

DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION: EMBEDDED REPORTED DISCOURSE IN BRITISH NEWSPAPER REPORTS

ZUZANA URBANOVÁ

University of Pardubice, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Department of English and American Studies,
Studentská 84, 532 10 Pardubice, Czech Republic. Email: zuzana.urbanova@upce.cz

ABSTRACT: This paper is concerned with reported language in British broadsheet newspaper reports and places special focus on various types of direct forms of presentation. Moreover, it pays attention to embedded discourse, a result of the recursively applied reflexive use of language. Reported language and embedding are interpreted from the point of view of the objectives and social function of newspaper reports: to describe recent events, the significance of which may be open to negotiation. The presence of external sources ensures heteroglossic background and impersonal treatment since the event portrayed is construed from a perspective other than the reporter's.

KEYWORDS: direct forms of presentation; non-direct forms of presentation; embedded discourse; heteroglossia; newspaper reports

1. INTRODUCTION

Newspapers contain a variety of writings ranging from reports, opinion and analysis, letters to the editor, obituaries, advertisements, etc. Newspaper reports deal with material acts, or happenings, describing socially, politically or otherwise significant events. Or, they describe verbal acts, for example accusations, demands, criticisms or announcements. The former are referred to as “event stories,” whereas the latter are “issues reports” (White 1997, 102). The reports dealing primarily with negative events that may threaten to destabilize the established norms and expectations are known as hard news (Bell 1991, Iedema, Feez, and White 1994; White 1997; White 1998). On the contrary, soft news reports deal with positive, stabilizing events, human achievements or points of interest directly reinforcing social values (Iedema, Feez, and White 1994, 139–40). In both cases, and in issues reports in particular, newspaper reporters incorporate into the text the language or thoughts of others. The most frequently cited reasons are objectivity, impersonal treatment, persuasiveness, reliability, solidarity with different viewpoints, individualization or vividness (van Dijk 1988; Waugh 1995; White 1998). Reported language also enhances the newsworthiness of newspaper reports since it imbues them with the prestige of the quoted source (Bell 1991, 158).

In all cases of reporting, language (or thought) is taken out of its original context and placed into a new context. Recontextualization is thus the essence of reporting, i.e., “communicat[ing] about the activity of using language” – one of the reflexive uses of language (Lucy 1993, 9). Moreover, reported forms themselves may be a source of reflexivity in that they may refer to (or recontextualize) a different language or

thought event, creating a complex, recursive reporting pattern similar to *He said that she said that they said* etc. In such cases, one form of reported language is contained within or “embedded” in another; more specifically, a reported (and simultaneously reporting) speaker “is presented as reporting words or thoughts produced by others (or by themselves) in a separate speech, thought or writing event” (Semino and Short 2004, 34). The aim of the present paper is to examine reported language and the phenomenon of embedding and interpret them in terms of their functions in the context of newspaper reports, namely objectivity, impersonality, solidarity, individualization and vividness. Focus will be placed primarily on forms of reporting that involve direct presentation of language and thought and their role in embedding structures.

Example (1) is an excerpt from a hard news report describing a fatal parasailing accident in which a father and daughter were involved; it describes a conversation between them immediately before the accident occurred. It is an instance of direct speech report (DS), with a typical structure consisting of a reporting clause (*She said*) and a reported clause enclosed in quotation marks, marked in bold (“*I asked . . . , Dad! . . .*”). Since it is not contained within any other form of reported language, it is non-embedded. The absence of embedding is indicated by a zero level of embedding, abbreviated to e0. However, the direct reported clause contains, i.e., embeds, three other forms of reported language: indirect speech (e1IS, *I asked what . . . height.*) and two instances of direct speech (e1DS, *he said, ‘You wouldn’t survive it anyway.’* and *I said ‘Thanks for reassuring me, Dad!’*). The embedded forms are marked in bold italics; their level of embedding is one, abbreviated to e1.

- (1) <e0DS>She said: “<e1IS>***I asked what would happen if you hit the water from that height*** and <e1DS>***he said, ‘You wouldn’t survive it, anyway.’*** <e1DS>***I said ‘Thanks for reassuring me, Dad! . . .’***” (Turner 2010)

By being direct in form, the embedded reports replay the conversation, and their presence makes an impression of authenticity and vividness. They allow the reader to witness or experience events more directly, thereby rendering the report more real and vivid. The embedded direct forms of discourse form a short dialogue reminiscent of speech reports in fiction. Such forms of reported language can appear in newspaper reports only as a result of recontextualization and embedding.

Since direct forms of presentation are pivotal to the topic of this paper, the treatment of embedding will be confined to three aspects. First, attention will be paid to embedded direct forms of presentation; second, their role as host categories will be discussed; and third, different types of non-direct forms¹ of presentation embedded in direct forms will be briefly touched upon. These issues will be related to an important factor in newspaper reporting, namely the need for impersonal treatment of reported events.

