Annika Hübl and Markus Steinbach

Quotation across Modalities
Shifting Contexts in Sign and Spoken Languages

The notion of 'quotation' is not necessarily restricted to written texts and the study of the use of quotation marks, but can also be applied to spoken and signed texts. Sign languages frequently use a specific kind of quotation: *role shift*. Surprisingly, role shift is neither the sign language equivalent of direct speech in spoken languages nor that of indirect speech. In fact, it combines properties of both direct and indirect speech. The visual-manual modality of sign languages offers the unique possibility of shifting into the role and adopting the perspective of the quoted person by slightly shifting the body position, changing the position of the head, and breaking the eye contact with the addressee. These so-called non-manual features marking role shift occur simultaneously to manual signs and take scope over the whole embedded clause (see example (1) from German Sign Language (DGS)).

(1) $3a<\underline{\hspace{3cm}}>3b$
        DAVID IX$_{3a}$ LISA IX$_{3b}$ SAY ： TOMORROW $_1$HELP$_2$
        'David said to Lisa that he will help her tomorrow.'

"< >" stands for the non-manuals indicating role shift in DGS, the shifted context is indicated by the local indices "3a" and "3b". Semantically role shift can be analyzed as a non-manual agreement operator that triggers a context shift leading to the interpretation that the embedded sentence in (1) has been uttered in a context C2 different from the actual context C1 with David (i.e. 3a) as the speaker and Lisa (i.e. 3b) as the addressee of the utterance in C2. Consequently, agreement verbs such as HELP in (1) are interpreted within the scope of the non-manuals marking role shift – the same holds for 1st and 2nd person personal pronouns such as IX$_1$ ('I') and IX$_2$ ('you'). In contrast to pronouns and agreement verbs, there is disagreement particularly with regard to the behaviour of temporal and local indexicals (such as TOMORROW in (1)). Sign languages seem to differ in how these types of indexicals are interpreted – with respect to the reported context or with respect to the context of the actual speech act. One conclusion of Quer (2011) is that Anand and Nevins' (2004) "Shift-Together Constraint" does not seem to hold for sign languages. However, Schlenker's (2011) data suggest that mixing perspectives in the scope of role shift is not adequate in American Sign Language (ASL). Herrmann and Steinbach (2007; 2012) present similar findings for DGS.

Four shortcomings of previous semantic analyses of role shift are (i) that they do not include other context-dependent elements such as, for example, speaker-oriented adverbials; (ii) that they do not explicitly discuss the interaction of matrix clauses and embedded role shift; (iii) that they do not account for the various functions of role shift and their potential effects; and (iv) that they lack a broad empirical basis (note, for example, that the corpus analysis of Herrmann and Steinbach (2012) only investigates the distribution of the non-manuals). In our talk, we will not only focus on the interpretation of agreement verbs and local and temporal indexicals, but also include anaphoric expressions and other context-dependent elements such as speaker-related expressions, which are usually realized non-manually in sign languages. In addition, we will discuss the interaction of role shift with accompanying matrix clauses. And finally, we will build our analysis on a small corpus of DGS narrations. For data elicitation, annotated DGS translations of the five ECHO-fables signed by three different signers were used (cf. Crasborn et al. 2007 and http://www.let.ru.nl/sign-lang/echo/).

We argue that the analysis of role shift should be embedded in two larger phenomena, which are very different at first sight. On the one hand, we analyze role shift as a special instance of constructed action, a modality-specific means of "quoting actions", and we discuss

the interaction of quoted utterances with "quoted actions". Among others, this idea can already be found in Liddell and Metzger (2008:672) who suggest the following table with different subtypes of constructed action.

(2)	**Types of constructed actions**	**What they indicate**
	Articulation of words or signs or emblems	What the |character| says or thinks
	Direction of head and eye gaze	Direction |character| is looking
	Facial expressions of affect, effort, etc.	How the |character| feels
	Gestures of hands and arms	Gestures produced by the |character|

On the other hand, we compare role shift to free indirect discourse, which is a specific kind of reported discourse typical of written literary texts (cf. Schlenker 2004; Sharvit 2008 among others).

(3) Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself. *For Lucy had her work cut out for her. The doors would be taken off their hinges; Rumpelmayer's men were coming. And then,* thought Clarissa Dalloway, *what a morning—fresh as if issued to children on a beach.*
(Virginia Woolf, *Mrs. Dalloway*. 1976. London: Hogarth Press; example taken from Sharvit 2008, 253)

There are apparent parallels in the analyses of both phenomena since both kinds of quotation (role shift and free indirect discourse) need not be overtly marked and keywords such as "shifting contexts" and "shifting perspectives" are highly relevant for role shift *and* for free indirect discourse. Note that Eckardt (2011) assumes a "Coherent Context of Narration" for the interpretation of free indirect discourse that is very similar to the "Shift-Together Constraint" named above. Thus, we will apply the formalism in Eckardt to the instances of quotation found in our fables and plead for an integrative theoretical analysis of reported discourse, covering spoken and sign languages as well as speech, thought, and action.

References

Anand, P. & Nevins, A. (2004). Shifty Operators in Changing Contexts. In Proceedings of SALT 14, 20-37.

Crasborn, O. et al. (2007). Sharing Sign Language Data Online: Experiences from the ECHO Project. In International Journal of Corpus Linguistics 12, 535-562.

Eckardt, R. (2011). Particles as Speaker Indexicals in Free Indirect Discourse. In L. Hogeweg & E. McCready (eds.). Particles. Special Issue of Linguistische Datenverarbeitung. Submitted. Available from: http://www.uni-goettingen.de/de/323434.html [accessed 13 April 2012].

Herrmann, A. & Steinbach, M. (2007). Wenn ‚ich' nicht ich ist. Zitieren in Gebärdensprachen. In E. Brendel, J. Meibauer, & M. Steinbach (eds.). Zitat und Bedeutung. Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft. Hamburg: Buske, 153-179.

Herrmann, A. & Steinbach, M. (2012). Quotation in Sign Languages – A Visible Context Shift. In I. van Alphen & I. Buchstaller (eds.). Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross Disciplinary Perspectives. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 203-228.

Liddell, S.K. & Metzger, M. (1998). Gesture in Sign Language Discourse. In: Journal of Pragmatics 30, 657-697.

Quer, J. (2011). Reporting and Quoting in Signed Discourse. In E. Brendel, J. Meibauer, & M. Steinbach (eds.). Understanding Quotation. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 277-302.

Schlenker, P. (2004). Context of Thought and Context of Utterance: A Note on Free Indirect Discourse and the Historical Present. In Mind & Language 19, 279-304.

Schlenker, P. (2011). Semantics and Sign Language. Workshop given at ESSLLI 2011, Ljubljana.

Sharvit, Y. (2008). The Puzzle of Free Indirect Discourse. In Linguistics and Philosophy 31, 353-395.