

## DIRECT SPEECH, FICTIVE INTERACTION, AND BIBLE TRANSLATION

LOURENS DE VRIES

The author is a UBS translation consultant, and holds the Chairs of Bible Translation and General Linguistics at the VU University Amsterdam in the Netherlands.

### Introduction

This article focuses on a cross-linguistically very important aspect of direct speech, the use of direct speech in so-called fictive interaction constructions, an aspect that has great importance for Bible translators. The term fictive interaction is from Pascual,<sup>1</sup> who uses the term in a cognitive linguistic context to refer to the use of the conversation frame in structuring cognition, grammar, and discourse. She gives examples such as:

- (1)
- (a) an attitude that says “*I’m better than you*”
  - (b) an attitude of “*I’m better than you*”
  - (c) an “*I’m better than you*” attitude

The direct speech constituents in (1) represent fictive communication, fictive as opposed to factive communication, since no one is reported to have said “I am better than you.” According to Pascual,<sup>2</sup> oral face-to-face verbal interaction is in many ways the most basic form of language use and that is why speakers apply the frame of a conversation also in other domains, for example, in written texts by using rhetorical questions, in question-answer pairs as a strategy to express conditionals (“Is the weather bad? Then we stay at home” > “If the weather is bad, we stay at home”) and in intra-sentential direct speech constructions such as (1). In the context of descriptive and typological linguistics the term “fictive interaction” is not used, but the same phenomena are discussed under the heading of quotative constructions or “inner speech” constructions.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 E. Pascual, *Imaginary Dialogues: Conceptual Blending and Fictive Interaction in Criminal Courts* (Utrecht: LOT Dissertation Series, 2002); “Fictive Interaction within the Sentence: A Communicative Type of Fictivity in Grammar,” *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.2 (2006): 245-67; “Questions in Legal Monologues: Fictive Interaction as Argumentative Strategy in a Murder Trial,” *Text & Talk* 26.3 (2006): 383-402; “Fictive Interaction Blends in Everyday Language and Courtroom Settings,” in *Mental Spaces Approaches to Discourse and Interaction* (ed. A. Hougaard and T. Oakley; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008), 79-107.

2 Pascual, *Imaginary Dialogues*.

3 L. J. de Vries, “Direct Quotations and Kombai Grammar,” in *Forms and Functions in Kombai, an Awyu Language of Irian Jaya* (Pacific Linguistics Series B, 108; Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1993), 91-130; Ger P. Reesink, “‘Inner Speech’ in Papuan Languages,” *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24 (1993): 217-25.

The opposition between direct and indirect forms of reporting speech is best understood in terms of the notion of deictic center of utterances. Compare (2) and (3):

(2) John said: "I am ill."

(3) John said that he was ill.

Direct speech or direct discourse refers to the mode of reporting speech exemplified by (2) where the reported speech ("I am ill") retains its own deictic center. Direct speech forms have all their deictic elements oriented towards the utterance-situation of the reported speech act. Deictic elements are those elements of language that point to features of the utterance-situation and that cannot be interpreted if the utterance-situation is not known. For example, tense and personal pronouns are deictic elements; they point to aspects of the utterance-situation.

There are two deictic centers in (2), one of the reporting utterance and one of the reported utterance. The two deictic centers manifest themselves in (2) in the shift of deictic elements, from past to present and from third person to first person. In the indirect speech of (3), both the tense and the pronoun of the reported utterance are adapted to the deictic center of the reporting utterance. There is only one deictic center in (3). The conjunction "that" in (3) indicates the embedded status of the object clause "that he was ill." Some languages, including Koine Greek, may employ constructions that combine features of direct speech and indirect speech, constructions that partially adapt features of the reported utterance to the deictic center of the reporting utterance.

In many languages there is a strong tendency to prefer direct speech over indirect speech. Sometimes this preference is so strong that indirect discourse is either absent or marginal. Drabbe claims that Mandobo and Wambon of the Awyu family of central New Guinea do not have indirect discourse.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, De Vries discusses the possible absence of indirect forms in Kombai, also of the Awyu family.<sup>5</sup> See Wilson for Yali, Murane for Daga of Papua New Guinea, and Bromley for Lower Grand Valley Dani.<sup>6</sup> Children universally acquire direct speech before indirect speech. In other words, both oral face-to-face conversation and direct speech are very basic and fundamental to human language.

