THE PRAGMA-IDEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF USING REPORTED SPEECH[1]: THE CASE OF REPORTING ON THE AL-AQSA INTIFADA[2]

Nawaf Obiedat

Abstract

From a systemic linguistics perspective, this paper investigates, via a corpus discourse analysis of news stories, the news reporters' purposes and intentions of using direct and/or indirect quotations (henceforth DQs & IQs) in news reporting. By randomly selecting and analysing a number of news stories taken from two leading American and two leading British newspapers, reporting the same two incidents of killing resulting from the al-Aqsa Intifada, this study reveals the following:
1. DQs are used to add some flavour, vividness and a sense of immediacy and authority to the news story that can be manipulated in such a way as to achieve a variety of certain socio-political ends, e.g. to make a mere viewpoint seem authoritative rather than personal (in our case the newsmaker's).
2. DQs function as a distancing and a disowning device, i.e. absolving the journalist/the news reporter from endorsement of what the source, i.e. the newsmaker, has said.
3. DQs are also used to show that what is reported is an unconvertible fact, despite the fact that a news reporter may take sides by selecting quotations, and may thus exhibit a biased and prejudiced position.
      As for the use of IQs, this study also reveals the following:
1. They show the subjective perspective of the news reporter, since he/she merely paraphrases and gives a summary of the content of what has been recorded, written or uttered by the newsmaker.
2. They indicate the political bias and prejudice of the news reporter.
3. They sometimes present an ambiguous account of what has been recorded, written or uttered by the newsmaker, since the news reporter only presents an interpretation, as in the cases of free direct & indirect quotations (henceforth FDQs & FIQs).
        However, IQs, and to a lesser extent DQs, can also serve the news reporter, by means of manipulating the pragma-linguistic functions of the reporting/projecting verbs, in assessing and evaluating both the socio-political stance and status of the newsmaker, in addition to exposing the political bias of the news reporter him-/herself.

Keywords: Political language, Subjective and objective perspectives, Elite-type newsmakers, Intertextuality, Evidentiality, Pragma-linguistic functions of verbs, Distancing & disowning devices.

---

[1] Throughout this study, the term "reported speech", is used as a shorthand for all types of quotations, whether direct, indirect, free direct or free indirect quotations.

[2] An earlier version of this paper was read at the 9th International Pragmatics Conference of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA) which was held in Riva del Garda (Italy), 10-15 July 2005.

0. Introduction

This paper discusses, on the basis of a quantitative corpus analysis, the pragma-ideological implications of the news reporters' use of reported speech (DQs & IQs) in news stories. To accomplish this objective, the paper starts with a theoretical linguistic background that explains the linguistic and communicative features of reported speech from a syntactic, a pragmatic and a discourse perspective, followed by a discussion of the nature and use of reported speech in journalistic discourse (cf. sections 1 and 2 below).

Then the paper proceeds to analyse the corpus which consists of eight news stories taken from four well-known and widely read newspapers, reporting the same two incidents of killing of a Palestinian leader and an Israeli leader (cf. section 3 below). In section 4 of this paper, the data are analysed from a pragma-ideological point of view. The paper concludes with a rather pessimistic view of how news reporters frame news stories in such a way as to convince their readership of the validity and truthfulness of the version they present (cf. section 5 below).

1. A theoretical linguistic background.

From a systemic linguistics perspective, i.e. functional grammar, Halliday has treated the issue of DQ and IQ under the topic of *projection* which he defines as a "logico-semantic relationship, whereby a clause comes to function not as a direct representation of a non-linguistic experience but as a representation of a linguistic representation" (1985: 227-228). In this respect, the relationship between clauses can be interpreted in terms of the logical components of the linguistic system, i.e. the functional-semantic relations that make up the logic of natural language. Halliday (1985) has also pointed out that there are two dimensions to this interpretation. The first is that of the system of interdependency or "tactic" system, i.e., *paratactic* and *hypotactic*, which is general to all complexes, e.g. words, groups, phrases and clauses alike. The second is that of the logico-semantic system of *expansion* and *projection*, which is a specific and an inter-clausal relation or rather, a relationship between processes which is usually (but not always) expressed in functional grammar as a complex clause.

In this sense, therefore, projection combines with the same set of interdependencies that occur with expansion, namely parataxis and hypotaxis. Thus, in an example like:

(1) Amr said, "Zaid is ambitious",

the quotation "Zaid is ambitious", represents a projected (quoted/reported) clause, which holds a paratactic relationship that is considered the simplest form of projection. On the one hand, the projecting, i.e. the reporting/quoting clause ('Amr said') is a verbal process, i.e. one of saying, in the Hallidayan systemic formulation, whereas, on the other, the projected clause represents that which is being said by Zaid.

As for the nature of each of the two clauses of the DQ in example 1 above, i.e. the projecting and the projected, the former ('Amr said') represents an ordinary phenomenon of experience, whereas the latter ("Zaid is ambitious") stands for 'wording', i.e., the

phenomenon it represents is a lexicogrammatical one, and represents an ordinary phenomenon of experience, i.e. a second-order phenomenon, so to speak, of something that is itself a representation. The latter, i.e. the projected clause, is also referred to by Halliday (e.g. 1985) as a 'metaphenomenon', since, according to him, the issue is not whether 'Zaid is ambitious or not', but, rather, whether 'Amr' has said those very words or not. The total structure, therefore, is that of a paratactic clause complex in which the logico-semantic relationship is one of projection in which the projecting clause is a verbal process and the projected clause has the status of wording.

In quoting a thought, however, the thought is represented as if it were a wording, beginning the projecting clause with a mental process verb, in Halliday's systemic formulation, and ending the clause complex with the projected clause which quotes the idea, as in:

(2) Zaid thought, "I'll just ask."

Here the implication is "Zaid said to himself", an expression that is often used, recognizing the fact that one thinks in words. However, only certain mental verbs are regularly used to quote this way such as *think, wonder, reflect,* and *surmise*, among a few others.

Unlike DQ, an IQ can be 'reported as a saying' by representing it as a meaning and not as a wording, which is referred to in the books of traditional grammar as 'reported/indirect speech'. Here, the relationship between the projecting clause and the projected clause is that of a hypotactic representation, i.e. that of dependency. But the principle behind this hypotactic representation of a verbal process is not, in fact, being presented as true to the wording; the reporter (in our case, the news reporter) is reporting the gist, so to speak, of what has been said by the original speaker (in our case, the newsmaker), and the wording may be quite different from the original (cf. 3c below), as in the following conversation between Zaid, Amr and a bystander:

(3a) Zaid said, "This typewriter does not work; you have to get it repaired."
(3b) Amr asked the bystander, "What did he say?"
(3c) The bystander said that he says it needs mending.

The above discussion does not suggest that when the speaker/the news reporter uses the paratactic, 'direct' speech form (in our case the DQ), he/she is always repeating the exact words of the source/newsmaker; far from it! But the idealized function of the paratactic structure is to represent the wording, whereas with the hypotaxis, indirect/reported or IQ, the idealized function is to represent the sense, or the gist of what has been uttered. Furthermore, the paratactic projection, e.g. in DQs, preserves the orientation of the projecting clause, which is that of the speaker/newsmaker, whereas in IDQs the deixis shifts and takes on the orientation of the speaker/news reporter.

However, talking is not the only way of using language, as we alluded to earlier; we also use language to think. Hence the process of thinking, i.e. the mental process, in systemic linguistic formulation, can also be used to project, as in:

(4a) Zaid said, "It is raining."
(4b) Zaid thought that it was raining.

In 4b, there is a phenomenon, e.g. 'Zaid thought', and a metaphenomenon, 'that it was raining.' The difference between 4a and 4b is that the projecting clause in 4b is a mental process and the projected clause is that of 'meaning' and not of 'wording' (cf. Halliday 1985), and although it is projected as meaning, yet it is still a phenomenon of language, i.e. a metaphenomenon, but presented at a different level – semantic rather than lexicogrammatical. According to Halliday's systemic formulation, when something is projected as a meaning it has already been 'processed' by the linguistic system, but processed only once and not twice as in the case of a wording like 4a. For 4b the phenomenon of 'the water falling from the sky' is coded as meaning by a mental process of cognition, reflected in the verb 'thought.' By comparison, the verbal process 'said' in 4a represents the same phenomenon of the meaning "it is raining", but it has been recoded to become 'wording'. Thus, the wording in 4a as it were, is twice cooked, in Halliday's systemic formulation of the steps of the grammatical realization of concepts. Hence, when something is projected as meaning, we are not representing 'the very words', because there are no words realized yet[3].

On the basis of the above, one can point out that DQs and IQs are not simply formal variants; they differ in meaning. The difference between them derives from the general semantic distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis as it applies in the particular context of projecting. In a DQ, for instance, the projected clause has an independent status; it is more immediate and lifelike, and this effect is enhanced by the orientation of the deixis, which is that of drama (e.g. an 'I' point of view) and not that of narrative (e.g. a 'he' point of view). An IQ, on the other hand, presents the projected clause as a dependent one. It still makes a choice of mood, but in a form that precludes it from functioning as a move in an exchange, and the speaker, e.g. the news reporter in our case, makes no claim of abiding to the wording[4], as in:

(5a) Zaid asked, "shall we stay here?"
(5b) Zaid asked whether they should stay there.

