

THE SANSKRIT QUOTATIVE: A HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY¹

Hans Henrich Hock

In 1967, Kuiper proposed that the Sanskrit quotative, marked by *iti*, owes its origin to Dravidian influence. This claim is now generally accepted as an argument for early substratum influence of Dravidian on Sanskrit. Unfortunately, arguments for this hypothesis, as well as the counterargument in Hock 1975, are based on very cursory examinations of synchronic and diachronic evidence, both in Sanskrit (and other Indo-European languages) and in Dravidian (and other relevant non-Indo-European languages). This paper attempts to provide a fuller account of the history of the Sanskrit quotative, of its possible Indo-European antecedents, of the parallels in the earliest attested relevant non-Indo-European languages (Sumerian, Accadian, Elamite), and of the evidence provided by the non-Indo-European languages of South Asia (Dravidian, Munda, Tibeto-Burman). For some of these, especially for much of Dravidian, for Munda, and for Tibeto-Burman, the available evidence is quite limited, making it difficult to come to conclusions about prehistoric stages. Combined with the fact that all the other ancient Indo-European languages (Hittite, Homeric Greek, Latin, and Avestan), as well as the ancient Near Eastern languages, have quotative formations, this situation makes it difficult to maintain Dravidian influence for the structure and development of the Sanskrit quotative. While this conclusion may perhaps not be accepted by ardent advocates of early Dravidian influence on Sanskrit, it is hoped that the linguistic observations on which it is based, especially those for Sanskrit, will be useful and interesting to all linguists.

1: Ever since Kuiper (1967) introduced the construction into the discussion,² the Sanskrit quotative has figured prominently in papers arguing for early, pre-Rig-Vedic influence of Dravidian on Sanskrit. Cf. e.g. Emeneau 1969 and 1971 (both reprinted in Emeneau 1980, thus apparently still reflecting his views), as well as Hamp 1976 (without reference to Kuiper). The only dissenting voice seems to have been that of Hock 1975.

Unfortunately, only three of these papers engage in any fuller discussions of syntactic evidence,³ namely Kuiper 1967, Hock 1975, and Hamp 1976. Even these, however, do not offer a sufficiently detailed syntactic study of the Sanskrit quotative, of its possible Indo-European cognates, or of its possible non-Indo-European sources. True, Kuiper attempted to detail the different contexts in which the quotative particle *iti* is used in (Rig-Vedic) Sanskrit. However, his discussion was geared toward making comparisons with Iranian, Dravidian, and Munda, rather than toward providing a full account of the Sanskrit evidence. Moreover, his discussion of Munda and especially of Dravidian is excessively cursory. Hock's dissenting 1975 account of the Rig-Vedic evidence and of relevant constructions in outside Indo-European languages, as well as of non-Indo-European evidence, suffers from similar defects. Finally, Hamp's paper was concerned mainly with the word order of *iti*, not with other aspects of its syntax.

It would be a mistake, however, to attribute the defects of these papers solely to the narrow, immediate concerns of their authors. Rather, the major reason lies in a veritable dearth of earlier work on the Sanskrit quotative and its potentially related constructions in other languages. And this dearth is attributable to the fact that until quite recently,

quotatives did not create much interest among linguists. (Recent work, such as Kachru's (1979) study of the quotative in selected South Asian languages, must therefore be highly welcomed, even if it may not cover the whole chronological and geographical range.)

For Sanskrit we at least have the treatments of Delbrück (1888:529-34) and Speijer (1886:380-88). The latter provides a quite adequate picture of the post-Vedic, Classical period, to which we can now add the discussion in Kachru 1979. Delbrück's account of the Rig-Vedic situation likewise is good, but his description of the later Vedic situation is too cursory. Moreover, being chapters or paragraphs in much more general treatments of Sanskrit syntax, both accounts are quite condensed.

For two of the other early Indo-European languages, Hittite and Latin, the standard handbooks and dictionaries provide at least some useful information. But for languages like Avestan and Homeric Greek there seems to be no adequate coverage. Outside of Indo-European the situation is even more desperate. Thus, as Hamp (1976, n. 31) aptly observed, even Dravidian has not yet received adequate descriptive and comparative treatment. True, the literary languages of the South and their quotative constructions have been described fairly well. However, for the other, "tribal" languages it is much more difficult to find adequate descriptions. It is probably because of these lacunae that Masica (1976:189) claimed that the quotative is not found in the Central and Northern Dravidian languages. For other language families, we depend on stray remarks in the grammars of individual languages.

2: The major purpose of this paper is to initiate a fuller study of the Sanskrit quotative and of possibly related constructions in other languages. The major focus will be on the Sanskrit quotative and its development in observable history. This will be followed by a briefer survey of the evidence of other ancient Indo-European languages. Next I will attempt to characterize similar constructions in relevant non-Indo-European languages. Finally, I will draw on the evidence thus amassed to assess the hypothesis that the Sanskrit quotative reflects Dravidian influence. While this latter assessment may perhaps not sway many of the scholars committed to the 'Dravidian' hypothesis, I hope that the rest of the paper will be interesting and useful to all linguists no matter what their stand on the Dravidian substratum issue.

3: One of the difficulties in dealing with a topic like 'the quotative' is one of definition: Presumably a quotative construction consists of direct discourse characterized by a special lexical or morphological marker. But must that marker be obligatory, or may it be optional? And if so, how "optional" may it be? Is it sufficient to have such marked constructions next to verbs of speaking, or should they be found more generally, such as with verbs of thinking, or without any overt governing verb? Etc., etc.

Rather than getting tangled up in a definitional morass, I will restrict myself to the minimal definition that there must be at least some degree of syntactic standardization, such that the marker is not just an occasional phenomenon, and that there be a relatively small number of possible variants for the marker. (Without such a minimal definition, we would probably be forced to find "quotatives" in all languages.)

Beyond that, I will try to characterize the various quotative constructions in terms of the following parameters. This, I feel, has the advantage of describing all the various quotatives within the same framework, thus making comparison easier. Moreover, it

makes it easier to describe historical changes in given quotative constructions. At the same time, however, for many languages this method of description points out the appalling lack of detailed information available at this point. Clearly, all that can be done in such situations is to list those features for which I have information and to leave the blanks as challenges for further research.

3.1: The first parameter is that of relative "obligatoriness". In some cases (Sanskrit, Greek, Avestan), this parameter can be established statistically. In others, some impressionistic judgments are possible. For some, however, I am unable to give any indications.

3.2: The second parameter concerns the morphosyntax of the quotative: What are the lexical items/morphemes employed a marker? If these are verbal, are they finite or non-finite? What is their ordering relative to direct discourse (QUOTE)? What is the position of QUOTE relative to the governing verb (SPEAK)? (Note that the term SPEAK will here be used in a technical sense, covering all the verbs under (i)-(v) below, if appropriate, i.e. if they govern QUOTE.)

3.3: The third parameter addresses more clearly syntactic (and pragmatic) questions, namely the kinds of verbs which govern the quotative construction, as well as the use of quotatives in other contexts, i.e. without SPEAK. In this discussion I have benefited greatly from the thorough analysis in Kachru 1979, although the nature of the data has made it necessary to make certain modifications. One of these is that I do not set up a separate category for verbs of non-oral communication (such as 'write'), since with the exception of the ancient Near Eastern languages, this category is not relevant at the early time depth of the Vedas, the Avestan texts, etc. The syntactic categories which I distinguish are the following:

(i) SAY: verbs of oral communication. (Examples of quotatives with 'write' etc. found in the ancient Near Eastern languages will be classified in this category.)

(ii) THINK: Verbs of thinking which cross-linguistically may be construed like SAY, with a QUOTE of the thought, but also (like verbs of believing) with factive complementizers.

(iii) KNOW: verbs of cognition and believing which commonly are construed as factives.

(iv) HEAR: verbs of oral perception which may be used with the QUOTE of what is heard, but which more frequently are used in other constructions.

(v) SEE: verbs of visual perception which are semantically affiliated with HEAR (as perception verbs), but which a priori are not expected with QUOTE.

(vi) \emptyset , i.e. the absence of any SPEAK. In and by itself this category is not particularly remarkable, since languages without quotatives may have QUOTE without any overt SPEAK. What makes this category interesting is the fact that languages with quotatives seem to have a tendency toward specialized uses of this \emptyset -construction. Some of these are detailed below.

(vii) CAUSE: The use of a \emptyset -quotative to indicate that QUOTE states the cause or purpose for the action referred to in the "main clause", as in (1) below. The starting point for such a use probably lies in constructions of the type (2), where an originally intended reading (a) is reinterpretable as (b).

(1) *vaideśikaḥ* asmi **iti** pṛcchāmi (Class. Skt.)⁴

- 'Since I am a stranger, I ask (you) ...'
- (2) ... *várunaḥ akarot íti* tú evá eṣáḥ etát karoti (ŚB 5.4.3.2)
 (a) "'Varuṇa did it" (so thinking) he also does it'
 (b) 'Because Varuṇa did it, (therefore) he also does it'

(viii) NAME: The use of the quotative construction to name or label persons or things.

(ix) QU: The quotative marker with question words, presumably a special development of (viii).

(x) EMPH: The use of the quotative for emphasizing an NP; probably a specialization of (viii).

(xi) ONOM: The use of the quotative marker with onomatopoeia.

(xii) OTHER: Other special developments in the use of the quotative.

I: SANSKRIT

4: The discussion of the Sanskrit quotative is complicated by the existence of competing constructions which at different times interact with the quotative. These competing constructions can be briefly characterized as follows, with illustrations from the Rig-Veda.

(a) A PARTICIPIAL structure of the type (3), in which the verb of the lower, QUOTE clause is participialized and, with its subject, is assigned case in the higher clause according to the following rules: The case is nominative if the subject of the lower clause is coreferential with the higher subject; elsewhere it is accusative (which in the passive, of course, turns into a nominative). In its full form, as just described, this construction is quite rare in the Rig-Veda. However, it is supported by parallel constructions with verbs of sensory perception, including HEAR which shows signs of being a SPEAK verb (cf. the fact that in (4) it is the message, not the action described, which is heard); cf. (4) and (5). Where the corresponding finite structure would have the copula, the participial construction always seems to delete the Copula. (Note that also elsewhere 'be' is quite commonly deleted.) For synchronic SPEAK, this is the most common variant of the construction; cf. (6). Although in many cases it is difficult to distinguish this construction from simple 'naming' structures (as in (7)), there are again parallel structures with sensory-perception verbs (whether functioning as SPEAK or not), as well as with *vid-* 'know' (cf. (8)), which show that the account proposed here must be on the right track. Because of the extensive structural differences between the participial quoting structures and the corresponding finite-verb quotes, they can only be considered indirect quote constructions.⁵

- (3) ... *mámsai nivácanāni śámsan* (10.113.10)
 SPEAK pple.
 'I may think (myself to be) speaking speeches'
 = 'I may think that I am making speeches'
- (4) ... *tvám ṛtuthā yātántam* ... *śṛṇómi* (5.32.12)
 pple. SPEAK⁶

Debrunner 1948 correctly noted, these structures are exceedingly rare. Normally, these constructions exhibit no shift in person or mood and must therefore be considered UNMARKED DIRECT DISCOURSE, as in (16) and (17).

- (15) *śúnaḥśépaḥ áhvāt ... ādityám áva enam ... váruṇaḥ sasrjyād*
 SPEAK
 'Ś. called out to Ā. (that) V. should release him (= Ś)' (1.24.3)
- (16) ... *tám ... sómaḥ āha táva ahám sakhyé nyòkaḥ* (5.44.14)
 SPEAK
 'to him Soma said "I am at home in your friendship".'
- (17) *utá enam āhuḥ ... párá dadhikrá́ asarat ...* (4.38.9)
 SPEAK
 'and they say of him "D. has gone off ..."'

It is these unmarked constructions, then, which most directly are relevant to the discussion of the Sanskrit quotative.

5: The Rig-Veda

5.1: The Rig-Vedic use of the quotative may be common, but not obligatory. Thus in book 10, the ratio between QUOTE marked by *iti* and unmarked QUOTE is 17 : 24.⁸ This ratio seems to hold good also for the rest of the Rig-Veda. The actual numbers, however, may vary. Thus it seems that QUOTES, whether quotative or unmarked, occur much more frequently in the later portions of the Rig-Veda. (Cf. 5.5 below.)

5.2: As elsewhere in Sanskrit, the quotative marker is *iti*, a word found in Sanskrit also in independent use, meaning 'thus'. In the Rig-Veda it is difficult to find unambiguous instances of this independent use. All possible instances can also be given a quotative interpretation, as shown by the various translations by different scholars; cf. e.g. (18). However, the multiplicity of different readings suggests that none of the quotative interpretations is cogent. (Such uncertain passages will be ignored in the subsequent discussion.⁹) In the Brāhmaṇas, however, clear examples can be found, such as (19) below.

- (18) **íti** cid hí tvā dhána jáyantam (/) máde-made anumádanti víprāḥ / ójīyaḥ dhṛṣṇaḥ sthirám ā tanuṣya (/) má tvā dabhan yātudhānāḥ duréyāḥ // (10.124.4)
 'for **thus** the inspired ones jubilate to you, the victor of booty, in every intoxication. Even stronger, bold one, extend the bow; the ill-intentioned warlocks shall not outwit you.' (Reference of *iti*?-- Possibilities: (a) to verse 2: *navanta ... mādēṣu* 'shout in their intoxications' (cf. the *máde-made anumádanti* of this verse; i.e. play on the word *mad-*); (b) to verse 3, addressed to the 'you' of this verse; (c) to the second half of this verse, which then would be the QUOTE of *anumádanti* 'jubilate'; (d) no such reference, but simply the meaning 'thus')
- (19) **íti** ágre kṛṣati átha **íti** átha **íti** átha **íti** (ŚB 7.2.2.12)
 'he first plows thus/in this manner, then thus, then thus, then thus' (In the oral tradition of the text this was accompanied by appropriate gestures)

5.3: In terms of the relative position of *íti*, SPEAK, and QUOTE, we may distinguish the following sub-types: an '*íti*-initial' construction, with both *íti* and SPEAK (in either order) preceding QUOTE, as in (20); a 'SPEAK-final' construction, with *íti* + SPEAK after QUOTE, as in (21); and an 'Embracing' construction, with SPEAK before QUOTE and *íti* after, as in (22).

- (20) **íti** bravīti vaktāri rārānaḥ / *vásoḥ vasutvā kāravaḥ anehāḥ* (10.61.12)
 SPEAK
 '(thus) says the giving speaker "Through the goodness of the good, the singers are guiltless"'
- (21) *yáḥ índrāya sunāvāma* **íti** āha (5.37.1)
 'who says to Indra "We shall press"'
- (22) *nákiḥ vaktá ná dāt* **íti** (8.33.15)
 SPEAK
 'no one is about to say "He shall not give"'

The frequency of these constructions relative to each other and to the corresponding unmarked QUOTE constructions can be preliminarily illustrated by means of the following table. (Working with various indexes for *íti*, I believe I have been able to give a complete picture for the quotative. For the unmarked construction, my collection outside book 10 cannot claim to be exhaustive. However, the relationship between pre- and post-posed SPEAK should not be seriously affected by this.)

	SPEAK + QUOTE	QUOTE + SPEAK
[+íti]	<i>íti</i> -initial: 5	
	Embracing: 10	SPEAK-final: 22
	Total: 15	
[-íti]	52	4

To these figures must be added a few examples of SPEAK and/or *íti* inserted into QUOTE, as in (23).

- (23) *idám udakám pibata* **íti** *abravītana (/) idám vā ghā pibatā muñjanejanam*
 SPEAK
 "'drink this water" you said, "or drink this rinsewater" (1.161.8)

In these structures we find two instances of SPEAK + QUOTE + *íti* + QUOTE, five of QUOTE + *íti* + SPEAK + QUOTE, and 3 of (*íti*-less) QUOTE + SPEAK + QUOTE. In addition, RV 10.34.12 has a complex structure with a SPEAK-like oath-taking expression surrounding QUOTE and then followed by SPEAK. (This construction will be ignored.)

5.4: QUOTE may also occur without SPEAK, with or without *íti*. Constructions marked by *íti*, such as (24)-(26), are easily located. On the other hand, for unmarked constructions the absence of any unambiguous clues makes the situation more difficult. I

have tried to include only the most obvious examples in my count, such as (27)-(29).¹⁰ My figures for this construction therefore may be a little conservative.

With these caveats, the ratio between unmarked and marked SPEAK-less constructions can be given as 9 : 6.

