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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 got one acrahss th'way then very
2     nice.
3 M: Have they.=
4 G: (=M:)
5 M: =Yah.
6     (0.2)
7 G: =Yeh.
8 M: =Yeh.

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

1 M: We wen'(in)tuh Hollywood dihday?
2 P: On didyuh?
3     (.)
4 M: =t Ye:'h"we did"
5 P: =Ye:ah?
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:ly:
3 L: =Ye: h
4 G: =Yeh,=
5 G: =Yeh:
6 L: =Yeh:h°
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 recogniz-
ably on the topic (i.e., Topic Hold).

We thought that the data might choose between the alternatives. In-
asmuch as the characterization 'topic attrition' might predict subsequent
termination of the topic, and 'topic hold' might predict subsequent contin-
uation, 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.
G: E-h thal:
M: En when you open outchih bedrooms arrre off the floh
G: I know they've got one acrahss th'way theh very
M: Have they=
G: =M-m-
M: Yah.

(0.2)

G: Ye-h.
M: +h So ah've got Stahrsky heuh,

(.)

M: hu-h-heh-huh-huh
G: u n : : !you're lookin ahfter im

0.2 [Expanded]

P: Wuddiyuh been doin.
M: nOh I u-I d- We wen' (in) tuh Hollywood dihday?
P: Oh didyuh?
M: 't Ye; h°we did°
P: [Ye:ah?]
M: Ye:ah,

(0.6)
P: Hm,

(.)

P: Djuh have a good ti:me?
M: Well we looked over you know they had'n open hou:se,

0.3 [Expanded]

G: Well I cann't leave im fih two houiz eef I'm if he's cryin=
G: =when I've left im fer one.
L: Oh: deah mae.
G: So: ah euh yihknow ez ah say I didn' get t in typing,[Oh::... yer'well
1 1
2 G: tie:d dow:n ahr't chu
L: [Well I am rea;ly:
3 G: ["Ye; "h°
4 G: "Yah,°
5 L: ["Ye:ah°
7 G: =[[cz'ee do'esn'ee thates being in un iz ow:n . . .
And uh: hhhheh *hh the e(h)nd a"th'evening Miss Ke-elly s'd Alice I guess this evening wz los'tin(h) y(h)ou(h)u

_Uh-huh_

_lhh Al(h)ice s'd no I've enjoyed it'n I b'lieve she di:::d._

[Uh hu:h, Ah think she does uh: en u [Ah hah.]

_she's been tuh Europe too: so: she wou]ld._

[Ye:ah.

_Ah ha:h, (0.3)

_B: Uh-huh.

_M: Uh-huh.

_B: Well it was loads'v fu::n.

_M: Uh-huh'hh Listen uh Meh- uh ah b'thinkin about Madeline, y-she didn't uh: pick up a boyfrin: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 Acknowledge-
ment Tokens, Cross-Speaker Multiples, Cross-Speaker Pairs, etc., were correalated 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.

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. 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.

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 time?", 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

---


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) [SBE:2:2:3:30:pr]

1 C: Well I haftuh get me some glasses, because these are all scratched, an' uh I can't see out of'em anyway, but I uhm I haftuh use'em anyway when I drive, but I haven't had'em changed in five years. An' uhm (.) so:: ah- 'hnh (.) I liked yer frames so well ah'll go over there en pick out th'frames there.

7 K: \[Ya:h. 'hnhh Uh:m (.) I ca:llld uh beh-uh: (.)

9 C: Oh are ther hus ther they co::me?
1.(2) [Rahman I:6]  ·  

1. G: it en ded with a great big bahng ehh heh h n I jum ped
2. L:  ·  
3. G: =outta the seat I jump'd (.), shot about three feet in
4. L:  ·  
5. G: =the air ah think the h hen
6. L: =Y e s': "hnh
7. ar hah done bah the way,

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

1. J: except when Chris' mas come's a-a- an'
2. L:  ·  
3. J: "hnh he siz wheredju get all thahh heh [hn huh] mehheh=
4. L:  ·  
5. J: =huh huh huh "huh" "hn"
6. L:  ·  
7. J: =huh huh huh h h h h Santa Claus hhheh-heh 'hh +Sanna Claus
8. brought it. (inniz sle::d) hh hi h [hn-hn- heh huh=
9. L:  ·  
10. J: =Yh: :m,
11. L:  ·  
12. L: =hhehhhehhh "(  I found a recipe: that I'm g'na try;

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

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

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

1. E: =WE:LL: now maybe nex'ti: me ah'll stay down ah'll see how things are = I gotta get I think + I oughta go home (0.2)
2. Ah don' know maybe Brad'd like me tuh sta:y hh(h) dun'
3. kno:'w.
4. L: [hn]hnh "hn"
5. E: (h) I think he'd like t-me tuh sta-ay
6. E:  ·  
7. E: "hn-hn"
8. L: =But fer ONRINESS ah'm goin ho:me, ph-h!
9. E:  ·  
10. L:  ·  
11. E: =hnh huh, 'hn-hh
12. L:  ·  
13. L: =God I see in the paper ther sure lotta halibut been caught down that coast,
1. (6) [TCI(b): 16:11-12]

J: My biggest thing is tryintuh figure out howtuh cut the neck en around th'ears.
L: Yeah,
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.]
J: Ye ah,
L: '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-unwell- I think you took the price offa yours didn'chuh.
L: → [Ye:ah.I w- I wouldn' call Marian'n uh that's gonna spoil her whole uh Thanksgiving.

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

R: We:::ll I wz hungry w'n I got home en I've J's finished I mean my main= (.4) [Ye:s
B: entree:
R: → [Ye:hm.^
B: 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 me.

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

M: I look like a wild 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: → 'h You say Phil's playing tgo:if?

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.
They have to go someplace,

Well I know it.

Uh huh,

I know, and I feel this.

Uh huh, and uh (2.0) I-th- these are big enough, she s-

uh the luh- uh the other one's uh smaller, but uh I'm

sure that (0.3) everything'll be cared for,

Mm hm, say tell me something, has Maizie moved back home
yet,

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

Well that's one rea:s'n I duh want three tables up here
Kate cuz: becuZ 'hnnh my house is 'hnnh' to s:ma:ll=

[A:N] uh t'hh if I ha:ve a(y) another wuh In th'frontroo:m
en th' dining room's fli:ne 8't if I ha:ve one in the
Kitchen over he:re.

(.)

Yah, 'hnnh' 'hnnh' 'hnnh' '[W]' then i'z too clo:se see,

Claire I think you came over'n played, the time I had three

[Did y]ou notice: uh tables with these all these other gais,

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

Th'semester, theoretically ends the twenty third I think=

=Ye:ah, 't'hhhh Tell me you guys er gunna go Tuh Frisco fer

Christmas:,

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

'h But I'm at the poi:nt whehr(y) (0.2) uh ti:me is more

import'n ti:me then money.

Oh 'yes.

(0.4)

A:nd uh: ( ) you know look et all

th'money but uh (0.3) it's jis too mi:ch.

Ye:s. 'hnnh Uh:m (0.3) I jist had a thought. I know someone

who uh'hhh uh:: (0.2) has (.) two smaller children'hh and uh

(0.7) would ti:le ke I think tih get in some jus s'm week:nds

you know.

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

B'cuz he wz wunning tih kno:w if uh,h 'f I w'd relieve the

morning nurse 'hnnh But: u:hm (.). 't'khh (0.7) uhm (0.3)

then when he wen' upsta:irs say goodnight'n wen'upstairs'z

said,h well M'z Danzig? y-y-c-come out any ti:me you ca:n

we'll make roo:m tuh 'hnnh huh: (hh Yihkno:) w=

[I mean e-he t'hh ]

[M m - m m : ]

en he's af'f'lly ni:ce;e' n I o'just t'uh

[hn:Ye:i:i:i]

'h Is he still in business or retired.
1. (15) [SBL: 1:1:6-7:1]

1. B: He does (. ) th' things he needs to the errands=
2. C: \[ M \sim \text{m thm} \]
3. B: \[ \frac{5\text{nm things: like that}^*}{M \sim \text{thm}} \]
4. B: \[ \text{'hh once in a while <i think} \]
5. C: \[ \text{uuh huh uh,} \]
6. B: \[ \text{hhhhhh "And uh" other than that why uh her?} \]
7. C: \[ \circ \text{oh} \]
8. B: \[ \text{in her condition.} \]
9. C: \[ \circ \text{-oh:: y} \]

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

1. M: althoh ah donh: seem tih see enuu ( . ) lots ahv yih
2. J: since yih c(hh)a(h)a(h)me,=
3. J: No heh heh
4. M: \[ ( ) \]
5. J: \[ hhh Buat it's th'settling in huge. \]
6. J: \[ gettin ehm ( . ) \]
7. M: straight, with this en then that
8. J: \[ eeyehs \]

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

1. N: W'll how a're you eniweh How's: uh'h have <Are: you are>
2. I: expectin any ( )
3. N: \[ "Oh. How e xing." \]
4. I: \[ u m : : m \]
5. N: \[ u h : : m: d-Lola wzh mated um (0.3) oh \]
6. about three weeks ago:
7. N: hhOh:
8. I: \[ A n d ( . ) Mitzie wzh mated about two weeks ago \]
9. N: \[ Loh \]
10. N: my goodness you do ah: sk for it, e
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. N: et th'same tti:me y' neh
14. N: \[ Well y e : : s , \]
15. N: \[ ye: s An-an whoidju go to. \]
16. I: \[ It is unh. \]

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

1. E: W'whuddiyuh t'doin.
2. (0.9)
3. N: What'm I doin?
4. E: \[ cleanin'g? \]
5. N: \[ 'hh I'm ironing would ju believe \]
6. E: \[ t'that. \]
7. E: \[ Oh: bless it's hear't \]
8. N: \[ In fa:ct I: ire I started ironing en I: \]
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)-1.1(10), and of the ten candidate instances of 'acknowledgment token → connected topic'; i.e., Fragments 1.1(11)-1.1(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 recipiency', 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). 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]

E: I'm not g'na plan things anymore. I mean this is ridiculous. course I know Mister Cole's sick let's
God 's hope ee gets well b't h'hh hhh h I know the
prob:um, hhh yih kno:w h
L: Whudiz he ha:ve.
(0.2)
E: 't'h Oh he:'s got this gallbladder and uh they-
he's vomiting en evrything they took in to the hospi'l
'n I don't know how long eez gonna be in er what the t-
well eez gonna be eighty fou::r,
(0.7)
L: Ye: [ahw el l]
E: [h'eez qu'ite a play:bo:y yih kno:w,
(\)
L: Yeah yih jis gotta be caref (\) we'll see: 'hh Dwight
only has (0.2) one gall bladder?
(0.7)
E: "Mm h'/**
L: He had e-en then he hastuh be careful what he eats
he can't eat anything grea: sy er anything yih kno:w hhh
(0.7)
L: Go:d whata ma:n he wz ou:t there this:morning en'e (\)
they have these great big ol:ive 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.
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. 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:n d uh, 'hnh has ( ) with'm fer about fifteen years.
4. A:nd uh, so consequently he's very? eez intelligent? en
5. he;'s ah'nh not ha:n' some, 'hh but he's nice
6. lookin: [g a:n]d ah, jist a rü:r ril nice: pers'nable,=
7. E: → Mm:hm,
8. N: very pers'nable very sweet.'hnh very: e'nsiderate my
9. gah all I had'do wz look etta cigarette'n'ee wz out'v the
10. cha:i:r lighting (h)itchhekn(h)o(h)ow.'hnh
11. E: → My: go'yish ((nasal))
12. One a'those kind,
13. N: 'hnhnh'a::n'so: thet w'z
14. E: *→ [Yeh] [THey DO THA:T BE FORE EN]
15. N: [Y'hheahh]=
17. N: [hah (hun)]'hnh 'hnh

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: *→ 'hnh- W'll I'm'nnna stop by brother's'n
9. leave the reel. We forget uh, didn'have the reel here, the
10. rod, so,'hnh 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.) [SHEL:2:1:7:3-4]

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

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

1. G: I dunno it's kind of a funny (0.3) uh: (1.0) it's a lady
2. that um (1.0) she wants tuh live over there, 'n have that
3. place,
4. B: → Mm hm,
5. G: And uh: (1.0) her daughter'n the children here. Well I would
6. think'd be just the opposite, cause that house is more, is
7. bigger for children than this one. [Mm hm,
8. B: → Mm hm,
9. B: → Mm hm,
10. G: But anyway, he uh sh- uh she uh happens tuh want, I guess
11. the uh bigger place.
12. B: → Mm hm,
13. G: So it's- it's alright, it's- it doesn't make any difference,
14. B: → Mm-hm,
15. G: [And uh: m, uh anyway, I don't know just how it's going
16. to turn out.
17. B: ↔ Yeah. Well, I will uh- whatever suits Maurice or whatever
18. but I- if the- if he has (them) that he wants to get rid of,
19. I'd love to have some of them

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

1. I: How's Madam:=
2. L: =F:" thank you ready tuh co:me back<
3. (.)
4. I: Oh †good.
5. (0.4)
1. (22.d.) [Heritage: 01:3:15-16]

B: If sh_s e gets (0.2) gets en ex-tra extra (0.5) thous'n quid (;) foah (;) d-dih-hhh-dih-d- doing it through the tagent. (0.9) She'll o:only(g) (;) gain about u-hhe-y-about a couple'v hundred t'pounds out v it.

