

The power of reflexive language(s): Code displacement in reported speech[☆]

Celso Álvarez-Cáccamo*

*Departamento de Linguística Geral e Teoria da Literatura, Universidade da Corunha,
15071 A Corunha-Galiza, Spain*

Received August 1991; revised version June 1994

Abstract

This work discusses the powers of code choices in reported speech (RS) to build conversational alliances and interactional control, and to index broader sociolinguistic aspects. Data come from today's highly ideologized context of language institutionalization in bilingual Galiza (Spain). The paper focuses on *code displacement* in RS, or the non-isomorphic attribution of code choices to characters as contrasted with their observed or expected behaviors. It is argued that the efficacy of code displacement rests on its *intended iconicity*, by which reporters attempt to create an *ideologized possible world* where characters behave discursively in a believable manner. Audiences, in turn, retrieve the meanings of code choices in RS through implicatures based on their linguistic ideologies and local theories about the connections between language behavior and social identification. Within this power-based process of intention/interpretation, RS becomes a creative resource for managing conversational alliances and sequentially controlling talk. In this sense, it is argued that RS tactics in Galiza reflect the broader struggle to conquer the symbolic value of the languages in conflict. Finally, it is suggested that the forms and limitations of members' metapragmatic awareness about the creative powers of RS may be connected to the forms and scope of language ideologization in society.

1. Introduction

In a recent work, Lucy (1993b) calls for research on the 'reflexive nature' of language as a means for understanding human behavior and cognition. In this paper I

[☆] Part of this material was previously presented at a session entitled *Documenting Power in Verbal Interaction* during the 1989 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. I thank John Gumperz, Pedro Lewin-Fisher, Marco Jacquemet, and Julio Ramos for their suggestions to that material. I also thank the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their comments to this version. This research was partly conducted with the support of a grant from the Program for Cultural Cooperation between the Ministry of Culture of Spain and U.S. Universities.

* E-mail: lalvarz@udc.es

will take on Lucy's call to look primarily at the *functions* and at the *creative dimension* of a paradigmatic type of reflexive language: reported speech. My goal is to study the powers of reported speech (RS) at several, co-occurrent levels of discourse: (1) RS as an index of sociolinguistic conflict and *linguistic-ideological struggles*; and (2) RS as a resource for *conversational power* (a) at the *sequential-interactive level*, (b) as a generator of *local power alliances* between interactants; and (c) in the inferential *re-construction of sociolinguistic reality*. I will focus particularly on what I will call *code displacement*, that is, the non-isomorphic attribution of language choices to a given character in the report of his or her speech. The broader social context against which I will map my observations is the current process of language spread and institutionalization of Galician Portuguese in bilingual Galiza, in the plurinational Spanish State.

2. Background

Reported speech is a strategic site for observing how social actors put into play their typifications of language-mediated social relationships. Given the practical irretrievability of most original or 'model' (Haberland, 1986) speech events, the previous statement is perhaps as far as we can go in terms of formulating a general principle about the relationship between the two (or more) worlds involved in the act of reporting or quoting speech.¹ In other words, by assigning code choices to the characters depicted, reporters selectively draw from their own sociolinguistic knowledge in order to construct a *possible world* where characters behave discursively as they do, within the confines of negotiated authenticity. Obviously, the success or failure of the reporter's tactics is subject to the audience's legitimating sanction. But, undeniably, these procedures in themselves reflect, on the level of practice, the ideological constructs by which members of a given speech community at a given point in time associate language behaviors with socio-discursive relationships of camaraderie, distance, dominance, or resistance (cf. in this sense Voloshinov, 1973 [1929], or Polanyi, 1982).

The relationship between such *reflexive language uses* and *linguistic ideologies* has emerged as a central concern of anthropological and cognitive approaches to RS (Lucy, 1993a,b; Silverstein, 1981, 1993; Briggs, 1993). In her in-depth review of narrativeness and point of view in fiction, Ryan (1981: 517f.) formulated the issue from a stylistic perspective, in the following terms: "What can you conclude from

¹ Questions regarding the relationships between RS and the real or imaginary original event (what Haberland, 1986, calls 'hypothetical reported speech') have been raised in roughly equivalent terms in work by Bakhtin (1981), Voloshinov (1973 [1929]), and Ducrot (1984); in sociolinguistic and ethnographic work on oral narratives (Bauman, 1986; Besnier, 1993; Gal, 1979); and in work on stylistics and discourse analysis (Bamgbose, 1986; Dubois, 1989; Haberland, 1986; Li, 1986; Tannen, 1986). In this sense, Tannen refers to RS as 'constructed dialogue'. Dubois (1989) labels as 'pseudoquotation' an act of RS which is, presumably, non-isomorphic with the model event. Johnstone (1987) focuses on tense alternations in RS to represent social power relationships between the narrated characters. A look into bilingual code-switching and quotation can be found in Gumperz (1982).

the utterance *x* about the speaker's knowledge and beliefs?" Within a comparable framework, Ochs et al. (1992) treat oral storytelling, particularly trouble-centered stories, as a collective 'theory-building activity' within which conversational strategies serve to present, negotiate, or challenge the 'facts' (i.e., what actually happened), the characters' 'methodology' or conduct, and the underlying 'ideology' or beliefs that sustain the story point. In a similar vein, it is my intention to ask: What can be concluded from the reporter's assigning language uses to characters about the ways in which language is viewed and used as a resource for the symbolization and construction of power? The issue at stake is whether (and how) reporters reproduce faithfully observed or expected language behavior, or whether (and how) they *re-construe and re-construct* such behaviors according, fundamentally, to underlying linguistic ideologies and conversational alignment needs.

Since 1984, I have been observing RS tactics in Galiza, where the changing sociolinguistic and linguistic-ideological landscape lends itself to conversationally rich forms of code manipulation. Briefly, the partial recovery of Galician national identity after Franco's death in 1975 has been visibly accompanied by new discourses on language and nationhood. Bilingual elites have emerged or re-emerged, and have taken partial control of the administrative, political, and cultural resources of the newly decentralized state. In everyday life, people 'know' that there now exists, below the central government in Madrid, an institutional Galician power: the highly self-propagandistic **Xunta de Galicia**.²

Within this process, the elaboration of a new technical *metalanguage* in the official planning laboratories, to talk about and construe language itself, is already having visible manifestations on speech behavior (Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1993). In a sort of 'theory effect', the dominant reinterpretation of the structural relationships between Galiza Portuguese and Portugal Portuguese, aiming at emphasizing difference rather than unity, is contributing to the emergence of a new linguistic consciousness of independence, selfness, and 'Galician languagehood'.

Further, the traditional language-identity associations which relegated the use and users of Galician Portuguese (hereafter, simply 'Galician') to the rural domain have given way to new, rather complex webs of social significations. Politicians, officials, and intellectuals now also use Galician in public. Speaking a given Galician variety (e.g. a stigmatized dialect) may index one's ruralness; but, speaking some other (e.g. one closer to the standard) may index one's education, structural class position, or political ideology. Thus, social power and control are no longer exclusively inherent to the practical use (or symbolic exploitation) of Spanish. Indeed, being (or *doing being*, as Sacks, 1984, would put it) 'Galician' or 'Spanish' through language is constantly negotiated in public discourse ... particularly at election time.

Indeed, changing linguistic ideologies and language values converge in markedly ideologized forms of language behavior (Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1993), which are

² Names of Galician institutions and organizations are represented in boldface, and in the spelling system used by the institutions, which resembles Spanish more than it does Portuguese. For a thorough review of the conflict between competing standardization proposals in Galiza, see Herrero Valeiro (1993).

observable, among other usages, in RS. It is not surprising that the incorporeal inhabitants of speech (that is, the people one talks about or refers to, and whose words one quotes) are depicted in ways that reflect their real or typified social position, status, interpersonal orientation, or ideology in the encounters reported.

One obvious, but not always transparent way in which this depiction is tactically effected is through the language the reporter assigns to characters. Given the changing symbolic power relationship between Galician and Spanish, the conversational problem the reporter must deal with is *what* language to assign to a given character (particularly when this character occupies a socially recognizable, high-status or high-prestige position). This is what we will examine in the following pages.

