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Abstract: Clark and Gerrig (1990) maintain that quotations in everyday speech are not necessarily attempts to reproduce the words of the quotation’s source, but instead are a type of demonstration, selectively depicting aspects of the referents. In this article, I use demonstration theory to define the particular properties and functions of quotes introduced by be saying and show how they work in both direct and indirect structures. I describe the syntactic distribution of be saying quotations and show that their primary function is evaluative. Using data from recorded meetings at Walpole Island First Nation, in Ontario, Canada, I show how speakers use be saying quotations to construct identities for the quoted sources by depicting the stances attributed to them. The be saying quotes are used by Walpole Natives and non-Natives to demonstrate opposing positions on the issue of water quality in the local river, either in favor of scientific knowledge or in favor of indigenous knowledge.

Keywords: direct speech; quotations; demonstration; identity; stance; First Nations

INTRODUCTION

Over the last thirty years, the use of quotations in discourse has gained recognition as a communicative component of language and there have been a number of studies on direct speech, indirect speech and quotative verbs (Labov 1972; Banfield 1973; Larson 1978; Coulmas 1986; Philips 1986; Mayes 1990; Clark and Gerrig 1990; Goodell and Sachs 1992). The newest theories argue against the idea that direct quotations are verbatim reports of words previously spoken and focus on various linguistic functions unrelated to reporting. For example, Wade and Clark (1993) conducted experiments which showed that even when speakers had memorized stretches of videotaped dialogue verbatim and were
capable of repeating the exact words with 99% accuracy, they chose to use other words when instructed to be amusing while telling a partner about the scene, lowering accuracy to 62%. Furthermore, their results showed that speakers “were no more accurate in direct than in indirect quotation” (Wade and Clark 1993: 805), which contradicts popular belief that direct quotations are more accurate, credible and reliable than indirect quotes (Philips 1986). If quotations in spoken discourse are not used primarily to paraphrase or report the speech of others, then what is their purpose? Some functions described in the literature include: making complaints and telling amusing stories (Holt 2000), highlighting information in an argument, showing strong emotion or marking the participation of a dominant character in a narrative (Glock 1986), marking changes in footing (Goffman 1981), engrossing listeners through role-playing and dramatization at important points in a narrative (Labov 1972; Li 1986; Tannen 1986), establishing interpersonal relationships in the classroom (Baynham 1996), and sounding authoritative (Mayes 1990).

In this paper, I use the theory developed by Clark and Gerrig (1990) in which quotations are seen as a type of demonstration that selectively depicts aspects of the referents and it is recognized that “speakers are not necessarily committed to trying to reproduce a source utterance verbatim” (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 802). Specifically, I analyze quotes introduced primarily by forms of be saying and show that these are particular kinds of quotations used to demonstrate attitudes, beliefs and characteristics attributed by the speaker to the source. The following is an example of a be saying + quotation structure used by a Walpole Islander arguing that scientific data is not necessary to validate indigenous knowledge.

(1) So what we tried to do is we’re saying, our elder was saying, No it’s not always that way, you know, there’s times, when we’re looking at the water where we don’t need no data to show us that that water’s polluted.

Rather than treating these quotations as speech that reports an original utterance, I argue that they are best analyzed as components of stance. Stance-taking is “a pragmatic function whereby the speaker’s type and degree of commitment, or stance... is reflected through linguistic means” Mendoza-Denton (1999:273). My analysis of be saying + quotation shows how “stances reflect and construct
aspects of social identity as speakers take up positions associated with particular social categories and groups” (1999:273). The be saying quotations are concise formulations of a position or belief that function as evaluative components in the speaker’s construction of the identity of those being quoted, as well as for the speaker’s own group. This is accomplished through the choice of words in the quotation and in the surrounding talk framing the quotation. For example, the stance of an opposing group is presented in a be saying quotation so that it can be argued against. I argue that this stance-taking through quotations reinforces divisions among groups with respect to a particular conflict, such as contrasting indigenous and scientific assessments of water quality. While typically, a division has been made between direct and indirect quotes, I will show that be saying quotations can be used in both structures because the function of the quotation as a whole is the same whether they are direct or indirect.

**DATA**

The corpus of data used in this analysis consists of 150 tokens of be saying, as defined below, found in transcripts of tape recordings of public meetings and interviews. The fieldwork was done in 1998 at Walpole Island First Nation in southwestern Ontario, Canada. The meetings and interviews focused on the topic of pollution in the St. Clair River. The effects of water pollution are particularly felt by the Walpole community because their territory comprises six islands in the delta at the mouth of the St. Clair River, downstream from 23 industrial plants which line the riverbanks. At the time of my fieldwork, one company was being singled out as a problem because of the proposed release of a large volume of treated waste water into the river. The meetings I recorded were held to discuss several scientific studies. Some were being done on behalf of the company in order to meet government requirements for approval of the discharge, other studies were done by government agencies as part of the regulatory process, and still others were done at Walpole Island to show the harmful effects of pollutants on the local ecosystem. Meeting participants included a representative from the government agency, the scientist working on behalf of Walpole Island, many members of the Walpole community, members of other
First Nations and several members of the general public, including environmental activists, who had an interest in the issue.

Most of the individual interviews were conducted by me, a Canadian from a city 30 kilometers upriver. I also recorded interviews done by an American woman producing a video on indigenous environmental knowledge. In addition to people living on Walpole Island, I interviewed two people who worked for the aforementioned company, the government scientist, and an environmental activist who worked for a company selling purified water.

