

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

The SFL/Pragmatics Interface: Reporting Strategies in Poe's William Wilson

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1887930> since 2023-01-27T17:07:09Z

Publisher:

Routledge

Published version:

DOI:10.4324/9781315299877

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

5 The Interface of SFL and Pragmatics

Reporting Strategies in Poe's "William Wilson"

Mounir Triki and Nesrine Triki

0. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explore the complexity of reporting strategies in fiction drawing on the tools offered by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), stylistics and pragmatics. Reporting in the context of this chapter takes a broader meaning than the one found in SFL, where it is considered as a type of projection. Outside SFL, reporting encompasses the various structural and semantic representations of direct and indirect speech and thought. We will first discuss how ideational and interpersonal projection can provide substantial material for the interpretation of a Gothic short story written by Poe and how such a functional grammatical analysis could constitute a solid base for the interpretation of the story from a pragmatic angle. The chapter emphasizes the value of blending linguistic and pragmatic frameworks in the analysis of literary texts.

Because literature primarily lives within and through language, linguistic tools are thought to be mandatory in the understanding of literature (Hasan, 1989; Fowler, 1986). Hasan (1989, p. 104) maintains that "without linguistics, the study of literature must remain a series of personal preferences, no matter how much the posture of objectivity is adopted: being objective implies knowing the nature of that which one is being objective about". Yet Hasan herself acknowledges that although linguistics is a fundamental step in approaching literary texts, it is not a "sufficient one" (*ibid.*). Because of their specificity, literary texts are thought to be problematic in their analysis as they often deviate from conventional writing styles used in non-literary genres. This is perhaps among the reasons for which literary critics often criticize linguists' analysis of literary texts (Fowler, 1986). In particular, the use of reporting techniques in fiction seems to be more complex than in other writing genres.

This chapter, therefore, seeks to show how it could be more enriching to blend SFL and pragmatic approaches to the analysis and interpretation of reporting. The underlying assumption is that the phenomenon of reporting is so complex that linguistic, stylistic and pragmatic frameworks need to be combined in order to optimize our understanding of reporting.

The chapter reviews the literature on reporting in those approaches and shows how it is possible to follow a two-step procedure in the analysis of “William Wilson”. The first step is the analysis of the ideational and interpersonal realizations of projection. The second is the interpretation of the findings using pragmatic tools.

1. The Grammar and Semantics of Reporting

Because the approaches use different labels to refer to the different forms of speech and thought presentations, we will use ‘projection’ for the SFL sections, ‘speech and thought presentations’ for the stylistics sections and ‘reporting’ for the pragmatic ones.

1.1. Reporting in SFL

1.1.1. Clause as Representation

In order to grasp the meaning of projection in SFL, it would be helpful to introduce it within a wider view of the theory, in particular, the three metafunctions of language, the different grammatical ranks and the logico-semantic systems. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 10), “[t]he clause is the central processing unit in the lexico grammar—in the specific sense that it is in the clause that meanings of different kinds are mapped into an integrated grammatical structure”. The different meanings that a clause can express are realized in the three metafunctions of language, namely the ideational (enacting of experiences), the interpersonal (speaker/hearer or writer/reader interaction) and the textual (information structure across clauses). At the ideational metafunction, clauses are analysed as representations of a certain experience enacted within different participants (Agent, Goal, Senser, Phenomenon, etc.), the types of processes these participants are involved in (material, relational, verbal, mental, behavioural and existential) and the various circumstances within which participants and processes interact (e.g. time, reason, angle etc.). When clauses are combined to form clause complexes, the logico-semantic meanings that could emerge are either Expansion (Elaboration, Extension and Enhancement) or Projection (Locution, Idea). Combined clauses could be of equal status (paratactic) or of unequal status (hypotactic), and sometimes clauses are rank-shifted to be participants in other clauses or embedded within nominal groups, in which case they are considered as embedded clauses.

Projection is defined as “the logical-semantic relationship whereby a clause comes to function not as a direct representation of (nonlinguistic) experience but as a representation of a (linguistic) representation” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 508). Although such a definition seems to restrict the meaning of projection to the clause, it does so only

because the clause in SFL is considered as the congruent realization of any meaning potential. In fact, as Halliday and Matthiessen point to, “a sequence of projection can thus be realized not only by the manifestation of projection in the clause nexus, but also by its manifestation in the clause or the group/phrase” (ibid., p. 720). Projection is, therefore, a “trans-phenomenal” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999, p. 223) category better thought of as a fractal motif (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999; Arús, 2008) that could be realized at different clause and group ranks.

Projection is analysed based on three systems: the level of projection, the mode of projection and the speech function of projection. The level of projection distinguishes between clauses projected in the form of meaning (idea), typically introduced via mental processes, and those projected in the form of wording (locution), delivered via verbal processes.

Mental process clauses are classified into four types (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014): emotion (*hate, fear, love*), cognition (*think, remember, consider*), desideration (*want, wish, hope*) and perception (*feel, perceive, notice*). These types of clauses involve two participants: a Sayer, the one involved in a cognitive, perceptive or emotional experience, and a Phenomenon, the thing that is felt, thought or perceived.

Verbal process clauses, on the other hand, are “clauses of saying, as in *What did you say?—I said it’s noisy in here*” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 302). The participants in a verbal process clause are the ‘Sayer’, the one issuing the saying activity; the ‘Receiver’, “the one to whom the saying is directed” (ibid., p. 306); and the ‘Verbiage’, the content of the saying.

Circumstantially, projection could be signalled via a circumstance of ‘Matter’ marking the Verbiage as in *about Paris* in *I don’t want to talk about Paris*, or a circumstance of ‘Angle’ marking the Sayer as in *according to the Prime Minister* in *According to the Prime Minister, taxes on revenues will be raised by 5%*.

1.1.2. Mode of Projection

The mode of projection sets the interdependency relations between clauses in clause complexes, in terms of parataxis (quotes) and hypotaxis (reports) “representing two degrees of remove from the original source” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 531) as well as metaphorically in rank-shifted clauses carrying the projected proposition functioning as Qualifier to the projecting head noun. Projection could also be used within clause simplexes in the form of comment adjuncts as in *presumably* in *The suspect has presumably hidden the crime weapon in the baby diapers*, or as participants as in *the rumor* in *The rumor spread so quickly*, and at group levels as a post-deictic as in *alleged* in *The suspect refused to admit the alleged crimes*. As for the speech functions of projection, these could be either propositions (e.g. statements, claims, enquiries, etc. . . .) or proposals (e.g. offers, promises, demands, etc.).

Another possible mode of projection, somehow controversial in its description in the literature, is the Free indirect style, which for Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 532) is “not so much intermediate as a blend” of quoting and reporting features, but for Thompson is more like an intermediate category: “although I have implied that reports and quotes are identifiably separate types of projection, it would be truer to say that they are extremes on a cline, and that there are many intermediate cases” (2014, p. 205). Regardless of whether they are considered as blends or as intermediate categories, in SFL the ‘Free’ modes seem to be restricted to the ‘indirect’ categories and to the ‘speech’ representation even though Halliday and Matthiessen recognise that “free indirect speech can be projected both verbally and mentally” (2014, p. 532). More discussion about Free categories of projection will be dealt with from the stylistic perspective in section 1.2.

1.2. Reporting in Stylistics

Stylistics, defined by Wynne (2005, p. 1) as “a field of empirical inquiry, in which the insights and techniques of linguistic theory are used to analyse literary texts”, offers detailed categorization of speech and thought presentations together with their semantic and pragmatic implications. Semino and Short (2004) refer to forms of reporting as Speech, Writing and Thought Presentations (SW&TP). Their model, which is a revised version of Leech and Short (1981), distinguishes between the three forms that an act of reporting could originally have. The three discourse presentations are presented along scales (see Table 5.1) that signal a move from the most involved form of reporting (left) to the most detached one (right).

In addition to the traditional forms of direct (DS and DT) and indirect (IS and IT) speech and thought, Semino and Short’s model makes a clear distinction between Free Indirect Speech (FIS) and Free Indirect Thought (FIT) (1a¹ and 1b), on the one hand, and between Free Direct Speech (FDS) and Free Direct Thought (FDT) (2a and 2b), on the other hand, thus allowing for a clear cut between the lexico-grammars of quotes and reports and between the nature of the represented material as either thought or speech (Semino and Short, 2004; Leech and Short, 2007).

Table 5.1 Speech, writing and thought presentation scales (Semino and Short, 2004, p. 49)

[N]	NV	NRSA	IS	FIS	DS	(FDS)
[N]	NW	NRWA	IW	FIW	DW	(FDW)
[N]	NI	NRTA	IT	FIT	DR	(FDT)

- (1) a. He looked straight at her. **He would definitely come back tomorrow!** She was pleased.
- b. He looked straight at her. **He would definitely come back tomorrow!** She remained unaware of his plan until the following day.
- (2) a. He looked straight at her. **'I'll definitely come back tomorrow!** She was pleased.
- b. He looked straight at her. **I'll definitely come back tomorrow!** She remained unaware of his plan until the following day

Such a distinction is relevant to the present study as it allows readers of literature to differentiate between how a character's mental and verbal representations are delivered to the reader and how such a difference could be deliberately misleading. More precisely, the non-presence of any reporting element makes it sometimes hard for the reader to set apart instances of narration (where no discourse presentation is being reported) and moments where the narrator is reporting a speech or thought event.

A second relevant distinction in Semino and Short's taxonomy lies within the new categories of Narrative Reports of Speech and Thought Act (NRSA and NRTA) (3a and 3b) and the categories of Narrator's Representation of Voice (NV) and Internal Narration (NI) (4a and 4b).

- (3) a. **I again urged more flexibility**, as I had learnt that some Ministers who would vote for her in the first ballot might not vote for her in the second.
- b. He looked straight at her and **thought about his imminent return**. She remained unaware of his plan until the following day
- (4) a. **We spoke to vice madam Michaela Hamilton from Bullwell, Notts**, who arranged girls for a Hudson orgy at the Sanam curry house in Stoke.
- b. **In the fleeting dizziness I had a nightmare vision**.

NRSA is different from IS in that it "prototypically has only one clause, with the 'speech report' verb often followed by a noun phrase or a prepositional phrase indicating the topic of the speech presented" Semino and Short (2004, p. 11). What is reported is, therefore, the "illocutionary force of a particular utterance" (*ibid.*, p. 52). This category has a summarizing function even when the speech act verb or noun is followed by a lengthy description of the topic of the original speech event. NRTA, on the other hand, refers to cases where "someone is presented as performing mentally what would normally count as a speech act if it had been uttered" (Semino and Short, 2004, p. 130). As such, there is no clear reference to the propositional content of the thought and no use of a separate reported clause.

The category of NV "captures minimal reports of speech, consisting either of simple references to the fact that someone spoke or of general

references to speech events” (Semino and Short, 2004, p. 69). There are several functions that this category could have, like introducing a speech event that will be reported in subsequent text or, in fiction, signalling that the speech event is

- (a) unimportant from the point of view that is adopted, or
- (b) too distant to be heard clearly from the point of view that is adopted, or
- (c) produced in such a way as to be inaudible from the point of view that is adopted.

(*ibid.*, p. 70)

The category of NI refers to chunks where the narrator reports a character’s

cognitive state or process, i.e. an experience that can be seen as involving some form of cognition, but without any indication of the occurrence of a specific thought act, let alone of any propositional content or wording that might have formed in the relevant person’s mind.

(Semino and Short, 2004, pp. 132–133)

This category might be controversial when looked at from an SFL perspective because it includes not only cognitive processes but also emotive ones as in (5).

- (5) A fortnight or so later Claudie invited Dr Wardener to have a glass of my father’s champagne and he called the nurses in to drink ‘my health’. **The phrase made me a little sad.**

In examples like (5), Semino and Short argue that although an emotional state is being described, it has been caused by a cognitive process. Accordingly, whenever a cognitive process is involved, similar structures are tagged as NI. Such thought categories would therefore be identified via lexis that has to do “with cognition and emotion (e.g. verbs like ‘envied’, ‘amazed’, ‘sad’, ‘mind’, and nouns like ‘longing’, ‘curiosity’, ‘revulsion’)” (*ibid.*, p. 133).

1.3. *Pragmatic Approach to Reporting*

The third basis proposed for the analysis of reporting is the multi-functionality of reported speech in pragmatics. First, reporting is a confrontation of two ‘I’s. Reporting involves the person of the reporter and that or those of the reported people. Triki (1989 and 1991) has shown three main parameters to be constitutive of SELF in language. The first is the representation of the world in terms of person, space and time

(the deictic parameter). The second is the representation of the world as perceived by one given centre (the perceptual parameter). The third is the representation of views about the world, feelings, attitudes, etc. (the affective/modal parameter). In all these centres, the mediation of the speaking subject is inexorably enshrined into and greatly influences the choice of linguistic forms.

Fragmentation of SELF: Within a theory of Dialogical Self (DS) (e.g. St. Clair, Thomé-Williams and Su, 2005), there is no single centralized storyteller at work. DS theory retains James' (1890) view of the self as consisting of different constituents: 'I' and 'Me'. The 'I' refers to the reflexive parts of the self (the self as subject, knower, thinker, etc.), whereas the 'Me' is described as the sum of everything someone can be said to own (the self as object, as known, thought, etc.). Each 'Me', however, is endowed with a voice to tell its own story (St. Clair et al., 2005). We wish to argue that the dialogue between the narrator and his double in the short story at hand inscribes within the narrative of this inner conflict between competing aspects of SELF

Heterogeneity of SELF: Hermans and Kempen (1993) develop the conception of the self as a multitude of different I-positions fluctuating within the imaginal landscape of the mind (Hermans, 2001), which is reminiscent of Bakhtin's (2008) concept of *ventriloquation* to the effect that individual speakers always speak in the social languages of their time; thereby expressing the position of the group they belong to. Accordingly, we argue that the two voices competing for expression in "William Wilson" may be a form of ventriloquating.

Culture and voice: Hermans, Kempen and Van Loon (1992) endorse the view that 'Western' culture, with its individualistic and rationalistic ideals of selfhood, influences the entire *organization* of dialogical selves, restricting its full potential and resulting in centralistically organized selves dominated by one or a few voices (St. Clair et al., 2005). The dominant conception of culture in DS theory today, however, stresses the existence of self and culture as a "multiplicity of positions among which dialogical relationships can develop" (Hermans, 2001, p. 243). In this conception, culture is a voice that may speak for itself or speak through another position (St. Clair et al., 2005). Thus, we argue that Poe could be said to be a precursor of this fragmentation of SELF into various social vantage points.

Goffman's (1986) Concept of the Self: Goffman, as reviewed by St. Clair et al. (2005), wants to show how even the most innocuous or apparently authentic of our social acts can be calculated to show the actor to his or her audience in a favourable light (Gouldner, 1970). Goffman's is a social theory that dwells upon the episodic and sees life only as it is lived in a narrow interpersonal circumference, a-historical and non-institutional, an existence beyond history and society, and one which comes alive only in the fluid, transient "encounter" (St. Clair et al., 2005). Rather than

conceiving of activities as a set of interlocking functions, Goffman's dramaturgical model advances a view in which social life is systematically regarded as an elaborate form of drama in which—as in the theatre—men are all striving to project a convincing image of self to others.

2. Methodology

To illustrate the complexity of reporting strategies and the need for combined approaches, a short story (Poe's "William Wilson") has been selected as a case study. The analysis of the text is to be considered as an illustration of the objectives previously mentioned and as a starting point for a more theoretically oriented discussion. Briefly, the story is about a protagonist depicted as wicked and evil (we will refer to him as Evil William) and a second character who bears his same first and family names, is born on the same day and comes from the same place, but who has the opposite moral values (he will be called Good William). Annoyed with Good William's interference in his life, Evil William decides to get his revenge and stabs Good William only to discover that while he stabbed him he actually stabbed himself. This dual self of the narrator results in confusion about who is actually reporting and who is being reported, which is specifically the reason for which this short story has been chosen for investigation.

The text (8068 words) was read manually, and all instances of reporting were coded using the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid Corpus Tool² (O'Donnell, 2008) as either locutions or ideas and as either quotes or reports. We also investigated the use of modality in those reporting environments in order to identify the various enactments of evidentiality and attitudes. Various types of fuzzy structures were encountered. The first could be related to the blurry boundaries between narration and reporting; i.e. while some clauses seemed to be pure cases of narration, they turned out to be instances of reporting of what is referred to in the literature as the 'Free' type. The second difficulty is related to the classification of some verbal and mental processes and their potential projecting aspect as in:

- (6) While he **spoke**, so profound was the stillness that one might have heard a pin drop upon the floor.
- (7) [. . .] in which he was more than usually thrown off his guard, and **spoke** and acted with an openness of demeanor rather foreign to his nature.

Indeterminacy in process-type categorization is a major difficulty faced by analysts while coding clauses. In particular, inconsistencies have been

noted in the identification of verbal *vs* material processes (Gwilliams and Fontaine, 2015) and of verbal *vs* behavioural processes (O'Donnell, Zappvigna and Whitelaw, 2009). Gwilliams and Fontaine (2015) argue that a possible reason behind these coding differences is whether the analyst favours grammatical criteria for their coding decisions or whether they prioritize verb semantics. In line with this indeterminacy issue, the verb 'speak' in (6) and (7) could be thought of as a behavioural rather than verbal process (see O'Donnell et al., 2009, for a deeper discussion of coding differences in similar cases). Still, the two clauses are coded as cases of projection where the reader can understand that the Sayer 'he' was involved in some speaking activity but the content of this speaking was neither quoted nor reported in the clause. The content of the wording is sometimes recoverable from previous clauses. For example, clause (6) was preceded by a lengthy quote and could therefore be paraphrased as *While he said "Gentlemen, I make no apology for this behavior . . . and the several little packages which may be found in the somewhat capacious pockets of his embroidered morning wrapper" so profound was the stillness . . .* Such a coding decision is influenced by Semino and Short (2004) and by Hasan (1989). Hasan, for instance, argues that with such verbal processes in verbal art, what matters in these contexts are the circumstances and manners rather than the content itself (1989, pp. 86–87).

Moreover, the identification of the source of projection, or in Martin and White's (2005) terms the 'Attribution' of projected sequences, was not a straightforward task. It was almost impossible to make decisions about who was reporting who due to the dual self of the narrator (Evil William *vs* Good William) and the overlap between the two selves (which will be referred to as William Wilson).

3. Level and Mode of Projection in "William Wilson"

Analysis has revealed the prevalence of reporting ideas at the expense of locutions (Table 5.2). Out of the 213 cases of projected speech and thought identified, locutions are projected in less than 32% of the total number of projection instances, while ideas amount to more than 68%. Locutions are related to several types of verbal and nominal processes as in (8) and (9).

Table 5.2 Level of projection in "William Wilson"

<i>Locution</i>	<i>Idea</i>	<i>Total</i>
68	145	213
32%	68%	100%

- (8) He **said** that **some person**, apparently in great haste, **demanded** to speak with me in the hall.
- (9) “Mr. Wilson,” **said our host**, stooping to remove from beneath his feet an exceedingly luxurious cloak of rare furs, “Mr. Wilson, this is your property.”

At the clause complex level, locutions are found to be realized paratactically and hypotactically as illustrated in (8) and (9). The verbal processes in *said* and *demanded* in (8) and *said* in (9) project the wordings of different characters in the text. Example (8) illustrates a common style in narratives, which is indirect speech or, in SFL terms, a ‘report’, whereas projection in example (9) takes the form of a ‘quote’ or direct speech. In terms of frequencies, quotes of locutions are not frequent in the short story, with only six cases identified. This alternation between quotes and reports seems to play a strategic role in the narrative process. Direct speech is used to quote very important messages in critical moments and scenes in the story (when Evil William’s cheating was discovered, when Evil William addresses Good William for the first time and when William Wilson stabbed himself) and gives therefore a theatrical, vivid and colorful aspect to the piece of fiction.

Examples (10), (11) and (12), on the other hand, represent cases of projection where the reader has no access to the original verbiage that was uttered and where the verbiage itself comes in the form of “the name of saying” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 306) as in *rumor*, *refusal* and *words* or in the form of “the content of what is said” (ibid.) as in *the day of the last conversation I there held with my singular namesake*.

- (10) I was galled, too, by **the rumor** touching a relationship, which had grown current in the upper forms.
- (11) With a well-feigned show of reluctance, and not until after **my repeated refusal** had seduced him into **some angry words** which gave a color of pique to my compliance, did I finally comply.
- (12) I mention it at all but **to define** the day of **the last conversation I** there held with my singular namesake.

Paratactic and hypotactic clause nexuses are also found in projected ‘ideas’. Ideas are mental representations of the narrator’s personal internal states of cognition or other characters’ as in (13), (14) and (15).

- (13) I would fain have them **believe** that I have been, in some measure, the slave of circumstances beyond human control.
- (14) I well **remember** it had no trees, nor benches, nor anything similar within it.
- (15) I **perceived** that we were even singularly alike in general contour of person and outline of feature.

However, with only one exception of a paratactically quoted idea (example 16), all 19 direct quotes of ideas are used in the Free direct style (17, 18 and 19).

- (16) *And again, and again, in secret communion with my own spirit, would I demand the questions “Who is he?—whence came he?—and what are his objects?”* But no answer was there found.
- (17) This has been already too much an object for the scorn—for the horror—for the detestation of my race. **To the uttermost regions of the globe have not the indignant winds bruited its unparalleled infamy? Oh, outcast of all outcasts most abandoned!—to the earth art thou not forever dead? to its honors, to its flowers, to its golden aspirations?—and a cloud, dense, dismal, and limitless, does it not hang eternally between thy hopes and heaven? I would not, if I could, here or to-day, embody a record of my later years of unspeakable misery, and unpardonable crime.**
- (18) This reverend man, with countenance so demurely benign, with robes so glossy and so clerically flowing, with wig so minutely powdered, so rigid and so vast,—**could this be he who, of late, with sour visage, and in snuffy habiliments, administered, ferule in hand, the Draconian laws of the academy? Oh, gigantic paradox, too utterly monstrous for solution!**
- (19) Gasping for breath, I lowered the lamp in still nearer proximity to the face. **Were these—these the lineaments of William Wilson?** I saw, indeed, that they were his, but I shook as if with a fit of the ague in fancying they were not. **What was there about them to confound me in this manner?** I gazed;—while my brain reeled with a multitude of incoherent thoughts.

The emboldened strings of words are to be understood as representations of the narrator’s inner thoughts. In (16), the italicized part stands as the projecting clause within which the circumstance *in secret communion with my own spirit* makes it clear that the process *demandis* is not realized in the form of wording but rather in the form of thought. The use of opening and closing quotation marks explicitly signals the direct aspect of projection. Such explicit projecting elements and punctuation are not present in (17), (18) and (19) and in several other similar cases. Yet the emboldened strings could not be analysed as part of narration or as instances of Free Direct Speech because of two main arguments. The first is the sudden shift from the declarative, which is the unmarked style in narration (Semino and Short, 2004, p. 126), into the interrogative and exclamative; the second is the cues spotted in neighbouring co-texts as in (19), where the complex clause *I gazed;—while my brain reeled with a multitude of incoherent thoughts* offers hints that the questions asked in the previous clauses were not uttered but raised in the narrator’s mind.

Free direct ideas are construed as yes/no and WH-interrogative clauses and as exclamation clauses in interior monologues. Interrogative mental clauses, according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 516), represent “an ‘undecided’ state of mind” and “are used to project indirect questions”. These Free direct categories are also construed in the form of vocatives, “*Oh, outcast of all outcasts most abandoned!*”, and signalled overtly via dashes and via punctuation marks (? and !) and juxtaposed in sequences of clauses. These vocatives, as suggested by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 510), cannot be reported and are construed as quotes. Interrogative clauses, however, could be paraphrased using a projecting clause of the type *I thought to myself* or *If asked myself*, followed by the projected sequences in the form of quotes. They are integrated within narration but could be understood as cases where the narrator shifts from narration of events or description of things and places into expressing inner thoughts and emotions related to unanswered questions, astonishment, admiration, anger or amusement. This deliberate blend of narration and projection contributes to the vivid aspect of the short story while, at the same time, it further complicates readers’ task in understanding the narrator’s flow of ideas. These ideas appear, therefore, to be as complicated and as mixed as the narrator’s identity.

As is the case with locutions, ideas are also projected in the form of rank-shifted clauses as in (20) or prepositional phrases as in (21) or as a nominal group as in (22).

- (20) It wasmy **intention**, now, *to put my scheme in operation*, and I resolved to make him feel the whole extent of the malice with which I was imbued.
- (21) by bringing to mind **dim visions of my earliest infancy**—wild, confused and thronging **memories of a time when memory herself was yet unborn**.
- (22) I **discovered**, or **fancied I discovered**, in his accent, his air, and general appearance, *a something which first startled, and then deeply interested me* [. . .]

Because reports are about reproductions of meanings rather than real wordings, with hypotactic combinations, the narrator has stronger influence on the speech or thought events being projected. Such an influence weakens when the narrator opts for quoting strategies, which have a role in “bringing characters to life” (Egins, 2004, p. 274). Because the content of ideas cannot be interpreted as fulfilling speech functions of “giving and demanding information” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 516), we can only question and doubt whether the projected mental activities did or did not actually happen in the narrator and in the other characters’ minds; that is, the reader can raise questions about “the status of the validity of the information” (ibid.).

The overwhelming projection of ideas (68% vs 32% for locution) reflects the type of narrative style used in the short story. It shows how the author, Poe, deliberately exposes his main character's internal thoughts to the readers in order to enable them to build their own readings of his personality and his behaviour. Yet, as will be discussed in the next section, the sources of projection seem to hinder this reading and to mislead the reader.

4. Interpersonal Projection

Two main aspects of interpersonal projection are identified in the short story. The first is the attribution of the projected locutions and ideas to a specific projector.³ The second relates to the various enactments of modalities accompanying projected chunks.

Although the narrator is at the same time the projector in the short story, this same narrator turns out to have a dual self, one representing the evil, wicked and even criminal side of the character, while the second self, the doppelganger, is the direct opposite, featuring the epitome of good morals, kindness and respect. Throughout the text, it seems almost impossible to decide who of the two selves is narrating, quoting or reporting. In particular, the opening (example 23) and closing (example 24) sections of the short story are the most confusing. For this, the projector is considered as the source (even when not explicitly mentioned), who could be either Good William or Evil William. In these two sections, only 14 instances of projection were identified.

- (23) I long, in passing through the dim valley, for the sympathy—I had nearly said for the pity—of my fellow men. I would fain have them believe that I have been, in some measure, the slave of circumstances beyond human control. I would wish them [. . .]
- (24) It was Wilson; but he spoke no longer in a whisper, and I could have fancied that I myself was speaking while he said: “You have conquered, and I yield [. . .] In me didst thou exist—and, in my death, see by this image, which is thine own, how utterly thou hast murdered thyself.”

In the opening scene, the ‘*I*’ is the source of all projected locutions and ideas, and although one could say that this ‘*I*’ refers to Evil William, and the ‘*he*’ in the closing scene refers to Good William, such a claim no longer suits when the reader reaches the last quote, whose source is at the same time ‘*I*’ and ‘*he*’ (the emboldened part in 24) and where the quote has two sayers, the two selves of the same character.

The projector in the remaining part of the text is identified as Evil William (though a different interpretation could also fit), and he has projected his and others’ ideas and locutions 201 times. This shows that the

dominant voice readers can hear is that of the ‘Evil’, who is given much more space and time compared to the ‘Good’ one. Good William is given little space to express himself. All that the reader knows about him is delivered via the stories narrated by Evil William, who is the projector and source of all projected ideas and locutions. Only once was he quoted, which leaves room open for readers to doubt the truth behind Evil William’s descriptions and reports of his doppelganger.

Interestingly, projected locutions and ideas in the short story are often blended with modality (119 instances in 213 occurrences of projection) (see Table 5.3). Modality in “William Wilson” contributes to the creation of figures where the narrator expresses wishes (example 25) about how he imagines others would think and behave, where he hesitates about his own words and thoughts (example 26) or where he refuses or denies actions and facts. In other words, modality helps in tracking the type of speech functions of ideas in particular, where “propositions are thought and proposals are hoped” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 527). Modality turns out to be a recurrent pattern in the short story, reaching therefore the status of ‘prominence’ that “contributes to the writer’s total meaning” (Halliday, 1971, p. 98).

- (25) I **would** fain have them believe that I have been, in **some measure**, the slave of circumstances beyond human control [. . .] I **would** have them allow—what they **cannot** refrain from [. . .]
- (26) It was **about** the same period, **if I remember aright**, that, in an altercation of violence with him
- (27) I **can** recall **no** occasion when the suggestions of my rival were on the side of those errors or follies so usual to his immature age [. . .]

The juxtaposition of modal and projecting mental and verbal processes points to a subtle difference between real and hypothetical projection. Mental process clauses, as suggested by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 531), can be interpreted as cases of ‘hypothetical’, as opposed to ‘real’, projections and as implying ‘possible’ as opposed to ‘certain’ occurrence of those mental activities. Hypothetical projections of ideas are found to be linked to the use of modal verbs like in (25), where the real alternative could be in the form of ‘*I had them believe*’ and ‘*I had them allow*’. These hypothetically projected ideas reflect William Wilson’s regrets and wishes

Table 5.3 Modality in projection

Modal verbs	51
Modal adjuncts	36
Negative polarity	32
Total	119

about events and circumstances that are now impossible to change or to realize. Regrets and wishes, however, do not explicitly refer to one of the two selves. William Wilson explicitly hints at these hypothetical mental activities in the very beginning of the story where he wonders whether he could be living in a dream as illustrated in (28).

- (28) Have I not indeed been **living in a dream**? And am I not now dying a victim to the horror and the mystery of the wildest of all sublunary visions?

It becomes even more difficult to trust the story of a dying narrator whose memories, to him, look more like a dream or a vision than real happenings. This, to some extent, could explain the mixed and distorted memories as in example (26). The presence of hypothetical projection helps in tracking and understanding the unstable state of mind of the narrator.

5. Pragmatic Analysis

At this level of analysis, the focus shall be laid on deixis, modality and perception as intervening parameters in the construction and analysis of reporting strategies. Although these features have been integrated in the SFL section, it will be demonstrated that pragmatics could add more insights and could go beyond the lexico grammatical aspects. The ideational metafunction in SFL explains the various construals of experiences at the clause level and is analysed within the transitivity system. It has been shown (section 1.1.1) how reporting strategies are construed among the participants, the processes and the circumstances. We will explain how those participants, Sayers and Sensors in SFL, person deixis in Pragmatics, and circumstances of time and space (spatial-temporal deixis) could further intervene in the understanding of reporting events.

5.1. Deixis

Within SFL, the study of deixis is linked to the various enactments of evidentiality, outlined in section 4, where the source of projection has been studied. The point has been made that there is a deliberate overlap between the narrator, who is at the same time the main character, and his conflicting selves, leading accordingly to confusion. Such confusion could be tracked along the different functions of person deixis in the short story, which are not necessarily used in the reporting instances but are rather located within a larger co-text.

In the opening of the story, the narrator points to the fact that the name he is using to refer to himself is not his real name (29). This marks a first dichotomy between the 'I' of the real name of the narrator versus the 'I' of the fake name he chooses to use.

- (29) In this narrative I have therefore designated myself as William Wilson,—a **fictitious title** not very dissimilar to the real.

As the story progresses, the narrator alienates himself (the 'I' of Evil William) from his other self ('he' for Good William). Yet the 'I' and the 'he' refer to the same character, in which case the 'I' vs 'Heh' = 'I' (30) or the 'I' vs 'he' = 'one' as in (31).

- (30) This exception was found in **the person of a scholar**, who, although no relation, bore the same Christian and surname as **myself**;—a circumstance, in fact, little remarkable . . .

Wilson's rebellion was to **me** a source of the greatest embarrassment. Yet this superiority—even this equality—was in truth acknowledged by no one but **myself**.

- (31) It was difficult, at any given time, to say with certainty upon which of its two stories **one** happened to be.

The deictic opposition 'now' versus 'then' expresses the opposition between the narrating self and the narrated self. However, either the present claim about the continuity of the past to include now is true, in which case the narrator is as *outré* as the protagonist, or it is not true, in which case the narrator is not reliable. Whatever the case might be, the reliability of the narrator is very much in doubt. This could be spotted in the ways place and time deixis are woven to create deliberate mystification of reference as shown in (32), where reference to the 'here' and 'now' of the reporter also equals the 'there' and 'then'; in (33), where 'these' could be understood as either a deictic reference or an anaphoric reference; and in (34), where a clear distinction between the 'now' and 'then' is marked.

- (32) During the five years of my residence **here**, I was never able to ascertain with precision, in what remote locality lay the little sleeping apartment assigned to myself and some eighteen or twenty other scholars.
- (33) The extensive enclosure was irregular in form, having many capacious recesses. Of **these**, three or four of the largest constituted the play-ground.
- (34) Yet I must believe that my first mental development had in it much of the uncommon—even much of the *outré*. [. . .] In childhood I must have felt with the energy of a man what I **now** find stamped upon memory in lines as vivid, as deep, and as durable as the *exergues* of the Carthaginian medals.

Reporting, therefore, inevitably involves reference to the grammatical category of person. The reporter has many options in so doing. One parameter would be whether the participants and the people referred to

in the original speech event happen to be the same as or different from the participants and the people referred to in the reporting speech event. The determination of who is reporting what to whom about whom has a direct bearing on the choice of pronouns, which is taken here as a social demarcation strategy. The second parameter is the reporter's perception of his/her social standing with respect to the addressee and the people referred to. This perception of power relations is reflected in the choice of referring expression.

In addition to the grammatical category of person, reporting necessarily involves contextualization in the structures of space and time. The reporter has to locate the spatial deictic information with respect to a given deictic centre measured against his/her own underlying here (viewed as either proximal to it or distant from it). To the difficulties related to deixis is added one further complication overriding them, namely the speaker's modal attitude to what is being reported (in terms of identification and belief vs distancing; involvement versus detachment).

The above-mentioned possibilities provide the basis for the notion of narrative transformations (Triki, 1989). The argument is that despite the complex surface structures informing widely different narrative forms, every use of indices pertaining to person, space and time or to attitudes and modal judgements is amenable in essence to the binary opposition 'I' versus 'not-I'. The complexity stems from the transformations which these basic structures undergo. The model proposed here is based on a basic opposition between one locus of consciousness as the axis of reference or anchorage and all the others being shifters (Triki, 1989); that is, they are defined with respect to this centre. The complexity stems from the confrontation of all these potential centres. The same linguistic devices could have different values depending on the identity of their defining centre. What is more, in case of displacement, they could be transformations of latent canonical devices. But sometimes transformations only operate half way through; that is, certain elements are transformed, and others are not; hence the ambivalence and potential confusion.

5.2. A Wider Context for Pragmatic Interpretation

Because the case study here is an example of verbal art, literary, psychological, sociological and ideological perspectives are also needed to account for the subtle use of reporting strategies and the possible reasons behind the choices Poe made while depicting his protagonist and his plot. First, Kirsch's (2011) functions of the unspeakable in American Gothic literature include the deliberate silences, irruptions, contradictions, omissions and other moments when the text either deliberately or perhaps unintentionally violates the conventions of written language—in order to explore their implications for socio-historical mindsets, for the

self-conscious construction of 'American' identity and for human psychology (Kirsch, 2011, p. 1).

From the angle of reporting, the narrator's insistence on the simultaneous existence of past and present (ibid., p. 2) and the ensuing simultaneity of history and present time suggests a profound anxiety over the impossibility of escaping history. This anxiety would be especially relevant and troubling for a region (the South) and a nation implicated in the immorality of slavery. Thus, in Poe's "William Wilson," linguistic excess (when this excess of words draws attention to its inability to contain definitive meaning) appears in moments of anxiety over the stability and uniqueness of the self, implicating a larger cultural insecurity of individual and national selfhood in a 19th century America which had only recently declared independence and had yet to fully distinguish itself culturally from Britain (ibid., pp. 1–2).

Evidence from psychology (Scottoline, 2008, p. 91) shows that the perception of a threat to SELF is greater when it comes from within than from without. Scottoline (2008, p. 91) contends that Poe may not have invented the Evil Twin, but he certainly anticipated it, as well as the spookiness that comes from the fragmenting or doubling of the self and the splintering of identity. Poe must have known that no monster is half as scary as the evil within us, and it is tempting to wonder if he 'wrote what he knew', considering his own personal unhappiness and the fact that he assigned William Wilson his own birthday.

Finally, the religious/biblical dimension is best developed by Scottoline (2008, p. 88), who compared the narrator to 'Ishmael', the Biblical envious brother of Isaac (Genesis XVI, XVII). She finds the twist/reversal of the doppelganger motif quite original (Scottoline, 2008, p. 89). Instead of the main character being the good one and the double being the bad one, in "William Wilson" the narrator is the bad one and the double is the good one. This reversal has intertextual allusions to John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, where Satan was given a higher degree of audibility and credibility than Jesus (Scottoline, 2008, p. 90).

6. Prospects for the SFL-Pragmatics Interface

The analysis of the short story introduced in sections 3, 4 and 5 constitutes an illustration of how texts could be analysed following a two-step procedure. The first step focuses on the lexico grammatical realizations of a specific language function such as reporting, leading thus to a deep understanding of the various choices made to report speech and thought. The power of the SFL framework in this first phase is to provide a clear understanding, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of the different meanings expressed, including metaphorical ones. A finer distinction between the various options is shown to be more prominent when other frameworks, such as the ones suggested by Leech and Short (1981) and Semino and Short (2004), are considered.

When it comes to the overall understanding of the hidden, and perhaps the deliberate intentions of authors, pragmatic analysis comes into play as a second step and opens up the scope to look at the inferential meanings of reporting strategies by considering wider contexts. Certain questions raised in pragmatics could not be answered in SFL. These questions, although rooted in the social, cultural and ideological dimensions of language, an aspect of language use immensely recognized in SFL, but relatively not thoroughly followed in the analysis and interpretation of the grammatical analysis, could be handled by pragmatic analysis. The focus in pragmatics is on what is not explicitly stated; in other words, the focus is not on what a certain utterance means but rather on what a speaker means by a specific utterance (Leech, 1983). The notion of meaning beyond the clause could as such be extended to cover meanings beyond the surface level of instantiation to encompass pragmatic nuances related to ideological implications of the surface meaning as rightly suggested by Martin (1986, p. 227) in his extension of the scope of context to include ‘ideology’ as a level higher than genre and register.

This complementarity between SFL and pragmatics is subject to a continuing debate in the literature about the extent to which SFL and pragmatics share common ground and common objectives. The two theories claim to provide analytical tools and methods that enable researchers to understand how language users deploy semiotic systems to interact with other language users in specific contexts. SFL suggests the investigation of language based on the three metafunctions of language which are thought to cover all aspects of human language properties, in the sense that any clause uttered would necessarily evoke a particular meaning that will be construed via the type of process used, the participants involved in the meaning generation and a particular relationship linking the speaker/writer and hearer/reader. Yet, being a form of artistic writing whereby the author would transcend language and meanings created in the language, literary texts are often elusive in accepting linguistic analyses that stop at the level of description and interpretation based on the sole tools in the theories of grammar, hence the need for a pragmatic approach.

This interface has been advocated by a number of researchers, pioneered by Butler (1988, p. 5), who acknowledges the “substantial overlap between Halliday’s concerns and those of pragmaticians”. Wylie (2009) advocates a functional account of the ideational metafunction as the seat of reference, being as it is the most pragmatic of the metafunctions rather than the least. He argues that Leech fails to make a convincing case for rejecting functionalism, while Halliday fails to make a convincing case for accepting it. Similarly, Song (2005) calls for a complementary relation between pragmatics and SFL. On the one hand, pragmatics and SFL have common interests in the function, context and meaning of language. On the other hand, the notions of presupposition and conversational implicature in pragmatics certainly benefit SFL, whereas the semiotic and functional conceptions of language in SFL favour pragmatics.

The pragmatic perspective (Mey, 2001) emanates from the importance attributed to the social dimension of language. As Pietarinen (2007, p. 127) has rightly argued, speech is not a personal possession, but a social one; for it belongs, not to the individual, but to the member of society. Moreover, Pietarinen (2007, pp. 129–131) notes the heterogeneous models of context: either being aware of the particulars of the conventions or normative grounds of language use may require a reconstruction of the socio-historical context within which the utterances must be understood, or the utterer's and the interpreter's propositional attitudes, including beliefs and intentions, delineate a different, cognitive type of context.

7. Conclusion

In this chapter, we have examined the complexity of reporting in an example of fictional narrative to show how verbal and mental representations of characters can be so complex that a combination of linguistic and pragmatic tools could be suitable to better unveil their realizations and meanings. We have argued that such a combination of approaches is indeed helpful in the analysis and interpretation of verbal art where categories of narration and projection, on the one hand, and categories of lexico-grammar and logico-semantic meanings, on the other hand, could overlap and mislead the reader. We have demonstrated that SFL offers a linguistic framework of analysis which can constitute the basis of pragmatic and literary interpretations. Thus, understanding how locutions and ideas, for instance, are construed at different group and clause levels is a necessary step towards a solid interpretation of literary texts in terms of the socio-cultural, psychological and ideological mechanisms that govern narrators' and characters' use of reporting strategies.

Glossary

Verbal art	Pragmatics
Projection	Evidentiality
Reporting strategies	SFL

Notes

1. All examples in this section are from Semino and Short (2004).
2. www.wagsoft.com/CorpusTool/.
3. The term 'projector' will include both Sayer and Senser.

References

- Arús, J. (2008) Ideational and interpersonal manifestations of projection in Spanish. In C. Wu, C. Matthiessen and M. Herke (Eds.), *Proceedings of ISFC 35: Voices*

- Around the World*. Sydney: International Systemic Functional Congress, pp. 195–200.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2008) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, edited by M. Holquist, 7th ed. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Butler, C. S. (1988) Pragmatics and systemic linguists. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, pp. 83–102.
- Eggs, S. (2004) *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. New York and London: Continuum.
- Fowler, R. (1986) Studying literature as language. In T. D'haen (Ed.), *Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Goffman, E. (1986) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gwilliams, L. and Fontaine, L. (2015) Indeterminacy in process type classification. *Functional Linguistics*, 2(1).
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1971) Linguistic function and literary style: An enquiry into the language of William Golding's 'the inheritors'. In S. Chatman (Ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 330–368.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999) *Construing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hasan, R. (1989) *Linguistics, Language, and Verbal Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2001) The dialogical self: Toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology*, 7(3), pp. 243–281.
- Hermans, H. J. M. and Kempen, H. J. G. (1993) *The Dialogical Self: Meaning as Movement*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M., Kempen, H. J. G. and Van Loon, R. J. P. (1992) The dialogical self: Beyond individualism and rationalism. *American Psychologist*, 47, pp. 23–33.
- James, W. (1890) *The Principles of Psychology*, vol. 1. New York: Henry Holt.
- Kirsch, E. (2011) 'Why? Why? Why? Why? Why?': Functions of the 'unspeakable' in American gothic literature. *AHSS Summer Research Report*.
- Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Leech, G. and Short, M. (1981) *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. and Short, M. (2007) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Martin, J. R. (1986) Grammaticalising ecology: The politics of baby seals and kangaroos. In T. Threadgold, E. A. Grosz, G. Kress and M. A. Halliday (Eds.), *Language, Semiotics, Ideology*, vol. 3. Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture.
- Martin, J. R. and White, P. R. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mey, J. (2001) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Donnell, M. (2008) The UAM CorpusTool: Software for corpus annotation and exploration. *Proceedings of the XXVI Congreso de AESLA*, Almeria, Spain.

- O'Donnell, M., Zappavigna, M. and Whitelaw, C. (2009) A survey of process type classification over difficult cases. In J. Carys and E. Ventola (Eds.), *From Language to Multimodality: New Developments in the Study of Ideational Meaning*. UK: Equinox eBooks Publishing, pp. 47–64.
- Pietarinen, A. V. (2007) On historical pragmatics and Peircean pragmatism. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 2(1), pp. 123–143.
- Scottoline, L. (2008) Identity crisis. In M. Connelly (Ed.), *In the Shadow of the Master: Classic Tales by Edgar Allan Poe*. Harper Collins e-books, pp. 87–94.
- Semino, E. and Short, M. (2004) *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Song, Y. (2005) The complementary relation between pragmatics and systemic-functional grammar. *US-China Foreign Language*, 3(11).
- St. Clair, R. N., Thomé-Williams, A. C. and Su, L. (2005) The role of social script theory in cognitive blending. In M. F. Medina and L. Wagner (Eds.), *Special Issue of Intercultural Communication Studies XI*, vol. V.
- Thompson, G. (2014) *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Triki, M. (1989) *Linguistic and Perceptual Subjectivity: Towards a Typology of Narrative Voice*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Essex University, UK.
- Triki, M. (1991) The representation of SELF in narrative. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 20(2), pp. 78–96.
- Wylie, P. K. (2009) Leech and the limits of functionalism. In C. Wu, C. Matthiesen and M. Herke (Eds.), *Proceedings of ISFC 35: Voices Around the World*. Sydney: International Systemic Functional Congress, pp. 161–166.
- Wynne, M. (2005) Stylistics: Corpus approaches. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier. Available at: www.pala.ac.uk/uploads/2/5/1/0/25105678/corpora_stylistics.pdf

Not for distribution