3. Isomorphic vs. non-isomorphic representations of language choices

Cases abound where RS reproduces characters' language choices in the model event in a congruent or *isomorphic* way, that is, according to observed behaviors or likely typifications. When confronted with these cases, informants tend to attribute to these choices social meanings which respond to stereotypical views on language use patterns. Examples of these are: quoting one's conversation with a schoolteacher in Spanish, mimicking a worker's Galician rural accent, or attributing the use of standard Galician to a nationalist politician (see Álvarez-Cáccamo, 1993). Albeit expected, these RS tactics in themselves offer valuable information about speakers' perceptions of the socio-indexical potential of language.³

³ Thus the switch to Spanish by a woman when reporting a conversation with her grandson's teacher:

- 1 A: **este** → **este vai ser um home de primeira** ↓
 2 ? : (xx xx xx)
 3 A: **a profesora doña belén quedou enamorada de miguel** ↓
 4 .. **dixem** →
 5 {[f] *doña belén* ↑ *no se preocupe* ↓
 6 *que usted tiene muchos hijos* } ↓
 7 B: **e netos** ↓
 8 C: **home CLARo** ↓

English version

- 1 A: **This (boy), this is going to be a real fine man.**
 2 ? : (xx xx xx)
 3 A: **(His) teacher, doña Belén, grew so fond of Miguel.**
 4 **I said (to her),**
 5 "*doña Belén, don't (even) worry,*
 6 *you have lots of children (yourself).*"
 7 B: **And grandchildren.**
 8 C: **Of course!/Really!**

The above is a case of what has been called a 'throwaway story' (Polanyi, 1982) – a short anecdote strategically deployed only to 'make a point' in conversation. In this case, Miguel is treated as a recipient of a series of compliments by A about his success in school.

All personal names in my data have been changed to ensure confidentiality.

4. Isomorphic RS and sociolinguistic change

Typifications expressed through language choices in RS may also reflect the ongoing language shift. The increasing assimilation to Spanish as a first language by rural populations (Fernández Rodríguez and Rodríguez Neira, 1994) is mirrored in the following, intergenerational group conversation where a middle-aged woman ironically quotes an 8-year-old boy. The topic of conversation is the extreme hardships that the woman and other participants had experienced after the Spanish civil war. Her words follow a sarcastic joke made by the boy which had been designed to minimize the dramatic tone of the exchange (Galician segments are in **bold font**; Spanish is *italicized*; for other transcription conventions, see the Appendix):

Case 1. *As peles de plátano*⁴

- 1 Mulher: **e ti aora se um plátano tem uma pizquinha maçada já:: – já te:: –**
 2 ?: [risos]
 3 .
 4 Mulher: **se t- a ti che dão um plátano →**
 5 {[ac] **já empeza(s a) dizi-** } –
 6 {[ac][hi] *ay mamá* } →
 7 {[hi] *pero aquí está pocho* } ↓
 8 {[hi] *nu lu 'quiero* } ↓
 9 *nu lu 'quiero que está pochu* ↓

Case 1. *The Banana Peels. English version*

- 1 Woman: **And you, now, if a banana is a little bruised, you already...**
 2 ?: [laughs]
 3 .
 4 Woman: **If y- they give you a banana,**
 5 **you already start to say,**
 6 *“Yuck, Mom,*
 7 *but it's brown here,*
 8 *I don't want it.*
 9 *I don't want it, it's brown!”*

Other characters of the woman's age or older had been quoted in Galician previously in the same conversation. Now, by contrast, the reporter publicly re-presents the boy in the language he indeed used during the conversation. On the surface, observed behavior and the reenactment of this behavior match.

However, significant evaluative meanings are channelled through the reporter's register choice. The quote in lines 6–9 gives the impression of an exaggerated mimicking of the boy's accent, through the rising of the final [ɔ]'s in “*nu lu 'quiero que está pochu,*” “*I don't want it, it's brown!*” (standard Spanish “*no lo quiero ... pocho*”), the opening of [ɛ] in the diphthong /je/ in “*quiero*” ['kjerɔ], and the sing-song contour punctuated by rhythmic stresses. While these are all vernacular Gali-

⁴ The recorded data were provided by Maria do Carmo Feáns.

cian features (and they are, in this sense, expected pronunciations for a bilingual), in this case they sound oddly parodic in a Spanish discourse. Translated into everyday language, what the woman's parodic prosody suggests is, "I don't care about your refinement and modernity; you appear very urban and very Spanish with your tastes, your attitudes, and your language; but you can't help being rural and Galician, like me". Prosody and accent are here mobilized for what Bakhtin (1981: 364) has called "parodic stylization" of the quoted language,⁵ through which the dialectic confrontation Spanish/Galician is entextualized. Indeed, the woman's tactic may reflect a linguistic ideology of covert resistance to assimilation: if one is going to speak Spanish (i.e. modern) but continue to *be* Galician (i.e. rural), why not then *speak* and *be* Galician?

Other cases of RS reflect a complementary dimension of sociolinguistic change: the spread of standard Galician in the public, political sphere, and the new linguistic-ideological constructs that now associate Galician, too, to the realm of social power.⁶ The following case will illustrate my point.

During major student mobilizations and strikes in the 1986–87 academic year, a well-known Socialist leader of the student movement participated in a debate broadcast by the Galician television. The student, who spoke Spanish, was urged by several panel participants to enter into 'negotiations' with the Galician Department of Education (**Consellería de Educación**), instead of calling for direct mobilization. He expressed his skepticism toward negotiation in the following terms:

Case 2. A folga dos estudantes

- 1 Estudiante: *negociar cómo ?*
 2 {[hi] *como siempre* → *presentando nuestras quejas* } ?
 3 *para que nos digan* →
 4 *bueno* ↓
 5 **tranquilinhos** ↓
 6 *.. que ao me*lhor* ↓
 7 *.. dentro de três ou quatro anos fazemos caso ?*

Case 2. The Student Strike. English version

- 1 Student: *Negotiate, how?*
 2 *As usual, by presenting our complaints*
 3 *so that they tell us.*
 4 *"Well,*
 5 **you take it easy there,**
 6 **and maybe**
 7 **in three or four years we'll listen to you" ?**

⁵ I owe to Besnier's (1993) discussion of RS on Nukulaelae my own re-reading of mimicking prosody in my data as Bakhtinian 'parodic stylization'.

⁶ In Álvarez-Cáccamo (1993), I analyze a case where the reporter quotes a corrupt local politician using the institutionally sanctioned Galician form for 'people', **pobo**, while the reporter himself uses the colloquial Galician **pueblo**, originally a *Spanish* loanword. I argue that, indeed, these two words now have two, distinct referential meanings: the *politically constructed* people, and the 'real', *social* people, respectively.

The ironic intent of S's quotation is apparent. The affective and diminutive suffix **-inho** is often used in a sarcastic sense in Portuguese (Skorge, 1957: 229–231). The propositional content of “**you take it easy there**” (line 5) or “**you just don't worry**”, (literally ‘[keep] calm+AFFECTIVE’) contradicts that of the statement that follows (6–7) in such a way as to virtually impose a non-literal, ironic reading (see Haverkate, 1985), one in which a breach in the conventional(ized) logic of propositional content is uncovered by implicature.

Most importantly, the passage represents *a new, visible articulation of the community's perceptions about language and political power*. Social information about the managers of official Galicianhood (the Galician-speaking political elites) is integrated and symbolically contrasted with information about a ‘resistant’, Spanish-speaking ‘we’ in a single discursive unit which subsumes the reporter's view of socio-ideological conflict.

5. Conversational alliances

In striking contrast to the previous case, the following one shows an opposite pattern of switching: the quotation of the ‘Spanish they’ in a Galician stretch of discourse. During a public debate (January 1987) on the controversial issue of the establishment of a new university in Southern Galiza, a high-school student representing the nationalist organization **ERGA** (Galician Revolutionary Students) voiced his criticisms of the project. In this passage, the student switches to Spanish to quote a written document produced by an organization which supported the new university project and was allegedly connected to powerful economic forces:

Case 3. A Universidade Sul de Galiza

- 1 Estudante: **porque** {[hi] **hasta aora** ↑
 2 **sólo se nos falava** ↑
 3 **de centros** } ↑
 4 .. **de centros para 'vigo a maio*ria** ↓
 5 **temos aqui um informe** ↑
 6 .. **no que se nos fala** } ↑
 7 {[lo] **vigo** } ↓
 8 {[hi] **e entre parêntesis** } ↑
 9 .. {[lo] **y pontevedra también** } ↑
 10 .. **e entre parêntesis** ↑
 11 **vigo** ↑
 12 **con el sur de galicia** ↑
 13 **pontevedra y orense** ↓
 14 .. **pos por isso quero de'zir** → **que** -
 15 .. **as cousas hai que empezá-las** ↑
 16 **polos pés** ↓ **e não polas telhas** ↓

Case 3. The University of Southern Galiza. English version

- 1 Student: **Because so far**
 2 **they'd only talked**

3 **about “[educational] centers”**
 4 **– centers for Vigo, most of them.**
 5 **Here we have a report**
 6 **were they tell us:**
 7 *“Vigo”*
 8 **and, in parentheses,**
 9 *“and Pontevedra too”*
 10 **and, in parentheses,**
 11 *“Vigo,*
 12 *together with Southern Galicia,*
 13 *Pontevedra, and Orense.”*
 14 **And that’s why I say that**
 15 **things have to be started**
 16 **from the foundations, not from the roof.**

In lines 7, 9, and 11–13 the student quotes from the document that proposed the creation of university centers in urban areas where educational demands were already sufficiently covered. As in the previous case, the reporter markedly pauses and shifts prosodic registers in what could be considered an invisible quotation mark (Goffman, 1974). As in Case 2, prosodic mimicking accentuates the evaluative effect. The intonational phrases “*and Pontevedra too*” (9) and “*Vigo/together with Southern Galicia/Pontevedra, and Orense*” (11–13) are all delivered in a singsong contour reminiscent of a child’s whimsical demand, “I want some, too!”. The speaker thus treats the proponent organization as a capricious force who insists on enjoying an even larger piece of the educational pie.

Personal voice, positional voice, and ideology interact in this case and in Case 2, The Student Strike, to reveal the techniques by which language not only reflects but also constructs situated power alliances. While the social-indexical and implicit evaluation procedures employed are similar in both cases (RS, language switching, prosody manipulation, and ironic distancing), what differs is, precisely, the articulation of the ‘Galician vs. Spanish’ play of identities, and the conversational affiliations and disaffiliations between speaker, audience, and reported characters. In each case, these alignments largely correlate with the speaker’s publicly stated political ideology and analytically retrievable *linguistic* ideology and practice.

6. Non-isomorphic RS and power alliances

The above cases clearly reveal the creative power of RS in building and controlling *conversational alliances* and *counter-alliances*. In Voloshinov’s words (1973: 119), the “dynamic interrelationship” between the model speech event and the reported speech event “reflects the dynamism of social interorientation in verbal ideological communication between people”. That is, in order to fully understand the significance of discursive choices in RS, we must simultaneously examine the

micro-practices concurrent with RS, and the broader social scenario in which collective actors construct their power relationships.⁷

Further, at the micro-analytical level, we need to conjugate the *symbolic dimension of power alliances* with the *sequential dimension of interactional control*. For this purpose, in this work I will adopt a view of conversational power as an interactively negotiated process resulting from agency or “transformative capacity” (Giddens, 1984: 15), that is, the ability to affect the actors’ dispositions (Voloshinov’s ‘social interorientations’) toward one another, the characters, and the subject matter of talk itself.⁸

As a general pattern in my data, when quotations of speech events are embedded in the discourse without switching codes, what is highlighted is the momentary, micro-chronological cohesion or solidarity between the reporter and the social actors involved in the report. Conversely, when the speaker tactically switches codes to quote others (particularly in accounts where the reporter is involved as a character), the *syntagmatic* contrast between the characters’ invoked identities indexes the *paradigmatic*, social and symbolic oppositions between social groups and languages. Since switching for RS is more marked than not switching, and thus entails a rearrangement of local discourse economy, switching must have some powerful, positive compensation in the form of richness in expressing social meanings and building interactional hegemony (as we will see).

⁷ What we need, suggests Mey (1989: 336), is a deeper “pragmatic understanding” of the “language system as well as of its processes”, as this understanding “engenders a critical attitude towards the control instances of society, and allows us to unmask society’s hidden [ideological] ‘macrostructures’ and surveillance organs”.

⁸ For Giddens (1984: 15), “[t]o be an agent is to be able to deploy (chronically, in the flow of daily life) a range of causal powers, including that of influencing those deployed by others. Action depends upon the capability of the individual to ‘make a difference’ to a pre-existing state of affairs or course of events”. This rather straightforward view of power as agency, which informs my work, is very much related to Goffman’s (1959, 1974) notions of ‘face’ and ‘impression management’ (cf. also Luckenbill, 1979; Mitchell-Kernan, 1972). Much of what has been argued as constituting power in micro-analytical research has been left unsaid, for the reader to reconstruct. Often, one has to read between lines in attempting to identify ‘power’ processes in face-to-face interaction, and readers coming from different theoretical presuppositions may thus arrive at widely diverging interpretations of the description. Not infrequently, the terms ‘power’ and ‘control’ have been applied to unequal encounters (typically, medical interviews, courtroom interaction, and classroom interaction) as interchangeable categories. For instance, Treichler et al. (1984: 64) while conceiving of power as “the negotiated product of a mutually constituted and mutually administered interaction system”, later proceed to equate the question-answer organization of medical interviews with “an important dimension of power and control” (ibid.: 68f.; my emphasis). Similarly, O’Barr (1984: 267ff.) emphasizes the *organizational* rather than the *interactional* dimension of talk, when he reviews a number of typical conversational strategies for ‘power’ (i.e. control). For her part, Lakoff’s (1982) instrumental notion of ‘unilateral discourse’ also refers to the unequal distribution of discursive tasks, rather than to the interpersonal orientations between interactants. Finally, Woolard’s view (1985) of power as ‘coercive domination’ is perhaps too narrow. More useful for the focus of this work is her notion of ‘status’ (from Brown and Gilman’s, 1960 power/solidarity framework), which would roughly include the attributes of “symbolic authority” (Woolard, 1985: 739).

7. Code displacement

In my data, the relationships between code choices in RS and characters' social identity are not as straightforward and predictable as one could imagine or as some research on bilingual conversation has argued them to be (cf. Gal, 1979; Mertz, 1993).⁹ On the contrary, tactical distortions or ideologically loaded (mis)representations of speech behavior often take the form of a *non-congruent, non-isomorphic* attribution of code choices to a given character under the guise of a faithful reenactment of previously spoken material.

This phenomenon, which I have labeled *code displacement*, reflects the ideologically-mediated capacity of reflexive RS to transform context. In the construction of a believable possible world, reporters assign to characters (including themselves) language choices which may visibly conflict with observed or expected behaviors. The notion of code displacement refers to the dislocation,¹⁰ transformation, or supplantation of identities, and to the generation of local power alliances through this supplantation. Further, alliances are established through *implicit evaluation* of other social actors, as code displacement (like certain forms of hypercharacterization or 'marking' in the Afro-American speech tradition; cf. Mitchell-Kernan, 1972) often carries an evaluative effect upon the subject of narration and the characters involved.¹¹

The following is a transparent case of code displacement. In 1984 the Galician Government launched its first, limited campaign for Galicianization. One of the activities it sponsored was a Conference on the Galician Language, the first **Xornadas da Lingua Galega**. Some time after the conference, one of the attendants expressed to this researcher her reservations about the quality of the meetings, both in terms of contributions and focus of analysis of the language problem in Galiza (A: Informant; R: Researcher):¹²

Case 4. As "Xornadas da Lingua"

1 A: **figura-te como seriam de boas as jornadas** →

2 **que hasta o x [#alcume#] presentou uma ponência** →

⁹ Gal (1979: 109) claims that in Oberwart, "in contrast to most GH [German-Hungarian, or bilingual] use, quoting is relatively predictable. All one needs to know to predict the language in which most quotes will be spoken is the language in which the original utterance was spoken". Closely following Gal, Mertz (1993: 166) asserts: "Predictably, code-switching is at times *precipitated* when a speaker *wants* to quote something said or written in the other language" (my italics). This emphasis on the 'triggering' effect of context for code-switching underplays the speaker's power to *renew* context itself.

¹⁰ A related notion can be found in Lyotard (1984 [1979]: 16). Lyotard indicates that, in the "agonistic game" of language, each reference or mention to a given participant involves a sort of "displacement" in the participant's position: "Each language partner, when a 'move' pertaining to him is made, undergoes a 'displacement,' an alteration of some kind that not only affects him in his capacity as an addressee and referent, but also as sender".

¹¹ Mitchell-Kernan (1972: 178) discusses how 'marking' may be "revealing of attitudes and values relating to language ... An individual, on occasion, may mark a nonblack using exaggerated black English, with the emphasis clearly being on communicating that the subject was uneducated and used non-standard usages".

¹² The case was transcribed from written notes shortly after it took place.

- 3 *incitación a la creación literaria* ↓
 4 **ou algo assi** ↓
 5 R: **presentou-na em castelão ?**
 6 A: **não não** → **em galego** ↓
 7 R: **ah como dixeches o título em castelão** ↑

Case 4. The Language Conference. English version

- 1 A: **You can imagine how “good” the Conference was**
 2 **that even X [#nickname#] gave a paper:**
 3 **“Incitement to Literary Creation”**
 4 **or something like that.**
 5 R: **Did he read it in Castilian (Spanish)?**
 6 A: **No, no, in Galician.**
 7 R: **Oh, since you mentioned the title in Castilian...**

In the production of an unequivocally ironic turn, A has twice exploited the Gricean Maxim of Quality (lines 1 and 3), thus inviting R to somehow reinterpret the intended meanings through conversational implicature. But, A's two maxim exploitations differ significantly. While in line 1 she ironically flouts the Maxim by stating that the conference was “good”, and, thus, implicating the opposite, in line 3 surface form apparently matches referential content: simply, that character X had read a paper which represented a call for or an “incitement” to write literature. What differs is, interestingly, the language that A attributes to X with the purpose of negatively evaluating his performance at the conference. Notice that R, in order to obtain a more accurate depiction of the original event, requests further information regarding the language actually used by X in his paper.

Character evaluations of this sort, channeled through code displacement, must be viewed in terms of the reporter's ideological typifications about the position that either language occupies in the territory of symbolic power.¹³ In the following case we can observe how the use of a ‘hidden quotation’ (Fónagy, 1986) in Spanish serves for the reporter to build a disaffiliative alliance with the character he is speaking about. The case comes from a session with an informant (B), who was asked to comment on an authoritative speech in Galician given by the Mayor of Vigo during a council debate on urban planning:

Case 5. “El bien de la Nación”

- 1 B: **é um discurso político que é um discurso político de defensa** →
 2 **não dos interesses do que escoita** ↓
 3 **que é o que che vota** ↓
 4 **senão de defensa do que *ti queres levar adiante** →

¹³ During the same conversation, A tended to consistently switch to Spanish when she quoted the (hypothetical?) words of the then-Secretary of Education of Galiza – a woman who used nothing but Galician in public life. When I noted this fact to my informant, she instantly recognized her habit of switching, but she added that she did not know why. An impromptu interpretation would be that the quoted politician demonstrated, despite her use of Galician, a ‘Spanishist’ (*‘espanholista’*) political ideology.

- 5 **por riba e e sem importar-che o: os intereses de quem che escoita ↓**
 6 **é algo que queres levar adiante polos intereses que sejam →**
 7 *el bien de la nación ↑*
 8 **e: ou porque os construtores pressionam →**
 9 **porque se construían →**
 10 **dez rascacielos em um sítio ↓**

Case 5. The “Good of the Nation”. English version

- 1 B: **(The Mayor’s) is a political discourse for the defense,**
 2 **not of the interests of those listening to you (=him),**
 3 **who are the ones who vote for you,**
 4 **but for the defense of whatever you want to carry out**
 5 **over and above any consideration of the interests of those listening to you.**
 6 **It’s something that you want to carry out for whatever interests you may have:**
 7 *“the good of the nation”*
 8 **and- or because the construction companies are pressuring you**
 9 **to build**
 10 **ten skyscrapers somewhere (in town).**

My interviewee’s hidden quotation in line 7 emblematically reproduces an infamously common motto during Franco’s years: “*el bien de la Nación*”, “the Good of the Nation”, as the driving force in the universal projection of the reborn Spanish “Empire towards God” – “*Por el Imperio hacia Dios*”, in Francoist political rhetoric. In his impressions of the Mayor’s speech, my informant understood that the Mayor “**is making an effort, trying to use the Galician language as a symbol or as a vehicle for expression, in order to somehow side himself with the majority of his people, with the society in which he lives**”. Yet, in the same session, my interviewee ironically attributed the Francoist motto and the language in which it was uttered to a democratically elected, Galician-speaking mayor in a post-Francoist Spain. How can we make sense of this tactic?

Simply, we must see in this ironic usage an implicit critique of authority, through the *transfer* of symbolic values associated with Spanish. The common practice of employing Spanish to evaluatively quote the voice of the representatives of centralist power during Franco’s years is now applied and transferred, in a different context, to the public behavior of new, Galician elites who share with their predecessors something perhaps more fundamental than ideology: political authority.

8. Code displacement, interactional power, and sociolinguistic conflict

As suggested earlier, code attributions and code displacement enter into the local management of power and control at several, co-occurrent levels of discourse: power alignments, sequential organization, and discourse tasks. But, how are these levels articulated? I will now examine this multiple articulation in a case where the speaker’s claim to *hegemony* through knowledge display (alignments) is grounded on a narrative which is primarily *controlled* by the narrator himself (sequential organization) and contains a *displaced self-representation* in RS (discourse tasks).

The case comes from a highly charged meeting of the board of directors of a local museum which I attended in 1984. Only after detailed examination of the tapes could I observe, through the crust of seemingly immaterial discussions, two aspects that deserve our attention. Firstly, the power dynamics between representatives of opposing political views. Secondly, and most significantly, the tactical manipulation of languages for group identification and for the establishment of local alliances. Language choices and usages were issues in their own right all throughout the meeting; metapragmatic phenomena such as explicit references to language behavior were perhaps the most visible manifestation of the participants' awareness of the value of language for self-presentation.

9. Conversational organization

The episode chosen took place during the routine report by the Art Curator, who was also the Secretary of the Board. The Secretary (Se, in the transcript) had passed on a request by the Provincial Government (**Deputación Provincial**), for the Museum to donate temporarily for exhibition a collection of paintings by a deceased Galician artist whom we will call Fouce. A member of the board (A in the transcript) – also a deputy of the Provincial Government and a member of the conservative party *Alianza Popular* – argued for the case. Well after the decision had been reached, off-record discussions about the artist's biography, personal accomplishments, and local patriotism were still populating this polyphonic microworld, with the uncomprehensibly speedy coordination which often characterizes (apparently) amenable talk.

The discussion finally turned to whether the collection of Fouce's paintings had been purchased or temporarily donated to the Museum two decades earlier. The episode begins (Segment (a)) with the History curator (Hi) emphasizing the importance of the painting collection, and concludes (Segment (b)) with a narrative by one of the members (C) about his personal intervention in the acquisition deal a few years earlier:

Case 6. A coleção de pintura. Segmento (a)

Participants: Hi: History Curator; Ch: Chairman; A: Elected board member, and provincial deputy; B: Appointed board member; C: Appointed board member (local artist); Se: Secretary of the Board and Art Curator.

- 1 Hi: o que passa é (que) probable _[mente] nenguma: -
 2 Ch: _[bueno]
 3 Hi: .. nenguma:.. nengum museo de galicia tenha o que temos nós ↓ =
 4 A: = ah _[não] ↓
 5 Hi: _[(em) quantidá e:::] ↓:
 6 A: _[não] ↓ esto: realmente foi: foi um
 moment _[o] -
 7 Hi: _{[este último momento de fouce não o t} _[em] -
 8 A: _[um momento]
 his*t _[órico] ↓
 9 Hi: _[esta representacião] _[como a nossa não o tem nengum museu] ↓
 10 A: _[este foi um momento em que se] ↓
 comprou → vamos ↓

Case 6. *The Painting Collection. Segment (a). English version*

- 1 Hi: **The thing is that probably no other –**
 2 Ch: **Well –**
 3 Hi: **no other, no other museum in Galicia has what we have...**
 4 A: **Oh no.**
 Hi: **...in quantity and –**
 6 A: **No, this really was, was a moment –**
 7 Hi: **This last period of Fouce's no (one) has –**
 8 A: **A historical moment.**
 9 Hi: **Such a sample (of his work) like ours no other museum has.**
 10 A: **This was a period in which we purchased, I mean**
 11 **by the way, very well, by the way, at a good price,**
 12 B: **No, but this wasn't b-. W- was it bought?**
 13 A: **And a (?) – uh?**
 14 Hi: **Uh?**
 15 C: **Yes, this was bought.**
 16 A: **Yes, (it was) bought, yes.**
 17 B: **Oh, this was bought.**
 18 Hi: **It was bought.**
 19 A: **Yes, it was bought.**
 20 B: **But, how, how (about) the, the –**
 21 A: **Bought, and very well bought, of course.**
 22 B: **WHERE is that work by uh–**
 23 **the one that was stored here?**
 24 <1.5>
 25 B: **Oh, no, no; that was Caride's (work), shit.**
 26 Se: **Caride's.**
 27 A: **No, that was Tonho Caride.**
 28 B: **Yes, Caride,**
 29 **yes, yes.**
 30 Hi: **Here we have two Fouce's from his first period.**
 31 B: **Yes, no,**
 32 **of course, of course, of course.**
 33 A: (xx xx xx xx xx xx xx)
 34 B: **Of course, of course.**
 35 C: **(The thing is,) this was...**
 36 B: **Fouce, of course.**
 37 A: **Very nice, by the way.**
 38 C: **...bought...**
 39 Se: **Next, we have here –**
 40 C: **...exactly in the year**
 41 **sixty-five...**
 42 A: **This was bought from his sister, right?**
 43 C: **...or sixty-six, for f- four-hundred thousand pesetas.**
 44 A: **From his sister, right?, the one who lives in (xx).**
 45 Hi: **Four-hundred thousand pesetas?**
 46 A: **It was a bargain.**
 47 Hi: **The entire collection of p(aintings)?**
 48 A: **It was a bargain.**

49 ? : **Yes.**

50 A : **Th- that was a bargain.**

Between lines 12 and 50 the activity centers on whether artist Fouce's collection had indeed been purchased or not, after B raises the question. In polyphonic participation, C (15), A (16, 19), and Hi (18), in this order, answer affirmatively. Additional support is provided, for example, by A, when he emphasizes that the purchase "**was a bargain**" (46, 48, 50).

The culminating confirmation of the facts will be C's narrative, announced in lines 35, 38, 40-41, and 43. The narrative, developed in Segment (b), contains the enactment of two conversations: first, C's encounter with the artist's sister while in Madrid; and, then, a conversation between the then-Mayor of the city, Mr. Rusinyol, and the then-curator of the Museum, Mr. Urquiza, regarding the opportuneness of going ahead with the acquisition:

Case 6. *A coleção de pintura. Segment (b)*

- 45 Hi: **quatrocentas mil peseta-s ?**
- 46 A: **{[lo] [foi tirad o] ↓**
- 47 Hi: **[toda a: coleção de q-- =**
- 48 A: **= {[lo] foi tirado } ↓**
- 49 ? : **[si] ↓**
- 50 A: **[ess--**
esso {[lo] foi tira-do } ↓
- 51 C: **[PORque- fum eu o recadeiro → o mensageiro →**
- 52 **.h.h que coincidim em madrid numa inauguração] =**
- 53 A: **{[lo] [s:i] ↓ =**
- 54 C: **= duma exposição de resende →**
- 55 **(e) estava ali a irmã de: *fouce ↓**
- 56 ? : **si] ↓**
- 57 A: **{[lo] [si] ↓**
- 58 C: **[e me (d)i- e::h não sei quê comente:i: →**
- 59 **{[ac] pró (= para o) dia seguinte → (d)ice ↓**
- 60 **não eu manhã vou-me a #cidade# ↓ =**
- 61 **= home } →**
- 62 **.h.h.h {[dc] [enunciação clara] ya que vas a #cidade# →**
- 63 **.. te agradecería hablaras con 'el alcalde →**
- 64 **'y que.. dijera } →**
- 65 Se: **.. si sí o si no ↓**
- 66 C: **{[st] e::: si sí.. o si *no } ↑**
- 67 **porque tengo aquí la obra →**
- 68 **.. y::: si no hay acuerdo pues dispongo de ella ↑**
- 69 **{[ac] porque estoy necesitada de: } ↓**
- 70 ? : **(x-x xx xx)]**
- 71 C: **[e aí f-oi donde me enterei →**
- 72 **.. que a:: cousa eram quatrocentas mil pesetas ↓↓**
- 73 **.. entonces eu cheguei a *#cidade# →**
- 74 **pedim(-lhe) audiência ao: senhor rusi*nyol →**
- 75 **... chamou a urquiza e dix(o) ↓**

- 76 *bueno hay que poner esto en: marcha* →
 77 *que (be xx y) no se nos vaya a ir y tal* ↓↓
 78 **pero el já** [(le)vava uns meses →
 79 ? : [mhm]
 80 ? : {[p] já} ↓
 81 C: [um pouco apar [t a] do:: →
 82 Ch: [claro] ↓
 83 C: ... (xx xx -xx)
 84 A: ... **OIE el era mais #gentilício# que de #cidade2#** ↓
 85 **digo eu por natureza** ↓
 86 **sem embargo se pr- s- projectava-se mais aqui não ? eh ?**

Case 6. *The Painting Collection. Segment (b). English version*

- 45 Hi: **Four-hundred thousand pesetas?**
 46 A: **It was a bargain.**
 47 Hi: **The entire collection of p(aintings)?**
 48 A: **It was a bargain.**
 49 ? : **Yes.**
 50 A: **Th- that was a bargain.**
 51 C: **BECAUSE I was the middleman, the messenger,**
 52 **because I ended up in Madrid in the opening...**
 53 A: **Right.**
 54 C: **... of an exhibition by Resende,**
 55 **and there she was, Fouce's sister,**
 56 ? : **Right.**
 57 A: **Right.**
 58 C: **and she tells me – uh, I don't know what comment I made**
 59 **about the next day, (I say),**
 5á **"No, I'm leaving for #City# tomorrow,"**
 61 **"Oh/Hey,**
 62 **.h.h.h [clearer enunciation] since you're going to #City#,**
 63 **I would appreciate it if you could talk to the Mayor**
 64 **and if he would say..."**
 65 Se: **"Yes or no."**
 66 C: **...uh, "yes... or no,**
 67 **because here I have [Fouce's] work,**
 68 **aaand if there's no agreement then I'll do something with it,**
 69 **because I'm in need of..."**
 70 ? : (xx xx xx)
 71 C: **And that's when I found out**
 72 **that the deal was four hundred thousand pesetas.**
 73 **Then I arrived at #City#,**
 74 **I requested an appointment with [the Mayor,] Mr. Rusinyol,**
 75 **he called [Curator] Urquiza and said,**
 76 **"Well, we have to get this (deal) going,**
 77 **so that (xx) it doesn't slip out from under us (our hands) and so on."**
 78 **But [Fouce] had already been for some months...**
 79 ? : Mhm.
 80 ? : **Yeah.**

- 81 C: ...kind of out of the scene.
 82 Ch: Right.
 83 C: (xx xx xx)
 84 A: LISTEN, he was more from #City3#, rather than from #City2#?
 85 I mean, by birth.
 86 However, he had more impact around here, didn't he? Uh?

Overall, C's participation can be broken down into three major activities: (1) an orientating summary (“**The thing is that this was bought exactly in the year sixty-five or sixty-six for f- four hundred thousand pesetas**”, 35–43); (2) the narrative which includes the two conversations (51–77); and (3) an evaluative coda (78–81) which also functions as a new-topic introducer. However, a detailed examination of conversational organization shows us that C's orientating turns (35–43), overlapping with other participants' voices, might have been planned as a self-contained unit, while the production of the main narrative body is somehow triggered by the development of the interaction, and, specifically, by A's contrapuntal interventions. Indeed, C's initial sequence is referentially and syntactically self-contained, and it ends with a falling tune (43), which is a propitious place for activity shift. In contrast, C begins his second contribution with the discourse connective “**PORque**” “**because**” (51), emphatically uttered as if to re-claim access to the floor, after the exchange between lines 45 and 50 threatened to shift the focus of information flow toward A, Hi, and an unidentified participant.

Further, C's detail in describing his encounter with Fouce's sister must be seen as a counter-strategy to A's display of knowledge in his remarks that the purchase “**was a bargain**” and that “**This was bought from his sister, right?**” (42), “**From his sister, right?, the one who lives in (xx)**” (44). Finally, in foregrounding the first person pronoun in line 51 (“**BECAUSE I was the middleman, the messenger**”), C emphasizes his direct participation in the events, and thus claims access to the domain of discourse (Goodwin, 1986) which he will later hegemonize. It is only after this strategy that C gains full control of the floor (52), as suggested by the fact that during his slight pause with inhalation he is not interrupted by any other participant. In sum, in the competition between A and C which centers on the display of information, A succeeds in making his remarks about Fouce's sister *count* for gradual topical development; but C, by taking advantage of A's allusion, succeeds even more dramatically in presenting himself as an instrumental character in the events retold.

There is additional evidence that, aiming at interactional control, C relies on the construction of an atmosphere of authenticity about the narrated events. I am referring specifically to the descriptive detail and to his lexical choices, such as “**exactly**”, (40) or the use of the presupposition-triggering factive verb “**me enterei**” in “**that's when I found out that the deal was four hundred thousand pesetas**” (71–72), as opposed to A's unqualified, reiterated remark that the purchase “**was a bargain**”. In brief, on the basis of this uncontestable narrative, C closes his crucial participation announced earlier, effectively gains control of information flow, emphasizes his personal involvement in the reported events, and claims the interac-

tional relevance that derives from his role in the whole affair.¹⁴ As in narrative performance (Briggs, 1993), C has gradually achieved interactional control by manipulating a number of discursive devices. One of these devices is, as I will now discuss, the appropriate selection of codes for intended verisimilitude.

10. Code displacement and intended iconicity

In the enactment of his dialogue with the artist's sister, C presents himself as addressing his interlocutor in Galician, while she responds in Spanish. I will argue that, within the climate of intended verisimilitude, what may appear at first sight as an accurate depiction of language choices falls apart if examined in detail.

As is common in direct RS, the beginning of the quotation of C's interlocutor ("**Oh/Hey**, since you're going to #City#, I would appreciate it if you could talk to the Mayor and if he could tell you ... yes or no ..."; 61–64, 66–69) is set off from the surrounding Galician discourse by a slight pause with an inhalation, and a clearer and slower enunciation (62). Notice, however, that this offset or conversational 'débrayage' takes place *after* the quotation had started, with the Galician discourse marker '**home**' ['omɐ] (61) (literally 'man'). In this context, '**home**' roughly translates as 'oh' or 'hey'; that is, it partakes both of an 'information receipt' function (Schiffrin, 1987) or 'response to an informing' function (Heritage, 1984) equivalent to English 'oh', and of an attention-getting function, similar to 'hey'. '**Home**' is a Galician pragmatic marker, but in this case it opens the quotation of the Spanish-speaker, while, at the same time, it is ambiguously embedded in an intonational phrase in Galician, delivered at an accelerated pace (59–61).

Two questions come to mind upon observing code manipulation in this short segment – a "translinguistic battlefield", as Hill (1985: 731) would expressively say, "upon which two ways of speaking struggle for dominance". Firstly, we may ask, *whose voice* is it at the beginning of the quotation, in line 61? And, consequently, on the basis of what communicative effect is that voice *not* maintained for the remainder of the quotation? As Mitchell-Kernan (1972: 177) points out in reference to 'marking' in Black English vernacular speech, "major disturbances in fluency are indexes of 'monitored' speech". The disturbance represented by the pause and the shift in enunciation indicates that something salient is taking place – something to which I referred earlier as an apparent rearrangement of the economy of the speech exchange. Thus, why pause and switch languages? Or, rather, what for?

Again, we must examine whether RS constitutes an isomorphic or, on the contrary, a displaced representation of language choices in the model event. What C reproduces is, to be sure, a non-reciprocal bilingual conversation which took place in Madrid in 1965 or 1966, a clearly marked temporal and spatial setting for such an exchange. From what we know about the history of the Spanish/Galician language

¹⁴ Indeed, this particular issue is settled after C's selectively detailed narrative, and A originates yet a new discussion (off the transcript) around the claim of the painter's local identity.

conflict, non-reciprocal exchanges of this sort would at that time constitute mutually face-threatening acts, in that such visible divergences in behavior would index contrasting social identifications and/or political ideologies. In contrast, other aspects of the reported conversation (e.g. the informal treatment with “tú” and the tone of familiarity suggested by the wording) signal social and conversational solidarity between C and the woman.

Nonetheless, the relative likelihood that the original encounter took place as depicted should concern us less than the question of whether C’s performance was *successful* in rhetorically re-producing the facts. Against the backdrop of the *collective construction* of the meeting discussion, carried out almost entirely in Galician, C indexed in-group self-identification through the contrasts he establishes between his own language choices (both as a character and as a narrator) and those of the other characters: the artist’s sister, and the city Mayor in his Spanish conversation with the curator (“Well, we have to get this (deal) going, so that it doesn’t slip out from under us”, 76–77). Again, syntagmatic language contrasts mirror paradigmatic language conflict.¹⁵

C makes use of several devices to maximize the intended authenticity of his narrative. First, his narrative orientation reflects a considerable liking for detail. The second device is the selection of what Labov (1982) calls ‘the most reportable events’ in a narrative by obviating irrelevant actions; in this case, two of these crucial events are conversations. Thirdly, and most importantly, C produces a *direct* rendition of these conversations. There is general agreement in the literature that direct reported discourse plays a major role in conveying objectivity or verisimilitude.¹⁶ As is obvious, the report must not necessarily reproduce exactly the original event (cf. the use of parodic prosody in Case 1, The Banana Peels and Case 3, The University of Southern Galiza). Instead, verisimilitude rests, I argue, on the *intended iconicity* of RS, that is, a property of speech by which the narration of an event *can* count for participants as isomorphic with the model speech event.

Finally, and crucially, C has made use of his bilingual repertoire to present himself and others in those ‘most reportable events’. Here, as in the other cases discussed, the broader pragmatic question that arises is whether or not acts of RS contain in themselves enough information about the language used in the original event (and thus, indirectly, about aspects of the characters’ social identity and ideology). That is, can we infer solely from the language(s) used in the report the language(s) used in the model utterance? We will examine this issue later.

¹⁵ On this level of conversational alignment, C’s choices simultaneously generate *conversational distance* within the two ‘storyworlds’, and *conversational involvement* (cf. Tannen, 1986) within the world of reporting, or the ‘storytelling world’. The creation of involvement is evident, for instance, in the Secretary’s contribution to the enactment of the model speech event (65).

¹⁶ Specifically, direct discourse suggests the speaker’s commitment to the events being retold (Haberland, 1986); it gives ‘transparent readings’ (Bamgboṣe, 1986); it ‘implies a greater fidelity to the source of information’ (Li, 1986: 41); it ‘‘may be a way of proposing the ‘objectivity’ of the account’’ (Mandelbaum, 1993: 259); it conveys ‘‘vividness’’ (Lucy 1993a: 118); it ‘‘reproduce[s] the quoted speech event as a whole’’ (Hickmann, 1993: 65); or it ensures the legitimacy of the speaker’s words in the culturally central ‘passing of information’ from a prestigious source (Besnier, 1993).

In the context of the Museum's activities for the production and circulation of Galician culture, C has thus recreated social conflict inside the space of the interaction. This conflict is the opposition between the Galician-speaking 'we' of the reporting episode, and the Spanish-speaking 'they' of the reported events. The power of linguistic choices here works for the construction of positive interactional face through strategic self-identification.

