

Preliminary Notes on the Sequential Organization of Laughter

Gail Jefferson
Center for Urban Ethnography
University of Pennsylvania

Harvey Sacks
School of Social Science
University of California, Irvine

Emmanuel Schegloff
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles

Revised draft of a paper presented to the Informal Seminars of the Ethology-Hormones-
Psychosomatics Research Groups, University of Pennsylvania, October 10, 1973.

Pragmatics Microfiche (Cambridge: Cambridge University,
Department of Linguistics, 1977)

Preliminary Notes on the Sequential Organization
of Laughter

Gail Jefferson
Center for Urban Ethnography
University of Pennsylvania

Harvey Sacks
School of Social Sciences
University of California, Irvine

Emmanuel Schegloff
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

This report focusses on laughter as a (1) sequence-systematic and (2) interaction-constructional phenomenon.

(1) Inspection of transcriptions of actually occurring laughter yields the fact that co-participants laugh serially, with finely coordinated transition. This fact is accounted for via the systematics of turn-taking in conversation offered by Sacks, et. al. (1973). It is proposed that laughter is adapted to the turn-taking system, and that Laugh Units are analogous to lexical turn-construction components.

(2) Inspection of extended laughing-together yields that it routinely occurs in touchy situations. A class of such talk is isolated and described as the Offense-Remedial Sequence. It is proposed that laughter is accomplice to the interactional business of offense remedy; is utilized as a matrix in which to embed, and a means by which to elicit and negotiate, offense remedial speech.

A single fragment of naturally occurring talk is treated as an instance of the Offense Remedial Sequence and examined in detail for the combined sequence-systematic/interaction-constructional workings of laughter.

Preliminary Notes on the Sequential Organization of Laughter

0. Laughter can reasonably be treated as a non-speech sound and identified or described rather than transcribed, particularly when the event being captured is, for example, Several Laugh. In that sense, laughter is similar to such a speech event as All Talking at Once, which is reasonably identified or described rather than transcribed.

Recently there have been attempts to capture some of the details of such phenomena, and at least for All Talking at Once the attempt has yielded insight into the orderly production of such talk.

There are now transcripts available which attempt to capture some details of laughter, and of such a phenomenon as Several Laugh.

Starting with the hypothesis that laughter may be produced in an orderly fashion rather than, e.g., constituting uncontrolled behavior, a collection of approximately fifteen transcripts was examined. Some initial observations were made which supported the hypothesis.

In this paper, some of those observations will be shown, with transcript fragments intended as illustrative rather than as proofs. Then, an extended fragment of a single interaction will be analyzed for the possible strategic resource which laughter, as an orderly conversational component could provide for interactants.

PART ONE

- I. A first and very simple observation is that when people laugh together they are not necessarily laughing in unison.
-

(1) [Schenkein:II:64] Ruth is talking about Academy Award nominees.

Ruth: What's his name. Who played in- Goodbye Mister Chips.

Lori: Mm hm.

Bill: Peter O'Toole.

Ruth: Pwiter O'Toole, fer that picture.

Bill: Wuhh

Ben: "Pwiter O'Toole."] heh heh

Bill: [.hh hh [heh heh]

Ruth: [eh eh heh]

(2) [NB:IV:7:52] Olive is telling her sister about some skinny dipping.

Olive: ...there's two places where the hot wahder comes in'n yih g'n get right up close to'm en ih yuz feels like yer takin a douche

Edna: [huh huh huh] ahh hah hah=

Olive: = [HUH HUH HUH HA HA uhh ha-uhh ha:: ha:: huh

Edna: [.hhh HUH HUH HAH HA HA HA HA HUH *HHHHH!

(3) [Rose:I:4] Ken is talking about a just-prior conversation.

Ken: I thought that wz pretty outta sight didju hear me say'r you a junkie.

(0.5)

Ken: hhheh heh [hhhheh-heh- [.hh huh huh [.hh .hh ah-huh-huh [huh
Kitty: [heh [heh-heh-heh [ha-ha-ha .hha! [.hh

(0.3)

Kitty: Nyea:h. Wow,

In fact, it appears that people can be laughing serially with some overlapping, and with some occurrences of No Gap, No Overlap. (Roughly, this is the way that speech can be described.)

II. A second observation is that when laughter and speech are contiguous, quite routinely the laughter will stop immediately after speech starts.

(1) [NB:IV:7:42]

Edna: So, I hh went'n, walk'down, the:~end the block'n cross' back down by Miramar'n there's a quarter lying in the street.

Olive: mh heh heh-heh

Edna: So I p(hh)icked id up'n pud it in my shoe,

(2) [Goldberg:II:1:6] Gene has been offered a salary of \$31,000

Patty: Wul knowing you you'd have thirty one en, -thousan and a nickel,

Gene: hhh! heh-heh-heh-heh

Patty: Shit y- I think y'got the original nickel.

(3) [Schenkein:II:36] Max, an elderly man, is talking about having taken a long walk on Hollywood Boulevard.

Bill: So you walked all the way upt'the Chinese theater.

Joe: Didje get- like stop in a restaurant or something? have summing t'eat?

Ruth: eh hee hee-heh!

Max: Stopped inna Shell Station.

This suggests a first possible orderliness to the production of laughter; that is, that laughter can be stopped, and recurrently is stopped, when a co-participant signals to the laugher to stop. One such signal is the starting up of talk.

III. A third observation is that laughter and/or speech can follow laughter with No Gap/No Overlap precision. That is, while in (II) some sort of negotiation was involved in the 'completion' of a stream of laughter, here it appears that concensus occurs vis-a-vis completion of a stream of laughter.

(1) [Goldberg:II:1:6]

Patty: hheh heh heh heh
Gene: ehheh heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! [Fu:nny.]

(2) [Goodwin:M:9]

Joe: 'I said "I don't even getta good night kiss" she says "No." 'n she got out 'n shut the door
Frank: uhheh hhheh heh heh!
Joe: I seh "Tha::t's it, ferget it, go ho:me,"

(3) [Goldberg:II:1:6] Note here that speaker/laugher and recipient both start to speak upon completion of laughter.

Patty: ...I think y'got the original nickel.
Dee: hhheh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-Not quite.
Patty: You en ol' man Black.

(4) [Reilly:3] The same thing occurs in this fragment.

Babs: I wz tryin t'get that straightened before I got out of th-without gettin outta bed=
Babs: =heh heh heh Y'know
Sue: Y'can't do it.

The phenomenon of Concensus Completion raises the possibility that the whole business is a matter of coincidence, or that there is something systematic to the production and hearing of the laughter itself, to which co-participants orient, and by which they coordinate their activities.

The notion of Concensus Completion for laughter is naive, and analogous to early notions of Utterance Completion. In the first case, there is something like a continuous stream of laughter which starts when someone starts laughing and ends when he stops. And in the second, there is a continuous stream of talk which is called an Utterance and consists of whatever occurs between someone's starting and stopping.

Recently, a more sophisticated notion has been applied to speech events and has yielded interesting results. An Utterance is examined in terms of Possible Completion Points in its course; these points occurring at the completion of such Units as, for example, a sentence or, for example, an action which may be done in units which are not sentences (e.g., "Hi" performs a Complete Greeting" and is therefore a Possible Complete Utterance).

The crucial feature of these speech units is that upon their completion a Possible Speaker Transition Place occurs, and a speaker may or should stop talking while a recipient may or should start talking. (Sacks, et. al.:73)

The emphasis shifts, then, from how an utterance is seen to be completed, to what shall occur subsequent to a recognizable completion point; from what is a speech unit to how are commonly known, recognizable speech units utilized in interaction, and what rules or procedures legislate their use in interaction.

IV. Importing the notion of Possible Complete Utterance to the phenomenon of laughter, suppose that there are possible completion/transition places in the course of laughter. The possible complete utterance for laughter will simply be called a Laugh Unit.

The collection of transcripts provides two sets of prosodic details of laughter: (1) the array and number of syllables and (2) the pronunciation of those syllables (distinguishing between, e.g., Open Position laughter "ha", "hah", "haah" and Closed Position laughter "heh", "hih", "huh", "hnh", etc.). There is also very rough indication of Intonation Contour, for example, a stream of laughter is sometimes transcribed with the sort of pauses which get Commas in transcribed speech, e.g., "heh heh heh, hnh hnh!" and occasionally some indication of stress is given, e.g., that an increase in volume and/or heightening of pitch is done, e.g., "heh heh heh!" Whether the stress is achieved by volume or pitch is not differentiated.

These details will be examined to see if some description of Laugh Units can be arrived at.

A. A first attempt involves the use of syllables, which will be simply called Parts, to see if there is such a thing as an N-Part Laugh Unit.

The following fragment suggests that there might be such an object.

(1) [Rose:III:7]

Ken: Jeanine wants tuh kill Bob.

Kitty: Yih-yer not kiddin we both d(h)o! hehh hehh [heh-heh] heh heh!

Ken:

This fragment shows no gap/no overlap serial production of three 2-Part Laugh Units by alternating laughers.

However, such an obvious display is rare. More routinely what can be proposed is a possible orientation to N-Part Units, by which co-participants organize the point at which they start up in the course of another's laughter. This would be analogous to the source of a massive amount of 'interruptions' in speech.

(2) [Schenkein:II:161] The topic is a pair of photos of John and Ono Lennon, front and rear view nudes, hanging in Bill's bathroom.

Bill: Somebody gave it tuh us,

Jo: (ehh heh heh) ehh 'hh 'hh Very good place for it!
 Ruth: (heh heh heh) heh heh

The first occurrence of a 3-part Laugh Unit is clean; i.e., Jo stops laughing and Ruth starts talking simultaneously. (The content of Ruth's talk was unheard by transcriber). The point at which Jo starts up in Ruth's laughter might be proposed as a Possible Complete 3-Part Laugh Unit. That is, Jo may be oriented to, and expect via the prior consensus that Ruth is oriented to, a 3-Part Laugh Unit.

(3) [Goldberg:II:1:6]

Gene: I go my way en she goes her way. heh heh
 Patty: (Yeh yeh I know) I heard that story before,
 Gene: (heh-heh) heh-heh
 Patty: hneh heh (heh heh)

Gene produces a 2-part Laugh Unit just after a first possible completion point in Patty's talk. The overlap is not random. Perhaps no more random is the overlapping of Gene's laughter by Patty's. That is, having heard

Gene produce a 2-part Laugh Unit, she may be oriented to that as the unit he will be using for this set, and therefore starts up at a first possible completion point; i.e., upon completion of a 2-part Laugh Unit.

The analysis can be pushed to propose that Gene is producing a pair of 2-part laugh units, the second pair being overlapped by a 2-part unit by Patty, and that upon completion of the simultaneous pair of 2-part units, Patty extends her laughter with yet another 2-part unit.

This can be interactionally motivated in the following way: Patty intends to be heard as laughing after Gene has finished. She has started up on a first completion of his and finds he is 'still laughing'. To accomplish that she is laughing after Gene, she adds another laugh unit, again upon completion of his 2-part unit. That is, the fact of Laugh Units may be initially obscured by the strategic utilization of such units, which can result in what looks like some undifferentiated stream of laughter.

Although we do not find the counting of syllables an attractive research procedure, it appears that conversationalists count things and use their counting as a resource for speech production.

A prototypical, and it turns out, utterly gross instance of counting as a resource is the following fragment. A first joke happens to have four occurrences of a phrase, although the number of repetitions is irrelevant for the joke. A second joke is told in which four is a key number; the punchline. It appears that the happenstance

occurrence of four units in the first joke was counted by a recipient, and triggered memory of the second joke.

[GTS:1:2:24]

Ken: What's black'n white thump, black'n white thump, black'n white thump, black'n white thump,
(1.5)
Ken: Nun rolling downstai:rs.
(3.0)
Al: Hah?
(0.6)
Louise: Y'know what a cute one is, y'wanna hear what a cute one is, what's purple an' goes bam bam bam bam.
(0.8)
Louise: A fouR door plum.
(2.0)
Ken: Terr::ifi:::c.

B. A second approach to Laugh Units is afforded by the transcripts. It can be noticed that (a) laughers quite routinely remain within a single pronunciational mode throughout a stream of laughter and (b) they sometimes alter that mode in a particular way which can be described as Stepping Up their laughter; i.e., they move from Closed Position to Open Position. A prototypical use of Step-Ups is as a signal of realized funniness, e.g., the following fragment, which involves a classic 'slow take'. Note that simultaneously with recipient's Step-Up, teller produces a lexical invitation to get the point.

[Frankel:V:119] Vic is telling a story about making it with a midget.

Vic: ...en I'm makin it widduh en I'm lookin at matriss.
(0.5)
Mike: hheh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-ha:h ha:h ha-ha-ha!
Vic: Th(hhh)is 's it. 'hh She ain't the:re.

In the following fragments, Step-Ups will be displayed in upper case letters as a transcript convenience. It can be noted that Step-Ups occur contiguously with completion points in ongoing talk when that talk is overlapped by laughter.

(1) [Frankel:V:98] Story about a man who tied his dog to the bathtub.

Joe: Come ho:me? the sonofabitch the tub? he couldn::: couldn' get it out the do::h, but ih wz outta the flo::h,

Carol: hneh. [ehheh heh heh heh heh heh heh] AH AH AH ih ih nh nh! 'hnhhh
Joe: Cost im sixty dolliz fuh plumbin.

(2) [Frankel:V:113] Here, a double Step-Up, the second via increased volume.

Joe: Yih'n heah comes the inspecta.

Carol: eh-huh-huh-huh-[huh HA HA HA HA] HA HA HA ha ha ah!

Mike: Uh- It's Big Daddy

James: Oh:: let's seh let's seh. . .

(3) [Goldberg:II:1:3] Here, a simultaneous two-party Step-Up

Patty: Go(hh)d you must be homesteading. [ehh-heh-[hneh hnh] KHAH HHAH 'hnhhh=
Gene: ehh-heh-[heh heh] AH-AH-AH-AH

Patty: =What'r you all up to these days.

