# Delocutive verbs, crosslinguistically

FRANS PLANK

*Abstract*

*Delocutive verbs can be defined as verbs derived from a base X which mean 'by saying or uttering "X" (to someone) to perform an act which is culturally associated with the meaning or force of X', where X is a variable ranging over types of things that can be said or uttered – 2nd person pronouns and other terms of address, words for asking and answering questions, formulaic expressions for social acts like greetings, various kinds of expressives, characterizations of speech peculiarities. Although originally identified as such in, and illustrated exclusively from, Indo-European languages by Debrunner (1956) and Benveniste (1958), delocutives are not confined to this family, but show a wide genetic and areal spread. The aim of this paper is to delineate the systematic possibilities for crosslinguistic diversity and for historical change in delocutive formations, and in particular to relate derivational delocutives to equivalent syntactic constructions. In such a wider typological and diachronic view, delocutives are seen not to be cases of ordinary quotation, nor a rare peculiarity at the margins of ordinary word formation, but to be one variation on the theme of complex predicates, instructively bearing on the general question of where verbs can come from. Their closest affinities, synchronic and diachronic, are to predications of existential causation (*DOING/MAKING, *often found to subsume* SAYING).*

*Keywords:   causative, complex predicate, delocutive, derivation, expressive, grammaticalization, quotative, verb, word formation*

## 1.   Elusive delocutives

At a first go and roughly following Albert Debrunner (1956) and Émile Benveniste (1958), who almost simultaneously put them on the crosslinguistic agenda, delocutive verbs can be defined as derived verbs which mean 'to say

or utter "*X*" (to someone)', where *X* is a variable for derivational bases ranging over types of things that can be said or uttered.[1] Latin *sālūtāre* is an example, one of Debrunner's and Benveniste's own: derived from the salutation *sālūs!*, originally a wish for a person's welfare, the meaning of the noun *sālūs* being 'health', the verb *sālūtāre* means 'to say "sālūs!" to someone', i.e., 'to wish someone well, greet someone'.[2] To also exemplify from English, the verb in *In vain he my-lorded his poor father in the sternest manner* (Anthony Trollope, *The Warden*, 1855) is derived from the term of address *My Lord*, with 1st person possessive pronoun unchanged like in direct speech (*\*his-lorded*), and means 'to address by using the term "My Lord" ', thereby to defining the relationship to one's addressee as a very formal one.

Such verbal derivatives had occasionally been noticed before, and had been clearly understood for what they were, in language-particular or family-particular accounts of word formation. This included Debrunner's own of Ancient Greek (1917), which was the main inspiration for a short paper by Hans Jensen (1950), who deserves special mention as a comparativist predecessor of Debrunner and Benveniste, finding delocutive verbs also in Hungarian and, abundantly, in Arabic. For Germanic, weak verbs (*ō*-class) often seemed to Wissmann (1932: 193–196, passim) to lack proper "roots", and he instead suggested expressive interjections as the original bases (e.g., Old English *wanian*, Old High German *weinon*, Old Norse *veina* 'to wail, weep' < 'to utter "va/wê/vei"', 1932: 156–157).

Though not limited to one particular language or another, the coverage of Debrunner's and Benveniste's eye-opening presentations was confined to Indo-European, encompassing ancient and also modern members of that family. Little work has been done since to place delocutive verbs in a wider crosslinguistic perspective. They have here and there been noticed elsewhere too, undermining the impression that they might be a specifically Indo-European possession; but synoptic connections remain to be made.

My aim in this paper is not to comprehensively survey the language families or areas of the world as to whether they know or do not know delocutive verbs or also other grammaticalized delocutive formations. This could not be done reliably under present circumstances, given that the category has only been

---

1. Probably because it was also being used for other kinds of phenomena in language and thought, Debrunner's term "Hypostasierung" proved less successful than Benveniste's more specific "délocutif".

2. The straightforward delocutive interpretation of this particular example, like that of many another from the Classical languages, has sometimes been contested. For Mignot (1981), *sālūs!* is a "locution fantôme", with *sāluē!*, the imperative of the corresponding verb 'to be well', having been the real greeting formula among the Romans; he assumes that *sālūtāre* was a plain denominal verb, whose derivation, however, will have owed something to the verbal greeting formula.

distinctly recognized some fifty years ago in a few Indo-European manifestations and is very likely to have gone unnoticed, or unrecognized for what it is, in descriptions of other languages that also have it.

A case in point is Dyirbal (Pama-Nyungan, Australian), whose only grammar overlooked them, despite an extensive chapter on derivational morphology; for this language, this oversight subsequently happened to be remedied by that grammar's own author (Dixon 1977). Again, in the five volumes so far of the *Handbook of Australian Languages* (edited by R. M. W. Dixon & Barry J. Blake, 1979-2000), delocutive verbs are only mentioned for a single language: Djapu (a Yolngu dialect of northeast Arnhem Land; Morphy 1983: 113–114). Likewise alerted by Dixon (1977), Crowley (1978: 85–86), Donaldson (1980: 80, 238, 242), Austin (1981: 167), Goddard (1985: 219–223), Wordick (1982: 88), and Dench (1995: 160) also find them in Bandjalung (also on the South Coast of Queensland), Ngiyambaa (further away in New South Wales), Diyari and Dhirari (South Australia), Yankunytjatjara (Western Desert), and Yinjtji- parnti and Martuthunira (Pilbara, Western Australia) (as summarized in Dixon 2002: 208). Further Australian noticings would not be unexpected.

The *Lingua Descriptive Studies Questionnaire* (Comrie & Smith 1977), otherwise the most complete grammatical checklist on the market, asks for derivational sources of verbs in terms of word or phrase classes (§2.2.2), but does not specifically mention locutions as bases. Accordingly, very few of the grammars in this by now substantial series volunteer delocutive verbs. From those that I was able to check (about two thirds) only three do: those of Greenlandic Es- kimo (Fortescue 1984: 328–329, with a cross-reference to the speech-reporting section, §3), Modern Greek (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 221), and Turkish (Kornfilt 1997: 456). There is reason to suspect that this is too mea- gre a yield, with delocutives going unrecorded, for example, for the Semitic languages in the series.

Also attesting to its rather modest renown, few linguistic dictionaries, ency- clopedias, surveys, or even handbooks devoted to morphology have an entry DELOCUTIVE or as little as a mention of the term or some equivalent in the index. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, compiled by a morphol- ogist (Matthews 1997: 90), is a rare exception.

Under the circumstances, my aim here is correspondingly modest: by delin- eating the SYSTEMATIC possibilities for crosslinguistic variation on the theme of delocutive formations and by suggesting some generalizations about them which appear to be borne out by the evidence available, I hope to raise the language-particular descriptive awareness of delocutives and to stimulate fur- ther typological research on their embedding in the fabric of lexicon and gram- mar. Special emphasis will be given (i) to clarifying the semantics (or also pragmatics) of delocutives; (ii) to situating them within the wider domains of quotation, appellation, and sound reproduction; (iii) to identifying the possible

origins and fates of delocutive forms; (iv) and to distinguishing the parameters along which delocutive formations can vary, in particular with regard to possible kinds of bases, of exponents, and of (morphological or syntactic) constructions. Far from being the rare peculiarity at the margins of ordinary word formation that they have sometimes been misperceived as, in such a wider perspective delocutives are seen to be just one variation, or one family of variations, on the theme of complex predicates, also bearing on the general question of where verbs can come from. Their closest affinities, synchronically transparent or diachronically reconstructible, are to predications of existential causation (to cause something to come into existence: DOING/MAKING, which in relevant languages is often found to subsume SAYING).

## 2.    Where to expect delocutives

### 2.1.    *Beyond Indo-European*

A first parameter for crosslinguistic variation of course is whether a language has or lacks delocutive formations – as defined initially, following Debrunner's and Benveniste's precedent: delocutive expressions taking the form of derived verbs. (They may also take other forms, as will be seen in more detail in Section 8.) Suffice it to say that variability in this respect is hard to rein in.

Even languages that are genealogically and areally closely related can differ widely on this count: only compare German, rich in delocutive verbs, and adjacent Dutch (both West Germanic), devoid of them, with the possible exception of a few verbs based on animal cries; or French and (contemporary) Italian (both Romance), with the latter lacking derivational counterparts of delocutive specimens most conspicuous in the former (namely *tutoyer*, *vouvoyer*); or Dyirbal, most productively deriving delocutive verbs from animal cries and some other bases, and its northerly North Queensland neighbour, Yidiny (both Pama-Nyungan, a family allegedly rife with diffusion where genealogical subgrouping is tricky), doing nothing of that kind (Dixon 1977: 29).

One safe conclusion, however, is that delocutive verbs are NOT an Indo-European phenomenon: while not universal within Indo-European on the one hand, their genetic and areal incidence is on the other hand far wider than that family and the areas that it covers.[3] In macro-areal terms, they are definitely at-

---

3. Published work specifically devoted to delocutive verbs in particular languages, adding to the factual crosslinguistic basis laid in Debrunner (1956) and Benveniste (1958), includes Büchi (1995) on Gallo-Romance, Dimitrescu (1961) on Romanian, Létoublon (1980) on Greek, Zagar (1988) on Slovene, Hillers (1967) and Tigay (1999) on Hebrew, Bravman (1968) and Larcher (1983, 1985, 2003) on Arabic, Dixon (1977) on Dyirbal, as well as the occasional grammar. I have not been able to consult the M.A. thesis by Niinistö (2001) on Finnish. Other than descriptive grammars my main source of information has been a questionnaire survey: for credits, and identification of languages thus covered, see the Acknowledgements.

tested in Eurasia, North Africa and the Near East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Australia, and the Americas, although there are (possibly large) parts of these areas and (possibly many) members of the resident families where they are missing. They are unlikely to be represented in every higher-level family or area worldwide: they are not universal in even this weaker familial or areal sense. For example, Niger-Congo, reluctant to derive verbs in the first place, shows no indication of morphologically deriving delocutives. In general, however, it would be well advised presently not to be too categorical about their total absence from particular families or areas, even when this conclusion seems confirmed by their absence from none-too-slim reference grammars with a section on word formation.

