

Voices in the Text: Discourse Perspectives on Language Reports

GEOFF THOMPSON

University of Liverpool

This paper investigates the ways in which language events are reported in English. Language reports are identified on functional rather than structural grounds. The definition that is used for identification is 'signalled voices in text', and the framework suggested here attempts to account for all instances in naturally-occurring text which are covered by such a definition. Four main dimensions of choice for the reporter in any language report are outlined and exemplified: the voice that is presented as the source of the report, the way in which the message is reported, the reporting signal, and the reporter's attitude. Some possible applications of the framework are outlined.

1 INTRODUCTION

'Indirect (or reported) speech' and 'direct speech' are familiar terms in grammar books and language textbooks, and there appears to be a general consensus that they refer to a clear linguistic category which needs little definition. However, any survey of real texts shows the justice of Voloshinov's (1973: 128 n.) view of the 'methodological perniciousness of divorcing grammar and stylistics' in this area especially. Although there are many examples which can easily be fitted into traditional categories, there are many more which clearly involve reporting someone else's language but which do not fall into these categories. The following examples¹ give some idea of the problematic areas.

- (1) It's a case of 'reform or die', according to Jasper Becker
- (2) The King congratulated him again on his patriotism and loyalty
- (3) In Paris you must, apparently, have a lover or a dog
- (4) Jackie Mann, his wife says, has not been awfully well lately
- (5) He was eighteen this year so he was able to vote. *He* was going to vote Labour, *he* didn't like Mrs Thatcher

In (1), there is an extremely frequent form of reporting signal (an adjunct—in this case 'according to') which is not a reporting clause, and the reported clause also includes a partial quote. In (2), the report may well be as close to the original words as a report of them in 'indirect speech' would be, but there is no separate reported clause and the reporting verb itself ('congratulated'), in addition to signalling that a language event is being reported, expresses some of the content of what was said. 'Apparently' in (3) will be interpreted as most probably meaning something like 'I am reporting this information from an unspecified source'. The reported clause in 'indirect speech' is traditionally classed as subordinate, but in (4) the reported clause shows no sign of structural subordination—it is not

possible, for example, simply to insert 'that' at the beginning of the reported clause. There is no indication in the wording of (5) that the second sentence is a report, but the speaker signalled that she was in fact reporting the young man's words by, amongst other things, using an exaggerated rise and fall in pitch both times on 'he'.

The traditional emphasis on direct and indirect speech and the relationship between them may be due at least partly to the long-standing interest in the grammatical phenomena of sequence of tenses and backshift—see e.g. the debate between Comrie (1986), Huddleston (1989), and Declerck (1990). In theory, the issue of tenses in indirect speech can be examined without using a quoted direct speech equivalent for comparison—the comparison could equally well be with a non-reported proposition. However, a constructed 'original' utterance assigned to the reported speaker obviously brings out more forcefully the characteristic differences in the behaviour of tense in reported clauses. From a purely grammatical point of view, the relationship between a quote and a reported clause can be probed in a way that is not true, for instance, of the relationship between the following two reports of the same language event.

- (6) A woman *wished a heart attack on me* two days ago, didn't she? She said, '*I hope you have a heart attack*'.

This example indicates one of the crucial facts that grammatical approaches rarely attempt to deal with: that many reports are expressed by means of structures other than quotes or reported clauses, and that, as Voloshinov (1973) argues, any attempt to treat indirect speech solely in terms of mechanical transformations is bound to distort the picture.

My purpose in this paper is to suggest an overall framework for the description of 'language reports' (this term is used in order to avoid the associations of terms such as 'indirect speech', which are likely to lead to confusion). I shall argue that language reports are best approached from a functional rather than structural angle, although it is desirable to draw up—as far as possible—a list of the structural and lexical features which may be used to signal the reports. Reporting constitutes one of the 'semantic diffusions' or 'semantic motifs' which Martin (1992: 16) argues 'permeate the grammar'—other examples are modality and causation. Each semantic motif is made up of a group of meanings which are related semantically but which may be realized through a range of very different structural forms. It is therefore difficult to show the fact that they are related unless they are approached from above (discourse) rather than from below (structure). The guiding principle in establishing a framework is that speakers and writers have available a range of ways in which they can choose to introduce language reports into their text, and a useful account of this area—as of any area of language—will set out all the options as fully as possible, in a way which allows the analyst, language teacher, etc., to investigate the factors which influence the choice of any particular option in any particular context.

The framework proposed in the present paper derives from an attempt to describe the language reports identified in a survey of naturally-occurring text.

(for the detailed description on which the framework is based, see Thompson (1994)) However, as Stubbs (1986) argues in the case of the semantic diffusion of modality, the immense variation in formal realizations and, even more, the lack of agreement as to the basic question of which forms should be included means that any claims can as yet only be advanced provisionally. On a practical level, there is also the constraint that the data available for informal conversation is still relatively sparse and hard to come by in comparison with data for written language (and planned spoken, such as news reports), and it is possible that the frequency, if not the occurrence or non-occurrence, in conversation of certain kinds of language reports could lead at the least to different emphases once more conversational data is available. Nevertheless, the framework suggested here includes the major features that emerged from my data as needing to be accounted for and may provide a basis either for refinement or for counter-proposals.

2 EXISTING ANALYSES OF LANGUAGE REPORTS

As I have argued above, grammatical approaches to describing language reports are inherently constrained by their focus on identifiable structures (preferably those which can be related to a generalizable model of clause and sentence structure). Traditional accounts, such as that given in Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985: 1020–33), devote almost exclusive attention to clauses representing indirect speech forms which can be derived from direct speech by grammatical transformations. Other accounts include a wider range of report types. Dixon (1991), for example, starts from verbs which signal reports and examines the structures in which they function, whether or not the structure includes a separate reported clause. Halliday (1994: 250–73) restricts his description of 'projection' to cases where there is a separate projected (reported) clause, but he makes a useful distinction between the reporting of propositions (statements and questions), typically realized by *that*-clauses and *wh*-clauses, and the reporting of proposals (commands and offers), typically realized by *to*-infinitive clauses. He also includes embedded projections, where the projected clause is rank-shifted to function within a nominal group, and what he terms 'facts'.

(7) *That Caesar was dead* was obvious to all (Halliday 1994: 266)

The inclusion of 'facts' underlines the structural bias, since it is prompted by the formal parallels between such clauses and canonical reported clauses. The distinguishing features of approaches such as those of Dixon and Halliday—the orientation towards semantically-based explanations and the inclusion of non-canonical forms of reporting—have clear advantages for application in text analysis. Nevertheless, they are still subject to essentially the same constraints as traditional accounts and therefore need to be complemented by a discourse-based perspective.

If we now turn to other approaches which offer such perspectives, there are three main areas of discourse analysis where language reports have received

sustained attention. The first is in the investigation of the use of citations in academic discourse (see e.g. Jacoby 1987, Swales 1990, Thompson and Ye 1991, Shaw 1992, Hunston 1993, Tadros 1993). One noteworthy general aspect of this research has been the readiness to accept a very wide range of structures under the heading of language reports. This is because the focus has justifiably been on use in discourse rather than on grammatical identification: lists of available structural options, if given, are mostly presented as preliminary to the main task of discussing the effects of different choices. However, this focus does mean that the identification of citations is seen as essentially unproblematic. In many cases this is true, because of the highly developed set of conventions for signalling citations, but even within academic writing there are examples where it is difficult to decide unambiguously whether a stretch of language can be counted as a language report or not. In addition, the citation conventions for academic writing are highly specialized and restrictive: some types of language reports are found only in this context, while there are a number of other types which are not permitted or at least rarely found.

The analysis of language reports has also traditionally been of interest in the study of literature (see e.g. Voloshinov 1973, McHale 1978, Banfield 1982, Toolan 1988). The most fully developed account for English text, drawing on earlier categorizations such as that of Page (1973: 35), is that given in Leech and Short (1981). Their model of 'speech and thought presentation' has the advantage of being designed to cope with the analysis of real texts and thus—as with the studies of academic discourse—of having to take into account any structures which appear to have the function of reporting language, whether or not they fall into the traditional 'indirect/direct speech' categories. It is therefore comprehensive in its coverage, and, although it starts essentially from functional considerations, it sets out linguistic criteria by which the different categories can be identified. The main categories which Leech and Short set up are Narrative Report of Speech/Thought Act (NRSA/NRTA), Indirect Speech/Thought (IS/IT); Free Indirect Speech/Thought (FIS/FIT), Direct Speech/Thought (DS/DT), and Free Direct Speech/Thought (FDS/FDT). Of these, IS and DS are the traditional categories, while FIS has long been recognized as important for the analysis of literary texts. FDS is DS with either the quotation marks or the reporting clause, or both, missing. NRSA covers a somewhat loosely-defined range of structures which have in common that there is no separate finite reported clause: examples are given of reporting verbs followed by *to*-infinitive clauses,² prepositional phrases, and noun groups functioning as objects. Each of the categories for reports of speech is paralleled by a corresponding category for reports of thoughts.

