

Rita Rafajlovičová

Presenting speech in literary and non-literary texts

Abstract

The paper describes an investigation into the use of different ways of presenting speech in a small size corpus of contemporary written literary and non-literary texts. It provides a brief description of the corpus, its size and sources the texts were selected from. In order to determine the distribution and frequency of the different categories of speech presentation, quantitative analyses of the various different text types were carried out. The theoretical base for the analysis was the model developed by Leech and Short and briefly introduced by Semino (2004). The aim of the analysis was to find out which of the categories of speech presentation are most frequently used in the three different text types and the corpus as a whole, which speech act verbs are most commonly used when interpreting someone's speech in fiction and non-fiction texts, and last but not least, to explain our statistical findings. The analysis shows that the most commonly used speech presentation mode is DS which enables the author to make his characters seem independent of the narrator. Any move away from the DS end of the scale brings with it the feeling of narrator interference. IS and NRSA, which are moderately common in the investigated text types, feel like forms which are heavily controlled by the narrator, because the words used are not those of the characters. The choice of forms of speech presentation as well as the choice of speech act verbs has significant consequences for the degree of importance that is attributed to different utterances, for the projection of viewpoint, and the creation of a contrast between the characters. The different forms of speech presentation account for interesting and effective variations in manipulating the narrative point of view in order to achieve a wide range of significant effects. In particular, in fiction or news reports they can bias and control the readers' empathy towards the characters.

Key words: reporting speech, reporting thought, direct and indirect speech, corpus, analysis, fiction, academic prose, newspaper.

1. Introduction

Reporting is important because a huge amount of information we get comes from other people. The nature of the language of reporting has long been of interest to a range of scholars and has been the subject of numerous and thorough studies throughout the last 40 years, which investigate how someone else's words and thoughts are mediated by the narrating voice or text. The study of the character speech and thought presentation is an important aspect of the narrative discourse. It has been extensively investigated within stylistics, syntax as well as narratology²¹. Moreover, research in this area has been also done by philosophers²², applied linguists²³, conversation analysts²⁴ and psychologists²⁵, who

²¹ D. Cohn, G. Leech, M. Short, S. M. Fludernik, E. Semino, and S. Rimmon-Kennan

²² Clark and Gerrig, 1990

²³ Buttny, 1997; Thompson, 1996; Baynham and Slembrouck, 1999; Myers 1999

²⁴ Holt 1999

examined in great detail the forms and functions of reported discourse (Jeffries, 2010). One of the most widely accepted frameworks for the description of the phenomenon in this tradition is Leech and Short's (1981) model, which has been developed on the basis of the analysis of a corpus of written narratives with the help of other scholars over a number of years and refined by investigating the nature of speech, thought and writing presentation (henceforth ST&WP) in spoken, as opposed to written, data (McIntyre, 2003).

2. Speech and thought presentation

Speech and thought presentation investigates how a speaker or writer presents the speech or thought of other people. There is a range of ways in which writers and speakers can present others' words or thoughts, and the choices made are important in determining what sort of impression the reader or listener will get of the character whose speech or thoughts are being presented. The writer/speaker can express the illocutionary force of an utterance by using not only performative verbs but also other reporting signals (nouns, adjectives, adjuncts) to affect the meaning of the original utterance. For example, the disagreement of a politician with some plan: "*No... We think the changes we have put forward are right.*" can be interpreted as: *His stubborn response dismayed fellow Tory MPs...*, which intensifies the negative context or purpose of the original utterance.

There have been various classifications of **speech presentation**. The most elementary concepts, which are presented in most pedagogical grammars, are those of **direct** and **indirect speech**. There is a fundamental difference between direct and reported (indirect) speech. The essential semantic difference between these two modes is that when one uses direct speech to report what someone has said one reproduces the words used verbatim, whereas in indirect report one expresses what was said in one's own words by maintaining the general idea of the utterance. In fact, while the two mentioned are the main modes of reporting, they are only 2 of a larger number of possibilities. Besides the categories of Direct Speech (DS) and Indirect Speech (IS) that a writer has available, according to Leech, Semino and Short (2004, 2007), one also has the possibility of representing speech using Free Indirect Speech (FIS), a Narrative Report of a Speech Act (NRSA), or a Narrative Report of Action (NRA). These categories vary in the degree of control posited by the character or the narrator, representing a progression from the most faithful to the least faithful to the speech act alone (DS,

²⁵ Ravotas and Berkenkotter 1998

FIS,IS,NRSA,NRA). The following are a set of options for the reporter from which he will choose according to what is most suitable for his communicative purpose.

