

Sonderdruck aus
SPRACHE DER GEGENWART

Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache

Band LIV

Dialogforschung

Jahrbuch 1980 des Instituts
für deutsche Sprache

PÄDAGOGISCHER VERLAG SCHWANN
DÜSSELDORF

GAIL JEFFERSON

The Abominable *Ne?*

An Exploration of Post-Response Pursuit of Response

1. The Abominable *Ne?*: Post-Response-Initiation Response-Solicitation

In 1978 Jörg Bergmann of the University of Konstanz came to work in California and brought with him some tapes and transcripts of German conversation. One of the tapes was an intake interview between a psychiatrist, a candidate patient, and her husband. We worked together on a segment of that tape, in the course of which I noticed a phenomenon which struck me as very odd. A Response Solicitation, *Ne?*, roughly translated as *Right?*, occurred (1) well after completion of the utterance to which it might belong as a Tag Question, and (2) in the course of a coparticipant's talk. Following is a fragment of Bergmann's original transcript, and a very free translation.

(1.1.a.) [Br.Prl.2.]

- Herr B.: Nö=datt hat ji mi' dem
Herr B.: eijindich [n Glaub'n gar nischt zu tun wenn ich den ganz'n
Frau B.: [Ja:a::
Herr B.: Tach von morijens bis: a:ms auch noch in de' Nacht
(*)
Herr B.: (j[pa] dört kni-] je und be(i)te,
Frau B.: [Ja natür-]
Frau B.: Ja: ja [ich hab-]
Herr B.: [und mach] da Schbirre:nsgiss=
Frau B.: =Was heisst ich knie'e und [be(i)te
Herr B.: [ne,
(*)
Frau B.: E-mein Gott iss j'auch imma bei mia=

(1.1.b) [Free translation]

- Herr B.: It has nothing at all to do with real belief if all
day long from morning to evening and through the night
(*hh) [I kneel and pray.
Frau B.: [()
Frau B.: Yea:h, well [I have ()
Herr B.: [and make a nu::sance.=
Frau B.: =Whuddiyuh mean I kneel an [d pray.
Herr B.: → [Right?
Frau B.: e-my God is always with me

My intuitive sense of such an object as *Right?* was that it belongs directly appended to an utterance, as a Tag Question:

(1.2) [BC:IV:B:9]

B.C.: because he's too cotton pickin lazy, to take advantage
 → of them. Right?
 Caller: Ri:ght.

or, if it occurs at some distance from that utterance, then there has been a silence; i.e., a prior speaker is soliciting a response which has so far been slow in coming.

(1.3) [Agorio:126]

Lorenz: because (*) we are not going to be here untih- til ten
 fifteen or something like that.
 → (1.3)
 Lorenz: → Ri:ght?
 (0.4)
 Vera: Right.

But in Fragment (1.1) the object occurs neither directly appended to its utterance, nor after some silence has elapsed. It appears to be soliciting a response when, in fact, recipient has started to respond; in effect, ignoring recipient's talk.

The production of a Response Solicitation, post-initiation of Response struck me as a particularly nasty device whereby a prior speaker might attempt to counter, override, interrupt, an 'unfavorable' response. It struck me not only as nasty, but as alien; something we Americans simply do not do, and just the sort of thing the Aryan mentality would devise.

There was, of course, the possibility that this (ab)use of the Response Solicitation was a quirk of this particular speaker. Bergmann decided to go through his collection of conversations to see if he could find any other instances. As it turned out, he did not have very far to go. This same intake interview opens with an instance of a Response Solicitation (in this case, *Is'das zutreffend?*, roughly translated as *Is that correct?*), which occurs post-initiation of Response. Here it is used by the interviewing psychiatrist as a counter to an unfavorable response by the candidate patient. Following is Bergmann's original transcript, and a very free translation.

(1.4.a) [Br.Prl.2.1.r]

Dr. F.: () grad Nachricht, (0.8) (Ihnen) nich
 ganz gut gu:t geht
 Frau B.: Ja:: also das ist [dann die Ansicht
 Dr. F.: → [Is'das zutreffen]d?
 Frau B.: dess Herrn Doktor Hollmann
 Dr. F.: A [ja
 Frau B.: [also meine ist es nicht
 Dr. F.: Ihre isses nich [t
 Frau B.: [Nei:n

(1.4.b) [Free translation]

Dr. F.: () I understand (0.8) () that you're
 not feeling very well.
 Frau B.: Yea::h well that is [t h e opinion]
 Dr. F.: → [Is that correc]t?
 Frau B.: of Doctor Hollmann
 Dr. F.: Uh [huh
 Frau B.: [but it isn't mine.
 Dr. F.: It isn't your [s
 Frau B.: [No:

And again, for this type of Response Solicitation, my intuition as to its proper placement was that it belonged either in Tag position or post-gap position, both of which are instanced in the following fragment.

(1.5) [OU:45:2B:JPD]

Counsel: No:w (0.7) February fou:rteenth of nineteen seventy
 five you were (0.3) you were down at th- in Boston.
 → Is that (*) is that right?
 Witness: Ye:s,
 Counsel: And you went to ā:: uh (1.0) eh:: you went to a ba:r
 in Boston.
 → (0.4)
 Counsel: → Is that correct?
 (1.2)
 Witness: It's a club

The discovery of another instance of a Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation by a different speaker (i.e., Fragment 1.4), indicated that this device was not just a quirk of one particular speaker. Given that I was prepared to treat it as a quirk of an entire culture, it became incumbent upon me to see if, in fact, we Americans never do such a thing. This generated a search through some 5,000 pages of transcribed conversations, looking for Response Solicitations at a distance from their utterance, starting up in the course of a recipient's talk. The search turned up three strong candidate instances, one exquisitely ambiguous

candidate instance, and a range of related phenomena. Following are the four American candidate instances of the Abominable *Ne*?

In Fragment (1.6), James is the superintendent of an apartment building where someone has damaged the front door. Apparently one of the tenants is responsible for the damage. Mike and Vic know who he is, but do not know his name. They are offering descriptions from which James is trying to identify the man. The fragment starts up at a point where James has just made an Nth attempt to identify the man.

(1.6) [Frankel:US:I:63]

Mike: It's the guy with the bicycles. Him and his wife they go two bicycles the grey haired fel^{low},
 James: Well he musta got the music shop there in the store.
 Mike: → Right?
 Vic: And he's got a kid.
 (0.6)
 Vic: No.
 Mike: Nonono not Frank-
 James: That's not hi:m.

In Fragment (1.7) two men are reminiscing about time they spent in Naples. One of them, Tony, briefly visited Naples on a tour of duty in the marines. The other, Jay, lived there for a year or so. Jay is describing the place he used to live. Tony is having difficulty locating it, and Jay has engaged in an attempt to pinpoint it.

(1.7) [Adato:VI:4-6]

Jay: you know where La Galleria is,
 Tony: Yeah.
 Jay: and the San Carlo Opera House,
 Tony: Yeah.
 Jay: Okay. (0.3) You know, right nearby there's- that church with the dome,
 (1.9)
 Jay: Piazza Treh- (T)iesta ih Trento I think it was called-
 Tony: Well I don't really remem^{ber} na:mes,
 Jay: Okay.
 Tony: It's been years.
 Jay: Okay, I thought that-
 (1.3)
 Jay: () La Galleria. R:right across the street from the Galleria is the San Carlo Opera House.
 Correct?
 (1.4)

Jay: Just a little bit away from the San Carlo Opera House, about a half a block, is- the- the pah- Pallazzo Raya^{leh}.
 Tony: Uh huh,
 Jay: The Royal Palace.
 Tony: The Royal Pa^{lace}.
 Jay: → Ri:ght?
 (0.4)
 Jay: Across the street, from the Royal Palace, is this big church. Ri:ght?
 (0.8)
 Tony: (())
 Jay: You remember now?

Fragment (1.8) occurs in the course of a storytelling. One of the recipients, Paul, produces a contribution-cum-heckle, which is met with the Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation.

(1.8) [Goodwin:Meat:15]

Andy: and if I do something she's gonna scream. I get in trouble.
 Paul: hhheh-heh He:y (he'll probably come) down=¹
 Andy: =with a shot^{gun} and blow your he^{ad} off.
 Andy: → Ri:ght? You know?
 (·)
 Andy: So I said . . .

Now we come to the ambiguous candidate Abominable. Specifically it fulfills only one of the two prescriptive features. While the Response Solicitation does start up in the course of a recipient's talk, it does not occur at a distance from its utterance, but in the standard Tag position.