As for the verbs used in the projecting clauses which are used to project DQ, they include: (1) *say*, the most general and neutral verb for quoting and reporting verbal processes, (2) verbs specific to statements, *tell, remark, observe* etc., and questions, *ask, demand, inquire* etc., (3) verbs combining *say* with some circumstantial element, e.g. *reply, explain*, and (4) verbs with connotations of various kinds, e.g. *insist* (say emphatically), *boast* (say proudly), *stammer* (say with embarrassment). Under point (4), a wide range of verbs can be pressed into service, verbs which are not verbs of saying at all, but which serve, especially in news stories, to suggest attitudes, emotions or expressive gestures that accompany the act of speaking, e.g. *chuckle, breathe, pant, sop, wail, gasp, bellow*.

---

[3] Halliday (1985) points out that when the concept has the status of 'wording', it lies not at one level but at two levels, or rather two removes, from worldly experience, e.g. it has gone two steps in the realization process (i.e. the semantic and the syntactic).

[4] As for FDQ and FIQ, these are discussed and treated in the same way as traditional grammarians have treated them.

Compared with these groups of verbs used in DQs, the verbs used in projecting IQs are more or less the same with two main variations. First, many semantically complex verbs, for rhetorical purposes, are used only in reporting, not in quoting, e.g. *insinuate, imply, remind, hypothesize, deny*, and *claim* (cf. Halliday 1985). Secondly, verbs that are not intrinsically 'saying' verbs are not generally used to report, even though they may be used to quote in news stories. This category of verbs mainly includes behavioural verbs such as *muse* (cf. also group 4 above).

Furthermore, systemic linguists and others (e.g. Quirk et al. 1995; Huddelston et al. 2002) have also identified two secondary modes related to the two primary ones used in reporting, which they call "free direct" and "free indirect" quotations (FDQs & FIQs, respectively). In both sub-modes, they have pointed out that there is no reporting clause. Rather, the act of communication is signalled by the absence of the reporting clause. In the case of FDQs, either the reporting clauses or the quotation marks, or both, are dropped, but the potentialities of direct speech sentence structure (i.e. mood, in Halliday's 1985 systemic formulation), deixis (i.e. personal pronouns, demonstratives, spatial and temporal adverbs), and verb tenses are retained. Thus, the structure of the quoted/reported clause is of a paratactic type, i.e. grammatically and semantically independent, as in:

(6)   Should I tell them now? I thought to myself, or should I wait until they are in a better mood? [FDQ]

By comparison, FIQs are signalled, in addition to the absence of a reporting clause, by a change in deixis, by a backshift in the reported verb tense, and by the fact that the major options of Halliday's (1985) mood structure of the clause are also retained, and, like in FDQs, the structure of the reported clause is also paratactic. Like direct and indirect quotations, also, FDQs & FIQs may report a representation of a mental activity which, by nature, is unspoken and normally involves a report of a supposed mental activity of the speaker, or they may be a representation of a physical activity which, by nature, is spoken, as in:

(7)   He asked himself, should he tell them or wait until they were in a better mood. (FIQ)

As for the distinction between DQs and IQs, Huddleston et al. (2002: 1027) pointed out that, sometimes, the distinction between them is blurred, i.e. it is not always sharply maintained, as in:

(8)   Zaid said that the territory justice system was so biased towards offenders that it was "totally corrupt."

Here, the DQ is inserted into what is primarily known as an indirect report, where the subordinator and the backshifted tense (e.g. was) marks example (8) above as an indirect speech, but the quotation marks around "totally corrupt" indicate that this phrase was used by an original speaker. This difficulty of distinction between the two major categories of reported speech has been investigated by a number of linguists, including Waugh: "there is no ONE good source for the criteria by which direct and indirect

speech are differentiated from each other" ((1995: 167; my emphasis), hence the existence of what is referred to above by free direct and free indirect speech.

From a pragmatic perspective, linguists have found out that among the differences in meaning of speech acts is a difference in the illocutionary slot (cf. Levinson 1983). With regard to DQs, for instance, the declarative clause preserves the illocutionary force of the speech act of the quoted speech. Linguists also pointed out that, in IQs, the meaning of the complementizer 'that' has the role of specifying the functional status of the proposition (cf. Harder 1996). In this respect, Harder pointed out that "while the declarative illocution signals that the proposition is to be understood as conveying a fact 'that' signals that what follows it is a proposition construed as an entity - a situation description with no truth-commitment on the part of the speaker" (Harder 1006: 432). In other words, there is only one declarative speech act in IQs (cf. (4b) above), whereas there are two in DQs (cf. (4a) above). Thus, instead of reproducing the source, i.e. the quoted speech act, (4b) above includes only the content of the reported speech act as an entity.

As for the deictic elements, the difference between DQs and IQs goes with a shift in the space from which they are viewed in the coding. In DQs, the addressee carries out the interpretation based on the original speech situation (i.e. the original speaker Zaid in (5a) above), whereas in IQs the addressee carries out the interpretation based on the reporting speech situation (i.e. the news reporter in (5b) above).

Therefore, part of the story about IQs is that while the ordinary elements are changed from the original speech situation, deictic elements have to be (re)-oriented to reflect the point of view of the report situation (i.e. of the news reporter in our case), like 'I' becoming 'he' and so on. This, however, does not hold in all cases. Referents' identification, which involves deictic elements in the shape of definiteness is, in general, systematically vague between source and report readings with no explicit clues, as illustrated in the following:

(9) Zaid said that <u>the fellow from London</u> was coming.

where we do not know whether the underlined description stems from the original speech situation or that of the reporter's. There are also other ways of sharing between the source and the reporter than the clear-cut deictic or non-deictic division, most famously through FIQs, as in:

(10) He was still thinking of yesterday.

Here, it is only tense and person deixis that can reveal the 'mole' narrator's "report-viewpoint"; he is, so to speak, reporting from a position where he can "spy" on the mental processes of the source subject.

Furthermore, among the special conventions applying to tenses in English in IQs, including FIQs, is the rule which says that when the original speech situation is in the past, the deictic tenses take the reporter's space (rather than the source) as their viewpoint (cf. Quirk et al. 1995; Harder 1996). If we maintain that the past time reference always reflects the reporter's point of view, we sometimes get a reading in which the reporter ignores the original time reference and substitutes it with a new one.

This last account reflects the same referential facts, and is, in that sense, equivalent, as in:

(11)   Zaid said, "Amr is coming".
(11a) Zaid said that Amr is coming.

Such cases of IQs in (11a) are no longer an exception to the basic generalization that present tense in IQs reflects the reporter's present point of view as well as the past, and is motivated by the fact that the reporter intends to let the clause apply to the present as in permanent facts. In addition, examples like (11a) predict that the embedded clause conveys something different from the source clause. The reporter brings the content of the statement up-to-date, i.e. letting it apply to the situation that is relevant in the reported speech situation, and leaves out that part of the original applicability that is now dead and gone. In presenting the information, the reporter surreptitiously edits the content of the source utterance by repeating it in the same tense form. If he merely wanted to report what was said, then he could not repeat the exact words in the new situation.

        According to the above account, the only additional feature needed to account for English deictic tense in IQs is an extra specification with respect to the point of view from which the tense should be understood, i.e. always the reporter's point of view. The updating is an exception not from the point of view of the tense, but because it is a kind of mixing of report and source (i.e. the reported and the original speech situations respectively). The reporter is shedding the obsolete part of the original message in reporting it.

        From a discourse perspective, Fairclough (1995), following in the footsteps of Volosinov (1973 [1929]), identified three aspects of discourse representations in media discourse. First, he suggested a typology of discourse representation built around 'the dynamic interrelationship' of primary and secondary discourse. In one major 'style' of representation, primary and secondary discourse are clearly differentiated (e.g. DQs); in the other, they are merged (e.g. IQs). Second, overlapping with this distinction is another aspect, i.e. overlapping between types of representation which represent, in Hallidayan terms, only the 'ideational' meaning (or 'message') of secondary discourse (e.g. IQs), and types which also represent 'interpersonal' (e.g. stylistic/expressive, e.g. DQ) meaning (cf. Halliday 1978: 112-113). Third, Faiclough also noted that the way in which the secondary discourse is interpreted may be controlled by the way it is contextualized in the primary discourse (cf. 4.1.3 below).

2. The nature of DQs and IQs in journalistic discourse

What characterizes reported speech (DQs and IQs) is that, within one discourse, we cannot only talk about the utterances of another discourse, but we can also represent them. Indeed, reported speech is the main method by which we can overtly represent the utterances of another discourse.

        As human being we can talk about anything of interest to us, i. e. we can speak about anything in the conceptual (e.g. imaginative) and perceptual (e.g. real) worlds which we live in. And most importantly, for the purpose of this study, we can talk about

talking, i.e., we can communicate about communication. In this respect, Volosinov (1973 [1929]: 115) pointed out that "*reported speech is not only speech about speech and utterance about utterance, i.e. discourse about discourse, but is also* [and this is what sets it off from other types of discourse] *a speech within a speech, an utterance within an utterance*" [my italics]. In other words, it is a discourse within a discourse, which necessarily means that there are two discourse events or two speech events at issue, a reporting speech event, i.e. the speech event the report is made of, and the reported speech event, i.e. the speech event about which the report is made[5].

In the case of newspaper reports, a reported speech event includes the reporting speaker (the news reporter), the general public (i.e. the readership) as an addressee, and the spatio-temporal and socio-cultural context in which the report is included (e.g. a newspaper published on a particular date in a particular location of the world with all its presupposed socio-cultural information and its ideological orientation and that of its staff). Most importantly, the reported speech event also includes the reported utterance represented by the reported speech, be it direct or indirect. It also includes the socio-cultural, spatio-temporal context (sometimes overtly expressed and sometimes omitted in a complex interface of presupposed and provided information).

In this respect, Waugh has pointed out a feature that is not common to all uses of reported speech, namely the fact that in journalistic discourse "reported speech attests to the presence of yet a third speech event – a real world, original speech event - and a third utterance, a real-world, referentiality, truth and so forth" (1995: 135). In other words, the interpretation of instances of reported speech requires differentiating three speech events: Reporting, reported and real-/imaginative world. With regard to journalistic discourse, these three events look something like this:

i. Reporting speech event (the journalistic text, i.e. the news report/story), including a reporting utterance,
ii. Reported speech event (represented in the text), including the reported utterance, e.g. direct or indirect.
iii. Original speech event (outside the text), including the original utterance.

In other words, all cases of reported speech in journalistic discourse, or, to be more precise, all cases of reported speech (DQs/ IQs) in which the reality of the original is not explicitly denied, are indexical, i.e. point at the existence of a specific, really existing and original text (outside of the quoting text) which was created by some other real person or persons at a real given time and place, i. e. in a real and an original speech event (cf. de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981).

There is, however, a second way in which reported speech is indexical in journalistic discourse. Not only does reported speech point to a factual utterance outside the reporting text, i.e. to the real world, but it also claims that it is really affected by the object represented in terms of its representation of it. In other words, the particular way in which the reported speech represents the original utterance has something to do with the original utterance itself.

---

[5] By speech event, I mean any case of linguistic communication, including written communication.

From a representational perspective, there are, as mentioned earlier, two major types of reported speech in journalism: DQs and IQs (sometimes called direct and indirect discourse; cf. Waugh 1995). These can, respectively, be exemplified, from the corpus, by the following two examples:

(12) "The man's [Abu-Ali Mustafa] resume is soaked with the blood of his victims", said <u>Raanan Gissin, a spokesman for Prime Minister Ariel Sharon of Israel</u>. (RC. 10, Text- 5: *The Washington Post).*

(13) <u>Sharon Spokesman Arnon Perlman indicated that</u> armed strikes were an option being considered. (RC. 20,Text-1: *The Washington Post)*

With examples like (12) and (13), the reporting speaker purports to bring into the reporting speech event the essential characteristics of the reported event, namely its utterance (message, discourse, text). In this sense, reported speech, direct or indirect, is always intertextual. Where the two differ is in terms of the type of representation (cf. de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). A quick way of characterising the difference between DQ and IQ is by saying that the former claims to demonstrate the original utterance verbatim in the reporting text, while the latter only describes it through a paraphrase of it (cf. examples 12 and 13, respectively).

Since DQs demonstrate, or represent, the words of the reported source speaker, it means that, through metonymy, the voice of that speaker is represented in the text as well. In other words, DQs allow another voice, different from the news reporter's voice, to be expressed in the text, with the mediation of the news reporter him-/herself. Thus, with DQs, "there are at least two voices in the text: The reporter's voice and the reported source speaker's voice, and the reported voice is, thereby, given a certain autonomy"(Maingueneau 1993: 97-98). With IQs, on the other hand, there is only one voice, the news reporter's voice, since he/she speaks for the reported voice which has no autonomy. With a DQ, therefore, it is not only the reported speaker's voice that is displayed by metonymy but also the reported speaker's personality through what he/she says and how he/she says it, as well as the reported speech event itself. This means that, in DQs, the reported speaker is, so to speak, on the scene, immediate in or proximal to the reporting speech event, creating the illusion of a dialogue text (cf. Chafe 1994). By contrast, an IQ does not do this. It describes (i.e. tells about) the reported speaker and the reported speech event, which are thus kept distant, and thus there is no illusion of dialogism (cf. Clark & Gerrig 1990). This cluster of differences between DQs and IQs is functionally related to pragma-ideological correlates, which will be analysed and discussed in section 4 of this paper.

As for the question of intertextuality which was alluded to above, Fairclough (1992) pointed out that intertextuality is basically a property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated (e.g. DQs) or merged in (e.g. IQs), and which the quoting text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, or even distort. In this respect, he identified two major types of intertextuality: "manifest" and "constitutive/interdiscursive"[6]. What concerns us in this study is the manifest type of intertextuality, where other texts are explicitly present in the text under analysis, and are

---

[6] By interdiscursive/constitutive intertextuality, Fairclough (1992: 68-69, 104) means the configuration of discourse conventions that go into the production of the text, where the primacy is given to the orders of the text.

manifestly marked or cued by features on the surface of the text, such as quotation marks. However, a text may 'incorporate' another text without the latter being explicitly cued; i.e. one can respond to another text in the way one words one's own text. For example, someone else's text may be clearly set off from the rest of the original text (in our case, the news story) by means of quotation marks and a reporting verb (e.g. DQs), or it can be unmarked and integrated structurally and stylistically, perhaps through rewording of the original, in the surrounding text (cf. Fairclough 1992: 118-20).

3. Analysis of the data

3.1. *The corpus*

The news stories for this study are randomly selected, via the internet, from four highly reputable newspapers, widely read all over the world, two American and two British. Reports of killing were taken from *The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Daily Telegraph,* and *The Independent*. The reports involve two incidents of killing: (1) the killing of a former Israeli Minister of Tourism, Rehavam Zeevi, on Wednesday 17 October 2001 (texts 1-4), and (2) the assassination of Mustafa Zibri (known as Abu-Ali Mustafa), Leader of the Public Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), who was murdered on Monday 27 August 2001 (texts 5-8)[7].

3.2. *Method of analysis*

For the purpose of the corpus analysis of the news stories, they were segmented and analysed following Halliday's (1985) concepts of the clause complex and of projection.

---

[7] Below are the websites and titles of the news stories that were selected and analyzed for this study.
   A. *The Washington Post: www.washingtonpost.com.* The headlines of the news stories are as follows:
      1. Palestinian Militants Kill Israeli Cabinet Official: Government Gives Arafat an Ultimatum. Oct. 28th , 2001. (Text-1)
      2.   Israel kills Palestinian Activist: Missiles Fly Through Windows of Building Housing Americans. Aug. 18th, 2001. (Text-5)
   B. *The New York Times: www.nytimes.com.* The headlines of the news stories are as follows:
      1. Far-Right Leader Is Slain in Israel. Aug. 18th, 2001. (TEXT-2).
      2. Widening Hostilities, Israel Kills Chief of P.L.O. Faction. Oct. 28th, 2001. (Text-6).
   C. *The Daily Telegraph: www.telegraph.co.uk.* The headlines of the news stories are as follows:
      1. Isaeli minister assassinated. Aug. 18th, 2001. (Text-3)
      2. PLO founder killed by Israeli missile attack. Oct. 28th, 2001. (Text-7)
   D. *The Independent: www.news.independent.co.uk.* The headlines of the news stories are as follows:
      1. Assassins kill general who said Palestinians were 'lice'. Aug. 18th, 2001. (Text-4)
      2. Top Palestinian official assassinated. Oct. 28th, 2001. (Text-8)

According to Halliday, a complex clause consists of one independent, i.e. main clause, plus one or more subordinate clause(s). This amounts to what Halliday himself calls a "rhematic clause" (RC), i.e. a clause consisting of a theme-rheme structure (cf. Halliday 1967, 1985).

As for the procedure adopted for the analysis of DQs and IQs in this study, quantitative corpus analysis was used. This quantitative analysis was carried out via the use of the 'pass system' which amounts to going over the news texts more than once, and count and record the number of occurrences of the various linguistic phenomena to be exemplified, analysed and discussed. In the first pass of analysis, the texts were gone through to count and record the number of occurrences of DQs, IQs, FDQs and FIQs in all news stories, with those reporting the killing of Zeevi (texts 1-4) being recorded in Table 1, and those reporting the assassination of Abu-Ali Mustafa (texts 5-8) in Table 2. The second pass was carried out to count and record the sources of the various types of reported speech (DQs or IQs), whether Israeli, Palestinian or other, and whether they are of the elite type or just laymen (cf. Tables 3 and 4 for texts 1-4 and 5-8, respectively)[8]. The third and final pass of analysis was carried out to count and record the number of occurrences of the projecting verbs the metapragmatic functions of which have been manipulated, in all types of DQs and IQs, for pragma-ideological purposes (cf. Tables 5 and 6 for texts 1-4 and 5-8, respectively)[9].

No. of Text	No of RC's	DQ's No.	DQ's %	IQ's No.	IQ's %	FDQ's No.	FDQ's %	FIQ's No.	FIQ's %
1	85	11	12.94	21	24.71	12	14.12	01	01.18
2	63	12	19.05	03	04.76	09	14.20	04	06.35
3	28	07	25.00	01	17.74	02	07.14	00	00.00
4	48	02	04.17	00	00.00	03	06.25	06	12.50
TOTAL	224	030	----	025	----	026	----	011	----
OVERALL RATIO	NA	13.39%		11.16%		11.61%		04.91%	

Table 1: The Occurrences of Reported Quotations (RQ's) in the in the News Stories about Zeevi's Killing

[8] I would like to draw the reader's attention to the fact that the numbers of sources in these tables do not reflect the number of the reported quotations counted in the corpus analysis of the data because a number of reported quotations, namely FDQs and FIQs, are without indicated sources.

[9] A fourth pass of analysis was carried out, however, to count the occurrences of "thought-type" projecting verbs, but nothing was found. Thus, no tabulation for such non-existing DQs or IQs, occurring with such types of verbs was made. It is also found that almost all the manipulated reporting verbs occur with IQs only.

No. of Text	No. of RC's	DQ's		IQ's		FDQ's		FIQ's	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5	53	05	09.43	03	05.66	06	11.32	02	03.77
6	35	05	14.29	03	08.75	09	25.71	00	00.00
7	35	04	11.43	01	02.86	03	08.57	01	02.86
8	52	08	15.38	00	00.00	11	21.15	01	01.92
TOTAL	175	022	----	07	----	030	----	04	----
OVERALL RATIO	NA	12.75%		4.00%		17.14%		2.29%	

Table 2: The Occurrences of Reported Quotations (RQ's) in the News Stories about Abu-Ali's Assassination.

Text No.	No. of RQ's	Sources of the Reported Quotations (RQ's):					
		Israelis		Palestinians		Others	
		Elite	Laymen	Elite	Laymen	Elite	Laymen
01	45	28	00	04	07	06	00
02	28	16	01	05	02	04	00
03	10	03	00	01	00	06	00
04	11	08	00	01	00	00	03
TOTAL	084	055	001	011	009	016	03
OVERALL RATIO	NA	65.84%	1.19%	13.09%	10.71%	17.04%	3.57%

Table 3: Sources of RQ's:
(Zeevi's Killing)

Text No.	No. of RQ's	The Sources of Reported Quotations (RQ's):					
		Israelis		Palestinians		Others	
		Elite	Laymen	Elite	Laymen	Elite	Laymen
05	16	07	00	03	03	02	01
06	17	04	00	06	03	00	00
07	09	05	00	02	02	01	00
08	20	08	00	03	04	00	05
TOTAL	062	024	000	014	012	02	06
OVERALL RATIO	NA	41.92%	0.00%	22.58%	9.35%	6.45%	9.68%

Table 4: Sources of RQ's:
(Abu-Ali's Assassination)

Text No.	No. of RC's	No of RQ's		No of MPV's	
		No.	%	No.	%
1	85	45	52.94%	08	17.17%
2	63	28	44.44%	03	10.71%
3	28	10	35.71%	01	03.67%
4	48	11	22.92%	02	18.18%
TOTAL	224	090	-----	14	------
OVERALL RATIO	NA	37.50%		16.67%	

Table 5: Manipulated Projecting Verbs (MPV's)
(Zeevi's Killing)

Text No.	No. of RC's	No. of RQ's		No. of MPV's	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
5	53	16	30.91%	02	12.50%
6	35	17	48.57%	01	05.88%
7	35	09	25.71%	01	11.11%
8	52	20	38.46%	00	00.00%
Total	175	62	-----	04	------
OVERALL RATIO	NA	35.43%		6.45%	

Table 6: Manipulated Projecting Verbs (MPV's)
(Abu-Ali's Assassination)

4. Discussion of the analysis

By looking at the overall occurrence of reported quotations (DQs, ID's, FD's and FIQs), it will be noticed that it is relatively close in the two sets of news stories (texts 1-4 and texts 5-8), with slightly more occurrences in the news stories which report the killing of the Israeli former Minister of Tourism, R. Zeevi (compare Tables 1 and 2). As for the sources (e.g. the news makers) of these instances of reported speech, the analysis reveals that the Israeli sources outnumber all other sources, i.e. Palestinian and other sources (mainly American) by more than 20%, especially when it comes to what Fairclough (1992, 1995) and Van Dijk (1988) call the "elite type sources" (compare also Tables 3 and 4). Even in the news stories which report the assassination of the leader of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), Abu-Ali Mustafa, the sources of the reported speech are mostly elite-type Israelis, compared with Palestinian sources who are mostly laymen (cf. Tables 3 and 4).

In what follows, there will be a detailed discussion and exemplification of these tables' analytic figures and of the various types of reported speech presented from a pragma-ideological perspective, taking into account the sources of the reported speech and the projecting verbs used in introducing them, be they DQs, IQs, FDQs or FIQs.[10]

---

[10] This study is not meant to be a contrastive study of what the news reporters report in this corpus in favour of the Israelis or the Palestinians. It is merely trying to reveal some linguistic devices, like reported speech, to attain some socio-ideological ends. However, one finding of this study has come to the forth as a result of this comparison and that is the bias and the prejudice on the part of the news reporters who, for instance, favour to quote one party at the expense of the other, a point that will be discussed, exemplified, analyzed and commented on at a later point in this study.

4.1. *Use of DQs*

By having a closer look at the occurrences of DQs in both sets of news stories of the corpus (e.g. texts 1-4 and texts 5-8), it is found that this type of reported speech has been used, as a rhetorical device, by the news reporters who reported the two incidents of killing, to accomplish a number of rhetorical purposes.

4.1.1. *Vividness, dramatic quuality and an authoritative reporting device*

From a traditional as well as a functional grammar (e.g. systemic linguistics) perspective, the projected/quoted clause in a DQ has an independent status (cf. part 1 of this study). In written English, this is supported by placing the quoted clause between quotation marks, by having its own clausal verb and by being separated from the projecting clause by a comma, or sometimes by a colon. In this respect, linguists have also pointed out that, when the projecting verb of the DQ is of the neutral type (e.g. the `say' type), the quoted clause is far more important than the quoting clause (cf. Halliday 1985; and Downing & Locke 1992). For these reasons and some other factors that will be listed, discussed, exemplified from the corpus and commented on below, DQs are vivid, life-like and have a sense of immediacy.
　　The first factor that makes the use of DQs in news reporting a more dramatic type of reporting is the orientation of the deictic elements involved in their reporting (e.g. verb tenses, personal pronouns and circumstantial adverbials of time and place), which are always oriented towards the original speech situation, as in:

(14)　"This is where we thought would be the best place to hit him [Abu-Ali], and this is where we had accurate intelligence_ and that is it," said Gissin, the Israeli spokesman. (RC. 23, Text-5: *The Washington Post*)
(15)　"In this area, can exist only one country", Zeevi once said. (RC. 67, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

　　The second factor which prompts those linguists, whose names are listed in the reference list of this study and who belong to different linguistic schools, and, who, consequently, may have different linguistic affiliations, to say, with various degrees of reservation, that a DQ 'purports' to reproduce what is being said by the source speaker (in our case, the newsmaker) or 'might' have been said 'verbatim'. I believe, following in the footsteps of systemic linguistics that a DQ refers to a real event i.e. wording or a lexico-grammatical phenomenon in Halliday's (1985) terms. By the same token, Hickman says: "a DQ reproduces the quoted speech event as a whole: Presenting not only what is said, but also how it was said" (1993: 56). However, there are other linguists who said otherwise, including Halliday (1985) himself, as has been alluded to in the first part of this study and as will be discussed below. Nevertheless, this 'verbatim' aspect of DQs, whether it is partial or complete, can serve to make the news story a more interactive event, and hence a somewhat dramatic event with newsmakers expressing different wording, regarding one and the same event, as in:

(16)　A statement from the White House said Mr Bush condemned the killing in strong

terms. "It is time for the Palestinian Authority to take action against terrorists,"
<u>it said</u> (RC's. 37 & 38, Text-2: *The New York Times*)

(17) President Bush condemned the killing. "This despicable act is a further evidence
of the need to fight terrorism", <u>said Ari Fleischer, The White House spokesman</u>.
(RC's. 15 & 16, Text-3, *The Daily Telegraph*)

(18) "And why is the US letting them [the Israelis] use American-made weapons to do
this? And what is Israel doing firing missiles at a political office and at a
building where children live?" <u>said Daas, a restaurant magnate</u> whose blue
American passport was tucked in his shirt pocket as he faced Western reporters.
(RC's 30&31, Text-8: *The Independent)*

As can be noticed above, examples (16) and (17) are about one and the same
event (the killing of Zeevi) using different wording, following the political orientations
of two sources. This factor also reflects the fact that DQs are used to slow down the
general flow of the narrative, e.g. the news story, to concentrate on certain newsmakers,
what they say, their relationships, their personalities, their socio-political backgrounds
and their ideological leanings (cf. also (16) and (17) above). This factor also involves,
as mentioned above, a certain degree of direct interaction, negative or positive, between
the newsmakers and the news reporters on the one hand, and between both of them and
their potential readership on the other (cf. example (18)). This situation, as can be seen
from the above examples, does not only make the news story a mere report of news, but
also a kind of theatrical show, where actors (in our case, newsmakers) are saying
different things on one and the same worldly event.