- **DS** – Direct speech

The original speech in inverted commas with a reporting clause.

He said, "I have been there several times."

- **FIS** – Free indirect speech

Representation of the original speech with no reporting clause retaining some features of DS such as direct questions and vocatives.

He disagreed with their proposal.

- **IS** – Indirect speech

Report in the words of the reporter applying backshifting of the original version (changes in tense, pronouns and adverbials of time and place to align with the time of reporting) Reporting clause + reported clause (subordinate NC)

He told me that he had been there several times.

- **NRSA** - Narrator's report of speech act

Performative Verb +NP/PP

She refused the offer. Tom accused him of lying.

- **NRA** - Narrator's report of action

VP+PP or NP

He talked about his experience. They presented the project.

The representation of a character's **thought** is essentially the same as that for the representation of speech. The writer can represent grammatically a character's thoughts through Direct (DT) or Indirect Thought (IT), Free Indirect Thought (FIT), a Narrative Report of a Thought Act (NRTA), or a Narrative Report of a Thought/an Act (NRT).

- **DT** – Direct thought

He thought "I can't do it myself".

- **FIT** - Free indirect thought

He couldn't do it himself.

- **IT** – Indirect thought

He thought that he couldn't do it himself.

- **NRTA** - Narrator's report of thought act

He considered the likelihood of giving up.

- **NRT** - Narrator's report of thought/an Act

He thought about asking for help.

However, there is a noticeable difference between the effects created by speech and thought presentation categories. G. Leech and M. Short (2007, p. 344) state that the reason for this is the difference between what is considered a norm for speech presentation categories on the one hand, and thought presentation categories on the other. Whereas the baseline for speech presentation is the direct speech (DS), the norm for the thought presentation is not direct thought (DT) but its indirect form (IT), as it comes closest to acknowledging the fact that it is implausible to suggest that we can directly observe the thoughts of others. Thought is not “verbally formulated and so cannot be reported verbatim” (Leech and Short, 2007). We do not actually have direct access to other people's thoughts and feelings by not claiming to correspond precisely to the thinker's precise thoughts (<http://www.languageinconflict.org/the-world-through-language/presenting-speech-and-thought.html>).

Speech and thought presentation can be a problematic area of investigation, especially when it comes to discourses which can't be fitted into traditional categories of direct vs. indirect speech and thought. There is a long tradition focussing on speech and thought presentation in written fiction (Banfield, 1973; McHale, 1978; and Fludernik, 1993). In fictional discourse (literary texts), no anterior speech event actually take place, everything is invented by the author. Some recent works on non-literary texts (Roeh and Nir, 1990; Slembrouck, 1992; Caldas-Couldhard, 1994 and Waugh, 1995) have highlighted the need for more systematic accounts of ST&WP phenomena across a wider range of text types (M. Wynne, M. Short, and E. Semino 1998). To analyse the presentation of someone's thought in non-literary texts is even more difficult. Thoughts often relate to information, beliefs or attitudes that the characters could not express openly, and therefore tend to contrast with what the characters do say (Cohn, 1978; Semino and Short, 2004).

3. Data and methodology

The main aim of our study is to draw attention to some important aspects of four different text types, namely discourse presentation (the ways of interpreting other's words) and the ways the reported message is expressed. The object of interest lies in exploring the choices, patterns and variations in the presentation of characters' words in different text types. It is also of interest to what extent the original speech changes when it is reported and how

linguistic choices might affect the projection of point of view and the potential for readers' sympathy towards the characters, as well as the readers' perceptions of the characters.

