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1. Introduction
In English, as in most other European languages, there are two principal types of reporting other people’s language: direct speech and indirect speech. The focus in this paper will be mainly placed on indirect speech since this type is most closely associated with the content clause, which has been one of the main topics in my doctoral thesis (Sekine 1996), and on various types of mixed speech such as free indirect speech, which are considered to share some of the grammatico-semantic properties of both types of reporting.

In this chapter, the general tenets of this paper will be given (1.1.), together with some critical reviews of the traditional views held by linguists and logicians alike (1.2.). In Chapter 2, direct speech will be summarily looked at because this is considered the basic form of reporting. In Chapter 3, indirect speech will be put to analysis mainly with a view to finding out how it is similar to and dissimilar from direct speech and how the two distinct types of clause (i.e. a that-clause and a zero-clause) are used in this type of speech. In connection with the former issue, the so-called sequence of tenses will be examined critically in the light of new findings made possible in my doctoral thesis. Lastly in Chapter 4, various types of mixed speech will be seen in their relation to the two basic types of reporting.

1.1. The basic tenets of this paper
The main thrust of this paper is to show, contrary to the received view, that there is no absolute qualitative difference between direct and indirect speech, barring one point as will be made clear in due course, because they are both instances of paratactic linking. That there is no qualitative difference between the two types can be readily seen from
the fact that no utterance can possibly be reproduced in its entirety without any surface-form change and that hardly any linguistic message to be conveyed by means of indirect speech can or need be wholly independent of actual linguistic (particularly lexical) means by which it is superficially realized: even if the report is word-perfect most of the original prosodic features will inevitably be lost in the telling and it can be extremely difficult to reproduce the same meaning without using any word in the original utterance.

As the two types of speech are thus distinct only quantitatively, it has come about in English that one more type of speech, the so-called mixed speech, rich in variety, is used to meet various communicative needs. Another contributing factor to this frequent use of mixed speech in English is that many instances of indirect speech may be constructed without any introductory conjunction (i.e. THAT) far more freely than in any other European language.

That the two types of indirect speech, one with a that-clause and another with a zero-clause, are fundamentally distinct semantically is a logical consequence of what has been established in my thesis (Ch. 7, especially 7.7.). They are distinct in the way the content of the original speech is reported, in the sense that the reporter is regarded as projecting him-/herself differently into what he/she assumes, from the speaker’s remarks, to be his/her intended meaning of the utterance in question. In the former, the reporter is seen to convey objectively what he/she imagines to be the speaker’s intended meaning, while in the latter, he/she is regarded as more subjectively committed to the content of the reported clause, in the sense that he/she is seen to imply at the same time that his/her view is in agreement with the speaker’s reported in the clause; in other words, the reporter’s view is also projected as part of the reporting act. It is only the first type of indirect speech that has been traditionally investigated to the total exclusion of the second type and this has been the main source of not a little misunderstanding of this linguistic phenomenon.

If the above hypothesis is correct, it will be seen, contrary to the received view, that there is no “anomaly” (see Ch. 4. in this paper) whatsoever in the relation between the two basic types of speech and the other mixed type exemplified by, say, free indirect speech and that every type of speech could be considered as plottable on a cline, depending on how strongly the reporter wishes to superimpose his/her own view on the message to be conveyed as the speaker’s.
1.2. Traditional views

The typical traditional view is beautifully summarized in the following remarks of Quine's (1960: 219):

“When we quote a man’s utterance directly we report it as if we might a bird call. However significant the utterance, direct quotation merely reports the physical incident and leaves any implications to us. On the other hand in direct quotation we project ourselves into what, from his remarks and other indications, we imagine the speaker’s state of mind to have been, and then we say what, in our language, is natural and relevant for us in the state thus feigned. An indirect quotation we can usually expect to rate only as better or worse, more or less faithful, and we cannot even hope for a strict standard of more or less; what is involved is evaluation, relative to special purposes, of an essentially dramatic act.”

The distinction between the two basic types of speech cannot be more clean-cut. In any case, in the above remarks, what has to be pursued more closely is to try to see what is really involved by “evaluation, relative to special purposes”, since it is not only “the speaker’s state of mind” that could be incorporated into the message in indirect speech.

The difference between the two types of speech is similarly summarized by Halliday (1994: 250ff.) as between ‘wording’ and ‘meaning’: direct speech is a ‘projection’ of wording and indirect speech of meaning.\(^1\) Based on this interpretation he concludes that, in grammatical terms, direct speech involves a paratactic interclausal conjunction and indirect speech a hypotactic conjunction. He makes a reservation, quite rightly I believe, about his standpoint by adding that the ‘wording—meaning’ distinction is an “idealized” one, not necessarily reflecting real language use. If he admits this, however, another distinction of his between paratactic and hypotactic conjunctions must be likewise admitted as an idealized one, in view of the fact that function and grammar are inseparably connected in his whole theory. But this could lead to a flagrant self-contradiction in theory, since there is no intermediate tactic relationship between them. The two tactic relations are not understood in his framework (nor in anybody else's, in fact) as those kinds of relationship which have a potential of merging together somewhere in between, even by the agency of some other type of relationship that shares some features of both kinds of tactic relationship; they are completely discrete.\(^2\) This interpretation of his is not
so novel in view of the general belief prevalent among grammarians of various persuasions that the reported clause in indirect speech is a grammatical object, hence embedded in the reporting clause. Halliday never says so; in fact he rejects the embedding interpretation (1994: 140). Yet the grammatical status of each clause is still thought different, that is to say, one of them (the reported clause) is dependent on the other (the reporting clause), hence hypotactically conjoined. There is no element of continuity between the two types of speech in his theory, either.

As far as I am aware, it is Davidson (1968), with Scheffler (1954) as his forerunner, who has made clear that the reporting and reported clauses are not so closely connected as is generally thought to be. He says, for example, “from a semantic point of view the content–sentence in indirect discourse is not contained in the sentence whose truth counts (p. 143)” . However, as can be glimpsed from his expression “the sentence (i.e. the outer clause of the sentence) whose truth counts”, every content clause, which follows this truth–value–oriented clause, is considered by him contrariwise “semantically inert (p. 133)” . On the other hand, he says in the same breath, “when I say that Galileo said that the earth moves, I represent Galileo and myself as samesayers (p. 140)” . If the reporter and speaker are thus represented, the content of this reported speech cannot be regarded as semantically inert, because, as will be made clear later in 3.3.2., the reporter is seen to be likewise asserting that the earth moves. All this confusion, I believe, comes from the fact that he has not placed too much importance on the lexico–grammatical forms taken in the reported clause and particularly from the fact that he has seen indirect speech as that realized by a that–clause alone. As a matter of fact, the content of the reported clause is anything but semantically inert on the one hand and someone else’s utterance can be reported in two different ways in indirect speech on the other: either with the reporter’s commitment to the truth of the content of the reported message or with his/her avoidance of any personal commitment of this sort. This latter distinction is grammatically reflected, on my hypothesis, in the use or non–use of the conjunction THAT.

In any case, reflecting the sharp division traditionally made between the two types of speech, direct speech will be provisionally considered an instance of ‘mention in form’, while the two types of indirect speech (with a that–clause and a zero–clause) one of ‘mention in content’ and of ‘use’ respectively. The reason for this naming will become clear as the discussion goes along.
2. Direct speech
The investigation of direct speech is essential to a true understanding of reporting because it is this type of speech which is generally thought of as primary; whereas direct speech does seem universal, indirect speech is not. This is clear even within the confines of European languages: Classical Latin does not have a construction corresponding to indirect speech in English, instead it uses an ‘accusative – infinitive’ construction which is rightly considered fully integrated into its matrix clause: e.g. *Novae copiae cras venient* (Reinforcements will come tomorrow) ⇒ *Consul dicit novas copias cras venturas esse.* (The consul says that reinforcements will come tomorrow (lit. The consul says reinforcements (*accusative*) tomorrow to be going to come(*future infinitive*))).

In direct speech, the quoted language is said to be usually signalled by the use of quotation marks in written form (Quirk et al. 1985: 1022), and by a prosodically prominent tone unit in spoken form (Knowles 1987: 201–2). The reporting clause in spoken form, on the other hand, is said to be usually less prominent than the reported clause and is often proclitic (Halliday 1994: 250). As a matter of fact, it can be highly prominent and coterminous with the end of one tone unit; this intonation break, sometimes accompanied with a brief pause, signals the beginning of a quotation, which is often doubly signalled by the use of discourse markers such as WELL. Here are some examples of direct speech below in spoken form (a little sanitized).

