

Отримано: 21 листопада 2017 р.

Прорецензовано: 22 листопада 2017 р.

Прийнято до друку: 23 листопада 2017 р.

e-mail: doolesya@gmail.com

DOI: 10.25264/2519-2558-2017-67-17-22

Ladnytska O. Speech presentation in Ian McEwan's «Enduring love» / O. Ladnytska // Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна». – Острог : Вид-во НаУОА, 2017. – Вип. 67. – С. 17–22.

UDC: 811.111'42

Olesya Ladnytska,

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv

SPEECH PRESENTATION IN IAN MCEWAN'S «ENDURING LOVE»

The article concerns the issue of discourse presentation in fiction and classifies all samples of speech presentation categories in the novel 'Enduring Love' analysing them in terms of their narrative and/or stylistic load as well. Interestingly, despite the novel being written in first person narrative (thus actually enabling its overall interpretation as free direct discourse of the narrator-cum-protagonist wholesale), there are cases of free indirect speech, in their turn capable of ironic effect apart from that of immediacy. Direct speech – treated broadly and encompassing free direct speech in its case of using either inverted commas or reporting clause and not both) – exceeds all other categories in terms of space accorded to it. All others amount to 504 samples. Indirect speech uses a variety of verba dicendi for its narratorial purposes. Narrative report of speech act features the most in number – 215 cases. Narrative report of voice and its reversed variety detected may paradoxically subvert the narratorial interference assumptions belying as they do the characters' emotions.

A peculiar feature of speech presentation in Ian McEwan's 'Enduring Love' is its functioning along the lines of tone, distance, point of view, manipulative effects, which results in treating the narrator as unreliable and reliable, depending on the reader's perception and his/her overall reading experience and disposition.

Key words: speech and thought presentation (STP), direct speech (DS), indirect speech (IS), free indirect speech (FIS), free direct speech (FDS), narrative report of speech act (NRSA), narrative report of voice (NV), «Enduring Love», Ian McEwan.

Олеся Львівна Ладницька,

Львівський національний університет ім. Івана Франка, м. Львів

ВІКЛАД МОВЛЕННЯ ПЕРСОНАЖІВ У РОМАНІ ІЕНА МАК'ЮЕНА «ENDURING LOVE»

У статті класифікуються та аналізуються способи викладу мовлення персонажів у романі Ієна Мак'Юєна «Enduring Love», простежуються їхні нарративні та/або стилістичні функції. Незважаючи на оповідь від першої особи (що, відтак, уможливило її трактування як вільне пряме мовлення оповідача-персонажа загалом), роман містить зразки невластиво-прямого мовлення, яке, своєю чергою, окрім відчуття присутності, здатне на іронічний ефект. Пряме мовлення – що розглядається широко і включає вільне пряме мовлення у випадку його викладу в лапках або в супроводі репрезентуючого компонента, а не обох відразу – перевищує за обсягом усі інші категорії, яких сумарно 504 випадки. Для непрямого мовлення характерні різноманітні дієслова говоріння, залежно від мовленнєвої ситуації. Найбільше зафіксованих випадків у категорії повідомлень про мовленнєвий акт (215). Повідомлення про голос та виявлена у романі його обернена форма парадоксально підривають ідею найбільшого втручання оповідача, оскільки засвідчують у процесі емоції персонажів.

Характерним для типів викладу мовлення персонажів роману Ієна Мак'юєна «Enduring Love» є їх функціонування в аспекті тональності, дистанції, точки зору, маніпулятивності, що проявляється у трактуванні критиками оповідача як ненадійного чи надійного, залежно від інстанції читача.

Ключові слова: виклад мовлення та мислення персонажів, пряме мовлення, непряме мовлення, невластиво-пряме мовлення, вільне пряме мовлення, повідомлення про мовленнєвий акт, повідомлення про голос, «Enduring Love», Ієн Мак'юєн.