S: _Mm_.

B: Be:- because the muh- rest a the th:ous'n wuh-w-would go on tagent's fees.

(0.4)

B: _So::: (0.7) they wo:n't rih: r:really be much (0.2) much (b) (;) bet:r' off th'n.

(1.0)

B: Wot we (0.8) wot we m-might do, b't ih- b't ( ) that we ca:n't rilly is soht'v (;) ge: direct (;) 'hh to (1.4) the towmuh.

(0.7)

B: And sa:y thet (0.3) dih-thi-th(h)i-th-th-this problem's Blown up'n evrything en ah-ah-an y-wouldn't wu (0.9) would the:y tell. (0.7) Tell huhr tuh suh soht'v tell the agent. B't (1.2) we ca:n't.

(1.7)

S: _Mm hm._

B: Anywa:y we'll just hav to (0.7) see nah,

(1.0)

B: See::(w) (0.4) what happ'ns: if _ anything.

(1.5)

B: _So:... (0.5)

B: _Yah._

B: Just a birt of a blo:w. _Th't's all._

S: *Ye:s_ Well if if (0.3) if I we're you;

B: _[ ] (0.6)

S: 'hh when you c'ny speak to huhr I'd sa:y yih neh- ee-ee-ee you know de-you've got to uhm 't'hh tell: the A:GENTS what uhm 'hh what'shu wan't t'hin do:.


A: if there are people in th'university, who ahr (;) b'long t'
the union,=

B: _Mm:_,

(0.3)

A: who ahr the sa:me:: (;) grade ess you, or in the [ ]

B: _Mm:_,

(0.6)

A: An' they get a: highuh(p) (0.4) wa:ge?
We (.3) 'presumably w'd auto-m'icly get [highhuh'Y'know?] =

[We:11:: ye:s] =

[A:]

B: **

=Ah m'n ah (think) (.3) (.3) ( )

[A:]

B: **

Ye:h =

[A:]

B: **

[wul wuh u-] happ'ns i's the 'n- Ah think they've

got wot they call a joint: (0.2) a joint:: (.3) uh:m bohrd

ohr something anyway all the peopl- thez about three'r

four differnt unions . . .

The following (and final) fragment of this array has an extended ser-

ies 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.) [SEL:1:1:12:4-5:r]

B: I stayed home last evening en I plan:' to: uhm (0.5) or

no I didn' I: w:z home I came home: y (.3) en w:z home fr'm

fi:ve 'till eight.

M: → M-hm,

B: 

I thought that's when (.3) yuhknow the ↑ca:lls :=

M-hm,

W'd be coming in: n. I went out: t. et eight uh'clo:ck.

M-hm,

B: [↑h:sh:aa hhh But uhm'tch'hh (.3) uh then:: uhm (1.0) I had

sev'ral tuhda:y,

M-hm,

(0.3)

M-hm,

B: And uhm (.3) I kih- I've cancelled the ↑ca:lls,

M-hm,

B: ↑t'h Cuz I didn't want them calling tomorrow you kno: w=

[M-hm]

B: Just ↑uh sa:y'hh

M-hm,

B: I've had I think three: since: uhm it's been rented,

M-hm,

J'st I had tuh say it's re:nted,

M-hm,

B: ↑nhhhhh And u-but I w's:: uhm: I gut-'hh OH WHAT I starduh

SA:Y'h So I just plan:ned tuh have this week:ned et home

Y'know, a[↓l all day Saturday'n all day Sundee: =

[M-hm]

B: =h'hhh

M: → [↑Ah hah:

B: [↑And it's ↑juhhs t bee(h)n ↑wo:nderfu(h)l.

M: → W'll ↑ah ↑be: it.

B: ↑hh'↑hh↑↑jus'tuh

B: [↑Ah'll bet it ha: s.

r:really (1.0) fee: l he:ld here= [↑Ah hu-u:h tu- y'know jus'tuh
B: =yihknow w't I mean ( )
M: *⇒ ["F E : A H"] ah know whatchee mean=
B: [Here for a(p)]
M: *⇒ ["Yih feel like yer really uh-accomplishin something while
Y'were stayin 'r hoo: 'me.]
B: 
M: *⇒ 
B: ["U-huh"]
M: *⇒ ["Y a :n ah think it's wunnerful hh I remember ah w'z-
member thinking () ah wz thinking about this t'myself
yesterday; uh you-oo () uh you know thinking about things
yid like tuh do; "hnn" ["M-hm,"]
B: 
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), pro-
ducing 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
recipieny', "M-hm," (line 48).

The possibility of a distinction between "Yeah" and "Mm hm" by refer-
ence 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 recipieny' 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 cir-
cumstances by reference to which the advice was generated; i.e., "Ye:ah.'h
'tch'hmmm 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. See G. Jefferson and J.R.E. Lee, "On the Analysis of Conversations in
which 'Troubles' and 'Anxieties' are Expressed", SSRC Final Report,
When the coparticipant declines to take up the close implicature of the optimistic projection and pursues the advice with a command-like utterance, "W'ut:se that on there" (line 32), a display of 'passive reciprocity', "Mm hm", is produced (lines 33 and 35).

1. (23.a.) [NB:NI:1:6:14-17ːr]
This fragment seems transparent for the distinction between 'passive recipiency' and 'speakership'. The command-like utterance "w' uː ze 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(.) that'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. (23.b.) [S:2:1:5:5-7:r]

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

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

G: I've just got th' ocher same plant right over there in the garden? We'll.
B: 

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

G: I uh you know she's older now then she was it gets harder all the time.
B: 

G: "Yeah, "Mm-hm," 
B: 

G: "Yeah, "Mm-hm," 
B: 

Well ah'm awf'lly glad tuh hear from yuh . . .
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 sequela 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 potenti-tiated earlier, as a subsequent to, and problematically coherent with, "wanting this that and the other", herself then doing some 'wanting'.

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 l.(1)-
l.(20) indicated a possible distinction between cases of the class 'acknow-
ledgedgment token', specifically as between "Yeah" and "Mm hm". This possible
distinction was followed up by an array exhibiting possible selective dis-
tribution of the tokens, Fragments l.(21.a.)-l.(22.f.), in which "Yeah"
emerges as recurrently associated with 'speakership', "Mm hm" with 'passive
recipiencty'.

With that possible systematicity as a resource, we could begin to see
some of the work it could be put to, as in Fragments l.(23.a.) and l.(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 conversa-
tional device.

And in the consideration of Fragment l.(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 recipiencty', then,
may be characterized as having elicited further talk, and rather dramati-

cally 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 copar-
participant's agreement that she could have them, etc. etc. All that
is treated as already in hand, requiring no explication. In this con-
text the little expilcatory-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]

1 C: The kid didn't have any place tih go, we saw im hanging around
  the church, he hel'my hub'sn fix ar car,
  (0.2)

4 D: → M-h'm

5 C: En I asked if he'd like tih stay with us 'h'hhh becuz
eez sleepin in cars.hh

7 D: → M-h'm

8 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

10 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 hhhhh 'hhhh
en I'm not just saying that it is true, (0.4) 'hhhh He hasn'
been able tin get work in iz own line evry time' he does, (.) ''hh
they say eez not fast enough, (.) en they can't bother
training in, 'hh he's forty two years old en eez working (0.3)
ter a (.) termite (.) place now,
(0.4)
D: → Mm-hm.
C: En that isn't the kinda work my husbin's gotta good brain.
(0.6)
C: There is gonna be no Chrismiss in this house becuz every
cent he's made 'hhhh 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.


C: We'll? uh it's been pretty hard tuh talk to'er cuz she's
not very coherent.
(0.6)
D: → [Mm hm?
C: In other words it's the same deal if she don't wan' itche
can't do anything.
D: *→ 'hh Yes the only thing (.) u-an:and (.) you (.) believe that
she don'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?
Well it's uh it's part of the uh tricky psychological system.

Most of the time most of us react to people the way our parents reacted to us and that's why we can't understand it. I see So that when you say alright that's enough I don't wanna have anything to do with you any more you're suddenly parents.

D: Yeh
C: Yeh you're suddenly emotionally

D: Yeh something like that
C: Not really, but

D: something like that, that's right
C: So it's not really you it's just a button pusher
D: Yah, yah
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 tape recorded 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.(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: Di hyuh have a gun at home?
2 C: A forty five,
(0.6)
3 D: Yih do have a forty five.
4 C: → Mm hm, 't's loaded.
   (( 15 lines omitted ))
21 D: Eyah ee- ɐ:-ah:: i n Yuh have a forty five en it's loaded.
22 C: → Mm:mm?
23 D: A:"nd uh (0.4) I spoze maybe evryone in:hh evrehwhuh- 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'.

---

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 P: Dizziness; (0.5) not like it use tuh be: ?hh (. ) permanently
2 through? (0.2) all th' tah: m, B't (1.5) in (. ) sh: ort
3 periods. th-in: e-it dezn' last that lo: ng.
4 D: Mm, "

¹. There is also a tendency to use "Yes" or "Yeah" where an American would use "Oh".
5 P: three: four times yestiddee.
6 D2: *hnhn
7 D: *Mm.
8 P: [A h ih] What's what's the headache like when it comes.
9 D2: *1.5
10 P: Wherever it stahts whether it's top front or back, it goes back (. ) eventually to the back.
11 D: *Mm.
12 (1.5)
13 P: Ah::: hhh Yestee didn'make no differnce, ih- it js carried on all d-aw-all day'n: bes'pah't'v the evenin.

The second fragment picks up as 'D' is initiating closure of the inter-
view.

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 P: [Yeh. [Ah still Ah still ca:n't ( ) r-rekinize
3 D: halif th'people ( )]. t's t's th' t's th'
4 P: t's t's th'
5 D: *M-hm,
6 P: ye:s.
7 D: *[uzzuh nu:r:se
8 D: * ['hhn Well don't ( ) eh don't worry about that
9 P: et the moment becuss when yu have electric treatmen't= 
10 D:= does te:n:d fer a ti:me 'hnn to upset yer mem'ry fer a birt.( )?
11 P: no this is befo re you staht ed giving me electric.
12 D: *[Ye:s b't ah mean: th'ih,h
13 P: th-the electric treatmen'does this "'yihku:m:w,
14 D: (0.4)
15 P: 'h a litle, 'hnn eh fer a l'il'le ti:me,
16 D: (0.4)
17 P: you'll fee- y'll fine you've you fingertful of things.
18 (0.7)
19 P: *M-mh.
20 D: ['hnnhhhh
21 (0.2)
22 D: An' you uh-uh-shyou musn't fuhget ( . ) you musn't eh uh-m-
23 D: (. ) worry about the othuh biheau:se, h' hnn you've got d'
24 P: accep't th'FACT thet yiv Been i:ll: fer a lo:ng ti:me=
25 D: W e l
26 P: [Ye:ah b't
27 D: [Bob en it's a very i:ll: i:-
28 P: [N o : w
29 D: You will ut tend tih finget ( . ) a lo''a things.
30 P: take the rememberin.
P: What'urts me uh(.).part fr'm that is uh- I can't remember 'all the tahn that'hh ah've only ever remm (.) remembered to (1.2) SHAVE m'self about fi ve tahnms In th'la-s' three-

D: →  

P: uhr four months. \[\frac{\text{o-M-hm}}{\text{M-hm}}\] (0.7)

D: → \[\frac{\text{M-hm},}{\text{U}}\] (1.2)

P: Ah can't remember the < (0.4)

D: (→) Ye:hh?hhh-hhh

P: (seat'n arrangements), Ah've still got this dah:mm dischahrgge comin fro:m?

D: → \[\frac{\text{o-M-hm},}{\text{M-hm}}\]

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 "o-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, "o-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', "o-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 pos-

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 simultaneity', 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.
sible 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.

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 not 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
   wasn't that the dirdies' Place?=
3  E: → =[[n I s'aid you know? I: felt the same thing? but I didn'
   wanna say'nything to yuh but I jis' fe][Y a'h.]
6  E: → =dirty when ah wa:lked un the carpet.

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

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

However, in these and other materials, the tokens may be retrospec-

tively 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]

L: I never said anything b't uh Dwight said d'day he siz
wasn't that the dirdes' place?

E: =[[Y e s.]]

L: =[[I'm I s a id you know? I: felt the same thing? but I didn'
 wanna say'nothing to yuh but I jis' fe'il]]

E: =

L: =dirdy when ah wa:iked un the carpet.

E: *=

'h Well you know we were the:re in Ju:ne,yihknow Brad
played go;lf en uh (,) when the:air conditioner wen'off?h

'hh en wir the bout the only ones that had'n air
conditioned room the rest of 'm were bro:ken . . .

1.(26) [Expanded]

N: It's the ni:ghts rilly it's getti:ng me do:wn,

I: =[[Ye:s.]]

N: =[["Ye:s.]]

I: =[[en early in the e:venings?]]

N: = Ye:'hh Well in a:wa:y I'm no:t uh 'hh

I: = I'm not sorry because Giny's arriving my granddaughter's

arriving from: uh'hh uh: Caraacas. tinda:y,

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

G: I'll do it uh jih- I'll g- ez just ez soon ez li: c'n get
kinda straightened ou: t'n get ti:h things go:ing=

B: =[[Y e ah, ]

G: =I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se cuz=

B: =[[Ye:ah.]]

G: =[[Re:y h a:id tih go ou:t tih phone me; when 'e- he found
the water wiz o:ff,]]

B: = Ye:ah "hhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh"

G: =[(0.3)]Ain'd uh; things j's,

B: *=

[But n o wy! don't chu:(d) e:; do
too much.running around er wear yerse;If ou:t.]

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

L: Alright chu jis come up there tih th'blo:ck enna half from
there.

E: = MM: hm?

E: = Go to the ri:ght.

L: Uh-y we'll it's on the right ha:nd=

E: =[( ]

E: =[[Yah.]]

L: Yeah en yuh tu;rn ba:ck in there to the yin' y i h e j o:

L: well yi'd go;=

E: =['hh

E: *=

=y:YA:E:KLE hadda place up there I think. This Yaekle of uh
*uh* uh: (,) automobile (0.2) ga:h thet wz ki:ll ed.
1. (29) [TCI(b):16:14-15] ((L accumulated enough gift-party credits to get a boardgame priced at $6.00 for free))

J: It looks like ud be fun.
L: Yeah, I think so I think 'hrrr fer _no_ then, yknw it's=
J: =[[kind've en expensive ga:_me,
L: 'hrrr'ah.
J: l'en'I'd ne ver buy it,=
L: [Ah-
J: --> =You wanna hear s(hh)uhhm? hnh hnh hnh=
L: =Wha-a-at,
J: =[['hrrr'rrr After Jack's mother bought that?=
L: U h h u i h ?
J: =[[?hrrr'rrr'rrr'rrr Ah: it's et Toys'R Us fer four thirdy
L: ei:ght. eh? hnh
J: Yer f_kide::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]

E: So uh Brad hadtuh work, I guess I toldjuh that.
L: ="Yuh,"
L: =Yea:uh.
E: *= What's new with you:

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

M: Lorrrna's awright is she?=
G: =Yes she's fine eh I popped (do:a:n) lahs' night.=
M: =[[Oh: thaht's good.She's awright,=
G: =[[ P'r awhile, Thomas came with
M: =me, s:or: u h
G: =YeeYeah,=
G: *= 'hh so that wz it'h How's Le:s anyway.
But that wz the only big money that I won.

"M-hm."

F: And uh I didn't 'hh (. ) I didn't (. ) lo:se (0.3) very much a' the money.

B: "M-hm" 

F: Uh: it-

B: r[ w' that's goo'-d.

F: \[ paid some a'my expenses.'h-hh

B: \"Ye:ah.\"

F: \[ So aa- uh o\v:er\v:al I think that we a:ll had a tri:p.

It sounds like a good trip.

Yi:know it's funny uh: uh Brad played at San Mar-av yih gotta minute?=

"Su: re." "Wm hm." 

\[ I'm not g'nna take too lon-g. "h-hh

\[ hhhhh [No u'm wait\']n on the electrician'e hasn' been here e:all en 'h-hh he w'spoze t'

be here et ei:ght un' clock this mornin'.

\[Oh: God. I y: I k-

I give uh- you know we gotta ch- we've gotta cra:ick in ar: beautiful new basin I to:ld Juh,"

\[Oh: \"W, \"(Bill) Jst
gotta come'n putta new one the 1-guy:'s gotta come en check It'n see: 'v Iv it's auth:hen:ic that it cra:icked'n all this bit yi:know,=

\[Ye:::uh,

\[h: B't any way we played golf et San or Brad played et

San Mar:rous so I went down with im . . . .

That's th'one I wanted to go en I couldn't go:. 

\[Uh huh,

(0.7) 

\[that ti:me." 

\[Ya:h."

\[t'hhh Well I won't keep you Bea . . . .

(So Brad fih- ) rigged it up tuhday with a smaller hook en a leader with a- 'hhh yi:know small line.

Yeah.

'hhh 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. (36.a) [SBE:3:1:8:r]  

1  M:  
2  en that's not en awful lotta fruitcake.  
3  (0.8)  
4  M:  
5  Course it is. A little piece goes a long way.  
6  H:  
7  Well that's right.

1. (36.b) [Heritage:01:2:Ex:1]  

1  I:  
2  'hh Uh: no:w 'hh uh Sue's got one or two things that she 
3  wants to get over.'hh What about Boxing Day afternoon? 
4  how are you fixed.  
5  (0.3)  
6  I:  
7  I mean if there are too many people say so, because it's 
8  not necessary  
9  (0.5)  
10  J:  
11  'Noo we we we'll be havin' hr ( )  
12  I:  
13  th'm when they come on Christmas Eve but 'hh I think 
14  (feruh)- she'd like tuh see th'm va::ill,  
15  (0.4)  
16  J:  
17  (W'l no do)- em Janet'n Ronald'n Anderson will hev goan 
18  own: to uh Ka:y's on-o: Boxing Da::ill,  
19  (eeYes. ) [eeYes.  ]  
20  [mm]:

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

1  E:  
2  'hh Well they wear those flairs ye'llie bit Lottie it's 
3  not too flai:red,  
4  (.)  
5  E:  
6  But uh I know how yeh feel,  
7  (.)  
8  E:  
9  Jist isn' comforuble 'hh Well (is hard) tuh make a dress 
10  (any( )),  
11  [O H : : : I-LOVED IT-LAST YEAR but it doesn't uh do any-  
12  [NO:  
13  [NO the- mnh  
14  (Yeh you've lost suh 
15  much weight.  
16  L:  
17  uhh hnh uhh mnh Well not that much.  
18  E:  
19  [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 receiving 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, let yoo, but I: 1: lo' ved it. Th wz just delig,htful.

2 P: [0 h : : i o 0 (Wel)]

3 E: I wz gla'd y o u ['(nd yer f: friends, r so da: ri: ng, =

4 P: =O h: : : : it wz:

5 E: e - that J a:n isn' she a do: [iY e' h isn't she pretty,

6 P: ()

7 E: Oh: she's a beautiful girl. =

8 P: =Yeh I think she's a pretty gi'rl.

9 E: [En that Matheson:]

10 E: She CCA:RES me, with eigh't kids en u-Oh my God what =

11 P: =she doe:s=.

12 E: Mm hm:.="

13 E: Fantastic?

14 P: Course I think she's u-over that, (0,3) pla:ce: yin'know wer

15 E: (.)

16 P: s-e she ha(d)- becauz see four a'them er

17 E: (Y'know what I)


19 P: =She on'y ha: s two et home no:w.

20 E: (0,3)

21 P: [Bu't] it wz sump'n though c'n you ima: gine nat Emma?

22 E: (.)

23 P: ha'll those years?

24 E: [That makes me s-tired ri: ght 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 informa-
tive 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 ylotta cute things down that Bay t'day.
2 E: Oh, Go: d they did.
3 E: (You o'dd(.),) shop there: really en have beautiful clo:ze
4 never leave th'place,
5 (0.3)
6 L: Yeah they sure got. Boy but their slacks er sure hi:gh,
7 E: Ye:ah.
8 L: Well slacks are high.
9 (0.2)
10 E: Ye:ah 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 segregated 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 'uhr fer a cuup a' tea in the shft
2 M: noon [i: ] [Ye:is.
3 M: Did theh li:ke it?
4 J: a0h ye: s.
5 M: [Ye:is uh'm du: re they did,]
6 J: W'l they beex in befoh:
7 (0.2)
2. (2) [SBL:3:4:1-2:r]

A: en ah rilly felt terribly ba:d abaat th' way she (. ) treated 'er be'fohhr. *

P: [Ye:ah,]

(0.2)

A: An' she jus: gb:abbed her buh th' hea:nd w'n she got through with it it wss: (0.4) it wz re:a:rilly +Oh it (w'digiz it)

(0.3)

A: one of the most thril ling progs ah know ah've ever been to.( )

P: [Wul it had a n:ice write up in the paper too]

A: ah noticed th(h)a(h)t

L'match! Wul that's g'd 'hhh W'il ↑LI:STEN uh-

↑Tuesday ni ght we're starting that Mother's Club bit again et the νchurch.

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

L: Doctor Hathaway wannida come down, gee I wan'oo uh pay'im fer yihknow giv'n me that stuff fer mah arthritis,

E: [Mmhm,]

L: En I mean, he won't take any money en evrything, 'hhh en then, Earl's gonna have uh: a guy from: Central. down. fer a week so. Yihknow.

E: [Mm.]

L: Mm hm,

E: I mean it's jus', eh, business.

L: [Ye:ah,]

( )

L: 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))

B: but most of them had children en: wun'duh be in Hope School dis trict.

M: [Mm hm, Mm hm?]

'hhhh And uh 'hh So I'm y-I jis thought I:

(w) d-wo:nduh share that with you=*

M: [Yeah well ↑good↑, 'hh Say tell me something Bea: ( ) What y-

Cu:]

M: is the uh:m I always feel sorry fer someone when they lose their husb'n er the husb'n loses the wi:fe.
2.5 [SEL: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
dressed for lunch. A luncheon.
4 V: [Oh.
5 V: *⇒ Well how nice. Well you know I didn't get through, it-it
was the strangest thing, see no matter which way I'd go
there'd be somebody looking f(hh)or m(hh)e... .

2.6 [SEL: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
afternoon. Paper was already off the press.
4 B: [Uh huh.
5 B: Uh huh.
6 H: Boy it was a bad one though.
7 B: → Well that's too bad.
8 H: Kinda (creepy.)
9 B: *⇒ [You know I looked and looked in the paper- I think
10 I told you f-for that uh f-fall over at the bowl that
11 night. And I never saw a thing about it... .

2.7 [Owen:SEL5(A):40-41]

1 A: and it wz about one pound fifty fer a bottle en it wz
2 rubberish.
3 B: Oh; (go[lly).
4 A: s(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 really was ba:d.
9 B: (Oh; hm:.)
10 (0.3)
11 B: → sTh't's° (0.2) 'tch ( ) disappointing.
12 A: sHM:.
13 B: *⇒ We had s'm;'hh my fa- () my fathuh makes wi:ne ez well
14 'n lahs'time we wuh thean he'd made s'm (.) g-s'm el::duh
15 flouh. En thahnt wz re:aa::lly nif: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:01:3:1]

1  B:    So:: really(n) () no:w we jus: jus: hav to suh'v () 'h
2     wait'n see I guess
3  S: -*  That's very: disappointing isn't it (\[\text{I-} \]
4     (0.8)
5  B:    Pain in the 'hh (0.2) neck.
6  S:    Yes
7  B:    (.)
8  S: -*  [Wel-
9     Really,
10  B:    (.)
11  S: -*  I was very annoyed with th'm this aftnoon probly y(h)or
12     mothfah th'thold 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, "That's/<We:<" (lines 5-6), and reintroduces it subsequently (line 8).

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

1  E:    They gon' take'm down the beach now'n wa:lk'm down the
2     beach thehr-so: cute] n one of'm] s blâ::ck,hîh'h
3  L:    [\[\text{h} : \text{g } u : u : d . o .
4     (.)
5  L: -*  That's/<
6  E:    That's wonderful isn't it?
7  L:    [\[\text{u-} \]
8  L: -*  I wz jis tell'n,Ea:rl we ha:d uh: few up there la:s'night= 
9  E:    ([\text{(vl)}] hûhûh[h]) [\text{(7)(sniff))}
10  L:    th'îrs'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 received, whereupon shift is achieved.

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

1  L:    He got marriedje know Da:ve.
2  E:    Oh no:::
3  L:    Ewuz- Kathy got married too.
4  E:    [\text{h}hh Oh no.
5  L:    Yeah.
6  E:    How'n the hell duh they find people tuh marry,
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 o:1 painting: uhh
2 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 goodnes's sake;

22 M: ["An' he's going tih have en exhibition.

23 (. )

24 M: Of 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 tih have en exhibition.

27 (. )

28 M: An' it's either gonna be et De la Terra Plaza they haven'

29 quite decided where it's going tih be: eh- o:1 raps in

30 the Fox Arlington there in th'lobby, t

31 B: Ah huh,

32 M: ["hhhhhh hhh! An' he's gonna make his own paintings,

33 (0.2)

34 B: ["M-hm"

35 M: = and or ah mean his own frames.

36 B: ["Yah, ."

37 M: But chee he az um beautifu1 things.

38 B: W'l isn't that nice.

39 M: * Oht: t.: Really I- I jis said to: uhm- m: 'tch (0.3) Maybe:

40 las'night ah s'd yihkno: w? in some other life he was a

41 genius'r something?< the wa: s.