One particularly important aspect of Leech and Short's model is that they present the categories in terms of a set of choices for the writer: the writer is seen as being in a position potentially to report any speech or thought event by means of any of the structures. They identify one main factor as influencing the choice in the kind of texts that they are investigating, that of narratorial 'interference' (Leech and Short 1981: 324): the categories are placed in order along a cline

from 'Narrator apparently in total control of report' (NRSA), to 'Narrator apparently not in control of report at all' (FDS) Thus, the model corresponds very closely to the kind of framework that I wish to set up Nevertheless, the fact that the model is primarily intended for literary text leads to certain emphases which are justifiable in that context but which to some extent restrict its usefulness in other contexts The focus on FIS and the thought presentation categories, and on the issue of narratorial interference, is clearly linked to the central question of how point of view is created in the novel, but in other types of text an investigation of these aspects may be less revealing Features such as the use of self-report or the reporter's evaluation of what s/he is reporting seems relatively unimportant in literary texts, whereas in other genres they may be crucial aspects of language reports In addition, there is typically in literature no 'original' language event to report, and thus it is usually not relevant to ask how faithful the report is to what was really said and why the reporter may have altered or interpreted the message in some way In fact, as will be seen below, Leech and Short's categories appear to relate primarily to one of the four main dimensions of choice in language reports, and a full picture of reports emerges only from a consideration of all four

An area in which the relationship between the report and the original language is important is in newspaper reporting, and linguistic analysis of language reports has played a major role in the study of journalistic discourse, particularly in recent years (see e.g. Slembrouck 1986, Short 1988, van Dijk 1988, Fairclough 1992; Waugh 1995) The focus in the literature has been on manipulative aspects of reporting, which involves an investigation of the way the reported message is expressed—how and why reports may differ from the original, of the source—whether or not the report is attributed to a specific source (and why), and of the reporter's attitude (often conveyed indirectly rather than explicitly stated) towards what is being reported Thus, in addition to taking a similarly generous view of what counts as reporting, research in this area has brought to the fore important issues that are less salient in other areas such as literary discourse

3 OPTIONS FOR LANGUAGE REPORTS

In order to encompass all the issues that have arisen in the three areas outlined above (and in others, such as the study of oral narratives), I would argue that it is useful to take a step back from any particular type of language use and to attempt a broader view of the options available in language reports The basic inspiration for this broadening also comes from stylistics from Bakhtin's (1981) concept of 'heteroglossia' For Bakhtin, the idea of language as inherently 'unitary', or homogeneous (as implied in Saussure's concept of 'langue') is misleading each socio-ideological grouping in society has its own 'language'—he gives as examples 'languages of social groups, "professional" and "generic" languages, languages of generations and so forth' (Bakhtin 1981: 272)—thus creating a background of heteroglossia against which unifying, centralizing forces in the society attempt to establish homogeneity A text (he is particularly

concerned with the novel) may draw on these different languages, which appear as more or less distinct, identifiable voices. In interpreting Bakhtin's approach Kristeva developed the concept of intertextuality (Moi 1986, see also Fairclough 1992) the idea that no utterance is in any real sense new, but that every utterance responds to, builds on, and reworks past utterances (and is itself then available in the same way for future utterances). Fairclough (1992) points out that this may happen in two ways: as 'manifest' or as 'constitutive' intertextuality.

In manifest intertextuality, other texts are explicitly present in the text under analysis, they are 'manifestly' marked or cued by features on the surface of the text, such as quotation marks. The constitutive intertextuality of a text, however, is the configuration of discourse conventions that go into its production (Fairclough 1992: 104).

For the following analysis of language reports it is manifest intertextuality that is the focus.³ The working definition of language reports that is used in this paper is 'signalled voices in the text'. I include as language reports any stretch of language where the speaker or writer signals in some way that another voice is entering the text, in however muffled or ambiguous a fashion.

Such an approach involves including a number of uses of language which are not normally associated with 'reported speech', but this follows logically from the attempt to apply a consistent set of functional criteria for the identification of language reports (this kind of broader view is well established within the French discourse analysis tradition—see e.g. Maingueneau (1991), and Authier-Revuz (1995)). As argued above, there are no consistent *formal* grounds for identifying a specific range of categories as language reports. A lexical approach (with some formal extensions to cope with, for example, quotes signalled only by inverted commas) seems more promising, since a very large number of language reports are associated with the presence of clearly identifiable lexical signals such as reporting verbs. However, although a lexical approach can cope more easily than a structural approach with examples (1), (2), (3), and probably (4) above, it cannot cope with (5), which is nevertheless as clear a case of reporting someone else's language as any of the other examples. In addition to these negative reasons for preferring a functional, discourse-based approach, there are positive advantages. The inclusion of as broad a range of types of language reports as possible helps us to place them in their wider context in the meaning potential of the language, and thus to understand more fully the nature of language reporting in general and of the choices made by users of the language in any particular instance. The basic choice—which, like all the choices outlined below, is only partially constrained by any real-world situation being talked about—is whether or not to introduce another voice. In Sinclair's (1988) terms, the choice is between averral and attribution, the text is taken as averring anything which is not specifically attributed to another source. Any case of attribution can be seen as a marked option, encouraging an investigation of the reasons why the speaker has chosen it. The pressures to choose this option may be more or less powerful: in academic discourse, non-attribution of something known to

be attributable is taken as a sign of at best ignorance and at worst plagiarism in research articles and students' essays, but is accepted as the norm in textbooks. To take a case where the pressures are less easily definable, though no less worth investigating, people narrating in conversation events that happened to them may offer their evaluation of the events either by direct averral at the time of narrating or by reporting their own speech or thoughts at the time of the events (Labov 1972: 372).

In investigating language reports, it makes intuitive sense to start from the four main elements which form the core of prototypical reports (of course, not all these elements need appear explicitly in the report, and the elements themselves may not be prototypical in type). The 'original' speech event gives us the person being reported and what s/he said, while the reporting event gives us the reporter and the fact that s/he is reporting what someone else said. From these we can identify four intermeshing but relatively independent dimensions of choice for the reporter:

- the voice (who or what is presented as the source of the language being reported),
- the message (the way in which the function or content of the 'original' language is presented),
- the signal (the way in which the present reporter indicates that this is a language report),
- the attitude (the evaluation by the present reporter of the message or the original speaker).

Each of these will be dealt with in turn. It should be emphasized that in all four dimensions the categories suggested below are not intended to be watertight: there will be both intermediate and indeterminate examples. However, the categories do seem to correspond to major groupings.

3.1 *Whose voice?*

Once the attribution option has been taken, the first question then is: whose voice? The possible voices appear to cluster into five main groups along a spectrum: self, specified other(s), unspecified other(s), community, and un-specifiable other(s).⁴ As mentioned above, there are intermediate cases occurring between groups, and there are also cases where the source is obscured for artistic or manipulative purposes—see, for example, Fairclough (1992: 108–9) on a newspaper headline whose source appears to be deliberately indeterminate (though the possible sources are still identifiable in terms of the categories suggested here).

3.1.1 Self

- (8) *I swore* I'd do as she asked
- (9) *I promise* I won't keep you a moment longer
- (10) *I think* he was a bit shorter than you are

Of the three examples, (8) is straightforward and is basically similar to the following group since the speaker is treating himself as a specified 'other' (in this case himself on a different occasion) Examples like (9) and (10), on the other hand, raise the issue of how to analyse 'reports' of our own present voice—the issue of why we sometimes treat our own voice as if it were another voice in our own text Performatives such as 'I promise' and explicit subjective modality markers such as 'I think' clearly function chiefly as interpersonal tags, labelling for the hearer the kind of speech act being performed, or the degree of conviction with which the speaker is advancing the proposition or proposal However, they can still be seen as language reports (albeit in the fuzzy region where reporting merges into other areas such as modality) In such cases, speakers divide themselves as it were into two: a labeller and an utterer, with the labeller presenting—i.e. reporting—the utterer's proposition Of course, phrases such as 'I promise' and especially 'I think' have now become so conventionalized that the link with reporting is fairly weak, but it is clearly not accidental that they derive from lexico-grammatical configurations whose main purpose is to report language We can understand better how they mean what they do if we include in the explanation the perspective that comes from seeing them as language reports

3 1 2 Specified other(s)