Олеся Львовна Ладницькая,

Львовский национальный университет им. Ивана Франка, г. Львов

ИЗЛОЖЕНИЕ РЕЧИ ПЕРСОНАЖЕЙ В 'ENDURING LOVE' ИЭНА МАК'ЮЭНА

В статье классифицируются и анализируются способы изложения речи персонажей в романе Иэна Мак'юэна «Enduring Love», прослеживаются их нарративные и/или стилистические функции. Несмотря на повествование от первого лица (что, следовательно, делает возможной его трактовку как свободной прямой речи рассказчика-персонажа в целом), роман содержит образцы несобственно-прямой речи, которая, в свою очередь, кроме ощущения присутствия, способная на иронический эффект. Прямая речь – которая рассматривается широко и включает свободную прямую речь в случае ее изложения в кавычках или в сопровождении репрезентирующего компонента, а не обоих сразу – превышает по объему все другие категории, которых суммарно 504 случая. Для косвенной речи характерны различные глаголы говорения, в зависимости от речевой ситуации. Самое большое количество зафиксированных случаев – в категории сообщений о речевом акте (215). Сообщение о голосе и обнаружена в романе его обратная форма парадоксально подрывают идею большого вмешательства повествователя, поскольку свидетельствуют в процессе об эмоциях персонажей.

Характерным для типов изложения речи персонажей романа Иэна Мак'юэна «Enduring Love» является их функционирование в аспекте тональности, дистанции, точки зрения, манипулятивности, что проявляется в трактовке критиками рассказчик как ненадежного или надежного в зависимости от инстанции читателя.

Ключевые слова: изложение речи и мышления персонажей, прямая речь, косвенная речь, несобственно-прямая речь, свободная прямая речь, сообщение о речевом акте, сообщение о голосе, «Enduring Love», Иэна Мак'юэна.

Ian McEwan's novel 'Enduring Love' (1997), written in first person narration, is often ascribed with the unreliable narrator in literary criticism [1; 7; 10]. Like several of McEwan's novel, it has marriage and identity in crisis as its centre: a couple whose union is threatened by the sudden appearance of a third, unwanted 'lover'. According to some criticism, the reader is never quite sure until late on whether Jed is indeed stalking Joe, or, as his partner Clarissa suspects, Joe is to some degree fabricating the story [1, p. xi]. Through these doubts and interpretations «Enduring Love» develops as a novel about the different narratives, theories and beliefs

people use to interpret events in their life. Much reviewed and analysed, the novel has not been studied from the angle of view of discourse presentation that it abounds in and that constitutes **the object** of research of our paper. More specifically, this article **aims at** revealing the various speech presentation categories that necessarily belie and underlie the identity of the narrator-cum-protagonist of 'Enduring Love' – Joe Rose. Hence, the **subject** of the study is the effect of various speech presentation categories in the novel on the reader's possible perception of it.

Doubtless, it is the opening balloon scene which both imaginatively and literally sets the motion of the whole story of «Enduring love» and the following quotation serves both epitomising the problematics of the novel and anticipating our research of the speech and thought presentation in it: „*I remember thinking, but not saying, that it was a precarious form of transport [the air balloon – O. L.] when the wind, rather than the pilot, set the course. Then I thought that perhaps this was the very nature of its attraction. And instantly the idea went out of my mind*» [8, p. 8].

The seminal Leech and Short model of discourse presentation in fiction best serves **the theoretical foundations** of our research. G. Leech and M. Short were the first to distinguish systematically between the presentation of speech and the presentation of thought. Their definitions of categories for speech presentation were partly on functional ground, partly on linguistic grounds and partly on contextual grounds. That is why they are predominantly stylistic in nature and correspond to the **methodology** of this paper. Famously, G. Leech and M. Short (1981) introduced parallel structures of speech and thought presentation (STP) categories for the novel:

Narrative report of speech act (NRSA)	He agreed.
Indirect speech (IS)	He said that he agreed.
Free indirect speech (FIS)	He was in agreement.
Direct speech (DS)	He said 'I agree'.
Free direct speech (FDS)	I agree.

In later models (2004) [11] an even more minimal category was added which does not even relate which kind of speech act has occurred (as is the case in NRSA), and simply states that speech has taken place. The category is called 'narrator's representation of voice' (NV) and could be exemplified by 'He spoke'.

The distinction between direct and indirect speech is the key point of speech presentation (SP). DS provides a verbatim account of what was said, while IS expresses what was said in the words of the narrator. In M. Fludernik's view, the 'originality' of direct quotation in fiction is entirely illusory, as is the independence of the quoted inset, which is always controlled by the framing context [2, p. 414].

Generally speaking, DS is used to offer the reader the most unchanged (though shaped by the reporting clause in the case of its presence) form of the actual spoken words of a person including colloquial expressions, grammatical mistakes, phonological idiosyncrasies and ejaculations to portray the entire vividness of the utterance and to characterize the person speaking. Just how important and self-speaking the exact words of a person are is incidentally revealed in Joe and Clarissa's dialogue about Jed Parry's first pestering phone call to Joe:

«What did he say? Just 'I love you', like that?»

