

Spoken/Written Language and the Oral/Literate Continuum

Author(s): Deborah Tannen

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1980), pp. 207-218

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Spoken/Written Language and the Oral/Literate Continuum

Deborah Tannen
Georgetown University

An understanding of the relationship between spoken and written language is crucial for both theoretical and applied linguistics.¹ In the real world, everyone wants to know why nearly all children learn to talk, but (as English teachers and their critics frequently wail) many "can't write." For example, someone who has had an accident rarely has more than momentary difficulty telling friends what happened. Yet consider the result when people have to write down what happened -- as in the following explanations reported on insurance company accident report forms:²

"I had been driving my car for forty years when I fell asleep at the wheel and had an accident."

"The guy was all over the road. I had to swerve a number of times before I hit him."

"In my attempt to kill a fly, I drove into a telephone pole."

The effect of discomfort with writing can thus be comic, but in more cases it is tragic -- as in the failure of children of certain ethnic and class backgrounds in educational and later in employment settings. Inability to write effectively hampers achievement at all levels of public performance. More and more service encounters begin with the injunction, "Fill this out," and for many, that is the start of failure to obtain rights and services. An understanding of the differences between speaking and writing is needed to begin to attack such problems.

In theoretical linguistics, research in recent and past years has focused on one or the other form of language without specifying or being concerned with the relationship between the two. Both European and American structuralists were concerned only with spoken language, considering written forms as an impoverished attempt to record spoken utterances. In contrast, American transformationalists effectively rejected spoken language as a locus of study, dismissing it as "mere performance." Sociolinguists analyzing variation were interested only in casual spoken language. Recent interest in discourse analysis has extended the domain of linguistic analysis "beyond the sentence." In order to determine which sorts of texts are appropriate for study, and to understand the relationship between findings of research based on various kinds of data, we need a perspective on the relationship between those kinds of data. Such an understanding may begin, most logically and crucially, with the relationship between spoken and written language.

A₃ number of linguists have turned their attention to this issue.³ The work of Chafe (1979, in prep) and Ochs (1979) will furnish a starting point for the present analysis.

Spoken vs. Written Language

Ochs (1979) hypothesizes a functional distinction between planned and unplanned discourse, suggesting that what has been regarded as "written" language is in fact written and planned, while what has been thought of as "spoken" language is spoken and unplanned. Language can be written and unplanned, as in personal letters or diaries, and it can be spoken and planned, as in formal lectures. Ochs goes on to concentrate on the differences between planned written and unplanned spoken language. She demonstrates the following characteristics of unplanned spoken language:

1. Dependence on morphosyntactic structures learned early in life, previously thought to be "replaced" by adult language.
 2. Reliance on "immediate context" to express relationships between propositions.
 3. Preference for deictic modifiers ("this man")
 4. Avoidance of relative clauses
 5. Preponderance of "repair mechanisms" (following Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson terminology)
 6. A kind of parallelism resulting in sequences of similar syntactic constructions, lexical items, and phonemes (Sacks' and Schegloff's "sound touchoffs" and "lexical touchoffs").
- In contrast, planned written discourse makes use of complex syntactic structures, formal cohesive devices, and topic sentences. In general, it is more "compact."

In comparing spoken and written language, Chafe (1979) considers the forms that Ochs has identified as planned written and unplanned spoken. He suggests that written language is characterized by a high degree of "integration," made possible by the slowness of writing and the speed of reading, while spoken language has a "fragmented" quality, resulting in part from the spurt-like nature of speech which probably reflects the "jerky" nature of thought (Chafe 1980). On the other hand, spoken language exhibits a high degree of "involvement" in contrast to the "detached" quality of written language.

The involvement factor in spoken discourse results from a number of phenomena, including the following.

1. Devices by which the speaker monitors the communication channel (rising intonation, pauses, verbal requests for back-channel responses)
2. "Concreteness" and "imageability"
3. A more "personal" quality
4. Emphasis on people and their relationships
5. Emphasis on actions and agents rather than states and objects
6. Inclusion of specific details and direct quotation

Like Ochs, Chafe notes that spoken discourse presents propositions without overtly marking their relationship to each other, or with the minimal cohesive conjunction "and," while written discourse makes use of subordinating conjunctions, subject deletion, and other complex syntactic constructions to achieve cohesion. He too notes the preponderance of hesitation phenomena (Ochs' "repairs").

Comparing Spoken and Written Stories

In order to verify and build upon this research on the relationship between spoken and written language, a large number of stories were recorded as told by various speakers who were then asked to write the stories down.⁴ In nearly all cases, the written narratives were shorter by more than half than their spoken counterparts, and they exhibited the expected written features. However, one narrative was twice as long in written form, and it exhibited many features expected in spoken discourse. The ensuing analysis will examine this pair of stories and hypothesize an explanation for their aberrance.

The written version of this pair of narratives is composed of 693 words in 51 sentences and 85 clauses/phrases. In contrast, the spoken story contained 383 words in 64 "idea units" (Chafe 1980), or spurts of speech. Furthermore, the written clearly did not seem less "personal" or "imageable." If anything, it seems more so. Finally, it contains many features associated with spoken language such as direct quotation and use of details. The key seemed to lie in the fact that the writer had produced not expository prose but a story in the literary sense -- a piece of creative writing, an act of fiction. That written fiction employs features of spoken language is not a new idea; but which features does it use, and to what end?

Both Ochs and Chafe were aware of the special status of fiction. Chafe suggests that a literary text is "an imitation of natural speech," and Ochs asserts that a "novelist trying to recreate a casual situational context will use many of the features ... of unplanned discourse in his story." Robin Lakoff (Lakoff in prep; Lakoff and Tannen 1979) has noted however that fictional dialogue does not in fact correspond to what appears in a transcript of spoken language. The present analysis supports her hypothesis. Somehow, the written text represents something that seems more spoken than it is by blending some features of spoken language with others of written. Examination of the spoken and written versions of "Fernandez" (see Appendix for complete texts) suggests that written fiction combines the involvement factors of spoken language with the integration of written. After presentation of the data demonstrating this phenomenon, I will suggest an explanation for it in the theory of oral vs. literate tradition.

Consider the following matched segments of the stories (S = spoken; W = written. Numbers refer to units as numbered in texts in Appendix).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(S45) So just then some young guy passes through the hall, with his two buttons undone, and his hair all stickin' out.</p> | <p>(W49) Just then a younger guy walked past wearing the latest in spiffy attire: short-sleeved shirt, no tie, two buttons undone, hair sticking out of his chest.</p> |
|---|--|

In some ways the written and spoken versions correspond to Ochs' and Chafe's descriptions of written/planned vs. spoken/unplanned

discourse. The written version uses the past tense whereas the spoken uses the present; the deictic "some" in the spoken ("some young guy") becomes the indefinite article in written ("a younger guy"). However, in other ways the written version is characterized by features identified as typical of spoken language: most strikingly imageability -- the details that create in the listener a sense of the immediacy and richness of experience. Thus the clothes of the "passing coworker" are described in more detail in the written ("short-sleeved shirt, no tie"). Throughout the written narrative, inclusion of more details contributes to the increased length.

Another important factor which contributes to the greater length of the written version is external evaluation. Labov (1972) notes that a storyteller is always concerned with making clear the point of a story, answering in advance the "withering question," "So what?" Evaluation in this sense can be internal; in that case the teller makes clear the significance of what s/he tells by word choice, paralinguistic features, expressive phonology, direct quotation, and so on. In external evaluation, the teller steps outside the story to call attention to the point, as for example in such frequently heard comments as, "Here's the best part," or "What was so funny about it was..." In the written version of "Fernandez," the writer frequently states outright what was not stated in the spoken version. For example, she makes overt the point about the passing coworker's clothes ("the latest in spiffy attire").

Another phenomenon that can be seen in these segments is the mixing of formal and informal registers in the written version. On the one hand, "spiffy attire" is formal, but "guy" and "sticking out" are preserved from the informal spoken register.

Ochs points out that spoken language makes use of parallelism and repetition. The phrase "spiffy attire" is repeated from an earlier phrase (W40). However, I believe the interval between the two instances is somewhat larger than might be expected in spoken language. In any case, repetition is observed in both the spoken and written versions, but syntactic parallelism is more overriding in the spoken. In the written, the force of the parallelism is muted while imageability it increased. For example, note the segments in which Fernandez is told to change his style of dressing (S48-63, W55-90). There are parallel constructions in both versions, but in the written they are farther apart and progressively less parallel:

- | | |
|--|--|
| (S48) I said hey, you gotta un .. you gotta take off your jacket. | (W58) I said "You've got to take off your jacket." |
| (S51) I say gotta take off your tie. | (W62) I said, "You've got to take off your tie." |
| (S55) I say you gotta undo your first two buttons. | (W70) I said, "You have to un- button your two top buttons and let your chest hair stick out." |

(S64) I say Ray, you gotta take off your tee shirt so your hair will stick out.

(W81) I said, "Ray, you've got your two buttons undone and your hair's sticking out, but you've got a tee shirt on. You can't walk around with your under-shirt showing."

While the spoken and written versions begin similarly, the parallelism continues in the spoken ("you gotta take off...") while it is gradually dropped in the written. The transition to present tense in the spoken is not seen in the written. While both versions give the speaker's words in direct quotation, the informal "hey" is omitted from the written, and some of the "dialogue" in the written seems to be serving the purpose of external evaluation: restating information that has already been given (W81) and making explicit the moral about the undershirt which is left unstated in the spoken. Thus the written story makes use of a device that is, on the surface, spokenlike (direct quotation), but is writtenlike in content and function (external evaluation). In the spoken discourse, Fernandez' part is played only by his actions. In the written, he is introduced as a character through participation in the dialogue.

In addition, Fernandez' actions are described in more detail and with more precision in the written story:

(S60) he's got his jacket on this arm and his tie over here,

(W63) He took off his tie and laid it neatly over the jacket on his arm.

Furthermore, the written segment integrates information about the jacket into the sentence about the tie. The choice of verb ("laid it") and adverb ("neatly") contributes to the portrait of Fernandez as "Mr Politeness," as he is introduced in the written story. Finally, the description is of an action rather than a state, just the opposite of what Chafe observed in written language.

In fact, action is added in the written that has no counterpart in the spoken narrative. This is seen most clearly in the inclusion of a final scene in which Fernandez reappears with no tee shirt and his top buttons undone. It is also seen, more subtly, throughout the written story. For example,

(S62) and he undoes his top button

(W76) Right in front of my very eyes, Ray reached up to his neck with his free fingers and undid his two top buttons. Then he fluffed the few stray gray hairs sticking out from his collar bone.

This passage shows as well the use in the written version of sound touchoffs, a phenomenon that Ochs, following Sacks and Schegloff, observed in spoken language. These are indicated in the above passage by underlining. Everyone will recognize this

as what is called "alliteration" by literary critics. Again, fiction embellishes upon a process that is spontaneous in natural spoken language.

Similar patterns emerge in the following example. The subject is the languages that Fernandez speaks.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (S5) ... And he knows Spanish | (W11) He knows at least four |
| and he knows French | languages fluently -- Spanish, |
| and he knows English | French, English and something |
| and he knows German. | else. |

The impact of Fernandez' ability to speak many languages is conveyed in the spoken text by the force of parallel constructions. In the written, the list is collapsed, or integrated, and the fact of his language ability is lexicalized in "fluently," a word which describes rather than recreating.

This does not mean, however, that the written version is always more compact. The next segment, in which the speaker/writer goes on to illustrate her foreign language interchanges with Fernandez, is more developed in the written discourse:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (S32) I say, "Aaaaa, Monsieur, comment ça va:, because I can't think of how to say it in Spanish. Or he walks in and I say, "Gracias, ... Señor Fernandez, ... and he says "Buenas Dias. ... Señora Whittaker." | (W13) Whatever language I speak to him in, he answers in that language. I'll say, "Bonjour Monsieur Fernandez, comment s'a va?" and he'll answer "Il va bon," or whatever the French say. He always says the right thing in the right language. But me, I forget what language I'm supposed to answer in, and I usually answer in some other language. Like if he asks, "Comment s'a va?" I answer "Va est gut, gracias." |
|---|---|

In the spoken text, she simply demonstrates a typical conversation; in writing, she both presents the dialogue and tells what the point is (external evaluation). She introduces, furthermore, the notion that she mixes languages. In the spoken version, the comic effect was accomplished paralinguistically: she raised her voice to a very high pitch, drew out vowel sounds, and paused significantly in reproducing the dialogue. But these paralinguistic effects are not available to the writer; hence she introduced humor by mixing languages in the written story.

The written version also exaggerates the writer's own linguistic incompetence to set off Fernandez' linguistic ability. While the written story thus introduces more specific examples of their dialogue, i.e. becomes more spokenlike, it also contains more explanation, or external evaluation, which is characteristic of written language. Notice, nonetheless, that while the increased external evaluation is writtenlike, it is rendered in a register that is decidedly spokenlike ("But me, ...").

Fiction as Integrated Involved Writing

Thus literary fiction, as represented by the written version of "Fernandez," combines features of written and spoken language. Specifically, it combines the integration of written with the involvement of spoken language. This is possible because integration and involvement are different orders of categories: the former is a quality of the surface form, and the latter a higher (or deeper) motivating function. In posing the question of why these aspects of spoken and written language are found in fiction, I suggest an explanation resides in an understanding of strategies associated with oral and literate tradition. The remainder of this paper will sketch a necessarily brief summary of research in this area and its relationship to spoken and written language.

Oral vs. Literate Tradition

The sixties witnessed pioneering research on the effects of writing on cognitive and social processes (Goody and Watt 1963, Havelock 1963, Ong 1967). The seventies brought continued work by the same scholars (Goody 1977, Havelock 1973, Ong 1977) as well as others (Cole and Scribner 1974, Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz 1980, Kay 1977, Olson 1977).

In literate society, knowledge is seen as facts and insights preserved in written records. In oral culture, formulaic expressions (sayings, cliches, proverbs, etc.) are the repository of wisdom. Formulaic expressions function as wholes, as a convenient way to signal knowledge that is already shared. It is not assumed that the words in the expressions contain meaning, in a way that can be analyzed out. In other words, oral tradition sees meaning as social meaning. Thus, in oral tradition, it doesn't matter whether one says "I could care less" or "I couldn't care less." The expression is, in either case, a handy way to make reference to a familiar idea (Tannen & Oztek 1977). As Olson (1977) puts it, "the meaning is in the context." In literate tradition, "the meaning is in the text."

Ong explains furthermore that "knowing" in oral tradition is achieved through identification with characters in the telling. In literate tradition, knowing is achieved through analysis. Havelock asserts that understanding in oral tradition is subjective, while understanding in literate tradition is objective. This explains the fact -- puzzling and disturbing to modern scholars -- that Plato would have banned poets from participation in educational processes in the Republic. Because of their ability to move audiences emotionally, poets were a dangerous threat to the transition to literacy, by which people were to learn to suspend their emotions and approach knowledge through analytic, logical processes.

In the broadest sense, strategies associated with oral tradition place emphasis on shared knowledge and the interpersonal relationship between communicator and audience. In this, it builds upon what Bateson (1972) calls the metacommunicative

function of language: the use of words to convey something about the relationship between interlocutors. Literate tradition builds upon what Bateson calls the communicative function of language: the use of words to convey information or content. This gives rise to the idealization that language can be "autonomous" (Kay 1977) -- that is, that words can carry meaning all by themselves, and that this is their prime function. In practice, language is probably never wholly autonomous, nor wholly metacommunicative. Rather, it is relatively weighted in favor of one or the other idealization -- hence, the oral/literate continuum.

Oral/Literate Tradition and Fiction

It is the goal and process of oral tradition then to focus on the interpersonal, the context, rather than decontextualized content, to engender in the listener a sense of identification with the speaker or the characters described. This accounts for the phenomenon Chafe calls "imageability" -- the use of details, of particularities, that gives the listener a sense of "experiential involvement," and of the speaker's "richness of thought." It accounts as well for the emphasis on people, and on action.

Written fiction has as its goal not the convincing of the reader through logical argument but instilling in the reader a sense of identification with its point of view. Thus it builds upon the immediacy function of spoken language -- "imageability" and "involvement." To this end, it borrows and embellishes upon some aspects of spoken language -- use of detail, direct quotation, description of action, as well as prosodic and rhythmic features such as parallel constructions and sound touchoffs. However, it eliminates other aspects of spoken language -- some because they are inefficient (hesitations, some repetitions), and some because they are impossible to create in writing (expressive phonology). Finally, written fiction can take advantage of the written form to present subtle relationships between propositions through complex constructions and choice of words with refined meanings.

Conclusion

In summary, I suggest that oral and literate tradition reflect two overriding communicative goals. Literate tradition entails an approach to discourse which emphasizes logical, analytic processes and focuses on the content of a message, conventionally de-emphasizing or ignoring the interpersonal dynamics between communicator and audience. Conventionally, the audience is to respond by means of analytic processes, not subjectively. The goal is for the relationship between propositions to be explicit, with the least connective tissue supplied by the hearer. Much of this connective tissue is supplied through integration -- that is, through complex syntactic constructions. In contrast, oral tradition emphasizes the interpersonal function and demands a maximum contribution from the audience in terms of supplying sociocultural knowledge and background information. It expects audience understanding to be mediated by emotional or subjective responses.

The fact that these goals operate as hypothesized is attested to by the existence of written fiction, which takes advantage of the written mode to achieve integrated prose, but which opts for many of the strategies associated with spoken language to create prose that also has a high involvement factor, to capitalize on the oral tradition function of emphasizing the interpersonal, making use of subjectivity for knowing through identification.

The explanatory power of the oral/literate continuum is not limited to written vs. spoken language. It can contribute to an understanding of many aspects of conversation; this analysis has been undertaken elsewhere (Tannen 1980, in prep[a]).

Notes

1. I am grateful to John and Jenny Cook-Gumperz for alerting me to the significance of oral/literate tradition, and to Wallace Chafe for continuing interchange about spoken and written language; to my Discourse Analysis class at Georgetown University, fall 1979, for stimulating discussion on this topic; and in particular to Della Whittaker and Susan Dodge for creating and collecting (respectively) the stories here analyzed, and for their insightful comments. The present paper is a preliminary version of a longer study of spoken and written language which is in preparation.
2. Thanks to Patrick Malizio for these examples, taken from a list attributed to the Toronto Sun, July 23, 1977.
3. Others include contributors to the volume Spoken and Written Language (Tannen, ed., in prep[b]).
4. The stories were collected by members of my Discourse Analysis class, Fall 1979, and I thank them.

Bibliography

- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. NY: Bantam.
- Chafe, Wallace L. In prep. Features Distinguishing Spoken and Written Language, in Tannen, ed., in prep[b]).
- _____. 1980. The Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of a Narrative, in Chafe, ed., *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- _____. 1979. Integration and Involvement in Spoken and Written Language. Paper presented at the 2nd Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies. Vienna, July.
- Cole, Michael and Sylvia Scribner. 1974. *Culture and Thought*. NY: Wiley.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny and John Gumperz. 1980. From Oral to Written: The Transition to Literacy, in M.F. Whiteman, ed., *Variation in Writing*. NY: Erlbaum.
- Goody, Jack. 1977. *Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, Jack and Ian Watt. 1963. The Consequences of Literacy. Rptd. in Giglioli, ed., *Language in Social Context*. Penguin 1972.
- Havelock, Eric. 1963. *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- _____. 1973. Prologue to Greek Literacy. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati Press.
- Kay, Paul. 1977. Language Evolution and Speech Style, in Blount and Sanches, eds., *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*. NY: Academic Press.
- Labov, William. 1972. The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. In prep. How Real is Real Discourse? in Tannen, ed., in prep[b].
- Lakoff, Robin and Deborah Tannen. 1979. Communicative Strategies in Conversation: The Case of Scenes From a Marriage. BLS 5.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Why Look at Unplanned and Planned Discourse? in Givón, ed., *Discourse and Syntax*. NY: Academic Press.
- Olson, David. 1977. From Utterance to Text: The Bias of Language in Speech and Writing. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47.
- Ong, Walter. 1977. *Interfaces of the Word*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1967. *The Presence of the Word*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. In prep[a]. Interruptions and Conversational Style. In _____, ed. In prep[b]. *Spoken and Written Language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- _____. 1980. Implications of the Oral/Literate Continuum for Cross-cultural Communication, in 1980 Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah and Piyale Cömert Öztekin. 1977. Formulaic Expressions in Turkish and Greek. BLS 3. Rptd. in F. Coulmas, ed., *Conversational Routine*. The Hague: Mouton. In press.

Appendix

Fernandez story, spoken: (Transcription conventions follow text)
 1 Oh, I have to tell you about this guy at work, Fernández. 2 He is so funny. 3 He is from South América, 4 from ... Chile. 5 ... And he knows Spanish, 6 and he knows French, 7 and he knows English, 8 and he knows German, 9 And he is a gentleman. 10 ... He must be about 59 years old. 11 And they're not doing right by him. 12 Only ... I think ... because 13 with his assortment of foreign languages that he knows 14 it takes him longer 15 to say ... what it is on his mind. 16 And also ... he thinks carefully. 17 ... And also I think with his assortment of foreign languages 18 when people speak fast 19 it takes him a while 20 ... to understand what they're saying. [Even though he is in America and everybody's speaking English.] (Laughing) 21 Yeah, so I, 22 the other guys, 23 ... they're just not nice to him. 24 He comes upstairs, ... 25 to Tech Reports, 26 ... and he wants help with this, 27 or help with that, 28 he wants to understand 29 well can this be done, 30 and can that be done, 31 and I just have a good time with him. 32 I say, 'Aaaaaa, 'Monsieur, ... comment ça 'va:', 33 because I can't think of how to say it in Spanish. 34 Or he walks in, 35 and I say, 'Gracias ... Señor Fernández. ... [laugh] 36 and he says, 'Buéνας Días, ... Señora

Whittaker. 37 So thé:n, ... I sée: ... that hé has on súch a nice
 súit one day, 38 and I say ... héy: Ráy:, 39 yóu're really dressed
 to kíll, 40 dóncha know you're working for the ÛS Góvernment?
 41 You gotta dress like a góvernment worker, 42 and he says, hōw
 is thát? 43 So just then some young guy passes through the hall,
 44 with his two búttons undone, 45 and his háir all stickin' out,
 46 I said, héy, you gotta un ... 47 you gotta take off your jácket.
 48 So he takes off his jácket. 49 I say gotta take off your tíe.
 50 He takes, 51 right there in the hall, 52 he takes off his tíe.
 53 I say, you gotta undo your first two búttons. 54 Meanwhile,
 two or three other guys are comin' through 55 with thér two top
 buttons undone 56 and their háir stickin' out. (Laugh) 57 So he
 un ... 58 he's got his jácket on thís arm 59 and his tíe over hére,
 60 and he undoes his tóp búttón 61 and he's got a T-shirt on under
 it. ... 62 I say, Ráy, you gotta take off your T-shirt 63 so your
 háir will stick out. 64 He says ... thát ... is the énd of the
 líne.

Transcription conventions:

- , indicates clause final intonation ("more to come").
- . indicates sentence final falling intonation.
- : indicates lengthening of preceding vowel sound.
- ... indicates measurable pause (approximately .5 second).
- each additional . indicates additional .5 second pause.
- ┌ indicates high pitch.
- ∕ indicates primary stress.
- ∖ indicates secondary stress.

[words in brackets spoken by interlocutor]

(parentheses indicate nonverbal utterance by speaker)

Numbers have been inserted for reference to lines of text.

Fernandez story, written:

1 At my agency, 2 there's a man who is Mr. Politeness. 3 He
 doesn't say "Hi," 4 he says "Good morning" 5 and "Good afternoon."
 6 Instead of calling me "Della," 7 he calls me "Mrs. Whittaker."
 8 And he dresses as if he worked in a business corporation down-
 town 9 instead of for the Government at a field office. 10 He is
 from Chile, South America. 11 He knows at least four languages
 fluently -- 12 Spanish, French, English, and something else.
 13 Whatever language I speak to him in, 14 he answers in that
 language. 15 I'll say, "Bonjour, Monsieur Fernandez, comment s'a
 va?" 16 And he'll answer "Il va bon," 17 or whatever the French
 say. 18 He always says the right thing 19 in the right language.
 20 But me, 21 I forget what language I'm supposed to answer in,
 22 and I usually answer in some other language. 23 Like if he
 asks, "Comment s'a va?" 24 I answer, "Va est gut, gracias." 25 I
 like to tease him, 26 and he likes me to tease him. 27 I don't
 think that anyone else at my agency teases him. 28 He's over 60,
 29 and most of the other physicists and engineers are punks of 35,
 30 so they're impatient with him. 31 Also, they don't like to
 stand around 32 and wait until he translates their English 33 into
 whatever language he's thinking in, 34 and they have trouble

understanding his accent 35 when he speaks English. 36 So I think they give him short shrift. 37 But I stand around 38 waiting for him to talk back, 39 and I do like to tease him in the hall. 40 One day I was praising him for his spiffy attire, 41 a really neat pin striped suit 42 with a white long-sleeved shirt 43 and dark tie. 44 He did look handsome. 45 I told him so, too, 46 and he smiled and thanked me. 47 He said that he liked to look business-like, 48 that appearance is part of getting along in the world. 49 Just then a younger guy walked past 50 wearing the latest in spiffy attire -- 51 short-sleeved shirt, 52 no tie, 53 two buttons undone, 54 hair sticking out of his chest. 55 I said, "Hey, Ray, businesslike is one thing, 56 but you've got to dress in the latest style." 57 "What's that?" he said. 58 I said, "You've got to take off your jacket." 59 He took it off, 60 right there in the hall. 61 "Now what?" he said. 62 I said, "You've got to take off your tie." 63 He took off his tie 64 and laid it neatly over the jacket on his arm. 65 "Now what should I do?" he said. 66 I couldn't believe my ears! 67 But I'd gone this far 68 and he'd gone with me, 69 so I figured I'd take it all the way. 70 I said, "You have to unbutton your two top buttons 71 and let your chest hair stick out." 72 Ray looked around 73 and saw that same young guy come back from down the hall. 74 He saw the guy's shirt undone at the top two buttons, 75 and he must have seen his hair sticking out from his chest. 76 Right in front of my very eyes 77 Ray reached up to his neck with his free fingers 78 and undid his two top buttons. 79 Then he fluffed the few stray gray hairs sticking out from his collar bone. 80 "How do you like that?" he said. 81 I said, "Ray, you've got your two buttons undone 82 and your hair's sticking out, 83 but you've got a tee shirt on. 84 You can't walk around with your undershirt showing." 85 "Oh," he said, 86 looked at his shirt, 87 and put his jacket back on 88 and his tie back around his neck. 89 "I'll think about that," he said, 90 and we parted laughing. 91 About a week later, 92 Ray came to my office 93 to discuss the title of a report 94 that he had been working on. 95 I had been bending over another report 96 when he came in, 97 and I recognized him only by his voice 98 as he said hello 99 and handed me his suggested title. 100 Still looking onto my desk, 101 I talked with him about wording. 102 When we were both satisfied about the title, 103 I handed it to him. 104 This time I looked at him. 105 He was smiling. 106 And so was I. 107 He had on a short-sleeved shirt 108 unbuttoned at the neck, 109 and he didn't have on any tee shirt.