## 2.2.   *Free or implicated?*

As to structural conditions, there probably are none that would be especially conducive or inimical to this particular derivational category, let alone categorically require or prohibit it – cf. German vs. Dutch, French vs. Italian, Dyirbal vs. Yidiny, with no dramatic typological differences among the members of each pair. Nor apparently are there any conspicuous *implicata* of having or not having delocutive verbs, other than ones relating delocutive to other kinds of derivational morphology, to be mentioned presently. This will disappoint those typologists thriving on implications and seeking to relate just about everything ("*tout se tient*") to supposedly major parameters such as basic word order, morphological type, relational alignment, configurationality, pro drop, verb serialization (well, who knows?), preference for iambic or trochaic meter, stress or syllable timing, or having or lacking tones. As there are no minor parameters either that could plausibly be suspected to tip the balance, delocutive verbs probably have to be conceded to be subject to relatively free crosslinguistic variation. They may well be something a language is free to add to its derivational programme at some point of its history, given suitable formal resources that can be exploited for this purpose, and perhaps given suitable models in a language in contact from which a delocutive form or the idea of it could be borrowed.

Naturally, if a language does not provide for any sort of verb derivation, delocutive verbs cannot be derived either. Overall, noun derivation is crosslinguistically more common and more productive than verb derivation; and delocutive verbs would, thus, seem to imply large-scale utilization of derivational morphology in the languages that have them.

Whenever languages do derive verbs, deriving delocutives will not be a first priority: verbs derived from nouns will primarily be about engaging in the activities that one typically associates with the things denoted by a noun, and

verbs derived from verbs or adjectives will primarily be about changes of valency (including causative and decausative) and of aspect or aktionsart. But then, saying them IS the activity that is typically associated with terms of address or abuse, salutations, questioning and answering words, expressives, etc. (see below, Section 4). From this point of view, delocutive verbs are no more unusual (and perhaps not even worth special mention) than straightforward denominal verbs like 'to hammer', 'to fish', or 'to Houdini (out of a predicament)', meaning, basically, to do what one is supposed to do with an instrument such as a hammer, to do what one needs to do to a fish in order to eat it (catch it), or to behave in the extricating manner that Harry Houdini was famous for.

To hint at another typological dimension, though one as yet insufficiently investigated, there are languages with rather few basic verbs, extending their small verbal inventories, not through affixal derivation, but through compounding or syntactic combinations of nouns and perhaps adjectives with a dozen or two of "light" verbs of very general meaning ('be, have, do, make, let, put, set, hold, get, give, bring, take, show, stand, move, come, go, …'): it is in such languages that non-derivational grammaticalizations of delocutivity seem to flourish, among other kinds of complex predicate formation.

When Benveniste (1958/1966: 283) asserted: "Ce sont en définitive les ressources et la structure de chaque système linguistique qui décident de cette possibilité de dérivation verbale comme de toutes les autres", what he had in mind merely was that, for any language to have them, there need to be (i) suitable bases and (ii) a lexical need for delocutive verbs. There is a lexical need when relevant meanings want to be expressed in a compact and routine sort of way, rather than compositionally in syntactic constructions, and are not expressed otherwise, that is, through basic verbs or non-delocutively derived verbs. A more fertile consideration for purposes of crosslinguistic or rather crosscultural diversification is how bases qualify as suitable: not just any "locution" does, but only "locutions FORMULAIRES", frequently used and culturally pregnant (Benveniste 1958/ 1966: 279) – and not all cultures might have such salient formulas in equal abundance.

## 3.   Types and forms of bases

### 3.1.   *Base types*

To elaborate on this parameter of suitable bases, the following types are attested across languages that have delocutive verbs:

(i)    pronouns of address, distinguished as formal and informal or along similar social or emotional lines;

(ii)  nouns of (abusive and other) address, including titles, epithets, (core) kin terms, and proper names;[4]

(iii)  words or phrases specialized for performing complementary dialogic speech-acts, in particular:
  (a)  words for answering yes/no questions and also for responding to commands ('yes', 'no', also 'perhaps' etc.),
  (b)  words for asking questions (i.e., interrogative pronouns),
  (c)  words for reacting to assertions (e.g., 'but', 'okay', 'uh-huh', 'oh');

(iv)  expressions for performing routine social acts, such as greeting, well-wishing, thanking, warning, permitting and forbidding, supplicating, swearing, cursing, chanting, getting someone's attention, and maintaining contact between speaker and addressee (on either side) – which formally can be nouns or noun phrases in appropriate case forms, such as nominative, accusative, or vocative, or verbs or verb phrases in imperative or optative or similar mood forms, or special calling forms, or even full clauses;

(v)  expressives:
  (a)  sound-related interjections or ideophones,
  (b)  conventionalized reproductions of human or animal sounds or calls;

(vi)  features of pronunciation characteristic of dialectal or other linguistic varieties or of individual speech peculiarities, including fillers for the pauses when one's speech is halting.

With the exception of (vi), essentially all these types of bases figured in Benveniste's study (1958), in one example or another. The focus of Debrunner (1956) had been on social-act delocutives (iv), but he too exemplified most other types at least in passing. This is possibly a closed list, then, comprising what arguably are the most salient types of "locutions formulaires" across languages or rather cultures.

    To illustrate these base types from a single language, German (with a little help from Russian), so far as possible with examples which are not especially far-fetched and which demonstrate the two morphological exponents used for this purpose in this language (suffix *-z* and zero derivation):[5]

---

4. More marginal possibilities under the headings (i) and (ii) are self- and also other-referring expressions. Pronouns of 1st person and names of speakers/writers themselves have been mentioned as bases of delocutive verbs; but these are probably nonce formations. When there are honorific distinctions for 3rd person pronouns, these forms could conceivably also serve as delocutive bases.

5. In a fairly comprehensive contemporary descriptive survey of German word formation such as Fleischer & Barz (1992), it is mentioned in passing (pp. 351–352, less than eight lines) that word classes such as interjections, personal pronouns, and answering particles can marginally serve as bases of derived verbs, but without noting the essence of delocutivity.

(i)     *jemand-en        du-z-en*                          /
        someone-ACC.SG   "du".NOM.SG-DELOC-INF   /
        *sie-z-en*
        "Sie".NOM.SG-DELOC-INF
        'to say "thou"/"you" to someone'
        (informal/formal personal pronoun of 2nd person singular)

(ii)    *jemand-en        ver-hund-z-en* (orthographically: *verhunzen*)
        someone-ACC.SG   PREFIX-"Hund"-DELOC-INF
        'to say "dog" to someone' (literal old meaning),
        more generally, 'to speak depreciatingly of someone/something'
        (with further semantic changes yielding 'to treat someone/something
        depreciatingly' and eventually 'to spoil something by doing a poor job
        on it')

(iii)   (a)  *die Frage    be-jah-en       / ver-nein-en*
             the  question  PREFIX-"ja"-INF / PREFIX-"nein"-INF
             'to answer "yes"/"no" to a question'
        (b)  unattested in German; illustrated from Russian (Jensen 1950:
             131):
             *kudy-k-a-t'   <   kuda     ty-k-a-t'*
                               "where  you?"-DELOC-THEME-INF
             'to go about uselessly asking people "where are you [going]?"'[6]
        (c)  Old/Middle High German *aber-(e)n* 'to say "aber"' (= 'again,
             but'), i.e., 'to repeat, to harp upon something, be argumentative
             and vituperative'

(iv)    *jemand-en        willkommn-en*
        someone-ACC.SG   "willkommen"-INF
        'to welcome someone by saying "welcome!" '
        (the base is the resultative participle, used with imperative force, of
        the verb *komm-*, whose suffix *-(e)n* is retained in the derivative);
        *jemand-em        zu-prost-en*
        someone-DAT.SG   to-"prost"-INF
        'to say "cheers" to someone (before drinking)'

(v)     (a)  *äch-z-en*
             "ach"-DELOC-INF
             'to say "ach!"', i.e., 'to give a deep sigh, groan'
             (with umlaut of the stem-vowel a possible, but not a regular con-
             comitant of suffix *-z*)

---

6. Or also derived directly from *kudy* 'where?', a colloquial or archaic form of *kuda*. Compare
   Ancient Greek *tí-z-ein* 'to always ask "tí?" [what?]', i.e., 'to constantly ask for explanations'
   (with deloctive suffix *-(i)z*, *-ein* is the infinitive ending; Debrunner 1917: §264).

        *wein-en*
        "weh"-INF
        'to utter "weh"', i.e., 'to wail (utter a prolonged plaintive inartic-
        ulate loud high-pitched cry of pain or grief), to weep'
        (with final /n/ and the stem diphthong synchronically
        unaccounted for)

(b)  *mau(n)-z-en*
        "miau"-DELOC-INF
        'to say "miaow"', i.e., 'to make pitiable noises, to wail, whine'
        (with some stem alterations: suppression of the glide /j/ before
        the diphthong and addition of stem-final /n/)

(vi)     unattested in German; illustrated from Russian:
        *a-k-a-t'*
        [a]-DELOC-THEME-INF
        'to speak a dialect where unstressed /o/ is pronounced as [a]';
        *togo-k-a-t'*
        this.GEN.SG.MASC/NEUT-DELOC-THEME-INF
        'to use "togo" a lot, being incapable of fluent speech'
        (with this form of the demonstrative serving as a conventional filler;
        dialectal)

### 3.2.  *Base forms*

In terms of general form classes, these base types instantiate stems or words
(including names of linguistic units such as phonemes or allophones, (vi)).
In the introductory Latin example, *sālūt-āre* 'to say "sálús!" to someone' (type
(iv)), although the delocutive verb is (arguably) derived from a salutation rather
than from the noun as such used for that purpose, it is the stem form of the
noun *sālūt-* that serves as derivational base, not the actual form of the saluta-
tion itself, which is nominative singular (*sālūs*).[7] Debrunner (1956) attempts to
motivate the stem as base form through the fuller greeting formula *sālūtem tibi
dīcō* 'I tell/wish you health', where the noun is an object in the accusative sin-
gular. But this is unnecessary since derivation in Latin is generally stem-based,
and delocutives are not exceptional in this respect – at least those which are
derived from nouns and other kinds of bases regularly participating in deriva-
tional morphology.[8] This, then, adds a typological dimension to delocutives,

---

7. And should the 2nd singular imperative *sāluē!* have had an influence (as Mignot 1981 would
   have it), it is again not that particular inflectional verb form that would have mattered.