'Yeah. He said, 'I feel it too. I love you...''

Clarissa put her hand over her mouth, little-girl style [8, p. 60].

By the way, that longish dialogue of the partners consisting of 31 turns and constituting 2 pages contains only 3 samples of DS proper – reported clauses in inverted commas and followed or preceded by reporting clauses. The majority of turns (19) are in what is seminally considered free direct speech (FDS) but that we prefer to treat here as DS, too – in inverted commas, from a new line, but no locutionary clauses (like the first above). The rest (9) are a contamination – accompanied by a report of some action or body language (i.e. mere narrative reports of action (NRAs)), like in the piece preceding the one above

She frowned. «Why didn't you say? What did he want?»

I didn't pause. «He said he loved me».

For a fraction of time the world froze as she took this in. Then she laughed. Easily, merrily.

«Joe! You didn't tell me. You were embarrassed? You clot!» [8, p. 60],

– or accompanied by an independent NV at the most:

She was looking at me in a new way now and was moving through the conversation with the caution of a bomb disposal expert. «Let me get this straight. You had this idea you were being followed even before you saw his shoe?» [8, p. 61]. The latter denotes the moment when Clarissa started suspecting that Joe was inventing the story, to be intensified later in the story while reading Jed's letter by her »His writing's rather like yours» [8, p. 108] hinting that not Jed but Joe might be the author. Elsewhere Clarissa says «you were so intense about him [Jed the stalker] as soon as you met him. It's like you invented him» [8, p. 86] and the police believe that his «being right is not a simple matter» [8, p. 216]. These doubts about the credibility of Joe's account make readers suspicious of the whole narration though they are impressed by the honesty and influenced by his rhetoric which convinces his implied narratees of his reliability.

The other conversations in the novel display different proportions of classical DS vs clauseless vs 'contaminated', some featuring few reporting clauses (still treated as DS in our research), some more, some intercepted by IS samples, some resorting to narrative reports of speech acts (NRSAs) which summarize relatively unimportant stretches of conversation or give just a gist of what was said (Joe, may, after all not remember how everything was said verbatim or may wish to paraphrase it for his own purposes). The absence of reporting clauses surely makes conversations more brusque and dynamic, stylistically marked. Thus, the following DS excerpt comes from the first compelling chapter of the novel:

'What's his name?' 'Harry.'

'Harry! Come on Harry. Harry! Take my hand, Harry. Get out of there Harry!' [8, p. 15].

The omission of reporting clauses, the juxtaposition of reported clauses of various speakers, the repetition of 'Harry' together with the exclamation marks add to the urgency and drama of the situation described, now vividly represented.

In the excerpt below the reporting clauses show how the conflict of religion vs reason epitomized in the persons of Jed and Joe respectively is developing:

He must have known his only chance of keeping me now was a radical change of tone. I was already several steps away when he called sharply, «Okay, fine. Please just have the courtesy to tell me this.»

It was irresistible. I stopped and turned.

«What is it, exactly, that stands in your way? I mean, are you able to tell me, do you actually know yourself what it is?»

For a moment I thought I wouldn't answer him – I wanted him to know that his faith laid no obligations on me. But then I changed my mind and said, «Nothing. Nothing's standing in my way.»

He was coming toward me again, with his arms hanging loose at his side and with the palms turned up and the fingers spread in a little melodrama of the reasonable man perplexed. «Then why don't you take a chance on it?» he said through a worldly laugh. «You might see the point of it, the strength it can give you. Please, why don't you?»

Again, I hesitated and almost said nothing. But I decided he ought to know the truth. «Because, my friend, no one's listening. There's no one up there» [8, p. 29].

With the help of reporting clauses containing adverbs/ adjectives we can see the gradation of Joe's attitude towards Jed's cues. Before the quoted passage Joe became 'speechless', but he tried to speak 'pleasantly', later we can see his reaction – he 'shrugged', i.e. he got irritated. Then he 'Americanised' his tone to show that he did not care about religion. Jed's 'radical change of tone' worked and proved 'irresistible' for Joe. Joe's 'last traces of ... embarrassment' disappeared and he even started to 'interrupt' Parry's long meditation on religion. First willing to teach Jed the lesson of silence, Joe the rationalist then changes his mind determined to show Jed trying to force religion on him that there is no God 'up there' controlling events on Earth. Ever since this first encounter Jed Parry is characterized (for the time being only by means of a question mark at the end of affirmative sentences) by his generation's habit of 'making a statement on the rising inflection of a question – in humble imitation of Americans or Australians or, as I heard one linguist explain, too mired in relative judgments, too hesitant and apologetic to say how things were in the world' [8, p. 26]. Sometimes – in urgency – his 'interrogative style' [8, p. 67] deserted him, sometimes – when 'his immediate distress was behind him, the interrogative inflection' [8, p. 70] returned to his statements, but later in the novel his rising tune is merely marked by a query mark, with no commentary from Joe – a kind of secondary norm within the novel.

Lack of reporting clauses serves another function in Chapter Eight where Joe phones the police station to report harassment, the dialogue consisting of 26 turns, with 8 turns running twice without any reporting clauses. The first block serves to reveal the non-individual recognizable format of police interrogation, absence of reporting clauses and aposiopesis (due to the policeman's interruptions) stressing its bureaucratic mold [8, p. 78]; the second block, with the policeman's 'interrogative flowchart' alternating with Joe's 'No' belies the absurdity of the police generalizing machine unable to process every private narrative:

«Has he made threats against your property?»

«No.»

«Or against third parties?»

«No.»

«Is he trying to blackmail you?»

«No.»

«Do you think you could prove that he intends to cause you distress??»

«Er, no» [8, p. 78].

To follow the turn-taking is rather easy, Joe's input being reduced to yes/no.

The same concerns Joe's visit to the police station later in the story (Chapter Eighteen), his conversation with Inspector Linley (53 turns in all) lacking any reporting clauses for 10-11 turns at a stretch intercepted with descriptions not only of his voice (as was the case with the telephone conversation above), but also with the body language details: 'he didn't look at me. He was staring into my chest' [8, p. 166], 'he rested his heavy symmetrical head on his hands, still untempted to write the story down' [8, p. 167], 'made a show of pursing his lips' [8, p. 167], 'Linley stood, but I remained obstinately sitting' [8, p. 169].

Actually, the speed, the tone of the character's utterances as portrayed by the narrator all matter for the analysis of SP of characters – and Joe as the narrator, too: 'Linley was talking faster. He wanted me out of there' [8, p. 169] – the speed indicating the policeman's reluctance to deal with the grievance properly and Joe's awareness of that; 'he read my account back to me, intoning each sentence as though it were an item on a checklist' [8, p. 191] – the tone belying the constable's habitual treatment of the case and adding to Joe's veracious report of it.

The latter comes from Joe's second visit to the police station that same afternoon and second in his life, too (Chapter Twenty). This time, after Jed's hired attack in the restaurant Joe is received with more care ('This was no longer a routine transcription of a witness statement', 'He smiled. He was almost perky' [8, p. 193], 'He raised a finger to forestall my denial', 'spoke in a confidential tone that had just a trace of pity' [8, p. 195]), the DS turns are accompanied with reporting clauses, descriptions, intercepted with memories and different thought presentation categories including free indirect thought (FIT). Again, DS is treated broadly and often includes cases of FDS as treated by Leech and Short. According to them, FDS must contain the direct string, but need not contain either the reporting clause or the punctuation surrounding the direct string [6]. It presents the words of the character with no interference from the narrator. With the narrator being simultaneously the protagonist of the novel the situation, however, changes: even the classical FDS could be treated as interfered with by narratorial presence, thus likening it to DS, unless it is his/her own FDS monologue, which in our narrower sense it could only be and of which we get 4 pure samples.

Thus, generally any one case with either proper punctuation or reporting clauses omitted are considered to be FDS cases already, but in our research of the novel which on the whole could be treated as primary free direct discourse of the narrator (either free direct writing (FDWr) or FDS) we treat the turns having at least one of these criteria as DS. Thus treated and counted, the samples of DS in the novel clearly outnumber any other SP category. It is of special interest because indeed Ian McEwan is known to be very scrupulous about fictional dialogues and his novels on the whole do not abound in them. 'Enduring Love' might be said to diverge from this. Except for Chapter Four, there are samples of DS throughout the whole novel, 25,1 per cent of whose pages contain some dialogues. Noticeably, the conversations are mostly between two people, polylogues comprise three or very rarely four people. Also, it is important that very few dialogues (with the exception of Jed's phonecalls and Joe and Jed's chaotic meetings) are narrated since

their onset up till their termination, and none of these usually start with the greetings and end with the goodbye words, phatic communication being minimal. The reasons behind these conversations being presented in medias res could also be analysed, not to restrict the cases to the alleged manipulative purposes of Joe Rose. One of them could as well be the fact that we (and Joe included) tend to forget the relatively unimportant pieces of conversations and the most relevant and meaningful turns stick in our mind, capable of being reproduced later. In Chapter Three we get reassurance that Joe tries to present the DS verbatim as precisely as possible: 'I have no doubt that I remember his words correctly» [8, p. 40]. It concerned Jed Parry's first phonecall and declaring his love on Joe, another pivotal moment in the novel. Actually, Joe's own anxieties about the unreliability of narrative and his consequent fretting at the difficulties he faces in telling his own story are 'both an appeal to honesty and what makes him a self-conscious narrator. He self-consciously dwells on the problematic nature of narrative that makes him always question the form and content of it throughout the text' [3, p. 30].

Most logically and naturally, DS is considered the baseline, the norm for the speech presentation (however illusory and preconditioned it is) because it claims to provide a verbatim report of what was said (or at least the way the narrator memorized it in our case) while in IS the narrator gives the substance of what was said without committing him/herself to the words used to express it. On the whole the novel features 109 samples of IS, the most (14) in Chapter 20 set in the police station with the statements of the other witnesses of the restaurant attack being retold to Joe by means of IS within DS of the constable in charge of that crime and none (0) in Chapter 15 portraying Joe on his lonely visit back to the tragedy scene and coming back home exhausted to find Jed ambushing him in front of his house and after that to find Clarissa in his study accusing him of investigating her own study (DS involved for all of these). Besides the usual *told/ said/ asked* as verba dicendi IS samples in 'Enduring Love' contain a range of other verbs and means of reporting. Appendix I – a case study of de Clérambault's syndrome (that Jed is presumably suffering from) – has no *said*, all 6 verbs being formal: She *claimed/ alleged* that he had prevented/ P *asserting* as confidently as before/ the court *ruled* that/ In interview P *insisted* that... [8, p. 251-258], the fact that there was an oral interview confirming the SP status of the dubious cases of discourse presentation within that written document from Appendix 1 (considered concocted by critics).

FIS (broadly considered as a contamination of 3rd and 1st person narratives, of DS and IS, of the narrator and the character's speech) is actually situated in between DS and IS on the narratorial cline of interference thus constituting a movement towards narratorial intervention as compared to DS and indicating less narratorial influence as compared to IS:

Speech Presentation: NV NRSA IS FIS **DS** FDS

FIS, having indications of an intervening narrator as well as some flavor of the original message, has a rather odd status in terms of truth claims and faithfulness. In the case of 1st person narrator-cum-protagonist it is less of a problem, united as those are in a single person, except for FISs of other characters. However, FIS is more of a problem as far as acknowledging its possibility in 1st person narrations altogether is concerned. According to the majority of scholars and until recently, those two phenomena excluded each other. However, G. Leech and M. Short argued that no particular linguistic features are criterial for FIS to occur (neither the past tense, nor 3rd person pronouns, nor the absence of the reporting verb). All that is needed is a mix of the sorts of features normally associated with DS and IS, or – still better – some indication of the forms of words which were used (the flavor of the original from any of the three major linguistic levels – syntactic, lexical or graphological), and /or best of all – 'contextual considerations alone' [6, p. 331]. M.Fludernik states that FIS can take the shape of a kind of dual voice even in first-person narratives [2]. An authority in speech, thought and perception presentation, M.Fludernik provides insights into a lot of problematic issues on the discourse presentation agenda in general. Likewise, H.Nielsen is ready to argue that FIS can also occur in 1st person fictional narrative where the main character has a voice with idiolects and personal characteristics, and this voice may interfere in the presentation of the narrative just as the characters' voices may interfere in the presentation of the narrative in the heterodiegetic mode [9]. According to Mervi Helkkula, if free indirect discourse (FID) is regarded more as a strategy making it possible for the speaker to move from one plane of enunciation to another, there is no reason why there couldn't be FID in first person: 'A narrator telling about his own past life can anchor his story on varying temporal planes, which means that he can tell the story either as seen through the eyes of his former, younger self, or from his actual point of view' [4] – this is relevant to Joe portraying the bygone days from a later perspective. Scholars of FID gradually expanded the range of what had initially been perceived as a rather local and specialized phenomenon limited to third-person literary narratives. It has since been identified in first-/ second-person, and present-tense contexts as well as in non-literary prose and oral narrative and its historical roots have been pushed back to the Middle Ages at least.

Treated these ways there are 30 cases of FIS pieces in 'Enduring love', 2 belonging purely to Joe (as a narrator and character) and 28 contaminating the voice of Joe the narrator and/or character and those of other characters (if rendered faithfully). We get the speeches of different characters presented via FIS – often Clarissa's, but also some minor characters, 4 samples embedded into DS of other characters. Some cases are still more contaminated: in Chapter Nine of the novel Joe imagines what the events of the story would be like from Clarissa's perspective, though we do not actually get her point of view until her letter later in the story, just what Joe imagines it would be like on that particular day, as he 'construed it'. Hence we have 5 FIS pieces from 'her' perspective as well as free indirect thoughts (FITs) within some broader schemes of seemingly Clarissa's STP, the following rendering allegedly her narration and presentation of Joe's speech and her thoughts: «[IS In fact, last time around, a real crisis two years ago, he ended by concluding that he was reconciled to his life and that it wasn't a bad one after all – and that was supposed to be the close of the matter. [NV He's raising his voice over the thunder of the taps, [NRSA (or plausibly FIS due to deictic 'now' and anaphoric 'and') back now with the harassment tale, and she hears the name Parry and remembers. [FDT Oh yes, that. [IT She thinks she understands Parry well enough. [FIT A lonely, inadequate man, a Jesus freak who is [...] dying to connect with someone, anyone, even Joe» [8, p. 87]. Soon after that there is an FIT piece where it is most vividly the anaphoras that betray the highly emotional stream of consciousness piece: «She's a borderline case, no more than tired perhaps, and upset by Sunday, and it's not her style to make a fuss, so instead she raises her foot and Joe drops to one knee, the better to ease off her boot – and he doesn't stop talking all the while» finally followed by FIS – «He wants to be back in theoretical physics, he wants the support of a department, he's happy to do whatever teaching would get him in, he's got ideas on the virtual photon» [8, p. 88]. The stream of consciousness technique that the FID is building up to here is all the more vivid in the following excerpt: «She is already wondering if she has gone too far. But here she is, prematurely out of her bath [...] They rarely row, Clarissa and Joe. She is especially bad at arguments. She has never been able to accept the rules of

engagement, which permit or require you to say things that you do not mean, or are distorted truths or not true at all...» [8, p. 92]. A curious combination of tenses in addition to STP modes (NRSA, FDS, FIS, FIT) parallels Clarissa's mixed feelings as a focalizer and Joe's commotion as the overarching narrator of the novel: 'his intensity is inhibiting her. Especially now that he is back on Parry. As Clarissa eases into the green water, she allows her concentration to settle fully on what he is saying. The police? You phoned the police? Thirty-three messages on the machine? But she saw it as she came in, the indicator said zero. He wiped them, he insists, at which Clarissa sits up in the water [...] When she was twelve, her father died of Alzheimer's, and it's always been a fear that she'll live with someone who goes crazy. That's why she chose rational Joe' [8, p. 88–89].

Though illustrated parallelly and commonly referred to as FID, FIS and FIT are not supposed to be treated identical: FIT has effects which are often opposite to those of FIS due to their relations with the norms on TP and SP clines respectively.

Next piece exhibits a DS (with NRSA and IT embedded) – NRSA – NRTA – FIT string of STP categories before reverting to straight narrative report (NRA):

She says, «I know I've said this before, so don't get angry. Do you think it's possible that you're making too much of this man Parry? [...] He's not the cause of your agitation, he's a symptom.» As she says this, she thinks of the thirty-three messages that got erased. Perhaps Parry, or the Parry described by Joe, does not exist. She shivers and lowers herself back into the water... [8, p. 90].

This is where Clarissa's suspicions of Joe fabricating story start/get revealed and the reader's opinion of him as an unreliable narrator should accordingly intensify. However, it is difficult to judge, embedded as this discourse is in the primary discourse situation of the novel, with Clarissa being rather a major focalizer in this chapter than a narrator. This weird narration, as Randall writes, makes Joe «the surrogate author figure, engaged with the process of making and also questioning each narrative strand of the novel itself» [1, p. 59]. The reader is thus made to oscillate between treating Joe the narrator as reliable and non-reliable and conclude for him/herself intuitively. As confessed by Ian McEwan, he wanted his narrator to be doubted by the reader, not just by Clarissa and the police: 'I wanted a man at the centre of this who was a clear thinker, who appears to be right but then perhaps is wrong, but in fact is right... I wanted, in other words, to write a book somewhat in praise of rationality which I think gets a very poor showing in western literature' [1, p. 5]. Rational, thus logical and consistent in portraying events, their cause and effect, Joe Rose also seems sincere and faithful to truth. A proof of that could be the desire to include the original words of the character even in FIS, imparting it with the emotion characteristic of that situation and making the reader sympathize with Clarissa (the one whose speech is presented via FIS): [IS She said she hated to see me back with that old obsession about getting back into science when I had such an enjoyable working life and was so good at what I did. [FIS She was trying to help me, but I had become in the space of just a couple of days so manic, so feverish in my attention to Parry, so... She had paused a second to locate the word. [NRA She was standing in the doorway... In morning light her pallor made her eyes appear all the greener. [FIT (highly emotional and credible, unambiguously referring back to Joe's thoughts then, hence – FID) She was beautiful. She seemed unattainable, an impression intensified by the word she chose. [DS «Alone, Joe...»] [8, p. 110–111].

Still, there are cases when FIS functions in a reversed way: instead of channeling the reader's sympathy towards the character whose speech is presented it distances that character from the reader. In the conversation with Joe (DS) Jean Logan, the widow of the man who did not let go of the flying balloon, says: '... Then I said to the sergeant, 'Have you gone through the car? Did you look for fingerprints?' And he said they didn't look and they didn't take prints. Do you know why? Because there hadn't been a crime» [8, p. 124]. The reader feels that this irony is not at the expense of Jean, it is her way of presenting the sergeant's view which she finds incorrect and inconsistent. It is this distancing which allows FIS to be used as a vehicle of irony. In contrast to other SP categories FIS is craftily used by authors/ narrators to control the 'light and shade' of conversation, to highlight and background the speech according to the role and attitude of characters. Along with other modes it can be used for more large-scale strategic purposes, like moving the reader towards one character and away from another (implicit in irony, for instance) or indicating changes in the role of the characters.

Moving still further along the increase of narratorial intervention one finds NRSA of which there are 215 samples in the novel. For example, Chapter Three running for 10 pages contains 24 samples of NRSA to report mainly on the stories told by characters on the evening of the balloon tragedy, for the benefit of the reader reduced to but an identification of the speech act involved ('Together we heaped curses on the pilot, James Gadd, and his incompetence, but this could not protect us for long from thoughts of all the things we should have done to avert Logan's death' [8, p. 32] – switching to NRTA at the end, the gist of the story ('I told the story of my first public performance on the trumpet, when I was eleven' [8, p. 38]) or the manner of its production ('We told it in the married style, running along with it for a stretch, talking through the partner's interruption sometimes, at others giving way and handing over. There were also times when we talked at once, but for all that, our story was gaining in coherence...' [8, p. 39] – in itself material for the study of turn-taking) etc. Because of their emotional touch and contamination by Joe the narrator the embedded stories – unlike the primary narrative thread mainly revealed in ordinary narrative reports of actions (NRA), NRSA and limited to 18 turns of DS and 7 IS cases – are also presented by means of FID which evoke the characters' manners of expression. Recourse to FIS allows an addresser a sense of immediacy not present in more indirect categories.

Next extract represents a movement along the SP continuum from bigger narratorial interference in NRSA through less so in IS and still less in FIS towards its absence in Clarissa's DS – 'absence' if we bracket the fact that Joe is a narrator:

[NRSA ...Clarissa returned us to the fall, to the precise moment when Logan had slid down the rope... and let go. [...] She said it all again, and repeated the lines from *Paradise News*. [IS Then she told me that she too had willed deliverance, even as he was in midair. [FIS What had come to mind were angels – not Milton's reprobates hurled from heaven, but the embodiment of all goodness and justice in a golden figure swooping from the cloud base to gather the falling man in its arms... [DS «The boy was in the basket, and Logan wouldn't let go. He had children of his own. He was a good man»] [8, p. 34].

Another extract featuring FIS decipherable in the context after a more dispassionate NRSA ('we told shivering and shaking stories, and as often happened in these talks, childhood was central...' [8, p. 38]) via a longish FIS not provided here culminates in DS devoid of any reporting clause: 'At the time I didn't connect it with the search for my cousin. It was just one of those things you observe neutrally as a child. I thought this might be what they meant by drunkenness...' [8, p. 38]. The latter in its turn contains

interesting cases of *NRTA* – an equivalent of *NRSA* on the thought scale (I didn't connect it...) – and *IT* (I thought this might be...), considered to be more free forms of rendering thoughts on the TP cline.

As concerns narrative report of voice (**NV**) – the category most apparently controlled by the narrator and reduced to a mere recognition of a fact of speech taking place, thus approaching simple *NRA* mode – there are **80** cases of these in 'Enduring Love'. However, considering the 1st person narration, the intervention is rather undermined. Paradoxically NVs seem even more credible for all that laconicity of presentation proper and for the richness of description of the speech situation instead or the very fact of its inclusion for the sake of faithfulness of rendition: *her voice dropped to a low monotone, as though she were speaking under hypnosis to recall the unspeakable day* [8, p. 124]/ *Rachel was saying something to me, which I did not hear, but I nodded all the same* [8, p. 133]/ *It was hard work, talking against the din* [8, p. 179] etc.

Besides, in our research we have singled out the samples of the **minus-NV** category – namely, **66** – distinguishing them from *NV* proper by the fact that the speech is reported not to have occurred. Actually this kind of unuttered 'intervention' on the part of the 1st person narrator also adds to the credibility of Joe's narration: *his words obliterated at irregular intervals by the passing traffic* [8, p. 97]/ *I was about to say this to her ... We were together, I didn't need to say my piece* [8, p. 109]/ *I parted my lips to echo the word, but* [8, p. 124]/ *I turned to call out one last goodbye, but* [8, p. 134]/ *I would have liked to tell the story of my encounter with Inspector Linley, spice it up a little and squeeze some amusement from it, but...* [8, p. 177] – the latter honestly admitting the liberty Joe may take while narrating, far from unreliability as it goes.

Speech presentation is thus not only a phenomenon of how the characters' words are presented by a narrator, but also of why. It is a means of varying point of view tone and distance, with all kinds of stylistic effects created in the process (characterization as dominant). In 'Enduring Love' SP projects itself on the issue of allegedly unreliable narrator and that of playing with the reader's perception. Given the variety and the ratio of SP categories in the novel and the narrator's endeavor to be as rational – and by corollary – as faithful as possible, the reader (at least in the person of the author of this article) is tempted to trust Joe Rose who – paraphrasing Ian McEwan – seems right and is in fact is right, hence – reliable.

List of References

1. Childs P. Ian McEwan's Enduring Love / Peter Childs. – London : Routledge, 2006.
2. Fludernik M. The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction / Monica Fludernik. – Routledge, 1993. – 556 p.
3. Habibi S. J. Self-Making Narrative in Ian McEwan's Enduring Love / S. J. Habibi, S. G. Kalkhajah // Metaphors : Contemporary Studies in Literature and Language. – 1, 1 (2016). – Pp. 26–33.
4. Helkkula Mervi. Is free indirect discourse possible in first person narration? Remarks on Proust's A la recherche du temps perdu [Electronic resource] / Mervi Helkkula. – Mode of access : [https://tuhat.helsinki.fi/portal/en/publications/fid-in-firstperson-\(4ed07ae6-ac09-4eb4-8ee8-c02c763cd62b\).html](https://tuhat.helsinki.fi/portal/en/publications/fid-in-firstperson-(4ed07ae6-ac09-4eb4-8ee8-c02c763cd62b).html). – Tampere, 2006
5. Jeffries L. Stylistics / L. Jeffries, D. McIntyre. – Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 224p.
6. Leech G. Style In Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose / G. Leech, M. Short. – London and New York : Longman, 1989. – 402 p.
7. Matthews S. Seven types of unreliability [Electronic resource] / S. Matthews. – Mode of access : http://www.academia.edu/2038425/Ian_McEwans_Enduring_Love_Seven_Types_of_Unreliability_2006
8. McEwan I. Enduring Love / Ian McEwan. – New York : Anchor Books, 1998. – 264 p.
9. Nielsen H. S. The Impersonal Voice in First-Person Narrative Fiction [Electronic resource] / H. S. Nielsen. – Mode of access : http://pure.au.dk/portal/files/99386941/The_Impersonal_Voice_in_First_Person_Nar.pdf.
10. Rudaityte, Regina. Foregrounded Artificiality as the Author's Disguise in Ian McEwan's Novel Enduring Love // Žmogus Ir Žodis 6.2. – 2004. – Pp. 33–36.
11. Semino E. Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing, and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing / E. Semino, M. Short. – London : Routledge, 2004. – 256 p.