- (11) There are two signs, *one proclaiming* 'This is the birthplace of Bill Clinton, Next President of the USA'
- (12) The two cricketers deserve better, *as Graham Gooch admitted*
- (13) The main goal of experimental reports, however, is persuasion. Their aim is to persuade the academic community to accept the new knowledge claims (*Latour and Woolgar 1979*)

This is the prototypical group along the 'voice' dimension: the voice of another speaker, frequently at another time in another place. Examples (12) and (13) have, however, been deliberately chosen to show that this option is separate from the structural options which constitute traditional 'indirect speech' (and see also the discussion of the reporter's attitude in 3 4 below)

3 1 3 Unspecified other(s)

- (14) *It was claimed* that the platypus laid eggs
- (15) One of the women of the house *allegedly* flung boiling water on the crowd in the street
- (16) Yet now there is *a suggestion* that these purchasers will have to find a 25% down-payment
- (17) One of the many differences between actors ('*lardies*' is the technical term) and comedians ('*turns*') is that actors do not get heckled

The examples here illustrate some of the main ways in which the speaker can choose to present something as a report without specifying the source although the source is, in principle, identifiable. The context may in fact make the source

completely unambiguous—in (14) the scientists who make the claim have already been mentioned—but in these cases it is obviously useful to explore the reasons why a non-specifying structure has been used. The choice of a reporting noun, as in (16), frequently seems to depend on the fact that it allows the source to be left unspecified (cf Hodge and Kress (1993) on nominalizations generally), though it is worth mentioning that this is not always the case—the source may be specified through, for example, a possessive ('the building society's suggestion')

The final example, (17), shows how this group merges over into the following ones: the writer signals that the terms 'lardies' and 'turns' come from a different source through the use of inverted commas (and in fact indicates the kind of source by calling them 'technical terms'). There are a number of possible functions of this use of inverted commas (or, in speech, an intonation pattern which isolates the phrase in an equivalent way), but two are worth mentioning since they have their own lay labels: 'technical terms', as in (17), which signal that the writer is passing on the term as probably unfamiliar to the reader but the one that those involved in the field use, and 'scare quotes', which signal that the term is or might be used by other people but is not the one the writer accepts. In both cases, it could be argued that the source is so vague that it cannot be specified. They are certainly on the borderline, but I prefer to include them as potentially specifiable, since an inherent part of their function is to imply that their source is a particular group or kind of person (which excludes the addressee and, perhaps, the reporter).

3.1.4 Community

- (18) The only rescuable items were a heavy rosewood desk, eastern, and a Wellington chest whose top and side panels had split badly. *Beggars can't be choosers*
 (19) *There were lorries to the left of us and lorries to the right of us*

Part of the meaning of proverbs such as that in (18) is that both speaker and hearer know that these words have been used before. There is no need to specify the source (although it is possible to do so—in (18) the speaker might well have added 'as they say'). With 'folk quotes' as in (19) the meaning again depends on joint recognition that the words are at least partially not original. The original source—in this case, Tennyson's poem 'The Charge of the Light Brigade'—may or may not be known, but the 'quotation' is felt to be so much common property that the wording can be freely adapted to suit the context (see Authier-Revuz (1995), for many similar examples in French).

It is worth mentioning that the 'community' may be relatively or even extremely restricted. For example, a family or group of friends may have their own set of phrases which do not have the same recognizably pre-used status outside the group, while academic communities recognize certain wordings as belonging to particular theoretical orientations (for instance, my own use of 'the meaning potential of the language' without quote marks in section 3 above indicates a Hallidayan orientation)⁵ This kind of voicing can clearly serve a solidarity function, being intended to be recognized only by those within the

community. It can also, for the analyst, be a way into examining the assumptions made by writers and speakers about the kind of knowledge that they expect their audience to have.

The question that arises with this group is how the presence of the other voice is recognized. With the more central types of reporting (especially the second and third groups above), there are usually identifiable reporting signals. With this group, on the other hand, that is no longer the case. Instead, we need to appeal to the concept of shared knowledge. Much of the language that we use consists of unconscious (or conscious but not meant to be noticed) echoes or repetitions of bits of language that we have used or been exposed to previously (see Hoey 1991: 155–9). In examples such as (18) and (19), this repetition is intended to be noticed, drawing on the speaker's assumption that the hearer has also used or been exposed to this bit of language before. This kind of shared knowledge can be seen as falling within Hymes' (1974) third aspect of communicative competence, occurrence, which relates to the fact that members of a speech community 'are aware of the commonness, rarity, *previous occurrence* or novelty of many features of speech and that this knowledge enters into their definitions and evaluations of ways of speaking' (Hymes 1974: 95, my italics).

3.1.5 Unspecifiable other(s)

- (20) All across the country, people spent the rush hour in bed. Some took their wives out to lunch for the first time in years, and for many, those little jobs that needed doing around the house were finally completed. *Pick up the kids from school? Certainly.*
- (21) Meanwhile, for all those Brooke Shields fans, the ordeal is almost over. *Her masterwork is coming out.*

There are cases where the writer seems to be introducing another voice into the text in a way which renders the question of specifying whose voice it is irrelevant—or, to be more precise, makes it appear non-co-operative of the listener to attempt to specify whose voice it is. In examples like (14), it would be possible to ask 'Who claimed that?', and even with (15) one could ask 'Who told you that?' In (20) and (21), on the other hand, such questions would seem a deviant response.

The question and answer in (20), an extract from a newspaper report of a transport strike which resulted in many people taking the day off work, represent the writer using the voice of a typical (male) reader echoing a request from his wife and agreeing to carry it out. The voice must remain unspecified, since each reader is in fact being implicitly encouraged to accept it as his own voice.⁶ The manipulative purpose which leads the writer to voice the reader's reactions (inducing the reader to accept him as his mouthpiece) would be less effective—more open to contestation—if the attribution were explicit ('No doubt, like many people, you offered to pick the kids up from school'). The recognition that this is not the writer's own voice comes from the reader's awareness that in this kind of journalism the writer's voice is normally

declarative, overtly monologic, and grammatically well-formed Breaking into it at this point there is a question which performs face-to-face interaction and imitates colloquial conversation Any irruption of this kind can be seen as a signal of a different voice, and thus of a language report In (20), the fact that this is another voice is particularly clear, but many so-called 'rhetorical questions' are basically examples of the same phenomenon (see Thompson and Thetela (1995), for a fuller discussion of interactive structures in written text, particularly in advertisements) The intruding voice in (21) works in a way which is rather different, but which shares the unspicifiability of (20) in this case, the utterance is ironic Irony essentially depends on the hearer understanding that the speaker is talking as if s/he were someone else ('an ironic utterance "echoes" someone else's utterance' Fairclough 1992: 123)—if the hearer does not understand this, the irony obviously misfires

As with 'community' voices, these voices depend on shared knowledge rather than explicit signals With rhetorical questions and the like, we have to assume shared knowledge concerning the probabilities of language use (Halliday 1993) language users recognize certain linguistic features as being marked in that type of text and thus signalling the other voice With irony, there may well be no marked linguistic features (although intonation may play a part), and the shared knowledge is likely to draw more on the broader socio-cultural context of situation the hearer knows that this particular meaning is not one that this particular speaker is likely to want to express in this particular context At this point, we are clearly again on the verges of language reports, where reports blend over into literary and other non-co-operative (in the Gricean sense) uses of language, such as lying

3.2 *What message?*

When we turn to the ways in which the message may be treated, we can again distinguish five main groupings the message can be quoted, echoed, paraphrased, summarized, or omitted The dimension of choice in this category relates chiefly—though not exclusively—to the question of how far the message is presented as matching the 'original' language event Thus, the groupings correspond to a large extent to Leech and Short's (1981) categories quotes are broadly equivalent to FDS/DS, echoes to FIS, paraphrases to IS, and summaries to NRSA It is worth noting that, unlike the other sets of choices, options here are not necessarily fixed by the initial choice for the whole of a language report In particular, the reporter may re-select for a quote after having begun a report by selecting a paraphrase or summary, thus giving rise to the phenomenon of partial quotes,⁷ and a similar switch happens with echoes

3.2.1 Quote

- (22) 'Why are you not Orthodox?' people say
- (23) Finally he lifted his chin and spoke 'I could swim when I was five
- (24) I says, 'Well I'm not committing myself to either till I find out what Liz wants us to do'—I put it in a nicer way, I think

(25) The question is, what happens next?

Quotes can normally be recognized in writing by the use of inverted commas or other specialized conventions of layout (a dash, indenting from both margins on a new line, etc.) In speech, the signals include the use of 'a special voice quality' (Halliday 1994: 251), gesture, etc. (see Clark and Gerrig 1990: 775–7 on aspects of delivery of quotes), and the use of a conversational discourse marker (e.g. 'Well' in (24)) to signal the start of the quote. In many cases, there may also be a lexical signal, though not necessarily in the same grammatical structure—see (23).

