

Mikulová, Jana

Verbs introducing direct speech in Late Latin texts

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2015, vol. 20, iss. 2, pp. [123]-143

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/134635>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

JANA MIKULOVÁ
(MASARYK UNIVERSITY, BRNO)

VERBS INTRODUCING DIRECT SPEECH IN LATE LATIN TEXTS

This paper examines means for introducing direct speech in selected Late Latin texts with a focus on verbal ones. The most frequently used verbs are dicere in finite forms, ait and the present participle dicens. The introducers inquit, ait and dicens show signs of at least incipient stages of grammaticalization. Ait is almost completely reserved for introducing direct speech, inquit was already specialized in introducing direct speech in Classical Latin. Dicens often follows another finite verb of speech in the introductory clause, which results in more or less redundant introducing construction. It seems that ait and dicens are progressive at the expense of inquit, which decreases in frequency of use in comparison to Classical Latin. The examined texts show a tendency to place introducing verbs before direct speech, which is manifested by inquit inserted into direct speech, often combined with another verb of speech placed before the direct speech. Individual texts differ in various aspects, but the correlation with the choice of introducing verbs cannot be proved unambiguously.

Key words: Direct speech; grammaticalization; Late Latin; quotation; quotative marker

Introduction

This paper examines means used for introducing direct reported speech (henceforth direct speech) in Late Latin texts, with a focus on verbal ones. An examination of which verbs are used, which are the most frequent ones, whether these verbs are reserved for introducing direct speech, and whether the examined texts differ in the choice of means for introducing direct speech is provided. For providing a more comprehensive view, non-verbal means are also mentioned.

The corpus of the examined texts comprises ten lives of saints from the 6th to 9th centuries, namely *Liber vitae patrum* by Gregory of Tours, *Vita Hugberti*, *Vita Memorii*, *Vita Eligii*, *Vita Goaris*, *Vita Wandregiseli*, *Vita*

Arnulfi, Vita Amati, Vitas patrum Emeritensium and *Vita Wilfridi* by Stephanus. These texts are included in the database *Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH)*, with the exception of *Vitas patrum Emeritensium*, included in the database *Library of Latin Texts*. The criteria of selection were: literary genre (*vita*, saint's life), use of direct speech within the texts, the period from the sixth to the ninth century.

Preliminaries

Reported speech was the subject of many studies in the past and still is frequently examined nowadays. Topics of research are, among others: the distinction between different types of reported speech (particularly direct speech, indirect speech, and so called free indirect speech);¹ the semantic nature of direct speech (for survey of different approaches and discussion, see, e.g., Capone, 2013); or its syntactic status (see below). Recently, a lot of attention has also been paid to: means of introducing direct speech (called also *quotative markers*²); *the grammaticalization of new quotative markers*, for example *like* (Romaine, and Lange, 1991), *go* or *be like* (Vandelanotte, 2012) in English; the analysis of reported speech in spoken language and its pragmatic functions (e.g. Golato, 2012; Blackwell, and Fox Tree, 2012), and the like.

In Latin linguistics, it is mainly indirect speech that has been so far examined (*oratio obliqua* in general, shift of tenses, pronominal and adverbial shift, etc.³), whereas direct speech has been a rather marginal topic of research and has been often examined in relation to indirect speech (see, e.g., Sznajder, 2002 or Baños Baños, 2009). Thus, detailed comprehensive studies of Latin direct speech are still lacking, although some articles concerned with the topic were published, among them, for example, an article about the verb *inquit* (Kieckers, 1919) and a study of grammaticalization in Latin (Fruyt, 2009), in which the participle *dicens* introducing direct speech is mentioned as an example of grammaticalization (Fruyt, 2009: p. 693). Most recently, an article about means introducing direct speech in biblical

¹ In the literature also other subcategories of reported speech are distinguished and studied, for example distancing indirect speech (Vandelanotte, 2004), hybrid speech (Vries, 2008: p. 58), etc.

² The term “quotative marker” is used as the term referring to all types of means used for introducing direct speech (verbs, nouns, particles, etc.). Other terms are found in literature as well, for example Guldemann (2008; 2012) uses the term “quotative indexes”.

³ See, e.g., Bolkestein (1996).

Latin (Sznajder, 2015) and an article about the manners of insertion of direct speech in discourse in Late Latin (Gayno, 2015) were published.

Despite the vast literature on the topic and the amount of attention paid to reported speech, some definitions and characteristics of reported speech are still widely discussed and scholars use different terminologies for describing the same or very similar concepts. The present paper follows approaches sketched in the subsequent paragraphs. The approaches used in this paper were also selected with regard to the nature of the examined texts, i.e. old texts written in a language that is no longer a mother tongue. With regard to the terminology, the term “direct speech” will be preferred to “quotation” to avoid confusion between “quotation” and “quote”, which is reserved for quoted citations from other authors. The term “introducer” will refer to a means introducing direct speech, whereas the term “quotative marker” will be used as a general term for all possible means for introducing direct speech including particles. In the references to the scholarly literature, the original terminology used by a particular scholar is maintained.

Selection of items to be examined

The selection of instances examined in the present research, which focuses on verbal introducers, was based on the following criteria:

- type of reported speech,
- the syntactic incorporation of direct speech into sentences.

