

Tom Güldemann - Manfred von Roncador (edd.): *Reported Discourse*.
A meeting ground of different linguistic domains (= Typological Studies
in Language 52). Amsterdam - Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2002

CHAPTER 1

Speech and thought representation in the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) languages*

Winfried Boeder
University of Oldenburg

The South Caucasian language family, also called “Kartvelian” after its dominant member (*kartvel-* ‘Georgian’), comprises Svan, Georgian, Mingrelian and Laz. These languages are spoken in an area reaching from the Black Sea in the West to Turkic-speaking Azerbaijan and to Armenia in the Southeast. Both genetically and structurally, the Kartvelian languages are closely related to each other. Most speakers of Mingrelian and Svan can speak Georgian, the language of instruction in school, and use it as their literary language, while most Laz speakers live in Northeast Turkey and use Turkish as their official language.

The general characteristics of Kartvelian “speech-reporting” are more or less well described in the linguistic literature.¹ But there are a few details and problems that have been neglected or insufficiently understood so far, e.g. the variation between direct and indirect speech, complete and partial “indirectness”, and use and absence of conjunction with direct speech; and in particular the history of quotatives and some aspects of Svan speech reporting. In the following survey, I will begin with some basic facts of Old Georgian, the language of a vast corpus of texts beginning with the 5th century AD (1.). A cursory assessment of the modern variants of Georgian (and of Mingrelian and Laz) leads to an overall picture of the historical development in this form of Kartvelian (2.). The Svan language spoken in the mountainous parts of the Western Caucasus is generally considered to be a very archaic form of Kartvelian. It is formally rather remote from its related languages; its various forms of reported speech deserve particular attention, and I will discuss at least some of its details (3.). In the last section (4.), some conclusions are drawn.

One of the main characteristics of reported speech is reference shift: in direct speech, the reference of person, time, etc. is typically not orientated towards the speech situation of the reporting clause; and in this sense, it is not in the indirect speech that their reference “shifts”, but rather in the direct speech, in which an “I” is not necessarily the reporter-speaker, a present is not the speech time etc.² However, I will follow the practice of school grammar and describe “indirect speech” as the result of a “shift” of person, time, etc. which adapts them to their

reference in the matrix clause,³ without, however, implying that indirect speech should be derived from direct speech in any theoretical framework. In particular, I use the term “shift” because Svan “semi-indirect” speech is easier to understand if we start from direct speech and describe the indirect variant as derivative.

Before entering into the details of Georgian, a simplified outline of some features of Kartvelian is in order that may help the reader to understand the data. The verbal system of both Georgian and Svan consists of at least three groups of tenses and moods, and these groups are characterised by specific alignments of relational coding: the subject of transitive verbs is in the nominative with the present-stem group (present, imperfect, imperfective subjunctive I and the corresponding perfective forms: future, conditional and perfective subjunctive I), in the ergative with aorist-stem verb forms (aorist and optative = subjunctive II), and in the dative with perfect-stem verbs (perfect, pluperfect and subjunctive III). The direct object is in the dative with present-stem verbs and in the nominative with aorist and perfect stem verbs. The indirect object is in the dative with present and aorist stem verbs, and is a demoted prepositional phrase (“for” + NP) with perfect stem verbs. Verbs of having, wanting, fearing, etc. have a dative subject (as with perfect-stem verb forms) and a nominative object.

In one of its meanings, the Georgian perfect is the evidential (indirective) counterpart of the aorist (or present in some contexts), indicating “hearsay” and “inference” or “surprise” (Boeder 2000). Mingrelian and Svan have a more elaborated system: in addition to the evidential perfect, they have for example evidential counterparts of the imperfect (suffix *-(i)n/na* and circumfix *lam-___-wn(e)/ne* in the Upper Bal dialect of Svan).⁴ These evidential forms belong to the characteristics of Svan reported speech.

1. Old Georgian

1.1 Direct speech in Old Georgian

Old Georgian⁵ is a highly standardised literary language which must have been under strong stylistic pressure from contemporary Byzantine Greek. Yet, there is no reason to believe that the forms of direct speech in the following passage from the first long non-translated text, the “Life of Grigol of Khanzta” by Giorgi Merchule (10th century), deviate from the “ordinary Georgian” of the time:⁶

- (1) (a) *mašin ik'itxa netar-man Grigol*, (b) *vitarmed* “sada ars qirna-j Basili:”
 (c) *da aucqes zma-ta sen-i mis-i*, (d) *da man brzana çodba-j*: (e) *xolo ma-t hrkues* (f) “*ver zaluc misva-j*” (g) *mašin hrkua ma-t* (h) “*çem mier arkut*, (i) *vitarmed* “*giçess šen mama-j Grigol*” (GrX LXI 4–8)

- (a) then he.asked blessed-ERG Grigol, (b) CNJ “where he.is youth-NOM Basil”. (c) and they.informed(AOR) him brother-P-OBJ illness-NOM his-NOM. (d) and he.ERG he.commanded(AOR).it calling(VN)-NOM: (e) but he-P-OBJ they.told(AOR) him (f) “imposs force.he.has(PRS).it going-NOM.” (g) then he.told(AOR).them he-P-OBJ: (h) “me from tell(AOR,IMP) him, (i) CNJ “he.calls(PRS).you you father-NOM Grigol”:
 ‘(a) Then the blessed Grigol asked: (b) Where is the young man Basil?
 (c) And the brethren informed him about his illness (= told him that he was ill), (d) And he told them to call him. (e) But they told him: (f) He is unable to go. (g) Then he said to them: (h) Tell him from me, (i) Father Grigol asks you to come.’

As in many other languages of the region (e.g. Greek and Armenian⁷), direct speech can, but need not, be introduced by a conjunction, *vitarmed*, compare (1b) and (1i) with (1f). Direct speech abounds in this text, while indirect speech is extremely rare.

The following passage from the oldest Georgian prose text (5th cent.) shows that the early authors were well familiar with the naturalistic “liveliness” of direct speech:

- (2) *da unda rajta-mca hrkua, tu “młkice-d degl” da tual-i hkida*
ᄎPitiaxš-man, sxua-j ver-ya ra-j scalda siqna-d, esten oden hrkua:
 “*młki . . .*” *da dadumna xolo* (Šušanišis cameba IX 2–5)
 and he.wanted.it CNJ-OPRT he.said.to.her, CNJ “fast-ADV stand!” and eye-NOM he.fixed.it.on.him Pitiashkh-ERG, other-NOM IMPOSS-PTCL something-NOM he.had.the.time.for.it saying(VN)-ADV, so only he.said.to.her: “sta . . .” and he.became.silent only.
 ‘St. Shushanik was taken from her palace to prison, her husband came behind her, cursing: her deacon stood near her way] and wanted to say: “Stand fast!”, when the Pitiashkh cast his eye on him. So he could say nothing but “sta . . .”, and became just silent.’

1.2 The syntactic status of reported speech in Old Georgian

But what is the syntactic status of direct speech in Old Georgian? There is no doubt that “to say” is a morphologically transitive verb in Georgian. It is true that direct speech is not normally marked for case, although it can be, if it is conceptualised as a repeatable entity:⁸

- (3) *ciskr-ad “netar arian”-n-i da galoba-n-i çartkumian* (GrX XVII 42)
 dawn-ADV “Blessed they. are”-P-NOM and song-P-NOM
 they.said(AOR.habitual).them
 ‘At dawn, they used to recite the psalm “Blessed are” and songs.’

But direct object pronouns also refer to reported speech and behave like nominal direct objects (in the nominative):

- (4) zma-ta hrkues: "... esē raj tkues ... (GrX LXXII 51)
 brother-P-OBV they.said.to.him: "... this.NOM when they.said ...
 'The brethren said to him: "... When they said *this* ...'

In this, reference to direct speech is not different from pronouns referring to embedded complement clauses:

- (5) esē aymitkwit, romel čemda sikuđidmđē ara ganhmrvavđet adgil-sa ama-s
 šina (GrX VI 95)
 this.NOM promise(AOR-IMP).me, CNJ my-ADV death.until not
 that.you.multiply(SUBJ-II) place-DAT this-DAT in
 'This I ask you to promise me: that you do not let your community
 become larger in this place until I die.'

However, it is much less clear if for instance (1f) is a direct object constituent clause of the reporting clause (1e). Notice that direct speech is normally referred to by modal pronominals like *ēšēt* 'thus' (like ancient Greek *hōs*), *viatar-ca* 'as' or even *ēšēt saxe-d* 'thus shape-ADV' (= 'in the following manner' = 'as follows'):

- (6) tkua esēt "upal-o, [...]" (GrX XLVII 15)
 he.said.it thus "Lord-voc, [...]"
 'He spoke thus: O Lord [...].'
 (7) viatarca iđqwis mocikul-i "mouklebel-ad ilocvedit-o" (GrX I 14)
 as he.says(PRS).it apostle-NOM "incessant-ADV pray-DUOT"
 'As the apostle says: Pray without ceasing.'

where the pronoun is cataphoric and refers to the subsequent direct speech, or rather: to one of its aspects that has still to be determined (- is it its propositional content or rather its locutionary aspect, "how s/he put it"?). Notice that although "to say" is "intransitive" or "semi-transitive" in many languages (Munro 1982), the use of "so" cannot be taken as a criterion of intransitivity (Roček 1994:336) in the case of Georgian: a Georgian verb form is either transitive or intransitive, and I think that (6) can only be interpreted as "he said *something* (specific) thus" — whatever the meaning of "thus" is.

The use of "thus" must be old. It is in accordance with the origin of the conjunction *viatar-med* in (1b) and (1i), which is an enlarged form of *viatar* 'how?'. As so many wh-words in the Indo-European languages, *viarmed* became a conjunction by its coalescence with the subsequent "answer"-sentence it asks for (Boeder 1993/94: 36): besides (a) "X said (it) thus (*ēšēt*): "Y", we may posit (b) "X said (it) how (*viatar-med*) ? "Y". As a result of reanalysis we get: (c) "X said *viatar-med* "Y", where *viatar-med* marks the dependence of the direct speech

sentence. It is less clear, however, if *viarmed* is a constituent of the direct speech sentence or rather of the preceding reporting clause (see below 2.2 and 3.2).

After *viatar-med* had become a conjunction, *esēt* 'thus', which had been in complementary distribution with *viatar* 'how?' at stage (a)-(b), may co-occur with the latter:

- (8) da ukvetu vimne gkixtvides: "rajsa-twis ayhagmit?" esēt (E este, C eset)
 arkut, viarmed: "upal-sa uqms ege" (Luke 19,31)
 and if somebody he.may.ask.you: "what-for you.loosed.it?" thus
 say.to.him: CNJ "Lord-DAT him.needs.it this.NOM"
 'And if any man ask you, Why do ye loose him? *thus* shall ye say unto
 him, (*that*) The Lord hath need of him.'

Finally, the *viarmed*-sentence could be reanalysed as a clausal constituent of the preceding sentence, i.e. embedded:⁹

- (9) (a) viatar cna, (b) viarmed ma-s dye-sa saerto-d igi sačmel-i ara qopil ars,
 (c) mašin romel-i igi mimeyo, (d) špot-it dastria [...] (GrX LXXXVI 8)
 as he.understood(AOR).it, CNJ that-DAT day-DAT common-ADV
 that.NOM meal-NOM not been it.is,¹⁰ then which-NOM PTCL
 I.had.taken.it, fury-INSR he.poured.it.out
 'When he understood: (*that*) "This has not been the common meal", he
 then in agitation poured out what I had taken (to him).'

The internal position of (b) suggests its status as an embedded constituent. But most direct speech occurs on the periphery of the sentence, in particular in final position. In these cases, there is no reason to believe that the direct speech is embedded in the reporting clause. While anaphoric pronouns referring to an independent direct speech antecedent are direct objects, it is not at all sure if *everything* "which was said represented the complement of the clause of saying" (Harris and Campbell 1995: 69), if complement clauses are understood as embedded. Similarly, it is rather doubtful if direct speech after cataphoric *esēt* etc. is a complement, because, as far as I can see, complements cannot be referred to by "so", and there is no indication that sentences like (1f) are complements in Old Georgian; rather, they could be thought of as "adjoined" (in the sense introduced by Hale 1975).

1.3 Indirect speech in Old Georgian

It is generally believed that indirect speech is embedded. "Indirect speech" in a broad sense does occur in Old Georgian side by side with "direct speech", and some authors (e.g. Žigjuri 1965) insist on its "naturalness" and its occurrence in the oldest texts. Indeed the following passage shows person shift (Hewitt and Crisp 1986: 126):

- (10) (a) movides da tkues, (b) vitarmed [vitar E] gamočineba-j-ca angeloz-ta-j *ixiles*, (c) romel-ta hrkues ma-t, (d) vitarmed: “cxovel ars igr”
 (a) they.came(AOR) and they.said, (b) CNJ appearance-NOM-too angel-POBL-NOM they.saw(AOR).it, (c) who-P-OBL they.told them she-P-OBL,
 (d) CNJ: “alive he.is(PRS) he.NOM”
 ‘(a) they came, saying, (b) that they had also seen a vision of angels, (c) who told them (d) that he was alive.’

where another manuscript has direct speech throughout:

- (11) (a) movides da itqodes, (b) vitarmed “xilva-j angeloz-ta-j *vixilet*, romel-ni itqodes, (c) vitarmed: “cxovel ars” (Luke 24,23 C)
 (a) they.came(AOR) and they.said(PERF).it, (b) CNJ “sight-NOM angel-POBL-NOM we.saw(AOR).it, (c) who-P-NOM they.said(PERF).it, (d) CNJ: “alive he.is(PRS)”..”

Notice, however, the contrast between the Georgian version of (10d) and its English counterpart: the Georgian version has no tense shift. I do not know since when the first examples of tense shift are attested as it is optionally used in Modern Georgian (see below 2.2). But indirect speech in the narrow sense seems to be very rare in non-translated, original Old Georgian texts.¹¹ Languages that have “indirect speech” in complement clauses (as in (9b), need not have the type of “indirect quotation sentence whose matrix is a verb of saying” (Li 1986:39).

1.4 The transitivity of “to say” in Old Georgian

Nominalised reported speech does not seem to occur after the simple verb “to say”, but it is attested with verbs of command (see (1d)) and information (see (1c)), and in an idiom:

- (12) ma-s žam-sa netar-sa Grigol-s *gul-man ukua* gseneba-j Saban Išxnel-isa-j (GrX XXXVI 1)
 that-DAT time-DAT Grigol-DAT *heart-ERG it.told.him* memory(VN)-NOM Saba Išxnel-GEN-NOM
 ‘At that time it occurred to the blessed Grigol to recall to mind Saba of Išxhan.’

1.5 The position of the quotative particle in Old Georgian

Some authors feel that the most natural form of direct speech in Georgian is the one with quotative particles,¹² and that the literary language tends to oust quotatives: the older the folklore texts and the less literate their speakers are, the more quotatives occur (Tonji 1975:42–3). Only a few examples of the quotative

particle *-o* occur in the oldest texts, e.g. in the Khanmeti version of the Gospels (7th cent.?):

- (13) man mactur-man tkua [...] *vitarmed* “šendgomad sam-isa dy-isa ayvage-*o*” (Matthew 27.63)
 that.ERG deceiver-ERG he.said.it [...] CNJ “after three-GEN day-GEN I.will.rise-*qvort*”
 ‘That deceiver said, [...] (that) After three days I will rise again.’

