

"I TAKE OUT THE ROCK — DOK!": HOW GREEK WOMEN
TELL ABOUT BEING MOLESTED (AND CREATE INVOLVEMENT)

Deborah Tannen
Georgetown University

Introduction: Involvement devices in narrative. In earlier work on spoken narratives in English and Greek (Tannen 1979, 1980) and on written as compared to spoken narratives in English and Greek (Tannen 1984), I analyzed narratives elicited in a naturalistic experiment. Twenty Greek women and twenty American women watched a short film and then were asked to tell what happened in the film.¹ Their resultant narratives were tape recorded, transcribed, and compared to each other.²

I wished, in addition, to analyze narratives which were told in a more natural setting, and, moreover, were personal narratives — stories told about speakers' personal experience: a kind of paradigmatic narrative genre, as Labov (1972) observed in his work on the language of vernacular Black English. (It might be argued, in fact, that descriptions of a film — even the action in a film — are not, strictly speaking, narratives, just as Labov argues that descriptions of movies and television programs are not true narratives.)

For this reason, at the time that I gathered the oral narratives about a film in Athens, I also tape recorded personal narratives told by Greek speakers in informal conversational settings. For reasons I will explain presently, I ended up with the greatest number of stories — 25 — told by women about their personal experiences having been molested by men.

When hearing these stories, in Greek or in translation, listeners report that they find them very vivid. This impression seems simply to reflect a phenomenon frequently observed, and supported by folk wisdom, that Greeks are good storytellers. I see as my goal documenting, in concrete terms, the linguistic features that contribute to that impression — features which I suggest contribute to the construction of involvement: both the involvement of the audience and the sense of the speaker's own involvement in the storytelling.

Involvement in storytelling. Earlier analysis of the narratives told in English and Greek about a film indicated that the Americans in the study (students at the University of California, Berkeley) approached the narrative task as a memory test, referring to their previous experience being subjects of psychological experiments. They tried to show that they were objective and that they remembered details accurately and in the correct temporal sequence. When they applied their critical acumen, it was to critique the film as a film; for example,

some complained about the sound track, some about the acting and costumes.

In contrast, the Greek subjects (English language students at the Hellenic American Union in Athens) seemed to be trying to tell a good story, referring to their previous experience in informal interaction. They told shorter stories, including only those details that contributed to a theme each identified; they were more interpretive, adding details and explanations that were not actually portrayed in the film, even to the point of changing what was portrayed. When they exercised their critical acumen, it was to critique the behavior of the characters, and to interpret the larger message of the film.

In short, the Greek women in the earlier study told better stories because they wanted to; they were more concerned with the interactive frame — interesting their audience. The Americans told more accurate and detailed narratives because they wanted to; they were more concerned with the testing frame — impressing their audience with their powers of memory.

These divergent goals in language use reflect a polarity I have written about at length (Tannen 1982a, b), which has at times been thought of as oral vs. literate tradition (Olson 1977, Ong 1967), but I prefer to think of and discuss in terms of relative focus on involvement (Tannen in press). In any communication, language performs both referential (or cognitive) and phatic (or social) functions. As Bateson (1972) put it, there is in every utterance both a message — what is said — and a metamessage — what is communicated about the relationship among interlocutors by the fact and the form of the utterance. In some contexts, the message is relatively more important — for example, in instructions or directions. In other contexts, the metamessage is relatively more important — for example, in cocktail-party chatter or small talk.

Many features of discourse can be understood by asking whether they grow out of or serve interpersonal involvement among speaker(s) and hearer(s) (that is, the social function), or whether they grow out of or serve the focus on information (that is, the cognitive function). And discourse genres can be understood by asking how they systematically balance the needs to serve these two functions. For example, many of the features that have been identified as typifying spoken discourse can be understood as serving the need for involvement, whereas many of the features that have been identified as typifying written discourse can be understood as serving the need to focus on information. Written literary fiction combines features of both in characteristic ways (Tannen 1982a).