The variants of speech activities will be categorised according to Leech and Short's (1981) model of speech and thought presentation. We will draw our attention especially to IS, FIS and NRSA, which are in the middle of the scale of faithfulness to the original speech and examine the speech act verbs that the writers use help to perceive the nature of the described event more intensively; thus these verbs to a considerable extent influence the reader and enhance the pragmatic function of the report.

The investigated material is a small size corpus of authentic, naturally occurring, connected, contextualized interactional language of different texts of written English (a collection of authentic texts comprising three text types: *academic prose*, *newspaper articles*, and *fiction*, all representing contemporary British and American English). The various texts compiling the subcorpora chosen for our investigation were randomly selected regardless the media, the topics, the level of language, and the age, sex, or social group of the users. The analysed texts within the subcorpora are of different length, but each subcorpus is approximately of the same breadth (15,000 words). The whole corpus thus includes more than 45,000 words. The texts chosen for the analysis are similar to one another as for the topic, but differ not only in terms of grammar but also in terms of style, and degree of formality.

The subcorpus of academic prose consists of research papers, academic articles, and passages from textbooks taken from different websites and study fields, such as psychology, medicine, economics, linguistics, etc. The analysed newspaper columns were sampled from across the various topics found in most newspapers. The texts covered the following major areas: domestic news, foreign/world news, arts (including cinema, theatre, fine arts, fashion, etc.), and social news (including reports about society people, environment, crime, etc.). The last investigated corpus, which is contemporary fiction, consists of several chapters taken from five different books: Brown, D. *Inferno* (2013); Patterson, J. *Run for your Life* (2009); Hislop, V. *The Return* (2008); Bond, A. *The Truth About Ruby Valentine* (2011); Connelly, M. *Nine Dragons* (2009). It is assumed that there exists an informal-formal continuum between the texts as they are taken from different genres and printed sources. Both the formal and functional description of the analysed structures will offer an overall view on different structural types/ways of presenting others' speech and the faithfulness to the original in the report.

In order to find out the different ways of presenting speech, we applied quantitative analysis of the different texts within the investigated corpus focusing particularly on the way

(structures) in which characters' utterances are presented. It is a well-known fact that news reports provide the reader with opinions, ideas, judgements, and feelings of the people involved, they present the attitude of the writer/author or the editorship; moreover, they enable the author to select and transform, it was interesting to investigate how the choice of particular structures affects the projection of point of view and the potential for readers' sympathy towards the characters, and to trace how faithfully the words by others are presented. We were also interested in the extent to which the mentioned structures occur in the texts of different degree of formality as it is supposed that the language used in reports in different printed media differs. According to D. Crystal (1997), it can be accounted for the fact that particular papers tend to adjust the language of their articles to the needs and expectations of their readers. First of all we distinguished between presentation of speech and thought. The structures that did not involve any of the mentioned presentations and those that we considered as ambiguous were not analysed. Then we analysed each text in terms of the use of structures which were marked as speech presentation and compared the results with that of the whole corpus. In the process of unfolding analysis the following research questions have emerged:

- 1/ Which of the categories of speech presentation are most frequently used in the corpus as a whole and in three different text types?
- 2/ Which performative (speech act) verbs are most commonly used when interpreting someone's Speech in fiction and non-fiction texts?

4. Analysis and discussion

Since the selection and transformation takes place when the writer chooses and introduces verbalisations, it was interesting to analyse the ways of reporting the original events with regard to the selected grammatical structures and formulations/expressions of the participants of the original communication event.

It is evident that different forms of speech presentation represent different degrees of faithfulness to the original words; therefore, they cannot be regarded only as syntactic forms of the same proposition. Especially, the category of FIS, defined both by lexical and syntactic features and where the marker of subordination is absent, is a very loose concept (Leech and Short, 2007). In non-literary texts, where ideology and persuasion is of high interest, and the text writers effort is to manipulate the reader's viewpoint, it might be difficult to find out "whose voice one is hearing in processing a text as we may be misled about the words that

someone uttered or be persuaded because of who we think uttered the words” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 144).

In our analysis, first of all we searched the corpus for all instances of presentation; afterwards, we distinguished between presentation of speech and thought. The structures that appeared ambiguous were not involved in the analysis. Some sentences included more than one category, and there were a lot of sentences that did not involve speech or thought presentation at all.

