

CUNYForum

No. 13

Editor

Robert W. Rieber

Editorial Assistant

Stephanie Smolinsky

1988

Ph.D. Program in Linguistics
The Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METAPHORICAL AND LITERAL INTERPRETATIONS: CROSS-CULTURAL
COMMUNICATION IN MEDICAL SETTINGS
Edward H. Bendix.....1
City University of New York
Graduate School & Hunter College

ANALYZING SYNCHRONIC LANGUAGE VARIATION
John D. Roy.....17
Brooklyn College

ELITE PROFESSIONAL BILINGUALISM AND THE PROCESS OF
LINGUISTIC DIFFUSION
Peter A. Slomanson.....61
Department of Linguistics
CUNY Graduate Center

SEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF REPORTED SPEECH: JAKOBSON, BAKHTIN
AND SOME CASES IN JAPANESE
Tsutomu Sakamoto.....90
Department of Linguistics
CUNY Graduate Center

NOTES ON COREFERENCE AND COMPLEMENTIZERS IN MBAY
John M. Keegan.....115
City University of New York

SEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF REPORTED SPEECH:
JAKOBSON, BAKHTIN, AND SOME CASES IN JAPANESE*

Tsutomu Sakamoto

Department of Linguistics
CUNY Graduate Center

0. Introduction

Reported speech is a form of expression in which two factors vary, i.e. reporting environment and reported matter. This type of speech is very interesting in that it can tell us how a language incorporates these two varying factors into one unified expression. First, we will examine Jakobson's (1957) viewpoint on reported speech. Then, we will survey Bakhtin's (1973, published under the name of Vološinov) approach to reported speech as compared with Jakobson's. Finally, we will consider some examples of reported speech in Japanese guided by these two works.

1. Typology of Reported Speech - Jakobson

Jakobson distinguishes "code" and "message", which concepts are analogous to those in information theory. Code is a common language system between the addresser (sender) and addressee (receiver). The message is the encoded information by an addresser, which is sent to an addressee to be decoded. The interaction between code and message produces four types of linguistic communication as follows:

- (i) M/M : message referring to message (Reported Speech)
- (ii) C/C : code referring to code (Proper Name)
- (iii) M/C : message referring to code (Autonomous)
- (iv) C/M : code referring to message (Shifter)

Here, reported speech is explained as a message unlike Proper Name (C/C) and Shifter (C/M), which are codes. Furthermore, it refers to a message unlike Autonomous, which refers to code. Reported speech, in this framework, is defined in relation to other forms of communication. This definition gives us a broader perspective than only the consideration of reported speech itself.

Jakobson mentions two characterizations of reported speech by others. According to Bakhtin, "reported speech is speech within speech, a message within a message and at the same time it is also speech about speech, a message about message." Bloomfield characterizes it as "relayed" or "displaced" speech. Jakobson's viewpoint is different from these two in that his definition focuses on the relation to other forms of communication.

According to Jakobson, reported speech cannot be defined by itself but has to be located in some relation to other forms of communication. That is, everything should be considered in relation to others. This fundamental thesis, inherited from Saussure, can be seen in various works by Jakobson. The most well-known case is his study of phonology. Jakobson and Halle

(1956) define a phoneme as a bundle of distinctive features, which are characterized by binary opposition. They claim that twelve pairs of opposition (e.g. "Vocalic/Non-vocalic", "Consonantal/Non-consonantal", "Compact/Diffuse", etc.) can describe all phonemes in every natural language. Of course, all the twelve pairs do not have to be used to define phonemes in a language, but some of them will be.

Here, let us consider how this principle of binary opposition is used by Jakobson in analyzing a poem. Jakobson and Jones (1970) analyze Shakespeare's Sonnet 129. First, they consider the constituents of this sonnet, i.e. rhymes, strophes, and lines, paying attention to spelling and punctuation. Then, the four strophes are scrutinized employing the principle of binary opposition, i.e. odd(I,III) vs. even(II,IV), outer(I, IV) vs. inner(II,III), anterior(I,II) vs. posterior(III,IV), couplet(IV) vs. quatrains(I,II,III), and center lines(7th and 8th line) vs. other lines.

Let us take one of these oppositions, e.g. odd vs. even. First, they say that the theme in the odd strophe is a confrontation of the different stages of "lust", and that in the even strophe is "metamorphosis" itself. The even strophes are compared with a motion picture of a straightforward development, and the odd ones are claimed to introduce a retrospective and generalizing approach.

The difference between the odd and even strophes is detected by the difference of the numbers of substantives and adjectives.

That is, the odd strophes have six substantives and one adjective, whereas the even strophes have seventeen substantives and ten adjectives. The distribution of these items is fairly biased; [6+1] vs. [17+10]. It is also noticed that all the six substantives are concrete nouns and all the seventeen substantives are abstract nouns. As for verbs, the even strophes are claimed to be dynamic, oriented toward verbs, whereas the odd ones exhibit a static, synthesizing tendency. Two animate nouns (taker, men) function as direct object in the even strophes. Conjunctions are copulative in the odd strophes and adversative in the even strophes. Only the even strophes display hypotaxis and end in multileveled "progressive" structures. The rhyming patterns between the first and the third strophes show a close similarity. The preposition in appears only in the odd strophes. Their analyses continue on and on to clarify the opposition between the odd and even strophes.

By employing the varied phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic information available from the text, they explore various interrelationships in the text. The same type of analysis can be seen throughout Jakobson's treatment of other poems, e.g. Jakobson and Levi-Strauss (1962), Jakobson (1970).

We have briefly examined Jakobson's relationalism, especially the principle of binary opposition. Now, let us go back to reported speech. Jakobson's discussion about reported speech is very brief. After giving the general framework, he quotes two characterizations of reported speech by Bakhtin and

Bloomfield. Then, he mentions that quoted and quasi-quoted speech are very common in our linguistic activity. Finally, he notices that some languages use "particular morphological devices to denote events known to the speaker only from the testimony of others."

Jakobson's main concern in his article (1957) is on how to classify verbal categories. There, the fourth type of linguistic communication, i.e. "code referring to a message (=Shifter)" plays an important role. Shifters are claimed to have both the characteristics of a symbol (conventional rule) and those of an index (existential relation). For example, the pronoun "I" is related to its object by conventional rule, otherwise we cannot explain why different codes require different sequences for this pronoun, e.g. Ich, je, ego, --- etc. This pronoun also stands in existential relation with its object, because "I" means the person uttering "I".

Jakobson introduces two basic distinctions in order to classify verbal categories as follows (p.133):

- 1) speech itself (s), and its topic, the narrated matter (n)
- 2) the event itself (E), and any of its participants (F), whether "performer" or "undergoer".

Categories characterizing only one narrated item (En or Fn) are called DESIGNATORS, and categories which characterize a narrated item with respect to another narrated item (EnEn or FnEn) are termed CONNECTORS. If these categories refer to the speech event

(---/Es) or its participants (---/Ps), they are called SHIFTERS, and if not, NON-SHIFTERS. Then, he presents the following table:

	F involved		F not involved	
	Designator	Connector	Designator	Connector
Non-shifter	Pn	PnEn	En	EnEn
Shifter	Pn/Ps	PnEn/Ps	En/Es	EnEns/Es

Although this table is proposed to characterize verbal categories, it has a direct relation to our concern, i.e. reported speech. Let us take a look at the definitions of some of these items. En/Es (Tense) characterizes the narrated event with reference to the speech event. The relation between these two events is defined by Tense. PnEn/Ps (Mood) characterizes the relation between the narrated event and its participants with reference to the participants of the speech event. This category tells us how the speaker of the reported speech describes the character (hero) in the narrated event.

Here again, each verbal category is defined in relation to other categories. These verbal categories are claimed to relate those items (Speech, Narration, Events, and Participants) in the linguistic activity. Namely, Jakobson is concerned with what causes the interrelationships between these items.