We do not know what the reason for the rareness of the quotative particle in classical Old Georgian is, but the absence of an equivalent in the prestigious Greek model language might have contributed to it (Hewitt 1984a:555). The “Life of Grigol of Khandzta” (see (1)) has a few examples (see (7)), but the Sinaitic Polykephalon manuscript of 864 offers more. *-o* occurs in clause-final position:

- (14) (a) romel-n-i itqvia, (b) vitarmed “gor-n-i ara šisxna upal-man kac-ta-gan-*o*, (c) aramed zec-it hkondes-*o*” (Sinuri Mravaltavi ed. A. Šanize 48,2–3)
 who-P-NOM they.say(PRS), (b) CNJ “flesh-P-NOM not he.put(AOR).them.on lord-ERG man-POBL-*qvort*, but heaven-INSTR he.will.have.them-*qvort*”
 ‘Who says: (that) Our Lord did not put on flesh from man, but he will have it from heaven.’

I. Imnaišvili (1975:99–100; cp. Žyiguri 1973:204) speaks of a postverbal position, which — with a few exceptions as in (14b) — very often coincides with the clause-final position in an essentially verb-final language. Indeed, the postverbal (not necessarily clause-final) position was predominant in medieval Georgian, e.g. in Rustaveli’s poem (c.1200):

- (15) mepe-man brjana: “vnaxe-*o* mizez-i kxin-ta lev-isa” (97[98],4)
 king-ERG he.commanded: “I.saw(AOR).it-*qvort* cause-NOM joy-P-OBL waning-GEN”
 ‘The king said: I have seen cause for loss of joy’ (transl. M. Wardrop).

It also occurs in the 19th century classics.

-o is similar to the Old Georgian interrogative particle *-a* in that it is a clitic and occurs in the same, postverbal position; compare:

- (16) hxedav-*a* ama-s dedakac-sa (Luke 7,44)
 thou.seest(PRS)-*Q* this-DAT woman-DAT
 ‘Seest thou this woman?’

2. Modern Georgian

2.1 The transitivity of “to say” in Modern Georgian

As in Old Georgian, “to say” is a transitive verb. Conceptualised direct speech is again case-marked.¹³ Occasionally, a concept may be formed on the basis of “who says “X” habitually”:

- (17) “*ar vici*”-s deda icinis, “*vici*”-sa deda țiris-o (proverb)
 “not I know:it”-GEN mother(NOM) she:laughs, “I know:it”-GEN
 mother(NOM) she:weeps-QUOT
 ‘The mother of ‘I don’t know it’ laughs, the mother of ‘I know it’
 weeps.’¹⁴

2.2 Indirect speech in Modern Georgian

Modern Georgian has both direct and “indirect” speech. Consider the following counterpart sentences (Žikia 1972:62):

- (18) a. *Pepia-m tkva: ‘sacodav-o Pepia-vi țem-i Tamro aba exla ki
 cocxal-i damarxul-i ikneba’*
*Pepia-ERG he:said: ‘poor-voc Pepia-voc! my-NOM Tamro.NOM
 PRCL now but alive-NOM buried-NOM she:will be(FUT)’*
 ‘Pepia said [to himself]: Poor Pepia! My Tamro will be buried alive
 by now.’
 b. *sacodav-ma Pepia-m tkva, rom mis-i Tamro exla ki cocxal-i
 damarxul-i ikneba*
*poor-ERG Pepia-ERG he:said, CNJ his-NOM Tamro.NOM now but
 alive-NOM buried-NOM she:will be(FUT)*

While person shift (*my* > *his*) is an unambiguous indicator of indirect speech in b), vocatives and some particles (here: *aba* ‘well then’) resist systematic transposition, as usual. But what is more important is the lack of tense shift in b), which is rather the norm, although shift also does occur:

- (19) a. *vkvrit: ‘cign-s vkitxulobt-o’ (Hewitt and Crisp 1986:123)*
we:said: ‘book-DAT we:are:reading(PRS).it-QUOT’
 ‘We said: We are reading a book.’
 b. *vtkvit, rom cign-s vkitxulobdit (ib.)*
we:said, CNJ book-DAT we:were:reading(IPRF).it
 (with a shift from present tense to imperfect)

Notice that the modern translation of (10) has an evidential perfect in (b) and (c) on the basis of its hearsay meaning (see Boeder 2000):

- (20) (a) *da movidnen da gvitkres, rom (b) uxilavt angeloz-eb-i, (c) roml-eb-
 sa-c utkvamt, (d) ‘cocxal-i-a-o’* (Biblia. Sakartvelos Sapatriarko
 gamocema 1989)
 (a) and they:came(AOR) and they:said(AOR).to us, CNJ (b) they:have:seen
 (PERF).them angel-P-NOM, (c) who-P-DAT-REL.PRCL they:have:said
 (PERF).it, (d) “alive-NOM-he-is-QUOT”.

In this example, then, “indirect speech” also comprises a shift in evidentiality that we will find in Swan, too (3.4.2). — The details of variation between shifted and non-shifted tense, time and local deixis in indirect speech cannot be discussed here;¹⁵ suffice it to say that the shift is “optional”, as in some other languages (Plank 1986):

- (21) *gušin xom gitxari, rom xvall/dyes movlen/movidothen (Hewitt and Crisp
 1986:128)*
*yesterday PRCL I.said.to.you, CNJ tomorrow/today
 they.will.come(FUT)/they.would.come(COND)*

where all combinations can mean: ‘I told you, didn’t I, yesterday that they would come *today* [and — look! — here they come] (ib.)’, although the variant: *gušin gitxari, rom xvall movlen/movidothen* can also mean: ‘I told you yesterday that they would come *tomorrow*’. The factors that favour the choice of “shifted” and “non-shifted” forms are unknown so far. Similarly, as with Old Georgian *vitarmd* (see 1.1), we do not know under what conditions the use of the conjunction *rom* is preferred. An examples with *rom* is:

- (22) *aste egonat, rom sige aris-o (Bl 110)*
so they:thought(AOR), CNJ son.in.law(NOM) he.is-QUOT
 ‘They thought: (that) He is their son-in-law/that he was their son-in-law.’

The absence of *rom* seems to be preferred in the literary language,¹⁶ but *rom* is particularly common in folklore texts (Itoni 1975:30–6).¹⁷

From a phonetic point of view, *rom*, like other conjunctions, normally belongs to the preceding reporting clause: a pause, if it is heard at all, comes after, not before, *rom* (see Boeder 1982; 2001), which does not speak for an embedded status of direct speech.

2.3 The position of quotative particles in Modern Georgian

In the modern literary language the repetition of quotative particles is avoided, and a speech-final position is preferred,¹⁸ but in colloquial Georgian, quotative *-o* occurs after (almost) every (phonological) phrase; in fact, *-o* “punctuates” the text (Wigger 1998:970) and can be used to determine phrase boundaries (Boeder 1982:384; 1984a:99). It seems to conform to the predominantly left-branching structure of

Georgian that direct speech units are marked as such at their closure: the “object”, the reported speech, follows its verb of saying (*tkva*, *utxra* etc.), but a final verb-like quotative particle (see 2.9 below) “recovers” the left-branching structure:¹⁹ Consider the following passages from a Georgian dialect (Kartlian) text:

- (23) *ert-ma kac-ma tkva: cavedi-o Lek-si-o kamecebi unda viqidot-o* (I 41)
 one-ERG man-ERG he.said: we.went.off-QUOR Daghestan.in-QUOR, buf-faloes it.is.necessary that.we.buy.them-QUOR
 ‘One man said: We went off into Daghestan in order to buy buffaloes.’

A possible line of development is from postverbal²⁰ to clause-final position (positions which very often coincide, see 1.5), then from clause-final position to phrase-final position (which again very often coincide), on the one hand, and — according to the literary norm — to exclusively sentence-final or speech-final position, on the other.

2.4 The speaker-reporter in Modern Georgian direct speech

The speaker of “direct speech” can be definite or indefinite (see Hewitt 1984a: 356):

- (24) *maga-s es codv-at acevs, ert-i vir-i ucvalebia-o* (Bl 84)
 she-DAT this sin-ADV it.lies.on.her: one-NOM ass-NOM
 she.has.tormented(PERF.EVID).it-QUOR
 ‘This sin weighs on her: she has tormented an ass, *they* say.’

In this indefinite sense (“they say, people say”), the quotative is the rule with proverbs and with all types of aphorisms and “commonly known” truths;²¹ see (17) above. But this rule is not just triggered by proverbs but by their use in everyday argumentation: proverbs are used as a backing of conclusions, where the speakers represent a social group and need not be specified more than other details of reported speech that are deemed irrelevant by the speaker (Mocher 1996; see 3.5.2).

2.5 Distribution of Modern Georgian quotative particles

In archaic Georgian dialects like Khevsur, and optionally in some other dialects (e.g. Kakhian), *-o* (or its allomorph *-v*) is used for *all* reported speech (Kačarava 1950:254):

- (25) (a) [*sc. Abas*] *utkom, šinš-isa-d*, (b) *ro “šen daibrake-v*, (c) *ro Aba-is-gan* [*sc. bič-i*] *kí ar as-a-v*, (d) *čem-gan as-a-v*” (Dolige 1975:61,15)
 (a) [*sc. Aba-DAT*] he.has.said(PERF.EVID), cousin-GEN-ADV, (b) CNJ

‘you take(AOR.IMP).the.blame.on.you-QUOR, (c) CNJ Aba-GEN-from [*sc. illegitimate child-NOM*] but not he-is-PTCL-QUOR, (d) me-from he-is-PTCL-QUOR’
 ‘(a) Aba, they say, said to him, to his cousin (b) (that): Take the blame on you, say: (c) He [*sc. the illegitimate child*] is not Aba’s, (d) he is mine.’

Rustaveli has the Khevsurian use of *-o*, e.g. with 1st-person singular and plural reported speech (in (26d) and (27)):

- (26) (a) “*mona-a-o Asmat-is-i*”, (b) *šemoqvana utxar šina*. / (c) *gul-sa šina daustraxe*: (d) “*ra mpova-o, anu vina?*” (361[363],3–4)
 (a) “slave.NOM-he-is-QUOR Asmat-GEN-NOM”, (b) leading.in(NOM) I.told.him.inside. / (c) heart-DAT in I.reproved.her: (d) “what.NOM she.found(AOR).me-QUOR, or who(NOM)”
 ‘(a) It is Asmat’s slave, he said. (b) I told him to bring him in. / (c) I thought in my heart: (d) What has she found in me, or who is she?’ (transl. M. Wardrop)

- (27) *vkvirí, tu: “mze-a-o kvegan-ad* [. . .]?’ (202[205],2)
we.said tu “sun(NOM).he-is-QUOR earth-ADV”

‘*We said*: (that?) He is a sun on the Earth [. . .]?’ (transl. M. Wardrop)
 In addition, however, he uses *-tko*, a particle used when the speaker is instructing the addressee to transmit the quote to somebody (Topuria and Giginėšvili 1970:161); compare *tko* in (28) with *-o* in (25c) in the same context:

- (28) *mikixos, hkadre: “iqo-tko aka ert-ia cam-ita*” (1021[103],4)
 should.he.ask.for.me, dare(AOR.IMP).to.say.to.him: “she.was-QUOR here one-INSTR moment-INSTR”
 ‘When he asks for me, say, She was here but now?’ (transl. M. Wardrop)

The particle *-metki* is used with reported 1st-person singular speech in modern literary Georgian and some of its dialects:²²

- (29) “*xom iloce-o?*” — “*rogor ara-metki*” (A. Cereteli apud Šiğiguri 1973: 202)
 “PTCL you.prayed(AOR)-QUOR?” — “how not-QUOR”
 ‘You prayed, didn’t you? — Of course, I said!’

tko < *tkv-a* in (28) is the 2nd-person singular subjunctive of *tkv-* ‘say’ (‘thou shall say’; see Hewitt 1984a). *metki* is obviously a simplified form of *me v-tkv-i* ‘I (SUBJ-SAY-AOR.Suffix)’ (= I said), but the form lost its past time reference and became a particle: it can refer to the future and to the present.²³

- (30) “momšordi-metki”, — veubnebi (Qazbegi apud Plonti 1996)

“go(AOR,IMP).away.from.me-quor”, — I say.to.him
 ‘Go away from me, I tell him [. . . I have no time for you].’

The co-occurrence of *metki* with a finite verb of saying in the last example shows that *metki* counts as a particle and not as a verb (or a clause).²⁴ But as we will see below (2.9), this does not necessarily preclude it from having verbal properties. Notice that *metki* and *tko* occur in the same, preferably postverbal, position as *-o*.

The quotative particles *metki/tko*, then, are etymologically transparent.²⁵ But why did they develop in the first place? On the one hand, we may speculate about their “expressive” origin: *tko* is a kind of command that could underline the imperative form of the verb of saying, and *metki* contains an “emphatic”,²⁶ possibly contrastive, pronoun *me* ‘I’ (– the verb form *vkvi* ‘I said, it’ is a self-contained sentence without *me*). As usual, the expressive character got lost and present-day *metki/tko* have become grammaticalised particles. — On the other hand, the introduction of *-metki/-tko* marks a difference in epistemic status: *-o*, but not *-metki* and *-tko*, gives the reported speech a hearsay meaning that is closely related to evidentiality (see (20b, c) and 3.4.2).

2.6 The instructional quotative in Modern Georgian

The description of *-tko* given above is incomplete: according to the modern literary norm, *-o* is used with reported first person plural speech as in Medieval Georgian (see (27)), but *-tko* also occurs:²⁷

- (31) rogor vutxari — “mepestan unda camoxvide-*tko*”, imav cam
 dagetanxma (N. Lortkipanize)
 as we.told.him — “to.the.king it.is.necessary
 that.you.come.away-quor”, that.very.moment he.agreed.with.us
 ‘As soon as we said to him: You must come away to the king, at that
 very moment he agreed with us.’

In addition, some western dialects of Georgian, in particular Imeretian, Lechkhumian and Rachian, and even some writers from this area, use *-tko* with reported first person singular speech where the standard language has *-metki*:²⁸

- (32) kac-ma utxra: me ase miycere cem ded-mama-s, cem mosvl-amdin
 šeinaxet čemi col-švil-i, ranatic unda iqos-*tko* (Šiğiguri 1956:302,11,
 Imeretian)
 man-ERG he.told.her. I so I.wrote.it.to.them my.mother-father-DAT, my
 coming-till take.care.of.them (IMP) wife-child-NOM, whatever.kind.NOM
 it.is.necessary that.it.be-quor
 ‘The man told her: I wrote thus to my parents: Until I return, take care
 of my wife and my children, no matter how.’

This shows that *-metki* and *-tko* are in a disjunctively ordered rule relation: *-tko* occurs with first person speakers where *-metki* does not — either because the reported speaker is non-singular or because *metki* is simply unavailable in the dialect.

