

Abstract

Research on reported speech (RS) and quotations has largely concentrated on these phenomena as a (re)presentation of spoken material produced by a source of consciousness different from the current speaker/reporter. As a result, types of reports such as *self-quotation* (Reported Speaker = Reporter) and *reported thought* (RT), i.e. presentation of mental material, often remain backgrounded.

Teptiuk (f.c.) has shown that self-quotations and RT share a semantic basis and reflect idiosyncratic characteristics when compared to RS attributed to other speakers. The reporter’s own thoughts are available to them by default, leading to a considerable amount of RT in self-quotations (ibid.). In contrast, reporting others’ thoughts becomes possible only when their authors previously verbalized these thoughts (see e.g. Schlenker 2004: 290–1; Teptiuk, forthcoming).

Making such observations becomes possible only when different manifestations of discourse reporting are investigated and compared. This is necessary not only for descriptive aims of linguistic work, but also for a better understanding of the phenomenon of discourse reporting and idiosyncrasies observed in its various types. Drawing on differences between types of reports also allows extending the results beyond linguistics. For instance, several studies have shown that some cultures disfavor or even prohibit attributing thoughts to other speakers or their reports even if they somehow became available to Reporter (see e.g. Besnier 1992; Michael 2015).

I propose a classification system that by default involves different types of reports and could be suitably applied to a corpus-based study. I suggest classifying reported discourse with two parameters: *type of content* and *source of report*. According to the type of content, I distinguish RS from RT; according to the source of report: self-quotations (Reported Speaker = Reporter) from quotations (Reported Speaker \neq Reporter) and quotations with unspecified sources (Reported Speaker = ?) (Table 1).

Table 1. Types of reported discourse

	Self-quot.	Quot.	Report with unsp. s.
Speech:	‘I said’	‘you/(s)he/they _{sp.} said’	‘they _{unsp.} said’
Thought:	‘I thought’	‘you/(s)he/they _{sp.} thought’	‘they _{unsp.} thought’

Applying these parameters allows a more inclusive approach to data collection. Furthermore, this method serves as a good basis for creating a cross-linguistic database of reported discourse constructions. The glosses in Table 1 serve to query different types of reported discourse and can be substituted with various morphosyntactic structures used for quote introduction: from clauses with the verbs ‘say’ and ‘think’ to new quotative construction of *be like*-type and non-clausal (self-)quotative particles.

In this talk, I demonstrate the design of a database created on the basis of the six Finno-Ugric languages: Hungarian, Finnish, Estonian, Erzya, Komi and Udmurt. I focus on the advantages of such a database and the challenges faced during its creation. I show how this database can be used to investigate different issues of discourse reporting (e.g. person alignment, perspectivization and temporal ordering in reported discourse; functional extensions of reported discourse and reported discourse constructions). Furthermore, since my database involves various quotative constructions, it allows scrutinizing the differences between them (within one language) and checking if homomorphic strategies are similarly distributed among reported discourse types.

Keywords: reported speech, reported thought, reported evidentiality, Finno-Ugric, database.

References

- Besnier, Niko. 1993. Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae Atoll. In: Hill, Jane H. & Judith T. Irvine (Eds.), *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*, 161–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2004. Context of thought and context of utterance: A note on free indirect discourse and the historical present. *Mind & Language* 19 (3). 279–304.
- Michael, Lev. 2015. The cultural bases of linguistic form: The development of Nanti quotative evidential. In: De Busser, Rik & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *Language Structure and Environment: Social, cultural, and natural factors*, 99–133. Benjamins: Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Teptiuk, Denys, forthcoming. Self-quotations of speech and thought, and how to distinguish them. In: Casartelli, Daniela, Silvio Cruschina, Pekka Posio & Stef Spronck (eds.), *Grammar of thinking*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.