

Another Failed Hypothesis:
Pitch/Loudness
as Relevant to Overlap Resolution

Gail Jefferson

38

With an appended glossary of transcript symbols

augustus 1983

820.08.203

Another Failed Hypothesis:

Pitch/Loudness as Relevant to Overlap Resolution

Gail Jefferson

Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg

Recently I have been grappling with the issue of Overlap Resolution. I have been looking to see if there are any simple, context-free features that can account for which speaker, if any, drops out in overlap. So far I have had no success. Recurrently I am forced back into deeply context-bound features to account for behaviors in overlap.*

In a draft paper, "Turn-Competitive Incomings" (1982), John Local and Peter French describe a prosodic device "which can signal the competitive status" of an utterance begun in the course of another. The device consists in "markedly raised pitch and loudness". The authors discuss various ways in which "current turn occupants" can be seen to orient to the competitive status of such an utterance; by specifically 'competing', or by 'yielding'.

As I was collecting cases of overlapping talk I would now and then come across what seemed to me to be 'nice instances' of the phenomenon described by Local and French. For example, in the following two fragments, a 'current turn occupant' immediately yields to a
- - -

* For a discussion of one such attempt, see "On a failed hypothesis: 'conjunctivals' as overlap-vulnerable", one of two reports in "Two Explorations of the Organization of Overlapping Talk in Conversation", Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature, Number 28, 1983.

'markedly' louder, mid-turn-entering utterance.

(1) [GTS:I:1:68:R:4:Standard Orthography] ((face-to-face))

Roger: and your brother was (0.9) the hero and the bad ↓g*uy.
(0.2)
Roger: → So you don't want to be
Louise: → [KIND OF LI]KE YOU MADE UP YOUR own
personality to come in here . . .

(2) [Her:II:1:3:2:Standard Orthography] ((telephone))

Simons: Have you:: got any:: Whelpie or anything li:ke that?
(0.4)
Doreen: u-What to give the puppies.
Simons: [Ye::s.
(0.3)
Doreen: Well no: but-ih- I mean they: When I put them on he:r:,
Simons: Yeh they will suck.
Doreen: [They suck for a bi:t.
(0.4)
Doreen: → Except that o[:ne
Simons: → [ARE they QUIET. or are they screaming
all the ti[:me.
Doreen: [No they're qui:et.=
Simons: =Oh well that's alright.
. .
Doreen: now there's one: that I don't know whether it's going
to pull through it's: very weak, h 'h and it isn't
sucking hardly at a:ll

I wondered if the domain of pitch/loudness could be turned to my problem. As Local and French point out, this prosodic feature can "operate independently of any particular activity type"; i.e., in my terms, it is 'context-free'.

So I did a data run, initially sorting the materials into three categories: Sotto, Neutral, and Forté. But, resist as I might, another category emerged, Mezzoforté. These were cases which simply would not sit comfortably in either Neutral or Forté. Here are examples of each of the four categories.

1. Sotto. The degree signs [°] bracket the Sotto components in an utterance, and in these displays are affixed to the arrows indicating

the relevant Sotto utterance.

(3) [NB:IV:13:R:17-18:Standard Orthography] ((telephone))

Emma: I haven't had a piece of mea:t since I've been down here.
(.)

Emma: I don't thi:nk except °whe:n° we eat out †No I didn't
have any when I ate out with you:.
(1.0)

Emma: °→ 't 'h °Wuh-°
Lottie: → [No y o u] had a bowl of sou:p,
Emma: 't Ye:ah,

2. Neutral. As the name indicates, such talk is neither loud nor soft, nor high nor low in pitch. The mild stressing, when it is present, is indicated by the underscoring of a single letter in a word.

(4) [Her:III:1:4:1-2:Standard Orthography] ((telephone))

Heath: Now she is wondering whether the doctor would uh would
°eh° (.) °°well°° give he:r 'h an indication of uhm:.
(.) 'hh of a-a-a a sort of: uh medicine that she can
bu:y from: the chemist. She does'n't wany any more †pills.
(0.6)

Heath: If this is °possible.°
(0.6)

Heath: Uh:m: I-I'm thiinking of an †ointment perhaps:.
(0.4)

Heath: → †That
Desk°: → †What has she done to her hand.

3. Mezzoforté. These are the materials rejected by Neutral because the pitch/loudness was 'too strong', and rejected by Forté because it was 'too weak'. The stronger-than-neutral rise in pitch/loudness is indicated by two or more letters of a word being underscored. Plus-signs [+] are affixed to arrows indicating the relevant Mezzoforté utterance.

(5) [Rah:II:22:R:Standard Orthography] ((telephone))

Ida: See you] to: †morro_w

Jessie: [Yes=

Ida: = †Un-

Jessie: → †I'll see yo_u at th_{is}

Ida: ↔ †[U n l e]s s you come over (.) with Thomas
for an hour

4. Forté. The 'markedly increased' pitch/loudness is indicated by UPPER CASE. Asterisks [*] are affixed to arrows indicating the relevant Forté utterance.

