chapter 9

Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation

GAIL JEFFERSON

In an investigation of stories told in conversation, Labov and Waletsky (1966) have shown that spontaneous stories can be subject to formal analysis, and under such analysis can be found to have a range of formal properties. While that study focuses on the story as the analytic unit, it suggests the relevance of "social context" to a story’s telling (cf., e.g., Labov & Waletsky, 1966, pp. 12-13 and p. 34).

In a series of investigations, Harvey Sacks has focused on the contextual occurrence of stories told in conversation, and has made preliminary observations which indicate that stories are sequenced objects articulating with the particular context in which they are told. For example, storytelling can involve a story preface with which a teller projects a forthcoming story, a next turn in which a coparticipant aligns himself as a story recipient, a next in which teller produces the story, and a next in which story recipient talks by reference to the story. Further, the story preface can have consequences for the story’s reception, and thus a rather extended series of turns at talk can be seen as a coherent conversational unit (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 2).
This chapter focuses on story beginnings and endings, sketching out two features via which a story can be seen to articulate with turn-by-turn talk: Stories emerge from turn-by-turn talk, that is, are \textit{locally occasioned} by it, and, upon their completion, stories re-engage turn-by-turn talk, that is, are \textit{sequentially implicative} for it.\textsuperscript{4}

\section*{STORIES ARE LOCALLY OCCASIONED}

In general, the occurrence of an utterance at a given moment is accountable, and a basic account is that a next utterance is produced by reference to the occurrence of a prior, that is, is occasioned by it (cf. e.g., Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 4 and Sacks, 1971, April 9). The local occasioning of a story by ongoing turn-by-turn talk can have two discrete aspects: \textit{(a)} A story is "triggered" in the course of turn-by-turn talk. That is, something said at a particular moment in conversation can remind a participant (speaker or hearer) of a particular story, which may or may not be "topically coherent" with the talk in progress.\textsuperscript{5} \textit{(b)} A story is methodically introduced into turn-by-turn talk. That is, techniques are used to display a relationship between the story and prior talk and thus account for, and propose the appropriateness of, the story's telling.

In the following fragments, both aspects are readily observable. \textit{(a)} An element of ongoing talk triggers a story which is \textit{(b)} methodically introduced into that ongoing talk.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{GTS:II:2:64}
  \begin{quote}
  \textbf{ROGER:} The \textit{cops} don't do dat, don't gimme that shit I live in the Valley.
  
  (0.5)
  
  \textbf{KEN:} The cops, \textit{over} the hill. There's a place up in \textit{Mulholland} where they've-- where they're building those housing projects?
  
  [  
  \textbf{ROGER:} \textit{Oh} have you ever taken them Mulhollan' time trials?
  
  'hh You go up there wid a girl. A buncha guys'r up there an' \textit{[STORY]}
  
  \textbf{Schenkein:I:7}
  \begin{quote}
  \textbf{ELLEN:} Tuh relax er during this last illness, on top a' the antibiotics,
  
  (1.0)
  
  \textbf{BEN:} \textit{W--well} on top a'\textit{thee}, \textit{cough} medicine.
  
  \textbf{ELLEN:} Yeah, and the cough medi--\textit{incidentally}. Did I tell you?
  
\end{itemize}
BILL: No.
ELLEN: That the d– he told us t’give uh Snookie a third of a
tea spoon of uh: cough medicine. Cheracol, is there a–
Is there a cough medicine call’Cherac’l=
BILL: [Yeah,]
BEN: [Yeah,]
ELLEN: =’hhh We happen’tuh have Vic’s Forty Four [STORY]

[NB:IV:7:51]
LOTTIE: ’hh (hh)en so ’hh when Duane left’tuhday we took off ar
s– ’hh suits yihknow en, eh– Oh en she gave me the most
• beautiful swimsuit you’ve ever seen in yer life.
EMMA: Gave it to yuh?
LOTTIE: Yeah,
EMMA: Aww:: ::
LOTTIE: A twunny two dollar one.

EMMA: Aww::::

LOTTIE: Well you’ve given her a lot in uh yer day Lottie,
LOTTIE: I know ut. En when we looked w–one et Walter Clark’s
you know wir were gonna buy one cuz [STORY]

The technique used in these fragments consists of two discrete devices produced consecutively: (a) a ‘disjunct marker’ such as “Oh” (F.1.L.7 and F.3.L.2) and “incidentally” (F.2.L.5) signals that the talk to follow is not topically coherent with the adjacent prior talk, and (b) an ‘embedded repetition’ locates, but does not explicitly cite, the element of prior talk which triggered the story (“Mulholland,” F.1.L.5. and 7., “cough medicine” F.2.L.4, 5, and 8, and “suits”/“swimsuit,” F.3.L.2 and 3).

This appears to be a version of an explicit Speaking of X format in which a marked repeat (cf. Jefferson, 1972, pp. 295–296) cites a component of prior talk as the source of the story being introduced.7

[GTS:II:2:50:r:2]
ROGER: Speakin about forties. I worked on a k-o::n
Morganelli’s Forty.

[SBL:2:5:12]
BEA: Saying dahlias, I just cut some fresh dahlias
at my neighbor’s this evening. . .
Fragment (3) is of particular interest for the methodic construction of a disjunct plus repetition format. Assuming that speakers monitor their own talk (cf. Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 2) and assuming the "s--" in (L.1–2) "... we took off ar s--" is the beginning of the word "suit" (cf., e.g., Jefferson, 1974, pp. 185–188), then it is possible that having started to say "suit" speaker finds she has a story and cuts off, preparatory to introducing the story. Thereafter, to set up a disjunct plus repetition, she produces the word in full, "... we took off ar s-- 'hh suits..." and subsequently produces the display of sudden remembering, the disjunct marker "Oh" followed by the embedded repetition (L.1–3) "... we took off ar s-- 'hh suits yihknow en, eh-- Oh en she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit...".

The combined devices of disjunct and embedded repetition signal that the matter now being talked of, while not topically coherent with prior talk, had that talk as its source, that is, is a direct product of monitoring that talk. This stands in contrast to a story triggered at a particular moment but not by ongoing talk, for example:

[J:FN] (6)

((three people walking together; someone passes them wearing a photograph tee-shirt))

Nettie: Oh that tee-shirt reminded me [STORY]

The two devices need not occur in combination. A disjunct marker can be followed by something other than a repetition (cf. F.25.L.26), and an embedded repetition can follow something other than a disjunct marker. In the following fragment, a story is introduced as a topically coherent next utterance, with a version of the once-upon-a-time format; that is, it starts with a temporal locator (F.7.L.7) "New Years we...". Subsequently an embedded repetition of the trigger word occurs (L.13, cf.L.1 and 4).

[GTS:II:2:87:r]

- AL: ((To Roger)) Probly poured glue over it. 'F I know you;

  (0.4) 1

- Ken: 'hhhhh No:, yih gotta be careful evry so often 'e takes

  that cup'n 'e takes a deep whiff he's gotta tube a'glue

  in it.

  (0.7) 5

- Roger: New Years we:: split up the dues so we each hadda buck

  fifty tuh buy booze with fer the New Years party?

  7

AL: Mm hm,
ROGER: So w’wen’ around the room they were takin orders. ’hh So 10
Lance k– So:, ’one guy bought a, dollar fifty worth a’ 11
Ripple, ’hh next guy b(hh)ought a dollar fifty worth a’ 12
glue:. uhh!
13
( ): ’hhh=
14
KEN: =heh huh– h u h
15
[ ] he–eh hehh he hh
16
ROGER: ’hhh! ’uff ff
17
[ ] hihhh!
18
AL: (JIM): hheh=
19
ROGER: =’Pl(h)anning on gittin ga:ssed. Huh La(h)nce.’
20
[ ]
(V e r y)
21
ROGER: hh ’uhh hyihh ’hhh h
22
=][
(good Roger) he:::h.
23
(1.0)
AL: (1.0)
24
ROGER: They were progressively gittin worse, ez we went
aroun’ 25
the circ(h)le,
26
KEN: m–hhmhh( )
27
[ ] he:h hehh' uh' hh nh
28
KEN: (That’s a true
29
) 
ROGER: I ordered rum’n 30
thought it wz ba:d y’(h)kno(h)ow 31

The story is not produced as a sudden remembering, but as continuous with prior talk. It appears that the procedure used to introduce the story is consequential for the story’s structure on this occasion of its occurrence. Specifically, the repetition does not occur as part of the introduction (cf. F.1–6), but as a component of the story’s punch line (L.12–13). Some details of the fragment suggest that the repetition’s punch line positioning is accompanied by a condensing of the story, with the repetition-bearing punch line occurring sooner than it might have, given the story’s events.9

Subsequent to the punch line is a series of commentaries, one of which proposes an order in which the events occurred (L.25), one of which offers an event which might have occurred prior to that which constitutes the punch line (L.30–31). That is, the order of events might
have been: They went around the room taking orders (L.10), progressively getting worse as they went around the circle (L.25); one guy ordered Ripple (L.11–12), Roger ordered rum and thought it was “ba:d” (L.30–31) until someone ordered glue (L.12–13 and 20).  

There are, then, a variety of devices and combinations of devices by which a triggered story can be appropriately introduced. The observable relationship between a story and prior turn-by-turn talk is a product of methodic displays, fitted to the talk so far and to the story to be told. Further, it appears that the particular circumstances under which a story is entered can have consequences for the structure of the actually told story, which itself is fitted to the manner of its introduction.

Entry into a story from turn-by-turn talk can be done economically or elaborately. So, for example, in the following fragments, entry is achieved via a conventional story-prefixeded phrase.  

[Actors’ Group:13] (8)

JOE: If they’re supposed to hate you up there, they do. 1
B.J.: eehaha ha 2
JOE: You kn ow. 3

• DARCY: Tha ss– 4

B.J.: They hold a grudge. 5
JOE: Yeah! 6
AMY: heh–heh–heh–heh 7
• DARCY: Thass true now th–uh Hal’s roommate Ron Bender [STORY] 8

[GTS:III:1:19] (9)

KEN: He was terrific the whole time we were there. 1
LOUISE: I know what you mean. Wh’n they– my sister and her boyfriend [STORY] 2

[Adato:III:21] (10)

VINNY: The guy at the top’s gonna make sure no one– knocks im off. 1
STAN: The guy in the middle is playin both of ’em against the other, so you know, whaddiyou got. 2
JAY: hih! huh huh Ki(hh)nd of a me(hh)ess. 3
• STAN: Really when you consider it. It’s– it’s like uh I heard Senator Kennedy [STORY] 4

[Reilly:9] (11)

FRAN: I feel sorriest for Warren hh hh how he sits there an’ listens to it I don’know? But, um. 1


HOLLY: Well he must'v known what she was like before 'e married 'er.

FRAN: I guess. And--

* HOLLY: He can be a bastard too, he uh one-- one day we [STORY]

[Carey:Bar:I:1]

FRANK: What'r these freaks mostly? who'r goin t'his,=

GEORGE: =No: They're perfectly legitimate-- 'hh d-- ezza

* mattera fact the g-- 'hh the guy [STORY]


PHIL: (Yeh) en the guy who broke it should c--certainly, clean it up.

VIC: But it don't happen that way becuss nine chances outta ten matter a'fact I know duh, u--dih guy [STORY]

[D.A.:17]

ANN: But nobody fought with huh like I fought with huh.

(1.4)

* ANN: Uhb--uh fer example, uh d--oh about two weeks before she [STORY]

[Goldberg:II:I:23]

MAGGIE: Very rarely do I get a Saturdee off. I mean I hav to like

* plan a month in advance for the Suh-- for the Saturdees

off, ez a matter a'fact I've [STORY]

The more elaborate procedures have a story emerging through longer stretches of turn-by-turn talk. The story emerges not only as topically coherent, as in fragments (8)–(15), but with coparticipant(s) specifically aligned as story recipients.

In the following fragment, a display of story triggering is produced (F.16.L.24–32) with a marked repeat (L.29) "And they are stars" which cites an element of prior talk (L.24) as the story trigger, and is followed by an embedded repetition (L.31–32; cf. also note 7). However, it appears that the story is actually triggered earlier, via a slightly more complex process than the one displayed here (cf. F.1–6).

[Labov:Battersea Park:B:3:r]

LADY: It's dying out yihkno:w,=

* PARKY: =Oh: ye:ss, Well they got s'm new, hh (·) new=

* PARKY: =They got th'dolphins in the:h=

MAN: =Mm.
TRACY: They *do*.

PARKY: *Fl ippah,hh*

LADY: *B't even:*=

PARKY: =la hk you av in Ameriker on the fi:lm,

LADY: *s o :.*

TRACY: *'h h h h h h O h :. Oh ye:s.*=

MAN: =Ye:h, them.=

PARKY: =Well we got s ome in the:h.

LADY: *P e e-

TRACY: *I'll b e da:::ned.*

LADY: People uh co mplaining a the pri:ce.=

PARKY: Ye:s th'pri:ce, Well et Oxf'd Street they've got'em the:uh.  

(0.2)

MAN: Ye :h.

TRACY: Hhuh.

PARKY: And uh ther very good et Oxf'd Street:t.

TRACY: *Hhu:h.*

PARKY: They've got fo'ovuh the:h,

(0.4)

PARKY: You s ee two: trainee:s, 'n then you see the two sta:hs.

( ):

( ): hhhhh

(0.2)  

PARKY: En theh ah stah:s my G.awt.(.')I 'm sittin up e the fro:nt=

( ):

PARKY: =wiv, (mah two guhl), 'hhh Un:d uh h- all et once one a'

these stahs wen'up'n the ay didn'alf go up too.'n w'n 'e

c(h)ome do:wn gow cracky I wz saturaite d.

MAN: *h-hheeh*

MAN: h e h,

PARKY: *'E co me right this e:nd.*

TRACY:  

h a   *h a!
It appears that in the course of disputing a prior utterance which has proposed that amusement parks are dying out, a speaker is starting to invoke a general category—something like “new attractions” or “new acts” (L.2). Starting on that, he is reminded of an incumbent of that category, a particular new attraction (L.3) “the dolphins,” about which he has a story to tell. And he proceeds in much the same fashion as does speaker in fragment(3) (L.1–2) “. . . we took off ar s–’hh suits. . .”; that is, he stops prior to completion of the unit “new–” and then starts to recycle it (L.2.) “. . . they got some new, hh (’') new. . . .” Thereafter he takes a different tack, abandoning the entire sentence-so-far and replacing it with (L.3) “’They got the dolphins in there.’” His subsequent talk may specifically “mask” the fact that a story has been triggered; that is, reference to the dolphins is preserved through turn-by-turn talk without a repetition of that word (L.6–8, 12, 16, 20, 22, 24). Rather, the particular new attraction is used as a base for topical talk, with teller proposing a special interest that one of his coparticipants might have in talk about dolphins (L.6–8) “Flipper. . . like you have in America. . . .” coparticipant producing tokens of special interest (L.10) “’hrrr O h:. Oh ye:s.’” With these tokens, while coparticipant does not herself offer topical talk about dolphins, she displays herself as receptive to talk on that topic; that is, she aligns herself as a recipient.

Thereafter, two of teller’s three coparticipants produce tokens of appreciation/understanding as the talk moves toward the storytelling (L.11, 14, 18, 19, 20). These two may be relevantly identified as “potential story recipients.” The third, however, competes with the talk out of which the story is emerging, overlapping both teller (L.6–8 and 12–13) and one recipient (L.14–15) with a single coherent sentence continuing the ongoing dispute (L.7–9, 13–15) “But even so:. . . Pee–. . . People are complaining of the pri:ce.” (cf. Sacks, 1967b, Lecture 13, and 1972, Lecture 4).

The disparate alignment of coparticipants prior to the story’s telling
seems to have consequences for its reception. The two recipients produce laughter (L.34–35, 37, 41.) while the disputer does not—that is, the positions taken by coparticipants prior to the story’s telling are preserved in its reception. Thus, the elaborated turn-by-turn emergence of a story from topical talk may be methodically constructed, not only by reference to its appropriate, locally occasioned occurrence, but by reference to its projected reception.

STORIES ARE SEQUENTIALLY IMPLICATIVE

In general, an utterance “projects for the sequentially following turn(s), the relevance of a determinate range of occurrences. . . . It thus has sequentially organized implications.” Further, there are ways of “methodically providing for such implicativeness [Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 296].” The re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk at a story’s completion is a matter of sequential implicativeness in both senses; that is, at a story’s ending two discrete aspects similar to those observed for local occasioning can be found. (a) A story can serve as a source for triggered or topically coherent subsequent talk, and (b) a range of techniques are used to display a relationship between the story and subsequent talk—techniques which provide that the story is implicative for subsequent talk and thus propose the appropriateness of its having been told.

As an initial approach to sequential implicativeness, an instance is shown in which it is absent. Here, a story (F.17.L.17–29) may have been triggered by an element of prior talk, the word “Brentwood” (L.13) which is being used to refer to a mental hospital (L.15–16), it happening that the hospital is located in a high-income suburb (cf. L.17–18). The story is introduced as continuous with prior talk (L.17; cf. F.7.L.7) and is elaborately told, but when its telling stops (L.29), ongoing talk is picked up where it left off (L.30). For clarity, the transcript has the story indented.

\[
\text{[GTS:IV:1:12]} \quad (17)
\]

\text{DAN:} \quad \text{Alright, except that again, you’re—you’re—you’re using an example of maybe one or two individuals,} \quad 1

\text{ROGER: Yes,} \quad 2

\text{DAN:} \quad \text{Uh::m and saying well look what these people did. And the other idea is that most schizophrenics, most psychotics are not really able to produce very much of any thing.} \quad 3

\text{ROGER:} \quad \text{I’m not saying don’t cure schi– I’m taking it as an individual} \quad 4

\]
case. I’m taking this individual and referring to only=

[ ]

Mm hm, it’s true–

DAN: =this individual.
ROGER: ’S true, and I’m sure that his artwork uhm all you have to
do is go over t’ Brentwood and see some very interesting
artwork I find it interesting.

[ ]

Where at the hospital?

ROGER: That’s right,

DAN: Yeah and you c’n also go into some of these
millionaires’ hou–homes. And they’ve bot– boughten
some of these uh artworks from different places in
the world? You c’n look at ‘em and– I mean I don’t
know anything about art, I can’t– I can’t draw that
well, I can draw cars, and junk like this when I
want to, but uh: go into some of these houses and
they– it looks like somebody took a squirtgun with
paint in it an’ just squirted it. Justa buncha lines
goin every which way an’ “Oh isn’t that terrific?”
“Yeah. What is it.” Y’kno(h)w? “Didjer child have
a good time when he was drawing that?” “Whad-diyuh
mean that cost me–” Y’know hhh

DAN: See but the other al– the alternative that you’re giving
me is to say well look, m–m– maybe uh maybe a person has
to be sick in order to be able to see these things,

ROGER: No, this man–

[[ ]

DAN: And I don’t think–

DAN: And I don’t think that’s true.

ROGER: I don’t think so either. But this man...

This is a dramatic instance; the story is treated as utterly irrelevant
to the ongoing talk and is sequentially deleted. More routinely, the rela-
tionship of a story to subsequent talk is negotiated between teller and
recipients. For example, recipients will not actively move to delete a
story, but will withhold talk which demonstrates the story’s sequential
implicativeness, and teller will search for ways to elicit recipient talk,
deploying story components as story exit devices.

In the following fragment a story reaches a point of possible comple-
tion (F.18.L.3) and is followed by a pause (L.4). Thereafter is a series
of postscripts and commentaries, each followed by a pause (L.5–8 and 9,
L.10–12 and 13, L.14–16 and 17). Finally, a commentary is followed by
turn-by-turn talk (L.22–25 and 27 ff.). Across the series of story components there is an observable progression away from the story, toward tangential and more general, but yet recognizably related, issues. And it is at the point where teller offers a general topic that recipients engage in turn-by-turn talk (L.22 ff.).

[GTS:II:2:64:r]

ROGER: [STORY] 'n were back t' the pizza joint we started from. (18)
Y'know, En we spend a whole night doin that, 'n waste a lotta money on gas'n, 'hh Buh we hadda ba:ll. (0.8)

- ROGER: En there's only two guys t'each car. That's th' thing

DAN: mkkhhhh. ((throat clearing))

DAN: mkkhhhm. ((throat clearing))

ROGER: y'know?

(0.5)

- ROGER: Ih wz during the summer en we do it lo:tsa times yuh know. W'call it a cru:i:se y'know, En the club enjoys doing that.

(1.0)

- ROGER: 'hhh B'd now most'the guys in th'club through 'hh one method'r another are either not driving'r don't have a ca:r. 'k-'ghhh?

(1.2)

- ROGER: So.

(KEN): hhhh

DAN: hmhm, hm.

(0.9)

- ROGER: 'hhhhhh Kids don't drive long. They start off w't their si-- by the time– when they're sixteen b'the time they're eighteen they're back wa-al:k ing.hh::: 'ehh-'eh th(h)rough c(h)irc(h)umsta(h)a(h)nces.

ROGER: uffffffffff

=[:,:]

AL: beyond their con tro::::::l.

[ beyond their c'n tro ::l.

DAN: Uh!hhY(h)e(h)s.

ROGER: = 'ihhh 'uh=
A prototypical display of story completion, a return "home" (L.1.) "'n were back t'he pizza joint we started from," is followed by commentary (L.2–3) and a secondary ending, now not of the story, but of the storytelling; an assessment (L.3) "'hh Buh we hadda ba:ll." There is no talk whatsoever at completion (L.3 and 4), nor over three recycles of a "transition-relevance place [Sacks et al., 1974, p. 703]," a place at which turn-by-turn talk might be re-engaged (L.5–8 and 9, 10–12, and 13, 14–16, and 17), and a request for recipient comment (L.18) "So," receives minimal tokens of appreciation (L.19 and 20) which, although they acknowledge and are occasioned by prior talk, are not themselves implicative for subsequent talk. These are followed by still another pause (L.21). The absence of recipient talk is dramatic.

Equally dramatic is the manner in which turn-by-turn talk is re-engaged. Teller himself provides a topical utterance which demonstrates the sequential implicativeness of the story (L.22–25). If recipients talk by reference to it, then the story will have re-engaged turn-by-turn talk. In the course of that utterance, he produces an object which can provide for the utterance's implicativeness and thus for the story's implicativeness: that is, teller offers a first half of an idiom (L.24–25) "'through circumstances...." It appears that he has specifically offered a first half: that is, immediately thereafter he produces, not its second half, but a form of laughter (L.26, cf. F.7–L.17). The second half of the idiom is produced by two recipients (L.27 and 28), and it is a second half fitted to the entire utterance; that is, "... beyond their control" (emphasis added) understands and talks by reference to the prior "Kids... they... they're..." and so on (L.22–24). This is a powerful demonstration of an
object's sequential implicativeness, with multiple parties producing a second part, given the occurrence of a first—the utterance has not merely implicated “a determinate range of occurrences,” but a single one, and a single one for more than one coparticipant. The fuguelike tumble thereafter might well be seen as a celebration of the re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk, of a return to a state of talking together.

A range of materials, in which it initially seems that a teller is indulging in story expansion, can be seen via sequential analysis as a teller searching for recipient talk by reference to the story, using story components as exit devices. In the following fragment it may be as a by-product of such a pursuit that teller provides a series of statements which progress from excoriation of an individual (F.19.L.4 and 10) to a denouncing of his entire family (L.15).

[Goldberg:II:2:23:r]

MAGGIE: [STORY] A::n uh: I guess once wz enough. 1
GENE: Yeah. (·) Yeah. 2
(1.0) 3
MAGGIE: ’tlk But ez far ez I’m concerned he [ex-husband] hez, 4
shown his color::s to the point where::: ’hhh n:obody 5
in iz right mi::nd who’s even got a: decent breath left 6
in them.’ ’hhh wou::ld think thot he wz ec:ceptable. 7
GENE: Yeah. 8
(0.7) 9
• MAGGIE: ’t En it’s a sure damn thing thot whenever::: this kid 10
[her son] grows up he’ll have n:obuddy tuh thank fer 11
anything. ’hh uh: of that family [ex-husband’s]. 12
GENE: Yeah. (·) Yeah. 13
(1.0) 14
• MAGGIE: I wouldn’t spit on the best side of’m en I’ve yet t’ 15
see the best si::de. 16
GENE: hhhehh heh-heh-heh ’hhhh Well how about the rest 17
a’the fam’ly. . . 18

Following an assessment (L.1) “And I guess once was enough” (cf. F.18.L.3), and over two recycles of a transition place (L.4–7 and 10–12) there is token acknowledgment by recipient (cf. F.18.L.19 and 20) followed by a pause (L.2 and 3, 8 and 9, 13 and 14). A third recycle (L.15–16) is followed by appreciation (L.17.; cf.F.16.L.34.ff. and F.18.L.18–20) and thereafter by an object which formally re-engages turn-by-turn talk: that is, a question which is observably occasioned by the prior utterance and itself implicates at least a next utterance.
While re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk may be the primary issue upon a story’s completion, there are other matters to which a storyteller may be oriented. Specifically, there may be orientation to what a recipient makes of the story and thus what the story has amounted to. Following is a dramatic instance in which recipient displays appreciation and understanding of a story at a possible completion point (F.20.L.2–4). It turns out that only a story segment has been completed and were the storytelling to stop at that point, recipient would be left with a misapprehension of the events being reported. That is, following recipient’s response (L.4.) is a story component which contradicts the sense to be made of the story so far (L.1–2 and 6–7).

[MC:1:15]  
HARMON: I said “And— and— and—” “What ih—” “Is her boyfriend a nice 1
man Joey?” He sz “Oh he’s very nice, he’s a colored man.” 2
hhhhhhhh HAH hah! 3

LIL: Oh no::: the poor kid yer kidding. 4

HARMON: I said– 5

HARMON: No waita second I said “Joseph, that’s, not your mother’s 6
boyfriend. That colored man is the man (_____) she– 7
eh he takes her tuh work every day. 8

LIL. Uh huh. 9

HARMON: This colored man. (_____) 10

LIL: Sure— What difference does it make, sure. 11

A generalizable feature of this fragment is that tellers can propose and recipients accept that a response was premature, that there is more story to come, and that upon a next completion point, recipients have a next opportunity to respond via their corrected understanding of the story.

Such a feature can serve as a resource for negotiations as to what a story shall have amounted to. Roughly, talk which demonstrates a story’s implicativeness may be tangential to it, as is teller’s commentary and subsequent turn-by-turn talk in fragments (18) and (19). In those fragments the tangential talk is clearly alternative to and remedial of recipient silence. When recipient talk follows directly on story completion, then silence may not be a relevant alternative; rather, the relevant alternatives are two types of talk—tangential talk as observably contrastive to talk which is directly continuous with and fitted to the story.

Storytellers do not explicitly challenge or complain of tangential
recipient talk (as they do not complain of recipient silence). Instead, they propose that the story was not yet completed by offering a next story component. Upon completion of that component, a next point occurs at which the story can be responded to (cf. F.20), and thus, at least an opportunity for, and perhaps an invitation to, a different order of response—in the case of tangential talk, a more fitted response—is provided by an added story component.

In the following fragment a story reaches a point of possible completion (F.21.L.5–7) and a recipient initiates tangential talk (L.9 and 12–13). In overlap with that talk, teller provides two recognizable next story components (L.10–11 and 14).

[Labov:T.A.:4:r]

RITA: She didn’have time tuh cook yesterday she got home la;te, 1
(0.4) 2
RITA: So ah met’er et (Promtiers). 3
(0.2) 4
RITA: She had a:, (0.3) a broi:led hambugrer, (0.6) with no: 5
gravy awnnit, (0.5) She hadda serving of cabbage, ’n she 6
hadda salad. 7
(0.3) 8
MARGE: Very—It’s terrific I bec ause I’m tellin yih— 9
[ ]
RITA: E n she couldn’ ev en= 10
RITA: =fini—ish :: i(h) t,= 11
[ ]
There’s 12
MARGE: =E:vrybody’s e ncouraging her there. 13
[ ]
• RITA: Enna cuppa ca:wf e e. 14

And in the following, story-tangential talk (F.22.L.2.) which overlaps a story commentary (L.1.1) is met with an added story component (L.5.).

[Rose:I:1]

COLEY: Really Har ry pulled a gun on me. 1
[ ]
MICKEY: We wanna bring a suit against im fer 2
discrimination. 3
(0.3) 4
• COLEY: An’ plus he, he— he hit me inna mou:th. 5

It appears that added story components can be deployed for a range
of contingencies. So, for example, in the following fragment a recipient
wisecrack in the course of a story (F.23.L.3) is met with an added story
component (L.6).

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{[Gaye:A:4:r]} & \tag{23} \\
\text{LEN:} & \quad \text{[STORY]} \text{ go getta- (0.2) cuppa co:ffe’n, (0.7) have a} \quad 1 \\
& \quad \text{c igare::tte ’n, hnh} \quad 2 \\
\text{RAY:} & \quad \text{Smoke twelve ci garettes } uh! \quad 3 \\
\text{[} & \\
\text{LEN:} & \quad \text{’n–hn} \quad 4 \\
\text{RAY:} & \quad \text{’h h hh} \quad 5 \\
\text{[} & \\
\bullet \text{LEN:} & \quad \text{’n have another cuppa co:ffe ’n:::} \quad 6 \\
\end{align*} \]

And in the following, an interchange between two parties (F.24.L.2–3, 5
and 6) who have so far been recipients of an ongoing story (data not
shown) is overlapped by an added story component (L.7.).

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{[Freas:A:4:r]} & \tag{24} \\
\text{LORI:} & \quad \text{[STORY]} \text{ And– heels or loafers: or, s a d d l e–} \quad 1 \\
\text{[} & \\
\text{BILL:} & \quad \text{((whispered)) Shouldn’ you check=} \quad 2 \\
\text{BILL:} & \quad \text{the} \quad 3 \\
& \quad =[[ \\
\text{LORI:} & \quad \text{oxfe rds,} \quad 4 \\
\text{[} & \\
\text{JAN:} & \quad \text{Hm?} \quad 5 \\
\text{BILL:} & \quad \text{((w)) Shouldn’t you check the ( )?} \quad 6 \\
\text{[} & \\
\bullet \text{LORI:} & \quad \text{And pony tails,} \quad 7 \\
\end{align*} \]

In a fragment shown earlier (see below, F.16a), following a comple-
tion point (L.33), teller produces tworecycles (L.36) "He come right this
e::nd’ and (L.38–42) “Fa:ct, . . . He done it purposely’” although recipi-
ents are offering appreciation (L.34–35, 37, 39, 40, and 41). Since ap-
preciation of a prior does not itself implicate subsequent talk, when the
appreciation stops the storytelling will have its sequential implicativeness
yet to be demonstrated (cf. F.18 and 19). The second recycle may consti-
tute one solution to that problem, providing materials for (and perhaps
specifically designed to elicit) a query by recipient (L.48) “Purposely?”
However, the query does not occur immediately after, and it appears that
a secondary solution is offered; that is, teller proposes a return to the
dispute with (L.45) “No: Oxford Street,”. When recipient offers the
query (L.48), thus formally re-engaging turn-by-turn talk (cf. fragment F.19); the initial solution is, after all, successful and teller abandons the dispute, providing a response to recipient’s query (L.50) “YE::S:. . .” In this case, the response leads to a next story segment (L.50-58).

[Labov:Battersea Park:B:3:r]

(16a)

PARKY: ... gow cracky I wz saturaite d.

[...

MAN:

h-hheh hhehh hheh=

=|[...

PARKY: 'E co me right this e:nd.

[...

TRACY: h a h a!

PARKY: F a : : c t,

[[...

MAN: (Yeh that's) good.

[[...

(LADY): (M m m m m M m m Yuh)

[...

TRACY: 'u::h h u h a , h a, h a, 'ha?

[...

PARKY: ' E dunnit pu:r possess y:: =

[...

MAN: M m.

( ) = ( )=

PARKY: =Nao: Ox 'n S treet,

[...

MAN: In O xf'd S tre et.=

[...

TRACY: huh-ha hu-

TRACY: ='hhhh Pu: rpose ly?

[...

PARKY: Pa:r-

PARKY: YE::: S::: T h e- t h e

[...

MAN: Yes they're uh they're very good=

MAN: (dolphin acts)

=|[...

PARKY: The bloke 'oo gives'em thee- instrucion on th'wissowl=

PARKY: = n ::

[...

TRACY: Ah hah?

(0.2)

MAN: ( )

[...

PARKY: This thing come up'n eez ovuh theh [NEXT SEGMENT]
Thus, a series of utterances which can be extracted from a conversation and identified as parts of "a story" can be sequentially analyzed as parts of "a storytelling," with recognizable story components deployed as story-entry and -exit devices, providing transition from a state of turn-by-turn talk among conversational coparticipants into a story told by a storyteller to story recipient(s), and a return from the latter to the former state of talk. Conversely, utterances which might not otherwise constitute parts of "a story" can be sequentially analyzed as parts of "a storytelling," with recognizable topical talk used to engage conversational coparticipants as story recipients, and to negotiate whether, and how, the story will be told, whether it is completed or in progress, and what, if anything, it will have amounted to as a conversational event.

A STORYTELLING

In this section, resources considered so far are turned to a partial analysis of a single extended fragment in which a storytelling is approached through turn-by-turn talk, where features of the story's emergence are consequential for its reception and its sequential implicativeness.

[GTS:II:2:50:r2]  
AL: I'm gonna'z thinkin about building that Healey up to competition use.  
1  
((door slides open))  
2  
ROGER: Good look.  
3  
((door slides shut))  
4  
KEN: Hi--ii.  
5  
(0.3)  
6  
ROGER: I'll te'yuh. hh  
7  
[ ]  
8  
( )  
9  
(·)  
10  
• ROGER: I wanna bui:ld, (·) the hottest street machine in West L.A.  
11  
(0.2)  
12  
AL: I'd like to do that too.  
13  
[ ]  
14  
• ROGER: 'N challenge Voodoo to a race I mean the hell with drag strips you gotta have ten thous'n bucks ready t'spe-- hh I wanna build a hot street machine.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
(0.7)  
19
ROGER: I mean—
[  
AL: (  ) dz— a hundred’n fo:ry in the stree :ts,
[  
ROGER: Pull into

A ’n W. hhhehh’hh en challenge. anybodi to a go, heh

‘hh th’Road Runner Voodoo hehh’khh “C’m on”
y’know,=

AL: Ey wuh—

=\[

ROGER: ’hnhnnn Oh there’s a twenny sev’n—

What’s the Voodoo.

AL: ( )

I’ve heard about it.

( )

ROGER: Oh that is a ru— it’s uhm:: (0.3) a myth. Ih—it— Well
the Voodoo is the fastest car, I’ve ever seen, inna
streets.

(0.3)

AL: What is it.

(0.4)

ROGER: It’s a fifty five Chevvy. It’s bright orange, (0.5) and
it has, ( ) it ha:d ’hh u—lemme tell y’bout this car.
’hh A three twunny seven:(·)Vet in it. (uhyi) an’ if
wuz uh, ’hh dual quads, ’hh hadda,full roller cam (0.3)
four speed neon hydrostick, four f’fty six postraction,
( ) big slicks, ’hh An’ it wuz thee fastest car. I’ve
ever seen in th’streets.

( )

ROGER: ’hh I’ll tell y’something there wz a big drag (in out’n)

th’Valley?

( )

ROGER: Y’know wa::y out there ih wz ’hhh bout ni:nety miles,

( ) hhhh=

ROGER: =So, ( ) We all the whole b—evrybody met et Scott’s’n we

went out there it wz a ( ) big caravan.

( )

ROGER: So the Voodoo doesn’t, it has the—p—grill blanked o:ff.Y’

know; hh so it couldn’git’ny air in the rad’er. So on the

freeway, ( ) he overheats.

(0.2)

ROGER: Y’know, ’hh Big water shoot’n out, ’hh He’s been driving
fer two hours mindja on the freeway. hh He overheats. Well we figured scratch one Voodoo. (0.2)

• ROGER: Y’know cz izzih—(·)ih wz overheated. So we left widout im, (0.4)

ROGER: So th’drag starts, (0.7)

ROGER: u—Everybody hear a big loud, n—noi:se like a cannon. hh Here comes Voodoo windin end a puffin up there, ‘hh We thought he ez dead fer sure—He doesn’t shut off the engine. hh He jus’ keeps on going, (·) One after another ’e shuts down e:vry car (offa) Valley. Superstock anything they had.’hh He didn’ shut off iz engine’n—’hh polished ’em o:ff one after another, (0.3)

ROGER: Turns aroun’n goes home. (0.4)

( ): hhmh (0.3)

ROGER: I gained a lotta respect fer that car. (·)

( ): hhhh (·)

ROGER: ‘hh Y’know what happened once?’hh He wz tunin the car. little tiny screw dropped down the ju:g, ‘hh lodged in the valve en (rhen) went the engine.’hh =

AL: =(N: n o s h i t.) [ ]

ROGER: So’e dropped in a four sixty sev’n. Do:dge. (0.6)

(ROGER): Whhhew. (0.5)

AL: There wzay uh:m (0.3) u–u–Bill Reilly rode in a car uh, en he toh–wz telling me about it.I’v seen it.arou:nd.

• it’s a:, sixty one Fo:rd with a three ninety bored out tuh four ten two four barrels (·) straight (differn) cam ’n all this, four speed close’spline.’hh four fifty si:x. big slicks, (·)

ROGER: Speakin about forties. (0.2)
ROGER: I worked on a k-o::n Morganelli's Forty.

(·)

( ) ( )

ROGER: =The guy's a (trip) but yihkno::w,

(·)

ROGER: He's sorta wierd.

[ ]

(Heyst)

(·)

AL: D'you know ( )-

[ ]

ROGER: He's gotta forty Fo:rd,

( )

(Heyst)

AL: (0.4)

ROGER: He took outta-- (·) t-uh: two ninety six Chrysler 'n put inna rhree: (uh) fifty Chrysler with dual qua::ds?

(·)

ROGER: Eh he:- He hates drag strips. Y'll never find im etta drag strip,

(·)

ROGER: 'S one a'these street me:n y'know,=

KEN: =( )

[ ]

AL: hh hh

[ ]

ROGER: Run' n fm th'fu:zzhh That car's pretty fast,

(·)

ROGER: Then I also worked o:n, w't is pobly.(·) ↑ thee fastest 17 car.faster'n Voodoo.

(·)

ROGER: He achorly doesn'live around here. 'e lives in Manha-uh:in uhm. (0.3) Y'know where Lance I forg'th'name a' th'place.

(·)

ROGER: Well it's uhm twenny sev'n Tee with a full blown Chrysler in it. (·) (Dual) quads. An' he dyives it in the stree::t.

(0.3)

ROGER: Guy's'n asshole. I mean he c'd i:dle et thirty miles 'n hour.

The story appears to be triggered via a mechanism similar to that described for fragment (16); that is, the naming of a category evokes an
incumbent of it. In the course of turn-by-turn talk a participant produces a
description of a car he would like to build (L.11–12) "the hottest street
machine in West L.A." In his next utterance he names a car against which
his would compete for such a status (L.15) "'N challenge Voodoo to a
race." And the story is about the car called Voodoo (L.45–77). It is
possible that the descriptive phrase is specifically a title—a category
which at any given time has a single current incumbent, determined by
means of contest, and Voodoo is that category’s current incumbent, such
that the category, used as a descriptor, has evoked a story about its
incumbent.

With the premise that the Voodoo story is triggered at lines 11–12, a
series of approaches to and veerings away from a storytelling can be
sketched in which it appears that the story will not be told unless copar-
ticipant aligns himself as recipient of talk about Voodoo.

While the naming of Voodoo (L.15) might serve as a basis for topical
talk (cf. F.7 and F.16.L.3ff.), or set up a same-speaker story introduction
via a disjunct plus embedded repetition (cf. F.2 and F.3) or a version of
the Speaking of X format (cf. F.16.L.24ff.), features of the next several
utterances suggest that in this case teller provides a trigger for his copar-
ticipant and thereafter, consecutively, produces talk by reference to (a)
the potential initiation of further talk about Voodoo by coparticipant, and
(b) its nonoccurrence.

(a) Latched to the sentence in which Voodoo is named is a next
sentence which embeds the naming into ongoing topical talk (L.15–17) "I
mean the hell with drag strips..." is topically coherent with prior talk,
proposing a contrast between dragstrip racing (cf. L.2. "competition
use") and street racing (L.11.; cf. also L.113–116).

The positioning of this sentence is systematically vulnerable to over-
lap by coparticipant, since triggered talk by a noncurrent speaker
routinely is initiated in overlap with the utterance-part adjacent to the
trigger word. So, for example, fragment (1) contains an overlapping dis-
junct plus repetition story introduction (L.6–7) and the following fragment
has an overlapping disjunct plus repetition query (F.26.L.7) which is
followed not only by further talk about the triggered topic (L.8) but by a
story (L.9).

[MC:1:14]  
LIL: I still say that the sewing machine's quicker.  
HARMON: Oh it c'n be quicker but it don't do the job.
oh really. well.

[not—not like i c’n do it,

well i, i ( )

with my little ha:: nds.

say how’s yer little boy,

oh he’s fi:ne. he’s just fine ( he’s— ) hheh something. ’hh i, i bought im a pair’v underpants

[story]

(b) Coparticipant offers neither story nor query in the course of the continuing utterance. If this utterance reaches completion, a transition-relevance place will occur, a place where coparticipant can produce a next utterance, one which is topically coherent with the prior (in this case, e.g., further talk about competition versus street racing).

Just prior to completion, teller cuts off (l.16–17) “... you gotta have ten thous’n bucks ready t’spe—.” A cutoff in a nonoverlapped utterance is a recognizable initiator of self-repair (cf. jefferson, 1974, pp. 185–188 and schegloff et al., 1976, pp. 9–10), which means that a repair of an error in the utterance-so-far will follow. As a consequence of the repair, transition will be delayed beyond its initially projected point, and thus coparticipant should delay initiation of his next utterance.

Latched to the cutoff is, not a repair, but a new sentence (cf. f.17.l.7–9), a reissue of a prior utterance (l.17–18; cf. also l.11–12) “’hh i wanna build a hot street machine.”18 Thus, in the absence of coparticipant-initiated further talk about voodoo, teller returns to the point at which the story was triggered, and thereafter, voodoo is named again (l.23–24) “... en challenge, anybody to a go, heh’hh th’road runner voodoo hehh. ...”19

Again, it appears that teller offers coparticipant a chance to initiate further talk about voodoo and thereafter consecutively talks by reference to (a) the potential nonoccurrence and (b) the actual occurrence of such an initiation.

(a) Latched to the sentence in which voodoo is renamed is a disjunct plus story introduction in which a car is identified. The car is not voodoo. If it were, then the slot in which identification is occurring—i.e., (l.26) “... a tweney sev’n...” would contain a repetition of “voodoo” (cf. f.1.l.8, f.2.l.8, f.3.l.3, f.4.l.2, f.5.l.1, and f.16.l.29). That is, teller is recognizably initiating another story, perhaps specifically as a substitute for, and literally in the place of, the voodoo story. Again, this
utterance is vulnerable to overlap by coparticipant, should he, now, choose to initiate further talk about Voodoo.

(b) Simultaneously with the substitute story, coparticipant initiates a disjunct plus query (L.25.; cf. also F.26.L.7) "Ey wuh-."," cuts off as teller produces a prespeech inbreath (cf. note 10), and recycles and completes the query (L.27) "What's the Voodoo," at a 'recognition point' in the identification component (cf. Jefferson, 1973, pp. 56–69 and F.2.L.9–11) thus, aligning himself as a recipient of information about Voodoo. Thereupon, teller abandons the substitute story (L.26) and initiates a response to recipient’s request (L.31, cf. F.16a.L.45–50).

While the response to recipient’s query might constitute a piece of information, it is also a ‘superlative assessment’ (L.32–33) "...the Voodoo is the fastest car, I’ve ever seen, inna streets." Superlative assessments belong to a class of objects which can elicit a "newsmark" or "solicit" from a coparticipant (cf. Terasaki, 1975). Recipient may produce general tokens like "Really?" "No kidding," etc., or tokens fitted to a prior utterance, for example, (F.16a.L.42 and 48) "He done it purposely." "Purposely?" Such tokens align coparticipant as a recipient of whatever is to follow. So, for example, in fragment (3), a similarly structured superlative assessment receives a fitted newsmark/solicit.

LOTTIE: . . .she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit you’ve ever seen in yer life.

EMMA: Gave it to yuh?

However, recipient does not offer such a token. Instead, he recycles his request for information (L.35; cf.L.27) "What is it." thus aligning himself, not as a recipient of whatever is to follow, perhaps a story (cf. F.26), but as a recipient of information. And teller produces information about Voodoo, an elaborate technical description of the car’s features (L.37ff.). Teller caps the description with an escalated recycle of the superlative assessment (L.42–43; cf.L.32–33) "An’ it wuz thee fastest car. I’ve ever seen in th’streets."

This can constitute a next chance for recipient to offer a solicit (cf. L.24 vis-à-vis L.15), and again, teller’s subsequent talk may be produced by reference to the potential occurrence or nonoccurrence of a delayed solicit (cf.L.25–27). Following the escalated recycle of a story prefatory superlative assessment is a secondary preface (L.45) "’hh I’ll tell you something." Should recipient overlap with a solicit, the secondary preface can be abandoned. Should he not, the secondary preface is one of a range of utterances which serve as story prefixes (cf.F.8–15) and the
story can appropriately occur with no observable absence of a solicit, directly thereafter. Recipient offers no solicit and, upon completion of the secondary preface, teller initiates the story proper (L.45) "...there wz a big drag (in out'n) the Valley?"

Thus, over a series of utterances, coparticipant is aligned as teller’s recipient, but not as a story recipient. When the story is told, it is told on a volunteer basis, and this may have consequences for the story’s sequential implicativeness.

At the story’s completion, teller engages in a search for recipient response. He produces a prototypical story-ending device (L.73; cf.F.18.L.1) "Turns around and goes home." This is followed by a pause (L.74), a token of appreciation (L.75) and another pause (L.76). Thereafter, he offers a prototypical telling-ending device, an assessment (L.77; cf.F.18.L.3) "I gained a lotta respect fer that car" which is followed by a token of appreciation (L.79). Over a series of recycled completion points, then, turn-by-turn talk has yet to be re-engaged; the story’s sequential implicativeness is yet to be demonstrated.

Teller produces a story tag (L.81–85) which is topically coherent with, and upon its occurrence can be seen to have been projected by, the sort of technical talk which preceded the story (L.37ff., particularly L.37–38 "and it has, it ha:d. . ."). Recipient’s subsequent talk is consistent with the story tag’s technical aspects (L.89–94). Although it is consistent with and thus demonstrates a sequential implicativeness of the story tag, and via the tag, of the story itself, recipient’s talk is intensely fitted to the utterance elicited by his recycled request for information (cf. L.37–42).

Both utterances follow the same format. Both start with a car’s year and make (L.37) "It’s a fifty five Chevy" and (L.91) "It’s a sixty one Ford" and both run through a list of components in identical order: engine (L.39) "a three twenty seven Vet" and (L.91–92) "a three ninety bored out to four ten," carburetor (L.40) "dual quads" and (L.92) "two four barrels," cam (L.40) "full roller cam" and (L.92) "straight (differn) cam", transmission (L.41) "four speed neon hydrostick" and (L.93) "four speed closed spline," traction (L.41) "four fifty six positractio" and (L.93) "four fifty six," and tires (L.42) "big slicks" and (L.94) "big slicks." Thus, it is the utterance specifically requested by recipient to which his subsequent talk is fitted; that is, his alignment prior to the story’s telling is powerfully preserved in his response to it. Further, the response tacitly disputes Voodoo’s status: that is, the story, which depicts an unsurpassable combination of car and driver in action, is encapsulated by technical talk in which a car is adequately characterized as a set
of components, and via such a characterization, recipient's "sixty one Ford" is comparable, perhaps equivalent, to teller's "fifty five Chevy."

It appears that teller's subsequent talk, at least in part, disputes recipient's treatment of the story and its protagonist. Voodoo is mentioned once more; this time as a basis for comparison with yet another car, a "twenty seven Tee" (L.128; cf. L.26), which is announced as "faster than Voodoo" (L.122). While the comparison proposes Voodoo as the lesser car by reference to one feature—speed—it establishes a context in which implicit comparison is provided for two other features relevant to Voodoo's status: that is, relevant to incumbency in the category The Hottest Street Machine in West L.A. By reference to those two features, the twenty seven Tee is not a candidate incumbent. It is neither from the relevant area (L.124–126) "He actually doesn't live around here," nor, crucially, is it a proper street machine, but a competition car illegitimately driven in the streets (L.129–133) "And he drives it in the streets. Guy's an asshole." By implicit comparison, Voodoo re-emerges as best in its class, where, further, its class is to be seen as the better class (cf., e.g., L.113).

These sorts of considerations yield an extended fragment of conversation as heavily occupied by activities relevant to the telling of a story, where the story itself occupies but a portion of that fragment.

NOTES

1 This is a revised version of a paper presented at Seminars in Ethnomethodology, Graduate Center, City University of New York, April 1973. Great appreciation is extended to Doug Maynard, Candy West, Tom Wilson, Don Zimmerman, and Roger Mandlebaum.

2 Several of Harvey Sacks' unpublished lectures deal with storytelling in conversation, for example, Lectures 1–8, Spring 1970 and Lectures 1–16, Fall 1971. (A version of Lectures 9–12, Fall 1971, appears in this volume under the title "A Technical Consideration of a Dirty Joke.") There are numerous references to Sacks' work in this paper. These are best treated, not so much as support for an argument, but as pointers to very interesting talk.

3 There is preliminary evidence that a story not only articulates with turn-by-turn talk at its edges, but throughout. Roughly, a story is not, in principle, a block of talk, but is constructed of "segments" via which teller's talk can alternate with recipient's. The segmental construction of the story itself will be considered in a later report.

4 The pair of features, local occasioning and sequential implicativeness, are regularly present in a single utterance: that is, a methodic display of local "occasionedness" is also a demonstration of the sequential implicativeness of a prior. Since this paper tends to treat the story as protagonist, focusing on its emergence from and re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk, the interrelationship of prior talk to story to subsequent talk is obscured.

5 Topical coherence is roughly defined as a current utterance standing in an appropriate, continuous relationship to ongoing talk; cf. Sacks (1968, April 17).
Abbreviations refer to fragments (F) contained in this chapter and their respective line numbers (L).

7 Routinely, the marked repeat is followed by an embedded repetition. It appears that the disjunct marker and the Speaking of X device perform a similar task, and placement is criterial to selection between the two. The disjunct is used prior to completion of the utterance containing the trigger word (cf. F.1–3) and a Speaking of X is used after completion of that utterance (for F.4, cf. F.25.L.96, data not shown for F.5, see also F.16.L.24).

8 Next positioning is a basic device for relating two utterances (cf., e.g., Sacks 1972b, Lecture 4). Disjunct-marked overlap and postcompletion Speaking of X may be used for triggered talk because without such devices the “next” positioning of an utterance can lead coparticipants to monitor it as topically coherent with prior talk; cf. Sacks (1968, April 17).

9 The repetition may have been \textit{removed} from an earlier to a later position. At lines 10–12 there is a shift in person reference, “So Lance k– So: one guy bought a dollar fifty worth of Ripple.” While the shift could be a repair of reference-type, from known-to-coparticipant to unknown-to-coparticipant (cf. Sacks, 1971, Lecture 5), at line 20 it appears that Lance is not the one who ordered Ripple, but the one who ordered glue, “Planning on gettin g\textit{a}ssed. \textit{Huh} Lance.” Thus, the shift in person reference may be a matter of reorganizing the story’s events and the actors associated with those events.

10 “Thought” is a sequencing object, a “first verb”, which implicates a next, “realized” (cf. Sacks, 1968, May 2 and 1970, Lecture 2). Its occurrence in lines 30–31 positions speaker in a series of activities, in this case, as prior to the order of glue.

11 These fragments were collected as instances of single-turn story-entry devices for next speaker (F.8–11) and current speaker (F.12–15). When the collection was examined, it was noticed that in seven of the eight cases (F.8–14) some form of \textit{perturbation} occurred adjacent to the entry device. Schegloff is noticing regularities in the occurrence of perturbation, for example, upon resolution of overlap and at various unit-initial positions (personal communication). It appears that perturbation occurs at junctures between discrete activity types, and its presence can serve as an index to junctures between discrete activities in otherwise apparently continuous activities like “story preface” and “story entry”. Another phenomenon which may indicate activity junctures is the \textit{audible inbreath} (cf., e.g., F.1.L.8; F.2.L.12; F.3.L.1; F.7.L.10,12; F.12.L.3, etc.).

12 This fragment and others designated “GTS” are taken from a series of group therapy sessions recorded in 1964 with teenage patients and an adult therapist. A feature of the therapy setting which may be relevant here is that it is one in which business is done, that business superseding personal talk, but in which some forms of personal talk constitute business talk and thus the relevance and admissibility of personal talk may be problematic. In this case it appears that personal talk is superseded by nonpersonal but recognizably “therapeutic” talk.

13 The “request” operation of postcompletion “So” is among the phenomena being considered in the forthcoming report on story segmenting (cf. note 3).

14 In a consideration of gossip, Sacks notes that person attributes are expandable from an individual to related others (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1967b, Lecture 2), those others being co-members of some “member of membership categorization device” category (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972). Fragment (19) may not only constitute an instance of such an expansion, but may locate a context in which it would routinely occur; i.e., in a series of story-exit devices. If the story is about an individual, recognizably related talk can be found by application of the device “family.” Or, for example, if, as in fragment (18), a story is about a teenage car club, recognizably related talk can be found by application of the device “age group” which yields “kids” (L.22).
15 A question is a prototypical Adjacency Pair first-pair-part, an object which has powerful sequential implicativeness (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972, Lectures 1 and 4).
16 ""There"" refers to a weight-loss organization to which teller, tangential speaker, and story protagonist belong.
17 The notation "‘thhee’" (F.25. L.121) is used to indicate higher pitch and amplitude than "‘thee’" (L.42). It appears that the shift in intonation contour is analogous to the immediately subsequent lexical unit "‘Faster than Voodoo’" (L.122), that is, is produced by reference to a distanced prior. Cf., for example, Sacks (1967, Lecture 13) and (1972, Lecture 4).
18 A repair initiator produced just prior to possible completion, followed by a new sentence, may be one solution to the "‘two-sentence problem” (Sacks, 1969, Lecture 9); that is, a second sentence is produced without a first ever having received completion.
19 There is a difference between lines 17–18 and 23–24 which permits the following consideration. The second occurrence bears no traces of, and perhaps specifically masks, the trigger mechanism (cf. F.16); that is, the descriptor "‘a hot street machine’" is not a category with an exclusive incumbent, but one which can contain multiples, and the context is no longer with one car, which might be the prior category's exclusive incumbent, but with "‘anybody’" with more than one instance of "‘anybody’" provided ("‘the Road Runner’" and "‘Voodoo’").
20 Teller, in his initial references to the car, calls it "‘Voodoo’" (L.15 and 24). Coparticipant, in his query, calls it "‘the Voodoo’" (L.27), and teller, in his response, calls it "‘the Voodoo’" (L.32). Technically, this series constitutes an ‘unmarked correction sequence’ which has as criatal features that, for a same referent, (a) a current speaker uses a term; (b) a next speaker uses an alternate term; and (c) prior speaker uses the alternate term. The abstract format is [X]–[Y]–[Y]. It appears in actual sequences like the following: For an identification of law enforcement officers [police]–[cops]–[cops], for an identification of the ridges on a metal pipe [wales]–[threads]–[threads].

[2:2:60]

KEN: . . . the police have said this to us. 1

ROGER: That makes it even better. The challenge of runnin 2

from the cops! 3

KEN: The cops say if you wanna race, uh go out at four or 4

five in the morning on the freeway . . . 5

[2:2:61]

J:FN: Hardware Store

CUSTOMER: ((examining a length of pipe)) Mm, the wales are wider 1

apart than that. 2

SALES MAN: Okay, let me see if I can find one with wider threads. 3

CUSTOMER: ((selects another piece of pipe)) How's this. 4

CUSTOMER: Nope, the threads are even wider than that. 5

The offer and acceptance of a [Y] is embedded into ongoing talk; that is, the replacement is done in unmarked form. In fragment (25), teller's acceptance of coparticipant's [Y] may be a matter of accommodating a not quite correct usage, the accommodation done by reference to the pair of relevant categories—candidate storyteller vis-à-vis candidate story recipient. Teller's accommodation of recipient's misuse is preserved in the story itself; that is, when the car is first mentioned (L.53) it is "‘the Voodoo’" but is abandoned at the story's climax (L.66) "‘Here comes Voodoo,’" and the final reference (L.122) is to "‘Voodoo’"
For a consideration of assessments as sequenced objects, see Pomerantz (1975) and (1977).

Preliminary inspection of conversational data indicates that a range of constructs like “I’ll tell you something” and their request-correlate “Tell me something” occur as prefixes with no place provided for a solicit.

While superlative assessments can initiate a sequence in which a storytelling is requested by recipient, that potential is not always utilized by teller, who can move directly from preface to story. For example, in fragment (16), someone attempting to talk after a superlative assessment (L.29) “And they are stars my God,” finds that teller has already started the story (cf. also F.25.L.81). But there are conditions under which a preface can be seen as a failed attempt to get a solicit. For example, in fragment (14), a superlative assessment (L.1) “But nobody fought with her like I fought with her” is followed by a substantial pause (L.2) and a secondary preface, one which does not admit the relevance of a solicit (L.3) “for example.” The secondary preface may constitute a repair of the initial preface’s failure to get a solicit. Fragment (25) shares features with both fragment (16) and fragment (14); that is, while teller does not provide a place for a solicit, he does produce a secondary preface which can be abandoned if a solicit occurs or can be directly followed by the story if a solicit does not occur, with no recognizable failure present.

These two segments, with their series of proper nouns, are a transcriber’s nightmare (cf. Sacks, 1967b. Lecture 12). A noun may be heard as an unintelligible sound, for example, F.25.L.92 “straight (differm) cam,” and F.21.L.3. “So I met her at (Promtiers).” Worse, it may be heard as perfectly intelligible and turn out to be misheard. For example, over multiple reheatings, F.25.L.41 was heard as “four fifty six pounds traction.” Rich Frankel mentioned that it ought to be “postraction.” On rehearing it was, unequivocally, “postraction.” Further, a name may be correctly heard, but not understood. So, for example, although the two segments were seen to be closely fitted, they did not appear to be so utterly equivalent until Frankel pointed out that (L.40) “dual quads” and (L.92) “two four barrels” have the same referent.