

## **Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset**

GAIL JEFFERSON

Department of Sociology, University of York, Heslington, York YO1 5DD, UK

### **Introduction**

This will be in part a recapitulation and in part an extension of some of the work I did during my two years at the Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg, exploring the orderliness of overlapping talk. I had been interested in overlap for a long time, and had been noticing evidence of its orderliness. But I had been looking at a few striking, indicative cases. At Tilburg I worked with a mass of materials in which overlap, in one form or another, occurred.

One immediate payoff was this: In the past I had noticed that not *all* overlap was a matter of 'people just not listening to each other', a messy chaotic business, but to the contrary, that it *could*, at least now and then, here and there, be a matter of fine-grained attention. But I'd had no idea just how massively overlap is associated with such attention. In the apparent chaos of overlapping talk, I began to locate a series of systematicities which collected and ordered an enormous amount of material.

I'll be talking about one of those: Transition-space onset.

### **1. Transition-space onset**

Looking at talk which might well be characterized as someone starting up 'interruptively', i.e., in the midst of another's utterance, I found again and again that the places at which such talk started were perfectly reasonable 'completion' points.

\* Some of the results are reported in *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature*, No. 28, 'Two Explorations of the Organisation of Overlapping Talk in Conversation: Notes on Some Orderliness of Overlap Onset', and 'On a Failed Hypothesis: 'Conjunctivals' as Overlap Vulnerable'. For a version of the former see Jefferson (1983).

The overlap could then be seen as a byproduct of two activities: (1) A recipient reasonably, warrentedly treats some current utterance as complete, 'transition ready', and starts to talk, while (2) the current speaker, perfectly within his rights, keeps going.

I located a series of 'positions' across the transition space, and I'll just show a few cases of each; an instance of clean transition, and then a couple of instances of overlap.

### Possible completion onset

#### 1.1 [NB:II:3:R:1]

Emma : G'morning Letitia =  
Lottie : = u-hHow'r YOU:. =  
Emma : = FI:NE

The equal signs are marking a particular sort of relationship of one utterance to another: an absolute adjacency; immediately as one ends, the other begins.

And it turns out that a great deal of overlap can be seen to be a byproduct of a recipient starting just upon possible completion, with the current speaker going on. I've picked out a few cases in which it seems to me the recipient has particularly good warrant to treat an utterance as completed or transition-ready.

And the overlap can be minimal and unproblematic, as in the following two cases.

#### 1.2 [GTS:I:1:43:R]

Roger : Y'proibly ev nutt'na do wih those people.  
Louise : Hm:?  
→ Roger : Proibly ev nothing tuh do with those p\*eo\*p\*le.  
→ Louise : [ h<sup>uh</sup>. ]  
[ I d ] o:n't.

The 'particularly good warrant' in this case is that the utterance in question is a repeat of a prior. It turns out to be repeat plus a bit more.

#### 1.3 [MDE:60-1:6:1]

Sheila : Hello:?  
Harriet : Hello is Lila home?  
Sheila : nNo she's no:t. She:'s et school.  
Harriet : Yeh d'you know what time she'd be back in t'day?

(0.2)

Sheila : Zis Harriet?

Harriet : Yeah.

→ Sheila : Hi Harriet. [ U<sup>h</sup> about fi:ve.  
→ Harriet : [ Hi:.

And of course the warrant in this case has to do with a 'greeting' as a prototypical adjacency-pair first pair-part, where it's not only that such an object has powerful relevance for a next action, but that having done one, its producer has a certain obligation to permit that next action to occur.

Let me just note that the minimal, unproblematic character of the overlap in this case may not be accidental. Given the relevant identities of these people; that they are connected by the absent Lila, Sheila being Lila's mother, Harriet Lila's girlfriend, Sheila may be able to project a 'no-name' greeting from Harriet, where 'Hi Sheila' would be too informal for these persons on this occasion, but 'Hi Missiz Lorenzo' would be too formal; the solution, then, a 'Hi' and no more.

So these overlaps occurring at possible completion can be minimal, perhaps achievedly so. But they can become more florid. Again, here are a couple of cases where I take it that the recipient has particularly good warrant to treat an utterance as completed or transition-ready.

#### 1.4 [SBL:3:3:R:5]

→ Milly : O:kay that's all ah wan'duh know  
→ Keith : [ I thought it w ] z mu ] c h ]  
[ Y a h w ' l ]  
w e w e don' know how much is  
[in:]come h\*ere though,

Somehow 'Okay that's all I wanted to know' has a strong sense of finality about it. But, no, one can perfectly well go on with more.

The last fragment in this little set is another one of those prototypical adjacency-pair first pair-parts, 'How are you?' In this case the one asking the question goes on to produce a candidate answer.

#### 1.5 [Her:0II:2:7:5:R]

Doreen : Yes well pop in on th'way back'n pick it up  
Katie : °Thhank you ve 'y much° eh ha-how are you |all.  
→ [ Yer a l ] ittle ti:red ] °nah°  
→ Doreen : [ Oh wir ] all fi:ne, ] Yes I'm jus: sohrta clearing up

We can note the reasonableness of such further talk for such an item as 'How are you?' That is, it is in the first place merely a pro-forma question which recurrently gets just the sort of pro-forma answer it gets here, 'Fine.' The additional material here provides that there was a bit more to the question than that.

I'll just quickly go through two more positions in the transition space, again showing a case of clean transition, and then a few in which there is overlap, both minimal and more florid. These next two positions entail a slight incursion into the utterance in progress.

#### Terminal onset

##### 1.6 [Fr:USI:99:R:2]

((Vic has just accused Mike of having made a statement that 'came from an attitude.' This idiom rather defies translation; suffice it to say it's not a good thing.))

Mike : [Dɪn' come f'm'n ʌtɪtʌtuːd? (.) °ʌDon'tell me it came f'm'n ʌtɪtʌtuːd.°

(.)

→ Vic : °ɪ ʌcəme fʌm ʌn a:tɪt [ 0 ] °  
 [ Mike : Ah hɑ:h.  
 [ Carol : °Ehka:y.°

I show this particular case because it has two people starting up 'there'. And somehow I find it useful for, in the first place proposing that it *is* a 'there', to have such consensus.

##### 1.7 [Her:I:11:10]

Norma : Oh: yes cz Mɪn:x nɔw is (.) θree:: (0.3) θree pou:nds

→ eleve [ n. ou:nc [ es,  
 → Doreen : [ Ye:s, [ Ye:s,

##### 1.8 [NB:IV:1:R:1]

Emma : W't time yih haftih gɔ e:eleven?

(1.2)

→ Lottie : [Nɔ:: abah a quarduh twe:l [ ve twenny ] minnis t'twelve.  
 → Emma : [ O h : : ]

##### 1.9 [Rah:B:2:(14):10:R]

((re. why Vera's visiting grandchildren didn't want any lunch.))

Vera : ·h they muucked intuh bɪskɪts. They had (.) quite a lotta

→ biscuit [ sʰn che ] e e ↓ : : i s e , ]  
 → Jenny : [ Oh : : ] well thahtʰs it th ] en

##### 1.10 [JG:I:8:3]

Marge : Well so anyway I certainly hope thatchu wɔuld go wɪθ

→ hi [ m: beec- hh·hh

→ Colin : [ Yeəh well tuh tell tell'm [ ah'm-

Marge : [ BECAUSE HE ha:s already  
 arranged uhr a h-room up there so I know thetchu'd hæv  
 a plæc tih stɑ:y.

#### 'Last-item' onset

##### 1.11 [Her:01:2:2]

→ Jean : So well they won't be here Boxing [ Day?

→ Doreen : [ Oh ʌwell that  
 doesn'mattuh

##### 1.12 [SCC:DCD:23]

Sokol : Ah'll tell you'ow she does i:t? ·hhh That's ɔll sewn

→ tihgethuh by [ hɑy:nd.

→ Bryant: [ I thought this wz a very expensive (business)  
 I, I see [ this.

Sokol : [ °Yeh.°

##### 1.13 [GTS:I:1:68:R:4]

→ Roger : u-But heck I do the same damn [ t h i n g ] buh-

→ Louise : [ Oh ev'ry ] b'ddy does  
 s'sa° ↓:me th [ ing.°

Roger : [ Bud yers wz pretty obvhhi(h)ou:s heh

Note that the overlap in this case is resolved by the current speaker dropping out; i.e., it is not in the first place 'minimal' in the sense that some of the others are.

I've been trying to show very simple cases. I'll just show one – another case of overlapped 'last item' onset – in which the phenomenon is not so obvious.

As it happens, a recipient is 'interrupting' an 'if-then' formatted statement which eventually, after several rounds, turns out to be '... if it quiets one thing maybe it quiets ... your whole ... gastric ... kind of business.' What may be happening here is that the recipient is utilizing a simpler version, 'If it quiets one thing it quiets everything, for which, then, she is starting up at the projected 'last item'.

## 1.14 [SBL:2:1:8:R:5]

Bea : VERY often u-\*u:: anything that's given to yuh to:: qhujet things do:wn quiets mo:re then you wah:nt.

((ca. 8 lines omitted))

Nora : Well I spoze it does if it quiets one thing maybe it

→ quiet [s yer  
→ Bea : [uSURE] ly. [E V R Y t h u] EVRYthi:ng.

Nora : [yer w h o : l ] e  
(0.4)

Nora : who::le gas-s-tric  
(0.6)

Bea : E [v- eh-]  
Nora : [kind'v ] business.

Bea : Ev↑rythi:ng. Uh ha:h

So there is this phenomenon: Transition-space onset, speaker continuation, resulting in overlap. it is massively present; obviously so in many cases, more obscurely in others.

This is not to say that *all* cases of overlap are accountable in that way. People do, for various reasons, start up before a current utterance is anywhere near completed or transition-ready. I'll just show a few cases of these. I tried to find a neutral term for them and came up with 'interjacent' onset.

## 2. Interjacent onset

## 2.1 [GTS:1:1:44:R:2-3]

Louise : That's FI:VE TE:N? en tha:t's six foot two?:  
(0.2)

→ Louise : 'N how t [all u h r] you [A:] l,  
→ Roger : [How tall'r] |you Al.]

(0.7)

Louise : ih [↑hhuh] ↑hu  
Al : [I'm fi] :ve ] seven,

## 2.2 [MDE:60-1:3:1-2]

Sheila : What time did'e get on the pla:ne.

Tom : UH:: (0.2) I: don't know exactly I think ih wz arou:nd three uh'clock er something a'that sort.  
(0.2)

→ Sheila : Oh: maybe he g [o t s'm]  
→ Tom : [He took it ] et fou:r. Gerda says.

## 2.3 [SBL:2:2:3:R:38]

Zoe : an' he sorta ↓scares me,h

Amy : Have you seen im?

Zoe : 'hhh We:ll I(m) I've °↓met eem,°

→ Amy : 'hhhhh W'l \*uh actually:

→ Zoe : [when s h e's]  
[En the way th] e:y ↓pla:y. Oh-:  
(.)

Amy : Serious huh?

Zoe : 'h ↑Y-ah,

## 2.4 [NB:II:4:R:16]

Nancy : He's jst a ri:l sweet GU]\*:y. 'h 't 'hhhhh

Emma : [↑WONder]f\*ul.

→ Nancy : ↑So: we w'r [s\*itting in

→ Emma : [Y E R LIFE] is CHANG [ing

Nancy : [↑↑EEYE::A:H

Among the cases I had stuck together as 'interjacent onset', I had a subset that I was calling 'post continuation onset'. In these, a recipient would start up just after the current speaker had produced a clear indication of going on, following a possible completion. Here are a few of these.

## 2.5 [SBL:3:1:R:6]

Amy : all thetu stuff Maryou:? requires a lo:↑tta spa]\*:ce.

→ Ah me [a:n] i h 'hhh

→ Marylou: [Spe] cially ] if yer gonna have it open fuh the public,

## 2.6 [Fr:GS:4]

Mary : hn (h)he shiz we:ll, (0.5) u-ghesshu get ha:lf

→ en [I sid I GET M O] RE THEN H(h)ALF

→ Sue : [Wuh year wuzit?]

## 2.7 [SCC:DCD:26]

- Bryant : that brai:ding that wouldn't of bean touched with'n  
 → i:yn. The m [o:st we'd of done]  
 → Sokol : [O h : n o a : w] right, steam

## 2.8 [NB:IV:4:R:4]

- Emma : cz you see she wz: depending on: hhjm takin'er in tuh  
 → the L.A. deeple s:- depot Sundee so ['e siz]  
 → Lottie : [Ah:'ll] take'er in:

And that's a reasonable enough place to 'interrupt'. For example, if what has been – adequately and syntactically possibly completely – said so far is something to which a recipient wants to respond, and now it looks like the speaker is at least continuing and perhaps moving on to other matters, then one might want to get in now, while the initial matter is still relevant, even if it means interrupting.

Or, for example, as in the following fragment, the utterance in question might itself be treated as interruptive of something prior. This is taken from an interview of a group of young girls. One of them, Cindy, produces an utterance which could be just a remark, but could also be a story preface. Another, Kathy, then produces a similar sort of utterance. After a first possible sentence completion, Kathy starts a next clause, and simultaneously both the interviewer and the initial speaker, Cindy, make a move; the interviewer asking a question which will provide for a story being told, the initial speaker simply continuing her story.

