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Abstract

This thesis project investigates the syntactic and semantic nature of the phenomenon of Role Shift (RS) in French Sign Language (LSF). The aim is to find the nature of this phenomenon in order to compare the shifting of context reference in Sign Language (SLs) to direct or indirect discourse in spoken languages and to make a comparative analysis with other SLs.

Starting from the literature on spoken languages, this project aims at studying the properties of RS related to indexicality and the shifting of first and second person pronouns. Moreover, the use of adverbs like “alternatively”, which marks the end of a sentence, can make us understand if RS entails a mono or a bi-clause structure. Looking at the data, we can also consider the possibility to consider RS as an instance of Free Indirect Discourse (FID) starting from the point that RS has an ambiguous nature concerning direct and indirect discourse.

This thesis has a scientific approach which requires the collection of data from deaf LSF informants. All the data will be analyzed with ELAN program. We argue that RS can be considered as both direct and indirect discourse, even if more research is necessary.
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Introduction

This thesis aims to present the syntactic and semantic nature of the phenomenon of Role Shift (RS) in French Sign Language (LSF). The objective is to find the nature of this phenomenon in order to compare it to direct or indirect discourse in spoken languages and to make a comparative analysis with other sign languages. Starting from the literature on spoken languages, this study wants to show the properties of RS related to indexicality and the shifting of first and second person pronouns.

First, we are going to present the characteristics of the phenomenon of shifting in spoken languages considering the works of Anand and Nevis (2004) and Schlenker (2004, 2010). We will focus on the shifting of first and second person singular pronouns in languages such as Amharic, Zazaki and Slave. Moreover, we will describe the properties of the shifting of spacial and temporal indexicals, too. Before turning to Sign Languages (SLs), we are going to look at one of the main restrictions linked to shifting: the “shift together constraint” proposed by Anand and Nevis (2004). All the aspects seen for spoken languages will be analyzed in SLs as well, in particular the main point of debate on this subject which is the nature of shifting as direct or indirect quotation. The difficulty in solving the problem consists in the fact that in these languages there is no complementizer such as “that” to show the presence of subordination. From the beginning, we are going to clarify that the test used for spoken languages are not good for SLs and for this reason we are going to use different ones.

After the part dedicated to spoken languages, we are going to turn to the second chapter where we are going to talk about SLs. We are going to give a general presentation of the phenomenon of RS, which corresponds to the shifting in spoken languages, describing its relation with indexicals. First, we are going to focus on indexical pronouns and then we will look at the indexicals of space and
time, giving particular attention to “here” in Catalan Sign Language (LSC). Then, we will present the “constructed actions” in order to clarify the different ways to refer to RS in literature and also because, in the section after, we are going to show the differences between them and RS. After this general description of the phenomenon, we are going to present the main aspect of this study which concerns the nature of RS as direct or indirect discourse. In fact, it is sure that RS has instances of direct quotation, also in LSF, but data seems to show the ambiguity between the two realizations. Moreover, we will consider also the option proposed by Quer (2012) and Hübl & Steinbach (2012) where RS can be considered as Free Indirect Discourse (FID).

In the third section, we will present the work done on LSF with two deaf informants. After having presented the methodology used, we will show the main properties of shifting found during the fieldwork. We will give a general description of the shifting of pronouns of 1st and 2nd person and of the constructed actions. After that we will focus on the explanation and the presentation of the two syntactic tests used. The first will prove that RS in LSF has not only a direct quotation nature but it also has a nature of indirect discourse. The second test will present the syntactic proof that RS and constructed action differ. The two tests are based on the use of adverbs. In particular, the first one shows dependencies between the main verb and RS, proving that RS can be a subordinate. Moreover, we will also present other data that confirms the double nature of RS.

Finally, in the analysis of the data, we will present syntactic structures that clarify the status of subordination of RS.
1. Shifting in spoken languages

One of the main topics at the interface between syntax and semantics of the last ten years in spoken languages is the shifting of indexicals. Indexicals are context-dependent expressions such as *I*, *you*, *here* and *now*. Their semantic value can be determined only by the context of utterance and cannot be affected by any operator. This is “the fixity thesis” proposed by Schlenker (2003), reported in (1).

(1) *Fixity Thesis*

The semantic value of an indexical is fixed solely by the context of the actual speech act, and cannot be affected by any logical operators.

(Schlenker, 2003)

The first contribution to the shifting of indexicals has been given by Kaplan (1977/1989, 1978). Considering a sentence like “I am here now”, it has to be *a priori* true and must necessarily refers to the context of utterance. In his theory, Kaplan conceives of as impossible the existence of indexicals that could refer to a context different from that of the speaker's. He calls these elements “monsters”. In fact, for example, if a person named John says “I”, the pronoun would refer to him and not to someone else. Nevertheless, Schlenker (2003) argues that there are some languages where the indexicals are interpreted in regards to the context of a *reported* speech act introduced by an attitude verb.

The shifting of indexicals concerns the time and the space as well. First, in this presentation, we are going to look at first and second person pronouns. Then, looking also at the “shifting together constraint” proposed by Anand and Nevins (2004), we are going to look at the indexicals of time and space, too.
1.1 Indexicality and shifting of 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronouns

In this section we are going to present the properties of the shifting of the indexical pronouns.

As we hinted before, indexical pronouns can refer to a context different from that of the actual utterance. As we can see in the example in (2), in Amharic, the first person singular pronoun used in the subordinate does not refer to the speaker but to the subject of the utterance verb.

(2) Situation: John says: ‘I am a hero’

\begin{align*}
\text{jon jəgna na-ññ} & \quad \text{yil-all} \\
\text{John hero be.PF-1sO} & \quad \text{3M.say-AUX.3M} \\
\text{‘John says that he i is a hero.’} & \\
\text{(Lit.: ‘John says that I am a hero.’)} & \\
\end{align*}

[Amharic] (Schlenker 2003)

We find the same phenomenon in other languages such as Zazaki and Slave (Anand & Nevins, 2004). In these languages have been also studied the properties of the second person singular pronoun, as they relate to verbs of utterance and attitude. We can see an example for each language in (3) and (4).

(3)  a. \begin{align*}
\text{Hesen i (mi-ra) va ez/ʃ k de/ʃ letia} \\
\text{Hesen.OBL (I.OBL-to) said that I rich.be-PRES} \\
\text{“Hesen said that \{I am, Hesen is\} rich.”}
\end{align*}

b. \begin{align*}
\text{Hesen i (Ali x-ra) va ke ti/ʃ k de/ʃ letia} \\
\text{Hesen.OBL (Ali.OBL-to) said that you rich.be-PRES} \\
\text{“Hesen said that \{Ali is, you are\} rich.”}
\end{align*}

[Zazaki](Anand&Nevins, 2004)
(4)  a.  [segha ràwòd’i] sèdidi yilé
[1.sg-for 2.sg-will-buy] 2.sg-tell- 1.sg PAST
“You sg. told me to buy it for you.”

b.  a. sù [leshuyie k'eguhw’e] yerinewe
Q [spoon l.sg-will-lick] 2.sg-want
Do you [ADDR (c*)] want to lick the spoon?


Semantically, to explain the shifting of reference, it has adopted a language with overt quantification over individuals, worlds, times, and contexts. Moreover, attitude predicates like “say” are quantifiers over contexts which can bind free context variables in their scope. Concerning the indexical pronouns in particular, each indexical for each language has been provided with a denotation. In (5) we can see the denotation for the first person singular pronoun in English and Amharic. We can see that “I” in English depends on the context of utterance (c*), instead of in Amharic where it is evaluated in order to a context variable (K). The same denotation of “I” in (5b) is also good for the Zazaki and Slave.

(5)  **Indexical denotations for Schlenker (2003)**

a. English ’1’: \[I] = AUTH (c*), c* the context of utterance.

b. Amharic ’1’: \[I] = AUTH(K), K a context variable.

Afterwards, in order to explain what provokes the shifting of context in these languages, specific context-shift operators were used which mark, for every language, the specificity of the shifting. They overwrite the context parameter of the interpretation function with the intensional index parameter. In (6) we can see the denotation of the context-shift operators in Zazaki and Slave.
Furthermore, as we said before, for Zazaki and Slave, it also tested the verb “tell” and “want”, not only “say”. Moreover, Anand and Nevins (2004) found that the shifting of indexical pronouns could be optional. In (7) we can see, for the two languages, Amharic and English the denotation of each operator in relation with the specific verb, in (7a) for Zazaki, in (7b) for Slave and respectively in (7c,d) for Amharic and English.

(7)  

a. **VERB LEXICAL ENTRIES CLASS DESCRIPTION [Zazaki]**  
    SAY [say (OP)] optionally shifts all person indexicals  

b. **VERB LEXICAL ENTRIES CLASS DESCRIPTION [Slave]**  
    TELL [tell (OP)] optionally shifts all person indexicals  
    WANT [want (Op auth)] optionally shifts 1st person indexicals  
    SAY [say (Op auth)] obligatorily shifts 1st person indexicals  

c. **VERB LEXICAL ENTRIES CLASS DESCRIPTION [Amharic]**  
    SAY [say (OP)] optionally shifts all person indexicals  

d. **VERB LEXICAL ENTRIES CLASS DESCRIPTION [English]**  
    ALL [att-verb] no indexical shift  

Looking at the schema in (7), we can see that for the verb “say”, the context-shift operator legitimates an optional shifting of both first and second person singular pronouns in Zazaki and Amharic. In Slave, instead, we have the obligatory shifting only of the first person singular pronoun. Moreover, in Slave, where they tested the verbs “tell” and “want” as well, the operator optionally shifts
respectively both pronouns with “tell” and just the first person singular one with “want”. In the case of English, no operator legitimates the indexical shifting.

Heretofore, we saw the general description of the shifting of indexical pronouns in spoken languages. As stated previously, this phenomenon concerns the indexicals of time and space as well.

In the next example in (8), we can see the shifting of “here” and “yesterday” in Zazaki (Anand&Nevins, 2004). In (8a) we can see the use of the second person plural pronoun which involve the speaker and the other participant, Hesen. The presence of “here” is authorized by the fact that it is evaluated in relation with the speaker, such as the place where both the speaker and the other participant are. In (8b), instead, we see that the speaker reports something said in the past by someone other than him. The indexical of time “yesterday” cannot be used in the subordinate because it can only be related to the speaker and evaluated starting from the actual moment of utterance. In other words, it is not possible to report something happened in the past using “yesterday” to refer to a moment that precedes the fact related because it can only refer to a moment that is before the moment of utterance of the speaker.

(8)  

a. Waxto kc ma D.-de bime, H. mi-ra va kε o ita ame dina  
   When that we D.-at were, H.obl me-at said that he here came world  
   “When we were in Diyarbekir, Hesen told me he was born {here, in D.}.”

b. Hefte nayeraravere, H. mi-ra va kε o vizeri Rojda paci kerd.  
   Week ago, H.obl me-at said that he yesterday Rojda kiss did.  
   “A week ago, H. told me that he kissed Rojda {8 days ago, #yesterday}.”
These two last examples showed the indexical nature of spacial element such as “here” and “yesterday” but it is the same also for “today”, “now” and there”.

Let's turn now to the presentation of the “shift together constraint” which shows the central empirical generalization for languages that allow indexical shift in embedded contexts.

1.1 “Shifting together constraint”

In the previous section, we presented some examples of shifting of indexicals and looking at (4), reporting here in (9), we can see that under the shifting we can find more than one indexical, in this case the two indexical pronouns.

(9)  
  a.  [segha r̂awòd'í] sédidi yîlê  
      [l.sg-for 2.sg-will-buy] 2.sg-tell- l.sg PAST  
      “You sg. told me to buy it for you.”  

  b.  a. sù [leshuyie k'eguhw'e] yerinewe  
      Q [spoon l.sg-will-lick] 2.sg-want  
      Do you [ADDR (c*)] want to lick the spoon?  


This aspect concerns the fact that in Slave and also in Zazaki, indexicals show shifting under certain modal verbs, but cannot shift independently. The name of this restriction is “Shift together constraint” (10) proposed by Anand and Nevins (2004).
(10) **SHIFT-TOGETHER CONSTRAINT** (from Anand and Nevins, 2004).

All indexicals within a speech-context domain must pick up reference from the same context.

a. \( C_A \ldots \text{modal} C_B \ldots [i_{[A,B]} \ldots i_{[A,B]}] \)

b. \( *C_A \ldots \text{modal} C_B \ldots [i_{[A,B]} \ldots i_{[B,A]}] \)

This approach based on the “shift together constraint”, also permits to predict the *multiple embedding* which concerns the use of shifted indexicals. In fact, as we can see in the example in (11) that follows, the first person pronoun in the second embedded sentence introduced by “said” cannot refer to the speaker and neither to the referent of the indexical used in the first embedded sentence where the context is shifted.

The situation presents Andrew who said that Ali said to him that another boy said to a girl that the boy is the brother of Rojda. In the sentence that reports all that, the first-person pronoun refers to the addressee of the first utterance verb. Instead, the second cannot refer anymore to Andrew, the referent of the pronoun of the first shifted context.

(11) *(Andrew): Ali_A mi_{A-ra} va ke hesen_{H-ra} fatima-ra va ez_{H,A,U} braye rojda-o Ali me-to said that Hesen Fatima-to said I brother Rojda-GEN

“Ali said to Andrew that Hesen said to Fatima that {Hesen, Ali, * Andrew} is Rojda's brother.”

As we can see form this example taken from Anand and Nevins (2004), indexical reference to the utterance context depends on whether higher indexicals shift.

Moreover, before looking at the phenomenon of shifting in SLs, too, we are going to present one of the main aspects which still is a subject of debate. It is not clear if these kinds of structures which present shifting are instances of direct discourse or not. Some tests made on Zazaki show that the grammatical dependencies between the matrix and embedded clauses implies that we can talk about indirect
discourse. The problem comes from the fact that in these kinds of languages presenting shifting, there is no complementizer corresponding to “that” in English that can prove the presence of subordination. The solution to determine the nature of the structure as indirect discourse consists in the creation of dependencies. The two main elements that can permit that are: the legitimation of the Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) and the \textit{wh}- extraction.

Starting from the legitimation of the NPIs, the characteristic of this kind of elements consists in the fact that they need to be in a relation of c-command with a negation element to be legitimated. The examples in English in (12) clearly show this property.

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad a. \quad \ast \text{Jhon bought anything} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{Jhon did not buy anything}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

This characteristic can be used to create dependency, in our case looking at direct and indirect discourse. The possibility of having dependencies shows the necessity of the use of indirect discourse because direct speech implies a bi-clause structure. In (13), we can see how the NPI is not legitimated in the case of direct discourse (13a) because the negation does not c-command it.

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad a. \quad \ast \text{Mary didn't say: “I love anyone”} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{Mary didn't say that she loves anyone.}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

To test the presence of a mono or bi-clause structure, this test can be used with indexical shifting as well.

In Zazaki, dependency has been tested looking at the NPIs which within a shifted context can be licensed by a matrix licenser, but not if they are cases of direct quotation. Looking at “any” (“kes”) in (14b), we can see that it can be used only in an embedded clause with shifted indexicals by a matrix negation.
The last examples (14) prove the indirect quotation nature of sentences which present indexical shifting.

The second test to show embedding is the wh- extraction. Starting from English, in (15) we can see that it is impossible to extract the wh-element from a question which is expressed in direct discourse. The lack for a mono-clause structure implies the impossibility of having dependencies, as we can see in the follow examples.

   b. Where did John say that he was e?

The same happens with A’ extraction with relatives. We have an example in (16).

(16) a. *The boy that Mary said,"I saw t” is nice.
   b. The boy that Mary said that she saw t is nice.

Considering now the indexical shifting, we can see in (17) that this test shows dependency in Zazaki. It is possible to make an extraction from the complement of the verb “vano” (“say”) that shows the presence of dependency and so the absence of direct quotation.
(17)  ceneke [kɛ HesVni va mi t paci kɛɾda] rindmi kes paci kɛrdka
   girl that Hasen said I t kiss did pretty.be-PRES
   “The girl that Hesen said {Hesen, I} kissed is pretty.”

In the next chapters we are going to see that we can find the same kind of
phenomenon in SLs, too. In particular, we are going to try to understand the
nature of the shifting in SLs as direct or interect discourse presenting other tests
than the ones used for Zazaki because they cannot be used for SLs.
2. Shifting in Sign Languages: Role Shift

In this chapter we are going to present the phenomenon of RS in LS as it relates to context shift and indexical shifting. In particular, we are going to look at the data from ASL and LSC. We see in SLs what we found also in the oral languages, namely the shifting of context reference as seen in one of the more productive structures in SLs. First we will give a general description of RS focusing on pronominal indexicals. Then, we will present the indexicals of time and space, especially in LSC. Finally, after having a look at the constructed actions presented in literature, we are going to present the dichotomy between the nature of RS as direct or indirect discourse.