In terms of the function of quotes, Clark and Gerrig (1990) argue strongly, both from attested counter-examples and on theoretical grounds, against the traditional view that 'in direct speech the reporter is committed to repeating the exact words of the original speaker' (Comrie 1986: 266). In fact, quotes appear to have two main functions. The first is to indicate a higher degree of faithfulness to an original (or possible) language event than any of the other options. In (23), the normal assumption would be that the man actually spoke the quoted words (although, since this is from a novel, the reported language event is, of course, imaginary). The second main function is to present the reported language event more vividly to the hearer by simulating the original event (Tannen 1986). These two functions may coincide, at least to a large extent: in (22), the attribution to multiple speakers suggests that the words quoted may not actually have been uttered, but the reader will assume that they are faithful to the spirit of what the people say. On the other hand, they may conflict. Short (1988) discusses interesting examples of dramatic 'quotes' in newspaper headlines that were demonstrably not uttered by the speaker to whom they are attributed (see also Thompson 1994: 85). In some genres—typically those where a written record of the original wording exists⁸—the first function dominates. In academic writing, for example, there is a set of conventions for signalling when any alteration, however minor, has been made to the original text (e.g. square brackets around words added). In other genres, such as oral narratives (Tannen 1989), the fidelity function is generally subservient to the dramatic function. The final comment in (24), from an oral narrative, suggests that fidelity is not a crucial issue, and the same emphasis on drama can be seen in the relatively frequent appearance of quotes of non-verbal noises ('She went: "Mm! Mmmm! Mphh!"') in oral narratives (Tannen 1986).

The inclusion of (25) is intended to show again that the boundaries between the groupings are not absolute. The fact that the quote is interrogative but is not marked off by inverted commas makes it very close to an echo (see below). The reason for including it here is that the wording is that of the 'original' utterance: the speaker is simultaneously uttering the question and quoting himself uttering it. This is a kind of self-report, where the signal ('The question is') functions in a similar way to the labelling discussed above under 'self' voices in relation to (9) and (10). In text analysis, this again leads to an examination of the reasons why the speaker chooses to label the question in this way at this point in his text.

As noted above, partial quotes may appear within paraphrases and summaries

- (26) He admitted that he adopted the name simply '*because it occurred to me at the moment*'
 (27) The presidency has been described as '*an irrelevant bore*'

The same considerations of fidelity and drama apply in these cases. In addition, there is a third function, which is also present in free-standing quotes but seems to be less prominent there than that of distancing the reporter, for whatever reason, from the language highlighted by the inverted commas (or quoting intonation, etc.) The distance may be desirable for a number of reasons, including disassociation ('I didn't put it in these words'), humility ('I couldn't put it better'), and superiority ('These aren't the words I'd use'). In example (27), it is perhaps disassociation which is dominant. This concept of distance links these partial quotes with another kind of quote, scare quotes or technical term quotes (see (17) above), which, unlike partial quotes, do not necessarily appear within another language report. These are both types of what Clark and Gerrig (1990: 789) refer to as 'incorporated quotations', where the quoted word or words are syntactically incorporated into a non-quoted clause (for an exhaustive analysis of this phenomenon, see Authier-Revuz 1995).⁹

3.2.2 Echo

- (28) Little Chandler had come home late for tea and, moreover, he had forgotten to bring Annie home the parcel of coffee from Bewley's. *Of course* she was in a bad humour and gave him short answers.
 (29) *Can you speak well in 3 weeks?* Yes, the record so far was 31 hours of study (for an O-level distinction!)

The extract in (28), from James Joyce's story 'A Little Cloud' (*Dubliners*, Penguin edition 1992: 77), is at first sight a straightforward description of events by the narrator. However, 'of course' in the second sentence is intended to be recognized as belonging to Little Chandler's voice rather than the narrator's. It implies interaction ('I know you expect this, but I have reasons for telling it to you anyway'), but, within the instantial norms established for these stories, interaction between the narrator and reader is avoided (unlike, say, many of Trollope's novels, in which the narrator frequently enacts direct interaction with the reader). The other possible interactant in the context is Little Chandler, commenting on the events to himself or an unspecified audience. In literature especially, this fading in and out of the characters' voices through the device of echoing has become a highly valued and intensively studied technique—see the references in section 2 above. In other genres, the same technique may be used for manipulative purposes, as in (20) above, or in (29) where the advertiser echoes the putative reader's voice asking a question in the hope that the real reader will accept the attribution and thus the imputed desire to know the

answer In both sorts of uses, part of the attraction of the technique is undoubtedly its potential for ambiguity concerning the source

This ambiguity arises because echoes are cases where the speaker avers in another voice—a kind of linguistic ventriloquism The voice may be more or less specifiable examples (18) to (21) and (29) are all echoes towards the unspecified end of the spectrum, whereas examples such as (5) and (28) are more precisely specifiable As with unspecified voices, the recognition of echoes depends on shared knowledge They use features which are not in themselves identifiable as reporting signals but which are intended to be recognized as marked in the language of the current speaker or writer and thus attributable to another voice The features may be functional (e.g. the signal of interaction in (28), or the intonation choices in (5)), lexical (e.g. the colloquial term ‘kids’ in (20)), or structural (e.g. the interrogative clause in (29)) In fact, echoes seem most frequently to be used to report spoken rather than written language, and all the features can be more broadly classed as those typical of overtly dialogic, informal interaction (see Thompson (1994: 18–20), for a fuller discussion) What is normally not marked in an echo report are the deictic features, which remain oriented towards the reporter exactly as in the other non-reporting sentences in the text Echoes are thus like quotes in that they depend on using some aspects of the precise wording from the reported speech event, but like paraphrases in that the deixis of the report (tense, pronouns, etc.) is related to the reporting context

As with quotes, echoes may appear in paraphrases—(30)—and even summaries—(31)

(30) I said to her, ‘Do you get off at Runcorn?’ She said *no*, she goes through to Liverpool

(31) Yesterday correspondents in the capital spoke of *frightened people venturing out onto streets deserted after a night of terror as government soldiers killed and looted at random*

For obvious reasons, in cases like these—unlike with quotes—it is often difficult if not impossible, to decide whether we have echoes of the original wording used or simply paraphrases and summaries of the meanings expressed In (30), there is clearly a discrepancy between ‘no’—the kind of interactive feature which is inappropriate for a paraphrase (see below)—and ‘she goes’ which shows that the report is not a quote On the other hand, in (31), the only justification for thinking that this is more than a straightforward summary is the rather dramatic language used

As Leech and Short (1981: 326) point out, echoes (FIS) can be seen as emerging from paraphrases (IS) when a paraphrase—or, we might add, a summary—is continued without the reporting signal being repeated

(32) He was always the first to be arrested, she thought proudly, he was so dedicated, so obviously—even to the police—self-sacrificing *Pure But there was something that didn't fit*

A related technique is where the reporting signal appears in a separate grammatical structure (cf (23) above, where the message is quoted)

- (33) The voice of a girl with a foreign accent answered *Mrs Mallory was out* But as soon as I said my name she was less formal *Mrs Mallory was at the hospital, but she had said I might call*

Such indeterminacy in the treatment of the message is typical of a wide range of genres. It has been most fully described in narrative, both written and oral, but it is also found in, for instance, academic papers, where detailed reports of previous research may continue through several sentences, not all of which are explicitly signalled as reports. The degree to which the other voice comes through as an echo varies from example to example. The presence of 'But' at the start of the sentence in (32) is an overt signal of (internal) dialogic interaction, while in (33) the reported messages have no clearly identifiable signals of the original wording but would most probably be read as echoing closely what the girl said. In extended reports in academic text, the unsignalled sentences may be formally indistinguishable from an averral by the writer, and could equally well be analysed as paraphrases (see below) with a structurally separate reporting signal.

3.2.3 Paraphrase

- (34) He wrote *that the situation was neither new nor surprising*
 (35) Finally she asked *what I'd brought with me*
 (36) He ordered her *to keep silent*
 (37) Dr Sidis categorically rejected the suggestion *that his son was naturally gifted*
 (38) According to Simon, *they spent an interesting evening looking at photos*
 (39) *She was alleged to be able to add up pounas and dollars with the speed and accuracy of a computer*

The distinguishing feature of a paraphrase is that the message is expressed entirely in terms which are appropriate to the reporter in the reporting context. Thus, signs of the original interaction (if there was one) are not carried over into the report. For example, (35) shows that the original interaction included a question, probably realized by an interrogative, but the function of the report is to make a statement rather than to ask a question and thus the interrogative mood choice is not retained. The same applies to the command, probably realized by an imperative, which is reported in (36). In addition, the deictic features (tense, pronoun reference, etc.) are related in an unmarked way to the context of the report.