But what do this use of *-tko* and the “instructional” use have in common? Notice that the rule for *-tko* is not: “occurring after a reporting clause with 2nd-person subject + verb of saying + 3rd-person indirect object”, or the like: the rule is not of a morpho-syntactic nature, but is based on speech act meaning. The wording of what counts as an instruction directed at the addressee may vary (Hewitt 1984a:359), as for instance in: *I should have been commanded by you: . . .*” or: *you might simply have said to me: . . .*” (ib.). In other words, the verb form *tkva* ‘you shall say’ lost its syntactic 2nd-person subject constraint and became a particle controlled by pragmatic conditions (see Hewitt 1984a:360). A link between the two stages is offered by a semantic peculiarity: Starting from the latter use (“(you shall) tell him/her”), we should bear in mind that imperatives (and other speech acts²⁹) in some respects behave as if their subject were the speaker, not the performer of the act itself. Consider purpose clauses like (a) *They left the door open for him to hear the baby* vs (b) *Leave the door open for him to hear the baby*. While it is the subject person of the matrix clause in (a) who has the intention expressed by the subordinate clause, it is the speaker’s intention in (b). Similarly, *-tko* marks the speech of first person matrix subjects and the speech ordered by the first person speaker of the sentence. Pronominalization in reported speech, on the other hand, crucially depends on the notion of underlying syntactic matrix clause subject: as Hewitt (1984a:356) rightly points out, a first person pronoun in the following example is normally understood as being identical with the (implicit) matrix subject (“the husband”), and not with the speaker of the sentence:

- (33) utxari šens cols, “me ver mova-*tko*” (ib.)
 say.to.her.your.DAT wife.DAT, “I.imposs I.will.come-quor”
 ‘Tell your wife: I cannot come.’³⁰

2.7 The development of quotative particles in Georgian

The history of Georgian quotative particles might be reconstructed as follows: at an initial stage, postverbal *-o*, comparable in its clitic position to interrogative *-a*, was used with all reported speech (Kačarava 1950:254); this stage is preserved in some dialects (e.g. in Khevsur). Then two “expressive” verb forms of “to say” developed into the grammaticalised particles *-metki* and *-tko*, and *-o* became the residual, default marker with a hearsay meaning. However, *-tko* developed beyond its original, instructional use: it became a marker of reported 1st-person speech

wherever the 1st singular marker *-metki* could not be used, that is, in the plural, and also in the singular in the western dialects that lack *-metki*.

2.8 The scope of quotative particles in Modern Georgian

So far, reported speech has been presented as the integral block of a “direct speech sentence”. However, clauses with an operator (interrogative or relative pronoun) are more complex — at least in colloquial Georgian. Consider:

- (34) “*vina-a?*” — “*ra vici me?*” — “*vin var-o ar tkva?*” — *vkixte* (N. Dumbaze)
 “who(NOM)-he.is?” — “what I know.it I?” — “who(NOM) I am-quor not he.said?” — I asked(AOR).him
 ‘Who is he? — No idea. — Didn’t he say who he is?, I asked.’
- (35) “*Ali Xorava čem-tana-c iqol?*” — *tkva Peride-m.* — “*Ra minda-o, Ali Xorava-m?*” — *vkixte me* (N. Dumbaze)
 “Ali Xhorava(NOM) me-at-too he.was!” — he.said Peride-ERG. —
 “what(NOM) I want(PRS).it-quor, Ali Xhorava-ERG?” —
 I asked(AOR).him I
 ‘Ali Xhorava came to see me, too!, said Peride. — What did he say he wanted, Ali Xhorava?, I asked?’

In these examples, the operator behaves as in English, but the rest of the clause is direct speech, without the shift phenomena characteristic of English dependent interrogative clauses. This phenomenon remains to be explored. In particular, it would be interesting to know if the behaviour of the operator is somehow related to the fact that conjunctions sometimes occur with direct speech (see above 1.1; 2.2). Consider:

- (36) *čad-ze tit-eb-i daakakuna, tu gamocxva-o* (N. Dumbaze)
 maize.bread-on finger-P-NOM he.tapped(AOR).on.them, CNJ
 it.was.baked(AOR)-quor
 ‘He tapped with his fingers on the maize-bread, [to see] if it was ready-baked.’
- where the conjunction *tu* ‘if’ marks a matrix clause-orientated “indirect question”, whereas *-o* marks *gamocxva* as direct speech.

2.9 The verb-like properties of quotatives in Modern Georgian

In the older texts, direct speech is normally introduced by a reporting clause. In the modern Kartvelian languages, however, the absence of a verb of saying is quite common.³¹ Georgian grammarians assume ellipsis here,³² but while this is an

intuitively plausible description of the historical origin, it might not capture the synchronic reality of (35): supplying *tkva* ‘he said’ would probably change the scope of the question: “Did Ali Xhorava say what he wanted?, I asked”. I think that “free direct speech” marked by quotative particles is autonomous in the sense that there is no need to posit an underlying verb of saying. The speaker is determined by the pragmatic rules of story-telling: it is for instance the protagonist or his or her interlocutor.

On the other hand, the ergative of the “speaker” Ali Xhorava in (35) presupposes a transitive verb of saying. If we dismiss “ellipsis” as a synchronic description, this suggests an intermediate position of Kartvelian quotative particles: they are not verbs in the sense that their position is different (they are never clause-initial), they are not “tensed”, and they co-occur with finite verbs of saying (see above 2.5); but they are like verbs in their autonomy (their capability to mark reported speech of 1st-, 2nd- and 3rd-person reporter-speakers³³), and in their transitive verblike behaviour, i.e., their occurrence with an optional speaker-argument.³⁴ However, the restrictions on constructions like (35) have still to be determined.

2.10 Quotatives in Mingrelian and Laz

Mingrelian and Laz cannot be studied here. As described by Kipsidze (1914: 142–3) and others, the distribution of quotative particles in these languages is the same as in literary Georgian.³⁵ Surprisingly, the distribution thus differs from that of the western Georgian dialects mentioned above (2.6), and of Svan (see below 3.3). Laz also uses Turkish verb forms as quotative particles: *dei* < Standard Turkish *diye* ‘saying’ (Çikobava 1936:136; Kutscher *et al.* 1995:110, note 2), *dedum* ‘I said’ (Kutscher *et al.* 1995:110).³⁶

3. Svan

Svan is a neighbour of both Mingrelian and Georgian. A schematic map may help to understand the situation (settlements in italics; see Figure 1). Upper Bal is the dialect that most materials in this chapter come from; it is considered to have undergone less influence from Georgian than Lower Svan. Svan is not used as a literary language. Our main sources are field work notes taken in Mestia, the administrative center of Upper Svaneti, which belongs to the Upper Bal region; and in particular the volumes of texts from all dialects written down in the 1920s and 1930s.³⁷

Svan reported speech is a very manifold phenomenon: it occurs with or without a verb of saying (3.1); with or without a conjunction, both as direct or as some form of indirect speech (3.2); with or without quotative particles (3.3); in

CAUCASUS MAIN RIDGE	
Upper Svanetia (in the north, along the Engur River):	
Mingrelian	Lower Bal dialects: Upper Bal dialects:
	<i>Becho</i> <i>Mestia</i> <i>Malakha</i>
	<i>Eiser</i> <i>Ipar</i>
SVANETIAN MOUNTAIN RIDGE <i>Ushguli</i>	
Mingrelian	Lower Svanetia (in the south, "Svanetia of the Dadians"):
	Lower Svan dialects:
	<i>Lentekh</i> <i>Lashkh(et)</i>
Mingrelian	Georgian dialects:
	Lechkhumiian Imeretian

Figure 1.

more or less "indirect speech" characterised by a shift of person and epistemic status (3.4), but otherwise with all kinds of direct speech properties (3.5).

Svan reported speech deserves particular interest: while Georgian has the more or less European type of distinction between direct speech on the one hand, and indirect speech as complement clauses with a main clause orientation on the other, Svan has three forms: complement clauses with a main clause orientation (see (69a) below), direct speech and non-direct speech with a partial shift of person and epistemic category, called "semi-indirect speech" by *Hewitt* (1982). Of these three forms I will concentrate on the last one. But it should be noted that reported direct speech does exist. It can, but must not, occur in the absence of a *preceding* reporting clause (see (37) and (38) below, with and without a subsequent reporting clause). On the other hand, there are only a few examples of direct speech after an introductory reporting clause (see (53b) below), although I suspect it occurs more often in contemporary Svan. But semi-indirect speech is certainly the preferred variant, and, as one of my Svan informants put it, it is "more Svan" than direct speech.

3.1 Free direct speech in Svan

In the texts, most reported speech is introduced by a reporting clause, but it need not be:

(37) [. . .] *i ču ibzi* 'ā, *nāḷav si, mājkapd xizbi?*' (242,23)

and *PRIV* he.eats.it: "O, would that you, what.kind.ADV you.eat?"

'And he eats it: O, how on earth can you eat this?'

Long dialogues are often free direct speech not introduced by any reporting clause (or a quotative particle, for that matter).³⁸ The same is true of semi-indirect speech (see e.g. (47) and (60) below). In other words, Svan reported speech is "autonomous" (see 2.9). Verbs of saying are rarely postposed to direct speech (38) or semi-indirect speech (39) or both preposed and postposed to reported speech (40):

(38) "atxe *dəmad žalvdi*", *dāvd xākv*, *ečka miča apxnegd xākv* [. . .] (243,11–12)

"now not.yet I.give(PRS).it.to.you", *dev.ERG he.said.to.him* then his fellow.ERG he.said.to.him

'I will not give it to you now, *the dev said*. Then his fellow said to him [. . .]?'

(39) "ala *eser xoča gāməš xāral*", *pāršmāgd rākv* (247,36–7)

"this.NOM QUOT good taste.GEN it.has.had.it(PERF)", *pāršmag.ERG he.said*

'This tasted good [lit.: I had it of good taste!], *the pāršmag said*.'

(40) *yertem xākv* "ešdiori lavāš-u *eser* annaḡe [. . .] *i ečk' eser ž' axqoči* *gezal*" — *xākv yertem* (234,11–14)

God.ERG he.told.him: "twelve lavash-OPR QUOT he.baked(AOR).them [. . .] and then QUOT *PRIV* he.will.recover(FUT).to.him son.NOM." — *he.said.to.him God.ERG*

'*God said to him*: Bake twelve lavash-breads [. . .] and then your son will recover, *God said to him*.'

3.2 Conjunctions with reported speech in Svan

Similar to Georgian (see 1.2 and (22)), Svan also has cataphoric "so" referring to subsequent direct speech:

(41) (a) *ečk' eser eḡa laxčvedn'*, (b) *ere "māi eser xār xoča?"* (c) *ečkas eser mžānem amžā-v xākv-ā:* (d) "lāčvā ləžātān *eser* dəsamagveš xār". (250,18–19)

(a) then QUOT that.NOM he.will.ask(FUT).her, (b) CNJ "what.NOM QUOT she.has.it good?" (c) then QUOT she.ERG so-OPR she.said.to.him-PTCL:

(d) "chamois.GEN milk.like nothing she.has(PRS).it"

'[A wife and her lover *dev* converse about the means of getting rid of the wife's husband. The lover's advice is to feign illness, and:] (a) Then he [sc. your husband] will ask you: (b) "What will help you?" (c) Then you should speak to him thus: (d) "There is nothing better for me than the milk of a chamois."'

And as with Georgian *rom* (see 2.2), the conjunction *ere* belongs to the preceding reporting clause: in (a)–(b) . . . *läxvvedi' ere* . . ., its initial vowel elides the final vowel of the preceding verb. Again, this casts some doubt on its embedded status in the reporting clause.

But while the syntactic status of reported speech is sometimes debatable, there are cases where it is not: direct speech can be case-marked (Boeder 1985b: 69):

- (42) *bäc ši ladey ingriv i* ‘Kantaziš dašniš näqir maķu’-s iškadal (Davidiani *et al.* 1957: 169, 34–5, Lower Bal dialect)
stone.NOM all day.NOM it.grew(IPERS).bigger and ‘Kentez.GEN sword.GEN hit(PPV).NOM I.want(PRS).it’-DAR it.shouted(IPERS).it
‘The stone [being a transformed woman] grew bigger every day and used to shout: ‘I want to be hit by Kentezi’s sword.’”

In this example, direct speech seems to refer to repeated tokens of a type established before in the text (“it shouted its ‘I want . . .’”). More often, this occurs with single words:

- (43) *dede-š mükvišg mi dor miri* (Šaniže *et al.* 1939b: 268, no. 91a, 25)
mother.GEN saying(PRS.PART).NOM I not I.have(PRS).him
‘I have nobody who would say “Mother?” to me.’³⁹

As in the case of Old Georgian *viarmed* (1.1) and Modern Georgian *rom* (2.2), the conjunction *ere* ‘that’ can introduce reported speech with a quotative particle (44) or without (45):

- (44) *xäķv Qalacıqläns, ere* “mäj eser xekvdeni, eciš eser xäčö” (247, 23)
he.said.to.him Qalachuqlan.DAT, CNJ “what.NOM QUOR he.will.want(FUT).it, that.DAT QUOR he.will.do(FUT).it.for.him
[sc. the Parshmag] said to Qalachuqlan: (*that*) Whatever you want, I will do it for you.’

- (45) *miča xexvvd xäķv, ere* “mäj li imya xäri xolam gu-ži?” (242, 13–14)
his.wife.ERG she.said.to.him, CNJ “what.NOM it.is why you.are(PRS) bad heart-in”
‘His wife said to him: (*that*) Why are you in a bad mood?’

But direct speech may occur without *ere* or a quotative:

- (46) *Qalacıqländ xäķv: amnoš nabord mäd maķu* (246, 30)
Qalachuqlan.ERG he.said.to.her: this.INSTR stirred(PPV) not I.want(PRS).it
‘He said to her: I do not want bread prepared with this [sc. urine].’

It is unknown so far which contexts favour the use of *ere*.⁴⁰ Where the quotative

comes with a delay (see 3.3.6), introductory *ere* seems to ensure that reported speech stands out against its non-reported context.

3.3 The distribution of quotative particles in Svan

Svan has three quotative particles: *-əž*, *eser*⁴¹ and *rok*.⁴² These entail semi-indirect reported speech (or rather: the application of the corresponding rules), and most semi-indirect speech is marked by quotative particles (see however 3.4.1.1).

