloneen/answers/120680473973](https://ask.fm/Joonas_Tuloneen/answers/120680473973)

*Daily Mail*

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3030136/Abbott-deserved-credit-McGregor.html>

*Demi*

<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-aaah-mita-ma-teen;>  
<https://www.demi.fi/keskustelu/suhteet-miten-unohan-jatkan>

*Eestimaa Loomakaitse Liit*

<http://loomakaitse.eu/lapsed-kui-te-seda-kassipoega-ei-vota-siis-ma-tapan-ta-ara/>

*Google books*

<https://books.google.ee/books?id=xQbWDwAAQBAJ&lpg=PT415&dq=%22azt%20mondta%20hogy%20szeretlek%20dr%C3%A1ga%20csillagom%22&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>

*gyakorikerdesek.hu*

[https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/gyerekvallalas-neveles\\_\\_babak\\_\\_1253137-halozsak-](https://www.gyakorikerdesek.hu/gyerekvallalas-neveles__babak__1253137-halozsak-)

*Kaksplus*

<https://kaksplus.fi/threads/alkionsiirroista-plussanneet.2458857/page-11>

*lansiuusimaa.fi*

<https://www.tallinna24.ee/blogit/satunnainen-herrasmies>

*Müürileht*

<https://www.muurileht.ee/skoda-mazda-ja-ritmos-liquidus/>

*nepmese.hu*

<https://www.nepmese.hu/index.php/mesetar/mesek/adj-uram-isten-szaz-forintot>

*Tus*

<http://tusjuk.blogspot.com/2015/>

*Twitter*

<https://twitter.com/allthingsmollie/status/690042054936772608>

*vk.com/biarmian*

<https://vk.com/biarmian>

*vk.com/knyazpozdey*

<https://vk.com/knyazpozdey>

*vk.com/udmurt\_ept*

[https://vk.com/udmurt\\_ept](https://vk.com/udmurt_ept)

Vremja Novostej Online [Time of News Online]

<http://www.vremya.ru/2009/74/5/228155.html>

Woman.ru

<http://www.woman.ru/rerelations/men/thread/4996059/>

XHardware

<http://extreme.pcgameshardware.de/mainboards-und-arbeitsspeicher/257287-ram-speed.html>

## References

- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey. 2014. *Clitics in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt* (Basic Research Program Working Papers, WP BRP 10/LNG). Moscow: National Research University Higher School of Economics.
- Beznosikova, Ljutsija M., Evgenija A. Ajbabina & Rajsa I. Kosnyreva. 2000. *Komi-roč kyvčukör* [Komi-Russian dictionary]. Syktyvkar: Komi knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. Preface: Introductory remarks on new and old quotatives. In Isabelle Buchstaller & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, xii–xxx. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Clark, Herbert H. 2016. Depicting as a method of communication. *Psychological Review* 123(3). 324–347.
- Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66(4). 764–805.
- Crystal, David. 2001. *Language and the internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2013. Ob osnovnyx raznovidnostjax sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka [On fundamental varieties of the contemporary Udmurt language]. *Ežegodnik Finno-Ugorskix Issledovanij* 3. 7–18.
- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2014. The varieties of the modern Udmurt language. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62. 376–398.
- Erelt, Mati & Helle Metslang (eds.). 2017. *Eesti keele süntaks* [The syntax of Estonian]. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

- Fedjunëva, Galina V. 2009. O refleksax praural'skix dejktičeskix častic \*e 'etot, tot' i \*o 'tot' v permskix jazykax [On the reflexes of the Proto-Uralic deictic particles \*e 'this, that' and \*o 'that' in Permic languages]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2009(1). 91–97.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi* [The large grammar of Finnish]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa, Marjut Johansson & Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen. 2014. Johdatus digitaalisen vuorovaikutukseen [Introduction to digital interaction]. In *Kieli verkossa: Näkökulmia digitaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen* [Language online: Perspectives on digital interaction], 9–20. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Karssenbergh, Lena & 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.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2005. The deictic *nii* 'so, in this way' in interaction. In Daniele Monticelli, Renate Pajusalu & Anu Treikelder (eds.), *From utterance to uttering and vice versa: Multidisciplinary views on deixis*, 109–126. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Kel'makov, Valentin K. 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 K. 1990. *Obrazcy udmurtskoj reči II: Sredinnye govory* [Examples of Udmurt speech II: Central varieties]. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 2016. Indirect and direct reports in Hungarian. In Alessandro Capone, Ferenc Kiefer & Franco Lo Piparo (eds.), *Indirect reports and pragmatics: Interdisciplinary studies*, 77–93. Cham: Springer.
- König, Ekkehard. 2017. The deictic identification of similarity. In Yvonne Treis & Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similitive and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 143–164. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard & Carla Umbach. 2018. Demonstratives of manner, of quality and of degree: A neglected subclass. In Marco Coniglio, Andrew Murphy, Eva Schlachter & Tonjes Veenstra (eds.), *Atypical demonstratives: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics*, 285–328. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Körtvély, Erika. 2016. Modal functions of the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ in Hungarian. In Kasper Boye & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer semantics in European languages*, 587–618. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 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.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2014. Udmurtness in Web 2.0: Urban Udmurts resisting language shift. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 38. 143–162.
- Pischlöger, Christian. 2016. Udmurt on social network sites: A comparison with the Welsh case. In Reetta Toivanen & Janne Saarikivi (eds.), *Linguistic genocide or superdiversity? New and old language diversities*, 108–132. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Reesink, Gerard Pieter. 1993. Inner speech in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24. 217–225.
- Teptiuk, Denys. 2019. New quotatives in Finnish and Estonian. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 42. 207–242.
- Uotila, T. E. 1985. *Syrjänische Texte I: Komi-Permjakisch*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Uotila, T. E. 1989. *Syrjänische Texte III: Komi-Syrjänisch: Luza-Letka-, Ober-Sysola-, Mittel-Sysola, Prisyktyvkar-, Unter-Vyčegda- und Udora-Dialekte*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Zubova, Yulia N. 2016. Sintaksis i semantika fokusnyx častic v bessermjanskom dialekte udmurtskogoazyky (na primere častic *ik* i *uk*) [Syntax and semantics of focus particles in Besermyan Udmurt (case study of particles *ik* and *uk*)]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 12(1). 442–451.