(1.9) [BC:I:G:96:r]

Caller: Because he could not understand, how a man who does things the like of which Powell did,
 B.C.: No dear he could understa:nd and he was angry: about it.=
 Caller: = [[He was-
 B.C.: = [[The questions=
 Caller: = [[That's it.]
 B.C.: → were large] ly rhetor^{ic} al.] Were they not?] =
 Caller: =Well tha^t's what I mean] =
 Caller: =He couldn't understa:nd.=
 B.C.: =Oh he could understa:nd it he just didn't like it.

That is, the unbroken utterance, *The questions were largely rhetorical. Were they not?* stands as an instance of Statement + Tag-Positioned Response Solicitation (cf. Fragment 1.5, *you were down at th- in Boston. Is that (·) is that right?*).

The feature that provides for the candidacy of Fragment (1.9) as an Abominable is that the response, *Well that's...* starts up prior to completion of the utterance in progress. Specifically, it starts up prior to the Tag-positioned Response Solicitation. And, similarly to Fragment (1.4), it starts up with the component *Well...* which can, and recurrently does, initiate an unfavorable response, and is oriented to as such by a coparticipant.²

The speaker-in-progress can have heard the overlapping response-initiation, and thus can have deployed the Response Solicitation as it is so clearly being deployed in Fragment (1.4); i.e., as an attempt to counter, override, interrupt, an unfavorable response-in-progress.

However, the fact that the response starts in such a position that the Response Solicitation can be directly appended to its utterance, permits this to be just another instance of a standard Tag-positioned Response Solicitation; one which just happens to occur in overlap with an early-starting response. The possibility of sheer, happenstance co-occurrence can be seen in the following fragments, in which there is no issue of 'unfavorable response', and thus the possible deployment of a Tag-positioned Response Solicitation as a counter, override, etc., does not arise.

(1.10) [PB:3-4:JP:31]

Merle: So your biochemistry is not a part of the medical school
 → it's part of the chemistry department [ment right?]
Royal: → [M m h m :.]

(1.11) [CDHQ:1:147]

Maw: → But they are diminishing somewhat [though aren't they?
Josh: → O h y e s . Y e s .

Thus, Fragment (1.9) is a systematically ambiguous candidate for the status of a Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation. It is not clear whether the Response Solicitation is produced by reference to, or independently of, an early-starting unfavorable response. And, indeed, that ambiguity may be an achievement. The speaker-in-progress can be siezing upon an opportunity to override, interrupt, etc., an unfavorable response by deploying a Response Solicitation, producing that object soon enough to have it recognizable as a component of an utterance in progress, rather than an unequivocal counter to an early-started unfavorable response.

So, a massive search has yielded three and perhaps four instances of the Abominable *Ne?* in American data. It does not occur frequently but it does occur. We do it, too. This confrontation and the search it entailed, generated an inquiry into a rather more general phenomenon; i.e., the

occurrence of Post-Response Pursuit of Response. Following are some of the results of that inquiry.

II. Prompting: Response-Solicitation produced Post-Completion of Response

The search for American instances of the Abominable *Ne?*; i.e., for Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation turned up a related phenomenon. It is nowhere near as rare, and nowhere near as nasty as the Abominable. While it has the Response Solicitation occurring at a distance from its utterance, and while there is some intervening talk by a coparticipant, that intervening talk constituting some version of a Response, (1) the response is very short; is itself no more than a token, and (2) the Response Solicitation occurs after completion of that token. Following are some, but not all, of the discovered instances of that phenomenon.

(2.1) [GTS:V:71-72]

Dan: Your only basic problem as far as direction: (0.6) as
 originally stated, was getting you into Art Center.
Roger: → Mm hm,
Dan: → Ri:ght?=
Roger: =That still is the thing.

(2.2) [Whitacre:902A:JPW:2]

Janet: Guess why I'm calling.
Larry: I: know cause I didn't do my math,
Janet: Well- how would I know, I wasn't at the school today.
 (0.7)
Larry: → Oh:.
 (0.4)
Janet: → Ri:ght?
Larry: Ri:ght.=
Janet: =-hhh But I am calling about math.

(2.3) [CDHQ:II:276:r] ((Coparticipants are working with a map))

Craig: Could you- um show- Do you know where we are right now,
Marty: n-Ye:ah? I'm gonna show you just where we are now let
 me see, we're right up here.
Craig: Yeah,
Marty: on:: four six six two Parkin- Parkinson. Right around
 the re.
Craig: → Yeah.
Marty: → Right?
Craig: Right.
Marty: Cause I was out- Cause I been ferrying back and forth
 between he::re an::d Dickson Barrack.

(2.4) [BC:II:R:144]

Caller: It was a good thing, it was a very great thing. It was in fact the greatest thing the world has ever known, at its time.
B.C.: → Mm hm?
Caller: → Right?
B.C.: Mm hm

(2.5) [Frankel:TC:1:27:S]

Shirley: Look it's an apartment with a bedroom a kitchen, and, (*) a bathroom just like a hundred other apartments.
Geri: → Yeah,=
Shirley: → =Right?h
Geri: Yeah

(2.6) [FD:III:52]

Caller: But the only thing now I wonder if it's- it's the best thing for me to do is to watch and see if there's any smoke comes out of any of the of the uh cracks.
Desk: → Right.
Caller: → Is that it?
Desk: Right.

(2.7) [Rose:Fairmount:II:6]

Carol: She didn't look at it as Marvin being her friend.
Lorrie: → _{r:Right.}
Carol: → Di:d she.
Lorrie: Right.

While the Abominables characteristically have Response Solicitations intersecting a response-in-progress, this phenomenon has a Response Solicitation produced after a coparticipant has relinquished the floor. The Response Solicitation, then, occurs in a proper next turnspace rather than introducing upon a turn in progress.

Further, these short, token responses can qualify as Continuers; objects with which a recipient indicates that he sees that a prior speaker has more to say, and invites him to go on with it (such objects as *Yeah, Right, Uh huh, Mm hm, Oh*, etc.).³ Thus a most benign characterization of the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation is that it is exhibiting that although the recipient may have taken it that prior speaker was not yet finished, he was indeed finished, and it is now recipient's turn to do some extended talk. That is, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be characterized as re-relinquishing the floor; technically, as being used as a Turn-Exit Device when turn-transfer has not been adequately accomplished.⁴

However, it appears that accompanying these turn-transfer negotiations are some interactional issues. Roughly, the fact that the recipient has, in the first place, produced no more than a Continuer can be problematic. The Response Solicitation, then, may be deployed to deal with the occurrence of mere acknowledgment when something else was sought and due; for example, some uptake of the point of the prior utterance. That is, the Response-Solicitation may work as a Prompting of some more elaborate response, not merely re-relinquishing the floor, but indicating to recipient the sort of talk he ought to be doing with the turn he had relinquished and is now being re-proffered.

We can begin to locate the sort of Prompting work done by the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation by noticing that such an object can occur in the course of a single turn at talk, as a Pivot between two utterance components, as in the following fragments.

(2.8) [Frankel:US:1:42]

James: heh heh, 'hh 'It's a funny thing. ' You know, (0.4) they → did that while I was gone. RIGHT? I WASN'T EVEN IN THE BUILDING.

(2.9) [GTS:IV:7]

Roger: Cause I like to set my- according to Mister Cheibel, set → myself up, with the odds against me. Right? That's what you were getting to.

In these instances, the objects seem to be working retrospectively-prospectively; i.e., marking that a prior component was point-laden, and prefacing a next component which brings home the point.

In the Bergmann materials, we find an Abominable usage of that format; i.e., a Post-Response-Initiation deployment of one or another segments of the three-part 'single turn'. In a single segment we find, first, a Post-Gap Response Solicitation → Post-Response-Initiation Bringing Home the Point (see the first set of bracketed arrows), and then a Post-Response-Initiation Solicitation + Bringing Home the Point (see the second set of bracketed arrows). Following is Bergmann's original transcript, and then a very free translation.

(2.10.a) [Br.Prl.2.]

Herr B.: Man darf dat nich iba-trraib'n
(0.3)
(): dhh
Herr B.: Ne,
Frau B.: Ich üb _{atrei:be kein bi} } ss-chjen=
Herr B.: _{Do:rum geh::ht's}

Herr B.: =Do: chch wail Du dat gan [z gewalti] ch i: battraibst
 Frau B.: [Ga:r nich]

(•)
 Frau B.: Nein ich übatreibe n[icht
 Herr B.: [Nö=da] tt hat ji mi' dem
 Herr B.: eijintlichen Glaub'n gar nischt zu tun ...