Table 1: The proportion of speech and thought presentation in each text type and the whole corpus

Text type	Speech presentation	Thought presentation
Fiction	62.5%	37.5%
Newspapers	73.8%	26.2%
Academic prose	80.3%	19.7%
whole CORPUS	72.2%	27.8%

Table 1 above shows that there is almost three times as much speech as thought presentation within the whole corpus. Looking at the text types separately, the incidence of speech presentation (SP) is higher than that of thought presentation (TP) in each of them; however, the proportion of SP to TP differs. The big difference in the proportion of speech presentation to thought presentation in academic prose can be attributed to the fact that academic writing requires exact articulation and identification of the speaker’s/writer’s position in relation to the issues. The authors of this type of discourse do not present beliefs, thoughts, or attitudes that the characters could not express openly, but present persuasive arguments supporting their position, and identify the relevance of their argument. To do that, they make use of communication verbs that express verbal processes or report information, such as *argue, claim, conclude, say, state, suggest, show, prove, demonstrate* etc. as in the example *Thompson-Schill argue that generalized “selection demands” increase in complex sentences, potentially confounding the signal for grammatical processing...*

When analysing how speech is presented, we focused on the following categories as introduced by Semino (2004):

DS (Direct speech) – the exact words in the report represented by utterances enclosed within quotation marks and an independent reporting clause. The language used is appropriate

to the speaking character, e.g. *The spokesman also said: "The strike may have resulted in collateral damage to a nearby medical facility."*

FIS (Free indirect speech) – resembles indirect speech in shifting tenses and other references, represented by utterances without a reporting clause using language that is partly appropriate to the narrator (tense and pronouns) and partly to the speaking character (grammar, lexis, deixis). In this technique the character's voice is partly mediated by the voice of the author; in other words, it retains some features of direct speech (direct questions and vocatives), e.g. *Stefanie wondered whether we should not have driven straight home.*

IS (Indirect speech) – conveys the report in the words of the reporter, represented by utterances with a reporting clause followed by a subordinated reported clause. The language is appropriate to the narrator with verbs generally 'backshifted' in tense and changes in pronouns and adverbials of time and place are made to align with the time of reporting. In indirect speech the reported clause does not re-enact the original speech event, but gives rather current speaker's perspective on the original sayer's words. For instance, the sentence of direct speech *"So what are you going to do about the Friday dance class?" asked Maggie.* Could be rendered in indirect speech as: *Maggie wanted to know what I was going to do about the Friday dance class.* The current speaker in the reported clause is referred to as *I* and not as *you* as in direct speech.

NRSA (Narrator's report of speech act) – expressed by a speech act verb usually followed by a noun or prepositional phrase representing the subject matter of the speech act, e.g. *Stokes rejected Afghan claims that Taliban fighters had been in the hospital grounds.*

NRA (Narrator's report of action) - is a verbalization process which can be followed by a prepositional or a noun phrase with minimal reference to speech taking place, e.g. *She replied to him.*

To get the answer to our first research question, at first, it was necessary to find out which stylistic variant (direct or indirect) was used to present speech in the different text types. Then, indirect presentations of speech were put into categories based on their faithfulness to the original version, starting with the most faithful to direct speech (DS), which is free indirect speech (FIS) through indirect speech (IS), narrator's report of speech act (NRSA), and to narrator's report of action (NRA). Table 2 below shows the results of quantitative analyses of speech presentation in the different investigated text types within the corpus.

Table 2: The distribution of different categories of speech presentation in the corpus

Speech presentation	DS	FIS	IS	NRSA	NRA	Total
Fiction	303 60.8%	45 9%	57 11.4%	72 14.5%	21 4.3%	498 51.9%
Newspapers	126 34.9%	24 6.7%	141 39%	62 17.2%	8 2.2%	361 37.6%
Academic prose	9 8.9%	11 10.9%	51 50.5%	27 26.7%	3 3%	101 10.5%
Whole CORPUS	438 45.6%	80 8.4%	249 25.9%	161 16.8%	32 3.3%	960 100%