42 B: ["M-hm."

43 (0.3)

44 M: Ah mean cuz eez so gifted'n he so versatile in so many wa:ys.

45 B: ["M-hm."

46 B: ["M-hm."

47 M: ["hhhhhh A:nd uhm (. ) but he az a snow scene. an' he has en

48 ocean scene . . .

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. (4.0)

4 E: *hnhn whhhhaa:: ((1.0)

5 L: Yeah.

6 E: Lottie, yih- [Yeh-

7 L: Yih

8 E: Yihknow Ronny went down'n got those guys from Pen'lton. I
didn't know you had comp'ny.

9 L: No.

10 E: And uh th- two of'em're goin across th'street, the toois-
kyu- and one of'm- uh down the street goin with Ronny, is
da::rk, 'hnhn There's uhv there's fou of'm'n one of'm's
colored.

11 L: 

12 E: Wul gooo::d.

13 E: *w* [Yeh isn't that trivig? so all the kids er stan'n
out here th'marihnes get outta the car th'sta(h)ation=

14 L: w*eh henh hnh assertion

15 E: *wa:g'nh huhh::hhh and .....

Again we note that following the teller's 'assessment-warranted' con-
tinuation (see lines 18-19) the recipient returns to an exhibit of 'recip-
ieny', 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 [utter-
ance → 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 acknow-
ledgement 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.
L: Oh Tuesdee I'm onna: it's Nebby's birthday en I'm onna give'm a party over et the 'waiian'ou:se o'w'th a s'prize party' e doesn'ev'n know ahah it.°
E: [Oh really?]
L: two peophle kh(h)o(h)mahn
E: inYehehuh.
L: in'Yehehuh.
E: Yee all back tighether again hu:h?
L: [Oh: *no: b't I'm g'nnen
E: give it to'm any'way,'°
L: Are yih (.)
E: How old's'e gunnuh be.
L: (0.7)
E: Fifty f' six?
L: Ye:ah.
L: (0.3)
E: Ah'll be done.
L: 'Eah.
E: (0.3)
E: 't'k Oh that's right. There's ulotta /birthdays
L: (.)
E: Ye:ah an: uh:: y::: Phil Par'r f'm Par'f feld Ranch wul: l he's gunnuh (.') bring all the chicken for me.
L: (.)
L: Sohu::'
E: *-- Oh that's swel'yih havern' got the H'waiian House rented

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 announce-
ment 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, detracting 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 emer-
gence 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 celeb-

rity'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 pro-
vides 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; i.e., 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]
1 R: Well you r'member the change fr'm the fifties t' the sixties.
2 M: 't'n Yes I do.
Ah mean that was The Change right? hhh-hh  

M: (0.3)  

R: Right.  

M: An' my: eh: kind'v my point en what I've th::ought about'n  

R: what I feel very strongly is that there is another change.  

M: 'hhh fr'm the seventies intuh the sixties. end uh,  

R: uh:: what you said about Billie may be a good example of  

M: that: 'hhh Ah::ee::uh:: yih can't go: (0.2) on th- on  

R: the values of the sixties anymore.  

M: en the life style.  

R: Wo- (. ) Just ez you couldn't uh: from the (0.2) fifties  

M: intuh the sixties. 'hhh A::nd it's changing. And ah'm-  

R: I'm trying to project what's: what's coming next.  

M: All of this, (. ) in a comedy.  

R: That's very very interesting cuz this is y- (. ) somewhat, of  

M: what th'ka:y::- sa:me type (. ) of thing wir dealing with,  

R: with this uh (0.7) 'tk'hnhh these kids ev gotten out of  

drug: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]  

H: gotchur ca:rd. Thank you very much. [ih-  

I: Goo:d h'hhh  

(. )
In this case, what might have led more or less directly to the request for advice is detracted 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 consensus-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: e0h:: 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. 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 ya: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) [SEL:1:1:12:3-4:r]

1  B: Oh it wz just in nice order... good eh: nice'n clean

M: M-hm.

3  B: in, si:de...

4  M: M-m, M-hm.

5  B: 'hhh 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) [SEL:1:1:12:6-7:r]

B: And so people don't uh: aren't buying them.

M: M-hm: [M.

M: 't'hh But ah remember w'n ah wz in: Billingsgs e-a:nd uh when I p't th- did the sa:yuh (.) I mean ah wz selling that house so I put'n a:d I had'n the real estate (. ) b't I al:so:,'hh ran'n ad myself? en I 'sold it my:seif: en I 'member et th' time thinkin't wz kinda fru:zn.

B: s'ee:aw: (. )

B: Aw huh,'h

M: [it i:s, 'huh? I wz uh:'hhh I j's thought gee: tihday I thaw gee I wish I had a couple a'more lot's: ..

The prior recipient's own telling is itself minimally receipted by the prior teller, who returns to her own telling.
M: → W'll I think that's wonderful Bea.
B: → Why I'm so thrilled, I jus' wanduh [call 2 someone you know—
M: → [Ah'll betchu a z:re,
B: → =en I [I thaw well ah'Il sha:re that with Ma:rgie=
M: → =[[she'll understa:nd, 'h-hh
B: → YEAUH. (.)
M: → [[En I'm
B: → I think it's wonderful really en I think it's: uh—
M: → But I [just=
B: → 'hh eh I'm just' so happy about it,
M: → Ye:a uh.
B: → [hh ekkkhm ekkhm No: en then too? u-ey bih- it's been
M: → fu:n doing it myse:lf.
B: → [t'h'h 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 [N o y u—'e-s-see I pla:n'
B: → tuh: I stayed home la:st evening en I pla:n:' to uh+ . . .

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; i.e., an assessment, the speaker produces a shift.

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

J: Bu:tt I don'k'n w'z thinkin, (.) with it (.) being co:ld
L: jhjk'n en it's g'na: (. ) prolly be getting rainy someday,
J: hhh hh h— Ihh wish it w'd ra:i:n,
L: [Y e:a : h,
J: 'hhhh:
L: tüh 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,
J: 'tch
L: → Yeah, that's go:od. 'hhh
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:h-hh
L: [Mm,
J: Th'gave'er the wrong z:ize so sh'astuh take those b:ack so
'hhh 'n I couldn't stand staying in the house another day...
2. (20) [Rahman:B:1:(10)f:3]  
1 L: B't we'adda good night'hh an' (..) they might be goin' across  
2 Duh Chestuh f'he 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 G: [Ye:s. [Ye:s. Ah'll see you inna fe'l'w minutes.  

1 S: She's surprized they could get it out the window cz she  
2 said it wz really heavy.  
3 M: Ye:s.  
4 S: Her dad'ad trouble liftin' it. So,  
5 M: (. )  
6 S: [Ya:h  
7 M: Th'back Ya:h.  
8 (0.5)  
9 M: So: uh  
10 S: 'B't it wz bran'new I mean  
11 M: Oo-h: (ye:s)  
12 S: [tch  
13 (0.2)  
14 S: 'Oh dea:r.  
15 (. )  
16 M: *→ Terrible isn't it,  
17 S: *→ [Any way I'd better go (Dad J's s'd-)  
18 (0.2)  
19 M: Ye:s.  
20 S: [Ye:Dad said's thinks people be ringing thorough  
21 M: probably willl . . .  
22  

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 Linguis-
tics, University of Cambridge, also under an SSRC grant. We will  

Report of the Project on Topic Organization in Conversations, Novem-
ber 1980.
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.

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) [(NC:I:53-54)]

1  L: I try to get home before five o'clock since the fog is been
2  \- 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
7  So
8  W: \-[Sure. Well then-uh::m
9  L: so I try tuh get home before
10  five uh'clock.
11  W: \[Yeh. Well it'll be gone tomorrow, I unduhstand it'll be the
12  last day.
13  L: That's what they said on TV \[but they're not always right,
14  \Ye\-ah.
15  W: \[No. Well look uh:::
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 that she hed jist ordered those item:s, en got them last week.hhhhhhhhhh
2 L: Oh:,
3 J: 't'llllhhh 'That's what makes me: really disgusted now I affih
tell those people that- we don't'(.), yih know well they=
4 L: [Yeah.
5 J: =don't have'em yih getter money back b't yet 'hhhhhhhh How come Cleo got'em yihknow en here I've been waiting fer two
6 months. hh'hkh
7 L: Ye:ah:
8 (.)
9 L: Right.
10 J: =That's what rilly made me mad=
11 =Hu:sh.
12 J: [hhhh En I thought maybe they've gotta some: supply:
'hhhh A:ssn' (.), tht uh:m 'tk'hh since she wz a deal:er then
they sold'em tuh her.
13 L: Hm:.
14 (0.2)
15 J: 't:o Ah don't kno:w.'
16 L: [ 'Ah don't kno:w.'
17 (0.3)
18 J: *=? 't'llllhh,
19 L: -> [W'll that's u too ba:d]
20 J: *=? [B't a:nyway it rilly makes me: (.), kinda
21 disgusted, 'hhhh Pay siz I'd write them a letter en tell'em
22 jus whatchu think about that kind of bu(h)si(h)nes:s'shhhehh
23 L: [Ye:ah,
24 J: 'n I sid ye:ah,
25 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'llllhh B't a:nyway it rilly makes me: (.), kinda...
24 L: *=? [W'll that'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 simultaneity, 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]

1 P: She's up et uh: Ronny's mo:m's no:w, she wen' up (.) Sundee
2 E: "hth-"hth-"hth They came down f'r dinner:=
3 P: =[[Mm:-hm:]]
4 E: en then uh: shil I'll go get her tuhmorow.
5 E: Oh. W'l that'ts "wonderful."
6 P: [En then uh, ](.) too- e- she has en ol'
7 friend . . .

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

1 G: An' is he any be(.)tter. Is it u-h
2 M: \twOo-ih- Ye:s his bahck
3 G: hahs been much better the lah's two da:y:s?
4 G: =aOh: that's good (the:n), [Bët h a d Th]. pai:n's go:n?:
5 M: →

In these two instances a prior speaker may be characterized as systematically 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

¹ The matter of an inbreath as recognizably 'initiating' that which follows is considered shortly (see pages 68-92).
"That's/We:"

respectively, and in Fragment 2.(18) page 52, "It is kinda fun Ah/\ knowing 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.

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: -e-eh henh henh hnh
3 E: =↑the ↓car-th'stat(h)ation wa:g'n'huhh::hhh
4 L: [c'henn henh hnh]
5 E: → [And]'hhh
6 6 E: → [Oh:]'that's won de e rful.'
7 E: → [the:re's uh'](.) two young gir:is 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.l.) [NB:IV:10:15]

1 L: They wanted me to stay tonight, an:::
2 E: [I thought maybe you did]
3 when I called you...
2.(23.c.2.) [NB:IV:14:16a]

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

And recurrently, such lexicalcs as "And", "But", "So", etc., are 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. [[[hnhnhnhh
3 (.).
4 R: A:::nd (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: (0.7) [So uh,
4 B: They always are((h)))hh

In Fragment 2.(23.c.) the utterance breaks off post the 'continuation' token "And 'hhh" 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'il that's u too ba:d
25 J: [B't a:nway it] rilly makes me: (.) kinda . . .
In Fragment 2.23.a.) there is hesitation and break in flow.

5  E: Oh. W'll that's",wonderful." [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: 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:n d e rful.
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

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-implication of a recipient's assessment.

In the following fragment a speaker is transparently responsive to the close implication 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 has two et home now.
2 (0.3) /
3 E: Neah.
4 P: But it wz sum'n though c'n you imagine nat Emma?
5 (.)
6 P: HAll those years?
7 E: [That makes me tired right no:w. Ez ah-'hhh
8 Mm:MMM:MMM:]
9 P: Wir painting like maid in th'kitchen and=
10 P: [Oh are yuh?]
11 E: = [Oh evrythin'g's workin out so pretty he re with ar
12 [Oh:.....]
13 E: i'nnat good.
14 *Yeaaa! hhhhhhh En I J's thought I'd give yih a buzz I
15 shoulda called yih sooner b't I don't know where the week
16 we:nt,
17 E: [y-We:ll: Oh yEmma tyou don'haftuh call me up=
18 P: [I want t o :]
19 E: [I w'js'tickled that= (.) y1hkn0:w w'n you came up...}
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 so pretty he//re with ar" (lines 11-12), and the post-assessment acknowledgment token, "↑Yeeah!" (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 'h How's Le:s anyway"; 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:1:6]

1. G: 'hhh An' it wz ↓(.) yiknow it wz a right good m:mur der-
2. L: ...-y-
3. G: [Right good ]-thrill [uh]
4. L: [Y e : s . ]-m-
5. G: [[Nm:]]
6. L: [Oh go o : d . ]
7. G: "'hh Ye:s:'h An' it ezzuh yiknow suht'y 'n: ç-
8. it en:ded with a great big 'bahng ehh h he 1-jump ped-
9. L: ["Oh-huh::"]
10. G: outta the ç seat . . .
2. (24.b.) [TCI(b):16:14]

1 L: So I got ten dollars credit fer that so(m) I go-ot twelve dollars worth of stuff.
2 J: Oh: 'god.
3 L: Yeah.'hh
4 J: 't Oh:::
5 L: 'hh I'm nna give one tuh my liddle sister.=
7 L: 'nd I'm g'nna: keep one fer u:s.
8 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'siz boy I sure like'er'n I hope I g'n make 'er happy so (.) when-'hh we came home why he went in bed 'n then we went swimming again,
3 E: "M m hm,"
4 L: [fore we(h'h)n't'bed.'hhhh,
5 E: Oh::, Go'd isn'at fu[: : : i]n,=
6 L: ehhh he
7 E: =Yeah.'hh So'hh (0.2) I told Isabel'e said'at'e seh yAh
8 yer a liar. I sz well no: at's he said the:: they-he said
9 that to me he s'z well'he never tells me en I siz 'e said
10 that- tuh:me
11 E: [Em 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).


1 B: I this's kind'v brought her t(h)uh li:fe I think,h'hhhh
2 R: The- the hou:se busi:ness
3 B: The ch(h)a:nge,
4 R: Uh huh.
5 B: Uh huh,
6 R: Well I think that's ni::ce.
Ye:ah'd. 'h, hh Thet she's going tih have something=
[That's really (great)
besides herself tuh think of fer awhile,
Well that's wonderfull.
Uh-huh'hh No,:t that she's too much given tuh that:
but I; think it was kind'v (0.2) bothering her yuhknow:
I mean the uh'hh [her health]
0'h DEAR when you get along like she 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

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  agreement 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 insis-
tance upon his own line, and the other party's relinquishment of a differ-
ent 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 recipien-
cy' 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 drama-
tic 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), 'subsidence 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 assess-
ment. 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]

1 L: 'hh out'v'er kit sales. I got uh:: (0.3) think it wz
2 thirdy four dollars.
3 J: — Ye:ah. (0.5) Goo::d=
4 L: **- =En the:n:: my regular party, 'hh uh my sales were a
5 hundred'n o::ne,
6 J: — Goo::d::
7 L: **- [En then y I got _ten_ dollars fer the packageen'n
8 stuff,
10 L: En then Deanna booked a party so ... 

2.(25.b.) [SHE;2:1;6:1]

1 B: I'm just serving uhm (1.0) 'tch
2 R: des:ert I imagine,
3 B: a bowl of ice cream an' some:: little home made (1.0)
4 cake cookies, or something,
5 R: — Oh good.
6 B: **- And uhm coffee, or Sanka,
7 R: — [Oh-
8 R: — That's fine.
9 B: **- And uhm I:: won't get it'n'til the last minute, because I
10 haven't room fer too much in- you know,
11 R: — [Oh.
12 R: — I wasn' I wasn' going to get it until late tomorrow ... 

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

1 G: I'm'nna do s'm spaghetti'n: (. ) n-eh::m meatballs f'tea
2 fuh this lot now,
3 L: — Oh lovely.
4 G: **- Cz they didn't have y they only had fish fingehs'n chips
5 fih'dinnih,
6 L: — 'ceYes.'
7 G: B't thez no'thing in to:wn. ...
2. (25. d.) [NB: IV: 1.9]  

L: Well it's right nex' door. She, I think they do real good work.
E: -> Good.
L: *'t least they sew all the buttons on'n stuff like that.
E: -> Yea:h.
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 'misapprehended' 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, "Yeaaaah! 'hnnnannnn 6n 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.) [SEL:1:1:12:7]

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

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

B:  "Mm hm," 'hnnnannn 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.) [SEL:2:1:5:14-15]

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

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

B:  → That's true: 'hnn 'hnnhnnhnn 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 contin-
uation. 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.


1  B: "W'l thet's good.
  2  F: ↑Ya:hp.h=
  3  B: ↑W'l I'm awf'ly ↑glad tih ↑hear it

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


1  B: W'l that's fu:in.
  2  (.)
  3  M: "↑Yeh."
  4  B: ↑Un how big <How many tables.

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 assess-

---

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. 'hhhhh=
E: MMMYUM!
N: =[[ Well I'm gonna call Neville's mother . . .]
ment', 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 in-breath 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.

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 in-breath 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]

10 C: 'hhhhh-th'W'll then i z too fclo:se fsee, [Did y]ou notice: uh...

11 K: [Did y]ou notice: uh...

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

1.(23.a.) [Detail]

5 E: ah this pro:vide iss: uh kind 'v a, hh'h'hh'h

6 L: \[\text{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.) [SEL:2:2:3:8:r]

1 C: En so, I mean y-we coulda we: we could of really got through, all'v ar ha:nds a lot fa:ster if they hadn'a' been: 'hnh'h

3 K: Yaha b't see we waste en awful lot en ah now

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

1. E: I don't know hhhhow in the hell yih get this Go:d da:mm
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. By e ah,] [h h h
4. G: =I wantuh getta phone in the hou:se cuz=
5. B: =[[Ye:ah,]
6. G: Roy h a:id tih go ou:t tih phone me; when'e- he found the
7. water miz o:ff,
8. B: =Ye:ah; "hhhh hh<
9. G: [(0.3)[A:n'd uh: things j's
10. B: [But no w↑don't chu: ;(g) ¥: do
too much, running around er wear yerse; If ou:it.

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 immi-
ment, 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:les, there.  
7 K:  →  Yahl. 'hhhh Um:m (.) I ca:iled...

1.(2) [Detail]

3 G:  I jump'd (.) e shot about th:ree feet in the air ah think 
4  →  the'h heh]: 'hh nn:om, we didn'go t'have ar haiuh done...
5 L:  →  

1.(3) [Detail]

8 J:  (inniz sle::d).
9 L:  →  [Y e]:: a h. 'hh (.) Un::om, . . . I found
   a _recipe: that 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:  →  ee?up. 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 tweney third I think.=
2 S:  =Yeh. '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:  →  Yeh:s. 'hhhh Um:m (0.3) t I jist had a thou:ght...
en he's awfully nice 'n I just uh... [n:Ye: ssh
'h is he still in business or retired.

other then that why uh he:
[4Ye:s. 'h Bu:t uh you see no
improvement.

with this ever then that
[Ye: i s, 'hh Ah yih quah-'t hahppy with
ier fuhr:nichuh,

That's all I know.
[Ye:ah, 'hh Well ah'm awfully glad tuh hear from
yuh...

That is, again and again such a configuration as Acknowledgment Token
+ Inbreath may be characterized as Response to Prior Utterance + Non-Lexi-
cal 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,'hhhhhh" (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 comple-
tion 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-
terminus 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 start-
ing; 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) "thel very ni://ce.",
Fragment 0.(3) "yer well tie:d do: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) "But 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: go://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 utter-
ance-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 moment-
tary 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, "franmen//there." Similar configurations can be found, e.g., in Fragment 1.(20) "They had (...) quite a lotta biscuit//s 'n cheee::ise," Fragment 2.(18) "Why I'm so ↑thrilled//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.'hnhh"; i.e., resembles 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 et cetera.\(^1\)

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, "Rory had tih go ou:t tih phone me; when'e- he found the water wiz oFF," (again, the rising intonation indicated by the non-underscored letter – underscored colon [ou:] configuration

---

1. Cf. an analogous 'retrogression' from Assessment to Acknowledgment Token in Fragments 2 (25:4) – 2 (25:4) pages 85 & 97
in "off,"). 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,"hnhn" (see lines 6-8).

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-implicativness 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.

l.(27) [Detail]

5  B:  [[Ye:ah,]
6  G:  [Ro[y h'aid tih go ou:t tih phone me: when'e- he found the
7      water wiz o:ff,
8  B:  [[Ye:ah, hnhn,hnh
9  G:  [\emptyset ][(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
\[ \phi \] 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, "'hnhhhnhh"). 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'he- he found the water wiz off,
8 B: [Ye:ah, 'hnhhhnhh]
9 G: \[ \phi \] [(0.3)\{Ain\'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-responsible 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 mmy fif t(h)y c(h)e(h)ents
C: [hnn-hnn-hnn-h a h-]ah-ha:h

1.(27.2.) [NB:IV:10:54:r]
L: 'n yis feels like yer-ta-kin a \[\{eh\}-uh\{uh\}-uh\{uh\}-a h-]ahh-ahh
E: [hnhh-ahh]

1.(27.3.) [Goodwin:AD:58:r]
C: I gotta git outta dih mood befo'I c'n git outta
dih t'cah,
L: a\{h ha ha ha ha ha ha
B: 'u-hu-huh\{h\}u: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 off, . . . and").

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

1.(27) [Detail 3]

8 B: [Ye:ah, 'hhhh-hh<]
9 G: [� [(0.3)) An'd uh: things I's]
10 B: [Fat n o w] don't chu:(d) e:: do
too much, running around er wear yerse:lf out.

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

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

J: But let's suppose that you are correct. And say that they do steal in order to get, specifically the marijuana. Alright?
R: Right.
J: Okay. Now uh, isn't that, uh:
R: Now I'm not saying every kid that steals is doing that=
J: [It-it-it-it-
R: fer that reason.

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

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

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

G: Well uh but uh yuh see've course she wouldn't uh:
J: [t No. of cou:rse. I mean then 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 hean from i'm tinday eh ah'1[l be[Ya:h.
2  E: =h hanging around that's nother reas'n thot ah
3  M: wantuh be he:uh.
4  E: Mem h m :
5  E: 't'hh W'1 Marth-a? I f y-
6  M: But thay'n'ks evuh sof' and um
7  E: *'f you NEED us? or wmd uh WAHNT a THING yihknow
8  M: w' 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 wmd 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 subse-
quent to the latter Acknowledgment Token + Inbreath raise questions about
the prior; i.e., about "Yeah(.)'nhnh" (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 t just ez soon ez I: c'n
2  get kinda straightened ou: t'n get thi:ngs going-
3  B:  [Ye ah, J- ] "h h h h
4  G:  =I want uh getta phone in the house 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 ap-
propriate 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 possibil-
ities, such as that which occurs, not immediately, but subsequently; i.e.,
"...getta phone in the house cuz" (line 4); i.e., "'n get" can be the pre-
decessor of something like "'n get]ta phone...". On its occurrence, then,
the overlapping sentential sub-unit "'n get" may be recognizably continua-
tion 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:ngs going-
3  B:  [Ye ah, J- ]
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, 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".  

Again, then, the recipient may be seen to be closely monitoring and responding to the unfolding component-in-progress, abandoning and then re-instituting 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

---

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 Construc

Construction as a Task and Resource", Psathes, G., Frankel, R., and Coulter, J.(ed.) 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.

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).

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, reinstallation and reabandonment, in comparison to the subsequent's initiation, commitment, abandonment and reinstatement.

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 reinstating 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(e) was extracted.

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

1. G: you know they always get so enth-uh:sed right away.
2. B: →
3. B: ← [uh-huh.]
4. G: ye:ah, hhh-\text{I}(h)kn(h)ow [\text{A n d t}he:n]: [h:pph:hhh
5. G: \text{Pretty }soon't begins tuh
7. B: ← [Yeah.]
8. B: ← [uh-huhhh Well Listen]
9. G: uh, she said everybody was ↑ so
10. B: ← [\text{Uh:}: in the house \text{oh}:? they were \text{Us} wonderful=]
11. G: [Goo:d. \text{A:n d s}o: uhm
12. G: I hope they stay thet way\text{.} \text{h A:n d s}o: uhm
13. (0.2)
14. G: uhm (0.4) They uhm (0.6) 'hh eh she feeuuls thet she's
15. not alo:ne wh'n:Penny goes out.
16. B: ← [Uh-huh,
Well of course that *is* nice.

That's true. (. ) 'huh: 'hhe: ahh:

hated tuh leave'er in the house. a 'lo ne.

Yes. j 'hh:

Well now d'you think you'll try tinh get up next 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]

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:1:6;10-11:r]

1. E: | Aw the kids'v had fun we been the fun zone we been out'n
2. th'boat 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-
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 real calm.
16. (0.4)
17. L: | Ye::ah.
18. (.)
20. E: ** 'fhn't'h-h-wul-
21. L: | Well bet id be good tihday wih this rain.
22. E: ** Ye::ah Well: wir (0.3) 'hh-hh Wir jis gettin things
23. kahnda wound 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'nat v good.", in the fragment at hand, "Oh:: goo::d." (line 6), herself initiates a shift, in Fragment 2.(24) "Yeeah!'hnhnhhnhh", in the fragment at hand, "Ye::a:uh'hnh" (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!'hnhnhhnhh 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 1963, 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

---

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.
someone should cut him off"; i.e., "that he's inviting 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 made vulnerable to and thus 'inviting' interruption, no interruption actually occurs. 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 tin 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 after the young children ez m(h)y w(h)ife did.
6 'hhh A::nd uh: (.). ythkneol:w, the strength of (.). young
7 children's demands . . .

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.


1 F: I've jus given them a meal so: (.). thehr gonna be uh
2 it'll keep'm wahrn fer awhile,
3 G: Oh(hh)(h)(h) or 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: [Yes,
8 F: [thez a hurriken uhr something 'hhh uh:: ah'll uh (.).
9 ah'll bring th'm in.
The elaborated analyses of these two fragments will not be shown. We point to the two candidate laugh-responsible utterances at lines 4-5 and 6-8 respectively; the first marked as such with in-speech laugh particles, "ez m(h)y w1(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).

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

---

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.
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.\(^1\)

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

\[\text{C: } \text{e-he-he-[e'-hhee-hh']\,e::a::yee:} \]
\[\text{B: } \text{n-he[u_h u_h[ehe']ahlahlahl]} \]
\[\text{L: } \text{eh'\,uh!ah!ah!ah!} \]

At lines 4/5/6 there is a marked diminution of volume (indicated by the degree signs \([\circ\])). The laughings-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 proceed with the telling, with "They" (line 10), he finds himself in overlap with a recipient's laughings 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 laughings-together. In system-

---

atic 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.

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, "'hiiiiii (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).

With the foregoing considerations we are arguing that in Fragment 2.(24) the teller who has so precipitously responded to the close-implication 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 you?]
11 E: =evrythin g's workin out so pretty he:re with ar
12 P: =Oh:------:
13 E: → i'nnat 4good,
14 P: =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 ma:d 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 called yih sooner b't I don't know where the week went, y-We'll: Oh-
17 P: =Emma you don't hard call me up=
18 E: =[[I want to :
19 P: =[[I w'js tickled thatche- (. ) nYihkn0w: w'n you came up...

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
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 recipien-

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

Inquiry (lines 7-9).

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

1. E: he's a goodlooking fell'm eez got a beautiful wi:fe.-
2. P: =Ye:s::Gor'geous girl'-'hh'h'hh e-We'll see he'n Ronny'v been
3. E: =Mm:hm:::::
4. P: ="h't So: he(g) e-he cont acted Ronny long time ago, en
5. E: Ronny said we'll h-'h'-'h'-'h (.) Ye:s: yiknow,
6. P: Is that his publicity then Sundee tht wz in the pa-per with 
7. E: [ i:Yeh? ]=
8. E: =Hu:rt?
9. (.)
10. P: [M m h m?]
11. E: [Ah'll be, (.)] da::rned,]
12. P: [uY a:h.
13. E: Oh: Go:d Isn't it fa::ntastic how things wor:k out,= [eYeh,]=
14. E: "t'h'h'h'h W e l l w i r ret,i::red en I don't know,=
15. [I'd really something].
16. E: =ehh heh'h'h'h hir- We gotta pai::ntbru::sh in ar hand i-y'know't
17. E: looks so big ethe pro:ject is so trummillous.
18. P: Oh:- Emma I've gott'n in s'many a':those projects where you
19. E: [U h: h h h h.]
20. P: =gid in half way then y'think o:oh: Ghho:d. o what've
22. E: [W h y we put new doo::rs in
23. E: =B't it a::ll wo:k::s ou:::t eh you know?]
24. P: =t'h'h'h'h'h'h'h'h Well honey li:sten ah'll thtaalk with yeh::
25. E: =\hhhhhh\ [eY 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 wife" is dispensed with and the connection between this man and the recipient's husband is taken up; i.e., "Ye:s:::Ge:orgeous girl-'hh'hhh e:We:ll see he'n Ronny've 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, "Ge:orgeous", 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." 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 fa:ntastic how things work out,'t'hhhh Well wir reti::red en I don't

---


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

B: 'T's- tsuh beautiful day out isn't it?

L: Yeh it's just gorgeous . .
know, ehh heh'hhh wir- We gotta pain:ntbrus:h in ar hand..." (lines 14-18; the equal signs [=] indicate speech continuity across transcript breaks).

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 works 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 that," 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'thhhhhhhhhh Well honey listen ah'll thhalk with yeh:" (line 31).

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  E: (.)
3  M: Ye:s they cam: right after I cam: back.'
4  E: Thank you: un-
5  M: 'F I: n'e.
6  E: [I wa:lked way down t'he jetty 'n I saw
7  M: Phil's si:gn:s en cam: back u:ip 'n 'hh
8  E: En there they we:re.
9  M: 'Yehhh!'hh We'll no he ca:mes right about ten minutes after
10 M: I leftcher place about fifteen minutes.
11 E: Well that's fi:ne.
12 M: [That's go:od.
13 E: I'm so:r ry I- 'hh
14 M: [But it-it's all hhe:re,'h
15 (0.3)
16 M: Well that's good de:ah,
17 [Alri:ght.
18 E: [Ah'll see yuh later.]
19 M: [We'll see yuh liddle laytuh.
20 E: [Ri:ght.
21 M: [B y e.
22 E: [A'right ba:h bye

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 13, which is not an Assessment, the 'collaborative utterance completion' "there they were" (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 good", 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, "I saw Phil's signs" (lines 8-9) may be invoking a prior reference.

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

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 conver-

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.
sation; 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).

This intended 'economy' turns out to generate further talk, as the co-participant 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 M: fif'ty two hundred of'em.
42 A: "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:

---

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

1 L: My father's six foot two feet, he's large, an'
2 K: [ehheh
3
4 (1.0)
5 K: - st(hh)able per-son yea(hh)h
6 L: - [sta- Mm hm,
7
8 (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: 'hnn Pt. nNot- not bad I was constipated a lot but I didn't have the uh:
40 D: - 'The pain.
41 P: - Yeah, I didn't have the pain an I didn't have umh 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,

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.
explanation, diagnosis of the error), 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 signs" 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.

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 sorry 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 good" (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

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.
here's '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 consensus, 1 which is

---

1. The consensus is a collaborative achievement, the call-recipient making serial attempts at, and eventually succeeding 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.


A: but I couldn't ev'n get up t'he dog r c'z (?)
M: [Ohh no::
A: it wz raining too (mu:ch)
M: Isn't that too bad.
A: mghhm 'n I didn' wanna (0.2) y'know try t'climb the fence
[(in that rain)
M: Yeh will it keep?
A: Oh yah. ( )
M: Oh w'll that's fine.
A: It's: hah-heh heh
M: [Fine. Kee:p
A: [You'll be real s'primed,=
M: =Y(h)ch I w'll, uhh heh heh
A: It's sorta Chris'm'ssy looking but that's alright,
M: Oh well that's fine that's fun.
A: It's something you c'n use around the year anyway.
M: Oh my goodness. I don' wanchu t'do that::t,
A: Nah it's just hm-mghm a'll it is I mean 'h' is one a' those
'h' little things 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.
exhibited in the subsequent talk. The caller produces a virtual repeat of the assessment which greeted the initial update, "Well that's good dear," (line 16, cf. line 4, "Well that's very good.") 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").

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,"

---

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.
etc. But whether bland or heated, Assessments may be produced to convey 'That's enough'.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>K:</th>
<th>I was at the police station this morning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R:</td>
<td>Big deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>K:</td>
<td>Big deal, yea(hh)h. Somebody stole all my radio equipment outta my car. Outta my Jeep. Everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R:</td>
<td>[You expect the cops t' do sump'n about it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>J:</th>
<th>I think that Pop is depressing, it's just-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R:</td>
<td>But you go-you go- take-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3  | J:  | Those guys are losing money. heh
| 4  | R:  | But you go down-down-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. |
| 5  | K:  | How c'n you tell. Hm?                 |
| 6  | 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;3-4:1] ((re. too much chatter while playing bridge))

1. K: I mean I: wz: u-one tht wz gr:eatly at fault. 'hmmm en I don't think Elva appreciates anything like that<No: it that 2 she said anything b't (0.4) yih jis don't pla:y bridge that 3 wary Claire.] 4 5 C: → [No she wa:sn't saying anything too much was i she.

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

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

3.(1) [Expanded]

2 K: 'hnhh en I don't think Elva appreciates anything like that. No, I think she said anything but (0.4). yin, is don't pay bridge that wavy Claire.
3 C: → [No she wasn't saying anything too much was she. 'hnhh I was j's wondering if we had that 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 well d'you wanna be,° (0.7)
16 N: hhhhh=
17 E: → =PA:RT of ut.w:Whddiyuh ↑doin.
19 (0.9)
20 N: What'm I doin?
21 E: → 'cleanin?[°n]°[°n]°h n 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:  (eeBle) wasn't worried when ah broke my thumb twelve
2     months ago (en i't's still broken).
3     (0.8)
4  I:  ""t
5  "'e:\h.
6  (0.8)
7  I:  → "Oh really they are casual aren't they."
8  L:  (Well he i's.)
9  I:  → "Ye:h, Yeh, "'hhh
10  L:  ("Okay")
11  "specifically:
12  I:  "he'll be oz (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).
In this case, following the recipient commentary, the speaker (J) produces a 'volition'-marked shift-initiation (line 14; cf. the consideration, pages 55-56). 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', "Baut uh:: anyway, (0.3)" (see the consideration, pages 97-98). 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 2.23 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'll how are you eniweh How's: uh'la have <Are you ex:pecting any ( )?>
2  I:  "h Well I hope so:="
3  N:  "Oh. How e-xpecting." [uh: : m] m: d-Lola wz mated um (0:3) oh
4  I:  about three weeks ago:
5  N:  hhOh:"( )"
6  I:  A n d (. ) Mitzie wz mated about two weeks ago:"
7  N:  my goodness you do ah-sk for i: t, £
8  I:  'h he-Well'ha a-always feel it's best t'ghet it all over
9  N:  e-t'ghet same ti:me y'nh
10 I:  Well y e : : s .
11 N:  Ye:s, An-an'who didju go: to.
12 I:  It's un:

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, and in contrast to a range of 'countering' devices, e.g., 'reciprocal: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 com-
mentary-component, "MAYBE 'E DIDN'T WANNA UNDERSTAND it," the speaker 'replies' with "'t'hnhh 'Could be': (0.2) who knows 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 ask for it, e" (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 arn'tche", 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 surprise.

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

1   P:                      It's jus' stuff I haftuh do fer ["Ye: ah."] I trik n o w=
2   E:        [E: n ]
3   E:  =En yer do in real good arntche.
4   P:                       [I : 'i'] m jis: so delighted I c'n
5   E:        [E: zam oz if: I didn't do it we'd haft uh hire it do: ne,
6   E:        [E: hnhnhh]
7   E:  i-Yihknow it's funny uh: uh Brad played et San Mar- av yih
8   E:  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. 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. 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: Yinhkow Isabel had her nail taken off, like you hadjer toenail taken off . . . 'nhh So anyway, she got this, Vi:dafoam, en, I bought some down there . . . 'hh en she said that was the only thing that healed um . . . I payed a dollar:: uh-eigthy three for it buth then it might be a lil' cheaper here.
3.(7) [NB:IV:10:45-47:]  

we bou;ght s'm ha:ts et Wah-uh Wal:d-y-er Clair:k's they had  
uh those uh (0.2) fishing ha:ts yihknow |[Mm: hm::: those lid'dle  
(badgers) Yeh.  
[doillar:so I: bou;ght one fer he:r.  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
t'hhh Oh en then that (. ) Esther Lau:der en: (. )  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
** Bullock's had y-a siale onnit e-uh: she uses that< (0.2)  
oi:ul.  
(. )  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
** hhh Oh:;:  
E: En it: ooh it's rea:1 nice so they hadda sale so 'hhh You  
c'd git the too:m:pa:ct en s'm mo:re cre:ee- cre:ee:m? (. )  
en: y-en uh:nother: (. ) t uh: lipstic:k,  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
fer five doillars. ( )-  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
I 'know ut ' T's wh't somebuddy 'tol'me.  
(. )  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
Yeah they ha:ve ( . ) they have a s-en ever once'n awhile  
they have a s:peical o:ni:nit:*  
[MM:::::  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
** So::; en the:n: u-Isabel bou;ght some too::;=  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
'en that's::: bout the o- Oh: 'hh 'n then comin home I  
bought: (. ) they had tanger:ines ten pounds fer a doillar  
so I got te:n pounds'n I got s'm o's:ai:ba=  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
'nn then I bought ( . ) yuh:;: (0.3) uh Edna back a box a'  
dates-ouz  
[Oh::; yuh: ni:::ice?  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
*Yihknow:;w.  
(. )  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
[She-  
[The: t's n:ice Lottie's] [That] 's beautiful.  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
't'hhhhh Well you hadda beautiful <now yuh feel like a noo=  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
=ga:1.'hh-[Yer per:ves'v  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
(0.3)  
yihknow there's so many other wunnerful people aroundju:  
'hhhuh uh it's good tih get away from::; yer fam'ly  
sometimes you gn-c'n be yersie: If yih know w't I ME:A:N?  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
=ga:1.'hh-[Yer per:ves'v  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
(0.3)  
yihknow there's so many other wunnerful people aroundju:  
'hhhuh uh it's good tih get away from::; yer fam'ly  
sometimes you gn-c'n be yersie: If yih know w't I ME:A:N?  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
=ga:1.'hh-[Yer per:ves'v  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
(0.3)  
yihknow there's so many other wunnerful people aroundju:  
'hhhuh uh it's good tih get away from::; yer fam'ly  
sometimes you gn-c'n be yersie: If yih know w't I ME:A:N?  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
=ga:1.'hh-[Yer per:ves'v  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
(0.3)  
yihknow there's so many other wunnerful people aroundju:  
'hhhuh uh it's good tih get away from::; yer fam'ly  
sometimes you gn-c'n be yersie: If yih know w't I ME:A:N?  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
=ga:1.'hh-[Yer per:ves'v  
L: |[Mm: hm:::  
E: |[Mm: hm:::  
(0.3)
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]: i U H .
9 B: [[[I thaw well sh'll share that with Ma rge
10 M: [[[she'll understand, h-h
11 YEAH.
12 (.)
13 B: En I'm
14 M: [[I think it's wonderful really en I think it's: uh-im:
15 B: But I
16 M: =End yer not g'na lose a day's rent.

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'h hh 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'na lose a day's rent." (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-

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 irresistibly 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 resemblance 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 Dnine 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, 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

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 invocation 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, SSHC Final Report, op. cit., pages 82-88.
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, proceeds to introduce some rather critical
unresolved details (lines 37-49).

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

1 L: Most of um sat'n wrote a: check right (0.2) yihknow.
2 J: Yeh: : a h.
3 L: [at th' party].
4 J: Yeah. *gammam* it So; en the ones then: All the ones that
did that were, the w:ones that had th' little bit bigger;
in (yeah) (0.2) purchases.
5 L: Yeh: : a h.
6 J: *[Yihknow,]
7 L: (=)
8 J: (.).
9 L: One of 'em.
10 L: [ihmmm] Usually they do that. En I've noticed that the
11 J: ones that have the bigger ones usually make'em out'n send
12 um er give'em to yih right (then).
13 L: [e Y e a h . ]
14 J: *hmmm I had the smaller ones t'haftih get. hmmm huh
15 [huh]
16 L: [Ye:ah,]
17 J: =k'hhhh: hihhh So;:
18 (0.2)
19 J: 'ptch' [*(] it right?]=
20 L: [o 'hh-
21 J: *hmmh We'll' [Ye'ah.
22 L: [Ye'ah.
23 J: *end ah::m 't'hmmm Uh: m ah' ll talk tih Ja:ck.
24 . ((ca. 7 lines omitted))
25 J: Then yihknow (. ) we'll ( . ) yihknow, 'p [maybe Wednesdee,
26 L: Ye'ah,
27 J: *hmm Uh::m: (0.8) Didju wanna all I men uh wz g'anna sa:y
d'you wanna get tihgether with my folks that night er dju
wuna get with them::
28 (0.8)
29 J: *No:: it's o-
30 L: [th' night (. ) after that er sup'm er::
31 J: *[nNo I don't think
32 L: there's w'll all git tihgether at the same [Ye'ah.
33 J: *O:ka:y. *
34 L: ['Yah.]
35 J: *So: I wz g'anna sa:y:: Uh::m. (0.2) 't'hmm You wanna go t'
36 L: their house? er::. (. ) come he're? er you're? 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: [hnnnhh, ''One of 'm] Usually they do that. En I've noticed the
12 J: ones that have the bigger ones . . .
13

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 consensus; 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 tuhn 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 about (. ) eight. Right?=
H: =Yea::h==
N: =Okay. 
(0.2)

N: Anything else to report, 
(0.3)

H: Un-------------:m:::, (0.4) getting my hair cut tomorrow,
an overlapped segment, which looks to be much weightier, "rilly thez nothing in to:wn" (line 14) is effectively deleted by the overlapping and subsequent talk (see lines 13ff.).

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

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]

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.
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 nothing 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
5  L: (0.3)
6  G: *→ [I'm'nna do s'n spagheṭti'n: (. ) n-e:h:m meatballs f'tea
7    fuh this lot now,
8  L: Oh lovely,
9  G: *→ CZ they didn't have they only had fish fingis'n chips
10  fih dinnuh,
11  L: *eeYes. "
12  G: *→ B't th'z nothing in to:wn. =
13  G: *→ =Mahrks'n S pencils shelves w'f e l e a : u h. 7
14  L: → [Well they wouldn' stay fer a meal. ]'n Actually
15     teh 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).

1  L: But she said oh ah 'v' ahd th'm y u-two days' n ah'm prayin
    f'th'm tih go_i,
    ( )

2  G: Aw:: de e u h,
    [So ah s'ld oh: well ah'm not the onl y one

3  L: then ah said ah'thought it wz MEE A:GE she- su she-
    [ rhyme Yeh it's a sha'tme

4  G: = yeh,=
    fih Vi_v: be'cuz she's got uhr hahnds f' l'd'n sh-e [really,]

5  L: =yeh,=
    [Y e h i h tis a shem fun V_i v. [re-a:illy,]

6  L: =when they naught y l[ike tha'-h]

7  L: e e Yeah.

8  G: =

9  G: = Yah 'h beez' you'd a thought they'd'v grown out'v it by now
    really.

10 L: [Yes

11 G: =

12 L: [Yes

13 G: =

14 G: Th- Ah mean theh n_7 ba:bies ahr they.

15 L: Theh not no;

16 G: =

17 G: =

18 G: =

19 L: 'h i'y goin yih won't be goin t'th'town tomorrow will you.

20 G: =

21 G: =

22 L: =

23 G: =

24 G: =

25 G: =

26 L: [Oh I c see. Yes.

27 G: =

28 G: =

29 G: =

30 L: =

31 L: =

32 G: =

33 G: =

34 G: =

35 G: =

36 G: =

37 G: =

38 L: =

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 comprises 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: becuz she's got uhr hahnds f'll d'n she really" (lines 7-8) plus a series of add-ons, "when they naughty like tha-'h" (line 11), "Yah bec'z you'd a'thought they'd've 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: Oof::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: ** L'hhhhhhh

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

3. (9.c.) [Detail]

20  L: Theh not no:
21       (.)
22  L: 'h 1Y' goin yih won't be goin t' th'town tomorrow will you.
23  G: ** [ooN 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).


1  M: Yih do: ye's.
2  J: [Yes,


1  M: In tisn't.
2  J: Ne2::.


1  A: Ye's it doe's.
2  G: [Ye's.

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

1  G: Well I am rea:
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 Frag-
ment 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[weekend.]
4 N: → 'Ah:::..:that's a sha:me.
5 E: → 'hnh wul listen I'll telluh what I could do dear, lD o : g g o : n e .
6 E: → Uh if Brad goes t' the boat' e could drop me off at the trailer.
7 E: → 'hhh Hey now that's en idea, 10 (1.0)
8 N: → And uh I jis'm not gonna walk around a lot, becuz uh,
9 E: → Ah:::,(0.2) it's not worth it to be on my fee:t,you know
10 [n:No:..]
11 E: → Ah:::,(0.2) it's not worth it to be on my fee:t,you know
12 [Ye:ah.
13 N: → Right. (.) Ah hah?
14 N: → (0.2)
15 N: → 'hnh Oh I was just ou:t wa:shing window: ss:
16 (N eventually arrives at the announcement that she met a "very, h very, n:mi:oe 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 [SEL: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:sh: h.
4 M: 'hhhh
5 B: "hOh wul."
6 (0.4)
7 M: "hh't 'hh wul'. Deaunh I'm dul:; tightened about sh'wz on a
8 B: [That's too ba:da:]
9 B: Whell, yiknow I buz so thrillled with it? it jus seems t'me
10 thet eh; 'hhn (0.2) "uhm" n
11 (,)
12 M: Well yer holdin the right thought.
13 B: =Ya:h? (,.) Yeh- Oh definitely. I j's knew it would be, yik
14 know,
15 M: Mn-hm?
16 B: ["hhhh "And uh:" t'k'hhhh (,.) "y-"
17 (0.3)
18 M: "tlk'Sa yiknow something oh 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: (,.) An ah won low po:t.hh
26 B: W'1: go: .:
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 inappro-
priately 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 Peauh I'm d_UL: _tighted about [cher house]." 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 y'know 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, "'hnh Uh gettin ba_ck tih this Viafor: foam Lottie is'er nail alright no:"?

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'/Beauh 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, "'hh Whell, yihknow I wz so thrilled with it? it jus seems t'me that eh: 'hhh (0.2) "Uhm"" (lines 9-10).

The faltering is followed by a Recipient Commentary, "Well yer holdin the right thought" (line 12); 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 (.) "y-= (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

---

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."
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.  

And with the 'teller's exhibit of topical exhaustion as a warrant, the 'recipient' proceeds 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 collec-

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".


M: I think what difference does it make, really, but

B: (No:)

B: None. N-uhtm (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 Koenig . . . 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.
tions 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.

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

1 G: So ah euh yihknow ez ah say I didn' get t in typing, [Oh::: yer'well]
2 L: → tied down ah n't chu.
3 G: → [Well I am really; "Yah," ]
4 L: → [Ye::h h,]
5 G: ** Ye::s yihknow c'zee do jesn'ee *hates being in un iz ow:n...
6 L: → ["Ye:ha"]

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-implicativity 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).

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]

N: a:n it's too bad that they hadn't stuck it out yiknow so
that they c'd 'hmmm clean from it what I felt that I ha:d.

h'hhmmm

E: "Mm hm,"

N: A:nd uhm (0.9) 'tch so afterwards over et Shakey's; uh
(0.2) they were talking about how intresting it was that I
had brought this up (. ) yiknow, 'hmmm an; one of the kids
had written 'hhmm uh:: (0.3) I think you deserve two A's
becuz it must've been twice ez har:dr fer you; to: (. ) ah:
'hhh remain in this cla:ss=

N: =uhhh:-h'ho:hu h'hu h'hu h'ho:

E: j'o: h[. ] 1\[. ] y?

N: ee-ceYa-ah'hh'h

E: l'o: I be o 1a:nd ah

N: A:nd ah

(.)

N: [So a any w]m new FRI:\-nds,

E: You made s'm nds,

N: th'hh ya:h, (. ) So: this kid said

well: this one blond fella (0.2) that wz ah,h'hh in the
class en he wz et least my age, (.) I'm su:re, (. ) maybe
(y') know 'roun my age, 'hhmmm en he wz there about
three weeks; a:nd ah (0.2) he w's: very quiet.

N: "Mf'm mm"

E: 3'th'whole when th'when 'e was there right't the beginning

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]

N: 'hmmm so he said I: (. ) y'know won't be able tih cahll you
'tnil th'firs th'we:k'n; I sed wu:h- hhyyhou (d)ohn't
(0.4) LI: didn'rilly know what tuh say: I wz so flustered,
'hmmhhh|H[. ] a h':hhhhhhhhhh|f(y')know)

N: wely:

E: go out e:n have fun with\-  \-  snff\- [mgh-mgh]

E: 3'things may come of it bu:t

N: ye:a:h.

E: go out e:n have fun with\-  

S: a:s I s a:y'nothing may come of it bu:t

E: 3'things may come of it bu:t

N: [mgh-mgh]

E: u-he wz jst a(y) a ri:l ri:l ni:ce:: fellow en I'm sure
thet (. ) if I: did have a'-'hhmmm chance' r if' he does ca:ll;

E: ah (0.2) en since he made it such a pointed effort tuh:

N: get my number he probably wi:ll, 'hmmm

E: [mgh-mgh]

N: shi:(. ) It's

131.

N: 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 that look ez nice ( ) but maybe you went, someplace like 0:tts'r someplace.

27

28 M: No.I got mine at uh:: (0.9) 'toh 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: =hundred of' em.

42 A: [tuh send ou::t.

43 M: →

44 A: ↑ Ye:::s, I deci,de'd

45 M: → ['hh 'boy w'll [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 and um, mgh;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 'subsidence', 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. guy. fer [that's fantastic.]
2 E: 
3 P: the Chamber's Commerce down there.
4 E: (.)
5 P: contacted him.
6 E: Isn't that fantastic.
7 P: 'hhhuh-huh
8 E: Well, (.).
9 P: He can't miss.
10 E: 
11 P: That's uh,
12 E: You both can't miss.
13 P: That's a different deal en so he's on (.). fer them too.
14 E: M'm hm,
15 P: 'hhhuh En then'e has uh: (.). this uh Harvard Park . . .

In the consideration of Fragment 2.28) pages 97ff, we noted an eventual arrival at 'consensus' (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 characterizable 'unforthcoming'. See, e.g., Jefferson and Lee, SSRD 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^ l°(Yah) 9
2 E: =evrything straight'n yihkno:w'n'h'h, hh "h'hh-
3 L: out you two Go'd let's go through life'hhhhhh So I; 'm goin
4 E: l° We'll; work thi[s thing
5 L: ^^So-
6 E: u:p uh: 'hhh Mondee too:, an: uh:
7 E: ""u:..:i: u-Ho-w long'z, e gunnah be gahn.
8 L: yihknok ^} 2
9 L: 'hhh God I don know: he doesn' know either I mean' hh if ih-
10 ul uh we talk'tuh Doctor Wil:son yihkno this: s-do:st-. (. )
11 L: yihkno fr'm: uh Glenda:le? 1
12 (0.2)
13 L: <Th's friend'v ar:s?=
14 E: "Mn h-fm 0
15 L: \[He's a big s:- u-one a 'th'biggest surgery 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

---

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 subsidence into 'passive recipiency. And in that regard, lines 7-12 may constitute a fine-grained negotiation.
is followed by a recipient's introducing an altogether new matter (see lines 16-18, page 126).

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:::o" 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 "[Yi:thknow]", 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:::o u-Ho:w long'z' e gunnuh be gah:n.
9 L:    [Yi:thknow]<

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 that
2 E:    uh:::;
3 [Mm:hm,

3.(16.b) [NB:III:3:8]

1 E:    Uh-I wz so s'prized I thought it wzyou 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).


1 F: But that wz the only big money that I wo:n.
2 B: "M-hm."
3 F: "A:nd uh: I didn't'hh (.I I didn't (.l) lo::se (0.3) very much a'the money.
4 B: "M-hm"
5 F: Uh: f: it-
6 B: W'ithet's goo: d. [paid some a'my expenses.'{"Ye:ah.
7 F: [ It sounds like a goo:d tri:p. (0.7)
8 B: So aa-uh overa:ll I think thet we a:ll had a
9 F: [It sounds like a goo:d tri:p. (0.7)
10 B: 't Well it (.I it (.I the weather was suhpe:rb?'hhn a:nd uh
11 F: we drove around the la:ke uh:
12 B: [Didju have'ny fall cul-coloring up
13 F: the:re?=
14 B: "hhn y: u-Lots'v a:spens.
15 B: Mm hh,
16 F: A:nd the yella a:spen wz suhper-b't yihknow those tree:s
17 F: 'hhhh uh they l00k 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 suhge:rb? 'hnh 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/u:h:" (lines 13-15).

Further, the two 'continuation-items' have the feel of 'conversation-al 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-reciprocency 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 proceedings. 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 trip" (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 3.0.1.) 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 preferred 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-recipiencty 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:nice gu:y."

3.(18) [NB:II:4:14-16:r]

1  N:  eez intelligent? en he:'s ah'nh not ha:n'some. 'hh but he's
2  E:  [Mm hm,]
3  N:  jist a ri:l ri:l nice; pers'nable, very pers'nable very
4  E:  [Mm hm,]
5  N:  sweet.'hnhn ve ry:. c'nsiderate my gah all I had'do wz
6  E:  [Mm hm,]
7  N:  look etta cigarette'n'e wz out'v the chai:r lighting(h)it
8  E:  [Mm hm,]
9  N:  'hnhh [A::]n' so:: that wz
10 E:  [Yeh [THEY DO TH-I:A:T BE FORE EN] y: [Thneahh,]
11 N:  [Mm hm,]
12 E:  [A::]n'I:H! [h a:n[hun'] 'hnhh 'hnh
13 N:  [Mm hm,]
14 E:  [Ree-
15 N:  [Mm hm,]
16 E:  [Naw i? Laura has k:nown k:Se:th, 'hnhh (0.3) Laura has known
17 E:  [Mm hm,]
18 N:  k:Se:th (0.2) I guess ever since he wz:'t'hh I don't know
19 N:  I think she's probably k:nown'm a good thirty yea:rs.
20 (ca. 13 lines omitted))
21 E:  [Mm hm,]
22 N:  en he's been very: very good tuh his aunt Lorna, 'hnhh
23 E:  [Mm hm,]
24 N:  =Ah:'n he's taking care'v her property; en shai's got (.)
25 N:  yihknow quite a bit t'do wit'h?
26 E:  [Mm hm,]
27 N:  [a:nd ah'hh works'n thi ya:rd
28 E:  [Mm hm,]
29 N:  an: 'hnh hez jist been very very sweet. yihknow to 'er, hh
30 N:  [Mm hm,]
31 E:  [Ye [Mm hm,]
32 N:  [k:e a::] is he's jist a ri:l sweet GU:y. 'hnhh 'hnh
33 E:  [Mm hm,]
34 N:  WOnderful.
35 E:  [Mm hm,]
36 N:  [Mm hm,]
37 N:  +So: we were sittin' there
38 E:  [Y E R I S CHANG I N G,]
39 N:  [EY AI H,]
40 N:  (.)
41 N:  +So: anyway it wz'z I say it wurz rill'y cute.
42 E:  [Gu: u:d,]
43 N:  ['hnhh So: hu:uh:m,
44 (1.0)
E: *-*  
((constricted)) Yih goin ou'with im tihnigght?

N:  
.  

51

52 N:  
'tch'n No:,. No:, he: 'd(.) e-he wz ril cute (. ) uh:n (0.3)  
We were in the froom we 'ed kep' talkin' talkin'  
talkin' talkin' y'know e:n en f obviously eh guy can't  
just (. ) yihknow come right out'n fron'of:: God'n  
everybody end '-hnhh a:nd say anything so, (. ) we: got  
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  
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:  
"hnh "And uh:. "t'k'hnhh (. ) °y-°  
(0.3)

18 M:  
"tlk >Say yihknow something< ah played bridge t'day . .

3.(13) [Detail]

47 N:  
"hnhh So: hu-uh:m,  
(1.0)

49 E:  
((constricted)) Yih goin ou'with im tihnigght?

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 froom we 'ed kep' talkin' talkin' talkin' 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 then" (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/or subsequently reinitiated in Fragment 2. (27) page 94 lines 14-29. Similarly to Fragment 2. (24) the close-implicative object is acknowledged, "Yeekah!" in that fragment, "EYE:A:Hi" 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 intersectionally "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 proceeding by reference to the fact that the answer to "Yih goin ou' with im tonight?" is "'tch' a 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:1 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.

3.(18.a.) [NB:II:4:1:r:Standard Orthography]

E: Why don't you come and see me. 
N: 'hnhh Well I was go:nnna call and ask you if you- Brad was playing golf this afternoon if you wanted to go over to Robinson's with me. I've got to uh 'hnhh I have go:t.hh t° g e t: h 'hnhh a couple of things to wear Emma-
E: lAh:ha-
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]

N: ez I say I've got to make the effort. Becuz I've jus' let weekend after weekend go, a:nd, uhmm I jus'simply haven't= [Mm hm, N: =yiiknow taken the time tuh rilly get over there, en I've, hones'tuh God, i em just 'hhhhhh I'll be goin tuh work n:paykid, if I don't get somethin::g
E: Oh::: no you won't,

- - - -

1. In an earlier conversation Emma phones Nancy in hopes of persuading 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'soughta go sh:oipping."
N: Well I should bu:t yihknow et eight dollars a mo:th
E: [4nhnh hm- h hm- m- hm anything I'd buy I'd (. ) ((smile voice)) be using up my raise fer [alph- a YEA:::r.
E: 'hnhh 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 surprise.

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  E:  compartmen'en I'll sh-tell you, what it says or yiknow 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    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)nmbfoundid . . .

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.

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 invocation 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."  

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 recip-
ient who, with commentary (and other close-implicative objects), is at
one point negotiating for topical closure, countered by teller continu-
ation, 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).

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.
The other instance does not appear in this report. Following are the few immediately relevant lines.

1.(21.a.) [Rahman:1:5]

- I said well y'hh h' don' know th'roads uh so ba-ad I(h)
m(h)ght not (. ) make fit:="
- Neoï? No-Were they very bad, Gwenn,ie, ( )
- jst thethou cahn't go: so fahs:it . . .

On the face of it, perhaps, perfectly appropriate, recipient 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]

- I hate it. Twelve and a half years old and I- seventeen
- and a half we look the same
- You know, my brother and I have come to one a- mutual
K: agreement that- that we-
L: [She's taller than I am too.
K: She is? She's taller'n you?
L: By maybe half an inch.
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 surprise 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 to treat 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).
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, closing 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: 'hnh en I: y-at's why ah liked the hote:L I c'd go up t'
2 B: bed when I: 'wanted to.]
3 F: C'z I: don't *drink too much. 'hnh'hnh
4 B: L*nm hm,°
5 F: An: I don' mind a cocktail before dinner but I don' want six
6 B: atmin six aft'o.'hnhhhhh
7 F: perfect ly we'll ha< 'hnh
8 B: 'hnhhhhh Fer:fe'lly ah-
9 F: *So it ser:veszh u we'll h'u
10 B: [An-
11 F: dro:ve down tuh Los Angli:ss an' I drove home: y-and it's
12 B: [Isn't that tv ni:ce?==
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]

M: Curss this is the state ah'm in et the mo(h)m(h)'nt
hh hnh heh huh huh 'hh Cahin't remembuh things 'hh
y:Ye:h.

M: [But It ga:me to meh.h]

How is yer banck any'way.

((ca. 9 lines omitted, identifying the trouble))

J: Oh yes thaht cleuehd uip Ja:net,h thank goodness, [Did it. Their- Mildred ] said.

M: yu:h They rahng you_ didn't-they.

M: [Ye:s:] Oh she did ye:s:.

M: Ye:s:.

J: And, h she said that i-e ih cleeahd u: F,

J: So ah wz lohcky the: h,

M: Mm:n t'h:hh hh [Ye:s:.

J: So aht nuh mo:m'nts I'm noh-u seh band

M: againht fr'm being d-very tlyhnd hh-heh-heh_ 'hh

M: [Ye:s: n l h n]

J: [[huh h u h

M: [huh 'huh] 'huh 'hh 'hh

M: eYe:s ah will,
35  J:  Yes.
36  M:  Yes.
37  J:  *-+Very then,
38  M:  Yes. hhh
39  M:  Right Jane, h
40  J:  Have a good ti[me en (hh hh: Thank you)
41  M:  ((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 Fragment 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).


1 A: I'm gonna suggest that we increase ahr resuh: rve by
2 another two hundred fifty which would mean five hundred
3 pou: nds.
4 M: Ye: a yes quit.
5 A: An' we could uh:m (1.0) invest in thee u.h in thee uh
6 National Savings you see fifteen p' cent.
7 M: Hm.
8 (M): (W'l be (0.4)
9 A: U h : : m I'd haftuh check, tuh see: whethuhr: in fec' wir not liable t' tex.
M: *→ Yes. (0.2)

M: *→ hhh Edith's just essed me how uhr the dogs I agree
with you Athert'n I think y'v gotta very good point

A: uh h Edith wuz asking how the dogs what.

A: 'h Oh well uh: m: uhmm uh: m: it it's a chapter's accident
I'm afraid,

M: *→ Ooh.

A: mghm we lost all th'm: she had sev'n.

M: Yes I know she w z

A: an they were all prematus, h,

M: I knew she was feeding one,

A: An they were all.

A: Yeh very small ye - s yes, ((cough))

M: → Yess ah: : : soohrry to hear that.

A: ((cough)) no they uhmm "hh last one died,

M: → Oh: I'm sorry t' hear that.

A: And uh: : : m uhmm I-I-ene wz very
distressed by it "hhh

M: → I bet she was.

A: Uh: m: she; she's got all uuhr family oheu:h o
ovuh heah fuh th' week: nd so: ah got ( ) so much on
uuhr plate "h she can't think about it but nohr little
uh: : : pohr lih-th' pohr little dah: g Lola.

M: → Yeh

A: She's pining.

M: → Yes.

A: =en she won't eat,

M: → No=

A: =eh: end a'course othat gets Ilene moh wuhrried.

M: → I'll bet it does.

A: So uh: m: anyway, hh uh, hh thea: hr there ih ti: s,

M: → Mm

A: uh: : just 'g' nna haftuh s- uh try agay:n next time.

M: → Yes

A: → 0.2

M: *→ ooh yes bo-hhh Uhnight Athert'n eokay so w'll leave the e=

A: arrangement's they ah: re,

M: Yahp

M: If I hear anything different you'll ring me.

A: Yes rightoh.

M: Okay thank, you fer calling=

A: Right.

M: =Buh bye,

A: Bye.

For one, this fragment suggests the possibility of an oriented-to
hierarchy among the shift-implicative devices; i.e., that Acknowledge-
ment Token → Shift is understood by participants to be, say, less
deferral 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 there there it i:a," (line 45), and note within it a series of 'dysfluencies' which might constitute 'interruption invita-
tions'; i.e., elicitations of 'topically interested' talk by the inquirer/recipient.