Fictive interaction with direct speech is used universally to express intentions, emotions, thoughts, purposes, and many other things. Although all languages employ fictive interaction constructions, there are crucial differences in the degree of integration into the grammar, in register, and in the semantic and pragmatic functions of these constructions. These differences have important consequences for the translation of the Bible and for the work of translation consultants. First, a typological overview is given of fictive interaction constructions in the languages of the world. Then, the consequences for Bible translation work are discussed.

4 P. Drabbe, *Kaeti en Wambon: Twee Awju-dialecten* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959), 23, 137.

5 De Vries, "Direct Quotations and Kombai Grammar."

6 John D. Wilson, "Scripture in an Oral Culture: The Yali of Irian Jaya" (M.A. thesis, Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh, 1988), 46; Elizabeth Murane, *Daga Grammar: From Morpheme to Discourse* (SIL Publications no. 43; University of Oklahoma, 1974); H. Myron Bromley, *A Grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1981), 271.

## The cross-linguistic picture

Languages differ in the degree of grammaticalization of fictive interaction constructions and in the pragmatic and semantic functions that these constructions may have. With grammaticalization I mean the degree to which fictive interaction constructions have become part of the grammar of a language.<sup>7</sup> Languages may grammaticalize these constructions to such an extent that they become the unmarked or only option in certain domains; they are no longer a stylistic option but an obligatory part of grammar. But there are also languages where these constructions are somehow associated with specific sociolinguistic groups and contexts of usage, where they are marked, and never obligatory. They are a style feature rather than a grammatical phenomenon in these languages.

## English fictive interaction

Let us first turn to English. In English, fictive interaction constructions include the *like* + *direct speech* construction that has an informal register, was first associated with young female American speakers, but seems to have become rapidly more and more accepted and unmarked in spoken genres. Consider these examples:

- (4) . . . some of you looked at me like “*Gosh, why are you asking me such a simple question?*” (court transcript)<sup>8</sup>
- (5) . . . a lot of people within the Democratic Party [...] felt like, “*okay, I don’t want to go through that again.*” (Al Gore, *BBC news*)<sup>9</sup>
- (6) It’s like, “*The pastor doesn’t need grace, but I do.*” (Rev. Timothy Conner, *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, Sept. 23, 2004)<sup>10</sup>

The range of semantic functions expressed by this *like* + *direct speech* fictive interaction construction is open ended, and *like* + *direct speech* constructions are used to represent thought, intentions, emotions, attitudes, types of individuals, situations, etc. In terms of contexts of use, the *like* + *direct speech* construction has spread to various genres and is produced by a large spectrum of American and British speakers of English, for example, in courtroom settings, ordinary conversations, press interviews, movies, documentaries, pop songs, radio and TV programs, etc.<sup>11</sup>

Languages with similar constructions include other Germanic languages such as Dutch, with the *zoïets van* + *direct speech* construction, German, Afrikaans,<sup>12</sup>

7 The term grammaticalization is used here in contrast with the term grammaticalization, which refers to processes in language that change lexical elements into function words, e.g. the grammaticalization of *because* from *bye cause of* in the history of English.

8 Court transcript, Pascual, *Imaginary Dialogues*, 236.

9 Pascual, “Fictive Interaction within the Sentence,” 252.

10 *Ibid.*, 252.

11 Pascual, *Imaginary Dialogues*; *idem*, “Fictive Interaction within the Sentence”; *idem*, “Fictive Interaction Blends”; E. Pascual, E. Królak, and Th. A. J. M. Janssen, “Do-it-yourself Compounds: Scenarios Set Up through Fictive Interaction” (Manuscript, 2008).

12 E. Pascual and Th. A. J. M. Janssen. “Zinnen in samenstellingen: Presentaties van fictieve verbale interactie,” *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 9.4 (2004): 285-310; A. Foolen, I. van Alphen, E. Hoekstra, H. Lammers, H. Mazeland, and E. Pascual, “Het quotatieve van: Vorm, functie en sociolinguïstische variatie,” *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* 76.2 (2006): 137-49.