(2.10.b) [Free translation]

Herr B.: You shouldn't exaggerate it.
 (0.3)
 (): e-hhh=
 Herr B.: =Right?
 Frau B.: I'm n[ot exaggerating at all.=
 Herr B.: [That's the point.
 Herr B.: =Yes you do, you are [exaggerating it tremendously.
 Frau B.: [Not at all.
 (•)
 Frau B.: [No, I'm not exagger[ating.
 Herr B.: [Ri:ght? it has nothing at all to
 do with real belief ...

We can also find instances of the milder, Post-Response-Completion deployment of this Pivotal Response Solicitation. That is, following a mere token response, we find the Response Solicitation + Bringing Home the Point, as in the following fragments.

(2.11) [GTS:V:52]

Roger: But it was never offered to you, or a field was never offered that interests you.
 (2.0)
 Jim: → Yeh
 Roger: → Right? That's the basic problem.

(2.12) [BC:II:R:50:S]

B.C.: He was then tried, in Israel.
 Caller: → Right,
 B.C.: → Right? A country that did not even exist at the time the crimes were committed.

Given the possible retrospective-prospective character of the Response Solicitation, its use in the candidate instances of Prompting; i.e., in Fragments (2.1)-(2.7) may be marking the pointedness of a prior utterance which has been treated by its recipient as no more than something to be acknowledged. Further, having marked its pointedness, projecting as a relevant and expectable next activity, Bringing Home the Point. But in these instances, specifically leaving it to the recipient to do that work; i.e., to now exhibit that he has taken the point.

That is, given an 'inadequate' initial response to a point-laden prior utterance, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be (1) marking that there is a point to be taken, and (2) offering the recipient a next opportunity to show that he has taken the point. And the recipient can show that he has taken the point by producing some appropriate talk in his next turn.

Now, in the great bulk of interchanges in which this form of Prompting occurs, that a recipient has taken the point is demonstrated formally, by means of an unfolding series of activities. This issue is considered in detail in Section III. But rarely is there an explicit uttering of what the initially 'missed' point of the prior utterance might have been, and thus of what, in particular, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation might have been pursuing.

It is only in Fragment (2.1) that we find a recipient explicating the point of a prior utterance. As it happens, that point is part of a larger pursuit, which is explicitly available in an expanded segment. The interchange occurs in the course of a group therapy session for teenagers. One of the patients complains that nothing has been accomplished. In the ensuing discussion the therapist attempts to bring the patient to acknowledge that something has, in fact, been accomplished.

(2.1) [GTS:V:71-72:Expanded Fragment]

Roger: Alright we've been here now how many wee:ks? (0.7) How long you been working on this problem, (0.4) I've opened → my mouth so many times, and we haven't got nowhere.
 .
 . ((approximately 38 lines omitted))
 .
 Dan: Your only basic problem as far as direction: (0.6) as originally stated, was getting you into Art Center.
 Roger: → Mm hm,
 Dan: → Ri:ght?=
 Roger: → =That still is the thing.
 Dan: Are we gonna get you through there, or no:t.
 Roger: [()-
 Dan: [Are you gonna get your self through there.
 Roger: [Yes,
 Dan: Oka:y.
 (1.0)
 Dan: → Then something has been accomplished. And maybe you understand some things that are functioning also, (0.6) at hq:me.
 (1.0)

Dan: which may have contributed to some of the things that that uh went on in- (0.3) that-that stopped you: from functioning as well as you could.
 Roger: *Mm hm,

The patient's Prompt-elicited uptake of the prior utterance is contentious (*That still is the thing* disputing either a proposal that the patient is complaining about something other than the *basic problem*, or an implication that that problem has been resolved; i.e., the past-tensing of *was getting you into Art Center*). And it is the therapist himself who eventually proposes the success of their enterprise (embedding that announcement in further talk, thus not providing a place in which confirmation by the patient is due, and if not offered then observably absent). In a range of ways, then, the therapist's pursuit of the patient's acknowledgment of success does not achieve its optimum outcome. Nevertheless, this interchange is transparent for the fact that a Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be engaged in pursuit of some specifiable outcome.

Such an understanding of the work of Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be turned to materials which are far less transparent. Following is an exercise exploring that aspect of Prompting, attempted on Fragment (2.3). The focal interchange takes place at a Civil Defense Headquarters during a hurricane. There has been a lull, and these two people, Marty, a stranger to the area and a civilian, and Craig, the teenage son of the C.D. Commander, get into conversation. They go through a range of topics, including some of Craig's problems in his English Literature course, Marty offering helpful hints. Eventually they turn to the wall map, and Craig puts Marty to a test.

(2.3) [CDHQ:II:276:r]

Craig: → Could you- um show- Do you know where we are right now,
 Marty: n-Ye: ah? I'm gonna show you just where we a:re now let me see, we're right up here.
 Craig: Yeah,
 Marty: on:: four six six two Parkin- Parkinson. Right around the re
 Craig: → Yeah.
 Marty: → Right?
 Craig: → Right.
 Marty: Cause I was out- Cause I been ferrying back and forth between he::re an::d Dickson Barrack.

In finer detail, Craig has initiated and abandoned a pass/fail test question, *Could you show-*, which he replaces with the more equable *Do you know where we are...* which has, as one of its appropriate responses, something like *No. Where are we?* Marty, however, re-invokes the pass/fail status of

the question by retrieving the initial wording, in *I'm gonna show you...* . That is, he exhibits that he is specifically 'taking a test'.

At the least, then, Craig's mere acknowledgment, while it indicates that the answer is not incorrect, in no way appreciates the fact that a test has been posed and successfully passed. Thus, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation in this case may be providing a next opportunity for a proper appreciation of a successful passing of a test.

But there may be more to this pursuit. And it may bear on Marty's re-invoking the stronger, pass/fail version of the test. This civilian and stranger to the area has apparently been helping out by *ferrying* people around. He has been at least useful, perhaps courageous. (And apparently it is in the course of this activity that he became competent with the map.)

Now, such information as that he has been helping out, were it simply volunteered, might be recognizably self-congratulatory. And there are systematic constraints on such an activity.⁵ A test situation, however, is one in which such information may be appropriately delivered; indeed, it may be specifically occasioned. That is, passing a test can be an occasion for praise by the tester, and praise by the tester can be an occasion for a display of modesty by the testee.⁶ And in this case, the display of modesty could be of the *It's nothing, really* genre; i.e., an account of how the competence with the map is just a byproduct of some *ferrying back and forth*.

Or, such information might specifically be requested; i.e., the one who posed the test, who can have expected failure and be surprised by success, may proceed to ask how the information was acquired. The fact that one had been *ferrying back and forth* could then be produced as a solicited account.

Thus, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation in this case, by referring its recipient back to the prior utterance with an indication that its point should be found and exhibited, may be pursuing, not only the appreciation due to the successful passing of a test, but the sequelae of such an appreciation, which could occasion the discharging of some otherwise transparently self-congratulatory information.

Notice that, in an activity analogous to that of Fragment (2.1), the pursuer eventually volunteers the critical item. Earlier I noted that were such information "simply volunteered", it might be recognizably self-congratulatory. In this case, the information is not "simply volunteered". It is formatted as an account, with *Cause..*, although as the

sequence has run off, there has been no call for either a display of modesty or a solicited account.

In finer detail, we can notice the repetition of *Cause* across a revision; i.e., *Cause I was out – Cause I been ferrying back and forth*. My own data searches, and the work of colleagues focussing on the structures of self-repair⁷, indicate that such turn-initial items as *Well, Because, So*, etc. etc. tend massively to be dropped in the revised recycle. The standard repair format applied to this revision would yield, *Cause I was out – I been ferrying back and forth*. The utterance as it actually occurs, is thus, systematically ‘overbuilt’ for its character as an account; i.e., may be actively defending against its recognizability as volunteered self-praise and emphasizing its status as a test-occasioned account.

Such an exercise as the foregoing indicates that the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can be accomplice to some rich and intricate interactional negotiations. And in such materials we find recurrently that negotiations which can be expressed, and thus accounted for, in turn-taking terms as [Completed Turn → Continuer → Turn Exit Device] can be expressed in interactional terms as [Point-Laden Utterance → Mere Acknowledgment → Pursuit of the Point].

That the negotiations can be sensibly expressed and accounted for in turn-taking terms may bear on the sensed ‘benignness’ of Prompting in comparison to the sensed ‘nastiness’ of the Abominables. In turn-taking terms, the Abominable has a Turn Exit Device positioned ‘interruptively’ in the course of a response which is not in the first place relinquishing the floor to a prior speaker. The expression [Completed Turn → Response-in-Progress → Turn Exit Device] is not a reasonable account. On its occurrence, such an interchange does not recommend itself to a turn-taking-systematics account.

Thus, someone confronted with such a series of actions (be it recipient or analyst) is directed by it towards an interactional account as the relevant, sensible account; i.e., is directed to seek and find what one participant is recognizably ‘doing to’ another. In contrast, Promptings’ negotiations can be reasonably expressed and adequately accounted for in terms which do not lead to finding that something interactional is ‘being done’. In this way, the sensed ‘nastiness’ of the Abominables and the relative ‘benignness’ of the Promptings may be a product of the design of the devices and the alternative accounts which they invoke.

III. On the Effectiveness of Abominables and Promptings

Although the Abominables may be designedly recognizably ‘doing something to a coparticipant’, a striking feature of these interchanges is that the device seems to be altogether ineffective.

Specifically, the Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation is positioned recognizably ‘interruptively’ in the course of a coparticipant’s talk. It can then be observed that the coparticipant’s talk is not interrupted, but continues at least to a first completion point. And, subsequently, there is nothing which might stand as ‘the solicited response’. We can review the relevant fragments with that issue in mind.

(1.1,b) [Br.Prl.2.JPB:S:Free Translation]

Frau B.: → Whuddiyuh mean I kneel an d pray.
 Herr B.: → Right?
 Frau B.: → e-my God is always with me. He is even with me through the night.

(1.4,b) [Br.Prl.2.l.r.: Free Translation]

Frau B.: → Yea:h well that is t h e opinion
 Dr. F.: → Is that correc t?
 Frau B.: → of Doctor Hollmann
 Dr. F.: Uh huh
 Frau B.: → But it isn’t mine.

(1.6) [Frankel:US:1:63]

James: → Well he musta got the music shop there in the sto re.
 Mike: → Right?
 Vic: → And he’s got a kid.
 (0,6)
 Vic: No.
 Mike: Nonono not Frank-

(1.7) [Adato:VI:4-6]

Tony: → The Royal Pa lace.⁸
 Jay: → Ri:ght?
 (0,4)
 Jay: Across the street . . .

(1.8) [Goodwin:Meat:15]

Paul: He’ll probably come () down with a
 → shot gun and blow your he ad off.
 Andy: → R i g h t? You know?
 (.)
 Paul: So I said . . .

(1.9) [BC:I:G:96:r]

Caller: → Well that's what I mean he couldn't understand.
B.C.: [Were they not?]
B.C.: =Oh he could understand it he just didn't like it.

The 'interruptively' positioned Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation of the Abominables recurrently appears to have no relevant effect upon the utterance it intersects. We find neither 'interruption' nor 'the solicited response'.

In contrast, the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation of the Promptings appear to have some effect. Specifically, the Solicitation is followed by an utterance which can stand as 'the solicited response'. Again, we can review the relevant fragments with that issue in mind.

(2.1) [GTS:V:71-72]

Roger: Mm hm,
Dan: Ri:ght?=
Roger: → =That still is the thing.

(2.2) [Whitacre:902A:JPW:2]

Larry: Oh.
(0.4)
Janet: Ri:ght?
Larry: → Ri:ght.

(2.3) [CDHQ:II:276:r]

Craig: Yeah.
Marty: Ri:ght?
Craig: → Right.

(2.4) [BC:II:R:144]

B.C.: Mm hm?
Caller: Right?
B.C.: → Mm hm

(2.5) [Frankel:TC:1:27:S]

Geri: Yeah.=
Shirley: =Right?h
Geri: → Yeah

(2.6) [FD:III:52]

Desk: Right.
Caller: Is that it?
Desk: → Right.

(2.7) [Rose:Fairmount:II:6]

Lorrie: r:Right.
Carol: Di:d she.
Lorrie: → Right.

However, the fact that, massively, these post-Response-Solicitation utterances are no more than an acknowledgment token, brings them into close convergence with an altogether contrasting type of activity. In this activity-type, a Second Acknowledgment Token does not constitute a Solicited Response, but a Recycle of what turned out to have been a 'premature' prior response.

Simply: A response which turns out to have occurred prior to completion of an ongoing utterance is recycled upon completion of that utterance. While a sizeable collection of instances was yielded by the search for the Abominable *Ne?*, only a few are shown here, with a disproportionate number involving Response-Solicitations. (See also, Fragments 1.10 and 1.11.)

(3.1) [Agorio:2:141]

Martinez: He's you know becoming even mo:re (0,4) more cautious
than befo:re.
Rose: → [Mm-hm,
Rose: → Mm-hm,

(3.2) [Schenkein:II:70]

Ellen: Just on the straight. (·) [of the fabric.
Lori: → [Yeah.
Lori: → Yeah.

(3.3) [Krakowski:D&R:10]

Leslie: Do you think it's gonna make any difference to me if
you said Friday or next week or two weeks from now?
Steven: → [NO!
Steven: → NO!

(3.4) [IPD:ND:II:114]

Desk: Fortieth and Boulevard [right?
Caller: → [Uh huh,
Caller: → Uh huh,

(3.5) [P356:II:1]

Desk: Twenty one, forty four Argyle. (·) [Right?
Caller: → [Yes.
Caller: → Yes.

(3.6) [Reilly:16]

Dora: Oh she has a great big station wagon [doesn't she
Inez: → [Yeah.
Inez: → Yeah,

(3.7) [Goodwin:GR:35]

Ron: The supermarket is a- is a standard place to gossip
 (though) [isn't it,
Beth: → Yea:h,
Beth: → Yeah,

Such a configuration re-positions a 'premature' response such that it now occurs, properly, post-completion of a current utterance. Specifically, the repeated token can be exhibiting that the 'premature' response is deemed still adequate to the eventual utterance-in-toto; that such subsequent material as *...of the fabric*, or *...or two weeks from now?* or *Right?* or *Doesn't she?* or *Isn't it*, is inconsequential; is itself inadequate to a revised response, and simply requires some turn-taking-organizational work which can be accomplished with a properly positioned repeat of the 'premature' response.

Indeed, it appears that a speaker who has started up early, who now wishes to be observably taking the appended materials into account, marks that some subsequent token is not a re-positioned prior response, but is a next-positioned, new response. And this is done, simply enough, by producing a recognizably different item. So, for example, in the following fragment, we find a particularly consequential Response Solicitation, marked for its consequence by its recipient.

(3.8) [GTS:I:1:48:r]

Dan: This was one of the reason that A:1 of course was so
 upset last week, I think.
 (0.7)
Roger: Lost his identify?
 (1.4)
Dan: He had certain viewpoi:nts on things.
 (1.0)
Dan: → And something ha:p p e n e d [didn't it.
Al: → [Yeah, · [M-hm'
 (0.3)
Al: → Oh yah,
 (1.2)
Dan: (I think) he's very hesitant to ta::lk about it,

In this case, a coparticipant is volunteering confirmation in the course of talk a b o u t him. That confirmation ('*Yeab*', '*M-hm*' – the degree-sign [] indicates low amplitude) overlaps a Tag-positioned Response Solicitation which is doing a specifiable job, redirecting the talk t o him. And in this case we find, not a recognizable re-positioned Recycle of a prior, overlapped acknowledgment token, but a recognizable next-positioned Response which takes into account the Response Solicitation and its work;

i.e., we find not another '*Yeab*', or '*M-hm*', but another class of activity, *Oh Yah*, which is not only a recognizable 'change', but is in itself markedly 'responsive'.⁹

It appears, then, that at least in some specifiable circumstances, the powerful relevance of sheer next-positionedness becomes weakened¹⁰, and can be undercut or enhanced, by means of repetition or change, respectively.

Consider the following two fragments in which a same speaker, in two different conversations, with two different coparticipants, is given a similar piece of news, in a similar format. The format can be expressed as [Good Fortune + Price Tag].

(3.9) [NB:IV:10:51]

Holly: and she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit you've ever
 seen in your life.
Emma: Gave it to you?
Holly: Yeah.
Emma: → Aw::::::
Holly: → [A twenty two dollar one.
Emma: → [Aw:::..:
 (0.6)
Emma: Well you've given her a lot in uh your day Holly,

(3.10) [NB:II:2:1]

Nancy: I got a rai:se.
Emma: → Goo::ud.
Nancy: → Yeh two dollars a week.
Emma: → Oh two:w.
Nancy: [Uh:::!! heh heh [heh!
Emma: [What are you gonna do with it all.

In Fragment (3.9) the price-tag component is treated by its recipient as inadequate to revised response, with a repeat of the response to the good-fortune component. In Fragment (3.10) the price-tag component is marked as adequate to revised response, with a recognizably new and markedly 'responsive' item (cf. Fragment 3.8).

Subsequent talk in each fragment supports this analysis. In Fragment (3.9) the good-fortune component, *She gave me the most beautiful swimsuit* is adequately referred to by, and is adequate to, the subsequent *Well you've given her a lot in your day*, which does not specifically address the price-tag component. On the other hand, in Fragment (3.10) the good-fortune component, *I got a raise* is adequately referred to by, and is adequate to the subsequent *What are you gonna do with it*, but is

inadequate to *with it ALL*, which specifically addresses the price-tag component, *two dollars a week*.

Thus, while in Fragment (3.9) the recipient constructs her consecutive utterances such that the price-tag component is (1) marked as, and (2) subsequently exhibited to be inconsequential, in Fragment (3.10) she constructs her consecutive utterances such that the price-tag component is (1) marked as, and (2) subsequently exhibited to be, consequential.

Now, Prompting appears to constitute a circumstance in which the power and relevance of sheer next-positionedness becomes weakened. This is because there is an acute convergence between the way the Promptings run off (see Fragments 2.2-2.7) and the way the overlap-occasioned re-positioned Recycles run off (see Fragments 3.1-3.7).

Specifically, it may become quite unclear as to whether the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation is operating as a sheer Turn-Exit Device, analogous to the Tag-Positioned Response Solicitation, or is pointing to the inadequacy of the initial response and attempting to occasion some revision. Equally, it may become unclear as to whether recipient's subsequent talk constitutes a next-positioned, revised Response, informed by the prior Response Solicitation, or merely a re-positioned Recycle, occasioned by, but marking the inconsequence of some intervening talk.

It appears that this possible ambiguity is oriented to and managed by the relative shape of the two consecutive acknowledgment tokens. A coparticipant who wishes to be seen as having been informed by the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation can produce a second acknowledgment token which is observably not the same as; i.e., not a possible recycle of, the earlier acknowledgment token. Further, he can produce it so that it is equally observably the same as; i.e., is specifically locating, the immediately prior Response Solicitation. This is the procedure used in Fragments (2.2) and (2.3).

(2.2) [Whitacre:902A:JPW:2]

L: Oh:: (0.4)
 J: [-]
 L: [+] Ri:ght?
 L: [+] Ri:ght.

(2.3) [CDHQ:II:276:r]

C: Yeah.
 M: [-] Ri:ght?
 C: [+] Ri:ght.

Roughly, this [-] / [+] Configuration orients to the weakness of sheer next-positionedness, and works to defend against the possible recognizability of the second acknowledgment token as a non-informed, re-positioned Recycle, and to enhance its status as an informed, next-positioned Response.

I want to make an observation which, at this point, stands as a possible mere curio; potentially no more than an artifact of the current corpus. The two instances in which a recipient produces this [-] / [+] Configuration are those in which the recipient is an incumbent in the Membership Categorization Device category 'Child', and the prior speaker, an incumbent in the category 'Adult'.¹¹ Further, in both cases, the categories 'Student' and 'Teacher' appear to be relevant. In Fragment (2.2) Janet is Larry's math tutor, and in Fragment (2.3) Marty has been offering advice about an English Literature course. That is, it just so happens that in both instances, the participants can be characterized in terms of a Superordinate/Subordinate relationship.

It is possible that with the use of the [-] / [+] format, the recipient is specifically invoking that relationship as the account of his behavior; i.e., is recognizably saying what he sees that his superordinate wishes him to say, and no more than that.

In a consideration of another pair of Superordinate/Subordinate categories, Master/Slave, Harvey Sacks points out that in the Pre-Civil War Southern United States, a slave was required to agree with any utterance made by a master. One consequence was that slaves were seen to be "evasive" and "deceitful". Further, "there were some negative consequences for the masters, in that they could never find out what they wanted to know."¹²

The [-] / [+] Configuration manipulates sequence and tokens to achieve recognizable Informed Uptake with no explicit demonstration of how the prior utterance was adequate to more than the initial response. Further, it may be invoking the Superordinate/Subordinate relationship as the account for the revised response. Literally, "Whatever you say, Boss." If this constitutes a successful outcome of the pursuit engaged in by the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation, it is a meagre one.

The remaining cases of Prompting, including those shown here, are even less 'successful'. A coparticipant who wishes to convey that the prior utterance was indeed inadequate to anything more than it initially got, but who does not wish to move into active dispute, can produce a second acknowledgment token which is observably not the same as; i.e., is specifically not locating, the immediately prior Response Solicitation.

Further, he can produce it so that it is equally observably the same as; i.e., a possible recycle of, the first acknowledgment token. This is the procedure used in Fragments (2.4)-(2.7).

(2.4) [BC:II:R:144]

BC: Mm hm?
 C: [+] Right?
 BC: [-] Mm hm

(2.5) [Frankel:1:TC:I:27:S]

G: Yeah,=
 S: [+] =Right?h
 G: [-] Yeah

(2.6) [FD:III:52]

D: Right.
 C: [+] Is that it?
 D: [-] Right.

(2.7) [Rose:Fairmount:II:6]

L: r:Right.
 C: [+] Dj:d she.
 L: [-] Right.

Roughly, this [+]/[-] Configuration relies upon the strength of next-positionedness to achieve that the second acknowledgment token is not, unequivocally, the repositioned Recycle its sheer repetition would otherwise define it as. The work done in these cases tends to reaffirm the adequacy of an initial, no-uptake response, and the inadequacy of the prior utterance to a different order of response. In effect, it is observably declining to take issue with the Post-Response-Completion Response Solicitation's proposal that the prior utterance warranted more than a mere acknowledgment.

Thus, while in comparison to the absolute zero effectiveness of the Abominables, Prompting can be seen as at least achieving some small measure of success, the foregoing considerations suggest that it is a drastically meagre one. Having noticed the absence or meagreness of success of the Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Response Solicitations, that very noticeability can be seen as a feature of the phenomenon. That is, this version of a Response Solicitation is produced as something to which its recipient ought to defer, and which, then, can observably fail at achieving, or can observably achieve only minimal deference.

At least in part, the observable success/failure derives from a characterizable activity performed by the Post-Response-(Initiation or Comple-

tion) Response Solicitation. The Response Solicitation is fully occupied by marking the pointedness of a prior, completed utterance, and proposing that a recipient should now exhibit that he has taken the point of that prior utterance. But, crucially, the Response Solicitation does nothing whatsoever to explicate the point of that prior utterance.

Now this is a rather special sort of activity, given that a recipient has just committed himself to a response; i.e., is in the course of proffering, or has just proffered, the results of his analysis of that prior utterance. The Response Solicitation informs a recipient that his response is/was inadequate, but provides no further materials from which the recipient might construct an 'improved' analysis. The defect is specifically located as residing in the recipient's analysis, and not within the prior talk, which is re-offered as adequate, as it stands.

At best, the Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Response Solicitation sets up a guessing-game or test. At worst it constitutes a complaint or rebuke; i.e., an insistence that a coparticipant behave differently, which virtually no grounds provided for revised behavior except that this speaker deems that revision is called for. Small wonder that the device is so massively unsuccessful.

IV. Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Recompletion: An Alternative

It turns out that there is an alternative type of pursuit device, one which may or may not be 'successful' in the interactional terms of the Response Solicitations, but one which does not in the first place operate in those terms. This alternative type of pursuit device operates in terms of a turn-taking organizational procedure which has as its first-order observable task the sheer completion of an utterance in progress.

This device can operate for an utterance which in fact has not reached completion when response is initiated. (In the interests of economy, this phenomenon will not be considered here.) It can also operate for an utterance which had achieved completion prior to initiation of response, but which is retroactively exhibited to have been incomplete and thus potentially response-inadequate at the point that a response was initiated. The following example may serve as a proto-type.

(4.1) [BA/Core:I:RD:32]

Marcus: Uh incidentally how many people, are in this A Program.
 Ed: Oh God I don't know I can uh
 Marcus: Well I mean is it a matter of, at any one time a few dozen, a few hundred,

Ed: → I would say what, two or three hundred Bill?
 Bill: → I would say, Uh,
 Ed: → statewide?
 Bill: I would say, statewide, app-between two fifty and three hundred.

The Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion specifically provides material via which the recipient might construct a revised analysis of the utterance in question; the potential defect is located within that prior utterance, which is now displayed to have been response-inadequate. Notice in this case that the Post-Recompletion response starts out with a repeat of the initial response; i.e., tends to converge with the phenomenon of re-positioned Recycling and thus mark the inadequacy of the Recompletion to a revised response. After the repeat of his own prior utterance, however, the recipient specifically incorporates the Recompletion component into his response, thus strongly exhibiting it to be consequential. This particular [+]/[-] → [+] Configuration may achieve a display that the recipient had initially been addressing just that aspect, independent of the Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion, while acknowledging the legitimacy, reasonableness, etc., of the 'interruptively'-positioned information.

Now, the legitimacy of such a procedure can be exploited in ways which strongly resemble both Abominables and Promptings, as in the following two fragments, respectively.

(4.2) [LC:1:LC trans] ((re joining a coffee boycott))

Basil: → They've had their worst crop and they're making the most profit.
 Milt: → Yeah but I
 Basil: → than they've ever made before.
 Milt: I
 Milt: I think that coffee bothers me.

In this case, the uneasy fit between *they're making the most profit*, and *than they've ever made before*, provides access to the sheer 'interruptive' deployment of this Recompletion component. Notice further that while "statewide?" is a substantive clarification or specification, *than they've ever made before* is at best a Simulacrum. It has the form, but not the substance of 'additional information'. Note, as well, that this Abominable use of the Recompletion device is as unsuccessful as is the Abominable Response Solicitation; i.e., the coparticipant simply goes on with his 'interrupted' utterance.

(4.3) [NB:II:4:4] ((Nancy has met a man who lives up north and who has entree to officer's clubs down south, where Nancy lives.))

Nancy: And apparently he just simply hasn't, been, interested
 [in,
 Emma: [Mmhm,
 Nancy: doing, a lot of dating, and, he said now I might have
 a, a reason to, you know, [get down there,
 Emma: [Gee wouldn't that be nice?
 Nancy: Yah he said they really treat you real nice.
 Emma: → Well goo::d.
 Nancy: → at those places.
 Emma: → Oh:: I'm glad.

In this case, the Prompt-like Post-Response-Completion Recompletion *at those places* (again, a Simulacrum), gets a revised, and markedly 'responsive' *Ob:: I'm glad*. (Cf. Fragment 3.8 *Oh yah* and Fragment 3.10 *Oh wo:w*.) However, the Prompt-elicited response is utterly equivocal in terms of a taking of the point of the prior utterance.

It appears that the Prompt-like Recompletion is in aid of some rather touchy disambiguation. Roughly, there are two converging alternatives. One is Circumstantial and 3rd-party assessable (i.e., how nice for him); that he might have a reason to *get down there* (to the locale of the officer's clubs). The other is Relational and 2nd-party assessable (i.e., how nice for you); that he might be asking Nancy out on dates. The former alternative is actualized in an utterance, but that utterance is overlapped by a response to what could well be a projection of the latter alternative. That is, *Gee wouldn't that be nice?* which overlaps *get down there*, might well be assessing something like *start dating again*. Thus, the assessment might constitute an undesirable Relational how-nice-for-you when what is being proposed is a Circumstantial how-nice-for-him.

Thus, the Post-Response-Completion Recompletion *at those places* may be a second attempt to elicit a response which explicitly locates and addresses the Circumstantial, 3rd-party assessable overlapped alternative, e.g., something like *Oh he really should get down there*. While the Prompt-elicited response charmingly resolves the for-him/for-you dilemma with 'how nice for me' (i.e., *Ob:: I'm glad*), it no more explicitly takes the pursued point than do those acknowledgment tokens which follow the Prompting Response Solicitations.

A feature which distinguishes Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Recompletion from Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Response Solicitation, then, is that the syntactic structure with which the Re-completions are formatted is capable of carrying various types of in-

formation (as in Fragment 4.1) which can engender a shifted response, or at least of carrying information simulacra (as in Fragments 4.2 and 4.3) which can at least occasion and warrant a shifted response.

In either case, the Recompletion can provide that the revised response, should it occur, is not observably a repair of an inadequate prior response, but constitutes a next relevant activity; a response occasioned by some new information. Indeed, if anything, the 'fault' is located in the prior utterance, which, although it was response-inadequate, gave the appearance of response-readiness.

On occasion, we find a much more interesting task being undertaken by a Post-Response Recompletion. Roughly, the prior utterance is not being 'clarified', but, under the auspices of 'additional materials', a drastic shift is achieved; that shift engendered by and responsive to information available in the response now underway.

That is, it appears that something is said in full expectation of a particular sort of response. The subsequent response is not what was expected. But it is not treated by a prior speaker as inadequate to the utterance. Rather, it is treated as informative. The result is a Recompletion component which may rather drastically alter the so-far thrust of the prior, completed utterance; that alteration accomplished as a syntactically coherent next component of a still-ongoing utterance, such that, at its end, the utterance turns out to be what the recipient was obviously making of it. Following is a most obvious instance.

(4.4) [SBL:2:1:7:7]

- Bea: I'm reading a bu- some of our conversation made me think,
I'm reading one of uh Harold Sherman's books.
- Maude: Mm hm,
- Bea: I think we read one, one time, about life after death or something,
- Maude: Mm hm,
- Bea: And uh this is How To Make uh E.S.P. Work For You.
- Maude: Mm hm,
- Bea: → And it's excellent.
- Maude: → Well, when you get through [with it,
- Bea: → [And he talks about=
- Maude: → =Is it your book?
- Bea: No, Eloise uh brought it by . . .

In this case, a recipient appears to be shortcutting a recognizable Offer Sequence. Recurrently such a sequence is produced over a series of moves in which an object is introduced, promoted, and eventually explicitly offered. Here, in what may constitute a display of intimacy and understanding of where the sequence is leading; i.e., a display of the

between-us-dispensability of a formal 'offer' component, the recipient provides acceptance after introduction and promotion (i.e., in this case, after the book is named and then assessed as *excellent*), but in the absence of an explicit, formal, 'offer' component. The attempt at an intimate dispensing of the formalities turns out to be a misapprehension; i.e., this was not an offer sequence, but something like a recommendation. As it happens, the speaker is not in a position to offer the book; it is not hers to lend, in the first place.

And in this case, at the point where it becomes unequivocally clear that an acceptance-of-an-offer is underway, a Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion is deployed; one which utterly disattends the acceptance-in-progress and simply goes on to describe the book. No sooner is the Recompletion initiated, then the recipient moves to exhibit an understanding of its import, with *Is it your book?*

In this case, then, an utterance which might on first inspection be seen as a rather rude 'interruption', turns out to be deeply sensitive to, and informed by, a misguided display of intimacy via a misunderstanding of what the prior talk was doing. Further, this fragment shows us that co-participants can and do utilize such a procedure; specifically, that a recipient can see and use the information provided by a Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion to revise their analysis of the prior talk.

With this obvious instance in hand, we can turn to a far more delicate interchange.

(4.5) [SBL:2:5:9:10]

- Gloria: And I said well gosh I-I'm not gonna leave them if I don't want to,
- Bea: Mm hm(hh)hh
- Gloria: And, but uh Bea, uh my gosh it'll- it costs a fortune to get those big things moved over there.
- Bea: [I know, it would be,
- Gloria: Uh huh, and I had a ([),
- Bea: [You should uh-
- Bea: → Listen that could be a job for Terry.
- Gloria: → Uh::, We'll he seems to be-
- Bea: → [and his station wagon.
- Gloria: → Oh he couldn't get them in.
- Bea: Oh, he couldn't,
- Gloria: Uh uh.
- Bea: Uh huh,
- Gloria: Uh::: I phoned to the um (1.0) uh (2.0) Oh I had a letter or note form p-Peg uh Hazel.
- Bea: Oh did you?
- Gloria: Uh [huh, and uh
- Bea: [What does she say.

Gloria: Well, she uh says she was in a rest home and she was try-making a battle to try to get on her feet . . .

A roughest sense of the interchange is as follows. A suggestion is made, which its speaker takes to be adequate as it stands. Specifically, why this particular party is being recommended for the job is available in the sheer naming; no explicit account is deemed necessary. However, upon the occurrence of recipient's *Ub::*, speaker discovers that recipient is having some sort of difficulty, and locates that difficulty as a fault of the suggestion in its current form; i.e., discovers that the account was perhaps not, after all, available in the sheer naming, but ought to be stated. Whereupon, the account is appended to the suggestion as a syntactically coherent next component, such that the utterance, at its (next) completion point, will be response-adequate.

Just such a series of activities appears to be occurring in the following fragment.

(4.6) [W:PC:1:(1):41]

Katie: We went (·) to: uh:m: (0.2) 'tch 'hh (0.6) thē: uh
→ Schooner at (·) Newtonworth Sca:les.
(0.2)

Nan: → Ehh::[m::

Katie: → Out the:re.

Nan: → 't 'hh[h

Katie: → Like the other si:de of Ki:rkham.
(0.2)

Nan: yEhh::m:: 't I'm just trying to plā:ce it.

Here, the 'search' item *Ebb::m::* is understood as marking some difficulty in locating a named place, and is intersected by a Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion; first the Simulacrum *Out the:re*, an item which in form if not in substance, attempts to aid in the search, and second, some possibly useful information, *Like the other si:de of Ki:rkham*. Similarly, in Fragment (4.5), the 'search' item *Ub::*, may be understood as marking some difficulty, e.g., in locating why, of all people, Terry is being recommended, and is followed by the Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion *and his station wagon*, which could be useful. And in this case, immediately upon completion of the now-adequate recommendation, the recipient, with no indication of difficulty, produces a reply, *Oh he couldn't get them in*.

Now this sense of the interchange may, in fact, capture an achieved observable formulation of their business. That is, the participants have co-constructed a series which can and should be understood by reference to, say, an initially inadequately expressed, then clarified suggestion.

But under the auspices of that achieved formulation, a rather different order of business may be underway. Following is a revised understanding of the interchange.

Again, a suggestion is offered in what its speaker takes to be, as between these two participants, a perfectly adequate form, with the account available in the naming. The account consists of a combination of Relational and Circumstantial features; i.e., this fellow who happens to own a station wagon stands in such a relationship to recipient that it is appropriate for her to enlist his aid.¹³ In its current form, the suggestion is 'weighted' towards the Relational aspect.

And the suggestion, in its current form, is indeed adequate. The problem is, it has happened to stumble upon a Relational Trouble; that is, whatever the situation was that provided for the taken-forgranted enlistability of this 3rd party's aid, some difficulties seem to have arisen. That such is the case is discoverable in the response-so-far; i.e., in the *Ub::*, *We[l]*.

As it happens, a range of Troubles are initiated with various 'delay' items (e.g., long in-breaths, 'search' tokens, etc.) plus *Well*. Following is a single representative instance.

(4.7) [Frankel:TC:I:1:25]

Shirley: 'hhh Have you guys made plans to see each other
ag[ain?

Geri: → 'hhhhh We:ll? (0.4) 't 'hhhh (·) Uh:::m, (·) 'k 'hhhh
As it looks no:w . . . ((there are obstacles))

And we have already seen that with very little 'substantive' material to go on, coparticipants can discover what the issue is, and can present their analysis of it, as in Fragment (4.4), in which the recipient of a Post-Response-Initiation Recompletion offers her analysis of its import vis-a-vis a recommendation misapprehended as an offer.

In the case at hand; i.e., Fragment (4.5), the prior speaker appears to be using the same device she uses in Fragment (4.4); i.e., given recipient's response-so-far she is able to discover that there is a problem, and what it might be, but rather than presenting her analysis of it, she moves to forestall its emergence. While in Fragment (4.4) *And he talks about...* simply disattends that an acceptance-of-an-offer is underway and goes on with a description of the book, in Fragment (4.5) *and his station wagon* reverses the weighting from Relational to Circumstantial. It both accounts for the suggestion as in no way addressing what has turned out to be a Relational Trouble (most grossly, this speaker is not to be seen as doing some delicate snooping by suggesting this 3rd party, thereby,

e.g., checking out some information she had gotten elsewhere), and permits just the sort of Circumstantially-based rejection it subsequently gets. In effect, *and his station wagon* proposes that the stumbled-upon Trouble was just that; it was not being inquired into, and it need not be told.

Recipient, who has hesitantly embarked on a Relationally-based rejection of the suggestion, now seizes the opportunity to produce a Circumstantially-based rejection, aborting the possible Troubles-telling. That is, whatever *Uh::, Well be seems to be-* was developing into, is abandoned.

The subsequent talk is congruent with this analysis. That rather detailed and lengthy consideration will not be presented here. Roughly, it appears that once the stumbled-upon character of the Trouble and possible snoop aspect of the Relationally-weighted suggestion have been remedied, a negotiation is undertaken as to whether the Trouble, now having arisen, shall in fact be told. Over a series of moves the result is that the Trouble remains untold, and the interrupted topic out of which the Trouble emerged (continuation of which might provide for its re-emergence) is abandoned for other matters entirely.

Again, then, an utterance which on first inspection might appear to be a rather rude 'interruption' turns out to be deeply sensitive to, and informed by, the shape of a response-so-far.

V. Post-Response-(Initiation or Completion) Response Solicitation and Recompletion as Systematic Alternatives

The foregoing considerations suggest that not only are Post-Response Re Completions distinctive from Post-Response Response Solicitations in the capacity of the former to engender or occasion-and-warrant a shifted response by providing additional information or simulacra thereof, but in that they can exhibit a sensitivity to, and respond to the import of, an unfavorable response-initiation. That is, not only can a prior utterance be 'clarified', but it can be utterly revised by reference to the character of the response.

It is this potential information-richness and flexibility which sharply distinguishes the Re Completions from the Response Solicitations. The latter are fully occupied by marking the pointedness of a prior utterance, neither 'clarifying' nor 'revising' by reference to an unfavorable response, but rather, placing the burden of change fully on a marked-as-offending recipient.

It appears that these sharply differentiated methods for dealing with an unfavorable response stand in alternation to each other, in two different senses. One is Aggregate-Distributional, the other, Sequential.

As to the Aggregate-Distributional sense of 'alternative'; across the current collection of conversations, there is a skewed distribution, most dramatically with regard to the Response Solicitation *Right?*. This item shows up repeatedly and in its various positions (Tag, Post-Gap, Post-Response-Completion (Prompting) and the rare Post-Response-Initiation Abominables) in several substantial sets of conversations, and absolutely never occurs, in any of its positions, in other equally substantial sets. Most roughly, then, whatever work *Right?* in its various positions can do, we find that whole corpuses of conversation manage perfectly well without it.

Further, in one corpus, several hours of formal negotiations, there is a single occasion on which *Right?* is brought into play. And that is in the final recorded session, just as the negotiations are beginning to break down and overtly belligerent talk is beginning to occur. Following is a condensed version of the materials.

(4.8) [BA/Core:V:63-66: Condensed Not to be used for Analysis]

- Ed: And the only thing that we have had, was this whole question, of all the different kinds of statistics that
→ uh [Name of Organization] decided that we, damn well had to give them. Now [this is where we stand,
- Marcus: [Alright now,
- Marcus: Basically then, the three major things that uh we're concerned with, is good faith, on the part of seach other.
→ *Right?*
- Ed: → *Ri:ght,*
- Marcus: The second thing that we're concerned with, there is an issue, on, (0.3) providing statistical data.
- Ed: → *Right,*
- Marcus: And the third thing, is thē, acknowledgment, of an agreement.
(): ((sigh))
Marcus: → between the groups. *Right?*
(pause)
- Ed: Let me point out that after the demonstrations up on Martindale Street. There was no agreement signed,
- Barton: → Listen I'm sick and tired of going through this same discussion, meeting after meeting . . .

While the deployment of *Right?* is designedly inoffensive (in the interests of economy a detailed analysis will not be shown here), the fact that it is brought into play after hours of negotiation in which it was not

used, and occurs just as breakdown is underway (specifically, following the belligerent *that we damn well had to give them* and itself followed by *Listen I'm sick and tired...*) points to (1) a sort of work *Right?* and other Response Solicitations might be regularly engaged in; i.e., invoking the presence of, or potential for hostile interaction, and (2) the other sense in which the potentially rich and flexible Recompletions stand in alternation to Response Solicitations; i.e., Sequentially.

That is, most roughly, a range of Response Solicitations may occur when, or upon their occurrence propose that, other methods have been tried and have failed, and now rather more drastic measures are warranted.

A review of two fragments shown as instances of Abominables and one shown as an instance of Prompting, yields a clearly serial relationship between the two types of pursuit; i.e., between Post-Response Response Solicitations and Post-Response Recompletions. In each of the three fragments, just prior to the Response Solicitation (see arrows 3) that speaker has used the device of Post-Response Recompletion (see arrows 2).

(1.1.b) [Br.Prl.2.JPB:Free Translation]

Herr B.: 1 → if all day long from morning to evening and through the night ('hh) [I kneel and pray.

Frau B.: ()

Frau B.: → Yea:h, well [I have ()

Herr B.: 2 → and make a *nui::sance*=

Frau B.: → =Whuddiyuh mean I kneel and [pray.

Herr B.: 3 → [Right?

(1.7) [Adato:VI:4-6]

Jay: Just a little bit away from the San Carlo Opera house,

1 → about a half a block, is- thē- thē pah- Pallazzo

Raya [leh,

Tony: → Uh huh,

Jay: 2 → The Royal Palace.

Tony: → The Royal Pa[place.

Jay: 3 → [Ri:ght?

(2.3) [CDHQ:II:276:r]

Marty: 1 → we're right up here.

Craig: → Yeah,

Marty: 2 → on:: four six six two Parkin- Parkinson. Right around the [re.

Craig: → [Yeah.

Marty: 3 → Right?

In each case an initial pursuit (arrows 1) is met with an unfavorable response, whereupon prior speaker produces a potentially useful Recompletion (in Fragment 1.1 *and make a *nui::sance** which brings home the practical consequences of the prior-named activities, in Fragment 1.7 the possibly helpful translation from Italian to English, and in Fragment 2.3 the address-specification which serves as an additional measure of expertise). In each case the possibly useful Recompletion, which might occasion a shift in response-type, is met with unfavorable response (in Fragment 1.1 the belligerent *Whuddiyuh mean I kneel and pray*, in Fragment 1.7 the non-place-recognizing repetition, and in Fragment 2.3 another mere acknowledgment token). It is then, and perhaps specifically, designedly-recognizably 'only then'; i.e., upon the failure of two prior attempts to elicit a favorable response, that the non-informative, recipient-blaming, possibly hostilities-implicative Response-Solicitation is deployed.

In these fragments, then, the use of the Post-Response Response Solicitation may be systematically-observably warranted by reference to the local context in which it occurs. It is an Nth in a series of events. In this regard, Fragment (1.4) becomes interesting.

(1.4.b) [Br.Prl.2.1.r:Free Translation]

Dr. F.: () I understand (0.8) () that you're not feeling very well.

Frau B.: Yea::h well that is [t h e opinion]

Dr. F.: [Is that corre]t?

This fragment consists of the opening moments of an intake interview at a psychiatric hospital. For the purposes of this consideration I am assuming that these two participants are unacquainted; that this fragment catches the early moments of their coming into a state of interaction. In such a circumstance, the immediate deployment of what may recurrently constitute an Nth-and-Alternative Pursuit Device (in this case, the psychiatrist's *Is that correct?*) is of particular interest. Further, it may be characterized as observably warranted.

In the brief consideration of Fragment (4.4) it was noted that while some conventional sequences are recurrently permitted to play out fully, they can be shortcut. That is, one needs only a 'part' to see the shape of the whole, and to respond then and there. And in the considerations of prior speaker's activities in Fragments (4.4) and (4.5) it was noted that upon the discovery of some emerging problem, moves can be made to forestall its development. Roughly, then, in Fragment (1.4), the unfavorable response may be then-and-there seen, not as an appropriate,

locally-generated answer to the prior question, but as a fully adequate index and premonitor of predictable, chronic belligerence; i.e., as an informative 'part' of a specifiable whole.

Now, it is one thing to make such a formulation of a coparticipant's activities, and another to make such a move as has been done here. For one, the immediate move to an otherwise Nth-and-Alternative device can inform this recipient that her activities are being monitored in just such terms; i.e., as an index of belligerence. And in that case, we have here an analogy of the sort of intimacy-display mentioned by reference to Fragment (4.4); a display that such a situation holds that both parties can be taken to understand each other perfectly well, without need of such 'formalities' as the playing out of an elaborated sequence via which the status of some activity becomes formally explicated. In effect, a diagnosis has been achieved, and that it has been achieved has been conveyed to the candidate patient.¹⁴

Further, the deployment of the Post-Response-Initiation Response Solicitation may offer the recipient an opportunity to re-open the negotiations by producing a display of extraordinary docility. That is, were she to do what, at least in the current corpus is never done; i.e., out off her response-in-progress and exhibit attention to the Response Solicitation, she could show that the import of the Response Solicitation has been understood, and that her behavior is modifiable by reference to such an understanding. As it happens, she does what everybody does; i.e., continues her response-in-progress, virtually uninterrupted. By doing what anybody would do, but doing it in these rather special circumstances, she may be seen as confirming the diagnosis which may result in her being taken on as a patient.

Thus, we have come full circle. A device which was initially characterized as gratuitously nasty turns out to be, at least in some materials, clearly available as a 'last resort' after a series of milder attempts to achieve the object of a pursuit (and its 'first resort' usage in Fragment 1.4 suggests other interesting ways in which it may be warranted and non-gratuitously used). And, while in sheer turn-taking terms the device appears to be utterly ineffective, it may warn a recipient that his activities are disapproved of. While recurrently such a warning may be no more than a momentary pique, submerged in subsequent talk, there can be occasions when it has enormous, if not immediately apparent, consequence.

Notes

- 1 The equal-sign [=] indicates no break in continuity.
- 2 For considerations of *Well* as an 'unfavorable' response, see, for example, Harvey Sacks, Fall 1967 Lecture 13, page 16, and Anita Pomerantz, *Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes*, MS, 1976.
- 3 For a consideration of Continuers, see Harvey Sacks, Spring 1971 May 24, pages 1-5.
- 4 For a consideration of Turn-Exit Devices, see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, *A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation*, in *Language*, Vol 50, No 4, 1974, page 718 Section (c).
- 5 See Anita Pomerantz, *Compliment Responses*, in J. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1978, pages 88, ff.
- 6 Pomerantz notes: "Recipients of praise are subject to self-praise avoidance, or modesty constraints." See "Compliment Responses", *ibid*, page 96. She goes on to exhibit instances of 'modesty' as "an achievement", page 110, footnote 13.
- 7 Anthony Wootton and Paul Drew, University of York (private communication).
- 8 Note that overlapped speakers can and do cut off immediately upon onset of overlap. For example:

(a) [JG:1:8:5]
 Marge: → Now this is your private number Mister Ha-
 Hanson: n-
No: that's...

(b) [SBL:2:1:8:3]
 Faye: You know, depending on what you eat,
 Bea: → Well, t-
 Faye: I don't like to get in a flap about it, but...
- 9 John Heritage of the University of Warwick argues about *Oh*, that "the particle is used to propose that its producer has experienced some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness." See A 'News' Receipt Token and its Placement in some Sequential Environments, a paper presented at a Sociology Language Group meeting, University of York, December, 1979.
- 10 Throughout his lectures, Harvey Sacks stresses the powerful relevance of next-positionedness. See, for example, Fall 1967 Lecture 13 pages 4-11, Fall 1967 Lecture 14, pages 15-18, and Fall 1971 Lecture 2, pages 5-8. He notes the particular relevance of next-positionedness for acknowledgment tokens, which are understood by reference to an immediately preceding unit (Fall 1967 Lecture 14, page 17).

- 11 For a consideration of Membership Categorization Device categories, see Harvey Sacks, On the analyzability of stories by children, in J.J. Gumperz and D.H. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- 12 See Harvey Sacks, Winter 1970 Lecture 4, pages 21-22.
- 13 For a consideration of 'relational' categories vis-a-vis enlisting aid, see Harvey Sacks, The Search for Help: No One to Turn To, in E. Schneidman (ed.), Essays in Self-Destruction, 1967.
- 14 Jörg Bergmann has some interesting considerations of the rapidity with which a decision to accept or reject a candidate patient is made, in a paper presented at, and to be included in the volume generated by, the SSRC/BSA International Conference on Practical Reasoning and Discourse Processes, Oxford, July 1979.