- (24) *prá vaya ápa vaya íti* āsate taté (10.130.1)
'they sit at the spread-out (sacrifice) (saying/thinking) "weave hither, weave thither"'
- (25) *námaḥ námaḥ íti* ūrdhvāsaḥ anakṣan (10.115.9)
'they have approached (with the words) "honor, honor"'
(Sim. *ibid.*; but note that the first half of the verse has QUOTE followed by *íti* ... SPEAK, and so does the preceding verse. That is, we could be dealing with 'carried-over' SPEAK.)
- (26) *tvāṣṭā duhitré vahatúm kṛṇoti (/) íti* idám vísvam bhúvanam sám eti (10.17.1)
"'Tvaṣṭṛ is arranging for the marriage of (his) daughter", (hearing, thinking, saying this) this whole world assembles' (There may be some question as to which verb of speaking should be supplied here. The metrical break before *íti*, however, suggests that the verb should be compatible with what follows.)
- (27) *utá mātá mahiśám ánu avenad (/) amí tvā .jahati putra devāḥ*
'and the mother looked after the buffalo (saying) "My son, these gods are leaving you' (4.18.3)
- (28) *parāyatím mātáram ánu acaṣṭa (/) ná ná ánu gāni ánu nū gamāni*
'He looked after his departing mother (thinking) "I will not not go (= I will not remain), I will go"' (4.18.3)
- (29) *írāvati ... bhūtám ... ví astabhnāḥ ródasī viṣṇo eté (7.99.3)*
'You, Viṣṇu, stemmed apart these two worlds (with the words/ so that) "You shall be full of sustenance"'

Finally, as a matter of curiosity, it might be mentioned that there is one Rig-Vedic verse in which *íti* occurs multiply, in a fashion which makes it difficult to be certain which instance of *íti* is "the" quotative particle; cf. (30). (The evidence of this verse is disregarded in the present discussion.)

- (30) *íti* vaí *íti* me mánaḥ (/) *gām áśvam sanuyām íti / kuvít somásya apām íti*
'Thus (?), thus (?) indeed (is) my mind "I would win cow (and) horse" (thus (?)), "perhaps I have drunk soma" (thus (?))' (10.119.1)

5.5: The data summarized in 5.3-4 can be interpreted in several ways. However, for the present discussion the relationship between the sub-types of the quotative and the manner in which they are embedded in the chronology of the Rig-Veda¹¹ are the most significant.

Chronologically, the three sub-types of the quotative are distributed in the Rig-Veda as follows:

	Early	Middle	Late
<i>íti</i> -initial	3		2

SPEAK-final	5	6	11
Embracing	2	2	6

At first sight, the most striking phenomenon might be the overall increase of quotative attestations in the Late period. However, it is questionable whether that increase is meaningful. For QUOTES in general, whether marked by *íti* or not, seem to occur more frequently in the late portions of the Rig-Veda. Thus my (incomplete) count for corresponding *íti*-less constructions jumps from 22 in the Early and Middle portion to 34 in the Late Rig-Veda. The ratio between marked and unmarked constructions, however, seems to remain fairly constant at all stages of the Rig-Veda. Thus the ratio in book 10, a collection mainly of Late hymns, is roughly the same as for all of the Rig-Veda:

	marked	:	unmarked	ratio
Book 10	17	:	24	1 : 1.4
All of RV	37	:	56	1 : 1.5

Significant differences can however be observed if the relations between the three sub-types of the quotative are considered:

(a) The *íti*-initial construction definitely is in the minority compared to those in which *íti* follows QUOTE (i.e., the SPEAK-final, Embracing, and SPEAK-less constructions). The total ratio is one of 5 : 38, disregarding structures with *íti* inserted into QUOTE. Moreover, in later Sanskrit, *íti*-initial constructions become exceedingly rare.

(b) The SPEAK-final type is considerably more vigorous. In fact, the figures above suggest a 100% increase in its use from the Early¹² and Middle¹³ periods to the Late Rig-Veda.¹⁴ However, given the noted general increase of QUOTES in the Late portions, it is difficult to judge whether that increase is meaningful.

(c) The case is quite different for the Embracing construction. Though the numbers are small, there does seem to be a significant increase in the Late Rig-Veda, from twice each in the two preceding stages¹⁵ to six times in the Late period.¹⁶ Moreover, as will be seen in subsequent sections, this increase marks only the beginning of what ultimately turns out to be the most productive quotative pattern.

Of these three patterns the most likely archaism is type (a). The greater popularity of SPEAK-final (b) might perhaps suggest an innovation. However, it can also be explained in terms of a polarization with the unmarked construction: Since the latter clearly prefers SPEAK before QUOTE (by a ratio of 52 : 4), the *íti*-quotative comes to prefer the mirror-image order QUOTE + SPEAK (by a ratio of 22 : 5, disregarding the embracing construction). Given this alternative explanation, it is possible that both (a) and (b) are inherited. Because of its marginal use (with a total of only 5 attestations for all of the Rig-Veda, the inserted *íti* + SPEAK pattern (cf. 5.3 above) probably likewise is an archaism. (On the other hand, the two instances of SPEAK + QUOTE + *íti* may be considered influenced by, or comparable to, the Embracing construction.)

The most clearly innovated pattern is the Embracing type (c). Moreover, in light of the facts just noted, this construction can easily be explained as a Rig-Vedic innovation, namely as a compromise between the order SPEAK + QUOTE of the preferred unmarked

construction and the order QUOTE + *íti* of the (heretofore) preferred quotative. This process may have been aided by the fact that in SPEAK-less QUOTE constructions, *íti* always follows QUOTE. If this construction is accounted for as resulting from the deletion of SPEAK, this latter order is not surprising, since as we have noted, the type QUOTE + *íti* + SPEAK was more productive than the *íti*-initial construction. After deletion, however, a construction QUOTE + *íti* can be reinterpreted as having the syntactic structure (31), rather than (32). That is, *íti* changes from being a member of the SPEAK clause to being one of QUOTE. As a consequence it would now no longer be necessary for *íti* and SPEAK to be clause mates.

(31) [[QUOTE *íti*] (SPEAK)] (innovated construction)

(32) [[QUOTE] *íti* (SPEAK)] (earlier construction)

5.6: There is evidence that such a syntactic reassignment of *íti* has in fact taken place: In the *íti*-initial and SPEAK-final constructions, *íti* could act as the initial element of the clause containing SPEAK. For the *íti*-initial type this is shown by the line- and clause-initial position of *íti* in (20) above (similarly in 10.95.18 and, with preceding "extrasentential" vocative, in 10.97.4). Notice that line breaks ordinarily coincide with clause boundaries. For the SPEAK-final type, note line- and clause-initial *íti* in (26) above and (33) below, as well as (34)-(36) which show *íti* as the first element of clause-initial strings.¹⁷

(33) *tvām stoṣāma ... // íti tvā agne ... řṣayaḥ avocan* (10.115.8-9)
SPEAK

"We shall praise you ..." (thus) the řṣis said to you, Agni'

(34) ... *íti ca brávat* (6.54.2)

SPEAK

'and QUOTE he shall say'

(35) ... *íti céd avocan* (10.109.3)

SPEAK

'if QUOTE they said'

(36) ... *íti yád vādanti* (10.37.10)

SPEAK

'when QUOTE they say'

On the other hand, excepting two (ambiguous) instances where *íti* occurs in the middle of a line/clause,¹⁸ all other (i.e. 8) cases of the Embracing construction have *íti* clause- or line-finally as in (37).

(37) *yé im āhuḥ surabhíḥ nīḥ hara íti* / (1.162.12)
SPEAK

'who say of it (the battle horse) "(it is) good-smelling, take it away"

5.7: The syntactic/pragmatic contexts in which the quotative construction (and QUOTE in general) can be used in the Rig-Veda are as follows:¹⁹

(a) With SAY (cf. e.g. (20), and (33)-(37)). This includes not only verbs meaning 'say, speak, tell', but also *nu-* 'shout' (ø, 8.96.14), *rap-* 'whisper' (ø, 10.10.11, 10.61.11), *iṣ-* 'order' (ø, 8.96.14), *nādh-* 'implore' (*īti*, 1.109.3), *śikṣ-* 'instruct' (ø, 10.95.17), as well as *ghóṣā āsīt* 'there was a noise/shouting' (*īti*, 10.33.1). For simple 'say, speak', there is also a rival construction with (quasi-)participialization, of the type exemplified in (6) and (7) above.

(b) A special sub-type of SAY is *prach-* 'ask': Though permitting QUOTE (as in 2.12.5, 8.77.1 with *īti* and 1.164.6, 8.45.4, etc. with ø), this verb quite commonly occurs in the 'indirect-question' construction discussed in section 4 above; cf. e.g. example (9).

(c) With THINK; cf. (38) and (39), the latter with a noun of thinking. Other examples occur at 10.146.4 (*īti*) and 10.34.5 (ø, *ā-dhī-* 'reflect').

(38) yád ... ná marai **īti** mányase (8.93.5)
SPEAK

'when you think "I will not die"'

(39) utá syá nah̄ ... matīḥ (/) áditih̄ útyā á gamat
"SPEAK"

'and this (is) our thought "May Aditi come with succor"'

With THINK, however, the more commonly found pattern is the participial construction discussed in section 4; cf. e.g. example (3).

(d) With HEAR: I have found only one example of this structure, without *īti*, namely (40) below. Elsewhere, HEAR is found in the participial construction as in (4) and (8).

(40) utá tvám ... śṛṇu (/) yás te váṣṭi vavákṣi tát (8.45.6)
SPEAK

'and hear/listen you: "If someone wants something from you, that you order ..."'

(e) On the other hand, with KNOW and SEE, no QUOTE constructions are found. For KNOW, there are a few examples of the participial construction (as in 1.10.10); but the normal pattern is the 'indirect-question' type exemplified in (11), (12), (14). For SEE, I have found only participial constructions, as in (5).

5.8: As the earlier discussion has shown (cf. also examples (24)-(29)), there are quite a number of SPEAK-less, or ø-examples, both with and without *īti*. Most of these are of no great interest, except to the extent that they may have helped bring about the developments sketched in 5.5.

There is however one example which deserves closer examination. This is example (26) which Kuiper (1967) considered to be an instance of the CAUSE construction of later Sanskrit (for which cf. section 3, examples (1) and (2)). While this is no doubt a possible interpretation, it is by no means only possible one. For as the glosses to (26) show, there are a number of other possible readings. Similar ambiguities can moreover be occasionally found with *īti*-less constructions, as in (29). However, none of these constructions provides incontrovertible evidence for the CAUSE pattern in the Rig-Veda.

At best, they show the ambiguities from which the later CAUSE type may have arisen by reinterpretation.

5.9: Of greater interest are the following constructions which, as (46) shows, may be found with \emptyset -SPEAK. These constructions might perhaps indicate the existence of the NAME construction. This would especially be the case in (46).

- (41) *tám āhuḥ suprajāḥ íti* (9.114.1)
 'him'SPEAK sg.N/V
 'they say of him "(He is) rich in progeny"
 OR: 'they say to him "(O you,) rich in progeny"
 OR: 'they call him "rich in progeny"
 (42) *yāḥ enam ādīdeśati (/) karambhād íti pūśanam* (6.56.1)
 'him' SPEAK sg.N/V
 'who says of him, of Pūśan "(He is) a porridge-eater"
 OR: 'who says to him, Pūśan "(O you,) porridge-eater"
 OR: 'who calls him, Pūśan, "porridge-eater"
 (43) *utā ghā némaḥ ástutaḥ (/) púmān íti bruve pañīḥ* (5.16.8)
 sg.N SPEAK
 'and many an unpraised niggard is talked about "(He is) a man"
 OR: 'and many an unpraised niggard is called "a man"
 (44) ... *śanaśrutam (/) índraḥ íti bravītana* (8.92.2)
 sg.A sg.N SPEAK
 'say of the one of ancient fame "(He is) Indra"
 OR: 'call the one of ancient fame "Indra"
 (45) *yāḥ mā mógham yātudhāna íti āha* (7.104.15; sim. *ibid.16*)
 'me' sg.V SPEAK
 'who falsely says to me "O warlock"
 (46) *índo índraḥ íti kṣara* (9.6.2)
 'O juice, flow (thinking) "(I am) Indra"
 OR: 'O juice, flow (as/called) "Indra"

Constructions like these are used frequently in the later language for the purpose of naming things or persons. A characteristic of these later constructions is the fact that they look like the quasi-participial naming constructions discussed in section 4 (and illustrated in example (7)), in that the person or thing named appears in the accusative case (except in the passive, where the nominative is used instead). The name, however, is introduced in the nominative case, as a quasi-QUOTE marked by *íti*.

There are however several difficulties with the interpretation of the Rig-Vedic examples. First of all, the case marking of the quoted NP is ambiguous in (41)-(42): Both nouns could either be nominative or vocative, the latter being a case not permitted in the naming construction of the later language. Moreover, (45) offers a clear case of a vocative. At the same time, however, (43)/(44) show that also nominatives can occur in this context.

Secondly, contextually parallel structures make it possible to interpret the above examples as genuine QUOTES. Thus, example (37) contains a plain nominative as the first "clause" of its QUOTE. And the context makes it clear that this is not a naming

construction, but a construction with omitted copula (*surabhīḥ (asti)* '(it is) good-smelling'). Moreover, this example, as well as many others (such as (16) and (17)), shows that the accusative preceding such a reduced clause and coreferential with its subject need not be a person 'named' by means of the QUOTE, but can simply be the person to whom or about whom the QUOTE is uttered.-- For (45) there is the parallel structure (47) found in the same hymn and in the same verse as the second occurrence of (45). And this structure can be interpreted only as a genuine QUOTE.--For (46), there is the parallel (48), in which a copula-less direct-quote interpretation seems to be the only possible analysis. Given this evidence, then, the NAME interpretation is not the only possible analysis for (41)-(46); but all the readings given in the glosses are a priori equally possible. We thus have no certain evidence for the NAME construction in the Rig-Veda.

- (47) yāḥ mā áyātum yā́tudhāna íti āha (/) yāḥ vā rakṣāḥ śúciḥ asmi íti āha
 'me' SPEAK SPEAK
 'who says to me, the one not being a warlock, "O warlock", or who being a rakṣas, says "I am pure"...' (7.104.16)
- (48) *īnduḥ īndraḥ íti* bruván (9.63.9)
 SPEAK
 'saying "The juice (is) Indra"'

As a matter of fact, it may well be argued that the NAME construction secondarily resulted from a reinterpretation of structures like (41)-(46) as somehow akin to the participial naming construction. What may have helped in this development is the quasi-passive type (43): Because of the passive-like nature of *bruve* 'is called/talked to, about', the quoted NP would have to appear in the nominative both in an *íti*-less genuine QUOTE construction and in the participial construction; cf. (49). The resulting ambiguity could then be extended to the *íti*-quotative, as in (50). (Both (49) and (50) are unattested as such; but structures of this sort would be possible in the Rig-Veda.)

- (49) paṇīḥ púmān bruve
 sg N sg.N SPEAK
 (a) 'the niggard is talked about "(He is) a man"
 (b) 'the niggard is called a man'
- (50) paṇīḥ púmān íti bruve
 sg.N sg.N SPEAK
 (a) 'the niggard is talked about "(He is) a man"
 (b) X

5.10: The evidence of the Rig-Veda, the earliest stage of Sanskrit, then can be summarized as follows.

Rig-Vedic Sanskrit had a quotative structure marked by *íti* 'thus' which coexisted with an *íti*-less construction and thus was only optional. Both constructions could occur with SAY (including *prach-* 'ask', which however preferred other, indirect constructions), as well as THINK and HEAR. (The latter two however show strong competition from indirect constructions.) In addition, both the quotative and the *íti*-less construction can occur without any overt SPEAK, in which case a CAUSE reading is occasionally

possible for either construction. There is however no evidence for this being an established use of the quotative. There are also ambiguous structures which indicate the potential for reinterpretations leading to NAME-quotatives. Again, however, there is no unambiguous evidence that such constructions have already arisen. (In addition, there is as yet no evidence for the use of the quotative with KNOW and SEE which, instead, use indirect constructions.)

The Rig-Veda does however offer evidence for the development of a new constructional type, in so far as the morphosyntax of the quotative is concerned. Where early on, Rig-Vedic Sanskrit seems to have had three major variants of the quotative, one *íti*-initial, a second SPEAK-final, and a third with *íti* + SPEAK inserted into QUOTE, a new, Embracing construction is seen to be coming in, in which SPEAK precedes and *íti* follows the QUOTE.

6: The Atharva-Veda²⁰

The Atharvanic quotative shows a very marked development vis-à-vis even the late Rig-Vedic stage. This manifests itself in all areas: in the extent to which the quotative has become obligatory, in the morphosyntax of the construction, and in the syntactic/pragmatic uses of the structure.

6.1: In terms of frequency, an examination of books 1-8 shows a ratio of 12 : 5 between SPEAK + QUOTE structures with and without *íti*. If SPEAK-less constructions are included, the ratio is 14 : 5. (In book 10 of the Rig-Veda the ratio was 17 : 24!) Moreover, while the verse sections of the Atharva-Veda contain about 15 examples of SPEAK-less *íti*-constructions, I have found no comparable constructions without *íti*. In short, then, the marked quotative is well on its way toward becoming quasi-obligatory.

