RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa
Vol. 10, No. 2 August 2024, Page 637-646

P-ISSN: 2406-9019
E-ISSN: 2443-0668
Available Online at https://ejournal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/jret

Logophoricity-and-Discourse Syntax in Indonesian

I Nyoman Udayana[1], Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati[2]

[1,2]*Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Udayana*
Jalan Nias 13 Denpasar 80114, Bali, Indonesia
Email: nyoman_udayana@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.10.2.10250.637-646

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$_i$ saw that he$_j$ had money
'He$_i$ saw that he$_j$ had money.'

b. o ri pe oun ni owo
he$_i$ saw that he$_i$ had money
'He$_i$ saw that he$_i$ 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$_i$ said that he$_i$ left.'

b. Kofi be e-dzo.
Kofi say Pro-leave
'Kofi$_i$ said that he$_j$ left.'

Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981: 20):

(3) a. aè kɔ aè dɔ̀.
Pro said Pro fell
'He$_i$ said he$_j$ fell.'

b. aè kɔ aè dɔ̀-è.
Pro said Pro fell-Log
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ fell.'

In Ewe and Gokana, verbs are marked for logophoricity by yè- and -è, 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; anticipated that John; would be elected.
c. *That John; 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$_i$ segera
lunch 1SG soon
menyiapkan **diri$_i$** 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$_i$
just this morning 1SG
memperkenalkan **diri$_i$** 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$_i$ tidak membandingkan
1SG NEG AV.compare.CAUS
diri$_i$ dengan mereka
self with 3PL
'I did not campare myself with them'

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

(8) a. Cobalah tenangkan **diri$_i$**, dan
try.PART calm.CAUS self and
yakin anda$_i$ 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$_i$ akan melakukan apaun
2 AUX AV.do whatever
untuk melindungi **diri$_i$**
to AV.protect self
'So, like water constellation, you will do whatever you can to protect yourself'

c. Muis$_i$ akhirnya berhasil

Muis finally successful
melarikan diri$_i$
AV.run.CAUS self
'Muis finally succeeded in making himself run away'

d. Dan sebagian besar para imam$_i$
and most all priest
telah menguduskan diri$_i$.
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$_i$ tak malu lagi
1SG NEG ashamed again
menampakan diriku$_i$
AV.see.CAUS self=1SG POSS
'I am not ashamed to show myself anymore'

b. Istriku$_i$ menerima.
wife.1SGPOSS AV.accept
diriku$_i$ apa adanya
self.1POSS COMP existenc
'My wife accepts me as what I am'

c. Tapi sepertinya kamu$_i$ belum
but seem 2 not.yet
memperkenalkan dirimu$_i$
AV.introduce self.2POSS
'But it seems that have not introduced yourself yet'

d. Kamu$_i$ harus yakin pada
2 AUX sure in
dirimu sendiri$_i$
self.2POSS self
'You must be sure of yourself'

e. Selama calon ibu$_i$,
while candidate mother
merias dirinya$_i$ sang ibu
AV.dress self.3POSS ART mother
menjual rujak kembang
AV.sell rujak kembang
'While the mother-to-be was doing her make-up, the mother was selling rujak kembang'

f. Anak perempuan$_i$ mulai
child female AV.begin
sering memperhatikan
often AV.pay.attention.CAUS
dirinya$_i$
self.3POSS
'Girls began to often pay attentions to themselves

g. Mereka$_i$ menganggap dirinya$_i$
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 menyipan 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$_i$ mengatakan bahwa diri$_i$
3SG AV.say COMP self
akan datang
AUX come
'He said that he would come'

b. Dia$_i$ mengatakan dirinya$_i$
3SG AV.say self.3POSS
akan datang
AUX come
'He said that he would come'

c. Kamu$_i$ percaya bahwa dirimu$_i$
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$_i$ memperkenalkan diri$_i$
3SG AV.introduce self
ke pada semua orang di sana
to all personthere
'(S)he introduced himself/herself to all the people there'

b. *Ia*i* melihat diri$_i$ di kaca
3SG AV.see self in mirror
'(S)he saw himself/herself in the mirror'

c. Dia$_i$ melihat dirinya$_i$ 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 dia perkenalkan
self 3SG OV.introduce
kepada semua orang di sana
to all person there'
*'Self she introduced to all the people there'

