TILL

Tilburg papers in language and literature

30

Gail Jefferson

Two papers on 'Transitory Recipientship'

Caveat Speaker:
Preliminary Notes on Recipient Topic-Shift Implicature

Notes on a Systematic Deployment of the Acknowledgement
Tokens "Yeah" and "Mm hm"

With an appended brief glossary of transcript symbols

juni 1983

Caveat Speaker: Preliminary Notes on

Recipient Topic-Shift Implicature

Gail Jefferson

Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg

June 1983

For some while I have been looking at overlapping talk. Early on I

noticed that while people can, and massively do, simply recycle an over-

lapped utterance (as in Fragment 1.4 below, line 11), they do, now

and then produce a minimal acknowledgement of the utterance which over-

lapped their own, and then produce the recycle. For example:

(0.1) [NB:IV:3:R:3:Standard Orthography]

```
1    L:          You: you walked ho:me hu:┌h?
2    E:                                    └↑Oh: ↓yeah it's del*i:ghtf*ul↓=
3    L:     →  =╓Did you go down to ┐
4    E:         ╙<but a ↑l o : t  of┘peo:ple ou:t.
5    L:     →  Yeah did you go down to the dime store?
```


(0.2) [MDE:60:1-2:2:Standard Orthography]

```
1    T:          What's he gonna do go down and pick it up later? or
2               something like ( ⁻)-┌Well that's AW┐:↓f*ul.
3    M:     →                       └H i s   friend┘
4    M:     →  Yeh h┌is  friend  Stee-┐
5    T:            └That really makes┘me ma:d,
6                       (0.2)
7    M:     ˙hhh Oh it's disgusting
```


(0.3) [SBL:3:5:R:11:Standard Orthography]

```
1    G:          Uh: (.) kind of keep it in mi:nd for next Wednesday,
2    M:          °↓*Mm:°˙kh┌hh
3    G:                    └And uh:
4                       (0.7)
5    G:          W:┌e'll see ↓how tha┐t u-works o┌ut↓ ┐
6    M:     →      └I: WOULDN'T ho:ld┘            └Ye I┘: wouldn't hold you
7               to it because I: I ↓never ca:- am sure ei:ther↓
```

And in the following fragment this configuration of 'Minimal Acknow-

ledgement' followed by 'Recycle' has a minimal laugh token as a component.

(0.4) [G:93:AD:35-36:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    C:     →    Well now I don't know ab out on p a : v ement b u t o n:=
2    G:                            [i-      [He: s-]He said it di]dn't ha-]
3    C:     →   =on something  l i k e  t h i : s.
4    G:              He said he didn't have to worry about u-hurting his skiis
5               because they never touched the grou:nd.=
6    G:         =hh hh
7    M:              °Mm:: mmmm° ye::h heh-heh-heh-heh hah-uh hah-uh-hah
8    C:     →           hnh huh
9    G:                 hhh hheh-heh-heh-hih-heh-huh ˙hh˙hh
10   G:         ˙hn
11                            (0.5)
12   G:         °uhh°=
13   C:     →   =I don't know abou:t pavement but now something like this
14               tho:se (.) tho:se snowmobiles can mo:ve boy they're °fast.°
```

Such a procedure struck me as a curious combination of taking on the job of responding (a job which is massively not taken on in such a circumstance), and executing that job in the most diminished way possible.

And that diminished, transitory recipientship stands in sharp contrast to, for example, the affiliative assessment "Oh it's disgusting" in Fragment 0.2, and, for example, the strong 'newsmark/topicalizer' "She is? She's taller than you?" below.

(0.5) [GTS:III:17:Standard Orthography]

```
1    L:         I hate it. Twelve and a half years old and I- seventeen
2               and a half we look the same.
3                        (2.0)
4    K:         You know, my brother and I have come to one a- mutual
5         →     agree ment that- that we
6    L:               [She's taller than I am too.
7    K:    →    She is? She's taller than you?
```

A feature of this alternative sort of response is that, at least at this point, it abandons whatever the overlapped talk was doing and takes up the overlapping talk.

One thing that can be said about the configuration of 'Minimal Acknowledgement → Recycle' is that it can manage both exhibiting attention to the overlapping utterance (as the straight Recycle does not), and immediately getting back to the overlapped talk (as the various uptakes do not). It is an attention on the way to something else.

1. Minimal Response → Topical Shift

When I began to look at the articulation of topic I was struck by a

very similar procedure. Recurrently, a recipient will at some point pro-

duce a minimal acknowledgement of a prior utterance, and follow that with

a shift in topic. For example:

(1.1) [Rah:I:6:Standard Orthography]

```
1   J:        It en:ded with a great big ↓bang ehh he┌h hn I ┌jum┐ped=
2   V:                                              └°Oh-huh::°┘
3   J:        =out of the e seat I jumped
4                        (.)
5   J:        e┌shot about three feet in┐the air I think=
6   V:         └°O─h : : : : : : : : :.°┘
7   J:        =↑he┌h heh┐      ┌˙hhhh
8   V:    →       └Y e s┘:.˙hh└Eh::m, we didn't go to have our hair done
9             by the wa:y,=
10  J:        =˙h No well I gathered not
```

(1.2) [NB:IV:1:R:2:Standard Orthography]

```
1   E:        I ↓think *I *ought to g*o↓ home,
2                        (0.2)
3   E:        I don't know maybe Bud would like me to stay hh I do(h)n't
4             ↓kno┌:w.
5   L:            └hhhh┌h  °↓h┌n°
6   E:               └hI  └think he'd like t-me to sta-:-:y
7   E:        khhh┌˙hhh
8   L:          └°hm h┌m°
9   E:                └BUT FOR ORNERINESS I'm going ho:me, mhh!=
10  L:    →   =Ye:ah.=
11  E:        =hnh huh,˙hhh┌h
12  L:    →                └↑God I see in the paper there's sure a lot of
13            halibut being cau:ght down that coa:st,
14                        (0.3)
15  E:        Ye:ah. Bo:y well: it sure is ↑goo::d, we had some it was
16            really goo:d.
```

(1.3) [TCI(b):16:11-12:Standard Orthography]

```
1   A:        My biggest thing is trying to figure out how to cut the neck
2             and around the ears.
3   D:        Yea┌h,
4   A:           └That's the hard phha(h)a(h)art=
5   D:        =Yeah,=
6   A:        =˙m˙hhhhh without making it look you know 'cause I can take
7             the scissors and cut right around his ears but then you can
8             really tell it.┌too:.┐So,
9   D:                       └Yeah.┘
```

(1.3) (ctd.)

```
10   D:        Ye┌ah,
11   A:          └·t·hhhh tha̲t's (.) the part I've got to figure out how
12             to do:,hh
13   D:   →    Yah how much did you get at yo̲ur gift and gadget party,
14                        ⎺(.)
15   A:        ·hhhhhh̲h̲ Uh::: u̲-se̲ven I think it wa̲:s
```

(1.4) [SBL:2:2:3:R:5a:Standard Orthography]

```
1    C:        Well tha̲:t's one re̲a:son I̲ don't want three ta̲bles up he̲re
2              Kate'cau̲se: becau̲se·hhhh my̲: hou̲:se is just to̲┌o̲: s:┌ma̲::ll=
3    K:                                                          └Ya̲:h.┘
4    K:        =╟Yah.┐
5    C:        "A:ND┘uh·t·hh if I ha̲:ve a(w̥) another wuh In the frontroo:m
6              and in the dining ro̲om's fi̲:ne b̅ut if I ha̲:ve one i̲n t̅he
7              KI̲tchen over he̲:re.
8                        (.)
9    K:   →    Yah.=
10   C:        =·hhhh┌hh┐Well then i┌t's too ↑clo̲::se┌see,      ┐
11   K:   →     ⎺⎺⎺⎺└Di̅┘d you̅ neh-┘              └Did y┘ou̲ notice: uh
12             Claire I thi̅nk you came over and pla̲yed. the t̅ime̅ I had
13             thr̲ee ta̲bles̅ with the̲se all these o̲ther gals,
14                        (1.0)
15   C:        eYe̲::a̲:h?
16   K:        We̅ren't you he̅re,
17   C:        Ye̲:a:h,
18   K:        ·h̅hhh̅hh=
19   C:        =One of the ti̲mes: I wa̲:s,
```

Looking over these four fragments we can notice that in each of them the token which precedes the topical shift is, in the British fragment, 1.1, "Yes", and in the American fragments, 1.2-1.4, "Yeah".

Now, in Fragments 1.1 and 1.2 these pre-shift tokens are different from the prior exhibits of recipientship; in 1.1 "°Oh-huh::°" and a pro-tracted "°Oh::::::::.°" (lines 2 and 6), and in 1.2, some soft laughter, "hhhhh °↓hn°" and "°hm hm°" (lines 5 and 8).

In Fragments 1.3 and 1.4, however, the same token is used across the course of the talk. But we can notice some slight differences in the tokens themselves. In Fragment 1.3, while the token is the same, its 'shape' is different: "Yeah" at lines 3, 5, 9, and 10, and a "Yah" at line 13, immediately preceding topical shift.

In Fragment 1.4, while the token is the same, and its 'shape' remains constant, there is a difference in intonation contours, at least as between its first use, "Ya:h." at line 3, with an up-to-down pitch shift, and its next two appearances, the flat "Yah." at lines 4 and 9.

And I think a case might be made that the two flat tokens constitute a case of a recycled start on a topic shift. That is, the shift is initiated at line 4 with a "Yah.", is abandoned in overlap, and then reinitiated at line 9, again with a "Yah." Following is a rough characterization of the events in this small section of the talk.

With the up-to-down-contoured "Ya:h.", the recipient may be showing herself to be topically engaged and responsive. And this object is produced at a systematic onset locus, just prior to a projected final component. In this case, specifically as the last component is being projected with a modifier. This phenomenon is addressed, and several instances shown, in the TILL paper, "Notes on Some Orderlinesses of Overlap Onset". Here I will show just two cases which look very much like the case under consideration. First, a detail of Fragment 1.4.

```
(1.4) [Detail]

2    C:        because ˙hhhh my: hou:se is just to o: s: ma::ll
3    K:                                             [Ya:h.
```

```
(1.4.a) [Rah:B:1:(13):8:R: Standard Orthography]

1    A:        Yes ex act ly.
2    J:                     [You know I mean (.) whereas we go to ↓Wharton's
3        →     and they're always very char:ming and very obli: ging=
4    A:    →                                              [Ye:s.
5    J:        =in ↓th*ere.
6    A:        Well that's i:t.
7    J:                     [And uh:: so that's it. uh- I mean this- if
8             you're paying money good heavens you want the se:rvice
9             do:n't you.=
10   A:        =Certainly you do ye:s.
11   J:                       [Mm,  [So she was a bit upset about it . . .
```

(1.4.b) [NB:II:4:R:7:Standard Orthography]

```
1    N:            ↑AWoh do↓ggone=
2    N:            =I┌thought┐maybe you┌could┐
3    E:    →        └I :' d ┘↑LIKE TO ┘GET S┘OME LITTL┌E slipper┐s but uh:
4    N:    →                                     ⌣   └Y e :*ah.┘
5                        (0.7)
6    E:            `t`hhh *I ↑just do:n't think I better walk it's ↑just
7                  bleeding a tiny bit and a:nd u-I think I'm gonna stay
8                  ↓o:ff of it it thro:bs a little b*it. You know that's
9                  no fun to have a nai:1 tak┌en *off.┐
10   N:                                        └°Y e a h┘ r*ight.°
```

It can be noted that in 1.4.a. and 1.4.b. the participant who pro-
duces the post-modifier acknowledgement token (which in each case happens
to have that up-to-down contour) remains in recipient alignment. What I
am proposing about 1.4. is that following such an acknowledgement token,
the coparticipant goes on to produce a next one, where that next one is
now moving out of recipient alignment; i.e., the flat "Yah." which is
positioned just at a point of possible utterance completion (i.e., immedi-
ately after "because my house is just too small").

At this point, however, we find a massively recurrent phenomenon: As
a next speaker is starting up at a possible completion point, the current
speaker is producing a continuation. And in this case the incipient topic
shift is abandoned, perhaps to be reissued at a more auspicious place.

While the point at which the next flat token occurs might not appear
to be, and turns out not to be, auspicious, it is a recurrent locus of
next-speaker onset. Most generically, a mid-utterance 'hitch'. More
specifically, the current speaker has produced the first part of an 'if/
then' construction and then stopped (lines 6-8). And recurrently an 'if'
so strongly projects its 'then' that it need not be, and is not, produced.
A glimpse of this phenomenon may be gotten in the following fragment, in
which a speaker does not go on with the 'then', but a recipient does. Not
only does the speaker not produce it, but the recipient's contribution has
the character of 'a mere stating of the obvious'; a redundancy.

(1.4.c) [Valdez:Alt:5]
```
1    R:          It's bad enough when he, when he uhm, (0.3) tells you how
2         →      much to make but when he tells you what to cook.
3    F:   →      Then it's really bad yeah.
```

In 4.b. the speaker does go on to produce the 'then' component, and

at a possible completion point therein, the recipient recycles her own

overlap-abandoned utterance. Now, the recycling is perfectly available

for such an utterance as "Did you neh-" "Did you notice...". But that some

"Yah." at point T2 is a recycle of a "Yah." at point T1 is utterly obscure.

These tokens are ubiquitous, and do ranges of tasks. This brief consider-

ation has hopefully provided some basis for treating these particular two

tokens as constituting a recycle, where there has been a change in contour

as between the 'topically engaged' "Ya:h." and the 'pre-shiftor' "Yah."

and its proposed subsequent recycle, again "Yah."

The possibility is, then, that in each of the base fragments, 1.1-1.4.,

a participant shifting over from recipientship to speakership, moving from

one topic or topical line to another, can be seen to be producing pre-shift

tokens.

The phenomenon being proposed via these four fragments is that, akin

to the Minimal Response → Recycle of Fragments 0.1.-0.4. whereby someone

whose talk has been overlapped exhibits attention to the overlapping talk

while returning to his own overlap-abandoned talk, a so-far recipient of

some topic or topical line can, with Minimal Response → Shift, be exhibit-

ing attention to that topic or topical line while introducing his own. In

both procedures, the display of recipientship is fleeting - a merest nod to

the other's materials before/while launching one's own.

I will turn now to two other response types: Recipient Assessments

and Recicpient Commentaries. Although they can be far more elaborate and

interactionally engaged than the pre-shift token, it seems to me that in

one crucial respect they are equivalent to it. They can be deployed to

get from a current speaker's topic or topical line to a recipient's. And

thus, on the occurrence of one of them, topic transition may, at that

point, be underway.

2. Recipient Assessment → Topical Shift

To start off with it can simply be noted that, as with the Acknow-

ledgement Tokens, we find that recipients recurrently follow an Assessment

with a Topical Shift. For example:

(2.1) [SBL:3:4:1-2:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    A:        and I really felt te:rribly ba:d about the way she (.)
2              treated her be°fohhre.°
3    P:                    [Ye:ah,
4                      (0.2)
5    A:        And she jus:t gr:abbed her by the ha:nd when she got through
6              with it It was:: (0.4) it was rea :lly ↑Oh it (          )
7    P:                               [↑Oh::::]t  h  a  t's :]
8                      (0.3)
9    A:        one of the most thri:lling. programs I know I've ever (0.6)
10             been to (        )
11   P:                 [Well it had a ni:ce wri:te up in the paper too
12   A:                                                            [Yeh I
13             noticed th(h)a(h)t
14   P:    →           [·mtch! Well that's good ·hhh Well ↑LI:STEN uh-
15             ↑Tuesday ni:ght we're starting that Mother's Club bit again
16             at the ↓church.
```

(2.2) [NB:II:3:10:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    E:        You haven't got the Hawaiian House rented ↓then °huh?°
2    L:        ·kh·hh We:ll u-no: I (.) u-We k- we ke:pt it open for a
3              couple weeks 'cause I want the-uh: Doctor Livingston wanted
4              to come down gee I want to: (.) pay him for you know giving
5              me that stuff for my arthr*i:ti s and I mean : he won't=
6    E:                                      [°m-Hm: hm,° ]
7    L:        =take any money and everything ·hh·hhh and then (.) Earl's
8              gonna ha:ve uh:: (0.2) a guy from:: Central. (0.3) do:wn,
9                         (.)
10   E:        ◊M  m  hm:      ]
11   L:         [for a wee: ]k so: hYou kno:w
12                          (.)
13   E:        Mm hm,
14   L:        ·k I mean it's jus::t
15                      (.)
16   E:        ih bu siness,     ]
17   L:            [(ta:kes) ]Yea::uh, (.) Ye a : h ·
18   E:    →                              [Yeh tha]t's goo:d.u-How is
19             your arthritis, you still taking sho:ts?
```

(2.3) [Her:I:6:3:Standard Orthography]

```
1    B:          I got your ca:rd. Thank you⌐very much.⌐
2    I:                                       └ih-        └Goo:d.h˙hhh
3                            (.)
4    I:        ⌐e-So: what are you doi-⌐*w
5    B:        └A : n d  the dogs are s┘::u:pe:r,
6    I:        u-Wot- ↑Mm::?
7    B:        The dogs are a:bsolutely lovel⌐y.
8    I:    →                                 └Oh good. I'm hoping for
9              another litter shortly
10                       ‾(0.2)
11   B:        Ah:: h⌐AH(          )⌐
12   I:              └Uh::    └Mitzie┘wuh (.) Mitzie was mated about uh:m
13             ˙tch˙h two weeks ago:.
14                       ‾(0.3)
15   B: →      Oh: ↓love⌐ly.
16   I:                 └So: if it's taken they should be here in about six
17             weeks but I ↓don't know yet of course you can't tell, (.)
18             until,˙hh⌐⌐about a month,⌐
19   B: →             └o└h  h o w  r e a┘lly lovely.˙hh As a matter of
20             fact I was going to ↓a:sk you, ˙p‾hhh eh:m (.) Is there
21             anyone very reliable that does clipping you know their
22             ↓cla:ws.
```

I've characterized the assessments as more interactionally engaged
than the acknowledgement tokens, because they at least exhibit a position;
i.e., the "that's good" of 2.1 and 2.2. and "Oh good" of 2.3 line 8 and
"Oh lovely" of 2.3 line 15, and its elaborated recycle at line 19, "Oh how
really lovely."

However, I want to propose that the assessments need be no more
topically engaged than the acknowledgement tokens. So, for example, the
effusive "Oh how really lovely." is thoroughly misfitted to the utterance
it is positioned upon, "...but I don't know yet of course you can't tell,
until..." (see lines 17-19). That is, although it is highly interaction-
ally engaged, it is thoroughly disattentive to the current state of the
talk. This particular case of an assessment, with its topical misfitted-
ness, may be seen as a rather blatant exposure of a feature of all the
assessments; i.e., while they are more interactionally engaged than the
acknowledgement tokens, they are every bit as topically disengaged.

I will show one more fragment in which this combination of interac-
tional engagement and topical disengagement is strongly present. The
assessment in question is prolonged and elaborate, and takes a powerfully
affiliative position on the topic in progress: "I agree with you Harmon I
think you've got a very good point there". However, it occurs immediately
after, and appears to be being used to mitigate, a drastic topic shift
(preceded by the version of the proposed pre-shift acknowledgement token
for British talk, "Yes").

(2.4) [Her:IV:2:4:1-2:Standard Orthography]

```
1    H:       I'm gonna suggest that we: we increase our rese:rve by
2             another two hundred fifty which would mean five hundred
3             pou:nds.
4    N:       Ye:s yes quite.
5    H:       And we could uh:m (1.0) invest in the uh,h in the uh
6             National Savings you see fifteen percent.
7    N:       Mm.
8                          (0.4)
9    (N):     ((off phone)) (            )
10   H:                                  ⌊U h : : m I'd have to check, to see:
11            whether: in fact we're not liable to tax.
12   N:    →  Yes.
13                         (0.2)
14   N:    →  °Oh.° ˙hhh Edith's just asked me how are the dogs I agree
15            with you Harmon I think you've got a very good point there-
16         →  ˙h⌈hh E⌉dith was asking how the dogs were.
17   H:        ⌊Ya:h⌋
```

Of course there are many places where assessments occur and there is
no (immediate) topic shift. At least in some of those cases, it is pos-
sible that the current speaker is orienting to the shift implicature of
such an object, and moving to counteract it. Such an orientation and
counteraction may be seen in a recurrent phenomenon, in which it appears
that a speaker is intersecting an assessment in progress.

The first case I will show is a rather long segment which occurs
early on, in what turns out to be a long conversation. The recipient of
the telephone call produces a warrant for curtailing the conversation; her
parents are going out and she wants to talk to them. And she twice

interjects utterances directed to them, the "No come on wait a minute" with

which this fragment begins, and another "Wait a minute" a bit later (line

21). For one, then, she is making it strongly available to her copartici-

pant that the conversation ought to be curtailed. And in the course of

the talk, we find her producing again and again, assessments (see arrows).

```
(2.5) [SBL:3:6:R:3-4:Standard Orthography]
1    M:           No come on wait a minute.'hh Uh::, (.) my folks think they're
2                 gonna go down (      ) so I want to talk to them a┌minute.
3    A:                                                             └Oh
4    A:           'h Well say you better┌Oka:y
5    M:                                 └Yah.
6    A:           Better not talk too long.'hh=
7    M:           =R┌ight
8    A:            └I didn't do tha:t uh you know to ta:lk too long call to
9                 talk┌(too long┌but)
10   M:   →            └Ye:ah.   └Well i:t┌'s real sweet of yu‹┐
11   A:                                   └I just wanted to s- ┘hn mghh::m see
12                whether you had been go:ne. and tell you we're sorry
13                ┌we missed you.┐ because ┌we had a┌little °(Christmas)°=
14   M:           └ihYe:ah       w┘ell- No:?└I-      └I: guess
15   A:           =Uh::m (.) 'tch uh:: (0.4) Christmas Cheer for you. hhuh huh
16                ┌(                            )┐
17   M:   →       └Oh:: well tha:t was sweet. ┘Oh:: huhh┌↑hehh, huhh
18   A:                                                 └You can't imagine what
19                it i:s it's just a little:: (1.0) you know rememberance is
20                really wh┌at it i:s,
21   M:                    └Wait a minute.=
22   A:           =uhhhhhhh heh huh huh.'hhh But uh mghhm uh-huh we':ve uh 'hh
23                I: went over to: uhm (1.0) Virginia's a(h)nd uh 'hh I did
24                the same thing for he:r,h
25   M:   →       Oh: well tha:t┌was: thou┐ght┌ful hh
26   A:                         └U  h  :  :┘   └the day before yesterday and I:
27                didn't get a chance to go to your place too at the same time
28                be┌cause (I ran out of) ti:me┐
29   M:   →        └O h : :  w e l l  t h a:t ┘was
30   A:           hm-mghhm
31   M:           Well we'll ha┌ve Christmas
32   A:                        └Talked to her too lo:ng you know?
33                    (0.3)
34   M:           We'll┌have Christmas  C h e e r┌a:fter Chris┐tmas
35   A:                └I thought I could do both┘of them but ┘
36                    (.)
37   M:           ↑ehh ↑hah hah
38   A:           'uh 'uh 'uh 'uh
```

It can parenthetically be noted that the last assessment in this frag-

ment is uncompleted, "Oh:: well tha:t was" (line 29). It is possible that

this is starting out to be the sort of utterly misfitted assessment we saw

in Fragment 2.3. Here, an assessment fitted to the string of assessments,

"sweet", "thoughtful", would be interactionally ghastly, given the prior

utterance, "I didn't get a chance to go to your place too at the same

time". And it appears that instead of searching for an assessment term

that might fit the prior utterance, the recipient abandons it and produces

an alternative object, one which is nicely close-implicative; a problem-

resolution, "We'll have Christmas Cheer after Christmas" (lines 31/34).

The phenomenon I want to be focussing on occurs at lines 25-26, where

the speaker starts up somewhere in the course of what turns out to be the

recipient's assessment:

(2.5) [Detail]

```
24   A:        I did the same thing for he:r,h
25   M:   →    Oh: well tha:t was: thou ght ful hh
                          [U  h : : ]   [the day before yesterday....etc.
26   A:   →
```

I am wondering if that 'somewhere' is specifiable as a point at which

a speaker can recognize that a recipient is producing an assessment, and

is then specifically counteracting a recognizable move towards closure of

the topic or topical line underway. Following are four more cases in

which a speaker intersects at more or less that point.

(2.6) [NB:V:4-5:Standard Orthography]

```
1    P:        She's up at uh: Ronny's mo:m's no:w, she went up (.) Sunday
2              'hhh-'hh-'hh They came down for dinner=
3    E:        =[Mm:-hm:
4    P:         [And then ]uh: she'll I'll go get her tomorrow.
5    E:   →     Oh. Well that's [°wonderful.°
6    P:   →                     [And then uh, (.) too- e-she has an old
7              frie:nd Oh well she's u:an old friend of uy a:ll of us.You
8              know.['h-'h-'h ]But she's eh she:'s uh up in Lodi.hh
9    E:            [M  m   h m,]
10   E:        O[h : : :.
11   P:         [So she's ]gonna come down . . .
```

(2.7) [Rah:II:3:Standard Orthography]

```
1    J:        And is he any tbe(.)tter. Is it u[h
2    I:                                          [wOo- ih- Ye:s his back has
3              been much better the last two: da:ys?=
4    J:   →    aOh: that's [good  ]|the:n.
5    I:   →                [It ha]:d The]pai:n's go|:ne:=
6    J:        =eeYe:s::
```

(2.8) [TCI(b):16:77-78:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    A:        That's what really made me ma:d.=
2    D:        =Hu: :h.
                   [
3    A:            ˙hhhhh And I thought maybe they've got uh some: supply:
4              ˙hhh A::nd a::nd (.) that uh:m ˙tk˙hh since she was a
5              dea:ler then they sold them to her.
6    D:        Hm*::.
7                         (0.2)
8    A:        ˙t °I don't kno:w.°
                 [                  ]
9    D:          [°I don't↑kno:w.°]
10                        (0.3)
11   A:        ˙t˙hh hhhh
                     [         ]
12   D:    →         [Well] tha t's u too ba:d
                            [                    ]
13   A:    →               [But a:nyway it] really makes me: (.) kind of
14             disgusted,˙hhhh Fay says ↑I'd write them a letter and tell
15             them just what you think about that kind of
16             bu(h)si(h)nes s ˙hhhehh
                             [
17   D:  (→)                 [Ye:ah,
18   A:        And I said ye :ah,
                             [
19   D:  (→)                 [I hope I don't have too much trouble,
```

(2.9) [NB:IV:12:R:2:Standard Orthography]

```
1    E:        So all the kids are STANDING OU:T here the maRI nes get o ut=
                                                              [           ]
2    L:                                                       [°heh heh°]
3    E:        =of ↑the CA : R the st(h)a (h)tion wa:gon ˙he:hhhh:
                   [       [        ]
4    L:             [°°he°° [°eh°] henh henh]
5    E:   ‖And u- ˙huhh
           [           ]
6    L:  →  ‖Oh: th]a t ']s wo nder f u 1.
                             [
7    E:  →                 [The:re's th e (.) two young girls you know
8              that's across the street and every thing they're a:1 1 ik-
                                                  [                    ]
9    L:                                            [°Ye oh:: y e h.° ]
10   E:        They're gonna take them down to the beach now and wa:1k them
11             down the beach
```

The combination of the state of the talk so far plus the utterly standardized format of assessments may provide for these intersections to be assimilated to the generic overlap onset category, 'pre-last component', one specification of which, 'post-modifier', was referred to earlier. In the case of intersected assessments, the specification most relevant would be that of 'idiomatics', e.g., "as far as I'm // concerned", "it's like banging your head against a // brick wall", etc. (The double obliques indicate the point of overlap onset.)

Before going on to 'Recipient Commentary', I want to briefly consider a detail of Fragments 2.8 and 2.9. It can be noticed that the speaker is

in some sense 'underway' prior to his intersection of the assessment in

progress; in 2.8 with an inbreath "ˑtˑhhhhhh" (line 11), in 2.9 with a

conjunction, a little break, and an inbreath, "And ṳ-ˑh̲u̲h̲h̲" (line 5). It

is possible, then, that the 'intersection' here is merely apparent, a

coincidence, the speaker producing his materials independently of whatever

the recipient happens to be doing; i.e., a more faithful rendering of each

of these utterances would be, "ˑtˑhhhhhh (.) But a̲:nyway..." and "And ṳ-

ˑh̲u̲h̲h̲ (.) the̲:re's the̲ (.) t̲w̲o̲ young g̲i̲r̲l̲s...".

It is also possible that the speakers are 'hesitating' by reference

to the fact that the recipient is saying something, and then starting up

again when that something becomes a recognizable assessment in progress.

To provide a glimpse of at least the capability for such a procedure, I

will show four fragments in which one participant to overlap is producing

'dysfluent' talk, the dysfluency terminating upon or just prior to comple-

tion of the overlapping utterance.

(2.10.a) [Rah:B:1:(11):1:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    J:          ˑhh because Vera's: eh ṳ-Vera popped round last ni̲:ght eh
2                [Val is there you kno̲:w,
3    A:          [V̄e↑ r y ↓n *i c e]
4    J           ˑhh[hh
5    A:  →          [Oh sh[e arri̲:ved.]
6    J:  →               [And  ṳ- eh ]sh:e s̲a̲i̲d̲ to me . . .
```

In this case we see again the earlier inbreath and then the 'inter-

secting' talk. Again it is possible that the speaker is working indepen-

dently of the recipient's onset. And again it is possible that the speaker

is moving to counteract a topical shift, preserving a focus on the 'Vera'

node, preventing a focus on the 'Val' node.

(2.10.b) [GTS:I:2:52:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    R:          I[↑wouldn't ↓mind getting kidn̲apped it'd be[: fu̲:n.]
2    K:          [( ̄  )                                     [For i̲n̲s̲t]ance?
3    L:          I:[hate to te̲l̲l̲ ]you but you're never gonna]=
4    D:          [No I mean you]w o u l d n't  m i n d  if]
5    L:  →  =[come b̄ack al[i̲:[↓*:ve. ]
6    D:  →   [you:r:  u h ]─[f a t h]er mother got kidnapped
```

(2.10.c) [SBL:2:2:3:R:53:Standard Orthography]

```
1    K:         Don't we need tallies?
2                        (1.8)
3    K:         °(books,)°
4                        (0.5)           ⌒‾‾‾‾‾‾⌃‾‾‾‾‾‾⌒
5    C:    →    YEH well ↑why don't ⌈I j u s t ⌈make ⌉u p ⌈Why c-⌉
6    K:    →                        ⌊Would you ⌊bring⌋the ⌊tallie⌋s?
7    C:    →                                                  ⌊↑Why can't I
8               just make those thin:gs up I made bef:↓o::re.
```

(2.10.d) [SCC:DCD:22-23:Standard Orthography]

```
1    B:         I ga:ve what I: thought was an explana:tion.which in fact.
2               and I: said the deg⌈ree of friction.⌉I-
3    S:                            ⌊it's w e a : r.⌋
4    S:    →    ₀So how could it be wea:r.⌈You tell m e:.⌉
5    B:    →    ₀I u- I duh I dN o : ‾I- I⌊said I seh I s⌋aid ↓friction actually
```

These fragments, in which one speaker might be characterized as just
stumbling and bumbling along for awhile, are thoroughly compatible with an
alternative characterization; i.e., that this speaker is tracking and
managing the overlapping talk, 'hesitating' and/or recycling until the
overlap is, or is just about to be, resolved.

Similarly, the speakers in 2.8 and 2.9 may be tracking and managing
the overlapping talk, breaking off by reference to the fact that the recip-
ient is saying something, and then starting up again when that something
becomes a recognizable assessment in progress; i.e., specifically moving to
intersect/counteract an assessment in progress. Thus, across the array
constituted by Fragments 2.5-2.9, we may be seeing a fine-grained orienta-
tion to and management of the shift implicature of a recipient's assessment.

3. Recipient Commentary → Topical Shift

Most roughly, Commentary is
even more 'interactionally engaged' than Assessment, and drastically moreso
than Acknowledgement. Rather than providing a relatively 'content free'
"Yeah", or a conventional/idiomatic phrase such as "That's good" or "That's
too bad", the recipient does something which qualifies as 'talking on the

topic'. A commentary can be brief and simple, as in Fragment 3.1 (line 6)

and Fragment 3.2 (lines 5-6).

(3.1) [Her:I:3:5-6:Standard Orthography]
```
 1    L:          (He) wasn't worried when I broke my thumb twelve month┌s ago=
 2    I:                                                                 [˙t
 3    L:          =(             ).
 4    I:                 ┌°Ye:h.°
 5                        ‾(0.8)
 6    I:    →     °↓Oh really they are casual aren't they.°
 7    L:          (Well ye:┌s.)
 8    I:                    [°Ye:h, Yeh,°┌˙hhh
 9    L:                                 [(            )=
10    I:    →     Uh: well look ˙hh uh ask Joe what sor- uh what time he'll
11               be'cause (see) I want to be he::re,=
12    L:          =°Think he's just gone (missing hold on).°
13                         (1.0)
14    L:          °Just left the room.°
15                         (0.9)
16    L:          ˙hhhh ↑Ri:ght I'll uh::mn, hhhh You're going to be busy in
17               the mo:rning?
```

(3.2) [SBL:2:2:3:R:4-5:Standard Orthography]
```
 1    K:          I mean I was: (.) one that was grea:t↓l*y *at f*ault.↓ ˙hhhh
 2               And I: don't ↓think ↑Elva appreciates anything ↓like that↓
 3               <No:t that she said anything bu(.)t you (.) you just don't
 4               (.) pla:y Bridge that wa┌y  Claire.┐
 5    C:    →                            [No uh she w┘asn't saying anythin:g
 6          →     too much was ↓sh*e.˙hhh˙hhhhh I was just wondering if we had
 7               that other ta:ble (0.2) in the dinin┌g room┐=
 8    K:                                             [(    )]
 9    C:          =to┌m e┐that w┌ould-
10    K:            [Yah]      [Now if I: had been Teres↓*a:. I: wou:ld have
11               (0.2) I don't know she could shorten her table but . . .
```

There is a strong convergence between these 'simple commentaries',

"Oh really they are casual aren't they", and "No she wasn't saying too

much was she", and the 'elaborate assessments', e.g., "I agree with you

Harmon I think you've got a very good point there" (Fragment 2.4 lines 14-

15). The two categories begin to part company as the commentaries become

more elaborate. Following are three blatant instances of elaborate commen-

tary followed by drastic topical shift.

(3.3) [WPC:1:(1):39-40:Standard Orthography]

((J has been talking about a neighbor whose parents are now
both dead, the issue now being whether she will sell the
family home))

```
1    J:         she was talking abou:t it yesterday she said she use to she
2               says if she can't settle it she mi:ght.
3                             (0.3)
4    M:         Ye:s┌she mi::ght, ye:h=
5    J:             [(        )
6    M:     ┌→     =˙hh Well you never kno:w do you someti:mes yo┌u feel as if=
7    J:     │                                                    [No:.
8    M:     │→     =you don't want to stay in the sa:me pla┌:ce,˙hh tha┌t where=
9    J:     │                                              [(pla:ce.)  [Ye:s.
10   M:     └→     =you've been with your pa:ren┌ts: ˙hh
11   J:                                         [Ye:s.
12                           (.)
13   M:         Mm┌:.˙hh
14   J:           [But uh:: anyway,
15                          (0.3)
16   M:    →     ˙mptlk By the wa:y Janet did you get my annive:rsary ca┌r:d.
17   J:                                                                 [↑Oh
18               ye:s thank you.
```


(3.4) [NB:II:2:R:16-17:Standard Orthography]

```
1    N:         He feels people have to be responsible and he taught this
2               throughout the whole class=
3    E:       =┌°° M m  h m °°
4    N:        [so I don't know]how in the hell this blond guy ever
5               misinterpreted what he sai:d.┌˙hhhhhhhh Bu:t uh=
6    E:                                       [Mm:
7    E:    ┌→     =MAYBE he DIDN'T ↑WANT TO UNDERSTAND it.
8    N:    │      ˙tch˙hhh ↑COULD ↑BE:,h<
9           │                (0.2)
10   N:    │      Who┌ k n o : w s ┌you know,┐
11   E:    │→       [Pu:shed it ou]:t of his┘mi:nd it┌didn┐:'t appea:l to him=
12   N:    │                                         [Ya:h]
13   E:    │→     =°he had so┌me uh° S┐ome of that stuff hits you pretty ha:rd=
14   N:    │                [°Ye:ah° ]
15   E:    │→     =and then: °you thin:k we:ll do you want to be°
16          │                (0.7)
17   N:    │      hhhhhh┌hh
18   E:    └→          [↑PA:R:T of it.w:What are you ↑DOing.
19                        (0.9)
20   N:         What am I do┌ing?
21   E:                     [Cleani:ng?=
22   N:         =hh˙hh I'm ironing would you belie:ve ↓tha:t.
23   E:         Oh: bless it┌'s ↓hea:rt.┐
24   N:                     [In  f a : c]t I: ire I started ironing and I:
25               d- I: (.) somehow or another ironing just kind of lea:ves me:
26               co:┌ld ┐
27   E:            [Ye ]ah,
28                          (.)
29   N:         ┌You know, ┐
30   E:  (→)    [Wanna come]do:wn have a bi:te of lu:nch with me?
```

(3.5) [NB:IV:10:R:51:Standard Orthography]

```
1    L:          and then coming home I bought:: (.) they had tangeri:nes ten
2               pounds for a do:llar so I got te n pounds and I g ot some=
                                                [M m : :  [↓M : m.
3    E:
4    L:          =casa:ba and then I bought (.) ↓uh*:: (0.3) *uh Edna back a
5               box of da:tes ↓cause
6    E:                      [°O h :]↓*::[th*at's n*i: c e,°]
7    L:                                  [(°·hh°)   [you kno]:w,
8               (.)
9    L:          ◖She:<
10   E:          ◖°Tha:]t's [↓n*ice L*ottie↓°      ]
11   L:                     [She fed the  c a : : ts and]
12   E:                                  [That's]°beau:tif*ul.°
13              (0.3)
14   E:  ⊢→    ·tk·hhhhhh Well y o u  had a ↑beau:tiful<Now you feel like a=
15   L:                       [°(O:↓kay.)°]
16   E:  ⊢→    =new ↓ga:l.·hh Your ↑NER::VES've
17   L:                      [Mm
18              (0.4)
19   E:  ⊢→    You know there's so many other wonderful people arou:nd you
20              uh ·hh·hhh uh It's good to get awa:y from:: your family
21          ⊾→ sometimes you-ih can be yours:↑E:lf. You know what I me EA:N?
22   L:                                             [Y e : : a h .]
23   L:          Ye:a h.
24   E:  →           [·hyhh Uh getting ba:ck to this Vi:afo:r: foam, Lottie
25              is her NAIL A:LRIGHT no:w?
26              (1.5)
27   L:          Her NAI :1?
28   E:             [A h]:[hah?
29   L:                   [Ye::]ah.
30              (0.2)
31   L:          It's ↑beautiful ·hh BUT IT would (.) i̯YOU KNO:W IT WOULD
32              JUS:T HURT ·hh and he ↑took the NAI:L O::F F you know and it=
33   E:                                                 [°(O h :  G o d)°
34   L:          =kept ·hhh getting li:ke you↓:rs.
```

One striking feature of these elaborate commentaries is that the
prior speaker-on-topic now comes into alignment as a recipient (see Frag-
ment 3.3 lines 7, 9, and 11, Fragment 3.4 lines 12 and 14, and Fragment
3.5 lines 17, 22, and 23), while the prior recipient, now speaker-on-topic,
produces a summary; i.e., shows that the topic is completed, resolved,
perhaps 'exhausted'.

Now the prior three fragments constitute blatant cases of the proposed
phenomenon, in which a recipient first produces a commentary and then
drastically shifts topic. There are also rather more subtle uses of this
device. I will show just one more fragment, which I take to be such a use.

(3.6) [Rah:B:2:(14):11-13:R:Standard Orthography]

```
1    V:         But she said oh I've had them u̧ u̧ two days and I'm praying
2               for them to go̱:,
3                        (.)
4    J:         Oh:: d⌈e a r ⌉                      ⌈°(    )°
5    V:          ⌊So I s⌋aid oh: well I⌊'m not the o:nly one
6               ⌈then I said I⌉thought it was ME A̱⌈:GE-
7    J:         ⌊e h h h h e h⌋                   ⌊·hh
8    V:         ⊔She-  so she-  ⌉
9    J: →       ⊔Yeh it's a sha⌋me for Vi:v:=
10   J: →       =be⌈cause she's got her hands full⌉doesn't sh⌈e ⌉really.⌉=
11   V:            ⌊Y e h  i̱ t  i̱ s  a shame for V⌋i v . ⌊Re⌋a̱::lly,⌋
12   V:         =Yeh,=
13   J: →       =when they're nau:ghty l⌈ike tha-·h⌉
14   V:                                ⌊e e Yeah. ⌋
15              (.)
16   J: →       Yah ·h because you'd have thou:ght they'd have grown out of
17              i̱t by now r⌈eally.
18   V:                    ⌊Yes
19              (.)
20   V:         ⊔Yes
21   J: →       ⊔Th- I mean they're not ba:bies a̱re they.
22   V:         They're not no̱:,
23                        (.)
24   V: *→      ·h iY'⌈going you won't be⌉going to the town tomorrow will you.
25   J:               ⌊°°N o : : : : .°°⌋
26   J:         ·h Well I have to go I:'m I've got some:: eh:: Li̱z and her
27              husband coming fo̱r:: (0.7) e̱ s- uh s- ↓suppe̱r=
28   J:         =I⌈suppose ·hhhh⌉=
29   V:          ⌊Oh I: see.Yes.⌋
30   J:         =So e̱-there was⌈not a thing.I: didn't know⌉wuh:=
31   V:                        ⌊So you'll be busy tomorrow⌋
32   J:         =I was just going to have a look round and see: what there
33              was to buy but honestly, ·h there wasn't a thing in Marks:...
```

In this case the recipient produces a series of commentaries which
become increasingly vacuous. Indeed, her final activity on this topic may
be specifically designed to put the topic into a state of 'attrition'.
That is, following her last commentary, "I mean they're not babies are
they" (line 21) and the prior speaker's agreement, "They're not no" (line
22), and a momentary silence (line 23), she herself concurs with a very
soft "No" (line 25).

A similar configuration can be seen in Fragment 3.3.. The recipient
finishes up her commentary, the prior speaker produces an acknowledgement
token, there is a momentary silence, and the recipient herself produces

an acknowledgement token, "Mm". Compare the two segments.

(3.6) [Detail]
```
21   J:        I mean they're not ba:bies are they.
22   V:    →   They're not no:,
23                        (.)
24   V:        ˙h iY'
25   J:    →            [°°No::::.°°
```

I have not rendered the very first part of line 24 into standard

orthography, but have preserved the minimal production of a word at that

point, where the "Y'" would needs be rendered as "You're", which would

pose a different set of activities than has actually occurred. The onset

of speech in the two utterances here is for all practical purposes simul-

taneous.

(3.3) [Detail]
```
10   M:        where you've been with your pa:ren┌ts: ˙hh
11   J:    →                                     └Ye:s.
12                    (.)
13   M:    →   Mm:.
```

In each case, then, each participant, in turn, 'passes' on doing

substantive topical talk. The topic may still be in progress, but at this

point it is free of 'content'.

Now, just about anything can happen after such a series, and in a

next utterance either participant can produce further on-topic talk. But

one often gets a feeling that that talk is a matter of 'keeping the topic

going'. For example:

(3.6.a) [SBL:1:1:12:R:8d:Standard Orthography]
```
1    M:        Everybody that had a dih- took a trick with a deu:ce got a
2              pri:ze (.) I mean and ee you'd ho-
3                        (.)
4    M:        ┌( )-
5    B:        ⌊Oh: ye:s rea:l party::,
6    M:        y:┌Ye:ah.┐
7    B:          ⌊tri:ck⌋s u┌h?
8    M:                     ⌊Uh-hu:h?
9    B:    →   Uh-huh,
10   M:    →   Uh-↓huh.
11                        (.)
12   B:        Well that's fu:n.
```

(3.6.a) (ctd.)

```
13                           (.)
14   M:        °↓Yah.°
15   B:        Uh how big<How many tables.
16   M:        Two:. Just two:.=
17   B:   →    =Oh. Uh↓huh.
18   M:   →    Uh huh,
19   B:        ˙hh:hh:hh Well that was ni::ce.
20                           (0.2)
21   B:        How's u-How's Janet Phipps getting on.
22   M:        Well uh uh::m I was talking to her a couple of nights ago...
```

In the above fragment, a shift occurs in the vicinity of the second

pair of 'passes' (lines 17-21). In other materials the shift occurs imme-

diately after such a series. For example:

(3.6.b) [Rah:A:1:(6):2-3:Standard Orthography]

```
1   F:        Yes he's go┌t a ↓key.┐
2   J:                   └He's got ┘the ↓key with him that's alright=
3   F:        =₀Yeah.
4   J:        ₀Just in case I don't hear him if he ↓knocks::.
5                           (0.5)
6   F:   →    Yah.┌˙hhhh
7   J:   →        └Yes.
8   F:        O:keydo┌ke  Any┐way  ┐
9   J:               └O k a y┘well┘thank you very much for having them...
```

Thus, while a range of things may follow a series of 'passes', I

think there are grounds for proposing that such a series is topic-shift

implicative; that with a second acknowledgement token the topic-in-

progress is put into a state of 'attrition'. Where, then, the shift-

implicature of such a series may be counteracted, as it is - at least

temporarily - in 3.6.a., or carried out, as in 3.6.b.

And in Fragment 3.6. there turns out to be particularly strong

concensus on the current relevance of topic shift, perhaps due to the

topical-exhaustion work of the series of commentaries. That is, more or

less simultaneously with the recipient's move into topic attrition, the

speaker herself is making a more definitive move, initiating topical

shift.

(3.6) [Detail]

```
22   V:          They're not no:,
23                              (.)
24   V:    →     ·h iY'[going you won't be]going to the town tomorrow will you.
25   J:    →         [°°N o : : : : :.°°]
```

Now, in Fragments 3.1.-3.5. the commentaries may be observably 'moti-

vated'; i.e., the recipient thereafter shifts to some pending business of

his own. The commentary in 3.6. is not directly available as 'motivated',

in part because it is the speaker who initiates a topical shift. But it

turns out that the matter which the recipient then raises; i.e., her

failed shopping expedition (lines 30ff), is one that she had tried twice

before to introduce:

(3.6.c) [Rah:B:2:(14):7:Standard Orthography]

```
1    J:    ┌→    Well I've been to to:wn but there's °oh(h)h=°
2    V:    |     =A[h : : : : : :]I was hoping I'd cat[ch:: you=
3    J:    └→      [really there's] no↑thing  in  to:wn]
4    V:          =They'd only just go:ne=
5    J:          =[A  h : : :]what ↑a  s h a : m e,]
6    V:           [you know and I]won↑dered if you (          )]·hh And I thought
7                 well if you're out you can call on the way u:p you kno[:w,
8    J:                                                                 [Mm::.
9                             (0.4)
10   J:          Well I wasn't sure whether they'd still be ↓there or not...
```

(3.6.d) [Rah:B:2:(14):8-9:Standard Orthography]

```
1    J:          I'm gonna do some spaghetti an:d (.) n-eh::m meatballs for
2                tea for this lot now,
3    V:          Oh lovely.
4    J:          'Cause they didn't have u they only had fish fingers and
5                chips for dinner,
6    V:          °eeYes.°
7    J:    ┌→    But there's no↑thing in to:wn.=
8    J:    └→    =Mar[ks and S[pencer's ] s h e l]ves were]↑c l e a : r.]
9    V:             [·hhh     [Well they]wouldn't]s t a y ]↑for a mea:l ]
10   V:          ·h Actually they were supposed to: when they ra:ng e when
11               Bill said he was taking me out for a meal you know they
12               never mentioned it today but any rate I didn't ↓want one.
13   J:          n-No::.
14   V:          Well they wouldn't have anything . . .
```

Given these repeated attempts to introduce her encounter with a town

full of empty stores, the commentaries in 3.6. may be seen as 'motivated';

i.e., this story now constituting a bit of 'pending business of her own'

(and in her subsequent talk, not shown in 3.6., she goes on to list the stores that were either empty or shut).

With the Recipient Commentaries, it is becoming clear that some quite extended segments of conversation can be tracked in terms of a recipient working to disengage from a topic in progress in order to introduce some other matters. Several more intricate and extended cases have been considered in G. Jefferson, "On Stepwise Transition from Talk about a Trouble to Inappropriately Next-Positioned Matters", in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.) Structures of Social Action, C.U.P., in press.

Conclusion

I have considered here a series of objects with which a recipient can manage both exhibiting attention to his coparticipant's talk, and shifting to matters of his own. This task can be accomplished with great dispatch, with an Acknowledgement Token preceding a topical shift. It can be made rather more elaborate by employing an Assessment, and yet more elaborate by inserting a Commentary.

Nor does this array exhaust the devices for 'attending while shifting'. Another candidate is beginning to emerge, but I have not yet developed it, and that is an object which would seem to be enormously 'topically engaged': Recipient Inquiry. At least occasionally such items can be seen to be working to disengage from a current topic and arrive at another, by doing something I am calling 'topical stabilization of ancillary matters' ((see "On Stepwise Transition", ibid)).

To provide at least a glimpse of such a capability and use of Recipient Inquiry, I will show one fragment which, although it is not the nicest case, has the virtue of brevity. In contrast to other data, the shift here occurs in close proximity to the inquiry.

(00.1) [NB:IV:10:R:11-12:Standard Orthography]

```
1    E:           I'm gonna fix the turkey I'm getting it th:awed ↑ou:t, so=
2    L:        =▯G o o d.⌉
3    E:           ⌊I  thoug⌋ht I'd just go aHEAD up to that A:lmata Market they
4                 deliver and I went up and put my or=I was there a(.)t ˙hhh
5                 ˙hhh˙hhh˙hhh˙hhh °a qua hhh° qua:rter of ni:ne. They didn't
6        →       open 'til ni:ne it was such a (.) beautiful mor⌈ning,⌉
7    L:                                                        ⌊Thih ⌋
8    E:           So I⌈:  just⌉
9    L:    →         ⌊This mo⌋rning?
10                          (.)
11   E:           Oh: ↓Go:d Lottie it was beautiful down here,
12   L:   *→      Ih: I g- I:t was ↑wa:rm? it felt real Well it was rea:l
13                war⌈m down at Pa⌉lm Spri:ngs.=
14   E:              ⌊M m   h m : ,⌋
15   L:           =Gee ↓it was gor˙hhh (.) But it⌈w a s ⌉
16   E:                                          ⌊The wi⌋nd ble:w didn't it?
17                          (.)
18   L:           Ye::ah. Toda:y. And la:st night it really ↓blew:.
19                          (0.4)
20   E:           °Mm hm:,°
21                          (0.7)
22   L:           And ↑yesterday we went down to u-tow:n . . .
```

Most roughly, what might otherwise remain an im passim mention of the
weather (line 6) is fixed on by the recipient, with an Inquiry (line 9).
She subsequently introduces the weather she experienced on her vacation
trip (lines 12-13), and from there goes on to talk at length about various
adventures (initiated at line 22).

Of course one powerful and exploitable feature of an Inquiry is that
it constitutes a canonical case of what Harvey Sacks talks of as
'adjacency pair first pair-parts'; objects which have the property of
'sequential relevance' such that, most roughly, a second pair-part
properly occurs next, and if it does not, then something is consequenti-
ally amiss (see, e.g., Spring 1967, Lecture 7, pages 1-7). Further,
someone who has produced a 'first pair-part' has what Sacks speaks of as
'a reserved right to talk again' (see, e.g., Spring 1966, Lecture 2, page
9). Thus, an Inquiry is a particularly apt device for 'stabilizing ancil-
lary matters', in that it projects (at least) a three-turn sequence on

those matters.

There is certainly a difference between the various objects I have been considering; especially dramatic as between, say, the Acknowledgement Tokens and the more elaborate Commentaries, not to mention the Inquiries, which specifically ask the teller to produce more. But I take it that the difference is characterizable in terms of something like 'interactional engagement', where, in terms of 'topical engagement' the various objects are being put to virtually identical use. They are, each of them, 'exhibiting attention while shifting'.