

## Logophoricity-and-Discourse Syntax in Indonesian

I Nyoman Udayana<sup>1</sup>, Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Udayana  
Jalan Nias 13 Denpasar 80114, Bali, Indonesia  
Email: nyoman\_uyayana@unud.ac.id

Published: 01/08/2024

### How to cite (in APA style):

Udayana, I. N., & Indrawati N. L.K. (2024). Logophoricity-and-Discourse Syntax in Indonesian. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 10(2), 642-651. DOI: <http://10.55637/jr.10.2.10250.642-651>

**Abstract-** Indonesian lacks dedicated logophoric pronouns. Instead, logophoric references are encoded through the use of reflexive pronouns within the discourse context. This study aims to elucidate the relationship between reflexive anaphors and logophoricity in Indonesian. Specifically, it seeks to demonstrate that a particular form, namely the complex reflexive formed by combining *diri* with possessive pronouns, is exclusively associated with logophoricity. The data for this study was extracted from naturally occurring expressions found in the Leipzig corpora. Analysis was conducted using discourse syntax, which examines the interplay between syntax and the surrounding textual environment, to observe the resulting phenomena. The findings indicate that logophors in Indonesian differ significantly from reflexive anaphors in four key aspects. Firstly, logophoric pronouns, unlike reflexive pronouns, can be bound at a long distance. Nevertheless, they still adhere to the principles of binding theory regarding their antecedents. Secondly, logophoric pronouns may not necessarily agree in phi features with their antecedents. Thirdly, the logophoric anaphor can occupy various grammatical functions, including both object and subject positions. Lastly, unlike reflexivization, logophoric constructions in Indonesian are subject to passivization.

**Keywords:** Logophoric Pronoun, Reflexive Pronoun, Discourse Syntax, Subject Position, Passivization

### I INTRODUCTION

Logophoric pronouns are special pronouns that occur in the clausal complements of the verbs of communication. They refer to a person whose consciousness is being talked about (Hagège 1974; Culy 1994, 1997; among others) They are found in languages of West African languages. However, the phenomenon of logophoricity has been observed to occur in Latin much earlier than when the existence of a dedicated logophoric pronoun in African languages was discovered (Kuno 1987). Let us first have a look at the instance of a dedicated logophoric pronoun in West African languages as illustrated by Yoruba in (1).

Yoruba (Trask 1996: 164)

- (1) a. o ri pe o ni owo  
he<sub>i</sub> saw that he<sub>j</sub> had money  
'He<sub>i</sub> saw that he<sub>j</sub> had money.'  
b. o ri pe oun ni owo  
he<sub>i</sub> saw that he<sub>j</sub> had money  
'He<sub>i</sub> saw that he<sub>j</sub> had money.'

Sentence (1a) is a complex sentence, containing the main clause headed by the verb *ri* 'see' and the embedded clause headed by the verb *ni* 'have'. Yoruba has complementizer *pe* 'that'. The pronoun *o* is a regular pronoun and the same pronoun *o* occurs in the embedded clause. They are not co-indexed. In other words, they are disjoint in reference, indicating that there is no logophoric relationship that holds between the

two (pronouns). In sentence (1b), on the other hand, the pronoun *ni* in the dependent clause is the logophoric pronoun whose logophoric trigger or its antecedent is in the main clause. Importantly the subject of the main clause and the pronoun *ni* are co-indexed indicating that the speech/perception of the subject he is reported in the clausal complement of the predicate of the main clause, ensuring that the two entities are in logophoric relation.

In contrast with Yoruba in which the logophoric relation is marked by different pronouns, logophoricity can be marked on the verb. This can be illustrated by Ewe and Gokana, as in (2) and (3) respectively.

Ewe (Clements 1975: 142):

- (2) a. Kofi be yè-dzo.  
       Kofi say Log-leave  
       ‘Kofi<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> left.’  
       b. Kofi be e-dzo.  
       Kofi say Pro-leave  
       ‘Kofi<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>j</sub> left.’

Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981: 20):

- (3) a. aè kɔ aè dɔ.  
       Pro said Pro fell  
       ‘He<sub>i</sub> said he<sub>j</sub> fell.’  
       b. aè kɔ aè dɔ-ɛ̃.  
       Pro said Pro fell-Log  
       ‘He<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> fell.’

In Ewe and Gokana, verbs are marked for logophoricity by *yè-* and *-ɛ̃*, respectively, which function as pro-clitics and enclitics. In this context, the logophorically-marked verb must occur in the embedded clause where the logophor appears. Thus, pronouns *e-* and *ae* in (2b) and (3a) are construed as belonging to a logophor. However, the pronouns *ye* and *ae* in (2a) and (3b) are logophoric pronouns.