1. (with a proclitic reporting clause)

   and I said I haven’t used a /sewing-machine for \△ YEARS(\ruby)\ruby // and \[\quip\] he said well \· \GO(\ruby) along and \{\TALK(\ruby) to them\}\\⁵

2. (with a reporting clause as a separate tone unit)

   and I /SAID(\ruby) \ruby // well I /don’t REALLY(\ruby) think\ruby // I could /WRITE(\ruby)\\⁶

2.1. The quoted language
The language quoted in direct speech is realized as a sentence (one such as a textual unit). So, there is no grammatical constraint on what comes as a quotation. Not only statements but every other type of sentence may come. They often need not be grammatical either. Below is an example of the so-called anacoluthon from a newspaper article (*The Times*, Dec. 6, 2000).
3. Penny Mansfield, (....) suggested that the rise in cohabitation was a factor.

   “We expect that people most at risk of marriage breakdown to be those people who are cohabiting—and therefore breaking up before marriage.”

In this example, Penny Mansfield is quoted verbatim in all probability: she started with we expect in a construction followed by that, but due perhaps to the rather lengthy intervening prepositional phrase most at risk of marriage breakdown she unknowingly has switched to another construction using a to-in infinitive.

Also, foreign languages may be quoted in full, as in the next example.

4. ‘Mais,’ said the Signore, staring from his scene of ignominy, where his wife played with another man’s child, ‘mais—voulez-vous vous promener dans mes petites terres?’

These kinds of quoted language will be called the ‘phonological’ mode of representation, as will be clearly seen from the following examples, since they are sentences, not as grammatical units but as textual units.

5. a) ‘Hum,’ says Claudia.

   b) ‘Gee–gee gone?’ enquired Lisa.

They are typical examples of direct speech in that they do not have indirect speech counterparts. In this sense they are literally instances of ‘mention in form’.

Even from a semantic point of view, there is hardly any constraint on the quoted language, if the reporting verb is a semantically neutral SAY. Enquired in 5. b) above, for example, could always be replaced by said. (The opposite is not always true.) The semantic appropriateness in direct speech depends on the semantic compatibility between the reporting clause and quoted language. Because there is not much variation in language use arising from the difference in the semantic characters of grammatical subjects in English, a great deal depends on the semantic compatibility between the reporting-clause verb and the content of the quoted language, in whichever sequential order the two elements may be realized. SAY imposes hardly any constraint, ADD a little, ADMIT a little more, DECLARE quite a little, and so on. Directive verbs like
ORDER may be placed at the other extreme, as can be seen from the fact that they are often followed by *to*-infinitives in indirect speech. Thus, how strongly the quoted language is semantically constrained by the reporting-clause verb, or vice versa, may be considered to form a cline, starting with SAY and finishing with ORDER or some other related verbs.

2.2. The reporting clause
As far as the reporting clause is concerned, one fundamental difference between written and spoken English in direct speech is that whereas the clause in question seems to be mostly restricted to initial position in spoken form (for different opinions, see Knowles 1987: 291–2, Halliday 1994: 250), in written form there is no such positional constraint, as shown below.

6. a) She said, ‘Would you like to come and have tea with me?’
   b) ‘Sit down,’ Tom said/said Tom.
   c) ‘The fact is,’ said George, ‘she doesn’t know anything about it.’

In fact, it is the second construction 6. b) above that is statistically most favoured in fiction. As far as its position is concerned, the reporting clause in written English behaves as if it were an adverbial comment clause, in that it may come to any position characteristic of adverbials (Leech & Short 1981: 351 note 11). Also to be noted is the inverted ‘verb – subject’ order when the clause stands in mid and final positions; although it is seldom that a pronoun subject, which is by definition lacking in new information, comes to sentence–final position.

2.3. The paratactic conjunction in direct speech
Given that many instances of quoted language are used without their reporting clauses, it might seem that what is the main carrier of information in direct speech is the quoted language. However this is not the case, as can be seen from the spoken example above (example 2) where the reporting clause is also the locus of key information. The even distribution of information in direct speech can also be seen from written examples like the following.
7. She settles, resignedly, for the long drive. 'Don’t come, you don’t have to,' Gordon has said, but of course she must (...) *

In 7. above, the two she’s in the surrounding texts are coreferential with you in the quotation, so must in the last clause can be seen as a zero substitution of must come. If the verb in the quoted language was, say, go, then the substitution would have to be that of must go. If there were no clue in the quotation as to what the substitution must corresponds to, the whole text would collapse. On the other hand, the reporting clause Gordon has said is likewise indispensable: without it the whole text would become meaningless. This is because the quoted language could not be attributed to its original speaker. So, it is only when this attribution is possible that the reporting clause is not required.

Also, rather rare though it is, it can happen that both the reporting clause and the quoted language are grammatically independent, as in the following example.

8. ‘He’s becoming crotchety.’ Hilda said, with satisfaction.  

These observations suggest that the reporting clause and the quoted language in direct speech are basically independent units and combine to make a larger sentence as equal partners. In the sense that they are on an equal footing as sentence constituents, they are regarded as linked paratactically, with the closest parallel being juxtaposition. If this interpretation is accepted it becomes possible to explain why the sentence like the following is well-formed.

9. The next time I saw my neighbour’s wife, I kissed her twice. ‘Non,’ she said, ‘trois fois.’  

Here, twice in the previous text and trois fois in the quotation are presented as semantically related. The quotation and its surrounding texts are thought to belong to different speakers, thus superficially represented as constituting two different linguistic levels. Yet this example clearly shows that they are grammatico-semantically integrated as one text. Although most linguists and logicians alike claim that it is the surface form, not the meaning, that is at stake in direct speech (hence named ‘mention in form’), this
position cannot explain many seemingly rather ‘anomalous’ examples like the above. How could twice and trois fois be considered related in surface form? Meaning cannot and should not be taken in isolation from surface form; otherwise the above example would become a mere gibberish. All this is because even the quoted language cannot be represented as such without once going through the reporter’s interpretation. Contrary to the received view, mention and use cannot be rigorously distinguished in direct speech, probably except for some examples of meaningless phonological mode.

The grammatical status of the quoted language in direct speech accorded by the most prevalent grammar is that of direct object (Quirk et al. 1985: 1022). If so, the quotation must be regarded as embedded in a larger sentence comprising the reporting clause. If so, it would have to be taken as completely integrated semantically as well, as can be seen from another typical example of embedding: in What was true in the nineteenth century is still true today it is meaningless to deny the content of the clause by saying *What was true in the nineteenth century (or was it?) is still true today. On the contrary, the content of the quoted language can always be doubted or denied freely, as is shown by the underlined parts of the next example.

10. ‘Thank you for your help, Miss Pamber. By the way, tell me something, in these days of universal first names, why do you all have Ms or Mr and your surname and an initial on your name tags? It seems very formal.’ ‘Oh, it’s not that,’ she said. (...) ‘Actually I’m Ingrid. No one calls me Ms Pamber, not anyone. But they say it’s for our protection.’ (...) ‘I don’t follow.’

These denials or queries are possible because the quoted language is part of the whole text, linked to the reporting clause paratactically. This is why it can be used without any reporting clause if it can be properly attributed to the original speaker.

To sum up: Contrary to the received view, it is not only the surface form that is at stake in direct speech; meaning also has an important role to play. This is because the reporting clause and the quoted language are linked on an equal footing, namely paratactically. As far as this grammatical linking is concerned there is no distinction between direct speech and indirect speech, to which we shall now move on.
3. Indirect speech
In indirect speech, i.e. indirect statement to be precise, the reported language is represented in both media as a content clause with or without an overt THAT (other types of indirect speech such as indirect question or indirect directive will not be dealt with in this paper, because its main concern is still the content clause). Traditionally the distinction between these two clause forms has been ignored as not reflecting any semantic difference; Quirk et al. (1985: 1026), for example, only mentions the use of zero-clauses in indirect speech in a note, saying, “As with other that-clauses, the conjunction that is frequently omitted from the reported clause in less formal indirect speech”. This distinction, however, is vital to a true understanding of how the original utterance is reported from two different points of view.

Unlike direct speech, indirect speech does not allow the reported language to be ungrammatical or truncated, because, by definition, it does not have the phonological mode of representation: there are no corresponding indirect speech versions of examples 5.a) and 5.b) above (‘Hum,’ says Claudia; ‘Gee-gee gone? enquired Lisa.). Also, the quotation in foreign languages must be put into English. The reported language in indirect speech is required to be represented in the ‘lexico-grammatical’ mode. The reporting clause is fixed to initial position and the word order in it is also fixed to ‘subject – verb’. In spoken form, the reporting clause can be followed by an intonational break as in direct speech; but mostly it is proclitic as it is normally not prominent. Some examples of spoken form will be given below (a little sanitized).

11. (with a zero-clause)
/did you say you were going to ▲ BURGOS(△)///12

12. (with a that-clause)
well /Nightingale ▲ said that he ▲ might ▲ want to ▲ get a ▲ way from ▲ Lower NETHERHALL(△) you SEE(△)///13

13. (with a prosodically prominent reporting clause)
I’ve /read an ▲ excellent ▲ BOOK(△) (a/bout the ▲ history of the ▲ British ARMY(△))////...by Co/relli ▲ BARNETT(△)/ which ▲ SAYS(△) that ▲ [ ▲ ]/// - - - /probably the ▲ CREATION(△)/ of the /British ▲ army in the ▲ First ▲ World WAR(△)/ - - - /was [ ▲ ri:] ▲ greatest ad ▲ ministrative A ▲ CHIEVEMENT(△)/// - - - /of ▲ [ ▲ ] - ▲ POSSIBLY(△)/// our en/tire
△HISTORY(\_/) // ... ¹⁴

3.1. That-clause vs zero-clause in indirect speech

In this paper, the *that*-clause and the *zero*-clause in indirect speech are regarded respectively as an instance of ‘mention in content’ and of ‘use’. ‘Mention in content’ is meant to be an indirect speech counterpart of ‘mention in form’ in direct speech (provided it is presented in the lexico-grammatical mode), with the only difference being the difference in weighting between meaning and form; both are fairly objective ways of reporting other people’s language, without any hint of personal commitment on the part of the reporter. On the other hand, ‘use’ is meant to be a fair reflection of the sentential status of *zero*-clause in grammatical terms; it could always be an independent sentence. Though it has been traditionally treated as an alternative way of reporting other people’s language, it is in fact a disguised way of projecting the reporter’s own view at the same time.

I assume here that, as with other less frequent verbs of utterance, SAY is basically *that*-full despite the statistical evidence sometimes pointing to the opposite direction. By this I mean that if the emphasis is on the process indicated by SAY, the accompanying clause only serves to show what kind of content is associated with the process. It is only when the reporter is more interested in the content of the reported language that the reporting clause will come to lose some of its main function and only to serve to show to whom that content is attributed as the original speaker. This is when the reporter projects his/her own view into the content of the reported language and he/she is basically seen to be committed to its truth. This personal commitment on the part of the reporter often takes the form of face-value acceptance of the original speech; in other words, what is imagined to be the original speaker’s utterance is wholly accepted at its face value, without any reservation made about its truth. It is this difference in the reporter’s attitude towards the original speech that is superficially reflected in the two distinct kinds of clause forms. That this is so can be seen from examples like the following.

¹⁴. Yet I ¼/GATHER(\_/) // they’re /they’ve got△ quite a — good o△ opinion of him THERE(\_/) // they /say he’s got a good MIND(\_/) // but — /I△ thought he was△ going to△ talk us into△ having to do another com△ plete set of △ set
△BOOKS(→) // for / that △bloody PHIL△OLOGY(\ ) PAPER(\ ) //

Here, the reporter is seen to have enough reason to believe that *he* is rather highly thought of *there*. So, whatever the actual speech attributed to *them* may be, it seems highly probable that it is not much different, if it is different, from the one used in this example, namely *he’s got a good mind*, because there is no reason for the reporter to hold it in doubt. Therefore this message has been taken at face value and reported very probably in its original form, though the reporter’s personal judgment of *him* is not so favourable as *theirs*, as can be seen from the succeeding text.

Similar examples can be found in abundance. Here are some below from written texts.

15. Dr Akande, you’re probably right when you say this is nothing. Melanie is somewhere where she has no access to a phone.16

Here, the reporter’s commitment to the truth of the reported language is clear from *you’re probably right*.

16. ‘Can we have the chocolate biscuits?’
   ‘Ask your grandmother.’
   ‘She’s gone to sleep,’ said Ben. ‘But she said we could have them after lunch and it’s after lunch now.’17

Here, the reporter’s grandson, Ben, is speaking on the authority of his grandmother to have chocolate biscuits. What he is interested in is not so much the fact (or fib) that she said something but *what* that something she said is. This is why the content is repeated verbatim. The original speech made by the grandmother is justifiably imagined to be *You can have them after lunch* because Ben has no particular reason to wish to change it. (The so-called sequence of tenses, which has been applied in this example, will be dealt with later in 3.3.)

17. ‘I should like to go,’ Dora said as her husband disappeared out of the door. She called after him, ‘I said I should like to go, Reg.’18
In this example, the reporter is self-quoting. Because she is naturally committed to what she said the clause must be that-less and also because there is no reason whatsoever to change her wording she simply repeats it.

18. Mummy says she wants to watch television, so we’re going upstairs.\textsuperscript{19}

In this example, the reporter does not have any reason to doubt that her mother really wants to watch television. So the original speech has been taken at face value and the reporter’s agreement is tacitly expressed in this reporting act.

19. ‘I’m a wreck after travelling,’ said Mrs Pusey to Edith.
   ‘Yet you’ve done so much,’ Edith replied.
   ‘Yes, well, I owed it to my husband. He wouldn’t go anywhere without me. Said he couldn’t bear to be away from me, the silly man.’\textsuperscript{20}

In this example, the reporter’s face-value acceptance of the original speech is seen from the silly man. He is silly because not many men would be expected to say in so many words that they can’t bear to be away from their wives (or would they?). In any case this original speech has been reported here almost verbatim because the reporter believes what her husband said.

We shall now move on to the examination of that-clause examples. Contrary to the examples of zero-clause, the reporter’s commitment to the truth of the reported speech is non-existent.

20. When the war began that summer (…) my father, who was too old for war and against it, said that we must all take refuge with his parents-in-law in Berlin. My mother poohpoohed his fears and we stayed put till next spring.\textsuperscript{21}

Here, the original speaker’s utterance, whatever it may have been, was taken with a pinch of salt by his family members (including the reporter), as can be seen from My mother poohpoohed his fears in the next sentence. Since his warning had been thus ignored, all of them were to stay put for some more time.
21. Jenny Burden said of her husband that if he had a choice, he would always enquire of a man rather than a woman, asked a man the way somewhere, go up to a male assistant in a shop, take the seat in a train next to a man.  

In this example, the content of the reported speech is a character sketch made by the wife of the person described in it. The reporter presents himself as a disinterested outsider; he does not say whether he thinks this description is right or wrong. He just reports objectively what has been told him. (Of course it is not inaccurate to say that the reported language in this example is constructed as a that–full clause due to the presence of the intervening of her husband and the clause–initial if. What I should like to stress here is that these considerations are part of the reason for the presence of that.) This kind of total lack of personal commitment on the part of the reporter to the truth of the content of the reported speech is typically seen with examples from academic books, where the information is required to be conveyed as objectively as possible.

On the other hand, if the emphasis is on the process of saying, the accompanying clause which only shows what is meant as its content has less information value than the reporting clause and accordingly is realized as a that–clause. That this is so can be more clearly seen when SAY is not used in the reporting in its strict sense because now there is no need to attribute the content of the reported speech to its proper speaker.

22. When I wrote that novel (...) I tried to unravel something about his character and his story. To say that Jules (...) was my father would be as misleading as to say that he was not. Jules is like my father and unlike; to what degree of either I do not know.  

23. Then she went to the window and stepped out on to the little balcony: the unexpected cold made her shiver. One could hardly say that it was winter, but it seemed as though it were no longer autumn.