1. The term ‘non-direct’ forms of reporting is used to cover all forms of reporting language and thought to the exclusion of pure direct and free direct language and thought reports. Consequently, indirect reports are considered only a kind of non-direct reporting. Other forms of non-direct reports will be introduced later.

As will become clear from the presented data, embedded direct forms as opposed to non-direct forms are infrequent, which is attributable to their formal properties as well as their function in newspaper discourse. They are nevertheless worthy of attention because they reveal how various forms of reported language interact in order to achieve a particular communicative goal. In all examples, the description of forms will be included in pointed brackets, preceding the form under discussion; the occurrence of embedding is abbreviated to the first letter with the accompanying number indicating the level of embedding: e1 abbreviates an embedded form at level one, e2 at level two and e0 indicates an absence of embedding. Embedded forms are italicised, while the stretches of directly reported discourse are in bold. If direct reported discourse contains any direct or non-direct embedded forms, they will be marked in bold as well since they are part of the embedding direct form. This system of coding is kept throughout the paper. All forms of reported language and thought and their abbreviations will be introduced gradually at relevant sections of the paper.

2. CORPUS DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY

The corpus comprises 105,905 words and consists of 221 newspaper reports excerpted from British broadsheets, namely *The Times*, *The Guardian*, *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Independent* issued in July and October 2010. The analysis was limited only to national and international news and excludes news reports from specialized sections, such as sports and business, and other kinds of texts, e.g., commentary, opinion, letters to the editor, obituaries, reviews, etc.

The analysis relies on a classification developed by Semino and Short (2004), a revised model of one presented earlier in Leech and Short (1981). They recognize forms representing speech, writing and thought events, and view reported language and thought as a scale reflecting different degrees of directness (Semino and Short 2004, 10–16, 42–53). Thus, at the most direct pole, reflecting the point of view of the reported speaker, there is free direct and direct reported discourse (FDD and DD respectively), including (free) direct speech (F)DS, (free) direct writing (F)DW and (free) direct thought (F)DT. At the opposite pole, lying in fact off the scale, there is narration, reflecting entirely the point of view of the reporting speaker. Between these absolutes there are forms accommodating to a different extent the perspective of either reported or reporting speaker, such as free indirect and indirect reported discourse (FID and ID respectively), including (free) indirect speech (F)IS, (free) indirect writing (F)IW and (free) indirect thought (F)IT. Other kinds of non-direct forms of presentation will be described and exemplified later together with non-direct forms combined with a stretch of directly reported discourse (Semino and Short 2004, 54–56).

As noted by Sternberg, the most distinctive feature of the reported element in DD is the fact that it “takes its orientation from the spatiotemporally self-contained speech event . . . whose coordinates diverge in principle from those of the . . . frame [reporting clause],” creating a “double-centered deictic structure” (1982, 110). FDD shares this property but, following Leech and Short (1981, 322), lacks the reporting clause within

the same sentence and/or quotation marks, or both. On the other hand, ID is a “single-centered” construction since the deictic expressions of the reported clause “take their orientation from the frame” (Sternberg 1982, 110). Thus ID is more reporting speaker oriented and perceived as a summary of the reported event. As the reported clause of DD is deictically self-contained and independent of the reporting clause, it retains all its deictic properties expressive of the deictic centre of the reported speech event. For instance, the embedded direct speech forms (e1DS) in example (1) above contain a first person pronoun (*me*) referring to the reported speaker (*she*), a vocative (*Dad*) and a non-sentential structure (*Thanks for . . .*, see, e.g., Quirk et al. 1985, 849–53), which are unlikely to appear in the reported clause in ID because it is deictically and syntactically subordinated to the reporting clause. The ability to evoke the reported deictic situation contributes to the sense of authenticity previously mentioned.

Deictic properties of the reported clause and its syntactic relation with the reporting clause go hand in hand. As noted by Quirk et al. (1985, 1022–24), the structural relation between the two clauses in (F)DD may be problematic. The reporting clause may be viewed as a main clause and the reported clause as subordinate, functioning as a direct object; or, the reported clause is viewed as a main clause and the reporting clause as subordinate, functioning as a comment clause. The looser relation between the reporting clause and the reported element is supported by the deictic and speech-functional independence of the latter, the absence of a subordinator and the variable position of the reporting clause or its total omission.

A partially quoted stretch of direct discourse, usually a phrase, can occur incorporated into an instance of non-direct reported language or thought.² Following Semino and Short (2004, 54–55), the occurrence of partial quotes, in bold, is indicated by a -q tag attached to the abbreviation of the non-direct form in question. For instance, in example (2) the abbreviation e1IS-q refers to a piece of directly quoted discourse occurring with an instance of indirect speech embedded at level one.