The phenomenon of logophoricity in languages outside West Africa has drawn the attention of linguists in other parts of the world, such as Icelandic and Norwegian. It's important to note that the term consciousness relating to logophoricity is closely linked to the use of body parts for reflexive pronouns, such as the word *diri* ('body' or 'self' in English), which in some sense encodes consciousness. Indeed, Asian languages like Japanese and Chinese employ reflexive pronouns (see Huang 2000, Sells 1987, Oshima 2004, among others, for Japanese; for Chinese and Korean, see Huang 2000).

Logophoric constructions, observed in the realm of discourse syntax, are discussed by Koster and Reuland (1991) and Büring (2005), among others, under the notion of long-distance

binding or long-distance reflexives. However, their relationship with discourse perspective was first developed by Kuno (1987) in his seminal work on the logophoric phenomenon. He suggests that logophoricity emerges from indirect discourse representation. Consider the following examples: in (4a), the clause represents direct speech by an unidentified speaker. If the speaker is Ali, then the clause resembles (4b). When direct speech is changed to reported or indirect speech, the subject pronoun in the reported clause, which was initially the first person, becomes the third person pronoun, indicating that the assertion is Ali's speech. Sentence (4d) is considered ungrammatical due to case disagreement; the subject must be in the nominative case, not accusative, which shows that clauses like (4d) fail to enter into a logophoric construction in English. (Examples (4a-c) are from Kuno (1987: 106), but sentence (4d) is added by us to demonstrate its impossibility/ungrammaticality due to agreement effects, see Rizzi 1990 and Satik 2022.)

- (4) a. “I am the best boxer in the world”  
       b. Ali claimed, “I am the best boxer in the world”  
       c. Ali claimed that he was the best boxer in the world  
       d. \*Ali claimed that himself was the best boxer in the world
- (5) a. [John anticipated ["I will be elected."]]  
       b. \*He<sub>i</sub>; anticipated that John<sub>j</sub>; would be elected.  
       c. \*That John<sub>j</sub>; would be elected was anticipated by him.

Kuno (1987: 107) goes on to maintain that the concept of indirect discourse representation bans (5b) and (5c) which are deviant of the underlying structure conveyed in (5a).

The study is structured as follows. After the introduction, we focus on the methodology describing the ways how to find the data for the Indonesian logophoricity and highlighting how the data are analyzed. Next, we move on to the analysis. Then the last section is the conclusion.

## II. METHODS

The study of Indonesian logophoricity requires data obtained from naturally occurring sentences/texts extent possible. Corpus data provides a valuable resource for this purpose. One such corpus is available through the Leipzig corpora, specifically the Indonesian Leipzig corpora. Logophoricity involves complex

sentences comprising a matrix clause and a dependent clause. Accessing the intended or targeted data within the corpus might pose challenges due to the complexity of logophoric constructions. These constructions hinge on the dependent clause, where the logophoric pronoun (such as *dirinya*, *dirimu*, *diri saya*, etc.) appears. Consequently, the fundamental elements of the data are the logophoric pronouns themselves.

Given that logophoric pronouns and ordinary pronouns share the same phonetic form in Indonesian, a meticulous selection of data is necessary to distinguish between their various usages. To ensure comprehensive coverage of all aspects of Indonesian logophoricity, additional resources such as Google Search are utilized to access diverse examples. However, the fabrication or manipulation of data through elicitation involving other Indonesian speakers is only considered as a last resort. All collected data undergo descriptive analysis.

### III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, the logophoric pronouns in Indonesian are derived from reflexive pronouns. First, let's familiarize ourselves with the forms of reflexive pronouns in Indonesian. They come in two types: simple reflexive and complex reflexive. The former is expressed by the word *diri*, meaning body, while the latter consists of a simple reflexive plus a possessive marker, either expressed by the possessive modifier or a bound formative indicating possession. The pronouns that participate in reflexive constructions include the simple reflexive anaphor *diri* and the complex reflexive anaphors, which are composed of the simple reflexive plus first, second, or third possessive formatives. The reflexive pronouns are:

- (6) a. First person complex reflexives: *diri saya* or *diriku* meaning 'myself'
- b. Second person complex reflexives: *dirimu* *diri saudara* 'yourself'
- c. Third person complex reflexive : *dirinya*, *diri mereka*

The occurrence of the types of reflexive anaphor in types of verbs (action or non-action/stative verbs) and whether those types can fill the subject (SUBJ), object (OBJ), or oblique (OBL) positions in a plain declarative (SVO) clause can be depicted in Table 1

**Table 1 The occurrence of the types of reflexive anaphor**

Anaphor	Action	Stative	SUBJ	OBJ	OBL
---------	--------	---------	------	-----	-----

type	verbs	verbs			
Simple reflexive	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Complex reflexive	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Similar to Balinese (see Udayana 2013, 2022a), all reflexive forms, including simple reflexives and complex reflexives, participate in reflexive constructions as reflexive anaphors. Both the simple reflexive and the complex reflexive can co-occur with action verbs, but the simple reflexive can only co-occur with non-action verbs. First, let's examine the action verbs that occur with the first person.

