

- Hymes, D.
1967 "The Anthropology of Communication", in F. E. X. Dance (ed.), *Human Communication Theory* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), 1-39.
- Jaffe, J., and S. Feldstein
1970 *Rhythms of Dialogue* (New York: Academic Press).
- Jakobson, R.
1964 Discussion of "Factors and Forms of Aphasia" by A. R. Luria, in A. V. S. de Reuck and M. O'Connor (eds.), *Ciba Foundation Symposium on Disorders of Language* (Boston: Little, Brown), 162-82.
- Jakobson, R., C. G. M. Fant, and M. Halle
1952 *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis: The Distinctive Features and Their Correlates* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press).
- Kendon, A.
1967 "Some Functions of Gaze-Direction in Social Interaction", *Acta Psychologica* 26, 22-63.
- Klir, G. J.
1969 *An Approach to General Systems Theory* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold).
- McQuown, N. A. (ed.)
1971 *The Natural History of an Interview (= Microfilm Collection of Manuscripts on Cultural Anthropology, Fifteenth Series)* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Joseph Regenstein Library Department of Photoduplication).
- Meltzer, L., W. N. Morris, and D. P. Hayes
1971 "Interruption Outcomes and Vocal Amplitude: Explorations in Social Psychophysics", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 18, 392-402.
- Scheffen, A. E.
1965 *Stream and Structure of Communicational Behavior* (Philadelphia: Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute).
- Sebeok, T. A.
1962 "Coding in the Evolution of Signalling Behavior", *Behavioral Science* 7, 430-42.
1963 "The Informational Model of Language: Analog and Digital Coding in Animal and Human Communication", in P. L. Garvin (ed.), *Natural Language and the Computer* (New York: McGraw-Hill), 47-64.
- Trager, G. L.
1958 "Paralanguage: A First Approximation", *Studies in Linguistics* 13, 1-12.
- Trager, G. L., and H. L. Smith, Jr.
1957 *An Outline of English Structure* (Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies).
- Yngve, V. H.
1970 "On Getting a Word in Edgewise", *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society), 567-77.

Starkey Duncan is an assistant professor of psychology at the University of Chicago. His chief research interest is face-to-face interaction. Among his principal publications are: "Nonverbal Communication" (1969), and "Some Signals and Rules for Taking Speaking Turns in Conversations" (1972).

GAIL JEFFERSON

A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation: Overlapped Tag-Positioned Address Terms in Closing Sequences

i. A widely used transcription procedure is that of marking the precise point at which some ongoing utterance is overlapped by the talk of another speaker. The version utilized here is to place a double oblique [/ /] in the talk of an ongoing speaker to indicate the moment at which another speaker has started to talk. This procedure has provided encounters with a variety of systematic phenomena, among which is the following. An 'address term' occurring in 'tag' position (as a last particle of an otherwise possibly complete utterance)¹ is overlapped by the talk of the recipient of that utterance. So, for example:

[FD:IV:40]

Desk: Is it a stretcher patient // Ma'am,
Caller^o: It's- Uh yes he is,

[NB:9-10-68:6:3]

Penny: O:kay. I'll see yuh.
Agnes: A::?right // Dear,
Penny: Bye bye,
Agnes: Bye bye,

That is, Desk's "Ma'am" is overlapped by Caller's "It's-" and Agnes' "Dear" is overlapped by Penny's "Bye bye".

¹ The structural-sequential features of a 'possibly complete utterance' have been described at great length by Harvey Sacks in a series of unpublished lectures. For the purposes of this paper the crucial features involve that while a complete utterance may be identical with a sentence it need not be, but may indeed consist of a single word; and that the occurrence of a possible complete utterance can provide for a next speaker's starting to talk at the moment of its completion.

ii. This paper argues that the occurrence of overlapped tag-positioned address terms is not a trivial misplacement in startings and stoppings, but an intensely organized phenomenon, involving a capacity for and an orientation to precise placement of talk on the part of conversationalists.

As an initial warrant for supposing that the phenomenon might yield to inquiry about its systematic features, two facts are adduced indicating at least that participants could have grounds for seriously attending to its occurrence: (1) that these occurrences involve address terms, and (2) that address terms (and overlapped address terms) massively occur in Closing Sequences.²

The literature on address terms describes them as loci for formulating, maintaining, and reformulating the status of a relationship.³ The occurrence of an overlap of an address term may be seen as having possible serious consequences, since any overlapped term is potentially unheard, and an 'unheard' address term, given its relation-formulating properties, may be particularly consequential. Talk that contains address terms is expectably given careful attention by participants, WHEN it occurs.

If a place in conversation can be located in which address terms SYSTEMATICALLY occur, a sort of organization can be seen for them, and for participants' attention to them. One such position is at the termination of a conversation, within Closing Sequences. And Closing Sequences are themselves a systematic locus of a variety of relational work, including the work done by address terms.⁴ This provides a specific, structurally organized place for a participant's orientation to the occurrence of such

² 'Closing Sequence' locates the sort of talk which precedes and leads up to the termination of, at least, telephone conversations. Emmanuel Schegloff and Harvey Sacks, in "Opening up Closings", *Semiotica* VIII: 4, 289-327, propose that a Closing Sequence is a discrete conversational object, whose workings involve participants in particular and characterizable orientations and tasks.

³ See, for example, Roger Brown and Marguerite Ford, "Address Terms in American English", *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62 (1961), 375-85, reprinted in D. Hymes (ed.), *Language in Culture and Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

⁴ Erving Goffman characterizes the work of 'closing salutations' for somewhat different circumstances than the termination of a single interaction in what may be a series of interactions. On p. 87 of Ch. 3, "Supportive Interchanges", *Relations in Public* (New York: Basic Books 1971), he talks about closing salutations in situations of leave taking. He remarks that such a place may be a locus of rather more extravagant expressions of esteem and affection than such other structurally fixed positions as greetings, precisely because participants speak in anticipation of soon being less available to one another. Perhaps this characterization may be adapted to the more local circumstances of the closing moments of a single interaction in what may be a series of interactions, and utilized here as support for the supposition that Closing Sequences will be structural loci for serious attention by participants to the occurrence and content of address terms.

things as address terms, and provides a warrant to look there for the resources available to deal with such a potentially problematic occurrence as an overlapped address term, and for systematic constraints as to selection among the available resources, which would thereby require participants not merely to attend to and solve these problems, but to do so in an orderly way. The task then is to discover how deeply and intensely organized such a phenomenon might be.

iii. A consideration of the orderliness of overlapped tag-positioned address terms will proceed as follows. A series of analytic resources will be developed, and applied to an analysis of an instance of 'double overlap':

[MC:II:2:14]

Jean: We'll go ahead, en I'm sure she'll get
in touch with you about the time.
Mel: Yah.
Jean: Okay,
Mel: Okeydoke.
Jean: Thank you // Mel,
Mel: Thank you // Jean.
Jean: Bye // bye,
Mel: Bye.

The analytic resources will be developed along the following lines.

(I) A recipient of some ongoing talk has the technical capacity to produce his talk with precision in relation to that ongoing talk. That technical capacity is a required feature of talk which abides by interaction-based constraints upon the placement of a recipient's talk.

(II) Precision placement is a feature of conversation by which a current speaker may position some objects within his utterance by reference to the recipient's capacity for and orientation to precision placement of his 'responsive' talk. The precise placement of a recipient's talk can then entail alternative possible actions performed by the recipient and provided for in the design of the current speaker's utterance, specifically so that any one of some set of actions has been appropriate.

(III) The very appropriateness, collaboratively achieved, of one of those alternative actions (the one constituted by an overlap of some designedly placed object in the current speaker's utterance) itself poses problems. Participants have access to a variety of solutions, and there are constraints upon which of those they can successfully employ. The attempt by coparticipants to deal with the occurrence of an overlapped

tag-positioned address term in an orderly fashion, using available and restricted resources, accounts for the occurrence of the double overlap.

I. A first requirement for the analysis of overlapped address terms is to establish that conversationalists have a technical capacity to place their talk with precision. If that can be shown, there are grounds for admitting the possibility that overlapped address terms in tag position are more than trivially misplaced startings and stoppings. A variety of occurrences will be displayed in which recipients can be seen to be starting up 'immediately'.

So, for example, 'collaborative sentences'⁵ indicate that people can, with an entire sentence under way, find just the place to start up with a 'completion' of a prior speaker's otherwise complete utterance. The following instances are from face-to-face interactions.

[Sh :29]

Ben: An'there- there wz at least ten mi :les
of traffic bumper tuh bumper.
Ethel: -because a' that.

[GTS :1 :71]

Roger: Well yeah I would've done something like
that maybe, but I wouldn't 'v made it a
point.
Al: -to bring it up.

And there are instances of recipients of some more or less prolonged utterance coming in at just the proper moment with their own proposed completion of the sentence in a prior speaker's as yet uncompleted utterance.

[GTS :3 :60]

Dan: Well I geh-yuh- uh you're sorra saying
then that uh that maybe even in the case
of your father, his mother tries to keep
him // in a kind of,
Ken: -young.

[GTS :1 :56]

Louise: No a Soshe is someone who // is a carbon
copy of their friend.
Roger: -drinks Pepsi.

⁵ An elaborate technical discussion of 'collaboratives' or 'joint productions' describing the work of a second speaker upon some prior speaker's talk may be found in various of Harvey Sacks' unpublished lectures, starting with a series given in 1967.

[GTS :3 :61]

Ken: Instead a my grandmother offering him a
drink, of beer, she'll say // "Wouldju-"
Louise: -"Wanna glassa milk?"

And there are instances of a recipient's attempting to achieve 'saying the same thing at the same time' as the ongoing speaker.

[GTS :1 :1 :44]

(Here, Louise is comparing the heights of Roger and Ken. Ken has said he is six foot two and Roger has said that he himself is five ten.)

Louise: That's fi :ve ten ? en that's six foot two ?
'N how tall are you, Al,
Roger: [How tall'r you Al.]

(0.5)

Louise: Eh // heh heh!
Al: I'm five seven.

(Roger talks very quickly, so that he and Louise both say "Al" simultaneously.)

[GTS :5 :31]

Dan: The guy who doesn't run the race doesn't
win it, but 'e doesn 't lose it.
Roger: [B't- lose it.]

In the above fragment, Roger may have initially attempted to do the entire last phrase, "But 'e doesn't lose it" simultaneously with Dan. He produces a start on "But", sees where Dan is in the course of that phrase, cuts off, and manages to place "lose it" simultaneously with Dan.

The foregoing series of occurrences indicate that a recipient of some sort of ongoing utterance has the technical capacity to select a precise spot to start his own talk 'no later' than the exact appropriate moment to place it so that it will sound like a 'continuation' of the prior/ongoing talk. An alternative notation, used on the 'completing an uncompleted utterance' may better display this.

Dan: ... his mother tries to keep him =
Ken: =[-young
Dan: =[-in a kind of,
Louise: No a Soshe is someone who =
Roger: =[-drinks Pepsi.
Louise: =[-is a carbon copy of their friend.
Ken: ... she'll say =
Louise: =[-"Wanna glassa milk?"
Ken: =[-"Wouldju-"

That is, the ongoing speaker's 'continuation' and the recipient's 'continuation' can be seen as simultaneously started phrases or clauses, with absolutely no gap between the former and latter.

However, in that the recipient/next speaker has 'had time' to see what is developing and work out the what and when of the 'continuation', the above occurrences may not appear to bear upon situations in which, after just one word which can stand as a complete utterance, a recipient begins to talk so that he overlaps an address term in tag position to that single word. And such occurrences constitute the major portion of the interchanges being considered. It remains to be argued that such work is within the technical capacity of conversationalists.

Following presentation of a collection of overlapped address terms in tag position, consideration will be given to a resource to which conversationalists may have access and by which they may be able to deploy their capacity for precise placement upon the occurrence of a single word.

[Trio :12]

Penelope: Yeh alright // Dear
 Jeanette: Okay,
 Penelope: [[Bye bye
 Jeanette: [[Bye bye

——end call——

[Ladies :2 :6 :13]

Ann: Yeah well, things uh always work out for
 the // best.
 Beth: Oh, certainly.
 Beth: Alright // Ann.
 Ann: Uh huh,
 Ann: Okay,
 Beth: G'bye.
 Ann: Goodnight,

——end call——

[NB :9-10-68 :6 :3]

Agnes: 'hhh I'll be down 'n a few minutes?
 Penny: O : : ? kay.
 (0.4)
 Penny: O : kay. I'll see yuh.
 Agnes: A : : ?right // Dear,
 Penny: Bye bye,
 Agnes: Bye bye,

——end call——

[Talk Show :1 :18]

Caller^o: Thanks en awful lot // Ted
 Ted: Okay dear.

[Talk Show :II :IV :114]

Ted: I think anybody theh really *looks* at it,
 and who *isn't* personally hung up one way
 or another, has *got* tuh be a little bit
 ambivalent about it.
 Caller: Ted Parsons? thank you very much.
 Ted: Mnice *talkin* tuh you // Sir.
 Caller: A 'right, ba : : h,
 Ted: Good night.

——end call——

[Ladies :2 :3 :6]

Lois: Okay well I will- We'll see you, —
 Rae: Okay // Dear.
 Lois: Bye bye.
 Rae: Bye,

——end call——

[Gib :II :II :2]

Matt: I'll see yuh t'morruh t'go over t'that other
 thing with you but // I'm not goin out t'night.
 Phil: Yeah.
 Phil: Yeah well okcedoe =
 Matt: Yeah.
 Phil: =[[I js thought I'd ask // yuh y'know ju // st in case.
 Matt: Yeah.
 Matt: Yeah.
 Matt: Yeah okay,
 Phil: Okay // Matt,
 Matt: I'll see yuh t'morrow up 't the shop then =
 = Yeh okay Buddy.
 Matt: Okay // Phil,
 Phil: Okay,
 Matt: Yeah. Tha // nks.
 Phil: G'bye,
 Matt: Yeah.

——end call——

[FD :I :66]

Mack: Thank you,
 Jerry: Mmhm,
 Mack: Oka : : y,

Jerry: Right // Mack.
 Mack: Bye : ;
 Jerry: Right.
 Mack: See yuh later,
 Jerry: Okay,
 Mack: Okay,
 Jerry: Okay, hh // hh
 Mack: See yuh coffee time,
 Jerry: Okay.
 Mack: R'aright // Jerry,
 Jerry: Right.

——end call——

[MC:II:2:14]

Jean: We'll go ahead, en I'm sure she'll get
 in touch with you about the ti.me.
 Mel: Yah.
 Jean: Okay,
 Mel: Okeydoke.
 Jean: Thank you // Mel,
 Mel: Thank you // Jean.
 Jean: Bye // bye,
 Mel: Bye.

——end call——

The materials displayed to argue the technical capacity of a recipient to start up 'no later' than the precise moment at which a particular sort of 'continuation' could be accomplished for an ongoing sentence involve no more than the two utterances that constitute the phenomenon. If a similar operation is performed on the overlapped tag-positioned address terms, the claim would be that in many cases the recipient of a single word has heard it, recognized its work, ascertained what his appropriate response can/should be, recognized a completed object, and has started to talk at the moment of perceived completion which virtually coincides with its inception.

Such a claim need not be made. Instead, it may be necessary to isolate as relevant the entire sequence in which the phenomenon occurs. It would then be proposed that, as a SENTENCE can provide a monitoring aid for a recipient, giving him a variety of usable information for the content and placement of his 'continuation', so a SEQUENCE may similarly operate. For convenience, a sentence can be considered as a 'horizontal package' and a sequence as a 'vertical package', where perhaps specific sorts of sequences have their components so arranged that they can be predictively monitored and used in their course — in this case by appropriately

alternating users of alternating components of the package. Further, the 'next utterance' might be seen as analogous to the sorts of 'continuations' displayed earlier; that is, a recipient is to be seen as providing a perfectly placed continuation of the developing vertical package.

The fact that the collected overlapped tag-positioned address terms occur in Closing Sequences may now be brought to bear upon the claim of a recipient's capacity to place talk at the precise end of a possible complete utterance consisting of a single word. Some detailed work has been done on a variety of sequence types, which argues that some of them can be stringently formal and intensely organized in a variety of ways.⁶ A sequence is then not merely the name of a series of utterances that happen to occur one after another, but a type of organization that is possibly analogous to the sentence, and that may provide for predictive monitoring by a recipient. So, for example, a participant in a Closing Sequence may, upon hearing "Okay", not only hear it as a complete utterance, but know that at that point in the package he can or should provide, as a 'continuing' component, a second "Okay" — or, if the prior "Okay" was a second "Okay", then he may know that at that point in the package he can or should provide "Take care" or "Thank you" or some situation-specified continuing component, which will be appropriately and expectably followed by a second case of that class, to which he will return with a first "Goodbye", the recipient of which will follow with a second "Goodbye".

Therefore, a recipient need not be described as dealing with some single word as it occurs, but can be monitoring where he is in the package now, in order to produce some appropriate next utterance/word/package component and find precisely where to place it. That the prior component is a single word need not be problematic for an operation involving a predictively monitorable package.

It should be noted that address terms, although they appropriately and expectably occur in a Closing Sequence, are not organized serially in the way that other components of that package are organized. An address term may occur before, within, or after, perhaps any of the serially organized Closing Sequence Components.⁷ The convergence of an

⁶ A range of sequence types has been described by various workers in terms of their structural organization. For example, Greeting Sequences, Greetings Bypass Sequences, Closing Sequences, Side Sequences, or Insertion Sequences, and such 'action' sequences as Announcement, Offer, Invitation, and Correction Sequences. A feature of at least some of them is that conversationalists orient to the projected structure in their conduct of 'base' versions or 'contracted' and 'expanded' versions of some given sequence.

⁷ That address terms are placed in 'tag' position is obvious enough. In the collection

intensely organized Closing Sequence with the consequential but quite differently organized placement of address terms for any given Closing Sequence may account in part for the frequent occurrence of address term overlapping.

The independently organized occurrence of Closing Sequence components and address terms not only provides systematically characterizable problems for which participants may expectably have access to solutions, but also, if this is a conceivable account for the occurrence of overlapped address terms, supports the initial claim that this phenomenon is in the first place a product of organized behavior and not a more or less random misplacement.

It will turn out that the sorts of placement events initially used to display a recipient's capacity for precise placement are quite gross compared to other sorts of placement work of which conversationalists are capable. A consideration of the more delicate operations will demonstrate a required component of the argument being developed; that is, that the technical capacity for placement is met with an ORIENTATION to that capacity, such that it can be systematically and differentially deployed to accomplish a variety of coherent interactional activities.

First of all, 'starting up immediately upon a perceived reason to talk' is an event based on interaction, requiring an orientation to one's coparticipant, and an orientation to a variety of systematic constraints upon one's placement of talk.

The following fragments involve a recipient's starting to talk prior to completion of a WORD within an ongoing utterance. It will be argued that such placement of the recipient's talk is involved in coparticipant-oriented work.

of Closing Sequences involving overlapped address terms, there is an instance of an address term placed in 'preface' position; i.e., "Ted Parsons? thank you very much." The following fragment involves what may be a reciprocal use of 'inserted' address terms.

[MC:II:4:9]

Nora: Thank you darling fer calling me.
Lila: A:lrigh I'll // be seeing yuh,
Nora: I just wanna be sure ().
Lila: O:kay darling I'll talk tuh yuh.
Nora: Alright.
Lila: Bye bye,
Nora: Bye.

-----end call-----

[FD:X:X]

Caller^o: Fire department, out at the Fairview Food // mart
there's a-

Desk: Yes.

Desk: We've already got thē uh call on that ma'am,

[Gib:II:1:2]

Gene: What's *happening*.

Cathy: Rilly not too much. = I jst ran up th'stai(hh)rs =
That's wh(h)y I'm huf // fing en puffing.

Gene: Oh:..

[FD:III:44-53a]

Caller: Downtown, though, she worked fer:: I
dunno if you know Russ Ogle // thorpe,

Desk: Yeah, I know'm. Mm hm,

Caller: She works fer him,

Again, these overlaps might be viewed as somewhat random misplacements of talk by the recipient; for example, that they are belated attempts at starting to talk immediately following the prior word. It will be proposed that there is some systematic work being done with the precise positioning of the recipient's talk.

Capturing the recipient's work in the following way may help to make clear the sort of work going on. "Fairview Food//YES.", "That's why I'm huf//OH::." and "... Russ Ogle//YEAH,".

If one were attempting to display "Yes I know who/what you're talking about" or "Oh I see what you're talking about" with generalized acknowledgers like "Yes" or "Oh", which do not particularly prove understanding, then the timing with which the acknowledger is produced may relate to its clarity and convincingness. It would be ill-advised to place a generalized acknowledger sooner than "Fairview FOOD" or "That's why I'm HUF ..." or "Russ OGLE ...". There are simply too many potential directions in which an utterance may move, given "Fairview" [hotel, dry cleaners, theater, etc.], "That's why I'm" [so tired, so excited, speaking so quickly, etc.], and "Russ" [... ty Smith, ...ell Jones, Harper, Markevitch, etc.], for one to be assured of being correct at that point and of clearly and convincingly showing he knows he is correct. By waiting for the next particle to be produced one drastically reduces the odds against correctness.

Considering that one may show that one knows what the other is talking about by using such techniques as completing the sentence of the

other's so far uncompleted utterance or by 'saying the same thing at the same time', these precisely placed generalized acknowledgers may be seen to be doing another type of work; showing that while I know what you're talking about, I have specifically gathered that information from you as my informant now, and bring to bear upon it what I know independently.

Such an activity may operate for each of the prior fragments in the following way. For the reported fire, while providing a demonstration of relevant competence and knowledge, Desk specifically acknowledges Caller's helpfulness by 'recognizing' information she is delivering rather than coproducing it. For the issue of "huffing and puffing", Gene indicates that he noticed the phenomenon, was wondering about it, and that the problem has now been solved. He simultaneously deals with the proprieties of noticing some possibly negative feature of his coparticipant; that is, a noticer ought to mention the nice thing he has noticed before he is asked if he noticed it, and ought to leave it up to the one of whom it is a feature to mention if it is a possible affliction. In the Oglethorpe fragment, Desk may be involved in selecting among a series of 'knowables' including Caller, where that happens to be relevant to this particular interchange. Caller has attempted to call a fireman known to him, has been put into contact with this one, for whom he claims acquaintance, about which Desk is unsure. It is possible that if one produced a 'completor' or a 'saying the same thing at the same time' — Desk and Caller simultaneously saying "Oglethorpe" — that sort of thing might be the way Desk begins to claim, not that he knows Oglethorpe, but that he now realizes that he knows Caller's WIFE by virtue of her being the lady who works for Russ Oglethorpe, and now Desk in some fashion knows Caller by virtue of his being the husband of the lady who works for Russ Oglethorpe. By using a generalized acknowledger, and placing it precisely after the occurrence of the first particle of "Oglethorpe", Desk claims that he does indeed independently know Oglethorpe, but that he only knows Oglethorpe, is recognizing that specific knowable by virtue of what Caller has so far said, and is not completing the independently known information as a preface to claiming recognition of other relevant knowables, as the "Yeah" is used as a preface to claiming "I know him".

In general, the placement of these acknowledgment terms may be operating under two fine constraints. One, a 'no later' constraint, relates to displaying that one does have some independent information and is using it. If one waits until the object has been completely produced,

one does not prove that one knows, one merely claims it. This can be particularly important for accrediting a claim such as "We've already got the call on that" or "I know him", having preceded the claim with a generalized acknowledger. One accomplishes that by starting to talk before the entire word has been produced.⁸ Perhaps one appears to risk having turned out to be wrong when the entire object is finally produced, and takes that risk on the basis of an assurance provided by independent knowledge, where, as we have mentioned, waiting for the first particle of that object to be produced drastically reduces the risk. That may constitute one sort of 'no sooner' constraint, that is, technically accomplishing a credible display of "I know what you're talking about".

A different sort of 'no sooner' constraint resides in displaying to the coparticipant that, if I turn out to be correct, it is in part because I have received enough information from YOU to recognize what you are saying, where distinctive actions may thereby be accomplished.

It may then be that delicate interactional attentions are not only possible but requisite for such a thing as the display of 'immediate recognition'. One can (or can fail to) acknowledge one's coparticipant, and that acknowledgment involves a 'no sooner' constraint on what might in the first place be viewed as a recipient's having started to talk as soon as recognition occurred. One does not talk just as soon as recognition occurs, but waits for that point at which various kinds of coparticipant attentions can be displayed.

To convey an idea of the collaborative possibilities for such an operation, and to suggest that not only need the recipient of some information be giving delicate attentions to the ongoing talk, but that the producer of that talk should orient to producing it with a variety of possible operations in mind, we briefly examine a joke that went wrong. It takes place in a multiparty interaction, and shows that the possible systematicity of 'sufficient information' is operating for more than one recipient.

⁸ Sacks notes that recognition, where it is SOUGHT by an ongoing speaker from a recipient, is done in a similar fashion, the by-product being an overlapped ongoing utterance. That is, one speaker, attempting to elicit a signal of recognition from his recipient, produces a series of description components, that series to be cut into and abandoned at the moment the recipient recognizes what is being described. So, for example, the following sort of interchange:

A: I heard you were at the beach yesterday. What's her name, oh you know, the tall redhead that lives across the street from Larry? The one who drove him to work the day his car // was-

B: Oh *Gina!*

A: Yeah Gina. She said she saw you at the beach yesterday.

[GTS:1:2:67]

- Ken: It'll be the twenny ninth. —(0.6)— would
be // Easter.
- Louise: No! It's *nex'* week- One more week left a'
schoo // I.
- Roger: Y'wanna hear something funny, I // can't
read a calendar,
- Louise: 'S the fourth week of *March*.
(0.6)
- Louise: You // what?
- Roger: An' I don't know the months in order, an'
ah pride mahself with i(h)t hehheh hh!
(0.2)
- Louise: ((sing song)) January February March, April
May, June Ju =
- Roger: I know you c'd say 'em, I said I can't
Louise: =[[= ly, Augus' September, December Novem]ber
Oc // tober.
- Ken: It-it-it's always // the
- Al: ((sung)) Thirty days hath September, April
June (and o : :r)

We focus attention upon Roger's overlap of Louise's recitation of the months. Note that although Ken overlaps Louise's utterance, he does so by starting up at the completion of Roger's utterance, which has ended before Louise completes her recitation. This may indicate that Ken is attending to such issues as utterance completion but has 'heard enough' of Louise's utterance to see, as Roger has seen, that it is going to be a straightforward recitation of the months in order.

Roger overlaps the recitation at a point precisely halfway through a twelve-item list the second half of which, that is, the seventh item, has been embarked upon. This may constitute both his decision and his coparticipant-oriented display that enough information has been delivered to suppose that Louise is simply going to recite all twelve months in order, and that he has reached that decision based on information provided by her.

Louise's recipients may be using a known system for the production and reception of information, to which they suppose she is orienting as well. Given that one should orient one's talk to what others know, they may understand that she, knowing that they are monitoring for what she is doing, has given them sufficient information by which to make a decision. Furthermore, insofar as they know this information, they may

have a warrant to interrupt to cut off talk that is insensitive to what she should know they know.

It appears that in fact she did not intend that the recitation be so treated. She used a conventional procedure for constructing a joke, that is, providing the 'surprise' at the end of something familiar. Insofar as this particular 'something familiar' is a twelve-item list, and there has been no introduction that might alert recipients to a forthcoming joke, by the time the list has reached the halfway point her recipients may be permitted to treat what she is doing as a prolonged correct recitation and have grounds so to treat it, and grounds to interrupt. She has, in effect, preempted some requisite orientation to the 'sufficient information' system, with its 'no sooner' and 'no later' constraints with an orientation to a well-constructed joke.

Given these considerations of the technical capacity to start talking at the moment of a perceived reason to talk, and the coparticipant orientation that may variously constrain the precise placement of talk so that one may be seen actually to be waiting to start rather than as starting up immediately, interchanges which initially appear to be the most routine sort of interaction, where a recipient begins to talk upon the COMPLETION of a prior utterance, will be examined as possibly involving 'delayed' starts by the recipient, and investigated for the interactional bases of such delay.

Following are instances of a recipient's talking at the completion of a prior utterance, marking an utterance component that occurred within it as something he want(ed) to refer to.

[Caught in passing]

- Steven: One, two, three, ((pause)) four five six,
((pause)) eleven eight nine ten.
- Susan: "Eleven"? eight, nine, ten?

[NB:1:10]

- Agnes: If *Percy* goes with- Nixon I'd sure like that.
- Portia: Who?
- Agnes: *Percy*. That young fella thet uh- his daughter
was murdered.

[NB:1:9]

- Agnes: I didn' get tuh vote I declined tuh state this
time, when I registered, so, I just uh, didn't
get tuh vote fer president so,
- Portia: You declined- Whaddiyou mean.
- Agnes: Well, I vote Republican *and* Democrat.

If permitting an utterance with a problematic component to go to completion is more than a matter of simply abiding by a rule that provides that a prior speaker ought to be allowed to finish talking before a recipient starts (and the earlier materials indicate that recipients do, for a variety of systematic reasons and in an orderly fashion, start up prior to someone else's completion), then such an event may be subjected to questions about the interactional bases of what may now be seen as a 'delayed response'.

As a technical matter, the recipient may reserve inquiry or comment under an expectation that, since the utterance is ongoing and not yet completed, further talk will address, remedy, modify, etc., the problematic component. At a point where he can see that such action will not be taken, he may then provide his inquiry. This procedure may have interactional significance. That is, the occurrence of a delay may relate to some work specifically relevant to a situation engendered by the occurrence of a problematic component in someone's talk. In other words, the recipient of some problematic component may, by waiting for the utterance in which it has occurred to be recognizably completed by its speaker before marking that component as problematic, account for his marking of it and display coparticipant orientation. The recipient shows that he has permitted, and the speaker has not provided, an unsolicited self-correction (or clarification or modification) of that problematic component. The recipient marks the problematic component now, BECAUSE the speaker has not dealt with it, and he did not mark it before because the speaker was expected to deal with it. The very display by the recipient of his having oriented to the speaker may then signal to the prior speaker that he did not sufficiently orient to his recipient. And it may be of some consequence which of a variety of correction-clarification procedures is followed (e.g., an unsolicited self-correction, a solicited self-correction, correction by a recipient at the moment of the problematic component's occurrence, correction by a recipient after some intervening talk, etc.).

It begins to appear that events like starting to talk immediately and waiting are both related to accomplishing a variety of interaction-based activities, THOSE activities characterized as 'starting to talk immediately' or 'waiting'. That is, one may accomplish an 'immediate start' where accomplishment involves some waiting. And one may accomplish a 'delayed response', which turns out to mean starting to talk as soon as the utterance in which a problematic component occurred is completed. The technical capacity to start up immediately and the

orientation to differentially placed starts are then resources much used in the accomplishment of a variety of work.

The following fragment will be examined for the interplay of starting up immediately upon a perceived reason to talk and interaction-based delay, requiring an orientation to those issues by several participants. Tracking some of the intricacies may serve to support the claims being made for the operation of immediate and delayed starts.

The materials are excerpted from a telephone call. Gene has called Cathy. Cathy's thirteen year old son Ronald is, at least at some point in the call, in the room with her as she is talking to Gene. As the conversation has proceeded so far there is no mention of Ronald's presence by Cathy. At one point Gene has inquired about Ronald.

[Goldberg :II :1 :10]

Cathy: ... he's getting t'be quite a, big bo:y,
he's -hhh Oh I'd say he's about what five
three enna half = Arentchu Ronald,
Ronald: Five (*fou:r*).
Cathy: Five four en 'e weighs about a hunnerd'n
thirty five pounds. =
Ronald: = AAUUGGH! WHADDA- // (L-LIE!)
Cathy: Well how- =
Cathy: = Owright? How much d'you weigh.
Ronald: One *twenty* five.
Cathy: Oh one *twenny* // five.
Gene: What'r yuh tryina make a fatty out'v'm?

Focusing on:

Cathy: ... en 'e weighs about a hunnerd'n thirty
five pounds. =
Ronald: = AAUUGGH! WHADDA- L-LIE!

Ronald's utterance appears to be an instance of starting immediately upon a perceived reason to talk. His outrage at the high estimate of his weight is placed at the instant of a possible completion of Cathy's utterance containing the estimate of his weight. It will be proposed that Cathy and Ronald are orienting to a series of issues related to the production of a problematic component and the placement of a response to it, which involve them in both immediacy and waiting.

To develop this point, we isolate an object that recurs in this fragment and is utilized at least once in its isolated state. We shall argue that it contains sufficient information for its recipient to grasp its import, and so recognizably contains that information that the recipient can legiti-

mately start talking and can have acknowledged information received in just the way that "Russ Ogle...", "Fairview Food..." "That's why I'm huf..." and "January February March April May June Ju..." contain recognizably sufficient information for a recipient to legitimately start talking. The object will be called a 'decad', and occurs in this fragment as "thirty" and "twenty". It is used by Gene as a vehicle for recognizably sufficient information. A rather elaborate consideration of that use will be developed and then turned to a consideration of the position of Cathy and Ronald *vis-à-vis* "AAUUGGH! WHADDA L-LIE!"

Although there are three participants to this fragment, it seems to be the case that Cathy and Gene are officially and technically the ones 'in conversation' with each other. Technically, while Gene apparently can hear Ronald, Ronald cannot hear Gene; thus they are not in a position to be in conversation with each other. Since Gene and Ronald are not in conversation with each other and Gene and Cathy are, then Gene's talk will be constrained by his orientation to Cathy as his official coconversationalist. This has specific consequences for the production of some of Gene's talk.

At one point in the fragment Ronald produces the correction "One *twenty-five*". Suppose that Gene has heard that correction, but in terms of his being 'in conversation' with Cathy, he has 'overheard' it, and to know it legitimately and use it for his own talk with Cathy he must 'hear' it from Cathy. He can accomplish this by starting to talk no sooner than the place where Cathy can have recognizably transmitted sufficient information; that is, by starting to talk upon the completion of the 'decad' "twenny" (the first estimate of Ronald's weight having been "... about a hunnerd'n thirty-five pounds", the correction has been done when "one *twenny*..." has been uttered). Such an operation might stand as a characterization and an account of that fragment:

Ronald:	One <i>twenty-five</i> .
Cathy:	Oh one <i>twenny</i> / / five.
Gene:	What'r yuh tryina make a fatty out 'v'm?

That the placement of a recipient's talk within the talk of the ongoing speaker to accomplish BOTH familiarity with the information and acknowledgment of a coparticipant is quite formal, may be demonstrated in the following way. It may be suspected that Gene's utterance was generated by Ronald's talk and 'merely' placed at an appropriate point in Cathy's talk. This may, in fact, be signalled to a coparticipant. That is, Cathy may understand that Gene has heard Ronald, has come up with

something to say to Cathy about what he's heard Ronald say, AND is deferring to her right to speak after Ronald has spoken, both as proper liaison for Ronald's talk, and as a structurally positioned next speaker in a Correction Sequence with Ronald. The relevance of this latter feature may then convey the information that Gene has been attending the entire sequence produced by Cathy and Ronald. Depending upon what she will say, perhaps, he will or will not say the thing he came up with when he heard Ronald's talk. He now signals both that he has heard enough of Cathy's utterance to determine what she is doing, and that that will not change what he had come up with in response to what Ronald said. It can then inform Cathy that Gene has been a witness to the interchange between her and Ronald, an interchange in which Cathy has necessarily produced her part knowing that Gene was attending to it, and perhaps orienting to his attending to it; that is, producing her part of it with Gene in mind. He may thus successfully orient to her as his proper coconversationalist and, by displaying that he was bringing to bear upon her talk information he already had available, indicates that he orients to her interchange with Ronald, as perhaps she has oriented to his witnessing of it.

The formal work is that of signalling both familiarity with the ongoing talk AND acknowledging the speaker of it. That formal work operates not only for utterances whose very content gives away familiarity, but for utterances whose content masks unfamiliarity. Whatever the content of the object, its placement at a precise point of 'no sooner and no later' within the talk of an ongoing speaker accomplishes the display of familiarity and the display of coparticipant acknowledgment.

That the 'decad' is a conventional 'place' for a recipient's 'no sooner, no later' work may be suggested by its occurrence in other materials. So, for example:

[Trio :4]

Estelle:	There was a <i>p'leecem'n</i> there? with a great big lo : :ng <i>gun!</i> —(0.6)— Heeadit in iz <i>ha:nd</i> . I mean it was not a lid'l <i>gan</i> , it was a- —(0.6)— ten, fifteen, twu / / nny inch <i>gu:n!</i>
Jeanette:	Yeah,

In this case the increment has been moving in fives, and "twunny" is the last item in a conventional three-part list. Starting to talk after "...twu..." Jeanette signals both that she recognizes the series and is, for example, not expecting "twunny-three", and that "twunny" will be the

last number Estelle will provide. Again, she displays her familiarity with and competence with such a device, and acknowledges her coparticipant.

That a 'decad' can be a locus of such a variety of work warrants examining less explicit events surrounding its occurrence. This will permit a consideration of some potentially delicate placement work by Ronald and Cathy.

Suppose that Ronald, knowing that he weighs one hundred and twenty-five pounds, hearing "... a hunnerd'n thirty..." (or even "a hunnerd'n thir..."), understands right then and there that the estimate is high by at least a 'decad'. Suppose he has the technical capacity to start talking at that moment. Why the delay? He may be attending to such issues as 'waiting for utterance completion', for example, to display that an unsolicited self-correction has been permitted by him and not provided by Cathy, which can give a particular warrant to his expressed outrage; that is, it is not merely outrage at the occurrence of a high weight estimate, but at its uncorrected status, given that he provided Cathy an opportunity to correct it.

The 'delayed' comment is placed at the moment Cathy's estimate is completed. This may display some technical capacity for placement on Ronald's part. It may also involve a sort of collaboration between Cathy and Ronald, in which Cathy has produced an utterance that lends itself to just such treatment. That is, Cathy can know that the weight component of her utterance is potentially problematic. It is specifically produced as an estimate, in an environment of an already corrected prior estimate: "On I'd say he's about what five three enna half-Arentchu Ronald ... en 'e weighs about ...".

It will be argued that she performs two interactional tasks; that she (1) so constructs her utterance that Ronald ought to wait until it is completed to see whether and how he should respond, and (2) constructs it in such a way that the problematic component turns out to occur just prior to completion of her utterance, which is specifically 'completed' after the occurrence of the weight estimate, at which point Ronald, having been invited in as a hearer to this segment of the conversation with rights to correct, can and should start talking. That is, she displays that he should wait and displays that and when he should start talking.

The utterance containing the weight estimate can be seen as a two-part list. It is constructed so that when it turns out to have been a two-part list, it is a correctly produced two-part list with its parts separated by "en".⁹ In its course, however, it might be a developing three-part list,

⁹ That part of the technique of constructing a list involves detailed, recipient-oriented

which is a conventional list format. So, for example, it could go: "Five four en 'e weighs about a hunnerd'n thirty five en eez getting better looking every day." The repeated "en" between each component of the list, although it may not be requisite for a three-part list, is certainly used, and specifically is ACCEPTABLE for a three-part list and CORRECT for a two-part list. This means that in its course, a hearer might find himself waiting to see when and how the list will be completed. If there is a third component like "and getting better looking ...", that could modify the sense of the high weight estimate and perhaps oblige a different response than "AAUUGGH! WHADDA L-LIE!"

A brief consideration of the modification possibilities for an intended (and in this case already embarked upon) response can be offered for the following interchange:

Ronald: AAUUGGH! WHADDA- // L-LIE!
 Cathy: Well how- =
 Cathy: = Owright? How much d'you weigh.

There is a difference between "Well how much d'you weigh" and "Al-right? How much d'you weigh." The latter is, roughly, a challenge. It appears that a first version of "How much d'you weigh", started in response to the noise of a complaint, cut off and restarted after the occurrence of "... LIE!" is involved in acknowledging the overlapped word and modifying her response to fit the CONTENT of the complaint in contrast to its contextually (and acoustically) derived sense. That is, Cathy displays that her initial request for the correct weight was 'too mild' considering what Ronald's utterance turned out to be; that the modified, tougher stance is in RESPONSE to Ronald's accusation, which was not initially expected to take that form.

The modification possibilities of a three-part list, as well as the possibility of an unsolicited self-correction or a correction request (cf. "-Arentchu Ronald?") provide grounds for Ronald's waiting to see how the utterance will end. The fact that Cathy may know that the weight estimate is a problematic utterance component seems to lead her to

attention to its junctures is indicated by some work by Michael Carnahan of the University of California at Irvine, who proposes that variant pronunciations of 'AND' within a list may serve systematically to separate and combine possible list components (unpublished seminar paper). So, for example, in the two-part list "...five four EN 'e weighs a hunnerd'N thirty five pounds", the contrast between "EN" and "N" specifically marks that whatever follows "a hunnerd" (which is a possible complete list component, given that it occurs in an estimate environment which has not included such measurement terms as "feet", "inches", etc.) is part of that list component begun with "a hunnerd" and not to be heard as an upcoming third list component, following a completed second component.

construct her utterance so that it will end upon the occurrence of that component. This is not merely a technical matter but has some interactional import. For example, an embedded problematic component may imply that the speaker does not intend it to be remarked upon, and supposes that recipient(s) will understand it or accept it. That may turn out to be programmatic for recipients, who, for example, 'let it pass', taking it that the speaker has intended it to be passed. A problematic component occurring at the end of an utterance may specifically pose a 'test' for recipients. At the end of the utterance a next speaker should talk. If he refers to the problematic component he may be responding to its accessible position as a signal to talk about it. Given its displayed accessibility, if he does not talk about it he may be seen as specifically claiming to understand it or accept it; that is, to have no need to talk about it. Roughly, the convergence of sentence end and problematic component may signal the speaker's awareness of the possible problematic nature of that component, and may assign some specific work to recipient(s).

In the materials at hand, it appears that Cathy has placed the problematic component merely 'more or less' at the end of her weight estimate. That is, "... a hunnerd'n thirty five" is followed by more talk, "... pounds." The analytic result is an elaborate consideration of the constructing of the estimate, which peters out. It will be argued that the placement of the problematic component can be technically characterized as 'directly prior to a component which, by simply signalling utterance completion, invites a next speaker to start talking'; that is, that "pounds" is strictly a transition-relevant device in a situation in which transition may need to be marked, insofar as the possibility of a third list component or self-correction is available.

A series of utterances in which the problematic component and sentence end converge will be briefly considered.

[GTS :2 :20]

Roger: But the *air's* gotta come in dere an' the
air is sorta infiltrated with little uh
pixy dust.

(1.0)

Ken: Doesn' bother *me* any,
Al: Pixy dust!?

[GTS :5 :37]

Roger: An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna
dance in private til he learns how.

Jim: And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and
asks you, y'know,

Roger: Gi(hh)rl asks you to- Alright,

[GTS :4 :23]

Jim: Like yesterday there was a track meet at
Pallisades. Rees was there. Isn't that
a reform school? Rees?

Roger: Yeah.

Ken: Yeah.

Jim: [[Buncha niggers an' everything?

Ken: Yeah.

Roger: You mean Negro dontchu.

Several observations may be made about these fragments.¹⁰ For the purposes of the analysis at hand, it will simply be noted that in the first fragment "pixy dust" is the end of the utterance, and in the other two, items like "Y'know," and "an' everything?" end the utterance. A way to formulate the three cases is that in each case SOMETHING other than an immediate recipient response happens subsequent to the problematic component. Since this is a discrete analysis inserted into a developing argument, it will be necessary to mention here something that belongs, and will be considered, later in the paper. For the latter two fragments, the talk that follows the problematic components may be characterized as 'utterance lengtheners', which indicate to the recipient that the utterance can have been completed so that he may begin to talk, while as well providing that the ongoing speaker has not stopped talking. This may be seen as a technique for specifically 'avoiding' just the sort of occurrence involved in the first fragment; that is, a pause between the utterance containing the problematic component and the recipients' response.

It may therefore be a known feature of problematic components that their occurrence generates a problem for recipients: is the speaker or is he not, himself going to talk about that object? If one does not intend to talk about it, one does not merely not talk. One properly signals that one does not intend to talk about it by REPLACING such talk with a signal that transition is now under way. It appears, then, that there is a structural place, i.e., following a problematic component, in which the ongoing

¹⁰ For an elaborate consideration of these sequences, see G. Jefferson, "Side Sequences", in D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (New York: Free Press, 1972).

speaker ought to provide EITHER talk about that object OR a signal that he does not intend to talk about it. When the problematic component literally ends an utterance, a pause may result. Note that this pause need not be characterized as a period in which the recipients ponder such things as whether or not the problematic component is problematic. That may be decided as the object is occurring. The issue appears to be one of turn-taking proprieties.

In the situation of the weight estimate, "... pounds" occurs in the slot immediately following "... a hunderd'n thirty five". That it is specifically related to transition work, in replacing talk on the problematic component with talk indicating that no such talk will be done, is argued in the following way. "... pounds." is not a necessary part of the weight estimate. Equivalent objects, such as "feet" and "inches" do not occur in the height estimate, and are not missing from it. The word "pounds" is not required for understanding a number that has been introduced as "en 'e weighs ...". Given that a series has been established that does not use such terms, the occurrence of "pounds" for an item in that series, converging with a slot that may specifically be connected with transition considerations following a problematic utterance component, may have its recognizable work specifically located there by its recipient(s).

It may then be a matter of delicate coordination that Ronald does not start up immediately upon hearing "thirty ...", nor upon a possible sentence completion, "thirty five ...", which, although it is a possible sentence completion, is perhaps quite obviously not a possible utterance completion for an utterance containing a problematic component, and that he does start up immediately upon the completion of "... pounds." Not merely may his outrage DERIVE from the structure Cathy has utilized for her weight estimate, but its expression may be PERMITTED, in just the form he uses, by her providing him such a signal as "... pounds", so that he need not be caught, as a recipient obviously can be caught, waiting to see what she will say next (where such an occurrence might provide for his expressed complaint to be done somewhat differently than it can be done following 'instantly' upon the error).

The foregoing consideration of the interplay of 'immediate starting' and 'delayed starting' has yielded a detailed partial analysis of a single fragment of conversation. Various components of that analysis may handle other materials as they turn up. And it is hoped that in the course of that analysis some support has been gained for the argument that conversationalists have a technical capacity to place their talk with precision, and that that placement is both generated and constrained

by a variety of interaction-based considerations to which participants are oriented.

II. With the technical capacity for and an orientation to interactionally based placement of talk as a resource, a second major aspect of the organized occurrence of overlapped address terms in tag position is examined; that of DESIGNED PLACEMENT by an ongoing speaker. This was briefly considered in Section I, and will be elaborated specifically in terms of the placement of address terms.

It will be argued that an ongoing speaker orient to the possibility that a recipient may exercise his option to place his talk so as to overlap a tag-positioned term or phrase.

It is evident that address terms CAN be designedly placed, in that there are systematic alternative loci for them in an utterance. They can go in a variety of places, including 'preface' position and 'tag' position. Obviously, preface-positioned address terms are not subject to overlap by a recipient, as are tag-positioned address terms. This would provide grounds for the preferred placement of address terms in preface position — if the mere occurrence of non-overlapped talk were an aim of some ongoing speaker. It seems to be the case that, in situations in which both positions turn out to be used, tag position is used first. And there may be reasons that tag position use is preferred.

The following fragment is used merely to display the order of occurrence of positioned address terms for 'similar' utterances. It is excerpted from a face-to-face interaction in which two teenagers, in the presence of a participating adult therapist, are disputing the distance of 'Camp Glenoak' from Los Angeles. Ken says it's 650 miles away and Louise says it's "Not even 350 miles" away. Then:

[GTS:3:54]

Ken:	I-I <i>know</i> it's more than that, Louise.
Louise:	It isn't.
	(3.0)
Ken:	((shouting)) Louise, you're not there!
	I <i>know</i> it's more than tha(hh)t // hehh
Louise:	It's <i>not</i> .

For this fragment it is merely noted that the address term "Louise" is associated with two versions of a same utterance; that its first occurrence is in 'tag' position and its second in 'preface'; that the first utterance has been 'frustrated' by its recipient, the second being a version of a 'first' responding to what has happened to the first, and that there are

more than two parties involved, which provides that potentially any speaker has more than one possible recipient.

Another fragment, affording alternative loci of address terms for same or similar utterances in a series, and also the possible preferential ordering, first 'tag' then 'preface', will be subjected to more detailed consideration. This is excerpted from a face-to-face interaction in a work situation. Cassie and Carol work under Tracy's supervision. The fragment starts as Cassie is working and Carol enters.

[Ts :b :2 :2]¹¹

Cassie: Hi Carol.
 Carol: Hi. Er you doing that?
 (1.0)
 Cassie: Yu : :p. That's what I'm doin'.
 Carol: How 'bout if I split it with ya.
 Cassie: Naaoh : :!
 Carol: I don' have (anything) else tuh do.
 Cassie: Well neither do I. =
 Tracy: = You want sumpn to do Carol? =
 Cassie: = I have tuh be here til five thirty.
 Tracy: Carol you want something tuh do?
 Carol: Why, what.

A first consideration involves a possible operation of the address term in tag position for the specific utterance series in which it occurs. The purpose is to convey an idea of the possibility of designing talk by reference to the precise point at which a recipient could and might start talking, where different starting points can constitute different actions by the recipient, whichever one occurs being appropriate, nonviolative, and provided for in the design of the prior utterance.

We focus on Tracy's "You want sumpn to do Carol?" and ask if that 'tag' placement can be operating by reference to the situation in which it occurs, orienting to some relevant interactional issues and to some specific alternative actions a recipient might do.

With specific reference to this utterance series, although it may be quite clear in the overall context of the ongoing talk that Carol is the intended recipient of and proper next speaker to Tracy's remark, the immediately prior two utterances (Carol's "I don' have anything else tuh do" and Cassie's "Well neither do I") provide a potential ambiguity as to the addressee of "You want sumpn to do?". Provision of an address term somewhere in the question will clarify that ambiguity. The placement

¹¹ Transcription by Alene Tsutsui, University of California, Irvine.

of the address term "Carol" as a 'tag' provides for alternative possibilities:

(1) If Carol responds immediately to the question component of the utterance; that is, overlaps the occurrence of her name, then she has correctly heard the question as addressed to her; the ambiguity was nonproblematic, and the occurrence of the tag-positioned "Carol" was unnecessary and unused.

(2) If enough time elapses for Tracy to produce Carol's name 'in the clear', then in terms of the potential ambiguity, the name has been appropriately produced, the speaker now having selected among the utterance's possible recipients and having clarified who ought to respond.

In effect, the placement of the address term in tag position can EXPECT an immediate response but can HANDLE a delayed response; the 'delay' is legitimate, and the tag-positioned address term stands as a solution to the cause of the delay.

Whether or not such attention is given by a speaker to a potential ambiguity and its solution in an utterance series that provides two conceivable recipients for a directed utterance, there is a much more general issue concerned in this particular situation to which the address term in tag position may be attending. Roughly speaking, for an utterance that provides a task for its recipient, as does "You want sumpn tuh do?" in a work situation by a supervisor, issues of willingness and reluctance on the part of the recipient are relevant. A question that invites its recipient to do a task may be 'well-constructed' if it orients to such issues; if, for example, it designs its components to make it possible to scrutinize the elapsed time between question and answer for a recipient's willingness or reluctance, not merely to speak, but to take up the task. Where an address term used to clarify a potential ambiguity could conceivably go in preface position, then at the completion of "Carol, you want sumpn to do?" there is a potential pause. That potential pause would not be any pause after any utterance, but a pause after an utterance that offered a task, a pause which could signal not merely reluctance to speak, but reluctance to accept the task.

Tag-positioned address terms, however, can operate to add to the length of an ongoing utterance; they can be included among a series of utterables which provide that a speaker has not stopped talking although a possible complete utterance has been produced, where if he were to 'have stopped', an informative pause might occur. A whole series of utterables can signal to a recipient that he may/should start talking, while providing that the current speaker has not stopped. For example:

[Gib:II:I:6]

Gene: Oh:: yeah it's justa buncha crap = Y'know? =
Cathy, = en it's, = I uh,
Cathy: Wul is the money there though Gene tuh
compensate, you?

Within Gene's utterance there are five points at which a recipient could legitimately start talking, can be seen to have been invited to start talking. The address term is one among a series of addable objects, at the completion of which a recipient may begin to speak.

Not all utterance lengtheners are appropriate for specific situations; for example, things like "Y'know?" and "Uh" may be characterized as 'pleas', which a supervisor proposing a task to a subordinate ought not use, and things like "Huh?", "Okay?", "Right?" may be characterized as 'demands', which for a first offer may be inappropriate. An address term used in a multiparty situation may function as 'merely a specification', neither a plea nor a demand, while it provides a matrix in which the occurrence of an immediate response is particularly marked and may be viewed as a display of recipient's 'willingness', while the occurrence of a delayed response is particularly unmarked, in that the ongoing speaker is still talking and hence the delayed response is not necessarily a display of 'reluctance'.

Such considerations can account for the preferred placement of the address term in the tag position, which supposes willingness and obscures reluctance. If this turns out to have been a 'first' occurrence, where the second is responsive to some abuse of the first, placement of the address term in preface position may be a warrantedly 'less considerate' version, potentially providing for a pause when the utterance is completed, a pause which may be seen as the intended recipient's silence and scrutinized for issues of reluctance.

For a tag-positioned address term to become a 'mere sound', a matrix upon which an immediate response to the utterance to which it is appended is displayed, is radically to shift its status from a key locus of relational work to a sound particle in the service of another type of interactional work. Further, it has so far been taken for granted that the occurrence of an overlap, an 'interruption', can be an appropriate conversational event, although a basic conversational rule that 'not more than one speaker talks at a time' may imply that it is a violation.¹²

¹² Sacks develops this rule and its consequences for participants in a series of unpublished lectures and in Ch. II of the draft manuscript of *Aspects of the Sequential Organization of Conversation*, to be published by Prentice-Hall.

One reason that overlapping talk may be a violation is that the overlapped talk is potentially rendered sequentially nonimplicative; it is treated as unheard, so that the developing course of talk may not include the overlapped talk, which was supposed to be included.

It will be argued that there are specific occasions of overlap that are appropriately nonconsequential, in which the overlapped object is 'deleted' (rendered sequentially nonimplicative) by collaborative efforts on the part of speaker and recipient.

The following metropolitan police department call is displayed as a clear instance of 'deletion'.

[S:P356:2:2]

Desk: Radio, Hubble.
Caller: Uh send a k- uh ambulance to fifteen oh four
Garvey Street. Kid hit by a car.
Desk: Fifteen oh four Garvey. // How bad is it.
Caller: Yes sir that's between Belmont and uh Third.
on Glenmore.
Desk: Alright. Send a car.
Caller: Send an amb'lance too please.
Desk: Alright sir,

———end call———

Caller has started talking no sooner and no later than the moment of completion of Desk's "Fifteen oh four Garvey" and has thereby turned out to have overlapped "How bad is it". The overlapped question receives no answer or acknowledgment, and the question does not recur. This is a systematic occurrence, the product of the work of both parties. Caller's utterance is specifically RESPONSIVE to Desk's ("Yes sir"), REFERS to it (with "that's", which may relate to both Desk's "Fifteen oh four Garvey" and Caller's "... fifteen oh four Garvey Street"; i.e., refers to both in their relationship to each other), and immediately FOLLOWS it. The very structure of Caller's utterance, its components and its placement, and its 'timing' can serve to explain why it is produced right here and now. It provides that Desk's talk up to that point was entirely adequate in ITS structure and components to elicit talk from Caller. It may then signal to Desk that he NEED not talk further.

At the moment of overlap, Desk can decide what to do about the 'further' talk that he is in the course of producing. And he does have systematic options. If he intends to have his talk included in the course of the developing sequence, and perhaps has recognized that Caller's talk is appropriate and ought not be cut off, he can provide a first com-

ponent of a Restart Format. That is, he can cut off his own talk and reintroduce it at the completion of Caller's utterance. Hypothetically, the sequence might go:

Desk: Fifteen oh four Garvey. // How bad-
 Caller: Yes sir that's between Belmont and uh Third.
 // On Glenmore.
 Desk: How-
 Desk: How bad is it.

Although hypothetical, this proposed sequence is not at all arbitrary. The following instance of a Restart is analogous to the hypothetical case, except that the 'restarter' is, as well, signalling that he does not consider the other's talk appropriate. He does this by placing his starts 'within' the talk of the other, rather than at points of possible completion:

[Talk Show :3 :47]

Caller: ... I don't know of any that want the Viet Cong,
 Ted: Yeah well this is the thing.
 Caller: They're // Buddhists and they are // Catholics,
 Ted: Bad-
 Ted: Desperate // and bad as war-
 Caller: They just don't want // the-
 Ted: Yeh
 Caller: They'd all be killed if the- the Viet Cong were
 to take over.
 Ted: Yah. Desperate and bad as warfare is, there are
 some things, we think, that are even worse.

The very fact that Desk's "How bad is it" is spoken to completion in a situation of overlapping talk may then provide that it is a potential deletable; that unless Caller acknowledges it and/or answers it, it will not take its place in the developing sequence. It MAY be repeated, but it does not signal that it WILL be repeated, as the Restart Format does signal. It is not 'being insisted upon' in the course of the other's talk. If there is a speaker's technical capacity to stop talking at the moment of a perceived reason to stop; i.e., upon another speaker's starting up, then there may be a recipient's orientation to such an action which may become programmatic for the recipient, informing him that whatever it was (if he did not hear some or all of it), it was not crucial to the speaker, thereby directing him that he need not now ask what that overlapped talk consisted of, and perhaps if he DID hear it, that he should disregard it in the interests of the sequence as it is now constituted.

It may then be that alternative actions are done with 'cut off' or 'complete' versions of an utterance; the former signalling that the

utterance is intended to reappear in the sequence (either by recipient's request or speaker's restarting), the latter being a specific 'disregard' signal.

These are the sorts of issues evoked in the characterization of 'deletion' as an interactionally achieved phenomenon. Deletion occurs in part as the result of an event that has happened (something has been overlapped) and in part as a result of the conduct of subsequent talk, of information delivered by and decisions made by both parties.

A brief note concerning a further feature of the sequence, which may be relevant to the issue of deletion. "How bad is it" may in the first instance be a possible 'deletable'. Desk's two-sentence utterance is reciprocally fitted to Caller's two-sentence announcement, dealing with its parts in order. It appears that the customary treatment of such a two-part first utterance is to deal with the last item first. This suggests that "How bad is it" by its very placement may be displayed as 'merely reciprocal' to "Kid hit by a car", where such an inquiry can be more or less obligatory given an announcement like that, independent of particular police business.

Perhaps analogously, the positioning of an address term after a possibly complete utterance may provide a structural potential for its deletability. Its placement signals that if it is heard at all it is not something about which a recipient should ask "What did you say?" It may specifically be that a recipient SHOULD not ask, since an expectable response to such a question for an overlapped address term is "Nothing, never mind", rather than "I said 'Carol'" or "I said 'honey'". Perhaps it is not merely that these terms CAN disappear if overlapped, but that they should be permitted to disappear.¹³ And that has some interest for the relationship of placement to potential deletability; that is, there may be systematically recognizable objects which, if overlapped, need not be asked about, and one such recognizable object may be the noise one realizes one has overlapped by starting to talk upon the occurrence of a complete utterance.

¹³ In a situation of a non-overlapped tag-positioned address term, a request for a repeat receives a repeat in which the two absent objects are a transition relevant preface, and the tag-positioned address term.

[MC:II:7]

Jean Well I mean I won't be where she c'n get me honey,
 Ans. Svc.: Pardon?
 Jean: I won't be where she c'n // get me.
 Ans. Svc.: Well that's alright, ...

Further, it may be suggested that 'deletability' for address terms is also provided for in the fact that the address terms are spoken to completion in a situation of overlap. This is not an absurd possibility, although the address term may consist of not more than one syllable. One-syllable words can be turned into a cut-off, restartable object. Given the possibility of the speaker's capacity to stop upon the instant of a perceived reason to stop, having begun to say "Sir", a speaker can have produced just "S-". And it turns out that recipients are capable of hearing such a sound as a word beginning, and of providing the appropriate finish. For example:

[GTS :3 :62]

Louise: My father's six foot two feet he's *la : rge,*
 en' // he's a very s-
 Ken: ehch
 (1.0)
 Ken: -st (*hh*)able *per* // son yea(h)
 Louise: -sta- Mm hm,

In such ways is the deletion of an object collaboratively achieved. An overlapping recipient may be signalled, and understand, that the object he overlapped is not to be inquired about; the one who produced it provides some continuation of the sequence and does not, for example, set up a Restart Format, which would signal that he intends that the overlapped object be reinstated into the sequence. If for some reason a recipient wished to reinstate the overlapped object, the foregoing considerations might provide constraints upon which of a series of remedies he could use.

III. Most of the overlapped tag-positioned address terms contained in the corpus of Closing Sequences displayed earlier appear to fall within the category of appropriately deleted objects. Talk continues and the conversations close without attempts at remedy.

There are, however, cases of Double Overlap. For these it is proposed that the second occurrence should not be treated as an independent occurrence of the same sort of event for the same sort of reasons, but as a product of an attempt to REMEDY the deletion of the first address term. A recipient of an address term, having overlapped it, may yet have heard it, and may wish to acknowledge that he heard it and have it reinstated into the sequence.

As a preliminary, two features of tag-positioned address terms will be dealt with and analogies to some more transparent materials will be

treated; thereupon the tag-positioned address terms will themselves be considered.

A first feature of overlapped tag-positioned address terms is that the utterance containing the address term has been misheard by its recipient. A second feature is that it has been misheard by virtue of the recipient's apparent attention to sequential features of a Closing Sequence, where it has been suggested that the designed placement of the address term in tag position allows for its potential overlap as a result of just such an orientation on the part of the recipient.

The more transparent instances to be considered appear to have those two features. A piece of talk is misheard by its recipient, and that piece of talk appears to be mishearable by virtue of its having a 'contextual' sense, specifically in terms of the development of an ongoing series of utterances and participants' orientation to that series, and an 'actual' sense, which requires the recipient to give another sort of attention to capture it. Roughly, the distinction between the 'contextual' and 'actual' senses is that the 'contextual' sense is structurally-sequentially available and the 'actual' sense is 'content-contained'.

It is to be noted that recipients, having responded to the 'contextual' sense, appear to mobilize immediately to do a reanalysis, and that the speaker does not, at the point he understands that the recipient has not caught the 'actual' sense, start up with a correction or a correction solicitor (e.g., "That's not what I meant") but permits the recipient a 'second chance'. A series of such occurrences, which will be called 'double takes', will be displayed and given brief consideration.

[DA :rd :3]

Here, Alice, a visitor from one big city is staying in a suburb of another big city with some relatives. She and Beth are arranging a get-together for reasons known to Alice but not yet to Beth. They are not well acquainted. Beth has asked if Alice intends to come into town and Alice says a friend of hers will be driving her in on Thursday and can take her to Beth's house.

Alice: Uh- she's gonna pick me up Thursday morning.
 (1.4)
 Beth: Uh how early is she gonna pick // you up.
 Alice: I have no idea.
 Alice: I mean if you uh *do* anything *definite* on
 Thursday, then uh, *don't* let me uh :,

Alice's first hearing of Beth's utterance is specifically sequential. She has heard it as if Beth had said "What time is she gonna pick you up" as a more or less conventional next utterance in a series of arrange-

ments, and as derivatively structured from Alice's prior utterance. Alice has done the work required to display a recognizable immediate start, waiting long enough into Beth's utterance for its derivative relationship to her own to be available. Immediately thereafter Alice catches the sense of "How early ..." and the delicate work it is doing in setting constraints on her meeting with Beth, where in the first place, Alice provided that they meet on Thursday, and now Beth is indicating that Thursday is not necessarily suitable, and that such a meeting would have to be brief and quite early in the day.

In the following fragment, Ken treats Al's overlapping talk first as a merely sequential object, an 'interruption', to which he responds with "Waita minute". Although in this case, Ken's 'double take' is not immediate, it can be noted that Al does not provide 'remedial' talk. Ken then captures the joking insult; that is, the content of the talk, to which he provides the insult-retort "Thanks!"

[GTS :2 :2 :23]

- Ken: You know the new fad in uh in about seven years
will be women smoking cigars, you- because before
it used to be all men were smoking cigarettes,
// and they-
- Al: Well so // you'll be smoking a cigar in seven
years // I don't care.
- Ken: Waita minute.
- Ken: Waita minute. They had a-
- Roger: hehh hhh // hehh hhh hhhh
- Ken: Thanks!

In the following fragment, Philip first hears a conventional Pre-Closing utterance; some reference to arrangements made earlier in the telephone call, and responds to it with an entry into the Closing Sequence ("Okay").¹⁴ He then hears its content, indicating that Lila is requesting confirmation of those prior, apparently firm arrangements.

[MC :II :11 :38]

- Lila: Well listen it's getting late, so we'll talk
again, and I'll probly see you Friday if its
convenient.
- Philip: Okay,
- Philip: Oh I'll see yuh three thirty definitely.

¹⁴ See Schegloff and Sacks, "Opening up Closings", *Semiotica* VIII: 4, 289-328 for a consideration of such a procedure, the relationship of talk involved in Pre-Closings to entry into Closings, etc.

In the following, two women during a phone call are talking about playing bridge. The topic moves to the husband of a woman with whom they have played bridge.

[Ladies :rd :2 :2 :3]

- Val: I don't know, an'- an' he sorta scares me,
- Cora: Have you seen im?
- Val: Well, I've- I've met im.
- Cora: Well, uh actually // when she's-
- Val: And the way they play, oh.
- Cora: Serious huh?
- Val: Yeah,
- Cora: Oh I don't wanna go.
- Val: Well, no, I-it-no, I didn't mean no- =
- Val: = Did she invite you over?
- Cora: Yeah,

The 'double take' here indicates that Val has heard Cora's "Oh I don't wanna go" sequentially, for its relationship to Val's prior utterance, in taking Val's assessment of the couple too seriously. Then she catches its content, that Cora has been invited to play bridge with them.

The operation of sequential considerations for a recipient's hearing of some utterance may provide a resource for the design of talk. A speaker who wishes to build a subtle utterance can do so by providing it a sequentially available sense independent of its content — and it is perhaps this asynchronous relationship of sequential and content-contained properties which signals a recipient to analyze some utterance for its specific content. A 'double take' is then in a variety of ways the work of both parties: the design of the misheard utterance by its speaker, the alertness of the recipient to there being 'something more', the capability and willingness of the recipient to provide an unsolicited self-correction, and the permission to do that by the one whose utterance was misheard.

There are, then, systematic sequence-based grounds for some utterances to be misheard, which may perhaps be used by a speaker to design a subtle utterance, and systematic sequential provisions for remedy by which the producer of the misheard utterance may permit and thereby EXPECT a remedy. In situations of a possibly designedly subtle object, a recipient who has misheard it may be able to rely upon his coparticipant's orientation to a forthcoming remedy. It will be proposed that this serves as a resource for the production of equally subtle remedies.

So, for example, if by attending the sequential features of some ongoing talk he has overlapped a tag-positioned address term (that position being

one of at least two alternative positions and therefore being possibly designedly chosen by the speaker), the recipient might be able to suppose that the speaker of the utterance containing the address term is specifically alert to its being potentially overlapped, and is expecting his recipient to do a reanalysis and provide a remedy. The recipient may also be able to suppose that if he does something rather subtle that may be heard as a remedy, it will be heard as such. This can provide him the resources to DO a remedy in the first place, where some of the more elaborate and direct resources are not available for a potentially deleted object (for example, recall that a request for a repeat of an utterance containing an address term may elicit a repeat of that utterance, but not of the address term).

With these considerations, a situation in which an overlapped tag-positioned address term may not be heard is investigated for the possibility of a particular form of acknowledging and reinstating the overlapped object.

[Glb:II:I:30]

Cathy: ·hh Okay Gene well then gimme a call in
 the next coupla weeks en then uh 'hh y'
 know we'll see what we c'n work out.
Gene: *Great.*
Cathy: Awrighty? =
Gene: = Okay Cathy, =
Cathy: = Okay // Love.
Gene: See yuh then = Yeah.
Cathy: Right. Bye bye.

——end call——

In this case, the overlapped address term is the endearment term "Love". There are systematic bases for both the occurrence of the endearment term and for the fact that it is overlapped. Generally, these are that the occurrence of a name CAN receive a reciprocal name use, and in some positions in conversation perhaps SHOULD receive a reciprocal name use, and that perhaps places like the 'middle' of a conversation, or even something as specifiable as Pre-Closings (of which Cathy's utterance is a part) do not oblige a reciprocal name, in contrast to Greeting and Introduction Sequences and Closing Sequences, in which case, the Closing Sequence provides an independent locus for a pair of address terms. However, it seems to be the case that if a name has been used once it should not be reused in close proximity to the initial use, and instead, a variant should be used. So, for example:

[Glb:Untranscribed]

Cathy: *Bobbie.* Hi = How *are* you.
Bobbie: *Fine* Cathy = How *are* you.
Cathy: *Fine* Sweetie.
Bobbie: *Goo:d.*

and

[Glb:II:2:2]

Phil: Okay // Matt,
Matt: I'll see yuh t'morruh up 't the shop then =
Phil: = Yeh okay Buddy.
Matt: Okay // Phil,
Phil: Okay,

The latter fragment preserves the distinction between a single occurrence of a name in Pre-Closings and a paired occurrence of address terms in the Closing Sequence, as well as containing an overlapped second pair member in that sequence.

Such considerations can more or less account for Cathy's use at that point of something other than a name.¹⁵ That it is overlapped may be partially accounted for as a result of the apparent attention a recipient of a single name use can pay it, so that in ensuing talk he may be seen to be providing a 'second' to it, although not as any specifiable sort of 'paired second', as "Okay Buddy", "Okay Phil" may be seen as a 'paired second'. That sort of attention may further be employed in the following way. Gene can be aware of, and can use the prior occurrence of his name to understand that if Cathy now produces a reciprocal paired address term, she will be obliged to use some variant. He may have specific grounds to suppose that she will not choose to produce such an object, which, given their relationship, would not appropriately be "Sir", but an endearment term, a term she might not be willing to produce under the auspices of the work it might be seen as doing in a Closing Sequence. He may then attempt to provide that her earlier use of his name was sufficient by placing his talk in such a way as not to expect further address work by her; that is, by starting to talk immediately upon completion of the Closing Sequence component "Okay". Cathy, however, has provided a reciprocal second, and Gene now turns out to have overlapped it.

¹⁵ That the particular TYPE of address term occurring in these fragments are 'endearment' terms may be sequence-specifiable (within the constraints of relational requirements). That is, at call beginnings and endings, they provide expressions of "glad to (have) hear(d) from you", and may, for endings in particular, be involved in work which, independently of the particulars of a given interaction, formulates it now as a happy and satisfying one.

Of interest is that such an occurrence as Cathy's having called Gene "Love" may have sequential-structural bases, but can independently be treated for its content and for its occurrence in a Closing Sequence as a locus for relational formulating and reformulating, and that while Gene's overlapping of that endearment term may have quite nicely coparticipant-attentive bases, it can be alternatively characterized as having been brusque, having been inattentive to the possible occurrence of an endearment term specifically by virtue of his attention to the Closing Sequence; that is, to getting the call terminated. All of which is to say there are some thoroughly systematic grounds to suppose that there is an intense orientation by participants to this occurrence, and to the need of a remedy, on the part of both the overlapped speaker and the overlapping intended recipient of "Love". With that in mind, the issue of acknowledgment is addressed, focussing on the following segment of the interaction:

Cathy: Okay // Love,
Gene: See yuh then = Yeah.
Cathy: Right. Bye bye.

Suppose that Gene's "See yuh then=Yeah" contains a remedy to his having overlapped "Okay Love" with "See yuh then"; that is, that the appended particle "Yeah" is specifically directed to acknowledging that object that was overlapped by the very talk to which it is appended. And further, that Cathy's "Right" serves as an acknowledgment of the proffered remedy. If such could be the case, then the sequence is 'put to rights' by agreement of the participants without interrupting the flow of the Closing Sequence, and without the employment of existing remedial techniques involving interruption of the ongoing sequence, which may specifically be designed to 'make much of' an occurrence which treated this way may be 'made little of'.¹⁶

To argue that possibility, we shall consider some specific technical apparatus and its utility for the conduct of conversation. To begin with, a transparent instance of a device for acknowledging an overlapped, and for sequential purposes potentially unheard, deleted term is considered.

¹⁶ The degree of fuss made about some event may be characterized quite formally, not only with respect to which sort of remedy is utilized, but which variant of a remedial sequence. So, for example, the materials involved in "AAUUGGH! WHADDA LIE!" have been independently characterized as an Expanded Correction Sequence; participants orienting to that feature of it to produce a 'big fuss'.

[GTS :3 :57]

Louise: ... another thing is that we had three drivers changing off. That means you c'n keep up a steady pace an' *you* only have one person,
Ken: I drove- I drove my Jeep the *whole* way up there by myself, loaded down with a- with a boat, an' trailer. —(1.0)— An' I went forty five the whole way up there. —(1.0)— And uh —(1.0)— I-I made pretty good time, but it's // tiresome.
Louise: But it was one pers-*yeah* it's tire // some
Ken: Ohh it's tiresome ...

Focussing on:

Ken: I-I made pretty good time, but it's // tiresome.
Louise: But it was one pers-*yeah* it's tiresome

Briefly, Louise starts out with what appears to be an attempted 'saying the same thing at the same time'. Within her own and Ken's talk are grounds for her deciding that Ken's "But it's ..." will turn into something like "But it's one person" as a summary completion of his utterance. She hears that her attempted 'saying the same thing at the same time' has overlapped something quite different, and has thereby potentially deleted it in favor of her 'one person'. She now interrupts her own utterance and provides a display of immediate response to HIS utterance ("*yeah*"). Insofar as she has begun one recognizable sort of activity, she may be obliged to display that what she will do now is not an intended remedy of her attempted 'same thing at the same time'; that, for example, she is not attempting to come off as if she had intended to say "But it's tiresome" all along (as Roger may be seen to remedy his belated entry into "The guy who doesn't run the race doesn't win it but 'e doesn't lose it" by cutting off "But" and picking up again at "lose it"). Louise's 'responsive utterance' contains not only a use of Ken's potentially deleted word, but contains an acknowledgment ("*yeah*") that it is Ken's use of "tiresome" that is being talked about. The use of "*yeah*" specifically marks the difference, marks a shift from 'saying the same thing at the same time' to doing an acknowledgment. Without the "*yeah*", "But it was one pers- it's tiresome" could stand as a remedied 'saying the same thing at the same time'.

That the use of "*yeah*" can do such work as distinguishing between two activities which might otherwise be identical in placement and terminology draws research attention to it and things like it as having some particular technical operation.

In the following fragment "Uh huh" occurs as the vehicle for acknowledgment, in a situation not of overlap, but of a rather different possible mishearing.

[Hurricane :II :100ff]

Roberts: His name is Joe,
 Johnson: Mm hm?
 Roberts: Vandiver.
 Johnson: Vandiver?
 Roberts: V-a-n, / / d-
 Johnson: -d-i-v-e-r.
 Roberts: -d-i-v-e-r. = Uh huh,

Johnson has assayed to spell the last part of a name that Roberts is spelling for him at his request. She follows his correct spelling of it with an identical spelling. The placement of her spelling, directly following his, might cause Johnson to wonder "Isn't that what I said?" The appended "Uh huh" refers to his spelling of the name, acknowledging its legitimate occurrence and its correctness. In some materials displayed earlier as an instance of capacities and orientations *vis-à-vis* a bit of sound smaller than a syllable, can be found an acknowledgment of a prior speaker's having been the one who said the object contained in the utterance to which the acknowledger is appended, when that prior speaker merely produced its first sound and no more.

Louise: My father's six foot two feet he's *la:rge*,
 en / / he's a very s-
 Ken: eheh
 (1.0)
 Ken: -st(hh)able per / / son = yea(h)
 Louise: -sta- Mm hm,

Given these possibilities for placing an acknowledgment, it seems plain that Gene's "See yuh then=Yeah" can be doing such work on Cathy's overlapped and potentially deleted "Okay // Love". That such work can be done in the course of some series of utterances, and sometimes in the course of a sequence, suggests a possibility that initially may seem over-complicated but turns out to be a simple and routine matter for the conduct of conversation. Suppose that participants have techniques for collaboratively 'restructuring' some prior talk; for changing what has actually occurred.

The sorts of overlaps that have so far been considered may not make apparent the sequential disorganization that could result from the occurrence of overlap in a conversational system which merely allowed

one utterance to occur after another, without provision for participants controlling and organizing (and specifically being able to REorganize) their talk. An obvious instance of the potential disorganization of a sequence of talk resulting from overlap and the need for reorganizing techniques is the situation in which two people have talked simultaneously.

[Talk Show :I :25]

Ted: Don't go 'way.
 Caller: Should I stay on the line now?
 Ted: Yep, jus' stand by.

[NB :9-10-68 :5 :4]

Agnes: *That's* about a :ll,
 Guy: What else.
 Guy: The hat,
 (0.5)
 Agnes: En the hat,

Obviously, someone is going to talk next, and it appears that people can decide which one. One of them does talk, and the other 'permits' him to, given the way they talk. This results in the simultaneous talk being treated as if one utterance had occurred before the other, the speaker who talks 'next' having talked 'first' and the one who permits him to speak having talked 'second'. An obvious resource for deciding which one shall talk next and has talked first is to see whose utterance ENDED last, the one whose utterance has ended first being the one who will talk next. This has some consequences for the transcription and analysis of conversation. That is, the latter fragment above is wrongly transcribed in that since they both STARTED together there is no systematic way to determine which utterance should be displayed first. It appears that one must attend utterance endings in such a situation in order to capture the actual work being done by conversationalists. This of course bears on the issue of utterance design through an orientation to a recipient's ability to place his talk with precision. In the following fragment the determining 'length' of the utterances is a matter of one syllable, and seems to serve for the participants to reorganize the simultaneous talk into serially occurring talk.

Jean: We'll go ahead, en I'm sure she'll get
 in touch with you about the ti:me.
 Mel: Yeah.
 Jean: Okay,
 Mel: Okeydoke.
 Jean: Thank you ...

Now, if such attention to the length of an utterance is within the technical capacity of conversationalists, it may become a 'strategically' employed feature. So, for example, in a situation where a tag-positioned address term has been overlapped and thereby potentially deleted, the one who has produced the address term may talk again immediately following the overlapping talk, thus indicating that an acknowledgment is not being awaited and the term is legitimately deleted, but can provide a 'long' utterance which will decide that the other spoke first if he chooses to speak immediately to provide an acknowledgment of the overlapped term. Since acknowledgment in such situations can and should be done with such single words as "Yeah", "Right", "Uh huh", it is not necessarily problematic for the one who wishes to produce a 'longer' utterance to determine what would constitute such an object; it need only be longer than "Yeah".

This sort of intricate work will be considered for the following fragment:

Mack: R'aright // Jerry,
 Jerry: Right.
 Jerry: Right.
 Mack: I see yuh later.
 Jerry: Okay.

Mack's "I see yuh later" and Jerry's "Right" start simultaneously. That Jerry speaks next provides, as has been considered, that the sequence is restructured so that Jerry's "Right" is treated as having occurred prior to Mack's "I see yuh later".

In terms of the acknowledgment work that is being considered, Jerry's acknowledgment of Mack's having produced his name, to BE acknowledging that, must be placed directly after it. Such objects as "Yeah", "Right", "Mm hm", etc., to accomplish acknowledging, need to be positioned directly after the object being acknowledged. Otherwise, since they are nonspecific sorts of referencing objects, they can be heard as acknowledging whatever they happen to follow. In this case, had "Right" occurred after "I see yuh later", it could perfectly well be a response to that.

Further, if the foregoing can be seen as a routinely used technique for reorganizing a sequence, the fact that Mack happens to produce an utterance like "I see yuh later", which is a more or less appropriate object in the closing segment of a conversation, may have systematic bases. It is predictably a longer utterance than the acknowledgment terms, and can provide that if Jerry chooses to do an acknowledgment simultaneously to

Mack's proposing that one is not necessary (by starting up to talk immediately after Jerry's overlap), the acknowledgment will be the shorter utterance and thereby Jerry will appropriately talk next after the two simultaneously started but serially ended utterances, restructuring the sequence so that Jerry's acknowledgment will have occurred prior to Mack's 'continuation' of closings. That is, the selection of a technical Pre-Closing utterance in the course of a Closing Sequence may involve a use of relevant resources to solve a particular problem.

A similarly delicate collaborative attention can operate in an alternative technique for acknowledging a possibly deleted object. Quite simply it involves that the recipient of that object USE it in his ensuing talk, perhaps specifically in what can be seen as 'matched' talk. For example, a 'paired second' may acknowledge an overlapped address term in the first to which this is now a paired second, in that the second duplicates the first, and the overlapped term occurs in precisely the position in which the overlapped term occurred relative to the utterance. An overlapping recipient can use the fact that the name occurred by producing a reciprocal second name use.

This technique can provide for UNMARKED acknowledgment, in contrast to the sorts of acknowledgments that have been considered so far. The unmarked acknowledgment technique may remedy the sequence in a more subtle fashion and therefore could be a preferred technique to that of marked acknowledgments, specifically for such delicate situations as an overlapped address term, where the one whose address term was overlapped may expectably be attending to a remedy in such a way that the subtlest sort of remedy will be understood, where these unmarked acknowledgments rely heavily upon the recipient's expectation of acknowledgment. However, the very reasons for that sort of attention to a forthcoming remedy are the reasons for the one whose address term was overlapped not to be attending a remedy, but to be occupied in specifically displaying that he does not expect one. Since, in interactional terms, the overlap can stand as a 'rejection' of the work that address terms attempt, and with the potential for deletion upon the occurrence of overlap, the one whose address term was overlapped/rejected may take up the option to have it all not have happened, and thereby officially not have been offered and not have been rejected.

A further constraint on the occurrence of unmarked remedies for overlapped tag-positioned address terms is that such a remedy is available only to the recipient of a first pair member in a set of reciprocally paired address terms who happens to overlap that first pair member. If the second

reciprocally paired address term happens to be overlapped, this particular remedy is not available. However, if the foregoing considerations about the systematic sources for overlap — orientation to the development of a tightly organized Closing Sequence and the 'unpredictable' placement of address terms within it — are at all correct, then overlaps are not likely to START occurring in the environment of a second pair member address term. The occurrence of the first ought to set a place for the expectable occurrence of the second. On the other hand, the overlap of a first use of an address term may set up a series of activities which result in a 'reciprocally overlapped' second address term. These are the sorts of intricate issues that we consider are related to the occurrence of Double Overlapped address terms.

IV. The resources that have been developed will be briefly summarized and then applied to an analysis of one instance of a Double Overlap.

There is a technical capacity for and an orientation to precision placement of talk through the performance of alternative actions of some set of possible actions.

Such an orientation may provide the basis for utterances designed to deal with placement possibilities in such a way that whichever action of a set of alternative actions a recipient performs by his placement of his talk, that action has been appropriate and expected.

One action a recipient can perform involves the overlapping of some portion of the ongoing talk. That overlapping can in some situations and for some objects result in the deletion of the overlapped object from the developing sequence. The ongoing speaker can design his talk in such a way that the deletion of some part of it is legitimate and nonconsequential.

The appropriateness of a deletion constitutes a problem in some situations. If an address term in tag position is designed to have been deleted if overlapped, the nonconsequential disappearance of that term from the sequence may itself become interactionally problematic in terms of the sort of work that address terms do, that is, the formulation and possible reformulation of a relationship in the environment of a Closing Sequence.

One basis for the problematic nature of the deletion of a tag-positioned address term may be that its positioned deletability has been part of a technique for providing that its recipient should be listening particularly attentively. That is, there are various techniques for requiring that a recipient work to capture the 'actual' sense of some utterance, where there is a readily available contextual sense overlying it. A tag-positioned

address term in a Closing Sequence may be such an object, 'testing' whether a recipient is monitoring the Closing Sequence and working in the interests of moving out of the interaction, or is attending the Closing Sequence as a locus for the occurrence of strong relational work, including the work done by address terms. The deletability of an overlapped address term provides that it cannot be acknowledged and reinstated in otherwise available direct ways. Specifically, it may not be elicitable by the use of "What did you say?"

Other remedial devices exist and are used for restructuring sequences and reinstating potentially deleted talk without directly reinvoking it. Thus, recipients do have resources for later acknowledgment of a currently overlapped and potentially deleted object. One such technique is the use of a precision-placed acknowledgment term. This accomplishes a marked acknowledgment and reinstatement of some otherwise deleted object. An alternative technique is that of unmarked acknowledgment, through the use of the overlapped object in the recipient's ensuing talk. This technique has the virtue of subtlety, which may make it an attractive remedy, but it has, as well, specific sorts of problems in that it relies on the very attention that can be directing a coparticipant to do work which disrupts the attempted remedy.

Although this rather elaborate collection of resources will be applied to an analysis of one actual occurrence of Double Overlap, they ought to hold for other such occurrences, and to be independently applicable to altogether different sorts of materials. Following is the single interactional fragment to be analyzed.

Jean: We'll go ahead, en I'm sure she'll get
in touch with you about the ti:me.
Mel: Yah.
Jean: Okay,
Mel: Okeydoke.
Jean: Thank you // Mel,
Mel: Thank you // Jean.
Jean: Bye // bye,
Mel: Bye.

Some brief structural observations will be made, followed by an utterance-by-utterance analysis.

Under way is a particularly tight version of a Closing Sequence in which the alternating components of the 'vertical package' consist of each participant's version of the series [Okay ... Thank you ... Good-bye] which occur as directly adjacent pairs. In contrast, address terms are

not predictable components of any particular one of the package components. Address terms can be placed before or after "Okay" or "Thank you" or "Goodbye". The situation of a tightly ordered Closing Sequence may heighten the unpredictability of the address term and as well serve as a resource for an attempted remedy.

As a specific warrant for supposing that these coparticipants are alert to the issues surrounding an address term, it is noted that at the beginning of the call, Jean addresses the one she will now call "Mel" as "Melvin". Whether or not it is intuitively obvious that such a 'first' is preserved, remembered over the course of a 14-page phone call, there is a striking recurrence of a phrase in Jean's introduction to the topic she offers and in the 'wrap-up':

[MC:II:2:1]

Jean: Say, uh- Melvin, I uh I'm in a kind of a- hh
'hh hh a little, hh unhappy position but
nevertheless I'll go ahead 'n make the best
of it.

recall that in her Pre-Closing she says:

Jean: We'll go ahead en I'm sure she'll get in
touch with you about the ti :me.

Jean: Thank you Mel,

At this stage of the research one is not in a position to claim that what Sacks calls the Overall Structural Organization of conversation (e.g., the relationship of 'beginnings' and 'endings')¹⁷ does operate to preserve its own particulars somewhat independently of a mass of intervening talk. It is, however, intriguing to speculate as to just how deeply and in what detail such a structure might operate for the particulars of its components. Suppose, for example, that there is an orderliness to the fact that the more formal "Melvin" is associated with "I'll go ahead ..." and the more intimate "Mel" with "We'll go ahead ...", that each address term variant is associated with the proximate formulations of the task-participants.

With these resources at hand, a detailed 'narrative' analysis is undertaken.

¹⁷ Sacks has done some preliminary work which indicates that for things like specifically relevant identities and their appropriate actions, overall structural organization can be seen to operate 'at a distance'; that is, at places which are serially unconnected, as are conversational beginnings and endings (unpublished lecture, SS 158Y, April 19, 1971).

(1) Jean places the address term "Mel" in one of a variety of places it can occupy if it occurs at all; after the otherwise complete utterance for this Closing Sequence, "Thank you".

(2) Mel, apparently oriented to the systematic development of the Closing Sequence, finds that "Thank you" is a complete utterance-component of that vertical package and starts to talk at the instant of its completion with a reciprocal-for-that-system response to Jean's "Thank you"; that is, his "Thank you".

(3) At the moment Mel starts to speak Jean can hear the system in which he is operating, and by which he has appropriately started at the completion of her "Thank you" Hearing that, she understands that he is not oriented to the Closing Sequence as a locus for the relational work of address terms in the possibly significant way she is, or that if he is so oriented, he did not expect the first address term use to occur at just that slot in the sequence.

Mel's overlapping of her tag-positioned address term provides that it is potentially deleted. She may take what has occurred as programmatic for her; may accomplish the deletion by reciprocating in her next utterance Mel's action upon her current utterance. That is, she may do an action which indicates that she does not expect Mel to use her name appended to his "Thank you", since he did not expect her to use his. This may stand as a technique for doing an unmarked acknowledgment of Mel's 'deletion'; providing that it was legitimate, acceptable, expectable, by using his conduct of his talk in her ensuing talk.

(4) At the moment Mel starts to speak, he hears that, by starting up at the instant of completion of Jean's "Thank you", he has overlapped her use of his name.

Specifically because the address term in tag position is deletable, Mel can see himself as having performed that deletion thereby potentially 'rejecting' whatever work the use of his name can be doing, having indicated that for him, for this conversation, for this position in the sequence, for whatever their relationship may be, he would not expect her to use an address term.

The specifics of his action can be different, depending upon what the address term was. If it was "Sir", then perhaps he has been 'friendly' in deleting/rejecting the term. Since it is his name, and the intimate version of a previously used formal version of his name that he has deleted, he may see himself as having done something interactionally problematic by indicating that he would not expect her to use his name, implying that he would not think of using HER name.

(5) Mel, however, has recourse to remedy. Since his utterance is just under way, he can use Jean's "Thank you Mel" as programmatic for HIM. He can do a reciprocal name use, and in so doing have done an unmarked acknowledgment that he heard her use his name, and thereby restructure the talk, reinstating the potentially deleted object into the sequence and providing that her utterance did go "Thank you Mel" as his now goes "Thank you Jean". The address term "Jean" is then specifically appended to what initially started out as just "Thank you".¹⁸

Jean can collaborate in that restructuring by permitting his use of her name to occur 'in the clear', displaying that his overlap of her use of his name was not consequential, that she knows he heard it and now permits him to acknowledge that he heard it. Alternatively, she might provide next talk consisting of a 'long' utterance, so that if his remedy and her denial of the need for it start simultaneously, his will have been the shorter utterance, and will be considered the first of the two simultaneously started utterances, his acknowledgment (if it is that type of acknowledgment) 'having occurred' directly after the object it seeks to acknowledge.

(6) However, it appears that Jean is engaged in the work of accomplishing the deletion potentially made by Mel's having overlapped her use of his name. To do so, she will start her next component of the Closing Sequence (a predictably 'short' utterance) at a point that indicates she does not expect Mel to produce her name; that is, at the instant of completion of his "Thank you". Insofar as the utterance is short, it does not presuppose the occurrence of a marked acknowledgment. The use of names for this point in the sequence, and perhaps thereby for the remainder of the sequence, is then cancelled.

(7) When Jean provides her reciprocal action by starting at the moment Mel's "Thank you" is completed, she turns out to have overlapped his unmarked acknowledgment of her use of his name. Although she has thereby failed to acknowledge the work that Mel has offered, thus providing that her use of his name has not been reinstated into the sequence but that its deletion has been finalized, she has, by overlapping and now potentially deleting his use of her name, initiated an alternative remedy. The sequence is not left in such a state as to have an

¹⁸ It is of interest here that the pseudonyms used in the transcript preserve one feature of the actual names: "Melvin" can be shortened to "Mel", while the diminutive form of Jean is perhaps more intimate, "Jeanie". It is interesting to speculate what the interchange would have looked like if, for example, "Jean" had a name like "Janice", diminutive to "Jan". At any rate, it appears that Mel's remedial resources are constrained by the specific features of the name he must work with. "Jeanie" is perhaps too intimate, and "Jean" does not reveal a possible intended reciprocity.

unreciprocated name as part of it. By overlapping Mel's use of her name she has preserved his deletion of her use of his name, the result being a reciprocally matched pair of deleted address terms. Each has recognizably attended the other in delicate and detailed ways.

(8) It might further be speculated that Mel's overlap of Jean's "Bye//bye" with his "Bye" is in part an acknowledgment by him of her overlapping his use of her name, that is, the acknowledgment by which a potential deletion can become finalized. By starting to talk at that moment he indicates that he does not now expect her to do some work acknowledging that she heard his use of her name, which she had overlapped with her "Bye", that "Bye" being a recognizable start of "Bye Bye", at the completion of which, if permitted, she might do some further remedial work. Further, by starting to talk at the point at which it is recognizable that "Bye bye" is being done, but well before it has been completed, he can use the capacity for and orientation to precise placement to signal that acknowledgment of his use of her name is not expected.

In part as well, his single-syllable "Bye" may be intended as the SECOND syllable of "Bye bye"; that is, it may be doing something like 'saying the same thing at the same time', intending to join her in the production of "bye bye". And it appears that an ideal end of a Closing Sequence is a simultaneous occurrence of the terminal pair. Speakers use such devices as waiting for some shared unit of time, for example, a 'beat', after the final preterminal closing component, and then simultaneously producing the terminal pair. If that is the case, these two have ENDED simultaneously, by design. And that can stand as a particularly nice resolution to the intricate, collaboratively produced tangle they have generated through their attentions to one another.

V. If such elaborate and detailed orientation by one speaker to another is possible, if the foregoing analysis has explained anything like what can actually occur between interactants, then it ought to be emphasized that these attentions are not motivated by 'personal' considerations, although they can become resources for interactants to do 'being personal'. In our opinion, the attentions that the individuals engaged in the interactions examined here pay one another are those that any acculturated person pays to any other, and the resources are in that sense utterly impersonal. The two people involved in the exchange that has just been analyzed are only somewhat acquainted, more or less as neighbors. The resources they use, the attentions they pay, are to be used by Anybody upon Anybody. The visible features by which 'intimates' are identified

and characterized, and in terms of which they may be seen to behave toward each other, are gross compared to the exquisite resources this culture provides for the interplay of its Anybodies.

Gail Jefferson is a Research Associate in the Institute of Urban Ethnology, University of Pennsylvania. Her chief research interest is the sequential analysis of naturally occurring conversations. Her paper, "Side Sequences", appears in *Studies in Social Interaction*, ed. by David Sudnow (1972).

SEMIOTICA

Revue publiée par l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique

Rédacteur en chef

THOMAS A. SEBEOK
Research Center for the Language Sciences
Indiana University
516 East Sixth Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
U.S.A.

Assisté de

K.M. FENTON et P. SCHVEY

Comité de Rédaction

ROLAND BARTHES (France)
UMBERTO ECO (Italie)
HENRY HIZ (U.S.A.)
JULIA KRISTEVA (France)
JURI M. LOTMAN (U.R.S.S.)
JERZY PELC (Pologne)
NICOLAS RUWET (Belgique)
MEYER SCHAPIRO (U.S.A.)
HANSJAKOB SEILER (R.F.A.)

Cette revue est publiée sous les auspices du Conseil International des Sciences Sociales, et du Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines, avec le concours d'Indiana University et de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (VI^e section).

SEMIOTICA est publiée en volumes de quatre fascicules; chaque fascicule a environ 96 pages.

Les versements doivent être adressés à Co-Libri, Boîte postale 482, La Haye 2076, Pays-Bas.

Les membres de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique (AIS) sont priés d'envoyer toute correspondance relative à leur qualité de membre de l'AIS au Secrétaire Général. Les souscriptions et les cotisations sont à envoyer à:

Association Internationale de Sémiotique
Compte de dépôt no. 101 758
Union des Banques suisses
Neuchâtel (Suisse)

© Copyright 1973 in The Netherlands.
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

Printed in Belgium by NICI, Printers, Ghent.