Tannen, Deborah (1989). Interpreting interruption in conversation. Papers from the 25th annual regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Part II: Parasession on Language in Context, 266–87. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Wilson, Thomas P. and Zimmerman, Don H. (1986). The structure of silence between turns in two-party conversation. Discourse Processes 9: 375–90.

Wilson, Thomas P., Wiemann, John, and Zimmerman, Don H. (1984). Models of turn taking in conversational interaction. Journal of Language and Social Psychology 3: 159–83.

4

Resources and repair: a cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair[1]

BARBARA A. FOX, MAKOTO HAYASHI, AND ROBERT JASPERSON

4.1 Introduction

The organization of repair in conversation has been the focus of much work in conversation analysis and related fields over the last twenty years (e.g., Hockett, 1967; Du Bois, 1974; Jefferson, 1974, 1987; Moerman, 1977; Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson, 1977; Schegloff, 1979, 1987a; Goodwin, 1981; Levelt, 1982, 1983, 1989; Carbonell and Hayes, 1983; Hindle, 1983; Levelt and Cutler, 1983; Reilly, 1987; van Wijk and Kempen, 1987; Good, 1990; Postma, Kolk, and Povel, 1990; Bredart, 1991; Blacker and Mitton, 1991; Bear, Dowding, and Shriberg, 1992; Couper-Kuhlen, 1992; Local, 1992; Shriberg, Bear, and Dowding, 1992; Nakatani and Hirschberg, 1993). This work has uncovered the mechanisms of self- and other-initiation of repair, self- and other-achievement of repair, repair position, perception of repair, and so on. But within this fairly extensive literature, the relationships between repair and syntax have received relatively little attention (the major exceptions being Schegloff, 1979; Goodwin, 1981; Levelt, 1983; Geluykens, 1987; van Wijk and Kempen, 1987; Fox and Jasperson, frth.). And the operation of repair in different languages, with different syntactic systems, has, to the best of our knowledge, been the object of only a small body of research (see Schegloff, 1987b).

This present study aims to begin to fill this gap by focusing on the syntax of repair from a cross-linguistic perspective. Cross-linguistic work on repair is especially compelling to us given our own, and others", research on the relationships between same-turn (also

known as first-position) self-repair and syntax in English conversation (Schegloff, 1979, this volume; Fox and Jasperson, frth.).

As Schegloff (1979) makes clear, same-turn self-repair and syntax are interdependent and co-organizing: each requires the other as part of its operation. As Schegloff points out, repair cannot exist without syntax, since syntax organizes the linguistic elements through which talk is constructed, and without talk, there can be no repair. Similarly, syntax cannot exist without repair: it is always possible that at any point in the course of an utterance the speaker could not know how to continue the utterance, or might have selected an inappropriate lexical item, or might find that the utterance projected is eliciting pre-disagreement indicators from the recipient;[2] in such cases, speakers must have access to mechanisms by which they can stop the utterance under construction before it reaches completion and project a completion anew. Syntax, at least syntax-for-conversation, must thus allow for the operation of same-turn self-repair.

Even stronger evidence for the interdependence of same-turn self-repair (henceforth just: repair) and syntax has come from studies of syntactic organization and repair. For example, Fox and Jasperson (frth.) found that repair in English conversation is strongly organized according to syntactic constituents. In that study, we found that when English speakers recycle part of an utterance, they do not back up a random number of words, as one might in replaying a tape, or even back to a randomly selected syntactic constituent boundary; in all cases of recycling in our data, speakers returned either to the beginning of a word within the phrasal constituent under construction when repair was initiated or to the beginning of the clause, but not to a word in a prior phrasal constituent or clause.[3] For example, when repair was initiated during a constituent in an adverbial subordinate clause, speakers recycled either to the beginning of a word in that constituent (e.g., a noun phrase) or to the beginning of the adverbial subordinate clause, but *not* back to the beginning of the turn or to some arbitrary place within the adverbial subordinate clause. The following utterances illustrate some of these patterns (we have used an asterisk to indicate the site at which repair is initiated):

(1) ^J: But it- it does i- it does work out if you have just the common dena-* denominator here

(2) ^M: Okay, well we could- do it from that angle then, because I don't-* I don't really .hh encounter that concept problem

(3) ^K: Okay, let's see if- before I go and look at the solution if I can-

     C: Mhm

     K: follo-* if I can break it out here

In example (1), the speaker recycles just the noun under construction when repair was initiated; in example (2), the speaker recycles back to the subject of the adverbial subordinate clause (and not back to the main clause); and in example (3), the speaker recycles back to the adverbial subordinate marker *if*.

We take these findings, and others like them, to be strongly indicative of the interdependence of repair and syntax. If speakers recycled back some number of syllables or words, or some number of units of time, or to a last pause, an interdependence of repair and syntax would not be indicated. However, speakers do not seem to orient to such possibilities.

Now, if it is the case that repair and syntax are interdependent, then it ought to be true that repair will be organized according to the syntactic organization of the language in question; in other words, the organization of repair ought to be different for communities of speakers with different syntactic practices. The reason for this can be stated in the following way. If repair represents a collection of strategies for responding to certain interactional pressures, and if languages consist of different syntactic (or even phonological) practices for managing those pressures, then their procedures for repair will be spun from those practices, and repair will reflect the organizations of those syntactic practices in general.

If these hypotheses are true, it ought to be possible to argue, at least tentatively, in the following manner. If we find differences in the organization of repair across languages, then we can suggest (if not deduce) that these differences arise at least in part from the different syntactic practices employed by the speakers of those languages. Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that other factors may influence the organization of repair; for example, it is possible that certain "styles" of repair are fashionable for a

given language/culture or that they work in that language/culture to create a certain construction of self (as perhaps tentative, submissive, unintelligent, etc.) and that these styles are more constrained than is required by the syntax of that language. It is also obviously plausible that other facets of a language – e.g., its phonology – would influence the operation of repair (cf. Schegloff, 1987b). Nonetheless, it is still possible that one could detect in the workings of repair the larger workings of general syntactic practices in a language. It is in fact this line of argumentation that we pursue in the present study.

This study seeks to explore the ways in which repair, whose operation is rooted in various interactional pressures, is managed in languages with vastly different syntactic practices to meet these pressures. To this end, we will discuss three ways in which the organization of repair differs across two languages, English and Japanese, and we will argue that these differences in repair organization – and possibly even differences in the mechanisms of turn-taking – correlate, at least in part, with larger differences in the syntactic practices employed by speakers of these two languages. We also examine the ways in which repair is used as a syntactic practice by speakers of both languages (see Ford and Mori, 1994, for a similar line of argumentation).

While such a study would, ideally, be done on a wide range of genetically and areally diverse languages, because it is extremely difficult to collect and analyze the appropriate data, we are able to report on repair in only two languages: English and Japanese. Even though the study is thus obviously limited in its data base, we believe our findings are sufficiently compelling to warrant the detailed discussion we provide here. This study is thus part of a growing enterprise which seeks to understand how interaction and grammar shape one another. Even though the findings are, of course, preliminary, it is our hope that it makes some small contribution to this increasingly fascinating endeavor. And perhaps this work will spur further studies on other languages.[4]

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 covers methodological issues of the study. Section 3 provides a brief introduction to the syntax of conversational Japanese and English, which will serve as background information for the subsequent discussions of Japanese and English repair. Section 4 discusses three differences

in the organization of repair between Japanese and English which we argue are rooted in syntactic differences between the two languages. Section 5 examines in detail two cases, one from English and one from Japanese, in which repair is used to produce two different syntactic projections within a single turn, thereby providing a resource for speakers to expand the syntactic possibilities present for them at the moment of speaking. Section 6 presents a discussion of the significance of these findings for the study of repair, and for the study of syntax.

4.2 Methodological preliminaries

4.2.1 Definitions

A possible first understanding of repair might be that repair is the process by which speakers correct errors they have made in their immediately prior talk. But, as Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) note, repair is not limited to error-correction; there are many instances of what we would like to call repair in which no error is made (in fact the reason for the repair is not obvious):

(4) M: I don't kno·w but it's·* it's gonna cost quite a bit

And in some cases, the projected utterance under construction is aborted, and one with a new syntactic organization is started, so there is no direct replacement involved:

(5) H: And I haf·*( ) my class starts at two·

These sorts of repair here, then, involve instances in which an emerging utterance is stopped in some way and is then aborted, recast, continued, or redone. Further examples illustrating the range of phenomena included in this category are given below:

(6) D: ((clears throa/t))

J: I gave·* I gave up smoking cigarettes::

(7) M: Called her 'n I t·* well actually I told her that my
best friend had gotten the measles

(8) B: She said they're usually harder markers 'n I said
   wo::wuh huhh! hhh I said there go, I said there's *
   there's three courses already that uh(hh)hh/ff

A: Yeh

B: I'm no(h)t gonna do well i(h)n.

(9) A: Like they- the biggest debate ih-* in our
   department in.* at Trenton was that when we had
   these faculty meetings

(10) K: Plus once he got- (0.8) some* um (1.3) he got some
   battery acid on (0.2) on his trunk or something.

Also included in the formal notion of repair are cases involving utterances which contain occurrences of syllables such as *um* or *uh* and their equivalents in Japanese, but in which the syntax continues as projected:

(11) ∧K: hh And I'm in the uh (0.2) school of law,

Similarly, there are cases in which the speaker does a cut-off at the end of a word, as if initiating repair, but then continues with the syntax as projected:

(12) ∧K: they've given me (1.5) the value of tangent in-
   the sense that it's less than zero

While these classes of utterances are considered repair, they played no significant role in the present analysis.

In this study we restrict our attention to *same-turn self-repair*. We use the term same-turn self-repair to mean the following. By "self-repair" we mean repair which is produced by the speaker of the repairable (see Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977), as in:

(13) ∧H: hh And tshe-* this girl's fixed up onna da-* a blind da;te.

In this utterance, H cuts off the subject pronoun *tshe* (the '₂' indicates glottalized cut-off) and in a sense replaces that pronoun with a full noun phrase, *this girl*. This example is classified as self-repair because both the repairable – the pronoun – and the repair – the full noun phrase – are produced by the same speaker. A second instance of self-repair occurs in this utterance: the first try at *date* is cut off to introduce a modifier – *blind date*.

The term "same-turn repair" refers to repair which takes place within the same turn constructional unit as the repairable. In utterance (13), for example, the cut-off and replacement of the subject pronoun occur within the same clause as the pronoun.

Throughout the chapter, we use the term *repaired segment* to refer to the part of the utterance which is repaired; we use the term *repairing segment* to refer to the part of the utterance which accomplishes the repair.[5] In examples where we thought some visual cues would aid the reader in understanding the organization of the repair, we put the repaired segment within square brackets and the repairing segment in boldface.

We use the term Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) according to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) and Ford and Thompson (this volume). According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), the turn-taking system of English conversation, and perhaps of conversation in all cultures/languages, initially allots one TCU to each current speaker. A TCU is thus a word, phrase, clause, or sentence which can constitute an entire turn (e.g. *yeah, in the cupboard, How are you?*). At the possible end of every TCU, speaker transition is possible (but not necessary). Speakers can, of course, make a bid for a multi-TCU turn, if, for example, they want to tell a story; such bids often take the form of what Sacks (1974) calls "story prefaces," of the sort "Did I tell you who I ran into yesterday?"

Throughout this chapter we use the term *syntactic practices* rather than more traditional terms, such as syntactic resources, syntactic constructions, and so on. We have done this for two reasons: first, since we view language as primarily for doing rather than for representing, we wanted to use a term that would remind us that syntax is an activity. Second, work on conversational data is sometimes dismissed as dealing with behavior (as in "performance") rather than with syntax per se (as in "competence"); such a distinction between syntactic behavior and syntax rests, we believe, on the assumption that syntax consists of a set of pre-stored (mental) constructions and that these representations may be implemented by speakers in more or less accurate ways during real-time speech. Because we do not wish to invoke this distinction and the view of language it presupposes in the present study (see Fox, 1994), we have avoided terms for syntax that

hint at static pre-existing mental representations and have chosen instead a term that arises from a different metaphor of language.

4.2.2 Language sample

Although this study draws conclusions which may apply to all languages, it is in fact based on only two languages, Japanese and English. We chose these two languages for the following reasons. English is an obvious choice for work that requires conversational data, since a great deal of English conversation has been recorded and transcribed, and a great deal of research has been done on the interactional organization of English conversation. And, as many students of conversation know, it is much easier to work with conversational data from one's native language: English is the native language for two of us and a fluent second language for the third. Japanese was also an obvious choice for us because there is a small but growing body of transcribed conversational data (to which one of us contributed substantially); Japanese is also the native language for one of us, and a fairly fluent second language for another.

The three of us thus have a fair amount of expertise, and data, in these two languages. We hope in the future to expand the research, and our research group, to include native speakers (and their data) of a wide range of typologically and areally diverse languages.

4.2.3 Data collection

Both the English data and the Japanese data were collected for the purposes of earlier projects (see Fox and Jasperson, frth; Hayashi, 1994).

For the English data, we culled 500 examples of repair from transcripts of naturally occurring conversations: the first 300 were from everyday conversations (both face-to-face and telephone conversations); the remaining 200 were culled from our own collection of English face-to-face tutoring sessions. We gathered instances of repair from the tutoring sessions in order to increase the sample size. The two sets of data were kept separate both in the collection stage and in the analysis stage of this project. Utterances appearing

in the text below which are taken from the tutoring sessions are preceded by "^".

Since tutoring is a bit different from everyday conversation, a few words about the tutoring data are in order. In the summer of 1986 one of us (Fox) received a grant to study human tutoring dialogue, as part of an endeavor to build more robust computer tutoring systems. As part of this project, we hired graduate students from math, physics, chemistry and computer science to serve as tutors; students needing tutoring were attracted to the project through ads in the student newspaper. Tutor and student pairs then met in a small lab room for an hour, where the interaction was audio- and video-taped. The pair was given no instructions beforehand on how to proceed, and the whole interaction was guided by the genuine needs of the student (several had tests coming up, for example). The resulting conversations were thus spontaneous and natural, in the sense that they were not in any way planned or orchestrated in advance. However, they are on rather abstract topics, and they bear many marks of the asymmetrical roles of the tutor and student in the teaching/learning process (and tutor and student had never met before this session). For these reasons, to be cautious, we have kept the tutoring session data separate from the everyday conversation data. But in fact in the analysis we found no consistent differences in repair between the two data sources.

For the Japanese data, we found 225 instances of same-turn self-repair in the transcripts of naturally occurring Japanese conversations (both telephone and face-to-face). The conversations were audio- and video-taped by a variety of researchers for a range of purposes. The conversations were transcribed by the researchers, all native speakers of Japanese, who originally made the tapes. As was the case for the English data, all participants in the conversations were native speakers of the language under study.[6]

Because the collection of Japanese conversational data is a relatively new enterprise, we did not have available to us an extensive body of Japanese data – hence the fairly small number of instances of repair in Japanese. Comparability between the English and Japanese repair data is thus obviously an issue. Nonetheless, we feel that the pool of repairs in Japanese is large enough to allow us to draw certain general conclusions about repair in Japanese; of

course, additional data will be important in advancing more specific claims.

4.2.4 Data coding

Instances of repair in both languages were coded for (1) the phrasal syntactic constituents, including clause, that were under construction when the repair was initiated (e.g., noun phrase and clause or verb phrase and clause); and (2) the syntactic organization of the repair (e.g., just the repairable was repeated, or the entire clause was redone). We used syntactic categories for the analysis, rather than, for example, interactional categories, to see if there were indeed syntactic patterns through which repair operates, or which emerge as constraining the operation of repair. Of course, in the analysis the interactional locus of each utterance was considered, so the analysis is by no means a purely syntactic exercise. But as syntax-linguists, we were interested in the possible syntactic configurations of repair.

Choosing syntactic categories for analyzing such data obviously poses several risks. First, it is not possible to know at the outset whether the phenomenon in question is organized according to syntactic categories. For example, Schegloff (1987a) demonstrates that one type of repair is governed by turn organization and *not* by sentence organization. So it was certainly possible that no description of repair could be made in syntactic terms. Second, it is possible that the categories we used, while widely accepted by linguists, would not be the *appropriate* syntactic categories; that is, it is possible that repair is indeed organized through syntactic categories – just not the syntactic categories typically recognized by linguists (Langacker, frth.).

Choosing syntactic categories that are appropriate for two typologically divergent languages is also complex. For example, in coding the English data it makes sense to distinguish subject and object noun phrases from prepositional phrases, since only the latter are marked with a separate linguistic element (the relevant elements are italicized):

(14) ^K_ */ have a wai value* that I kno^w, (0.3) is uh. less than zero.

(15) M: ... on the back of his pickup truck *with a,* (0.4) *with a jack*

In (14), the noun phrases *I* and *a wai value* are not preceded by any markers indicating their grammatical roles in the sentence; in (15), on the other hand, the role of the noun phrase *a jack* is marked by *with*. So for English, it makes sense in some way to distinguish subject and object noun phrases (like *I* and *a wai value*) from prepositional phrases (like *with a jack*), although prepositional phrases involve noun phrases.

But for Japanese, this distinction would distort the facts of the language: in Japanese, referring nouns can be marked with a "case" particle, which follows the noun. Subject noun phrases, object noun phrases, and locative phrases are marked each with their own postpositional case particle (subject and object case particles are sometimes omitted in conversation):[7]

(16) H: teyuuka YUUkosan ( ) **jishin ga** OOkii kara.....
        I mean   Yuko   self   SUBJ   tall   because
        'I mean, because Yuko herself is tall.....'

(17) Y: ichioo   zen kokumin no (0.7) **joohoo**   **o**   nigitteru,.....
        by and.large all citizen GEN[8] information OBJ have
        'By and large, (they) have information about all the citizens'

(18) K: Takashimaya no   ano un nan- **chijoo**   **de**   matteta.
        Takashimaya GEN um uh wha- ground floor LOC waiting-past
        '(I) was waiting um uh wha- on the ground floor of Takashimaya'

Because of these facts, it is not clear that there is any reason to distinguish these phrases as noun phrases and postpositional phrases. So, for Japanese, all noun phrases were treated together. In general we tried to be as true to the nature of the language under study as we could, rather than trying to force an unnaturally parallel treatment of both languages.

Throughout the coding we tried to be conscious of the pitfalls of our syntactic analyses; the usefulness of these analyses can be seen in the fact that we did find extensive differences in the organization of repair across the two languages which we believe are real differences.

4.3 Syntax in Japanese and English

This section provides background information on the conversational syntax of Japanese and English; this information will be used in sections 4 and 5. It should be kept in mind that the syntax of conversational Japanese and English differs from the syntax of the written varieties of these languages, as well as from linguistic descriptions based on elicited sentences.

The descriptions offered here are not meant to be exhaustive of the phenomena examined but are rather meant as rough guides to later discussions.

4.3.1 Syntax in conversational Japanese

Japanese is often described as an SOV, or verb-final, language (where S stands for subject, O for direct object, and V for verb). In our conversational data, some utterances are verb-final, at least in the clauses that contain a verb:

(19) T: soo yatta to **omou.**
   so be-past quotative think
   '(I) think that (it was) so.'

(20) H: de tashoo **maketoku**
   and more or less discount
   'and (we) discount more or less.'

However, there are many utterances in which elements follow the verb (see Ono and Suzuki, 1992; Maynard, 1989; Clancy, 1982; Hinds, 1982; Ford and Mori, 1994; Simon, 1989). The following examples illustrate the use of lexical elements after the verb (the postverbal element is in boldface):

(21) H: tabun () ichiban ue de. **Yuukosan ga:.**
   probably most older be Yuko SUBJ
   'Probably (she) is the oldest, Yuko'

(22) H: YUUdachi ga () kek- kuru mitai yo **ashita.**
   evening shower SUBJ fi- come seem FP tomorrow
   'It seems li-like there might be an evening shower, tomorrow.'

Japanese also has a large class of what are called "final particles," whose specific functions include the marking of how a speaker knows what was just said (evidentiality), politeness, and so on:

Japanese conversational discourse is characterized by frequent final particles whose use is to appeal to the interpersonal feelings of the recipient of the message. (Maynard, 1989: 30)

These so-called final particles have been the subject of a great deal of research (e.g. see Maynard, 1989; Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975), because they seem to be an important part of the organization of conversational Japanese. An indication of their importance can be seen in the fact that Maynard (1989) found that 32 per cent of her Pause-bounded Phrasal Units (similar to Chafe's (1987) Intonation Units) were marked by final particles. Consider the following example:

(23) I: aa sugoi **ne::.**
   oh amazing FP
   'Oh, (it is) amazing'

So far we have suggested that the notion "verb-final" is a complex issue in Japanese. The distribution of S and O is also more complex than suggested by the order SOV. It is commonly known that S and O are often not expressed in conversational Japanese (Hinds, 1982; Kuno, 1978; Maynard, 1989). Consider the following examples (words which are not expressed in the Japanese are given in parentheses in the English translations):

(24) I: okaasan ni na no, otoosan ni na no::?
   mother resemblance be FP father resemblance be FP
   '(Does she) take after (her) mother or (her) father?'

(25) H: hajimete mita kedo.
   for the first time saw but
   '(I) saw (her) for the first time.'

In (24), the subject is not expressed; in (25) neither the subject nor the object is expressed.

Even verbs can remain unexpressed. Consider the following example:

Barbara A. Fox, Makoto Hayashi, Robert Jasperson

(26) H: Imanaka-san mo izure sochira de?
Imanaka also some day there LOC
'Ms. Imanaka, (are you getting married) there some day too?'

In this example, we have a subject noun phrase ("Ms. Imanaka"), a time adverbial ("some day"), a locative, and no expressed verb. Of course, the action performed by the subject is clear to the participants from the preceding context.

The result of these patterns is that clauses in conversational Japanese often show one or more nouns which are not S or O but are rather nouns describing locations, times, and other settings; these are then followed by a verb in some utterances, though not in all; final particles often follow the verb.

In some cases, only a verb is expressed:

(27) K: a soo soo kieta kieta
oh yeah yeah came came
'Oh yeah, yeah, (a typhoon) was coming'

(28) K: atsui yo ne toka yutte,
hot FP FP quotative say
'(she) said like, "(it'll be) hot, won't it?"'

The order of nouns that do occur in an utterance is flexible, responding to the interactional needs of the moment of utterance.

Prescriptive Japanese grammar says that referring nouns must be followed by case particles, or postpositions, which indicate the role of the noun in the clause (e.g. subject, direct object, locative). These particles function somewhat like case marking systems in languages like German and Russian (but see Shibatani, 1990, Ch. 11, for a discussion of the complexity of Japanese case particles). Examples exhibiting case particles are given above in (16) - (18). In casual conversation, however, case particles for subject and direct object can be omitted; examples illustrating this phenomenon are given below (nouns that could have been marked with a case particle appear in boldface):

(29) C: demo **kane** motte nee mon **ano hito**.
but money have NEG FP that person
'But (she) doesn't have money, that person'

(30) Y: konna jikan **koitsura** ZEttai **terebi** miteher wa...
like,this time these guys ever TV watch NEG FP
'Around this time (of the day), these guys never watch TV...'

In English, complex clauses often consist of first a main clause and then a complement clause. A complement clause is a whole clause that occupies the slot for a direct object.[9] For example, in English one can say *I think this* or *I think you're beautiful* where *this* and *you're beautiful* both are the direct object of *think*, but *you're beautiful* is a whole clause and not just a noun. Examples follow (the complement clause is enclosed in curly braces):

(31) ^J: I don't think {I'll do this}

(32) ^J: So I'd recommend- {working through some of the mid-range ones}

Unlike English, Japanese places the main clause *after* the complement clause, which often results in a structure like this (where NP stands for Noun Phrase and C stands for complement marker): [NP V] C V. Consider the following example:

(33) K: datte {gonen mo inu} to omotte sa:
because five.years as.long.as stay quotative think FP

NP   V   C   V

'Because (you) think that (you)'ll be (there) as long as five years'

The structure of this utterance is: NP V Complement-marker V FP, where the second verb is the verb *omou* "think"; notice that this word order is the mirror image of word order in English (where "think" comes before the verb of the complement clause, "stay").

Furthermore, markers of other kinds of relationships between two clauses – for example, subordinate clause markers (like *when* and *because* in English) – tend to occur at the end of clauses in Japanese while they occur at the beginning of clauses in English (see also Ford and Mori, 1994). Consider the following utterance:

(34) H: ano chotto **HONya** ni ne yoritai **kara::**
um just bookstore LOC FP stop.by.want because
'um because (I) just want to stop by the bookstore'

Notice that in this example the Japanese subordinate clause marker *kara* occurs at the end of the clause, while in the English translation *because* appears at the beginning. This is another instance of the general pattern across the two languages that items that tend to precede in English (e.g., *prepositions*, main clauses) tend to follow in Japanese (e.g., *postpositions*, main clauses). Readers should keep in mind this apparent "mirror image" relationship between Japanese and English word order for the discussion in section 4.4.3.

Verbs in Japanese are marked for tense and various kinds of modes. In at least one case, a conjunction (*-te*, roughly equivalent to English *and*) can occur as an ending attached to a verb. Verbs in Japanese do not exhibit agreement with the subject (that is, there is no marking on the verb for the person or number of the subject).

For further information on Japanese syntax, interested readers should consult Kuno (1973), Martin (1975), Maynard (1989) and Shibatani (1990).

4.3.2 *Syntax in conversational English*

English is usually described as a rigid SVO language. While there is some word order variation in our conversational data, in fact most utterances do tend to be SV(O), with prepositional phrases coming after the direct object, if one is present. Subjects in our data are overwhelmingly pronominal:

(35) ^J: **We're not missing anything**

(36) ^J: **You**'ve just dropped the minus sign essentially

It is important to point out here that English is somewhat odd cross-linguistically in requiring the presence of a subject in all utterances; this constraint produces the "dummy" *it* constructions for which English is well known, in which a non-referring *it* occurs as the subject of an utterance ("*it* takes one to know one," "*it*'s raining," "*it* takes two to tango," etc.). In some cases, this "dummy" *it* projects a complex clause structure (as in "*it* seems to me that ..."). It is rare, even in fast conversation, for speakers to produce a main clause without explicit mention of the subject.

Subjects and objects are unmarked in English; other kinds of nominals are marked by prepositions. While subjects and objects tend to be relatively fixed in their order with regard to the verb (just before and just after the verb, respectively), prepositional phrases exhibit a greater range of positions in a clause/TCU. Consider the following (the prepositional phrases are in boldface):

(37) ^J: :hh **In this case** (0.7) you again want to go ( ) one degree down in your

denominator

(38) ^J: You're left **with the stuff** that you started with

In (37), the prepositional phrase occurs at the beginning of the TCU, while in (38) it occurs after the verb.

Verbs in English exhibit subject agreement: they are marked for the person and number of the subject. Verbs are also marked for tense/aspect.

Readers interested in further details of English conversational syntax should consult Chafe (1987), Givón (1993), Fox and Thompson (1990), Ford and Thompson (this volume), Ford and Thompson (1993), Ono and Thompson (frth).

4.4 Organization of repair

In this section we present a discussion of three ways in which repair is organized differently across the two languages in question. We then argue that these differences in repair organization arise, at least in part, from more general syntactic differences exhibited across the two languages (the findings reported here were first noted in Hayashi, 1994).

We start with a discussion of the most straightforward case and work up to more complex instances.

4.4.1 *Morphological repair*

Our first type of difference comes from the realm of morphology,[10] which is typically included in the larger domain of syntax, especially in cross-linguistic studies.

We found in our Japanese data a kind of morphological repair which did not occur in the English data. Consider the following

example (we have not attempted to translate the repair itself in this example into English):

(39) K: ja   nanji   goro ni   kurida[shi-*]soo?
          then   what time   about OBL   go out
          'Then about what time (shall we) go out?'

In this example, the speaker K replaces only the inflectional ending of the verb with another. The citation form of the verb used by K is *kurida-su*, which has the "conclusive" ending *-su* (we are using terms from Shibatani, 1990, in this discussion of verb inflection in Japanese). The first form that K produces in this example (*kurida-shi*) has the "adverbial" ending *-shi*. The adverbial endings of Japanese verbs may or may not be followed by certain kinds of auxiliaries and/or particles, but in the context of this example, the ending *-shi* was very likely to be followed by some auxiliaries and/or particles. However, K cuts off the verb and replaces *-shi* with the "cohortative" ending *-soo*. In other words, K has replaced one bound morpheme with another.

In our English data, we found no examples parallel to example (39) from Japanese. That is, we found no examples of the following invented sort, in which the past-tense morpheme *-ed* is replaced by the present tense morpheme *-s*.

(40) She look[ed]-*s at the table.

We would like to argue that this difference in repair can be attributed to the differences between English and Japanese verb morphology. While both languages do exhibit verb morphology, and, more specifically, they both exhibit suffixes (endings) rather than prefixes (beginnings), the nature of these endings is different across the two languages, both in sound structure and in meaning. And it is these differences which we believe produce the difference in repair.

To begin with, consider the sound structure of the Japanese verb endings in example (39). The endings *-shi* and *-soo* (as well as the citation form ending *-su*) are full syllables, each consisting of a consonant and a vowel. Now consider the sound structure of the English verb endings in example (40). Although *-ed* is spelled with two letters, in most cases it is actually pronounced as a single consonant sound (either [t] or [d]), and *-s* is clearly a single consonant.

Thus the English verb endings are not full syllables, and hence are unlikely to be pronounceable by themselves. (An exception to this is the suffix *-ing*).

Now consider the form-meaning relationships of verb endings in the two languages. Japanese is considered to be an agglutinating language, which means that in Japanese each morpheme has roughly a single grammatical meaning. For example, *-shi* is associated just with the grammatical meaning "adverbial" and not with person and number, or any other possible category (as mentioned earlier, person and number are not marked on verbs in Japanese). English, on the other hand, is considered to be a fusional language, which means that in English most bound verbal morphemes are associated with several grammatical meanings. For example, *-s* carries not only the meaning of present tense; it also signals that the subject is third person singular. Bound verbal morphemes are thus semantically complex in English in a way that they are not in Japanese.

There is one more difference related to this that is probably relevant. In Japanese, the verb endings (suffixes) are not agreement markers; that is, they do not signal anything about the subject of the utterance. They modify the verb in a more adverbial way than do agreement markers. In English, on the other hand, verb suffixes sometimes overtly indicate characteristics of the subject (person and number). Verb suffixes in English thus in a way refer back to something earlier in the utterance, namely the subject, while in Japanese, the verb endings have no explicit relationship to what has gone before (although they may signal possibilities to come, as with the "adverbial" ending).

These three differences between English and Japanese verb endings suggest to us that at a variety of levels verb endings in English are more tightly "bonded" to the verb than are verb endings in Japanese and hence are less available for individual replacement than are verb endings in Japanese.[11] In a sense then, it is possible that English verb suffixes are not available as interactional objects in the same way that Japanese verb suffixes are. Differences in repair strategies across the two languages may thus arise from differences in the organization of their verb morphology.

4.4.2 Procedures for delaying next noun due

The second type of difference in repair has to do with the general function of delaying the production of a next item due. In this study we focused on delays involved in the production of lexical parts of noun phrases – in particular, nouns.[12]

Both Japanese and English share a set of repair procedures involving the use of "fillers." This phenomenon is well-documented for English (cf. (11) above, and Schegloff, 1979), and many instances from both languages occurred in our corpora. The following is an example from the Japanese corpus.[13]

(41) I: jaa honyasan no mae no sa .h ano: **nanka:** (0.7) kitaroo toka...
then bookstore GEN front GEN FP um like amusement GEN

a-a- itsumo **nanka** (0.7) kitaroo toka...
uh-uh-always like Kitaro etc

However, we discovered that syntactic differences between the two languages may be implicated in a different set of repair procedures for delaying the production of a noun. Consider first the following examples from English:

(42) M: on the back of his pickup truck [with a.*] (0.4) **with a** jack

(43) B: We're gonna take it [through the*] **through the** mill so to speak.

(44) ^K: .hh So I'm going to start just- very simply [with-*] **with** number one.

(45) B: are you going here [for an-*] **for an** In dian class by any chance

(46) ^A: What if you put (4.6) what if you put double quotes around (0.2) the:
(0.2) the thing [with a-*] **with: a** space in it.

In these examples, the speakers have begun a prepositional phrase, initiated repair, and then recycled the preposition and a possible article before progressing with the rest of the phrase. In each of these cases, recycling constitutes a procedure for delaying the production of a next item due. This procedure could, for example, be part of a word search, a request for recipient-gaze, management of overlapping talk, and/or production of a dispreferred. In the case of English prepositional phrases, what is delayed is the production of a noun, as in (42)-(44),[14] or modified noun, as in (45) and (46); it is also possible that this procedure could be used to delay items such as modifiers, as well as verbs, verb particles, etc.[15]

nouns.

Japanese speakers, it turns out, do not use recycling to delay the production of nouns. The reason for this seems to be that while prepositions and articles in English precede their nouns, postpositions such as case particles in Japanese follow their nouns. It is clear that English speakers make use of the fact that prepositions and articles precede their nouns; prepositions and articles provide material to be recycled before the speaker must produce a noun. Japanese speakers, on the other hand, do not have available to them non-lexical material to recycle before a noun, since case particles follow their nouns (and Japanese has no articles).

Because of the syntactic organizations of the two languages, then, English speakers can make use of preposition, and article recycling as part of a delay strategy, while Japanese speakers cannot. Our data indicate that Japanese speakers make use of other practices for delaying the production of a next item due.

One interesting strategy occurred in our data. Consider the following examples:

(47) M: .hh maa sonna... **are ga:::** (1.5) u:: meedosan ga iru yoona ie
well like that SUBJ uhm maid SUBJ exist such family

(48) Y: demo sono mae ni WA:: (0.6) ano::: (0.5) **are ga** attan desu yo
but it before OBL TOP um that SUBJ exist be FP

ano::(1.0) e:::to ne warito ano (1.0) nante yuun desu ka (1.0)
um well FP sort of um what say be question

onngaku BANgumi toka.
music program etc.

'But before it, there was um that, you know, um, like... sort of, what should I say, music program and so on'

In cases such as these, speakers make use of a repair procedure which involves the following elements: a demonstrative pronoun (translated as "that" or "there") and case particle, followed by the

delayed noun and optional case particle. The demonstrative pronoun serves as a place holder while the speaker looks for some lexically specific noun. Markers translated as *um, well, what should I say,* etc. appear before the delayed noun phrase, though these may be part of a distinct repair procedure operating on the delayed noun, as in (41).

This is a useful strategy for speakers of a language which does not systematically provide phrase-initial grammatical material. Once again we see how it is possible that the syntactic practices employed by speakers shape the organization of the repair strategies that are used.

4.4.3 The scope of recycling

The third type of difference also involves recycling. In this case the difference leads us to postulate the possibility of very basic differences in the turn-taking mechanisms of the two languages. Consider the following examples from our English data:

(49) B: in this building- we finally got [a-*] hhh a roo:m today in-
        in the leh- a lecture hall.

(50) K: Plus once [he got- (0.8) some*] um (1.3)
        he got some battery acid on (0.2) on his trunk
        or something.

In (49), repair is initiated after a noun phrase (defined as a noun plus any modifier that might occur) has been started. In recycling, the speaker only repeats the part of the noun phrase that has been produced so far – the indefinite article. The speaker does not recycle "back to" anything earlier in the utterance.

In example (50), the speaker also initiates repair after starting a noun phrase; in this case, however, the speaker repeats the whole clause (excluding "plus once") rather than just the part of the noun phrase produced so far.

One way of stating the pattern in English is to say that the domain of recycling can either be the local constituent under construction at the time repair is initiated (e.g. noun phrase), or it can be the clause. This pattern holds for all constituents, including verbs and prepositional phrases.[16]

Additional examples of this pattern in English are given below.

(51) B: ((to J)) (I don't think- I bedju would// nextime we-)
     D: Hey, would you like [a Trenth:::*] a Trentn
        telephone directory.

(52) ^M: Okay, well we could- do it from that angle then, because [I don't-*]
         I don't really .hh encounter that concept problem (0 3) in any of the
         problems.

In comparison to this pattern, our Japanese data show only constituent-internal recycling; that is, at least in our data, Japanese speakers do not make use of clausal recycling. This means that if a speaker initiates repair after starting a noun phrase, s/he will recycle back to the beginning of that noun phrase but not further back; repair initiated during the construction of the verb usually is handled by recycling just the verb, not other elements that might have preceded the verb (except in one case the direct object of the verb, which makes a local constituent – a verb phrase). So one does not find counterparts in the Japanese data to example (50). Below we give examples of recycling in Japanese:

(53) M: tteyuuka koko denwa   [kakei-*] kakete kite sa,
        I mean here telephone ca-   call   come FP
        'I mean, (they) ca- called us here,'

(54) T: ... mukoo   no   [sutahhu-*] sutahhu mo sa: yuushuu.
        the.other.party   GEN staff   staff   also FP excellent
        '... their staff- staff is also excellent.'

(55) M: sorede sa, ne [atashi wa-*] atashi wa sa, sokode sa, koisura
        then   FP, FP I   TOP   I   TOP FP   then   FP   these guys

        karakatte yare toka   omotte   sa,
        tease   do   quotative think   FP

        'Then, I, I then thought, "let's tease these guys."'

We thus seem to have a systematic difference in the possible domains of recycling between the two languages. The reason for

Barbara A. Fox, Makoto Hayashi, Robert Jasperson

this difference, we believe, lies in the different syntactic practices employed in managing local interactional needs.

The different syntactic practices which seem to be at the heart of this difference in repair are the following. As mentioned in section 3, all referring nouns in Japanese can be marked for case, and the order of nouns before the verb is flexible (perhaps because of the case-marking). In addition, subjects and objects in Japanese, particularly subjects, are often not explicitly realized (e.g., (25)). The verb in Japanese comes at or near the end of the clause.

The kind of clausal TCU structure these facts commonly lead to typically, although of course not always, starts with some kind of discourse marker (e.g., *ano*, *nanka*), followed by adverbials, or nouns indicating setting of some kind, followed by the verb, and possibly followed by so-called final particles. So what occurs early in the TCU is often only loosely associated structurally with what is to follow. Conversational utterances in Japanese thus seem not to show tight syntactic organization (for similar findings see Iwasaki and Tao, 1993; Iwasaki, 1993).

What do we mean by "tight syntactic organization"? In most current views of syntax, including "functional syntax" of most varieties, the relationships between a verb and its subject and object (if it co-occurs with an object) create the basic syntactic organization of a clause. For example, in most functionally oriented views of syntax, subjects and objects are said to be "core arguments" of a clause, of which the verb is the nucleus; other elements are thought to be "peripheral," bearing looser syntactic relationships to the basic clause made up of S, O, and V (e.g., Foley and van Valin, 1984). So a language, like Japanese, which tends to leave S, O and even V unexpressed, appears to have more loosely organized syntax than a language which requires the expression of those basic elements (like English).

Consider, for example, the following utterance (example (26) repeated here as (56)):

(56) H Imanaka-san mo izure   sochira de?
     Imanaka   also some day there   LOC
     'Ms. Imanaka, (are you getting married) there some day too?'

In this example, we have an utterance that begins with a noun phrase (*Imanaka-san*), then exhibits an adverbial particle (*mo*),

then a temporal phrase (*izure*), then a locative phrase (*sochira de*). There is no expressed verb and the elements that are expressed do not bear usual syntactic relationships to each other and they do not form a coherent syntactic structure, as this notion was described above.

English, on the other hand, requires the presence of an overt subject and is fairly rigidly SV(O). This leads to TCUs which may begin with a discourse marker (e.g., *well, so*) and then continue with a subject, then verb, then a direct object if one is appropriate, and then prepositional phrases if appropriate; adverbials typically occur after the verb. Conversational utterances in English thus show a higher degree of syntactic coherence.

From a syntactic perspective, then, we can say that in English the subject begins a tightly knit clause structure and hence syntactically is the "beginning" of the clause, while in Japanese there is no consistent element that serves as the beginning of a tightly knit syntactic unit – in fact, there is no such tightly knit unit. In Japanese, elements in an utterance seem to be more independent from one another than are elements in an English utterance; we believe that the difference in the organization of recycling across the two languages reflects this difference.

We would like to suggest that these syntactic facts affect repair because they affect a crucial aspect of the turn-taking mechanisms of these two languages, namely *projection*. Although a full exploration of the turn-taking system of Japanese conversation is beyond the scope of the present study (see Maynard, 1989, for a beginning), we would like to offer as a possible explanation that turn-taking is managed in a different way in Japanese than it is in English, to wit: the beginnings of TCUs in Japanese do not tend to have elements that *syntactically project* the possible organization of what is to follow. For example, from the presence of an adverbial or a location-indicating noun a recipient cannot necessarily predict what kind of syntactic element will come next. It seems, however, that the beginnings of TCUs in English do project possible organizations for what is to follow; one knows (in a practical sense) that a verb is coming; and as soon as one hears the subject, one knows what is likely to come after the verb: certain kinds of verbs typically co-occur with direct objects while others typically co-occur with embedded

clauses. That is, the beginning of the clause in English is rich with information about how the clause is likely to continue. The beginning of the clause in English projects its likely continuation. Consider the following utterances:

(57) ^J: And we should've actually noticed this sooner

(58) D: I belie've you could really live in this area inna tent.

In (57), after hearing this instance of *we*, we know that some kind of verb is coming up; after hearing this instance of *should've*, we know that a main verb is still coming; after we hear this instance of *noticed*, we know that a direct object is coming. In (58), after hearing *I* we know that some kind of verb is coming; after hearing *believe* we can guess that a complement clause is coming, which will probably start with a subject and have a verb in it. In both cases, the recipient can make reasonably good guesses about how the clause is likely to continue on the basis of the subject and the verb (in particular the verb). Notice that these projections can be made after only a few syllables of the TCU have been produced.

Compare these utterances with the following Japanese utterance:

(59) H: shoo   de   onnanoko ga   cho- [ta-*] **chanto   tabe:kireru** ...
small as.for girl   SUBJ ju-   ea-   completely eat.up.can

'As for a small (ramen), a girl can juh- ea- eat (it) up completely...'

The clause begins with a noun phrase, *shoo de*, "as for a small (ramen)". This noun phrase is not the subject of the clause or the object. It is not possible to predict what syntactic elements will come next, since the subject or the object could be left unexpressed; perhaps the recipient can anticipate that eventually a verb will be produced. After this first noun phrase, another noun is produced which turns out to be the subject of the clause. Notice that because Japanese uses *post*-nominal case markings, it is not possible to know for sure the case of a noun until the case marker is produced, although of course native Japanese speakers can make reasonable guesses about the syntactic and semantic role of a noun (but these guesses about the syntactic and semantic characteristics of referents - e.g., humanness - and not necessarily on the syntax of the utterance so far); so we are quite far into the clause before we hear what we know to be a subject. After hearing the subject we might expect

an object, but an object need not occur if (a) it is not explicitly realized or (b) the verb is not transitive. And in example (59), the object is left unexpressed. After hearing a subject noun phrase, the recipient can predict that a verb may be produced before the TCU is complete. So the syntactic projections for this utterance may come relatively late in the utterance.

So we are suggesting that English speakers and recipients are able to use an "early projection" strategy because of the syntactic practices they employ. As Schegloff (1987a) says, of English conversation:

Turn beginnings are an important initial place, and an important initial resource, for the projection of the turn-shape or the turn-type of the turn that is being begun at that turn beginning. Such projection is a critical resource for the organisation of the turn-taking system for conversation. It is a critical resource for the organisation of a system that aims to achieve, and massively does achieve, the feature: one speaker speaks at a time in conversation...(p. 71)

Japanese speakers and recipients, on the other hand, engage in syntactic practices which do not make easy "early projection" strategies; from our data, we believe it is possible that Japanese speakers make use of "wait and see" strategies which are enabled by the syntactic projection can take place earlier in an utterance in English than in Japanese. Obviously, neither set of strategies is in any way better than the other; they simply provide different resources for accomplishing transition to a next speaker.

We are not suggesting that Japanese recipients are completely unable to make predictions about what the speaker might say next, just that projection may take place later in the utterance in Japanese than in English. Obviously, any native speaker of a language has countless experiences with how utterances tend to go in their language, and the meaning of what is being said helps recipients to make guesses about what the speaker is likely to say. We are instead suggesting that the syntactic practices of English make *early* projection of the upcoming syntax a more straightforward process than do the syntactic practices of Japanese; the syntactic practices of Japanese do not facilitate this process to the extent that the syntactic practices of English do.

Evidence outside of repair for this difference in projection between English and Japanese comes from Maynard's (1989) study of turn-taking in Japanese conversation. While her study did not examine repair strategies, it does provide some interesting indirect evidence for our claim.

Maynard found that Japanese speakers tend to produce what she calls Pause-bounded Phrasal Units (PPUs), which are bits of talk surrounded by pauses (she does not say how long the pauses are). The average length of these PPUs is 2.36 words – much shorter than the average length of similar units (what Chafe, 1987, calls Intonation Units) in English, which is about four words per Intonation Unit (see Chafe, 1994). We take this as a piece of indirect evidence that Japanese speakers tend to produce their turns in small constituents, where each constituent is syntactically independent from other constituents to a degree greater than one would find in Intonation Units in English. Intonation Units in English tend to be clauses, which, as we suggested earlier, show a high degree of syntactic coherence, while PPUs in Japanese tend not to be clauses (although the definition of "clause" is tricky for Japanese, for all the reasons we have touched on). Japanese recipients tend to produce back-channels (continuers) at the end of each PPU, leading to a style of interaction which has led scholars of Japanese to conclude that Japanese conversationalists are more "involved" than their American English-speaking counterparts (see also Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki, and Tao, frth.).[17] We would not argue against the view that high social involvement is one of the goals of this kind of interaction; but we would like to suggest that it could also have a function related to the nature of Japanese syntax and its effect on turn-taking. That is, if we are correct that the beginnings of TCUs in Japanese do not provide the recipient with much information about how the utterance is going to proceed, then it makes sense for speakers to produce relatively short PPUs whose interactional implications the recipient can acknowledge or question as the speaker works on a larger turn (exactly what happens with multi-TCU turns in English). This allows the recipient to acknowledge small pieces without having to know exactly where the speaker is going with the full turn (see Iwasaki and Tao, 1993, for similar findings).

Maynard also found that smooth speaker transition tends to occur significantly more often at a point of grammatical completion followed by a *pause* than at other possible points. We feel that this, too, is indirect evidence for our claim, in the following way.

We have claimed that English recipients are able to use the beginning of a TCU to project a possible course for that utterance, while Japanese recipients "wait and see" how the utterance develops. It is thus possible that English recipients are able to predict with such accuracy how the utterance-under-construction will come to an end that they are able to plan their own utterance to start up exactly at the moment the current utterance comes to a possible completion point (this is, in fact, the claim made by Sacks et al. (1974) with regard to turn-taking in English conversation), with no pause between the end of the current turn and the start-up of their own turn. In Japanese, on the other hand, since recipients are not able to make such detailed predictions about the course of the current utterance, they wait until they hear the last few syllables of the turn (which often contain such "ending signals" as final particles, or special completion-relevant verb forms) before starting their own utterance.

It is also possible that final particles evolved at least in part to help manage this facet of Japanese conversation, that is, to serve as an overt indication of a point of possible completion of a turn. In a language in which early syntactic projection is not facilitated by the syntax, it makes sense that speakers would tend to be end-oriented rather than beginning-oriented, and would provide overt ending cues.[18] We would argue that conversational English tends to be beginning-oriented, in contrast with conversational Japanese.

We have seen so far that the beginning of TCUs carries with it different interactional possibilities in English than in Japanese. In fact, it is possible that TCU beginning, or "turn beginning," is not an interactional object in Japanese the way it is in English. This fact suggests a possible motivation for English speakers' return to the subject in some cases of recycling, while Japanese speakers stay within local constituents for recycling: in English, the beginning of the clause is a coherent syntactic and interactional object from which a re-projection for the entire clause can be made; whereas in Japanese the beginning of the clause may not be syntactically knit to what follows in the clause, and would not be the site of re-projec-

tion. In Japanese, projection may be done much more bit-by-bit than it typically is in English, and the organization of recycling reflects this fact.

Of course, at this stage of our research these suggestions on the organization of turn-taking in Japanese are merely speculations; extensive conversation analysis needs to be undertaken in Japanese to determine their actual predictive power.

4.4.4 Summary

In this section we have provided evidence (a) that the organization of repair differs across the two languages we examined, and (b) that this difference arises, at least in part, from differences in the syntactic practices available to speakers of each language in managing the functions typically associated with repair. In a sense, then, we have been exploring the ways in which syntactic practices constrain the organization of repair. In the following section, we explore another facet of the complex relationship between syntax and repair in examining how repair expands the syntactic practices available to speakers of a language.

4.5 Repairing limited resources

So far we have taken the view that the syntactic practices of a language shape the organization of repair. In this section we provide evidence that the shaping is not unidirectional; repair also serves as a resource for expanding the range of syntactic practices engaged in by speakers of a language by enabling them to create two different syntactic projections within a single TCU that otherwise could not be "grammatically" united before reaching a Transition Relevance Place (TRP; see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). We will consider one instance of this reprojection from each language.

4.5.1 English

Consider the following passage, taken from a transcript of a conversation between two couples, at the home of one of the couples (B and T are visiting H and C). H has been relating her traumatic past experiences as a young white teacher in an inner city school. B, who at the time of the conversation is teaching English as a Second

Language at a nearby university, relates a similar story of "getting shit" from a student in his class. The utterance we will focus on in our discussion of repair is B's look, *challenge yourself by asking me* continue to ask me hard questions.*[19]

(60)

B: It's a little bit diffrince from Japa:n =
     =Ha:hn.

T: (H)e( ) ((continues into beginning of H's telling below))
     [

          (0.3)

B: tch

H: =W'll my experience was a bit diffrent from (0.3) probably (0.5) most ( ) Ame:rican =
     =PLUS I don't- (0.4) -I: >think they probably< show more respect to somebody
     who ( ) loo:ked older::: a:cts older::, .hh and has a mor:e um traditional type
     classroom=>I was< very:: BLUNT- an' (0.3) yu'kno:w

B: Hehehe

H: A(H)A(h)ahaha //. :hhe::. hhe =

B: I: get ( ) shi:t from a German (0.3) student in my cla:ss: (0.4) becuz I look younger than
     he- I don't think he thinks I'm as old as .hh

H: You a:re

B: I am. But I know if lik- like I looked older had greying hai:r or something.
     (0.5) •I would/n' get it.

H: ↑Doesn't that* bug you?=

B: =↑NOT- It's NOT shi:t >it's more of a< .hh // He doesn't kno::w what's:::: (0.2) ↓culturally
     okay=

H: He's not respectful.

C: =It's very ↓ou.gh.

H: It's very respe:ct oriented too:: isn't it?

B: =>B'cuz< ( ) German culture'z a little bit diffrent =

C: No but dyu dyu dyu fee:l dyu fee:l like he's atta:cking:?°>when'e< asks
     questio:ns?

```
    (0.6)
C:  Is that what it is?
    (0.7)
B:  At first I did but then later I just said loo:k, (0.7) since y'r so g(oo)- ↓'cuz he
    is the best student in the cla:ss, ↓'cuz one reason is th't he speaks a//n
    IndoEuropean language?
T:  Y'mean-
T:  (not) right no:w?
B:  ↑Ye:s right now=↓And (0.5) he um (4.0) he uh: (0.2) ↓He was getting bored
⇒   >so I said< ↑loo:k, challenge yourself by asking me (0.4) continue to ask me
    hard questions>But wht< FIR:st .hhhhh he was like challenging me.
```

B's utterance *look, challenge yourself by asking me* continue to ask me hard questions is created through the use of repair: B appears to reformulate his first try, *challenge yourself by asking me to continue to ask me hard questions*. But we have found in analyzing this sequence that the second try is not meant to replace or correct the first try. Rather, we would like to argue that both parts of B's utterance do important work in managing the interaction at that point, and that in fact B is making use of repair to accomplish several competing interactional goals before reaching a TRP.

Recall that, according to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), the turn-taking system of English conversation, and perhaps of conversation in all cultures/languages, initially allots one TCU to each current speaker.

Earlier in the passage B tells a story that is offered as an appreciation of H's earlier story about her difficult experiences in the classroom. H says that her students would have shown more respect to someone who *looked older, acts older*, than to her. B's story, in appreciating H's, makes a similar point: he *"gets shit"* from a student, and if he *looked older, had greying hair or something* he wouldn't *get it* (see Fox and Jasperson, frth., for a detailed analysis of this segment).

But the assessment of the student's behavior cast by the term *shit* comes to be seen as problematic in the interaction, as is evidenced by the ensuing series of attempts by B (and others) to correct the situation. B's first attempt is done as an explicit denial of that word

choice: *Not, it's NOT shit*, followed by an explanation which proposes that the student comes from a different culture and so does not understand what kind of behavior is *culturally okay* here (in a part of the US).

A next attempt at mitigating the negative assessment of the student's behavior occurs in a story told in response to a question from C, repeated here:

```
B:  At first I did but then later I just said loo:k, (0.7) since y'r so g(oo)- ↓'cuz he
    is the best student in the cla:ss, ↓'cuz one reason is th't he speaks a//n
    IndoEuropean language?
```

Here the student is praised as *the best student in the class*, although some of the value of this assessment is rescinded by the reason for the student's skill – he speaks a language closely related to English, a fact more about where he grew up than about his intelligence or hard work.

There are then two more attempts. One accounts for the student's behavior as a result of his boredom. The next occurs at the location of the repair with which we are concerned here.

```
B:  ↑And (0.5) he um (4.0) he uh: (0.2) ↓He was getting bored
⇒   >so I said< ↑loo:k, challenge yourself by asking me (0.4) continue to ask me
    hard questions>But wht< FIR:st .hhhhh he was like challenging me.
```

B's emerging turn, describing how B handled the student, has revealed one more opportunity to address the problematic assessment. The repair at this location permits the addition of material which recasts "getting shit" as being asked "hard questions." It is legitimate for students to ask hard questions, not give shit.

B initially gains the floor in this segment through being selected by C with the question *d'you feel like he's attacking?* B's response, *at first I did*, projects an extended turn: one TCU for what happened "at first" and a second for what happened "later." Notice that the second TCU is self-interrupted twice with non-final kinds of clauses (started with *'cuz*), which are warranted here by their embedded status. In fact, the second TCU that B starts, *later I just said look, since y'r so g(oo)-*, is never completed; instead, after getting the floor again by answering T's question *(not) right now?* B starts with a new formulation of the second TCU. After *he was getting bored*, he

uses a rush through (Schegloff, 1982) to secure the complex TCU we are concerned with here: *so I said look, challenge yourself by asking me* continue *to ask me hard questions.*

Now we can ask: why does B initially start with *challenge yourself by asking me*... He has characterized the student as "getting bored," and his intervention with the student is obviously intended at least as a remedy for the boredom. One way to remedy boredom, either by more difficult material from the instructor, or by more interesting interaction between the student and instructor. B offers the latter here, by suggesting the student challenge himself in the interaction – by asking B... And here is where repair comes in to play. B has projected an utterance which will be possibly complete after the production of an object of the verb *ask*. But the formulation of the object now presents a problem: if B says "challenge yourself by asking me hard questions," he implies that the student should change his behavior from whatever he was doing before to asking hard questions. But then that suggests that the student was not asking hard questions before; what was the student doing, then, that was so aggravating that B characterized it as "getting shit"? It must be something worse than asking "hard questions," but since B has been very concerned with mitigating the force of *get shit*, he presumably does not want to suggest now that the student was doing something worse than asking hard questions (what could be worse student behavior than asking hard questions if not disruptive, obnoxious, shit-like, behavior?). So if B finishes this TCU with "hard questions," he will be heard, potentially, as reinforcing, rather than mitigating, his earlier negative assessment.

At this point, before the object of *ask* is produced, B initiates repair. He appears to restart this clause, this time with a non-change of state verb: *continue*. By using a non-change of state verb, B equates the student's past behavior (previously characterized as giving shit) with the desired future behavior (now characterized as asking "hard questions"). *Continue to ask me hard questions* thus addresses the problem of *shit*, in recharacterizing *shit* as "hard questions." The non-change of state verb does not, however, address the student's boredom: if the student continues with the same behavior, he will presumably continue to be bored.

It is for this reason that we believe B intends his recipient to hear the whole utterance, not just the repairing segment; the first formulation crucially addresses the issue of the student's boredom by suggesting a *change*, and the second formulation crucially addresses the prior negative assessment of the student's behavior by recharacterizing it as asking "hard questions." Both parts are thus needed in the interaction, and B must produce both parts without completing the first formulation and before reaching a TRP (at which point one of the other parties present could begin to speak). The precise placement of the repair initiation and the nature of the second formulation allow B to accomplish both of these goals. Repair thus allows B to create two different syntactic projections with different goals within a single TCU.

One could ask at this juncture why B didn't use some kind of complex syntactic construction which would have allowed him to grammatically unite both parts. We suggest that no such construction presents itself in English. Consider the following possibilities:

(61) Look, challenge yourself by asking me hard questions, which is what you've been doing

(62) Look, challenge yourself by asking me hard questions, as you've been doing

(63) Look, challenge yourself and continue to ask me hard questions

(64) Look, continue to ask me hard questions and challenge yourself

(65) Look, challenge yourself by continuing to ask me hard questions

All of these would fail for B's purposes. All but (64) seem contradictory given the change of state implied by *challenge* and the non-change of state implied by *continue*; if the student is just doing what he was doing before, and he was bored before, then how is this a new challenge? (64) seems to suggest that the student should continue to ask hard questions and then do something else to challenge himself, but that something else is left unspecified, so this statement would not be much help as a suggestion to the student.

We believe these nicely integrated constructions fail exactly because they are too integrated: they do not capture the tension between continuing and changing that is beautifully managed by B's real utterance. By using repair, B allows the interpretation that

the second try is in fact a *second* try, a redoing of the first and not necessarily a smooth continuation of the first. But because the recipient will not erase the first formulation from his/her memory, the first formulation also stands. Both parts are allowed to stand, and they are not required to exist in some consistent syntactico-semantic relation to each other.

As a syntactic device, then, repair provides B with a mechanism for creating what from a traditional perspective looks like a spliced utterance which could not otherwise be licensed by the syntax of English. Repair thus expands the syntactic possibilities present for English; in fact, we would claim that repair in general expands the syntactic possibilities present for speakers of any language. Below we discuss a similar example from Japanese.

4.5.2 Japanese

Consider the following passage from our Japanese corpus, where H and T are talking about the sister of their mutual friend Fukaya (the repair in question appears at line 7, marked by an arrow):

(66)

```
1  T: ikutsu    nandesu ka?    imootosan       tte.=
      how.old be  question  younger.sister   quotative
      'How old is (this) younger sister?'

2  H: =imootosan::       wa    nijuu::::
      younger.sister    TOP    twenty::::
      'She is twenty::'

3  T: aa sonnani // ookii no         ka::
      oh that.much  big   nominalizer  FP
      'Oh, that big. (I didn't know that she is as old as you just said)'
```

```
4. H: go?
      five
      '... five'

5.    (0.5)

6. T: nijuu  go::?
      twenty five
      'Twenty five?'

⇒7. H: de  mata ne: (.) taikaku   mo Fukaya  yori: dek-* (0.8) ashi  wa   sukunakutomo
       and also FP     body    also Fukaya  than  bi-          leg   TOP  at.least
      Fukaya  yori  nagai  no. // hhh
      Fukaya  than  long   FP
      'And also, (her) body is bi-, at least (her) legs are longer than Fukaya's.'

8. T: a:::n   a! // ookii (   )
      hmm  oh     big
      'Hmm. Oh (she is) big.'
```

1. T: How old is this younger sister?
2. H: She is twenty
3. T: Oh, that // big?
4. H: five
5.   (0.5)
6. T: Twenty five?
⇒7. H: And also, her body is also than Fukaya bi- at least her legs are longer than Fukaya's.//
      hhh
8. T: Hmm. Oh she is big.

In this fragment, H and T are discussing the sister of their mutual friend Fukaya. In line 1, T asks H how old this sister is. H replies with *nijuu go* "twenty five," and T expresses in line 3 her surprise at

Barbara A. Fox, Makoto Hayashi, Robert Jasperson

this age – twenty-five is unexpectedly older than she had thought. In fact, T seems to have thought that the sister was even under twenty years old, as can be seen by the fact that she starts responding right after H produces *nijuu* "twenty". What is important here is that T uses the word *ookii* to describe the unexpected age of Fukaya's sister. *Ookii* literally means "big," but it can also be used to refer to the age of young people (as can *big* in English).

Since T uses *ookii* in line 3 in response to H's description of the age of Fukaya's sister, *ookii* here is obviously not meant to refer to the physical size of Fukaya's sister. However, H's subsequent utterance in line 6, which actually introduces the topic of the sister's physical size, is produced in a way which displays its connection to the use of *ookii* in line 3. Notice that the particle *mo* "also" marks the subject *taikaku* "body" in line 7. *Mo* indicates addition to what has been expressed previously. Although the predicate of the sentence that contains *mo* in line 7 was cut off and abandoned in the middle, it appears that it was going to be *dekai* "big," which is a slang equivalent of *ookii*. From these facts it is clear that H's talk about the sister's physical size in line 7 is built in a way that anchors it in the prior use of *ookii* as its source.

H begins the utterance at line 7 by talking about the sister's *taikaku*, "body." But right before he completes the predicate adjective, at the end of which he would reach a TRP, he initiates repair and reformulates his statement about the physical size of the sister by specifying a part of her body ("legs"). What is the significance of this repair?

First of all, the repair may have been initiated just to correct an incorrect statement and thereby avoid a possible misunderstanding. The word *taikaku* here refers to the size of the sister's body (in both vertical and horizontal dimensions). After H produces *taikaku*, he uses the comparative *Fukaya yori* "than Fukaya." So it appears, when he starts to produce the adjective *dekai* "big," that he is saying that the sister is actually physically bigger than Fukaya (notice that in Japanese the comparative phrase occurs before the adjective, while in English the comparative phrase occurs after the adjective: *Fukaya yori dekai* "bigger **than Fukaya**").

Resources and repair

de mata ne: taikaku mo Fukaya yori: dek-*
and also FP body   also Fukaya than bi-*
'and also she is than Fukaya bi-' or 'and also she is bigger than Fukaya'

But later in the conversation H suggests that the sister is in fact shorter than Fukaya by two or three centimeters (line 14 in Appendix 1), and it can also be inferred, from another part of H's talk about her, that she is not wider than her brother, either (cf. the story H initiates at line 21). So the utterance he appears to be producing is factually incorrect: Fukaya's sister is not bigger than Fukaya. It is therefore possible that this repair is an instance of error correction; and as Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) point out, repair within the same TCU as the repairable (as in line 7) is the preferred locus of error correction.

Although this repair may indeed be a case of error correction, the repair accomplishes interactional goals beyond simple error correction. As we argued above, the repaired segment (*dek-*) functions as a warranted way of introducing the physical size of the sister, by linking it to the preceding topic, the sister's age.

That is, if H had started with the "corrected" statement about the length of the sister's legs, he would not have been able to use the predicative adjective *dekai* or *ookii*, because *ashi* "leg" requires a different predicate adjective (such as *nagai* "long," which in fact is chosen by H in the repairing segment).[20] And if *dekai* or *ookii* cannot be used, the introduction of physical size would not be warranted by the preceding utterance by T at line 3, in which she uses the word *ookii*, because it is this lexical item that H utilized to build his utterance in a way that creates coherence between the two topics. Moreover, "leg" is too specific a comment about physical size given that the level of generality in the preceding utterances was at the level of "age"; that is, it would probably be odd to go directly from talking about the sister's age to the length of her legs. From these observations we can conclude that the repairable (*dek-*) plays a significant role in creating coherence with the preceding utterances which warrants getting a mentionable mentioned at this moment in the interaction.

Also, H's formulation of the repairable in line 7 accomplishes another piece of interactional work – managing the talk in the turn so as to "get what needs to be said said before the end of the

first unit's completion" (Schegloff, 1982:75). "What needs to be said" in our case is the somewhat unusual, and possibly funny, fact that the younger sister has longer legs than Fukaya.[21] Now, the turn at line 7 is not constructed in such a way that attempts to achieve a multi-unit turn (e.g. through the use of devices such as story-preface; see Schegloff, 1982), and thus there is a systematic basis for H to complete the talk about the "funny tellable" before he reaches a TRP, where the current non-speaker T may start up. In the present case, H accomplishes this interactional goal by exploiting the occasion of error-correction.

To see how this interactional work is achieved through the repair in line 7, let us reconsider possible reasons why repair may get initiated at this point in the turn's talk. We have suggested that one source of the problem with the repairable is the connotations that the word *taikaku* conveys. As mentioned above, it refers to both vertical and horizontal dimensions of the human body, and by using this word, the speaker could be heard as speaking of, for instance, how fat this sister is. We then argue that one plausible reason for initiating repair is to cancel this possible interpretation. This analysis is grounded in the fact that H is concerned only with the vertical dimension of the sister's body (height, length of legs) in the repairing segment as well as in his subsequent talk about this topic (see Appendix 1).[22]

Now, consider another aspect of the problem with the repairable. Notice that it contains the comparative phrase *Fukaya yori* "than Fukaya" in it. In Japanese, a comparative sentence and its non-comparative counterpart differ only in the presence of a comparative phrase, as in the following:

a taikaku mo **Fukaya yori** dekai
   body   also Fukaya   than   big
   'She is also bigger than Fukaya'

b taikaku mo dekai
   body   also big
   'She is also big'

Considering the fact that the sister is more than one hundred seventy centimeters tall (lines 9 - 11 in Appendix 1), which may be considered "big" by Japanese standards, the statement in (b)

above may not be so problematic as (a), which is factually incorrect. In other words, it could be argued that it is the presence of the comparative phrase that makes the repairable in line 7 problematic.

One possible way of repairing this aspect of the problem of the repairable, then, could be to cancel the comparative sense conveyed by the inclusion of *Fukaya yori*, by saying something like the following, which does not have a comparative phrase in it (the replacement of *taikaku* with *se* "height" is intended to cancel the problematic connotation of the former discussed above):

taikaku mo Fukaya yori dek-* **se mo sugoku takain da yo**.
body   also Fukaya than bi-   height also very   high   be FP

[Translation of the bold-face part]: 'She is also very tall'

Notice, however, that, instead of canceling the comparative sense, H in fact chooses to construct the repairing segment in such a way that retains the comparative phrase *Fukaya yori*. That is, his formulation of the repairing segment orients to elaborating on the comparative sense by mentioning the specific body part (*ashi* "legs") for which he is sure that the comparative sense he has introduced in the repaired segment holds. *Sukunakutomo* "at least" indicates this move of H's clearly. Why he chooses this move rather than canceling the comparative sense appears to stem from the funniness (at least to H) and the "tellability" of the fact that the sister has longer legs than Fukaya, for the telling of which, the presence of the comparative sense is crucial. A ground for arguing that not only we analysts but also H *himself* finds this fact funny and worth telling is found in H's subsequent attempts to elaborate on it and re-tell it in the form of a story whose punch-line is to reveal this fact (see lines 21-27 in Appendix 1).

As we argued above, H's first attempt to launch into the telling of this "funny tellable" in line 7 is done without devices that warrant a multi-unit turn, and thus a systematic orientation to finishing the telling in a single TCU operates at this moment in the interaction. H then effectively exploits the occasion of error-correction to accomplish this task – since the repaired segment has already established coherence with the prior topic, H can use the opportunity of repair to get a mentionable mentioned in a way that anchors it in the prior usage of *Fukaya yori* as its source. At the same time, he brings in the

specific part of the body (*ashi* "legs") and the predicate adjective (*nagai* "long"), which could not have been introduced in the repaired segment, and which are part of the essence of the funniness of the fact that H is to mention before relinquishing the floor.

The complex utterance at line 7 created by syntactic reprojection thus allows H to accomplish two goals before reaching a TRP: he can introduce a new topic in a way coherent with the preceding one; and he can get a mentionable mentioned before yielding the floor.

4.5.3 *Summary*

In this section we have argued that repair is not just constrained by the syntactic organization of a language, but in fact serves as a resource for expanding the syntactic possibilities present to a speaker at a given moment in an interaction. We believe this to be true for speakers of English and Japanese, and perhaps to speakers of all languages, making it possible for them to achieve multiple goals before reaching an interactionally vulnerable locus – a TRP. Speakers can thus use repair to create utterances whose interactive achievements would not be possible within the limits of "normal" syntax in a given language at a given moment in time.

This function of repair has, to the best of our knowledge, not been described before; it seems to us to be significant in at least two ways: first, it demonstrates the deep relationships between grammar and interaction; and second, it raises interesting questions concerning the domain and units of syntax (e.g. should a whole repair utterance be considered a single construction?).

4.6 Conclusions

In this study we have explored the ways in which repair is shaped by the syntactic practices of the speakers of a language, and, to a lesser extent, the ways in which repair shapes these practices. This mutual influence is already a recurrent theme in the research on interaction and grammar (e.g. see Goodwin, 1981; Fox, 1987; Ford, 1993; Ochs, 1988; Ochs and Schieffelin, 1989; Ono and Thompson, frth.; Geluykens, 1987; Schegloff, this volume; Ford and Thompson, this volume); the cross-linguistic methodology adopted here merely makes the influence more striking.

We were particularly excited by the possibility that the syntactic organization of different languages might affect their deep interactional workings, for example, the mechanisms by which speaker transition is accomplished in those languages. So although we started with the possibility that repair is influenced by the syntactic practices of speakers of a language, we may have found an even deeper connection between interaction and grammar: the heart of interactionality – multiple speaking parties – may be the locus of the workings of the grammar of a language. The importance of this possible relationship between interaction and grammar cannot be overstated – it lies at the center of our understanding of grammar and of interaction. It suggests that those of us interested in interaction must also turn our attention to the specifics of the languages whose conversations we analyze, and it suggests that those of us interested in grammar cannot avoid the interactional functions which those patterned practices we call "syntax" have evolved to serve. It clearly calls for empirical testing on a wide range of languages.

Moreover, this possible relationship between interaction and grammar calls into question our common understanding of syntax as a set of structures which can be deployed in a discourse (see also Hopper, 1987, 1988). If it is true, as we suspect, that interaction and syntax are not in fact separable but are rather different ways of looking at the same phenomenon, we may be better off thinking of syntax as a "hermeneutic for interpretation" (a term suggested to us by Stephen Tyler), and interaction as the occasion for that interpretation. This view of syntax recasts the academic fields of conversation analysis and syntactic analysis as essentially the same enterprise, with different foci of course, depending on the interests of the analyst. And it allows us to see how, for participants in a conversation, they might be one and the same.

Appendix 1

The following are the lines subsequent to lines 1 - 8 in 5.2

```
9.  H: hyaku      nanajuu::   ne::,
       one.hundred seventy    FP
       'One hundred and seventy-'

10. T: e::  //11   na::::
       oh       good FP
       'Oh, I envy her.'

11. H: ikuts(u)-  (0.2) gurai  anun  (da  yo)  tashika  (0.3) imootosan.
       something        about  exist  be  FP   I'm.sure      younger sister
       'She's about [one hundred seventy-] something in height, I'm sure, his younger sister.'

12.    (0.5)

13. T: sonnani  toshi  ga    chikaino  ka//::.
       such     age    SUBJ  close     question
       'I didn't know she was that close in age to him.'

14. H: u:n  DE::  shichoo  mo  ni  san  senchi   shika  tashika  chigawanai
       yeah and   height   also two three centimeter only   I'm.sure different.not
       ka   gura//i  nanda  yo.
            FP
       'Yeah, and (her) height is also only two or three centimeters different from his.'

15. T: sugo::i  ooki  ne.=
       amazing  big   FP
       'Amazing. She is tall.'

16. H: =de  ()  sooshitara  sa::,=
       and      then        FP
       'And then,'
```

```
17. T: =u::n.
       uh.huh
       'Uh huh'

18. H: ano  e- e- ()  tto kore  wa   moo kookoo    no    toki  no   hanashi ka    na
       uhm well       this  TOP  now high.school GEN  time  GEN  story  question FP
       // daigaku  no   koro  no   hanashi ka      wasureta kedo // sa,
       college  GEN  time  GEN  story  question forgot    but        FP
       'Uhm, well, I forgot if this is an episode from our high school days or from our
       college days, but ...'

19. T: u::n.
       uh.huh
       'Uh huh'

20. T: un.
       uh. huh
       'Uh huh'

21. H: sono imootosan  ga    sa:  Fukaya no    sa  nanka sa  ji- juppan ka nanka
       that younger.sister SUBJ FP  Fukaya GEN like  FP  je- jeans or something
       // sa:  hhh koo  nanka // koo:: hako- // machigaete ka nanka       SHIRANAI
       FP        uhm like   uhm  put.on   by.mistake or something  know.not
       KEDO  ha- haite   tara   sa:,
       but      pu- put.on when FP
       'That younger sister put on Fukaya's je- jeans or something- I don't know if
       um, well, (she did so) by mistake, but when she was pu- putting (them) on,'

22. T: u:n
       uh.huh
       'Uh huh'
```

23. T: II na::
good FP
'I envy her'

24. T: atashi nanka zettai hakenai. un
I TOP ever wear.cannot. yeah
'I can never wear yeah'

25. H: nani yo kore toka itte konna deta // tok(h)a itte.
what FP this quotative say this.much stick.out quotative say
'"What is this!" she says. Her legs stuck out (of the jeans) this much'

26. T: ah hah hah hah

27. H: nande konna mijikai zubon // haiten no toka iwarete ( ) toka sa:,
why like.this short pants wear P quotative be.said quotative FP
'She says, "Why do you wear such short pants?"'

28. T: ie::::::
wow
'Wow!'

Notes

1 We would like to thank Sandra Thompson and Emanuel Schegloff for very helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. We would also like to thank John Du Bois, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin, and Emanuel Schegloff for the use of their transcripts. Thanks also to Graeme Hirst, Ed Hovy, Willem Levelt, and Elizabeth Shriberg for providing much needed assistance in finding literature on repair in Psycholinguistics and Computational Linguistics. We are also grateful for comments offered by an anonymous reviewer. Transcription conventions are described in the glossary.

2 We use the term recipient in this study to refer to the hearer of the utterance, for whom the utterance was designed.

3 By recycling we mean the repeating, either with no apparent changes or with some additions or deletions, of the repaired segment. Recycling is thus a subtype of repair (see Schegloff, 1987a).

4 In an attempt to make this study accessible to a wide range of scholars in diverse disciplines, we have tried to write it as much as possible in non-technical language. In cases where we thought that technical terms from linguistics or conversation analysis would make the discussion clearer, we have defined those terms as early in the discussion as pos-sible (in some instances this means the definition appears in a foot-note). Given the rather technical nature of the subject matter, it would be impossible for us to eliminate all technical jargon from a discussion like the present one, but we have tried to keep it as readable as we could. Any failings in this area, as in any other, are our own. We ask the reader's patience with the definition of basic terms from their fields.

5 The terms "repaired segment" and "repairing segment" relate to the terms "repairable/trouble source" and "repair segment" of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). A repaired segment contains the repair-able or trouble source, and a repair-accomplishing repairing segment is just a repair segment.

6 We would like to thank Ryoko Suzuki and Tsuyoshi Ono for the use of their conversational data. The Japanese data used as the basis for this study represent a range of varieties, including Tokyo and Kansai.

7 Case marker and other abbreviations used in the glosses are:

SUBJ = subject
OBJ = direct object
LOC = locative
GEN = genitive
TOP = topic
OBL = oblique
FP = final particle
NEG = negative

8 The grammatical relationship "genitive" is roughly equivalent to cer-tain uses in English of the preposition of, as in *The door of the build-ing*.

9 Complement clauses can also be subjects of clauses, but we will not focus on these here.

10 Morphology is the domain of morphemes, which are the smallest units of meaning in any language. Morphemes are typically either free, in which case they can usually occupy a variety of positions in an utter-ance, or they are bound, in which case they are attached to another kind of morpheme. For example, the morpheme -s in English is a bound morpheme – it cannot occur by itself and must be attached to either a noun (if it is the plural marker) or a verb (if it marks third person singular present tense). In this discussion we are focusing on bound morphemes.

11 Bybee (1985) provides confirming evidence for this in her cross-linguis-tic examination of where verb markers occur with regard to the verb stem. She found that the more relevant a verb marker was to the

meaning of a verb, the more likely it was to be (a) closer to the verb stem, and (b) phonologically fused with the verb stem.

12 The term "lexical pair" is being used in contrast to grammatical morphemes such as articles and adpositions, and would include pre-nominal adjectives though we were not able to consider these. In some sense, lexical items are more contributionally consequential, semantically richer, and perhaps possibly less available (e.g., during word searches) than the more restricted class of grammatical morphemes.

13 We have tried to translate the repairs in the English free glosses; such translations are obviously only approximations to the original repair.

14 Example (43) may in fact involve a delay in the production of the whole idiomatic chunk, *take something through the mill*, as is evidenced by the utterance-final marker which references it, *so to speak*.

15 But see Fox and Jasperson (frth.) for important possible restrictions on the delay of just post-verbal items in English.

16 Verb phrases turn out to be an exception to this pattern (see Fox and Jasperson, in press, for a discussion of this fact).

17 In her comparative study of American English and Japanese conversation, Maynard found that Japanese speakers use roughly twice as many back-channels as do their English-speaking counterparts (Maynard, 1989).

18 Maynard's comments on this topic resonate with our own:

The fact that the Japanese language provides for devices such as final particles not only at the end of the sentence but also sentence-internally makes it possible to make [sic?] overtly the potential moments for back-channel expressions. (1989: 173)

19 Fox and Jasperson (frth.) discuss another repaired utterance from the same part of this conversation.

20 The utterance

Ashi mo Fukaya yori dekai
foot also Fukaya than big

has a different meaning than the one H wants to convey, since it means that the sister's feet are bigger than Fukaya's feet. This is because *ashi* can mean both "leg" and "foot," but when it is used with *dekai* "big," it almost always means "foot."

21 To elaborate on possible reasons why this fact is tellable, we may note at least the following: (1) culturally (at least for many young people) having short legs is considered embarrassing; (2) men are usually thought to be taller than women, and consequently to have longer legs; (3) since the society respects age differences (even age differences of only a few years), incidents showing that a younger person is in some ways superior to an older person can be worth telling. Thus, although Fukaya is male, older than his sister, and actually two or three centimeters taller than she, what gets told in the repairing seg-

ment reveals that he has shorter legs than she does, which is embarrassing to him and funny to other people.

22 This point was brought to our attention by Tomoyo Takagi.

References

Auer, Peter (1996). On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margaret Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bear, J., Dowding, J., and Shriberg, E. (1992). Integrating multiple knowledge sources for detection and correction of repairs in human-computer dialog. In *Proceedings of the Association of Computational Linguistics*.

Blackmer, E. and Mitton, J. (1991). Theories of monitoring and the timing of repairs in spontaneous speech. *Cognition* 39: 173–94.

Brazil, David (1985). Phonology: intonation in discourse. In Teun A. van Dijk, (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* volume 2: *Dimensions of Discourse*. London: Academic Press.

Bredart, S. (1991). Word interruption in self-repairing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 20: 123–38.

Bybee, J. (1985). *Morphology: A Study of the Relation Between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carbonell, J. and Hayes, P. (1983). Recovery strategies for parsing extragrammatical language. *American Journal of Computational Linguistics* 9: 123–46.

Chafe, W. (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, pp. 21–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

—(1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clancy, P. (1982). Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. In D. Tannen (eds.) *Spoken and Written Language*, pp. 55–76. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Clancy, P., Thompson, S., Suzuki, R., and Tao, H. (frth.). The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1992). Contextualizing discourse: the prosody of interactive repair. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds.) *The Contextualization of Language*, pp. 337–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, J. (1974). Syntax in mid-sentence. In C. Fillmore, G. Lakoff, and R. Lakoff (eds.) *Berkeley Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, I, III, pp. 1–25. Berkeley: Department of Linguistics and Institute of Human Learning, University of California.

Foley, W. and van Valin, R. (1984). *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C. E. (1993). *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C. E. and Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: a cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics* 4: 31–61.

Ford, Cecilia E., Fox, Barbara A. and Thompson, Sandra A. In preparation. Practices in the construction of turns: the "TCU" revisited.

Fox, B. (1987). *Discourse Structure and Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(1994). Contextualization, indexicality, and the distributed nature of grammar. *Language Sciences* 16: 1–37.

Fox, B. and Jasperson, R. (frth.). A syntactic exploration of repair in English conversation. In P. Davis (ed.) *Descriptive and Theoretical Modes in the Alternative Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fox, B. and Thompson, S. (1990). A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language* 66: 297–316.

Geluykens, R. (1987). Tails (right dislocations) as a repair mechanism in English conversation. In J. Nuyts and G. de Schutter (eds.) *Getting One's Words into Line: On Word Order and Functional Grammar*, pp. 119–29. Dordrecht: Foris.

Givón, T. (1993). *English Grammar: A Function-based Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Good, D. (1990). Repair and cooperation in conversation. In P. Luff, N. Gilbert, and D. Fröhlich (eds.) *Computers and Conversation*, pp. 133–50. London: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization*. New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1967). *Intonation and Grammar in British English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Hayashi, M. (1994). A comparative study of self-repair in English and Japanese conversation. In N. Akatsuka (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, vol. IV*, 77–93. Stanford: CSLI.

Hindle, D. (1983). Deterministic parsing of syntactic non-fluencies. In *Proceedings of the Association of Computational Linguistics*.

Hinds, J. (1982). *Ellipsis in Japanese*. Carbondale and Edmonton, Canada: Linguistic Research, Inc.

Hockett, C. (1967). Where the tongue slips, there slip I. In *To honor Roman Jakobson*, pp. 910–36. The Hague: Mouton.

Hopper, P. (1987). Emergent grammar. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 13: 139–57.

(1988). Emergent grammar and the A Priori Grammar postulate. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Linguistics in Context*, pp. 117–34. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Houtkoop, Hanneke, and Mazeland, Harrie (1985). Turns and discourse units in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 595–619.

Iwasaki, S. (1993). The structure of the intonation unit in Japanese. In S. Choi (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, vol. III*. Stanford: CSLI.

Iwasaki, S. and Tao, H. (1993). A comparative study of the structure of the intonation unit in English, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese. Paper presented at the LSA Annual Meeting.

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society* 2: 188–99.

(1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds.) *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 86–100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

(1978). *Danwa no Bunpoo* [Grammar of discourse]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Langacker, R. (frth.). Conceptual grouping and constituency in cognitive grammar. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm 3*.

Levelt, W. (1982). Zelfcorrecties in het spreekproces. *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* 45: pp. 215–28.

(1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition* 14: 41–104.

(1989). *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levelt, W. and Cutler, A. (1983). Prosodic marking in speech repair. *Journal of Semantics* 2: 205–17.

Local, J. (1992). Continuing and restarting. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds.) *The Contextualization of Language*, pp. 273–96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Local, John, and Kelly, John (1986). Projection and "silences": notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human Studies* 9: 185–204.

Martin, S. (1975). *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Maynard, S.K. (1989). *Japanese Conversation: Self-contextualization Through Structure and Interactional Management*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Moerman, M. (1977). The preference for self-correction in a Tai conversational corpus. *Language* 53: 872–82.

Nakatani, C. and Hirschberg, J. (1993). A speech-first model for repair detection and correction. *Proceedings of the ACL*, 1993.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text* 9: 7–25.

Ono, T. and Suzuki, R. (1992). Word order variability in Japanese conversation: motivations and grammaticization. *Text* 12: 429–45.

Ono, T. and Thompson, S. (frth.). What can conversation tell us about syntax? In P. Davis (ed.) *Descriptive and Theoretical Modes in the Alternative Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Postma, A., Kolk, H., and Povel, D.-J. (1990). On the relation among speech errors, disfluencies and self-repairs. *Language and Speech* 33: 19–29.

Power, R. J. D. and Dal Martello, M. F., (1986). Some criticisms of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson on turn-taking. *Semiotica* 58-1/2: 29–40.

Reilly, R. G. (ed.) (1987). *Communication Failure in Dialogue and Discourse.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking,* 1st edn, pp. 337–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Schegloff, E. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givón (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 12.* New York: Academic Press.

(1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk.* In D. Tannen (ed.), pp. 71–93. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

(1987a). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.) *Talk and Social Organization,* 70–85. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

(1987b). Between micro and macro: contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, et al. (eds). *The Macro-micro Link,* pp. 207–34. Berkeley: University of California Press.

(1988). Discourse as an interactional achievement II. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding,* pp. 135–58. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Schegloff, E., Sacks, H., and Jefferson, G. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361–82.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The Languages of Japan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shriberg, E., Bear, J., and Dowding, J. (1992). Automatic detection and correction of repairs in human-computer dialog. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Speech and Natural Language Workshop.*

Simon, M.E. (1989). An analysis of the postposing construction in Japanese. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Thompson, S. and Mulac, A. (1991). A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E. Traugot and Heine, E. (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization, vol. 2,* pp. 313–29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Uyeno, T. (1971). A study of Japanese modality: A performative analysis of sentence final particles. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan.

van Wijk, C. and Kempen, G. (1987). A dual system for producing self-repairs in spontaneous speech: evidence from experimentally elicited corrections. *Cognitive Psychology* 19: 403–40.