Reported speech is often classified into subcategories on the basis of the existence of two deictic centres and the degree of their independence and relations (Vandelanotte, 2004: pp. 490ff.). In Vandelanotte’s (2004: p. 490) terminology, these centres are called *Speaker* and *Sayer/Cognizant*. *Speaker* is defined as “associated with the actual speech situation” and *Sayer/Cognizant* as “the ‘consciousness’ being represented in the represented speech situation”. Along the same lines, reported speech is defined also by Güldemann (2008: p. 6).⁴ Direct speech as a subcategory of reported speech is characterized by Güldemann (2008: p. 8) as follows: “shifters and other pragmatically determined elements in the reported text refer to the

⁴ “Reported discourse is the representation of spoken or mental text from which the reporter distances him-herself by indicating that it is produced by a source of consciousness in a pragmatic and deictic setting that is different from that of the immediate discourse.” (Güldemann, 2012: p. 18 and Güldemann, 2008: p. 6).

hic-et-nunc of the SP (= speaker) and the AD (= addressee) in the non-immediate communicative setting; thus the formal interference of the reporter is maximally restricted". Vandelanotte (2004: p. 491) characterizes direct speech as a "shift from Speaker to Sayer/Cognizant, resulting in two separate and fully operational deictic centres" and, similarly, Sznajder (2002: p. 361) defines direct speech indicating that "L1 (= locuteur primaire)⁵ recrée à l'intérieur de sa propre parole l'espace d'un locuteur L2 (= locuteur secondaire).⁶"

Formal properties of direct speech are often described in contrast to a typical indirect speech, which in Latin is characterized by shifts in tense, mood, person, pronouns and adverbials and is syntactically embedded.⁷ As shown by Rosén (2013), these formal characteristics appear, however, also in free indirect speech, which is "situated between the two poles of manifestly direct discourse on the one hand, and manifestly indirect discourse with all its trimmings on the other" (Rosén, 2013: p. 231). The present research is concerned only with instances of clearly direct speech including direct speech introduced by *quia*⁸ 'that' which show characteristics of typical direct speech, i.e. two different deictic centres and lack of shift in tense, mood, pronouns and person (1).

(1) *Negavitque* coram omnibus, *dicens, quia*: "Numquam vidi hominem istum neque res eius abstuli". (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 8, 9)

He denied the deed in front of everyone, saying, "I have never seen this man, and have taken nothing from him."⁹

As regards the syntactic incorporation of direct speech into the discourse, scholars differ in their analysis and opinions. An overview of different approaches is provided, for example, by Güldemann (2008: pp. 224ff.), who agrees with the assertion that direct speech cannot be considered a sentential complement (e.g. direct object), because it differs from the canonical direct object in many aspects. He also rejects the idea that direct speech could be a paratactic structure, and comes to the conclusion that the direct speech should be considered in relation to larger units such as "sentential units or units still more complex, namely an entire text or subpart of it like a para-

⁵ The texts in parentheses are mine.

⁶ L1 (= primary speaker) creates space for the speaker L2 (= secondary speaker) in the interior of his speech.

⁷ See, e.g., Traina (1993: pp. 474ff).

⁸ For more details about this topic, see Sznajder (2002).

⁹ Transl. by Jones (1991: pp. 60–61).

graph” (p. 231). He admits (p. 229), however, that some instances of direct speech can show characteristics of a typical direct object. Despite Gülde-mann’s argumentation, I think that the analysis of instances of direct speech as sentential complements can be useful for the purpose of the present research since it enables us to rule out instances such as parenthetical exclamations, which can be also considered as instances of direct speech. The approach adopted here is based on the typology proposed by Vries (2008), and particularly on types included in the subclass called embedded direct speech.¹⁰ For the purpose of the present paper, only some subtypes are relevant: direct speech that “can be a major constituent of a clause” (p. 50), i.e. direct object, subject or predicate noun; direct speech that “functions as a specification of a manner adverb” meaning ‘so’, ‘in this way’, etc. (p. 52); or direct speech that “functions as a specification of a noun phrase” (ibid.).

In the texts examined, the majority of instances of direct speech could be considered direct objects, other types are much less frequent. For example, direct speech specifying a nominal phrase headed by nouns such as *verba* ‘words’ or *sententia* ‘sentence, words’ appears only in 13 instances. Thus, embedding is an important criterion for selection of an item, so instances termed by Vries (2008: p. 58) as *hybrid speech* or *mixed quotation* are excluded. He defines these as instances of direct speech that are “transparently syntactically (and hence compositional-semantically) part of the matrix clause, and they are citations”. The example of a hybrid speech is provided by Vries’ words as cited in the preceding sentence. In the examined texts, there are only few instances of hybrid speech and they are usually biblical quotes. In most cases, quotes are typical direct speeches. It is worth mentioning that quotes, mostly biblical ones, represent an important group of direct speeches in the examined texts (23% of all instances of direct speech). On the contrary, selection of instances for further examination is not based on the content of the direct speech, i.e. on the pragmatic function of the direct speech or its function within the discourse.¹¹

Grammaticalization

The development of the use of some verbal introducers, particularly in comparison to Classical Latin, is considered on the basis of the theory of grammaticalization and its application to different types of quotative markers. The basic characteristics of the grammaticalization of quotative

¹⁰ A table of all the subtypes is provided on p. 60 and their description on pp. 50–55.

¹¹ For more details about this topic, see Vries (2008: pp. 60ff.) or Terraschke (2013).

markers are the same as in other cases, namely desemanticization (semantic reduction), extension (or context generalization), decategorialization, or erosion (phonetic reduction),¹² which can be summarized as loss of autonomy and increase in grammatical functions (for more details, see, e.g., Heine, 2005 or Hopper, and Traugott, 2003). The grammaticalization of new quotative markers has been described for many languages; see, among others, Deutscher (2011), Klamer (2000), Güldemann (2008), Romaine and Lange (1991) or Vandelanotte (2012). As is usual in grammaticalization, individual quotative markers can show a different degree of grammaticalization. The highest degree is reached by particles which are not sentential constituents of the introductory clause. Earlier stages of grammaticalization are usually characterized by partial desemanticization in particular.

