

Pronominal patterns in Finnish reported speech and free indirect discourse

Elsi Kaiser, University of Southern California, elsi.kaiser@gmail.com

Many languages have logophoric pronouns referring to the person whose speech/thoughts/feelings are reported; some languages also have antilogophoric pronouns (Culy 1997). I investigated (anti)logophoricity in the pronominal system of Finnish, in particular in reported speech and free indirect discourse. I show that seemingly disparate referential patterns shown by two third-person pronouns can be reconciled if we consider register differences and differences in the scope of logophoricity in reported speech and free indirect discourse.

Finnish pronouns: (1a) shows the human pronoun *hän* (s/he) referring to a character in a novel, but in (1b) the same character is referred to with the non-human *se* (it). (2) shows that *hän/se* also alternate reported speech (matrix sub = *se*, coreferential embedded sub: *hän*).

(1a) Sitä **Heikkilä** ei oikein tiennyt. **Hän** oli nukahtanut tuoliinsa...

‘**Heikkilä**_i didn’t really know that. **He**_i had fallen asleep in his chair’ (novel, Raittila 2003:202)

(1b) **Heikkilä** loiskautti vettä lattialle. **Se** nousi ylös kylpyammeesta....

‘**Heikkilä**_i splashed water onto the floor. **It**_i got up from the bathtub...’ (Raittila 2003:203)

(2) [Context: talking about fishing spots] Kundi luulee omistavansa sen paikan, vaikka mä olin aamulla jo tuntia ennen sitä sillä paikalla. **Se** sano, että **hän** on tään paikan alun perin löytänyt.

‘The guy_i thinks he owns the place, although I was already there in the morning an hour before him. **It**_i said that **he**_i had originally found this place.’

(jippii.fi/jsp/forum/thread.jsp?b=kalastus&t=570)

What governs the behavior of these forms? One possibility is a **register-driven explanation** based on the differences between *standard Finnish* (used in writing and official settings, uses *hän* ‘s/he’ as default) and *colloquial dialects* (in conversation, uses *se* ‘it’ as default). However, this account is insufficient: (2) (Colloq) and (3) (Strd) show alternating forms within a register.

(3) Snelli ei käsittänyt kuinka tavarat saataisiin pois torilta ... **Se**_i kyseli oliko **hän**_i ymmärtänyt... ‘Snelli didn’t understand how the objects could be transported away from the square (...). **It**_i asked whether **she**_i had understood....’ (Raittila 2003:115)

A second possibility is a **salience-based account**. Subjects are more salient than objects. Are there correlations between choice of *hän* vs. *se* and the antecedent’s grammatical role? This expectation is *not* supported by the corpus data I analyzed (novels, dialect examples). Both *hän* and *se* refer to subjects (1a,b), and other examples show they both also refer to non-subjects.

The third option builds on the **idea that *hän* has a special use in reported speech in colloquial Finnish**. Many dialects of colloquial Finnish use *se* as the default pronoun and *hän* as a logophoric form in reported speech. Laitinen (2002) notes that *hän* “appears in reported speech or thought and is coreferential with the subject of the speech act or mental verb”, as in ex.(2). Adapting a term from Sells (1987), a logophoric pronoun refers to SELF. The logophoricity of *hän* is shown by the fact that the embedded sentence must match the expressive content of what was said/thought. Imagine the conversation in (4a) between Laura and Tiina (ex. based on Potts 2003). Later, Tiina shows the blue vase to Liisa and reports Laura’s comment with (4b). In (4b), *hän* sounds strange because Laura did not refer to the blue vase as beautiful, and so logophoric *hän* is not appropriate.

(4a) **Laura**: This blue vase is really ugly. The orange vase is much more stylish. Since I can only fit one on my shelf, I plan to throw away the ugly blue vase. **Tiina**: But I think the blue vase is beautiful! You shouldn’t throw it away. **Laura**: Do you want it? Here, take it, it’s yours.

(4b) **Tiina**: **Se**_i sano että **se**_i/**#hän**_i aikoo heittää tämän kauniin maljakon roskeen!

‘**It**_i said that **it**_i/**she**_i plans to throw away this beautiful vase!’

Thus, in reported speech in colloquial Finnish, (i) *hän* ‘s/he’ triggers a logophoric interpretation and refers to the SELF (subject of speech act/mental verb), and (ii) *se* ‘it’ is the unmarked

pronoun; it is nonlogophoric (not antilogophoric; it can refer to SELF, presumably since *se* is the register default). (Interestingly, fiction also show this usage, as in (3), even if written in otherwise standard Finnish, perhaps via register shifting/use of colloquial rhetorical structures.)

However, this conclusion fails to explain the *hän/se* alternation in (1) with no speech act/mental verb (see also Saukkonen 1967, Hakulinen 1988). Instead, it seems **free indirect discourse** is at play in (1). Free indirect discourse (FID) is a means of signaling a character's thoughts/words without an explicit verb of speaking/thinking, as in (5) (from a novel by Polva 1989:60; translated by me into English). *Hän* refers to Juha (SELF) and *se* to Tiina (NON-SELF).

(5) 'Juha had started walking away with long steps, but when he_{JUHA} was sure that he_{JUHA} was no longer visible from the bar, he_{JUHA} slowed his walking down to a crawl. Tiina could easily catch him_{JUHA}, if it_{TIINA} left right away, and of course it_{TIINA} would, of that he_{JUHA} was sure.'

My corpus data show that in FID, *hän* is used for SELF, and *se* for NON-SELF (see also Saukkonen 1967, Hakulinen 1988). However, use of *se* for the NON-SELF is not obligatory; the register-default *hän* can also be used (see ex. in Rouhiainen 2000). Crucially, since FID is used primarily in literature, it is usually in Standard Finnish. Two paradigms emerge:

Reported speech (colloquial Finnish)

hän → logophoric/SELF

se → **non**logophoric (unmarked)

Free indirect discourse (standard Finnish)

hän → **non**logophoric (unmarked)

se → **anti**logophoric/NON-SELF

It seems that the referential properties of *hän* and *se* are very different in reported speech vs. FID. This seems undesirable. I show that we can capture their behavior with *one basic generalization* if we take into account (i) the fact that both reported speech and free indirect discourse are 'logophoric' but *differ in the size of their logophoric domains*, and (ii) the register differences between standard and colloquial Finnish.

Let us first consider the logophoric domain. In (6a), Tiina's mother talks about Tiina getting on a train and forgetting to buy a ticket (but her friend had bought one for her). Now imagine a context where (6b) is inside FID (6c). In reported speech, the matrix subject is not in the logophoric domain ([...]); the embedded subject is. In FID, both are in the domain.

(6a) Tiina's mother: "**Se**_{TIINA} thought that [**hän**_{TIINA} hadn't bought a ticket]."

Tiina thinks: "**I** haven't bought a ticket." (REPORTED SPEECH)

(6b) Narrator: Tiina: [**Se**_{POLICEMAN} thought that **hän**_{TIINA} hadn't bought a ticket].

Tiina thinks: "He thinks **I** haven't bought a ticket." (FID)

(6c) Context: *T had bought her ticket the day before; the lady selling tickets now thinks that T hopped on the train without paying, and calls for help. Tiina watched incredulously as the policeman walked into the compartment where she was. Why did this stuff always happen to her?*

If we combine this observation with register differences, we can represent the referential properties of *hän* and *se* in a unified way (s. box) under a general

principle, namely that there is an **association between *hän* and SELF, and *se* and NON-SELF**. The other details can be derived from register differences and the size of the logophoric domain.

Time permitting, I will also present data with **demonstrative *tämä* 'this'** (cf. Hinterwimmer & Bosch 2015 for related work on German). *Se* and *tämä* can both refer to NON-SELF, but with multiple NON-SELF referents, *se* is used for the most salient and *tämä* for less salient ones. Reference resolution theories need to consider both logophoricity and salience.