The quantitative analysis of the five categories of speech presentation show to what extent the investigated texts differ in terms of the frequency of particular speech presentation variants. The division into DS, FIS, IS, NRSA, and NRA indicate that that Direct speech (DS) is by far the most frequent form of speech presentation. In our analysis it accounts for 45.6% of all speech presentation in the corpus and is highly represented especially in fiction. However, it is not the most frequently occurring category in each of the investigated text types. A significant cline can be noticed from the lowest figure of only 9 instances (8.9%) in academic texts to the highest, 303 (60.8%), in fiction, so on this level it can be claimed that the use of DS is text type relevant. In newspapers DS occupies the second place, and in academic prose it belongs to the least frequently used category. The figures in Table 1 above suggest that the occurrence of direct speech depends on the degree of formality of the text type: the greater the frequency of DS, the less formal the text is.

The results indicate that indirect speech (IS), realized by reporting clauses followed by subordinated reported clauses, is the second most commonly used variant of reporting other people's speech. It represents 25.9% of reported speech within the whole corpus. Here again, there is an evident cline from its lowest incidence in fiction texts (11.4%) followed by newspapers (39%) to the highest in academic prose (50.5%). In contrast to DS, which is very common in less formal text types, the relatively high incidence of IS indicates that it is more typical for formal texts.

Narrator's report of speech act (NRSA) in total makes up 16.8%, which is the third most commonly occurring way of speech presentation. The distribution of this category

within particular text types differs. While in fiction and academic prose NRSA is the second most frequently used way of presenting speech, in newspapers it occupies the third position being used less commonly than DS and IS. In fiction it accounts for 14.5% and it is more frequent than IS. With 80 occurrences, which is 8.4% in the whole corpus, free indirect speech (FIS) belongs to the least frequent form of speech presentation together with Narrator's report of voice (NV), which is the most minimal with only 3.3% in the corpus. Both are relatively infrequent in all three investigated text types.

4.1 Direct Speech

The most frequently occurring category of speech presentation in the subcorpora of fiction and newspapers is direct speech (DS). This form of speech presentation is "associated with the faithful, verbatim reproduction of an original utterance" (Semino, 2004), the actual words uttered by the speaker. It consists of an independent clause/s in inverted commas and conveys the illocutionary force of speech act/s, its propositional content. Direct speech includes all the deictic properties (tense, pronouns, lexis) appropriate to the speaker. The use of DS in fiction and news reports helps to foreground particular situations, events and dramatize the narrative as in: "*Robert, do you realize what this means? It means the words circa trova were already in your subconscious! Don't you see? You must have deciphered this phrase before you arrived at the hospital! You had probably seen this projector's image already...but had forgotten!*" (Brown, 2013). Using DS the writer draws attention to the importance of the situation and according to Semino (2004, p. 8) "gives the reader the impression that he/she is listening directly to the character's voices without mediating interference of the narrator".

In news reports using DS foregrounds the actual words of speakers, especially politicians, so that the reader feels he/she gets what the speaker himself said, not a version worded through the journalist's language, as in: "*I can't say there is big optimism,*" said one of the diplomats. "*There is a strong feeling that protection of external borders is the competence of the countries. Very many want to state their reservations*" (<http://www.theguardian.com>, cit. 16/10/2015). DS is conventionally associated with the faithful, verbatim reproduction of an original utterance. In serious non-fictional writing there may be a greater reluctance to use the direct forms where the original cannot be reproduced. However, DS can sometimes be misused in order to affect many people's views. The direct discourse forms journalists use may be accompanied by expressions which undermine the

