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1. Introduction

The phenomenon I wish to look at here is the way in which speakers in relating events often report what someone said, supposedly repeating the actual words said. This is traditionally known as oration recta (e.g., 'he said "That won't affect me"'), rather than using reported speech, oratio obliqua, (e.g., 'he said that would not affect him'). In this paper I will refer to oratio recta as quoted direct speech. This is one of the ways in which "as animators, we can convey words that are not our own" (Goffman 1981: 150).

2. Data

The examples that will be discussed are taken from a microsociolinguistic study of the dialect of Ayr, a town of approximately 50,000 inhabitants in southwest Scotland (Macaulay, in prep). The sample consists of interviews with twelve speakers recorded in 1978 and 1979. The interviews vary in length and quality, ranging from just over 4,000 words to 21,000 words in length, some containing numerous narratives that make up a substantial portion of the interview and others having no narratives at all. Since the interviews vary in not only in length but also in the diversity of language genres they include, they clearly do not equally represent the everyday language of the speakers but by dealing with the interviews as complete speech events and treating the quality of speech in the interview as problematic it is possible to chart the dynamics of each interview, showing the interaction between the language used and such factors as topic, genre, and the interview situation. Since the sample is socially stratified, with equal numbers of lower-class and middle-class speakers, it is possible to show which linguistic features are sensitive to social variation although the individual speakers in each group do not always conform to the pattern of the other speakers in their group.

The interviews with the twelve speakers were transcribed in their entirety in a slightly modified orthography
intended to indicate certain phonological features that are socially distinctive (e.g. *oot* [ut] vs. *out* [aut], *hame* [hem] vs. *home* [hom], *eicht* [ext] vs. *eight* [et]). No attempt is made to indicate all socially variable phonological features (e.g. glottal stops, alveolar vs. velar nasals) or prosodic and paralinguistic features [1]. The transcriptions also generally do not include the interviewer's back-channel responses unless these are linguistic [2]. Since one of the aims of the larger study was to investigate syntactic variation, the examples are presented with each syntactic structure given a numbered line. (By syntactic structure is meant clause, infinitive, participle, or gerund, with truncated responses to questions treated as a separate category; see Macaulay 1987b for the coding used.) For the purposes of narrative analysis this line division may not be ideal (cf. Chafe 1986; Hymes 1981; Labov 1972) but nothing that I have to say here hinges upon a division into other kinds of communicative units.

3. Quoted direct speech

It is clear that the use of quoted direct speech is not necessary to convey the propositional content of the utterance, as can be illustrated by an example from the interview with one of the lower-class speakers, Andrew Sinclair:

(1)

```
368 and --eh -- when I was waiting on the milk
369 eh-- the farmer came oot
370 and he says
371 "That you left the school noo Andrew?"
372 says I
373 "It is"
374 he says
375 "You'll be looking for a job"
376 says I
377 "Aye"
378 he says
379 "How would you like
380 to stert here?"
381 well I would have liked
382 to have started at the farm
383 I did like farm work
```

The examples of quoted direct speech are the sequences
shown in (1) between quotation marks. Sequences of this kind do not usually occur in natural conversation with accompanying quotation marks indicated by verbal transliteration or finger gestures as sometimes occurs in lectures (Goffman 1981: 161). In (1), however, the sequence "that you left the school noo Andrew?" in line 371 is bracketted by and he says in line 370 and says I in line 372. All the examples of quoted direct speech in (1) are similarly bracketted except for the last in lines 379-80 where the change of speaker in line 381 is indicated by the turn-taking marker well (cf. Schiffrin 1987). There is thus no doubt at any point in (1) as to the identity of the speaker or the referent of the deictic you.

The information conveyed in (1) could have been expressed as in (2):

(2)

1 when I was waiting on the milk
2 the farmer came oot
3 and he asked me
4 if I'd left the school
5 I said
6 I had
7 and he said
8 I'd be looking for a job
9 and when I said yes
10 he asked
11 if I would like
12 to start there on the farm

or even more briefly:

(3)

1 when I was waiting on the milk
2 the farmer came oot
3 and asked me
4 if I'd like
5 to work there
6 now that I'd left school

Extended examples of reported speech such as (2) are rare in ordinary spoken discourse and it is not clear why
anyone would want to give the information in that type of explicit form. The summarised version in (3) is a better candidate for an alternative and examples like this do occur in the interviews, generally with the middle-class speakers, as in this example from John MacGregor's interview:

(4) JM1115 and we had a long chat....
1118 and --eh-- he asked me
1119 to come to South Africa
1120 and he said
1121 I could either come into the army with him or go with the K____ in --eh-- physical training

In this example the use of délécit pronouns after the reporting verb he said shows that this is clearly reported speech (oratio obliqua) with the narrator referred to by I and the reported speaker by him, though the contrastive use of come (with him) and go (with another organization) retains the orientation of the original speaker. Reported speech is much less common than quoted direct speech in the interviews and since the latter is generally more verbose it is legitimate to ask what purpose is served by this extra effort on the part of both speaker and listener. It is reported speech, however, that has received more attention in linguistics (see, for example, the articles in Coulmas 1986).

Vološinov observes:

"Earlier investigators of the forms of reported speech committed the fundamental error of virtually divorcing the reported speech from the reporting context. That explains why their treatment of these forms is so static (a characterization applicable to the whole field of syntactic study in general). Meanwhile, the true object of inquiry ought to be precisely the dynamic interrelationship of these two factors, the speech being reported (the other person's speech) and the speech doing the reporting (the author's speech). After all, the two actually do exist, function, and take shape only in their interrelationship, and not on their own, the one apart from the other. The reported speech and the reporting context are but the terms of a dynamic interrelationship. This dynamism reflects the
Vološinov is thinking of literary works, as his reference to "the author" indicates, but his remarks are equally pertinent to the study of naturally occurring oral narratives.