In the above examples, no one in particular is reported as having said so and so. In 22., the whole construction in question is impersonal in that the verb say is used in a non–finite form without any overt subject. The emphasis is on the process indicated by this verb, which is, to make matters clearer, contrastively repeated. In 23., on the other hand,
the relative importance of the outer clause is partly shown by its formal complexity. In eleven examples of *that*-clause in the same author’s text, eight are modalized in the outer clause (CAN, SHOULD, HAVE TO and WILL) and one is featured by a non–finite use of SAY just like 22. above. Also in this example, *one could hardly say* is contrasted with the subsequent *it seemed as though*. In both examples, on the other hand, the contents of the respective reported clauses are simply repeated in the following texts, either in its antonymous form (i.e. *Jules was my father ⇔ he was not*) or in its synonymous form (i.e. *it was winter ⇔ it were no longer autumn*).

But what has been explained above is not restricted to the non–reporting use of *SAY*. The following examples will make this point clear.

24. And he always said, didn’t he, that it was far safer to cling to the wreckage and wait to be picked up than attempt a long and exhausting swim against the current?25

In this example, the emphasis is clearly on the verb *said*, as is seen from the tag *didn’t he*. This in itself does not mean that the content of the reported clause does not carry as much information (far from it!); it only means that at least much the same amount of emphasis is also placed on the verb *said*. So the clause is *that*-full.

25. When I say that the whole village lived much in the same way, I am thinking of their work, their food, their religion and their leisure.26

Here, the reporter is self–quoting: in the previous text she said, “All lived much in the same way”. In this self–quotation, what is important is not that she asserts the fact already made clear but that she *said* it, because what she wishes to clarify now is to show in what meaning this fact was told in the previous text, as can be seen from *I am thinking of*... in the succeeding text.

26. Crispin was occasionally thought to be Jewish, to which he would say that an enterprising Czech in England had no need to be Jewish.27

Here, the original speaker *Crispin* is described by the reporter as having often defended
himself by *saying* so and so against the false allegation that he was Jewish. Whether the reporter is committed to the truth of this content is not immediately relevant. The emphasis is again on the process expressed by *say* which is in addition modalized.

27. She turned to me, Will you explore with me? Will you stay on? Will you keep me company? She said it most charmingly. I *said* that I would.28

Here, the second *said* (underlined in the example) is contrastively used with the same word in the previous text. The only difference is the subjects of these verbs. And this is precisely what the reporter wishes to highlight: first *she* said so and so and then *I* said so and so. The emphasis this time is on the difference in grammatical subjects. This is why the reporting clause is more important than, or as important as, the reported language.

28. ‘Melanie had no previous knowledge of Annette Bystock, doctor?’

I’m sure she didn’t. I remember her exact words. “I have to see the New Claims Adviser at two-thirty,” she said, and then, a while later, “a Ms Bystock,” she said.’

Wexford *said* gently that the doctor had not told him that before.29

In this example, the speaker is seen to reproach his interlocutor mildly as not having provided him with the information which might be highly relevant to the investigation of a missing girl he is engaged in. The emphasis is on his act of saying this, more than or as much as on the content of this reproach. So the clause is *that*-full.

Much the same kind of explanation may clear one more case of similar example which has already been given towards the beginning of Chapter 7 of my doctoral thesis (see example 7.2. in 7.2.1): *He said frankly that he often fancied black women, they had such fantastic long legs.* This time it will be given with its contexts.

29. Peter Stanton wanted to know if Sojourner was good looking. He *said* frankly that he often fancied black women, they had such fantastic long legs. He liked their long necks, little black swans, and narrow hands. And the way they walked, as if they carried a heavy jar on their heads.30
Here, what is described in the original one-sentence example serves as a reason for Peter Stanton’s wanting to know whether Sojourner, a black girl, was good looking. To know that, he made clear how he felt about black women. Again the emphasis is on the verb *said*, this time as much as on the content of what was said (as is clear from the long explanation given later). If this interpretation is right, it will be seen that even this example has its own semantic reason to keep *that*: it is not only to retain the clause identity, which might be lost if the attribution of *frankly* is thought to be rather doubtful as to whether it should be taken as part of *He said* or of *he often fancied* ..., that the clause is *that*-full.

3.2. The paratactic conjunction in indirect speech

Based on the findings made in my doctoral thesis (in Ch. 7), the so-called complementation is regarded in this paper as an instance of paratactic conjunction. It is only the interpretation of this kind which will make it possible to explain seemingly rather anomalous examples such as ‘*Liz Probert rang up Philida and said that I’ve invited her to Covent Garden.*’ — ‘*But hadn’t you?*’ — ‘*Of course I had.*’ or ‘*Your mother will say I have worked you too hard — have I, dear?*’; kinds of examples which cannot be accounted for by the prevalent ‘embedding’ theory, because what we are witnessing in these clauses is ‘main clause phenomena’ (Green 1976). If the reported speech is an instance of grammatical embedding, it would become impossible, semantically, to contest the content of the clause, as in these examples. Also, it is only the interpretation of this kind that will make it possible to show that direct speech (which has been seen in the previous chapter to be an instance of paratactic conjunction) and indirect speech are only quantitatively different, the fact which in its turn will make it possible to explain why so many instances of mixed speech, which will be dealt with below (Ch. 4), are grammatically well-formed.

That the reporting clause and the reported language are paratactically conjoined can also be seen from the fact that it can happen, rather rare though it is, that they are grammatically independent, as in the following example.

30. ‘I just wanted to *say*. Now all our friends are here. Under one roof. *That* of course no one can ever replace Sally. For me and the children. But with Simon
and Sara’s approval (...) ‘There’s going to be another doctor in the Dacre family.
Pamela’s agreed to become my wife.’

That the reported clause is also a main clause, on the other hand, can be seen from
examples like the following.

31. ‘You said, did you not, (....) that this is a beautiful painting.’
‘It’s very fine.’

What is expected of the second speaker in this example is to give a reply as to whether
he actually said so and so. Instead his remark is directed towards the content of the
reported language: his answer is not directly relevant. This is only possible because the
two clauses are paratactically conjoined.

So the only difference between the two types of speech can be reduced to the difference
in how the original speech is reported, namely to the difference in weighting between
form and meaning. But as was pointed out at the outset, most of the prosodic features
of the original speech will inevitably be lost in the telling. To be sure, an attempt is often
made to retrieve these original prosodic features, as is shown in the next example, but
it must be said to be a rather poor attempt in that it is only a tiny portion of these
features that could be thus recaptured.

32. ‘Now, when you first saw Mrs Postern, what did she say, exactly?’
‘She said, “I did it. It was an accident.”’
‘She said, “I did it.” Might it not have been, “I did it”?’

In so far as both types of speech are represented in the lexico-grammatical mode, the
difference between ‘mention in form’ and ‘mention in content’ is considered not discrete
but continuous, since, as has been repeatedly pointed out above, more often than not, the
reporter does not feel any particular reason to change the original wording in indirect
speech. This is particularly so if the following clause is that-less. Thus, the difference can
justifiably be considered only a matter of degree.

I think that the distinction between direct speech and indirect speech will boil down in
the final analysis to the basic fact that the phonological mode of representation is
possible only with the former type of speech. This point has already been made clear with
the cases where the original speech is truncated or ungrammatical, as in examples 5.a)
and 5.b) (*Hum,* says Claudia and *Gee-gee gone? enquired Lisa*). Let us see here in
passing, therefore, what the reporter normally does when he/she is faced with the
problem of reporting what is said or written in foreign languages.

33. Thanet was still an island when Augustine landed there in 597. Bede estimated
the width of this strait as 3 furlongs (*stadia*) and said that it could only be forded
at two places. Thanet remained an island throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.34

The Latin original of the reported language of the above example is (*qui...et*) *duobus
tantum in locis est transmeabilis*. So, it can be seen that the reporter has translated the
original literally word by word: the only variation he could have had is the translation
of *transmeabilis* into something like *passable* which is given in Lewis & Short’s *A Latin
Dictionary*. Because it refers to a strait, however, *fordable* is seen much better. Davidson’s
example (1968) *Galileo said that the earth moves* cannot be improved any further as an
indirect speech version of the putative original *Eppur si muove*, because its literal
translation (*Yet it moves*) contains the word *yet* which does not fit too well in indirect
speech and the subject *it* cannot be left as it is. In short, contrary to Quine’s claim (1.2.),
real examples of indirect speech clearly show that the reporter does not have much
choice available and that we normally *can* hope for a rather strict standard of good or
bad fit between the original speech and its indirect speech rendering. It is not the case
that anything goes here.

To sum up: It has been generally agreed among grammarians (see, for example,
Banfield 1973) that the two types of speech are not derivable one from the other. Partly
as a logical extension of this, it is now stressed that they are qualitatively distinct. But
this is overkill. Contrary to this now prevalent view it has been seen above that they are
only quantitatively distinct. Firstly, in grammatical terms, indirect speech is also an
instance of paratactic conjunction. So, as far as the tactic relation holding between the
two constituents of a sentence is concerned, there is no distinction at all between direct
speech and indirect speech. Secondly, in semantic terms, the distinction is only a matter
of degree. As Leech (1980: 46–7) says, the semantic relation between direct speech and
indirect speech is “one of similarity”, if not “synonymy”, rather than one of ‘dissimilarity’. The decisive distinction still remaining is that there is one mode of representation which cannot be applied to indirect speech, namely the phonological mode of representation.

3.3. The sequence of tenses
What will be addressed in this section is the so-called sequence of tenses. An attempt will be made below to find out what kind of considerations are involved in the distinction between the sentence in which the tense in its reported clause is ‘backshifted’ (together with the shift of deictic centre) and the sentence in which this backshifting has not taken place. The tense system in English itself is too big a problem to be dealt with here, so it will have to be bypassed (for a detailed account, see Comrie 1985). The only assumption made in connection with the issue at hand is that the use of tense must not be seen as a mechanical reflection of relatively ordered occurrences of events along the dimension of purely physical time; it has the speaker’s viewpoint behind it.

3.3.1. Traditional views
If the reported language in indirect speech is considered grammatically embedded in the reporting clause, it is logical to assume that the tense and some other deictic expressions in the reported clause are required in its temporal and deictic relations to conform fully to the situations set up in the reporting clause. About these grammatical requirements, Quirk et al. (1985: 1026–27), for example, say as follows:

“When the time reference of the original utterance (...) no longer applies at the time that the utterance (...) is reported, it is often necessary to change the tense forms of the verbs. Such a change of verb forms in indirect speech is termed BACKSHIFT. The resulting relationship of verb forms in the reporting and reported clauses is known as the SEQUENCE OF TENSES (...) Backshift is optional when the time-reference of the original utterance is valid at the time of the reported utterance (...)” (my underlining)

What will be contested here is the notion of “being valid” in these remarks. As an illustration of this, they say in the immediately following text that “the appropriateness
of the present forms (...) therefore depends on their reference at the time of the reported utterance”, and accordingly “present forms may be retained in indirect speech” in examples such as *Sam told me last night that he is now an American citizen*, as against *Sam told me in 1970 that he was then an American citizen*. If this is the real meaning of “being valid”, then it will be seen that a sizeable number of real examples would have to be judged very odd. In, say, *He told me that he did most of his work in Sierra Leone*, the example already cited in my thesis (in 7.7.), the chances are that *he* still does most of *his* work in Sierra Leone: the situation described in the reported clause is justifiably deemed applicable at the time of the reporting act. It is just that whether this is so is considered by the reporter needless to be specified. The fact of the matter is that hardly anyone bothers to say always *He told me that he did and still does most of his work in Sierra Leone*. What is claimed by Quirk et al. sounds too artificial.

### 3.3.2. Shifted and unshifted versions of indirect speech

With respect to this point, the following remarks by Van Ginneken (cited in Jespersen 1924: 293) are highly illuminating.

> “*Je ne savais pas qui il était*. Est-ce que je veux dire par-là qu’il est quelque autre maintenant? Nullement. *Était* se trouve là par inertie, et par *savait* seul on comprend qu’il faut entendre la chose ainsi: *était* et est encore.” ³⁵

In his view, in short, the backshifting in the tense in the inner clause is automatically carried out if the tense in the outer clause is past, with not much attention being paid to whether or not what is described in the inner clause is still valid at the time of the reported utterance. This view would probably win far more approval of most native speakers of any European language where backshifting of this kind is expected to take place. Contrary to most of the grammar books which dictate that the sequence of tenses should be performed as if it requires a great deal of conscious effort on the part of the reporter, he denies that grammatical exercises of this kind never take place with native speakers. In my view, it is only in this sense, not in a grammatical sense as Halliday says (1994: 260–1), that the shifted version of indirect speech is considered “the unmarked choice in the environment in question”. ³⁶

It is evident from the grammatical terms sometimes used such as *oratio obliqua* or
oratio recta that the view adopted in most of these grammar books is still strongly influenced by Latin grammar. Its complex system of backshifting to be learnt by rote should be nothing but a mental exercise for any European who has just set out on mastering its grammar. Mechanical views of tense of this kind are only valid if the reported speech is thought grammatically contained in the reporting clause, for in that case everything in the reported language is naturally required to conform to the situations set up in the reporting clause.

However, if the two clauses are considered paratactically linked, as is done in this paper, it is not possible any longer to see what is happening in the reported clause as a faithful reflection of grammatical constraints thus imposed. Instead it would become possible to assume that backshifting takes place automatically as a realization of requirements imposed by the semantic compatibility that must be established between the two clauses.

Then a problem arises as to why this automatic shifting does not occur in some examples like the following.

34. A conversation with Otmar was similar in a way. (...) I smiled at him. ‘An uncle of Aimée’s has been found,’ I said. ‘Isn’t that good news at last?’
   ‘Oh, ja.’
   He nodded several times.
   ‘Ja,’ he said again.
   I didn’t press; I didn’t try to draw enthusiasm from him. But the fact was that someone would love Aimée now; and in time Aimée herself would love. I didn’t say to Otmar that there has to be love in a person’s life, that no one can do without receiving it or giving it. I didn’t say that love, as much as a daughter and a girlfriend, had been taken away. I didn’t say that love expired for me on a Wall of Death.36

In this example, there are three instances of (didn’t) say: the first one is followed by two that-clauses in which there is no backshifting in tense, the second is followed by its own that-clause where the tense has been backshifted to the past perfect (has been taken away ⇒ had been taken away) and the third is rather mysterious in the sense that although backshifting to the past perfect in its that-clause (expired ⇒ had expired) does
seem to be expected yet it has not taken place (I have no idea why this is so). Why this difference?

About this point, I find the following remarks of Jespersen’s (1924: 294) still more convincing than any other explanation I have ever come across:

“The use of the unshifted present (…) implies that the actual speaker is himself convinced of the truth of the assertion, whereas the shifting of the tense also shifts the responsibility for the saying on to the original speaker; (…)”

If he is right in this assumption, the problems posed by example 34 above (at least by its first two cases) are shown to be explicable in the following way: the first and second *that*–clauses in 34 are not backshifted in time because the reporter, the same *I* as the original speaker, is convinced of the truth of what is maintained there, the ‘eternal truth’, so to speak, to her, whereas what is told in the third *that*–clause is nothing more than a personal statement based on the original speaker’s personal history.

Then it follows, on our hypothesis, that the unshifted tense is more likely to be met in the clause which is not introduced by the conjunction THAT, because the use of a zero-clause is considered in this paper to be a semantic reflection of the speaker’s commitment to the truth of its content. This assumption seems to be validated by examples like the following.

35. ‘Crispin *said* he thinks Godfrey married Cordelia because he thought she was an aristocrat,’ said Sandy. 37

In 35. above, the reporter *Sandy* is interpreted as being in full agreement with the original speaker *Crispin* in the belief that *he thinks Godfrey married Cordelia because he thought she was an aristocrat*.

On the other hand, in the example cited earlier *He told me that he did most of his work in Sierra Leone*, the reporter does not show any personal commitment to the truth of the content of the reported speech, because she has no means to tell whether it is really so. For this is something which has been told her for the first time, as has been made clear in my thesis (in 7.7.). So the tense in the reported speech has been automatically shifted to the past, irrespective of whether or not the description still applies at the time of the
reporting.

Towards the end of the next example, the reporter is quoting someone else’s (Miss Baker’s) utterance; the first three Is are this Miss Baker, the original speaker, and only the fourth is the reporter himself (in this respect this example contains an element of mixed speech which will be dealt with later, but this fact itself has no relevance here). In the act of doing this, he is seen to have switched from I’ve to I’d in the reported speech.