6.2: As far as its morphosyntax is concerned, the quotative no longer seems to be attested in its *íti*-initial variety. And the ratio between SPEAK-final and Embracing quotatives shows a marked development toward predominance of the latter construction, as can be seen from a comparison of Late Rig-Vedic, Atharva Verse, and Atharva Prose. (Note that it is generally acknowledged that the Prose sections are relatively late in the Atharva-Veda. In the Prose sections I ignore repetitions of the same collocation within a given "hymn".)

	Late RV	AV Verse	AV Prose
QUOTE + <i>íti</i> + SPEAK	11	13	5
SPEAK + QUOTE + <i>íti</i>	6	12	8

6.3: Perhaps the most striking and interesting changes can be observed in the syntax/pragmatics of the quotative:

(a) Impressionistically, it seems that indirect constructions are very much on the wane, for all relevant verbs, except SEE which does not show any quotative constructions as yet. Still, occasional indirect constructions may be found, such as (51).

(51) vidmá vaí ... yátaḥ ... jáyase (AV 7.76.5)
 SPEAK YA
 'We know whence you are born'

(b) In addition to a greater incidence of quotatives with THINK, we now also observe quotative constructions with HEAR (while in the Rig-Veda we only found one example of an *íti*-less QUOTE), as well as with *vid-* 'KNOW' a category not yet taking QUOTE in the Rig-Veda; cf. (52) and (53). This latter extension can be taken as resulting from the reinterpretation of THINK as 'believe (to be true)', hence 'KNOW (to be true)'.

(52) ... *saptagr̥dhrāḥ íti* śuśrumā vayám (AV 8.9.18)
SPEAK

"... (They are) seven-vultured" (so) we have heard'

(53) *bhūmih íti* tvām abhiprāmanvate jānāḥ (/) *nírṛtiḥ íti* tvā ahám pári veda
SPEAK SPEAK

sarvātaḥ (AV 6.84.1)

'People think of you (as) "earth", I know you completely (as) "Nirṛti" (= "perdition")'

(c) As the (translation of the) last example shows, there is good reason to believe that at this stage a NAME variant of the quotative has developed. This is indicated first of all by a larger number of relevant constructions than were found in the Rig-Veda. In the Rig-Veda, constructions which might possibly qualify as NAME quotatives amount to only 6 out of a total of 46 *íti*-constructions; i.e. the ratio is about 1 : 8. In Atharva-Veda verse, 11 out of 40 *íti*-quotatives are interpretable as NAME constructions; i.e. the ratio is about 1 : 4. More important, however, is the evidence of (54), where *nāmadhēyam* 'name' is explicitly specified, and of (56) where an *íti*-less NP in a parallel construction strongly suggests that *íti* is inserted without recourse to a (deleted) SPEAK, but simply as a naming device. Note that in a Rig-Vedic passage comparable to (54), no *íti* is found; cf. (55).

(54) *sāmvasavaḥ íti* vaḥ nāmadhēyam (AV 7.109.6)
"Sāmvasus" (is) your name'

(55) *ghṛtāsya nāma ... yád ásti (/) jihvā devānām ...* (RV 4.58.1)
'which is the name of ghee: "tongue of the gods ..."'

(56) *udanvātī dyaúḥ avamā (/) pīlumatī íti* madhyamā / *ṛtīyā ha pradyaúḥ íti*
(AV 18.2.48)

'watery is the lowest heaven, "full of pīlus" the middle one, the third (is) the "foreheaven" ...'

This new NAME construction was to acquire a considerable degree of popularity in the later language, including in grammatical literature. Its attractiveness seems to have lain in the fact that it made it possible to "integrate" lexical items into a syntactic context in their citation (nominative or stem) form, without further adjusting that form in accordance with its grammatical status within the sentence. (For the probable origin of this construction, cf. section 5.9 above.)

6.4: In addition, there is evidence that the Atharva-Veda is in the process of developing a CAUSE variety of the quotative, viz. a use of the quotative to indicate purpose. Disregarding infinitival constructions, the Rig-Vedic device for marking purpose clauses was a structure with *yáthā* 'so that' + subjunctive, as in (57). Similar

constructions continue in the Atharva-Veda, cf. (58). Beside these, however, we find constructions like (59) and (60), without *yáthā*, but with subjunctive, and with the particle *íti*.

- (57) gṛhān gacha gṛhapátnī yáthā ásaḥ (RV 10.85.26)
subj.
'go home so that you be lady of the house'
- (58) huvé devím áditim ... sajātānām madhyameṣṭhāḥ yáthā ásāni
subj.
'I invoke divine Aditi so that I be the midmost of my fellows' (AV 3.8.2)
- (59) sárvāḥ sámahvi óṣadhīḥ (/) *ítaḥ naḥ pārayā[n]* ²¹ **íti** (AV 4.17.2)
subj.
'I have called together all the herbs (thinking) "May they save us from this"
OR 'I have called together all the herbs so that they may save us from this'
- (60) káḥ asya bāhú sámabharad (/) *vīryām karāvād* **íti** (AV 10.2.5)
subj. accented
'who brought his arms together so that (?) he do something heroic'
(Sim. ibid.17, 6.128.1)

What is especially interesting is that in a number of examples (cf. (60) vs. (59)), the verb of such *íti* + subjunctive clauses is accented, indicating that the clause functions as a dependent clause, just as does a *yáthā* construction. (Elsewhere, however, main-clause verbs within a QUOTE normally are unaccented.)

Moreover, there is other evidence suggesting an (incipient) equivalence between *yáthā* clause and *íti* construction. One consists of their apparent interchangeability in (61). The other, in the occurrence of an apparent blend between the two constructions; cf. (62).

- (61) *asaú me smaratād* **íti** (/) *priyāḥ me smaratād* **íti** /
devāḥ prá hiṇuta smarám (/) *asaú mām ánu śocatu* //
yáthā *mama smárād asaú (/) ná ámuṣya ahám ... /*
devāḥ prá hiṇuta smarám (/) ... (AV 6.130.2-3)
'so that yonder (man) love me, so that the dear one love me, O gods, send love,
may yonder (man) burn after me.
'so that yonder (m an) love me, not I him ..., O gods ...'
- (62) *tvaṣṭá tám asyāḥ á badhnād* **yáthā** *putrám janād* **íti** (AV 6.81.3)
subj.
'Tvaṣṭṛ shall bind that on her so that she may give birth to a son'

In terms of internal Sanskrit evidence, this new construction can be explained as the result of reinterpretation of potentially ambiguous constructions such as Rig-Vedic, *íti*-less (26) and its *íti*-quotative counterparts.

6.5: Other innovations include the first instance of a pattern which becomes prominent in the Vedic Prose of the later Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas and which might be referred to as 'Ritual Quotative', i.e. a sacred formula quoted during a ritual act and marked by *íti*, usually without an accompanying SPEAK; cf. (63).

- (63) ... *piśācān sārvaṅ darśaya (/) iti* tvā rabhe oṣadhe (AV 4.20.6)
 "... make (me) see all the Piśācas" (with these words) I take you, O herb'

Another fore-runner of a construction quite common in Vedic Prose, but not found elsewhere in the early language, is that given in (64), in a passage from Atharvanic Prose. This is the use of the quotative with FEAR.

- (64) *tāsyāḥ jātāyāḥ sārvaṃ abibhed iyám evá idám bhaviṣyati iti*
 'fear'
 'of her, when she was born, everthing was afraid (thinking) "this one will indeed become this world"' (AV 8.10.1)

6.6: The most striking innovation of the Atharva-Veda, however, is the use of quotative *iti* with ONOMATOPOEIA, cf. (65), (66), and (67).

- (65) *ṛthivyām te nipécanaṃ bahīḥ te astu bāl iti* (AV 1.3.1-9; refrain)
 ONOM.
 'on the earth be your outpouring, outside of you, "splash"
 (66) *ajéna kṛṇvántaḥ śítám (/) vṛṣéṇa ukṣantu bāl iti* (AV 18.2.22)
 'making you cool with the goat, let them sprinkle you with rain "splash"
 (67) *bhúg iti abhígataḥ (/) śál iti apákrāntaḥ (/) phál iti abhiṣṭhitaḥ* (AV 20.135.1)
 "'bounce", he has come; "whist", it is gone; "bang", it has trodden'²²

For Kuiper (1967) and Emeneau (1969), these structures were clearly due to Dravidian influence. Kuiper, to be sure, did note something of a Rig-Vedic antecedent, the expression *bāl itthá* (= *bád itthá*) 'indeed, truly, etc.', which contains an interjection vaguely reminiscent of the above *bāl*, *bhúg* etc., plus a cognate of *iti*; cf. e.g. (68) below. Now, in many of its attestations, *itthá* may be looked upon as a simple emphasizer. Occasionally, however, it is used in the meaning 'thus' and may, like *iti*, be used even with SPEAK; cf. (69)-(70).

Kuiper does not pursue this matter. As it turns out, however, Avestan has evidence for similar uses of its cognate *iθā* (YAv. *iðā/iθā*), as well as for the quotative use of that particle; cf. 12.5-6 below. While this does not prove that the *itthá* of *bád itthá* was quotative and thus a more or less direct ancestor for the *iti* of (65)-(67) above, the parallel is tantalizing. Still, given that RV *bád* is not an onomatopoeic interjection, the way of caution would advise against such a direct connection.

- (67) *bád itthá* mahimā vām ... pániṣṭhaḥ ... (RV 6.59.2)
 'truly, your greatness is praised most ...'
 OR 'thus indeed (it is): Your greatness is praised most' (?)
 (Sim. 1.141.1, 5.67.1, 5.84.1)
 (68) *satyám itthá* vṛṣā íd asi (RV 8.33.10)
 'truly thus (it is): You are the bull'
 (69) *apāḥ índraḥ ... turāśāṭ / itthá* sṛjānāḥ ... ártham ... viviṣuḥ

'Indra, conquering the might (released) the waters; thus released, they pursued their duty' (RV 6.32.5)

(70) ... *bhāvā mr̥ṣīkāḥ* / **itthā** gr̥ṇántaḥ ... syāma ... gośátamāḥ

SPEAK

"... Be merciful," (thus) praising (you) may we be the most cow-winning' (RV 6.33.5; sim., with *vad-* 'speak', 6.18.5)

The normal pattern for onomatopoeia in the Rig-Veda, disregarding derived nominals, seems to have consisted of a choice of the following:

(a) The onomatopoeia is turned into a verb-stem and then inflected as a verb, such as probably in *héṣati* 'whinneys', *próthati* 'snorts', as well as in participial *jájhjhatīḥ* (RV 5.52.6) 'laughing' or 'hissing', *jáñjati* (RV 1.168.7) 'blazing, flaring (of fire)'.
(b) The onomatopoeia is extended by the verb *kr-* 'do, make', as in *ciścā kr̥ṇoti* 'makes a whizzing sound (of an arrow)' (RV 6.75.5), *hín-kr-* 'make the sound *hín* (of a cow)' (RV 1.164.27, 28), *kikirā-kr-* 'scratch' (RV 6.53.7, 8), *akhkhalī-kṛtyā* 'jubilating' (RV 7.103.3); cf. also *phát karikrati* 'they keep making "crash"' (AV 4.18.3).

(c) The onomatopoeia is extended by *bhū-* 'be, become', as in *alalā-bhāvantiḥ* 'rustling (of water)' (RV 4.18.6), *jañjanā-bhāvan* 'blazing, flaring (of fire)' (RV 8.43.8).

What is common to all of these processes is an attempt not to use an onomatopoeic expression by itself, but to "integrate" such words into the ordinary vocabulary--and the syntax--of the language by turning them into a recognizable--and syntactically usable--category, namely into verbs. (In fact, the coexistence of *jáñjati* and *jañjanā-bhāvan* suggests that for 'spur-of-the-moment' expressions, any of these processes could equally well be used, i.e. that they all were "equal" in implementing a conspiracy against using plain, unextended onomatopoeia.)

Given this background, it is perhaps not surprising that once the NAME construction with *íti* had been introduced into the language, as a device to "integrate" names etc. into the rest of the sentence without further syntactic adjustment (cf. 6.3 above), it could be used as an additional device for "integrating" onomatopoeia into the rest of the sentence, coexisting with the other devices throughout the remainder of the (Vedic) language.

That there may have been a time lag between the development of the NAME construction and the special ONOM use of the quotative is suggested by the following considerations. The NAME construction is found throughout all the various chronological layers of the Atharva-Veda. ONOM, however, appears only in contexts which look like late additions: The hymn in which (66) occurs was not included in the more conservative Paippalada recension of the Atharva-Veda. And though some of the material of the hymn from which (65) is taken is found in the Paippalada, the quoted passage itself is not, suggesting that it is a later addition to a pre-existing hymn. As for (67), it occurs in the very problematic 'Kuntāpa hymns' which had not yet been included in the Atharva-Veda at the time that the grammatical analysis reflected in the pada-pāṭha was undertaken. Bloomfield (1899:100-1) very aptly describes the changes in the ritual which must have led to the late inclusion of these hymns into the Vedas. At the same time, however, variants of (65) and (66) appear in the latest Vedic hymn collections--in KS 13.9, TS 3.3.10.2--, and a variant of (67) is found in the non-canonical and frequently quite late Rig-Vedic 'khilas' (5.18). It is therefore probable that the construction had come

into existence by the end of the Vedic-Poetry period, and before the Vedic-Prose stage which will be discussed next.

6.7: The evidence of the Atharva-Veda thus suggests the following developments: The quotative is well on its way to becoming quasi-obligatory, both compared to unmarked QUOTE and to the indirect constructions. Of its three major Rig-Vedic variants, the *íti*-initial structure is too rare to even be attested, and the Embracing pattern is well on its way toward predominating over the SPEAK-final one. HEAR and KNOW are now attested with quotatives. A NAME variant of the quotative has developed which in turn may have furnished the basis for an ONOM construction. In addition, a purpose variant of the CAUSE construction, a 'Ritual Quotative', and the use of the quotative with FEAR can be observed to be developing.

7: Vedic Prose

The language of the prose texts of the post-Atharvanic Saṁhitās, as well as of the Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas, shows the quotative construction almost fully developed to its state in the Classical language.

7.1: Compared to other, indirect or direct quote constructions, the quotative is now virtually de rigueur. Thus in two samples from the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, selected because of their different subject matter and style,²³ *íti* constructions outnumber other constructions by 31 : 1 and 27 : 2 respectively. (The figures are even more impressive if the (mostly SPEAK-less) quotes from the Vājasaneyī-Saṁhitā and the explanatory restatements and paraphrases are included: 55 : 1 and 31 : 2, respectively.)

This is not to say, however, that *íti*-less QUOTE and indirect constructions are entirely wanting. Thus in the two samples there are one example of a participial construction with KNOW and two examples of 'indirect questions' with THINK, respectively. Elsewhere, occasional examples of *íti*-less QUOTE can be found, as in (71). (Cf. also 7.4 below.) In general, it can be stated that SAY may occasionally be used with the participial construction (cf. e.g. (75), inside QUOTE) and unmarked QUOTE; THINK and KNOW with the participial construction and 'indirect questions'; and SAY may also occur with 'indirect questions' where genuine questions are being asked, as in (72).

(71) *yádi ít tu anyé vādanti kás tát saṁdhám upeyāt* (ŚB 2.4.3.10)

SPEAK

'if now others say "who would incur this combination (of mistakes)?" ...'

(72) *brūhi yátaḥ khánema* (ŚB 3.3.3.11)

SPEAK

'say where we should dig'

This competition between different constructions may perhaps be responsible for the occasional appearance of syntactic blends, such as (73) with 'indirect-discourse' marker *yáthā* 'that' AND quotative *íti*. Moreover, it may account for the fact that where SPEAK interrupts a QUOTE, *íti* may occasionally be placed only at the end of one of the QUOTE fragments (cf. (74)), although the normal pattern has *íti* at the end of all fragments (cf. (75)).

(73) *sáḥ ṛtám abravīt yáthā sárvásu evá samāvad vásāni íti* (MS 2.2.7)
SPEAK

'he swore an oath that "I will live with all of them equally"'

(74) *idám ø hí āhuḥ rákṣāṃsi yoṣítam ánusacante tát utá rákṣāṃsi eva rétaḥ ādadhati íti* (ŚB 3.2.1.40)²⁴

'for "here (on earth)," they say, "the rakṣases pursue young women and then the rakṣases put their seed in".'

(75) *átra u sáḥ kāmāḥ úpāptaḥ íti* ha sma āha máhitthiḥ *yám cárakāḥ prājāpatyé*
SPEAK

paśáu āhúḥ íti (ŚB 6.2.2.10)

"'Therein that wish was obtained," (so) Māhitthi once said "which the carakas say (to be) in the Prajāpati-victim".'

As noted earlier, Vedic Prose also offers examples of non-quotative *íti* meaning 'thus', cf. (19) above. (In the first of the two Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa samples referred to earlier, there happen to be five such examples. Overall, however, this use is found much more rarely.)

7.2: The tendency, observed in the Atharva-Veda, toward predominance of the Embracing construction over against the SPEAK-final variety of the quotative can be observed even more fully in Vedic prose. In the two Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa samples studied in detail, the ratios between the two constructions are 19 : 1 and 18 : 5, respectively.)