b. Dirinya$_i$ dia perkenalkan
self.3POSS 3SG OV.introduce
kepada semua orang$_i$ di sana
to all person there
'Himself/herself (s)he introduded 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$_i$ tidak percaya dengan *diri/
3SG NEG believe with self
dirinya$_i$
self.3POSS
'(S)he cannot believe in himself'

b. *Dia$_i$ memperkenalkan diri$_i$ dan
3SG AV.introduce self and
Tono
Tono
'(S)he introduced himself/herself and Tono'

c. Dia*i* memperkenalkan dirinya$_i$
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$_i$ mengatakan bahwa [diri
1SG AV.say COMP self
saya]$_i$ akan datang
1SGPOSS AUX come
'I said that I would come'

b. Kamu$_i$ mengatakan bahwa
2 AV.say COMP
dirimu$_i$ akan berenang di sana
self.2POSS AUX swim there
'You said that you would swim there'

c. Dia$_i$ merasa bahwa dirinya$_i$ 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
b. 'That person was pinched by me/you'
c. '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$_i$ loves himself $_i$
(active)
b. *Himself $_i$ is loved by him $_i$
(passive)

(22) a. He$_i$ nodded his $_i$ head
(active)
b. *His $_i$ head is nodded by him $_i$
(passive)

(23) a. He$_i$ loved him $_j$
(active)
b. He$_i$ was loved by him $_j$
(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$_i$ mengatakan bahwa
3SG AV.say COMP
dirinya$_i$ mencintai Ana
self.3POSS AV.love Ana
'He said that he loved Ana
b. Dia$_i$ mengatakan bahwa Ana
3SG AV.say COMP Ana
dicintai oleh dirinya$_i$
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$_i$ mengantakan bahwa Ana $_j$
3SG AV.say COMP Ana
mencintai dirinya $_{i/j}$
AV.love self.3POSS
(i) He said Ana love himself'
(ii) He said that Ana loved herself'
b. Dia$_i$ mengatakan bahwa dirinya$_i$
3SG AV.say COMP self.3POSS
dicintai oleh Ana
PASS.love by Ana
'He said that he was loved by Ana'
c. *Dia$_i$ mengatakan bahwa dirinya$_j$
3SG AV.say COMP self.3POSS
dicintai oleh Ana*j*
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$_i$ saw that they$_{i+j}$ had come out.'
b. Kofi kpɔ be wo-do go.
Kofi see COMP 3PL-come out
'Kofi$_i$ saw that they$_j$ had come out.'

Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981: 20):

(28) a. lébàreè kɔ baè dɔ- ɛ́.
Lébàreè said they fell-Log
'Lébàreè$_i$ said that they $_{i+j}$ fell.'
b. lébàreè kɔ baè dɔ .
Lébàreè said they fell
'Lébàreè$_i$ said that they$_j$ 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$_i$ merasa bahwa [diri
1SG feel COMP self
kami] $_{i+j}$ tidak
1PL EXCL.POSS NEG
akan memenuhi persyaratan
AUX AV.fulfil reqirement
yang salah itu
REL wrong that
'I feel that we will not fulfill that wrong requirements'
b. * Kami$_i$ merasa bahwa [diri
1PL EXCL feel COMP self
saya] $_{i+j}$ tidak akan memenuhi
1SG POSSNEG AUX AV.fulfil
persyaratan yang salah itu
reqirement 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$_i$ percaya bahwa [diri
1SG believe COMP self
kita] $_{i+j}$ bisa
1PL.INCL.POSS AUX
memecahkan masalah itu
AV.solve problem that
'I believe that we can solve the problem'
b.*Kita$_i$ percaya bahwa [diri
1PL INCL. believe COMP self
saya]$_{i+j}$ 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'

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$_i$ yakin bahwa [diri kita] $_{i+j}$
2 sure COMP self1PLINCL
akan berhasil
AUX successful
'You are sure that we will be successful'

b. *Kamu$_i$ mengatakan bahwa [diri
2 AV.say COMP self
kami]$_j$ membuat semua itu
PLEXCL AV.make all that
'You said that we made all those things'

c. Kamu$_i$ harus percaya bahwa [diri
2 AUX believe COM self
kamu semua] $_{i+j}$ 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$_i$ berkata bahwa dirinya$_i$
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$_i$ berkata bahwa [diri mereka] $_{i+j}$
3SG say COMP self 3PLPOSS
akan membeli baju.
AUX AV.buy shirt
'He said that they would buy a shirt'

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, symmetricality 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.

Himmelmann, 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 Logophorocity. 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.