Paraphrases are clearly related to the traditional category of 'indirect speech', although of the examples given above, only (34) and (35) would unambiguously fall into that category. Within the traditional pattern where the message is construed in a dependent clause, it is possible to draw up a more or less familiar list of fairly robust correlations between the kind of dependent clause used and the kind of speech act being reported. Typically, statements are reported in *that-*

clauses—see (34), questions are reported in *wh*-clauses—see (35)—and *whether/if*-clauses, and commands are reported in *to*-infinitive clauses—see (36). Offers, requests, and other future-oriented speech acts may be reported in *that*-clauses with modals, or in *to*-infinitive clauses (this latter emphasizes their link with commands, which also relate to future behaviour).

A further, though less familiar, correlation, illustrated in (39) above, suggests that the link which has emerged above between *to*-infinitive report clauses and orientation to the future is part of a wider correlation between these report clauses and modality in general (see Halliday (1994: 278) on the ‘unreal’ character of *to*-infinitive verbal groups). The structure exemplified in (39) is probably best seen as a modalizing structure expressing the reporter’s abstention from averring the truth of the report (see e.g. Perkins (1983) on lexical modal verbs, and Halliday (1994) on grammatical metaphor). Some supporting evidence for this correlation is given by examples such as (40).

(40) Several people claimed *to have seen someone shoot him*

It seems plausible that the use of the *to*-infinitive report clause here is related to the fact that to label a statement a ‘claim’ is to imply that its truth status has not yet been firmly established. In both (39) and (40), it is possible to report the message using a *that*-clause, and the reporting verb itself may (as with *allege* and *claim*) signal suspension of judgement. However, it seems likely that a semantic context of epistemic uncertainty at least favours the use of a *to*-infinitive, and in cases where the verb does not necessarily imply doubt (e.g. *is reported to*) its use may play a more important role in reflecting the uncertainty.

To move beyond the traditional patterns of ‘indirect speech’, example (41) raises interesting issues concerning the effect of having the reporting signal following the message.

(41) *Members of the United Steelworkers ratified a four-year contract with Armco Inc.*,
the union said

It is useful to compare this with what happens when questions are reported with the signal preceding the message, as in (35), or in a different position, as in (42).

(42) *What did she think*, he asked, *was it adequate?*

It is clear that the reported questions in (42) cannot show subordination by a declarative mood choice as happens in (35), just as the reported statement in (41) cannot show subordination by being prefaced by *that* as happens in (34). It would therefore seem feasible to class both (41) and (42) as echoes rather than paraphrases. However, the effect of the non-initial position of the reporting signal is different in the two cases. The ordering in (41) seems to move the report further away from the original speech event than (34), since it begins as formally indistinguishable from an averral by the present writer, an impression which is only corrected by the final reporting signal. On the other hand, (42) moves the report closer to the original speech event, by echoing the original interaction in a

way which is inappropriate for the present, declarative, purposes of the reporter. Thus, it seems to make better sense to take (42) as an echo, but (41) as a paraphrase (compare the discussion in 3.2.2 of echoes emerging from paraphrases)

3.2.4 Summary

- (43) Tom's boss demanded *a pledge of loyalty* from him
- (44) Lendl spoke *about his growing love affair with Wimbledon and how he has gradually come to terms with the eccentricities of British life*
- (45) Your article quite rightly *criticizes 'cut-price' company cars*
- (46) He *apologized for disturbing their Sunday dinner*

In structural terms, summaries¹⁰ consist of two main types of message: a noun group or a prepositional phrase following a reporting word—see (43) and (44). The reporting word is usually a verb, but reporting nouns and adjectives can also be followed by a message in a prepositional phrase. With certain reporting words (which typically do not appear with quotes or paraphrases), the reporting word itself carries part of the message—see (45) and (46). In all these cases, the amount of information about the message can range from fairly minimal, as in (43), to a fairly lengthy summary, as in (44). As mentioned earlier, summaries may include partial quotes and echoes.

It was noted above that summaries roughly correspond in form to NRSA in Leech and Short's (1981) categories. However, their description of NRSA, as reporting a speech act 'in a way that puts it on a par with other kinds of action' (ibid. 324), masks important functional characteristics, and applies much more clearly to cases where the message is omitted (see below). Summaries are embedded within the clause which carries the reporting signal, and thus it is true that the focus is likely to be on the speech event more than the message. However, there is still information about the message, though it typically serves a different purpose from, say, a paraphrase. The reasons for choosing a summary rather than other message options are too varied to describe in full here, but as an illustration we can compare two similar reports, the first a paraphrase and the second a summary:

- (47) Life is full of the promise of spring. Yet the French are *grumbling that they have too much time off to enjoy all this*
- (48) People were *grumbling about a sick economy* as they celebrated the bicentennial.

In (47), the focus is on what the French are saying, which is labelled as 'grumbling'. In (48), on the other hand, the summary of the message is presented as an explanation of why they are grumbling. Even in this case, however, we have an indication of what was said, which distinguishes the report fairly clearly from cases where the message is omitted (see below). Thus, it seems preferable to separate summaries from omissions rather than subsume them in the one category of NRSA.

3.2.5 Omission

- (49) He walked down the stairs, still *muttering*
 (50) In December Pitt *issued orders* to his commanders in North America
 (51) She had paid over her money in return for *a promise*

In many cases, the speaker mentions that a speech event took place, but gives no information about what was said. The most frequent way of omitting the message is by using a non-reporting 'language event' verb, as in (49), but it is also possible to use a 'language event' noun in a similar way. The noun may form a collocation with a general verb such as 'make' (e.g. 'make a complaint'). On the other hand, the verb itself may also refer to a language event, as in (50)—compare this with the summary pattern illustrated above (see (43)) where the verb signals a report, but the following noun group does not label the event in terms of its speech function (e.g. as an 'order') but summarizes the 'real world' content of the message. A 'language event' noun group may also appear by itself, as in (51). There is clearly no reporting when the message is omitted: this is *speaking or writing treated much like any other physical or mental event* such as kicking or seeing. Nevertheless, it is useful, if not essential, to include this option in an examination of language reports because, unlike other kinds of event, the event in this case involves language. The language *could* therefore have been reported (irrespective of whether the language event is referred to through a verb or a noun), but, for whatever reason, the reporter has chosen not to report it at this point in the text.¹¹ Indeed, mentioning that something was said but not saying what it was is best seen as a marked option—but this only makes sense if it is seen as an option within reporting.

3.3 *What signal?*

The ways in which the reporter can signal that the hearer or reader is to understand a stretch of language as a report are far more varied than simply the traditional reporting clause. From a functional point of view, there appear to be two main aspects in this dimension of choice. The first is the logical relationship between the signal and the message as realized through the structural dependencies. One way of expressing these logical dependency choices is to see the signal as either separate from or fused with the message, and, if it is separate, as grammatically dominant in relation to the message, or as equal to the message, or as subordinate to the message.¹² The second main aspect is the nature and position of the signal itself, which construes how the report fits in with the surrounding text and the broader context of situation. This is clearest in cases such as nominalizations of reporting verbs, which may be used—as with any nominalizations (Halliday 1988)—to indicate that the report is an established fact and not open to question, and in cases where the reporting signal is moved from its unmarked position for thematic reasons. These two aspects are typically closely related: in an example such as (41) above, the marked choice to place the reporting clause after the reported clause is simultaneously a thematic choice—the Theme is allocated to the reported clause—and a dominance

choice—the reported clause is not clearly subordinate to the reporting clause as it would be if the order were reversed

The reasons for choosing to realize the signal in any particular one of the ways described below are extremely varied, though Thompson (1994: 77–83) discusses some of the general factors which play a role. Here it is sufficient to note that the reasons are broadly the same as, or very similar to, those which determine any choices concerning textual and ideational relationships between elements of a text (see Martin 1992, especially Chapter 4). The following section will therefore merely provide a brief outline of the main structural realizations of the choices. However, a note of caution should be introduced here. The treatment of structural dependency is essentially based on established approaches to grammatical subordination, but, to take one feature which is touched on briefly below, the mobility of the reporting clause or adjunct in relation to the reported clause does not fit easily into such an approach, suggesting that their status needs to be reconsidered along with other types of ‘interpolation’ (Winter 1982) which are equally problematic for traditional accounts. There is also evidence that for spoken discourse in general a new model of dependency is needed (Schleppegrell 1992), and this would certainly affect the way in which the relationships between separate signals and messages in reporting are analysed.