A third factor which contributes to the vividness, the dramatic quality and the
authoritative nature of DQs in news reporting follows from the fact that they are
capable of directly instantiating the expressive character and function of language, i.e.
language use to express a certain perspective (in our case, the perspective of the news
maker, the "I" point of view of drama rather than the "he" point of view of a narrative
(cf. Lucy 1993[11]). This factor is also enhanced by the use of the "inclusive we", e.g. the
"solidarity-type we", and its pragma-ideological implications (cf. Obiedat 2000).   In
this respect, the news reporter is, implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) inviting the
readership, through the newsmaker's perspective, to take part in what he/she is
reporting in order to let them get involved and adopt a certain stand (hopefully, a stand
which tallies with that of the news reporter him-/herself). This can be illustrated from
the corpus by the following examples:

(19) Israeli officials say Mustafa was targeted because he engineered a string of car
bombing in recent months. "The message is clear: Terrorism will not be
tolerated. <u>We</u> will keep going after terrorist leaders again and again until they
stop attacking Israeli citizens," <u>said Meir Sheetrit, Israel's minister of justice</u>.
(RC's. 10-12, Text-8: *The Independent)*

---

[11] Lucy (1993) points out that direct speech (e.g. DQs) fuses the expression (e.g. point of view) with
the communication (e.g. the message) and that indirect speech (IQs) represents the message without the
expression, i.e. left under the control of the news reporter in news stories.

(20) "<u>We</u> will wage all-out war on the `terrorists', those who collaborate with them and those who send them," <u>Sharon told a hastily convened special session of the Knesset, Israel's parliament,</u> where Zeevi's empty chair was covered with a black Sash. (RC. 15, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

A fourth major factor which contributes to the vividness, the life-like and authoritative nature of DQs in news stories stems from the fact that DQs are pictorial and can represent an iconic image of what has been represented by them. They are pictorial in terms of rendering even the intonation of what is being said by the source, e.g. the newsmaker, and they are iconic images in terms of being pithy, colourful and seek to achieve some sort of equivalence, a point-for-point isomorphic mapping between the forms and the meanings of the DQs and the forms and meanings of the original utterances.   These meanings include, most importantly, the propositional contents (the particular claims and assertions carried out by the original), as well as other information, such as the evaluative/affective elements used (cf. Bell 1991; Waugh 1993, 1994). This can be illustrated from the corpus by means of (21):

(21) Sitting on a couch outside Mustafa's office, Salah heard an explosion. Seconds later, a second blast. "<u>I ran</u> into his office and called his name [Abu-Ali]. But everything was blown up and black. <u>I knew</u> he was dead," <u>said Salah, his office manager</u>. (RC's. 50-54, Text-8: *The Independent*)

4.1.2. *Distancing, disowning and an objective reporting device*

As mentioned in the theoretical part of this study, the DQ form imitates and represents the reported speech event from the perspective of the original speech situation, i.e. from the point of view of the original speaker, e.g. the newsmaker (cf. sections 1 and 2 above). From this perspective, the use of DQs demonstrates what Parmentier (1993: 263) calls "a reverential obeisance", and can also be considered a mechanism for transferring the atmosphere of objectivity and representational naturalness from the inner to the outer frame of discourse. In this respect, it is precisely this presumed distancing of the quoted utterance that allows the news reporter to harness the authority attached to the quotation, without calling attention to the creative purpose of doing so. In other words, the news reporters can induce legitimacy upon their news stories through the juxtaposition of iconically represented and authoritative speech of elite-type newsmakers, such as state and party leaders, well-known politicians, union leaders and the like, as in:

(22) <u>Mr Sharon said</u>: "<u>We</u> will wage a war without mercy against the terrorists. Only criminal terrorists could dream of assassinating elected members of 'democratic state' I hold Arafat fully responsible inasmuch as he set the terrorism in motion, even though he knew what the consequences would be." (RC's. 12-14, Text-3: *The Daily Telegraph*)

Sometimes, however, and despite their attempts to distance themselves in order to look objective and try to disown themselves from what they quote in their news stories,

news reporters, for one reason or another, adopt an interactional position, and at least implicitly evaluate those sources they quote who are, in our case, capable of putting their words into action (cf. example (22) above). This interactional position, exhibited through quotations rather than describing such a position in vernacular terms, is one means by which reporters can defensively maintain a formally objective stance (cf. Robinson & Sheehan 1983), as in:

(23)   Afterwards, the Israelis threatened to declare the Palestinian Authority a terrorist
        state if the killers were not handed over "immediately", raising the prospect that
        Israel is preparing to launch early retaliatory strikes against Palestinian targets.
        "If the Palestinian Authority does not meet <u>our</u> demands, there will be no
        choice but to consider it as an entity that supports terrorism and act accordingly,"
        <u>said G. Saar, the Cabinet Minister</u> (RC's. 6 & 7, Text-3: *The Daily Telegraph*)

4.1.3. *A truth and factuality reporting device*

The quite extensive use of DQs in news stories arises from the fact that this usage can be utilized as a device for truth and a factuality claims in relation to what the news reporter is trying to convince the readership of, bearing on the reliability and truthfulness of what he/she is trying to tell them (cf. Dijk 1988; Fairclough 1992; Baynham 1996). By having a closer look at the many occurrences of DQs found in the analysed corpus (cf. Tables 1 and 2), two linguistic phenomena are, consciously or unconsciously, utilized by news reporters to show the readership that what they are informing them of is an unconvertible fact. These two linguistic phenomena, which will be discussed, exemplified and commented on below, are: (1) evidentiality and (2) intertextuality.

       As alluded to above, the claim to truth and factuality in news reporting, through the use of DQs, is based upon the assumption that the quoted utterance represents the 'very' form of the words used by the original speaker (in our case, the newsmaker), although most linguists, including Halliday (1985), Van Dijk (1988), Tannen (1989), Clark & Garrig (1990) and Baynham (1996), to mention just a few, deny this assumption. If we leave this denial of the 'non-verbatim' quoting aside for the moment, and follow the other linguists who believe in a more-or-less degree of the news reporters' 'verbatim' quoting (cf. Coulmas 1985[12]), we will find that linguists like Anderson (1986: 237) insist on linking the issue of direct reporting (i.e. DQs) with the question of 'evidentiality' which he defines as "the kinds of evidence a person has for making factual claims".

       Quite related to the concept of evidentiality or to truth claims in DQs, however, is the issue of authority or authorisation, which amounts to embedding an utterance as spoken by the newsmaker, and to pointing out that such an utterance is authorized by someone, e.g. an official source, other than the news reporter. These official sources, or the elite-type newsmakers, are regarded incontestable so that, sometimes, they are not even named explicitly by the news reporter when he/she quotes what they say, as in:

---

[12] When Coulmas (1985: 4), discusses the issue of "verbatim" reporting, he writes: "According to generally received opinions, A DQ implies faithfulness to form and content of the original reported utterance".

(24) After a lengthy meeting of Israeli's security cabinet, the government gave Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat an ultimatum: Hand over the killers and the PFLP's current leaders and dismantle terror organizations, or face a response more severe than any recent attack on the Palestinians.
"The time for words has ended, and the time for 'deed' has come," <u>said a formal statement from the Israeli government</u>. (RC's. 5 & 6, Text-1, *The Washington Post*)

As we have mentioned at the beginning of this part of the study, the elite-type sources of the reported speech, DQs and IDQs, are mostly Israeli, even of the reported quotations in the news stories which report the death of the Palestinian PFLP leader (cf. tables 3&4). This indicates, without a shadow of a doubt, that these news reporters are biased and prejudiced and are siding with the Israelis by showing their readership that what they report are facts because they are quoting high-ranking and elite-type Israeli officials, who, the news reporters believe, are telling the truth, and, at the same time, the news reporters themselves show their own bias and prejudice with regard to Palestinians, but in a different way, as shown by the contents of almost all the quotations selected by them in almost all the above examples.

