



Open Linguistics

Editor-in-Chief: Ehrhart, Sabine

1 Issue per year

Covered by:
Clarivate Analytics - Emerging Sources Citation Index
ERIH PLUS

OPEN ACCESS

Online

ISSN 2300-9969

- See all formats and pricing
- Print Flyer
- Get eTOC Alert ›
- Get New Article Alert ›

More options

Volume	Issue	Page	GO
--------	-------	------	-----------

Select Volume and Issue

Volume 1, Issue 1 (Jan 2015)

Regular Articles

Unexpected Final Vowel Retention in Malakula

Lynch, John

Published Online: 09/01/2014

DOWNLOAD PDF

SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Nasal place assimilation and the perceptibility of place contrasts

Kawahara, Shigeto / Garvey, Kelly

Published Online: 10/02/2014

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Strong epistemic modality in parliamentary discourse

Vukovic, Milica

Published Online: 10/15/2014

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Expressives and Expressivity

McCready, Eric

Published Online: 10/27/2014

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

What are Languages? A Biolinguistic Perspective

Mendivil-Giró, José-Luis

Published Online: 11/19/2014

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

The Boundaries of Lexical Innovation within a Question-Defined Semantic Cohort

Carvajal, Camilo Andres Bonilla

Published Online: 12/30/2014

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Being a former Second World War partisan: Reported speech and the expression of local identity

Guerini, Federica

Published Online: 01/16/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

The morphology of tense and aspect in Nama, a Papuan language of southern New Guinea

Siegel, Jeff

Published Online: 02/27/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Metaphor Evaluation of Leadership Styles: A Case Study of Presidential New Year Greetings

Arcimaviciene, Liudmila / Jonaitiene, Vida

Published Online: 04/01/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

The Role of Exemplars and Lexical Frequency in Rendaku

Sano, Shin-Ichiro

Published Online: 04/16/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Japanese /r/ is not feature-less: A rejoinder to Labrune (2014)

Kawahara, Shigeto

Published Online: 06/11/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Lexical selection and the evolution of language units

Hadikin, Glenn

Published Online: 06/25/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

An emerging future infinitive in present day German?

Reiner, Tabea Elina

Published Online: 08/03/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Optimization of the Verbal Inflectional Paradigm by the Cyclic Application of Morphophonological Processes: Evidence from Potential Forms in Japanese

Sano, Shin-ichiro

Published Online: 09/07/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Dialect and stance-taking by non-Egyptian celebrities in Egypt

Bassiouney, Reem

Published Online: 11/03/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Writing systems as modular objects: proposals for theory design in grapholinguistics

Neef, Martin

Published Online: 12/16/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Toward a generative theory of language transfer: Experiment and modeling of sC prothesis in L2 Spanish

Daland, Robert / Norrmann-Vigil, Ingrid

Published Online: 12/31/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

The Sarikoli reflexive pronoun

Kim, Deborah

Published Online: 12/31/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

✔ Special issue on other-initiated repair across languages, edited by Mark Dingemanse and N. J. Enfield

Other-initiated repair across languages: towards a typology of conversational structures

Dingemanse, Mark / Enfield, N. J.

Published Online: 02/05/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in English

Kendrick, Kobin H.

Published Online: 02/24/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Siwu

Dingemane, Mark

Published Online: 02/26/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Lao

Enfield, N. J.

Published Online: 03/21/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Icelandic

Gisladottir, Rosa S.

Published Online: 03/22/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Murrinh-Patha

Blythe, Joe

Published Online: 04/29/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Italian

Rossi, Giovanni

Published Online: 05/21/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Yéli Dnye: Seeing eye-to-eye in the language of Rossel Island

Levinson, Stephen C.

Published Online: 06/24/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Cha'palaa

Floyd, Simeon

Published Online: 09/08/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

Other-initiated repair in Russian

Baranova, Julija

Published Online: 09/29/2015

 DOWNLOAD PDF

 SAVE

 OPEN ACCESS

✓ **Topical issue: Translation Techniques in the Ancient and Oriental Cultures, edited by Artemij Keidan**

Meaningfulness, the unsaid and translatability: Instead of an introduction

Keidan, Artemij

Published Online: 11/03/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

The birth of the adjective class as a problem of translation

Alfieri, Luca

Published Online: 04/30/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Translation as Innovation in Literature: the case of a Sanskrit Buddhist poem translated into Chinese

Lettere, Laura

Published Online: 06/04/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Syriac into Middle Iranian: A Translation Studies Approach to Sogdian and Pahlavi Manuscripts within the Church of the East

Barbati, Chiara

Published Online: 07/02/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

A conversation and a letter. Heidegger, Derrida, and the (un)translatable East

Marinucci, Lorenzo

Published Online: 08/24/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

📌 **Topical issue on sign linguistics and gesture studies, edited by E. Engberg-Pedersen**

Perspective in signed discourse: the privileged status of the signer's locus and gaze

Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth

Published Online: 07/08/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

The parallel development of the form and meaning of two-handed gestures and linguistic information packaging within a clause in narrative

Sekine, Kazuki / Kita, Sotaro

Published Online: 07/17/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Multimodal analysis of quotation in oral narratives

Stec, Kashmiri / Huiskes, Mike / Redeker, Gisela

Published Online: 07/30/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Indicating verbs in British Sign Language favour motivated use of space

Cormier, Kearsy / Fenlon, Jordan / Schembri, Adam

Published Online: 11/30/2015

 [DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

 [SAVE](#)

 [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Forging a morphological system out of two dimensions: Agentivity and number


Horton, L. / Goldin-Meadow, S. / Coppola, M. / Senghas, A. / Brentari, D.

Published Online: 12/16/2015

 **DOWNLOAD PDF**

 **SAVE**

 **OPEN ACCESS**

 **Comments (0)**

[LIBRARIES](#)

[TRADE](#)

[AUTHORS](#)

[SOCIETIES](#)

[NEWSROOM](#)

[TEXTBOOKS](#)

[OPEN ACCESS](#)

▼ [ABOUT DE GRUYTER](#)

▼ [E-PRODUCTS & SERVICES](#)

▼ [IMPRINTS AND PUBLISHER PARTNERS](#)

▼ [HELP & CONTACT INFORMATION](#)

▼ [NEWS](#)

Copyright © 2011–2018 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH

Powered by PubFactory

Research Article

Open Access

Federica Guerini

Being a former Second World War partisan: Reported speech and the expression of local identity

Abstract: This paper presents a qualitative analysis of narrative sequences extracted from a sample of semi-structured interviews to a group of former Second World War partisans living in the Camonica valley (in the province of Brescia), for a total of roughly 15 hours of recordings. The analysis combines the interpretative frameworks of conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics with the study of reported speech and of the strategies of voice representation in dialogic and narrative texts. Special attention is devoted to the use of code-switching as a ‘contextualisation cue’ (Gumperz 1982) in order to mark portions of reported speech and set them off from the surrounding talk or from the main flow of a narrative episode, even in the absence of explicit recourse to *verba dicendi* or other quotation devices. Our findings show that code-switching may serve as a quotative marker, whereby speakers index the beginning of the reported utterances and shape the characters alternating in a dialogic sequence by drawing on the various linguistic resources at their disposal.

Keywords: Code-switching, Bresciano dialect, Italian, conversation analysis, quotative markers.

DOI 10.2478/opli-2014-0010

Received June 3, 2014; accepted December 5, 2014;

1 Introduction¹

Reported speech is believed to be universal to all human languages, though there is considerable inter-linguistic variation as regards the means of indicating whether the reported utterances are quoted in direct or in indirect form (cf. Coulmas 1986: 14). The structural and functional differences between direct and indirect speech have attracted the attention of several scholars (Li 1986; Mayes 1990; Holt 1996, 2000, 2007; Sakita 2002; MacAulay 2005; Clift 2007; Haakana 2007; Jones & Schieffelin 2009, to name but a few examples; among the scholars who focused on the Italian language, it is worth mentioning Mortara Garavelli 1985, 1995a, 1995b; Francescato 1986; Lavinio 1998; and Calaresu 2004).

In non-narrative contexts, reported speech is typically deployed “as a means of heightening evidentiality” (Couper-Kuhlen 2007: 82), i.e. as a conversational device whereby the speaker substantiates his/her assertions and corroborates his/her findings, by providing additional evidence by a third party, who is considered to be a reliable source of information. In informal story-telling, on the other hand,

¹ A shorter version of the present paper was presented at the 2014 GSCP (*Gruppo di Studio sulla Comunicazione Parlata / Special Interest Group on Spoken Communication*) International Conference “*Parler les langues romanes / Parlare le lingue romanze / Hablar las lenguas romances / Falandu linguae românicas*”, which was held at Stockholm University and Uppsala University on April 9th - 12th, 2014. I am grateful to Florian Coulmas for his comments on an earlier version of this work. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of the manuscript and their constructive suggestions. Needless to say, any remaining inaccuracy or lack of clarity is entirely my responsibility.

