

# ЦИТИРОВАНИЕ В УСТНОМ ДИСКУРСЕ: ИНТОНАЦИЯ КАК СРЕДСТВО ИНТЕГРАЦИИ

**Литвиненко А. О.** (allal1978@gmail.com)

Московский государственный университет  
имени М. В. Ломоносова, Москва, Россия

**Ключевые слова:** цитирование, чужая речь, прямая речь, косвенная  
речь, полупрямая речь, интонация, просодия

# REPORTED SPEECH IN SPOKEN DISCOURSE: INTONATION AS A MEANS OF INTEGRATION<sup>1</sup>

**Litvinenko A. O.** (allal1978@gmail.com)

Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

I discuss typical intonation patterns in Russian reported speech constructions, based on the data from the Prosodically Annotated Corpus of Spoken Russian which consists of 4 experimental subcorpora of Russian spoken discourse (the current version of the corpus is available on the website <http://spokencorpora.ru/>). More than 400 occurrences of reported speech of different types (direct speech, indirect speech, semi-direct speech) have been analyzed. I have attempted to show that (i) intonation patterns in preceding framing clauses (falling tone in main phrasal accent, rising tone in main phrasal accent and absence of main phrasal accent) correspond to the type of the reported speech (direct, indirect and semi-direct, accordingly); (ii) however, this correspondence is more a tendency than a cause-and-effect relationship; (iii) there are some typical patterns in semi-direct speech that use 'mixed' intonation in order to keep the 'original' illocutionary meanings and to integrate the reported speech into the following context as much as possible: the *list pattern* and the *head-tail-pattern*.

**Keywords:** reported speech, direct speech, indirect speech, semi-direct speech, intonation, prosody

---

<sup>1</sup> This research is supported by Russian Foundation for Humanities, grant #12-04-00258.

## 1. Introduction. Reported speech as an ambiguous phenomenon

Reported speech in spoken discourse presents most interesting object for linguistic research as it appears on the border between two different discourses, the main one and the one that is being reported, or rather, re-created (see Tannen 1989; Holt 1996; Klewitz, Couper-Kuhlen 1999; Litvinenko et. al 2009; Litvinenko 2011). The speaker needs both to recreate the 'other' discourse as close to verbatim as possible and to integrate it into current discourse as well as possible, at the same time; we consider this ambiguity to be the main reason for the reported speech types' variety. Thus, *direct speech* and *indirect speech* are the prototypical models that speaker uses to prioritize one or the other of these two opposite objectives; for anything that lies in-between, we will use the term *semi-direct speech* (please refer to Litvinenko et. al 2009 and Litvinenko 2011 for detailed analysis of reported speech types). Typical reported speech construction consists of two parts; one is the reported speech itself, the other is the inquit of some kind (that can be a proper framing clause, a discourse marker, or both); the inquit can also be absent with some types of reported speech.

As opposed to written text, speakers use intonation as the most complex and the most powerful means to both 'recreate' the original's tone and attitude, and to smoothen the transition between discourses, to express the speaker's own feelings and evaluations in relation to the discourse being reported. Speakers change voice quality, tempo, pitch and loudness to express several things simultaneously:

- the very fact that some part of what they say does not belong to them, but is being reported;
- the intentions and emotions, as well as the illocutionary intent of the 'original' speaker;
- the speakers' attitude to what they report;
- the connection between what is being reported and the current discourse itself.

There are two main points that are most interesting from this point of view; these are the points where the reported speech 'meets' the main (current) discourse 'first-hand'. One of these points of interest is the framing clause; the other is the reported speech itself, but especially its right border (the last elementary discourse unit, or EDU<sup>2</sup>). Both possess some very interesting prosodic characteristics.

