

## Royal language and reported discourse in sixteenth-century correspondence

Evans, Melanie

DOI:

[10.1075/jhp.18.1.02eva](https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.18.1.02eva)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Evans, M 2017, 'Royal language and reported discourse in sixteenth-century correspondence', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 30–57. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.18.1.02eva>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 8/3/2016

**General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# Royal language and reported discourse in 16<sup>th</sup> century correspondence\*

Mel Evans, University of Birmingham

## 1. Introduction

Early Modern English letters are full of voices. As written texts composed to inform, instruct, and entertain, letter-writers draw on the utterances of others in the process of constructing their message. Thus, we find anecdotes like the following example, which Henry Stuteville (Stuffield) uses to conclude his letter to Sir Nathaniel Bacon in 1584:

hir Majestye was verye pleasante upon Asche Wedensdaye whoe in goinge to the chappell the gentelmen usshers callynge on the Lordes to goe on afore answer was returned that the chappell dore was sh[u]t & that they colde not get in: the Quene answered that was a good skewce for those that refused to com to church at all. (PCEEC, BACON\_309, 1584)

Although it may seem a fairly innocuous example, Stuteville's anecdote illustrates the integral role of language reporting in Early Modern correspondence. He reports, and thus recontextualises, the original words of the gentleman ushers, the Lords and, for the punchline of his tale, the answer of Queen Elizabeth I. It is the forms and functions of this latter example, what I call "royal reports", that are the focus of this paper.

What might have led to Stuteville to report the queen's utterance in the way he did? It is recognised that the interplay between the original utterance and its repurposing for a new reporter and addressee allows reported language to serve diverse discursive goals (Volosinov 1973: 119). Present-day studies (e.g. Johansen 2011, Lampropoulou 2012) find that speakers use reported language strategically, drawing on the stylistic value of presentation forms, to repurpose the autonomous utterance for their purposes. Work on the history of English suggests that reported language has similar communicative significance for speakers in earlier periods of the

---

\* I wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive comments on an earlier version of this paper.

language, but that the systems and values were differently configured (Moore 2011). In the case of Stuteville, he may have felt that the queen's comment warranted acknowledgement: a glimpse of her wit among the trappings of sovereignty. What cannot be identified, on the basis of a single example, is whether Stuteville's royal report, an indirect speech report, is typical of the genre in the period. A corpus-based approach, using the *Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence*, offers a means of examining the formal and functional aspects of royal reports.

Surprisingly, sixteenth-century correspondence is underutilised for studies of reported language, although its potential is indicated in work on eighteenth-century letters (e.g. Palander-Collin and Nevala 2010). The relationship between *who* letter-writers report, and *how* they report them, is similarly under-examined; especially when a writer is recontextualising the language of high-status sources, such as the monarch.<sup>1</sup> Although present-day studies have identified a link between quotation and the authority of the reported speaker (e.g. Caldas-Coulthard 1994), less work has been done to assess how, and when, this status-sensitive system came about. If, as Volosinov (1973: 117) posits, language reports provide a unique insight into how society perceives and receives the language of others, then, I suggest, royal reports offer a window on how authoritative sources were framed, valued, contested, and utilised in the past, and allow us to consider their bearing on the values and practices of reporting in the history of English. The findings suggest that the PDE system of reported language was influenced by the early modern cultural shift from oral traditions to written records and print (e.g. Fox 2000). Royal bureaucracy has previously been identified as an important contributor to this development (Clanchy 2013), and I suggest that the status of reports of royal sources, which increasingly relayed written as well as spoken utterances, played a role in the development of English reporting systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, "speaker", "reporter" and "letter-writer" are used interchangeably to refer to the reporter of an anterior utterance. "Source" is used to refer to the original speaker of the utterance.

## 2. Reporting Language in Present-Day English<sup>2</sup>

Studies of reported language are concerned with three dimensions: form, authenticity and function (Clift and Holt 2007: 3). The formal dimension considers the linguistic properties of a report, which reflect the level of interference with the original utterance during the process of recontextualisation. Direct speech preserves the orientation (deixis, tense, pronouns) of the original utterance, whereas indirect speech subsumes the utterance into the present speaker's perspective.

The authenticity dimension is concerned with the fidelity of the report. Studies observe a difference between values and actual practice, suggesting that an expectation of *verbatim* reproduction for direct reports is a widely-held belief, but that in practice it applies to a narrow range of (largely written) genres, e.g. academic writing. Elsewhere, particularly in speech, concerns over authenticity are subordinate to priorities such as engaging the listener (e.g. Wade and Clark 1993). Direct reports are thus better understood as a demonstration of the original utterance (Clark and Gerrig 1990), rather than an exact clone. Along similar lines, Short et al. (2002) posit that "faithfulness" is a better descriptor than verbatimness for the fidelity implied by direct reports.

The third dimension of reported speech is its functionality: what reporters do with a reported utterance. The power of reported language arises from the pragmatic potential of recontextualisation. A reported utterance "serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions" (Bakhtin 1981: 324): that of its reporter and that of the source. The double-voicedness of reported language grants it an important role in agency-framing and responsibility-framing for speakers, whereby the "locus of agency" (Johansen 2011: 2857) can be projected to a greater or lesser extent onto the source of the utterance, which a speaker can then evaluate accordingly (Johansen 2011: 2849).

---

<sup>2</sup> Scholarship on language reporting has debated the terminology used to describe the phenomenon. Leech and Short (2007) originally suggest "representation", which Short (2012) augments to "presentation" on the basis that representation suggests a definite, anterior utterance, which is not applicable in many (most) instances. Conversely, conversation analysts have continued to use the term "report", whilst acknowledging that such reports are fluid and diverse in their authenticity and presentation form (e.g. Tannen 1989). This paper also uses "report" with similar caution. The interface between oral and written modes of utterance and presentation in correspondence, which emphasises documentation, are usefully alluded to in the term.

The stylistic values of direct and indirect speech are essential to the speaker's strategy. The attributes of a report, including the reporting verb or noun, attitudinal markers, and the message presentation (direct or indirect) can shape how a report is received in its new context. Direct reports create a "gap" between the utterance and the reporter due to the lack of the latter's interference (Thompson and Ye 1994), foregrounding the action of the utterance and enabling the reporter to signal objectivity, deference, or distance from the reported proposition and the source. This can be seen in the way that direct speech offers greatest license for speakers to report taboo utterances with "reduced personal responsibility" (Goffman 1974: 512). Indirect reports, due to their greater integration into the new context, have a lesser gap between source and reporter. This downplays the utterance's action and potentially impedes the evaluation and attribution of responsibility towards the source, rather than reporter (Johansen 2011).

The representational power of reported language for the reporter is particularly acute when the source has a high social status. This promotes particular practices of reporting. Media texts elevate the language of powerful individuals through direct report, and downplay those with lesser social status either through the use of indirect forms of presentation, or by silencing them entirely (Caldas-Coulthard 1994). This strategy allows the most significant utterances to 'speak' in the new context, a pragmatic quality that is perhaps equivocal to taking the floor in a face-to-face conversation, whereby the powerful speaker holds the floor for longer. By letting a high-status source speak directly, the reporter can defer to their authority and then endorse or mitigate the utterance as befits their argument.