reliability of the actual words uttered by the speaker, or show the speaker in a bad light, e.g. *Guy Verhofstadt, leader of Liberal group Alde in the European Parliament, yesterday warned the EU: „From a cost, security and cultural perspective, this is completely the wrong move“*. (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk>, cit. 12/10/2015). Indeed, it is likely that readers will have different expectations of the status of material within quotation marks depending on their perception of the text-type they are reading (Short, Semino, Wynne, 2002). As Bayman and Slembrouck (1999) suggest, the use of DS in news reports fails to represent a range of aspects of spoken utterances, such as voice quality, accent, intonation, paralinguistic features, etc. The English writing system is bad at representing these features of speech, but journalists can, and obviously do make use of conventional orthographic representations to suggest pronunciations, or insert information into the narrative description by the use of adverbs or speech act verbs as in *“Plan Frontera Sur has turned the border region into a war zone,” argued Alberto Donis convincingly* (<http://www.theguardian.com>, cit. 16/10/2015). This is even more common in fiction where the use of adverbs and reporting signals helps the writer express the way the actual words were pronounced as well as the illocutionary force of the original utterance, e.g. *“Sienna Brooks,” the man declared suddenly, the words crystal clear.* (Brown, 2013), or *“Ruby?” she yelled. “Is that you?”* (Bond, 2011). Short, Semino and Wynne (2002) argue that fictional examples are fundamentally different from discourse presentation in non-fictional language use, given that they do not, by definition, refer back to an independent antecedent occasion when the language being re-presented was originally produced.

The use of direct speech in the subcorpus of academic prose is minimal with only 9 instances, which is by far the least compared with that of fiction and newspapers. This can be attributed to the character of academic writings, which is a product that results from thinking and lacks face-to-face interactiveness. The example: *In a recent review, Kaan and Swaab (2002) note: “Broca’s area shows increased activity not only to contrasts such as....”* Is by its form it is DS; nevertheless, it is clear from the context that it is in fact presentation of some writing.

4.2 Free Indirect Speech

Free indirect speech (FIS) is the category in between DS and IS. It is thought of as a freer version of an indirect form. It is the mixture of features, some of which are appropriate for IS, and some for DS in that it resembles IS in shifting tenses and other references. As a

result it is often very ambiguous as to whether it represents faithfully the words of the character or whether it is the narrator's words which are being used. In FIS the reporting clause is omitted, which allows the reported clause to take on some of the syntactic possibilities of the main clause, and in this respect share some of the features typically associated with DS (direct questions and vocatives). Leskiv (2009, p. 52) suggests that FIS captures something between speech and thought which can neither be paraphrased in a propositional form nor cast into an expression with a new first person referent. A prototypical example of FIS is *Sienna wondered what was wrong with his face* (Brown, D. *Inferno*, 2013). The context indicates that it is a representation of something Sienna says and verb 'wonder' here may be interpreted as a query rather than a representation of her thought.

As Semino and Short (2004) state, free indirect speech (FIS) is considered to be the least frequent category of speech presentation, yet "it is believed to be linguistically more complex than other forms since it is a mixture of direct and indirect features it be lexical, grammatical or deictic markers of subjectivity" (Semino and Short, 2004). The figures obtained from the analysis of our corpus support this finding and also suggest that this way of speech presentation with only 8.4% occurrence is not very common in literary and non-literary texts.

4.3 Indirect Speech

Indirect speech (IS) the second most frequently used category in the corpus with 249 instances, which represent 25.9% of all types of speech presentation found in the investigated texts. The figures show that IS in academic texts (50.5%) as well as in newspapers (39%) is by far the most common form of presenting someone's speech compared to the other four categories. Out of 361 instances of reporting speech in newspapers, 141 use the form of IS, which consists of a reporting clause with a finite verb expressing the speech act and a reported clause, which is subordinated grammatically to the reporting clause with all the deictic items appropriate for the narrator's 'voice' (*Prosecutor Ulf Willuhn said officials would carry out a psychiatric examination to investigate whether that was the man's primary motive or whether his health played a role.*). IS tends to be used where the content of what a character says is more relevant, in context, than the form of the relevant utterance(s). The propositional content of the original speech act is specified, but no claim is made to present the words and structures originally used to utter that proposition (McIntyre et al., 2003)

The reported clauses are most commonly realised by post-predicate nominal *that*-clauses and *zero that*-clauses. The post-predicate reported clauses are controlled by a wide range of verbs falling into different semantic domains. The most frequently used verb in the reporting clause is *say* as in *US military officials said that deployment of some 3,000 troops had begun for the three-month Operation Atlantic Resolve* (<http://www.theguardian.com>) together with other speech act and communication verbs such as *admit, agree, announce, confirm, deny, inform*, etc. In newspaper texts, though in a limited number, reported clauses appear also after some other communication verbs (*recommend, insist, suggest, and demand*), which are used to propose a potential course of action rather than report some information, e.g. *Mr. Butler rightly recommends that the JIC chairmanship should be the holder's last job* (The Independent on Sunday, cit. 27/09/2015).