3.3.1 Separate dominant

- (52) *British Coal said* it could only damage the industry
- (53) She sat calmly through the film despite *the usherette’s protestations* that she was under age
- (54) Experts *predicted* years of stagnation for the world’s banking industry
- (55) Bank of England officials were *dismissive* of *suggestions* that measures were needed against speculators

The examples show the main kinds of dominant reporting signal: a main reporting clause, with the message in a following subordinate reported clause, as in (52), a reporting noun, with the message in the post-modifier, as in (53),¹³ a reporting verb, with the message as object, as in (54), and a reporting adjective, with the message in the post-modifier, as in (55) (which also includes a further example of a dominant reporting noun). The dominance is, of course, different in each case, with a possible distinction to be made at the next level of delicacy between (52) and the others, since it includes two ranking clauses. Some idea of the effects of choosing one particular type of dominant signal rather than another can be gained by imagining other ways of expressing the report (e.g. (53) ‘although the usherette protested that ...’, (55) ‘Bank of England officials dismissed suggestions ...’).

3.3.2 Separate equal

- (56) Then *he said gently*, ‘How have you been, Hannah?’
- (57) *Only the director agreed* ‘Yes, we know.’

- (58) *Her complaint was that the meeting had been boring*
 (59) *The cash dividend paid on the common stock will also apply to the new shares, the company said*
 (60) *They were the only ones left in his bag—or so the story goes!*

Equal status for the signal and message is clearest in the case of quotes—see (56) (and see Halliday (1994: 251), for the arguments in favour of treating the two clauses as paratactic or equal). As mentioned earlier, the signal need not appear in the same grammatical structure as the quote—see (57), and (23) above. Paraphrases may also occur with signals of equal status, either where the signal is subject of an identifying relational clause, as in (58), or where the reporting clause does not come in initial position, as in (59). In (60), the message is initially presented as averred by the present writer, but then reclassified in the final clause as a report: this is similar to (57) in discontinuity, but clearly serves a different function which brings it closer in effect to (59).

3.3.3 Separate subordinate

- (61) *As Voisin points out, without earthworms there would be no civilisation*
 (62) *'The world is not hostile, nor yet is it friendly,' in the words of J. H. Holmes 'It is simply indifferent'*
 (63) *Apparently he would often sing popular songs when he went to a party*

The signals which definitely belong in this grouping all serve grammatically as adjuncts, and functionally as tags or labels for the dominant message, as in (61) to (63). However, there is one slightly problematic type of signal which should probably be included here in terms of meaning, although grammatically it appears dominant in its clause since it functions as the finite verb. This is the embedded passive reporting verb:

- (64) *In Massachusetts food prices have been reckoned to be 10–15% above the national average*

Intuitively, the message about food prices seems to be the 'topic' of this sentence, rather than the fact that this has been reckoned by someone—the possible acknowledgement, 'Oh, are they (so high)?' seems at least as appropriate as 'Oh, have they (been reckoned to be that high)?' One way of viewing this structure is as a form of modalization (see the discussion of example (39) above), and therefore semantically subordinate to the main verb 'be', which it modifies.

3.3.4 Fused

- (65) *But she could not really see herself with whatever it was vase, or rug or necklace, trying to sell it. No, that was out*
 (66) *She is 'good with people', a talent that Evelyn envies*

In this grouping, there is no separate piece of language which functions as a reporting signal: the signal is in the wording of the message itself. Thus there is a tendency for the grouping to be associated with the voice groupings which do

not have a specifiable voice see (18) to (21) above. The other grouping with which it is associated, naturally enough, is that of echoes in structures which are not overtly reporting see (28) to (29) above. Looking at both these groupings from the point of view of how the reporter signals that they are language reports brings out the fact that, despite their being the results of choices on different dimensions, they both depend on the hearer or reader recognizing that the wording itself (or the intonation—see (5) above) in some way does not originate from the reporter.

In the case of quotes such as (66) (see also (17) above) where the quoted word or phrase is syntactically incorporated into a non-reporting structure, it seems most appropriate to argue that the signal (the inverted commas) belongs to the quote and is thus an example of a fused rather than a separate signal. It could be argued that this analysis might be extended to cover cases such as

(67) He was sat there with an '*I told you so*' look on his face

(See Clark and Gerrig 1990: 771, and note 9 below.) However, the clear lack of fit between the quote and its context brings this in some ways closer to prototypical quotes such as (56) above—especially taking into consideration the occurrence of intermediate cases such as (68)

(68) She started nervously to apologise, but was cut short by Hunt's savagely polite *Stow it Katie just trample on the cheap stuff, will you* '.

Such examples underline the long-recognized difficulties of deciding how quotes—and indeed indirect report clauses—should be handled in a syntactic description of the sentences in which they appear (see e.g. L1 1986). However, they are infrequent enough in the data to suggest that, while needing to be accounted for, they can be treated as exceptions which do not fit easily into the categories suggested but which do not have to affect the general model.¹⁴

3.4 What attitude?

(69) He questioned why no action had been taken

(70) Anthony *told* him the proposal was out of the question

(71) Robert Birmingham also *points out* that forward planning can help avoid stressful pitfalls

(72) *As dad put it* 'You have to face the truth'

(73) He died in prison. From pneumonia. *Or so they say*

(74) Lane *was quoted as saying* that Clear was 'a difficult person to work with'

The final main dimension of choice relates to the reporter's attitude to the reported message. The basic choices in this category are common to all expressions of attitude: neutral (e.g. (70)), positive (e.g. (71)), or negative (e.g. (73)), and for language reports one of the main types of value that are assessed in these terms is the truth or validity of what the original speaker or writer said. It should be noted, however, that in some language reports the question of the reporter's attitude towards the truth of the message is irrelevant. For example, in

(69), it seems to make no sense to ask whether the reporter agreed with the questioner. In other cases—normally where it is a statement rather than a question, command or other speech function that is reported, and normally where the message is reported in a separate clause rather than, for example, a prepositional phrase—the issue of whether or not the reporter agrees with what s/he is reporting is often a crucial one. It is particularly important in certain kinds of discourse, most obviously in academic discourse (see especially Tadros (1993), and Hunston (1994)), where it plays a vital role in the primary function of academic papers, to evaluate the usefulness of the research of the writer and of other researchers. Even where no overt attitude is expressed, the fact that the message is reported creates a distance between the reporter and the content of the message, thus opening an ‘evaluative space’ (Thompson and Ye 1991: 369) which may subsequently be brought to closure by the reporter—the norm in academic discourse—or may be deliberately left open, for example to suggest the reporter’s objectivity—a frequent device in journalism.

There is no space here to give more than a brief indication of some of the ways in which reporters can show their attitude towards the truth of the reported message. The most obvious is through the choice of reporting verb (Thompson and Ye 1991): in (70) the choice of *told* gives no indication of the reporter’s attitude towards what Anthony said, whereas in (71) *points out* signals acceptance by the reporter that Birmingham’s view is correct. There are also, for example, structures such as *as*-clause reporting adjuncts—see (72), and (12) above—or bracketed references—see (13) above—which can show the reporter’s adherence to the validity of the reported message: indeed, in cases such as (72), (12), and (13), it is perhaps more appropriate to talk of ‘delegated averral’,¹⁵ since the reporter is stating his or her own view but indicating that it is shared by, or originates from, someone else. Other signals function primarily to indicate scepticism—such as the *or so* type exemplified in (73)—while others more or less ostentatiously suspend judgement on the validity of the message—see (74), and also the *to*-infinitive structure exemplified in (39) above.

The discussion of attitude so far has focused on the true/false dimension of evaluation. However, as Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1980: 115) points out, reporters may also indicate other types of evaluation, in particular their attitude towards the speaker rather than the message. There are again many ways of doing this, including through the choice of reporting verb (where the main choice seems to be to opt for negative evaluation):

- (75) ‘I bet you parlay French pretty well, don’t you?’ *brayed* the general
 (76) She goes *wittering on* all the time about how she can never remember things these days
 (77) On cue, he *fulminated* on camera: ‘I am not prepared to take part in this charade’

This type of expression of attitude occurs relatively frequently in narratives, as in (75), where speech—both the content and manner—has a privileged role in guiding the reader’s evaluation of the characters in the narrative. It is also frequent in conversation, as in (76), where the constant expression of personal

feelings helps, amongst other things, to maintain a desired degree of intimacy. It can occur, though less often, in journalism, as in (77). From my data, it appears that certain public figures—a fairly small number in any one period—are far more likely to be reported with this kind of attitudinal marker than others (for those familiar with the reporting of British politics of the 1980s, the fact that *he* in (77) is the miners' trade union leader Arthur Scargill will not be a surprise).