In this paper I suggest that language use in Greece is often characterized by more focus on interpersonal involvement as compared to mainstream American discourse which is characterized by relatively more focus on information, to the (at least conventional) downplay of the need to display and create interpersonal involvement.

I have analyzed the Greek women's spontaneous narratives of personal experience in order to discover the linguistic devices that give their narratives a sense of vividness, and thereby both demonstrate the involvement of the speaker in her own narrative and create involvement with the hearer(s). I will suggest that involvement is created by (1) immediacy, portraying action and dialogue as if it were occurring at telling time and (2) forcing the hearer to participate in sensemaking.

The stories. I began to collect spontaneous conversational narratives in connection with the project at the University of California, Berkeley, which led to the film-narratives. We wanted to collect stories by numerous speakers about similar personal experiences. A consultant to the project, sociolinguist Charlotte Linde, suggested that since San Francisco had recently opened the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) subway system, we might collect stories about experiences on BART. At the same time, I was interested in comparing New York and California speaking styles, so during a trip to New York City I asked friends and strangers about their experiences on the New York subway.

The BART stories never panned out. People tended to evaluate the new system rather than tell of personal experiences on it. But asking New Yorkers whether they had had any experiences on the subway elicited many gripping personal narratives.³ Since we had decided on the film-narrative project to include only women as subjects, I also elicited subway stories from women only. And it turned out that most of the stories told by women about their experiences on the New York subway were stories about being molested by men. Therefore, when I sought a group of comparable stories told by Greek women in Athens, I asked if they'd had any experiences being molested.

All the Greek women to whom I asked this question — four in a small group of friends, four in private conversation with me — said that they had many such stories. And they told 25 of them. The stories ranged from very short — a single sentence — to very long — two pages full of transcript. The offenses described included groping on crowded buses, movies, and elsewhere; indecent exposure; following and harrassing in the street; nuisance phone calls; uninvited sexual advances; and physical assaults and attempted rape. All of the stories ended with the speakers unhurt physically. In four of the stories, the speaker reportedly struck back; in six she talked her way out of the situation; in eight she did nothing. I am not here interested in the psychological impact of such experiences, or any other psychological aspects of the narratives — fascinating as they are. I will discuss only the linguistic features by which the speakers created involvement in telling their stories — in most cases, features which do not typify the American narratives collected.

Involvement features in the stories. The features which typified the Greek narratives and which contributed to involvement are:

- (1) repetition
- (2) direct quotation in reported speech
 - (a) dialogue exchanged
 - (b) thoughts of speaker
 - (c) thoughts of man
- (3) historical present verbs
- (4) ellipsis
 - (a) deletion of verb of saying
 - (b) deletion of copula
 - (c) deletion of comment or proposition
- (5) sound-words
- (6) second person singular
- (7) *now* for time frame *then*
- (8) minimal external evaluation

Each of these devices will be illustrated and discussed in turn. In conclusion, I will present an entire narrative to show how the devices work together to create involvement in a story.

Repetition. Ordinary conversation is full of repetition. I am in the process of investigating the many forms and functions that repetition can take. In the Greek molestation stories, repetition served two striking and divergent functions, with two different associated forms: (1) immediate repetition of words or phrases to show repeated aspect, and (2) immediate or delayed repetition of longer utterances to emphasize a point. The latter is common in American storytelling as well, but the former seems particular to modern Greek.

In many cases, immediate repetition serves to communicate repeated aspect without the actual content of the proposition being verbalized. For example, the speaker I will call Marika, who told 9 of the 25 stories collected, and who told particularly vivid stories, reported how she told off a man who had thrown her down and tried to rape her:⁴

ton evriza, "Den drepese, palianthrope?"

toupa, toupa, toupa ekei ...

"satire, yero, aidestate, saliarì,"

toupa toupa toupa.

I cursed him, "Aren't you ashamed, scoundrel?"

I-told-him, I-told-him, I-told-him there ...

