

# Agrammatism, adaptation theory, conversation analysis: on the role of so-called telegraphic style in talk-in- interaction

CLAUS HEESCHEN†  
and EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF‡

† Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nymegen, The Netherlands

‡ Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, USA

## Abstract

In this paper, a specific aphasiological problem is approached by means of conversation analysis: the varying manifestations of agrammatism in the speech of one patient. According to the adaptation theory by Kolk and Heeschen, (most) agrammatics have the option to speak either in complete sentences (with the usual problems familiar to any aphasiologist) or to resort to systematically simplified expressions ('telegraphic style'). Two episodes from a conversation between an agrammatic patient and her best friend are analysed—one episode in which the patient uses hardly any 'telegrams' and one in which telegraphic expressions figure more centrally. The core questions are: What is achieved by resorting to telegraphic style in talk-in-interaction? and; How far does the healthy co-participant organize her conduct contingent on the varying practices in the patient's speech? A first answer suggests that telegraphic style is a resource for mobilizing the co-participant to become more engaged and to provide more help and is deployed specifically to exploit this feature. In the analytic explication of the episodes, turn by turn, turn component by turn component is addressed in some detail, thereby not disregarding any observation as irrelevant *a priori*. It is this procedure that is central to the potential contribution of CA to aphasiology. In the course of the explication further questions emerge: Is the notion of 'telegram' meaningful within an interaction-oriented approach? Is there variation in the patient's speech not only across occasions, but also across co-participants and across settings? The process of analysis of the episodes is informed by two domains of data: prior aphasiological knowledge and the experience and expertise of conversation analysts with talk and conduct in interaction among language-unimpaired speakers. Combining the two lines of research is not straightforward: it might lead to complex multivalent characterizations of some occurrences in the data, specifically those related to the question of how far the co-participant treats the patient as 'impaired' and how far she avoids the exposure of linguistic deficiencies in the patient.

## Introduction: goals, resources and the problem

This paper has two goals. One is to explore and to display one way in which conversation analysis (CA) might be a resource for aphasiology. What CA has to

Address correspondence to: Claus Heeschen, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Postbus 310, NL-6500 AH Nymegen, The Netherlands. e-mail: claus@mpi.nl

offer is a corpus of description and analysis of the phenomena of talk and other conduct in interaction, developed over some 35 years; some relatively formal characterizations of the practices by which talk-in-interaction is co-constructed by participants and organizations of such practices (such as turn-taking, repair, etc.); and techniques of data collection, data preparation and data analysis which have yielded this cumulative corpus. The promised contribution to aphasiology is constituted by the prospect of bringing this corpus of work to bear on talk and other conduct in interaction which prevails in the world of aphasiology's client population and/or its practitioners, many of whose preoccupations concern, precisely, 'talk and other conduct in interaction'.

The second goal is to make some contribution to the understanding of so-called 'telegraphic speech', a familiar feature of the speech of some agrammatic aphasics. Here, the resources of CA are joined to past work in aphasiology under the rubric 'adaptation theory', with the goal of adding to the more diffuse and generic fruits of the first goal a more focused and specific contribution to an established aphasiological interest. What is offered is not an easy solution, but a hopefully promising step forward, and a sense of a possible direction for further inquiry.

Below will be presented some background and orientation to adaptation theory, to telegraphic speech, and to several features of German grammar which will figure importantly in the remainder of the paper. Though longer than the authors would prefer introductory considerations to be, they enhance the accessibility of the discussion to follow to this journal's readership. The remainder of this section aims to provide a bit of orientation to CA which is specifically preparatory to its deployment in the remainder of this paper, without duplicating the background provided by the editors of this special issue.

The first of the goals mentioned above, as embodied in the paper, may engender puzzlement and resistance in some readers, for it addresses in great detail several episodes in the interaction of two persons, one of them an agrammatic aphasic, turn by turn—indeed, turn component by turn component. There is a rationale for proceeding in this way, however, and it is central to the contribution which CA offers in this area.

Unlike many other genres and fields of disciplined inquiry, which begin with a defined view of what is relevant to their undertaking and what is not, CA begins with a commitment to explore as relevant anything which may be shown to be oriented to as relevant *by the participants in the interaction*, for, if it was relevant to the participants, it may be shown possibly to have contributed to the constitution and shaping of their conduct and thereby to the character and trajectory of the interaction, all of which it is our aim to understand. Furthermore, experience has shown that what participants orient to as relevant is rarely accessible to casual observation, or to ordinary or vernacular conceptions of what 'matters'.

Accordingly, CA procedure is to examine a stretch of interaction repeatedly, registering whatever occurrences in it can be made 'observable'—that is, noticeable, describable, formulatable, and so on, and then to show what, in the detail of the talk and of its context which has emerged as observable, is a locus of order; that is, what is demonstrably an oriented-to feature of the setting (including the preceding course of the interaction as part of the 'setting'), what is treated as a part of the arena of interaction, what has been made a resource for accomplishing an action or for interpreting the conduct of another.

Past experience has shown that this procedure can be revelatory in breaking

through the relentless familiarity of ordinary interaction to describe and specify analytically how it actually is put together by the parties in ways largely inaccessible to articulate reflection. In the case of those whose conduct is, on the face of it, at variance with ordinary or 'normal' speech, ordinary uptake, ordinary conduct, and so on, there are intrinsic features of the setting which break the blinkers of familiarity in understanding conduct; but those 'deviations' have themselves become the object of routinized interpretation and grasp—whether the professionalized 'routinization' of those whose occupational commitment is to deal with and help such people (e.g. by way of common attributes of established diagnostic categories), or the common-sense routinization of those who live with them or adopt the society's and the culture's so-called 'stereotypes' about them. Here again, then, there may be some use in bringing other tools of analysis to bear which address the otherwise routinized objects of study from an obliquely related direction.

Doing this involves neutralizing our ordinary inclination to dismiss some things which happen in interaction as mere 'noise', as irrelevant detail, as random variation, as 'just manners of speaking', and so on, that is, as occurrences not warranting serious investigation. It involves entertaining the possibility that each observable might matter, trying to figure out *how* it might matter and for *what*, and then finally asking whether it might matter for the special topic to which we have addressed ourselves.

This is roughly how the present authors have proceeded in doing the work on which is reported in this paper (informed in this case, of course, by the results of past work in CA as well). Most of this text works its way through several bounded segments of interaction between an agrammatic aphasic and her friend—the boundaries of these segments themselves being grounded in the orientations of the participants, embodied in their practices for accomplishing the talk; analysis starts at sequence starts, and stops at *possible* sequence closure, even if the episode turns out to have continued. If it is plausible to figure that the variation in how agrammatics speak is related to, or contingent on, the context and exigencies within which they are speaking, then it is plausible to look for them here—in the moment by moment unfolding of the talk and its uptake. The authors urge those readers who are irritated by this 'turn-by-turn, observable-by-observable' feature of the text to persist, and to assess at the end whether the returns yielded by proceeding in this fashion do not encourage its continued application.

The longer term prospect is to complement the neurological, psychological and linguistic resources of aphasiology with those of an analytic apparatus which, for its purposes, must treat every possible observable as potentially relevant to the organization of interaction, and therefore to the understanding of the conduct of the agrammatic aphasic and the conversational partner within the particular interaction that is examined. If it is the case that the linguistic performance of aphasics must be understood in context, then surely the pre-eminent context involved is talk-in-interaction (whether conversation, therapy, etc.), and talk-in-interaction in context is just what CA studies. In what follows next, this intersection is approached from the aphasiological side.

*The problem specified*

An approach which takes the communicative and interactional problems of aphasic patients into account does not need any special justification. After all, talk-in-interaction is the 'place where the results of brain damage become visible and consequential for people's lives' (Goodwin 1996). However, expressed like this, investigations of aphasics' behaviour in talk-in-interaction are just complementary to 'traditional' aphasia research which focuses 'primarily on processes inside the individual patients' (ibid.). 'Traditional' aphasia research and interaction-oriented research would peacefully co-exist. The authors of the present study want to go one step further and show how a so-called traditional problem, which may resist solution by 'traditional' methods (tests, experiments, quantifications), may respond to an interaction-oriented approach. In other words, interaction-oriented investigations might not only complement traditional research, but might also become informative for the latter.

The problem the authors want to address in this paper has to do with the varying manifestations of agrammatism. Kolk and Heeschen and collaborators (Heeschen and Kolk 1988, Kolk and Heeschen 1990, 1992, Hofstede 1992, Hofstede and Kolk 1994) showed in their investigations of Dutch- and German-speaking agrammatic patients that there is not only considerable variation across patients, but also *within one and the same patient*. Most notably, they found drastic differences in speech obtained in test-like situations on the one hand and speech obtained in informal conversations on the other hand. In the body of the present study the authors want to investigate in some detail how interaction between a German-speaking agrammatic patient and her unimpaired friend is organized dependent on the varying ways in which the agrammatism manifests itself in this patient. In these materials variation is examined not only within the same patient but *within the same context and with the same interlocutor*. By examining within the same context different practices of speaking by the agrammatic patient, the intention is to gain insight as well as leverage, into the importance of variation across contexts, across interlocutors (interactional partners) and, potentially, across aphasics.

In this introductory section, some examples of this within-patient variation are given and discussed. This discussion serves simultaneously to familiarize the reader with some basic grammatical properties of German. Although the paper treats only German examples, German and Dutch are sufficiently related that the decisive features presented here hold for Dutch as well.

The following speech samples come from W, a patient with severe Broca's aphasia and very marked agrammatism (not the patient examined in the later sections of the paper). The patient had suffered a trauma 10 years before she was contacted by the first author (H).<sup>1</sup> Her age was 41. She had a marked right hemiparesis (arm and leg). Her formal education consisted of 10 years of elementary schooling. She had never had a profession. The patient was asked to tell what happened in a series of four cartoons. The first cartoon shows a farmer sowing

<sup>1</sup> Claus Heeschen is the author who had personal contact with the patients presented in this paper, with their families, and their friends. He is a native speaker of German and familiar with Berlinisms. He is an aphasiologist. Emanuel A. Schegloff is not a native speaker of German, but, as a native speaker of Yiddish, has more-than-minimal access to German as well. He is a sociologist and conversation analyst.

corn, the second shows how the corn is growing, the third shows the farmer examining the corn (and he is obviously content), the fourth cartoon shows the farmer transporting the corn with a truck. How W told the little story is given in example 1 (the transcription is rough because only the grammatical properties of W's agrammatism are to be examined).

*Example (1): Story telling by agrammatic patient W:*

01	der Bauer sät (2.0)	der Bauer sät (3.0)	der Mann guckt /die/ Mais
	the farmer sows (2.0)	the farmer sows (3.0)	the man looks /the/ mais
02	(1.0) wächst ähm (4.0)	der Bauer ißt /der/ die Maiskolben (( patient sighs))	
	(1.0) grows ähm (4.0)	the farmer eats /the/ the cobs	
03	betrachtet (2.5) (( patient sighs))	der Bauer guckt die Maiskolben an (1.0) ähm	
	views (2.5) ((patient sighs))	the farmer looks at the cobs (1.0) ähm	
04	der Wagen (0.8)	der Wagen rennt /zur/ ähm verkaufen	
	the car (0.8)	the car runs /to-the/ ähm to-sell-INF	

(( slashes indicate errors, see also Appendix. INF stands for "infinitive", see also list of abbreviations, Appendix))

This story telling shows all the features of agrammatic speech usually described in textbooks:

- incomplete constructions (line 1: 'der Bauer sät/*the farmer sows*' requires an object; line 2: the verb form 'wächst/*grows*' has no recognizable subject; line 3: the verb form 'betrachtet/*views*' has no object);
- misconstructions (line 4: 'der Wagen rennt zur ähm verkaufen'—just as hopeless as the English translation);
- incorrect function words (line 1: '/die/ Mais'; the gender of the article is wrong [German definite articles are marked for gender, case, and number]; line 4: if an infinitive like 'verkaufen' is substantivized, then it always has neutral gender [das Verkaufen]; the patient uses 'zur'—a contraction of the preposition 'zu' and the feminine dative singular article 'der'—another gender error);
- one feature which usually figures centrally in agrammatic speech—omission of grammatical morphemes—is not present in this excerpt. But there is an abundance of omissions in other excerpts from this patient, for example in describing another cartoon story showing how a burglar tries to enter a house through the window (example 2).

*Example (2):*

W:	Einbrecher steigt	Fenster
	burglar	climbs window

Here the article for 'Einbrecher/*burglar*' is omitted as well as the preposition and article for 'Fenster/*window*': it should be 'durch das Fenster/*through the window*'.

To summarize, the speech of patient W displays all the features that are usually described as typical of agrammatic speech (at least for the major Western European languages):

- omission of function words
- substitution of function words
- break-offs of constructions
- incorrect constructions.

The fact that not only the omission of function words (or of grammatical morphemes in general) but also substitutions are characteristic of agrammatic speech has long been known and had already been discussed in the 'classical' neurological literature at the beginning of this century (De Bleser 1987). Caplan (1987, p. 278-279) confirms this idea, and the investigations of elicited agrammatic speech by Kolk and Heeschen (1992) and by Heeschen (1985) indeed show that agrammatics produce no fewer substitutions than Wernicke's (or conduction) aphasics; for experimental results pointing to the same direction see Haarmann and Kolk (1992).

However, as shown by Kolk and Heeschen and collaborators this is only half the picture. In informal conversational settings (for example a chat over coffee during a break in an experimental session) the same patient can express him/herself in a quite different way. The following sample comes from a conversation between patient W and the first author in the same session in which she was asked to tell the cartoon stories. The session took place shortly after the Christmas and New Year holidays.

*Example (3): From a conversation between patient W and first author*

(( H is served a cup of coffee and takes a sip ))

01 W: zu stark gemacht?

too strongly made-PAST PRC? (PAST PRC stands for past participle)

02 H: Nee, das ist schon in Ordnung.

No, that is PRT OK. ((PRT stands for untranslatable particles, s. also list of abbreviations, Appendix, and Appendix))

03 (3.0)

04 H: Waren Sie kürzlich beim Arzt?

Were you-POL recently at-the physician?