8. There are many other examples in Latin, amply (and sometimes controversially) discussed
   before and after Benveniste and Debrunner, which make the same morphological point. To
   give an example that is more complex insofar as part of the basic locution is omitted: *pārent-
   āre* 'to utter the formula "sāluē, pārens!" [greetings, parent!], and thereby make a memorial

insofar as they are implicated in the typology of possible bases in derivational morphology (roots, stems, word-forms, perhaps phrases).

Formulaic locutions are not formed, and do not become culturally pregnant, on the spur of the moment. Sentences which are formed on the fly, therefore, should not normally occur as bases of delocutive verbs – unless they have acquired the status of set phrases instantiating one of the types distinguished above.[9] To give an example, of base type (iv), routine social acts, of what this could conceivably be like: *Don't you ever "How-are-we-feeling-today, sir?" me again, nurse!* Again, delocutives would not be expected to be the only kind of derivatives in a language to be able to be clause-based.

### 3.3.    *Base type and transitivity*

Being inherently addressee-oriented, derivatives from base types (i)–(iv) should be more on the transitive side, while (v) and (vi) should primarily yield intransitive delocutives. Nonetheless, transitivity is not strictly predictable from base types alone. For example, a term of address (type (ii)) such as 'father' can yield a transitive delocutive with the meaning 'to address, and hence consider, someone as "father"', but also an intransitive one with the meaning 'to call out "father" (possibly with the intention of attracting father's or someone else's attention, or to make a memorial offering to a parent)'. Analogously, expressives (type (v)) can form intransitive delocutives meaning 'to utter "*X*"', but also transitive ones, when the meaning is something like 'to say "*X*" to someone in order to get her/him to do something'.

### 3.4.    *Preferences for and affinities among base types*

As to interrelations among base types – which adds a further typological dimension, though one not extending beyond delocutivity itself – when a language has delocutive verbs, it may not form them for all six types. Few do, if any, though some Indo-European languages of Europe can get close to being exhaustive.

Base types which tend to cluster, co-occurring with each other whenever languages have delocutives, are pronouns/nouns of address (i)/(ii) on the one hand, and speech/social acts (iii)/(iv) on the other, and then these two sets of pairs also like to partner with each other. When seeking a rationale for these affinities, it is found in the addressee-orientation which these four types share. What types (iii) and (iv) share among each other is that, although such bases are not fully articulated propositions syntactically, they have some sort of a propositional value.

---

offering', where the stem of vocative/nominative singular *pārens* is *pārent-*.

9. See especially Jensen (1950) on phrasal derivatives of a delocutive kind.

These types that like to co-occur need not utilize the same formal derivational means, though. This was seen above for German, where answer words (iii) and wishes (iv) take no special verb-derivational suffix (with the former also taking multi-purpose verbal prefixes *be-*/*ver-*), while all other delocutive bases take suffix *-z*. Similarly, in Finnish, *-k* suffixes are unique to interjections (e.g., *voih-ki-* "voih!"-DELOC- 'to groan'), as opposed to the more general *-t(t)* suffixes (e.g., *sinu-tt-ele-* "thou"-DELOC-DELOC- 'to address someone informally', *herro-i-tt-ele-* "sir"-PL-DELOC-DELOC- 'to call someone "sir"'). Such non-parallelisms are not so disconcerting as they might seem: the motivation for such formal patterns is a fundamentally different one from that licensing the co-occurrence pattern of types of bases. As suggested by German,[10] it is to do with the derivational activity of formal kinds of bases: here a special derivational suffix, *-z*, is preferably being used for such bases which do not regularly participate in (stem-based) morphological derivation at all, viz. personal pronouns (i) and interjections and animal cries (v), and earlier also answering words (iii).[11]

Although it is not uncommon to find the same formal means used for delocutives of base types which are not particularly prone to co-occur in delocutive inventories across languages, they can be entirely different too. For example, in Dalabon (Australian; Evans 2000: 144 and p.c.), the suffix *-hmû*, a general verbalizer also used to derive factitives, derives delocutives from expressives (type (v)), while a specific complex suffix *-ngandung* (*-ngan-* 'my', *dung* 'say, swear') is used for kin-term bases (type (ii)).

Individually, the most common bases for delocutive verbs appear to be nouns of address, and especially of abusive address (ii), on the one hand and animal cries and other expressives (v) on the other; but there is no strict implication between these two types one way or another. Other categories seem less common, though often enough they are part and parcel of a fuller delocutive inventory. Pronouns of address (i) do not make sense as bases of delocutives unless they come in pairs or larger sets in a language, differentiating degrees of formality, politeness, etc.; but many languages lack such differentiations. Greeting, wishing, and similar social phrases do not uncommonly form delocutives (as in Central Alaskan Yup'ik and probably elsewhere in Eskimo-Aleut, Turkish, Arabic and probably their respective relatives), but the incidence of this type (iv), especially when used productively, seems genetically and areally

---

10. And as suggested for this language by Ehrismann (1903/04: 220).

11. In Old/Middle High German answer words too used to take suffix *-(a/i)zzen* (Gothic *-atjan*), and forms such as *ver-nein-z-en* 'to say "no"' are attested even later. On the other hand, delocutive verbs are sometimes also zero-derived from pronouns of address in Middle High German and later (Ehrismann 1903/04: 218–220). Delocutives in *-z* based on nouns (like *verhunzen*), which are derivationally active, are rare; other denominal delocutives are zero-derived. All of which goes to show that such distributions are fluid and need not be diachronically stable.

circumscribed. A delocutive verb based on an interrogative pronoun (iii.b) has been illustrated above from Russian, involving a somewhat complex cultural constellation. More straightforwardly, in those languages (perhaps not many) which boast interrogative pro-verbs, these can be delocutive derivations. Tarma Quechua, where a delocutive (or more generally quotative) suffix contrasts with causative and inchoative ones, shows how such delocutive interrogative pro-verbs differ from (crosslinguistically perhaps more common) non-delocutive ones: *ima-ni* 'to "what?"-say' (i.e., 'to ask', like Ancient Greek *tí-zein* 'to be always asking', though with a multi-purpose verbalizing suffix *-z*), *ima-na* 'to what?-do', *ima-ya* 'to what?-become' (Adelaar 1977: 179). Finally, features of dialectal pronunciation (as in Russian or also Hungarian) are encountered least commonly as bases of delocutive verbs (vi).

What should be borne in mind in trying to rank base types by crosslinguistic frequency is the general Benvenistean condition mentioned above: delocutives will not be formed unless there is a lexical need for them. This adds a typological corrective to absolute rankings. If a language already happens to have BA-SIC verbs for the sort of meaning that would be expressed by delocutives, there would hardly be an incentive to derive any. For example, having a basic verb for 'to ask' would render delocutives based on interrogative pronouns, such as 'to perform an interrogative speech act by uttering "who/what/where/why …?"' (type (iii.b)), redundant. Presumably, if languages have sizeable vocabularies of basic verbs, verbs for routine speech acts and social acts will be among them, so that these base types ((iii) and (iv)) should not have the highest priority in delocutive derivation. Far less common are basic VERBS for terms of address: this is typically what pronouns and nouns are relied on for; and if corresponding verbs are really wanted, they will need to be formed (base types (i) and (ii)). As to a subset of nouns of address, kinship terms, there are certain languages that do express them through basic verbs: see Evans (2000) for the most comprehensive survey to date, covering Iwaidjan (Australian), Iroquoian, Uto-Aztecan, and Yuman (North and Middle American families). What needs to be distinguished in kinship verbs is a variety of meanings or uses: in particular, the core meaning of 'to be in a given kin relation to someone' and the delocutive meaning 'to address someone as a given kin relative'.[12] In all relevant languages, kinship verbs appear to be used with this delocutive meaning

---

12. Though clearcut in theory, such distinctions may be subtle in practice – as this dialogue from Herman Melville's *Pierre, or the Ambiguitie*s (1852; Bk. V, Ch. iv) illustrates:

> "My dear sister," began Pierre.
> "Sister me not, now, Pierre; – I am thy mother."

The ambiguity here is between addressing someone through a kin term or being (or behaving towards someone) like such a relative.

(and of the families covered, Yuman appears to favour this use and not to have the core "being" meaning at all) – which minimally detracts from the wide crosslinguistic incidence of terms of address as a base type for delocutives (ii).[13]

## 4.   Doing things with delocutive words

With the full range of base types illustrated, it is time to reconsider definitional matters and their crosslinguistic implications.

Seeking to establish delocutives as a distinct category, Benveniste (1958) had emphasized that these verbs imply the saying rather than the doing of something, distinguishing them from denominal verbal derivatives. Given a semantic characterization such as his, there is the question of whether delocutives are plain quotatives, expressed through bound morphology rather than through independent verbs. If the answer is yes, then delocutives would be crosslinguistically very common indeed, because bound (or clitic) quotative markers are very common.

However, it probably ought to be no. Arguably, there is something special about delocutives of the kind considered so far in comparison with ordinary speech reporting. First, the base of a delocutive is not a locution that has been uttered by a particular speaker at a particular place and at a particular time, as is typically the case with speech reporting: in a sense, it is a type rather than a token. Second, what is "quoted" with delocutives is not a fully articulated proposition expressed in a spontaneously formed sentence, but a locution of types (i)–(vi). Third, delocutive verbs imply the doing of something, the performing of a culturally recognized act, by saying '*X*', rather than just the saying of '*X*' itself. For example, to be on informal or formal terms with someone who one addresses by using the respective 2nd person pronoun 'thou' or 'you' for her/him; to depreciate someone by calling her/him a dog; to answer a question in the affirmative or negative, or more generally to adopt a positive or negative attitude towards a proposition at issue, by the alternative words available for this special purpose; to welcome and be pleased to accept someone (or something) by uttering the conventional phrase of welcome; to signal that one is under pressure by uttering the conventional sigh of pressure; to distinguish oneself by speaking a dialect characterized by a particular feature of pronunciation.[14] Rather than resembling plain quotative SAYING, delocutive semantics

---

13. In actual fact, while the basic kinship terms are verbal in the other families, in Yuman only some are verbs while others are nouns (Halpern 1942). For the kin nouns, the delocutive uses therefore involve conversion, and such Yuman languages have to be counted among those with derivational delocutives of base type (ii).