The lowest number of speech presentation as a whole was found in the analysed academic texts. In the subcorpus comprising about 15,000 words, there were only 101 instances of speech presentation to be found. Academic texts usually present procedures and convey referential information that characterizes most commonly inanimate entities in the text. Since academic writing is the product that results from thinking, it makes much more use of thought presentation (which enable the writers identify their attitudes in relation to the discussed issues within the field) than presentation of speech. There is also a difference in the use of verbs controlling reported clauses in academic prose compared with that in the other text types. The most commonly occurring communication verbs in academic prose are *assume, argue, suppose, indicate, conclude, prove* and *suggest*. These verbs enable the writers to present persuasive arguments supporting their position and identify the relevance of their argument, e.g. *Fodor suggests that in this area less research needs to be done*. The relatively high occurrence of IS compared to the frequency of DS in academic texts can be attributed to the character of this text type and its level of formality.

IS in fiction is not as common as in newspapers and academic writings. Its occurrence is even lower than that of NRSA. It is due to the fact that in this genre there is a relatively strong preference for fictional dialogues presented by DS; moreover, there is an extremely high frequency of mental verbs to describe the thoughts and other cognitive states of fictional characters used in narratives, so the majority of reported clauses report rather thought than speech. The most common speech act verb controlling reported clauses in our subcorpus is the verb *say* and *tell*, less common but still moderately used are *admit, agree, complain, deny, explain, mention, suggest*, etc. as in *Wearily Kelly explained once more that she should like to see or speak to Max*. (Bond, 2011).

4.4 Narrator's report of Speech Act and Narrator's report of Action

The figures in Table 2 show that narrator's presentation of speech act (NRSA), which accounts for 16.8% of all instances of speech presentation in the whole corpus is more common than FIS but less frequent than IS. If we look at its incidence in the different text types, the frequency of occurrence of NRSA is higher than that of IS only in fiction. NRSA is considered to be more indirect than indirect speech, the narrator is in significant control of the report.

Fictional NRSA is realized in sentences which consist of brief references to the illocutionary force of utterance that signals that a speech act has occurred with no focus on what was said nor what words were uttered as in "*After that he barked out a list that demanded accurate answers*" (Hislop, 2009). NRSA, reporting a minimal account of the original statement, is used to summarise stretches of discourse (Leech and Short, 2007), e.g. "*He criticised Ella's behaviour.*" (Bond, 2011). As a consequence, NRSA often has a backgrounding function, i.e. it tends to be associated with relatively unimportant utterances, as compared with more direct forms of presentation.

In academic prose, NRSA is the second most frequently occurring form of speech presentation. It might be due to the fact that in this type of non-fiction texts there is a relatively strong preference for communication verbs such as *demand, explain, ensure, report, suggest, and show*, which are used in the structure VP+ NP/PP as in "*Halgren suggested also other kinds of computational system.*" (Pinker, S. *So How Does the Mind Work?*, 2005), which is typical for scientific and research papers.

The least frequently used category of speech presentation in the whole corpus in general as well as in each of the three analysed text type is narrator's report of action (NRA) with only 32 instances of 960, which represents only 3.3%. This category that does not refer to the original speech at all and where the narrator totally controls the report has the highest occurrence in fiction. It is sometimes rather difficult to distinguish between NRA and pure narration as in "*Bosh turn to her and whispered something.*" (Connelly, 2009).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, speech presentation categories present a wide variety of possibilities for writers. These modes exhibit various features that can be exploited by fiction and non-fiction writers in a number of ways. Table 2 gives an overview of the frequency distribution of

different categories of speech presentation in the whole corpus and each subcorpus (text type) within it. As seen above, the most commonly used speech presentation mode is DS which enables the author make his characters seem independent of the narrator. Any move away from the DS end of the scale brings with it the feeling of narrator interference. IS and NRSA, which are moderately common in the investigated text types, feel like forms which are heavily controlled by the narrator, because the words used are not those of the characters. The different forms of speech presentation account for interesting and effective variations in manipulating the narrative point of view in order to achieve a wide range of significant effects. In particular, in fiction or news reports they can bias and control the readers' empathy towards the characters.