- (7) a. Setelah menemani ibu,  
after AV.accompany mother  
makan siang aku; segera  
lunch 1SG soon  
menyiapkan **diri**<sub>i</sub> menuju UIA  
AV.prepare self go.to UIA  
'After accompanying my mother for lunch, I immediately prepared myself to go to UIA'
- b. Baru tadi pagi aku;  
just this morning 1SG  
memperkenalkan **diri**<sub>i</sub> didepan  
AV.introduce self in.front.of  
Teman-teman baruku.  
teman- RED new.1SGPOSS  
'Just this morning I introduced myself in front of my friends'
- c. Saya<sub>i</sub> tidak membandingkan  
1SG NEG AV.compare.CAUS  
**diri**<sub>i</sub> dengan mereka  
self with 3PL  
'I did not compare myself with them'

Second, the action verb whose internal arguments are second-person and third-person simple reflexive pronouns.

- (8) a. Cobalah tenangkan **diri**<sub>i</sub>, dan  
try.PART calm.CAUS self and  
yakin anda<sub>i</sub> pasti bisa membantu  
surely 2 AUX AV.help  
anak anda.  
'Try to calm yourself, and make sure that you can help your child'
- b. Jadi, seperti rasi bintang air,  
so, like constellation water  
anda<sub>i</sub> akan melakukan apaun  
2 AUX AV.do whatever  
untuk melindungi **diri**<sub>i</sub>  
to AV.protect self  
'So, like water constellation, you will do whatever you can to protect yourself'
- c. Muis<sub>i</sub> akhirnya berhasil

Muis finally successful  
 melarikan diri<sub>i</sub>  
 AV.run.CAUS self  
 ‘Muis finally succeeded in making  
 himself run away’

- d. Dan sebagian besar para imam<sub>i</sub>  
 and most all priest  
 telah menguduskan diri<sub>i</sub>  
 already AV.consecrate.CAUS self  
 ‘And most of the priests have  
 consecrated themselves’

Similarly, the internal argument of a verb in a simple declarative clause can be filled by complex reflexive anaphors which can be realized by first, second, or third person

- (9) a. Aku<sub>i</sub> tak malu lagi  
 1SG NEG ashamed again  
 menampakan diriku<sub>i</sub>  
 AV.see.CAUS self=1SG POSS  
 ‘I am not ashamed to show myself  
 anymore’
- b. Istriku<sub>i</sub> menerima.  
 wife.1SGPOSS AV.accept  
 diriku<sub>i</sub> apa adanya  
 self.1POSS COMP existenc  
 ‘My wife accepts me as what I am’
- c. Tapi sepertinya kamu<sub>i</sub> belum  
 but seem 2 not.yet  
 memperkenalkan dirimu<sub>i</sub>  
 AV.introduce self.2POSS  
 ‘But it seems that have not introduced  
 yourself yet’
- d. Kamu<sub>i</sub> harus yakin pada  
 2 AUX sure in  
 dirimu sendiri<sub>i</sub>  
 self.2POSS self  
 ‘You must be sure of yourself’
- e. Selama calon ibu<sub>i</sub>,  
 while candidate mother  
 merias dirinya<sub>i</sub> sang ibu  
 AV.dress self.3POSS ART mother  
 menjual rujuk kembang  
 AV.sell rujuk kembang  
 ‘While the mother-to-be was doing  
 her make-up, the mother was selling  
 rujuk kembang’
- f. Anak perempuan<sub>i</sub> mulai  
 child female AV.begin  
 sering memperhatikan  
 often AV.pay.attention.CAUS  
 dirinya<sub>i</sub>  
 self.3POSS  
 ‘Girls began to often pay attentions to  
 themselves’
- g. Mereka<sub>i</sub> menganggap dirinya<sub>i</sub>

3PL AV.consider self.3POSS  
 cowboy  
 cowboy  
 ‘They consider themselves cowboys’

Regarding simple versus complex reflexives, we argue that logophoric constructions in Indonesian adhere to discourse syntax principles. This means that the second-mentioned entity is in a definite form. First, let's examine this phenomenon in a non-logophoric context.