14. This general point has been made by de Cornulier (1976) and Anscombre (1979a/b, 1985a/b, also Anscombre et al. 1987), mostly with reference to French. While, on the one hand, Ben-

is thus more along the lines of TELLING (i.e., informing) someone that *X* (a proposition), CALLING someone or something an *X* (an epithet), NAMING someone or something *X* (a name), where saying also means doing something by uttering the relevant words, rather than just uttering and perhaps quoting them.

Now, ordinary "direct" quotation itself does not perforce amount to verbatim quotation, tone of voice and all. Owing to the crucial importance of the DO-ING-by-saying component, making allowances for non-literalness is even more natural for delocutives. For example, even if an act of answering a question in the affirmative is performed by uttering [m.ˈhm̩] or also by the non-linguistic act of nodding one's head, rather than by uttering *ja*, it would still be covered by the delocutive verb *bejahen* in German. Ditto for the introductory Latin example *salūtāre*, where the base of the delocutive verb is the stem *salūt-*, not the nominative singular *salūs* that would actually have been uttered (or even the imperative *saluē*). What counts for a delocutive is the communicative force of the base, not its sound or morphological form.

Verbs formed from sound-related interjections or expressives and conventionalized reproductions of animal and human sounds or calls (type (v)) have potentially the least performative surplus value of all base types distinguished above: they may simply mean 'to utter sound/call *X*', as per the simple introductory definition, rather than, for example, 'to imitate the respective animal by uttering (the conventionalized reproduction of) its characteristic call'. But distinctions along this line can be subtle.

In examples for (v) like those quoted from German above (*äch-z-en*, *mau(n)-z-en*), there presumably are semantic nuances above and beyond what can be associated with the base items merely being uttered. This is best seen when comparing them with other verbs derived from expressives by means of a phonologically similar suffix, *-s*, which are merely sound-reproducing:[15] *quiek-s-en* 'to squeal' (i.e., *"quiek" machen* 'to go "quiek" '), *gick-s-en* 'to squeak', *gluck-s-en* 'to gurgle', *knack-s-en* 'to crackle', *knip-s-en* 'to snap', *piep-s-en* 'to chirp', *jap-s-en* 'to gasp', *(nicht) muck-s-en* '(not) to stir', *plump-s-en* 'to plop'.

In Dyirbal, there are a few delocutive verbs from bases for speech and social acts, of types (iii) and (iv), which meet the performative criterion; but most are based on institutionalized renderings of bird calls and the cries of a few

---

veniste's notion of delocutives has thus been conceived of as a rather restrictive one, it has, on the other hand, also been extended in one way or another, especially so as to subsume all performative verbs. Larcher (2003) offers a concise history of this characteristically eloquent French debate.

15. Or also by zero derivation: compare *miau-en* 'to miaow' with *mau(n)-z-en* 'to wail, whine'. Although there is some phonological conditioning involved (*-s* after obstruents), the suffixes *-z* and *-s* are no mere phonological variants; the phonological condition itself is significant in distinguishing kinds of expressives.

further animals, and merely mean to produce these calls (on the part of the respective animals, and possibly also of humans imitating them), and not to do anything special on top of it by doing so (Dixon 1977). On the other hand, in McGregor's (2001) diachronic scenario, delocutive formations from expressive bases in Pama-Nyungan, or also more generally in Australian as a whole, are supposed to have caught on precisely because of their ability to substitute for less expressive "doing" verbs; e.g., 'he "splash" said/did' would mean 'he did an action characteristically producing a splashing noise', or in less colourful words, 'he swam'.[16]

In potentially numerous other languages, however, especially of North and South America and also Australia (e.g., Diyari, according to Austin 1981: 167), Eurasia (e.g., Dutch), and South Asia (e.g., Sanskrit and Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi and further modern Indo-Aryan languages; see Hoernle 1880: 37, 63–78, Deo 2002), the only formations that meet the wider semantic definition of delocutivity have interjections, ideophones, or other sound-reproducing expressives as their bases, and do not imply the doing of something by uttering these locutions other than producing such utterances. What they still share with delocutives in the narrower, "doing" sense is that the locutions verbalized are non-propositional, unlike typically in other quotation.

Benveniste himself in fact did not regard verbs derived from expressive bases (type (v)) as delocutive, on the grounds that such bases, unlike those of genuine delocutives, are not proper "signifiants". Clearly, however, such expressives are not mere "signifiés", but need to be associated with some kind of conventional meaning in order to license a verbal derivation of the relevant sort. What may be missing, rather, is the DOING-by-saying. But, as shown by the German contrasts mentioned above (*mau(n)-z-en* vs. *miau-en* etc.), some special DOING may be present even with expressive bases.

## 5.   Face to face

The semantics, or indeed pragmatics, of delocutives could also be conceived of even more narrowly, as also comprising an allocutive component – if this does not come automatically with the "doing" one. What is done by saying '*X*' would accordingly have to be said directly to the face of the person getting this done to her/him.[17] Delocutives from pronouns of address would be the prototypical case, then. On this model, abusing someone by calling him a dog in conversation with someone else would not do to qualify for prototypical

---

16. Though similar in formative principle, examples like *plätschern* 'to produce a noise best rendered by the vocalization "platsch"', hence 'to splash about in water, producing this sort of noise' in German differ in being more or less isolated, rather than to instantiate the prevalent mode of forming verbs in the language.

17. This was a suggestion of Nigel Vincent's (p.c.).

delocutivity, and would not license the relevant delocutive formation. However, in languages that have them, no such strict allocutive condition would really seem to be imposed on delocutives from bases other than pronouns of address.

## 6.    Going [inarticulate]

What delocutive constructions in this narrower illocutive and perhaps allocutive sense share with ordinary propositional speech reporting is that the '*X*' that is being uttered, in order to do something (especially to one's interlocutor), is a conventional linguistic sign or sign combination with a meaning (or a meaning-distinguishing function, such as a phoneme or allophone, see (vi)) and a form; it is not a mere vocal noise.

In speech reporting, in recognition of such a distinction, languages frequently employ separate verbs for introducing reproductions of non-linguistic sound (including silent gestures) as opposed to linguistic quotations. They are typically recruited from the store of light verbs, especially those for doing actions (including autolocomotive movements) or making artefacts: cf. German *Gott sagte 'Amen'* vs. *Er machte 'tsk tsk'* (='made'); English *God said 'Amen'* vs. *He went 'tsk tsk'*. Although it is unusual for bound morphology to be used in this function, there are cases like Tagalog, where the non-linguistic quotation marker is not a verb, but a combination of the perfective form of the actor-topic prefix and the actor-topic 3rd singular pronoun (e.g., *Nag-'tsk tsk' siya* 'he went "tsk tsk"'). But then, in other languages this distinction is found to be neglected, and just one single verb of saying is used for both articulate and inarticulate quotation.[18] Commonly this single quotative verb 'to say' then also means 'to do', which suggests that linguistic and other man-made productions (whether actions or artefacts) are not being strictly distinguished to begin with in such speech communities.[19]

Now, even in the case of delocutive formations based on interjections or animal sound reproductions etc. (type (v)), these bases are words or phrases of sorts rather than just inarticulate groans or suchlike. Still, here seems to be where the boundary between the quotation of linguistic and non-linguistic sound can easiest become blurred, insofar as expressives, though not inarticulate, tend to be phonologically deviant. And non-linguistic sound products too,

---

18. This is partly also true for English, where *go* is encroaching on the articulate territory of *say* in colloquial varieties of speech reporting.

19. This is also the interpretation of Rumsay (1990) apropos of Ungarinyin and relevant other languages of northwestern Australia with just one verb for quotation, causation, and intention. To my mind implausibly, he takes a Whorfian position, holding grammar (among other parameters, the absence of a distinction between direct and indirect speech) and lexicon (a single "causing" verb) responsible for the minimal valorization of wording as distinct from meaning and acting.

no matter how phonologically deviant, are not categorically barred from ever winning approval as conventional signs. A case in point happens to be *tsk tsk*: in English and many other languages,[20] a dental click, [|], represented in spelling by letter combinations such as *tsk* or *tut* and not recognized as a phoneme, is the conventional expressive verbal gesture for rebuke, impatience, or contempt – and, when quoted, it almost merits the linguistic quotative verb 'say' rather than 'go' or 'make'. Apart from being non-propositional,[21] delocutive formations of type (v) are not squarely on the side of linguistic speech reporting in respect of articulation either.

In this same respect, delocutive formations at least of base type (v) are also rather close to another species of verbs of sound production, namely manner-of-speaking verbs (*to yell*, *shout*, *whisper*, *holler*, *sigh*, *shriek*, *miaow*, *grunt*, *croak*, …).[22] Despite their focus on the physical characteristics of the speech act or on the kind of sounds produced, these can in many languages (but not in all) be used for quoting conventional linguistic sound (*God hollered 'Amen'*), and thus are in both the articulate and inarticulate camps too. It should not come as a surprise, then, to find special morphology being shared between non-linguistic quotation and/or manner-of-speaking verbs on the one hand and genuinely delocutive verbs on the other. Thus, the delocutive suffix *-z* in German also shows up in several manner-of-speaking verbs (mostly with no synchronically recognizable morphemic base, or with bases back-formed from the verbs): e.g., *kräch-z-en* 'to croak', *grun-z-en* 'to grunt', *raun-z-en* 'to runt, reprove, berate', *schluch-z-en* 'to sob', *schnal-z-en* 'to click'.

## 7.   Kinds of (bound) exponents

To form delocutive verbs, the kinds of exponents used in the main are those which are also available for morphological purposes in general, and which are usually also utilized for other derivational purposes in the relevant languages themselves:

---

20. Contact David Gil if interested in the areal circumscription.

21. Cases such as the dental click, [|], suggest that propositionality is not in fact such a clearcut notion: though typically categorized as an interjection, [|] can be verbalized in the form of a proposition, 'I hereby register my disapproval or contempt of your or someone else's behaviour'. Incidentally, the corresponding delocutive verb in English is not only morphologically regular like all derived verbs (*She tut-tutted the idea*), but is also regularized phonologically, avoiding the click and resorting to a spelling pronunciation [tʌt.ˈtʌt].