Source status has a related impact on the framing of reports. In spoken discourse, Blackwell and Fox (2012) found a difference in the quotative choices of Northern Californian students, with the prototypical (conservative) *say* preferred over the innovative *be like* for high-status speakers. Johnstone (1987) found a similar correlation between the use of the historical present (*says*) and high-status sources. Similar stylistic properties are evident in written discourse, such as the selection of reporting verbs that offer neutral, positive or negative evaluations of the reported message from recognised authorities, such as peer-reviewed research in academic writing (Thompson and Ye 1994).

The relationship between reporting style and high-status sources applies cross-linguistically. Satoh (2001) found that the Japanese press presented the language of the Imperial family almost exclusively in direct reports. Satoh (2001: 179-80) suggests this strategy allows journalists to "protect themselves against libel, restrictions on coverage, and attack", using the greater gap between utterance and reporter, whilst also demarcating the family as one that "belongs to a noble class". This latter aspect is achieved through the ability of Japanese to mark direct speech typographically or through the inclusion of honorifics not normally reproduced in journalistic writing. Satoh found that the latter kind of direct speech, which he terms "authentic", was exclusive to royal language reports, offering a presentation of the Imperial family as "well-mannered, genteel...[and] polite to everyone all the time" (Satoh 2001: 180). The discursive strategies of the Japanese press, through the limited mediation of royal reported language, adhere to and thus sustain the authority of the royal family, drawing on the ideological values of direct presentation as being more objective and in accordance with negative politeness, more distanced and respectful.

### **3. Reported Language in Early Modern English**

The growth of research on reported language in PDE has been paralleled in investigations of historical periods. For the Early Modern English (EModE) period (conventionally dated 1500-1700), studies suggest that the formal properties, values and functions are differently configured. Moore (2011) finds that linguistic features (e.g. reported clause, interjections, vocatives) play a more significant role in language reports than in subsequent periods, partly due to inconsistent punctuation practices. Reporting verbs, such as *say* and *quoth*, are pragmaticalised, acting primarily as structural markers that point to the reported utterance. Relatedly, the distinction between direct and indirect reporting categories in EModE appears less rigid than in PDE. Some reports do not include the expected deictic shifts, and other quotations move fluidly between categories without attention to utterance boundaries or textual marking.

There are also differences in authenticity values. Early Modern speakers appear to prioritise sense over lexico-grammatical form, indicating that values surrounding *verbatim* reporting were less established than in PDE. Moore's (2011: 105) analysis

of sermons suggests that scriptural quotations were valued not "as a testament of the particular words of a given scriptural source, necessarily, but as an expression to be valued because authoritative, hence, true". A different ideological framework helps to explain the 'inaccurate' replication of authority sources; for example, a sermon that presents a quotation of St. Bernard in direct speech actually paraphrases the original utterance (Moore, *ibid.*). These examples demonstrate "a looser relation [...] to authoritative citation than present-day quotation practices" (Moore 2011: 104-5). Moore's careful analysis of sermons, as well as depositions and literary texts, suggests that the EModE is a key period for the development of language reporting, with the values and formal properties intertwined.

The patterns of reporting style for high-status sources in Present Day English offer a useful frame through which to explore the three dimensions of language reporting in earlier periods; particularly, I suggest, for EModE, because the social structure of sixteenth-century England was so highly stratified. Individuals were more constrained by their social rank than present-day English society. Early Modern social structures have already shown correlations with morphosyntactic change in the period (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003), and in pragmatic properties such as indirect requests (Culpeper and Archer 2008).

Although the status of a source can be contextually determined, i.e. the standing of an eyewitness statement compared with a speculative account, the notion of status pursued in the present analysis is the kind derived from hierarchical social structure.<sup>3</sup> Similar to Satoh's study of journalistic reporting practices of the Imperial family, the following exploration of source status uses reports of the reigning monarch as its focus. In the sixteenth-century, the monarch was an elite, unique individual, distinct from the nobility and gentry on the basis that their position as ruler was appointed by God. Their status was thus indisputable (in principle, at least), always superior, and warranted recognition by all subjects (Griffiths, Fox and Hindle 1996: 2). Importantly, the analysis of royal reports complements previous scholarship on the Tudor monarchy primarily conducted in literary and historical frameworks. This work suggests that the construction of royal authority in the sixteenth-century was largely a verbal exercise, highlighting the role of texts and documents in the design and

---

<sup>3</sup> Contextually-derived status is also of interest, but requires information that is not reliably available in a corpus-based study of Early Modern correspondence.

propagation, celebration, and contestation of authority throughout the Tudor regime (e.g. Gordon, under review; Sharpe 2009). However, whilst these studies have documented a range of social practices that constitute the royal political machine, less attention has been paid to their linguistic realisation, and the relation of these communicative acts to other developments in the English language of the period.

The complex phenomenon of royal authority was engineered by a team of bureaucrats and secretaries acting in spoken and written capacities. Thus we find scenes such as the following, chronicled by Hall (1548), which foreground reporting as a key device in the mechanisms of power:

[T]he kyng (by the mouth of the Lord Chauncelor) answered that where he [Audley] disabled hym selfe in wit and learnyg, his awne ornate oracion there made testified the contrary (Hall [1548] 1809: 765).

Appreciably, language reports of royal sources are only a small part of Early Modern reports, but I follow the suggestion of Culpeper and Archer (2008) that close analyses allow the pragmatic nuances of linguistic forms to be documented, which are then compared to the language system more generally. This study thus contributes to our understanding of how royal, authoritative language was perceived and received, and how this relates to the known practices of language reporting for EModE.

#### **4. Methodology: royal reports in correspondence**

The analysis of royal reports could potentially consider a range of genres from the sixteenth century, with discussions of royal power and the presentation of royal voices found in texts as diverse as historical chronicles and dramatic dialogue. However, correspondence provides a particularly rich resource for the investigation of sixteenth-century conceptions of reporting and source status, due to the functions and conventions of the genre.

Correspondence has long been a means of conveying and discussing royal instructions and information. Clanchy (2013: 5) suggests royal letter-writing was a primary factor in shifting documentation practices from oral to written records. In the centuries preceding the Tudor regime, he observes that the government was the primary producer of written texts, with a particular kind of letter, writs, used to convey



succinct written commands (Clanchy 2013: 92). Epistolary exchanges continue to play a central role in the transmission of news and events throughout the sixteenth century. Additionally, royal reports in correspondence offer examples of actual anterior language reports, rather than fictitious constructs (i.e. dramatic dialogue). Letters also provide evidence of the interactive use of royal quotation, which form part of the letter-writer's strategy to inform, instruct or entertain a specific recipient.