Swedish,<sup>13</sup> and Frisian.<sup>14</sup> But Romance languages have them also: Spanish,<sup>15</sup> French,<sup>16</sup> Portuguese<sup>17</sup>; they have been found in Slavic languages: Polish<sup>18</sup>; and in non-Indo-European languages: Hittite, Tok Pisin, Buang, and Lahu,<sup>19</sup> Hebrew,<sup>20</sup> Japanese, Turkish, and Finnish.<sup>21</sup>

The function of elements such as *like* in English and *zoiets van* in Dutch fictive interaction constructions seems to be to distinguish fictive from factive verbal interaction. By using *like* the speaker indicates that direct speech is used to characterize inner states, not to report words actually said. English and Dutch are at the low end of the cline of grammaticalization of fictive interaction constructions. In these languages they are associated with specific sociolinguistic groups and contexts of usage, marked, never obligatory, with an open-ended range of meanings.

Biblical languages also use fictive interaction with direct speech; just as in English, it is a stylistic feature in the biblical languages rather than a part of grammar, because it is never obligatory. Koine Greek, for example, uses fictive interaction constructions with direct speech to portray intentions and thoughts of participants, in a rather neutral register. Take Mark 5.28:

GNT ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.

NRSV <sup>27</sup> She had heard about Jesus, and came up behind him in the crowd and touched his cloak, <sup>28</sup>for she said, “If I but touch his clothes, I will be made well.” <sup>29</sup> Immediately her hemorrhage stopped;

NIV <sup>27</sup> When she heard about Jesus, she came up behind him in the crowd and touched his cloak, <sup>28</sup>because she thought, “If I just touch his clothes, I will be healed.” <sup>29</sup> Immediately her bleeding stopped;

Notice that NIV has rendered ἔλεγεν with “she thought” to make explicit the fictive interaction or “inner speech” nature of ἔλεγεν. This reading finds support in the parallel passage in Matt 9.21, ἔλεγεν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ• ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι

13 Mats Eriksson, “A Case of Grammaticalization in Modern Swedish: The Use of ‘ba’ in Adolescent Speech,” *Language Sciences* 17.1 (1995): 19-48.

14 E. Hoekstra, “*Van* als markeerder van zinnen in de directe en indirecte rede in het Fries en Nederlands” (Manuscript, 2005).

15 S. A. Schwenker, “Some Reflections on *o sea*: A Discourse Marker in Spanish,” *Journal of Pragmatics* 25.6 (1996): 855-874; R. Cameron, “A Variable Syntax of Speech, Gesture, and Sound Effect: Direct Quotations in Spanish,” *Language Variation and Change* 10.1 (1998): 43-83.

16 S. Fleischman, “Des jumeaux du discours,” *La Linguistique* 34.2 (1988): 31-47.

17 Ad Foolen, “Marking Voices in Discourse: Quotation Markers in English and Other Languages” (Paper presented at the *JCLC*, Santa Barbara, July 26, 2001).

18 E. Królak, “Fictive Interaction: A Cognitive Study” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Warsaw, in prep.).

19 B. D. Joseph, “Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)*, and Sanskrit *iva*,” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95 (1981): 93-98; B. D. Joseph and L. C. Schourup, “More on (*i*)-*wa(r)*,” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96 (1982): 56-58.

20 Y. Maschler, “*Veke’ilu harglâyim sh’xa nitka’ot bifnim kaze* (‘and like your feet get stuck inside like’): Hebrew *kaze* (‘like’), *ke’ilu* (‘like’) and the Decline of Israeli *dugri* (‘direct’) Speech,” *Discourse Studies* 3.3 (2001): 295-326.

21 Foolen, “Marking Voices in Discourse.”

τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι, where the addition of ἐν ἑαυτῇ makes the fictive interaction nature explicit in the Greek text. If one rendered the Greek fictive interaction construction in English with “for she was like, if I but touch his clothes, I will be made well,” most readers would object to the translation because of the low register of the *like* + direct speech construction.