*Corresponding author: Federica Guerini: University of Bergamo, Bergamo, Italy, E-mail: federica.guerini@unibg.it

reported speech is resorted to both to convey the words uttered —by the speaker herself/himself or by another character— in a prior interactive episode and to convey the speaker’s attitudes towards the reported utterances. Indeed, narrative is the privileged locus for the deployment of reported speech.

This case study is based on the qualitative analysis of a sample of semi-structured interviews with a group of former World War II partisans living in the Camonica valley (Brescia, Italy). All the partisans interviewed were born in the 1920s and, for reasons to be explained below, their competence in the local Bresciano dialect (the Eastern Lombard Italo-Romance dialect spoken in the Camonica valley)² greatly exceeds that of the younger generations, who display a higher fluency in Italian, the national language. As we shall see, most instances of reported speech are embedded in a story framework. In fact, all the occurrences of direct as well as indirect reported speech which will be the focus of the present analysis are part of a larger narrative context, involving the description of emotionally charged episodes witnessed by the interviewees while they fought the German occupation of Northern Italy.

In the following sections, I will introduce the interpretative frameworks of conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics and provide a short outline of the structural and functional features of reported speech constructions in the Romance varieties under consideration (Section 2). After describing the data and the sociolinguistic setting from which they are drawn (Section 3.1), I will focus on the use of code-switching as a ‘contextualisation cue’ (Gumperz 1982: 132–135), whereby bilingual speakers mark portions of reported speech and set them off from the surrounding talk or from the main flow of a narrative episode (Section 3.2). The following conversational features will be taken into account: *i*) the frequency of *direct* speech constructions as opposed to *indirect* speech; *ii*) the relative position of quoting frames and reported utterances and *iii*) the direction of the switchings and the motivations underlying language choice (e.g. a mimetic intent, such as the adoption of the same language employed by the original speaker). In the final section (Section 4), the results of the analysis will be summarized and briefly commented upon.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Discourse analysis and reported speech

Interactional sociolinguistics may be defined as “the application of the interpretative methods of discourse analysis to gain insight into social/cultural issues [...] by systematically looking at how speakers and listeners involved in these issues talk about them” (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 2007: 483). A key assumption of this approach is that communication entails the active collaboration among two or more interlocutors: in both monolingual and multilingual interactions, “interlocutors publicly display and continuously update for each other their on-going understanding of talk —including identity negotiations— as talk unfolds turn by turn, thereby making these negotiations of meaning visible for analytic treatment” (Bailey 2007: 46). Meaning and identity work are “dialogical phenomena” (Blommaert 2005), i.e. the product of a speaker and of an interpreter. The participants’ on-going interpretations rely on a variety of both verbal and non-verbal signalling processes which are referred to as “contextualization cues” (Gumperz 1982), of which code-switching is an instance.

The main conversational function of reported speech is to animate and enact the various characters involved in a narrative episode (cf. Goodwin 2007). This is especially apparent in spontaneous, informal speech, where the insertion of a succession of dialogic sequences is a very common narrative strategy. As early as 1974, Erving Goffman pointed out that, in reporting utterances, speakers stage past (as well as imagined) dialogues as “little shows” (1974: 506). From a conversation analytic perspective, reported speech is traditionally deemed to entail a shift of footing³: the speaker “[warns] us that what he is saying is

² Note that Italo-Romance *dialecti* are not local varieties of Italian, but autonomous linguistic systems, displaying different degrees of elaboration, structural distance and mutual intelligibility. See Section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion of this point.

³ I take the term ‘footing’ from Goffman, who defined it as “the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (1981: 128).

meant to be taken in jest, or as a mere repeating of words by someone else, then it is clear that he means to stand in a relation of reduced personal responsibility for what he is saying” (Goffman 1974: 512).

In monolingual speech, shifts in prosody, a rise in pitch, changes in voice quality or speed, as well as style or register-shifting (Coupland 2001), may indicate that the speaker has shifted footing to reproduce the words of another character. In multilingual interactions, on the other hand, multilingual competence may be creatively resorted to in order to construct socially interpretable identities as well as to mark portions of reported speech, thereby isolating from the surrounding utterances the different voices emerging within the narration itself (Bakhtin 1981).

Irrespective of the language (variety) adopted in order to quote someone else’s words, research into reported speech has shown that it does not necessarily entail an accurate, word-by-word report of the utterances pronounced by the original speaker (e.g. Mortara Garavelli 1985: 29; Mayes 1990: 330–31; Alfonzetti 1992 and 2012: 128–129; Calaresu 2004: 46–62). Vološinov (1971), an outstanding member of the circle of scholars who collaborated with Mikhail Bakhtin, was the first to reject the assumption that reported speech is to be equated with *verbatim* quotation. He maintained that both direct and indirect reporting are affected by the dynamic interpersonal relationship involving the reporter and the original speaker. Hence, the reported utterances represent the reporter’s interpretation of what the original speaker said and are assimilated into the reporter’s discourse.

In her review of the extensive literature on the topic, Calaresu (2004: 52) identifies three main arguments supporting Vološinov’s position. (i) Due to limitations of memory, direct speech hardly ever entails a word-for-word quoting of the original utterances. (ii) Human beings have the capacity to report only the contents that they have actually understood (and hence, stored and re-elaborated in long-term memory). (iii) *Verbatim* rendition of the original utterance(s) is not the primary conversational function of reported speech. Rather, in informal talk and story-telling, reported speech is resorted to “because of its characteristic ability to instill in the listener a presumption of the truth of the reported events, by creating the illusion of the listener also being an eye-witness” (Sakita 2002: 189), as well as to increase the vividness and the dramatic effect of the recalled (or imaginary) events (e.g. Li 1986; Mayes 1990). This explains why story climaxes or the punch line of narrative texts are often marked by the presence of reported utterances.

The purpose of this paper is not to provide a typology of reported speech constructions or to discuss the morpho-syntactic traits which should be taken into account in order to describe a certain construction as an occurrence of direct vs. indirect reported speech. This has already been done by a number of scholars (e.g. Mortara Garavelli 1985, 1995b; Li 1986; Thompson 1996; Sakita 2002; Calaresu 2004).

What is more, contrary to what is traditionally claimed by normative grammars, a distinction between direct and indirect forms of reported speech is not always clear cut. Most scholars (see, for example, Yule 1993: 236; Sakita 2002: 223) now agree that the reported speech constructions occurring in natural, spontaneous conversations fall along a continuum having at one extreme the prototypical instances of *direct* speech, at the other extreme the prototypical occurrences of *indirect* speech, and in the middle a number of intermediate forms (often described as ‘free direct speech’ or ‘free indirect speech’), displaying structural features of both prototypes as well as a number of syntactic and pragmatic peculiarities. Likewise, a speaker may begin quoting an utterance by means of a direct construction and then switch to an indirect one (Yule 1993; Holt 1996). This is a very common interactional pattern, which is also attested in the data that we are about to examine.

Nevertheless, in order to illustrate the structural features that guided my interpretation of a certain form as an occurrence of *direct* vis-à-vis *indirect* reported discourse, let us briefly consider the closing turns of a narrative sequence extracted from the interviews that will be analyzed in the following section⁴:

⁴ All the extracts commented on in this paper are preceded by the interviewee’s initial(s), followed by f (female) or m (male), with the exception of the excerpts pronounced by a group of interviewees who preferred to be identified by the *nom de guerre* they adopted when they joined the Resistance (e.g. *Gelsomino*, *Ciocari*). A synthetic description of the sociolinguistic setting and of the interviewees’ language competence is offered in Section 3. For further details on the video-recordings and on the sociolinguistic profile of the partisans interviewed, the reader is referred to Guerini (2013). The data are available for examination and potential replication of results.

