G. Jefferson. On the articulation of topic in conversation. Final Report to the (British) Social Science Research Council. 1981.

Contents

Page

Section 0. Introduction

'Multiple Acknowledgment Tokens' as a candidate phenomenon . . 1- 6

Section I. Recipient Acknowledgment Tokens as Shift-Implicative . 6- 39

Recipient Acknowledgment Token → Immediate Recipient Shift . . 6- 11

Distinction between cases of Acknowledgment Tokens: "Mm hm" as 'Passive Recipiency', "Yeah" as Speakership-Implicative 11- 32

The 'Perverse Passive' 17- 21

Practitioner's Recipientship ("Mm hm") 23- 31

What about "Uh huh"? 31- 32

Recipient Acknowledgment Token → Subsequent Recipient Shift. . 32- 34

Recipient Acknowledgment Token → Speaker Shift 34- 36

Acknowledgment Tokens as Consequentially 'Neutral'. 36- 39

Section II. Recipient Assessments as Shift-Implicative. 39-105

Recipient Assessment → Immediate Recipient Shift 39- 41

Recipient Assessment → 'Delayed' Recipient Shift 41- 43

'Affiliativeness' of Assessments as a 'Warrant' for Speaker Continuation 43- 45

Recipient Assessment → Eventual Recipient Shift. 45- 53

Technical 'interest' and 'disinterest'. 48- 53

Recipient Assessment → Speaker Shift 53-103

"Anyway" as a 'volitional shift'-marker 54- 56

'Spurious' concensus. 55- 61

Fractionally non-simultaneous startings 55- 61

Inbreath as a recognizable action-initiation? 56- 57

'Continuations' as Abandonables 58- 59

'Dysfluency' in 'hastily mobilized' Actions 59- 61

Recipient Assessment → Speaker 'Precipitous Abandonment' . . . 61- 97

  Post-Recipient-Assessment Speaker Acknowledgment. 62- 67

    Speaker Acknowledgment → Speaker Continuation. 62- 65

    'Display of Special Interest' (Inquiry). 64- 65

    'Passive Recipiency' as exhibited 'capitulation' 65

  Post-Recipient-Assessment Speaker 'Sheer Continuation'. . . 66- 67

  Inbreaths as Salient Features of Topical Shift. 68- 97

    'Free-Standing' Post-Recipient-Assessment Speaker-Acknowledgment. 69, 85-87

    Inbreaths as Abandonables. 70- 79

    Inbreaths as Indices of 'Imminent Shift' 71- 79

    Next-Speaker Start pre-completion of Last Word 73- 74

    'Free-Standing' Recipient Acknowledgment Token as Non-Imminent Shift 76- 78

    A 'Two-Staged' Inbreath. 78

    Next-Speaker Start post 'Search Token' 80

    'Dysfluency' in 'hastily mobilized' Actions. 80- 81, 86

    Inquiry as 'Topically Interested'. 86

    Acknowledgment Tokens as Topic-Directionally 'Neutral' . 87

    'Interruption-Invitations' 87- 92

    Fractionally Non-Simultaneous Startings. 91- 92

  Nth Attempt → Recipient Close-Implicature → Speaker 'Precipitous Abandonment' (cf. pages 61ff) 94- 97

    'Upgraded Second Assessment' → Shift 95

    'Confirmation' as 'Topically Disinterested'. 96

    Inbreath as 'Interruption Invitation'. 96- 97

  Multiple Recipient Assessments in an Achieved 'Short Phone Call'. 97-103

'Collaborative Completion' as Close-Implicative 98- 99
'Confirmation' → 'Correction' 99-100
Achieved 'Concensus'. 100-103
Recipient Assessments as 'Affiliative' 103-105
'Unkind' Responses as Topically Felicitous 104-105
Section III. Recipient Commentary as Shift-Implicative. 105-147
Recipient Commentary → Immediate Recipient Shift. 105-118
'Volition-Marked' Speaker Shift-Initiation as an Interruption Invitation 108
Inquiry to Arrive at a Request for Information. 109
Recipient Commentary as 'Orientationally Problematic' 109-110
Speakers 'Replying To' Commentary. 109-110
Inbreath as 'Imminent Shift' 110-111
'Dual Closure': A local Problem and the Larger Topic. 113-115
Repeated Response-Types as 'Deleting' Intervening Talk . . 113-114
Commentary → 'Matters of Concern to Recipient' (versus 'conversational fodder'). 115-129
Fractionally Non-Simultaneous Startings. 122-125
Post-Agreement Acknowledgment as a Phenomenon. 123
'Spurious' Non-Concensus (Exhibited Commitment to Closed-Off Topic) 124-125
Strategic Possibilities of 'Talking on an Exhausted Topic'. . 125-129
A 'Distanced' Inappropriate 'Next' Topic 126-129
Speaker 'Countering' Recipient Commentary 130-133
Post-Recipient-Commentary Speaker Acknowledgment → Continuation. 130-131
Post-Recipient-Commentary Speaker 'Reply'. 132
Post-Recipient-Commentary Speaker 'Sheer Continuation' . . 133

Achieved 'Concensus'. 133-134

Fractionally Non-Simultaneous Startings 134

Recipient 'Return to Recipiency' via Inquiry 134-147

A 'Fine-Grained Misapprehension'. 135-136

'Conversational Fodder' 137

An Analytic Problem: Is the Activity "Countering" or "Misapprehending"?. 137-139

A Methodological Problem: What Sort of Categories are 'Countering' versus 'Misapprehending'?. 139

A Topically Felicitous Inquiry as Interactionally Hostile. 142

The Preservation of Innocence 143-145

'Passive Recipiency'. 144-145

'Fragile' Telling-Components 145-146

Section IV. Appendum: Recipient-Inquiry as Shift-Implicative. . 147-155

Topic-Internal Inquiry as Shift-Implicative. 147-149

Topic-Initial Inquiry as Shift-Implicative 149-152

'Felicitational' Inquiries and Conversation Closure . . 149-155

"Caveat Speaker": A Preliminary Exploration of Shift-Implicative Recipiency in the Articulation of Topic

0. Introduction

Early on in the examination of conversational materials by reference to the general issue of Topic Articulation in Conversation we came across a curious little phenomenon. At some point, some talk-in-progress would comprise virtually no more than a batch of 'acknowledgment tokens'. Following are a few instances.

0.(1) [Rahman:B:1:(12):3]

```
1    G:          I know they've gōt one acrahss th'way theh very
2                ni[:ce.
3    M:            [Have they.=
4    G:  →       =M[m::.
5    M:  →         [Yah.
6                          (0.2)
7    G:  →      [[Ye:h.
8    M:  →      [[Yeh,
```

0.(2) [JG:I:3:3:r]

```
1    M:          We wen'(in)tuh Hollywood dihday?
2    P:          Oh didyuh?
3                     (.)
4    M:  →       't Ye:[h°we did°]
5    P:  →             [ Ye:a:h? ]
6    M:  →       Ye:ah,
7                        (0.6)
8    P:  →       Hm,
```

0.(3) [Rahman:I:4]

```
1    L:          Oh:::: yer well tie:d dow:n ahn't[chu
2    G:                                           [Well I am rea:[lly:]
3    L:  →                                                       [°Ye:[h
4    G:  →                                                            [°Yah,°
5    G:  →       Ye:s yihknow=
6    L:  →       =°Yea:h°
```

0.(4) [SBL:2:1:7:15-16:r]

1 M: She's been tuh Europe too: so: [she wou]:ld.
2 B: → [Ye:ah.]
3 B: → Ah ha:h,
4 (0.3)
5 B: → Uh-huh.
6 M: → Uh-huh.

Our initial responses to the phenomenon differed. One of us reacted with "Well, that's one way to keep a topic going" and named it Topic Hold, the other with "Well, that's one way to kill off a topic" and named it Topic Attrition. Each of us could see the sense to the other's reaction; i.e., while neither participant was offering material which might nourish the topic (i.e., Topic Attrition), nevertheless they were still recognizably on the topic (i.e., Topic Hold).

We thought that the data might choose between the alternatives. Inasmuch as the characterization 'topic attrition' might predict subsequent termination of the topic, and 'topic hold' might predict subsequent continuation, then we could simply look to see what happens next and discover which of our characterizations was accurate.

As it turned out, the data declined to act as arbitrator. Of the four instances selected for the above array solely on the basis of containing a nice batch of acknowledgment tokens, expanded versions show them to be divided equally on the issue of termination/continuation. This fortuitous feature makes the above array adequately representative of the larger collection. In Fragment 0.(1) the topic is terminated, in Fragment 0.(2) it is continued, in Fragment 0.(3) it is continued, and in Fragment 0.(4) it is terminated.

0.(1) [Expanded]

01 M: Uhm'h theh'v gon to see eh(k) eh:m a trailuh tent fi:rst,h
02 'hh uhm u-yihknow theh thehr̊ being made et Buhrkenhead uhr
03 somethi[ng,
04 G: [·h Oh one'v these thetchu pahck into a: (li'l)
05 [trailuh.
06 M: [(Yihnuh) Yes. Iss a trailuh,

```
07                      (.)
08   G:          E┌h ↑ha:.
09   M:           └En when you open outchih bedrooms arre off the floh
010              yih┌know.
1    G:             └I know they've got one acrahss th'way theh very
2                ni┌:ce.
3    M:            └Have they.=
4    G:          =M┌m::.
5    M:            └Yah.
6                       (0.2)
7    G:         [┌Ye:h.
8    M:         [└Yeh,
9    M:  →       ˙h So ah've got Stahrsky heuh,
10                     (.)
11   M:          hu┌h-heh-huh┌huh
12   G:            └O h : : :└you're lookin ahfter im
```

0.(2) [Expanded]

```
01   P:          Wuddiyuh been doin.
02                     (0.6)
1    M:          nOh I u-I d- We wen'(in)tuh Hollywood dihday?
2    P:          Oh didyuh?
3                      (.)
4    M:          ˙t Ye:┌h°we did°┐
5    P:                └ Ye:a:h? ┘
6    M:          Ye:ah,
7                      (0.6)
8    P:          Hm,
9                      (.)
10   P:  →       Djuh have a good ti:me?
11   M:          Well we looked over you know they had'n open hou:se,
```

0.(3) [Expanded]

```
01   G:          Well I cahn't leave im fih┌two houiz eef I'm if he's crying=
02   L:                                    └n:No.
03   G:          =when I've left im fer one.
04                     (.)
05   L:          Oh: deah mae.
06   G:          So: ah euh yihknow ez ah say I didn' get t┌ih typing,┐
1    L:                                                    └Oh:::: yer┘well
1                tie:d dow:n ahn't┌chu
2    G:                           └Well I am rea:┌lly:┐
3    L:                                          └°Ye:┌h,°
4    G:                                               └°Yah,°
5    G:          Ye:s yihknow=
6    L:         =[[┌°Yea:h°  ┐
7    G:  →       [[└cz'ee do┘esn'ee ↑hates being in un iz ow:n . . .
```

0.(4) [Expanded]

```
01   B:        And uh: hhhheh ˙hh the e(h)nd a'th'evening Miss Ke-elly
02             s'd Alice I guess this evening wz los'tih(h) y(h)ou(h)u
03   M:        Uh[huh
04   B:          [˙hh Al(h)ice s'd no I've enjoyed it'n I b'lieve she
05             di::[d.
06   M:            [Uh hu:h,  Ah think she does uh[: en u ]=
07   B:                                           [Ah hah.]
1    M:        =she's been tuh Europe too: so:[she wou]:ld.
2    B:                                       [Ye:ah. ]
3    B:        Ah ha:h,
4                    (0.3)
5    B:        Uh-huh.
6    M:        Uh-huh.
7    B:  →     Well it was loads'v fu::n.
8    M:  →     Uh-huh˙hh Listen uh Meh- uh ah b'thinkin about Madeline,
9              u-she didn't uh: pick up a boyfrie:nd,
```

It appears that 'a batch of acknowledgment tokens' is not a phenomenon in which salient features emerge from a collection. And various attempts to sub-classify the batches, and to correlate the sub-classifications with a range of other features of the talk failed to yield systematic results.[1] In sum, it appears that multiple acknowledgment tokens do not constitute a 'device' in their own right; i.e., there is no 2-part or 3-part or 4-part 'sequence' with a characterizable function and predictable outcome, in contrast, for example, to the 4-part Conversation Terminal Sequence demonstrated by Graham Button.[2] Rather, it appears that these batches are accumulated byproducts of single serial actions. And what is being done with these actions is a matter of analysis of each instance, in its particulars, with its own topical and interactional context.

---

[1] So, for example, such categories as Same-Speaker Multiple Acknowledgement Tokens, Cross-Speaker Multiples, Cross-Speaker Pairs, etc., were correltated with such features as Disjuncted Topical Shift, Connected Topical Shift, Remain on Topic, Disjuncted or Connected Shift to a New Topic, to a Prior Topic, to a Related Topic, to Conversation Closings, by a Teller or by a Recipient, etc. etc. The results were consistently equivocal.

[2] See G. Button, "No-Close Closings" M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) Structures of Social Action, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming 1981.

So, for example, intensive single-instance analysis of the materials from which Fragment 0.(3) was extracted indicates that the teller (G) is attempting to prolong the telling, to arrive at an appropriate sequential and interactional context in which to deliver a rather bizarre diagnosis of the child's crying.[1] On the other hand, the recipient (L) is attempting to curtail the telling, to arrive at an appropriate sequential and interactional context in which to introduce another topic.[2]

And, for example, while no analysis of Fragment 0.(2) has been undertaken, sheer 'ethnographic' features suggest that the caller (M) may be orienting to his 'news' as not deliverable here and now, while the call-recipient (P) is attempting to elicit a telling. Briefly, the caller has delivered a message from the call-recipient's ladyfriend. The call-recipient's wife being present while the telephone call is taking place, he may be working to make it 'a conversation' between two friends rather than a brief instrumental call; i.e., a 'message'. The caller, on the other hand, may be heavily oriented to the call as 'a message'. Thus, it is only following an inquiry by the call-recipient, "Did you have a good ti_:_me?", that the caller produces topically expansive talk.

While our attempt to develop 'multiple acknowledgment tokens' as a phenomenon in its own right resulted in failure, it focussed our attention on acknowledgment tokens, per se, with their topically dual-faceted character, as objects of possible analytic interest. Since such objects are so utterly ubiquitous in conversation, no attempt was made at an exhaustive

---

1. See G. Jefferson, "Exploratory Notes: 'Selective Detailing/Glossing' in the Convergence of 'Telling a Trouble' and 'Building a Defense'" K. Ehlich (ed.) "Diskursanalyse: Das Seminar fur Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft", forthcoming.
2. See the attached draft, "On 'Stepwise Transition' from Talk about a 'Trouble' to Inappropriately Next-Positioned Matters", pages 16-36. To appear in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) op. cit.

study of acknowledgment tokens and their various workings. Rather, the phenomenon was picked at here and there, focussing on materials in which topical movement was transparently relevant, and focussing on the use of acknowledgment tokens by recipients of some ongoing talk.

The focus on *recipients' acknowledgment tokens* by reference to topical movement led to exploration of two other objects, *recipients' assessments* and *recipients' commentaries*. Together, the three explorations comprise this report.

I. *Recipients' Acknowledgment Tokens as Topic-Shift-Implicative*

Independent of the various outcomes of multiple acknowledgment tokens we start off by noticing *one recurrent position of a recipient's acknowledgment token: immediately preceding a topical shift*.

The shift may comprise a complete change of topic as in Fragments 1.(1)-1.(10) below, or may in one or another way be topically connected to the prior as in Fragments 1.(11)-1.(20) below.

Our policy for displaying a possible phenomenon is to be as economical as possible in the number of instances shown. In this case we feel obliged to show a large number of instances. Perhaps this is because an acknowledgment token seems such a transient and incidental thing. It is the encountering, again and again and again, of its occurrence just prior to a topical shift which recommends it as of possible analytic interest.

1.(1) [SBL:2:2:3:30:pr]

```
1   C:        Well I haftuh get me some glasses, because these are all
2             scratched, an' uh I can't see out of'em anyway, but I uhm
3             I haftuh use'em anyway when I drive, but I haven't had'em
4             changed in five years. An' uhm (.) so:: ah- 'hhh (.) I
5             liked yer frames so well ah'll go over there en pick out
6             th'fra:mes.┌there.
7   K:  →                └Ya:h. 'hhhh Uh:m (.) I ca:lled uh beh-uh: (.)
8             Jerry, ba:ck.
9   C:        Oh are theh ken they co::me?
```

1.(2) [Rahman:I:6]

```
1   G:       It en:ded with a great big ↓bahng ehh he[h hn I jum]ped=
2   L:                                               [°Oh-huh::°]
3   G:       =outta the e seat I jump'd (.)e[shot about thrree feet in]=
4   L:                                      [°O h : : : : : : : : : :.°]
5   G:       =the air ah think ↑he[h heh]        [ˈhhhh
6   L:  →                         [Y e s]:.ˈhh  [Eh::m, we didn'go t'have
7            ar haiuh done bah the wa:y,
```

1.(3) [TCI(b):16:64]

```
1   J:       excep'when Chris'mas co[:mes a-a]-an'
2   L:                              [Y e a hh]
3   J:       ˈhhhh he siz wheredju get all thahheh heh[hn huh]=
4   L:                                                [mehheh]
5   J:       =huh hu[h huh °huh°]°hn°
6   L:              [ˈh h h h h ]Santa Claus.hhheh-h[eh
7   J:                                              [ˈhh ↑Sanna Claus
8            brou::ght it.(inniz sle::d).hn[hih] [hn-hn-[heh huh=
9   L:  →                                  [Y e]:[a h.  [ˈhh
10  L:  →    =Uh::[:m,
11  J:            [ˈhhhehhhhh °(                 ).°
12  L:  →                                 [I found a recipe: thet I'm
13           g'nna try:,
```

1.(4) [Heritage:I:6:7]

```
1   H:       she's the ty:pe,ˈhh thet (.) one has tuh take huh by the
2            no:se.
3   I:       Oh and ihh heh heh he[h-heh-hn=
4   H:                            [And-
5   H:       =I:'m: I:'m the only puhrs'n available t'take huhr by the
6            no:se.
7   I:  →    eeYup. Yup.ˈhhh Well now look e-Barnaby said he'd be back
8            t'morrow morning . . .
```

1.(5) [NB:IV:1:1-2:r]

```
1   E:       WE:LL: now maybe nex'ti:me ah'll stay down ah'll see how
2            things are<I gotta get I think ↓I oughta go home (0.2)
3            Ah don'know maybe Brad'd like me tuh sta:y hh(h)dun'
4            kno:[w.
5   L:           [hhh[hh °hn°
6   E:               [(h)I thi:nk he'd like t-me tuh sta-ay
7   E:       ˈhhh[hh
8   L:           [°hn-h[n°
9   E:                 [But fer ONRINESS ah'm goin ho:me, ph[h!
10  L:  →                                                   [Ye::ah.=
11  E:       =hunh huh,ˈhh[hh
12  L:  →                 [↑God I see in the paper ther sure lotta
13           halibut bein cau:ght down thet coa:st,
```

1.(6) [TCI(b):16:11-12]

J: My biggest thing is tryintuh figure out howtuh cut the neck en around th'ears.

L: Yea[h,

J: [That's the hard phha(h)a(h)art=

L: =Yeah,=

J: ='m'hhhhh without makin it look yihknow c'z I c'n take the scissors'n cut right around iz ears but then yih c'n rilly tell it.[too:.]So,

L: [Yeah.]

L: Ye[ah,

J: [·t'hhhh that's (.) the part I gotta figure out howtih do:,hh

L: → Yah how much didju git et yer gift'n gadget party.

1.(7) [NB:IV:4:14:pr]

E: I'M GOIN OUT'N READ THE PAPER, 'N I'M GONNA WRAP YER CHRISTMAS PRESENTS. I TOOK THE PRICE off'm, en-uhwell- I think you took the price offa yours didn'ch[u.

L: → [Ye:ah.I w- I wouldn' call Marian'n uh that's gonna spoil her whole uh Thanksgiving.

1.(8) [SBL:1:1:1:4:r]

R: We::ll: I wz hungry w'n I got home en I've j's finished I mean my mai:n (0.4) [uh

B: [Ye:s

(.)

R: entree:

B: °M-hm,°

R: En I:'ll have a little ice crea:m la[:ter.

B: → [Yeah.'hh Yihknow I worked Wednesdee en Thursdee maybe that's when you tried tih get me.

1.(9) [NB:IV:5:2-3:r]

M: I look like a wi:ld Indian[cuz I'm'hh I (.) piled it all=

E: [↓Ye:ah.

M: =up on top I'm gunnuh[give it a]good washing.

E: → [Y e : a h]

E: → 'h You say Phil's playing ↑go:lf?

1.(10) [SBL:1:1:12:36]

M: Well, I think it's awfully nice of you to r-rent to a family with children.

B: Well, that was uh built for that, it's in a- too good a school area.

M: Yeah.

B: You know, [that's what I intended.

M: [Yeah.

M: Well some- uh so many people though, uh you know they're just won't- won't do this.

```
10   B:        They have to go someplace,
11   M:        Well I know it.
12   B:        Uh huh,
13   M:        I know, and I feel this.
14   B:        Uh huh, and uh (2.0) I-th- these are big enough, she s-
15             uh the lih- uh the other one's uh smaller, but uh I'm
16             sure that (0.3) everything'll be cared for,
17   M:  →     Mm hm, say tell me something, has Maizie moved back home
18             yet,
```

1.(11) [SBL:2:2:3:4:r]

```
1    C:        Well tha:t's one rea:s'n I duh want three tables up here
2              Kate cuz: becuz ˙hhhh my: hou:se is jus' to[o: s:]ma::ll=
3    K:                                                   [Ya:h.]
4    K:      =[[Yah.]
5    C:       [[A:N' ]uh˙t˙hh if I ha:ve a(w̥) another wuh In th'frontroo:m
6              en in th' dining room's fi:ne b't if I ha:ve one in the
7              KItchen over he:re.
8                    (.)
9    K:  →     Yah.[]
10   C:            [] ˙hhhh[Di[dju  neh-  ]
11   K:  →                 [hh[W'I then i]z too ↑clo::se[see,    ]
12                                                       [Did y]ou notice: uh
13             Claire I think you came over'n played. the time I had three
               tables with these all these other gals,
```

1.(12) [Frankel:TC:I:1:14-15]

```
1    G:        Th'semester, theoretically ends the twenny third I think.=
2    S:  →     =Ye:ah.˙t˙hhh Tell me you guys er gunna go tuh Frisco fer
3              Christmas::,
```

1.(13) [SBL:1:1:10:7:r]

```
1    D:        ˙h But I'm at the poi:nt whehr(m̥) (0.2) uh ti:me is more
2              import'n t'me then money.
3    B:        Oh ↓yes.
4                     (0.4)
5    D:        A:nd uh: (                                  ) you know look et all
6              th'mo:ney but uh (0.3) it's jis too mu:ch.
7    B:  →     Ye:s.˙hhhh Uh:m (0.3) ↑I jist had a thou:ght. I know someone
8              who uh˙hhh uh:: (0.2) has (.) two smaller children˙hh and uh
9              (0.7) would ↑li:ke I think tih get in some jus sᵀm weeke:nds
10             you know.
```

1.(14) [SBL:1:1:1:6:r]

```
1    B:        B'cuz he wz wunning tih kno:w if uh,h 'f I w'd relieve the
2              morning nurse ˙hhhh Bu:t u:hm (.) ˙t˙k˙hh (0.7) uh:m (0.3)
3              then when he wen' upstai:rs say goodnight'n wen'upstairs'e
4              said,h well M'z Da:nzig? u̥-u̥-c-come out any time you ca:n
5              we'll make roo:m tuh[hhh huh] ˙hh Yihkno]:w=
6    C:                            [Oh*::::]:*ah - ah: ]
7    B:       =I mean[e̥-he t-˙hh]
8    C:              [M m - m m :]
9    B:       en he's awf'lly ni::ce['n I °jus:t]uh°
10   C:  →                          [n:Ye::*::s]
11   C:  →     ˙h Is he still in business or retired.
```

1.(15) [SBL:1:1:1:6-7:r]

B: He does (.) th'things he needs to the errands=
C: =M-[m ↓hm
B: [°'n things: like [that°
C: [M m [↓hm
B: [·hh Once in a while < I think
one day a week he plays go-olf,
C: Uh[↓hu:h,
B: [·hhhhhh °And[uh° other then tha:t why uh he[:
C: → [°( )° [↓Ye:s.
C: → 'h Bu:t uh you see no impro:vement.
(1.5)
C: [[in her con]dition.
B: [[o-Oh::: u]

1.(16) [W:PC:1:(1):28]

M: althoh ah doh:'seem tih see enuu (.) lots ahv yih
[since yih c(hh)a(h)a(h)me,=
J: [No heh heh heh
J: =[[( )
M: [[·hhhh Buut it's th'settling in da::y[s.
J: [gettin ehm (.)
strai:ght, [with thi:s en[then thaht
M: → [eeYe:s [Y e : : s, 'hh Ah yih quah-'t
hahppy with iyer fuhr:nichuh,

1.(17) [Heritage:I:11:3]

N: W'l ho:w a:re you eniweh How's: uh'h have <Are: you- are
you ex:pecting[any ( )?]
I: [·h Well I hope]so::=
N: =[[°Oh. How e]xci[ting.°]
I: [[u h : : m] [u h : :]m: d-Lola wz mated um (0.3) oh
about three weeks ago:.
N: hhOh:.[( )
I: [A n d (.) Mitzie wz mated about two weeks ago[:.
N: [£Oh
my goodness you do ah[sk for i]t,£
I: [eh-h e h]
I: ·h he-Well'h I a-always feel it's best t'ghet it all over
et[th'same ↑ti:me y']neh,
N: [Well y e : : s .]
N: → Ye:s.[An-an who]didju go: to.
I: [It's uh:]

1.(18) [NB:II:2:14:r]

E: w:Whuddiyuh ↑doin.
(0.9)
N: What'm I do[in?
E: [cleani:n[g?
N: [·h'h I'm ironing wouldju belie:ve
↓tha:t.
E: Oh: bless it'[s hea:rt]
N: [In fa:c]t I: ire I started ironing en I:

```
 9   N:          d- I: d-somehow er another ahrning dis kind of lea:ves me:
10               co:[ld,
11   E:  →          [Yea:h,
12                     (.)
13   E:  →       [[Wanna c'm down'n[av a bahta lunch with me:?
14   N:          [[°(Y'know),°      [°(                      )°
```

1.(19) [TCI(b):16:18]

```
 1   J:        but yihknow it's just the t-idea whether yih nu- wanna go:,
 2             'hhhh out'n shop for it or i[f you wanna get it there.=
 3   L:                                    [Ye:ah,
 4   J:        =That['s,the]thi[ng.[So.
 5   L:             [Hu:h, ]   [ 'hh[I'll haftih go tuh Toys'R Us,
 6             [uh:::m,]sometime[before]Christmas,]
 7   J:  →     [Ye::ah.]        [ 'hhhhh]O h  :  I w]unna a:sk you. 'hh
 8             [What do you want to do, about Christmas.
 9   L:        [Ye(s),
```

1.(20) [Rahman:B:2:(14):9-10]

```
 1   G:        I'm suhprized the ↑children eh:m (.) deh- don't want
 2             anything et mid da:y,
 3                   (0.3)
 4   L:        'hhh Well ah think they do et ho:me Gwenny bu[t-it's not]
 5   G:                                                   [Y e : s : ]:=
 6   L:        =s'ch a big meal[ah:nd eh 'h they muucked intuh biscuits.=
 7   G:                        [↑Yes:,
 8   L:        =They had (.) quite a lotta biscuit[s'n c h e e : : : s e,]
 9   G:                                           [Oh: well thaht's it th]en
10   G:        Ye[s,
11   L:          [a:nd e-she said that's enough fo:hr them.
12   G:  →     M-hm:: Theh bonny ki:ds[I  m u s t  s a y ,]
13   L:                              [They ahr: lovely ch]il:dren
```

These arrays, which we assert to be representative of the larger collection of 'acknowledgment tokens → topical shift' not only indicate that there may be some systematicity to the occurrence of such a transient and possibly incidental object as an acknowledgment token, but that there may be systematic distinctions as between cases of that class; i.e., as between such items as "Mm hm", "Uh huh", and "Yeah" (or "Yes").

In particular, we can notice a possible distinction as between "Mm hm" and "Yeah" (or "Yes"). Strictly as a matter of counting, it can be noticed that of the ten candidate instances of 'acknowledgment token → new topic'; i.e., Fragments 1.(1)-1.(10), and of the ten candidate instances of 'acknowledgment token → connected topic'; i.e., Fragments 1.(11)-1.(20), nine of each involve "Yeah" (or "Yes") and one of each involve "Mm hm" (Fragments 1.(10) and 1.(20) respectively).

This purely numerical observation can be tied in with an observation made during analysis of a fragment by reference to other aspects of topic articulation. It was noticed that, in the course of a 'troubles-telling', at a point where a 'troubles-teller' could see that her coparticipant was possibly taking over 'tellership' she might be recognizably relinquishing her own tellership and taking up 'passive recipientship', by producing an acknowledgment token (see Fragment 1.(21) below, line 17), and thereafter re-exhibiting that status with a series of such tokens (see lines 17, 20, 24 and 28).[1] As it happens, the token is "Mm hm". It can also be noticed that the coparticipant, as she moves into possible tellership, uses the token "Yeah" as a turn-initial item (see lines 12 and 14).

1.(21) [NB:IV:10:18-19:r]

```
 1   E:        I'm not g'nna ↓pla:n things anym*ore.h I mean this is
 2              ri°diculous° cou:rse I know Mister Co:le's sick let's
 3              God let's hope'ee gets well b't,h˙hhhhhhh I know the
 4              pro:bum,hhh yihkno:w,h
 5   L:         Whudiz he ha:ve.
 6                      (0.2)
 7   E:         ˙t˙hh Oh he:'s got this ↓ga:llbladder a:nd uh they-
 8              he's vomiting en evrything they took im to the ho:spi'l
 9              'n I don't know how long eez gonna be in er what the t-
10              well eez gonna be eighty fou::r,
11                      (0.7)
12   L:  →      Ye::┌ah┌w e l l┐
13   E:             └'n└eez  qu┘ite a play:bo:y yihknow,
                        (.)
14   L:  →      Yea:h yih jis gotta be caref (.) we:ll see: ˙hh Dwi:ght
15              only has (0.2) o:ne ga:ll bladder?
16                      (0.7)
17   E: *→      °Mm h┌*m°
18   L:              └He had e-en then he hastuh be careful what he eats
19              he can't eat anything grea:sy er anything yih┌know˙hhh
20   E:  →                                                   └°Mm°hm::;,
21   L:         Go:d whata ma:n he wz ou:t there this:morning en'e (.)
22              they have these great big o:live trees all over
```

---

[1] This fragment is considered in the attached paper, op. cit., pages 9-16. The possible phenomenon of exhibiting a shift into 'passive recipiency' is not taken up in the paper, but was set aside for future reference.

```
23   L:        yihkn┌ow,
24   E:  →          └Mm: hm::,
25   L:        't En the win'wz so ba:d thet the-the-th- (.) the bra:nches
26             were hitting the hou:se'n (.) Go:d (0.3) *u-:-: I got up
27             about (.) wull ih wz about eight uh'clo:ck,
28   E:  →     Mm:┌hm,
29   L:           └'n here eez up there s:sawin those o:ff yihknow
```

A search through other conversations in this corpus of telephone calls yielded a possibly systematic distinction as between "Yeah" and "Mm hm", by reference to such an alternation as 'speakership' and 'passive recipiency' by the troubles-teller → recipient of Fragment 1.(21).

1.(21.a.) [NB:I:6:13]

```
1    L:        I'm kinda cleaning up from yesterday.
2    E:  →     Mm: hm,
3                   (1.0)
4    L:        I wz jist washin the dishes,
5    E: *→     Yeah, wir jis- cleanin up here too.
```

1.(21.b.) [NB:II:4:13-14:pr]

```
1    N:        he's gotta ril good job with a big air conditioning comp'ny,
2    E:  →     Mm┌hm,
3    N:          └A:nd uh,'hhh has (      ) with'm fer about fifteen years.
4              A:nd uh, so consequently he's very? eez intelligent? en
5              he:'s ah'hh not ha:n'some.'hh but he's ni:ce
6              looki:n:┌g a::n┐d ah, jist a ri:l ril nice: pers'nable,=
7    E:  →             └Mm hm,┘
8    N:        =very pers'nable very sweet.'hhhh ve:ry:. c'nsiderate my
9              gah all I had'do wz look etta cigarette'n'e wz out'v the
10             chai:r lighting (h)itchhekn(h)o(h)ow┌'hhhhh┐
11   E:                                            └My: go┤↓:sh ((nasal))
12   N:                                                   └One a'those kind,
13             'hhhhhh┌a::┐:n'so┌: thet w'z┐
14   E: *→            └Yeh┘     └THEY DO TH┘A:T┌BE┌FORE EN┐
15   N:                                        └y:└Yhheahh┘=
16   E:     =[[┌A:FTER┌THEY┌D O┐:n't.┐
17   N:        └↑AHH! └hah └huh┘'hhhh┘hhh
```

1.(21.c.) [NB:IV:1:2-3]

```
1    E:        You goin fishin?
2                   (0.2)
3    L:        o-Oh:: gee I don'know. I haven'┌decided┌yet.
4    E:  →                                    └Mm,    └Mm hm,
5    L:        I don'know what- yihknow,=
6    E: *→    =[[┌Yeah,
7    L:          └wait til I see what ha┌ppens.
8    E: *→                              └'hhh- W'l I'm'nna stop by brother's'n
9              leave the reel. We fergot uh, didn'have the reel here, the
10             rod, so,'hhh┌HE WANSUH BORROW THAT. HE'S goan fishin
11   L:                    └Oh.
```

And in other materials, other participants can be seen to be using the two items by reference to such a distinction; "Mm hm" exhibiting 'passive recipiency', "Yeah" associated with 'speakership'.

1.(22.a.) [SBL:2:1:7:3-4]

T: I said I le- wouldn'wanna be quoted, an' I'm not s-speaking
with any word of uh- I'm not authentic at all, but I said I
have an idea that Winnie is pretty well heeled.
B: → Mm hm,
T: And cause she had a duplex thet she sold, and she's bought
'n sold sto:cks, and uh people can't do thi- and she's
worked, I said she's worked, and she's been very thrifty.
B: → Mm hm,
T: So I said it uh adds up to one thing, money someplace,
B: → Mm hm,
T: But eh sh-she transacts all'er business in Los Angeles, you
know'n people like this are so secreetive it's a m- really,
it's uh almost a mental state.
B: *→ Yeah. Well, uh::m (1.0) uh there's something wrong too, if
she doesn't pay her bills. She doesn't know th-it-I thought
she'd know more about the law of presperity then that,

1.(22.b.) [SBL:2:1:5:7-8]

G: I dunno it's kind of a funny (0.3) uh:: (1.0) it's a lady
thet um (1.0) she wants tuh live over there, 'n have that
place,
B: → Mm hm,
G: And uhm (1.0) her daughter'n the children here. Well I would
think'd be just the opposite, cause that house is more, is
bigger for children than [this one.
B: → [Mm hm,
B: → Mm hm,
G: But anyway, he uh sh- uh she uh happens tuh want, I guess
the uh bigger place.
B: → Mm hm,
G: So it's- it's alright, it's- it doesn't make any difference,
B: → Mm [hm,
G: [And uhm so, uh anyway, I don't know just how it's going
to [turn out.
B: *→ [Yeah. Well, I will uh- whatever suits Maurice or whatever
but I- if the- if he has (them) that he wants to get rid of,
I'd love to have some of them

1.(22.c.) [Heritage:I:3:1]

I: How's Madam:,=
L: =↑Fi:ne thank you ready tih co:me back<
(.)
I: Oh ↓good.
(0.4)

```
6     L:          Been well ↓ma:ted I got the knots out'v her ea::rs?=
7     I:  →       =M[m hm?
8     L:            [I've done'er toenai:ls?
9                        (0.2)
10    I: *→       ·t·hhh Yes[:  good<]   [°becuh-°
11    L:                    [Y'c'd he]a:r[You c'd hear'er in th'nex'county?
```

1.(22.d.) [Heritage:OI:3:15-16]

```
1     B:          If sh::e gets (0.2) gets en ex:tra extra (0.5) thou:s'n
2                 quid (.) fohr (.) d-dih-hhih-dih-d- doing it through the
3                 ↑agent. (0.9) She'll o:nly(g) (.) gain about u-hhe-u-about
4                 a couple'v hundred ↑pounds out'v it.
5     S:  →       Mm:.
6     B:          Be:- because the muh- rest a'the th:ous'n wuh-w-would go
7                 on ↑agent's fees.
8                        (0.4)
9     B:          ↑So::: (0.7) they wo:n't rih: r::really be much (0.2) much
10                (b) (.) bett'r off th'n.
11                       (1.0)
12    B:          Wot we (0.8) wot we m-might do, b't ih- b't (     ) that we
13                cah:n't rilly is soht'v (.) geo: direct (.) ·hh to (1.4)
14                the ↑ownuh.
15                       (0.7)
16    S:  →       Mm hm,
17    B:          And sa:y thet (0.3) dih-thi-th(h)i-th-th-this problem's
18                blown u:p'n evrything en ah-ah-an u-wouldn't wu (0.9) would
19                the:y tell. (0.7) tell huhr tuh suh soht'v tell the agent.
20                B't (1.2) we cah:n't.
21                       (1.7)
22    B:          So:::::.
23                       (0.5)
24    B:          Anywa:y we'll just haf to (0.7) see nah,
25                       (1.0)
26    B:          See::(w) (0.4) what happ'ns: if anything.
27                       (1.5)
28    S: *→       Ya:h.
29    B:          Just a birt of a blo:w. °Th't's all.°
30    S: *→       °Ye:s° Well if if (0.3) if I we[re you:,
31    B:                                         [(            ),
32    S:          ·hh when you c'n speak to huhr I'd sa:y yih neh- ee-ee-ee
33                you kno:w de-you've got to uhm ·t·hh tell: the A:GENTS what
34                uhm ·hh whatchu wan'tih do:.
```

1.(22.e.) [Owen:8B15(A):12-13]

```
1     A:          if there are people in th'university. who ahr (.) b'long t'
2                 the union,=
3     B:  →       =Mm:,
4                        (0.3)
5     A:          who ahr the sa:me:: (.) grade ess you, or in the[(       ).=
6     B:  →                                                       [Mm:,
7     B:  →       =Mm:,
8                        (0.6)
9     A:          An' they get a: highuh(p) (0.4) wa:[ge?
10    B:  →                                          [Mm:,
11   A:         We (.)•presumably w'd auto↑matic'ly get┌highuh°Y'know?°┐
12   B: *→                                             └We::ll::   ye:s ┘=
13   B: *→      =Ah m'n ah┌(think) (.)┌(        )
14   A:                   └Bec'z      └if evrybuddy hass tuh be:=
15   B: *→      Ye:h=
16   A:         =the s-the┌s a : m e,┐
17   B: *→                └Wul wuh u-┘happ'ns i┌thing┐
18                                             └s the┘h- Ah think they've
19              got wot they call a•join:t (0.2) a joint::: (.) uh::m bohrd
20              ohr something <anyway all the peopl- thez about three'r
                four diffrent unions . . .
```

The following (and final) fragment of this array has an extended series of "Mm hm"s. The "Yeah" is not followed by 'speakership', but by another acknowledgment token; not, however, "Mm hm", but "Ah hah", which itself is followed by speech (see lines 26-32). Thereafter we find the "Yeah" → 'speakership' relationship in direct form.