3.3.1 *-əž*

-əž corresponds to Georgian *-kə* in its “Imetian” distribution (2.6). That is, it is used with 1st-person singular and plural speakers⁴³ (see (47b–c) and (48)) and with an instructional meaning with its “hidden” 1st-person speaker (2.6) (see (49)).⁴⁴

- (47) (a) “im rokv xvičod, Švanär?” — (b) “im-əž i am lüntv jervu tve amecū ekälisga nimšia (c) i tets-əž dem nahvidix (d) i atxe Gagräške yuri (e) i ka xoščivle.” (39, 3–8 [par])
(a) “what.DAT QUOR we.do(PRS).it, Svans?” — (b) “what-QUOR and this winter two month here thorn.in we.have.worked(PERS) (c) and money.DAT-QUOR not they.give(PRS).it.to.us (d) and now Gagra.to I.go(PRS) (e) and PREV I.will.sue(FUT).him.”
(a) What do you do, Svans? — (b) What? During this winter, we worked in the thorns here for two months, (c) but they do not pay us.
(d) And now I will go to Gagra [a city in Abkhazia] (e) and will sue him.
(48) *amčün ätvzeläl: “hēsä-ž ime ira näzv Bečvitesgä”* (41, 11–12 Mestia)
here I.went.by: “if-QUOR where he.will.be(FUT) going(PART) Becho.to.in”
‘I went by: In case there is somebody going to Becho [, I thought].’
(49) a. (si) *xäķa (ere) “mi-ž moxar qvedni”* (Inf)
(you) you.tell.him(AOR.IMP) (CNJ) “I-QUOR tomorrow I.will.come”
‘Tell him: (that) I [the speaker] will come tomorrow.’
b. *mi maķu xäķva (ere) “moxar-əž qvedni”* (Inf)
I I.want.it that-you.tell.him (CNJ) “Tomorrow-QUOR I.will.come”
‘I want you to tell him that I will come tomorrow.’

Notice that the use of *-əž* does not require a 1st-person singular matrix clause subject in variant (49b) (cp. 2.6). Also, *-əž* crucially refers to the speech of the *actual* 1st-person speaker. “Underlying” 1st-person speakers, when shifted, do not trigger 1st-person quotatives (see (58c–e) below). The same is true for instructions, not to reported 1st-person speaker instructions; for instance, although (41d) is an instruction to a 2nd person, it is marked by *eser*, not by *-əž* (cp. (87b)). In this, Svan seems to differ from Georgian, which allows *-kə* to be triggered by a reported 1st-person reporting clause (see (32)).

3.3.2 *eser*

Eser is the “elsewhere” form of the quotative particle paradigm: it occurs with reported 3rd-person speakers (see (39), (40), (44)), and with 2nd-person speakers:

- (50) (si) (ka) mēka: “maxar *eser* (ka) qvedni” (Inf)
 (you) (PREV) you.said.to.me: “tomorrow QUOR (PTCL)
 I.will.come(PRT)”
 ‘You told me: I [= addressee] will come tomorrow.’

but not with the instructional meaning:

- (51) *(si) xeka (ere): “maxar *eser* qvedni/qedni” (Inf)
 (you) you.tell(AOR.IMP) (CNY): “tomorrow QUOR
 I.will.come/he.will.come”
 (in the sense of: ‘Tell him: I [speaker or addressee] will come tomorrow.’)

We can tabulate now the distribution of quotative particles in Georgian and Upper Svan:

	Instructional	1st Sg	1st P	Elsewhere
Khevsurian . . .	o	o	o	o
Rustaveli	tko	o	o	o
Literary Georgian	tko	metki	o/tko	o
Imeretian	tko	tko	tko	o
Svan	až	až	až/rok(v)	<i>eser/rok(v)</i>

3.3.3 *The interchangeability of Svan eser and rok(v)*

In most contexts, *eser* and *rok(v)* are interchangeable, and all authors so far (e.g. Gudgedjiani and Palmaitis 1986:35–6; Tuire 1997:40–1) seem to consider them as free variants. Indeed, *eser* and *rok(v)* occur close to each other within the same text:

- (52) (a) xākʷ, (b) ere “bāzi *eser* jervāi mānʷi anqes mineštāssa, (c) eža *rokʷ* šišd cū-v adgārʷ” (333,35–6)
 (a) he.said.to.him, (b) CNY “this.evening QUOR who.NOM first.NOM he.may.come(SUBJ.II) to.them, (c) that.NOM QUOR immediately PREV-OPRT they.killed(AOR).him”
 ‘(a) He said to him: (b) Whoever comes first to you (plural) this evening, (c) you shall kill him.’
- (53) (a) miča dis xākʷ: (b) “mišgu di, lādi zugʷ-ži mānʷ, (c) ere “Sulasaxel *eser* xajšxa.” (d) eža xevvd vode *rok* do onqude, (e) ečkad lišvern *rok* nōma-v mārʷ” (100,7–9 Ipar)
 (a) his.mother.DAT he.said.to.her: (b) “my mother, today hill-on

- they.said.to.me, (c) CNY “Sulasakhel.NOM QUOR she.is.called(PRS).” (d) that.NOM wife.ADV aslong.as QUOR not I.should.lead(SUBJ.II).her.home, (e) so.long rest.NOM QUOR not-OPRT I.have(PRS).it”
 ‘(a) He told his mother, (b) Mother, today they told me on the hill, (c) that her name is Sulasakhel/“Her name is Sulasakhel.” (d) As long as I do not marry her, (e) I shall have no rest.’

As in so many fairy tales, there are often three people saying or promising one thing after the other: in a Lower Bal text, there are three brothers saying one after the other: “I will keep watch over him”. In spite of their parallelism, the speeches of the eldest and of the intermediate brother have *eser* (Davitiani *et al.* 1957:167,3; 8); the speech of the youngest brother has *rok* (ib. 167,13).⁴⁵

3.3.4 *The difference between Svan eser and rok(v)*

However, *eser* and *rok(v)* have a different distribution. Firstly, *rok(v)*, but not *eser* can replace *až* with reported 1st-person plural speakers (see Hewitt 1982:208):

- (54) ečas läxvčveddad: “ame-isga rokʷ im nahvdid kirājs?” (38,20–2 Ipar;
 cp. 38,27)
 that.DAT we.asks(AOR).him: “this-in QUOR what you.give(PRS).us
 hire.DAT”
 ‘Him we asked: How much hire will you give us for this?’
- (55) äxymāzred yerbet: “yerbet rokʷ, si lanešd [. . .]” (36,4 Mestia)
 we.prayed(AOR).(to).him God.NOM: “God QUOR, you
 you.help(AOR.IMP).us”
 ‘We prayed to God: God, you help us!’

Second, even a cursory look at the texts shows that both their syntactic behaviour and their distribution in the dialects differ: the Lower Svan dialects (Lashkh and Lentekh) have *lok* < *rok(v)*, and not *eser* (Topuria 1985:143; Čanlāge 1998:227). *eser* dominates in most dialects of Upper Svanetia, with the notable exception of Ushgul, which has *rok(v)* because of its connections to Lower Svanetia and to Georgian Imeretia.⁴⁶ A careful analysis of all the texts may modify this picture, but it seems reasonable to assume that *rok* spread from the south.

3.3.5 Svan quotatives as clitics

As we saw above, Georgian quotative particles are enclitics that attach to the verb, the clause or the sentence they belongs to; in addition they may attach to any phonological phrase in Modern Georgian. The Svan quotative particles are different: as so many other Svan particles, they are clitics that attach to their preceding host and occur before the verb or after the first (phonological) phrase of the clause (Wackernagel’s position⁴⁷): these positions often coincide with each

other in a spoken language. While the latter position seems to dominate in the Upper Bal prose texts, the preverbal position is more frequent e.g. in the Lower Bal proverb collection of Davitiani (1974). It should be noted here that *eser* can occur more than once in a clause:

- (56) mič *eser* immā xaqūni? mine mančir *eser* māna *eser* āri. (255.32)
 he.DAT QUOT how he.is.afraid(PRS).of.it? their subduer.NOM QUOT not
 QUOT is
 ‘[The dev says to his horse:] Why are you afraid? There is nobody who
 can overpower us.’

The second clause probably consists of two phonological phrases, and the multiple occurrence of *eser* would be similar to that of Georgian -o (2.3).

3.3.6 Use and non-use of the Swan quotative

From a processing point of view, it is interesting that quotatives may come with a “delay”, e.g. after an address without quotative (see (57)) or after an initial part identified by other means, e.g. the conjunction *ere* (see (58)):

- (57) hat xolā, kvitārs *eser* čāzar otkvaj i ime jār ārix? (53.26 Lendjer)
 go.ahead bads, thieves.DAT QUOT horses they.have.led(PERF).them.away
 and where who they:are?
 ‘Hurry up, you lazybones, the thieves have stolen our horses, and where
 are you?’ (lit.: ‘where is who of you?’)

- (58) (a) zurāld xākvy, (b) *ere* “miča laǰmīla mič otdagra. (c) mič *eser*
 nākviǰv *eser* xāra: (d) ervāj *eser* miča laǰmīlas čvadgrina, (e) eǰa *eser*
 čāsđ xākvy” (256.35)

(a) woman.ERG she.said.to.him, (b) CNJ “her brothers.NOM he.DAT
 he.has.killed(PERF).them, (c) she.DAT QUOT something.that.was.said.NOM
 QUOT she.has.had(PERF).it: (d) whoever.NOM QUOT her brothers.DAT
 he.would.kill(PRV.COND).them, (e) that.NOM QUOT husband.ADV
 she.wants.him”

‘(a) The woman told him: (b) You have killed my brothers. (c) I had vow-
 ed: (d) Whoever would kill my brothers, (e) him I want for my husband.’

On the other hand, the quotative particle can be omitted after its occurrence in the initial clause(s):

- (59) ečka dāvā xexvd xākvy, *ere* “lemessg *eser*, māj mizer ira, dōm laxhōdne,
 mare [. . .]” (379.38–380.1 Mestia)
 then dev.GEN wife.ERG she.said.to.her, CNJ “fire.DAT QUOT what.NOM
 reason.NOM it.will(FUT).be, not she.will.give(FUT).it.to.her, but [. . .]”
 ‘Then the dev’s wife said to her: As for the fire, there is no reason why I
 should not give it to you, but [. . .]?’

3.4 Shift phenomena in Swan semi-indirect speech

It is time now to characterise “indirectness” of reported speech in Swan which consists of a shift in person and epistemic category (“evidentiality”). In the following, I will give a rule that possibly allows a deeper understanding of its functional basis. Its tentative character should, however, be underlined. In particular, examples involving speech act participants are extremely scarce and inconclusive in the published materials, and it is my impression that contemporary Swan shows some variation which may be due to Swan-Georgian bilingualism and which I have not yet been able to capture.

3.4.1 Swan person shift

The rule for person shift seems to be:

In semi-indirect speech, person is orientated towards the (actual) speech-act, to the extent that its reporting clause is orientated towards the actual speech act, except in reported 1st-person speech.

This rule is optional with present and future tense clauses.

In other words, 1st and 2nd person refer to the actual speaker and addressee, respectively, if they do in the reporting clause, and 3rd person is used elsewhere; in 1st-person reported speech, on the other hand, we have the usual speaker-addressee reversal of reported direct speech.

To make clear the impact of this rule, I will consider two examples illustrating its first half (3.4.1.1), before I discuss the impact of its restriction and optionality condition (3.4.1.2).

3.4.1.1 Examples of person-shift in Swan

Person shift is particularly frequent in narrative texts. Consider the following example:

- (60) “(a) mādlī-u *eser* xēra (b) i alamāg māre no-v *eser* anxvīf, (c) ka-v *eser*
 apišvd. (d) māi *eser* xākvy, (e) ečas *eser* xāčō.” — “(f) mič *eser* xākvy
 miča mahvrēne gezal, (g) učizād māj āǰsād. eǰa.” (242.1–4)

‘(a) grace.NOM-OPR QUOT he.will.have(FUT).it: (b) and so many
 man.NOM not-OPR QUOT he.slew(AOR).them, (c) PREV-OPR QUOT
 he.released(AOR).them, (d) what.NOM QUOT he.wants(PRS).it, (e)
 that.DAT he.will.do(FUT).it.for.him.” — “(f) he.DAT QUOT
 he.wants(PRS).it his youngest child.NOM, (g) wifeless.ADV who.NOM
 he.remained(AOR).to.you, that”

‘[A man meets a dev who does not let him pass by. He says:] (a) I be-
 seech you, (b) do not slay so many men, (c) allow us to go. (d) What-
 ever you want (e) I will do it. — (f) I want your youngest son, (g) the
 one who is left to you unmarried, that one.’

(a) The 1st person (Svan *mi*) is shifted to 3rd-person *mič* 'he.DAT'. The nominative of *mič* is *ža* 'he' (see (76), (80), (90c), (91) below). *žal/mič* is a 3rd-person pronoun; it is the short form of the demonstrative pronoun *eža* 'that', and has a contrastive or intensifier meaning ("s/he (him/herself"⁴⁶) in subject and object positions, as in:

- (61) anqəd atxe ägi-te, dina larda-te adgene; ža sga ačəd kor-te i laxxvas ägis
 esxid (253,2–4)
 he.came(AOR) now home-to, girl.NOM abode-to he.put(AOR).her,
 he.NOM PREV he.went(AOR) house-to and brothers.DAT home.DAT
 he.met(AOR).them
 '[The hero] came home now [with the king's daughter], the girl he
 accommodated in a room; he himself went into the house and met his
 brothers at home.'

This meaning of *žal/mič* is a corollary of its contrast with zero anaphora⁴⁹ ("pro drop"); notice that subject and object arguments are marked in the verb.

In semi-indirect speech, *žal/mič* is the 3rd-person counterpart of explicit 1st/2nd-person pronouns; it replaces them where they would occur in direct speech. As a non-shifted 3rd-person pronoun it has the meaning illustrated in (60f). In positions where *žal/mič* does not contrast with zero anaphora (i.e. where verb-internal marking is excluded), it is a normal 3rd-person pronoun, for instance in expressions like *miča xev* 'his wife.NOM' or *mičes-te* (382,24) 's/he.GEN-to' ('to her/him').⁵⁰ Since *žal/mič* neutralises an underlying opposition of person (Deeters 1930:184), it is of some functional relevance that my informants sometimes had to look at the later context before they could decide "who did what to whom".

(b) As a corollary of person shift, 2nd-person imperatives, i.e. 2nd-person aorist indicatives, have to be shifted into 3rd-person optative (subjunctive II) forms (Deeters 1930:185 § 345): "let us go (allow us to go)" must become optative "he is to let them go" in (c). However, the optative is (almost?) always replaced in this context by an alternative, synonymous form, namely an optative particle (-u) plus the 3rd-person indicative counterpart of the optative, which is the aorist ("he let us go"). Similarly, 2nd-person present tense prohibitions appear as a 3rd-person present tense plus optative particle:

- (62) amy' eser num-a-v li lučxvave (291,29 apud Šarazeniže 1946:305)
 for.this QUOR not-OPR s/he.is(PRS) worried(PPP)
 'Don't be worried about this.'

(c) Persons occurring in idiomatic expressions are not exempt from shifting: the unshifted form in (60a) would be: *mädil-u žära* 'grace-OPR you.will.have(FUT).it' in the sense of "I implore you".

My data seem to suggest that Svan semi-indirect speech is normally restricted to quotative-marked speech. However, the following example shows semi-indirect speech without a quotative particle:

- (63) zurald laxtvi: "mädi-u xera, miča semi šaur mičnem-u adje i heb
 nom-ä-v oxkercxe" (56,12–13 Lendjer)
 woman.ERG she.called(AOR).to.him: "grace.NOM-OPR
 he.will.have(FUT).it, his three shaur.NOM he.ERG-OPR
 he.took(AOR).them.away and cherry.NOM not-OPR
 he.hewed(trimmed)(AOR).it.to.her"
 'The woman called to him: I implore you, take your three shaurs [= coins], and don't cut off the branches of my cherry!'

