

Workshop proposed for the 53rd Annual Meeting of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea*, University of Bucharest, 26–29 August 2020 (<http://sle2020.eu/>)

Workshop title:

‘The grammar of thinking: Comparing reported thought and reported speech across languages’

Organizers (from the University of Helsinki):

Daniela Casartelli: daniela.casartelli@helsinki.fi

Silvio Cruschina: silvio.cruschina@helsinki.fi

Pekka Posio: pekka.posio@helsinki.fi

Stef Spronck: stef.spronck@helsinki.fi

Keywords

Reported Speech, Reported Thought, Evidentiality, Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization

Workshop description

Speakers may resort to a variety of linguistic strategies to report communicative acts (‘reported speech’ = RS) or mental states (‘reported thought’ = RT). While RS has received relatively much attention (Buchstaller & Alphen 2012; Güldemann & Roncador 2002; Janssen & Wurff 1996), RT is not often explicitly discussed. Authors either group RT together with RS as a type of ‘inner speech’ (Vygotsky 1987; Vološinov 1973), or treat it as a completely separate phenomenon. This is the case for formal semantic approaches to quotation and propositional attitudes, where RS more naturally fits the former category and RT the latter or and also for functionalist analyses of quotative meaning (Boye 2012).

Both positions have merit. From a syntactic viewpoint, structures involving RS and RT are roughly equivalent (Palmer 1986: 135; Spronck & Nikitina 2019). Moreover, both RS predicates (e.g. *say, tell*) and RT predicates (e.g. *think*) behave as bridge verbs allowing for a number of syntactic phenomena, including extraction across wh-questions, embedded V2 in Germanic languages, and complementizer deletion (Cocchi & Poletto 2002; Dor 2005; Erteschik-Shir 1973; Vikner 1995; see also Salvesen & Walkden 2017). The structural resemblance is even greater in languages that do not make a lexical distinction between ‘say’ and ‘think’ at all, examples of which have been found on nearly all continents (Güldemann 2008; Larson 1978; Reesink 1993; Rumsey 1990; Saxena 1988; Spronck 2015).

Nevertheless, predicates of RS and RT may select different complementizers (see, e.g., Ledgeway 2005) or different moods in the embedded clause (see, e.g., Laca 2013), and behave differently with respect to other phenomena such as negation raising (Horn 1989). Functional, corpus-based analyses of RS/RT have revealed differences in preferred syntactic patterns with respect to word order, expression and omission of arguments and complementizers, and different preferences for hypotactic vs. paratactic constructions in colloquial speech (e.g., Posio & Pešková, to appear). Formalist accounts highlight differences in the syntactic structure of RS/RT complement clauses: the complement of RT predicates seems to lack an independent illocutionary force, while RS predicates select for clauses with a full structure licensing root phenomena (Heycock 2006; Hooper & Thompson 1973). Semantically, this difference has been related to the fact that only the complement of RS predicates constitutes an independent speech act. Differences also emerge in the grammaticalization/pragmaticalization processes out of predicates of RS/RT that yield

different types of evidential and epistemic structures and markers such semi-grammaticalized constructions, parenthetical expressions, evidential or epistemic adverb(ial)s (cf. English *methinks*, Spanish *dizque*, Greek *lei*), discourse markers and modal particles, and grammatical elements (e.g. complementizers) (Cruschina 2015; Cruschina & Remberger 2008; Thompson & Mulac 1991; Posio 2014; Wiemer 2018, and references therein).

The aim of the proposed workshop is to bring together linguists from different frameworks working on the relationship between RS and RT, and on their different linguistic manifestations. On the one hand, it continues the trend towards the joint analysis of categories of cognition and perspective, which in recent years has gained a strong presence in typology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. On the other, it also seeks to assess whether RT constitutes a separate category, RS/quotation or (other) attitudinal expressions. We seek to bring together scholars working on the analogies and differences between the two domains of RS and RT, embracing the investigation of their semantic, pragmatic and morpho-syntactic properties, as well as of the historical linguistic processes that lead to the emergence of RS (evidential) and RT (epistemic) markers. Ultimately, we aim to contribute to the understanding of the notions RS and RT, their crosslinguistic extent and their limitations, and to foster debate across theoretical divides and approaches.