2. Dynamics of Reported Speech - Bakhtin

Saussure distinguished langue and parole, and claimed the importance of the former for the study of language. Since then, linguistics has been engaged in studying the abstract system of language. This trend of Structuralism is called "Abstract Objectivism" by Bakhtin.¹⁾ Arguing against this trend, Bakhtin emphasizes the importance of "the concrete forms of utterance" or "forms of concrete speech performance" in studying language. Therefore, he criticizes the "elementariness" of modern linguistic theory. The usual approach in linguistics starts from analyzing an element into smaller elements, and identifying the level of analysis, i.e. Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and so on. In order to prove the deficiency of this approach, Bakhtin suggests considering an utterance as consisting of a single word.

Following his suggestion, let us take "Fire!" as an example. The analytic procedure will tell us that this example consists of a sequence of four phonemes /faɪə/, which can further be divided into distinctive features, e.g. /f/ = Non-vocalic, Consonantal, Diffuse, Grave, --- etc. This sequence of sounds forms a free morpheme (c.f. Bloomfield) which functions as a noun or a verb in a syntactic construction. However, no matter how precisely we analyze a given linguistic element, we cannot grasp the whole meaning of an utterance. Does it mean "Look at the fire", "Evacuate into the safer place", or "Fight the fire"? Therefore, Bakhtin says, "that extra something that converts this

word into a whole remains outside the scope of the entire set of linguistic categories and definitions."

Thus, Bakhtin criticizes studying the anatomy of language and proposes to study language as a whole. This wholeness applies not only to an entire utterance but also to a single sentence. As a highly productive and "pivotal" example for such a case, reported speech is to be considered in his book. Here, reported speech is defined as "a language for the reporting of other person's utterances and for incorporating those utterances, as the utterances of others, into a bound, monologic context." Reported speech itself is, of course, not a form of dialogue but a monologue (cf. Bakhtin (1984) for a detailed analysis of dialogue). However, reported speech is one of the variants of a dialogue in the sense that a dialogue is presented as embedded in an authorial context.

Bakhtin argues that the fundamental error in previous studies is to have separated the reported speech from the reporting context. The point is that reported speech involves the "active relation of one message to another" or the "active reception of other speaker's speech". Namely, what we should study is the dynamic interrelationship between the following two factors: "the speech being reported (the other person's speech)" and "the speech doing the reporting (the author's speech)". According to Bakhtin, this dynamic interrelationship between reported and reporting discourse reflects "the social dynamism of social interrelationship in verbal ideological communication

between people." His concern with the sociological aspect of language is clear in the sub-title of his study of reported speech, i.e. "Study in the Application of the Sociological Method to Problems of Syntax." He claims that the style of reported speech changes according to the change in sociological ideology. The chronological sequence of ideology with the characteristics of reported speech in European society is summarized as follows (p.123):

1. Authoritarian dogmatism: characterized by the linear, impersonal, monumental style of reported speech transmission in the Middle Ages
2. Rationalistic dogmatism: with its even more pronounced linear style in the 17th and 18th centuries
3. Realistic and critical individualism: with its pictorial style and its tendency to permeate reported speech with authorial retort and commentary (end of 18th century and early 19th century)
4. Relativistic individualism: with its decomposition of the authorial context (the present period)

So far, we have seen Bakhtin's basic viewpoint concerning reported speech. That is, reported speech is characterized by the dynamic interrelationship between reporting and reported speech and reflects the sociological ideology of the given period. Now, let us examine various modifications of reported speech following Bakhtin. First, he distinguishes indirect and direct discourse and discusses three types of modification for indirect and six for direct discourse. In indirect discourse, the form of the reported speech is altered by the author and

incorporated into the reporting context. The referential content of the reported speech may remain unchanged, but the actual form spoken by the speaker is changed. The crucial point, thus, is that reported speech is analyzed from the author's point of view.