- (2) <e0IS>His spokeswoman stressed that <e1NRSAp> *he had not been accusing the Pakistani Government of sponsoring terrorism*, but <e1IS-q> *was repeating his previous demands for it to do more to “**shut terror groups down**”*. (Grice 2010b)

In (2) there are two instances of indirect reported speech (IS): one form is non-embedded (e0IS), functioning as a host to the embedded categories; the italicised indirect speech (e1IS-q) is embedded at level one and the non-finite reported clause (*to do more . . . down*), modifying the nominal part of the reporting element (*demands*), contains a stretch of partially quoted direct discourse, marked in bold.³

2. No unambiguous forms of free indirect discourse (combined with a partial quote) were identified in the contexts relevant to the present discussion.

3. An alternative interpretation not endorsed in the present analysis is to establish two separate reporting forms – one based on the verb *repeat* and the other on the noun *demands*. This would make e1IS-q embedded in the form referred to by the verb, the so-called narrator’s representation of speech act with topic (Semino and Short 2004) discussed later. And since this form would already be embedded in

Towards the more non-direct end of the scale there occurs the so-called “narrator’s representation of speech act with topic” (Semino and Short 2004, 52–53), exemplified in (2) as *e1NRSAp* (*he had not been accusing . . . terrorism*), embedded in *e0IS*. The form has a greater summarizing potential since the content, or topic (referred to with a -p tag), is not presented in the form of the reported clause but a phrase, for example, a prepositional phrase (*of sponsoring terrorism*) in example (2) or a noun phrase (*Christian people*) in example (3). Notice that in (3) the italicised form embedded at level one (*e1NRSAp-q*) also contains a stretch of partially quoted discourse, again marked in bold.

- (3) *e0IS*>He told them that his father had gone to stay with *e1NRSAp-q*> *what he called “Christian people”*. (Sanderson 2010)

The forms in (4) and (5), further towards the narrative end of the scale, do not dispose of the possibility to report content but solely indicate that a communicative event occurred. Consequently, they cannot combine with partially quoted direct discourse but will be commented upon as they will occur in later examples.

- (4) *e0DS*>“*e1NI*>*I am deeply concerned,*” *eNRS*>he said. *e0FDS*>“**The basis on which *e1NRSA*>*this statement has been made is very fragile . . .*” (Grice 2010b)**
- (5) *e0DS*>Tam Fry, . . . , said: “*e1NV*>***We had this debate 18 months ago when . . .*” (Ramesh 2010)**

In (4), the non-embedded free direct speech (*e0FDS*, in bold) contains an embedded nominalised form (*e1NRSA*, in bold italics) indicating only the illocutionary force of the verbal event (*statement*) without any reference to its content; it is referred to as a “narrative report of speech act” in Leech and Short (1981, 323–24) and as a “narrator’s representation of speech act” without topic in Semino and Short (2004). The non-embedded direct speech (*e0DS*, in bold) in (5) contains an embedded minimal form of presentation (*NV*, in bold italics) referred to as “narrator’s representation of voice” (Semino and Short 2004, 43–45). The report is limited merely to an indication that a communicative event, in this case a speech event, has occurred without specifying either content or speech act value. So far, the examples have illustrated various forms on the speech scale; analogical forms of presentation can be found on the writing scale and thought scale to a certain extent as well. Example (4) illustrates an embedded minimal form of thought presentation (*e1NI*), a so-called “internal narration” (Semino and Short 2004, 45–47), indicating only a state of mind without expressing any particular thought.

3. DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION AND EMBEDDING

So far, a number of embedded forms of presentation have been discussed, including direct, non-direct and combined forms. Embedded direct speech (*e1DS*) and indirect

e0IS, such an approach would also automatically increase the level of embedding of *e1IS-q* from one to two.

speech (e1IS) occurred in example (1), while embedded indirect speech combined with a partial quote (e1IS-q) occurred in (2). Examples (2) and (3) illustrate an embedded narrator's representation of speech act with topic (e1NRSAp and e1NRSAp-q), in the latter case combined with a partial direct quote. An embedded form of the narrator's representation of speech act without topic (e1NRSA) occurs in example (4); embedded minimal forms of reported discourse are shown in examples (4) and (5), illustrating a minimal form of thought (internal narration, e1NI) and speech (narrator's voice, e1NV) respectively. The following paragraphs will be devoted to the discussion of embedded direct forms of presentation, including non-direct forms with a partial quote. The results are summarized in Table 1 and exclude all ambiguous cases. For ease of presentation, the scales of speech and writing have been conflated; also, as free direct reported discourse and direct reported discourse are, due to their deictic properties, functionally nearly equivalent, the two categories have been merged as well. As for the abbreviations used in the table, (F)DD refers to (free) direct reported discourse, covering speech, writing and thought; ID-q is used as an umbrella term for indirect speech, writing and thought combined with a partial quote (-q); NRDAp-q abbreviates a narrator's representation of speech, writing and thought act with topic partially reported in direct form. As noted, the level of embedding is indicated by the combination of the letter *e* and a number, with e0 referring to non-embedded forms.