36. I /must SAY(\{}\)// /I rang △ up on △ THURSDAY(\{}\)// be/cause I △ had a △ LETTER(\{}\)// an OF/FICIAL(\{}\) △ letter// /AGES(\{}\) a △ go// /from [\hat{\phi}] - △ Miss △ BAKER(\{}\)// /saying △ come at △ ten O’CLOCK(\{}\)// so I /RANG(\{}\) up saying I’m △ terribly SORRY(\{}\)// but I /shan’t be △ with you until △ five past △ TEN(\{}\)// /WELL(\{}\)// the IM/MEDIATE(\{}\) re △ action △ got// which/rather TIED(\{}\) me// was /WHY(\{}\)// - - I said I’ve /just EX PLAINED(\{}\)// in a /full △ long SENTENCE(\{}\)// /why I was △ going to be △ there at △ five to TEN(\{}\)//

On the one hand, the reporter’s (i.e. the original I’s) commitment to the truth of the reported clause is clearly indicated by the lack of that (meaning ‘I had no doubt about her having explained so and so’). On the other hand, what was expected by the original speaker (i.e. the reporter’s coming there by ten o’clock) has turned out not to be acted on by the reporter himself; in other words, the reporter is in no position to assert the truth of the content of the reported clause at the time of this reported utterance. This is why the temporal backshifting from I’ve to I’d has automatically occurred in this example.

Put differently, the choice of a zero-clause and that of the unshifted tense in the reported language are inseparably connected in that they have the same motivation of asserting implicitly the reporter’s conviction that what is described in the reported clause is true. The only difference between these two choices is that with the former (i.e. the use of a zero-clause) the reporter’s commitment to the truth is still time-bound in the sense that what is described in the reported clause is regarded as true and asserted as such only in reference to the tense in which it is framed, the tense whose use being determined in its relation to the tense in the reporting clause (i.e. at the time of the original utterance), whilst with the latter (i.e. the adoption of the unshifted tense) it is
not constrained by any consideration of time reference but that of the time of the reporting act, the extreme case being the eternal truth as in example 34: it involves not only the situational validity of the content of the reported clause at the time of reporting but also the reporter’s commitment to the truth of that content.

Thus it is not the case, as is implied by Quirk et al., that a zero-clause is selected, on the one hand, as a reflection of less formal register (though this in itself is true, I think) and the unshifted tense is independently selected in the reported clause, on the other, as a reflection of the situational validity of its content. As R. Lakoff (1970: 841) says, “in some cases at least, the realness or vividness of the subject matter of the sentence in the speaker’s mind is of greater importance in determining the superficial tense to be assigned to the verb than are such factors as relative (real) time of reference”.

To sum up: As has been explained so far, my position on the issue of the sequence of tenses is that in most cases it is automatic for native speakers if the reporting clause is in the past, irrespective of whether what is described in the reported clause is valid at the time of the reporting. It does not involve any conscious effort of mechanical arithmetic on the part of the reporter. Only in the case that the reporter is committed to the truth of the content of the reported clause, does this automatic backshifting not occur. It is in this sense that there is a considerable amount of overlap between the use of the unshifted tense in the reported clause and that of a zero-form as this clause.

It has to be admitted, however, that my data is not fully convincing as to the validity of the assumption made immediately above on the partial correlation between the unshifted tense and the that-less reported clause: firstly because examples confirming this point are not numerous enough in my data and secondly and more importantly, as is always the case with the problems surrounding the use of a that-full or a that-less clause, it is naturally expected that there should be quite a few exceptions to the ‘rule’ (if it can be called that), since the presence or otherwise of THAT depends on many other factors. That this is the case has already been seen in example 34, where THAT is required even in the first and second clauses because there, as well as in the third and fourth clauses, the fact of her not having said this or that, i.e. the process in the reporting clauses, is stressed through the repetition of didn’t say. It is clear, therefore, that a more detailed statistical study has to be made on this point.
4. Mixed speech
As has been made clear so far, the two basic types of speech, i.e. direct speech and indirect speech, are considered only quantitatively distinct; grammatically both are instances of paratactical conjunction and semantically, in so far as both are represented in the lexico-grammatical mode, they are continuous. Besides, the reported clause in indirect speech can be realized as a zero-clause as well. It is these features of reporting in English, it is thought, that make it possible for a rich variety of mixed speech to be used alongside the two basic types. As will be seen later, some grammarians think that these mixed types of speech are semantico-grammatically anomalous. As a matter of fact, there is no anomaly whatsoever. They are a logical consequence of the way in which the two basic types of speech are constructed in English.

4.1. Free indirect speech
The most highly developed mixed style in speech in European languages is the so-called free indirect speech. About a sudden rise in popularity of this style in French literature, Ullman (1964: 134-5) says as follows. His account from a mainly stylistic point of view is worth quoting in detail since it is the best of its kind (for a detailed discussion of this style, see Coulmas 1986).

“In French literature, something like free indirect speech had existed for many centuries; (...) Yet the construction was comparatively rare even in the first part of the nineteenth century. It was in the novels of Flaubert, especially from Madame Bovary onwards, that it became an invaluable and virtually omnipresent stylistic device (...) Over and above the general advantages of free indirect style (...) there were several specific reasons which explain Flaubert’s fondness for this construction. Some of these reasons were purely linguistic. The monotonous repetition of the conjunction que, which seemed perfectly harmless to writers in the Classical period, was repugnant to the hypersensitive ear of Flaubert; (...) Free indirect style, with its avoidance of explicit subordination, proved an easy way out of this difficulty. It also commended itself to Flaubert because it transposed the present tense of direct speech into the Imperfect, a form of which he was particularly fond.

At a deeper level, free indirect style, a self-effacing mode of presentation in which the author disappears behind his characters, fitted admirably into Flaubert’s doc-
trine of impassivity, the withdrawal of the writer from his work (...)

At the same time, free indirect style, enabling as it does the author to slide imperceptively from the plane of the narrative on to that of inner speech, provided an ideal vehicle for another fundamental attitude of Flaubert, for what he himself called his ‘pantheistic faculty’: his complete self-identification with its characters.”

If this is true, it will be readily seen that free indirect speech is more likely to commend itself to English writers than to French ones because the conjunction THAT is not necessarily required in English from the beginning of its history and because the reported speech is not subordinated to the reporting clause as in French (if it is subordinated, as Ullman claims). In fact it is generally agreed that it started earlier in English than in French, with J. Austen as its originator (Lodge 1992: 43). Below, this mixed speech will be examined with the examples (37, 38 and 39) from M. Forster’s Lady’s Maid (1990) because its potentials are extensively exploited there.

In the next example, it will be seen that the reported speech in the shifted tense (enclosed by brackets < >) is almost completely integrated into the surrounding narrative texts.

37. Miss Henrietta had told her five o’clock was an important time in the house.
   <At five o’clock Mr Barret returned from the City. He would go straight to his room and change his coat and wash his hands and then he would go to see Miss Elizabeth. She, Wilson, should be there, ready. She should have Miss Elizabeth sitting in her chair, composed and comfortable, and when Mr Barret entered she should leave, returning precisely half an hour later.> Miss Henrietta stressed the importance of good time-keeping over and over.

That these sentences are not part of the narrative is seen from the fact that what is described there is not the description of events actually taking place at the time of the reporting. So Wilson (underlined in the example) in them can be seen as a vocative deriving from You, Wilson, should be there, ready.

What is of interest with this novel is that, some examples of free indirect speech are used, unlike the typical examples of it (in the third person, past tense, without the reporting clause), with the apparent reporting clause, but always without THAT’s.
Clauses of this kind have reason to be considered added on, independently of the reported language. They are not instances of an introductory clause in a strict sense but are required to show to whom the reported language should be properly attributed; so, they are no mere adverbal clauses.

In 38. below, this adapted version of free indirect speech is used alongside indirect speech.

38. He (= the master) called Wilson into his study and told her he was pleased with her, that she had worked well. Wilson thanked him. He said he should like to send a gift to Wilson’s mother of some chocolate (...) And then he said that, although she was in his daughter’s employment he would like to contribute something to the expenses of her journey home and back, and gave her two guineas.

Of the two uses of *he said*, one is accompanied by free indirect speech and the other by indirect speech, as is seen from the use of *that* in the latter and from the distinction between *should like to* (< *I should like to send a gift*...) and *would like to* in the two reported clauses. The first instance of *he said*, seemingly subordinating the following reported language, is actually added on, as a kind of introductory clause. It is required because the change of subjects (i.e. *he* ⇒ *Wilson*) has taken place in the immediately preceding text. The reported language itself has been in the free indirect speech construction from the beginning: otherwise *should* would have been changed to *would*. These two clauses can be paratactically linked because they are basically free independent units. Contrary to Leech & Short’s view (1981: 325), it is considered that the presence of the apparent reporting clause does not prevent indirect speech of this kind from being still ‘free’ in the sense that it does not subordinate the reported language at all. In any case it is seen that examples of this kind are those of another type of speech which is intermediate between indirect speech and free indirect speech. If this mode of reporting is possible at all, then it becomes almost impossible to tell whether (*he*) *told* in the previous text is used with free indirect speech or indirect speech in its relation to the first zero-clause reported language (*he was pleased with her*). Structural continuity between these two types of indirect reporting cannot be seen more clearly elsewhere.
About free indirect speech, which is so popular with English writers of today, Halliday comments as follows (1994: 261).

“Strictly speaking it is not so much intermediate as anomalous: it has some of the features of each of the other two types (i.e. direct speech and indirect speech). The structure is paratactic, so the projected clause has the form of an independent clause retaining the mood of the quoted form: but it is a report and not a quote, so time and person reference are shifted (…)”

Is it anomalous? Probably so, if we only choose to think, just like him, that there is no intermediate level between the two basic types of speech. Contrary to his view, however, Jespersen, who does not think that direct and indirect speech are strictly distinguishable (1924: 298–9), has shown with an authentic example (they asked where she was going, and would she come along with them? Carlyle) that free indirect speech can be ‘embedded’ in indirect speech without causing any noticeable incongruity. Here is another such below from Forster.

39. Fanny asked what it (= the letter) said and could she read it or have it read to her.

In conclusion, it must be stressed that free indirect speech is another type of speech intermediate between the two basic types of speech and that all this is only possible because the distinction between these two basic types is not strictly maintainable.

4.2. Free direct speech

Free direct speech is said to have made its first appearance in the late 1950s (Wales 2001: 162). Unlike free indirect speech, it is basically used to quote, not to report, other people’s language. It is represented in a way characteristic of direct speech (in the first or second person, present tense) without the reporting clause, as in the next example.

40. Can that be really you? Mrs Robbins now said.$^9$

Just by comparing the above example with the one already cited above as that of direct
speech (‘He’s becoming crotchety.’ Hilda said, with satisfaction) it will become instantly clear that the only distinction between them is whether the quotation marks are used or not. So free direct speech is a natural development of direct speech.

What is of great interest for the grammatical study of speech is that some instances of free direct speech are again seemingly preceded by the reporting clauses. Their presence is again considered to be required by the fact that the change of subjects takes place quite frequently, so that there must be some construction which serves to show to whom the quoted language is attributed, as can be seen from the next example.

41. She had two keys on the bedside table. She gave me one (...) and she said, now you’ll be able to let yourself in tomorrow. So I said I would, yes, I would, and I’d get the things and to get well soon, and she said would I draw the curtains in the living room on my way out.40

In the above example, the second and third instances of reported language following I said and she said respectively are used in free indirect speech, as is seen, for one thing, from the fact that the tense and deictic expressions are shifted in both of them, and for another, from the use of yes in the former and from the interrogative sentence word order in the latter. In the first instance of speech following she said, however, the language is not reported but quoted in that these shifts have not taken place. Despite this, it still seems as if it is introduced by the reporting clause. Again it is considered here that these apparent reporting clauses are added on, independently of the quoted language, just to show to whom the quotation should be attributed. They are introductory clauses of a kind and distinct in function from similar-looking adverbial comment clauses. That this is so can be seen from examples like the following.

42. He kept muttering under his breath, <What did we wrong?> I said <we didn’t do anything wrong, Terry is just made that way>. He said, <do you know what they do, men like that?> And I said, <no, and I don’t want to, it’s none of my business and none of yours either>, I said, <You’re going to make yourself ill over this if you’re not careful>, and sure enough the next morning he had one of his turns, and had to be rushed to hospital.41
This example abounds in instances of free direct speech (enclosed by brackets < >), with the apparent reporting clauses in the past. These clauses normally come before the quoted language because their sole function is to identify the speaker first. One instance of them (i.e. the last I said) however occurs at sentence-final position. Obviously it is used to pass a comment on the preceding quotation, paraphraseable as something like ‘That's what I said’. In this sense it is adverbal. It is evident, therefore, that the apparent reporting clause is distinct in function from this adverbial clause.

The author uses the above mixed speech style in one of the letters that have been brought in to provide the background information necessary to give coherence to the story. Its style is very colloquial and the transition from speech to narrative and back is frequent and dynamic. Quirk et al. (1985: 1024) say that this type of speech is used frequently in newspaper reporting.

In any case, these examples show beyond any doubt that there is structural continuity between direct speech and free direct speech, continuity much the same in kind as that between indirect speech and free indirect speech.

As has been seen above, indirect speech and free indirect speech, on the one hand, and direct speech and free direct speech, on the other, are respectively continuous in their relation to each other. Both ‘free’ versions have attained their popularity by virtue of the ‘forefronting’ effect they exert on the reported and quoted language respectively. If structural continuity of this kind does not exist, this popularity could not have been so easily won, because the resulting style would become much clumsier. And, I think, this is another reflection of the fact that direct speech and indirect speech themselves are structurally continuous, barring one exception of those examples represented in the phonological mode. Yet even these exceptions seem capable of being incorporated rather well into other types of speech, as will be shown in the next section.

4.3. Other types of mixed speech
The two representative types of mixed speech, i.e. free indirect speech and free direct speech, having been examined above, it now remains to be seen what other types of mixed speech are actually used in real examples.

The first type is a partial quoting exemplified by the following example.
43. Coleridge later modestly said that his purpose in lecturing was ‘to keep the audience awake and interested during the delivery, and to leave a sting — i.e. a disposition to study the subject and, under the light of a new principle’.  

The purpose of this method is to present as a quotation only the part which is considered by the writer highly relevant to the subject in hand, thus making it possible for him/her to change or cut out other parts which are in his/her view rather beside the point.

In the next example, it is easily seen that a direct quotation represented in the phonological mode (underlined in the example) is placed right in the middle of reported language.

44. She said again that she was tired, oh so tired, and that she wished she could sleep a hundred years.  

Things are much more complicated in the next example.

45. ‘Was she someone?’ enquires the nurse. Her shoes squeak on the shiny floor; the doctor’s shoes crunch. ‘I mean, the things she comes out with (...)’ And the doctor glances at his notes and says that yes, she does seem to have been someone, evidently she’s written books and newspaper articles and ... um ... been in the Middle East at one time ... typhoid, malaria ... unmarried (one miscarriage, one child he sees but does not say) ... yes, the records do suggest she was someone, probably.  

The doctor’s language in this example is represented as a mixed type of speech, in clear contrast to the nurse’s direct speech. It is partly represented as a direct quotation, containing words like yes or um and some pauses which would not appear in indirect speech; yet at the same time, it is introduced by THAT (underlined in the example). And interestingly enough, this original language is interrupted halfway through by the writer’s parenthetical comment, which is only possible because it is presented as a part of indirect speech.

Why is such a great variety of mixed speech possible in English? The answer seems
something like this:

“Because any of the features pertaining to either basic type of speech can be picked up and blended in such a way that they can be successfully embedded in the discourse, thus allowing the speaker/writer to exploit the intended effects deriving from this combination to his/her maximum advantage.”

In this sense, mixed speech is not anomalous but only composite, or better, intermediate, as has been traditionally explained. It only becomes anomalous on the assumption that direct speech and indirect speech cannot be mixed since they contract completely different grammatical relations of parataxis and hypotaxis respectively. The fact of the matter is that both contract the same interclausal relation of parataxis, comprising two clauses equal in status.

5. Conclusion
It has been shown in this paper that, contrary to the received view, the two basic types of speech in English, direct speech and indirect speech, are only quantitatively distinct in the sense that, except for some represented in the phonological mode, examples of both types are both grammatically and semantically continuous. This is a logical consequence of the basic position taken in my doctoral thesis that the so-called complementation should be regarded as a grammatical relation of parataxis because it is nothing but a grammatical realization of the semantic compatibility that obtains between the two constituent elements.

Once this position has been accepted the rest follows rather automatically. Firstly it has been established that the reporting clause and the quoted language in direct speech are linked paratactically and then that the same grammatical relation has been found to obtain between the reporting and reported clauses in indirect speech. Secondly, in accounting for this basic fact, it has also been explained why there is a distinction in indirect speech between that-clause and zero-clause as a grammatical realization of two different attitudinal meanings given to the content of reported language. What has been pointed out there is again a logical extension of the findings made in my thesis (Ch. 7). Lastly the various types of mixed speech have likewise been accounted for as a logical extension of what has been found with respect to the two basic types of speech.
In this way, contrary to the received view, every type of speech has been shown qualitatively continuous. This is rightly so, because, after all, every type of speech is nothing but a combination of two constituent elements: one element which contains some predicative of utterance and another which shows the content of this utterance. It is naturally expected that there should be a semantic compatibility between these two elements whatever mode of speech may be adopted. There cannot be any fundamental difference so long as the basic lexico-grammatical conditions are met in any style of speech.

Notes

1. ‘Projection’ is defined as follows (Halliday 1994: 290):
   “It is (...) a relationship between processes—between a mental or verbal process on the one hand, and another process (of any kind) that is mentalized or verbalized (projected) by it.”
2. Surely Halliday admits (1994: 231), with reference to finite clauses with while and whereas which follow their ‘primary’ clauses, that “the line between parataxis and hypotaxis is not very sharp”. But the point is that these clauses are not the only case where the distinction is blurred. For further details about this point, see Sekine 1996: 4.5.
3. This insight of Halliday’s seems to have been lost on Morley when he says as follows (2000: 171):

   \[ \alpha \qquad \beta \]

   \[ John \ said \quad \text{that the parcel had arrived.} \]

   Yet in the sentences John said the password and John said whatever he wished, the phrase the password and the clause whatever he wished were treated as objects within their respective alpha clauses. Whatever he wished was handled as a rankshifted unit, whereas that the parcel had arrived was not. However, the alpha clause subject and predicator elements in all three sentences are the same, and the post-verbal sequences can all be said to answer the question ‘What did John say?’. Hence I argue that within the syntactic structure each should be regarded as fulfilling an object function, irrespective of whether it is realized by a word, phrase, reported or non-reported clause.

   The source of this confusion, I think, lies in his concept of ‘question techniques’ (p. 112). In this connection, the following remarks of Halliday’s should be noted (1994: 141):
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Note that ‘what is said’ in the sense of the wording in quoted or reported form (‘direct or indirect speech’) is not Verbiage. Such projected matter is not a constituent of the projecting verbal process clause. In the ‘probe’ form what did you say?, what is functioning as Verbiage.

Also, I cannot see how a that-clause can be a grammatical object without being subjected to rankshifting or embedding, since, as Morley himself admits (pp. 113–117), the object is a nominally functioning element in a clause. Even when a set of strings serve the same grammatical function, it is not always the case that all members of this set belong to the same grammatical class. This point is conceded by him when he says, for example, as follows (p. 114).

“Subjects which refer to a circumstance are circumstantial subjects, as in, for example, Tomorrow / in the evening / by train would be best, and are labelled $S^{exc}$. They are therefore also susceptible to questions of the type ‘how/ why/ where/ when?’ Thus in connection with Tomorrow would be best, as well as ‘What would be best?’ one can ask ‘When would be best?’ (which focuses on the semantically circumstantial meaning).”

No grammarian of any persuasion would claim that in the evening or by train is in itself a nominal phrase. It functions as a grammatical subject just because it is in clause-initial position which is normally filled by a subject. Likewise, although a that-clause in complementation looks as if it is a nominal clause just because it is placed in a slot which is usually associated with a grammatical object, this in itself does not guarantee that the clause is nominal, as is rightly claimed by Jespersen (Sekine 1996: 94).


5. J. Svartvik & R. Quirk (eds.) A Corpus of English Conversation, S. 1.3.

For the notations of prosodic features used here and in the other examples from the same source, see Sekine (2001): ‘Two Types of That-clause’ (Note 2), Bulletin of the College of Sociology, Shukutoku University, 35, 153–170.


7. D.H. Lawrence Twilight in Italy.

8. P. Lively Moon Tiger.


10. P. Mayle A Year in Provence.

11. R. Rendell Simisola.


16. R. Rendell op. cit.

17. R. Rendell op. cit.

18. R. Rendell op. cit.
19. A. Brookner Hotel du Lac.
20. A. Brookner op. cit.
22. R. Rendell op. cit.
23. S. Bedford op. cit.
24. A. Brookner op. cit.
27. K. Amis The Russian Girl.
28. S. Bedford op. cit.
29. R. Rendell op. cit.
30. R. Rendell op. cit.
32. J. Mortimer Rumpole and the Genuine Article.
34. P.H. Blair An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England.
35. ‘I didn’t know who he was (lit. I knew not who he was). Do I mean to say by that that he’s someone else now? Not at all. Was is there through inertia, and by knew alone we see that it’s necessary to take the matter this way: (he) was and (he) still is.’
36. W. Trevor Two Lives (My House in Umbria).
37. K. Amis op. cit.
39. S. Bedford op. cit.
40. R. Rendell op. cit.
42. R. Holmes Coleridge.
43. M. Forster Lady’s Maid.
44. P. Lively op. cit.
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日本語梗概

関 本 文 夫

本論の研究対象は、日本の英語教育などで「話法」と呼ばれている言語現象である。具体的には、他の人の言ったことを伝える場合に、どのような言語表現上の伝達手段を考えられるか、ということである。この手段が言語において異なることは、既にComrieらの指摘のところであるが、こと現在の英語においては具体的にどのような方法が存在するか、というのが第一の問題点である。現在、前の文章には記載のないような話法が新たに登場し、多用されている。言語は絶えず進化し続けるものであり、その原動力は、言語の使用者としての人間が言語に課すコミュニケーション上の新たな必要性である。

そこで次に問われるのは、この意味論上の新たな要請を実現するために、言語はその構造上いかに柔軟でなければならないかということである。たとえいかなる要請があったとしても、それを実際に表現手段に帰するだけの構造上の要件が整わなければ、この要請は実現されえない。そこで発言する言語が基本的には何があったかによって、問題の意味論上の新たな要請は様々な形態をとるものと思われる。あるいは他の言語要素からの借用も必要とされるかもしれない。現在の日本語における「受身」の形などは、明らかにこの範疇に属すると考えられる。しかしだまでも、もし日本語にその借用を受け入れるだけの構造上の要件が整っていなければ、これをも不可能である。同様にして、現在の英語において多種多様な話法が存在しうるのは、やはり英語が本来的には持ちつている構造上の柔軟性にその起源があるようにと思われる。

英語の話法は、基本的にはDirect Speech（直接話法）とIndirect Speech（間接話法）に区別される。従ってこの二つは、構造的に同質のものとして捉えられてきた。この点では、筆者がその立場を最も近くするHallidayも同じ見解をとっている。しかしもうそうだとすると、これら二つの話法の要素を持ちながら、しかも一般的の話法とは異なり、いわば二者の間に位置すると考えられ、しかもその使用がますます顕著になりつつあるMixed Speech（混交話法）は、その説明が不可能となってしまう。何故なら、異質の二者の間に中間は存在しないからである。この二者のうち、直接話法については、文法家の間にある程度の意見の一致が
存在する。しかし間接話法になると、主流の文法理論は全く異なる術を知らない、というのが筆者の見解である。何故なら、彼らによればThat節を含むこの構文は、直接話法とは全く異なる構造と捉えられているからである。

本論における筆者の結論は、直接話法と間接話法を構造的に連続線上にあると考えれば、基本的な問題は解決されるということにある。そのためには、間接話法で問題となるThat節の捉え方を根本から変える必要がある、というのがその主たる主張である。このThat節の理解が中心の話題となるという点で、本論は筆者の博士論文の延長を成すものである。