7.3: An innovation in the area of morphosyntax, occasioned no doubt by the increasing number of uses for the quotative, is the fact that at this stage of the language we find the first examples with 'nesting' of *íti*-quotatives within *íti*-quotatives, as in (76).

(76) *hiranyáyi íti vaí abhyúktā íti* (ŚB 6.3.1.42)
'(saying) "it is said (to be) 'golden'."'

There is, however, as yet no evidence for a possible 'pile-up' of *ítis* at the end of a QUOTE, as it can be found in the later, Classical language. Rather, such a 'pile-up' seems to be actively avoided, as in (77), where instead of expected ONOM-*íti* plus QUOTE-final *íti*, only a single *íti* is found. (In the Classical language, this would come out as (78), with double *íti*.)

(77) ... *tám juhuyād dévāṃśo yásmāi tvā īḍe tát satyám upariprutā bhaṅgéna hatáḥ asau pháṭ íti* (ŚB 4.1.1.26)

'he should sacrifice with that (saying) "O divine sprig, for what I pray to you (let) that (be) true; (let) this man (be) struck by destruction-from-above, 'crash'."'

(78) ... *asau pháṭ íti íti*

7.4: The area of syntax/pragmatics likewise exhibits innovations in the use of the quotative.

(a) One of these is the fact that the quotative may now be used also with SEE; cf. (79). This innovation no doubt is attributable to generalization from HEAR to other verbs of sensory perception.

- (79) *sá ha etád evá dadarśa anaśanátayā vai me prajāḥ pārābhavanti* **íti**
 'see'
 'he then saw "These creations of mine are perishing of hunger"' (ŚB 2.5.1.3)

(b) The NAME construction now appears in a new function, namely that of characterizing technical terms (80) and of serving as italics, to characterize quoted forms in discussions of a technical, philological nature; cf. (81).

- (80) *té vai eté páripaśavye* **íti** āhuti (ŚB 3.8.1.16)
 'these two libations are "paripaśavyas"
 (81) *vāk* **íti** ékam akṣáram *akṣáram* **íti** tryàkṣaram (ŚB 6.3.1.43)
 'vāk (is) one syllable, *akṣaram* (is) trisyllabic'

(c) A further extension of the NAME construction, a structure marking EMPHASIS, has developed by this time; cf. (82). (The accusative case marking in (82) might perhaps suggest that this is unrelated to the NAME quotatives. However, as (83) shows, also the NAME construction occasionally may retain the accusative of the unmarked construction, rather than switching it into the nominative.)

- (82) *dvaú trín* **íti** evá pitāmahān somapān vindanti (ŚB 5.4.5.4)
 du.A pl.A pl.A
 'they find only two or three (not more) soma-drinking forefathers'
 (83) *tátaḥ ásurāḥ rauhiṇám* **íti** agním cikyire (ŚB 2.1.2.13)
 sg.A sg.A
 'then the Asuras built themselves the "rauhiṇa" Agni/fire'

(d) The 'Ritual Quotative', the beginnings of which were noted in the Atharva-Veda, now is fully established. It is frequently found followed by a restatement or paraphrase. While the Ritual Quotative almost invariably is unaccompanied by any overt SPEAK, but is always followed by *íti*, the subsequent restatement may or may not be followed by SPEAK and/or *íti*. Example (84) may serve as an illustration of some of the patterns which can be found.

- (84) *devásya savitúḥ savé* **íti** (*l*) *devéna savitrā prásūtaḥ* **íti** etát (*l*) *svargyāya śaktyā* **íti** (*l*) *yáthā eténa kármaṇā svargam lokam iyád evám* ∅ etát āha
 SPEAK
 '... "at the impulse of divine Savitr" (= VS 11.3b); that (is) "impelled by god Savitr" (= the explanation/paraphrase); "with power to the heavenly (world)" (= VS 11.3c); "so that by this act one might go to the heavenly world" (= explanation/paraphrase), that he says' (ŚB 6.3.1.14)

7.5: Finally, in addition to further instances of FEAR with *íti*-quotative and the Purpose variety of CAUSE with QUOTE + *íti* (cf. sections 6.4 and 6.5), Vedic Prose also offers the first attestations of a truly 'causal' CAUSE construction. And while the other two constructions just mentioned retain certain characteristics (in terms of subjunctive

mood and optional accentuation of the verb), the causal construction has no such overt features of subordinate structure; cf. (85). However, the frequent occurrence of the causal correlative *tásmād* 'therefore' after such causal quotative constructions clearly suggests a dependent-clause interpretation.

- (85) *yajñám ... tanavai íti tásmād* ādityám carúm ... nír vapati
'(Because/thinking) "I will ... spread the sacrifice", therefore he prepares the
Āditya pap ...' (ŚB 3.2.3.7)

At the same time, however, at this stage of the language it still seems to be always possible to supply an expression like 'thinking', as in the gloss above. Where such a reading would not be possible, i.e. where the causal relation between dependent and main clause is conceived of as an objective one, existing independently from the thinking of the agent of the main clause, different structures are found, as in (86) and (87).²⁵

- (86) **yád** daśadaśa ékaikam camasám anuprásrptāḥ bhāvanti **tásmād** u evá
daśapéyam (ŚB 5.4.5.3)
'because each time ten (men) creep after the cup, therefore it is called the
daśapeya (= the one to be drunk by ten)'
(87) **yád** eṣām rájānaḥ rájasūyayājínaḥ ásuḥ **tád** ha sma tád abhyāhuḥ
'because their kings were performers of the *rājasūya*, therefore they used to
say this' (ŚB 5.5.2.5)

This restriction on the use of the causal construction clearly indicates the origin of the structure, namely as a reinterpretation of quotatives with deleted THINK.

7.6: The major innovations of Vedic Prose, then, lie in the development of 'nesting' *íti*-quotatives (but with a constraint against *íti* 'pile-up'), the use of the quotative with SEE, the extension of the NAME quotative to technical terminology, its use as an equivalent of italics in technical discussions and to indicate emphasis, and the development of a Causal variety of the CAUSE construction (limited to causes existing in the mind of the main-clause agent). In addition, Vedic Prose shows further extensions of the Embracing quotative at the expense of other competing constructions, as well as fuller use of the 'Ritual Quotative'. At the same time, however, older, rival constructions persist (leading to occasional blends between indirect and quotative constructions). Moreover, we find occasional instances of archaic *íti* 'thus', used non-quotatively.

8: The Classical Language

The post-Vedic language described by Speijer (1886:379-88) does not differ markedly from the Vedic-Prose situation just described. (Even syntactic blends between indirect and quotative constructions continue to be found; cf. *ibid.* 382-3.) The main differences can be briefly characterized as follows:

(a) The occasional appearance of *íti*-initial quotatives, as in (88) below, seems to suggest that though moribund and not appearing in the post-Rig-Vedic earlier language, this construction never was completely lost.

- (88) **íti** ca enam uvāca duḥkhitā / *suhṛdaḥ paśya* ...

'and (thus) she, distressed, said to him "See the friends ..."'

(b) *iti* may appear after QU(estion words), as in *kim iti* 'why' (lit. 'saying what' [or rather: "“what” unquote’ = ‘because of what; for what purpose’ = ‘why’]).

(c) The quotative may be used to state 'objective' CAUSE, not just a causal relationship existing in the mind of the main-clause agent; cf. example (1) above.

9: Sanskrit summary

Surveying the evidence of Sanskrit we find a constantly expanding use of the quotative construction, especially that of the Embracing variant. This expansion can be diagrammed as follows.²⁶ (The inserted quotative is ignored.) Given this increasing expansion and reshaping of the construction, from very modest, and morphosyntactically quite different beginnings in the Rig-Veda, to the full panoply of attestations in the Classical language, it is not difficult to see in the quotative a Sanskrit INNOVATION, just barely in its beginning stages in the earliest, Rig-Vedic language. At the same time, however, it is also possible to argue that in the shape in which it appears in the Early Rig-Veda, the quotative may be essentially INHERITED and that the innovations which have taken place lie in the gradual reinterpretation, reshaping, and expansion of the construction.

To more meaningfully decide between these two competing interpretations, it will be necessary to look at outside, comparative evidence

	Obligatoriness/Frequency				Syntax/Pragmatics												
	G	I	F	E	SAY	THI	KNO	HEA	SEE	∅	Pur.	Caus	NA	QU	EMPH	ONO	OTH
Earl y RV	C	R	F	R	+	(+)	-	(+)i	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Late RV	C	R	F	C													+i
AV	C/F	-	C	C	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+i%
Late AV	C/F	-	C	F	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+i%
Ved. Pr.	F	-	R	F	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(+)£	+\$	-	+	+	+i%
Clas s.	F	(R)	R	F	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+i%

Notes: iOnly *iti*-less construction; i'Ritual Quotative' (or, in the Classical Language, quotation of authorities, etc.); %With FEAR; £Not 'objective' cause; \$Also 'technical' uses.

II: COMPARATIVE INDO-EUROPEAN

10: Latin and Hittite (Anatolian)

The only other two ancient Indo-European languages which are generally acknowledged to have a quotative construction are Latin and Hittite (and other ancient Anatolian languages related to Hittite).

10.1: In Latin,²⁷ the quotative construction is marked by the finite-verbal form *inquit, inquam* 'says, say', usually (but not necessarily always) inserted into QUOTE after the first word or constituent of the quotation; cf. the examples below. In general, this quotative construction requires the presence of SAY or of an easily recoverable SAY. However, some special uses can be discerned. One is found in the quotation of scriptural authority, where however a verb of speaking is easily supplied; cf. (89). Similarly, the use as a 'definitory' construction, as in (90), is not too difficult to derive from a literal interpretation of *inquam* as 'I say'. The most specialized use seems to be that found in (91), where *inquit* marks the objections of a hypothetical opponent in what is hypostasized as a 'real' argument.

- (89) *furem ... luce occidi vetant XII tabulae: 'cum ... hostem ... teneas, nisi se telo defendit inquit, 'etiamsi ..., non occides ...'*
 'the 12 Tablets prohibit killing a thief by daylight: "When you should hold an enemy, unless he defends himself with a weapon" "even if ..., you should not slay ..."'
- (90) *has compedes, fasces, inquam, hos laureatos*
 'these fetters, "these laureled powers of authority" (I say)'
 = 'these fetters, i.e. these laureled powers of authority'

- (91) '*parva* **inquit** '*est res*'; at magna culpa
'(one might say) "the case is (of) small (significance)", but the guilt (is) great'

Note that though the Latin quotative construction is not excessively rare, it is dwarfed in much of Classical literature by the indirect accusative-cum-infinitive construction.

10.2: Unlike Latin *inquit/inquam*, the Hittite and general Anatolian quotative marker *wa(r)* is quite commonly used. True, there may be occasional exceptions, especially in the mythological texts and in short verbal exchanges; cf. Friedrich 1967:140-50. But ordinarily the particle is used; cf. (92) beside (93).

Ever since Götze and Pedersen (1934:74) proposed it, the generally accepted derivation of *wa(r)* has been from the verb Hitt. *wer-iya-* 'call, invoke'. To Götze and Pedersen's mind, such a derivation would have parallels in the [clitic-shortening] development of quotative Russ. *de*, OPol. *dzie*, Czech from earlier full verbs of saying. [These earlier full forms are **dějati* 'put, say' for Russian and Polish, *pravy* 'said' for Czech.] Recently, however, Joseph (1981, 1982) has proposed a different source, namely Hitt. *iwar* 'like, as', for which Joseph finds parallels in the development of *like* into a quotative particle in certain American English dialects, an apparently similar development in Neomelanesian, and the use of particles meaning 'like, thus' in Buang (New Guinea) and in Tibeto-Burman Lahu.²⁸ Given that both 'thus' and SPEAK can frequently function as quotative markers, Joseph's hypothesis may well constitute a credible alternative. (I would feel more comfortable however, if it could be shown how Hittite non-deictic *iwar* 'thus, like' could acquire the deictic meaning 'thus' normally found with such quotative markers.)

Be that as it may, the morphosyntax of the particle is quite simple: To the extent that it is used at all, *wa(r)* occurs in the characteristic initial strings of the Anatolian languages, following the first (presumably accented) element of each quoted sentence.

Ordinarily the quotative is governed by SAY. However, 'name', 'inscribe' may also be found. In a number of cases with omitted SPEAK, it is also possible to supply a verb like THINK, but SAY cannot be ruled out.

Frequently, however, the preceding SPEAK may be further accompanied by deictic *kiššan* 'thus'; cf. e.g. (92) below. (Additional examples may be found in Friedrich 1967 and elsewhere (passim).) Note that this introductory formula may also occur where no quotative particle occurs in the QUOTE; cf. (93).²⁹

- (92) nu man **kiš(š)an** kuiški memai *annišan-war-an LUGAL-izanni kuwat tittanut*
SPEAK

kinunma-wa-šši kurur kuwat hatrieškiši (/) man-war-ašmukan šulliyat kuwapi
Ú-UL

'Now if someone speaks as follows "Why did you formerly place him on the throne? And why are you now declaring war on him?" (In answer, I say) "If he had never started hostilities with me ..."' (Apology of Hattusilis 3.73-77)

- (93) nu **ki]ššan** memahhi *kiez φ mahhan [ni]ngir zig-φ-az* ^DKAL ^{KUS}kuršaš
SPEAK

(Ritual of Anniwiyanis 4.2-3)

'Now I speak thus "As these have drunk, so drink you, KAL of the Shield'
(Sim. ib.3.35-44; but 1.28-29 has *wa*.)

The last sentence of example (92) also shows that the quotative marker may characterize a QUOTE not accompanied by an overt SPEAK. In (92), it is easy to recover an 'I answer'. However, there are contexts where such an analysis would be more difficult. The most striking construction of this sort which I have found is (94), in which the most likely interpretation seems to be that QUOTE specifies the reason or CAUSE for the fact that there is no recompense.

- (94) takku SAL-an kui[šk]i pittenuzzi (/) EGIR-andama[šm]a[š]a [š]ardiyaš paizzi
(/) takku 2 LÚ.MES našma 3 LÚ.MES akkanzi šarnikzi[1] NU.GÁL [z]ik-**wa**
UR.BAR.RA kišat
'If anyone elopes with a woman, and a rescuer goes after them, if two men or
three men die, (there is) no recompense "You have become a wolf"
(Selections from the Code, 2.29-30)

Other special uses of the \emptyset -SPEAK quotative seem to be the appearance of quotative *-wa-* in Hieroglyphic Hittite, in what Dressler (1970:387) plausibly refers to as 'talking' inscriptions (of the type "I am the monument of ..."), and perhaps also the Palaic example (95) below (cf. Carruba 1972:16 and 20).

- (95) [nuku] pašhullašaš ti[ya]z tabarni LUGAL-i *papazku-war* ti [anna]zku-**war** ti
... (KUB XXXV.165vs.21-22)
'And now, sungod of the gods (?), for Tabarna, the king, you (are) "father",
you (are) "mother" ...'

Unfortunately, the interpretation of this inscription is made difficult by the presence of several hapax legomena, as well as the uncertain value of the *ku* preceding *war*. Still, it is possible that we have here something akin to the NAME variant of the Sanskrit quotative.

Hittite and the other Anatolian languages thus offer clear evidence for a quasi-obligatory quotative particle *-wa(r)-* which normally is incorporated into the initial string following the first word of each clause of the QUOTE. Beside with overt SPEAK (= SAY), it may also be used with \emptyset -SPEAK. And this construction shows some probable evidence for extended, secondary or specialized uses (as in (94) and in the 'talking' inscriptions of Hieroglyphic Hittite), and some possible evidence in (95). In addition to, and sometimes instead of, the quotative particle *-wa(r)-*, Hittite quite frequently shows *kiš^vsan* 'thus' preceding QUOTE.

11: Homeric Greek

As noted in my other contribution to this volume, Homeric Greek has a Final Formula which ordinarily indicates the end of a single-speaker direct quote or of an (extended) verbal exchange between several speakers. This Final Formula comes in two basic variants, one consisting of the defective verb *ê* '(he) said', the other of *hōs* 'thus' plus a verb of speaking, most usually a finite form of *phē/pha-* 'speak'; cf. (96) and (97). In the first three books of the Iliad, out of 60 cases where this Final Formula could occur,

only 5 do not show it. That is, in Homeric Greek, this construction appears to be quasi-obligatory.

- (96) *Pēleídēs d' ... proséeipe ... / ... / hōs pháto Pēleídēs ...*
 SPEAK
 'But the son of Peleus spoke ... QUOTE ... (Thus spoke the son of Peleus) and ...' (Il.1.223-45)
- (97) *tēn d'apameiboméno proséphē ... Akhilleús / ... / ê kai*
 SPEAK
 'to her, answering, spoke Achilles QUOTE (He spoke) and ...' (Il.1.214-19)

This Formula usually occurs after a QUOTE introduced by a preceding SAY as in the above examples. Sometimes a related noun may appear instead of the verb. Exceptions to this pattern are exceedingly rare. I have noted only the types exemplified in (98) and (99). Note however that in (98) there is a noun of speaking next to finite HEAR; and in (99) a verb (or noun) of speaking is easily supplied. In both cases, the Final Formula is used, even though in (99) no explicit SAY is found in the structure preceding QUOTE, and in (98) the finite verb is HEAR.