The questions addressed in the workshop include (but are not limited to):

- Which morphosyntactic properties characterize RS and RT in individual languages or in a crosslinguistic sample?
- Should RT be treated as a distinct category? Which tests and criteria can be used to distinguish between the two domains both syntactically and semantically?
- Does complementation under RS/RT predicates involve different semantic and syntactic units and objects? Does complementation under RS/RT predicates involve different semantic and syntactic units and objects? Do the differences that have been observed in complement clauses align with RT/RS or rather with the distinction between assertive and non-assertive predicates?
- Can we identify patterns of polysemy between concepts of ‘saying’ and ‘thinking’?
- What differences and similarities in the expression of RS and RT can be found in corpus-based studies? Are such tendencies specific to individual languages or varieties or rather extend across languages?
- Are RT and RS subject to similar pragmatic constraints?
- What is the relationship between the different linguistic manifestations of RS and RT, including both full predicates and grammatical elements?
- Does RT differ from RS with respect to processes such as grammaticalization, pragmaticalization or also acquisition?
- Semantically, how does RT relate to quotation on the one hand and propositional attitudes on the other? Can RT be interpreted as ‘inner speech’?

We accept submissions that contribute to the description, discussion, and analysis of these and other issues concerning RS and RT in any language or in a typological/comparative perspective. We welcome contributions from all frameworks and approaches, including synchronic, diachronic, data-driven, corpora, discourse, typological, and theoretical analyses.

References

- Boye, K. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-cognitive Study*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Buchstaller, I. & I. van Alphen (eds). 2012. *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cocchi, G. & C. Poletto. 2002. Complementizer deletion in Florentine: the interaction between merge and move. In C. Beyssade, R. Bok-Bennema, F. Drijkoningen & P. Monachesi (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, 55–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cruschina, S. 2015. The expression of evidentiality and epistemicity: Cases of grammaticalization in Italian and Sicilian. *Probus* 27: 1–31.
- Cruschina, S. & E.-M. Remberger (2008). Hearsay and reported speech: Evidentiality in Romance. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33: 99–120.
- Dor, D. 2005. Toward a semantic account of that-deletion in English. *Linguistics* 43: 345–382.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. 1973. On the nature of island constraints. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Güldemann, T. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Güldemann, T. & M. von Roncador (eds). 2002. *Reported Discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heycock, C. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Vol II*, 174–209. Boston/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hooper, J. & S. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465–497.
- Horn, L. R. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Janssen, T. & W. van der Wurff (eds). 1996. *Reported Speech: Forms and functions of the verb*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Laca, B. 2013. Temporal orientation and the semantics of attitude verbs. In K. V. Molsing & A. M. Tramunt Ibanos (eds), *Time and TAME in Language*, 158–180. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Larson, M. L. 1978. *The Functions of Reported Speech in Discourse*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Ledgeway, A. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: The dual complementiser system in the dialects of southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103: 336–396.
- Palmer, F. R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Posio, P. 2014. Subject expression in grammaticalizing constructions. The case of *creo* and *acho* 'I think' in Spanish and Portuguese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 63: 5–18.
- Posio, P. & Pešková, A. to appear. Le dije yo, digo: Construccionalización de los introductores cuotativos con el verbo decir en español peninsular y argentino. *Spanish in Context*.
- Reesink, G. P. 1993. Inner speech in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24. 217–225.
- Rumsey, A. 1990. Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92(2): 346–361.
- Salvesen, C. M. & G. Walkden. 2017. Diagnosing embedded V2 in Old English and Old French. In E. Mathieu & R. Truswell (eds), *Micro-change and Macro-change in Diachronic Syntax*, 168–181. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Saxena, A. 1988. On syntactic convergence: The case of the verb “say” in Tibeto-Burman. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 375–388.
- Spronck, S. 2015. *Reported speech in Ungarinyin: grammar and social cognition in a language of the Kimberley region, Western Australia*. The Australian National University.
- Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1): 119–159.
- Thompson, S. A. & A. Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 313–339. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vološinov, V. N. [1929] 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. [1934] 1987. *Thinking and speech*. In *The Collected Works of Lev Vygotsky, Vol. 1*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Wiemer, B. 2018. *Catching the Elusive: Lexical evidentiality markers in Slavic languages (A questionnaire study and its background)*. Berlin: Peter Lang.