22. See Zwicky (1971) and Mufwene (1978) on this verb class, with reference to English, though it can similarly be delimited in other languages. Holisky & Kaxadze (1986) describe it for Georgian, a language apparently without accompanying genuine delocutive verb formation, despite a rich quotative morphology.

(i)　affixes or affix combinations:
German, Slavonic, Sanskrit, Hindi and elsewhere in modern Indo-Aryan, and elsewhere in Indo-European;
Finnish, Estonian, and elsewhere in Uralic;
Turkish and probably elsewhere in Altaic;
Indonesian, Tukang Besi, and probably elsewhere in Austronesian;
Diyari, Ngiyambaa, Dyirbal, Djapu, Dalabon, and elsewhere in Australian;
Central Alaskan Yup'ik, Greenlandic, and elsewhere in Eskimo-Aleut;
Tarma Quechua and probably elsewhere in Quechuan

(ii)　(a)　affixation combined with a reduplicative template of sorts:
French *tu-t-oyer* from *tu* 'thou', *vou-v-oyer* from *vous* 'you','to address someone informally/formally'[23]

(b)　full reduplication:
[Teuto-]Turkish *tak-tak-la-h-mak* tak-tak-DENOMINAL-RECIPROCAL-INF 'to say [tak] (= German *Tag*) to each other';[24] Dyirbal in at least one case

(c)　consonantal gemination:
Moroccan Arabic (e.g., *kebber* 'to call out "'llahu ʔakbar"', omitting 'God' and formed from the root *k-b-r* 'great')

(iii)　zero (i.e., conversion):
English, German, Romance, Mwotlap (Oceanic), Chinese, Hopi, Yuman, widespread elsewhere.

Conversion is apparently the commonest strategy, especially for delocutive bases which are nouns, and hence are able to participate in regular derivation, while other, derivationally less active base types tend to require greater morphological effort.[25] Nonetheless, to generalize from the current evidence, when zero derivation is available in a language for verbalization, forming delocutive verbs will not be the first nor the only use it is put to; it is likelier to be the last, implying the full range of other noun-to-verb conversions.

---

23. In the case of informal address, the reduplicative pattern could be coincidental, if the verb were to to be analysed as based on the combination of the conjunct and free forms of the pronouns (*tu*, *toi*). Spanish has the reduplicative template (with no such combinatory motivation) only with the pronoun of informal address, *tu-t-ear* vs. *vos-ear*. Such reduplicative templates as in Romance are the language-particularly most idiosyncratic kinds of morphology on record for delocutive verbs.

24. But then, reduplication is not the means to form delocutive verbs as such, but of forming adverbs from expressives, which are in turn verbalized by multi-purpose *-lA* or specifically delocutive *-dA* (cf. Kornfilt 1997: 456, Lewis 1975: 231).

25. In morphological descriptions of relevant languages, such zero-derived delocutive verbs have sometimes been accounted for adequately even before Debrunner (1956) and Benveniste (1958); for English, for example, in great detail in Biese (1941), where they are called "quotation-word formations".

Suffixes of similar shape, featuring an alveolar obstruent, recur with delocutive verbs in several languages of Europe across families, which perhaps points to borrowing: German *-z*, French *-t-oy*, Older Italian *-zz* as in *ti-zz-are* 'say "thou"', Late Latin *-s/-z* as in *tui-s-are* and *tibi-s-are/tibi-z-are* ditto, Greek *-iz*, Hungarian *-z*, Finnish *-ttA*, Estonian *-ta*. Also, suffixes with a velar consonant recur in Slavonic and Finno-Ugric. Benveniste (1958) had already suggested borrowing (or calquing) as a factor in the crosslinguistic distribution of particular delocutive types or tokens. It remains to be seen whether delocutive formation shows significantly stronger areal than genealogical patterns on a worldwide scale.

## 8.    Bound or free (within limits)?

Delocutives belong with derivational, verb-forming morphology – when defined as at the outset, following Debrunner and Benveniste, and as refined subsequently, crediting delocutives with special illocutive and perhaps allocutive semantics differing from that of general quotatives. However, bound morphology is not the only possible manifestation of delocutivity, as has already been adumbrated on several occasions above: it may equally well be non-bound, taking the form of independent delocutive verbs (or other non-bound marking devices).

Within Indo-European, Italian is prominent for such lexical expressions for delocutives for pronouns and nouns of address and for certain routine social acts (base types (i), (ii), and (iv)), productively using 'to give' rather than the linguistic quotative verb 'to say' (*dire*) for this special purpose: *dare del tu/cretino a qualcuno* 'to give someone of the "thou"/"fool"', *dare la buonanotte a qualcuno* 'to give someone the "good night"'. While *dare* is not a (light) verb dedicated to delocution, as a verb of transfer it is especially well suited to addressee-oriented delocutive purposes.[26] The use of the preposition *di* (plus definite article) for the patient (here the '*X*' said) is rather special: it is unexpected for literal or metaphorical transfer constructions with *dare*, and it also distinguishes delocutive transfers of types (i) and (ii) from those of type (iv). *Di* fused with definite article is also the partitive article in Italian, and it is probably through this unusual use of the partitive article that at least some delocutive constructions distinguish themselves from other transfer constructions.

---

26. Similarly, though focusing on a phase preparatory to actual transfer, German uses *anbieten* 'to offer' with the pronoun of informal address: *jemandem das Du anbieten* 'to offer someone to use "thou" for mutual address'. English *to bid*, as in *to bid someone welcome*, is similarly motivated, drawing on the old meaning 'to offer' (rather than 'to command'). However, unlike Italian *dare*, these verbs are being used in perfectly straightforward syntactic constructions in German and English, with no specifically delocutive features.

Outside Indo-European, Turkish uses the same verb for quoting linguistic and non-linguistic sound (*de-* 'to say, utter'), and in a non-productive gerundial (or converbial) form also puts it to delocutive uses (*evet di-ye cevap verdi* "yes" say-ing answer (s)he-gave '(s)he answered "yes"', *kus pır di-ye uçtu* bird "pirr" say-ing flew 'the bird flew going "pirr"'; Lewis 1975: 175, and Geoffrey Haig, p.c.). In Pama-Nyungan and generally in Australian, a verb *ma* 'say, do, put, cause', similarly non-distinctive between linguistic and non-linguistic quotation, is widespread in compound verb constructions (McGregor 2001, 2002: 144–145).[27] In Lahu (Tibeto-Burman), a verb of non-linguistic quotation likewise combines with expressives in tight syntactic construction, while elsehwere in Southeast Asia expressives tend not to be subject to such a co-occurrence limitation specifically to quotative verbs (Watson 2001: 392). In North and South American families such as Iroquois, Yuman, Muskogean, Penutian, Uto-Aztecan, Carib, and Quechuan, it is also the regular verb 'to say' (sometimes, however, also meaning 'to do') which combines with expressives, themselves being phonologically deviant and often showing reduplication, as the only type of delocutive base permissible; the 'say' verbs themselves tend to be reduced in stress and segmental substance, and the syntax of such expressive constructions is not quite like that of regular speech reporting.[28] Although Sub-Saharan Africa and Ethiopia have sometimes been singled out as areal centres of such practice,[29] it is in fact common almost without any areal and genealogical limitations for ideophones and similar expressives either to be able to be used as verbs directly or to be verbalized with the help of 'to say', or of a verb for both saying and doing, or also of other light verbs for sound reproduction, in colloquial if not always formal speech.[30]

However, in such constructions with a 'saying(/doing)' verb, the only non-propositional base type permissible tends to be expressives (and their range may well extend beyond the sphere of sound into those of sight and motion), and the performative surplus value of delocutive verbs in a narrower sense is also missing.

---

27. In fact, we may be dealing with a couple of rather similar looking verbs here, which then get conflated in some languages (Nick Evans, p.c.). Supporting this assumption of a conflation rather than original identity, Nyikina (a Nyulnyulan language) has both *ma* 'put' and *ma* 'say', but they belong to different conjugations (Claire Bowern, p.c.).

28. See, e.g., Langdon (1977), Mithun (1982), Munro (1998, with further references for North America); Derbyshire (1979: 80, 82, 190–191), Nuckolls (2001).

29. See recently Appleyard (2001), Cohen, Simeone-Senelle, & Vanhove (2002), and Güldemann (2002), covering Afro-Asiatic and Nilo-Saharan.

30. See the by now vast literature on the syntax of ideophones/expressives, including many contributions in Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz (2001); also Langdon (1994), adding Guaraní. Outside the traditionally recognized ideophone/expressive areas, such verbal constructions tend to get short shrift in descriptive grammars.

When a language has genuinely bound delocutive morphology, such less succinct "periphrases" by means of 'saying(/doing)' and suitable other verbs seem to be avoided, although they are not strictly preempted. Thus, in German, the verbs that can be used for this same purpose are linguistic and (for expressives) perhaps also non-linguistic quotative and appellative ones: e.g., *'du' zu jemandem sagen* 'to say "thou" to someone', *jemanden einen Hund nennen/heissen/rufen* 'to call someone a dog', *jemanden als Hund bezeichnen* 'to designate someone as a dog', *jemanden 'Bodo' taufen* 'to name someone "Bodo"', *jemanden willkommen heissen* 'to bid someone welcome', *miau machen* 'to miaow'. In Latvian (Baltic, Indo-European), where the pronoun of formal address (2nd person plural) can be straightforwardly verbalized (*juːs-ot*, with verbs in -*ot* being the most productive conjugation), the verb of addressing has to be used periphrastically with the pronoun of informal address (2nd singular, *uzrunaːt uz tu* 'to address by "you"', with a nominative form after the preposition, rather than the usual genitive or accusative), since its verbalization would be phonologically non-optimal (*\*tu-ot*).

Now, although just about any language can presumably find ways and means of exploiting quotative or appellative verbs or suitable other light verbs for delocutive purposes, for potentially the entire range of base types, delocutivity cannot be considered grammaticalized unless there is something special about the syntactic or morphological constructions of such verbs, differing from the normal syntax of direct quotation, in particular of whole propositions. Bound morphology is the tightest form of its grammaticalization. But it can also be grammaticalized, at least incipiently, in syntactic form, as it is in Italian (*dare di*) and in many languages with expressive 'say(/do)' constructions, whenever delocutive syntax is special in one way or another.