1.(22.f.) [SBL:1:1:12:4-5:r]

```
1    B:         I stayed home la:st evening en I pla:n:' to: uhm (0.5) or
2               no I didn' I: wz home I came ho:me:: u (.) en wz ho:me fr'm
3               fi:ve til ei:ght.
4    M:  →      M-hm,
5    B:         I thought that's when (.) yuhknow the ↑ca:lls:=
6    M:  →    =[[M-hm,
7    B:         [[w'd be coming i:n. I went ou:t. et eight uh'clo:ck.
8    M:  →     [[M-hm,
9    B:         [[•hhe::a:hhh But uh:m•tch•hh (.) uh then:: uh:m (1.0) I had
10              sev'ral tuhda::y,
11   M:  →      M-hm,
12                      (0.3)
13   B:         And uh::m, (.) I kih- I've ↑cancelled the ↑a::d,
14   M:  →      Mm hm:,
15   B:         •t•h Cuz I didn't want them calling tomorrow yo┌u kno:w=
16   M:  →                                                   └M-hm
17   B:         =just t┌uh sa:y•hh
18   M:  →             └M-hm,
19   B:         I've had I think three: since: uh it's been rented,
20   M:  →      M-hm,
21   B:         J'st I had tuh say it's re:nted,
22   M:  →      M-hm,
23   B:         •hhhhhh And u-but I w's::uh:: I gut-•hh OH WHAT I starduh
24              SA:Y•h So I jus'pla:nned tuh have this weeke:nd et ↓ho:me
25              yihknow, a┌:ll a:ll day Saturday'n all day Sundee.=
26   M: *→                └↓Yah.
27   B:         =•h┌hh
28   M:  →         └Ah h┌a:h,
29   B:                  └And it's ↑juhhst bee(h)n ↓wo:nderfu(h)l.
30   M: *→      W'l ↑ah ↑be::t.
31   B:         •hhh!•hh┌↑Jus'tuh
32   M: *→              └Ah'll bet it ha:┌:s.
33   B:                                  └Ah hu-uh tu- yihknow jus'tuh
34              r:really (1.0) fee:l he:ld here=
35   B:          =yihknow w't I┌mean (          ]          )
36   M: *→                     └↑Y E : A H ]ah know whatche mean=
37   B:       =[[┌Here  for  a(p)┐
38   M: *→      [[└yih feel like y┘er really uh-accomplishin something while
39                 y'were staying ↑ho:┌me.
40   B:                               └Ye:ah he:re for a purpose.
41   M: *→        ↑Ye:uh:.
42                        (.)
43   B:  →      [[┌°U-huh°┐
44   M: *→      [[└ Y  a :┘h ah think it's wunnerful'hh I remember ah w'z-
45                'member thinking (.) ah wz thinking about this t'myself
46                yesterday: uh you-oo (.) uh you know thinking about things
47                yid like tuh do:,┌'hhh
48   B:  →                       └°M-hm,°
49   M:          A::n' u-I wz thinking . . .
```

We can also note the former teller (B) using "Yeah" as a turn-initial item (line 40), and, post her coparticipant's own "Yeah" (line 41), producing a soft alternative acknowledgment token, again, not "Mm hm" but "°U-huh°" (the degree-sign [°] indicates low volume), and finally, when the coparticipant is fully launched into a telling, the token of 'passive recipiency', "°M-hm,°" (line 48).

The possibility of a distinction between "Yeah" and "Mm hm" by reference to 'speakership' and 'passive recipiency' respectively, casts an interesting light on the following two fragments, in which we may be seeing systematically 'perverse' uses of 'passive recipiency' where 'speakership' is appropriate.

In the following fragment one participant (E) is attempting in a range of ways to decline some problematic advice. One attempt involves the taking of 'speakership' and using it to offer an optimistic projection on the circumstances by reference to which the advice was generated; i.e., "Ye:ah.'h 'tch'hhhh Well I'm gonna make it" (lines 29-30). Other work indicates that the 'optimistic projection' is strongly implicative of closure for talk by reference to the circumstances being assessed.[1]

---

[1] See G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, "On the Analysis of Conversations in which 'Troubles' and 'Anxieties' are Expressed", <u>SSRC Final Report</u>, December 1980, pages 38-39.

When the coparticipant declines to take up the close implicature of the optimistic projection and pursues the advice with a command-like utterance, "W' u↑:se that on there" (line 32), a display of 'passive recipiency', "Mm hm", is produced (lines 33 and 35).

1.(23.a.) [NB:I:1:6:14-17:r]

```
1    L:          Wah'onche git that┌nay-uh:: Revlon nai┌:l: uh ┐
2    E:                            └·hhhhh             └·t·hh W┘ell that's
3                not therapeutic Lottie really it says on the (0.3) thi:ng
4                uh-th-when yik- ah this pro:xide iss: uh kind'v a,hh
5                ·hhh┌h
6    L:              └Wuddiyuh mean uh th-uh do:ctors use it,
7                      (0.3)
8    E:          ·t·hhhh W'l on the little jar it siz not therapeutic so::
9                      (0.6)
10   E:          Yihknow w't I mea:n? ih doesn'kill any:: infection if I'm
11               not mistaken I don'kno:w.
12                     (0.3)
13   E:          Th'do:ctors use it?
14   L:          Wul:: uh Do:ctor Hathaway gave it to me?
15   E:          ·hh This Revlo:n?
16   L:          Su:re nai:l builder.┌it's┌i n  t h a t┌little┐
17   E:                              └·hh └W'l at's w't└ I  ha┘:ve.=
18   L:          =that li'l cream ja┌::r.
19   E:                             └↓Ya:uh.
20                     (0.3)
21   E:          ·hhh┌hh
22   L:              └Wul I g-I start getting it'n I use it fer a couple
23               a'days'n hell it goes right a┌wa:y.
24   E:                                       └Yayah.
25                     (0.2)
26   L:          cuz it's got the white ↑iodine er you c'n use the white
27               iodine b't the white iodine seem ·hhh ih-it's a li'l bit
28               stronger it kinda burns y┌er flesh a li'l┌bit.
29   E:  →                                └Ye:ah.         └Ye:ah.·h·tch
30   E:  →       ·hhhh Well I'm gonna make it uh-hh-hh I: uh
31                     (0.4)
32   L:          W' u↑:se that on the┌re. Je:┐sus=
33   E: *→                           └Mm: hm,┘
34   L:          =that's the only thing thet helps me:,
35   E: *→       Mm: hm,
36                     (0.6)
37   E:          ·t·hhh I sat on the fan the other day right on the very
38               e:dge onna to:wel so: ah min ah d'n git mah foot in the
39               (0.2) fa:n b't I'm fi:ne,
40                     (0.2)
41   L:          Y┌e:ah.
42   E:           └I think ah'll make it.
43   L:        ┌┌Oka:y,
44   E:        └└·hh·hhhh Alright,
45   L:          Ah see yih next week then.
46   E:          Bah bye┌:,
47   L:                 └Bye bye
```

This fragment seems transparent for the distinction between 'passive recipiency' and 'speakership'. The command-like utterance "W' u↑:se that on there" is, in its context, clearly not a 'telling in progress', in the course of which a coparticipant appropriately might display passive recipiency, but the sort of action following which a coparticipant expectably and appropriately assumes 'speakership' and accepts, rejects, or otherwise deals with the advice/command.

In that regard we note that the way this advice/command-recipient 'deals' with the matter is to change the topic (see lines 34-39), thus producing a method of topic shift which we are not exploring; i.e., post a conversational 'lapse'. In this case, that talk on the prior topic has 'lapsed' may be particularly strongly demonstrated by the (0.6) silence which has followed a 'passive-recipiency' token; i.e., the floor has been unequivocally returned to the prior speaker, she not 'continuing', the 'topic' may be seen to be 'exhausted' and other matters turnable to.

In the following fragment a telling is in progress, re. the sale of a house and the attendant scavenging of fixtures and furnishings. As it happens, the recipient has an interest in "some of the plants" (lines 57-58). What we initially notice here is that her inquiry into the matter occurs at a distance from the teller's reference to people "wanting this and wanting that"(lines 1-9 and 40-41) and the possible consequence of such acquisitiveness; i.e., of "queering a deal" (line 40).

We next notice that at a point where, if one had something one wanted to say, one might well introduce it; i.e., after an explicit assertion that a telling has been completed, "So: uhm,h (.) tha:t's the ↓story" (line 44), the recipient does not make such a move. Instead, she produces the 'passive recipiency' token "Mm hm" (line 45). And we find the teller searching for and coming up with more to tell -- about the sale of the house, but no longer about the marked-as-terminated business of "wanting this and wanting that" (lines 47-54). It is in the course of this topical node that the recipient moves into 'speakership' with "Yeah" and produces her inquiry into the plants (lines 55-58).[1]

1.(23.b.) [SBL:2:1:5:5-7:r]

```
1    G:          u-We:ll Loretta wa:nted thi:s, 'n (.) she wanted tha:t? 'n
2                ·hhh a:nd uhm (0.8) uh:m Loretta- w-the woman said t↑me w'l
3                what uh: are you takin:g ou:t a'the house.thet's atta:ched.
4                           (.)
5    B:          M-hm,
6                           (0.2)
7    G:          ↑An:d uhm (0.3) ↑I said we:ll (0.4) I guess noth:ing ·h
8                (0.2) uh:m I thought well s- ih heavens. after ↑all y'
9                c(h)an't t(h)ake evrythi:ng,
10   B:          No:,
11   G:          ·hhhh A:nd um (.) [S o  t h e y  e ]
12   B:                            [You're going ti ]h take s'm crystal things
13               though arntchu?
14   G:          Uh we:ll . . .
                 .
                 .      ((ca. 20 lines omitted re. switching chandeliers))
                 .
35   G:          I'd li:ke tih have the mirrors. But if she wants ↑th'm? (.)
36               ·hh ↑why that's: i-th-tha:t's ↑fi::ne.
37   B:  →       Mm hm,
38   G:          If she's going t'use them yuh kno:w.
39   B:  →       Mm[hm,
40   G:            [·hhhhhh I'm not going to uhm,hh maybe queer a dea:l jus'
41               by wanting this that'n the othe[r (yihknow),
42   B:                                         [NO:.
```

---

1. At other points in the conversation the teller produces such explicit assertions of completion, whereupon the recipient assumes speakership.

1.(23.a.1.) [SBL:2:1:5:3:r]

```
G:           I:'ve just got tih take the ga:rdner ↑over there in the
             morning?[We:ll?
B:  →                [M-hm,
                   (0.2)
G:  →        So tha:t's ↑tha:t.
B: *→        Ye:ah, ·hh We:ll I understa:nd . . .
```

1.(23.a.2.) [SBL:2:1:5:11-12:r]

```
G:           I uh you know she's ↑o:lder now then she was it gets ↑harder
             all the t[ime.
B:  →                 [Ye:ah. °Mm-hm,°
                   (0.6)
G:  →        ↑A:nd uh:,hh tha:t's uh: that's tha:t. That's all[I  kno]:w.
B: *→                                                          [Ye:ah.]·hh
B: *→        Well ah'm awf'lly glad tuh hear from yuh . . .
```

43 (0.2)
44 G: ˙hhhh s:So: uhm,h (.) tha:t's: the ↓story.
45 B: *→ Mm hm,
46 (0.2)
47 G: An:d uh (0.6) uhm,hhh (1.0) ˙hhhh u-Then I have a ma:n
48 coming Tue:sdee tuh see abou:t uh remo:deling the kitchen
49 the way ahwan'it che know? en the butler's pa:ntr[y
50 B: → [°Uh huh,°
51 G: ˙hhhh en doing a few thin:gs like tha::t.
52 B: → Uh-huh
53 G: ˙hhh ↑A:nd uh: (.) it's jus (.) just geh- yuhknow working
54 then tih tr[y'n ge]t (.) things kinda li:ned u::p.
55 B: *→ [Yea:h.]
56 B: *→ Yeh<˙hh Now I wonder uh:m˙hh eh-uh:(w) (0.5) ˙h whhen would
57 eh: (0.2) ˙tch˙hh be the bes'ti:me for me tih get some of
58 the pla:nts thet Maurice doesn't wa:nt.

That is, at a point where it might be appropriate for a recipient to assume speakership, but where it would also be a particularly unfortunate position for the recipient's pending business; i.e., reference to wanting something from the house at a point where the teller has just referred to possible adverse consequences of "wanting this that and the other", the recipient manages the problem by preserving her status as recipient and thereby preserving her coparticipant's status as teller, on a matter which has been marked as altogether 'exhausted' by the teller.

The sequelae in this case are particularly fortunate for the recipient; i.e., the (re)established teller finds further materials on the general topic to tell, and in bringing that subsequent node to a close, happens to produce a reference to "trying to get things kind of lined up" (line 54). When the recipient assumes speakership and inquires into the plants she wants, it is as a subsequent to, and can be heard as coherent with, 'lining things up', herself now doing some 'lining up' work, rather than, as potentiated earlier, as a subsequent to, and problematically coherent with, "wanting this that and the other", herself then doing some 'wanting'.[1]

---

[1] Indeed, the inquiry is formatted as a 'lining up' rather than a 'wanting'; i.e., it is an arranging to get the plants rather than, e.g., a

Earlier it was proposed that in sheer numerical terms Fragments 1.(1)-1.(20) indicated a possible distinction between cases of the class 'acknowledgment token', specifically as between "Yeah" and "Mm hm". This possible distinction was followed up by an array exhibiting possible selective distribution of the tokens, Fragments 1.(21.a.)-1.(22.f.), in which "Yeah" emerges as recurrently associated with 'speakership', "Mm hm" with 'passive recipiency'.

With that possible systematicity as a resource, we could begin to see some of the work it could be put to, as in Fragments 1.(23.a.) and 1.(23.b.), the candidate instances of the 'perverse passive'. For one, then, an item like "Mm hm" is not just some quasi-involuntary noise, an automatic index of a current participant's conversational status, but a working conversational device.

And in the consideration of Fragment 1.(23.b.) it was mentioned that by preserving her status as 'recipient' a participant thereby preserved her coparticipant's status as 'teller', and that, at least in this case, the consequence was that the coparticipant accepted her (re)classification as 'teller' and found more to say. The exhibit of 'passive recipiency', then, may be characterized as having elicited further talk, and rather dramatically so, in that the coparticipant had just produced a topic terminator; i.e., further talk by a (prior) teller was elicited at a point where the teller may well take it that the recipient may/can/should assume speakership.

At the point in our exploration at which we had identified the phenom-

---

request for them, or, e.g., a reminder of her interest in them and coparticipant's agreement that she could have them, etc. etc. All that is treated as already in hand, requiring no explication. In this context the little explicatory-reminding appendum, "that Maurice doesn't want" emerges as rather pointedly produced by reference to the matters from which this participant has worked to achieve disengagement. In effect, perhaps, a bit of a 'giveaway' or, as Erving Goffman has it, a 'leak'.

enon of Acknowledgment Token → Topical Shift, we did not yet have in hand the possible distinction as between cases of 'acknowledgment tokens'; i.e., we took it that a range of acknowledgment tokens, "Yeah", "Mm hm", "Uh huh", etc., were for all practical purposes interchangeable. And that led us into an erroneous (and fortunately short-lived) train of thought. Specifically, if 'acknowledgment tokens' were so recurrently associated with termination of some prior topic, what effect would this have on, for example, clients of those practitioners whose stock in trade was the acknowledgment token; i.e., psychologists, psychotherapists, etc.? Would the clients be constantly confronted with, and having to deal with objects which, in their everyday world, were associated with termination of whatever they had been talking about?

But the distinction indicated in Fragments 1.(1)-1.(20) and exhibited in Fragments 1.(21.a.)-1.(22.f.) led to an alternative and accurate understanding. That is, there are acknowledgment tokens and acknowledgment tokens. In the everyday world, distinctions are made. And indeed, a preliminary survey of a small corpus of therapeutic conversations indicates that, inasmuch as therapists use the lexicon of their everyday world, the distinction is carried into the therapeutic conversation.

So, for example, in the following fragments from a suicide prevention center, the distinction can be seen to be holding.

1.(24.a.) [SPC:IV:6:4-5]

C: The kid didn'have any place tih go, we saw im hanging around
the church, he hel'my husb'n fix ar car,
(0.2)
D: → M-h[m
C: [En I asked if he'd like tih stay with us ˙h˙hhh becuz
eez sleepin in cars.hh
D: → M-hm
C: He said yes thet he'd pay us ten dollars a week he wz working
in a doughnut shop et the time.˙hh hhhh
D: → Mm hm,
(0.4)

C: My husbin hez been out'v work,hh (0.5) he- he:: wz'hh kicked
out'v his job by a bunch'v Communists, (.) 'hh hhhhhh 'hhh
en I'm not just saying that it is true, (0.4) 'hhhh He hasn'
been able tih get work in iz own line evry time'e does, 'hh
they say eez not fast enough, (.) en they can't bother
training im,'hh he's forty two years old en eez working (0.3)
fer a (.) termite (.) place now,
(0.4)
D: → Mm-hm,
C: En that isn't the kinda work my husbin should be doing my
husbin's gotta good brain.
(0.6)
C: There is gonna be ↑no Chrismiss in this house becuz every
cent he's made 'hhh we hadtih pay on back bills.
(0.3)
D: → Hmh.
(0.2)
C: En I'm tired a'being pushed around.
D: *→ Yes, you've hadda lotta trouble.

1.(24.b.) [SPC:TC:55:Ex:2]

D: Has anyone talked with her about getting any he:lp.
(0.6)
C: We:ll? uh it's been pretty ha:rd tuh talk to'er cuz she's
not very coherent.
(.)
D: → [[Mm hm?
C: ['n other words it's the same dea:l if she doesn'wan'itche
can't do anything.
D: *→ 'hh Yes the only thing (.) u-an:d (.) you (.) believe thet
she doesn't want help.

The following fragment comes from the same corpus of suicide prevention center calls, but is a very early transcript, produced by Harvey Sacks at the beginnings of his development of Conversation Analysis. The tape has since gone missing.

1.(24.c.) [SPC:NYE:Sacks Trans:31-33]

C: Why is it very often if this kind of a person that we're
talking about that criticizes you
D: → Uh huh
C: and puts you down When you finally lose your temper and
say I don't want any more of this I don't want any more of
you I don't want to hear from you again I don't want you
around my house suddenly get very subservient
D: → Uh huh
C: and do an abrupt about change
D: → Uh huh
C: And start being very propitiating
D: → Uh huh
C: Now why is that?

14 D: Well it's uh it's part of the uh tricky psychological
15 system
:
((ca. 8 lines of explanation omitted))
.
24 D: Most of the time most of us react to people the way our
25 parents reacted to us and that's why we can't understand it
26 C: I see So that when you say alright that's enough I don't
27 wanna have anything to do with you any more you're suddenly
38 parents
39 D: *→ Yeh
40 C: frightening them
41 D: *→ Yeh you're suddenly
42 C: They're afraid they're gonna be kicked out of the home
43 emotionally
44 D: *→ Yeh something like that
45 C: Not really, but
46 D: something like that, that's right
47 C: So it's not really you it's just a button pusher
48 D: *→ Yah, yah
49 C: You sound very young to know so much

Two observations may be made by reference to Fragment 1.(24.c.). For one, the caller may be orienting to the shift from 'passive recipiency' to the rather more ordinary-conversational 'speakership' produced by this staff member. At an earlier part of the conversation she remarks upon his recipiency with "It sounds like a real professional uh huh uh huh uh huh". Here, with her remark about his apparent youthfulness, "You sound very young to know so much" (line 49) which follows his series of 'speakership' productions (lines 39-48), she may be catching, not 'youth' so much as a non-professional, lay aspect of his talk.

Secondly, it is possible that this practitioner is not producing an item more akin to "Mm hm" than "Yeah"; i.e., "Uh huh", but is in fact producing the prototypical 'passive recipiency' token, "Mm hm". In the five or six telephone calls surveyed, involving at least four staff members, each of them uses "Mm hm". It is only in this call that we find "Uh huh". As noted, this is a very early transcript produced by Sacks just at the start of his work with taperecorded materials. We no longer have the tape. However, other tapes, of which he had transcribed segments at that early point, do exist and have been retranscribed. And these materials indicate that he was not distinguishing between "Mm hm" and "Uh huh" but using the latter as a symbol for 'that sort of utterance' whatever its acoustic particulars. So, for example, in the following fragment Sacks shows a speaker using "Uh huh".[1]

1.(24.c.1.) [SPC:Gun:Sacks Trans]

1 D: Do you have a gun at home
2 C: A forty five.
3 D: You do have a forty five.
4 C: → Uh huh, loaded.
:
((8 lines omitted))
13 D: You have a forty five and it's loaded.
14 C: → Uh huh,
15 D: And I suppose maybe everyone in Burnside Park has one.

A retranscription of that segment of the tape shows the speaker to be using the "Mm hm" form.

1.(24.c.2.) [SPC:Gun:Retrans]

1 D: Dihyuh have a gun at home?
2 (0.6)
3 C: A forty fi:ve,
4 D: Yih do have a forty fi:ve.
5 C: → Mm hm, 't's loaded.
:
((15 lines omitted))
21 D: Eyah ee- ẹ:-ah::: ih Yuh have a forty fi:ve en it's loaded.
22 C: → Mm:mm?
23 D: A:nd uh (0.4) I spoze maybe evryone in:hh evrehwuh- in
24 Burnside Park has one

Thus, at least in all the Suicide Prevention Center tapes surveyed except that from which Fragment 1.(24.c.) was excerpted, and possibly in that one as well, not only do therapeutic practitioners, like lay conversationalists, use one sort of token attendant to 'speakership'; i.e., "Yeah" and another sort attendant to 'recipiency'; i.e., "Mm hm" or "Uh huh", but consistently use a particular form of the latter attendant to their 'recipiency' work; i.e., the token we are proposing to exhibit 'passive recipiency', "Mm hm".

---

[1] See the unpublished lecture, Fall 1964 Tape 5 Side 2 October 5 Retranscribed version, page 1 and page 15.

Our brief survey of practitioners' uses of acknowledgment tokens was done on American data. We became curious as to how British practitioners worked. A possible difference was raised by the lay-conversational materials we had collected in Britain over the past three years. Although the British conversationalists we have on tape can and do make use of "Mm hm" or "Mm" (see, e.g., Fragments 1.(22.c), 1.(22.d.) and 1.(22.e.) above), they massively use "Yes" or "Yeah".[1]

Since our prior work, on talk about 'troubles', had focussed on lay interaction, we had not collected any British professional interaction. However, our colleague Graham Button at Plymouth Polytechnic has a collection of such materials. We phoned him, briefly described the possible phenomenon and our curiosity about British practitioners. Just as we were completing the draft of this report, two tapes arrived from Plymouth with a note saying "I've run through them quickly" and that they "might be useful."

Now it was our turn to "run through" the tapes. And the result was immediate and clear. In this very limited sample the British therapists deploy their tokens just as the American practitioners do (and in contrast to the bulk of the British lay-conversationalists sampled). We show two extracts from a single interview; the first simply to exhibit the use of the 'passive recipiency' token, the second to exhibit the selective use of 'passive recipiency' and 'speakership'-associated tokens.

1.(24.d.1.) [Plym:15-11-76:D:272]

```
P:          Dizziness:, (0.5) not like it use tuh be:?hh (.) permanently
            throu:gh? (0.2) all th'tah:m, b't (1.5) in (.) sh:ort
            periods.ih-in: e-it dezn'last that lo:ng.
D:  →       °Mm,°
```

---

[1] There is also a tendency to use "Yes" or "Yeah" where an American would use "Oh".

```
                    .     .
                    .
 5    P:            three: four times yestihdee.
 6    D2:           ˙hhhhhh
 7    D:  →         °Mm.°
 8    P:          [[A h :  ]
 9    D2:         [[What's What's the headache like when it comes.
                    .
                    .
10    P:            Wherever it stah:ts whether it's top f:ront or back. it
11                  goes back (.) eventually to the back.
12    D:  →         °Mm.°
13                          (1.5)
14    P:            Ah::,hhh Yestee didn'make no diffrence. ih- it is carried
15                  on all d-aw-all day'n: bes'paht'v the evenin.
```

The second fragment picks up as 'D' is initiating closure of the interview.

1.(24.d.2.) [Plym:15-11-76:D:298]

```
 1    D:           Alright Bob we'll give yih something tuh help yih tih sleep
 2                 [en relax you a[bit (       [      )
 3    P:           [Yeh.          [Ah still    [Ah still ca:n:'t (.) r-rekinize
 4                 hahlf th'people (            ). I[:t's the[
 5    D:  →                                         [°M-hm,° [°M-hm,°
 6    P:           the, I c'n get'm:
 7    D: *→        Ye:[s.
 8    P:              [uzzuh nu:r[se
 9    D: *→                      [˙hhh Well don't (.) eh don't worry about that
10                 et th[e moment becuss when y[ou have electric treatmen'it=
11    P:                [(  )                  [(   )-
12    D:           =does te:n:d fer a ti:me ˙hhh to upset yer mem'ry fer a
13                 bi[t.(        )?
14    P:             [No this is before you staht[ed giving me electric]
15    D: *→                                      [Ye:s b't ah mean:  th]ih,h
16                 th-the electric treatmen'does this °u:::° yihkno:w,
17                         (0.4)
18    D:           ˙h a little, ˙hhh eh fer a li''le ti:me,
19                         (0.4)
20    D:           you'll fee- yi'll fine you've you fihgetful of things.
21                         (0.7)
22    P:           °M[mh.°
23    D:             [˙hhhhhhh
24                         (0.2)
25    D:           An' you uh-uh-shyou musn't fuhget (.) you musn't eh uh-m-
26                 (.) worry about the othuh bihcau:se,h˙hhhh you've got d'
27                 acce[pt th' ]FACT thet yiv been i:ll: fer a lo:ng ti:me=
28    P:               [W e l  ]
29    P:       =[[Ye:ah  b't  ]
30    D:        [[Bob en it's a very i[:ll: i-]
31    P:                              [N o : w]
32    D:           You will ↓tend tih fihget (.) a lo''a[things.
33    P:                                                [take the rememberin.
```

```
34   P:         What'urts me uh(.)part fr'm thaht is uh- I can't remember
35              'alf the tahm thet'hh ah'v only ever remum (.) remembered
36              to (1.2) SHAVE meself about fi:ve tahms in th'la[s'three=
37   D:  →                                                       [°M-hm°
38   P:         =uhr[four months.[]
39   D:  →          [°M-hm°      []Mm hm,
40                   (0.7)
41   D:  →     [[M-hm,]
42   P:        [[Uh:::]
43                   (1.2)
44   P:         Ah can't remember the<
45                   (0.4)
46   D: (→)     Ye::h?hhh[hhh
47   P:                  [(seat'n arrangements), Ah'v still got this dah:mn
48              dischahrge comin fro:m?
49   D:  →      °M-hm:,°
```

Again, then, the practitioner is using "Mm" and "Mm hm" for his 'passive recipiency' and "Yes" associated with 'speakership' (see especially Fragment 1.(24.d.2) lines 5-9, the progression from "°M-hm,°" to "Ye:s" to "'hhh Well don't..."). The patient uses the same system (see line 3, "Yeh" followed by "Ah still Ah still ca:n't...", line 22, "°Mmh.°" followed by no further talk, and lines 29-33, "Ye:ah b't...No:w...take the rememberin.").

The patient may also be producing a 'perverse passive' (cf. the consideration of Fragments 1.(23.a.) and 1.(23.b.) pages 18ff). That is, the patient has offered a complaint about his memory (lines 3-8) and the doctor counters with dismissal and explanation (lines 9-20). At a point where the dismissal/explanation may be recognizably completed; i.e., that "for a little time you'll find you're forgetful of things", and acceptance or rejection or some other answering-to may be expectable and appropriate (cf. Fragment 1.(23.a.)), and after a substantial (7/10 second) silence, the patient produces a token of 'passive recipiency', "°Mmh.°" (line 22).

Most roughly, thereafter the doctor finds 'continuation' materials (cf. Fragment 1.(23.b.)). We note in this case that the 'continuation' is dramatically 'dysfluent' and has an unfortunate (and immediately repaired) use of the 'admonishment' format, "You musn't forget" (lines 25-26); i.e., again roughly, it appears that the doctor was 'unprepared' to continue, was orienting to the sufficiency and response-readiness of his prior talk.[1]

Comparison of the two fragments, one extracted from the 'body' of the interview, in which the doctors are asking questions and the patient producing responses, the other picking up as the doctor attempts to close the interview and the patient starts volunteering material, yields a possible yet-finer distinction; i.e., as between "Mm" and "Mm hm". Simply enough, when the doctor is 'receiving' material he has elicited, he uses the most minimal form. When he is doing something more like 'conversing', and indeed 'competing', he uses a fuller form.

We are not in a position to develop the upward-intoned "Ye::h?hhhhhhh" (line 46). Recurrently an upward-intoned acknowledgment token is used to invite further talk. However, not infrequently such an 'invitation' occurs in the course of otherwise-observable attempts by a recipient to close down some ongoing talk. It comes off as utterly spurious and may be produced to be seen as utterly spurious. In this particular context, and followed as it is by a prolonged exhalation, the token comes off as an exhibit of impatience; of recipiency...just.

And we note that as the patient offers, not further talk about his memory, but another symptom, "this damn discharge" (lines 47-48) the doctor subsides into 'passive recipiency' with an "Mm hm" (line 49). It is possible that the introduction of another complaint is responsive to the exhibit of impatience. The way in which the complaint is introduced can be seen to be responsive to, reciprocal of, that display. Specifically, the patient now exhibits impatience with his symptom, by "damning" it. The 'proposal' then being, it's not the patient who is the 'target' of the doctor's exhibited impatience, but the "damn" symptoms which are the target of and cause of both parties' exasperation.

---

[1] As noted, these materials arrived when the report was all but completed. Our inspection of them was therefore informed and enriched by observations which do not appear until later in the report. These various considerations indicate that some very delicate negotiation may be occurring at this point (i.e., lines 20-26), including the 7/10 second silence (see the consideration of recipient silence as consequential, pages 36-38), the 'virtually simultaneous' start of the patient's 'passive recipiency' token and the doctor's 'pre-speech inbreath' (see the considerations of 'virtual simultenaity', pages 91-92 and page 122, and of inbreaths, pages 68ff), and the brief silence which follows the doctor's prolonged inbreath (see pages 87-91 for a consideration of the 'interruption invitation'). The subsequent dysfluency as an indicator of 'unpreparedness' is considered at pages 59-60, 80-81, and 86.

These considerations of both lay and professional interaction indicate a distinction as between two cases of the class 'acknowledgment tokens'; i.e., as between "Mm hm" and "Yeah". Further, Fragments 1.(24.d. 1.(24.d.1.) and 1.(24.d.2.) taken together, indicate a finer distinction; i.e., as between 'minimal' and 'full' forms of "Mm hm". And the consideration of Fragment 1.(24.c.) vis-a-vis Fragments 1.(24.a.) and 1.(24.b.), and Fragments 1.(24.c.1) and 1.(24.c.2.) indicate a distinction as between 'acoustic variants' of the same case; i.e., as between "Mm hm" and "Uh huh".

Given our still-lingering sense of the triviality and transiency of acknowledgment tokens in general, it feels like academese pushed to its ultimate absurd to propose that the work of "Uh huh" remains to be explored. Nevertheless, there it is. Our explorations of acknowledgment tokens in the environment of transparent topic-shift relevance have turned up and thus focussed on a distinction between "Mm hm" and "Yeah". We have not been led to deal with "Uh huh".

However, it can at least be noted that some of the materials dealt with so far are suggestive. For example, in Fragment 1.(15) page 10, there is a possible 'progression' from "Mm hm" (lines 2 and 4) through "Uh huh" (line 7) to "Yes" followed by a topical shift (lines 9-10). Similarly, in Fragment 1.(23.b.) page 21, following a series of "Mm hm"s including the 'perverse passive' (lines 37, 39, and 45), the perhaps strategically-elicited 'intervening topical node' (lines 47-54) is received across its course with "Uh huh" (lines 50 and 52), and eventually with "Yeah" followed by a topical shift (lines 55-56ff). That is, in these two fragments we may be seeing movement across a continuum of co-participancy, from the 'passive recipiency' of "Mm hm", through a more 'speakership-ready' recipiency, exhibited by "Uh huh", into the 'speakership'-associated "Yeah".

If such distinctions do indeed exist and are oriented to, they permit of some rather delicate attuning over the course of a telling, as between the current teller and the current recipient/projected next speaker.

With the notion of the acknowledgment token "Yeah" as associated with 'speakership' serving as an analytic resource, we can turn to materials in which, at the local level of [utterance → response → next utterance] "Yeah" appears to be working as a sheer 'recipiency' token; i.e., it is <u>not</u> followed by a shift by the current recipient, but by 'continuation' by the current speaker. For example:

1.(25) [NB:IV:10:30:r]

```
1    L:          I never said anything b't uh Dwight said d'day he siz
2                wasn'that the dirdies'place?=
3    E:  →     =[[Y e s.]
4    L:          [['n I s]aid you know? I: felt the same thing? but I didn'
5                wanna say'nything to yuh but I jis' fe[:lt]
6    E:  →                                           [Y a]h.=
7    L:          =dirdy when ah wa:lked un the carpet.
```

1.(26) [Heritage:I:11:12]

```
1    N:          It's the ni:ghts rilly it's getti[ng me do:wn,=
2    I:  →                                        [Ye:s.
3    I:  →     =[[°Ye:s°
4    N:        =[[en early in the e:venings?
```

However, in these and other materials, the tokens may be retrospectively understood to have been proposing preparedness to shift. Simply enough, although for whatever reasons, shift does not occur then and there, it does occur shortly thereafter.

1.(25) [Expanded]

```
1   L:          I never said anything b't uh Dwight said d'day he siz
2               wasn'that the dirdies'place?=
3   E:  →     =[[Y e s.]
4   L:         [['n I s]aid you know? I: felt the same thing? but I didn'
5               wanna say'nything to yuh but I jis' fe[:lt]
6   E:  →                                            [Y a]h.=
7   L:          =dirdy when ah wa:lked un the carpet.
8   E: *→       'h Well you know we were the:re in Ju:ne.yihknow Brad
9               played go:lf en uh (.) when the:air conditioner wen'o:ff?h
10              'hh en wir the bout the only ones thet had'n air
11              conditioned room the rest of'm were bro:ken . . .
```

1.(26) [Expanded]

```
1   N:          It's the ni:ghts rilly it's getti[ng me do:wn,=
2   I:  →                                        [Ye:s.
3   I:  →     =[[°Ye:s°
4   N:         [[en early in the e:venings?
5   I: *→       Ye:h'hh Well in a wa:y I'm no[t uh 'hh
6   N:                                       [(       )
7   I:          I'm not sorry because Ginny's arriving my grandaughter's
8               arriving from: uh'hh uh: Caraacas. tihda:y,
```

1.(27) [SBL:2:1:5:3:r]

```
1   G:          I'll do it uh jih- I'll g- ez ↑just ez soon ez I: c'n get
2               kinda straightened ou:[t'n get]thi[ngs going=
3   B:  →                             [Y e ah,]   ['h h h h
4   G:          =I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se cuz=
5   B:  →     =[[Ye:ah.]
6   G:         [[Ro:y h]a:d tih go ou:t tih phone me: when 'e- he found
7               the water wiz o:ff,
8   B:  →       Ye:ah,[ 'hhhh[hh<]
9   G:                [(0.3) [A:n]d uh:[things j's]
10  B: *→                              [But  n o w]↑don't chu::(d) e:: do
11              too much.running arou:nd er wear yerse:lf ou:t.°
```

1.(28) [NB:IV:10:32:r]

```
1   L:          Alright chu jis come up there tih th'blo:ck enna half from
2               ther[e.
3   E:              [Mm: hm?
4                   (0.3)
5   E:          You go to the ri:ght.
6                   (1.2)
7   L:          Uh-u we[ll it's on the right ha:nd=
8   E:                 [(    )
9   E:  →     =[[↓Yah.
10  L:         [[Yeah en yuh tu:rn ba:ck in there to the yih[ y i h  g]o:,
11  E:  →                                                   [°↓Ya:h.° ]
12  L:          well yi[d go:,=
13  E:                 ['hh
14  E: *→       =y:YAE:KLE hadda place up there I think. This Yaekle of uh
15              °uh° uh: (.) automobile (0.2) ga:h thet wz ki:lled.
```

1.(29) [TCI(b):16:14-15] ((L accumulated enough gift-party credits to get a boardgame priced at $6.00 for free))

```
1    J:            It looks like ud be fu:n,
2    L:            Yeh. I think so I think ˙hhhh fer notheen, yihknow it's=
3    J:  →       =[[Ye:ah.
4    L:           [[kind'v en expensive ga:me,
5    J:  →         ˙hhh[hh[Ye: [ah.
6    L:                [en[ I- [I'd ne[ver]buy it,=
8    J:                               [Ah-]
9    J: *→         =You wanna hear s(hh)uhhm? hnh hnh hnh,=
10   L:            =Wha-a-[at,
11   J:                   [˙hhi:hhh After Jack's mother bought tha:t?=
12   L:          =[[U h  h u : h ?]
13   J:           [[˙hh-˙hhhhh-˙hh]hh Ah: it's et Toys'R U:s fer four thirdy
14                 ei:ght. ehh[hhh
15   L:                       [Yer ↑kidee::n.
```

And similar configurations can be seen in Fragments 1.(9) page 8, 1.(11) page 9, and 1.(23.a.) lines 19-30 page 18.

In the foregoing array what is readily available is the recipient's orientation to some ongoing talk as sufficient and terminable. In the following fragments such an orientation on the part of the speaker is equally readily available. Whether by concensus or negotiation, following a display of shift-readiness by the recipient; i.e., following a "Yeah", the *speaker* produces a shift.

