

*Free indirect speech
in Croatian oral folk tales*

GORDANA LACO*, SINIŠA NINČEVIĆ**

1. Introduction

Forms and functions of speech representation, as the linguistic and narratology subject of analyses, are a central issue in literary and narrative studies. Free indirect speech (or discourse)¹ is a much-discussed form of speech or thought representation. Narratologists, stylisticians and grammarians have been interested in the mixing of narrators' and characters' languages present in the narrative, particularly in the vehicle of dual-voice or polyphony (see: Herman et al. 2008: 188, 558, 560).

In contemporary Croatian philological analyses, free indirect speech is frequently mentioned (henceforth referred to as FIS) as a particular syntactic and stylistic device of modern narration. It is commonly associated with the

* <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0699-8193> University of Split, Croatia, glaco@ffst.hr

** University of Split, Croatia, nincevic@ffst.hr

¹ The term "free indirect style" is also known in English, but recently that of "free indirect discourse" has been employed most frequently, which includes free indirect speech and free indirect thought (see: Herman et al. 2008: 560).

stream-of-consciousness novels and narrative techniques, placing the emphasis on the role of subjectivity (involvement) of omniscient narrator (see: Flaker 1986: 350-352, Vuletić, 2006: 143, Božanić 2007: 239-240). Attention was drawn to the stylistic values of FIS in Croatian philological literature over the course of the 1960s. This calls a few notable observations to mind in terms of FIS as regards the narratological and linguo-stylistic stance in Croatian literature. The peculiar features of FIS were then disregarded both in Croatian philological literature and grammar books, albeit a common approach to linguo-stylistic methods among Croatian writers – particularly modern Croatian prose writers – as was much disputed by Frangeš (1963).² In the aforementioned discussion, Frangeš gives a definition of FIS as follows: “Someone else’s words are reported verbatim as part of their speech in order to emphasise their genuineness, their literal exactness, on the one hand, and the narrator’s critical attitude, on the other, i.e. the attitude of affectation towards them.” (Frangeš 1963) This is exemplified by Miroslav Krleža’s prose that illustrates a refined employment of FIS as for the use of intonation change and exclamation marks, the omission of the main verb (*verbum dicendi*), or reflections, and the transposition of grammatical persons (commonly from first person to third person, *I – He*). On the ground of such a narrative course of action, Frangeš shows that FIS is both “noteworthy and valuable, for the storyteller comes first. [...] not for a moment should it be forgotten that each utterance, peculiarly someone else’s words, is filtered through the storyteller’s senses of hearing and speech as regards the technique of FIS” (Frangeš 1963). In addition, Vuletić takes examples from Krleža’s prose texts³ and, by the same token, demonstrates that FIS encompasses elements of both direct speech and

² In recent reviews of literary works, we notice that the presence of FIS has been mentioned every now and then, which may lead to a false assumption as for the origin and nature of stylistic techniques. Therefore, special emphasis should be placed on FIS as the conscious intention of using the features of modern prose, whereas FIS in itself stands for a spontaneous way of transmitting someone else’s words, thus having been deeply rooted in speech act and oral narration as observed by Božanić and Brešan (2007: 239).

Also, it is worth mentioning that the forms of FIS can be found in the 19th-century Croatian writers. Frangeš, for example, displays a highly expressive FIS through verses by Ivan Mažuranić (*Smrt Smail-age Čengića*, 1846). Božanić believes that FIS has existed for centuries in oral-aural culture and that it “entered literature in the 19th century, with the advent of Romanticism and Realism” (Božanić 2015: 468). In turn, Flaker says that “writers had used FIS since time immemorial” (Flaker 1986: 351), but more research is needed.

³ It has been noticed that Croatian philological literature has the highest number of the FIS analyses from the prose works of Krleža. Vuletić maintains, by way of explanation, that “Krleža never narrates

indirect speech, the writer's narration as well, i.e. in relation to the grammatical point of view that displays the distinctive features of FIS marked by the linguistic and extralinguistic (speech) elements identifying the narrator. Accordingly, Vuletić observes that the writer's subjective attitude stands out by means of FIS (Vuletić 2006: 145). The same methods for creating FIS are described by Pranjić. However, as the aforementioned analyses accentuate the role, the point of view, or the narrator's attitude, Pranjić has concluded that "for the most part, someone else's words are reported, not exclusively from the reporter's (omniscient narrator's), but the character's point of view...", i.e. the point of view of the storyteller's protagonists is rendered more significant than that of his personal point of view by the use of FIS (Pranjić 1986: 216). It is noticeable that such a conclusion does not accord with the aforementioned conclusions.⁴ Furthermore, we consider it not being about conflicting claims or having a different understanding of the grammatical and stylistic features of FIS. Also, it is our opinion that these differences in the interpretation of the function/storyteller's point of view ensue from the complexity of FIS, i.e. from a variety of techniques by which someone else's words are incorporated into the narrative parts of a text as if they were his own words. Namely, it is well known that words, thoughts, and feelings may be incorporated in narration by a skilful storyteller in such a way that it is not quite clear if it is either his own speech or the character's speech being narrated by the former. The analyses of literary works of art show that it is sometimes merely intonation and sentence rhythm, or a portion of a text which may indicate the very FIS itself.

As mentioned above, FIS is used in everyday speech as well. As folk literature (folklore) entails elements of everyday speech at all levels, it is only to be expected that oral (folk) storytellers employ FIS as well. In the said

some events objectively... Krleža seems to be completely absorbed at all times, and I believe that such commitment leads to his counterpart exactly in the form of free indirect speech." (Vuletić 1976: 205).

⁴ This and similar opposing views of FIS are by no means unusual. McHale says: „Nothing about FIS is uncontroversial, from its history and distribution to its putative function as a vehicle of dual-voice discourse.“ (Herman et al. 2008: 189).