- (98) *... ameílikton d' óp' ákousan / ... / ê kai ...* (Il.11.137-43)
 'voice' HEAR
 'but they heard an ungentle voice QUOTE (He spoke) and ...'
- (99) *aĩpsa d' ep' Aíanta proíei kēruka Thoōtēn / ... / hōs éphat ...*
 'sent'
 'Forthwith he sent to Aias the herald Thootes (with the words) QUOTE (Thus he spoke) ...' (Il.12.342-51)

In terms of its quasi-obligatoriness and the relatively few variants which it permits, the Homeric Greek Final Formula clearly qualifies as a quotative. However, it is remarkable that there is no strong evidence for extended uses of the construction, with or without \emptyset -SPEAK.

In concluding this section it might be mentioned that in addition to the Final Formula, a variant of one of its sub-types may occasionally occur preceding QUOTE, in a 'generic-quote' construction; cf. (100). (Cf. also note 27 of my other contribution to this volume.)

- (100) *hōde dé tís eípesken Akhaiôn te Tróōn te / ... / hōs éphan ...*
 'and thus would say one or another of the Achaeans or the Trojans QUOTE
 (Thus they spoke) ...'

12: Avestan³⁰

As noted by Kuiper (1967), Avestan has a construction with *uiti* 'thus' which in many ways resembles the early Rig-Vedic *íti*-construction, but which also differs from it in its morphosyntax. In the following I will take a closer look at the Avestan evidence, including a construction overlooked by Kuiper.

12.1: In addition to indirect constructions similar to those of Sanskrit, Avestan also has two direct quote constructions, one employing the particle *uiti* 'thus', the other having no special particle. Both of these can be used with SAY and THINK; the unmarked construction additionally can occur with HEAR, FEAR, and \emptyset -SPEAK; cf. the examples below.

- (101) *mraoṭ ahurō mazdā spitamāi zaraθuštrāi ...* (Yt.10.1)
 SPEAK
 'A.M. said to Z., the Spitamide, QUOTE'
- (102) *uityaojanā miθrāi vouru.gaoyaoitēe ...* (Yt.10.1)
 SPEAK
 'Thus speaking (they cry to/address) M.V. QUOTE'
- (103) *iθa mainyete duxšvaranā / noiṭ imaṭ višpəm dužvarštəm* (Yt.10.105)
 SPEAK
 "'Thus", thinks the ill-fated, "(it is) not all this illdoing ..."
 OR: 'Thus thinks the ill-fated ...' (?)
- (104) *aḍāṭ fraša ḥam.rāzayata ātarš ... uiti avaθa maṅhānō* (Yt.19.47)
 'thus' SPEAK
 'then A. stood up, thinking thus QUOTE'
- (105) *sraotū ... gūšahva tū ahurā / kē airyamā aṅhṭ* (Y 49.7)
 SPEAK SPEAK
 'let him hear, listen you, O A. "What Aryan shall be ...?"'
- (106) *yahmaṭ ... fratərəsenti ... mōi tū iθra ahurahe ... vaēyāi jasaēma* (Yt.10.68-9)
 FEAR
 'wherefore they are frightened ... "May we not meet here with the charge of the ... lord"'
- (107) *srira daḍāiti daēmāna ... kō maṅ yazāite ...* (Yt.10.107-8)
 'he looks around (lit. he places/gives beautiful eyes) (thinking/saying) "Who will worship me? ... "'

12.2: Except perhaps for (103), all the above examples have SPEAK (\pm *uiti*) before QUOTE; and that is in fact the most common pattern. However, a minor pattern is that found in (108), with (*uiti* +) SPEAK inserted into QUOTE.

- (108) *ušta ahmāi naire mainyāi / uiti mraoṭ ahurō mazdā / āi ašāum zaraθvštra*
 (Yt.10.137; sim. ib.138, Yt.19.53)³¹
 "'Hail to the authoritative man" said A.M. "O truth-owning Z."

12.3: The relative frequency of the *uiti*-construction over against the unmarked structure is subject to considerable fluctuation. Thus in the Gāthas, the ratio of *uiti* to \emptyset is 1 : 10 (counting as one single instance the 9 repetitions of the formula *taṭ θwā pārəsā ...* 'that I ask you QUOTE' in Y 44). In the hymn to Mithra it is 5 : 16. In the total Romanized selection of Reichelt 1911, the ratio is 17 : 100. However, that ratio is skewed by two factors: One is the frequent use of the Verbal Exchange Formula (cf. (109) and the discussion in section 16 of my other contribution to this volume); and that formula never occurs with *uiti*. The other consists of 20 instances of the formula exemplified in

(110), in which *yazata/yazanta* 'worshipped' is followed by *jaḍyaṭ/jaḍyən* 'prayed' which with the subsequent QUOTE specifies the 'content' of the worship. In its structure, this formula is parallel to what we find in (111), there *uiti* + SPEAK takes the place of *jaḍyaṭ* (in the same hymn). If we exclude these formulaic expressions, the ratio will be more like that in the hymn to Mithra, namely 17 : 35. (If only the Verbal Exchange Formula is excluded, the ratio will be 17 : 55.) Even with these adjustments, however, the *uiti*-construction must be said to be used quite sparingly.

(109) ā dīm pārəsaṭ zaraθuštrō (Y 9.1) (Sim. 44 x elsewhere)

SPEAK

'Z. asked him QUOTE'

(110) taṃ yazata ... āaṭ hīm jaiḍyaṭ (Yt.5.17-18) (Sim. ib. 19 x)

'her he worshiped ..., and to her he prayed QUOTE'

(111) taṃ yazata ... paitivacaṇhaṭ **uiti** vacēbiš aojanō (Yt.5.76)

'with speech' 'with words' SPEAK

'He worshipped her with speech, thus speaking with words QUOTE'

12.4: What is especially interesting is that *uiti* almost invariably occurs next to SPEAK (cf. e.g. (102) and (104)), at best separated from it by a noun of speaking (cf. (111)). More than that, when placed next to *aoj-* 'speak', *uiti* quite frequently appears in its sandhi form *uity-* (as in (102)). Considering that sandhi across word boundary, in Avestan, is limited to words which form a single phonological unit (mainly to compounds), this suggests that there has been an (incipient) univerbation of *uiti* with SPEAK.

Examples (102), (104), and (111) further show *uiti* occurring with a participle of SPEAK. This is no accident, for of the 17 instances of *uiti* + SPEAK in Reichelt 1911, fully 11 have a participle of SPEAK. Moreover, this *uiti* + SPEAK-participle construction may be used either with a 'higher', finite-verb SPEAK (as in (111)), or with a non-SPEAK higher verb (cf. (104)), or with no higher verb at all (as in (102)). Considering that present participles are not normally used by themselves or with non-Aux.-verbs, the use of participles of SPEAK in constructions like (102) and (104) suggests the need for a special explanation. The most probable explanation seems to be that *uiti* + participle of SPEAK has become a synchronically productive quotative marker. (Structures like (108), with finite SPEAK, then might be archaisms.)

While this interpretation of the participial *uiti* + SPEAK construction as a synchronically productive quotative marker may be somewhat speculative, it is I believe safe to state that the general *uiti* + SPEAK (or \emptyset -SPEAK) construction is comparable in its range of uses to Homeric Greek and comparable to Latin in terms of the frequency with which it is employed.

12.5: There is evidence that in addition to this quotative construction Avestan developed another quotative marker. As apparently first noted by Geldner (1885:246-7), a couple of very late texts, whose functions vis-à-vis the earlier hymns is comparable to that of Vedic Prose in relation to the Vedic hymns, offer *iḍa* 'here; (thus)', once also *iθa* 'thus; (here)', indicating 'Ritual Quotes' as in (112) and (113). (Note however that this marker is not obligatory.) Unlike the *uiti* + SPEAK construction, this *iḍa/iθa* regularly

occurs AFTER the quoted passage, although string-initial elements (such as *para ĩm* in (112)) may intervene between QUOTE and the marker.

(112) *dazda manañhō* para ĩm **iθa** manañhe cinasti (Y 19.13)

SPEAK

"*dazda manañhō*" (a quotation from Y 27 on which Y 19 is a commentary) teaches/means "for the thought/for thinking"

(113) yaṭ dīm dāmabyō cinasti *mazda* **iθa** tēm yaṭ ahmāi dāmañ (ib.14)

SPEAK

"*mazda*" (= Y 27.13b *mazdāi*) teaches/means that he (exists for the creatures (and) that the creatures (are) for him¹³²

Etymologically, the *iða* of these constructions creates certain difficulties, since it seems to reflect earlier *idā* 'here' (cf. Skt. *ihā* 'here'), an unlikely quotative marker. However, the one-time occurrence of quotative *iθa*, combined with other considerations, provides a clue toward a more satisfactory explanation, identifying the *iða* of these constructions as a descendant of earlier *iθā* 'thus', a cognate of Skt. *itthā*: First of all, there is independent evidence for a merger of *θ* and *ð* (< *d*) in the spoken language of late Avestan; cf. e.g. Skt. *veda*, GAv. *vaēdā* : YAv. *vaēða* beside *vaēθa* 'knows', Skt. *padyate* 'falls, goes' : YAv. *paiðyāite* 'he shall fall' beside *paiθyeiti* 'goes', etc. Secondly, that such a merger led to the interchangeability of earlier *idā* 'here', and *iθā* 'thus' is suggested by occasional uses of *iθa* in the meaning 'here' and of *iða* as meaning 'thus'; cf. (114) and (115). In addition, the use of *iða* in (116) is strikingly similar to that of *itthā* in RV *bád itthā* (cf. (67) above).³³ Moreover, the occasional use of deictic relatives of *iθa*, viz. *aθa* and *avaθa* 'thus', in reference to a following QUOTE (cf. (117) and (118), as well as (104) with *uiti* + *avaθa*) suggests that *iθā* likewise must have been usable to refer to QUOTE.³⁴ Finally, note that conversely, the ordinary quotative marker *uiti* shows occasional attestation in the meaning 'thus'; cf. (119).

(114) mā avi zaṃ ni.urvise **iθa** mē tūm haṃ.caraṇuha antarə.arəðəm nmānahe (Yt. 17.60)

'do not go down to the earth. **Here** wander around in the interior of my house ...'

(115) nōiṭ zī ĩm zā šā yā darəya akaršta saēta ... **iða** carāiti huraoða yā darəya apuθra aēiti (V 3.24)

'for the earth (is) not happy which lies unplowed (for) long, **thus/likewise/just** as a beautiful woman who goes childless (for) long'

(116) **bāða iða** āfrasāne daṇhubyō **bāða iða** aēni bərəθi ... (V 3.27)

'truly (thus (it is)), I will go to the countries, truly (thus (it is)), I will go on to give birth ...' (Sim. *ibid.*29, except the second *bāða* occurs without *iða*)

(117) yō **avaθa** vyāxmanyata (Yt.19.43)

SPEAK

'who spoke thus at the meeting QUOTE' (Cf. (104), *ibid.*47)

(118) **aθa** mraoṭ ahurō mazdā (Āfrinakān 4.3)

SPEAK

'Thus spoke A.M. QUOTE'

(119) *yōi vaṇhēuš ā manaṇhō šyeintī yāscā ūiti* (Y 39.3)
'who (masc.) hold on to the Good Thought and who (fem.) **thus**/likewise'

12.6: The late Avestan 'Ritual Quotative' construction with *iḍa/iṭa* thus can be identified as an earlier *iθā* 'thus' construction, and thus as ultimately related to the quotative *uiti* 'thus' construction: Apparently *uiti* and (***)*iθā* represent different specializations of constructions in which a deictic adverb meaning 'thus' was used to focus the listener's attention on a particular QUOTE. While *uiti* was almost entirely specialized in this new function (the type (119) seems to be limited to three examples), *iθā*--like *aθā* and *avaθā*--largely retained its original deictic function, becoming quotative only in the 'Ritual Quotative'.

12.7: In conclusion it might be noted that the normal use of *uiti* + SPEAK before QUOTE, the rarer insertion into QUOTE, and the positioning of **iθā* after QUOTE indicate an original freedom of occurrence comparable to that of *iti* + SPEAK in early Rig-Vedic (cf. 5.3-5). This impression of comparability is further supported by the fact that just as in the Rig-Veda (cf. section 5.3) the Avestan order of the quotative particle and SPEAK may in a few rare cases be reversed; cf. (120).

(120) *aḍaē-ca ūiti* (V 4.47)
SPEAK
'and I say (thus) QUOTE'

The dynamics of the Avestan constructions, however, differ from what we find in Sanskrit: There is no evidence in Avestan for the complex developments found in the late Rig-Veda and especially in the post-Rig-Vedic language. Moreover, unlike the Sanskrit quotative, the Avestan constructions remain quite optional throughout the attested history of the language.

13: Other Indo-European languages

Attested considerably later than the languages so far discussed, the other Indo-European languages do not seem to offer in their earliest stages any unambiguous evidence for quotative constructions. In some of the languages however, some such constructions did develop. The case is most clear for Slavic, where as noted in 10.2, Russian, Old Polish, and Czech have a particle *de*, *dzie*, *prý* respectively, which can be traced to earlier SPEAK. To these might be added the similar Russian (slang) *mol*. Constructions marked by these particles (which usually take the second position within QUOTE) may or may not be preceded by 'independent' SPEAK. The constructions are used in various contexts, similar but perhaps not identical to the use of the German subjunctive in reported speech. These may range from quoting someone without taking responsibility for the accuracy of what is being quoted, to just a simple repetition of that the speaker has said earlier. Unlike the German subjunctive construction, however, these Slavic particles are always used with DIRECT QUOTE.³⁵

A quasi-quotative construction is found in the *quotha* of earlier Modern English, as in (121) below. However, this construction is limited to very special (ironic, etc.) pragmatic settings.

(121) *The fickle moon, quotha*, I wish my friends were half as constant³⁶

A more recent development is that noted by Joseph (1981) for (*it's*) *like* in colloquial Ohio English, as a marker of "internal" quotation--an approximate representation in the form of reported speech of what someone had in mind but did not express.' In some ways, of course, the use of a construction with *like*, rather than *thus*, is quite unusual. However, one may conjecture that this regional development (a) is parasitic on the more general use of *like* in colloquial American English and (b) may have proceeded from a structure of the sort (*it's*) *like this*.

Developments of this sort are interesting in that they show that quotative constructions may arise at various times, through independent developments. Moreover, they show that similar elements (Verbs of speaking and adverbs meaning 'thus') may be drawn on in such independent developments. At the same time, however, it is interesting how rare such developments seem to be in the more modern Indo-European languages of Europe. This makes the appearance of quotative constructions in all the early Indo-European languages³⁷ so much more remarkable.

14: Summary of the Indo-European evidence

All of the ancient, earliest-attested Indo-European languages have some kind of quotative construction. The morphosyntax of these constructions may differ considerably, as indicated in the following table. Moreover, even to the extent that languages might agree on using SPEAK, 'thus', or a combination of these as quotative marker, the actual morphemes employed differ (as between Skt. *īti*, Av. *uīti/iθa*, Gk. *hōs* 'thus'). Also the degree of obligatoriness may differ, with Hittite and Homeric Greek having the construction most consistently, Avestan and Latin showing it much more sparingly, and Rig-Vedic Sanskrit holding an intermediate position. All of the languages, however, agree on permitting the construction only under quite limited syntactic/pragmatic conditions: mainly with SAY and to some extent also with THINK; with HEAR the construction occurs seldom at best. Hittite and Latin, however, also show evidence for some specialized uses of the construction; and so does Avestan with its (late) 'Ritual Quotative'. (None of these, however, are comparable to the full panoply of uses found in Classical Sanskrit.)

In spite of these differences, however, it is--as noted--remarkable that all of these languages should have quotative formations. Moreover, disregarding the differences in morphosyntax and specialized uses which can easily be attributed to independent innovations, the languages show a remarkable agreement in the syntactic/pragmatic contexts in which they permit their respective quotatives. It is, I believe, hardly likely that this situation should be due to chance. It therefore seems more attractive to attribute the construction to the proto-language.

True, this does cause certain difficulties as far as the morphosyntax is concerned. But these are not insurmountable. Thus the appearance of the quotative particle in clause-second position (within the QUOTE) in Hittite and Latin can be attributed (a) to the pattern with quotative marker inserted into QUOTE and (b) to the fact that the marker may well have become clitic and thus--synchronically functioning as sentence clitic for QUOTE --would have gone into clause-second position in accordance with Wackernagel's Law.