Bakhtin distinguishes two types of modification according to what is analyzed in indirect discourse. The "referent-analyzing" modification analytically transmits the referential content (what the speaker said) into the indirect discourse. Thus, the referential meaning of the reported speech is integrated into the entire discourse of reporting speech. This type of indirect discourse leads to depersonalization of the reported speech and dogmatism of reporting speech.

On the other hand, the "texture-analyzing" modification focuses on the speaker of the reported speech, on the manner of speech, on his state of mind as it appeared in the forms of speech not in the content. It retains the subjectivity of the reported speech, whose specificity is detectable. The expressions of reported speech incorporated into indirect discourse are "made strange" (the Formalist's term) in a direction that suits the author's needs and accommodates his attitudes - irony, humor, etc. Thus, this type of modification gives an image of the speaker's individuality and an authorial evaluation of that image.

The third type of modification of indirect discourse is called "impressionistic" modification, which is employed "for reporting the internal speech, thoughts, and experiences of a

character." In this type, a wide range of freedom in authorial modification is allowed. However, it does not totally depersonalize the speaker of the reported speech. Certain expressions originate from the mind of the speaker of the reported speech, but what comes through most is the author's irony, humor, etc. Thus, this type "lies somewhere midway between the referential-analyzing and the texture-analyzing modification."

Bakhtin restricts his discussion about direct discourse to "those modifications which display a mutual exchange of intonations, a sort of reciprocal infectiousness between the reporting context and the reported speech." Thus, the reported speech maintains its integrity and authenticity. We can see the dynamic interrelationship between authorial and reported context.

The first modification of direct discourse is termed "preset direct discourse", which emerges out of indirect discourse or quasi-direct discourse whose role is to preset the appreciation of the direct discourse; namely, "The basic themes of the impending direct discourse are anticipated by the context and are colored by the author's intonations." 2)

The second one is called "particularized direct discourse".

The traits which the author employed to particularize a character have an influence on the reported speech. The referential meaning of the reported speech is less significant than the characterization, picturesqueness, or the time-and-place of the reported speech. 3)

The third type is "anticipated and disseminated reported

speech", in which "two intonations, two points of view, two speech acts converge and clash." Bakhtin's example (p.136) shows that the author, through his narrator, makes his hero ironic and ridiculous. He claims that there are two intersecting contexts, two speech acts: the speech of the author-narrator (ironic and mocking) and the speech of the hero (who is far removed from irony).⁴⁾

The fourth modification is "quasi-direct discourse", which is "the most syntactically standardized case of an interferential merging of two differently oriented speech acts." Bakhtin devotes one chapter to the critical analysis of this type of direct discourse. There, he criticizes Bally's abstract objectification, because it does not pay attention to the living reality of language, and also argues against the Vosslerites' individualistic subjectivism, because it forgets that subjective designs and intentions do not exist outside their material objectification in language.⁵⁾

The fifth one is "rhetorical direct discourse". Bakhtin says that rhetorical questions or rhetorical exclamations seem to be located in-between authorial and reported speech, and slide into one or the other. They can be interpreted either as the author's question or exclamation or as the hero's.⁶⁾

The sixth and the last modification of direct discourse in Bakhtin's discussion is "substituted direct discourse", in which the author substitutes for his hero and says instead of the hero what he might or should have said. Thus, the author's intonation

and the hero's intonation go in the same direction, i.e. there is "parallelism of intonation". Because the author is in the same position as the hero, there is no interference but an overlap.⁷⁾

We can summarize Bakhtin's discussion about reported speech as follows:

(I) Indirect Discourse (Reported Speech is incorporated into authorial context)

- (i) referent-analyzing
- (ii) texture-analyzing
- (iii) impressionistic

(II) Direct Discourse (Reported Speech retains its form)

- (i) preset direct discourse
- (ii) particularized direct discourse
- (iii) anticipated and disseminated reported speech
- (iv) quasi-direct discourse
- (v) rhetorical direct discourse
- (vi) substituted direct discourse

Bakhtin does not intend to enumerate all the possible types of reported speech. Nor does he take into account other devices of linguistic communication. He focuses on the dynamic inter-relationship between reported and reporting discourses. In other words, the dialogical principle underlying Bakhtin's analysis leads him to concentrate on "how" those elements in reported speech are interrelated. On the other hand, Jakobson tries to

locate reported speech in a broader context of linguistic communication. Thus, the combinations of items involved in reported speech (cf. the table on p.6) are supposed to exhaust the possible patterns of reported speech. Jakobson's viewpoint as a structuralist makes him focus on "what" causes the interrelationship between elements in reported speech.

3. Reported Speech in Japanese

In this section, we will consider three issues concerning reported speech in Japanese. First, the role of two types of postverbal particles in Old and Middle Japanese is mentioned. Second, we will discuss the reason why the distinction between these two particles has been lost, and that compensatorily a personal pronoun-like system has developed in Modern Japanese. Finally, the relation between reported speech and honorific is discussed.

3.1. Two Postverbal Particles on Reported Speech

In Old and Middle Japanese, there are two different types of postverbal particle (or, auxiliary verb) to mark the past tense, i.e. "ki" and "keri".²⁾ When a speaker himself directly experienced some event and talked about the event, he had to use "ki". When a speaker did not experience the event but heard it from someone else, he should use "keri". Let us take examples from Tsurezuregusa (Reflections in Hours of Idleness) by Kenkoo Yoshida (1283? - 1352?) (COMP=Complimentizer):

(1) kono ki nakara-masika-ba to oboesi-ka
 this tree not-exist-if COMP think-PAST

((I) thought that if this tree does not exist, it would be better)

(2) Ninna-zi ni aru hoosi --- kati yori maude-keri
 Ninna-temple at exist monk foot with visit-PAST

(A monk in Ninna-temple --- visited on foot)

In (1), ka is a conjugated form of ki. Japanese postverbal particles conjugate according to aspect. This particle indicates that the person who thought is the speaker himself, even if the pronoun "I" does not appear in this sentence. Namely, the speech event is the speaker's direct experience. On the other hand, keri in (2) shows that the speaker did not experience the event but heard it from someone else. This is what Jakobson calls a "quotative postfix", which indicates that the speech event is known to the speaker only from others. Now, let us take an example that includes both "ki" and "keri" from the same book (EMPH=Emphasis, TOP=Topic Marker):

(3) " --- yukasikari-sika-do, kami e mairu koso hoi
 want to see-PAST-though God to worship EMPH aim

nare to omoi te yama made wa mi-zu"
 is COMP think because mountain also TOP see-not

to zo ii-keru.
 COMP EMPH say-PAST

((He) said that "--- Although (I) wanted to see (the mountain), (I) did not see it, because the very aim is to worship God.)

The postverbal particle sika (<ki) indicates that the speaker of the reported speech is the person who wanted to see the mountain, whereas keru (<keri) tells us that the author reports this event as a second-hand information. That is, the author is not involved in the narrated event nor the speech event. This is exactly what Jakobson calls "Evidential (EnEns/Es)", in which "the speaker reports an event on the basis of someone else's report (quotative, i.e. hearsay evidence)".

Although there is no personal pronoun which indicates who the speaker is, we can clearly detect how the author is reporting the speech event, and who is the speaker of the speech event, owing to the distinction of these two postverbal particles.

3.2. Reported Speech and Personal Pronoun System

The distinction between "ki" and "keri" has been lost in Modern Japanese (in the last one hundred years or so) and merged into the single form "ta". Japanese no longer has the device to indicate whether the author is involved in the speech event or not. Although we are not interested in the exact history of this change, we are concerned with why this change has happened. Why has the author's involvement in the speech event become unexpressed in Japanese? Although Jakobson is helpful to locate "keri" in a broader perspective of linguistic communication, his structuralistic viewpoint cannot answer this question. Let us consult Bakhtin.

According to Bakhtin, there should be some sociological and

ideological change that triggered this linguistic change. That socio-ideological change must be associated with the influence of European civilization including languages. Japanese modernization began about one hundred years ago by opening the country to other countries. Until then, Japan had closed the door to foreigners for almost four hundred years, and had not experienced any Industrial Revolution. The country had been governed by absolute Feudalism. In order to promote modernization, the most important task was to translate European (Western) texts into Japanese. Japan had to make contact with European countries through language, because the geographic location of this country prohibited the direct contact. Consequently, Japanese has been deeply influenced by European languages. During this period, the Japanese language experienced drastic change never experienced since Chinese influence on it.

The influence of European languages and ideology as embodied in these languages deprived Japanese of the device to express an author's involvement in reported speech, because these languages do not have such a grammaticalized device.

Compensatorily, Japanese developed a personal pronoun system analogous (but not the same as) to those in the European languages.⁹⁾ As can be seen in the previous examples, personal pronouns very rarely used in Old and Middle Japanese. When context can help to identify who the speaker is, personal pronouns are likely to be unexpressed still in Modern Japanese as in the following example:

(4) "Daizyobuno yooda. Moo nete kure" to,
all right seem now sleep please COMP

tuma ni it-ta.
wife to say-PAST

((I) said to (my) wife, "It seems all right.
Go to bed, please)

- Morio Kita. (1979)
Makkurakenoke (The Darkness).

It is unclear who (author or narrator) said this speech event. If "ki" is used instead of "ta", we can see that the narrator reports this event, on the other hand, if "keri" is used the reporter must be the author. In this case, the preceding context indicates that the story is based on a conversation between a wife and her husband, and that the narrator and the author is the same person (i.e. the husband). If a context is not available to indicate who the speaker is, a personal pronoun has to be used as follows (HON=Honorific):

(5) "Okaasan-wa --- sakki sini-masi-ta" kare-wa --- it-ta
mother-TOP just now die-HON-PAST he-TOP say-PAST

(He --- said, "(Your) mother --- died just now")

- Shusaku Endo. (1975)
Hahanarumono (Motherhood).

Here, the personal pronoun kare indicates that the narrator is different from the author. If this pronoun is omitted, the speaker of this speech event can be either the narrator or the author, i.e. we cannot tell who reported this speech event.

As will be noticed in the example (4) and (5), the complimentizer to can be optionally used in direct speech. Therefore, it is impossible to discriminate indirect from direct speech simply by detecting the presence of the complimentizer. Furthermore, Japanese does not show Agreement in Tense and Person between reporting verbs and verbs in reported speech.

We argued that a personal pronoun system has been developed to compensate the loss of distinction between the two postverbal particles mentioned earlier. However, this pronoun system has peculiar characteristics compared to that of European languages. This system is complicated in that it has a lot of phonological and lexical variants.¹⁰⁾ In spite of this complicatedness, it does not have dual, plural, and gender distinctions.¹¹⁾ Pronouns are mostly supposed to be deictic, and anaphoric usage of them is very rare.¹²⁾ This deictic usage inevitably includes social deictic character as well as personal one. That is, the choice of a specific personal pronoun necessarily accompanies with a specific social status.

The underdevelopment of Japanese personal pronoun system compared to European languages will be well explained if we take honorific system into consideration. In other words, due to rich honorific system, Japanese did not have to develop its personal pronoun system fully. Let us consider some examples of honorifics concerning reported speech in the next section.

3.3. Reported Speech and Honorific

Although the pronoun system is not so well developed from a viewpoint of European languages, Japanese has a well developed system of honorific as a special device to express certain attitude (authorial or not) in reported speech.¹³⁾ Let us take some examples (NOM=Nominative):

(6) "O-bugyoo-sama ni o-negai-ga atte
HON-magistrate-Sir to HON-entreaty-NOM have

mairi-masi-ta." to Ichi-ga --- it-ta.
come-HON-PAST COMP Ichi-NOM --- say-FAST

(Ichi said that, "(I) came here to ask the magistrate for an entreaty")

- Ogai Mori, (1915) Saigo No Ikku (The Last Word).

(7) Sensei-wa --- "Iwanami-kun, kaeroo yo." to
Professor-NOM Iwanami-Mr. go back let's COMP

iwa-re-ta.
say-HON-PAST

(The Professor said that, "Mr. Iwanami, let us go back")

- Yoichi Kono, (1971) Nishida Sensei No Henei (A Portrait of Professor Nishida)

In (6), o is an honorific prefix, mairi is a special honorific verb, and masi is an honorific postverbal particle. These honorifics are addressed to bugyoo (magistrate) by Ichi (a name of a girl), whereas the author does not use any honorific to Ichi. There are honorifics in the narrated event and no honorific in the speech event. On the other hand, in (7) the

honorific postverbal particle re is used toward the speaker of the speech event, i.e. Sensei (Professor) by the author. There is no honorific in the narrated event and an honorific in the speech event. The author honors the speaker of the speech event, but the speaker does not honor the participant in the narrated event.

Honorific is used to honor a person in a narrated or speech event, and the direction of honoring is determined by a socio-economic status of the participants. Thus, honorific reflects the attitude of the participant of the speech event toward the participant of the narrated event in relation to the narrated event. According to Jakobson, this is the characteristics of MOOD (PnEn/Ps). However, it has also the characteristics of the "particularized direct discourse" in Bakhtin's sense, because how the author characterizes the participants in these events is an important factor of honorifics. Furthermore, we must take into account various non-linguistic variables such as age, sex, occupation, etc. which are relevant to the direction of honoring. The system of honorific is so important in understanding Japanese, we will need specific consideration how this system interacts with reported speech.

4. Summary

We have examined Jakobson's approach to reported speech, and found that his analysis gives us a broader perspective to locate reported speech in relation to other devices of linguistic communication. The possible combinations of items in reported speech tells us that what makes these combination possible. Bakhtin's discussion concerning reported speech focuses on the dynamic interrelationship between two discourses; reporting and reported. His detailed analysis of various modifications of reported speech tells us how these discourses interact.

When we examined the reported speech in Old and Middle Japanese, Jakobson's analysis made it possible to locate the issue in a proper perspective. That is, the postverbal particle "keri" has the characteristics of a quotative postfix characterizing "Evidential (EnEns/Es)". Bakhtin's theory helped us to account for the change from Old and Middle to Modern Japanese in the forms of reported speech. We discussed that the change of forms in reported speech reflects the change of socio-ideological change caused by modernization of Japan. Furthermore, we discussed that Japanese has developed a personal pronoun system analogous (but not the same) to that of European languages to compensate the loss of distinction of author's involvement between two postverbal particles in Old and Middle Japanese. Finally, we mentioned the honorific system of Japanese related to the issue of reported speech.

FOOTNOTES

* I would like to thank Professor Samuel R. Levin and Professor John Dore for their valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper. My gracious thanks to Michael Huntington for his helpful suggestions. Of course, I am solely responsible for everything expressed in this paper.

1) The counter trend to this trend is termed "Individualistic Subjectivism", for which Vossler is one of the main proponents. Todorov (1984) claims that Bakhtin's basic idea is to critically synthesize these two trends and present a new principle, i.e. the "Dialogical Principle", although this claim may not be really accurate.

2) As an example of this type, Bakhtin gives us the fifth chapter of Part II of Dostevskij's Idiot. That is, "Prince Myskin's directly reported speech resounds within his self-enclosed world, since the author narrates within the confines of his, Prince Myskin's, purview." (p.134).

3) Bakhtin says that this kind of modification can be seen in Gogol's and writers of so-called "naturalschool", and Dostevskij's Poor Folk.