Note that some core theories and typologies of the narrative situation have emerged in the study of world literature on the basis of the narrator's role and his narrative point of view. For instance, the question of diegesis and mimesis in narrative discourse, Genette's perspective of focalisation, the question "who speaks" and "who sees" in narrative texts and such like; therefore, FIS is a significant indicator in those analyses. As for a more detailed comparison of contemporary narratological theories as regards oral narration (see: Božanić and Brešan 2007).

discussion, however, Frangeš analysed oral poetry and concluded that folk expression exclusively recognized direct and indirect speech, i.e. “that FIS is both a specific psychological stage beyond the reach of folk expression” and “an example of extraordinary possibilities in view of urbanised expression” (Frangeš 1963).⁵ This claim was disproved by contemporary researchers and recorders of Croatian oral literature (Bošković-Stulli, Marks, Božanić). Recent studies point to the peculiarities of live storytelling, while there is a departure from the language norm, for example, an awkward sentence structure and inexact grammatical agreement and such like; yet the multifarious intensification of style has been displayed as well (see: Bošković-Stulli 2006: 143-146). It has been noticed that in oral narration the storytellers also use certain forms of FIS which were either absent or extremely rare in older collections (dating from the 19th and the early 20th centuries) (see: Bošković-Stulli 2006: 143-144).⁶ Having considered some authentically recorded texts based upon first-hand accounts, Bošković-Stulli (1975: 164) has concluded that “folk expression knows of more methods for transmitting someone else’s words apart from direct and indirect speech, the rudimentary forms of FIS as well, which is common in everyday speech and irrespective of modern literature.” FIS is also found in oral prose of contemporary written accounts, for example, the insertion of affectation by which the storyteller addresses his listeners (Marks 1993: 214). Laco (2003: 32-34) has observed that storytellers used FIS in Croatian oral fairy tales, most frequently omitting both the main verb and the use of the conjunction *that* in the process. Božanić and Brešan have reviewed FIS regarding oral non-fictional tales, originating from the Island of Vis, and categorically rejected Frangeš’s conclusion. The authors have ascertained that “the storyteller developed a set of skills and the knowledge of using stylistic devices from the perspective of the storytelling triangle, Storyteller – Protagonist – Listener, as the psychology of play that

⁵ Note that Frangeš examined folk literature in book collections by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, a collection which caught the theorists’ and grammarians’ attention until 1970s. A subsequent study showed that the writings of Karadžić had been unreliable both from a linguistic and stylistic viewpoints, as Bošković-Stulli explained quite straightforwardly many a time (1975: 150-151).

⁶ This has also been noted by Božanić, who offers the following explanation: “...traditional oral tales were mostly handwritten, frequently from memory, correcting, overlooking, or ignoring the FIS at the time when the meta-language consciousness of its stylistic values had not yet been developed” (Božanić 1992: 178).

is very close to the storyteller” (Božanić and Brešan 2007: 246). As such, we ascertain these conclusions.

Prior to any evaluations and coming to final conclusions as regards considering the values of FIS in Croatian oral tales, it might be worth drawing attention to some typical features of this narrative oral forms. We would hereby like to point out the basic language characteristics of more recent texts, faithfully written down from the original oral form, since these tales constitute the corpus relevant to our study. The language as employed in oral tales conspicuously differs from the standard Croatian. For instance, on the syntactic level, it may be observed that oral storytellers frequently make use of parataxis, elliptical sentences, and colloquial sentence constructions, sometimes awkwardly put together, which may also be partly explained by the immediacy and spontaneity of recounting, as well as the narrator’s involvement in the events related. These tales are obviously marked, not only by traditional models, but also the narrator’s personal procedures. This personal approach manifests itself primarily in language expression, in the choice and/or depiction of characters, the way of interpreting the tales by voice, mimic, gesture, etc.⁷ It has been consequently established that oral storytellers are not only the bearers of certain *sujet* they have heard, but also – to a certain extent – they create and enliven the story in accordance with their choice, skills, and affinities. We believe that the narrator’s personal choice determines the structure of the tale, i.e. they choose when and how they will shift from narration to dialogue, to indirect speech, or FIS.

Although Božanić’s systematic, thorough, and valuable research (1992, 2007, 2015) shows and illustrates the existence and values of FIS in the so-called *facenda* (oral non-fictional tales recorded on the Island of Vis), we are of the opinion that it has by no means exhausted or eliminated the need for the forms and features of FIS to be explored in a wider corpus, i.e. Croatian oral fictional tales.

This paper discusses FIS in Croatian folk tales (fairy tales, legends, traditions, and fables). A series of folk tale collections, edited by Maja Bošković-Stulli, has been analysed as follows: *Narodne pripovijetke* (1963) [Folk Tales]; *Narodne pripovijetke Sinjske krajine* (1967) [Folk Tales of Sinj Region]; *Narodne predaje Sinjske krajine* (1967a) [Folk Tradition of

⁷ For more details see: Bošković-Stulli 1997a: 145-150; Marks 1993.

Sinj Region]; *Zakopano zlato* (1986) [Buried Gold] and *Usmene pripovijetke i predaje* (1997) [Oral Tales and Oral Tradition].⁸ These folk tale collections originate from all parts of Croatia and, therefore, cover all three Croatian dialects (Shtokavian, Chakavian, and Kajkavian).

It is the aim of this paper to look into and study the forms in which FIS appears in the observed corpus. With regard to the aforementioned existing research in Croatian philological literature, no effort was spared to broaden the scope of analysis pertaining to all parts of Croatia and its dialects, covering as comprehensively as possible their stylistic values and different types of FIS employed by traditional (folk) storytellers engaged in an unmediated delivery of live oral narration, along with their stylistic values.

By means of a qualitative analysis of the contents under observation, FIS is primarily viewed from a linguistic-stylistic perspective, which is inevitably linked to the storyteller's role/point of view in the storyteller – listener/reader relationship.

We have studied more than three hundred texts, paying particular attention to those faithfully written down according to the original accounts, without much editing or polishing; selecting and showing representative examples not included in the existing research of oral literature, but grammatically indicating the existence of FIS. Our observations have been compared with the existing descriptions of FIS, found both in literature and traditional oral tales. In this, the aforementioned studies: Frangeš (1963), Vuletić (1976, 2006), Flaker (1986), Pranjić (1986), all dealing with FIS as employed in the Croatian language and literary fiction, need to be particularly pointed out and deserve a particular mention, as do the studies of Božanić (1992, 2015, 2019) and Božanić and Brešan (2007), dedicated to oral literature of the Island of Vis.

The expected forms of FIS (omission of the reporting verb, the declarative conjunction *da*, certain features of speech) have all been confirmed by this analysis, which has also shown that oral tales contain some forms of FIS not yet either noticed or described in the existing Croatian literature.

⁸ Further in the text, examples are given along with the title of a folk tale and the year of publication of the collection. The examples are numbered.