Still, even in incipient form, delocutivity is not grammaticalized universally. In Iroquois, for example, constructions of 'say' with expressives as objects do not seem to differ from ordinary propositional quotative constructions in the slightest. Especially for base types (ii), including proper names, titles, and epithets, many languages have a rich lexical stock of appellative verbs: e.g., 'to name/christen/term/dub/title someone/something "*X*" ', 'to be named "*X*" ', 'to call/designate someone/ something (as) "*X*" ',[31] 'to address/announce someone as "*X*" '. Often these appellative verbs are somewhat marginal in their syntactic constructions, insofar as they may, for instance, govern two accusatives, or an accusative and a nominative or vocative, in languages where ditransitive verbs more commonly take one object in the accusative and the other in the dative. Nonetheless, when such syntactic peculiarities are not specifically delocutive,

---

31. Which is often hard to distinguish, or indeed indistinguishable, from verbs of existential causation ('to make someone/something an X') – a connection also found with grammaticalized delocutives, see below, Section 11.

as they are in the case of Italian *dare* (requiring a partitive article) and its kind, there are no grounds to consider such verbs as even incipiently grammaticalized manifestations of the notional category of delocutivity.

## 9.   Origins

It will disappoint those who expect all bound morphology to have come about through univerbation, and are hopeful to be able to identify the original sources, that it is rather rare for delocutive affixes to be transparently related to the obvious lexical sources, namely verbs of quotation, linguistic or non-linguistic, specifically delocutive or otherwise ('say', 'tell', also 'ask', 'do/make', 'go', etc.), verbs of appellation ('name', 'call', etc.), or verbs of transfer, material or communicative ('give', 'offer', etc.). This is especially remarkable when there is reason to assume, as there frequently is, that delocutive, or delocutively used, morphology is of relatively recent origin, not inherited as such from a proto-language.

For Turkish, among the languages considered, there is what could seem to be a remarkably close similarity between the delocutive suffix *-dA*, used with expressives and genuinely a suffix (undergoing vowel harmony), and the verb 'say' (*de-*) or its fossilized gerundial form *di-ye*. Still, this is hardly a straight-forward case of univerbation – if there is any diachronic connection between the verb and the suffix at all. First, in forming delocutives *-dA* competes with the general-purpose verbalizing suffix *-lA* in Turkish, and their distribution is not only determined by base types, but also phonologically (Lewis 1975: 228, Kornfilt 1997: 456). This could suggest that the consonant of *-dA* is an innovation, which seems confirmed by other Turkic languages having a suffix *-rA* in similar function (Räsänen 1957: 167, 253); also, in corresponding nominalizations of such delocutive verbs in Turkish itself, *-dA* changes to *-dI/-tI* (Lewis 1975: 231). Second, in other Turkic languages and elsewhere in Altaic, suffixes presumably cognate with Turkish *-dA* serve a much wider range of functions, including causative, inchoative, intensive, and iterative (Räsänen 1957: 145–146, 155-156, Menges 1968: 161–163); and it is not obvious which of these functions is diachronically primary. It has indeed been suggested that the lexical source of such suffixes, including those forming delocutive verbs from expressives, might be a verb 'to do, make' (Räsänen 1957: 253) – which would include Turkic among those families not drawing a sharp lexical line between saying and doing.

For Hindi-Urdu and other modern Indo-Aryan languages with expressive-based delocutive verbs formed with a suffix (sometimes classified as "disyllabic roots" owing to the supposed lack of productivity of the suffix), such as Hindi *jhaTak* 'to make the sound *jhaTat*', a good case can be made for tracing the suffix to a light verb *kr-* in Sanskrit (Hoernle 1880, Deo 2002). But then

this source verb was not specifically quotative, but also meant 'do/make' and generally served to verbalize non-verbs; and this general-purpose status was retained when the light verb was turned into a suffix, combining delocutive with, among others, causative function.

Other areas where approximations to univerbation of quotative verbs with the expressions uttered in delocutive acts have been observed are Northeast and Southern Africa and Australia. The results of such fusions, however, more often seem to be complex predicates or tightly structured light verb constructions or possibly also compounds, rather than genuinely morphological words with the quotative verbs reduced to genuine affixes.[32] Of those languages examined, it is possibly in the Australian family that an affixal status of saying verbs seems best justified, as exemplified by *-ma* in Yankunytjatjara or *(-ngan)-dung* in Dalabon (used with kin bases only).

Wherever delocutive expression is genuinely morphological rather than syntactic, the re-analysis of existing non-delocutive morphology, or rather its re-use for yet another purpose, with the earlier functions continuing to be catered for, is a diachronic scenario far commoner than univerbation – at least as far as the not-too-distant, safely reconstructible past is concerned.

## 10.   Once a delocutive …

As a category, grammaticalized delocutivity is subject to change. It can be innovated, extended from one base type to another, reduced in its extension, and lost (or fall dormant; see below).

With the category as such unaffected, individual delocutive formations can change too; in particular, they can cease to be delocutive.

In the narrow sense, delocutive verbs imply some special doing-by-saying. There are occasional examples where the saying component has as much as vanished, such as Swiss German *dervo-siech-e* away-"Siech"-INF 'to run away', originally motivated by the shouting of the term of abuse *Siech* 'leper' at those from whom one is running away (Debrunner 1956). Equally, few speakers of German today, when doing what the verb *verhunzen* designates, namely, to spoil something by doing a poor job on it, would even remotely associate the action with the utterance of the noun *Hund* (nor with the notion of 'dog' to begin with). In a way, this sort of change is reminiscent of 'say' constructions with expressives in Australian and African languages (and perhaps elsewhere) where the action denoted is not really one of speaking but of doing, and where a semantic development from 'saying' via 'saying and/or doing' to 'doing' seems more plausible than the reverse.

---

32. See McGregor (2001, 2002: 139–145) for Pama-Nyungan, and Güldemann (2002) for Northeast Africa.

Exemplifying a different kind of development with the saying component remaining intact, there are many instances of verbs on record in Indo-European ceasing to be delocutive through the increasing opacity or loss of the base word, as in German *weinen* 'to wail, weep', whose relation to expressive *(o) weh* is no longer transparent, or in French *crier*, Italian *gridare* 'to shout' from Latin *quirītāre* 'to shout "Quirītēs!"', i.e., to call out to fellow citizens to come to one's help (in the collections of both Debrunner and Benveniste).

Perhaps expressive-based formations are most resistant to their delocutive quality vanishing in some such manner. On the contrary, manner-of-speaking verbs that are not really transparently derived may inspire the "hypostasis" of an expressive as their base (as illustrated by German examples such as *krächz!*, *grunz!*, re-formed from verbs like those mentioned in Section 6).

## 11.   Dedication

Whatever means are used for grammaticalized delocutive formations, once they have come into and while they are in existence, they are virtually never dedicated to just this single purpose.[33] (And it would be an interesting question just how peculiar they are in this respect: Which forms or constructions, once grammaticalized, are determinedly single-minded?)

If it is verbs in not-quite-ordinary syntactic constructions, these will be ordinary verbs of propositional speech reporting or probably also appellation, light verbs for non-linguistic quotation, light verbs not differentiating saying and do-ing/making, or other light verbs of suitable semantics, such as verbs of transfer ('give'). It is in the nature of light verbs to be eminently multi-functional, and 'to say(/do)' is of kindred spirit.[34] No specifically delocutive verbs appear to be attested in such constructions.

Bound delocutive morphology is most commonly (i) general-purpose mor-phology to derive verbs, including in particular through plain conversion (An-cient Greek, Latin, Latvian, German, Hungarian, Turkish, Arabic, Malay/Indonesian, Tukang Besi, Dyirbal, Dalabon, Yuman); or it is (ii) verb-deriving morphology subserving several functions, including in particular ones relat-ing to (a) aspect or aktionsart (such as iterative, frequentative, habituative, or momentative: e.g., German, Hungarian, Finnish, Slavonic), (b) intensification (e.g., German), (c) causative or specifically existential-causative (Dyirbal, Di-yari, Dalabon, other Australian, Chinese, Modern Indo-Aryan) or causative

---

33. This impression, gained from some of the older Indo-European languages (Greek, Latin, San-skrit), made Darms (1980: 206) wonder whether Benveniste's "delocutive" was a valid cate-gory at all.

34. What 'say' can be or become is listed, for example, in von Roncador (1988: 29, passim), with further references, and its grammaticalization paths are now also summarized in Heine & Kuteva (2002: 261–279).

plus frequentative (Finnic), (d) transitivity, with an emphasis on the change of state or location of the object (as with preverbs such as *be-/ver-* in German or *le-* 'down' in Hungarian, as in *le-szamar-az* 'to call someone "ass"'), and (e) non-linguistic and perhaps also propositional linguistic quotation (Slavonic, Turkish, Central Alaskan Yup'ik, Tarma Quechua).

To the extent that this can be reliably determined, delocutive functions are always diachronically secondary in such functional combinations.

There is a common semantic denominator between (existential-)causative and perhaps general transitive verb-deriving morphology on the one hand and (light) verbs of making/doing on the other, themselves a common source of bound causatives or transitivizers: delocutive formations expressed by such means seem to conceptualize what is said in order to perform the act in question as a sort of effected object. As to the other major functional affinity (and indeed formal affinity too, concerning the fondness for reduplication and other doubling), the link from the attested aspectual or aktionsart and related functions (such as iterative, frequentative, intensive) to delocutivity is arguably via typical semantic nuances of verbs of sound (re-)production: these are among those verb classes (along with movement verbs) where such qualitative and quantitative differentiations (repetition, intensity) are most relevant.[35]

There are of course many parallels to delocutives insofar as derivational morphology and light-verb periphrasis are in competition (e.g., causatives, just mentioned as one category providing delocutive exponents). In a way the most striking parallel is the nativization of borrowed verbs: for purposes of loan-verb adaptation the same formal means may be utilized, in particular verbs of saying in periphrastic construction (cf. Muysken 2000: 197, passim); and it remains to be seen whether bound morphology too can be specifically shared between delocutive formations and verb nativization, and which of these two functions is diachronically primary.