In the course of the analysis we focused on the choice of speech act verbs used in the indirect categories of speech presentation in different text types. We found out that the verb *wonder* is the most commonly used verb in FIS in each text type. By far the most common communication verb found in IS in the corpus is the verb *say*. *Tell* and *ask* are much more frequent in fiction than in newspapers and academic prose. Verbs such as *argue* and *suggest* were to be found relatively equally distributed in all three text types. Except for these, fiction makes use of *agree*, *admit*, *complain*, *deny*, *explain*, and *mention*, the most commonly used verbs in newspaper text are *announce* *confirm*, *deny*, *inform* and *assume*, *suppose*, and *conclude* in academic writings. As for the most frequently used verbs to report speech act (NRSA) in fiction, these are: *admit*, *agree*, *complain*, *deny*, *explain*, *mention*, and *suggest*. The verb *demand* is the most frequent in newspapers and *explain*, *ensure*, *report*, *suggest*, and *show* in academic texts. The choice of forms of speech presentation as well as the choice of speech act verbs has significant consequences for the degree of importance that is attributed to different utterances, for the projection of viewpoint, and the creation of a contrast between the characters.

References

- Banfield, A., 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language* 10.
- Baynham, M., and Slembrouck, S., 1999. Speech representation and institutional discourse. *Text*, 19 (4), 61-81.
- Biber, D., 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Bond, A., 2011. *The Truth About Ruby Valentine*. Penguin Books, Ltd.
- Brown, D., 2013. *Inferno*. London: Bantam Press.
- Caldas, C., and Couldhard, M. eds., 1994. *Texts and Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Conelly, M., 2009. *Nine Dragons*. Orion Books.
- Crystal, D., 1997. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fludernik, M., 1993. *The Fictions of Language and the Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Hislop, V., 2008. *The Return*. Headline Publishing Group, UK.
- Jeffries, L., 2010. *Critical Stylistics. The Power of English*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Leech, G., and Short, M., 2007. *Style in Fiction*. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 255-281.
- Leskiv, A., 2009. The literary phenomenon of free indirect speech. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, 6.
- McHale, B., 1978. *Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts*. Poetics and Theory of Literature.
- McIntyre, D., Bellard-Thomson, C., Heywood, J., McEnery, A., Semino, E. and Short, M., 2003. The construction of a corpus to investigate the presentation of speech, thought and writing in written and spoken British English. In: D. Archer, P. Rayson, A. Wilson and A. McEnery, eds. *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2003 Conference*. Lancaster University: UCREL Technical Papers, 16, 513-523.
- McIntyre, D., 2003. Building a corpus to investigate the presentation of speech, thought and writing in spoken British English. *PALC (Practical Applications in Language Corpora) Conference 2003*, Łódź University.
- Patterson, J., 2009. *Run for your Life*. Arrow Books, UK.
- Roeh, I., and Nir, R., 1990. Speech presentation in the Israel radio news: ideological constraints and rhetorical strategies, *Text*, 10.
- Semino, E., 2004. Representing characters' speech and thought in narrative fiction: a study of England by Julian Barnes. *Academic Journal Style*, 38 (4), 428.
- Semino, E., and Short, M., 2004. *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Short, M., Semino, E. and Wynne, M., 2002. Revisiting the notion of faithfulness in discourse presentation using a corpus approach 1. *Language and Literature*, 11(4), 325-355.
- Tannen, D., 1982. Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language*, 58 (1), 1-21, Linguistic Society of America, available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/413530>.

Wynne, M., Short, M. and Semino, E., 1998. A corpus-based investigation of speech, thought and writing presentation in English narrative texts. *In: A. Renouf, ed. Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 231-245.

<http://www.languageinconflict.org/the-world-through-language/presenting-speech-and-thought.html>