This paper is based on the data from Prosodically Annotated Corpus of Spoken Russian, that consists now of 4 experimental subcorpora of Russian spoken discourse, more than 4 hours of sound in total (children's Night Dream Stories collection (NDS), and 3 adults subcorpora: Stories about Presents and Skiing (SPS), Siberian Lifestories collection (SLS) and Funny Lifestories collection (FLS)). Night Dream Stories collection is published; the other 3 subcorpora are in various states of development. The current version of the corpus is available on our website <http://spokencorpora.ru/>. On the site, you can also find basic information on the general principles our transcription is based

---

<sup>2</sup> The elementary discourse unit (EDU) is the key unit of our discourse transcription system. The prototypical EDU is a single clause that is also a single intonation unit. It is pronounced in one breath and expresses one situation. See also Kibrik, Podlesskaja, Korotaev 2009 for details.

on, corpora descriptions, etc. This paper uses simplified transcription (only main phrasal accents; pauses without precise length; no marking for sound prolongation, except in the places where it is needed specifically; no aspiration and various stops marked). There are 472 occurrences of reported speech in the corpus that were analyzed for this research.

## 2. Common intonation patterns in framing clause

Preceding framing clause is the main means to introduce reported speech into current discourse. In our corpora it is used in 88% of the occurrences, both in children's and adults' narrative. Postpositional or incorporated framing clause is very rare; in most of the other cases, the framing clause is not used at all, and the reported speech is marked either by heavy intonation changes (so-called 'doing voices') or by special discourse markers (or both). For our research, we used only the occurrences with the preceding framing clause, which make more than 400 examples (150 in children's stories and about 260 in adults' ones).

As far as the framing clause is concerned, there are three main intonation patterns that are used to introduce reported speech of different types: *falling tone* in the main accent, *rising tone* in the main accent, and *no accent* at all in the framing clause (basically, in this case the framing clause and the first EDU of the reported speech form one intonation unit). There are also some cases of *level tone*, which show more or less the same tendencies as the falling tone. Probably that means that level tone should be considered an allophone of the latter; however, the total quantity of such occurrences is too small to make any positive conclusions.

In the *Table 1* we can see the total statistics for using different tones in the framing clause before different types of reported speech. As the frequency of usage for these types depends heavily on narrative genre and speakers' age, and some types are used more often than the others, we give here the statistics per 100 occurrences in each type.

**Table 1.** Tones in framing clause before reported speech (per 100 occurrences in type)

	Direct	%	Semi-direct	%	Indirect	%	Total	%
–	12	49.0%	8	31.2%	5	19.8%	25	8.3%
\	51	<b>42.1%</b>	37	30.5%	33	27.3%	122	40.6%
/	4	7.2%	12	19.0%	45	<b>73.8%</b>	61	20.4%
No accent	32	34.8%	43	<b>47.1%</b>	17	18.1%	92	30.7%
Total	100		100		100		300	

The *falling tone* in the framing clause corresponds mostly with the direct speech (42%), but is also quite frequent with the semi-direct speech (30.5%). Its frequency decreases slightly more with the indirect speech (27%). We can also see that it is the most frequent tone used to introduce reported speech.

(1) FLS, #40

… A *Elizaveta Petrovna* \skazala:  
 And Elizaveta Petrovna said  
 … «*Eta malenkaja zapytaja* … *ochen' mnogo* \znachit.  
 This small comma very much means  
 .. *Ochen' \mnogo.*»  
 Very much.  
 (And Elizaveta Petrovna said, “This small comma is very important.  
 Very important.”)

(2) SLS, #5

… *Potom nam* /pozvonili,  
 Then us.Dat they.called  
 .. \skazali,  
 they.told  
*chto* «*V gorode idyot sil'nyj* /dozhd',  
 that In city.Loc goes strong rain  
 … *vam luchshe* /\svalivat' ottuda;!  
 you.Dat better to.get.away from.there  
 (Then [they] called us, said that “It’s raining heavily in the city, you better  
 get away from there!”)

(3) SPS, #R1-8

… *muzhik* \reshil,  
 the.guy decided  
*chto ne \stoit pokupat' etu mashiny,*  
 that not worths to.buy this car  
*slishkom uzh* \dorogo.  
 too emph.part expensive  
 (The guy decided that he should not buy this car, it cost too much.)