(4) [NB:IV:7:53] Here, after an initial solo step-up, one party does a next step-up by producing a very loud Closed Position laugh^①, and is joined in that by the other.^② Thereafter, they both produce another Step-Up by maintaining the same loud volume and moving to Open Position laughter.^③

Olive: ...there's two places where the hot wahder comes in'n yih g'n get right up close to'm en ih yuz feels like yer [takin a douche.]^①

Edna: uhh huh huh AHH HAH HAH=^②

Olive: =[[^② HUH HUH HUH HUH] HA HA uhh ha-uhh ha:: ha:: huh
Edna: =[[^③ 'hnh HUH HUH HAH HA HA HA HA HUH 'hnhhhh!

It appears that the initially observed pronunciation shift is delicately coordinated with events in the surrounding talk, and that the Step-Up provided by that shift constitutes such a conversational activity as doing a 'take' or acknowledging laugh-overlapped speech.

What might otherwise be seen as undifferentiated streams of laughter can be broken down into, e.g., a Double Step-Up, a Two-Party Step-Up, a Step-Up followed by a Two-Party Double Step-Up, etc., and analyzed for the actions such behaviors might achieve.

Furthermore, in combination with the notion of N-Part Laugh Units, it can be observed, for example, that in (2) James starts to talk at the completion of a 3-Part Step-Up, and that there is apparent ^{attenuate} concensus there, Carol beginning to / her laughter, decreasing volume while maintaining Open Position. Or, for example, that in (4) Olive starts her Closed Position/High Volume Step-Up immediately upon completion of Edna's 3-Part Step-Up, as Edna is taking an in-breath.

00. The foregoing observations suggest that the production of laughter in conversation is orderly.

That laughter may be serially constructed out of recognizable complete Laugh Units;

That co-participants can be oriented to such units as constituting utterance completion points and thereby providing for possible speaker transition;

That transition is finely coordinated, yielding No Gap, No Overlap startings and stoppings at Possible Completion Points, or, equally finely, negotiated /constructed foreshortenings and expansions.

Inspection of the materials shown so far should make it obvious that the orderly production of laughter can be accomplice to the pursuit of a range of interactional businesses. This issue will be addressed in the next section.

V. A first observation about the interactional workings of laughter is that laughter is an Indexical phenomenon. When laughter occurs it is presumed by interactants to occur by reference to something else, and that something else is sought as the source, the referent, of the laughter.

As such, it is a potential Token of Understanding; a sort of object which depends for its sense upon its placement vis-a-vis surrounding talk.

Obviously laughter can refer backwards; i.e., laughter can appreciate a joke which just occurred. In more delicate ways, e.g., the Step-Ups, it can acknowledge and appreciate verbal materials which were possibly impaired by the sound of the laughter which preceded the Step-Up. (See, e.g., (1), (2), and (4), p. 11.)

Laughter can also refer forwards; i.e., indicating that one sees the projected course of talk, and already knows and appreciates the outcome.

A gross instance of such forward reference occurs when someone of a punchline has prior knowledge/and is signalling that, or has figured it out well in advance of its actual verbalization.

(1) [Merritt:E:1]

David: Put some e:ggz up tuh boil en then took a na:p,
(0.7)

David: I [woke up,]
Thursa: [AH! AH! →] En then they po:pped,

(2) [Schenkein:II:36] Max took a long walk on Hollywood Boulevard

Bill: So you walked all the way up t'the Chinese theater.

Ben: Didge get- like stop in a restaurant or something? have summing t'eat?

Ruth: EH HEE HEE [HEH! _____] tih go- [pee pee,
 Max: [Stopped inna Shell Station. [Where's the Chinese [restaurant.
 Lori:

(3) [Labov et al:B.G.:5] An embroiglio about garbage involving a functionary in Cherry Hill and the lady Mayor of Gibbsborough.

Joan: 'hhh She wrapped u:p in a very ni(h)cely gift wrapped,=

Betty: =[[ss:::
 Joan: [[bo(hh)::: [k [bo:x, 'nh [a load of shit.
 Doris: [HN-HEHN HN- [HEHN HN-HEHN, _____]

(4) [Frankel:V:98] Here, the relationship of laughter to talk is delicately coordinated to achieve a simultaneous production of the punchline.

Joe: 'S like my brother one time wants a do:g. He wantsuh bring home a do:g.
 But he w'nssa getta mean one net bites.

Carol: I almos' brought a dog home.

Joe: [B't he wannid duh dawg tuh bite iz wife.

(0.4)

Joe: So he come s home one night'n the sonofa bitch, bit him.
 Carol: [HEH HEH HEH HEH HEH HEH [bit hi:m, AH! AH! _____]

And, can note the subsequent Step-Up.

On a more delicate scale, there is a device for displaying "I see what you're saying" which involves the use of some standard token of understanding (e.g., "Yes." "Oh::", "I know", etc.) placed within some ongoing talk at a point No Sooner than it is recognizable and mutually available

that understanding can have been achieved, and No Later than that point; i.e., before the item being understood-in-its-course has been fully presented.

This procedure yields events as delicate as mid-word placement.

(1) [FD: :]

Caller: Fire department, out at the Fairview Food_[mart] there's a-
Desk: YES.

Desk: We've already got thē uh call on that ma'am,

(2) [FD:III:44]

Caller: ...she worked fer:: I dunno if you know Russ Ogle_[thorpe],
Desk: YEAH,

Desk: I know'm. Mm hm,

(3) [Goldberg:II:1:2]

Patty: I jst ran up th'staihhrs that's whhhy I'm huf_[fing] en puffing.
Gene: OH::

(4) [Frankel:V:4]

Vic: Or he liable tuh hit me en I'd be inna hos_[heh] pi(h)tl(hh) 'hh!
Rich:

(5) [NB:4C:4:14] Lena has just met a "very very nice guy"

Lena: My God all I had'do was look et a cigarette'n 'e wz out of the chair lighting i(h)tche(h)kno(hh)w 'hhh!

Edna: My Go:d. [Yeh [They do that be fo:re en after they do:n't.
Lena: One a' those kind, 'hhh A:nd so-but- Y(HH)EH [AHH! HAH HAH 'hhh

VI. The usability of laughter as a token of understanding in a device for signalling "I see what you're saying" is a very restricted sense of its indexical meaningfulness. It is obvious that the activity of laughing together is itself meaningful and may be shown to be indexical.

A. Inspection of laughings together yield that they are either arrived at via serial expansions of laugh units, or consist in toto of such serial production.

(1) [NB:IV:7:52]

Olive: ...there's two places where the hot wahder comes in'n yih g'n get right up close to'm en ih yuz feels like yer [takin a douche.]

Edna: [uhh huh huh] ahh hah hah=

Olive: [HUHH HUHH HUHHH HA HA uhh ha-uhh ha:: ha:: huh

Edna: =[['hhh HUH HUH HAHH HA HA HA HUH 'hhhhhh!

Olive: [En we- En she wz on one end'n I wz ovethother en with er=

Edna: [[I C'N SEE YOU TWO KIDS] ()-

Olive: =legs up yihknow. . .

(2) [Goldberg:II:1:1]

Gene: I calledjuh I don'know how many god damn times I leave messages I never hear from yuh. Are yih avoiding me like the plague=

Patty: =Nno:: of-wahl yih nah you know better then [that.

Gene: [I'm not syphletic.

Patty: 'hhh No I know yer not [hhhh [heh hkeh hkeh 'hhh=

Gene: [heh, heh-heh-heh-heh-heh, [heh-heh

Patty: =[[I keep running tests on yuh I know yer not] 'hhhhh

Gene: =[[heh heh heh eh [heh-heh-heh-heh, heh-heh-heh

Patty: Uh::hh No Gene, I've just- hh 'hhh been in en been out'n sometimes, hhh y'know the paths, 'hhh cro:ss, but uh the time is bad,

(3) [Rose:I:4]

Kitty: Now wuhddiyou think of all₁that.

Ken: Well see? Now we're gonna start this commission,
en we're gonna be suing, all'v our good neighbors around here. 'hh

(1.3)

Kitty: Ee-no, no, b- b't that's ridiculous.

(0.9)

Ken: It's- it's ou(hh)tta sigh(h)tch,

Kitty: I think that₁i:s,

Ken: I thought that wz pretty outta sight didju hear me say'r you
a junkie.

(0.5)

Ken: hheh heh₁ ['hh huh huh] ['hh 'hh ah-huh-huh- [huh

Kitty: [hhheh-heh- [heh] heh-heh-heh [ha-ha-ha 'hha!] 'hh huh hha:: hnh!

(0.3)

Kitty: Myeah. Wow,

(0.7)

Kitty: Ev'ryb'ddy d-I y'know I don't approve a' that et all. 'hh I like Henry. I think
eez funny en all. But.

(0.5)

Kitty: That's kinda ridiculous.

- B. Inspection of the laughings together and surrounding materials permits a gross initial observation about their 'meaning'. They all have a feature which has been otherwise described for a type of speech event, Side Sequences or Insertion Sequences. That feature is that they seem to constitute a Time Out; that something which can be seen as the Ongoing Talk is stopped while these events occur, and then resumed afterwards.

So, for example, in (1) Edna resumes the telling of her story; in (2) Patty answers Gene's question; and in (3) Kitty returns to her assessment of the "all this" she initially formulated, and subsequently formulates as "ridiculous".

Which is to say that the Laughings Together do not advance the conversation; e.g., do not move it in such a way that the prior matters cannot be retrieved or need be effortfully retrieved.

Now, Side or Insertion Sequences can be engaged in for a range of activities. For example, for challenging the appropriateness of someone's talk, for correcting mistakes, clearing up misunderstandings, filling in missing information, achieving recognition of someone who has been mentioned, remembering mislaid names, etc.

The entire range of such Sequences appears to be directed to discover whether there has been any rupture in the state of participants "minds being together", and to repair such ruptures if they are discovered, or assure each other that a possible rupture is not after all a rupture. Once the problem is resolved, the ongoing talk continues.

It appears that the collaboratively constructed Laughings Together have a similar function. Specifically, they seem directed to mutual reassurance that a possible violation of the basis upon which they are talking together has not occurred.

So, for example, Gene's "I'm not syphletic" and Olive's "...takin a douche" may violate the standards of good taste for the collection

of mentalities currently interacting; i.e., may introduce a possibly offensive mentality into the interaction.

If the offensive materials can be subsequently treated as vehicles for amusement and participants can laugh by reference to the amusement which the materials afford, then that may resolve the potential rupture and assure that no offense has been intended and none taken.

- C. It is intuitively obvious that laughter cannot go on indefinitely. There seems to be some natural boundary on the expansion of a laugh sequence. It may also be the case that pure laughter is an equivocal and restrictedly effective remedial device, insofar as its indexicality merely points to and understands a prior utterance, and does so in token form. A solution to both problems can be observed in (1) and (2), page 15., apparently attempted and failed in (1) and successful in (2), and that is that someone may produce another Laughable, thereby providing for another round of laughter, thereby extending the ongoing laugh sequence.

Further, it is observable that not just any Laughable will do, but a Topically Coherent Laughable is produced. That is, it is not enough to keep a state of laughter alive by producing anything in the world that can be laughed at.

The Laughable may specifically be selected not only for its topical coherence, but for its remedial workings. Specifically, if the "someone" who produces another Laughable turns out to be the recipient of the potential offense (and such is the case in (1) and (2)), then it may recurrently be the case that the object with which they expand the laugh sequence is also an object with which they unequivocally remedy the possible rupture in the state of 'minds together', by implicating themselves in the potentially offensive mentality.

So, for example, Edna's "I c'n see you two kids..." shows that she is willing and able to picture in her mind's eye just the sort of scene which anyone coming upon would turn away from as fast as humanly possible. The fact that her utterance is not followed by further laughter may have to do with the fact that Olive has simultaneously started, and subsequently produces, a verbal depiction of the event; i.e., at that point their minds are quite perfectly together.

And, for example, Patty's "I keep running tests on yuh" proposes an ongoing, prior-to-this-mention-of-it attention to the possibility that Gene is "syphletic". Again, not merely claiming that his remark was inoffensive, but showing that it intersected her own thoughts about him. A display, that is, of a meeting of the minds.

It appears, then, that laughter and laughings together are components of a Laugh Sequence and provide, e.g., a matrix in which speech events implicating the recipient of a possible offense in the offensive mentality can be elicited and embedded without breaking the conversational surface. The possible rupture, between minds and of the conversation, is sealed with displays of a meeting of minds -- a display which is occasioned by the occurrence, in the first place, of a possible offense.

Such a procedure has interesting implications for the relationship of violations, e.g., obscenity, rudeness, etc., and intimacy. It is possible that the occurrence of a violation can mobilize its recipient towards a solution of the conversational breach such a violation might engender. One solution is to produce some token of understanding, such a token being selected, e.g., from a set of

utterly conventional tokens (e.g., "I can just see you doing X!") or in a range of ways derived from the utterance which carried the offense (e.g., as Patty's "I know yer not...I keep running tests on you" derives from Gene's "I'm not X.^v"); that token or parasitic understanding nevertheless being treated as a personally, independently generated index of intimacy, and thereby potentially consequential for subsequent talk, subsequent conduct of the interaction, and perhaps of the relationship.¹

000. In this section some observations about the interactional workings of laughter have been made:

that laughter can operate as an Indexical Expression, and as such, as a token of understanding;

that laughter can be precision-placed in the course of ongoing talk as a component of a device for displaying "I see what you're saying";

that some extended series of Laugh Units can be turned into a sequence of laughing together, and such a sequence can be offense-remedially used via the indexicality of laughter, which, however, is merely a token, and merely a token of understanding, and therefore an equivocal offense-remedial device;

that such a sequence of laughter may serve as a matrix for an unequivocal offense-remedial act, performed via speech which co-implicates offense-recipient in the offensive mentality, that act embedded within the Laugh Sequence.

1. Some consideration of a delicate version of offense-remedial recipient work appears in "Almost-Verbalized Errors", Section One of unpublished doctoral dissertation (Jefferson:72:UCI) p. 34ff, and in the revised version, "Error Correction as an Interactional Machinery", unpublished manuscript.