TABLE 1: EMBEDDED AND NON-EMBEDDED DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION

		EMBEDDED AND NON-EMBEDDED DIRECT FORMS			
		(F)DD	ID-q	NRDAp-q	Total
E0	Speech/Writing	850	202	96	1148
	Thought	0	1	0	1
	Total	850	203	96	1149
E1	Speech/Writing	30	14	13	57
	Thought	8	8	4	20
	Total	38	22	17	77
E2	Speech/Writing	3	0	0	3
	Thought	1	2	0	3
	Total	4	2	0	6
E0-E2	Total	892	227	113	1232

As Table 1 shows, direct forms of presentation on speech and writing scales (1148 e0, 57 e1 and 3 e2) clearly predominate over those found on the thought scale (1 e0, 20 e1 and 3 e2); also, (F)DD (892) is more frequently employed than the non-direct forms combined with a stretch of quoted discourse (227 ID-q and 113 NRDAp-q). Disregarding speech and writing vs. thought distinction, a great majority of direct forms are not embedded. As for the level of embedding and the frequency of occurrence, there is a decreasing tendency: 1149 direct forms were found non-embedded, 77 instances were embedded at level one and six instances at level two. The decrease is not unexpected because a higher level of discursal embedding may contribute to the overall grammatical and deictic

complexity of the whole structure. Though non-embedded (F)DD (850) is employed much more frequently than non-embedded ID-q (203) and NRDAp-q (96), the difference in the frequency of occurrence of embedded forms is not so significant. There are 38 cases of e1(F)DD and 39 cases of embedded combined forms, 22 of e1ID-q and 17 of e1NRDAp-q. At the level two of embedding there appear 4 instances of e2(F)DD and two instances of e2ID-q.

Since in direct forms, especially (F)DD, the original deictic centre is retained, a switch from the host category to the embedded one also involves a switch in the deictic centre, affecting most notably spatial-temporal expressions or first and second person pronouns, as in example (1). Moreover, the presence of different speakers, reporting clauses and an extra set of quotation marks may make the whole structure cumbersome (Semino and Short 2004, 177–79). The reported element of combined forms is necessarily a combination or sequence of two separate deictic centres. In example (2), the embedded e1IS-q is contained in an instance of e0IS, neither of which involves a shift from the deictic centre of the reporting context; the partial quote is accompanied by a deictic shift, but there are no deictic elements that would markedly clash with the deictic orientation of the co-text. Similarly, the shift in the partial quote in e1NRDAp-q (example 3) is not deictically demanding either.

Discoursal embedding may be accompanied by an increase in grammatical complexity, which is here understood mainly as the presence of grammatical embedding, defined by Quirk et al. as “the occurrence of one unit as a constituent of another unit at the same rank in the grammatical hierarchy” (1985, 44). The relation between the reported and reporting elements in (F)DD is freer, and in this respect (F)DD may not contribute to grammatical complexity to such an extent. In (1), the two instances of e1DS are embedded in the host e0DS, none of which involves an undisputed relation of subordination of the reported clause to the reporting clause. On the other hand, due to the lack of subordination the range of structures in the reported element is virtually unlimited and can amount to a single word or a sequence of sentences, as follows in (6). In ID, on the other hand, the reported clause is clearly subordinated to the reporting one (example 1 e1IS); in (2), subordination occurs both in the host e0IS and in the embedded e1IS-q. As far as the NRDAp-q is concerned (example 3), its main formal property, namely the reported content realized in the form of a phrase, would naturally predestine it as the one most suitable for discoursal embedding (Semino and Short 2004, 181). Nevertheless, as shown in (2), the phrase realizing the topic can grammatically embed a non-finite reporting clause and move the form closer to ID. This ties in with the scalar character of the forms of presentation, both from formal and functional points of view.

Formal and deictic properties must be viewed merely as a potential of a form to appear embedded. Also, every instance of embedding is subject to an interplay of factors, asserting themselves to a different extent. In embedded (F)DD, the reported element is not clearly subordinated but involves a deictic switch and may vary in terms of length and grammatical structure. In contrast, in embedded ID-q the subordinated reported element contributes to grammatical complexity but at the same time may

evinced a higher degree of deictic assimilation to the reporting context. Example (6) illustrates an unusually complex embedding structure: the e2DS, in bold italics, contains several sentences; both the ultimate non-embedded (e0IS) and intermediate embedded (e1IT) host categories are instances of ID, though (F)DD is normally embedded in other instances of (F)DD (Semino and Short 2004, 179). Notice also that the embedded e2DS contains an instance of internal narration (e3NI, underlined bold italics) embedded at level three.