(1) Sf

- 01 34:24[...] *dopo due ore, a gennaio, con la neve, col freddo, arriviamo a*
 ‘[...] two hours later, in January, with the snow, in cold weather, we reach
- 02 *Presegno, lui chiama suo fratello e l'avvocato Leonesio e dice:*
 Presegno, he calls his brother and Leonesio, the attorney, and tells them:
- 03 *venite a farmi da testimoni per'ke el dis, eh, 'spuze la san'tina!*
 «Would you please be my witnesses, **because**» he says, «**eh, I am going to marry Santina!**»
- 04 *ma te te se mat! Niente, andiamo dal prete, bussa alla porta,*
 «**But you must be crazy!**» So, we go to the priest's, he [the groom] knocks the door,
- 05 *don Maifredi viene alla finestra, cosa volete?*
 father Maifredi comes to the window, «What do you want?»
- 06 *el dis, eh, vogliamo sposarci, io e la Santina,*
 he [the groom] says, «Eh, we want to get married, Santina and I»,
- 07 *perché ci conosceva bene il prete, insegnavo lì!*
 for the father used to know us well, I was a school teacher over there!
- 08 *Ma voi siete matti, e chiude l'imposta. E lui di nuovo bussa, ma forte.*
 «But you must be crazy», and he shuts the window. And he knocks again, but stronger
- 09 *Allora apre di nuovo la finestra, se non ci sposa, andiamo via*
 Then he [the father] opens the window again, «If you do not marry us, we are going away
- 10 *insieme lo stesso! Allora non si poteva fare una cosa così,*
 together all the same!» At that time, you could not do something like that,
- 11 *era una cosa tipo Renzo e Lucia, no? Che addirittura non/*
 it would be a sort of “Renzo and Lucia” affair, wouldn't it? Indeed, not/
- 12 *Allora è venuto giù, ha acceso qualcosa, si è messo qualche parapetto*
 So he [the father] came downstairs, lit something [a candle?], put on a certain garb
- 13 *e ci ha sposato.*
 and he married us’.

Extract 1 is good example of the pervasive presence of reported discourse in spontaneous talk and story-telling: the account of the events that preceded the narrator's clandestine marriage with the head of a partisan brigade is intertwined with as many as six occurrences of reported speech. The first one, in lines 2-3 (*lui chiama suo fratello e l'avvocato Leonesio e dice: venite a farmi da testimoni per'ke el dis, eh, 'spuze la san'tina!*, ‘he calls his brother and Leonesio, the attorney, and tells them: «Would you please be my witnesses, **because**» he says, «**eh, I am going to marry Santina!**») appears to be a prototypical instance of direct speech introduced by a *verbum dicendi* (*dice*). Note that the reported utterance is marked by a switching from Italian (the language of the narrative) into Bresciano, which occurs in the middle of the quotation and is presumably triggered by the presence of the homophone /per'ke/⁵. The switched portion is introduced by a repetition of the verb of saying, which is followed by the informative focus of the utterance (‘eh, I am going

5 I am well aware of the methodological and analytical problems posed by the investigation of code-switching involving language pairs with low structural distance (such as Italian and the various Italo-Romance dialects). The topic was first addressed by Berruto (1985), and further discussed in a number of subsequent works by the same scholar (e.g. Berruto 2005, 2012a). The presence of a large number of homophones —Berruto talks about “the existence of a core of lexical forms common to the standard language and [Italo-Romance] dialects” (2005: 88)— combined with a similar syntactic structure and a considerable degree of convergence as a result of long-term language contact, entail that, in many cases, it is entirely arbitrary to ascribe a form to either linguistic system, and hence, to determine the length of the switched unit. In order to handle this shortcoming, which is particularly consequential when the homophonous element is a complementizer, a relative clause marker or a clause connector, I decided to accept the compromise proposed by Berruto (2012a: 28), which can be summarized as follows. Complementizers and relative particles are generally taken to represent the highest level of the dependent clause that they introduce. Hence, they are the first constituent of the dependent clause and indicate clause boundaries. Homophonous complementizers will be ascribed to the linguistic system which provides the highest number of morphemes to the subordinate clause that they introduce. In (the rare) case that both Italian and Bresciano provide the same number of morphemes, the complementizer will be conventionally ascribed to the language of the first non-homophonous element following the complementizers itself.

to marry Santina!'). The next sentence (line 4) coincides with another occurrence of reported speech. The prospective witnesses' reply is reported without quoting frames (**ma te te se mat!**, 'But you must be crazy!') and only the analysis of its propositional content justifies the interpretation of this utterance as pronounced by a different character. As I mentioned, shifts in reporting style are a very common conversational pattern. In this case, the absence of quotation devices increases the dramatic effect of the narrative through the juxtaposition of the different voices alternating within the story. A similar occurrence of free direct speech is attested in line 5, where the words pronounced by father Maifredi (*cosa volete?*, 'what do you want?') are reported without the recourse to quoting frames. In the following line, a switch into Bresciano introduces a second occurrence of direct reported speech (line 6: **el dis**, *eh, vogliamo sposarci, io e la Santina*, 'he [the groom] says, «eh, we want to get married, Santina and I»'). Again, switching into a language other than the one used up to that point of the narration separates the utterance pronounced by father Maifredi from the words uttered by the groom, who announces his intention to get married. Father Maifredi's reaction is disclosed in line 8 by means of free direct speech. The words uttered by the father (*Ma voi siete matti*, 'But you must be crazy!') are inserted into the narrative without a quoting frame. Finally, in lines 9-10, there is another occurrence of free direct speech (*se non ci sposa, andiamo via insieme lo stesso!*, 'If you do not marry us, we are going away together all the same!'), which reports the words that convinced father Maifredi to come downstairs and marry the young couple.

Of the six occurrences of reported speech attested above only three involve code-switching, and accordingly, are immediately pertinent to the present analysis. However, extract 1 illustrates well the structural features that guide the interpretation of reported discourse in the next sections. In the Romance languages considered here, the main difference between direct and indirect speech is that indirect speech is a complement of the *verbum dicendi* introduced by *che* /ke/ 'that' (homophonous in Italian and Bresciano), whereas the direct quote is syntactically independent from the sentence containing it (Mortara Garavelli 1995b: 444). This is evident when we compare the example in (2a) with the indirect rendering of the same quotation in (2b):

(2) a) Direct Speech (DS)

el dis, *eh, vogliamo sposarci, io e la Santina*

he says, «Eh, we want to get married, Santina and I»

b) Indirect Speech (IS)

el dis *che vogliono sposarsi, lui e la Santina*

he says that they want to get married, he and Santina

In (2a) both clauses are syntactically independent and, in Goffman's terms, a shift of footing (marking the beginning of the quotation) is accomplished by a switching from Bresciano into Italian, as well as by the presence of a hesitation (*eh*), which serves as a discourse marker signalling the speaker's embarrassment and emotional involvement. As we shall see, direct speech is often introduced by discourse markers (e.g. Schiffrin 1987: 102; Sakita 2002: 190; Couper-Kuhlen 2007: 86), that function as elements indicating the beginning of the reported utterance.

In (2b), on the other hand, the verb of saying is followed by a complementizer (*che* /ke/ 'that') and the third person pronoun employed in the reported utterance (*lui*) is co-referential with the subject of the *verbum dicendi*. The subordinate status of the reported clause is displayed also by the fact that the use of tenses in the latter is governed by the rules of *consecutio temporum*. In this case, for instance, a present tense verb occurs in both clauses. Besides, interjections, hesitations and discourse markers tend to be encountered less frequently than in direct speech (Mortara Garavelli 1995b: 445; Calaresu 2004: 24).

Similar differences in pronominalization, personal or spatial deixis and verb tense can also be observed between free direct and free indirect discourse. Without entering into a detailed discussion of the peculiarities of these reporting styles—which, as we anticipated, display a number of intermediate syntactic and functional features—we may note that both constructions are characterized by the absence

of *verba dicendi* or other quotation devices, but only the latter (i.e. free indirect speech) presupposes a transposition of all the deictic elements contained within the reported utterance (cf. Mortara Garavelli 1985: 51–57; Calaresu, 2004: 94–95):

(3) a) Free Direct Speech (FDS)

Allora apre di nuovo la finestra,
Then [the father] opens the window again,
se non ci sposa, andiamo via insieme lo stesso!
«If **you** do not marry **us**, **we** are going away together all the same!»

b) Free Indirect Speech (FIS)

Allora apre di nuovo la finestra,
Then [the father] opens the window again,
se non li sposa, vanno via insieme lo stesso!
if **he** does not marry **them**, **they** are going away together all the same!

The motivation for using free direct speech in story-telling is evidently to re-enact the original dialogue as mimetically as possible or –to borrow Goffman’s theater metaphor again– to stage a little show. Indeed, this construction tends to be viewed as “the form of reported discourse having a performative function par excellence” (Calaresu, 2004: p. 30, *my translation*). On the other hand, by using a free indirect style the narrator introduces another participant’s voice and, at the same time, creates some distance to that participant’s perspective. In fact, free indirect speech is a reporting construction widely deployed in literary texts in order to provide a detailed representation of the characters’ thoughts and emotions, a narrative technique that is often described as ‘stream of consciousness’ or ‘interior monologue’.