4 CONCLUSION

Having thus outlined the main dimensions of choice which I suggest are open to the speaker or writer in language reports, it may be useful at this point to summarize them in a figure: see Figure 1. The primary focus of the framework set out here has been on function, and Figure 1 reflects this. Nevertheless, it may also be useful to give a complementary summary of the range of possible language report structures that have emerged from the discussion: see Figure 2. It should be noted that in Figure 2 the implied order of signal followed by message is only one of three possible orderings: the signal may also follow the message or may appear in the middle of the message. In addition, it is clear that any structural description of this kind does not give a complete picture, since it inevitably privileges certain kinds of reports at the expense of others, and obscures a number of the most important choices to be made by the reporter. Nevertheless, it may serve a useful purpose, not least as a reminder of how much more variation there is in reporting, even in structural terms, than allowed for in the traditional view.

This paper has set out to provide a provisional overview of the 'semantic diffusion' (Martin 1992) of reporting, as a guide for further corpus-based research. It is certainly clear that, even with the existing data, there are a number of points where alternative analyses suggest themselves. For example, the possible need for revisions in the way dependency relations are analysed has already been mentioned in section 3.3, and the distinction between reported speech and reported thought has been relegated to a second level of delicacy here (see note 4), but it could be argued that the central place given to it in Leech and Short's (1981) model for literary texts more accurately reflects its overall importance in all types of reports. It is also important to emphasize that the relative lack of attention paid to canonical types of language report in the discussion is merely intended to redress the balance rather than to imply that they do not need attention. They clearly do have a central role in any account of reporting. However, it would be useful to have a fuller examination of a range of different genres and registers in order to determine the frequency of the different types of reports in each, and to see how far the grammarians' views of centrality correspond to frequency of usage in different contexts. The importance of non-canonical types has already been established for literary texts, for instance, but their importance in other genres such as academic writing remains to be explored in more detail. Despite the caveats, I would argue that the framework, arising as it does from a practical attempt to describe the wide variety of phenomena thrown up by an investigation of an extensive corpus,

Dimension of choice	Clune of options
voice	self specified other(s) unspecified other(s) community unspecifiable other(s)
message	quote echo paraphrase summary omission
signal	separate { dominant equal subordinate fused
attitude	relevant { positive neutral negative not relevant

Figure 1 Functional options for language reports

Signal	Message
reporting clause reporting adjunct reporting noun reporting adjective reporting verb [no separate signal]	quote reported clause main clause <i>that</i> - clause <i>wh</i> - clause <i>to</i> - infinitive clause <i>-ing</i> clause prepositional phrase nominal group [no separate message]

Figure 2 Structural options for language reports

presents a viable basis for development. In particular, the separation of the dimensions of choice allows for certain important similarities and differences to emerge which are masked by a more unidimensional analysis, and for a clearer delimitation of some problematic areas.

In addition to any descriptive value, the framework has potential practical applications in a number of areas. One area in which a better understanding of

language reports could be of practical use is forensic linguistics (Coulthard 1993). A key part of the work in this area concerns the authenticity of confession statements which are presented in court as verbatim records taken from dictation. The relationship between the original language and the report (the statement) is vital here, but it is clearly not enough to see the issue simply in terms of fidelity: a more complex, multi-dimensional approach is needed which utilizes the concept of different possible voices in the text. In this case, of course, any intrusive voices are not in fact meant to be noticed, but the forensic linguist has essentially the same task as the literary linguist in trying to explain exactly what triggers the recognition of another voice.

However, the main areas where application seems most viable are educational. A functional approach to language reports is already well established not only in literary criticism but also in the teaching of literature (see e.g. Short 1994), and from my own experience with undergraduates the present framework can act as a useful complement to the model in Leech and Short (1981), particularly by making explicit certain key aspects (such as the source of voices in the text) which are to some extent left implicit in that model. As with Leech and Short's model, analyses in terms of the categories suggested here rely on close attention to linguistic choices—in the context of the possible choices which were not made—and thus help to sensitize readers to the techniques by which the writer creates the effects to which they are, perhaps unconsciously, responding.

In language teaching, there has been a general trend away from presenting language as a set of context-independent structures to be mastered towards an emphasis on language as a resource for making meaning. This is being reflected in the way that language reports are handled: there is a corresponding shift away from mechanical transformations of direct to indirect speech, and a greater focus on the range of possibilities for talking about what other people say (see e.g. Willis 1990, Yule, Mathis, and Hopkins 1992). The framework (in conjunction with the kind of frequency surveys mentioned above) could serve as a basis for deciding in a principled way which types of report might be most usefully introduced at different stages and for learners with different purposes and interests. In addition, suitably adapted versions of the dimensions of choice might well prove pedagogically effective guide-lines for the learners themselves, providing a less forbidding alternative to relying on grammatical 'rules' as the way in to dealing with language reporting. With more advanced learners, an examination of language reports in genres such as journalism along the lines suggested here is an excellent starting point for training in critical reading (Wallace 1992), especially where it is possible to compare a report with the original language event and/or with other reports of the same event from different sources. Training in the understanding and use of citations in academic text is an important part of courses in English for Academic Purposes, and the teaching of academic reading and writing gains a motivating degree of intellectual pleasure if citations are viewed from the sceptical 'what's the writer up to here?' angle which a functional perspective tends to inspire. I have found that,

unsurprisingly, the academically-able students on EAP courses respond particularly well to an approach which asks them to look at their own and other writers' texts intelligently and discriminately. Indeed, I would argue that in any language teaching, both of a foreign language and of the mother tongue, the framework opens up possibilities of making language reports a deservedly central and unexpectedly rewarding and enjoyable area.

There has not been space in the paper to present an analysis of a text using the framework, although in Thompson (1994: Ch. 5) I illustrate the application of the framework to a range of texts, showing how each report contributes to the overall meaning construed by the text. Clearly, much more analytical work along these lines remains to be done, but the basic set of choices has so far shown itself to be encouragingly robust. Similarly, some of the applications mentioned above are already being tried out, but others remain for possible future exploration and development. The 'prolonged fieldwork' (Stubbs 1986) needed for a fuller understanding and more adequate pedagogic presentation of language reports is already under way in a number of areas, and I hope that the approach suggested in this paper will contribute to that work.

(Revised version received January 1996)

NOTES

¹ The majority of the examples in the paper are taken from the Bank of English at Cobuild, Birmingham, which formed the basic corpus in the preparation of *Reporting* (Thompson 1994). The main method of examining the corpus is by concordance programs, which are obviously better adapted to identifying reports where there is a separate signal of reporting such as a reporting verb. This was complemented by a survey of texts drawn particularly from literature, journalism, academic writing and presentations, and informal conversation, in order both to gain insights into the function, frequency and co-occurrence of types of reports in different genres and, more importantly for the present paper, to identify reports where there is no separate piece of language acting as a reporting signal (see e.g. (17)).

² As will be seen, I follow Halliday (1994) in including *to*-infinitive clauses as paraphrases (roughly equivalent to IS) rather than summaries (NRSA).

³ Fairclough's (1992) definition of manifest intertextuality allows him to include presupposition and negation. Since a distinguishing feature of these manifestations of intertextuality is that the presupposed message does not appear in the text (if it did, it would no longer be presupposed), they do not fit easily into the approach adopted in this paper.

⁴ At a further stage of delicacy, it is also possible to identify voices in terms of the language source: for each voice the 'original' language may be reported as being in the medium of writing, speech, or thought. In addition, moving towards the boundary of reporting, the source may be an idea (opinion, knowledge, feeling or perception—see Thompson 1994: 124). In the final voice category mentioned, where no originating voice can be specified, ideas turn into facts (Halliday 1994: 266—see example (7) above). However, because of limitations of space, I will concentrate here only on voice in terms of the entity to whom the message is attributed, and will not investigate these more delicate choices in any detail.

⁵ I am grateful to an anonymous *Applied Linguistics* reviewer for pointing out both the general idea of restricted communities and this particular example

⁶ The lack of specificity does not mean that we cannot tell a good deal about the kind of person whose voice we hear: male, employed, married, affluent enough to afford restaurants, with young children. The text construes these characteristics as unquestionably the norm for 'people'. It is interesting to speculate how readers who do not match this description read the text—and how far the writer was consciously giving a voice to the central readership which the newspaper (the *Daily Mail*) is known to target.

⁷ Of course, all quotes are 'partial' in relation to the original language event. The term is used here to emphasize that the quote forms only part of a more extensive report.

⁸ Interesting issues of fidelity in quotes are raised by official records of speech in contexts such as the courts and Parliament. These claim to be verbatim records of what was said, and in many cases they have not just an official but a legal status as true records. However, any comparison of, say, a transcript of a recorded sitting in Parliament and the account of it in Hansard will show many discrepancies. Slembrouck (1992) explores convincingly the ideological assumptions about language underlying the way in which Hansard represents parliamentary debate. I am grateful to a second *Applied Linguistics* reviewer for drawing my attention to these cases.