- (6) <e0IS>Mr Cameron said <e1IT>he recalls<e2DS>saying: ***“It’s not going to happen. I’m going to be leader of the Opposition. <e3NI>I’m depressed that it hasn’t worked out as we wanted it. I’m going to be in opposition for another couple more years.”*** (Grice 2010a)

Embedding, however, cannot be explained only by reference to the complexity of form, but primarily by the function of embedded forms. (F)DD may be preferable in situations requiring full evocation of the reported situation in order to achieve a truthful and authentic portrayal of the communicative event. Though ID-q (example 2) and NRDAp-q (example 3) serve the purpose of a summary, they simultaneously highlight the words quoted directly. In these cases, the non-embedded forms may be preferable. This, however, applies only to forms reporting speech and writing. The following section offers a few comments on reported thought.

4. DIRECT FORMS PRESENTING THOUGHT AND EMBEDDING

As Table 1 shows, the overall frequency of pure direct thought reports or non-direct forms with partial quotes is very low, 24 in total. Also, the tendency on the thought scale is completely opposite to that on the speech and writing scales: the embedded forms (20 e1 and 3 e2 forms) prevail over the non-embedded ones (1). This can be attributed to the nature of direct thought and the examined type of discourse. Thought cannot be observed directly, and thus its verbalization in a direct form may be perceived as artificial, especially in discourse where the reporter does not have access to the mind of the reported speaker (Leech and Short 1981, 345; Semino and Short 2004, 118). Consequently, the reporter tends to resort to non-direct forms of presentation, or direct thought is construed as embedded.

In (7), the direct reported thought (e1DT, bold italics) is embedded at level one in non-embedded e0DS; it is a self-quote, so the problem of the access to the mind of others does not occur. The rhetoric effect is to allow the reader to see for themselves what was going on in the mind of the reported speaker. This effect is achieved by maintaining the deictic centre evocative of the reported situation, reflected, e.g., in the retention of tense and interrogative form.

- (7) <e0DS>Dannatt, . . . , told the Chilcot inquiry: “. . . <e1DT>***‘Where did it come from?’ was my feeling at the time.***” (Norton-Taylor 2010)

Example (8) is different in that it is not expressly attributed to any specific individual. The italicised embedded indirect thought combined with a partial quote, in bold, (e1IT-q) does not contain a reporting verb but a noun (*idea*) with the content reported in the form of an appositive clause. The content construed as a projected idea (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 467–70) suggests acknowledgement of alternative viewpoints; and since the content is not presented as an undisputed fact but relegated to the realm of thought, it thus may be more easily challenged or, indeed, rejected. This is related to the concepts of heteroglossia and monoglossia and the need to show solidarity with different points of view (Martin and White 2005).

- (8) <e0NRSAp>The Justice Secretary has rejected <e1IT-q> *the idea that “**prison works**”*. (Kirkup 2010)

5. DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION IN HOST FUNCTION

So far, attention has been paid to direct forms of presentation embedded in other forms of reported language. Let us now briefly examine direct forms functioning as a host to various types of non-direct forms. For ease of presentation, speech, writing and thought were conflated since direct thought in itself is infrequent and speech and writing are ontologically similar. Moreover, focus is placed on the formal properties of host categories, which are identical irrespective of speech, writing and thought distinction. The analysis was limited only to those ID-q and NRDAp-q in which the embedded form of presentation was found within the boundaries of the partial quote. Admittedly, such an approach cannot offer a complete picture since the exclusion of non-direct embedded forms lying outside the partial quote in the host category necessarily lowered the number of host categories as well as the number of embedded non-direct forms, to be dealt with in the next section. On the other hand, the limitation makes host (F)DD, ID-q and NRDAp-q more comparable in terms of the deictic switch.