(( "at-the" indicates the contraction of the preposition and the article in German, see also Appendix; POL stands for the polite address form, see also list of abbreviations, Appendix ))

05 W: Zwei, drei Wochen - Aufzeichnungen.

Two, three weeks recordings.

06 H: Sie meinen EEG?

You-POL mean EEG?

07 W: Ja, hm, äh, (1.0) viertel Jahr!

Yes, hm äh, (1.0) quarter of a year!

08 H: Ach so, alle drei Monate. Zwei Wochen wäre auch ein bißchen viel.

Oh so, every three months. Two weeks would PRT a bit much.

09 (4.0)

10 H: Was haben Sie denn über Weihnachten und Neujahr gemacht?

What have you PRT over Christmas and New Year done?

11 W: Weihnachten hier, Bettina und Freund, Gans, Schweinebraten äh Gans gegessen.

Christmas here, Bettina and boy-friend, goose, pork äh goose eaten.

((Bettina<sup>2</sup> is daughter of W))

Before calling attention to several noteworthy features of this exchange, it will be useful to offer a few remarks on German grammar (more is given in the Appendix and at various points in the paper, where necessary).

- (1) In spoken German, the perfect tense is used like the preterite: 'Ich war in Amerika/*I was in America*' and 'Ich bin in Amerika gewesen/*I have in America been*' have more or less the same meaning. This is, of course, an oversimplification; but it is good enough for the present purposes (for more details see Klein and Vater 1998).
- (2) German word order is relatively free except for verbs. A finite verb form (i.e. a verb marked for tense and person) has to appear in second position. Non-finite verb forms (infinitives, participles) have to appear at the end of the clause. This holds for main clauses; in subordinate clauses the finite verb form has to appear at the end. This is, in many respects, similar to some familiar registers of English. In Bible translations still used today, for example, one can find expressions like 'six days shalt thou labour' (Exodus 20:9 in Bible 1982).
- (3) Spoken German is very rich in particles. Their contribution to meaning is very subtle and cannot be captured by any direct translation into English. In the transcripts, all particles are indicated by PRT. These particles are explained and analysed in the main text.

As English is not that different from German, the transcripts in this paper provide a word-by-word translation of the original text. Sometimes explanatory indications are attached (as, for example, PAST PRC = past participle; a list of abbreviations is included in the Appendix). Sometimes, when the word-by-word translation could be confusing or inaccessible, a third line of transcript is provided with an idiomatic English translation. For more on translation, see the Appendix.

The speech used by patient W in the conversation in example 3 is strikingly different from her speech in the cartoon story-telling in the testing situation in example 1. Instead of attempting to construct complete sentences, she expresses

<sup>2</sup> All names of persons in the transcriptions are changed. The German data protection laws are so severe that the authors could not even indicate the year in which the conversations took place because the year plus events reported in the conversations could, in principle, lead to the identification of persons involved.

herself in fragments, in subsentential units (that is, in utterances which—from a normative point of view—are incomplete; most notably, they do not contain finite verbs). This type of agrammatic speech is almost exclusively characterized by omissions and is traditionally referred to as 'telegraphic style'. It surely appears to be a sort of simplification. How shall W's undertaking to speak in complete sentences in telling the cartoon story be understood? How shall her use of the telegraphic style in informal conversation be understood? What is the outcome of the use of telegraphic talk? What does W achieve? And how is the interaction of the healthy co-participant organized in response to the different ways in which an agrammatic patient expresses him/herself? These are the types of questions and issues explored in this paper by analysing two excerpts from another agrammatic patient. However, some further remarks on telegraphic style are first necessary.

The terms 'agrammatic' and 'telegraphic' are not interchangeable. In keeping with the vast majority of the literature, 'agrammatic/agrammatism' is used by the authors as denoting problems with the grammatical organization of utterances in non-fluent aphasics. These problems can manifest themselves in various ways, of which 'telegraphic style' is just one.

Kolk and Heeschen and collaborators have examined large numbers of telegraphic utterances by agrammatics in Dutch and German as they occurred in informal conversations (mostly with professional aphasiologists). They were able to show that the omissions used in telegraphic style are of a very systematic character: they lead to expressions which also occur in the casual speech of normal people. These normal 'reduced' expressions were called 'contextual ellipses' by Clark and Clark (1977). These ellipses are self-contained; they do not result from reduction operations on preceding verbal material (as, for example, 'and I wine' as part of the coordination 'Peter likes beer and I wine'). Clark and Clark's definition as adopted by Kolk and Heeschen also excludes immediate responses to constituent questions; for example, A: Where do you come from? B: (From) Berlin. (This definition of 'ellipsis/telegram' is not unproblematic in examining the speech of agrammatic aphasics from a conversation analytic point of view; this issue is addressed later.) An operational definition of a 'telegram' or an ellipsis was proposed by Hofstede (1992): any expression without a finite verb form (and that is *a fortiori* also any expression without any verb form at all) is considered to be a telegram or a contextual ellipsis except immediate responses to questions. Making the absence of a finite verb form criterial for the classification of an expression as telegraphic-elliptic (at least for Dutch and German) was based on theoretical-linguistic considerations put forward by Klein (1985), showing that many of the regularities and constraints on the well-formedness of contextual ellipses centre around the absence of finiteness. The present paper incorporates Hofstede's proposal, with the terms 'telegram/telegraphic' being used in the context of aphasia.

That said, work by Kolk and Heeschen and by Hofstede showed not only that agrammatic telegrams are structurally identical to normal contextual ellipses, but also that they are perfectly correct (leaving aside 3–5% errors related to the total of grammatical morphemes—a number which does not exceed the rate of errors in the speech of unimpaired speakers).

The fact that agrammatic telegraphic/elliptic utterances are correct is not trivial (according to the motto 'what is omitted cannot be wrong') because they require the observation of some refined peculiarities of German grammar. To mention just the two most conspicuous examples:



*Word order*

As explained above, non-finite verb forms have to appear at the end of a main clause. An inspection of W's utterances in line 1 and line 11 in example 3 shows that she indeed observes this regularity for the past participles. To give an example for the substitution of the finite verb form by the infinitive from another patient: the patient K, while recounting his morning routines, used the following expressions (in which 'um sechse', 'uffstehn' and 'denn' are 'Berlinisms' for High German 'um sechs', 'aufstehn' and 'dann').

*Example (4):*

"...um sechse uffstehn, denn duschen, und denn Kaffee trinken"  
 ....at six o'clock to-get-up-INF, then to-take-a-shower-INF, and then  
 coffee to-drink-INF  
 (for the English "to take a shower", German needs only one verb "duschen")

The German prefixed verbs like 'aufstehn' require a short explanation: these prefixes are separable, that is, if the verb is finite (marked for tense and person), then the verb has to appear in second position (as noted above), but the prefix at the end of the clause ('Ich stehe um sechs auf/*I get at six up*'). In non-finite forms the prefix precedes the verb stem; prefix and verb are contracted into one phonological word. In example 4, patient K does not inflect the verbs, and they all appear—correctly—at the end of the clauses, and the separable prefix 'auf-' is correctly combined with the infinitival form.

*Inflection of attributive adjectives*

Attributive adjectives in German take on suffixes depending on the gender, case, and number of the modified noun. However, these suffixes are different depending on whether a definite article precedes or does not precede the construction. Thus, it must be 'der andere Patient/*the other patient*', but 'anderer Patient/*other patient*' (where 'der' is the definite article 'the-masc.sg.nom'). Articles belong to the elements which are most often omitted in telegraphic speech (and also in elliptic expressions as used by normals). Surprisingly, Kolk and Heeschen virtually never found incorrect adjective inflections in agrammatic telegrams after omission of the article; that is, the construction of the noun phrase incorporated omission of the definite article.

These examples are introduced here to illustrate the point that telegrams/ellipses do not simply result from the omission of some elements with the remaining parts of the utterance being the same, but that they involve a different utterance construction and organization (i.e. telegrams are not simpler just because they are shorter). In keeping with most current models of language production (see Levelt 1989), these organizational differences between fully elaborated sentences and telegrams/ellipses led Kolk and Heeschen and collaborators to assume that

agrammatics—when speaking telegraphically—do not plan a full sentence. Rather, they simplify the preverbal message from the beginning of the speech production process so that it can be expressed in the form of a telegram which, in turn, is simple enough that the patient's impaired grammatical encoder can just process it. The fact that agrammatics try to speak in complete sentences in some situations (with the usual problems mentioned above), but in simplified telegraphic style in other situations is interpreted by Kolk and Heeschen and their collaborators as an indication that agrammatics have the capacity to speak in one or the other way and therefore they have a 'choice' between them. The simplified telegraphic style is considered to be a form of adaptation to the impairment, a strategic adaptive choice. It involves different practices of speaking.

The adaptation idea has considerable methodological import. For more than a century, telegraphic style in agrammatics has been considered to be a direct expression of the underlying linguistic impairment (Isserlin 1922 is an exception). What was—from a normative point of view—'missing' in the telegrams (articles, verb inflections, auxiliaries, etc.) was evaluated as something that the patients were unable to produce. However, looking at telegraphic style as a strategic adaptation which follows an established pattern of simplification/reduction in the language forces the aphasiologist to accept the 'missing-ness' of certain elements as legal and normal. Furthermore, telegraphic-elliptic style not only *permits* certain omissions (as, for example, the articles), but sometimes even *requires* certain omissions (as, for example, grammatical subjects in certain constructions). Thus, the absence of a grammatical subject in telegrams cannot be taken as lack of elaboration, as something 'negative', but rather invites understanding as the result of regular constraints on telegrams/ellipses, that is as something 'positive' or 'affirmative'.

The notions of adaptation and strategic choice have, however, frequently given rise to misunderstandings. Most notably, 'adaptation' is misunderstood as a consciously controlled option. This is not necessarily the case and is surely not entailed by this analytic stance. Many agrammatic patients are entirely unaware of the fact that they sometimes speak like this and sometimes like that. This, of course, is not incompatible with at least some patients being well aware of their varying type of speech (see the patient discussed by Isserlin 1922). But adaptation theory does not critically depend on the assumption of a conscious and controlled option. It is entirely sufficient to say that the patients have one more degree of freedom (in a technical sense) with respect to their way of expressing themselves.

A second misunderstanding concerns the question of whether all agrammatics make use of telegraphic style in informal situations. If resorting to telegraphic style is considered as a strategy (to repeat, not necessarily a controlled strategy) and not as a biological or physiological compulsion, then it is not a surprise that some patients do not use telegraphic style—not even in informal conversation. From the data given by Hofstede (1992) and Heeschen and Kolk (1994) it can be seen that approximately 75 % of all agrammatics use telegraphic style at least occasionally. In addition, there is the misunderstanding that patients with an inclination toward the use of telegraphic style always turn to it as soon as they are in an informal conversational situation with any conversational partner at all. As this paper will show, the use of telegraphic style is not only dependent on the situation in gross terms (such as testing vs. conversation), but also on the conversational partner, his/her interactional practices, and the tenor of the interaction at that moment.

Finally, there is the misunderstanding that the 'adapтивists' want to maintain that

telegraphic style in agrammatics is 'normal correct speech'. This has never been maintained. The adaptivists have always emphasized that agrammatics *overuse* telegraphic expressions. According to Hofstede (1992), approximately 10% of all utterances in the speech of unimpaired speakers are contextual ellipses. If this percentage is exceeded—either overall or in particular episodes—the speech has to be considered as 'deviant from normal'. Most of the agrammatic patients investigated by the supporters of adaptation theory show from 30% up to almost 90% telegraphic-elliptic utterances.

It was mentioned above that the agrammatic telegrams are structurally identical to contextual ellipses used by normal people in casual speech. A list of these constructions and their distribution of frequency is presented by Hofstede (1992). However, at least one example from a normal-normal conversation should be given to illustrate the formal identity of agrammatic telegrams and normal ellipses (example 5).

*Example (5):*

- (( The conversation took place between a conversant M (male) and V (female) in Berlin.  
M and V are living in Berlin, but they are not native Berliners. They discuss the  
job situation in Germany [line 1-5] and then M tells where he comes from. ))
- 01 M: Also, in Deutschland ((2syll)) geht's ja nich, bloss, ((1syll))  
PRT, in Germany works-it PRT not, only  
In Germany things are just not working
- (( "xsyll" in double round brackets stands for incomprehensible speech of roughly  
the duration of x syllables of the given speaker given his/her beat; see  
also Appendix. ))
- 02 V: Im Moment, meinen Sie, ja?  
Momentarily, mean you, yeah?  
For the time being, you mean, right?
- 03 M: Jaja. [Nee, also so weitschweifende Pläne  
Yeayea. No, PRT so far-reaching plans  
Yeah. [No, I have no long term plans.
- 04 V: [ajah  
[Yeah
- 05 M: hab' ich nicht.  
have I not.
- 06 V: Ajah.  
Yeah
- 07 M: Nee, aber ich ging von ((2syll)), aeh, von Reckum, Reckum hieß das Dorf  
No, but I went from from Reckum, Reckum is the village called  
No, but I went from ((2syll)) uh from Reckum, the village is called Reckum
- 08 V: Mhm
- 09 M: Lüneburg, und dann nach Hannover. (un:d) Also meine Wurzeln sind da etwas.  
Lüneburg, and then to Hannover. (and) PRT my roots are there a-bit.  
Lüneburg, and then to Hannover. (an:d) PRT my roots are sort of there
- 10 V: Auch über Arbeit hier gelandet!  
Also through job here landed-PAST PRC  
Also ended up here for work!

M tells V (lines 7–9) that he originally came from the area around Hannover before coming to Berlin. His expressions ‘Lüneburg, und dann Hannover’ are most probably telegraphic–elliptic. In line 10, V makes the guess that M, too, has come to Berlin because of work and a job, in the course of her utterance omitting the grammatical subject, the article for ‘Arbeit/job’, and the finite verb (the auxiliary ‘sind’). V’s turn in particular strongly resembles the telegrams used by W in the conversation with H. But what is the grammatical status of these utterances?