3.4.1.2 Examples of speech act participant orientation in Svan

The non-shift condition with 1st-person speech captures e.g. the fact that no person shift occurs with *žž* (3.3.1) in (47)–(49) (but see 3.6) and in reported speech with *rok(v)* and 1st-person plural speakers (see (54)–(55) above). Now consider:

- (64) (a) räkvx, (b) ere "äljar eser otqidx-u mine xošäm i xäkvx-u, (c) ere "ež
 zuräl rokv čväsöqän i gzelir rokv čvähz i cxvad-išga rokv ž' anžäb"
 (371,13–15 Mulakh)
 (a) they.said, (b) CNJ "these.NOM QUOR they.brought.them.to.him-OPR
 their senior.DAT and they.said.to.him-OPR, (c) CNJ "that woman.NOM
 QUOR she.went.mad(AOR) and children.NOM QUOR she.killed(AOR).them
 and boiling.water.in QUOR PREV she.boiled(AOR).them"
 '(a) They said: (b) (that) Let us take these to our senior and let us say:
 (c) (that) That woman went mad and she killed her children and boiled
 them in boiling water.'

As the reported 1st-person speaker in (64c) is himself shifted to a 3rd-person form according to the usual rule ("let us say" → "let them say"), it does not prevent person shift.⁵¹ In other words, the rule works from top downwards. As pointed out by Čanlajze (1998:226), the rule does *not* require a general shift to 3rd-person (Šarazeniže 1946:290). Indeed, we get examples like:

- (65) mišgu apxnegd mäkw: emoš eser mämada nišge nazimzi zagärteži
 čkärd lizi, ečkas išgen bargär mič-oy loxo (Davitiani et al. 1957:85,26–7,
 Lower Bal)
 my fellow.ERG he.said.to.me: if QUOR it.is possible,for me OUR
 opposite.on mountain.to on quick.ADV going(VN).NOM, then other
 piece.of.luggage.P.NOM him.OPR I.gave.them.to.him
 'My fellow said to me: If you can climb the mountain in front of us
 quickly, then you should give me the other luggage.'

where the 2nd person of the “underlying” direct speech is shifted to 1st person because it refers to the (actual) speaker of the sentence (cp. (47a): “you Svans” > “we Svans”), and the 1st-person exclusive possessive correctly codes the 1st-person + 3rd-person combination (where 3rd person refers to the “you” of the addressee in the underlying direct speech).⁵² Similarly, the following example offers a shift of 1st person to 3rd person (“me” > “him”), whereas the 2nd person is shifted to 1st person because it refers to the speaker:

- (66) eṣnem mäkv: (ere) ‘al lair eser oxqida mišgovd i mičašd māna’ (ČG)
 s/he.ERG s/he.said.to.me: (CNI) ‘that book.NOM QUOR
 s/he.has.bought((PERR.ENV)) it me.for and him/her.for not’
 ‘S/he said to me: I bought the book for you and not for me.’⁵³

As for the tense condition, person shift with present and future reference seems to be the preferred variant in the texts; cp. (44), (47a), (56), (58)–(60), (90). But there are occasional cases of non-shift (431,24; 433,10–11 apud Čanlaze 1998:230), and my informants offered both alternatives:

- (67) eṣnem xäkv: ‘kəmpets eser laxvedne, həma eser xoča čqint’ ira / kəmpets
 eser lašivedne, həma eser xoča čqint’ xira’ (ČG)
 s/he.ERG s/he.said.to.him/her: ‘sweets.DAT QUOR s/he.will.give(FUT).
 it.to.him/her, if QUOR good child.NOM s/he.will.be(FUT) / sweets.DAT
 QUOR I.will.give(FUT).it.to.you, if QUOR good child.NOM you.will.
 be(FUT)’
 ‘He said: I will give you sweets, if you are a good child.’

3.4.1.3 Quotative particles in *Svan proverbs*

As we saw above (2.4), Georgian proverbs are represented as direct speech plus quotative particle. In Svan, proverbs are semi-indirect speech with a regular person shift: even generalizing “you” becomes “s/he” etc.:

- (68) mä či xočxa, mič-ov-i eṣi xočxon (Davitiani 1973:83 no. 245, Lower Bal)
 what.NOM everybody.DAT s/he.prefers((PRS)).it, s/he.DAT-OPR-and
 that.NOM s/he.prefers((PERR)) it
 ‘What everybody prefers, that you should prefer too.’

3.4.2 *Svan “tense shift”*

As Deeters (1930:184–5) observes, person shift is somehow related to “tense shift”.⁵⁴ This is true in the sense that if one of the rules applies, the other must apply, too (be it vacuously), and that the optionality of person shift depends on tense. However, “tense” should not be understood in the sense of “sequence of tenses”. In Svan complement clauses, backshift of tenses does occur (69a), although not in the speaker-indexical time adverbials (69b) (see 3.5.3):

- (69) a. läšqəd ečka Āmirans eč’ é, mič er xangär xäbədə (95,28 apud
 Abesaze 1978:8)
 he:remembered(AOR).it then Amiran.DAT that PTCL, his CNI
 dagger.NOM it.hang((PERR)) on him
 ‘Then Amiran remembered that he had his dagger hanging [on his
 side].’
 b. zural ačkuarda, he anqedni miča muxvbe maxar ägite (C. Margiani
 apud Abesaze 1978:8)
 woman.NOM she.worried, if he.will.come(FUT) her brother.NOM
 tomorrow home
 ‘The woman worried if her brother would come home the day after.’
- But instead of backshift, semi-indirect speech shows a shift of epistemic category from non-evidential to evidential (“indirective”, “inferential”). The following rule seems to hold:

In semi-indirect speech, indicative tenses with past time reference shift to their evidential counterparts, except in reported 1st-person speech.

The exception repeats the condition on person shift (see 3.4.1). Notice that this shift occurs where person shift is not optional (as in present and future tense clauses). Examples for non-shift with non-past tenses are found in (47a-c) and (60a-f). The indicative aorist, which otherwise is a narrative tense with past time reference, counts as non-past with the optative particle in (60c). Similarly, present (56), future (70), conditional (71) and subjunctive (72) are not shifted:

- (70) amñ läšis eser ečgvars oxqide, ere yo ivaladäy mič ämzardädx (54,14–15
 Lendjer)
 this.GEN too seed.DAT QUOR such.DAT he.will.bring(FUT).it.to.him, that
 PTCL ever.day he.DAT they.shall.bless(SUBJ.I).him
 ‘I also will find you such a seed of this that you will be grateful for ever.’

- (71) ka-j atambazənx: ‘jər eser aŋəjvəłs i jed sədlis jər anmārtis?’
(379,13–14 Mestia)
PREV-TOO they:wondered: ‘who:NOM QUOT
s/he.will.have.swept(PFV.COND) and or meal.DAT who:NOM
s/he.will.have.prepared(PFV.COND).it?’
‘They also wondered: Who will have swept and who have prepared a meal?’
- (72) šomvəj eser xəjdandəds, ečka əšxv čü-v izobda (287,5)
when QUOT he.should.be.hungry(SUBJ.I), then one.DAT PREV-OPR
he.ate(PERF).it
‘Whenever you will be hungry, eat one.’

Consider now the shift of past time verbs to their evidential counterparts. The evidential counterpart of the narrative aorist tense is the perfect (see introductory section):⁵⁵

- (73) xəji Daud xəkv miča gezals, ere ‘māj eser xočvmina, otyh’ eser mā?’
(369,26–7)
Hadji Daud.ERG he.said.to.him his son.DAT, CNJ ‘what QUOT
he.has.done(PERF).it, he.has.killed(PERF).her QUOT Q’
‘Hadji Daud said to his son: What did you do, have you killed her?’

(cp. the contrast between direct and semi-indirect speech in (90b) vs. (90c) below). Imperfect forms of stative verbs like “to stand” and “to know” (see (90f)) count as aorists and are shifted to the perfect:

- (74) letnapd eser məj xəgnəmə amzav’ (51,18 Lendjer)
letnap[cattle.fed.for.the.Easter-meal].ADV QUOT what
it.has.stood(PERF).for.them this.year
‘What did you have for slaughter-cattle on Easter this year?’

Unlike Georgian, Svan has special evidential forms for the imperfect:

- (75) xola kvin eser imzi xeqni, čigar eser ləmsqəvin lezəbs i ala eser dəsa moš
xokra miča baba Xəji Dauts! (368,25–7)
bad breath.NOM QUOT how it.will.smell(IPFV.FUT), always QUOT
she.used.to.make(IPRF.EVID).it meal.DAT and this.NOM QUOT not PRCL
he.has.said(PERF).it her father Hadji Daut.DAT
‘How can a bad odour come from it [sc. the meal], I always used to
prepare the meal, and hardly has my father Hadji Daud said this.’

In a sense, sequence of tenses and shift of epistemic category are complementary: the controlling property is the past vs. non-past distinction in the reporting clause in the one case and in the reported clause in the other; in both cases the target is

the dependent clause. But the controlled properties are different: tense vs. epistemic status, and this explains the difference between the exceptions: 1st-person reporting, which guarantees continuing reliability, with semi-indirect speech vs. “continuing applicability” with indirect speech (Comrie 1986:284–5). But why should evidentials be used in reported speech in the first place, and why is the shift to evidential forms restricted to past time reference forms, and excluded from reported 1st-person speech? The domain of evidentiality and reported speech overlap: one meaning of evidential forms is “hearsay”, and the Georgian evidential perfect can be used in complement clauses to code this epistemic meaning (Boeder 2000:292–4): in sentences like: *I have heard/I know that she wrote the letter*, the verb *wrote* can be either in the aorist (neutral meaning) or in the perfect (“somebody told me that she wrote it”; cp. (20b, d)). — As for time reference, we may speculate that the most frequent domain of hearsay information is the past and conclusions from accessible evidence most often refer to the past. In fact, most evidential forms in the languages of the world refer to the past.⁵⁶ — Notice that future and conditional tenses (as in (71)) have an inherent relation to epistemic status (Boeder 2000:280–1). — The absence of tense shift from 1st-person speech is to be expected, too. While 2nd and 3rd-person reporter speech is “hearsay” per se,⁵⁷ this is not necessarily true for 1st-person reporter speech. It is true that a sentence like: *I told him that she wrote the letter* can have *she wrote* in the evidential perfect form if I want to give the complement clause a hearsay meaning (“I told him that, apparently, she wrote the letter”),⁵⁸ but this use does not result from the application of the tense shift rule for semi-indirect speech.⁵⁹ Notice that the perfect in (73) occurs in a question, although the opposition between evidential and non-evidential forms is normally restricted to non-modal assertions (Boeder 2000:291–2). In other words, the tense shift as described above, although originally motivated by “evidentiality”, has become a grammaticised, automatic rule of semi-indirect speech, and (73) in all probability has no “inferential” meaning: neither the story-teller nor Hadji Daud give their question an “evidential” epistemic status.

3.4.3 Distributional differences between Svan eser and rok(v)

In general, *rok(v)* (or its variant *lək*) follows the rules given above:

- (76) xəkv [sic] miča xaxvem: ‘yə rokv xola märe, leyv čotcvira i šdəmrär
sgoxqida’ (378,8–9 Mestia)
she.said his wife.ERG: ‘he.NOM QUOT bad man.NOM, meat.NOM
he.has.left(PERF).it and ears.NOM he.has.brought(PERF).them.in’
‘His wife said to him: You bad man, you left the meat and brought the
ears home.’

But there are instances of *rok(v)* with direct speech where person shift would be expected with *eser*:

- (77) *laxvčvedda: šukvži rok žaxvienax jar?* (103,6–7 apud Cantlage 1998:229)
 he asked.them: way.on quor they.met(PERF),you who.NOM?
 ‘He asked them: Who met you on your way?’

As with *eser*, the person-shift role does not (necessarily) apply to clauses with non-past tenses, even if the embedding clause has tense and person shift:

- (78) (a) *eckas eser eži kils ikeđ* (b) *i mič eser aqabe*, (c) *mare vodo-do miča*
vidiläš kvin ädyvenas, (d) *ere demgvaš rok v žeo*, (e) *eckad nomeg-u*
apışvd (Davitiani *et al.* 1957:34,27–9 apud Hewitt 1982:209)
 (a) then quor that.NOM shrieking.DAR she.leads(PRS).it (b) and he.DAR
quor she.frightens(PRS).him, (c) but until-not her sister.GEN soul.DAR
she.may.swear(SUBJ.II).on.it (d) CNJ nothing quor *It she.do/es(PRS)*.
it.to.you (e) till.then not-OPR he.let(AOR).her go
 ‘(a) Then she will begin to shriek, (b) and she will frighten you. (e) But
 do not let her go (c) until she swears on her sister’s soul (d) that she will
 do you no harm.’ (transl. Hewitt) or: ‘... (d) I will do you no harm...’

I feel unable to give a reliable rule for *rok*. Hewitt (1982:211–12) suggests that one factor determining the form of reported speech in Swan is co-referentiality of referents in the reporting and dependent clauses.⁶⁰ But while person shift seems to be optional, tense shift, as far as I can see, is not: the simple aorist *ađgarx* is unacceptable even with *rok(v)/lok* in:

- (79) *ešnjem leky, ere* ‘lat lok *ađgarx/ordagrax’ (Hewitt 1982:212)
 s/he.s/he.said, CNJ ‘yesterday quor
 *they.killed(AOR).her/they.killed(PERF.VIN).her’
 ‘S/He said: They killed him/her yesterday.’

~~because the reference of “s/he” and of “they”/“him/her” are diverse. However, more data are needed to substantiate the rule.~~

3.4.4 The development of quotatives in Swan

The historical development may be reconstructed as follows: originally, *rok(v)* was simply ‘s/he said’, used with direct speech. It has a transparent etymology like Georgian *metki* and *kvo*, in that it has developed from *rāk v* ‘s/he said it’ (Topuria 1967:248 note 2). In the southern dialects, which have contact with the “Imeretian” type of Georgian dialects, *rok(v)* replaced *eser* in the neutral contexts where no shift is required (non-past tenses, 1st-person reporter speech). As a concomitant result, *rāk v* became a clitic quotative particle and was phonetically reduced to *rok*. On the basis of partial equivalence, *rok* could extend into other areas of *eser*: on the one hand, it replaced it in semi-indirect speech, thus preserving the typical Swan form (as in (76)). On the other hand, in many contexts, it was used without shift, as it

had before, with the result that *rok(v)* occurs in more instances of non-shifted direct speech.⁶¹ This latter development could have two models, one internal and the other “external”. Firstly, there is the 1st-person reporter speech with *-əž*, which never occurs with semi-indirect speech. Second, the development could be reinforced by the Georgian type of speech reporting. This latter model has the “advantage” of avoiding the neutralization of person with its specific difficulties (see 3.4.1.1). In Kartvelian, then, we have a combined geographical expansion of two types. (1) Verb forms of “to say” like Georgian *metki* and *kvo* and Swan *rok(v)*, that are still etymologically transparent, replace non-transparent particles like Georgian *-o* and Swan *eser*. (2) Swan semi-indirect speech is more and more replaced by non-shifted variants that have the form of direct speech. If this is a general trend, there is no basis for the assumption that semi-indirect speech developed from direct speech without completely reaching the level of indirect speech (Hewitt 1982). Rather, the stricter rules of *eser* could be an archaism, while the intrusion of *rok* entails a “bleeding” of the person-shift rule.⁶²

3.5 Direct speech properties in Swan semi-indirect speech

Swan semi-indirect speech has many properties that are considered typical of direct speech in languages like English.

3.5.1 Main clause privileges in Swan semi-indirect speech

Firstly, main clause privileges like vocatives, expressive elements, formulas (see (60a), (63), (76), (86a)) and the like are preserved, but their pronouns are shifted:

- (80) *Sostruqvđ xākvy: “ixēre, miča-v māzig laxqeda, laiš-u eser zixs!”* ‘Ah,
 yetem-u eser xakdis, ž’eser dām itre miča zixs’ (394,19–22)
 Sostruq.ERG he.said.to.him: “wolf.NOM(=VOC), his-OPR pain.NOM
 it.has.come(PERF).to.him, he.drunk(AOR).it-OPR quor blood.NOM!” —
 ‘Ah, God.ERG-OPR quor he.may.avert.it.(from)him(SUBJ.II),
 he.NOM-quor I.MPOSS he.drinks(PRS).it his blood.DAR’
 ‘Sostruq said to him: Wolf, my dear, please drink my blood! — O, God
 forbid, I cannot drink your blood!’
 (81) *ōō, atx’ eser deš xār xocēmiš* (Chr 162,29 Mestia)
 o, now quor I.MPOSS they.have.it good.GEN
 ‘O, now our matters are not in a fair way!’

This combination of speaker-indexical elements with person-shift is the real “anomaly” (Hewitt 1982) in Swan speech reporting: on the basis of the shift phenomena of more or less indirect speech, speaker-indexicality normally implies non-shift in other respects; in particular, no person shift would be expected in languages such as German (Plank 1986:296). However, it is not obvious that Swan

“semi-indirect” speech is to be located somewhere on the direct-indirect speech-scale — no more so than free indirect (“experienced”) speech, to which it bears some resemblance.

3.5.2 *Non-verbaticum reported speech in Swan*

Some direct speech expressions testify to the fact that “direct speech” is not always to be understood as a realistic reproduction of reported utterances:⁶⁵ see Modern Georgian *ese da es* ‘this and this’ and *ama da am dros* ‘at that and that time’ and its Swan equivalent in:

- (82) *aš-i-aš eser xqfa* (260,32)
so-and-so QUOR he.has.done(PRRF).IT
‘He has treated me in such and such a fashion.’⁶⁶

L₄

In examples of this type, direct speech is simply reduced to those aspects of its “original” that are intersubjectively relevant where details of place, time and action can be omitted (*Mošket* 1996:73).

3.5.3 *Non-shift of deictic categories in Swan semi-indirect speech*

Last but not least, deictic expressions of time and space (like “now” in (81), (90d), “today” in (91) and “tomorrow” in (69b)) are preserved, which demonstrates their difference from “person”:

- (83) *innär eser i däv axšgebaš lädi* (245,31 = 246,4)
why QUOR and dev.NOM he.has.assaulted(PRRF).them today
‘Why? The dev assaulted us today [and ate all our bread].’

Deixis includes directional semantics (as in “come” vs. “go”, “bring” vs. “take”):
otqid ‘s/he took it (there)’ contrasts with: *oxqid* ‘s/he brought it’ as in:

- (84) *šjär labar-ü eser oxqid!* (244,11)
hands(GEN?) washwater.NOM-OPR QUOR he.brought(AOR).IT
‘Bring me water to wash my hands!’

3.6 *Embedding in Swan semi-indirect speech*

Most clauses and reported speech embedded in reported speech do not differ from their matrix clauses: conditional clauses (85a), complement clauses (86b) and embedded reported speech (41b) (if we take the conjunction *ere* as an indicator of embedding) are marked as semi-indirect:

- (85) (a) *lax ätu xäc*, (b) *ečka eser ibda-v-lics* (256,8–9)
(a) if hot he.should.have(SUBJ.I).IT (b) then QUOR
he.poured(IPRRF).IT.on.himself-OPR water.DAT
‘When you feel hot, pour the water on you.’

- (86) (a) *š, xiadül eser Xvitisavar*, (b) *mič eser mäš xaku*, (c) *aš eser xoxal* (d) *i ži-v anqäd i* [. . .] (251,24–5)
(a) a, pleasure.diminutive QUOR Khvitisavar, (b) he.DAT QUOR what.NOM he.wants(PRS).IT, (c) so QUOR he.knows(PRS).IT (d) and PRV-OPR he.came(AOR) and [. . .]
‘O well, Khvitisavar, you know well what I want anyway. Come on and [. . .]?’

Repeated embedding poses an interesting question: how do the quotatives conditioned by the different layers of clauses interfere? Gudgedjiani and Palmaitis (1986:35) give an example:

- (87) (a) *mi xväka Šikos*: (b) *babas-ež xäka*, (c) *čüž* [= *ču+u+ež*] *eser atčem*,
(d) *mič-ež mäna xožib*
(a) I I.said.to.him Šiko.DAT: (b) dad.DAT-QUOR say(AOR.IMP).to.him,
(c) PRV-OPR-QUOR QUOR he.mowed(AOR), (d) he.DAT-QUOR not he.can
‘(a) I told Šiko: (b) Tell thy dad: (c) Do mow, (d) he cannot.’

ež is used in (b)–(d) because the whole sentence is reported 1st-person speech. In other words, as in the examples given above, the quotative marking “percolates” into the lowest clause of the sentence. *eser* in (c), on the other hand, seems to be triggered by the second person of the imperative “(you) tell him” in (b), because it is a reported instruction (see 3.3.1). The result is double quotative marking in one and the same clause. “You” (subject of imperative) in (b) is not shifted because (a) is reported 1st-person speech, whereas “he” in (d), although it is co-referential with “I” in (a), has no 1st-person counterpart in (b) and therefore cannot appear as a 1st person. As we saw above (3.4.1.2), the rule works from the top downwards, and the resulting orientation of the lower reporting clause overrides the orientation of the higher clause.⁶⁵ Notice, however, that my own informant found a non-shifted variant of (87) (without quotative particles) more natural:

- (87') (a) *mi xväka Šikos*: “(b) *babas xäka*, (c) *ere čvädčemas*, *mi mäni mižib*”
(CG)
(a) I I.said.to.him Šiko.DAT: “(b) father.DAT tell.him, (c) that he.should.mow(SUBJ.II), I not I.can”.⁶⁶

As *Ebert* (1986:151,156) points out, pragmatic speech-act orientation of its participants (i.e., avoidance of 3rd person for the actual speaker and hearer) is natural in even in those languages where indirect speech does not exist. (87') is an attempt to remedy “unnaturalness” against the workings of the general rule.⁶⁷

3.7 *Swan embedded clauses without shift*

⁶⁵ *Vat thava ceam tv ha arantiamm: fva imdanan the vlabian: daram: im: (CG): im: . . .*

(afterthought) position has a non-shifted form without quotative. Indeed, semi-indirect speech can “fade away” in long passages of reported speech. Such a transition from semi-indirect to a long direct speech without quotative we find in:

- (88) *jayv atx' eser lax čvādyanvəns, ečk' eser yo ka čqint xetni i ečas Zurabū atžax. mi ečcvire lalsgura čžžs, [. . .]* (232,15–17)
 PRCL now quor if she.should.become.pregnant(SUBJ.II), then quor
 PRCL PRV boy.NOM he.will.borne(FUT).to.her and that.DAT
 Zurab.NOM.OPR she.called(AOR).him. I.I.will.leave(FUT).you
 to.sit(on(PART) horse.DAT [. . .]
 ‘Now, if you should become pregnant, then you will give birth to a boy,
 and call him Zurab. I will leave you a riding horse.’ [four more lines in
 direct speech]

But the opposite case, a transition from direct speech to indirect speech, also seems to occur: Deeters (1930:184) offers examples from the Lashkh dialect where indirect speech forms begin in the second clause of the sentence and even inside the clause. These cases still await a careful study.

3.8 The devs' speech in Svayn

The devs, bad, clumsy giants in Caucasian fairy tales, have their own “language”, characterised by the special particle *unqvs*. This particle seems to occur with direct speech only, and in the same clitic position as the quotative particles. As far as I can see, *unqvs* and the “normal” quotative particles are in complementary distribution:

- (89) *xočā-v unqvs ladāy žārxl* (Chr 155,20–1)
 good-OPR unqvs day.NOM you.have.it
 ‘May you unqvs have a good day!’ (German Guten Tag!)
- (90) (a) *ečka dāv laxčvėddā*. (b) ‘jār-unqvs lāsv alā?’ — (c) ‘ž' eser lamār Rostom.’ — (d) ‘Rostom eser mič atxe mād otkvarāiā žuyva-te?’ — (e) ‘mičāš-šāl xol' eser mād li: (f) corev eser xaldēna i kāmteklī.’ (235,31–5)
 (a) then dev.NOM he.asked.him: (b) ‘who.NOM-unqvs he.was this.NOM?’ — (c) ‘he.NOM quor he.has.been(PERR.EVID) Rostom.NOM’ — (d) ‘Rostom.NOM quor he.DAT now not he.has.thrown(PERR) him sea-into?’ — (e) ‘his-like bad.NOM quor not he.is: (f) swimming.NOM quor he.has.known(PERR).it and he.has.returned(PERR).out’
 ‘(a) Then the dev asked him: (b) Who unqvs was this? (c) — I was it, Rostom. — (d) Didn't I throw Rostom into the sea now? — (e) I am not so bad as you: (f) I knew swimming and came back out of it.’⁶⁸

- (91) *māi eser xaku?* — *māi eser i ladi moxāřž eser žā li* (Chr 162,20 Ipar)
 what.NOM quor he.wants(PRS).it? — what quor and today
 bearer.of.tribute.NOM quor he.NOM quor he.is
 ‘[Sosturg says:] What do you want? — [The dev answers:] What else
 than that you must bear me the tribute today?’

As we see in (90d) and (91), the devs otherwise use “normal Svayn”, including Svayn semi-indirect speech in clauses without *unqvs* (see (90b) vs. (90c)). — Both *unqvs* and the quotatives signal different “voices” in speech. We may say that *unqvs* offers an example of overlap between the marking of speech reporting and the function of characterizing individuals or “species” — similar to the distinct language characteristics of different animals found e.g. in San (“Bushman”) fairy tales (Westermann 1940:7). In a sense, speaker-indexicality is one of the functions of reported speech.

4. Conclusion

1. Georgian and Svayn share some formal features of speech reporting that are quite common in the languages of the Near East and of Europe: reported speech tends to be preceded by a conjunction both with indirect and direct speech; local and temporal indexical expressions tend to be preserved in all types of reported speech; tense shift (consecutio temporum) tends to be avoided; and both languages use quotative particles that differentiate between 1st-person and non-1st-person speech reporting — a distinction that recurs in other languages of the Near East like Late Akkadian (Soden 1952 § 121b) and Elamite (Khackijān 1998: 61–2) and fits well into the picture of languages that differentiate between the epistemic status of direct experience and that of indirect experience (evidentiality). The rules for the quotative particles are based on speech act meaning, not on the morpho-syntactic form of a reporting clause.

2. In spite of genetic relationship and long-lasting contact, the two languages differ in some respects: while Georgian has indirect and direct speech, with a definite preference for the latter, Svayn has (free) direct speech, semi-indirect speech and indirect speech, the latter being restricted to “real” complement clauses. Svayn semi-indirect speech is characterised by a shift of epistemic status category (use of evidential forms) and by a person shift. This latter shift also affects expressions known for their main clause privilege (for instance vocatives). However, semi-indirect speech is restricted to non-1st-person speech and — largely — to past tense clauses, restrictions that are related to the epistemic status of reported speech (see 3.4).

3. Person shift in Svayn works from the top downwards. It is orientated

towards the actual speech act to the extent that its reporting clause is orientated towards the actual speech act. The orientation of a lower reporting clause overrules the orientation of the higher clauses.

4. Quotative particles tend to develop from verb forms of "to say" and to replace non-transparent particles. Swan semi-indirect speech tends to be replaced by the Georgian type of direct speech; it is an open question whether direct speech is more easily processed than semi-indirect speech in a face-to-face language such as Swan, but by partly neutralising the opposition of 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, it can obscure personal reference.

5. The function of the different types of speech reporting has not been studied here. But there is good reason to say that direct or semi-indirect speech is the preferred variant in the Kartvelian. This preference is no less a characteristic feature of these languages than their categorical rules, and it is a task of future research to look for other linguistic features that co-vary with this preference.

Notes

* My thanks go to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, which supported work on part of the Swan materials on which the present study is based. I wish to express my gratitude to Ciuri Gablani (Mestia) and Aleksandre Oniani (Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi) for their most generous and patient help over the years: they translated large portions of the Upper Bal text collections for me into Georgian. A. Oniani also kindly checked the interpretation of many Swan verb forms. However, they should not be held responsible for any misunderstandings contained in this article. I also thank Chato Gudgediani (Mestia) for providing me with Swan translations of some test sentences. — I am indebted to Kevin Tuite (University of Montreal) and in particular to George Hewitt (School of Oriental and African Studies, London: letter of Nov. 11th, 2000, hereafter: p.c.) for extremely valuable critical comments and corrections; to Gernot Wilhelm (University of Würzburg) for information on Akkadian and Elamite; to Robert McLaughlin (University of Oldenburg) for correcting the English of an early version of this chapter; and to Manfred von Roncador for his unending patience as an editor and, last not least, for encouraging me to write a contribution to this volume in the first place.

1. See e.g. Deeters (1930); for a recent survey see *Hewitt and Crisp* (1986).
2. See *Roncador* (1988) for a profound analysis of reference shift.
3. See e.g. *Li* (1986) for an elaboration of co-reference rules ("pronominalisation strategies").
4. See *Topuria* (1967:130–6; 191–3); *Tuite* (1997:31); *Oniani* (1998:205–7). For some discussion of Swan evidentials see *Sumbatova* (1999).
5. The most complete historical survey of Georgian direct and indirect speech is *Žigjuri* (1973:177–207).

6. The Kartvelian languages have **polypersonal** verb forms that can be used as self-contained sentences ("pro-drop", verb-external "zero anaphora"). In the following, the glosses do not mirror the polysynthetic structure of the verb forms; for the sake of simplicity, they give a paraphrase rather than an analysis. Also, the very frequent sequence: "... said(AOR).it..." will be simplified as: "... said..." in the glosses.

The following abbreviations are used: Bl = Bleichsteiner 1931; CG = Ciuri Gablani; ĆG = Čato Gudgediani; Chr = Šanize — Kaldani (edd.) 1978; Ć = Pionti 1974; GX = Marr 1911; I = G. Imnaisvili 1974; Inf = informants from Mestia; other abbreviations refer to private letter writers.

7. See the extensive study by *Kieckers* (1915–16: 14–34) with data from Armenian, Ancient and Modern Greek (in particular in the former Greek dialects of Turkey), Modern Persian, Turkish (*ki*), Lithuanian, Coptic, and many other languages. *Kieckers* also discusses the possibility of calquing (e.g. of a grecism in Romance languages, Old Church Slavonic and Gothic).

8. Cp. *Our Father* as a noun and Latin *tum vero suo more victoriam conclamant* (Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* 5,37,3) "Then they shouted "Victory!", as they were used to". For more details see *Hahn* (1929); *Boeder* (1985b).

9. This history of *vitar(med)* parallels that of the Old Greek conjunction *hos* 'how, so > that'.

10. *Qopil ars* is an analytic perfect form. It is also probable that (b) has an inferential meaning ("from what I understand I conclude that this has not been the common meal").

11. The Old Georgian examples of "indirect speech" cited by *Žigjuri* (1965:97) are not particularly convincing. Complement clauses like the following involve more than simple person shift: *ubrganē, romel ertxel cize-d movides* (GrX LXVIII 70) command.him, CNJ once fortress-Adv he.should come 'Tell him that he should come once to the fortress'; *utxa Rut dedamti-sa twis-sa, sada-igē kriba* (Ruth 2,19) she.told.her Ruth mother.in-law-DAT her.own-DAT, where-PRC.R she.collected 'Ruth told her mother-in-law where she had gleaned!'.
12. *Xundaze* (1901:126–30 cp. *Žigjuri* 1965). — *Schuchardt* (1902:369–70) in his interesting review of this pedagogic grammar rightly stresses the natural preference for direct speech in Georgian, but he seems to have misunderstood *Xundaze*'s terminology: "Es verhält sich also gerade umgekehrt wie der Verfasser meint: die direkte Rede stehe dem Georgischen nicht an; durch die angegebenen Anhangsel wird ja die Rede nicht zur indirekten." *Xundaze* distinguishes between "direct speech" (*pirdapiri mimatva*) and speech "with particles" (*naqlakebit*), which is *not* "indirect speech".

13. Cp. the proverb: *var-s gawqare da ur-s ševqare-o woe-DAT I.moved.away.from.it and dear.me-DAT I.met.with.it-quot* 'I left a "Woe!", and I met with a "Dear me!"'.
14. Cp. word formations like: *zarnac* 'lazy' < *zar-mac* 'fear-it.is.laid.on.me 'I fear/hesitate to do something'); *dačemba* 'to usurp' < *da-čem-eba* *PRAV-my-Suffix* 'to say "it's mine"'.
15. See, however, *Hewitt and Crisp* (1986:123–8). As far as I can see, the problem of shift in reported speech is not discussed in native Georgian grammars.

16. The following example was deemed "old-fashioned" by one informant: *utxari, rom cota*

- darnaviandeba-ko* (Šanize 1955:106) tell him/her, CNJ little I will be (FUT) late-quor 'Tell him/her I will be a bit late!'. See also note 30 below.
17. See Žigūri (1973:192); Škita (1972:192).
18. Compare the European literary tradition that shuns the constant repetition of "s/he said".
19. In this regard, the quotative particle is similar to a resumptive pronoun after postposed relative clauses of the type (60f-g) below, which is very common in the Kartvelian languages, in particular in Mingrelian.
20. In the collection of Tonli (1996:256–61), only 8 out of 37 examples with *-o* are clause-final, but not postverbal; the numbers for *-ko* (see below 2.5) are: 4 out of 31, and for *-meki*: 2 out of 36.
21. Žigūri (1973:202); Boeder (1985a). — Šanize (1973:610 § 650) explains this usage by invoking explicit or implicit expressions introducing the proverb: *nakvamia* and *tkmula* 'it is said', *amboben* and *iqviyan* 'they say' (cp. Quintilianus IX 2,37 *incertae personae factae oratio*). However, direct speech is autonomous (see 2.9).
22. The first examples of *meki* and *ko* are found in a 10th–11th cent. manuscript: *Marxvata sakitzavebi* (ed. I. Abulaze apud Erelšvili 1962:184, note 1); see also Harris and Campbell (1995:410 with note 25). — Činčarauli (1960:114) points out that speakers are well aware of the difference between dialects with regard to quotative particles: in one poem, a Khevsurian says: *me ki čarnave Kazeta, k'let magiera xenia* [...] "xolme" *da "meki" siqviyani satkmelad sakvirehnia*. 'But I came to Kakhetia, where there are trees instead of rocks [...] The use of the words *xolme* ['use to'] and *meki* is remarkable [in Kakhetia].'
23. Žigūri (1973:446); Harris and Campbell (1995:170).
24. See Žigūri (1973:446), who interprets this as a sign of becoming "functionally opaque". — On the development of the particles *meki/ko* see Harris and Campbell (1995:168–70).
25. Quotative *-o* is not. A development *tkua* 's/he said' > *ko* > *o* (Topuria 1985:143), although it conforms to a frequent source of quotative particles (see 3.4.4), is phonetically arbitrary and in no way necessary.
26. Harris and Campbell (1995:410–11, note 30).
27. Kačarava (1950:256); Topuria — Giginėšvili (1970:166); Žigūri (1973:198–9), Hewitt (1984a:358).
28. Topuria and Giginėšvili (1970:165); Žigūri (1973:195, 198).
29. See Ebert (1986:155) for a Newari parallel with switch reference in clauses embedded in questions.
30. If it is the speaker of the sentence who cannot come, a different construction is preferred: *čem-ze utxari šen-s col-s, ver mova-ko* (Inf) me-on tell (AOR.IMP).it.to.her your-DAR wife-DAR, IMPOSS he.will.come-quor 'Tell your wife that I, the speaker, will be unable to come'. I have the impression that the use of the conjunction *rom* in (33) (see note 16 above) would suggest the reading where the "I" refers to the speaker of the sentence (*utxari*

- šen-s col-s, rom ver mova-ko*). If this is correct, the use of a conjunction makes reported speech more "indirect".
31. For a collection of examples, see Kvančaliani (1990:17–18); Suxišvili (1999).
32. Škita (1972:61) assumes a zero introducer (*nulonani čemtrveli* 'null inserter') in reported dialogues without verbs of saying; for "ellipsis" see Quintilianus IX 2,37 *detractum est enim qui dixeret*.
33. The deficiency of person-marking in quotative particles does not in itself contradict their verblikeness, because it occurs in many finite verb forms of languages like English, too. (For a different view, see Harris and Campbell 1995:410 note 26.)
34. A somewhat similar idea with regard to *meki/ko* is found in Harris's comment on Žigūri's example of Kakhetian: *meki gaetrie dkeidan* (Žigūri 1973:446) 'I said drag yourself away from here' with *meki* in initial position, which behaves like a finite verb: 'in this dialect the change is incomplete' (Harris and Campbell 1995:410 note 27). — There is not the slightest evidence, however, that (35) is the survival of an older construction (in fact, it is rather doubtful if *-o* was a "real" verb in prehistoric times). Rather, the intermediate position of the quotatives may receive several different historical interpretations. For instance, the construction in (35) could be the result of a secondary analogy between quotatives and verbs of saying.
35. It is interesting that Kačarava (1950:252) considers the co-occurrence of Mingrelian *mak ptkvi* = Georgian *meki vtkvi* 'quor I said, it' a case of Georgian influence. *mak(i)š* < *ma ptkvi* corresponds exactly to *meki* < *me vtkvi* (Kipšidze 1914:142). However, Kačarava (1950:249) considers *-k* an "addition" (*darnuli*). The Mingrelian–Laz equivalent of *-ko* is *-šo*, which has no convincing etymology so far (but see Kačarava 1950:252). Only *-a* with its variants unambiguously corresponds to Georgian *-o*. Notice that *-a* occurs before clause-final conjunctions: *dovyuri-a-v-a-da, do mingaria-a* I.will.die-linking.element-quor-linking.element-when, and weep.for.me-quor 'If I die, mourn for me' (Kačarava 1950:255).
36. Čkobava (1936:136) also gives *deri*, which seems to be *dədi* 's/he said'. Bertt Brendemoen (University of Oslo, letter of Febr. 18th, 2000) informs me that *deri* does not occur in his Turkish dialect materials from the Atina/Pazar region.
37. For the rest of this chapter, simple numbers in the brackets refer to the volume of Upper Swan texts edited by A. Šanize and V. Topuria (1939a), specifically to texts from the village of Mulakh, if not stated otherwise.
38. See e.g. Šanize and Topuria (1939:267–9).
39. Cp. "žekar" = "mekar" = *šv gveš dem eser isk'iti* (Davitiani 1974:198,11) "I told you" = "you told me" = INSTR matter not quor it.will.be.done 'By saying: "I told you" and: "You told me" there is nothing done'; *meduk'ən xevv'āmiel i "dab'andi, dab'andi" -s xaqle* (52,15–16) shopkeeper.NOM he.is(PRS).grateful.to.them and "take.a.seat, take.a.seat" = DAR he.says(PRS).to.them 'The shopkeeper was very grateful to them and said: Sit down! Sit down!', where *dab(i)zandi* is a Georgian polite form; as Wigger observes for Irish (1998:981), the foreign language of the "original speech" very strongly tends to be preserved.

40. For some attempts to describe an interaction between *ere*, quotative, and person identity relations between main and dependent clauses, see *Hewitt* (1982).
41. The etymology of *-əʒ* and *eser* is unknown. Topuria (1985:143) reports a proposal to connect *eser* with Armenian *aser* 's/he said', but this would not explain the syntax and position of *eser*, and I see no reason for a borrowing from this language.
42. Itoni (1975:41–2), relying on information given by A. Davitiani (probably a speaker of Lower Bal), has a fourth quotative particle *oyv*, without however offering an example. According to him, *rokv* is more used with the future (*momavis gagebis natkvami*), while *oyv* refers to past speech. This must be a misunderstanding: *oyv* is a variant of the optative particle *-u*, and if there is any time reference in these particles, *-oyv* refers to the future. On the other hand, it remains to be explained why my informants, too, sometimes mistook *-u* for a quotative particle (Georgian *-o*).
43. According to Topuria (1985:143), *-əʒ* is also used with 2nd-person speaker reporters. I could not confirm this use, but maybe it is the instructional meaning that he had in mind.
44. According to Šaragenziz (1958:248), the Lower Bal dialect of Tskhumar has *-id* instead of *-əʒ*.
45. Similarly in a text from Becho (Davitiani *et al.* 1957:54,28–30). — However, the speeches of the *kady* (sorcerers) in an Upper Bal text from Ushguli (61,26–32) have *rok*. The speeches of three wives in a text from Mestia (Chr 168,9–10), on the other hand, all have *eser*.
46. Ivane Nizargze, the author of a Russian-Svan dictionary from 1910 and originating from Ushguli, offers only *rok* as a translation of Russian *mol'*! — Among the Lower Bal dialects of Upper Swanetia (see "map" at the beginning of Section 3.), most have *eser* and a few occurrences of *rok* in the texts, in particular in Eiser (with old connections to the south), while Becho (a village somewhat remote from the main valley) has almost no occurrence of *rok*. Similarly, the Upper Bal dialect texts have almost exclusively *eser* (with an average of 10 instances per page!), in particular in Mialakh (which is again "communicatively" more remote from the southern regions). — In addition to possible pragmatic and processing factors, a variational study would have to consider sociolinguistic factors as well: in the Upper Bal village of Ipar, halfway between Mialakh and Ushguli, *eser* predominates in the texts, but the members of two families seem to prefer *rok* or its preferred Lower Svan variant *lok*!
47. This is also the position of the Hittite quotative particle, see Friedrich (1960:148–9); for Kartvelian clisis, see Boeder (1994).
48. My informants tend to translate it by Georgian *tviton* 'her/himself'.
49. See Tuite (1997:43); Boeder, forthcoming.
50. There seems to be no reason, then, why *ʒal/miž* should be "a special pronoun" (Tuite 1997:40). Its remote similarity to "long distance reflexives" and logophoric anaphora remains to be determined.
51. Cp. Gudgediani and Palmantis (1986:36): "If the speaker refers to himself but is not the 1st person, forms of the 1st person cannot be used."

52. Under my interpretation, then, this example is not due to an "influence of narration on the psychic disposition of the speaker himself" (Čanlaze 1998:233), but a perfectly normal person shift: It is also not true that in Svan speech reporting "if the verb is 3rd person, then a pronoun must also be 3rd person, and there is no mixing" (Čanlaze ib. 229). — In a poetic text, a 1st-person speaker tells about his encounter with another Svan who threatens him; in spite of the 1st-person speaker's pacifying speech, the other Svan levels his gun at him and says: *dem rokv igni ž' ežkad, vode / mišgva ziss rokv do lağtarei* (Sanjze *et al.* 1939b:66, no. 21, 21–3) not quor he.will.stand.there he.nom so.long, as /my blood.dar quor not he.will.drink if I will stay here until I drink your blood! Čanlaze (1998:229) finds fault with the Georgian translation, which has "your blood", as in English, whereas Svan has "my blood". But this is exactly what we expect: the Svan pronoun is orientated towards the understood reporting clause: "he said to me", whereas the Georgian and English translations have the pronouns of direct speech. The 1st-person of direct speech ("I will stay"), on the other hand, is shifted, because its counterpart is 3rd person in the understood reporting clause ("He said...").
53. Still, there may be examples that do not fit into the picture. For example, one informant offered me: *lat ežnem nākvin: "maxar eser qedni mišgva-te"* (Inf) yesterday s/he erg s/he.said.to.me: "tomorrow quor s/he.comes.(prs) me.to" Yesterday, s/he said to me: I will come to you tomorrow', where the 2nd person ("to you") of the reported clause is correctly shifted to 1st person because it refers to the (actual) speaker ("to me"), whereas the 1st-person subject of the underlying reported clause is shifted to 3rd person because it refers to a non-participant of the speech act ('s/he said"). Afterwards, however, my informant corrected *mišgva* into *isgvate* 'to,you', with the speaker-addressee reversal typical of direct speech. But the reported clause refers to the future, where the "underlying" direct speech variant *qedni isgvate* 'I,come to,you' is an option according to the rule. So the correction could be a contamination of the two admissible versions (semi-indirect speech with *qedni mišgva* and non-shifted direct speech with *qedni isgvate*).
54. "Hand in Hand mit der Personenverschiebung geht eine Tempusverschiebung."
55. See Boeder (2000).
56. It is a common feature of evidentiality that it is optional with non-past tenses (Kozinceva 1994:100) and that "it is not marked in future, and there is typically no secondhand specification in present tense" (Alkhenvald and Dixon 1998:247).
57. A sentence like: *si qele, ere emtādełxi you you.say.(prs), cni you.went.(prp:evd)* 'you say that you went' (*Hewitt* 1982:212) is unacceptable and must be marked by *lok*. On the other hand, speakers do not give their assertions about themselves a "hearsay" or inferential status (except in rare cases where they were unconscious of what they did). For similar reasons, an evidential form would be strange in: *mi ʒaqlē (ere) cigns-iž xviwānīs I I.say.(prs).it.to.you (cni) book.dar-quor I was.reading.(prp:f)* 'it I tell you that I was reading the book' (ib. p. 211).
58. Compare the following examples elicited by *Hewitt* (1982:211): *mi ʒaqlē (ere) lat-iž adğarx/ otadğarx I I.say.(prs).to.you (cni) yesterday-quor they.killed(AOR).her/they.apparently.killed.(prp:evd).her* 'I tell you that they killed her yesterday/that they apparently killed her yesterday'.
59. This is perhaps what *Hewitt* (1982:211) had in mind: "Where the main verb's subject