2. Free Indirect Speech in Oral Folk Tales

As mentioned in the Introduction, the omission of the main verb (*verbum dicendi*), the use of the conjunction *da* [that], the exchange of the 1st and the 3rd grammatical persons, the use of questions, exclamations, and onomatopoeic expressions frequently feature as forms characteristic of FIS in Croatian contemporary literary works. These stylistic devices here become manifest on the example of Croatian oral tales. We also consider the use of the imperative, as well as adverbial pronouns of place and particles, as pertaining to FIS in narration, i.e. narrative parts of the text.

2.1. Omission of the main verb and the declarative conjunction *da* [that]

Writers frequently report the words of the characters they speak about by omitting the main verbs, incorporating the words merely by using the conjunction *da* [that], thereby expressing the characters' thoughts, but also their own experience and attitude towards the events they relate in a more affective way (see: Frangeš 1963; Pranjić 1986: 217). Oral tales often contain such sentences, though they do not always have this function.

Namely, it may be observed that FIS, in some of the examples, does not have the function of intensifying thoughts or emotions: it merely serves the purpose of condensing the narration. For instance, in one of the tales the king has decided to give his daughter's hand to the winner of the horse race:

- (1) *A tamo u kralja bila je ćer; da će je metit na obdulju, ko je odnese, da onoga će bit njegov.* (Kraljeva kći na obdulji, 1967: 335)

[And (I've **heard** that) the King had a daughter, who was to be given in marriage to the winner of the horse race: whoever wins, shall have her as a reward (The King's Daughter at the Horse Races)].⁹

In another story the king angrily accuses the servants of having destroyed his precious flower:

⁹ Such examples are impossible to translate into English without using indirect speech, along with the pertaining conjunctions and main verbs. In other words, main verbs and/or the declarative conjunctions, cannot be omitted. The same applies to the following examples (2, 3, 4, 5, etc.).

- (2) *Ka se on vratio s puta, najprvo mi ide viđe ta njegov cvijet, počeo sahnut. I on na sluge zašto mu cvijet sahne, da što su mu činile, da su ga zalile vrućom vodom. A one da nijesu.* (Bus ruzmarina, 1997: 97).

[Upon returning from his voyage, he first went to see that flower of his, and saw **that** it had begun to wither. And he (**asked**) his servants why the flower was withering, what they had done to it, they had poured hot water on it. And they (said) that they hadn't. (The Rosemary Bush)]

In the above examples the narrators have incorporated the characters' words by using the declarative conjunction *da* [that], omitting, however, the main verbs, e.g. *he said, he announced, he proclaimed, he shouted, he asked, he accused them*, etc. We notice that in analysed oral tales such sentences frequently occur, replacing the direct or indirect speech, e.g. when they announce a miraculous event (as in Example 2), or, at the beginning of tales, where they briefly state the motivation for the events and actions to follow (as in Example 1). Such examples of FIS may not always result in the stylistic effect as accomplished by the writers of literary works; however, one should bear in mind the fact that oral narration, as opposed to written texts, achieves expressiveness by the intonation of the voice and the gestures of the narrator. Nevertheless, we may come across some very expressive sentences in which the main verb has been omitted and the conjunction *da* [that] used. For instance, although the technique is the same as in the above examples, the following passage reveals a different effect achieved by FIS. The whole legend of the Emperor Diocletian's daughter has been related without the use of main verbs, the entire text being bound together by the use of the declarative conjunction *da*:

- (3) *A čuja san i za njegovu ćer, priko Solina priko mosta to na Veliki petak da u kočiji prođe... da izađu iz vode ispod mosta od Solina, da izađu tu s kočijom i da prođu put Splita. Ali kao ta najveća oluja, onako da oni proletu, nikako da se ne moru svrnit. U kočiji da prođu, dva konja crna da vozu kočiju...* (O kralju Decikljanu i o njegovoj kćeri, 1967: 383).

[And I've also **heard** of his daughter: **that** she passed in her carriage through Solin, across the bridge, **that** it was on Good Friday. **That** they emerged from the water under the bridge from Solin, **that** they passed through Solin in the carriage, **that** they went towards Split. **That** they rushed past like a flash of lightning, **that** was how they rushed past, **that** there was no way for them to stop. **That** they passed in the carriage, **that** it was drawn by a team of black horses... (Of Emperor Diocletian and His Daughter)]

In this legend, the narrator has omitted the main verbs, e.g.: *govori se, pripovijeda se* [it is said, it is rumoured]. By using the conjunction *da* [that] he confirms that he is merely relating what he has heard, but does not know with any certainty, and – by repeating this conjunction – he seems to have achieved the required rhythmicity and the intonation of the text. Such use of FIS in literary works is thought to be extremely expressive,¹⁰ and modern grammatical descriptions find such employment of FIS “to have only quite recently appeared in the Standard Croatian language” (Katičić 1991: 355). With respect to the example quoted above, as well as similar ones in Croatian oral tales, it may be concluded that this particular type of FIS has been adopted from oral literature.

It is not infrequent, however, for the oral storytellers to create FIS by omitting both the main verb and the declarative conjunction *da* [that], e.g.:

- (4) *A baba mu pisala da je rodila dva pasića: ča će o njih učinit?* (Bog me je stvorija, čovik me je rodija, 1997: 95).

[And the old woman **wrote** to him **that** she had given birth to two puppies: **what was she to do with them?** (God Made Me, Man Gave Me Birth)]

Instead of indirect speech, which would have been introduced by the main verb, e.g. *she asked*, the narrator condenses the sentence by using FIS, thereby emphasizing the question (*ča će učinit?* [what is she to do?]). This emphasis has been marked by a colon, thereby also indicating a shift in the sentence intonation. The following example is also interesting. In order to save her nine bewitched brothers, a girl made a vow that she would not speak for nine years, having to keep silent and keep her vow a secret even from her mother:

- (5) *Majka se tom dosjetila da je to nekakva zakletva, da se ona zarekla da neće govoriti, valjda će i' spasiti.* (Devet braće vukova, 1967: 108)

[The mother somehow divined that it must be a sort of vow, that she had sworn not to speak, **perhaps she will save them.** (The Nine Wolf Brothers)]

The narrator conveys the mother's conclusion as information, from the 3rd person's point of view, adding, however, his hope: *valjda će i' spasiti* [perhaps she will save them]. The sentence has been interpolated by the nar-

¹⁰ For instance, Frangeš (1963) found similar examples of FIS in Krleža's prose, observing that without that *da* [that] “the sentence would have a different intonation, somewhat more objective and colder.”

rator, omitting both the main verbs and the conjunctions: actually conveying the mother's words in the form of FIS.

