

## Representing Characters' Speech and Thought in Narrative Fiction

*Elena Semino, Lancaster University*

### 1. Introduction

Much work in stylistics involves the in-depth analysis of individual literary texts or extracts, usually in order to relate specific linguistic choices and patterns to potential meanings and effects. To my mind, this kind of work represents one of the main strengths of the stylistics tradition: for all the controversy that sometimes surrounds the linguistic study of literature, explicit, rigorous and sensitive linguistic analyses provide invaluable insights into the workings of texts and language generally, as well as useful hypotheses and explanations with respect to readers' interpretations.

Inevitably, however, the analysis of specific texts involves implicit or explicit comparisons with other texts. Claiming that particular linguistic choices and patterns are significant because they are deviant, or conventional, or typical of an author or genre inevitably involves claiming that similar choices and patterns will, or will not, be normally found in other (comparable) texts, or in general language use. This is where analysts often have to rely on their own intuitions as language users and literature readers, and on the assumption that these intuitions will be shared by their audience.

The increased availability of corpora provides new resources that can usefully complement analysts' intuitions, and therefore strengthen and refine the conclusions drawn from the intensive analysis of individual texts. My aim in this paper is to demonstrate this by carrying out an in-depth analysis of an extract from Julian Barnes's *England, England* against the background of a relevant corpus. I will focus particularly on the way in which characters' speech and thought is presented, and on how this affects the projection of point of view and the potential for readers' sympathy towards the characters.

The presentation of characters' words and thoughts is a crucially important aspect of narrative, which has received a great deal of attention within stylistics and narratology (e.g. Cohn 1978, Fludernik 1993, Leech and Short 1981, Page 1973, Rimmon-Kenan 1983, Toolan 2001). My analysis will benefit particularly from the findings of a corpus-based project on speech, writing and thought presentation (SW&TP) which I have been involved in at Lancaster University in the mid-1990s (e.g. Semino *et al.* 1997, Semino and Short 2004). The project involved the creation of a corpus consisting of 120 extracts of approximately 2,000 words each, for a total of 258,348 words of (late) 20<sup>th</sup> century written British English. The 120 text samples were drawn from three different written genres: prose fiction (87,709 words), newspaper news reports (83,603 words), and biography and autobiography (87,036 words). Each genre section was further divided into a 'popular' and a 'serious' sub-section. In the case of prose fiction, we made a distinction between popular romances and action novels on the one hand, and prestigious, 'high-brow' novels on the other (by authors such as Virginia Woolfe and Salman Rushdie). The corpus was manually annotated for SW&TP using a specially-designed

annotation system (see Wynne *et al.* 1998 and Semino and Short 2004: 26ff.). Thanks to this annotation, it is possible to search the corpus and all its sub-sections for particular forms of SW&TP, in order to study their characteristics, frequencies, patterning and potential effects.

The availability of this corpus will benefit my analysis in two ways. First, I will apply to the extract an updated model of SW&TP that was developed during the corpus project starting from Leech and Short's (1981) earlier account of speech and thought presentation in fiction. As I will show, this revised model captures a wider range of phenomena than was the case with previous models. Second, I will compare choices and patterns in Barnes's extract with the patterns that occur in the corpus as a whole and in the fiction section in particular.

## 2. The extract for analysis

Julian Barnes's *England, England*, which was published in 1998, deals with themes such as authenticity, history, Englishness and the commodification of culture in an original and irreverently humorous way (see Nünning 2001).<sup>1</sup> In the second (and longest) of the novel's three parts, an eccentric billionaire, Jack Pitman, sets up on the Isle of Wight a hugely successful theme-park (called 'England, England'), which brings together all that, according to customer surveys, is regarded as quintessentially English: from the Royal Family to Manchester United, from Robin Hood to Samuel Johnson, from the cliffs of Dover to Anne Hathaway's cottage. The (shorter) first and third parts of the novel, in contrast, focus on the novel's main character, Martha Cochrane, who, for a time, plays a central role in Pitman's team. In particular, the first part includes a delicate evocation of Martha's childhood, which was marked by her father's sudden disappearance when she was still very young. The third part portrays an older Martha living in a post-industrial England, which has apparently returned to an older, rural way of life as a consequence of the success of the 'England, England' theme park.

The novel is extremely witty and sharp, but, in my view, its satirical and philosophical elements partly succeed at the expense of the creation of believable and fully rounded characters. In this respect, the novel's first part is quite different from the rest of the novel. Although it prefigures the novel's main themes, it convincingly and painfully evokes Martha's childhood, and particularly the contrast between the blissful, naïve innocence of her first years and the painful discoveries that started with her father's disappearance.

From the very start of the novel, Martha reflects on the illusory nature of personal memories, which in her case include her favourite childhood game, a 'counties-of-England' jigsaw puzzle. Martha remembers how each time, as she laboriously got to the end of the puzzle,

'a piece would be missing. Leicestershire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Warwickshire, Staffordshire – it was usually one of them – whereupon a sense of desolation, failure, and disappointment at the imperfection of the world would

come upon her, until Daddy, who always seemed to be hanging around at this moment, would find the missing piece in the unlikeliest place. What *was* Staffordshire doing in his trouser pocket? How could it have got there? And she would smile her Nos and head-shakes at him, because Staffordshire had been found, and her jigsaw, her England, and her heart had been made whole again.’ (Barnes 1999: 5-6)

On the day of her father’s disappearance, the Nottinghamshire piece of the jigsaw also disappears, never to be found again. For a while, the young Martha thinks that her father is simply prolonging their usual game by delaying the completion of the puzzle. Afterwards, her memory of his unexplained departure remains intimately connected with the memory of her incomplete jigsaw puzzle.

The novel sets up a potential parallel between Martha’s partly conscious reconstruction of her own personal history and the reconstruction of national history in the ‘England, England’ theme park. Similarly, Martha’s focus on her ‘Counties-of-England’ jigsaw puzzle anticipates her involvement with a miniature, fake England as Jack Pitman’s employee. But, even on a first reading, the first part of the novel worked (for this reader at least) as a powerful evocation of an individual’s memories, that are no less compelling for being potentially only partly ‘true’.

At the end of the first part of the novel, Martha, who is now in her mid-20s, has graduated from University and moved to a job in London. She is presented as reflecting on the fact that, ‘after the age of twenty-five, you were not allowed to blame anything on your parents’ (Barnes 1999: 22). This reflection is followed by a description of her single most painful memory, which is the extract I will be concerned with (NB: sentences have been numbered for ease of reference).

(1) But there was one thing, one tiny yet ineradicably painful thing for which she could never find the cure. (2) She had left university and come to London. (3) She was sitting in her office, pretending to be excited about her job; she had heart-trouble, nothing too serious, just a man, just the usual mild catastrophe; she had her period. (4) She remembered all that. (5) The phone went.

‘(6) Martha? (7) It’s Phil.’

‘(8) Who?’ (9) Someone over-familiar in red braces, she thought.

‘(10) Phil. (11) Philip. (12) Your father.’ (13) She didn’t know what to say. (14) After a while, as if her silence doubted his identity, he reconfirmed it. ‘(15) Daddy.’

(16) He wondered if they could meet. (17) What about lunch one day. (18) He knew a place he thought she might like, and she suppressed the question, ‘How the hell would you know?’ (19) He said there was a lot to talk about, he didn’t think they should either of them get their expectations up too high. (20) She agreed with him about that.

(21) She asked her friends for advice. (22) Some said: say what you feel; tell him what you think. (23) Some said: see what he wants; why now rather than before? (24) Some said: don’t see him. (25) Some said: tell your mother. (26) Some said: whatever you do, don’t tell your mother. (27) Some said: make sure you get there before him. (28) Some said: keep the bastard waiting.

(29) It was an old-fashioned, oak-panelled restaurant, with elderly waiters who took world-weariness close to sardonic inefficiency. (30) The weather was hot, but there

was only heavy, clubman's food on the menu. (31) He urged her to have as much as she wanted; she ordered less. (32) He suggested a bottle of wine; she drank water. (33) She answered him as if filling in a questionnaire: yes, no, I expect so; very much, no, no. (34) He told her she had grown into a most attractive woman. (35) It seemed an impertinent remark. (36) She did not want to agree or disagree, so she said, 'Probably.'

'(37) Didn't you recognize me?' he asked.

'(38) No,' she replied. '(39) My mother burnt your photographs.' (40) It was true; and he deserved that wince, if nothing more. (41) She looked across the table at an elderly, red-faced man with thinning hair. (42) She had deliberately tried not to expect anything; even so, he looked shabbier than she would have thought. (43) She realized that all along she had been working on a false assumption. (44) She'd been imagining for the last fifteen or more years that if you disappeared, if you abandoned a wife and child, you did so for a better life: more happiness, more sex, more money, more of whatever was missing from your previous life. (45) Examining this man who called himself Phil, she thought he looked as if he'd had a worse life than if he'd stayed at home. (46) But maybe she wanted to believe that.

(47) He told her a story. (48) She absented herself from judging its truth. (49) He had fallen in love. (50) It had just happened. (51) He didn't say that to justify himself. (52) He had thought at the time a clean break was fairer all round. (53) Martha had a half-brother, name of Richard. (54) He was a nice boy, though he didn't know what he wanted to do with his life. (55) Normal enough at that age, probably. (56) Stephanie — the name was spilt suddenly into Martha's half of the table, like a knocked-over wine glass — Steph had died three months ago. (57) Cancer was a brute of an illness. (58) She'd been diagnosed first five years ago, then there'd been a remission. (59) Then it came back. (60) It's always worse when it comes back. (61) It just takes you.

(62) This all seemed — what — not untruthful, but irrelevant, not a way of filling the exact, unique, fretsaw-cut hole within her. (63) She asked him for Nottinghamshire.

'(64) Sorry?'

'(65) When you went off, you had Nottinghamshire in your pocket.'

'(66) I thought that's what you said.'

'(67) I was doing my Counties of England jigsaw.' (68) She felt awkward as she said it; not embarrassed, but as if she were showing too much of her heart. '(69) You used to take a piece and hide it, then find it in the end. (70) You took Nottinghamshire with you when you left. (71) Don't you remember?'

(72) He shook his head. '(73) You did jigsaws? (74) I suppose all kids love them. (75) Richard did. (76) For a while, anyway. (77) He had an incredibly complicated one, I remember, all clouds or something — you never knew which way up it was until you were half finished ...'

'(78) You don't remember?'

(79) He looked at her.

'(80) You really, really don't?'

(81) She would always blame him for that. (82) She was over twenty-five, and she would go on getting older than twenty-five, older and older and older than twenty-five, and she would be on her own; but she would always blame him for that.

(Barnes 1999: 23-5)

I have selected this passage for analysis because it concludes the first part of the novel, and relates to a single, crucial episode in Martha's life. Although this particular experience is not, strictly speaking, central to the plot, it adds depth and humanity to Martha's character, who, in the second part of the novel, is presented as determined,

ambitious, and cynical (she is employed by Jack Pitman as the project's official cynic). In addition, the narration of the restaurant conversation between Martha and Philip foregrounds once again the central theme of memory. Although Martha had earlier acknowledged the constructed nature of childhood memories, the most insurmountably painful aspect of the conversation with her father is the fact that he clearly does not share her memories of the jigsaw puzzle. This becomes, for Martha, more important than her father's disappearance itself, the years of silence, and the casual revelations about his subsequent life. Significantly, the narration of the episode itself is presented as a flashback, and therefore also as partly filtered by Martha's own memories.

Even on a first reading, it should be evident that this episode is narrated from Martha's point of view. This applies in spatial terms (we share her positions and follow her movements in the fictional world), in evaluative terms (e.g. the descriptions of the restaurant in sentences 29 and 30 and of Philip in sentence 41), and in psychological terms (her thoughts and internal states are repeatedly presented throughout the extract). Philip, in contrast, is portrayed entirely from the outside: although his speech is repeatedly presented, the narrator does not give us any direct access to his thoughts. Given that Martha is also the 'wronged' and most vulnerable party in the relationship, this imbalance between the two characters makes it even more likely that readers will sympathise with her rather than Philip. In my analysis of the extract I will show in detail how Barnes manipulates the presentation of speech and thought to project Martha's own experience of this particular event.

### 3. Speech presentation in the extract

In order to discuss the specific characteristics of the extract against the more general 'norm' provided by the SW&TP corpus, I have applied to the passage the same kind of analysis that we applied to the corpus itself.<sup>2</sup>

In the process of annotation, we first of all distinguished between the presentation of speech, writing, and thought.<sup>3</sup> All stretches of text that did *not* involve speech, writing or thought presentation were marked with the tag 'N', which stands generally for 'narration'. All stretches of text that were analysed as ambiguous between two or more forms of SW&TP (or between forms of SW&TP and N) were marked with a 'portmanteau tag': for example, the tag DS-DT indicates an ambiguity between direct speech (DS) and direct thought (DT) presentation.

Table 1 allows an overall comparison between the extract, the SW&TP corpus as a whole and the fiction section of the corpus, in terms of the proportion of words which were analysed as speech presentation (S), writing presentation (W), thought presentation (T), 'narration' (N) and as ambiguous (Portmanteau). I will discuss the figures presented in this table as my analysis progresses. I should stress, however, that the quantitative comparisons I will make in the course of the paper are not aimed, of course, at describing Barnes's style generally or even the style of *England England* in particular, but rather at

comparing the particular characteristics of the extract with the general trends we identified in the corpus.

*Table 1 – Percentages of words included under the main types of tags out of all words in the SW&TP corpus, the fiction section of the corpus, and the Barnes extract.*

	<b>Whole SW&amp;TP corpus</b>	<b>Fiction in SW&amp;TP corpus</b>	<b>Extract</b>
S	33.13	31.59	53
W	2.92	0.63	0.8
T	11.41	19.20	14
N	48.51	45.04	13
Portmanteau	4.03	3.54	19.2
Total	100	100	100

Much of the extract is concerned with conversations between characters, namely between Martha and Philip on the phone and in the restaurant, and between Martha and her friends. It is therefore not surprising that the proportion of words of speech presentation in the passage (53 per cent) is higher than the average for the corpus as a whole (just over 33 per cent) and for the fiction section in particular (just over 31.5 per cent).

The various conversations that make up more than half of the extract are presented via a range of forms of speech presentation. I will argue that the choices that are made at different points in the extract foreground some parts of the conversations and background others, and generally contribute to reflect Martha's perceptions and attitudes in the conversations with her father.

The model that was developed on the basis of the analysis of the SW&TP corpus includes five main categories of speech presentation, which are briefly introduced in Figure 1.

*Figure 1 – Categories of speech presentation*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Brief description</b>	<b>Example</b>
Narrator's representation of voice (NV)	Minimal reference to speech taking place.	She talked on. (Aldous Huxley, 1928, <i>Point Counter Point</i> , p. 140)
Narrator's representation of speech acts (NRSA)	Reference to the illocutionary force of an utterance or utterances (possibly with an indication of the topic)	She asked her friends for advice. (Sentence 21)
Indirect speech (IS)	Representation of an utterance or utterances via a reporting clause (e.g. 'she said') followed by a (grammatically subordinated) reported clause. The language used in the reported clause is appropriate to the narrator (in terms of pronouns, tense, deixis generally, lexis, etc.)	He told her she had grown into a most attractive woman. (Sentence 34)
Free indirect speech (FIS)	Representation of an utterance or utterances typically without a reporting clause (e.g. 'she said') and using language that is partly appropriate to the narrator (e.g. tense and pronouns) and partly to the character (e.g. lexis, deixis, grammatical structures).	He wondered if they could meet. What about lunch one day. (Sentences 16-17)
Direct speech (DS)	Representation of an utterance or utterances typically via a reporting clause (e.g. 'she said') and a (grammatically independent) reported clause, which is typically enclosed within quotation marks. The language used in the reported clause is appropriate to the speaking character (in terms of pronouns, tense, deixis generally, lexis, etc.)	'Didn't you recognize me?' he asked. (Sentence 37)

In Table 2 I present the number of occurrences of each category of speech presentation in the extract and in the fiction section of the corpus, and the proportion of each out of all instances of speech presentation. I will return to this table as I discuss each form of speech presentation in detail.

*Table 2 – Speech presentation categories in the fiction section of the SW&TP corpus and in the extract*

Category	Fiction section of corpus	Extract
NV	111 (5%)	1 (2%)
NRSA	251 (12%)	15 (31%)
IS	117 (6%)	5 (10%)
FIS	57 (3%)	4 (8%)
DS	1,569 (74%)	24 (49%)
Total	2,105 (100%)	49 (100%)

### **3.1 Direct Speech**

The most frequent form of speech presentation in the extract is direct speech (DS). Sentence 37 (*'Didn't you recognize me?' he asked.*) is a prototypical example, which displays all the typical characteristics of DS listed in figure 1.

Because the words that are presented via DS reported stretches are typically appropriate to the deictic orientation and verbal repertoire of the original speaker, DS is conventionally associated with the faithful, verbatim reproduction of an original utterance. In recent years, this conventional association has been shown to be problematic in many discourse contexts, and particularly informal spoken interaction (Fludernik 1993, Sternberg 1982a, 1982b; Slembrouck 1992, Tannen 1989). I would argue, however, that the suspension of disbelief that readers adopt when reading fiction normally confers a high degree of reliability to DS stretches, so that readers tend to imagine that the words reported in DS form were 'actually' uttered by the characters within the fictional world (see Short *et al.* 2002). Hence, the use of DS often results in the foregrounding of the utterances it relates to, since it gives us the impression that we are listening directly to the characters' voices, apparently without the mediating interference of the narrator.

This foregrounding effect of DS is relevant to most of the instances of DS in the extract, which relate to particularly salient and emotionally charged points in the conversations between Martha and Philip. At the beginning of the extract, DS is used in sentences 6-8, 10-12 and 15 to present the opening of the telephone conversation between Martha and her father, which constitutes the first contact the two characters have had since Martha was a child. DS is then used in sentences 37-39 to present the part of the restaurant conversation where Martha reveals that her mother had burnt Philip's photographs. Towards the end of the extract, DS is used in sentences 64-67, 69-71, 73-78 and 80 to present the part of the restaurant conversation that relates to Martha's jigsaw puzzle – a topic which, although apparently trivial, is highly emotive for Martha and eventually decisive for her subsequent attitude towards her father.



In order to appreciate in more depth how Barnes uses DS in the extract, however, we need to consider its less prototypical forms. Leech and Short (1981) distinguish between DS (which has the prototypical characteristics given in figure 1) from the category of free direct speech (FDS). FDS captures those cases of direct speech presentation where either the quotation marks or the reporting clause, or both, are absent (e.g. sentences 6-7 and 22 in the extract). However, our corpus-based study confirmed the view suggested in Short (1988) that FDS is best regarded as a variant of DS, rather than a separate category of speech presentation (Short and Semino: 88-97, 194-97; see also Short 1996: 300-4). It is nevertheless useful, in some cases, to distinguish the FDS variant from the prototypical form of DS because of the specific local effects it can be used to achieve.

In our extract, FDS accounts for 20 out of 24 instances of DS. This contrasts with the situation in the fiction section of our corpus, where FDS accounts for only about one third of all instances of DS. In most of the examples of FDS in the extract (i.e. 13 out of 20), the reporting clause is omitted, but the quotation marks are present. In some cases, reporting clauses are probably omitted because they would be redundant: in the direct report of the conversation about 'Nottinghamshire', for example, readers can easily infer who is saying what from the content of the utterances and from the alternate turn-taking between the two characters.

A more strategic use of FDS without a reporting clause can be found in the opening of the telephone conversation, in sentences 6 to 15. In sentence 5, the narrator mentions that the phone is ringing (thereby suggesting that we are still positioned with Martha in the fictional world, rather than with the caller). No reference is made to Martha picking up the receiver and answering, since this information can easily be inferred by readers and has low relevance in the context of the scene. FDS is then used for the following utterances, which correspond to the phase of the telephone conversation in which the caller checks that s/he has the right number and identifies him- or herself. This phase of the phone call, which would in other contexts be rather unimportant, is of course highly significant here. While readers can easily distinguish between Martha's and the caller's turns, the omission of reporting clauses (and hence of any explicit references to the caller) means that, like Martha, first-time readers are initially unaware of the caller's identity, and may therefore experience a surprise effect that approximates, to some extent at least, the shock that Martha as a character experiences in the text world. Barnes also prolongs the caller's identification stage by interposing Martha's (mistaken) thought in sentence 9, so that readers are also put in a position to appreciate the contrast between her initial guess (*someone overfamiliar in red braces*) and reality.

Clearly, the creation of these potential effects is possible because it is Martha's point of view that is presented throughout. Readers may of course appreciate Philip's awkward predicament from their general world knowledge and from the uncertain and gradual way in which he introduces himself: he utters both the short and full forms of his first name ('*Phil. Philip.*') before using the words that unmistakably reveal his identity to Martha ('*Your father*'); then, ultimately, faced with silence, he refers to himself using the form of address that Martha would have used for him when they last spoke to each other

(‘Daddy’). However, while we are regularly updated on Martha’s internal states (sentences 9 and 13), the narrator provides no access to Philip’s thoughts, so that, in textual terms, there are fewer potential triggers of empathy for him than there are for Martha.

The vast majority of examples that were identified as belonging to the FDS variant of DS in our corpus were similar to the examples I have just discussed: they consisted of a stretch of text within quotation marks but without a reporting clause (see Semino and Short: 92). More specifically, a random sample of 100 FDS instances I obtained from the corpus included only two instances where no quotation marks were present. Interestingly, the opposite situation applies to thought presentation: out of 58 instances of the FDT variant of DT (direct thought) in our corpus, only two involve quotation marks. This may be due to the fact that, strictly speaking, quotation marks are more appropriate in the case of speech presentation, where a physical, perceptible event can, in principle, be reproduced word-by-word in writing. With thought presentation, the event in question is private and not necessarily verbal in form, so that the use of quotation marks may be generally felt to be inappropriate and rather artificial (see Leech and Short 1981: and Short and Semino: 119).

In context, the use of quotation marks for FDS but not for FDT can also help to avoid confusion between speech and thought presentation. Consider sentences 8 and 9 in the extract. Sentence 8 is an FDS presentation of Martha’s response to Philip’s first attempt at identifying himself. Sentence 9, in contrast, is an FDT representation of what she thinks, but does not say, at that particular point. If the stretch of direct thought presentation (*Someone overfamiliar in red braces*) had been enclosed within quotation marks, readers would have had to rely on the subsequent reporting clause (*she thought*) to distinguish between what Martha actually said and what she thought. The presence vs. absence of quotation marks therefore provides an earlier and rather unmistakable clue as to what is uttered as opposed to what is not. In visual terms, the absence of quotation marks in direct thought presentation may also work symbolically to emphasize the private nature of thoughts, which, unlike spoken words, are not graphologically foregrounded against the rest of the narrative. Indeed, in the fiction section of our corpus, the FDT variant is nearly three times more frequent than prototypical DT (58 instances for FDT and 19 for DT). FDS, on the other hand, is less frequent than prototypical DS (737 instances for FDS and 832 for DS), and is, in any case, overwhelmingly characterised by the omission of the reporting clause rather than of quotation marks.

Contrary to the trends we found in our corpus, however, 8 out of 20 occurrences of FDS in the extract do *not* include quotation marks. This applies particularly to the presentation of Martha’s friends conflicting advice in sentences 22-8. I analysed these sentences as instances of direct presentation because of their formal characteristics (the reported clause is not grammatically subordinated to the reporting clause and the language in the reported clauses is appropriate to the original speakers). However, the conventional association of DS with a word-by-word reproduction of the original utterances clearly cannot apply here: each reported clause represents what several different people said to Martha, so that they can only amount to summaries of the gist of the different types of

advice that Martha received (see also Short 1988 for the notion of ‘speech summary’ and FDS in the press). Similar considerations apply to the other instance of FDS with no quotation marks in the extract, in sentence 33. Here the reported clause (*yes, no, I expect so; very much, no, no*) does not relate to a specific individual utterance, but rather represents, in list form, the kind of minimal responses that Martha gave to her father’s questions in the course of their conversation in the restaurant.

Overall, therefore, in this extract Barnes seems to reserve the use of quotation marks for the direct representation of individual spoken utterances, which readers can interpret as word-by-word reproductions of what a character said (there is one exception, in sentence 18, which I will discuss later).

As table 2 shows, DS (including the FDS variant) is the most frequent form of speech presentation in the extract, accounting for nearly half of all instances of speech presentation. Its preponderance among speech presentation categories, however, is not as large as in the fiction section of our corpus, where DS accounts for 74 per cent of all instances of speech presentation. I will now turn to the other categories of speech presentation.

### **3.2 Free Indirect Speech**

The free indirect forms of presentation (and particularly free indirect thought) have received more scholarly attention than any other SW&TP phenomena (Banfield 1982, Fludernik 1993, McHale 1978, Pascal 1977). This is largely due to their linguistic versatility and to the nature and complexity of their possible effects.

Following Leech and Short (1981), I define FIS (and, *mutatis mutandi*, its counterparts for thought and writing presentation) as a form of presentation which involves a combination of linguistic features which are typical of IS (i.e. appropriate to the reporting narrator) and linguistic features which are typical of DS (i.e. appropriate to the reported character). Sentence 16 in our extract (*He wondered if they could meet.*) is a prototypical example. Because of the context in which it occurs, it is likely to be interpreted as a representation of something that Philip *says* to Martha, rather than simply a representation of his thoughts. There is, however, no reporting clause – an absence that is typical of the free variant of DS. In addition, the use of the verb ‘wonder’, which is highly conventional in making suggestions, may be interpreted as a reflection of Philip’s tentativeness in proposing a meeting. On the other hand, the use of the third person pronoun and of the past tense reflects the narrator’s perspective on the character, and is typical of IS.

Free indirect speech (FIS) is the least frequent form of speech presentation in the fiction section of the SW&TP corpus (3 per cent of all instances of speech presentation). It is also relatively infrequent in our extract, where it accounts for four separate stretches of text (8 per cent of all instances of speech presentation). These figures, however, are potentially deceptive. Firstly, the four stretches of FIS in the extract are rather long (their average length is 33.75 words, as compared with 18.63 in the fiction section of our

corpus). Cumulatively, they include a total of 135 words, which represent about 32 per cent of all the words of speech presentation in the extract. In addition, all four instances of FIS represent utterances produced by Philip, first in the telephone conversation (sentences 16, 17 and parts of 18 and 19) and then in the restaurant (sentences 49-61, apart from the part of sentence 56 which is enclosed within dashes). This contrasts with the fact that, in total, only 59 of Philip's words are represented via DS (or its FDS variant).

FIS is typically associated with the creation of distancing effects with respect to the character whose speech is being represented. Leech and Short (1981) explain this by placing the speech presentation categories on a 'scale' of 'narratorial interference' from the least direct form (NV in our case) to the most direct (DS). The vertical sequencing of the categories in figure 1 corresponds to Leech and Short's scale (see also Semino and Short 2004: 9ff.). In the top part of the scale, we have forms of presentation where the narrator's presence is most obvious (NV, NRSA, IS); in the bottom part of the scale (FIS, DS), the narrator's presence is less obvious, so that, with DS, we have the impression that we have unmediated access to the characters' own voices. Because it is always possible, in principle at least, to reproduce verbatim the words that somebody uttered on a particular occasion, DS can be regarded, Leech and Short argue, as the 'norm' for speech presentation, the default way of representing speech (see also Halliday 1994: 254). The findings from the SW&TP corpus project lend some quantitative support to this claim, given that, as I have shown, DS is by far the most frequent form of speech presentation. The choice of FIS, according to Leech and Short, involves a move from the 'norm' (DS) towards the narratorial end of the speech presentation scale, away from potential unmediated access to the character's own voice. This can account for why FIS often has a distancing effect, and is sometimes used for ironic purposes.

In my reading of the Barnes extract, FIS does have strong distancing effects. In the paragraph following Philip's self-identification on the phone, FIS is used to represent his suggestion that Martha should meet him, his reference to a suitable meeting place, and his comments about what he and Martha should or should not expect. The use of FIS here, rather than DS, potentially reflects Martha's perception of her father's utterances after the shock caused by the revelation of his identity. I imagine her barely able to take in what he is saying, and possibly also instinctively wishing to reject this sudden friendly advance after so many years of silence. The thought presented in sentence 18 also suggests a critical, sarcastic attitude. The same applies to the long stretches of FIS between sentences 49 and 61, which represent Philip's account of his life since he abandoned Martha and her mother. Here I imagine Martha trying to maintain a cool-headed distance from the personal and highly emotive revelations she is experiencing in quick succession (finding out that she has a half-brother, and the details about her father's 'other' woman). Readers may also get a sense of her tension between the need for emotional compensation (after so many years of pain) and a feeling of rejection or even revulsion at Philip's apparently casual, matter-of-fact tone.

The use of IS in these two parts of the text would have resulted in an unnecessary repetition of reporting clauses. The use of DS, in contrast, would have given Philip two

rather lengthy turns, where readers would have had the impression of ‘listening’ to him directly, rather than via the filter of the tense and pronouns of third-person narration. The use of FIS, therefore, allows both for a fairly vivid representation of Philip’s utterances and for the projection of a potentially critical, cautious perception of them on Martha’s part. In this context, it is perhaps significant that, in the extract, FIS is used for Philip’s speech only.

### ***3.3 Other forms of speech presentation***

Two further forms of speech presentation are used in the extract to represent Philip’s and Martha’s utterances: indirect speech (IS; e.g. sentence 34) and the narrator’s representation of speech acts (NRSA; e.g. sentence 63).

Because of the formal and semantic characteristics I have summarised in figure 1, IS tends to be used where the content of what a character says is more relevant, in context, than the form of the relevant utterance(s). In the fiction section of the SW&TP corpus, IS only accounts for 6 per cent of all instances of speech presentation. In our extract, IS is also relatively infrequent (five occurrences, amounting to 10 per cent of all instances of speech presentation). More specifically, like FIS, IS is used for three of Philip’s utterances (in sentences 19, 31 and 34), but never for Martha’s (two further instances of IS are embedded inside FDS in sentence 22; see section 5 below).

With 15 occurrences, NRSA is more frequent than IS in our extract, where it accounts for 31 per cent of all instances of speech presentation. This contrast with the corresponding proportion in the fiction section of the corpus, which is 12 per cent. In terms of form and function, however, the use of NRSA in the extract reflects the general pattern we noticed in the corpus. Fictional NRSAs tend to consist of brief references to the illocutionary force of utterance, possibly with a brief indication of their content (e.g. *She asked her friends for advice*, sentence 21; *she ordered less* in sentence 31). As a consequence, NRSA often has a backgrounding function, i.e. it tends to be associated with relatively unimportant utterances, as compared with more direct forms of presentation. This can be said to apply to the use of NRSA in the extract, with one notable exception: *She asked him for Nottinghamshire* in sentence 63. Here NRSA is used to present a question that is a crucial and highly sensitive for Martha. Significantly, this is also the only occasion in the extract where Martha is presented as taking the initiative in the conversations with her father, during which she otherwise produces minimal responses or remains silent. The contrast between the sensitivity of the question (for Martha) and the form used for its presentation could be interpreted as reflecting something about her attitude in the performance of this speech act, namely hesitation, tentativeness, or even apparent nonchalance at asking about something so viscerally important to her and yet apparently trivial and almost nonsensical. Philip’s nonplussed response and the subsequent conversation about ‘Nottinghamshire’, however, are presented in DS, as I mentioned earlier.

The most minimal form of speech presentation, the narrator’s representation of voice

(NV), has only one occurrence in the extract, which will be discussed in the section on hypothetical and embedded SW&TP below.

In this section I have shown how the choice of forms of speech presentation in the extract has significant consequences for the degree of importance that is attributed to different utterances, for the projection of viewpoint, the creation of a contrast between the two main characters, and the potential for empathy on the part of the reader.

#### 4. Thought presentation in the extract

Although Philip is presented as speaking longer and more frequently than Martha, speech presentation clearly alternates between the two main characters in the extract. In contrast, in my reading of the extract, the narrator only gives us direct access to Martha's thoughts and internal states (e.g. in sentences 9, 13, 18, 36, 42-46, 68, 81, 82). What access readers have to Philip's thoughts is via Philip's own words, where he talks about what he thinks or feels (e.g. in sentences 52 and 66). In the terms we used in the analysis of our corpus, all instances of thought presentation relating to Philip are 'embedded' inside instances of speech presentation (see Semino and Short 2004: 171ff., and 5 below). This results in a crucial difference in the presentation of the two characters in the extract: due to the special 'license' that is associated with fictional third-person narrators, we *know* what Martha thinks, but we only know what Philip *says* that he thinks. This has potentially major consequences for how close readers feel to each character, and for the extent to which they are able to empathise with one character as opposed to the other.

Table 1 above shows that the proportion of words which I analysed as thought presentation in the extract (14 per cent) is higher than in the corpus as a whole (just over 11 per cent) but lower than in the fiction section (just over 19 per cent). These figures are deceptive, however. According to my analysis, the extract has a much higher percentage of 'ambiguous' stretches of text (over 19 per cent) than both the corpus as a whole (just over 4 per cent) and the fiction section in particular (just over 3.5 per cent). Moreover, all of the instances of ambiguity involve thought presentation, and approximately two thirds of them signal an ambiguity between two different categories of thought presentation. As a consequence, the actual proportion of thought presentation in the extract is in fact similar, or possibly higher, than in the fiction section of the corpus.

The categories of thought presentation parallel in form the speech presentation categories as introduced in figure 1. They are as follows:

NI = Internal Narration

NRTA = Narrator's Representation of Thought Acts

IT = Indirect Thought

FIT = Free Indirect Thought

DT = Direct Thought

I will discuss some important differences to do with functions and effects as I consider each category in turn.

Table 3 allows an overall comparison between the use of thought presentation categories in the extract and in the fiction section of the SW&TP corpus. I will return to these figures in the course of the discussion.

*Table 3 – Thought presentation categories in the fiction section of the SW&TP extract and the corpus*

Category	Fiction section of corpus	Extract
NI	503 (53%)	13 (43%)
NRTA	62 (6%)	7 (23%)
IT	95 (9%)	8 (26%)
FIT	230 (24%)	-
DT	77 (8%)	2 (8%)
Total	967	30 (100%)

#### ***4.1 Direct and indirect thought presentation***

Thought presentation can sometimes form a kind of counterpoint to speech presentation, when the report of conversational exchanges is punctuated by the presentation of the thoughts of one or more of the characters. These thoughts often relate to information, beliefs or attitudes that the characters could not express openly, and therefore tend to contrast with what the characters do say (see Cohn 1978: 82, Semino and Short 2004: 128 *et passim*). This is the case on the two occasions when Martha's thoughts are presented via direct thought (DT) in the extract.

In sentence 9 (*Someone over-familiar in red braces, she thought.*) the free variant of DT (FDT) is used to represent Martha's unspoken reaction to the opening turn from a so far unidentified male caller. By saying 'Martha? It's Phil', the man appears to presume more familiarity between them than she feels is appropriate, which triggers her stereotype of an over-confident male. As I mentioned in 3.1 above, the vast majority of instances of FDT in our corpus are similar to this particular instance, in that the reported clause is not enclosed within quotation marks.

The other instance of DT in the extract similarly provides an insight into Martha's internal reaction to something Phil says, but *does* involve quotation marks: *and she suppressed the question, 'How the hell would you know?'* (sentence 18). Here DT is used to represent a question that springs to Martha's mind when her father suggests meeting in a restaurant that *he thought she might like* – something she feels is presumptuous, given that he has not seen her since she was a child. The reporting clause, however, tells us that this question was never uttered, so that it only occurs in Martha's thoughts. The use of the quotation marks may therefore serve to indicate that, in contrast with the previous

example, here we have potential speech, which Martha presumably suppresses in order to avoid being openly antagonistic towards Philip.

With only two occurrences, DT is an infrequent category of thought presentation in our extract. The same applies to the SW&TP corpus, where, by coincidence, the proportion of DT out of all instances of thought presentation in the fiction section is the same as in the extract (8 per cent). Semino and Short (2004: 118ff.) argue that DT is proportionately less frequent than DS because of the potential artificiality involved in providing an apparently word-by-word representation of a private phenomenon such as thought (see also Cohn 1978: 76). Indeed, in the fiction section of the corpus, DT tends to be used for highly conscious, potentially articulate thought, which sometimes amounts to a silent dialogue with oneself or others (Leech and Short 1981: 342-44; Cohn 1978: 80; Fludernik 1993: 77-8). This is clearly the case with Martha's 'suppressed' question.

With eight instances, indirect thought (IT) accounts for 26 per cent of all (non-ambiguous) instances of thought presentation in the extract. This contrast with the fiction section of the corpus, where the relevant percentage is nine per cent. However, five of the eight occurrences of IT are embedded within Philip's speech presentation (e.g. sentence 66). The remaining three represent Martha's reflections at various points in her interactions with her father, particularly concerning the contrast between how she had imagined her father's new life to be and the reality that she is now faced with (e.g. *She realized that all along she had been working on a false assumption*, sentence 43; *she thought he looked as if he'd had a worse life than if he'd stayed at home*, in sentence 45).

IT is less vivid and immediate than DT, but it does not carry the same potential for artificiality, since it is typically associated with the representation of the content, rather than the wording, of somebody's thoughts. For these reasons, it has been described as the default form of thought presentation, in contrast with DS for speech presentation (see Leech and Short 1981: 344; Halliday 1994: 253). The analysis of our corpus, however, does not provide quantitative support for these claims as straightforwardly as it does for DS (see Semino and Short 2004: 147-49 for a discussion of the complexities involved here).

#### ***4.2 Other forms of thought presentation and ambiguity***

The most frequent category of thought presentation in the extract and in the fiction section of the SW&TP corpus is Internal Narration (NI). This category was introduced during the analysis of our corpus in order to cater for 'all those cases where the narrator reports a character's cognitive and emotional experiences without presenting any specific thoughts' (Semino and Short 2004: 46). Sentence 68, for example (*She felt awkward [ . . . ]*), reveals an internal state of Martha's that has both an emotional and a cognitive component: her feeling of awkwardness results from a cognitive appraisal of the image of herself she has projected by mentioning her childhood jigsaw puzzle. Most instances of NI in the extract are actually embedded within Philip's speech (e.g. inside FIS in *He had fallen in love*, sentence 49) or within Martha's own thoughts (e.g. inside IT in *She realized that all along she had been working on a false assumption*).



NI is the form of thought presentation that falls at the narrator's end in Semino and Short's (2004: 49) version of the thought presentation scale, which parallels the speech presentation scale that can be seen in column 1 of figure 1. The formal correspondences between speech and thought presentation, however, belie some fundamental differences in the uses and functions of corresponding categories. I have already pointed out some important differences in frequency and function between DS and DT. Semino and Short (2004: 132-35, 227-30) point out some more specific difficulties with NI as a category of thought presentation. On the one hand, the introduction of this category allows analysts to include within thought presentation references to internal states and processes that were not accounted for within Leech and Short's (1981) model, such as sentence 68 in our extract (see also Simpson 1993: 24-5 for the limitations of Leech and Short's model in this respect). On the other hand, NI contrasts in important ways both with its counterpart for speech presentation (NV) and with other forms of thought presentation, so that it may perhaps be best seen as a form of narration that should not be part of the thought presentation scale at all. Further work will be needed to resolve this issue.

The most minimal form of thought presentation in Leech and Short's (1981) model was the narrator's representation of thought acts (NRTA), which was conceived as the thought counterpart of NRSA. As Semino and Short (2004: 130) point out, however, NRSA is primarily defined as a reference to the illocutionary force of utterances – a notion that cannot be straightforwardly applied to a non-communicative phenomenon such as thought. A few cases of NRTA in our corpus do involve references to what may be seen as 'silent' speech acts (e.g. 'Silently, I thanked God for small mercies' from Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years*, p. 852). However, in most cases, the NRTA category captures references to what can be described as specific acts of thought, such as *She remembered all that* (sentence 4) and *Examining this man who called himself Phil* (sentence 45).

With seven occurrences, NRTA accounts for a larger proportion of (non-ambiguous) instances of thought presentation in our extract than in the fiction section of the corpus (23 per cent vs. 6 per cent respectively). As with NI, however, more than half the instances occur within other forms of speech or thought presentation (e.g. within DS in sentence 37: '*Didn't you recognize me?*' he asked.).

Free indirect thought (FIT) is the only category of thought presentation that, according to table 3, does not appear to occur in the extract. However, table 4 shows that 10 of the 11 stretches of text which I analysed as ambiguous involve FIT (and it is of course possible that others will regard some of the relevant stretches of text as straightforward examples of FIT). More specifically, table 4 shows that the passage contains instances of ambiguity between FIT and all the least direct categories of thought presentation (IT, NRTA, NI) as well as with narration (N).<sup>4</sup>

Table 4 – Number of occurrences of ambiguity in the extract (in alphabetical order)

Type of ambiguity	Number of relevant stretches in extract
IT-FIT	2
N-FIT	2
NI-FIT	2
NRSA-NRTA	1
NRTA-FIT	4
<b>Total</b>	11

Consider the final paragraph of the extract (and of the first part of the novel):

(81) She would always blame him for that. (82) She was over twenty-five, and she would go on getting older than twenty-five, older and older and older than twenty-five, and she would be on her own; but she would always blame him for that.

The paragraph reveals the consequences of the ‘Nottinghamshire’ conversation for Martha’s attitude towards her father from that point in her life onwards. On the one hand, this paragraph can be read as an FIT representation of her thoughts at the time and/or at the time of her later recollection of the whole event: the tense and pronouns (‘she would’ as opposed to ‘I will’) are appropriate to the narrator, and hence to a potential IT reported clause; however, there are no reporting clauses of thinking (e.g. ‘she thought that’), and the use of repetition (of *she would always blame him for that* and *older*) potentially conveys some of the emotional intensity of the character’s deliberate, defiant thoughts. Within this reading, the paragraph involves a prediction on Martha’s part of how her current attitude will never change, no matter how long she lives. On the other hand, the paragraph could also be read as the narrator’s anticipation of Martha’s attitude towards her father for the rest of her life. Indeed, at the end of the novel, we are presented with an aged Martha living on her own, but at this particular point in the plot, only the omniscient third-person narrator can gauge that far into Martha’s future. Within this reading, sentence 81 and the final segment of sentence 82 (from *but she*) would be analysed as NRTA, and the first part of sentence 82 as narration (N). My own analysis of the paragraph tries to take both possibilities into account, by seeing sentence 81 and the final part of sentence 82 as NRTA-FIT, and the first part of sentence 82 as N-FIT.<sup>5</sup>

I have arrived at a similar analysis of stretches of text such as *It was true; and he deserved that wince, if nothing more* in sentence 40 (N-FIT), *She had deliberately tried not to expect anything*, in sentence 42 (NRTA-FIT), and *This all seemed — what — not untruthful, but irrelevant, not a way of filling the exact, unique, fretsaw-cut hole within her* (NI-FIT). Readers may well disagree with my analyses, particularly if they only regard one of my two possible readings as acceptable. Overall, however, my approach leads to an observation that I regard as important. If the FIT interpretation is privileged in each case, a substantial part of the extract represents Martha consciously reflecting on her own internal states and reactions. If, on the other hand, the instances of ambiguity involving FIT are read as instances of N, NI, etc., the relevant parts of the text would be

references, on the part of the narrator, to thoughts or internal states that Martha is not necessarily fully aware of, at least at the relevant point in the story. For all its inevitably subjectivity, my analysis attempts to account for both these ways in which the extract can be read.

The only case of ambiguity I have identified which does not involve FIT is sentence 20: *She agreed with him about that*. In context, this sentence could be interpreted as referring either to the illocutionary force of an *utterance* produced by Martha (i.e. NRSA), or to a thought on Martha's part (NRTA). Either way, her 'agreement' with the fact that neither she nor her father should have too high expectations of their prospective meeting is rather sarcastic. Given that Martha has been presented as suppressing a potentially antagonistic response two sentences earlier, readers may conclude that her 'agreement' with part of what Philip said also remains unspoken. However, in my view it is also possible to imagine Martha actually responding to her father at this point.

In my analysis of the extract, the ambiguous stretches of text in the passage represent 12 per cent of all instances of SW&TP – a very similar proportion to that found in the fiction section of the corpus (11 per cent). As Semino and Short (2004: 182ff.) point out, SW&TP ambiguities can be broadly divided into two types: those that involve adjacent categories on the relevant presentation scale (e.g. NI-NRTA) and those that involve non-adjacent categories (e.g. N-FIT). In the former case, the ambiguity results from the fuzziness of the boundaries between categories, so that a particular stretch of text could be seen as, for example, either an instance of NI or an instance of NRTA. In the latter case, the ambiguity results from the possibility of interpreting a particular stretch of text in different ways. Most of the ambiguities I identified in the extract belong to the latter category, i.e. they are due to the possibility of reading a particular stretch of text as representing, for example, speech vs. thought (as with NRSA-NRTA), or as representing a thought act vs. a conscious reflection on one's own attitudes and reactions (as with NRTA-FIT).

## 5. Embedded and hypothetical SW&TP

During the analysis of the corpus, a number of specific SW&TP phenomena were accounted for separately within the annotation system. Consider the following example from the corpus – an FIT representation of the thoughts of the protagonist of J. G. Ballard's *Empire of the Sun*, Jim, who is a prisoner in a Japanese camp during World War 2:

It was important to keep in with Basie, who had small but reliable sources of food. He could tell Kimura that Basie knew about the secret camp radio, but then the extra food would cease. (J.G. Ballard, 1984, *Empire of the Sun*, p. 165)

In this stretch of text, Jim is weighing up the advantages and disadvantages of revealing something about Basie (another prisoner) to Kimura, one of the Japanese guards. The underlined stretch of IS, therefore, relates to an utterance that (a) is part of Jim's

thoughts, and (b) has not occurred in the fictional world (as opposed to a memory of something that did occur). In the annotation of the corpus, we tagged all instances of SW&TP that were presented within other instances of SW&TP as ‘embedded’, and all instances of SW&TP that were presented as not having (yet) occurred in the ‘actual domain’ of the text world as ‘hypothetical’. The instance of IS above was therefore analysed as both embedded and hypothetical (see Semino *et al.* 1999, Semino and Short 2004: 159ff., 171ff.).

These two phenomena, which were not explicitly accounted for in earlier models of SW&TP, are highly relevant to the analysis of the Barnes extract, both separately and in combination: much of what the characters think and talk about is to do with other utterances or thoughts, some of which have not (yet) occurred in the fictional world.

In sentence 19, for example, the IS and FIS representation of Philip’s proposal to Martha includes references to:

- a potential future conversation between him and Martha (*there was a lot to talk about*), which I analysed as an embedded, hypothetical instance of the most minimal form of speech presentation, NV;
- potential but inappropriate expectations that either or both characters might form in advance of the meeting (*he didn’t think they should either of them get their expectations up too high*), which I analysed as an instance of embedded, hypothetical NI.

Similarly, the FDS reports of the advice Martha received from her friends include references to several hypothetical future utterances/speech events, which she is advised either to realize (*tell him what you think*, in sentence 22; *tell your mother*, in sentence 25) or to avoid (*don’t tell your mother*, in sentence 26). All these examples are both embedded (they occur within FDS reported clauses) and hypothetical (they have not yet occurred, and may indeed never occur).

In the part of the extract concerning the meeting in the restaurant, Martha is presented as thinking about her own past thoughts, so that instances of thought presentation are embedded inside other instances of thought presentation (e.g. NI is embedded within IT in sentence 43: *She realized that all along she had been working on a false assumption*). Philip, in contrast, is presented as talking about his thoughts and internal states, which results in the embedding of thought presentation inside speech presentation (e.g. IT is embedded within FIS in sentence 52: *He had thought at the time that a clean break was fairer all round*).

