

“I said ... she Said:” Direct Quotations in the Performance of Accusations and Gossip in Galician Everyday Conversation

Marina Pedreira-Vilariño
Development and Alumni Relations Office
University of Sussex

ABSTRACT. This paper explores the uses of direct quotations in the performance of accusations and gossip in Galician conversation. It argues that speakers distance the accusations from the present event by projecting them onto a reported past, thus mitigating their force and avoiding confrontation. In turn, through reports of gossip, together with claims of participation in the reported event, speakers convey verisimilitude to the reported words, while underscoring their role as carriers of authentic gossip.

Key words: Accusation, Gossip, Direct speech, Galician.

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, there are two major ways of reporting speech: direct quotation (*oratio recta*), and indirect quotation (*oratio obliqua*). The former conjures up the exact words of the original speaker, both in form and content, whereas the latter adapts those words to the speech event through indirect discourse.¹ Work within a discourse-pragmatic framework

Data de aprobación: decembro de 2001.

Acknowledgments. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 1996 meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest. I am indebted to Teresa Fanego Lema and Jill Brody for their continuous assistance and helpful suggestions on earlier drafts. Of course, I am solely responsible for any errors and infelicities that remain. I acknowledge the Linguistics department at Louisiana State University, where great part of the research for this paper was conducted while I was a visiting researcher in 1996.

¹ A further reporting mode, which combines aspects of both direct and indirect quotation, is the so-called *style indirect libre* (free indirect style), characteristic of narrative fiction.

has, for decades, aimed to reveal the formal and functional intricacies of this form of “reflexive language” (Lucy 1993), as well as to identify what discourse contexts trigger different reporting formats. The result is a myriad of different interpretations that point to the complex communicative significance of this metalinguistic practice. Macaulay (1987), for instance, views quoted direct speech as a strategy that fulfills several functions such as mimicry, taboo expressions, embedded evaluation, indirection, and translation. For Yule and Mathis (1992), however, the same linguistic phenomenon provides a dramatic representation of selected reported events. In turn, Tannen (1989) views the creation of involvement as the primary function of direct reported speech, or *constructed dialogue*, as she prefers to refer to this linguistic strategy.²

Reported speech, like all linguistic activities, is not only contextually influenced, but also language specific and, consequently, culturally bound. The comparative viewpoint of the contributions to Coulmas (1986), Lucy (1993) and Janssen and van der Wurff (1996) is a testament to this linguistic and cultural specificity. Yet, the current steady flow of cross-linguistic studies concerning reported speech does not imply that we have unveiled all the complexities, let alone achieved complete understanding, of this metalinguistic phenomenon. In fact, several scholars such as Janssen and Van der Wurff (1996:1), Lucy (1993a: 29) and Maynard (1996: 225) have explicitly emphasized the need for further cross-linguistic research in order to continue uncovering the properties inherent in this specific mechanism of representation of speech and thought.

The present paper takes the aforementioned call to provide an insight into the discourse functions of direct reported speech in the performance of two types of speech events, accusing and gossiping, which appear juxtaposed in my data. I will focus particularly on the relationship between the syntactic form of reporting, the performance aspects of accusing and gossiping, and the speaker’s presumed intention. The method adopted relies on the microanalysis of a stretch of naturally occurring conversation that incorporates these two types of linguistic practice.

In order to accomplish this aim, the section below introduces the work by Álvarez-Cácamo on reported speech in Galician conversation. The ensuing section concentrates on a brief discussion of the discourse saliency of direct reported speech. Subsequently, I introduce the situational context and the participants in the conversation. This is followed in the next two sections by an analysis of the functions that reported speech fulfills in the performance of the two types of linguistic practice that constitute the focus of the present study.

² Aside from Tannen, other scholars have also put into question the relationship between a given utterance and a quoted report of it. This is reflected in additional labels adduced in the literature to refer to this phenomenon: “hypothetical reported speech” (Haberland 1986), “pseudoquotation” (Dubois 1989), “the verbatim assumption” (Clark and Gerrig 1990) and “typifying reported speech” (Parmentier 1993).

Reported Speech in Galician Conversation

As regards the study of reported speech in Galician, Álvarez-Cáccamo's (1996) insightful article on the functions and the relationship between the use of this type of reflexive language and linguistic ideologies in the context of language institutionalization in bilingual Galicia deserves special attention.

According to Álvarez-Cáccamo, reporters, when reproducing the original words of a speaker, can assign them a particular code choice, based on observed patterns or stereotyped views of language use. This intuition guides reporters in deciding which language (Galician or Spanish) is appropriate for a given character under given circumstances. Likewise, the listeners assign to the linguistic choice in the reported speech a social meaning judging by stereotypical and conventional views on the uses of the two linguistic codes. This technique of speech reporting proves extremely valuable for, as Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996: 36) puts it, it reveals "information about speakers' perception of the socio-indexical power of language."

Additionally, the reporter's choice to switch (or not) codes conveys, implicitly, significant evaluative meanings. Thus, Álvarez-Cáccamo argues that quotations embedded in the discourse without switching codes underscore solidarity between the speaker and the characters in the reported event. Inversely, in those quotations involving the switch of codes, "the *syntagmatic* contrast between the characters' invoked identities indexes the *paradigmatic*, social and symbolic oppositions between social groups and languages" [1996: 41; emphasis in the original].

In the context of sociolinguistic conflict in Galicia, the interactional success and acceptance of code displacement lie primarily in its implicit appeal to shared linguistic ideologies and sociolinguistic knowledge. It is the audience's implicatures based on their shared knowledge of sociolinguistic theories and linguistic ideologies that contribute to inferring the meanings of the code selected. In this light, reported speech is shown as an index of sociolinguistic and linguistic-ideological conflicts, as well as a powerful resource to build conversational alliances and to obtain interactional control.

Although divergent in focus and aim to Álvarez-Cáccamo's work on reported speech tactics, the present paper draws heavily on its awareness of the communicative richness of this type of conversational report in Galician.

Saliency of direct quotations

Lucy (1993b: 93), in a discussion of reported speech in Yucatec Maya, emphasizes that the meaning of linguistic forms is acquired, to a great extent, by virtue of their value in a paradigm of alternatives in a language. From Lucy's contention it follows, then, that in those languages where direct quotation constitutes the only means available of reporting speech, such as Aguaruna and Navajo, the use of this metalinguistic format is devoid of spe-

cial significance within the linguistic community. Contrariwise, in those languages where an opposition exists between direct and indirect quotation, the reporter's choice of either form to reproduce speech must, consequently, signal some sort of special meaning.

Indirect reports have been described in the literature as reproducing a speaker's words placing primary emphasis on the referential aspects of the reported event, while incorporating into the framing message those other formal and functional aspects of the original utterance that are intrinsically nonreferential (Lucy 1993b: 95). In turn, direct quotations have been said to replicate "not only what was said, but also how it was said" (Hickmann 1993: 65), by presenting the propositional content of an utterance, while simultaneously foregrounding the nonreferential aspects of the original event. In short, the main distinction between direct and indirect quotation lies not in what they report but in what they foreground.

As direct quotation allows for the incorporation of nonreferential aspects of the original event, this strategy emerges as a suitable rhetorical device to foreground a certain stretch of speech and, consequently, make it more salient than its surrounding words. As we will see in the conversation under analysis, the information that seems to be regarded by the speaker as relevant and worthy of special attention is foregrounded by presenting it to the audience in the form of direct quotation (cf. Yule and Mathis 1992). This reporting format, then, proves a highly convenient rhetorical ploy for speakers to mark a specific reported stretch of discourse as the *focal event* of their words (Goodwin and Duranti 1992: 3).