### Kombai: Grammaticized fictive interaction

At the other end of the cline of grammaticization we find languages such as Kombai in Indonesian Papua,<sup>22</sup> and Kwaza in Brazil<sup>23</sup> where fictive interaction constructions with direct speech have become unmarked and are obligatory in certain domains, fully integrated in the grammar, used by all speakers in all contexts, and highly frequent. Languages with similar patterns of grammaticized fictive interaction:

- Papuan languages: Korowai,<sup>24</sup> Amele, Usan,<sup>25</sup> Teleefool<sup>26</sup>;
- Austronesian languages: Kamera, Buru, Tukang Besi<sup>27</sup>;
- Australian Aboriginal languages: Nunggubuyu,<sup>28</sup> Ungarinjin,<sup>29</sup> Kuuk Taayorre<sup>30</sup>;
- Amerindian languages: Kwaza,<sup>31</sup> Quechua, Aymara, Araucanian<sup>32</sup>;
- Alaskan languages: Dena’ina Athabaskan<sup>33</sup>;
- African languages: Ewe.<sup>34</sup>

Consider the following examples of Kombai<sup>35</sup>:

- (7) *Yafō-fina*                      *wakhumolei-neno*  
 Their-thought      COM.die.3SG.NF-say.PL  
 “They think that he has already died.”  
 Lit.: Their thought, “he has already died” they said.

22 De Vries, “Direct Quotations and Kombai Grammar.”

23 H. van der Voort, “The Quotative Construction in Kwaza and Its (de)Grammaticalisation,” in *Current Studies on South American Languages* (ed. M. Crevels, S. van de Kerke, S. Meira, and H. van der Voort; Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ILLA) 3; Leiden: Research School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies, 2002), 307-28.

24 G. J. van Enk and L. de Vries, *The Korowai of Irian Jaya* (Oxford University Press, 1997).

25 Reesink, “‘Inner Speech’ in Papuan Languages.”

26 Phyllis M. Healey, “Teleéfoól Quotative Clauses,” *Pacific Linguistics* A 3 (1964): 27-34.

27 M. Klamer, “How Report Verbs Become Quote Markers and Complementisers,” *Lingua* 110.2 (2000): 69-98.

28 J. Haiman, “Alienation in Grammar,” *Studies in Language* 13.1 (1989): 129-170.

29 A. Rumsey, “Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology,” *American Anthropologist* 92.2 (1990): 346-61.

30 A. Gaby, “A Grammar of Kuuk Taayorre” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Melbourne, 2006).

31 Van der Voort, “The Quotative Construction in Kwaza.”

32 W. F. H. Adelaar, “The Role of Quotations in Andean Discourse,” in *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on His 50th Birthday* (ed. H. Pinkster and I. Genee; Dordrecht: Foris, 1990), 1-12.

33 O. C. Lovick, “Agentivity and Participant Marking in Dena’ina Athabaskan: A Text-based Study” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cologne, 2005).

34 B. Heine, U. Claudi, and F. Hünemeyer, *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991).

35 De Vries, “Direct Quotations and Kombai Grammar.”

- (8) *Camate luwa kho yademo-nane-ne*  
 District head say.3SG.NF person meet-IMP.PL-say.SG  
 “The district head wants the people to come together.”  
 Lit.: The district head says: ‘People, come together.’”
- (9) *Kharabumano fenemora ma-khe-y-e-ne*  
 be.astonished.3PL.NF how do.3SG.NF-Q-TR-CONN-say.SG  
 “They were astonished because of the things he did.”  
 Lit.: They were astonished: how does he do this?”
- (10) *Aifo-nene*  
 Go.1PL.INTENT-say.PL  
 “They want to go.”  
 Lit. “We want to go” they say.
- (11) *Nu ai galemofo-ne-ra wa-me-de*  
 I pig buy.1PL.INT-say-SS COM-come-1SG.NF  
 “I have come to buy the pig.”

Kombai obligatorily uses fictive interaction constructions with direct speech and quote-markers in three types of intentional (“want”) contexts:

- i. when intender (e.g., district head in [8]) and intended person (e.g., the people in [8]) differ;
- ii. with second and third person subjects (10);
- iii. with all grammatical persons in purposive contexts with motion verbs (11).

Quote-marking morphemes in these languages are often historically based on forms of verbs of saying. In Kombai the quote-markers *nenō/near/ne* are frozen forms of a verb of speaking that is never used as an independent verb and they are the only forms of that verb still present in the language.

Thoughts (7) and emotions (9) are normally expressed with fictive interaction constructions in Kombai. The grammatical form of fictive interaction reports and of factive verbal interaction reports is the same and there are no elements such as English “like” to distinguish fictive and factive usages. This is a crucial difference between English and Kombai. Consider this example:

- (12) *Luwano kho mofena yafe.rambo-neno*  
 they.said man that good.very-say.PL  
 “They praised that man.”

The reporting speaker of example (12) does not claim that the words *kho mofena yaferambo* “that man is very good” have been uttered by the reported speakers. He just claims that they have praised that man. Reported speech in Kombai always has the *form* of a direct quote but the quoted words always function as the portrayal of the *intention* of the reported speakers. Non-verbalized intentions are represented in exactly the same way as verbalized intentions. This means that an expression such as (13) has two readings out of context:

- (13) *ami-f-e-ne*  
 drink-1SG.INT-CONN-say.SG

“I want to drink” –he.says

= “he wants to drink” OR “he says that he wants to drink”

To disambiguate and to indicate that the intention was verbalized, an anaphoric or cataphoric demonstrative may be inserted (*‘luwa mene, ami-f-e-ne* = “he said this, I want to drink”).

This disambiguation does not mean that when anaphoric or cataphoric elements have been used the direct speech is viewed as the very own words of the reported speakers. This is because Kombai speakers do not distinguish between *saying* and *meaning*, between intentions and the words used to express those intentions.

Rumsey and De Vries have argued that the distinction between saying something and meaning something is not made in many languages of New Guinea and Australia.<sup>36</sup> One of the consequences of the absence of the distinction between the words produced and the intention behind those words is that the distinction between direct speech as a representation of someone’s “own words,” and indirect speech as the representation of someone’s intention without the pretension that someone is quoted *verbatim*, is absent in these usually oral communities.

Now all speech act verbs in Kombai require direct speech constructions. Speech acts are actions that require speech in order to be performed. *To promise* is a speech act verb, *to kill* is not. Consider (12), a reported praise, and (14), a reported promise, both with obligatory direct speech constructions:

- (14) *Nu wamedefe-ne luwa*  
 I come.1SG.F-say.SG say.3SG.NF

“He promised to come.”

Lit. “I come” he said.<sup>37</sup>

Since the distinction between wording and intention is not made, reported speech acts always ascribe words to people without claiming that people uttered those very words occurring in the “quoted” direct speech. This raises the question of what is fictive and what factive in Kombai examples such as (12) and (14). The factive aspect is that both (12) and (14) report a verbal communication that really took place; the speaker of (14) reports the fact that someone else uttered a promise to come. But since only intentions are reported, it is irrelevant with which words the promise was made and people routinely ascribe words to other people that they in fact never uttered, just to portray the intention. In other words, the quoted words in (14) are fictive but the reported intention is factive.

Languages such as Kombai represent the high end of grammatization. Kombai fictive interaction constructions are not associated with specific sociolinguistic groups or contexts of usage, but they became unmarked and fully conventionalized constructions to express a given set of meanings. Fictive interaction strategies of language use froze into direct speech constructions in Kombai grammar with:

36 Rumsey, “Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology”; L. J. de Vries, “New Guinea Communities without Writing and Views of Primary Orality,” *Anthropos* 98 (2003), 397-405.

37 De Vries, “Direct Quotations and Kombai Grammar.”

- (a) well-defined and unique language-specific morphosyntactic properties;
- (b) well-defined language-specific semantic functions.

In this freezing process, differences between languages emerge. Kwaza (Brazil), for example, uses fully grammaticized fictive interaction to represent wishes and causation but not emotions.<sup>38</sup>

### Fictive interaction in Bible translations

On the basis of our analysis we would expect Bible translations in languages with fully grammaticized fictive interaction to have many examples of fictive interaction constructions to portray intentions, emotions, thoughts, and so on. For languages like English where fictive interaction is very common in everyday language but where fictive interaction constructions tend to have a low register, we would predict that Bible translations, with their normally high register, will not use them, unless in translations with a very specific skopos.

Indeed we find many examples of fictive interaction constructions with direct speech in Bible translations of New Guinea, for example, to express intention (15), thoughts (16), emotions and feelings (17):

(15) Mark 6.19

ἡ δὲ Ἡρωδιάς ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι

“And Herodias wanted to kill him.”

Kombai:

<i>Mana</i>	<i>Herodias</i>	<i>Yohanes</i>	<i>ufo-ne</i>
And	Herodias	John	I.want.to.kill-say.SG

“And Herodias wanted to kill John.”

(15) is an example where the Kombai language grammatically requires a fictive interaction construction, namely, with third person intenders. Notice that the use of the direct quote “I want to kill John” only represents the intention of Herodias; it does not claim that Herodias said those words.

(16) Mark 3.2

καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύσει αὐτόν

“They watched him closely whether on the sabbath he would heal him.”

Western Dani Bible:

*Yt aakvmy nogome nen: “Tamban eekwy paga ap obeelom eeke kamyn a leka? j'inuk . . . nyngen pykpak vgo nogogwaaryk.*

They watched him closely with their eyes . . . saying . . . “Will we see him heal on the day we worship or not?”

(17) Mark 1.22

ἐξεπλήσσαντο . . .

They were astonished . . .

38 Van der Voort, “The Quotative Construction in Kwaza.”



Western Lani<sup>39</sup>

*'Wi! j'jinuk, pi wareegwarak*

They were all amazed, saying "Oh!"

Notice the presence of the interjection *wi* in (17). This is very common in Papuan Bible translations when fictive interaction constructions are used to express emotions of fear, surprise, amazement, and so on. The use of interjections is fully part of the conventionalized and grammaticized nature of fictive interaction constructions in many Papuan languages. This means that the use of these interjections does not imply a low or informal register. This is different in languages like English where fictive interaction constructions with interjections such as "It's like *wow!*" have a low register, a register too low for most types of Bible translations. Perhaps they might be used in Bible comics and certain Bible translations with a very specific skopos.

For exegetical consultants who check Bible translations in languages with grammaticized fictive interaction, with direct speech ascribed to Jesus and other biblical persons, complete with interjections, it is important to know that such direct speech as in (15)-(17) is not meant as a representation of the words of these biblical persons, of what they *said*, but only as a representation of what these biblical persons *meant*—their intentions. If consultants are not aware of the linguistic properties of these fictive interaction constructions, they might force translators to remove fictive interaction constructions; and the misunderstandings between the translators and the exegetical checkers would be massive and disastrous.

When these Papuan languages make a distinction between direct and indirect speech, it is made in terms of degrees of adaptation to the deictic center of the reporting speech act, not in terms of representing what somebody said, his very own words, versus representing what somebody meant, his intentions. Therefore, both indirect speech and direct speech represent intentions, not uttered words, in these languages.

## Summary

When fictive interaction constructions with direct speech are highly frequent in language use as a stylistic option, they may first become the unmarked way to express intentions, emotions, thoughts, and other inner states, and then further freeze into obligatory ways of expressing these notions; they become integrated into the grammars of languages. This has happened in hundreds of languages worldwide. This means that Bible translations in these languages cannot avoid using these constructions.

Consultants should not judge these constructions in terms of their own languages where they might have a low register, be associated with spoken genres, and where the use of direct speech may imply that the reported speaker has uttered the quoted words. Ascription to biblical persons of words and utterances that do not occur in the source texts would seem exegetically wrong to consultants who do not understand the grammars of these languages.

---

<sup>39</sup> G. F. Larson, *The Use of Direct Quotations in Western Dani Bible Translation* (Irian Jaya: CAMA, 1984).

Primary orality seems to favor the (multifunctional) use and grammaticization of fictive interaction with direct speech. The vast majority of languages that have fully grammaticized fictive interactive constructions are oral languages. Pascual (in a personal communication) suggests the following explanation. In primary oral communities oral face-to-face conversation is an even more basic and frequent form of language use than it is in languages with writing. Accordingly, the use of the conversation frame in structuring grammar, discourse, and thought would also be more pronounced in oral communities than in those with writing. Further research is needed to establish to what extent grammaticization of fictive interaction is linked to orality.

### Abbreviations

COM	completive aspect
CONN	connective
F	future tense
IMP	imperative
INT	intentional mood
NF	Non-Future tense
PL	plural
Q	question marking morpheme
SG	singular
SS	same subject in next clause (switch reference)
TR	transitional sound