- (10) a. Dia mengatakan membeli  
 3SG AV.say AV.buy  
 buku dan ternyata buku  
 book and indeed book  
 mahal  
 expensive  
 ‘(S)he said that she had bought a book  
 and indeed a book is expensive’
- b. Dia menyimpan surat tetapi dia  
 3SG AV.keep letter but 3SG  
 Dapatkan surat sulit dibaca  
 find letter difficult PASS.read  
 ‘(S)he kept the letter but he found it  
 difficult to be read’

In both (10a) and (10b), the second-mentioned lexical items, buku 'book' and surat 'letter' respectively, remain indefinite. In such cases, as argued by Halliday and Hasan (1976), there is no cohesive relationship between the same lexical item mentioned previously. This implies a lack of semantic interdependence between them; they are not co-identified and are considered two distinct objects. However, the situation changes in (11) where the two lexical items, pensil 'pencil' and baju 'dress', take different paths: the first remains indefinite, while the second becomes definite. Therefore, unlike in (11a) and (11b), they refer to the same object.

- (11) a. Mereka mambeeli pensil, dia  
 3PL AV.buy pencil, 3 SG  
 kemudian tahu bahwa pensil itu  
 then know COMP pencil that  
 rusak  
 broken  
 ‘They bought a pencil, She then knew  
 that the pencik was broken’
- b. Ali membeli baju dan dia dapatkan  
 Ali AV. buy shirt and 3SG find that  
 baju itu bagus kualitasnya  
 shirt that good quality=DEF  
 ‘Ali boght a dress and he found that the  
 dress was in good quality’

As mentioned earlier, the logophoric pronoun in Indonesian originates from reflexive

pronouns. The reflexive anaphors selected correspond with the concept of given and new information in discourse syntax. This is evident in the requirement that all reflexive elements involved in logophoricity must be part of a definite noun phrase, overtly marked by a possessive marker, to indicate co-reference with the intended antecedent. Consequently, the simple reflexive *diri* is excluded. Consider the following contrast:

- (12) a. \**Dia<sub>i</sub>* mengatakan bahwa *diri<sub>i</sub>*  
 3SG AV.say COMP self  
 akan datang  
 AUX come  
 ‘He said that he would come’  
 b. *Dia<sub>i</sub>* mengatakan *dirinya<sub>i</sub>*  
 3SG AV.say self.3POSS  
 akan datang  
 AUX come  
 ‘He said that he would come’  
 c. *Kamu<sub>i</sub>* percaya bahwa *dirimu<sub>i</sub>*  
 2 believe COMP self.2POSS  
 akan mendapatkan pekerjaan  
 AUX AV.get job  
 itu  
 that  
 ‘You said that you would get the job’

There are two primary reasons that may account for the ungrammaticality of (12a). Firstly, *diri* is only compatible with certain verbs, particularly highly transitive ones like *memperkenalkan* ‘introduce’, as demonstrated in (13a). Conversely, low transitive verbs such as *melihat* ‘see’ cannot be paired with *diri* (13b); instead, only the complex reflexive form works well with this type of verb, as illustrated in (13c).

- (13) a. *Ia<sub>i</sub>* memperkenalkan *diri<sub>i</sub>*  
 3SG AV.introduce self  
 ke pada semua orang di sana  
 to all person there  
 ‘(S)he introduced himself/herself to all the people there’  
 b. \**Ia<sub>i</sub>* melihat *diri<sub>i</sub>* di kaca  
 3SG AV.see self in mirror  
 ‘(S)he saw himself/herself in the mirror’  
 c. *Dia<sub>i</sub>* melihat *dirinya<sub>i</sub>* di kaca  
 3SG AV.see.self.3POSS in mirror  
 ‘(S)he saw himself/herself in the mirror’

Secondly, while the simple reflexive can accompany high transitive verbs, it cannot be used in the OV construction or appear in a preposed position (as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (14a)). However, transforming the simple reflexive in (14a) into

the complex reflexive yields a grammatical OV construction (14b), indicating that complex reflexives play a crucial role not only in reflexivization but also in Indonesian logophoricity.

- (14) a. \**Diri<sub>i</sub>* dia memperkenalkan  
 self 3SG OV.introduce  
 kepada semua orang di sana  
 to all person there  
 \*‘Self she introduced to all the people there’  
 b. *Dirinya<sub>i</sub>* dia memperkenalkan  
 self.3POSS 3SG OV.introduce  
 kepada semua orang di sana  
 to all person there  
 ‘Himself/herself (s)he introduced to all the people there’

The ungrammaticality of (14a) aligns with the status of *diri* in Indonesian, which possesses clitic properties; it can only be cliticized to a verb. It cannot function as the object of a preposition (as seen in (15a)), and a clitic cannot be coordinated (Spencer & Luís, 2012), as demonstrated in (15b). However, object coordination is permissible only with the complex reflexive. This further underscores that all the constraints associated with the simple reflexive render it incapable of participating in Indonesian logophoric constructions.

