



---

Tilburg papers in language and literature

Two Explorations of the Organization  
of Overlapping Talk in Conversation

Gail Jefferson

Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg

28

Notes on Some Orderlinesses of Overlap Onset

and

On a Failed Hypothesis:

'Conjunctionals' as Overlap-Vulnerable

With an appended glossary of transcript symbols

820.08.203

## On a Failed Hypothesis:

### 'Conjunctionals' as Overlap-Vulnerable

#### Introduction

For about a year and a half I have been working on overlapping talk. Recently I have been trying to see if there are some general procedures for deciding who drops out and who precedes in overlap. So far with no success. Lately I have been focussing on some items I am lumping together and calling 'conjunctionals'. I am working with the sequential conjunctionals 'Uh' and 'Well', and the syntactic conjunctionals 'And', 'But', 'Because', 'So', and 'Or'.

I have spent some time with them because during my preliminary data run I got the impression that they might be 'weak' in terms of taking or holding speakership, and therefore that there might be a general procedure: Conjunctionals Drop Out in Overlap. And that is the sort of thing I am looking for. It turned out not to be true. But my explorations yielded some interesting possibilities, two of which I will report on here.

Let me make a note about the data. I am focussing on telephone call materials, both British and American. But I am using some 'face-to-face' materials as well. And that permits a sort of 'control' on various phenomena I am noticing. Specifically, I can check to see if a phenomenon is instrumentally exclusive; i.e., might be accounted for in terms of what it is like to talk on the telephone versus in person. So far none of the phenomena I have looked at have that character.

In my earlier reports I used a format: One British telephone, one British face-to-face, one American telephone, and one American face-to-

face. I am no longer so compulsive about it. But I do try to include at least one face-to-face instance in each of the arrays.

The two interesting possibilities yielded by my explorations into the 'weakness' of conjunctionals are: I. A Specification of the Turntaking Rule: First Starter Acquires Rights to a Turn, and II. Pro-Tem Speakership.

I. A Specification of the Turntaking Rule: First Starter Acquires Rights to a Turn

Although I was collecting instances of overlap, once I got the idea that conjunctionals might tend to be 'weak', I started noticing various of their behaviors. And one way that they recurrently seem to be used is the following. At a point where a speaker is starting, resuming, or continuing an utterance, he indicates that he is doing so with a conjunctional, and then 'pauses'. For example:

1.1 [O:8B15(A):20] ((British face-to-face))

Andrea: Mistuh Topp's in Munich is'e?  
 Bette: → Uh:::m (0.8) He's either in Munich or Colo:gne now, ah  
 → f'goh- ah'v lost track. One or the o(h)ther, Uh::,hh (2.7)  
 I think he's::: . . .

1.2 [NB:IV:9:R:2] ((American telephone))

Emma: Honey ah'll come down after I had muh liddle bowl a'soup'n  
 salad'n ah'll call'm ba:ck to yuh uh'd love it.  
 (0.8)

Penny: → We:ll (0.7) oka:y

1.3 [SBL:3:3:R:2] ((American telephone))

Keith: ah'll t-call ↓Te:d en (0.2) let im go over this agreement

1.4 [NB:II:2:R:21] ((American telephone))

Nancy: Assooming yihknow that he'd be taking th'payment

b<sub>[</sub>'k b\*a:c<sub>]</sub>k with im<sub>]</sub>  
 [°M m : ]h m : .°]

Emma:  
 Nancy: → 'hhh'hh So:: (0.7) 'tch he said Dad js didn't trust me . . .

1.5 [Fr:USI:4:R] ((American face-to-face))

Mike: → She ez no use fer it but (0.5) she jis don't like the idear  
 'v im givin an<sup>y</sup>thing away b'fore'e essuh.

## 1.6 [SBL:3:5:R:2] ((American telephone))

Milly:            ʔahh'm gunna learn thet it cert'nly is easy en all you haf  
                   tuh do is tru:st en just sorta go alahng en I hhope it's  
                   → this way becuz 'hhhh ʔthis's gunnuh be: jis ʔʔWoghNderful

## 1.7 [TCI(b):9:5] ((American telephone))

Linda:            Yih don't have enough money tuh git Joshua a chew bo:ne?  
                   → o:r (.) or 'hhh mi:lk en e:ggs y'don't have enough money tih  
                   git all tha:t.

And recurrently the starting, resuming, or continuing speaker will go on to close the pause - eventually as in Fragments 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5, or quickly as in Fragments 1.3, 1.6 and 1.7.

But recurrently as well, a next speaker will start up - eventually or very quickly - and there is no problem. 'Clean' speaker transition occurs. For example:

## 2.1. [SBL:2:1:8:R:13] ((American telephone))

Nora:            but I c'n (.) close muh bedroom o:ff it gets so hot'n  
                   the:re.  
                   (0.3)  
 Bea:            → Yah. 't'hhhhh'hhh Uh:m  
                   → (1.0)  
 Nora:            → W'l who wouldju drum u:p.  
                   (.)  
 Bea:            I don't kno:w.

## 2.2 [NB:III:1:5-6] ((American telephone))

Fran:            I can't be dirty en do that to um.  
                   (0.4)  
 Ted:            → Ne::ah, we-ell,  
 Fran:            → We:l̩ that's th'way it goe:s.  
 Ted:            Well one ti:me maybe,

## 2.3 [SBL:3:6:R:6] ((American telephone))

Adele:            We mi:ght go over en: watch TeeVee with'm er some thing  
 Milly:            [.hh [Ye:ah  
                   that's what- Well we- we always enjoy watching TeeVee:  
                   → en:=  
 Adele:            → =Well I hope it isn't raining . . .

## 2.4 [NB:III:3:R:8-9] ((American telephone))

Bud: 'hh Hadn'been up t'get iz ch<sub>[eck tuh d]</sub>eposit=  
 Emma:                    Y a : h ,  
 Bud:                    → ='n the ba:nk so  
                           →                    (0.3)  
 Emma:                    → 't'hhhh Okay honey well gee tha:nks fer calling . . .

## 2.5 [O:8B15(A):10] ((British face-to-face))

Andrea:                 Two pounds fifty a week.  
                           (2.5)  
 Andrea:                 ((whispered)) Grea:t!  
 Bette:                 → So:  
 Andrea:                 → ↑Oooo: hI thought that we weren't allowed tih get (.)  
                           in:creases'v any type.

## 2.6 [MDE:60-1:5-3] ((American telephone))

Sheila:                 → 'hhhh So uh I haven't uh, hh 'hh met Nadine b't, hh  
                           →                    (0.3)  
 Erma:                    → She's a do:ll.

## 2.7 [Friedell:37] ((American face-to-face))

Sandy:                 WHICH ONE'S the one that he marries the girl en she die:s  
                           in the car wreck.  
 Hank:                    °ehho° That's::: On Her  
                           (1.0)  
 Hank:                    → On Her Majesty's::: Service er:::=  
 Sandy:                 → On Her Majesty's Secret Service, °thet's right°  
 Hank:                    [°Secret Serv]ice yeah.°

## 2.8 [NB:IV:10:R:11] ((American telephone))

Emma:                    If this THANKSGIVING THING DOESN'T TURN OU::T I'VE GOT THE  
                           TURKEY in ah'll cook the DA:MN THI:NG? 'n freeze part of  
                           → ut 'n give you some of ut er  
                           →                    (1.0)  
 Lottie:                 → Oh::.  
                           (0.7)  
 Lottie:                 Uh::., no I don't wan' any,

And I suppose a predictable enough consequence of these two recurrent phenomenon is overlap; i.e., just as a speaker is 'closing a pause', a next speaker is starting up. For example:

## 3.1 [MDE:60-1:1:23-24] ((American telephone))

Sheila:                 I've a feeling Nina will cah you.'hh  
                           (0.6)  
 Dick:                    Yeah. Okay.

## 3.1 (ctd.) (0.4)

Dick: → Uh:::m  
 → (1.2)  
 Dick: → Y<sub>[</sub>es ( )-  
 Sheila: [→ ]<sub>[</sub>OR I w'l.

## 3.2 [Rah:C:1:(16):4] ((British telephone))

Ida: ngDju want tuh te:k yoo:h carr ez we:ll?  
 (.)  
 Jessie: → Eh-hm,  
 → (.)  
 Ida: → Ahm' then we  
 Jessie: [→ ] Ah think ah'd better Ideh . . .

## 3.3 [GTS:I:1:69:R:7-8] ((American face-to-face))

Ken: cause my father sih now there's g'nna be a buncha kids in  
 → here'n this routine 'n  
 → (0.6)  
 Ken: [→ ] th<sub>[</sub>is'n that'n the<sub>]</sub> other<sub>]</sub> °thing°  
 Roger: [→ ] Keep yer gua:rd u(h)u p 'he †'hehh'hih†

## 3.4 [NB:III:3:R:6] ((American telephone))

Emma: W'l HONEY WIR LOOKIN FORW'R DUH SEEIN YUH. Th' KIDS SAY=  
 Bud: (Okay.)  
 Emma: → =when's †gra:mpa coming en<  
 → (.)  
 Bud: [→ ] T h a : t's (n<sub>[</sub>ice).  
 Emma: [→ ] †It's really †We've hadda n:i:ce time honey

## 3.5 [O:8B15(A):44] ((British face-to-face))

Andrea: 'hh but if you deci:de ju want some.  
 Bette: M<sub>[</sub>m:  
 Andrea: → ]<sub>[</sub>st †say bec'z:  
 → (0.9)  
 Andrea: [→ ] I<sub>[</sub>'ve e v e n<sub>]</sub>  
 Bette: [→ ] Uh yih g'nna put yohs out now then?

## 3.6 [G:93:AD:56:R] ((American face-to-face. Cal is telling a joke; they are in a mid-joke laughing-together; "Oops" is a laugh-cue))

Cal: ]e:::a::yee:]°ee::°  
 Lenny: ]uh!ah!ah!ah!]°  
 Bart: [°ehhhh]hh°  
 Lenny: [°uhhhh°=  
 Cal: → =So:.  
 → (.)  
 Lenny: [→ ] Oo [::b(h)z=  
 Cal: [→ ] They-  
 Bart: =neghh- [heh heh  
 Cal: [huh ha:] ha: ha: ha:

And in such a circumstance, as seems to be the case for the various sorts of overlap I've looked at, there appears to be no general rule for deciding, now, who shall drop out and who shall procede.

My data run turned up some 40 cases of the phenomenon. In about 11 of them the 'current speaker' drops out. In about 11 of them the 'next speaker' drops out. And in some 18 of them neither drops out. As pretty a picture as you would want of a 'no rule' situation.

(Parenthetically, I am presenting these numbers as approximations because on various scans of the corpus, various fragments get dropped or added, depending upon how strictly I am defining the phenomena.)

What strikes me as interesting here is that in Set 2, 'Clean' Speaker Transition, a speaker who has initiated an intra-utterance pause makes no move to close it, while in Set 3, Post-Conjunctonal Overlap, such a speaker does procede to close it.

A possibility raised by and accounting for these contrasting sets is that there are two distinctive procedures for which conjunctionals are used. One is an 'intra-utterance pause'. The other is, say, a 'trail-off'; i.e., the speaker is, although in mid utterance, available for speaker transition.

At the point of initiation, however, just which of the procedures is underway may be equivocal, and open to negotiation. Such that, as we see in Set 2, if a next speaker starts up in a post-conjunctonal silence, then the prior talk, which is to this point equivocally at a point of an 'intra-utterance pause' or 'trailoff', will be mutually constituted as a 'trailoff'. That is, whether or not the potentially 'still current' speaker had intended to continue, he now does not.

Now Set 3 is specifically a collection in which a next speaker does not accomplish starting up in a post-conjunctonal silence, but at what

has turned out to be its end; that is more or less simultaneously with what is now 'the closing of an intra-utterance pause'.

That is, whether or not a 'still current' speaker had been 'trailing off', permitting a next speaker to start up, finding at some point in a silence that a next speaker has not started up, he takes up the alternative option, to 'close an intra-utterance pause'.

And once committed to that alternative he tends to proceed with it across the simultaneously-started 'next' utterance. By so doing he can, for one, retroactively exhibit the from-the-start character of his silence as, not a 'trailoff' which got no uptake, but indeed an 'intra-utterance pause' which was not available for speaker transition.

This would be a nice bit of orderliness: If a next speaker starts up in such an equivocal silence, then the thus-constituted producer of a 'trailoff' stays out. If a next speaker does not start up within such a silence, then the thus-constituted 'still current' speaker proceeds.

We may then be seeing a negotiation for the status of an utterance, and for speakership, conducted in a silence, with specific terms and outcomes.

And recurrently these do seem to be the terms and outcomes. The mutually-constituted 'trailoff' via a next-speaker in-silence start is seen in some 59 cases of 'clean' speaker transition, a 'pickup' collection (not the product of a concerted data run) from which Set 2 was assembled.

We do find possible 'counter cases'; materials in which a 'still-current' speaker starts up after a next speaker's in-silence start. There are approximately 6 of these, the total yield of a concerted data run. On the face of it this is a problematic 'set'. The phenomenon has pulled two distinctive types of materials.



One type, seen in Fragments 4.a.1-4.a.3 below, is characterizable in terms of a particular problem associated with pathological speech production. These three cases come from two conversations, in each of which one speaker has a 'stammer'. And it is that one who produces the phenomenon, starting up after a next speaker's in-silence start.

4.a.1 [Her:OI:7:2] ((British telephone))

Barnaby: Oh: (.) ↓good well that's n- (.) that's n:- (.) really good.  
(.)

Merrie: e0:kay?  
Barnaby: ∥ Good en u very(b)  
(0.4)

Barnaby: → Very gllad'n  
→ (.)

Merrie: → Well it'll [l: help]  
Barnaby: \*→ [gla:d  
Merrie: It'll [h e l p yr]  
Barnaby: [you've done] this Missiz Coates

4.a.2 [Her:OI:7:5-6] ((British telephone))

Barnaby: Oka:y?  
Merrie: O:↑kay?  
Barnaby: 'hh (.) Fair enough?=  
Merrie: 'h  
Barnaby: → =∥ Wu1?  
→ (0.2)

Merrie: → The best'v luck.]  
Barnaby: \*→ [Once agai:n:  
(0.3)

Merrie: 'hh [h [I-  
Barnaby: [think you:?

4.a.3 [GTS:I:2:57:R:1] ((American face-to-face))

Roger: I: H:APPEN duh wea:r (.) bl:ue jeans constantly.  
(0.2)

( ): 'e\_h  
Ken: → [↑Well  
→ (0.2)

Roger: → Even i\_n  
Ken: \*→ [so do I no:w,  
(.)

Roger: formal occa:sions yihknow hheh'hhn

A candidate account here is that on occasion a stammerer may (perhaps under advice of a speech therapist) concentrate on getting his

utterance out and not letting others' impatience with his impediment cause him to keep aborting. Such a project may on occasion take priority over such conversational procedures as the candidate 'terms and conditions' I am proposing here; i.e., that a current speaker having produced a break and a next speaker having started, the erstwhile 'current speaker' should relinquish.

The other three, Fragments 4.a.4-4.a.6 below, are seated in intensely problematic interaction, and might better be characterized as motivated incursions than as sheer continuations. That is, it may not be 'a turn at talk' per se which is at issue, but some interactional business which is being worked out. I am providing expanded fragments and will do a brief consideration of each of these.

4.a.4 [O:8B15(A):44] ((British face-to-face))

Andrea: Bah th'way d'you †want'ny lettisiz liṭṭle lettisith? bihc'z  
they've c'm ou:t̩: very we ll

Bette: †Have they,

Andrea: †Yeh  
(0.4)

Bette: †Oh:.

Andrea: °'F yer intrestid°  
(1.0)

Bette: u:Uh:::m I'm js(tr̩)- thinking.it's probly not  
(.)

Bette: Ah d' [know (lemme give it u-)]=  
Andrea: [We:ll w'tevuh you decide ]=  
Andrea: =hh but if you deci:de ju want some.  
Bette: M,m:  
Andrea: [jst †say bec'z:  
(0.9)

Andrea: I've e v e n  
Bette: → [Uh yih g'mna] put yohs out now then?  
Bette: → °c'ss:°  
Andrea: → Wul ah don't k n e o :w ah dn't-  
Bette: \*→ [thet's th' problem isn' it.]  
Andrea: Ah don't think theh rilly ready  
(0.2)

Andrea: You know ah think h 'hh  
Bette: You [°N o :°]  
(0.2)

Andrea: Ah think hh we're very lah:kly tih get mohr fr<sub>ost</sub>.  
Bette: fr<sub>ost</sub>.

Most roughly, a precipitous and perhaps ill-considered offer is being resisted. The offer is precipitous in the sense that routinely offers are produced rather more cautiously, the 'information' component (in this case that some lettuces have come out very well) preceding the 'offer' component which then can be contingent upon a recipient's response to the information component. The precipitousness may be based upon and convey an assumption that of course the offer will be welcome, thus enhancing the problem of its not being well received.

That the offer is perhaps ill-considered appears to be what is at issue in the segment in which the overlap in question occurs. Specifically, the issue is that of the calendar-timing of the offer and all that such timing carries with it, where what is being 'offered' is the housing and tending of some seedling lettuces until they can safely be set out.

The problematic character of the timing is raised, not only by the fact of such a query as "Are you gonna put yours out now then?" but perhaps in its particulars. It seems to me the reference to "yours" has a more contextually fitted alternative, 'them'. The selection of "yours" may be invoking one of its contrast terms, 'everyone else's', against which what is proposed for "yours" is to be seen as deviant.

And it is the explicit formulation of that as "the problem" and thus an account for/warrant of the recipient's resistance to the offer, which is incursively introduced into the offerer's post-conjunctional utterance.

Where, further, the incursion may specifically be responsive to the shape of the utterance so far. That is, to the query "Are you gonna put yours out now then?" we don't get a taken-for-granted "Mm hm", or a response to a possible challenge, e.g., "Oh yes", but the "Well I" which

turns out to have been the start of a statement of the offerer's doubts, and may then and there be hearable as such.

4.a.5 [SBL:2:1:8:R:1-2] ((American telephone))

- Nora: B't I: ʊ-I thought Ma:d'line (1.0) as I sa:y was (.) a complete (.) a:nswer to this: business that (.) you ne:ver take one a'those fa:s'tours. b[ec'z ]'hhhhhh  
 [Uh hu]h
- Bea:
- Nora: she had the physical sta:mina tuh,h 'hh Ah wz think'n this morning I w'z having little trouble'n th'ba:throom 'n I thought oh bo:y I (.) I-ah-ʊ (.) this business'v (.) getting up't six ʊ'clock'n: being ready (t'ea:t) i-is nu-is no:t fer me ihh[h huh]huh  
 [Uh hu]h,
- Bea:
- (0.4)
- Bea: → Well (.) uh(th:) ekhh hkkhhem=  
 =Someho:w yo,u endure,i t.]
- Nora: →
- Bea: \*→ [THERE'S'N]e-TH]ERE'S'N A:NSWER TIH THA:T  
 t:oo:.hh  
 (0.7)
- Bea: 'hhhhhh'h hh ehhh A physic'l a:nsw(h)er t(h)o 'hhh'hh[huh]h  
 [Yih]
- Nora:
- mean takin: la:xative et ni::ght.=
- Bea: =((smile voice)) No:: suppo:sitor,\*ies.  
 (.)
- Bea: Tha\_t takes,  
 [We:ll it]doesn't always work fer me Bea:=
- Nora:
- Bea: =No:?  
 [It didn'work this morning.
- Nora:
- Bea: Ah hah uhhh huh °hu° 'hhhh W'l list'n that's wot suits you:.

The situation here is that of a 'delicate' problem, delicately referred to as "having a little trouble in the bathroom", and a delicate remedy, delicately arrived at via a long leadup and a puzzle/guessing-game format.

It is the long leadup that appears to generate the problem here. It consists of a conjunctive "Well" and a momentary break, followed by another conjunctive, "uh", plus an unvoiced start on the first component of the 'guessing game', "(th:)", which is not yet brought to voice but is followed by a throat-clearing, "ekhh hkkhhem".

In other materials (data not shown) such 'leadup' work can be seen to have an orientational function, preparing a recipient for problematic

upcoming materials. But in this case that orientative work seems to have gone for naught, in that the candidate recipient of the delicate remedy treats all of the foregoing as a 'trailoff' and starts to talk.

As it happens, her utterance is close-implicative for the sequence in which, were it to continue, an offer of a remedy would be appropriate. That is, "Somehow you endure it" is an analog of, for example, "That's the way it goes", "Never mind", etcetera. I have no idea whether the speaker who has just produced the 'leadup' to advice can hear from "Somehow yo//u" that closure is underway, or whether that bit of talk is heard as, e.g., the start of an elaboration of the complaint. What I take it the advisor can be said to hear is that her coparticipant has (mis)taken a 'leadup' for a 'trailoff'.

And the way in which the advisor 'closes her intra-utterance pause' across her coparticipant's talk may be responsive to, rather than independent of, that talk. That is, an 'unobstructed' next component, "There's an answer to that too", might have been produced a bit differently than it is here, its loudness and insistent recycle standing in utter contrast to the cautious, hesitant prior - and subsequent - talk.

The last fragment in 'set' 4.a. is a condensation of a long chunk of conversation, in which the context for the phenomenon under consideration is developed.

4.a.6 [SBL:3:5:R:8-11] ((American telephone. Re. a Bible class))

Ginny: You haven't eaten yet?

Milly: No wir jist now ea t ing.

Ginny: [W'l why don'ch]u go ahead Milly 'hh

(0.2)

Ginny: (→) En u-ah:'ll sto:p o:n my way down en:nif you feel like (.)  
coming with me fi:ne 'n:d if y' [do:n't w h y]

Milly: [Yer still go]↓\*ing.

(0.3)

Ginny: 'hh Yeh I think ah'll go o:n.=

Milly: =Ah hah.

- Milly: 'hh Well you better CAHLL then (.) eh deon't chu think maybe  
 en see if yer sposetuh go tuh Betty's er tuh Audrey's?  
 (1.0)
- Ginny: Yeh buh I'm pragdigly sure it's ↓Audrey's cz=  
 Milly: = [O h y o u ah?]  
 Ginny: = [that's where I w] ent be [f o r e y o u see]  
 Milly: = [Oh that's where you] went  
 be ↑fo [↓:re.]  
 Ginny: [Y a h.]
- .
- . ((ca. 26 lines omitted))
- .
- Milly: °Ohh:: I:: ↓see [well I]:: tho:t that she to:ld me uhm°=  
 Ginny: [Yihknow]  
 Milly: =En she said you were having the ta:pes of Hunter,
- .
- . ((ca. 7 lines omitted))
- .
- Milly: She tol'me he wz wonderful,  
 Ginny: [Yah]  
 Milly: 'hhh'hhhhh ↑OKAY HONEY  
 (.)
- Milly: 't'hh [h [THA:NK]S FER C [AHLING ME:] and uh]  
 Ginny: [O:: [::::: 'k a y] ALRIGHT]=  
 Ginny: =We'll then ↑w]e'll 'hh  
 Milly: [I really  
 (.)
- Ginny: Wi-:ll keep it y-y- (.) 'h You think ↓abahd] \*it.↓  
 Milly: [Y e : s.]  
 (.)
- Milly: 'hh  
 Ginny: → [End uh  
 → (0.2)
- Milly: → Wul may be I c'n(w)  
 Ginny: \*→ [Dju want me tuh] stop by:?  
 Milly: 'hh We:ll you ↑better no:t may:be: uhm buhcuz I- I sorta  
dou:bt ah: think Jan has ulotta wo:rk en I'm sert'v uh=  
 Ginny: [°Ohh°  
 Milly: = 't'hhh MAYBE ah'll cah:ll you if I decide I c'n  
go [would that be] be [tter?]  
 Ginny: [↑ O k a : y ↓Swel l.]

The event in question here is a Bible class; such a thing as tends to enhance the problematic character of a disinclination to attend, and to warrant the sort of pressure-to-attend being produced here.

And again the overlap in question may involve an incursion by reference to the shape of an utterance-so-far. Earlier, the advocate of attending the Bible class, Ginny, has addressed the problematic character

of the situation by proposing "I'll stop by on my way down and if you feel like coming with me fine and if not why...". The problem is being located in the coparticipant's 'indecision'. The fact that pressure is being applied is simply not at issue; i.e., that Ginny will stop by (and thus make it enormously difficult for Milly to send her on her way again, alone) is simply a given.

It is possible that with her subsequent "You think about it. And uh" Ginny is producing a mirror-image reiteration of her earlier proposal, the projected continuation being something like "and let me know when I come by."

Now it is then possible that what follows is a self-generated repair; i.e., somehow and at last it occurs to her that her stopping by is not a given but is also problematic, whereupon she produces the query, "Do you want me to stop by?" It is also possible that the 'somehow' has to do with Milly's post-conjunctional "Well may//be...", where an available alternative would be some 'uptake' of the projected reference to Ginny's stopping by; for example, following "You think about it (.) and uh", Milly might produce something like "And I'll let you know when you get here", at which point Ginny's subsequently-produced "Okay swell" would do nicely.

Whether the materials are self-generated without regard to what the coparticipant is saying, or produced by reference to that talk, the materials are not well characterized as a still-current speaker simply closing an intra-utterance pause, or reclaiming a turn at talk which has been usurped by an interruptively-starting next speaker. Between the "And uh" and the subsequent query something has happened such that the query is no longer a direct 'continuation', but, now, a fresh and incursively-started utterance.

Thus, each of these six possible 'counter cases' are characterizable not so much in terms of a 'still current speaker continuing', but of variously motivated incursions on a next-speaker's legitimately-started, post-trailoff utterance.

Given the very special character of these six possible 'counter cases', the candidate orderliness is still viable: If a current speaker produces a 'Conjunctional + Break' and a coparticipant starts up within that silence, then the current speaker should not procede. The phenomenon is then mutually constituted as a 'trailoff' and not an 'intra-utterance pause'. That is, it is collaboratively achieved that no interruption of a current speaker by a next has occurred.

And given such a possible procedure, we can return to Set 1, the various Intra-Utterance Pauses, and notice that they too can be seen as collaboratively achieved.

That is, for what turn out to be intra-utterance pauses of from one-tenth second to two and seven-tenths seconds, we can see the application of a correlate to the proposed procedure. Simply enough: If a current speaker produces a 'Conjunctional + Break' and then starts up again within the ensuing silence, a potential next speaker should not start.

This correlate may be seen to be represented by the 'pickup' collection of some 109 instances from which Set 1 was assembled. Once again there is a possible 'counter collection'. It consists in 3 fragments, the total yield of a concerted data run, in which a next speaker starts up after a still-current speaker 'closes an intra-utterance pause'. I will briefly consider each of them in turn.

The first two fragments in this 'set' of three are condensations of long stretches of talk in which the context is developed.



## 4.b.1 [Rah:C:1:(16):1-4:R] ((British telephone))

- Ida: Uhm ah'v ruung to ahsk uhm 'hh wouldju like a ruun uup to  
Middlesb'r in the mohrn<sub>[ing.]</sub>
- Jessie: kHey that's funny I wz gon'  
to ahsk hhyou the<sub>[Well,</sub> same think.
- Ida: (.)
- Ida: iYe<sub>[s:</sub>
- Jessie: Eh:m=
- Ida: =Well Ja<sub>[no's</sub> ruung you see:,  
.  
.  
((ca. 23 lines omitted))  
.
- Ida: [she's] pickin me up (.) abah hahlf pahs'↓nine.  
.  
.  
((ca. 8 lines omitted))  
.
- Ida: Ahn then (.) she'll pick you up on the way: down then ahs  
↓ah said.↓  
(0.3)
- Jessie: Well it's a<sub>[bit eh]</sub> in: a<sub>[hp ish]</sub>  
Ida: I s<sub>[I s]</sub> is that too leahr↓ly:  
Jessie: eh- No: no  
it's not too early it's jist uh how long is she gon'to be  
in Middles<sub>[ber.Thi's's the,th]</sub> ing.
- Ida: 'hh i-jis turned hahlf pahst eleven quartuh tih twelve.  
(0.6)
- Ida: She's goht tuh be in then, becuz 'hhh Rohbert is going out.
- Jessie: Oh I see:. Well<sub>[I di:n- yeh-eok-ahm:</sub>
- Ida: Yeah,  
Jessie: Cuz I wantuh get curtains'n things ah don'n'whether ah'll  
be able to manage it in thaht ti:me that's th'thing.
- Ida: eeYeah. eeYeah.
- Jessie: Eh:m  
(0.2)
- Ida: Uh hah?  
(0.6)
- Ida: Uh:-e-only she's goht tuh be ho:me she said (0.3) <about i-  
(.) yihknow hahlf past eleven quartuh tuh twe:lve,  
°Oh:..°
- Jessie: → Uh:m  
→ (.)
- Ida: → Wu:l wih-<sub>[(ih see)</sub>
- Jessie: \*→ 'N did yo<sub>[u want anything in Middlesbruch Ider</sub>  
<sub>[ohr are you jis] going f'r the ri'.]</sub>  
Ida: [A h : : : dohn'] Ah d o h n' ] t eeveh-°ah h- ah hahv  
no° money Jessie heh he<sub>[h huh] ha h a ] ha ha ]</sub>  
Jessie: <sub>[uhhhh] hu h hu ] h huh</sub>  
.  
.  
((ca. 9 lines omitted))  
.
- Ida: B't et any reht. 'h Wul  
(0.6)
- Ida: ngDju want tuh te:k yoo:h carr ez we:ll?

As in Fragments 4.a.3 - 4.a.6, the phenomenon under consideration is seated here in a thoroughly problematic interactional field. Most roughly what might be a nice little coincidence - two people each having intended to invite the other along on a shopping trip - is drastically more complicated; a triangle consisting of Jessie, Jessie's friend Ida, and a kinsman of Ida's (I think it is her daughter), Jano. Where, now, the two primary movers - those with means of transportation and specific plans - Jessie and Jano, have conflicting timetables.

The query which intrudes upon a still-current speaker's post-conjunctional talk, "And did you want anything in Middlesbrough Ida or are you just going for the ride", could be crucial to breaking the deadlock. If it turns out that Ida does have some plans of her own, then perhaps she has unnecessarily accommodated herself to Jano's circumstances where a solution would be for Ida and Jessie to go together in Jessie's car, leaving Jano free to make her inconveniently early departure.

As it happens, the answer ("I have no money") indicates that such is not the case. And with her subsequent "Do you want to take your car as well?" Ida makes it clear that she and Jano constitute the fixed unit by reference to which Jessie's activities shall be coordinated, or else she can proceed on her own.

Akin to the materials in Fragment 4.a.6, while the incursion into Ida's still-current speakership might well be produced regardless of what Ida happens to be saying - this new and useful thought introduced the moment it occurs to Jessie - it is also possible that, whenever it might have occurred to Jessie, she is introducing it by reference to the just-prior talk. In this case she may be introducing it at a point where, given the two consecutive conjunctionals ("Uh:m (.) We:11"), it appears that Ida

sees that she should be talking, but has nothing in particular to say.

It is also possible that something rather more intricate is going on. Given where they are in their negotiations, and given the general availability of such a solution as that they both go in Jessie's car, Jessie could be hearing Ida herself cautiously 'leading up to' just that solution. Where, for Ida to proffer it would be a bit touchy, in that she would be inviting herself into Jessie's car (which could open up such further touchy possibilities as Jessie picking Ida up). I take it that this could be a bit awkward independent of the fact that Jessie had earlier invoked just that possibility (with her response to Ida's "Would you like a run up to Middlesbrough in the morning", "I was going to ask you the same thing").

And I have come across materials in which analogous situations arise. Roughly, the more 'awkward' of two relevant alternative activities is initiated. And it is not uncommon in those cases for the awkward activity to be 'interrupted' by the more interactionally apt alternative.

Such might be the case here. Jessie, hearing Ida working her way cautiously towards the awkward proposal that she go along with Jessie, 'interrupts' it with an inquiry which could have as one of its outcomes that Jessie will invite Ida to come along with her.

As it happens, the outcome is something different. And it is not impossible that Ida's consecutive conjunctionals were indeed a 'lead up' to something rather touchy; to the proposal she produces upon completion of the talk generated by Jessie's inquiry which 'interrupted' at that point; i.e., not that Ida ride with Jessie, but that Jessie travel alone.

In Fragments 4.b.2 and 4.b.3 we get something that I find puzzling. A next speaker starts up incursively in a still-current speaker's post-conjunctional continuation, and then drops out.

## 4.b.2 [0:8B15(A):15:R] ((British face-to-face))

((Bette earlier announced that they are getting a raise of about £10 a month, which Andrea reformulated as £2.50 a week. Now, later in the conversation, Andrea offers another formulation.))

Andrea: So we get about uh:,hh pou:nd a week. mohr uh(less),  
(0.4)

Andrea: W'get neahrly two pounds a week mohr.  
(0.7)

Bette: → Uh::m::,  
→ (1.9)

Bette: → How much wz it?  
Andrea: \*→ Ahftuh  
(0.2)

Andrea: Well it's two pounds::  
Bette: Oh ahf tih tax you mean ye:s  
Andrea: Yes

This fragment may not belong in this 'set' of next speakers starting up after a still-current speaker 'closes an intra-utterance pause', but may constitute a case of response by reference to an ongoing utterance's adequacy. That is, Bette's "Uh::m (1.9) How much was//it?" can, at the point of overlap onset, be perfectly available as locating a problem in Andrea's "nearly two pounds a week more", vis-a-vis the £10 a month Bette had earlier announced.

And the 'Conjunctival + Break' in this case can be, not only a 'leadup' marking the touchy character of the talk now underway, but can, in and of itself, constitute an indication of trouble in Andrea's statement and provide a place for her to produce a self-repair. Indeed, the silences which follow each of Andrea's formulations may be involved in eliciting while not explicitly requesting repair. For a consideration of these sorts of matters, see Anita Pomerantz's paper, "Pursuing a Response" (M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds., Structures of Social Action, C.U.P., forthcoming 1983).

And as Bette may be attempting to mitigate the touchy character of

the current interchange, so may Andrea be, with her initiation and abandonment of what turns out to be available as an explanation of her problematic "nearly two pounds a week"; i.e., 'After tax'. For one, 'After tax' can constitute an eliding of an otherwise longer sequence involving that the question be answered and then an explanation given.

Secondly, by producing only the first component, "After", and no more, Andrea may be providing a 'clue' for Bette. And by thereupon dropping out, she offers Bette an immediate opportunity to pick up on the clue, where, should that occur, then the problematic exchange can be drastically minimized.

Thereafter, Bette not immediately picking up on the clue, apparently not catching its import, Andrea abandons this attempt at minimization and proceeds to play out a fuller version of the problematic exchange, starting to deal with the question, "How much was//it?" with "Well//it's two pounds:::", dropping out when it becomes clear that Bette has, at last, picked up on the clue.

Thus, while in sheer turntaking/overlap terms, the phenomenon of a next speaker starting up incursively and then dropping out is puzzling to me, an analysis of the interaction in its own right provides an account. I had the same experience with the third fragment in this 'set' of three possible 'counter cases'. Looking at it in terms of sheer overlap, I was puzzled.

#### 4.b.3 [SBL:2:2:3:R:8] ((American telephone))

Chloe:            Jo said she js gotta t'rrific headache.  
 Claire:           Oh: did she,  
 Chloe:            Uh: at [when wu]  
 Claire:            [Well sh]:e star'd out with Jo- uh wi:th eh with Paa'  
                   poor Jo [: yih know]  
 Chloe:    (→)            [Y a h well] I-I:  
                   (→)            (0.2)  
 Chloe:    →    Uh:  
                   →            (0.2)  
 Chloe:    →    I don't [see how Pa]t can't like Jo:,  
 Claire:            [En she c'n]



of her 'nice guy' task and drops out. But it can be noted that as the talk proceeds, it turns out that Claire was very close to the mark, Chloe moving along a razor's edge between a 'personal position on' and something a bit more 'objective', with her "I can see where you can't like Pat", which itself was set up by the momentarily overlapped "I don't see how Pat can't like Jo".

Examination of the six possible 'counter cases' for the candidate procedure in which a still-current speaker should not 'close a pause' if a next speaker has started up, and now of the three possible 'counter cases' for the candidate correlate, in which a next speaker should not start up if a still-current speaker has 'closed a pause', indicates that they are not so much characterizable in terms of an equally legitimate procedure and its correlate (i.e., that a 'still-current' speaker perfectly well may 'close a pause' after a next speaker has started up, and that a next speaker perfectly well may start up after a 'still current' speaker has 'closed a pause), as that they are characterizable in terms of discretely accountable departures from the proposed procedure and its correlate.

And the skewed distributions as between the 'clean' cases (of both speaker transition and intra-utterance pauses, Set 2 and Set 1 respectively) and the 'incursions' (by both still-current and next speaker, Set 4.a. and 4.b. respectively) may be an artifact of and index to a base procedure which can be stated as: If a current speaker produces a 'Conjunctive + Break', then, whoever talks within the post-conjunctive silence, the other should stay out.

Such a procedure turns out to be a nice little specification of the 'rule' of 'First Starter Acquiring Rights to a Turn' proposed by Sacks et. al. in "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn

Taking for Conversation" (Language, November 1974).

The specification provides that this 'rule' applies not only to possibly complete utterances, but to incomplete utterances as well - at least at two characterizable and perhaps specifically critical places in terms of speaker transition; i.e., just after an utterance has begun, and just after it has passed a possible completion point.

Now this is an interesting possible regularity, but it is a bit ironic, and is indicative of the nature of the problem I am trying to work with, that in a search for some generic 'rules' for the resolution of overlap; i.e., for deciding who drops out and who proceeds, I have turned up a specification of a generic 'rule' for the prevention of entry into overlap in the first place.

I will turn now to the second possibility turned up in my exploration of conjunctionals.

## II. 'Pro-Tem' Speakership

I started exploring conjunctionals because I had got the impression that they were 'weak' in terms of taking or holding speakership. One can get such a feeling from Set 2, the 'clean' post-conjunctive speaker transitions. But I first got the impression from materials in which these objects were involved in overlap.

I found that recurrently when two speakers start up at the same time, or one starts up at possible completion and the other proceeds with further talk; i.e., in situations of what I am clumping together and calling 'transitional overlap', then: If one speaker is producing a conjunctive, that speaker drops out.

And as the collections grew, it turned out that in a limited sub-collection there are some 137 cases in which a conjunctive drops out



against an utterance or component begun with one of various other types of items. (The sub-collection excludes cases in which both or neither starts with a conjunctive, and cases in which an utterance or component begun with a conjunctive drops out but only eventually, or proceeds to completion but 'dysfluently'). Here are some examples.

### 5.1 [Rah:A:1:(6):2-3] ((British telephone))

Jessie: I think Thomas's gohtta ke:y thet̩ (.) u-Has'e taken it with  
'im do you kno:w?  
(.)

Mr. F.: \*→ Uh,

Jessie: → If- 'e wants tuh get in in the mohrning.

### 5.2 [NB:II:3:R:8] ((American telephone))

Emma: en God ah d'n e:v'n have't fo:n.  
(0.3)

Lottie: → °N [ o : ° ] kiddi:ng.

Emma: \*→ [ We:l< ]

Lottie: How come yih didn't sta:y.

### 5.3 [GTS:I:2:40:R:S] ((American face-to-face))

Ken: This wz th' firs'book that I think innybuddy wz ever ho:nest  
innit.  
(.)

Roger: Melt'n Ber:le wz innit,  
(0.4)

Roger: \*→ A: [nd

Ken: → [No I don' [know] ↑who it w]: 'z b y : ]  
Louise: [The firs' thing yih haft'do] is . . .

### 5.4 [Her:I:11:1] ((British telephone))

Doreen: Is it flu: you've ↑got?

Norma: ↓N\*ao \*I d\*on't th\*ing I refuse tuh have all the:se things

\*→ real [ly b(h)] 't hhh

Doreen: → [e h h h] h-heh-heh huh

### 5.5 [SBL:3:3:R:1] ((American telephone))

Milly: Uh Mister Osterhath agrees it w [ ' z ] p o o r l y 'hh  
Keith: [ We do ] n't care w ] hether

\*→ they raise'm or no:t. Be: [ ↓cuz:

Milly: → [ °Yah. ° hhh It was poorly do:ne

## 5.6 [NB:III:1:10] ((American telephone))

Fran: Yeh b't if I turn off on Harbor Bouleva:rd.hh'hhh I'd go  
 \*→ down t'th'Coast Highway en turn le:ft?er-  
 Ted: → nNo:::, that's  
 Thirty Ni:ne.

## 5.7 [Rah:A:1:(7E):1-2:R] ((British telephone))

Jessie: An'then about five minutes laytuh this chahp's fa:thuh  
 phoned. 'hhh tih say that it wz alright he'd put the  
 t(h)ent (h)up hhh huh hoh 'hhuh'h'hehh hhuh'hn< u-hhuh  
 'hhh Well I nearly die:d?  
 (.)

Jessie: Becuz I mean it's ↓co:ld an'it's bean so we(hh)t ez  
 we(h)e(h)ll heh heh  
 (0.7)

Jessie: \*→ 'hhh!'hhh S u - ]  
 Mum: → 'S'ee a ]lri:ght?  
 Jessie: fWell'e hasn'g'm b:ack yet.f

At least some of these fragments, and others like them, lend themselves to the following sort of characterization. One participant, finding himself with an occasion to start or resume speaking, or having just produced a possibly complete utterance, is now occupying a turn on a 'pro-tem' basis; i.e., unless/until another moves to take it. Such a participant is ripe for dropping out.

As it happens, conjunctionals are especially well suited for 'pro-tem' speakership. In the version of their paper, "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking" published in J. Schenkein, ed., Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, 1978, Academic Press, page 32, Sacks et. al. note that such objects

satisfy the constraints of beginning. However, they do that without revealing much about the constructional features of the sentence to follow. That is, they do not require that the speaker have a plan in hand as a condition for starting.

Now, an obvious extension of the feature, 'no requirement of a plan in hand' is that, using one of these objects, one can be showing, making it available, that one has no plan in hand.

Further, the availability of 'Conjunctional + Break' as a technique for producing an 'intra-utterance pause' provides for an extension of a state of speakership without yet proceeding into 'substance'. Where, further, the fact of a break in an utterance-in-progress can provide an occasion for a next speaker's starting (cf. the consideration of Progressional ('Hitch') Onset in "Notes on Some Orderlinesses of Overlap Onset").

Thus we have a candidate activity, 'pro-tem' speakership, and a device for its achievement, 'conjunctional + break'.

This activity and its device may account for at least some of the 59 cases of 'clean speaker transition' from which Set 2 was assembled, as well as some of the 137 cases in which conjunctionals drop out against utterances/components begun with various other items, represented in Set 5.

In some of the fragments of Set 5, it is possible that a participant who is taking on - and employing a device by which he might be available as taking on - 'pro-tem' speakership, has already been relieved of that task by a coparticipant more or less simultaneously taking on speakership. That is, we may be seeing concensus; one party prepared to speak unless/until another starts, another then and there starting.

The possibility of such concensus; i.e., of simultaneous onset of pro-tem speakership and another party's starting, may account for at least some of the 109 fragments from which Set 1, the 'clean intra-utterance pauses', was assembled. Specifically, a speaker prepared to relinquish a turn should another start up, finding himself now into and beyond the conjunctional with no other yet having started up, might take it that a next speaker is not going to start up, and procede now to 'close an intra-utterance pause'.

And this decision may be made very rapidly. In just under half of the 109 cases, the 'pause' is closed within two-tenths of a second (after about one-tenth of a second in some 38 cases, and after about two-tenths of a second in some 12 cases). To get a sense of such rapid decision-making, see Fragment 5.7, in which a speaker may, from the completion of her announcement that a tent had been put up, be monitoring for some response, such that in the 'micropause' [(.)] between "Well I nearly died" and "Because I mean...", a decision that a recipient is not going to respond may have been made and acted upon.

However, there is the altogether pervasive alternative phenomenon: Simply enough, that one starts an utterance and gets on with it, and one initiates 'continuation' and thereupon continues; i.e., one just takes up or continues speakership.

Earlier I said that conjunctionals are 'well suited for pro-tem speakership'. In the case of standard speakership it is not so much a matter of their being 'well suited'. Rather, it is some of their features which can have been adapted to pro-tem speakership. But the base phenomenon in which conjunctionals are involved is that of announcing a start or continuation and then going ahead with it.

And this base phenomenon may account for some of the 109 fragments from which Set 1, the 'clean intra-utterance pauses', was assembled. In at least some of those cases we may be seeing a speaker getting beyond a problematic point; i.e., showing that he has started to talk 'right now', where some 'right now' might matter. Or, having possibly completed, showing that he has not completed but is going on. That is, at points where another might start to talk, the conjunctionals may be deployed to keep him from doing so.

And while the subsequent break may be accountable in various ways, including now trying to work out the particulars of an utterance started in haste, or trying to remember something, or simply drawing breath, it might also serve an orientational purpose.

That is, a possible still-current or next speaker, perhaps aligning himself as such at this point, now having been shown that this is not a place to continue or start, can, in the 'break', reorient himself to his status as a recipient; i.e., prepare, again, to listen not talk.

Finally, the base procedure of employing conjunctionals for the standard, pervasive job of simply starting or continuing an utterance, can account for the fact that given the identical circumstances posed at the beginning of this section, then recurrently: If one speaker is producing a conjunctional, that speaker precedes. That is, in this same limited sub-collection of 'transitional overlap' involving conjunctionals, there are some 114 cases of utterances/components begun with conjunctionals proceeding against other items (as compared to the 137 cases in which the conjunctionally-begun utterances/components drop out). For example:

6.1 [MDE:60-1:6:1] ((American telephone))

Harriet: Yeh d'you know what time she'd be back in t'day?  
(0.2)

Sheila: Zis Harriet?

Harriet: Yeah.

Sheila: \*→ Hi Harriet. Uh about fi:ve.

Harriet: → Hi::

Harriet: Oh:::

6.2 [SBL:3:3:R:4] ((American telephone))

Milly: u-HAA M'CH DO I HAFTUH MAKE before I haftuh pay ta:x.  
(2.0)

Keith: 't' hhhhhhhh.

Milly: → I sn't there ] a cert ] 'n ]  
Keith: \*→ We : :ll ] i : t ] d' ] pends un'ow many deductions yih have

## 6.3 [SBL:2:2:3:R:9] ((American telephone))

Claire: Jo: was waitin tuh bi::d yihkno:w=  
 Chloe: → = [Yeh sh' kep ]tee  
 Claire: \*→ = [an:'she kep ]TAH]:LKIN A [BOUT IT]E N ]JO W'D STO:P YIHKNOW...  
 Chloe: [ha h a ]thaha

## 6.4 [NB:IV:3:R:3] ((American telephone))

Lottie: You: yih walked ho:me hu: h?  
 Emma: \*→ [Oh: |yeah it's del\*i:ghtf\*ul|  
 Lottie: → [ <but a ]lo:tta ]peo:ple ou:t.  
 [Dja go ]downa  
 (.)  
 Lottie: Yeah dja go down the dime store?

## 6.5 [G:93:AD:7:R:7] ((American face-to-face))

Denice: en'e go:t barred f'm the go-(.)cart track=  
 Denice: \*→ =be [cuz he ra:un liddle ]kids o(h)ff the tr [a:ck, ]  
 Cal: → [O v e r ]in Tiffen. [hmhhh]  
 Bart: [hmhhh]

## 6.6 [NB:II:2:R:18] ((American telephone))

Emma: Wanna c'm do:wn'av a bah:ta lu:nch w]ith me? Ah gut some  
beer'n stu:ff,  
 (0.3)  
 Nancy: ↑Wul yer ril sweet hon: ↓uh:m  
 (.)  
 Nancy: → [L e t- ]I : ]hu  
 Emma: \*→ [Or d'y ]ou' ]sup'n ]else °( )°  
 Nancy: n:No: I haf to: uh call Rol's mother...

## 6.7 [SCC:DCD:22-23] ((British face-to-face))

Bryant: I ga:ve what I: thowt wz'n expl'na:tion which in fact un I:  
 said the dig<sub>[it's w e a : u h.]</sub>ree of friction.]=  
 Sokol:  
 Bryant: → =I- [I u-I duh I dNo: I- I ]said I seh I s ]aid ↓friction . . .  
 Sokol: \*→ [So'ow cd it be wea:uh. You tell me:.]

Now, I have only two cases of the 114 in which 'Uh' is the conjunctive which precedes, and it does so against 'weak' competition. I have shown one of them, and it is worth a bit of discussion.

In Fragment 6.1 someone initiates an inserted 'greeting sequence' and then starts to talk before the projected return-greeting can be produced. It is possible that the 'Uh' in this case is deployed to 'absorb'

the return-greeting, which can be argued to be predictably "Hi" and no more, since one alternative is "Hi Missiz Lorenzi", which would be problematically formal and the other is "Hi Sheila" which would be problematically informal as between a teenaged caller to the youth-culture-oriented mother of the intended called. (For a consideration of just this sort of situation and just this sort of solution, see Harvey Sacks' unpublished lecture, Fall 1966 Lecture 1 pages 3-6, in which a new teenaged patient to a group therapy session reciprocates the therapist's "Hi Jim" with a 'no-name' greeting.)

And conjunctionals are 'well suited' to the task of such absorption, in that, as Sacks et. al. note (ibid, page 32), "their overlap will not impair the constructional development or the analyzability of the sentence they begin."

The remaining conjunctionals procede against both 'weak' and 'strong' competition. The instances in Set 6 were selected to show conjunctionals proceding against 'strong' competition. (Parenthetically, the 'overlap absorption' feature is clearly present in Fragment 6.2).

Given the altogether pervasive character of simply taking up or continuing speakership, it is pointless to develop a characterization analogous to that which follows Set 5. Simply enough, at a place where starting and/or stopping and/or continuing is relevant, both participants, effectively simultaneously, make a move to take up or continue standard speakership. In each fragment one of the participants happens to be using a conjunctional at that point.

So, it appears that there are these two discrete but converging/conflicting uses of conjunctionals. One has to do with the taking on of pro-tem speakership, with an inclination to drop out should someone else

start up. Evidence for such a phenomenon may be seen in Set 5, as well as the 'clean speaker transitions' of Set 2.

The other has to do with the pervasive, standard procedure of starting an utterance and getting on with it or initiating 'continuation' and thereupon continuing; i.e., simply taking up or continuing standard speakership. Instances of this phenomenon constitute Set 6.

Now, earlier I did some work with skewed distributions, as between the 59 'pickup' cases of 'clean speaker transition' from which Set 2 was assembled, and some 6 possible 'counter cases' shown in Set 4.a, and as between the 109 'pickup' instances of 'clean intra-utterance pauses' from which Set 1 was assembled, and the 3 possible 'counter cases' shown in Set 4.b.

I proposed that Sets 1 and 2 represented a standard procedure, the generic of which is 'First Starter Acquires Rights to a Turn'. It was not only that the distributions were heavily skewed, but that the 'collections' of possible 'counter cases', sets 4.a and 4.b, were wholly constituted by discretely accountable problematic interchanges which could then be characterized as variants of or departures from a standard.

That is, there seems to be a warrant for proposing that the larger collection instances a standard procedure, the smaller instancing, not so much a 'procedure' as a byproduct feature of problematic interaction.

In the two collections we are now looking at, we have no such warrant. Of 251 cases of 'transitionally overlapped' conjunctionals, of which a substantial enough number are on the face of it non-problematic (roughly 80 cases or 30% of the corpus are seated in interaction which is neither problematic, sensitive, nor speech-production pathological), we have 137 in which conjunctionals drop out and 114 in which they procede.



That is, something like 55% drop out and 45% procede. And while the 5% difference might be indicative, what it is indicating may well be the phenomenon of pro-tem speakership; i.e., that conjunctionals are recurrently used by speakers inclined to drop out should another start up. But all things considered, I would not be tempted to pose as a generic rule: Conjunctionals Should DropOut - and then treat the other 114 cases as problematic variants.

Thus, for a crucial event in which the 'strength' versus 'weakness' of conjunctionals might be assessed; i.e., one in which the activity being measured and some vaguely-conceived 'control' activity are initiated on an equal footing, the initial promising possibility that conjunctionals could be generically described as 'weak' against other activities, and thus that the sheer occurrence of a conjunctional could be treated as a definite 'factor' in the determination of why one participant drops out and one proceeds, appears to be invalidated.

#### Conclusion.

While the phenomenon of Overlap Onset lavishly rewards systems-focussed 'batch analysis', Overlap Resolution does not.

I specifically focussed on overlap in which conjunctionals were involved because over the course of the preliminary data run I'd got an impression that something general could be said about it; i.e., that conjunctionals tended to be 'weak' or 'overlap vulnerable'. As it turns out, it is very likely that what I was seeing was an artifact of the pro-tem speakership phenomenon, which is not a matter of 'weakness', but of a distinct procedure in which conjunctionals are deployed. When conjunctionals are deployed for standard speakership they seem to be no 'weaker' than any other utterance component.

In contrast to the batch-analyzability of Overlap Onset, the phenomenon of Overlap Resolution seems to require attention to such a range of possible 'factors' that an attempt to account for who drops out and who proceeds amounts to case-by-case, single-instance, interaction-focussed analysis. And the various attempts I have made to account for overlap resolution in materials not involving conjunctionals, has led me to the same procedures and conclusions.

It seems to me that the issue of orderliness vis-a-vis overlap resolution will have to be studied in an alternative fashion; i.e., by noticing and developing various discrete procedures in which overlap and its sequelae come into play, as artifact or device (pro-tem speakership, for example), rather than by looking for generic solutions.

And one can turn to the possible range of devices deployed within overlap to seek to resolve it. For example, John Local and Peter French of the University of York have proposed a particular acoustic configuration (loudness + high pitch) which may be deployed to induce a coparticipant to drop out. And, for example, some of our preliminary work has yielded various overlap-management devices such as internal recycling and prolongation of utterance components for the duration of a stretch of overlap (see, e.g., Jefferson and Schegloff, "A Sketch of Some Orderly Aspects of Overlap in Natural Conversation", unpublished, 1975).

But again, these various devices seem to be deployed in, and to stand as evidence of, the absence of generic rules for deciding who shall drop out and who shall proceed. It appears that what generic rules there are, are designed to prevent the occurrence of overlap in the first place.

## Glossary of Transcript Symbols

- [ A single left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset
- ] A single right bracket indicates the point at which an utterance or utterance-part terminates vis-a-vis another.
- = Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no 'gap' between the two lines.
- [] A combined left/right bracket indicates simultaneous onset of the bracketted utterances.
- It is also used as a substitute for Equal Signs to indicate no 'gap' between two utterances. This relationship may be shown as:
- E: Yah,=  
L: =Tuh hell with im.
- or as:
- E: Yah, []  
L: Tuh hell with im.
- (0.0) Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in silence by tenths of seconds. For example, (1.3) is one and three-tenths seconds.
- (.) A dot in parentheses indicates a tiny 'gap' within or between utterances. It is probably no more than one-tenth of a second.
- Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude. A short underscore indicates lighter stress than does a long underscore.
- :: Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The length of the colon row indicates length of the prolongation.
- :: Combinations of stress and prolongation markers indicate intonation contours. If the underscore occurs on a letter before a colon, it 'punches up' the letter; i.e., indicates an 'up → down' contour. If the underscore occurs on a colon after a letter, it 'punches up' the colon; i.e., indicates a 'down → up' contour.
- In the following utterance there are two pitch-shifts, the first, in "venee:r", an 'up → down' shift, the second, in "thou:gh", a 'down → up'.
- J: it's only venee:r thou:gh,

↑ ↓ Arrows indicate shifts into higher or lower pitch than would be indicated by just the combined stress/prolongation markers.

.,?? Punctuation markers are used to indicate intonation. The combined question mark/comma [?] indicates a stronger rise than a comma but weaker than a question mark.

These markers massively occur at appropriate syntactical points, but occasionally there are such displays as:

C: Oh I'd say he's about what.five three enna ha:lf?arentchu Robert,

And occasionally, at a point where a punctuation marker would be appropriate, there isn't one. The absence of an 'utterance-final' punctuation marker indicates some sort of 'indeterminate' contour.

WORD Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.

° The degree sign is used as a 'softener'.

Utterances or utterance parts bracketted by degree signs are relatively quieter than the surrounding talk.

A sub-scribed degree sign indicates unvoiced production.

A sub-scribed degree sign in parentheses [(b)] indicates an 'incipient' sound. For example:

E: you couldn'ev'n putcher hand ou:ts:I:DE the CAR  
ih jiz:(b)bu:rn.

And in the speaker-designation column, an empty parentheses plus degree sign [( )°] indicates that an unidentified speaker sounds like a female.

word A sub-scribed dot is frequently used as a 'hardener'. In this capacity it can indicate, e.g., an especially dentalized 't'. Usually when it occurs under a 'd' it indicates that the 'd' sounds more like a 't'. And, for example, under a possibly ambiguous 'g', it indicates a hard 'g'. Under a possibly ambiguous 'th', it indicates a hard 'th'.

Another sense in which it works as a 'hardener' is to indicate that a sound which is implied in the spelling of a word but is not usually pronounced, is indeed pronounced. For example, in "different" and "evening", which are usually pronounced as "diff<sup>h</sup>erent" and "eev<sup>h</sup>ning".

The sub-scribed dot is also frequently used as a 'shortener'; for example, in 'the<sup>h</sup>', which is pronounceable as "thee" or "thuh", if "the<sup>h</sup> uh:" is shown, then it is being pronounced "thuh".

And it can indicate a trilled 'r'.

- < A pre-positioned left carat indicates a hurried start; in effect, an utterance trying to start a bit sooner than it actually did. A common locus of this phenomenon is 'self repair'. For example:  
 C: Monday nights we play, (0.3) <I mean we go to ceramics,  
 J: y'see it's diffrent f'me:.<eh f'(.) the othuh boy:s  
 A post-positioned left carat indicates a sudden stop.
- A dash indicates a cut-off.
- > < Right/left carats bracketting an utterance or utterance-part indicate speeding up.
- 'hhh A dot-prefixed row of h's indicates an inbreath. Without the dot the h's indicate an outbreath.
- wohhrd A row of h's within a word indicates breathiness.
- (h) A parenthesized 'h' indicates plosiveness. This can be associated with laughter, crying, breathlessness, etc.
- f The florin sign is, for the time being, used to indicate a certain quality of voice which conveys 'suppressed laughter'. I have not yet settled on a symbol for this phenomenon.
- \* An asterisk indicates 'creaky voice'
- wghord A 'gh' stuck into a word indicates gutturalness.
- hr An 'h' preceding an 'r' softens the 'r'. This device is used frequently in my transcripts of British talk. Thus, e.g., 'part' is shown as "pahrt", 'court' as "cohrt", etc.
- ( ) Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said. The length of the parenthesized space indicates the length of the untranscribed talk.  
 In the speaker-designation column, the empty parentheses indicate inability to identify a speaker.
- (word) Parenthesized words are especially dubious hearings or speaker-identifications.
- (∅) A nul sign indicates that there may or may not be talk occurring in the designated space.
- (( )) Doubled parentheses contain transcribers' descriptions rather than, or in addition to, transcriptions.