Some colleagues have expressed their doubt as to whether telegrams/ellipses such as those in example 5—even if used by normal subjects—can be classified as ‘grammatically correct’. At least, so it is argued, they should be marked as incomplete. The present authors understand this view to be derived from a linguistics which takes isolated sentences as the analytic primitives. The stance toward grammatical correctness or completeness taken up here is different. Within CA, designed to grasp the production of actual talk in context rather than grammatical competence *per se*, the comparably central notion is the ‘turn constructional unit’ (TCU), that is, any expression which can serve as a full turn within the sequential structure of talk-in-interaction in some local context—serving as a next turn to a preceding one and as a possibly complete preceding turn to a next. ‘Turn constructional units’ are such constructions as can serve, on their possible completion, to make transition to a next speaker relevant, whether or not it is actually accomplished (Sacks *et al.* 1974, pp. 702–4; Schegloff 1996a, p. 55). A language *unimpaired* lady once told the first author that one morning she detected that her cat was seriously ill. She was asked: ‘Und was haben Sie dann gemacht?/And what did you do then?’ To which she answered: ‘Na, ich nischt wie in die Tierklinik/na, I immediately to the animal hospital’ (*sic*), directly after which she was asked whether the staff in the animal hospital had been able to do something for the cat. Because the elliptic expression ‘Na, ich nischt wie in die Tierklinik’ was recognized (correctly) as composing a possibly complete turn, as evidenced by a next speaker starting up on its completion and not encountering any continuing talk by the prior speaker, it is unclear on what basis it should be analytically reckoned to be incomplete. Actually, from a CA point of view, one has even to ask whether, in its sequential position, this subsentential TCU is not the default form of construction, and whether a more elaborated expression would constitute a special use. To answer such questions, ‘positionally sensitive’ grammars are needed (Schegloff 1996a), though not yet available. The upshot of this discussion is to render the notions of ‘ellipsis’ and ‘telegram’ themselves equivocal and open to rethinking. Throughout this paper, therefore, use of these terms is meant simply to follow the established terminology in this area, and not to suggest that something is ‘missing’.

#### *Summary so far*

In more formal test-like situations, agrammatics tend to express themselves in complete sentences which, however, result in a substantial number of errors (omissions and substitutions of grammatical morphemes, misconstructions, etc.). In informal conversational situations, they are more likely to use sentence fragments or—to follow the established terminology—telegrams which, in German and Dutch, require a quite different organization and planning from fully elaborated sentences. A number of facts suggest that this switch from one type of

speech to another is not 'compulsory', that telegraphic style is a strategic option (though not necessarily under conscious control), that it contingently mobilizes a distinctive set of practices for talking in interaction. Among these facts are the following: that it happens in some patients, but not in others; that one and the same patient employs telegraphic style in some episodes, but not in others, in some social contexts, but not in others; that employing telegraphic style can be dependent on the co-participant and his/her interactional practices, on the character of the interactional episode in progress, and so on. Although two studies which tried to replicate in English the findings by Kolk and Heeschen failed to do so, these studies cannot be taken to provide unequivocal counter-evidence to adaptation theory (Kolk and Heeschen 1996). In the study of Goodglass *et al.* (1993) the patients were asked to tell cartoon stories in the so-called free condition; the authors did not include conversational speech. And Hesketh and Bishop (1996) averaged findings from spontaneous speech obtained under various conditions. A serious attempt to replicate the adaptation findings would require researchers to distinguish carefully between speech obtained in conversations and speech obtained under other conditions, even if they give patients considerable freedom (as in the cartoon storytelling of Goodglass *et al.* 1993).

The evident tie between the application of an adaptive telegraphic style by agrammatics and features of the interactional context (experimentally verified also by Heeschen and Kolk 1994) suggests a course of further inquiry. If agrammatics' speech is adapted to context, then surely one *desideratum* is a grasp of the context in the terms in which participants—speakers and recipients, whether aphasic or not—appear to orient to it and grasp it. Among these terms are included not only social context in the conventional sense (testing session vs. informal conversation), but also the structure of the occasion; the local sequential context, including not only topical content but also the structure of action sequences, interactional stances, and so on. This necessarily implicates attention to the turn-at-talk in its sequence, for it is in turns-at-talk that speakers speak; it implicates attention to the TCU in the turn, for it is out of TCUs that turns are composed by their speakers and parsed by their recipients; and it implicates the understanding of the current point of articulation by a speaker by reference to its unfolding TCU-in-progress, in its turn, in its sequence, in its interactional episode, at some juncture in the overall structural organization of the occasion of talk. These terms may be unfamiliar to readers of this journal, but they are part of the analytic resources brought to this task by CA, analytic tools derived from the examination of talk-in-interaction of various sorts, and deployable for the analysis of agrammatic talk in various contexts. CA's commitment has been to the elucidation of the co-construction of interaction in the terms relevant to the parties' construction of it in real time, rather than in the terms of professional investigators; and that makes CA most suitable for the present task, for which the context, as operationally understood and acted on by the parties, is central. For a variety of reasons, it will be particularly telling to bring these analytic resources to bear on peer-to-peer conversations rather than institutionalized talk-in-interaction (such as patient-therapist encounters), although the latter undertaking should also yield useful results. Among these reasons the following two may be singled out: (i) because it is only plausible to assume that patients develop adaptive strategies not in order to satisfy the constraints of interacting with professional aphasiologists in professional contexts, but to interact with familiars in ordinary settings of everyday life; (ii) because talk-

in-interaction more generally appears designed for interaction *among* familiars *about* familiars, and the study of interaction among family members and friends and acquaintances examines talk in the settings for which it appears to have evolved, rather than in professionally specified settings at considerable variance from talk's primary context of relevance.

The present study, then, is devoted to the focused question derived from Kolk's and Heeschen's adaptation theory: what are the consequences of the use of telegraphic style by agrammatic patients in peer-to-peer conversations? In keeping with the other goal of the paper to explore the usefulness of CA in addressing data and issues of interest to aphasiology, dealing with this question will involve exploring aspects of the talk in the very brief episodes examined which may initially appear unrelated to the focal inquiry. It turns out that some of these will be relevant to the central question; which of the details of the talk, in its context, is irrelevant can be decided only *a posteriori*.

This paper represents an effort to explore the use of CA for the analysis and understanding of talk and other conduct in interaction involving persons characterized as aphasic after some form of damage to the brain. Its genre might be termed 'CA-assisted aphasiology', differing from straightforward CA on the same materials by taking prior aphasiological understanding as part of its point of departure and as part of its problematic. Such an effort incorporates two different domains of data which inform the process of analysis. The aphasiological input, and the experience of aphasiologists, is apt to set any particular piece of data in the context of other aphasic patients, other conversational partners of the aphasic patient, other episodes involving this or other aphasic patients. Prior conversation-analytic work, and the experience of conversation analysts, is apt to set any particular piece of data in the context of other occurrences of events of that sort—turns, sequences, repairs, references, and so on—across compositional features of the participants in ordinary interaction. This can engender complex, multivalent characterizations of some occurrences in the data, as when an intervention by a conversational co-participant in response to an aphasic participant can be understood both as underscoring a problem in the latter's talk, and as doing so in much less pejorative terms than other co-interactants with aphasics. Sorting out the relevance of alternative analytic domains for the diverse professional/scientific interests which intersect in this work is a project which will undoubtedly require long-term working out.

### The interactants

Paradoxically, it was a patient who almost never used telegraphic style who engendered some key initial insights with respect to its potential interactional advantage. The patient was a female Broca's aphasic with fairly mild agrammatism who hardly ever used telegraphic style in conversations with the first author, at least the number of telegraphic expressions did not exceed the number that can be considered normal for casual speech (around 10%; Hofstede 1992). The same holds for her speech in a conversation with her husband. However, she used telegraphic expressions in a conversation with her best friend at least occasionally, and in one episode extensively. This episode was quite revealing. First, an episode is analysed in which the patient does not use telegraphic expressions except where

they are normal or 'positionally motivated', that is canonical; only later is the episode analysed in which telegraphic expressions figure more centrally (episode 3).

The patient was diagnosed as having Broca's aphasia by means of the *Aachen Aphasia Test* (AAT) by Huber *et al.* (1983). The general degree of severity of the aphasia was mild as assessed by the Token Test of the AAT (seven errors). The major symptoms were mild agrammatism, word finding problems, articulatory and/or phonematic problems, non-fluency. The non-fluency, though clearly present, was also fairly mild compared with other Broca's aphasic patients. The patient had a marked hemiparesis of the right arm; for gesturing and any other fine movements the left arm and hand were used. The patient was right handed. Aetiology was a cerebrovascular accident when the patient was aged 50. At the time the following conversation was recorded, she was 7 years post onset. The patient's first and only language was German. Her formal education consisted of 10 years in elementary school; her profession is not known. At the time she was contacted she was not working and she made some remarks suggesting that she had never had a profession, but had been a housewife from a fairly early age. Mood was normal given the circumstances.

The episodes presented come from a conversation between the patient (henceforth A) and her closest (female) friend (henceforth B). The conversation took place in the home of B in the pre-Christmas season. A paid a visit to B in the afternoon for a chat over coffee and cake. The visit was not especially arranged; A and B had flats close to each other in a middle-class area of West Berlin, and often visited each other. Both participants were speakers of standard High German with occasional Berlin-specific peculiarities.

### Analytic observations on some episodes

(For transcription conventions and principles of translation see the Appendix.) In what follows, a moderately detailed explication of some conversational exchanges is provided to set the context and the analytic terms within which the uses of telegraphic speech can properly be explored.

#### *Full sentence production*

In the first episode to be examined, A's talk is designed for production formatted as full sentences. Although she encounters difficulties in the course of producing these turns, their underlying design in sentence format is apparent—for example, in their regular incorporation of finite verbs.

#### *Episode (1)*

- 01 B: =Jaja, - aber Gundula (0.3) ah, wat ham die denn da anjeboten,  
 =Yeah, - but Gundula (0.3) ah, what have they-DEM PRT there offered,  
 Yeah, but Gundula, what did they offer there,
- 02 >((1syll)) /wo< de/ mir, weiß gar nicht, wo du hingefahren bist,  
 >((1syll))/wo< de/ to-me, know not at all, where you travelled have,  
 don't know at all where you went,

- 03 nach Bremerhaven, sagt Mitzi?  
to Bremerhaven, says Mitzi?  
to Bremerhaven, says Mitzi?
- 04 A: Nee  
No
- 05 B: Brem [(en)?  
Brem (en)?
- 06 A: [Ma(t)-, /Prauβ-nschweig/.  
Ma(t)-, /Prauβ-nschweig/.
- 07 (0.5)
- 08 B: Braunschweig (?)  
Braunschweig (?)
- 09 A: Jaha.  
Yeah.
- 10 B: Ähä..  
Ähä..
- 11 (.8) ((A swallowing food))
- 12 A: ·hhh (0.5)/om.prep/ Braun:schweig ist denn, äh, äh, ·hh der (0.5) hm, äh, /Kar-/,  
·hhh (0.5) Braun:schweig is PRT, äh, äh, ·hh the (0.5) hm, äh, /Kar-/  
13 °nein° Weihnachtsmarkt.= ((A carrying out gesture indicating largeness of the  
fair))  
no Christmas fair.=
- 14 B: =Ja.  
=yes.
- 15 A: Aber ·hhh °äh°, e- un:wahrscheinlich /grote/. ((A carrying out rhythmical  
But ·hhh °äh°, e- unbelievably /large/. gesture, hand and arm stretched))
- 16 (0.8) ((B nods))
- 17 A: Und eine Stunde /haben/ wir nur. ((A carrying out gesture indicating "1" and  
And one hour /have/ we only. repeating it rhythmically ))
- 18 B: Aufenthalt (?)  
{a} stop-over (?)
- 19 A: Nee.  
No.
- 20 (0.2)
- 21 A: [ ((1.5syll))
- 22 B: [Dann seid ihr da äh spazierengegangen.=  
Then have you-PL there äh wandered-around.=  
Then you made a walk there.
- 23 A: =J:a.  
=Y:es.

In this episode, the two women have been speaking about an excursion in which A participated approximately 2 weeks before the conversation. It is a type of excursion with the nickname 'Butterfahrt/butter excursion'—a name the origins of which date back to the times before the introduction of unrestricted free trade between the members of the European Union. It is a one-day excursion by bus, normally organized by a certain very large coffee-chain in Germany, to a place worth seeing and is combined with the opportunity to buy certain goods at a discount price. This type of excursion is usually organized for elderly people. Although they have been talking about this excursion for a while, there has been



no mention of the site of the excursion or the merchandise being offered at low prices—and we begin at the point at which B raises these questions. B asks first what especially cheap things were offered, but she does not wait for an answer despite the fact that A, on the word 'anboten/offered', launches a gesture indicating that she is prepared to answer that question. Instead, B continues and enquires about the place the excursion visited by mentioning (complaining?) that she does not know this, and offering what Mitzi (a mutual female friend) had told her, namely, that it was 'nach Bremerhaven/to Bremerhaven'. The turn ends with a rising intonation, marking Mitzi's information as a candidate response.

'Bremerhaven' is rejected by A (line 4), and B offers 'Bremen' (line 5) as next candidate. Before ending the word 'Bremen', A intervenes and offers the correct answer, 'Braunschweig'. Note that A intervenes at exactly the earliest point she can (Jefferson 1973, 1984): after 'Brem-' the completion point becomes projectable, it is entirely clear what B is saying, and that she is on the wrong track.

The name of the city 'Braunschweig' is mispronounced by A (line 6): she stumbles in the middle of the word. The voiceless onset [p] instead of the correct voiced [b] is a mispronunciation as well, but it matters less than the stumbling because, in Broca's aphasics in general, the difference between voiced and voiceless is somewhat indistinct (Blumstein *et al.* 1980; for a more recent discussion see Wambaugh *et al.* 1997). The mispronounced 'Braunschweig' is preceded by a false start 'Ma(t)'—in all likelihood the beginning of the city name 'Magdeburg'. The patient immediately suppresses it and self-repairs. Note that the mispronunciation of 'Braunschweig' is not so severe that it could lead to a misunderstanding.