- (15) a. *Dia<sub>i</sub>* tidak percaya dengan \**diri<sub>i</sub>*/  
 3SG NEG believe with self  
*dirinya<sub>i</sub>*  
 self.3POSS  
 ‘(S)he cannot believe in himself’  
 b. \**Dia<sub>i</sub>* memperkenalkan *diri<sub>i</sub>* dan  
 3SG AV.introduce self and  
 Tono  
 Tono  
 ‘(S)he introduced himself/herself and Tono’  
 c. *Dia<sub>i</sub>* memperkenalkan *dirinya<sub>i</sub>*  
 3SG AV.introduce himself/herself  
 dan Tono  
 and Tono  
 ‘(S)he introduced himself/herself and Tono’

It is noteworthy that in languages with dedicated logophoric pronouns, such as some West African languages, there's a tendency to avoid using first and second-person logophoric constructions. This means that only third-person logophoric expressions are considered acceptable in those languages (see Huang, 2000). This contrasts with the situation in Indonesian, where all person values in logophoric constructions are

permissible, as demonstrated in the following examples.

- (16) a. Saya<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa [diri  
 1SG AV.say COMP self  
 saya]<sub>i</sub> akan datang  
 1SGPOSS AUX come  
 ‘I said that I would come’
- b. Kamu<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa  
 2 AV.say COMP  
 dirimu<sub>i</sub> akan berenang di sana  
 self.2POSS AUX swim there  
 ‘You said that you would swim there’
- c. Dia<sub>i</sub> merasa bahwa dirinya<sub>i</sub> akan  
 3SG AV.feel COMPself.3POSS AUX  
 menang pada kompetisi itu  
 win in competition that  
 ‘He felt that he would win in that  
 competition’

Upon closer examination, it seems plausible that the avoidance of first and second-person logophoricity is related to the phenomenon of information packaging or information structure. In information structure, first and second person entities are directly implicated in discourse and are thus associated with what is termed old information, whereas the occurrence of third person entities typically relates to new information. This phenomenon mirrors the behavior observed in passive sentences, as illustrated in (17) and (18), taken from Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 243-244).

- (17) a. A dog attacked me in the park.  
 b. I was attacked by a dog in the park

- (18) a. I bought a tie  
 b. ?A tie was bought by me.

The information structure underlying the contrast between an active construction and its passive counterpart hinges on the distinction between old and new information. In (17a), the subject NP is associated with new information, while in its passive counterpart, the subject I represents old information. Conversely, in (18a), the subject of the active clause is old information. Both active constructions are grammatically correct, as there are no restrictions on whether the subject of an active clause can represent new or old information.

Huddleston and Pullum suggest a problem with passive sentences. Specifically, it is seen as odd that the internal complement in passive sentences (the object of the preposition *by*, representing the actor of the event) is linked to old information (first-person or second-person). This suggests that the active sentence in (18a) is

more preferred than (18b). The intuition here is that passive sentences are derived sentences, constituting a report. If a report conveys negative or unfavorable information, it becomes a sensitive issue for both the speaker and the hearer (the persons involved in discourse), which may lead to a face-threatening act in the resulting passive expressions.

The restrictions to the use of the first and second-person agent *by*-phrase seem to be universal. It also applies to Indonesian. Consider the following examples:

- (19) a. Dia membeli buku kemarin  
 3SG AV.buy. book yesterday  
 ‘(S)he bought a book yesterday’  
 (active)
- b. Buku itu dibeli oleh dia  
 book that PAS.buy. by 3SG  
 kemarin  
 yesterday  
 ‘The book was bought by him/her  
 yesterday’  
 (passive)

The passive counterpart of (19a) doesn't present any issues. The presence of the third-person *by* phrase in the passive sentence is acceptable. However, this contrasts with the passive construction involving first and second person *by* phrases, which are prohibited, as indicated by the asterisk symbol (Sneddon, 1996). To remedy the ungrammaticality of (19b), Sneddon proposes using sentence (20c), which he refers to as passive type 2 in Indonesian, categorizing the passive clause in (20b) as passive type 1.

- (20) a. Saya/kamu mencubit orang itu  
 1SG/ 2 AV.pinch person that  
 ‘I/you pinched that person’  
 (active)
- b. Orang itu dicubit oleh \*saya/\*kamu  
 person that PASS.pinch by 1SG/2  
 ‘That person was pinch by  
 him/her/you’  
 (passive)
- c. Orang itu saya/kamu cubit  
 person that 1SG/2 OV.pinch  
 (i) ‘That person was pinched by  
 me/you’  
 (ii) ‘I/you pinched that person’

It is worth noting that the analysis of sentence (20c) remains controversial in Indonesian syntax. It is interpreted either as having a passive interpretation (see Nomoto, 2018 and 2021) or an active interpretation related to the symmetrical voice system (see Arka, 1988,

2002, 2003; Himmelman and Riesberg, 2013; Udayana, 2022b for further details).

In conclusion, like passive sentences, logophoric constructions inherently involve reporting. This rationalizes the avoidance of first-person and second-person logophoricity in some languages (West African languages).