2.1 Describing RS

The phenomenon of Role shift is one of the more productive structures used in SLs. It is a particular morphosyntactic device that allows signers to take the role of a person being discussed. RS is possible not only embedded within verbs of saying but also with other predicates that take sentential complements. However, the use of a verb to introduce it is optional. Moreover, Quer (2005) also shows more precisely that “RS constitutes a much more genuine mechanism of reporting someone else's utterance or thought than regular indirect discourse”.

From a non-manual point of view, RS is characterized by several NMM:

- SLsight body shift towards the locus in signing space where the author of the reported utterance has been previously located (18a);
- break in eye gaze contact with the actual addressee; the eye gaze is directed to the interlocutor of the shifted context (18b);
- change in head position (18c);
- facial expression associated with the author of the reported utterance (18d).
Furthermore, semantically, the shifting of reference of the participants implies that the there is a shifting of the reading of all the elements linked to the speaker, the indexicals. All the indexicals, are affected by the shift of the context. In particular, under RS the first person singular pronoun does not refer to the speaker but to the referent introduced before the RS. As in the spoken languages we saw in the previous section, the shifting of the reading of pronouns also concerns the second person singular one. Looking at the NMM characteristic of RS, in the next examples we can see IX-1 which refer to the speaker (19a) and to the shifted referent (19b).
Moreover, in (20a) we can see an example of RS, involving the first person singular pronoun, from American Sign Language (ASL) taken from Lee et al. (1997). In (20b), we can also see agreement with the second person singular pronoun.

(20)  a. \( \text{JOHN, SAY IX-1, WANT GO} \)  
     “John said: 'I want to go.'” / “John said that he wanted to go.”

   b. \( \text{YESTERDAY ANNA, IX-3, 3a-TELL-1 IX-1, 1-HELP-2} \)  
     “Yesterday Anna told me that she would help me.”

In the last examples there is a case of RS introduced by an utterance verb where we can see the shifting of reference of the first person singular pronoun from the speaker to John (20a) and to Anne (20b). In fact, the referent of the pronouns under RS is introduced before by the speaker.

Let's turn now to look at the syntactic representation of this phenomenon in
literature. We will see: the POV predicate of Lillo-Martin (1995), the PVOp of Quer (2005) and the semantic approach of Zucchi (2004). For the last two perspectives, we will also refer to the semantic studies on the context shift made by Schlenker (2010).

One of the first proposals for a syntactic structure to represent RS is that of Lillo-Martin's (1995). Looking at logophoric pronouns in the African languages Ewe and Gokana, she proposes the existence of a sort of complementizer called POV which introduces the RS. In particular, she compares the shifting of reference in ASL to the aspect of logophoricity in West African languages. We have a logophoric pronoun when a specific pronoun is used in an embedded clause for coreference with a matrix subject or object of a certain verb, especially a verb of saying. We can see examples in Ewe (21) and Gokana (22) took form Lillo-Martin (1995).

(21)  
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. Kofi be e-dzo} \\
&\text{Kofi say pro-leave} \\
&\text{“Kofi, sais that he, left.”} \\
&\text{b. Kofi be yè-dzo} \\
&\text{Kofi say log-leave} \\
&\text{“Kofi, said that he, left.”}
\end{align*}

(Ewe- from Clements, 1975)

(22)  
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. aè kɔ aè ḃọ} \\
&\text{pro said pro fell} \\
&\text{“He, said he, fell.”} \\
&\text{b. aè kɔ aè ṭọg} \\
&\text{pro said pro fell-log} \\
&\text{“He, said he, fell.”}
\end{align*}

(Gokana- from Hyman and Comrie, 1981)

In (21) and (22) we see an example of logophoric pronoun in Ewe and logophoric
suffix in Gokana. Moreover, the verbs that authorize the use of logophoric pronouns typically indicate a reportative context; in other words, as says Lillo-Martin, “they indicate that the following context will convey the point of view held by someone other than the speaker”. In particular, the element that permits the presence of a logophoric element is a sort of complementizer, “be”, as we see in (23).

(23) a. Kofi se Koku wò-nɔ e dzu-m
   Kofi hear Koku pro-be pro insult-Asp
   “Kofi, heard Koku insulting him.”

   b. Ama se be yè-xɔ nunana
   Ama hear that Log-receive gift
   “Ama, heard that she had received a gift.”
   (From Clements, 1975)

Looking at ASL, Lillo-Martin thinks that the first person singular pronoun is a logophoric pronoun and she proposes that, as in the West African language, the element that authorizes IX-1 in ASL is the Point of View Predicate (POV). Any pronouns in the complement of POV are considered logophoric pronouns. The syntactic structure proposed (24b) for the sentence in (24a) presents the POV in the head of the VP and the proposition affected by shifted reference is in CP, as complement of the verb.

(24) a. MOM POV IX-1 BUSY
    Mom (from mom's point of view), I'm busy.
    “Mom's like, I'm busy.”

1 As we will see in the section 3.3, this structure called by Lillo-Martin “be+like” will be considered as RS for some properties that we are going to describe. Moreover, we will give a different translation in English.
b. 

Afterwards, Lillo-Martin (1995) proposes the existence of a covert predicate of utterance or attitude that takes the reported proposition as a subordinate CP. Afterwards, in Lillo-Martin (2006)'s approach, the "quoted" material is understood as embedded whether or not there is an overt matrix verb. Any first-person pronouns in the complement to the POV predicate are logophoric; they are interpreted as coreferential with the subject of POV.

The first author who criticized the approach of Lillo-Marin is Neidle (1997) which proposes that, concerning RS, we cannot consider it as an embedded structure but as two separate sentences. In particular, Neidle considers the fact that POV is equivalent to a verb, which happens to have no manual instantiation. However, the POV verb expresses agreement spatially, through body shift. Using Lillo-martin's proposal, to represent a sentence that contains an utterance verb to introduce the RS, we should have two subordinates, as in (25).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RS John} \\
(25) \quad \text{a. } \text{JOHN, SAY IX-1, WANT GO} \\
\quad \text{"John said: 'I want to go.'"}
\end{array}
\]
Starting from Neidle's (1997) account, instead of the Point of View Predicate (POV), Quer (2005) proposes a covert operator over contexts (PVOp) positioned in a very high projection of the functional structure of the clause. The existence of an operator for RS is legitimated by the fact that we have one operator for questions and negation in the case where they are expressed only by NMM. For the negation, as in (26) from ASL, the head shake is the only way to negate something.

(26) \underline{head shake}  
\text{JOHN } \underline{BUY } \underline{HOUSE} \text{  }  
"John didn't buy a house."  
\text{ (From Neidle et al. 2000)}

Concerning the syntactic position, PVOp is considered to be in the head of the projection Speech Act Phrase (SAP) proposed by Cinque (1999). As we see in the representation in (27) for the same sentence as in (19a), the operator is generated in the head of SAP and then it moves to incorporate into the verb in V°. In this way we can also justify the fact that the verb that introduces the RS is not necessary.
Finally, Zucchi (2004) has a more semantic approach and he even refuses to apply to SL Schlenker's (2010) proposal for oral languages. As we saw, Schlenker (2010) presents the existence of context-shifting operators which overwrite the context parameter of the interpretation function. Zucchi, instead, concerning RS, refuses the idea of changing the context index or quantifying over contexts. To explain the changing of referent under RS, he proposes the existence of an operator → of assignment function which denotes an individual other than the signer. Looking at LIS, for Zucchi, thinking about RS as a quantification over contexts may change too many features of the context at once.

In this part we have generally presented the different approaches that we find in literature concerning RS. In particular, we focused on the indexical pronouns, especially the one of first person singular. In the next session, even if we are not going to treat this aspect in LSF, we will present some data on shifting of indexicals of time and space, especially in LSC.
2.2 Describing other indexicals

In this section we are going to present some data on the shifting of indexicals of time and space under RS in SLs. As is the case with pronominal indexicals, the evaluation of space and time is linked to the speaker. Afterwards, in the case of RS we have the shifting from the context of the speaker to the one of the shifted referent.

As we saw for the spoken languages in section 1, SLs indexicals of time and space present the same properties. For the time indexical “here”, we consider an example in LIS (28).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Topic} \\
(28) \quad \text{PAUL}_{j} \text{IX-3}_{j} \text{TELL YESTERDAY IX-1}_{j} \text{SEE XI-3}_{k} \text{JOHN}_{k}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ICE-CREAM EAT} \\
\text{RS Paolo}
\end{array}
\]

“Paul, told: «Yesterday I, saw John, eating an ice-cream cone».”

As we can see in (28), the indexical of time “yesterday” is signed under RS and so it is evaluated in respect to shifted referent “Paul”, the author of the shifted context, and not to the speaker. Normally, without shifting, it would be evaluated in order to the actual context of utterance of the speaker.

Concerning the indexicals of space, in particular “here”, LSC presents very interesting data. Quer (2005), as we can see in (29b), found that LSC seems to be violating “the shift together constrain” presented by Anand and Navins (2004).

2 This example is taken from the data of previous research that I conducted on RS in LIS. Moreover, more research is necessary to understand how to translate this kind of structures which present an indexical of time.
As we have seen in explaining “the shift together constrain”, under RS all the indexicals shift and so all the elements that before were linked to the speaker, they then are evaluated only in respect of the shifted referent. We have an example of this kind of structure in (24) where when one indexical shifts, all the other do the same thing as well. But in (24b), we can see that even under RS, “here” refers to Madrid, that is the place where the speaker is and not to the position of the shifted referent. It is important to notice that we can have the lecture in (29b) only if we specify the place that the indexical refers to.

Looking at the schema of Anand and Navins (2004), this situation refers to the case that was expected to not to be possible (30b).

(30) **SHIFT-TOGETHER CONSTRAINT**

a. \( C_A […] \text{modal} \ C_B […] [i_{[A,B]} \ldots i_{[A,B]}] \)

b. \( *C_A […] \text{modal} \ C_B […] [i_{[A,B]} \ldots i_{[B,A]}] \)

However, this kind of study has been made only for LSC so more research has to be done.
After having presented the literature's approach on RS and its relation with the shifting of indexical, we will look at the constructed actions which are considered to be a structure similar to RS.

2.3 Constructed Actions

In this section we are going to present a kind of structure called “constructed actions” which is very common in SLs. In the literature, it is often considered similar to RS but in the next chapter we are going to clarify, also with a syntactic test, their different characteristics.

In the literature, any kind of way used to express actions and dialogues of someone else other than the speaker is considered a constructed action. In particular, Liddell and Metzger (1998) consider the constructed dialogues as part of the constructed action. Moreover, for the two authors, this kind of structure represents the blend of two mental spaces: the real and the cartoon one. The first is the sudden representation of the immediate environment and the second is the mental conception of the cartoon from the signer's point of view. We can see an example presented by the two authors in (31).

(31) CAT LOOK-UP ‘OH-SHIT’ CL-X (press remote control)

“The cat looked up at the owner. He thought, ‘Oh shit’ and pressed the remote control.”

(ASL)

In the last example we also see the flow between constructed action, constructed dialogues and the presence of the narrator; this structure is typical of stories. Liddell and Metzger (1998) also give detailed types of constructed actions expressing their meaning (32).
Types of constructed actions | What they indicate
--- | ---
Articulation of words | What the character signs or thinks
Direction of the head and eye gaze | Where the character is looking
Facial expressions of affect, effort, etc. | How the character feels
Gestures of hands and arms | What the character produces.

(Liddell & Metzger, 1998)

This table helps us to compare SLs with spoken languages. In fact, we can realize this kind of structure in spoken languages modifying the use of the voice. Afterwards, every use of “change of role” is seen as construction actions. Lillo-Martin (2009), referring to Padden (1986), compares this kind of structure to that of “be+like” that we find in English. In English, this structure is also called by Streek (2002) “body quotation”. In fact, we can see two examples in (33) where in the first there is the signer who acts like someone who is working and in the second we use an example already employed in (24) above.

(33) a. HUSBAND WORK
“The husband was like - “here I am, working”.

b. MOM POV IX-1 BUSY
Mom (from mom's point of view), I'm busy.
“Mom's like, I'm busy.” (ASL)

This is the status of constructed actions in literature but it is important to underline that they differ from RS and we are going to present the elements that differentiate them.

Heretofore we have given a general panoramic on the phenomenon of RS in SLs, focusing on the shifting of indexicals and on their constraints. Moreover, we presented the constructed actions in order to clarify the terminology that we are
going to use also because we are going to differentiate them from RS even if they are both a way to report the actions of someone different from the speaker.

Now, let's turn to the main topic of this study: the dichotomy of the nature of RS between direct and indirect discourse.

### 2.4 RS: Direct and indirect speech

In this section we are going to introduce the problem of duality that exists between direct and indirect quotation in SLs, also considering the data from LSF where the presence of direct discourse is evident.

The main works about RS and its nature have been made by Quer (2005) and Zucchi (2004). They both agree on the fact that RS has properties of both direct and indirect discourse. In particular, Zucchi (2004) underlines the fact that for both structures, the NMM are the same.

As for spoken languages seen in section 1, the main problem is to understand if this kind of structure, where we find shifting of reference, are main or embedded sentences. The element necessary to easily solve this point would be the presence of a complementizer. In section 3.3, we are going to present a syntactic test that can prove the indirect quotation nature of RS. However, as we can see next, it is clear that RS has a direct discourse nature, too.

In the following examples (34) from LSF collected during this study, there are two clear instances of RS as direct discourse. The first is a dialogue between two people. The second (34b), which will be seen again later, presents elements of speech such as “hey” and “yes” which cannot be expressed in indirect discourse.
“Pierre met Jean and they were talking. Pierre said «Yes! Yesterday I saw Mary put make-up on herself, she was beautiful, perfect, and I want to do my make-up the same way. What do you think?» (Jean) : «You are stupid!»”.

“For the last two signs seen in (34b), in (35) we can see an example of each one.
Comparing the marks of direct quotation seen in LSF to those in LSC (Quer, 2012), such as those glossed as AUTHOR, DECLARE, VOICE and SAY1-SENTENCE (36), we can confirm the cross-linguistic value of RS as direct discourse.

As we saw for LSF, we can see an example of SAY1-SENTENCE in (37) taken from Quer (2012).
Considering now the following sentence (38a) and the two translations of it, we see that there is no hint that can help us to understand the nature of this structure. It is at this point that we perceive the ambiguity between direct or indirect quotation looking at RS.

(38)\[\text{YESTERDAY IX-1 SEE IX-LOC MARY CRY IX-1 WIN}\]
\[\text{LOTTERY (TO THE LEFT) IX-1 WIN LOTTERY (TO THE RIGHT)}\]

a. “Yesterday I saw Mary who was crying that she won the lottery, to the left, and that she won the lottery, to the right.”

b. “Yesterday I saw Mary who was crying: «I won the lottery», to the left, and «I won the lottery», to the right.”

In the section 3.3, Test1, we are going to present a test that can show us the nature of RS as indirect discourse using the adverb “alternatively”, put at the end of the sentence, after RS, affecting the main verb. The realization in the final position of the adverb that modifies the main verb which introduces the RS, shows the impossibility of having direct quotation because the RS would have to be subordinated.
In this chapter we presented the phenomenon of Role Shift in SLs. In particular, we described the RS in relation with the shifting of indexicals. First, we looked at the first and second person singular pronoun and then we presented the indexicals of time and space focusing on the properties of the spatial indexical “here” in LSC. Afterwards, before treating the main point of the question of RS in literature, we explained precisely the existence of the “constructed actions” that some authors consider as the realization of RS. Finally, we started looking at the problem of duality that exists between direct and indirect quotation in SLs concerning RS. In the last section we have presented only the data that refers to the direct quotation explaining that the aspect concerning the indirect discourse will be handled in the next chapter.
3. RS in LSF

In this chapter we are going to present the data found from this first study on RS in LSF. We are going to explain the methodology used during the fieldwork to collect the data for LSF with two deaf native informants. We are also going to give a general presentation of the functioning of the shifting of first and second person pronouns in LSF showing also how to disambiguate the reference to the speaker or to the shifted referent using the first person singular pronoun. Moreover, we will give a brief description of a potential constraint related to the embedding of shifting. In addition, we will present the implications of some data where we found subordination and RS which gave us the first hint to investigate the test session further. In the last part of this chapter, in fact, we are going to present the tests used to try to solve the controversy on the nature of the role shift as direct or indirect discourse markers and to define the characteristics of constructed actions. The first test is based on the use of the adverb “alternatively” to look at the presence of direct or indirect discourse. The second one, which uses adverbials as well, is needed to describe constructed action in contrast to RS.

3.1 Methodology

In this section we are going to look at the methodology used to collect the data during the fieldwork.

During the collection of the data, the different tests that we are going to describe later in 3.3 have been presented to the two native deaf informants using written French and LSF. Moreover, we used illustrated stories and comics strips written by us for the purpose of testing specific aspects of the phenomenon. During every fieldwork session, we first presented every sentence written in French and we asked the informants to translate the sentence indicated from French to LSF. For each sentence, after the translation, the work kept on using LSF asking questions to have more details presenting other contexts and situations for the realization of
different aspects of the phenomenon. In other cases, we started presenting an illustrated story or a comic strip to sign freely. After the first realization, as for the sentences, the work kept on in LSF on what they signed. Moreover, during the sessions, both the informant and the person who asked the questions had a copy of the sentences.

Every fieldwork session lasted 2 hours and all the data collected was analyzed with the program ELAN. The program has been necessary for the segmentation of the sentence and for the analysis of each sign to better understand the nature of the sentences comparing each other. In the picture that follows (39), we can see an example of how a work section of ELAN looks.

(39)

In the picture we can see the different tools available to analyze the SL videos using ELAN. In the left we can see the video with the controls that permit to watch it in detail, even frame to frame. On the bottom there are the different tiers
created to annotate the linguistic functions that will be analyzed. For each tear, all the annotations (sentences, signs, translation of the proposition, non-manual markings...) are reported at the top on the right. In that part it is also possible for example to modify the speed of the video to be able to do a more precise analysis.

Moreover, in (40) we can see an example of the kind of sentence presented to the informants during the fieldwork session, structured with a progressive complexity.

(40)
2013.02.12
1) Jean a crié qu’il a gagné au loto
2) Jean a crié à droite et à gauche qu’il a gagné au loto
3) Jean a crié alternativement à droite et à gauche qu’il a gagné au loto

In the next section, from the data we found, we are going to present the general functioning of the shifting of first and second person pronouns in LSF.

### 3.2 General description. Shifting of pronouns of 1st and 2nd person and constructed actions in LSF

In this section we are going to present the phenomenon of shifting reference of first and second person pronouns in LSF from the data found during this first study. Due to a lack of time on the fieldwork sessions, we are not going to present data on the shifting of indexicals of time and space but we leave if for future research.

As we saw in section 1.1.1, in spoken languages we find the realization of shifting reference involving the first and second person pronouns, as in Amharic, Slave and Zazaki and in particular in the studies of Schlenker (2004) and
Anan&Nevins (2004). First person pronoun, introduced by an utterance verb, can refer to someone other than the actual speaker; as well, the second person pronoun can refer to the addressee of the embedded context even if it is different from the actual addressee. Before presenting the data, we have to underline the fact that in literature the verbs that are used to introduce the shifting are utterance verbs such as “say” and “tell” and the attitude verb “want”. In our study on LSF, we will consider the utterance verbs “say”, “cry”, “answer”, “explain” and the attitude verb “remember”.

Focusing on the **first person singular pronoun**, in (41) we are going to see the use of first and third person singular pronouns without the use of RS: if we do not use the RS, the first and third person singular pronouns can refer only to the actual context of utterance.

\[(41) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{MARY PUT-ON FIRST MASCARA SECOND EYE-LINER LIPSTICK BLUSH X-1 THE-SAME IX-1} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{“Mary put on her at first some mascara, secondly some eye-liner, some lipstick and some blush. I will do the same”}. \\
\text{b.} \quad \text{BOY RUN WINDOW OPEN SCREAM IX-3 LOVE MARY} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{“The boy ran to the window and screamed that he loves Mary”}
\]

The context of evaluation of the pronouns has to be the one of utterance so in (41a), the first person singular pronoun refers to the speaker, and “IX-3” in (41b), the third person singular pronoun, refers to the boy, evaluated from the speaker's point of view.

In (42a) we are now presenting an example where the first person singular pronoun is used under RS and it does not refer to the speaker but to the subject of the verb that introduces the RS. The utterance verb permits the shifting of the context and so the first person singular pronoun is evaluated not in the utterance context.
context but in the shifted one. Moreover, as we saw in section 1 looking at the “Shifting together constraint”, under RS we have the shifting of all indexical elements related to the shifted referent. In (42b) we can see the shifting of the possessive pronoun that refers to the shifted referent.

(42) a. \(\text{BOY}_k \text{ RUN WINDOW OPEN-CL SCREAM } \text{IX-1}_k \text{ LOVE } \text{MARY} \)
    “The boy ran to the window and screamed that he loves Mary”

b. \(\text{MARY ANSWER } \text{IX-1} \text{ PROUD SOMEONE COPY SAME } \text{IX-1-POSS BEAUTIFUL MAKEUP } \text{CNM (HAPPINESS)} \)
    “Mary answered that she’s proud that someone (wants to) copy her beautiful make-up”

Looking at the second person singular pronoun, as for the first one, we have the same phenomenon of shifting where, under RS, the pronoun refers to the actual utterance context: it does not refer to the interlocutor of the speaker but to the one of the shifted referent. In (43) we can see an example.

(43) \(\text{IX-1 HEY YES } \text{IX-LOC } \text{IX-1 SEE } \text{IX-LOC } \text{MARY PUTTING ON MAKE-UP } \text{EYE-LINER } \text{MASCARA } \text{LIPSTICK } \text{BLUSH } \text{PERFECT} \)
    “Hey! Yes! There I saw Mary who was putting makeup on herself: eye liner, mascara, lipstick, blush. It was perfect. I want to do my make-up the same way. And you told me go ahead.”

In the last example, the first singular pronoun refers to someone different from the speaker introduced before in the context. Consequently, the second person pronoun is evaluated in accordance to the shifted context. Furthermore, this example proves again the “shift together constraint”, proposed by Anand and
Nevins (2004), also in LSF. Referring again to Anand and Nevins (2004), we see understood that both pronouns refer to the same context, following the schema in (44).

(44)  **SHIFT-TOGETHER CONSTRAINT**

   a.  $C_A [\ldots \text{modal } C_B \ldots [i_{\{A,B\}} \ldots i_{\{A,B\}}]]$

   b.  $*C_A [\ldots \text{modal } C_B \ldots [i_{\{A,B\}} \ldots i_{\{B,A\}}]]$

As explained at the beginning, we did not have the time to look at how it works with the other indexicals, in particular to try to verify if in LSF we have the same results as in LSC for what concerns the indexical “here” (Quer, 2005), as we saw in the section 2.2 where we saw the violation of the “shifting together constraint”.

Thanks to unexpected data from LSF, we are also going to see a) the fact that RS is not necessary introduced by a verb, b) how to disambiguate the referent of IX-1 and how to refer to the speaker even under RS; c) we will also see that we can have embedding of shifting pronouns into RS.

At first we want to show that we can have RS and shifting of pronouns also without the use of a verb that introduces them. It is not so obvious that RS has to be the complement of an utterance or attitude verb. In the example in (45), we have the realization of the typical NMM spread on all the sentences which shows its presence; also the context given to the informant clarifies the shifting of the reference.

(45)  **IX-1 HEY YES IX-LOC IX-1 SEE IX-LOC MARY PUTTING ON MAKE-UP EYELINER MASCARA LIPSTICK FARD PERFECT IX-1**

   **RS**

   WANT THE SAME COPY IX-1

   “Hey! Yes! I saw Mary there putting make-up on herself: eye liner, mascara, lipstick, blush. It was perfect. I want to do my make-up the same way.”
Then, as we said at the beginning, the first person singular pronoun used under RS can refer only to the referent of the shifted context but data confirm that the NMM are not always clearly marked creating ambiguity in the lecture of “IX-1”. The syntactic strategy used to clarify the reading of the pronoun consists in the use of pseudocleft sentences. This kind of proposition is very productive in LSF and, as in spoken languages, it is a kind of cleft sentence in which the subordinated clause is a clause headed by an interrogative pro-form. This type of sentence helps to make clear who is the referent of the utterance verb that introduces its complement. As we see in (46a), it is clear that the IX-1 pronoun in the subordinate clause refers to the speaker because it has been introduced before in the interrogative pro-form. We find the same process in (46b) to refer to a third person singular.

(46)  a. JOHN\textsubscript{j} MEET PAUL IX-3\textsubscript{j} TELL EVERYBODY SEE-\textbf{IX-1}\\ WHAT IX-1 CRY\textsubscript{right} WIN LOTTERY CRY\textsubscript{left} WIN LOTTERY EVERYWHERE-CL JUMPING\\
     “John met Paul. John told everybody that I did what?! that I cried to the right and to the left that I won the lottery.”

b. IX-3\textsubscript{k} CL-PERSON\textsubscript{k} JOHN IX-3-POSS SISTER\textsubscript{j} CL-PERSON\textsubscript{j} IX-3-POSS MOTHER\textsubscript{i} CL-PERSON\textsubscript{i} IX-3\textsubscript{k} SAY-TO-IX-3\textsubscript{j} SAY-TO-IX-3\textsubscript{i} RS John IX-3\textsubscript{k} SAY WHAT IX-1\textsubscript{k} WIN LOTTERY\\
     “There was John, his sister and his mother. He said to his sister and to his mother what?! that he won the lottery.”

Moreover, during the fieldwork, in the specific task of referring to the signer under RS, we expected to find a pronominal realization on the body to refer to him, probably on the shoulder that is closer to the position of the speaker in the real space before the use of the typical NMM of RS which imply a little torsion of the body. We finally did not find any pronominal realization that could realize
the speaker's reference under RS. Therefore, to refer to him under RS, we found two strategies: the use of the name of the speaker or the employment of a third person singular pronoun. We see an example in (47).

(47) PIERRE MEET JOSEPH TALK NEWS TALK PIERRE REMEMBER
    HEY YES IX-1 HAVE-TO EXPLAIN YESTERDAY IX-1 SEE MARY
    MAKE-UP PERFECT BEAUTIFUL ANGELIQUE WANT COPY
    SAME MAKE-UP IX-3 JOSEPH ANSWER IX-3 ANGELIQUE
    RS Pierre
    RS Joseph
STUPID

“Pierre met Joseph and they talked about the news and Pierre remembered: «Hey! Yes! I have to explain to you that yesterday he saw Mary putting make up on herself, it was perfect, beautiful, Angelique wants do her make-up the same way » and Joseph answered that Angelique is stupid.”

After having explained how to disambiguate the reference of the first singular person pronoun, and how to refer to the speaker under RS, we are going to look at another property of the pronominal indexicals which is shifting under recursive embedding. As we saw for the Slave in the example that we use again in (48), it is possible to find repeated embedded shifting also in LSF.

(48) (Andrew): Aliₐ miₐ-ra va ke Hesenᵢᵢ Fatima-ra va ezᵢᵢ [H,A,U] braye Rojda-o
    Ali me-to said that Hesen Fatima-to said I brother Rojda-GEN
    “Ali said to Andrew that Hesen said to Fatima that {Hesen, Ali, * Andrew} is Rojda's brother.”

The particular thing consists in the fact that until now, every shifting of reference was caused by RS which took a different role every time. In (49), instead, we find the presence of two “IX-1” pronouns under the RS of just one participant and they refer: the first, to the person who the speaker takes the role of and, the
second, to another referent introduced by the first shifted referent using the utterance verb “to answer”. Therefore, we have the shifting into the second context embedded in the first context shift introduced by the speaker. In the situation we have a girl who meets a friend of hers and she talks about a boy who she saw crying something.

\[(49) \quad \text{BEFORE STORY GIRL FIND SO GIRL FIND CL-PERSON MEET}
\]
\[
\text{IX-3 POSS FRIEND G} \text{IRL}_j \text{ DRESS-CL MEET EXPLANE YES IX-} 1_j
\]
\[
\text{SEE IX-3 BOY}_k \text{ CRY IX-} 1_k \text{-LOVE M-A-R-I-A CRYright}
\]
\[
\text{IX-} 1_k \text{-LOVE P-I-E-R-A}
\]

“About the earlier story, the girl met her friend. The girl with the nice dress explained: «Yes! I saw a boy who was crying that he loves Maria and he was crying to the right that he loves Piera»."

For what concerns the shifting of pronominal indexicals using RS, we found a cross-linguistic correspondence between LSF and the spoken languages studied by Schlenker, Anand and Nevins presented before.

Before turning to look at the specific tests did during the fieldwork, let's present the main characteristics of constructed action. In fact, the second test is dedicated to establish a clear way to distinguish constructed actions from RS. From LSF data we found four main characteristics:

a) constructed actions can be used under RS to report the actions of someone else other than the speaker or of the shifted referent;

b) in constructed actions there is the absence of first person singular pronoun to refer to the author;

c) as in RS, under constructed actions, there is no eye contact with the interlocutor;

d) under constructed actions it is not necessary to move the body or use NMM proper of RS.
Let's look an example for the first two points.
First, in the literature, as in Lillo-Martin (1995), constructed actions are considered as RS but we saw that in LSF, constructed actions can be realized even under RS. Under RS, the shifted referent can reproduce something did by someone else other than her (50a) or herself as well (50b).

(50)  a. IX-1, LISTEN YES IX-1, SEE THERE MARY PUTTING ON

MAKE-UP SO GOOD EYE-LINER MASCARA LIPS-STICK

RS girl

const. act. Maria

FARD PERFECT IX-1 WANT THE SAME COPY

“Hey! Yes! There I saw Mary who was putting makeup on herself: eye liner, mascara, lipstick, blush. It was perfect. I want to do my make-up the same way.”

b. IX-1 HEY YES IX-1 SAW-IX-LOC MARY PUTTING ON

MAKE-UP PERFECTLY MASCARA LIPSTICK EYE-LINER

const. act. girl

BLUSH PERFECT IX-1 WANT THE SAME COPY BUT IX-1

TRY PUTTING ON MAKE-UP WAIT EYE-LINER LIPSTICK

RS girl

BLUSH SO HOW LOOK?! HEY LOOK PERFECT IX-2

RS adressee

MMM... SO GOOD

“Hey! Yes! There I saw Mary who was putting makeup on herself: eye liner, mascara, lipstick, blush. It was perfect. I want to do my make-up the same way but I tried putting makeup on myself; wait! eye liner, mascara, lipstick, blush- Hey! Do I look perfect? And you: «Mmm, so good!».”
The examples in (50) also show an ambiguity in this kind of structure: depending on the scope of the constructed action or of the RS, we can read the constructed action as a result or as an action in process. In the first case, referring to the situation in the examples in (50), the referent would talk about the fact of copying Mary's final make-up. Instead, in the second one, we were talking about the action of putting on the make-up acting in the same way as Maria. Afterwards, to have the lecture linked to the final result, the constructed action has to have scope on RS; for the actions in progress reading, the scope has to be inverse.

Second, different again from Lillo-Martin (1995)'s approach, in constructed actions we have not the use of first person singular pronoun. The shifted referent is introduced by the speaker. We can see an example in (51) where there is no pronoun used.

(51) IX-1 SEE IX-1-POSS BROTHER PLAY-VIOLIN-IMBARASSED FLUSH GO CONCERT GALA BE-SORRY
    “I saw my brother playing violin and he was so embarrassed. He blushed. I went to the gala concert and I was sorry.”

Contrary to Lillo-Martin, we see that we can refer to constructed action thinking about something which is different from RS, especially if it is introduced by an utterance verb. In fact, as we saw in the previous section, for Lillo-Martin the presence of the first-person pronoun does not imply any difference and it is important to underline that she never considers sentences where there is an utterance or attitude verb which introduces the “shifted material”. Moreover, this is the main argument used by Neidle to criticize the Lillo-Martin (1995)'s proposal.

After having presented some properties of RS and constructed actions, let's now look at the specific tests concerning RS as direct/indirect discourses and the constructed actions.
3.3 Test

In this section we are going to present the data that concerns, in particular, the nature of RS, as direct or indirect discourse. As we have already seen in the section 2.3, there is no doubt that RS in LSF can be analyzed as direct discourse but data shows also the possibility of having indirect quotation in the case of RS. The test that we are going to present and other data found, show a relation of dependency between the main utterance or attitude verb and the RS. It means that we cannot talk about direct quotation in this case.

Moreover, in this chapter we are going to describe the results of the study in order to demonstrate one of the main properties of constructed actions which proves to us, syntactically also, that they cannot be confused with RS. In fact, as we saw in 2.3, the two structures are different, starting from the point that in constructed actions we do not find any pronoun and therefore no indexical shifting, even if there is context shifting.

In both tests we are going to use adverbials. In Test1, “alternatively”, that modifies the main verb and not the one in RS, is used to show that RS can be a subordinate as well; in Test2, modal adverbs that cannot be expressed lexically in constructed actions, confirm the impossibility of having any lexical element in this kind of structure, differently from RS. After that, we are going to present a hint for another evaluation of the phenomenon, also proposed by Quer (2012) and Hübl & Steinbach (2012), concerning the Free Indirect Discourse (FID).

Test 1: “Alternatively”

As hinted above, in this part we are going to present the syntactic test that we used to prove that the RS has also an indirect quotation nature, not only a direct one. It is called “Alternatively” because this is the adverb that we are going to use. First, we are going to present what we expected, looking at Italian in
comparison with LSF. After, we are going to see the data found.

The objective of the test is to show that an adverb that modifies the main verb can stay at the end of the sentence after the main verb and the sentence of RS that it introduces. In particular, we consider the utterance verb “cry” and the adverb “alternatively”. The situation shows a person who won the lottery and thus cries to the left and the right alternatively what happened to him. Moreover, the test is gradually complex: it starts with a simple sentence which becomes more complex adding the adverbs “to the right and to the left” at first and then “alternatively”. Moreover, during the fieldwork sessions, concerning LSF, we also asked sentences without RS in order to have a more complete paradigm of this kind of structure. Afterwards, we collected three paradigms for three different pronouns: third person singular, first person singular referring to the speaker and first person singular under RS.

As we can see in the examples in French (52), this is the paradigm for the third person singular. We did the same for the first person singular pronoun, with and without RS. The adverb cannot modify the main verb if put in a separated sentence, for this reason (52e) is agrammatical.

(52)  a. Jean a crié qu'il a gagné au loto.
     “John, cried that he, won the lottery.”

b. Jean a crié à droite et à gauche qu'il a gagné au loto.
   “John, cried to the left and to the right that he, won the lottery.”

c. Jean a crié alternativement à droite et à gauche qu'il a gagné au loto.
   “John, cried alternatively to the left and to the right that he, won the lottery.”

d. Jean a crié à droite qu'il a gagné au loto et à gauche qu'il a gagné au loto, alternativement.
   “John, cried to the right that he, won the lottery and to the left that he, won the lottery, alternatively.”

f.  *“John, cried to the right: « I won the lottery » and to the left « I won the lottery », alternatively.”

Looking at the data from LSF, we start by presenting the first paradigm with the third person singular pronoun in the subordinate and then we are going to see the use of the other two pronouns in relation with “alternatively”. Look at the examples in (53).

(53)  a.  JOHN CRY IX-3 WIN LOTTERY
      “John cried that he won the lottery”
   b.  JOHN CRY_LEFT CRY_RIGHT CRY_LEFT CRY_RIGHT PRO WIN LOTTERY
      “John cried to the right and to the left that (he) won the lottery.”
   c.  JOHN CRY_LEFT CRY_RIGHT CRY_LEFT CRY_RIGHT IX-3 WIN LOTTERY
      “John cried to the right and to the left that he won the lottery.”
   d.  JOHN CRY_LEFT IX-3 WIN LOTTERY CRY_RIGHT PRO WIN LOTTERY
      “John cried to the left that he won the lottery and to the right that he won the lottery.”

We can see the same attitude of the structure using the first person singular pronoun, without RS (54a) and with it (54b). In (54b), the first person singular pronoun is related to the features of the shifted context, where IX-1 refers to Mary and not to the speaker.

(54)  a.  JOHN CRY_LEFT CRY_RIGHT IX-1 WIN LOTTERY
      “John cried to the right and to the left that I won the lottery.”
It is important to underline that in SLs, modal adverbs such as “to the left, to the right” are incorporated into the verb so we cannot have a lexical entry for them. The main important aspect is the fact that the verb agrees in the space with the direction of the adverb and we can express this linguistic information economically. Furthermore, the nature of this kind of adverb is not adequate to show syntactic dependencies cause of their simultaneous realization with the main verb.

Let's look now to “alternatively” (55).

(55) a.  

\[
\text{JOHN, MEET PAUL, } IX-3, \text{ EXPLAIN, EVERYBODY SEE-IX-1} \\
\text{IX-1_{speaker} CRY_{RIGHT} WIN LOTTERY PRO_{speaker} CRY_{LEFT} WIN} \\
\text{LOTTERY ALTERNATIVELY} \\
\]

“John met Paul and he explained to him that everybody saw me crying to the right that I won the lottery and I was crying to the left that I won the lottery alternatively.”

b.  

\[
\text{MARY, CRY_{LEFT} IX-1, WIN LOTTERY CRY_{RIGHT} IX-1, WIN} \\
\text{LOTTERY ALTERNATIVELY} \\
\]

“Mary cried to the left that she won the lottery and to the right that she won the lottery, alternatively.”

In the last examples we see IX-1 referring to the speaker in the first one and to shifted referent in the second. Moreover, the modal adverb that shows the direction of where the action took place is incorporated in the main verb. Finally, the adverb “alternatively” is always realized at the end of the sentence, after the
RS proposition, too. The use of “alternatively” at the end of the sentence confirms the use of indirect discourse because the adverb modifies the verb in the main sentence and not the one into RS. It show that the RS sentence is a subordinate because we need to find “alternatively” in a high position as adjunct to the main verb. We are going to see in the details the syntactic structure in the next session of data analysis.

Furthermore, other unexpected datum shows the clear presence of indirect discourse.

(56) AT-A-CERTAIN-POINT TREE VOICE IX-LOC WITCH NAME
    M-A-R-I-A IX-3j P-I-E-R-A JOHN YES LOOK HOW MEET JOHN IX-LOCk IX-LOCj IX-LOCj IT-DOES-NOT-MATTER IX-3
    CRY IX-1-LOVE M-A-R-I-A CRy left IX-1-LOVE P-I-E-R-A
    BECAUSE ONE-OR-THE-OTHER ANSWER-to-IX-1 palm-up

“At a certain point from a tree a voice said that the name of the witches was Maria and Piera and John looked to the direction of the voice saying yes. He looked how to meet them but he didn't care and he cried that he loved Maria and that he loved Piera to the left because one of the two answered him back.”

The element that shows the presence of indirect discourse in (56) is the subordination. As we know, direct discourse is realized through an independent sentence that cannot be linked to another proposition. Therefore, in (56), the complementizer is signed by the speaker but the content of the subordinate is signed under RS. It means that we have indirect discourse where the IX-1 pronoun cannot be translated in English with “I” but with “he”. If we had direct discourse, we should have to use the pronoun “I” as the subject of the derived verb. So, this sentence shows that RS can remain in embedded sentences which is introduced by a complementizer such as “because” or, as we saw thanks to
“alternatively”, it seems that RS can also remain in “direct embedding” where the complementizer is “that”.

Let's turn now to the constructed actions. As we have seen in the section 3.2, constructed actions can get confused with RS but they present different characteristics. Test 2, besides the properties described before, gives us a syntactic key to distinguish the two structures.

**Test 2: Constructed actions and adverbials**

In this section we are going to present the syntactic test that we used to clearly distinguish RS and constructed actions proving that the definition of Liddle and Metzger (1998) is not valid. They describe instances of RS as constructed action but we have already seen in the section above that they have different characteristics. Moreover, we can prove it from a syntactic point of view, too. Before presenting the test, it is important to underline that, instead of Lillo-Martin (1995)'s approach, in this experience we introduced the constructed action by an utterance verb to realize minimal pairs with the examples of RS considered. During the test, we started giving to the informant the sentence in (57a) that she translated with the two sentences in (57b,c).

(57) a. Jean a dit que sûrement Paul aurait douté en choisissant le cadeau.
    “John said that for sure Paul would have doubts to chose the present.”

b. JOHN SAY SURE PAUL PRESENT CHOOSE HESITATE
    “John said that he was sure that Paul would have doubts to chose the present.”
c. **JEAN** SAY SURE PAUL PRESENT ONE-OR-THE-OTHER-
   const. action Paul
   DOUBT
   “John said that he was sure that Paul would have doubts to chose
   the present.”

d. **JEAN** SAY SURE PAUL PRESENT ONE-OR-THE-OTHER
   const. action Paul
   HESITATE

In the first two examples in LSF, we see that in (57b) the informant does not use
constructed action and the adverbial information is lexically expressed. The
attitude of doubt of the participant “Paul” is expressed with the lexical verb “to
hesitate” signed after the lexical verb “to choose” that it has to modify. In the last
example in (57c), instead, using a constructed action to express the fact of
“hesitating to choose the present”, the informant acts like the person who is
choosing the present and the attitude of doubt is signed using NMM instead of a
lexical adverb. Moreover, the informant confirmed the impossibility of having a
lexical adverb signed under constructed action, as in (57d). Afterwards, looking
at the other characteristics of constructed actions, we can also see the absence of
the main verb signed using its lexical entry. Also, there is no pronoun.

Turning now looking at the nature of this structure, in literature, constructed
actions are defined as “be+like” structures. As we have already seen, Lillo-Martin
(1995) uses this definition also for structures where there is shifting of context
and the use of first person singular pronoun. In the case of the sentence in (57c),
we can consider it as indirect discourse because the speaker is reporting what
Jean said and there is no index of direct speech. As in (57b,c), we have the same
sentence realized in two different ways, keeping the same meaning and the same
context of reference.

From this Test 2, we can affirm that constructed action and RS, both introduced
by an utterance verb, present different properties.
Afterwards, looking at both RS and constructed action, during the fieldwork we found structures that present both marks of direct speech and the adverb “alternatively”. As we have just seen, the function of the use of “alternatively” at the end of a sentence where we find RS introduced by an utterance verb, consists in proving the presence of indirect speech. Afterwards, in the sentences that we are going to look at, we are going to have a contrast between elements that prove the use of direct quotation such as “yeah” and “alternatively” that show an instance of indirect speech.

Let's see the example in (58).

(58) MARY PLAY-LOTTERY LOOK AT THE TICKET (NMM
____________________________________
SURPRISE) YEAH! CRY_RIGHT IX-1 WIN LOTTERY YEAH! CRY_LEFT
____________________________________RS Mary
IX-1 WIN LOTTERY ALTERNATIVELY

“Mary played at the lottery, she looked at the ticket and surprised 'Yeah!!!' she cried to the right that she won the lottery, 'Yeah!!!' she cried to the left that she won the lottery.

As we can see, the use of “alternatively” which modifies the main verb CRY shows the presence of indirect discourse as we explained for the examples above concerning the Test 1. Furthermore, there is the element “yeah” which is a mark of direct speech because it is like an exclamation of exultation. One way to look at this structure is to consider the proposal of Quer (2012) and Hübl & Steinbach (2012) who propose that RS can be analyzed as Free Indirect Discourse (FID). In particular, we should look at Maier's (2012) approach who analyzes FID as “mix quotation”. Free Indirect Discourse can be analyzed as a mix of direct and of indirect discourse: tenses and pronouns are expressed in the same way as in an attitude report (eg. She thought about how she did it), while the other elements, including the indexicals of time and space, behaves as in direct discourse. Among the elements evaluated as instances of direct speech, we find the exclamation,
too. We can see an example in (59).

(59)  *My mother reminded me of this every day with a raised eyebrow and sentences that trailed off into a question mark – she was married at 24, which was already “up there,” and all my friends back in Tombov had at least one child by now. She was only living to see me married, she said.*

Moreover, Maier (2012) underlines the fact that the presence of the parenthetical “x said/thought” is optional. This approach could be a way to interpret the phenomenon of RS in its complexity. However, more research is necessary.

In this chapter we focused on the RS in LSF reporting the data found during the fieldwork sessions. First we presented the data concerning the shifting of pronouns of first and second person in LSF. Also, we described the main characteristics of constructed actions that distinguish them from RS. After that, we started presenting the tests used to prove the duality of the nature of RS as direct and indirect quotation. One of the two tests concerned the constructed action: it gave a syntactic evidence of the fact that RS and constructed actions are different structures. At the end of the chapter, we also proposed another way to interpret RS, already proposed by Quer (2012) and Hübl & Steinbach (2012), concerning the interpretation of RS as Free Indirect Discourse (FID).

Let's now look at the analysis of the data presenting the syntactic representation of the two structures found with Test1. We are going to see the use of the two elements that show the presence of subordination with RS: “alternatively” and the “because” clause.
4. Analysis of the data

In this section we are going to analyze the data presented in the previous sections. We are going to try to give a syntactic structure that can explain the functioning of the RS in LSF, starting from the proposals found in the literature.

Briefly resuming the results found in the previous sections, we can conjecture that RS has also a nature of indirect quotation, not only of direct discourse. The elements that make us think this are:
- the use of “alternatively” at the end of the sentence after RS;
- the possibility of having RS introduced by the complementizer “because”.

First, concerning the adverb “alternatively”, as in the example in (60), we can see that it modifies the main verb “cry” and not the one signed under RS. However, at the beginning there is an ambiguity of reading of the adverb. In fact, we can think that Mary won the lottery more than once or that she screamed something more than once. We made sure that the second reading was accessible (and given the context also the most natural) and this assures us about the position in the structure of the adverb: adjunct on the right to the main verb “cry”.

(60)  \[\text{MARY}, \text{CRY}_{\text{LEFT}} \text{IX}-1, \text{WIN LOTTERY} \text{CRY}_{\text{RIGHT}} \text{IX}-1, \text{WIN LOTTERY ALTERNATIVELY}\]

“Mary cried to the left that she won the lottery and to the right that she won the lottery, alternatively.”

Indeed, the position of the adverb at the end of the sentence and the fact that it modifies the main verb, lets us think that RS is a subordinate of “cry”. Moreover, as a subordinate, we can only interpret the first person singular pronoun in English as a third person singular one because we have indirect discourse. The presence of “alternatively” prevents the use of direct quotation and so the use of
two separated sentences.

In (61) we can see a general syntactic structure of (60) which shows the influence of the adverb on the main verb. Concerning which syntactic approach to adopt for the representation of the syntactic structure, we agree with the Quer's (2005) proposal. Nevertheless, we will just keep the presence of an operator of shifting context which introduce the RS but we are not going to use the SAP projection preferring a less labeled structure.

The structure in (61) definitely shows us a relation of dependency between the main verb and the RS introduced by PVOp.

Moreover, we can confirm that the Test 1 presented in the section 3.3 gives a syntactic evidence for the fact that RS has also the nature of the indirect
discourse.

Second, other evidence from the data is the possibility of having RS introduced by the complementizer “because”. As in the last case, in the sentence in (62), the “because clause” modifies the main verb and not the one under RS, as we can see in the syntactic structure in (63).

(62) AT-A-CERTAIN-POINT TREE VOICE IX-LOC WITCH NAME
     M-A-R-I-A IX-3j P-I-E-R-A JOHN YES LOOK HOW MEET JOHN IX-LOCk IX-LOCj IX-LOCj IT-DOES-NOT-MATTER IX-3

______________________________________________________________________________________RS John

CRY IX-1-LOVE M-A-R-I-A CRYleft IX-1-LOVE P-I-E-R-A

______________________________________________________________________________________RS John

BECAUSE ONE-OR-THE-OTHER ANSWER-to-IX-1 palm-up

“At a certain point from a tree a voice said that the name of the witches was Maria and Piera and John looked to the direction of the voice saying yes. He looked how to meet them but he didn't care and he cried that he loved Maria and that he loved Piera to the left because one of the two answered him back.”
As for “alternatively”, the complementizer “because” entails the use of indirect discourse in the case where it introduces RS. It is another proof of the double nature of RS and it seems that, syntactically, “alternatively” and “because” are a sort of obstruction to the realization of RS as direct quotation.

In this chapter, we saw that RS can be realized as a subordinate sentence which entails that it cannot be expressed using direct quotation. This fact shows the double and ambiguous nature of RS in the realization between direct and indirect discourse. In fact, without the presence of marks of speech act or structural dependencies, we are not able to determine the nature of RS.
Conclusions and final remarks

In this thesis a detailed characterization of role shift in French Sign Language (LSF) has been offered, focusing on understanding the nature of RS as instance of direct or indirect discourse. The presence of marks of direct speech act such as “hey” and “yes” under RS, proved the realization of direct discourse. However, at the same time, the test made using the adverb “alternatively” and the possibility of having RS introduced by the complementizer “because” show that RS can be embedded in a subordinate construction. So, this study led us to conclude that RS is used for both direct and indirect reports. Presenting RS, we also looked at the constructed actions which revealed to have different properties from RS even if they are both a way to report the actions of someone different from the speaker. Afterwards, as we have seen, they can stand in the same structure where constructed action are used under RS.

Moreover, concerning the main subject of direct or indirect discourse associated to RS, authors such as Quer (2012) and Hübl & Steinbach (2012) propose that RS can be analyzed as Free Indirect Discourse (FID). In particular, looking at the studies of Maier (2012) it seems that there is a connection between FID analyzed as “mix quotation” and RS. This kind of structure presents a mix of direct and indirect discourse where essentially all of the sentence is expressed through indirect discourse with some instances of direct discourse inside. In this way, tense and pronouns are variables, carrying semantic features that restrict their binding possibilities, while other indexicals simply get their referent from the context from which they originated. During the fieldwork for this study, we found data that seem to present the same characteristic of FID in LSF, too. In the kind of structure found in LSF, we see the presence of marks of direct speech and the presence of the adverb “alternatively” which prove that the sentence is an instance of indirect discourse.

Anyway, more research has to be done on this aspect of the linguistics of Sign Languages, also to better understand how this phenomenon of shifting works in
spoken languages. Further research needs to be done on this aspect of the linguistics of sign language, in particular in order to understand how the phenomenon of shifting works in spoken languages.
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