The absence of any resistance from C's interlocutors in the form of conversational countermoves to the way the dialogues are presented is the best indicator that the narrative is interactionally successful. In other words, the absence of others' 'challenges to [characters'] methodologies' or of reporters' 'redraftings of the narrative facts' (Ochs et al., 1992) clearly shows that the sociolinguistic 'theory' and linguistic ideology underlying narrative coherence are shared among participants. Quite surely, linguistic-ideological, theory-building consensus took precedence over a respect for all the narrative facts.¹⁷ What counted in the interaction as a believable enactment, may in actuality have constituted a distortion of the reality experienced.

The meanings of code displacement can be further illuminated by examining the broader sociolinguistic situation of Galiza. At the time of the meeting in 1984, the city council had just signed an agreement, along with more than one hundred other municipalities, to Galicianize institutional life. As a result of this commitment, the minutes of the council meetings and those of the institutions directly dependent upon the municipal government, like the Museum, were written in Galician. The minutes and other documents generated in each session went through the **Servicio de Normalización Lingüística** (Office of Linguistic Normalization), which translated them or rendered them into the institutional Galician norm. In sum, as the analysis has shown, at stake in C's performance was something other than the accurate rendition of a past experience:¹⁸ namely, an appeal to the authoritative and cohesive functions of Galician. Only by considering the emerging symbolic power and material authority of Galician in social life, as well as throughout the entire event, can we understand how C, through his heroic, *self-impersonating* maneuver, situationally succeeds in presenting the unlikely as possible, or, perhaps, the impossible as real.

11. Conclusions

I have tried to show, at a general level, that the play of identities when quoting language(s) goes far beyond supposedly unambiguous correspondences between the

¹⁷ As indicated earlier, there is extensive evidence that language choices and usages were crucial for power alliance dynamics all throughout the meeting. For instance, before the formal opening of the meeting, as the Chairman was conversing with a board member in Spanish, another member interjected ironically in Galician, "**Hey, Chairman, are we going to speak Galician or what?**" ("**A ver, presidente, falamos galego ou que?**"). Metapragmatics also took the form of corrections of the Chairman's usages of Galician, explicit references to language choices, puns, etc.

¹⁸ As Hickmann (1993: 87) states, "direct quotations rarely reproduce exactly the entire message as in (2) [a detailed depiction of a two-turn event], unless this message is at issue, and framing has multiple functions in addition to the anchoring of deictics".

language used in the quotation and observed behaviors. Rather, the tactical manipulation of language(s) in RS helps construct situated power alliances with the multiple inhabitants of the space of talk: hearers and overhearers, recipients, 'primary' audiences (Brenneis, 1986, 1987) (the radio and television audiences in Cases 2 and 3, The Student Strike and The University of Southern Galiza), 'secondary' audiences, and narrated characters. Reporters establish these alliances on the basis of underlying linguistic ideologies that tell us which language is appropriate for a given character under given circumstances. *Representational meanings* (what language a character is made to use) and *evaluative meanings* (what alignment the reporter signals to be sustaining toward that character) are selectively foregrounded, so that *similar RS tactic-types may represent diverging or even opposite patterns of conversational power alliances* (contrast, again, Cases 2 and 3, referred to above). Furthermore, this tactical symbolization of identity and ideology can be put into play to highlight conflicts of interests between the reporter and other parties, either co-present recipients (Case 1, The Banana Peels) or absent characters (Cases 2 through 6).

I have also shown that, while the meanings of code choices in RS must be seen *in reference to* language ideologies and native theories of language, they are primarily constructed and interpreted *locally*. First, my analysis has yielded that code manipulation for indexical projection entails a *reterritorialization* of the various 'we's' and 'they's' of discourse.¹⁹ But the local boundaries between the 'we' and the 'they' must not be taken for granted, nor can they be simply determined from observation of other patterns of language behavior in the community. The categories of 'we' and 'they', each of which represents a player for a given course of action, emerge *micro-chronologically* in conversational context; consequently, they must be examined empirically in each situation. For these reasons, contrary to any deterministic view, I have found *no predictable patterns* of code choice in RS, of the type 'when quoting in variety A, one switches to B', or vice versa.

Second, at the level of conversational inference, the issue underlying the interpretation of code choices in RS is how participants reconstruct the original language use on the basis of propositions that may not reproduce, either in Manner or in Quality, what originally took place. This concerns the articulations between propositional content and speech act form (including code choices) in the representation of reality. The question to explore is, to be sure, (a) whether propositions which predicate about speech acts (e.g. $p = 'X \text{ said } y'$) contain in themselves information about the language of the reported act (in which case p should be rewritten $p = 'X \text{ said } y \text{ IN LANGUAGE } z'$), or (b) whether such information is conveyed and retrieved through implicature.

¹⁹ In fact, one cannot avoid perceiving *any one* act of metaphorical code-switching – whether for RS or for other stylistic purposes – as an act of *self-quotation* and *self-impersonation*. By this act, the speaker is not actually speaking, but, perhaps, *doing speaking* with another, socially constructed voice, and thus entering a social territory where the boundaries between the one-language-speaking 'we' and the other-language-speaking 'they' become blurred and indistinct. As Fónagy (1986: 282) discusses, our daily speech is intertextually pervaded by 'hidden quotations', the hidden texts of others' words and voices (if words and voices indeed belong to individual social actors), which become our own by the appropriation effected in merely uttering them.

Evidence against formulation (a) comes from cases such as 4 (The Language Conference), where the hearer interrogates the reporter about the language used in the model speech act. Evidence could also come from cases where the narrator qualifies RS by stating explicitly something such as ‘And she told me, in Galician, ...’ Interestingly, I have no record of any such cases in my data.²⁰ More commonly, reporters either reproduce the character’s quote in the embedding language, or switch for conversational alignment purposes.

This leaves us with the impression that most often, information about the language used in the model event is conveyed through implicatures. Consequently, the successful retrieval of such implicatures – and the successful interpretation of the ‘facts’ of the reported world – rests on *assigning discursive relevance* to shared knowledge and beliefs about sociolinguistic facts. Precisely because direct RS is devoid of *explicit* evaluation (Lucy, 1993a), its efficacy relies on the sharing of knowledge. Such knowledge includes assumptions about (a) the patterned associations between the characters’ social identity and their language practices, (b) the local organization of the reporting situation, and (c) the broader sociolinguistic and ideological landscape. In other words (to follow Ochs et al., 1992), participants put into play their respective native *sociolinguistic ‘theories’* and *linguistic ideologies* that sustain the verisimilitude and likelihood of the characters’ actions purported in the RS act. Communicative misunderstandings (cf. Case 4, The Language Conference) may thus mirror the participants’ differing local theories and ideologies.

In this regard, the phenomenon that I have labeled *code displacement* represents the reporter’s attempt to *construct a(n ideologized) possible world where the proposition and its implicated meanings may be true*: a world where characters are made to speak in a believable manner – one where, for instance, public authority figures, even those who use only Galician in public, may speak Spanish. The relative impunity of reflexive code displacement rests, precisely, on an appeal to shared linguistic ideologies and sociolinguistic knowledge that sustain interpretation. However, because of the unstated nature of these ideologies and knowledge, the manipulative powers of code displacement may be quite elusive to metapragmatic awareness. Preliminary impressions of some informants’ accounts indicate that in daily life code displacement may be viewed simply as a stylistic device, rather than as the skillful use of a tool to re-create context and reality. This provides additional evidence that, as is suggested regarding the limits of metapragmatic awareness (Silverstein, 1981; Lucy, 1993a), there may be more to reflexive language than meets the eye – or the ear.

Additionally, my data suggest that this limitation of linguistic awareness is subject to historical contingencies. In Álvarez-Cáccamo (1993), I discuss a number of cases where metalanguage (e.g. self-justifications for the use of Spanish in a public event, or explanations of one’s ‘linguistic disobedience’ to using a given standard Galician word) reflects the scope of linguistic ideologization in a process of language institu-

²⁰ Examples of explicit mention of the language of the model event cited by Lucy (1993a) and Mertz (1993) come from data-eliciting sessions with informants. It is not surprising that they are explicitly metapragmatic.

tionalization. In the same manner that the social distribution of communicative competence is a crucial issue in sociolinguistic research (Gumperz, 1982), the *social distribution of (meta)pragmatic awareness* (roughly, a form of ‘discursive consciousness’; Giddens, 1984), as well as its articulation with the social distribution of competence (Giddens’ ‘practical consciousness’),²¹ is still a largely unexplored field, whose study might greatly illuminate the broader processes of language-based social stratification and sociolinguistic conflict.²² As Mey (1989: 335) claims regarding the interrelations between social control, language practices, and ideology, “[w]hoever successfully exerts control of our language, controls our consciousness”.²³ Historical-cultural circumstances, such as language institutionalization, may thus enhance awareness among strategically located social groups, who may, in turn, affect how subaltern groups ideologize language and metapragmatically externalize language values and attitudes.

