The *'listen to characters thinking'* novel

Fictive interaction as narrative strategy in English literary bestsellers and their Polish and Spanish translations

Esther Pascual and Emilia Królak

Zhejiang University, China / University of Social Sciences, Poland

This article explores direct speech involving *fictive interaction*, that is not functioning as an ordinary quote (e.g. "a look of *'I told you so'*", Pascual, 2006, 2014). We specifically deal with its use as a literary strategy, in which different fictive speech constructions may serve to: (i) give access to characters' mental worlds; (ii) show the relationships and non-verbal communication between characters; (iii) create new semantic categories; and (iv) produce such rhetorical effects as vividness or humor. Special emphasis is placed on a comparative analysis of the English fictive direct speech plus noun construction (e.g. "the *'why bother?'* attitude") with its translations into Polish and Spanish. We show that the construction proves a challenge to translators, since neither of these languages has an exact syntactic equivalent. This study is based on an extensive and heterogeneous database that includes 30 bestselling novels from different genres, published between 1935 and 2013.

1.   Introduction

Literary fiction is by definition about the imaginary, about a self-contained made-up world governed by rules that may or may not resemble those of actuality. Regardless of how realistic a novel may be, knowing about the mental and emotional states of fictional characters, as well as the relationships they hold with other characters, is critical for understanding and fully appreciating the plot of a literary work.

A vastly common literary technique that allows readers to access characters' inner selves and their relationship with others, one which may come from theater, is having them speak with each other (e.g. Brumme & Espunya, 2012). These fictional dialogues may even involve animals and entities (cf. Xiang, 2016). In Lewis Carroll's (1865) *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, for instance, the main character converses with the Cheshire Cat and follows the instructions in two messages written on – and ascribed to – an inanimate bottle ("*DRINK ME*") and a small cake ("*EAT ME*"). Two related literary devices to gain access to the mind of literary characters are free indirect speech (Jakobson, [1957] 1971; Eckardt, 2014) and 'distancing indirect speech or thought' (Dancygier & Vandelanotte, 2009; Vandelanotte, 2004, 2009, 2010, 2012). In free indirect speech, a character's mental and emotional states are presented from that character's perspective, but integrated in a third person narrative, as in "Bob welcomed [Anna] with excitement. *He had found her car key! Wasn't she lucky to have him?*" (Eckardt, 2014, p. 1). By contrast, 'distancing indirect speech or thought' involves incorporating another's discourse without shifting to another deictic center, as in "Bob welcomed [Anna] with excitement. *He was the one who had found her car key. She was lucky to have him*".

In this paper we discuss a fourth literary device that seems to share formal and functional characteristics with imaginary dialogues, free indirect speech, and distancing indirect speech or thought, while having forms and functions of its own. This constitutes the use of literary dialogues that never happened in actuality (they are not quotes from real conversations), and that we maintain should not be construed as belonging to the fictional world of a novel plot either. Instead, they help to tell the story by showing a character's deictic center while maintaining the narrator's perspective. Consider for instance this fragment from Tolstoy's masterpiece, *War and Peace* (our italics and underlining):[1]

(1)   He seemed to <u>say</u> by his <u>look</u>: *"I know you, I do, but what is the use of bothering with you? Though you would be glad enough if I did."* It may be that, upon meeting women, <u>he did not think that</u> (indeed, it is very likely he did not, because he thought very little anyway), but such was his look and his manner. (*War and Peace*, vol. IV. by Lev N. Tolstoy, 1864-1869, translated from the Russian by Leo Wiener, 1904, p. 363)

In (1), a piece in the direct speech, displaying dialogical features, such as the first and second person pronouns and the interrogative form, is used as a means of characterizing a character's "look and his manner". The enunciation in question (i.e. *"I know you, I do, but…"*) is not the character's reported thought, as made explicit by the narrator, or something the character – let alone his look – actually said. The 'speech' demonstrating what that particular kind of look seems to communicate is neither actual (it was never

---

[1] In all examples fictive direct speech appears in italics and underlining marks dialogic elements or parts of the selected fragment we want to draw particular attention to.

uttered in the real world) nor is it fictional in the elementary sense of being part of the story at hand (it isn't presented as uttered by a character in Tolstoy's novel). It is thus ontologically different from the altogether imaginary scenario in which it is embedded (i.e. the plot of *War and Peace*). This enunciation is construed as *fictive* (Talmy, [1996] 2000), it is utterly imagined in nature and presented for the purpose of ongoing discourse, a case of what has been called *fictive interaction* or 'FI' (Pascual, 2006, 2014, Pascual & Sandler, 2016). Note that the non-genuine channel of communication set up is relevant in the factual interaction in the narrative (i.e. the made-up relationship between literary characters). Indeed, "Tolstoy believed that although people lie when they speak, their true thoughts can often be read in their facial or bodily expressions" (Proffer, [1969] 1984, p. 29). Giving voice to a look, even in appearance, may thus be used as a literary device to present a character's state of mind or attitude towards others, one the character in question may not even be aware of, as in (1). This may even involve a non-human – and a non-anthropomorphic – being, who can thus communicate but not factually 'speak'. For instance:

(2)   [The <u>dog</u>] was looking at him and its <u>eyes</u> were <u>saying</u>, *I won't hurt you, don't be afraid, she wasn't when I found her on that other day.* (*Seeing,* by José Saramago, 2004, translated from the Portuguese by Margaret Jull Costa, 2006, p. 131)

Both amateur and experienced novelists seem to use fictive direct speech constituents ascribed to looks, facial expressions, gestures, tones of voice, feelings, or attitudes as a literary alternative to descriptions, pieces of dialogue, or sentences in the free indirect speech or distancing indirect speech or thought. In English, these may occur at different

levels of syntactic embedding: the clause (3a), the phrase (3b), and even the lexeme (3c):

(3) a.   The two women exchanged glances, which <u>said</u>: *He was bound to say it, let's get it over with*. (*The Golden Notebook* by Doris Lessing, 1962, p. 19)

    b.   …who go to the museum and, instead of looking at the magnificent Brueghel, take a picture of it […]. It's not *"Look what Brueghel did, painted this masterpiece"* but *"Look what 'I' did, went to Rotterdam and stood in front of a Brueghel painting!"* (*"Let's Explore Diabetes with Owls" Essays, Etc.* by David Sedaris, 2013, p. 233)

    c.   I *no-no-no'*ed my index finger at him. (*"You better not cry"* by Augusten Burroughs, 2009, p. 88)

As suggested by the English translations of literary fragments originally written in Russian (example 1), Portuguese (2), and Norwegian (4b below), fictive speech constructions appear in different and diverse languages (and see also Pascual, 2014, p. 29-57, 84-112, Pascual & Sandler, 2016). Even though as a linguistic phenomenon fictive interaction is cross-linguistically very widespread, some of its grammatical manifestations still constitute a challenge for translators, since not all languages display them at the same grammatical level. For instance, the grammar of Germanic languages allows the use of direct speech constituents as nominal modifiers, as in the examples in (4) below, something that is altogether ungrammatical in Slavic languages (Królak, 2008, 2016) or Romance languages (Pascual, 2010, 2014). The direct speech plus head noun construction is a particularly interesting one, as it involves the embedding of a fictive (part of a) dialogue – a discourse or conversational element – into a syntactic constituent: a nominal phrase or even a lexical item, both used as a head noun and as the

modifier of a nominal compound (see overview of the latter in Królak, 2008; Pascual et al., 2013, Pascual, 2014, pp. 59-81). Consider for instance the following rather complex literary examples, in which a head noun is modified by an elliptic enunciation (4a), an incomplete one (4b), and two coordinate clauses of different illocutionary force, with a vocative (4c):

(4) a. She would sing about hard times, bad times, and *somebody-done-gone-and-left-me* times. (*The Bluest Eye* by Toni Morrison, [1979] 1990, p. 18)

b. They love these *the-father-of-my-child's-a-celeb* etc., etc. stories, don't they. (*The Snowman* by Jo Nesbø, translated from the Norwegian by Don Bartlett, 2010, p. 401)

c. The man had probably spent years perfecting this look: the *Shut up, client, I'm thinking* look. (*Gone Girl* by Gillian Flynn, 2012, p. 62)

This construction is further interesting for having been poorly studied. The lack of attention it has received from grammarians and literary scholars alike may explain the fact that there is no consistency in its punctuation (it is typically marked with hyphens and/or quotation marks), even within the same novel by one given author (Pascual, 2014, p. 20). This is an additional challenge for translators.