While reflexive and logophoric pronouns in Indonesian stem from the same word, "diri," there are distinctions. Logophoric use of complex reflexives can undergo passivization, while their reflexive uses cannot. This aligns with the claim made in English by Quirk et al. (1985) that reflexive constructions cannot undergo passivization. They argue that no action is transferred if it's performed by the same person, whether involving the entire body or just body parts, as illustrated in (22b).

- (21) a. He<sub>i</sub> loves himself<sub>i</sub>  
(active)  
b. \*Himself<sub>i</sub> is loved by him<sub>i</sub>  
(passive)
- (22) a. He<sub>i</sub> nodded his<sub>i</sub> head  
(active)  
b. \*His<sub>i</sub> head is nodded by him<sub>i</sub>  
(passive)
- (23) a. He<sub>i</sub> loved him<sub>j</sub>  
(active)  
b. He<sub>i</sub> was loved by him<sub>j</sub>  
(passive)

From the examples, it's evident that co-indexation indicates the NPs in question refer to the same entities, making the associated clause unable to be transformed into a passive construction. However, in the example in (24a), the explicit reference indicates that the entities of the two NPs are different, thereby allowing the sentence to be transformed into a passive construction in (24b).

- (24) a. Dia<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa  
3SG AV.say COMP  
dirinya<sub>i</sub> mencintai Ana  
self.3POSS AV.love Ana  
'He said that he loved Ana'  
b. Dia<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa Ana  
3SG AV.say COMP Ana  
dicintai oleh dirinya<sub>i</sub>  
PASS.love by self.3POSS  
'He said that Ana was loved by him'

In Indonesian, the pronoun *dia* '3SG' is ambiguous, as it can refer to either a male or female person. In a logophoric context, *dia* is interpreted as referring to a male person. However, in the clausal complement, *dirinya* is

ambiguous between serving as a third-person male logophor and a third-person female reflexive. Consequently, the sentence as a whole is ambiguous, allowing for both reflexive and logophoric readings, as observed in the translation.

- (25) a. Dia<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa Ana<sub>j</sub>  
3SG AV.say COMP Ana  
mencintai dirinya<sub>ij</sub>  
AV.love self.3POSS  
(i) He said Ana love himself'  
(ii) He said that Ana loved herself'  
b. Dia<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa dirinya<sub>i</sub>  
3SG AV.say COMP self.3POSS  
dicintai oleh Ana  
PASS.love by Ana  
'He said that he was loved by Ana'  
c. \*Dia<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa dirinya<sub>j</sub>  
3SG AV.say COMP self.3POSS  
dicintai oleh Anaj  
PASS.love by Ana  
'He said that Ana was loved by herself'

Now, we delve into a new phenomenon in logophoricity closely linked to an aspect of discourse grammar or discourse syntax, namely synecdoche. Synecdoche concerns itself with part-whole relations, as illustrated in (26). Sentence (26a) asserts that Jakarta, as the capital city of Indonesia, represents Indonesia as a whole. Consequently, it's reasonable to use Jakarta to discuss Indonesia in discourse syntax. Therefore, according to this conception, (i) is deemed unacceptable. Expanding the sentence in (26a) into a complex sentence, where the subject NP of the matrix clause is represented by Jakarta, conveys the idea that Jakarta represents Indonesia, and discussing Indonesia within the clausal complement of the verb in the matrix clause is perfectly acceptable. However, attempting to reverse this idea, where the subject NP of the matrix clause is Indonesia and the subject of the clausal complement is Jakarta, fails to imply a synecdoche relation. Hence, (26c) is considered bad in terms of discourse syntax.

- (26) a. Jakarta menyetujui pertemuan itu  
Jakarta AV.agree.with meeting that  
(i) \*'Jakarta agreed with the meeting'  
(ii) 'Indonesia agreed with that meeting'  
b. Jakarta menyatakan bahwa Indonesia  
Jakarta AV.state COMP Indonesia  
menyetujui pertemuan itu  
AV.agree.with meeting that  
'Jakarta stated that Indonesia agreed with that meeting'

- c. \*Indonesia menyatakan bahwa  
 Indonesia AV.state COMP  
 Jakarta menyetujui pertemuan itu  
 Jakarta AV.agree.with meeting that  
 ‘Indonesia stated that Jakarta agreed  
 with the meeting’

Discourse syntax also intersects with synecdoche. Let's examine examples of this phenomenon in languages with dedicated logophoric pronouns, such as Ewe and Gokana, as illustrated below. As previously mentioned, Ewe employs a special logophoric pronoun, while in Gokana, logophoricity is marked on the verb, indicating that the verb's subject is a logophor.

In (27a), *yèwodo* functions as a logophor and is co-indexed with the subject of the matrix clause. Although the logophor is plural in number, its antecedent is singular, indicating that the antecedent is part of the group designated by the logophor. Conversely, in (27b), the pronoun *wodo* is non-logophoric, resulting in disjoint reference with its antecedent. Similarly, in Gokana, (28a) features the subject NP of the dependent clause categorized as a logophor, serving as the argument of the logophoric verb it co-occurs with. Conversely, the pronoun in (28b) does not co-occur with a logophoric verb, rendering it non-logophoric and thus unable to be co-indexed with the subject of the matrix clause. Ewe (Clements 1975: 151):

- (27) a. Kofi kpɔ be yèwo-do go.  
 Kofi see COMP LOG-PL-come out  
 ‘Kofi<sub>i</sub> saw that they<sub>i+j</sub> had come out.’  
 b. Kofi kpɔ be wo-do go.  
 Kofi see COMP 3PL-come out  
 ‘Kofi<sub>i</sub> saw that they<sub>j</sub> had come out.’

Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981: 20):

- (28) a. lébàrèè kɔ bàè dɔ- é.  
 Lébàrèè said they fell-Log  
 ‘Léba<sub>rèè</sub><sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>i+j</sub> fell.’  
 b. lébàrèè kɔ bàè dɔ .  
 Lébàrèè said they fell  
 ‘Léba<sub>rèè</sub><sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>j</sub> fell.’

The synecdoche relation in Indonesian is also evident in the antecedent-logophor relations, where the subject of the matrix clause, serving as the antecedent of the logophor, controls the relation. In (29a), the subject *saya* '1SG' is used to refer to *diri kami*, indicating that *saya* is part of *diri kami*. This part-whole relation results in the two NPs having joint reference or being co-indexed. As previously noted, altering the position where *kami* is used as the antecedent, while replacing the anaphor with the singular first

person, leads to ungrammaticality. In other words, the antecedent-logophor relations fail because *diri saya* does not represent *kami*, as illustrated in (29b).

- (29) a. Saya<sub>i</sub> merasa bahwa [diri  
 1SG feel COMP self  
 kami]<sub>i+j</sub> tidak  
 1PL EXCL.POSS NEG  
 akan memenuhi persyaratan  
 AUX AV.fulfil requirement  
 yang salah itu  
 REL wrong that  
 ‘I feel that we will not fulfill that  
 wrong requirements’  
 b. \*Kami<sub>i</sub> merasa bahwa [diri  
 1PL EXCL feel COMP self  
 saya]<sub>i+j</sub> tidak akan memenuhi  
 1SG POSSNEG AUX AV.fulfil  
 persyaratan yang salah itu  
 requirement REL wrong that  
 ‘We feel that I will not fulfill that  
 wrong requirements’

The first-person *saya* is not only a part of the first-person plural exclusive but also part of the plural first-person inclusive, thus enabling both to engage in logophoric relations. What they have in common is that if we reverse the situation, with the first-person plural exclusive as the head of the matrix clause and the first person turned into a logophor, the logophoric relation cannot be maintained, resulting in the oddity of (30b). Although (30c) may appear similar to (a), both being compatible with logophoric relations, (30c) differs from (30a) mainly in terms of stylistic variations. The informal first person *aku* is still compatible with the pars pro toto relation because Indonesian does not have an informal version of the first-person inclusive.

- (30) a. Saya<sub>i</sub> percaya bahwa [diri  
 1SG believe COMP self  
 kita]<sub>i+j</sub> bisa  
 1PL.INCL.POSS AUX  
 memecahkan masalah itu  
 AV.solve problem that  
 ‘I believe that we can solve the  
 problem’  
 b. \*Kita<sub>i</sub> percaya bahwa [diri  
 1PL INCL. believe COMP self  
 saya]<sub>i+j</sub> bisa memecahkan  
 1SG POSS AUX AV.solve  
 masalah itu  
 problem that  
 ‘We believe that I can solve the  
 problem’  
 c. Aku merasa bahwa diri kami



1SG feel COMP self 1PL.EXCL  
 tidak akan menemui dia  
 NEG AUX AV.meet 3SG  
 'I feel that we will not meet him'

AUX AV.buy shirt  
 'He said that they would buy a shirt'

Now, let's explore the synecdoche relation involving the second person. The concepts of inclusivity and exclusivity within the first person plural affect the logophoric environment. Inclusivity encompasses the second person, while exclusivity, as the name implies, does not. This distinction renders (31a) grammatical, while (31b) is not entirely acceptable. Moreover, (31c) demonstrates how pronominal plurality can be achieved by modifying *kamu* with the adjective *semua* 'all', making it a plural pronoun and thus ensuring the acceptability of (31c).

- (31) a. *Kamu<sub>i</sub> yakin bahwa [diri kita]<sub>i+j</sub>*  
 2 sure COMP self1PLINCL  
 akan berhasil  
 AUX successful  
 'You are sure that we will be successful'
- b. \**Kamu<sub>i</sub> mengatakan bahwa [diri*  
 2 AV.say COMP self  
*kami]<sub>j</sub> membuat semua itu*  
 PLEXCL AV.make all that  
 'You said that we made all those things'
- c. *Kamu<sub>i</sub> harus percaya bahwa [diri*  
 2 AUX believe COM self  
*kamu semua]<sub>i+j</sub> akan siap*  
 2 all AUX ready  
 dengan pekerjaan itu  
 with job that  
 'You have to believe that you all will be ready for the job'

An interesting observation pertains to third-person plural logophoricity. The formative *-nya* denotes possession related to either the third person singular or plural. Thus, *dirinya* in (32a) is glossed as '3POSS'. However, to circumvent potential ambiguity in the meaning of (32a), the third-person possessive modifier *mereka* '3PLPOSS' is employed in (32b).

- (32) a. *Dia<sub>i</sub> berkata bahwa dirinya<sub>i</sub>*  
 3SG say COMP self.3POSS  
 akan pergi ke Jakarta  
 AUX go to Jakarta  
 (i) 'He said that he would go to Jakarta'  
 (ii) 'He said that they would go to Jakarta'
- b. *Dia<sub>i</sub> berkata bahwa [diri mereka]<sub>i+j</sub>*  
 3SG say COMP self 3PLPOSS  
 akan membeli baju.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have investigated logophoricity in Indonesian. Indonesian lacks dedicated logophoric pronouns. The concept of logophoricity first emerged in the seminal work of Hagège (1974), clarifying that the so-called logophoric pronoun represents the thoughts or speech of the subject in the clausal complement of a verb of communication. Linguists then began exploring languages beyond those of West Africa. It is intriguing that in these languages, although they lack dedicated logophoric pronouns and associated characteristics, reflexive pronouns consistently fulfill their roles. However, the behavior of reflexive pronouns or anaphors in handling logophoricity varies across languages. For example, the construction *Dia mengatakan bahwa dirinya akan menang*, meaning he said that he would win, as discussed earlier, is acceptable in Indonesian. A similar construction in English, such as *He said himself would win* is prohibited due to the inability of *himself* to function as a subject in English. Regarding the logophoric situation in Indonesian, I have argued that Indonesian logophoric constructions adhere to most principles of discourse syntax. Notably, they satisfy principles such as topic and comment relations, synecdoche interpretation, and distinguishing between old and new information.

#### REFERENCES

- Arka, I Wayan and Christopher D. Manning. (1998). Voice and grammatical relations in Indonesian: A new perspective. Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference The University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- Arka, I Wayan. (2002). Voice systems in the Austronesian languages of Nusantara: Typology, symmetry and Undergoer orientation. Paper presented at the 10th National Symposium of the Indonesian Linguistics Society, Bali-Indonesia.
- Arka, I W. (2003). Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University.
- Büring, D. (2005). Binding Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clements, G. N. (1975). The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10.141-177
- Culy, C. (1994). Aspects of Logophoric Marking. *Linguistics*, 32:1055-1094.
- Culy, C. (1997). Logophoric Pronouns and Point of

- View. *Linguistics*, 35: 845-849
- Hagège, C. (1974). Les Pronoms Logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69.287-310.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Huang, Y. (2000). *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. and Sonja Riesberg. (2013). Symmetrical Voice and Applicative Alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 52 (2): 396-422.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. (2005). *A Student's Introduction to the English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyman, Larry M., and Bernard Comrie. (1981). Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3.19-37.
- Koster, J., & Reuland, E. (eds.). (1991). *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Nomoto, Hiroki (2018). The development of the English-type passive in Balinese in *Wacana*, 19 (1): 149-167.
- Nomoto, Hiroki (2021) Overlooked bare voice constructions in Western Austronesian in *NUSA*, 71: 1-18.
- Oshima, D. Y. (2004). On Emphatic and Logophoric Binding. Workshop on Semantic Approaches to Binding Theory. Nancy, France August 2004
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Satik, D., (2022) "Unraveling Balinese Binding", *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 7(1).
- Sells, P. (1987). Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.445-479.
- Sneddon, James Neil. (1996). *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Spencer, A. & Luís, A. R. (2012). *Clitics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trask, R.L. (1993). *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Udayana, I Nyoman. (2013). *Voice and Reflexives in Balinese*. Ph.D. The University of Texas at Austin. Dissertation
- Udayana, I Nyoman (2022 a). On the Distribution of Reflexive Anaphors and Logophoric Anaphors in Balinese in *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12 (9): 1848-1857.
- Udayana, I Nyoman (2022 b). Di- Passive and Discourse Context in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13 (6): 1304-1312.