	Obligatoriness	Quotative marker		Morphosyntax of major quotative marker			
		thus	SPEAK	Before QUOTE	In QUOTE	After QUOTE	Other
Sanskrit (Early RV)	C	+		R	R	F	Ri
Avestan	C/R	+	(+) ⁱ	F	R	R [£]	
Hittite (Anatolian)	F	(+) ^{\$}	+ [%]	-	F	-	
Homeric Greek	F	+*	+*	(R)§	-	F	
Latin	C/R		+	-	F	-	

Notes: ⁱEmbracing construction; ⁱIf univerbation of *uiti* + SPEAK is accepted; [£]In the rarely attested 'Ritual Quotative'; ^{\$}Frequently preceding QUOTE, even without quotative *-wa(r)-*; [%]But note Joseph's connection with *iwar* 'as, like'; *Both 'thus' + SPEAK and plain SPEAK are used; §Only in the rare 'generic quote' pattern.

Noting now the prominent role played by words meaning 'thus' in Sanskrit, Avestan, and Greek, and the optional use of 'thus' in Hittite,³⁸ as well as the role of SPEAK in Greek and Latin (and also perhaps in Hittite), it is possible to reconstruct a syntactic pattern with 'thus' + SPEAK as a quotative construction for Proto-Indo-European and to permit this structure to occur before, after, and inserted into QUOTE: All we need to allow for is the possibility that just as in independent uses, 'thus' and SPEAK were subject to constant morphological and lexical remakings (cf. Skt. *itthā/itthām, iti, tātā* Ay. *uiti, iθa, aθa, avaθa*, Hitt. *kiššan*, Gk. *hōs, hōde*, etc., Lat. *ita, sic*, all meaning 'thus, so'), so also in their quotative uses they could undergo some remaking, especially as long as the etymological meaning/function of the construction was still quite transparent. Where through reinterpretation, however, one or the other of the two markers becomes the major quotative marker and where the position of that marker gets to be relatively fixed, at that point the construction would tend to become frozen, permitting little or no further change.

In all fairness, however, it must be admitted that a different, 'areal' explanation is conceivable, namely that the appearance of quotative constructions in these ancient Indo-European languages was due to influence from the ancient Near Eastern prestige languages which, as we shall see presently, had quotative constructions of similar structure. What may be attractive about this explanation is the fact that as the prestige of these ancient Near Eastern languages and their cultures declined, so apparently did the use of quotatives in the Indo-European languages (except for Sanskrit which by this time however, can be assumed to have been safely located in another quotative area, that of South Asia). For note that there does not seem to be any evidence for a survival of the Avestan, Homeric Greek, and Classical Latin quotatives in the later (quasi-)descendant languages. (Note that though later Greek may occasionally show constructions reminiscent of the Homeric patterns, these lack the obligatoriness and the relative standardization of the Homeric structures.)

Attractive as this alternative analysis may appear, however, I am bothered by the assumption that the Near Eastern influence reached as far west as Latin. Moreover, it may be the disappearance of quotative constructions which is an areal phenomenon, just like the change from SOV to SVO syntax in (most of) continental Europe (cf. Hock 1982). In fact, this disappearance of the quotative may geographically be more limited than would appear at first sight. For later Greek and Iranian (Persian), as well as Armenian show direct-discourse structures (without change in person or mood) introduced by a new set of markers: Gk. *(h)óti*, MPers. *ku*, NPers. *ki*, Arm. *(e)the, bam* (etc.); cf. Hock 1975:107 and Friedrich 1943. And as Friedrich (ibid.) shows, constructions of this sort are found also in Georgian (with postposed *-o*) and Turkish (with *diye* 'having said').

Whether we attribute the early Indo-European quotative constructions to inheritance or to areal influence, however, the conclusion seems inescapable that quotative constructions remarkably similar in their morphosyntax and syntactic/pragmatic uses to what we find in early Rig-Vedic are found also in the other early Indo-European languages and that this remarkable similarity can hardly be attributed to independent developments.

III: NON-INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

15: Ancient Near Eastern languages

15.1: The earliest attested language, Sumerian, is reported to have had a quotative construction marked by *-e-še-*, perhaps an 'emphatic' form of a verb *še-* 'say'. This construction, however, seems to have been used quite rarely. Moreover, it could apparently be used independently, in non-quotative contexts. The syntactic position of this form was post-QUOTE. (Note that Sumerian was an SOV language.) Cf. e.g. Jestin 1946:331-5.

15.2: Accadian (likewise an SOV language) also has a quotative construction which, however, seems to be used more commonly. (Even so, other constructions were available, such as unmarked QUOTE (von Soden 1952:208), or dependent clauses introduced by *kīma* 'that' (ibid.233).) The Accadian quotative construction either was introduced by preposed *enma* (later *unmā*) 'thus' or marked by inserted *mi* or *me* (a shortened form of *enma*) which frequently, but not necessarily occurs after the first element of QUOTE. (Cf. von Soden 1952:176, 178.) Examples would be the following.³⁹ Note that (122) shows that the quotative construction may be used without overt SPEAK. I have, however, not found any evidence for specialized uses of the quotative.

(122) **enma** íškūn- ᵀdagan ana lugala-ra

'Thus (says/writes) I.D. to L.QUOTE'

(123) apunama *guitumma-me eqlam ula a'ruš* a taqbí

'Do not under any circumstances say "The Gutaeans (are here, therefore) I did not cultivate the field"'

Given that Accadian SOV is commonly attributed to Sumerian influence, (cf. e.g. Riemschneider 1969:16), it is tempting to see Sumerian substratum also in this construction. However, as noted earlier, the Sumerian quotative construction is quite rare.

Moreover, its morphosyntax (postposed SAY) is rather different from the preposed or inserted 'thus' of Accadian.

Similarly, one might perhaps be tempted to see Accadian influence in the Hittite quotative. In this case, the morphosyntax would in fact be much more similar, especially if preposed Hitt. *kiššan* 'thus' is taken into consideration and if *-wa(r)-* is derived from *iwar* via a meaning 'thus'. However, as we have seen, the Hittite pattern has parallels also in the other ancient Indo-European languages.

15.3: Also Elamite had a quotative construction, marked by something like an old, clitically shortened absolutive of a verb SAY which is placed after QUOTE; cf. Friedrich 1943. In addition, however, the examples in Friedrich suggest that QUOTE often is preceded by structures of the sort 'He spoke thus' or even longer expressions; cf. e.g. (124), where *na-an-ri* preceding QUOTE is the synchronically productive absolutive of a verb of speaking.

(124) hi ši-la ap ti-ri-iš na-an-ri QUOTE **ma-ra**
 'thus'⁴⁰ 'spoke' 'saying'
 'He spoke thus, saying QUOTE'

Apparently this construction could be employed also with THINK. I have not seen any evidence for specialized uses of the construction.

This "exuberant" type of construction, with multiple instances of SPEAK as well as of 'thus', looks rather different from the Sumerian and Accadian constructions, but may compare well with some of the early Indo-European constructions, as well as with Classical Tibetan (cf. below).

Here again, direct influence from Sumerian or Accadian may be difficult to justify. At the same time, however, there does now seem to be sufficient evidence to suggest the existence of a quotative linguistic area in the ancient Near East, an area with which perhaps also Proto-Indo-European or at least prehistoric Indo-Iranian, Greek, Anatolian, and Latin may have been affiliated.

16: The languages of South Asia

The interpretation of the evidence furnished by the various non-Indo-European languages of South Asia is made difficult by several factors. Perhaps the most important of these is that none of the languages is attested anywhere as early as Rig-Vedic Sanskrit. Many are attested only since the last century, or even later. Even under the best of circumstances we are therefore required to go back beyond the actually attested data, (closer) to the reconstructed proto-stage, before we can meaningfully compare these languages with early Rig-Vedic.

This is further complicated by the fact that except for the great literary languages (Tibetan; Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam), thorough grammatical descriptions either do not yet exist or are hard to get at for the non-specialist. Even where descriptions do exist, however, they often do not go beyond the morphology and/or morphosyntax of quotative constructions.

Moreover, just as a number of modern Indo-Aryan languages have lost the old quotative (replacing it with the Persian *ki*-construction or similar structures), so also a number of non-Indo-European languages seem to lack quotative constructions. And just

as some Indo-Aryan languages (e.g. Nepali, Bengali, Oriya, Dakhini Hindi/Urdu, and Marathi) have quotative constructions but do not agree with each other (or with Sanskrit) on the marker of the constructions, so also we find patterns of disagreement in many of the non-Indo-European languages of South Asia.

As a matter of area linguistics we may say that there is on one hand a Southern group of Dravidian languages, comprising the old literary languages, but also many of the neighboring "tribal" languages, in which postposed absolutes of a Proto-Dravidian *aṅ/en/iñ-* (hereafter: *eṅ-*) 'say (so)' are used to mark quotatives. To the North of this there is a 'Central' area in which quotatives seem to be found in most of the languages (whether Dravidian, Munda, or Indo-Aryan), but in which there is less agreement on the choice of quotative marker and on its morphosyntax. Intruding into this area is the large group of (North-Central and) Northwestern languages which lacks comparable constructions. This group comprises, among others, Hindi/Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri on the Indo-Aryan side, Brahui on the Dravidian side, and Korcu and Kharia on the Munda/Austro-Asiatic side. To the East of this area, however, we find two quotative areas: Bengali and Oriya on one hand, Nepali on the other. (Are these two areas linked with each other, or does the 'Northwestern' area extend between them?) And to the North and East we find in Tibeto-Burman a further group of quotative languages. Like the 'Central' group, these languages show a great degree of variation in quotative markers.

The greatest difficulty lies in interpreting these patterns. Kuiper (1967), attributing the 'Southern' *eṅ-* absolutes to Proto-Dravidian, evidently felt that it was this Dravidian pattern which spread to the Indo-Aryan and Munda languages with quotatives, and that the differences in marking observed in the non-Dravidian languages result from different directions taken in calquing the Dravidian construction. On the other hand, Masica (1976:189) apparently took essentially the same pattern of distribution as indicating a need for caution in this matter. Note however that his belief that North and Central Dravidian had no quotatives must have been based on insufficient evidence (cf. below). Before trying to tackle this difficult issue of interpretation, it would seem best to take a closer look at the evidence.

17: Dravidian

17.1: The four literary languages of the South clearly have a quotative marked by an absolute of the verb *eṅ-* which is postposed to QUOTE. This in turn normally seems to be followed by SPEAK, although given other evidence for extraposition in Dravidian, I would not be surprised to find occasional examples of extraposed QUOTE + quotative marker which would thus resemble the Embracing construction of Sanskrit. Unfortunately, however, information on patterns of this sort is virtually impossible to come by, using standard reference works.

In terms of their syntactic/pragmatic uses of the quotative, these languages show patterns strikingly similar to Sanskrit; cf. Kachru 1979. However, the use of quotatives with QU does not seem to be attested for either Kannada or Tamil, the two Dravidian languages studied by Kachru. And Tamil shows no quotatives with either HEAR or SEE. On the other hand, Indo-Aryan Marathi has virtually all of the Sanskrit uses, except those with ONOM and SEE. And Nepali, likewise Indo-Aryan, has all the Sanskrit uses outside of NAME, EMPH, QU, and ONOM. In this respect, then, the differences between

modern Dravidian and Indo-Aryan are not overwhelming. What is remarkable, though, is that none of them seems to have the full panoply of uses found in Classical Sanskrit.

It is also interesting to note that the morphology of the quotative marker shows variation, within a given language, across different languages, and through history. Thus as Kachru notes, Tamil and Kannada have two different absolutive formations each. Moreover, as Kuiper showed, the modern Tamil *enru* seems to be a replacement of an earlier *ena*, which outranks *enru* in Old Tamil by a ratio of 200 : 26. Finally, as Kuiper notes, Old Tamil *enru* is with two exceptions, always used 'in its full lexical meaning' (1967, note 41.)

17.2: Moving further to the North, we find some kind of quotative construction in apparently all the Dravidian languages other than Brahui. However, the further North we go (roughly speaking), the greater the differences from the Southern pattern.

Thus Pengo has two quotative markers, *inji* and *injele*, but unmarked QUOTES frequently occur instead of quotatives, cf. Text 1.8, 9; 6.1, 12 vs. 6.3, 7-9, 10, 11 in Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970. The postposed quotative markers *injali?e* (etc.), *injihih* (etc.) of Kuvi often are accompanied by *ele* 'thus'. QUOTE may in addition frequently be preceded by *ele icesi* 'said thus'. That is unlike the Southern languages, Kuvi frequently uses structures similar to the Sanskrit Embracing quotative, as well as structures involving an element 'thus'. Finally, finite (*ele*) *icesi* may occur after QUOTE instead of the non-finite quotative markers. (Cf. the texts in Israel 1979.)

No information has been accessible to me concerning the syntax/pragmatics of quotatives in this area.

17.3: Yet further North we find Malto with a possibly archaic, synchronically unmotivated quotative particle *ay*, but also with unmarked QUOTE, as well as with extraposed structures in which QUOTE is followed by absolutive-like 'conditional' *ānko/ānkah* 'saying, speaking', which always seems to be a part of the following, independent main clause. That is, in these structures, the absolutive-like form of SPEAK does not seem to be part of the preceding QUOTE, but seems to be functioning as a link with the following clause, an element which in terms of surface structure belongs to the following sentence. In addition, *tan*, *je*, and *ki* 'that' may be used after SAY, THINK, and SEE. Cf. Mahapatra 1972:197, 199, and text.

Kurukh uses a 'conjunctive participle' of one of its verb for SAY to mark direct discourses employing this construction also to mark Purpose, cf. Hahn 1911. However, the verb employed is *bāc-*, not a cognate of *en-*. Moreover, the 'conjunctive participle' is simply the finite verb agreeing in person and number with the main verb and optionally linked with it by *kī* or *darā*. Finally, note that in Hahn's Kurukh version of the Prodigal Son, all direct discourse is unmarked and that a similar situation is found in the examples of Vesper (1971).

Brahui, finally, apparently has no traces of a comparable quotative.

17.4: This evidence can be interpreted in several different ways. On one hand one might claim that the lack of a quotative in some of the languages and the disagreement in the choice of marker and in morphosyntax between many of the languages, as well as the chronological differences between, say, Old and Modern Tamil, indicate that Proto-Dravidian lacked a quotative construction. (It is on the grounds of such arguments that Kuiper (1967) claimed that the quotative constructions found in many of the Munda languages cannot be inherited but must be borrowed from Dravidian.) A necessary

corollary to this claim would have to be the assumption that the remarkable degree of agreement in the choice of *en-* as the basis for the quotative marker of most of the Dravidian languages is attributable to cross-linguistic diffusion, presumably from (one of) the Southern literary languages. Toward the Northern periphery of this diffusion area, then, the change would have slowly lost momentum, leading to the noted irregularities and aberrancies in the languages of the transition area.

This claim might be countered by pointing to the synchronically unmotivated quotative marker *ay* of Malto, which can be taken to suggest that quotative constructions, even if now no longer de rigueur, have a long prehistory even in this language. This argument would be strengthened if it could be shown that *ay* can be plausibly derived from an earlier form of *en-*. It might therefore be argued that the quotative is in fact inherited in Dravidian, and that it was originally built on the verb *en-* 'say (so)'. This argument, too, would require certain corollary assumptions: First, one would have to argue that whatever the morphology of the original construction, it could undergo morphological renewal (as in OTa. *eṇa* vs. Mod.Ta. *eṇru*; cf. also Kuvi finite *icesi* (?)). Moreover, one might have to claim that Kurukh *bācas* (*ki/darā*) shows that even the verbal root could undergo such a renewal. As for the fact that unmarked QUOTES are more common in the Northern area and that there is no inherited quotative at all in Brahui, this would have to be attributed to the influence of Munda and/or (regional) Indo-Aryan.

Some variant of this second analysis may well be correct. Still, one would feel more comfortable if for instance Malto *ay* could be shown to go back to an appropriate form of *en-*; or if relics (in 'frozen' onomatopoeia, perhaps) of the old quotative could be found in Kurukh and/or Brahui; or if the optional *ele* 'thus' of Kuvi could be plausibly accounted for; etc.

Even more difficult is the question of the morphosyntax of the original quotative construction. Should we assume that the quotative marker syntactically belonged to QUOTE (as it certainly seems to do in the Southern languages) or that it was a linking element, connecting QUOTE to the following sentence (as it seems to be in Malto)? Similarly, should we assume that the fairly rigid QUOTE + quotative marker + SPEAK structure of the Southern Dravidian languages is inherited or that the extraposed, Embracing structures found for instance in Kuvi are more original?

The most difficult issue, however, is that of the original syntax/pragmatics of the quotative. Should we attribute the patterns found in the Southern languages to Proto-Dravidian? Note that one would feel more comfortable about doing so if the relevant facts in the other Dravidian languages were better known. Even then, however, the difficulty arises as to whether we should reconstruct the more fully developed pattern of Kannada or the more restricted structures of Tamil. (Given the general conservatism of Tamil, the decision should perhaps be made in favor of this language (?).) Moreover, we have to contend with the fact that a number of Modern Indo-Aryan languages have comparable patterns and that Classical Sanskrit shows the most fully developed system.

Under these circumstances it would be difficult to argue for or against any of the following propositions:

- (a) The extended syntax/pragmatics of the quotative is entirely Dravidian in origin;
- (b) The extended syntax/pragmatics of the quotative is entirely Indo-Aryan in origin;

(c) The extended syntax /pragmatics of the quotative originated in a third language group;

(d) The extended syntax/pragmatics of the quotative results from convergent and mutually reinforcing developments in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian (as well as, perhaps, in other languages of the area).

18: Munda/Austro-Asiatic

As Kuiper (1967, with ample references) pointed out, a number of the Munda languages have quotative constructions, marked by forms of verbs of speaking, although the verb selected as a marker and its morphological make-up may differ. Combined with the apparent absence of a quotative in Korku and Kharia, this fact is interpreted by Kuiper as showing 'that this construction has been introduced in relatively recent times,' presumably under Dravidian influence.

However, as noted earlier, if we applied the same kind of reasoning to Dravidian, we might have to claim that also in that group of languages the quotative cannot be inherited. Moreover, we have just seen that if we do reconstruct a quotative for Proto-Dravidian, then we must allow for morphological and lexical renewal or even loss in some of the individual languages. Surely, what is acceptable practice for Dravidian must be acceptable also for Munda. Finally, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Hock 1975:90), quotative markers derived from different verbs of saying are found also in the non-Indian languages Mon, Khmer, and Nicobarese, which belong to the same, larger, 'Austro-Asiatic' family as Munda. Here as elsewhere, therefore, the possibility of inheritance cannot be ruled out.

Note that in the case of Munda, our knowledge of extended uses of the quotative is even more restricted than for the "tribal" Dravidian languages, except that Kuiper makes references to the use of the quotative with ONOM in some of the Munda languages.

19: Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman

As noted by Hamp (1976:361 with note 33), Hock (1975:90), and Joseph (1982), quotative constructions are found also in (Modern) Tibetan, Gurung, Lahu, Lushai, and Burmese. In many cases the quotative particles are synchronically opaque; but note-Mod. Tib. *se* (quot.) beside *see* (quot./SAY); cf. Goldstein and Kashi 1973:114-15. Note also the (Northeast India) Kokborok quotative particle *hinoy*, whose *-oy* looks suspiciously like the verbal absolutive marker; cf. Karapurkar 1976:99. And in Lahu the marker seems to mean 'thus, so'.

The earliest attested language of this group, Classical Tibetan, shows even more interesting constructions, similar in their morphosyntactic "exuberance" to ancient Elamite, involving preposed SPEAK plus preposed *di* 'this' and postposed *de* 'that', elements such as *skad(a)* 'speech', pre- and postposed *ces(a)* 'thus', as well as pre- and postposed absolutive forms of SAY, such as *(ba)sgoo* 'saying'; cf. Jäschke 1883:84-5, as well as pp. 38 and 108.⁴¹ Interestingly, the sentence dividers in Jäschke's text sample suggest that the postposed combination of *ces(a)* 'thus' + absolutive of SAY belongs with QUOTE, not with the following sentence.

Perhaps, then, some quotative construction is native also to Tibeto-Burman. Unfortunately, however, it is again difficult to get any information of the syntactic/pragmatic uses of the construction.

20: The larger area

As can be seen from the discussion in sections 15-19, quotative constructions are found over a vast territory, stretching from the ancient Near East, through South Asia-- and even beyond, to the Far East (cf. Hamp 1976:361 with note 33). Recurrent features of the quotative constructions found in these languages are (a) some, usually non-finite form of SAY and/or (b) a particle meaning 'thus'.

This 'areal' aspect of the quotative opens up the possibility that any of the languages or language families historically attested with a quotative may owe the construction at least in part to convergent developments, rather than to straight inheritance. However, given the uneven chronological attestations (ranging from the 5000-year old record of the Ancient Near East to the present-day evidence of some of the "tribal" languages), given the large number of languages and language families involved, and given the lack of reliable information on the (pre-)history of most of these, it must at this point be considered impossible to establish a single source for the quotative and to trace the processes through which the construction spread through the area.

IV: SANSKRIT RECONSIDERED (CONCLUSION)

21: The findings of the preceding sections and the evidence for quotative constructions in all of the early Indo-European languages have important repercussions for an assessment of the claim that the Sanskrit quotative resulted from Dravidian influence:

The early Rig-Vedic morphosyntax and syntax/pragmatics of the *íti*-quotative do not seem to differ in any appreciable manner from the various patterns found in the other ancient Indo-European languages or in the non-Indo-European languages of the ancient Near East. Specifically, the morphosyntax and syntax/pragmatics of early Rig-Vedic are remarkably similar to what we find in Avestan (except that Avestan has two constructions in complementary distribution, one marked by *uiti* 'thus', the other by **iθā* 'thus').

The Embracing construction of Late Rig-Vedic and especially of the later language, to be sure, differs appreciably from what we find in any of these other ancient languages. True, as we have seen in 5.5, it is possible to motivate this innovated construction in terms of the synchronic structure of Rig-Vedic Sanskrit. Still, the absence of similar developments in other Indo-European languages and the fact that in the non-Indo-European languages of South Asia, structures of this sort are possible (as in South Dravidian) or even common (as in some of the "tribal" Dravidian languages, as well as in Classical Tibetan), suggest that the development may have been due to areal pressures. It does not follow, however, that these pressures must have come from Dravidian. For as noted earlier, it is by no means clear whether Embracing constructions (with extraposition of QUOTE plus quotative markers should be reconstructed as a common phenomenon of Proto-Dravidian, or whether the stricter pattern QUOTE + quotative marker + SPEAK of the Southern Dravidian languages should be reconstructed. If the latter should be the case, then of course the Embracing construction of Sanskrit, with its extraposition of QUOTE + *íti*, would be quite un-Dravidian. Moreover, given that

extraposition is an eminently Indo-European phenomenon, it might be possible that the Embracing quotative of Sanskrit and the rebracketing of the quotative marker with the preceding QUOTE likewise is an essentially Indo-European development, and constitutes one of the elements which Sanskrit contributed to the South Asian convergence area.

A much more promising area would be that of the syntax/pragmatics of the quotative. For in the other ancient Indo-European languages, as well as in the ancient Near Eastern languages, that syntax/pragmatics was rather "shallow", with only SAY and THINK (occasionally also HEAR), as well as \emptyset , governing the quotative, and with very few specialized uses of the quotative. If it should turn out that the impressive array of uses found in Classical Sanskrit and, in somewhat diminished form, in Modern Tamil, Kannada, Bengali, Oriya, Nepali, Marathi, and Dakhini Hindi/Urdu, is limited to South Asia, then the increasing development of Sanskrit toward such a complex quotative syntax may constitute a component of the "Indianization" of Sanskrit.

Even here, however, it seems necessary to exercise some caution. For in our present state of knowledge we cannot be sure (a) whether the extended quotative syntax is an exclusively South Asian feature and (b) to what extent that syntax may be attributable to Sanskrit, to Dravidian, to other languages of the area, or to convergent and mutually reinforcing developments in all of these languages. Note that as we have seen, all the Sanskrit uses of the quotative can be explained in terms of purely internal developments, involving reinterpretations and generalizations. In fact, the more fully developed range of uses found in Classical Sanskrit (as compared to Modern Tamil and Kannada) makes it somewhat difficult to attribute the total pattern to Dravidian influence.

The best that can be said, then, at our current state of knowledge, is that the development of the Embracing construction and of various special syntactic/pragmatic uses of the quotative in later Sanskrit may constitute part of the "Indianization" of Sanskrit. It is not, however, possible to state with any degree of certainty the extent to which these developments are attributable to internal Sanskrit developments, to outside influence, or to a convergent combination of the two. Nor does our current state of knowledge permit the claim that if there was outside influence, that influence can have come only from Dravidian.

Clearly, what would be needed to come to more informed judgments in this matter is a significant increase in our understanding of the structure and history of the various non-Indo-European languages and language families of South Asia. It is my fervent hope that this challenge will be met, especially by scholars who would like to argue for outside, non-Indo-Aryan influence on Sanskrit.⁴²

NOTES

1 Research on this paper has been in part supported by 1979-80 and 1982-83 grants from the University of Illinois Research Board. I have also benefited from discussions and correspondence with the following scholars: M. B. Emeneau, F. B. J. Kuiper, C. Masica, E. Polomé, F. Southworth, S. N. Sridhar. Needless to say, these scholars would not necessarily agree with all the conclusions reached in this paper.-- For perspicuity's sake, Sanskrit examples will be given in their pre-pausal form, not in their attested sandhi form. Quotative particles and related linguistic forms are characterized by double underlining; quoted material single underlining.

2 Bloch (1934:325-8) and Mayrhofer (1953:355) anticipated Kuiper. However, Bloch had certain reservations about claiming Dravidian influence, and Mayrhofer felt that there might have been a pre-Dravidian and pre-Sanskrit substratum from which both Sanskrit and Dravidian got their quotatives.

3 Emeneau's 1969 paper expands on Kuiper's discussion of onomatopoeia + *iti* in post-Rig-Vedic Sanskrit.

4 Classical Sanskrit examples quoted in this paper are from Speijer 1886.

5 Note however that Debrunner 1948 prefers not to consider this a type of indirect discourse (or of direct discourse).

6 *śru-* 'hear' is attested once in the Rig-Veda with direct discourse; cf. 5.6, example (40) below.

7 Possible additional Rig-Vedic examples of such more 'orthodox' indirect discourse constructions, not listed in Debrunner, are found at 4.18.6, 5.27.4 (with preceding *iti*), 5.30.2, 5.48.5, 10.52.1 (2x).

8 QUOTE + *iti* at 10.17.1, 24.5, 33.1, 34.6, 61.12, 73.10, 95.18, 97.4, 109.3, 115.8-9 (4x), 119.1 (2x), 130.1, 146.4. Unmarked QUOTE at 10.9.6, 10.11, 18.1, 22.6, 23.2, 27.18; 34.4, 5, 12, 13; 40.5, 11; 52.1, 61.18, 79.4, 82.2, 88.17, 95.17; 97.17, 22; 109.4, 120.9, 129.6, 164.1.

9 Rig-Vedic passages with such uncertain interpretation of the function of *iti* are: 1.138.3, 4.1.1, 5.7.10, 5.27.4 (followed by indirect discourse), 5.41. 17, 5.53.3, 6.62.7, 8.30.2, 10.27.3, 10.61.26, 10.120.4. In addition there are considerable difficulties in interpreting the occurrences of *iti* in 1.191.1 and 5.52.11; cf. Hock 1975, note 22.

10 Other examples occur at 5.30.9, 8.24.30, 10.18.9, 10.23.2, 10.52.4, 10.61.8.

11 This chronology is for the purposes of this paper stated in terms of Arnold's (1905) division of the Rig-Veda into five strata: Archaic (A), Strophic (S), Normal (N), Cretic (C), and Popular (P). For ease of exposition and so as to have sufficiently large numbers

for statistical comparison, I have combined the first two and the last two of these and, with some renaming, divided the Rig-Veda into the following three chronological strata: Early (= A + S), Middle (= N), Late (= C + P).-- I am fully aware that there are a number of problems with Arnold's criteria for determining chronological affiliation. However, I don't know of another full chronologization which could satisfactorily replace it. Moreover, some comfort can be derived from the fact that the quotative was not one of the criteria used by Arnold in determining his chronology.

12 The attestations are at 5.61.8, 8.92.2, 8.93.5, 9.101.5, 10.73.10.

13 4.25.4, 4.33.5, 4.35.3, 5.37.1, 9.39.1, 9.63.9.

14 1.109.3, 1.161.9 (2x), 6.54.1, 7.41.2; 7.104.15,16 (2x); 10.33.1, 10.109.3, 10.146.4.

15 Early: 8.32.15 and 10.24.5; Middle: 4.33.5 (2x).

16 1.162.12, 1.164.15, 2.12.5 (2x), 6.56.1, 9.114.1.

17 For definition and discussion of this term, cf. my other contribution to this volume. Note that *ca* and *céd* (< *ca* + *íd*) never can be clause-initial, and that *céd* must be second in its clause.

18 Both at 2.12.5.

19 Here, \emptyset indicates non-quotative; *íti*, quotative.

20 A great deal of Atharvanic material has been taken over verbatim from the Rig-Veda. This material is ignored in the following discussion.

21 The text has *-d* (sg.3) which, however, makes no sense.

22 This follows the translation of Bloomfield (1899), who takes this difficult passage to be a riddle, the answers being: 'the dog', 'the leaf', 'the hoof of an ox'.

23 These passages are (a) ŚB 8.1.1, 8.1.3-4, 8.2.1.1-6,12-18, and (b) 11.5. 1. (a) contains (in 8.1.1 and 8.2.1) sections heavily quoting from the ritual texts of the Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā, with brief explanatory restatements or paraphrases and (in 8.1.3-4), less 'text-bound' explanations of the ritual. (b) contains the story of Urvaśī and Purūravas, with the text of RV 10.95 used as the direct quotations of the two protagonists. Though containing a few explanatory restatements or paraphrases of that text, this selection represents a much less 'technical', much more 'literary' variety of Vedic Prose.

24 A similar passage, with *íti* 'omitted' after the second, final fragment of QUOTE, is found at JB 2.128-30. Conversely, there are a few cases where *íti* may appear after each sentence of a longer QUOTE, even if there is no intervening SPEAK; cf. the following example;

yām ... kāmáyeta kṣódhukā syād **íti** iṣam ... ādi **íti** (MS 3.2.5)
'of which he should desire "May it be hungry;" "I have eaten its strength ..."'

24a I have found only one possible exception, namely (ii) below. However, the context is such that this passage can be explained as a case of dittology: The preceding paragraph contains (i) which, following the general rules of Vedic Prose, gives an 'internal', 'subjective' reason for an action. Both (ii) and (iii), on the other hand, state 'external', 'objective' reasons, where it would be impossible to insert or supply something like 'with this thought'. In (iii) this reason is stated by means of a dependent-clause structure, marked by *hí* 'for, because', following what appears to be the normal practice of Vedic Prose. The deviation from that practice in (ii) seems most naturally explained as due to the influence of (i) in the immediately preceding paragraph. (It is of course possible that 'dittological' structures of this sort formed the basis for the post-Vedic extension of causal *íti* to 'external', 'objective' contexts.)

- (i) ... tām ha sma tām purā brāhmaṇāḥ ná taranti *ánatidagdhā agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa* **íti** (ŚB 1.4.1.14)
'that (river) the earlier brahmīns did not use to cross (**thinking/because**) "A.V. has not burned it over"'
- (ii) ... tād ha ákṣetrataram iva āsa ... *ásvaditam agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa* **íti** (ibid.15)
'at that time it (= the area near the river) was quite uncultivated, **because** A.V. had not tasted it'
- (iii) ... sá ápi ... sám iva evá kopayati távat sítā *ánatidagdhā hí agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa* (ibid.16)
'that (river) roars through (the area), as it were, so cold (is it), **because** A.V. has not burned it over'

25 For most of the abbreviations see section 3. In addition, note that R = rare, C = common, F = frequent. Also, I = *íti*-initial, F = SPEAK-final, E = Embracing quotative; G = general frequency (for all quotative structures). (For G, the frequency rating is made in comparison to competing constructions; for I, F, and E, it is between these three constructions only.) Finally, the names of the various sub-types of SPEAK are given only in terms of their first three letters.

26 The data are taken from the Thesaurus, s.v. *inquam*.

27 I am not, however, convinced of the usefulness of the Sanskrit evidence cited by Joseph: As far as I can see, *iva* 'like, as' never has any meaningful quotative value, comparable to that of *íti* or other quoted-speech markers.

28 Unless otherwise indicated, examples are taken from the selections in Sturtevant 1935. References to these are by descriptive title, followed by section and line number. For ease of exposition I give a quasi-phonetic interpretation of the syllabic transcription, without any vowel length indications. And to more clearly set off QUOTES, I make no distinction in underlining between Sumerograms and other portions of the text.

29 For Avestan I rely on the evidence of the Romanized portions of Reichelt's (1909 and 1911) selections. In addition I have worked through the Gāthas and the Hymn to Mithra in their entirety. For these I have used the editions of Humbach (1959) and Gershevitch (1967). To save space, I have in many cases indicated the location of QUOTE merely in the glosses.

30 For other references, cf. Bartholomae 1904, s.v. *uiti*.

31 The interpretation of this passages seems to be difficult.

32 In fact, RV *bád* (once *bádā*) has been connected with Av. *bāt*, *bāda*; cf. e.g. Dehrunner 1957:92 with references. Note however that Bartholomae (1904, s.v.) points out that *bāt* is a hapax legomenon, the usual form being *bā*. Moreover, on the Sanskrit side, one would need to account for the retroflex, not dental stops. Presumably, however, this could be done in terms of contamination from the ritual interjections *váṣaṭ*, *śraúṣaṭ*, for which see Wackernagel 1896:41, 172. etc.

33 Except for the ambiguous (103) above, I have not noted any such examples with *iθa* 'thus'. The closest thing would be passages like *iθa āt yazamaidē ahurəm* (Y 37.1, sim. Y 39.1, 3) 'thus we worship A.', without QUOTE (or any other obvious referent for *iθa*).

34 I am grateful to my colleague, Frank Gladney, for providing information on the use of the Slavic constructions.

35 Cf. the OED. s.v. *quotha*

35a Except for Old Persian which, however, is attested only in royal proclamations, with very little opportunity for the use of quotatival constructions

36 Also Latin occasionally has *ita* 'thus' with SPEAK. However, the examples in the Thesaurus (s.v.) seem to be generally followed by indirect (infinitival or dependent-clause) structures, as in *ita laudabunt: bonum agricolam* (acc.) 'they will praise him thus, (as being) a good farmer ...'

37 These examples are taken from Riemschneider 1969:162-3.

38 Friedrich's presentation does not make it possible to be absolutely certain as to which of the three initial words means 'thus, in this way'.

39 I apologize for the perhaps unconventional transliterations of Jäschke's Tibetan-script exmples.

40 An appropriate conclusion to this paper might consist of the revival of an obsolete, quasi-quotatival English expression, found in books of the 16th century; *Finis, quoth* Hans Henrich Hock.

ABBREVIATIONS OF TEXTUAL REFERENCES

Avestan: V = Vidēvdāt; Y = Yasna: Yt. = Yasht.

Sanskrit: AV = Atharva-Veda; JB = Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (Caland's selections); KS = Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā; MS = Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā (non vidi); RV = Rig-Veda; ŚB = Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; TS = Taittiriya Saṁhitā; VS = Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā.

REFERENCES

- ARNOLD, E. Vernon. 1905. Vedic metre in its historical development. Cambridge: University Press. (Reprinted 1967, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.)
- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian. 1904. Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BLOCH, Jules. 1934. L'indo-aryen du véda aux temps modernes. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (Engl. transl. by A. Master, with retention of 1934 pagination, *ibid.* 1965.)
- BLOOMFIELD, M. 1899. The Atharvaveda. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BURROW, Thomas, and S. Bhattacharya. 1970. The Pengo language. Oxford: Clarendon.
- CARRUBA, Onofrio. 1972. Beiträge zum Palaischen. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Osten.
- DEBRUNNER, A. 1348. Indirekte Rede im Altindischen. *Acta Orientalia* 20.12032.
- , 1957. Nachträge zu Band I of Wackernagel 1896 (1957).
- DELBRÜCK, Berthold. 1888. Altindische Syntax. Halle: Waisenhaus.
- DRESSLER, Wolfgang. 1970. Grundsätzliches zur Funktion der altanatolischen Satzpartikeln. *Archiv Orientalny* 38.385-90.
- EMENEAU, Murray B. 1969. Onomatopoeitics in the Indian linguistic area. *Language* 45.274-99. (Reprinted in Emeneau 1980.)
- , 1971. Dravidian and Indo-Aryan: the Indian linguistic area revisited. *Symposium on Dravidian Civilization*, ed. by A. F. Sjöberg, 33-68. (Reprinted in Emeneau 1980.)
- , 1980. *Language and linguistic area: essays selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil.* Stanford: University Press.
- FRIEDRICH, Johannes. 1943. Die Partikeln der zitierten Rede im Achämenidisch-Elamischen. *Orientalia* 12.23-30.
- , 1967. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Winter.
- GELDNER, Karl. 1885. Miscellen aus dem Avesta. *KZ* 27.225-60.
- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya. 1969. The Avestan hymn to Mithra. Cambridge: University Press.
- GOLDSTEIN, Melvyn C., and Tsering Dorje Kashi. 1973. *Modern Literary Tibetan*. Urbana: University of Illinois Center for Asian Studies.
- GÖTZE, Albrecht, and Holger Pedersen. 1934. *Muršilis Sprachlähmung*. (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Hist.-fil. Meddelelser, 21:1.) Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- HAHN, Ferd. 1911. *Kurukh grammar*. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat.

- HAMP, Eric 1976. Why syntax needs phonology. Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, 348-64. Chicago: CLS.
- Hock Hans Henrich. 1975. Substratum influence on (Rig-Vedic) Sanskrit? Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 5:2.76-125.
- , 1982. AUX cliticization as a motivation for word order change. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 12:1.91-101.
- HUMBACH, Helmut. 1959. Die Gathas des Zarathustra. Heidelberg: Winter.
- ISRAEL, M. 1979. A grammar of the Kuvi language. Triyandrum: Dravidian Linguistics Association.
- JÄSCHKE, H. A. 1883. Tibetan grammar. 2nd ed. London: Trübner.
- JESTIN, Raymond. 1946. Le verbe sumérien. Paris: Boccard.
- JOSEPH, Brian. 1981. Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)* and Sanskrit *iya*. KZ 95.93-8.
- , 1982. More on (*i*)-*wa(r)*. KZ 96. (Prepublication copy received from the author.)
- KACHU, Yamuna. 1979. The quotative in South Asian languages. South Asian Languages Analysis 1.63-77.
- KARAPURKAR, Pusha Pai. 1976. Kokborok grammar. Mysore: CIIL.
- KUIPER, F. B. J. 1967. The genesis of a linguistic area. Indo-Iranian Journal 10.81-102. (Repr. 1974, in International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics 3.135-53.)
- MAHAPATRA, B. P. 1979. Malto: an ethnosemantic study. Mysore: CIIL.
- MASICA, Colin P. 1976. Defining a linguistic area: South Asia. Chicago: University Press.
- MAYRHOFER, Manred. 1953. Die Substrattheorien und das Indische. Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 34.230-42.
- OED = "The Oxford English Dictionary", i.e. A new English dictionary on historical principles, 1897-1928 + Addenda. (Micrographic reprint of reissued version, 1971.) Glasgow et alibi: Oxford University Press.
- REICHEL, Hans. 1909. Awestisches Elementarbuch. Heidelberg: Winter.
- , 1911. Avesta reader. Strassburg: Trübner.
- von SODEN, Wolfram. 1952. Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- SPEIJER, J. S. 1886. Sanskrit syntax. (1973 reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.)
- STURTEVANT, Edgar, and George Bechtel. 1935. A Hittite chrestomathy. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- THESAURUS linguae latinae. 1900-76. Edited by 5 German Academies. Leipzig: Teubner.
- VESPER, Don R. 1971. Kurukh syntax with special reference to the verbal system. University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics.
- WACKERNAGEL, Jakob. 1896. Altindische Grammatik, I. (Reprinted 1957, with a revised Introduction générale by L. Renou and Nachträge by A. Debrunner. Both of these have separate pagination.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

¹ Research on this paper has been in part supported by 1979-80 and 1982-83 grants from the University of Illinois Research Board. I have also benefited from discussions

and correspondence with the following scholars: M. B. Emeneau, F. B. J. Kuiper, C. Masica, E. Polomé, F. Southworth, S. N. Sridhar. Needless to say, these scholars would not necessarily agree with all the conclusions reached in this paper.-- For perspicuity's sake, Sanskrit examples will be given in their pre-pausal form, not in their attested sandhi form. Quotative particles and related linguistic forms are characterized by double underlining; quoted material single underlining.

² Bloch (1934:325-8) and Mayrhofer (1953:355) anticipated Kuiper. However, Bloch had certain reservations about claiming Dravidian influence, and Mayrhofer felt that there might have been a pre-Dravidian and pre-Sanskrit substratum from which both Sanskrit and Dravidian got their quotatives.

³ Emeneau's 1969 paper expands on Kuiper's discussion of onomatopoeia + *iti* in post-Rig-Vedic Sanskrit.

⁴ Classical Sanskrit examples quoted in this paper are from Speijer 1886.

⁵ Note however that Debrunner 1948 prefers not to consider this a type of indirect discourse (or of direct discourse).

⁶ *śru-* 'hear' is attested once in the Rig-Veda with direct discourse; cf. 5.6, example (40) below.

⁷ Possible additional Rig-Vedic examples of such more 'orthodox' indirect discourse constructions, not listed in Debrunner, are found at 4.18.6, 5.27.4 (with preceding *īti*), 5.30.2, 5.48.5, 10.52.1 (2x).

⁸ QUOTE + *íti* at 10.17.1, 24.5, 33.1, 34.6, 61.12, 73.10, 95.18, 97.4, 109.3, 115.8-9 (4x), 119.1 (2x), 130.1, 146.4. Unmarked QUOTE at 10.9.6, 10.11, 18.1, 22.6, 23.2, 27.18; 34.4, 5, 12, 13; 40.5, 11; 52.1, 61.18, 79.4, 82.2, 88.17, 95.17; 97.17, 22; 109.4, 120.9, 129.6, 164.1.

⁹ Rig-Vedic passages with such uncertain interpretation of the function of *íti* are: 1.138.3, 4.1.1, 5.7.10, 5.27.4 (followed by indirect discourse), 5.41. 17, 5.53.3, 6.62.7, 8.30.2, 10.27.3, 10.61.26, 10.120.4. In addition there are considerable difficulties in interpreting the occurrences of *íti* in 1.191.1 and 5.52.11; cf. Hock 1975, note 22.

¹⁰ Other examples occur at 5.30.9, 8.24.30, 10.18.9, 10.23.2, 10.52.4, 10.61.8.

¹¹ This chronology is for the purposes of this paper stated in terms of Arnold's (1905) division of the Rig-Veda into five strata: Archaic (A), Strophic (S), Normal (N), Cretic (C), and Popular (P). For ease of exposition and so as to have sufficiently large numbers for statistical comparison, I have combined the first two and the last two of these and, with some renaming, divided the Rig-Veda into the following three chronological strata: Early (= A + S), Middle (= N), Late (= C + P).-- I am fully aware that there are a number of problems with Arnold's criteria for determining chronological affiliation. However, I don't know of another full chronologicization which could satisfactorily replace it. Moreover, some comfort can be derived from the fact that the quotative was not one of the criteria used by Arnold in determining his chronology.

¹² The attestations are at 5.61.8, 8.92.2, 8.93.5, 9.101.5, 10.73.10.

¹³ 4.25.4, 4.33.5, 4.35.3, 5.37.1, 9.39.1, 9.63.9.

¹⁴ 1.109.3, 1.161.9 (2x), 6.54.1, 7.41.2; 7.104.15,16 (2x); 10.33.1, 10.109.3, 10.146.4.

¹⁵ Early: 8.32.15 and 10.24.5; Middle: 4.33.5 (2x).

¹⁶ 1.162.12, 1.164.15, 2.12.5 (2x), 6.56.1, 9.114.1.

¹⁷ For definition and discussion of this term, cf. my other contribution to this volume. Note that *ca* and *céd* (< *ca* + *íd*) never can be clause-initial, and that *céd* must be second in its clause.

¹⁸ Both at 2.12.5.

¹⁹ Here, \emptyset indicates non-quotative; *íti*, quotative.

²⁰ A great deal of Atharvanic material has been taken over verbatim from the Rig-Veda. This material is ignored in the following discussion.

²¹ The text has *-d* (sg.3) which, however, makes no sense.

²² This follows the translation of Bloomfield (1899), who takes this difficult passage to be a riddle, the answers being: 'the dog', 'the leaf', 'the hoof of an ox'.

²³ These passages are (a) ŚB 8.1.1, 8.1.3-4, 8.2.1.1-6,12-18, and (b) 11.5. 1. (a) contains (in 8.1.1 and 8.2.1) sections heavily quoting from the ritual texts of the

Vājasaneyī Samhitā, with brief explanatory restatements or paraphrases and (in 8.1.3-4), less 'text-bound' explanations of the ritual. (b) contains the story of Urvaśī and Purūravas, with the text of RV 10.95 used as the direct quotations of the two protagonists. Though containing a few explanatory restatements or paraphrases of that text, this selection represents a much less 'technical', much more 'literary' variety of Vedic Prose.

²⁴ A similar passage, with *īti* 'omitted' after the second, final fragment of QUOTE, is found at JB 2.128-30. Conversely, there are a few cases where *īti* may appear after each sentence of a longer QUOTE, even if there is no intervening SPEAK; cf. the following example;

yām ... kāmáyeta kṣódhukā syād **īti** īṣam ... ādi **īti** (MS 3.2.5)

'of which he should desire "May it be hungry;" "I have eaten its strength ... "'

²⁵ I have found only one possible exception, namely (ii) below. However, the context is such that this passage can be explained as a case of dittology: The preceding paragraph contains (i) which, following the general rules of Vedic Prose, gives an 'internal', 'subjective' reason for an action. Both (ii) and (iii), on the other hand, state 'external', 'objective' reasons, where it would be impossible to insert or supply something like 'with this thought'. In (iii) this reason is stated by means of a dependent-clause structure, marked by *hí* 'for, because', following what appears to be the normal practice of Vedic Prose. The deviation from that practice in (ii) seems most naturally explained as due to the influence of (i) in the immediately preceding paragraph. (It is of course possible that 'dittological' structures of this sort formed the basis for the post-Vedic extension of causal *īti* to 'external', 'objective' contexts.)

(i) ... tām ha sma tām purā brāhmaṇāḥ ná taranti ánatidaghdā agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa **íti**
(ŚB 1.4.1.14)

'that (river) the earlier brahmins did not use to cross (**thinking/because**) "A.V. has not burned it over"'

(ii) ... tād ha ákṣetrataram iva āsa ... ásvaditam agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa **íti** (ibid.15)

'at that time it (= the area near the river) was quite uncultivated, **because** A.V. had not tasted it'

(iii) ... sá ápi ... sám iva evá kopayati távat sítá ánatidagdhā **hí** agnínā vaiśvānaréṇa
(ibid.16)

'that (river) roars through (the area), as it were, so cold (is it), **because** A.V. has not burned it over'

²⁶ For most of the abbreviations see section 3. In addition, note that R = rare, C = common, F = frequent. Also, I = *íti*-initial, F = SPEAK-final, E = Embracing quotative; G = general frequency (for all quotative structures). (For G, the frequency rating is made in comparison to competing constructions; for I, F, and E, it is between these three constructions only.) Finally, the names of the various sub-types of SPEAK are given only in terms of their first three letters.

²⁷ The data are taken from the Thesaurus, s.v. *inquam*.

²⁸ I am not, however, convinced of the usefulness of the Sanskrit evidence cited by Joseph: As far as I can see, *iva* 'like, as' never has any meaningful quotative value, comparable to that of *íti* or other quoted-speech markers.

²⁹ Unless otherwise indicated, examples are taken from the selections in Sturtevant 1935. References to these are by descriptive title, followed by section and line number.

For ease of exposition I give a quasi-phonetic interpretation of the syllabic transcription, without any vowel length indications. And to more clearly set off QUOTES, I make no distinction in underlining between Sumerograms and other portions of the text.

³⁰ For Avestan I rely on the evidence of the Romanized portions of Reichelt's (1909 and 1911) selections. In addition I have worked through the Gāthas and the Hymn to Mithra in their entirety. For these I have used the editions of Humbach (1959) and Gershevitch (1967). To save space, I have in many cases indicated the location of QUOTE merely in the glosses.

³¹ For other references, cf. Bartholomae 1904, s.v. *uiti*.

³² The interpretation of this passages seems to be difficult.

³³ In fact, RV *bád* (once *bádā*) has been connected with Av. *bāt*, *bāða*; cf. e.g. Dehrunner 1957:92 with references. Note however that Bartholomae (1904, s.v.) points out that *bāt* is a hapax legomenon, the usual form being *bā*. Moreover, on the Sanskrit side, one would need to account for the retroflex, not dental stops. Presumably, however, this could be done in terms of contamination from the ritual interjections *vāṣat*, *śraúṣat*, for which see Wackernagel 1896:41, 172. etc.

³⁴ Except for the ambiguous (103) above, I have not noted any such examples with *iθa* 'thus'. The closest thing would be passages like *iθa āt yazamaidē ahurəm* (Y 37.1, sim. Y 39.1, 3) 'thus we worship A.', without QUOTE (or any other obvious referent for *iθa*).

³⁵ I am grateful to my colleague, Frank Gladney, for providing information on the use of the Slavic constructions.

³⁶ Cf. the OED. s.v. *quotha*

³⁷ Except for Old Persian which, however, is attested only in royal proclamations, with very little opportunity for the use of quotational constructions

³⁸ Also Latin occasionally has *ita* 'thus' with SPEAK. However, the examples in the Thesaurus (s.v.) seem to be generally followed by indirect (infinitival or dependent-clause) structures, as in *ita laudabunt: bonum agricolam* (acc.) 'they will praise him thus, (as being) a good farmer ...'

³⁹ These examples are taken from Riemschneider 1969:162-3.

⁴⁰ Friedrich's presentation does not make it possible to be absolutely certain as to which of the three initial words means 'thus, in this way'.

⁴¹ I apologize for the perhaps unconventional transliterations of Jäschke's Tibetan-script examples.

⁴² An appropriate conclusion to this paper might consist of the revival of an obsolete, quasi-quotational English expression, found in books of the 16th century; *Finis, quoth* Hans Henrich Hock.