As mentioned above, the grammars of Slavic and Romance languages do not allow such grammatically complex nominal modification. This does not mean, we hasten to point out, that these languages do not display fictive direct speech constructions as such. They certainly do, appearing 'only' as clauses, phrases, or lexical heads. Consider the following attested examples from Polish (5) and Spanish (6), by professional and non-professional writers:

(5) a. *Myślę, że to pewnie któraś z dziewczyn zawiadamia, że musi odwołać weekendowe spotkanie i z miną pod tytułem: wiedziałam, że tak będzie odczytuję wiadomość.* (www.scarabee.blog.pl)

Lit. 'I suspect that one of the girls is informing me that she must call off the weekend meeting and I'm reading the message with the face <u>entitled</u>: *I knew it.'*

b. *Wszystko jest nie tak, człowiek boi się jej o cokolwiek zapytać, bo zaraz lodowe spojrzenie typu "jestem tobą rozczarowana".*

Lit. 'Everything is wrong, you are afraid to ask about anything because you may immediately get the ice-cold look of the type *"you disappoint me".'* (www.feliz76.blox.pl)

c. *Godzina a-czy-po-nas-nic-nie-pozostanie.*

Lit. 'The hour *Won't anything be left of us.'*

('The hour of *do-we-vanish-too-without-a-trace*', official translation by Stanisław Barańczak and Clare Cavanagh, poem "Czwarta nad ranem" 'Four in the morning' by Wisława Szymborska)

(6) a. *Fue entonces cuando María cambió de posición y situó sus ojos a la altura de los de su marido, en señal de atención, como queriéndole decir "continúa hablando, te escucho".*

Lit. 'It was then when Mary changed positions and placed her eyes at the height of her husband's, in a sign of attention, as if willing to <u>say</u> to him *"keep talking, I'm listening to you".'* (*Un Burca por Amor* by Reyes Monforte, 2007, p. 159)

b. *Mi padre asintió, ponderando la casualidad con gesto de mira-tú-por-dónde.*

Lit. 'My father nodded, considering the coincidence with a gesture <u>of</u> *look-who-would-have-thought-of-that.'*

Lit. 'My father nodded, with a *fancy-that* gesture.' (*La Sombra del Viento* by Carlos Ruiz Zafón, 2001, p. 190)

c. *Una de estas personas "quiero y no puedo" que se sumergen en la cursilería de un falso señorío.*

Lit. 'One of these people *"I want but cannot"* that immerse themselves in the kitschness of a false royalty behavior.' (*La Gangrena* by Mercedes Salisachs, 1974, p. 27)

In these examples, a particular kind of facial expression, look, gesture, feeling, or attitude is presented through a direct speech construction ascribed to such an expression, gesture, or state (or the time when that state typically emerges, in 5c), using different syntactic constructions other than the modifier plus noun one.

In this paper, we discuss the literary function of various English direct speech constructions in international bestsellers and examine whether they survived in their translations into Polish and Spanish. We seek to understand how the alternative constructions used by the translators influence the reading of the relevant literary passages.

2. Data

We selected instances of fictive speech constructions from 30 bestsellers originally written in English by (near-)native speakers of British, American, or Canadian English. In order to have a heterogeneous enough database, we included works of literary fiction from different genres, specifically: fantasy, comedy, thriller, erotic, historical novel, memoirs, and one book on the life sciences for a lay audience. The great majority of

these acclaimed works show creative uses of fictive interaction compounds ('FI C.' in the table in Appendix I), from just one instance (in *The Berlin Stories* or *The Bluest Eye*) to over a dozen (in *Fifty Shades of Grey* and *Gone Girl*). Most novels also contain examples of fictive interaction on other levels (the clause, the phrase, or the lexical head). All these examples were either found by ourselves, as we read the books, or they were provided by colleagues or other relations who knew of our interest in the phenomenon. In the latter case, we naturally checked the examples in question to be able to assess their validity and also scanned the entire novels for further occurrences. The 30 bestsellers with fictive speech constructions considered in this paper are listed in chronological order in Appendix I, specifying their author, genre, extension, year of first publication, and amount of fictive interaction compounds (for the translation study).

Since our focus is the use of fictive interaction as a narrative device, we only considered entirely creative cases. We disregarded lexicalized instances, as in (7a), or those representing an actual quote from speech (7b) or thought (7c), even when involving constructed speech (Tannen, 1986, 1988, [1989] 2007) in a hypothetical or counterfactual scenario (7d):

(7) a. You - stand - there - and tell - me that you dig a pit in a garden, and just make a cesspit, without a *by-your-leave*, without any authority! (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 70)

  b. I keep coming back to the *I don't do the girlfriend thing* quote, and I'm angry that I didn't pounce on this information sooner, […]. (*Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James, 2011, p. 53)

    c.   Alice looked around the big expensive room. She thought: *I'll take one of those little netsukes, and run out, they'll think it was the Spanish woman.* (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 34)

    d.   …Alice knew that if she had got up and put her arms about him he would have collapsed in to her embrace like a little heap of matchsticks, with, *'Alice, I'm sorry, I don't mean it, please come and be my partner.'* (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 273)

Since a clear indicator of and one of the characteristics of fictive speech is viewpoint information (Pascual & Sandler, 2016, p. 11-12), we also disregarded ambiguous instances, with no explicit deixis, as in (8a), or involving a fictive enunciation presented through indirect reported speech, as in (8b):

(8)   a.   Alice slid back into her place, saying, to their querying, *ready-for-any-emergency* looks, 'It's all right, it was nothing.' (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 182)

        b.   She shut the door on the kitchen, and on a <u>laugh</u> that <u>said</u> she was bossy, but not impossibly so. (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 91)

In cases in which a given creative fictive interaction occurrence was used more than once in the same literary work, we only counted that instance once. For the translation study of the direct speech modifiers, we chose five bestselling novels that had a minimum of three examples each, had become particularly popular, represented a different genre and decade, and had been translated into both Polish and Spanish. In total, 39 instances of fictive speech modifiers were found in the original English

construction of those five bestsellers. The novels in question are: *The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing (1985)*, The Gun Seller* by Hugh Laurie (1996)*, Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* by J. K. Rowling (2007)*, Think of a Number* by John Verdon (2010), and *Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James (2011), which belong to the genres of historical fiction, comedy, fantasy, thriller, and eroticism, respectively. Please see the details concerning the editions of the original English versions and their published Polish and Spanish translations used in this study in Appendix II.

3. Analysis: Fictive interaction as literary strategy

Fictive interaction plays various and diverse functions in language, depending, among others, on the type of text in which it occurs (Pascual & Sandler 2016, pp. 113-168). In this paper we concentrate on the most important functions of fictive interaction in literary bestsellers, which seem to be: (i) giving access to characters' mental worlds; (ii) showing relationships and non-verbal communication between characters; (iii) creating new categories of concepts; and (iv) adding vividness and humor. It should be noted that these functions are not mutually exclusive and often intertwine. All of them can appear in one and the same example, as in the two instances below, a direct speech modifier and a nominal head:

(9)   When my shadow fell on Sparks's table, she glanced up with an *Is-that-the-person-I-was-expecting-oh-it's-a-monster-from-the-darkest-pits-my-date-must-be-late* look. She turned back to her paperback, an Oscar Wilde collection. When I put my hand on the chair across from her, she gave me her best *Why-are-you-stopping-here-when-you-must-be-planning-to-maul-someone-at-another-table?* (*Nevernever* by Will Shetterly, 1993, p. 5)

The two fictive interaction constituents above give readers access to the thoughts and emotions of the character to whom both fictive enunciations are ascribed, thereby showing her attitude towards some individual she encountered at a particular moment by demonstrating a category or type of look she gave to that individual at that point. Additionally, the passage becomes humorous and grabs our attention immediately: the two fictive interaction parts are unusually long and contain such rhetorical devices as emotive interjections ("*oh*"), exaggeration ("*monster from the darkest pits*", "*maul*"), and rhetorical questions ("*Is that the person I was expecting*", "*Why-are-you-stopping-here…?*").

In this section of the paper we will illustrate the discourse functions of fictive interaction with the original English data from our 30 literary bestsellers. We will also discuss whether the original fictive direct speech compounds in the 5 bestsellers we selected for the translation part of our study were kept in their Polish and Spanish versions respectively, and if not, what effect was lost as a result.

3.1 Access to characters' mental worlds

In literature, fictive interaction frequently fulfills the function of revealing to readers the mental and emotional states of characters. This may be illustrated by these examples:

(10) a. So I have my usual *Poor Go* [i.e. 'Poor Mar<u>go</u>'] face on when Nick emerges, the
           eggs hardened on the plate. (*Gone Girl* by Gillian Flynn, 2012, p. 111)

      b. He lowered himself into the alcove seat beside her with a little *well-here-we-are*
           sigh. (*The Child in Time* by Ian McEwan, 1987, p. 174)

The characters' intimate thoughts and attitudes can be accessed not only by verbally depicting their facial expressions and bodily reactions but also by giving 'voice' to paralinguistic or rhetorical features. Consider the direct speech compound in (11a) below, together with its official translations into Polish (11b) and Spanish (11c).

(11) a.   "That's why I wanted him here today," said Rodríguez in his *I'm-in-charge-here* style. (*Think of a Number* by John Verdon, 2010, p. 208)

   b.   *Dlatego właśnie chciałem, żeby tu się dzisiaj zjawił – powiedział Rodriguez tonem "nie-zapominajcie-kto-tu-rządzi".*
   Lit. 'That is why I wanted him to turn up here today – said Rodriguez using the tone *"don't-forget-who-rules-here"*.' (2011, p. 214)

   c.   *Por eso lo quería aquí hoy -dijo Rodríguez en su estilo de aquí mando yo.*
   Lit. 'For this I wanted him here today – said Rodriguez in his style of *here I'm the one who's in charge*.' (2011, p. 18)

Here, the character's domineering attitude appears verbalized in a fictive enunciation ascribed to him, which helps frame and interpret his actual words in the story ("That's why I wanted him here today"). In the original English version of the novel and in the Spanish translation of this extract the fictive speech revealing bossiness grammatically modifies the noun 'style'. Such an attitude is thus presented as characteristic of the fictive speaker's overall social behavior. In the Polish translation, however, it is the noun 'tone' that is modified by the fictive enunciation. The quality of the character's tone of voice is thus used as an indication of the character's attitude, motives, and intentions when uttering his actual words. In all three versions, what the character meant

with his initial utterance is presented as fictive direct speech, a not uncommon strategy (cf. Pascual 2014, pp. 123-126). It is probably for this reason that the fictive speech and thus the function it serves were maintained in both the Polish and Spanish translations.

Let us now turn to another interesting literary strategy involving fictive interaction whose function is to expose the thoughts of the main character:

(12) a. My subconscious nods sagely, a *you've-finally-worked-it-out-stupid* look on her face. (*Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James, 2011, p. 237)

   b. *Moja podświadomość mądrze kiwa głową z wyrazem twarzy mówiącym "Wreszcie do tego doszłaś, głuptasie".*
   Lit. 'My subconscious nods sagely with an expression saying "*You have finally worked it out, you fool*".' (2012, p. 404)

   c. *Mi subconsciente asiente, sabia, con cara de "Por fin te has dado cuenta, boba".*
   Lit. 'My subconscious nods, wise, with a face/expression of "*Finally you noticed, fool*".' (2012, p. 361)

Throughout this novel, the character's subconscious appears personified, her conflicting thoughts often being presented in the form of an internal dialogue between the subconscious and the self. In (12) the point of view held by the subconscious is conveyed by means of a fictive utterance that verbally demonstrates its 'body language', what the alter ego communicates non-verbally to the character's self. Additionally, the fact that the narrator's subconscious addresses her own self through the derogatory vocative 'stupid' creates a comic impact. All the rhetorical effects achieved in this passage were kept by the translators of the original, as fictive enunciation was maintained both in the Polish (12b) and the Spanish (12c) versions.

3.2 Relationship and non-verbal communication between characters

The use of fictive interaction in literary works allows the authors to reveal not only the characters' unexpressed views and feelings but also the meaning of their non-verbal signs by means of which they communicate with others. These messages, akin to thoughts, can be conveyed via different body parts and movements. Examples are:

(13) a.   She gave him a <u>look</u>, a <u>shrug</u>, which <u>said</u> — *There's nothing we can do for* now. (*Atonement* by Ian McEwan, [2001] 2003, p. 135)

  b.   While most <u>handshakes</u> <u>mumble</u>, his <u>spoke</u> clearly, <u>saying</u> both *We'll get through this as quickly as possible* and *I'm looking forward to your vote this coming November.* (*Dress your Family in Corduroy and Denim* by David Sedaris, 2004, p. 45)

  c.   "Ça va?" [Dentist] Dr. Granat asked, and I <u>raised my hand</u>, international dental <u>sign</u> for *"There is something vital I need to communicate". ("Let's explore diabetes with owls" Essays, Etc.* by David Sedaris, 2013, p. 9)

In the examples above a look and a shrug, a handshake, and raising one's hand are presented as communicators conveying particular messages expressed by means of fictive speech constituents. What these instances of non-verbal communication reveal can thus not be an actual utterance, even when introduced by indisputably verbs of saying as 'to mumble', 'to speak', and 'to say' in (13a) and (13b), and even when presented as a conventional sign rather than a gesture, as in (13c).

This strategy helps novelists show the often intricate relationship between fictional characters in literature. This is particularly evident in the examples below (Pascual et al., 2013, pp. 352-353):

(14) a. Tom looked at the Perfectionist. He made his *'no big deal to me'* face.

The Perfectionist looked at Tom. She made her *'same here'* face. (*All My Friends Are Superheroes* by Andrew Kaufman, 2006, pp. 101-102)

b. '...sometimes I dream about this guy I kissed in a bar last month.' Natalie made a noise. 'Something you should have told me about?'

'Maybe. But not like that. It was a *Fuck Off* Kiss.'

'You were telling him to fuck off?'

'No, I was <u>telling everyone else</u> they could fuck off. (*American Gods* by Neil Gaiman, 2001, p. 615)

The example in (14a) presents an exchange of looks as two non-actual conversational turns. This shows that fictive interaction, as its name suggests, reflects and represents a communicative exchange between individuals, even if it never occurred in actuality. It sets up messages that are always directed at somebody, even when this somebody may be our inner self or alter ego, as in (12) above. Example (14b) illustrates the fact that a kiss can communicate a message not only to its recipient but also to those witnessing the act of kissing, and thus 'overhearing' the fictive enunciation from the kisser to the kissee. The silent message the kiss communicates to others, what it reveals to them, can then appear as a characterizing feature of that kiss.

Let us now consider further examples of fictive interaction illustrating this function of demonstrating the relationship between characters and see whether it is preserved in the Polish and Spanish translations of the original English texts:

(15) a.   Her mood soon became obvious to them, and they even exchanged *'Mummy-is-cross'* glances at one point, earning from her a sarcastic smile. (*The Good Terrorist* by Doris Lessing, 1985, p. 294)

  b.   *Wkrótce zorientowali się, że jest nie w humorze, i wymienili nawet w pewnym momencie spojrzenia w stylu "mama się gniewa", co spotkało się z jej sarkastycznym uśmiechem* (2008, p. 331)

  Lit. 'Soon they realized that she is in a bad mood and at one point they even exchanged the looks of the style "*mummy is cross*".'

  c.   *Ellos no tardaron en captar su estado de ánimo y en cierto momento incluso intercambiaron una mirada que decía "mamá está enfadada", que les valió una sarcástica sonrisa de ella.* (2007, p. 385)

  Lit. 'They didn't take long to see her mood and at a certain point they even exchanged a look that <u>said</u> "*mummy is cross*", which cost them a sarcastic smile from her.'

At this point in the novel, characters communicate non-verbally by exchanging a particularly communicative type of look. The message they convey is expressed by the author by means of the fictive enunciation "*mummy is cross*". Since the reader knows that the three characters involved do not have a child-parent relationship (they are all comrades), the characterization of that look must be interpreted non-literally. The embedded fictive enunciation metonymically sets up the prototypical script of a mother

being angry at and disappointed about her children's actions and making the children feel guilty about that (see section 4). The two men presented as exchanging glances in the narrative seem to be in a close relationship with the woman who accompanies them. They may consider the female character had a slightly patronizing attitude towards them, which they treat with some dose of humor or irony. This example shows that the use of even a short piece of fictive direct speech may provide rich information about the relationships between characters. A similar interpretation of the scene is favored by the Polish and Spanish translations of the text. In both cases the translators decided to preserve the fictive enunciation in the original as a means of specifying the non-verbal communication between characters through embedding a fictive enunciation in a categorizing nominal phrase ('looks of the style') in the Polish version in (15b) and following a communicative verb ('a look that said') in the Spanish version in (15c). This is not the case for the following example and its Polish and Spanish translations:

(16) a. Ron looked around at Harry and Hermione, to see Hermione giving him a *stop-talking-now!* sort of look, but the damage was done; […] (*Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* by J.K. Rowling, 2007, p. 105)

   b. *Spojrzał na Harry'ego, a potem na Hermionę, która dawała mu znaki, by zamilkł. Było już jednak za późno.* (p. 130)

      Lit. 'He looked at Harry and then at Hermione, who gave him <u>signals to stop talking</u>. But it was already too late.'

   c. *Echó una ojeada a sus amigos, y vió que Hermione le lanzaba una mirada de advertencia: "¡No digas ni una palabra más!"; pero el mal ya estaba hecho.* (p. 113)

      Lit. 'He looked at his friends, and saw that Hermione threw him a <u>look of warning</u>: *"Don't even say one more word!"*; but the damage was already done.'

In this passage from a fantasy novel the author also presents characters communicating non-verbally by means of a particular look. In the original version what is revealed by the look in question is demonstrated by the fictive command "*Stop talking now!*", modifying the head noun 'look'. The use of the imperative construction followed by the exclamation mark evidences that the character's reaction was very emotional and that the atmosphere of the overall scene was rather tense. This effect is weakened in the Polish version of the text, in which the translator decided against using the direct speech construction, replacing it with an infinitive phrase ('signals to stop'), which merely presents the content of what is silently communicated from one character to another without the emotional aspect we find in the original. In the Spanish translation, by contrast, we observe the use of a 'double' strategy. The fictive interaction part is preserved, which serves to illustrate the characters' reaction and makes the scene quite vivid and easy to imagine. Additionally, the prepositional phrase is used to describe the kind of look at issue as a 'look of warning', a characterization that can be inferred from the fictive enunciation defining the look, but that is absent from the original.

Novel characters may communicate non-verbally not only by means of body language but also via different objects they may display or exchange with each other. Consider:

(17) a. The next morning she […] picks out an aggressive *touch-me-if-you-dare* suede outfit in armor gray […]. (*Wilderness Tips* by Margaret Atwood, 1991, p. 196)

    b. *You think you know*, Bill seemed to be <u>saying</u> in every [art]work, *but you don't know. I subvert your truisms, jokes, absurdities*. (*What I loved* by Siri Hustvedt, 2003, p. 297)

These examples show that inanimate objects such as clothes or art may be presented as fictively 'speaking' for their owners or creators, or those individuals may be fictively speaking through them, as those objects reveal aspects of their inner selves. Below is another example of an object as medium of communication, and its translations into Polish and Spanish:

(18) a. An airline ticket. A *come away with me for the weekend and we'll have wheelbarrows full of sex and champagne* ticket. (*The Gun Seller* by Hugh Laurie, 1996, p. 188)

   b. *Bilet lotniczy. Bilet z gatunku: "Wyjedziemy razem na weekend, będziemy uprawiać seks i pić szampana od świtu do nocy".* (p. 235)
   Lit. 'An airline ticket. A ticket of the type "*Let's go away for the weekend together, we'll have sex and drink champagne from dawn till dusk*".'

   c. *Un billete de avión. Un ven conmigo a pasar el fin de semana y a disfrutar de sexo desenfrenado y cubiteras de champán.* (p. 115)
   Lit. 'An airline ticket. A *come spend the weekend with me and enjoy wild sex and buckets of champagne.*'

The airline ticket referred to in (18) was given to one of the novel's female characters by her romantic partner. Its particular meaning or purpose is pinpointed by a sample of fictive speech attributed to the male character, the giver of the 'talking' ticket. This provides the reader with much information about the kind of relationship the lovers have – or one the male character wishes them to have. The use of the fictive interaction construction for this purpose adds to the vividness and humor of this excerpt. These

effects were preserved in the Polish and Spanish translations in (18b) and (18c) respectively, as both translators kept the direct speech construction used in the original, even if presenting them in a different grammatical structure.

3.3 Categorizing function

Another important function of fictive interaction in literature is categorization, that is, giving a unique name to a particular type of individual, entity, or process that the writer may find especially salient in a given context. The following examples of the construction illustrate what properties or what (sub)types of the categories fictive speech serves to introduce.

(19) a. I give Margery my *"I have seen you naked"* look, but, as always, it has no effect. (*Barrel Fever* by David Sedaris, 1994, p. 51)

b. He was standing in front of me now, his hands held wide in that *welcome-to-my-vision* gesture that politicians like to use these days [...] (*The Gun Seller* by Hugh Laurie, 1996, p. 169)

c. I know I am going to be angry – that quick inhale, the lips going tight, the shoulders up, the *I so don't want to be mad but I'm going to be* feeling. Do men not know that feeling? (*Gone Girl* by Gillian Flynn, 2012, p. 72)

Note that the categorization of a look, a gesture, and a mental and emotional state by means of fictive enunciation fragments in (19) constitutes a very precise and productive linguistic device, especially when compared with the traditional modes of categorization achieved by adjective plus noun combinations, such as 'angry look', 'anxious look', or

'quizzical look'. The reader has no doubts as to what is meant to communicate with the looks and gesture in (19a), and (19b), and the feeling in (19c). Additionally, categorization based on the fictive speech fragment allows us to create virtually countless classes of body language, mental or emotional states, and an infinite number of other entities (see the discussion below). In other words, the language user can make up as many names for types of non-verbal signals as there are thoughts, feelings, or communicative intentions that may motivate their occurrence. It is worth nothing that the categorization function of fictive speech is especially evident in the English nominal compound construction, in which a fictive interaction unit modifies the head noun that follows it, as in the examples in (19). By virtue of its form, this construction introduces a new semantic category that helps present what may be a familiar referent in a new light.

The kind of fictive interaction fragments that may serve as the basis for categorization of given (types of) individuals, entities, or concepts vary in degree of conventionalization. They may occasionally be quite context specific and difficult to interpret outside the original communicative event in which they appeared. More often, however, they contain a proposition that is easily recognizable to addressees, as it is retrievable from their experience with everyday language use. The fictive utterance itself may also be familiar, as it forms part of the interlocutors' shared social, cultural, or historical knowledge, as illustrated by the examples below:

(20) a. I asked [the secretary] if she knew why he had called me, and in one of those bored, *I-only-work-here* voices, she said she didn't. (*Hand to Mouth* by Paul Auster, 1997, p. 379)

   b. Did it suggest a healthy lack of a *winning-is-all* mentality or was it an excuse for

laxness? (*What I loved* by Siri Hustvedt, 2003, p. 128)

c. These *'make love, not war'* primates have evolved peaceful societies with female bonding and female dominance. (*Tree of Origin* by Frans De Waal, 2002, p. 41)

The fictive utterances in the examples above are well-known to many users of the English language. They may thus give access to so-called 'socio-cultural scenarios', the organized knowledge structures stored in our brains. The fact that certain fictive speech expressions are capable of activating entire socio-culturally meaningful scenes makes them very economic – much more is communicated than explicitly verbalized.

Both the fictive interaction constituent and the head noun in a direct speech compound take part in the creation of the particular category. The semantic range of head nouns that can be found in these nominal constructions is quite striking. Especially important, however, is the fact that all the categories of head nouns can be placed within the CONVERSATION frame, that is, they are somehow related to human verbal interaction. Novelists frequently use these linguistic structures to characterize their characters, as in:

(21) a. He seems very keen, says I'm his – but that's just part of his *I-must-own-and-have-everything-now* – control-freak dominant self, surely. (*Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James, 2011, p. 26)

b. "But you don't give a rat's fart, do you, it's only the Forbidden Forest, Harry *I've-Faced-Worse* Potter doesn't care what happens to her in there— […]" (*Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* by J.K. Rowling, 2007, p. 253)

In (21a), the fictive interaction plus noun phrase construction is used in order to unambiguously present a particularly salient personality trait of one of the novel's main characters, a hyperbolic demonstration ascribed to that character, presented from the viewpoint of another character (i.e. the utterer of the extract in 21a). Example (21b) is similar and particularly interesting for both its form and semantics. First, the fictive interaction fragment does not precede the noun but is used as a kind of 'middle name' – in between the first and second name of the character. This kind of infix is, in fact, quite common in literature. Other examples are "Christian *I-don't-want-you* Grey" from *Fifty Shades of Grey* and "*Call-Me-Roger* Buchanan" from *The Gun Seller* (for similar ones in ordinary language use, see Pascual, 2014, p. 74). In both cases, the enacted statements are attributed to characters other than the one speaking and present something they in fact never said earlier in the novel, or not with these exact words. These pseudo-quotations are set up in order to present the speaker's assessment of them and their attitude and thus involve a mixed viewpoint (cf. Pascual 2006, p. 255, Pascual & Sandler, 2016, pp. 11-12).

Apart from referring to types of people, fictive interaction fragments may categorize many other phenomena. Let us now consider two more examples in (22) and (23) below, both from the same novel:

(22) a. Kate is excited as she heads into the kitchen for our '*Exams are finished hurrah Champagne*'. (*Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James, 2011, p. 36)

 b. *Kate cała w skowronkach idzie prosto do kuchni po naszego "szampana na koniec egzaminów".* (p. 70)

 Lit. 'Kate full of excitement goes straight to the kitchen for our "champagne for the end of exams".'

c. *Kate está emocionada mientras se dirige a la cocina por nuestro "Champán para celebrar que nuestros exámenes han acabado".* (p. 54)

Lit. 'Kate is excited as she heads to the kitchen for our *"Champagne to celebrate that our exams are over".*'

The kind of champagne in (22a) is characterized by means of a fictive utterance ascribed to the individuals who are about to celebrate a particular kind of successful event with it. The fictive interaction fragment makes the scene more vivid and it expresses the emotional state of the fictional characters at that moment, particularly through the use of the emotive interjection 'hurrah'. Both the interjection and the celebratory cheer itself are missing from the Polish and Spanish translations in (22b) and (22c). Both translators replaced the demonstration in the English original with mere descriptions of the purpose of drinking the champagne, which lack the emotional layer in the original. Let us consider a similar example:

(23) a. He's more like the brother I never had. Katherine often teases me that I'm missing the *need-a-boyfriend* gene, but the truth is I just haven't met anyone who… well, whom I'm attracted to, [...] (*Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James, 2011, p. 23-24)

b. *Traktuję go raczej jak brata, którego nigdy nie miałam. Katherine często się zemną droczy, że brak mi genu "potrzebny mi chłopak", ale prawda jest taka, że po prostu nie spotkałam nikogo, kto... cóż, kto by mi się spodobał [...]* (p. 34)

Lit. 'He's more like the brother I never had. Katherine often teases me that I miss the gene *"I need a boyfriend"*, but the truth is I just haven't met anyone who… well, whom I liked [...].'

    c.   *Es más bien el hermano que nunca he tenido. Katherine suele chincharme*

        diciéndome que me falta el gen de buscar novio, pero la verdad es que no he

        conocido a nadie que… bueno, alguien que me atraiga, [...]. (p. 34)

        Lit. 'He's more like the brother I never had. Katherine tends to tease me telling

        me that I miss the gene <u>of looking for a boyfriend</u>, but the truth is that I haven't

        met anyone whom… well, anyone I feel attracted to, [...].'

In order to describe her friend's attitude towards dating, one of the novel's characters jokingly creates a particular type of DNA locus that she refers to as the '*need-a-boyfriend* gene'. The very idea of making up such a socially specialized gene and characterizing it by a fictive interaction fragment, ascribed to the carrier of the gene, creates a comic impact. The same effect is achieved in the Polish translation in (23b), in which the fictive enunciation used in the English original is maintained. The Spanish version of the excerpt in (23c) loses some of the extra humor in the original, as the translator decided to use an ordinary descriptive prepositional phrase presenting the gene's supposed purpose ('gene of looking for a boyfriend') to refer to the gene in question.

3.4 Humor and other rhetorical effects

Fictive interaction constituents are frequently used in fiction to achieve humorous effects. Various examples discussed in this section so far, apart from fulfilling other functions, could also be viewed as amusing. Consider now two examples of embedded fictive enunciation constructions taken from two works of comic fiction:

(24) a. But in reply he just gave a <u>shrug</u> that seemed to <u>say</u> *"whatever your problem is, it's your problem, not mine, which is sad but rather amusing, because from the look of you, you're the type of idiot that makes a habit of getting into stupid, no-win situations like this. And by the way that shirt is totally gross"*. (*A Year in the Merde* by Stephen Clarke, 2004, p. 32)

  b. "My room is a disaster."

  "Nothing-fits-in-the-closet disaster?" Heather asked.

  *"Can't-**find**-the-closet* disaster," Ilana replied.

  Heather shrugged. "I've seen worse." She walked past Ilana, heading for the stairs.

  "Heather, no!" Ilana called after her. I **meant** it's a *Can't-find-the-closet-but-I-know-it's-there-because-I-left-a-tuna-sandwich-in-it-last-week* disaster." (*Temping Fate* by Esther Friesner, 2006, p. 81)

The humor of these passages arises mainly from the fact that the fictive interaction fragments are both excessively long and exaggerated, and particularly concrete. It does not seem possible that a mere shrug could convey so much information in such level of detail as the one in (24a) or that one could be in a kind of chaos that is both so extreme and specific as the one referred to in (24b). Another instance of fictive interaction with a humor-producing function is provided in (25) below, together with its Polish and Spanish versions.

(25) a. I offered to nip out and get a cake, but O'Neal showed me his fiercest '*the defence of the Western world is on my shoulders'* expression, [...]. (*The Gun Seller* by Hugh Laurie, 1996, p. 45)

b. *Zaofiarowałem się, że wyskoczę do sklepu po ciastka, ale O'Neal zaprezentował swoją najgroźniejszą minę pod tytułem: "Bezpieczeństwo świata zachodniego spoczywa na moich barkach", [...].* (p. 61)

Lit. 'I offered to nip out and get a cake, but O'Neal showed me his fiercest face <u>entitled</u>: "*The defence of the Western world is on my shoulders*", [...].'

c. *Me ofrecí a salir para ir a comprar unos pasteles, pero O'Neal me dedicó su más feroz expresión de "la responsabilidad de la defensa del mundo occidental descansa sobre mis hombros", [...].* (p. 29)

Lit. 'I offered to go out to buy some cakes, but O'Neal gave me his fiercest expression <u>of</u> "*the responsibility of the defence of the Western world rests on my shoulders*", [...].'

Also in this case a humorous effect is produced, since the fictive interaction fragment is comically exaggerated. The character's facial expression and attitude, conveyed by means of fictive speech, is presented as excessively serious, especially in contrast to the hedonistic offer of a sweet indulgence by the narrating character. The use of fictive speech also involves a clash between the two voices involved— that of the indulgent narrating character and that of the serious character who is being mocked. Fictive speech naturally also allows the use of theatricality, a critical feature in fictive enunciation (Brandt & Pascual, 2016), which enhances humor. In both the Polish and Spanish we observe a literal translation of the fictive utterance, otherwise the humor of the passage would have been partly lost.