On current evidence, as a lone, and correspondingly implausible, possible candidate for (synchronically) dedicated delocutive morphology remains the suffix *-kV*, *-gV* in Finnish and Estonian, forming verbs from interjections, unaccountably similar to a stem extension of nouns but not relatable to any of the recognized delocutive source or partner categories.[36]

---

35. The German *-z* suffix, although subsequently supported through the association with manner-of-speaking verbs, was originally presumably a general-purpose verb-deriving suffix with no particular semantic specialization, as also found in other Indo-European languages (among others in delocutive use).

36. In Hakulinen (1957: 217–218), quite a number of verbs are listed under the heading of the reflexive/translative/passive suffix *-(p)u-/-(p)y-* which could be delocutive and which seem to have a /k/ preceding the putative suffix in /p/-less form; but no analysis is provided. Delocutive verbs identified as such are listed under the causative/instrumental suffix *-tta-/-ttä-* (1957: 222); the analysis of *-tt-* as deriving from *-kt-* is considered questionable.

And there is the suffix *-dA* in Turkish, doing nothing else but forming delocutive verbs from (reduplicated) expressive bases, in competition with the general verbalizing suffix *-lA* (to which it is possibly phonologically related) and the fossilized gerund *di-ye* 'saying' (to which it might conceivably be diachronically related). But then, *-dA* has cognates elsewhere in the family with the customary wider range of functions, including causative, inchoative, intensive, and iterative (see above), which somewhat relativizes its delocutive dedication.

## 12.    Serious or playful morphology?

It has sometimes been suggested that delocutive formation in general is not regular but marginal or even extragrammatical (or also metagrammatical) morphology. For Debrunner, one of the delocutive pioneers, "solche kühne Bildungen [stehen] am Rand oder jenseits der 'normalen' Wortbildung" (1956: 113; see also the title of Debrunner 1946). By contrast, Benveniste seemed more concerned to claim delocutive verbs for ordinary morphology.

Expressive and other extragrammatical morphology, not necessarily subject to the general constraints on plain morphology, has been attributed characteristics such as (i) producing special pragmatic effects, (ii) requiring conscious reflection of the playful or intentionally creative word-smith, (iii) being promiscuous with regard to base and also derived categories, (iv) being applicable to all sorts of base material rather than just regular stems or words, (v) producing words not obeying the regular rules of syntax, and (vi) showing considerable variation from speaker to speaker (cf. Zwicky & Pullum 1987, Dressler 2000).

On virtually all of these counts, delocutive morphology is plain rather than expressive, even with bases of the type of (existing) expressives.

Delocutive derivation can admittedly be somewhat promiscuous as to the word class of bases, depending on how many of the six base types of Section 3.1 it is licensed by; but this is arguably true for much regular derivational morphology too (Plank 1981: 43–65). Also, as with ordinary multiple-based derivation, sometimes delocutive derivation does take different form depending on the base type (cf. *-z/-s/-Ø* in German). And, as seen above (Section 3.2), delocutive verbs do take bases of the right formal kind, in line with the root-, stem-, or word-basedness of other derivational morphology in the language concerned.

Admittedly, bases can be of dubious wordhood, when less articulate noises can be turned into delocutive verbs. Still, delocutive verb formation even from such bases as animal calls is subject to a general constraint on ordinary morphology, namely that of blocking by synonyms – as for example in Dyirbal, when *gugu-mba-y*, from the kookaburra's call *gúgúgúgú...*, is blocked by the verb *miyanda-y* 'to laugh', deemed appropriate to describe just that sound typically produced by kookaburras (Dixon 1977, Plank 1981: 175).

The rare base type (vi), attested in Russian and Hungarian, verbalizing features of pronunciation characteristic of dialectal or other linguistic varieties, may well require more metalinguistic ingenuity than most everyday morphology does. Nonetheless, such delocutives are morphologically just as active and morphologically and syntactically as regular as any other derivatives of Russian, undergoing for instance further aspectual derivation: e.g., *za-a-ka-t'* IN-CEPTIVE-a-DELOC-THEME-INF 'to take up the *a*-for-*o* pronunciation, to begin speaking in the *a*-for-*o* dialect'.

Lack of or limitations on productivity do not necessarily set apart expressive from plain morphology, either. In the case of delocutive verbs, at any rate, their relative scarcity in languages that can in principle form them would seem to follow from the scarcity of suitable bases – which have to be culturally salient doings-by-saying, "locutions formulaires", "formules prégnantes" rather than just "locutions". And as the turnover of such bases cannot be expected to be rapid, once a supply of delocutive verbs has been formed, and has been lexicalized as permanently useful possessions (in the process perhaps acquiring formal and semantic idiosyncrasies), the occasions for replenishing it will remain correspondingly limited. Forming a new item once in a while – by ordinary morphological means which, however, are exercised but little – may then give the impression of being out of the ordinary, playful, creative.

Real nonce formations would be those derived from a type of base not licensed in the language concerned, on the analogy of a permissible base type.

When delocutives are expressed through light verbs in special syntactic or perhaps also morphological construction with suitable base items, there can be no question of "specially delocutive" meaning extragrammatical: they are just one kind of complex predicate formation, often hardly distinguished from others.

But then, there is a larger question here, whether delocutives are expressed morphologically or syntactically, and this is about the status of quotation as such. Quoting has been argued by Clark & Gerrig (1990) to be a kind of non-serious, "demonstrating" action – which is to selectively DEPICT rather than to seriously DESCRIBE the real thing. In that general sense only, delocution is playful too.[37]

## 13.   More delocutives

Though arguably most prominent among their kind, delocutive VERBS are not the only kind of derivatives that can be analysed as delocutive.

---

37. Apparently unaware of delocutive verbs as an established category, Clark & Gerrig (1990: 772–773) in fact adduce English delocutive examples in support of their theory of quotation-as-demonstration.

Adverbs can equally be derived from locutions. Thus, the adverb in a French example like *Ça sent diable-ment mauvais* 'it stinks devil-ishly badly', formally derived from a noun, only makes sense when related to an introductory utterance of this noun (*Diable! Ça sent mauvais*), called forth by the extreme degree to which the state of affairs holds which the following sentence describes (Anscombre 1979, Conte 1984, Fradin & Kerleroux 2002).

Disregarding nominalizations of delocutive verbs, nouns themselves can also be based on locutions (Littmann 1916, Debrunner 1958, Chambon 1989 etc., Swiggers 1989, Hagège 1993: 15–18). English *damn*, as in *I don't give a damn*, is a zero-derived delocutive noun, referring to the act of saying *Damn!*. Perhaps most common are delocutive names, titles, and other terms of address especially of persons and foreign peoples; to exemplify: *monsieur* and *madame* and their equivalents elsewhere, though not everywhere reanalysed as common nouns as completely as in French (at least the male form: cf. *ce monsieur* 'this [person addressed as] my-sir'); French *Depardieu*, an oath meaning 'God-damn!', hence the epithet and eventually name of a person prone to utter this swear word; Portuguese *camone*, jocularly referring to the English, based on what they would tell you or each other, *come on!*; Italian *Benvenuto*, derived from the welcoming wish (in participial form) *ben venuto!* '[be] well arrived!'.[38]

In examples like Frisian *omke-sizzer* 'cousin/nephew', literally 'uncle-sayer', *beppe-sizzer* 'grandchild', literally 'grandma-sayer', etc.,[39] where a kin relation is denoted through the kin term that is the term of address prototypically used by (not for!) that (little) person, the delocutive component is explicitly verbalized in the second part of the compounds; but this is regular compounding, with nothing specifically delocutive about it. In comparison, there is "inverse" address, as not uncommonly practised in the Balkans and elsewhere in Europe, the Caucasus, the Near East, and probably beyond, where a speaker addresses an addressee (typically younger or female) as the addressee would address the speaker,[40] which could be seen as nominal delocutivity grammaticalized. When, for example, a grandmother addresses her grandchild as 'grandmother' (in diminutive or hypocoristic form), on this interpretation 'you, little grandmother' would be short for 'you who address me as *grandmother*', rather than, as has been suggested, being a mere echoing of the addressee's own words, baby-talk-style, or elliptic for something along the lines of 'you, grandmother['s little one]'.

---

38. By contrast, French *Benveniste* is probably not delocutive, being derived from the 2nd person indicative assertion *bene venisti(s)* 'you (SG/PL) have arrived well' (Debrunner 1956: 122).

39. Brought to my attention by the late Helma van den Berg.

40. Among many others, see Renzi (1968) and Sgroi (1981).

Extending beyond nouns on their own, whole noun phrase constructions consisting of a possessive determiner and a noun for core kin relations and certain deferential titles have been argued to be delocutive in Italian (and other Romance languages or dialects with clitic possessives), in order to explain why they are lacking the definite article, which obligatorily accompanies prenominal possessives with other nouns (Hölker 1998, elaborating on earlier accounts which had article omission licensed by vocative or proper-name-like uses of such nouns): *(\*la) mia madre* '(\*the) my mother' or *(\*la) Sua Altezza* '(\*the) Her Highness' would accordingly be short for 'the person that I address as *madre*', 'the person that s/he addresses as *Altezza*', with the respective nouns used as terms of address lacking the definite article too.

But these are only hints; delocutive adverbs and nouns and noun phrases,[41] as such and in their possible correlations with delocutive verb formations, remain to be surveyed from a crosslinguistic angle.

*Correspondence address:*    Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz, D-78457 Konstanz, Germany; e-mail: frans.plank@uni-konstanz.de

---

41. At least delocutive nouns were collected by Littmann (1916) for a limited areal spread of languages, including Egyptian and Coptic, Semitic, Georgian, Turkish, Armenian, and Farsi.

## The delocutive classics

Benveniste, Émile (1958). Les verbes délocutifs. In Anna G. Hatcher & K. L. Selig (eds.), *Studia philologica et litteraria in honorem Leo Spitzer*, 57–63. Bern: Francke. Reprinted in É. Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, I: 277–285. Paris: Gallimard, 1966. English translation: Delocutive verbs, in É. Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, translated by Mary E. Meek, 239–246. Coral Gables: University of Florida Press, 1971.

Debrunner, Albert (1956). Zur Hypostasierung von Wünschen und dergleichen. In Margarete Woltner & Herbert Bräuer (eds.), *Festschrift für Max Vasmer zum 70. Geburtstag*, 113–123. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

## Other references

Adelaar, W. F. H. (1977). *Tarma Quechua: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Anscombre, Jean-Claude (1979a). Délocutivité benvenistienne, délocutivité généralisée et performativité. *Langue français* 42: 69–84.