In line 8, B repeats the answer in correct pronunciation. The rising intonation is not very marked, if there is a rise at all; hence the question mark in round brackets. In the context of aphasia, one might be tempted immediately to classify this move by B as a correction and/or as giving A a model for repetition (such a possible analysis is grounded below). However, there are alternative possible understandings of B's turn. As a response to an answer, it can constitute the action of registering the answer (Schegloff 1996b, pp. 178–179, 1997a, pp. 527–531). And it can serve as a check on the hearer's hearing/understanding of the utterance (Schegloff *et al.* 1977, p. 368 *et passim*; 1997a, pp. 525–527). A third possibility is discussed below. It appears that A takes B's 'Braunschweig (?)' as the second of these: she reconfirms her answer by the response 'Jaha' in line 9 instead of repeating the name of the city (as would be relevant had she heard it as a correction or a model for repetition). Although B's repeat in line 8 is thus not treated by A as making relevant a corrected articulation in the next turn, it can be seen in line 12 that A does in fact benefit from the model presented by B in line 8: her articulation of 'Braunschweig' is now perfect; indeed, it is 'overcorrect' at exactly the point where she had encountered fairly severe trouble in line 6: the 'n' is lengthened.

'Braun: schweig' at line 12 is the beginning of a longer turn in which A takes up a stance toward the preceding exchange. The overcorrectness of its articulation can be taken to display a continuing orientation to the trouble in line 6, and to the turn in line 8 where B presents 'Braunschweig' in correct pronunciation. Given our professional knowledge about A's type of aphasia and the degree of severity of her aphasia, it is not surprising that A benefits from the model in line 8; no problems with repetition are expected, at least if only one word models are involved which are not tongue-twisters. However, within an interaction-oriented framework, the *observer's a priori* aphasiological knowledge is less relevant than what B *knows* about

her friend's language problems and about how she can help her, knowledge which B can bring to bear in her interaction with A. In order to shed some light on these questions, a look at lines 1-12 in episode 2 is quite useful.

Episode (2)

- 01 A: ·hhh /om.art./ Rücken ·hh tut ih(n) weh, /om.art./ A- Arme ge /tut/ ihn weh,  
·hhh back ·hh hurts him X, a- arms ge /hurts/ him X,
- 02 ·hhh äh (tj) /bis:/, äh ·hh /bist/  
·hhh äh (ch) /bite/, äh ·hh /bite/
- 03 B: Gebiß,=  
bite,=
- 04 A: =/biß/, ohoho Gott ((laughing)) ·hhh ja.  
=/bite/, ohoho God ((laughing)) ·hhh yes.
- 05 B: Was >noch<?  
What else?
- 06 A: Ja.  
Yes.
- 07 B: [Wie?]  
how?
- 08 A: [ äh ] ·hh Kopfschmerz[en].  
äh ·hh headaches.
- 09 B: [und? ((points to mouth))  
and?
- 10 (1.5) ((A pointing to mouth))
- 11 A: Ge:[biß].  
BITE
- 12 B: [Ja. ((smiling))  
Yes. ((smiling))
- 13 (0.8)
- 14 A: ·hhhhh ·hhhhh (°ha:ch, Mensch, nee°°) Das tut mir /(we-)/  
·hhhhh ·hhhhh (°ha:ch, man!, no°°) That makes me /(we-)/ {feel}
- 15 so lei:d.  
so sorry.
- 16 B: Ja, und, (am), die ham dir nich' 'n Tip gegeben,  
Yes, and, (am), they-DEM have to-you not any advice given,  
Yes, and did they not give you any advice
- 17 [was du machen sollst] en [oder so?]  
what you do should en or so?  
what you should do or so?
- 18 A: [Ne-, nein], [ä:hm ] tj! na  
No-, no, ä:hm tj! na
- 19 ·hhh (0.8) äh ·hh /om.art./ Schwiegermutter hab' ich denn: gesagt,  
·hhh (0.8) äh ·hh /om.art./ mother-in-law have I then said,
- 20 äh- ·hh anrufen und /danns/- ist (0.8) na-  
äh- ·hh to-call-up-INF and /thens/- is (0.8) na-
- 21 äh ·hh (0.3) n:, na a äh, ä:h z- äh Hause.  
äh ·hh (0.3) n:, na a äh, ä:h z- äh home.

- 22 B: Die soll nach Hause [kommen, >also< wirklich [jetzt mal.  
 She-DEM should to:home come, >PRT< really now PRT.<sup>3</sup>  
 She should come home so really!
- 23 A: [Ja:.. [ .hhh  
 Yes:.. .hhh
- 24 Und- äh gestern bin ich äh bei (ge-) ihr ihr gewesen,  
 And- äh yesterday have I äh at (ge-) her her (place) been,  
 And yesterday I was with her
- 25 .hhh und dann habe ich gesagt, äh bitte [hhh]=  
 .hhh and then have I said, äh please .hhh=  
 and then I have said: please
- 26 B: [ Ja ]  
 Yes
- 27 A: =/tomm / - mal - nach Hau [se.]  
 =/come/ - PRT - to {my} home.  
 come to my home.
- 28 B: [Ja,] ja.  
 Yes, yes

At line 1, A is enumerating the physical problems from which her husband is suffering. A's turn contains several grammatical errors typical of agrammatism when the patients do not speak in telegraphic style (note that A's utterances in these lines are not telegraphic by definition: she uses finite verb forms). Both 'Rücken/back' and 'Arme/arms' require an article or a possessive pronoun or some other determiner or specifier. This is not 'prescriptive' of 'proper' German, but simply a rule of actual German usage. Furthermore, the verb form 'tut' is wrong; it is 3.sg., but the 3.pl. 'tun' is required here. The 'ihn/him' is the accusative of the personal pronoun 'er/he'; in High German the dative 'ihm' is required in this context. But the 'ihn-ACC' need not be taken as incorrect given the common carelessness of Berliners with respect to the ACC/DAT distinction.

In naming the third body part with which her husband is having problems, A gets into trouble (line 2). After a short search phase, she produces the paraphasia '/bis:/', then self-initiates a self-repair (Schegloff *et al.* 1977) which, however, results in another paraphasia '/bist/'. In line 3, B provides A with the problematic item, 'Gebiß/bite' (the whole structure of jaws and teeth), but even after this model, A again produces a paraphasia '/biß/' and expresses her awareness of the error as well as her dissatisfaction with her speech with the exclamation 'ohoho Gott' and a laugh which sounds a bit desperate (line 4). It appears that A's 'ja' in line 4 serves to register and mark receipt of B's provision of 'Gebiß' as what she (A) had been trying to say; in any case, there is no effort on A's part to make another try at the correct pronunciation of 'Gebiß'. Then, at line 5, B asks 'was noch?/what else?'

This question is somewhat ambiguous. It can be understood as a request to continue with the enumeration of A's husband's miseries or as a request for another repetition of the preceding, problematic, item. However, the following 'wie?' by B in line 7 is fairly unambiguously a repetition request. Although literally translated as 'how', it may here be glossed as 'what?' with the import of a repetition request (Egbert 1996). However, this is apparently misunderstood by A;

that she takes the 'was noch?' together with the 'wie?' as a request to continue with the enumeration of the miseries of her husband is displayed by her mentioning of another of his physical problems, 'Kopfschmerzen/headaches'. There is a basis for this understanding and response by A. 'Was noch' with terminal intonation and stress on the second word would be appropriately understood as asking more about other physical problems, that is, promoting further telling. It is the stress on the first word, the upward intonation contour, and the extremely short pronunciation of 'noch' by B which mark it as repair initiation, stopping a continuation of the telling in favour of (repaired) repetition of what has already been said. The non-understanding by A raises the question as to whether there is a problem in interpreting the contribution of prosody in analysing the sequential and action import of an utterance (in A and/or in Broca's aphasics more generally).

In line 9, B insists on her repetition request and reformulates it as the prompt 'und?/and?', and this time she makes very clear that she is asking for repetition of the trouble item by pointing to her mouth. Furthermore, she is sitting in a very formal upright position and is looking in a very friendly and encouraging way at A. The whole scene has a touch of the institutional; the friend behaves like a therapist, so that we have here the intriguing case of an institutional-type other-initiated self-repair in the middle of a peer-to-peer conversation. In line 11, A finally produces the correct 'Gebiß' and is 'rewarded' by a bright smile by B which begins exactly after the articulation of the onset of 'Gebiß'. Note that—analogue to the overcorrect 'Braun:schweig' in line 12 of episode 1—A pronounces the previously problematic part of 'Gebiß' in an overcorrect way, evidencing that she knows where the problem was. And B's overlapping 'Ja' in line 12—immediately after the delivering of the prefix 'Ge:' which was missing in A's preceding trials—and B's smile beginning exactly when A is launching the articulation of the prefix, all this shows that it was really this prefix which B wanted to elicit. This strengthens the impression that B is conducting herself here like a therapist and thus constitutes the patient as 'impaired'.

For the discussion of B's move in line 8 of episode 1 as the provision of a model to correct the articulation of 'Braunschweig', the relevant observation here is that B does not give the model 'Gebiß' once more, but elicits the final successful self-repair of A by pointing to the 'Gebiß'. It is as if she cannot really believe that A was unable to repeat the model immediately at line 4. And actually, a closer inspection of the videotaped data shows that B's non-believing is justified. Directly after A's unsuccessful production of the self-initiated self-repair '/bist/' in line 2, A continues to move her lips and appears clearly to be launching a third try, that is, another self-repair. But B intervenes before she can do so by providing the word in line 3. Given A's ongoing visible articulatory movements, however, her '/biß/' in line 4 is almost certainly not the response to the model given by B, but rather the third self-initiated try initiated before that model. There is a problem here, but not a repetition problem. Provided with the model only once and then unmistakably requested by B to repeat it, A is perfectly successful—as expected on the aphasiological knowledge about A, but obviously also expected by B who appears to know that A can potentially profit from being given a model.

Taking into account this analysis of episode 2, the 'Braunschweig' in line 8 of episode 1 can be plausibly considered as the implementation of two actions at the same time. One of them (production of a corrective model as potential help for A in talk still to come) treats A as 'impaired'. However, this 'therapeutic' aspect is

mitigated by embedding it in another action. As mentioned above, it can be an understanding/hearing check. From the perspective of common practices in ordinary conversation with unimpaired interactants, this action, however normal in this sequential position, in fact accomplishes the underscoring of the occurrence of a problem. It does so by stopping the sequence in progress in order to deal with a problem of hearing/understanding (although, we note again, A's paraphasia in line 6 is so mild that the name of the city is unlikely to have been misunderstood). It would exemplify an 'exposed' correction rather than an 'embedded' one (Jefferson 1987). However, from the perspective of what can be observed in interactions with aphasics—be it in institutional or in 'everyday's life' settings—B's move in line 8 can be considered as relatively unobtrusive.<sup>3</sup> She combines the action of helping her friend to a correct pronunciation in talk to come with the action of an hearing/understanding check. The latter treats A's paraphasia as problematic for understanding, but at the same time it 'masks' the action of providing help. We have to appreciate that B at least tries to play down the aphasiological background. This is an occurrence which exemplifies the earlier discussion in the introduction about the possible multivalent characterizations of an utterance.

However, there is still another understanding of B's 'Braunschweig (?)' (returning to the third analysis promised earlier), one which characterizes it as a definitely benign action—whichever universe of discourse is used to frame it. For B's 'Braunschweig' can be taken here as a marker of surprise; she has after all had her previous understanding (based on what Mitzi said) corrected, and she can here be marking A's utterance as 'news'. Such an action is a common practice in this sequential position and thus does not constitute the patient as 'impaired'. The action of providing help would be really 'embedded' in this action. It remains unclear whether B checks understanding or expresses surprise at line 8. But it can be safely said that it is at least not designed to launch a quasi-therapeutic exercise as in episode 2, and there is some indication that at least A receives it as an understanding/hearing check (see discussion of lines 12–13).

To summarize so far, B's utterance at line 8 achieves two things: she gets the reconfirmation that Braunschweig was in fact the site of the excursion (either as a response to an understanding check or as a response to her being surprised), but she has also helped her friend to a correct articulation of this city name in subsequent talk. And this help is given in a minimally intrusive way, in a way which plays down the aphasiological background and does not too strongly underscore A's linguistic deficiencies.

B's unobtrusive support in episode 1 contrasts strikingly with her openly therapeutic behaviour in episode 2. But the latter is absolutely unique in the whole of this hour-long conversation; there is no other comparable occurrence. In fact,

<sup>3</sup> B's interventions contrast, for example, with interventions by A's husband such as the following:

- A is in a word finding problem and appeals to her husband for help; he does provide the word, but only after saying: 'Now once more, we are in a situation where we can't go on'
- A offers a telegram 'boys getting up'. The husband responds with raised, teacher-like voice and with continuation intonation: 'When the children get up—'

It is clear that the husband—unlike B—underscores the deficiencies of A's talk. He does co-construct, but in a way which casts A as 'impaired'. And this is apparently so problematic for A that she avoids 'inviting' him to help her by resorting to telegraphic style (for a more elaborated discussion of this aspect of telegraphic style, see analysis of episode 3 and Conclusion and Perspectives). Perhaps this can be taken as a warning against the naive conviction that collaboration is always a friendly act.

the relatively unobtrusive way of giving support is common in B's conduct (and several more instances will be shown in this paper). Thus, there remains the question: how shall we understand B's openly therapeutic stance in episode 2? One strong possibility seems fairly straightforward and can be found in the second part of episode 2, as well as in several other episodes not presented in this paper: B treats as problematic the topic of A's problems with her husband. Whenever A is talking about her husband's problems and her problems with him, B gives the conversation a turn away from this delicate territory. In episode 2, B takes the opportunity of a local problem (the paraphasia '/bis:/') to solve a considerably more substantial problem—the general topic of the talk which A is pursuing. The fact that she does not succeed in this respect (A continues with the topic) is a different matter.<sup>4</sup>

Let's now continue the analysis of episode 1. In line 10, B produces a sort of 'sequence-closing third position' turn (Schegloff 1995, pp. 113–142); but here the 'ähä' may serve as well to ratify the 'grounding' (Clark and Schaeffer 1987) of A's identification of the city which is the setting for the telling. With this, the sequence initiated by B's second question at lines 2–3 has been brought to possible (though not necessary) completion, and A could now proceed to answer B's first question at line 1, or in some other fashion extend the telling about the excursion. A does indeed go on to take the turn, and, at lines 12–13, she produces a sentence which would, after removal of all troubles and repairs, be: 'Braunschweig ist denn der Weihnachtsmarkt/*Braunschweig is PRT the Christmas fair*'. There is—grammatically speaking—an illegal omission of a preposition before 'Braunschweig', not unusual in agrammatics when not speaking in telegraphic style. Otherwise, the sentence is correct; in particular, it includes a finite verb, the absence of which would be criterial for telegraphic-elliptic expressions (Hofstede 1992; see above). The trouble and the repair in lines 12/13 deserve some more detailed description, as does the sequence-organizational status of the utterance and the action it is accomplishing.

After the 'denn', A gets into word finding problems. After some 'editing terms' and an inbreath, she produces a definite article (which, retrospectively, turns out to be correct: nom.masc.sg.). With the onset of the article, A also launches a gesture with her left arm consisting in raising the arm (approximately up to the height of the shoulders), then forming a sort of a quarter-circle by turning in at the elbows and the wrist. However, after the article, A's word finding problems persist. She pauses and produces further editing terms. During this interruption of the NP, the gesture is interrupted too. The arm goes down, and is only raised again to repeat the gesture at A's first attempt to go on with the NP. This first attempt is a false start 'Kar-' which is immediately stopped and explicitly rejected by a '°nein°/no'. Note that the gesture on 'Kar-' is stopped too, just as at the start of trouble after the article. While uttering the rejection 'nein', the arm drops down. Then, with the

<sup>4</sup> Because we are not going to explicate the second half of episode 2, here some summary remarks on it for the reader's help: it is not only that A's husband has physical problems, but they, in turn, lead to a matrimonial crisis. B does not always approve of the steps taken by A in order to cope with the crisis nor does she always agree with A's assessment of the crisis. In this episode, B is shocked when she learns that A appealed to her mother-in-law and asked her to come to A's home in order to intervene. The sequence of particles produced by B at line 22 of episode 2 '> also < wirklich jetzt mal' is very idiomatic; its meaning can be conveyed in the following way: 'You are a hopeless case; I do not want to argue with you any longer. Go on with your telling; but I won't say anything any longer'. This withdrawal by B—though a drastic expression of her disapproval—has at least the advantage that it spares B repeated expressions of this dispreferred action.

onset of the correct 'Weihnachtsmarkt', A performs the same gesture as before. It is clearly an iconic gesture, projecting the largeness of the Christmas fair which A addresses in line 15. During the word search phase in line 12, A's body position and gaze remain oriented towards B. However, after she produced a clear error (the false start /Kar-/), she turns entirely away from her friend. This is quite compatible with behaviour of non-aphasic people during word search (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986); and the dramatic shift of body position and gaze direction after the error may be taken to display an orientation to the preference for self-initiated self-repair in the same turn (see Schegloff *et al.* 1977, pp. 375–377). A's behaviour during word search and self-repair will be re-addressed in the discussion of episode 3, below.

Although the gesture affiliated with 'Weihnachtsmarkt' thus appears to anticipate the turn at line 15, the turn at lines 12–13 itself is designed to extend the preceding sequence beyond the previously discussed possible sequence completion at line 10. It is largely through the deployment of the particle 'denn', here renderable as a weak form of 'after all', that this is accomplished (note that the use of 'denn' in this context is highly specific to North-German speakers including Berliners). A here takes up a somewhat remonstrative stance toward the preceding trouble with 'Braunschweig'—the puzzle over its identity and the claim of trouble in recognizing its articulation embodied in B's understanding check. A's utterance here can be rendered roughly as, 'Braunschweig after all *is* the Christmas fair!'. Besides the particle, it is the use of the definite article (der Weihnachtsmarkt) which links A's utterance to the preceding sequence. It marks the Christmas fair in Braunschweig as a 'famous' event so that Braunschweig is a place that can serve as the destination of a 'butter excursion' in the Christmas season—hence no reason to be surprised or to request a reconfirmation. As A's gesture anticipates the ensuing turn to a description of the size of the Christmas fair, the utterance in which it is deployed embodies a stance toward what has occurred in the preceding sequence, a move which serves to bring it to possible closure again. The turning away from the latter to the former is marked, as noted below, by 'Aber/But', which sets off a new departure in the talk at line 15.

The talk at lines 12/13 contains a methodologically interesting feature. Articles and particles belong to 'those terrible small words' with which agrammatics notoriously have problems. From the data presented by Stark and Dressler (1990), it can be inferred that, in the speech of German agrammatics, there is an imbalance between definite and indefinite articles in favour of the definite ones. And Regenbrecht *et al.* (1992) find such a substantial overuse of the definite articles in German Broca's aphasics that the authors exclude them as a reliable 'tie' serving the constitution of cohesion. Thus, aphasiologists would probably shrink from giving the particle and the definite article such a relevance as has been attributed to 'denn' and 'der' in the preceding discussion. Here is a matter of considerable methodological import: should the speech of aphasics be inspected for its robustness or for its weakness? In other words, should the utterances of patients be taken as just what the patients 'mean to say' (at least, as far as there are no compelling reasons not to do so) or should whatever a patient says always be hypothesized as a possible error and not what was intended? More generally, shall such persons always be treated as primarily and most relevantly 'aphasics', or is this just one of the identities they can relevantly assume in and for the interaction (cf. Schegloff 1991, 1992a, 1997b)? Within the framework of CA, such identities—and any particular identity out of the indefinitely large set which characterizes any

person—are taken to be, in principle, contingent achievements of the interaction itself. Accordingly, the utterances are taken and explicated as they are produced and the observers do not *a priori* bring to bear a stock of aphasiological knowledge as necessarily relevant to any given utterance or component of an utterance. The relevant question is not what *aphasiologists* may classify as potentially incorrect, but what is treated by the *speaker* and the *recipient* as problematic, and what is treated by the recipient (and by the speaker) as bringing to the fore the relevance of the speaker as ‘aphasic’ (as in episode 2). In the present case, there is no sign that B receives A’s utterance, including the remonstrative stance expressed in it, as problematic or as ‘unjustified’.

In line 15, A characterizes the ‘Weihnachtsmarkt/Christmas fair’ as ‘un:wahrscheinlich /grots//unbelievably large’. There is a minor paraphasia: ‘/grots/’ instead of ‘groß’. The expression is linked to her preceding talk by the connective ‘aber/*but*’, a usage which may here be understood to mark a shift in the telling from the course of the telling-so-far, and the immediately preceding identification of its site in particular, to its negative aspects—the ill-suited limitation of available time to the extensiveness of the market. Note that the deployment of ‘aber’ in this way can only be explicated if the definite article and the particle in the preceding TCU are taken ‘seriously’, that is as retroactive stance markers. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, aphasiologists might not be inclined to do so. But if the particle and the definite article are treated as ‘potentially incorrect’, then one would be forced to consider also the connective ‘aber’ as incorrect or at least as problematic (then ‘und/*and*’ would be the more appropriate connective). Again, linguistics-oriented aphasiologists will probably not hesitate to do so (see remarks of Stark and Dressler 1990, on connectives—in their study under the rubric ‘conjunctions’). But to permanently look at certain words and constructions (or their omission) in agrammatical speech as potentially incorrect would lead to a methodological dilemma: whatever a patient says might not be what s/he ‘wants (intends?) to say’. This is not in keeping with what the co-participants of aphasic patients do. First of all, they are not specialists in language pathology (at least not as a professional discipline, although they may be quite knowledgeable in a practical sense about a particular person’s difficulties). And, second, CA’s commitment as an analytic explication of social interaction requires analysts to register something as ‘problematic’ only if this claim can be grounded either in the demonstrable treatment of the occurrence as problematic by the parties to the interaction, or by demonstrating both the empirical basis for the claim of problematicity and the concerted conduct of the participants in avoiding its being made overtly problematic on that occasion. And in the present case—the impact of ‘denn, der, and aber’—none of this is demonstrable.

The expression ‘aber unwahrscheinlich /grots/’ is a telegraphic utterance according to the definition given earlier. The missing elements would be a grammatical subject referring to the Christmas fair and the copula ‘war/*was*’. However, one can reasonably ask oneself whether—in this position—the expression is not entirely canonical (compare, for instance, with the examples from unimpaired speakers presented earlier). It would be telegraphic-elliptic only from the perspective of a normative grammar which takes isolated sentences/utterances as its analytic primitives. In a ‘positionally sensitive’ grammar (Schegloff 1996a, pp. 106–111 *et passim*), the expression would not need any further analysis or special classification. Instead, a grammatically more elaborated expression such as ‘Aber



der war unwahrscheinlich groß/*but it-DEM was unbelievably large*' would constitute some special use.

The two syllables 'un-' and 'schein-' are accompanied by two gestural movements. They are carried out with the elbow and wrist fully stretched and the hand flat. On the two syllables (both are stressed) the patient vertically waves her arm. The gestures may serve as intensifiers which capture in gesticulation the semantic intensification realized by the word 'unwahrscheinlich/*unbelievably*'. The form of the gestures (stretched arm, flat hand—as if pointing to a far away point) is certainly iconic. It focuses on another aspect of the extension of the market than the gesture in lines 12/13. Thus, the whole gesticulation in line 15 constitutes a complex gesture: its rhythmical repetitions function as intensification which is superimposed on the iconic gesture. It may be noted here that in this occurrence of complex gesticulation, as well as in any other action of gesticulation of A, the authors could not detect any property striking them as deviant from normal although, on the basis of McNeill (1992, p. 332 ff.), one would have expected to find problems (overuse of representational gestures, difficulties in the rhythmic deployment of gestures).

In line 17, A ends her turn by deploring that they had only one hour to stroll around the market. With the beginning of 'eine/*one*', A raises her thumb—the conventional gesture for '1' in German—and then she carries out fine quasi-repetitions (arm and raised thumb are retracted and then put forward again) on the stressed syllables 'Stun-' and 'ha-'. These, together with the non-canonical word order (the object-NP is preposed), underline the aspect expressed explicitly by the final 'nur/*only*': just one hour was not enough in A's eyes.

The expression of A in line 17 is a fully elaborated sentence, but it contains a grammatical error (the tense of 'haben/*have*': it should be the preterite 'hatten'). In addition, the sentence sounds very 'wooden' and unidiomatic. This is due to the missing word 'Aufenthalt/*stop-over*'. In the context of such bus excursions, German speakers usually add 'Aufenthalt' to the indication of the time span. The word order is free; it can immediately follow the expression indicating the time span, but it can also be separated from it: 'Eine Stunde Aufenthalt hatten wir nur' and 'Eine Stunde hatten wir nur Aufenthalt' are both fine. Note that this 'Aufenthalt' does not really add new information; its presence is simply idiomatic (at least for the first author and some other native German speakers consulted by him). Thus, what B does in line 18 is a sort of correction of A's utterance by rounding it off, making it 'more idiomatic'. However, this offer of a re-completion is at the same time an act of making sure that she understood A correctly, as evidenced by the slightly rising intonation.

Given the fact that the attachment of 'Aufenthalt' to A's sentence does not really add more information, it is somewhat surprising that A responds with a negation in line 19. It is conceivable that the 'nee' actually is a confirmation. The 'nur/*only*' in A's turn line 17 is proxy to something like 'no more', so that the 'nee' confirms this negative aspect. However, A wants to say something more after the 'nee' and a short pause but what she says remains incomprehensible and, is in overlap with the start of B's next turn. Thus, it is equally conceivable that A's 'nee' is really a negation, and that A is launching an account for this dispreferred response. The observer is in the privileged position to say that it is uncertain what A is really doing with her 'nee', but not so the co-participant. B has to do something with the 'nee', and the fact that she does not wait for an account, but rather makes a guess

at what the participants in the excursion did after the stop-over, attests that she took the 'nee' as a confirmation or at least as something that is entirely unproblematic for her. It is worth remarking that B's understanding check is here clearly gratuitous and thus exposes the unidiomatic character of A's utterance. But this time, unlike with the 'Braunschweig (?)' at line 8, A does not assume a remonstrative stance to this gratuitous check.

The talk about the butter excursion is not yet over at this point. The first question asked by B at line 1 has remained unanswered, having been, in effect, displaced or superseded by the one at lines 2-3. In fact, after the whole episode of the excursion has been recounted, ending with A's return home, B asks again about the merchandise which was on offer at low prices and then gets a reply.

*To summarize*

- (1) The interaction between A and B works in a relatively unproblematic way. The management of turn taking does not show any special properties. Here is found orientation to the same preferences as found elsewhere, such as the preference for self-initiated self-repair in the same turn.
- (2) A clearly does not speak in telegraphic style. She aims at complete sentences except in positions where a positionally sensitive grammar would classify the subsentential expression as canonical (line 15). A's constructions show deficiencies which are described as typical of agrammatism: a mixture of omissions and errors, relatively simple sentences which sound a bit unskilful and/or unidiomatic.
- (3) B shows herself to be aware of the fact that she is conversing with someone who has a language problem and needs help from time to time. Furthermore, she appears to know fairly precisely how she can help A (see first half of episode 2). Her help and support is often given in a minimally imposing way compared to other interactants with aphasic persons (including A's husband; see footnote 3), but still in a way which can, in ordinary conversation (without 'impaired' participants), be taken to register the presence of trouble in the talk by stopping what is otherwise in progress in order to check the co-participant's understanding.
- (4) Throughout the whole conversation B does not display any orientation to overt syntactic errors in A's speech. She lets pass the illegal omission of the preposition in line 12, and the incorrect tense in line 17, and she ignores the massive misconstructions in line 1 of episode 2. This is also common practice in ordinary conversation among the neurologically unimpaired; it is rare to find other-initiated repair addressed to syntactic problems.

*'Telegraphic' speech*

Let us now examine episode 3. This episode comes approximately 8 minutes after episode 2 which, in turn, came 5 minutes after episode 1. A's practices of talking in this episode are in various respects different from those in the preceding extracts and will be characterized in the subsequent discussion.

## Episode (3)

- 01 A: .hhh Ach, .hhh Herr Ahlert? (1.0) ((pointing to the outside)) ä:h,  
 .hhh ach, .hhh Mr. Ahlert? (1.0)
- 02 siebentausend Mark (1.2) n:, na:, .hhh drei - /perso:l/ ähm, nein=  
 seventhousand marks (1.2) n:, na:, .hhh three - /perso:l/ ähm, nein=  
 03 B: =Geklaut.  
 =stolen.
- 04 A: Ja.  
 Yes.
- 05 B: Der wurde beklaut?  
 He-DEM was robbed?
- 06 A: Ja. .hhh ä:h, äh, .hhh äh:, /mest/, nee, äh, (Bru-), nee tch!  
 Yes. .hhh ä:h, äh, .hhh äh:, /mest/, no, äh, (brea-), no tch!
- 07 hana= (( A vividly pointing to her breast during line 6-7 ))  
 hmna=
- 08 B: =Pis [tole.  
 =gun
- 09 A: [Pistole: auf die Brust ((1syll)), und Hände /nachunten/, ((A puts hands to  
 back))  
 gun to the breast((1syll)), and hands /downwards/,
- 10 .hhh und, äh, um drei:.  
 .hhh and, äh, at three (o'clock)
- 11 (0.8) (( A points to the outside ))
- 12 A: [Äh.  
 Äh.
- 13 B: [Nachmittags?  
 (in the) afternoon?
- 14 A: Ja.  
 Yes.
- 15 (0.8)
- 16 A: Um [drei.  
 At three.
- 17 B: [In dem Laden [da? (( B points to the outside with chin ))  
 in the shop over-there?
- 18 A: [Ja.  
 Yes.
- 19 (0.7)
- 20 B: Ach:!  
 Ach:!
- 21 (0.2)
- 22 B: Und wann?  
 And when?
- 23 A: .hhh ä:hm, a, z- Freitag, aber: - vor acht Tagen.  
 .hhh ä:hm, a, z- Friday, but - before eight days.
- 24 (0.5)
- 25 B: (Es wird) immer schlimmer.  
 (it becomes) always worse.  
 Things get worse and worse

26 A: Ja.

Yes.

What makes this episode different should be readily apparent. As mentioned above, A showed no tendency towards telegraphic style either in conversations with the first author or in a conversation with her husband; and even in the conversation with her friend B, complete sentences prevail, with the usual properties of agrammatism. In this respect, episode 1 is quite representative of A's speech in this conversation. However, in episode 3, we find recurrent use of telegraphic expressions. To repeat, the present use of the term 'telegraphic expression' does not necessarily imply that—from the perspective of CA—anything is missing so that the expression becomes problematic. It should also be repeated that the use of the term 'adaptive strategy' does not necessarily imply that a patient switches over to a telegraphic style as the product of conscious control. Agrammatics sometimes (try to) speak in complete sentences (as A in episode 1), and sometimes they speak in telegraphic expressions (as A does in episode 3). The question of whether this is partly under control is interesting, but not of relevance here. The questions being addressed are, (1) if telegraphic style is used, what is achieved by it; and (2) does the co-participant organize his/her interactional practices contingent on the way the patient expresses him/herself?

Immediately preceding episode 3, there was talk about a topic which petered out and was then followed by a relatively long pause. In this pause, A reaches for her cup of coffee, but interrupts this action and launches a turn with a deep inbreath and an 'ach'—the conventional sound in German for indicating that something occurred to the speaker or that s/he all of a sudden remembered something worth telling to the co-interactant (for the English equivalent 'oh', see Heritage 1984). From this 'ach' on, B sits stock still, sustainedly looking at A, without an eye blink till her own turn in line 3 (that is, no eye blink for more than 10 seconds). This conveys the impression that B is particularly attentive during A's turn at lines 1–2. After the 'ach', A takes another deep inbreath—projecting a longish turn. She then introduces a new referent by using his proper name as a recognitional person-reference form (see Sacks and Schegloff 1979, Schegloff 1996c); this 'Herr Ahlert' is spoken with rising intonation and is clearly 'try-marked' (ibid.) to check whether the new referent has been recognized by the co-participant. B confirms recognition by vertical head nods, which are performed in a somewhat slow and 'solemn' way. But these head nods are slightly delayed in their deployment. When A finds B not yet displaying recognition as she is finishing saying the name, A deploys a pointing gesture, analysable as an additional means to identify the new referent as 'outside'. (In fact, Herr Ahlert is the owner of a kiosk in the immediate vicinity of B's house.) Just after the onset of this gesture which follows 'Herr Ahlert', B performs her head nods; their slow and somewhat extended enactment may be measured to extend to the confirmation of the recognition of the pointing gesture, thus conveying: 'yes I know who Herr Ahlert is and that he is 'located' where you just pointed' (and, perhaps, that no such pointing was needed to recognize who was being referred to).

After having obtained the confirmation that 'Herr Ahlert' is recognized by B, A tries to continue, but encounters trouble. She produces an 'ä:h', after which a second chunk of information is delivered: 'siebentausend Mark/7000 marks'. This NP does not have terminal intonation and the following pause and the trouble-

indicating sounds display that A is not quite satisfied with her productions. Nevertheless, she prepares herself by an inbreath to deliver a third chunk of information 'drei /perso:l//three /perso:l/'. The paraphasia appears to be a blend of 'Personen/*persons*' and 'Pistole/*gun/pistol*'. ('Appears' here refers to investigators with the benefit of hindsight; whether it appears so to B who has not yet heard what is to follow cannot definitely be determined; but see below for a guess). This paraphasia is immediately rejected by A herself and she is about to launch a second try; she turns her whole body and gaze away from B (as was previously observed after the false start of 'Kar-' in line 12 of episode 1). However, this time B does not wait for A's self-correction, but breaks in. What B is doing in her two next turns (line 3 and 5) is linked to the first two chunks of information; the 'drei /perso:l/' is set aside for the time being, it is sequentially deleted (Schegloff 1987, p. 110; 1992b, pp. 209–210).

The first two expressions—'Herr Ahlert' and 'siebentausend Mark'—certainly constitute what would be called 'telegraphic speech' by any aphasiologist, including supporters of adaptation theory. This is in the first instance by virtue of their syntactically incomplete status. Looked at from the perspective of their status as TCUs, this is not necessarily decisive, as lexical and phrasal constructions can constitute complete turns in appropriate sequential contexts (cf. the earlier discussion of line 15 of episode 1 and of the notions 'ellipsis' and 'telegram' in the introductory section). In this sequential context, however, 'Herr Ahlert' as well as 'siebentausend Mark' turn out to be not only grammatically incomplete, but delivered with non-final intonation as well: they are delivered as utterance fragments. Furthermore, it is not clear whether they are fragments of what is being constructed to be the same TCU, or whether they are fragments of two different TCUs, each abandoned in turn. In view of the not-yet-possibly-complete state of A's turn, B could withhold entry until A brings her turn to closure. Instead, she enters at the point of a local trouble (the blend '/perso:l/') and undertakes to help construct—or construe—the problematic talk which preceded the blend.

Before discussing what B is doing, a brief remark on the grammatical properties of the German verb 'klauen'—colloquial for 'stehlen/*to steal*' is in order. 'Klauen' in an active sentence takes the objects that are stolen as the direct object in the accusative, while the person who is victim of the theft has to appear as indirect object in the dative. Thus, in a passive construction, only the stolen objects can be the grammatical subject while the victim has to remain in the dative. In German, only direct accusative objects can become subjects of passive constructions. Thus, the English 'I am helped' has no direct parallel in German as the person who is helped is marked for dative in an active construction ('X hilft mir/*helps to-me-DAT*'; hence, the passivized equivalent: 'Mir-DAT wurde geholfen/*to-me-DAT was helped*'). As a consequence, if one were to reorganize A's two first chunks as one TCU, the result would be '(Dem) Herrn Ahlert [or any anaphoric expression in the dative] wurden siebentausend Mark geklaut' (roughly, 'To/from Mr Ahlert were 7000 marks stolen'). Here the original expression by A, 'Herr Ahlert', which is in the nominative, must be changed by marking it for the dative. For B to do this would overtly underscore the deficiencies of A's talk, which is something B often undertakes to avoid (see the analysis of episode 1).

What B does here is different. She takes the two chunks of information as belonging to two abandoned TCUs. In line 3, she completes the 'siebentausend Mark/7000 marks' by linking it to the passive participle 'geklaut/*stolen*'. This

completion is delivered with a falling intonation. As this is a so-called 'B-event statement' (Labov and Fanshel 1977, p. 100),<sup>5</sup> it is received by A as a request for confirmation, and she indeed confirms it by her 'Ja.' in line 4. In order to complete 'Herr Ahlert' without changing it with respect to case marking, a verb has to be found which—in the passive—can have the victim of the theft as grammatical subject. In line 5, B does indeed find such a verb: she prefixes 'klauen/steal' with a 'be-' and this prefixed verb 'beklauen' does take the victim as the direct object in the accusative in an active construction, and thus as the grammatical subject in a passive construction. By using this prefixed verb in the passive, B does not have to implicitly or explicitly change the nominative expression 'Herr Ahlert' as used by A. If A's original expressions are combined with the constructions by B in lines 3 and 5, a linguistically perfect beginning of a robbery story would be the result: 'Herr Ahlert, der wurde beklaut. Siebentausend Mark geklaut/Mr Ahlert, he was robbed, robbed of 7000 marks'. To extrapose the subject and then to resume it by an anaphoric expression ('er/he' or 'der/he-DEM') is quite common in colloquial German. Furthermore, the following 'elliptic' expression 'siebentausend Mark geklaut' would also constitute a perfectly normal and complete TCU in this position. One can hardly conceive of a more parsimonious way of doing something with A's original expressions: neither expression has to be grammatically marked in a different way and the added lexical material is minimized as well, by the ingenious trick of prefixing the verb 'klauen'.

A last remark on this sub-episode concerns the sequential organization of B's support: she first addresses the 'siebentausend Mark' and only then 'Herr Ahlert'. This is in keeping with a common practice in addressing multiple parts of a preceding turn; one does so in the reverse order of their occurrence (cf. e.g. Sacks 1987 [1973]).

Once again, as in episode 1, B supports A's telling by formulating candidate understandings of what A may be conveying where she has displayed trouble in articulating it. By adapting these formulations to the grammatical forms A has actually used, B employs one practice for minimizing the underscoring of deficits in A's speech. However, the combining of A's fragments at line 1 and B's turns at lines 3 and 5 so that they resulted in two perfect TCUs should not be taken to suggest that B follows here the practice of collaborative sentence construction as described by Lerner (1991, 1996). In A's first turn, there are no 'sentences in progress' (Lerner 1991), and B's turns at lines 3 and 5 are not completions, but rather candidate understandings. The combining of the pieces of the puzzle should serve only to suggest the skilfulness and parsimoniousness of B's response.

There is one question connected with B's doings which has to remain unanswered. As mentioned above, the observer has the benefit of hindsight and is thus able to identify the paraphasia '/perso:l/' in line 2 as a blend of 'Personen' and 'Pistole'. It is not implausible that the blend is immediately understood in this way by B as well. If so, then the blend would be remarkably informative and an interactional resource (cf. Jefferson 1974). It would explain the speed and ease with which B displays her uptake of the story as a robbery story in lines 3 and 5. But we cannot count on this blend as having been recognizable to B without access to later

<sup>5</sup> A 'B-event' is 'known to B, but not to A', where A is the speaker and B the recipient; the 'rule of confirmation' is formulated as, 'If A makes a statement about B-events, then it is heard as a request for confirmation'.

talk. Thus, there remains the question of how B was able immediately to understand that the story is about a robbery and that 7000 marks were stolen from Herr Ahlert. The authors could not find any sign in the episode which would demonstrate any pre-knowledge about the robbery by B.

After the confirmation 'Ja.' in line 6, A's inbreath displays a commitment to talking further, very probably to continue the story. Recall that, in intervening to deal with 'Herr Ahlert' and 'siebentausend Mark', B had sequentially deleted another fragment, 'drei /perso:l/', and its similarity to 'Pistole—pistol/gun' has already been remarked on. So in 'continuing' the story, A is in effect retrieving what she had already (almost) mentioned—the pistol. Still, A quickly encounters trouble in articulating the continuation, although she displays what she means to express, in large measure by her vivid gesturing. Following the 'Ja.', she forms a sort of gun with her hand, mobilizing the gesture during the inbreath, and directing her pointing forefinger, which can be taken to represent the barrel of the gun, to her breast as she tries to begin her utterance. That she wants to start the utterance with a reference to the breast is evidenced by her paraphasias '/mest/' and '(Bru-)'—each of which contains a component of the target 'Brust/breast'. However, this is not a very felicitous choice. Despite the relatively free word order of German grammar, the expression 'Pistole auf die Brust/gun on-to the breast' is fairly fixed in this order. In principle, it is also possible to say 'auf die Brust die Pistole', but this would be a very marked non-canonical word order. Furthermore, one cannot begin with the noun 'Brust' itself; the preposition and the article 'auf die' cannot be omitted. This is not 'prescriptive', but simply registers recognizably correct ordinary usage of German grammar. Not even in telegraphic-elliptic utterances can the preposition and the article be omitted. Thus, A's paraphasias '/mest/' and '(Bru-)' are not only phonematic paraphasias, but also constitute quite straightforwardly a constructionally false start.<sup>6</sup>

It was noted earlier that A shows an orientation to the normal preference for self-initiated self-repair in the discussion of line 12 of episode 1. There this preference was drastically displayed by A's turning away her whole body and gaze in the aftermath of trouble in her talk, as an embodiment of a commitment to repair the trouble herself. However, in line 6 of episode 3, A behaves in a somewhat different manner. After the initial 'mis-speaking', that is, after the paraphasia '/mest/', she briefly looks down at her own breast, but otherwise remains oriented towards B. After the second mis-speaking, the cut-off '(Bru-)', she averts her head and gaze, though not her whole body. And at the second 'editing term' after '(Bru-)', that is, at 'hmna', and before a next try at self-repair, she redirects her head and gaze towards B, recognizably re-establishing herself as an aligned recipient *vis-à-vis* B. She thereby gives the impression of welcoming help from B, at least after the '/mest/', and maybe even after the '(Bru-)'.<sup>6</sup>

And help is what she obtains. In line 8, there is a self-initiated other-repair. B helps A into the construction by giving her the word 'Pistole'. As evidenced by the overlap at lines 8 and 9, the first syllable is enough to enable A to continue and to finish the expression without further problems, except a certain unskilfulness in

<sup>6</sup> The gesture A has composed can be seen to 'represent' both components: the hand embodies (literally) the gun, the gesture represents its pointing to the breast. It appears that the act of gesturing takes primacy here, and promotes the saving of the target of the pointing gesture over the instrument/agent of the gesturing in the speech-production process. As well, some representation of 'Pistole' has already been produced in the blend.

pronunciation. 'Pistole:' is pronounced in a syllabifying way and with overcorrectness of the last vowel (it is an unreduced lengthened [e:], whereas it should be a schwa in normal spoken German). From a 'traditional' aphasiological perspective, this could easily be explained as part of A's impairment: Broca's aphasics are commonly said to have a tendency towards a syllabifying pronunciation, with schwas being transformed into full vowels (also called 'scanning [German: *skandierend*] speech'; Poeck 1986, p. 114). Alternatively, a recurrence of a practice noted before might be recognized here; when A succeeds at producing an item that had previously been problematic, and does so after prompting or modelling by B, her production of the item is 'over-careful', as it is here. However, in this case, there is yet another alternative account of the special pronunciation of 'Pistole:'—related to a distinct feature of the just-prior interaction, an account worth taking note of. The 'syllabification' can be considered as a normal 'post-resolution hitch' (Schegloff 1997c), that is, a commonly observable form of perturbation in the 'surviving' turn immediately following resolution of overlapping talk. In this case, A's overcorrect final vowel directly follows emergence of her talk at line 9 from overlap with B's talk at line 8. This analytic tack again poses the issue of choosing between, on the one hand, an account framed by common practices of talk-in-interaction made relevant by the immediately preceding events in the conversation without respect to particular attributes of the interactants, and, on the other hand, an account which invokes special attributes of the participants, here aphasiological claims about the speech of agrammatics. In other words, are we looking at an impairment characteristic of aphasics or a quite common phenomenon in talk-in-interaction? (Schegloff 1991, pp. 66–67).

The expression 'Pistole auf die Brust' would clearly be seen as a telegram (or contextual ellipsis)—traditionally as well as in adaptation theory. However, unlike the earlier fragmentary utterance parts in lines 1 and 2, this expression has a clear completion point; the expression is designed to compose a possible subsentential (in this case, two-phrasal) TCU. It follows a structural pattern which is commonly found in casual speech of neurologically *unimpaired* German speakers. It is not, in that sense, anomalous. Whether such a TCU is observably deployed in such a sequential position is another matter, which cannot be resolved at present. This 'telegram' is, in any case, quite a different object from the ones at lines 1 and 2, and poses quite different questions, for this is an object with its own structural integrity, which the others are not.

Having registered this difference, and the integrity of 'Pistole auf die Brust' as a turn component, note that B prompts A into such a 'telegraphic construction', and not into a more elaborated utterance format. She provides A with the noun 'Pistole' without the preceding article which would be absolutely obligatory in a grammatically elaborated utterance: 'Pistole auf die Brust hat man ihm gesetzt/*gun on-to the breast has one him-DAT put*' is grammatically unacceptable. The 'Pistole' must be preceded by either the article 'die' (definite) or 'eine' (indefinite). One possibility is that providing support to the patient in this form displays B's sensitivity to the fact that A is now in another 'register' (Hofstede 1992): no longer complete sentences, but telegrams (or fragments). This way of providing support then would be a sort of accommodation in the sense introduced by Giles *et al.* (1991). Alternatively, it may be noted that B, having retrieved the two earlier fragments in A's turn (by her turns at lines 3 and 5) at the cost of sequentially deleting the third, she now retrieves the third by prompting A to return to it with



a 'repetition'—that is, the production of her version of what A 'meant to produce' at line 2, corrected with respect to articulation but otherwise used as a prompt in the form in which it was originally said. Both alternatives have one point in common: B is sensitive to the way in which A expressed herself.

The following expression by A in line 9 'und Hände /nachunten//and hands /down/' contains trouble. 'Nach unten' is contracted to one phonological word with resyllabification: the [ch] is made the onset of [un-] although it should recognizably be the last consonant of 'nach'. But there is an additional problem: the accompanying gesture by A suggests that the target here is 'Hände nach hinten/hands in back'. Understanding '/nachunten/' as paraphrastic for 'nach hinten' makes the whole expression appear to be a direct quotation of what the robbers (allegedly) said to Mr Ahlert. The form of this harsh command is in all likelihood canonical—given our admittedly limited knowledge of the verbal habits of German robbers. (Imagine if the robbers had used a fully elaborated sentence such as 'Würden Sie bitte so freundlich sein und Ihre Hände auf den Rücken legen'—roughly: 'may we kindly request you to put your hands in back'—that would certainly be a very special use with a quite different interactional impact from the subsentential command 'Hände nach hinten'.) If this is so, the 'Hände nach hinten' would not only be a structurally but also a positionally normal and motivated expression.

After 'Hände /nachunten/' (at line 10) A takes an inbreath and deploys a conjunction 'und', projecting that she is going to produce a substantial addition to the turn; but this is followed first by a momentary 'search', and then by a mention of the time of day at which the robbery occurred—'und, äh, um drei/and, äh, at three {o'clock}'—produced as an increment to the preceding talk and in a way which indicates that it is not the continuation which the inbreath and conjunction had projected. Nevertheless, in a sense, she is going on: in the pause which follows (at line 11) she carries out a large (though not 'gigantically enlarged', McNeill 1992, p. 336) pointing gesture to the outside (the same as in line 1), suggesting that she is now going to say something about the location of the robbery or its protagonists. However, before she can address the location issue, B intervenes with a question checking her understanding of the just-articulated time reference—'Nachmittags?/{in the} afternoon?' (line 13). A confirms B's supposition that it was 'p.m.' by her 'Ja.' in line 14, and—after a gap of silence (line 15)—she reconfirms that it was at three o'clock (line 16). There is an echo here of A's apparent remonstrance with B about needing to confirm her hearing and understanding of 'Braunschweig' in episode 1. It being plain enough that the excursion was to such a place, and that a robbery with pistols pointed to the breast of a kiosk owner would not occur at 3 o'clock in the morning (kiosks are closed overnight in Germany), there is a note of impatience in the aftermath of each confirmation of the understanding checks. Though B may be trying to be inoffensive in these understanding checks, there is some evidence that A registers them as gratuitous. (B, on the other hand, may have been registering with shock the brazenness of robbers carrying through such an action in a public place in the middle of the afternoon.)

B appears not to need any further time specification; after the preposition 'um' which projects the completion point of a time-indicating expression, B addresses the location issue, that is to say, she responds to A's pointing gesture during the silence at line 11. That B's utterance 'in dem Laden da/in the shop over-there' is, in fact, responsive to A's gesture is supported by the fact that B—simultaneous with

her utterance beginning—carries out a pointing gesture with her chin—in exactly the same direction as A did before with her hand and finger. Note that something very striking has happened here: in lines 11 and 12, A had launched a course of action (displayed in her gesture) addressing the location issue, but had no chance to carry it through because B intervened with an understanding check of the time of the incident (line 13). However, A's pointing gesture was not in vain. After confirmation of the time reference, it is B who resumes the location issue in speech. B having blocked the progress of A's telling by her intervention, it is she who prompts the resumption of that with which she had interfered (as was proposed about 'Pistole' earlier). Here, it may be noted, B's conduct is not necessarily that of a 'normal' toward an 'impaired' speaker, but that of an interrupter toward the 'victim' of the interruption. In so far as 'normals' may find themselves more often interrupting 'impaired' speakers, they may engage in this practice frequently as well, but it is worth differentiating what they do as support-for-the-impaired from what they do as repairing-interrupters. And here B appears to be acting at least as much in the latter capacity as in the former.

B's guess with respect to the location is confirmed by A in line 18. The early start of her confirmation, overlapping the final 'da' of B's preceding turn with her 'Ja.' is not only enabled by the strong projection of the 'da' by 'in dem Laden', in particular given B's pointing gesture with her chin, but also by the fact that it is A's projected but unrealized utterance which B is articulating. After a pause (line 19), B produces an evaluative 'Ach:!' displaying her understanding of the story's theme and her alignment with it (recall that the recounting of this event was begun by A at line 1 with 'Ach'). This, by the way, is also displayed by some lateral head shakes, produced by B at various points in the preceding talk (cf. the 'oh wow' head shakes described by Goodwin 1980; cf. also Schegloff 1987, pp. 105–106). In line 22, B returns to the time issue. In German, the 'wann' is ambiguous: it can be a question for the time of the day, but also for the day. However, in this position—after multiple clarification of the time of day in lines 10–16—it constitutes fairly unambiguously a question for the day (or date). Indeed, A answers B's question in this sense: in line 23 she informs B that the robbery happened 'Freitag, aber vor acht Tagen/*Friday, but before eight days* ['vor acht Tagen' is idiomatic for 'one week ago']'. This first part of the story ends with a second round of evaluation by B in line 25: '(Es wird) immer schlimmer'—literally translated 'it becomes always worse'; more idiomatically translated as 'things get worse and worse'. The story-telling continues, taking up in particular the allusion to 'three persons' in the blend 'drei /perso:l/' at line 2, but we leave off our account at the episodic boundary marked by B's evaluation at line 25.

#### *Summary of some key observations in episode 3*

It was noted first that A expresses herself here in a quite different way from that in the more characteristic mode of episode 1. In episode 1, A formats her turns as sentences, and brings her sentences home—with or without errors, in a more or less skilful and idiomatic way. In episode 3, however, all of her speech consists of subsentential expressions. She speaks in what is traditionally called 'telegraphic style' (a term which is also used by Kolk and Heeschen and collaborators in their adaptation theory). In the introduction, the notions 'telegram' or 'ellipsis' were defined on the one hand as any subsentential expressions which do not exploit

preceding verbal material, or, on the other, as expressions lacking a finite verb. However, in explicating episode 3, several instances were encountered suggesting a reconsideration of this broad category, one which takes into account the turn-design practices of the speaker and the sequential and interactional relevancies which these engender.

At the very least, one has to distinguish between subsentential expressions which do not even constitute a TCU and are not delivered as such (e.g. the NPs of A in line 1 of episode 3) and expressions that can compose a full TCU (e.g. 'Pistole auf die Brust', line 9 of episode 3). In both cases, the terms 'telegram' or 'ellipsis' are misleading, but on differing grounds. In the first case, it would be more appropriate to speak just of fragments, thereby indicating that they are part of an abandoned TCU; for the parties themselves, therefore, they are missing something. In the second case, the traditional terms suggest that there is something missing, but this is grounded in linguistic theories directed to formal competency in abstract grammar, not in the production of contributions to talk-in-interaction, and the orientations of those engaged in that activity. From the perspective of CA, TCUs can take forms other than the complete sentences of formal syntax, and in some sequential positions, a subsentential expression composing a TCU might even be canonical; that is to say, a more elaborated expression would constitute a special use deserving analysis (Schegloff 1996a). Thus, the apposition 'aber unwahrscheinlich groß' in line 15 of episode 1 is almost certainly canonical, as is the apparent direct quotation of what the robbers said to Mr Ahlert in line 9 of episode 3. Given the fact that we still do not have 'positionally sensitive' grammars, there is no systematic basis for establishing for classes of TCU and classes of sequential positions a canonical status or relationship, even though judgement for particular constructions-in-context may be warranted. Still, in episode 3 A tells a story without any fully elaborated sentences, and this surely appears to be somewhat special. Thus, somewhere in episode 3, there certainly are subsentential TCUs that are not canonical. In short, the terms 'telegram' or 'ellipsis' are too broad. One should at least distinguish between three categories:

- (1) mere fragments;
- (2) subsentential expressions composing a TCU, but not being canonical in a given position;
- (3) subsentential expressions composing a TCU, being canonical in a given position.

The authors feel that such a differentiation would help us to better understand and assess the linguistic problems an agrammatic person confronts in talk-in-interaction. In the following, continued reference is made to 'telegraphic style', but with these reservations and largely for consistency with earlier usage in this paper.

The core aphasiological question of this paper was: what is achieved by agrammatic patients by resorting to telegraphic style as an adaptive strategic option? For patient A, at least one answer is straightforward: in episode 3, her subsentential expressions prompt her co-participant into a very active co-construction (compare Goodwin 1995). Almost half of the story is verbalized by B, despite the fact that it was A who remembered something worth telling. Her initial 'Ach' indicates that she remembered something for telling to B. Nevertheless, B has work to do to make something of A's expressions in order to get the story

constructed. She has to complete expressions by A or otherwise reconstruct them, and at one point (line 17 as a response to A's gesture in line 11) she comes to say something for which A would be the authoritative teller (the location). In episode 1 B does participate in the co-construction of the talk, but this largely takes the form of 'reception' utterances—offering the recipient's understanding of what has been conveyed. But in episode 3, the burden of verbal co-production on B's shoulders is of a different character from that in other episodes for which episode 1 was only a representative example. Here she becomes the virtual speaker—on A's behalf—for things which A does not adequately say for herself, and for which A herself deploys a different turn design. The 'division of labour', present in all talk-in-interaction, is different in episode 3 from that in episode 1. Two further observations have a bearing on this claim:

- (1) The display of specially enhanced attention by B was mentioned as soon as A has launched her story about Mr Ahlert with a fragmentary expression, that is, an expression on which B had to work in a fashion different from that which recipients ordinarily have to bring to bear on utterances.
- (2) When discussing the trouble phase in line 6 of episode 3, it was mentioned that A's behaviour does not display the ordinary preference for self-correction. It was noted that A conveyed the impression of being open to B's help upon encountering trouble in the turn's production.

Perhaps the use of telegraphic style is, in general, a resource for mobilizing the co-participant to get more—and differently—engaged in the collaborative construction of verbal expressions. This would exemplify a major exploitation of one of the most consequential features of conversational organization for natural language: the availability of the organization of repair, and in particular the possible involvement of a recipient in contributing to repair on a speaker's turn, allows for a flexibility in the deployment of language in talk-in-interaction—in ambiguity, polysemy, redundancy, allusion, joking ... and impairment—a flexibility which would not otherwise be tolerable in a natural system of behaviour basic to organized human life (Schegloff 1989, pp. 142–144).

### Conclusion and perspectives

There are several substantive points emerging from an examination of these materials which invite further investigation across various aphasic persons in a variety of contexts:

- (1) Telegraphic speech serves to display trouble in a distinctive way. Aphasic efforts to speak in full grammatical sentences also display trouble, of course, but there are different kinds and forms of trouble, and they enter and are taken up in interaction in different ways. These will sustain substantial further inquiry and specification. However, it appears that ...
- (2) Telegraphic speech, as a distinctive form of problematic talk, can serve to mobilize help from the co-participant, and is deployed to exploit this feature. Furthermore, telegraphic speech appears to mobilize a different form of help than do other forms of problematic talk—help in which the recipient articulates

in the first instance robust versions of what the aphasic person 'means to say', as compared to help in which the recipient displays for confirmation or rejection their understanding of what the aphasic person has said. For another account of a circumstance in which describable practices are employed for bringing the recipient to articulate what the teller means to tell, the delivering of bad news, see Schegloff (1988).

- (3) There is a suggestion in the materials examined that story telling in conversation is a form of talk for which telegraphic production is of enhanced relevance. In part this is because story telling may be taken to require more sustained trajectories of talk by the teller, without benefit of interpolated turns by recipients. For an aphasic teller, it holds open the need for sustained talking without utterances by others on which the aphasic person's talk can be built, on which it may be scaffolded. It is precisely in that form of talk-in-interaction, in which recurrent turn transfer at each possible turn completion is put into potential abeyance, that aphasic speakers appear to adopt ways of talking that provide for their recipients to interpolate talk into their own. Is this a mere coincidence?

All of these observations and tentative lines of enquiry have here emerged by bringing conversation-analytic techniques of analysis to bear on recorded data of naturally occurring episodes of talk-in-interaction between acquaintances of long standing, one of whom has been diagnosed as aphasic. A CA-assisted aphasiology would bring such analysis to bear on other materials involving these participants, and on similar interactions involving other participants, to establish their recurrence, their specificity, and the mechanisms by which such regularities of conduct as may be established are produced. Work of this sort proceeds on two tracks—detailed analysis of single episodes of interaction (as in the prior sections of this paper) and more formal treatment of recurrent practices and organizations of practice. The pay-offs to aphasiology of work along these lines should be sought on both tracks.

### Acknowledgements

The authors thank Herrn Oliver Voß for his outstanding transcriptions of all the tapes involving German aphasics. The authors also thank W. J. M. Levelt (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nymegen, The Netherlands) for suggesting and then facilitating the authors' collaboration in both a moral and a material way.

### References

- ATKINSON, J. M. and HERITAGE, J. (Eds), 1984, *Structure of Social Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- BIBLE, THE, 1982, Authorized Version. The Bible Societies (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- BLESER, R. DE, 1987, From agrammatism to paragrammatism: German aphasiological traditions and grammatical disturbances. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 4, 187–256.
- BLUMSTEIN, S. E., COOPER, W. E., GOODGLASS, H., STATLENDER, S. and GOTTLIEB, J., 1980, Production deficits in aphasia: a voice-onset time analysis. *Brain and Language*, 9, 153–170.
- CAPLAN, D., 1987, *Neurolinguistics and Linguistic Aphasiology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- CLARK, H. H. and CLARK, E. V., 1977, *Psychology and Language* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich).
- CLARK, H. and SCHAEFFER, E., 1987, Collaborating on contributions to conversation. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, **2**, 19–41.
- EGBERT, M., 1996, Context-sensitivity in conversation analysis: eye gaze and the German repair initiator 'Bitte'. *Language in Society*, **25**, 587–612.
- GILES, H., COUPLAND, N. and COUPLAND, J., 1991, Accommodation theory: communication, context, and consequence. In H. Giles, J. Coupland and N. Coupland (Eds) *Contexts of Accommodation: Development in Applied Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1–68.
- GOODGLASS, H., CHRISTIANSEN, J. A. and GALLAGHER, R., 1993, Morphology and syntax in free narrative and structured tests: fluent vs. non-fluent aphasics. *Cortex*, **29**, 377–407.
- GOODWIN, M. H., 1980, Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological Inquiry*, **50**, 303–317.
- GOODWIN, C., 1995, Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, **28**, 233–260.
- GOODWIN, C., 1996, Introduction to the panel discussion 'The pragmatic life of brain damaged patients: situating language impairments within conversation' at the 5th International Pragmatics Conference, Mexico City, July 4–6. Programme of the conference, p. 153.
- GOODWIN, M. H. and GOODWIN, C., 1986, Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, **62**, 51–75.
- HAARMANN, H. J. and KOLK, H. H. J., 1992, The production of grammatical morphology in Broca's and Wernicke's aphasics: speed and accuracy factors. *Cortex*, **28**, 97–112.
- HEESCHEN, C., 1985, Agrammatism and paragrammatism: a fictitious opposition. In M.-L. Kean (Ed.) *Agrammatism* (New York: Academic Press), pp. 207–248.
- HEESCHEN, C. and KOLK, H. H. J., 1988, Agrammatism and paragrammatism. *Aphasiology*, **2**, 299–302.
- HEESCHEN, C. and KOLK, H. H. J., 1994, Adaptation bei Agrammatikern—interaktional motiviert? In I. M. Ohlendorf, T. A. Pollow, W. Widdig and D. B. Linke (Eds) *Sprache und Gehirn. Grundlagenforschung für die Aphasietherapie* (Freiburg: HochschulVerlag), pp. 125–135.
- HERITAGE, J., 1984, A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds) *Structure of Social Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 299–345.
- HESKETH, A. and BISHOP, D. V. M., 1996, Agrammatism and adaptation theory. *Aphasiology*, **10**, 49–80.
- HOFSTEDE, B. T. M., 1992, *Agrammatic speech in Broca's aphasia. Strategic choice for the elliptical register*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nymegen, The Netherlands. NICI Technical Report 92–07.
- HOFSTEDE, B. T. M. and KOLK, H. H. J., 1994, The effect of task variation on the production of grammatical morphology in Broca's aphasia: a multiple case study. *Brain and Language*, **46**, 278–328.
- HUBER, W., POECK, K., WENIGER, D. and WILLMES, K., 1983, *Der Aachener Aphasie Test* (Göttingen: Hogrefe).
- ISSERLIN, M., 1922, Über Agrammatismus. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie*, **75**, 322–410.
- JEFFERSON, G., 1973, A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica*, **9**, 47–96.
- JEFFERSON, G., 1974, Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, **2**, 181–199.
- JEFFERSON, G., 1984, Notes on some orderliness of overlap onset. In V. D. P. Leonardi (Ed.) *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetoric* (Padova: CLEUP Editore), pp. 11–38.
- JEFFERSON, G., 1987, Exposed and embedded corrections. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (Eds) *Talk and Social Organization* (Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters), pp. 86–100.
- KLEIN, W., 1985, Ellipse, Fokusgliederung und thematischer Stand. In R. Meyer-Herman and H. Rieser (Eds) *Ellipsen und fragmentarische Ausdrücke* (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 1–24.
- KLEIN, W. and VATER, H., 1998, The perfect in English and German. In L. Kulikov and H. Vater (Eds) *Typology of Verbal Category* (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 215–237.
- KOLK, H. H. J. and HEESCHEN, C., 1990, Adaptation symptoms and impairment symptoms in Broca's aphasia. *Aphasiology*, **4**, 221–231.

- KOLK, H. H. J. and HEESCHEN, C., 1992, Agrammatism, paragrammatism and the management of language. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 7, 89–129.
- KOLK, H. H. J. and HEESCHEN, C., 1996, The malleability of agrammatic symptoms: a reply to Hesketh and Bishop. *Aphasiology*, 10, 81–96.
- LABOV, W. and FANSHIEL, D., 1977, *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation* (New York: Academic Press).
- LERNER, G. H., 1991, On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society*, 20, 441–458.
- LERNER, G. H., 1996, On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (Eds) *Interaction and Grammar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 238–276.
- LEVELT, W. J. M., 1989, *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- MCNEILL, D., 1992, *Hand and Mind: What Gestures Reveal about Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- POECK, K., 1986, *Neurologie* 6th edn (Berlin: Springer).
- REGENBRECHT, F., HUBER, W. and GLINDEMANN, R., 1992, Zum Verhältnis von Kohärenz und Kohäsion bei Aphasie. In G. Rickheit, R. Mellies and A. Winneken (Eds) *Linguistische Aspekte der Sprachtherapie* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag), pp. 111–137.
- SACKS, H., 1987 [1973], On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (Eds) *Talk and Social Organization* (Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters), pp. 54–69.
- SACKS, H. and SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1979, Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (New York: Irvington), pp. 15–21.
- SACKS, H., SCHEGLOFF, E. A. and JEFFERSON, G., 1974, A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1987, Analyzing single episodes of interaction: an exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 101–114.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1988, On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems*, 35, 442–457.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1989, Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. Bornstein and J. S. Bruner (Eds) *Interaction in Human Development* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), pp. 139–53.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1991, Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (Eds) *Talk and Social Structure* (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp. 44–70.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1992a, On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds) *Talk at Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 101–34.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1992b, In another context. In A. Duranti and Ch. Goodwin (Eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 193–227.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1995, Sequence Organization. Department of Sociology, UCLA, manuscript.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1996a, Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (Eds) *Interaction and Grammar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 52–133.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1996b, Confirming allusions: toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 161–216.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1996c, Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: a partial sketch of a systematics. In B. A. Fox (Ed.) *Studies in Anaphora* (Amsterdam: John Benjamin), pp. 437–485.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1997a, Practices and actions: boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23, 499–545.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1997b, Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society*, 8, 165–87.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., 1997c, Overlap, interruption and turn-taking: accounts of conduct in interaction. manuscript.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A., JEFFERSON, G. and SACKS, H., 1977, The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.

- STARK, J. A. and DRESSLER, W. U., 1990, Agrammatism in German: two case studies. In L. Menn and L. K. Obler (Eds) *Agrammatic Aphasia: a Cross-Language Narrative Source Book* (Amsterdam: John Benjamin), pp. 281–441.
- WAMBAUGH, J. L., WEST, J. E. and DOYLE, P. J., 1997, A VOT analysis of apraxic/aphasic voicing errors. *Aphasiology*, 11, 521–532.

### Appendix: List of abbreviations

---

acc./ACC	accusative
art.	article
dat./DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
INF	infinitive
masc.	masculine
nom.	nominative
NP	noun phrase
pl./PL	plural
POL	polite address form
PRC	participle
PRT	particle
sg.	singular
TCU	turn constructional unit

---

#### *Some remarks on the transcription and translation*

Transcript conventions have been followed as outlined by Atkinson and Heritage 1984, pp. ix–xvi with the following three minor additions or qualifications.

- (1) Any material between slashes indicates erroneous speech (for example, paraphasias). The exact nature of the error(s) is explained in the text. Illegal omissions of function words are indicated in the original text by an ‘om.’ followed by the category to which the omitted element belongs. As for the errors, these illegal omissions are also put between slashes.
- (2) Incomprehensible speech and its duration is indicated by the number of syllables given the speaker’s beat; the whole is presented in double round brackets. See example 5 in the introductory part.
- (3) The dash indicates a micropause, that is an extremely short pause—probably shorter than the explanations by Atkinson and Heritage might suggest (‘a short untimed pause’).

The presentation of the German original follows the normal rules of German orthography. This holds also for non-standard and Berlin-specific pronunciations: they are written in such a way that the application of the rules of German orthography would lead to the actual pronunciation used by the conversant. In addition to the Berlinisms already mentioned, the frequent change of syllable-initial [g-] to Berlinish [j-] should be mentioned.

In positions where in English transcriptions frequently an ‘uh’ appears, German speakers (or at least Berliners) have two possibilities—either ‘äh’ or ‘hm’. The



sound indicated by 'äh' is not always so open as the a-umlaut might suggest, but it seems to be the best approximation. The 'hm' indicates a hummed sound produced with closed mouth and a weaker or stronger puff through the nose. This seems to be typical not only for Berliners or Germans, but for most speakers in Central Europe.

The authors decided not to gloss the German text in idiomatic English, but to give an interlinear word-by-word translation (except for a few complex utterances). This practice is based on the consideration that—at least for the patient—the original German is not standard or idiomatic. Furthermore, most of the expressions of the patient are very short so that a word-by-word translation would coincide with idiomatic glosses anyway. In addition, all errors and omissions are indicated in the original German by slashes, and the exact nature of the error or problem is explained in the analytic descriptions.

Occasionally explanatory abbreviations are attached to an English word or between two English words:

- The German demonstrative pronoun 'd-' is frequently used as a personal pronoun with only a mildly demonstrative touch. In the translation, this is indicated by the English personal pronoun with an attached '-DEM'.
- When one single word in German requires more than one word in English, these words are connected by hyphens. Example: German 'mir' (= dative of 'ich/I') appears in the translation as 'to-me'. In this context it should be mentioned that a preposition and an article are frequently contracted into one word in such a way that number, case and gender of the article remains recognizable. This appears in the English translation as preposition linked with a hyphen to 'the' (without further specification of number, gender, and case, if not necessary).
- In the opposite case, when two or more words in German require just one word in English, the English equivalents to the German words are connected by dots. Example: German 'nach Hause'/English 'to.home' in contexts such as 'Wir gehen nach Hause/*we go to.home*'.

Readers without any knowledge of German are urged to keep in mind also the hints in the introduction concerning word order, use of perfect tense, and particles. In addition, it should be mentioned that German has no do-support, either in questions or in negations.

In order to facilitate understanding of the translation, a word has sometimes been added which does not correspond to any word in the German original. These added words are presented in curly brackets.