In my data, direct reported speech often appears bracketed by speech-act expressions containing the verb *dicir* "to say," which serve as signals of the commencement or the end of a quote, depending on their location in the utterance. As stated earlier, the choice of specific linguistic forms among paradigmatic variants must be the carrier of some sort of special meaning. Consequently, the choice of the semantically neutral verb *dicir* to flank the reported words may, in itself, be interpreted as a meaningful option since there exist, at the speakers' disposal, other verba dicendi or verb-like expressions that can predicate more about the reported discourse than *dicir*.³

The fact that the framing clauses in my data are entirely devoid of semantic and affective meaning, and consequently provide no specification of the force of the reported utterance, reinforces the need for the audience to pay closer attention to the potential communicative significance of the adjacent framed utterances. In Lucy's (1993b: 97) own words, by prefacing the direct quotation with the semantically neutral locutionary verb "to say," "the reporting utterance and the reporting modality are minimized, and the reported utterance and its pragmatic force are *maximally foregrounded*" (emphasis added).

Furthermore, since direct quotation emphasizes the form of the reported utterances, this reporting format often emerges as the preferred locus for the integration of expressive

³ Tannen (1986: 322) has coined the term "graphic introducers" to refer to those framing verbs that convey the manner in which the original utterance was uttered.

nuances of the original event. The incorporation of these features within the reported utterance effectively underscores the communicative saliency of certain performance aspects of the reported event. Lucy (1993b: 95) has already emphasized the reproduction of the *form* of the original event as the primary function of direct quotation. As he puts forward, "direct report must be used in those cases when one wishes to emphasize those forms or functions of the reported utterance which cannot be lexicalized, for example, certain *expressive elements*, imperatives, dialect differences... [emphasis added]". It is this capacity to foreground the expressive qualities of a reported utterance, Lucy (ibid: 118) adds, that accounts for the commonly established association between the perception of vividness and direct quotation. Therefore, the capacity of direct reported speech to capture certain expressive features that indirect speech would not, makes this metalinguistic strategy especially productive in the re-construction of seemingly verbatim speech, while simultaneously conveying the affective characteristics of the original event. In the conversation under analysis, the manipulation of certain prosodic features embedded in the quote allows the speaker to portray in a dramatic fashion the actual force and affect of the reported event. The incorporation of expressive elements within the quoted utterance foregrounds the reported words, while simultaneously underscoring their communicative significance within the context of the reporting event.

Given the dramatic power of direct reports, by resorting to this reporting tactic, the speaker does not merely reproduce a previously uttered accusation, neither does she simply report a piece of gossip. Rather, in words that remind us of Bakhtin's "staging," the speaker evokes and recreates the events at the present moment of speaking, while situating the audience at the privileged position of actual witnesses of the original events. This interpretation evokes the postulation held by Briggs (1996a: 215), and others before him, that "events do not simply exist, they are created in discourse."

Finally, it is important to bear in mind that, as the Galician linguistic repertoire provides an opposition between the grammatical strategies to express direct quotation and indirect quotation, the obvious preponderance of one of these strategies over the other must be primarily attributed to communicative purposes. Unveiling these constitutes one of the primary aims of the following sections.

Background to the conversation

For my discussion below I will use an excerpt of an extensive conversation that took place in Muimenta, a rural village of a few hundred inhabitants situated in inland Pontevedra, in the summer of 1994.⁴ The mother tongue of most residents in the village is Galician and consequently this is the language in which everyday social interaction is carried.

⁴ The extract of the conversation can be found at the end of the paper in Appendix II.

Family reunions in rural Galicia contain rich linguistic material as they often involve rather effusive arguments, hearty chats, and harmless gossip that provide information about the people in the community. The conversation I have chosen for analysis incorporates long sessions of accusations and gossip, which constitute two recurrent activities in social interactions among closely related individuals. Verbal conflict and gossip prove invaluable research sites not only from a linguistic perspective, but also from an anthropological viewpoint, for they often reveal the conventional and social norms, as well as the prevailing values of the society in focus (cf. Besnier 1990, Brison 1992, Briggs 1996b).

Interestingly enough, accusation and gossip emerge as juxtaposed speech events in the course of this conversation. As we will see, the transition from one event to the other brings about a shift from what constitutes a type of agonistic dialogue in the performance of the accusation, to an apparent more cooperative and animated interaction in the gossip session. In this light, the present paper departs from earlier studies that have treated conflict talk and gossip in (relative) isolation, or one as embedded in the other (see Goodwin 1980; Brenneis 1996). Instead, gossip emerges in the course of the present conversation as the speech activity that brings about the resolution to a previously existing conflict.

The following is a brief presentation of the participants taking part in the conversation: Amelia, who is around seventy years of age, and Lina, her daughter, reside in Muimenta and they always converse in Galician, their mother tongue and Amelia's sole code of communication. Xosé is Amelia's son. He is around fifty years of age, and so is María. They are married and reside in Pontevedra, the capital town of the province, where they moved for professional and educational purposes. Both are fluent speakers of Galician and Spanish, shifting from one to the other depending, primarily, on the context and addressee. Accordingly, since they are visiting their relatives, they adopt their mother tongue, namely Galician, as a signal of intimacy and family unity. Tina is a graduate student in her late twenties. She lives and studies in the city of Santiago de Compostela and is also visiting Amelia, her grandmother. Her contribution to the conversation is minimal, and although Spanish is her first language, she shifts to the language in which the conversation takes place, namely Galician.

The setting for the conversation is the kitchen. This room is traditionally the heart of the dwelling, due to the presence of a wood burning stove which serves as both cooker and heating system, and it is generally the preferred setting for socializing and informal entertaining.

The summary of the interactional sequence reads as follows. Amelia and Lina are cleaning the kitchen immediately after their mid-day meal. Both, and particularly Lina, feel angry and disappointed because Xosé and María failed to arrive for lunch as expected. As soon as Amelia and Lina hear them coming in, the latter bursts into criticism about their being late, for she had cooked a different dish for Xosé, who had recently begun a special diet for health reasons. After a prolonged series of accusations uttered by Lina, the participants engage in a conversation that deals first with the exams of Xosé and María's son (Luis),

and then with a neighbor's grades (Isabel) in her first year in college. Immediately after the excerpt in the appendix, they all revert to Luis' exams.

Reporting Accusations

As reflected in the ample literature on verbal disputes, conflict is a pervasive social phenomenon that manifests itself in various nonverbal and verbal forms such as insults, jokes, complaints, challenges, and accusations. Conflict may be expressed directly or indirectly through the use of linguistic, paralinguistic, prosodic, and kinesic devices. Too overt manifestations of antagonism may lead, to say the least, to unpleasant interpersonal confrontations, if not to a break in the social relationship among the parties involved. In intrafamilial contexts in particular, given the (usually) high level of familiarity and confidence between the participants, feelings of anger may easily end up in direct confrontations. Yet, in a context such as the present one, where the preservation of family union and intrafamilial solidarity is highly valued, the expression of criticism and accusation must be performed in a somewhat ambiguous and indirect manner, in order to maintain social harmony.

As mentioned earlier, Lina starts attacking Xosé verbally as soon as the latter enters the house. Yet, instead of accusing him directly, Lina embeds her accusations in reports of her own words, or self-quotations.⁵ The following section is aimed to unfold the communicative functions the speaker fulfills by presenting her accusations through this reporting format. In particular, it attempts to demonstrate that self-quotation allows the speaker to manifest her anger and criticism, while avoiding direct confrontation with the intended target of her accusations. In order to accomplish this aim, certain distance must be established between the reporter, the accusations reported and the target of the accusations.⁶

Distancing

Lina expresses her most powerful accusations through self-quotation. By resorting to this reporting format, Lina creates the illusion that she is reenacting accusations she previously uttered while the target of her words (i.e. Xosé) was still absent. An illustrative piece of evidence in support of this is found in (5) below. Lina not only explicitly utters the name Xosé, but she refers to him using the grammatical third person, as if he were not yet present and she were addressing a third party.

⁵ Compared to other reporting formats, the study of self-quotation has not received much attention in the literature. Some discussions of this type of speech reporting include, for instance, Macaulay (1987), Johnstone (1987), Dubois (1989) and Maynard (1996).

⁶ See Shuman (1986: 168-169) for a different interpretation of reported speech and the manipulation of distance in the performance of accusations within oral fight stories.

- (5) L: xa dixen hoxe →[hi] [ac] NU::NCA má::is volvo ter costilletas nin bistec pa Xosé á plancha →
I already said today “I will NE::VER ever make grilled steaks or cutlets for Xosé”

Thus, self-quotation provides the accuser with the opportunity to exclude the target of her reported accusation (i.e. Xosé) from the group of her addressees, thus relegating Xosé’s conversational role to that of an overhearer. Conversely, the remainder participants become passive addressees, or, in Brenneis’s (1986: 344) terms, “dummy addressees” for the speaker, while her real target individual is the overhearer (i.e. Xosé), who is present in the room. In other words, and to use Levinson’s (1988) terminological distinction, Lina’s utterance presumably has as apparent “interlocutors” María, Nuria and Amelia,⁷ but as “indirect target” Xosé.

In the light of the above, by ostensibly referring to Xosé in the third person, Lina creates a spatial distance between herself and the actual perlocutionary target of her words (cf. Goffman 1974: 519-520; Macaulay 1987: 22). By excluding her target from the group of her addressees, and consequently from the conversation, the speaker manages to dramatize her reproach, while situating the target of her words in a difficult position to defend himself from the deprecations. Interestingly, similar indirect ways of mitigating critical remarks about persons that are physically present by not addressing them directly are found, for instance, in teasing and insulting rituals described in Fisher (1976), Brody (1991) and Irvine (1993, 1996).

Distancing is further achieved through the use of the locutionary verb *dixen* “I said,” which frames most of the quoted portions in the conversation. This quotative verb anchors the lines of reported speech to the past, thus allowing the speaker to distance herself from the present moment of speaking and, consequently, from her reported words, projected into a foregoing time. This demarcation between (past) reported event and (present) reporting event involves a shift in the conversational role of the speaker. Using Goffman’s (1981[1971]) terminology, a distinction must then be made between the alleged “author” of the accusation in the reported event and its “animator” in the reporting context. The division of participant roles is inextricably related to a dissociation of voices, which further underscores the distance of the speaker from her reported words. With Maynard (1996: 212; cf. Hill and Zepeda 1993), I hold that even though, physically, only one person stands behind the reported and the reporting event, self-quotation serves to present two distinct voices at two levels of discourse. One is the voice that directly utters the accusation and the other one is the voice framing (or animating) the reported accusation. The speaker, then, not only dissociates addressee from

⁷ These third parties to which the speaker seems to address in the ongoing reporting event coincide with what Irvine (1996: 146) has called “alignable parties”, i.e. “those participants who can be aligned with Speaker or Addressee as extra first or second persons.”

target, but also speaker (or animator) from author. This dialogic tension between the two voices enables the pragmatic speaker to express herself overtly, while softening the force of the reported accusation.

In sum, distancing is calibrated in a temporal, spatial and personal dimension through the combination of different metapragmatic strategies that involve the use of quotatives, and the manipulation of grammatical features such as tense-shifting.⁸ As illustrated above, distancing permits the ostensibly vivid dramatization of (putative) past accusations, while mitigating the face threatening force of words that perhaps would not be (so freely) conveyed through direct discourse in the "now" of the reporting context.

Further distancing, further accusation

Occasionally, the "introducers" (Johnstone 1987), or clauses that frame the reported words, are omitted, and it is the speaker's voice quality, tone and intonation that serve as indexical cues that effectively frame the utterance as self-quotation. As the following analysis of some of these examples suggests, the omission of explicit framing clauses constitutes yet another function that distances the speaker from the words uttered, while creating an appropriate site for the manifestation of additional criticism.⁹

- (8) L: eu non me vou matar ho::→
I will not kill myself
- (9) es igual chico # non te preocupes ho::↓
never mind; don't you worry man
- (10) [hi] nin-nin chaman por teléfono ↑ [pois eu tampouco ↓
"they don't even phone, then I won't either"
- (11) A: [xa dixen eu → arre demo () ↓
I already said "damn it"
- (12) L: [ac] antes chamaba tódolos días ↑ e agora nada ↓
"before, he used to phone every day, but now nothing"

The lines of speech in (10) and (12) are not introduced by an overt locutionary verb. Nevertheless, the styled voice in which they are uttered, coupled with the retention of the personal and temporal deixis appropriate to the reported context, serve as sufficient pieces of evidence to interpret Lina's utterances as reconstructions of her alleged words prior to the latecomers' arrival.

⁸ See Briggs (1996a) for an interesting analysis of the manipulation of person and temporal deixis in narratives of marital disputes as implicit metapragmatic strategies to evade and shift blame on to the partner.

⁹ In Greek stories, Tannen (1983) found ellipsis of the verb of saying as a strategy that creates involvement, as the audience are forced to fill in the missing introducer and to be more involved in the narration of the stories.

The accusation conveyed in (10) and (12) diverts from the original indictment, i.e. the fact that Xosé did not arrive for lunch. Instead, this context seems to appear appropriate to let out a further imputation on her brother's behavior in a somewhat indirect fashion. As Hill (1995: 118) has stated: "[reported speech] is a domain of flexibility and openness, which can be exploited to a variety of purposes." In (10), Lina's accusation still relates to the original reproach, since her words presumably imply that Xosé and María should have telephoned to announce their belated arrival. However, the accusation in (12) adopts a different direction, as Lina accuses Xosé of not phoning them any more, perhaps animated by the mother's dramatization, in (11), of her alleged imprecation at Xosé's failure to warn them of his change of plans. Amelia's brief alignment to the line of accusation, then, seems to induce Lina to vent further criticism. Additionally, unlike in (10), Lina's words in (12) refer only to Xosé, as reflected in the shift to third person singular, thus clearing María from what appears a much stronger recrimination than that conveyed through her previous words.

Lina underscores Xosé's reputed current negligence by confining his practice of phoning them to the past, through the use of the imperfect tense, which confers past habitual aspect to the act of phoning (*chamaba* "used to phone"). This is further intensified by a contrast in the temporal deictics used, which clearly opposes his actions in the past (*antes* "before"), when it is implied that he used to be more responsible, to those in the present (*agora* "now"), when he reportedly fails to do anything (*nada* "nothing"). The avoidance of any lexical introducer to the reports in (10) and (12) leaves these utterances without an overtly attributed utterer, thus potentially implicating any member of the household as plausible performer of the model reproach. This strategy frees Lina from overt responsibility for the accusation reported, while allowing for the indirect expression of further criticism at a point of apparent tension and potential confrontation (cf. Irvine 1993, 1996).¹⁰ After the reproduction of these accusations, Lina goes on to contrast Xosé's conduct with her own behavior in (24), which coincides with a change to direct discourse.

- (23) L: [*nin chama* ↑ *nin nada* ↓
 "he doesn't call or anything"
- (24) eu polo menos chamo que → cando veña a factura do teléfono # →
 at least I phone and when the phone bill comes
 ...
- (26) L: = *deberémolas orellas* (.) ↓
 we will probably be in debt(.)
- (27) [dc] ((lower tone, almost a whisper)) *cas chamadas que hai do entierro* ↑ (.)
virxen santísima ↓ (.) with all the phone calls from the funeral (.) good lord

¹⁰ Similarly, Hill (1995: 115), in an analysis of a Mexicano narrative, notes that when sequences of conversational turns marked by locutionary verbs stop being marked, a shift occurs from dialogue to drama.

Lina's lexical choices, in particular "at least," and the use of the contrastive personal pronoun "I" to introduce her demeanor as counter to Xosé's further undermines the position of the latter. Notice also the alliteration of the nasal alveolar /n/ in (23), which additionally endows Xosé's behavior with negative connotations. Moreover, in (26) and (27) above, Lina's allusion to the money spent in numerous phone calls reinforces the contrast between her and her brother, by implying that she, unlike Xosé, telephones as often as required, even if that jeopardizes her economic situation. The tension built up by the dramatic representation of the previous accusations comes to a conclusion in the implicit moral comparison established between Lina and her brother. Thus, Lina manages to indirectly depict Xosé as irresponsible and unreliable, whilst presenting herself in a more positive light.

It is noteworthy that Lina resorts to a whisper tone to introduce her comment about the calls concerning what she refers to as "the funeral" (27), and that this expression is flanked by marked pauses that set it off from the surrounding discourse. These pauses constitute a clear example of what Besnier (1990) defines as the "three-dot phenomenon;" that is to say, information that needs not be overtly stated because its knowledge is shared among the participants in a conversation. Lina is referring here to their father's funeral, which took place a few weeks prior to the conversation. The low voice, almost a whisper, with which she utters those words, together with the subsequent vocative to the Virgin Mary, are indicative of Lina's apologetic reaction for alluding to her deceased father in what might be deemed as a rather frivolous context. By creating the impression that she regrets uttering those words, Lina is able to make her point, while evading an open reprimand from her audience.

Ambiguity of Meaning

As shown earlier, distancing enables the speaker to express accusations quite overtly through self-quotation, while evading direct confrontation with the target of her words. Yet, in order to ensure the performance of these accusations within the context of intrafamilial solidarity and union, the speaker's words allow for a double reading, hinging on whether the interpretative focus lies in the context of the reported event or in that of the present moment of reporting.

The first interpretation derives from the format in which most of the accusations are presented. Thus, by framing these accusations as "recontextualizations" (Bauman and Briggs 1990) of a past event, Lina could be suggesting that her reports are merely informative reproductions of the model accusation that do not relate at all to her current feelings. Support for this interpretation emerges, primarily, from the quotative frames containing locutionary verbs in the past tense. These introductory forms explicitly anchor the apposed accusations to the past, while clearly dissociating the (past) reported event from the (present) moment of reporting.

In contrast, placing the focus on the actual reported words, stripped of their introductory frames, unveils a different interpretation. By pronouncing the accusations through direct (self) quotation, Lina is able to vent her grievances in a dramatic format that emphasizes both

the content and the form of her original words, thus “bringing into play syntactic, stylistic, and compositional norms” (Vološinov 1978: 149). This reporting format enables the accuser to infiltrate her original voice, thus foregrounding her ire and exasperation at the reported offense. The theatrical possibilities inherent in direct quotations have already been pointed out by numerous scholars such as Wierzbicka (1974), Goffman (1974: 521-522), Tannen (1983), Yule and Mathis (1992) and Maynard (1996), to mention only a few.

The feeling of anger and frustration that is inferred from Lina’s utterances does not (solely) evoke from the propositional content of her reported words, but from the reenactment of a prosodic pattern that captures the intonational aspect of the model accusation. Thus, without explicit reference to her affective state, Lina manages to convey her aggravated emotional disposition by superimposing on the reported accusation an intonational contour and other expressive phenomena that serve as “contextualization cues” (Gumperz 1982) in the communication of affect.¹¹ The sharp shifts in prosody that characterize the lines of quotation adduced below illustrate the dramatic effect imparted on the reported accusations. In the work of scholars such as Labov and Fashel (1977), Tannen (1984) and Selting (1994), marked prosodic changes are also shown to be indicators of emotive meaning.

- (5) L: xa dixen hoxe [hi] [ac] → NU::NCA ma::is volvo ter costilletas nin bistec pa Xosé á plancha ↓
 (6) HA::COMER do que tiñamos ↓
 I already said today “I will never have grilled steaks or cutlets for Xosé. He’ll have to eat whatever we have”
 (18) L: dixen eu [hi] NA::DA ↑
 (19) HA::COMER do que lle fagan ↓
 I said “nothing, he’ll have to eat whatever is prepared for him”

Recurrent features such as high pitch, loud volume, accelerated tempo, emphatic stress on key lexical items, and parallelism contribute to the vivid portrayal of the speaker’s original state.

An interesting line of self-quotation is (31) below, where the speaker claims to be in a mass ceremony at the time of uttering the reported words.

- (31) L: = [lo] cando non os vin na misa dixen → u::h ↑esos xa non veñen↓
 = when I didn’t see them in mass I said “oh, they won’t come”

Here the quoted utterance can only be interpreted as the reconstruction of the inner voice of the speaker, as it is obviously very unlikely that she had actually uttered those words during a religious ceremony. The self-quotation of thought reproduces Lina’s deliberation while in mass, and through her use of prosody (in a downhearted tone) conveys her disap-

¹¹ Reported speech has also emerged as the preferred locus for the indirect manifestations of affect in the work of scholars such as Briggs (1988, 1996a), Hertzfeld (1996), Haviland (1996) and Besnier (1993, 1990).

pointment at the realization that Xosé and María would not arrive in time for lunch. This apparent change of attitude is further substantiated by the discourse particle prefacing the reported thought, (*u::hh*, "oh"), which combined with a change in prosody effectively conveys the speaker's stance and affect in the reported event.

The dramatic interludes in the interaction may invite the "overhearer" to interpret the reported words as an admonition that is still felt in the present moment of the reporting event, rather than as a mitigated reproach that is merely being reported. In other words, the manipulation of prosodic features joins with the rhetoric and dramatic power of self-quotation to extrapolate to the reporting context the illocutionary force of the original accusation.

By exploiting this ambiguity of "metacommunicative framing" (Irvine 1993), that is, whether her feelings should be viewed as anchored to the past or to the present moment of speaking, Lina manages to attenuate the risk of a face-to-face confrontation with her eldest brother, while simultaneously giving vent to her anger.¹² Further, the ambiguity of Lina's words allows Xosé to ignore her verbal attacks and to interpret them merely as the manifestation of past feelings.¹³ Silence, then, becomes the safest response in order to prevent conflict (cf. Tannen 1990), for to initiate interaction about the offensiveness of his act would most likely unleash an overt conflicting exchange that might pose a threat to the flow of the conversation. Of the above, and granted that meaning in conversation is constantly being (re-)negotiated among the participants, it seems plausible to argue that covert manifestations of emotion confer an active role to the audience, as these are invited to a process of inference through which affective meaning can be decoded.

Finally, it must be noticed at this point that much of the analysis depicted above accords well with the interplay of the four dimensions of indirection isolated by Brenneis (1986). These dimensions are, simplifying grossly: the multiplicity of meanings, which, according to Brenneis, constitutes the core of indirection; the listeners' active role in interpreting the speaker's words, which in its turn disavows the speaker of full responsibility for her words; and a final formal dimension. This fourth direction isolated by Brenneis refers to the formal features of the text that serve as signals for the audience to look beyond the overt content of what is being said. In the present conversation, the interplay of these dimensions permits the expression of accusations within the context of apparent intrafamilial harmony.

GOSSIPING: BRINGING AN END TO CONFLICT

Gossip, like verbal disputes, also emerges as a common speech activity in informal group interactions. Galicians are talkative people; they like getting together and talking

¹² In a similar vein, as described by Irvine (1993), the best way to get away with uttering insults in Wolof (Senegal) is by creating the ambiguity of whether the words uttered may count as insults or not.

¹³ Similar interpretations of indirection as a linguistic strategy that provides the listeners with the opportunity to ignore the speaker's words can be found in Arno (1990), Mckellin (1990) and Besnier (1990).

about the events and people related to the community. In the rural areas of Galicia, marked by dense social networks where the anonymity that characterizes large cities is practically nonexistent, gossip emerges as a routine activity in the maintenance of the social relations of their inhabitants. The act identified here as gossip or *cotilleo* meets the principles that often constrain this type of idle talk. Thus, the participants are not acquainted with the subject of the gossip, the object of the gossip is not present, and the gossip takes place among members of the same kin group. Gossip is socially permissible in intrafamilial contexts or within groups of close friends, and its practice within these confines usually enhances the feeling of intimacy among the participants.

I mentioned earlier that the gossip episode ensuing the conflict situation brings to an end the tense and agonistic climate underlying the verbal dispute. However, prior to the gossip session proper, there exists a set of interactional exchanges that constitute an interlude between the two modes of speech practice. More importantly, these lines of dialogue bring interactants together in anticipation for a smooth transition from the session of accusing to that of gossip.

In (32) Amelia seems to be determined to bring the conflict episode to a close by drastically changing the topic of the conversation inquiring about the wellbeing of Xosé's son, Luis. It seems noteworthy that Amelia's attempt to change the topic immediately follows Lina's comment about her father's funeral, perhaps as a way of preventing that subject from becoming a point of discussion. It is interesting to notice that the dysfluent repetition and pause that mark the initiation of Amelia's line of talk "Luis then-Luis (.) eh, but Luis is all right, isn't he?," together with further false starts and pauses in (34) and (35), suggest that Amelia's contribution of speech may be the result of a rather impulsive desire to divert the current issue (the funeral?), while defusing Lina's apparent anger and dissipating the seemingly underlying conflict between brother and sister.

The participants overlook Lina's accusations, and instead initiate comments on Luis' exams as a response to Amelia's queries. At this point, Lina, not receiving much response from her brother, seems to welcome, or at least accept, the change in the speech activity. She contributes to the new topic by establishing a parallelism between the dates of Luis' last exam and Isabel's (a neighbor's daughter) in (41). Reference to the date of Luis' exams serves as a convenient transitional topic that enables Lina to shift from her nephew's exams to those of a neighbor, in an attempt to preempt the floor and draw the hearers' attention as a precursor to introducing her gossip comment. The conflict is then seemingly dropped and the speech activity of accusing shades into the introduction of a gossip session, in which all take part.

Lina introduces the gossip about the neighbor's failing exams, in (42), in parallel to the queries about Luis' examinations. Further, the gossip about the neighbor's daughters is initiated immediately after Amelia's suggestion to Xosé and María that Luis (their son) should not worry about the possibility of failing his exams, which clearly adds an ambiguo-

ous and ironic tone to the piece of advice provided. The implication seems, then, to be that Xosé and María should indeed worry about their son's exams, thus suggesting that academic failure makes a family vulnerable to gossiping. Lina's words seem to have been strategically introduced in an attempt to provide a final subtle attack on Xosé and María, who offered no apology for their late arrival.¹⁴

Involving the participants

Lina's first words on the actual gossip topic, namely the fact that Isabel failed two subjects in her first year in college, are introduced through indirect reported speech.

- (42) L: dixo ((lower voice, almost a whisper)) que dúas xa as tiña suspensas
she said that she had already failed two subjects

The speaker's shift to an almost whisper voice points to the confidential and secretive status of the bit of gossip she is about to reveal, as well as indexing a change in "footing" (Goffman 1981[1971]: 154). The disclosure of this piece of information is followed by short turns from the participants, suggesting positive affective meaning about the reported information. These brief turns which resemble back channel utterances or "verbal engagement displays" (Besnier 1990) clearly reflect the participants' interest in Lina's statement. The positive response that those words stimulate provides the adequate scenario for Lina to animate the gossip by dramatizing the same utterance in a more believable format.

Thus, seemingly encouraged by the participants' inquisitive interest in her words, Lina reiterates and expands the propositional content of her previous utterance, though this time through direct quotation in (45) and (46). The fact that these lines of quotation are preceded by indirect reported speech echoes Holt's (1996: 243) hypothesis that the latter often precedes the former, perhaps as a way of setting the scene prior to the exact reproduction of the utterances the speaker wants to focus on.

The positive verbal engagement displays, together with the lack of attempts to usurp the floor, are the best indicator that the gossip episode is interactionally successful. This success becomes evident from the moment in which information about Isabel's grades is brought up in (42), bringing about a change in the interactive style of the participants. Thus, Lina's previous accusations cease, and all the interactants commence to show interest in what seems to be unknown information to them. The reaction of the participants to Lina's gossip comment evidences that the dramatization of the speech of others in the midst of a gossip session contributes to building on the interpersonal involvement between speaker and hearers (Chafe 1982; Tannen 1983, 1986, 1988).

¹⁴ I owe this interpretation to Judith T. Irvine.

In turn, shared interest in the gossip and interpersonal involvement decrease the distance among the participants, thus bringing about a change in the uneasy atmosphere created by the preceding outspoken grievances. This change is clearly reflected in the way the conversations are conducted in both speech events. Thus, the active participation of all the interactants in the gossip episode contrasts sharply with the agonistic exchanges and interruptions that dominate the episode of the accusations. In the latter, the lack of response to Lina's utterances, except for Xosé's monosyllabic line in (7), makes Lina's words resemble a monologue that occasionally intersects with the sporadic and brief interactional exchanges between Xosé and Amelia.

Additionally, the transition to the gossip session is further evidenced by a marked shift in prosody. Thus, the extra-loudness and high pitch register that characterized the episode involving accusations run counter to the lower pitch, much lower volume and somewhat slower pace of Lina's utterances in the gossip session.

Claiming Reliability and Verisimilitude

As mentioned above, the surprised and inquisitive responses that Lina's comment in (42) inspires seem to encourage Lina to reproduce the gossip comment in the words of their alleged actual source. The apparently verbatim reconstruction of the original speaker's words confers Lina the right to reclaim the floor, for she presents herself as the transmitter of reliable information. Further, by resorting to a reporting format that echoes the reported event not only on the level of content, but also on the level of form, Lina is able to reveal particular nuances of the original conversation without explicit reference to them.

In light of the above, Lina avails herself of the possibility that this reporting strategy offers to modulate one's voice quality, thus echoing the original voice and conferring more credibility and vivacity upon the quoted words. For instance, in (52), the iteration of the model utterance in a tone close to a whisper resembles a reenactment of the reporter's actual encounter with the quotee at the time the latter revealed the information to Lina. This mimicry, then, brings about a dramatic scene, as well as the possibility for the audience to enter a possible world in which they become witnesses of the original information as it was first delivered.

- (51) L: e de Isabel dixo que ela quedou asustada X
and about Isabel she said that she was shocked
- (52) L: e dixo W((whisper tone)) e as que poida suspender *inda* V
and she said "and those she may fail still"

Direct quotation interacts with the manipulation of prosody to highlight the reported utterance and emphasize its relevance and secrecy, while simultaneously maintaining the audience interested and in abeyance through the reporter's dramatic representation. The

previous examples deserve special attention because the significance of the information following (51) is stressed not only by prosodic cues, but also by the repetition of the conjunction *e* 'and' preceding the verb of reporting, which contributes to creating audience expectations of more interesting information yet to come. Support for this interpretation comes from the subsequent reactions of the participants, whose astonishment about the news received is reflected in the back channel utterances following Lina's lines of dialogue (see 53 ff). Additionally, through the emphatic stress on key words such as *dúas* "two (subjects)" in (45) and *inda* "still" in (52), together with a final rising intonation in (52), Lina aptly portrays the mother's disappointment at her daughter's academic results without dwelling on detailed descriptions of her reactions.

Lina, then, seems to pay particular care in ensuring that her portrayal of the reported event should be perceived as rendering the exact wording of the original utterance. It has often been argued, following Bakhtin (1981), that one of the most effective linguistic strategies to convey verisimilitude and authenticity is through the creation of double-voicedness in reported speech. As Li has noted: "A direct quote communicates a more authentic piece of information than an indirect quote in the sense that a direct quote implies a *greater fidelity* to the source of information than an indirect quote (1986: 41; emphasis added). Lina demonstrates fidelity to the source through the juxtaposition or dialogue of voices in the Bakhtinian sense of the term, since the quoted talk of the source speaker, Laura, is embedded within the reporter's speech, namely Lina, who acts as a surrogate for the former. By distinguishing between the original speaker (the source of the information) and the pragmatic speaker (the source of the illocution), a dissociation arises once again between the reported and the reporting events. However, unlike in the performance of the accusation, the distance between the reported and the reporting contexts must now be abridged in order to indicate the pragmatic speaker's active participation in the original event, while legitimizing the right to reproduce it before her audience (cf. Goodwin 1980, Shuman 1993).

Lina provides evidence of her involvement in the model event by providing constant explicit reference, within the quotative frames, to the reputed identity of the original source (*dixo Laura* "Laura said"). An interesting frame occurs in (48), *eso díxome a min Laura o outro día* "Laura said that to me (lit. told me that to me) the other day," which closes Lina's quotation in (45-46). Here Lina insists upon her right, or "entitlement" (Shuman 1986), to reproduce Laura's words by emphasizing her position as a ratified participant of the model conversation, while simultaneously excluding the report from mere hearsay. The emphasis in her position as confident of the original event is further reflected grammatically through the use of an emphatic and contrastive indirect object pronoun immediately following an indirect object clitic pronoun (*díxome a min* i.e. she (told me) said that to me, and not to anybody else). Interestingly, the fact that the time reference (*o outro día*, "the other day") provided in the quotative frame above is rather open and ambiguous provides a clear contrast with the explicit and reiterated reference to the alleged exact source of the original utterance

(i.e. Laura). This divergence in explicitness suggests that (accurate) allusion to the source of the original message is one of the most important factors for the successful communication of gossip, while explicit reference to other contextual specifications appears secondary.

This framing strategy, followed by the reproduction of gossip through direct quotations, enables Lina to emphasize her role as a conduit for Laura's words, as well as underscoring her reliability as carrier of authentic information. In other words, the quotative frames function as evidential elements that point to the reporter's authority to reproduce the original words, while simultaneously deflecting responsibility for the words uttered. Furthermore, by expressing her involvement in the original episode and emphasizing her credentials as a legitimate animator (or reporter) of the model utterance, Lina constrains the potential responses from her listeners, as she manages to prevent losing the floor to more believable gossip.

The point has often been made that direct quotations convey vividness and verisimilitude to the reported events. As Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996: 52) eloquently states: "verisimilitude rests ... on the intended iconicity of RS [reported speech], that is, a property of speech by which the narration of an event can count for participants as isomorphic with the model speech event." In the context of the present analysis, and building on Álvarez-Cáccamo's words, it seems reasonable to argue that it is the combination of direct quotations, together with evidential claims of having witnessed the original event, what makes the gossip report count as isomorphic with the original event, thus further contributing to its success.

Conclusion

The present paper has hopefully provided further insight into some of the intricacies and communicative potential of direct reported speech in the Galician language, while contributing to the study of Galician discourse in general. The conversation under analysis was saturated with two types of direct quotation, namely direct representations of one's own speech and direct representations of the speech of others. These two varieties of the same reporting mechanism are skillfully manipulated to fulfill different communicative functions in the performance of the two communicative events under analysis, accusing and gossiping.

In both speech events a tension exists between the putative past (reported) event and the present (reporting) event. Thus, in the accusing episode, the tension arises because the speaker tries to mitigate the illocutionary force of utterances that could potentially lead to face-to-face confrontation. To do this, she distances her accusations from the present event by projecting it onto a reported past. Further, the accuser manages to distance herself from the actual target of her words by not addressing the latter directly. In order to accomplish the distancing, then, the speaker must perform the accusation accompanied by the manipulation of several devices comprising quotatives and deictic shifts.

Direct reported speech, however, has often been described as an effective device to dramatize reported events and to make them more vivid. In this light, the performance of

accusations through self-quotations was also shown to foreground the display of the reporter's negative affective disposition by superimposing to the reported words the prosodic structure characteristic of direct accusations. The rendering of the accusation through self-quotation was suggested to fulfill a cathartic function. In other words, it enables the accuser to vent her anger "through non-verbal leakage" (Haviland 1989: 32), while presenting the accusation in a format that mitigates the force of her words, thus averting direct confrontation with the target of her utterances. The present analysis, then, shares Maynard's (1996: 208) postulate that "self-quotation facilitates discourse functions such as dramatization and distancing."

In turn, in the gossip episode a similar tension occurs between the present event and the reported past event. Thus, in order to make the gossip effective, the speaker animates it, by presenting her utterances in a reporting mechanism that allows for the dramatization of the original event. Yet, for the audience to actively engage in the gossip, the speaker must appear reliable and believable. To accomplish this, and thus enhance the effectiveness of the gossip, the speaker cannot simply reproduce her source's words in an apparently verbatim format, but must also inspire credibility by claiming firsthand experience in the reported event. This strategy underscores the authenticity and verisimilitude of the reported utterances, as well as the reporter's authority to reproduce them.