2.2. Transposition of the grammatical person

A typical form of a very expressive use of FIS in modern Croatian literary works is when the speaker reports someone else's words, to shift from the 1st person to the 2nd or 3rd person, which is usually grammatically indicated by verb forms and pronouns (see: Frangeš 1963). In oral narration, it is not unusual for the narrators to immerse themselves in the story, so much so that they shift from the 3rd person to the 1st person unconsciously, as though they were speaking of their own experience, which is not even regarded as FIS (see: Bošković-Stulli 1997a: 145-146). However, we may encounter some constructions which may be considered to be a form of FIS. For instance, there is a legend in which a girl patiently works and fasts in order for the Most Blessed Virgin to deliver her from hell on the day of the Annunciation of Our Lady:

- (6) *Kad osvanula Gospa Blagovist, misli **ona** bidna, nema ništa. Nema pomoći nikakve, **eto zašto san postila, zašto san radila**. Čekaj ona, čekaj...* (Kći predana vragu i Gospa Blagovist, 1967: 343).

[On the day of the Annunciation of Our Lady, the poor girl **thought (that)** she had nothing. No help at all. **Is this why I fasted, why I worked?** And she waited and waited... (The Daughter Committed to the Devil and the Annunciation of Our Lady)]

The narrator begins to relate this event in the 3rd person, shifting into FIS (*misli ona bidna, nema ništa* [*the poor girl thinks, there's nothing*]) which, accompanied by the declarative conjunction *da* [*that*], would constitute indirect speech. She then continues the narration in the 3rd person, changing into the 1st person (*eto zašto **san** postila* [*Is this why **I** fasted, why **I** worked?*]), however, without any grammatical designation of direct speech (by using a main verb), as is the case in other parts of this legend. The narrator clearly literally reports the words as thought by the character, incorporating them, however, in the narration as though they were his own, which is why this may also be regarded as FIS. In the following example, the narrator incorporates the character's thoughts by a dependent clause as indirect speech, relating them, however, directly in the 1st person:

- (7) *Ta brižan soldat se misli da kako je to, da ja sam tako nesrećan; ma sejno je ime korada da gre napreda iskat to pravico...* (Vojnik i cesar, 1986: 131).

[The poor soldier **thought** why all that, **why am I so unfortunate**, but he nevertheless mustered the courage to go on to seek justice... (The Soldier and the Emperor)]

In indirect speech the bolded sentence would read as follows: *kako je on tako nesrećan* [*why he was so unfortunate*]. The conclusion, therefore, becomes inevitable: such transpositions are indeed forms of FIS, or techniques very similar to it, by which the narrators identify themselves with their characters, emphasising very emotionally the position they are in. One can also feel the change in the sentence intonation as is typical of FIS, and one may imagine a change of voice and mimic of the narrator in the live oral narration.

2.3. Interrogative sentences (questions), exclamations, imperatives

FIS is particularly characterised by its use of questions, exclamations, and similar expressions used by speakers in direct speech. Also, oral tales frequently contain such elements in narration. We would hereby like to draw attention to several stylistically designated examples signifying FIS. One narrator, for instance, speaks of a priest in trouble for not having someone to impersonate St Philip:

- (8) *A sutridan je bi svetac svetega Filipa – fešta. A svetega Filipa ni. Sad, ki će bit onde? Kako će delat feštu i kako će mašu promašiti kad svetega Filipa ni? Ča će mu ljudi reć?* (Pop i zvonar, 1986: 172)

[And tomorrow was St Philip's Day – a feast. And St Philip wasn't there. **Now, who will be there?** How is he going to make a feast and say Mass if St Philip isn't there? What **will** people say to him? (The Priest and the Sacristan)]

The interesting feature in this example is the transmission of words, i.e. the monologue of the main character. The omniscient narrator knows what will happen in the church the next day: however, he assumes the character's position and relates his questions in FIS as his own reflection and doubts. The bolded interrogative sentences are posed from the 1st person's point of view, in direct speech. The narrator relates them in this way, at the same time changing grammatical persons as in indirect speech (*on će održati; što će mu reći* [*he says Mass; What will people say to him?*]). This is a technique typical of FIS as employed in literary works with a view to creating

most expressive interior monologues. A similar procedure may be noticed in the following example where the main character encounters fairies in the forest:

- (9) *Najenput on čuje velikoga šuma v zraku. Kaj je ve to za šum? On se ogleda, gljedi, vidi on da neke kakti ljudi lete, ne žene. Ljepe. Lasi njim vise rudani, ljepi – i stanejo na to livado k tomu potoku.* (Stekljena gora, 1997: 76)

[All of a sudden, he hears a loud noise in the air, (thinking) **What kind of noise is that?** He looks round and sees some men flying, **no, women. Beautiful.** They have long, beautiful red hair – and they land there, on the meadow beside a stream. (The Glass Mountain)]

The narrator assumes the character's position, interpolating in his narration an interrogative sentence as imagined by the character, simultaneously evoking a moment of fictional reality, viewing and pondering what the character sees (*ljudi; ne, žene. Lijepe. [men flying, no, women. Beautiful]*). The omission of main verbs may lead one to the conclusion that it really represents FIS, by which the omniscient narrator identifies himself with the character, speaking in his stead, thereby also achieving a very expressive rhythm and intonation. The following examples also reveal the thoughts of characters being spoken about. In this passage a priest speculates who may have stolen the princess's ring from her room:

- (10) *Onda normalno sitijo se – ima devet sluškinja – da su ga odnile sluškinje, ko će ga drugi odnit, niko ne zalazi unutra.* (Pop i Cigo, 1967: 368)

[Then, naturally, he remembered – he had nine maids – that the maids must have taken it away, **who else would have taken it, no one ever goes in there.** (The Priest and the Gypsy Man)]

The omniscient narrator knows what has happened, therefore it is clear that both the question and the comment are made by the character in this tale. The narrator interpolates his words as indirect speech. However, by omitting the main verb, he creates a form of FIS. Similar to this is the following example of interpolating an interrogative clause. In the fairy tale entitled "Šingala-mingala" a peasant was given some meat by his godfather, who sent him to the devil. The peasant went looking for the devil and asked:

- (11) *...svakog pita di može biti vrag. Ne zna niko kazat, a ko će kazat di vrag stoji.* (Šingala-mingala, 1997: 141)

[...he asked everyone he met on the way where the devil could be. No one seemed to know, **and who can say where the devil dwells?** (Šingala-mingala)]

This interrogative sentence also reflects the narrator's attitude towards the events. The question is merged in FIS and gives an impression of the narrator's comment or rhetorical question, demanding no answer, but intensifying the wonder and the uncertainty of the events to follow.