4. Functions of Quoted Direct Speech

a) Indirection

In the narrative from which (1) comes, Sinclair is giving a long answer to the question "What did you do when you left school?" The narrative is surprisingly eloquent and well-organised (see Macaulay 1985 for a fuller discussion of the whole narrative) and leads on to an account of Sinclair's first jobs in the coal mine. As Sinclair is to make clear at many points later in the interview, he was by his own account respected as a good worker. In (1) he shows how the farmer asked him if he would like to work there before Sinclair had even said he was looking for a job. This suggests that the farmer recognised Sinclair's potential and wanted to get in first with the offer of a job. The narrative episode ends with the information that Sinclair had left the job on the farm, not because of any shortcomings on his part but because of a dispute between his parents and the farmer over compensation for an injury he had received. The dialogue quoted in (1) shows Sinclair, who was barely fourteen years of age, being treated with respect by the farmer almost as if he were an equal. This is not conveyed so effectively by the paraphrases in (2) and (3). One of the functions of quoted direct speech is to be able to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly. Or as Goffman observes by repeating the words said by someone else, the speaker "means to stand in a relation of reduced responsibility for what he is saying" (1974: 512). In example (1) Sinclair is also following...
what Pomerantz (1978: 88-92) has called the constraint on avoidance of self-praise. Indirection as a mode of speech is just beginning to be recognized (cf. Brenneis 1986; Brown and Levinson 1987; Duranti 1984). The narrative from which (1) is taken occurs fairly near the beginning of the interview. It is a remarkably long response to a question that could have been answered by a single sentence, e.g. "I worked on a farm for a bit". Instead, Sinclair, in a narrative that extends to 84 lines, provides a great deal of information about himself and his family's circumstances, partly as background information in the orientation sections. The quoted direct speech is not an integral part of the narrative in the sense that the farmer's precise words are essential to the point ostensibly being made (cf. some of the examples below). The farmer's attitude, however, conveyed through the quoted direct speech, is an effective preparation for Sinclair's later account of himself as a miner, working and living "among the cream of human beings in the country" and his despair when he was temporarily out of work.

b) Embedded evaluation

An important use of quoted direct speech is to provide what Labov (1972: 372-3) has called embedded or internal evaluation. Labov argues that the evaluative portion of any narrative explains why the story is reportable, or worth telling. He uses the term "external evaluation" when the narrator gives this justification explicitly as a comment in his own role as narrator and the term "internal evaluation" when the point of the story is conveyed through the story itself, including the remarks of another person. There are many examples of internal evaluation in the narratives told in the interviews. One occurs in Ella Laidlaw's account of her first job in a carpet factory at the age of sixteen. Her mother, who worked in the factory, had got her a job in what she termed "one of the nicest parts", the finishing room. Laidlaw soon found that the other workers would swear at her if she did anything wrong and were not sympathetic to the problems of a learner. She put up with it for about two weeks and then went to tell her mother she was quitting:
and I went up to my mother
my mother worked in the dyehouse then
and I says
on the drying machine
and I says to her
"I'm no going back in there"
she says
"How are you no going back in ?"
I says
"I'm no going back in
You should hear the swears of them in
there"
she says
"They don't swear in the finishing room"
I says
"Do they no?
You want to come and hear them"
so there were a big woman worked with
her
she was an Italian girl -- Ina Solotti
and Ina Solotti says
"Who said the finishing room didnae
swear Mary?"
my mother says
"Me"
"Well" she says
"we've nothing on them
away you go and listen to them at their
door" she says
"and you'll get the shock of your life
Who was swearing at you hen" she says
and she was a great big woman
she was aboot eighteen stone
I says
"Jean MacPherson and Dorothy Thompson"
"Ah well" she says
"I'll go oot to them"
so on goes the cap again
and away she crosses the yaird
and what she gied these two lassies
was naebody's business

This passage illustrates the effective use of repetition
as a rhetorical device in lines 1239, 1241, and 1243 in
which no going back in there is repeated with appropriate
deictic shifts by both speakers (cf. Tannen 1987). (There are even more striking examples elsewhere in the narrative but they are not relevant to the present discussion.) Laidlaw at many places in the interview stresses that she was brought up very strictly by her mother. In this narrative she shows that her mother was not always right in her assessment of situations and she brings out the full force of this judgement by putting it in the mouth of Ina Solotti. Laidlaw had already described the conditions under which she had to work but the exchange between Ina Solotti and Laidlaw's mother emphasises the extent of the latter's misjudgement: *We've nothing on them*. Note Ina Solotti's question in line 1253 *Who said the finishing room didnae swear Mary?* This echoes the mother's remark in line 1246 *they don't swear in the finishing room*. This is the kind of clarification request preceding disagreement that Pomerantz (1984: 71) notes in conversational exchange. She also remarks:

"Disagreement components may also be delayed within turns. Conversants start the turns in which they will disagree in some systematic ways. One way consists of prefacing the disagreement with 'uhh', 'well's', and the like, thus displaying reluctance or discomfort."

[Pomerantz 1984: 72]

Ina Solotti prefices her disagreement in lines 1256-57 with *well*: *"Well" she says "we've nothing on them"*. It is significant that speakers in reporting the speech of others include discourse markers such as *well*. (See below on other examples of the use of discourse markers in quoted direct speech.) The function of embedded evaluation is one of the most frequent uses of quoted direct speech, presumably because responsibility for the remark is clearly attributed to someone other than the speaker. As Vološinov observes:

"Reported speech is regarded by the speaker as an utterance belonging to *someone else*, an utterance that was originally totally independent, complete in its construction, and lying outside the given context. Now, it is from this independent existence that reported speech is transposed into an authorial
WG1075 his parents -- are -- ah-- are -- em -- sort of
1076 [coughs] at least his father is a self-
made man
1077 who's now quite wealthy
1078 his mother is a very -- uh -- brilliant char-- mind and
1079 but the father -- still -- speaks -- sort of--
1080 I was up at the house recently in Troon
1081 and -- eh-- we were wanting
1082 to use his -- recording gear for something
1083 and he was
1084 [imitating] "Oh just a minute noo
1085 I can get the plug" and so on
1086 "Now here we are
1087 now boys"
1088 quite a wealthy man
1089 but he speaks like that
1090 but mother [imitating] talks like that
1091 "You know Mr Gibson"
1092 and Douglas said
1093 "Oh it irritates me
1094 she's a nice person mother
1095 but she puts on this voice"
1096 he says
1097 "I like my father better
1098 because he doesn't cover up"

In this passage Gibson imitates three speakers, the father, the mother, and Douglas, the son, quite successfully, though the transcript (the imitated sections are underlined) does not bring this out. Gibson's use of the three forms is similar to the use of parodied sociolects found in Scottish comedians (Macaulay 1987a). It is clear that Gibson identifies with the form of speech he uses for Douglas which lies between the affected form used by the mother and the lower-class form used by the father. Gibson goes on to tell of a visit to a miner's family and he imitates their form of speech and also, briefly, that of an English curate's wife whose speech is in high contrast to that of the miner's family. Gibson himself claims to use a wide variety of speaking styles from "an almost RP at times... down to speaking quite Scots" [3]. His use of quoted direct speech, which is
quite frequent in his interview, allows him to demonstrate this in a number of quite different situations. His mimicry of lower-class speech is quite effective, employing intonation and voice quality as well phonologically marked forms. His mimicry of the mother's affected speech and of the Englishwoman is very brief and closer to parody than a realistic imitation.

Quoted direct speech allows the speaker to show knowledge of linguistic features that he or she does not normally use in the interview situation. Duncan Nicoll is the only middle-class speaker who occasionally uses the negative clitic -nae instead of the expected n't. All the lower-class speakers variably use forms such as wasn'ae, doesnae, and couldnae where the middle-class speakers use wasn't, doesn't, and couldn't. Most of Nicoll's examples come in quoted direct speech, as shown in (8):

(8)

```
DN119  I said
     120 "Would you like
     121 to go to the castle?"
     122 "Ah but mister" they said
     123 the castle's shut"
     124 "Oh" I said
     125 "I know the man --
     126 that's got the key"
     127 "Oh that would be fine
     128 but we cannæ walk"
     129 it's a fair walk up to the castle
     130 I said
     131 "Oh but I --
     132 we'll get the cars up to the front door"
     133 "But you cannæ get
     134 doing that mister"
     135 I said
     136 "Oh I know the man
     137 that lets you up to the door" you see
     138 so we got them up
     139 and got the door opened
```

Here in lines 128 and 133 Nicoll demonstrates his familiarity with lower-class speech. Presumably all the middle-class respondents could have done this but it is only Nicoll and Gibson who do. In this case Nicoll appears to be having a little bit of fun at the expense of "the old decrepit people" (as he had earlier described
them who have come to visit the castle. He knows that I know he is the man with the key and with the authority to let the cars go up to the door, but tells the story as if he had concealed this information from the pensioners. It could be argued that he is simply being modest with them in not explaining to them that he is the man in charge, but the way in which he quotes their remarks suggests that he is really scoring points off them because of their ignorance. The pensioners statements underline their helplessness in the face of physical handicap ("we cannæe walk") and unresponsive authority ("the castle's shut", "you cannæe get doing that"). Their form of address ("mister") indicates politeness but no great respect. If they had known he was the man in charge, they would not have addressed him in that way. The story that Nicoll is telling is actually one that shows him in a good light. He was kind to these old people and they appreciated it but the quoted direct speech, both his own and that of the old people, reveal an undercurrent of a slightly patronising attitude. This is brought out by the conclusion to the narrative:

(9) DN149 we came to the going away
150 and I'm standing with -- er --
151 one of my friends-- a very dear friend of mine had on her arm a terribly crippled bent old woman
152 and as she passed me
153 she said
154 "Good night Your Highness"
155 [nods slightly] just her head
156 she couldnæe move -- just her head
157 it was wonderful
158 it made the day

This is perhaps how Nicoll wanted to be addressed, "Your Highness" not just "Mister". Although he tells it as a joke, it may help to explain the undercurrent of the earlier use of quoted speech. Among the middle-class speakers, Gibson and Nicoll display a particular ability to mimic and their narratives are populated by a wide variety of individuals speaking in character, where the purpose of the mimicry is to draw attention to the form of speech. As it happens, in the Ayr interviews it is only the middle-class speakers who
mimic the lower-class speakers, never the reverse. This asymmetry may be accidental since I have recorded examples of lower-class speakers mimicking middle-class speech elsewhere, but it is also probable that middle-class respondents feel more comfortable imitating lower-class speech in the presence of a middle-class interviewer than lower-class speakers in the complementary situation. It is also likely that the salient features of lower-class speech are easier for middle-class speakers to reproduce than the less marked characteristics of middle-class speech are for lower-class speakers. Goffman (1974: 537) suggests that there are "rules of mimicry" that vary "from culture to culture and within a speech community from one category of speaker to another". This is a question that deserves more attention than it can be given here. (4)

d) Taboo expressions

Quoted direct speech can also include the use of taboo expressions that might not otherwise be considered appropriate in the interview situation. On several occasions one of the lower-class speakers, Sinclair, an ex-coal-miner, hints at stories but claims "oh there's some of them too crude to be told". (It is at such moments that one wishes the interview were taking place in the evening over a glass or two of beer rather than in the afternoon with a cup of tea.) Almost at the end of the interview, however, Sinclair refers to the kind of "great characters" there used to be in the neighbourhood:

(10)

3632 you were maybe sitting
3633 and you say
3634 if you done this or that
3635 and Davie used to say
3636 "Ah but if the wee bird didnae shite
3637 it would burst"
3639 you know I mean this was one of his great sayings

There is only one other taboo expression in Sinclair's long interview and it also comes in quoted direct speech.
Sinclair would not have used the word *shite* (the long vowel is normal in Ayrshire speech) as part of his non-narrative speech in the interview. As Goffman asks in connection with what he calls "censorship rules", "In quoting another's use of curse words and other taboo utterances some license is provided beyond what the speaker can employ on his own behalf, but where does this license stop?" (1974: 539). The few examples of taboo expressions that occur in the Ayr interviews come in quoted direct speech, but they are all relatively mild. This example from Sinclair is the strongest.

**e) Authenticity**

The assumption underlying the use of quoted direct speech in narratives is that the speaker is reporting what was actually said. The quoted speech in (10) is not part of a narrative but an example of one of Davie's "great sayings". In examples such as (10) it can be assumed that the report is accurate since it is the saying itself which is the point of the example. In narratives, however, the quoted remarks are part of the action of the narrative and have same standing as the other narrative events reported. The validation for Nicoll's report that the old lady said "Good night Your Highness" is exactly the same as that for the report that she nodded her head. Nicoll is reporting on what he heard and saw. Since the remark is short and the point depends upon the form of address, the listener has no reason to question its validity. With longer utterances, the validation may be less obvious.

In certain situations it is reasonable to suppose that the words themselves were so memorable as to stick in the speaker's memory. There is some evidence that people have a substantial memory for surface structure and not just meaning in experiments testing recall of dialogue (Bates, Masling, and Kintsch 1978; Hjelmquist 1984). If this can happen in experimental situations where there is no emotional involvement, it is perhaps not surprising that speakers should be able to recall specific remarks that made an impression on them. Tannen argues against this view. She claims that "what is commonly referred to as reported speech or direct quotation in conversation is constructed dialogue, just as surely as is the dialogue
created by fiction writers and playwrights" (1986: 311). Unfortunately, it is equally hard to show that quoted direct speech is always constructed as it is show that it has been recalled accurately. There are some situations in which the reported speech is more plausible and some in which it is less. In (11) Walter Lang is telling of an accident that happened in the pit to a man who had been having problems because his wife was not paying their bills:

(11)

WL758 I'll never forget the look on his face
759 when I went up
760 he was lying you see
761 so I row'd up his troosers [i.e. rolled]
762 "Oh" I says
763 "Jackie, your leg's broken"
764 "Oh no, Willie
765 it cannae be
766 it cannae be broken"
767 says I
768 "Jackie your leg's broken
769 make no mistake aboot that"
770 "Oh" he says
771 "it cannae be" he says
772 "this is the end of the quarter"
773 this was the Cooperative
774 "The end of the quarter as sure as I never move"
775 that's the words
776 that wee man said
777 and I could see you know the hunted look on his face
778 it just couldnae be
779 because he'd
780 to pay this Cooperative there at the quarter
781 that was a fact

In addition to Lang's explicit claim "that's the words that wee man said", the point of the story is the problem with paying the bills not the injury itself so the quoted speech is integral to the story and not merely a way of making it more dramatic. The essential point is not whether Lang is recalling the actual words Jackie used, although it is possible that he is (cf. Goodwin 1982:801).
The rhetorical structure of the narrative with its counterpoint of repetitions clearly make this a well-told story:

(12)

763 Jackie your leg's broken
765 it cannae be broken
768 Jackie your leg's broken

765 it cannae be
766 it cannae be broken
771 it cannae be
778 it just couldn't be

772 this is the end of the quarter
774 the end of the quarter as sure as I
never move
780 to pay this Cooperative there at the
quarter

775 that's the words
776 that wee man said
781 that was a fact

758 I'll never forget the look on his face
777 and I could see you know the hunted look
on his face

Regardless of the source of the quoted speech Lang has succeeded in telling the story effectively and that provides the validation, since the quoted speech is fully integrated into the telling.

In some cases the validation is more complicated. Laidlaw narrates the story of how her father died unexpectedly, "he just lay doon on the settee and turned over and that was him gone". She goes on to tell how her mother had left her father sitting in the garden while she went into town to shop for groceries:
and it was an exceptionally good afternoon
and she put him out in a basket chair
sitting at the window outside in the garden
she went in on the one bus
and came back on the same bus
because the conductress says to her
"Thought you said
you were going for messages" [shopping]
she says
"So I was"
"Well" she says
I'm awful glad
I'm no waiting on you" she says
"You couldn't have got much
because you've got the same bus back"
"Ach well" she says
I don't like the idea
of leaving him too long"
and she went up the road
she noticed
his basket chair was there
but he wasn't there
she never thought anything about it
because it was too warm
she thought
he'd naturally gone inside
and when she went in
he was lying on the settee
and she's auld-fashioned very tidy very smart
everything had to go in its place
she took off her coat
hung it up
put away her shopping bag
and she says
"It's rather early for our tea -- our dinner
so I'll go and ask him
if he wants a coffee"
and she made the coffee
and she went through
and shook him
to ask him
if he wanted tea
and he dropped off the settee in front of her
and she just--
her mind just broke
and she's never known
what it is since
This is an extraordinary story. Presumably, Laidlaw herself was not present during any of the events she narrates. The only source could have been her mother. So even if "her mind just broke", she must have been coherent enough to tell what had happened, if we are accept the quoted direct speech at its face value. It is also a story full of detail:

(14) 3617 she took off her coat  
3618 hung it up  
3619 put away her shopping bag

Laidlaw also relates her mother's thoughts, both in oratio obliqua, "she noticed his basket chair was there", "she never thought anything about it", "she thought he'd naturally gone inside" (with the transposed tense he'd), and in oratio recta, "It's rather early for our tea" etc. It is the section in lines 3591-3603, however, that is most remarkable. Laidlaw could only have known about this exchange if her mother had told her. The story could have been told without these lines since they do not advance the action, which has already been fully described: "she went in on the one bus and came back on the same bus". What the dialogue with the conductress provides, however, is the dramatic anticipation of the tragedy "I don't like the idea of leaving him too long". Once again, the quoted speech has an important role to play in the narrative, though it is structurally less crucial to the story than in the previous example from Lang. By the use of quoted direct speech Laidlaw has transformed what would otherwise have been a straightforward third person account of her mother's actions on the day that her father died into a dramatic narrative in which the perspective varies with different speakers.

f) Translation

The validation of the quoted speech may come from the narrator rather than from the speaker to which the speech is attributed. Gemmill is a retired farm laborer who had earlier explained that when he was young he had had no holidays, though after World War II things had been different. Here he is describing his first visit to London with his daughter:
(15)

HG1301 eventually we come to a corner
HG1302 and here there's addresses in this
HG1303 so we're staunning [i.e. standing]
HG1304 looking at this
HG1305 when this woman came along and said
HG1306 what were we looking for
HG1307 and we're looking for somewhaur
HG1308 to stay the night
HG1309 "Where do you come fae?"
HG1310 "Scotland"
HG1311 "You're no feart of coming here without
HG1312 somewhere to stay"
HG1313 so she gi'en us half a dozen addresses

It is highly unlikely that the woman whose speech is quoted is herself Scots. If she had been, the exchange would probably have included some reference to that or questions about which part of Scotland Gemmill and his daughter were from. If the woman had been Scots, that would have been a reportable fact, since it would have been a coincidence the first person who spoke to them was herself Scots. It is even more unlikely that anyone not from Scotland would say *Where do you come fae?* ("Where do you come from?") and *you're no feart* ("You aren't afraid"). In this case it seems obvious that Gemmill is reporting informal speech in the form that is normal for him and not for the speaker to whom the remarks are attributed. This is the mirror image of mimicry. For Gemmill to present the speech of the London woman in an appropriate form he would have had to abandon his normal form of speech. Although he presumably could have attempted this, he does not do so. The reason is probably that, unlike the cases of mimicry, the woman's form of speech is not integral to the story. On the contrary, it is her friendly behavior that is important. Attempting to imitate her form of speech might have implied a critical attitude to that kind of speech or appeared to mock her. Instead, Gemmill employs the most neutral form of speech, his own, regardless of the realism of the quoted speech. Although they are not bracketed by markers other than intonation, there is no way to interpret lines 1309-12 as other than quoted direct speech. There is an obvious contrast with the reported speech in lines 1305-6 with the transposed pronoun *we* compared with the deictic *you* in line 1311. This seems to be a clear example where the use
of quoted direct speech cannot be taken as evidence of the form of the original utterance, though there is no reason to doubt the content. There is a second example a little later in the interview describing another visit to London when Gemmill reports the ticket seller at Euston station as saying:

(16) HG1458 there mair folk nor you
   [i.e. more people than]
   1459 got to go back
   1460 to start their work

This would be more plausible if reported of Glasgow Central station as it certainly is not a typical specimen of London speech. Again, however, the phonological and syntactic form of the speech are irrelevant; it is the content of the utterance that is important for the narrative. By using his normal form of speech Gemmill avoids distracting attention from the main point. It is perhaps worth adding that I do not recall finding these examples of quoted direct speech at all remarkable when Gemmill was telling me the stories. It was only on analyzing them that the discrepancy between the remarks and the speaker to whom they were attributed struck me. In this sense, Gemmill's tactic worked. On the other hand, I was quite aware at the time of the significance of the mimicry employed by Gibson and Nicoll.

g) Self-quotation

Finally, it is interesting that speakers do not use quoted direct speech only to convey the views of others. Speakers quite frequently quote themselves, even when there is no other dialogue and the information could easily have been conveyed in a different form. The example in (17) comes from the interview with Nicoll where he is explaining his problems as a church elder visiting the families in his district, which he admitted was "not the best end". Nicoll has found that it is difficult to get enough quiet in order to be able to "give them the story of the church", as he put it:
and uh it's a job
when you go in
to get them
to put off the television
the minister finds this quite often
that uh he's fighting against the television
but if he does--
I can get--
and I'm sure
he does it too
"Now listen"
I'm only in for ten minutes
will you just switch off that box
I know
it's your favourite programme
but switch it off
I'll go away in ten minutes
and you can get it again"
and you get them
and you give them the story of the church

On many occasions in the interview Nicoll makes it clear that he is an effective speaker and that he is aware of this ability and how important it has been to him in various aspects of his career. Later he explains how he can talk to people on a wide range of subjects:

and you've got
to be able
to talk bookie
you've got
to be able
to talk pub
to talk everything
but having had the width in the hotel business the C_____ business
then you get used to
talking to people
and finding a way

In (18) the first two uses of you in lines 2020 and 2023 are equivalent to the indefinite one but in line 2028 Nicoll is referring to himself in the way that the middle-
class speakers sometimes refer to themselves by one as a less personal form of I (see Macaulay, in prep).

In (17) Nicoll is simply illustrating his skill in a difficult situation in much the same way as he might quote someone else that he admired. This kind of self-quotation thus becomes a kind of distancing whereby Nicoll can present himself as an actor in a scene even though the others present are not given the opportunity to speak (cf. Goffman 1974: 519-20). Nicoll is the speaker who has the highest proportion of quoted direct speech in the total sample and more than half of that consists of his own remarks, though usually his remarks form part of a dialogue with other speakers.

4. Problematic uses

There are occasions when the use of quoted direct speech is more problematic. Later in the story about his job on the farm than the part given in (1) Sinclair reports his response to the farmer's question:

(19)

AS407 and --eh -- I said
408 I would like it fine anyway
409 and well he says
410 "Think
411 and ask your mother"" you see -- eh
412 "See
413 what they say at it
414 and tell her" he says
415 "you've fifteen shillings a week"
416 so I went hame with the milk
417 and I told my mother and faither
418 what was said and that
419 and they said
420 "Well if you want
421 to start there
422 you can start"
423 so I sterted work on the ferm the next
day --eh-- and that

Although, as pointed out earlier, this was an important event in Sinclair's life, the form of the farmer's remarks is not a crucial part of the story and nothing critical hinges upon their being reported accurately. Yet they
sound convincing both in the preposition in see what they say at it and in the pronoun switching in tell her. In Sinclair's interview and in other lower-class interviews it is clear that it is the mother who is responsible for the family finances and she is the one who gets any money earned by the children, so the pronoun switch in line 414 is appropriate. Both mother and father are to be consulted about the possibility of Sinclair's working on the farm but it is the mother who would need to know how much money he would earn. If Sinclair is not repeating what the farmer actually said he has managed to create a plausible imitation.

The remark attributed to his mother and father well if you want to start there you can start is less convincing. In the first place it is an improbable remark in itself. It seems more like the summary of an exchange which might have included the direct question Do you want to start there? Its implausibility is reinforced by the introducing verb they said since it is highly unlikely that "they" both uttered it (in unison? in sequence?). There is also the contrast between start in lines 421-22 and started in line 423. This is the reverse of a sequence earlier in the same story:

(20)
AS379 "How would you like
380 to start here?"
381 well I would have liked
382 to have started at the farm

The form start for start is the traditional dialect form (see Macaulay 1987c) and Sinclair fluctuates in his choice both here and elsewhere in the interview. The question that arises in lines 421-23 in (19) is whether the contrast between start and started is deliberate. In (20) it is natural that the farmer should be reported as using start in speaking to the boy while Sinclair in addressing his middle-class interviewer uses start, but it is less obvious why the use should be reversed in lines 421-23 in (19). One possibility is that Sinclair's parents actually used the form start and not started, or at least that his mother did, and he is accurately reporting what she said (or what she might have said, since the truth is not the issue). Another possibility is that the use of start in lines 421-22 indicates either in the original discourse or in the narrative a formality of diction appropriate for a
serious decision. The third possibility is that it marks the transition from the quoted speech to Sinclair's narrative speech. It is also possible that there is no narrative significance to the switch and that the two forms are in this respect in free variation for Sinclair. This last possibility is the least satisfying explanation but there is a similar alternation in another story that Sinclair told near the end of the interview. (The whole story is reproduced in Macaulay 1985: 117-19.) In this story Sinclair three times refers to a remark made by his father about not buying him a drink:

(21)

AS3512 my father bought a round of drinks after the meal
3513 there wasnae one for me you see
3514 and one of the men happened to comment
3515 he says
3517 "Bob" he says
3518 "you forgot the boy"
3519 he says
3520 "No" he says
3521 "I didnae forget the boy" he says
3522 he says
3523 "If he wants a drink" he says
3524 "he'll buy it"
3525 but I'm no buying him one"

Since Sinclair was an adult at this time and a member of the group that was on their way to a race meeting, it would be normal for someone buying a round of drinks to include him. One of the men obviously notices this and "happens" to comment on it. The references to the boy meaning "your son"/"my son" are normal forms of familial reference in this speech variety (see Macaulay, in prep). This is a story that Sinclair told me to illustrate how things had changed since he was young when "you knew your place" and did not expect to be treated as an equal by adults immediately after leaving school. The point of the story is that his father would not object if Sinclair had a drink but he was not going to encourage him by buying him one. Sinclair was apparently anxious that I should get the point of the story because he repeats the main point twice:
AS3538 and he says
3539 "Well I'm no buying him a drink
3540 because I don't believe in it
3541 but if he wants *vin"  
3542 as much as to say
3543 "Well if he wants *vin
3544 he can have *vin
3545 but I'm no buying him it"

[22 lines omitted]

3567 he didnae say
3568 "Don't drink"
3569 but he says
3570 "I'm no buying you *one"

Lines 3523-25 in (21) give the original remark as quoted in the context of the story and the indefinite pronoun is *one*. Lines 3539-45 in (22) although reported as quoted direct speech are in fact a paraphrase of what his father said (and meant); the indefinite pronoun, used three times, is *vin*. Lines 3568-70 in (22) are a rephrasing of the paraphrase with a change of the personal pronoun from *him* to *you*, and the indefinite pronoun is again *one*. This is a puzzling situation which it would have been easier to explain if *vin* had been used in (21), the original version, and *one* for the other examples in (22) where Sinclair is clearly rephrasing the original remark for my benefit. As it is, the switch in (21-22), like that in (19), raises questions about the significance of the differences. Sinclair is the lower-class speaker who makes the greatest accommodation to the interview situation so that it is tempting to look for significance in the kind of switches shown here, but the explanation is not obvious.

A different kind of example comes from the interview with Laidlaw, who is the other lower-class speaker to show extensive variability during the interview. She quotes her singing teacher at primary school:
(23)
EL517 when you went for singing
      518 he used to say
      519 "Annie Laurie?
      520 Annie Laurie would dee
      521 she would die in her box" he says
      522 "If she heard youse
      523 there none of youse can sing" he would
      shout at us

Laidlaw uses *none* (for *none*) only twice elsewhere in the
interview and this is her only use of *dee* (for *die*),
although both *none* and *dee* are common in lower-class
speech. It is interesting that she should quote a teacher
as using these forms and also the stigmatized plural form
*youse*. It is minimally credible that a primary teacher at
that time could have used these forms in addressing the
children but it would not have been the expected form of
speech. It is also possible that Laidlaw has translated
what the teacher said into how she might have heard it as
a child even if the teacher had used middle-class forms.
Later in the same story, however, Laidlaw tells how she
had got into trouble for making up words about this
teacher and being overheard singing them by the teacher
himself:

(24)
EL564 the following morning we goes in
      565 he's standing
      566 and he says
      567 "Right Miss Dunlop
      [Laidlaw's maiden name]
      568 upstairs to Mr Walker"
      569 that was the headmaster
      570 up the stair we went
      571 and that boy-- unfortunately that boy
      Patterson was among them
      572 and he
      573 "Please sir we didnae sing it
      574 it was just her"
      575 they were that loyal [laughs]
      576 because we were all petrified of him
      577 "Youse were all singing"
      578 "No sir we didnae say the words
      579 it was Ella Dunlop
      580 that said the words"
so Ella Dunlop got into trouble
and when Mr Walker the master he says to me
"Repeat what you said Ella"
and when I repeated it
he couldn't strap me
for laughing
he says
"You must admit" he says
"Mr Kerr" he says
"there's something
she must be a bit of a poet" [laughs]
I wasn't a bit of a poet
I thought I was being funny

Once again Laidlaw reports the teacher as using *youse* (in line 577) but she reports the headmaster as using a very different kind of language. Although Laidlaw does not try to mimic him, she uses a different voice quality, suggesting a more typically middle-class speaker. She also reports the headmaster as using epistemic *must*, a form which is rare in the lower-class interviews and more common in the interviews with the middle-class speakers. This suggests that the contrast between the teacher's language and the headmaster's is not accidental and therefore the use of *nane*, *youse*, and *dee* in (23) may be significant.

There remains a puzzle in (23). The change from *dee* in line 520 to *die* in line 521 is hard to interpret. It does not appear to be Laidlaw's repair, changing to a middle-class form of speech more appropriate for a teacher since she quotes him as using *nane* and *youse* in the next two lines. It could be the teacher's own self-repair but line 521 is not an obvious repair of line 520. In fact, she would die in her box seems more like a mis-statement for something like she would turn in her grave. If so, there is no way to know whether the fault lies with Laidlaw or the original speaker, but if Laidlaw is actually remembering accurately, this would a rare case of quoting a self-repair though the oddness of the remark might account for its memorability.
5. Linguistic characteristics of quoted direct speech

It was pointed out in section 3 (b) above that the use of the discourse marker well in quoted direct speech corresponds to its use in actual conversation. An even more striking example is the use of oh as a turn-taking signal. Schiffrin (1987: 73-101) has pointed out the role of oh as a marker of information management, including shifts in speaker orientation. There are 60 examples of oh in quoted direct speech in the Ayr interviews and they all mark a change of speaker. This is particularly important when there is no reporting verb to bracket the quoted speech. The following example comes from the interview with Willie Rae, another coal miner:

(25)

WR145 and the auld yin says to him
146 "Whaur are you going?"
147 he says
148 "I'm going to my work"
149 "Oh you got a job?"
150 "Aye"
151 "Whit are you daeing?"
152 says
153 "I'm labouring tae a bricklayer in
the town"
154 "Oh very good
155 away and get your bus" he says

In lines 149 and 154 oh is turn-initial and marks a change of speaker that is not otherwise signalled. It is remarkable that speakers in quoting direct speech include such items as oh and well which have clear discourse functions which would not be contained in a paraphrase of the propositional content of the utterance or in reported speech (oratio obliqua). On the other hand, speakers less frequently include the discourse markers you know or I mean, which refer to hearer and speaker participation. Polanyi (1985: 195) points out that the pronouns in you know and I mean when used in the course of a narrative will be taken to refer to the teller and the listener and not to anyone in the storyworld. This suggests that quoted direct speech has its own properties, distinct from other forms of speech.
One example of this can be seen in the syntactic structure of quoted direct speech. In a comparison between sections containing quoted direct speech and the interviews as a whole, there is a considerable difference in the frequency of coordinate clauses which make up only 10% of the total syntactic structures in quoted direct speech compared with 26% in the interviews as a whole. Since coordinate clauses are particularly important in maintaining the floor and extending a turn, it is perhaps not surprising that they should be less frequent in quoted direct speech. Speakers seldom report themselves or others as having long turns. Instead, there are frequently adjacency pairs such as question and response. This can be seen in the much higher proportion of questions in quoted direct speech (11%), compared with less than 2% in the interviews as a whole. The interactive nature of quoted direct speech is also seen in the high proportion of imperatives (7%), compared with 0.3% in the remainder of the interviews. Quoted direct speech thus reveals much more interaction than the speech in the rest of the interview.