However, the reasons for using falling tone in such contexts can be different. In some cases, its purpose is indeed to mark the border between two different discourses, like in the example (1) with direct speech. Sometimes it used in the same way before semi-direct speech and even before indirect one too, as the speaker most probably rearranges discourse on the fly, changing strategy. Such obvious cases are marked in our transcription system with a colon, and they are indeed most frequent before the direct speech. In other cases, falling tone is obviously used automatically as an adaptive tone before a rising one, like in the example (2). The most obvious reason for the falling tone on *skazali* is the necessity to make a fall before the rising tone in the next EDU, on the word *dozhd'*. There are contexts, though, where the purpose of falling tone usage is unclear, as in the ex. (3), where the speaker uses a series of falling tones, which can be interpreted either as a case of slight emphasis or as some personal preference of the speaker.

The **rising tone** corresponds mostly with indirect speech (almost 74%); take the example (4) where we can see a typical case of it, with rising tone in the framing clause and falling one in the reported speech itself.

- (4) SPS, #R1-3  
... *i /-skazal*,  
and he.said  
.. *chto stoit ona ... \dorogo*.  
that costs it.Fem expensive  
(... and [he] said that it cost much.)

The rising tone is almost never used with direct speech, and the cases of semi-direct speech with a rising tone in the framing clause usually follow indirect intonation pattern in the reported speech itself (see section 3 below).

The **absence of any accent** in the framing clause corresponds more with the semi-direct speech (47%), but is also frequent before the direct speech (almost 35%), as in the examples (5) and (6) below.

- (5) FLS, #5  
*On govorit*  
he says  
«/\Zdravstvujte,  
Hello  
*ja redactor /gasety.*»,  
I editor newspaper.Gen  
.. *kakoj-to voobshche \neponyatnoj*,  
some.Gen totally unknown.Gen  
(He says, “Hello, I am an editor in a newspaper”, some totally unknown one)

- (6) FLS, #7  
.. *i kto-to menya \oklikajet*,  
and somebody me.Acc calls  
*kakoj-to \paren'*,  
some lad  
*on krichit*  
he shouts  
.. «/\Devushka@!  
young.girl  
.. /Devushka@,  
young.girl  
*chto vy /delaete?!*»  
what you.Pl do.Pres.Pl  
(... and someone calls out to me, some young man, he shouts, “Miss! Miss, what are you doing?!”)

This is a common occurrence in the contexts where the first EDU of the reported speech is short, and the phrasal accent falls on the first content word (not counting conjunctions, particles and other discourse markers). That is the case for 71% of such contexts. One of the typical examples of such short EDUs in the beginning of the reported speech is a vocative expression that forms a single EDU, like in the example (6). It also often occurs with exclamations and emphatic questions.

### 3. Common intonation patterns in reported speech. Mixed intonation in semi-direct speech

Of all the prosodical variety that can be found in reported speech depending on various illocutionary meanings, we are interested in those patterns that contribute to reported speech being properly integrated into context.

In this regard, ‘classic’ direct and indirect speech occurrences are simple cases. Indirect speech is not prosodically and illocutionary independent, and therefore is usually pronounced as a part of a typical polypredicative construction, as in the example (4). Direct speech, on the opposite, is prosodically and illocutionary independent, and as such uses typical intonation patterns (e.g. for a statement, question, exclamation, etc.), as in examples (1) and (6).

However, semi-direct speech provides a broad range of different ‘mixed’ intonation patterns, where the ‘original’ intonation combines with the one that the speaker uses to integrate the reported speech into the context and/or to express his/her attitude and emotions concerning the text that is being reported. In this paper, we would like to demonstrate two typical patterns, or strategies, that are often used with semi-direct speech in our corpus.

The first one is the *list pattern*. This scheme uses a series of identical or similar accents to convey the idea of retelling/reporting someone else’s words. Rhythmical organization of reported speech has been often described as typical (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen 1999; Levontina 2010); however, here we can observe not only a specific temporal structure, but a series of similar accents. Such series of accents can be combined with additional meanings, e.g. exclamations, emphasis, surprise, etc. In the example (7) below, the speaker retells her own admonishing of her friend who was drunk and tried to steal a road sign.

- (7) FLS, #18  
*ja govoryu*  
 I say  
 «/\Brenton@  
 Brenton  
*Kakoj /\koshma-ar!,,,*  
 What nightmare  
*nelzya takije /\ve-eshchi!,,,*  
 must.not such.Pl things  
*eto zhe /\u-uzhas prosto!,,,*

this emph.part terror simply  
.. *nas posadyat v /\tyur'mu nepremenno!*».  
us.Acc will.lock.up.Pl in prison for.sure  
(I say, “Brenton! It’s terrible! One must not do such things! It’s simply dreadful!  
They will lock us up in prison for sure!”)

Here we have typical persuasive intonation on one hand (rising-falling tone marked as ‘/\’ and slight emphasis), but at the same time, we have series of prolongations, that adds the idea of ‘open list’ to the pattern. The result is marked with a combination of ‘!’ and ‘,,,’ in our transcription.

This is a very common scheme. It can be used with simple rising tone (/ , marked as ‘;’); with rising to high-level tone (/–, marked as ‘,,,’), and sometimes with persuasive rising-falling tone, like in the example we have just discussed. In some cases this scheme is used for the whole reported speech construction, and sometimes the list starts somewhere in the middle, like above, where the first EDU with the vocative phrase is pronounced normally.

The second typical pattern is the *head-tail pattern*. This scheme uses more or less ‘direct’ intonation in the most part of the reported speech construction, and then on the last EDU switches to normal narrative intonation, either with ‘comma intonation’ (rising tone or not-deep falling tone that ends up in a medium pitch range) or with a ‘period’ one (falling into low pitch). As a result, the last EDU of the reported speech also serves as a means to make the whole construction a part of the discourse.

In the example (8) below, the speaker recreates her mother’s exclamations in the first two EDUs of the reported speech, but the last one has weakened accents and typical narrative intonation, needed to incorporate the reported speech into the story line.

(8) SLS, #12

.. *Ona –govorila:*  
She said  
.. «/\Vot!,  
Here  
.. /\posmotritej!  
look.Imp  
.. *Kakije –doma.*»,  
what buildings  
*no my s Galechkoj ne smotreli ni na \Kreml’*,  
but we with Galechka.Instr not looked neither at Kremlin  
.. *ni na \kakije doma*,  
nor at any buildings  
(She said, “There! Look! What [beautiful] buildings!”) but Galechka and me did not look either at Kremlin, or at any buildings, ...)

In the similar way, the speaker in the example (8) retells the policeman’s exclamations and prompting with correct Russian intonation for such illocutionary acts,

but in the end of the last EDU she switches to the ‘uncertain open list’ intonation, instead of making it a proper question. It is more important to her to convey the idea that the policeman said ‘many things of the same type’ than to recreate his intonation precisely.

(9) FLS, #2

*V itoge ona real'no /zazhuzhzhala,*

In result.Dat it.she really buzzed

*i militsioner skazal*

and the.policeman said

«/\Devchonki@

Girls

*U vas chto-to s /\dvigatelem!*

of you.Gen something with the.engine.Instr

*Ezzhajte v avtoservis s avarijkoj /\bystreej*

Drive.Imp to the.service with the.alarm.light quick

*Ili mozhet byt' vam vyzvat' etogo kak ego tipa /"Angela"?»...*

Or may be you.Dat to call this how it.Acc like ‘Angel’

(In the end, the policeman said, “Girls! There is something [wrong] with your engine! Turn on the alarm lights and go to the service station quickly! Or maybe you should call for that – what’s-its-name – ‘Angel’?” [Angel is a name for vehicle recovery service])

This is also one of the most common patterns for the semi-direct speech. Basically, it is a compromise between needing to express several illocutionary meanings at the same time and to make the reported speech a part of the discourse as a whole (in the case of a narrative speech, a part of the storyline).

#### 4. Concluding remarks

In this short study, I have examined the basic intonation patterns in Russian reported speech constructions, based on the data from the Prosodically Annotated Corpus of Spoken Russian. I have attempted to show that (i) intonation patterns in preceding framing clauses correspond with the type of the reported speech; (ii) however, this correspondence is more a tendency than a cause-and-effect relationship; (iii) there are some typical patterns in semi-direct speech that use ‘mixed’ intonation in order to keep the ‘original’ illocutionary meanings and to integrate the reported speech into following context as much as possible: the *list pattern* and the *head-tail-pattern*.

This lays foundation for the future research that will include working with a fully annotated corpus, where in addition to main and secondary accents, and punctuation marks for illocutionary meaning we plan to use markings for specific intonation schemes. This will allow for a full analysis of intonation patterns in reported speech and other polypredicative constructions in Russian spoken discourse.



## References

1. *Couper-Kuhlen E.* (1999), Coherent voicing: On prosody in conversational reported speech, in Wolfram Bublitz & Uta Lenk, eds., *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: How to create it and how to describe it*, Benjamins Amsterdam, pp. 11–32.
2. *Holt E.* (1996), Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation, *Research on language and social interaction*, 29 (3), pp. 219–245.
3. *Kibrik A. A., Podlesskaja V. I., Korotaev N. A.,* (2009), Spoken discourse structure: main elements and iconic features [Struktura ustnogo diskursa: osnovnye èlementy i kanonicheskie javlenija], in Kibrik A. A., Podlesskaja V. I. (eds.) (2009) *Rasskazy o snovidenijax: Korpusnoe issledovanie ustnogo russkogo diskursa* [Night Dream Stories: A corpus study of spoken Russian discourse], *Languages of Slavonic Culture*, Moscow, pp. 55–101.
4. *Klewitz G., Couper-Kuhlen E.* (1999). Quote — Unquote? The Role of Prosody in the Contextualization of Reported Speech Sequences. *Pragmatics*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1999, pp. 459–485.
5. *Levontina I. B.*, Pereskazyvatel'nost' v russkom jazyke [Quotation and rendering markers in Russian]. *Komp'juternaia Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii: Trudy Mezhdunarodnoj Konferentsii "Dialog 2010"* [Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies: Proceedings of the International Conference "Dialog 2010"]. Bekasovo, 2011, pp. 284–288.
6. *Litvinenko A. O., Korotaev N. A., Kibrik A. A., Podlesskaja V. I.* (2009), Reported speech constructions [Konstruktsii tsitatsiej, ili "chuzhoj rech'ju"], in Kibrik A. A., Podlesskaja V. I. (eds.) (2009) *Rasskazy o snovidenijax: Korpusnoe issledovanie ustnogo russkogo diskursa* [Night Dream Stories: A corpus study of spoken Russian discourse], *Languages of Slavonic Culture*, Moscow, pp. 288–308.
7. *Litvinenko A. O.*, Strategii peredachi 'chuzhoj rechi' v rasskazah po kartinkam (na materiale russkogo jazyka) [Speech reporting strategies in Russian comics-based stories]. *Komp'juternaia Lingvistika i Intellektual'nye Tehnologii: Trudy Mezhdunarodnoj Konferentsii "Dialog 2011"* [Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies: Proceedings of the International Conference "Dialog 2011"]. Bekasovo, 2011, pp. 425–433.
8. *Shvedova N. Ju.* (ed.) (1980) *Russkaja grammatika* [Russian grammar]. Moscow: Nauka.
9. *Tannen D.* (1989) "Oh talking that is so sweet": Constructing dialogue in conversation, in *Talking voices*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 98–133.