1.(30) [NB:IV:13:2:r:s]

```
1    E:            So uh Brad[hadtuh work, I guess I toldjuh that.
2    L:  →                   [°Yuh,°
3    L:  →         Yea:uh.
4                        (.)
5    E: *→         What's new with you:.
```

1.(31) [Rahman:II:2]

```
1    M:            Lorŗna's awri:ght is she:?=
2    G:            =eYes she's fine eh I popped (doa:n) lahs' night.=
3    M:          =[[Oh: thaht's good.She's awri[ght,
4    G:           [[(                 )        [f'r awhile, Thomas came with
5                  me, s:o[:  u h  ]=
6    M:  →                [eeYeah.]
7    G: *→         =˙hh so that wz it˙h How's Le:s anyway.
```

1.(32) [SBL:2:1:4:2-3:r]

F: But that wz the only big money thet I wo:n.
B: °M-hm.°
F: A:nd uh: I didn't ˙hh (.) I didn't (.) lo::se (0.3) very
much a'the money.
B: °M-hm°
F: Uh[: it-
B: [W'thet's goo:[d.
F: [paid some a'my expenses.˙h[hh
B: → [°Ye:ah.°
F: *→ So aa- uh overa:ll I think thet[we a:ll had a]
B: [It sounds like]a goo:d
tri:p.

1.(33) [NB:V:6-7]

E: Yihknow it's funny uh:: uh Brad played et San Mar-av yih
gotta minute?=
P: =Su:[:re.]°Mm hm,°]
E: [I'm]not g'nna]take[too lon[g. [˙hhhhh]
P: [˙hhhhhh[No u[m wait]'n on the
electrician'e hasn'been here e-all en ˙hhh he w'spoze t'
be here et ei:ght uh'clock this °mornin[g°
E: [↑Oh: God.I u:I k-
I give uh- you know we gotta ch- we've gotta cra:ck in
ar: beautiful new basin I to:ld[juh,]
P: [Oh::]: I kno::[w,
E: [(Bill) jst
gotta come'n putta new one the l-guy:'s gotta come en
check it'n see::'v iv it's authennic thet it cra::cked'n
all this bit yihknow,=
P: → =Ye::::uh,
E: *→ ˙hhh B't anyway we played golf et San or Brad played et
San Ma:rcus so I went down with im . . .

1.(34) [SBL:2:1:1:3:r]

N: That's th'one I wanted to go en I couldn't go[:.
B: [Uh huh,
(0.7)
N: °that ti[:me.°
B: → [°Ya:h.°
N: *→ ˙t˙hhh Well I won't keep you Bea . . .

1.(35) [NB:III:4:3]

E: (So Brad fih-) rigged it up tuhday with a smaller
hook en a leader with a-˙hhh yihknow small line.
L: → Yeah.
E: *→ ˙hhhh Well I won't keep yuh honey,

It appears, then, that the acknowledgment token "Yeah" (or "Yes") can be deployed by a recipient of some talk-in-progress specifically in aid of achieving termination of that talk. And it can be so oriented to by a coparticipant/current speaker. Nevertheless, as initially struck one of us and was agreed to by the other, and supported by the data, the token is observably, albeit minimally, 'on topic'; observably, albeit minimally, attending to the rights and obligations entailed by the fact of talk-in-progress with participants distributed as 'speaker' and 'recipient'. It is, albeit minimally, 'responding to' prior talk and not -- not quite yet, introducing something new.

We will be turning to two other response-types which, while they are recurrently associated with topic shift, do not share the utterly minimal character of the acknowledgment token. One immediately observable difference is that these other types exhibit some analysis of and position on the prior talk, whereas the acknowledgment token does not. They may also be seen to be interactionally affiliative. Affiliation/Disaffiliation is a pervasively relevant aspect of conversation in respect of which acknowledgment tokens are at best neutral, and possibly weighted towards disaffiliation.

To get a sense of this possible feature of acknowledgment tokens, we note that, at least under some circumstances, such items seem to constitute the sort of recognizable 'withholding of disagreement' Anita Pomerantz discusses by reference to recipient silence. Most roughly, for such materials as the following, she proposes that a prior speaker can take it that a recipient is being hesitant to produce a response counter to the thrust of the prior utterance. The prior speaker then reviews that utterance to find how it can have generated the counter-response now being withheld, and offers the results of that review.[1]

---

[1] A. Pomerantz, "Pursuing a Response", J. Schenkein (ed.) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction: Volume II, New York, Academic Press (forthcoming 1981).

1.(36.a.) [SBL:3:1:8:r]

M: → en that's not en awful lotta fruitcake.
→ (0.8)
M: *→ Course it i:s. A little piece goes a long wa:y.
H: Well that's ri:ght.

1.(36.b.) [Heritage:OI:2:Ex:1]

I: 'hh Uh: no:w 'hh uh Sue's got one or two thi:ngs that she
→ wants to get over.'hh ↑What abou:t ↓Boxing Day afternoo:n
how are you fix:ed.
→ (0.3)
I: *→ I mean if there are too many people SA:Y so:. because it's
not necess↓ary
(0.5)
J: ↑Noo we we we'll be heu[:hr ( )
I: [I mean she c'n easily give th'm to
th'm when they come on Christmas E:ve but 'hhh I think
(feruh)- i- she'd like tuh see th'm ↓a:::ll,
(0.4)
J: (W'l no do)- eh:m Janet'n Ronald'n Anderson will hev goan
own:: to: uh Ka:y'[s on-o]n[Boxing Da::[:y,
I: [eeYes.] [eeYes. [Mmn:.

1.(36.c.) [NB:IV:3:6:pr]

E: → 'hh Well they ↓wear those flairs yliddle bit Lottie it's
not too flai:red,
→ (.)
E: *→ Bu:t uh I know how yih feel,
(.)
E: *→ Jist isn' comfterble 'hh Well ('s hard) tuh make a dress
[any( ).
L: [O H : : : : I[LOVED IT[LAST YEAR but it doesn't uh do any-
E: [NO: [NO the- mhh
L: it doesn't do anything for me th- now.[Yihknow,
E: [Yeh you've lost suh
much weight.
L: uhh hmhh uhh hmhh[Well not that much.
E: [AAGHH HAGHH HAGHH!

The following fragment has a similar character. In this case, some information is offered which might bring about a change of position. The ensuing silence may be understood by the offerer of the information as constituting a failure of the information to effect a change of position, whereupon the offerer affiliates with the coparticipant's prior-asserted and apparently unchanged position. We show some of the prior talk to set the context. Roughly, a participant (E) who takes it that praising another's friends is a compliment to that one, is confronted with a coparticipant (P) who hears only that others are recieving praise, and works to undercut their praiseworthiness.

1.(36.d) [NB:V:2-3]

```
1    E:        Oh honey that was a lovely luncheon I shoulda ca:lled you
2              s:soo[:ner but I: ]l:[lo:ved it.Ih wz just deli:ghtfu[:l.  ]
3    P:             [↑O h : : :  ]  [°(       )°                    [Well ]=
4    P:        =I wz gla[d  y o u   ](came).]
5    E:                 ['nd yer f: ]friends]'r so da:rli:ng,=
6    P:        =↓Oh:::[: it wz:]
7    E:               [e-that J]a:n isn'she a do:[:ll?]
8    P:                                          [iY e]h isn't she pretty,
9                    (.)
10   E:        Oh: she's a beautiful girl.=
11   P:        =Yeh I think she's a pretty gir[l.
12   E:                                       [En that Matheson::
13                   (.)
14   E:  →     She SCA:RES me. with eigh:t kids en u-Oh[my God what  ]=
15   P:                                                [°(eY:::eh)°  ]
16   E:        =she doe:s.=
17   P:        =°Mm hm:.°
18   E:        Fantastic?
19   P:        Course I think she:'s u-over that, (0.3) pla:ce: yihknow wer
20             s-e-she ha(d)- becuz see four a'them er
21                   (.)
22   P:        (Y'know[what I)]
23   E:               [Ye:::::]ah ther go[: : : : n e]
24   P:  →                               [She on'y ha]:s two et home no:w.
25       →           (0.3)
26   E:        N[e:ah.]
27   P: *→      [Bu:t ]it wz ↑sump'n though c'n you ima:gine nat Emma?
28                   (.)
29   P:        hA[ll those years?  ]
30   E:          [That makes me s- ]tired ri-ight ↑no:w.
```

We note here that after 3/10 second silence (line 25), virtually simultaneously both participants produce utterances. She of the apparently unchanged position now offering a 'neutral' object; i.e., an acknowledgment token (line 26), her coparticipant offering an affiliation with that position (line 27).

The following fragment has a configuration similar to Fragments 1.(36.a) -1.(36.d.), and in particular, similar to Fragment 1.(36.d.), except there is no intervening silence. Lying between a same speaker's proposal and counterproposal is an acknowledgment token. In this fragment there has just been an interchange in which a proposal has been lavishly agreed with (see lines 1-5). This prior series may stand as a dramatic and informative contrast, not only to those of us who are examining the data, but to the offerer of the proposal, in situ.

1.(36.e.) [NB:IV:3:3-4:4]

```
1    L:        They had ulotta cute things ↓down┌that Bay t'day.↓┐
2    E:                                         └↓°Oh:° Go:d they┘↓di:d.
3    L:      [[(        )]
4    E:      [[You c'd┘(.) sho:p there: really en have beautiful clo:ze
5              never leave th'place,
6                     (0.3)
7    L:  →     Yeah they sure got. Boy but their slacks er sure hi:gh,
8    E:  →     Ye:ah.
9    L: *→     Well slacks a:re high.
10                    (0.2)
11   E:        Yea:h they got good ma:kes see they don't run chea:p stuff.
```

The at-best 'neutral' and potentially disaffiliative character of the shift-implicative Acknowledgment Token "Yeah" stands in contrast to the affiliativeness exhibited by the two shift-implicative devices we now turn to, the Recipient Assessment and the Recipient Commentary.

II. Recipient Assessments as Shift-Implicative

As with the consideration of acknowledgment tokens, we start off by noticing a recurrent use of an assessment: immediately preceding a topical shift. Again, the shift may comprise a complete change of topic or may in one or another way be seen to be topically connected to a prior, but since, for the phenomena we have been and are now focussing on, such an issue does not appear to be relevant, we have not segreated the instances for this array as we did for the analogous array in Section I.

2.(1) [W:PC:1:(1):21-22]

```
1    J:        Juus (0.2) came 'euhr fer a cuup a'tea in┌the ahfti┌noon
2    M:                                                └i         └Ye:s.
3    M:        Did theh li:ke it?
4    J:        aOh ye┌::s.
5    M:              └Ye::s uh'm ↓su┌:re they did,┐
6    J:                             └W'l thev  bee┘:n befoh:::,
7                     (0.2)
```

8 M: When i[t*wss:
9 J: [Not uh:
10 (0.3)
11 J: Yihkno[w not when it wz oll th'cah[rpets thah]
12 M: [·t'hhh
13 J: [cahr:peted] No:: [No::,=
14 M: *→ =Oh luvleh,·hh[By: the way I: gut a nahce suhpri:ze= [No:.
15 J: [( )
16 M: =last wee:k,

2.(2) [SBL:3:4:1-2:r]

1 A: en ah rilly felt te:rribly ba:d abaht th'way she (.) treated
2 'er[be°fohhre.°
3 P: [Ye:ah,
4 (0.2)
5 A: An' she jus: gr:abbed her buh th'ha:nd w'n she got through
6 with it it ws:: (0.4) it[wz rea[:lly ↑Oh it](w'digiz it)
7 P: [↑Oh::: [t h a t's :]
8 (0.3)
9 A: one of the most thri:lling. programs ah know ah've ever
10 (0.6) been to[( )
11 P: [Wul it had a ni:ce wri:te up in the paper[too
12 A: [Yeh
13 ah noticed[th(h)a(h)t
14 P: *→ [·mtch! Wul that's g'd ·hhh W'l ↑LI:STEN uh-
15 ↑Tuesdee ni:ght we're starting that Mother's Club bit again
16 et the ↓church.

2.(3) [NB:II:3:10:pr]

1 L: Doctor Hathaway wannida come down, gee I wan'oo uh pay'im
2 fer yihknow giv'n me that stuff fer mah arthritis,
3 E: [[Mmhm,
4 L: [[En I mean, he won't take any money en evrything, ·hhhh en
5 then, Earl's gonna have uh:: a guy from:: Central. down. fer
6 a[week so. Yihknow.
7 E: [Mm.
8 E: Mm hm,
9 L: I mean it's jus', eh[business.
10 E: [( ).
11 L: Yea::h,
12 (.)
13 L: Ye[:ah.
14 E: *→ [Well at's good. Uh-how is yer artheritis.

2.(4) [SBL:1:1:12:2:r] ((B has just succeeded in renting out a house which a newly-widowed tenant is leaving))

1 B: but most of them had children en: wun'duh be in Hope School
2 dis[trict.
3 M: [Mm hm:, Mm[hm:?
4 B: [·hhhhh And uh ·hh So I:'m u-I jis thought I:
5 (w) d-wan'duh share that with you?=
6 M: *→ =Yeah well ↑goo:d.[·hh[Say tell me something Bea: (.) What u-
7 [Cu:[z
8 M: is the uh:m I always feel sorry fer someone when they lose
9 their husb'n er the husb'n loses the wi:fe

2.(5) [SBL:2:2:4:8-9]

1 B: Well I was sorry that I couldn't wait to[day,
2 V: [Oh ( ).
3 B: But I was going to a luh- I had to come home an'get
4 dressed for lunch.[A luncheon.
5 V: [Oh.
6 V: *→ Well how nice. Well you know I didn't get through, it-it
7 was the strangest thing, see no matter which way I'd go
8 there'd be somebody looking f(hh)or m(hh)e . . .

2.(6) [SBL:1:1:11:3-4]

1 H: It wasn't in the paper last night, I looked.
2 B: Uh huh. Probably didn't (0.3) make it.
3 H: No. No you see this was about three o'clock in the
4 afternoon.[Paper was already off the press.
5 B: [Uh huh.
6 B: Uh huh.
7 H: Boy it was a bad one though.
8 B: → Well that's too ba:d.
9 H: Kinda[(creepy.)
10 B: *→ [You know I looked and looked in the paper- I think
11 I told you f-for that uh f-fall over at the Bowl that
12 night. And I never saw a thing about it . . .

2.(7) [Owen:8B15(A):40-41]

1 A: and it wz about one pound fifty fer a bottle en it wz
2 rubbish.
3 B: Oh:, (go[lly).
4 A: [°(Yes it wz:)°
5 B: Hm.
6 A: Italian: no it wz a (.) it wz a:: (0.3) French red wi:ne.
7 B: ↑Oh:,
8 A: En it rea:lly was ba:d.
9 B: (Oh:, hm:.)
10 (0.3)
11 B: → °Th't's° (0.2) 'tch ( ) disappointing.
12 A: °↑Mm:,°
13 B: *→ We had s'm:'hh my fa- (.) my fathuh makes wi:ne ez well
14 'n lahs'time we wuh theah he'd made s'm (.) e-s'm el::duh
15 flowuh. En thaht wz r:ea::lly ni:ce:: . . .

In the following fragment, the full production of an utterance occurs at a bit of a distance from an assessment (see lines 3 and 11) but can be seen to have been initiated immediately upon completion of the assessment and cut off as the prior speaker starts up; i.e., "That's very: disappointing isn't i//t <I-" (the double obliques [//] indicate the point at which an overlapping utterance starts up). The utterance is started again, this time following a shift-implicative acknowledgment token,

and again cut off as the prior speaker starts up (see lines 7-10).

2.(8) [Heritage:OI:3:1]

```
1    B:            So:: really(n) (.) no:w we jus: jus: haf to suh'v (.) 'h
2                  wait'n see I guess
3    S: *→         That's very: disappointing isn't i[t <I-
4    B:                                              [(We suht'v:)
5                           (0.8)
6    B:            Pain in the 'hh (0.2) neck.
7    S:  →         Yes
8                           (.)
9    S: *→        [[Wel-
10   B:           [[uReally,
11   S: *→         I was very annoyed with th'm this ahftinoon probly y(h)or
12                 moth↑ah ↑thhold j(hh)oo hh
```

And the following fragment has a similar configuration. Post an assessment (line 3), a recipient initiates a telling and then abandons it by reference to the prior speaker's starting up, "Tha:t's//We:<" (lines 5-6), and reintroduces it subsequently (line 8).

2.(9) [NB:IV:12:1-2:r]

```
1    E:            Theh gon' take'm down the ↓bea:ch now'n wa:lk'm down the
2                  beach theh[u-so: cute]'n one of'm]'s ↓bla::ck,hih'h
3    L:  →                   [°O  h  :  ] g u u :d.°]
4                           (.)
5    L: *→         Tha:t's[We:<
6    E:                   [That's wonderful isn'[it?]
7    L:                                         [u- ]
8    L: *→         I wz jis tell'n[Ea:rl we ha:d uh:[few up there la:s'night=
9    E:                           [((vl)) °hhuhhh°  [((sniff))
10   L:            =th'firs'time we've ever ha:d'm.
```

In the following three fragments, again, a topical shift occurs at a distance from an assessment. In this case we do not see an immediate initiation, but rather the assessment itself is intersected by talk by the prior speaker. That talk is then duly recepted, whereupon shift is achieved.

2.(10)[NB:IV:13:13]

```
1    L:            He got marriedje know Da:ve.
2    E:            Oh no::.
3    L:            Ehwuz- Kathy got married[too.
4    E:                                    ['hhh Oh no.
5    L:            Yeah.
6    E:            How'n the hell duh they find people tuh marry,
```

7 L: 'hh Wul He-she-eh-he married a ri:l young girl, but ril
8 cute, errybuddy likes'er she's so fulla pep'n errything,
9 she's go[tta liddle gi:rl.
10 E: [Hmm.
11 E: Mm:: mh.
12 L: An' uh, they live down around' uh, Thirdy Firs'Street there.
13 E: → Oh:: well goo[::d.
14 L: [Back of Marti's, place'n that [channel there.
15 E: [O h : : y e a : h.
16 E: *→ 'hohhh HOW IS ERRYTHING ET THE (PESKIT) are yuh busy uh
17 Thanksgiv[ing,
18 L: [m::Ne::o. Terrible.

2.(11) [NB:II:1:5-6:r]

1 L: 'N we got a lot of fish over the:re 'hh en we take'em down
2 tih the Dorrie yihknow th'Dorrie fishermen dow:n there en
3 they clean'em for yuh.
4 E: → Well ↑goo:↓:::[:d.
5 L: [Yihknow give'm a 'h (.) mbu:ck er so: yih
6 know it's better th'n (0.2) you doin it,
7 E: Ya:uh.
8 (0.4)
9 E: *→ 'hhh Well I jis' tried tih getta ↑ca:ll through ah wz gonna
10 call Nancy: uh Thomas she's (.) been comin down here once
11 in awhi:le . . .

2.(12) [Frankel:TC:I:1:2]

1 G: D'ju just hear me pull up?=
2 S: ='hhhh ↑NO:. I wz ↑TRYing you all day.'n the LINE wz busy
3 fer like hours.
4 G: Ohh:::::::, ohh:::::. 'hhhhhhh We:ll,hhh ah'm g'nna c'm
5 over'n a li'l while help yer brother ou:t,
6 S: → Goo[:d.
7 G: [((mournfully)) 'hh C'z I know he needs some he::lp,
8 S: 'khh Ye:ah. Yeh he mention'that t'day.=
9 G: =M-hm,=
10 S: *→ ='hhh Uh:m, 'tch'hhhh Who w'yih ↑ta:lking to.

As we mentioned earlier, assessments differ from acknowledgment tokens in that they exhibit some analysis of the prior talk. They at least provide a [+/-] result (e.g., "Well that's good" or "Well that's too bad", respectively). And, with the proffering of such a result of analysis, they are technically 'affiliative'; i.e., they at least concur with prior talk. Nevertheless, their recurrent topical/sequential operation is virtually identical to that of acknowledgment tokens.

The exhibited 'affiliativeness' of recipient assessments can be used by speakers-in-progress as a resource for managing the assessments' shift-implicature. A speaker can himself affiliate with his recipient's assessment and follow his own affiliation with further talk; in effect, treating the assessment as a warrant for further talk. For example, in the following two fragments tellers are delivering news which appears to be, to them, of particular moment.

2.(13,a.) [SBL:1:1:12:9-11:r]

```
1    M:        ˙hh Say Bea: if ↑you: ever:,hhh nee:d en oi:l paintin:g uh
2              yihkno:w my former lan:'lady the a-the Axlerods ↑I don'
3              think you ever met them
               .
               .       (( ca. 15 lines omitted ))
               .
19   M:        well Mister: Axlerod of course'd retired [LONG TAPE BREAK]
20             ...he's painting pictures.
21   B:        For good↑nes┌s ↑sakes.┐
22   M:                    └A:n'  he'┘s going tih have en exhibition.
23                     (.)
24   M:        O┌f course he's always had iz own paintings in iz house
25   B:         └°Uh huh°
               .
               .       ((ca. 15 lines omitted ))
               .
26   M:        But ↑he's going tuh have en exhibition.
27                     (.)
28   M:        An' it's either gonna be et De la Terra Plaaza they haven'
29             quite decided where it's going tuh be:: eh- o::r? p'raps in
30             the Fox Arlington there in th'lobby.˙t
31   B:        Ah h┌uh,
32   M:            └˙hhhhhh hhh! An' he's gonna make his ow:n paintin:gs,
33                     (0.2)
34   B:        °M-hm°=
35   M:        =a:nd or ah mean his own fra:mes.
36   B:        °Yah,°
37   M:        But chee he az um bee↓utiful things.↓
38   B:  →     W'l isn't that ↑ni:ce.
39   M: *→     Oh↑::↓:. Really I- I jis said to: uhm-m:˙tch (0.3) Maybelle::
40             la:s'night ah s'd yihkno::w? in some other li:fe he was a
41             ↓genius'r something<↑he wa:┌s.
42   B:  →                                └°Mm hm.°
43                     (0.3)
44   M:        Ah mean cuz eez so gifted'n he so versatill in┌so many ↓wa::ys.
45   B:  →                                                   └°Mm hm°
46   B:  →     °M-┌hm.°
47   M:          └˙hhhhh A:nd uhm (.) but he az a snow scene. an' he has en
48             ↑ocean sce:ne . . .
```

And we note that following the teller's 'assessment-warranted' continuation (see lines 38-39), the recipient subsides into 'passive recipiency' (lines 42, 45 and 46).

2.(13.b.) [NB:IV:12:1:pr]

```
1    E:       Well listen she's busy I'll┌call'er
2    A:                                  └No. She's ri'here, wayminnit.
3    A:       Waitaminnih hol'it.
4                  (4.0)
5    E:       ˙hhhh whhhhaya::
6                  (1.0)
7    L:       Yeah.
8    E:       Lottie,┌yih-
9    L:              └Yeh-
10   E:       Yihknow Ronny went down'n got those guys from Pen'lton. I
11            didn'know you had comp'ny.
12   L:       No.
13   E:       And uh th- two of'em'r goin across th'street, the toois-
14            kyu- and one of'm- uh down the street goin with Ronny, is
15            da:::rk, ˙hhhh There's uhv there's four of'm'n one of'm's
16            colored,
17                 (.)
18   L: →     Wul goo::┌:d.
19   E: *→             └Yeh isn'that trivvig? so all ↑the kids er stan'n
20            out here th'mari┌nes get outta ↑the ↓car┌th'↑sta(h)ation=
21   L: →                     └°eh henh hnh°          └°henh henh°
22   E:       =wa:g'n ˙huhh:::hhh and . . .
```

Again we note that following the teller's 'assessment-warranted' continuation (see lines 18-19) the recipient returns to an exhibit of 'recipiency', in this case the soft little laughs (line 21).

In these two instances a speaker may be characterized as countering the shift-implicativeness of an assessment by exploiting one of its features, that of affiliativeness.

As with the consideration of the shift-implicature of acknowledgement tokens, we find series of assessments which, at a local level of [utterance → response → next utterance] might not recommend themselves as shift-implicative; i.e., one might take it that a recipient is thoroughly delighted with the telling. However, as with the consideration of acknowledgement tokens, we find recurrently that while for whatever reasons, recipient-shift does not occur post a first or Nth assessment, it does occur shortly thereafter.

2.(14) [NB:II:3:9-10:r]

```
 1   L:      Oh: Tuesdee I'm'onna: it's Nebby's birthday en I'm'onna
 2           give'm a party over et the'waiian'ou:se °w'th a s'prize
 3           party'e doesn'ev'n know abaht[it.°
 4   E:                                   [Oh reall[y?
 5   L:                                            [I got abaht twunny
 6           two peophhle kh(h)o(h)min[hn
 7   E:                               [Oh: rea:lly:?
 8   L:      ihYehehhuh.
 9   E:      Yee all back tihgether agai:n hu[:h?
10   L:                                      [°Oh: ↓no: b't I'm g'nna
11           give it to'm any[way,↓°
12   E:                      [Are yih
13                  (.)
14   E:      How old's'e gunnuh be.
15                  (0.7)
16   E:      Fifty ↑six?
17   L:      Ye:ah.
18                  (0.3)
19   E:      Ah'll be darn.
20   L:      ᵀEah.
21                  (0.3)
22   E:      't'k Oh that's right. There's ulotta ↓birthdays
23                  (.)
24   L:      Ye:ah a:n: uh::: u::: Phil Pa:r' f'm Par'field Ranch wul:[1]
25           he's gunnuh (.) bring all the chicken for me.
26                  (.)
27   L:      S[uh I'm j's gunnuh ha]:ve that (.) chicken.
28   E: →     [↑W o : n d e r°f'l.°]
29   L:      He ᵀn iz wife: gunnuh c[ome,
30   E: →                           [Well that's: wonderfuh::l.
31   L:      °So:,°
32                  (.)
33   E: *→   Oh that's swel<Yih haven'got the H'waiian House rented
34           ↓then huh?
```

In this fragment there appear to be two conflicting sets of interests. Roughly, the teller may be concerned to deliver the news that this celebrity (see line 24 and footnote 1) is supplying a good quantity of food and attending the party. And she may be concerned to deliver that news, not as a voluntary announcement, but as a conversational emergence. Given the general run of conversation, she has a good chance of that happening. Specifically, announcements of hosting a party are not infrequently followed

---

1. The name and place pseudonymed here are the owner of, and his well-known tourist attraction in Southern California, the name also associated with a line of foods.

by talk of the feeding arrangements. In this case, the laughing announcement that there are "about twenty two people coming" (lines 5-6) may well elicit and may indeed be designed to elicit an inquiry into the feeding arrangements, out of which can 'necessarily' emerge the news about the celebrity.

However, there are other issues available in the announcement of the party, and it is to these issues that the recipient turns her attention, thus, for one, detracking the possible emergence of the news about the celebrity and providing that if it is to be told, it must be volunteered, as it eventually is (see lines 5-9 for the locus of possible emergence and lines 24-29 for the actual volunteering). This conflict of interests may account for the observably problematic, stilted, halting talk which we take to be characterizable as intervening between the locus of possible emergence and the actual volunteering. Specifically, the teller is producing utterly minimal, topically non-progressive responses to the recipient's inquiries (see lines 9-24).

And we note that when no response to the announcement of the celebrity's contribution is immediately forthcoming (see lines 25-26, cf. lines 2-4 and 6-7 where the response "Oh really?" is immediate), the teller provides for the merely-party-instrumental character of the announcement; i.e., "So I'm just gonna have that chicken" (line 27). Where, then, the fractionally delayed, virtually-simultaneous assessment "Wonderful" (line 28) may be treated by the teller as a warrant for a return to the 'look who's coming to dinner' aspect of the announcement, "He and his wife are gonna come" (line 29).

Not only is an issue available in the initial announcement problematic for the production of an emerging versus voluntary telling, but another issue available therein generates closure of the telling and topical shift;

i.e., the mention of the party's locale, "I'm gonna give him a party over at the Hawaiian House" (lines 1-2) is subsequently taken up for an altogether different matter, "You haven't got the Hawaiian House rented then huh?" (lines 33-34).

This fragment permits of the development of such notions as technical 'interest' and technical 'disinterest'. That is, the recipient may be, technically, characterized as 'interested' in a range of issues available in the initial announcement. Specifically, she produces inquiries such as "You're all back together again huh?" (line 9), "How old is he gonna be" (line 14) and, eventually, "You haven't got the Hawaiian House rented then huh?" (lines 33-34). And such indices of 'interest', with their provision that the teller should at least answer, and can perhaps elaborate, stand in strong contrast to both the acknowledgment tokens considered in Section I, and the assessments under consideration here.

Technically, then, the recipient may be characterized as 'disinterested' in the announcement of the celebrity's contribution and attendance; ie., she produces no more than a series of assessments, objects which do not implicate 'answer' or 'elaboration', but, as we have seen, are intimately associated with closure and shift, as they are in this case.

That is, although assessments differ from acknowledgment tokens in that the former are observably 'affiliative', in terms of technically characterizable 'topical interest', they are, equally, 'disinterested'.

In that regard we note that in the following fragment, a recipient produces a 'topically disinterested' object; i.e., an assessment, using it as a 'pivot' into other matters. In this case, the object which exhibits topical disinterest, asserts interest.

2.(15) [MDE:60-1:1:18-19]

R: Well you r'member the change fr'm the fifties t'the sixties.
M: 't'h Yes I do:.

3 R: Ah mean that was The Cha:nge right? ·hhh [hh
4 M: [It seemss::
5 (0.3)
6 M: Ri:ght.
7 R: An' my: eh: kind'v my point en what I've th:::ought about'n
8 what I fee:l very strongly is thet there is another cha:nge.
9 (0.4)
10 R: ·hhh fr'm the seventies intuh the sixties. end uh,
11 (1.2)
12 R: uh:: what you said about Billie may be a good example of
13 tha:t. ·hhh Ah:::ee:::uh::: yih can't go:. (0.2) on th- on
14 the values of the sixties anymore.
15 (0.4)
16 R: en the life style.
17 (1.0)
18 R: Wo- (.) Just ez you couldn't uh:: from the (0.2) fifties
19 intuh the sixties. ·hhhhh A::nd it's changing. And ah'm-
20 I'm trying to project what's: what's coming next.
21 (0.7)
22 R: All of this, (.) in a comedy.
23 M: *→ That's very very intresting cuz this is u- (.) somewhat, of
24 what th'ka:y- sa:me type (.) of thing wir dealing with,
25 with this uh (0.7) ·tk·hhh these kids who ev gotten out of
26 dru:gs.

Here, while the teller (R) is concerned to explicate "my point and what I've thought about and what I feel very strongly" (lines 7-8), and his management of "all of this in a comedy" (line 22), the recipient's concern is with the opportunity for a telling provided by aspects of the prior telling. The assertion of 'interest' is, on its occurrence, and shown by subsequent talk to have been, a topically 'disinterested' topic-shift device.

In the following fragment, a different sort of 'conflict of interests' may be seen. In this case, one participant may be specifically initiating talk on a particular topic to arrive at a particular outcome, a request for advice. The "absolutely lovely" dogs in question (see lines 5 and 7) were in the first place received from the coparticipant, who distributes her puppies among her neighbors.

2.(16) [Heritage:I:6:3]

1 H: I gotchor ca:rd. Thank you very [much.]
2 I: [ih-] Goo:d.h·hhh
3 (.)

4 I: [[e-So: what'r you doi-]whh
5 H: → [[A : n d th'dogs'r s]u:pu:h,
6 I: u-Wot- ↑Mm::?
7 H: → Th'dogs er a:bsolutely lovel[y.
8 I: [Oh good. I'm hoping fuh'nothuh
9 littuh shortly
10 (0.2)
11 H: Ah::[(ha [ ).
12 I: [Uh::: [Mitzie wuh (.) Mitzie wz mated about uh:m'tch'h
13 two weeks ago:.
14 (0.3)
15 H: → Oh: ↓love[ly.
16 I: [So: if it's taken they should be heuh in about
17 six weeks b't I ↓don't know yet'v course you cahn't tell,
18 (.) until,'hh[] [about a month,]
19 H: *→ []O[h h o w r e a]lly lovely.'hh Ez a matter
20 'v fact I was going to ↓ah:sk you, 'p'hhh eh:m (.) is
21 there anyone fery reliable thet does clipping you know theh
22 ↓cla:ws.

In this case, what might have led more or less directly to the request for advice is detracked by an [Assessment → Shift]-formatted report about the coparticipant's own dogs (lines 7-8, cf. lines 1-5 in which a similar format is used on a concensus-terminatable item, whereupon both parties move simultaneously to shift to other matters; one participant (I) to a standard open inquiry, the other (H) to the possibly pre-request mention).

The possible teller (H) now becomes recipient to her coparticipant and produces, among other things, a series of assessments. It can be noted that the second, and thoroughly enthusiastic assessment, "Oh how really lovely" (line 19) which directly precedes a topic shift, is misfitted to the talk which it, itself directly follows; i.e., that one cannot tell whether a mating has taken, which is rather oddly assessable as "really lovely".(see lines 17-19).[1]

It appears that the assessment is being deployed more for its observ-

---

[1] Rather more appropriate treatment is found in another conversation.

2.(16.a.) [Heritage:I:11:4-5]

I: So: uh wi'll jus wait'n see now. You cahn't tell'ntil about a month,
N: eOh:: I see,

holistic affiliativeness than its topical tracking; i.e., 'interest', that affiliativeness constituting adequate regard for the prior talk to warrant its treatment as sufficient, terminable and shift-ready. In effect, affiliation is being substituted for attention/interest.[1]

The following fragment may be exhibiting a similar use of sheer affiliativeness prior to and in aid of a topical shift. We point to the assessment (line 6) and the subsequent expressions of accord (lines 8, 10 and 12), the latter of which bears a strong resemblance to the 'thoroughly enthusiastic' assessment of Fragment 2.(16) line 19, and is followed, not *quite* as immediately, by topical shift (line 14).

2.(17) [Rahman:II:17]

```
1    G:        B't it didn't kem to a decision yuh see:,h┌huh ↑huh
2    M:  →                                               └°Y:ass.°
3    G:        ·hhe:┌hh  ┌So:,·hh
4    M:  →          └eeYa└(ss)
5    G:        So ah s'well thaht's very exciting is↑n'┌t i:┌t.·hhh
6    M:  →                                             └I:::└Lo:vely,=
7    G:        =S┌o we-┐We're hahnging on┐neo:w.=
8    M:  →       └Y e s┘ i  h  t  i  s .┘
9    G:        =tuh see whether'e┌wi:n┐s er nŏt,┐
10   M:  →                       └Oh: ┘well I: h┘ohpe soh.=
11   G:        =ee┌Ye:s ┐
12   M:  →        └Yes a┘h rreelly do:.
13   G:        Mm,
14   M: *→     Uh I went last Wednsdih yihknow ·hh Oh ↑by the wa:y=
15   G:        =Oh didche ↑keep fi:t,
16   M:        eeYhhe:┌:s,
17   G:               └Didju:. uAow didyeh┌get aw:n  Myra,┐
18   M:                                   └Oh(it's) ↑mah:r┘velous:.
```

---

[1] It appears that one consequence of the attempting teller's (I's) status as 'distributor of the puppies' is that she also becomes treated as 'distributor of advice' about them. When her neighbors talk to her about dogs, they tend to exhibit technical disinterest in *her* tellings and pursue various requests for advice. So, for example, Fragment 1.(17) page 10 is taken from this corpus of conversations and is between the puppy-distributor and another neighbor. Again, the neighbor may specifically be initiating talk-about-dogs to arrive at a request for advice. In this case the talk is initiated with an inquiry into the distributor's dogs; i.e., with an object exhibiting 'technical interest'. We note, however, that the elicited telling is received with a series of close-implicative objects: an Assessment ("Oh. How exciting") subsequently with an object which will be proposed as an instance of Recipient Commentary ("Oh my goodness you do ask for it") and finally, Acknowledgment Tokens followed by the request ("Well ye::s. . . Ye:s. An-and who did you go: to.").

And finally with regard to technically disinterested affiliation, in the following fragment a so-far 'passive' recipient (see lines 2-4) lets loose a veritable thundering herd of 'thoroughly enthusiastic' acknowledgments and affiliations prior to the initiation of a telling. The speaker has just successfully handled the rental of a house, had gotten "amazing" response to an ad she'd run, and to top it all off, the new tenant has reported that the house had been kept in good condition by the departing tenant. She is now in the course of "sharing" the good news with a friend. As it happens, her recipient has had a more or less similar experience.

In this case, as in Fragments 2.(8) and 2.(9) page 42, a telling-initiation, "I//know when I-" is overlapped by and aborted in deference to, further talk by the prior speaker (see lines 26-27).[1]

2.(18) [SBL:1:1:12:3-4:r]

1 B: Oh it wz just in nice order: goo[d eh: nice'n clea:n=
2 M: [M-hm.
3 B: =in[si:de.]
4 M: [Mm hm,] M-hm,
5 B: ˙hhhh And uh: ˙t˙hhh

- - - -

---

[1] The telling which we take to have been initiated and aborted in Fragment 2.(18) emerges somewhat later in the conversation.

2.(18.a.) [SBL:1:1:12:6-7:r]

B: And so people don't uh: arn't ↑buying them.
M: Mm hm:,
(.)
M: *→ ˙t˙hh But ah remember w'n ah wz in: Billin:gs e-a:nd uh when I p't th- did the sa:yuh (.) I mean ah wz selling that hou:se so I put'n a:d I had'n the real estate (.) b't I a:lso::, ˙hh ran'n ad myself? en I ↑sold it my:self: en I 'member et th' time thinkin't wz kinda ↑fu:n.
B: gYeeaw:.
(.)
B: Aw hu[h,
M: [Uh[it i:s, [really,]
B: *→ [It i:s.] [Uh huh?] I wz uh:˙hhh I j's thought gee: tihday I thaw gee I wish I ha:d a couple a'mo:re lo:ts. . .

The prior recipient's own telling is itself minimally receipted by the prior teller, who returns to her own telling.

```
M: →     W'l I think that's wonderful Bea.
B:       Why I'm so  thri:lled[I jus' wanduh ]call s]omebody youknow=
M: →                          [Ah'll betchu a]::re, ]
B:      =en[I  ] [I thaw well]ah'll sha:re that with Ma:rge=
M: →       [YA]:[ :  U  H . ]
B:    =[[she'll under]sta:nd,'h[h
M: →   [[Y E A U H . ]         [YEAUH.
                  (.)
B:      [[En I'm
M: →    [[I think it's wonderful really en[I think it's: uh[:m:  ]
B:                                        [But I           [just ]=
M: →     =End yer not g'nna lose a day's re:nt.
               (.)
B:       'hh eh I'm jus' so happy about it,
M: →     Ye:a[uh.
B:           ['hh ekhhhm ekhhm No:? en then too:? u-ey bih- it's been
         fu:n doing it myse:[lf.
M: →                        ['t'hh YA:H=
M: →    =AH[IMAGINE  i t] would be:.  ]
B:         [en GETTING A]:LL these  c]a::lls,
M: *→    AH HA:H? It is kinda fu:n Ah[know w'n ah-]
B:                                   [ N  o   y u-]e-s-see I pla:n'
         tuh: I stayed home la:st evening en I pla:n:' to uhm . . .
```

As with the consideration of the shift-implicature of acknowledgment tokens, what is readily available in the foregoing arrays is the recipient's orientation to some ongoing talk as sufficient, terminable, shift-ready. In the following fragments, such an orientation on the part of the speaker is equally readily available. Whether a matter of concensus or negotiation, following a display of shift-readiness by the recipient; ie., an assessment, the speaker produces a shift.