6. Conclusion

The use of quoted direct speech adds liveliness to a narrative, it provides the possibility of a different perspective, and it can give an impression of authentic recollection of an event, though it would be unwise to assume that it necessarily reports the actual words used. By appearing to quote the actual words said, the speaker is giving the listener the opportunity to interpret the statement without the risk of it being distorted by the form in which it is reported. More importantly, the speaker can quote someone else as saying things in a way that present the speaker in a favourable light, whereas in a summarised form that implication might be lost, unless stated explicitly in which case the speaker might be perceived to be boasting. Like many other features of discourse it is a rhetorical device. Its widespread effectiveness is a reflection of the skill which many speakers have of recreating dramatic dialogue that is appropriate to the protagonists and the scene. As Polanyi has remarked:
"... both for literary artists and everyday tellers, the problem of finding a place to stand in order to report the goings on in another world while carrying out one's role as a competent and trustworthy member of society (who cannot know what he or she could not know, for example) is a problem of telling and not the locus of 'verbal art'."

[Polanyi 1982: 169]

Quoted direct speech allows the speaker an additional stance.

As Abercomble (1965: 2) has observed, "monologue" is a very specialized use of spoken language and has "certain distinguishing linguistic, including phonetic, peculiarities" which set it off from other uses of language. The speech in the best of the Ayr interviews approaches close to monologue. In my interviewing I tried to say as little as possible leaving it to the respondent to feel the responsibility of filling in the silence. It turns out that there is an inverse relationship between the number of questions I asked and the success of the interview. In the shortest interviews I asked the most questions and received the shortest responses. In the most successful interviews the respondents took advantage of extended turns to tell stories which include quoted direct speech. In four of the interviews more than ten percent of the speaker's interview consists of quoted direct speech.

This frequent use of speech attributed to others allows the language of the interview to become "polyphonic" in Bakhtin's sense (Bakhtin 1973:4). Instead of a single point of view, the speaker is able to present different perspectives while retaining control of the discourse. To quote Vološinov again:

"Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance."

[Vološinov 1986: 115, emphasis in original]

The purpose of this paper has been to examine the use of quoted direct speech in the Ayr interviews. It has been shown that speakers use quoted direct speech to provide
internal or embedded evaluation, to display knowledge of and attitudes towards other forms of speech, to make claims about successes or skills indirectly, and to add credibility to a narrative. The use of quoted direct speech, however, is no guarantee of its accuracy since speakers may quote others as using forms that are improbable in the context. The language used in quoted direct speech differs most from that of the rest of the interview in containing more questions and imperatives and fewer examples of coordinate clauses. This reflects the more interactional nature of the quoted speech and the fact that speakers do not use direct quoted speech as a way of telling extended narratives. Speakers also display an ability to reproduce turn-taking signals in reporting dialogue. In their use of quoted direct speech, speakers reveal in many ways their knowledge about the use of speech within their community.

NOTES

* I am grateful to Charles Goodwin and Alessandro Duranti for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. The research on which it is based was supported by the Research and Awards Committee of Pitzer College and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

[1] While this is not the place to discuss the point in detail, I fully agree with Ochs that any transcript must be selective:

"One of the important features of a transcript is that it should not have too much information. A transcript that is too detailed is difficult to follow."

[Ochs 1979: 44]

Of course, it remains an empirical point to decide what is "too much". My preference is for the simplest possible transcription, a decision that others may find frustrating or perverse.

[2] Following the general policy on transcription (see previous note), I have included my responses only where they are relevant to the point under discussion. Back channel responses are worthy of separate study (Duncan 1974) but are not the focus of this paper. Moreover, as pointed out in the body of the paper, I made a conscious
effort to limit my speech, leaving the speaker with the obligation to fill up the silence.

[3] RP is the abbreviation for Received Pronunciation, the class-marked accent of the English upper classes which is frequently suggested as a model of pronunciation. See Macaulay (in press) for a jaundiced view of this phenomenon.

[4] Mitchell-Kernan describes the form of mimicry known as marking in Afro-American speech:

"The marker attempts to report not only what was said but the way it was said, in order to offer implicit comment on the speaker's background, personality, or intent.... His performance may be more in the nature of parody and caricature than true imitation. But the features selected to overplay are those which are associated with membership in some class.... Perhaps more than anything, marking exhibits a finely tuned linguistic awareness in some areas and a good deal of verbal virtuosity in being able to reproduce aspects of speech which are useful in this kind of metaphorical communication."


She also observes: "In a linguistic community which is bilingual or bidialectal, the code in which messages are conveyed is likely to be highly salient both to members of the community and to the ethnographer" (1972: 163). Although I would not call the situation in Ayr bidialectal, certain aspects of lower-class speech are highly salient and it is these features that are likely to be used in mimicry.
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