VII. The foregoing considerations will be turned to an analysis of a single episode in which two women construct an Offense-Remedial Laugh Sequence. A relatively special situation is involved in this telephone-call event; the husband of the woman who produces the offensive remark is co-present and overhearing her side of the conversation. His presence may be relevant to the construction of the Laugh Sequence, specifically in that the sequence may be geared not only to sealing a possible rupture between the two on the phone, but as well, to the local solution of a general problem. That is, routinely, just such events become part of a repertoire of stories that, e.g., one spouse tells about the other. For example:

[Goodwin:G/R:rd:15] Two couples, Jan and Ron, Edith and Fred, having dinner together at Edith and Fred's house.

Jan: Loren has this new hou:se. en it's got all this like- ssilvery:: g-go:ld wwa:llpaper, *hh (h)en R(h)o(h)n sa(h)ys, y'know this's th'firs'time we've seen this house.Fifty five thousn dollars, in Cherry Hill.Right?

(0.4)

Edith: Uh hu:h?

Jan: → Ro(h)n said. dih-Did they ma:ke you take this=

Edith: =[[hk!

Jan: =[[wa(h)llpa(h)p(h)er? er(h)di//dju pi(h)ck i(h)t ou(h)t]=

Edith: ahh huh huh huh huh]=

Edith: =huh//huh

Ron: uhh hih huh hu//h

Jan: UEWOOghhKHHHH! Y'kno(h)w that wz // like the firs' bad one.

Edith: Uh:oh wo::w hh

(0.2)

Ron: But I said it so innocuously // y'know,

Jan: Yeh I'm sure they thought it wz-

Ron: hnh-hnh-hnh-hnh! *hnhh! I h(h)ope I s(h)aid it innocuously.

One aim of the Remedial Laugh Sequence may be to expunge a gaffe which the husband has heard his wife make; to perform some here and now work which will keep it out of his repertoire of stories and prevent it from becoming a continuing source of embarrassment. (And, of course, the implication of the offense-recipient into the offensive mentality may operate for the future tellability of the event and promise that it will not become a thing that she will report to others.)

The foregoing fragment and the following series of fragments afford an opportunity to track the issue of Tellability vis-a-vis recipient co-implicatedness in an offensive mentality. In the foregoing fragment it can be observed that the overhearer of Ron's offensive remark, his wife, carries it as a gaffe on his part and tells it as such, and that it is received as such by Edith who does not implicate herself in the reported offensive mentality and does implicate herself in the Teller's mentality. Speculatively, it can be imagined that at the time of the initial occurrence, there was no remedial, co-implicative talk. As Ron remarks, "I said it so innocuously.", which may capture the absence of explicit noticing by the recipient of the remark or by the overhearer, at the time.

In the following series of fragments it can be observed that a recipient co-implicates in a Teller's mentality, up to a point, ~~And that that~~ co-implication is crucial for the conduct of the story. Specifically, the nitty gritty materials do not appear until an initial 'preferred' co-implication has been offered, and do appear upon the instant of that occurrence. Olive's Nude Swimming story comes up four times in the course of a very long telephone conversation with her sister, Edna. The first appearance is brief, and the subject is changed.

[NB:IV:7:3]

Olive: Jeeziz Chris'shu shd see that house E(h)dna, you have no idea // hmh!
 Edna: I bet it's a dream. With a swimming pool enclo//sed,=
 Olive: Uh-
 Edna: =huh,
 Olive: Oh::: K(h)od we-
 Olive: 'hhh Uhh huhh=
 Olive: → We swam in the nude 'hh Sundee night u(h)ntil abaht // two uh'clock.
 Edna: Ehh! heh huh ha ha ha // 'hhh
 Olive: HA HAH! HA//::
 Edna: Oh:: I bet in the moonlight, !n the beautiful stars the wind blew terribly though.
 Olive: → Yeah, the wind blew down there en the wind blew tuhday but oh God comin home through the canyon tuhnight oh man it was horrible.

The second mention is treated as Offense-Indexical by recipient, and the offense is attributed to the hostess, Adeline. The subject soon shifts.

[NB:IV:7:14]

Olive: ...so Adeline'n I, unh! w(h)e swam in tha(h)t pool until two uh' clo(hh)//ck in the morning.
 Edna: Oh::
 Edna: [[Go:d.
 Olive: → [[i(h)n the nude 'hh uh//ho(h))h God it was fun.
 Edna: I::sn't she cu::te,
 Edna: 'hh She still drinkin er liddle drinks?
 (0.9)
 Olive: Yea::h, en // then-
 Edna: Yeah.
 Olive: We swam all day tuhday I t- I never, well I got out about e'rry five minnits er so=
 Edna: =[[Oh I betcher tanned.
 Olive: =[[en then en take a-
 (0.4)
 Olive: 'hh Yeah, ki:nda, yeah.
 Edna: Mm hm::
 Olive: → 'hh en then, I left there et uh:: (0.5) exacly et three o'clock. Tch! 'hhh en I didn' get inna any traffig et all

The third mention is appreciated and the talk shifted to finding husbands.

The implication is that Adeline is one lucky bitch.

[NB:IV:7:20]

Olive: But the water is, eighdy // five,
 Edna: Oh I know it. Isn' it gorgeous // ()
 Olive: Budyih know when yih ged ou:t it's kinda co:ld.=
 Edna: =[[Oh:: yea:h.
 Olive: =[[-or was,
 Olive: -two uh'clock in the morning, en // then las' ni-
 Edna: ho ho ho ho::
 Olive: [[nhh!
 Edna: [[I be(h)t // tha(h)t wiz // fun!
 Olive: hnh hnh hnh
 Olive: → With no k- 'hhh cloze // on, God it's good!]=
 Edna: AAAOwww!]=
 Olive: =[[huhhuh huh! huh!
 Edna: =[[Isn't that exci:ding,
 Olive: Uh:://::?
 Edna: Oh, that's wonder//ful ()-
 Olive: Oh, God we had- we- I never had so much fun in my // life.
 Edna: → Oh:: I'm gladju went. COD OLIVE, I wish you c'd meet somebuddy like that.

At the fourth mention of nude swimming, a Second Story (Sacks:71) by Edna is offered, and directly after that, the douche event is presented.

Inspection of the data yields that the douche talk is preceded by mention of the bathrooms and toilets in the house. This may be an instance of Premonitoring (Jefferson:73) where some prior talk sets up and moves toward some subsequent talk. If the story contains that sort of continuity, then a Parenthetical Story Node may also be placed in the narrative with an eye to the forthcoming douche event.

That is, when Olive talks about a \$22 bathing suit given her by Adeline, she may be offering it as an instance of the sort of gentle extortion people engage in; i.e., Adeline's gift may 'predispose' Olive to going along with the suggestion to swim nude, and the subsequent suggestion to play with the hot water inlets. The \$22 bathing suit may specifically be introduced into Olive's narrative to indicate to Edna how, in the first place, she came to be implicated in such a mentality.

It can further be noted that in Edna's Second Story, she provides an indication of how she came to be doing this possibly offensive activity; i.e., she reports that her co-participant acknowledged its touchy status and asked "Do you mind?".

Following is the prolonged fragment in which these activities occur.

[NB:IV:7:51]

Olive: Cheezuz en, en all the li:ghts yihknow en the air conditioning
en goes on, in thē // uh-
Edna: Innerco:m // I suppose,
Olive: Ut-
Olive: Hu:h?
Edna: Intercom?

(0.4)

Edna: You c'n talk // from one room // t'the other,
Olive: Yuh-
Olive: Oh:: yea:h, en the sunken bathtuh- I never took a bath there=
Edna: huh huh huh
Olive: =[[cuz the pool's so clean.=
Edna: =[[I know.
Olive: =[[The sunken ba-'hhh
Olive: en then the toilet's way off in a // liddle cubby hole=
Edna: Yeah?
Edna: Yeah.
Olive: =[[yihknow en with a- Oh:: // God it's-
Edna: () the lavatory's in the bedroom I spoze with- basins
in the bedroom,
Olive: Yeah let's see she's // got-
Edna: ()-
(1.0)
Olive: -four bathrooms.
Edna: ((whispered)) Oh my God.
Olive: eh-en, she eesh- She's a great person a' run aroun n:naygid yidow,
hhhuh! 'hh Well yih can there, nobody yihknow, great big walls
nobuddy c'n see over 'r anything yihknow?
Edna: ah ha ha // ha
Olive: 'hh 'n Christ yih kin, 'hh (hh)end so 'hh when Claude lef' tuhday
we took off ar s- 'hh suits yihknow en, eh- Oh en she gave me the
most beautiful swimsuit chu've ever seen in yer life.
Edna: Gave it to yuh?
Olive: Yeah.
Edna: Aww://::
Olive: A twunny two dollar // one.
Edna: Aww::.
.
.
.
Olive: So then when Claude l(hh)ev w(hh)e took the suits off e(hh)n swam
aroun'n the nude'n huhh huhh 'n took a sunbath'n the nude 'n
e'rrything. 'hh//hhh
Edna: You know Em'ly en I usetuh do that on the rivers if the feller'd
go down'n get gasleen fer their boats, hh 'hh she'd say "D'you
mind," we'd be in a cove, but we'd take it out, under the wahder.
Yihknow becuz uh, -- ee we're out in the open. yihknow, 'hh But
we'd jus slip ar bathing suit ow- en geh- en swim around in that
r:river. That uh Colorado River til, 'hhh God whadda thrill. --
I always have like tuh swim in the nu//de,
Olive: Me, too, yihknow, eh- 'hh en then, 'hh right- eh deh- there's
two places where the hot wahder comes in'n yih g'n get right up
close to'm en ih yuz feels like yer // takin a douche.

Edna: uhh huh huh=
 Edna: ahh hah hah // 'hhh HUH HUH HAHH HA HA HA HA HUH 'HRRHHH!
 Olive: HUH HUH HUH HUH HA HA uhh ha-uhh ha:: ha:: huh
 Olive: [En we-
 Edna: [I C'N SEE YOU TWO KIDS // ()-
 Olive: En she wz on one end'n I wz ovetheother en' with 'r legs
 up yihknow en // yi:::hh!=
 Edna: Yeh-
 Olive: =hhfe(hh)l' so(hh) good=
 Edna: = [Oh she's a cutey.
 Olive: [Ahh hahh
 Edna: [God she's uninhibitiduh. 'hhhh
 Olive: [Oh yeh
 Olive: Yeh-//-eah.
 Edna: She's-
 Olive: Yea//h.
 Edna: Oh at's wonderful Olive, I'm so happy, -- 'hh//hh
 Olive: Yeah.
 Edna: En I've hadda real good time too.

Some intricacies of co-implicatedness vis-a-vis future tellability might be traced. For example, however much the laughter and the "I c'n see you two kids!" may implicate Edna in the offensive mentality, it is clear that although she can and will co-implicate in nude swimming, as a doer of such things, she will not co-implicate further than a willingness to visualize douching at the hot water inlets -- in contrast to treating that as a doable she has not yet done; i.e., the standard "Oh I can't wait to try it!" sort of response which warrants and co-implicates recipient into the thing told.

Subsequent talk, focussing on attributes of Olive's friend may be equivocal for issues of future telling, e.g., may indicate that Edna will protect the story insofar as she indicates some approval, or may talk about it as something offensive, but offensive about Adeline, or may talk about it as something offensive about Adeline and about Olive as accomplice or dupe.

Two more laughter sequences generated by possible offenses will be displayed, in which offense recipient co-implicates in the course of laughter.

[NB:IV:8:27] Martha, an elderly woman whose husband is on a business trip on Thanksgiving day.

Edna: Well Martha? now I'd love tuh have you join us -- if you, feel as though you'd like tuh come over.

Martha: Well thank you dear, I don't think so, -- I had my little- 'hh he:n, a:nd uh 'hh I'm looking forward to just uh 'hh having a little, (0.6) ti:me tuh myself,

Edna: A:a'ri::ght,

Martha: I've look' forward t(hh)o i(hh)t s(hh)o_{law-} 'hh_{Yhhknow=}

Edna: AAWW::oh:::

Martha: —> =like Gahbo, 'hh_{Eh::heh!} heh_{But uh...}

Edna: —> Yeh hh_{hheh!} "AH WANT TUH BE ALO:::NE."

The issue being addressed here for future telling may turn on whether Martha can be talked about by Edna as a reclusive, possible pre-senile old woman, and that issue may be resolved with the reference to the glamorous Garbo and Edna's co-implication in that image.

[NB:III:3:6] Bill and his wife are spending the weekend at a beach house. Carl is talking to Bill on the phone, has remarked that Bill sounds tired. Bill explains that he just woke up.

Bill: No we cm in frm the beach, then we cm in en take a na::p you kno:w,

Carl: Yeh::you really been screwin around_{there}

Bill: It's really- yuh really get-

Bill: Ye:::h,

Carl: Right?

Bill: En then we t- k-

(1.0)

Bill: —> [-have a beer,

Carl: —> ['n the kids'r theh-ther di- ((soprano)) "Daddy Mummy Daddy"=

Carl: =hheh_{heh-heh-heh}

Bill: Eh yeh hehhehh

Bill: heh hehh ehhehh

Bill: hehh

Carol: heh heh

Bill: —> ((alto)) "Get outta there."

Carol: { hehhehhehhehhehhehhehhehhehchh

Bill: { eh heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh

Carl: Aah, well av a good time.
 Bill: No, no hanky panky.
 Carl: No hanky pan_{ky}.
 Bill: No:: hanky panky.

(0.4)

Carl: Well, have a good time.
 Bill: Oh(hh)kay_(h)I'll-
 Carl: 'n I'll, see yuh later.
 Bill: Okay Carl,
 Carl: Yeah.
 Bill: [[Bye.
 Carl: [[Bye.

Here, Bill co-implicates in the mentality which imagizes the kids intrusion into the bedroom, providing Mummy's response. Once the offensiveness has been negated, the facts of the matter are re-formulated and acknowledged, for future tellability. Carl may be thereby instructed not to report that Bill and his wife are screwing around, not by virtue of its tabu status -- Bill proposing that it's perfectly talkable about -- but by virtue of the fact that they just don't happen to be doing it (so don't talk about it!).

These sorts of materials suggest that the issue of future tellability is oriented to in current interactions (and in possibly sequentially orderly ways); that a Laugh Sequence can be instrumental in managing such an issue; and that the serial production of laughter can serve in the collaborative construction of the laugh sequence in which displays of co-implicatedness and negotiations for future reference can be elicited and embedded.

PART TWO

0. Analysis of an extended fragment of a single interaction will be undertaken, focussing on the occurrence of a Laugh Sequence. The analysis will be directed to explicating the hypothesis that laughter is an interaction-constructional resource, treating Laugh Units as turn-constructional components and attempting to account for their occurrence, as such, in some actual talk. The accounts will be generated by, and attempt to come to terms with, the hypothesized interaction-constructional operation of laughter.

The Analysis will procede in three sections: (I) a rough abstract of the extended fragment, (II) some consideration of relevant pre-Laugh Sequence materials, and (III) a detailed consideration of the Laugh Sequence itself.

I. Abstract of the extended fragment (Data attached at end of paper)

In the course of thanking Margy for a recent luncheon she gave which Edna attended, and apologizing for the delay in offering the thanks, Edna produces an Interactionally Generated (Sacks:70), "someday" invitation to Margy and her mother, to Coco's, a high class coffee shop, but a coffee shop nevertheless. (lines a.1.-a.9.)¹

In standard form for Interactionally Generated Invitations, Margy proposes they go "Dutch", and Edna declines (lines a.12.-a.13.) The invitation is tabled with the introduction of other matters, which turn out to be relevant to the invitation insofar as mention is made of a friend of Margy's mother who will be staying with them for some time (lines a.19.-a.23.).

1. That Coco's is such a coffee shop is an assertion derived from sources external to these data.

Approximately 10 minutes later, at the start of the Closings Sequence (Sacks, Schegloff:72), Margy takes up the invitation again, this time including someone named "Elss", who is presumably the prior-mentioned friend of her mother. It appears that Margy seizes upon the "someday" invitation as a means of entertaining her house guest. Insofar as a guest is now involved, Coco's becomes problematic (lines b.3.-b.4.) Edna continues to opt for Coco's, in the course of which she declares that one of its virtues is that "It's cheap," (lines b.5.-b.9.), that constituting a possible offense to Margy as recipient of a Price Tagged invitation.¹ In the course of back and forth apologies by Edna and protestations by Margy, Edna announces that Bud is overhearing them, at which point Margy cuts off in mid-protest (lines b.21.-b.23.). Edna then produces a full apology and explanation (lines b.25.-b.27.) whereupon she and Margy enter an extended Laugh Sequence (lines b.29.-b.41.), in the course of which Margy implicates herself in the offensive mentality (line b.32.). The Laugh Sequence terminates with a re-entry into Closings (lines b.42.-43.).

II. Relevant pre-Laugh Sequence materials

Two events are focussed upon: (A) the introduction of Bud, as an overhearer, into the ongoing talk, and (B) the consequent initiation of the Laugh Sequence. The initiation of the Laugh Sequence is broken down into the following sub-events: (1) the occurrence of a possible Adjacency Pair Insertion Sequence, (2) expansion of that paired unit into a Laugh Sequence, (3) insertion of Parenthetical Materials into the sequence, (4) the operation of the Parenthetical Materials, and (5) closure of the parenthesis, entry into the Laugh Sequence proper.

1. Price Tagging is being independently studied as a locus of repair work in conversation.

A. Introduction of Overhearer into the ongoing talk

~~It appears~~ It appears that the announcement of Bud's presence is accomplice to the Offense-Remedial Laugh Sequence. For the purposes of the interaction, Bud is co-present and listening to Edna's side of the conversation, at least from the point at which she declares that Coco's is "cheap" (see lines b.9.-b.22.).

Conceivably, Bud has just popped into the room, dropped the remark that it "sure sounded like [Edna] meant it" and left. Conceivably, he is not present at any time and Edna has generated the remark herself, presenting it to Margy as authored by Bud.

The fact remains that Edna selects to inform Margy that Bud is co-present, is listening, and is listening critically; specifically, that his criticism is directed to Edna's apologies vis-a-vis "It's cheap"; that he is noticing an apparent failure of those apologies to effect a remedy.

Such information can ~~be interpreted~~ have consequences for subsequent talk between Edna and Margy, ~~and the recipient's search for information can be used to see such intention.~~ Margy can extract from Edna's utterance that Edna's repeated apology is being assessed by Bud, and is being negatively assessed.

B. Initiation of the Laugh Sequence

One immediate consequence of Edna's announcement is that Margy cuts off her protestations and produces a laugh.

Margy: She's just the kind'v a person it- y'know it doesn't make any
di,ffrence tuh-

Edna: Bud says it sure sounded like I meant it but, I didn't.

Margy: (Aa:::ha ha ha)

The placement and content of Margy's overlap indicate that she is, at least, responsive to Edna's announcement, e.g., in contrast to such placement and alternative content indicating an attempt to continue her interrupted protestation, i.e., a re-interruption of Edna's interruption.

1. A possible Adjacency Pair Insertion Sequence. The Laughable and its responsive Laughter could constitute a minimal Insertion Sequence; i.e., an Adjacency Pair. Such a unit is a massively occurrent, apparently central construction unit for conversation (Sacks:72). In this case, the Pair Type is [Laughable/Laughter] and may be affiliated to a list which includes, e.g., [Question/Answer], [Greeting/Return Greeting], [Request/Acceptance-Rejection], etc.

Margy's laughter, as an Adjacency Pair Second Pair-Part can operate to acknowledge that she understands that Bud is listening, and indicate that she is prepared to go along with the manner in which Edna proposes to handle the problem; that is, not only in contrast to an attempted continuation of her interrupted protestation, but in contrast to, e.g., picking up on Bud's announced presence as a topic for talk (which could be insensitive to Edna's covert announcement).

As a member of the class of Insertion Sequences, a feature of such an Adjacency Pair is that upon its completion, co-participants can/should return to the ongoing talk. (see p. 16).

2. Expanding an Inserted Adjacency Pair into a Laugh Sequence. Margy's laughter is overlapped by a second Laughable by Edna.

Edna: Bud says it sure sounded like I meant it but, I didn't. (I don't have a Diner's-
 Margy: Aa:::ha ha ha

The offering of a second Laughable has been considered as a candidate device for extending a sequence of laughter which is in progress (see p. 18). When a second Laughable occurs as the third utterance in a series which has so far consisted of a Laughable and a Laugh, it may serve as a device for proposing that a Laugh Sequence be entered, in contrast to, e.g., a return to the ongoing talk which is in order upon the completion of an Adjacency Pair Insertion Sequence.

One sort of grounds for entering a Laugh Sequence has been seen; i.e., the Sequence provides a place for the offense-recipient to produce, as a Laughable, an utterance which co-implicates him in the offensive mentality and thus performs crucial offense-remedial work (see p. 19), while an Adjacency Pair is completed without such work having occurred.

3. Inserting parenthetical materials into a Sequence. If Edna is engaged in an attempt to generate a Laugh Sequence, then why does she self-interrupt her second Laughable and produce talk which is continuous with the ongoing talk; i.e., a third apology?

Edna: Bud says it sure sounded like I meant it but, I didn't. (I don't have a Diner's-
 Margy: Aa:::ha ha ha)

Edna: ('hh No honey I really didn' mean that,)

- (a) A first sort of account is 'turn-strategic' and proposes that by overlapping Margy's potential Adjacency Pair Second Pair-Part prior to its completion, with a second Laughable, she heads off a potential return, by Margy, to the series of protestations and apologies which have constituted the ongoing talk. A 'delayed'

version of such a device is seen in the following excerpt from a different conversation between these two interactants, where Margy attempts to return to the ongoing talk after a Laughable/Laughter Adjacency Pair, Edna interrupting the return with a Second Laughable, Margy cutting off her return to the ongoing talk, and laughing again upon completion of the Second Laughable.

[NB:IV:6:3]

Margy: But I thought that uh, 'hh
 Edna: Her huh- uh-her father in law's in the hospit'l so I don't know what the deal honey I've just released myself of evrything I'm dis going along with the ti:de.
 Margy: heh heh huh? 'hhh
 Edna: 'hh=
 Margy: [= Well I'll tell-
 Edna: And the wind blows en I'll go where the wind blo:::ws
 Margy: Eh! huhh oka(hh)y heh heh

Then, by self-interrupting prior to a first completion point in the second Laughable, "I don't have a Diner's [Card]", she heads off the expectable response to it and achieves some clear floorspace in which to offer, once again, her apology.

Further, the apology is formed up as continuous with the prior "Bud says it sure sounded like I meant it..." as a Contrast Pair [what it sounded like/what it really was]. And it can be heard as an overlap-remedial repeat (Schegloff:73), recovering "...but//I didn't." from its possibly overlap-impaired status.

One thrust of this account is that "I don't have a Diner's-" is encapsulated and discarded, having served some local turn-strategic function.

(b) A second sort of account is 'sequence-strategic' and proposes that not only can the foregoing be in operation but that "I don't have a Diner's-" is preserved. The self-interruption is seen as utilizing an orientation to a Sequence-in-progress, such that having started one, it can be departed from and returned to, and its projected return will be anticipated by a co-participant.

(1) To get at the possible co-orientation to a Sequence-in-progress, an earlier event can be examined.

Edna: An' it's chea:p, hh
 Margy: Yeh hah!
 Edna: hhh (h)I'm on uh, 'hhh I'm on retirement-
 Margy: Hey well yer not takin us Edna. . .

In the first place, the type and positioning of the laughter with which Margy receives Edna's first Laughable may indicate her interest in pursuing the ongoing negotiations. That is, the 1-part Laugh Unit, appended to the sequence-continuative "Yeh" is a constructed display of minimal and afterthought appreciation of the prior utterance as a Laughable. This is in clear contrast to, e.g., the N-part Laugh Unit which greets the announcement that Bud is listening (see p. 31).

Secondly, recalling the No Sooner-No Later placement of Tokens of Understanding (see p. 13-14), it can be seen that Margy's "Hey" intersects Edna's talk at just such a point. In this case, the object is not merely a token of understanding, and its placement may not merely be proposing "I see what you're saying", but, e.g., "I see what you're doing and stop right there!" And it is not merely some/any utterance which Margy proposes to cut off, but the projected Laugh Sequence which "I'm on

retirement", as a Second Laughable, generates. Margy is attending not merely the syntax-semantics of an utterance, but of a Sequence.

- (ii) There may, in fact, be a continuity between the two attempts to enter a Laugh Sequence, the above materials constituting a first attempt and seen as an attempt to enter a Laugh Sequence by Margy. If her interruption of the second Laughable proposes that the sequence it projects be abandoned in favor of continued protestations and apologies, then Edna's subsequent announcement that Bud is listening may specifically constitute a second appeal to enter that sequence, now explicitly (if somewhat covertly) explaining her reasons for wanting to get out of the series of apologies Margy's protestations are eliciting and Bud is overhearing, and into the Remedial Laugh Sequence.

It can be seen that Edna self-interrupts the Second Laughable in this series at a No Sooner-No Later recognition point in her utterance; i.e., when she has said "...Diner's-", "Diner's Card" having been projected. Again, that which can be recognized is not merely the syntactics-semantics of some/any utterance, but of a Sequence.

- (iii) If "I don't have a Diner's-" is recognizable as the occurrence of a Second Laughable and thereby as an attempted entry into a Laugh Sequence or re-entry into the prior, interrupted, Laugh Sequence, then Edna's precision-placed departure from it may constitute an instance of a standard conversational device: Parenthesizing. Recurrently, people are found to be breaking off some bit of talk and doing some other, and then returning to the talk which had

been broken off. What might otherwise be seen as meandering and redundant talk turns out to be orderly; a first occurrence projecting a line of talk, a next occurrence of that object indicating a return to the projected line of talk, with the materials between the two occurrences of the same object being recognizably 'merely parenthetical'. In some cases, the import of the parenthetical materials is obvious, and as well, the import of their parenthetical, afterthought status. For example:

-
- (1) [Adato: :] Tony is describing an encounter with an insurance salesman, who is Jewish and went to acting school with Kirk Douglas.

Tony: So I says "What happena you."

Kirk Douglas is Jewish too. Bud anyway. Dat's immaterial.

So I says "what happena you" i says un "how come you didn' make it."
He siz

-
- (2) [Goodwin:G/R:rd:]

Jan: Loren has this new hou:se. En it's got all this like- ssilveryy::
g-go:ld wwa:llpaper, 'hh (h) en R(h)o(h)on sa(h)ys,

Y'know this's the firs'time we've seen this house. Fifty five
thous'n dollars, in Cherry Hill. Right?

Beth: Uh hu:h?

Jan: Ro(h)n said. "dih-Did they ma:ke you take this wa(h)llpa(h)per?. . ."

And in the following fragment, an entire Story Node is marked as parenthetical. The possible import of that node has been considered earlier (see p. 24).

(4) [NB:IV:7:51]

Olive: So 'hh when Claude lef'tuhday we took off ar s-'hh suits y'know en, eh-

Oh en she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit chu've ever seen in yer life.

Edna: Gave it to yuh?

Olive: Yeah.

Edna: Aww: ::

Olive: A twunny two dollar one.

Edna: Aww: ::

(0.6)

Edna: Well you've given her a lot in uh yer day Olive,

Olive: I know ut. En when we looked w-one et Walder Clark's you know we were gonna buy one cuz they have this big sale, but they didn' have anything en Bullock's were all twunny six dollars en I sez "Shoot I don' wanna spen' that now" yihknow 'hhh So t'day she siz "I got one back there" en it's ril lo:ng yihknow en it's jus beautiful.

Edna: Mm hm,

Olive: So then when Claude l(hh)ef w(hh)e took the suits off e(hh)n swam aroun 'n the nude'n huuu huuh 'n took a sunbath 'n the nude'n e'rrything.

It is possible, then, that Edna's "I don't have a Diner's-" is sequence-strategically operative. After a second start on a Laugh Sequence which was interrupted by Margy's protestations, Edna sets up a parenthesis in which she inserts her apology and explanation while Margy has been requested to abandon her protestations by reference to the appeal that Bud is listening, that appeal embedded in the Laughable which initiates this attempted entry into the Laugh Sequence.

(iv) Now, perhaps ideally, the apology and explanation should come off with no interruption from Margy, who has been instructed to await

resumption of the Laugh Sequence. Margy does interrupt, starting up at a first possible completion point in Edna's apology.

Edna: I don't have a Diner's-'hh No honey I really didn' mean that, but Bud'n I ate
 Margy: I::: ()

Edna: up there the other night it was- really' good food very reasonable.

It may well be that there are not only recognizable parenthesizing formats, but recognizable/appropriate parenthetical materials; things which can be seen as, e.g., incidental intelligence, after-thought, by the ways, etc., and the recycled apology is not such an object, potentially constituting a subversion of the parenthesizing format for the introduction of non-parenthetical talk. And Margy begins to protest. When it turns out that the apology is a lead-in to appropriate parenthetical materials (in this case constituting incidental intelligence), Margy relinquishes.

- (4) Import of the parenthetical materials. The parenthetical materials have a range of functions, one of them perhaps crucial to the Remedial Sequence. Focussing on "...it was- really good food, very reasonable," it appears that the central working of this utterance-part, and of the entire utterance in which it is embedded, is to Synonymize the offensive term "cheap" to the innocuous "reasonable". Synonymizing appears to be a device for achieving unmarked remedy of an offense; specifically, by treating as synonymous two terms which might otherwise be importantly contrastive. For example: In the following materials, an offense is noted by one recipient. In contrast to the offense-remedial correction-explanation-apology sequence which might be expected, the offender attempts an unmarked remedy by synonymizing.

[GTS:IV:23] Jim is a newcomer to a teenage therapy group. He's in the course of a story about a friend of his.

Jim: He went right down on that field, an' he was just sittin there talkin like a nigger, an' all the guys, an' y'know all these niggers are all up there an'

Roger: You mean Negro, doncha.

Jim: Well an' they're all-

Ken: An' Jig¹ hehh¹

Jim: They're-

Jim: They're all up in the stands you know, all, the-these guys are just completely radical I think- I think Negroes are cool guys, you know?

Synonymizing can intendedly achieve expunging of the offense:/sealing of the interactional rupture, by indicating that while specialized work might be done with one term vs. another, such was not the intention of this particular speaker, who treats the two terms as synonymous. However, it may itself display some parting of the minds, insofar as it is a claim to idiosyncratic language use on the part of its speaker, or a suggestion of hypersensitivity on the part of its recipient/complainant, and thus necessitate further remedial work.

Margy's second interruption of the parenthetical materials may be in response to the latter consequence of synonymizing, and remedially intended, starting up at a No Sooner-No Later recognition point.

Edna: ...it was- really good food, very reason¹able.

Margy: I, Edna you know I didn't- you know-

Furthermore, with the placement of her protest, Margy pinpoints the attempted synonymizing, marking its progenitor as the offense to which she/they are talking.

1. In multi-party conversation, whether some utterance has constituted an offense is negotiable. A third party can implicate himself in the mentality which has been proposed to be offensive, as Ken does with "An' Jig".

The considerations so far talk to an intuitive sense one might have for these sorts of events in general, and these materials in particular; i.e., that apologies, protestations, explanations, etc., do not themselves remedy offenses; in fact, appear to enhance them. That enhancement may be directed to pre-remedial diagnostic work; locating, clarifying, formulating, agreeing upon, etc., the nature of the offense so that it may be remedied by such offense-embedding procedures as, e.g., unilateral Synonymizing or collaborative construction of an Offense-Remedial Laugh Sequence.

So far in the interaction under consideration, there have been several problematic issues, e.g., whether Edna shall pay, the inclusion of a fourth party, the appropriateness of Coco's, and whether Edna shall pay the bill at a more expensive restaurant for more people, Edna proposing that she will pay, but only for Coco's, insofar as it is "cheap". Now, "It's cheap" may be an ideal vehicle for resolving the range of troubles between them. In the first place, it is a prototypic sore thumb (cf. "...takin a douche", "I'm not syphletic", p. 17., and "...all these niggers...", p. 38.), and in the second place, the introduction of such a 'rude' mentality into the interaction is the most trivial of their troubles.

Thirdly, and perhaps crucially, "It's cheap" locates Edna as the Offender and Margy as Offense-Recipient, an issue which has so far been unresolved.

It is at this point in the talk that agreement may be reached to focus on "It's cheap" as the offense, such that it being resolved, the multifaceted trouble between them shall be treated as also resolved.

5. Close parenthesis. At the point where ~~it~~ "It's cheap" has been focussed upon via the pinpointing of the attempted Synonymizing to "reasonable", the Laugh Sequence becomes fully elaborated, Edna closing off the parenthesis she generated with "I don't have a Diner's-" by providing a topically coherent

next Laughable, "...I'm on retirement", which is a repeat of an earlier Laughable, the first appeal to enter a Laugh Sequence. This continuity may propose to parenthesize the entire segment of, now, intrusive talk which constituted the apologies and protestations, such that the actual Offense-Remedial talk is tied directly back to the locus of the agreed-upon offense. A printout of lines (b.9-11, 24, and 29) yields this achieved continuity.

-
- (9) Edna: An' it's chea:p, hh
 (10) Margy: Yeh hah!
 (11) Edna: hhh (h)I'm on uh, 'hh I'm on retirement-
 .
 .
 (24) Edna: I don't have a Diner's-
 .
 (29) Edna: Hell you know I'm on ret(h)i::rement, I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh
 C(h)ountry C(h)lub,
-

C. The Laugh Sequence

The remainder of this report will focus on the Laugh Sequence proper, treating it as a sequence constructed to seal the rupture between Edna and Margy, using "It's cheap" as the vehicle for resolving a multi-faceted trouble, including the fact that Bud overheard their wrangle and unless it is here and now repaired, ^{it} may constitute a gaffe by Edna which Bud can incorporate into his repertoire of stories about her for future telling (see p. 21ff).

While Margy can be recruited into such a task via, e.g., standard decency and an interest in preserving her friendship with Edna, and more locally, via an interest in keeping Edna's invitation alive as a means to entertain her house guest, there may be another reason; a reason attendant to situations like this

one, and of which this interaction is an instance.

Given that Margy is engaged in finding ways to entertain her house guest and has seized upon Edna's "someday" invitation, and given that Bud is overhearing Edna's side of the conversation as far as Margy knows, it becomes interesting that Edna gives no indication in her talk that a fourth party has become involved. (see lines b.5.-b.29.).

By avoiding reference to the inclusion of a fourth party, Edna can protect herself from Bud's consequent assessment of her as being exploitable by Margy. So, for example, her continued opting for Coco's in the face of Margy's suggestion they go elsewhere (lines b.4.-b.5.) may evidence her unwillingness to be overheard as being exploited, insofar as switching to another restaurant can be overheard as responsive to a suggestion by Margy, the recipient of Edna's invitation; i.e., as being exploited, not to mention the reason for the proposed change of venue; i.e., Margy's inclusion of a fourth party.

The fact that Edna has not, so far, mentioned the inclusion of the fourth party into the luncheon invitation may provide the local leverage by which Margy is recruited into the Laugh Sequence; i.e., Margy can be interested in protecting herself from Bud's assessment of her as being exploitive of Edna, should Edna's talk subsequently reveal what Margy has done.

The Sequence, then, may be entered by two parties operating via the relational category pair Exploiter-Exploitee, a relational pair one might intuitively understand to be intensely collusive and mutually protective.

The Sequence can be broken down into the following events: (1) Achieved Concensus Entry into the Laugh Sequence, (2) Co-Implication of Offense-Recipient into Offensive Mentality, (3) Delayed Recognition of Offense-Remedial Act,

(4) Escalation of the Offense, (5) Resolution of the Escalation, (6) Winding down the Sequence, and (7) Achieved Concensus Exit from the Laugh Sequence.

(1) Achieved Concensus Entry into the Laugh Sequence

- (a) Margy's laughter is technically characterizable as sensitive to Edna's Laughable in that it directly follows a within-speech laugh by Edna.

Margy: Edna you know I didn't-[you know-
Edna: Hell you know I'm on ret(h)i[ehh ye(h)hmmh 'hmm hmh!
:rement, I c(h)an't...

The serial sensitivity of laughter to laughter was noted earlier (see p. 2); indeed, the standard germination of laughing together involves laughter followed by laughter (Laugh Reciprocal Laughter) in contrast to simultaneously begun co-laughing (Laughable Responsive Laughter). Furthermore, the relationship of a second laugh to a first varies, and that variation may be interactionally occupied. For example, at page 2 (2), Ruth, the one who initially mis-pronounced "Peter O'Toole" starts laughing an instant after Bill has started to appreciate Ben's mimic of her error. This may be an assertion of simultaneous, i.e., Laughable Responsive, laughter, where in fact it was Laugh Reciprocal; the delay being a matter of Ruth's hoping that no one would be amused by Ben's teasing her. And at page 2 (3), Kitty, who has just been treated to a brag by Ken, starts laughing upon completion of Ken's 2-part Laugh Unit. This may indicate to Ken that she is laughing in response to his laughter, going along with him, rather than appreciating his utterance; i.e., producing recognizable Laugh Reciprocal laughter in contrast to Laughable Responsive laughter.

In the case at hand, the occurrence of a laugh after a single within-speech aspirated plosive may constitute an assertion of simultaneously begun laughter; i.e., of Laughable Responsive laughter, when in fact it is Laugh Reciprocal laughter.

- (b) Margy's laughter may be broken down into Laugh Units, with "'hnh hnh!" constituting an Nth-in-a-series Unit, and sequentially operative as such.

Edna: Hell you know I'm on ret(h)i::rement,
 Margy: eh ye(h)hnh + ('hnh hnh!)

That Nth, 2-part Laugh Unit may be geared to the possible turn-transfer point which occurs at the completion of Edna's "...I'm on ret(h)i::rement". It can serve as a possible next turn at talk in the event that Edna stops talking at that possible sentence/utterance completion point.¹ Should Edna stop, then Margy's "'hnh hnh!", as a turn at talk, can operate analogously to a Second Laughable (see p. 32.), and indicate that she is entering the Laugh Sequence, in contrast to, having completed an Adjacency Pair [Laughable/Laughter], being prepared to return to the ongoing talk (see, e.g., p. 32, where a single 3-part Laugh Unit "heh heh huh?" premonitors a return to the ongoing talk).

It may be a feature of laughter (and other tokens of understanding) that it can, but need not, constitute a turn at talk. If it occurs in the clear, then it constitutes a turn at talk; if it occurs in overlap with other talk, then it is not treated as an attempt to occupy that turn at talk such that the other should stop and permit it to occur in the clear. For the purposes of this particular interaction, the Nth-in-a-series, 2-part Laugh Unit can operate in the following way.

- (i) If Edna stops at that first possible completion point, the Laugh Unit will occupy Margy's turn at talk, and at its completion, it will be

1. For a consideration of the rules of turn-taking, see Sacks et.al., A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation, Language, forthcoming. Considerations in this report are based on that paper.

Edna's turn, e.g., to continue laughing or provide a next Laughable, Margy having now indicated her own entry into a Laugh Sequence.

- (ii) If Edna continues with speech or starts up laughter, then the Laugh Unit does not compete with Edna's talk; specifically, it does not invite Edna to stop, which would leave Margy with a turn at talk to occupy, perhaps specifically with a Laughable.
- (iii) Should Edna produce a Laughable while Margy is laughing, then Margy can cut off her laughter at a Laugh Unit completion point, permitting Edna's talk to occur in the clear (see p. 3.), or can continue laughing and produce a Step-Up by which to acknowledge and appreciate the Laughable upon its completion (see p. 10.).
- (c) Edna 'continues' her utterance with a second sentence/Second Laughable, overlapping Margy's N-Unit laughter with ^{that} candidate device for entry into a Laugh Sequence (see p. 32.).

Edna: Hell you know I'm on ret(h)i_l:::rement, I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh
 Margy: eh_h ye(h)h_hh_h *h_hh h_hh!

Edna: C(h)ountry C(h)lub,

The product of these serial operations is a pair of utterances, the relationship of the two achieving a display of consensus entry (or re-entry into the Laugh Sequence proper.

(2) Offense-Recipient co-implicates in offensive mentality

- (a) Upon completion of the Second Laughable, Edna performs an operation similar to that described for Margy's "'h_hh h_hh!" at (1.b.).

Margy: =[[*h_hh h_hh!
 Edna: =[[I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh C(h)ountry C(h)lub, heh heh heh!

That is, she produces a Laugh Unit which, if Margy does not start to speak or laugh, will serve as a next 'continuation' of Edna's turn at talk, upon completion of which it shall, now, be Margy's turn, and which, if Margy does start to speak or laugh, will not compete and thereby provide a chance of Margy's stopping and returning the floor to Edna. It appears that, in general, the placement of Laugh Units after first completion points in speech or laughter can be geared to defense against a key index of failure of a Laugh Sequence; i.e., the silence which constitutes a lapse in the interaction.

And it can be noted that while Edna is completing her second sentence/ Second Laughable, Margy is silent, and specifically silent through what may constitute an invitation to laugh along; i.e., the within-speech laughter which occurs in "...C(h)ountry C(h)lub...". Such an invitation can be accepted via the sort of No Sooner-No Later placement of laugh-sensitive laughter considered in (1.a.). Here, the invitation has been declined. The Laugh Unit may then be seen as an appended or tag-positioned utterance-part, produced by reference to Margy's silence so far.

- (b) Simultaneously with Edna's tag-positioned Laugh Unit, and placed with no gap-no overlap precision upon the completion of the second sentence/ Second Laughable, Margy offers the utterance by which she implicates herself in the offensive mentality.

Margy: =[['hnh hnh!
 Edna: I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh C(h)ountry C(h)lub, I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt
 heh heh heh!

With this utterance Margy displays that she does categorize restaurants

by price, has a file of restaurants categorized as 'expensive', and can, in conversation-time, recognize "Country Club" as an instance of the latter and come up with another instance.

Furthermore, while "Country Club" is a generic name for an expensive restaurant, the Stuffed Shirt names a specific expensive restaurant in the area,¹ thus upping the ante on Edna's proposal, and thereby providing 'best evidence' of Margy's evil-mindedness. In effect, she is producing a Black Mass backwards version of the standard demurrs and counter-invitations which, in the polite world, and in her own prior talk, are attendant to the offer of invitations (see lines a.12., b.12, 16, 18, 21.).

Margy's silence-so-far, which is a possible source of Edna's tag-positioned laughter, may be accounted for in the following way.

The pair of named restaurants constitutes the sort of meeting of the minds considered earlier as a standard component of Offense-Remedial Sequences (p. 19ff). It is possible that Margy has been monitoring the talk so far for resources by which to achieve that meeting, and seizes upon Edna's Second Laughable in its course, such that by the time Edna has said "I can't take you to the-'hh" a solution is at hand. For Edna's sentence, all that remains is to fill in the name of some place that Edna, being on retirement, can't take Margy to. Margy can, at that point in the utterance so far, find herself with an object with which to fill in the blank.

Such an operation is commonplace enough; people coming up with completions to each other's developing utterances. This

1. Assertion derived from sources external to these data.

phenomenon has been extendedly studied (Sacks:67, Jefferson:72).

A single, prototypical instance is the following.

[GTS:1:56]

Louise: No a Soshe is someone who₁ is a carbon copy of their friend.
 Roger: ₁drinks Pepsi.

If Margy, in similar fashion, can have come up with "Stuffed Shirt" prior to completion of Edna's utterance, then the silence which follows "I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh" may constitute an interactionally-based delay; the withholding of and subsequent placement of Margy's talk no sooner than completion of Edna's constituting an achieved display of reciprocal evil-mindedness by offering "Stuffed Shirt" as a second to Edna's first, in contrast to a display of "I see what you're saying" achieved by offering it simultaneously, as it might have been. Indeed, Margy may be doing a version of Laughing + Pausing which is most delicately accomplished in the following fragment, except in her case, the pause is designed to extend just until completion of Edna's utterance, while in the following case, the pause is designed to extend just until the punchline and permit simultaneous utterance completion.

[Frankel:V:98] See p. 13 (4) for an extended fragment

Joe: So he come₁s home one night'n the sonofa₁bitch₁ bit him.
 Carol: ₁heh heh heh heh heh heh ₁bit hi:m, ah! ah!

Margy's silence may be broken down into two segments, the first engaged in monitoring Edna's utterance for its projected direction, the second specifically engaged in waiting for utterance completion, whereupon she

will (and does) precision-place the object she came up with earlier.

A print-out of that possible tacit event looks like this:

 Margy: =[['hnh hnh!
 Edna: =[[I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh' C(h)ountry C(h)lub, [I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt ((Stuffed Shirt))]

3. Delayed recognition of Offense-Remedial act: Doubletake

- (a) Edna has produced a 3-part Laugh Unit which turns out to overlap the start of Margy's Offense-Remedial utterance. She now produces a 3-part Laugh Unit at the point of first possible completion.

 Edna: =[[heh heh heh!
 Margy: =[[I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt [heh heh heh!]

Technically, the pair of 3-part Laugh Units looks like an instance of Response-Copying, and as such may stand in direct contrast to the working of Step-Ups. Response Copying is particularly striking when it involves spontaneity markers. It appears that on occasion, when a bit of response to some prior talk is overlapped, it is salvaged and re-produced as a next response. For example:

(1) [Goodwin:G/R:rd:52]

Fred: We're lookin at uh houses around here. It's very interesting.

(0.7)

Jan: Are you gunnuh buy a house!?

Fred: We're jus'sorta d-like, jus', seeing what's involved

Jan:

Beth:

[Woo::.]

[Woo::.]
 [We're g'nnuh take-]=

Beth: =We're g'nnuh take it through the, 'hh through the mill so to speak.

(2) [Merritt:4]

Thursa: 'n sh's'z "I haven' gotta stick of furniture!"
(1.0)

Thursa: An' ah- e:nd uh ah, says "Well-"
Beth: hhh! hhh!

(3) [NB:IV:7:51]

Olive: Oh en she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit chu've ever seen in yer life.

Edna: Gave it to yuh?

Olive: Yeah.

Edna: Aww::: Aww:::

Olive: A twunny two dollar one.

(4) [NB:VII:11]

Edna: Oh Coco's is fun, up there on the hill en yuh look down, It's so pretty.

Margy: Yeah. Yeah.=

Margy: =Let's do it.

The Response Copying appears to dis-attend the talk between the pair of responses, the action of copying solving a problem for such indexical expressions; i.e., that they refer to whatever they follow. Copied responses may be seen to refer to the source of the initial response. And, for example, in the case of (1) and (2), since the response starts up in some faltering talk, the initial response and its copy may be seen to refer to a Respondable which occurred prior to the faltering; in (2), to Thursa's quote "I haven' gotta stick of furniture!" and in (1) to Jan's own initial response, and, via that, to Fred's announcement "We're lookin at uh houses around here."

In (3), the dis-attending of the Price Tagging of the gift may be one of the ways in which people manage money talk; such talk turning out to be a tender issue in conversation, and routinely very delicately handled. And of course in (4), the dis-attending of extended attributes of Coco's can be part of Margy's efforts to treat the place as not terribly desirable, as she has initially indicated with "...or we'll go somewhere else." It may then be not incidental, not a unilateral move on Edna's part, that she proposes immediately thereafter "An' it's cheap" (lines b.5.-9.); i.e., she is making sense of Margy's Response Copying and yielding to its meaning, turning the third attribute of Coco's [...it's fun...it's so pretty...an' it's chea:p] into an explicit formulation of the possible offense engendered by her having suggested it in the first place.

If Response Copying can have such a function, and if Edna's Laugh Unit at first completion of Margy's Laughable is an instance of Response Copying, then Edna appears to be actively dis-attending this most crucial utterance in the Laugh Sequence, referring back through the talk and focussing upon her Laughable as the source both of Margy's Laughable and her own subsequent laughter.

It appears, however, that Edna is not dis-attending Margy's Offense-Remedial act as such, but has heard it, via its surface features; i.e., for the parasitic relationship of "Stuffed Shirt" to "Country Club", and via her interpretation of Margy's prior silence as a rejection of an invitation to laugh along and therefore indexical of Margy's willingness to participate, such that she is unprepared for an offering of Offense-Remedial work by Margy, and recognizes it as a weak contribution to the sequence, best appreciated by acknowledging its secondary status.

- (b) Immediately after the 3-part Laugh Unit, Edna produces an object which is at least a Step-Up, and thereby acknowledges the crucial sense of the talk which she had first heard as defective.

Edna: =[[heh heh heh!
 Margy: =[[I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt [heh heh heh! (OH:::)]

This may be an instance of a phenomenon called Doubletakes which has been considered elsewhere (Jefferson:72), which involves that a first hearing is based on some surface features of the current talk and treats that talk as defective, and a second hearing understands the import of the talk. One instance will be shown, which has similar features to the above.

[D.A.:2] Betty is arranging to visit Fanny. A friend of Betty's is picking her up on Thursday anyway, and will drive her over to Fanny's house.

Betty: Uh:::, d-she's gonnuh pick me up Thursday mawning.
 (1.4)

Betty: *hhhh

Fanny: Uh how early is she gunnuh pick you up.

Betty: I have no idea. I mean if you uh do anything definite on Thursday, then d-uh, don't letme uh:::,

Briefly: "How early" is heard as synonymous with "What time..." and the whole question is seen by virtue of its parasitic relationship to Betty's prior utterance and is No Sooner-No Later interrupted with an answer to the surface question, which is dismissed as inconsequential and perhaps redundant, since had Betty known what time, she would have said so in the first place. The second hearing "I mean if...." picks up the sense of "How early..." as indicating plans for Thursday, such that the visit will have to occur, e.g., "quite early".

In similar fashion, Edna dismisses Margy's utterance as secondary to her

own prior, rather than as displaying a meeting of the minds, then picking up on the import of the utterance for the latter.

- (c) Some attention can be given to the workings of Margy's use of Edna's name which is appended to the crucial utterance, as an Import Marker.

Margy: I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt Edna,
 Edna: heh heh heh! OH:::!

Whether or not this involves a response to some indication that Edna has not yet grasped the significance of Margy's utterance, e.g., insofar as Edna has not started up at a No Sooner-No Later recognition point, e.g., "...the StuffAh ha ha" or "...the Stuff' Shi:Ah ha ha", or whether the appended name is independently generated, it may operate as a signal to pay special attention to the materials which precede it.

As it happens, Margy uses Edna's name frequently in this part of the conversation, and such talk may be seen as idiosyncratic to Margy. It turns out that Edna uses the endearment term "honey" with identical frequency. Such talk may be seen as idiosyncratic to each of them. However, each time name or endearment term-use occurs, it is in conjunction with an utterance of some interactional import. They occur at first entry into Closings (lines b.3.-4.) and second entry into Closings (lines b.43.-48.), such places being locci of relation-formulative work (Goffman:71), and for argumentative stress, e.g., when Margy interrupts Edna's first attempt to enter a Laugh Sequence (lines b.11.-12.), when Edna repeats her apology vis-a-vis "It's cheap" (line b.19), and, exhausting the occurrences of names/endearment terms for the corpus at hand, when Margy protests Edna's apology for delayed thanks (lines a.1.-2.).

Were the distribution of such utterance components being used as a device for scanning the data, it might pose as a question why Margy uses Edna's name in association with a Laughable which is nothing more than a version of something Edna just said. That is, as an Import Marker, it might raise the issue of importance for an utterance which has been analyzed here for its import, but which otherwise pass as nothing much...except that the Import Marker invites inquiry into its possible import...which is precisely the conversational work proposed for such an utterance component. If Edna has missed the import of Margy's utterance, the tag-positioned address term may invite her to reinspect it for an intended import.

4. Escalation of the Offense

- (a) Appended to Edna's recognition of the import of Margy's utterance is a laugh unit which extends beyond Margy's laughter.

Margy: I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt, Edna, 'hh yuh(hh)h!
 Edna: heh heh heh! OH:::! hunnhunhhunh

In sequential terms, this 3-part Laugh Unit occurring in the silence of the other occupies a turn at talk and returns the floor to Margy (see 1.b. and 2.a.). As an interaction-constructive component it can be directed to Bud's overhearing of the Laugh Sequence so far and/or to a systematic consequence of Offense-Recipient co-implicating in an offensive mentality.

- (i) From the standpoint of Bud's overhearing: It is possible that one can monitor differential participation in a Laugh Sequence. Sacks

has pointed out that a party to a conversation can talk and yet be characterized by co-participants as not having talked when his talk has been seen as merely responsive to others' attempts to initiate, and not itself initiating, talk. (Sacks:67). And, for example, an extended Question-Answer sequence, with one party responding one by one to each question is common index to a defective conversation, indeed, a defective interview. Similarly, if it becomes obvious that one party is offering all the Laughables and the other is merely responding, one by one, to each Laughable, the Laugh Sequence may be observably skewed.

Having just received a volunteer Laughable from Margy, Edna can attempt to induce her to continue as laugh-initiator with Edna as Laughable-responsive recipient, thus equalizing the distribution. If Bud can overhear Edna laughing at a series of Laughables offered by Margy he can make of it that Edna's "I c(h)an't take you to the 'hh C(h)ountry C(h)lub" has been sufficient to remedy the offense; that Margy is now doing such talk that if he were to attempt to tell this incident as a story about Edna's conversational incompetence, she would be able to refute him with a direct quote from Margy, e.g., "Oh don't be silly, we laughed like crazy. She said "I wanna go to the Stuffed Shirt! Ahh ha ha ha!", in contrast to the weak self-assessment that Ron provides, having no such direct quote from the Offense-Recipient, i.e., "But I said it so innocuously..."(p. 21.).
Independent of laugh distribution^{considerations,} Edna can be attempting to gather just such resources for future reference with her continued laughter, should Bud not catch the here and now remedying, or attempt to ignore it.

(ii) That Edna produces a Laugh Unit and not a Laughable may invite Margy to occupy the upcoming turn at talk with a Laughable. It may propose that in her efforts to remedy an initial offense, Margy has "gone too far", her attempted Offense-Remedial utterance itself constituting an offense, just as Edna's attempt to remedy the offense engendered by proposing to take Margy to Coco's resulted in "It's cheap."

Now it is Edna's option to co-implicate at this new level. And she can specifically display that she "cannot" talk at that level by observably 'merely' laughing. Indeed, the conversational definition of an Offense turns on the fact that it leaves its recipient with nothing to say; i.e., provides no resources which he can agreeably, sanely, decently, etc., talk to. If Edna cannot talk to "I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt", it may be incumbent upon Margy to find something she can/will talk to.

This spiraling escalation, Offense...Remedy/Offense...Remedy/Offense... may be intuitively obvious. It is blatantly displayed in the following materials.

[Ward, Kassebaum:1963:II:25] Training session for prison guards who will be running group therapy sessions among their prisoners. They are talking about homosexuality among the prisoners. (This transcript was done in 1963, at which time this transcriber was not attending a range of details, including overlap.)

- Short: Marv, both you and Bill use the word disgusted or revolted or something of this type. I wonder if you could say what other things in life disgust you or revolt you.
- Riddle: Oh, a lot of things. I don't know what I could associate with, or describe how I feel when I say disgusted. Actually at first, when I first started work up there, it was almost nauseated.
- Short: Well, what other experiences. You said lots of them. Can you think of one or two?
- Riddle: What do you mean lots of them.

Short: Lots of things in life disgust you. What would you say?
 Riddle: Oh I can't think of a particular thing right now.
 Short: Can you think of anything?
 Falker: Well, I think that things disgust me, as you would ask, if they are
 .(that don't uh...follow in the social acceptance of society.) I
 guess. I don't know if this is right or not.
 Short: You mean (somebody who eats peas with a knife?)
 Falker: Yeah, something along this line. (Someone who'd take off their shoes
 and put 'em up on the table-)
 Short: That disgusts you...revolts you?
 Falker: It would disgust me, yes. Uh...I can think of a lot of things that
 would disgust me.
 Short: Of the same intensity that you feel about homosexuals.
 Falker: Oh, I don't know if it's the same intensity or not.
 Donnely: I can give you a good example. I was getting ready to go back to the
 ship one night, and this one fellow who worked for me, he was a little
 bit drunker than usual, and he kept going on a crying tear, and lying
 on the fence there, and when we had to go back to the ship, "Ain't you
 gonna help me back?" (and then he would heave, and roll around in it...)
 That ain't exactly disgusting. Sickening maybe-
 Arlett: (I'll go for that.)
 Donnely: (You have all the puke and vomit from him,) and he rollin' around him,
 and keep on cryin' and needs help back to the ship and all that-
 Falker: I would feel about the same way about that man that I would about a
 queen. Thanks, Mr. Donnely. Disgusting.
 Arlett: I'd feel the same way about something like that, or (how about a handful
 of shit.)
 Baines: Or (how about some guy drinking his piss) or something like that after a
 twenty mile hike or something like that.
 Benson: We got a couple of queens over there in my building (that disgust me in
 that same way.) Now the rest of them, no trouble whatsoever.

Roughly, the communal mentality is constructed turn by turn and is not achieved by caveat. The two gratuitous offerings; i.e., after Mr. Falker has accepted a definition of 'disgusting' may be particularly high risk utterances, and whereas Mr. Baines' second ratifies and remedies the offense potential of Mr. Arlett's offering, Baines may find himself out on a limb when Benson continues with a generalized reference to his feelings about the queens in his building. By sheer sequencing considerations Baines, as last, has "gone too far".

- (b) Margy, upon completion of her utterance, can be sensitive to the possibility that she will be left out on a limb, depending upon what

Edna does next, and Edna's production of a Laugh Unit may ensure that Margy will attempt to find a next Laughable to which Edna can talk, if she 'cannot', by virtue of its offensiveness, talk to this one. Margy occupies her next turn at talk with a Laughable.

Margy: I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt, Edna, 'hh yuh(hh)h!
 Edna: heh heh heh! OH:::! hunhhunhhunh I'll pack a lunch!

This appears to be another instance of the delay phenomenon considered at 2.b., p.47. In this case, the discovery of "I'll pack a lunch!" can have been triggered by and simultaneous to her own "I wanna go t'the Stuff' Shi:rt", involving a punlike transformation from 'stuff' to 'pack' which are, independent of this context, synonymous verbs. Margy's silence through Edna's Laugh Unit may, then, be seen as interactionally occupied, withholding talk in expectation of a Laughable by Edna which will ratify and remedy the possible offense engendered by "I wanna go t'the Stuff' Shi:rt". Seeing, upon completion of the Laugh Unit, that Edna will not provide such an object, Margy finds that (a) it is incumbent upon her to offer the Offense-Remedial Laughable, and (b) she has one to offer. The Laughable itself may constitute an attempt to de-escalate insofar as it switches from a display of mock rejection of Edna's plea of poverty to mock charity. A similar de-escalation format can be seen when Baines, who has started up directly upon completion of Arlett's offering, finds that no one is starting up directly upon completion of his own, and supplies, as a next offering, a generalized reference "...or something like that", de-escalating further with reasonable grounds for such an atrocious act.

5. Resolution of the Escalation Potential

- (a) Edna produces a stream of laughter which is intonationally segregated into two Laugh Units. The first Unit occurs in Margy's silence after her second Laughable. It stands in alternation to the offering of a Laughable by Edna which would ratify and remedy Margy's prior talk.

Margy: I'll pack a lunch!
 Edna: Ahhhahh hnh hnh,

The second Laugh Unit may be responsive to Margy's silence during the first Unit and can be intended to recycle the turn-taking apparatus as described in (1.b.) and instanced in (2.a.) and (4.a.), should Margy remain silent.

Margy: I'll pack a lunch!
 Edna: Ahhhahh hnh hnh, + hnh hnh hnh hnh

- (b) Margy starts to talk at completion of Edna's first Laugh Unit, her talk starting up simultaneously with Edna's second Unit.

Margy: I'll pack a lunch!
 Edna: Ahhhahh hnh hnh, Gee whiz, hnh hh
 hnh hnh hnh hnh

"Gee whiz" accepts and occupies a turn at talk but does not provide new resources out of which Edna can construct a reciprocal-remedial co-implication. It refers Edna back to "I'll pack a lunch!" as the resource, a resource she might have/ought to have used in the prior turn at talk. Structurally, the sequence so far resembles the Arlett/Baines series in the prison guard materials.

 A: ...or how about a handful of shit.

B: Or how about some guy drinking his piss

B: + or something like that + after a twenty mile hike + or something like that.

E: ...I c(h)an't take you to the-'hh C(h)ountry C(h)lub

M: I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt

M: + Edna,+ I'll pack a lunch! + Gee whiz,

In each instance, a second speaker starts up directly upon completion of an utterance which not only contains offensive talk but positions the explicit instance at utterance completion, and starts up with an escalated version of the directly prior instance. That relationship sets a precedent for subsequent talk, and illuminates as a relevant absence, the fact that others decline to follow the precedent.

- (c) Edna subsequently (and at last) produces a next Laughable. This utterance is particularly interesting in terms of Bud's overhearing, and in terms of the escalation potential for Offense-Remedial utterances.

 Margy: I'll pack a lunch!
 Edna: Ahhahh hnh hnh, [Gee whiz, hnh hh
 hnh hnh hnh hnh

Edna: (I'll pack a lunch'n buy you a martini.)

The entire utterance is locally derived; the first part repeating Margy's prior, the second part turning on the Acoustic Consonance of "martini" to "Margy".¹

 1. This phenomenon is being studied (Sacks:71, Jefferson:74) and raises the chicken-egg question for such utterances: is the locally derived object merely the term in which some thought is expressed, or the source of the thought it expresses? (See also Margy's "You'll like Elss....or we'll go someplace else." line b.-4.)

- (i) In terms of Bud's overhearing, the utterance may not merely be parasitic on Margy's prior, but may constitute line stealing. Margy has come up with "I'll pack a lunch!". Bud cannot hear that. He can hear, and hear as an independently generated utterance, Edna's "I'll pack a lunch'n buy you a martini."

The intonation contour of Edna's utterance permits it to be heard as independently generated, in contrast to a contour which would indicate its secondary, responsive status, e.g., "I'll pack a lunch..." or the combination of intonation contour and lexical components, e.g., "Oh I'll pack the lunch...".

The appending of "...n buy you a martini" can be geared to permitting Margy to hear it as a reasonable second to her own first, the repetition of "I'll pack a lunch..." being used to frame the new materials (Sacks:67).

- (ii) In terms of the discrete interaction, Edna's repetition of Margy's utterance may constitute a solution to the problem that an Offense-Remedial move on Edna's part can potentially escalate the offensive mentality so far, such that an infinite series of remedial utterances/escalated offenses is projected, or someone will be left out on a limb. That is, she simply re-uses the prior offense in her remedial utterance. Further, she indicates that she is re-using it, in contrast to quoting it appreciatively, which would be an alternate device for returning the floor to Margy with the offense yet unremedied. This she does by refraining from laughing in the course of repeating the utterance.

Some work has been done isolating a range of repeat-types and describing their interactional functions (Jefferson:72). And one of the repeat-types involves the occurrence of Laugh Tokens

in the course of the repeat, such a repeat serving to appreciate the repeated object.

(1) [GTS:1:2:29] Ken's car has been taken to the repair shop. The kids are proposing that he's been taken to the cleaners.

Al: Then th'r gonna dismantle the frame'n see if the frame's still there.

Louise: hh, heh heh heh!

Al: Got termites. [0.6]

Ken: T(hh)er(h)mite(h)s hhh

(2) [GTS:2:2:89]

Al: I think I'm greater than all of you. [1.0]

Ken: I think yer out of yer fuckin mind heh

Roger: I beg to differ with you.

Al: hehh heh hhh I b(h)eg to differ with you.

Whereas one might initially suppose that a Laugh Sequence would be a locus of anywhere, here and there occurrence of within-speech laughter, its occurrence appears to be thoroughly systematic and accomplice to specific activities. The range of activities to which within-speech laughter is accomplice will not be considered here. It appears, however, that in the case of re-utterance of prior talk, the appearance of absence of within-speech laughter is accomplice to distinguishing among re-utterance types (a) being used when one is asserting that the re-utterance constitutes an appreciative quote and (b) being omitted when one is asserting that "a re-utterance which might be so heard should be otherwise attended. That is, in the course of a Laugh Sequence there can be systematic refrainings from laughter, as well as systematic occurrences of laughter.

In terms of Bud's overhearing, if within-speech laughter marks that one is doing an appreciative repeat, then it is omitted for the same reason that

a range of intonational-lexical repeat markers are omitted.

In terms of the discrete interaction, if one were to think of laughter as an artifact of one's mood, state of being, etc., then, since Edna has been chuckling for awhile, it would be no surprize if her subsequent talk was laugh-infected. In terms of the systematics of laughter, since within-speech laughter in a re-utterance marks it as an appreciative quote, and if the object one is so re-uttering happens to be a prior offensive remark, then by quoting it, one is not appreciating it in contrast to dis-appreciating it, but appreciating it in contrast to co-implicating in the offense it engendered. By refraining from the use of within-speech laughter; i.e., by specifically stopping laughter in order to produce a non-laugh-infected re-utterance, Edna can display that she is using the re-uttered phrase in the construction of her own next Laughable; the fact that she can, not merely appreciate it and speak it (that being a trivial issue for "I'll pack a lunch!", but relevant for more pungent speech), but can locate it within her own repertoire of language and produce a coherent utterance of her own which includes the offensive materials, effecting co-implication in the mentality which produced it in the first place.

Furthermore, having used a prior offensive utterance instead of producing a new instance, co-implication is achieved without potential escalation.

(iii) At this point, the initial offense and subsequent escalation engendered by attempts to remedy the initial offense have been remedied. However, the added materials "... 'n buy you a martini", could start a new round of Remedy/Offense...Remedy/Offense...etc. escalations, this time directed to whatever sensitivities each or either one of them might have about what and when to drink.

- (d) The placement and components of Margy's utterance display enthusiastic agreement to Edna's utterance, treating it as a suggestion and accepting it; literally jumping at it.

Edna: I'll pack a lunch 'n buy you a martini.
 Margy: Hey okay,

Such a display may be sufficient to co-implicate Margy, cf. p. 56, where Arlett's "I'll go for that" is sufficient co-implication to permit Donnelly to escalate his prior "...heave..." to "...puke and vomit...". The enthusiastic agreement, as an instance of action-programmatic treatment of prior talk (cf. "I can't wait to try it!", p. 26.) stands in alternation to the non-implicative appreciation a laugh, or laugh-infected repeat displays. Further, it achieves co-implication with no escalation. At this point, then, the escalation problem is resolvable.

6. Winding Down the Sequence

Margy's utterance may serve not only to close up prior matters, but to project the future direction of their talk.

- (a) "Hey okay," can serve as the final component of an Expanded Offer Sequence (Jefferson, Schenkein:74). A model, and recurrent, unexpanded sequence consists of an offer and its acceptance/rejection, while the expanded version consists of a series of offers, demurrs, counter offers, negotiations, etc., reserving for last slot the action of acceptance or rejection. When that action occurs, the sequence is terminated. In this case, whatever else it may be, "Hey okay" accepts an offer.

Furthermore, "Okay" is a conventional pre-Closings utterance (Sacks, Schegloff:72), and while it is used here to display enthusiasm for Edna's suggestion, its positioning at the termination point of an Expanded Offer Sequence, coinciding with the resolution of the Offense Remedial Laugh

Sequence, may project an entry into Closings. That is, the arrangements for getting together which have been inserted into and are a proper component of a Closings Sequence, which have been interrupted by an Expanded Offer Sequence which itself generated an Offense-Remedial Laugh Sequence are all at a possible termination point such that Closings can be resumed.

- (b) Margy forecloses the possibility that her "Hey okay," is a preface to a Laughable within that turn of talk (for example, a reciprocal offer to supply a drink for Edna ("Hey okay, and I'll buy you a beer!"), which could set off a series of imaginings about the two of them carrying on in the Stuffed Shirt, such imaginings supplying great potential for someone's saying something offensive to the other) by producing a sort of a self-appreciative snort.

Edna: I'll pack a lunch 'n buy you a martini.
 Margy: Hey okay, + enngshh!

Again, this can have the turn-taking function considered at (1.b.) and displayed in (2.a.), (4.a.), and (5.a.), should Edna remain silent at the turn's first possible completion point; i.e., at "Hey okay,".

- (c) Simultaneously with the snort, and at the completion/turn-transfer point which arises after "Hey okay," Edna starts up a stream of laughter which can be broken down into three discrete Laugh Units.

Margy: Hey okay, enngshh!
 Edna: nhh! + hunh hunh hunh + hah hah-'hhh

- (i) The first Unit, "nhh!" may be produced by reference to the possibility that Margy will continue her current turn at talk with another

Laughable, in which case "nhh!" will be non-competitive. And, if Margy turns out to have stopped, then "nhh!" can be the first sound in a stream of laughter.

- (ii) The second Unit, "hunh hunh hunh" may be produced by reference to the fact that Margy has foreclosed the possibility of her talking in her current turn at talk by snorting. The second Unit proposes that a Laugh Sequence is still underway, occupying Edna's turn in that Sequence with laughter and returning the floor to Margy for laughter or another Laughable, as in (1.b.), (2.a.), (4.a.), (5.a.), and (6.b.). Although Margy may be interested in entering Closings, and may have indicated that interest, a formal feature of telephone conversation is that Caller (Edna) has the right/obligation to move into Closings (Sacks:71). Called's do initiate Closings, but with a range of excuses and explanations; i.e., it is touchy work. The fact that they have worked to remedy some prior touchiness may deter Margy from taking further initiative to enter Closings. This may give Edna the leeway to offer Margy opportunities to talk again; i.e., she will expectably not use those opportunities to say goodbye, but can be coerced back into the Laugh Sequence.
- (iii) Margy maintains her silece at completion of Edna's second Laugh Unit, and Edna starts a third Unit, a Step-Up "hah hah-", which may simultaneously account for her continued laughter (proposing that she is doing a 'slow take' on the prior matters, now finding it funnier than she first thought) and invite Margy to display a similar 'take' and join the renewed laughter. (See p.10 for instances of Step-Ups and the occurrence of simultaneous Two-Party Step-Ups.)

7. Achieved Concensus Exit from the Laugh Sequence

- (a) Margy's silence through two Laugh Units by Edna may specifically mark her exit from the Laugh Sequence. And it appears that the configuration of Edna's third and final Laugh Unit attends Margy's exit.

Routinely enough, when people find themselves extendedly laughing alone, they perform such activities as attenuating the laugh and/or capping it with some non-laugh sound (e.g., "tss!" "whh::ew", etc.), or with speech (e.g., "Oh my", "Oh wo::w", etc.). The following instance displays both attenuation and capping.

[Frankel:V:98]

Joe: ...he couldn' get it out the do::h, but ih wz outta the flo::h,
 Carol: hheh. [ehh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh [ah-ah-ah + (ih-ih + nh-nh! + 'hhhh)
 Joe: Cost in sixty dolluz fuh plumbin
 Carol: Ahh ha::h, 'hhhh (Ooo::: God.)

Edna has been extendedly laughing alone. In contrast to the sort of attenuation/capping procedures routinely used for such a situation, Edna appears to have cut off an N-part (more than 2-part) Laugh Unit, the cut-off occurring at the highpoint of a stream of laughter. This may display recognition of the fact that the meeting of minds so painstakingly engineered in prior talk is in danger of coming apart, should Edna continue laughing in Margy's silence.

An instance of an almost identical recognition of parting of the minds occurs in these same materials at the first entry into Closings. Edna is in the midst of a prolonged description of some changes she and Bud have made to their kitchen. As she is talking, she realizes that Margy doesn't know what she is talking about, cuts

off the utterance and enters Closings.

Edna: Why we put new doors in the kitchen I'll never know but they're looking
g-beautiful! We've sanded uh- the liddle uh- You haven't seen our extra
liddle cupboard that's gone into the kitchen, (but- 'hhh)

Margy: No::: Mm-mm.

Edna: (Well honey listen. I'll talk with yuh) . . .

In the above instance, Margy declines to implicate in the offered mentality by indicating that, no, she hasn't seen it, in contrast to treating that she hasn't seen it as action-programmatic for her; e.g., "Oh I can't wait to see it!" (cf. considerations of "I c'n see you two kids!" versus "Oh I can't wait to try it!", p. 26.). Similarly, her continued silence in the face of Edna's laughter may decline to continue in the mentality of the Laugh Sequence. And in each case, such declination foreshortens Edna's talk dramatically.

(b) Margy produces a sigh, subsequent to Edna's cutoff Step-Up

Margy: Hey okay, [ennngshh!]

Edna: nhh! + hunh hunh hunh + hah hah-'hh [((sigh))]

At the point where Edna has cut off her laughter, Margy may be the right-ful or obligated next speaker, having maintained silence through two possible turn-transition places. And she may be interested in officially entering Closings, having with her prior utterance provided a candidate termination to the nested Arrangements/Offer-Acceptance/Offense-Remedial Sequences. And she may see that Edna has yielded to the forthcomingness of Closings by cutting off her laughter. However, it is Edna's right or obligation, as Caller, to move into Closings.

Margy's sigh does not offer to close (as it should not), nor will it interfere or compete with an offer to Close by Edna, should she offer one. The sigh, then, shares the turn-taking operation of laughter considered at (1.b.) and displayed in (2.a.), (4.a.), (5.a.), (6.b.) and (6.c.). Should Edna remain silent or should she attempt to start up more laughter or laughables, the sigh can be heard as a second appeal by Margy to Edna to enter Closings, while not explicitly offering to Close.

(c) Simultaneously with Margy's sigh, Edna moves into Closings.

Edna: hunh hunh hunh hah hah-^hh (Well honey I'll-I'll talk to yuh later?) en gee
 Margy: ((sigh))

The independently arrived-at simultaneous occurrences achieve another display of their meeting of the minds, a consensus exit from the Laugh Sequence.

00. This particular fragment was selected for intensive analysis because the overt presence of an overhearer serves as a device to dramatize the collaborative constructability of a Laugh Sequence; i.e., provides an intuitively plausible reason for participants to do such a thing if they possibly could. Insofar as laughter can be utilized for such problem-solving activities as an Offense-Remedial Laugh Sequence, and insofar as Offenses occur whether or not someone is overhearing, it appears that the resources mobilized for this particular event, in the presence of an overhearing third party to one side of a telephone conversation, are not reserved for such special occasions, but are massively, routinely utilized in the conduct of interaction. (So, for example, actions which have been accounted for in terms of an orientation to an overhearing

third party have been independently accounted for in terms of its operation in the discrete interaction). A range of candidate features of laughter and Laugh Sequences, particularly the existence of Laugh Units and their utilization as a crucial constructional-organizational resource, can therefore expectably be turned to the analysis of whatsoever naturally-occurring conversation and yield an intense orderliness to its production.

REFERENCES CITED

<u>Page</u>	<u>Matters Considered</u>	<u>Reference</u>
5	recognizable possible completion points	Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson, "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking in conversation", presented at the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Ann Arbor, August, 1973, and forthcoming in <u>Language</u> .
27	interactionally generated invitations	H. Sacks, unpublished lectures, Winter, 1970, Lecture 5, p. 17. (at U.C.I.)
24	second stories	H. Sacks, <u>ibid</u> , Summer, 1970, Lecture 5.
24	premonitoring	G. Jefferson, "Stories as conversation artifactual objects", paper presented to Seminars in Ethnomethodology, CUNY, April, 1973.
28	closing sequences	H. Sacks, E. Schegloff, "Opening up closings", in <u>Semiotica</u> , forthcoming.
30	adjacency pairs	H. Sacks, <u>op.cit.</u> , Spring, 1972, Lectures 1 and 2.
30	insertion sequences	H. Sacks, <u>ibid</u> , Spring, 1972, Lecture 1, p. 19, Lecture 3, p.13.
32	overlap-remedial repeats	E. Schegloff, unpublished lectures, presented at Summer Institute of Linguistics, Ann Arbor, August, 1973.
47	completing another's sentence	H. Sacks, <u>op.cit.</u> , Fall, 1967, Lecture 4, p.9. G. Jefferson, "A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation", <u>Semiotica</u> , forthcoming.
51	doubletakes	G. Jefferson, <u>ibid</u> .
52	import of closings	Erving Goffman, "Supportive interchanges", in <u>Relations in Public</u> , New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1971, p. 87.
54	monitorability of differential participation	H. Sacks, <u>op.cit.</u> , Fall, 1967, Lecture 10, p. 1.
59	sound sequencing and acoustic consonance	H. Sacks, <u>ibid</u> , February 19, 1971 p. 3., March 4, 1971, p.3-5, March 11, 1971, p.3-12, April 5, 1971, p. 2-5. G. Jefferson, "The pseudonym problem", in Sacks, Schenkein, Weingarten, eds., <u>Studies in Conversation Analysis</u> , Suhrkamp, forthcoming.
60	repetition framing	H. Sacks, <u>op.cit.</u> , Fall, 1967, Lecture 12, p.2.
60	repeat types	G. Jefferson, "Side sequences", in D. Sudnow, ed., <u>Studies in Social Interaction</u> , N.Y., Free Press, 1972.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Matters Considered</u>	<u>Reference</u>
63	expanded sequences	G. Jefferson, J. Schenkman, "Negotiations in expanded sequences", in Sachs, Schenkman, Weinstatten, eds., <u>op.cit.</u>
63	pre-closing components	H. Sachs, E. Schlegel, "Opening up closings", <u>op.cit.</u>
65	caller initiates closings	H. Sachs, <u>op.cit.</u> , April 19, 1971, p. 8-14.

DATA

Edna has called Margy, and is thanking her for a luncheon she gave.

A [NB:VII:3]

- (1) Edna: I jus' thought I'd give yih a buzz I shoulda called you sooner but I don't know where the week we:nt,
- (2) Margy: Uh-we::ll, oh y-Edna you don't haftuh call me up,=
 (3) Edna: =[[I want to.
 (4) Margy: I'm jus' tickeled thetche-
 (5) Margy: Y'know, en you came up en uh 'hh
 (6) Margy: We'll haftuh do that // more often.
 (7) Edna: 'hhh Well why don't we um why don't I take you'n Mom up there tuh Coco's someday fer lunch. We'll go, -buzz up there tuh=
 (8) Margy: =Good.
 (9) Edna: Huh?
 (10) Margy: That's a good deal.
 (11) Edna: En I'll take you both // up-
 (12) Margy: No::? we'll all go Dutch.=B't // let's do that.
 (13) Edna: No we won't! Becuz uh:: uh-may- does yer Mom like tuh shop uv-'n look aroun // in the stores-
 (14) Margy: Yes oh yes.
 (15) Margy: She luh- She's up et uh Larry's Mom's now. She wen' up Sunday, 'hh they came down fer dinner,=
 (16) Edna: =[[Mm hm,
 (17) Margy: En then uh she'll- I'll go get'er t'morrow.
 (18) Edna: On that// 's wonderful
 (19) Margy: En then uh, to- she has en ol' friend oh she's uh en ol' friend of ey-all'v us. You know. 'hh//hhh
 (20) Edna: Mm hm,
 (21) Margy: But she's eh she's uh, up in Lodoc.
 (22) Edna: Oh:::.
 (23) Margy: [[So she's gonna come down uh I-I don'know, how long she'll be eh here.

[[Talk turns to other matters. Note that the "Elss" referred to later is probably the "old friend" talked of here.]]

Approximately 5 minutes later, Edna initiates Closings.

B [NB:VII:11]

- (1) Edna: Why we put new doors in the kitchen I'll never know but they're looking g-beautiful! We've sanded uh- the liddle uh- You haven't seen our extra liddle cupboard thet's gone // into the kitchen, but- 'hhh
- (2) Margy: No::.. Mm-mm.
- (3) Edna: Well honey listen. I'll talk with yuh, uh, we'll get // t'gether ah-
- (4) Margy: 'hhhh Yeh well Edna, maybe next week eh- You'll like Elss. She's a lotta fun. She's coming down, 'hnff, you know, 'hh and uh, m- Why don't we all do that. We'll go up en eat et Coco's? er we'll go someplace else.

- (5) Edna: Oh Coco's is fun, up there on the hill en yuh look down=
(6) Margy: =[[Yeah.
(7) Edna: [[It's so pretty.
(8) Margy: Yeah. Let's do it.
(9) Edna: An' it's chea:p, hh
(10) Margy: Yeh hah!
(11) Edna: hhhh (h)I'm on uh, 'hhh I'm on retire//ment-
(12) Margy: Hey well yer not takin' us Edna, but I // think you should still meet Elss
(13) Edna: Aww don't be suh-
(14) Margy: [[No
(15) Edna: [[I didn' mean that the- uh I didn' mean that // at a::ll,
(16) Margy: Well no. I'm not, gonna invite all'v us up there en, en then, have you pay the bill, 'hhhh
(17) Edna: ehh!
(18) Margy: [[I jus' think ih'd be fun tee- all have all'v us go. En I want Elss tuh see uh, 'hh 'hh
(19) Edna: Oh // honey I didn' mean that // et a::ll.
(20) Margy: (she's)-
(21) Margy: She's just the kind'v a person it- y'know it doesn't make any di//ffrence tuh-
(22) Edna: Bud says it sure sounded like I meant it but // I didn't.
(23) Margy: Aa::haha//ha.
(24) Edna: I don't have a Diner's- 'hh=
(25) Edna: =No honey I really didn' mean that,=
(26) Margy: =[[I:::, ()
(27) Edna: =[[but Bud'n I ate up there the other night it was- really good food, very reason//able.
(28) Margy: I, Edna you know I didn't- // you know-
(29) Edna: Hell you know I'm on ret(h)i//::rement, I c(h)an't take you to the- 'hh C(h)ountry C(h)lub,=
(30) Margy: Ehh ye(h)hhmh 'hnh hnh!
(31) Edna: =[[heh heh heh!
(32) Margy: =[[I wanna go t'the Stuff'Shi:rt // Edna, 'hh yuh(hh)h!
(33) Edna: heh heh heh!=
(34) Edna: =OH::! hunhhunhhunh
(35) Margy: I'll pack a lunch!
(36) Edna: Ahhhahh hnh hnh,=
(37) Margy: =[[Gee whiz, hnh hh
(38) Edna: hnh hnh hnh hnh
(39) Edna: 'hh I'll pack a lunch'n buy you a mar//tini.
(40) Margy: Hey okay, // enngshhh!
(41) Edna: nhh! hunh hunh hunh hah hah- 'hhh
(42) Margy: [[((sigh))
(43) Edna: [[Well honey I'll-I'll talk to yuh later?=
(44) Margy: =[[Yeah?
(45) Edna: En, gee I sure // hadda nice time // the other day ih wz beautiful.
(46) Margy: Yeh-
(47) Margy: Oh:well:I-
(48) Margy: -jist loved havin you come up Edna