TABLE 2: DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION EMBEDDING NON-DIRECT FORMS

	DIRECT FORMS EMBEDDING NON-DIRECT FORMS			Total
	(F)DD	ID-q	NRDAp-q	
e0	450	57	11	518
e1	12	3	0	15
e2	1	0	0	1
Total	463	60	11	534

Table 2 shows that direct forms that are not embedded (518) function as a host more frequently, and the frequency of occurrence decreases with an increase in the level of embedding (15 e1 forms and only 1 e2 form). This can be explained by the increase in the deictic and grammatical complexity. As for the type of host category, especially (F)DD (463) seems to evince a propensity to function as host in comparison to partially quoted non-direct forms ID-q (60) and NRDAp-q (11). (F)DD (e.g., examples 1, 4,

5) is an ideal host since the reported element is deictically and syntactically more independent than its ID-q counterpart and thus more flexible in the range of categories and grammatical forms it may embed. In ID-q, the subordinate reported clause seems more limited in its host function, presumably due to the syntactic dependency of the reported clause and increased grammatical complexity (Semino and Short 2004, 182). In host NRDAp-q, the relationship existing between the reporting verb and the reported element involves no subordination, but due to the phrasal character of the reported element, a form of presentation that is discursively embedded in NRDAp-q is also likely to be grammatically embedded. On the whole, the data suggest that in comparison to (F)DD non-direct forms with only partially quoted direct discourse are less frequently employed in the host function. Apart from their formal properties, their limited occurrence as hosts may be related to their greater summarizing potential, which may be less compatible with the host function.

6. NON-DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION EMBEDDED IN DIRECT FORMS

The last aspect to be commented on concerns non-direct forms of presentation embedded in (F)DD and combined forms. The topic will be dealt with only briefly and mainly in order to compare embedded non-direct forms of presentation with their counterparts combined with a partial quote. As in the previous section, the discussion will be limited only to forms embedded within the confines of directly quoted discourse.

TABLE 3: NON-DIRECT FORMS OF PRESENTATION EMBEDDED IN DIRECT FORMS

	NON-DIRECT FORMS EMBEDDED IN DIRECT FORMS				
	ID	NRDAp	NRDA	Minimal	Total
E1	226	119	78	323	746
E2	25	33	36	53	147
E3	0	2	4	4	10
Total	251	154	118	380	903

Speech, writing and thought categories are conflated into indirect discourse (ID; example 1, e1IS),⁴ the narrator's representation of discourse act with topic (NRDAp; example 2, e1NRSAp) and without topic (NRDA; example 4, e1NRSA), and finally minimal forms of reporting, covering the narrator's representation of voice on the speech scale (example 5, e1NV), its analogy on the writing scale and internal narration on the thought scale (example 4, e1NI and example 6, e3NI). As Table 3 shows, the frequency decreases with the increase in the level of embedding: there are 746 e1

4. The category of embedded ID contains 198 instances categorized as indirect thought, with an initial clause containing verbs such as *think* or *believe*. It is doubtful whether all these instances could be regarded as IT *per se* or as parenthetical comment clauses, employed as hedging devices. The status of the clause is problematic especially in the absence of prosodic cues and the subordinator *that* (Kaltenböck 2009, 49–50). The ambiguity in function could at least partially explain its high frequency of occurrence in comparison to forms with greater summarizing potential.

forms, 147 e2 forms and 10 e3 forms. In contrast to the embedded direct and combined forms listed in Table 1, embedded non-direct forms are more numerous and have been identified even at level three, even though the occurrence is very low and limited to forms not involving clausal subordination of the reported element. In comparison to their embedded combined analogues, embedded non-direct forms clearly predominate: alongside the total of 251 embedded ID, there are only 24 embedded ID-q forms; similarly, to the total of 154 embedded NRDAp forms correspond only 17 instances of embedded NRDAp-q. The higher frequency of embedded non-direct forms over embedded (F)DD and combined forms can be explained by the fact that pure non-direct forms do not involve a deictic shift and do not require the presence of quotation marks (Semino and Short 2004, 181–82). As will be shown in the next section, their summarizing potential may be mainly availed of for the purpose of a brief reference to communicative events the contents of which have already been presented. Further examples of NRDA and minimal reports are given in examples (13) and (14) below.

As mentioned, (F)DD and non-direct forms with a partial direct quote are predominantly non-embedded, and if they appear embedded, it is with much lower frequency than fully non-direct forms. Apart from the formal properties already discussed, this can be also attributed to the overall function of direct forms in newspaper reports: they imbue discourse with persuasiveness, evidentiality, reliability and credibility (Waugh 1995, 132–34). Since embedded discourse involves two or more stages in reporting resulting in a possible decrease in reliability, it may be assumed that persuasiveness and credibility can be achieved more successfully via non-embedded forms than embedded ones. Naturally, this account offers only a partial presentation since for a full treatment one would have to consider also non-direct forms embedded within other non-direct forms; nevertheless, it can be assumed that the tendencies already noted would be supported rather than refuted.

7. THE FUNCTION OF NON-EMBEDDED AND EMBEDDED FORMS OF PRESENTATION

The following paragraphs attempt to interpret the presence of reported language in newspaper reports in general and explain the occurrence of embedding. As mentioned, news stories are often concerned with a portrayal of events representing a normative breach; they chronicle events perceived as a disruption to the *status quo*, identify sources of social-order disequilibrium and help consolidate the established social values (Iedema, Feez, and White 1994, 107; White 1997, 106). For example, the source of disequilibrium in (1) is a fatal accident, in (2) and (4) a controversial remark made by David Cameron, in (3) a murder and the role of imprisonment in (8). Also, such events, due to their novelty and contentious nature, are subject to negotiation; in order to explain, interpret and evaluate them and simultaneously maintain impersonal treatment, the newspaper reporter relies on external sources.⁵

5. The impersonal style of hard news reports is achieved by a typical generic structure referred to usually as “the inverted pyramid” (van Dijk 1988, Bell 1991) and so-called “reporter voice,” characterized by

The presence of external voices contributes to a heteroglossic background of the text since an attributed proposition is necessarily construed as bound to the individual reported speaker and thus allows for possible alternative viewpoints (Martin and White 2005, 99). The presence of external sources and diverse perspectives on the reported matter is important in order to avoid presenting it as given, naturalised and taken for granted (Martin and White 2005, 99–100); this is especially true if the event is recent, socially disrupting and there is a possibility of reinterpretation of its social-political or economic significance. Issues reports, dealing with perceived disruptions that are communicative in nature, are rich sources of reported language and embedded forms of presentation. In order to achieve impersonal treatment, the reporter “extravocalises,” i.e., explicitly attributes (White 1998, 125), all interpretation and evaluation; the author reports on what an external source has said about a projected destabilising event, and such forms involve embedding. The following forms of presentation, some of them already dealt with, have been excerpted from an issues report dealing with David Cameron’s accusation that Pakistan supports terrorism. Supporting terrorism in itself can be seen as a source of disequilibrium, but as is clear from the excerpt it is the verbal act that is perceived as threatening.

- (9) <e0NI>Pakistanis irate over <e0DS>PM’s “**exporting terror**” remark (headline)
- (10) <e0NV>DAVID CAMERON sparked a diplomatic row yesterday by<e0IS-q> warning that Pakistan should not be allowed to “**promote the export of terror**” to the rest of the world. (lead)
- (11) <e0IS>His spokeswoman stressed that<e1NRSAp> *he had not been accusing the Pakistani Government of sponsoring terrorism, but <e1IS-q>was repeating his previous demands for it to do more to “**shut terror groups down**”*. (body)
- (12) <e0DS> “<e1NI>**I am deeply concerned,**” <NRS>he said. <e0FDS> “**The basis on which <e1NRSA>this statement has been made is very fragile . . .**” (body)
- (13) <e0IS-q>Denis MacShane, a former Foreign Office minister, warned that <e1NRSA> *Mr Cameron’s “**foolish insults**” of Pakistan would be counter-productive.* (body) (Grice 2010b)

Since Cameron’s accusations are perceived as threatening, they appear very early in the text – in the headline (9) and lead (10), with the controversial content presented as non-embedded, unmediated e0DS (“*exporting terror*” remark) and e0IS-q (*warning that . . . the world*) respectively. Also, the direct consequence of the accusation, namely the disrupted political order, is described in minimal forms of presentation, internal narration (e0NI, *irate*) in the headline and a narrator’s representation of voice (e0NV, *diplomatic row*) in the lead.

minimal authorial evaluation (see, e.g., Iedema, Feez and White 1994, White 1998 or Martin and White 2005).

The forms of presentation excerpted from the body of the text (11)–(13) describe the reactions to and the interpretation of the PM's remark. As the external sources refer to the controversial statement, the latter ultimately appears embedded in the forms representing the utterances of the former. In (11), the spokeswoman tries to negotiate the intended illocutionary force and content of Cameron's remark, stressing (e0IS) that his statement is not to be understood as an accusation (e1NRSAp) but a demand (e1IS-q). In (12), a Pakistani senator expresses his concerns in the form of internal narration (e1NI, bold italics) embedded in e0DS (in bold) and questions the credibility of the controversial statement (e1NRSA, bold italics) in the form of non-embedded e0FDS (in bold). Example (13) reports Denis MacShane's warning of possible consequences (e0IS-q) and his negative evaluation of Cameron's remark, referred to as a *foolish insult* in the form of an embedded narrator's representation of speech act (e1NRSA, bold italics).

In addition, there seems to be a clear correspondence between the form of the reported language, embedding and the need to distance oneself from the content by means of extra-vocalisation: the content which by its nature requires heteroglossic treatment is presented via non-embedded direct forms. As the text develops and proceeds from presenting the source of the disequilibrium to its interpretation, the forms of presentation referring to the remark alter from non-embedded direct (e0DS, example 9) and combined (e0IS-q, example 10) forms in the headline and lead to embedded combined forms in the body (example 11, e1IS-q) and finally embedded nominalized summaries with no topic reported (examples 12 and 13, e1NRSA). Simultaneously, as the source of the disequilibrium has been processed and focus is placed on evaluation, non-embedded direct forms are employed to provide solidarity with different evaluating and interpreting viewpoints. This can also explain the prevailing occurrence of non-embedded direct forms over embedded direct forms as well as of embedded non-direct forms over embedded direct ones.

8. CONCLUSION

The analysis has shown a number of tendencies in the use of direct forms of presentation. First, direct forms appear more frequently non-embedded than embedded, and the frequency of occurrence of embedded forms representing speech and writing decreases with the increase in the level of embedding. From the formal point of view, this can be attributed to the possibility of increased deictic and grammatical complexity following from the deictic and syntactic properties of the individual embedded forms. On the other hand, forms involving direct presentation of thought are almost exclusively found in the context of embedding; this can be explained by the nature of thought presentation and the discourse of newspaper reporting. The deictic and grammatical properties can also explain the predominance in a host function of (F)DD over non-direct forms combined with a partial quote.

As for the frequency of embedded (F)DD, combined forms and their fully non-direct analogies, the non-direct embedded forms prevail. If direct forms are to serve the

function of credibility and reliability, quoting the source only via one projection stage may be desirable. The function of direct forms is inextricably related to their deictic properties, i.e., to the retention of the deictic centre and the potential to reflect the perspective of the reported speaker. This potential can be exploited, e.g., in the uses of embedded (F)DD reminiscent of conversation or narrative, where (F)DD serves to achieve an enlivening and dramatizing effect (examples 1, 6 and 7). Simultaneously, thanks to the retention of the deictic centre and consequently the subjectivity of the reported situation, direct forms also contribute to the maintenance of impersonal, i.e., non-authorial perspective (examples 8, 11–13). Interpretation or judgement is extra-vocalised, hence non-authorial, and provides the desired heteroglossic background. The presentation of alternative viewpoints or at least one of many possible viewpoints is important in cases where the event described is controversial or socially disruptive; in the so-called issues reports, the source of disruption to social order is projected and thus involves reported language (examples 9–10). The presence of extra-vocalised, non-authorial comments referring to the projected source of disequilibrium results in discursual embedding (examples 8, 11–13). Heteroglossic portrayal can be achieved by non-direct forms as well as direct ones. Embedded forms with a greater summarizing potential may be preferred in an extra-vocalised reference to communicative events that have already been introduced in the text and where content may not be at issue.

WORKS CITED

- Bell, Allan. 1991. *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Halliday, Michael A. K., and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Iedema, Rick, Susan Feez, and Peter White. 1994. *Media Literacy*. Sydney: Disadvantaged Schools Programme, NSW Department of School Education.
- Leech, Geoffrey, and Michael H. Short. 1981. *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Lucy, John. 1993. "Reflexive Language and the Human Disciplines." In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, edited by John Lucy, 9–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2009. "Initial *I think*: Main or Comment Clause?" *Discourse and Interaction* 2 (1): 49–70.
- Martin, James R., and Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Semino, Elena, and Mick Short. 2004. *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1982. "Point of View and the Indirections of Direct Speech." *Language and Style* 15 (2): 67–117.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1988. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Waugh, Linda R. 1995. "Reported Speech in Journalistic Discourse: The Relation of Function and Text." *Text* 15 (1): 129–73.
- White, Peter. 1997. "Death, Disruption and the Moral Order: The Narrative Impulse in Mass-Media 'Hard News' Reporting." In *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*, edited by Frances Christie and James R. Martin, 101–33. London: Continuum.
- White, Peter. 1998. "Telling Media Tales: The News Story as Rhetoric." PhD diss., University of Sydney.

CORPUS

- Grice, Andrew. 2010a. "Cameron: I Didn't Think I Would Become Prime Minister." *Independent*, July 29.
- Grice, Andrew. 2010b. "Pakistanis Irate over PM's 'Exporting Terror' Remark." *Independent*, July 29.
- Norton-Taylor, Richard. 2010. "Blair Brought Military Close to Seizing Up, Says Ex-Army Chief." *Guardian*, July 29.
- Kirkup, James. 2010. "Prison Jobs Could Put Law-Abiding Workers on the Dole." *Daily Telegraph*, October 6.
- Ramesh, Randeep. 2010. "Tell People They Are Fat, Says Minister." *Guardian*, July 29.
- Sanderson, David. 2010. "Law Student 'Murdered his Controlling Father and Buried his Body in Concrete.'" *Times*, July 29.
- Turner, Lauren. 2010. "Man Joked about Parasail before Falling to his Death." *Independent*, July 29.