The importance of achieving a successful gossip session proves crucial in this particular conversation for the vividness and dramatic effect imparted by direct quotation animates the gossip and, consequently, enhances interpersonal interaction among the participants. More specifically, the animation of the gossip, coupled with the general interest that it arises, brings about a harmonious resolution to the previous domestic strife.

References

- Álvarez-Cáccamo, Celso. 1996. The Power of Reflexive Language(s): Code Displacement in Reported Speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 33-59.
- Arno, Andrew. 1990. Disentangling Indirectly: The Joking Debate in Fijian Social Control. In Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White, eds., pp. 241-289.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Michael Holquist, ed., Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Austin: Austin University Press.
- Bauman, Richard, and Charles Briggs. 1990. Poetics and Performance as Critical on Language and Social Life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59-88.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale*. Éditions Gallimard.
- Besnier, Niko. 1990. Conflict Management, Gossip, and Affective Meaning on Nukalaelae. In Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White, eds., pp. 290-334.
- , 1993. Reported Speech and Affect in Nukalaelae Atoll. In Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds., pp. 290-334.

- Brenneis, Donald. 1986. Shared Territory: Audience, Indirection and Meaning. *Text* 6: 339-347.
- , 1996. Crog and Gossip in Bhatgaon: Style and Substance in Fiji Indian Conversation. In *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*. Donald Brenneis and Ronald K. S. Macaulay, eds., pp. 209-233. Colorado/ Oxford: Westview Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. (ed.) 1996. *Disorderly Discourse: Narrative, Conflict and Inequality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. 1988. "Since I am a Woman, I will Chastise my Relatives": Gender, Reported Speech, and the (Re)production of Social Relations in Warao Ritual Wailing. *American Ethnologist* 19: 336-361.
- , 1996a. Conflict, Language Ideologies, and Privileged Arenas of Discursive Authority in Warao Dispute Mediations. In Charles L. Briggs, ed., pp. 204-242.
- , 1996b Introduction. In Charles L. Briggs, ed., pp. 3-40.
- Brison, Karen J. 1992. *Just Talk*. Berkley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.
- Brody, Jill. 1991. Indirection in the Negotiation of Self in Everyday Tojolab'al Women's Conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1: 78-96.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1982. Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature. In *Spoken and Written Language*, Volume IX. Deborah Tannen, ed., pp. 35-54. Norwood, New Jersey: Alex Publishing Corporation.
- Clark, Herbert, and Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language* 66/4: 764-805.
- Coulmas, Florian (ed.). 1986. *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin/New York/ Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dubois, Betty Lou. 1989. Pseudoquotation in Current English Communication: "Hey, She didn't really Say it." *Language in Society* 18: 343-359.
- Fisher, Lawrence. 1976. *Dropping Remarks* and the Barbadian Audience. *American Ethnologist* 3: 227-242.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- , 1981 [1971]. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Alessandro Duranti. 1992. Rethinking Context: An Introduction. In *Rethinking Context*, Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds., pp. 1-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harnes. 1980. He-Said-She-Said: Formal Cultural Procedures for the Construction of a Gossip Dispute Activity. *American Ethnologist* 7:674-695.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haberland, Hartmut. 1986. Reported Speech in Danish. In Florian Coulmas, ed., pp. 219-253.
- Haviland, John B. 1989. 'Sure, Sure': Evidence and Affect. *Text* 9/1: 27-68.
- , 1996. "We Want to Borrow your Mouth": Tzotzil Marital Squabbles. In Charles Briggs, ed., pp. 158-203.

- Herzfeld, Michael. 1996. Embarrassment as Pride: Narrative Resourcefulness and Strategies of Normativity among Cretan Animal-Thieves. In Charles Briggs, ed., pp. 72-94.
- Hickmann, Maya. 1993. The Boundaries of Reported Speech in Narrative Discourse: Some Developmental Aspects. In John A. Lucy, ed., pp. 63-90.
- Hill, Jane H. 1995. The Voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and Self in a Modern Mexicano Narrative. In *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*. Dennis Tedlock and Bruce Mannheim, eds., pp. 97-147. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Hill, Jane H. and Judith T. Irvine (eds.). 1990. *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane H. and Ofelia Zepeda. 1993. Mrs. Patricio's Trouble: The Distribution of Responsibility in an Account of Personal Experience. In Jane Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds., pp. 197-225.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 1996. Reporting on Talk: The Use of Direct Reported Speech in Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29/3: 219-245.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1993. Evidence and Responsibility: Verbal Abuse in a Wolof Village. In Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds., pp. 105-134.
- , 1996. Shadow Conversations: The Indeterminacy of Participant Roles. In *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, eds., pp. 131-159. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Janssen, Theo A. J. M., and Wim van der Wurff. 1996. Introductory Remarks on Reported Speech and Thought. In *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Theo A. J. M. Janssen and Wim van der Wurff, eds., pp. 1-12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 1987. 'He Says ... so I Said': Verb Tense Alternation and Narrative Depictions of Authority in American English. *Linguistics* 25: 33-52.
- Labov, William and David Fashel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1988. Putting Linguistics in a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation. In *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*. Paul Drew and Anthony Wootton, eds., pp. 161-227. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Li, Charles N. 1986. Direct and Indirect Speech: A Functional Study. In Florian Coulmas, ed., pp. 29-47.
- Lucy, John A. (ed.). 1993. *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, John A. 1993a. Reflexive Language and the Human Disciplines. In John A. Lucy, ed., pp. 9-32.
- , 1993b. Metapragmatics Presentationals: Reporting Speech with Quotatives in Yucatec Maya. In John A. Lucy, ed., pp. 91-126.
- Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 1987. Polyphonic Monologues: Quoted Direct Speech in Oral Narratives. *IPra Papers in Pragmatics* 1 / 2: 1-34.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1996. Multivoicedness in Speech and Thought representation: The Case of Self-Quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 207-226.

- McKellin, William H. 1990. Allegory and Inference: Intentional Ambiguity in Managalase Negotiations. In Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White, eds., pp. 335-370.
- Parmentier, Richard J. 1993. The Political Function of Reported Speech: A Belauan Example. In John A. Lucy, ed., pp. 261- 286.
- Selting, Margret. 1994. Emphatic Speech Style – With Special Focus on the Prosodic Signaling of Heightened Emotive Involvement in Conversation. In *Involvement in Language. Special Issue of Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 375-408.
- Shuman, Amy. 1986. *Storytelling Rights: The Uses of Oral and Written Texts by Urban Adolescents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1993. “Get outa my face”: Entitlement and Authoritative Discourse. In Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, eds., pp. 135-160.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1983. “I Take out the Rock - Dock!”: How Greek Women Tell about Being Molested (and Create Involvement). *Anthropological Linguistics* 25/3: 359-374.
- , 1984. *Conversational Style*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- , 1986. Introducing Constructed Dialogue in Greek and American Conversational and Literary Narrative. In Florian Coulmas, ed., pp. 311-333.
- , 1988. Hearing Voices in Conversation, Fiction, and Mixed Genres. In *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. Deborah Tannen, ed., pp. 89-114. Norwood, NJ.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- , 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1990. Silence as Conflict Management in Fiction and Drama: Pinter’s Betrayal and a Short Story, “Great Wits”. In *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations*. Allen D. Grimshaw, ed., pp. 260-280. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1978. Reported Speech. In *Readings in Russian Poetics*. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska, eds., pp. 149-175. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Contributions.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen A. and Geoffrey M. White (eds.). 1990. *Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1974. The Semantics of Direct and Indirect Discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7: 267-307.
- Yule, George and Terris Mathis. 1992. The Role of Staging and Constructed Dialogue in Establishing Speaker’s Topic. *Linguistics* 30: 199-215.

Appendix I Transcription notation

#	overlapped utterance	=	turn latching.
[utterances that begin simultaneously	(.)	short elapsed silence
(..)	two second pause	—	stress.
CAPS	increased volume	((whisper))	comment
()	unclear utterances	::	lengthened vowel
[ac]	accelerated tempo	[dc]	decelerated tempo
[hi]	high pitch	[lo]	low pitch
?	rising ending tune in questions		
W	sustained tune at the end of intonational group		
X	falling tune at the end of intonational group		
V	rising tune at the end of intonational group		

Appendix II The Conversation

- (1) X: qué tal ↓
how are you?
- (2) T: buenas tardes ↓
good afternoon.
- (3) L: gracias a Dios ↑
thank God.
- (4) X: qué? qué che pasou?
what? what happened to you?
- (5) L: xa dixen hoxe →[hi] [ac] NU::NCA má::is volvo ter costilletas nin bistec pa Xosé á plancha
I already said today "I will NE::VER ever make grilled steaks or cutlets for Xosé"
- (6) HA:: COMER do que tiñamos ↓
"he'll ha::ve to eat whatever we have"
- (7) X: [lo] exa::cta#mente ↓
exa::ctly
- (8) L: eu non me vou matar ho →
I won't kill myself
- (9) es igual chico # non te preocupes ho ↓
never mind # don't worry man
- (10) [hi] nin-nin chaman por teléfono ↑ [pois eu tampouco ↓
"they don't even phone, [then I won't either"
- (11) A: [xa dixen eu - dixen eu → a::rre demo () ↓
[I already said, I said "damn it "()
- (12) L: [ac] antes chamaba tódolos días ↑ e agora nada ↓
"before he used to phone every day but now nothing"

- (13) X: qué?
what?
- (14) A: e por qué estás ()? # [estás mal hoxe?
why are you ()? # are you sick today?
- (15) L: [*POIS NADA* ↑
“well nothing”
- (16) X: Non ↓ mal non estou ↓
no, I’m not sick
- (17) A: será # frío tamén? ()
maybe it is # a cold, don’t you think?
- (18) L: dixen eu → [hi] *NA::DA* ↑
I said “nothing”
- (19) *HA:: COMER* ↑ *do que lle fagan* ↓
“he’ll have to eat whatever is prepared for him”
- (20) X: eh?
what?
- (21) A: tes frío? se cadra =
are you cold? Maybe =
- (22) X: [No:: ↓
- (23) L: [*nin cha::ma* ↑ *nin nada* ↓
“he doesn’t call or anything”
- (24) eu polo menos chamo → que cando veña a factura do teléfono # →
at least I phone and when the phone bill comes #
- (25) A: pero claro porque - =
but of course because - =
- (26) L: = deberémolas orellas ↓ (.)
we’ll probably be in debt (.)
- (27) [dc] ((Lower voice, almost a whisper) cas chamadas que hai do entierro ↑ (..) virxen santísima ↓ (..)
((Whisper tone)) with all the phone calls from the funeral (..) good Lord
- (28) *ARRE DEMONIO* ↓ (..) contábamola pasada ↑ nada ↓
damn it, we expected you last week and nothing
- (29) contábamos hoxe ↑ xa # ()
we expected you today and # ()
- (30) A: e logo por qué non viñechedes á mañá? =
and then why didn’t you come in the morning? =
- (31) L: = [lo] cando non os vin na misa dixen → U::h ↑ esos xa non veñen ↓
= when I didn’t see them in mass I said “oh, they won’t come” =

- (32) A: Luis logo → Luis (.) e::h → pero Luis está ben ↑
Luis, then-Luis (.) mm, but Luis is all right, isn't he?
- (33) M: está ben está ↓
yes, he is fine
- (34) A: está? (.) bueno pois que non se preocupe tanto →
is he? (.) well, then he shouldn't worry so much
- (35) se-se-se non aproba ↑ pois e::h (.) xa aprobará (.) ↓
if-if-if he doesn't pass (.) he'll pass eventually
- (36) pa qué molestarse tanto # () ↓
why worry so much?
- (37) L: e cando acaba?
and when will he finish?
- (38) M: acaba o oito (.) de julio ↓
he'll finish on the eighth (.) of July
- (39) N: acaba tarde ↓
he finishes late
- (40) A: arre demo que # pobre rapaz ↓
good lord # poor kid
- (41) L: Isabel tamén seica acaba o oito → dixo Laura ↓
I believe Isabel also finishes on the eighth, Laura said
- (42) dixo ((lower voice, almost a whisper)) que dúas xa as tiña suspensas ↓
she said ((whisper tone)) that she already failed two subjects
- (43) T: [MM? quén? Isabel?
mm? who? Isabel?
- (44) M: [arre demo ↓ pobre rapaza ↓
Uauhhh, poor girl
- (45) L: mm ↓ dixo (.) [hi] dúas xa as ten ↑
mm she said "she's already failed two subjects"
- (46) [ac] e as que pode suspender d'aquí pa diante ↓
"and those she may fail from now on"
- (47) A: pois logo non sei →
it's hard to understand
- (48) L: eso díxomo a min Laura o outro día # ↓
she told me that the other day #
- (49) A: era ben boa → que me leve nunca o demo ↓
she was very smart, I swear
- (50) L: Cristina aprobou todo (.) ↓
Cristina passed everything (.)

- (51) e de Isabel dixo que ela quedou asustada ↓
and about Isabel she said that she was very surprised
- (52) e dixo → ((whisper))] *e as que poida suspender inda* ↑
and she said ((gradually decreasing the volume to a whisper)) “and those that she may fail yet”
- (53) A: arre demo ↓
my goodness
- (54) X.: pero Cristina cal é?
but which one is Cristina?
- (55) a que está en Santiago?
the one in Santiago?
- (56) A: Cristina é a máis nova → e a máis # ela é - =
Cristina is the youngest one and the most # she is - =
- (57) L: [é a máis ruín ↓
she is the weakest one
- (58) X: [a::h ah bueno ↓ xa me parecía moito que a outra - = →
ha:: ha well; I found it strange that the other one- =
- (59) A: pero a outra #
but the other one #
- (60) L: A ver → Isabel- Isabel foi a que suspendeu dúas ↓
Let's see, Isabel, Isabel was the one who failed two subjects
- (61) N: () no primeiro ano da universidade #
in her first year in college #
- (62) X: Isabel suspendeu dúas?
did Isabel fail two subjects?
- (63) L: [hi] *de momento suspendeu dúas* → dixo Laura →
“so far she's failed two subjects” said Laura
- (64) *e inda as que poida suspender hasta-hasta o oito de Julio* ↑ *que* ()
“and those she may fail till-till the eighth of July that” ()
- (65) X: pero (.) a que está en Santiago cal é?
but (.) which one is the one in Santiago?