Selective language choices for RS are an act of power. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1981) speculative argument that *all* language constitutes an order, an *order-word* or ‘mot d’ordre’ emphasizes the perlocutionary effect of language in altering the surrounding social reality. In this sense, by manipulating language, reporters/social actors attempt to *order others around* or *impose an order* in the interpretation of the events being retold, that is, to orchestrate people’s world view in a common fashion. However, conversational power is not an immanent attribute of the social actors. As in any other form of talk, in RS conversational power is the dialectic relationship between reporter and audience in the negotiation of the definition of the reported situation. Power expresses itself materially in the confrontational binomial of intention+interpretation, out of which consensual reality (specifically, ‘what language(s) people speak’) emerges by reference to socio-cultural knowledge (cf. Bauman, 1986: 6) and to linguistic ideologies. Thus, in the context of sociolinguistic conflict in Galiza, the micro-practice of speaking about speaking simultaneously plays into the construction of interactional hegemony and control, and reflects a broader sociolinguistic struggle: the ongoing struggle to conquer a social space through appropriation of the symbolic-ideological values of the language(s) of power.

Appendix: Transcription notation

Galician

Spanish

↑ → ↓ rising, sustained, or falling tune at end of intonation group
 ? rising, emphatic ending tune (e.g. in questions)

²¹ For instance, it is obvious that code displacement is not available to monolinguals, as it involves *reflexive* language switching.

²² See, in this regard, Briggs’ (1992) account of linguistic ideologies and power in Warao discourse.

²³ Specifically, “[u]sing the mechanisms of social control that language planning (and language politics in general) puts at its disposition, society is capable of controlling not only how communication happens between the individual members of society, but also how people manage their consciousness, both as individuals and (especially) **collectively**” (Mey, 1989: 335; emphasis in the original).

–	truncated intonation group; truncated sound
[ac]	accelerated, faster tempo in {segment}
[dc]	decelerated, slower tempo
[f]	<i>forte</i> , louder volume
[p]	<i>piano</i> , softer volume
[hi]	higher pitch register
[lo]	lower pitch register
[st]	<i>staccato</i> enunciation
[laughs]	comment
[abc]	voice overlapping
[xyz]	
=	turn latching
..	short pause (about 0.5 seconds)
...	longer pause (about 0.75 seconds)
< >	pause in number of seconds
'	rhythmic accent
*	emphatic, contrastive phrase accent
:	sound lengthening
(xx)	unintelligible syllable
()	unclear segment
CAPS	louder volume over short segment
# #	personal or place name withheld
.h.h	inbreath
hh	outbreath, laugh

References

- Álvarez-Cáccamo, Celso, 1993. The pigeon house, the octopus, and the people: The ideologization of linguistic practices in Galiza. *Plurilinguismes* 6: 1–26.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M., 1981. Discourse in the novel. In: *The dialogic imagination*, 259–422. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bamgbose, Ayo, 1986. Reported speech in Yoruba. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*, 77–97. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bauman, Richard, 1986. *Story, performance, and event. Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Besnier, Niko, 1993. Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae. In: J.H. Hill and J.T. Irvine, eds., *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*, 161–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brenneis, Donald, 1986. Shared territory: Audience, indirection and meaning. *Text* 6(3): 339–347.
- Brenneis, Donald, 1987. Talk and transformation. *Man* 22(3): 499–510.
- Briggs, Charles L., 1992. Linguistic ideologies and the naturalization of power in Warao discourse. *Pragmatics* 2(3): 387–404.
- Briggs, Charles L., 1993. Generic versus metapragmatic dimensions of Warao narratives: Who regiments performance? In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 179–212. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman, 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: T. Sebeok, ed., *Style in language*, 253–276. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari, 1987. Postulates of linguistics. In: *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia 2*, 75–110. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dubois, Betty Lou, 1989. Pseudoquotation in current English communication: 'Hey, she didn't really say it'. *Language in Society* 18(3): 343–359.
- Ducrot, Oswald, 1984. *El decir y lo dicho*. Buenos Aires: Hachette.
- Fernández Rodríguez, Mauro and Modesto Rodríguez Neira, coords., 1994. *Mapa Sociolingüístico de Galicia, Vol. I: Competencia e lingua inicial*. Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia.
- Fónagy, Ivan, 1986. Reported speech in French and Hungarian. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*, 256–309. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gal, Susan, 1979. *Language shift. Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Goffman, Erving, 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, Erving, 1974. *Frame analysis. An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, Charles, 1986. Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text* 6(3): 283–316.
- Gumperz, John J., 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haberland, Hartmut, 1986. Reported speech in Danish. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*, 219–253. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haverkate, Henk, 1985. La ironía verbal: un análisis pragmalingüístico. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 15(2): 343–391.
- Heritage, John, 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.
- Herrero Valeiro, Mário J. 1993. Guerre des graphies et conflit glottopolitique: lignes de discours dans la sociolingüistique galicienne. *Plurilinguismes* 6: 181–209.
- Hickmann, Maya, 1993. The boundaries of reported speech in narrative discourse: Some developmental aspects. In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 63–90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane H., 1985. The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. *American Ethnologist* 12(4): 725–737.
- Johnstone, Barbara, 1987. 'He says ... so I said': Verb tense alternation and narrative depictions of authority in American English. *Linguistics* 25: 33–52.
- Labov, William, 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In: *Language in the inner city. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, 354–396. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William, 1982. Speech actions and reactions in personal narrative. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1981*, 219–247. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lakoff, Robin T., 1982. Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1981*, 25–42. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Li, Charles N., 1986. Direct speech and indirect speech: A functional study. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*, 29–45. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Luckenbill, David F., 1979. Power: A conceptual framework. *Symbolic Interaction* 2(2): 97–114.
- Lucy, John A., 1993a. Metapragmatic presentationals: Reporting speech with quotatives in Yucatec Maya. In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 91–125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, John A., 1993b. Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 9–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 1984 [1979]. *The Postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mandelbaum, Jenny, 1993. Assigning responsibility in conversational storytelling: The interactional construction of reality. *Text* 13(2): 247–266.

- Mertz, Elizabeth, 1993. Learning what to ask: Metapragmatic factors and methodological reification. In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 159–174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob, 1989. 'Saying it don't make it so': The '*Una Grande Libre*' of language politics. *Multilingua* 8(4): 333–355.
- Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia, 1972. Signifying and marking: Two Afro-American speech acts. In: J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, eds., *Directions in sociolinguistics*, 161–179. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- O'Barr, William M., 1984. Asking the right questions about language and power. In: C. Kramarae, M. Schulz and W.M. O'Barr, eds., *Language and power*, 260–280. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ochs, Elinor, Carolyn Taylor, Dina Rudolph and Ruth Smith, 1992. Storytelling as a theory-building activity. *Discourse Processes* 15: 37–72.
- Polanyi, Livia, 1982. Literary complexity in everyday storytelling. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*. *Advances in discourse processes* 9, 155–170. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure, 1981. The pragmatics of personal and impersonal fiction. *Poetics* 10: 517–539.
- Sacks, Harvey, 1984. On doing 'being ordinary'. In: J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds., *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 413–429. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael, 1981. *The limits of awareness*. Sociolinguistic Working Paper No. 84. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Silverstein, Michael, 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In: J.A. Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 33–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skorge, Silvia, 1957. Os sufixos diminutivos em português. *Boletim de Filologia* 16: 222–305.
- Tannen, Deborah, 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*, 311–332. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Treichler, Paula A. et al., 1984. Problems and *problems*: Power relationships in a medical encounter. In: C. Kramarae, M. Schulz and W.M. O'Barr, eds., *Language and power*, 62–88. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Voloshinov, Valentin N., 1973 [1929]. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A., 1985. Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12(4): 738–748.