⁹ As Clark and Gerrig (1990) make clear, the incorporation is reciprocal: both incorporating utterance and incorporated quotation are syntactically compatible. This differentiates them from quotations of the kind 'These are not "I really should" radishes' (example quoted p. 771). Although the quotation here functions in the modifier slot within a nominal group, it clearly does not 'mesh with' the context. In Clark and Gerrig's terms, this is an 'embedded quotation' of essentially the same kind as the prototypical quotation with a reporting clause.

¹⁰ 'Summary' here is not used in the same way as Short's (1988) 'speech summaries' cases in which it is clear that the report summarizes many things that the reported speaker said. As Short points out, 'speech summaries' can occur in quotes (see e.g. (22) above), paraphrases or summaries, in fact, they simply represent an option within the fidelity scale.

¹¹ The 'omitted' message may actually follow in a subsequent sentence—see example (23)—or may already have been reported. One fairly frequent use of this pattern is to label a report prospectively or retrospectively. Francis (1994) discusses this phenomenon fully and gives many examples.

¹² These options are largely independent from the other sets of choices outlined so far, but there are certain configurations where two or more choices are made simultaneously: for example, unspecifiable and community voices necessarily involve a fused signal, and summaries necessarily involve a dominant signal (in neither of these cases is the requirement reciprocal).

¹³ A post-nominal message clause as in (53) may be analysed as being in apposition to the reporting noun (e.g. Winter 1982: 59). If this analysis is accepted, it would mean that the signal and message were of equal status.

¹⁴ Alternatively, one could emphasize the fact that all non-incorporated quotes are disjunctive in relation to their syntactic context—cf. Partee (1973), who argues that a quote is not syntactically part of the sentence in which it appears. In this case, the issue of dominance or equality would be largely irrelevant for quotes, and Clark and Gerrig's (1990) distinction of embedded (i.e. disjunctive) vs. incorporated would be more useful.

¹⁵ This term has been coined by Puleng Thetela (personal communication).

REFERENCES

- Authier-Revuz, J.** 1995 *Ces Mots Qui Ne Vont Pas de Soi Boucles Réflexives et Non-coïncidences du Dire* Paris Larousse
- Bakhtin, M. M.** 1981 *The Dialogic Imagination* (tr. C. Emerson and M. Holquist) Austin University of Texas Press
- Banfield, A.** 1982 *Unspeakable Sentences Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* Boston Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Clark, H. H. and R. J. Gerrig** 1990 'Quotations as demonstrations' *Language* 66 764–805
- Comrie, B.** 1986 'Tense in indirect speech' *Folia Linguistica* 20 265–96
- Coulmas, F.** (ed.) 1986 *Direct and Indirect Speech* Berlin Mouton de Gruyter
- Coulthard R. M.** 1993 'On beginning the study of forensic texts Corpus concordance collocation in M. Hoey (ed.) 1993
- Coulthard, R. M.** (ed.) 1994 *Advances in Written Text Analysis* London Routledge
- Declerck, R.** 1990 'Sequence of tenses in English' *Folia Linguistica* 24 513–44
- Dixon, R. M. W.** 1991 *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles* Oxford Clarendon Press
- Fairclough, N.** 1992 *Discourse and Social Change* Cambridge Polity Press
- Francis, G.** 1994 'Labelling discourse An aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion' in R. M. Coulthard (ed.) 1994
- Halliday, M. A. K.** 1988 'On the language of physical science' in M. Ghadessy (ed.) 1988 *Registers of Written English* London Pinter
- Halliday, M. A. K.** 1993 'Quantitative studies and probabilities in grammar' in M. Hoey (ed.) 1993
- Halliday, M. A. K.** 1994 *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd edn.) London Edward Arnold
- Hodge, R. and G. Kress** 1993 *Language as Ideology* (2nd edn.) London Routledge
- Hoey, M.** 1991 *Patterns of Lexis in Text* Oxford Oxford University Press
- Hoey, M.** (ed.) 1993 *Data, Description, Discourse* London HarperCollins Publishers
- Huddleston, R.** 1989 'The treatment of tense in indirect speech' *Folia Linguistica* 23 335–40
- Hunston, S.** 1993 'Projecting a sub-culture The construction of shared worlds by projecting clauses in two registers' in D. Graddol, I. Thompson, and M. Byram (eds.) 1993 *Language and Culture* Clevedon BAAL and Multilingual Matters
- Hunston, S.** 1994 'Evaluation and organisation in a sample of written academic discourse' in M. Coulthard (ed.) 1994
- Hymes, D.** 1974 *Foundations in Sociolinguistics An Ethnographic Approach* Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press
- Jacoby, S.** 1987 'References to other researchers in literary research articles' *ELA Journal* 1 33–78
- Joyce, J.** 1992 (new edn.) *Dubliners* Harmondsworth Penguin
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C.** 1980 *L'énonciation de la Subjectivité dans le Langage* Paris A Colin
- Labov, W.** 1972 'The transformation of experience in narrative syntax' in W. Labov (ed.) 1972 *Language in the Inner City* Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press
- Leech, G. and M. Short** 1981 *Style in Fiction* London Longman
- Li, C. N.** 1986 'Direct and indirect speech A functional study in F. Coulmas (ed.) 1986
- Mainueneau, D.** 1991 *L'Analyse du Discours* Paris Hachette

- Martin, J. R. 1992 *English Text System and Structure* Philadelphia John Benjamins
- McHale, B. 1978 'Free Indirect Discourse: A survey of recent accounts' *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3 248–87
- Moi, T. (ed.) 1986 *The Kristeva Reader* Oxford Basil Blackwell
- Page, N. 1973 *Speech in the English Novel* London Longman
- Partee, B. H. 1973 'The syntax and semantics of quotations' in P. Kiparsky and S. Anderson (eds) 1973 *A Festschrift for Morris Halle* New York Holt
- Perkins, M. R. 1983 *Modal Expressions in English* London Pinter
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1985 *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* London Longman
- Schleppegrell, M. J. 1992 'Subordination and linguistic complexity' *Discourse Processes* 15 117–31
- Shaw, P. 1992 'Reasons for the correlation of voice, tense and sentence function in reporting verbs' *Applied Linguistics* 13 302–19
- Short, M. 1988 'Speech presentation, the novel and the press' in W. Van Peer (ed.) 1988 *The Taming of the Text* London Routledge
- Short, M. 1994 'Understanding texts: Point of view' in G. Brown, K. Malmkjær, A. Pollitt and J. Williams (eds) 1994 *Language and Understanding* Oxford Oxford University Press
- Sinclair, J. McH. 1988 'Mirror for a text' *Journal of English and Foreign Languages* (Hyderabad, India) 1
- Slembrouck, S. 1986 'Towards a description of speech presentation and speech reportage in newspaper language' *Studia Germanica Gandensia* 9 44–115 (edited by A.-M. Vandenberghe *Aspects of Style in Brussels Newspapers*)
- Slembrouck, S. 1992 'The parliamentary Hansard "verbatim" report: The written construction of spoken discourse' *Language and Literature* 1 101–19
- Stubbs, M. 1986 'A matter of prolonged fieldwork: Notes towards a modal grammar of English' *Applied Linguistics* 7 1–25
- Swales, J. 1990 *Genre Analysis* Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Tadros, A. 1993 'The pragmatics of text averral and attribution in academic texts' in M. Hoey (ed.) 1993
- Tannen, D. 1986 'Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative' in F. Coulmas (ed.) 1986
- Tannen, D. 1989 *Talking Voices* Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Thompson, G. 1994 *Reporting* Collins *Cobuild English Guides* 5 London HarperCollins Publishers
- Thompson, G. and P. Thetela. 1995 'The sound of one hand clapping: The management of interaction in written discourse' *Text* 15 103–27
- Thompson, G. and Y. Y. Ye. 1991 'Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers' *Applied Linguistics* 12 365–82
- Toolan, M. 1988 *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction* London Routledge
- van Dijk, T. A. 1988 *News as Discourse* Hillsdale, NJ Lawrence Erlbaum
- Voloshinov, V. N. 1973 *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (tr. L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik) New York Seminar Press
- Wallace, C. 1992 *Reading* Oxford Oxford University Press
- Waugh, L. 1995 'Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The relation of function and text' *Text* 15 129–73
- Willis, D. 1990 *The Lexical Syllabus: A New Approach to Language Teaching* London Collins

- Winter, E. 1982 *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English* London George Allen and Unwin
- Yule, G , T Mathis, and M. Hopkins 1992 'On reporting what was said' *ELT Journal* 46 245–51