Researchers have also noted that speakers may alternate between quotative forms depending on the source of the reported words: some quotative constructions tend to be favoured in order to enhance the reality value of the reported utterances, thus acting as markers of evidentiality (e.g. Romaine & Languette 1991; Singler 2001). This is particularly relevant when a speaker reports the words or thoughts of another (rather than his/her own): in this case, “direct quotation, by virtue of its formal features, can be considered as a means for restaging a verbal performance, and as such it creates the illusion to witness the scene evoked by the narrative” (Fónagy 1986: 255). Indirect speech, on the other hand, tends to be associated with a lower degree of commitment and reliability. In a recent study focusing on American English, Jones and Schieffelin (2009: 95) observed a clear stylistic link “between quotative form and the representational specificity of enquoted utterances, with users favoring *say* to establish factual matters and *be + like* to assert judgments and evaluations”. The prevalence of direct speech in our data (cf. Section 3.2) confirms that direct constructions tend to be perceived as the most effective means for depicting the narrator as a direct, reliable witness of the recounted events.

2.2 Code-switching as a “contextualisation cue” indexing a change of footing

As I pointed out above, this case study will focus on the occurrences of reported speech involving a switching between Italian and Bresciano, the Romance languages alternating in a sample of semi-structured interviews to a group of former Second World War partisans. I am not aware of any other study that has focused on code-switching between Bresciano and Italian, with the exception of Fava and Palmerini (2005), which, however, does not specifically address the interrelation between code-switching and reported speech⁶.

For the purpose of this analysis, the term ‘code-switching’ refers to *the functional juxtaposition of two (or more) languages, performed by a single speaker, within a single utterance or a single communicative event*. This definition entails that code-switching is related to a change of communicative intention or a change of topic, of addressee, of footing, and so forth. In this sense, code-switching is always locally meaningful

⁶ Besides, as I argued elsewhere (Guerini 2013), Fava and Palmerini’s case study displays a number of methodological and analytical shortcomings which make comparison with its results a difficult task.

(cf. Auer 1984; 1995): it is a conversational strategy deployed in order to fulfill a number of discursive functions, including that of marking a given stretch of talk as the words that someone else has pronounced in a previous (or imaginary) interactive episode.

Code-switching is a frequent and natural practice among bilinguals, and its linguistic manifestations extend from the insertions of single words or phrases to the alternation of larger units, including whole sentences. Indeed, in some bilingual communities, under certain circumstances (e.g. in informal conversations), code-switching itself can constitute an unmarked communicative practice, i.e. both “the ‘default’ choice, and as the most frequent choice” (Matras 2009: 115-116)⁷.

A number of studies examining bilingual speech have demonstrated that a single occurrence of code-switching may serve different purposes, e.g. signalling the beginning of a reported utterance and indexing a bilingual identity by the insertion of a discourse marker or an interjection in a language other than the one used up to the point of the interaction. By selecting among the various linguistic resources of their individual repertoire, speakers organize the on-going conversation and act on a local level in order to convey different individual and/or collective identities.

The importance of investigating the relationship between language choice and the expression of individual and/or group identity had already emerged in Le Page and Tabouret-Keller’s seminal work on “acts of identity” (1985), which drew attention to the fact that in multilingual settings language choice is always an “act of identity”, regardless of the language (or languages) involved. As a result of the symbolic potential inherent in selecting among different linguistic alternatives, in multilingual interactions

reported speech is a resource speakers creatively and strategically draw upon to contextualize social types and do identity work. [...] reporters not only evaluate the quoted characters and their behavior, but implicitly position themselves and construct their own identity; i.e. the construction of alterity is closely connected to the reporters’ own identity management. (Günthner 2007: 419)

Needless to say, the language choices made by multilingual speakers may also be motivated by the wish *not* to be identified with a given social, ethnic or language group. Indeed, language choices may be viewed as an attempt either to distance oneself from a given speaker / social group or to display one’s membership to a given community (cf. Auer 2011). Goffman observed that, in informal talk, speakers may occasionally resort to a stereotyped accent, such as “baby talk, ethnic and racial accents, national accents and gender role expressions” (1974: 535) in order to express their disaffiliation from the social and/or ethnic group traditionally associated with the language variety (or to the accent) in question⁸. In any sociolinguistic setting, some linguistic traits “are perceived as membership markers more than others, that is, they are iconized as markers rather than indicators” (Ervin-Tripp 2001: 46). In this sense, narratives and dialogic sequences are resources for identity work: language choices, or even the choice of a single linguistic trait, may be exploited either to ascribe a given character to a certain social group or to distance oneself from it.

3 Reported speech and code-switching as a quotative marker

3.1 The corpus

The data on which this analysis is based were collected in 2010 by a group of volunteers of the Italian National Partisan Association (A.N.P.I.) in order to produce a documentary film on the Italian Resistance, intended for elementary and middle-school children. The corpus –which, accordingly, was not collected for the purpose of carrying out a (socio)linguistic survey– amounts to roughly 15 hours of video-recorded semi-structured interviews with a group of World War II partisans living in the Camonica valley, in the province of Brescia.

⁷ On code-switching as an unmarked choice, see Myers-Scotton (1993).

⁸ A conversational strategy that Rampton (1995), in a well-known study focusing on language use among British-born adolescents in a South Midlands multiethnic urban centre, named *language crossing*.

The 24 partisan interviewed (8 of whom are female) were born in the 1920s. At the time of the recounted events, i.e. in the early 1940s, some of them were high school or university students and had grown up in middle-class families; others were factory workers, peasants or mine workers, coming from low-income households with little education (cf. Guerini 2013). All of them had been exposed to the Fascist propaganda in their school days, through the press, cinema and radio broadcasts, as well as by joining the various youth organizations of the Party, which played a crucial role in disseminating Fascist values and world view. Yet, they had developed a certain aversion towards the Fascist ideology, a feeling exacerbated by Italy's entrance into the Second World War and by the compulsory levy imposed at a national level.

Despite two decades of Fascist language policy⁹, the Bresciano dialect must be assumed to have been the first language learned by most interviewees. It is worth noting here that we use the term “dialect” in order to translate the Italian term *dialetto*, whose meaning is different from the meaning attributed to “dialect” within an English-speaking context. Italo-Romance *dialetti*¹⁰ are not social and/or geographical varieties of Italian, but autonomous linguistic systems derived from the varieties of Latin spoken across the peninsula. Indeed, as Gaetano Berruto maintained, “the structural distance between the standard [i.e. Italian, F.G.] and most Italo-Romance dialects is comparable to that existing between different Romance languages, such as Italian and Spanish. Thus, many Italians [...] are in a sense bilingual and exhibit the same bilingual mode of spoken communication one finds in many bilingual communities” (1997: 395).

As argued in a number of sociolinguistic studies exploring the process of Italianization (i.e. the gradual spread of Italian as the national language, cf. Guerini 2011; Berruto 2012b), in the 1920s and 1930s, Italo-Romance dialects continued to be the languages of primary socialization, especially in rural and peri-urban areas. In a classic work on the subject, Grassi, Sobrero and Telmon describe the relationship between Italian and Italo-Romance dialects *until the first half of the twentieth century* in terms of *diglossia without bilingualism*: “[...] Italo-Romance dialects were used in all domains of everyday life. Everybody spoke the dialects, but only a minority was also proficient in Italian, i.e. was bilingual” (2003: 31, *my translation*). This was true of both uneducated and educated families. Italian was a written language, extensively used as the language of public administration and in the school system. In ordinary, everyday conversations the dialect prevailed¹¹.

In the second half of the twentieth century, the spoken use of Italian progressively spread through all social classes and in domains of language use which were traditionally dominated by Italo-Romance dialects (see De Mauro 2014): Italian, at present, is regularly used in a wide range of written, institutional and formal domains, as well as in ordinary, informal talk, while Italo-Romance dialects are hardly ever written, are only occasionally heard in radio and television programs, do not occur in official documents and are mostly employed either within the family domain or in informal conversations.

The main discursive outcome of this Italianization process was the gradual emergence of language

⁹ A nationalistic language policy whose main objective was, notoriously, the repression of Italo-Romance dialects and of the various minority languages spoken in Italian territory. Klein (1986) is a crucial reference on this topic, but see also Foresti (2003). The latter argues that “the insistence on the purification of Italian, on the defence of the linguistic unity of the nation – a linguistic unity which in fact did not exist, except for a minority of Italian speakers (who were bilingual in Italian and in an Italo-Romance dialect, anyway) – entailed the refusal to see the actual linguistic conditions of the [Italian] peninsula and of its islands. Indeed, it entailed the unwillingness to intervene in an effective way, since the whimsical proclamation of the linguistic homogeneity of the nation, that is, of Italian monolingualism, was accompanied by a propaganda campaign against Italo-Romance dialects, which were excluded from the educational system, where in the early 1920s they used to be employed as means of instruction” (Foresti 2003: 19, *my translation*).

¹⁰ They are traditionally referred to as *dialetti italo-romanzi* ‘Italo-Romance dialects’, as opposed to the Gallo-Romance varieties spoken both in France and in part of the Italian territory (e.g. Occitan and Franco-Provençal), and to the Rhaeto-Romance varieties spoken in the Eastern Alps, in a bordering area between Switzerland and Italy. For more details on the Italian sociolinguistic context the reader is referred to the various papers contained in Guerini & Dal Negro (2011), as well as to Grassi, Sobrero and Telmon (2003), Ruffino (2006) and D’Agostino (2007). On the structural features of the *Bresciano* dialect, see Sanga (1997) and Bonfadini (1989) and (2010).

¹¹ See also De Mauro (2003[1963]), who explains that “at the beginning of the last century, in elementary education, the common language [i.e. Italian, the national language, F.G.] was still a distant reality, separated from everyday life, which found expression in the dialect. [Italian] was the language of education, but it was not commonly spoken” (De Mauro 2003 [1963]: 93, *my translation*).

alternation patterns which became an additional communicative resource in the individual repertoire of most community members. As Berruto points out,

Generally one finds a remarkable functional interchangeability of Italian and dialect in ordinary discourse, even in situations that are not obviously informal [...]. The main situational factor determining bilingual discourse seems to be the addressee. Italian / dialect switching and mixing may occur quite normally in every communicative situation, if the speaker believes that the addressee understands the dialect. (Berruto 1997: 396)

In the data examined here code-switching is frequently deployed as a conversational strategy aimed at organizing the on-going narrative, expressing the speaker's emotional involvement, filling linguistic gaps and accomplishing identity work. It has to be acknowledged, however, that the conversational setting in which the data were elicited —video-recorded semi-structured interviews aimed at the production of a documentary film for school children— influenced the interviewees' linguistic behaviour, especially in the opening phases of the interviews. While Italian is arguably the unmarked choice in the interview setting anyway, the interviewers' explicit recommendations of using Italian further reinforced the presence of this language in the recordings. At times, when the speakers' emotional involvement occasions a switch to Bresciano, the interviewers remind them that school children may not understand the dialect and that they should stick to Italian. These admonitions notwithstanding, the interviewers use Bresciano extensively, especially when talking about emotionally charged events. As Berruto argued in the above quote, the alternation of Italian and Bresciano is probably triggered by interlocutors who are proficient in both languages.

3.2 Analysis and discussion

In our sample, the total number of reported speech constructions contextualized by code-switching is 95. A closer look at Table 1 reveals that nearly 60% of them are instances of direct speech, which corroborates the findings of previous studies (e.g. Mayes 1990; Sakita 2002) that in oral *corpora* direct speech is more frequent than indirect speech. If we add to this figure the percentage of free direct speech occurrences, direct discourse turns out to be the most frequent choice (four out of five occurrences).

Table 1: Breakdown of the occurrences of reported speech

Direct Speech (DS)	Indirect Speech (IS)	Free Direct Speech (FDS)	Free Indirect Speech (FIS)
55 (57.9%)	11 (11.5%)	24 (25.3%)	5 (5.3%)

The results of an experimental study focusing on a sample of English native speakers (Sakita 2002) suggest that the structural complexity of the reported utterances and the speakers' affective/emotional involvement in the reporting are the main factors influencing the choice of reporting style:

When reporting long and structurally complicated sentences, indirect reporting style reduces the ambiguities caused by the complexities [*sic*]. Indeed, in reporting very long sentences, speakers often shift from direct to indirect style in mid-sentence. In short and simple sentences, there is usually less ambiguity, so there is less motivation to use indirect style [...] (Sakita 2002: 204).

In a similar way, direct speech is the preferred choice in order to report emotionally charged events, when “the important thing is not the content but the way the communication proceeds and the speakers, as

actors, [...] animate dialogues with distinct voices” (Sakita 2002: 220). To this purpose, code-switching is a conversational device that bilingual speakers have at their disposal for organizing narrative sequences, in addition to the various verbal and non verbal strategies that competent monolingual speakers normally use¹². This is true irrespective of whether the quotation is introduced by a *verbum dicendi*, as the following extracts illustrate:

(4) **Pergiani**

01 24:11 *sono andati lì in due e si sono presentati lì e loro li hanno salutati:*

‘The two of them went there, approached them [i.e. they approached a group of Fascist militants] and when the latter [i.e. the Fascist militants] greeted them, [exclaimed]:

02 **'alha le ma dihgra'fat!**

«Hands up, rascal!»

(5) **LPm**

01 07:00 [...] *sennonché l'8 settembre, 'njent, fa per entrare in fabbrica e c'è una*

‘[...] then the 8th of September, **you know**, he is about to set foot into the factory and there is a

02 *guardia che era un suo amico, el g-a dit, Cesare non presentarti perché sono*

sentinel, who was a friend of his, **he told him**, Cesare don't show up because they [the Nazis] are

03 *qui ad aspettarti, a'lura è tornato indietro, non è entrato e si è dato*

inside, waiting for you, **so** he went away, he did not show up and he went

04 *alla macchia per tot el periodo della resistenza*

into hiding **throughout the** Resistance period’.

For code-switching to contextualize someone else's speech, the switched portion need not coincide with a whole utterance as in (4), where the speaker is describing the events leading to the arrest of a group of Fascist militants and the reported words coincide with the climax of the narrative sequence. Even a single word or a phrase involving a switch into a language other than the one used up to that point of the narrative enables the speaker to set off a voice other than his or her own. In (5), for instance, the boundaries of the reported utterance are clearly marked by two Bresciano insertions, the first one involving a verb of saying (line 2) and the second one involving a conjunction (**a'lura**), which signals the end of the quotation and the resumption of the narrative. In this sense, code-switching functions as a quotative discourse marker.

As a result of the important syntactic similarities shared by the Romance varieties discussed, *verba dicendi* represent a recurrent switching point in our corpus, as illustrated by the frequency counts displayed in Table 2. The switched unit may begin with a Bresciano verb of saying inserted in an Italian narrative, as in extract (5) or in extract (6) below:

(6) **LBm**

01 08:00 [...] *aveva la fotografia in sala*

‘[...] he had a picture [a portrait of Mussolini] in the sitting room

02 **e o dit, siamo fermati in un posto non tanto bello!**

and I said, we have not chosen a good place to stop!’

¹² Gumperz himself, in *Discourse Strategies*, remarked that in bilingual settings “code-switching signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes” (1982: 102).

Table 2: Breakdown of DS occurrences

Direct Speech Occurrences					
total occurrences = 55 (57.9%)					
Bresciano <i>verbum dicendi</i>			Italian <i>verbum dicendi</i>		
+			+		
Bresciano quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote	Bresciano quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote
11	16	12	8	---	8

Alternatively, code-switching marks the beginning of the reported utterance, as in (7), where Italian, the language of the narrative, is invaded by a Bresciano quote (line 2, **ke j-aha'ra det 'forhe al hɔ han'fi!** 'he must somehow be involved!'), introduced by an Italian verb of saying (*loro avranno detto*, 'they would say'):

(7) **GBm**

01 41:34 *Allora gestire la parte del principale sarà stato difficile*

'So being a factory director must have been difficult,

02 *perché loro avranno detto: ke j-aha'ra det 'forhe al hɔ han'fi!*

since they [the Germans] would say, **he must somehow be involved** [i.e. a factory cannot be repeatedly sabotaged unless its director is somehow colluded with the resistance fighters]!

03 *Può darsi, però qualcosa avrà/ dei momenti 'mia/ non belli, ma anche*

Maybe, in any event, something must have/ some moments **not/** unhappy (moments), but even

04 *il movimento antifascista che faceva di supporto alla resistenza*

the anti-Fascist movement supporting the resistance fighters

05 *ha subito un attacco [...]*

suffered an attack [...].'

In excerpt (7), direct speech is deployed in order to report the imaginary thoughts that the speaker attributes to the German officials who arrested the director of a well-known local ammunition factory on the accusation of favouring the partisans' acts of sabotage against the factory. Examples like this one show that there is no stable, one-to-one relationship between the choice of a certain language and the social or ethnic affiliations that it is intended to convey (cf. Bailey 2007: 355). In this case, for instance, the local dialect is adopted to enact a foreign voice –of a German officer–which is actually unlikely to be associated with it: the need to contextualize reported speech by means of code-switching prevails over the established identity-related associations.

Extract (8), on the other hand, displays the insertion of a Bresciano verb of saying that marks the beginning of a mixed language quote, whose boundary is marked by a second Bresciano insertion (line 2):

(8) **Fm**

01 27:25 Io so **ke g-o dit as'kulta**, so che si chiamava Ceco anche lui, Ceco

'I remember **that I said**, «**Listen** —he too was named Ceco— Ceco, please

02 *accompagnami, io non li conosco, magari 'zbaʎe kamjun'si,*

come with me, I do not know them, maybe **I could stop the wrong lorry**»

- 03 mi ha accompagnato e lì son salito sul camioncino[...]
He accompanied me, and I jumped into the lorry [...].

The absence, in Table 2, of direct speech occurrences involving an Italian *verbum dicendi* introducing an Italian quote is probably due to the fact that Italian is the quantitatively dominant language in the corpus. Hence, reported discourse is generally contextualized by inserting a Bresciano clause or phrase within a larger Italian sentence, rather than vice versa. At the same time, given the functional importance of the local dialect in the interviewees' repertoire, Bresciano is also likely to be the language employed in the original speech events. Hence, its occurrence in reported speech has a mimetic justification as well.

Another interesting observation emerging from extract (8) is that, as suggested by a number of previous studies (cf. Section 2.2), direct speech tends to be introduced by interjections, allocutives, hesitations and discourse markers which function as elements indexing the beginning of the reported utterances and increase the vividness and the mimetic effect of a dialogic sequence. In our *corpus*, this strategy is adopted in nearly one quarter of the occurrences of direct speech (i.e. in 13 occurrences out of 55, corresponding to 23.6%). Extract (9) below illustrates the use of a very common interjection expressing surprise and/or disappointment (**ma'dora**, literally 'Our Lady, Madonna'), whereas in extract (10) the Italian allocutive form *amico*, '(my) friend' (line 2) marks the beginning of reported speech in a narrative sequence characterized by the prevalence of the Bresciano dialect:

(9) Af

- 01 10:37 [...] io mi fermo un momentino e parlo con lui e mi dice **ma'dora ke 'brōta**
'[...] I stop briefly to talk to him and he tells me: «**Goodness, what a shabby**

- 02 **va'lidža ke ta g-e!** e preso uno spago ha legato tutte e due le mie
suitcase you have got!» And he takes a string and binds it around both my

- 03 valigie con lo spago.
suitcases'.

(10) Gelsomino

- 01 10:28 **e a'lura nel rja'do 'g-ia/ en me l-a tro'at a ka en g-a dit**
'**And then when we got there, there was/ we found him at home and we told him:**

- 02 *amico* **en va 'mia be džu me l-a la'gatdža**
«My friend, **things are not going well! We have already lost one guy,**

- 03 **'ada ke he en 'kambja 'mia hih'tema en va o'ju per noh kunt!**
look, if things do not change, we are going to split up!

- 04 *Cioè* **en dehfa'ho en hē 'mia en 'tai ma en fa 'preht a dehfa'fō!**
That is **we** [the partisan unit] **are going to split, we are not many, it is easy to split up!**»

Another aspect that has attracted the attention of scholars investigating reported discourse concerns the relative position of quoting frame and reported utterance(s). In our sample, the latter are consistently preceded by a verb of saying. The opposite sequence (reported speech followed by a verb of saying, as in extract 11) is attested in only 5 occurrences out of 55. Note, however, that the ratio could differ if frequency counts took into account the total number of direct speech constructions in the corpus, rather than focusing only on those contextualized by code-switching.

(11) **Fm**

01 23:11 [...] *questo Balilla da Milano è stato accompagnato da una staffetta*
 ‘[...] this Balilla from Milan was accompanied by a dispatch-rider

02 *e portato a Provaglio d’Iseo, dice io vado ancora là perché c’era*
 and he was taken to Provaglio d’Iseo, he says «I am going back over there, since there is

03 *Franchini, li conosco, me te fo kompa'nia g-o dit,*
 Franchini [a partisan commander], I know them» «**I am going with you**», **I said,**

04 *è stato un rischio enorme perché saranno stati trenta quaranta chilometri*
 it was a huge risk, for there must have been roughly thirty or forty kilometers [...].

A final observation concerns the use of direct speech in order to introduce self-quotations and thoughts. In this case, the speaker’s thinking is often preceded (or followed) by an account of the motivations underlying his or her reasoning, which aims to justify the speaker’s past actions or misunderstandings (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen 2007: 101). In extract (12), for instance, the interviewee explains what prevented him from fleeing at the sight of a group of men approaching his hiding place: he had been told that some fellow partisans would join him and did not suspect that he would run into a bunch of Fascist militants who were patrolling the area:

(12) **Fm**

01 17:15 *siccome mi avevano detto a un certo momento arriveranno tanti*
 ‘Since I had been told: «At a certain moment several partisans would arrive

02 *partigiani che vi vengono a prendere e me g-o pen'sat*
 and join you», **so I thought,**

03 **j-ε i nos kom'pan** e sono stato tranquillo,
they must be our fellow partisans and I did not worry

04 *sdraiato come un pascià, era una bella giornata anche*
 and lay down like a king, it was such a sunny day [...].

Free direct speech, the second most frequent construction in our *corpus*, comprises roughly one quarter (25.3%) of the occurrences of reported speech. Frequency counts, displayed in Table 3, show that, in the absence of verbs of saying or other quotation devices, a switching from Italian to Bresciano is the preferred contextualization cue signalling the beginning of a reported utterance. This holds true both for the occurrences involving the switching of a whole clause or sentence and for those involving a mixed quote.

Table 3: Breakdown of FDS and FIS occurrences

Free Direct Speech			Free Indirect Speech		
total occurrences = 24 (25.3%)			total occurrences = 5 (5.3%)		
Dialect quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote	Dialect quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote
14	2	8	2	2	1

As I observed in Section 3.1, these figures are partially biased by the interviewers' recommendations concerning the choice of Italian as the language of the interaction. Yet, the concurring influence of other factors cannot be ruled out. We can safely assume that most of the interactions recalled during the interviews were actually conducted in Bresciano. Hence, the motivation underlying some of the switchings may be the adoption of the language used in the original speech event.

Italo-Romance dialects are a classic example of a 'we-code' (in the sense of Gumperz 1982: 95): the languages of solidarity and intimacy. These dialects were –and for many speakers of interviewees' generation still are– the preferred means of communication with friends and family. For instance, we have good reasons to believe that the suggestion to join the partisan army reported in (13) must have been formulated in Bresciano (rather than in Italian):

(13) **Fm**

- 01 09:25 *Con me alla Breda lavorava un ragazzo, era delle zone lì della*
 'When I was at the Breda [a local ammunition factory] I used to work with a boy who came from
- 02 *valle Camonica, 'dai ke n'dimo ən mon'tapa!*
 the Camonica valley, «**Come on, let's go to the mountains** [i.e. let's join the partisan army]!»
- 03 *In montagna, a fa ki? ...*
 «To the mountains, **to do what?**»
- 04 *Ne parlo con mio padre, non era un leader, però era al corrente di*
 I discussed [the matter] with my father, he was not a leader, but he was aware of
- 05 *certe cose ... el me/ no, guarda che non c'è nent, non andare!*
 certain things ... **he** [told (?)] **me/ no**, look, there is **nothing** [to do], do not go
 [i.e. do not join the partisans]!

The only two occurrences of free direct speech involving an Italian quote are illustrated in extract (14) below. Note that Bresciano is the language of the narrative, while Italian is likely to be the language used by the German soldiers, cited in line 1 and in line 5, in order to address the local people:

(14) **Ciocari**

- 01 37:57 'pɔta ɛntra'kwɛla «Mani in alto!» 'pɔta fa kɛ? le o a'lhade ho
 'So, meanwhile, «Hands up!» So, what could I do? I raised my hands,
- 02 *quando k-ən he la'gaitf'hol put de la 'griɲa me o tʃa'pat la rivol'tɛla*
 when we had parted near the bridge over the Grigna creek, I had taken the gun,
- 03 *la nof'longa e l-o ka'hada 'deter ke ke de 'holit*
 a number nine long gun, and put it here [indicating his shirt pocket], whereas we used to
- 04 *ən la mi'tia ən 'tahka de dre kon/ kon ɛl bor'hɛl nɔ?*
 keep it in the back pocket of our trousers, together with/ with the wallet, you see?
- 05 «Mani in alto, documenti!» *te ribe'laɛt nɔ?*
 «Hands up! Your documents, please!» you would react, wouldn't you?

In this case, code-switching serves a double purpose: contextualizing the reported utterance(s) and distinguish the voice of “the enemy”, who is excluded from the use of the in-group code (i.e. the Bresciano dialect), thus recreating the vividness which is typical of narrative sequences.

If we turn to the occurrences of indirect speech, we may note that there is an almost equal split between those introduced by an Italian verb of saying and those introduced by a Bresciano verb of saying. The latter are mostly followed by an Italian quote, hence the switching of the quoting frame is the only contextualization cue signalling the beginning of the reported discourse (cf. extract 15 below), a conversational strategy also observed in a number of direct speech occurrences.

Table 4: Breakdown of IS occurrences

Indirect Speech Occurrences					
total occurrences = 11 (11.7%)					
Dialect <i>verbum dicendi</i>			Italian <i>verbum dicendi</i>		
+			+		
Dialect quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote	Dialect quote	Italian quote	Mixed quote
2	4	---	3	---	2

(15) **Fm**

01 36:35 [...] *ma naturalmente io agli interrogatori non gli ho detto che ero*
 ‘[...] but obviously when I was interrogated I did not tell them that I was [a resistance fighter]

02 *in montagna, g-o dit che ero scappato al mio paese, a Sulzara, a*
 in the mountains, **I told them** that I had fled to my home village, to Sulzara, so as to

03 *lavorare con i tedeschi, e siccome la mia classe l-ε 'stada tʃa'mada 'dɔpo,*
 work for the Germans, and since my age group **hadn't been called up yet** [to military service]

04 *io son del secondo semestre, mi son salvato*
 I was born in the second semester, I saved myself

Indirect speech occurrences also include three infinitive constructions, introduced by the preposition *de* followed by an infinitive verb form, as illustrated in extract (16), where the speaker recalls the partisans' habit of confiscating the local farmers' livestock in order to feed their troops:

(16) **LPm**

01 31:53 [...] *quando era impossibile avere da mangiare bisognava sequestrare*
 ‘[...] when it was impossible to get something to eat, we would confiscate

02 *qualche bestia e a'lura andavamo dal/ dal contadino, kɛl ke ge 'n-εra pjø*
 some cows, and **then** we would go to a farmer, **the one who owned the largest number**

03 *'tante e dicevamo de 'damen 'dʒona, inoltre, non solo lasciavamo la ricevuta,*
 [of cows] and we would tell [him] **to give us one**, however, we would give him not only a receipt

04 *ma anche la/ la dichiarazione che i partigiani avevano sequestrato*
 but also the/ the document attesting that the partisans had seized

05 *questa bestia*
 this cow’.

- (17) **LPm**
 01 33:43 *non hai raccontato quando en kan'ta-a di fronte ai la'ur la*
 'You have not told them about [that time] when **we were singing** in front of **those things/**
- 02 *quando i me di'zia de arin'dis*
 when **they asked us to surrender**
- 03 Interviewer: *Eh, ma l'hai raccontata tu ieri!*
 'Eh, but you told us yesterday!'
- 04 **Cm se te l-e kun'tada te=**
 'yes, you did='.
- 05 Interviewer: *=basta uno!*
 '=Once is enough!'

In (17), on the other hand, the interviewees recall another salient episode, which had already been portrayed in a previous interview, as the interviewer points out in line 3. A group of partisans, surrounded by the soldiers of the Fascist militia, dared sing “The red flag” in front of the enemy, who was taken by surprise and was unable to prevent their escape. Note, in line 2, another infinitive clause introduced by *de* and preceded by a Bresciano verb of saying. Contrary to Sakita’s (2002) findings, which highlight a correlation between indirect speech and the quotation of long and syntactically complex sentences, in our data indirect speech is normally deployed to report short, structurally simple clauses, as the above examples illustrate. The latter examples also confirm the impression that indirect constructions tend to be deployed when the speaker is less concerned with *verbatim* reporting or with the mimetic enactment of a given character, but provides only a sketchy account of the original conversation.

4 Concluding remarks

The World War II partisans whose speech is examined in this case study display a balanced bilingual competence no longer accessible to the younger generations. In the second half of the twentieth century, as a result of the on-going process of Italianization, the intergenerational transmission of Italo-Romance dialects was discontinued and Italian became the first language of an increasing part of the population. These differences in terms of ‘linguistic socialization’ (Bhatia & Ritchie 1999: 589) influenced the interviewees’ behaviour: they were inhibited from displaying their full linguistic and communicative competences by the request to give their testimony in Italian, a request motivated by the fact that school children, the final recipients of their speech, would be unlikely to understand the local Bresciano dialect. This limitation notwithstanding, the interviewees drew on their linguistic resources in order to organize their speech and distinguish the different voices alternating within the narration. They creatively resorted to the juxtaposition of Italian and Bresciano as a contextualization cue in order to signal a number of discursive activities, including the beginning and/or the end of reported speech, thereby elevating code-switching to the role of the quotative marker setting off the reported utterances from the main flow of a narrative episode.

The analysis showed that the insertion of a single word in a language other than the one used up to that point of the interaction may function as a cue signalling the onset of reported speech. This is especially evident in direct speech, where the switching of an interjection, a discourse marker or a pronoun (as in extract 18, below) may index the beginning of a quotation and ascribe a local identity, even in the absence of quoting frames:

(18) **Sf**

01 27:32 Ad un certo punto l'interprete dice «Noi sappiamo tu essere
 'At a certain point, the interpreter says «We know you are a

02 grande bandito» «**me**, bandito?» Perché i/ i ribelli li chiamavano
 big bandit» «**Me**, a bandit?» For the rebels [i.e. the partisans] used to be called

03 banditi, lo sa, no?
 bandits, you know that, don't you?»

The above extract reveals how the insertion of a monosyllabic pronoun like Bresciano *me* (instead of the corresponding Italian form, *io*) may serve a double purpose: *i*) indexing the beginning of the words pronounced by the narrator (who is recalling the interrogation to which she was subjected when she was arrested by the Nazis on the accusation of being a partisan dispatch-rider), and *ii*) constructing a local (Bresciano as well as partisan/anti-Fascist) identity as opposed to the extraneous, threatening presence of the Germans. Incidentally, the symbolic distance separating the narrator from the German occupants is also conveyed by the stylistic choice of a stereotyped, non-native variety of Italian («Noi sappiamo tu essere grande bandito», 'We know you are a big bandit'). The portrayal of the German interpreter as a 'foreigner' relies on a number of stereotyped linguistic traits (e.g. the absence of a complementizer after the main verb *sappiamo*; the use of the infinitive verb form *essere*; the ill-suited choice of an adjective like *grande* 'big'), that contribute to the 'construction of alterity' (cf. Günthner 2007) and enhance the separation between 'the occupants' and 'the local people'. Even a short dialogic sequence like the one mentioned above may be a resource for identity work and for shaping the various characters of a narrative episode (Bakhtin 1981).

The preference for *direct* over indirect constructions is apparent in our data, where direct speech is attested in four occurrences out of five. A reason for this probably lies in the higher complexity of indirect forms, which entail a shift of all deictic elements as well as the formulation of a subordinate clause, requiring syntactic planning unlikely to occur when talking about an emotional experience. Besides, direct constructions enable the speaker to re-enact the original dialogue as mimetically as possible, enhancing the vividness and the authenticity of the narration and depicting the speaker as a reliable witness of the recounted events (cf. Section 2.1).

As for the direction of the switchings, the data are inevitably affected by the choice of Italian as the language of the narration: the most common pattern involves a switch to Bresciano to contextualize reported speech and then a switch back to Italian, either spontaneously or prompted by the interviewers. In the rare excerpts where the narration is delivered in Bresciano, the opposite pattern prevails. Hence, it is not easy to determine whether the switchings are motivated by a mimetic intent or by the need to achieve a contrastive effect by the juxtaposition of elements belonging to different linguistic systems. A recent study focusing on code-switching between Italian and a Southern Italo-Romance dialect (Alfonzetti 2012: 128-129) suggests that the direction of the switching is inconsequential so far as a contrastive effect is achieved. The sociolinguistic setting examined by Alfonzetti (who analyzed the speech of bilingual adolescents living in Sicily), however, is very different from the one considered here.

The group of former World War II partisan analysed in this case study provides an interesting example of bilinguals who successfully exploit their language competences in order to balance narrative efficacy and semantic transparency. Without losing sight of their intended audience's language skills, they capitalised on their proficiency in the Bresciano dialect in order to organize the on-going narrative and accomplish identity work, thus injecting their invaluable testimony with a local flavour.

Acknowledgements: The present case study is part of the PRIN 2011 Research Project “*Rappresentazioni linguistiche dell’identità. Modelli sociolinguistici e linguistica storica* [Linguistic representations of identity. Sociolinguistic models and historical linguistics]”, financed by the Italian Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (MIUR) (prot. 2010HXPF2; national coordinator: professor Piera Molinelli, University of Bergamo).

References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 1992. *Il discorso bilingue. Italiano e dialetto a Catania*. Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 2012. *I giovani e il code-switching in Sicilia* [Youths and code-switching in Sicily]. *Materiali e ricerche* 31. Palermo: Centro di Studi Linguistici e Filologici Siciliani.
- Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter. 2011. Code-switching, conversational structure and social identities. In Raffaella Bombi, Mari D’Agostino, Silvia Dal Negro & Rita Franceschini (eds.), *Lingue e culture in Contatto. In memoria di Roberto Gusmani*. 27–45. Perugia: Guerra.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2007. Language alternation as a resource for identity negotiations among Dominican American bilinguals. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities. Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 29–55. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Bakhtin, Micheal M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bhatia Tej Krishan & William C. Ritchie. 1999. The bilingual child. In William C. Ritchie & Tej Krishan Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Child Language Acquisition*. 569–641. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 1985. «’l pulman l-è nen ch-a cammina tanto forte». Su commutazione di codice e mescolanza dialetto-italiano [«The bus is not going too fast». On code-switching and Italian-dialect mixing]. *Vox Romanica* 44. 59–76.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 1997. Code-switching and code-mixing. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The Dialects of Italy*, 394–400. London / New York: Routledge.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 2005. Dialect/standard convergence, mixing, and models of language contact: the case of Italy. In Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens & Paul Kerswill (eds.), *Dialect Change. The Convergence and Divergence of Dialects in Contemporary Societies*, 81–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 2012a. Sul ruolo dei complementatori nella commutazione di codice [On the role of complementizers in code-switching]. In Vincenzo Orioles (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica*. Vol. II, 27–41. Udine: Forum.
- Berruto, Gaetano. 2012b. Lingua nazionale e dialetti a 150 anni dall’Unità d’Italia [National language and Italo-Romance dialects 150 years after political unity]. In Pietro A. Di Pretoro & Rita Unfer Lukoschik (eds.), *Lingua e letteratura italiana 150 anni dopo l’Unità* [The Italian language and literature 150 years after political unity]. Atti del Convegno di Studi presso l’Università di Zurigo, 30 marzo – 1 aprile 2011. Muenchen, Meidenbauer. 95–111.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonfadini, Giovanni. 1989. Il dialetto bresciano: modello cittadino e varietà periferiche [Bresciano dialect: the urban model and the peripheral varieties]. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* XIV. 41–92.
- Bonfadini, Giovanni. 2010. Lombardi, dialetti [The Lombard dialects]. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell’Italiano Treccani*. On-line version. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/dialetti-lombardi_\(Enciclopedia-dell’Italiano\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/dialetti-lombardi_(Enciclopedia-dell’Italiano)) (accessed 8 April 2014).
- Calaresu, Emilia. 2004. *Testuali Parole. La dimensione pragmatica e testuale del discorso riportato* [Textual words. The pragmatic and textual dimension of reported speech]. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Clift, Rebecca. 2007. Getting there first: non narrative reported speech in interaction. In Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*, 120–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1986. Reported speech: some general issues. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, 1–28. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2007. Assessing and accounting. In Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*, 81–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2001. Language, situation and the relational self: theorizing dialect-style in sociolinguistics. In Penelope Eckert & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 185–210. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- D’Agostino, Mari. 2007. *Sociolinguistica dell’Italia contemporanea* [A sociolinguistic profile of contemporary Italy]. Bologna, Il Mulino.
- De Mauro, Tullio. 2003[1963]. *Storia linguistica dell’Italia unita* [Linguistic history of united Italy]. Roma-Bari, Laterza.

- De Mauro, Tullio. 2014. *Storia linguistica dell'Italia repubblicana. Dal 1946 ai nostri giorni* [Linguistic history of republican Italy. From 1946 to the present]. Roma-Bari, Laterza.
- Erving-Tripp, Susan. 2001. Variety, style-shifting and ideology. In Penelope Eckert & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 44–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fava Elisabetta & Anna Palmerini. 2005. Tra italiano e lombardo orientale: aspetti di bilinguismo e diglossia [Between Italian and Eastern Lombard: aspects of bilingualism and diglossia]. In Klaus Hölker & Christiane Maass (eds.), *Aspetti dell'italiano parlato*, 205–279. Münster: LIT.
- Fónagy, Ivan. 1986. Reported speech in French and Hungarian. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, 255–309. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Foresti, Fabio. 2003. Le varietà linguistiche e il “language planning” durante il fascismo: un bilancio degli studi (1977-2001) [Language varieties and language planning during the Fascist period: an overview of the existing studies (1977-2001)]. In Fabio Foresti (ed.), *Credere, Obbedire, Combattere. Il regime linguistico nel Ventennio*, 11–25. Bologna: Pendragon.
- Francescato, Giuseppe. 1986. Per una sottocategorizzazione dei *verba dicendi* [On the classification of verbs of saying]. In Klaus Lichem, Edith Mara & Susanne Knaller (Hrsg.), *Aspetti della sintassi dell'italiano contemporaneo*, 85–91. Tübingen: Narr.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. Interactive footing. In Elisabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*, 16–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grassi Corrado, Sobrero Alberto & Tullio Telmon. 2003. *Introduzione alla dialettologia italiana*. Roma-Bari, Laterza.
- Grosjean, François. 2001. The bilingual's language modes. In Janet Nicol (ed.), *One mind, two languages. Bilingual language processing*, 1–22. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guerini, Federica. 2011. Language policy and ideology in Italy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 210. 109–126.
- Guerini Federica & Silvia Dal Negro (eds.). 2011. Italian Sociolinguistics: twenty years on. [Special Issue]. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 210.
- Guerini, Federica. 2013. «Me en dger'manja ge ndo 'mia, io sto qui!» Commutazione di codice e organizzazione della conversazione nelle testimonianze degli ex partigiani in Valle Camonica [«I am not going to Germany, I am going to stay here!» Code-switching as a conversational strategy in the narrations of former partisans from the Camonica Valley]. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* XXXVII. 77–105.
- Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz John & Jenny Cook-Gumperz. 2007. A postscript: Style and identity in interactional sociolinguistics. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities. Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 477–501. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2007. The construction of otherness in reported dialogue as a resource for identity work. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and Social Identities. Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, 418–443. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Haakana Markku. 2007. Reported thought in complaint stories. In Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*, 150–177. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 1996. Reporting on talk: the use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29(3). 219–245.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2000. Reporting and reacting: Current responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33. 425–454.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2007. «I'm eyeing your chop up mind»: reporting and enacting. In Elizabeth Holt & Rebecca Clift (eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*, 47–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Graham M. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2009. Enquoting voices, accomplishing talk: Uses of *be + like* in Instant Messaging. *Language & Communication* 29. 77–113.
- Klein, Gabriella. 1986. *La politica linguistica del fascismo* [The language policy of the Fascist regime]. Bologna, il Mulino.
- Lavinio Cristina. 1998. Tipi di parlato e discorso riportato [Types of speech and reported discourse]. In Maria Teresa Navarro Salazar (ed.), *Italica Matritensia*, 299–313. Firenze: Franco Cesati Editore.
- Le Page Robert & Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Charles. N. 1986. Direct and Indirect Speech: a functional study. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, 29–45. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MacAulay, Ronald. 2005. *Talk that Counts: Age, Gender and Social Class Differences in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mayes, Patricia. 1990. Quotation in Spoken English. *Studies in Language* 14. 325–363.
- Mortara Garavelli, Bice. 1985. *La parola d'altri* [Other people's words]. Palermo: Sellerio.
- Mortara Garavelli, Bice. 1995a. Il discorso indiretto: risvolti teorici [Indirect speech: theoretical aspects]. In Mortara Garavelli Bice. *Ricognizioni. Retorica, grammatica, analisi dei testi*, 51–63. Napoli: Morano.

- Mortara Garavelli, Bice. 1995b. Il discorso riportato [Reported speech]. In Lorenzo Renzi, Gianpaolo Salvi & Anna Cardinaletti (eds.). *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*. Vol. III, 426–468. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Claredon Press.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London / New York: Longman.
- Romaine, Susan & Deborah, Lange. 1991. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thoughts: a case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech* 66(3). 227–279.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 2006. *L'indialetto ha la faccia scura* [The dialect has a dark face]. Palermo: Sellerio.
- Sakita, Tomoko I. 2002. *Reporting Discourse, Tense, and Cognition*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Sanga, Glauco. 1997. Lombardy. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The Dialects of Italy*, 253–259. London / New York: Routledge.
- Schenkein, Jim (ed.). 1978. *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, New York: Academic Press.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Singler, John V. 2001. Why you can't do a VARBUL study of quotatives and what such a study can show us. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 7(3). 257–278.
- Thompson, Geoff. 1996. Voices in the text. Discourse perspectives on language reports. *Applied Linguistics* 12. 365–382.
- Vološinov, Valentin Nikolaevic. 1971. Reported speech. In Ladislav Matejka & Krystyna Pomorska (eds.). *Reading in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, 149–175. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Yule, George. 1993. Vera Hayden's dilemma, or the indirection of direct speech. In Mushira Eid & Gregory K. Iverson (eds.). *Principles and Prediction: The Analysis of Natural Language*, 233–242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.