Oral narrators often address the audience, as is evident in the following example where, by an exclamatory sentence, the listener is indirectly drawn into the fictional world of the tale:

- (12) *Kad je doli sašo, niza skale je sašo doli, a budi Bog i Gospod s nami, doli je đavlina...* (Čovjek spasio đavla, 1997:185)

[When he got down there, when he descended the stairs, **may the Good Lord be with us!** – down there was a huge devil. (A Man Saved the Devil)]

By a familiar exclamatory sentence invoking God's help, the narrator relates what the character must have thought at the moment of meeting the devil. With this interpolation the narrator relies upon the collective consciousness of the audience to evoke the atmosphere of fear, affectively intensifying the sentence intonation as well. However, as Božanić and Brešan have pointed out, one is left with a "narratological dilemma" as to whether this is indeed FIS. Namely, these authors interpret such interpolations as FIS due to their linguistic features (elements of direct speech, posing, however, the question: *Whose voice is it?*, i.e. who is thinking or uttering the words, emphasizing that FIS "is characterized by duplicating the voices of the narrator and the speaker" (Božanić and Brešan 2007: 242), which is also applicable to the quoted example. It can consequently be concluded that such interpolations are indeed forms of FIS by which the narrators, at the same time, express their attitude towards the events being related. It should be noted that diverse forms of addressing the reader in literary works are interpreted as a stylistic device by the use of which the narrators become an intermediary between the events, characters, and the reader (see: Flaker 1986: 353-354).

In oral narration various exclamations are frequently used in dialogues, but also in narrative passages. The narrators sometimes start a sentence by an exclamation in order to draw the listeners' attention, as in the following example:

- (13) *He, vidu oni da nema šale, počeli oni...* (Popov sluga čuva grob, 1997: 181).

[Hey, they can see this is not a joking matter, they have started... (The Priest's Servants Keeps Watch of the Grave)]

Such uses are not regarded as FIS, but rather a more affective binding of the episodes on the part of the narrator. However, we can often find exclamations signalling FIS. For example, the priest is praying, expecting a miracle:

- (14) *Doša pop, donija libre, moli pop..., eh nema ništa.* (Tko se prvi naljuti, 1967: 355)

[The priest came, brought the books, the priest prayed..., **eh there was nothing!** (Whoever Gets Angry First)]

It is clear that in this sentence the narrator first relates the event, subsequently reporting the priest's words and his exclamation of disappointment. However, he uses neither direct or indirect speech: he interpolates the words as though they were his own, i.e. as FIS, thereby simply condensing the sentence and enlivening the intonation. More expressive forms of FIS with exclamations may be found. For instance, in the following passage the narrator introduces exclamations, whereby he evokes the fictional reality. A man was pulling a woman out of the pit:

- (15) *...iša on, uze drugu konistru, konop i spuščo doli. Kad najedanput, on diže konistru, e, osjeti, teška, aha, evo je. I diže, diže...* (Žena i vrag u jami, 1997: 250)

[...and he went, took another bucket and a rope, and put them down. When suddenly, lo and behold, he lifts the bucket, and feels (that it is) **heavy, yes, here it is.** And he lifts and lifts... (The Woman and the Devil in the Pit)]

Expressions such as *e, aha, evo* [*here, lo and behold*] are normally used in direct speech, but the narrator incorporates them in his narration, imitating the actions of the main character. Apart from this, he uses the adjective *heavy*, omitting the main verbs altogether, i.e. he reports the words of the character in the form of FIS instead of direct or indirect speech. In direct speech the sentence would read: *...on diže konistru i govori: "E, teška je, aha, evo je!"* [*he lifts the bucket and says: "Here it is, it's heavy..."*], whereas in indirect speech the same sentence would read: *...on diže konistru i pomisli / govori kako je teška.* [*he lifts the bucket saying / thinking that it is heavy*]. The narrator identifies himself with his character, reporting his words in the

form of FIS. By doing so he has presented the events in a more intense way, combining the diegetic and mimetic rendering of the story.

We would hereby like to draw the attention to the use of the narrative or historic imperative. In Croatian it refers to the past and is used in extremely animated relating of past events. Katičić says that this form “originates from folk tales and in the Croatian literary works it is felt as a powerful stylistic device” (Katičić 1991: 65-66). The historic imperative can quite frequently be found in the processed corpus, many times in the tales from the *Shtokavian* speaking areas. In the above-mentioned Croatian literary theory on FIS, there are examples where FIS is signalled by the use of the imperative, usually in the utterances from the point of view of the speaker, containing the elements of direct speech.¹¹ However, this function of the historic imperative is not explicitly mentioned anywhere. Here is an example which illustrates that this form may also signal FIS. The narrator relates the moment when a table, laden with food and drink, appears in front of the peasant:

- (16) *...razgrnio on trpezu, pića, jéca koliko god oćeš, bogati, jidi i pij.* (Šingala-mingala, 1997:141)

[...he uncovered the table, food and drink in abundance, **good heavens!, eat and drink to your heart's content!** (Šingala-mingala)]

It is an incomplete, elliptical sentence: the verbs of thinking or perception have been omitted and are implicit (e.g. *pomisli, vidi* [*thought, saw*]). The narrator begins the reporting in the 3rd person *razgrnio on trpezu* [*he uncovered the table*], but continues to address the audience using the 2nd person – *koliko god oćeš* [*to your heart's content*], adding the colloquial exclamation *bogati!* [*good heavens! / my goodness! / by God!*]. By doing so he clearly shows his involvement in the story, assuming the position of the character he speaks about. He then goes on to express his satisfaction in a more animated manner by the imperative *jidi i pij!* [*eat and drink!*], used as an exclamation. This form does not express a command, but rather an encouragement, which can refer to the 1st and 2nd person, unlike the ordinary imperative that primarily concerns the 2nd person (*ti* [*you*]). These words may have equally been uttered by the character, a bewildered and overjoyed peasant, in direct speech, where the sentence would read: *...razgrnio on*

¹¹ A similar example is also given by Vuletić in an analysis of FIS in the prose of Krleža (Vuletić 1976: 196).

trpezu i pomisli: "Ima jića i pića koliko god oćeš, bogati, jidi i pij!" [he uncovered the table: "Food and drink in abundance, eat and drink to your heart's content!"]. In neutral, objective narration or in indirect speech, the expressions *bogati!* [good heavens! / my goodness! / by God] would have to be omitted, and a verb of thinking would have to be added. The sentence would then read: *...razgrnio on trpezu i pomislio (vidio) da ima jića i pića koliko god oće* [he uncovered the table and thought (saw) that there was food and drink in abundance, as much as he wanted]. If we were to preclude the possibility that in the quoted example indirect speech may as well have been used, the conclusion remains that the imperative forms *jidi i pij!* [eat and drink!] actually represent the narrator's comment. Each comment on the part of the narrator is usually interpreted as an extremely expressive FIS. We may therefore come to the conclusion that the narrator has constructed a form of FIS by incorporating in his narration expressions and forms typical of direct speech, resulting in a very lively rhythmicity and intonation.

2.4. Deictic words (adverbial pronouns, particles) as used in FIS

In oral tales and stories there are instances of deictic words (adverbial pronouns of place and particles) as employed in FIS. Such uses have not as yet been described in the Croatian philological literature on FIS, and we consider them to be interesting and important linguistic tools, referring to spatial and temporal relations between the participants of the events being recounted.¹² They also demonstrate the narrator's point of view: his attitude to the fictional events, as well as to the listeners, i.e. they serve to emphasise the narrator's role in the creation of the story.

In an actual speech act (utterance) deictic words constitute the basis of the communication process, since every communication occurs in a certain space and at a certain time. The Croatian language is particularly precise in differing deictic words with respect to the persons engaged in a direct oral communication. From demonstrative pronouns *ovaj, ova, ovo; taj, ta, to; onaj,*

¹² We would hereby like to draw attention to the fact that in the contemporary theories of narration spatial and temporal adverbs are treated as elements of structural difference between the 1st person and 3rd person narrative texts. For example, Stanzel analyses deictic expressions (adverbs of place and time) as employed in fiction, showing how, by means of spatial and temporal deixis, the narrator can come close to the world of the characters, intertwining his narrative present with the emotional reality of the characters, which is extremely important for the interpretation of a narrative text. (Stanzel 1992: 191-199).

ona, ono [*this, that, these, those*] adverbial pronouns have been derived, also distributed according to persons and, from the speaker's point of view, indicate spatial relations. By the adverbs¹³ *ovdje, ovuda, ovamo* [*here, this way, hither*], the 1st person is indicated, i.e. the place close to the speaker (*ja* → *ovdje*... [*I* → *here*]); the adverbs *tu, tuda, tamo* [*there, that way, thither*] refer to what is closer to the 2nd person, the addressee (*ti* → *tu* [*you – there*]), while the adverbs *ondje, onuda, onamo* – [*there, that way, thither*] relate to the 3rd person, i.e. whatever is far from both the speaker and the addressee (*on* → *ondje*... [*he* → *there*]). In this respect Croatian obviously makes a more precise distinction than English. Consequently, adverbial pronouns of place simultaneously refer to the participants in communication and the space where they communicate or about which they speak. This orientation system is also described (and prescribed) by grammar books. However, there is nothing in grammar books on alternate replacement of these adverbs in direct speech, indirect speech, or FIS. We therefore deem it necessary to point out that such expressions in sentences are alternated depending upon who is speaking, e.g. the narrator or persons in a dialogue deixis. We believe that they may indicate FIS as well.

In Croatian oral tales the narrators usually properly employ deixis in direct speech. In dialogues, however, they convey the experience of real spontaneous communication, i.e. the experience of orientation, as in a real communication act, it is consistently transposed into the fictional time and space. It may be observed that “consistent and proper distribution of deictic words in characters’ dialogues not only contributes towards the experience of a convincing conversation, but also creates a sense of credibility and coherence of the events being narrated” (Laco and Ninčević 2015: 242). The narrative parts of the tales most frequently feature adverbial pronouns of place which, in the fictional world, refer to the items close to the 2nd person (*tu, tuda, tamo* [*there, that way, thither*]). These uses are consistent with linear narration and joining of the episodes, also reflecting a closeness between the narrator, tale, and the listener (Laco and Ninčević 2015: 249). Certain cases of narration, however, can be found where the narrator departs from the usual distribution of deictics and, from the point of view of the 3rd person, uses such adverbs as *ovamo* (or the dialect form *simo* [*here, hither*]) with the same meaning

¹³ By their meaning, these words are adverbs but, due to their pronominal and deictic role, they have come to be called adverbial pronouns.

instead of the adverb *onamo* [*there, thither*]. For example, in the tale “The Raven Brothers” the narrator recounts the moment in which the sister finds a long-lost brother:

(17) *I su počeli oba plakati i upita kako je ona sama **simo** prišla. I ona mu je povedala sve....* (Braća gavrani, 1986: 58)

[And they both started to cry and he asked her how she had managed to get **there** on her own. And she told him everything... (The Raven Brothers)]

In the tale “The Emperor’s Son and the Pretty Shepherdess”, the Prince asks the shepherdess to dinner:

(18) *Pa on ferma jedan veli obed i je pozval čuda puka ...i je pisal njoj da neka i ona pride sa svojimi školani **simo** na obed.* (Cesarov sin i lipa ovčarica, 1997: 164)

[Then he prepared a big dinner and invited a lot of people... and he wrote to her to come **there** to dinner. (The Emperor’s Son and the Pretty Shepherdess)]

In the examples quoted above, the narrator, using the 3rd person narration, relates the characters’ words, but from indirect speech (*upita kako je... [he asked her how...]; pisao joj je neka... [he wrote to her to...]*) they are transformed into FIS, signalled by the adverbial pronoun *simo*, which, in the grammatical distribution, agrees with the 1st and not the 3rd person. For example, the first sentence (in *The Raven Brothers*) would read: “*Kako si sama **simo** prišla?*” [*How did you manage to get **here** / **hither** on your own?*]. In indirect speech the same sentence would read: *...upita kako je (ona) sama **ondje** / **tu** prišla* [*...he asked how she had managed to get **there** / **thither** on her own*]. Therefore, the episodes have been retold in the form of indirect speech, but using the deictic word *simo* [*here, hither*] which pertains to direct speech. Similar combinations of direct and indirect speech in the same utterance are typical of FIS. In the sentences quoted above the adverbial pronouns could have been omitted and the meaning would have remained equally clear. However, this spontaneous transition from the 1st to the 3rd person’s point of view reveals the narrator’s involvement in the narration. From their point of view the narrators shift to the characters’ perspective, thereby expressing their closeness to the characters and events they recount.

In the Croatian language the particles *evo, eto, eno* [*here, there, hither, thither*] are also deictic words. These expressions, in much the same way as demonstrative and adverbial pronouns, refer to the items closer to or farther

away from the addressee. The speaker (1st person), by means of the particle *evo* [*here*], refers to what is near or closer to him; by using the particle *eto* [*there, thither*], he points to the 2nd person, the addressee, and the items closer to him, whereas *eno* [*there, thither*] indicates the items far away from both the speaker and the addressee. These words also denote the absolute present, i.e. the time of narrating. Consequently, their only role seems to be direct deixis in space and time, which is why they are used in direct speech as well. Here, we need to point out that they cannot be transferred into indirect speech, i.e. narration. However, in oral tales we can find occasional, though rare examples of these particles being used in the narrative segments of texts. The use of the particle *evo* has already been mentioned in Example (15). Moreover, we want to mention an interesting use, where the main character, the priest's servant, had spent the whole night keeping watch of a grave, waiting for the priest who was supposed to come at dawn:

- (19) (19) *Evo svanuće dolazi, vidi on, je svanuće, al boji se da ga vara. Kad je svanuće, evo brzo sunce izlazi, evo sunce izašlo, ide neko. Vidi on, je pop, ali ne viruje da je pop, boji se da ga varaju.* (Popov sluga čuva grob, 1997: 180)
[*Here is the daybreak, he can see it, it is dawn, but he is afraid that he is mistaken. It is dawn, the sun rises, look, the sun has risen, someone's coming. He can see it is the priest, but he doesn't believe it really is the priest, he is afraid he is being deceived.* (The Priest's Servant Keeps Watch of the Grave)]

In this passage, the narrator inserts sentences typical of direct speech: *evo svanuće dolazi, je svanuće, evo brzo sunce izlazi, evo sunce izašlo*. [*It is dawn, the sun rises, look, the sun has risen*]. The particle *evo* [*here*] denotes the 1st person, the speaker, accompanied by imperfective verbs in the present tense (*dolazi, izlazi, ide neko* [*rises, is coming*]). As was said earlier, such syntagms in Croatian grammatically refer to the time of speaking, not the time spoken about, and they are usually used in direct speech. It may be observed that the passage quoted above can be easily transferred into direct speech, i.e. the priest's servants monologue. Instead, the narrator quotes his very words and, by means of the particle *evo*, incorporates them in the 3rd person narration (*vidi on, boji se, ne viruje...* [*He can see, he doesn't believe, he is afraid...*]), thereby constructing FIS. It may be said that he has skilfully connected diegetic with mimetic method of recounting the events. By this procedure he has created an impression of absolute present, realism, and suspense, thereby capturing and holding the listeners' attention.

While discussing the use of deictic words in FIS, it may be observed that there is a difference in the affective attitude and the points of view of the narrator. It may also be noticed that, by employing the adverbial pronouns, the narrators, for a moment, spontaneously assume the characters' perspective: by using the deictic particle *evo* [*here*], as in the above example, the narrator identifies himself with the character. In this identification he combines narration with monologue, which represents an extremely expressive and effective stylistic device.

3. Conclusion

Dealing with FIS in Croatian oral tales, we have noticed that the omission of the reporting verb (i.e. the main verb) represents its most frequent feature. By omitting the main verbs oral narrators often concisely recount the crucial events (our Examples 1 and 2). Such a way of reporting someone's words can be found in everyday speech: in colloquial style its purpose is a simpler conveying of information. Narrators are expected to adopt it and use it in oral narration as well. However, the examples selected for this discussion show that this type of FIS is frequently used by the narrators in order to make their story more effective and not merely to convey information (Examples 3-5). Other forms typical of FIS, which have been discussed and illustrated: transposition of grammatical persons, interrogative sentences, interpolating exclamatory sentences, exclamations, and language elements designating the speaker (Examples 6-16), frequently encountered in the texts concerned, represent procedures and techniques by which narrators relate the words of their characters, thereby also expressing their attitude or their emotions towards the events and characters. This is the basic characteristic of FIS, which is in philological analysis usually attributed to the peculiar features of modern artistic prose. Of course, it is not our intention here to compare oral (folk) tales with intricate and complex structure of literary works of art, but merely to describe FIS as a linguistic instrument. It is noticeable that all forms of FIS encountered in Croatian oral tales are also used by authors of artistic prose. Consequently, FIS is confirmed to be a procedure adopted in both oral (folk) tales and literary works. While an educated writer, a skilful narrator, employs FIS articulate and elaborate thoughts and feelings, thereby creating intricate artistic structures, oral narrators, usually uneducated, but gifted, im-

merge themselves in the story and, spontaneously assuming the characters' position, present their fictional world to the audience in a more animated and affective way. In the act of narration they raise their narration above the level of the needs of everyday communication. In the above quoted forms of FIS, the involvement of the oral narrator may be perceived, in very much the same way as we recognise the involvement of the authors of literary works.

It might be worth emphasising that, along with the aforementioned forms which are characteristic of FIS, we have hereby also explored the procedures and techniques yet unnoticed in Croatian studies in linguistics and stylistics to date, these being the use of historical imperative, adverbial pronouns of place and particles (Examples 17-19). Such procedures in the oral tales are not so frequent: particularly rare is the use of the particle *evo*. This has led us to the conclusion that they represent exceptionally expressive stylistic devices indicating FIS and deserve to be explored and analysed in literary works as well, particularly because deixis is known "to play a key role in narrative. From the viewpoint of textual cohesion, deictic forms maintain reference to persons, places, and objects within a text as it unfolds" (Herman et al. 2008: 100). Fludernik also speaks of the stylistic effect of such expressions: "In free indirect discourse, the hero's thoughts may be represented in the third person and past tense, but the use of demonstrative pronouns *this/these* and proximal deictics of space and time (*here, now*) can signal to the reader that a passage is to be understood as rendering a character's subjective perspective on the fictional world." (Fludernik 2011: 103). A similar, perhaps even more powerful, effect may be noticed in our examples of FIS, employing deixis which strongly suggests that the narrator assumes the subjective perspectives of the characters.

