



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Holt, Elizabeth

Indirect reported speech in storytelling: its position, design and uses

### Original Citation

Holt, Elizabeth (2017) Indirect reported speech in storytelling: its position, design and uses. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 50 (2). pp. 171-187. ISSN 0835-1813

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/31704/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

# Indirect reported speech in storytelling: its position, design and uses

Elizabeth Holt

University of Huddersfield (e.j.holt@hud.ac.uk)

## Abstract

*In this study conversation analysis is used in an investigation of indirect reported speech (IRS) in storytelling. It reveals its recurrent sequential positions showing that it occurs in distinct places from direct reported speech (DRS) and performs different interactional tasks. IRS recurrently occurs in talk surrounding the focus of the telling (including background detailing prior to, during or following the focus of the story), and in introducing sequences of DRS. It tends to be brief - usually one unit long- and non-granular. It summarises or glosses an action rather than enacting a locution from a particular context and is recurrently embedded into larger structures. In this way it regularly manages transitions either from detailing to the focus, or from the focus to related matters. Thus, analysis throws light on the use and design of reported speech in interaction and adds to our knowledge of the way storytelling is constructed and how movement between different segments is managed. The data are drawn from collections of English telephone calls recorded in the UK and US.*

In interaction participants regularly report what others, or they themselves have said. Reported speech is particularly common in storytelling, and recurrently constitutes the focus of the telling sometimes occurring at a peak or climax (Drew, 1998; Heritage, 2011; Holt, 2000, Li, 1986; Mayes, 1990). Direct reported speech - where the speaker purports to enact an utterance from another occasion - is common in such positions, and a number of studies have explored its use and design in this environment (see for example Holt, 2000, and Bangerter, Mayor and Pekarek Doehler, 2011). However, indirect reported speech - where the speaker summarises or conveys the words of another without purporting to enact them - also occurs recurrently in stories (though to a lesser degree), but has received little attention (but see Norrick, 2016). In this article I investigate the use of indirect reported speech (IRS) in the environment of storytelling, showing how distinctive features of its design make it appropriate for the recurrent positions in which it occurs.

To better understand and define the forms reporting takes, investigation regularly begins with consideration of the difference between direct and indirect reports. By considering examples of reported speech (real or invented), analysts have identified a range of grammatical features that distinguish these forms. In English IRS deictic references, pronouns, vocatives and verb tenses cohere with the reported context, whereas in DRS they are commensurate with the reported one (Partee, 1973; Banfield, 1973, 1982; Wierzbicka, 1974; Li, 1986). Analysis of instances from English interaction has identified distinguishing characteristics of the design of the two forms: in DRS turn initials (such as 'oh' and 'well') and shifts in prosody or voice quality are used to suggest that the speaker is enacting a locution from a different occasion (Mayes, 1990; Holt, 1996, 2015: see Capone, 2016; Clift and Holt, 2007 and Holt, 2009 for

summaries). Mayes (1990) points out that a range of constructions and components cannot occur in indirect reports, including discourse particles, interrogatives, vocatives, exclamations, and imperatives.

As well as analysing the forms these devices take, authors also considered the extent to which IRS and DRS purport to re-enact locutions made on prior occasions. According to Coulmas (1986: 2) DRS “evokes the original speech situation and conveys, or claims to convey, the exact words of the original speaker”, while IRS “adapts the reported utterance to the speech situation of the report” (p.2) and is, therefore “variable with respect to the extent that faithfulness to the linguistic form of what was said is being claimed” (p.6). Mayes (1990: 351) states:

“...an indirect quote is merely a restatement of a previous utterance, and there is no expectation that words, sentence structure, intonation, or non-verbal messages should be preserved.”

In DRS speakers purport to re-enact or ‘demonstrate’ (Clark and Gerrig, 1990) the reported locution, giving the recipient ‘access’ (Holt, 1996, 2000), whereas IRS conveys a summary or gist of what was said (Holt, 2016).

Analysis of reported speech in interaction reveals that the distinction between them is not clear-cut (Günthner, 1997; Holt, 2016).

But despite the lack of a clear boundary, distinguishing between them is worthwhile because participants to conversation do so: barring some combined forms, speakers recurrently design contributions as either direct or indirect employing these devices in distinct sequential positions in the service of different interactional tasks. I demonstrate this by focusing on the recurrent positions of IRS in the environment of storytelling in interaction. I show how recurrent aspects of the design of IRS make it ideal for these sequential positions and the interactional tasks it is used to fulfil. To help highlight these features I begin by contrasting it to DRS in storytelling, thus outlining central characteristics through comparison. Then, after a brief discussion of storytelling in interaction, I demonstrate the recurrent positions of IRS in this environment: 1. in detailing surrounding the peak of the story; 2. in introducing a sequence of DRS; 3. as a departure from a sequence of DRS; and 4. within a direct report. This provides insight into how IRS contributes to the construction of storytellings, its role in creating different sections within them, and in managing transitions between them.

Conversation analysis is used to investigate a corpus of instances drawn mainly from two-party telephone calls recording in the UK and US (including the ‘Holt’, ‘Newport Beach’, ‘Heritage’ and ‘Rahman’ data sets)<sup>1</sup>. Most of the calls are informal conversations between friends and family members. The participants speak British English and American English. I initially made a collection of all instances of reported speech (amounting to over 400 examples). I then divided these into direct and indirect instances (see Holt, 1996, 2016). In analysing the use and sequential position of indirect examples within the surrounding talk, I found that whether they occurred in narrative or non-narrative environments was significant in terms of their contribution to the sequence. I thus continued my analysis by focusing on

IRS in storytelling environments. I began with a broad definition of what constituted a storytelling and used the analysis to reflect on what constitutes activity as the research progressed. A collection of instances (around 50) was analysed to identify regularities in the position, design and use of the device.

### IRS and DRS in storytelling

To further explore the nature of IRS and demonstrate the benefits of analysing its design and use in sequences of interaction I compare it to DRS, thus highlighting a number of features that are recurrent in the extracts that constitute the corpus.

(1)[Holt:SO88(II)1:4:8]

(Hal is talking about a recent trip to Kent, when he visited Canterbury. He reports staying at a village outside the city called 'Gillim' - which has a similar name to a town near Hal's home but is pronounced differently.)