Fictive interaction used in literature is capable of producing many other rhetorical effects apart from humor. The particular effect it has depends on its immediate context of occurrence and on the content of the fictive speech itself. There are, however, commonalities. For instance, most occurrences of the construction are attention-

gripping and vivid (see also Królak, 2008, 2016; Pascual, et al., 2013; Pascual, 2014, pp. 59-81). This is due to the use of direct speech, which draws the readers' attention and produces vividness (Wierzbicka, 1974; Longacre, 1976; Schiffrin, 1981; Chafe, 1982), constructing a sense of immediacy and involvement (Tannen, 1986), as readers get a first-hand experience of somebody speaking to them, demonstrating rather than describing a particular scene. The fictive speech sets up a scenario that may appeal to addressees' imagination and emotions. This effect is strengthened when the fictive speech fragment contains exclamatives, swear words, and/or rhetorical questions, as in this example:

(26)   A long, tired, *Jesus what am I going to do with you* sort of sigh. (*The Gun Seller* by Hugh Laurie, 1996, p. 158)

Last but not least, fictive interaction constructions may be used to convey a person's stance or attitude towards some concept or individual. We mentioned this effect when discussing examples (21a), "his *I-must-own-and-have-everything-now* – control-freak dominant self", (21b), 'Harry *I've-Faced-Worse* Potter', and (25), "'*the defence of the Western world is on my shoulders'* expression". As a viewpoint construction, fictive speech provides language users with the possibility of presenting the message in the enunciation ascribed to a given character together with the narrating character's stance towards it. This a good discourse strategy for putting a given person or group in a particular light and thus serves particularly well for achieving irony or sarcasm (cf. Pascual 2006, p. 255, Pascual & Sandler, 2016, pp. 11-12).

In this analysis section, we showed that fictive speech can be used as a literary devise to: (i) give the reader access to characters' thoughts and emotions (subsection 3.1); (ii) demonstrate the often complex relationships between characters (subsection 3.2); (iii) create new semantic categories (subsection 3.3); and (iv) produce such rhetorical effects as vividness or humor (subsection 3.4). Fictive enunciation can be used as an appealing strategy, frequently serving to enact and characterize paralinguistic information attributed to literary characters: their tone of voice, looks, facial expressions, gestures, and other bodily movements, as well as objects they may display or exchange with each other in order to communicate something. Non-verbal communication thus demonstrated may potentially convey much more information than the factual words ascribed to the characters in literary dialogues. Additionally, fictive interaction enables the presentation of the characters' conflicting thoughts in the form of internal conversations with one's alter ego or personified subconscious, as in (12a). This way the reader may get a very specific and rich characterization of the characters' mental world, their attitudes, and relationships, presented in an involving and vivid manner. Indeed, fictive speech tends to add to the vividness and humor of literary texts, as it is often excessively long and exaggerated, frequently containing emotive interjections, swear words, vocatives, or rhetorical questions. The use of embedded direct speech, which involves viewpoint shift within a syntactic constituent, further draws the readers' attention and engages them into a fictive communicative situation by appealing to their emotions and imagination.

4. Discussion: Metaphor and metonymy in fictive speech

It should be pointed out at this point that the cognitive mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy play an important role in fictive speech used in literature, and in other discourse genres for that matter (Królak, 2008; Pascual et al., 2013, Pascual and Sandler, 2016, pp. 12-13). Mental or emotional states may be personified and presented as metaphorical speakers (see overviews in Pascual, 2014, pp. 3-5, 92-96, and Pascual and Sandler, 2016, pp. 5-6). Instances of thoughts or emotions expressed through fictive speech, as in "*I so don't want to be mad but I'm going to be* feeling" (19c) or "*winning-is-all* mentality" (20b), could be viewed as involving what Barnden (1997) calls the IDEAS AS INTERNAL UTTERANCES metaphor, in which thoughts are construed as natural language utterances inside an agent's head. The more creative "My subconscious nods sagely, a *you've-finally-worked-it-out-stupid* look on her face" (12a), also illustrates the MIND PARTS AS PERSONS metaphor, in which a mind (often one's own) appears as a set of person-like entities, which may talk to each other.[2] This is reminiscent of Pang's (2005) "model that sees the self as a conglomeration of all the narratives constituting a person's experiences" (2005, p. 1), as in conventionalized expressions such as "I listened to my heart", "that's his pride talking just now", and "the optimist in me says, *'Sweet!'*".

Other examples show a metonymic link between a given entity or behavior and some mental, emotional, or attitudinal state or process that entity or behavior seems to reveal or emerge from. These involve what could be called the SAYING AS

---

[2] For a discussion on the forms and functions of personification in discourse, see Dorst (2011).

REVEALING metaphor, in which the source of an inference is presented as 'speaking' to the one to draw that inference (cf. Baynham 1996). In "an aggressive *touch-me-if-you-dare* suede outfit" (17a), clothes are presented as metaphorically speaking for the wearer of those clothes (cf. Pascual, 2014, p. 75). Similarly, in "*You think you know*, Bill seemed to be <u>saying</u> in every [art]work […]" (17b), an artist speaks to observers through its inanimate artwork, something that also commonly occurs in artists' descriptions of their work, often even involving the presentation of the artwork itself metaphorically speaking to viewers or the artist (Sullivan, 2006, 2009, 2016). In examples like "[a] *come away with me for the weekend and we'll have wheelbarrows full of sex and champagne* ticket" (18) or "*Exams are finished hurrah* champagne" (22) the fictive enunciation expresses the intention behind the purchase of the entities doing the metaphorical talking (a plane ticket and a bottle of champagne).

The majority of examples in this paper constitute paralinguistic or multimodal elements presented as metaphorical communicators, as the indicators of certain mental or emotional states that, if verbalized, could become manifest as the utterances in fictive speech characterizing them (e.g. "*well-here-we-are* sigh", "'*Mummy-is-cross*' glances", "*welcome-to-my-vision* gesture"). These often involve complex mixes of metaphor and metonymy. For instance, if someone exchanges "'*Mummy-is-cross*' glances" with someone else, one could argue that this comprises a personification metaphor, with the looks appearing as a person, with also a metonymic link between what that fictive enunciator says and what the real person thinks and feels. Simultaneously, a given look may be the more tangible indicator of the person's mental processes, so there also seems to be a metonymic link between the look and the person. Furthermore, in "'*Mummy-is-cross*' glances" the fictive enunciation ascribed to looks metonymically sets up the

FAMILY frame, just as the entire MARRIAGE frame is metonymically set up by the fictive wedding vow in "*'I do!'* ring" (Pascual 2014, pp. 65-67).

Lastly, since fictive enunciations are always utterance types rather than tokens (Pascual & Sandler, 2016, pp. 10-11), all instances seem to involve an accompanying ACTUAL-FOR-POTENTIAL metonymic link between the fictive utterance ascribed to say a feeling, outfit, or look and what the person presented as experiencing that feeling, wearing that outfit, or giving that look might well be inclined to say to express the feeling, the meaning of the outfit or of the look in question.

5. Summary and conclusions

In this paper we examined English nominal constructions involving fictive direct speech, which are used as stylistic devises by commercial novelists and Literature Nobel prize winners alike. We also carried out a comparative analysis of English direct speech compounds from five bestselling novels representing different genres and from different decades, and their translations into Polish and Spanish.

Our study shows that fictive interaction is a useful and appealing literary strategy that may be readily chosen by authors to fulfill a variety of functions. We put special emphasis on one particular grammatical manifestation of fictive interaction in English, namely the head noun modifier (e.g. "the *'why bother?'* attitude"). This nominal construction is especially interesting, since apart from the above-mentioned functions, it is also frequently used to categorize, to give unique names to salient concepts. The range of phenomena that can be illustrated in this manner is wide and it may satisfy various expressive needs of novelists. Not just their communicative gestures and

postures, but also the novels' characters themselves may be characterized by means of this construction. We argue that the categories introduced through fictive speech modifiers – as opposed to ready-made descriptive alternatives, such as adjective-noun and noun-noun combinations – are special in that they provide an exceptionally accurate yet economic and creative characterization of a virtually unlimited number of phenomena. The categories thus created are not only attention-gripping, as mentioned above, but they may also implicitly carry some evaluation of the characterized concepts, the addresser's stance. This is due to the fact that the fictive utterance in the modifier's position is only presented as attributed rather than actually uttered by the fictional character in the narrative, which makes it an appealing means of putting that character in a particular light, thereby revealing the speaker's or author's viewpoint.

Our translation data shows that in spite of grammatical challenges, a small majority of English fictive interaction compounds in the original texts were translated into Polish and Spanish as alternative fictive interaction constructions. This is interesting, since the English nominal compound construction has no exact equivalent in Polish or Spanish, even though the syntax of both languages does allow the embedding of (fictive) direct speech constituents. In Polish, heavy elements, such as direct speech constituents, are usually placed after instead of before the noun and are frequently preceded by a quotative marker, such as *w stylu* ('of the style'). In Spanish, embedded direct speech constructions usually appear as clauses following a quotative phrase such as *como diciendo* ('as if to say'), as regular elaborating phrases following *de* ('of'), or alternatively, they may occur after the head noun, just as in Polish, occasionally preceded by a quotative maker such as *del estilo* ('of the style'). The results of the comparison are presented in Appendix IV. In Polish, fictive interaction was kept in 64%

of the examples and it was lost in 36% of them. In Spanish, 59% instances of the construction were preserved and 41% lost.

We hope to have shown that fictive direct speech is a powerful literary device with a great expressive potential, readily used by successful authors of different and diverse types of novels. We thus hope to have convinced readers that fictive direct speech may be used in more genres and for more functions than in modern public discourse (Fairclough, 1994; Vis et al., 2012) or the colloquial speech of the contemporary youth (cf. Streeck, 2002), as generally assumed. This notwithstanding, our impression is that while professional writers are certainly aware of the power of fictive speech construction as literary device, they are not sufficiently acquainted with it as grammatical construction. It can be noticed, for instance, that even within the same novel, the punctuation used to introduce fictive enunciation constituents is not uniform: they may appear in italics, between inverted commas, joined with hyphens, or alternatively in a combination of these markings or with no marking at all (for details see the table in Appendix III). Such inconsistency in punctuation is most probably a reflection of the fact that the construction has barely been studied and no prescriptive rules or guidelines exist in grammars or style manuals as to how to punctuate it. More generally, we view the fictive interaction construction as indicating a socio-cultural model of language as informational (in the default case, what one says is what one means, and corresponds with the truth, Grice, 1989; Sweetser, 1987), so that we can present a kind of a quote to talk about non-verbal behavior, such as a look or shrug, or an inner state, such as an attitude or feeling. At the same time, they all invariably involve multiple viewpoints (Dancygier, 2008, 2012, Dancygier & Sweetser, 2012,

Dancygier et al., 2016), which need to be dealt with in literary translation (Lu & Verhagen, 2016).

The phenomenon of fictive interaction has only recently become the focus of linguistic research. Our study of fictive direct speech as literary device should be regarded as a preliminary one; its aim was to show the wide scope of the phenomenon and hopefully inspire further research that could include, for instance, the use of fictive interaction in different discourse genres and originally written in languages other than English. We believe that it would be particularly fruitful to study the phenomena in novels, philosophical, or scientific texts written in languages used in predominantly oral cultures.

Acknowledgements

References

Barnden, J. A. (1997). Consciousness and common-sense metaphors of mind. In S. O'Nuallain, P. McKevitt, & E. MacAogainMacAogain (Eds), *Two sciences of mind: Readings in cognitive science and consciousness* (pp. 311-340). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baynham, M. (1996). Direct speech: What's it doing in non-narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(1), 61-81.

Brandt, L., & Pascual, E. (2016). 'Say yes to this ad': The persuasive rhetoric of fictive interaction in marketing. In E. Pascual & S. Sandler (Eds.), *The conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction* (pp. 303-322). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brumme, J., & Espunya, A. (Eds.). (2012). *The translation of fictive dialogue.* Brill: Rodopi.

Chafe, W. L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written Language: Exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35-53). Ablex: Norwood.

Dancygier, B. (2008). The text and the story: Levels of blending in fictional narratives. In T. Oakley & A. Hougaard (Eds.), *Mental spaces in discourse and interaction* (pp. 51-78). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dancygier, B. (2012). *The language of stories: A cognitive approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dancygier, B., Lu, W.-l., & Verhagen, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Viewpoint and the fabric of meaning: Form and use of viewpoint tools across languages and modalities*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (Eds.). (2012). *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dancygier, B., & Vandelanotte, L. (2009). Judging distances: Mental spaces, distance, and viewpoint in literary discourse. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics: Goals, gains and gaps* (pp. 319-370). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dorst, A. (2011). Personification in discourse: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions. *Language and Literature*, 20(2), 113-135.

Eckardt, R. (2014). *The semantics of free indirect discourse: How texts allow us to mind-read and eavesdrop*. Leiden: Brill.

Fairclough, N. (1994). Conversationalisation of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In R. Keat, N. Whitely & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *The authority of the consumer* (pp. 253-268). London: Routledge.

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Jakobson, R. ([1957] 1971). Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. In R. *Jakobson, Selected writi*ngs, ii. Word and language (pp. 130-47). The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.

Królak, E. (2008). *Fictive interaction: Its functions and usage in discourse*. PhD Dissertation, University of Warsaw.

Królak, E. (2016). A Polish nominal construction involving fictive interaction: Its scope and functions in discourse. In E. Pascual & S. Sandler (Eds.), *The conversation*

frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction (pp. 266-253). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Longacre, R. E. (1976). *An Anatomy of speech notions*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Lu, W.-l., & Verhagen, A. (2016). Shifting viewpoints: How does that actually work across languages? An exercise in parallel text analysis. In B. Dancygier, W.-l. Lu & A. Verhagen (Eds.), *Viewpoint and the fabric of meaning: Form and use of viewpoint tools across languages and modalities* (pp. 169-190). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Pang, K.-y. S. (2005). 'This is the linguist in me speaking': Constructions for talking about the self talking. *Functions of Language,* 12(1), 1-38.

Pascual, E. (2006). Fictive interaction within the sentence: A communicative type of fictivity in grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(2), 245-267.

Pascual, E. (2010). El concepto de interacción ficticia en español: De la conversación a la gramática [The concept of fictive interaction in Spanish: From the conversation to grammar]. *Dialogía: Revista de Lingüística, Literatura y Cultura*, 5, 64-98.

Pascual, E. (2014). *Fictive interaction: The conversation frame in thought, language, and discourse.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pascual, E., Królak, E., & Janssen, T. A. J. M. (2013). Direct speech compounds: Evoking socio-cultural scenarios through fictive interaction. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 24(2), 345-366.

Pascual, E., & Sandler, S. (Eds.). (2016). *The conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Proffer, C. R. ([1969] 1984). Practical criticism for students. In C. R. Proffer (Ed.), *From Karamzin to Bunin: An anthology of Russian short stories* (pp. 31-51). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Streeck, J. (2002). Grammars, words, and embodied meanings: On the uses and evolution of *so* and *like*. *Journal of Communication*, 52(3), 581-596.

Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language*, 57(1), 45-62.

Sullivan, K. (2006). How does art 'speak' and what does it 'say': Conceptual metaphor theory as a tool for understanding the artistic process. In D. E. Boyes & F. B. Cogan (Eds.), *Thought tools for a new generation: Essays on thought, ideas, and the power of expression* (pp. 81-89). Eugene, OR: Robert D. Clark Honors College.

Sullivan, K. (2009). The languages of art: How representational and abstract painters conceptualize their work in terms of language. *Poetics Today*, 30(3), 517-560.

Sullivan, K. (2016). Silent abstractions versus "*Look at me*" drawings: Corpus evidence that artworks' subject matter affects their fictive speech. In E. Pascual & S. Sandler (Eds.), *The conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction* (pp. 87-109). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sweetser, E. (1987). The definition of lie: An examination of the folk theories underlying a semantic prototype. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 43-66). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Talmy, L. ([1996] 2000). Fictive motion in language and 'ception'. In *Toward a cognitive semantics: Concept structuring systems* (pp. 99-175). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Tannen, D. (1986). Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 311-322). Berlin: Mouton.

Tannen, D. (1988). Hearing voices in conversation, fiction, and mixed genres. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding* (pp. 89-113). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. ([1989] 2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vandelanotte, L. (2004). From representational to scopal 'distancing indirect speech or thought': A cline of subjectification. *Text*, 24(4), 547-585.

Vandelanotte, L. (2009). *Speech and thought representation in English: A cognitive-functional approach.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Vandelanotte, L. (2010). 'Where am I, lurking in what place of vantage?' The discourse of distance in John Banville's fiction. In B. Dancygier & J. Sanders (Eds.), Special issue of *English Text Construction*, 3(2), 203-225.

Vandelanotte, L. (2012). 'Wait till you got started': How to submerge another's discourse in your own. In B. Dancygier & E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Viewpoint in language: A multimodal perspective* (pp. 198-218). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vis, K., Sanders, J., & Spooren, W. (2012). Diachronic changes in subjectivity and stance: A corpus linguistic study of Dutch news texts. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 1, 95-102.

Wierzbicka, A. (1974). The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7(3), 267-307.

Xiang, M. (2016). Real, imaginary, or fictive? Philosophical dialogues in an early

Daoist text and its pictorial version. In E. Pascual & S. Sandler (Eds.), *The

conversation frame: Forms and functions of fictive interaction* (pp. 63-86).

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix

I. *Literary data*

Nr.	Bestseller's Title	Author	Genre	Pages	Year	FI C.*
1	*The Berlin Stories*	C. Isherwood	Fiction	398 p.	1935	1
2	*The Bluest Eye*	Toni Morrison	Historical fiction	164 p.	1970	1
3	*Changing Places*	David Lodge	Comic fiction	832 p.	1975	1
4	*This Life*	Sidney Poitier	Memoir	416 p.	1981	3
5	*The Invention of Solitude*	Paul Auster	Memoir	192 p.	1982	0
6	*The Good Terrorist*	Doris Lessing	Historical fiction	370 p.	1985	6
7	*The Child in Time*	Ian McEwan	Fiction	272 p.	1987	2
8	*Wilderness Tips*	Margaret Atwood	Fiction	240 p.	1991	3
9	*Nevernever*	Will Shetterly	Fantasy	240 p.	1993	2
10	*Barrel Fever*	David Sedaris	Comic essays	208 p.	1994	2

11	*The Red Notebook*	Paul Auster	Memoir	104 p.	1995	1
12	*Hand to Mouth*	Paul Auster	Memoir	224 p.	1997	1
13	*The Gun Seller*	Hugh Laurie	Comedy	343 p	1996	11
14	*Enduring Love*	Ian McEwan	Fiction	272 p.	1997	1
15	*American Gods*	Neil Gaiman	Fantasy	624 p.	2001	1
16	*Thinks…*	David Lodge	Comic novel	832 p.	2001	2
17	*Tree of Origin*	Frans de Waal	Life Sciences	320 p.	2002	1
18	*All My Friends Are Superheroes*	Andrew Kaufman	Fantasy	140 p.	2003	2
19	*What I loved*	Siri Hustvedt	Fiction	384 p.	2003	1
20	*Dress your Family in Corduroy and Denim*	David Sedaris	Comic essays	257 p.	2004	0
21	*A Year in the Merde*	Stephen Clarke	Comic fiction	288 p.	2005	0
22	*Starship Troopers*	Robert Heinlein	Fantasy	263 p.	2005	0
23	*Temping Fate*	Esther Friesner	Fantasy	288 p.	2006	3
24	*Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*	J. K. Rowling	Fantasy	607 p.	2007	3
25	*Deaf Sentence*	David Lodge	Comic fiction	291 p.	2008	1
26	*Think of a number*	John Verdon	Thriller	448 p.	2010	6
27	*Fifty Shades of Grey*	E.L. James	Eroticism	514 p.	2011	13
28	*Let the Devil Sleep*	John Verdon	Thriller	464 p.	2012	1

| 29 | *Gone Girl* | Gillian Flynn | Thriller | 419 p. | 2012 | 15 |
| 30 | *Let's Explore Diabetes with Owls* | David Sedaris | Comic essays | 288 p. | 2013 | 2 |

* 'FI C.' = amount of fictive interaction compounds.

II. *Data sources: Original novels and translations*

1. English original: *The Good Terrorist*, by Doris Lessing. Flamingo, Amsterdam: Harper Collins, [1985] 2007.

Polish translation: Doris Lessing, *Dobra terrorystka*, translated by Andrzej Szulc. Warsaw: Albatros, 2008.

Spanish translation: Doris Lessing, *La Buena terrorista*, translated by Mireia Bofill. Madrid: Santillana, 2007.

2. English original: Hugh Laurie, *The Gun Seller*. London: Arrow Books, 1996.

Polish translation: Hugh Laurie, *Sprzedawca broni*, translated by Jacek Konieczny. Warsaw: WAB, 2008.

Spanish translation: *Una Noche de Perros*, translated by Alberto Coscarelli. Barcelona: Planeta, 2006.

3. English original: *Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James. London: Vintage Books, 2011.

Polish translation: *Pięćdziesiąt twarzy Greya*, translated by Monika Wiśniewska. Katowice: Sonia Draga, 2012.

Spanish translation: *Cincuenta sombras de Grey*, translated by Alberto Pilar de la Peña Minguell and Helena Trías Bello. Barcelona: Random House Mondadori, 2012.

4. English original: *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* by J.K. Rowling. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.

Polish translation: *Harry Potter i insyginia śmierci*, translated by Andrzej Polkowski. Poznań: Media Rodzina, 2008.

Spanish translation: *Harry Potter y las Reliquias de la Muerte,* translated by Gemma Rovira Ortega. Barcelona: Salamandra, 2008.

5. English original: *Think of a number* by John Verdon. London: Penguin Books, 2010.

Polish translation: *Wyliczanka*, translated by Krzysztof Mazurek. Krakow: Otwarte, 2011.

Spanish translation: *Sé lo que estás pensando*, translated by Javier Guerrero. Barcelona: Roca Editorial de Libros, 2011.

III. *Punctuation of fictive interaction compounds in the English Data*

	Inverted commas	Hyphens	Italics	Hyphens + Italics	Inverted commas + italics	Inverted commas+ hyphens + italics	No marking
The Good terrorist	0	0	0	4	1	1	0
Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
The Gun Seller	4	5	0	0	0	0	2
Think of a Number	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
Fifty Shades of Grey	0	11	1	0	0	0	1
Total	**6**	**22**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**1**	**3**

IV. Translation of the 39 fictive interaction compounds in the five novels

1. *The Good terrorist* (6 FI compounds in the English original)

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	*Total preserved instances of FI*
Polish translation	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	*2*
Spanish translation	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	*4*

2. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (3 FI compounds in the English original)

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	*Total preserved instances of FI*
Polish translation	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	*2*
Spanish translation	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	*2*

3. *The Gun Seller* (11 FI compounds in the English original)

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	*Total preserved instances of FI*
Polish translation	0	2	2	4	3	0	0	*11*
Spanish translation	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	*9*

4. *50 Shades of Grey* (13 FI compounds in the English original)

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	*Total preserved instances of FI*
Polish translation	0	2	4	2	0	0	5	*8*
Spanish translation	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	*3*

5. *Think of a Number* (6 FI compounds in the English original)

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	*Total preserved instances of FI*
Polish translation	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Spanish translation	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	2

Total of FI constructions in the five novels

	FI phrase	FI clause	N + quotative marker + FI	N+ FI	FI + N	Lexical FI (noun)	Lost (No FI)	Total preserved instances of FI
Polish translation	0	5	9	8	0	0	**14 (36%)**	**25 (64%)**
Spanish translation	17	**4**	0	0	0	2	**16 (41%)**	**23 (59%)**

Address for correspondence

Dr. Esther Pascual

Dept. of Spanish Language and Culture and Dept. of Linguistics

School of International Studies

Zhejiang University

866, Yuhangtang Road

310058 Hangzhou

China

pascual@zju.edu.cn,

esther@estherpascual.com

Biographical notes

Esther Pascual (PhD, VU Amsterdam, 2003) is currently a 'Hundred Talents' senior researcher and assistant professor at Zhejiang University, China. She works on what she has labeled 'fictive interaction', as in her monograph *Fictive Interaction* and her co-edited volume *The Conversation Frame*, both by John Benjamins. She has received prestigious research grants from the Fulbright foundation and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, and is founding co-editor-in-chief of the peer-reviewed journal *Language Under Discussion*.

Emilia Królak graduated from Warsaw University (Poland), where she obtained her PhD in the field of Cognitive Linguistics in 2008, with a dissertation on fictive interaction in Polish and English discourse. She currently works as a lecturer at the University of Social Sciences in Warsaw. Her linguistic interests include: manipulation in language and cognitive mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy.