

A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation

Gail Jefferson

Overlapping talk initially appears to be messy – a product of people's not much attending each other. Our transcription procedures make it possible to focus on such places in conversation, and to find preliminary indications of intense co-attention and orderliness.

An array of conditions can be sketched out, each with orderly procedures attendant to it. *Overlap Onset* can be the product of devices assigned to perform specifiable activities. *Within-overlap talk* can involve procedures for resolving overlap and/or for competition for the turn space. *Post-overlap talk* can be examined for its relationship to the prior overlapping talk, and can involve procedures for retrieving talk potentially impaired by its occurrence in overlap

0. For a number of years transcripts have been produced which capture the precise point at which an overlap of two utterances begins. In this paper the point of overlap-onset is indicated by a left-hand bracket in the ongoing utterance with the starting utterance positioned on the next line down, e.g.:

Fran: He's not gunnuh li:sten [tuh tha:t,
Jim: [I'm not sayin-

More recently, attention is being paid to the point at which overlap ends, and in this paper overlap resolution is indicated with a right-hand bracket.

Fran: He's not gunnuh li:sten [tuh tha:t,]
Jim: [I'm not say]in-

Some results have been reported (e.g., Jefferson 1973; Schegloff 1987 [1973]). Basically, it appears that overlap can be an orderly phenomenon, and, as inquiry proceeds, its orderliness is turning up in finer and finer detail.

I. It has been found that overlap-onset can be the product of systematic procedures. Specifically, a party can precision-place his talk in the course of another's, can select and hit a target point. For example:

1. A display of independent knowledge of what is about to be said can be achieved by starting to talk just as some object comes due in an ongoing utterance.

Joe: So he come[s home one night'n the sonofa] bitch [bit him.
Carol: [heh heh heh heh heh heh] [bit hi:m

2. A display of recognition of what is in the course of being said can be achieved by starting to talk midway through the recognized object.

Caller: Fire Department, out at the Fairview Food[mart there's a-
Desk: [Yes.
Desk: We've already got the uh call on that ma'am,

3. And it appears that a not infrequently targeted starting point is the moment of completion of an ongoing utterance, no sooner and no later. That activity is a "latch", and is indicated by equal signs at the end of the prior and beginning of the next utterance.

Earl: How's everything look.=
Bud: =Oh looks pretty goo:d,

That procedure is not only used by interacting parties but can be a noticed and reported event.

Vic: uh- at the beginning of it all befaw any chair moved outta
'ere I says Carol you want some a' th'm barbuh chairs.No.

And such a procedure provides a systematic locus of overlap. For example, when an ongoing speaker turns out to have stretched his last syllable and a next speaker is starting up in latch position, overlap occurs. The prolongation of a sound is indicated by colons.

Joe: Just like tha::t.
Mike: [Right.

Or, for example, when a possible completion point turns out not to be the point of actual completion and ongoing speaker appends a syntactically coherent next utterance component while a next speaker is starting up in latch position, overlap occurs.

Bert: Uh you been down here before [havenche.
Fred: [Yeh.

4. Another routine locus of overlap is post a possible completion and a pause. Regularly enough, more than one party simultaneously start to talk. This feature holds for relatively long pauses, for example, seven tenths of a second. Timing is shown in parentheses between the two utterances.

Ava: He'n Jo were like on the outs, yihknow?
(0.7)

Ava: [[So uh,
Bee: [[They always a(h)re hhh!

It holds as well for relatively short pauses, for example, one and a half tenths of a second.

James: (I'll) set it dehr own the sidewalk.
(0.15)

Vic: [[No.
James: [[Izzat ehkay No.

II. There are, then, various indications that overlap-onset can be a systematically generated occurrence. This leads to inquiry into possible systematicity *within* overlap: i.e., examination of how parties deal with the fact that they are producing more-than-one-party-at-a-time talk when a fundamental feature of conversation is that one party talks at a time (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson:1974).

A basic course of action is to resolve the overlap; i.e., one of the overlapping parties drops out, i.e., stops talking, and a state of one-at-a-time is (re)established. This feature appears to hold across a set of starting positions for overlap, e.g., one of two simultaneously starting parties can be found to drop out.

Tracy: [[T-
Lady: [[Ye:s.

First starter can be found to drop out as second starter begins.

Essie: I think Cookie [ta-
Janet: [I didn' even know'e was i:ll.

And a second starter can be found to drop out immediately after an attempted start.

Dan: May [be yer brother is . . .
Louise: [()-

Multiple serial starts and drop outs can be found in association with an ongoing utterance which has several points of possible completion plus continuation by ongoing speaker, with a next speaker attempting to start at latch position for each possible completion point. In this fragment the equal signs indicate no elapsed time between one utterance component and a next. The utterance is produced as a single continuous object by its speaker and has been decomposed for clarity in this fragment.

Polly: I jus' thought it was so kind of stupid=
Janet: =[Y-
Polly: [[I didn' even say anything=
Janet: =[Eh-
Polly: [[when I came ho:me.
(0.3)
Janet: Well Essie jus' called 'n I- an' I aftuh call 'er back . . .

(This particular instance contains a possible consequence of the serial starts and dropouts at possible completion points. Notice that the party who had been starting up at each possible completion point (and who thereafter permits a pause before a next attempt post a next possible completion), herself produces an utterance with a first possible completion and a continuation ("Well Essie jus" called" + "'n I aftuh call'er back. . ."). Note that at the juncture point of those two segments, i.e., just the sort of point in her own utterance at which she had been attempting entry into the turn space occupied by the prior utterance, she produces a cutoff and restart: "Well Essie jus' called ['n I- an' I] aftuh call 'er back. . ." It appears that the prior juncture-point problem has been carried over into a subsequent, otherwise undisrupted, utterance.)

III. While a fundamental feature of conversation is that one party talks at a time, and a basic procedure for achieving such a state from a state of overlap is that one party drops out, we also find that it is not always unequivocal for participants who shall drop out. For example, we find each party to an overlap dropping. Thereafter, following a 'micropause' (for now, roughly, an untimed pause of less than 2/10 second, indicated by a dot in parenthesis), one of them takes and is given the turn space.

Johnson: [[I-
Roberts: [[Uh-
(.)

Johnson: I heard uh first that there was really some water in. . .

And in some cases both parties drop, both parties start up again after a micropause, both parties drop again, and subsequently one takes and is given the turn space.

Edna: [[Well-
Bud: [[Un-
(.)
Edna: [[uh-
Bud: [[less-
(.)
Bud: If ev'rything goes well.

And in the following, after an initial pair of drop/restarts, both parties pursue their utterances a bit further before each again drops. Subsequently one party takes and is given the turn space.

Tracy: But [had-
Lady: [But
(.)
Lady: [[this-
Tracy: [[hh Ha-
(.)
Lady: [[Ni:neteen s e]v e n]ty I,
Tracy: [[Hadju finished] ()]
(.)
Lady: was:: had 'n invitation to, (0.3) Bucking'm Palace,

IV. Given that parties can and do drop out of overlap almost instantly, it become an observable event when one or both persevere beyond an initial drop point. An given a possible initial equivocalness as to which of them shall drop out, perseverance can be seen as negotiation for which of them shall drop, one (or both parties indicating to the other that he is not dropping and the other should.

Some systematic procedures for negotiation within overlap can be sketched and two types of procedures can be isolated: Within-word *pronunciational adjustments*; i.e., manipulation of the sounds of the word a speaker is currently producing (its speed, pitch, amplitude, etc.), and within-utterance *segment*

adjustments; i.e., manipulation of larger parts of the utterance a speaker is currently producing (its words, clauses, phrases, etc.).

1. Pronunciational adjustments

(a) “*Stutters*”. Depending upon our transcripts’ detailedness, stutters are roughly or precisely available for their relationship to overlapping talk. Some collection of them appear to be roughly or precisely coterminous with that overlapping talk, and the subsequent, unstuttered portion of the utterance coincides with overlap resolution.

Johnson: [[I’m glad to hear it.
 Roberts: [[But- uh- uh, uh understand that um Franklin . . .

 Gladys: [[En-
 Edna: [[En you need [som:e]uh,]
 Gladys: [S- s-] sh:]redded lettuce?

(b) “*Stretches*”. In the following fragments a word is prolonged, and the prolongation roughly or precisely coterminates with the utterance it overlaps, the production of the subsequent portion of the utterance coinciding with overlap resolution.

Ken: Heck [a lotta-
 Roger: [Les:::try it!

 Carol: Tha:[t’s what they say,]
 Denise: [will soo::: n] learn.

The observable cotermination of stutter or stretch with the overlapping talk leads to a posing of these objects as resources for overlap management. They can be extended across the span of the overlap, permitting subsequent utterance components to be produced clear of overlap.

2. Segmental adjustments

A similar provision for some part of an overlapped utterance’s occurrence in the clear can be observed for these devices. While the pronunciational adjustments are perhaps addressed to preserving talk across an overlap, the segmental adjustments appear to be explicit attempts by one party to claim a turn space occupied by another. So, for example, in the following fragments we can have

an intuitive sense that one party is Turn Occupant, the other Turn Claimant, with Turn Occupant simply producing an utterance while Turn Claimant produces serial segmental adjustments.

Mike: [[Th-
 Vic: [[Y’know I cut [m y s e l f {o n y o [u : r f r e a k i n [g l a : s s ,]
 Mike: [Th’ least ’e [c’do- [Th’ least ’e coulda [do::ne,
 (.)
 James: [[Y e : h ,]
 Mike: [[Least ’e c]’d’v done w’z come dow:n en letchu know what
 happen’

Of the two overlapping utterances, one has a phrase recycled over the continuous course of another, permitting some projectable part of the recycled utterance to occur clear of overlap. The same feature holds for the following fragment.

Ken: No, they’re women who’v devo[ded their l-
 Roger: [They’re women that hadda=
 Roger: =[[bad love [life’n became nuns.hh [heh hh !
 Ken: [[their [their life- [their life, to uh
 (0.6)
 Ken: the devotion of the church.

(In this particular case there is some indication that projection of a component and reservation for overlap-cleared production can be an abstract matter; i.e., whether or not the component’s actual content is known in advance, is formed up for speech-delivery, etc., it can, in principle, as not yet more than a projected component type, be reserved for overlap clearance by a within-overlap recycling of its prefatory segment(s).)

In these fragments, while Turn Claimant’s work is obvious, Turn Occupant’s talk, *as work*, is not transparent, i.e., it is not obvious that Turn Occupant is doing something vis-à-vis the state of overlap in which his talk is occurring, by constructing a single continuous utterance. To get a sense of it as work, we might consider the sheer acoustic battering Occupant’s talk is subjected to. More to the point, we might consider each recycle by Turn Claimant as a request that Occupant relinquish the turn space, and each ‘continuation’ by Turn Occupant as a declination to relinquish.

There are, then, two distinct forms of overlap competition occurring in these fragments; one announces a trouble and attempts to remedy it (via the recycled utterance segments) and one neither recognizes nor attempts to remedy

an observable trouble. We might call the former procedure *Marked Competition* and the latter *Unmarked Competition*. Both *do* competition, but one announces it is doing that and the other proceeds as if nothing of the sort were occurring.

Such a distinction can be informative about procedures used by various parties to an overlap competition. It turns out to inform inquiry into activities subsequent to overlap, as well.

V. *Once an overlap has been resolved there can be a problem: What, if any, of the talk which occurred in overlap shall have been 'heard'; i.e., shall have consequence for subsequent talk?* There seems to be a collection of procedures by which talk that is possibly hearing-understanding impaired via the state of overlap in which it occurred can be *retrieved*. These procedures fall into two types: Self-Retrieval, via which a party to an overlap provides for his own talk's consequence, and Other-Retrieval, via which a party to an overlap provides for someone else's, not his own, talk's consequence.

Further, these two groups each have Marked and Unmarked forms; forms which announce trouble and explicitly retrieve talk out of the prior overlap, and forms which do not recognize trouble nor explicitly retrieve talk out of overlap.

1. Marked self-retrieval: Restart

A party to an overlap, having dropped out to resolve overlap and re-establish a state of one party talking at a time, can, upon the other party's dropping out or reaching completion, retrieve the utterance he himself had potentially relinquished by restarting it. This procedure holds across the three positions for overlap-onset; i.e., at simultaneous starts:

Edna: [[Hy -
Olive: [[Yeah.
(.)
Edna: Hide it.

At first starter's dropping out as second speaker starts:

Rich: I think if [you-
Carol: [Am I right?
(.)
Rich: If you bring it intuh them.

And at second starter's dropping out after an attempted start:

Louise: I w'nd' if [rilly is someone back the[re,
Roger: [That- [That attracted
their attention,

This retrieval device appears in affiliation with overlap competitive procedures; i.e., a party may continue to talk until the other drops out and immediately thereafter perform a restart (see Schegloff 1987 [1973] for a detailed consideration of this procedure). For example:

Ann: [[He : ha-]
Marty: [[Course wi-] widespread is a double edged swo:rd.
.....
Bee: T! [Except thet cl]u -
Ava: [that's not ba:d.]
(0.2)
Bee: That class is suh:: yihknow this is the Indian class...
.....
Fran: He's not gunnuh li:sten [tuh tha: :t,]
Jim: [I'm not say]in- I'm not sayin that ...

2. Unmarked self-retrieval: Continuation

A party to an overlap, having dropped out to resolve overlap and re-establish a state of one party talking at a time, can, upon the other party's dropping out or reaching completion, retrieve the utterance he had potentially relinquished by continuing from the point of dropout. Whereas the prior retrieval device announces, and specifically pulls a word out of, overlap, this device proposes that the overlap, as an event which might have consequence for the coherent production of an utterance, was of no consequence. For example:

Fred: [[The-
Bert: [[Yah-
(.)
Fred: waves 'r about tuh wash us away.
.....
Roger: I happen tuh wear buloo jeans constantly.
(0.3)
Ken: Well,
(.)

Roger: Even [in-
 Ken: [so do I now,
 (.)
 Roger: formal occasions, y'know? hheh hh!

The materials considered earlier as instances of problems as to who should drop out (p. 47), can be re-examined for the presence of marked and unmarked self-retrieval. So, for example, in one case both parties appear to be doing unmarked self-retrieval; i.e., continuation, one constructing a continuous "Well uh" while the other constructs a continuous "Unless".

Edna: [[Well-
 Bud: [[Un-
 (.)
 Edna: [[uh-
 Bud: [[less-

And in another case, one party does unmarked self-retrieval; i.e., constructs a continuous "But this. . ." and then a continuous "Ni:neteen seventy I, was:::..." across overlap and micropause, while the other does marked self-retrieval, restarting each time, "But had-", "hh Ha-", "Hadju finished ()".

Tracy: But [had
 Lady: [But-
 (.)
 Lady: [[this-
 Tracy: [[·hh Ha
 (.)
 Lady: [[Ni:neteen seventy I,
 Tracy: [[Hadju finished ()
 (.)
 Lady: was:: had 'n invitation ...

3. Marked other-retrieval: Repeat request

This procedure appears to have some regularity of occurrence after competitive overlap. One of the competing parties announces trouble and explicitly initiates repair procedures by requesting a repeat of his co-competitor's overlapped utterance.

In the following fragment, each party displays Turn Occupancy and the continuously produced utterances reach completion simultaneously. There-

after, one way to characterize the conditions under which it is decided who should yield is to find that a continuation of prior talk has yielded to initiation of a new topic; the explanation "Before he gets home" yielding to "You goin up'n getcher hair fixed tuhday,". (Whether this is a generalizable feature of overlap management remains to be seen.)

Gladys: En then you could return it uhb, oh along about noon.
 (.)
 Edna: You goin up 'n get [cher hair fixed tuhday,]
 Gladys: [Before he gets home.]
 (0.5)
 Gladys: What deah?
 (.)
 Edna: Yer goin up t'day en getcher hair fi [xed.
 Gladys: [Oh no.

In the following, each party displays Turn Occupancy, with one party's utterance extending beyond overlap resolution. Perhaps a way to characterize the conditions under which it is decided who should yield is to find that First Stopper has yielded to Last Stopper. (Again, whether this is a generalizable feature of overlap management remains to be seen.)

Lil: A:n' I'm hoping a lo:t,=
 Lil: =-hh thet [you'll] [do a few a' them,]
 Tony: [(Yeh)] I [bet yooer t e r r] ibly hoping,
 (0.2)
 Lil: t! Hu:h?
 (0.2)
 Tony: t! I bet yer terribly [hopi [ng.
 Lil: [·hhh [I'm terribly terribly hoping.

In the following two fragments one party displays himself to be Turn Occupant, the other Turn Claimant. In each case Turn Occupant is also Unmarked Competitor and is also First Stopper, yielding to Turn Claimant who is also Marked Competitor and is also Last Stopper. In the first fragment Turn Occupant/Unmarked Competitor/First Stopper produces an utterance plus continuous, extended laughter while Turn Claimant/Marked Competitor/Last Stopper produces a complete question repeated three times over the course of the continuous display.

Mary: [[I s i d I get mo]re the n h(h)alf=
 Sue: [[Wuh year was it?
 Mary: =hh(h)unhh heh [hehh hnnnn hnnnn]
 Sue: [Wh't year was i:t?]
 (.)
 Mary: u-hnnn -huh -hu[h -hnnnn!]
 Sue: [Wuh year] was it?
 (.)
 Mary: Ha:h?
 (.)
 Sue: What w-year wa[s it?]
 Mary: [Ni:ne] teen fifty.

And in the second fragment Turn Occupant... etc produces a single coherent utterance: "Okay duh soopuh. Freak it. He's a bitch he didn'pud in duh light own dih sekkin flaw, -hh man tell im. Y'kno:w?" while Turn Claimant... etc. produces revisions of a same question: "Y' didn't getta holda-", "Listen man.", "Y' couldn't gitta hol-", "Jim wasn' home uh what."

Vic: It's, the attitude of people!
 (1.0)
 Vic: Okay[
 Mike: [Y'[didn't getta holda-]
 Vic: [d u h s o o p u h]
 (.)
 Mike: Listen [man.
 Vic: [Freak it. He's a bitch he didn' pud in
 duh light own dih sekkin flaw, -hh=
 Mike: =Y' couldn't gitta ho[l-
 Vic: [Man tell im.
 (.)
 Mike: Jim[wasn' home] uh what.
 Vic: [Y' kno:w?]
 (0.5)
 Vic: Hah?
 (.)
 Mike: Jim wasn' home [°(Whenyih wenovuh deh)°]
 Vic: [I did n' go by the h.]

(This particular case is transparent for the constructedness of the competitive continuous coherent utterance, with the bulk of its components starting

up after co-competitor has himself gotten started. Further, the issue of who shall have been First Stopper appears to be systematically negotiable, in this case via Appendor Questions; Turn Occupant's "Y' kno:w?" followed by Turn Claimant's "or what?")

4. Unmarked other-retrieval: Acknowledgment and embedded repeat

These devices appear to have their home in situations of minimal overlap, where competition is not marked or protracted.

(a) *Acknowledgment*. With the post overlap-resolution proffering of an acknowledgment token ("Yeah", "Uh huh", etc.), one party treats the other's overlapped utterance as if it had occurred in the clear; does not recognize the consequence of, or explicitly retrieve the object from, overlap, but simply responds to a prior utterance

Bea: Come to think of it, I think I can manage uh:: otherwise.
 (.)
 Francis: Well [ten people-
 Bea: [So don't
 (.)
 Bea: Un huh, because part of them were going to drink coffee,

 Martha: ...because she w- you know, was [in the house[
 Bea: [so near- [Yes.

 Ray: Okay Maggie,=
 Maggie: =Okay [Love
 Ray: [See yuh then Yeah.

The acknowledgment token does appear in conjunction with competitive talk, serving as a minimal acknowledgment of a co-competitor's utterance, but not directed to its subsequent consequence. So, for example, in the following fragment an acknowledgment token turns out to preface a restart i.e., a marked self-retrieval.

Helen: Specially when they [don' know what they're doin]=
 Bill: [N o t b e i n g b-]
 Helen: =in the [f i r s t] place.]
 Bill: [Yeh no]t being] bulat'nt.

And in the following, an acknowledgment token turns out to preface a revised a restart.

- Olive: I didn' know what time you were gonna get down, so I
wen' out [shopping yester[day,
Edna: [Oh::: we got- [Yeah=
Edna: =We didn't get down till about- (0.6) Oh I don't know,
six uh'clock...

The acknowledgement token as accessory to competition may import some function from its operation as a recognitional in 'recognition-placed' overlap (see page 44, point 2, and Jefferson 1973); i.e., proposes that hearing-understanding of the overlapped talk was achieved, *and* the talk so far was sufficient for recognition of the projected line, *so* co-competitor need say no more.

(b) *Embedded repeat*. With this device a party can retrieve another's overlapped talk by incorporating the other's possibly-unheard materials into his own next utterance, resulting in an undisrupted flow of talk. For example:

- Clara: Isn't that place [something.
May: [I tell yuh.
(.)
May: It is really something.
.....
Lottie: How come yih didn' stay. Oh ih w'zis [too hot huh,
Emma: [OH::: there-
(.)
Emma: [Jus' too hot Lottie, an' it was...

And the combination of acknowledgment and repeat provides for an unequivocal retrieval of another party's talk.

- Ken: I-I made pretty good time, but it's [tiresome.
Louise: [But it was one pers=
Louise: =Yeah it's tiresome.
.....
Carol: [[He-
Denise: [[He's ser[vin Jody.]
Carol: . [serves?]
Carol: [[Jo:dy?
Denise: [[Yeh!
(.)
Denise: He serves Jody.

(In this case both parties display Turn Occupancy, one with a serially constructed single coherent utterance: "he + ser:ves? + Jo:dy?", the other with a through-constructed single coherent utterance: "He's servin Jody." Note that the party who provides the acknowledgement token thereafter produces the other party's version of that same statement; i.e., shifts from "He's servin Jody" to "He serves Jody.")

In the following it appears that each party is attempting to acknowledge token retrieve the other's version of a same statement ("drops" vs. "dump"). The matter is resolved with a combined acknowledgment token/repeat.

- Loren: ...people thet jus' come en leave their little kids
et th' skating rink's appalling.
(pause)
Loren: Y'know[drops them]
Kate: [dump them]=
Loren: =Yeah.
(.)
Kate: Yeah.
(.)
Loren: Yeah dump. Y' know. These car pools just pour
out five and ten kids.

It should be noted that the other-retrievals, in both marked and unmarked forms, by putting a speaker at the service of another's talk, simultaneously stand as an offer to delete one's own utterance; to withdraw it from contention for consequence in the ensuing talk. This opens up such questions as: can the currently withdrawn materials reappear in the conversation, do they have some continuing relevance, can they achieve consequence for subsequent talk, and if so, how?

One rather curious fragment will be shown as an indication of the possible continuing relevance of currently withdrawn talk. In this fragment a Last Stopper (Frank) does a repeat request ("Huh?") and the request is declined by First Stopper (Kitty), who, instead of reproducing her own talk ("...they just rescued-"), retrieves, via a repeat, the overlapped part of Last Stopper's utterance ("Oh God"). Subsequently the initially withdrawn, now repeat-request-declined materials (that "they had rescued a lot of people") reappear.

- Kitty: They said they've been, huge wa:ves.=
 Kitty: =en they [jus' rescued-
 Frank: [Oh:::: God. Over the pier:
 (-)
 Frank: Huh?
 (-)
 Kitty: Oh Go::d.
 (0.2)
 Frank: Excep' tuhday it's t-calm' down, I guess ih was a storm
 out et [sea,
 Kitty: [Yeah, they said that it was gah- it hed gotten nicer
 but they ed rescued a lotta people, en Newport Beach wz
 spozetuh have, (0.2) huge waves.
 (-)
 Frank: Oh they w' clear over the pier.

The entire sequence is reproduced and reorganized with the "rescue" segment specifically removed from contention for consequence by now being placed prefatory to the segment about "...huge waves...", "...over the pier...". The fact that such a procedure is undertaken in this fragment suggests that in general, overlapped non-retrieved talk is not thereby extinguished, but may remain relevant, to-be-resolved. That such is the case remains to be seen.

VI. Conclusion

With a transcript device that captures the precise positioning of overlapping talk it is possible to focus on places in conversation where it appears that a lot of messy talk is going on and people are not much attending each other (i.e., situations of overlapping talk), to find some preliminary indications of intense orderliness and co-attention which can be sketched out. The sketch presented here consisted of an array of conditions, each with orderly procedures attendant to it.

(1) *Overlap Onset* can be the product of systematic procedures, those procedures constituting means of performing specifiable activities; specifically, a party can precision-place his talk in the course of another's, can select and hit a target point. With such a capability a display of independent knowledge of what is about to be said can be achieved by starting to talk just as some object comes due in an ongoing utterance; a display of recognition of what is in the course of being said can be achieved by starting to talk midway through the recognized object; and it appears that a not infrequently targeted starting

point is the moment of completion of an ongoing utterance, this last resulting in overlap should the currently speaking party continue talking beyond that point.

(2) *Within-Overlap Talk* can involve systematic procedures for resolving overlap and/or attempted solutions to a problem which arises as to who should drop out. It can also involve systematic procedures for competing within overlap, negotiating for who shall drop out via, e.g., pronunciational and segmental adjustments. Further, it appears that participants routinely distribute their talk into displays of Turn Occupancy (with a single coherent continuous utterance) and Turn Claimancy (with a repeated recycle of an utterance component). These activities can be examined for their status as Marked and Unmarked competitive forms; i.e., for their explicit attention to, or displayed dismissal of, the fact of overlap and the trouble it might cause for hearing-understanding.

(3) *Post-Overlap Talk* can be investigated for its relationship to the prior overlapping talk, and can involve systematic procedures for retrieving talk potentially not heard due to its occurrence in overlap; i.e., for providing for its consequence in subsequent talk. And these procedures seem to be distributed into types: Self-Retrieval and Other-Retrieval, each type with its marked and unmarked forms; restarts constituting marked self-retrieval, continuations constituting unmarked self-retrieval, repeat-requests constituting marked other-retrieval, and acknowledgment tokens and/or embedded repeats constituting unmarked other-retrieval.

These procedures show up in their simplest forms and in more complex versions, further enriching the array of resources available and used for the resolution of overlap and subsequent retrieval of overlapped talk.

References

- Jefferson, Gail (1973). A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation: Overlapped Tag-Positioned Address Terms in Closing Sequences. *Semiotica*, 9, 47-96.
 Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987) [1973]. Recycled Turn Beginnings: A Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn-taking Organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 70-85). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
 Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50 (4).

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series

Editor

Andreas H. Jucker
University of Zurich, English Department
Plattenstrasse 47, CH-8032 Zurich, Switzerland
e-mail: ahjucker@es.unizh.ch

Associate Editors

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern Denmark

Herman Parret
Belgian National Science Foundation, Universities of Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren
Belgian National Science Foundation, University of Antwerp

Editorial Board

Shoshana Blum-Kulka Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni University of Lyon 2
Jean Caron Université de Poitiers	Claudia de Lemos University of Campinas, Brazil
Robyn Carston University College London	Marina Sbisà University of Trieste
Bruce Fraser Boston University	Emanuel Schegloff University of California at Los Angeles
Thorstein Fretheim University of Trondheim	Deborah Schiffrin Georgetown University
John Heritage University of California at Los Angeles	Paul O. Takahara Kansai Gaidai University
Susan Herring University of Texas at Arlington	Sandra Thompson University of California at Santa Barbara
Masako K. Hiraga St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University	Teun A. Van Dijk Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona
David Holdcroft University of Leeds	Richard J. Watts University of Berne
Sachiko Ide Japan Women's University	

Volume 125

Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation
by Gene H. Lerner

Conversation Analysis

Studies from the first generation

Gene H. Lerner

University of California, Santa Barbara

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia