Title: Onomatopoeias and Reported Speech in English – Few Remarks on Syntax and Evidentiality

The aim of this presentation is twofold. First, it aims at drawing a parallel between onomatopoeias and reported speech (sometimes called *represented speech*, McGregor 1997 ; Nølke et Olsen, 2000 ; Rabatel, 2003 ; Vandelanotte, 2004, 2009; Verstraete, 2011 ; Rendulic, 2015) and to describe them as similar syntactic phenomena, belonging to a dedicated syntactic domain (Spronck & Nikitina, 2019) which we call "referential equivalents". Second, its purpose is to study evidentiality marking in reported speech and onomatopoeias (and more generally, any item that Buchstaller calls *sound effects* or *mimetic re-enactments*, 2014: 101) and suggest that they mark evidentiality via a conceptual metaphor and a conversational implicature. This is a theoretical investigation on the syntactic and semiotic status of onomatopoeias and direct reported speech in contemporary English.

To begin with, we will present a distinction between what we have called in a previous study (Meinard, 2021) "acts of exposition", like "pop" in *it went: "**pop**"* and "acts of designation", like "the following thing" in *she said **the following thing**: "I don't care"*. We will show that this difference is a consequence of the speaker's enunciative postures (how the speaker regards the referent); we will make use of concepts in Cognitive Grammar, like viewing arrangements, to describe these enunciative postures. Then, we will show that acts of exposition cannot be part of a predicative relationship and can be better described as referentially equivalent to other elements in the sentence, which will be revealed by tests on the scope of adverbs. We will show that this difference in scope is in accordance with the attention shift revealed by Pelyvás (2006: 123-124), who distinguishes cognitive predicates from non-cognitive matrix predicates by studying the scope of question tags. In this respect, onomatopoeias and direct reported speech are syntactically and semiotically similar.

In the second part of the presentation, we will study evidentiality in onomatopoeias and reported speech and propose the hypothesis that evidentiality is marked via the previously mentioned conceptual metaphor and via a subsequent conversational implicature (it is possible to present raw information because of a direct access to the information).

Keywords: Onomatopoeias; Reported Speech; Syntax; Evidentiality

Bibliography:

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality* (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 452p.

Authier-Revuz J. (1992). « Repères dans le champ du discours rapporté ». L'information grammaticale, 55(1), 38-42.

Buchstaller, I. (2014). Quotatives: New trends and sociolinguistic implications. John Wiley & Sons. 306 p. ISBN 978-0-470-657188

Clift, R. (2006). "Indexing Stance: Reported Speech as an Interactional Evidential". In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10.5: 569–595.

Haßler, G. (2002). "Evidentiality and Reported Speech in Romance Languages". In *Reported Discourse. A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*, edited by Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Roncador, 143–172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kleiber, G. (2006). « Sémiotique de l'interjection ». In Langages, vol. 40 (161) pp. 10-23.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. University of Chicago press. 632p.

Li, N. C. (1986). *Direct speech and indirect speech: A functional study. Direct and indirect speech*. Florian Coulmas (ed.), 29-45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McGregor, W. B. (1997). Semiotic grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meinard E-M. (2021). Le défi définitoire de l'interjection et de l'onomatopée : une étude contributive, axée sur l'anglais contemporain. Linguistique. Université de Lyon, 2021. Français. NNT : 2021LYSE2056. Id : tel-03608244

Mélac, É. (2014). *L'évidentialité en anglais-approche contrastive à partir d'un corpus anglais-tibétain* (Thèse de Doctorat, Paris 3).

Nikitina, T., Aplonova, E., Roa, L.C. (2023). The use of interjections as a discourse phenomenon: A contrastive study of Chuvash (Turkic) and Wan (Mande). John Benjamins Publishing Company. *Discourse Phenomena in Typological Perspective*, Studies in Language Companion Series (227), John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.65-89, 2023, Studies in Language Companion Series, ISBN 9789027212900. ⟨10.1075/slcs.227.04nik⟩. ⟨halshs-03909195⟩

Nølke, H., & Olsen, M. (2000). « Polyphonie : Théorie et terminologie », in *Polyphonie-recherches en linguistique et littérature* (2).

Pelyvás, Péter 2006. Subjectification in (expressions of) epistemic modality and the development of the grounding predication. In: Athanasiadou, Angeliki – Canakis, Costas – Cornillie, Bert (eds.): Subjectification. Various paths to subjectivity. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 121–150.

Rabatel, A. (2003). « Les verbes de perception en contexte d'effacement énonciatif: du point de vue représenté aux discours représentés ». In Travaux de linguistique, (1), 49-88.

Rendulic, N. (2015). *Le discours représenté dans les interactions orales. De l'étude des structures en contexte vers la construction de l'image des relations interlocutives* (Doctoral dissertation, Université d'Orléans).

Rosier, L. (1995). « La parataxe: heurs et malheurs d'une notion linguistico-littéraire ». In *Travaux de linguistique (Gent)*, (30), p. 51-64.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002). "Pragmatics, modularity and mind-reading". In *Mind & Language*, *17*(1-2), 3-23.

Spronck, S. (2012). "Minds Divided: Speaker Attitudes in Quotatives". In *Quotatives: Cross-linguistics and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid van Alphen, 71–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Spronck, S., & Nikitina, T. (2019). "Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain". In *Linguistic Typology*, *23*(1), 119-159. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2019-0005

Vandelanotte, L. (2009). *Speech and thought representation in English: A cognitive-functional approach* (Vol. 65). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Verhagen, A. (2005). Constructions of Intersubjectivity: Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Verstraete, J.-C. (2011). "The functions of represented speech and thought in Umpithamu narratives". In *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 31(4). 491–517.