The extract only contains one instance of writing presentation, which falls within the scope of our definition of hypothetical SW&TP: *She answered him as if filling in a questionnaire: yes, no, I expect so; very much, no, no*, in sentence 33. Here the reference to filling in a questionnaire can be analysed as an instance of the narrator’s representation of writing act (NRWA), which is the writing counterpart of NRSA (see Semino and Short 2004: 104-5). However, this ‘writing act’ does not occur in the text world, but is mentioned by the narrator in order to convey the curt, minimal way in which Martha

answers Philip's questions during their meal in the restaurant.

According to my analysis, the passage contains 29 embedded instances of SW&TP, amounting to 32 per cent of all instances of SW&TP in the extract. This is a very high proportion, especially considering that embedded SW&TP only accounts for 12 per cent of all instances of SW&TP in the corpus, and for nine per cent of all instances of SW&TP in the fiction section in particular. Similarly, there are 16 examples of 'hypothetical' SW&TP in the extract, amounting to 18 per cent of all instances of SW&TP. This contrasts with the corresponding proportions in the SW&TP corpus, where hypothetical SW&TP accounts for four per cent of all instances of SW&TP in the corpus as a whole, and for three per cent of all instances in the fiction section in particular. Of the 16 instances of 'hypothetical' SW&TP in the extract, 15 (i.e. 94 per cent) were also analysed as embedded (so that 16 per cent of all instances of SW&TP in the extract are *both* hypothetical and embedded). In the SW&TP corpus as a whole, approximately 62 per cent of instances of hypothetical SW&TP were found to be embedded inside other instances of SW&TP.

The higher than average frequency of embedded and hypothetical SW&TP in the extract highlights some important aspects of the episode it relates to and of the way in which this episode is told. The extract is basically concerned with whether and how Martha and Philip should meet in order to talk for the first time since Martha was a child, and with their subsequent meeting. Consequently, in the first part of the extract, both Philip and Martha's friends are presented as talking about this possible conversation, leading to several instances of SW&TP that are both embedded and hypothetical (since the conversation has not yet occurred). In addition, Philip's contributions to the two conversations with Martha are often concerned with his own and others' thoughts and internal states (whether in the past or in a possible future). For her part, Martha is repeatedly presented as reflecting on her own thoughts, assumptions and expectations.

All of this results in an unusually high frequency of embedded and hypothetical SW&TP in the extract, which helps to reveal the depth of the characters' misconceptions and mutual misunderstandings. More specifically, it is via embedded and/or hypothetical SW&TP that readers are made aware of (i) the conflicting advice that Martha received from her friends, (ii) the contrast between her own expectations about her father and reality, and (iii) her father's well-intentioned but hopelessly inadequate decision at the time of his disappearance (*He had thought at a time a clean break was fairer all round*). Hypothetical SW&TP, in particular, reveals characters' intentions, predictions, wishes, fears, etc. and therefore contributes to project what Ryan (1991) calls the 'domain of the virtual' within a fictional world, namely the complex network of (often conflicting) unrealized possibilities that, according to Ryan, play a central part in making stories 'tellable' (Ryan 1991: 156ff.).

## 6. Final remarks

I hope to have shown how a detailed stylistic analysis can reveal the subtle ways in which

the different forms of speech and thought presentation can be manipulated in order to achieve a wide range of significant effects. In particular, I have suggested that the choice and patterning of speech and thought presentation in the Barnes extract contributes to convey Martha's perception of a particularly salient experience in her life, and therefore potentially biases readers' sympathies towards her. More generally, an analysis such as mine can reveal the writer's craft at the most minute level of textual organization, including the strategic inclusion or omission of quotation marks or reporting clauses.

I have also attempted to show how the SW&TP model derived from the Lancaster corpus project captures a wider range of phenomena than was the case with previous models, including particularly embedded and hypothetical speech and thought presentation. In addition, the availability of the SW&TP corpus as a source of comparative data has provided a more solid foundation for my claims about how the particular characteristics of the Barnes extract conform or deviate from general tendencies in contemporary fiction.

### Works Cited

- Ballard, J.G. *Empire of the Sun*. London: Orion, 1984.
- Banfield, Ann. *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Barnes, Julian. *England, England*, London: Picador, 1999.
- Cohn, Dorrit. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1978.
- Fludernik, Monika. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Mick Short. *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman, 1981.
- McHale, Brian. "Free indirect discourse: a survey of recent accounts." *Poetics and Theory of Literature* (1978) 3: 249-87.
- Nünning, Vera. "The Invention of Cultural Traditions: The Construction and Destruction of Englishness and Authenticity in Julian Barnes' *England, England*." *Anglia* (2001) 119: 58-76.
- Page, Norman. *Speech in the English Novel*. London: Longman, 1973.
- Pascal, Roy. *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and its Functioning in the Nineteenth Century European Novel*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.
- Semino, Elena, Mick Short, and Jonathan Culpeper. "Using a computer corpus to test a model of speech and thought presentation." *Poetics* (1997) 25: 17-43.
- Semino, Elena, Mick Short, and Martin Wynne. "Hypothetical words and thoughts in contemporary British narratives." *Narrative* (1999) 7.3: 307-34.

- Semino, Elena and Mick Short. *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Short, Mick. "Speech presentation, the novel and the press." *The Taming of The Text*. Willie van Peer (ed.) London: Routledge, 1988. 61-81.
- Short, Mick. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman, 1996.
- Short, Mick, Elena Semino, and Martin Wynne. "Revisiting the notion of faithfulness in discourse presentation using a corpus approach." *Language and Literature* (2002) 11.4: 325-355.
- Simpson, Paul. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Slembrouck, Stef. "The parliamentary Hansard 'verbatim' report: the written construction of spoken discourse." *Language and Literature* (1992) 1.2: 101-19.
- Sternberg, Meir. "Proteus in quotation-land: mimesis and the forms of reported speech." *Poetics Today* (1982) 3.2: 107-56.
- Sternberg, Meir. "Point of view and the indirections of direct speech." *Language and Style* (1982) 15.2: 67-117.
- Tannen, Deborah. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Thatcher, Margaret. *The Downing Street Years*. London: Harper Collins, 1993.
- Toolan, Michael. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Wynne, Martin, Mick Short, and Elena Semino. "A corpus-based investigation of speech, thought and writing presentation in English narrative texts." *Explorations in Corpus Linguistics*. Antoinette Renouf (ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998. 231-245.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, I will refer to an edition of the novel published in 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Contrary to what was the case in the annotation of the corpus, however, I have not treated reporting clauses separately.

<sup>3</sup> Treating writing presentation separately is an original aspect of our work, but I will barely discuss it here as it has little relevance to the passage.

<sup>4</sup> A potential ambiguity between FIS and FDS arises when a sentence occurring within a stretch of FIS includes no tense and pronouns, which are normally criterial for an FIS interpretation (e.g. sentence 17: *What about lunch one day*). In my analysis, I have included these examples under FIS.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, it would also be possible to interpret the use of the verb 'blame' here as NRSA. However, in context, I think this interpretation is unlikely, and I have therefore not taken it into account.