The data show several opposing positions on the issue of water quality. Most prominent was an ongoing debate about the authority and credibility of different types of knowledge: scientific versus indigenous. Many people disputed the results and the methodologies of the scientific studies and complained about the lack of authority given to indigenous knowledge in legal and bureaucratic processes. Despite assurances given by the government and industries that the water was safe, people living in the area did not believe it was fit to drink or swim in and brought up cases of human illness and other negative effects on plant and wildlife attributed to the pollution in the river. The *be saying* quotations discussed here illustrate this conflict and, as I will show, contribute to the construction of opposing stances by evaluating particular attitudes, values, processes and behaviors through demonstration.

**DEFINITION AND PROPERTIES OF BE SAYING**

First, it is important to distinguish *be saying* from the common verb to say. In general usage, to say means “to state” or “to declare”. It is the unmarked form for introducing reported speech or direct quotes, as in (2).

(2) Janet said, *There’s no more milk.*

In contrast, *be saying* is used in specific cases to depict what an individual or group believes, feels, values or thinks. The quotes it introduces, either direct or indirect, are typically concise statements of a larger, complex set of ideas and attitudes that serve certain power-related interests. For example, “saying” that the water is

---

1 A preliminary discussion of *be saying* appears in Pennesi (1999).
either safe or polluted evokes the unequal power relationships between scientists, government and First Nations experts in which what science says is upheld as truth by government. Compare examples (3) through (7) with (2). Unlike (2) where the complement of say is an instance of reported speech, in the following examples, the complements of be saying are beliefs or values.

(3) E: OK, so you think the polluters should pay.
   V: Well, isn’t that what we’re saying here?
   (two non-Natives discussing the responsibility of industry to pay for improving water quality)

(4) K: Indians have been saying that all along.
   (Walpole Islander, in reference to scientific studies confirming pollution in the river)

(5) G: All I’m saying is, something’s wrong here.
   (activist for clean water, in relation to increasingly diseased fish in the river)

(6) E: OK, so now you’re saying– now you believe the water that comes out of there is good and fine.
   (activist, questioning industry scientist about water treatment)

(7) W: And we’re not saying stop, we’re saying let’s slow down.
   (Walpole Islander, referring to a moratorium on pollution of the river)

In these examples, the be saying quotation is part of the negotiation of meaning as speakers attempt to best express and interpret beliefs and attitudes which are not always easy to put into words. Once an interpretation is made of what another person or group is saying, the new information is connected to other stances or behaviors, which may be referred to in later conversation. In this way, “stances can build up into larger identity categories” as speakers position themselves and others in relation to the talk (Bucholtz and Hall 2005:595). Thus, the quotations introduced by be saying are depictions of the source’s stance, rather than simple reports or declarations about the world. For the remainder of this article, I will refer to the set of beliefs, attitudes, values and thoughts relating to one’s position regarding a particular issue as “stance”.

I contend that there are two meanings of say: one as a declarative for reported speech, as seen in (2), and one which functions as does be saying, depicting a stance as in (9a), (10a) and (11a). In these instances, the quoted stance is not introduced by be saying in that it does not take the -ing form, but instead occurs as say, says or said. Despite the surface similarity to the simple declarative say, these forms are more properly understood as functioning like be saying. This can be tested by substitution. Returning to (2), if we substitute be saying, the meaning changes.

(8) Janet was saying, There’s no more milk.

The only possible interpretation for this unlikely sentence is that something was occurring during the few seconds it took Janet to utter the words, “There’s no more milk.” This is because the referent for the quoted material is not representative of a stance as is expected when be saying is used. Whether or not there is any milk does not say anything about Janet or her interests, so the sentence in (8) only makes sense as a recap of what Janet had been saying when interrupted. While (2) reports Janet’s sentence, (8) describes Janet’s act of speaking within a larger context.

In comparison, in (9a) below, we could easily substitute a be saying form and retain the same meaning in (9b).

(9a) S: And see that’s where I found in that project is that, it’s only over that much it’s OK, that’s one item there. And we have another item that’s only over that much. But see what it does, every item, every chemical that’s allowed, it’s always going over the percentage and government says, Ok, it’s only over this much but that’s OK because it’s a little amount.

(9b) ...and government is saying, OK, it’s only over this much but that’s OK because it’s a little amount.

The difference in this example is that the quote is constructed to demonstrate the government’s attitude toward chemical pollution. Using “is saying” instead of “says” does not alter the meaning, nor does it imply a change in context.

A stance-representative quotation can also be introduced by trying to say, as in sentences like (10a) and (11a).
(10a) L: What I'm trying to say is that, the Ministry of Environment views these corporations as clients.

(10b) L: What I'm saying is that, the Ministry of Environment views these corporations as clients.

(11a) D: Do you understand what I'm trying to say?
(11b) D: Do you understand what I'm saying?

In these sentences, the speaker is attempting to express a particular idea, but is having difficulty. By removing “trying to” in the (b) versions, we have not altered what L and D are conveying, we have only eliminated the speaker’s signal that her words may not be well chosen. As these substitution tests illustrate, some instances of say or trying to say have the same function as be saying. For this reason, when coding the data for quotations of stance, I have included all forms of be saying as tokens as well as those forms of say or trying to say where substitutions of be saying could be made without altering the meaning of the quote.

**REPORTED SPEECH VERSUS CONSTRUCTED STANCE**

Many of the be saying quotations in my data have as the source a group or collective entity, such as government, industry, they, we, Indians, rather than an individual. In this way, they constitute what Tannen has termed “constructed dialogue” because the quotes are not meant to represent the exact words of a particular speaker, but are illustrations of the general type of things people in those groups might say (Tannen 1986: 313). Other evidence that be saying quotations are best characterized as constructed dialogue is that they can be used to demonstrate conversations where the current speaker was not originally present and they can depict thoughts, or things otherwise unspoken. These types of quotation fall into Tannen’s categories of “impossible” or “highly improbable” quotes which describe instances where the words either are attributed to more than one person, were never spoken, refer to thoughts, contain variable expressions like bla bla bla or such-and-such, or were spoken without the current speaker being present (Mayes 1990: 331-336). In fact, “impossible” or “highly improbable” wording occurs quite frequently in stance-depicting quotations introduced by be
saying and I suggest that this is one of the defining features of this linguistic structure. The following examples illustrate.

(12) W: We said, put some budget in there, let’s make sure that these studies are allowed to happen.

(13) D: I’m not saying we’re living longer here.

(14) W: The left brain is saying, hey, wait a minute here, you have a job to do here.

(15) D: They’re saying, it’s a different sun up there, ozone stuff and bla bla bla.

Thus, as Mayes notes, “it makes little difference whether the quotes are real or invented, as long as they are effective” (Mayes 1990: 338).

Clark and Gerrig also argue against the verbatim assumption that direct quotes represent the actual words a specified person uttered in the past. They observe that you know is used most frequently to make appropriateness repairs as speakers search for the best way to express something, whereas I mean is used to make error repairs when speakers are attempting to be accurate. In their experiments, you know occurred within direct quotes far more frequently than I mean did. Based on these results, Clark and Gerrig conclude that speakers are not really trying to be accurate and instead are concerned with making their point most effectively (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 797). Analysis of my data shows the same tendency. I found no instances of I mean to repair errors and an abundance of you know for appropriateness repairs as in (16). This is evidence that the quotes are invented rather than reported.

(16) S: So what we tried to do is we’re saying, our elder was saying, No it’s not always that way, you know, there’s times, when we’re looking at the water where we don’t need no data to show us that that water’s polluted. You know and we have the, the professor saying Yes you need to have, you need to know the

---

2 The concept of “repair” refers to attempts by speakers to rephrase what is being said to better conform to expectations or preferences. In this case, “I mean” and “I know” are distinguished based on the type of problem they are used to fix: inaccuracy in reporting or an inappropriate/inadequate expression.
counts of this, the counts of that. So in work and just that alone, that example we’re able to say OK, you know, we can use our own judgement to a, to a limit, you know, to see is this um, do we need data for this, you know or is it just common sense, that there’s something wrong?

Finally, the responses of interlocutors indicate that they do not interpret the quotations as reported speech meant to accurately represent the words of the original speaker. It is accepted that the quoted material is the spontaneous construction of the current speaker used for his or her own purpose. In the exchange below, note that the improbable wording of the quotes is not questioned or corrected, as the speakers address only the content, or stances, being conveyed. V’s last sentence summarizes the information just presented by E and uses completely different wording, even though it is framed as a quote. E simply confirms its correctness based on the content, not the form of the quote.

(17) V: That’s right, that’s what I was just going to say. So- ‘cause I don’t know that for sure. If you’re saying there’s eight ponds being untouched?
E: ‘Cause those were the ABC ponds, they have nothing to do with RTA.
V: OK, then that’s why then.
E: ‘Cause RTA said, We don’t want all your old ponds full of crappy water.
V: That’s right, and ABC’s saying and we don’t want no new stuff.
E: Right.
V: So make your own pond.
E: Yeah.
V: Oh, I see what happened. So you’re saying they treated the water in the two ponds, and divert it to another- they made other ponds.
E: Yeah.

Now that I have shown that be saying quotes are not reported speech in the traditional sense of attempts at verbatim reproductions, I will provide evidence that they are indeed quotes before moving on to demonstration theory.
FORMS OF QUOTATION

I have shown that the quotes depicting stances do not represent real utterances; however, they are syntactically constructed as if they did. I will now discuss the characteristics this type of quotation has in common with direct and indirect quotes. Direct and indirect quotes can be differentiated by examining certain properties. First, the main clause of a direct quote contains few syntactic restrictions and has the same deictic center as the original utterance (Mayes 1990: 338). As with direct speech, the quotes introduced by be saying show changes in pronouns, verb tenses and demonstrative elements which reflect a different context from the present interaction. In this manner, the quoted sections are distinguished from the surrounding talk.

Another distinguishing property is that exclamations, interrogatives, vocatives and discourse particles such as well, OK, oh, look, geez, hey, et cetera can be used in direct quotes but not in indirect quotes. These devices make the quote seem more authentic by reflecting natural speech as if someone had actually said the words (Mayes 1990: 342). In my data, speakers use these regularly.

(18) G: I think what the RAP’s trying to do is be proactive, and just say, well geez, that stuff’s been sitting on the bottom of the river for forty years, it must not be going anywhere.

(19) S: And they come back, and they have zero point three parts, per whatever, and they’re saying, OK it’s only over point one percent, right? That’s not no problem.

(20) W: Instead of saying, Damn it, Larry! you know, if you wanna be on my team, you know, this is exactly what I need you to do. Or, what do you mean you wanna go to ceremonies?! We got a proposal to finish here! You know, you can’t be going to ceremonies, this is serious business here. So, someone, some hierarchical someone telling everyone who they need to

---

3 The “deictic center” locates the speaker in time, space and person. It is the reference for “now”, “here” and “I” and other words whose meaning depends on the speaker’s position.
be and what they need to do in order to accomplish this goal.

The be saying function can also be accomplished by indirect quotes, with or without the complementizer that. Indirect quotes introduced by be saying are used to correct errors or clarify meaning, as Mayes points out (Mayes 1990: 326). Sometimes, be saying occurs without the quote as a complement, referring only to the demonstrative pronouns this and that. The deictic center is that of the present speaker so pronouns and verbs do not change. Consider the examples below.

(21) D: Is it um, is this an either or situation? Either um, and I’ll guess I’ll kind of just use across the river, and I don’t even want to say us, against Native. You know what, is it that, if we don’t change then you guys aren’t going to survive? Do you know what I’m trying to say? I don’t want to say that I’m separate from you because I don’t feel like I am, but but there’s, there’s from what I’m understanding is that, that Americans, Can- you know non-Natives have to change their way, for you guys to survive in your way, in your tradition. Is that what you’re saying to me?

M: No.

D: Do you understand what I’m trying to say?

M: Yeah I think I do. Um, no I don’t want to ah, I don’t want to think like non-Natives. And I don’t want non-Natives to think like Natives.

(22) V: So you’re saying they treated the water in the two ponds, and divert it to another- they made other ponds.

(23) V: Right, but we do know down the river. That’s what I’m saying. You know the ones at the other end? They’re gonna raise hell.

(24) E: Like you’re saying you think the water’s clean so just in your opinion, why do you think they were going on and on and spending all these millions of dollars that they don’t really have, to do this? Well, not millions, but million. In terms of, like, what I’m trying to say is, they don’t have a lot of money as a community.
Stance-depicting quotations introduced by be saying share elements with both direct and indirect speech. Given that they function the same way whether they are used in the structure of direct or indirect quotes, it seems unnecessary to make a distinction on this basis. That is, the defining aspects of be saying quotations as a component of language are that the referent is a stance comprised of values, attitudes and thought processes, and the function of the quotation structure is to make this perspective explicit.

**BE SAYING QUOTATIONS AS DEMONSTRATIONS**

Clark and Gerrig begin their discussion of demonstration theory by establishing that direct quotes are demonstrations. The fundamental features of demonstrations are that they (1) are nonserious actions; (2) selectively depict rather than describe; (3) can be recursive; and (4) are components or concurrent parts of serious actions (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 766-7). Each of these will be discussed as it relates to stance quotations introduced by be saying.

First, Clark and Gerrig use Goffman’s distinction between serious and nonserious actions, where nonserious actions are transformations of serious actions (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 766). Nonserious actions include imitations or untrue statements made in jest, for example. Quotations as demonstrations are nonserious actions because the words in the quote are invented and may be characterized as impossible or improbable. However, in as much as the quotes are embedded in the talk, these demonstrations are components of a larger serious action. For example, in the exchange below, V and E are discussing whether the discharge of waste water by the company where V worked for 25 years is the cause of particular problems at Walpole Island. E is an activist supporting the Walpole’s anti-pollution cause. The be saying quotations demonstrate how the argument is made for scientific studies as proof. (Underlining indicates speaker’s emphasis.)

(25)  

V: You have to know what is the problem, address the problem, what’s it caused by, and it can’t be a theory, it has to be proven. To get rid of it. To get rid of the problem. *You can’t just say, we think it’s this, not we think.* It’s like *we know this water’s good, we don’t’ think it’s good.*

E: Yeah, well they say, maybe there’s people out there saying, *we know this water’s bad.*
V: Prove it. We proved it’s good, prove it’s bad. See, that’s what took five years of all this, lots of money, to prove it’s good. According to our standards of today, and there it is. That’s all you can do. Now you’re gonna have to get somebody and do some studies and say, no it’s not, see, this is what’s wrong. Oh, OK, and then we’ll fix it. Until then, it’s good.

All of these quotes are impossible utterances. In the first token, V quotes what cannot be said. E says “maybe” there are people who say that, so the existence of a source is questionable. In V’s last token, the quote takes place in the future. Therefore, these demonstrations are nonserious actions, but they are integral components of a serious ideological debate between the two, in which “thinking” or having an opinion has a lesser truth-value than “knowing” based on studies and acceptable proof. Establishing the legitimacy of the proof is essential to claiming knowledge rather than mere opinion, and that is precisely the heart of the conflict between Walpole Island’s indigenous knowledge and the industry’s science.

Clark and Gerrig outline four aspects of demonstration. The depictive aspects comprise the “demonstration proper,” allowing speakers to distinguish the referent from other possible referents by focusing on selected features of it. This is called the selectivity principle and is a fundamental concept in demonstration theory. The supportive aspects are those which are necessary to the demonstration but do not depict. The annotative aspects include commentaries about the demonstration. Finally, incidental aspects are those that have no intentional meaning but which occur during the demonstration (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 768). I will illustrate the four aspects of demonstrations in example (26).

(26) S: And it’s a root, it grows underneath, so it always has to take up that water, and the people were saying, well this medicine, you know, it used to be able to cure us for anything. Now if we, if we have that cold, instead of taking this much, we have to take this much [indicates small and larger amounts with hands], just because the medicine being so much polluted, you know, it’s not being as effective as it was.
The be saying quotations as demonstrations selectively depict aspects of their referents. The referent being depicted is the way the people from Walpole Island determine that the water is polluted and causing harmful effects. S selects the increase in the amount of medicine needed as the aspect to demonstrate this. More medicine required means it is less effective and this is attributed to pollution. The whole quote in italics is a demonstration of the empirical nature of the people's knowledge. Traditional medicine is a common topic in discussions of indigenous knowledge and the dependence of people on the land and water, so by selecting this aspect of the referent to depict, S is choosing something both familiar and symbolic. The supportive elements in this demonstration are the words this much, which accompany the hand gestures, indicating a larger amount is needed now compared to before. The movement of the hands from close together to far apart showed a difference in amount of medicine required, but the same words this much were used for both the smaller and larger amounts. Therefore, the words this much are supportive in the demonstration, not depictive of the change in amount. The annotative aspect consists of the final comment about the medicine being polluted and less effective. Here, S is rephrasing what he demonstrated in the quote. An incidental aspect is you know, which occurs in the middle of the quote. It is incidental because it does not contribute to the demonstration in any way, nor does it require any interpretation.

The decoupling principle refers to the fact that the four aspects of the demonstration can be separated. The demonstrator has ways of indicating to the listener which features of the demonstration are depictive, supportive, annotative and incidental (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 768). For instance, in (27) the propositional content of the quote is supportive. This is signaled by use of indefinite terms such as this, this point, and anywhere which do not convey any information. The referent being depicted is the co-operative process so the details of each stage are not important.

(27) S: And so I guess really what we're trying to work towards is how can we come to a common ground where we could sit down at the table and say: OK, this is where we are to this point, you know and this is where we have to go and this is how we have to work together in order to get anywhere, you
know, to move ahead and get out of this water pollution crisis that we’re in.

One way to emphasize the depictive aspect of the demonstration is to rephrase the gist of it in a following sentence, or to preview it in the preceding sentence. Looking at (20) again, repeated below as (28), the sentence immediately following the quote is a rephrasing. The speaker is demonstrating his value of individuals contributing what they can to a project by depicting the opposite: a situation where a leader is dictating what individuals must contribute.

(28) W: Instead of saying, Damn it, Larry!, you know, if you wanna be on my team, you know, this is exactly what I need you to do. Or, what do you mean you wanna go to ceremonies?! We got a proposal to finish here! You know, you can’t be going to ceremonies, this is serious business here. So, someone, some hierarchical someone telling everyone who they need to be and what they need to do in order to accomplish this goal. Instead of it that way, everyone decides what they bring to the group.

The markedness principle refers to the way some aspects of the quote are marked to indicate to the listener that they are not incidental (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 774). For instance, the use of variable expressions like such-and-such or bla bla bla are unmarked and are therefore supportive aspects of the demonstration. On the other hand, by choosing an expression like “water pollution crisis” in (27), S is marking it as depictive in relation to the rest of the quote in which he uses more general expressions. Annotations provide explicit information about what is being depicted. In (29), S clearly states in the underlined section that he is demonstrating a particular point of view.

(29) S: You have to want that respect, you have to, you have to say OK, you know, maybe it’s time that, you know I’m speaking from a government or industry’s ah, point of view. Maybe it’s time that we have to sit down and think, “Why are the people from Walpole Island First Nation always opposing the release of the stuff in the water? Why are they always trying to fight back? You know, Why can’t they just let us spill?”
Clark and Gerrig (1990: 782) maintain that “speakers can quote anything they can recognizably demonstrate,” including dialect, intonation, emotions, gestures and words. Thus, if one chooses to demonstrate an intonation pattern, the words chosen are supportive, whereas changes in pitch are depictive. In be saying quotes, the exact wording is often supportive, in keeping with their impossible or highly improbable nature. What is being depicted are attitudes, beliefs, thought processes and values that comprise a stance toward an issue. The be saying quotations “enable a speaker to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly” (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 792). Rather than inadequately describing something like an emotion or a sense of urgency, a speaker can demonstrate such things quite well through quotes (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 793). The following are examples of the referents being depicted in the be saying quotations found in my data: the government’s dismissive attitude toward nonscientific knowledge (30), the certainty of the Walpole Island members that industrial pollution is harming their community (31), a desire for immediate action (32), the belief among First Nations people that scientific studies are insufficient evidence of water quality (33) and the legitimacy of the decision-making process used for releasing industrial waste water (34).

(30)  B: Very recent hearings, back in ninety-four, all the way through, where I was, privileged to sit and listen to scientists. Being praised for the information on behalf of, of ah, the chemical companies, and our people being degraded for their own bio-monitoring, technology. 
Saying yeah, you got a great argument, Walpole, but you lack the scientific evidence.

(31)  K: When, when the truth of it is, is that, while you’re over there, your people are over there, and they’re covering themselves in paper, and getting totally lost, completely, we’re over here saying this is totally wrong. And everybody knows it. So what, I don’t- this, this paper business is, is, is a bunch of bull.

(32)  M: You need to have us fighting for the short term or the long term or you need to have us saying, Let’s get to the cause.
Let’s let’s not talk about all these symptoms. But, let’s tackle these big issues.

(33)  S: We’re talking about um, mercury for example, if they say there’s a limit. OK, the limit is, point zero two parts per billion, that, of mercury that’s allowed, right? And they come back, and they have zero point three parts, per whatever, and they’re saying, OK it’s only over point one percent, right? That’s not no problem....But see what it does, every item, every chemical that’s allowed, it’s always going over the percentage and government says OK, it’s only over this much but that’s OK because it’s a little amount. But when you think about all the different types of industries that are up river, all the different types of pollutants that presently exist in the water, you know, when the combination of all of those things come together, who knows what the effects will be? Scientists? They don’t have an understanding of what the effects will be...

(34)  V: The pond, was already contaminated and the government knew that. And you cannot release that until it’s been approved that it’s OK. Right? All right, so they say, Well, um, what do we have to do to make it OK? And they’ll say, Well, we don’t want anything in there that’ll harm anything. Before you put it to the river....And maybe they’ll say, you have to bring it down to this level, not absolutely a hundred percent free, you just have to get it down to a point where we can enter it in, bleed it in the river, and it, and it doesn’t hurt nothing- anything.

Quotations are effective in making things explicit because as demonstrations, they allow listeners to make interpretations through direct experience (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 767). While it is impossible to demonstrate thoughts, certain aspects of the thought process can be depicted in quotes, as can manifestations of attitudes or values. In the example below, B demonstrates the need to educate the general public by first pointing to public ignorance and then depicting how politicians are only concerned about compliance with regulations in regard to effects of pollution on humans and do not recognize the effects on fish and animals. The contradiction between what people on Walpole Island claim to be true—that there are problems with the fish and animals—and what the politicians are claiming and the public evidently believes—that the level of pollution
is acceptable—is experienced directly by the listeners, one of whom responds to B’s comment.

(35) B: The key issue here today is going to be that we have to educate the general public out there, because if you go out there, if you go to downtown Wallaceburg, downtown Chatham, and you ask them, what is the major problem in the river? They couldn’t tell you. Politicians have- saying that yeah, this was an acceptable level. But they’re not telling you what the long term hazards are. They’re not telling you what the problems are with the fish, and the animals.

U: I’m an educator. And I agree with what you’re saying, that we do have to educate the general public.

By demonstrating and making explicit the views and attitudes of other people through be saying quotation, listeners have something specific to respond to.

The third of Clark and Gerrig’s features of demonstrations is recursion. That means a quote can contain a quote as in (36). Note that the embedded quote is a thought and is placed in quotation marks.

(36) S: You have to want that respect, you have to, you have to say OK, you know, maybe it’s time that, you know I’m speaking from a government or industry’s ah, point of view. Maybe it’s time that we have to sit down and think, “Why are the people from Walpole Island First Nation always opposing the release of the stuff in the water? Why are they always trying to fight back? You know, Why can’t they just let us spill?”

In demonstration theory, the referent in the quote can be a state, process, event or object. My main argument is that be saying quotations are a special kind of demonstration of stances formed out of attitudes, values, beliefs and experiences. It is this specific type of referent that defines the quotes introduced by be saying and sets them apart from other types of quotation. This structure has particular functions that will be discussed in the next section.

A unique feature of direct quotes is that the referent can be depicted from more than one vantage point. This is quite evident in my data as (37) shows. In fact, given that be saying referents are points of view or stances, quotations are ideally suited to
demonstrate them. The underlining shows three different vantage points in this example: a joint category of the industry/the ministry/the public, a whole crowd of people over here, and everybody else on the other side.

(37) E: At least that’s what it seems like to me because as you say, you’ve got the industry, the ministry, even the public might say OK, well we all believe that guy. He proved it to me. And there’s a whole crowd of people over here saying well he didn’t prove nothing to me. I don’t believe that. I don’t go along with your testing. Why? Because we still have all these indicators to us saying it isn’t good, it isn’t clean because we’ve still got these problems, you know, fish with tumors, bla bla bla. So if it was so good, how come we have all this? So then they’re gonna say that we’ve got this and this and this indicator that prove to us that there’s a problem, and everybody else on the other side seems to be saying, Well, you didn’t tell me that my stuff in the water is doing that, or you didn’t prove to me that it was this thing that caused that thing, so their methods of proof, I guess are different. Is that what it seems like? ‘Cause that’s what it seems like to me.

Portraying the stances of more than one group is an effective way for speakers to frame a controversy from their own perspective, in essence, demonstrating the conflict. The be saying quotations display the speaker’s interpretation of the stances of each of the groups mentioned and her conception of the relations between them. The quoted statements are understood to be general, typical paraphrases of what a member of each group might say. The sources are all collective entities, which masks individual differences, instead focusing on stereotyped group identities. The groups themselves are divided according to the speaker’s perception of shared stances. It is not necessary to portray more than one vantage point in every turn, but it is common for a speaker to change vantage points several times over the course of a conversation. My analysis shows that these particular properties— a collective source and a stance as a referent— distinguish be saying quotations as a special kind of quotation.

Be saying quotations represent both types and tokens. Types refer to kinds of utterances at a general level. Each type consists of a set of characteristics that make it identifiable from other types. Most
frequently, the quotes are types as noted above, demonstrating generalities or habitual sayings of groups. They represent the type of thing a particular group or person would say. Tokens refer to specific occurrences of a type, exemplifying its salient characteristics. Be saying quotations also occur as tokens of specific examples of possible utterances that one group member would say or has said. Type quotes are attributed to collective sources, as most of the examples so far have shown, while the token quotes tend to be attributed to individual sources, as in (38).

(38) S: I heard one of the ladies saying yesterday, talking about the muskrats and she was saying, Yeah the muskrats used to come all the way up into the marsh area, but now, because of all the contaminants that exist within the marsh...

Summing up the properties of be saying quotations: the quoted material is not a verbatim reproduction, the referent of the quote is a stance, the form of be saying + quotation forms a demonstration in which selected aspects of the stance are depicted, and the demonstrations are non-serious actions which are components of the serious actions in which they are embedded. Demonstration theory is useful because it allows us to focus on the larger context of the interaction in which the demonstration itself is meaningful. Moreover, it highlights the speaker’s creative role in determining which aspects of the referent stance are to be depicted and in choosing words that will produce an effective demonstration. This differs from discussions of reported speech as a reflection of a source utterance on which it is presumed the speaker is basing the quote. Because the quotes being discussed here are all understood as inventions of the current speaker, analyzing them as demonstrations points directly to the communicative function of the quotation device.

**FOOTING AND THE FUNCTIONS OF BE SAYING**

After observing that direct quotes are not actually authentic verbatim reproductions, Mayes concludes that “there must be some advantage to phrasing an utterance which is not a direct quote as if it were” (Mayes 1990: 338). There are several functions of be saying quotations, which I will outline here. Goffman’s notion of footing offers some insights. “Footing” describes the stance or projected self
(Goffman 1981: 128) of participants in talk. Changes in footing mark changes in alignment of the self and the others present. These changes range from subtle to grossly obvious and are happening constantly as a natural part of talk. Linguistic markers of changes in footing include code-switching, alterations of pitch, volume, rhythm, stress, tone and register. Some theories of quotation describe the speakers as taking on different roles, like an actor in a play, when they use direct speech. They may change their voice in every way mentioned above in order to dramatize their performance (Li 1986; Tannen 1986).

The be saying quotations found in my data do not involve changes of voice quality in most cases. Speakers may choose certain expressions they do not normally use themselves to represent the speech of the source, but they commonly used their own ways of speaking with little marked change in the quoted speech style compared to the surrounding talk. This fact was offered earlier as evidence that the quotes are not verbatim reports, since it is highly improbable that the source would have used the same words the speaker has chosen. By maintaining their own voice in be saying quotes, speakers are signaling that such things as pitch, intonation, rate of speech and even most word choices are supportive aspects of the demonstration, not depictive (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 782). Nonetheless, footing can still be marked explicitly in the identification of the source, as we saw in (29).

Goffman differentiates aspects of the “production format” in his discussion of the structure of footing. The production format refers to the notion of speaker. There are three kinds of speaker: the animator, the person who is active in the production of the utterance; the author, “someone who has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded;” and the principal, “someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say” (Goffman 1981: 144). In be saying quotations, the animator and the author are the same person, whereas the principal is the source of the quoted material and is the person or entity on which the demonstration is based. Goffman explains that the principal is “active in some particular social identity or role... some socially based source of self-identification” (Goffman 1981: 145). The animator uses “we” or plural pronouns, rather than singular, when giving voice to the
principal. This supports my analysis that the sources of be saying quotes are typically collective entities. Furthermore, I have argued that the referents of be saying quotes are stances, which matches Goffman’s description of principals. Sometimes it is the case that animator, author and principal are one in the same, such as when a speaker constructs a be saying quote for himself; however, there are only a few instances of this in my data. For example, I return to (16), repeated below as (39), as a good illustration of changes in footing and of the concepts of principal, animator and author.

(39)  
S: So what we tried to do is we’re saying, our elder was saying, No it’s not always that way, you know, there’s times, when we’re looking at the water where we don’t need no data to show us that that water’s polluted. You know and we have the, the professor saying Yes you need to have, you need to know the counts of this, the counts of that. So in work and just that alone, that example we’re able to say OK, you know, we can use our own judgment to a, to a limit, you know, to see is this um, do we need data for this, you know or is it just common sense, that there’s something wrong?

In the middle of the quotes, the animator is evident in the interjections of you know. As was mentioned earlier, these are used to signal the animator’s concern with appropriateness. The author is the same as the animator, S, as he is inventing words for all of the quotes in this hypothetical interaction and is making no attempt to accurately reproduce a past utterance. The principals in this example are “our elder,” representing the Native point of view, “the professor,” representing a Western scientific point of view and “we,” which from previous utterances is understood as the students in S’s program at the Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources. These be saying demonstrations function as a device with which S can evaluate the methods for doing environmental impact assessments. Each of the principals represents a different stance or position regarding the validity of different types of knowledge. S is able to express his and the other students’ perspective as a combination of the elder’s and professor’s stances by depicting selective aspects of each one.

