On Dispensability

Emanuel A. Schegloff
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles

I describe 5 sequential environments in which speakers produce talk designed to be, and to be recognizable as, "the same" as something previously said. Examination of such talk reveals that such resayings may omit elements that occurred in the first saying—elements that are apparently taken to be dispensable in getting "the same thing" said. On the other hand, some resayings *add* elements to the first saying—elements that were apparently dispensable on the first saying. In some resayings, both of these occur. Finally, the treatment of possibly dispensable turn-initial markers—that is, re-using them or dispensing with them—is shown to be a vehicle for achieving the reflexivity of position and composition in conversation: The usage making some position the currently relevant one and the currently relevant position making relevant the usage that is employed.

Other-initiations of repair can be roughly separated into those which *request* or *ask* for a fix and those which *offer* one for confirmation. By this I mean to distinguish those like "huh," "what?," "say again?," "who?," "where?," and the like on one hand from repeats and so-called understanding checks or candidate understandings on the other. The former set of types are often taken to display "hearing problems" and to be requesting repeats of the trouble source or the trouble-source turn.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Emanuel A. Schegloff, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, 264 Haines Hall, 375 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095–1551. E-mail: scheglof@soc.ucla.edu

In fact, as those who have spent time with these objects know, these re-pair initiators often elicit something quite different from the trouble-source turn speakers who thereby show themselves to figure that quite different problems are involved than hearing problems. Responses to these repair initiators not uncommonly involve backdowns or downgradings of epis-temic strength in apparent response to incipient or manifest disagreement, as in Extract 01 at lines 9 and 11, in response to lines 8 and 10, respectively, or in Extract 02 at line 11 in response to line 9:

(01) US, 27 (NTRI #2)

```
 11   Mike:              You have a tank I like tuh tuh- I-I  [like-
  2   Vic:                                                    [Yeh I gotta fa:wty::
  3                      I hadda fawtuy? a fifty enna twu  [nny:: en two ten::s,
  4   Mike:                                                [Wut- Wuddiyuh doing
                         wit
  5                      [dem. Wuh-
  6   Rich:     -->      [But those were uh:::  [Alex's tanks.
  7   Vic:                                      [-enna fi:ve.
  8   Vic:      -->>     Hah?
  9   Rich:     -->>>    Those'r Alex's tanks weren't they?
 10   Vic:      -->>     Podn' me?
 11   Rich:     -->>>    Weren't- didn't they belong tuh Al [ex?
 12   Vic:                                                  [No: Alex ha(s) no tanks
 13                      Alex is tryintuh buy my tank.
 14                      (1.2)
```

(02) HG, 41 (NTRI #39a)

```
  1   Hyla:              =nNo after six it's uh: ·hh
  2                      (0.2)
  3   Nancy:             It's  [cheaper?
  4   Hyla:                    [ seventy five cents fer thr(h)ee min[utes.=
  5   Nancy:             [Oh:. ( )
  6   Hyla:             =Before six it's a d(h)  [ollar [thirty [fi(h)ve,
  7   Nancy:     -->                            [That's [rilly [pretty chea::p.
  8                      (.)
  9   Hyla:      -->>    Hu:h?
 10                      (.)
 11   Nancy:     -->>>   Sev'ndy five cents fer three minutes is not ba:d,
 12                      (0.5)
 13   Hyla:              ·k tuh-Are you kidding fer four minutes it's a dollar:.=
 14   (Nancy):          =°·hh- ·hh°
 15                          (0. 4)
```

Or they may involve replacement of "specialized" reference terms—whether technical ones, recognitional ones, uncommon ones, or others—by ones designed to be more accessible, better recipient designed, and so forth as in Extracts 03 to 05.

(03) SPC, NYE, 6 (NTRI #130b)

```
1   A:      -->     Do you have some church affiliation, now?
2   B:      -->>    What?
3   A:      -->>>   Do you belong to a church now?
4   B:              No I went to church I haven't been to church for a long
                    time
5                   and I went Its funny thing I went Christmas eve with my
6                   family...
```

(04) NB, 1, 1, 4 (NTRI #22)

```
1   Guy:    -->     Is Rol down by any chance dju know?
2   Eddy:   -->>    Huh?
3   Guy:    -->>>   Is uh Smith down?
4                   Eddy: Yeah he's (here)/(down)
```

(05) Adato, 5:2 (NTRI #29)

```
1   Sy:             He gave it to yuh?
2   Jay:            NO he didn:t uh:: —
3   Jim:            heh! [heh!
4   Jay:            [Some other guy  [took it off,
5   Sy:                             [Yuh swiped it.
6   Jay:            No some other guy took it off his desk 'n gave
7                   ih t'me, —But, that's- what- one does. One,
8                   ((pause))
9   Sy:     -->     Pillage.
10  Jim:            hhh
11  Jay:    -->>    Hm?
12  Sy:     -->>>   Pillagers y'know, —ra:nsacked iz desk.
13                  ((pause))
```

Such responses display treatment of the repair initiation as locating problems of understanding, of alignment, and the like rather than hearing problems. Although all the assertions I have just made are well worth documenting further, I do not intend to document them further here, for I mean them only to limit the scope of what I *will* be addressing by calling attention to the many potential alternatives to it.

That said, many other-initiations of repair of this "request" type—and in particular, those elsewhere (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p. 369, n. 15) termed "weakest"[1]—*do* get as their responses repeats of the trouble-source turn. These repair initiations (such as "huh," "what?," "hm?," "pardon?," "say again?," etc.) are "weakest" in claiming and displaying only the slightest access to the problematic talk—what could be taken to claim only that something was heard to have been said. Extracts 06 to 09 were drawn from a pool of many such exchanges.

(06) MTRAC 90–2; side 2 (NTRI #15a)

```
 1   Marcia:             Hello
 2   maria:     -->      °hello Marcia it's Maria how are you
 3   Marci:     -->>     H:mmm?
 4   maria:     -->>>    °hello Marcia it's Maria how are you
 5   Marcia:             Hi-ah eh=eh Your voice still
 6   maria:             Yeah I kno:w. I had a fever last night 'n ah if- it
 7                      doesn't git any better I'(ll)- probably check inta
 8                      the doctor ·hh
 9   Marcia:            Is this the bronchi:tis sti°ll?
10   maria:              yeah. —right. It's just ah taking a longer time
11                      ta to heal
```

(07) CDHQ, 38 (NTRI #55a)[2]

```
 1   CDD:               Go right out there.
 2   Vol:               Go right out there?
 3   CDD:               Yes,and you'll see uh you'll[ see su-
 4   Vol:               [What about identification to get
 5                      out there.
 6   CDD:               Uh-
 7   Vol:       -->     Will they let me out there.
 8   CDD:       -->>    Huh?
 9   Vol:       -->>>   Will they let me  [out there.
10   CDD:                               [Yes suh they'll letchu out [there.
11   Vol:                                                         [I gotta mariner's
12                      pass, I mean I got  [the ( )
13   CDD:                                 [That's all you need.
14   CDD:               That's all you need an' if you run into any trouble, you tell
15                      'em that the:: director of civil defense said …
16                      Vol: Ok I'll be right out there.
```

(08) Chinese Dinner, 55 (NTRI #137c)

```
 1   Beth:              No this isn' ( ). That's (what I wz,  [ ).
 2   Don:       -->                                        [I didn't
```

```
3               -->     get that joke. I hope the  [camera got it,
4   Jerry:                                          [UmMo::::m
5   John:       -->>    Wha:t?
6   Don:        -->>>   I didn't get that joke. I hope the came [ra got [it.
7   Jerry:                                                      [N o w [ we go=
8   John:               [Oh:,
```

In these exemplars, the repairs are not only thoroughgoing repeats lexically speaking, they are virtually identical prosodically, at least to the naked ear.

As I started to assemble and work on a large collection of other-initiated repair sequences some years ago, I noticed responses to these sorts of repair initiations that *did* appear to take them as embodying a hearing problem at least in part, for they were clearly designed to do "repeating"; but the repeating that they did involved either some *reduction* from the form of the utterance that appeared in the trouble-source turn or some *additions* to it. Not *any* reductions or additions but ones that appeared designed to disencumber the trouble-source turn from elements now superfluous or to restore to the trouble-source turn elements that properly belonged in it but that had been left out in the first saying in the trouble-source turn. I came to think of what was removed or added as "dispensable." That is, when the trouble-source had to be redone to be more accessible, these elements were dispensable. Or when the trouble-source turn had to be redone, it sometimes seemed that something had been left out that now appeared *in*dispensable but had been dispensed with and now had to be restored.[3] What are these dispensable elements that can be left out or can turn out to have been left out? How should their dispensability be understood?

Here are some answers—not *all* of them—in a nutshell.

SOME SORTS OF DISPENSABLES

Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) Initial Operators

One class of dispensables are turn-initial or TCU-initial operators, "discourse markers," connectives, tokens, practices, and so forth that served on the *first* saying to relate the TCU that they were initiating to preceding talk or to take up a stance toward it.

That "preceding talk" can be the speaker's own in a prior part of the turn in its prior saying, as in Extract 09 in which "but" had done this job (in

line 2, omitted in line 6; this exchange is taken up in greater detail in
Schegloff, 2002):

(09) HG II (NTRI #120)

```
1   Nancy:              =A:kshlly I should say what would'v gotten intuh me:,
2              ->        but yer more ambitious then I am,
3                              (·)
4   Hyla:      ->>       ·t Wha:,
5                              (·)
6   Nancy:     ->>>      Yer more ambitious then I am.
7                              (0.6)
8   Hyla:                (Fer  [what widduw) ]
9   Nancy:                     ['s there a la]ck'v c(h)mm [u(h)nica:tio(h)n he(h)re,
10  Hyla:                                                 [hhhhhhhhhhhhhh
```

The preceding talk can have been their speaker's own in a prior turn as in
Extract 10 in which the "An:::d" and "Okay" are treated as dispensable:

(10) Daden, Post-Mortem, New Year's Invitation (NTRI #121)

```
1   Bonnie:             If Denise calls me, the'n I(h)'ll call you 'n we(h)'ll
2                       try to d(h)o something. {.hhhh/(0.8)}
3                       'cuz (0.5) uh hm that would ber ba:d.
4                              (1.8)
5   Bonnie:    ->       An:::d (2.0) okay d'you think you c'd come? pretty much for
6              ->       sure?
7   Marina:    ->>      What?
8   Bonnie:    ->>>     D'you think yuh c'd come pretty much for sure?
9   Marina:             Sure.
10                             (0.7)
11  Bonnie:             ·hh Okay.
```

It can have been preceding talk in a prior turn by prior-speaker/now-ad-
dressee, as in Extract 11 in which the now-dispensable element is "yeh but."

(11) BC, Beige, 20–21 (NTRI #113d)

```
1   Brad:               ...You uh:: wha'diyuh do, fer a living.
2   Caller:             Eh::m I woik inna driving school.
3   Brad:               Inna dri:ving school.
4   Caller:             Yeh. I? spoke t'you many ti:mes,
5   Brad:               Oh yeah. You gottuh beautiful thing goin'. Haven'tche.
6   Caller:             Yea [::h,
```

```
 7   Brad:                  [ You can'- You can' make a living.
 8   Caller:          No,I manage yih know,I go by bus, de fellehz drive me
                      over
 9                    you know,
10   Brad:      ->    Yeh but ha'di- whaddiyuh do et school
11                    ((pause))
12   Caller:    ->>   Excuse me?
13   Brad:      ->>>  Whaddiyuh do et school.
14   Caller:          Whaddiyuh mean 'n school.
15   Brad:            Well you work ettuh driving school,  [Right?
16   Caller:                                               [Yeh but I jus' go to the
17                    motor ve'icle 'n awl that. I'm not an instructor ye [t.
18   Brad:                                                                [Oh I
19                    see. Y'dun 'aftuh worry abuht that.
20   Caller:          No,
21   Brad:            Okay.
```

Or it can have been preceding talk in a prior turn by another but co-member of the same party, as in Extract 12 in which Fred is "taking orders" in the living room from visiting relatives Marty, Deb, and Naomi, and Marty's request at line 7 is appended by "En" to Deb's at line 5 but is dropped in the repeat at line 10:

(12) Post-Party, 23 (NTRI #144b)

```
 1   Anne:            Ask Uncle Freddy nice [ly
 2   Fred:                                 [Whatchu want Naome, c'mon (I- )
                      come
 3                    t'the  [ki [(tchen.)
 4   Naomi:               [Pl [ease a glass a'milk,
 5   Deb:                    [Water fer me Fre:d,
 6   Fred:            Ajuu [ahhh!  ((sneeze))
 7   Marty:     ->        [En'n as [htray fer me Fred,
 8   Fred:                         [ (Scuze me?)
 9   Fred:      ->>   What?
10   Marty:     ->>>  A:shtray fer me,
11   Fred:            (Two [ ashtrays?)]
12   Deb:                 [ Ash tray,  ] water, milk.
13   Fred:            Okay. En ashtray en ennything tuh drink.
14                    (0.5)
```

In all four environments, these elements are now dispensable because that prior talk is no longer the proximate predecessor to the trouble-source talk; the latter does not need to be related to it and it is now

most proximately responsive to the repair initiation. Overwhelmingly, if the response to the repair initiation is a repeat of the trouble-source turn, that repeat omits turn-initial markers if they were present on first saying.

Less commonly, turn-*final* markers of relationship to sequential context may also be dropped on repeat. For example, when something is misplacement marked (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, pp. 319–320) on its initial saying—for example, with "by the way,"—it is no longer misplaced when repeated in response to a repair initiation; it is perfectly appropriately placed there as in Extract 13:

(13) CDHQ, HH2 (NTRI #42a)

```
 1   E:              [PBX is dead,
 2   C:              [Canal Boulevard (              ).
 3   F:              You're what?
 4   E:              We're dead,
 5   F:              Bury it!
 6   E:              [I'm not kiddin you-
 7   G:     ->       [This's dead too, by the way,
 8   F:     ->>      Hm?
 9   G:     ->>>     Yer [electricity down here is dead too.
10   C:                  [ (              ) that information   [ (              )
11   E:                                                        [ PBX is dead.
12   F:              Switchboard.
```

In this exchange in a Civil Defense Headquarters during a hurricane, E has announced (line 1) that telephone communications have been lost, and this announcement is still being worked through when G uses it at line 7 (by employing "too") to occasion the report of a similar failure, marking its misplacement (i.e., in the course of still working through the prior report) with "by the way." On its repeat at line 9, however, after the repair initiation, it is the sequentially implicated next turn, and the "by the way" is dropped.[4]

So, again, turn-initial or turn-final markers of relationship to preceding talk by self or another may be dropped when a trouble source or trouble-source turn is repeated in response to a repair initiator.[5]

TCU-Initial "Constituents"

There are other turn-initial components that speakers may treat as dispensable when replying to other-initiated repair, and these may be more

surprising, for they appear to be more "endemic" or "organic" parts of the talk—if only in the sense that they are grammatical constituents of the "sentences" conventionally thought to be the basic building blocks of turns. For this reason, I provide a somewhat more generous sample of specimens in the following extracts.

In Extract 14, only the subject term "I" is dropped in the repeat, although whether it is its "subject-ness" or its anaphoric character that figures here is unclear.[6]

(14) Clayman, Editorial Conferences

```
 1   ED:              'N my downtown stor:y.
 2                    (2.0)
 3   CE:              Oh yeah.
 4                    (.)
 5   CE:              I forgot about that.
 6                    (1.9)
 7   CE:      ->      UH::m >I- (thought you) jus' wanted< page one
                      candidates.
 8                    (.)
 9   ED:      ->>     Huh:?
10   CE:      ->>>    Thought you just wanted page one c(h)andid(h)a[tes.
11   ED:                                                            [Isn't
12                    that a page one candidate?
13                    (0.5)
14   CE:              I think I- I guess: (.) it i:s.
```

In Extract 15, both the subject and an auxiliary verb are treated as dispensable:

(15) Three Sisters, 3 (NTRI #49a)

```
 1                    (1.0)
 2   May:             She: ws-gonna clean, she slipped.
 3   Rose:            N'what's on yer adgenda tuhm::orr:ow=nothing?
 4                    (2.0)
 5   May:     ->      Well=I'm going out tomorrow ni:ght.
 6                    (0.2)
 7   Rose:    ->>     Huh.
 8                    (0.3)
 9   May:     ->>>    Going out tomorrow night.=
10   Rose:            =Who yih going with.
11                    (0.3)
```

| 12 | May: | With Ah<u>lene</u>! |
| 13 | Rose: | She <u>called</u> dju. |

In Extracts 16 to 18, the subject, [auxiliary,] and main verb are dropped:

(16) SPC, 182 (NTRI #12a)

1	D:	->	C'd I have yer name.
2	S:	->>	Uh?
3	D:	->>>	Yer na:me?

(17) SPC, NYE, 3 (NTRI #28)

1	A:		How long've you been divorced?
2	B:		Oh a long time maybe about eleven years
3	A:		uh huh
4	B:	->	I guess at least eleven years
5	A:		Pardon me, I couldn't hear you.
6	B:		<u>Hah</u>? ((loud, surprised, awakened))
7	A:	->>	I couldn't hear you,
8	B:	->>>	Bout eleven years
9	A:		I see
10	B:		Is someone else trying to get you
11	A:		Pardon me
12	B:		Is someone else trying to get you the phone is clicking
13	A:		No no I imagine that's just the exchange.

(18) Schenkein II:27 (NTRI #5)

1	Joe:		I went- I, went to, uh Escon [dido Friday.
2	Leni:		[( )!
3	Leni:		(with [ ),
4	Edith:		[-with Jo:hn,
5	Joe:		-with [<u>John</u>.
6	Leni:		[Didje-
7	Leni:	->	(Didje go fishing?)
8	Joe:	->>	Huh?
9	Leni:	->>>	[Fishing?
10	Edith:		[No to look et some pro//perty thet John …

In Extract 19, the utterance is already without an articulated subject term in the initial saying of the target turn; its repeat drops the verb as well.

(19) GTS 5:13 (NTRI #134d)

| 1 | Ken: | | Four months onna deserted island he:hh hnhh |
| 2 | | | (0.4) |

```
3    (Roger):          Aaa:h.=
4    Ken:              =·hi:::hh.
5                      (0.2)
6    Jim:      ->      Go [t some imagina:tion don't] yuh. hheh
7    Ken:                 [ Home made abo(h)rtion. ]
8    Roger:    ->>     Wha:[t?
9    Jim:                  [ ((clears throat)) (0.2)
10   Jim:      ->>>    Some imagination.
11                     (0.5)
12   Roger:            Who:se.mi:ne?
13   Jim:              No hi:s.
14   Roger:            hhihh ·hh hh ,hh
```

In Extracts 20 and 21, the subject, verb, and preposition are treated as dispensable, leaving the rest of the prepositional phrase as the whole of the reply to the other-initiation of repair. Indeed, in Extract 20, what was done in the initial saying (at line 5) only as an apparent "afterthought"—more technically, as an increment ("Tuhnight")—is retained in the repeat, whereas most of the original TCU is not, yielding what would ordinarily be thought an "ungrammatical" utterance.[7]

(20) Adato 3:26 (NTRI #134b)

```
1    Stan:             Whadidjuh have upstairs.
2    Matt:             Wha:?
3    Stan:             Whad'they have upstairs.
4    Matt:             All kindsa coldcuts, 'n meats. and uh salads 'n (        ).
5    Stan:     ->      Is that fer evrybody? Tuhnight?
6    Tony:             G- [ gee en now I'm not hungry.
7    (Matt):   ->>        [ (What?)
8    Stan:     ->>>    Evrybody tuhnight,
9    Tony:             I'm not hungry t'night.
```

(21) Debbie & Shelley, 5

```
1    Shelley:          I mean we haven made alot pla:ns and I-↑I don't
2                      know. no:w I feel defensive. hhh
3    Debbie:           Ma:ll ya shoudn't be defensive I mean theres been
4                      pa:rtie:s like here comere here do this or
5                      whatever:an [.hhh
6    Shelley: ->                   [you were at the halloween thing.
7    Debbie:  ->>      huh?
8    Shelley: ->>>     the halloween p [arty
9    Debbie:                          [ri:ght.
10                     (2.5)
```

Two additional observations should be registered before leaving this point.

First, although I have limited myself in the preceding documentation to dispensability displayed in the *repeat* of an utterance, there are convergent instances in which the *initial* saying dispensed with components that are then added in response to other-initiated repair, as in Extract 22, which dispenses with the subject term and auxiliary verb in the initial saying at line 1 but adds them in responding to the claim of problematic hearing/understanding.

(22) Earthquake, IV:40–41 (NTRI #105a)

```
 1  D:     ->      Have yer name an'= phone number please,
 2  D:             [Just-
 3  S:     ->>     [I beg yer pardon?
 4  D:     ->>>    C'd I have yer name an' phone number in case
 5                 [I 'av to call you back,
 6  S:             [ ( ) my name?
 7                 ((pause))
 8  S:             It's-
 9  S:             I:: didn' hear yuh sir,
10  D:             C'd I have yer name, an' phone number in case I haf tuh call
11                 you back,
```

This specimen may be juxtaposed with Extract 16 in which the "Could I" is part of the initial request but is dispensed with in the repeat.

Second, I should note that some exchanges that look and sound in many respect like Extracts 14 to 20 invite an alternative understanding. Consider, for example, Extracts 23 to 25:

(23) Earthquake, IV:50 (NTRI #111a)

```
 1  S:     ->      I'd like to speak to Mister Garrison at nine please?
 2  D:-    >>      Pardon me?
 3  S:     ->>>    Mister Garrison?
 4                 ((pause))
 5  S:             At nine?
 6                 ((pause))
 7  D:             This is the fire department sir,
 8  S:             Oh I'm sor' I must have the wrong numbuh.
```

(24) CDHQ, 60 (NTRI #115b)

```
 1  E:     ->      Uhh Colonel Erdman again over here at uh CD
                   headquarters?
 2  E:             Uhh-
```

```
3  P:     ->>     Say again please sir?
4  E:     ->>>    Uh Colonel Erdman?
5  P:             Yes sir.
6  E:             Alright now. I know thatchu set aside fifteen thousand bags
7                 for the levee board.
8  P:             That's right.
```

(25) Schenkein, Living Room, 97 (NTRI #126)

```
1  Leni:   ->      But you know single beds'r awfully thin tuh sleep on.
2  Sam:    ->>     What?
3  Leni:   ->>>    Single beds. [They're-
4  Edith                        [Y'mean narrow?
5  Leni:           They're awfully narrow [yeah.
6  Edith:                                 [You c'd get- [you c'd get one,
7                  three quarter bed en (                on tha::t,)
```

In Extracts 23 and 24, it appears something quite different from dispensability is involved. When a recipient initiates repair, a speaker's job is to figure out from the trouble-source utterance in its context what in particular the trouble source might be and what the nature of the trouble is. The reply to the other-initiated repair can reveal what the trouble-source speaker's solution has been to this inquiry by the remedy that is offered in response. One search procedure speakers use is to review the trouble-source turn in a recipient-design-sensitive fashion to see if it includes components that could be the source of the trouble for the repair-initiating recipient. Such components can include difficult or unusual words, technical terms, recognitional reference forms (Schegloff, 1996b; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), and the like—items whose use was predicated on the speaker's understanding of this recipient, an understanding that can be taken to have been faulty. If a likely candidate turns up, repair is likely to focus on that trouble source, and the repair turn may be entirely addressed to dealing with it in particular, either by replacement or by other repair means.

In Extracts 23 and 24, the trouble-source speakers appear to have figured that it was the name that was the trouble source, and it is the name that they address the repair to. It is not so much that the rest of the trouble-source turn is/was dispensable as it is that this particular component has been diagnosed as the trouble-source and that has been displayed and acted on by addressing the repair to that component alone. In Extract 25, it appears that the trouble-source speaker has a candidate solution to what the trouble source is and repeats only that. As it happens, that was *not* the trouble source for the recipient who thereupon initiates another round of repair;

it is, in effect, a modulated other-correction, a dispreferred move that its speaker's prior repair initiation allowed the avoidance of by not specifying the trouble source more closely but that did not work.

Looking back now at Extract 21, analysis along these lines can also be entertained, for, aside from the components of the trouble-source turn that are omitted, another is replaced—and it is a form of pro-term ("thing") whose occasion-specific referent can be problematic and is another in the class of items speakers entertain as the possible source of trouble. However, not every instance in which elements of a first saying are omitted invite/allow analysis along these lines. Each instance requires examination in its local context.

Explication of Indexical Expressions

Having just had occasion to take note of pro-terms (and, I might add, definite descriptions and demonstratives) as candidate trouble sources, it may be apt to expand on this observation with some documentation, for one form of dispensability is a speaker's reliance on a pro-term or demonstrative or definite description to do reference while dispensing with a more explicit detailing of what is being referred to. There is a source of such "dispensing" in the general maxim for recipient design that a speakers should not tell recipients what they suppose —or *ought* to suppose—the recipients already know; they should *exploit* it, *use* it, for example, *presuppose* it. The use of pro-terms is one way of doing this (as are the use of technical terms, recognitional reference forms, literary or "sophisticated" usage, or "in-group" terminology, etc.). When a repeat of a turn is expanded relative to its first saying, one recurrent operation that has been applied is the explication of pro-terms, demonstratives, and/or definite descriptions, an explication that now introduces specification of reference that had been dispensed with on first saying. I offer here only a few exemplars, the first of which has been seen before in another connection (as Extract 13) and is reproduced here for convenience:

(13) CDHQ, HH2 (NTRI #42a)

```
1   E:              [PBX is dead,
2   C:              [Canal Boulevard (          ).
3   F:              You're what?
4   E:              We're dead,
```

```
 5   F:                    Bury it!
 6   E:                    [I'm not kiddin you-
 7   G:          ->        [This's dead too, by the way,
 8   F:          ->>       Hm?
 9   G:          ->>>      Yer [electricity down here is dead too.
10   C:                        [ (          ) that information [(          )
11   E:                                                        [ PBX is dead.
12   F:                    Switchboard.
```

(26) SBL, 3:6:15 (NTRI #143)

```
 1   B:                    O(hh) An'- an' emphysema's terrible en-
 2              ->          D'you know anyone with that?
 3                          (1.0)
 4   A:          ->>        What¿
 5   B:          ->>>       -with emphysema, d'you know anyone who has that.
 6   A:                     No I do:n't.
```

(27) CDHQ (NTRI #107)

```
 1   A:                    …They haven't seen anything a the Salvation Army.
 2   B:                    Oh the Salvation Army, [they- they already got there,
 3                         (                      ). [
 4   C:                                               [No they (              )
 5                         they've left already.
 6   C:          ->        They [came in an' left.
 7   A:          ->>            [I beg yer pardon?
 8   C:          ->>>      Red Cross has been there an' left. The Salvation Army's
 9                         the one that stayed on.
```

(28) FD III:44 (NTRI #119)

```
 1   D:          ->        Have you tried his home?
 2   O:          ->>       What is it?
 3   D:          ->>>      Have you tried uh Mister Bell's home.
 4   O:                    No we haven't.
```

In Extract 13, aside from the previously discussed dropping of "by the way" in the turn's repeat, something is added and that is the replacement of "This" in line 7 with "Yer electricity down here"—replacement of the demonstrative by its explication. Similarly, in Extract 26, what is added is an explication of "that" with "with emphysema" and then a redoing of the question using the now-reliable "that." In Extract 27, "They" gets expanded to "Red Cross," having been somewhat removed positionally from its refer-

ent. In Extract 28, "his" gets expanded to "Mister Bell's," which had been dispensed with by the use of "his." So another recurrent locus of dispensability is the set of deictic and anaphoric terms we call pro-terms, demonstratives, definite descriptions, and so forth.

Turn-Final Position

We have already seen that turn-initial position is a locus of dispensability; so is the other edge of a turn—turn-final position. In fact, three of the four deictic expansions just examined have the to-be-expanded term in either turn-initial or turn-final position. Here I can register only some of the most common items that turn out to be dispensable in turn-final position.

Turn-final address terms. Although potentially relevant on the first saying to mark the addressee and secure their aligned recipiency, once the addressee has replied with a repair initiator, no address term is needed to do this job (on addressing as a practice for next speaker selection, cf. Lerner, 2003). This observation is in point for both turn-initial and turn-final address terms, especially in multiperson interactions. See, for example, in Extract 29, the address term in turn-initial position at lines 8 to 9—dropped at the repeat at line 11.

(29) GTS 3:6 (NTRI #33)

```
 1  Louise:          It's- Uhm, Oh my family is just starting family therapy.
 2  Ken:             Oh [ That's always fun, you know, that's [ what I-
 3  Louise:             [Which is a-                          [ It's good cause we
 4                   used to do it on our own. With one-you know, one person as
 5                   moderator type? I-in our family. Alone. And it-it didn't work
 6                   out-it worked out. But it wasn't that- you know, we needed
 7                   someone who was ba- who wasn't uhm  (0.4)  [biased.
 8  Ken:      ->                                    ((v.soft))  [Louise. Louise.
 9                   ((whispered)) You're gonna be sorry.
10  Louise:   ->>    Hm?
11  Ken:      ->>>   ((sing-song)) You're gonna be sorry,
12  Louise:          No. My mother's already been in therapy, my father's been in
13                   therapy, [I've been in therapy, -
14  Ken:                      [Yeah- yeah I know, but I mean, they bring out eheh
```

```
15                    eheh stuff like uh your dates, uh the kinda kids you hange
16                    around with,
```

In turn-final position, the previously examined Extract 12 is reproduced
following:

(12) Post-Party, 23 (NTRI #144b)

```
 1   Anne:            Ask Uncle Freddy nice[ly
 2   Fred:                                 [Whatchu want Naome, c'mon (I- )
                      come
 3                    t'the [ki [(tchen.)
 4   Naomi:                [Pl[ease a glass a'milk,
 5   Deb:                      [Water fer me Fre:d,
 6   Fred:            Ajuu [ahhh! ((sneeze))
 7   Marty:    ->           [En'n as[htray fer me Fred,
 8   Fred:                          [(Scuze me?)
 9   Fred:     ->>     What?
10   Marty:    ->>>    A:shtray fer me,
11   Fred:            (Two [ashtrays?)]
12   Deb:                   [Ash tray ,] water, milk.
13   Fred:            Okay. En ashtray en ennything tuh drink.
```

I noted before the dropping of "and" (i.e., "en") at line 7, dropped at line 10.
Now I note the use of the address term "Fred" in turn-final position at line
7, dropped at line 10. Although address terms are deployed for many uses
other than addressee designation or next speaker selection (and especially
in turn-final position without an intervening silence), here both Deb and
Marty are "piggybacking" requests of their own on to that of Naomi, to
whom Fred had addressed himself, and the turn-final address terms at both
lines 5 and 7 serve to register that it is *he* who is being addressed and tar-
geted by these additional (parasitic) requests, a job that need no longer be
done after he has initiated repair (displaying that he knew it was he who
was being addressed and who is having trouble with the utterance)—hence
its dispensability at line 10. Similar trajectories of use occur in Extracts 30
and 31, both also taken from multiperson interactions in which who is be-
ing addressed can be problematic:

(30) Oolie Dinner, 14:08 (NTRI #14c)

```
 1   Dad:      ->      D'you want s'more Steven,
 2   Boy:      ->>     huh,
```

```
 3                      (1.0)
 4   Dad:      ->>>     You want s'more chicken,
 5   Boy:              mm mm
 6                        (1.5)
 7   Dad:               I'll have anothuh piece.
```

(31) GTS 5:61 (NTRI #60a)

```
 1   Ken:              Maybe then I will be what I want, but uh in some ways I don'
 2                     really- y'know, 's a lotta fields open.
 3                      (0.8)
 4   Roger:            Oh well, hhmhhhh
 5                      (1.4)
 6   Roger:    ->      You have no interests Jim.
 7                      (0.2)
 8   Jim:      ->>     Hm?
 9   Roger:    ->>>    You have no interests.
10   Jim:              In what?
11   Roger:            In anything.
12                      (0.4)
13   Jim:              Well nobody's ever pushed me into-y'know what I
                       m-nowat-
14                     not [ that, nobody's said-
```

Note in both of these exchanges (a) that there is an address term in turn-final position on the initial saying of what gets treated as a trouble-source turn (lines 1 and 6, respectively); (b) that it is omitted on the second saying in response to other-initiated repair (lines 4 and 9, respectively); and (c) that in both exchanges, there is a reference problem that gets addressed—by dad in Extract 30 who deals at line 4 with the allusive or elliptical reference to "some more" without specifying "some more what" but need not use an address term and by Jim in Extract 31 who gets the initial complaint at line 6 repeated without an address term at line 9 but without solving *his* reference problem—interests "in what."[8]

Courtesy terms.   Also in turn-final position, what appear initially to be courtesy terms—whether a "please" marking a request as in Extracts 32 and 33 or a "ma'am" marking a sort of gender-marked etiquette as in Extracts 34 and 35—are dispensed with in the repair-supplying repeat.

(32) Fire Department IV:11 (NTRI #105)

```
 1   Dispatch: ->     What is yer name please,
 2   Caller:   ->>    Beg yer pardon?
```

```
    3   Dispatch:  ->>>    What is yer name?
    4   Caller:            Barry Jackson
```

(33) Earthquake IV, 40-41 (NTRI #105a)

```
    1   D:        ->       Have yer name an'= phone number please,
    2   D:                 [Just-
    3   S:        ->>      [I beg yer pardon?
    4   D:        ->>>     C'd I have yer name an' phone number in case
    5                      [ I 'av to call you back,
    6   S:                 [ (      ) my name?
    7                      ((pause))
    8   S:                 It's-
    9   S:                 I:: didn' hear yuh sir,
   10   D:                 C'd I have yer name, an' phone number in case I haf tuh call
   11                      you back,
```

(34) Earthquake IV:38 (NTRI #107a)

```
    1   Dispatch:  ->      This is inside the school ma'am?
    2   Caller:    ->>     I beg yer pardon?
    3   Dispatch:  ->>>    THIS IS INSIDE THE SCHOOL?
```

(35) Fire Department IV:117 (NTRI #127)

```
    1   A:        ->       Couldju tell me what's on fire ma'am?
    2   B:        ->>      What,
    3   A:        ->>>     Couldju tell me what's [o n [fire?
    4   B:                                         [It's [-a trailer an' it's-it's
    5                      going quite bad.
```

In fact, rather than courtesy terms, these may be better understood as markers of institutional talk, all coming—in the data that I have examined—from service personnel in service organizations like the Fire Department, Emergency Service, and the like in the course of service-providing contacts.[9]

"Or X." The address terms and courtesy terms mentioned or examined in the preceding two points—elements dropped in the second saying of the turn—all come after grammatical possible completion but not after "final" prosody; they are all in the same intonation contour with the preceding TCU. Other sorts of turn-final elements are similarly positioned grammatically, although more variably prosodically. For example:

(36) JG, 2B, 8:23 (NTRI #53)

```
    1   D:        ->       Wul did'e ever get married 'r anything?
    2   C:        ->>      Hu:h?
```

```
3   D:          ->>>    Did jee ever get married?
4   C:                  I have [ no idea.
5   D:                         [(        )
6   C:                  How would I know.
```

(37) Upholstery Shop, 2 (NTRI #23b)

```
 1   Mike:                 =Y' [didn't getta holda-   ]
 2   Vic:                       [ d u h  ß ø ø π u h .  ]
 3   Mike:                 Listen [ man.
 4   Vic:                          [ Freak it. He's a bitch he didn' pud in
 5                         duh light own dih sekkin flaw, ·hh=
 6   Mike:                 Y'couldn't gitta ho  [l-
 7   Vic:                                       [-man tell im.
 8   Mike:       ->        Jim [wasn' home] uh what.
 9   Vic:                      [ Y'kno:w ?]
10                         (0.5)
11   Vic:         ->>       Hah?
12   Mike:        ->>>      Jim wasn' home, [°(when y'wen over there)]
13   Vic:                                  [ I didn' go by theh.]=
14                         =I [left my garbage pail in iz hallway.
15   Carol:                   [Vi:c,
```

In both Extract 36 and 37, the speaker adds an "or X" component to the inquiry that the turn is making after its first possible grammatical completion; the X is an unexplicated alternative, not a delimited one "paired" with what preceded in the turn. Adding an "or X" part of this sort ("or anything," "or what," "or something," etc.) despecifies the question from a "this-thing question" to a "such-things question." In doing so, it may be seen either as weakening its thrust by backing away from its particularity and lowering the threshold of response or as strengthening its thrust by broadening the range of replies that align with or comply with it. In these two exchanges, the inquiry is marked for negative polarity (by the "ever" in Extract 36 and by the negative "not" in Extract 37); it is designed for a "no" answer.

In both instances, the inquiry is followed by other-initiated repair: in each, the repair initiation projects possible disagreement (which is subsequently realized); in each the inquiry proper is repeated with no backdown, but the "or X" add-on gets dropped. Curiously, in both instances, the problematic response turns out not to be the rejection of the "proposition" the inquiry is about but a denial of access altogether; rather than a "no" answer, it gets a "no answer." Dropping the broadening of the inquiry in the re-

sponse to the repair initiation appears then to be a backdown from the initial calibration of the question.

It is worth noting then that the dispensability of the dropped component was built into the very design of the utterance. The "or X" is presented as "an add-on" and not as part of the turn's core inquiry. This itself reflects a decision about the level of granularity (Schegloff, 2000a) at which to pitch the question: rather than a categorical wh-question (e.g., "what's his current marital situation?" or "Where was Jim?"), the question is built more narrowly to proffer one possible outcome/answer and to "prefer" alignment with that candidate answer, and the broader scope that was bypassed by this design is "snuck in" by the "or X" add-on—grammatically isolated and thereby rendered potentially dispensable.[10]

Epistemic downgrades.   Extracts 38 and 39 include a different sort of post-possible-completion add-on, which turns out to be dispensable:

(38) NB 1, 1:4 (NTRI #22)

```
1   Guy:      ->       Is Rol down by any chance dju know?
2   Eddy:     ->>      Huh?
3   Guy:      ->>>     Is uh Smith down?
4   Eddy:              Yeah he's (here)/(down)
```

(39) SPC, NYE, 10 (NTRI #113b)

```
1   B:                 …How could I love a woman my age that's talking as
2                      hysterically and emotionally immaturely as I am How
3                      could you love that.
4                      You can't.
5   A:                 Well why are you so proud?
6   B:                 Am I proud?
7   A:                 Yes, why uh why do you have to be something other than
8                      what you are in order to love yourself? Why can't you
9                      love yourself just as you are.
10  B:        ->       Cuz they didnt, I guess
11  A:        ->>      Well- Pardon me?
12  B:        ->>>     Cause they didnt
13  A:                 Ok why then why change yourself for them?
```

The speakers of the trouble-source turns in Extracts 38 and 39 both add epistemic downgrades to a possibly complete TCU: in Extract 38, "by any chance" about the predicate and "do you know" about recipient access to it;

in Extract 39, "I guess" downgrades the epistemic strength of the preceding assertion. Here again, the design of the turn's construction leaves these markers in an exposed position (as compared, e.g., to "I guess because they didn't" in 39 or "I wonder if Rol might happen to be down" in 38). In both cases, these epistemic downgrades are dropped after repair is initiated.

Tag questions.   A last type of turn-final element vulnerable to being omitted when a speaker is ostensibly saying "the same thing" is a tag question, as exemplified in Extract 19 reproduced here for convenience and Extract 40:

(19) GTS 5:13 (NTRI #134d)

```
 1   Ken:                    Four months onna deserted island he:hh hnhh
 2                           (0.4)
 3   (Roger):                Aaa:h.=
 4   Ken:                    =·hi:::hh.
 5                           (0.2)
 6   Jim:       ->           Go [t some imagina:tion don't] yuh. hheh
 7   Ken:                        [ Home made abo(h)rtion. ]
 8   Roger:     ->>          Wha: [t?
 9   Jim:                          [ ((clears throat))     (0.2)
10   Jim:       ->>>         Some imagination.
11                          (0.5)
12   Roger:                  Who:se.mi:ne?
13   Jim:                    No hi:s.
14   Roger:                  hhihh ·hh hh ,hh
```

(40) NTRI #146

```
 1   A:                      Sanna Barb'ra hhh· huh [ huh
 2   B:                      Bar [ bra.
 3   A:                           [ I-
 4   B:                      [Uhuh,
 5   A:                      [·hhhh
 6   A:                      We gotta Barbra didn' we.
 7   B:                      Mmyuh.
 8                          (0.6)
 9   A:                      Yea:uh.
10   B:         ->           Took time uh?
11   A:         ->>          What?
12   B:         ->>>         Took ti:me.
13   A:                      Took ti(hh) hhhh yehheh we got two litttle bra:ts,
```

Extract 19 was previously examined for the erosion of its initial word on repetition, but I also note the omission of the tag question "don't yuh" at line 10. Extract 40 has a similar omission of the postcompletion tag question or prompt "huh" (Schegloff, 1997). In both instances, the turns to which these tags are added involve their speakers' characterization of the recipients' circumstances or character to which they—the recipients—are presumed to have authoritative access, hence, the gesture of subordination of the comment to their approval. In both instances, the tag questions are dropped in the repeat that follows the repair initiation.

It may be noted that many, if not all, of the TCU components discussed in this section were registered in the turn-taking article (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, pp. 707–708)) as vulnerable to overlap by virtue of their occurrence after possible completion in the transition space in which another may be entitled to start a next turn. Here I have noted that they are vulnerable not only to the intervention of *others* but to omission by their speakers. In part, this is related to issues of turn design. However, it should be noted that "post-possible completion"—a position in the organization of turns and in the organization of the transition space—is a position that is the systematic locus for a variety of activities such as stance marking (Schegloff, 1996c, p. 90). Many of the items I have been examining, although not all, are engaged in just such stance marking—either with respect to the turn or with respect to its speaker. Such elements are treatable as dispensable when resaying what was said before.

Simplification

A fourth form of reduction in repeats might be termed "simplification." Less localized in the turn than the practices previously described, it serves to pare down what was being said to its minimal form, rendering what is eliminated as "dispensable." One of the most transparent exemplars that I know has this feature foregrounded by what could be called the "complexification" of the first saying, setting up its simplification on resaying. Here Charlie had undertaken to give a fellow student a ride to another city, an undertaking he is now calling to withdraw. The utterance in which he intimates this—sort of—is at lines 3 to 4:

(41) Trip to Syracuse, 1 (NTRI #137g)

```
1   Charlie:            I spoke teh the gi:r- I spoke tih Karen.
2   (Charl):            (·hhhh)
3   Charlie:    ->      And u:m:: (·) ih wz rea:lly ba:d because she decided
4               ->      of a:ll weekends fuh this one tih go awa:y
5                       (0.6)
6   Ilene:      ->>     Wha:t?
7                       (0.4)
8   Charlie:    ->>>    She decided tih go away this weekend.
9   Ilene:              Yea:h,
```

I don't want to take up here the ways in which this utterance is designedly complex or what that might be doing (these are treated in Schegloff, 2002). I mean only to offer a clear exemplar of dispensability and simplification in what is done to it in what is otherwise its "repeat" at line 8.

There are two lines of continuation worth pursuing at this point. The one I am foregoing is to take up instances of the several types of reduction operation I have mentioned to spell out in the particularities of each episode in context how the repair initiation figures and how the response to it—with its departures from repetition—fits that configuration. The other is this.

The departures of the repairs I have been examining have been measured against a particular standard that provides what they are departures from. That standard is a repetition of the trouble-source turn in its initial saying. That is, saying the same thing in the same words. The appropriate use of that standard rests on the claim that in general, trouble-source speakers who understand the repair initiation to display a problem of hearing or grasp are oriented to responding by doing "saying the same thing," and they do that by "using the same words." It is by reference to that criterion that the absence of some items is made relevantly noticeable and potentially consequential analytically—both for coparticipants and for professional analysts.

As it happens, this class of other-initiations of repair does not provide the only sequential locus for the relevance of doing "saying the same thing" by "using the same words." In what follows, I sketch four other environments in which this orientation appears relevant to speakers, and I suggest that comparable departures from "same talk" may be found in those environments as well as ones that differ in the environment that has already been described. All of this will remain sketchy (although not, I hope, ineffective) for reasons of space, and I regret that, but it seemed to me unsatis-

factory to develop these environments without providing any account of the departures from "same talk" and equally unsatisfactory to provide some findings about the departures without establishing the constraints of relevance that underwrite their import and indicating several places in which those constraints seem clearly oriented to.

FOUR OTHER LOCI FOR SAME TALK

The larger project of which the preceding discussion now becomes part is concerned with the following theme. When speakers undertake to say what is meant to be the same thing and to say it in what is meant to be the same words,[11] one nonetheless finds some previously present elements of the talk being dropped and some elements being added that were not part of the previous saying.[12] In the end, I aim to describe what sorts of elements these are that appear to be, or to have been, dispensable and what adding them or dropping them does to the talk in which they figure or previously figured.

The first task needing to be addressed in this larger project is to establish environments in which speakers are claimably, or better yet, *demonstrably,* oriented to producing talk that is "saying/doing the same thing by using the same words," or what I at times refer to more compactly as "same-talk." These environments are ones grounded either in some specifiable sequential or interactional juncture in the interaction or in some specifiable type of action or activity being implemented by the speaker. In either case, the point is that in finding the talk to replicate earlier talk or to depart from it, I am tapping a feature of the talk arguably oriented to by the participants—and methodically so. By the last phrase, I mean to capture that the orientation of the parties to the sameness or differentness of the talk is material to—rather than tangential to—constructing or recognizing the action or activity that that talk is recognizably implementing and that it was designed to recognizably implement.[13] Although undertaken in the service of this larger project here, the more particular commitment of this discussion is meant to stand on its own and to support other inquiries that may require examination of materials in which speakers appear oriented to saying again what they said before.[14]

There are several places in conversation—that is, either sequential contexts or specific practices of talking—in which speakers seem demonstrably oriented to producing talk that "says the same thing" as was said be-

fore and does so by saying it "in the same words." Among these are the following: (a) as a speaker's talk emerges from overlap with another's talk; (b) occasions on which a speaker whose earlier effort to say/do something has been "ineffective," that is, has not engendered any responsive talk or other conduct, and the speaker "tries again"; (c) in same-turn repair of the "insertion" sort in which bringing it off *as* an insertion turns on saying it the same way *but* for the inserted element(s); (d) when a speaker undertakes to confirm that another has correctly understood a previous, inexplicitly conveyed "message" or action; and the one taken up in the previous section, (e) when the prior saying has been followed by an indication that its reception or grasp is problematic—an indication embodied in other-initiated repair, and its speaker responds by "saying it again."

Now these environments are by no means equivalent. For example, whereas the last two are clearly designed to be heard as "repeatings," the first two may often be produced and heard as being said (to appropriate Garfinkel's [1967, p. 9] memorable phrase) "for another first time." Still, even in this capacity, the action being accomplished often turns on a recognition by interlocutor that what is being said was said before, and this is, indeed, *another* first time.

It should also be obvious that with the partial exception of the same turn repair instances, the circumstances of the second saying are different from those of the first. Most obviously because there has already been another saying or partial saying. Yet also because the resaying almost always follows something other than the first saying followed, and this element of sequential context is prima facie *con*sequential. The import of this claim is that a burden must be met in undertaking to establish that it is *not* consequential, but this burden can be met as, for example, in the case of resayings after overlap resolution or otherwise grounded nonimplicativeness in which the point of the "identical" resaying may be precisely to show that the current saying is *not* responsive or sensitive to anything that has happened since the first saying and inherits its sequential context.

Although the first and second sayings are thus in various ways ordinarily different, I start by showing that in each of these environments, speakers are oriented to producing "the same utterance as before."

Emerging From Overlap With Another Speaker

As a speaker emerges from overlap with another's simultaneous talk with their own talk in the clear, there are three sorts of things that pretty

much exhaust the range of sequelae (cf. Schegloff, 2000b, for a fuller discussion). First, the speaker may continue producing the TCU that was in progress as the competing speaker's turn came to an end or they dropped out as in Extract 42 at lines 4 to 6:

(42) Upholstery Shop, 43

```
1   James:          Alright. Becau:se, it's insu:red anyway, when I call de
2                   office, dey'll send a man up eh tuh put that glass I:N.
3   Vic:            Well,
4   James:    ->    But dis [person thet DID IT,
5   Vic:                    [If I see the person,
6   James:->         -IS GOT TUH BE:: ·hh taken care of. You know what I
                    mean,
```

Second, the speaker may abandon what they were in the process of saying and address themselves to what the other said in the just finished competing turn as in Extract 43 at lines 1 to 2 ("I have sir"):

(43) Bush/Rather (from Schegloff, 1988/1989, p. 231, simplified)

```
1   Rather:   ->    =Now [how do you- How] do you reconc-  ]  I have (sir ]
2   Bush:     ->          [ Read the memo.  ] Read the memo.] What they::]
3                   were doing.=
4   Rather:         How: can you reconci:le that...
```

Or third, they can abandon the ongoing utterance so as to say it again, this time free of the potential subversion of overlapping talk, or as I called it some years ago (Schegloff, 1973/1987), they can "recycle" it as in Extract 44 at lines 8 to 9:

(44) KC–4, 7:13—27

```
1   Rubin:          Well thee uhm (.)(a paz) they must have grown a culture.
2                   (0.5)
3   Rubin:          You know, (.) they must've I mean how lo- he's been in
4                   the hospital for a few day:s, right?
5                   {(1.0)/.hhh}
6   Rubin:          Takes a [bout a week to grow a culture, ]
7   Kathy:    ->            [ I don think they grow a    ] I don think they
8             ->    ^grow a culture to do a biopsy.
9     Rubin:        No:. (.) They did the biopsy while he was on the ^table.
```

10	Kathy:	Nononono. They did a frozen <u>sec</u>tion. when he [was on the tab [le.
11	Rubin:	[No,
		[( )
12	Kathy:	But they didn't do the- it takes a while to do a complete
13		biopsy.

The way a speaker shows that it is the third of these tacks that is being taken is to use the same words to show they are saying and doing the same thing. So this is one environment in which speakers do use the same words to say the same thing—to do "saying the same thing" in which "sameness" matters and is oriented to.

"Ineffective" Utterance

A second environment in which "same talk" is specifically deployed is closely related to this one but is more general. A speaker who finds some utterance to have been ineffective—in that no subsequent talk or action by interlocutor(s) has displayed any responsiveness to it—may "try again," doing so by saying again what had been said before and doing so with the same words. In Extract 45, Dave is undertaking to convey how much hard work was involved in his wife Kathy's creation of a weaving. At line 2, he finds himself in overlap with guest Rubin who is asking for confirmation of his understanding of Kathy's earlier account of her work.

(45) KC-4:17

1	Kathy:		You know, [( )]
2	Dave:	-->	[B u t- (·) b u t] listen tuh how long it]
3			Rubin: [In other words,] you gotta string up thee:-] you
4			gotta string up thee: colors, is that it?=
5	Kathy:		=Ri [ght.]
6	Rubin:		[I n] [thee:] in thee: [warp.]
7	Dave:		[°yeh°] [ ]
8	Kathy:		[Right.] Right.
9			(0.2)
10	Dave:	-->>	Buh listen tuh [how lo:ng it took to put in the-] the:- =
11	Kathy:	-->	[And then each weft-]
12	Dave:		=the <u>wa</u>:rps. [(though)]
13	Kathy:	-->>	[A n d] then each we:ft, y'know then I did-
14			I s- my warp was strung up. so that [I had (each colors.)

```
15     Rubin:                                                    [(Where's at come from,)
16                            "warp and weft."
17                            (0.8)
18     Kathy:       ↑I haven't the faintest notion.
19     Rubin:       I mean (there aren't many: [uh      [        ) ]
20     Kathy:                                   [(We     [        ]
21     Freda:                                            [ (      ] beautiful
22                            though, [↑really beau:tiful.
23     Kathy:                        [↑Thank you.
24                            (0.2)
```

Dave drops out of the overlap and (perhaps *because*) Kathy attends to Rubin's inquiry and responds to it. Dave allows the sequence engendered by Rubin's inquiry to come to possible completion (and even participates in it at line 7) and then redoes his earlier—hitherto ineffective—utterance at lines 10 through 12.

The kinship of this environment for same talk with the one previously sketched is underlined by the implication of overlap in both of them, but that is in some measure an artifact and a distraction here. A participant's utterance can be rendered ineffective in diverse ways, of which subversion by competing overlapping talk (or other activity) is only one, and the ineffectiveness can be short-lived or extended. In the case of recycled turn beginnings, the potential for ineffectiveness is short-lived, and the talk is recycled as soon as the competing talk has ended. In other instances, however, the competing activity engenders its own sequelae, which have their own claim on the ensuing trajectory of the conduct of the parties to the interaction. In Extract 45, this trajectory is limited and so the redoing of the ineffective talk comes quite close to the initial, ineffective, saying. In other instances, very long stretches of activity indeed may develop—so long that it may escape the notice of an external analyst that an utterance that follows that spate of activity is redoing an utterance and its action, which had previously occurred without consequence.

For example, in one instance from the Upholstery Shop data that some may recall from other research reports, 14 pages of single-spaced transcript intervene between the first and second saying, representing almost exactly 11 min in the interaction. Mike works in a neighborhood used furniture store, and Vic and James are janitors in several apartment houses in The Bronx in New York City in the early 1970s. Someone had broken a window in one of James's buildings in his absence; Mike and Vic had helped clean it up (mainly Vic), and they have been discussing that and other local matters in the Upholstery shop

(where they "hang out"), awaiting James's arrival to tell him about the incident. In their earlier discussion, Vic had anticipated that James might try to "confiscate" the garbage barrel (here also called a "can" or a "pail") in which he had put the broken glass. On James's arrival, they "greet him" with the news:

(46) US 36:33–37:

```
 1   VIC:              JA::[MES!
 2   MIK:                  [Somebuddy broke yer window Jim,
 3   JAM:              Eh(hh)h!
 4                     ((door slams))
 5   JAM:              I'm very well aware uh duh fact.
 6   VIC:              [AH, EN.
 7   JAM:              [(I'd like to) thank (you).
 8   JAM:              [Ahh heh
 9   VIC:      a-->    [En my [ p a i l ' s   ] the:h,
10   MIK:                     [It's cleaned up.]
11   RIC:              Heh-heh [heh-heh!
12   JAM:                      [(I'd [like tuh-)
13   VIC:      a-->                 [My pail's theh,
14   JAM:              Hoh?
15   VIC:      a-->    My pail w's in yuh hallway.
16   JAM:              Yo pai:l,
17   MIK:              Yeh with  [duh glass innit.
18   VIC:                        [My gahbidge pail!
19   MIK:              Wid all the glass [innit.
20   JAM:                                [DATCHO' PAIL?
21   MIK:              Uh [huh,
22   VIC:      b-->       [I CLEANED UP THE [ga::m gla::ss?
23   MIK:                                   [(Right).
24   VIC:              Shit.
25   JAM:              DATCHO' PAIL?
26   MIK:              [Uh huh,
27   VIC:              [Yeh.
28   JAM:              Well it ain't chors no mo', hh HEH HA HA huh uh!
```

One things leads to another for 11 min, and as a prior sequence is brought to a close, the following transpires:

(47) US, 53:07-25

```
 1   VIC:              Ja:mes,
 2   JAM:              =Uh right.=
 3   JAM:              =[(Uh hah?)
```

```
    4   VIC:     a-->>    =[The pail is in yuh hallway,
    5   VIC:              [(Uh,)
    6   JAM:              [I know it hu(hh)//h!
    7   VIC:              The-the- I didn' have a broom wit' me, if I udduh hadda
    8                     [broom I'd uh swept [up.
    9   JAM:              [e(hh)h!                    [
   10   JAM:                                          [That's alright.
   11   VIC:              So [(dat's, right on.)
   12   JAM:                  [That's a'ri'- somebody- [got it up, I don'know who.
   13   VIC:                                           [(Look). But do me a favr-
   14   VIC:              Do, me, one fa:vuh,
   15   VIC:     b-->>    I  [cleaned it up!
   16   JAM:                 [Yeh hh
   17   JAM:              Yeh right. I
   18   JAM:     c-->     Ih-deh ca:n, (I- brought de) can (I'll) set it dehr own the
   19                     sidewalk.
```

Note the return 11 min later of virtually identical utterances (with changes for deixis and initial vs. subsequent mention) at arrows a and b in the two extracts. Note as well that James shows his recognition that the request sequence that he had derailed in the earlier exchange by jokingly confiscating the barrel is being retried by Vic by now offering at arrow c to return it. Here then one can see that an utterance may be redone subsequently when it has not been sequentially implicative for reasons other than overlap[15] and that by saying it again in the same words, a speaker can get it recognized for what it was doing and can get it responded to now in a way it was not responded to before.

Insertions

A third environment in which doing showing the same thing is being said by using the same words occurs when a speaker undertakes same turn repair designed to achieve the insertion of a new element—ordinarily a word or phrase—into the turn in progress. The most common insertions are of descriptors being inserted just before what they are descriptors for as in the following case (described at greater length in Schegloff, 1987) in which a recent winner in the local automobile races in Ohio is being discussed:

(48) Auto Discussion, 5 (simplified)

```
    1   Curt:            Dz he go out there pretty regular¿
    2                    (1.5)
```

```
3    Mike:              Generally evry Saturdee.
4                       (1.2) )
5    Phyllis:           He wins js about evry Saturday too.
6    Curt:      ->      He- he's about the only regular <he's about the
7               ->      only good regular out there'z, Keegan still go out?
```

Here, "good" is inserted as a descriptor for "regular," and that operation is constituted as this repair's design by the repeating of all the elements of the TCU-so-far into which the new element has been inserted. The repeated part of the host TCU is rarely as extended as this, but this exemplar makes transparent the orientation to the relevance of using the same words as a way of showing "this is the same utterance *but for* the insertion."

Confirming Allusions

A fourth environment in which "same talk" is specifically deployed is one in which one interlocutor has offered a candidate or proposed understanding of what the other is conveying, and that other confirms the substance of the proffered understanding and also that it had indeed been inexplicitly conveyed in the preceding talk. To do such "confirming of an allusion" (as I have referred to it elsewhere; Schegloff, 1996a), the confirmer may, instead of employing confirmation tokens such as "right," "exactly," and so forth, repeat the candidate understanding that has been proposed as in Extract 49 at lines 9 through 10:

```
(49) Shreve: 2.
Interview with Susan Shreve on National Public Radio concerning her recent
novel.

1    Edwards:            Why do you write juvenile books.
2                        (0.5)
3    Edwards:            ['s that- b- (0.?) [hav]ing    [children? ]
4    Shreve:             [Because I love child[ren]. [I really do:]=
5                        =·hh I enjoy children:, ·hh I started writing: (·)
6                        juvenile books fer entirely pra:ctical reasons, ·hh
7                        (·)
8    Shreve:             [u- u-
9    Edwards:   ->       [Making money::.
10   Shreve:    ->>      Making [money
11   Edwards:            [yes ((+laughter))
12   Shreve:    ->>      that- that practical reason hhh
```

```
13                          (·)
14   Shreve:                I've been writing juvenile books for a lo:ng..
```

Here, Edwards has understood "entirely practical reasons" at line 6 to refer to making money; he offers that as his understanding at line 9 and has it confirmed by the speaker at line 10 through a resaying of just what he has proposed followed by overt relating of that exchange to the allusive "practical reasons," for which it was a "solution." (Additional exemplars can be found in Schegloff, 1996a). Here again, the specific action of "confirming *as* an allusion" (as well as *the* allusion) is implemented by the practice of confirming by repeating the interlocutor's proffered understanding, and so this is also an environment in which "sameness" matters and is oriented to.

Repeat in Response to Other-Initiated Repair

A fifth such environment in which a premium may be put on saying again what had been said before is the one taken up in earlier sections of this article; it occurs when a speaker's utterance has posed a problem of hearing and/or understanding for a recipient and the recipient has launched a course of "repair" by the sort of repair initiation construction that could be taken to claim only that something was heard to have been said. As noted earlier, parties to interaction know that such other-initiations of repair (ones such as "huh?," "hm?," "What?," "Pardon me?," "I can't hear you," etc. termed by Drew, 1997, "open class") do not invariably mark thoroughgoing inaccessibility of the talk; they do not invariably mark the whole of the prior turn as the trouble source, and they are not invariably to be understood as indicating a hearing problem and as requesting repetition. However, quite commonly they *are* taken (and apparently correctly) as potentially targeting the whole of the prior turn, as registering the type of trouble as "hearing" trouble, and as inviting as the appropriate form of repair a straightforward resaying of the trouble-source turn—overwhelmingly the turn preceding the repair initiation. Transparent instances of this sequential environment were provided earlier in Extracts 6 to 8 and are reproduced following for convenience:

(06) MTRAC 90–2; side 2 (NTRI #15a)

```
1   Marcia:           Hello
2   maria:     ->     °hello Marcia it's Maria how are you
```

```
 3   Marcia:   -> >      H:mmm?
 4   maria:    -> > >    °hello Marcia it's Maria how are you
 5   Marcia:              Hi-ah eh=eh Your voice still
 6   maria:               Yeah I kno:w. I had a fever last night 'n ah if- it
 7                        doesn't git any better I'(ll)- probably check inta
 8                        the doctor ·hh
 9   Marcia:              Is this the bronchi:tis sti°ll?
10   maria:               yeah. —right. It's just ah taking a longer time
11                        ta to heal
```

(07) CDHQ, 38 (NTRI #55a)

```
 1   CDD:               Go right out there.
 2   Vol:               Go right out there?
 3   CDD:               Yes, and you'll see uh you'll [ see su-
 4   Vol:                                            [What about identification to get
 5                      out there.
 6   CDD:               Uh-
 7   Vol:     -->       Will they let me out there.
 8   CDD:     -->>      Huh?
 9   Vol:     -->>>     Will they let me [out there.
10   CDD:                               [Yes suh they'll letchu out [there.
11   Vol:                                                          [I gotta mariner's
12                      pass, I mean I got [the (            )
13   CDD:                                  [That's all you need.
14   CDD:               That's all you need an' if you run into any trouble, you tell
15                      'em that the:: director of civil defense said …
16   Vol:               Ok I'll be right out there.
```

(08) Chinese Dinner, 55 (NTRI #137c)

```
 1   Beth:              No this isn' (        ). That's (what I wz, [      ).
 2   Don:     -->                                                 [I didn't
 3            -->       get that joke. I hope the [camera got it,
 4   Jerry:                                       [UmMo::::m
 5   John:    -->>      Wha:t?
 6   Don:     -->>>     I didn't get that joke. I hope the came [ra got [it.
 7   Jerry:                                                    [N o w [ we go=
 8   John:                                                            [Oh:,
```

Here again, then, the specific action being taken and the understanding that
it displays of the interlocutor's prior turn and the trouble that the turn
displays is implemented by the practice of repairing the trouble precisely
by saying again what had been said before; and so this is also an en-
vironment in which "sameness" matters and is oriented to.

DISPENSABLES ACROSS LOCI OF SAME TALK

Having sketched five environments in which "saying the same thing" by using the same words ("same-talk") is a demonstrably deployed practice, I now examine what if any latitude there is assessing which words compose the "saying of that thing" and which are taken to be extraneous or "dispensable." As we shall see, some "flexibility" is not only tolerated but is mandated. Indeed, it is not flexibility; it is constitutive of doing "saying the same thing" to use—in some respects—*different* words.

Preeminent here, and virtually invariant, is the replacement of various deictic terms to accommodate change of speaker—most obviously interchangeability of pronouns such as "I" and "you." Saying the same thing requires changing these words; leaving these words unchanged may undermine the recognizability of "saying the same thing" and transform it into a form of parody, mimicry, word play, and so forth. This will be noted with data on several occurrences in what follows and will thereafter be taken for granted. Extract 50 is taken from the opening presentation by a pediatric resident at a leukemia case conference; M2 is her supervising hematologist who has just arrived (late) at the conference (cf. Schegloff, 1996a, pp. 203–205 for a more detailed account).

(50) Schegloff, 1996a, p. 204

```
  1   M2:                There's almost an infinite number of things tuh
  2                      dis-discuss on-on this case between thuh new
  3                      technique of dialysis we use an' a helluva lot
  4                      of other things. You presented the:: I'm sorry
  5                      tuh be late I wz uh (.) ( ).
  6   Pr:                N-I j's presented thuh presenting histry 'n I
  7                      haven't gone into his subsequent course.=I
  8                      wi[ll quickly go into °that=°
  9   M2:                   [That's fine.
 10   M2:                =No. I'd like to talk about where we are.
 11         -->          You talked abou'what happened at thee other hospital?
 12   Pr:   -->>         I talked about what happened at thee other hospital.
 13                      He did get …
```

As will readily be recognized, this is another instance of the previously discussed environment of confirming an allusion. The resident had already launched into her presentation before M2's arrival, and at line 4, he is starting to get caught up on what has already been presented when he

breaks off into an apology for being late. The resident has heard "where
he was going" and replies at lines 6 through 8 about what she has already
presented ("I just presented the presenting history") and what she pro-
poses to do next. Then, at line 11, M2 asks a question whose answer can
be understood to have already been conveyed by the resident at line 6
("What happened at the other hospital" is surely part of the "presenting
history"), and she replies by "confirming the allusion" by repeating the
very words of the inquiry as its response—except for the replacement of
"you" by "I." It is this sort of replacement of deictic terms to accommo-
date change of speaker that I meant by writing just previoulsy that it is
constitutive of doing "saying the same thing" to use—in some respects—
different words. Variations of this sort will not be further addressed ex-
plicitly and will not be taken to undermine the claim of "same talk" or to
constitute a notable "modification" of the prior saying bearing on
dispensability. In what follows, I turn to examine the occurrence of the
sorts of elements I have found to be "dispensable" in the environment of
other-initiated repairs across other environments in which I have estab-
lished that "same-talk" is relevant for the participants. Space consider-
ations mandate that this examination be selective.

Resayings Postoverlap Resolution

In the environment of overlap and its resolution, as noted earlier, one
recurrent practice is to resay something that was said before as a "move" in
the working out of who gets the turn. In the practice of "recycling a turn be-
ginning" (Schegloff, 1973/1987), turn-initial markers may be omitted as a
"winning" overlap competitor emerges into the clear as in the previously
cited Extract 45 reproduced here:

(45) KC–4:17

```
1   Kathy:                You know, [(                )]
2   Dave:    b-->                    [B u t- (·) b u t] listen tuh how long it  ]
3   Rubin:   a-->                    [In other words, ] you gotta string up thee:- ]
4            a-->>      you gotta string up thee: colors, is that it?=
5   Kathy:              =Ri[ght.]
6   Rubin:                 [ I n ][thee: ] in thee: [warp.  ]
7   Dave:                  [°yeh°]          [       ]
8   Kathy:                                          [Right.] Right.
```

```
 9                          (0.2)
10   Dave:     b-->>       Buh listen tuh [how lo:ng it took to put in the-] the:- =
11   Kathy:    c-->                   [A n d   t h e n   e a c h   w e f t- ]
12   Dave:                 =the wa:rps. [(though)]
13   Kathy:    c-->>                   [ A n d  ] then each we:ft, y'know then I did-
14                         I s- my warp was strung up. so that [I had (each colors.)
15   Rubin:                                                    [(Where's at come from,)
16                         "warp and weft."
17                         (0.8)
18   Kathy:    ↑I haven't the faintest notion.
19   Rubin:    I mean (there aren't many: [uh      [          )]
20   Kathy:    [                          (We      [          ]
21   Freda:                                        [ (        ] beautiful
22              though, [↑really beau:tiful.
23   Kathy:             [↑Thank you.
24                         (0.2)
```

Here, at lines 2 through 4, Dave and Rubin find themselves talking si-
multaneously and persistently so. As Rubin hears Dave withdraw, he re-
cycles his turn to that point using the same words (the "a" arrows) but
omitting the turn-initial paraphrase marker "in other words."[16] One obser-
vation, then, is that the same dispensability previously registered in the
environment of responses to other-initiated repair is found in this other
environment of "same-talk"—recycling of overlapped talk on emergence
into the clear.

In the same extract, however, one can see just the opposite practice
as well at lines 2 and 10 and again at lines 11 and 13. In the first of these
(not so much an instance of overlap retrieval as an utterance that got no
uptake and was then redone), Dave withdraws from overlap with Rubin,
and when he undertakes again to get his utterance said effectively, he
uses the same words *including* the turn-initial "But." At line 11, Kathy
finds herself in overlap with Dave and withdraws, but on completion of
his utterance, she resays what she had said or *started* to say before, re-
taining the turn-initial "and." Indeed, she does this same saying—use of
the same words—precisely to show that this is what she was saying be-
fore and then drops it in favor of an alternative form of talk, which is thus
formed up as "the same thing I was saying before now put differently"
(see Schegloff, 2000b, pp. 31–32 for discussion). In the environment of
overlap or otherwise ineffective talk then, speakers can do "same talk,"
and this can be done while *dropping* turn-initial markers or *retaining*
them.

Other Restarts

It is worth mentioning that "restarts" occur in different environments and for different uses than management of overlap. Goodwin (1980), for example, showed that they can be used as an element of "phrasal breaks" as a practice for attracting the gaze of an otherwise-not-aligned recipient for a speaker's talk. Whether in such an environment or in other deployments of the restarting of a turn or TCU, the restart may employ different words (thereby potentially changing what is being said or done) or the same words as composed the just prior start. When the restart features the same words, it may include a previously used turn- or TCU-initial marker, as the "en" in Extract 51:

```
(51) TG, 13:32–38

    1   Bee:              'T's too muh-they did that with my linguistics class a:lso.
    2   Ava:              hh[hh!
    3   Bee:                [·hh they stuck us in a cornuh somepla[ce.
    4   Ava:                                                     [mThat's funny. ·hhh
    5   Bee:      ->       En this- en::: this guy fuh linguistics lass- lafts et iz
    6                      own: jo:kes (h)yihknow so [it's-
    7   Ava:                                        [mYe:h
```

Or it may omit the previously used turn- or-TCU-initial marker as with "en" in Extract 52, the "plus" in Extract 53, and the "You know" in Extract 54:

```
(52) MDE, Stolen, 1:14–20

    1   Marsha:           En Ilene is going to meet im:.Becuz the to:p wz ripped
    2                     off'v iz car which is tih say someb'ddy helped th'mselfs.
    3   Tony:             Stolen.
    4                        (0.4)
    5   Marsha:           Stolen.=Right out in front of my house.
    6   Tony:     ->      Oh: f'r crying out loud,=en eez not g'nna eez not
    7                     g'nna bring it ba:ck?
```

```
(53) SN–4:11

    1   Kar:              Oh my friend useteh make up the best insurance stories.
    2                     ·hhh He ha:d u:m (1.0) Whuh wuz iht. (0.3) Oh. He had
    3                     some paint: (·) da:mage.on iz car.=so he wz going tih-
    4                     {(0.5)/·hh} get these gu:ys t'throw e:ggs en all this
    5                     stuff at it.'n write- (0.2) t-Je::w en all this stuff
```

```
 6                       all [over   it. ] = [jus' so: he could ] claim=
 7    Mark:                    [°(mm hm)]   [ heh  hih  Je:w. ]
 8    Kar:               =it on [iz insurance en get]ta free: uh- (0.8) paint job.
 9    Mark:                          [How appropriate [ly   ]
10    (??)                                            [hhh]
11                         (·)
12    Mark:               mm hmm
13    Kar:        ->      Plus once he got- (0.8) some u:m (1.3) he got some ba:ttery
14                        acid on: (·) on his trunk er ≠something the [t someb'dy did. ]
15    ?She:                                                           [ Ooh  I   did ]
16                        too.
```

(54) TG 17:23–26

```
 1    Ava:                Why donch [a I mean you won' haftuh do any ]thing,
 2    Bee:       -->                 [.hh  You  know  I  wu-u-u  ] I wonder if
 3                        Do:nna went back tuh school, i'z [I wz curious tuh know, ]
```

Once we see that such turn- or-TCU-initial elements are dispensable, their retention on resaying invokes the possibility that their inclusion was *indispensable* for the accomplishment that it implements and prompts a search by interlocutors for what that accomplishment may be—"why that now"; and for that reason, it prompts such a search for inquirers as well.

The same may be said for restarts that choose to add a turn- or TCU-initial marker where there was none on the initial saying. Such restarts with inserts treat the inserted element as indispensable in context—so indispensable that the speaker interrupts the unit in progress so as to incorporate the inserted element in what will turn out to have been said. Extracts 55 and 56 offer two specimens of such inserts, both involving the misplacement marker "By the way," which figured in the earlier discussion of other-initiated repair sequences:

(55) SN–4, 1

```
 1               (knock knock knock knock))
 2                       (1.0)
 3    Ruth:             Tch. C'mi::n.
 4                       (1.4)       ((door squeaks))
 5    Mark:             Hi Sherry, hi Ruthie,
 6    Ruth:             Hi Ma:rk.
 7    Sher:             Hi Ma:rk.=
 8    Mark:             =[How're you guys.
 9                       =[((door slams))
```

```
10                      (0.2)
11   Ruth:              Jis' fi:ne.
12                      (0.2)
13   Sher:              Uh:: tired.
14   Mark:              Tired, I hear yih gettin' married.
15                      (0.6)
16   (??):              °((sniff))
17                      (0.3)
18   Sher:              Uh:: you hear right.
19                      (0.2)
20   Mark:              (Ih) shah-I hear ri:gh [t.
21   ?Shr:                                    [mmhh [(heh hh])
22   Mark:      ->                                  [Didja e-] by the way didja
                        ever
23                      call up uh: Century City Hotel 'n
24                      (1.0)
25   Sher:              Y'know h'much they want fer a wedding¿ It's incredible.
26                      (0.5)
```

(56) Wong, TJ:4:4

```
1    Tang:              Yeah, for the temple you know then the children
2                       grow up, you know
3                       (0.4)
4    Tang:      ->      Oh d- by the way did you get the tapes?
5    Jim:               Oh yeah I did.
```

In both of these extracts, a speaker is beginning a new sequence at the ar-
rowed line. In each, the turn is cut off in progress, "by the way" is inserted,
and the "same turn" is restarted by using the same words and word parts as
had been used before ("Didja e-" in Extract 55 and "d-" in Extact 56 in
which, it may be noted, turn-initial "oh" is dropped from the first saying
and "by the way" is added to it).[17]

Turn-initial markers are not the only things that can be dropped,
added, or changed in restarts. Another change that was found in resayings
responsive to repair initiation was the shift between pro-terms and full ref-
erence forms (see Extracts 27 and 28 previously), and these can be found in
restarts as well. To cite but one instance

(57) TG, 4:01–14

```
1    Bee:               So, <I got some lousy cou(h)rses th(hh)is te(h)e(h)rm too.
2    Ava:               Kehh huh!
3    Bee:               ·hhh [h   m- ]
```

```
 4   Ava:                    [W-whe]n's yer uh, weh- you have one day y'only have
 5                           one course uh?
 6   Bee:           mMo[nday en Wednesday: [s right.] That's ] my linguistics=
 7   Ava:              [·hhhh                 [ O  h. ] that's- ]
 8   Bee:           =course [hh
 9   Ava:                   [O[h, oh [ : .     ]
10   Bee:      -->             [·hhh  [This i ]s (a)-/(w)- This course is a winnuh
11                   (hh)ih really i(h) [ : s .     ]
12   Ava:                             [ Oh I ha ]ve thee- I have one class in the
13                   e:vening.
14   Bee:           On Mondays?
```

At line 10, Bee is apparently starting to say "This is a winner," but restarts to expand the pro-term "this" to the full reference "this course," treating it as nondispensable in context.

Confirming Allusions

Another of the environments of relevance for same talk previously introduced was that of "confirming allusions." As remarked earlier and exemplified in Extracts 49 and 50, a speaker can confirm that an interlocutor's proposed understanding of preceding talk is correct in its "content" and in its having registered that content as previously inexplicitly conveyed (or "alluded to") by repeating the interlocutor's proposed understanding. In doing so, the confirming speaker commonly omits from the "same saying" "realization" markers such as "oh" (what Heritage, 1984, called "change-of-state tokens") or "inference" markers such as "then" or "so" as, for example, in Extract 58:

(58) Brun-Cottan, 1989, 5:2

```
 1   M:             ...you:::
 2   F:             I'm well: thank you.
 3   M:             .hh(d) you sound like you have a jo:b hh
 4   F:             No I do:n(hh)(hh)'t. .hh
 5   M:      -->    Oh you're not tha:t wel[l.
 6   F:     -->>                           [I'm not that well, .hh
 7   M:             Oh: goodness::.
 8   F:             I- before we get into anything else …
```

M has suspected from the vigor of F's response at line 2 that she has met with success in the job search in which they are both engaged. In reinter-

preting the response of line 2 at line 5, M begins with the change-of-state marker "oh" to register the revision prompted by F's rejection of the initial "read." In repeating the candidate understanding at line 6, F not only changes the pronouns to suit the change of speakers (as in the previously discussed Extract 50); she omits that turn-initial marker—as was noted earlier in repeats following other-initiated repair; see, for example, Extracts 09 to 12 previously. (See Schegloff, 1996a, pp. 188–189, for further treatment of this exchange.)

In Extract 59, a turn-terminal inference marker is dropped in the repeat of the turn being confirmed:

(59) Heritage, Allusions, #27

```
1   Dana:              So (.) I'm g'nna watch Neighbors
2                      hh then I sh' get changed
3   Gordon:            .hhh [hhhhhhh
4   Dana:                   [An' then I sh' be over.
5   Gordon:   -->      Are you home then.
6                                     (0.2)
7   Dana:     -->>     I'm ho:me
8                                     (1.0)
```

Dana is setting out the activities to be completed before coming over to visit Gordon. Gordon offers the understanding he has gleaned from her account about where she is calling from and marks this as an inference with his "then." When Dana confirms (at line 7) where she is and that she had been conveying that inexplicitly, she drops that inference marker.

Exquisite evidence is provided in Extract 60 that parties may be oriented to just the issue of inclusion or exclusion of such markers. Two students are discussing the state of a mutual acquaintance who has just undergone radical facial surgery:

(60) Drew (Schegloff, 1996a, pp. 189–192)

```
1   B:                 but e- I mean he was in a terr:ible state, because
2                      they- W( ) they took away the roof of his mouth an'
3                      his cheek bone an' all the inside of his nose.
4                      (0.8)
5   B:                 an' his one eye they've sewed ^up.
6                      (0.5)
7   P:                 ^e::h::::
```

```
 8                        (0.5)
 9   B:                   ((cough)) (0.4) yeah and th [en-
10   P:                                              [so he's in quite a state
11                        [reall [y *is he.*
12   B:                   [Oh he[is, an' of course he can't eat: you see,
13                        or swallow so he's just having these fluids and things,
14                        (0.9)
15   P:                   ^oo::h[:
16   B:                         [he's so thin that I think 'tis really (.) quite
17                        unbelievable you know that anybody could be so thin.
18   P:                   O::^h: [:^
19   B:                         [and still sort of (0.3) sit u(h)p if (h) you
20                        kn(hh)ow what I mean.
21   P:                   ^o::h:: ^God[ :   ]:
22   B:                               ['tem]
23                        (.)
24   P:         ->        He can't eat any solid food at all[: then?
25   B:                                                      [he can't
26              ->>       eat any solid food at all at the moment.
27   P:                   o^o::h ^my:-
```

Here again P has gathered from B's account what the consequences of
the surgery must have been and marks this with an inference marker
("then" at line 24). B projects the end of P's turn to come at its grammati-
cally possible completion (at "at all") and starts the confirmatory repeat
at just that point with the consequence that the turn-final inference
marker is overlapped. Even though such discourse markers are regularly
dropped in such contexts and activities, B undertakes to show that he
heard the item that his overlapping talk potentially obscured. He does so
by a practice of adding to the end of his turn evidence that he had heard
what was obscured by its beginning (Schegloff, 1973/1987, pp. 83–84).
What he does here is to add not an inference marker (although "then"
might have been heard as a "consequence" marker, i.e., the consequence
of the surgery) but a contrast to the polysemic temporal meaning of the
word he has overlapped ("at the moment" emerging then as something of
a macabre pun). The point here, however, is the evidence that what is be-
ing said, said again, omitted from a resaying, and so forth are indeed
closely monitored and perceivedly consequential features of the talk in
its course. (Further account of this data is in Schegloff, 1996a, pp.
190–192.)

However, when an allusion is being confirmed, its "same talk" may in-
clude a turn-initial inference marker as well, as in Extract 61 in which Vera

has been telling Jenny about the recent visit of her daughter, son-in-law, and grandchildren:

(61) Rahman B:2:JV(14)2 (#12)

```
 1   Vera:              Any rate ehv eh ah'm tapin' fuh Bill no:w:
 2                      etheh little devils with the ta:pes you kno:w
 3   Jenny:             Oh: they pull the tap[es (puhhaps do they)]
 4   Vera:                               [A h : n d   e m : ]
 5   Jenny:             Mhm,=
 6   Vera:              =Jean said oh I didn't knew- (·) know you had the
 7                      Tapestry reco:rd. of Carol King's which is a luvly
 8                      reco[:rd Jenny ]
 9   Jenny:                 [Ah: she li]kes[thaht does she
10   Vera:                                [So-
11   Jenny:             Mm,
12   Vera:              I: s'd why:: so: she s'd oo ahr James: broke it.
13                      (0.3)
14   Vera:              So ah s'd oh well ah'll do y'anothuh
15                      one.yihkno [w, ahn also they wa:nt eh:m (·)=
16   Jenny:                        [Mm:,
17   Vera:              =Neil Diamond, Bill listen'to it heahr 'n'e sid oh thaht's
18                      smashin,=
19   Jenny:             =A [h t h e y: [like  [the Neil [Diamond,]
20   Vera:                 ['n ah sai [d ah-[·hh      [ah'll tape] it
21                      [fohr you]=
22   Jenny:             [Y e : s.]
23   Vera:              =en John Denver they want doing.yih [know,]
24   Jenny:                                               [ehhhh]=
25         -->         heh so yuh busy at it [again. ]
26   Vera:     -->>                         [So: ah]'m busy at it
27                     agay:[n.  yih [nuhhh
28   Jenny:                 [·hhhh[hu:h ·uh
```

Here Vera's repeat of Jenny's upshot-formulating utterance at lines 26 to 27 includes its inference marking "so."

Same-talk in the context of allusion confirmation can be done while dropping an initial or final discourse marker or while retaining it, although the default appears to be dropping it.

Once again, I note that it is not only turn-initial or final markers that figure in the environment of confirming allusions as they did in responses to other-initiated repair. In Extract 62, the same dropping of early elements of the TCU itself is seen in this environment as was earlier exemplified in

Extracts 14 through 21. In Extract 62, for example, one sees the same drop-
ping of the subject term that one saw in Extract 14. The setting is an edito-
rial conference at a major city newspaper evaluating possible stories for the
next day's edition; CE is the city editor, ME is the managing editor, and BE
is the business editor:

(62) Schegloff, 1996a, pp. 205–206

```
 1   CE:              This story is cute.
 2   ?F:              hhh! (0,8) hhh
 3   CE:              Kid yesterday w- uh Sunday goes out to the park with
 4                    his parents, (0.4) [really liked the park.
 5   ?F:                                 [((whispering))
 6                    (0.5)
 7   CE:              So what happens?
 8   ?F:              *(This is )*
 9   CE:              He wakes up in the middle of the night, (.) Sunday-
10                    (.) Sunday night, (0.3) decides that he is gonna get
11                    outta the house, this is in Logan Squa:re, and go back
12                    to the park. (1.0) This is a three year old kid.
13   ??:              Hhh
14   CE:              Gets lost on the way, (0.2) police- somebody calls the
15                    cops about three a'clock in the morning and says
16                    hey there's a kid on the street. (0.2) Cops come out,
17                    pick the kid up, (0.3) take him to the station, .hh he
18                    goes through hamburgers, he goes through all kinds of
19                    uh junk food, (1.0) finally the cops: give up.=I mean
20                    the- uh little- kid can't remember his name or isn't
21                    telling it, (0.5) can't remember his address, (0.4) uh:
22                    cops take him out on the street just for a- a walk along
23                    tour of the neighborhood hoping that you know maybe if
24                    the kid will remember something, .hh kid spots his cat
25                    (0.8) follow the cat into this apartment building he's
26                    follow the cat- follow the cat into an apartment building
27                    (.) knock on the door (0.7) Mommy comes- comes out 'nd
                      says
28                    WHAT THE HECK ARE YOU DOING OUTTA HERE.
                      (0.4) As it turns
29                    out she's always hated the cat until this morning.
30                    (1.0)
31   ME:              (She) loves the [cat now ((laughter))
32   BE:       -->                    [She didn't realize her son was missing?
33   CE:       -->>   Didn't realize her son was missing.
34                    (0.6)
35   GE:              Sleeping at three in the morning I'd think I'd
```

36	BE:	>Oh what <u>time</u> was h- you know what time he was brought <u>ho</u>me?
37	CE:	Uh::early today.
38	BE:	Oh
39		(3.0)

The story has conveyed, without stating explicitly, that the child had wandered out of the house unbeknownst to his parents. When the business editor offers that candidate understanding for confirmation at line 32, the city editor both confirms it and does so in a fashion that registers as well that it had been inexplicitly conveyed before. He does so by "repeating" the prior turn (at line 33); but this repeating deletes the subject term "She" from the first saying, much as we have seen such deletions in resayings in response to other-initiated repair (as in Extract 14 previously).

RECAPITULATION AND DISCUSSION

The central points of the preceding pages have been these:

1. Although not all deployments of the weakest repair initiations ("huh?," "what?," etc.) are properly understood as displaying hearing problems and requesting repetition of the trouble source turn, some are.

2. Trouble-source speakers who are responding with such an understanding respond with a "repeat"; they display their orientation to doing so by doing "same talk," that is, by "using the same words."

3. It turns out that doing repeats by doing "same talk" can involve departures from the words employed in the initial saying. Some words that figured in the initial saying are omitted or dispensed with in the repeat without subverting its status as a repeat. Some words that did not figure in the initial saying may be added in the repeat or may replace words from the initial saying, thereby treating elements that had been treated earlier as dispensable as indispensable, and this also does not compromise the status of the utterance as a repeat.

4. Among the elements that appear to figure, or to have figured, in dispensability in responses to other-initiated repair, the following were brought to attention and documented:

   (a) Discrete turn-initial markers of various sorts.
   (b) Discrete turn-final object of various sorts.

(c) Early positioned constituents of the turn-initial TCU including subject terms, auxiliary verbs, main verbs, and so forth.

(d) Pro-terms, demonstratives, and definite descriptions.

5. Responses to some of the weakest other-initiations of repair are not the only sequential environment for the relevant deployment of the practices of "same talk." Four others were described and documented:

(a) Recycling TCUs on emergence from overlap with another.

(b) Redoing an earlier turn that was rendered "ineffective" by not being responded to.

(c) Same-turn self-repair doing an insertion into an already ongoing TCU or other same-turn repair.

(d) Confirming an allusion by repeating its explication by recipient.

6. In selectively documenting the appearance of dispensability in other environments of same talk, it turns out that turn-initial markers, turn-final objects, omission of early constituents of the TCU, and replacement of pro-terms by full-form references may be found in the other environments as well—recycling parts of turns either for insertion, redoing, or on emergence from overlap and confirming allusions.

7. It also turns out that there is some variability between these environments. For example, in restarting or resaying a turn or turn start rendered potentially or actually ineffective by overlap or nonresponse, one finds both the deletion and the retention of turn-initial markers; in response to other-initiation of repair, they appear overwhelmingly to be dropped. It is to this observation that I return to here.

One possible understanding of the difference might be formulated by reference to location or sequential position along lines such as the following. When the resaying is done as a product of winning the floor fight, that is, in the same turn position (as in Extract 45 at the "a" arrows), then turn-initial markers may be deleted, the final saying of the turn in the clear being treated as still being under the scope of—as still in effect incorporating—the discourse marker with which it began, even though it may have been compromised by its implication in overlap. When said in a *new* turn position, however, that is, when the speaker's first saying came to naught and was ineffective and is retried in a recognizably new turn position (as in Extract 45 at the "b" and "c" arrows), then the turn-initial marker is re-

tained; the efficacy of its previous articulation is lost when the turn is re-done in a new turn position.

An alternative account of deletion or retention of turn-initial markers would focus not on location or position but rather on what is *done* by each of them. Dropping the turn-initial marker can display a speaker's stance that what it was being used to do is no longer relevant, either because the present sequential context is different or because of the continuing effectiveness of its prior deployment. Retaining it can display both its continuing relevance and the possible *in*effectiveness of the prior deployment or the speaker's display that the current saying means to "inherit" or retrieve the sequential context of the prior saying, and it does this by duplicating the effort to fit to it that the turn-initial marker embodies.

In contrast to the environment of responses to "weak" other-initiations of repair, then, in which same-talk responses virtually always drop turn-initial markers (because the resaying occupies a distinctive and different turn position, viz., responding to the repair initiation), in the environment of emergence from overlap, inclusion and deletion of a previously articulated turn-initial marker constitute alternative practices that accomplish different stances or sequential positionings for the repeated talk.

Perhaps these are best treated not as alternatives but as conjointly relevant if not reflexive. On one hand, position matters; whereas undertaking repair on one's prior turn after other-initiation of repair by recipient is not seriously optional, persisting in overlap until the other stops does not constrain the remaining speaker to redo the turn so far (alternatives were sketched at Extracts 42 and 43 previously and elaborated in Schegloff, 2000b). On the other hand, whatever the position, there remains the issue of what the speaker undertakes to do in and by redoing some earlier talk. I noted earlier that by retaining a turn-initial marker, the speaker reclaims the sequential position the first saying occupied and marked by that turn-initial marker. Deleting it declines to do so. However, even in replies to other-initiation of repair, a speaker may display an orientation not only to the position of responding to the repair initiation but also to the position that was occupied by the prior saying of the utterance—the one targeted as a trouble source by the repair initiation. Consider, for example, Extract 6, reproduced following:

(06) MTRAC 90–2; side 2 (NTRI #15a)

    1   Marcia: Hello
    2   maria: -->   °hello Marcia it's Maria how are you

3	Marci:	-->>	H:mmm?
4	maria:	-->>>	°hello Marcia it's Maria how are you
5	Marcia:		Hi-ah eh=eh Your voice still
6	maria:		Yeah I kno:w. I had a fever last night 'n ah i<u>f</u>- it
7			doesn't git any better I'(ll)- probably check inta
8			the doctor ·hh
9	Marcia:		Is this the bronchi:<u>tis</u> sti°ll?
10	maria:		yeah. —right. It's just ah taking a longer time
11			ta to heal

In responding to the repair initiation by repeating not only the self-identification and "howaryou" inquiry that will be sequentially implicative but also her greeting and address term, Maria's repeat shows her orientation to the position in the overall structural organization of the conversation in which she is talking. It is not simply that some sequential position "shapes" what a speaker will do in an utterance and how they will do it; what they do and how they do it activates the relevance of the sequential position it displays an orientation to. This is not a new theme; it obtains elsewhere in the organization of repair (e.g., Schegloff, 1992, pp. 1326–1334), in the organization of reference to persons (e.g., Schegloff, 1996b, pp. 451–453), and elsewhere. Sequential position and the character of what is done in it are reflexive—distinct and yet inseparable.

NOTES

1 These are what Drew (1997) referred to as "open class" initiators. That term, however, implies a contrast with "restricted class" initiators (or some such term), perhaps initiators like "Who?," "Where?," or "When?." This way of partitioning forms of other-initiation of repair therefore appears to address only the set I have termed the "request" type and not the "offer" type, which is constructed around specifics, not classes. Some have understood "open class" initiators always to have as their trouble-source some sequential or topical disjunction, and the ordinary progression of sequences or topics from turn to turn contributes to the possibility of sustaining such a view. Extracts 01 through 05 can be taken to show that not all such "open class" repair initiators are to be understood by reference to topical or sequential disjunctures and perhaps not even the majority.

2 This exchange is taken from a telephone call between a volunteer (Vol) and the Director of Civil Defense (CDD) in the course of a major disaster.

3 The second of these usages of dispensability is more a literary than an analytic one. I do not mean to suggest that the speaker had "begun" with a fuller version of the utterance

and then omitted parts of it that were considered dispensable but wrongly so. It is only with the retrospect afforded by the addition of new elements in the resaying that their "indispensability to begin with" is brought into view. My thanks to Gene Lerner for suggesting that this asymmetry be made explicit.

4   More specifically, on the misplacement marker ("by the way"), in one respect, this is a right place to mention that one thing having been announced to be dead ("the switchboard"), there is now another dead thing ("the electricity"). On the other hand, it is also clear from the response to the first announcement, which was "bury it" and which was clearly treating it as a joke, that that sequence wasn't finished yet. So reporting a second thing being in trouble, although it is relevant on one hand, is slightly wrongly placed on the other because another sequence is hearably still in progress. Although the "by the way" drops out in the repeat, the thing that warrants the observation about the electricity being dead (that the PBX has been said to be dead, which is the allusion of the "too")— the "too"—is retained into the resaying.

5   I might add that the reverse is not the case in the data available to me. That is, such turn-initial operators are not added to the repeat of a turn in response to other-initiated repair when not present in its initial saying. I add this negative observation in anticipation of subsequent discussion in which other usages are found to be both dropped or added in response to repair initiation.

6   For an examination of zero anaphora in English, compare Oh (2002), *Referring to People in Korean and English,* one of whose findings is the recurrence of "zero anaphora" in repeats or resayings (among other sequential locations).

7   In contrast to views that take sentential forms to be the default for the organization of language, among the most *common* reductions in repeats of a trouble source in response to repair initiation is—the text has suggested—to *drop* the full sentence format and repeat only the key element(s), that is, to *de*-sententialize it. In some instances, this involves just the so-called (by some linguists) pro-drop, that is, the omission of the subject pronoun as in Extract 14; but the text has shown more extensive "dropping" than that. In these instances then, it is not that stripped down utterances are problematic and are restored to sentential form when they prove recalcitrant to the recipient's grasp; just the opposite is the case. Of course, the former does also happen, as in the following:

   (a) Schenkein 2:17 (NTRI #7)

1	Joe:		C'mon now=
2	Joe:		=I don' wanche t'get sick.
3	Sam:	->	Get there I'll have so[mething.
4	Joe:	->	[Huh?
5	Sam:	->>	When I <u>get</u> there <u>I</u>'ll <u>eat</u>.
6	Joe:		<u>Yeah</u>=
7	Joe:		=butche better eat sumpn before.

Here the repeat at line 5 includes a "When I" that was not present in the first saying. See also the soon-to-be discussed Extract 33:

(33) Earthquake IV, 40–41 (NTRI #105a)

```
 1  D:        ->        Have yer name an'= phone number please,
 2  D:                  [Just-
 3  S:        ->        [I beg yer pardon?
 4  D:        ->>>      C'd I have yer name an' phone number in case
 5                      [ I 'av to call you back,
 6  S:                  [ (        ) my name?
 7                      ((pause))
 8  S:                  It's-
 9  S:                  I:: didn' hear yuh sir,
10  D:                  C'd I have yer name, an' phone number in case I haf tuh call
11                      you back,
```

Here the repeat at line 4 includes a "Could I" that was not there at line 1.

8 Of course, an address term can have a different use than targeting an addressee, and such address terms might figure differently in the repeat. For example, Liana Grancea (personal communication, May 15, 2002) examined address terms in turn-final position that occur precisely in second sayings after a first saying has failed to be sequentially implicative.

9 I should say that these terms are not always dropped on repeat. For example

Earthquake IV:54 (NTRI #106a)

```
 1  S:                  Fire prevention please,
 2  D:        ->        Uh  There's no one ninnere right now sir,
 3  S:        ->>       I beg yer pardon,
 4  D:        ->>>      There's no one in nere at-at th'moment sir,
```

10 It may be useful to add some account of what is going on here to fill in this "constructional sketch" with its interactional specificity. Mike works in a used furniture store in the Bronx in the early 1970s; Vic and James are janitors in neighborhood apartment houses who "hang out" in the furniture store. Someone (perhaps a tenant) had broken a window in one of James's buildings while James was away from the site, and Vic had "cleaned up the mess." While awaiting James's return, Vic is recounting to Mike and Rich (who is a tenant in Vic's building and is recording the occasion) his encounter with a tenant whom he suspects of having broken the window; at the same time, Mike has been trying to ask how come James himself had not so far been involved. For several minutes, as Vic is recounting his confrontation with the tenant, Mike has recurrently tried to ask about this with the following series of turn fragments (intermingled with responses to Vic's telling), none of which elicit a reply: "Didju-," "Dih-," "You couldn't

find Jim?," and "Didju find Jim?"; and then line 1 of Extract 37 continues this undertaking of Mike's.

Note just the following features of the line Mike is taking:

1. The focus of his inquiries is Vic's conduct, not James' conduct.
2. The potential interactional delicateness of this is reflected in Mike's vacillation between what Vic did and what Vic could do—as in "You couldn't find Jim?" and "Didju find Jim?" previously, and "Y'didn't getta holda-" and "Y'couldn't gitta hol-" in Extract 37 at lines 1 and 6, respectively, the "didn't"'s attributing the outcome to Vic, the "couldn't"'s mitigating his responsibility.
3. Either way, a negative observation about the recipient's conduct is subject to being heard as a complaint or criticism (Schegloff, 1988; Jacoby & Gonzales, 2002), and both "Y'didn't getta holda-[Jim]" and "Y'couldn't gitta hol- [Jim]" are vulnerable to such a hearing.
4. So the shift at line 8 to "Jim wasn' home uh what" can be understood as backing away from this possible analysis by Vic by offering a candidate account for Vic's "not contacting" James rather than the fact itself, but it continues to make Vic accountable in some respect.

11 Saying the same thing does not require using the same words. In Schegloff (1976/1984), I proposed about the two successive utterances "For whom" and "By what standard" that, in context, they were saying—and doing—the same thing, perhaps in a fashion that using the same words would not have achieved.

12 There is a difference, then, between a "word repeat" as it figures in, for example, "word repeat to mark turn end" (as discussed in my NCA talk of November 1998 [Schegloff, 1998]) and "saying the same thing by using the same words." The former points to, invokes, and displays a current speaker's continuing orientation to what was going on in the talk in which the repeated word or construction figured. Saying the whole, or virtually the whole, of some earlier TCU is a different undertaking than inserting into otherwise different talk an element from earlier talk.

13 The concern with "saying same thing in same way" at issue here is perhaps the prototype contrast with Chomsky's (1959) early preoccupation with a grammar that could generate an "infinity of new sentences." These are designedly *not* new sentences, whereas "new sentences" are rarely *designedly* new sentences; perhaps it would be useful to find and discuss some *designedly* new sentences. In any case, one may ask the context for deciding whether something is a "new sentence." In the Chomsky tradition, I think this means "in the context of all the sentences ever produced or produceable." The point of "new sentences" for Chomsky (1959) was very likely in contrast to a Skinnerian behaviorist model (Skinner, 1957) in which someone is trained to produce some sentence(s) by reinforcement and so forth, and one can then ask, as an investigator looking at a collection of sentences, can the subject produce another sentence other than the one trained—a "new" sentence. Yet this is hardly the way the matter presents itself in the real world of users of the language. However, the more relevant context for actual users of a language, actual producers of sentences, may be sentences (or other TCUs) recently produced. What does "recently" mean

here? Longer than one might suppose; see, for example, the discussion of Extracts 46 and 47 at pages 123–125 below.

14 For example, the psychologist Slobin and his associates (e.g., Küntay & Slobin, 1996; Slobin, Hoiting, & Küntay, 1999) have introduced into the study of child language acquisition the notion of a "variation set," that is, "a series of utterances that express a constant intention, along with lexical substitution and various sorts of rephrasing and reordering" (Slobin et al., 1999). Such variation sets "can help the child discover argument structures of verbs, discourse pragmatics of speech acts, and cultural levels of event analysis." Here there would seem to be a premium on seeing successive utterances as variants of "the same thing" and make relevant such issues as how the recipient could come to grasp that and what can vary—be added, dropped, reordered, and so forth—as part of constructing such a succession of sayings. It to such issues that the work reported here is directed.

15 Although overlap surely occurs in the exchange, the sequence is diverted not by the overlap but by a mock confiscation of the pail/can. When the sequence is retried, "I cleaned it up" is not sequentially deleted as it was before by "checking the ownership of the pail" but is met by the offer to return it.

16 In Schegloff (1973/1987), I argued that the "in other words," in displaying that the talk to come would be engaged in repair, made a special claim on rights to the turn but that that claim was no longer relevant when the recycle was done, precisely because it was done just when the fight for the turn space had been won.
"In other words" as an idiom registers the relevance of an orientation to same versus other words—here the relevance of "other words" used to say "the same thing" as a practice for showing understanding. This suggests that ordinarily "other words" would be initially parsed for the "other thing" being said. This marker—"in other words"— alerts the hearer: Parse this not for a *new* thing being said/done but for "same thing as last said," which is to say that, ordinarily, "same thing" is to be said in "same words."

17 Here is another in which "Well" at line 4 is dropped, and "Lemme think" at line 6 is added:

(a) TG, 11:08–14

```
 1   Bee:                                   [I didn'know when you were hh[ome=
 2   Ava:                                                                  [Tch!
 3   Bee:               =[or-I wz gunnuh k- ]
 4   Ava:        -->      [We l l  M o n d a  ] y:::,
 5                               (0.2)
 6   Ava:        -->>   Lemme think. ·hhh Monday::: Wednesday, (0.5) and
                        Friday(s).
 7                      I'm home by one ten.
```

I have *no* instances in which a same-talk resaying in response to other-initiated repair adds a turn- or TCU-initial marker that was not present in the initial saying.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of verbal behavior by B. F. Skinner. *Language, 35,* 26–58.

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28,* 69–101.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry, 50,* 272–302.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Jacoby, S. W., & Gonzales, P. (2002). Saying what wasn't said: Negative observation as a linguistic resource for the interactional achievement of performance feedback. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 123–164). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Küntay, A., & Slobin, D. I. (1996). Listening to a Turkish mother: Some puzzles for acquisition. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 265–286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society, 32,* 177–201.

Oh, S.-Y. (2002). *Referring to people in Korean and English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 28–52). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. First appeared as Schegloff, E. (1976). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In Vol. 2.2, pp. D8–G1. Pragmatics Microfiche: Department of Linguistics, Cambridge University; partially reprinted as Schegloff, E. A. (1976). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In W. U. Dressler (Ed.), *Current trends in textlinguistics* (pp. 81–102). New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50,* 101–114.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 70–85). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. (Lecture delivered 1973)

Schegloff, E. A. (1988/1989). From interview to confrontation: Observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22,* 215–240.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided place for the defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 95,* 1295–1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 102,* 161–216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996b). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 437–485). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996c). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23,* 499–545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998, November). *Word repeat as a practice for ending.* Paper presented at the 84th Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New York.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000a). On granularity. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26,* 715–720.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000b). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society, 29,* 1–63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002). Overwrought utterances: 'Complex' sentences in a different sense. In J. Bybee & M. Noonan (Eds.), *Complex sentences in grammar and discourse: Essays in honor of Sandra A. Thompson* (pp. 321–336). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in theorganization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8,* 289–327.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Slobin, D. I., Hoiting, N., & Küntay, A. (1999). *Variations in child-directed speech as a guide to language form and use.* Paper presented at the Center for Language, Interaction and Culture, UCLA, Colloquium.