## 2.9 [Labov:Quadro:I:1720:5:Simplified]

- Cindy : Th:ey got mad on Friday though I dint get home t'leven  
 thirty,  
 Debbi : ·hhhh [ ]  
 → Kathy : [ ] Yeh my mo [Oh::::] ther wz kinda mad  
 I [ ] din get  
 [ ] Louella : [ ] Where were you.  
 [ ] Cindy : [ ] En I had the ca:r, I don'know we were just– we went  
 t'the basketball game ...

So it looks like this is certainly some kind of 'there', a place for another or others to start up. Now, there was one really puzzling bunch of these things: someone would start at this 'post-continuation' place, and then immediately drop out. For example:

## 2.10 [Fr:USI:43:R:2:Simplified]

- Mike : Least'e c'd'v] done wz c'm dah::n en letchu know w't  
 → happ'n hey [look yi ] h gla:ss broke,  
 → James : [Tha:t– ]

## 2.11 [Her:III:1:4:2-3]

- Desk : Just one moment I'll uh he's in uh-actually in suhr:gery  
 → et the mo:ment ah'll [see'f I c'n get hold of [him,  
 → Heath : [ee– [eeYe:s,

## 2.12 [SCC:DCD:9]

- Phipps : Didju hev it ma:de (0.3) ju– soon ahftih you bowt th'  
 → m'terial? ohr ohr [lay::tuh. Was i [t in ] Febru'ry:  
 → Sokol : [W'1 I ]

## 2.13 [NB:II:1:R:12-13]

- Emma : °God ih° jist like a night ma: [re,  
 Lottie : [ ] Ihd e-seems like a  
 → fairy storeh I [ ] : couldn'believe it.  
 → Emma : [ ] I–

## 2.14 [GTS:I:1:50:R:1-2]

- Dan : it is part a'the function a'°th' ]group to begin d'sha:re°  
 → in ° ]some a'these things  
 so [ ] the others c'n understand ...°  
 → Roger : [W'1 ]

The question was, what on earth is this? They start up after it's obvious that someone is continuing, and then do this 'oops sorry' and drop out. I kept collecting the things, with this sort of question in mind, and after awhile it occurred to me that I'd got it wrong. Maybe they're not starting up 'post continuation'. Maybe the way to characterize where they're starting up – and this would handle, account for, these immediate dropouts – is that they're starting up by reference to the possible completion which precedes the continuation.

Further, there is a massively recurrent, systematic position for next speaker startings, which these things might be treated as instances of. It's another transition-space position. Where, then, just as the other 'transition space' onsets can end up in overlap as the current speaker continues talking, so can this one. I'm calling this position 'unmarked next' position.

### 3. 'Unmarked next' position

I call it 'unmarked' simply because in my transcripts I don't use a symbol to show this particular relationship. A recipient/next speaker produces his talk in such a way that it occurs with neither haste nor delay. It is not pushed up into or latched immediately onto the prior utterance, but permits just a bit of space between the end of the prior and the start of the next. It is 'simply next'. And I have the impression that this is the most common, the usual, the standard relationship of one utterance to another. Here is an instance.

#### 3.1 [NB:1:1:R:1:R]

Curly : Hello?  
 Bud : Curyly?  
 Curly : Ye:h.  
 Bud : Bud Hoffmeier.  
 Curly : Hī Bud how you doin.  
 Bud : Fīne.

To get a sense of 'unmarked next position' as a locus of overlap I'll sneak up on it gradually, starting with innocuous cases.

For example, there are cases where the overlapped material, while it might well indicate that a current speaker is 'going ahead', does not constitute 'talk' as such. Rather, the speaker is taking a breath, perhaps in preparation for further talk. So the overlapped material is literally, air. And the next speaker is producing talk which does not seem to be of the sort which would motivate 'interruption'; such things as brief 'receipts', 'acknowledgement tokens', etc. The resulting data is innocuous to the point of vacuousness.

#### 3.2 [SBL:2:1:6:R:3]

Tess : becuz I wz going dih haftih get out (.) early in the  
 morning I have (.) a p- (0.3) transaction et the  
 → ba::nk. (h) [hh  
 → Bea : ( ) [Yā:h.  
 Tess : A:nd uh 'p but it wou|dn't a'made any dīffrence cuz ah  
 → wz gunnuh dress t'guh down'n dō it  
 any↓WA:Y. (h) [hh  
 → Bea : ( ) [Yā:h.

#### 3.3 [Her:I:11:12]

→ Doreen: en Jonathan's gone tuh Kingston fer a meeting,  
 → Norma: ( ) [hh  
 → Norma: ( ) [Oh:.

#### 3.4 [MDE:60-1:5:1]

→ Sheila : they were already off someplace so Tony  
 called. (h) [hh  
 → Erma : ( ) [Oh:.

But these little receipts and acknowledgements also occur 'in the midst' of another's talk; specifically, after it is clear that a speaker is going ahead after a possible completion.

#### 3.5 [Rah:B:1:(13):3]

Jenny : I think she's got a- uh-m: one a'those: uh permanent  
 caravahns. (up) [in: Gro] ze|da: [le.  
 → Ann : ( ) [M m : ] [A:oh.

#### 3.6 [NB:IV:3:R:5]

→ Lottie : becuz they would really be the Spri:ng.  
 → Emma : (Let) [s see tha] t's twunny fī:'dollars ...  
 → Emma : ( ) [Ye a h.]

#### 3.7 [SBL:3:5:R:4]

→ Milly : Well that's it (an) [it's dīffrent then I've e:ver |līved  
 → Ginny : ( ) [ °Yah°

#### 3.8 [Owen:8B15(A):36]

Bette : It really keeps you going actually hol- ah mean both  
 → looking forward an'looking ba:ck. (on th) [holiday ...  
 → Andrea: ( ) [Ye:h

#### 3.9 [Friedell:30]

Hank : Well we better not spend three hundred fifty a month  
 → better be able tuh hold it, (0.6) three hundred,  
 → Sandy : (we) [ °Yeh,°

While in fragments 3.2-3.4 a current speaker may be not only pausing for breath but making a space for various orientation signals from a recipient, in fragments 3.5-3.9 no such opportunity is provided. That is, the recipient is pro-

ducing such a display just after a speaker has shown that no such thing is called for.

This phenomenon could be accounted for if the recipient/next speaker was designing his talk by reference, not to what occurred immediately prior to the start of his own talk, but by reference to what occurred a bit earlier; i.e., the possible completion of the other's utterance.

The design of the recipient/next speaker's talk could be characterized as providing a bit of space between the two utterances. The bit of silence, then, being part of the recipient/next-speaker's work in the first place.

It would not then be a matter of an utterance reaching possible completion, a silence occurring, and the recipient/next speaker understanding thereby that the prior turn is completed, whereupon he starts to talk, as is sometimes argued. Rather, as is nicely evidenced by 'last item' onset and 'terminal' onset, upcoming completion is projected as the talk in progress is unfolding. In the cases at hand, it may be that the recipient/next speaker undertakes to produce a particular, standard sequential configuration, with a small inter-turn space as a projected part thereof.

What the recipient/next speaker is doing, then, might best be described as producing an action which consists of: permitting a bit of space and then starting to talk.

Now, such an action might not have the recipient/next speaker in such an orientation as would have him listening for or attending to the occurrence of that small particle of sound inhabiting the little silence he is now, as part of his activity, providing for. He is, as it were, in a 'blind spot'. He is no longer in recipient orientation, but in a state of speakership, although he is not yet producing sounds.

Such an account handles these 'post-continuation' acknowledgements and receipts, and also the set of 'post-continuation' onsets followed by immediate dropouts (see fragment 2.10-2.14). They are not being produced 'post-continuation', but 'post possible completion plus a bit of silence'. That is, they are being produced to occur in 'unmarked next position'. As with other transition-space onsets, they happen to collide with a current speaker's producing further talk.

The possibility of a systematic, designed 'latency' in a recipient/next speaker's talk provides for an orderliness to some other sorts of overlap.

I'll mention two. One of them I haven't done any work on, and the data are often very messy. But they might at least partially be accounted for if this 'latency' is produced not only by recipients, but by speakers as well. That is, in a sort of correlate to the way in which a recipient might shift into speakership orientation and not listen for or hear a particle of further talk, a speaker having reached a point of possible completion might not shift into recipient orienta-

tion but maintain speakership orientation, and thus not listen for or hear that a recipient has started to talk. The speaker, then, could be characterized as providing a bit of space between two adjacent activities, and/or two adjacent syntactic components.

I haven't systematically collected these, but here are a few cases that will do for the time being.

### 3.10 [SBL:2:2:3:R:38]

- Zoe : well with Bud? en the way he says I'm not bid uh(h) w(h)'  
(h)if you s(h)ay two(h)o sump'n then I'm not gunna bi:d,  
→ (hh) [hh [I] dɒn't] thi:k Elva si-Elva would =  
→ Amy : (hh) [Oh th [ey] don't] ·hh  
Zoe : = take that kindly

### 3.11 [SBL:2:1:8:R:12]

- Nora : En the] little edge ed curled up'n wz showing re:d.h  
→ (hhh) [h En ah thought gee wh] iz what's thi:s.  
→ Bea : (hh) [Oh [f e r g'dness °say°]

### 3.12 [NB:IV:10:R:50]

- Lottie : we bought s'm hats et Wah uh Wəl:d-u-er Clɑ:rk's they  
həd uh: those uh (0.2) fisheen hɑ: [ts yih] know ] =  
Emma : [Mm:] hm:, ] =  
→ Emma : = (doze lid) [dle] (badges) Yeh  
→ Lottie : (doze lid) [\*a-] do:llar ] so I ]: bought one fer he:|:r,

One that I have collected systematically occurs after a completion followed by a silence. One participant starts up a bit after another. Again, the possibility is that each now being in speaker orientation is not listening for or hearing that the other has started. In such cases the 'latency' can be on the part of prior speaker or recipient, or as in fragment 3.20 below, can occur as between two recipients of a prior utterance. I'm showing cases across a range of lengths of silence, from a 'micropause' of just over 1/10th second, to a substantial silence of one and four-tenths second.

### 3.13 [Her:I:6:11]

- Helen : Alright ↓fine.  
Doreen : Okay,  
→ (.)

→ Doreen : (Lo) [ve t'you |a] ll  
 → Helen : ( ) [ B y e : , ]  
 (.)

Helen : Bye:,  
 Doreen : ↑Bye:,

## 3.14 [JG:II(a):6:1]

Maggie : But'e said a lotta times it happens 'e said I could've even  
 been allergic tih something thet I js:t yihknow (.) ATE  
 → (0.2)

→ Maggie : (en) [it j's] t effected me like tha [ t.  
 → Sorrell : ( ) [ °Yeah, ° ] [ °(Mm) ° ]

## 3.15 [Erhardt:8:1]

Pam : I want to kno:w (0.7) whether you: will(b) would be free:,  
 (.) to work o:n um tomorrow night.  
 → (0.4)

→ Vicky : (Thur) [s d a] y? [ ] Yes.  
 → Pam : ( ) [bec'z] [ ] Yes.

## 3.16 [Owen:8B15(A):25]

Bette : [Oh::.  
 Andrea : [on a G ] ood ↑Fri [ day.  
 Bette : [ Friday.

→ (0.5)  
 → Andrea : (So) [w e 'v e g o t to take th'MQ ] torbike or =  
 → Bette : ( ) [Where'v you got to get to this ]  
 Andrea : = something

## 3.17 [Labov:Bat:II:4]

Parky : They've got fo'ovuh there,  
 → (0.7)

→ Parky : (You s) [ee two, (.) trainees en then you see the two =  
 → Lorna : ( ) [I-  
 Parky : = stah:s.

## 3.18 [GTS:I:2:94:R:1-2]

Louise : ennit's discussion |groups:. on a subject with one  
 teach\*er.  
 → (0.8)

→ Louise : (I) [t' s u] m ↑very few cla:sses. as classes.  
 → Roger : ( ) [ °Hm, ° ]

## 3.19 [JG:I:24:8-9]

Laura : But I know thet Joe did say he had a letter from im.  
 → (1.2)

→ Marge : (Eh di) [d he tell you- 'hh  
 → Laura : ( ) [That's all he said.

Marge : Well did he tell you that when you phoned im . . .

## 3.20 [G:84:AD:52]

Cal : You know why niggers are always goin like dis?  
 → (1.4)

→ Bart : (Ban) [d e o d orant? ]  
 → Len : ( ) [They don'know ] what they wanna do:.

So there is a great deal of data in which, in varying degrees, someone starts up 'in the course of' another's talk, which can be characterized in terms of 'transition-space' onset or, as in fragments 3.13-3.20 in terms of for all practical purposes 'simultaneous' starts. The account for the 'interjacent' starting has to do with a systematic 'blind spot', each participant being in speakership orientation and not listening for or hearing a bit of talk by another. That is, someone can be systematically described as not having heard.

Now, this is not to say that participants *cannot* be hearing and dealing with either the sheer fact that someone has started to talk or is continuing after a possible completion, or with what is being said, in particular, in that bit of talk. People can and do react to small particles.

## 4. Consensus or reaction?

In the following two fragments, someone does a checkout on a prior utterance, and the prior speaker produces a confirmation. In each case, after just a bit of the confirmation object has been produced, we get an acknowledgement of that confirmation.

## 4.1 [JG:II(a):3:2]

Sorrell: she's a'ready gone cz Claire's there.  
 (0.3)

Maggie Oh: (.) Claire came in?

→ Sorrell: (Ye) [ ah. en she siz ] no prob'm she'd work tihda:y  
 → Maggie : ( ) [ °O h: okay, ]



## 4.2 [JG:I:16:6]

- Pete : No ah'll call again,  
 Grace : You will.  
 → Pete : (Ye) [ ah.  
 → Grace : ( ) [ Ah-hah ·hh Ah'll tell'im then.

And across a range of circumstances and activities we can see recipients attending to small particles. The cases I'm showing might be seen as a systematic subset of 'interjacent' onset; i.e., 'recognitional' onset.

## 4.3 [Her:I:6:9]

- Doreen: If by any chance, (0.8) theh isn't anybody heuh I've got  
 tih go out jus fer awhi:le, [ ·hh ] What is your- new-  
 Helen : [ Ye: ] s  
 → Doreen: What is your (telee) [ phone ] nummuh?  
 → Helen : ( ) [ Well ] we're n] ot on the phone  
 y [ et.  
 Doreen: [ Ah I see:.

## 4.4 [Rah:II:11:R]

- Jenny : But- ee-ee °two pihleece cahrs'd° stopped outsi:de. =  
 Ida : = eeYe:: [ s?  
 Jenny : [ ·h An'that whether he tho:wt that I ed'n  
 → Ida : (ac) [ cidn't [ [ ohr someth ] ing I don't kno:w. =  
 → Ida : [ I:: [ [ k n e o : w ]  
 Jenny : [ B't ·h  
 Ida : = [ n↓No::

## 4.5 [Fr:TC:I:1:2-3]

- Shirl : Who w'yih [ta:lk]ing to.  
 (0.6)  
 Geri : Jis no:w?  
 → Shirl : ·hhhh No I called be-like between  
 (ele) [ ven en  
 [ I: wasn't talkeen tuh a:nybuddy. (b) Bo-oth  
 Marla 'n I slept'ntil about noo:n,

## 4.6 [MDE:60-1:5:2-3]

- Erma : did you hear w't'e: she- tol:d Lisa? ·hhh thet they w'r  
 c'nsidered the cutest couple in [ the cla:ss? [ ( )  
 Sheila : [ ·hhhhhh [ Yeh- Wul  
 this: this was official, apparently this goes into the  
 → (yea) [ rbook.  
 → Erma : ( ) [ Oh: yer kidding. How adorable.

## 4.7 [NB:IV:13:R:12]

- Emma: What city is] it i]:n.  
 (0.8)  
 → Lottie: Wul 't 's in (Cos) [ ta Me ] :sa  
 → Emma: ( ) [ Costa ] Mes ] a

Some of these 'recognitionals' can get quite delicate. In the following fragment it appears that an initial consonant is adequate for acknowledgement to occur. Here, a repair is being made from 'fifty cents' to 'fifty dollars'.

## 4.8 [Friedell:32]

- Sandy : I wz figuring- six twunny five is what I get f'm Merit so  
 rother [ t h e n ] be [ ing f ] ifty cents.  
 Hank : [ A'right ] [ Okay, ]  
 (.)  
 → Sandy : u-mean fifty (d) [ ollars. ] (.) ou:t, we'd be ...  
 → Hank : ( ) [ Ye:h, ]

And in the following fragment a possible alternation between 'shoot' and 'shit' is reacted to upon the occurrence of the crucial vowel. I'll just note that we have a great deal of talk between these two women, and their friends, neighbors, relatives, and this is the only occurrence of the word 'shit'. They routinely use 'shoot', 'doggone' and others of a mild grade, 'damn' and 'hell' being the boundary expletives.

## 4.9 [NB:II:5:R:3]

- Emma: 'e wantih pull a tooth'n make me a new go:ld uh: ·hhhh  
 (0.2) bridge fer (.) EI:GHT HUNDER'DOLLARS.  
 → Lottie : °Oh:: sh:: [ i ] :t.°  
 → Emma: ( ) [ Shi ] :t. (0.2) is [ ri:ght.

In fragments 4.1-4.10 it seems quite clear that a recipient is exhibiting that his response is directed to the particle which directly precedes that response.



## 4.12 [GTS:I:2:19:R:5]

((Jeff is reporting a success with his parents, who have stopped interrogating him about his comings and goings.))

Jeff : Nob'ddy se|z inning yih jis keep °whha:lkin.° hh  
°yihknow  
(0.2)

Jeff : It's j|bghuggin' |mhhe(h)now [ hm hm  
Joann: [ ↑Don'ta ] lk tih |them talk

t'ɹ:°s:  
(1.3)

Jeff : No (.) th- (0.4) drapes er closed now I c'n see through  
that liddle crack et th'window over there  
(2.0)

→ Dan : Yer very ↑°conscious'v th'm being in the:re. (Je) [ ff.  
→ Joann: ( ) [ He

keeps:: [ ↑talk [ in' |there.  
Jeff : [ °ih° [ It doesn' ] rilly |bother me,

The overlap in question could be occurring at a very touchy moment. Joann having raised the issue of the observers in the first place, it's possible that Dan's remark is addressed to her. Indeed, the appending of the boy's name may be directed to clearing such a possible ambiguity, similar to Elmondorf's work in the prior fragment, with his shift from 'Go ahead' to 'City.'

And similarly to City's problem in the prior fragment, Joann could be monitoring for which of the two who have shown themselves to be 'conscious of them being in there' is being addressed. If that is so, then the 'recognitional' work in this case is a bit finer than in the prior, the alternative names in this case starting with the same consonant. What would be involved here, then, would be another instance of that very fine sort of monitoring and response seen in fragment 4.9 vis-à-vis the 'shoot'/'shit' alternatives; i.e., recognition upon the occurrence of the crucial vowel.

One problem with this fragment is that it is face-to-face interaction and we don't have the video. Dan might be looking straight at Jeff, in which case we have a trivial instance of 'unmarked next position' onset happening to overlap with an appended and unnecessary particle. On the other hand, it turns out that frequently just such actions as Dan is producing; e.g., challenges, confrontations, etc., are done 'blind' – a term introduced by a graduate student of Harvey Sacks, Blaine Roberts. That is, they are done specifically *not* looking at the recipient. And there is at least one other reasonable target for Dan's eyes – the controversial observation window.

So, we have a possible case of a very delicate monitoring for and reaction

to an otherwise 'blind spot' particle. Or just another case of overlap in the transition space.

I'll show one more case of possible intermediate reaction to a small particle, or possible independent actions which exhibit consensus. It's taken from a conversation between the two ladies of fragment 4.9. In this case, in a range of ways, we can see Lottie working to have the conversation end, without herself having been the one to end it.

## 4.13 [NB:III:4:R:3]

Emma: ·hhhh Well ah won't KEEP yih honey,

Lottie: Oh [that's oka:y, (uh) [ (I'm just)

Emma: ( ) [ Have ↑fun fīshin↑ ah hope yih  
catch a big one,

Lottie: Yeah.  
(0.2)

→ Emma: (Al) [right,  
→ Lottie: ( ) [Okay] honey,  
(.)

Emma: [ ] Bye bye,  
Lottie: [ ] Bye bye

For example, 'Oh that's okay' does not disagree with the proposal that she's being 'kept' on the phone. In other such cases we see strong disagreement items, and/or devices for showing that one is happy to keep talking, e.g., introducing a new topic, referring back to a prior one, asking about something in recipient's life, etc.

Then, the 'Yeah'. It occurs at a point where she could initiate Closings with, e.g., 'Okay.' So she's clearly not doing Closings. But in terms of being in conversation, she's put the talk into a state which John Lee and I call 'attrition/hold'. Roughly, it hasn't been closed off, and thus is still alive, but such an object as 'Yeah' provides no materials for the coparticipant to take off from or work with. If the talk is to keep going, it's up to the coparticipant to find something to say. Thus, the sense of 'attrition'.

Focal for us is her 'Okay' which is alternatively 'latent' or 'recognitional'. It *might* be occurring just and only when Emma has recognizably initiated Closings. That is, withholding an overt entry into Closings until Emma does the initiating, and then pouncing on it the moment she has, reifying it with what might stand as a 'simultaneous second', similar to the terminal pair (the 'good-byes') (see work on closings of G. Button, forthcoming).

For the terminal pair there is indeed perfect independent consensus; they occur utterly simultaneously. But for the prior pair there is, ambiguously, con-

sensus or fast reaction, one party waiting until the other has recognizably made a move, and then responding to it.

To get a sense of the issues involved here, we can look at another case of Closings; one which is in some ways very similar, but in crucial ways quite contrastive. In this case there is no possibility of seeing 'consensus'. This is a man talking to his elderly mother.

4.14 [Her:I:5:6:R]

Heath: Well you leave that w'n with me.  
(0.3)

→ Janet : Yes (alri) [ :ght, ]  
→ Heath: (   ) [ A ] right,  
(0.5)

Heath: Bye:,  
Janet : Bye darling,

In the first place, Janet's 'alright' is not necessarily a Close-initiation, but an agreement to an arrangement. By coming in on it in terminal overlap, with another 'Alright', Heath retroactively provides that it is the first of a Close-initiating pair.

And in contrast to fragment 4.13, there is no subsequent consensus. Janet remains silent at a point where she might herself volunteer the first of the terminal pair.

In this case we can see Heath placing his 'Alright' in such a way that, that Janet has done a first is unequivocal; i.e., enough of it has been produced before he starts up. In fragment 4.13, Lottie places her 'Okay' in such a way that it is not clear whether she is responding to Emma's, or whether they have both independently and for all practical purposes simultaneously, moved to close the call. In fragment 4.14 we have a clear case of 'you started it'; in 4.13 a possible case of 'we agree'. (And see fragment 2.1 as another ambiguous case involving a possible 'saying the same thing at the same time' consensus).

Now, the fact that people do have the capacity to react to a very small particle – when they are in various ways primed for its occurrence – may provide them with the capacity to achieve a display of consensus in contrast to response, specifically by responding quickly enough to make it at best ambiguous as to whether they're acting independently or responsively. And in fragments 4.11-4.13 we may be seeing such achieved independent consensus occurring in what is otherwise a 'blind spot' in conversation. That is, the consensus is achieved in part by producing what is systematically characterizable as transition-space overlap; a mere coincidence of two independent activities.

In a sense, I've gone to a lot of trouble and ended up within a membrane's

thickness of where I started. That is, I started out with a batch of cases which I initially took to be someone starting up after hearing that another was still talking after a point of possible completion. I argued that they might not be that at all, but yet another sort of transition-space onset, providing for a 'blind spot' in which just those particles which make the new talk 'interruptive', are not heard. And now I'm trying to argue that perhaps *some* of those cases are indeed perfectly well heard.

But I think that membrane-thin difference matters. It can matter in terms of managing to exhibit independent-minded consensus when one has, in fact, responded to what another is doing. It may also matter in terms of something like 'rights to a turnspace'. Roughly, if one can manage one's talk in such a way as to achieve a lawful placement of it, i.e., in the transition space, then one may have every bit as much right to be talking as did the prior speaker in his turnspace. And I would argue that the vast majority of apparent transition-space onsets – Last-item, Terminal, Possible Completion, and Unmarked Next-Positioned – are lawful. That is, that they are produced by reference to seeing that an utterance is just ending or just ended.

But there is this very recurrent business of a recipient starting up in the transition space for an utterance, finding that what he took to be 'an utterance' was not yet an utterance, and that the current speaker is still talking.

## 5. What is 'completion'

Perhaps the materials and considerations I've gone through could be the basis for a complaint against the way a lot of recipients do a lot of their talk. That is, if they would only wait a bit longer, they'd see that the speaker isn't finished just because he's arrived at a possible completion point. That is, we could propose that something like Utterance + Pause *should* be the way talk proceeds. Perhaps, indeed, the way it is designed to proceed, where, then, we're seeing a 'breakdown' of conversational rules.

But that doesn't take into account the fact that even a very tiny silence can be treated by a *speaker* as problematic; where, then, they will engage in activities to deal with that problem. Anita Pomerantz (1984) considers this issue: she works with rather substantial silences, of approximately one second. I'll just show a few fragments in which even a tiny delay can cause problems.

Here are two fragments from a same corpus; calls between a family and some of their friends and neighbors. There are two women who call routinely to talk to the mother. When the phone is answered by the youngest boy, he tells his mother that it's 'Auntie Lorna' or 'Auntie Myra'. When the older boys answer, they just tell her 'It's for you.' And that sets up the problem. In one such call we get the following.

- 5.1 [Rah:B:1:(12):1]  
 Jessie: °Hello?°  
 (0.5)  
 → Myra: Jessie?  
 → (0.3)  
 → Myra: It's me:,  
 Jessie: Oh hello My:ra.

I don't know what the first silence of half a second is about, but I doubt whether it involves Myra waiting to see if Jessie is finished talking or not. What I want to note here is the shorter (0.3) silence, in the course of which I take it that Myra decides that Jessie hasn't recognized her voice, whereupon she provides more voice (with 'It's me'), whereupon Jessie, in unmarked next position, displays recognition — and with the 'Oh' shows that there was indeed a problem (see John Heritage, 1984, on 'Oh' as a 'change of state' token).

In a subsequent call we get a tighter version of this phenomenon, with a silence of under two-tenths of a second; i.e., a 'micropause'.

- 5.2. [Rah:C:1:(16):1]  
 Jessie: °Hello:°  
 → Myra: Hello Jessie.  
 → (.)  
 → Ida : [ [ It's m e :. ]  
 Jessie: [ [ Oh hello the ] ah.

And in this case it so happens that just as Myra sees that there is a problem and moves to resolve it, her recipient has herself resolved it.

This very short 'tolerance' by a speaker for inter-turn silence can be seen across a range of activities. I'll just show a few cases, in which, as in fragment 5.2, a speaker's problem-resolutional activity collides with a recipient's (slightly delayed) response.

- 5.3 [Rah:A:2:(9):1-2:R]  
 Jessie: I've only jus goht in en ah thowt w'l p'hahps ih wz a  
 bit late tih come round [ d f'coff ] ee:. [ ]  
 → Alice : [ N o ↑: ] [ ] If you've t̄:me,  
 → (.)  
 → Alice : [ [ Have yih? ]  
 Jessie: [ [ It's j̄st ] ] thet evrybuddy seems t'be in to:wn tihday.

- 5.4 [GTS:I:1:44:4]  
 → Roger : I guess I jis didn'wanna be like evrybuddy ↑c:lse.  
 → (.)  
 → Roger : [ [ Y'knō ] w? ]  
 Louise: [ [ You: ] a\_\_ ] rn't.

- 5.5 [G:93:AD:7:7]  
 → Bart : Well you r'member when McKuen did tha:t?  
 → (0.3)  
 → Bart : [ [ L o :ng ] t̄ime ago ...  
 Cal : [ [ ↓(Nō:.) ]

- 5.6 [SBL:2:2:3:R:27]  
 → Zoe : Ellen had fiftee:n.  
 → (0.3)  
 → Zoe : [ [ h̄undred.  
 Claire : [ [ Oh:,

Here's another, that I think is particularly lovely. It occurs in the course of a conversation which is part of a series taking place during a hurricane and flood in New Orleans. Josh is the commander of the New Orleans Civil Defense. Opal is a woman who has been trying to reach her brother by telephone. She finally has reached him, and has told Josh some of the eyewitness materials she got from him.

The point at which the fragment starts involves a nice sort of problem. Josh is attempting to elicit further information, with a device Anita Pomerantz (1980) has described. Roughly, one does not ask, but provides for its relevance by delivering the partial knowledge one has oneself. In this case, however, that Josh is Commander of Civil Defense may be relevant to Opal's hearing of his utterance. She (eventually) produces no more than an acknowledgement token, and a token of the sort I have elsewhere proposed to display particularly 'passive' reciprocity.

Parenthetically, the fact that she doesn't do even that for half a second may constitute a real case of silence telling a recipient that some sort of speaker transition should occur.

- 5.7 [CDHQ:II:252:R:3-4]  
 Josh : Ah heard uh: first thet there wz r̄illy s'm water in:  
 Mohg'n C̄ity up uh: waiz d̄eep uhr something.  
 (0.5)  
 → Opal : M̄m hm,

- (0.2)  
 → Opal : [ [ Well ] now he ]  
 Josh : [ [ U h ] how f<sub>0</sub> ] :r inlin:d uh did he ↑say 'nything  
 about s'im: uh|::\*: s'm qthuh (0.6) ·k \*uh: cities like  
 Lahfeeyet ...

What I want to be focussing on is that in the (0.2) silence following the acknowledgement token whereby Opal shows herself to be still aligned as a recipient, both parties come to see that there is a problem, and what the problem is. Simultaneously they produce the same class of remedial activity. Opal starts to report something that a 'he' told her, and Josh asks what a 'he' said, 'he' being the temporarily lost brother with his eyewitness materials.

It seems to me that fragments 5.2-5.7 are particularly nice data for the issue of completion not being a matter of an utterance + pause. Even such tiny silences can be problematic and generate remedial activities. And, as in these cases, result in overlap. But it might be argued that I've got it wrong again; that what I'm treating as completion + problematic silence + remedial activity is in fact a speaker making the briefest of intra-utterance hesitations; that what they say next was in the first place designed to be part of a single utterance. That is, that neither the recipients nor I have waited long enough, and once again what we're seeing is some form of interjacent onset, or 'interruption'. Well, how long shall we wait? Over half a second?

#### 5.8 [NB:IV:13:R:25]

- Emma: yih don't go tuh work til three:,h  
 (0.4)  
 → Lottie: Fou:r.  
 → (0.6)  
 → Lottie: [ [ T'da:y ] 's Sa: ] turday.  
 Emma: [ [ O h: f ] ou:r. ]  
 (.)  
 Emma: ↑Aoh that's ↓r\*ight.°

How about one second?

#### 5.9 [Fr:USI:8-9:R]

- Vic : Wut's left aftih you take th'chez up.  
 (.)  
 [ Mike : Nothi [ ng. ( )°  
 [ Fred : [ There's [ b<sub>a</sub>:re floo:r.  
 → (1.0)

- Mike : [ [ Just fl ] oo:r. ]  
 Vic : [ [ Thez no ] ho: ] le?  
 Mike : NO::|::.

I'll stop at one second because some work I've done recently indicates that one second is some sort of 'standard maximum' silence (Jefferson, forthcoming), so whatever one might mean by 'waiting long enough', waiting beyond one second is waiting too long.

Every now and then we can find materials in which a best characterization might in fact be that a speaker takes it he's finished and a recipient isn't sure, so he waits a bit. There was that possibility in fragment 5.7. And here is the one other case I have that feeling about.

#### 5.10 [SBL:3:5:R:10]

- Milly : En I said I'd never heard Hunter so that w'd be most  
 interesting. =  
 \*→ Ginny: = It certainly could (the) [ et le ] ast tha:t one ] that =  
 Milly : [ Y a h ] she tol' ] me ]  
 Ginny: = I heard was  
 → (0.7)  
 → Milly : She tol'me he wz wonder [ ful,  
 Ginny: [ Yah

Roughly, there may be a particularly problematic combination of structure and intonation which makes it unclear whether 'At least that one that I heard was' is a completed pro-formed re-use of the prior 'that would be most interesting', or is as yet incomplete, its speaker in a wordsearch for a description, e.g., 'At least that one that I heard was ((pause)) fascinating.'

But as far as I can see, for the vast majority of cases 'utterance + pause' does not capture the routine ways that recipients monitor talk in progress. What it does recurrently catch is a particular sort of problem posed for speakers.

When I talk about how recipients monitor an utterance in progress, I talk in terms of possibly complete actions, and/or syntactic possible completion. Now and again people ask if I've considered intonation, and if so, does it matter? I say I have, and it doesn't seem to.

At the start of this project on overlapping talk I did a mass of transcribing, and was careful to catch a range of intonational features, assuming that would have a lot to do with the phenomenon. But while I was working with the materials, it didn't seem to matter. Speakers would, for example, produce what I

heard as 'full stop' intonation and then keep going (see, e.g., fragments 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.7, 1.9, 2.5, 2.7, 2.12, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.11, 3.18, 4.1, 4.5, 4.10 and 4.12). Or, for example, speakers would produce 'continuing' or indeterminate intonation, a recipient would start up, and there would be clean transition (see, e.g., fragments 1.1, 1.5 and 2.3). What held across cases of clean transition and recipient onset resulting in overlap alike was observable completed actions or syntactic possible completion.

But recently, John Local and John Kelly at the University of York have been doing some interesting work with intonation in actual sequences of talk, and getting some possible results in terms of turn transition, etc. (see the following paper in this issue: Eds.); and their work brought me to wonder if I had been looking at the phenomenon properly. Perhaps intonation does matter, and somehow I'd missed it. I undertook a data run, to see how often 'clean transition' and 'overlap' were associated with 'completion' intonation and 'non-completion' intonation.

I immediately ran into two problems. One was that I have only the grossest idea of what 'completion intonation' is, or could be defended to be. But there were some contours I supposed anybody would agree to be completion or non-completion intonation, so I focussed on those. The second problem has begun to be familiar. Roughly, if something 'works' it's there and if it doesn't 'work' it isn't there. So there would be an intonation contour that I'd identify as 'completion intonation'. If it occurred in a case of clean transition, it was unproblematically 'completion intonation'. But if it occurred in a case of overlap, I found myself doubting that it was really a case of 'completion intonation'.

Nevertheless I counted, and came up with some strong results. I suppose this could mean that the base phenomenon is very strong indeed, if the cockeyed way I was going at it could get results. I used some 800 cases of transition-space overlap involving 'possible completion' and 'unmarked next position' onset. And I matched those with some 800 cases of clean transition, with recipients starting up in those two positions. The results:

Clean Transition:	ca. 70% after completion intonation;
	ca. 30% after non-completion intonation
Overlap:	ca. 75% after non-completion intonation;
	ca. 25% after completion intonation.

For one, in the vast majority of these cases, intonational features that can be described as signalling intent to stop or continue are matched by what speakers actually do thereafter (in 70% of clean transitions and 75% of overlap; about three quarters of the total corpus).

And in a great number of these cases, recipients can be described as starting

up not only by reference to a possibly complete action and/or syntactic possible completion, but to a speaker's signal of intention to stop (again in that 70% of clean transitions, and in 25% of overlap; about half of the total corpus).

And if there is something like an intonational rule that says if a speaker signals completion then he should stop, and if he signals non-completion then a recipient should not start, then *all* of these cases of overlap could be described as the result of one or another party violating the rule. Three quarters involve a recipient starting up where there has been possible syntactic/activity completion but not completion intonation. One quarter involve a speaker producing completion intonation and then not stopping.

How could I have missed this? I suppose it has to do with the fact that the whole of my original corpus consisted in these 'violations'. To use a Man From Mars analogy: plunk this creature down on a city street near some traffic lights. Now every car going through the intersection crashes into a car coming across the other street. Asked what sort of orderliness he noticed, he might propose, 'Crashes occur at intersections!' Pressed about whether the traffic signals matter, he might well say, 'Not so you'd notice.'

But even when an equal number of clean transitions are added to the corpus of transition-space onsets, with all 1600 cases taken in the aggregate, a problematic pattern can be seen: just under two thirds of the entire corpus involves what could be described as some sort of 'violation' of this candidate rule. About 27% are done by speakers (15% stopping without signalling completion and 12% continuing after signalling completion) and about 35% are done by recipients (starting with no completion signal from a speaker).

So, although in three quarters of the cases, speaker's subsequent activities can be seen to match the intonation contour they've used on a possibly complete utterance, and in half the cases recipient's activities can be seen to match the intonation a speaker has used, it is only in just over a third of the cases (the seventy percent of clean transitions) that the two sets of activities coincide; i.e., a speaker produces completion intonation and stops, and a recipient starts.

Conceivably, then, the intonation contours in question constitute some sort of 'accompaniment' rather than a transition-relevant 'signal', such that in these clean transitions we are seeing an incidental convergence rather than something like cause and effect. Perhaps it's not 'because' a speaker produces completion intonation that a recipient starts up, but it just so happens that a speaker has produced this contour while a recipient has – by reference to such features as action and syntax – found an utterance to be possibly complete.

There is of course another set of materials that would have to be considered: those cases in which a speaker produces a multi-sentence utterance and a recipient remains silent over its course. For example, as in fragment 1.3, 'nN<sub>Q</sub> she's no:t She:'s et school.' 2.2., 'I: d<sub>Q</sub>n't know exactly I think ih wz arou:nd three

uh'clɔ:ck . . .' 3.2, 'becuz I wz going dih haftih get out (.) early in the mɔ:ning I have (.) a p- (0.3) transaction et the bɑ::nk.' 3.14, 'But'e said a lotta times it happens 'e said I could've even been allergic . . .' 4.5, 'I: wasn't talkeen tuh a:nybuddy. (b) Bo-oth Marla'n I slept'ntil about noo:n,' and 4.13, 'Have [fun fɪshɪn] ah hope yih catch a big one,'.

In this very small sample we see both intonation contours used; non-completion in fragments 2.2, 3.2, 3.14, and 4.13, and completion in fragments 1.3 and 4.5. Again then, the relationship of these contours to a speaker's intention to stop or go on, is obscure.

And here's another sort of data which bears on this issue. Some number of recipients starting up in the transition space, finding that the speaker has continued talking, immediately drop out. It was that phenomenon that raised the possibility that what initially looked like 'interjacent', 'post-continuation' onsets were produced to be 'adjacent', 'unmarked next positioned' onsets. Looking back at the small set of samples, fragments 2.10-2.14, we can notice that this phenomenon is associated with both types of speaker intonation. In fragment 2.12, a recipient starts up after completion intonation. But in fragments 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, and 2.14 they start up where there has been possible utterance completion but not completion intonation – and immediately drop out as the speaker keeps going.

That is, it appears that recipients are monitoring not only for a possibly complete utterance, but for a speaker's projected silence thereafter. These could be two distinct and separable aspects of the issue of 'completion'. And recipients could be oriented to the former and not, or not necessarily, to the latter. That is, recipients could be starting to talk by reference to something like 'entitlement', exclusive of a sensitivity to whether a speaker intended to stop or keep going, and had signalled that by one or another intonation contour.

But materials such as fragments 2.10, 2.11, 2.13 and 2.14 suggest that recipients do indeed produce their talk not only by reference to 'entitlement', but by reference to speaker's intentions. However, it appears that they don't use these intonation contours to decide that a speaker is or is not intending to stop or go on. That an utterance is possibly complete, in terms of action and/or syntax, appears to be used to handle both aspects of 'completion'.

I take it that the issue is far from settled. And I don't have the analytic resources to handle it. Fortunately, there are sequentially-oriented phonologists like Local and Kelly who are beginning to make some inroads on these sorts of problems.

## References

- Button, G. (forthcoming). Moving out of closing. In G. Button and J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1983). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso and P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric*. Padua: Cleup Editors.
- Jefferson, G. (Forthcoming). Notes on a possible metric which provides for a 'standard maximum' silence of approximately one second in conversation. In *Interdisciplinary approaches to interpersonal communication*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: 'limited access' as a 'fishing' device. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 186-198.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.