- is 1st person, the inferentials will not be used if that same 1st person functions in any way within the dependent clause, otherwise the inferential necessarily indicates that the information is hearsay or inferred in some way".
60. Hewitt's comment on (79) is: "if the main verb's subject is not a participant in the dependent clause, then not only may the speech-particle be omitted, but it is no longer obligatory to substitute the inferential for the indicative" (1982:212).
61. Čanlaga (1998:233-4) gives some examples where the Lashkh text of Arsenia Oniani has *lok* with direct speech, whereas its Upper Bal translation, again with *lok*, has person shift. However, as the contexts are unavailable to me, I am unable to check their relevance here.
62. G. Hewitt (p.c.) rightly points out to me that the two possibilities are not necessarily mutually exclusive: "failure to develop fully *oratio obliqua* and contamination from (say) Georgian, with its preference for *oratio recta*". But disregarding glottogenic speculation, I do not see any indication of an earlier stage when Swan had no (or less) "indirectness" in reported speech.
63. For a detailed study of direct speech elements that cannot reproduce an "original" speech "realistically", see *Roncador* (1988:88-126).
64. Cp. *eṭiṣ-i-eṭi so* (and so) much' (332,20); *ependiṣ eser niča bedži amži iari oxazza* [...] (369,18) *ependi-DAT QUOR her concerning so-so letter-nom he has-written(PERF)*; it 'The *ependi* wrote *such and such a letter* about you [...]' (cp. 52,26 Lendler).
65. The rule given by Gudgedjiani and Palmatis (1986:35-6) reads as follows: "If the speaker mentions himself in the 3rd person [as in (d)], -*ž* and *eser* are to be used together, -*ž* relating to the 1st and *eser*-to the 2nd or to the 3rd person. [...] As can be seen, direct speech is used in Swan when it is double, i.e. when one quotation is subordinated to another." The term "direct speech" seems to be applied here in the sense of "non-shift of person", but I do not see how this applies to (c) and (d).
66. For G. Hewitt (p.c.), "this looks suspiciously like a "foreign" influence in order to avoid the complexities discussed earlier [in this article]. One could well imagine a Georgian saying: *me utxari Sikos: mamas utxari, tom momkas — me ar šemiṣia(-meṭi)* 'I told him Siko-DAT father-DAT tell him, that he shall now(SUB,II) — I not I am able to(-QUOR)' in order to avoid having to sort out to logically anticipated, but actually impermissible: *... *mamas utxari-meṭi, momki-žo-meṭi — me ar šemiṣia-meṭi* ... father-DAT tell him-QUOR, now(IMP)-QUOR-QUOR I not I am able to-QUOR".
67. For some discussion, see *Roncador* (1988:122).
68. Other examples: 162,23; 240,27; 243,34; 245,13; 16; 390,25sqq; Chr 154,1; 10; 12; 18-20.

References

- Abesaze, Nia. 1978. "Gränobis da kma-bʒanebis gamomxatvel zmnata šemcveli kveçqobili çnadadebebi Svamurši". *Tbilis: Universiṣeṣi Šromebi* 200: 5-20.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. W. Dixon 1998. "Evidentials and areal typology: a case study from Amazonia". *Language Studies* 20: 241-57.
- Bleichsteiner, Robert. 1919. *Kaukasische Forschungen. Erster Teil: Georgische und mingrelische Texte* (Osten und Orient. Erste Reihe: Forschungen 1). Wien: Verlag des Forschungsinstituts für Osten und Orient.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1982. Review of I. Tverdazge: *Kartuli prozodiṣ sakixebi* 1978. *Bedi Kartisa* 40: 384-6.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1985a. "La structure du proverbe géorgien". *Revue des Etudes Géorgiennes et Caucasiennes* 1: 97-115.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1985b. "Zur Grammatik des Vokativs in den Kartwelsprachen". In Ursula Pieper and Gerhard Stükel (eds.): *Studia Linguistica Diachronica et Synchronica. Werner Winter Sexagenario Anno MCMLXXXIII gratis animis ab eius collegis, amicis discipulisque oblata*. Berlin, New York and Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 55-80.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1993-94. "Semantisch-pragmatische Tendenzen in der Entwicklung der algeorgischen Satzgefüge". *Iberial-Kavkasiuri Enatmeçrebiṣ Çiçiduli/Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics* 20/21: 24-46.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1994. "Kartwelische und indogermanische Syntax: Die algeorgischen Klitika". In Roland Bielmeier and Reinhard Stempel unter Mitarbeit von René Lanzewert (eds.): *Indogermanica et Caucasia. Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 6). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 447-71.
- Boeder, Winfried. 2001. "Protasis und Apodosis in den Kartwelsprachen". In *Varlam Topuria 100*. Tbilis: Tbilis Universiṣeṣi gamomcnoloba, 31-45
- Boeder, Winfried. forthcoming. "Anapher im Swanischen".
- Čanlaga, Iza. 1998. *Kartvelologiuri ziebani* I. Tbilis: Kartuli Ena.
- Çikobava, Arnold. 1936. *Çanuris grammatikuli analizi tekstebiuri/Analyse grammaticale du dialecte thane (laze) avec les textes*. Tbilis: SSRK Mecnierebata Akademis Sakartvelos Piliṣis gamocena.
- Çimçarauli, Aleks. 1960. *Xevsurulis taviseburebani. Tekstia da indeks*. Tbilis: Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Akademis gamocmoloba.
- Davitiani, Aleks. 1974. *Svanuri andazebi*. Akaki Šantija da Maksime Kaldanis redakciṣ (Masalebi Kartvelur enata šecavlatavis V). Tbilis: Mecniereba.
- Davitiani, Aleks, Varlam Topuria and Maksime Kaldani. 1957. *Svanuri prozodiṣ tekstebi II. Balskvemouri klio/Svanske prozavestkie teksty II. Nižneval'skoe nareçie* (Masalebi Kartvelur enata šecavlatavis III). Tbilis: Mecniereba.
- Deeters, Gerhard. 1930. *Das khatwelische Verbum. Vergleichende Darstellung des Verbalbaus der südkaukasischen Sprachen* (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig. Forschungsinstitut für Indogermanistik, Sprachwissenschaftliche Abteilung. Band 1). Leipzig: Markert & Petters.
- Doiže, Givi. 1975. *Xevsuruli tekstebi (leksikonituri)/Chevurskie teksty*. Tbilis: Tbilis Universiṣeṣi gamomcnoloba.
- Çigiguri, Šota. 1956. *Kartuli dialektis krestomatia leksikonituri*. Tbilis: Samecniero-metoduri Kabineṣis gamomcnoloba
- Çigiguri, Šota. 1965. "Tribi meçvelebiṣ dasacavad". *Çiçkari* 1965, 7: 94-101.

- Šigviri, Šota. 1973. *Kavširebi Kartul enaši/Conjunctions in the Georgian Language*. Tbilisi: Tbilis universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Šikha, Nel. 1972. "Svata siqva Kartuliš" /Cužaja reč' v gruzinskom jazyke. *Kartuli Ena da Literatura Školaš* 1972.2: 59–63.
- Šikha, Nel. 1976. "Načlakani pirdapiri nakvanis scavleba VIII klasiš" /Izučenie prjamoj reči s časticej v VIII klasse. *Kartuli Ena da Literatura Školaš* 1976.4: 23–6.
- Erdlišvili, Parnaoz. 1962 [1963]. *Rtuli cinadadebis istoriavis Kartuliš I: Hipoiakis sakixebi* (Axali Kartuli Enis Katedis Šromebi 4). Tbilisi: Tbilis Universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1960. *Hebräisches Elementarbuch*. 1. Teil: *Kurzgefaßte Grammatik*. Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Plonti, Aleksandre. 1974. *Kartuli zyprebi. Šadgina, šeswali da šenišvebi dauro A. Glorima*. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- Plonti, Aleksandre. 1975. "Svata siqvis o dialogiš". In *Xalvuri prozis enisa da sihis sakixebi/Voprosy jazyka i sihia narodnoj prozy*. Tbilisi: Tbilis Universitetis gannomcemloba, 39–43.
- Plonti, Aleksandre. 1996. *Kartuli cinadadeba. Savarjiso masala sintaksi*. Meotce ševsebuli gannocma. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- Gudjedžiani, Chato and Mykolas L. Palmaitis. 1986. *Upper Swan: Grammar and texts/Cato Gudjedžiani and Mykolas L. Palmaitis: Aukštūnių Swanų kalbos gramatika su tekstų pavyzdžiais* (Kalbotyra XXXVII (4) Kalbų aprašai: Swanų kalba). Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1975. "Gaps in grammar and culture". In M. Dale Kinkade, Kenneth L. Hale and Oswald Werner (eds.): *Linguistics and Anthropology. In Honor of C.F. Voegelin*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press, 295–315.
- Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Imnaišvili, Grigol. 1974. *Kartliuri dialekti II: Teksiebi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Imnaišvili, Ivane. 1975. *Sinuri miravtavi. Gamokleba da leksikoni/Sinajski mnogolav (pervaja gruzinskaja datirovannaja rukopis' 864 goda. Issledovanie i slovar')* (Sveli Kartuli Enis Katedis Šromebi 17). Tbilisi: Tbilis Universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Káčarava, Giorgi. 1950. "Svata siqvis načlakebi Kartulsa da Zanurši (Megrul-Zanurši)" /Časticy kosvennoj reči v gruzinskom i zanskom (megrel'sko-čanskom) jazykach. *Studentita samecnierio šromebis krebuli* 5: 242–57.
- Khacišjan, Margaret. 1998. *The Elamite Language* (Documenta Asiana 4). Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- Kipšidze, I. 1914. *Grammatika mingrel'skogo (ivertskago) jazyka s' chrestomatijei i slovareni* (Materialy po jafetičeskomu jazykoznaniju VII). S.-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- Kozinceva, Natalija A.. 1994. "Kategorija evidencial'nosti (problemy tipologičeskogo analiza)". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1994.3: 92–104.
- Kutscher, Silvia, Johanna Mattissen and Anke Wodarg. 1995. *Das Mur'af-Lazische* (Arbeitspapier Nr. 24 (Neue Folge)). Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Köln.
- Kvanitšiani, Leila. 1990. *Kartuli zepiri meqvelebis sintaksis sakixebi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

- Marr, Nikolaj Ja. 1911. *Georgij Merčulj: Žitie sv. Grigorija Chandat'jiskago*. Gruzinskij tekst". Vvedenie, izdanie, perevod" N. Marra [...]. S.-Peterburg".
- Omiani, Aleksandre. 1998. *Svanuri ena (ponologisa da morfologis sakixebi)* (Kartvelologuri biblioteka 2). Tbilisi: Sulxan-Saba Orbelianis saxelobis Tbilis Saxelmčipo Pedagogiuri Universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Šaniže, Akaki. 1955. *Kartuli enis gramatika*. Naclii II: *Sintaksi martčeris sakixebiturt* (VII–VIII klasis saxelmgyvanelo). Tbilisi: Saxelgami.
- Šaniže, Akaki. 1973. *Kartuli enis gramatikis sapgyvlebi I. Morpologia*. Meore gannocma. Tbilisi: Tbilis Universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Šaniže, Akaki and Maksime Kaldani (eds.). 1978. *Svanuri krestomatia. Teksiebi šekribes A. Šanižem, M. Kaldanna da Z. Čamburizem* (Sveli Kartuli Enis Katedis Šromebi 21). Tbilisi: Tbilis Universitetis gannomcemloba.
- Šaniže, Akaki and Varlam Topuria (eds.). 1939a. *Svanuri prozauli teksiebi I. Balženouri klio. Teksiebi šekribes A. Šanižem da V. Topuriam* (Masalebi Kartvelur enata šesgavlisarvis I). Tbilisi: SSRK Mecnierebata Akademis Sakartvelos Pilihis gannomcemloba.
- Šaniže, A., V. Topuria and M. Gučęjani (eds.). 1939b. *Svanuri poezia I: Simyerebi. Teksiebi šekribes da Kartulad targmes Akaki Šanižem, Varlam Topuriam, Meri Gučęjania/ Pošie svane I: Chansons recueillies et traduites en géorgien par A. Chanidzé, V. Topuria et M. Goudjedžiani* (Masalebi Kartvelur enata šesgavisarvis II). Tbilisi: SSRK Mecnierebata Akademis Sakartvelos Pilihis gannomcemloba.
- Šarageniže, Tinatin. 1946. "Dargopiti načlakebi Svanurši" /Oricatel'nye časticy v svanskom jazyke. *Iberul-Kavkasiuri Etnomečnerieba* 1: 289–328.
- Šarageniže, Tinatin. 1958. "Svanuri enis Cxumarli kłokavis yriadi taviseburebani" / Osobennosti cxumar'skogo podgovora svanskogo jazyka. *Iberul-Kavkasiuri Etnomečnerieba* 9–10: 221–50.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1902. Review of Xundage 1901. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 16: 362–79.
- Soden, Wolfram von. 1952. *Grundriß der Akkadischen Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Suxišvili, Murman. 1999. "Meqvelebis semantikis gardamaval zmnata sintaksisarvis". *Etnomečneriebis Sakixebi* 1: 73–9.
- Sumbotova, Nina. 1999. "Evidentiality, transitivity and split ergativity: Evidence from Swan". In Werner Abraham and Leonid Kulikov (eds.): *Tense-aspect, Transitivity and Causativity*. Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov. Edited by (Studies in Language Companion Series 50). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 63–95.
- Topuria, Varlam. 1967. *Svanuri ena I. Zmna/Svanskij jazyk I. Glagol* (Varlam Topuria: Šromebi I/Trudy I). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Topuria, Varlam. 1985. "Svanskij jazyk", *Iberul-Kavkasiuri Etnomečneriebis Čelidzeuli/ Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics* 12:100–148
- Topuria, Varlam and Ivane Giginėšvili. 1970. "Svata siqvis martčeris sakixebi". In *Tanamedrove Kartuli salieraturo enis normebi*. Pirveli krebuli. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 161–7.
- Tuite, Kevin. 1997. *Swan* (Languages of the World. Materials 139). München — Newcastle: LINCOM EUROPA

Westermann, Diedrich. 1940. *Afrikanische Tabusitten in ihrer Einwirkung auf die Sprachgestaltung* (Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1939. Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 12). Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Xundage, Silovan. 1901. *Saliterajuro Kartuli*. Slov. Xundagejs gamokvleva. Kutaisi: Kilağisa da Xelagis stanba.