Comparing bilinguals' quoted performances of self and others in tellings of the same experience in two languages

MICHÈLE KOVEN

Department of Speech Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
244 Lincoln Hall
702 S. Wright Street
Urbana, IL 61801
mkoven@uiuc.edu

ABSTRACT

This article lends empirical support to the notion that quoted speech is "constructed dialogue" by exploring empirically how narratives of personal experience involve creative performance of locally imaginable personas, rather than accurate or faithful representation of actual people and their words. This work examines quotation in narratives of personal experience as a site where speakers use language pragmatically to enact socio-culturally locatable identities. Using a corpus of narratives in which French–Portuguese bilinguals told the same narratives of personal experience once in each language, it demonstrates that speakers do not quote more extensively when recounting experiences in the language in which those events "originally" occurred. Ultimately, what differs most in speakers' quotations in French and Portuguese tellings of the "same event" are the nonequivalent kinds and ranges of registers in which narrated characters are quoted. More specifically, speakers are more likely to quote themselves as speaking or having spoken in creative, marked registers in French than in Portuguese. This difference in the registers put in the mouths of quoted characters, in particular of quoted selves, may point to ways in which these bilinguals' multiple identities are instantiated within and across their two languages. More broadly, this work reveals ways in which all speakers may use narrative not only to describe the past but also to perform a variety of cultural selves, reinventing and reenacting characters as quoted selves and others. (Narratives of personal experience, retellings, reported speech, bilingualism, stylistic variation, identity)*

INTRODUCTION

In this article, I examine how speakers perform and transform the voices of quoted characters across multiple tellings of the same personal experience. More specifically, I look at the systematic changes that the "same" quotations undergo from one telling to another when each telling is in a different language, French or

513

Portuguese. The discussion first reviews scholarship that treats quotation as constructed dialogue. It then focuses on debates over the constructedness of quotations among scholars of codeswitching who discuss the significance of the LANGUAGE in which bilinguals quote speech. Specifically, scholars disagree over whether the language in which a bilingual quotes is a faithful replica of the originally spoken language, or whether the language in which speech is quoted is itself a "constructed" fiction of the current narrative performance. I discuss how quotation in personal narratives can be seen as a discursive device through which speakers embody multiple types of locally recognizable personas of self and other. Throughout the article, I make the claim that the constructedness of quoted speech can best be understood by examining the semiotic underpinnings of quotation in first-person narratives. Quotations work nonreferentially, through semiotic relations of iconicity and social indexicality. Quotations are not necessarily icons of the ACTUAL WORDS OF ACTUAL SPEAKERS but rather are icons of credible utterances from culturally specific TYPES OF PERSONAS. Speakers evoke these types in quoted speech by drawing on their available repertoires of register variation, in which each of the multiple ways of "saying the same thing" is indexically associated with a different kind of socially locatable persona. With this perspective, quotation becomes a verbal strategy through which speakers perform particular kinds of local, quotable identities.

I then address these issues through an empirical study of quotations of self and others in bilinguals' narratives of the same personal experience in two languages, looking systematically at how French-Portuguese bilingual speakers transform and re-present the "same" quoted speech when presenting it in narratives told in their two languages. The current work is part of a larger study (Koven 1998, 1999, 2002) addressing bilinguals' narrative performances of self and examining how bilinguals perform different identities when telling the same stories of personal experiences in their two languages. As part of this ongoing project, I have collected a corpus of narratives in which French-Portuguese bilinguals told the same narratives of personal experience twice, once in each language. Here, I demonstrate that speakers do not quote more extensively when recounting experiences in the language in which those experiences originally occurred. In fact, they sometimes provide equally if not more vivid quoted reenactments when narrating in the other language. This research thus contributes to discussions of how narratives of personal experience involve creative performance (Goffman 1974/1986) more than "accurate" or "faithful" representation, lending empirical support to the notion that quoted speech is "constructed dialogue" (Tannen 1985, 1995). Moreover, the current work extends discussions of the constructedness of reported speech, not only by supporting the claim that reported utterances are indeed constructions but also by discussing the specific sociolinguistic resources that speakers use to construct dialogue in French and Portuguese. The "same" characters are consistently made to speak through strikingly divergent registers in each language. This shows that bilingual speakers use quotation not only to

evoke actual words of actual speakers in the language in which those words were spoken, but also to invent and perform compelling, culturally imaginable French and Portuguese speaking personas. How bilinguals quote the same events in two languages reveals some of the ways in which speakers construct dialogue to perform voices that are both iconic and indexical of the socially recognizable personas they present.

QUOTATION IN NARRATIVES OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Telling a story of personal experience frequently involves the representation of past speech events, often as accounts of who said what to whom, how, and to what effect. In this respect, personal stories involve talk about talk, and thus they involve a range of reflexive (Lucy 1993), metalingual (Jakobson 1960), or meta-pragmatic strategies (Silverstein 1993) to calibrate narrated and narrating speech events. Strategies of quotation become a critical set of resources that speakers deploy in order to tell a story of personal experience. Quoted utterances often become the essential kernel or punchline of a narrative (Bauman 1986). Quotation has therefore been described as one central discursive device that storytellers use to represent narrated events.

Quotation has been discussed as an important verbal resource through which speakers not only describe but also enact narrated events, using language both referentially and nonreferentially (Silverstein 1995b). Goffman 1974, 1979, Labov (Labov & Waletzky (1967)1997, Labov 1972a, 1997), and Bakhtin 1981 have all discussed reported speech as a site in which speaker's footing (Goffman), evaluation (Labov), or voicing (Bakhtin) is instantiated. As discussed by Hymes 1981 and Wolfson 1978, shifts into direct quotation can constitute "breakthroughs into performance," in which the storyteller no longer speaks from the perspective of a narrator, but from the perspective(s) of enacted characters within the story. Through complex strategies of quotation, storytellers may make narrated and narrating moments seem to coincide (Silverstein 1993), bringing to life a presupposed "there and then" with a performance in the "here and now" for the participants in the speech situation to evaluate together. What and whom do quotations perform, and how do quotes accomplish such performances? Questioning how speakers accomplish such character performances forces us to explore non-referential functions of language. To achieve its sociopragmatic effects, quoted speech typically relies not just on referential functions of language, but on ICONIC and SOCIALLY INDEXICAL functions.

SEMIOTIC UNDERPINNINGS OF QUOTATION IN NARRATIVES OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Iconicity of quotations to quoted utterances: Constructed dialogue

Quotation has been cited as an example of a discursive device that compels us to complicate views of language as primarily referential or representational. As Leech

1978, 1980 has argued, quotations are not easily classified as "'true' or 'false'; instead, a broader, gradable notion of representational accuracy or faithfulness is more applicable" (Leech 1980:58).[1] This notion of "faithfulness" implies a relationship of resemblance between quoting and quoted utterances. Because participants take that relationship as one of likeness or resemblance, quoted speech seems to accomplish part of its sociopragmatic work through (at least intended) ICONIC performance of the "original" or model speakers and utterances (Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996, Urban 1989). Quotation is thus one site in everyday talk where language works not only through reference and description but also through performances intended to resemble – or to bear an iconic relationship – to the speech of the characters evoked.

However, many scholars have argued that the iconic relationship between quoted and quoting utterances cannot be taken literally, challenging the notion that quotations need to or can at all resemble the utterances they quote. Reporting speech is no simple, straightforward matter. Voloshinov 1973 and Bakhtin 1981 discussed the complex social processes involved in transmitting others' words, such that the speaker in the current reporting situation and the speakers in the "original" reported event are dynamically in dialogue and reciprocally influence the forms and functions of reported messages. Reporting speakers thus cannot help but transform others' words. Tannen 1985, 1995 proposes that we call all reported speech "constructed dialogue."[2] She argues that even if participants react to reported speech as if it were a direct replica of the reported speech event, all quotation has more to do with verbal creativity in the current event of reporting than with faithfulness to some "original" event. Here the "original" event may never even have transpired; and even if it did, it may play little if any role in determining if and how speech is subsequently reported. Quotations cannot to be taken by the analyst to be transparent reflections of the utterances they report.[3]

Iconicity of quotations to quoted utterances: Constructed dialogue and language choice among bilinguals

The nature of the iconic relationship between quoting and quoted speech events has been a topic of dispute among scholars of bilingual conversational codeswitching. Quotation figured among Gumperz's (1982) formal and functional reasons that may account for speakers' codeswitching. Subsequently, many others have discussed how and why bilingual speakers so often codeswitch when they report speech (Alfonzetti 1998, Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996, Auer 1995, Gal 1979, Hill & Hill 1986, Myers-Scotton 1993, Sebba & Wootton 1998). In particular, the issue of faithful speech reporting vs. creative dialogue construction has typically been framed in terms of the relationship between the language in which speech is quoted and the "original" language used by the quoted speaker. Because most of these authors are interested in bilinguals' language use from a sociopragmatic perspective, they do not emphasize whether speakers preserve or faith-

fully reproduce the referential content of the "original" utterance, but whether the language of the quotation (as part of the nonreferential meaning of the message) is "faithful" to the language of the original.

Some authors (Gal 1979, Myers-Scotton 1993) have claimed that codeswitched quotations may indeed replay the "original" language. Gal (1979:109), for instance, argued that German-Hungarian bilinguals typically quote speakers in their "original" language. Similarly, Myers-Scotton (1993:117) wrote that a speaker may quote in a code different from the code of the surrounding conversation to indicate the unmarked code for the quoted speech event. From the perspective of these two authors, the language of a quotation may indeed be taken as directly iconic of the language of the quoted speech event. The fact that speech will be reported in the language in which it was first uttered leads us to ask whether (and why) the "original" language should be expected to determine the quoting language.

There have been numerous critiques of this more literally iconic view of quotation. Gumperz himself readily acknowledges, "It is clear that not all speakers are quoted in the language they normally use" (1982:82). For Gumperz, codeswitching is generally used as a "contextualization cue" (1982) to communicate a range of socially indexical information. Similarly, in Koven 1998, I showed qualitatively how two French-Portuguese bilinguals presented themselves differently in two narratives of personal experience told in two languages. In particular, I discussed how one speaker, Isabel, performed far more vividly in French than in Portuguese a narrative of a fight that originally happened in a monolingual Portuguese context. She quoted herself, her monolingual Portuguese godmother, and a Portuguese monolingual bank teller far more extensively in French. Others have also argued that codeswitched quotations serve a more meaningful function within the current discursive context and do not necessarily bear any direct relationship to the original speech event and the language(s) spoken during it (Alfonzetti 1998, Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996, Auer 1995, Hill & Hill 1986, Sebba & Wootton 1998).

Therefore, although quotation seems to work through an iconic relation between quoting and quoted speech, many scholars have become highly critical of the notion that this iconic relationship allows or compels quoting speakers to report the words of others in a manner that directly replicates either the content or form (here, language) of some original utterance. This need not refute the notion that quotations work iconically, but it forces us to reconsider who or what is being iconized.[4]

Quotation, social indexicality, and identities of quoted others

Quotations may indeed work as icons of the speech events they replay, but they are not necessarily iconic of ACTUAL utterances. As any stretch of discourse may work through multiple sign relations, simultaneously functioning symbolically, iconically, and indexically (Peirce 1940, Hanks 1995), quotation also works through several semiotic modalities. Quoted performances may not necessarily

resemble the REAL WORDS OF ACTUAL PEOPLE as much as they INDEX or point to images of socially locatable, LINGUISTICALLY STEREOTYPABLE KINDS OF PEOPLE. So, for example, in Hill & Hill's analysis (1986), Mexicano speakers quote someone in Spanish not because the quoted speaker necessarily spoke Spanish, but to portray indexically the quoted speaker as malevolent. In order for quoted language choice itself to point to positive and negative images of quoted speakers, there must already exist, within the broader speech community, implicit linguistic ideologies (Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity 1998, Silverstein 1998, Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, Woolard 1998) that link language choice with other socially valued and devalued activities and types of people. For Mexicanos, Spanish is the language of corruption and cruelty. Quoting speakers in Spanish as opposed to Mexicano, regardless of whether the quoted speaker actually spoke Spanish, creatively juxtaposes the values associated with each language. Quoting speech, therefore, may not be a direct icon of the original quoted speech; it works to align participants in the current conversational context relative to broader linguistic ideologies about the contested social meanings of the different languages juxtaposed in quoted utterances (Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996). Thus, codeswitching to report speech also works through social indexicality, insofar as the quotation includes discourse features that summon up an image of the social identity of the quoted speaker (Silverstein 1995b). In this respect, quotation involves the performance of SOCIALLY INDEXICAL ICONS of locally recognizable kinds of people. Speakers make their quoted characters use particular languages to inhabit, position themselves relative to, or even juxtapose linguistically embodied social identities. Reported speech is then one site where we can examine the real-time discursive construction of projected social identities.

Quotation, social indexicality, and identities of quoted selves

Just as quoting OTHERS is a complex, ideologically mediated process, speakers do not simply quote THEMSELVES to replay what they may have actually said, but rather position themselves as particular kinds of social actors. Beyond bilingual contexts, quotation has been discussed as a pivotal site for seeing how speakers can incarnate the potentially multiple, alternative versions of self (Ochs & Capps 1996, Urban 1989, Wortham 1999) or for calibrating the distance between self and completely separate cultural others (Bauman 1986; Hill 1995; Miller & Sperry 1987; Miller et al. 1990; Silverstein 1993, 1994, 1996b; Schiffrin 1996). As Urban 1989 argues, speakers' use of multiple kinds of "I"s – from everyday referentially indexical "I" to different kinds and degrees of performance and identification with other kinds of cultural "I"s, in and outside of quotation marks – may give us crucial insight into cultural constructions of selfhood. Through both iconicity and social indexicality, speakers make their quoted selves sound like culturally imaginable types by adopting a way of speaking that points to shared images of such types. Quotation has therefore been discussed as one potential site for the discursive inhabitance of cultural identities of self and others.

518   *Language in Society* **30**:4 (2001)

CURRENT STUDY

This article examines empirically how bilingual speakers perform the "same" quoted characters when telling the "same" story in two languages.[5] More specifically, it analyzes whether speakers' quotations faithfully replay quoted speakers' original words through a kind of direct, unmediated iconicity, or whether quotations instead replay quoted speakers through a less direct kind of iconicity in which replays are not of actual people's actual words but of socially indexed types of characters.

How can we determine the degrees of faithfulness as opposed to creative social indexicality in quotations? Scholars rarely have access to recordings of the original utterances from which speakers quote. Thus, an effort to determine systematically how quoting speakers transform others' words is impeded by the difficulty of directly comparing original utterances with subsequent quotations of them. In some contexts, however, one may be able to hypothesize with some confidence the LANGUAGE in which bilingual speakers in the presupposed original event would have spoken.[6] One can then compare how speakers quote others in the same language they originally spoke with how speakers quote the same others in languages different from the original language. The goal of the current study is to investigate systematically multiple tellings of the "same" events, and to determine whether and how quotations have been transformed in repeated narrations of an event, within and across languages.

First, I will determine whether speakers consistently quote more in one telling of an event than in the other. This should disclose whether such systematic differences can be understood as a result of speakers' having retold the event in the language in which that event originally happened, or whether the speakers always quote more in one language than the other. This will permit systematic examination of the effect of the language of the narrated/quoted and narrating/quoting events on the extensiveness of quoted speech.

As a refinement of the first question, I will then explore whether speakers use direct or indirect quotation more in either language, either because they are retelling the event in the "original" language, or because of their use of a particular language of narration. This will reveal if speakers indeed more frequently use the more vivid or expressive potential of direct quotation when narrating in the language of the original experience to be "faithful" to or literally iconic of the code in which the quoted speaker originally spoke. This will allow us to see concretely whether speakers are compelled to replay a quoted speaker more in that speaker's "original" language.

Finally, I will explore in greater depth not only the frequency with which speakers quote in general, but also how speakers present themselves and others as quoted characters in each language. Here I will look both qualitatively and quantitatively at the registers in which narrators make the "same" quoted characters speak when performing them in each language. More specifically, I will see

whether speakers perform THEMSELVES as characters differently from the way they perform OTHERS as characters. This should disclose whether part of the narrator's task in quoting self and others in two languages is not merely one of accurate replication of characters' actual words, in the language in which those words were presumably spoken, but more one of representing quoted versions of self and other as particular kinds of locally recognizable/audible personas.

By investigating how quoted versions of self and others are evoked in qualitatively and quantitatively describable manners in their two codes, the current analysis thus adds to my ongoing investigation of the relationship between bilingual speakers' different experiences and expressions of self in their two languages. This analysis will demonstrate in greater detail how narratives evoke narrated experiences, by showing the socially indexical and iconic functions of quotation in narratives of personal experience (Silverstein 1995b). It thus contributes to scholarships in several areas that address the construction of personal and cultural identity in discourse. By analyzing narratives not only for their referential content but also as verbal performance, this approach contributes to a growing field of research into how speakers use language pragmatically to enact socio-culturally locatable identities.

ETHNOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF
FRENCH-PORTUGUESE BILINGUALS

Drawing on 19 months of ethnographic fieldwork in France and Portugal with a much larger group of Luso-descendants, in Koven 1998, 1999, ms., I describe at greater length the ethnographic contexts in which speakers have learned these two languages, as well as the socially indexical values associated with each.[7] A full treatment of the ethnographic context is beyond the scope of this article; here, I summarize the sociolinguistic contexts in which speakers have learned and used both languages, and the range and flexibility of register variation they command in both.[8] I then discuss their creative use of register variation within each language, and the consequences this creativity may have for the range and kinds of quoted identities they perform in each.

General context of migration and language use

Luso-descendants are the offspring of Portuguese migrants who left rural Salazarist Portugal for urban France in the 1960s and 1970s for economic reasons. Most Luso-descendants were either born in France or moved there at a young age. Both generations maintain complex cultural and sociolinguistic ties to France and Portugal (de Villanova 1987, 1988). It is common for parents and children to circulate frequently between the two countries, spending at least one month a year in Portugal. Many from both generations plan to move to Portugal permanently, and many have returned to live there for brief or even extended periods.

Because of their constant transnational movements and their efforts to achieve social mobility in both French and Portuguese societies, these speakers' socio-

linguistic situations are quite complex. Regimes of monoglot standard (Silverstein 1996a) are firmly entrenched in both French and Portuguese societies, so speakers regularly are evaluated and evaluate their own competencies in both languages relative to monolingual norms (Koven 1996, 1999, ms.). For this reason, Portuguese cannot be described merely as a migrant community's in-group code of solidarity, and French as the dominant language of the host society. Speakers realize that both Portuguese and French are standardized languages of European nation-states with gradiently prestigious and stigmatized varieties, the mastery of which positions speakers in the social hierarchies of both societies.

Most Luso-descendants attempt to master a RANGE of registers in both French and Portuguese. How shall we identify the specific registers these speakers use and recognize within each language?[9] The French and Portuguese spoken by these bilinguals are not monolithic entities. Luso-descendants use and recognize a range of socially meaningful registers, in both languages, that may index social identity and/or social context.

Portuguese repertoires

For many Luso-descendants, Portuguese was their first language, and it often remains the language their parents speak around and to them at home. Portuguese is often associated with older kin. Many report that their parents find it more respectful for their children to address them in Portuguese. The Portuguese spoken by both first and second generations bears the traces of the parents' social origins as rural, regional, and from the lower strata of Portuguese society. Most Luso-descendants' parents originally came from the rural north or center of Portugal and have little more than a fourth-grade education. Luso-descendants' Portuguese is thus often described by those remaining in Portugal as "old-fashioned," like that of "old people in the country."[10]

Although many Luso-descendants are aware that they "speak the Portuguese of their parents," many actively struggle to speak more contemporary, standard, or urban varieties, with varying degrees of success (Koven 1998, 1999, ms.). Typically spending at least one month a year with their families of origin in Portugal, most Luso-descendants are regularly exposed to Portuguese as it is spoken in contemporary Portugal (de Villanova 1987, 1988) from their monolingual family members and peers in Portugal. They are thus regularly exposed to a range of colloquial and more formal ways of speaking, with varying degrees of class and regional markedness.

Similarly, in anticipation of a future permanent return to Portugal, many families enroll their Luso-descendant children in Portuguese courses both within and outside the French educational system. Many of the teachers are from the Portuguese urban middle class, adding to the multiple kinds of Portuguese Luso-descendants encounter beyond their homes.

Ultimately, Luso-descendants are exposed to a range of different socially marked ways of speaking Portuguese, from urban standard to rural, colloquial,

and archaic. However, their productive control of the kinds of Portuguese spoken outside their homes is variable. Although many may try to speak more like their non-émigré peers in Portugal or like their urban Portuguese teachers, most continue to speak a Portuguese that reveals their families' rural, lower-class, émigré origins.[11]

French repertoires

Most Luso-descendants attend French school from a young age and have many French-speaking peers there, so their French does not mark them as Portuguese. Supporting Dabène & Moore's (1995) description of the French linguistic competencies of the children of immigrants raised in France, I have also found that there is nothing about the way Luso-descendants speak French that "gives them away" as anything other than native speakers.[12] Most speak contemporary versions of age-graded "young" (Boyer 1997) Parisian and suburban colloquial French. All have been exposed to standard French through the French educational system, and many speak it with ease. Some speak French in a way that marks them as working-class. Therefore, as with Portuguese, they are exposed to and speak a range of different kinds of French. However, their productive mastery of a broad repertoire of different varieties is typically more solid in French than in Portuguese.

Therefore, although most Luso-descendants are fluent speakers of both languages, the social locations their speech communicates are not socially equivalent. Their most colloquial speech in Portuguese comes across as rural; in French, as urban/suburban. Given their regular transnational movements between monolingual contexts, many attempt regularly (if not always successfully) to pass as monolinguals in both French and Portuguese contexts.

Speakers' intra-language creative register usage

Because Luso-descendants are aware that each language is the only native tongue for many of their peers in France and Portugal, many also believe that they SHOULD be able to use each language to cover their entire range of social activities and domains – that each language is SUPPOSED to be an autonomous system that can meet all the social needs of its speaker, sufficient for professional, intimate, familial, and peer contexts. In this respect, speakers believe they should be able to function with the register range of French and Portuguese monolinguals.

Although they may not have the same ease and self-confidence in both languages, many speakers are able at least to recognize, if not produce, the formal, standard registers required in interactions with strangers in service and educational settings. Many can recognize and produce the solidary yet respectful usage appropriate to conversing with older kin, or they can use the informal speech for spending time with immediate family members. Many are able to avoid offending the storekeeper by not speaking to him as a kinsman, to be familiar with family members while still showing respect, to joke colloquially with peers without

being considered vulgar, and to address a teacher differently from how they would their parents. Some have also been exposed to the age-graded speech of their youth peers in Portugal. In other words, they are familiar with, recognize, and (perhaps somewhat less reliably) produce "appropriate" usages across a variety of formal and informal contexts in France and Portugal.

Nevertheless, although Luso-descendants may master a range of more and less formal and informal registers in both languages, they maneuver and SHIFT creatively among them less in Portuguese than in French. In Portuguese, they may strive to produce the appropriate, unmarked form, often with success. In French, however, speakers not only master a range of registers to cover a range of formal and informal social interactions; they juxtapose and shift among different registers of French for dramatic effect, engaging in what has been variously called use of marked speech (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998a, 1998b, 2000), initiative shifts (Bell 1984), metaphorical switches (Blom & Gumperz 1972), or creative index-icals (Silverstein 1992, 1995a, 1995b). They thus can produce not only the possible unmarked forms for a range of social situations, but they also play with and intersperse strategically chosen marked forms. Therefore, what distinguishes Luso-descendants' sociolinguistic practice in their two languages is not only the social locations their speech indexes (rural, uneducated, émigré vs. [sub]urban, working class, upwardly mobile), but also the ways in which they manipulate Portuguese and French intra-language register variation.

In essence, these different sociolinguistic competencies and practices point to their range and flexibility of possible sociolinguistically mediated self-presentations. This differential use of register shifting in both languages may affect the kinds and range of identities Luso-descendants can strategically claim and assume in French and Portuguese sociolinguistic contexts. In her discussions of language and identity, Johnstone 1996, 1997a, 1997b argues against a deterministic view of the relationship between social identity and language use, in which scholars have treated demographic variables as static forces that CAUSE speakers to adopt a particular way of speaking. She claims that part of speakers' sense of distinctive individuality emerges from creative, strategic blendings of socially meaningful registers. This may be an apt description of how Luso-descendants use sociolinguistic variation in French contexts. In Portuguese, however, speakers are more sociolinguistically constrained and restrained. Luso-descendants may be able to produce an UNMARKED form, but they may be less likely to produce creatively marked forms strategically. These speakers, then, may not have equivalent degrees of freedom in their sociolinguistic presentations of self in French and Portuguese sociolinguistic contexts. In this respect, they not only project different personas and social origins in their two languages; they also are better able to use language to manipulate and shift among multiple personas in French in the same stretch of discourse. Therefore, in monolingual settings, speakers do not accomplish the same kinds of sociolinguistic identity work in each language.

METHOD

As part of my larger study, I have compared the ways French-Portuguese bilingual speakers present themselves differently in narratives of personal experience told in each language. The materials in this article thus come from a controlled study in which I collected people's stories of personal experience told twice, once in French and once in Portuguese.

Participants

Here, I discuss material from 12 French-Portuguese bilingual speakers between the ages of 18 and 25, all children of Portuguese migrants. Six of them told the same narratives of personal experience twice, once in one language, and then in the other. The other six told the same narratives twice in the same language and serve as a control group. Given the small sample size (n = 12), I focused in depth on a relatively homogeneous group of speakers. For this reason, only women were interviewed and served as interviewers.[13]

Procedures[14]

Each interview consisted of three tasks: first, an elicitation of stories of several different kinds of personal experience in French or Portuguese; second, an elicitation of the same stories in the other language; and third, an interview about the experience of telling the same story in two languages. The order in which interviewees told stories – French-Portuguese or Portuguese-French – was varied to avoid an order effect. The control group told the same stories twice in the same language, either French-French or Portuguese-Portuguese. All interviews were then transcribed verbatim.

As Briggs 1986 urges, when taking elicitation techniques to the field, researchers should be mindful of how the interactional genre of the research interview might be construed according to local communicative norms. In planning more structured interviews, I observed carefully the kinds of peer-group conversations among Luso-descendants, to get a sense of how more controlled procedures would be construed. Thus, the disciplinarily hybrid method of the controlled portion of this study is informed not only by the sociolinguistic interview as understood by Labov 1972b, but also by ongoing ethnographic work that let me set up recordable situations that would be as conducive as possible to the kinds of engaged, informal storytelling in which people ordinarily participate. I spent a good deal of time with these same people in their daily lives, asking them about how it felt to use each language and watching them use both languages in naturally occurring contexts. In this way, I sought to approximate informal conversation between peers, as close as possible to real peer-group storytelling, yet still maintain control to facilitate comparisons within and across persons. I addressed this question systematically through interviews that were carefully designed to feel casual to the speaker yet still be sufficiently controlled to make interview contexts comparable to each other.[15]

For the controlled story elicitations, it seemed best to have native-speaker Luso-descendants as interviewers. Although I was already known to most of the Luso-descendants I interviewed, my Portuguese communicative competence (Hymes 1972) was unambiguously different from theirs. Furthermore, I did not want my ambiguous status as a non-Luso-descendant researcher to influence the naturalness of their expression. To recreate as much as possible the atmosphere of natural conversation among peers, in two languages, I chose to have speakers tell their stories not to me, but each time to a different female French-Portuguese bilingual of the same age, selected to be the speaker's plausible social peer. My interviewers were also young women between the ages of 18 and 25, and several had themselves been interviewed. With Luso-descendant interviewers, speakers knew they shared certain cultural, linguistic, and sociolinguistic experiences and competencies. Speakers share both French and Portuguese vernacular forms, and even among previously unacquainted Luso-descendants, there is social pressure to speak informally. Since most of the people I worked with participated in Portuguese associations with other Luso-descendants, they regularly interacted with other French-Portuguese bilinguals. All immediately knew that each was also a Luso-descendant – another solidarity-creating piece of knowledge.

Based on my ethnographic sense of the kinds of stories Luso-descendant peers ordinarily tell each other, I chose several general story topics likely to elicit good, engaged narration and to create an interview situation that encouraged storytelling talk about topics similar to those found in participants' naturally occurring talk among peers. Labov's "danger of death" story genre (Labov & Waletzky 1997[1967]; Labov 1972a, 1972b) did not seem appropriate to this population. I picked a range of topics from less to more emotionally engaging and self-revealing. The general topics were broad enough that speakers could easily think of narratable experiences[16]:

(1) Stories about times when they laughed hysterically.
(2) Stories about times when they were very afraid.
(3) Stories about bad experiences in both France and Portugal with a relative stranger.
(4) Stories about bad experiences with people they did know well, either family or friends, in both French and Portuguese contexts.

Stories that originally occurred in both countries were deliberately elicited in order to get examples of incidents that had originally occurred in both languages. Therefore, people told a minimum of six stories each, two times, resulting in at least 12 narratives. Because I wanted to get comparable sets of first-person stories in each language from which intra-subject analyses would be performed, if people had multiple stories to tell for a particular topic, or additional stories on other topics, they were encouraged to tell those as well.

During the actual storytellings, only one interviewer and one interviewee were in the room. I explained to the interviewee that the interviewer would ask her to

tell about a variety of everyday experiences in one language. Because many Luso-descendants express concern or linguistic insecurity (Labov 1972b) about the "goodness" of their Portuguese, I reassured them that neither the interviewer nor I was interested in evaluating or judging their Portuguese. I instructed the interviewers to be as casual and appreciative as possible, making backchanneling sounds to show their interest, but otherwise to yield the floor to the storyteller as much as possible.[17] Interviewers' requests for different story topics were worded in a colloquial style. After each story, the interviewer would jot down a key word for the story. After this first session, the first interviewer was replaced by the second, who would use the keywords to jog the storyteller's memory of which experiences she had just narrated. The second interviewer would do this in the other language by saying, for example, "You told X about a bad experience in the metro, can you tell me what happened?" The order in which speakers told stories, French-Portuguese or Portuguese-French, was varied, as was the language in which the interviewers conducted the interviews.

Following this second set of tellings, interviewers left me alone with the interviewee. I then talked to the person about her experience of the two tellings. I asked people generally how they found the experience of telling the same story to two different people in two different languages, as well as whether they remembered specific differences in how they told the different stories. I also asked them more generally about their experiences with both languages, and other aspects of their experiences in French and Portuguese contexts. Overall, most people seemed at ease during each part of the interview. Relevant to the current analysis, I asked speakers to confirm the original language in which each event originally occurred.

This three-part interview took from 90 minutes to four hours, typically lasting around two hours. All interviews were conducted in Paris during the winter and spring of 1995.[18] Interviews were audio and video taped. Three speakers told stories first in French, then in Portuguese; three others, first in Portuguese and then in French. To check for the effect of stories changing through the mere act of repetition, six speakers told their stories twice in the same language, three in French and three in Portuguese. Here, I analyze the stories of six speakers: three French-Portuguese and three Portuguese-French.[19] I then compare this group with the control group.

DATA ANALYSIS

The narratives of all 12 speakers were coded for quoted character speech. Quotations were then coded as either direct or indirect, first or third person. The register of quoted character speech was also coded for whether it was marked or unmarked for the situation evoked. A detailed description of these categories follows.

Character coding

Clauses of quoted speech were coded throughout the entire narrative corpus of the 12 speakers. An instance of quoted speech was defined as a clause of a story

presented from the perspective of a character, reenacting the purported thoughts, speech, and other deeds of narrated characters, usually through the use of one of several possible modes of reported speech. Characters may be quoted in direct or indirect discourse, and their speech may or may not be framed by a metapragmatic verb of speaking. Each clause of character speech was counted as a single instance of "character role."

Each clause was then coded as direct or indirect.[20] Both direct and indirect quotation purport to replay the thoughts or speech of characters, with varying degrees of performance highlighting various aspects of the reported utterance – its content or its form (Coulmas 1986, Lucy 1993, Voloshinov 1973). Direct quotation has been called a more vivid manner of reporting speech which retains expressive features of the quoted utterance, and indirect quotation has been described as more focused on the referential content of the quoted utterance and more oriented toward the narrator's frame.

From this corpus, the grammatical resources for quoting directly and indirectly in French and Portuguese appear to be quite comparable. They are grammatically similar European languages in which the direct and indirect reporting of speech follows certain "Standard Average European" (Whorf 1956) conventions; they use the deictics of verb tense, temporal adverbs, and pronouns to indicate whether an utterance is presented primarily from that of the quoted character or more from that of the quoting narrator (Lee 1993, 1997).[21] The examples below come directly from my corpus.

(1) French and Portuguese direct discourse

(French)
Il me dit, "J'ai une surprise pour toi dans la voiture."
'He says to me, "I have a surprise for you in the car." '

(Portuguese)
Disse-me assim quando veio-me buscar assim, "Tenho uma surpresa para ti."
'He said to me like that when he came to get me like that, "I have a surprise for you." '

In these two examples of direct quotation in both languages, the deictics in the quoted utterances (verb tense and pronouns) are presented from the perspective of the quoted speaker. For example, the first person present tense verbs (Fr. *j'ai*, Port. *tenho*) present the speech as if from the quoted speaker's point of view.

(2) French and Portuguese indirect discourse

(French)
Elle a cru que elle a cru qu'on était avec des garçons dans le cim– à côté du cimetière.
'She believed that she believed that we were with boys in the cem– next to the cemetery.'

(Portuguese)
A minha tia pensou logo que nós 'távamos a a brincar com uns rapazes no cimiterio.
'My aunt thought right away that we were playing with boys in the cemetery.'

In ex. 2, in both French and Portuguese, the aunt's indirectly reported thought retains the deictics of the framing clause. The first person plural pronoun (Fr. *on*,

Port. *nós*) referentially indexes the narrator's presentation of her aunt's perspective. Character speech was also coded to determine whether the speaker was quoting herself (first person quote) or someone else (third person quote).

Coding of register of quotations as marked/unmarked

Although quotation has frequently been described as a discursive strategy that creates a global sense of "involvement" (Chafe 1982, Tannen 1985) or vividness (Coulmas 1986, Lucy 1993, Voloshinov 1973), it is also a site for displaying and evaluating SPECIFIC, LOCAL kinds of social voices. A device used for more than just faithful verbatim reenactment or involvement in general, quotation has been called a privileged site for enacting and commenting on PARTICULAR social voices that are made to exploit the implicit, socially indexical values associated with different ways of speaking – within and across languages. It is therefore of interest to determine not only if and how extensively quotation occurs, but also the range and kinds of socially indexical registers and languages characters are made to use.

However, comparing registers across languages is no straightforward matter. Even if a French and Portuguese coder were to categorize a speaker's French usage of *le mec* and Portuguese usage of *o gajo* (roughly, 'the guy') as both colloquial usage, the social location of the quoted speaker who uses either may still differ. Luso-descendants' colloquial usage typically evokes an image of rurality and regional belonging in Portuguese, and one of tough, urban/suburban youth in French. This nonequivalence of social locations was something I noted from elicitations of listeners' judgments of the social images and personas these bilinguals' speech summoned up, as well as ethnographically in French and Portuguese contexts (see Koven 1998, 1999). Such differences are perhaps best captured qualitatively. However, although the actual personas that speakers evoke in their two languages may best be described ethnographically, the frequency with which speakers present quoted characters as speaking in creatively unexpected, incongruous ways is something that can be described quantitatively. Therefore, although it is not a substitute for careful qualitative analysis of the range and combinations of registers speakers deploy, coding character speech as "marked"/"unmarked" more easily allows comparisons of not entirely equivalent speech registers across languages, thus enabling one to compare FREQUENCIES of creative departures from the presupposed/expectable usage in French and Portuguese.

The distinction between marked and unmarked character speech is inspired by the work of Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998a, 1998b, 2000. A stretch of character speech was coded as marked if quoted characters were made to use a speech register that gradiently challenges or departs from local sociolinguistic norms and expectations of co-occurrence and alternation (Ervin-Tripp 1995) for the kind of speech event represented. For example, speakers could make an adult character speak in baby-talk, make a teenager speak in a very formal style to a

peer or in a peer-like register to an elder, or make a bank teller speak in a vulgar register to a customer. Furthermore, speakers may shift the register in which they have a character speak, within a single quoted utterance or within the same narrative – starting in a neutral, unmarked register to address a stranger and then becoming noticeably more formal or informal over the course of the interaction.

Therefore, after quotations had been identified in the corpus, coders were asked to judge whether the quoted utterances were "marked" or "unmarked," given the social context of the quoted interaction. They were asked to consider: "Does the way in which the speaker makes this character speak differ at all from what one would typically expect in such a situation? Is there anything remarkable about how this character speaks, that is either more familiar or more formal than one might normally expect in this situation?"

On what basis do coders make these determinations? Speakers and listeners, of course, exploit and respond to multiple formal levels of lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax to shift and to recognize shifts in registers. It is, however, impossible to give an exhaustive list of formal features that would assign a particular stretch of quoted discourse to a particular marked or unmarked category. Speakers do not make judgments of markedness based on grammatical cues alone. Rather, it requires ethnographic knowledge and/or insider's intuitive knowledge of the events evoked through reported speech to know what registers are more or less marked, or challenging to co-occurrence expectations for a given context (Ervin-Tripp 1995). In order to make these determinations, coders had to depend either on their ethnographic knowledge (as was the case for me, the primary coder) or on their insider knowledge or "markedness metric" (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998a, 1998b, 2000). Thus, the judgment of markedness relied on coders' knowledge of speaking norms in the situations that the speakers presented, as well as departures from expectable, "neutral" ways of talking.

Of course, marked/unmarked may seem a relatively broad distinction to capture the range of creative departures speakers may make in the ways they present characters as having spoken – departures that are not exclusively reducible to such a dichotomy. This distinction, however, seems to capture part of how speakers creatively use socially meaningful intra-language variation in French and Portuguese. As we will see in the examples below, the marked/unmarked distinction was often quite unambiguous. Similarly, inter-rater agreement for this category was relatively high (see "Reliability" below).

One criterion for markedness of register is use of a register that is incongruous or unexpected for a particular character in the context. For example, one 24-year-old speaker quoted herself as a 13-year-old in an encounter with an older man:

(3) *"Tu n'as pas à me parler comme ça. Sache une chose, c'est que j'ai treize ans, et que toi, tu en as sûrement le double, donc adresse-toi, à des jeunes filles qui soient de ton âge"*
'"You oughtn't speak to me like that. Be advised that I'm thirteen, and that you are surely twice that, so speak to young ladies of your own age." '

Coders agreed that ex. 3 is marked – that is, not "typical" of how a young adolescent girl would speak to a young man whose romantic attention she didn't want. It is incongruous, or non-isomorphic (Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996). The speaker has her character use a very "high" register, with subjunctive-like imperative *sache*, the subjunctive *soient*, *jeunes filles*, (instead of *filles*), liaison between *pas* and *à*, inclusion of *ne*, and *adresse-toi* (instead of *parle*). This usage is not conventional in this context, and it could present the speaker as haughty. Of the eight clauses of speech presented here, five contain marked features. The only clauses without clearly marked features are *c'est que j'ai treize ans, et que toi, tu en as sûrement le double*.[22]

A second criterion is a shift from unmarked to marked. Often quotations would be coded as marked because the quoted speaker was made to shift from an unremarkable register to a remarkable one with the same interlocutor, over the course of the same narrated interaction. The quotation after such shifts was almost always coded as marked. These creatively indexical shifts (Silverstein 1992, 1995b), initiative shifts (Bell 1984), marked usage (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998a, 1998b, 2000), or metaphorical switches (Blom & Gumperz 1972) are marked because they indicate there has been some change in the way the speaker is performing the characters. For example, one woman quoted herself speaking to an elderly woman on the Metro in what both coders agreed was an unmarked neutral style:

(4) *J'ai fait, "Excusez-moi, j'ai pas fait exprès, il y avait beaucoup de monde."*
  'I was like, "Excuse me, I didn't do it on purpose, there were a lot of people." '

For this kind of interaction, nothing is striking in the way the speaker quotes herself as having spoken. Her dropping of the *ne* of negation in *j'ai pas fait exprès*, is so frequent in standard oral French that its absence is not noteworthy. Nothing in this segment can be coded as marked. Later in this same story, however, she quotes herself as saying to the same elderly woman,

(5) *J'ai fait, "Bon ben, parle toute seule, si ça te plaît."*
  'I was like, "Okay well, talk to yourself if it makes you happy." '

The use of the informal *tu* to an unknown elderly woman is jarring within current urban French norms. Furthermore, for a young woman to speak to an elderly stranger in this manner not only departs from the expected in general, it ALSO departs from the manner in which she had herself speak to this character earlier in the same narrative (with the more formal *vous* in *Excusez-moi*).

Another speaker quoted her own complaint to an unhelpful bureaucrat, who was unwilling or unable to give her information because her colleague was absent. In the beginning of this story, the speaker quotes herself in an unmarked manner as politely requesting information:

(6) *"S'il vous plaît, euh, je voudrais savoir, je voudrais avoir des renseignements au sujet des des euh des prix, de ce que vous proposez en tant que traiteur."*
  ' "Please/excuse me, I'd like to have some information about the prices, what you offer as a catering service." '

Later in the same story, when she tells the clerk that she should be able to get information even if her colleague is absent, she shifts to a far more familiar, marked register:

(7) *"alors pendant six mois, les gus, ils vont se pointer, vous allez leur rien– rien leur dire,"*
'so, for six months the guys, they're gonna show up, you're not gonna tell them anything–anything,' [23]

In this way, no form is marked in and of itself; it is judged as such depending on the character and situations for which it is used. Although, one might think that the coding of marked/unmarked register usage is a relatively unobjective measure because there is no list of formal markings that make a particular usage "marked" or "unmarked," intercoder agreement was relatively high for this code (0.86 in French and 1.0 in Portuguese; see below).

Reliability

Intercoder reliability was determined by having two coders independently code 10% of the stories from the French corpus and 10% from the Portuguese corpus for each speaker, selected randomly from across the 12 speakers' corpora. I served as the primary coder; a native speaker of European Portuguese and a native speaker of metropolitan French were the second coders in both languages. [24]

Agreement between coders was computed on an item-by-item basis. Here, the rate of agreement was determined by dividing the total number of agreements by the sum of total number of agreements plus the disagreements divided by two: (agreements/(agreements + (disagreements/2))) (Kaye 1980).

Agreement between French coders for determining the presense of character speech was 0.85 (N = 66), and 0.91 for Portuguese coders (N = 110). Within the character role, reliability was also assessed for how often coders agreed whether the quote was direct or indirect. Reliability for determining whether quotes were direct or indirect was 1.0 (N = 49) in French and 1.0 (N = 91) in Portuguese. Reliability for the markedness/unmarkedness of the register of character speech was 0.86 (N = 49) in French and 1.0 (N = 91) in Portuguese. Reliability for determining first and third person quotes was 0.98 (N = 49) in French and 1.0 (N = 91) in Portuguese.

Summarizing within subject data for the purpose of cross-subject analysis

Each speaker and each of her stories provides very rich, creatively elaborated narrative material that could be analyzed in many different ways, both across and within subjects. I have previously addressed some of these individual, within-speaker complexities in Koven 1998, 1999. In this article, I present general trends ACROSS the six speakers and six control speakers. Once certain discourse features have been discovered to have important pragmatic effects, quantitative analysis allows one to analyze the relative frequencies with which those and related discourse features occur. Therefore, while quantitative analysis is not intended or

suited to reveal the subtle cultural meanings of particular language forms or the textured richness of individual examples, it does allow us to go beyond single examples and speakers in order to investigate more generalized trends and patterns. Where possible, I will illustrate quantitative results with qualitative examples of the phenomena in question.

Rates.   What is the best way to summarize data quantitatively within and across speakers? In order to make cross-subject comparisons, and to preserve within-speaker complexity, I have summarized the within-language data for each speaker for each variable of interest (amount of character speech, amounts of direct and indirect discourse, and amount of marked register character speech) in the following manner. Across all stories told by each speaker under one condition (told in language of original experience, told in other language; told first, told second; told in French, told in Portuguese), I counted the total number of instances of each variable (clauses of quotation, clauses of direct and indirect quotation, clauses of marked/unmarked register speech) under each condition, and then I divided those numbers by the total number of words uttered by that speaker under that condition. By dividing the number of instances of a particular variable by the total number of words, we thus make corpora that may be of different lengths comparable to each other, both within and across speakers. The resulting figure was then multiplied by 1,000. This conversion yields for each speaker, for each condition (French or Portuguese; first or second telling), a rate of a particular variable per 1,000 words:

$$\text{Frequency} = \frac{\text{no. instances}}{\text{Total no. words}} \times 1{,}000$$

Proportions.   For certain variables, I report not only the frequency but also the ratios of frequencies to each other, expressed as percentages of different kinds of variables. This will tell us, for a particular variable such as character speech, the relative proportions of, for example, direct to indirect quotation. These within-variable percentages reveal a speaker's repertoire of strategies for that particular variable.

Because my results are based on within-subject differences, I have used two-tailed paired t-tests as my statistical test for significant within-person differences. This allows me to determine whether within-speaker differences under the two conditions are consistent enough across speakers that I may speak of a more general pattern.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS RESTATED

I will determine whether systematic differences exist between speakers' narrative discourses following these questions:

I. Extensiveness of quoted character speech
  A. Does the language in which an event originally happened have an effect on the amount of quoted speech?
  B. Does the language in which an event is told determine the extent of quoted performance? Do people quote more or less in French or Portuguese in general?
  C. Does the order in which a story is told affect the extensiveness of quotation?

II. Extensiveness of direct vs. indirect character speech
  A. Do people use direct discourse as a strategy for quoting speech more frequently when telling events in the language in which those events originally occurred?
  B. Is quotation in general (direct, and indirect) not just more or less extensive in one language than the other, but more likely done in direct discourse in one language than the other?
  C. Does telling the same story twice in the same language make a difference in how likely a speaker is to render character speech in direct discourse?

III. Register of character speech
  A. As a matter of quantity, if quotation is no more or less extensive in either language, do speakers quote characters in qualitatively different ways, or more specifically, in different registers?
  B. Is marked register character speech equally distributed across characters? Do speakers present themselves (first-person characters) as opposed to others (third-person characters) more frequently in quoted speech, as the kind of character who uses marked register speech?

SIZE OF CORPUS

Each storytelling session in each language lasted approximately 30 minutes. Therefore, for each speaker, I taped, transcribed, and coded approximately 60 minutes of storytelling talk.[25] This resulted in a total coded corpus of approximately 12 hours (one hour for each speaker), with a total of 45,656 words (see Table 1). Each speaker told an average of 17 stories of personal experience, the "same" 8.5 stories twice. This generated a corpus of 110 stories told twice, or 220 stories.

When dealing with bilinguals, determining a clearcut single language in which an event originally occurred is no simple matter. Speakers' self-reports of language use are notoriously unreliable. When bilinguals interacted with other bilinguals, it is quite possible that both languages were spoken; however, these speakers regularly function in monolingual contexts in both France and Portugal by necessity. For example, although an argument with one's émigré mother could well have occurred with much codeswitching and mixing, a dispute with a functionary in Portugal could be expected to have occurred exclusively in Portu-

TABLE 1. *Corpus size.*

Speaker	Number of stories told	Corpus size = number of words
1. Teresa PF	$9 \times 2 = 18$	9,254
2. Isabel PF	$10 \times 2 = 20$	6,875
3. Linda PF	$11 \times 2 = 22$	5,887
4. Ana FP	$8 \times 2 = 16$	8,666
5. Clara FP	$11 \times 2 = 22$	2,634
6. Maria FP	$14 \times 2 = 28$	3,538
	mean $= 10.5 \times 2 = 22$	
Control		
1. Susana FF	$13 \times 2 = 26$	2,478
2. Antónia FF	$6 \times 2 = 12$	1,373
3. Elena FF	$8 \times 2 = 16$	1,005
4. Aline PP	$6 \times 2 = 12$	1,249
5. Diana PP	$6 \times 2 = 12$	1,017
6. Natália PP	$8 \times 2 = 16$	1,680
	mean $= 7.8 \times 2 = 15.6$	
Total subjects and control subjects	$110 \times 2 = 220$	45,656

guese, or an encounter in the Paris Metro in French. Therefore, in order to determine whether telling the story in the language in which it originally happened affects how it is narrated when told in that language, I selected for each speaker only those stories in which I could be relatively sure, from speaker report and ethnographically derived knowledge, which language was originally used. Across the six speakers who told stories once in each language, the majority of the stories told took place in monolingual settings. I therefore had to eliminate only a small number of stories whose original language was indeterminate, reducing the analyzable corpus size only slightly. Table 2 shows the corpus size after those stories were eliminated.[26]

R E S U L T S

Extensiveness of quoted character speech

Question IA: Does the language in which an event originally happened have an effect on how vividly it is told, in terms of the amount of quoted speech? Is there an effect of telling stories in the language in which the narrated events originally occurred?

As shown in Table 3, speakers do not seem to quote characters consistently more when speaking the language in which a quoted exchange originally oc-

TABLE 2. *Length of corpus, in language of experience vs. other language, expressed in number of words.*

Speaker	Told in language of experience	Told in other language
1. Teresa PF	1,568	1,392
2. Isabel PF	3,237	3,638
3. Linda PF	1,641	2,179
4. Ana FP	3,565	3,219
5. Clara FP	1,312	1,322
6. Maria FP	1,531	1,726
	mean = 2,142	mean = 2,246
	SD = 986.6	SD = 973.9

TABLE 3. *Number of clauses of character speech/1,000 words for stories told in language of original experience vs. other language.*

Speaker	Told in language of experience	Told in other language
1. Teresa PF	79.7	58.9
2. Isabel PF	31.5	54.2
3. Linda PF	37.8	49.1
4. Ana FP	64.2	73.0
5. Clara FP	25.9	28.7
6. Maria FP	13.7	12.7
df = 5	mean = 42.1	mean = 46.1
t Stat = −.66	SE = 10.2	SE = 8.9
p = .54	SD = 24.9	SD = 21.8
	variance = 620.4	variance = 476.1

curred. This suggests that quotation is not, per se, about accurate memory, where quotation would replay the actual words spoken in the manner in which they were spoken. Speakers are just as likely to quote a character vividly in the OTHER language, as creative "constructed dialogue" (Tannen 1985, 1995). This also supports arguments made by Hill & Hill 1986 and Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996.

   For example, in ex. 8 Linda tells about having been reproached by an elderly woman in the crowded Parisian Metro for having accidentally pushed her. Character speech is underlined. Interviewer speech appears in single parentheses. This speaker is equally able to quote her reply to the woman in both languages – regardless of the fact that this event must originally have occurred in French.

(8) Excerpts from two versions of the same story with different amounts of character speech

Portuguese	French
uma vez foi assim com uma pessoa, não sei como é que foi, bah, a gente do, dei-lhe assim um encontrâo e ela foi logo, "Você não 'tá a ver, não sei o quê, eu sou mais idosa do que você, você nem liga, nem nada,"	*ouais, j'ai bousculé un- – (tu as bousculé une dame?) – mh, et puis bon elle m'a, elle m'a engueulée, quoi, elle n'a pas arrêté, p'ce que j'étais mal élevée, pa'ce que,*[27]
eu, "Olhe, desculpe, foi sem querer, que isto, aqui 'tá tanta gente,"	*mais je me suis excusée, j'ai fait,* "Excusez-moi, j'ai pas fait exprès, il y avait beaucoup de monde."
"Pois, você é mal educada, não sei quê," *ficou logo ali a berrar.*	*et puis bon elle m'a, elle m'a engueulée quoi. Elle a dit tout ce qu'elle avait à dire, en fait, que (.), j'étais mal élevée, que je pou-,(.) que ça se faisait pas, qu'elle était d'un certain âge, et que je devais faire attention, et patati et patata.*

'one time it was with a person, I don't know how it was, bah, the people -, I bumped into her and she went right away, "You don't see, blabla, I'm older than you, you're not even paying attention, not even anything,"	'yeah, I pushed a- –(you pushed a woman/lady?) –mh and then okay she, she yelled at me (fam.), y'know, she didn't let up, because,(.) I had no manners, because
me, "Look, excuse me, it wasn't on purpose, there are so many people here,"	but I apologized, I was like, "Excuse me, I didn't do it on purpose, there were a lot of people,"
"Yeah, you have no manners, blabla," she started yelling there right away.'	and then well she, she yelled at me (fam.), y'know, she said everything she had to say, in fact, that(.) okay, I had no manners, that I cou-, that that wasn't done, that she was of a certain age, and that I should pay attention, and blablabla.'

Note how, in ex. 8, the speaker actually quotes the woman in direct discourse MORE in Portuguese than in French. In French, all the quoted woman's words are rendered in indirect discourse. Across speakers and stories, as well as in this example, there is no simple relationship between the language in which an event happened and how that event is later retold. This speaker is perfectly able to replay herself and the elderly woman as quoted characters in both languages. Therefore, whether someone tells an event in the language in which the event originally occurred does not appear to affect how extensively the event is replayed in either language.

Question IB. Does the language in which an event is told itself determine the extent of quoted performance? Do speakers consistently inhabit the roles of quoted characters in general more in French or in Portuguese?

TABLE 4. *Number of clauses of character speech/1,000 words for speakers telling stories in two languages.*

Speaker	Portuguese	French
1. Teresa PF	68	67
2. Isabel PF	26	52
3. Linda PF	50	56
4. Ana FP	78	53
5. Clara FP	22	31
6. Maria FP	15	10
df = 5	mean = 43.2	mean = 44.8
t Stat = −0.24	SE = 10.7	SE = 20.7
p = .8	SD = 26.1	SD = 20.7
	variance = 682.6	variance = 427.8

One might then ask whether there are either French or Portuguese narrative conventions that might influence the relative extensiveness of reported speech in either language. As shown in Table 4, however, speakers do not consistently reinhabit the role of character to significantly differing degrees in either language. In Portuguese, speakers used a mean of 43.2 clauses of quoted speech per 1,000 words, as opposed to a mean of 44.8 clauses in French. This difference was not statistically significant, showing that it is not the language alone that seems to play a decisive role in how speakers (re-)present narrated events.

This tells us that these speakers do not quote speech more in either language by virtue of narrating in that language. Although certain speakers may seem to quote more frequently in Portuguese than in French (speakers 6, 4), others quote more in French than in Portuguese (speakers 2, 5). Two other speakers (1, 3) seem to quote at very similar rates in each language. Although this analysis may not reveal other contextual factors that influence the amount of quotation, it demonstrates that the language alone is not a significant factor in the amount of speech quoted.[28]

Question IC. Does the order in which a story is told affect the extensiveness of direct quotation? Is there an order effect from the sheer act of repetition of the same stories twice?

Here, as shown in Table 5, data from those speakers who told the same stories twice in the same language are used to determine if the mere fact of repeating the same story twice might lead speakers to report speech more or less extensively in the first or second tellings of their stories. Since the control group showed no significant difference in the rate of character speech between first and second

TABLE 5. *Number of clauses of character speech/1,000 words for control group speakers telling stories twice in the same language. (FF = French, PP = Portuguese.)*

Control	First telling	Second telling
1. Susana FF	38	43
2. Antónia FF	7	12
3. Helena FF	14	8
4. Aline PP	9	16
5. Diana PP	31	62
6. Natália PP	48	47
df = 5	mean = 24.5	mean = 31.3
t Stat = −1.31	SE = 6.9	SE = 9.1
p = .25	SD = 16.9	SD = 22.3
	variance = 286.7	variance = 495.1

tellings, there seems to be no clear order effect. Individual speakers may seem to quote more frequently in the first or second telling, but there is no cross-speaker trend to suggest that repetition alone significantly influences how much speakers quote speech. As with the effect of language, although this analysis may not reveal other contextual factors that influence the amount of quotation, it demonstrates that repetition alone is not a significant factor there.

Summary of results of Question I. From the preceding analyses, it seems that speakers do not perform characters in significantly different amounts because of the language of narration, because the event is retold in the language in which it occurred, or because the story was repeated.

II. Extensiveness of direct vs. indirect character speech

To extend the results of section I about the extensiveness of quotation in general, one might ask whether speakers favor direct or indirect quotation in either telling. This will demonstrate whether they resort more frequently to the purportedly more vivid or expressive potential of direct quotation.

Question IIA. Do people use direct discourse as a strategy for quoting speech more frequently when telling events in the language in which those events originally occurred?

In fact, as shown in Table 6, there seems to be no overall trend to suggest that telling stories in the language in which the experience originally occurred makes any systematic difference in how likely a speaker is to replay quoted speech in direct discourse. On average, speakers replayed 59.2% of character speech in

538

TABLE 6. *Percentage of character speech rendered in direct discourse: language of experience/other language.*

Speaker	Told in language of experience	Told in other language
1. Teresa PF	87	87
2. Isabel PF	61	86
3. Linda PF	55	82
4. Ana FP	82	72
5. Clara FP	41	34
6. Maria FP	29	82
mean	59.2	73.8
variance	511.4	409.0
df = 5		
t Stat = −1.46		
p = .2		

direct discourse when speaking in the original language, as opposed to 73.8% in the other language. In fact, three speakers used more direct discourse in the OTHER language. This indicates that direct quotation is a device speakers use to create a compelling story in the "here and now," and not accurately replay verbatim what may have been said originally.

In ex. 9, Isabel tells a story about having been sexually mistreated in Portugal and how she stood up to her abuser. Indirect discourse appears in bold, and direct discourse is underlined.

(9) Excerpts from two tellings of one story, showing creative use of direct discourse in the language in which the event did not originally occur.

Portuguese

Nunca mais dei-lhe confiança a esse a esse homem
–(desde aí, ele nunca mais te tocou?)
–nunca mais me tocou,
*porque ele sabia perfeitamente que **eu não era da- das raparigas que se podiam deixar tocar assim***
–(mh)
–logo pus os, pus as coisas ao certo

'Never again did I trust that that man
–(from then on, he never touched you again?)
–he never touched me again, because he knew perfectly [well] that **I wasn't one of the, of those girls who would let themselves be touched like that**
–(mh)
–Right away I put the, I made things clear.'

French

*je me suis dit que, bon, tu vois, **ça,(.), ca allait pas,** quoi, **c'était pas normal,***

jusqu'au jour où j'avais mis les points sur les "I" en lui disant, "Maintenant, t'arrêtes, chuis pas,(.) chuis pas n'importe qui, et euh, je me laisserai pas faire, hein chuis pas la salope du coin, quoi,"

'I said to myself, okay, you see, **that,(.) that it wasn't okay,** y'know, **that wasn't normal,**

until the day when I dotted the I's [made things clear], saying to him,"Now, you cut it out, I'm not,(.) I'm not just anybody, and uh, I won't let myself be taken advantage of eh, I'm not uh the slut of the neighborhood, okay," '

Isabel had earlier described her abuser as having always lived in Portugal, so we can assume that this event originally occurred in Portuguese. In the Portuguese version, no characters speak in direct discourse; the character speech comes in the form of what her abuser knows – thoughts she attributes to him, rendered in indirect discourse. In representing her own response, she uses no character speech at all, just the metapragmatic expression *pus as coisas ao certo* ('I made things clear'). It is up to us to imagine how she accomplished this.

In the French version, Isabel uses more direct discourse, in a language this character doesn't speak and that Isabel would not believably use with him. She has herself stand up to him in direct discourse, in a vividly replayed demonstration. Her indirect discourse presents what she wants us to believe her character thought at the time. So for this brief swatch of discourse, none of the Portuguese is presented in direct discourse, whereas five of the seven clauses of character speech, or 71% of the French, is rendered in direct discourse. There is not, therefore, a simple relationship between mode of quotation (direct or indirect) and whether the language used matches the language of the original utterance.

Question IIB. Is quotation in general (direct, and indirect) not just more or less extensive in one language than the other, but more likely done in direct discourse in one language than the other?

Direct discourse. One might also ask whether there are French or Portuguese narrative conventions that might influence the relative extensiveness of direct quotation. Does French or Portuguese favor a greater use of direct discourse? Since direct discourse has been described by many writers as a more vivid manner of quoting others' words, are people more likely to present others' words more frequently in one language than the other? When speakers perform the role of a quoted character, are they more likely to make that character speak in direct discourse in one language than in the other?

As shown in Table 7, as a matter of frequency or proportion, these bilinguals do not have statistically greater rates or proportions of direct discourse in one language than in the other. Although the mean frequency (35.4 vs. 28.4) and percentage (70% vs. 57%) of direct quotation is higher in French, this result is not statistically significant ($p = .37$, and $p = .34$ respectively). This shows us that, even though several individual speakers (2, 3, 5) may use direct discourse noticeably more in French, there are other speakers (4, 6) for whom the trend is reversed.

Although ex. 9 shows a speaker using more direct quotation in French, ex. 8 shows one using more direct discourse in Portuguese. Again, although there may be other contextual factors that influence how frequently speakers use this discursive device, it does not appear for these speakers that, as a general trend, the use of either language alone plays a significant role in how frequently speakers use direct discourse.

TABLE 7. *Amount of character speech rendered in direct discourse by speakers telling stories in two languages.*

Speaker	Frequency/1,000 wds		% of all character speech in direct discourse	
	Portuguese	French	Portuguese	French
1. Teresa PF	56.6	59.3	84	88
2. Isabel PF	9.1	46.1	34	88
3. Linda PF	33.5	42.5	68	76
4. Ana FP	58.3	45.7	75	85
5. Clara FP	2.8	15.3	13	50
6. Maria FP	10.1	3.4	67	33
mean	28.4	35.4	57	70
variance	615.6	454.0	747.8	535.6
p = .37			p = .32	p = .34
df = 5			df = 5	
t Stat = −.98			t Stat = −1.07	

Question IIC. Does telling the same story twice in the same language make a difference in how likely a speaker is to render character speech in direct discourse?

As shown in Table 8, for the control group, there seems to be no systematic difference between first and second tellings of stories in regard to how much character speech is rendered in direct discourse. The difference in means −53.2 for first tellings, 54.8 for second tellings – is minor and not statistically significant. Three speakers used a greater percentage of direct discourse in the first telling, whereas the trend reverses for the other three speakers.

Summary of results to Question II. Based on the analyses of direct and indirect discourse, as an overall cross-speaker trend, speakers do not use more direct quotation to present characters when retelling a story in the language in which it happened, as a function of speaking French or Portuguese, or as an effect of repeating the story twice.

III. Register of Character Speech

Question IIIA. If quotation in general, and direct quotation more specifically, are no more or less extensive in either language, do speakers quote characters in qualitatively different ways, or more specifically, in different registers?

Register. We will now see whether speakers perform character roles not only more or less in each language, but in different registers. In ex. 9, the speaker's

TABLE 8. *Percentage of character speech rendered in direct discourse by control group.*

Speaker	First telling	Second telling
1. Susana	76	71
2. Antónia	25	10
3. Helena	0	25
4. Aline	50	44
5. Diana	74	100
6. Natália	94	79
mean	53.2	54.8
variance	1250.6	1180.6
df = 5		
t Stat = −2.2		
p = .82		

quote of herself to her abuser in French is in a familiar register both phonetically (*chuis pas*, not *je suis pas; t'arrêtes*, not *tu arrêtes*) and lexically (*salope* ['slut/bitch'], her use of *tu* with a Portuguese elder[29]). The quotes in the Portuguese version are in a far more neutral register. Speakers do seem to quote characters in consistently different manners in French and Portuguese.

As shown in Table 9, in French, an average of 10.2 clauses of character speech/1,000 words in a marked register appear, whereas in Portuguese, only 4.6 such clauses appear. As a matter of frequency, this difference approaches conventional standards of statistical significance, at the .07 level. As a matter of proportion, this contrast is even more striking. In French, an average of 24.2% of the clauses of quoted speech from performed characters is rendered in a marked low or high register, vs. 12.2% in Portuguese; this was significant at the .006 level.

Ex. 10 shows how this phenomenon is manifest. Teresa tells how a little girl accused her and the group she was with of staring at her. Marked register character speech is underlined.

(10) Excerpts from two tellings of same story in different registers.

Portuguese	French
não insultou, mas disse assim, "Quê é que ela tem a olhar para mim assim?"	*et puis elle dit à sa copine, "Qu'est-ce qu'ils ont à me <u>mater</u>, ces <u>cons</u>-là?"*
'she didn't insult, but said like this, "Why does she have to look at me like that?"'	'and then she says to her friend, "Why do they have to <u>check me out</u> (vulg.), those <u>assholes</u> over there?"'

In Portuguese, the quoted speaker is not presented as saying anything that might, through register alone, be offensive. Furthermore, Teresa frames the Portuguese quote by saying that the quoted speaker did NOT insult. In these two clauses of quoted speech, both were coded as unmarked. In the French example, however, *mater* and *cons* are both highly familiar if not vulgar lexical choices for Teresa to

TABLE 9. *Amount of quoted character speech in a marked register.*

Speaker	Number of clauses of marked register quoted speech/1,000 words		Percentage of all quoted speech that appears in a marked register	
	Portuguese	French	Portuguese	French
1. Teresa PF	2.5	11.9	4%	18%
2. Isabel PF	3.9	14.0	15%	27%
3. Linda PF	3.3	14.6	7%	26%
4. Ana FP	11.7	7.9	15%	15%
5. Clara FP	3.7	9.6	17%	31%
6. Maria FP	2.2	2.9	15%	28%
mean	4.6	10.2	12.2%	24.2%
variance	12.7	19.1	28.2	39.0
	p = .07		p = .006	
	df = 5		df = 5	
	t Stat = −2.29		t Stat = −4.62	

put in the mouth of a little girl speaking in public, within earshot of the people whom she accuses of staring at her. In these two clauses of quoted speech, the second was coded as marked.[30] In this example and in general, quoted characters in French were more often presented as speaking in a register that is somewhat at odds with, or marked in relation to, what such a quoted character would plausibly say in such a context. As I will argue below, by quoting the characters like this little girl in these two different registers, Teresa may present them as different kinds of people within local French and Portuguese ideologies that link register usage to socially locatable images of persons.

Control group's repetitions of stories and marked register character speech

As with the other questions, there were no statistically significant differences in frequency or percentage of marked register use for the control group (Table 10). Note the similar register that a control group speaker uses ex. 11. In this story, she talks twice in Portuguese about her jealous boyfriend. Character speech is underlined:

(11) Excerpts from two tellings in same language with similar styles of character speech

Portuguese telling 1
–e euh, pois, 'tou sempre, "Ah não tens confiança em mim, não sei quê, não sei quê mais."

e bom, começamos a-,
mas ele, "mas, não é verdade, não sei quê, não sei quê," pois

Portuguese telling 2
e eu 'tou a dizer, "Ah, não fazes confiança, não sei quê, não deixes ir, não me faz confiança, porque não vou fazer nada de mal,"

e ele, "Mas, não, não é verdade, não sei quê,"

TABLE 10. *Amount of character speech in a marked register for speakers telling stories twice in the same language.*

Control group	Number of clauses of marked register character speech/1,000 words		% of character speech that appears in a marked register	
	First telling	Second telling	First telling	Second telling
1. Susana FF	4.2	4.8	11%	11%
2. Antónia FF	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
3. Helena FF	0.0	1.9	0%	25%
4. Aline PP	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
5. Diana PP	4.9	12.5	16%	20%
6. Natália PP	1.0	1.4	2%	3%
mean	1.7	3.4	4.8%	9.8%
variance	5.13	22.83	48.2	115.0
	p = .21		p = .27	
	df = 5		df = 5	
	t Stat = 1.45		t Stat = −1.23	

bom, 'tamos sempre a ralhar.	*–(pois)*
	–é sempre assim.
'–and um, okay, I'm always,"Ah, you don't trust me, and so on and so forth."	'and I'm saying,"Ah, you don't trust, and so on and so forth, you don't let [me] go, you don't trust me, because I'm not going to do anything bad,"
and well, we start to-, but he, "but, it's not true, and so on and so forth," okay	and he, "But, no, it's not true, and so on,"
okay, we're always yelling.'	*–(sure)*
	–it's always like that.'

In this quoted replay, although the quotations are somewhat longer in the second version, the register usage in the two quotations is very similar, often with the exact same lexical choices (*confiança, verdade*).

Question III B. Is marked register character speech equally distributed across characters? Do speakers present themselves (first-person characters) as opposed to others (third-person characters) more frequently in quoted speech, as the kind of character who uses marked register speech?

As a further refinement of the question about whether character speech is rendered more frequently and in greater proportion in one language than the other, we shall now see if marked register speech is equally distributed across quoted

TABLE 11. *Amount of quotation of others as characters in a marked register.*

Speaker	Number of third person clauses of quoted speech in a marked register/1,000 words		Percentage of third person speech appearing in a marked register.	
	Portuguese	French	Portuguese	French
1. Teresa PF	.7	4.0	1%	6%
2. Isabel PF	.4	1.5	2%	3%
3. Linda PF	.9	4.2	2%	8%
4. Ana FP	5.6	1.8	7%	3%
5. Clara FP	3.7	8.9	17%	29%
6. Maria FP	2.2	2.9	15%	28%
mean	2.25	3.88	7.3%	12.8%
variance	4.2	7.3	49.9	151.0
	p = .26		p = .09	
	df = 5		df = 5	
	t Stat = −1.28		t stat = −2.08	

characters. In other words, are speakers more or less likely to quote themselves as opposed to others as speaking in a marked register? The words that speakers put in their own mouths vs. those of others, as quotable characters, may give us insight into speakers' verbal modes of self- and other-presentation more generally.

Quotation of others in a marked register. Are speakers more likely to quote others as characters speaking in a marked register in French or in Portuguese? As shown in Table 11, as a matter of sheer frequency, it seems that speakers' quotations of others in a marked register does not really approach conventional levels of statistical significance; however, five of the six speakers (1, 2, 3, 5, 6) still quoted others more in a marked register in French.

With percentages as with the frequencies, the results here are less robust than for first-person quotation (see Table 12 below) – a 7.3% mean in Portuguese vs. 12.8% mean in French, but with enough variance that p = .09 – therefore only approaching conventionally accepted levels of statistical significance. However, as with the frequencies, the same five speakers still quoted a higher percentage of third person speech in a marked register.[31] Third person marked register quotation was illustrated in ex. 10.

Quotation of self in a marked register. We can also determine whether speakers are more likely to quote themselves speaking in unexpected ways – in marked registers. As shown in Table 12, it seems that there is a tendency for speakers to quote themselves as characters more frequently in a marked register in French than in Portuguese (6.5 clauses/1,000 words, vs. 2.3 clauses/1,000 words). Indeed, in French,

TABLE 12. *Amount of quotation of self as character in a marked register*

Speaker	Number of first person clauses of quoted speech in a marked register/1,000 words		Percentage of first person speech appearing in a marked register	
	Portuguese	French	Portuguese	French
1. Teresa PF	1.7	7.8	3%	12%
2. Isabel PF	3.5	13.2	13%	25%
3. Linda PF	2.4	10.4	5%	18%
4. Ana FP	6.1	6.2	8%	11%
5. Clara FP	0.0	1.3	0%	4%
6. Maria FP	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
mean	2.3	6.5	4.8%	11.7%
variance	5.4	26.2	25.4	82.7
	p = .06		p = .02	
	df = 5		df = 5	
	t-Stat = −2.41		t Stat = −3.18	

people are not only more likely to present all characters as speaking in more marked registers, but in particular to present *themselves* as speaking that way. In Portuguese, a mean of 4.8% of quotations of self are rendered in a marked register, whereas 11.7% of quotations of self are rendered in a marked register in French.

To illustrate this trend, ex. 12 shows how one speaker quotes the thoughts of her teenage self. In both versions, she quotes her character wondering what a group of people were doing in a cemetery late at night. Notice the register difference in the words she puts in the mouth of her 16-year-old self:

(12) Excerpts from two tellings of same story with different amount of self-quotation in a marked register

Portuguese	French
achei aquilo estranho, "*mas, o quê é que aquelas pessoas estão ali a fazer?*"	*je me suis dit,* "<u>*Merde,*</u> *qu'est-ce qu'ils* <u>*foutent*</u> *là-bas à cette heure-là?*"
'I thought it was strange, "but, what are those people over there doing?"'	'I said to myself, "<u>Shit</u>, what the <u>fuck</u>/<u>hell</u> are they doing over there at this hour?"'

In Portuguese, there is nothing noteworthy about the register in which this speaker quotes herself. We are presented with directly quoted voice of a first person character whose thought processes are (re)played. In French, the speaker also directly quotes the inner speech of the character of her teenage self; however, she makes her own character adopt a very colloquial register.

Summary of results to Question III. These bilingual speakers' quotations in different languages therefore differ most in the creative usage of marked register

put in characters' mouths. This trend was particularly pronounced for how speakers made THEMSELVES speak in quotation marks as quoted characters.

EFFECTS OF MARKED REGISTER QUOTED SPEECH

To suggest the effects of these different amounts of marked register quoted performance, let me briefly provide an example of listeners' reactions to such double performances of self and other.[32] I had bilingual listeners react to audio recordings of both French and Portuguese tellings of a fight that a young woman had with someone in a train station. Since the speaker never specified whether this event occurred in France or Portugal, the listeners were unable to determine in which language the event originally had taken place. The speaker had so successfully performed both the quoted voice of her aggressor and herself in French and in Portuguese that listeners said they could believe that the scene and the characters had occurred either in French in a suburb of Paris, or in Portuguese in Lisbon. Both were credible performances. That there was an "original" event to which one of the two tellings may have been more "faithful" was thus not immediately evident from the narrative performances.[33] Nonetheless, listeners commented that, in each version, they had a very different image of the aggressor and of the speaker. The former seemed to listeners to be of different ages, social classes, and ethnicities in the two tellings; however, both quoted characters struck listeners as far more aggressive in the French telling than in the Portuguese.

In general, listeners reported that after hearing Portuguese stories with characters who spoke in marked registers, they imagined those quoted characters to be rural, backward, and unschooled. When listeners commented on the marked register speech of French characters, it was typically to say that the character seemed either "bourgeois" and haughty, or a young, aggressive suburbanite. Listeners' reactions thus indicate that the speaker, by putting locally meaningful ways of speaking in quoted characters' mouths, had evoked nonequivalent but equally compelling, authentic-seeming, culturally imaginable speaking personas in both languages. I would contend that speakers do not need to intend these effects consciously in order for speakers and listeners to sense that particular identities have been performed. These experienced personas are socially indexical entailments (Silverstein 1995b) of adopting these different ways of speaking.

INTERPRETATIONS OF MARKED REGISTER QUOTED SPEECH

How might one interpret speakers' greater usage of marked register quotations in French than in Portuguese? They seem to perform more shifting/shiftable quoted incarnations of themselves and others in French than in Portuguese. These speakers may indeed have greater control over their language-mediated self-presentations in French than in Portuguese contexts, in general. One might speculate that their more flexible quoted self-presentations – and, to a lesser extent, quoted presentations of others in French – point to a greater range of

socially available identities to which they have access and with which they can be creative in French contexts. One might argue that, although these speakers are fluent bilinguals, they may not productively master an equivalent range of registers in French and Portuguese. Even if this is the case, though, competence to use or to quote characters as using particular registers is no neutral, context-free skill. These bilinguals have learned and used both languages in sociolinguistically complex contexts in both France and Portugal, across a variety of settings. The socially meaningful registers they have learned and used both result from and have consequences for the social identities to which they have access and/or to which they are subject. It is also possible that the difference can be understood as not merely a question of the speakers' productive competence – of the identities they are ABLE to perform – but also of the social identities that they are ENTITLED to perform in French and Portuguese sociolinguistic contexts. Particularly in performances of their own first person characters, they may not be at liberty to perform in Portuguese, the persona of an aggressive, outspoken urban or suburban youth or that of a haughty elitist because of the gender and class identities to which they are subject in Portuguese contexts. The difference in their register usages may then result in part from their awareness that, in their Portuguese incarnations as young women from the countryside, offspring of parents of modest social origin, they can permit themselves only so much. It could be that quoted performances of more socially daring selves and others – characters who curse, tease, and condescend – would reflect poorly on speakers' need to preserve locally valued images as honorable young women whose verbal and nonverbal comportment is beyond reproach. Whether it is a question of ability, entitlement, or both, the divergence in their productive usage of these registers has consequences for the range of personas they can legitimately perform in each language, or effectively, who they can present themselves and others as being and as having been. In future work, I plan to explore further how the identities they can and do perform in French and Portuguese sociolinguistic contexts relate not only to their mastery of linguistic resources but also to the social resources and identities in French and Portuguese contexts that those verbal resources index.

CONCLUSION

The comparison of multiple compelling performances of the "same" quotable event by the same speaker demonstrates in detail the strategies through which speakers not only represent but also perform the events they recount. The results of the analyses of these bilinguals' strategies for quotation indicate that they seem to enact narratives by performing themselves and others as quoted characters differently in French and Portuguese. Speakers did not differ significantly in how extensively they performed the roles of characters through some form of quoted speech in either language. Elaborated quoted reenactment of past events does not

seem to require that the presupposed past event be told in the language in which it originally occurred to be vividly reconstructed in either language. Furthermore, it is not the language alone that seems to play a decisive role in how speakers (re-)present narrated events. Speakers did not quote more in either French or Portuguese as a virtue of speaking French or Portuguese; the language in which the story was told did not itself affect how extensively these speakers reported speech. Thus, there does not appear to be a generalized effect of French or Portuguese conventions for the extensiveness of quoted speech.

What DOES differ markedly in speakers' French and Portuguese quoted character performances is the socially marked within-language variation of French and Portuguese – the nonequivalent registers speakers had quoted characters use. Speakers presented themselves and others in qualitatively different ways (culturally nonequivalent kinds of quoted characters) and quantitatively different ways (by the frequency within which they could make characters speak in relatively marked or incongruous ways). Indeed, it seems that in French, people were not only more likely to present all characters as speaking in more marked registers, but in particular to present themselves as speaking that way. Speakers thus were able to present quoted incarnations of themselves as adopting more frequent, creatively indexical ways of speaking.

Analyzing this corpus of speakers' repeated performances of the "same" quotations within and across languages contributes to our understanding of reported speech as constructed dialogue (Tannen 1985, 1995). These results provide empirical, systematic support for the notion that speakers' quotations are not faithful reports, straightforwardly tied to a static version of "original" events, whose subsequent narrations differ only in the degree to which they more or less faithfully reproduce those events. In particular, the current work extends earlier discussions of constructed dialogue by looking systematically at the ways in which speakers transform reported speech in different (sociolinguistic) contexts. Note, for example, that speakers typically used some form of reported speech at equivalent moments in two tellings of the "same" event.[34] Similarly, the CONTENT of reported utterances – in the examples presented, WHAT quoted characters said in each language REFERENTIALLY – also differed very little between the two versions of a story. Therefore, the presence or absence of quotation and the quotation's referential content were not what differed in repeated tellings within and across languages. What differed most when speakers performed quotations in their two languages was the speech register in which they made quoted characters talk. The speakers in this study constructed dialogue with consistently different PRAGMATIC resources in their two languages. More precisely, these are resources that may be used for socially indexical, iconic effect – to quote characters in such a way that the quoted speaker need not resemble any "original" speaker, but rather resembles images of locally imaginable kinds of speakers. In this respect, the difference in the manner of self-quotation and (to a lesser extent) of other-quotation may shed light on some

sites where these bilinguals' multiple identities get instantiated within and across their two languages, and on how this happens.

Also of interest are the pragmatic effects of such differences in the way speakers make their quoted characters talk. If we take register systems as repertoires of multiple ways of saying the "same" thing that differ primarily in socially indexical (rather than referential) meaning, use of different register alternants points to the locally specific social contexts and/or identities of the speaker and speech event in question (Silverstein 1998). These bilingual speakers' use of marked register quotation could reveal something about the range of linguistically embodied personas they can draw on and perform in French and Portuguese. In Koven 1998, 1999, I discuss further how a second, demographically similar group of bilinguals reacted to audio recordings of the same stories from speakers in both languages.[35] When I asked listeners to tell me how they pictured recorded speakers and the characters in their stories, they consistently perceived these bilinguals' verbally performed identities as different in French and Portuguese. Listeners consistently reported that they experienced the speakers as "not quite the same person" in the two languages. Moreover, in French, listeners attributed a greater number and range of identities to speakers; in Portuguese, speakers and their characters were imagined primarily to be rural or émigré characters. When speakers and characters were commented on as being unpleasant, it was usually in their role as backward-thinking relatives and/or villagers. In French, on the other hand, unpleasant speakers and their characters were imagined variously as young, aggressive suburban hoodlums, haughty schoolteachers, rude bureaucrats, or university students. Listeners, therefore, did seem to hear a greater range of characters performed in French. These reactive materials reveal the social psychological effects that the performance of these different registers may have on listeners' and speakers' experience of verbally performed identities. In past and ongoing work (Koven 1998, 1999), I discuss further the links between these socially indexical discursive forms and the experiences of identity that they evoke for both speakers and listeners. Within local ideologies that link register usage to socially locatable stereotypes of kinds of people, perhaps the register(s) in which a quotation is rendered indeed makes the quoted character come to life as a particular kind of person.

Speakers' different (sociolinguistic) contexts draw on different kinds of quotable performances of self and other. This material shows that one challenge for these bilingual/bicultural speakers may be not just the accurate representation of quoted self and other in their two codes, but the rendering and transforming of multiple plausible quoted performances of selves and others across sociolinguistic contexts. In general, attention to the ways in which speakers quote themselves and others in and across contexts may illuminate more broadly the ways in which we use narratives not only to describe the past but also to perform a variety of cultural personas. Furthermore, the creative potential for novelty in such narra-

tively constructed quotable selves and others – in other words, our ability to remake and present our characters in distinctive (even idiosyncratic) ways – is not infinite. The identity-creating sociolinguistic resources to which we have access and the identity-creating sociolinguistic constraints to which we are subject together shape who we and others can be when we reinvent people as quoted selves and others.

NOTES

[1] As Hill & Hill 1986, Hill & Irvine 1992, and Urban 1989 have argued, "faithfulness" must be understood according to local cultural norms of evidence and responsibility that underlie the social claims that speakers make through their presentations of others' words.

[2] See also Vlatten 1997.

[3] Why do scholars and nonscholars alike wonder whether reported speech "really" captures the form and/or content of some original utterance? Although numerous scholarly authors challenge the idea that we can ever take quotation as accurate, verbatim reporting of actual speech, there is ethnographic evidence that in several North American contexts, speakers do seem to take some kinds of reported speech at face value – acting as though a speaker's presentation of another speaker's words is unmediated and unaffected by anything in the current speech event (Hill & Irvine 1992; Tannen 1985, 1995). In particular, speakers seem to take reported criticism at face value, as if it were a transparent mirror of what the original critic said. Similarly, in Marjorie Harness Goodwin's work (1990) on speech reporting among African-American girls in the verbal genre of the "He-said-she-said," the child who has been informed that another girl has talked about her behind her back typically holds the original source (not the intermediary) responsible for the gossip. These speakers care greatly about the "truth" of the transmitted utterances, and they seem also to overlook the dynamic role of the reporting context and speaker in transforming the form and content of quoted utterances. In general, the current speaker's report is taken by participants to be "an inert vessel"(Tannen 1995:200). According to Tannen, this reaction to quoted speech may be attributed to a more widespread Western folk view about speech as "a matter of exchanging information, and that information is immutable, true or false, apart from its context" (1985:109) Within this context, a quoting speaker is then believed to be merely a "neutral conduit of objectively real information" (Tannen 1985: 108), so that quoted words are believed to reflect transparently the real words of quoted speakers.

[4] One can consider the implications of these issues not only in terms of the relationship between narrating and narrated events, but also in terms of the more general relationship between language and memory. Authors in experimental psychology and in psychoanalysis have also asked about the relationship between the language of the remembered/narrated event and the language of the remembering/narrating event. Schrauf 2000, a review of the experimental and clinical literature on this subject, discusses the relationship between the language in which memories are evoked and the language in which those memories occurred in terms of the "Equal access assumption" vs. the "Mother tongue hypothesis." In clinical (psychodynamic and psychoanalytic) research, Schrauf explores this issue in terms of the relationship between the language in which psychotherapy is conducted and the language in which important life events occurred. Psychoanalytic authors have often argued that talk therapy is most effective when the language of treatment and the language of experience coincide – in other words, when the patient can talk about life experiences in the language in which those experiences "originally" occurred. In experimental work, Schrauf discusses this issue in terms of the language of recall/retrieval vs. the language of encoding. In these studies, authors have asked whether the language of recall or retrieval needs to match the language of encoding for memories to be more numerous, earlier, more affectively laden, or clearer (Javier &

Barroso 1993; Javier, 1995, 1996; Marian & Neisser 2000; Otoya 1987; Schrauf & Rubin 1998). In particular, these experimental scholars ask whether the language in which an event transpires becomes part of the memory trace itself. The clinical and experimental studies Schrauf reviews all explore whether speakers have privileged access to past life events when (re)capturing those events in the language in which they occurred. The present study addresses the issue of language(s) and personal memories by looking at remembering as a narrative task, and examining the discursive features of "reliving" past events through quotation.

[5] Elsewhere (Koven 1998, 1999, 2002), I have discussed the multiple ways in which speakers not only quote characters but also show other kinds of current attitudinal alignment toward the events they recount, and toward the interaction in which they tell the story. For present purposes, I focus on quoted speech.

[6] As we will see, the speakers in the current study narrated experiences that occurred primarily in clearly monolingual contexts.

[7] In both France and Portugal, there is disagreement over the most neutral way to refer to these speakers that does not stigmatize them as immigrants in France or émigrés in Portugal. Although the term "Luso-descendant" has been criticized by Portuguese and non-Portuguese alike as too "politically correct," it remains the most neutral term, and is preferred over "second-generation Portuguese immigrants" (in France) or "émigré's child" (in Portugal).

[8] A discussion of the relationships between inter- and intra-speaker variation is beyond the scope of this article. As Agha 2000, Irvine 2001, and Silverstein 1998 have noted, there is not necessarily a clearcut distinction between situational variation (defined typically as variation according to context) and dialectal variation (variation according to speaker). Following Silverstein 1990, 1998, here I use "register system" to refer to the multiple ways of saying the "same" thing both within the verbal repertoire of a given speech community and within the repertoires of individual speakers. Of course, the full repertoire of a given community is unequally distributed across speakers, so that no individual speaker has access to all the registers of the larger speech community. Speakers partially index their social identities, across contexts, through their use and combination of different ways of speaking from the larger community's repertoire. Within this framework, what is to be considered dialectal vs. superposed variation is not fixed, but contextually defined (Silverstein 1998). For native speakers, using one alternate form rather than another changes the socially indexical (not the referential) "meaning" of an expression. Utterances in a particular register thus point to the speakers' social identity, role inhabitance, and/or the social context in ways that may both alter or maintain participants' understandings of the social identities, roles, and contexts in play.

[9] In both France and Portugal, people talk about register variation in terms of "language levels." These have been described in the scholarly literature on French on a continuum from literary through formal and current to familiar. For French specifically, several authors have talked about *dédoublement du vocabulaire* ('doubling of vocabulary') (Gadet 1989, 1992; Lodge 1993) or *vocabulaire parallèle* (Sauvageot 1964) where there is a great profusion (particularly of lexical items) of "ways of saying the same thing" that may mark the speaker's identity and/or the social context in which they are used. A similar phenomenon exists in Portuguese. These different lexical expressions vary most in their socially indexical value, not their referential value.

(13) Register alternants of saying "a man"

Register	English	French	Portuguese
formal	the gentleman	*le monsieur*	*o senhor*
current	the man	*l'homme*	*o homem*
familiar	the guy	*le mec*	*o gajo*

Speakers often think of registers as more fixed than they necessarily are (Gadet 1989, 1992; Lodge 1993). These authors, as well as Joos 1962 and Myers-Scotton 1998a, have argued that registers are perhaps better understood as gradient rather than categorical phenomena. The different kinds of registers speakers may use and recognize is certainly more complex than this three-tiered system would suggest. There are, for example, different kinds of "familiar" registers; there are the familiar registers associated with baby talk as opposed to adolescent peer-group talk. Furthermore, the range of registers is manifest at all levels of linguistic structure – lexical, syntactic, phonetic, and morphological.

[10] With the 1974 fall of the Salazarist regime, Portuguese decolonization of Africa, Portugal's 1986 joining of the European Union, and rapid urbanization, the Portuguese social and sociolinguistic landscape has undergone vast changes since the time when most Luso-descendants' parents emigrated.

[11] Language contact phenomena are very important in this population. A full treatment of these is beyond the scope of this article, but see Koven 1998, 1999, ms.

[12] There are ways in which speakers may deliberately, strategically integrate Portuguese into French, in very specific contexts; see Koven 1998, ms.

[13] In future work, it would be interesting to replicate this study with a group of male speakers.

[14] Because the data described here were collected in the same manner as in Koven 1998, the methods section that appears here is similar.

[15] The ways in which the stories recorded for this study differ from naturally occurring conversational narratives is a topic I am currently exploring. I also have a corpus of naturally occurring peer-group conversations in which most of these same speakers took part. Interestingly, I often heard speakers retell the same stories that they told in the interview context during spontaneous conversations with their peers. This reassuringly demonstrates that, at least in terms of their content, the stories speakers told during the interview context were not necessarily different from those told in peer groups. One would expect that some aspects of the FORM of the "same" story told both spontaneously in naturally occurring conversation and in the interview context would differ. Such differences might include, at the least, how co-participants manage turns and how the story is triggered by and integrated into these two different interactional contexts. However, the ways such tellings differ is an empirical question. In future work I will compare how the "same" story was not just retold in two different languages in the interview, but also how the "same" story got retold spontaneously, comparing multiple tellings in ways similar to those described here.

[16] To put the speaker at ease, at the beginning of the storytelling session, speakers were also asked to tell about an experience they had had with a pet – their own or someone else's. In both France and Portugal, most people have either had a pet or have known others with pets. Pet stories typically engage the speaker in her narrative without requiring her to reveal anything very personal. These first stories thus functioned as "ice-breakers" or "warm-ups" to the rest of the interview. Since most of the pet stories were told in the third person, they differ from the other, first-person narratives elicited; for this reason, pet stories have not been included in the subsequent analysis.

[17] Interviewers were instructed to yield the floor as much as possible the interviewees in order to render individual interviewers' styles comparable enough to permit comparison across interviewers. It is true that this design limits the extent to which interviewers could play an active role in the co-narration of stories. That said, it makes systematic comparison within and across participants and interviewers far more feasible. Although I believe that this does not necessarily render the data presented artificial, one would not want to assert that stories told during the course of spontaneous conversation would be just like these. I am currently analyzing narrations and co-narrations told by many of these speakers in naturally occurring peer groups, and I intend to compare those with the interview stories.

[18] Whether the country in which the study was conducted affects the way in which speakers use each language in the interview setting is an intriguing, empirical question. This study could be replicated with a similar group of speakers during their annual trip to Portugal, or with Luso-descendants who have moved permanently to Portugal. I have collected ethnographic but not experimental material with many of these same speakers while they were vacationing in Portugal or since they have relocated there. In ongoing work, I am exploring shifts in the nature and meanings of speakers' performance of French and Portuguese identities in these two national contexts.

[19] There is a small literature on the changes the "same" story undergoes when told in different contexts. The most famous contribution is Richard Bauman's discussion (1986) of Ed Bell. The interactional text of Ed Bell's repeated narrations of the same event to different audiences does shift, although many elements remain stable, in particular the presence of quoted speech. See also Moore 1993, Norrick 1998, Polanyi 1981, and Chafe 1998.

[20] Although most instances of reported speech were classifiable as direct or indirect, occasionally the categories may blur into each other. A third category called quasi-direct-discourse or indirect free style has been written about extensively for literary discourse (Banfield 1982, Mchale 1978, Toolan 1988, Voloshinov 1973) as a mode that retains features of both direct and indirect discourse – where the speaker/writer uses expressive features associated with direct speech, but deictics associated with

indirect discourse. It has been argued that this mode of discourse allows the speaker/writer to blend narrator and character perspectives, making it ambiguous whose perspective is being presented (but see Banfield 1982). Although this mode of reporting speech or thought has been described primarily for literary, or more specifically, novelistic discourse, there is very little written about its use in oral discourse. In my corpus, I found several examples of this mode of reported speech/thought in oral French and Portuguese:

(i) *a minha mãe não queria que aquilo acontecesse. <u>já era velha, já era mais grande, não podia ser.</u>*
'my mother didn't want that to happen. <u>I was already old, I was already bigger, it couldn't be.</u>'

In ex. i, although the pronouns and tense (first person, past tense) make this more like the narrator's voice, there remain several expressive markers (the intensifiers, and the expression *não podia ser*, somewhat evocative of the mother's voice as well). The occasional instance of quasi-direct discourse was coded as indirect discourse.

[21] There is a relatively extensive literature on represented speech in literature of French (Bally 1912, Ducrot 1984, Fónagy 1986, Voloshinov 1973). See Bauche 1946, Bres 1996, Gaulmyn 1996, and Morel 1996 for examples of studies of reported speech in contemporary European oral French. It is difficult to determine whether the conventions for reporting speech in oral French differ from those in European Portuguese; I have found virtually nothing written on conventions of reported speech in oral European Portuguese. From my own corpus, it does not appear that the frequency and distribution of direct and indirect discourse differ, or that the transformation of direct to indirect discourse and vice versa are fundamentally different. Future comparative research of conventions of speech reporting from both other monolingual and bilingual populations should be revealing.

[22] As discussed in Koven 1998, 1999, 2002, aural judges listened to many of these stories and were asked to report how they imagined the speaker to be. Five independent judges all reported that this speaker came across as unusually haughty in this story.

[23] *Les gus* and *se pointer* are more familiar in French than are their English translations.

[24] Ideally, second coders would be from the same sociolinguistic population as the original speakers – children of Portuguese migrants, bilingual in French and Portuguese. Unfortunately, I was no longer at the research site when coding was undertaken. Coders were hired from an available pool of native-speaker French and Portuguese graduate students at the researcher's university, none of whom were Luso-descendants in France themselves. This need not be perceived as an inherent difficulty, however. As the original speakers often tell stories about interactions in MONOLINGUAL contexts, they often try to display their knowledge of monolingual sociolinguistic norms in both languages (Koven 1999, ms.). In this respect, the use of monolingual coders may not be so problematic, since some aspects of markedness norms of these quoted French and Portuguese monolingual interactions may be shared by Luso-descendants and monolingual coders.

[25] The initial "warm-up" pet stories were excluded from the current analysis.

[26] Teresa is the one exception: a speaker whose corpus was more noticeably reduced because more of her stories seemed to have occurred with other bilinguals, and therefore the language of the original experiences remains somewhat more indeterminate.

[27] Although *pa'ce que j'étais mal élevée* could be interpreted as first person descriptive narration, within the researcher's coding scheme it was classified as indirect/quasi-direct discourse, because in context it seems to present the speaker's ironic representation of the OTHER WOMAN's speech and thoughts, rather than her OWN self-attribution as ill-mannered.

[28] Whether monolingual speakers of French or Portuguese quote more or less extensively is of course a different question. Because my corpus has focused on bilingual speakers, I can only speculate at this point about how monolinguals quote in the two languages. In future work, I hope to compare monolingual French and Portuguese groups along similar dimensions.

[29] Many Luso-descendants have described how the norms for second person address differ between urban France and rural Portugal. Most Luso-descendants would probably be expected to use more formal address terms to a Portuguese male elder.

[30] Quotations were parsed into clauses in the following way: *Qu'est-ce qu'ils ont/ à me mater, ces cons-là./ Quê é que eles têm/ a olhar para mim assim?/* Interrogative constructions such as *<u>qu'est-ce qu'ils ont</u>* and *<u>quê é que eles têm</u>* were coded as part of the same clause as the verbs that follow (*têm, ont*).

[31] In my ongoing analyses of 22 other speakers' corpora, I will be able to determine how these results are borne out across a larger sample of speakers.

[32] Space limitations prevent inclusion of the original tellings or of listeners' comments about them (see Koven 1998, 1999, 2002) for fuller discussion of my use of listeners' reactions to recorded materials.

[33] Whether the speaker herself experienced both tellings as equally compelling or faithful to her remembered experience is another, though not necessarily separate, matter.

[34] Norrick 1998 also notes that quotations are usually repeated in multiple tellings of the same story.

[35] I also asked the original 12 speakers to tell me about their experienced identities in each language.

REFERENCES

Agha, Asif (2000). Register. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9:216–19.

Alfonzetti, Giovanna (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In P. Auer (ed.), *Codeswitching in conversation*, 180–211. New York: Routledge.

Álvarez-Cáccamo, Celso (1996). The power of reflexive language(s): Code displacement in reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25:33–59.

Auer, Peter (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages*, 115–35. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bally, Charles (1912). Le style indirect libre en français moderne. *Germanisch-Romanisch Monatsschrift* 4:549–56, 597–606.

Banfield, Ann (1982). *Unspeakable sentences*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bauche, Henri (1946). *Le langage populaire*. Paris: Payot.

Bauman, Richard (1986). *Story, performance, and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, Alan (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13:145–204.

Blom, Jan-Peter, & Gumperz, John D. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics*, 407–34. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Boyer, Henri (1997). "Nouveau Français", "Parler Jeune", ou "Langue des Cités": Remarques sur un objet linguistique médiatiquement identifié. *Langue Française* 114:6–15.

Bres, Jacques (1996). Aspects de l'intéraction rapportée dans le récit oral conversationnel. *Cahiers du Français Contemporain* 3:45–59.

Briggs, Charles (1986). *Learning how to ask*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Chafe, Wallace (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*, 35–53. Norwood: Ablex.

———— (1998). Things we can learn from repeated tellings of the same experience. *Narrative Inquiry* 8:269–86.

Coulmas, Florian (1986). *Direct and indirect speech*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dabène, Louise, and Moore, Danièle (1995). Bilingual speech of migrant people. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 17–44. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

de Villanova, Roselyne (1987). La circulation des langues dans les familles Portugaises. In G. Vermès and J. Boutet (eds.), *France, pays multilingue: Pratique des langues en France*, 130–42. Paris: Éditions de l'Harmattan.

de Villanova, Roselyne (1988). Le Portugais: Une langue qui se ressource en circulant. In G. Vermès (ed.), *Vingt-cinq communautés linguistiques de la France*, 283–300. Paris: l'Harmattan.

Ducrot, Oswald (1984). Esquisse d'une théorie polyphonique de l'énonciation. In his *Le dire et le dit*, 171–233. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1995). Sociolinguistics. In B. Blount (ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A book of readings*, 300–65. Prospect Heights, NJ: Waveland.

Fónagy, Ivan (1986). Reported speech in French and Hungarian. In Coulmas 1986, 255–310.

Gadet, Françoise (1989). *Le Français ordinaire*. Paris: Armand Colin.

———— (1992). *Le Français populaire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Gal, Susan (1979). *Language-shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

Gaulmyn, Marie Madeleine (1996). Témoignage et crédibilité. Performativité du discours rapporté. *Cahiers du Français Contemporain*; 3:27–44.

Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: North-eastern University Press.

———— (1979). Footing. *Semiotica* 25:1–29.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1990). He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Hanks, William (1995). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Hill, Jane H. (1995). The voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and self in a modern Mexicano narrative. In D. Tedlock and B. Mannheim (eds.), *The dialogic emergence of culture*, 97–147. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

————, & Hill, Kenneth C. (1986). *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic language in Central Mexico. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.*

————, & Irvine, Judith (1992). *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269–293, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

———— (1981). Breakthrough into performance. In his *"In vain I tried to tell you,"* 79–259. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Irvine, Judith T. (2001). "Style" as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In J. Rickford & P. Eckert (eds.), *Stylistic Variation*, 121–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobson, Roman (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350–75.

Javier, Rafael Art (1995). Vicissitudes of autobiographical memories in a bilingual analysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 12:429–38.

———— (1996). In search of repressed memories in bilingual individuals. In R. P. Foster et al. (eds.), *Reaching across boundaries of culture and class: Widening the scope of psychotherapy*, 225–41. Northvale: Jason Aronson.

————, & Barroso, Felix (1993). Autobiographical memory in bilinguals. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 22:319–38.

Johnstone, Barbara (1996). *The linguistic individual: Self-expression, language, and linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———— (1997a). Self-expression and linguistic variation. *Language in Society* 26:221–46.

———— (1997b). Social characteristics and self-expression in narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7:315–20.

Joos, Martin (1962). *The five clocks*. New York: Harcourt.

Kaye, Kenneth (1980). Estimating false alarms and missed events from interobserver agreement: A rationale. *Psychological Bulletin* 88:458–68.

Koven, Michèle (1996). Émigré/immigrant or French/Portuguese: Linguistically instantiated identities of Luso-descendants in France and Portugal. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

———— (1998). Two languages in the self/the self in two languages: French-Portuguese bilinguals' verbal enactments and experiences of self in narrative discourse. *Ethos* 26:410–55.

———— (1999). French-Portuguese bilinguals' enactments of self in two languages. University of Chicago. Ph.D. dissertation.

———— (2002). An analysis of speaker role inhabitance in narratives of personal experience. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

———— (ms) Transnational perspectives on language and symbolic power in French-Portuguese transmigration.

Labov, William (1972a). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pensylvania Press.

———— (1972b). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———— (1997). Some further steps in narrative analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7:395–415.

————, & Waletzky, J. ((1967) 1997). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7:3–38.

Lee, Benjamin (1993). Metalanguages and subjectivities. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 365–91. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

———— (1997). *Talking heads*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey (1978). Natural language as metalanguage: An approach to some problems in the semantic description of English. *Transactions of the Philological Society of London* 1976–1977, 1–31.

———— (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lodge, R. Anthony (1993). *French: From dialect to standard*. New York: Routledge.

Lucy, John (1993). Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language*, 9–32. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Marian, Viorica, and Ulric Neisser (2000). Language-dependent recall of autobiographical memories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 129(3):361–68.

Mchale, Brian (1978). Free indirect discourse: A survey of recent accounts. *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3:249–87.

Miller, Peggy J., and Sperry, Linda L. (1987). Early talk about the past: The origins of conversational stories of personal experience. *Journal of Child Language* 15:293–315.

————, et al. (1990). Narrative practices and the social construction of self in childhood. *American Ethnologist*, 97–116.

Moore, Robert (1993). Performance form and the voices of five characters in five versions of the Wasco Coyote cycle. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 213–40. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Morel, Mary-Annick (1996). Le discours rapporté direct dans l'oral spontané. *Cahiers du Français Contemporain* 3:77–90.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Social motivations for code switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———— (1998a). Introduction. In C. Myers-Scotton (ed.), *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties*, 3–17. New York: Oxford University Press.

———— (1998b). A theoretical introduction to the markedness model. In C. Myers-Scotton (ed.), *Codes and consequences*, 18–40.

———— (2000). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In L. Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader*, 137–65. New York: Routledge.

Norrick, Neil R. (1998). Retelling stories in spontaneous conversation. *Discourse Processes* 25:75–97.

Ochs, Elinor & Lisa Capps (1996). Narrating the self. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25:19–43.

Otoya, Maria Teresa (1987). A study of personal memories of bilinguals: The role of culture and language in memory encoding and recall. Harvard University. Ph.D. dissertation.

Peirce, Charles (1940). Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs, In J. Buchler (ed.), *The philosophy of Peirce: Selected writings*, 98–119. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Polanyi, Livia (1981). Telling the same story twice. *Text* 1:315–36.

Sauvageot, Aurélien (1964). *Portrait du vocabulaire français*. Paris: Larousse.

Schieffelin, Bambi B.; Woolard, Kathryn A.; & Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1996). Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in Society* 25:167–203.

Schrauf, Robert (2000). Bilingual autobiographical memory: Experimental studies and clinical cases. *Culture and Psychology* 6(4):387–417.

Sebba, Mark, & Wootton, Tony (1998). We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code switching in conversation*, 262–86. New York: Routledge.

Silverstein, Michael (1990). The skin of our teeth: Registers, poetics, and the First Amendment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans. November 1990.

———— (1992). The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough enough? In P. Auer & A. D. Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*, 55–76. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

_____ (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language*, 33–58. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1994). 'Relative motivation' in denotational and indexical sound symbolism of Wasco-Wishram Chinookan. In L. Hinton, J. Nichols, and J. Ohala (eds.), *Sound symbolism*, 40–60. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1995a). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Paper presented at SALSA III, Austin, Texas, 1995.

_____ (1995b). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In B. Blount (ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A book of readings*, 187–221. Prospect Heights: Waveland.

_____ (1996a). Monoglot "standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis & H. S. Macaulay (eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology*, pp. 244–306. Boulder: Westview.

_____ (1996b). The secret life of texts. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*, 81–105. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ (1998). The uses and utility of ideology: A commentary. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideology: Practice and theory*, 123–45. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (1985). *Talking voices*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1995). Waiting for the mouse: Constructed dialogue in conversation. In B. Mannheim & D. Tedlock (eds.), *The dialogic emergence of culture*, 198–219. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Toolan, Michael J. (1988). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Urban, Greg (1989). The "I" of Discourse. In G. Urban & B. Lee (eds.), *Semiotics, self, and society*, 27–52. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vlatten, Andrea (1997). Quotatives, reported speech, and constructed dialogue in everyday German conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. University of Texas at Austin. Ph.D. dissertation.

Voloshinov, Valentin N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York: Seminar Press.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956). *Language, thought, and reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Wolfson, Nessa (1978). A feature of performed narrative: The conversational historical present. *Language in Society* 7:215–37.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideology: Practice and theory*, 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____ & Schieffelin, Bambi (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:55–82.

Wortham, Stanton (1999). The heterogeneously distributed self. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* 12:153–72.