— (1979b). Délocutivité généralisée et rapports syntaxe/sémantique. *Recherches linguistiques* (Vincennes) 8: 5–43.

— (1985a). Onomatopées, délocutivité et autres blablas. *Revue Romane* 20: 169–207.

— (1985b). De l'énonciation au lexique: Mention, citativité, délocutivité. *Langages* 80: 9–34.

Anscombre, Jean-Claude, Françoise Létoublon, & Alain Pierrot (1987). Speech act verbs, linguistic action verbs and delocutivity. In Jef Verschueren (ed.), *Linguistic Action: Some Empirical-Conceptual Studies*, 45–67. Norwood, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Appleyard, David (2001). The verb 'to say' as a verb "recycling device" in Ethiopian languages. In Andrzej Zaborski (ed.), *New Data and New Methods in Afroasiatic Linguistics: Robert Hetzron in Memoriam*, 1–11. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Austin, Peter K. (1981). *A Grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biese, Y. M. (1941). *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B, 45-2.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Bravman, Meïr M. (1968). An Arabic parallel to *benedicere*. *Arabica* 15: 317–322.

Büchi, Eva (1995). Typologie des délocutifs galloromans. In *Estudis de lingüística i filologia oferts a Antoni M. Badia i Margarit*, Volume 1, 141–163. Barcelona: Publications de l'Abadia de Montserrat.

Chambon, Jean-Pierre (1989). Démimologiques: Délocutivité et zoonymie dans le domaine gal-loroman. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 84-1: 81–109.

Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerrig (1990). Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66: 764–805.

Cohen, David, Marie-Claude Simeone-Senelle, & Martine Vanhove (2002). The grammaticalization of 'say' and 'do': An areal phenomenon in East Africa. In Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), *Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*, 227–251. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Comrie, Bernard & Norval Smith (1977). *Lingua Descriptive Studies*: Questionnaire. *Lingua* 42: 1–72.

Conte, Maria-Elisabeth (1984). Délocutivité, performativité, contreperformativité. In Guy Serbat (ed.), *E. Benveniste aujourd'hui*, Volume 1, 65-76. Paris: Société pour l'information grammaticale.

Cornulier, Benoît de (1976). La notion de dérivation délocutive. *Revue de linguistique romane* 40: 116–143.

Crowley, Terry (1978). *The Middle Clarence Dialects of Bandjalang*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Darms, Georges (1980). Problèmes de la formation délocutive des mots. *Museum Helveticum* 37: 201–211.

Debrunner, Albert (1917). *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.

— (1946). Kühnheiten in Wortbildung und Formengebrauch. *Sprachspiegel* (Bern) 2: 82–86, 97–106, 121–127.

Dench, Alan C. (1995). *Martuthunira: A Language of the Pilbara Region of Western Australia*. (Pacific Linguistics, C-125.) Canberra: Australian National University.

Deo, Ashwini (2002). A diachronic perspective on complex predicates in Indo-Aryan. Paper at the Workshop on Complex Predicates, Particles and Subevents, Universität Konstanz, 30 September – 2 October.

Derbyshire, Desmond C. (1979). *Hixkaryana*. (Lingua Descriptive Studies, 1.) Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dimitrescu, Florica (1961). Despre verbele 'delocutive'. *Studii şi Cercetări Lingvistice* 3: 307–311.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1977). Delocutive verbs in Dyirbal. In Paul J. Hopper (ed.), *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics: Festschrift for W. P. Lehmann*, 21–38. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

— (2002). *Australian Languages: Their Nature and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donaldson, Tamsin (1980). *Ngiyambaa: The Language of the Wangaaybuwan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dressler, Wolfgang U. (2000). Extragrammatical vs. marginal morphology. In Ursula Doleschal & Anna M. Thornton (eds.), *Extragrammatical and Marginal Morphology*, 1–10. München: Lincom Europa.

Ehrismann, Gustav (1903/04). Duzen und Ihrzen im Mittelalter (Schluß). *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung* 5: 127–220.

Evans, Nicholas (2000). Kinship verbs. In Petra M. Vogel & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Approaches to the Typology of Word Classes*, 103–172. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fleischer, Wolfgang & Irmhild Barz, with Marianne Schröder (1992). *Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fortescue, Michael (1984). *West Greenlandic*. (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars.) London: Croom Helm.

Fradin, Bernard & Françoise Kerleroux (2002). Trouble with lexemes. In Geert Booij, Janet de Cesaris, Sergio Scalise, & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Mediterranean Meeting on Morphology*. Barcelona: IULA.

Goddard, Cliff (1985). *A Grammar of Yankunytjatjara*. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development.

Güldemann, Tom (2002). A type of complex predicate as an areal feature in Northeast Africa. Unpublished manuscript, Universität Leipzig.

Hagège, Claude (1993). *The Language Builder: An Essay on the Human Signature in Linguistic Morphogenesis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hakulinen, Lauri (1957). *Handbuch der finnischen Sprache, 1. Band*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Halpern, A. M. (1942). Yuma kinship terms. *American Anthropologist* 44: 425–441.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalizatio*n. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hillers, Delbert R. (1967). Delocutive verbs in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86: 320–324.

Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf (1880). A collection of Hindi roots with remarks on their derivation and classification. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 49-2: 33–81.

Holisky, Dee Ann & N. Kaxadze (1986). Manner of speaking verbs in Georgian, Part 1: An exercise in semantic description with comments on sound symbolism. In Fridrik Thordarson (ed.), *Studia Caucasologica* 1, 184–207. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Hölker, Klaus (1998). Un caso di delocutività: L'assenza dell'articolo davanti al possessivo con nome di parentela in italiano (e in altre lingue romanze). In Paolo Ramat (ed.), *Sintassi storica: Atti del XXX Congresso internazionale di studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana*, 567–576. Roma: Bulzoni.

Jensen, H. (1950). Ableitung von Verben aus Wortgruppen. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 4: 126–131.

Joseph, Brian D. & Irene Philippaki-Warburton (1987). *Modern Greek*. (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars.) London: Croom Helm.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997). *Turkish*. (Descriptive Grammars.) London: Routledge.

Langdon, Margaret (1977). Semantics and syntax of expressive 'say' constructions in Yuman. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 3: 1–11.

— (1994). Noise words in Guaraní. In Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols, & John J. Ohala (eds.), *Sound Symbolism*, 94–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Larcher, Pierre (1983). Dérivation délocutive, grammaire arabe, grammaire arabisante et grammaire de l'arabe. *Arabica* 30: 246–266.

— (1985). "Vous avez dit 'délocutif'?" *Langages* 80: 99–124.

— (2003). La dérivation délocutive: Histoire d'une notion méconnue. *Historiographia Linguistica* 30: 389–406.

Létoublon, Françoise (1980). Le vocabulaire de la supplication en grec: Performatif et dérivation délocutive. *Lingua* 52: 325–336.

Lewis, G. L. (1975). *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Littmann, Enno (1916). Anredeformen in erweiterter Bedeutung. *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1916*, 94–111. Göttingen: Weidmann.

McGregor, William B. (2001). Ideophones as the source of verbs in Northern Australian languages. In Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz (eds.) 2001, 205–221.

— (2002). *Verb Classification in Australian Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matthews, Peter H. (1997). *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Menges, Karl H. (1968). *The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Mignot, Xavier (1981). *Salutare* in Latin, *saluer* en français sont-ils bien des verbes délocutifs? *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 76-1: 327–344.

Mithun, Marianne (1982). The synchronic and diachronic behavior of plops, squeaks, croaks, sighs, and moans. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48: 49–58.

Morphy, Frances (1983). Djapu, a Yolngu dialect. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry J. Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages*, Volume 3, 1–188. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. (1978). English manner-of-speaking verbs revisited. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 14, *Papers from the Parasession on the Lexicon*, 278–288.

Munro, Pamela (1998). Chickasaw expressive 'say' constructions. In Leanne Hinton & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Studies in American Indian Languages: Description and Theory*, 180–186. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Muysken, Pieter (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Niinistö, Kati (2001). Älä muruttele minua! Suomen kielen delokutiivisesti johdetut verbit. ["Don't you 'darling' me!": Delocutive verb derivation in Finnish.] M.A. thesis, Helsingin yliopisto.

Nuckolls, Janis B. (2001). Ideophones in Pastaza Quechua. In Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz (eds.) 2001, 271–285.

Plank, Frans (1981). *Morphologische (Ir-)Regularitäten: Aspekte der Wortstrukturtheorie*. Tübingen: Narr.

Räsänen, Martti (1957). *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen*. (Studia Orientalia, 21.) Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.

Renzi, Lorenzo (1968). *Mamà, tatà, nene* ecc.: Il sistema delle allocuzioni inverse in rumeno. *Cultura neolatina* 28: 89–99.

Roncador, Manfred von (1988). *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: Nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Rumsay, Alan (1990). Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92: 346–361.

Sgroi, Salvatore Claudio (1981). Il sistema dell'allocuzione, diretta e inversa, secondo il modello performativo. *Lingua e Stile* 16: 3–11.

Swiggers, Pierre (1989). Une classe de noms propres: "les rétrolocutifs". *Nouvelle Revue d'Onomastique* 13/14: 157–164.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. (1999). Some more delocutive verbs in Hebrew. In Robert Chazan, William W. Hallo, & Lawrence H. Schiffman (eds.), *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, 407–410. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Voeltz, F. K. Erhard & Christa Kilian-Hatz (eds.) (2001). *Ideophones*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Watson, Richard L. (2001). A comparison of some Southeast Asian ideophones with some African ideophones. In Voeltz & Kilian-Hatz (eds.) 2001, 385–405.

Wissmann, Wilhelm (1932). *Nomina postverbalia in den altgermanischen Sprachen nebst einer Voruntersuchung über deverbative ō-Verba*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Wordick, F. J. F. (1982). *The Yindjibarndi Language*. (Pacific Linguistics, C-71.) Canberra: Australian National University.

Zagar, Igor Z. (1988). Aspect et performativité en slovene: Plaidoyer pour une hypothèse délocutive. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38: 275–287.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1971). In a manner of speaking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 223–233.

Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum (1987). Plain morphology and expressive morphology. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13: 330–340.