In the sixteenth century, letters are positioned at the crossroads of spoken and written traditions, in a period in which the traditional values of oral memory were gradually being superseded by written statements. The transition towards the primacy of text (especially print) was a gradual and often difficult process, with many people greatly suspicious of the authenticity of a written document compared with an oral account (Clanchy 2013: 194). Correspondence exemplifies the tensions between the old and the new. Even in the sixteenth century, with the advent of printing, correspondence layered orality over the written text. A letter was the product of speech and writing; the message typically transcribed by a scribe according to the dictated (spoken) instruction of the named author. Its reception was a combination of hearing and seeing, as the letter's bearer would typically read the letter aloud to the named recipient. Bearers were also often entrusted with a verbal message separate from a letter, which was deemed unsuitable for writing (Clanchy 2013: 265). At the same time, visual properties of correspondence carried increasing social significance; for instance, the choice of script and the layout of the page indicated a writer's relationship with the recipient (see Daybell 2012). Thus, letters offered a range of pragmatic affordances, depending on how one conceptualised their message, as primarily spoken or written.

Work on Late Modern English correspondence has identified "general tendencies" in how letter-writers use language reports (Palander-Collin and Nevala 2010: 113), with the writer's relationship with the recipient, the topic, and the writer's purpose influencing reporting practice, particularly in regards to direct quotation. As the analysis will show, the reporting of royal sources similarly reveals some general tendencies, which appear sensitive to the epistolary conventions of the Early Modern period, and in which direct quotation has especial significance.

The investigation uses data from the *Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence* (henceforth PCEEC), a corpus that has proven valuable in previous studies of language variation and change (e.g. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003). The study of royal reports is limited to sixteenth-century correspondence, a period which offers socio-political coherence. The Tudor monarchy, spanning 1497 to 1603, show consistency in their macro-level strategies of rule (Sharpe 2009), which provides a solid basis for descriptive and interpretative analysis. The events of the seventeenth century (e.g. the Civil War and the Restoration) provide a very different social context that warrants substantial attention in its own terms. The sixteenth century is also characterised as a period of rapid linguistic change, suggesting reported language may also show development in this time.

The socially representative composition of PCEEC affects the royal reports available for analysis. Not all letter writers have cause or opportunity to report the speech of the monarch, and thus the linguistic practices of those who *do* have cause, such as those based at the Court, are necessarily over-represented. However, the potentially narrow social range of the data is itself significant, as the styles of royal reports may differ across communities (cf. Lampropoulou 2012). The Court, in particular, has been identified as a leading group for many morphosyntactic changes during the sixteenth century, and thus identifying the practice of royal reporting may provide an important reference point for the development of reporting more broadly.

The reports of royal language were identified with wildcard searches for monarchic titles (e.g. *grace*, *highness*, *king*) using AntConc 3.4. The search results were extracted from relevant concordance lines with further royal reports identified from the surrounding context e.g. anaphoric references (*he*, *she*). Following Moore (2011), the boundaries of a reported utterance token were based on a break in expression such as the end of a sentence, or a new reporting clause.

The royal reports were manually sorted and categorised according to socio-pragmatic and formal criteria. Classification of report style was based on the framework of Short and Semino (2004), originally devised for PDE but which has proven applicable to Early Modern data (McIntyre and Walker 2011). This specifies the mode of report (speech, thought or writing) and the category of presentation (direct, indirect, reports of speech acts and narration of voice). The framework

requires two adjustments to capture the particular qualities of royal report. Firstly, the mode Expressed Intent is introduced for reports in which some kind of communicative act is reported, but is not modally specified (see section 10).<sup>4</sup> Secondly, the writing presentation framework is expanded to include the category Written Objects, which includes references to the monarch's written texts, such as their letters or books. The most similar existing category in the Semino and Short (2004: 102) framework is Narrator's Representation of Writing but this appears, based on examples, to apply to acts of writing, rather than the products of it. The functionality and sheer frequency of object references (double the number of other categories of writing report) warrants their categorisation as a particular kind of royal report. This category is discussed in more detail in section 11.

## 5. Overview of Results

The reports of royal language identified in PCEEC span speech, thought, writing and intent modes (see Table 1). Spoken sources account for over half of the data, a proportion that corresponds to the prominence of this mode in other genres in EModE (McIntyre and Walker 2011), and also in PDE texts (Semino and Short 2008: 59).

[Table 1 here]

Previous studies of reported speech and speaker status suggest a link with the category of presentation, with direct speech particularly prominent in reports for high-status sources. However, royal reports do not correspond to this trend (Table 2). Direct reports comprise only 4.6% of the overall dataset, and are used only with spoken reports ( $p > 0.001$ ). The infrequency of direct speech, too, contrasts with the reporting styles found in other genres. McIntyre and Walker (2011: 117) find that direct speech constitutes over 40% of spoken reports in Early Modern news and fiction.

[Table 2 here]

Early Modern letter-writers, then, show an unusual reluctance to use direct speech for royal reports. Only five (male) writers use the form, out of the fifty-four letter-

---

<sup>4</sup> I thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this terminology.

writers represented in the dataset. All are writing in the first-half of the sixteenth century, reporting the language of Henry VIII or a European male monarch. This narrow temporal and social frame makes direct reports a marked style in the PCEEC data. Indirect reports are the norm for letter-writers throughout the century.

The results may arise from the Early Modern valuation of direct and indirect speech differing to that of present-day English. The remainder of this paper will consider the realisation and extent of these differences in detail. Although the correspondence data concur with previous analyses of language reports in the period, which also identify different values of authenticity and accuracy, it is important to note that these studies do not suggest that direct speech was a rare form. Moore's (2011) analysis of sermons, for example, found direct speech was used to present the authority of the source, rather than offer lexico-grammatical accuracy, but she does not suggest that sermon writers would avoid direct speech as a presentation method. To investigate the possible reasons for the distribution of royal reports, direct and indirect speech will be considered first, before contrasting this data with the other modes, in order to build up a picture of the formal, value and functional dimensions of royal language reporting.

## 6. Royal Direct Speech Reports

It is first necessary to establish whether the infrequency of direct speech is specific to royal sources, or if it is a characteristic of correspondence more generally.

Although it has not been possible to compare the royal reports with all non-royal reports in PCEEC, a comparison can be made with reports framed by three of the most frequent reporting verbs: *say*, *answer*, and *quoth*.<sup>5</sup>

[Table 3 here]

Table 3 shows the proportion of direct royal speech found in all occurrences of direct speech that use *say*, *quoth* and *answer* in PCEEC. On average, 13.4% of direct speech reports are quotations of royal speech: a fairly substantial quantity for a small, select social group. However, this average is potentially distorted by the

---

<sup>5</sup> Whilst some studies have been able to extract direct speech using modern editorial punctuation e.g. Moore (2011) uses the CEMVP, this is not sufficiently reliable with PCEEC, which combines texts from edited sources with manuscript transcriptions.

frequency of royal reports with *quoth*, which arguably constitutes a greater proportion of royal utterances than the overall trends would indicate. Notably, of the 150 tokens of *quoth* in PCEEC-16thC, Thomas Wyatt and William Paget (men working as ambassadors in European courts) are responsible for 89%, both royal and non-royal. The social trajectory of this specialised reporting verb warrants further research. By comparison, the prototypical verb, *say*, shows a much smaller proportion of royal reports at 5.4%. The distribution between reporting verbs is statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Another perspective on the distribution of royal and non-royal direct reports is the proportion of each as used for direct and indirect presentation styles. Direct forms account for 16.8% of the non-royal utterances with *say*. They are less frequent for royal speech, with 10% of royal reports with *say* presented directly. Similarly, 2.3% of non-royal reports framed by *answer* are direct, compared with 1.5% of direct reports for royal speech (Table 4).<sup>6</sup> The differences are slight, and are not statistically significant.

[Table 4 here]

From these quantitative findings, we can suggest firstly that direct speech (royal and non-royal) is less frequent (with these verbs) in correspondence than in other genres in the period. This is comparable with the genre's profile for later centuries; Palander-Collin and Nevala (2010: 114) find that direct reports constitute between 12-23% of all reports in eighteenth-century correspondence. Secondly, and contrary to PDE trends, the status of the source has no clear impact on a letter-writer's use of direct presentation, both in terms of frequency and for the reporting verb used.

The infrequency of direct presentation as a reporting style for high-status sources could indicate that direct reports in EModE did not possess the same pragmatic properties found in PDE. Alternatively, it may be that Early Modern letter-writers did not feel compelled to present royal sources any differently to non-royal sources. Yet, the extensive rhetoric inscribed for writing to high status recipients, particularly royals, suggests that the latter is unlikely (Daybell 2012, Pender 2013).

---

<sup>6</sup> This analysis excludes *quoth*, as the verb is used only for direct reports in EModE.

In eighteenth-century letters, Palander-Collin and Nevala suggest that a writer's use of direct reports links to intimacy, emotional foregrounding, and "involvement between the correspondents" (Palander-Collin and Nevala 2010: 115). Below, I consider the formal and functional dimensions of direct royal reports in sixteenth-century correspondence, considering how source status and genre affordances intersect.

Firstly, there is no formal evidence that suggests the use of direct reports is more 'problematic' in letters than other genres. The 47 examples show similar formal properties. All reports are framed with a reporting verb, of which prototypical forms *say* (example 1) and *quoth* (example 2) make up the majority (42 instances). Lexical features, such as discourse markers, affirmatives, or address forms, demarcate the reported speech from the surrounding context. The utterances consistently preserve the orientation of the original utterance such as tense and pronoun choice and support Moore's (2011) argument for the pragmaticalization of reporting verbs and associated features in EModE. In fact, the importance of these features for the letter-writers is indicated by the corrections in a letter by Thomas Cromwell (CP 1/24). The writer inserts "saying" interlineally, despite the main verb "answer" carrying sufficient semantic meaning (for modern readers, at least) to mark the reported utterance (example 1).

1. your grace Sobyrye answeyrd saying that I was not all men, Surlye my lorde as ye know I lykyd her beffor not well but now I lyke her moche woorse (CROMWELL, 1540).
2. Mary, quoth his Grace, I am well a paied therof (MORE, 1523).

Comparing royal and non-royal direct reports, it is the social properties that are most striking. The use of direct presentation for royal language is socially restricted, with the five letter-writers either ambassadors to the English monarch (Thomas Wyatt, William Paget) or high-ranking councillors of Henry VIII (Thomas Cromwell, Thomas More, Stephen Gardiner). By contrast, the letter-writers using direct speech for non-royal reports are from a wide range of social backgrounds. The social distribution of indirect royal reports is also broad.

The users of direct royal reports are also writing to high-status recipients. The ambassadors write to Henry VIII or Mary I, and the other recipients include statesmen such as Thomas Cromwell, Thomas Wolsey or Stephen Gardiner (men who themselves use direct royal reports). However, there is no evidence of social intimacy triggering direct royal reports, as attested in the eighteenth century correspondence of Charles Burney and contemporaries (Palander-Collin and Nevala 2010). Other functions, outlined below, appear more salient.

There is an epistemological difference between royal and non-royal direct speech. The royal reports include only first-order reports; that is, utterances that the letter-writer witnessed in person. This may be significant, given the underlying values of objectivity and authenticity attached to direct reports in PDE. One interpretation is that to use direct speech for royal language, one's account must be based on personally experienced discourse rather than relaying second-hand information or offering hypothetical constructions. The latter kinds of reporting, by contrast, are found in the PCEEC data for direct speech (with *say*, *answer* and *quoth*) for non-royal sources. This suggests that letter-writers did make a link between proximity and direct reports, with the five male letter-writers all in a privileged position to interact with a monarch. Might this be indicative of a verbatim-focussed evaluation of direct reports? I suggest that a verbatim constraint is unlikely, with other attributes such as vividness having a greater explanatory power when considered in the context of epistolary reading, as a spoken process (indeed, as they do in non-royal direct reports in conversational contexts in PDE, as well as eighteenth century correspondence).

Direct speech occurs in narrative accounts of a letter-writer's interaction with the monarch. For example, Thomas More uses direct speech in his account of his attendance upon Henry VIII when writing to his superior Thomas Wolsey:

3. [H]is Highnes perceiving lettres in my hand prevented me ere I could bygynne and saied , Ah ! ye haue lettres nowe by Johne Joachym and I trow sum resolution what they will do (MORE, 1524)

It seems highly unlikely that this quotation reports the king's actual words, verbatim. Instead, I suggest that the direct speech is used for the temporal-spatial and

interactive specificity (e.g. exclamative "Ah!", direct address "ye", adverbial "now") and the reliability this detail adds to the report (Caldas-Coulthard 1994: 303). A key factor influencing language reporting is the recipient of the recontextualised utterance and their relationship to the reporter (Volosinov 1973: 117). At the time of writing, More was working at the Court for the letter's recipient, Thomas Wolsey. The direct report plausibly boosts the reliability of the report, whilst also reflecting positively on More because it demonstrates (verbally) his rapport and proximity to the king. It testifies to his professionalism and accountability.

The ambassadors Thomas Wyatt and William Paget use direct reports as part of the epistolary documentation of their duties, reporting utterances they have witnessed first-hand at the European courts to Henry VIII. The reporting style again suggests the detail and greater dramaticity of direct speech may boost the reliability of their reports; but, as I shall show, in terms of sense, not lexico-grammatical form. Wyatt's correspondence reports his observations of the court of Emperor Charles V, where he had been dispatched on royal command to arrange marriages between Princess Mary and the Infante of Portugal (Burrow 2004). His relationship with Henry VIII was fraught, as the King was unimpressed with Wyatt's ambassadorial performance. Reading the correspondence in this socio-political context, the direct speech appears to be a discursive strategy through which Wyatt can offer an objective (that is, unmodified and thus faithful) account of conversations for Henry's scrutiny. For example:

4. quod he But I wold that both your master and yow wist it well, it is to muche to vse that terme of Ingrate vnto me [...] But peraventure bycause the langage is not your naturall tonge ye may mistake the terme (Wyatt, 1540)

This extract supports the suggestion that direct speech was used for its greater (dramatic) specificity, rather than for its verbatim authenticity, in part because of the translation underpinning the report. The conversations between ambassador and European monarch did not take place in English, yet the majority of both indirect and direct reports are presented in the vernacular. This reporting property is particularly striking in example 4, given that the Emperor's speech comments on Wyatt's non-native linguistic skills.



The direct reports used by the ambassadors and More accrue an additional dimension when one considers that they would have been experienced aurally, as well as visually. Direct speech allows the monarch's words to be 'recreated' for the recipient, and the articulation of the spatial-temporal and interactive properties of the royal utterance provides a richer, more emphatic demonstration of the reported conversation. The first-order direct speech demonstrates distal speech events, to which the letter-writer was a witness, and consequently provides experiential (auditory) verisimilitude to those (that is, their recipient) listening to the letter text.

Some examples do indicate an awareness of, and concern for, the lexicogrammatical authenticity of royal reports. Thomas Cromwell, writing in 1540 whilst imprisoned in the Tower, offers a written testimony of his conversations with Henry VIII, regarding his (unconsummated) marriage with Anne of Cleves. What Cromwell reports, therefore, as being said by the King, has direct consequences for real-world events pertaining to himself and Henry. This context may explain why, unlike the other letter writers, Cromwell inserts evaluative clauses before the direct reports. These "disclaimers" (Moore 2002) emphasise that the accuracy of the quotation is bound to the sense, rather than the specific words:

5. and your grace being in and abowte the middes of your Chamber of presens Callyd me vnto yow Saying thes woordes or the lyke in centens my lorde yf it were not to Satysfye the woorld and my Realme I wolde not doo that I must doo this day For none erthlye thing (CROMWELL, 1540).

Moore (2002) identifies similar disclaimers in Early Modern witness testimonies, e.g. "or siclyk in effect" (2002: 408), which flag the report as formally inaccurate. However, she queries whether these disclaimers were part of the original utterance (that is, stated by the witness) or if they were added as part of the clerk's transcription. This question is important when considering the conception of reported speech in the period, and the social dimension of developments in reporting values. Cromwell's disclaimers are highly formulaic, and show the same non-finite comparative structure as those in slander depositions. Significantly, Cromwell had a legal background (Leithead 2008), which points to disclaimers being part of legal discourse. This suggests that the court clerks, who would have had a comparable

level of legal literacy to Cromwell, were responsible for the deposition disclaimers. Although Cromwell uses direct royal reports in other letters, the disclaimers are only found in the 1540 testimony letter to Henry VIII. Notably, Cromwell is transferring what was traditionally an oral tradition (testimony) to the written/spoken context of correspondence, where the letter would serve both as a record as well as a demonstration of the recollected events.

The disclaimers co-occur with other stylistic elements. Cromwell engineers the reports to foreground the speech of the King, placing his own anterior utterances largely in the background through indirect presentation (example 6), which parallels strategies identified in Present-Day English (e.g. Caldas-Coulthard 1994).

6. I spake with your grace and demandyd of your magestye how ye lykyd the ladye Anne your highnes answeyrd as me thought hevelye And not plesantlye nothing so well as She was spokyn of Saying Ferther that yf your highnes hadde known asmoche beffore as ye then knew she shold not haue Commen within this Realme, Saying as by way of lamentacyon what remedye, vnto the which I answeyrd and said I knew none (CROMWELL, 1540)

Cromwell carefully signals his role as reporter through evaluative clauses that frame the direct presentation of the King's words: "me thought heavily", "as by way of lamentation". This widens the gap between the original utterance and its re-contextualisation as witness testimony, breaking any illusion arising from the use of direct speech. It is a strategy that foregrounds the action of the King's utterance, faithfully relayed, and distinct from Cromwell's spatial-temporally specific interpretation. The disclaimers suggest that the wording of reports carried social value, with some expectations about the accuracy of direct speech reports, at least in legal contexts.

The five letter-writers use direct reports for their detail and dramaticity. Each writer is subordinate to their recipient, with their task being to witness and document royal events. Their social standing and the purposes of the reports appear to be relatively unusual, which helps to explain why direct reports constitute such a small part of the data. It may be significant that these men were all social aspirers, who may have felt that pragmatic effects of direct speech were beneficial to their social ambition. From

this perspective, there is a rather unfortunate correlation, too, between the use of direct royal reports and death by execution: both More and Cromwell were sentenced to death by Henry VIII, and Thomas Wyatt was lined up for the block, prior to his pardon by Queen Katherine Howard. These biographical details testify, perhaps, to the socio-political import of the activities of these men, of which their correspondence, and thus their style of royal reports, played a part.

Comparatively, however, the dominant style of reporting royal language in PCEEC is indirect reports, suggesting a possibly conventionalised practice, socially and stylistically. The possible reasons for this are considered in section 7.

## **7. Royal Indirect Speech**

Having considered royal direct speech in some detail, I now compare it with the indirect royal reports. Impressionistically, the frequency of indirect speech suggests that the significance of most reports is the propositional content, the speech act, rather than the words of a particular utterance. Thus, indirect royal reports offer an insight into how Early Modern letter-writers evaluate royal language: what was deemed relevant to report (in paraphrase) and, although we cannot trace it, what was deemed acceptable to omit. The frequency of indirect reports may partly arise from the practicalities of the genre. Indirect presentation can more flexibly respond to space and time limitations (significant factors for the letter-writing process), whilst ensuring that the propositional content and illocutionary force (i.e. the directive or other speech act) is clearly conveyed. The social distribution of indirect royal reports spans all ranks of letter-writers, and the normalised frequencies, treated as a rough guide, suggest that merchants report the language of the monarch as frequently as nobility (around 2.5 times per 1000 words).

Table 5 shows the distribution of reports across the four modes. Because the analysis has previously focussed on direct speech, I consider the indirect speech categories here, before turning to the other reporting modes in sections 8-10 below.

[Table 5 here]

Indirect reports and report of speech acts (RSA) are the preferred presentation categories, comprising over 80% of the examples in total. The two categories have

different emphases and stylistic qualities, with RSA foregrounding the illocutionary force (i.e. directive, commissive) of the utterance over its formal realisation.

In indirect reports the reporting signal is a significant resource, indicating how the reporter has interpreted, and thus wishes to frame, the reported message (Thompson 1994: 38). The signals for royal reports support the hypothesis that letter-writers were concerned primarily with emphasising the propositional content and illocutionary force of royal speech. In indirect speech, the most frequent verb is the neutral verb *say*, which accounts for 25% of report forms. However, the second-most frequent reporting signal (as well as the most frequent verb for RSA) is *command*, where the illocutionary force relies on the authority of the speaker.

7.       Wherefore his Grace commaunded me to write vn to your Grace that he requyreth your Grace that it may lyke you either in the Starre Chambre to examine the mater of the said citee (MORE, 1528).

The reports of royal commands have two syntactic structures. The first, typical of directives in general, is a finite reporting clause with a non-finite reported clause (Thompson 1994: 37). The second structure (example 7) combines the *to*-infinitive stating the speech act with a *that*-clause, specifying the content of the embedded command in paraphrase. Thus, even though the writer re-orientates the message to their perspective, the reporting verb frames the letter-writer's role as relayer. This is particularly explicit in examples where the command relates to the letter-writer's present actions of writing or informing, usually to give instructions to the recipient that originate from the monarch.

The majority of signals for RSA are nominalisations (57%), which are often embedded within genitive constructions, such as "your maiesties advice" (WYATT, 1540). Thompson (1994: 83) observes that in PDE nominalisations substantiate the report as an established fact, whereas the verbal equivalent presents the action of reporting with room for negotiation i.e. that the speaker did not make such an utterance. Assuming similar implications for EModE, this style of royal report perpetuates the monarch's authority by framing the utterance as an established event. Whilst this is not unsurprising given the verbal basis of Tudor authority, the frequency of this kind of report (and reporting signal) suggests that letters were a key channel for conveying and depicting the monarch's power as an unquestionable fact.

Alongside the reporting signal, indirect reports use other framing devices. Around a quarter of examples contain attitudinal markers, such as adjectival or adverbial premodification (e.g. *gracious*, *gentle*). These are primarily positive evaluations (example 8; Mary Tudor to Edward VI); the rare exceptions are descriptions of *answers* as *cool* or *cold*; temperate metaphors that ensure the criticism is rendered implicit, rather than the semantically more direct (e.g. "cruel answer"; example 9; Thomas Cromwell to Henry VIII).

8. whereunto your Majestie made me a very gentle answer (ORIGIN2, 1551).

9. like as he had brought at his retourne afore , a cold answer from Themperour (CROMWELL, 1539)

The majority of indirect speech reports use a small set of positive modifiers, suggesting that ways of evaluating royal speech were conventionalised. This is particularly notable in collocates of *thank* and *thanks* (e.g. *hearty*, *affectuous*, and *condign*). Curiously, these expressions echo epistolary salutation formulae (Nevala 2004), indicating that reports of royal gratitude are perhaps of questionable authenticity as anterior reports, but are better recognised as a technique pertinent to the letter-writer's purpose. The superlative tone of these reports (example 10), suggests an attempt to flatter the recipient, which typically precedes a directive from the king, also relayed by the letter-writer. Indirect reports in these contexts serve to oil the (correspondence) chains of command. Authenticity is less important than the perlocutionary outcome of the reported illocutionary act.

10. the Kingis Grace , whoo moost affectuousely thanketh your Grace for your spedye advertisement and specially for your studious consideration of the same so diligently declaring by your moost prudent lettres such thingis of waight and substance as to your high wisdomes seemed worthy to be noted (MORE, 1523)

## 8. Summary: Direct and Indirect Royal Speech

The letters that contain direct speech are, as has already been noted, associated with a small group of men writing in the first half of the sixteenth century. All are writing either to the monarch (Henry VIII, Mary I) or to a high-status councillor at the Court to provide an account of specific verbal events that they observed (as auditors or interlocutors) with a given sovereign. Their purpose is thus a kind of news reporting, conveying the "factual basis of the story" (Ikeo 2012: 1184), with professional and legal expectations reliant on, and arising from, their documentation. In PDE news reporting, direct speech is used to provide eyewitness statements that testify to the "factuality...precision and the immediacy of the report" (Ikeo 2012: 1184), a specific kind of reliability that invokes the dramaticality of demonstration (Clark and Gerrig 1990). In Early Modern letters, the demonstration is realised quite literally in the context of epistolary reading (aloud) practices. PCEEC suggests that direct reports of royal speech may constitute a shared practice within the inner-circles of the Court, sustained by the circularity of letter exchange, as seen in the overlap between users and receivers of direct royal reports.

The majority of the letters, however, are a means to pass on the directives, commissives and opinions of the sovereign to relevant subjects. Indirect reports offer a writer greater control over the interpretation of the utterance (Ikeo 2012: 1184): a vital attribute for these letter-writers. Thus, they are careful to foreground the reliability of their indirect report, if we understand this to derive from the authority of the source. The stylistic properties of indirect reports work to emphasise the royal source through features such as reporting signals, speech act verbs, the use of positive evaluative descriptors, and particular syntactic structures (e.g. *to +that* reports). The lexico-grammatical specificity of direct speech is irrelevant in these contexts; the illocutionary force and the signalling of the authority source are of most significance. The complexities of Tudor bureaucracy, where many councillors, secretaries and scribes acted (verbally) on the sovereign's behalf, means that the language reports can simply allude to the idea of the royal speaker, rather than pinpoint the who and how of the speech act. These letter-writers rely on, and perpetuate, royal authority in their reports, but in a very different way to the direct reporters. Upon reading aloud, the proposition and speech act would be clearly signalled. Attention is drawn to the message and its source, rather than its medium.

## 9. Royal Indirect Thought

Reports of royal thought comprise about a quarter of the data, less than speech, but comparable to written reports (see section 11). Thought has previously received most attention in literary studies (e.g. Cohn 1978; Sotirova 2008) because of its necessary artificiality. In the non-literary world, thought is "a private and often non-verbal phenomenon" (Short and Semino 2004: 114), and direct access - even when one is self-reporting - is not possible. The presentation of thought has different conventions to speech and writing presentation, with indirect presentation the typical category. This PDE trend is matched by the PCEEC data, in which only indirect reports are found.

These reports share the prototypical forms of other indirect categories (e.g. *that-* or *to-*clause, deictic orientation to reporter). The signals are drawn from a relatively small set. *Think*, the prototypical verb, is the most common, used for 40% of all reports, alongside others including *seem*, *doubt*, *marvel* and *imagine*. 38 of the 57 tokens of *think* in this category are used by one letter-writer, Sir Thomas More (e.g. example 11):

11. his Highnes verily thinketh as your Grace hath moost prudently wrytten that there were no wisdom therein (MORE, 1523).

It is fair to surmise that More uses *think* as a synonym for *say*, perhaps condensing the meta-cognitive declarative of the king: 'I think that'. However, *think* may also boost the legitimacy of More's report, signalling his proximity to the monarch. There is a superlative dimension to More's reporting style, marking the truth of the thought report (*verily*), and flattering the writing of his recipient. This strategy fits with More's use of direct speech, which also foregrounds the detail (and thus faithfulness) of his account of royal discourse in letters to his superior, Thomas Wolsey (see section 6).

## 10. Expressed Intent

This mode is comparable in its formal and functional qualities to indirect speech and thought reporting, with the distinction that the manner of communication is ambiguous and implicit. It is these examples, in particular, which provide clearest

evidence that indirect royal reports are used for the authority of the proposition (i.e. the source and sense), rather than lexico-grammatical form. These reports all share a specific reporting signal: the genitive noun phrase "the king/queen's pleasure". The examples are functionally similar to the *command* reports in the speech data, used to qualify the letter-writer's actions, or frame a directive aimed at the recipient. Unlike *command*, however, *pleasure* does not explicitly mark the monarch's directive as a spoken or written act. It explicitly attributes the message to its royal source, but does not divulge the mode of delivery:

12. Hir Majeste's pleasure is that you should proceade strictly (BACON, 1576)

The OED Online lists the genitive expression as a sub-entry of *pleasure*, with the definition: "(originally) according to the will of the sovereign". It is first attested in the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century, potentially correlating with the emergence of the royal authority as a verbal (English) phenomenon (Sharpe 2009). It is used by PCEEC writers from a range of social backgrounds, from nobility to merchants. The conventionalisation of the phrase as a reporting signal in many ways parallels the authenticating indexicality of the monarch's personal pronoun *royal we*; a form that was predominantly used by the secretariat of the monarch, signalling (and constituting) the authority of third-party royal texts, rather than the holograph letters and documents of the king or queen themselves (Evans 2013). *Pleasure* is part of the metalinguistic apparatus for talking about royal authority, and illustrates the focus on sense and source, rather than the medium.

## 11. Royal Reports of Writing

In PDE, speech and writing are often discussed collectively, due to their similarity in form and function (Short and Semino 2004). To an extent these similarities are evident in the PCEEC data, for indirect reports at least. However, I suggest that direct writing had a different status to direct speech in the sixteenth century. The data contains no instances of direct writing as embedded or quoted in individual letters: a distribution not overly surprising in light of the other reporting modes. Writers prefer indirect reports and writing acts, which share formal properties with their spoken counterparts, although the distribution of the indirect categories differs with royal speech: 72% of writing reports are Writing Acts (NRWA) compared to 43%



RSA. This plausibly reflects the significance of written actions for the performance of monarchic rule. Letter-writers describe the monarch as *signing*, *writing* and *addressing* texts, particularly letters, as well as providing written answers to previous communication (example 13). Similar to the reports of speech acts, the data foregrounds the verbal (specifically, textual) basis of royal actions through nominalised reports: e.g. *proclamations*, *grants* and *licenses*.

13. that lyke as the French King byfore wrote and bosted vn to his mother that he had of his awne mynd passed in to Italy (MORE, 1524).

The significance of royal authority as a written phenomenon is compounded by the category Written Objects. An addition to Short and Semino's framework, Written Objects are references to royal texts, rather than their act of creation or propositional content, and thus sits at the opposite end of the spectrum to Direct Writing. Although the majority of letter-writers discuss objects separate from their own temporal-spatial position, around one-fifth of reports point to a copy of the monarch's letter enclosed with the letter-writer's text (e.g. example 14).

14. wherof I haue sent you herin closed a vere true and examyned copy (DERBY, 1536)

If reported language is "regarded by the speaker as an utterance belonging to someone else" (Volosinov 1973: 116), then the duplication of a royal letter constitutes a kind of direct writing. The copied reports show similarities with conventional direct writing in both form and function. The letter-writers' references to the copied object act as the reporting signal and, materially, the copies of the letter (the message) preserve the lexico-grammatical attributes of the source text. The copies are effectively a demonstration of the original, approximating and reproducing the linguistic and material properties of the source (Clark and Gerrig 1990). Indeed, they offer a far higher level of modality than an embedded direct report. Copied writing reports have modern equivalents. Matoesian (2000) proposes that the tape-recorded statements used in the Kennedy Smith rape trial operate as a "hyper-form of direct speech" (2000: 900), which provide a vivid and seemingly objective report. The recordings are a step removed from (or beyond) conventional direct

speech because the reporter's role is almost entirely minimised. The similar absence of interference in the copying of the monarch's letters, which maintains the formatting and text for the new recipient, is comparable with Matoesian's hyper-direct reports. Although sixteenth-century letter-writers could, and did, incorporate parts of quoted letters into their correspondence, the PCEEC data suggests this is not the case for royal reports of writing. This could suggest that the decision to either paraphrase or reproduce a text was sensitive to speaker status, as well as reflecting more developed verbatim values for writing than royal speech reports, as suggested by the specified accuracy of the writing copy (see example 14). This suggests that the emergence of the authenticity value of *verbatim* direct presentation may link to the contemporary cultural shift towards written rather than oral records, which was especially marked in writing associated with high-status individuals, such as the monarch.

In the sixteenth century, the growth of documentary culture triggered increasing anxieties about the authenticity of written texts, especially letters (Gordon, under review). Forgery, for example, was a growing concern particularly in regards to royal documents, with new laws asserting the illegality of forging the king's signature and epistles. This signalled a clear shift from preceding centuries; Clanchy (2013: 323) observes that medieval royal charters were frequently updated or renewed 'by' a long-deceased author, which he suggests reflects the transference of the "flexibility of speech and memory" to written records. By the sixteenth-century, the written record was acquiring distinctive values, with attention turning to the linguistic and material properties of the text. Forensic considerations of verbal form and appearance were used to assess the legitimacy of an epistle (Gordon, under review), with the words on the page taking precedence over memory and oral recollection. One might link the increasingly elaborate design (and size, in the case of Elizabeth I) of the signatures of the Tudor monarchs to this shift in attention to written text and authenticity in correspondence, which sat alongside the old spoken conventions of epistolary communication.

Reporting practices cannot have been unaffected by this cultural reconceptualisation. The centrality of royal documentation in this process, in particular, suggests that the treatment of reports of royal writing must have carried considerable pragmatic and social weight. How one reported a text - through careful duplication - is seemingly distinct from how one reported spoken interaction, and the

frequent references to royal written artefacts more generally substantiate the importance 16th century letter-writers placed on the monarchic document. Such importance was realised in its presentation as an accurate, *verbatim* reproduction, in contrast to the employment of direct speech.

## 12. **Conclusion: Early Modern Styles of Reporting Authority**

The analysis of PCEEC suggests that sixteenth-century letter-writers, from royal authors to professionals and merchants, frequently reported royal language as part of their epistolary activities. The comparison of all reports in PCEEC framed by *say*, *answer*, and *quoth* found that royal reports constitute an average of 13% of language reports, which is not an inconsiderable percentage given that the reigning monarch constitutes a single figure (in name, at least). These findings indicate that correspondence was a medium in which reported language was frequent, and that the monarch - as a figure of power and authority - was worthy of talk from all ranks of Early Modern society.

The data indicates that indirect reports were the normal mechanism for reporting royal language, in contrast to PDE preferences. The indirect reports share linguistic features that foreground the source and illocutionary force of the royal utterance. These semi-conventionalised properties enable letter-writers to talk about royal authority even when removed from the original utterance. The message could be disseminated through the chains of commands whilst maintaining its authoritative force by marking its source and proposition. By comparison, direct speech is rare and socially constrained, linked to first-order reports of the social elite. Direct writing is not traceable except through object references, because of its material separation from the reporting clause (the letter text), with evidence of concern for the accuracy of writing reproduction.

There are two main points arising from the analysis of high-status sources in reporting discourse. Firstly, approaches to reported language generally consider the reporter as one who has discursive control; as Caldas-Coulthard posits "[w]riters who report speech in factual reports are extremely powerful because they can reproduce what is most convenient for them in terms of their aims and ideological point of view" (1994: 303). However, I question the accuracy of this statement for sixteenth-century

reporters of royal sources. Royal reports and reporters in correspondence are somewhat circular in their authority because, in most cases, the cause or motivation for the royal report *is* the royal report itself. Unlike in PDE news discourse, whereby a writer can elect to "reproduce the parts they think are important" (*ibid.*), letter-writers reporting royal language are constrained by the requirements and expectations of their sovereign i.e. to fulfil the monarch's command, or by the writer's professional duties. Letter-writers could accrue power through association, but they had little room to express any viewpoint other than one compliant with the dominant, royal ideology. This is reflected in the shared stylistic properties of reports of royal language, such as the phraseology of reports of royal gratitude.

Secondly, the royal reports suggests that modal differences in reporting practice may be an important factor in the development of PDE reporting systems. The references to copied written texts suggest that this mode of report was more bound up with values of *verbatim* reproduction than their spoken counterparts, possibly linked to the contemporary tensions between spoken and written modes. The Early Modern period saw documents replace spoken communication as the authoritative - and thus referential - source. The increasing awareness of the power of documentation, a format that presents ideas and propositions in a precise and traceable lexico-grammatical form, potentially shaped the valuation of high-status reports; more so in writing than in speech. In this period, how something was textually portrayed became increasingly central to testifying to its authenticity, its significance and its authority.

The distinction between speech reports and copied writing, as identified in royal reports, may comprise a small but significant development towards the reporting values of PDE. With royal reports, there is an emphasis on first-hand witnessing in evidential uses of direct speech, which respects the authority of the source and complements the professionalism of the letter-writer. In direct writing, the letter-writers emphasise the fidelity of a written copy of a royal original, paying attention to form and modality (however so realised in practice). As the role of written texts, not just letters, gained momentum as a device for the propagation of authority, the practices of reporting, reproducing, and authentic duplication could be disseminated and reinforced. These practices subsequently may have influenced and shaped the conceptualisation of spoken reports too, when realised in written contexts.

### 13. References

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Blackwell, N. and S. Fox-Tree. 2012. 'Social factors affect quotative choice', *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 1150-1162.

Burrow, C. 2004 [2011] 'Wyatt, Sir Thomas (c.1503–1542)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press,

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30111>, accessed 24 Oct 2014]

Caldas-Coulthard, C. 1994. 'On Reporting Reporting: the representation of speech in factual and factional narratives', in Coulthard (ed.) *Analysing Written Text*

Cromwell, T. 1540. CP 1/24. *Cecil Papers Online*

[[http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url\\_ver=Z39.88-](http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-)

2004&res\_dat=xri:cecil:&rft\_dat=xri:cecil:rec:01\_0065. Last accessed 26th October 2014]

Coulmas, F (ed.). 1981. *Direct and Indirect Speech* Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Clark, H. and R. Gerrig. 1990. 'Quotations as Demonstrations', *Language* 66 (4), 764-805.

Clanchy, M. T. 2013. *From Memory to Written Record*. Third Edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clift, R. and E. Holt. 2007. 'Introduction', in Clift and Holt (eds.) *Reporting Talk: reported speech in interaction* Cambridge: CUP.

Culpeper, J. and D. Archer. 2008. 'Requests and directness in Early Modern English trial proceedings and play texts, 1640-1760'. In Jucker and Taavitsainen (eds.) *Speech Acts in the History of English* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 45-84.

Daybell, J. 2012. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: manuscript letters and the cultures and practices of letter-writing 1512-1635* London: Palgrave.

- Evans, M. 2013. *The Language of Queen Elizabeth I: a sociolinguistic perspective on royal style and identity* Transactions of the Philological Society. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fox, A. 2000. *Oral and literate culture in England 1500-1700* Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Gordon, A. Under review. 'Material Fictions: counterfeit correspondence in Early Modern England'. In Daybell and Gordon (eds.) *Cultures of Correspondence*.
- Griffiths, P., A. Fox, and S. Hindle. 1996. *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hall, E. 1548/1809. *Hall's Chronicle, Containing the History of England During the Reign of Henry IV and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry VIII* Edited by H. Ellis. London <<http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004404948>>
- Ikeo, R. 2012. 'Misleading speech report in the media with a special reference to an Australian defamation case', *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 1183-1205.
- Johansen, M. 2011. 'Agency and responsibility in reported speech', *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 2845-2860.
- Johnstone, B. 1987. 'He says... so I said: verb tense alteration and narrative depictions of authority in American English' *Linguistics* 25 (1), 33-52.
- Lampropoulou, S. 2012. *Direct speech, self-presentation and communities of practice* London: Continuum.
- Leech, G. and M. Short. 2007. *Style in Fiction* London: Routledge.
- Leithead, H. 2004 [2009] 'Cromwell, Thomas, earl of Essex (*b.* in or before 1485, *d.* 1540)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6769>, accessed 24 Oct 2014]
- Li, C. 1986. 'Direct and Indirect Speech: a functional study. In Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 29-34.

- Matoesian, G. 2000. 'Intertextual authority in reported speech: production media in the Kennedy Smith rape trial', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 879-914.
- McIntyre, D. and B. Walker. 2011. 'Discourse presentation in Early Modern English writing: a preliminary corpus-based investigation', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 16 (1), 101-130.
- Moore, C. 2011. *Quoting Speech in Early English* Cambridge: CUP.
- Moore, C. 2002. 'Reporting direct speech in Early Modern slander depositions' In Minkova and Stockwell (eds.) *Studies in the History of the English Language: a millennial perspective*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 399-416.
- Nevala, M. 2004. *Address in Early English Correspondence: its forms and socio-pragmatic functions* Helsinki: Société Néophilologique
- Nevalainen, T. and H. Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language change in Tudor and Stuart England* London: Longman.
- Palander-Collin, M. and M. Nevala. 2010. 'Reporting and social role construction in eighteenth-century personal correspondence' In Pahta, Nevala and Nurmi (eds.) *Social Roles and Language Practices in Late Modern English*, Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins, 111-133.
- Pender, P. 2013. *Early Modern women's writing and the rhetoric of modesty* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence, text version. 2006. Compiled by Terttu Nevalainen, Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, Jukka Keränen, Minna Nevala, Arja Nurmi and Minna Palander-Collin, with additional annotation by Ann Taylor. Helsinki: University of Helsinki and York: University of York. Distributed through the Oxford Text Archive.
- Satoh, A. 2001. 'Constructing imperial identity: how to quote the Imperial family and those who address them in the Japanese Press', *Discourse and Society* 12 (2), 169-194.
- Semino, E. and M. Short. 2004. *Corpus Stylistics: speech, writing and thought presentation in a corpus of English Writing* London: Routledge

- Sharpe, K. 2009. *Selling the Tudor monarchy: authority and image in sixteenth-century England* London: Yale University Press.
- Short, M. 2012. 'Discourse presentation and speech (and writing, but not thought) summary', *Language and Literature* 21, 18-32.
- Short, M, E. Semino and M. Wynne. 2002. 'Revisiting the notion of faithfulness in discourse presentation using a corpus approach', *Language and Literature* 11(4), 325-355.
- Tannen, D. 2007. *Talking Voices: repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) Cambridge: CUP.
- Thompson, G. 1994. *Collins CoBuild English Guides 5: Reporting* London: HarperCollins.
- Thompson, G. and Y.Y. Ye. 1991. 'Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers', *Applied Linguistics* 12, 365-82.
- Voloshinov, V. N. 1973. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Translated by L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York; London: Seminar Press.
- Wade, E. and H. Clark. 1993. 'Reproduction and Demonstration in Quotations', *Journal of Memory and Language* 32 (6), 805-819.