(6) [NB:IV:10:R:13:Standard Orthography] ((telephone))

Lottie: and then: (.) we got dre:ssed? and I p- wo:re my WI:G?hh
 +→ (h)and^fGod di^d we have^f
 Emma: *→ [Did you WEAR YOUR] †WI::G?

I ended up with a corpus of some 1,282 cases: 80 Sotto, 641 Neutral, 356 Mezzoforté, and 205 Forté. Following is an elaborate tabulation of the various categories and the materials they collected.

Table of Pitch/Loudness Types

Sotto

Sotto Drop (Other Proceed)	36	(45%)	
Sotto Drop (Other Drop)	3	(3%)	
Sotto Proceed (Other Proceed)	20	(25%)	
Sotto Proceed (Other Drop)	19	(25%)	
Both Sotto, Both Proceed	2	(2%)	Total: 80

Neutral

Both Neutral, One Drop	394	(61%)	
Both Neutral, Both Drop	45	(7%)	
Both Neutral, Both Proceed	202	(32%)	Total: 641

Mezzoforté

Mezzo Proceed (Other Drop)	160	(45%)	
Mezzo Proceed (Other Proceed)	55	(15%)	
Mezzo Drop (Other Drop)	10	(3%)	
Mezzo Drop (Other Proceed)	44	(12%)	
Both Mezzo, One Drop	26	(7%)	
Both Mezzo, Both Drop	6	(2%)	
Both Mezzo, Both Proceed	55	(15%)	Total: 356

Forté

Forté Proceed (Other Drop)	120	(59%)	
Forté Proceed (Other Proceed)	36	(13%)	
Forté Drop (Other Drop)	10	(5%)	
Forté Drop (Other Proceed)	23	(11%)	
Both Forté, One Drop	10	(5%)	
Both Forté, Both Proceed	6	(3%)	<u>Total: 205</u>

1,282

One striking feature of the Table of Pitch/Loudness Types is that Neutral constitutes one half the corpus (641 cases, as

compared to Sotto, Mezzoforté, and Forté combined, which also add up to 641 cases). Thus, whatever relevance pitch/loudness might be found to have for the issue of which, if any, speaker drops out of overlap, in the first place at least half the corpus must be decided by other means.*

Nevertheless, there seems to be some orderliness to the pitch/loudness phenomenon. One set of figures indicates that when these pitch/loudness variations are present, the talk tends to run off as one might expect. There are, altogether, 402 cases of drop/procede consensus (one speaker dropping out, the other proceeding) in which the pitch/loudness differential is present (31% of the 1,282 cases, and approximately 50% of all cases of consensus).

Of those 402 cases, 316 (79%) run off as one might expect; most roughly, the 'stronger' utterance proceeding, the 'weaker' one dropping. 86 cases (21%) 'reverse' the expectable ordering.

<u>'Expectable' Ordering</u>	<u>'Reverse' Ordering</u>
Sotto Drop (Stronger Proceed) 36	Sotto Proceed (Stronger Drop) 19
Mezzo Proceed (Weaker Drop) 160	Mezzo Drop (Weaker Proceed) 44
Forté Proceed (Weaker Drop) <u>120</u>	Forté Drop (Weaker Proceed) <u>23</u>
'Stronger' Proceed (Weaker Drop) 316	'Weaker' Proceed (Stronger Drop) 86

And when one inspects the raw data, it is recurrently plausible and reasonable that the lowered or raised pitch/loudness is decisive, or at least strongly relevant to the drop/proceed consensus. Following are a few examples (with apologies, not in Standard Orthography).

(7) [NB:IV:10:R:17] ((telephone))

Lottie: S:o: uh: (.) I left? en then I (0.2) *e::u w'l I stopped
 °→ on the way tih ↓ea:t °'n then°
 Emma: +→ [Whur dji'av] dinner with theghm.
 Lottie: 'hh Oh we went dow:n tuh: Indi↓*o:.

- - -

* See Appendix.

materials, I began to lose cases, especially in the 'reversals' of the expectable pitch/loudness orderings; i.e., those in which the stronger-spoken participant drops out, and those in which the softer-spoken participant proceeds unperturbedly.

On re-hearing the materials, now with a particular issue in mind, it seemed that the pitch/loudnesses were somehow less differentiated than they had sounded to me when I was unmotivatedly transcribing the materials.

I think the two problems are related. A possible conclusion is that the pitch/loudness differential is only plausibly decisive or relevant when the softer-spoken participant does something that can be interpreted as 'orienting to' the relatively heightened pitch/loudness of the other's utterance; i.e., when he drops out, or falters, or recycles, or stretches, etcetera. When he does no such thing, but just unperturbedly maintains his 'turn-occupancy', then excuses are available for the apparent non-operation of the pitch/loudness differential, or else it no longer seems to be present in the first place.

This possibility seems to me to drastically undercut the candidate systematicity of the pitch/loudness differential. Roughly, this may be one of those phenomena that can be characterized as 'relevant (or even present) only when applicable.' And there are such phenomena.

Years ago I came upon a rather similar issue by reference to the phenomenon of Freudian Slips. Simply enough, a range of technically characterizable speech errors become 'freudian slips' (to participants as well as analysts) when, and only when, such an interpretation is reasonably applicable.

(8) [GTS:I:2:69:R] ((face-to-face))

Roger: Hah kin yih hate cher sister.
(0.6)

Louise: °→ °Oh'r you°
Roger: +→ It's impossible. She's a relative.

(9) [NB:III:2:R:1] ((telephone))

Bob: W'l d- I †thutchu w'r in that †deal agin with the Go:d
damn union.
(0.2)

Bob: → Whe[r e]you uh
Ted: +→ [tch]Well he]c'n take it outta my:: (0.4) my:
u-verage then.

(10) [Fr:USI:11-12:R:2-3] ((face-to-face))

Vic: Suh I give Joe: thuree che:†:z
Mike: +→ Well you kno[w like-
Vic: *→ [EN THE]:N LIKE MY WIFE co:me::s behan'me
en say widdiyou ha:ftih en you din ev'n: (0.3) bring'm
in by me 'n ah s'd well Carol I a:st you:.=
Mike: +→ =She fi[gyid i]f Jih]
Vic: *→ [Y E H]B'D I]: coulda . . .

And many of the 'reversals' are amenable to proposals of some special interactional considerations superceding the usual pitch/loudness orderings. Here are just two, with very brief discussion.

(11) [Rah:II:12:R] ((telephone))

Ida: 'ee w'so: close t'°Aar'n°wa:sn't'ee.
Ida: +→ 'Ee wa's v e ↓r y : .]
Jessie: °→ [°Well this's it]chu se[e::,]ye::s.°
Ida: [An'no]w he's †go:ne.

This fragment is extracted from some intensely sensitive interaction. At this point one participant, Ida, is making a delicate assertion about the relationship of her coparticipant's youngest son to his recently-deceased father/the co-participant's husband. This may be a place where the coparticipant's response can be crucial. That is, this may be a point at which a speaker may be especially sensitive to a coparticipant's activities, such that an utterance

which in this case might constitute confirmation or disconfirmation of the delicate assertion, although it is produced softly, is sufficient to achieve dropout by the speaker-in-progress.

(12) [GTS:I:1:49:R] ((face-to-face))

Roger: Don't tchi undihstand it's time d' [take yuh'pa°:rt<°]
Al: I gotta make a de_cision

↓fi:rst
(0.3)

Louise: → Y e h w e-
Al: °→ Ah haftuh°] think a|baht it.↓

Roger: °Ok*a [y°
Al: Ah'll: go'n my cor_ner'n think abaht it.

Most roughly, the situation here is one which might well engender special sensitivity to one participant's talk. This fragment is taken from a group therapy session for teenagers. For the past two minutes the group has been trying to get one of their members, Al, to talk about an incident that is troubling him. At the point of the overlap in question, he might conceivably be announcing his "decision" as to whether he will talk or not. In such a circumstance and at such a point, his softly-initiated utterance might have priority over other, louder, talk.

I take it that what may hold for these two cases is generalizable; i.e., if one participant can hear that another is talking (or perhaps in face-to-face interaction, see that another is talking), then there can be circumstances in which the perceptible, although softer, talk takes precedence.

All of which is to say: When there is a difference in pitch/loudness between two utterances in overlap, there appears to be a tendency for the softer to drop, the stronger to proceed. The possible 'counter-cases', those in which this tendency is reversed, might turn out to be specifiable variants of, or departures from, a

general, and context-free orderliness.

Thus, although the pitch/loudness differential, at least at the level I am currently monitoring, does not apply to the 641 cases in which the talk occurs in Neutral, nor to the 105 cases in which both parties are producing their talk in Sotto (2), Mezzoforté (87) or Forté (16), it could be enormously useful. With the pitch/loudness differential we have a feature which is applicable to 31% of the corpus, and which may account for the occurrences in 79% of the cases to which it is applicable.

However, a real problem I am having with the pitch/loudness differential is this: I am beginning to think that it does not apply to that 31% of the corpus. That is, I am not sure that the pitch/loudness differential is relevantly present.

As I said earlier, when one looks at materials in which there is a pitch/loudness differential, and the softer-spoken participant drops out while the stronger-spoken participant proceeds, it certainly is plausible that the pitch/loudness difference is decisive, or at least relevant. However, there are many cases in which there is such a difference, and it seems to have no relevance whatsoever.

Following is a batch of materials in which the softer-spoken participant proceeds across a more strongly-produced utterance; the stronger utterance either dropping out, or proceeding, as well. What I want to be noticing about this array is that the softer-spoken participant's talk is unperturbed; i.e., he is not, in Local and French's terms, exhibiting orientation to the stronger talk by either 'competing' or 'yielding'.

(13) [GTS:I:2:66:R:1] ((face-to-face))

Ken: °→ [the] twunny ninth:.h'hhhh [°will be Ea,st↓er.°]
 Louise: *→ [n ↑ ↑ N O]it's n]↑↑NEX[week]

(14) [SBL:2:1:8:R:9] ((telephone))

Nora: Yihknow e-I think it's too bad we don't do that once'n
 while [insteada p] laying Bri:dge,er 'hh
 Bea: [U h hu:h?] [Uh hu:h,
 Bea: I wz aFRAID (.) *u: some might (0.7) miss their Bri:dge
 b't eh: 'hhh
 Nora: °Oh:: ↓fiddlesticks°=
 Nora: °→ °they play B r i d g e ,a:ll th' ,ti:me.°
 Bea: *→ = [I w'z wuh] YOU DON'T TH]INK THAT] e-YOU DO]N'T THINK THAT
 WZ what wz th'MATTER with Maizie.

(15) [Rah:B:2:(14):2:R] ((telephone))

Vera: → I'm] sorry yih hahd th'm all o [n you [J e s s i e]like that]
 Jessie: *→ [°hhh [↑O h don't] b e sill]y

(16) [NB:II:2:R:5] ((telephone))

Nancy: course ↓I: don't know whether it's that er jst that we're
 js:t (.) c'mpletely bo:gging down et work,h 'hhhhmh
 (.)
 Nancy: *→ E [r whatta] WIH: WITH ME: wi]th my fi]nals?;hhhh
 Emma: → [Oh: well] e v' r y]buddy's sa::d.

(17) [NB:IV:10:R:7-8] ((telephone))

Emma: ↑which is a Go:d da:mn LIE:,
 (.)
 Emma: 'hh hhh
 Lottie: → [Oh↓::: y:eah [c u z]you'd never sai:d tha*:t.
 Emma: +→ [e-H e]

(18) [Rah:II:13-14:R] ((telephone))

Ida: °Ye [s y e s °]
 Jessie: [Bt it's jis:t]=
 Jessie: → =u-w'n [eez o]n iz ow [n'e d]z'n like]bein on]iz ow:n] 'h
 Ida: +→ [°coss°] H e]ha::tes] t h a t]house o'n iz
 ow↓:n.

(19) [NB:II:4:R:4] ((telephone))

Emma: An't they don't know whhur it comes fro:m yih
 → [w h e r e y u h geh-]
 Nancy: °→ [°I don't think I've ev'er heard'v it.°

(20) [SCC:DCD:14] ((face-to-face))

Phipps: → We:ll [p'reps we c'n ge [t Mister Bryant t'tell us]
 Sokol: +→ En i f you [Well will-will come t'that]
 Bryant:

(21) [SBL:2:2:3:R:8] ((telephone))

Kate: → ↑I don't [see how Pa]t can't like Jo:,
 Claire: +→ En she c'n

(22) [SBL:3:3:R:1] ((telephone))

Milly: +→ Uh Mister Osterhath agrees it w [' z] p o o r l y , ' h h
 Keith: → [We do] n ' t c a r e w h e t h e r
 they raise'm er no:t.

So, the sheer fact of a difference in pitch/loudness between two utterances in overlap need have no effect at all.

Further, another sort of difficulty with the relevant presence of the pitch/loudness differential emerged in two different ways. First of all, in preparing this report, when ever I would examine the transcriptions of the fragments shown in these arrays, I would find that, in direct contrast to the plausibility of the decisiveness or at least relevance of the pitch/loudness differential in the cases where the softer-spoken participant drops out, in those in which he precedes unperturbedly I would be trying to explain away the differential.

In cases where there is a big difference I would find myself thinking, "Well, it's a telephone call and maybe the pitch/loudness doesn't register on the ears in the same way as in face-to-face." Or, "Well, it's face-to-face, maybe they're at some distance from each other." Explanations like that. And when the difference is smaller, then I would find myself thinking, "Well, it's just not enough of a difference to matter."

Secondly, as I was putting together a display-tape of these

In his Psychopathology of Everyday Life (1901), Freud has a chapter on "Slips of the Tongue". Here, he cites prior research:

This is a subject on which I find myself in the exceptional position of being able to acknowledge the value of a previous work. In 1895 Meringer and C. Mayer published a study on 'Slips in Speaking and Reading'. . . . One of the authors, who acts as a spokesman in the text, is in fact a philologist, and it was his linguistic interests which led him to attempt to discover the rules that govern the making of slips of the tongue.

Freud goes on to show some examples of slips of the tongue collected by the authors, "grouped by them in purely descriptive categories". Among those categories are transpositions (e.g., 'the Milo of Venus' instead of 'the Venus of Milo'), pre-sonances or anticipations (e.g., 'es war mir auf der Schwest...auf der Brest so schwer'), and post-sonances or perseverations (e.g., 'ich fordere Sie auf, auf das Wohl unseres Chefs aufzustossen' instead of 'anzustossen'). And for these various slips of the tongue, Meringer provides a technical account.

To explain the various kinds of slips of the tongue he had observed, Meringer postulates that different spoken sounds have a different psychical valency. When we innervate the first sound in a word or the first word in a sentence, the excitatory process already extends to the later sounds and the following words, and in so far as these innervations are simultaneous with one another they can exercise a modifying influence on one another.

Somewhat later in this chapter, Freud cites another article by Meringer, written in 1900, and now focussing not on sounds of words, but on "meaning". He quotes Meringer as follows:

"Extensive observations have taught me that words with opposite meanings are, quite generally, very often interchanged; they are already associated in our linguistic consciousness, they lie very close to each other and it is easy for the wrong one to be evoked."

And indeed, one can confirm Meringer's "extensive observations"

and compile collections of various sorts of 'sound' and 'meaning'-generated errors. Following is a set of 'sound'-generated errors which may be characterized in Meringer's terms as 'pre-sonances or anticipations'.

(22.1) [Football Broadcast]

Announcer: Staubach goes back in a dreep- deep dropback

(22.2) [News Broadcast]

Announcer: this new system might require two or three gaydes of gra- grades of gasoline

(22.3) [News Broadcast]

Announcer: the blade haz- blaze had raced through the building

(22.4) [Sportsnews Broadcast]

Announcer: Bonavita would not flight- fight Flloyd Patterson

(22.5) [Golf Broadcast]

Announcer: Everybody talks about his distance. He also has a great tutting- uh pütting touch.

(22.6) [News Broadcast]

Announcer: they state that they have every reason to believe the mussles- missiles were fired by Russians

(22.7) [Football Broadcast]

Announcer: Mike Bagg- Bragg will drop deep . . .

And following is a set of 'meaning'-generated errors, in which "words with opposite meanings are...interchanged."

(23.1) [CDHQ:I:196:Standard Orthography]

Loomis: Oh, yah. That's-that's where the old beach is at.

Marty: Yeah.

Loomis: I mean the new beach.

Marty: Right,

(23.2) [Pollner:TC:Standard Orthography]

Mr. L.: I was- made my left, uh my right signal . . .

(23.3) [SBL:2:1:8:R:13:Standard Orthography]

Nora: I expect it's as cool down there as it is up here I was gonna say we could play(d) (.) down here (.) up here but I think . . .

(23.4) [GJ:FN]

Brad: And maybe there's a better way of getting uh, giving them some power.

(23.5) [SBL:3:1:R:2:Standard Orthography]

Marylou: then more people will show up. (.) 'Cause they won't feel obligated to se*:ll to bu↓*:y.

(23.6) [FD:Wife:R:5]

Harry: A:n:d, (.) the last we hea:rd they were coming sou:th <uh north, they were in Seattle.

(23.7) [Mahoney:LAPD:6-9:Standard Orthography]

((Recorded during a police chase of a shooting suspect))

Link: Five A twenty five what's your location.
(3.9)

Car 5A25: → Five A twenty five sou:thbou:nd on Figuro::a.

Link: No:w southbou:nd. Figuroa,

Car 5A25: Five A twenty five cro:ssing Artesia.

Link: No:w crossing A:rtesia. Five Xray: twenty fi:ve south bound Figuroa crossing A:rtesia. (2.0) In pursuit of a nineteen sixty six Ch:evrole:t,
(0.2)

Car 5Z3: → ZEBRA THREE FOR A VERIFY IS THAT NORTHBOUND OR SOUTH BOUND.

(3.0)

Link: Five A twenty fi:ve are you southbound on Figuroa?=

Car 5A25: → =FIVE A TWENTY FIVE. THAT'S NORTHBOU:ND.

Link: Northbou:nd. Figuroa. passing A:rtesia

Car 5A25: Fi:ve A twenty five pa:ssing Alondra,
(1.0)

Link: Now passing Alondra,
(2.2)

Link: → Sti:ll sou:th- (0.3) correc:tion no:rthbound Figuroa,

(23.8) [FD:IV:71:Standard Orthography]

Desk: He was here lay- uh earlier, but he left.

However, in his essay on errors in which one word is replaced by another, Meringer introduces a new element. Freud describes it as a claim that "a special practical significance attaches to particular cases in which one word is put for another - viz. to those cases in which a word is replaced by another that has the opposite meaning." And he quotes Meringer's discussion of the phenomenon.

"You probably still recall", he writes, "the way in which the president of the Lower House of the Austrian Parliament opened the sitting a short while ago: 'Gentlemen: I take notice that a full quorum of members is present and herewith declare the sitting closed!'"

"His attention was only drawn by the general merriment and he corrected his mistake. In this particular case the explanation no doubt was that the President secretly wished he was already in a position to close the sitting, from which little good was to be expected. But this accompanying idea, as frequently happens, broke through, at least partially, and the result was 'closed' instead of 'open' - the opposite, that is, of what was intended to be expressed."

This sense of "a special practical significance" of slips of the tongue, the notion that various errors constitute a "breaking through" of "secret" wishes, ideas, etc., which has become known as the 'Freudian Slip', was also becoming part of the layman's repertoire. So, for example, in a popular novel by Frank Harris written in 1899, A Man's Woman, we find a 'significant error':

"Go! Go, marry Mr. Campbell. Be happy. I forgive you both. Go, leave me to die alone."

"Sir, I will go. Forget that you ever knew an unhappy woman - female, whose only fault was that she loved you."

That notion, and its appellation 'freudian slip' can be found in the talk of laymen. So, for example, in the following two fragments, utterances which might otherwise simply pass as 'stuttering', and be characterized by an analyst as 'sound'-generated errors, are identified in situ as 'freudian slips'.

In the first fragment, a technical description might propose the error as combinedly a post-sonance of the series of 'l's in the prior talk, and a pre-sonance of the next word, 'blue'. The result is, instead of "Bond's Blue Chips" (a low-priced line of men's suits), "Blah- Bond's." (cf. Fragments 22.1-22.7)

(24) [B.C.] ((A live advertisement for Bond's Blue Chip suits))

B.C.: Big, beautiful savings from America's largest clothier.
Blah- Bond's. Blondes, my goodness. Why that's a
Freudian Slip

This 'sound'-generated error, because "blah-" happens to be hearable as a start on 'blondes', is amenable to the application of the notion 'freudian slip', and is identified as such.

Likewise, in the following fragment, an error which might be technically characterized as primarily a post-consonance, the "ank" of the prior word "bank", perseverating in an attempt to say "stacks", which results in "stank", is treated as a 'freudian slip'. This fragment is excerpted from a series of meetings between a militant civil rights group and a huge bank chain, re. the hiring of minority-group employees.

(25) [CORE/B.A:Standard Orthography]

Howard: I, just kind of assume that a large company like the
Bank of America that s:tank- stacks dozens of ar:med
u_h,
Breen: Eh was that a_h Freudian Slip? Mister uh:::
Howard: blue uniformed men,
(0.3)
Howard: in fr_hont of their banks,
Breen: Howard?
Howard: hhunh hunh hunh `hh`hh Well, it could be:::

And, for example, in the following fragment, a sort of error which might otherwise be technically characterized as another case of that phenomenon which "quite generally, very often" occurs; i.e., "the interchanging of words with opposite meanings" (cf. Fragments 23.1-

23.8), achieves the status of a 'freudian slip'. This fragment is excerpted from a group therapy session for teenagers. Roughly, they are now talking about parents not letting their children choose their own paths in life.

(26) [GTS:IV]

Roger: The mother isn't holdin- the father isn't- ah
 Freudian Slip heh heh "mother" hah hheh hhhehh

That is, it appears that there is a Members' phenomenon which has come to be known as the 'freudian slip', in which one inadvertently reveals something through a speech error. What I want to be noticing is that of the myriad 'sound'- and 'meaning'-generated errors, only a tiny portion achieve the status of 'freudian slips'. And those are the ones to which such a notion is, in the first place, reasonably applicable (in the cases at hand, where sex, hostility, and the Oedipus Complex, respectively, are evoked).

The frequent 'innocuous' occurrences are not in the first place candidates for such a status. Indeed, at least one sub-set of them are given a different status. So, for example, the announcer who asserted that a passer "goes back in a dreep- deep dropback" might well comment on his error. His comment would not be, "Why that's a Freudian Slip", but, "That's a tongue-twister."

The validity of such a notion as the 'freudian slip' is sustained by only noticing as candidates those events which are plausible cases. Thus, a corpus of possible 'counter-cases' is never accumulated.

And this appears to be the situation which obtains for my attempts to pose a pitch/loudness differential as decisive or at least relevant in the resolution of overlap. When the context provides for

the applicability of the pitch/loudness differential, then I take it to be present and relevant. When the context does not provide for its applicability, then I find myself explaining away its presence, or doubting that it is 'sufficiently present'. Again, then, the possible 'counter cases' have a tendency to disappear.

Given these problems and considerations, I am beginning to wonder if the pitch/loudness differential might not constitute a 'redundant cue'. A simplest statement of this possible (non)status of the pitch/loudness differential is also methodologically outrageous, but here it is: It is possible that the coparticipant's activities would be the same regardless of the relative pitch/loudness.

Perhaps a more workable statement would be: The 316 cases in which relatively heightened pitch/loudness is met with coparticipant dropout may be effectively equivalent to the 430 cases in which one of two speakers with similar pitch/loudness drops out (i.e., the 394 'Both Neutral, One Drop', the 26 'Both Mezzo, One Drop', and the 10 'Both Forté, One Drop'). In all 746 cases the relevant account would be something other than that one speaker was producing louder/higher-pitched talk than his coparticipant.

That is, whatever is operating to achieve the 430 dropouts for utterances produced with similar pitch/loudness may be operating in the 316 dropouts by a softer-spoken participant (and, as well, for the 86 'reversals'; the dropouts by a stronger-spoken participant).

And the 'whatever is operating' may turn out to be discoverable by, and stateable in terms of, the sort of analysis sketched out for two of the 'reversals', Fragments (11) and (12); i.e., in terms of deeply 'context-bound' features of any given interactional bit.

This is not to say that, on occasion, a speaker might not use, as a 'device' to claim a turnspace, an utterance produced with "markedly raised pitch and loudness". Nor is it to say that, on occasion, a coparticipant might not respond to that very feature; i.e., that the pitch/loudness differential might not, on occasion, be found to be operating in a 'context-free' fashion. Likewise, it is not unreasonable to suppose that sometimes a speech-error just might be generated by, and reveal, "secret" wishes, ideas, etc. (in effect, reversing the relative frequency implied in Freud's "sometimes a cigar is just a cigar").

In the following fragment is an occurrence which I take to be a candidate instance of 'context-free' operation of "markedly raised pitch and loudness". Here, one participant makes three unsuccessful attempts to be heard by his coparticipants (see lines 14, 21, and 28). His fourth, and successful, attempt consists in a loud, shrill whistle (see lines 31-33).

(27) [GTS:I:1:56:R:1:Standard Orthography] ((face-to-face))

1 [Roger]: [What about Soshes]
 2 Louise: Soshes?
 3 (.)
 4 Roger: They're distinct by being like everybody te:lse.
 5 (0.4)
 6 Louise: 't They're distinct by being different than a human.
 7 (0.9)
 8 Roger: They're what?
 9 (0.4)
 10 Ken: 'kh hhuh eh
 11 (.)
 12 Louise: 'hh They're °distinct by being different than human.°
 13 (1.2)
 14 Ken: → 't I do:n't see ^[w h a t this:]
 15 Roger: But they're a:ll ali:ke.
 16 Louise: [Mm hm?
 17 (0.4)
 18 Louise: That isn't h*uman.
 19 (1.0)

- 20 Roger: °()°
 21 Ken: [→ °t I don't see what this=
 22 Ken: [→ Soshe d i s, cussion b, rings } u p }
 23 Louise: =°Th*ey're carb on copies } of ea } ch o } ther
 24 Roger: [Dis a ↓ gree:.
 25 (.)
 26 Roger: That couldn't be a distinction in anybody's m_i:nds.
 27 (0.4)
 28 Ken: → 'h Hey w [hat does this]
 29 Louise: [i-] THEY'RE s o: carbon co↑:py th [at=
 30 Ken: [hh
 31 Louise: =they ar en't even
 32 Ken: *→ [(whi] STLE)]
 33 Louise: °Ye:s, °
 34 Ken: mhh hhe-ū-What does this Soshe discussion bring up

Now, at least in my corpus, the shrill whistle is a drastically occasional device. It is used only one other time, in this same group, by this same participant, in the course of some loud, multi-party overlap.

(28) [GTS:I:1:40:R:4:Standard Orthography] ((face-to-face))

- 1 Ken: I alway [s have gone
 2 Louise: [I [N ↑U]: N I] S O : : : :N=
 3 Roger: [I CA N REME] MBER ABOUT<
 4 Louise: =I: n ↑u: : : NISO :N : : .
 5 Roger: [↑FOUR WE] EKS i] [·hh
 6 Roger: I can remember abou: t
 7 Louise: [THE:] THE [· VALE NTINE 'S DAY: ↑dance=
 8 Ken: [· huhh N O :] N O I]
 9 Louise: =f [o r ↑o n e] ↓thi [n: g]
 10 Ken: → [((↑whi ↓: ↑stle))] [No I] always ↑go ↓to the shop. ↓

In Fragment (28) the whistle is not "markedly" stronger than the surrounding talk. And we can note that the coparticipant to overlap does not break off, but continues to completion (see line 9). In Fragment (27) the whistle is "markedly" stronger than the surrounding talk. And the coparticipant to overlap breaks off (line 31). That is, the sheer, 'context-free' fact of "markedly raised pitch/loudness" may indeed be decisive in this case.

However, it appears that this very feature may constitute the device as observably problematic. It can be noted in Fragment (27)

that the shrill whistle is not merely attended, but is meta-attended. The overlap coparticipant, having dropped out (line 31), thereafter produces a soft display of attention, "°Ye:s,°" (line 33). I hear it as an ironic display; the irony perhaps in part achieved by the utterance's softness in contrast to the whistle's shrillness. And the whistler thereupon produces a little laugh, "mhh hhe", prior to the initiation of his recycle (line 34). I take it that the overlap coparticipant's ironic display of attention and the whistler's little laugh are addressing the problematic character of the device used to get a hearing.

That is, in this candidate instance of the effective operation of the 'context-free' device, "markedly-raised pitch and loudness", the very fact that the utterance in question is nothing more than markedly louder and higher-pitched than the surrounding talk; i.e., has no contextual warrant, may provide for its oriented-to character as problematic.

This last consideration may add another factor to the issue of Overlap Resolution; i.e., it may be not only that overlap is massively resolved by reference to deeply context-bound features of the talk, but that it is properly so resolved, such that the observably context-free use of such a device as "markedly raised pitch and loudness" is interactionally problematic.

Appendix

To provide a sense of what approximately 50% of the cases of dropout concensus look like (i.e., the 394 cases in which both participants produce their talk in Neutral, and one drops out), I am appending the following batch of instances.

(0.1) [NB:II:2:R:25] ((telephone))

- Nancy: So:: anyway: let me: uh 'hhh call Ro'l's mother,h
 (.)
- Nancy: a:nd uh,h
 (0.4)
- Nancy: Don't, (make eh)
- Emma: [[W'l G] IVE ME A B] U:ZZ if you u
 (0.2)
- Emma: Uh c'm o:n down if you eh ah'd li:ke tih have yuh
 → come do:wn fe_[r a]
- Nancy: → Yer] a r'l ↑sweetheart.

(0.2) [GTS:I:1:53:R:1] ((face-to-face))

- Ken: 'h h u meɑ:n
 (0.4)
- Ken: → If if: certain thi[:ngs
 Roger: → Wut h] e wanted tuh be: wz like
errybuddy (.) e:lse.

(0.3) [SBL:2:2:3:R:9] ((telephone))

- Kate: 'h h h h Yih hadtuh go around ask about ten times now
pard'n me wudju say 'h h h h h This shd'n ↓ha:pp*en.
 → [A : n d]
- Claire: → [Yeh we] ll jee Jo: was waitin tuh bi:d yih kno:w

(0.4) [G:93:AD:7:R:3] ((face-to-face))

- Lenny: W'n wz ih la:st wee:k sumpn like th't ha_[pp'n too?]
 Cal: ↓Oh=n o :]=
- Cal: → =thi[s:]]
- Lenny: → [Somebo]dy bumped somebody else

(0.5) [Her:OI:13:3] ((telephone))

- Heath: She just fe:lt that she: she owt t'do s'mohr
heomewehrk.°°y'know°°
 (.)
- Nan: → Ye:s [n o I -]
- Heath: → [Bihcause sh]e's taking the do:g ow::f to Newb'ry

(0.6) [Rah:II:14:R] ((telephone))

- Jessie: → I supp [o:se y]ou ↓know: i [t's iz]
 Ida: → [Well<]_ [Y e h-]
 (.)
 Ida: Ih-ih-it Let im coss ah min iss noht all thaht ↓long
 → yihkno [w'n]_ [Jis:]
 Jessie: → [Yeh]_ h W' [l y's] ee it's diffrent f'me::.

(0.7) [SCC:DCD:34:R] ((face-to-face))

- Bryant: But they do take that into accou:nt. becuss I mean
 this's oll pahrt of the people'oo do this kneow the
 wheole p_rocess'n they kneow the
 Sokol: → W'l why [duh they puu't] do:wn then.
 Bryant: → pressing i s

(0.8) [NB:IV:13:R:10] ((telephone))

- Emma: They're ↑comin do:wn this weekend,hh
 (0.2)
 Emma: * Ahll um,
 Lottie: Oh:.
 Emma: → 't1'k i-So:: ah'll hha [ve'm] thi [s]
 Lottie: → [Yuh-] [Yih mean the nex'
 weeken'.
 (0.5)
 Emma: 'k u-This nex'SATURDEE'n Sundee yah.

(0.9) [Fr:USI:28:R:1] ((face-to-face))

- Mike: I ↑saw it buh I nevuh look'yihknow (.) dih-ih dih-
 → d'middle ↓one look [s] jus like,h]
 Vic: → Daa w'z mah f' irs' ↓wi:::fe

In assembling a display-tape of cases of Neutral dropout consensus, a problem analogous to that plaguing the display-tape of cases of Pitch/Loudness Differential dropout consensus cropped up. Again I was losing cases. Here, I found that it now sounded as if the talk which dropped out was perhaps just that bit softer than the talk which preceded; i.e., there now appeared to be a possibly relevant differential. Again, then, the phenomeon of relevant-when-applicable made its troublesome appearance.

- - -

* In Standard Orthography this would be rendered as "All of them".

References Cited

- G. Jefferson, "Two Explorations of the Organization of Overlapping Talk in Conversation: Notes on Some Orderlinesses of Overlap Onset, and On a Failed Hypothesis: 'Conjunctionals as Overlap-Vulnerable'", Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature, Number 28.
- J. Local and P. French, "Turn-Competitive Incomings", draft manuscript, 1982, Department of Language, University of York, Heslington, York, YO1 5DD, England.
- S. Freud, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life, 1901
- F. Harris, A Man's Woman, 1899