1 Hal: A:nd uh then at Ca:nterbury you paid on  
 2 your way out.  
 3 Skip: I: see:,  
 4 (0.3)  
 5 Hal: An' then when you .hh[we When we- When  
 6 Skip: [khm-khm  
 7 Hal: I came back see Skip cuz we decided to go  
 8 in by trai:n we thought it- (.) be better  
 9 tha[n ↓dri:v]ing  
 10 Skip: [ihYe:s, ] I think parkin's: a proplem  
 11 there[n o w,].hh[h  
 12 Hal: [Yea:h.] [And when I came back to  
 13 Canterbury station 'n had to get a ticket  
 14 I said .hh I've ↓I: said I(h) wanted two  
 15 to Gill↓im:.=  
 16 Skip: =.p.h[°aa-°  
 17 Hal: [Gellin:g Gill↓im[:.  
 18 Skip: [ihYeh,=  
 19 Hal: =So 'ee said where ↑the  
 20 devil[do y(hh)ou]↑come[vro(h)m↑]=  
 21 Skip: [g n i k k ]ehhh [h h e h ]=  
 22 Skip: =↑hh[h [eh[uh  
 23 Hal: [sai[d [oh Somerset. 'ee said I  
 24 ↑THOU:GH[T ↓so(h)o,  
 25 Skip: [ehh heh.hh h↑e:h [↑hih uhh ]  
 26 Hal: [He said w'l]we  
 27 call it Jillim o[ver (here).]  
 28 Skip: [h u h h h ]

In 14 and 15 Hal uses IRS to portray his request for train tickets at the station on his return from Canterbury to 'Gillim'. He then shifts into DRS to portray the ticket seller's response (lines 19 and 20), his answer to the question (line 23) and the ticket seller's subsequent turn (lines 26 and 27). The initial turn is IRS since the verb is in past tense and is therefore commensurate with the current situation rather than the reported one. The portrayed request is brief - one short segment. It is also not very granular (Schegloff, 2000) in terms of the portrayal of the request: the action is portrayed in minimal detail. The IRS is embedded into a

larger unit - "And when I came back to Canterbury station 'n had to get a ticket I said .hh I've ↓I: said I(h) wanted two to Gill↓im:". It briefly summarises the request, focusing on the action rather than how it was uttered or what was said. Thus, the entire unit sets the scene for the subsequent interaction and forms a transition from background details concerning why they went by train, to the vocal exchange which forms the focus of the story. In using indirect reported speech to briefly gloss his request, Hal also creates a transition to the subsequent turns of DRS (Holt, 2016).

Further turns of the dialogue are portrayed through DRS: the pronouns are commensurate with the reported speakers' points of views and they contain elements that cannot be indirectly reported such as 'where the devil do you come from' (lines 20 and 21) and 'oh' (line 24). These turns of DRS contrast with this initial turn of IRS in a number of ways. First, there are several turns of DRS while there is just one of IRS. This is a recurrent pattern: instances of IRS in the current corpus are generally isolated. DRS in storytelling, however, regularly involves multiple units (Holt, 1996). Second, rather than being embedded into a larger unit, the DRS is only preceded by the pronoun and speech verb (though there is also 'so' at the beginning of line 19). Thus, it occurs as a series of directly reported turns with little accompanying talk (at line 23 the pronoun is omitted resulting in an introduction of just 'said'). Third, the directly reported utterances are portrayed in a granular fashion and give a fuller indication of the stances of the participants. For example, the inclusion of 'where the devil' in line 20 suggests that the ticket seller was possibly somewhat critical of or amused by Hal's pronunciation of the village's name. It also conveys the incongruous nature of the ticket seller's response to Hal's request. The 'oh' at the start of Hal's reported response suggests his surprise at the ticket seller's question (Heritage, 1984). The 'well' at line 26 suggests the dispreferred nature of his correction of Hal's pronunciation (Pomerantz, 1984). By enacting these turns in this granular manner Hal implicitly conveys the stances of the speakers and the way in which the interaction unfolded. Part of the success of the telling lies in the way portraying the turns creates a puzzle (concerning why the ticket seller responded in this incongruous way, asking where he comes from) which is solved at the end of the dialogue.

So, the IRS is one brief unit that summarises a request rather than depicting it in detail. It is embedded into a unit which helps create a transition from the background detailing to the directly reported dialogue forming the focus of the telling. The dialogue which is the focus of the story is delivered through several turns of DRS. The talk accompanying them introduces the report and is brief. These turns are multifaceted and granular: they give a detailed portrayal of how the interaction unfolded and contain insights into the stances of the speakers. Thus, there are a number of distinctions between the IRS and the DRS in terms of the design of these utterance, their position in the telling and the actions they perform. The instances of IRS in the current collection share these characteristics:

1. they represent a brief (usually one unit long) summary or gist of a spoken action;
2. they are embedded into larger units (not just a pronoun/noun plus speech verb);
3. they are non-granular in their presentation of the locution;
4. they form transitions within the telling (and sometimes from the telling to less clearly narrative talk);
5. they retain the focus on the presented action (e.g. a request) rather than on portraying how it was said.

In later sections I show how these characteristics make IRS ideally suited for the positions in storytelling that it regularly occupies. First I begin by considering the nature of storytelling and how reported speech is recurrently used within its construction.

## Storytelling in interaction

Storytellings in interaction generally consist of a number of segments including the introduction (often taking the form of a pre-sequence), background detailing necessary to understanding the focus of the telling, the focus itself, and, sometimes, talk following the focus of the telling that connects to it, such as a summary or upshot (Jefferson, 1978; Labov and Waletzky, 1966; Mandelbaum, 2013; Selting, 2000; Sidnell, 2010; Stivers, 2013). Thus, participants construct extended sequences constituted by distinct kinds of actions. According to Couper-Kuhlen (2007) storytelling is:

where a sequence of events is recounted in chronological order and participants in these events are animated as story-world figures. (P. 81)

The section where the teller recounts events and animates participants is generally constructed as the focus of the story, and may include a segment that is the peak or climax of the telling.

(2)[Holt:C85:4:2-3.]

( Lesley is telling a story about visiting a church fair)

1 Lesley: °Oh:.° hh Yi-m- You ↓know I-I- I'm broiling about  
2 something hhhheh[heh hhhh  
3 Joyce: [Wha::t.  
4 Lesley: Well that sa↓:le. (0.2) at- at (.) the vicarage.  
5 (0.6)  
6 Joyce: Oh ↓ye[:s,  
7 Lesley: [ t  
8 (0.6)  
9 Lesley: u (.) ihYour friend 'n mi:ne wz there  
10 (0.2)  
11 ( ): (h[h hh)  
12 Lesley: [mMister: R:,  
13 Joyce: Oh ye:s hheh  
14 (0.4)  
15 Lesley: And em: p ↑we (.) ↑really didn't have a lot 'v  
16 cha:nge ↓that (.) day becuz we'd been to ↓Bath  
17 'n we'd been: Christmas shoppin:g, (0.5) but  
18 we thought we'd better go along t'th'sale 'n  
19 do what we could, (0.2) we had↑n't  
20 got a lot (.) of s:e- ready cash t'↑spe:nd.  
21 (0.3)  
22 Lesley: .t[ hh  
23 Joyce: [Mh.=  
24 Lesley: =In ↑any ↓case we thought th'things were  
25 very ex↑pen↓sive.  
26 Joyce: Oh did you.  
27 (0.9)  
28 Lesley: AND uh ↑we were looking rou-nd the  
29 ↓sta:lls 'n poking about 'n he came  
30 up t'me 'n he said Oh: hello Lesley, (.)  
31 ↑still trying to buy something f'nothing,

32 Joyce: .tch! hahhhhhhh!  
 33 (0.8)  
 34 Joyce: Oo[: : :]: L e s l ey]  
 35 Lesley: [↑Oo:.]huh huh ]  
 36 (0.2)  
 37 Joyce: ↓I:s[n ' t] [↓he  
 38 Lesley: [↑What]do ↑y[ou ↑sa↓:y.  
 39 (0.3)  
 40 Joyce: ↓Oh isn't he ↓drea:dful.

This telling is made up of a number of sections: a story preface (lines 1 to 2), background detailing (lines 4 to 25), then detailed portrayal of the events that form the focus of the telling (lines 28 to 31). This story peaks with the animation of 'Mr R' at lines 30 to 31 using direct reported speech. Following this there is appreciation of the story by Joyce as both she and Lesley convey their reaction to the events (lines 32 to 40). The preface gives some clues as to what the story is about (i.e. some occurrence that has annoyed Lesley), but it is not until she reaches the reported speech that what this is becomes clear. Thus, the introduction helps to constitute this as the peak of the narrative: it sets up a puzzle for the recipient regarding what has irritated Lesley, which is solved by the reported utterance. This is further evidenced by the fact that Joyce then begins an elaborate response to the report, thus treating it as complete and demonstrating a similar stance towards the comment (Holt, 2000; Heritage 2011). Thus, this story is constructed over a number of turns with distinct sections; it involves chronological detailing of events culminating in a highly granular portrayal of actions and animation of a story-world figure.

Not all stories are as neatly constructed as this. Stories evolve out of the ongoing interaction so tellers orient to recipient's responses, thus stories can include asides, sections can be recycled, etc. They do not always have a section built as a clear peak. Some have long sequences of reported dialogue and, thus, an extended section forming the focus of the telling rather than a climax towards which other detailing builds.

Analysis of IRS in storytelling shows that it recurrently occurs around, and helps to manage transitions between these sections that constitute storytellings. While DRS recurrently constitutes the focus of the telling - recalling a chronological series of utterances (and sometimes connected events) in granular detail (Bangerter, Mayor and Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Heritage, 2011; Holt, 1996, 2000) - IRS regularly occurs in segments that are not the main focus of the telling and at transitions from or towards the focus (Bangerter, Mayor and Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Bauman, 1986). Over the following four sections I present the recurrent sequential positions of the IRS in my corpus.

### **IRS in talk surrounding the focus of the story**

IRS recurrently occurs in either background detailing leading up to the peak of the telling (which is regularly delivered using DRS) or afterwards. In the first extract the IRS occurs as

part of the detailing that helps the recipient make sense of the interaction reported using DRS that follows it.

(3)[NB:IV:10:35]

1 Lottie: .hhh But we wen' in: uh the De:si  
2 Arne:z place onna way ba:ck en: uh e-had  
3 (.) uh: they had'n a:fter dinner dri:'n  
4 God there wasn't a sou:l ih We w'r the only  
5 ones et the bar en there wz abha'two parties  
6 in th[e dining]roo' .p.hhhh  
7 Emma: [°Ye:h.° ]  
8 Lottie:→ En I din'wanna say-eh: A:deline said she  
9 → aweess wanduh see it so .hnhh I never said  
10 anything but- uh: Claude said dihday he siz  
11 wasn't that the dirdies' place?=  
12 Emma: =[Y e :s]  
13 Lottie: =[ 'n I s]ai:d you know? (.) I: felt the same  
14 thing b't I didn' wanna say 'nything to yih  
15 but I jis fe[:l']  
16 Emma: [Ya:]h  
17 Lottie: dirdy when ah walked un the ca:r↓p\*t.h .hh

In lines 1 to 6 Emma recalls visiting a hotel during her recent trip, including details - regarding its lack of patrons - that hint at the quality of the establishment. She then begins to report that she didn't want to comment on the quality of the hotel (line 8) but self-repairs to provide a detail that explains her reluctance to complain - that her friend had 'said she always wanted to see it'. Thus, IRS is used to convey her friend's inclination to visit. She then continues with the repaired element 'so I never said anything' followed by a direct report of what Adeline's husband said 'today' which explicitly criticises its cleanliness. A further unit of DRS is used to then portray her response which supports Claude's opinion. The indirect report of Adeline's desire to visit, then, forms part of the detailing necessary to understand why Emma did not voice her negative opinion at the time, and perhaps also the significance of Claude's opinion that supported her own.

Several elements of the construction of the turn in lines 8 to 11 help constitute the reported comment as part of the background details rather than the chronological series of events forming the main focus of the telling. First, Lottie begins to say that she 'didn't want to say-' (line 8) likely breaking off before saying 'anything'. She then begins a different unit (i.e. not a redoing of the self-repaired segment) thus suggesting this is something new that needs to be included before continuing. She picks this up again after the reported comment - 'so I never said anything' (lines 9 to 10), constructing the IRS as important for understanding her decision not to comment on the quality of the hotel. It is possible that Adeline made this comment during her visit to the hotel but when and where the locution was uttered are not specified. Thus, it is not clearly portrayed as part of the chronological unfolding of events. Contrast this with the construction of Claude's comment that follows. This is clearly placed in the chronological order with 'Claude said today'. Lottie then produces another reported

speech introduction - 'he said' - before enacting his interrogative, thus clearly marking this as direct reported speech and as contrasting with the preceding indirect speech.

Aspects of the design of the IRS contribute towards constituting this as a background detail necessary for understanding the directly reported utterance that follows. The IRS is embedded into a larger unit "A:deline said she aweess wanduh see it so .hnhh I never said anything". The second part of the unit focuses on her decision not to speak out. Thus, the IRS does not simply portray Adeline's stance but uses it to explain Emma's reluctance. In this way the report forms part and is used in the service of conveying Emma's reaction to the hotel. Emma frames the report as something Adeline said but she does not purport to enact the comment. Thus, the focus of this segment is on Adeline's stance (i.e. that she's always wanted to visit the hotel), rather than on the act or occasion of saying it. The portrayal is brief and non-granular - there are no other details -such as a turn initial 'oh' -that would give a more complete indication of the locution or the occasion(s) on which it was uttered. In this way it fits well into the story in conveying a detail necessary for understanding the events without becoming the focus.

In the following extract the IRS again occurs prior to an utterance of DRS that forms part of the focus of the telling. While in the previous extract the IRS was part of detailing necessary for understanding the events that are recounted following it, in the next excerpt the IRS occurs in an aside. While recounting information leading up to the climax of the story (see Holt, 1996) Mum interjects that Prince Phillip also offended people on a visit to China. In agreeing, Lesley recalls a remark by her husband, but not one that is explicitly portrayed as being part of the events that she is engaged in portraying (and that she continues to recall, ending with the DRS at the end of the extract).

(4)[Holt:X(C)1:1:6:7]

(Lesley's husband's firm has been presenting a display at an agricultural show attended by the Queen and Prince Phillip. Just before the extract she reports that Prince Phillip was in a 'foul mood'.)

1 Lesley: [iYes .hh he'd- ↑apparantly they said that  
2 he'd had some sorta tiff with the £Quee:n.£  
3 (0.2)  
4 Mum: heh! (0.2) h[uh. (huh)  
5 Lesley: [A:nd he wz in a (.) ↑dread↓ful  
6 move. ↓he- a[n' (.) an' he went e-mood .hh  
7 Mum: [Mm  
8 Lesley: an' he went fr'm sta:ll to sta:ll in a  
9 .hh (.) a thundercloud, eh[heh!  
10 Mum: [( )  
11 Mum: Oh dea[:r.  
12 Lesley: [An' a:fter he'd go:ne: they had t'go  
13 round t'th' sta:ll holders 'n apologi:ze for  
14 him  
15 Mum: (Oh[ )  
16 Lesley: [.p.hhhh becuz he wz cu:rt,  
17 to everybod[y:

18 Mum: [We:ll- yes  
19 [an:'[ 'e did it-(.)↑( )- W'[l'e did it in=  
20 Lesley: [.hh [An' [u-  
21 Mum: =↑Chi::na too didn'e.[( )  
22 Lesley: [ih↓Ye::s uhm--: u-  
23 → Mark said eez not surpri:zed that he:,hh  
24 → that he behaved like tha:t?  
25 Mum: eh↑heh  
26 Lesley: .hhh An' he ↑came to their ↓sta:ll?  
27 Rimbold's sta:ll-  
28 (0.7)  
29 Lesley: and he- (.) they- (.) showed him ↓everything  
30 'n 'e said ↓huh. .hh making another desert I  
31 see, ↓

Lesley reports that the prince was in a 'dreadful mood', that he was 'curt' to the stallholders and that 'they' had to apologise to them after his visit. At lines 16 and 17 Mum reaches what might be seen as a possible ending of the story (since she refers to what happens after the visit). However, the 'An' at line 20 may be the beginning of Lesley's continuation (which she takes up again at line 26). But, in line 21, Mum overlaps with a turn that refers to another incident where Prince Phillip was allegedly rude on a state visit (possibly taking Lesley's story to be completed). Lesley agrees and then conveys her husband's opinion using IRS which links to both events (i.e. implying that he wasn't surprised about this experience because he was aware of his reputation from past occasions). It is an indirect report rather than a direct one since the pronoun is from the current speaker's point of view. Lesley then continues the story, picking it up again with 'and', line 26. She steps back in time in the story-world to the point at which Prince Phillip came to her husband's stall (lines 26 to 31).

Thus, the IRS at lines 23 and 24 is uttered in response to Mum's comment at lines 18, 19 and 21, and forms part of a slight departure from the recalling of events that surrounds it. It is embedded into a larger structure which begins with the agreement 'Yes', indicating that this is a response to Mum's prior turn rather than a continuation of the recalling of the events that form the focus of the story. The IRS portrays her husband's opinion without making explicit the context in which it was said or claiming to convey the exact locution. It is brief and non-granular: it lacks elements that would convey a more multifaceted and detailed portrayal of Mark's utterance, such as a turn-initial 'well' which would also give some clues about the context in which the comment was 'originally' uttered (i.e. implying that it was a response). In this way it helps mark this segment as a departure from the chronological recounting of the events of the agricultural show. Using IRS to briefly convey Mark's opinion maintains the focus on his stance rather than on the act of uttering it and the occasion of its production. Using IRS here to suggest this is a long-standing stance by Mark is particularly apposite in the face of Mum's competing claim to comment on Prince Phillip's behaviour by referring to a different occasion (see Clift. 2007).

In these two extracts the IRS occurs prior to DRS used to convey utterances that form the focus of the story: in (3) it conveys a background detail necessary for understanding the

directly reported interaction that follows, in (4) it occurs in an aside begun by the recipient, before continuing to recount a series of events. In the next excerpt the IRS occurs in talk that follows the DRS. Again, the IRS conveys information relevant to the story but not part of the focus of the telling which is conveyed mainly through DRS.

(5)[NB:IV:4:1-2]

(Emma announces that her husband has left her and then begins to recount the events that led up to his departure.)

1 Emma: .hhh ↑We were spoze tih gone ou'tuh dinner with  
2 Bill'n Gla's we w'r over there watchin  
3 th'ga::me'n (.) .t.hhh (.) H\*e adda ↓b:ee:r'n I  
4 hadda m-martini: en then we came over 'n uh  
5 \*u-w\*e Ah hadjer ↑thing thu (.) tha:wing out  
6 yihknow that ↑rice ↓st\*uff en I thought w'if we  
7 don't go out ah'll ha:ve that'n (.) .hhhh 'ee  
8 siz w'l yih kno:w you've gotta put that back in  
9 the rih .hhhh y'don't put it ba:CK in the  
10 freezer,h  
11 (0.2)  
12 Emma: w'n yih (0.2) take out'n I sid w'l I: know  
13 tha:t,h  
14 (.)  
15 Emma: Yihkno:w,h  
16 (0.2)  
17 Emma: .hhhh En then wen'e khh-came in w'n ah-uh fr'm  
18 fishin en I sid gee lookit I: did a:ll the hhh  
19 things with aw- va:cuum cleaner I've been all  
20 over the(b) f::- wul .hhh (.) 'e siz w'l hhow  
21 couldje do i:t. uh: ↓uh Didje do a good  
22 jo::b,h.hh .hhh w'l that tee:d me o::ff,hh  
23 (.)  
24 Lottie: hkhh °hhuh huh [he:h,°  
25 Emma: [.hh.hh So'EE ↑PACKED IZ  
26 --> CLO:THES'N'EE WENT en'ee siz'ee won't ev'n  
27 --> be down vuh Thanksgi↓ving. So I think ah'll  
28 ca:ll Barbra'n cancel the who:le thing.°°hmhh°°  
29 (2.2)  
30 Emma: Ihdn'this re:diculous ↑en u-en BILL'N GLADYS  
31 WAITIN OUT THERE IH GO TUH DINNER'N ah: had tih  
32 go tell'm ↑Isn'he re:diculous?  
33 (1.0)  
34 Lottie: He's cra:z↓y.

Emma is telling Lottie that she and her husband have fallen out and he has left her at their holiday home to return to the city. Detailing and multiple units of DRS are used to portray, in chronological order, their actions before and after his fishing trip (lines 1 to 22). In line 22 she assesses his comment with "w'l that tee:d me o::ff,hh". Lottie produces a little laughter at line 24. Then Emma turns to the upshot of the argument saying that he packed a bag and left and "'ee siz'ee won't ev'n be down vuh Thanksgi↓ving.". Use of the pronoun 'he', the inclusion of 'even' and the lack of indicators of DRS such as a turn initial and a shift in prosody, all indicate this is indirect rather than direct reported speech. Thus, she uses IRS to convey his decision not to return for the upcoming Thanksgiving celebration. Continuing on this forward looking train of thought, she then says she might call her daughter to cancel. Thus, in this turn (lines 25 to 28) there is a gradual transition from recalling the events in chronological order to considering the implications and what she should do next. The first part of the turn - 'so he packed his clothes and he went' - portrays an event that followed the interaction conveyed through the preceding DRS. However, the IRS - 'and he says he won't even be down for Thanksgiving' - deviates from the chronological order and focuses on an upshot of the argument. The following unit - 'so I think I'll call Barbara and cancel the whole thing' - is a further step away from chronological portrayal of the events.

So, the IRS at lines 26 and 27 is part of a transition away from granular portrayal of the events that led to his leaving to the knock-on effect for future plans. The IRS is embedded into this sequence dealing with the consequences. It forms part of a larger two-part structure (involving two turn construction units) listing three actions by Bud:

1. So'EE ↑PACKED IZ CLO:THES/'N'EE WENT
2. en 'ee siz'ee won't ev'n be down vuh Thanksgi↓ving

The IRS deviates from a chronological portrayal (as seen in the preceding sequence of DRS). Rather, this list of three items (packing, leaving and saying he won't return for Thanksgiving) formulates the upshot of the argument. Using IRS rather than DRS maintains the focus on the action (i.e. his decision not to return for Thanksgiving) rather than enacting the locution. Where and how it was made are not specified. Its brief, non-granular design means that it is not explicitly portrayed as continuing the enactment of the interaction played out in the preceding DRS. The indirect form maintains this transition away from chronological portrayal of the events towards consideration of the implications.

The IRS in these extracts occurs before or after the focus of the telling: in (3) it is used to introduce a detail relevant to understanding the focus of the telling (mainly conveyed through DRS); in (4) the IRS comes in an aside, sparked off by the recipient's comment and prior to continuation to the peak of the telling (involving an utterance of DRS); and in (5) the IRS occurs in a transition away from the peak of the telling (mainly conveyed through DRS) to consider the upshot of the events recalled. Recurrent features of the design of these utterances containing IRS render it useful in conveying information that does not form part of the main focus of the telling. The IRS contrasts with the chronological portrayal of actions manifest in the sequences of DRS that precede or follow, giving a brief, non-granular gloss or summary of action rather than enacting a locution from a specified occasion.

### **IRS in introducing DRS in storytelling**

Another look at extract (1) reveals the next recurrent sequential position of IRS in storytelling.<sup>2</sup>

(1)[Detail]

12 Hal: → [Yea:h.] [And when I came back to  
 13 → Canterbury station 'n had to get a ticket  
 14 → I said .hh I've ↓I: said I(h) wanted two  
 15 → to Gill↓im:.=  
 16 Skip: =.p.h[°aa-°  
 17 Hal: [Gellin:g Gill↓im[:.  
 18 Skip: [ihYeh, ?=  
 19 Hal: =So 'ee said where ↑the  
 20 devil[do y(hh)ou]↑come[vrō(h)m↑]=  
 21 Skip: [g n i k k ]ehhh [h h e h ]=  
 22 Skip: =↑hhe[h [eh[uh  
 23 Hal: [sai[d [oh Somerset. 'ee said I  
 24 ↑THOU:GH[T ↓so(h)ō,  
 25 Skip: [ehh heh.hh\_h↑e:h ↑hih u h h ]  
 26 Hal: [He said w'l]wē  
 27 call it Jillim o[ver (here).]  
 28 Skip: [.h u h h h ]

The turn containing the IRS at lines 12 to 15 is used to introduce the recalled dialogue between Hal and the ticket seller. The rest of the dialogue is presented using DRS. So, the indirect form is used to present the request that begins, and accounts for, the subsequent turns portrayed through DRS. This pattern - a unit of IRS used to introduce a sequence portrayed through DRS- is recurrent in the corpus. In these instances rather than occurring as part of the talk surrounding the focus of the telling, the unit containing the IRS forms a transition from detailing leading up to the focus and the directly reported talk that constitutes it. As became clear in the previous section, attributes of the design of the device render it useful for this transitional role, including the fact that it tends to be brief and less granular than DRS, embedded into a larger unit and summarises or glosses an action rather than enacting a locution from a specific occasion.

In (1) the brief gloss of Hal's request forms part of a larger unit whereby he makes a transition from background detailing about why they went by train to his interaction with the ticket seller. This unit specifies who spoke to who - it is presented indirectly here through saying that he 'had to get a ticket', how and where they came to speak - by mentioning the station and by explaining his need to purchase a ticket, and, using the IRS, a brief gloss of the turn that began the sequence - 'I said I wanted two to Gillum'. In Holt (2016) I showed that these characteristics - presenting the *who*, *when/how* and *what* of the following directly reported utterances- are regular features of the units including the IRS in this sequential position.

Sometimes the IRS immediately precedes the DRS (as in [1]), in other instances further details can intervene as the next extract illustrates.

(6)[NB:IV:10:64]

(Emma is recalling events of the day: while she was entertaining her friends Gladys and Bill, another friend, Margy rang to ask if she could help her with her accounts.)

1 Emma: .tlk.hhhh OH YA:H ↑I CALLED AFTER I got  
2 (.) through din'r I tol' Margy I: said u-  
3 ahw- uyuh (.) e-uh: (0.2) I helped her  
4 with all this (0.2) gett'n these b'k  
5 (0.2) ↓werk things ↓ yihknow ah hadtuh ca:ll  
6 ↓back numbers: 'n accou:nts ↓for'er .hh  
7 → .hhhhh.hh A:nd uhm (0.3) tshe: ↑cahlled me  
8 → on the phone dih ask me if I:'d he:lp ↓\*'er.  
9 (0.3)  
10 Emma: Yihknow: (.) w'n Bill'n Gladys w'r here'n  
11 I sid ↑su:re ah'll be do:wn nuh bu I  
12 u[m'n I'm g]IV'N THEM A CO:CKteel now=  
13 (Lottie): [(°M hm, °)]  
14 Emma: ='n they're goin out (.) tih dinner sh'se  
15 ↑ooh no:w don't- don't ru:sh but I sed (.)  
16 .hhhhh (0.2) UH: hhhe AH'LL BE DOW:N HELP  
17 you...

At the beginning of the extract Emma and Lottie are talking about trying to contact each other prior to the current call. Emma describes helping her friend Margy do her accounts. Then at lines 7 and 8 Emma begins detailing the circumstances that led up to her going to visit Margy. She begins at the point where Margy rang her to ask for her help while Emma was entertaining Bill and Gladys. She uses IRS to convey the request. Then, after giving another detail necessary to understanding the report that follows, she uses multiple units of DRS to portray her response and subsequent turns.

The IRS forms a transition into the storytelling. After detailing what she did prior to ringing, Lottie shifts (line 7 and 8) into more clear-cut storytelling going back to the beginning (i.e. Margy's request for her help) and beginning to recall the events in a chronological order. The IRS and the unit into which it is embedded bring about this transition and set up the next move into granular representation of the conversation between Emma and Margy following the request. It presents information about the *who*, *when/how* and *what* of the portrayed interaction: 1. who spoke to who is indicated through '**she called me**'; 2. how the participants came to talk is recalled with '**called me on the phone**'; and 3. the IRS is used to give a brief gloss of the starting point of the interaction with '**to ask me if I'd help her**'.

By providing a brief, non-granular summary of Margy's request rather than enacting it, Emma focuses on the action instead of its delivery. There is a marked contrast between this indirect report and the highly granular direct reports that follow which give insight into the way these were delivered, what was said and, consequently, the stances of the speakers (for example, by reporting that Margy said "ooh no:w don't- don't ru:sh" she implicitly conveys her consideration for her friend). The IRS sets the scene for Emma's reported response conveyed using DRS (line 11) indicating that she willingly accepted despite currently entertaining friends. Thus the focus is less on Margy's request and more on Emma's response and subsequent turns in the reported dialogue. The IRS is crucial in bringing about this transition between describing the circumstances behind the call and enacting the conversation that took place when Margy rang.

Recurrent aspects of the design make IRS ideal for managing the transition from detailing to directly portraying utterances. The fact that it is recurrently embedded into larger units means

that other parts of the utterance can indicate who spoke to who and how or when they talked. This makes it useful for giving details necessary for enacting a dialogue. The fact that it is a brief, less granular summary of spoken action renders it useful for glossing the beginning of the interaction before moving to more detailed and multidimensional enactment of utterances.

So far two recurrent sequential positions of IRS in storytelling have been presented: 1. in non-focal talk before or after the direct portrayal of locutions that constitute the focus of the story; and 2. in introducing DRS as a transition from detailing to a reported dialogue. These are the two most common patterns in the corpus, however, IRS also recurrently occurs on two other positions: 1. as a departure within a sequence of directly reported utterances; and 2. within DRS (i.e. a directly reported speaker is reported as using IRS). Again, recurrent aspects of the design of the device render it ideal for use in these positions.

### IRS as a departure within a sequence of DRS

In the following extract Emma is recalling to Lottie a conversation with her daughter (Barbara) regarding the fact that Bud has left, and the plans to get together for Thanksgiving. Multiple units of DRS are used to convey the interaction between Barbara and Emma. IRS is employed to portray an utterance which is not part of the current reported dialogue but helps to explain an element.

(7)[NB:IV:10:8]

(Emma reports Barbara saying that her father-in-law, Mr Black, is in hospital and this, on top of the problems between Emma and Bud, may mean she and her husband Hugh cannot come for Thanksgiving.)

1 Emma: .hhh She siz ah:: (0.2) .hhh \*I: cah:ll-deh  
2 Mist'r Bla:ck's in the hospital'n we don't  
3 know wut's gonna hap'n we ma:y haft'go: eh  
4 Hugh wanssa see iz mother'n besides if  
5 you'n Dad er havin fi:ght why: Hugh en I:  
6 don't wanna be invo:lved I s'd w'l wir not  
7 f:i:ghting she siz well Da:d siz you wanna  
8 → KILL'I:M in .hhhhhhh a:n' I seh tuh couple  
9 → a'theyngs yihknow I hope'e dro:p  
10 → ↓dea:d'n uh:[:  
11 Lottie: [↓Yea:h  
12 Emma: End he's (.) wanniduh kill me'n all'ihknow  
13 how yih ↓talk  
14 Lotti: Yea: [h?  
15 Emma: [So I didn't au:gment on that I mean  
16 it's ul (.) (lo:d of care) .hhhhh So she  
17 siz well we don'wan'come down thez  
18 any prob'm...

In lines 1 to 8 Emma uses DRS to portray a number of turns between herself and her daughter in the reported interaction. The final unit is "well Da:d siz you wanna KILL'I:M". To explain

this Emma then switches from enacting the interaction to summarise comments she made to Bud which she first loosely glosses as 'a couple of things' then adds "I hope'e dro:p ↓deɑ:d'n uh::". Thus, she uses IRS to portray one comment, possibly beginning to add another (with "n uh:") but tailing off as Lottie overlaps with "↓Yea:h". The indirectly reported talk here is not framed as part of the interaction with Barbara but as background information necessary to understand the directly reported utterance at line 8. The IRS is embedded into a larger unit which begins with a vague gloss and then uses this to illustrate the kind of 'things' she is referring to. The indirect report is brief and non-granular. Rather than being portrayed as an utterance from a specific moment, it is presented as the kind of thing she may have said on various occasions. The focus is on the action (presented as being recurrent) rather than on enacting a particular interaction in which it was uttered. In this segment, therefore, Emma creates a transition away from recalling the interaction with Barbara towards providing details relevant to understanding part of the portrayed conversation. The IRS is embedded into a unit that constitutes background details rather than being part of the directly reported conversation that is the focus of the telling.

At lines 12 and 13 Emma reports her husband also wanting to kill her. This may also be something like IRS since, although it is not introduced with a pronoun and speech verb, it is followed by 'you know how you talk'. Thus, this is similar to the report in lines 10 and 11: it is brief, non-granular and not presented as an enactment of an actual utterance made on a specific occasion. Following some further talk that adds to this departure from the focus of the telling, Emma returns to portraying the conversation she had with Barbara at line 16.

So, IRS sometimes occurs within a sequence of DRS that constitutes the focus of a storytelling. The IRS portrays background details and creates a transition away from granular, step-by-step enactment of an interaction to glossing a stance conveyed through speech without anchoring it to a particular context.

### Directly reported IRS within DRS

In the previous extract IRS occurs in talk that forms a departure from recalling a conversation using DRS. Occasionally, however, IRS occurs within directly reported speech: i.e. a participant uses DRS to portray a reported speaker using indirect reported speech. Using IRS rather than DRS in this environment is recurrent<sup>3</sup>, but not inevitable. That is to say, it is possible to portray a directly reported speaker using direct reported speech as another look at extract (8) illustrates.

(8)[Detail]

1 Emma: [SO THEN I CA:LL'Barbr'en I said loo:k.  
 2 (1.0)  
 3 Emma: → Yer FATHER LE:FT ME THE OTHER night'n he  
 4 → siz well yer ↓alweez ↓bitchin en: ↓this:'n  
 5 → tha:t yih don'like the a↓paa:rtment en  
 6 → .t.hhh.hhh a:nd eh: .hhh.hhh hard dih ↓live  
 7 wi:th↓ en ih wen'aroun this bing thet ah wz  
 8 gonna ↓khill eem I said a couple a' ti:mes  
 9 udrop deɑ:d'n I sid dih th- wisht the boat

10 ed ↓sɑ:nk er b'd I didn' say that he tol' me  
 11 a couple a'times 'e c'd (0.2) ↓chɔ:ke me duh  
 12 death ↓tʊ: so (.) let's face it wutche say  
 13 in a:ng↓\*er.

Prior to the IRS considered above, Emma portrays her reporting some of the things her husband said to her prior to walking out. Here, rather than use DRS to recall her conversation with her daughter and IRS to report what she said about her husband criticising her, instead she uses DRS for both. Thus, this shows that a speaker can use DRS to convey the words of a directly reported speaker reporting talk, but analysis of the following extracts demonstrates that using IRS can fulfil certain interactional exigencies as well as better distinguishing the two voices.

In the following extract Deena directly portrays her future son-in-law producing an utterance in which he indirectly reports his fiancé (Deena's daughter).

(9[Holt:M88:2:4:45])

(Deena is recalling a conversation between her daughter's fiancé - who is a police officer - and his boss - the inspector. The inspector advises the fiancé to move house since he is getting married and currently lives in a rough area.)

1 Deena: =they um (0.2) his inspector- (1.2) uh:m  
 2 got iz papers out 'n said oh 'e said I  
 3 (.) see you live on the Ansel Estate.  
 4 which is a k- (.) was a Council estate  
 5 which is gradually an' slowly been (0.6)  
 6 sold off[( )you know=  
 7 Mark: [eYes  
 8 Deena: =[an' it's a very very nice house actually.  
 9 Mark: [Yes  
 10 (0.2)  
 11 Mark: .p.t  
 12 (0.3)  
 13 Deena: He: said um are you thinking of moving uhm  
 14 (.) °( )° he said to im (0.6) So: 'e  
 15 said well I am sir 'e said bec'z: um  
 16 Deirdre doesn't want to live (0.7) in my  
 17 → house becuz she says i-it won't be ours  
 18 → it'll always be mi:ne.  
 19 (0.3)  
 20 Mark: [nYea:h,  
 21 Deena: [( ) a:nd um u-he said well I advise  
 22 you to move as ↑soon as you ↓ca:n. (0.2)  
 23 'e said oh: why:.

In this extract Deena uses multiple turns of DRS to portray the inspector's and the fiancé's dialogue. At lines 17 and 18 she reports the fiancé reporting her daughter - Deirdre - regarding her reasons for wanting to move. This report is IRS within the directly reported utterance: 'mine' is from the fiancé's point of view, not Deirdre's. One reason for using IRS

rather than DRS to convey this is that it helps distinguish the different voices. In a direct form - 'it won't be ours it'll always be yours'- the referent of the final pronoun could be confusing. Indirect report also shares characteristics with the others in the collection. It is a brief - one unit long - summary of spoken action. It is less granular in that little detail is given and the focus is on summarising her spoken opinion rather than conveying how or when it was said. It is embedded into the larger direct report, thus it is preceded by 'well I am sir because Deirdre doesn't want to live in my house', thus it gives further evidence to support and explain his stated intention to move. By not directly reporting the utterance, the focus is maintained on the fiancé's decision rather than on portraying his conversation with Deirdre. In this way, there is a brief transition into portraying the reported speaker reporting an utterance before a return to conveying the conversation between him and the inspector (lines 21 to 23).

The next example also contains IRS within a portrayed interaction using DRS. Here the IRS is more extended, conveying a list of three objections that Emma (the current recipient) is reported to have said to her husband about living in their apartment rather than remaining at the beach house. Emma is recalling a conversation she had with her daughter about the disagreement between her and Barbara's father.

(10)[NB:IV:10:8]

15 Emma: [So I didn't au:gment on that I mean  
 16 it's ul (.) (lo:d of care) .hhhhh So she  
 17 siz well we don'wan'come down thez  
 18 any prob'm I sid well eyuh- we're not gonna  
 19 have any a:rguments I: said it's jis one  
 20 a'those things ah don'know WHAT'S GONNA  
 21 HA:↓pp\*en.  
 22 (0.2)  
 23 Emma: 'f wir gunnuh separate er wha:t.  
 24 (.)  
 25 Lottie: [Y e a h ?]  
 26 Emma: [°↓\*I sid° I]'ve: kind'v had it.h.hh.hhhhh  
 27 → s'nen she s'z well: < (0.3) DA:D se:z you  
 28 → won't LIVE IN THE A↓PA:RTMENT in  
 29 → thetcher unHA::PPY UP THERE'n you want him  
 30 → tuh c'mmute BA:CK 'n forth evry day ↑whi:ch  
 31 is a Go:d da:mn LIE:,  
 32 (.)  
 33 Emma: .hh[hhh<  
 34 Lottie: [Oh↓:::~::~: y:eah[c u z]you'd never sai:d  
 35 tha\*:[t.

The IRS occurs when Emma directly portrays her daughter reporting comments made by her father (lines 27 to 30). The report within this report is indirect: for example, the pronouns 'you' are from the point of view of the reported recipient (Emma) rather than 'she' which would have suggested that Barbara used a direct report of Bud's comments. The three-part list conveys an indication of the kinds of comments that Bud made to Barbara. The fact that this is in IRS and lacks the kinds of details (e.g. turn initials) that give some insight into the

reported context in which these utterances were purportedly made, and that three units are portrayed without introductory speech verbs, suggest this is something of a loose gloss of what Barbara reported Bud saying rather than an attempt to enact the actual locutions. In this way Emma portrays Barbara as giving a flavour of the argument as reported to her, without shifting into consideration of the specific turns that reportedly constituted the disagreement.

These instances demonstrate that IRS occurs within direct reports and thus during the dialogue that forms the focus of the story. But recurrent aspects of the design that make it useful in all the positions considered here are also in evidence in these instances. Central is the fact that the IRS is a brief summary of locutions without enacting those utterances or conveying the occasion on which they were uttered. Thus, reported speakers are portrayed as briefly using reported speech to indicate the stance of another speaker while maintaining the focus on other matters such as the fiancé's decision to move in (12) and the fact that Emma and Barbara have fallen out in (13).

## **Conclusion**

This analysis shows that while the use of indirect over direct reported speech may, in part, be due to the fact that it contrasts with DRS and may clarify referents, aspects of its design make it ideally suited to these sequential positions over and above the fact that it contrasts with direct forms. Furthermore, IRS recurrently occurs in different positions in comparison to DRS in storytellings. While DRS commonly constitutes the peak or focus of the telling (involving enactment of what was said in a granular fashion) IRS occurs in background detailing, in introducing DRS, in breaks from DRS and within DRS to report a reported interaction. Aspects of its design make it ideally suited to these positions and the concomitant interactional tasks. As a brief, non-granular summary of a spoken action it keeps the focus on the ongoing action rather than on portraying the utterance. Thus, for example, in (1) the IRS briefly portrays Hal's request for a ticket before DRS is used to portray his continuing interaction with the ticket-seller, focusing on his mispronunciation of the name. In this way it forms a transition from the detailing necessary to understanding the story to its focus (the reported dialogue).

A consequence of the design of IRS is that it is ideal at managing transitions within stories and conveying information necessary to understanding the focus of the telling. DRS is recurrently used to animate story-world actors through the chronological portrayal of their interactions (Couper-Kuhlen, 2007). Thus, it is prototypically storytelling. However, IRS, generally being the brief summary of an action or stance conveyed through speech without contextualisation, is less so. Thus, using DRS is often to engage in storytelling, whereas using IRS is to depart from it. The IRS deviates from the chronological order, is not explicitly placed in context and less dramatically animates the story-world figure. Thus, using different forms of reported speech can be an important factor in constituting talk as storytelling or as something other.

## **References**

- Banfield, A. (1973) Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language*, 10: 1-39.

- Banfield, A. (1982) *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Kegan Paul: Routledge.
- Bangerter, A., Mayor, E. and Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011) Reported speech in conversational storytelling during nursing shift handover meetings. *Discourse Processes*, 48(3) 183-214.
- Bauman, R. (1986) *Story, performance and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Capone, A. (2016) On the (complicated) relationship between direct and indirect reports. In A. Capone, F. Kiefer and F. Lo Piparo (eds) *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics: Interdisciplinary Studies*: 55-76. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Clark, H. H. & R. J. Gerrig (1990) Quotations as demonstrations. *Language*, 66: 764-805.
- Clift, R. (2007) Getting there first: non-narrative reported speech in interaction. In E. Holt and R. Clift, (eds) *Reporting on Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*: 120-149.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clift, R. & Holt, E. (2007) Introduction. In E. Holt and R. Clift, (eds) *Reporting on Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*: 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1986) Reported speech: Some general issues. In F. Coulmas, (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*: 1-28. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Couper-Kuhlen (2007) Assessing and accounting. In E. Holt and R. Clift (eds.) *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*: 81-119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1998) Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interactions*, 31: 295-325.
- Goffman, E. (1981) Footing. In E. Goffman (ed.) *Forms of Talk*: 124-159. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Günthner, S. (1997) The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.) *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expression and Theoretical Foundation*: 247-275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heritage, J. (1984) A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*: 299-345 . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2011) Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: empathic moments in interaction. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds) *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*: 159-183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Holt, E. (1996) Reporting on talk: the use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29, 3: 219-45.
- Holt, E. (2000) Reporting and reacting: Concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33: 425-454.
- Holt, E. (2007) 'I'm eyeing your chop up mind': reporting and enacting. In E. Holt & R. Clift (eds): 47-80.
- Holt, E. (2009) Reported Speech. In S. D'hondt, J-O. Ostman and J. Verschueren (eds). *The Pragmatics of Interaction: Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights 4*: 190-205. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holt, E. (2016) Indirect reported speech in interaction. In A. Capone, F. Kiefer and F. Lo Piparo (eds) *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics: Interdisciplinary Studies*: 167-188. Cham: Springer.
- Holt, E & R. Clift (2007) *Reporting on Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J.N. Scenkein (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*: 219-248. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Labov, W., and Waletzky, J. (1966) Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*: 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Li, C. (1986) Direct and indirect speech: A functional study. In C. Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect speech*: 29-45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mandelbaum, J. (2013) Storytelling in interaction. In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*: 493-507. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Mayes, P. (1990) Quotation in spoken English, *Studies in Language* 14: 325-363.
- Norricks, N. (2016) Indirect reports, quotation and narrative. In A. Capone, F. Kiefer and F. Lo Piparo (eds) *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics: Interdisciplinary Studies*: 93-114. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Partee, B. H. (1973) The syntax and semantics of quotation. In S. R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky (eds.) *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, pp. 410-418. New York: Holt Rinehart and Wilson.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*: 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Selting, M. (2000) The construction of “units” in conversational talk. *Language in Society*, 29: 477–517.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000) On granularity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 715-720.
- Sidnell, J. (2010) *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Stivers, T. (2013) Sequence organisation. In J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*: 200-203. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking voices. Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whittle, E. (2016) The question of reported speech: Identifying an occupational hazard. In A. Capone, F. Kiefer and F. Lo Piparo (eds) *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics: Interdisciplinary Studies*: 265-290. Cham: Springer
- Wierzbicka, A. (1974) The Semantics of Direct and Indirect Discourse. *Papers in Linguistics*, 7, 3/ 4: 267-307.

---

<sup>1</sup> These corpora were recorded several decades ago in the US and UK and are used widely within the CA community. Most were transcribed by Gail Jefferson using the system she developed.

<sup>2</sup> See also Holt (2016) for more on IRS introducing DRS in storytelling.

<sup>3</sup> Though IRS within DRS is more common than DRS within DRS, overall the number of instances in my corpus is small. Thus, this is the least prevalent of the four positions.