"Satyr, dirty-old-man, repulsive [creature], slob"

I-told-him, I-told-him, I-told-him.

The compound form toupa, from tou eipa I told him, is repeated six times, in two sets of three, representing the many things Marika said to the man — the many names she called him — which are not here listed but which can be filled in by the hearer. This filling-in involves the hearer in making sense of the story.

Earlier in the same narrative, Marika tells how she tried to get the man off her by verbal resistance:

"Fyge!"

Tipota.

"Fyge!"

Tipota.

"Get away!"

Nothing.

"Get away!"

Nothing.

By twice repeating the pair, "Fyge!" Tipota *Get away! Nothing*, she creates the impression of repeated protests which are repeatedly ignored.

There are many such instances of double or — more often — triple repetitions, to signify continued action. Another example is *mou milaye he was talking to me* uttered three times in immediate succession to indicate that a man in the street kept following and talking to the speaker.

The second type of repetition is the repeating — in the same or slightly altered words, in immediate juxtaposition or separated in the text — of an element or observation that is central to the story. For example, Marika told of escaping from several onslaughts — including the one in the preceding example — by using a rock. In a story about hitch-hiking in Italy, she states at three different points in the narrative that she had a rock with her.

Ego imouna panta me mia petra stin tsanta

...

panta me mia petra stin tsanta

...

Ego eicha tin petra stin tsepi mou

I was always with a rock in (my) purse

...

always with a rock in (my) purse

...

I had the rock in my pocket

The rock is central to this story. The first line cited is the first line of the narrative, and the entire narrative is, in a way, an illustration of that line: the usefulness of carrying a rock for self-protection. A related point of the story is Marika's presentation of herself as ready and able to fight back.

Nearly every narrative in the corpus includes a phrase or utterance that is repeated which underlines the point of the narrative, or an element that is particularly salient. For example, in another story, Marika repeats three times in a very short narrative that the incident took place in Turkey. Her point in telling the story was that in Turkey she did not fight back, since Turks, she explained, could be dangerous if angered. Another speaker repeated several times that she is a free spirit and talks to people freely — which is why she sometimes has had experiences. Yet another repeated several

times that the man who attacked her in Paris was Algerian. And another repeated twice that for a period of time after she was assaulted by a man on her way home from school, her father drove her to school. Thus repetition makes salient to hearers the main point of a story or an element that is particularly salient to the speaker.

Direct quotation in reported speech. When speech is reported in these narratives, it is reported in direct quotation. This is the case with 15 of the 25 narratives; the remaining 10 do not report dialogue at all. The words of the speaker are represented in the first person, and at times the words of the speaker's thoughts and even the words of the man's thoughts are cast in the first person.

For example, when Marika tells of deciding to call the friend of a friend during a trip to an island, she reports her decision in the form of a comment to her traveling companion:

Tis leo tis xadelfis mou,
 "Kaiti, den pame kai ston sistimeno ton anthropo
 na mi fygoume apo tin Rodo
 kai den echoume patisi to podaraki mas?"
 "Pame," mou leei.
I say to my cousin,
"Katie, shouldn't we go see the fellow
we were told to look up,
so as not to leave Rhodes
without having set foot [on his doorstep]?"
"Let's go," she says to me.

By casting the decision in the form of dialogue, Marika creates a dramatic scene and shows by her phrasing that she was motivated by a sense of obligation to behave properly.

Marika then tells that the man insisted on taking them for a tour of Rhodes, and showed up with a friend. She lets us know what she feared, and builds suspense, by reporting her thoughts in the form of direct quotation:

Leo, "ti thelei
 dyo ekeinon, dyo emeis,
 ti echei skopo na mas kanei?"
I say [to myself], "what does he want,
two [of] them, two [of] us,
what does he intend to do to us?"

In four stories Marika represents her thoughts as direct quotations to herself, sometimes even addressing herself by name:

"Kala" leo, "Marika edo eimaste tora."
 "Okay" *I say [to myself], "Marika, here we are now."*

In two narratives, one by Marika and one by another speaker, even the (projected) thoughts of the man are presented as direct quotations. In telling how she chased off a man who had been harrassing her and her friend, Marika tells what the man (must have) thought upon seeing her step toward him brandishing a rock:

sou leei
 "afti den echei kalo skopo"
he says to you [i.e. himself]
"she doesn't have a good purpose"
[i.e. "she's up to no good"]

In the other instance, the speaker tells of having an oral examination with a university professor who deliberately kept her late and made improper advances. When he tries to keep her late on a second occasion, she insists on being examined first, and he complies, thinking (according to the teller),

sou leei
 "xero ego borei nachei kai kanena afto,
 na mou kanai kamia zimia"
he says [lit. to you, i.e. to himself]
"who knows she may have some,
make some kind of scandal for me"

Much has been written about reported speech; an entire volume is in preparation devoted to the topic, edited by Florian Coulmas. It seems clear, at least, that reporting dialogue in direct quotation creates a more vivid impression on the hearer, as if the speaker were reliving events at the time of telling. Reporting the thoughts of the speaker and even the thoughts of another character creates of the narrative a dramatic dialogue, heightening the inherently dramatic nature of narrative. (See Rosen 1982 for a discussion of the dramatic nature of narrative.)

The historical present. Direct quotation of reported speech regularly co-occurs with the historical present which, as Schiffrin (1981) has shown, also contributes to vividness by presenting the action as if it were enacted in telling time. In addition to the introduction of direct speech, as in *leo I say*, *mou leei she says to me*, the action of the longer stories was reported in the historical present. This is a feature common to American personal narratives, but not, according to Schiffrin and also according to my observation of Greek narratives, in stories told about the experiences of others. (Such second-hand narratives were excluded from this corpus.)

Ellipsis. In some cases, the verb of saying introducing a quotation is deleted; the speaker's voice quality, tone, and rhythm of speaking do the work of framing the utterance as reported speech. For example, a speaker told of being sent to speak to a man, a friend of a friend, who was supposed to help her find a job. She reports how she introduced herself to the man:

aplos "irtha apo ton tade" kai ta leipa
simply "I came from so-and-so" and so on.

The representation of what she said is not preceded by *I said* but is framed by the way it was spoken.

Deletion of words in the Greek stories is a frequent device, forcing the audience to fill in and hence to become

more involved in the storytelling. Such deletion is frequently associated with repetition, as has been seen earlier. For example, the previously cited segment in which Marika represents repeated protests repeatedly ignored:

"Fyge!"

Tipota.

"Fyge!"

Tipota.

"Get away!"

Nothing.

"Get away!"

Nothing.

From this elided form, the hearer understands something like: I kept saying, "Get away," but he didn't comply.

An example presented earlier also exhibits deletion:

Leo, "ti thelei

dyo ekeinon, dyo emeis,

ti echei skopo na mas kanei?"

I say [to myself], "what does he want,

two [of] them, two [of] us,

what does he intend to do to us?"

By the truncated form dyo ekeinon, dyo emeis (lit., *two they, two we*), Marika communicates something like, *He saw to it there were two of them, and there were two of us*. The truncated form establishes a more regular and more compelling rhythm at the same time that it forces the hearer to fill in meaning and seems to reflect more closely the voice of Marika's inner consciousness at the time.

An entire proposition could be deleted, leaving the audience to supply it. For example, when Marika tells of carrying a rock with her, she says,

panta me mia petra stin tsanta

kai molis mas peiraze enas,

amesos.

always with a rock in (my) purse

and as soon as someone bothered us,

immediately.

What happened amesos *immediately* is not stated but is filled in by the audience. Unfortunately, I have these stories on audio-not video-tape. I hypothesize that the deletion was accompanied by a gesture suggesting an attack with a rock. Although I cannot document it yet, I believe that the frequent use of ellipsis in Greek conversation is associated with the frequent use of gesture and facial expression.

Sound words. One of the aspects of Greek conversation that impressed me early on is the use of sound words, or sound non-words, to represent action. When the short sound word communicates an action that would take more words to describe, it is a form of ellipsis. There are 13 instances of sound words in the 25 narratives. A few examples follow.

peftei aftos apano mou
 xereis apano mou BAM.
he falls on top of me
y'know on top of me BOM.

In this example, as in the following one, the sound word BAM BOM illustrates the action that has been described (and emphasized by the repetition of *apano mou on top of me*).

opou vlepeis ton [name]
 opos einai kontochondros
 na pesi epano mou paidia
 etsi epese PLAF
when you see [name]
as he is short-and-fat
falling on top of me, guys,
like that he fell PLAF

And, finally, my favorite example, in which three successive sound words are used to represent action which is not otherwise described:

vgazo tin petra-- DAK!
 pali do etsi-- DOUK!
 ekane ena TAK!
 kai exifanisthi aftos.
I take out the rock-- DOK!
again here like this-- DUK!
(he/it made a TOK!
and he disappeared.

Without a videotape of the gestures, I can not reconstruct the actions that the sound words represent, but I can reconstruct that Marika's DAK/DOUK DOK/DUK represented some form of attack with the rock. Ekane TAK! [*It/He*] went [*lit. made/did*] TOK! would have been disambiguated by a gesture as well.

The sound words that appear in the narratives are: BAM, GAN, GA, DAK, DOUK, TAK, MATS-MOUTS, PLAF, ACH, A, and PSIT-PSIT. The last is somewhat different, I believe; it represents onomatopoetically the sound with which Greek men get the attention of women and chase away cats. All the other sound words are composed primarily of the large-sounding back vowels /a/ and /u/; the abrupt voiceless and voiced stops /k/ /g/, /t/ /d/, and /p/ /b/; and consonant clusters /ts/ /pl/. Joseph (1983) has observed the phonetic components of sound symbolism in modern Greek. In the narratives under study, it is important to note that the sound words are phonologically graphic, and they contribute to involvement by forcing the hearer to recreate the action represented by the sound.

Second person singular. In the example quoted earlier, Marika uses the second person to refer to what is actually her own perspective:

opou vlepeis ton [name]
 opos einai kontochondros
 na pesi epano mou paidia
 etsi epese PLAF

when you see [name]
 as he is short-and-fat
 falling on top of me, guys,
 like that he fell PLAF

Vlepeis you seo is used to represent what she saw. Four different speakers use this device which grammatically (by grammatical convention) inserts the hearer into the narrative.

Now for Then. Three of the eight Greek storytellers, in five stories, used the word *tora* now to refer to the time of the story action. For example, in telling about her experiences in Turkey, Marika said *pantremeni ego tora*, literally *married I now*, or, in effect, *I was married then*. (The copula is deleted as well, adding to the stark impact of the phrase.) Using *now* for the story time, like using direct quotation, dramatizes events and lends immediacy.

Evaluation. The key element that gives character and effectiveness to narrative, according to Labov (1972), is evaluation — the means by which a speaker communicates the point of a story, the way that she answers in advance what Labov calls "the withering question, 'So what?'"

Evaluation, according to Labov, is of two types: internal and external. Internal evaluation resides in every word of a narrative. By including certain events, by presenting them in certain words, by portraying the words and actions of characters, a speaker builds toward the desired effect (and reveals, intentionally or not, her own view of events). External evaluation is a more obvious and direct way of making a point. In external evaluation, the speaker moves outside of the event frame and tells the audience what to make of events, and what, from the vantage point of telling time, she felt at the time of events. Typical examples of external evaluation include, "And here's the best part," "Get this," or "I was so upset."

Labov found that the most effective stories — in his research, those told by inner city Black teenagers — made greater use of internal evaluation, whereas less effective narratives — in his research, those told by middle class white speakers — make greater use of external evaluation. Internal evaluation is more effective because it allows hearers, guided by the invisible hand of internal evaluation, to draw the intended conclusions about characters and events, and thereby to feel (rather than be told) the point of the story.

The stories told by the Greek women were characterized by far more internal than external evaluation. In the 25 stories told about having been molested, only two speakers stated negative evaluations of the events they reported: *itane tromero* *it was terrible*, and *itane tarachi* *it was upsetting*. Only one speaker, in two stories, stated how she felt: *epatha megalo sok*, *tromaxa* *I underwent a great shock*, *I was frightened*; *aisthanthika para poly aschima* *I felt very very awful*. Instead of describing how they felt, almost all the Greek speakers dramatized events in such a way that the audience surmised

how they felt. This will be seen clearly in the sample complete narrative.

A sample story. Now that a number of involvement devices have been discussed and illustrated, I will present a complete story in which some of the cited examples and many not previously cited can be observed in context. It is one of Marika's stories:

A- ego imouna panta me mia petra stin tsanta.
Ktipao.

Echo dosei chastoukia
echo dosei grothia se nafti
echo dosei chastouki
echo dosei grothia se nafti
echo dosei klotsia
echo
ti allo echo kanei

Stin Italia
se ena oto-stop
me mia kopella alli filenada mou
foititria ego tora
isame 20 chronon, 21
kykloforousame panta me mia petra stin tsanta
kai molis nas peiraze enas
amosos.

Itane de to oraio
i skini
stis 4 i ora ti nychta sti Venetia, e-
erimi i Venetia
ego me tin Thalia ekei tin fili mou
afti ti mikri
i opoia itan kai aniliki
itan 15 chronon
ego imouna 21
kai tin eicha ypefthyni mou
eicha loipon olo to aisthima tis efthynis

e-
kai gyrizame na doume tin Venetia
yiati tin alli mera to proi tha fevgame me to traino
opou parousiazetai enas andras
aidestatos
me vammena cheilia, paidia
ena vdielyro ypokeimeno glytsiaris sichamenos
pou na ton vlepeis
kai na les "polos xerei ti arrosties tha echi aftos apano tou"
kai archise na kolai
ti ti ti, ti ti ti
kati etsi kati tetoia.

Ego eicha tin petra stin tsepi mou
egootan tou leo "pasato"

den ixera kai Italika

"pasato"

tipota

"pasato" tou kano.

Me to deftero "pasato" ekana kai ena vima bros

aftos eide to prosopo mou

pos eiche agriepsi

ki itan kai vammenos

poios xerei ti aidestatos itane

sou leei "afti den echei kalo skopo"

vgazo tin petra-- DAK!

pali do etsi-- DOUK!

ekane ena TAK!

kai exifanisthi aftos.

I de alli evrethike chamo

kai na pethaini sta yelia i Thalia

na kylietai sto patoma

tis leo "Vre mi yelas tha xanarthi"

alla imouna paidi kai go

kai me piasane kai mena ta yelia

kai yelegame

pos ton eichame dioxei afton kakin kakos.

Ah- I was always with a rock in (my) purse.

I hit.

I have given smacks

I have given a punch to a sailor

I have given a smack

I have given a punch to a sailor

I have given kicks

I have

what else have I done.

In Italy

during a hitch-hiking (trip)

with another girl a friend of mine

I (am) a student now

about 20 years (old), 21

we traveled around always with a rock in (my) purse

and as soon as anyone bothered us

immediately.

It was a great scene [i.e. really something]

at 4 in the middle of the night in Venice, eh-

Venice (is/was) deserted

I with Thalia there my friend

this little one

who was underage too

(she) was 18 years (old)

I was 21

and I was responsible for her

I always had the feeling of responsibility

eh-
 and we were going around to see Venice
 because the next morning we were leaving by train
 when a man appears
 repulsive
 with painted lips, guys,
 a repulsive slimy disgusting thing
 who if you looked at him
 you'd say "who knows what diseases he must have on him"
 and he began to stick to us
 what what what, what what what
 something like that, that kind of thing

I had the rock in my pocket
 so I said to him "pasato"
 I didn't even know Italian
 "pasato"
 nothing
 "pasato" I go.
 With the second "pasato" I took a step forward
 he saw my face
 how it had gotten wild
 and he was painted
 who knows how repulsive he was
 he says [to himself] "she is up to no good"
 I take out the rock-- DOK!
 again here like this-- DUK!
 (he/it) made a TOK!
 and he disappeared.

The other one [my friend] was on the ground
 and dying of laughter, Thalia
 rolling on the floor
 I say to her "Hey don't laugh he'll come back"
 but I was a kid myself
 and the laughter grabbed me too
 and we were laughing
 about how we had thrown him out willy nilly.

All the features discussed can be seen in operation in
 this story: repetition, direct quotation, historical present,
 ellipsis, sound words, second person singular, now for then,
 and internal evaluation by which the speaker's feelings are
 dramatized in her actions rather than described from outside
 the story frame. All these features contribute to the involve-
 ment created in the audience and lend the story its vivid,
 effective, and typically Greek character.

WORKS CITED

- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. Steps to an Ecology of Mind. New York: Ballantine.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In W. Chafe, ed., *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 9-50.
- Hymes, Dell. 1981. "In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. Language use in the Balkans: The Contributions of historical linguistics. *Anthropological Linguistics* 25.3.
- Labov, William. 1972. The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 354-96.
- Olson, David. 1977. From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. *Harvard Educational Review* 47.3:257-81.
- Ong, Walter J., S.J. 1967. *The Presence of the Word*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Polanyi, Livia. 1979. So what's the point? *Semiotica* 25.3/4:207-241.
- Rosen, Harold. 1982. The nurture of narrative. Paper presented at International Reading Association, Chicago.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1981. Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57:45-62.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1978. The effect of expectations on conversation. *Discourse Processes* 1.2:203-9.
- _____. 1979. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In Roy Freedle, ed., *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 137-81.
- _____. 1980. A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. In Wallace Chafe, ed., *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 51-87.
- _____. 1981. Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style. *Discourse Processes* 4.3:221-33.

- Tannen, Deborah. 1982a. Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language* 58:1-21.
- _____. 1982b. The oral/literate continuum in discourse. In Deborah Tannen, ed., *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1-16.
- _____. 1983. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- _____. 1984. Spoken and written narrative in English and Greek. In D. Tannen, ed., *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- _____. In press. Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse. In David Olson, ed., *Literacy, Language, and Learning: The Nature and Consequences of Reading and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NOTES

1. Such global terms as "Greek" and "American" are used with caution. My own work has shown, for example, striking differences in the language use of Americans of varying ethnic and regional backgrounds — for example, the greater use of indirectness by Greek-Americans (Tannen 1981) and the use of many involvement features in New York Jewish conversational style (Tannen 1983).
2. Data collection and transcription were carried out under NIMH Grant #25592 to Wallace Chafe at the University of California, Berkeley (1975-1976). The theoretical approach underlying analysis was developed while I held a Rockefeller Humanities Fellowship (1982-1983). I am grateful for both sources of support.
3. I don't know whether this is due to differences between BART and the New York subway, or between how apt Californians and New Yorkers are to tell stories. One subway story thus elicited has been much analyzed; cf. Polanyi 1979, Tannen 1978.
4. In this and other examples, to facilitate comprehension and highlight structure, the transcript is laid out in lines and verses, reflecting in print the natural groupings which are realized in speech by intonation contours and pauses. This practice was begun on the narrative project previously mentioned (see Chafe 1980 for discussion) and is similar to the recent practice of Hymes (1981) and others with American Indian narratives. Three dots (...) represent words or lines omitted from the transcript. An English representation — not always a word-for-word translation — follows the Greek.

5. The word *pasato* seems to be an attempt to say *go away* in Italian. (Angela Iovino tells me that the correct form would be *passate*.) Thus, this interchange has the same form as one cited from another story Marika told: "Fyge!", Tipota "*Get away*", Nothing.