2.(19) [TCI(b):16:37-38]

```
J:        Bu::t I don'know I w'z thinkin, (.) with it (.) being co:ld
          jihknow en it's g'nna (.) prolly be gitting rainy someda:y,
          hhh[hh hn- Ihh]wish it w'd rai:n,
L:           [Y e a : h,]
J:        'hhh[hh
L:            [tUh hu[h
J:                   [A::n' (0.2) I thought (.) that w'd keep um
          busy doin stuff.when'[e can't go outside maybe,
L:                             [Yeah,
( ):      'tch
L: →      Yeah, that's goo:d.[ 'hhhh
J: *→                        [°°(     )°° 'hhhh B't anyway my mom en I
          er going out to the city this afternoon I g'she got s'm
          nylons'n they didn't ↓fit, 'hh[hh
L:                                      [Mm,
J:        Th'gave'er the wrong ↓size so sh'astuh take those ↓back so
          'hhh 'n I couldn't stand staying in the house another day...
```

2.(20) [Rahman:B:1:(10):3]

```
1    L:         B't we'adda good night'h an' (.) they might be goin across
2               tuh Chestuh f'the day on: (.) on Monday an:' (.) 'e said
3               wouldjeh like t'come with iss Mum.
4    G:  →      °Well thaht's nice.⌈(Lorna.)°
5    L: *→                         ⌊Yes.'h Anyway ah'll tell y'all the news.
6               ⌈when u⌈h  ⌈when yuh  c o m e  b y .⌉
7    G:         ⌊Ye:s. ⌊Y e⌊s. Ah'll see you inna fe⌋w minutes.
```

2.(21) [W:PC:III:2:14-15:pso] ((re. a stolen stereo set))

```
1    S:         She's surprized they could get it out the window cz she
2               said it wz rea:lly heavy.
3    M:         Ye::s.
4    S:         Her dad'ad trouble liftin it.⌈So,
5    M:                                      ⌊This wz et the ba:ck.
6                    (.)
7    S:       ⌈⌈Ya:h
8    M:       ⌊⌊Th'back- Ya:h.
9                    (0.8)
10   M:        So⌈: uh
11   S:          ⌊B't it wz bran'new I mean
12   M:        Oo⌈h: (ye::s)
13   S:          ⌊·tch
14                   (0.2)
15   S:        °Oh dea:r.°
16                   (.)
17   M:  →     Terrible isn't⌈it,
18   S: *→                   ⌊Anyway I'd better go (Dad j's s'd-)
19                   (0.2)
20   M:        Ye:⌈s.
21   S:           ⌊u-Dad said'e thinks people be ringing thr⌈ou:gh
22   M:                                                     ⌊We::ll they
23             probally wi:ll . . .
```

The above three fragments were selected simply as clear instances of a recipient assessment followed by a speaker shifting topic. When they were assembled, it turned out that in each case the speaker uses the same object attendant to the shift; i.e., "Anyway" (see lines 12, 5, and 18, respectively).

Such a regularity recommends further investigation. As it happens, the phenomenon is being studied by Marian Owen at the Department of Lingustics, University of Cambridge, also under an SSRC grant.[1] We will content ourselves with an impressionistic proposal that the 'basic' use of "Anyway" is as a current-speaker's independent shifter object. That is, the participant using it exhibits his status as current speaker, and is to be seen as orienting, alerting, his recipient to a shift he, himself is producing in the talk-in-progress; talk in which the current speaker is the 'active' party.

---

[1] Marian L. Owen, "Aspects of Conversational Topic", SSRC Interim Report of the Project on Topic Organization in Conversations, November 1980.

That such an object and its workings constitute a device and not a simple manifestation of some actual state of affairs may be glimpsed via the following fragment, in which we get a sense of a spurious use of the current-speaker's independent shifter object "Anyway". Specifically, it follows a shift by the recipient (see lines 13-15).

2.(22) [MC:I:53-54]

```
1    L:         I try to get home before five o'clock since the fog is been
2               so terrible, [up-
3    W:  →                   [Yeah, yeah.
4    L:         up- comin up that hill en on in it's just thick ez- (0.3)
5               (      ) en I, I really, I'm not comfortable in driving
6               innit [so
7    W:  *→           [Sure. Well then-then [uh::m
8    L:                                     [so I try tuh get home before
9               five uh'clock.
10   W:         Yeh. Well it'll be gone tomorrow, I unduhstand it'll be the
11              last day.
12   L:         That's what they said on TV[] [but they're not always right,
13   W:  →                                 []Ye[ah.
14   W:  *→     No. Well look uh[::
15   L:  *→                     [But anyhow I- the minute I getta chance t'
16              get in (      )- maybe if yer not too busy maybe you c'n meet
17              me'r something . . .
```

That is, although the recipient has clearly made a shift, the speaker exhibits that a/the shift is occurring in the course of her own talk, by reference to that talk, in her own time, on her own recognizance, independent of the recipient's talk.

The possibility of 'spurious concensus' raised by Fragment 2.(22) casts an interesting light on the following fragment in which there appears to be 'true' concensus; i.e., for-all-practical-purposes-simultaneously the

the recipient indicates shift-readiness with an assessment (line 24) and the speaker produces the "Anyway" shift.[1]

2.(23) [TCI(b):16:77-78:r]

```
1    J:        Well Cleo tol'me thet she hed jist ordered those item:s, en
2              got them last week.hhhhhhhhhhmhh
3    L:        Oh::,
4    J:        ·t·hhhhh ↑That's what makes me: really disgusted now I aftih
5              tell those people thet- we don't (.) yih[know well they=
6    L:                                                [Yeah.
7    J:        =don't have'em yih gitcher money back b't yet ·hhhhhhhh How
8              come Cleo got'em yihknow en here I've been waiting fer two
9              months.hh·khh
10   L:        Ye:ah:.
11                   (.)
12   L:        Ri:ght.=
13   J:        =That's what rilly made me ma:d.=
14   L:        =Hu:[:h.
15   J:            [·hhhhh En I thought maybe they've gotta some: supply:
16             ·hhh A::n' (.) thet uh:m ·tk·hh since she wz a dea:ler then
17             they sold'em tuh her.
18   L:        Hm*::.
19                   (0.2)
20   J:        ·t[°Ah don't kno:w.°]
21   L:          [°Ah don' ↑kno:w.°]
22                   (0.3)
23   J: *→ ?   ·t·hh[hhh]
24   L:  →          [W'l]tha[t's u too ba:d]
25   J: *→                  [B't a:nyway it]rilly makes me: (.) kinda
26             disgusted,·hhhh Fay siz ↑I'd write them a letter en tell'em
27             jus whatchu think about that kind of bu(h)si(h)nes[s·hhhehh
28   L:                                                          [Ye:ah,
29   J:        'n I sid ye[:ah,
30   L: *→                [I hope I don't have too much trouble,
```

A question by reference to concensus shift is, are lines 23-25 best displayed as they are in the above fragment, or should lines 23 and 25 be shown as a single line:

```
23   J: *→     ·t·hh[hhh]   [B't a:nyway it]rilly makes me: (.) kinda. . .
24   L: *→          [W'l]tha[t's u too ba:d]
```

---

[1] In this case the speaker's shift may be an instance of what Harvey Sacks talks of as a 'right hand parenthesis', a return to business prior to the immediately preceding talk (see Sacks' unpublished lectures, Spring 1972 Lecture 5, page 18). The immediately preceding talk in this case is an attempted diagnosis of the troublesome situation, one which is not affiliated with by the recipient (see lines 15-19), and which, with perfect simultenaiety, both participants assess as undetermined (see lines 20-21). The "Anyway" shift returns to a focus on the problem itself (line 25, cf. lines 1-13).

That is, should it be display-stressed or suppressed that the lexical items which constitute the speaker's shift onset slightly after the recipient's assessment? Should it be display-stressed or suppressed that the speaker's inbreath is possibly a non-lexical start on the shift?

We have materials which indicate that speakers manage the shift-implicature of an assessment by intersecting an assessment-in-progress with a continuation. For example:

2.(23.a.) [NB:V:4-5]

```
P:          She's up et uh: Ronny's mo:m's no:w, she wen'up (.) Sundee
            ·hhh-·hh-·hh They came down f'r dinner:=
E:        =[[Mm:-hm:]
P:          [en then]uh: shil I'll go get her tuhmorrow.
E:  →       Oh. W'l that's[°wonderful.°]
P:  →                     [En then uh, ](.) too- e-she has en ol'
            frie:nd . . .
```

2.(23.b.) [Rahman:II:3]

```
G:          An' is he any  be(.)tter. Is it u[h
M:                                           [wOo-ih- Ye:s his bahck
            hahs been muuch better the lahs'two da:ys?
G:  →       =aOh: that's[good (the:n),  ]
M:  →                   [Eet  h a d  Th]'pai:n's go:n:?
```

In these two instances a prior speaker may be characterized as sytematically starting up no sooner and no later than just as an assessment-item is due, just after it may have been recognizably projected with it's prototypical lexical predecessor, "that's". But in Fragment 2.(23) the prior speaker's "But anyway" starts up just a bit earlier, within the "that's", and she has made a speech-relevant move _prior_ to the onset of the recipient's assessment; i.e., the audible inbreath "·t·hhhh".[1]

At various points in this exploration we have noticed possible _initiations_ of utterances which occur fully somewhat or a lot later; for example, in Fragment 2.(8) and 2.(9) page 42, "That's very: disappointing isn't i//t.<I-" and "Tha:t's//We:<", respectively, and in Fragment 2.(18) page 52, "It is kinda fu:n Ah//know w'n ah-". These at least give us some lexical clue as to what was being started. In Fragment 2.(23) we have only the possibility that some sort of utterance is being started. It might be the "Anyway"-shift which ensues, it might not. It might just be a breath.

---

[1] The matter of an inbreath as recognizably 'initiating' that which follows is considered shortly (see pages 68-92).

Further, even lexical clues cannot resolve the matter. For example, in the following fragment, simultaneously a speaker initiates continuation and a recipient initiates an assessment. This fragment is a follow-on of Fragment 2.(13.b.) in which a teller is proposed to be countering an assessment by treating it as a warrant to continue (see the consideration, pages 43-45).

2.(23.c.) [NB:IV:12:1-2:r]

```
1   E:          So all ↑the kids er stan'in out here th'mari┌nes get outta=
2   L:                                                      └°eh henh hnh°
3   E:          =↑the ↓car┌th'sta↑(h)ation wa:g'n'huhh:::hhh
4   L:                    └°henh henh°
5   E:  →     [┌And┐'hhh
6   L: *→     [└Oh:┘that's wo┌n d e rful.┐
7   E:  →                    └the:re's uh┘(.) two young gir:ls yihknow. . .
```

That the speaker has produced a lexical indicating continuation; i.e., "And" (line 5), secures that she has initiated continuation. However, that does not necessarily secure that what she produces thereafter is 'continuous' with the lexical item. That is, she may be prepared to abandon the continuation contingent upon whatever it is that the recipient has simultaneously initiated.

Other work shows that 'continuations' are eminently abandonable. Two brief examples:

2.(23.c.1.) [NB:IV:10:15]

```
1   L:          They wanted me to stay tonight, an┌::d,
2   E:                                            └I thought maybe you did
3               when I called you . . .
```

2.(23.c.2.) [NB:IV:14:↓6a]

1 E: Well it goes with the fingernail bit too.[But uh- ((sniff))
2 L: [ˈhh And it just
3 spread through your body huh?

And recurrently, such lexicals as "And", "But", "So", etc., are deploy deployed to 'cover' absence of response by a recipient, and abandoned by reference to the onset of response. Again, two brief examples:

2.(23.c.3.) [MDE:60-1:1:5]

1 R: A:::nd I got about another three four weeks of: work on
2 that. ˈhhhhhhhh
3 (.)
4 R: → A:::n[d (then)
5 M: [You but you actually have have: written by yourself
6 a movie?

2.(23.c.4.) [TG:20]

1 A: He and Gail were like on the outs you know?
2 (0.7)
3 A: → [[So uh,
4 B: [[They always are(hh)hhh

In Fragment 2.(23.c.) the utterance breaks off post the 'continuation' token "And ˈhhh" and restarts at a point which may be characterized as when the recipient has not only projected but embarked upon the assessment-item; i.e., at "that's wo//nderful." The discontinuity may then be a product of a series of monitorings and decisions.

Further, in Fragments 2.(23)-2.(23.c.); i.e., the candidate cases of a teller intersecting a developing assessment, there is another sort of 'discontinuity'. Each of the utterances initiated or continued in the course of an assessment-in-progress are, to some extent, 'dysfluent'. In Fragment 2.(23) we can note a slight hesitation, "makes me: (.) kinda..." (the dot-in-parentheses [(.)] indicates a momentary, say, 1/10 second, silence and the colon ["me:"] indicates prolongation).

2.(23) [Detail]

24 L: W'l tha[t's u too ba:d]
25 J: [B't a:nyway it]rilly makes me: (.) kinda . . .

In Fragment 2.(23.a.) there is hesitation and break in flow.

2.(23.a.) [Detail]

5 E: Oh. W'l that's [°wonderful.°]
6 P: [En then uh,](.) too- e-she has . . .

In Fragment 2.(23.b.) we find a 'false start'; i.e., a revision from "It had" to "The pain's gone".

2.(23.b.) [Detail]

4 G: aOh: that's [good (the:n),]
5 M: [Eet had Th]'pai:n's go:n:?

And in Fragment 2.(23.c.), again, a slight hesitation, "uh (.) two", cf. Fragment 2.(23.a.) "uh, (.) too-".

2.(23.c.) [Detail]

6 L: Oh: that's wo[nderful.]
7 E: [the:re's uh](.) two young gir:ls . . .

E. Schegloff at the University of California, Los Angeles, has been noticing the massive recurrence of what he calls the 'post-overlap hitch'. This phenomenon may at least in part converge with materials which, as in Fragments 2.(23.a.)-(23.c.) contain 'dysfluency' not only post overlap but in its course. That is, they may be artifacts of overlap, per se, and/or artifacts of whatever it is that a speaker may be attempting by starting up in overlap.

It is possible that at some point in a coparticipant's talk, someone may be engaged in initiating some recognizable action, e.g., a 'question', an 'answer', a 'topical continuation', a 'topical shift', etc. etc., and once the initiation has been launched, thereafter attends to the subsequent particulars of the utterance which has been initiated.[1]

---

[1] See G. Jefferson, "Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation", J. Schenkein (ed.) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, 1987, Academic Press, New York, pages 224-225 and footnote 11 for another locus of 'dysfluency', as a story is being introduced into ongoing turn-by-turn talk.

It is at least possible, then, that for such materials as Fragments 2.(23) and 2.(23.d.), whatever a speaker has been doing prior to his recognition that an assessment is underway, he is thereafter dealing with the assessment. In Fragment 2.(23.d.) the assessment is countered with a continuation of the prior-initiated 'continuation'. In Fragment 2.(23) the assessment is taken up, but with an exhibit of independent action on the part of the speaker engaging in topical shift.

And in sum, we raise as a possibility that Fragments 2.(23)-2.(23.c.) exhibit a fine-grained orientation by speakers to the close-implicature of a recipient's assessment.

In the following fragment a speaker is transparently responsive to the close implicature of a recipient's assessment. Specifically, an utterance in progress, which is part of a telling in progress, is overlapped by an assessment. The utterance and the telling are precipitously abandoned. This fragment is a follow-on of Fragment 1.(36.d.) page 38, in which one participant (P) showed a certain resistance to praise of others by her coparticipant. It appears she also has a certain resistance to hearing her coparticipant's tellings.

2.(24) [NB:V:3-4:r]

```
1    P:          She on'y ha:s two et home no:w.
2                      (0.3)
3    E:          N┌e:ah.  ┐
4    P:           └Bu:t   ┘it wz ↑sump'n though c'n you ima:gine nat Emma?
5                      (.)
6    P:          hA┌ll those years?   ┐
7    E:            └That makes me s-  ┘tired ri-ight ↑no:w.┌Ez ah-˙hhh  ┐
8    P:                                                    └Mm:mmm::::  ┘
9    E:          Wir painting like ma:d in th'kitchen a:nd=
10   P:        =[┌Oh┌are yuh?  ┐
11   E:  →      [└Oh└evrythin  ┘g's workin out so pretty he┌re with ar  ┐
12   P:    ┌                                                └Oh:::::::: ┘::
13         └     i'nnat ↓good.
14   E: *→       ↑Yeeah! ˙hhhhhhhh En I J's thought I'd give yih a buzz I
15               shoulda ca:lled yih sooner b't I don't know where the week
16               we::n┌t,
17   P:              └u-We:ll:: Oh- yEmma ↑you don'haftuh call me up=
18   E:        =[┌I want ┐t o : .  ┐
19   P:         [└I w'Js ┘tickled  ┘thetche- (.) nYihkno:w w'n you came u:p...
```

The abandonment of utterance and telling recommends itself as, say, a 'capitulation' (in contrast to the exhibited 'concensus' of Fragments 2.(19)-2.(23) pages 53-56ff). This character of the abandonment may be achieved by a combination of features: the left-uncompleted status of the assessment-overlapped "evrything's working out <u>so</u> pretty he//re with ar" (lines 11-12), and the post-assessment acknowledgment token, "↑<u>Y</u>eeah!" (line 14).

A fragment shown as an instance of a speaker's orientation to the shift-implicature of a recipient's acknowledgment token, Fragment 1.(31) page 34, can serve as a rough contrast to the 'capitulation' exhibited in Fragment 2.(24). Specifically, post an overlapping acknowledgment token, an utterance is brought to a close, and with it, the telling, "·hh so that was it ʼh <u>H</u>ow's <u>Le:s</u> an<u>y</u>way"; i.e., the speaker exhibits 'independent' termination and shift. In Fragment 2.(24) the speaker exhibits 'interruption by' and 'response to' the recipient's assessment.

Earlier, one device by which a speaker can manage the close-implicature of a recipient's assessment was shown; i.e., the Reciprocal Assessment → Continuation of Fragments 2.(13.a.) and 2.(13.b.) pages 44-45. The post-assessment speaker's acknowledgment token is recurrently deployed in similar fashion. For example:

2.(24.a.) [Rahman:I:6]

```
1    G:         ʼhhh An' it wz ↓ (.) yihknow it wz a right good m:mur⌈der=
2    L:                                                              ⌊y-
3    G:     =[[⌈right. good⌉thrill⌈uh⌉
4    L:        ⌊Y e : s .  ⌋      ⌊m-⌋
6    G:      [[⌈Mm::.⌉
7    L: →      ⌊Oh go⌋o:⌈d.
8    G: →               ⌊ʼhh Ye:s:.ʼh An' it ezzuh yihknow suht'v 'n: e-
9               it en:ded with a great big ʼbahng ehhh he⌈h hn I Jum⌉ped=
10   L:                                                 ⌊°Oh-huh::°⌋
11   G:         outta the e seat . . .
```

2.(24.b.) [TCI(b):16:14]

```
1    L:       So I got ten dollars credit fer that so(m) I go-ot twelve
2             dollars worth of stu:ff.
3    J:  →    Oh: ↓goo:d.
4    L:  →    Yeah.˙hh[[    [B't ]   [[all I got wz two Perfection ghhahhhme
5    J:                [[m: [:Ye ]h. [[
6    J:       ˙t Oh:[:.
7    L:             [˙hhh I'm'nna give one tuh my liddle sister.=
8    J:       =Ye:ah.
9    L:       A:nd I'm g'nna:: keep one fer u[s.
10   J:                                      [Uh huh,
```

2.(24.c.) [NB:IV:10:17:pr]

```
1    L:       so when she wen't'the re:stroom I siz boy there goes a (.)
2             great gal'n'e siz boy I sure l:love'er'n I hope I g'n make
3             'er happy so (.) when- ˙hh we came home why he wentuh bed
4             'n then we went swimming again,
5                     (.)
6    E:     [[°M m  hm,°]
7    L:     [['fore we(h]h)n't'[bed.˙hhhh]
8    E:  →                     [Oh:-:, Go]d isn'at fu:[: : : :]n,=
9    L:                                               [ehhh he]
10   L:  →   =Yeah.˙hh So˙hh (0.2) I told Isabel'e said'at'e sezh yAw
11           yer a liar. I sz well no: at's he said the::: they-he said
12           that to me he s'z well'e never tells me en I siz 'e said
13           that- tuh[me
14   E:               [Mm hm,
```

And in each of these three fragments the assessing recipient thereafter returns to 'recipiency' (lines 10, 6, and 14, respectively).

In the following fragment the process of Recipient Assessment → Speaker Acknowledgment + Continuation goes two rounds, the speaker having produced in the first round a possible slur on a third party's character (lines 7-9) which she thereafter redresses (lines 11-14). The recipient, meanwhile, has initiated a now-familiar consequent of assessment; i.e., a shift, and a particularly drastic one. Specifically, she initiates entry into Closings with "Alright" (line 12).

2.(24.d.) [SBL:2:1:6:10:r]

```
1    B:       I this's kind'v brought her t(h)uh li:fe I think,h˙hhhh
2    R:       The- the hou:se busine[ss
3    B:                             [The ch(h)a:nge,
4    R:       ↓Uh huh.
5    B:       Uh huh,
6    R:  →    Well I think that's ni::ce.
```

```
7    B:  →      Ye:ah.·h[hh         [Thet she's going tih have something=
8    R:                 [That's     [really (great)
9    B:         =besides herself tuh think of[ fer  awhile,  ]
10   R:  →                                   [Well that's w  ]onderful.
11   B:  →      Uh-huh·hh No[:t that she]'s too much given tuh tha:t=
12   R: *→                  [A l r i ght]
13   B:         =but I: think it was kind'v (0.2) bothering her yuhkno:w
14              I mean the uh·hh[  [her health  ]
15   R:                         [O [h DEAR whe  ]n you get alo:ng like she
16              is . . .
```

In this case, the first and third of a recipient's three serial assessments are managed by Speaker Acknowledgment Token + Continuation (lines 6-7 and 10-11). We note as well that the second assessment (line 8) may be being managed, as well; i.e., lines 7-8 constitute still another candidate instance of a speaker serially monitoring and making decisions by reference to a recipient assessment-in-progress (cf. Fragments 2.(23)-2.(23.c.) pages 56-58ff).

And in this case, a recipient who has followed a series of close-implicative assessments with the initiation of a drastic shift; i.e., entry into Closings, and thus declared not only the topic but the conversation sufficient and terminable, subsequently exhibits a particularly powerful 'interest' in the topic. In contrast to the 'recipiency' displays of Fragments 2.(24.a.)-2.(24.c.), the recipient in this case produces on-topic, affiliative talk, "Oh DEAR when you get along like she is" (lines 15-16).

She may thereby specifically be redressing her prior attempts to close off and depart from a matter which her coparticipant exhibits to be still in full progress. Other work shows that participants who have opted to move in one direction and are brought to relinquish that direction in favor of a coparticipant's direction on occasion produce 'tokens of special interest'. Following is a single example.[1]

---

1. See G. Jefferson, "Side Sequences", D. Sudnow (ed.) Studies in Social Interaction, New York, Free Press, 1972.

2.(24.d.1.) [GTS:III:17]

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'n you?

Most roughly, with such an object, both one party's pursuit and insistance upon his own line, and the other party's relinquishment of a different line and taking up of his coparticipant's line are warranted; i.e., the pursued and taken-up line is exhibited to be especially attention-worthy. The pursuit and uptake, then, not at all to be seen as a matter of interactional insistence and capitulation, but as an intrinsically 'topical' matter.

In Fragment 2.(24.d.) the Close-initiating recipient's production of affiliative, on-topic talk may constitute a version of this 'display of special interest'.

Parenthetically, over the course of this exploration, we frequently have gotten the sense that a recipient's 'subsiding into passive recipiency' is a 'display'; i.e., is produced to be understood as a 'subsiding' by the coparticipant; as 'capitulation'. The availability and at least occasional use of the 'display of special interest' constitutes a particularly dramatic alternative. By reference to such an alternative, and other, less dramatic ones (e.g., the little laughs of Fragment 2.(13.b.) lines 18-21 page 45, e.g., the "°Oh-huh::°" and "·t Oh::" of Fragments 2.(24.a.) and 2.(24.b.) above respectively), 'subsidance into passive recipiency' may be a recognizable interactional event.

With the foregoing consideration we come to see that a speaker has resources available to manage the close-implicature of a recipient assessment. He may treat it as a warrant for further talk with a Reciprocal

Assessment + Continuation as in Fragments 2.(13.a.) and 2.(13.b.) pages 44-45. He may simply acknowledge the assessment and continue on, as in Fragments 2.(24.a.)-2.(24.d.) above. These devices are available to a speaker who chooses in the first place to attend the recipient's assessment at all. We find that speakers recurrently manage a recipient's assessment by treating it as a sheer 'recipiency' display requiring and receiving no response. The speaker simply continues.

2.(25.a.) [TCI(b):16:13]

L: ·hh out'v'er kit sales. I got uh:: (0.3) think it wz
thirdy four dollars.
J: → Ye:ah. ↓Goo:d.=
L: *→ =En the:n:: my regular party,·hh uh my sales were a
hundred'n o::ne,
J: → Goo::[:d.
L: *→ [En then u I got ten dollars fer the packageen'n
stuff,
J: → Ye:ah.
L: En then Deanna booked a party so . . .

2.(25.b.) [SBL:2:1:6:1]

B: I'm just serving uhm (1.0) ·tch
R: des[sert I imagine,
B: [a bowl of ice cream an' some:: little home made (1.0)
cake cookies, or something,
R: → Oh good.
B: *→ And uhm coffee.[or Sanka,
R: [Oh-
R: → That's fine.
B: *→ And uhm I:: won't get it'ntil the last minute, because I
haven't room fer too much in- you know,
R: → [[Oh.
R: [[I wasn' I wasn'going to get it until late tomorrow . . .

2.(25.c.) [Rahman:B:2:(14):8-9]

G: I'm'nna do s'm spaghetti'n: (.) n-eh::m meatballs f'tea
fuh this lot now,
L: → Oh lovely.
G: *→ Cz they didn't have u they only had fish fingihs'n chips
fih dinnih,
L: → °eeYes.°
G: B't thez no↑thing in to:wn. . .

2.(25.d.) [NB:IV:1:9]

1 L: Well it's right nex'door. She, I think they do real good
2 work.
3 E: → Goo:d.
4 L: *→ 't least they sew all the buttons on'n stuff like [that.
5 E: → [Yea:h.
6 L: Yuh know,

In the above array it can be noticed that in each case a recipient who has produced a, or N assessment(s) thereafter produces an alternative, and perhaps contextually, if not intrinsically, less close-implicative object (see lines 9, 11, 6, and 5, respectively). Thus, a recipient who has '(mis)apprehended' a coparticipant's talk as sufficient and terminable, may be brought to 'see', and can exhibit his revised 'understanding', that the talk is still in progress.[1]

Again, then, there is a range of resources available to a speaker by which to manage the close-implicature of recipient assessment. And further, if he does choose to comply, he has at least one device available to him whereby the shift can be exhibited as 'independent', on speaker's own recognizance; i.e., the "Anyway" device (see pages 53-56ff). In Fragment 2.(24) the speaker does not avail herself of these. The combination of activities she selects; i.e., acknowledgment of/response to the assessment, followed by a shift with no 'volition'-marker may comprise, and may be produced to be seen as, 'compliance with', 'capitulation to' the close-implicature of the assessment.

---

[1] While recurrently successful in bringing a shift-ready recipient back to the talk in progress, the Post-Assessment Continuation, like any other conversational device, is not guaranteed of success. So, for example, in Fragment 2.(16) pages 49-50 lines 15-19, an assessment is countered by Continuation (lines 15-16) and the recipient subsequently intersects the continuation with another assessment which is directly followed by topical shift (lines 18-19). And, for example, in Fragment 2.(4) page 40 lines 5-7, a Post-Assessment Continuation is overlapped by, and abandoned by reference to, a Post-Assessment Topical Shift.

Given our attention to this single utterance, an otherwise innocuous feature recommends itself as possibly salient; i.e., the prolonged inbreath situated between the acknowledgment token and the topical shift, "↑Yeeah! ˙hhhhhhhh En I j's thought...".

Inbreaths are 'innocuous' in a particular sense for us. Specifically, our very early transcripts do not attend their occurrence. Following is a single example. We show first the old and then the new transcript.

2.(a.1.) [SBL:1:1:12:7]

```
    B:          Mm hm, Well uh, Oh another thing...
```

2.(a.2.) [SBL:1:1:12:7:r]

```
    B:          °Mm hm,° ˙hhhe:a:hhhh We:ll, uh: Oh another thing...
```

Somewhere midway through the transcription of this corpus of conversations, large inbreaths began to be attended while small ones were not.

2.(b.1.) [SBL:2:1:5:14-15]

```
    B:  →      That's true. ˙hhh-
    G:         Because uh before, Penny hated tuh leave'er in the
               [house alone.
    B:         [Yeah.
    B:         Well now do you think...
```

2.(b.2.) [SBL:2:1:5:14-15:r]

```
    B:  →      That's true:.˙hhh[˙hhehhahh]
    G:                          [B e c a u]:se uh befo:re? Penny hated
               tuh leave'er in the[house]a[lone.
    B:  →                         [↓Yes.] [˙hh
    B:  →      ˙hh Well now d'you think...
```

Specifically, a very early transcript, which was disattentive to a range of non-strictly lexical details, would show the acknowledgment token directly followed by the subsequent topic-shifting talk (cf. Fragment 2.(a.1.) above). At the very least, then, we can notice that there is a space between the two lexical components.

We earlier mentioned the device of post-assessment Acknowledgment Token + Continuation with which a speaker might manage the shift-implicature of a recipient's assessment (see Fragments 2.(24.a.)-2.(24.d.) pages 62-64). Occasionally, a prior speaker produces a 'free-standing' post-assessment acknowledgment token; i.e., does not follow it with continuation. And when that procedure is employed, it occasionally is followed by on-topic talk by the recipient.[1] So, for example, in the following fragment, post a post-assessment acknowledgment token, the recipient produces another assessment of sorts. It is certainly close-implicative, but it is not itself a topical shift.

2.(26.a.) [SBL:2:1:4:6:r] ((re. a healed arm))

1 B: °W'l ↑thet's good.°
2 F: ↑Ya:hp.h=
3 B: =W^{T}l I'm *awf*'lly ↓*gl*ad tih ↓*h*ear it

And in the following fragment, post a post-assessment acknowledgment token, the recipient produces the technically 'interested' Inquiry.

2.(26.b.) [SBL:1:1:12:17-18:r] ((re. a bridge party))

1 B: W'l *that*'s *fu*::n.
2 (.)
3 M: °↓Yeh.°
4 B: Uh how *big* < How many *ta*bles.

That is, at the very least, a post-assessment acknowledgment token with some space after it might have that space occupied by on-topic talk by the recipient. Thus, it is possible that while the speaker of Fragment 2.(24) is exhibiting 'shift in compliance with recipient close-implicative assessment', she may also be providing an opportunity for the recipient to return to topical talk. Further, the fact that the space is occupied by an inbreath may be rather more actively negotiating for a recipient return to topic. Most roughly, it may be recognizably initiating topical shift, but doing so with an object which is eminently 'interruptable'; i.e., exhibiting to the recipient the consequence of her assessment and now providing her a chance to redress it.

---

[1] As usual, there are no guarantees. So, for example, in the following fragment a post-assessment acknowledgment token is overlapped by recipient topic-shift.

2.(26.c.) [NB:II:2:24] ((re. the sun coming out))

N: That's great.ʼhhhhh=
E: =[[MMMYUH!
N: [[Well I'm gonna call Neville's mother . . .

To cut into this possibility, we start out by noticing that inbreaths are among a range of items vulnerable to, and abandonable by reference to, intersecting talk (cf. 'continuation tokens' as intersectable/abandonable, Fragments 2.(3.c.1.)-2.(3.c.4) pages 58-59). So, for example, a review of the fragments shown so far yields instances of overlapped inbreaths.

In the following fragment a coparticipant can be seen to be starting up in the course of a speaker's inbreath and cutting off when the speaker actually starts producing talk, starting up again at a first possible completion point of the utterance.

1.(11) [Detail]

C: ˙hhhh[hh[W'l then i]z too ↑clo::se[see,]
K: [Di [dju neh-] [Did y]ou notice: uh...

In the following fragment, a speaker whose mid-utterance inbreath has been intersected by a coparticipant's talk, relinquishes the floor.

1.(23.a.) [Detail]

E: ah this pro:xide iss: uh kind'v a,hh˙hhh[h
L: [Wuddiyuh mean uh...

A similar configuration can be found in the following two fragments drawn from the same two conversations as Fragments 1.(11) and 1.(23.a.).

1.(23.a.1.) [SBL:2:2:3:8:r]

C: En so, I mean u-we coulda we: we could of rea:lly got
through, all'v ar ha:nds a lot fa:ster if they hadn'a'
been: ˙hhh[hh
K: [↓Ya:h b't see we waste en awful lot en ah now
I think...

1.(23.a.2.) [NB:IV:4:3]

1 E: I don'know hhhhow in the hell yih get this Go:d da:mn
2 thing but-˙hhh[hh
3 L: [Well wudz he sa:y ih- was it a fungus?

The following fragment was selected as just another instance of the vulnerability of inbreaths to, and abandonability by reference to, intersecting talk. However, we became interested in a possible inbreath-relevant phenomenon available in that fragment. This generated a rather extensive exploration of the phenomenon in its own right, which, however, turned out to be informative for our consideration of Fragment 2.(24) with its possibly negotiational inbreath. Following, then, is the fragment and the lengthy exploration generated thereby.

The phenomenon of which this fragment was selected as just another instance occurs at lines 8-9; i.e., an inbreath is intersected by and is cut off by reference to, coparticipant's talk, "˙hhhh//hh<".

1.(27) [Repeat]

1 G: I'll do it uh jih- I'll g- ez ↑just ez soon ez I: c'n get
2 kinda straightened ou:[t'n get]thi[ngs going=
3 B: [Y e ah,] [˙h h h h
4 G: =I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se cuz=
5 B: =[[Ye:ah.]
6 G: [Ro:y h]a:d tih go ou:t tih phone me: when'e- he found the
7 water wiz o:ff,
8 B: → Ye:ah,[˙hhhh[hh<]
9 G: [(0.3)][A:n]d uh:[things j's]
10 B: [But n o w]↑don't chu::(d) e:: do
11 too much.running arou:nd er wear yerse:lf ou:t.°

The possible phenomenon which presented itself to examination of this fragment with an interest in its inbreaths is: Not only can we see the series of acknowledgment tokens premonitoring a shift, as was proposed earlier by reference to this and other fragments (see pages 32-34), but the presence or absence of audible inbreaths across the series is indicative of the imminence (or not) of the approaching shift.

Most roughly, it is possible that at line 3 shift is observably imminent, at line 5 it is not, and at line 8 it is again imminent. One line of support for this proposal comes from inspection of the array of instances of Acknowledgment Token → Shift, another from a tracking of the particular tokens in this fragment, in their relationship to the coparticipant's talk; i.e., one line of support is gained from a collection of instances, the other from detailed single-instance analysis.

We start by noticing that many of the instances of Acknowledgment Token → Shift have the token followed by an inbreath. For example:

1.(1) [Detail]

```
6    C:        en pick out th'fra:mes.[there.
7    K:  →                            [Ya:h. 'hhhh Uh:m (.) I ca:lled...
```

1.(2) [Detail]

```
3    G:        I jump'd (.) e shot about thrree feet in the air ah think
4              ↑he[h heh]
5    L:  →        [Y e s]:.'hh Eh::m, we didn'go t'have ar haiuh done...
```

1.(3) [Detail]

```
8    J:        (inniz sle::d).hn[hih]
9    L:  →                      [Y e]: a h. 'hh (.) Uh:::m, . . . I found
               a recipe: thet I'm g'nna try:,
```

1.(4) [Detail]

```
5    H:        I:'m the only puhrs'n available t'take huhr by the no:se.
7    I:  →     eeYup. Yup.'hhh Well now look e-Barnaby said...
```

1.(8) [Detail]

```
7    R:        En I:'ll have a little ice crea:m la[:ter.
8    B:  →                                          [Yeah. 'hh Yihknow I
9              worked Wednesdee en Thursdee...
```

1.(12) [Repeat]

```
1    G:        Th'semester, theoretically ends the twenny third I think.=
2    S:  →     =Ye:ah.'t'hhh Tell me you guys er gunna go tuh Frisco...
```

1.(13) [Detail]

```
6    D:        but uh (0.3) it's jis too mu:ch.
7    B:  →     Ye:s.'hhhh Uh:m (0.3) ↑I jist had a thou:ght....
```

1.(14) [Detail]

```
9    B:         en he's awf'lly ni::ce┌'n I °jus:t┐uh°
10   C:                               └n:Ye::*::s ┘
11   C:  →      'h Is he still in business or retired.
```

1.(15) [Detail]

```
8    B:         other then tha:t why uh he┌:
9    C:  →                                └↓Ye:s. 'h Bu:t uh you see no
10              impro:vement.
```

1.(16) [Detail]

```
7    J:         with thi:s en┌then thaht
8    M:  →                   └Y e : : s, 'hh Ah yih quah-'t hahppy with
9               iyer fuhr:nichuh,
```

1.(23.a.2.) [Detail]

```
5    G:         That's all┌I  kno┐:w.
6    B:  →                └Ye:ah.┘'hh Well ah'm awf'lly glad tuh hear from
                yuh...
```

1.(26) [Expanded:Detail]

```
4    N:         en early in the e:venings?
5    I:  →      Ye:h'hh Well in a wa:y I'm not uh'hh I'm not sorry...
```

That is, again and again such a configuration as Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath may be characterized as Response to Prior Utterance + Non-Lexical Initiation of New Materials. And in Fragment 1.(27) there are two candidate instances of this segment of the process, "Yeah.(.)'hhhh" (line 3) and "Ye:ah,'hhhhh<" (line 8).

The proposal, supported by the array of Acknowledgment Token → Inbreath → Shift is, then, that on each occurrence of the acknowledgment token plus inbreath in Fragment 1.(27), this participant is prepared to shift then and there; is indeed in the process of shifting. A question then becomes, why doesn't the shift occur then and there, as it does in the above array? And that leads us to our second line of support, a tracking of the series of tokens in their relationship to the coparticipant's talk.

We start by noticing that the onset of the first acknowledgment token occurs at a standard locus of next-speaker startings, just prior to completion of a possible last word in an utterance; in this case, "ez soon ez I: c'n get kinda straightened ou://t". And the possible last word, "ou://t", has the intonation contour frequently present in utterance-terminal words; i.e., the rise → fall indicated by the underscored letter → non-underscored colon [ou:] configuration (see, e.g., the Fragment 1.(1) detail above, "fra:mes.", appropriately followed by a next-speaker starting; see also the Fragment 1.(4) detail, "no:se.", appropriately followed by a next-speaker starting, and the Fragment 1.(13) detail, "mu:ch.", appropriately followed by a next-speaker starting).

And instances of a next speaker starting just prior to completion can be found throughout the report, e.g., in Fragment 0.(1) "theh very ni//:ce.", Fragment 0.(3) "yer well tie:d dow:n ahn't//chu", Fragment 0.(4) "I b'lieve she di::://d.", Fragment 1.(7) "you took the price offa yours didn'ch//u.", Fragment 1.(16) "Buut it's th'settling in da::y//s.", Fragment 1.(17) "Mitzie wz mated about two weeks ago//:.", Fragment 1.(18) "ahrning dis kind of lea:ves me: co://ld," Fragment 1.(20) "They had (.) quite a lotta biscuit//s", Fragment 1.(22.f.) "Ah'll bet it ha://:s." and "while y'were staying ↑ho://me.", Fragment 1.(23.a.) "that li'l cream ja//::r.", etc. etc.

That is, at the point of onset of the acknowledgment token at line 3, the recipient has good grounds to take it, and to propose, that an utterance-in-progress is at a point of imminent completion. Thus, the activity produced by the recipient at that point may be, and may be appropriately, Acknowledgment → Shift, with the shift already in progress at the point of the inbreath.[1]

---

[1] A more detailed analysis will be sketched out shortly, when additional resources have been developed. It will take into account the momentary silence between the token and the inbreath at line 3. While this is a distinctive configuration from any of those in the above array, that may be a transcript artifact. The marking of that silence is the product of a 'motivated retranscription' focussing on the inbreaths. A

As occasionally happens to next utterances targetted to occur at completion of a prior, the Acknowledgment → Shift is overlapped by prior-speaker continuation (lines 2-3). This configuration occurs minimally in the detail of Fragment 1.(1) above, the speaker adding another word, "fra:mes.//there." Similar configurations can be found, e.g., in Fragment 1.(20) "They had (.) quite a lotta biscuit//s 'n chee::se," Fragment 2.(18) "Why I'm so ↑thri:lled//I jus wanduh call somebody", Fragment 2.(20) "Anyway ah'll tell y'all the news.//when uh when yuh come by.", and Fragment 2.(24) "↑you don'haftuh call me up//I w'js tickled".

In Fragment 1.(27) a next possible completion point, "'n get things going" (line 2) is not completion-intoned. It has a rising intonation (indicated by the underscored 'i'). This non-completion-intoned next component is itself followed by a next component (the equal signs [=] indicating absolutely no break in flow) "going I wantuh getta phone..." (lines 2=/=4).

It is possible that in the course of producing the non-lexical initiation of the shift; i.e., the inbreath, the recipient is hearing, not only that the speaker is now continuing, but that she will continue further, beyond "'n get things going", and by reference to that possible and immediately actualized still-further continuation, the shift-in progress is abandoned.

Thus, the fact that in Fragment 1.(27) we find an acknowledgment token plus an inbreath, not followed by a shift, yields to analysis as the possible product of a series of monitorings and decisions the outcome of which is abandonment of a shift-in-progress.

---

retranscription produced only a few days earlier, 'unmotivated' by reference to inbreaths, 'motivated' by an interest in the onset-positionings of the tokens, shows an unmarked token-inbreath relationship, "Yeah.'hhhh"; i.e., ressembles the objects in the array. On the other hand, a 'motivated retranscription' of the latter token + inbreath (line 8) shows no silence between the two objects.

We turn now to the acknowledgment token at line 5, "Ye:ah.", which is not succeeded by an inbreath, and which we propose to be recognizably not preparing for shift then and there, but indicating shift-readiness.

Like the component which overlaps the Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath, "'n get things going" (line 2), the component which follows on from it is also possibly complete and/but not completion-intoned; i.e., "=I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se" (the rising intonation indicated by the non-underscored letter → underscored colon [ou:] configuration in "hou:se"), and is followed-on by the start of a next component, "cuz" (see line 4).

The syntactic/prosodic context in which the second acknowledgment token occurs is, then, powerfully continuation-implicative, in contrast to the termination-implicative syntactic/prosodic context in which the first (and perhaps intendedly only) acknowledgment token (+ inbreath) occurred.

Thus, the recipient may be seen to be producing two related, but distinctive activities, each responsive to the context in which it is occurring. The first is a series of two actions: (1) marking 'incipient shift' and (2) non-lexically initiating shift. The action series onsets at a point where a telling-in-progress has reached possible completion, is recognizably sufficient, terminable, shift-ready. The second is a single action, a retrogression to the status of a current recipient marking 'incipient shift' in the course of a telling-in-progress, when it has turned out that the telling is not, after all, sufficient and etcetera.[1]

Given the considerations so far, the third occurrence and the context in which it occurs appear to be problematic. Specifically, the utterance which precedes an Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath, while lexically possibly complete, is not completion-intoned, "Ro:y ha:d tih go ou:t tih phone me: when'e- he found the water wiz o:ff," (again, the rising intonation indicated by the non-underscored letter → underscored colon [o:] configuration in "o:ff,"). That is, the intonation contour is continuation-implicative. But in this case the utterance is followed by the configuration we propose to be appropriately placed by reference to a termination-implicative prior; i.e., by an Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath, "Ye:ah,'hhhhh" (see lines 6-8).

---

[1] Cf. an analogous 'retrogression' from Assessment to Acknowledgment Token in Fragments 2.(25.a.)-2.(25.d.) pages 66-67

If we accept the possibility that Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath constitutes the initiation of a shift, in contrast to the 'free-standing' token as a marker of incipient shift, we might casually propose that this recipient has become impatient, is taking the bit in her teeth and, appropriately/warrantedly or not, going ahead with a shift; i.e., moving to achieve interruption of some ongoing and ongoing and on and on and ongoing talk.

However, detailed inspection of the materials at that point yields the possibility that the recipient is, over the course of her two-part series of actions, (1) appropriately responding to the continuation-implicativeness of the prior utterance, (2) monitoring and appropriately responding to her coparticipant's subsequent activities, and (3) providing a particularly clear and strong display of her own course of action. That is, she may be being especially attentive of and informative to her coparticipant.

1.(27) [Detail]

```
5    B:     [[Ye:ah.]
6    G:     [[Ro:y h]a:d tih go ou:t tih phone me: when'e- he found the
7             water wiz o:ff,
8    B:     [[Ye:ah,[ 'hhhh]hh
9    G:     [[  ø   [(0.3) ]
```

In the first place, on its occurrence the acknowledgment token can be a free-standing token; i.e., again marking recipiency/incipient shift, but not here and now initiating shift. But in contrast to the prior two tokens, this one finds itself occurring in the clear; i.e., although the speaker has possibly projected further talk she has not, as in the prior two rounds, followed-on with further talk (this circumstance indicated by the null-sign

[Ø] in the above detail at line 9).

It may be specifically by reference to the absence of a follow-on that the recipient now produces the shift-initiative inbreath. And we can note that the inbreath itself is rather more prolonged than the general run of pre-shift inbreaths (see pages 72-73), and is produced in two phases. It starts off at one level, and as the prior speaker's silence continues (see the (0.3) silence at line 9), the inbreath becomes louder (indicated by the underscoring of the latter portion, "'hhhhhh"). Such a 'staging' may be produced as a display of the recipient's first seeing the possibility of, and then as the speaker remains silent, becoming assured of, a warrant for here-and-now topical shift.[1]

Our proposal of a multi-staged, coparticipant-sensitive movement into shift is supported by subsequent events.

1.(27) [Detail 2]

```
7    G:        when'e- he found the water wiz o:ff,
8    B:     [[Ye:ah, [ 'hhhh[hh< ]
9    G:     [[   Ø   [(0.3) [A:n ]d
```

---

[1] An analogous use of the 'staging' device is readily seen in the production of laughter. In the following fragments we see a two-stage process; 'anticipatory' laughter occurring as a laugh-respondable utterance approaches completion, 'appreciative' laughter upon completion. Specifically, at completion the laughter is 'escalated'. It becomes louder, and the particles may become more prolonged and/or more 'open-positioned'.

1.(27.1.) [Goodwin:AD:43:r]

```
B:        'n took mhhy fif[t(h)y c(h)e(h)ents ]
C:                        [hnn-hnn-hnn-h a h- ]ha:h-ha:h
```

1.(27.2.) [NB:IV:10:54:r]

```
L:        'n yis feels like yer[ta[kin[ a [dou[:che.]
E:                             [eh[-uh[-uh[-uh[-a h-]ahh-ahh
```

1.(27.3.) [Goodwin:AD:58:r]

```
C:        I gotta git outta dih mood befo'I c'n git outta
          d[i[h ↓cah,    ]
L:         [a[h  ha ha   ]ha ha ha ha
B:           [u-hu-huh   ]hu:h hu:h hu:h
```

Simply enough, as the prior speaker starts to speak again the recipient's inbreath, which has just become stronger, comes to an abrupt and absolute halt (indicated by the left-carat [<], "˙hhhh//hh<"). That is, a shift initiated by reference to the prior speaker's silence is aborted as the prior speaker produces the continuation projected by the intonation contour of the prior utterance (i.e., "the water wiz o:ff, . . . a:nd").

We note finally that the aborted shift is reinstituted at a recurrent locus of mid-utterance next-speaker startings, post a 'search token' such as "uh".

1.(27) [Detail 3]

```
8    B:        [[Ye:ah, [˙hhhh[hh<]
9    G:        [[ 0     [(0.3)[A:n]d uh:[things j's]
10   B:                                [But  n o w]↑don't chu::(d) e:: do
11                too much.running arou:nd er wear yerse:lf ou:t.
```

Following are just a few examples of post-search-token next-speaker starting.

1.(27.a.) [Adato:7:22]

```
1   J:          But let's suppose that you are correct. And say that
2               they do steal in order to get, specifically the
3               marijuana. Alright?
4   R:          Right.
5   J:  →       Okay. Now uh, i:sn't that, uh::::
6   R: *→       Now[I'm not saying every kid thet steals is doing that=
7   J:             [It-it-it-it-
8   R:          =fer that reason.
```

1.(27.b.) [C/BA:IV:78-79]

```
1   F:  →       B't I think y'oughta have en agreement as to uh,
2   B: *→     [[Right.
3   M: *→     [[We- we will meet again upon- after we receive the letter.
```

1.(27.c.) [D.A.2:13]

```
1   G:  →       Well uh but uh yuh see'v course she wouldn't uh:::,
2                        (.)
3   J: *→       ˙t No. of ↑cou:rse. I mean theh this I unduhstand.
```

And the following example has a very similar character to Fragment 1.(27). The shift (line 6) is further along at the point of intersection and (temporary) abandonment (lines 6-7).

1.(27.d.) [NB:IV:11:3-4:r]

```
1    M:        I expec'tuh heah from i[m tihday en ah'l[l be]
2    E:                               [Ya:h.           [Yah ]=
3    M:        ='h hanging around that's 'nother reas'n thet ah
4              [wantuh be he]:uh.
5    E:        [M*m  h m :  ],
6    E:  →     ·t·hh W'l Marth[a? i f  y-]
7    M:  →                    [But  tha:n]ks evuh so: an:d um
8    E: *→     'f you NEED us? or wnd uh WAHNT a THING yihknow
9              w'r right he:re:
```

In both Fragments 1.(27) and 1.(27.d.) the recipient's reinitiation of the (temporarily) abandoned shift occurs post "and uh" (see lines 9-10 and 7-8 respectively). For one, recalling our earlier consideration of 'continuations as eminently abandonable (pages 58-59), such a combination as 'and + uh' may be recognizably 'especially amenable' to intersection. Thus, not only in the abandonment, but in the reinitiation of the shift, we may be seeing recipients exhibiting 'sensitivity to' their coparticipants.

Secondly, that such an object as "and uh" is occurring at such a point in the talk may constitute a version of the sort of 'dysfluency' considered at pages 59-60; i.e., the object 'warranting' re-initiation of the shift may be an artifact of a hastily-initiated action, in these instances deployed by the speaker to intersect a recognizable shift-in-progress, and a subsequent attending to the particular's of the action's utterance.

In that regard it can be noted that the recipients' subsequent shift-reinitiations are also 'dysfluent'; dramatically so in Fragment 1.(27) lines 10-11, "But now ↑don't chu::(d) e:: do too much", rather less obtrusively in Fragment 1.(27.d.) line 8, "'f you NEED us? or wnd uh WAHNT a THING". That is, they each may be recognizing and siezing upon an appropriate, warranted opportunity to reinstitute the just-abandoned shift, then and there launching a recognizable action and thereafter attending to the particulars of the action's utterance.

Now, these various proposals of intense coparticipant-sensitivity on the part of the shift-initiating recipient, in the course of and subsequent to the latter Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath raise questions about the prior; i.e., about "Yeah.(.)·hhhh" (line 3), in which the token does not find itself occurring in the clear but is nevertheless followed by an inbreath; i.e., by shift-initiation.

1.(27) [Detail 4]

```
1    G:      I'll do it uh jih- I'll g- ez ↑just ez soon ez I: c'n
2            get kinda straightened ou:[t'n get]thi[ngs going=
3    B:                                [Y e ah,]   [·h h h h
4    G:      =I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se cuz
```

We can cut into the 'nevertheless', again by tracking the course of the recipient's activities by reference to those of the speaker. We start by noticing that the acknowledgment token, which onsets at a perfectly appropriate point; i.e., just prior to a syntactically/prosodically-projected utterance completion (see pages 73-74), overlaps and is coterminous with the sub-unit "'n get".

Such a sub-unit may project a range of utterance-extendable possibilities, such as that which occurs, not immediately, but subsequently; i.e., "...getta phone in the hou:se cuz" (line 4); i.e., "'n get" can be the predecessor of something like "'n get]ta phone...". On its occurrence, then, the overlapping sentential sub-unit "'n get" may be recognizably continuation implicative. And at that point, had the recipient intended to follow the acknowledgment token with a shift-initiatory inbreath, she may see that such an action would be inappropriate. And, at the simultaneous completion of the token and the continuation-implicative sentential sub-unit, the recipient lapses into silence.

1.(27) [Detail 5]

```
2    G:      kinda straightened ou:[t'n get]thi]
3    B:                            [Y e ah,](.)]
```

However, as the speaker's continuation unfolds across the recipient's silence, it may be recognizably completion-implicative. The word which follows the coterminous acknowledgment-token and sentential sub-unit is "things". And with that word, the unit-in-progress may be recognizable as a 'generalized completer'-in-progress,[1] as, indeed, it turns out to be; i.e., "'n get things going" is such an item and is akin to, e.g., "and get things(settled, sorted out, together...etc.)". Thus, at the point where "'n get" can be seen to be being followed by "things" and not by some specific, e.g., the subsequent "a phone", the utterance in progress may be now recognizably on the way to completion.

And the inbreath may be characterized as systematically placed by reference to the word which now implicates completion. It occurs at a 'recognition point' in that word; i.e., midway through "thi//ngs", in the component which has been projected to be something like and turns out to be "'n get thi//ngs going".[2]

Again, then, the recipient may be seen to be closely monitoring and responding to the unfolding component-in-progress, abandoning and then reinstituting a shift as the component moves from continuation-implicature, "'n get", to completion-implicature, "'n get thi//ngs"; i.e., following the acknowledgment token with a silence, and thereafter with an inbreath.

We note that this particular inbreath starts out and remains at the same level, in contrast to the subsequent post-acknowledgment-token inbreath which increases in volume. Indeed, we are unable to pinpoint exactly where this inbreath terminates. It peters out somewhere prior to the end of "going". This 'petering out' may itself be sensitive to the continuation-implicative rising intonation of "going". Where, then, the subsequent (and intonation-projected) continuation is permitted to occur in the clear (see line 4).

---

[1] This possibility is made available by a study of list-production, in which it was found that recurrently a list is exhibited as completed with a 'generalized list completer'. See G. Jefferson, "List Constru Construction as a Task and Resource", Psathes, G., Frankel, R., and Coulter, J..(eds.) Interaction Competence, Ablex, forthcoming, 1981. Included among cases of the class 'generalized completer' are, e.g., "and things like that", "and that sort of thing", etc.

[2] For a consideration of 'recognition-point overlap' see G. Jefferson, "A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation", Semiotica, IX, 1973, 1, pages 56-59.

It appears, then, that the initial Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath is passing through an intricate series of monitorings and decisions equal to that of the subsequent; i.e., through initiation, abandonment, reinstitution and reabandonment, in comparison to the subsequent's initiation, commitment, abandonment and reinstitution.

One product of this analysis is the possibility that at some point in an interaction, prior to the actual emergence of a shift, 'imminent shift' can be located; i.e., a participant can be observably producing a shift-initiatory inbreath and then, for whatever reasons, abandoning the shift and reinstituting it subsequently.

The notion of 'imminent' versus 'non-imminent' shift as traceable via the presence or absence of post-acknowledgment-token inbreaths can be applied to the following fragment, which occurs some ten transcript pages further into the conversation from which Fragment 1.(27) was extracted.

1.(27.e.) [SBL:2:1:5:14-15:r] ((re. a friend's changed housing situation))

```
1    G:        you know they always get so enth┌u:sed r┐ight awa:y.
2    B:  →                                   └°Uh-huh.°┘
3    B: *→     Ye:ah,hhh┌I(h)kn(h)ow ┐.┌ ˙h┌hhhhh
4    G:                 └A n d  the:n┘:└ :└pretty soon't begins tuh
5              we┌a:r o:: ┐ff.
7    B:  →       └ Yeah.  ┘
8    B: *→     Uh-huh˙hhhh Well┌LIsten┐
9    G:                        └B u :t┘uh she said evrybody was ↑ so
10             ↓ni:ce in the house oh:? they were jus wonderful?=
11   B:  →   =[[┌Goo:d.┐  ]]I hope they stay thet way,
12   G:         └ a:nd ┘uh                            ]]˙h A:nd so: uhm
13                   (0.2)
14   G:        uh:: (0.4) They uhm (0.6) ˙hh eh she feeuls thet she's
15             not alo:ne wh'n┌Penny go┐es ou:t.
16   B:  →                    └Uh-huh, ┘
```

17 G: W[ell of c]ourse that ↑is ↓ni::ce.
18 B: → [↓Ye::s.]
19 B: *→ That's true:.(.)'hhh:['hhe:ahh]
20 G: [Beca u :]se uh befo:re? Penny
21 hated tuh leave'er in the[↓house] a[↓lo]ne.=
22 B: *→ [↓Yes.]'h['hh]
23 B: *→ ='hh Well now d'you think you'll try tih get up next
24 wee:k?

No detailed analysis of this fragment will be provided. We want, however to note that the utterance at line 4, marked with an asterisked arrow as comprising 'imminent shift', is ambiguous. The inbreath is a possible shift-initiation but also a possible post-laughter catching-of-breath. The progress of the inbreath when tracked by reference to the coparticipant's talk suggests the sort of 'sensitivity' attendant to an interactional activity such as 'shift-initiation' in contrast to a 'physical function' such as post-laughter catching-of-breath.

Specifically, the inbreath onsets after the speaker's overlapping continuation (line 5) takes on a configuration which can indicate, e.g., 'hesitation'; i.e., "And the:n::". The inbreath starts off strongly and becomes softer as the speaker produces a next word.

1.(27.e.) [Detail]

5 G: And the:n:[: [pretty soon
4 B: ['h[hhhhh

That is, while the object and its general positioning (post laughter) qualifies it as a 'mere function', its behavior qualifies it as a 'device'.

The final fragment we turn to in this exploration of post-acknowledgement-token inbreaths is taken from the same corpus of conversations as is Fragment 2.(24), the fragment which generated this exploration, and involves the same speaker who produces the object in question, this time with a different recipient.

In this case the notion of 'imminent shift' yields the possibility that an utterance which occurs at one point (line 22) and was obviously attempted a bit earlier (line 20), was initiated and abandoned earlier still (line 8).

1.(27.e.) [NB:I:6:10-11:r]

```
1     E:        ↑Aw the kids'v had fun we been the fun zone we been out'n
2               th'boa:t we went fishin Lottie (.) cuh- or Marian caught
3               a:-(0.4)˙tch (0.4) oh:: a: benita, (.) trawlin out there
4               by the (0.4) Newport Pie:r,
5                   (.)
6     L:        °Oh::: goo::d.°
7                   (0.2)
8     E: *→     Ye::a:uh ˙hh┌hh
9     L:                    └Whenju go:, thah: (.)┌yeh-┐
10    E:                                          └Uh F┘ri:dee.
11                  (0.2)
12    L:        Oh:.
13                  (.)
14    L:        °U┌h huh,°
15    E:         └↑En it wzn'↓ba:d out there God the water's rea:l ca:lm.
16                  (0.4)
17    L:        Ye::ah.
18                  (.)
19    L:        Ye::ah.
20    E: *→     ˙hmh˙t˙hh┌Wul-
21    L:                 └Well bet id be good tihday wih this rai:n.
22    E: *→     Ye:ah.Well: wir (0.3) ˙hh-˙hh Wir jis gettin thi:ngs
23              kahnda wou:nd up here ah don'know uh wish:: (.) they
24              may leave early . . .
```

What we take to be actually occurring at lines 8-9 in this fragment is what we are proposing to be provided for but not occurring in the fragment which started off this exploration; i.e., Fragment 2.(24).

In both fragments a prior speaker whose recipient has produced an assessment and thus has indicated readiness to shift, in Fragment 2.(24) "Oh::::::: i'nnat ↓good.", in the fragment at hand, "°Oh::: goo::d.°" (line 6), herself initiates a shift, in Fragment 2.(24) "↑Yeeah!˙hhhhhhhh", in the fragment at hand, "Ye::a:uh˙hhhh" (line 8).

At this point the two fragments part company. In Fragment 2.(24) the prolonged and progressively stronger inbreath is followed by the projected shift, "↑Yeeah!˙hhhhhhhh En I j's thought I'd give yih a buzz". In the fragment at hand the inbreath is intersected by, and the shift-in-progress abandoned by reference to, the recipient's returning to topic with a display of 'topical interest'; i.e., the inquiry "Whenju go:, thah: (.) // yeh-" (line 9).

The series of elements and the outcome in the case at hand are similar to those of Fragment 2.(26.b.) page 69, which was proposed as instancing a possible outcome of the procedure being used by the speaker in Fragment 2.(24). That is, in contrast to the actual outcome of Fragment 2.(24), we see in Fragment 2.(26.b.) and in the case at hand, a recipient's assessment followed by a prior speaker's acknowledgment token, followed by the recipient returning to topic.

In both these instances, the way in which the recipient returns to topic is similar; i.e., with the display of 'topical interest', the inquiry. In the case at hand, "Whenju go:, thah: (.) // yeh-" (line 9), and in Fragment 2.(26.b.), "Uh how big < How many tables."

And in both cases we see the possible indicator of a hastily-deployed activity; i.e., 'dysfluency'. A question is, why would a recipient who has himself implicated topical closure and shift, now precipitously return to topic? The answer may have to do with the character of the 'free-standing' acknowledgment token produced by the prior speaker.

We earlier noted that the free-standing acknowledgment token is contrastive to other recurrently-used speaker responses to recipient assessments, e.g., the 'volitional' "Anyway"-marked shift, in Fragments 2.(19)-2.(23) pages 53-56, e.g., sheer continuation, in Fragments 2.(25.a.)-2.(25.d.) pages 66-67, and e.g., the acknowledgment token + continuation in Fragments 2.(24.a.)-2.(24.c.) pages 62-63.

With those devices, a speaker whose recipient has just implicated topical closure and shift, produces a move one way or another; i.e., himself produces the projected shift, or counters close-implicature with continuation. The free-standing acknowledgment token neither shifts nor continues. It is topic-directionally 'neutral'.

Recall the earlier consideration of the acknowledgment token as positionally 'neutral' and a recurrent consequence of variously exhibited 'neutrality'; i.e., a coparticipant's reversing his prior position (see Fragments 1.(36.b.)-1.(36.e.) and the consideration at pages 37-39). In a context in which the acknowledgment token is operating 'topic-directionally', the same process may hold; i.e., the recipient may be thus informed that he has 'misapprehended' his coparticipant's talk to be sufficient and terminable, and that he should now exhibit his revised 'understanding'; should reverse his prior position; i.e., should produce continuation-implicative talk.

In Fragment 2.(26.b.) and in the fragment at hand, the recipients do just that; they reverse their topic-directional position (with observable precipitous alacrity) and produce an especially strong continuation-implicative object, the Inquiry.

In Fragment 2.(24) the recipient abstains from reversing her topic-directional position. And this abstention is preserved across a particularly extensive 'opportunity space'; i.e., across the prolonged inbreath which lies between the acknowledgement token and the shift.[1]

In his unpublished lecture of May 29 1968, Harvey Sacks considers an interchange in which an ongoing speaker is "cut off". Sacks proposes that one might have "suspicions" that a speaker may be talking"so as to provide someone should cut him off"; i.e., "that he's <u>inviting</u> someone to cut him off." (page 13, emphasis in the lecture-transcript). The phenomenon has been named the 'interruption invitation', and various of its systematic aspects are under study. The phenomenon is, of course, most amenable to study when 'interruption' actually occurs. It is recalcitrant when we have our "suspicions" about such materials as Fragment 2.(24). Nevertheless, we continue to collect and consider cases in which, while the talk may have a collection of features which make it vulnerable to 'interruption', and which we hope to be able to characterize as being <u>made</u> vulnerable to and thus 'inviting' interruption, no interruption actually occurs.

---

[1] Another aspect of the inbreath, its increasing loudness, may also be informative to the recipient and designedly elicitive of continuation-implicative talk by her. This aspect will not be developed here. We simply note that the increasing loudness may constitute a display of the imminence of the projected shift (cf. the consideration of Fragment 1.(27), especially page 78). In general, a display of imminence can have alternative consequences; i.e., someone can respond by now curtailing his own activities in order to permit the imminent occurrence. He can also respond by mobilizing his own activities in order to prevent the imminent occurrence.

We show two instances for which we have a certain affection, which we take to be 'failed interruption invitations'. The invitation in both cases is to 'interrupt' with laughter.

In the first of the two fragments, a panelist on a radio call-in program is responding to a caller's description of her problems.

2.(26.a.) [JRE:A:2]

```
1    P:          We:ll Harriet. May I say you know fuhrst'v all: how (.)
2                sympathetic I am tih yer difficulties. Uh:: I unduhstand
3                th'm very well in fact my children were born while I w'z
4                still a stud'n:t. en in many ways I: spent ez much time
5          →     looking ahfter the young children ez m(h)y wi(h)fe did.
6          →     ˙hhh A:nd uh: (.) yihkneo:w, the strength of (.) young
7                children's dema:nds . . .
```

In the second fragment, a neighbor who is overseeing a night out in a backyard tent by his own and his coparticipant's little boy, is providing assurances of due care and attention.

2.(26.b.) [Rahman:A:1:(6):2]

```
1    F:          I've jus given them a mea:l so: (.) thehr gonna be uh
2                it'll keep'm wahrm fer awhile,
3    G:          Oh(hh)h(h)o┌hh˙he:hh
4    F:                     └Uh::
5                     (0.3)
6    F:          Nuh- en now if it du:z uh (.) get in bad joorin the night,
7    G:          i┌Yes,
8    F:   →       └thez a hurriken uhr something ˙hhh uh:: ah'll uh (.)
9                ah'll bring th'm in.
```

10 (0.4)
11 F: Soh:: (.) y'know thell be al[right]
12 G: [So it]wih=
13 F: =[[(Nothing f'you t'worry about)]
14 G: [[Yes. Because of course ih tis]very s-eh: dahmp still...

The elaborated analyses of these two fragments will not be shown. We point to the two candidate laugh-respondable utterances at lines 4-5 and 6-8 respectively; the first marked as such with in-speech laugh particles, "ez m(h)y wi(h)fe did", the second unmarked (perhaps in part because a just-prior, and thematically similar little joke has been received with laughter, lines 1-3).[1]

In each case, following the little jokes (which, we notice, run off quite fluently), the speaker goes through a dysfluent patch before returning to the business at hand. In Fragment 2.(26.a.), "·hhh A:nd uh: (.)", and in Fragment 2,(26.b.), "·hhh uh: ah'll uh (.)". In each case, 'continuation' is initiated; first, with an intersection-vulnerable inbreath, and then with some lexicals. In Fragment 2.(26.a.) the speaker plunges ahead with a conjunction, "A:nd" while in Fragment 2.(26.b.) he offers, first an intersection-vulnerable search-token "uh" and then the 'actual' continuation item, "I'll". Both follow on with a search token "uh" and both follow that with a silence.

We take it that these dysfluencies are no mere random bumbling, but comprise a 'device', the 'interruption invitation'. The device is systematically positioned, and may well be systematically assembled.

Below, the 'continuation + hesitation' format is successfully deployed by the teller of a joke which has been generating laughter across its telling. The transcript picks up in one of these inter-nodal laughings-together, at a point where the laughter has begun to die away.[1]

---

[1] The 'thematic similarity' turns on an exhibited caring coupled with a professed indifference. That is, he has given the children a meal, and it will "keep them warm". But only "for awhile". The implication being that thereafter they fend for themselves. And, although he will literally be keeping a weather eye on the children, the implication is that nothing short of "a hurricane or something" will mobilize his intervention; i.e., again, they fend for themselves.

2.(26.c.) [Goodwin:AD:56:r]

```
1    C:         e-he-[he-  [ˈe-ˈhhee[hh! [e::::a::yee: ]
2    B:              [n-he [u-h u h  [    [             ]=
3    L:                              [eh! [uh!ah!ah!ah! ]
4    C: →   =[[°ee::°]
5    B: →    [[°ehhhh]hh°
6    L: →            [°uhhhhh°=
7    C: *→      =So:.
8                     (.)
9    L:         Oo[::p(h)s=
10   C: *→        [They-
11   B:         =neghh-[heh heh]
12   C: →              [huh ha-]ha: ha: ha:[ha a[h ah! ah! ]
13   L:                                    [e!e![e! e! a! ]°a!°
14   B:                                         [hgheh-heh  ]
```

At lines 4/5/6 there is a marked diminution of volume (indicated by the degree signs [°]). The laughing-together is nearing termination. At this point the joketeller proposes to return to the joketelling with "So:." (line 7). He does not, however, follow on with the joke's next node, but 'hesitates' (line 8, cf. "A:nd uh: (.)" and "I'll uh (.)" in the two above fragments).

And when he does move to procede with the telling, with "They" (line 10), he finds himself in overlap with a recipient's laughing re-reference to the prior node, "Oo::p(h)s" (line 9), to which he immediately defers by cutting off. And after a first particle of laughter by another recipient, the joketeller joins in (lines 11-12).

In effect, his return to the joketelling has been overlapped by, and abandoned by reference to, another round of laughing-together. In systematic terms, he has constructed a display of interruption-responsive abandonment. In the first place, as Sacks has it, "he talked so as to provide that someone should cut him off." Secondly, he may have subsequently produced his talk so as to exhibit that someone did cut him off.

---

[1] An elaborated analysis of the extended laughing-together is found in G. Jefferson, H. Sacks, and E. Schegloff, "Notes on Laughter in the Pursuit of Intimacy", J. Schenkein (ed.), op. cit. Volume II, forthcoming.

We are noticing the virtually simultaneous recipient re-reference and teller continuation (lines 9-10). The phenomenon of virtually simultaneous startings is interestingly problematic. On occasion we try to make a case for the fractionally next start as, indeed, a next; i.e., as 'onset sensitive' to the fractionally first; as responsive to it.[1] But frequently it appears that the fractionally next-started utterance is quite independent of the first; i.e., the two utterances are for all practical purposes simultaneously-started. We take it that this problematic character of fractionally non-simultaneously-started utterances is exploitable, and exploited, by participants to conversation. A speaker hearing and responding to a just-started prior can effectively 'have started simultaneously'; i.e., independently.

It is, then, at least a possibility that the joketeller, having produced the 'continuation + hesitation' interruption-invitation format, now hearing that a recipient is initiating talk, recognizing it as the re-reference which might generate a next round of laughter, thereupon produces a display of 'continuation'; i.e., exhibits that he was committed to the telling and/but forced to abandon it.

We note parenthetically that a similar sort of consideration might apply to the Doctor-Patient materials, Fragment 1.(24.d.2.) page 28, lines 22-23, the 'virtually simultaneous' occurrence of a 'passive recipiency' token by the patient and a 'continuation-initiatory' inbreath by the doctor; i.e., hearing that the patient will not assume speakership and, e.g., accept the doctor's reassurances, the doctor thereupon exhibits independent continuation. And subsequently we can notice the 'continuation + hesitation' format, "·hhhhhhhh (0.2)", and when the patient abstains from 'interrupting', the now-familiar possible index of a hastily-deployed action; i.e., the thoroughly dysfluent 'continuation' which includes the contextually unfortunate admonishment; i.e., "An'you uh-uh-shyou musn't fuhget" (see lines 20-25).

---

[1] See, for example, the consideration of post-laugh-particle onset of coparticipant laughter in G. Jefferson, "A Technique for Inviting Laughter and its Subsequent Accpetance/Declination," G. Psathes (ed.) Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology, New York, Irvington, 1979, pages 82ff.

With the foregoing considerations we are arguing that in Fragment 2.(24) the teller who has so precipitously responded to the close-implicature of her recipient's assessment by cutting off a telling's utterance in progress, may thereafter be not only providing an 'opportunity' for the recipient to return to topic, but in a range of ways strongly proposing that she do so. For one,

For one, the free-standing post-assessment acknowledgment token with its topic-directional 'neutrality' may be deployed to elicit a reversal of the recipient's topic-directional position (see the consideration, pages 86-87). Secondly, the prolonged inbreath may constitute a version of the 'interruption invitation' device, initiating 'continuation' while not yet fully (i.e., lexically) continuing, 'inviting' the recipient to produce the talk implicated by the free-standing acknowledgment token.

That the teller does (eventually) produce a topic shift can be seen to be the outcome of fine-grained negotiation.

Two further features of the topic shift will be noted but not developed here. For one, once the negotiation is resolved, and resolved in favor of topical shift, the outcome is exhibited to be acceptable to the prior teller, if not, in fact, independently produced; indeed, already in progress earlier.

Specifically, the abandoned telling is retrospectively exhibited to have been, not a 'telling' per se, but a preliminary component of a standard caller's format, "I was doing X when I decided to call you."

2.(24) [Detail]

```
9     E:  →    Wir painting like ma:d in th'kitchen a:nd=
10    P:     =[[┌Oh┌are yuh?┐
11    E:       └Oh└evrythin┘g's workin out so pretty he┌re with ar┐
12    P:                                                └Oh::::::::┘::
13              i'nnat ↓good.
14    E:  →    ↑Yeeah! ˙hhhhhhhh En I j's thought I'd give yih a buzz
```

The 'adjusted' production may be seen to delete the problematic negotiation, and now to be understood as "We're painting like mad in the kitchen and I just thought I'd give you a buzz."

Secondly, following this retroactive 'adjustment' of the failed telling to a 'preliminary component', the teller may be providing yet another opportunity for the recipient to take up the telling, by referring to a problematically unnoticed passage of time -- where an account for that unnoticed passage might be her preoccupation with the redecorating project.

2.(24) [Detail 2]

```
14    E:         En I j's thought I'd give yih a buzz I shoulda ca:lled yih
15-6        →    sooner b't I don't know where the week we:n┌t,
17    P:                                                   └u-We:ll:: Oh-
17               yEmma ↑you don'haftuh call me up=
18    E:     =[[┌I want┐t o : .┐
19    P:       └I w'js┘tickled┘thatche- (.) nYihkno:w w'n you came u:p...
```

Perhaps a sufficiently other-attentive recipient might combinedly warrant the call's delay and redress the consequence of her assessment and subsequent abstention by offering a candidate account of the week's unnoticed passage; i.e., her coparticipant's hectic and successful redecorating project. Instead, she addresses the delay in its own right with a highly affiliative and (latent)-topically-disinterested disclaimer (line 17), and returns to the matter by reference to which this call is 'delayed'; i.e., the "lovely luncheon" she gave and her coparticipant attended (see Fragment

1.(36.d.) page 38, lines 1-4).

Five minutes further into the conversation, the telling which was curtailed and retroactively exhibited to have not been 'a telling' in the first place, is attempted again, and again curtailed. We show an extended chunk of prior talk because it contains yet another instance of the Assessment → Shift device (line 2) with a coparticipant subsiding into 'passive recipiency' (line 4 cf. line 1), and thereafter producing a 'topically interested' Inquiry (lines 7-9).

2.(27) [NB:V:13-14]

```
1    E:           he's a goodlooking fel'n eez got a beautiful wi:fe.=
2    P:           =Ye:s::.Go:rgeous girl-'hh'hhh e-We:ll see he'n Ronny'v been
3                 friends fer a long ti:me.=
4    E:           =°Mm:[hm::::°
5    P:                [·h·t So: he(c) e-he co:ntacted Ronny long time ago, en
6                 Ronny said we:ll?·h-·h-·h-·h-·h (.) Ye:s.yihknow,
7    E:           Is that his publicity then Sundee thet wz in the pa[per with]=
8    P:                                                              [ i:Yeh? ]
9    E:           =Hu:rt?
10                      (.)
11   P:         [[Mm  h m?]
12   E:         [[Ah'll be,](.) da::r[ned, ]
13   P:                              [uY a]h.
14   E:           Oh: Go:d.Isn'it fa:ntastic how things wor[k out, ]=
15   P:                                                    [eYeah, ]
16   E: *→        =·t·hhh[hh  W e l l  w i r  ret]i::red en I don't know,=
17   P:  |               [°(Id really something)°]
18   E: *→         =ehh heh'hhh wir- We gotta pai:ntbru:sh in ar hand i-y'know't
19                looks so big ethe pro:ject is so truhmendous.
20   P:           Oh:- Emma I've gott'n in s'many a'those proj[ects where you]=
21   E:                                                        [U h : h h h h.]
22   P:           =gid in half way theh y'think °oh: Ghho:d.° what've
23                I[: ↑do]:ne.y'[k n o w] ·hhh]
24   E:            [What-]      [What've]we d]o:ne.=
25   P:           =B't it a::ll wo:rks ou:::t.eh[you know?]
26   E: *→                                      [W h y  we]put new doo:rs in
27                the kitchen ah'll never know b't they're lookin:g u-BEAUtiful.
28                We:'ve sa:nded uh, (.) the liddle uh you haven't seen ar:
29                extra liddle cupboard thet's gone i[n here in th'kitchen but ]=
30   P: →                                           [°n:N o : : : : :. Hn-n,°]
31   E: *→        =·t·hhhhhhhhhhhh Well honey li:sten ah'll thhalk with yeh::
32                uh: wil[git tih]ge[ther:: [e ]
33   P:                  [·hhhhhh]  [eH e y [w]'l Emma maybe next week . . .
```

Before we turn briefly to the re-curtailed re-attempted telling, we note that at lines 1-2 the topical potential of this "goodlooking fellow" and his "beautiful wi:fe" is dispensed with and the connection between this man and the recipient's husband is taken up; i.e., "Ye:s::.Go:rgeous girl-˙hh˙hhh e-We:ll see he'n Ronny'v been friends fer a long ti:me." (And, as noted, thereafter the prior speaker subsides into 'passive recipiency' (line 4) and subsequently produces a 'topically interested' Inquiry (lines 7-9).

In this case, the shift-preparatory assessment-item, "Go:rgeous", is an agreement with, indeed an upgrade of, the prior speaker's assessment of the "beautiful" wife. It is produced by the same participant who, in Fragment 1.(36.d.) page 38, consistently undercuts praise of others. (See in particular, lines 10-11 in which the coparticipant's assessment, "beautiful girl" is downgraded to "Yeh I think she's a pretty girl.").

As it happens, what she is doing at this point constitutes an instance of an 'upgraded second assessment'; a phenomenon developed by Anita Pomerantz. In her discussion, Pomerantz proposes that agreement in general, and the upgraded second assessment in particular, are "termination devices"; that they "provide points of possible termination of sequences."[1] Thus, what in this case might strike us as a welcome but uncharacteristic willingness to accept and even contribute to praise of another, turns out to be a topically strategic device.

Turning now to the re-curtailed re-attempted telling, we note most briefly that it is arrived at via the Assessment → Shift device, "Oh: Go:d. Isn't it fa:ntastic how things work out,˙t˙hhhhh Well wir reti::red en I don't know, ehh heh'hhh wir- We gotta pai:ntbru:sh in ar hand..." (lines 14-18; the equal signs [=] indicate speech continuity across transcript breaks).

---

[1] See A. Pomerantz, "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes," Atkinson, M. and Heritage, J. (eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming, 1981. Among the instances of 'upgraded second assessments' shown by Pomerantz is one very similar to the case at hand.

2.(27.a.) [JS:II:28]

B: 'T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?
L: Yeh it's just gorgeous . . .

In this case the coparticipant does not become a 'recipient of a telling' but a co-speaker in a comparison of circumstances (lines 20-23), which she then exhibits to be sufficient and terminable with an aphorism perfectly fitted to the assessment with which the attempting teller moved into her attempted telling; i.e., with "B't it a::ll wo:rks ou:::t." (line 25, cf. line 14).

And with a procedure similar to post-recipient-assessment speaker-continuation (see Fragments 2.(25.a.)-2.(25.b.) pages 66-67), the attempting teller simply presses on (lines 25-26ff).

The curtailment is effected, not with an Assessment, but with a version of the Recipient Acknowledgment Token, a confirmation; i.e., to "you haven't seen our extra little cupboard" (lines 28-29) and overlapping the utterance's continuation, and its continuation-implicative post-positioned conjunction "but" (line 29; cf. the consideration of Fragment 1.(27) page 76, a recipient's sensitivity to continuation-implicature, including a post-positioned conjunction, "cuz"), the recipient produces "°n:No:::::. Hn-n,°" (line 30).

While 'confirmation' might be appropriate, it may also be seen as 'topically disinterested' when compared with other available responses, e.g., an Inquiry such as "When did you do tha:t," or, especially given its status as 'news', then a news-receipt/display of 'special interest' analogous to that of Fragment 2.(24.d.1.) page 65, "She is? She's taller'n you?", e.g., "You put in a new cupboard?".

And following this display of 'topical disinterest', the attempting teller produces a vast and progressively stronger inbreath, an object the topic-directional relevance of which we have been at some pains to develop.

The inbreath having proceeded for a time with no intervention by the recipient, the teller abandons the telling, and proposes to terminate the conversation, as well, "'t'hhhhhhhhhhhh Well honey li:sten ah'll thhalk with yeh::" (line 31).[1]

For our final consideration of the close-implicature of Assessments we turn to a very brief conversation in which the attempting teller of Fragments 2.(24) and 2.(27) is confronted with a series of close-implicative responses, the bulk of them assessments, by a coparticipant who has apparently phoned for an update (see lines 1-3) and no more than that.

2.(28) [NB:IV:8:r] ((Opening utterances unrecorded))

1 M: ...dear didjeh getcher groceries.
2 (.)
3 E: Ye:s they came right after I came ba:ck,[hh
4 M: → [Well that's ↓goo:d.
5 E: Tha:nk y[ou: u-]
6 M: → [F i : n[e.
7 E: [I wa:lked way down t'the jetty 'n I saw
8 Phil's si::gns en came ba:ck u::p 'n 'hh
9 M: → En there they we:re.
10 E: ↑Yehhh! 'hh We:ll no he ca:mes right about ten minutes after
11 I leftcher place about fifteen minutes.
12 M: → Well that's fi:ne.
13 E: ↓I'm so:r[ry I- 'hh]
14 M: → [That's go[o:d.
15 E: [But it-it's all hhe:re,'h
16 M: → Well that's good de:ah,
17 (0.3)
18 E: *→ [[Ah'll]see[yuh later.]
19 M: *→ [[We'll] [We'll see y]uh liddle laytu[h.
20 E: [Alri:[ght.
21 M: [Ri:ght.
22 M: [[B y e : ,]
23 E: [[A'right ba]h bye

---

[1] For one, the prolonged, topic-strategically deployed inbreath may have resulted in an overloading of air, which is discharged in the breathy "thhalk". Secondly, the proposal to terminate this conversation may not be unrelated to the fate of this participant's topic. In another conversation this same teller responds to another coparticipant's failure to take up a potentially rich topic (a 'troubles-telling') by initiating a conversation-close trajectory. See G. Jefferson and J.R. E. Lee, SSRC Final Report, op. cit., pages 78-80.

We focus first on the one utterance produced by the caller, following the update-request and its response, and preceding Closings; i.e., the one utterance between lines 3 and 18, which is not an Assessment, the 'collaborative utterance completion' "En there they we:re" (line 9).[1]

It was noted about Fragment 2.(16) pages 49-50 that the assessment, "Oh how really lovely" is misfitted to the talk which immediately precedes it, and thus, although it is warmly affiliative, it is transparently 'topically disinterested'. The 'collaborative completion' in the case at hand yields a similar 'topical disinterest' although (and because) it is perfectly fitted to the immediately prior talk. In this case the misfitting resides in the larger context.

Roughly, it appears that the call-recipient has taken up the topic-close implicature of the initial assessment, "Well that's ↓goo:d", herself producing a terminal item, 'Thank you' and shifting now to matters which succeeded the arrival of the groceries; i.e., the long walk (see lines 4-8). Indeed, she may be referring to matters talked of in that prior conversation in which the groceries were initially discussed (the matter being problematic enough to generate this current update call). Specifically, "'n I saw Phil's si::gns" (lines 8-9) may be invoking a prior reference.

That is, the call-recipient may now be engaging in a series of updatings on matters raised in that prior conversation; first the groceries, and now "Phil's si::gns".

However the caller is focussed on only one of those updateable matters, the groceries. Further, she is now engaged in exhibiting the sufficiency and terminability of a topic in what will be a strictly monotopical conversation; topic-termination and shift, then, resulting in Close-initiation. By virtue of the local, utterance-level context, she *can*, and by virtue of her constricted topical focus she obviously *does*, hear this Nth update as an elaboration of the first (and from her standpoint, only) update, which, with the 'collaborative' completion, she moves to bring to a soonest possible termination (see lines 9-10).

---

[1] For a consideration of 'collaborative' productions, see Harvey Sacks, unpublished lectures, e.g., Fall 1965 Lecture 1 pages 2-7, Fall 1967 Lecture 4 pages 9-15, and Fall 1968 Lecture 5 pages 1-9.

This intended 'economy' turns out to generate further talk, as the coparticipant corrects the misunderstanding exhibited by the collaborative completion.[1]

We note parenthetically that the correction follows an acknowledgment token which, in its sequential context, confirms the collaborative completion which is immediately thereafter disconfirmed, "↑Yehhh!·hh We:ll no..." (line 10). The initial 'confirmation' may be at least in part an artifact of and response to the sheer fact that a 'collaborative' is being produced. Recurrently a prior speaker/recipient of a collaborative completion produces a confirmation. We show a single instance, taken from materials which are considered in Section III.

3.(16) [Detail]

```
40   A:         I still have all th'z cards got about a hundred
41              f[ifty two hundred[of'em.
42   M:  →       [ehh!·hh         [tuh send ou::t.
43   A:  →      ↑Ye::::s.
```

That procedure is used even when the prior speaker turns out to take issue with the proposed completion. For example:

---

[1] For another instance of an intended 'economy' attendant to characterizeable 'disinterest', and the sort of misunderstanding and repairative talk it can generate, see the Cargo Syndrome, in G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, SSRC Final Report, *op. cit.*, pages 171-175, and G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, "The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a 'Troubles-Telling' and a 'Service Encounter'," *Journal of Pragmatics*:5:5:1981 (in press).

2.(28.a.) [GTS:3:62]

```
1    L:        My father's six foot two feet, he's large, an'
2              [he's a very s-
3    K:        [ehhehh
4                   (1.0)
5    K: →      st(hh)able per[son yea(hh)h
6    L: →                    [sta-  Mm hm,
7                   (1.0)
8    L: →      Stable or not, he's uh (1.0) aggressive kind of person,
```

And in the following fragment we might wonder if a doctor's collaborative completion, confirmed by the patient, is a different item than that which she intended and subsequently produces as a 'list assimilated' next item.[1]

2.(28.b.) [Frankel:6-15-81:1:FrankTrans]

```
38   D:        How were your symptoms then?
39   P:        ˙hhh Pt. nNot- not bad I was constipated a lot but I didn't
39             have the uh:,
40   D: →      °The pain.
41   P: →      Yeah. I didn't have the pain an I didn't have uhm diarrhea.
```

In Fragment 2.(28), although the exhibited misunderstanding and its subsequent correction constitute a failed 'economy', the end result is a return to talk about the arrival of the groceries (see lines 10-11).

And in her subsequent talk, the call-recipient may be using a procedure similar to that described by Pomerantz by reference to recipient silence (see the consideration, pages 36-39). Specifically, the call-recipient may be attempting to come to terms with the two most recent responses; i.e., the 'collaborative completion' which exhibits an exclusive focus on the matter of the groceries, and then the assessment "Well that's fi:ne" (line 12) which follows the correction of the misunderstanding, and, for one, exhibits disinterest in further talk about the misunderstanding (e.g., apologies, explanation, diagnosis of the error),[1] or in further talk about the misunderstood item; i.e., now having gotten the reference straightened out, the matter of the long walk and "Phil's si::gns" might be returned to, especially since Phil is the caller's husband, a 'primary other', and thus the caller is observably declining to pursue talk about matters tantamount to talk about herself.

---

[1] For a consideration of 'list assimilation' as a device for avoiding disagreement or correction, see G. Jefferson, "List Construction as a Task and Resource", op. cit.

The call-recipient's first attempt to come to terms with this series of informative activities is to understand that something more about the groceries is appropriate. And she comes up with a candidate which may redress her own possibly over-terse treatment of the update; i.e., the brief 'Thank you' followed by a shift to an Nth update (lines 6-8); i.e., she now produces an apology, "↓I'm so:rry I-'hh" (line 13). That is, whatever is being 'thanked' for may be one of those matters which can also be apologized for (thank you for your help, I'm sorry to have troubled you), and the exhibited focus on the groceries coupled with disinterest in other matters may be taken as an index of the unfinished character of an interchange which was too abruptly terminated with no more than a 'Thank you'. That is, the call-recipient may now come to understand that an apology is due, and is being pursued by the caller.

However, the tendered apology is intersected by yet another assessment, "That's goo:d" (line 14), and is abandoned. It is followed by what may be an alternative understanding of what is now becoming an extended series of close-implicative responses.

The utterance which follows the assessment-intersected, abandoned apology is a version of the initial, solicited, update, "But it-it's all hhe:re,·h" (line 15, cf. line 3). At this point the call-recipient may be proferring the result of a process-of-elimination analysis of the caller's single-focussed, close-implicative activities; that the matter which started the call was not intended to *start* a call, but to *be* the call; i.e., that this was, and is, to be a monotopical 'quick update' and no more. And with this result the two participants have achieved concensus,[1] which is exhibited in the subsequent talk. The caller produces a virtual repeat of the assessment which greeted the initial update, "Well that's good de:ar," (line 16, cf. line 4, "Well that's ↓goo:d."),[1] and thereafter they simultaneously enter conversation-closings (lines 18-19), each proffering the warrant and account for the brevity of this call; i.e., that they will be seeing each other shortly (see especially the caller's "We'll see you a little later").[2]

---

[1] For a consideration of the sort of talk recurrently generated by 'error-correction', see G. Jefferson, "On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation," J. Schenkein (ed.), op. cit., Volume II.

---

[1] The concensus is a collaborative achievement, the call-recipient making serial attempts at, and eventually suceeding in, coming to terms with the caller's activities. In the following fragment a series of close-implicative responses by a call-recipient is managed by the caller in a fashion similar to that of Fragments 2.(25.a.)-2.(25.d.) pages 66-67; i.e., she simply presses on. Some 6 transcript-pages earlier the call-recipient has shown grounds for, and the caller has agreed to, a short call. Some 3 transcript-pages earlier the call-recipient has initiated conversation-closings. The fragment picks up as the caller is reinvoking a Christmas gift she'd attempted to deliver.

2.(28.c.) [SBL:IV:6:9-10:r]

A: but I couldn't ev'n get up t'the doo:r c'z[(   )
M: [Ohh no::.
A: it wz raining[too (mu:ch)
M: → [Isn'that too ba:d.
A: mghhm'n I didnᵀwanna (0.2) yᵀknow try t'climb the fence
[(in that rain)
M: → [Yeh will it keep?
A: Oh yah.[(   ).
M: → [Oh w'l that's fine.
A: It's: ↑heh[heh heh
M: → [Fi:ne. Kee[:p
A: [You'll be real s'pri:zed,=
M: → =Y(h)eh I wi:ll, uhh[hhehh hu
A: [It's sorta Chris'm'ssy looking but that's alright,
M: → Oh well that's fi:ne tha[t's fu:n.
A: [It's something you c'n use around the yea:r anywa:y.
M: Oh my goodness. I don'wanchu t'do tha::t,
A: Nuh it's just hm-mghm a:ll it i:s I mean·hh is- is one a'those ·hh little things I, I just ↑came across it . . .

The transcript continues for another 14 pages, the recording ends with the conversation still in progress. We note that while the call-recipient does not succeed in closing the call, she does eventually succeed in making interactional trouble for her talkative coparticipant. Specifically, she produces responses to a subsequent 'troubles-telling' which have achieved 100% 'coder reliability' as utterly outrageous. See G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, SSRC Progress Report, *op. cit.*, pages 110-122, and G. Jefferson, "On the Organization of Laughter in Talk about Troubles," M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, *op. cit.*

The foregoing considerations show that Recipient Assessments are massively, recurrently, and systematically deployed in aid of topic closure/ topic shift. While the Assessments are more topically vivacious than the close-implicative Recipient Acknowledgment Tokens in that they at least take a [+/-] position ("That's nice" or "That's too bad") and thereby exhibit some gross analysis of the prior talk, they can in a range of ways be seen to be 'topically disinterested'.

However, the Assessments do exhibit interactional affiliativeness, which may be deployed as an alternative to 'topical interest'; an alternative to continued hearing, tracking, analysing, etc.; i.e., an alternative to continued 'recipiency'. And we can observe various enhancements of the affiliative character of Assessments in such utterances as "Well that's wonderful," "Oh how really lovely," "That's very disappointing isn't it," etc. But whether bland or heated, Assessments may be produced to convey 'That's enough'.

---

[1] The 'virtual repeat' may be recognizably implicating closure of the conversation as well as of the topic. After some substantial work with conversation closings, Graham Button reports an impression with which we concur (private communication), that close-implicative utterances using a coparticipant's name or an endearment term are, for one, regularly associated with entry into conversation-closings, and secondly, are regularly associated with, and seem to be proposing, a short Close-trajectory.

[2] In our consideration of Fragment 2.(24) we proposed that a problematic topical negotiation/curtailment was effectively 'deleted' (see page 93). In the fragment at hand a similar deletion of a problematic negotiation/curtailment is effected; the conversation, now, for all practical purposes 'having amounted to' lines 1-3(15)-4(16)-17-23.

Years ago, in a seminar with Harvey Sacks, one of his students was examining the following fragment.

2.(29.a.) [GTS:4:1:1]

K: I was at the police station this morning.
R: → Big deal.
(2.0)
K: Big deal, yea(hh)h. Somebody stoled all my radio equipment
outta my car. Outta my Jeep. Every[thing.
R: [You expect the cops t'
do sump'n about it?

The student characterized the utterance "Big deal" as a 'shut down', as closing off whatever talk might follow the prior announcement. Sacks suggested that the student look at the talk which followed the candidate 'shut down'. He pointed out that in order to talk about what an object is doing, one ought to look to see how, indeed, it seemed to be working in the actual talk. And in the actual talk, it seemed perfectly capable of generating further talk. While one might name the object, e.g., a 'challenge', one might not want to define it as a 'shut down'. "Big deal" might be interactionally unkind, but it might also be topically felicitous.

Several years later, Sacks included that theme in one of his lectures. He addresses the following fragment, in which there is competition between two participants "with respect to what line of development is going to be taken."

2.(29.b.) [GTS:4:51-52] ((re. amusement parks, P.O.P and New Pike))

J: I think that Pop is[depressing, it's just-
R: [But you go-you go- take-
J: Those guys are losing money. hehh
R: But you go down-dow-down to th'New Pike there's a buncha
people, ohh an' they're old, an' they're pretending
they're having fun, but they're really not.
K: → How c'n you tell. Hm?
R: They're they're tryina make a living, but the place is
on the decline . . .

As one upshot of a complicated analysis, Sacks proposes that a "hostile question", K's "How can you tell. Hm?" has been topic-directionally felicitous for its recipient (R), and thus, "the fact that the question is 'hostile' is secondary to the fact that it nonetheless operates to preserve the line R was trying to take."

The sort of object we have been considering in this section, Recipient Assessments, lends itself to an opposite characterization; i.e., the fact that an assessment is 'friendly' is secondary to the fact that it "nonetheless" operates to terminate the line a speaker was trying to take.

Our final object of inquiry, the Recipient Commentary, can be 'friendlier' yet. For one, it not only takes a [+/-] position on prior talk and thus shows some gross analysis of it, but exhibits the results of some rather more specific topical tracking. This specificity permits of an affiliativeness unavailable to Assessments; i.e., Recipient Commentary can be especially 'friendly'. We will argue that it is "nonetheless" operating to terminate the line a speaker was taking.

III. Recipient Commentary as Shift-Implicative

We start with two fragments in which a recipient is commenting on something said by a prior speaker. In the first fragment the comment is simple.

3.(1) [SBL:2:2:3:3-4:r] ((re. too much chatter while playing bridge))

```
K:          I mean I: wz: u-one thet wz gr:eatly at fault. ·hhhh en I
            don't ↓think ↑Elva appreciates anything like that<No:t thet
            she said anything b't (0.4) yih jis don't pla:y bridge that
            wa[y Claire.]
C:  →         [No she wa]sn't saying anythi:ng too much was ↓she.
```

In the second fragment, the comment is lengthy and elaborate.

---

1. See H. Sacks, unpublished lecture, Spring 1971, April 9, pages 1-5.

3.(2) [NB:II:12:13-14:r]

1 N: Uh he feels people haftuh be responsible en he taught this
2 throughout th'whole class so[I don't know how in the hell=
3 E: [°°M-hm°°
4 N: =this blond guy ever misinterpitid what'e sai:d.
5 N: ˙hh[hhhhhhhhh But uh=
6 E: [°°Mm:.°°
7 E: → =MAYBE 'E DIN' ↑WANNA UNDERSTAND it.
8 N: ˙t˙hhhh ↑Could ↑be:,
9 (0.2)
10 N: Who[k n o : w s]yihknow,]
11 E: → [Pushed it ou]:t'v iz]mi:nd ih[didn:'t appea:l to im=
12 N: [Ya:h,
13 E: → =°'e'ad suh[muh some° a'that stuff hits yuh pretty ha:rd=
14 N: [°Ye:ah,°
15 E: → ='n then °yuh thin:k well d'you wanna be,°
16 (0.7)
17 N: hhhhhh=
18 E: → =PA:RT of ut.

In extended fragments, in each case, the recipient's comment, simple or elaborate, is followed immediately by topical shift.

3.(1) [Expanded]

2 K: ˙hhhhh en I don't ↓think ↑Elva appreciates anything like
3 that<No:t thet she said anything b't (0.4) yih jis don't
4 pla:y bridge that wa[y Claire.]
5 C: → [No she wa]sn't saying anythi:ng too
6 *→ much was ↓she. ˙hhhhh I wz j's wondering if we had that
7 other table (0.2) in the dining room . . .

3.(2) [Expanded]

13 E: → some a'that stuff hits yuh pretty ha:rd'n then °yuh thin:k
15 well d'you wanna be,°
16 (0.7)
17 N: hhhhhh=
18 E: *→ =PA:RT of ut.w:Whuddiyuh ↑doin.
19 (0.9)
20 N: What'm I do[in?
21 E: [cleani:n[g?
22 N: [˙h˙h I'm ironing . . .

In Fragment 3.(1) the shift is moderate; i.e., from explication of a problem (too much talking while playing bridge) to a possible solution of the problem (separate the tables into different rooms). In Fragment 3.(2) the shift is drastic; i.e., from a discussion of a student's "misinterpretation" of a teacher's position, to an inquiry into a coparticipant's immediately current activities (which turns out to be an invitation-initial inquiry, see Fragment 1.(18) page 10, of which this fragment is the predecessor).

We start out, then, with a simple observation, that recipient commentary can precede topical shift. And, in line with our prior considerations of I. Recipient Acknowledgment Tokens and II. Recipient Assessments, we propose that III. Recipient Commentaries can be specifically deployed in order to disengage from a topic and prepare for topical shift. That is, with this form of talking-on-topic, a recipient can be departing from it. While experientially, perhaps, a far cry from "Yeah", it is 'essentially' doing the same work.

The device, Recipient Commentary → Topical Shift can be seen in the following series of fragments. The commentary may be simple or elaborate, the shift moderate or drastic, occurring immediately or somewhat at a distance from the commentary. We are not segregating the arrays on those factors.

3.(3) [Heritage:I:3:5-6]

```
1    L:        (eeEe) wasn't worried when ah broke my thumb twelve
2              month[s ago (en i[t's still broken).
3    I:             [·t         [°'e:h.°
4                     (0.8)
5    I:  →     °↓Oh really they are casual aren't they.°
6    L:        (Well he i[s.)
7    I: *→               [°Ye:h, Yeh,°[·hhh
8    L:                               [(                  )=
9    I: *→     =Uh: well look ·hh uh ahs[k Joe what sor- uh what time=
10  (L):                                [(°Okay°)
11   I:        =he'll be cz (see) I want tuh be he::re,
```

In this case we can note that although the shift does not occur until line 9, it may have been initiated and abandoned by reference to overlapping talk at line 7; i.e., initiated with the post-acknowledgment-token inbreath (see the consideration, pages 68ff).

3.(4) [W:PC:1:(1):39-40] ((re. whether a recently-orphaned woman will sell her family home))

```
 1   J:          she wz tolkin abou:t it yestihdee shed she use to sh'z if
 2               she cahn't settle't she mi:ght.
 3                    (0.3)
 4   M:          Ye:s[she mi::ght, ye:h=
 5   J:              [(     )
 6   M:  →       =·hh Well yih nevuh kno:w do yuh someti':s yi[h feel ez=
 7   J:                                                      [No:.
 8   M:  →       =if yih don't want tih stay'n the sa:me pla[:ce, ·hh=
 9   J:                                                    [(pla:ce.)
10   M:  →       =th'[t whear y'v been with yih pa:ren[ts: ·hh
11   J:              [Ye:s.                           [Ye:s.
12                     (.)
13   M:          Mm[:. ·hh
14   J: *→         [Buut uh:: anyway,
15                    (0.3)
16   M: *→       ·mptlk By the wa:y Janet did yih get my annyve:rs'ry
17               cah[r:d.
18   J:             [↑Oh[ye:[s thank you.
19   M:                 [·hh[We:ll
20   M:          Ih-iss alrah:ght.b't ah'd hha:te tuh think yih hahdn't
21               got i[t. ·hhh becuz, ah wasn't: s:shu::ah,h . . .
22   J:               [Ye:s,
```

In this case, following the recipient commentary, the speaker (J) produces a 'volition'-marked shift-initiation (line 14; cf. the consideration, pages 53-56). With it, she can be exhibiting concensus as to the sufficiency and terminability of her topic. However, the 'volition'-marked shift-initiation is constructed as an 'interruption-invitation', "Buut uh:: anyway, (0.3)" (see the consideration, pages 97-92). And one thing it could be 'inviting' is 'interruption' with an exhibit of 'topical interest' by the recipient, e.g., an Inquiry. It receives the appropriate 'interruption', but with a topical shift.

The following fragment was initially shown as an instance of Acknowledgment Token → Shift (see Fragment 1.(17) page 10), and was noted as an Nth instance of a problem faced by the neighborhood puppy-distributor; i.e., that her tellings are curtailed by requests for advice (see footnote 1, page 51). Given our considerations of Recipient Assessments, and now of Recipient Commentary, the recipient's talk, following her Inquiry (lines 1-2) may now be seen as totally shift-implicative (cf. the consideration of Fragment 2.(28) pages 97ff). That her responses are so structured leads us to wonder if the inquiry was produced in the first place by reference to the subsequently-occurring request for advice; i.e., as a way to arrive at it in an emergent fashion rather than be recognizable as having phoned with, and perhaps expressly for, a request.

3.(5) [Heritage:I:11:3]

```
1    N:          W'l ho:w a:re you eniweh How's: uh˙h have <Are: you- are
2                you ex:pecting┌any (          )?┐
3    I:                        └˙h Well I hope ┘so::=
4    N:  →    =[[┌°Oh. How e┐xci┌ting.°   ┐
5    I:          └u h : : m ┘   └u h : : ┘m: d-Lola wz mated um (0.3) oh
6                about three weeks ago:.
7    N:          hhOh:.┌(    )
8    I:                └A n d (.) Mitzie wz mated about two weeks ago┌:.
9    N:  →                                                           └£Oh
10               my goodness you do ah┌sk for i┐t,£
11   I:                               └eh-h e h┘
12   I:          ˙h he-Well˙h I a-always feel it's best t'ghet it all over
13               et┌th'same ↑ti:me y'┐neh,
14   N:  →         └Well  y e : : s .┘
15   N: *→        Ye:s.┌An-an'who┐didju go: to.
16   I:               └It's  uh:┘
17   I:          Well: I went to uhm:n u-Missi:z Boggs.
```

Several of the preceding fragments exhibit a feature which indicates that whereas for such devices as Acknowledgment → Shift, and Assessment → Shift, a speaker-in-progress can, on the occurrence of the shift-implicative component (i.e., the acknowledgment token or the assessment), orient to its shift-implicature and, e.g., comply or counter, the Commentary → Shift device may be orientationally problematic.

Specifically, andin contrast to a range of 'countering' devices, e.g., 'reciprocation → continuation' (pages 43-45), e.g., 'acknowledgment → continuation' (pages 62-64), e.g., 'disattention → continuation' (pages 65-67), speakers can be found recurrently to be 'replying to', producing topically-coherent next utterances for, recipient commentary.

So, for example, in Fragment 3.(2) at lines 7-10, to the initial commentary-component, "MAYBE 'E DIDN' ↑WANNA UNDERSTAND it," the speaker 'replies' with "˙t˙hhhh ↑Could ↑be:, (0.2) Who kno:ws yihknow,". In Fragment 3.(3) at lines 5-6, to the commentary "°↓Oh really they are casual aren't they", the speaker 'replies' with "(Well he is.)". And in Fragment 3.(5) at lines 9-16, to the commentary "£Oh my goodness you do ahsk for it,£" (the pound-sign [£] indicates a certain compression recurrently associated with 'suppressed laughter'), the speaker 'replies' at length (lines 12-13) and moves to continue but is overlapped by, and cuts off by reference to, the recipient's topical shift (lines 15-16).

The same feature can be found in Fragment 3.(6) below at lines 3-6, where, to the commentary "En yer doin real good arntche", the speaker 'replies' at length, the at-length reply cut into and then followed by the recipient's topical shift.

That is, in these fragments, a speaker is not 'managing' a close-implicative object, is not 'countering' an exhibit of 'topical disinterest', but is responding to an exhibit of topical commitment, of interest in the topic and the speaker. The speaker and recipient are in an 'exchange of on-topic talk', the speaker now producing a sequentially/topically appropriate next utterance. The recipient's subsequent topical shift may, therefore, come as something of a surprize.

3.(6) [NB:V:6]

```
1    P:          It's jus'stuff I haftuh do fer[° Ronny,°] [˙t˙hh
2    E:                                        [°Ye::ah.°]I[k n o w=
3    E:  →       =En y[er do]in real good ar[ntche.]
4    P:                [E : n]              [I : ' ]m jis: so delighted I c'n
5                do it E[mma cz]if: I didn'do it we'd haft[uh hire it]do:ne,
6    E: *→              [˙hhhhh]                          [W'l y'know]
7    E: *→       i-Yihknow it's funny uh:: uh Brad played et San Mar- av yih
8                gotta minute?
```

We note parenthetically a possible inbreath-initiated and abandoned first attempt at the topical shift (line 6 vis-a-vis line 5). The inbreath starts up fractionally post a first possible completion point, "I:'m jis:

so delighted I c'n do it E//". And the rise-fall intonation across do it" may contribute to the recognizability of completion at that point. The inbreath is prolonged across a next possible 'last word', "I c'n do it E//mma", where, while the upward intonation might project continuation, it might also be a constituent of the sing-song "delighted" intonation contour of the utterance-in-toto, of which the possible completion-intonation of "do it" has turned out to be such a constituent. It appears that the post-positioned conjunction, "cz", is unequivocally informative, and the inbreath is coterminous with that item (cf. the consideration of Fragment 1.(27) page 76).

In the following fragment, the topic-shifting recipient of Fragment 3.(6) may be seen to be producing an enormously elaborated version of the "En yer doin real good" commentary. (See Fragment 3.(7) below, lines 38-45) We show an extended course of talk in order to point out a possible point at which shift can have become relevant, and from which shift may be being worked toward.

Some dozen transcript-pages earlier in this conversation the two participants had been talking about a possible remedy for a nail fungus, used and highly recommended by a woman, Isabel, with whom one participant, Lottie, had spent a few days vacation in a resort town where Isabel lives. Lottie had then and there bought some, and has now relayed the recommendation on to her coparticipant, Emma.[1] This fragment picks up at a point in the conversation where the returned vacationer is describing one of the vacation days, a day spent shopping in town with her friend Isabel.

---

[1] Following is a collapsed version of the relevant data.

3.(7.a.) [NB:IV:10:33]

L: Yihknow Isabel had her nail taken off, like you hadjer
toenail taken off . . . 'hhh So anyway, she got this,
Vi:dafoam, en, I bought some down there . . . 'hh en she
said that was the only thing thet healed um . . . I payed
a dollar:: uh-eighdy three for it buth theh it might be a
li'l cheaper here.

3.(7) [NB:IV:10:45-47:r]

```
1    L:       we bou:ght s'm ha:ts et Wah-uh Wal:d-u-er Cla:rk's they had
2             uh those uh (0.2) fishing ha:[ts yihknow]         [u-
3    E:                                   [Mm:   hm:: ]those lid[dle
4             (b[adgers)]Yeh.]
5    L:         [do:llar]so I]: bou:ght one fer  he:r.
6    E:       Mm: hm:[:.
7    L:              [.t'hhh Oh en then tha:t (.) Esther Lau:der en: (.)
8        **   Bullock's ha:d u-a s:ale onnit e-uh: she uses tha:t< (0.2)
9             oi:ul.
10                    (.)
11   E:       'hhh Oh::.
12   L:       En it: ooh it's rea:l ni:ce so they hadda sale so 'hhh You
13            c'd git the ↑co:mpa:ct en s'm mo:re cree-ee- crea::m? (.)
14            en: u-en uh:nother: (.) t uh: lipstick,
15                    (.)
16   E:       fer fiv[e do]ll[ars.]( )-
17   L:              [f'r-]  [fer ]fi:ve do:llars.
18   E:       I ↑know ut. 'T's wh't somebuddy ↑tol'me.
19                    (.)
20   L:       Yeah they ha:ve (.) they have a s-eh ever once'n awhile
21            [they have a s]pecial °o:[nnit.°]
22   E:       [M m   h m : :?]          [M m  h]m:,
23                    (.)
24   L:  **   So::, en the:n: u-Isabel bou:ght some too:,=
25   E:       =°M[m hm°
26   L:          [en tha:t's:: bout the o- Oh: 'hh 'n then comin home I
27            bought: (.) they ha:d tangeri:nes ten pounds fer a do:llar
28            so I got te[:n pounds'n I]got s'm c'sa:ba=
29   E:                  [°Mm::::::::,°]
30   L:  **   ='n then I bought (.) ↓uh::: (0.3) uh Edna back a box a'
31            da:tes[cuz]
32   E:  →          [°Oh]:: ↓at's ni:[:ce↓°
33   L:                              [yihkno:w.
34                     (.)
35   L:      [[She-  ][sh'fed the ca:]:[t 'n]
36   E:  →   [[°Tha:]t's[↓nice Lottie↓°] [That]'s beautiful.
37                    (0.3)
38   E:  →     't'hhhhh Well[you hadda beautiful <now yuh feel like a noo=
39   L:                     [°(    )°
40   E:  →     =↓ga:l.'hh-[Yer ner:ves'v
41   L:                   [Mm:.
42                    (0.3)
43   E:  →     Yihknow there's so many other wunnerful people arou:ndju:
44             'hhhhh uh it's good tih get awa:y from:: yer fam'ly
45             sometimes you gn-c'n be yers:e:lf yih[know w't I ME]A:N?
46   L:                                             [Y e :  : a h .]
47   L:        Ye:a[h.
48   E:  *→        ['hhhh Uh gettin ba:ck tih this Viafor: foam Lottie is
49             'er nail alright no:w?
50                    (1.4)
51   L:        Her nai[:l?
52   E:               [A h :[hah?
53   L:                     [Ye:ah.
```

There may be a dual closure-operation in this case, the first involving the series of assessments (lines 32-36), the second, the elaborate commentary. The first attempt at closure may be locally generated; i.e., an attempt to close of an explanation that something brought back for this woman, Edna, was a reward for feeding the cat, with appreciation of the bringing back of a gift; where it may be relevant here that there has been no mention of something brought back for the current coparticipant.

A similar configuration is found in a similarly touchy context, in Fragment 2.(18) pages 52-53 at lines 7-12.

2.(18) [Detail]

```
7    B:        I jus'wanduh call somebody youknow en=
8    M:  →   =[[YA]:[ :   U   H .  ]
9    B:        [I ]  [I thaw well  ]ah'll sha:re that with Ma:rge
10             [she'll under]sta:nd, 'h[h
11   M:  →     [Y E A U H . ]          [YEAUH.
12                  (.)
13   B:       [[En I'm
14   M:       [[I think it's wonderful really en[I think it's: uh[:m:  ]=
15   B:                                         [But I          [just ]
16   M:        =End yer not g'nna lose a day's re:nt.
```

That is, the recipient has grounds to take it that she has been phoned as no more than an available "somebody", and the subsequent flurry of very loud acknowledgment tokens may be preserving that as the thrust of her coparticipant's talk, disattending the subsequent explanation, that she was specially selected for her capacity to "understand".

Other work indicates that a repeated response-type, as in Fragments 3.(7) and 2.(18), provides that the initial response is still adequate, that the subsequent materials are inadequate to revised response and simply require some turntaking-organizational work; i.e., that a response occur at completion of the utterance.

Thus, in Fragment 3.(7) the completion-positioned "That's beautiful" constitutes a recycle of the post-initial-component "Oh that's nice", and in Fragment 2.(18) the completion-positioned "YEAH" constitutes a recycle of the post-initial-component "YEAH"; the intervening talk in each case 'amounting to nothing'. Recipients exhibiting that they have been 'informed' by the intervening material produce a recognizably distinctive response-type.[1]

And in each of the two fragments, the possibly-offended recipient can be seen to be boundarying off the problematic interchange, in Fragment 3.(7) with a generalized summation, "°t°hhhhh Well you hadda beautiful <now yuh feel like a noo ↓ga:l . . ." (lines 38ff; i.e., the Recipient Commentary), and in Fragment 2.(18) with a return to recipiency-of-the-good-news, rather than recipiency of a report on the character of her selection; i.e., "End yer not g'nna lose a day's re:nt." (line 16).

The larger-scale closure operation in Fragment 2.(18) has already been considered (see pages 52-53). In Fragment 3.(7) the larger-scale closure operation may be in aid of a matter which is made even more imminent by the touchy interchange embedded in its course.

Our proposal that nothing was brought back from the trip for the current coparticipant is not fully accurate. Something was brought back; i.e., the relayed recommendation of a remedy. It may be no coincidence, then, that following the reference to Isabel's "use" of "that oil", (see lines 8-9 and 24), and of various thoughtfulnesses by the teller, early on in the report, to her friend Isabel (lines 1-5), subsequently to her friend Edna (note: the transcript-pseudonyms preserve the similarity between the name of the stay-behind who was brought something, Edna, and the stay-behind who was brought nothing -- except the recommended remedy, Emma), that the recipient finds herself with a renewed interest in the remedy used and recommen-

---

[1] G. Jefferson, "The Abominable 'Ne?': A Working Paper Exploring the Phenomenon of Post-Response Pursuit of Response", Manchester Occasional Paper No. 6, 1980/81, pages 31-35; also in *Dialogforschung*, 54:1980 pages 69-72.

and recommended by Isabel, the recommendation 'brought back' by the returning vacationer. That is, a renewed interest, beginning to glimmer early on in the fragment, may become irrisistably strong in the course of the touchy exchange about something brought back for "(.) uh::: (0.3) Edna" -- where at least one possible account of the hesitation and search is the very close ressemblance of the two problematically-related names (and cf. Fragment 1.(27.e.), in which the speaker uses the name of her recipient, "Lottie", and then replaces it with the name of the person who actually did the reported activity, "Marian" (lines 2-3). In this case, an utterly standard reportable is that Lottie caught a fish of some kind or another; i.e., the 'usual' report emerges although in this case it happens to be incorrect. In Fragment 3.(7), it may well be that there is some version of 'usualness' to such a report as "I brought Emma back (a gift of some kind)". If not something routinely done, it may be something one should do).

The following fragment was selected as just another instance of Recipient Commentary → Shift; in this case, a shift into conversation-Closings (line 24). However, so many of the prior fragments had a commentary followed by a shift to a matter of some concern to its introducer,[1] that we were led, simply as a matter of curiosity, to look beyond the shift. And in this case, as well, it turns out that a commentary (lines 13-17) is produced in aid of arriving at some topic of concern. Here, under the auspices of general Closings arrangements, the participant who had used a series of shift-implicative devices (see lines 2, 4, and 8) culminating in an elaborate commentary, procedes to introduce some rather critical unresolved details (lines 37-49).

---

[1] In Fragment 3.(2) an invitation to lunch is initiated. In Fragment 3.(3) a so-far uncompleted arrangement, which will be consequential for the introducer's activities, is re-initiated. In Fragment 3.(4) a telling of problems re. the sending of an anniversay card is initiated. In Fragment 3.(5) a request for advice, in Fragment 3.(6) a projectedly long telling for which the introducer specifically reserves some extended space. And in Fragment 3.(7), not only is the matter turned to with the topical shift the possibly beneficial remedy and now the possible invokation of a gift-surrogate, but it soon develops into an attempted 'troubles-telling' which has been pending for quite some time (see G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, SSRC Final Report, op. cit., pages 82-88.

3.(8) [TCI(b):16:87-89:r]

```
1    L:       Most of um sat'n wrote a: check right (0.2) yihknow.
2    J:       Y[e : : a h.]
3    L:        [at  th' pa[rt y.]
4    J:                   [W'l a]t's goo:d.
5    L:       Yeah.°°hmhh°°'t So:, en the ones theh: All the ones thet
6             did that were, the w:ones thet had th'liddle bit bigger:,
7             ('hhh) (0.2) purchases.
8    J:       Ye[:  :  a  ]h.=
9    L:         [Yihknow, ]
10   L:       =(       ).
11                   (.)
12   L:     [[One of]'m]
13   J:  →  [['hhhhh]Us]ually they do tha:t.En I've noticed thet the
14            ones thet have the bigger ones usually make'em out'n send
15            um er give'm to yih r[ight (then).]
16                                 [e Y e a h . ]
17   J:  →    'hhhhh I had the smaller ones t'haftih get. hhhhh huh
18            [huh]
19   L:       [Ye:]ah,=
20   J:       =k'hhhu::hhhh So::,
21                   (0.2)
22   J:       'ptch[[°(        it right?)=
23   L:            [[So 'hh-
24   J: *→    ='hhhuhh We:ll,[[  ['t Ah'll letche go::,=
25   L:                      [[Yea[h.
26   L:       =Yeh=
27   J:       =end ah::m 't'hhhh Uh::m ah'll talk tih Ja:ck.
          •         ((ca. 7 lines omitted))
          •
35   J:       The:n yihknow (.) uwi'll (.) yihknow,'p[maybe W]ednesdee,
36   L:                                              [Ye:ah, ]
37   J: *→    'hhh Uh::m:: (0.8) Didju wanna a:ll I men uh wz g'nna sa:y
38            d'you wunna get tihgether with my folks that night er dJu
39            wunna get with them:::
40                   (0.8)
41   L:       No[:, it's o-  ]
42   J:         [th' night   ](.) after that er sup'm e[r::
43   L:                                                [nNo I don't think
44            there's wi'll all git tihgether et the same ti[:me.
45   J:                                                     [Ye:ah.
46   J:       °O:ka[y.°
47   L:            [°Ya:h.°
48   J: *→    °So: I wz g'nna° say:.Uh:m. (0.2) 't'hhh You wanna go t'
49            their hou:se? er:. (.) come he:re? er you:rs? er . . .
```

Parenthetically, we note a very determined little inbreath with which the commentary is initiated. At lines 12-13, simultaneously the speaker introduces what looks to be the start of an instantial anecdote, "One of'm" and the recipient takes a breath. In contrast to the speech-onset-sensitive inbreaths considered at pages 70ff, the recipient's inbreath persists across the introductory words and is followed by her own introduction, "Usually", to which the prior speaker's utterance exhibits sensitivity and cuts off.

3.(8) [Detail]

11 L: [[One of]'m]
12 J: [.hhhhh]Us]ually they do tha:t. En I've noticed thet the
13 ones thet have the bigger ones . . .

A sensitivity of sorts by the recipient to the prior speaker may be exhibited in the subsequent talk about "ones"; i.e., there is topical concensus; both the abandoned and the ongoing being 'instantial'.

Likewise, the following fragment was selected as just another instance of a simple commentary, "So yuh busy at it again" (line 8) followed shortly by a topic shift, "Well I've been tuh to:wn" (lines 12/14).

In its immediate context, this latter utterance recommends itself as a bit of conversational fodder; i.e., something mentioned to keep the talk going rather than out of any particular concern to tell it.[1] And we note,

---

[1] Graham Button considers such objects in his paper "No-Close Closings", M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) op. cit. He points to reports solicited by 'topic initial elicitors', specifically at a point where the conversation is otherwise on a closing trajectory. Following is one of the fragments he considers.

3.(9.1.) [HG:15-16]

N: You'll come abou:t (.) eight.Right?=
H: =Yea::h,=
N: =Okay.
(0.2)
N: → Anything else to report,
(0.3)
H: → Uh:::::m:::, (0.4) getting my hair cut tihmorrow,

an overlapped segment, which looks to be much weighter, "rilly thez no↑thing in to:wn" (line 14) is effectively deleted by the overlapping and subsequent talk (see lines 13ff).[1]

3.(9) [Rahman:B:2:(14):6-7]

```
1    L:        ahn also they wa:nt eh:m (.) Neil Diamond, Bill listen'to it
2              heahr'n'e sid oh thaht's smashin,=
3    G:        =A[h  t h e y:[like [the Neil[ Diamond, ]
4    L:          ['n  ah  sai[d ah-[·hh     [ah'll tape]it[fohr you]
5    G:                                                   [Y e : s.]=
6    L:        =en John Denver they want doing.yih[know, ]
7    G:                                           [ehhhh]heh=
8    G:  →     =So yuh busy at it[again.]
9    L:                          [So: ah]'m busy at it agay:[n.yih[nuhhh
10   G:                                                     [·hhhh[hu:h·uh
11   L:        hu-·ehh[·hhh
12   G: *→            [Well I've been tuh to:wn but thez oh(h)h=
13   L:  →     =A[h : : : : ]ah wz hoping ah'd ca]tch: yuh=
14   G: *→       [rilly thez]no↑thing  i n  to:wn]
15   L:        =theh'd only jus'gah:n[yinknow](              )]·hh
16   G:                              [A h : :]what a sha:me. ]
17   L:        Ahn' ahthought well if (yerr out) yih c'n call on the way
18             u:p yihkno[:w,
19   G:                  [Mm::.
20                  (0.4)
21   G:        Well ah wasn't shoo whethuh they'd still be ↓theahr or not
22             [chiknow >en ah]thought[well ah< w]ouldn't pop in,
23   L:        [n : N o : : . ]       [ N  o  . ]
24   L:        Oh you ↓shoulda don[e. G w e n n y.]
25   G:                           [C'z I've got th]at li:br'y book fohr you
```

Again, then, we are noticing a simple commentary (line 8) followed by a topical shift (lines 12/14) which does not recommend itself as a matter to which there is any particular telling-commitment.

---

[1] The reference to having been in town is treated as a re-reference to the missed opportunity to get together with which the conversation began, and from which the talk to the point at which Fragment 3.(9) emerges is topically coherent.

3.(9.a.) [Rahman:B:2:(14):1]

```
L:         Hello:,
G:         Hello Lorna[:?
L:                    [He:llo Gwenny ev yih jus got[bahck
G:  →                                              [I jus got in: en
           [David]said thet chu'd called.]
L:  →      [A h :]I thought ah'd a caught]yuh ah thought you coulda
           called up fuh coffee.
G:         Oh:::. Hahv they'av yih visitiz gone then,
```

Again, however, so many of the prior fragments had a commentary followed by a shift to matter which their introducers could be seen to be proffering as more than merely passing mentions, that we began to inquire into the status of this one. Exploration of the subsequent talk yielded evidence of strong telling-commitment.

For one, at a next opportunity, specifically at the termination of talk generated by the 'mention' of the trip into town and the topically-tied reference to the return of a library book (see Fragment 3.(9) line 25) the topic is shifted (line 6 below) and the 'deleted' report-component; i.e., that "there's no↑thing in town" (see Fragment 3.(9) line 14) is re-introduced (line 12 below). The fragment picks up as arrangements re. returning the library books are being concluded.

3.(9.b.) [Rahman:B:2:(14):8-9]

```
1    L:         So- ah'll take them oll in,┌'n:d uh:m
2    G:                                    └Ye:s::.
3    G:         Mm,
4                    (0.3)
5    L:       [┌check'em
6    G: *→    [└I'm'nna do s'm spaghetti'n: (.) n-eh::m meatballs f'tea
7               fuh this lot now,
8    L:         Oh lovely.
9    G:  →      Cz they didn't have u they only had fish fingihs'n chips
10              fih dinnuh,
11   L:         °eeYes.°
12   G: *→      B't thez no↑thing in to:wn.=
13   G: *→      =Mahrks'n S┌pencihs shelves w'↑c l e a : u h.┐
14   L:  →                 └Well they wouldn'stay fer a meal. ┘.h Actually
15              theh w'suppose teh: . . .
```

Once again the 'mention' of the shopping trip is intersected and abandoned, with a return to talk about the coparticipants "visitors".(lines 13-15). This talk continues on for a few more transcript-pages. At the next topic shift, an accounting of the problematic shopping trip emerges (see lines 27-38) below.

3.(9.c.) [Rahman:B:2:(14):11-13:r]

L: Buut she said oh ah'v 'ahd th'm u u-two days'n ah'm prayin
f'th'm tih go:,
(.)
G: Aw:: d[e e u h] [°( )°
L: [So ah s]'d oh: well ah['m not the o:nly one
[then ah said ah]thought it wz ME A[:GE- she- su she-]
G: → [e h h h h e h] ['hh Yeh it's a sha]me
fih Vi:v: be[cuz she's got uhr hahnds f'll]d'n sh]e [really.]
L: [Y e h i h tis a shem fuh V]i v .]re]a::lly,]=
L: =Yeh,=
G: → =when they nau:ghty l[ike tha-'h]
L: [e e Yeah.]
(.)
G: → Yah 'h bec'z you'd a'thou:ght they'd'v grown out'v it by now
r[eally.
L: [Yes
(.)
L: [[Yes
G: → [[Th- Ah mean theh not ba:bies ahr they.
L: Theh not no:,
(.)
L: *→ 'h iY'[goin yih won't be]goin t'th'town tomorrow will you.
G: [°°N o : : : : .°°]
G: → 'h Well ah hahftih go ah:'m ah'v got s'm:: eh:: Liz en uhr
husb'n coming foh::(0.7)e s- uh s- ↓supper I[suppose 'hhhh]=
L: [Oh I: see.Yes.]
G: → =So e-theh wz[nut a thing.I: didn'know]wuh: ah wz jst gun to=
L: [So y'll be busy t'morrow]
G: =hahv a look round en see: what thehr wuss tuh buy b't
honestly. 'h theh wzn't a thing in Mahrks: 'h
L: A[h↓::]:::[[
G: [ahn:] [[Hint'ns wz clo:sed,
(.)
G: th'[cohrnuh wz c l o : s e d,]
L: [Yes ah know Hint'n wz clo:]sed[yeh,
G: ['hhh an'uh Frakety's don't
hahv ↓muuch in[thaht] [(line),
L: [°n:↓No]:[: (no they don't)°

In the first place, as with so many of the other instances of Recipient Commentary → Shift, the device which exhibits 'topical interest' to a strong degree, can be seen to be deployed in aid of closing down the topic in which it is exhibiting 'interest', and arriving at a topic of some moment for its introducer.

Secondly, the sense of the eventually-emerging report of the futile shopping trip as something which, over a span of talk, a participant has been attempting to deliver, gave us a basis upon which to come to terms with the talk out of which the telling emerges.

Fragment 3.(9.c.) was originally collected as a discrete instance of Recipient Commentary → Shift. As such, it was a puzzling case. Specifically, after a string of commentaries (see lines 7, 11, 14, and 19), it is not the recipient who initiates topical shift, but the prior speaker (see line 22).

Whereas such shift-implicative objects as Recipient Acknowledgment Tokens and Recipient Assessments have been proposed to be orientable-to as such by a speaker (see pages 34-36 and 53-56), Recipient Commentary has been proposed to be orientationally problematic, speakers recurrently hearing, and 'replying to' topical-talk-in-progress (see pages 109-110). Fragment 3.(9.c.) however, constitutes a perfectly good instance of a speaker orienting to the shift-implicature of recipient commentary by herself producing a topical shift.

Given that this is not a discrete instance but an Nth (and successful) in a series, we are led to wonder if, in this case, the recipient is using the shift-implicative device which is least obviously 'topically disinterested' in the topic which has successively overridden her own, while at the same time working to permit the speaker to orient to its shift-implicature.

Features of the commentary are amenable to such a proposal. We note that in contrast to, for example, Fragments 3.(2), 3.(4), 3.(7) and 3.(8) in which the commentary comrpises an elaborated statement (see lines 11-18, 6-10, 38-45, and 13-15 respectively), that of Fragment 3.(9.c.) comprises a *series* of commentaries; an initial elaborated statement, "'hh Yeh it's a shame fih Vi:v: becuz she's got uhr hahnds f'll d'n she really" (lines 7-8) plus a series of add-ons, "when they nau:ghty like tha-'h" (line 11), "Yah bec'z you'd a'thou:ght they'd'v grown out'v it by now really" (lines 14-15), and "Ah mean theh not ba:bies ahr they" (line 19).

We are noticing the progressive topical vacuity of the commentaries, in particular the final one (line 19) which is effectively not much more than a reiteration of the prior (lines 14-15). With such a configuration the recipient may be recognizably 'carrying on with an exhausted topic', for whatever reasons one might do that.

Further, the series of commentaries are designed to elicit agreement. As Pomerantz has noted, "agreements are termination devices." (see page 95). And the speaker duly provides a series of agreements (lines 10, 12, 16, 18, and 20). In effect, the speaker has become a shift-ready recipient of the recipient's shift-implicative commentaries.

At the point where the commentaries are becoming thoroughly vacuous; i.e., upon the occurrence of the reiteration (line 19 vis-a-vis lines 14-15), the speaker produces a strong agreement, "Theh not no:," (line 20) and after a momentary silence, initiates shift, "'h iY'goin yih won't be goin t'th'town tomorrow will you" (line 22).

We note in that regard that when the speaker does eventually initiate shift, there is an instance of the problematic 'virtually simultaneous' co-starting mentioned by reference to Fragment 2.(26.c.) in which a joketeller moves to continue the joketelling fractionally after a coparticipant has re-initiated laughter by reference to the prior joke-node, and Fragment 1.(24.d.2.) in which a doctor moves to continue a reassurance fractionally after his patient has initiated a 'passive recipiency' token (see pages 91-92).

2.(26.c.) [Detail]

```
7    C:         So:.
8                     (.)
9    L:  →      Oo[::p(h)s
10   C: *→        [They-
```

1.(24.d.2.) [Detail]

```
20   D:        y'll fine you've you fihgetful of things.
21                    (0.7)
22   P: →      °M┌mh.°
23   D: *→      └·hhhhhhh
```

A similar configuration occurs in Fragment 3.(9.c.).

3.(9.c.) [Detail]

```
20   L:        Theh not no:,
21                    (.)
22   L: →      ·h iY'┌goin yih won't be┐goin t'th'town tomorrow will you.
23   G: *→           └°°N o : : : : .°°┘
```

That is, fractionally post initiation of a shift, the recipient is 'still talking to the prior topic', with a post-agreement acknowledgment. Post-agreement acknowledgment occurs in general, and among these particular coparticipants (see Fragment 3.(9.c.4.) below).

3.(9.c.1.) [W:PC:1:(1):2]

```
1    M:        Yih do: ye┌:s,
2    J:                  └Yes,
```

3.(9.c.2.) [W:PC:1:(1):5]

```
1    M:        Ih tisn't.
2    J:        Neo::.
```

3.(9.c.3.) [Rahman:B:1:(11):4]

```
1    A:        Ye:s it doe┌:s.
2    G:                   └Ye:s.
```

3.(9.c.4.) [Rahman:I:4]

```
1    G:        Well I am rea:┌lly:┐
2    L:                      └°Ye:┘h,°
```

But features of Fragment 3.(9.c.) lead us to wonder if in that case the acknowledgment is a spurious exhibit of 'still talking on the topic' which is now, recognizably, being terminated by its speaker. For one, we note that the general run of post-agreement acknowledgments start up just after, if not before completion of the agreement; i.e., the fractionally next-started acknowledgment is also already fractionally delayed (see Fragment 3.(9.c.) line 21, cf. the immediate post-agreement acknowledgments in Fragments 3.(9.c.1.)-3.(9.c.4.)).

In the following fragment, a delayed bit of 'still on topic' talk is grossly delayed, and thereby transparent as a possible strategy. The talk here may be seen as a correlate of the 'spurious concensus' exhibited in Fragment 2.(22) page 55 lines 14-15, in which a 'volition'-marked shift follows a shift-initiation.

2.(22) [Detail]

```
14   W:          No. Well look uh[::
15   L:                          [But anyhow I- the minute I getta chance
```

In the following fragment we see a spurious exhibit of non-concensus; i.e., well into a post-assessment speaker shift (cf. pages 53-56ff) the recipient produces another 'response to' the prior matter. We note but do not show data to exhibit, that the 'still responding' recipient has been working toward the telling which ensues.(see line 17 below).

3.(9.c.5.) [NB:II:4:9:r]

```
1    E:          It's jis'kinda du:ll, Ghod whatta m:mizer'ble mizer'ble,
2    N:          'tch'hh
3    E:          w[eekend.]
4    N:  →        [Ah:::::]that's a sha:me.
5    E: *→       'hhhh Wul listen[I'll tellyuh what I]could do dear,
6    N:  →                       [D o : g g o : n e .]
7    E:          Uh if Brad goes t'the boat'e could drop me off et the
8                trailer.
9    N:          'hhh Hey now that's en idea,
10                    (1.0)
11   E:          A:nd uh I jis'm not gonna walk around a lot[becuz uh,
12   N:                                                     [n:No::.
13   E:          Ah::, (0.2) it's not worth it to be on my fee:t.you[know
14   N:                                                             [Ye:ah.
15   N:          Ri:ght. (.) Ah hah?
16                    (0.2)
17   N: *→       'hhhh Oh I was just ou:t wa:shing window:ss:

                 ((N eventually arrives at the announcement that she met a
                 "very,h very, n:ni:ce gu:y" the night before.))
```

That is, having worked toward topic shift, and now seeing that topic shift is occurring, a recipient produces one final display of commitment to the no-longer extant topic. What is transparently the case above, may be occurring at a fine-grained level in Fragment 3.(9.c.).

It may be not altogether fortuitous that the materials introduced at the point of topical shift provide so nicely for the N-attempted telling to emerge. The conversation has gone on for awhile (some 12 transcript-pages) and a current topic is recognizably 'exhausted'. Conversations which have gone on for awhile may systematically have Closings as a relevant next event upon termination of this current topic. And one massively recurrent Close-associated business is Arrangements, establishing when the participants will have their next conversation.

It is possible, then, that upon the close of this current topic, Closings, with its associated Arrangements, will be due. As noted, the recipient is recognizably 'talking to an exhausted topic'. One account of such an activity, at such a point in the conversation, might be that she has nothing further to add, her own topical materials having been exhausted in the earlier talk, but she is not taking it upon herself to initiate Closings. Thus, the prior speaker may/should do so. And in this case she does so with an inquiry into her coparticipant's plans for tomorrow.

That is, it is possible that the participant whose several attempts to introduce a topic have been intersected by, and abandoned by reference to, a return by the coparticipant to her own topic, now manages the talk such that not only does the coparticipant well and truly terminate her own topic, but provides for emergence of the N-attempted topic.

The strategic possibilities of recognizably 'still talking on an exhausted topic' may be exploited in another way in the following fragment, which picks up as talk about a 'trouble' is coming to a close. We note that in rapid succession, first, reference to a prior topic is made (line 7); that topic comprising some good news which its teller had phoned to deliver. Second, a report of a bridge party attended by the call-recipient is produced (lines 18ff).

3.(10) [SBL:1:1:12:14-15:r]

```
1    M:        en Maybelle didn't say who it was b't I knew sh'wz on a
2              terminal°ca:se.°
3    B:        Ye:a[:h.
4    M:            [·hhhh
5    B:        °hOh  wul°
6                   (0.4)
7    M: *→     ·hh·t·hhh Wul[↑Beauh  I'm dul:]:↑ighted abou:t cher ho[u:se.
8    B:                     [That's too ba:d,]                       [·hhh
9    B:        Whell, yihknow I wz so thri:lled with it? it jus seems t'me
10             thet eh: ·hhh (0.2) °uhm°
11                  (.)
12   M:  →     Well yer holdin the ri:ght thou:ght.
13   B:        =Ya:h? (.) Yeh- Oh definitely. I js knew it would be, yih
14             know,
15   M:        Mm-hm[:?
16   B:             [·hhhh °And uh:°·t·k·hhhh (.) °u-°
17                  (0.3)
18   M: *→     ·tlk>Sa[y yih]know something< ah played bridge t'day'n ah-aa-
19   B:               [(   )]
20   M:        I wz et th'home en awf'lly nice party down on: uh: La Marina:.
21                  (0.4)
22   M:        La M'rina.
23                  (0.2)
24   B:      [[Yeah.
25   M:      [[°(          )-° ·hhh (.) An ah won low  po:t.hh
26   B:        W'l ↑go[o : :↓: : : : : d .]
27   M:               [ehh hehh hhahh W(h)'l]ah(h)'ll tell y'something ah
28             n:::↑never had such lousy cards . . .
```

In the attached paper, "On 'Stepwise Transition' from Talk about a 'Trouble' to Inappropriately Next-Positioned Matters", a distinction is reported as between materials properly introduced following talk about a trouble, and materials inappropriate for such placement. It is noticed that the latter occur at a bit of a distance from talk about a trouble and can be characterized as having been 'distanced', with materials produced specifically to intervene between the talk about a trouble and the inappropriately next-positioned matter.

In Fragment 3.(10) the post-troubles-talk reference to a prior topic is consistent with procedures described for producing appropriately next-positioned talk. For one, it is highly 'other-attentive' and affiliative, "Wul ↑Beauh I'm dul::↑lighted abou:t cher hou:se." The new topic, which is introduced, not post-troubles-talk but post the reference to the good news, is precisely of the type identified as inappropriately produced immediately following talk about a trouble; i.e., the 'self-attentive' report of a non-special event, ">Say yihknow something<ah played bridge t'day".

In sheer sequential terms, then, the re-reference to the good news is amenable to characterization as a transition between talk about a trouble and an intended new topic which is not appropriately introduced immediately following the troubles-talk.[1]

And features of the re-reference and the talk which follows tend to support such a characterization. For one, the re-reference is done with an object which is close-implicative and topically 'disinterested'; i.e., something akin to an assessment, the assertion of "delight". There are other ways to re-refer to a topic, for example, the device used in Fragment 3.(7) page 112, an announcement of return-to-topic followed by an inquiry, "·hhhh Uh gettin ba:ck tih this Viafor: foam Lottie is'er nail alright no:w?"

And while the coparticipant treats the assessment-like object as inviting further talk; i.e., producing a reciprocal expression of delight and initiating further topical talk (cf. Fragments 2.(13.a.) and 2.(13.b.)

---

1. In the attached paper is a consideration of a fragment in which it is proposed that an inappropriate next topic was occasioned in the course of talk about a trouble, and then actually produced at a distance, in a more appropriate environment (see pages 16-36). The same is conceivably the case here. Whereas in the materials considered in the paper there is some internal support for the proposal of an occasioned topic, in this case there is none. Strictly speculatively, then, it is possible that Maybelle's Terminal Case was a topic of conversation at today's bridge party. If that is so, then the report of the bridge party may not be a bolt out of the blue, but can have been occasioned by the reporting in this conversation of a topic which figured in that prior conversation; i.e., the current reference to Maybelle's Terminal case 'bringing to mind' the circumstances of a recently prior reference to that topic.

pages 44-45, it appears that this return to her good news has caught her unprepared to deliver (for one, she has just been engaged as a recipient of the prior talk about a trouble; indeed, has intersected the topic-shift-initiatory "˙hh˙t˙*hhh* Wul//*Beau*h I'm dul:" (line 7), with a farewell display of commitment, "That's *too* ba:d"(line 8; cf. Fragment 3.(9.c.5.) lines 5-6). Specifically, following the reciprocal expression of delight, her talk begins to falter, "˙hhh *W*hell, yih*kn*ow *I* wz so thri*:*lled with *it*? it *j*us *s*eems t'*me* thet eh: ˙hhh (0.2) °Uhm°" (lines 9-10).

The faltering is followed by a Recipient Commentary, "*We*ll yer hold*in* the ri*:*ght *thou*:ght" (line 12);[1] i.e., the party who has just returned to the topic, but has done so with a close-implicative object, now produces another close-implicative object, and does so prior to completion of the teller-elect's utterance.

While the 'teller' confirms this proposal (lines 13-14) and again initiates further talk, the 'recipient' exhibiting passive recipiency with an "Mm-hm*:*?" (line 15), the further talk falters again, "˙hhhh °And uh:° ˙t˙k˙hhhh (.) °ụ-° (0.3)" (see lines 16-17).

In this case, then, while the 'recipient' may be contributing to the topical non-development of the re-reference (with the close-implicative utterances and with the display of 'passive recipiency' -- for this latter as a topically strategic device, see Fragments 1.(23.a.) and 1.(23.b.) pages 18-20, and see also Fragment 1.(24.d.2.) page 28 lines 20-25), it is the 'teller' whose talk unequivocally exhibits that, talking on this topic at this point in the conversation, they are 'still talking on an exhausted topic.' Her talk, in toto, has consisted in responses to her 'recipient's (close-implicative) utterances followed by faltering attempts to produce independent topical talk.[1]

---

[1] These participants talk in terms of 'mind over matter' procedures, where thinking properly about something can influence its outcome. Thus, "You're holding the right thought" is akin to, e.g., "You've been doing the right thing."

And with the 'teller's exhibit of topical exhaustion as a warrant, the 'recipient' procedes to introduce fresh topical materials (line 18).

In the foregoing array, Recipient Commentary emerges as a device akin to Acknowledgment Tokens and Assessments; i.e., as deployed by a recipient in pursuit of topical shift. And, as with the two prior-considered devices, tellers produce activities which can be seen to be countering its close-implicature.

The following fragment, which is considered in detail in the attached paper (pages 16-36), served as the Minerva instance of the close-implicative work of Recipient Commentary. Although the Acknowledgment Tokens and Assessments had been intuitively obvious as close-implicative, and collections of each had been assembled, Recipient Commentary was not. It was out of intense single-instance analysis that this device came to light, whereupon a data search was undertaken and a collection assembled.

---

[1] It should be noted that 'unpreparedness' to deliver at this point does not mean that the topic has been exhausted. Some 18 transcript-pages later, the faltering 'teller' of this fragment announces that she has come up with "what I started to tell you".

3.(10.a.) [SBL:1:1:12:28-30:Condensed]

M: I think what difference does it make [really, but
B: [No::
(0.3)
B: None. N-uhm (2.0) Oh I know what I started to tell you, uhm
(0.3) one (0.3) reason I knew that this uh that I would get
a- tenant without any trouble . . . you know uh Minerva
Koening . . . well every once in awhile she calls me, and
she'll call me and- tell me uh ask me to (0.3) put a name
or two on my prayer list. And so she called one day and was
talking, and so she said oh Bea she said, uh will you uhm
in your prayers remember our son, and daughter in law . . .
they've just moved someplace and they'll be looking for a
house . . . And so I have, and I've been thinking about
that couple . . . and uhm, uh, praying you know that they
find, that they'll be guided and find just the right one,
and all at once uh just a day or two ago, it just struck me,
I thought well doggone. This is doing something for my
situation too . . . And uhm I thought why it'll it's already
done.

3.(11) [Rahman:I:4]

```
1   G:       So: ah euh yihknow ez ah say I didn'get t[ih typing,]
2   L:  →                                             [Oh:::: yer]well
3            tie:d dow:n ah'nt[chu.
4   G:  →                     [Well I am rea:[lly:]°Yah,°
5   L:                                       [°Ye:]h,°
6   G: *→    Ye:s yihknow[c'zee do]esn'ee ↑hates being in un iz ow:n...
7   L:                   [°Yea:h° ]
```

The topical shift we take to be implicated by the commentary in this case (lines 2-3) is considered in the attached paper. The teller's counter consists in a 'reply' to the commentary; i.e., treating it as 'an exhibit of topical commitment', etc., see page 110. However, that she is oriented to its shift-implicativeness may be seen in her subsequent talk; i.e., she herself produces an Acknowledgment → Shift which moves her well back into the topic (line 6).[1]

The data search generated by this fragment yielded a range of instances, including those shown above, and the following instances in which a teller appears to be countering the close-implicature of Recipient Commentary, rather than (mis)understanding it as exhibiting commitment to the topic. So, for example, the Acknowledgment → Shift device seen in the above fragment, also is used in the following two fragments.

---

[1] A section of this fragment is shown as Fragment 0.(3); i.e., as one of the cases which drew our attention to a possible phenomenon in its own right, the 'multiple acknowledgment tokens,' which we failed to develop as such, our proposal being that 'multiple acknowledgment tokens' is not a phenomenon but a byproduct of serial single actions. And analysis of this fragment accounts for the two latter tokens; the first (line 6), as mentioned, a new move, the initiation of Acknowledgment → Shift. The second (line 7) appears to be a counter-move by the recipient, proposing that the prior "Ye:s yihknow" is an adequate complete utterance, a free-standing next token (plus response-elicitor) and not the start of an at-length continuation on topic.

3.(12) [NB:II:2:11-12:r]

```
1    N:        a:n it's too bad thet they hadn:'t stuck it out yihknow so
2              thet they c'd ˙hhhh glean from it what I felt thet I ha:d.
3              h[˙hhhhh
4    E:         [°Mm hm,°
5    N:        A:nd uhm (0.9) ˙tch so afterwards over et Shakey's: uh
6              (0.2) they were talking about how intresting it was thet I
7              hed brought this up (.) yihknow, ˙hhhh an: one of the kids
8              hed written ˙hhhh uh:: (0.3) I think you deserve two A's
9              becuz it must'v been twice ez har:d fer you: to: (.) ah:
10             ˙hhh remain in this cla:ss=
11   N:        =uhhhh[h°hu h]u hu°] ˙hhh]
12   E:              [↓O h:  ]↑ rea](h)l[ly?
13   N:                                 [ee-eeYa-ah˙hh[h
14   E:                                               [°I be° d[amn
15   N:                                                        [A::nd ah
16                   (.)
17   N:       [[So  a n y w]
18   E:  →    [[You made   s]'m new FRIE::[nds,
19   N: *→                                [˙hh Ya:h, (.) So: this kid said
20             well: this one blond fella (0.2) thet wz ah,h˙hh in the
21             class en he wz et least my age, (.) I'm su:re, (.) maybe
22             (.) y'know 'roun my age, ˙hhhhhh en he wz there about
23             three weeks:, a:nd ah (0.2) he w'ss: very quiet.
24   E:  →     °M[m mm°
25   N:          [th'whole when th'when 'e was there right't the beginning
26             a'the cla:ss . . .
```

In the above fragment, and in the following (a different conversation between the same two participants) after what we propose to be an attempt to close down a telling, and a teller's countering of that attempt, the coparticipant subsides into 'passive recipiency' with "Mm hm" (line 24 above, line 13 below).

3.(13) [NB:II:4:19:r]

```
1    N:        ˙hhh so he said I: (.) y'know won't be able tih cahll you
2              'ntil th'first th'wee:k'n: I sed wu:h- hhyhhou (d)o(h)n't
3              (0.4) £I: didn'rilly know what tuh say: I wz so flustered,
4              hhh[hhhhhh]↑HA:]H[˙a h]˙hhhhhhhhhhh]       [(y'know)
5    E:  →        [°Oh::°]well] [guud]I:'m gladje f]ou:nd[somebuddy y'gn
6    N: *→     Ye:ah.
7    E:  →     go out e[n have[fun with<]   [˙snff            [mgh-mgh]
8    E: *→             [S O: a[s  I  s a]:y[nothin:g ma:y[come of]it bu:t
9              u-he wz jst a(ɣ) a ri:l ri:l ni:ce:: fellow en I'm sure
10             thet (.) if I: did have a-˙hhh chance'r if'e does ca:ll:
11             ah (0.2) en since he made it such a pointed effort tuh:
12             get my number he probably wi:ll,˙hhh[hhh
13   E:  →                                         [°Mm:[hm:°]
14   N:                                                  [ah::](.) It's
15             jist a sha:me thet uh he's jis so far awa:y.
```

In the following fragment a teller 'answers to' a commentary with "Well..." (line 46); i.e., treats it as topic-progressive. These materials pick up a few lines from the end of Fragment 2.(28.c.) page 102, in which the proposed project is a short call.[1]

3.(14) [SBL:IV:6:10-12]

```
1     A:        By the way I ↓loved yer Christmas card,
                •
                •     ((ca. 23 lines omitted))
                •
25    A:        I didn't see any thet look ez nice (        ) but maybe you
26              went, someplace like O:tts'r someplace.
27                    (0.7)
28    M:        No.I got mine at uh::. (0.9) ˙tch uh::: Scott's
                •
                •     ((ca. 8 lines omitted))
                •
37    M:        But I: looked over quite a few places.
38    A:        (      [   )
39    M:               [before I get-ah:: go:t them.
40    A:        I still have all th'z cards got about a hundred f[ifty two=
41    M:                                                         [ehh!˙hh
42    A:        =hundred[of'em.
43    M:  →             [tuh send ou::t.
44    A:        ↑Ye:::[:s.[I  deci]de[d             [˙hhh
45    M:  →           [˙hh[Boy w'l]  [you have      ['m early fer next year the:n.
46    A: *→     Well I stardid addre::sing'em see,
47    M:  →     eYe:ah.
48    A:        ˙hh a:nd um, mghh:m these- I continued fr'm last year . . .
```

In this case, following the teller's countering of the close-implicative commentary, the recipient produces a "Yeah" (line 47). By contrast to her prior talk it may constitute a 'subsidance', but it may preserve the shift-readiness considered in Section I.

We note that in this call, "Yeah" is the massively-used response token. This recipient does, very sparingly, use "Mm hm" and "Uh huh", and/but those occur in a particular and special context; in the course of two

---

[1] Among the close-promotive objects used by the recipient is a 'collaborative completion' (line 43) which is followed by teller acknowledgement (line 44) and the recipient's commentary (line 45). This may be the configuration projected in the relatively successful short call of Fragment 2.(28) page 97 lines 8-9; i.e., following the recipient's completion of the teller's utterance, the teller would acknowledge, and in that case, the recipient would produce an assessment (e.g., "Well that's good dear"). In that fragment a 'tracking error' defeats the attempt.

'troubles-tellings' by the coparticipant.[1]

In the following two fragments a teller does not acknowledge a commentary, as in Fragments 3.(11)-3.(13), or 'reply to' it as in 3.(14), but simply continues on (cf. Fragments 2.(25.a.)-2.(25.d.) pages 66-67). In the first of the two, the recipient subsides into 'passive recipiency' with "Mm hm" (line 14). In the second, we will see a stronger post-continuation display of recipiency, an Inquiry followed by 'passive recipiency'.

In the first of the two fragments, the procedure of 'continuation' is used, first on assessments and then on commentary.

3.(15) [NB:V:10-11]

```
1    P:       So: Ronny is the L.A. gu:y. fer tha[:t.
2    E:  →                                       [°That's fanthhas[tic.°
3    P: *→                                                        [En then
4             the: Chamber'v Commerce down there.
5                    (.)
6    P:     [[conta:cted im.
7    E:  →  [[Isn'that fantastic.
8    P:       ·hhhhh[hhh
9    E:  →          [We:ll,(.) [[ [He ca]n't]miss.
10   P: *→                     [[S[o :  , ]uh, ]
11   P: *→    Th[at's uh,  ]
12   E:  →      [You both]can't miss.=
13   P: *→    =That's a di:fferent dea:l en so he's on,(.)fer the:m.too:.
14   E:  →    M[m hm,
15   P:        [·hhhhh En then'e has uh: (.) this uh Harvard Pa:rk . . .
```

In the consideration of Fragment 2.(28) pages 97ff, we noted an eventual arrival at 'concensus' (see pages 102-103), with a simultaneous entry into Closings. A similar occurrence may be seen in the above fragment.

---

1. Given the sort of responses which massively occur in, and may be appropriate to 'troubles-tellings' in ordinary conversation, "Mm hm" and "Uh huh" are characterizably 'unforthcoming'. See, e.g., Jefferson and Lee, SSRC Progress Report and Final Report, op. cit., and Jefferson and Lee, "The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a 'Troubles-Telling' and a 'Service Encounter', op. cit. It appears that these tokens are appropriate in the professional 'service encounter' (see pages 23-31 above) but problematic in the context of a lay 'troubles-telling'. Recall that this is the "outrageous" troubles-recipient mentioned in footnote 1 for page 102.

After a series of assessments and commentaries countered by 'continuation', the teller produces a heavily 'completion-intoned' possibly complete utterance, "...so he's on,(.)fer the:m.too:." (the strong rise→fall contour on the last two words indicated by the underscored letters and non-underscored colons). The recipient nevertheless, now produces a 'passive recipiency' token as, almost simultaneously, the teller initiates continuation (see lines 13-15).[1]

In the following fragment, a recipient opting for closure, met with continuation, exhibits a strong return to recipiency with, first an inquiry (line 8), and then a token of 'passive recipiency' (line 15).

3.(16) [NB:IV:14:19-20:r]

```
1   L:        Mondee'n Tuesdee ah wz up there with Ea:[rl getting=
2   E:                                                [°(Yah)°
3   L:        =evrything straight'n yihkno:w'n·hh[hh              [·hhh-
4   E:  →                                        [We:ll:: work thi[s thing
5             out you two Go[d let's go through life·hhhhh]
6   L: *→                   [So-                          ][So I:'m goin
7             u:p uh:·hhh Mondee too:, an: uh:
8   E:  →     °u:::° u-Ho[w long'z]ᵀe gunnuh be gah:n.
9   L:                   [Yihknow<]
10  L:        ·hhhh God I don'know: he doesn'know either I mean·hh if ih-
11            ul uh we talk'tuh Doctor Wil:son nyihknow this: s-do:ct-(.)
12            yihknow fr'm: uh Glenda:le?
13                   (0.2)
14  L:        <Th's friend'v ar:s?=
15  M:  →     =°Mm h[m°
16  L:              [He's a big s:- u-one a'th'biggest surgeons there . . .
```

Further, it can be noted that the recipient's response to the teller's continuation is especially topically 'friendly' in that it occurs as the teller is faltering, "an: uh:" (line 7), where an alternative use of teller-faltering has been seen in Fragment 3.(10), in which a teller's faltering is followed by a recipient's introducing an altogether new matter (see lines 16-18, page 126).

---

[1] Given the prior considerations of inbreaths (pages 70-86), and of fractionally non-simultaneous co-startings (pages 91-92 and 122-125) we might wonder if the teller's continuation is sensitive to her co-participant's subsidance into 'passive recipiency. And in that regard, lines 7-12 may constitute a fine-grained negotiation.

At this pivotal point in the interchange we note the possibility of a fine-grained misapprehension by the teller. The teller's utterance having faltered, "an: uh:", the recipient makes a soft speech-onset noise "°u:::°" and then produces a lexical, "How...". The teller intersects the recipient's lexical onset with talk continuous of her own prior talk; i.e., with "Yihknow", and terminates it abruptly as the recipient's inquiry emerges (the left carat [<] indicating abrupt cessation).

3.(16) [Detail]

6-7 L: So I:'m goin u:p uh:'hhh Mondee too:, an: uh:
8 E: °u:::° u-Ho[w long'z]'e gunnuh be gah:n.
9 L: [Yihknow<]

It is possible that the teller's continuation is sensitive to the onset of the recipient's talk. Specifically although only the first sound of "Ho//w" has been produced, it may recognizably stand in contrast to an alternative object which occurs post a falter, "Mm hm". For example:

3.(16.a.) [NB:II:3:5:r]

1 L: Yeah that's what- the only trouble you can't work tha:t
2 uh::[::
3 E: [Mm:hm,

3.(16.b.) [NB:III:3:8]

1 E: Uh-I wz so s'prized I thought it wzhyou en ee- a:nd uh=
2 B: =Mmhm.

3.(16.c.) [NB:IV:4:2]

1 E: 'hh he says well how c'dju do it- uh[::
2 L: [Mm hm,

That is, in Fragment 3.(16) what the teller may be hearing and countering is that the recipient is not exhibiting 'passive recipiency' but 'speakership'. When it emerges that the 'speakership' is active, 'topically interested' recipiency; i.e., an inquiry, the countering 'continuation' is abruptly stopped.

The following fragment combines features of Fragment 3.(14), speaker opting to 'reply to' a commentary (lines 11-13 below; cf. 3.(14) lines 45-46) and Fragment 3.(16), recipient actively contributing to the life of the topic with an inquiry and thereafter subsiding into 'passive recipiency' for the at-length talk the inquiry can have generated and the display of passive recipiency can invite (lines 15-19 below; cf. 3.(16) lines 8-16).

Having mentioned a possible speaker-'misapprehension' in Fragment 3.(16), we note possible recipient-'misapprehensions' in 3.(16) and 3.(17) which may partially account for the recipients' post-continuation strong display of recipiency; i.e., in each case the close-implicative commentary follows some strongly close-implicative talk by the speaker; in 3.(16), "So aa-uh overa:ll..." (line 10), in 3.(17) "getting evrything straight..." (lines 1-3; cf. Fragment 1.(27) the 'imminent shift' post "ez soon ez I: c'n get kinda straightened ou://t", lines 1-3 page 71, see the consideration pages 73-74).

3.(17) [SBL:2:1:4:2-3:r]

```
1    F:       But that wz the only big money thet I wo:n.
2    B:       °M-hm.°
3    F:       <A:nd uh: I didn't'hh (.) I didn't (.) lo::se (0.3) very
4             much a'the money.
5    B:       °M-hm°
6    F:       Uh:[: it-
7    B:          [W'thet's goo:[d.
8    F:                        [paid some a'my expenses.'h[hh
9    B:                                                   [°Ye:ah.°
10   F:       So aa-uh overa:ll I think thet [we a:ll had a ]
11   B:  →                                   [It sounds like] a goo:d tri:p.
12                  (0.7)
13   F: *→    't Well it (.) it (.) the weather was suhpe:rb?'hhh a:nd uh
14            we drove around the la:ke[uh:
15   B:  →                             [Didju have'ny fall cul-coloring up
16            the:re?=
17   F:       ='hh u: u-Lots'v a:spens.
18   B:  →    Mm hm,
19   F:       A:nd the yella a:spen wz suhper- b't yihknow those tree:s
20            'hhhh uh they look so clea:n . . .
```

Again, the inquiry which follows the post-commentary continuation may be seen to be especially topically 'friendly' in that, having opted to continue, the teller appears to be casting about for tellables. She produces one, and as it nears sentential completion, produces a stretch which might be an 'emphasizing' device, but can also be starting the ensuing search for a next tellable (the search also constituting an 'interruption invitation'); i.e., "the weather was suhpe:rb? ˙hhh a:nd uh". She produces another, which also goes into stretch as it nears sentential completion. And in this case the ensuing search-token is overlapped by the recipient's inquiry, "we drove around the la:ke//uh:" (lines 13-15).

Further, the two 'continuation-items' have the feel of 'conversational fodder' (cf. "Well I've been to town", Fragment 3.(9) page 118 line 12, and the recipient-elicited "Uh::::::m::, (0.4) getting my hair cut tomorrow", Fragment 3.(9.1.) page 117).

The recipient's inquiry, then, may be seen to be combinedly warranting the speaker's post-commentary continuation in the first place, and warranting the introduction of these topically 'unpromising' items (their introduction in this particular topic-directional context perhaps particularly problematic), indeed reviving them as they are potentially fading out. Specifically, the inquiry warrants continuation with such 'weak' items by itself providing for their elaboration, which the subsequent passive-recipiency token 'settles down' to attend (see lines 14-19, and note the bit of 'dysfluency' which may indicate some hasty mobilization, "Didju have'ny fall cul-coloring"; see the consideration pages 59-60 and im passim, e.g., pages 80 and 86).

Now we have come to a problem in our consideration of this fragment. We initially took it that a speaker is 'countering' an obviously close-implicative commentary (and duly included it in this array). And there is a range of details which provide for the commentary's obvious status as close-implicative. For example, we note that while the recipient has been producing passive-recipiency tokens (lines 2 and 5), as the speaker starts to falter, "Uh://:" (line 6), the recipient produces an assessment (line 7). That is, the recipient may be characterized as finding and exploiting an opportunity, or accepting an invitation, to begin closure procedings. And as the speaker intersects the assessment with continuation (i.e., counters the exploitation or exhibits the misapprehension of 'invitation'), the recipient subsides. But not altogether; i.e., she produces, not another "Mm hm", but a "Yeah" (lines 8-9). The recipient, then, may be recognizably oriented to upcoming topic closure.

And the gross positioning of the commentary; i.e., post a close-implicative component, "So aa-uh overa:ll" → "It sounds like a goo:d tri:p" (lines 10-11) recommends itself as an uptake-and-progression of close-implicature, a version of the close-implicative 'collaborative completions' seen in Fragment 2.(28) page 97 lines 8-9 (see the consideration pages 98ff) and Fragment 3.(14) page 132 lines 41-43 (see footnote 1 page 132). And indeed, such may be the design of the commentary.

However, another feature of the commentary's positioning might provide for ambiguity and perhaps weight it toward recognizable continuation-implicature. While it follows a close-implicative component, it also intersects a close-implicative utterance-in-progress. This latter feature may recommend itself as an attempt to counter, to head off, impending topical closure.

And the substantial post-commentary silence might in part be occupied by the speaker's attempting to work out the problematic positioning; where the fact that across that substantial silence the recipient is not producing the possibly-projected topical shift, may progressively across the silence weight more strongly towards recognizable continuation-implicature. The speaker, then, may find that further topical talk has been elicited by the recipient, whereupon she complies with the series of 'weak' items (cf. Fragment 3.(9.1.) page 117).

At this point, then, we are wondering if perhaps we ought to have included this fragment in the earlier array in which speakers are claimed to be 'misapprehending' a commentary rather than, as in the current array, to be 'countering' it.

Our difficulty with this fragment raises a touchy and unresolved analytic issue turning on the distinction we are making as between speaker 'misapprehension' and speaker 'countering' of a commentary (see pages 109-110 and 129-130ff respectively). Such a distinction is enormously methodologically troublesome in that, at least at the moment, it is essentially impressionistic and subjective, and appears to be trying to deal with speakers' psychological states. However, we take it that 'misapprehension' and 'countering' are social activities, and thus that what we are now glimpsing impressionistically/subjectively may eventually be technically characterized. A small start on such a technical working out can be seen in the prior consideration of a problematic commentary.

And we can at least note that our difficulties and workings-out appear to be shared by the coparticipants; i.e., not only may the speaker be seen to be 'trying to come to terms with a commentary's problematic implicature', but the recipient, in her subsequent talk, may be redressing the problem generated by her designedly close-implicative 'collaborative completion', by now producing especially topically 'friendly' talk; i.e., by exhibiting 'interest' in, and providing for elaboration of, the very 'weak' items proferred by her coparticipant, perhaps recognizably in response to the problematically-positioned commentary.

The fragment we turn to for our final consideration has a similar configuration to that of Fragments 3.(16) and 3.(17); a recipient opts for topical closure with assessments and commentary, a teller counters with continuation, whereupon the recipient relinquishes pursuit of closure with, first an inquiry, and then a passive-recipiency token (lines 40-59 below).

The fragment picks up in the course of a telling which has been going on for some five transcript-pages (see Fragment 3.(9.c.5.) page 124 for the lead-in), of an encounter with a "very,h very, n:ni:ce gu:y."

3.(18) [NB:II:4:14-16:r]

```
1    N:          eez intelligent? en he:'s ah'hh not ha:n'some.'hh but he's
2                ni:ce looki:n:[g a::n]d ah,
3    E:                        [Mm hm,]
4    N:          jist a ri:l ril nice: pers'nable, very pers'nable very
5                sweet.·hhhh ve:ry:. c'nsiderate my gah all I had'do wz
6                look etta cigarette'n'e wz out'v the chai:r lighting(h)it
7                chhekn(h)o(h)w[ 'hhhhh]One a'those kind,
8    E:                        [My: go ]↓:sh ((nasal))
9    N:          'hhhhh[A::]:n' so[: thet w'z]
10   E:                [Yeh]      [THEY DO TH]A:T[BE [FORE EN]=
11   N:                                          [y: [Yhheahh ]
12   E:      =[[A:FTER[THEY[D O]:n't.]
13   N:       [[↑AHH! [h a h[huh]'hhhh]hhh
14   E:       [[Ree-
15   N:       [[Naw:? Laura has ↓known ↓Se:th,hhhh (0.3) Laura has known
16               ↓Se:th (0.2) I guess ever since he wz:'t'hhh I don't know
17               I think she's probably known'm a good thirty yea:rs.
                 •     ((ca. 13 lines omitted))
                 •
31   N:          en he's been very: very good tuh his aunt Lorna.[ 'hhhh
32   E:                                                          [Mm hm.=
33   N:          =Ah:'n he's taking care'v her property: en she:'s got (.)
34               yihknow quite a bit t'do wit[h?
35   E:                                      [M[mhm
36   N:                                        [a:nd ah'hh works'n thi ya:rd
37               an: 'hhh hez jst been very very sweet. yihknow to 'er,hh=
38   E:      =[[M .m[ h m ]
39   N:       [[An'[<he i]:s he's jist a ri:l sweet GU:Y. 'hhm't[ 'hhh
40   E:  →                                                      [WONderful.
41   N:          ↑So: we were[↓sitting theh]
42   E:  →                   [Y E R  LIFE I]S CHANG[ING.
43   N:                                            [↑EYE:A:H,
44                    (.)
45   N:           SO:: anyway it wz'z I say it wuss rill[y, ]    [cute.=
46   E:  →                                              [Gu]u:d.[
47   N:          ='hhhh So: hu-uh:m,
48                    (1.0)
```

49 E: *→ ((constricted)) Yih goin ou'with im tihni[:ght?
50 N: [·t
51 (.)
52 N: ·tch·h No:. No:, he::'d(.)e-he wz ril cute (.) uh:n (0.3)
53 We were in the frontroom we 'ed kep' talkin'n talkin'n
54 talkin'n talkin' y'know e:n: en ↑obviously eh guy can't
55 just (.) yihknow come right out'n fron'of:: God'n
56 evrybody end ·hhhhh a:nd say anything so, (.) we: got
57 tah'n bout my ca:r.h en the service onnit?
58 (.)
59 E: → [[°Mm hm,°]
60 N: [[Y'kno:w a]n:: (.) so: (.) Bruce'n I were arguing about a
61 six thou:s'n mile service. En I said . . .

((The upshot being that she goes out to her car, Seth follows her, and, to her utter amazement, asks if he might give her a call to arrange for a dinner together. For some of that material see Fragment 3.(13) page 131 lines 1-4.))

Akin to but rather more dramatically than Fragments 3.(16) and 3.(17) the inquiry occurs as the teller is faltering (lines 47-49; cf. lines 7-8 page 134 and 13-15 page 136). The configuration here stands in particularly sharp contrast to Fragment 3.(10) page 126, in which a teller's faltering is followed by a recipient's introducing an altogether new matter.

3.(10) [Detail]

16 B: ·hhh °And uh:° ·t·k·hhhh (.) °u-°
17 (0.3)
18 M: ·tlk >Say yihknow something< ah played bridge t'day . . .

3.(18) [Detail]

47 N: ·hhhh So: hu-uh:m,
48 (1.0)
49 E: ((constricted)) Yih goin ou'with im tihni:ght?

And in this case the recipient-renewed topic goes on for another five transcript-pages. Further, it is at least possible that a matter produced in reply to the inquiry; i.e., "We were in the frontroom we 'ed kep' talkin'n talkin'n talkin'n talkin..." (etc., lines 53ff through to the upshot), is that which was initiated earlier but intersected by, and abandoned by reference to, the commentary; i.e., "↑So: we were// sitting theh" (lines 41-43; cf. Fragments 2.(8) and 2.(9) pages 41-42, in which minimal initiation → abandonment is followed shortly thereafter by reinitiation, and Fragment 2.(24) page 61 lines 11-14, in which a possible telling is intersected by an assessment, abandoned, reformulated as something other than an 'attempted telling', and/but subsequently reinitiated in Fragment 2.(27) page 94 lines 14-29. Similarly to Fragment 2.(24) the close-implicative object is acknowledged, "↑Yeeah!" in that fragment, "↑EYE:A:H" in the case at hand, but the abandonment is differently handled; in Fragment 2.(24) with the elaborately-considered inbreath, etc.; in the case at hand, with a 'volition'-marked summary statement which might equally constitute closure of the telling or introduce a next node).

It is possible, then, that the inquiry has turned out to be especially topically 'friendly'; i.e., has provided a means whereby a matter abandoned earlier can now be reintroduced.

The inquiry may also be interactionally "hostile"; i.e., an instance of the sort of utterance about which Sacks proposes, "the fact that the question is hostile is secondary to the fact that it nonetheless operates to preserve the line [a teller] was trying to take" (see pages 104-105).

We are proceding by reference to the fact that the answer to "Yih goin ou'with im tihni:ght?" is "'tch'h No:." (lines 49-52). And we are speculating that inasmuch as this telling has been in progress for some five transcript-pages, the recipient might have grounds to suspect that the answer to her 'topically interested' inquiry will be "No".

Simply enough, if this were the telling of an encounter which will be immediately followed by a "going out", it might well be structured in such a way as to have that fact emerge very much earlier. As it stands, it is a telling of a "last night" encounter, and not of an anticipated "tonight" out. The question may then be designed to get, in effect, an 'admission' that this "ri:l sweet GU:Y" who so conspicuously attended her on the night in question (e.g., the lighting of the cigarettes, lines 5-7ff), is not following through.

We parenthetically note that the teller nevertheless has high hopes. This is available not only in her talk (see Fragment 3.(13) page 131 lines 11-12), but in her larger activities. Specifically, she has phoned to invite this coparticipant on a shopping expedition.[1]

3.(18.a.) [NB:II:4:1:r:Standard Orthography]

1 E: Why don't you come and see me.=
2 N: =˙hhh Well I was go:nna call and ask you if you- Brad was
3 playing golf this afternoon if you wanted to go over to
4 Ro:binson's with me. I've got to uh ˙hhh I have go:t.hh
5 t[o g e]t.h˙hhh a couple of things to wear Emma=
6 E: [Ah:ha-]
7 N: =I(.)just don't have enough clothes to: to go to work in.

The alternative motive for the shopping trip; i.e., for work clothes, is preserved following the telling of the encounter and its possible outcome. One transcript-page post the telling's ending we get:

3.(18.b.) [NB:II:4:22-23]

1 N: ez I say I've got to make the effort. Becuz I've jus' let
2 weekend after weekend go, [a:nd, uhm I jus'simply haven't=
3 E: [Mm hm,
4 N: =yihknow taken the time tuh rilly get over there, en I've,
5 hones'tuh God, I em just ˙hhhhhhh I'll- be- goin tuh work
6 n:naykid. [if I don't get somethin::g
7 E: [Oh:: no you won't,

---

[1] In an earlier conversation Emma phones Nancy in hopes of pursuading her to "go shopping or do something". Nancy, announcing she just got a (small) raise, shows no inclination to use the raise as an occasion to go shopping.

3.(18.a.1.) [NB:II:2:1-2:r]

N: I jus'don't know how I'm gunnuh spend all that money.
E: °Y'*oughta go sh*o:pping.°
N: Well I should bu:t yihknow et eight dollars a
mo:n[th
E: [↓hmh hm[h hm- m- hm]
N: [anything I'd] buy I'd (.) ((smile voice)) be
using up my raise fer 'alf[a YEA:]r.
E: [Ya::h,]
E: ˙hhh Brad jis lef'tuh play go:lf . . .

Again parenthetically, given the contingent status of their shopping together on Brad's playing golf (see Fragment 3.(18.a.) lines 2-3), a possible 'mere mention', "Brad jis lef'tuh play go:lf", may be seen to be intimately associated with the activities in progress; i.e., with Emma's encouraging of Nancy to "go shopping".

The character of the shopping trip strikes us as similar to the way in which the "very nice guy" is provided an opportunity to 'say something' but not "in front of God an everybody" (see Fragment 3.(18) page 142 lines 53ff). In that case an alternative motive for the teller's removing herself from "everybody"'s presence is proposed; i.e., to settle an argument about the car's service warranty, going out to the car to get the manual (see Fragment 3.(18.c.) below). And the alternative motive is preserved in the telling, although the outcome; i.e., that he took an opportunity to 'say something' not "in front of God and everybody" is known by the teller and will shortly be known by the recipient. The business is preserved as 'innocent', as something that 'just happened', as a complete surprize.

3.(18.c.) [NB:II:4:17]

1 N: So finally I saida Bruce well dammit I'm gonna get up, en
2 I'm gonna go out'n get that manual, out of my glove
3 compartmen'en I'll sh-tell you.what it says or yihknow or
4 you c'n read it.'hhhh So I wen'out'n God the first thing
5 I know there's Seth. right ahhh huh huh! [right behin' me,
6 E: [Mm hm?
7 N: 'hhh so I wz out'n I ed sat in the car en reached over
8 int'the glove compartmen' en he came up tuh the door, en
9 he said uhm 'hhh Nancy? he said wouldju uh, mind if I
10 would give you a call.
11 E: Mm hm,
12 N: A:n I(hh) was so:: du(h)mbfoundid . . .

We note that the recipient's responses here are quite dramatically 'passive', particularly that which follows the teller's laughter, in that it constitutes not merely 'passive recipiency' but declination of an 'invitation to laugh' (lines 5-6).[1]

As for the shopping expedition motivated by a search for work clothes, it is not unlikely that the shopper will just so happen to come across a dinner dress and find herself somehow buying it. Department stores are designed to effect just such an outcome, and while consumer advocates complain of such design, actual consumers may utilize it. The acquisition of a dinner dress can be an 'innocent' outcome, happenstance, unplanned, and in no way motivated by the (mere anticipation of a) dinner date.

---

[1] See G. Jefferson, "A Technique for Inviting Laughter and its Subsequent Acceptance/Declination", op. cit., pages 83ff.

We noted by reference to the reported innocently-motivated trip to the car, the recipient's dramatically 'passive' responses (Fragment 3.(18.c.) especially lines 5-6). And we can note by reference to the teller's post-telling invokation of the innocently-motivated trip to the store, a curiously literal response; i.e., to "I'll be going to work naked" the recipient offers, "Oh no you won't" (Fragment 3.(18.b.) lines 5-7). And we note that earlier in the telling the recipient has done a bit of heckling; i.e., evidence of the fellow's "considerateness" is proposed by the recipient to be standard courtship/conquest behavior (see Fragment 3.(18) page 140 lines 5-12).

It appears that in these various segments, the recipient is marking a 'fragile' moment in the telling, and is doing so as well with her 'topically interested' but perhaps interactionally 'hostile' inquiry, "You going out with him tonight?" (Fragment 3.(18) page 141 line 49); i.e., is marking the teller's 'neglecting' to mention that there is no announceable upshot of last night's encounter.

We take the term 'fragile' from Sacks. In one of his unpublished lectures he considers a telling in which the teller "comes off awfully clean out of what is plainly a messy situation." Sacks proposes that the recipients "permit" it, and do not produce what might seem to be rather obvious queries, probes, challenges, etc. It is the availability of a telling to challenge, etc., that Sacks marks as its 'fragility'.

He notes, however, that 'fragile' stories are recurrently permitted by their recipients to "come off as in no way fragile, but as correctly experiencing the world in a warranted way." Where, then, someone with a fragile story to tell might "find an audience which will not subject his reports of his circumstances in the story he's telling" to scrutiny and challenge.

In his usual sweet way, Sacks points out that such an analysis is not a "criticism, because we could on the other hand treat it as how in the world do perspectives which are delicate and tender, like a seven layer cake or a flickering candle, get passed on for generations as reasonable characterizations of the world, without getting smashed, burst, dropped, ruined. And that makes the finding of someone to tell, a distinctly relevant part of the enterprise of getting to preserve a version of what happened."[1]

In the case at hand, it appears that the teller has not chosen her recipient with due care and attention to the sort of treatment her fragile story requires. It is subjected to a range of at best 'resistive', at worst, 'hostile' responses, including the 'topically interested' inquiry which generated this parenthetical exploration of some of the telling's 'fragile' moments.

Nonetheless, this inquiry into a fragile issue, while it does yield, and 'put on the record' that there is no certainty of a follow-up to the encounter, does provide an opportunity for an elaborate telling (and re-enjoying) of the encounter (see Fragment 3.(18) page 141 lines 52ff, Fragment 3.(13) page 131 lines 1-4, and Fragment 3.(18.c.) page 144 lines 1-12).

Like many of the other fragments subjected to varying degrees of single-instance analysis, Fragment 3.(18) was selected as just another instance of a phenomenon; in this case, an Nth fragment in which a recipient who, with commentary (and other close-implicative objects), is at one point negotiating for topical closure, countered by teller continuation, relinquishes the pursuit of closure and produces a powerfully continuation-implicative object, an Inquiry (and subsequently exhibits passive recipientship to the talk generated by the inquiry).

---

[1] H. Sacks unpublished lecture, March 4, 1971, pages 11-16.

Our attention was drawn to this particular Inquiry because, unlike its predecessors in the array; i.e., the inquiries of Fragment 3.(16) page 134 line 8, and Fragment 3.(17) page 136 lines 15-16, it struck us as designedly 'hostile'. Exploration of the materials showed that the object, although interactionally 'hostile' turned out to be topically 'friendly', a perfectly decent member of the current array; as Sacks has it, it "operates to preserve the line [the teller] was trying to take."

Our focus on this particular Inquiry with its interactional hostility and 'nevertheless' topical felicity reminded us of other materials in which the reverse seemed to be true; i.e., the inquiries had struck us as interactionally innocuous, if not outright friendly, but in topical terms, were quite specifically not "preserving" the topical line.

Following, then, is a brief appendum on a possible operation of Recipient Inquiry.

IV. Recipient Inquiry as Shift-Implicative (Et Tu Brute?)

Other work suggests that the Recipient Inquiry, with its self-evident and recurrently observable topic-progressive character, can be recruited to the service of topical curtailment, shift, closure, etc. In the attached paper, two candidate instances of 'stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters' contain, among the devices deployed to achieve transition, Recipient Inquiries. A brief segment of one of those instances appears in this report as Fragment 1.(21) page 12.

1.(21) [Detail]

E: cou:rse I know Mister Co:le's sick let's God let's hope'ee
gets well b't,h'hhhhhhhh I know the pro:bum,hhh yihkno:w,h
L: → Whudiz he ha:ve.
(0.2)
E: 't'hh Oh he:'s got this ↓ga:llbladder a:nd . . .

The other instance does not appear in this report. Following are the few immediately relevant lines.

1.(21.a.) [Rahman:I:5]

G: uCz Ivan said in the mohrning wd I take im to Saltbehn en
I said well u 'hih hI don'kno:w th'roads uh so ba-ad I(h)
mi(h)ght not (.) make ↑i:t.=
L: → =Neo:? No-Were they verry ba:d, Gwenn[ie,( )]
G: [Ehm-no]it wasn'it's
jst thetchu cahn't go: so fahs:t . . .

On the face of it, perhaps, perfectly appropriate, recipiently behavior. Operationally, these Inquiries are pulling off into materials which can, and in the event do, lead to introduction of altogether new matters, toward which, with their use, the recipient can be seen to be working (see the attached paper, pages 9-16 for a consideration of the materials associated with Fragment 1.(21), and pages 16-36 for a consideration of the materials associated with Fragment 1.(21.a.).

Our refreshed interest in these materials, now focussing on the fact that these particular instances of a device used in stepwise transition were Inquiries, led us to look again at the Inquiry we have characterized as a prototypical display of 'special interest', the inquiry of Fragment 2.(24.d.1.) page 65, "She is? She's taller'n you?". This fragment comes from an old and infrequently-used corpus. Returning to it we found the following sequelae.

2.(24.d.1.) [Expanded]

L: I hate it. Twelve and a half years old and I- seventeen
and a half we look the same.
(2.0)
K: You know, my brother and I have come to one a- mutual

5 K: agree[ment that- that we-
6 L: [She's taller than I am too.
7 K: → She is? She's taller'n you?
8 L: By maybe half an inch.
9 K: *→ I'm as tall as my brother is now, exactly.

Analogously to the many Recipient Acknowledgments, Assessments, and Commentaries which appear in the various foregoing arrays, at least these few Recipient Inquiries can be characterized as talking on a topic, or a topical line, in order to depart from it.

As we mentioned earlier, it came as something of a surprize that the Commentaries were so recurrently implicated in closure/shift. And such is our bias toward Recipient Inquiry, although we had two instances of Inquiry implicated in topical shift, it did not occur to us totreat that as a candidate phenomenon and assemble a collection. An exploration for the future, then, is the in-situ use of Inquiry as a device for achieving topic closure/shift.

And such materials as Fragment 3.(5) page 109, in which one might suspect that a topic-initial Inquiry is produced in aid of arriving at a request for advice from the coparticipant (in contrast to being generated out of an 'interest' in the coparticipant's circumstances, in which, with a series of assessments, the recipient exhibits 'topical disinterest') certainly indicate the necessity of exploring, not only topic-internal Inquiries, but those which get a topic going in the first place.

In that regard, over the course of our exploration, we did notice one class of Inquiry which may be especially amenable to topic-strategic use, the Felicitational Inquiry.

Felicitational Inquiries are frequently found in the course of conversation Closings. Following is a single fragment which contains two instances, each similarly structured: Inquiry → brief response → assessment + shift (lines 4-9 and 9-13).

4.(1) [SBL:3:3:4-5:r]

```
1    K:        Depreciation'n evrything.=
2    M:        =u-huh,'hhh O:kay (.) tha:nk you very much[Keith,
3    K:                                                  [°Ah-hah°
4    M:  →     Ha:ppy New Year didje[have a good Christmas?]
5    K:                             [  O  k  a  :  y  .   ]
6                   (.)
7    K:        °Mm hm?°
8                   (.)
9    M:  →     Goo:ud.[Didje get thi- yer leg got alri:ght huh,
10   K:               [°(          )°
11   K:        Oh yah.
12                  (.)
13   M:        Oh: good. Tell Keith Rock hello fer me.=
14   K:        =Aari:ght,
15   M:        Tha:nk you,=
16   K:        =Ya:h
17   M:        G'by[e:,
18   K:            [Bye,
```

One of the Felicitational, Close-associated inquiries in this case is an inquiry into a presumably-past trouble (line 9). In the following two fragments, just such inquiries occur prior to initiation of conversation-Closings, and may well be using the association of such inquiries with Closings to move the conversation toward closure; i.e., once such talk is in progress, Closings is in progress.

The following fragment occurs several transcript-pages further into the topic for which closure became relevant at Fragment 3.(17) page 136.

4.(2) [SBL:2:1:4:6-7:r]

```
1    F:        'hhh en I: u-at's why ah liked the hote:l I c'd go up t'
2              bed when I: ↓wanted[to.↓
3    B:                           [Ye:ah.
4    F:        C'z I: don't ↓drink too much.↓ 'hh[hhhh
5    B:                                          [°Mm hm,°
6    F:        An: I don'mind a cocktail before dinner but I don'want six
7              a:tmuh six a:fte[r.]'hhhhhhhhh
8    B:  →                     [0 ]-hm 'hh En yer ar:m m-stayed
9              perfect[ly ↓we:ll[ha< 'hh
10   F:               ['hhhhhhhh[Per:fec'ly[: ah-
11   B:                                    [So it ser:veszh[u ↓we:ll h[u
12   F:                                                    [An-       [I:
13             dro:ve dow:n tuh Los Angliss an' I drove home: u-and it's
14             ↓wonderf[ul.
15   B:                [Isn't that ↓ni::ce:?=
```

16 F: =u-Well: (0.3) I: tellyuh that's (.) ˙hh That's worth the
17 ↑blood'n ↑tea:rs I: had (.) exercising i[t buhlie:ve me:=
18 B: [Oh ↓yes.
19 F: =it (.) [it's very ˙hhhhh (.) eh adaptable,=
20 B: [°Mm°
21 F: =an ↑no dis↑comfort °eh ta:ll.°
22 B: Isn' thet wond[erf'l
23 F: [Ah wasn't ↑ti:red my ↑arm wasn'tired w'n I
24 gah down there.
25 (0.3)
26 F: ˙t˙k˙h[hhh
27 B: [°W'l ↑thet's good.°
28 F: ↑Ya:hp.h=
29 B: =W'l I'm a[wf'lly]↓glad tih ↓hear it=
30 F: [We:ll]
31 B: *→ =Well I've been ↑thinking of yuh'n I ↑think ih wz Mondee
32 evening ˙hhhhh thet I came by: tih see you
33 F: Ye:ah::.
34 B: And uh:=
35 F: =Well thu- ah'm suh- ah'm sorry ah wasn't ↑ho::me,
((the conversation ends ca. 22 lines later))

The following fragment occurs several transcript-pages further into the topic initiated at Fragment 3.(4) page 108.

4.(3) [W:PC:1:(1):43-44]

1 M: Curss this is the sta:te ah'm in et the mo(h)m(h)'nt
2 [hh hih heh huh huh ˙hh Cah:n't remembuh things ˙hh
3 J: [y:Yea:h.
4 M: [[But it ga:me to meh.h]
5 J: → [[How is yer bahck any]way.
.
((ca. 9 lines omitted, identifying the trouble))
.
15 M: Oh: yes thaht cleeuhd uup Ja[net,h [thank goodness,]
16 J: [Did it. [They- Mildred]said.
17 yi:h They rahng you: didn't [they.
18 M: [Ye::s::? Oh she did ye:[s::.
19 J: [Ye:s.
20 M: Ye:[s::.
21 J: → [And,h she said thet i-e ih cleeahd u[:p,
22 M: [Ye::s:.[˙hhh
23 J: [Mm:.
24 M: So ah wz lohcky the:[:h,
25 J: [Ye::s.
26 M: Mm:n.˙t˙hhhh[hh
27 J: *→ [We:[ll
28 M: [So aht nuh mo:m'nts I'm noh-u seh bahd
29 apahrt fr'm being d-very tiyihd hh[heh[heh[°hn°]
30 J: [heh[h n[h n]
31 J: [[huh h u h]
32 M: [[˙huh ˙huh]˙huh˙hh[hhh
33 J: [Oh well 'ahv a rest.
34 M: eYe::s ah will,

```
35  J:          Ye:[s,
36  M:             [eYes:.
37  J:  *→      ↑O[:ka[y then,
38  M:            [Yes[·hhh
39  M:          Ri::ght Ja[net,h
40  J:                    [Have a good ti:[me e[n (          )
41  M:                                    [·hh [hh:: Thahnk you:?

                ((the conversation ends ca. 40 lines later))
```

Our final note has the character of a 'stop press'. The bulk of the report had been completed, the final draft typed up, the typewriter taken into the shop for its regular post-report overhaul, when we encountered some new materials. The process of collecting and transcribing data is, of course, not boundaried by any particular project, and some preliminary indexing of additional [Heritage] materials is now underway. This is the corpus which includes the neighborhood puppy-distributor (see Fragments 1.(17) page 10, 2.(16) pages 49-50 and 3.(5) page 109).

The indexing is a matter of locating beginnings and endings of the conversations on the tapes, noting the participants, and some indication of what is in the conversation. This particular segment was chosen for transcription out of a purely gratuitous interest in the 'puppy' theme. When the tape was backed up to find the start of this topic in this particular conversation, a rather dramatic instance of 'shift-implicative recipiency' emerged.

Specifically, a new topic is introduced via Acknowledgment Token → Shift (lines 12-14), the topic-initiation is abandoned and a Commentary/Assessment is produced, "I agree with you Atherton I think you've got a very good point there" (lines 14-16), whereupon the new topic is re-initiated (line 16).

4.(4) [Heritage:IV:2:4:Ex.1-3]

1 A: I'm gonna suggest thet we: we increase ahr resuh:rve by
2 anothuh two hundred fifty which w'd mean five hundred
3 pou:nds.
4 M: Ye:s yes quite.
5 A: An' we could uh:m (1.0) invest in thē uh,h in thē uh
6 National Savings you see fifteen p'cent.
7 M: Mm.
8 (0.4)
9 (M): (W'l be [ ). ((off phone))
10 A: [U h : : m I'd haftuh check, tuh see: whethuhr:
11 in fec' wir not liable t'tex.

12 M: *→ Yes.
13 (0.2)
14 M: *→ °Oh.° ˙hhh Edith's jist essd me how uhr the dogs I agree
15 with you Athert'n I think y'v gotta verry good point
16 theh-˙h [hh E]dith wz asking how th'dogs wuh.
17 A: [Ya:h]
18 (0.3)
19 A: ˙h Oh well uh:m: uhm uh:m: it it's a chapter'v accid'nts
20 I'm afrai:d,
21 M: °Ohh.°
22 A: mghhm We lost all th'm: she had sev'n.
23 M: Ye:s I kn[ew s h e w ' z]
24 A: [an'they wuhr a:ll] prematua:h,
25 M: I knew [she w'z feedin:g]one,
26 A: [°An'they were all°]
27 A: Yeh very ↓sma:ll ye[s yes] [((cough))
28 M: → [Ye:s-] ah[:: sohhrry to heah that.
29 A: ((cough)) No they uhm ˙hh lahst one die:d,
30 M: → Oh:: I'm sorry[t'°hear that°]
31 A: [A:nd u h : :]m uhm I-lene wz very
32 distressed[by it ˙hhh
33 M: → [I bet she was.
34 A: Uh::m: she; she's (.) she's got oll huhr fam'ly °↓heu:h°
35 ovuh heah fuh th'weeke:nd so:: ah got (.) so much on
36 huhr plate.˙h she cahn't think about it but pohr little
37 uh:::: pohr lih-th'pohr little dah:g Lola.
38 M: → Yeh
39 A: She's pining.
40 M: → Yes::=
41 A: =en she won't eat,
42 M: → No=
43 A: =ah:: end a'course °that gets Ilene moh wuhrried.°
44 M: → °I'll bet it does.°
45 A: So uh:m anyway,hh uh,hh thea:hr there ih ti:s,
46 M: → M[mh
47 A: [uh:: jus'g'nna haftuh s- uh try agay:n nex'time.
48 M: → Yes
49 (0.2)
50 M: *→ °°Oh yes°° ˙hhhh Uhnight Athert'n eokay so w'l [leave th]e=
51 A: [A'right-]
52 M: =arrangement'z they ah:re,
53 A: Yahp
54 M: If I hear anything diffrent you'll ring me.
55 A: Ye:s rightoh.
56 M: Okay thank [you fer calling=
57 A: [°Right°
58 M: =Buh bye,
59 A: °Bye°

For one, this fragment suggests the possibility of an oriented-to hierarchy among the shift-implicative devices; i.e., that Acknowledgement Token → Shift is understood by participants to be, say, less deferential to topic than is Assessment and/or Commentary → Shift. In this case, the Commentary/Assessment appears to be 'remedial' of the prior Acknowledgment Token → Shift. However, the utterly pro-forma character of the Commentary/Assessment is in itself transparent for the shift-implicature of such objects as Assessments and Commentaries.

Secondly, we can notice, again, the association of an Inquiry into a Trouble, and Conversation Closure. Again, it is possible that the Inquiry is produced in the first place as a 'felicitational', Close-Implicative device. In that regard we note that the bulk of the inquirer's responses are, if not clearly topic-close-implicative (e.g., the repeated "I'm sorry to hear that", lines 28 and 30), then at least non-topically-progressive; i.e., 'topically disinterested' (see lines 33, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46 and 48, and the eventual Acknowledgment Token → Shift via which Closings is initiated, line 50).

We note as well an eventual arrival at 'concensus' with the speaker's 'volition'-marked announcement of topic completion, "So uh:m anyway,hh uh,hh the:re there it i:s," (line 45), and note within it a series of 'dysfluencies' which might constitute 'interruption invitations'; i.e., elicitations of 'topically interested' talk by the inquirer/recipient.