Means of introducing direct speech in the examined texts

Both verbal and non-verbal means for introducing direct speech are found in the examined texts. The verbal means comprise both finite and non-finite verbal forms, and they obviously prevail over non-verbal ones, since verbal means introduce 706 instances out of 753 direct speeches. 13 instances are introduced by nouns semantically related to the verbs of speech (e.g. *verba* ‘words’ or *sententia* ‘a sentence, words’). The 34 remaining instances fall into a group which includes all other introductory means on condition that they are not used in combination with a verbal introducer. It is a somewhat heterogeneous group but since the research focuses on verbal introducers it is not further subdivided into subclasses. This group comprises expressions such as *cui sacerdos* ‘the priest to him’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 6, 5), *et ille* ‘and he’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 1, 5) or *tum ille* ‘then he’ (*V. Am.* 15). These instances may be analysed also as an ellipsis of a verbal introducer, particularly if they occur in dialogical passages. Other means included in this group are expressions such as *propheticum illud* ‘prophetic (words)’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 17, 2) or *illud apostoli* ‘(words) of the apostle’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 13, 1), in which the pronoun *ille* stands for a noun with the meaning ‘word’, ‘sentence’; or expressions such as *iuxta Paulum apostolum* ‘according to apostle Paul’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 17, 3). 22 instances of direct speech are introduced by expressions such as *et* ‘and’ (e.g. *V. Wandr.* 9), *et iterum* ‘and again’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 18), *et alibi* ‘and elsewhere’ (Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.* 12, 2), *et rursus* ‘and again’ (*V. Elig.* 1, 7). These expressions are found in a sequence of more direct speeches (19 of them are quotes), they coordinate

¹² See Heine (2005: p. 579).

two pieces of direct speech and create patterns such as *He said: "... and somewhere (he said): "...*. Also these cases may be analysed as an ellipsis of the verb introducing direct speech.

As stated above, the overwhelming majority of instances of direct speech are introduced by verbs, both in finite and non-finite forms. Verbal introducers are divided into five groups: 1. *dicere* 'to say' (it includes all verbal forms of *dicere* except the present participle), 2. *ait* 'he/she says/said', 3. *inquit*¹³ 'he/she says/said', 4. the present participle *dicens* 'saying' in different case forms, and 5. other verbs of speech (nouns semantically related to the verbs of speech are also included).

The present participle *dicens* represents a special group, because it shows traits that differentiate it not only from other verbal forms of *dicere*, but also from other groups. The term 'verb of speech' is used as a label referring not only to "core" verbs of speech (e.g. 'to say', 'to tell'), but to a much larger group of verbs. Scholars concerned with the research of reported speech point to the fact that direct speech can be introduced by a variety of verbs. Deutscher (2011: p. 652) uses the expression *speech related verb* and gives the verb 'to write' as an example. Güldemann (2008: p. 12) uses the terms *generic speech verbs* (e.g. 'to say', 'to speak', 'to tell') and *specific speech verbs* (e.g. 'to ask', 'to answer', 'to refuse', 'to call'). Simultaneously, he shows that direct speech can be introduced by verbs which can be read as 'to say', if they function as introducers of direct speech, but not in other contexts.

On the basis of this wider definition of verbs of speech, the fifth group includes verbs and verbal phrases such as *loqui* 'to speak, to tell', *respondere* 'to answer', *responsum dare* 'to answer', *scribere* 'to write', *exclamare* 'to call, to exclaim', *plaudere* 'to approve, applaud', *addere* 'to add', *adocere* 'to add', *pandere* 'to explain, to make known', *exprobrare* 'to reproach'. This group is necessarily heterogeneous but it stands in opposition to the remaining four groups of introducers since the verbs included in it have specific semantic features in comparison to verbs with the meaning 'to say'.

Before describing individual groups it is necessary to point to the fact that the number of introductory verbs is higher than the number of instances of direct speech, since 33 examples of direct speech are introduced by two verbs of speech, or by a noun and a verb of speech. A more detailed description of these instances will be provided within sections concerning individual groups. Direct speech introduced by two verbs, or generally by two quotative markers, is found in various languages, for example in Middle and contemporary English (see Herlyn, 1999) and also in Classical Latin (see

¹³ Since the forms *ait* and *inquit* clearly prevail they are used as labels for the respective groups.

TLL, s. v. *loquor*: 1668, p. 69). The combination of two quotative markers is also studied by Güldemann (2008: pp. 191–219) within his examination of the mutual positions of quotative marker and direct speech. He takes over four basic positions found in older typologies, thus distinguishing preposed (on-quote), postposed (off-quote), circumposed (on/off-quote combination) and intraposed (intra-quote) quotative markers (p. 192). Subsequently, he adds their possible combinations (e.g. on-quote + intra-quote) and creates his own typology (see p. 205). Latin verbal introducers are mostly preposed or intraposed and, as indicated above, they could be combined with another verb already in Classical Latin. From the point of view of the development of Latin verbal introducers, it is worth mentioning Güldemann's (2008: pp. 212–213) observation concerning a cross linguistic tendency to place quotative markers before direct speech regardless of the basic order of verb and direct object in a given language. Güldemann explains this phenomenon as a consequence of the cross-linguistically observed tendency to place complex constituents after less complex ones, because the direct speech is usually the most complex constituent in the sentence.

Description of groups

Individual groups differ not only in the verb employed but also in other characteristics and their degree of internal heterogeneity.

1. *Dicere*

The introducer *dicere* (i.e. all verbal forms of *dicere* except the present participle *dicens*) is used in 192 instances: 180 out of them are finite verbs and 12 are infinitives. *Dicere* is used not only for introducing direct speech but also indirect speech and the like, which implies that it is used in the same way as in Classical Latin. *Dicere* precedes direct speech in almost all cases. However, on three occasions (Steph. *V. Wilfr.*: 50 and 53; Greg. Tur. *vit. patr.*: 15, praef.) it is intraposed, and on one occasion (Steph. *V. Wilfr.*: 61) it follows the direct speech, which is also introduced by the participle *dicens*.

2. *Ait*

The verbal forms of *aio* introduce direct speech in 180 instances. The form *ait* occurs in 167 instances, *aiunt* in 5, *aiebat* in 6 and *aio* in 2 instances. The 3rd person of singular prevails not only in the case of *ait*, but also

in the case of *dicere*, *inquit* and other verbs. This is not surprising since the examined texts concern the life of a saint and their acts.

Contrary to *dicere*, *ait* differs from its Classical Latin usage. Whereas in Classical Latin *ait* not only introduces direct speech but regularly governs, for example, the accusative with infinitive (AcI), in the examined texts *ait* hardly ever appears outside the context of direct speech. Only in Gregory of Tours' *Liber vitae patrum*, is the parenthetical *ut aiunt* 'as they say' found on two occasions. Therefore, *ait* has become a verb specialized in introducing direct speech. Although neither its syntactic function in the introductory clause (i.e. the function of a predicate) nor its meaning has been changed, its development could be, in my opinion, considered an example of at least incipient grammaticalization since it shows an increase in pragmatic function. To prove this claim, however, it would be necessary to examine a much larger corpus of Late Latin texts. *Ait* almost always precedes direct speech. Only three times (*V. Elig.* 2, 55; *Greg. Tur. vit. patr.* 16, 3; *V. Arnulf.* 11) is it intraposed. In one of these instances (*V. Elig.* 2, 55) it is combined with *coepit volvere* 'he started to reflect on' preceding the direct speech.

3. *Inquit*

The introducer *inquit* is found in 68 instances. Apart from *inquit/inquid* (64 instances), only the forms *inquam* (1 instance), *inquunt* (2 instances) and participle *inquiens* (1 instance) occur in the examined texts.

The verb *inquit* differs from the others because already in Classical Latin it was a verb used especially for introducing direct speech and it was intraposed. It is mentioned also by Güldemann (2008: p. 198), who gives *inquit/inquam* as an example of intraposed introducers (in his terminology 'quotative indexes') that cross-linguistically tend to become grammaticalized and stereotyped/routinized. *Inquit* is inserted into the direct speech in most instances found in the examined texts but it occurs in other positions as well. On five occasions it precedes the direct speech and only on one occasion does it follow it. In a high number of instances (31 out of 68) the intraposed *inquit* is combined with another preposed verb or noun of speech to introduce the same direct speech. Thus one direct speech is introduced by two verbs of speech (2) or a verb and noun of speech. *Inquit* can be combined with a verb from all the remaining groups.

- (2) Post haec autem, cum iam senes profectaeque essent aetatis, Lupicinus abba scilicet et Romanus, frater eius, *ait* Lupicinus germano suo: "Dic", *inquid*, "mihi, in quale monasterium vis tibi parari sepulchrum, ut simul quiescamus?" (*Greg. Tur. vit. patr.* 1, 6)

Later, when Abbot Lupicinus and Romanus were old men advanced in age, Lupicinus said to his brother: “Tell me, in which monastery do you want your burial place to be prepared, so that we may rest together?”¹⁴

Moreover, the intraposed *inquit* is often combined with expressions such as *et ille* ‘and he’, *quibus ille* ‘he to them’, which precede the direct speech (in 22 instances). It occurs particularly in dialogical passages, see (3). Since this type of expression can introduce direct speech by itself, these instances could be also considered examples of the multiple introduction of direct speech. Regardless of whether it is a case of the multiple introduction of direct speech or not, it is obvious that the intraposed *inquit* shows a strong tendency to occur together with another preposed introducer or element preceding the direct speech which functions as a clear sign of the beginning of direct speech.

- (3) Quae statim adveniens, *ait*: “Ecce adsum, quid vis, fili?” *Et ille*: “Ne timeas,” *inquit*, “mater; beatus enim Martinus super me crucem Christi faciens, surgere me iussit incolomem”. (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 8, 1)
She immediately ran in and said: “Here I am. What do you want, my son?” And he said, “Do not fear, mother. The blessed Martin made over me the sign of the cross and ordered me to rise, since I am no longer ill.”¹⁵

Some instances of *inquit* combined with another introducer may be considered examples of an anacoluthon. An example is provided by (4), in which the direct speech is uttered by a speaker, referred to by both the nominative subject of *inquit*, and the ablative *sancto Gallo* in the introductory clause. Similar cases do not appear only in *Liber vitae patrum* but also in *Vita Eligii* (e.g. *V. Elig.* 2, 29) and *Vita Wilfridi* (*Steph. V. Wilfr.* 16). The instances of anacoluthon and combination with other introducers could point to certain degree of grammaticalization of *inquit*.

- (4) Cumque, episcopo alio missas dicente, diaconus ille propter iactantiam potius quam propter Dei timorem cantare velet, a sancto Gallo prohibebatur, *dicente* sibi: “Sine”, *inquit*, “fili, quando, Domino iubente, nos celebraverimus solemnia, tunc et tu canere debes. Nunc eius clerici concinant, qui consecrat missas”. (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 6, 5)
When another bishop was saying Mass, this deacon wanted to sing, from vanity rather than through fear of God. But Gallus prevented him, saying: “Stop, my son. When we

¹⁴ Transl. by Jones (1991: p. 10).

¹⁵ Transl. by Jones (1991: pp. 50–51).

celebrate the ceremony, by the grace of God, then you may sing. Now the clerics of the celebrant are going to sing.”¹⁶

4. *Dicens*

The participle *dicens* introduces the direct speech in 170 instances. The most frequent form is the nominative singular *dicens* (120 instances), followed by the nominative plural *dicentes* (30 instances) and by all the remaining case forms (19 instances). Also one ablative of gerund *dicendo* (5) is included in this group since in Late Latin the ablative of gerund tends to assume some functions of the present participle.¹⁷

- (5) ...nec lacrimis ab oculis mitigare valebat, sed lurida facie et genas hu-
mectas fletus rigando percurrens, amarissimo animo *dicendo*: “Non fui
dignus ego miser, ut cum ipso interemptus fuisset”. (V. Hugb. 1)
...he was not able to suppress tears, so his face was pallid, tears were running down
his cheeks and he said sadly: “O me miserable man! I was not worthy of being killed
together with him.”¹⁸

Outside the context of direct speech, *dicens* occurs as the *participium coniunctum* (in 21 cases) or in absolute constructions (in 13 cases). The group of the *participia coniuncta* includes also instances of *dicens* which governs Acl or a complement clause with conjunction. In some texts (in *Vita Memorii*, *Arnulfi*, *Amati*, *Wandregiseli*), however, there is no instance of *dicens* outside the direct speech. This fact cannot be explained as a consequence of a generally low number of *dicens* in these texts since in *Vita Wandregiseli* *dicens* is the most frequently used means for introducing direct speech.

As in the case of *inquit*, instances of anacoluthon are also found in which *dicens* shows disagreement in case and sometimes also in case and number. In (6), for example, it is clear that the direct speech is a quote of an inscription. However, instead of the correct accusative *dicentem*, which would agree with the noun *titulum* ‘inscription’ in the accusative, the nominative *dicens* is used, perhaps because of the influence of the nominatives *scribens* ‘writing’ and *ipse* ‘he by himself’.

¹⁶ Transl. by Jones (1991: p. 38).

¹⁷ See, e.g., Maraldi (1994).

¹⁸ If the name of translator is not indicated in the footnote, the translation is mine.

- (6) ...suum iussit preparare sepulcrum, **scribens** desuper **titulum** quem **ipse** edidit, hoc modo **dicens**: “Omnis homo Dei, qui in hunc locum sanctum ad orandum introieris, si obtinere merearis que postulas, pro anima Amati penitentis hic sepulti Domini misericordiam deprecari digneris, ...”. (V. Am. 13)

...he ordered to prepare his sepulchre and to write upon it an inscription, composed by himself, saying: “Every man of God who will enter this holy place for praying, if you obtain what you want, be so kind and pray the compassionate God for the soul of Amatus, repenting man who is buried here,...”

Dicens differs from *dicere*, *ait* and a group of other verbs of speech since it much more frequently follows another verb or noun of speech that could introduce direct speech even without *dicens*, see (7), (8). The verb or noun of speech and *dicens* co-occur in the introductory clause before the direct speech although they need not be adjacent.

- (7) E quibus unus nomine Sagatus, qui preerat ceteris, **respondit dicens**: “Habeo quidem unum solidum; sed si hunc dederō, nicil omnino, unde nobis uel euectiuncule nostre in postmodum emamus, habebimus”. (V. patr. Emerit. 5, 7)

One of them, called Sagatus, who had charge of the others, answered, saying: “I have one gold coin, but if I give it to you, we will not have anything for which we can buy things for us or for our animal.”

- (8) *Antedictus tamen sacerdos non inmemor iniuriae, sicut quondam Paulus apostolus de Alexandro, ita et hic de Proculo decantabat, dicens*: “Proculus aerarius multa mala mihi fecit, reddat illi Dominus secundum opera sua”. (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 4, 1)

Nevertheless, remembering the injuries which he had received, he spoke as the apostle Paul did after injuries from Alexander, saying: “Proculus the publican has done us much ill; the Lord will deal with him according to his deeds.”¹⁹

Instances of two introducers which co-occur in the introductory clause are also found in the case of verbs of other groups (e.g. *respondens dixit* ‘answering he said’ in *V. Goar*: 8 or *Steph. V. Wilfr*: 60). They can occur, however, as much as up to ten times, whereas *dicens* following other verb or noun of speech appears in 89 instances (e.g. *loquitur dicens* ‘he speaks saying’ in *Greg. Tur. vit. patr.* 10, praef. or *oravit dicens* ‘he was praying saying’ in *Greg. Tur. vit. patr.* 10, 3).

¹⁹ Transl. by Jones (1991: p. 23).

5. Other verbs of speech

As stated above, this group includes speech related verbs, i.e. not only verbs such as *loqui* ‘to speak, to tell’ or *respondere* ‘to answer’, but also *adocere* ‘to add’, and the like. The most frequently used verb is *respondere* in various verbal forms. It occurs in 44 instances (5 of them are present participles) out of total 129 direct speeches introduced by another verb of speech. The number of each of the remaining verbs can be as many as ten. Verbs of this group appear regularly outside the context of direct speech, including *respondere* which governs, for example, AcI.

Overview of verbs and other introducers

	Total of all instances	Not combined verbs	Intraposited or postposed combined verbs ²⁰	Frequency of individual verbal forms ²¹
<i>dicere</i>	192	191	1	Vf: 180 (dixit: 111, dicit: 20, dicebat: 8, diceret: 2, dixisset: 1, others: 38) inf.: 12
<i>ait</i>	180	179	1	ait: 167 aiunt: 5 aiebat: 5 aio: 2
<i>inquit</i>	68	37	31	inquit/inquid: 64 inquiunt: 2 inquiens: 1 inquam: 1
<i>dicens</i>	170	170	0	dicens: 120 dicentes: 30 dicentis: 2 dicentem: 5 dicente: 9 dicentium: 1 dicentibus: 2 dicendo: 1
other verbs of speech	129	129	0	Vf: 39 repondens: 5
Total of verbs	739	706	33	

²⁰ The verb is intraposited or postposed and, at the same time, it is combined with another preposed verb or noun of speech.

²¹ The most frequent form is in bold.

	Total of all instances	Not combined verbs	Intraposited or postposed combined verbs ²⁰	Frequency of individual verbal forms ²¹
nouns	13	13	0	
<i>et ille</i> , etc.	34	34	0	coordinated with preceding direct speech: 22
Total of all introducers	786	753	33	

Comparison of groups

The above data show that in the examined texts direct speech is introduced most frequently by different verbal forms of *dicere* except the present participle, the second most frequent introducer is *ait*, the third *dicens*, the fourth other verbs of speech and the least frequently used is *inquit*. *Inquit* is, however, more frequent than individual verbs included in the group of other verbs of speech. A closer look at the data shows that *ait* is the most frequently occurring verb and that it is almost completely reserved for introducing direct speech. It is also obvious that the use of *ait* changed, if compared to Classical Latin, in which *ait* used to be employed outside the context of direct speech and governed Acl.

By contrast, *inquit*, which in Classical Latin was an intraposed verb employed especially for introducing direct speech, clearly decreases in use. The high number of instances of *inquit* occurring in combination with another verb or noun of speech to introduce the same direct speech, a combination with expressions such as *et ille* ‘and he’ preceding the direct speech in many of remaining instances, and a few instances of preposed *inquit* indicate that the position of introducers before the direct speech is strongly preferred. The anacoluthon of *inquit*, found in some instances, can be a sign that *inquit* was perceived as a stereotyped expression which forms part of the prestigious Classical Latin norm.²²

The anacoluthon is rarely found also in the case of the participle *dicens*. Contrary to *inquit*, its use increased considerably in comparison to Classical Latin, in which it was hardly ever used for introducing direct speech. Although it is not employed only (or almost only) for introducing direct speech, as it is the case of *ait*, its potential for grammaticalization is obvious from a large number of instances, in which it co-occurs with another verb of

²² The expression “norm” refers to the language used by classical authors, which became a prestigious model for later writers.

speech in an introductory clause and is more or less redundant (89 instances out of 170). In Deutscher's view (2011: p. 651), the structures propitious for the grammaticalization of quotative markers are both *he answered, he said*, and *he answered, saying*. Thus, also the finite verb such as *ait* could be a source for further grammaticalization, particularly if it was proved that it is specialized in introducing direct speech in Late Latin texts. However, *ait* is not found in the paratactic structure mentioned above. In a few instances it is found with another verb of speech in the introductory clause but it is always coordinated by the conjunction 'and'. The coordination also determines the interpretation (9), which need not be unambiguous in the case of *dicens* following another verb of speech, cf. instances (10) and (11). In (10), *evocat matrem* "he calls his mother" is followed by *dicens* and the direct speech which contains the words used by a boy to call his mother to him. Thus, *evocat matrem dicens* is interpreted as "he calls his mother with these words". By contrast, in (11) the content of direct speech points to the interpretation "he calls the abbot and says", because the direct speech is a request to the abbot.

- (9) Advenit dies dominica, *vocat* ministrum suum et *ait*: "Praepara quiddam cibi, quod accipiam, quia valde defessum me sentio". (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 20, 4)
 One Sunday he called his servant to him and said, "Prepare me some food to take, for I am very weak."²³
- (10) ... (puer) convaluit et gaudia cordis risu praecedente patefaciens, aperto divinitus ore, *evocat* matrem, *dicens*: "Accede huc". (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 2, 4)
 ... (the child) awoke and shows by a laugh the joy of his heart; he opened his mouth and calls his mother, saying, "Come here!"²⁴
- (11) ... abbatem *vocat*, *dicens*: "Supplica, quaeso, pro me Dominum et accipe hunc servum ad eius cultum; forsitan promerebor recipere lumen amissum". (Greg. Tur. vit. patr. 5, 1)
 ... he calls abbot to him and says: "Plead to the Lord on my behalf, I beg you, and take this slave into His service: perhaps I will then deserve to recover the light which I have lost."²⁵

²³ Transl. by Jones (1991: p. 130).

²⁴ Transl. by Jones (1991: p. 15).

²⁵ Trans. by Jones (1991: p. 29).

The examined texts display an obvious tendency to place introducers before the direct speech, which corresponds to a cross-linguistically documented preference and can be explained by the fact that the position before the direct speech facilitates the orientation in the text. In this respect the verb *ait* has an advantage over the Classical Latin *inquit* which is inserted into the direct speech. The importance of position before the direct speech is indicated also by five instances of preposed *inquit* and the high frequency of expressions such as *tum ille* ‘then he’, *cui ille* ‘he to him’ before the direct speech introduced by intraposed *inquit*.

It can be concluded that *dicere*, *ait* and *dicens* seem to be progressive verbal means for introducing direct speech at the expense of *inquit*; and that three introducers – *inquit*, *ait* and *dicens* – may be considered as examples of grammaticalization. *Ait* and *dicens* seem to compete with (and win over) older *inquit*, which may have reached a certain degree of grammaticalization already in Classical Latin. Both *ait* and *dicens* have the advantage to be preposed and could be considered as examples of at least incipient grammaticalization. Although *ait* seems to be more specialized in introducing direct speech than *dicens*, *dicens* may be an element apt to undergo further grammaticalization into a quotative marker, since it occurs in a convenient context (i.e. in the structure *he answered saying*) in more than half of the instances found in the examined texts. *Dicens* is considered an element undergoing grammaticalization also by Gayno (2015: pp. 4–6), who analyses texts from the same period (the *Chronicle of Fredegar*, *Excerpta Valesiana*, the second book of Gregory of Tours’ *Historia Francorum* and the second book of his *De virtutibus sancti Martini*). A tentative look at later Latin texts seems, however, to suggest that *dicens* did not become grammaticalized as the only introducer of direct speech and that the variability of means introducing direct speech was preserved. Nevertheless, to obtain reliable results, it would be necessary to examine a large corpus of texts.

Differences between individual texts

In the preceding paragraphs the use of introducers was examined across all the selected texts. The following section concerns itself with the following questions: how individual authors differ in their choice of introducers; and whether their preferences change in time.

Means introducing direct speech in individual works

Differences between individual texts are shown in the following chart, which includes the three most frequently used introducers in each of the texts:

	Century	1.	2.	3.	Total of introducers ²⁶
Greg. Tur., Liber vitae patrum	6	ait: 93 (33%)	dicens: 67 (24%)	dicere: 42 (15%)	281 (271/10)
Vita Hugberti	9	other verbs: 18 (34%)	ait: 13 (25%)	dicere: 10 (19%)	53
Vita Goaris	8	dicere: 41 (68%)	dicens: 8 (13%)	other verbs: 6 (10%)	60 (59/1)
Vita Memorii	8	ait: 14 (54%)	other verbs: 7 (27%)	dicere: 3 (12%)	26
Vita Eligii	8	other verbs: 23 (24%)	dicere: 18 + inquit: 5/13 (19%)	dicens: 16 + ait: 15/1 (17%)	96 (82/14)
Vita Wandregiseli	7	dicens: 14 (48%)	dicere: 8 (28%)	other verbs: 5 (17%)	29
Vita Arnulfi	7	ait: 9 (29%)	dicens: 7 (23%)	dicere: 5 (16%)	31 (27/4)
Vita Amati	7	ait: 7 (33%)	inquit: 6 (29%)	dicere: 3 + dicens: 3 (14%)	21 (20/1)
Vitas patrum Emeritensium	7	ait: 25 (30%)	other verbs: 23 (27%)	dicere: 21 (25%)	84 (83/1)
Vita Wilfridi	8	dicere: 40 (38%)	dicens: 38 (36%)	other verbs: 21 (20%)	105 (103/2)
All the examined texts		dicere: 192 (24%)	ait: 180 (23%)	dicens: 170 (22%)	786 (753/33)

²⁶

The number after the slash indicates the number of instances of direct speech which are introduced by two verbs placed in different positions with relation to the direct speech (e.g. by a preposed and an intraposed verb).

Whereas *dicere*, *ait* and *dicens* are the most frequent introducers in the examined texts considered together, in individual texts other verbs can appear among the first three, particularly various verbs of speech contained in the fifth group, and in two texts, also *inquit*. Some authors show a strong tendency to prefer considerably one introducer or even one verbal form. This is the case of *dixit* in *Vita Goaris*, *ait* in *Vita Memoriae* and *dicens* in *Vita Wandregiseli*.

As regards development in time, unambiguous conclusions cannot be drawn. For example, the use of *ait* decreases in the majority of the examined texts from the 8th century, but it does not hold for *Vita Memoriae* also dating back to the 8th century, in which it is the most frequent introducer, employed for introducing 55% of examples of direct speech. Similarly, it seems that the choice of introducers does not depend on the content of the direct speech and its function in the discourse (e.g. whether the direct speech is a quote from other authors or texts, or whether it is a part of a dialogical passage).

Conclusions

This paper has focused on the use of verbal means for introducing direct speech in ten Late Latin texts from the 6th to the 9th centuries. In the examined texts considered together the most frequently used introducers are *dicere* (mostly in finite form), *ait* (only rarely in a form other than in the 3rd person singular) and the present participle *dicens* (with the prevalence of the nominative of singular). *Ait* seems to be a verb employed especially for introducing direct speech and it is almost never found outside the context of direct speech. For example, there is no instance of *ait* governing a completive clause, although in Classical Latin it used to govern AcI. It is obvious that *dicens* increases in frequency as a means for introducing direct speech, whereas in Classical Latin it was hardly ever used as an introducer. Contrary to *ait*, *dicens* is used also outside the context of direct speech and there are some instances of *dicens* governing a completive clause. In more than half of the instances considered, *dicens* combines with other verbs of speech in introductory clause according to the pattern *he answered saying*, which results in more or less redundant constructions and creates a context favourable for further grammaticalization of *dicens* into a quotative marker. In a few cases, *dicens* shows disagreement in case, or in case and number.

Findings concerning *ait* and *dicens* indicate that both of them could be considered as examples of at least incipient grammaticalization. Although *ait* seems to be more specialized in introducing direct speech than *dicens*,

dicens may have a higher potential for further grammaticalization into a quotative marker since it occurs in a convenient context (i.e. in the structure *he answered saying*) in more than half of instances. Whereas both *ait* and *dicens* seem to spread in function of introducer, *inquit*, verb employed in Classical Latin especially for introducing direct speech, clearly decreases in frequency. We can surmise that this verb has already reached a certain degree of grammaticalization in Classical Latin. In the examined texts it also seems to show signs of some degree of grammaticalization, or at least of a routinely used expression which forms part of a prestigious Classical Latin norm. If it is intraposed, it is often combined with another preposed verb or noun of speech or with expressions such as *et ille* ‘and he’, *cui ille* ‘he to him’ which are placed before the direct speech. This points to a tendency to place introducers before direct speech, which corresponds to the cross-linguistically documented preference and can simultaneously facilitate reading comprehension. Comparing *inquit*, *ait* and *dicens* as to some degree grammaticalized introducers, it seems that the older introducer *inquit* is being superseded by the newer ones – *ait* and *dicens*. Apart from the above mentioned verbs, direct speech is introduced also by other verbs of speech (*respondere* is the most frequent one) and in a few cases, also by nouns of speech.

The examined texts differ from each other in various aspects, for example in the most frequently used verb for introducing direct speech. It seems, however, that these differences do not enable general conclusions to be drawn. For example, it cannot be claimed that the choice of the most frequently used verb or verbs develops over time. Similarly, it seems that the choice of introducers does not depend on the content of the direct speech or its function within the discourse (e.g. whether the direct speech is a quote from other authors or texts; or whether it is a part of a dialogical passage).

Abbreviations

Greg. Tur. <i>vit. patr.</i>	Gregorius Turonensis, <i>Liber vitae patrum</i>
Steph. <i>V. Wilfr.</i>	Stephanus, <i>Vita Wilfridi</i>
<i>V. Am.</i>	<i>Vita Amati</i>
<i>V. Arnulf.</i>	<i>Vita Arnulfi</i>
<i>V. Elig.</i>	<i>Vita Eligii</i>
<i>V. Goar.</i>	<i>Vita Goaris</i>
<i>V. Hugb.</i>	<i>Vita Hugberti</i>
<i>V. Memor.</i>	<i>Vita Memorii</i>
<i>V. patr. Emerit.</i>	<i>Vitas patrum Emeritensium</i>
<i>V. Wandr.</i>	<i>Vita Wandregiseli</i>

Bibliography

- Baños Baños, J. M. (2009). El discurso indirecto. In J. M. Baños Baños (Ed.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico* (pp. 733–758). Madrid: Liceus E-Excellence.
- Blackwell, N., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2012). Social factors affect quotative choice. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1150–1162. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.001.
- Bolkestein, A. M. (1996). Reported speech in Latin. In T. Janssen, & W. Wurff (Eds.), *Reported Speech* (pp. 121–140). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Capone, A. (2013). The pragmatics of quotation, explicatures and modularity of mind. *Pragmatics and Society*, 4(3), 259–284. DOI: 10.1075/ps.4.3.01cap.
- Deutscher, G. (2011). The Grammaticalization of Quotatives. In H. Narrog, & B. Heine (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization* (pp. 646–655). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fruyt, M. (2009). Grammaticalization in Latin. In P. Baldi, & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Vol. 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology* (pp. 661–864). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gayno, M. (2015). Les modalités d'insertion du discours direct en latin tardif: bornage et redondance. *Revue de Linguistique Latine du Centre Alfred Ernout De Lingua Latina*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/IMG/pdf/DLL_11_M-Gayno.pdf>
- Golato, A. (2012). Impersonal quotation and hypothetical discourse. In I. van Alphen, & I. Buchstaller (Eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Crossdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 3–36). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Güldemann, T. (2008). *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Güldemann, T. (2012). Thetic speaker-instantiating quotative indexes as a cross-linguistic type. In I. van Alphen, & I. Buchstaller (Eds.), *Quotative: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 117–142). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, B. (2005). Grammaticalization. In B. Joseph, & R. Janda (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (pp. 577–601). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Herlyn, A. (1999). So he says to her, he says, “Well,” he says Multiple Dialogue Introducers from a Historical perspective. *Historical Dialogue Analysis*, 66, 313.
- Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kieckers, E. (1919). Zum ‚pleonastischen‘ inquit. *Glotta*, 10(3), 200–209.
- Klamer, M. (2000). How report verbs become quote markers and complementisers. *Lingua*, 110(2), 69–98. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-3841(99)00032-7.
- Maraldi, M. (1994). Some remarks on the historical development of the ablative of the gerund in Latin. In G. Calboli (Ed.), *Papers on Grammar IV* (pp. 141–164). Bologna: CLUEB.
- Romaine, S., & Lange, D. (1991). The Use of like as a Marker of Reported Speech and Thought: A Case of Grammaticalization in Progress. *American Speech*, 66(3), 227–279. DOI: 10.2307/455799.
- Sznajder, L. (2002). Interférences et conflits dans les formes du discours indirect. In A. M. Bolkestein (Ed.), *Theory and description in Latin linguistics: selected papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, June 24–29, 2001* (pp. 361–377). Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Sznajder, L. (2015). Segments introducteurs de discours direct et repérages énonciatifs en

- latin biblique: éléments pour une étude diastatique et diachronique. *Revue de Linguistique Latine du Centre Alfred Ernout De Lingua Latina*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/IMG/pdf/DLL11_SZNAJDER.pdf>
- Terraschke, A. (2013). A classification system for describing quotative content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 59–74. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.11.015.
- Traina, A., & Tullio, B. (1993). *Sintassi normativa della lingua latina: teoria* (2nd ed.). Bologna: Cappelli Editore.
- Vandelanotte, L. (2004). Deixis and grounding in speech and thought representation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 489–520. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.003.
- Vandelanotte, L. (2012). Quotative go and be like: Grammar and grammaticalization. In I. van Alphen, & I. Buchstaller (Eds.), *Quotative: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 173–202). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Primary sources, dictionaries, translations

- Die digitalen Monumenta Germaniae Historica (dMGH)*. Reprint. Published by Monumenta Germaniae Historica and Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. Available from: <<http://www.dmg.de>>.
- Jones, E. (1991). *Gregory of Tours. Life of the Fathers*. Transl. with an introd. and notes. 2nd ed. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Plaetse, R., & Tombeur, P. (2013). *The Electronic Monumenta Germaniae Historica (eMGH)*. 13th release. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers. Available from: <<http://www.phil.muni.cz/wlap/>>
- Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (2004). (3rd ed.) Leipzig: K. G. Saur.
- Tombeur, P., & al. (2015). *Library of Latin Texts – Series A. Centre Traditio Litterarum Occidentalium*. Turnhout: Brepols. Available from: <<http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/Default.aspx>>.

Mgr. Jana Mikulová, Ph.D.
 Department of Classical Studies
 Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University
 A. Nováka 1, CZ-602 00 Brno, Czech Republic
 jmikulova@gmail.com