The second linguistic phenomenon, which emerges as a result of analysing the corpus and the rhetorical purposes which lie behind the extensive use of DQs and which the news reporters have utilized to substantiate their claims to truth and factuality, is the device of intertextuality as text linguists call it (cf. de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). De Beaugrande & Dressler have pointed out that intertextuality refers to the ways in which the production and reception of a given text depend upon the participant's (in our case, the news reporters' and the readership's) knowledge of other texts. This knowledge can be applied by a process describable in terms of "mediation", i.e. the extent to which one feeds one's current beliefs, ideologies and goals in the model of the communicative situation. In this respect, the greater the expanse of time of processing activities between the use of a current text and the use of previously encountered texts, the greater the mediation is going to be. Thus, from a text linguistics perspective, every text reminds the reader of (a) previous text(s), a fact which prompts Plett (1991: 5-6) to say: "All intertexts are texts and every text is an intertext". Consider:

(25) Standing next to a poster of Zeevi, one read a statement in the name of what he called the Brigades of Martyrs Abu-Ali Mustafa, the *nom de guerre* of the leader who was killed by Israeli helicopter gunships.
"The assassination of the Zionist criminal Rehvam Zeevi is only the first step according to the principles of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth and a head for <u>three</u> heads," <u>said the man reading</u>. (RC's. 46 & 47, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

(26) To one and all, Zeevi was known as "Ghandi", an improbable nickname he picked up as a teenager by dressing up on one occasion as an Indian pacifist. "He [Zeevi] represented the <u>'Mayflower' generation</u> who fought for Israeli creation. And his political views were the very same ones on which he was
educated," <u>said Moshe Arens, a former defence minister</u>. (RC's. 61-63, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

However, the two examples above represent a highly mediated type of intertextuality, a mediation that reaches the extent of an abuse of the original wording and meaning in the case of example (25) and an abuse of the meaning in the case of (26). In example (25), the news reporter is supposed to be standing with the group of Palestinians who are listening to the original speaker who is reading from a paper a verse from the Holy Quran (copies of which have been stepped over and thrown in the toilets of the Guantanamo concentration camp by the soldiers of 'the most democratic country on Earth') which every Muslim, in the Arab and the Islamic worlds, knows pretty well, and which reads as follows:

> We ordained therein for them: Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal. But if anyone remits for retaliation by way of charity, it is an act of atonement for himself. And if fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah Hath revealed, they are (no better than) wrong- doers. (The Holy Quran, Al-ma'ida Sura, verse, 45).[13]

If the one reading this Holy Verse makes the mistake shown in example (25), the audience will correct him, except the news reporter, because this is the basic judicial rule of retaliation in Islam. Thus, I believe this erroneous quotation is meant to distort the true image of Islam and that of Muslims, following the ideological orientation of the newspaper and its potential readership. As for example (26), the first immigrants who travelled from Plymouth in the United Kingdom to New England in the USA on board of the Mayflower in the 1620's, never said that they were going to throw out the original citizens who lived in the United States at the time when they first arrived and never did or said something like what is reported in example (36) below[14].

Up to this point in this study, we have tacitly assumed that DQs in news stories remain unchanged, but in actual fact and in most cases, they are re-shaped and re-supplied with new meanings. At the very least, DQs are lifted out of certain textual contexts and are inserted into very different ones which represent them, frame them, manipulate them, and sometimes distort and subordinate them to another voice (e.g. the voice of the newsmaker in our case) and to different communicative goals. By definition, this decontextualization and recontextualization usually deforms the original meaning to some degree, as has been illustrated in examples (25) and (26) above.

4.2. *Use of IQs*

Following from what has been discussed in the theoretical part of this study and the result of the analysis of data, it is found that IQs have been used, by news reporters, in the analysed news stories, for two major rhetorical purposes, as discussed in 4.2.1. and 4.2.2.

---

[13] For additional information on the above verse, the reader is referred to Y. Ali. (1989: 262).

[14] For additional information on the trips of the Mayflower between the Port of Plymouth in the UK and New England and its passengers, the reader is referred to website: www.mayflowerhistory. com

4.2.1. *A subjective reporting device*

Halliday (1985) has pointed out that the idealised function of IQs is to represent the sense, e.g. the content, or the gist of what has been said/written by the source (in our case, the newsmaker). Furthermore, it is also a fact that, in real life, any version involving a paraphrase or a summary is bound to be subjective. In this respect, what is usually said/ written by a newsmaker is transposed, via the use of IQs, in line with the perspective of the news reporter who is reporting it, as in:

(27) In an emergency session of the full Israeli cabinet, Sharoon blamed the assassination on Arafat, saying the Palestinian leader had failed to rein his terrorists. Several Israeli ministers likened the slaying of Zeevi to the Sept. 11 suicide airplane attacks in the United States, and said that Israel is justified in making a military response, just as the US is doing in Afghanistan. (RC's. 13 & 14, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

(28) Within hours, a Jewish settler was killed when his car came under fire near Nablus on the West Bank. The PFLP claimed responsibility. A statement was issued by the PFLP promised that "other operation will follow" in the wake of its leader's "assassination."(RC's. 19 & 20, Text-7: *The Daily Telegraph*)

The two examples above are given the status of "a permanent fact" from the perspective of the news reporter. In example (27), for instance, the killing of Zeevi is likened to the human disaster of the 11th of September, where thousands of innocents got killed. By comparison, Israel "is justified", all the time, to kill Palestinians, a state that is made current and is given a permanent status by preserving the present tense of the passive form of the verb. Compared with (27), example (28) is also given the status of a permanent fact by preserving the tense (the future tense, this time) of the reported quotation and by placing parts of the IQ between quotation marks in order for the news reporter 'to distance' himself and to give the readership the impression that these are 'the very words' that were uttered by the source of the statement. This, of course, is done in order to accuse the Palestinians of permanently acting violently against the Israelis.

     In IQs, therefore, there is only one voice and one point of view, and that is the news reporter's. In each of the above examples, he is using his own version of the speech event rather than the words that were actually used by the newsmakers. Thus, reporting speech indirectly has the effect of foregrounding the news reporter's rather than the newsmaker's perspective. In order to support this perspective, the content of the complement, following the complimentiser/subordinator "that", orients itself, also, to the deictic centre of the news reporter rather than that of the newsmaker, and a number of formal adjustments are made in terms of this deictic shift (cf. Coulmas 1986; Bloor & Bloor 1995; Dik 1997). One of the consequences of these formal changes (e.g. verb tense, deixis of time and place and person) in IQs is putting what has been said by the newsmaker under the control of the news reporter and his socio-ideological perspective.

     This re-orientation of deixis in IQs towards the current reported situation has to do with putting the reporter in full control of focusing the news story. This will enable him/her to combine information and wording from scattered parts of what has been said

or written by the newsmaker and, consequently, will give him/her the opportunity to add his/her own interpretation to what the newsmaker has said, as in:

(29) "As far as we are concerned his hands are soaked in blood." Said Dore Gold, a foreign policy advisor of Ariel Sharon. "The distinction between political and military leaders is completely irrelevant in this case."
Palestinians asserted that Mr. Abu-Ali Zibri was a political leader, and they asserted that Israel is opening a new phase in the conflict by extending its killing to the Palestinian Political leadership. (RC's. 26 & 27, Text-6: *The New York Times*)

By re-orienting the personal deixis which refers to the Palestinians in the second clause from "we" in a DQ, into "they" in example (29) above, the news reporter gets full control of the whole statement. For instance, he preserves the tense of the reported quotation in the present continuous form when he changes the DQ into an IQ in order to give the readership the impression that this is a continuing state of affairs, since he/she is reporting what was supposed to have happened from his own perspective, which seems biased and prejudiced against the Palestinian people. This position is also supported, as will be discussed and illustrated below, by the device of manipulating the pragma-linguistic functions of the reporting verbs.

4.2.2. *Manipulating the pragma-linguistic functions of the projecting verbs of IQs*

As mentioned in passing above, the corpus analysis of the data has also revealed that one of the main rhetorical purposes which prompts the news reporters to use IQs in their news stories is the manipulation of the newsmaker's statements, especially those Israeli officials' statements which the news reporters indirectly quoted, by means of manipulating the pragma-linguistic functions of the reporting verbs. As a result of the biased and prejudiced stand these news reporters adopt against those they are reporting about (in our case, the Palestinians), they manipulate the newsmakers by using connotative types of reporting verbs in order to have the opportunity to use these very verbs to identify the newsmakers as a particular kind of person, i.e. a kind of person who speaks with certain voices which, in most cases, tally with that of the ideological leanings of the news reporters themselves.
As mentioned in the theoretical part of this study, these categories of reporting verbs are used to indicate the manner of speaking of the newsmaker, the manner carried out by the news reporter him-/herself to directly quote or indirectly report the newsmaker, and, finally, to assess what has been quoted or reported, with regard to its validity and truthfulness. Except for the neutral-type reporting verbs (the `say-type' category), there are some categories of reporting verbs (e.g. speech act verbs) that have various connotative meanings that are widely used in news reporting to express some emotive states and attitudes and, in our case, the socio-political status of each of the newsmakers (cf. also examples (28) and (29) above). These categories of verbs are used, with varying degrees of frequency, by news reporters, as more stimulating substitutes to the basic and neutral verbs of reporting, as in:

(30) After meeting with his top security advisors past midnight, Mr. Sharon imposed on Arafat a stark choice that is likely to present the Bush administration with one as well. In a statement, <u>the Israeli cabinet</u> <u>demanded that</u> the Palestinian Authority, which governs Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, immediately extradite those behind it and move, as well, against other "terrorists organizations operating in Palestinian areas." (RC's. 8 & 9, Text-2: *The New York Times*)

In addition, the selection of such reporting verbs in reported speech can also have a significant effect on how news stories are interpreted (e.g. the <u>assertive</u> speech act verb in (30) above and the <u>directive</u> speech act verb in (31) below). This effect often marks the illocutionary force of these reporting speech act verbs in the news stories, i.e. the illocutionary force which imposes a certain type of interpretation upon the represented discourse in the news stories, as in:

(31) There was international condemnation after Mr. Zeevi was shot dead by guerrillas at point-blank range. The outrage was not altered by the fact that he was widely acknowledged to have extremist views, including advocating the expulsion of Palestinians from Occupied territories.
<u>He</u> was outraged by what he saw as the lenient handling of the Palestinians and [0=he] alarmed that their government bow to US pressures and return to the Oslo peace process (RC's. 12-14, Text-4*: The Independent)*

In IQs, in particular, where the news reporter is having the upper hand in rewording and manipulating what the source might have said, the choice of certain types of reporting verbs which dominate the embedded reported content clauses contributes to evaluating the content of these reported clauses as well as their sources. In addition, the news reporter will sometimes try to induce a certain propositional attitude, on the part of the readership, towards both the content of the reported utterance as well as the newsmaker who 'might have' said it, as also in:

(32) Mr. Zeevi, 75, a staunch nationalist hawk was shot dead in the head and neck as he stepped out of a lift at the Hayatt hotel East Jerusalem. He died in hospital. The killing threatens the fragile cease fire between Israel and the Palestinians.
<u>The PFLP</u> <u>claimed responsibility saying that</u> it was in response to Israel's killing of the Front leader Abu-Ali Mustafa, two months ago. (RC's. 8-11, Text-3: *The Daily Telegraph*)

From an ideological perspective, news stories usually promote the beliefs and opinions of an elite group of newsmakers in any society (cf. 4-1-3 above). Pragmatically speaking, however, it is not primarily the type of global speech act that pertains to the action of the newsmaker (e.g., *promises, threats* and the like), or those of the reader (e.g., *accuse*), but rather the bulk of everyday news which represents instances of '*assertions*' (cf. Van Dijk 1988). For such speech acts to be appropriate, the news reporter must express propositions that are not known to the reader and which the news reporter wants the reader to know, as in:

(33) The PFLP is on the State Department's list of terrorist organization. It staged a number of spectacular attacks in the 1970s, including airplane hijacking. But <u>Habash had declared that</u> the time for such operations is over, and the PFLP was relatively dormant until the current round of violence erupted in Sept. last year. (RC's. 51-53, Text-5: *The Washington Post*)

From a speech act perspective, the reporting speech act verbs, *demanded, alarmed, claimed* and *declared* in examples (30)-(33), perform the acts which they describe and are characteristic of news as talk (cf. Grice 1975; Searle 1979; Leech 1983; Bell 1991). In this sense, they are called "performatives", and cannot be judged as true or false. However, if they are performed happily by a person with high authority to do so (e.g. the Israeli Cabinet in (30), Zeevi in (31), the PFLP in (32) or Habbash in (33)), such performatives become news actions, and this is actually how they are represented in the news stories. In this respect, Fishman (1980: 99) says: "journalists love performatives because these are 'the hardest facts' they can get their hands on."

More often than not, having the status of action, the speech act verbs above carry the stance of the news reporters with regard to the IQs that follow (cf. (30) and (31) above). Furthermore, all the above reporting speech acts verbs are evaluative; i.e. they key the readership on how to interpret the IQs. In addition, there is also an implicit (sometimes an explicit) relationship between the sources of these IQs, the reporting speech act verbs chosen to report them and their illocutionary force on the one hand, and between them all and the news reporters on the other, since what is being indirectly quoted is carried out from the news reporters' perspectives (cf. examples (30) and (31)).

4.3. *Use of FDQs & FIDQs*

As mentioned earlier in this study, a FDQ is a form of a DQ with some minor formal changes, such as a removal of the authoritative reporting clause, the quotations marks or both. In either form, the news reporter manipulates this reporting form for some rhetorical purposes, which has some consequences.

Firstly, by foregrounding and maximizing the role of the newsmaker, the news reporter, under the guise of being 'objective', gives the readership the impression that he/she has nothing to do with what is being reported, as in:

(34) The PFLP, a secular organization with Marxist-Leninist roots stretching back to the 1960's, said "a special quad" had hunted down Mr. Zeevi in revenge for Israel's killing of the group's leader in August.
It was the first slaying by Palestinians of an elected Israeli politician, government officials said; <u>its sophistication stunned the security establishment that Mr. Zeevi championed before the state founding</u>. (RC's. 5 & 6,Text-2: *The New York Times*)

(35) "This is where we thought would be the best place to hit him, and this is we had accurate intelligence - and that is it", said Gissin, the Israeli spokesmen.
<u>Another Israeli official said</u> Israel would have suffered a public relation disaster if the Americans had been hurt. <u>Israel receives more than $ 2 billions in aid annually from the US</u>. (RC's. 25-26, Text-5: The Washington Post)

In the two examples above, however, the underlined clauses look ambiguous to the normal reader of the two newspapers with regard to identifying their sources. The sources could be either the newsmakers or the news reporters themselves. In either case, this ambiguity is intentional on the part of the news reporters in order to add what they wanted to add, and, at the same time, to distance themselves by minimizing their roles in what is being said, and to foreground the roles of the newsmakers.

Secondly, by removing the reporting clause (e.g. the authorial voice), the reported material is to a varying degree liberated from narrational control and becomes a sort of direct interaction between the newsmaker and the readership, which results in the newsmaker speaking for him-/herself within a dialogue that contains no authorial interference. And if reporting is continued and sustained using FDQs over a longer stretch of the news story, it will gradually switch to first person, and in this case the newsmaker ends up telling the whole news story, as long as what he/she says is in line with what the news reporter wants, as in:

(36) "This is <u>our</u> forefather's land. <u>We</u> suggest that the Arabs will go back to the land where they come from. This transfer ideology is not invented by me nor by the Israelis; it happens everywhere in the world. In the 20th. Century, 124 million people were transferred from one country to another." (RC's. 68-71, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

(37) "This is unacceptable. <u>We</u>'re civilians here; we have children here. <u>We</u> have American passports." (RC's. 40-42, Text-5: *The Washington Post*)

As for FIQs , Clark (1996) pointed out that they are represented in the news reporter's words, but from the newsmaker's perspective. However, if that is the case with regard to their representation, then the readership will hear both voices, i.e. that of the newsmaker and that of the news reporter him-/herself with different strength, depending on how much the news reporter wants to "filter" what the source has said (cf. Simpson 1994). However, comparable to the manipulation of FDQs, this is also done by the news reporter in order to minimize, to a certain extent, his role regarding what has been presented. For this reason, FIQs are difficult to identify in a news story, but this elusiveness is very much part of its stylistic effect and its rhetorical purpose, as in:

(38) In 1991, Zeevi caused a scandal by telling a Cabinet meeting that President Bush Sr. was "an enemy of Israel" and America was plotting a second Holocaust. On another occasion, he hurled an anti-Sematic insult at Martin Indyk, an American ambassador to Israel, and challenged him for a fight.
<u>Zeevi believed</u> the three million Palestinians of the West Bank <u>should be</u> "transferred" to Arab neighbouring countries. (RC's. 35-37, Text-4: *The Independent*)

I also believe, following in the footsteps of Simpson (1994), that the most important characteristic about FIQs is that they give the readership the impression that both the newsmaker and the news reporter are speaking or thinking at the same time. But the altered person deixis and adverbials of time and place as well as the tense shift

of the verbs, all serve the reported material to be in line with the central framework of the news story as narrated from the news reporter's perspective, as in:

(39) Zeevi was the most prominent and passionate advocate of what he called "transfer". By that, he meant the departure from the West Bank and Gaza strip of more than 3 million Arabs, many of whose families have been on the land for centuries. He said the departure should be voluntary, but Arabs believe he favoured outright expulsion, and they cited his inflammatory rhetoric as proof. (RC's. 64-66, Text-1: *The Washington Post*)

Furthermore, FDQs and FIQs do have a major stylistic effect that has been discussed by a number of linguists and can be noticed clearly in examples (36) and (37) above. These two examples demonstrate what Leech (1988: 110) pointed out when he said that these two constructions "aid concision by allowing the writer [in our case, the news reporter] to retell someone's [in our case, the newsmaker's] word, directly and indirectly, at length and without having to keep inserting expressions like 'he said/he said that . . .etc."

5. Conclusion

Newspapers report what they call "news stories" every day, telling events that have happened all over the world. Such writing is generally thought to be 'telling the truth, nothing but the truth', or, 'telling it as it was' in ways which distinguish it from fiction (cf. Bell 1991). However, reporting any event, as has been discussed above, involves a process of selection, manipulation, bias and prejudice, on the part of the news reporter, not only with regard to the 'facts' themselves, but also with respect to the words used to express or describe these facts, which can result in the same event being presented from completely different perspectives.

One means through which this process of manipulative selection is carried out is through the use of reported speech, be it direct, indirect, free direct or free indirect, to give legitimacy to what is being reported, especially when such reported speech is uttered by, or put in the mouth of, an elite-type newsmaker whose "declarations, announcements, warnings", and the like, cannot be "twisted" and have to be taken into account. However, the news reporter him-/herself can twist, so to speak, the words of the newsmaker, partially or completely, if the former wants "to change hats" with the latter and wants to speak through him. This, of course, takes place when the news reporter manipulates what has been uttered by the newsmaker, either by directly quoting selected parts of what he/she has said and representing it, or convert it to an IQ or a FIQ, where the news reporter's voice takes the lead or gets mixed with that of the newsmaker's (cf. 4.2 and 4.3 above).

Another means by which the process of selection is achieved is by the selection of the reporting verb which can have a significant effect on how the news story is to be interpreted and understood by the readership (cf. 4.2.3 above). The choice of a neutral-type verb like "say" to describe a certain news event, has no further implication than to describe what happened, compared with a performative verb such as "explain", which connotes that what happened conveys a "factual" element and not merely an opinion, or

with a performative verb like "claim", which connotes an opinion with no commitment to factuality.

This study has also revealed that one of the main criteria of representing reported speech in news stories is that of significance. What this amounts to, as far as the news reporter is concerned, is the fact that he/she selects only those parts of what has been uttered by the source that seem significant to him/her in terms of a particular view, political or otherwise, and represents them in the news story as a whole. Such a representation will particularly be in line with the overall policy of the newspaper and its potential readership. Thus, rather than incorporating stretches of interactive/dialogical types of discourse, news stories are more likely to select a number of utterances that comply with the news reporter's and the newspaper's ideological orientation on the one hand, and with that of its potential readership on the other.

Thus, on the basis of what has been analysed, discussed and commented on throughout this paper, one can say, without any reservation, that the news reporters can distort what has been said by the newsmakers, whether or not both parties have the same or different ideological leanings. In some cases, however, this distortion by the news reporters is carried out even if the newsmakers are of the elite type and are 'on the same sheet of music' with the overall policy of the newspaper that employs and pays those news reporters. In either case, they can be extremely powerful when it comes to reproducing, under the guise of what they call 'fact', what is most convenient for them to convey, in terms of their aims and their perspectives. At one radical extreme, news reporters can make up the speech, but more commonly they will select parts of what has been said on the basis of what they think is important.

On the basis of the above discussion and comments, I can safely agree with N. Fairclough (1995: 84) when he says:

> News reports include mechanisms for ordering voices, subjecting them to social control. The mere fact that a plethora of voices is included in the media treatment of social and political issues does not entail an absence of control, merely that the question of how voices are woven, how they are ordered with respect to each other, becomes decisive.

Finally, through the process of cutting and pasting under various guises, including the stylistic one, news reporters can change the order of the utterances, which in many cases completely changes the meaning of what has been said. As a result, the readership will assume that this is how the original speech has been uttered, something which forces one to say: I cannot agree more with what Fairclough maintains in the above statement.

References

Ali, A.Y. (1989) *Translating the Meanings of the Holy Quran into English: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Brentwood, Maryland, USA: Amana Corporation.

Anderson, L.P. (1986) Evidentials, paths of change and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetrics. In C. Wallas, and N. Johanna (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguist coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 273-312.

Bakhtin, M. (1981 [1953]) The problem of speech genre. Translated by V. MaGee. In *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 60-102.

Bakhtin, M. (1981 [1935]) Discourse in the novel. Translated by C. Emerson. In *Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 259-422.

Banfield, M. (1993) What epistemology, style, and grammar meet literary history: The development of represented speech and thought. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive Language*: *Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 339-364.

Baynham, M. (1996) Direct speech: What's it doing in non-narrative discourse? *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 61-81.

Bell, A. (1991) *The Language of Mass Media*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Bell, A., & P. Garratt (eds.) (1998) *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Bloor, T., & M. Bloor (1995) *A functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayean Approach*. London: Edward Arnold.

Brown, P., & S. Levinson (1978) Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E.N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56-289.

Caton, S.C. (1993) The importance of reflexive language in George H. Mead's theory of Self and Communication. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 315-337.

Chafe, W. (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Clark, H., & R.J. Gerrig (1990) Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66.4: 261-286.

Clayman, S.E. (1990) From talk to text: Newspaper account of reporter-source interaction. *Media, Culture and Society* 12: 79-103.

Clark, U. (1992) *An Introduction to Stylistics*. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Stanley Thomas Publishers Ltd.

Coulmas, F. (1985) Direct & indirect speech: General problems and problems in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 41-63.

Coulmas, F. (1986) Reported speech: Some general issues. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-28.

Cruze, D.A. (2000) *Meaning in Language: An introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Beaugrande, R., & W. Dressler (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.

Dik, S. (1997) *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Downing, A., and P. Locke (1992) *A University Course in the English Grammar*. London: Prentice Hall.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*. New York: Edward Arnold.

Fishman, M. (1980) *Manufacturing the News*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London and New York: Routledge.

Geis, M. (1987) *The Language of Politics*. New York: Springer Verlag.

Glasgow University Media Group (1980) *More Bad News*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 183-198.

Gruber, H. (1988) The Jewish Trick: The dissemination of anti-Semitic prejudice in a newspaper editorial. Transl. *Ide Informationen Zur Deutschdidaktik* 12.2/88: 72-84.

Gruber, H. (1990) Anti-Semitic prejudice in newspaper reports: A textlinguistic study of two Austrian newspapers [Trans.]. *Klagenfurter Beitrage Zur Sprachwissenschaft* 15-16: 145-162.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1967) Transitivity and theme in English: Part 2. *Language* 2: 199-244.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978*) Language as Social Semiotic. London*: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harder, P. (1996) *Functional Semantics: A Theory of Meaning, Structure and Tense in English*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hickman, M. (1993) The boundaries of reported speech in narrative discourse: Some development aspects. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 63-89.

Holborow, M. (1999) *The Politics of the English Language*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Huddleston, R., & G.K. Pulum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, H. (1990) *Grammar and Meaning: A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. London and New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (1988) *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman.

Leech, G., & M. Short (1981) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S.C. (1981) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Locher, M., & S. Wortham (1996) Voicing on the news: An analytic technique for studying media discourse. *Text* 16.4: 557-585.

Lucy, J. (ed.) (1993) *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics , Vols. 1 & 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maingueneau, D. (1993) *Linguistique pour le texte littéraire*. 3rd ed. Paris: Dunod.

Obiedat, N. (2000) The use of first person deixis in political interviews: A pragma-ideological implication. *Dirasat* (University of Jordan) 27.2: 514-531.

Obiedat, N. (2002) Biased news reporting of the Israeli-Palestinian clashes following al-Aqsa intifada. *Dirasat* (University of Jordan) 30.3: 798-820.

Parmetier, R.J. (1993) The political function of reported speech: A Belauan example. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 261-286.

Plett, H.F. (1991) "Intertextualities". In H.F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 3-29

Quirk, R. et al. (1995) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reisigl, M., and R. Wodak (2001) *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Robinson, M.J., and J.A. Sheenan (1983) *Over the Wire and on TV: CBS & UPI in Campaign 1980*. New York: Russel Sage.

Searle, J.R. (1979) *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, P. (1994) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.

Short, M. (1988) Speech presentation, the novel and the press. In W. van Peer (ed.), *The Taming of Press*: *Exploration in Language, Literature and Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 61-81.

Tannen, D. (1988) *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tuchman, G. (1978) *Making News: A Study of the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.

Tuchman, G. (1972) Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology* 77.4: 660-679.

Van Dijk, T. (1988) *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Verschueren, J. (1985) *International News Reporting: Metapragmatic Metaphors and the U-2*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Volosinov, V.N. (1986) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waugh, L.R. (1993) Arbitrariness: Imitation and motivation revived, with consequences for textual meaning. *Diacritics* 23: 71-87.

Waugh, L.R. (1995) Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The relation of function and text. *Text* 15.1: 129-173.

Wodak, R. (1987) And where is the Lebanon? A case study in the selection of news. *Text* 7.4: 377-410.