Along with linguistic and stylistic characteristics of FIS, the perspectives/points of view of the narrator and the characters are also being discussed. Consequently, as was mentioned in the Introduction, any analysis of FIS necessarily concerns the function of the narrator in a narrative text. Not possessing a required extensive knowledge, we do not wish to embark upon a discussion on narratological issues. Nevertheless, the discussion hereby presented seems to lead to the conclusion that the contemporary narratological views may also be applied to oral tales as well, particularly because this aspect is usually neglected or ignored.

For instance, the famous Genette's question *who sees?* or *who speaks?* in the narrative or its segment, or discussing the *variable focalisation* / focalisation shifts (Genette 1997: 96-103) may also be shown in the analysis of oral tales. Božanić has accurately interpreted Genette's conclusion, showing how storytellers in recounting the events (*facenda*) can skilfully shift from the position of the omniscient narrator (external focalisation) to the character's perspective (internal focalisation). Such spontaneous shifts have also been confirmed in our examples (4-10), particularly affective narrator's identification with the characters being those in examples 14-19, where a dual-voice has been created (of the narrator and the character, respectively).

Furthermore, we are familiar with the fact that more recent narratological theories seem to have departed from the need, by means of FIS, to separate points of view / voices of narrators from those of their characters. Hrabal, for instance, considers the theories of communication concept of the narrative text, concluding that the act of narration is primarily an act of constituting the narrative, i.e. a fictional world of the tale, in which what matters is not the category of the narrator, but rather the way of relating the story (Hrabal 2011: 100-101). Such conclusions are also justified and acceptable. We may therefore say that the use of FIS, instead of direct or indirect speech, in oral narration also represents a means serving to express thoughts, experiences, or feelings more effectively, regardless of whether they pertain to the characters (protagonists) or the narrator.

For instance, a shift in the narrative perspective also implies a different degree of emotional charge, influences the condensing of particular episodes, changes the rhythm and intonation by which the attention of the audience (listeners, readers) is maintained, at the same time creating a sense of the fictional world coming closer to the real world. We deem that these features of narration in these simple narrative and language constructions contribute towards intensifying particular stylistic values.

References

- Bošković-Stulli M., 1963, *Narodne pripovijetke*, Zagreb: Zora, Matica hrvatska.
Bošković-Stulli M., 1967, *Narodne pripovijetke Sinjske krajine*, „*Narodna umjetnost*”, 5-6, p. 329-372.
Bošković-Stulli M., 1967a, *Narodne predaje Sinjske krajine*, „*Narodna umjetnost*”, 5-6, p. 372-411.

- Bošković-Stulli M., 1975, *Usmena književnost kao umjetnost riječi*, Zagreb: Mladost.
- Bošković-Stulli M., 1986, *Zakopano zlato: hrvatske usmene pripovijetke, predaje i legende iz Istre*, Pula: Čakavski sabor.
- Bošković-Stulli M., 1997, *Usmene pripovijetke i predaje*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Bošković-Stulli M., 2006, *Priče i pričanje*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Božanić J., 1992, *Komiške facende*, Split: Književni krug.
- Božanić J., 2015, *Viški facendijer*, Split: Književni krug.
- Božanić J., 2019, *Vernakularna stilistika*, Split: Književni krug.
- Božanić J., Brešan T., 2007, Slobodni neupravni govor u facendama otoka Visa, „*Čakavska rič*“, XXXV, 2, p. 237-247.
- Flaker A., 1986, Umjetnička proza. – *Uvod u književnost*, eds. Z. Škreb, A. Stamać, Zagreb: Globus, p. 335-377.
- Fludernik M., 2011, The Category of ‘Person’ in Fiction: *You and We*. – *Current Trends in Narratology*, ed. G. Olson, Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, p. 101-143.
- Frangješ I., 1963, Slobodni neupravni govor kao stilska osobina, „*Umjetnost riječi*“, 4, p. 261-275. <http://stilistika.org/slobodni-neupravni-govor-kao-stilska-osobina>.
- Genette G., 1992, Tipovi fokalizacije i njihova postojanost. – *Suvremena teorija pripovijedanja*, ed. V. Biti, Zagreb: Globus, p. 97-115.
- Herman D., Jahn M. and Ryan M.-L. (eds.), 2008, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Hrabal J., 2011, Što (sve) znaju pripovjedači?, „*Umjetnost riječi*“, LV, 3-4, p. 97-113.
- Katičić R., 1991, *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Laco G., 2003, *Stilistika hrvatskih narodnih bajki*, Zadar: Magistarski rad u strojopisu.
- Laco G., Ninčević S., 2015, Mjesto, vrijeme i osobe u hrvatskim usmenim pričama. – *O pričama i pričanju danas*, eds. J. Marković, Lj. Marks, Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, p. 233-257.
- Marks Lj., 1993, Stilografija usmene proze suvremenih zapisa, „*Croatica*“, XXIII/XXIV, 37/38/39, p. 203-216.
- Pranjić K., 1986, Stil i stilistika. – *Uvod u književnost*, eds. Z. Škreb, A. Stamać, Zagreb: Globus, p. 193-232.
- Stanzel F., 1992, Pripovjedni tekst u prvom i pripovjedni tekst u trećem licu. – *Suvremena teorija pripovijedanja*, ed. V. Biti, Zagreb: Globus, p. 179-199.
- Vuletić B., 1976, *Fonetika književnosti*, Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber.
- Vuletić B., 2006, *Govorna stilistika*, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Free indirect speech in Croatian oral folk tales

This paper considers free indirect speech (FIS) in Croatian oral folk tales (fairy tales, legends, oral tradition and fables). Oral folk tales (folklore) from all parts of Croatia, and that in all three Croatian dialects (the Shtokavian, the Chakavian, and the Kajkavian) have been analysed. Special attention is paid to first-hand accounts according to authentic tellings in recent times. The types of FIS that are commonly attributed to the linguo-stylistic characteristics of modern art prose have been considered. Additionally, some techniques that also indicate SNG have been analysed, which has neither been noticed nor described in the hitherto Croatian philological literature. It is concluded that FIS is a linguo-stylistic device which affects the way of delivering (creating) a story, but it is also a feature which distinguishes one tale from another.

Key words: free indirect speech, Croatian oral folk tales, narrator (storyteller), narration (storytelling), stylistic features