Holt (2000) elaborates on the evaluative function, which I believe to be of primary importance in be saying quotations. She remarks that analyzing reported speech in the context of the whole
interaction, as opposed to isolating just the quotes, “has started to shed light on the subtle and intricate ways in which speakers can comment on the utterances they report while simultaneously appearing to simply reproduce them” (Holt 2000: 426). Speakers give clues to their own evaluation before, during and after the quotation and “the teller’s preferred response already has been made clear” before the listener reacts (Holt 2000: 427). In this way, be saying quotations allow the speaker to comment on the attitudes and beliefs of the constructed source as well as on his or her own attitudes and beliefs.

Often in my data, these stances conflicted. Speakers attempted to persuade listeners that their own point of view was correct while the “other side” was unjust or uninformed. In order to elicit the desired reactions from other participants, the opposing stances were demonstrated in a carefully selected way. Schiffrin (1985: 658) talks about creating “the fiction of originality” while performing a direct quote. This is especially useful in situations where all participants share the same stance and are discussing the opposition they face. When those representing the conflicting values and beliefs are absent, it is necessary to construct their side of the debate in order to develop the topic of discussion. In this situation, be saying quotes function very well. Moreover, using be saying quotations provides a safe way to talk about potentially unpopular attitudes or beliefs because the speaker can detach responsibility for the utterance from the self and attribute it to the source (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 792). Related to this is Holt’s analysis of how direct reported speech is used to make complaints.

Holt notes that “reported speech is simultaneously a report of a previous thought or locution and part of a new sequence used for a different purpose” (Holt 2000: 433). In the case of be saying quotations, I have already discussed the fact that they are not really tokens of reported speech in that they do not attempt to reproduce previous utterances. Nonetheless, Holt’s notion that the quote is simultaneously part of a past and a present context holds true. Speakers can use be saying quotations to refer to past experiences and make complaints about them in the present context. She observes that direct quotes are “highly appropriate for use in constructing complaints” because the complaint itself is often about what someone has said (Holt 2000: 435). Again, this fits in very well with my analysis of be saying because people use be saying quotes
to complain, not about the words someone spoke, but about what
someone “is saying” in the sense of the stance that leads them to
unacceptable behaviors. Returning to the point made earlier that
quotations allow listeners to directly experience something through
demonstration, complaining by way of quotation gives listeners “a
kind of access” to the original negative experience so they “can
judge its reprehensibility” for themselves (Holt 2000: 436).

Syntactically, be saying quotations are embedded in the talk as
part of what the speaker is communicating on his or her own behalf.
They are components of language that accomplish the
communicative work of demonstration. Because they refer to
sources about which some information must be known, be saying
quotations are more likely to occur once a conversation has been
underway for some time or in relation to a topic that has previously
been discussed. Clark and Gerrig mention that using direct quotes
with little explanation tacitly assumes that the hearer will interpret
them in the same way as the speaker intends (1990: 793). Indeed, I
found that when the participants were well known to each other, the
frequency of be saying quotations and quotation in general was
greater compared to gatherings where many of the participants were
unknown to each other. Be saying quotations tended to occur in
clusters, especially where speakers were presenting several
interpretations of a particular event or behavior. Further analysis on
the distribution could be done to consider how the quotations fit into
the larger interaction and how their use is affected by the relations
among participants.

Finally, be saying + quotation can be used to verify
interpretations and information. Often this takes the form of an
indirect quote. Consider (40), an exchange, in which V seeks to
verify his interpretation of E’s claim that eight ponds of waste water
have not been discharged into the river.

(40) V: That’s right, that’s what I was just going to say. So- ‘cause
I don’t know that for sure. If you’re saying there’s eight
ponds being untouched?

E: ‘Cause those were the ABC ponds, they have nothing to
do with RTA.

V: OK, then that’s why then.
E: ‘Cause RTA said We don’t want all your old ponds full of crappy water.

V: That’s right, and ABC’s saying and we don’t want no new stuff.

E: Right.

V: So make your own pond.

E: Yeah.

V: Oh, I see what happened. So you’re saying they treated the water in the two ponds, and divert it to another- they made other ponds.

The key to the clarification is E’s quote introduced by said, markedly in the past tense, in which she provides RTA’s justification, as the company which bought the ABC operations, for denying responsibility for getting rid of ABC’s waste water. The quoted sections embody the negotiation of meaning and provide a statement of the situation that both come to agree on.

CONCLUSION

This analysis has shown that be saying quotations are a special kind of quotation whose primary function is to evaluate the attitudes, beliefs and values linked to the stance of the source or principal. Be saying + quotation is a component of language that reveals the social construction of identities as speakers demonstrate and evaluate what they perceive others and themselves to believe and to be. By selecting certain aspects of the source’s stance on an issue, the speaker constructs that stance for the listeners, while simultaneously indicating his or her own position in relation to it. This evaluation is discernable in the sometimes highly improbable or impossible words that are chosen for the quote, which highlight the speaker’s positive or negative orientation to the source.

In terms of linguistic structure, be saying quotes can be either direct or indirect. The quotes are not verbatim reports, but instead are demonstrations of internal processes, which are not often or easily expressed verbally. The quotation provides a frame around the important words, the essence of the stance being expressed, at the same time marking those bits of talk as separate from the speaker’s own stance. When multiple stances are being taken, the be saying quotations allow a single speaker to change footing and demonstrate these effectively. An analysis of be saying quotations is useful in contexts where multiple stances or value systems are in
conflict. Examining who quotes whom and what aspects are being depicted in the quotations can shed light on points of similarity and difference.
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