4) Look at the example from Dostevskij's Skvernyj Anekdot (A Nasty Story) given by Bakhtin on page 135-137. Citing some passage, Bakhtin says, "By each of these banal epithets, the author, through his narrator, makes his hero ironic and ridiculous."

5) The detailed discussion on quasi-direct discourse is found on Page 141-159.

6) As an example of such a discourse, Bakhtin gives us Puskin's The Captive of the Caucasus. (p.138).

7) Bakhtin cites a passage from the same Puskin's book. (p.139).

8) Roughly speaking, Old Japanese spans from A.D. 700 to 1200, and Middle Japanese from 1200 to 1870.

9) The so-called Japanese pronoun system may be written as follows:

	singular	plural
1st	wata(ku)si	wata(ku)si-tati, domo, ra
2nd	anata	anata-tati, ra
3rd male	kare	kare-ra
3rd female	kanozyo	kanozyo-tati, ra

10) Let us take first person singular pronouns. As lexical variants, there are the following words: watakusi, boku, ore, temae, syoosei, --- etc. Among them, watakusi is the most widely used and has a lot of phonological variants as follows:

- (1) w a t a k u s i
- (2) a t a k u s i
- (3) w a t a s i
- (4) a t a s i
- (5) w a t a i
- (6) a t a i
- (7) w a s i
- (8) w a t e
- (9) a t e
- (10) w a i

Historically, this pronoun means "personal" compared to "public".

11) Plural forms of personal pronouns are constructed simply by adding one of some suffixes (tati, ra, or domo) as can be seen in the footnote 9).

Although there seems to exist gender distinction in 3rd person, this distinction is not a real one. Historically speaking, the 3rd person male pronoun kare (< ka (that) + re (thing)) has been used to indicate unclear thing, object, place, time, or person that is not included in the domain of the speaker. The 3rd person female pronoun kanozyo was coined about one hundred years ago to translate 3rd person female pronoun in European languages (e.g. she, elle, sie, etc.). This pronoun can be analyzed as ka (that) + no (particle) + zyo (woman). Very often, these pronouns are used as nouns meaning "boy friend" and "girl friend" respectively.

12) For example, second person pronouns (konata, sonata, and anata) have been formed space deictic plus honorific prefix and noun. That is, ko, so, a (<ka) plus no (particle) plus on (honorific) plus kata (direction, time, person). Once in the history of Japanese, konata was used as a polite second person form, this usage is now extinct. The form sonata serves as archaic usage. The space deictic a (<ka) indicates distance from both speaker and hearer. Then, the second person form anata (<ka-nata <ka-no-on-kata) was originally used to mention a third person and was used for second person as a polite form like a polite second person pronoun in German (Sie) or Spanish (Usted).

13) Traditionally, an honorific system is considered to be divided into three subcategories; (i) sonkei (respect) : to put an addressee in a higher rank than an addresser (ii) kenzyoo (condescending) : to put an addresser in a lower rank than an addressee (iii) teinei (polite) : to express politeness. See Harada (1976) for another classification of honorifics.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. (Voloshinov, V.N.) (1973). Marxism and The Philosophy of Language. New York: Seminar Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). Language. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Harada, S.I. (1976). "Honorifics," in Syntax and Semantics vol.5, Japanese Generative Grammar. ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani: 499-561.
- Jakobson, R. (1957). "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb," in: Selected Writings II, 130-147.
- Jakobson, R. (1970). "On the verbal art of William Blake and other poet-painters," Linguistic Inquiry 1, 3-23.
- Jakobson, R. and Halle, M. (1956). Fundamentals of Language. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jakobson, M. and Levi-Strauss (1962). "<<Les chats>> de Charles Baudelaire," L'Homme II.
- Jakobson, M. and Jones, L.G. (1970). Shakespeare's Verbal Art In The Expece of Spirit. The Hague: Mouton.
- Saussure, F. de (1974). Course in General Linguistics. Translated from the French 1916 by Wade Baskin. London: Peter Owen.
- Todorov, T. (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle. Minneapolis: Univ. Minnesota Press.