GAIL JEFFERSON

Side Sequences*

In the course of some on-going activity (for example, a game, a discussion), there are occurrences one might feel are not "part" of that activity but which appear to be in some sense relevant. Such an occurrence constitutes a break in the activity—specifically, a "break" in contrast to a "termination"; that is, the on-going activity will resume. This could be described as a "side sequence within an on-going sequence."

The following fragment is a verbatim report of such an occurrence in the midst of a game called "Marco Polo" which three children are playing in a swimming pool. The three participants are Steven (age 6), Susan (Steven's older sister, age 8) and Nancy (Susan's best friend, age 8). The game involves, in part, that It shuts his eyes and counts to ten while the Not-Its

use that time to "hide"—in this case, to position themselves somewhere in the pool. When the ten-count is completed, It, keeping his eyes shut, attempts to locate and tag one of the Not-Its by a "sounding" technique: It yells *Marco*! and the Not-Its are obliged to respond *Polo*! When one of the Not-Its is tagged, he becomes It, and the cycle is repeated. The report picks up at a point where Steven has been tagged and thereby becomes It:

> As he begins to count to ten, Susan and Nancy move to about halfway across the pool.
>
> STEVEN: One, two, three, ((pause)) four, five, six, ((pause)) eleven, eight nine ten.
> SUSAN: "E*le*ven"?—eight, nine, ten?
> STEVEN: Eleven, eight, nine, ten.
> NANCY: "E*le*ven"?
> STEVEN: Seven, eight, nine, ten.
> SUSAN: That's better.

Whereupon the game resumes.[1]

(The report offers no description of the "resumption" procedure.)

Steven's ". . . eleven, eight, nine, ten" may be the sort of error or violation which people often report to be a "trivial matter," as an account for not having initiated correction procedures for it.[2] There are ways to justify such a claim; for example, in that the rules of Marco Polo do not contain provisions for such an event, i.e. it is not a game-relevant error or foul or illegality; or perhaps in that, insofar as the purpose of the count goes—to provide a more or less standard time interval which the Not-Its use to "hide" themselves—the substitution of "eleven" for "seven" does not alter that interval as would, for example, an ommission.

As it happens, such "trivialities" are often taken to task, and there may be an interesting relationship between objects that have as an account for their not being corrected that they were "not worth bothering about," and the sort of issues involved in correcting them. This essay will attempt to characterize the "bother"—that is, to discover some of the issues involved in correcting such an error. For example, how it is that, upon a remarking by one of the three players, the halting of the game is cooperatively and instantly accomplished and attention is shunted from game activity to the dealing-with of a single word, such that further progress of the game awaits an outcome. To accomplish that, an analysis of "side sequences" will be undertaken, which will involve an attempt to describe in detail some of the resources available to these three children.

The analysis will begin with Susan's "'E*le*ven'?—eight, nine, ten?" which will now stand as a proposed case of a device which can generate a side sequence.

"'E*le*ven'?—eight, nine, ten?" is, in part, a "repeat." A "repeat" is a

conversational object identifiable whether or not one has heard something twice in succession. One can apparently hear a piece of talk, and without having heard some prior piece of talk (actually not hearing it, for example, not being present on the occasion of its occurrence; or, having heard it, not understanding it, not "catching" it) hear that the talk is a "repeat" and thereby hear that something was said "before," that it is that item which is being said now, and that, being said now, it is being said "again."[3]

A "repeat" is differentiable from such a similar object as a "frame" or "locator," which may also be replicating that which has been said before. That is to say, in "Eleven?—eight, nine, ten?" it is "eleven" which is being "repeated," and the "repeat" is "framed" by replications of the digits eight, nine, ten.[4]

The differentiatability of a "repeat" from other replications derives from the distinctive work that they do; "repeats" have as a specific consequence of their occurrence and recognition that, for example, further talk will be done, whereas the work of the other replications, as in this case, may be directed to locating precisely the repeated item and perhaps emphasizing its noticability by providing the "ground" on which it stands out.

A "repeat," then, may be said to have a specific prior object as its "product-item." For a hearer to understand what is being done with, for example, "*El*even?—eight, nine, ten?", he must find that "eleven" has been selected out, and is being noticed via its occurrence in "One, two, three, four, five, six, eleven, eight, nine, ten."

There is another set of conversational objects, "interrogatives": things like "What?", "Who?", etc., which may also be talked of as having prior objects as their product-items. For these, however, the work of selecting a prior object as a product-item is actualized in the talk, in contrast to a "repeat" which in effect *is* its product-item. This may be observed in the following fragment.

A: If *Percy* goes with—Nixon I'd sure like that.
B: *Who?*
A: Percy.[5]

Here it can be seen that, indeed, the operation that yields a product-item involves the issue of selection. Whereas in the case of the "repeat" it might appear that it is the entire replicated series that has become the product-item of a "repeat" as an undifferentiatable device from "replication" in general, and that, for example, there is an ambiguity that Nancy then clarifies by producing only the intended product-item, "*El*even?," in the case of the interrogative, of two possible "who"-relevant objects (Percy / Nixon), one is yielded. The recipient of "Who?" apparently has no problem finding which "who" is the intended product-item.

Just *how* that selection is accomplished is an issue that will be at least alluded to later. However, for the selection problem itself, there is a possible solution having to do with issues of "timing" or "placement." Selection of the product-item could be accomplished by placing the "repeat" or "interrogative" immediately adjacent to the object—that is, the instant it has occurred. This does not happen for the two fragments so far considered. However, that the repeat and interrogative do not occur immediately adjacent to the intended product-item does not mean that they occur just anywhere. Specifically, it can be observed that they occur immediately adjacent to the *utterance* containing the intended product-item. There is a "recognizeable complete utterance"[6] which is immediately followed by the repeat or the interrogative.

STEVEN: One, two, three, ((pause)) four, five, six, ((pause)) eleven, eight, nine, ten.
SUSAN: "E*le*ven"?—eight, nine, ten?

and

A: If *Per*cy goes with—Nixon I'd sure like that.
B: *Who*?

It might be argued that this apparent "utterance-adjacency" is happenstance, that, for example, the next speaker couldn't arrange his utterance "in time" to follow the intended product-item. However, in other places various sorts of immediate juxtapositions can be found.

A: Uh, how early is she gunnuh pick⌈you up.
B: ⌊I have no idea.[7]

and in the following, "Uh" signals that the next speaker is starting to talk, where perhaps his utterance is not completely arranged at the moment he starts talking.

DESK: Which hospital.
CALLER: Uh, it-it to uh, ih-well, bring 'em, over to Doctor Tower's o⌈ffice, or Presbih—
DESK: ⌊*UH : : :* that's—we can't take to a,
CALLER: Well, Presbyterian emergency room.[8]

The capacity for immediate juxtaposition is observable in both cases above, and such items as "uh" provide that it can be done whether or not an utterance is delivery-ready at the moment speech begins. In the second instance there is a suggestion of the sort of reasons for an adjacency lapse such as is found in the initial data and the Percy fragment; it might be that the one who is going to do the interrogative or the repeat is permitting

the one who is currently speaking to remedy the troublesome item without that remedy being solicited. In the "UH : : :" case above, A's juxtaposition was done "too soon" since B's ". . . or Presbih—" is the beginning of a remedy to "Doctor Tower's office" *vis-à-vis* the initial question, "Which hospital?"

By permitting an utterance to go to completion, upon completion it may be assumed by the one who is going to do the interrogative or repeat that there is no unsolicited remedy forthcoming. Such an assumption may be legitimatized by the fact of a recognizeable completion having occurred, where the placing of a repeat or interrogative prior to completion might be claimed by its recipient to be unwarranted.

Since such items as repeats and interrogatives appear to be specifically selective of their product-item, it may not be necessary to place them immediately adjacent to the intended product-item for a recipient to be able to locate it. Since there is the capacity for item-adjacency, where utterance-adjacency occurs the issue may be interactional; the "adjacency lapse" a means of permitting the current speaker to do an unsolicited remedy. Conversationalists might be seen to be orienting to that issue in the Percy fragment where there appear to be two possible "who" items such that item-adjacency would seem to be necessary. In such a case, the one who does the interrogative or repeat might feel that its recipient in some sense "already knows" that it is a possibly troublesome item; that a minimal noticing will be sufficient to locate it.

This is not to say that placement does not matter. If in fact Susan's "E*le*ven?—eight, nine, ten?" generates a "side sequence," it is at least imaginable that had this remark been placed "too late" it might be bypassed in the interests of other activities that are on-going. Consider the following fragment.

> A: We stole—okay d—we'll *tell* him. We stole all the uhm
> B: I stole the Mama Lisa.
> A: No we didn't,
> B: ⌈⌈And sold it to a pusher.
> A: ⌊⌊Well, *you* may've—
> A: I came in last night // and I stole all the reco(hh)rds.
> C: →The *Ma*ma Lisa?
> D: The—
> A: —from here.
> D: Oh you did huh?
> A: heh heh
> D: Good luck.
> A: heh I burned it in a large pile.[9]

In this case, where a repeat is not placed adjacent to the utterance in which its product-item occurs, it might be guessed that D, in his first, cut-off

utterance, "The—" might be posing a response to C's repeat; for example, starting to say "The *Mona* Lisa I think is what he means," and retracts that in favor of continuing the on-going activity.

For the interrogatives, of course, placement can be crucial. If items such as "Who?", "What?" are not in recognizable following-adjacency to the utterance in which the intended product-item occurs, they may be heard in recognizable following-adjacency to some other item, not the intended product-item.

"Repeats," then, are differentiable from initially "similar" objects— for example, "replications"—and have features comparable with features of initially "dissimilar" objects—for example, interrogatives. Among repeats themselves are sub-classes, each with differentiable, comparable, sometimes converging features.

The repeat in the initial data has an intonation that is regularly characterized as "disbelief," "surprise," etc. For convenience.it is being referred to as a "questioning repeat." This type of repeat characteristically signals that there is a problem in its product-item, and its work is to generate further talk directed to remedying the problem.[10] (Further instances of this type of repeat will be considered, and its work detailed, shortly.)

Another type of repeat is that procedure whereby one demonstrates "appreciation," "enjoyment," etc. of the product-item; where "laugh tokens"[11] alternate with syllables of the repeat. For example:

AL: Then th'r gonna dismantle the frame 'n see if the frame's still there.
LOUISE: hh//heh heh heh!
AL: Got *ter*mites.
(0.6)
KEN:→"T(hh)er(h)mite(h)s" hhh
LOUISE: Well y'know wi—n—*fall*out. Who knows what they'll eat now.
(0.6)
KEN: hhhh
(1.5)
KEN: hh hh
(1.0)[12]

ROGER: He's a politician.
AL: Yes. I'm a politician. 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."
( ): ((sniff))
( ): ((cough))
ROGER: Yer better'n *most* of 'em. Cept me.
(4.0)[13]

Roughly, the "laugh token" repeat differs from the "questioning" repeat not only in that they do not "mean" the same thing (for example, that the former demonstrates some sort of approval and the latter demonstrates some sort of disapproval), but in that they do not do the same work. Laugh tokens in general are regularly associated with termination of talk[14] and it can be proposed that the laugh token repeat is regularly associated with termination of talk with reference to its product-item.

That may appear to be directly contradicted by the data—that is, immediately following the laugh token repeat is an utterance that refers to the product-item of the laugh token repeat: "Well y'know wi-n-*fall* out. Who knows what they'll eat now.", and "Yer better'n *most* of 'em. 'Cept me." However, immediately following that referential utterance there is an appreciable pause (where a standard between-utterance pause is something like 0.3 to 0.6 seconds, and in these cases the pauses are at least 3.0 seconds), and it is possible that the referential utterance is produced specifically by reference to the fact that laugh tokens are associated with termination, such that, for example, an attempt to "keep the topic going" may be seen. In the first case, such an attempt is in some sense successful, but the utterances that follow the long pause are specifically observable as attempts to keep things going via, for example, the problem in selecting which aspect of the prior talk is now being "continued."

> KEN: hh hh
> (1.0)
> LOUISE: They sh'd really take the upholstery apart, tuh see if there's any money in it. hh
> (1.0)
> LOUISE: At'sa firs'in(hh)g // they do.
> ROGER: Funny if termites starded eatin steel,
> (1.4)

In the second case, "closure" is in a sense marked by the occurrence of an "assessment"[15] which incorporates laugh tokens.

> ROGER: Yer better'n *most* of 'em. 'Cept me.
> (4.0)
> KEN: Go(h)d. Damn I haven't seen this group this bitchin in *yea(hh)rs* hehh

An alternative account for the possible "delay" utterance involves an ambiguity which inheres to laugh tokens. A laugh token in following-adjacency to an item such as "Got *ter*mites" or "*I* beg to differ with you"—objects that are intendedly jokes and can be "appreciated" via laughter—can alternatively and equivocally be another sort of object; that is, it can be "laughing at" and not "laughing with" the joker. A laugh token can then

converge with a questioning repeat if it is found to be possibly non-appreciative; that is, it may then call for some remedial work (cf. p. 303, "heh heh 'Mother' hah hheh hhehh" and p. 316, I, "Well illuminate(h)d?"). Further, there seems to be a uni-directionality to the hearing of "at"/ "with"; where "at" may be heard unequivocally, but "with" is also possibly "at." For example, in the following fragment there appears to be no ambiguity for the recipient of a laugh token.

A: See Judy was a Soshe. And we both said "We're not Soshes" yet she was. And she would say "I'm not a Soshe, I'm not a sho—s—*I'm* not a Soshe." Y'know, this—and she was so Soshey.
B: heh hehhehh
A: That was a tongue twister.[16]

In this case it is clear that B's laughter is "at" A's tongue-tiedness in "I'm not a sho—s—. . . .," which A attends with "That's a tongue twister." On the other hand, where there is an intended joke that is surely hearable as such, there is apparently still an open possibility that the repeater is otherwise dealing with it. This possibility is attended via a sort of hedging, where a more or less remedial, explicatory item is produced, say, "just in case."

Apparently, the proper way to handle a laugh token repeat is to ignore it (and regularly it is handled in just that way), since, if it is heard as an object signalling appreciation via laughter, then it is a terminator. If it is heard as its alternative possibility, then the problem it raises ought to be talked about—if the item is acknowledged at all. In a sense it is a compliment which enforces modesty upon its recipient, in the interests of continuing the on-going sequence. Specifically, even if the laugh token repeat is taken as a compliment, it is not properly returned with "Thank you." Compare that to another way of doing "appreciation" which may specifically elicit further talk from the one who did the "appreciated" item:

LOUISE: What's wrong with *you* t'day.
    .. ...
    .. ...
    .. ...
    .. ...
DAN: *Yea:h.* That's a good *ques*tion.
    (1.0)
LOUISE: *Thank* you.
    (0.3)
DAN: *Does // he have—?
LOUISE: °I get an A?
    (0.5)
DAN: *D'z'e have some//thing (   )?

LOUISE: °(I c'd use another A,)
     KEN: 's gotta com//plex.
ROGER: Am *I* hiding something,[17]

(For clarity, certain liberties are taken with the transcripts. The dots indicate omitted utterances.)

In this case, via "That's a good question" being a possible compliment (where it is also—and here clearly is being used as—something else, for example, a way to impress upon Roger the import of the question, to urge him to answer it), it generates for one of its hearers an acknowledgement series in which the complimenter ought to then acknowledge her thanks with "You're welcome," and is then, for that device, talking competitively with the very person he engaged in talk.

There is still another type of repeat, the sort that "recognizes correctness" or does "affirmation"; which does not generate further talk directed to the product-item, nor does it raise issues of possible termination, but provides that the one who was speaking before the "side sequence" occurred will, upon its completion, continue.

A: Uh, she asked me to stop by, she bought a chest of drawers from um
        (4.0)
A: What's that gal's name? Just went back to Michigan.
        (2.0)
A: Helen, um
B: Oh I know who you mean,
        (1.0)
B: Brady— *Brady.*
A:→Yeah! Helen Brady.
B: Mm hm,
A: And, she—she says she's uh never had a new bedroom set so she's fixed this all up . . .[18]

and

B: No, *I* had the *queen* Cora. And uh Ray uh that Morgan, or—no their names aren't "Morgan," but Ray an' Lisa or Lah—um oh whoever they // are,
A: Yeah I-I keep saying "Morgan"—*Smith.*
B:→Yeah, Smith.
A: Uh//huh,
B: Uh—that Ray had the ace-king.[19]

These various repeat procedures are also available to a single speaker, such that one can remark on one's own talk. In the first of the two above cases, B's "Brady—*Brady*" is such a same-speaker repeat; an affirmative repeat. In the following report there is also an affirmative same-speaker repeat:

As the play ends, Patrick says "That was my point," casually.
Ernie objects, "No it wasn't!"
"Yes it was!" says Patrick with determination. "You hit it there. It bounced right there," says Patrick, pointing to a spot near the net on Ernie's side. "It hit there."
→Patrick points and repeats with certainty, "It bounced right there."[20]

And here, a repeat that attends a troublesomeness of its product-item, following a remedy plus a characterization of the trouble:

The mother isn't holdin—the father isn't—ah Freudian slip heh heh "Mother" hah hheh hhehh[21]

The preceding was not intended as an exhaustive list of the kinds of repeats, or an analysis of their workings. There are other sorts of repeats—for example, questioning repeats that do not have "surprise" associated with them, but are more nearly straight requests for information:

A: I didn' get tuh vote I declined tuh state this time, when I registered, so, I just uh, didn't get tuh vote fer president so,
B: →You // declined—
A: I think I—
B: What—whaddiyou mean.
A: Well, I vote Republican *and* Democrat.
     (1.0)
B: Oh : : : yea : : : h.[22]

and

A: I got in a phone booth, it w'about two o'clock in the morning. We w—comin home—I w'z comin home from a party. I got on the phone and I started—I started hearin this tick tick tick tick an' the heh I just hung up an' ra(h)n heh God uh // I didn't know
B: →"Tick tick tick"?
A: Thought it was a time bomb or—you know,[23]

There are doubtless others. The intention here is to provide a sense of the sort of object a "repeat" is: an object that has as its product-item a prior occurrence of the same thing, which performs some operation upon that product-item. Focus is directed to "questioning repeats" which, it will be shown, provide that the one who produced the object which is repeated is obliged to talk some more with reference to that object, contrasted to, for example, directly continuing with the on-going talk.

In effect, Susan's questioning repeat is a juncture point between the game and non-game activity. It provides that the talk that precedes it, Steven's count to ten, is not only a game action, but "becomes" the first part of the series of utterances which comprise the non-game activity.

The dual status of Steven's utterance will not be directly considered, but the assertion that it is "part" of a series of utterances will be examined; that is, the claim that it is a unit in a "sequence." Since the notion "sequence" is crucial to this analysis, it will be given detailed attention.

The term "sequence" refers to events that occur as a "serial unit," which belong together and follow one after another. They do not just happen to occur one after another. One can go through a corpus of transcribed conversations and pick out many "similar" one-after-anothers, which can be found upon closer observation to be characterizeably cases of a "same" sort of sequence.

For example, one can find a Misapprehension Sequence of three parts. The parts will be named for convenience, and, as is the case with other names of objects in this paper, are not intended as definitive of the objects, but a way to handle them readily. In the Misapprehension Sequence there is a statement of sorts, a misapprehension of sorts, and a clarification of sorts: (s)–(m)–(c). Following are a few cases of the Misapprehension Sequence.

(1.a) A: (s) Are you serious or are you—kidding.
      B: (m) No I'm serious he said I could have the room if I wanted it.
      A: (c) No I mean uh about beating you up.[24]

(1.b) A: (s) Her whole room she's got it wallpapered. She just—she just got done rewallpapering it about a month ago,
      B: (m) —with the pictures of the Beatles.
      A: (c) No. A month ago Mom had it done in this grasscloth. . . .[25]

(2.a) A: (s) Does he own my house? // hehhehh
      B: eheh heh heh
      C: Yeah he bought it last—a week ago. I don't know, probably does.
      D: (m) What are you getting at Roger?
      A: (c) *Nothing.* Every week he tells us something else h(h)e owns or i—or is involved in you know . . .[26]

(2.b) A: (s) . . . there was these three girls and they just got married,
      B: ehh hehh hhh hhh Hey waita se(h)cond.
      C: heh!
      B: (m) Drag tha(h)t by agai(h)n hehh hehh
      A: (c) There—there was these three *girls.* And they were all *sisters.* An' they'd just got married to three *bro*thers.[27]

These sequences have an orderliness which—if this were a game—could readily be seen as the product of participants' acting according to a rule, and for the purposes of this paper it will be assumed that conversationalists do behave according to such rules.[28] In the case of the Mis-

apprehension Sequence the rule seems to provide that if a statement is made and is followed by a demonstration/assertion that a hearer did not understand, then the one who made the statement may/must provide a clarification.

The preceding fragments will be independently examined to see the distinction between alternative forms ("may" and "must") of the "clarification rule." These considerations will have some relevance for the "questioning repeat" as it will be later developed that the talk generated by such an object is indeed a "sequence," and that sequence involves the "must" form of an expanded version of the clarification rule.

Cases 1.a and 1.b are instances of the "may" form clarification and cases 2.a and 2.b are instances of the "must" form. Roughly, for the first two, the "clarificatory" (c) utterances ("No, I mean uh about beating you up" and "No. A month ago Mom had it done in this grasscloth") stand in a relation to the "misapprehensions" (m) (". . . he said I could have the room if I wanted it" and "—with the pictures of the Beatles") where it is the business of the (c)-speaker to show that the (m)-speaker's utterance was a misapprehension of (s). That is to say, in 1.a and 1.b (m) is a *product* of (c), and not necessarily a "misapprehension" in its course. As it is occurring it is intendedly or proposedly a correct apprehension of (s), and "becomes" (m) as a result of the work the (c)-speaker does upon it.

In this "may" form clarification, the option is the clarifier's in the sense that (m) could just as well be something else, but for the fact that the clarifier shows that an (m) occurred. Thus, some item that precedes a clarification in the "may" form sequence is an *either-or* object. (An "either-or" object can be briefly characterized here as something which may be *intended* as one thing—for example, a "correct interpretation," a "strike" thrown by the pitcher, a "pressuring" of Roger by Dan; and may *turn out* to be something else—for example, a "misapprehension," a "home run" hit by the batter, a "compliment" received by Louise.)

Cases 2.a and 2.b are instances of the "must" form clarification. The relationship between (m) and (c) here is one where it is the business of the (m)-speaker to show that (s) requires clarification, and (c) is then an obliged utterance. This means that, first, the (m) is a non-equivocal object —as in the initial data, being tagged is being tagged, unequivocally; and second, one either produces a "clarification" or is observably not producing it (as contrasted with observably doing some other action altogether).

The "must" form (c) is an *"if-then"* object which can be briefly characterized by reference to the initial data, where "counting to ten" is an "if-then" object in the sense that, having the "counting to ten" as the action name for the reported utterance "One, two, three, four five six, eleven eight nine ten," a reader of that report can—knowing the rules of Marco Polo—know what game action *preceded* it, i.e. that preceding Steven's counting to ten, Steven was tagged. One can know it because

"counting to ten" is a piece of behavior which abides by one of the rules of the game, that rule being an if-then, "must" form rule: if Steven is tagged, then Steven is It and will now therefore close his eyes and count to ten. Further, if Steven does not count to ten he is not doing an alternative game action, he is in violation of the rules, i.e. is "not counting to ten."

The option in the "must" form is not the clarifier's as it is in the "may" form, but the misunderstander's in the sense that (s) could just as well be understandable but for the fact that the (m)-speaker asserts that a misapprehension (or no comprehension) has occurred. In case 2.a it appears that at least for some of the participants (s) is understandable; that is, someone other than the (s)-speaker or the (m)-speaker produces laugh tokens which could be a demonstration that he "got" (s), and still another participant finds (s) understandable in that he can produce an answer to it.

In short, whereas in the first two cases it is the clarifier who could "let it go," in the second two cases it is the misunderstander who could "let it go." The option in the "must" form is to "misunderstand", a second speaker's option, where in the "may" form the option is to "clarify", a first-speaker-again option.

Having "options" as analytical resources, the data might be examined to begin to develop a sense of "talk control." Specifically, in case 2.a and 2.b it might be seen that the (m)s ("What are you getting at?" and "Drag that by again") can be designated as Bs for which the (s)s are A, but are in some sense becoming As for which the speaker who produced the (s) will now do a B. There are various other occasions of this shifting relationship; for example, upon a statement by an A-speaker, say, an "announcement" which has as an expectable B for it some sort of comment, the B-speaker produces a question, which is now an A for the answer which is its B, and the initial A-speaker becomes a B-speaker.[29]

Further, as can be seen in 2.a, there is not only this linear working of talk, but, so to speak, horizontal working. The first utterance, "Does he own my house?" is, among other things, a "question" for which an "answer" will be its B: "Yeah he bought it last—a week ago . . ." However, the "question" that elicits an "answer" from one party as its B, also elicits laugh tokens, i.e. what is, directed to one person, a "question," appears to be, for another person, a "wisecrack" which has "laughter" as its B. This "question-wisecrack" also receives, as its B, a statement of misapprehension, providing that the A is an "unclear object." ·

This is not merely to point out that conversational activities are complex, but to focus on at least one feature of these bits of talk, a feature that matters not only for the immediately prior data, but for the initial data and for consideration of the "questioning repeat" in general, i.e. to focus on objects that are B to a prior A and A for an expectable—perhaps obligated—B. Specifically, they can generate a sequence of talk involving the initial A-speaker as a B-speaker; a sequence which that initial A-speaker

did not necessarily intend to generate, and at least did not directly provide for.

There appears to be a series of specifically B-type actions which may be produced upon the occurrence of various A-types, where those A's cannot be seen, for example, to require such a B in the sense that a "question" requires an "answer" or "Marco!" requires "Polo!" So, one option on some statement is to produce a one-line wisecrack which in variously characterizable ways stands as a B to the statement, that wisecrack then generating a sequence that consists at least of a B, say, a "retort," for which the wisecrack is its A:

> KEN: (A)   The new fad in about seven years will be women smokin cigars, you—because be*fore* it used to be all men were s-smoking cigar*ettes,*
>
> AL: (B/a)→Well so you'll be smoking a ci*gar* in seven *years* I don't care.
>   (1.0)
>
> KEN: They had a—
>
> ROGER: (b)   heh! hh//hh hhh hehh
>
> KEN: (b)   *Thanks.*[30]

In this particular case, and in general, a "wisecrack" sets up among its next utterances things like laughter and retorts. These next utterances stand as B's for which the wisecrack is an A, where the wisecrack was produced as a B to some prior A.

The possibility for a B-to-some-prior-A, A-for-the-next-B object provides that an A-speaker cannot necessarily control what will be done with some utterance he makes. He can—merely or however—project a possible sequence.

It is the case for wisecracks as B-to-A, A-for-B objects (and it remains to be determined whether it is so for all or some of the other such objects, including the "questioning repeat"), that they cannot guaranteedly control what will be done with *them*. On the occurrence of a wisecrack, which is now an A for the sequence that may be generated upon its occurrence, a B-speaker to that wisecrack now has an option, involving the "either-or" formulation. A B-speaker can hear something other than the intended wisecrack, such that some item which is upon its occurrence clearly a wisecrack, may turn out to be transformed by a B-speaker into a "misapprehension" to which a (c) will be its B; that is, instead of a wisecrack getting a retort, a misapprehension gets a clarification.

> (3.a) A: (s)   Why didn't they do anything about that bullet cause that was another wound. .
>
> B: (m)   Well what are they gonna do about it, ((pause)) except remove it.

> A: (c) No! But that means that there was another bullet, from a different direction, shot.[31]

(3.b) A: (s) . . . I shave around Saturday night y'know, cause goin out Saturday night. hhh

B: (m) You—you know—The rest of the week you don't shave but Sa(h)turday night.

A: (c) No, I mean I usually shave in the morning except on Saturday when I shave at night.[32]

It might be noted that whether in fact or for anyone's observation, some, or all, or any of the six cases that involve objects that receive clarificatory utterances are "really" misapprehensions or wisecracks, that is not the issue. The point is that there are objects that can be either wisecracks or misapprehensions, such that an object like an "intended wisecrack" can be treated as a "misapprehension" and is not a non-transformable object in the sense that the game-action "tagging" is non-transformable; and also that the clarifier's option is not necessarily contingent upon a determination as to whether some object was a "real" misapprehension. They all may receive clarifications. Possibly the phrase "No, I mean . . ." which introduces some of the clarifications can be seen to specifically occur when the (c) is produced via the "may" form clarification rule; that is, given that for this version of the rule the (c) is optional, then it may be necessary to signal, with "No I mean . . ." that the prior utterance was indeed an (m) for which this is a (c).

On the other hand, it appears that a clarification occurring as a B to a misapprehension (intended, transformed, joking, etcetera), is a non-transformable object—that is, when a clarification occurs it is treated as something that means what the speaker was trying to say before. (Extended versions of cases 1.a through 3.b appear in the appendix. No analysis has been done on occurrences following the clarifications, but perhaps it can be observed that there is nothing in that talk to suggest that the participants are manipulating the clarificatory utterance, or examining it to see if it is indeed a clarification, or if not, what then.)

At this point it will be proposed that one of the utterances in the initial data, the one in which Steven at last provides a correction for "eleven," belongs to the same class of actions as "clarifications," i.e. a "clarification" may be a sort of "correction," and/or both of these are members of the class of actions which can be called "remedies."

Using this extended collection, it may be observed that, as a statement of misapprehension—such as, in 2.a "What are you getting at?" and 2.b "Drag that by again"—involves the "must" form of the clarification rule and is a second speaker's option, so the questioning repeat involves a remedy as its if-then, must-form obligated next action.

It is being proposed, then, that the questioning repeat, as a B-to-a-prior-A, A-for-a-next-B object is generative in the ways that a statement of misapprehension is, is generated by work that a B-speaker performs on some A, and can set up a sequence that is not necessarily intended by the A-speaker, and which is not subject to the possibility of transformation that the otherwise similar wisecrack is.

At this point also, it must be noted that the various utterances that have so far been identified as initial A-type objects, are in some sense or another regularly B-type objects for some sequence of talk which has been on-going. So, as a specific instance, the question-wisecrack-unclear statement in 2.a ("Does he own my house?") is clearly in reference to something that has been said before, and now this question is asked about some "he," where that pronoun directs attention to that prior piece of talk as its source. And, returning to the initial data, Steven's "counting to ten" belongs to the on-going sequence, whereas the sequence generated by a B-speaker to it does not belong to the game sequence. It will be developed here that the latter sequence is not merely "another" sequence, but that it and others like it are, in a series of ways, *subsidiary* to the former sequence.

The action "counting to ten" is provided for by the structure of the on-going sequence, the game of Marco Polo. It is also the case that *how* the action is done is not controlled by the structure nor legislated by the rules of that game. So, for example, where "counting to ten" might be preferably done by producing "One, two, three; four, five, six; seven, eight, nine, ten," it might be adequately done by producing "Wuhtoothree-fawfisisenayniten," and there is nothing wrong, in terms of game action, with a count to ten that includes "eleven" as one of its digits (cf. p. 295). However, there are procedures for—and apparently reasons for—dealing with such characterizably "trivial" matters. Several procedures have been sketched. The issue of "reasons" for initiating procedures to generate remedies can be focused on via the demonstrated capacity of the recipient of a questioning repeat, an interrogative, a laugh token, to locate the intended product-item of such an object. The recipient can then provide further talk directed to clearing up what *he* can see to be the problem with it, without any further delineation of that problem, and this holds even for places where there is possible ambiguity, such that "heh hehhehh" is treated by its recipient as noticing the stammer and not expressing amusement at the anecdote, and an explication is offered (cf. p. 301). In the Percy fragment, not only is the product-item of "Who?" located, but there is further talk directed to identifying Percy for the interrogator.

B: *Who?*
A: Percy. That young fella thet uh—his daughter was murdered.
     (1.0)
B: Oh *yea : : h. Yeah.*[33]

It would seem that, given not much more than an indication that there is a problem, the recipient can "also" find that there is a problem, can locate that problem, and can offer a remedy for it. By producing a remedy, the recipient legitimatizes the complaint.

Earlier it was mentioned that completion of an utterance that has a problematic item in it might, for its hearer, legitimatize his assumption that an unsolicited remedy was not forthcoming, whereupon he may initiate remedial procedures. It might also be seen that with the offering of a remedy, the act of initiating remedial procedures is observably a legitimate one. It is, then, the recipient's action that demonstrates that there was good reason for someone to do, for example, a questioning repeat. This is not to say that any given recipient of such an object can decide whether or not he will do an action to warrant that object, since the remedy appears to be sequentially obligated given the complaint (cf. p. 305 ff). The point is that once a remedy is offered, no further justification is needed for the object that elicited it, and no further attention is given that object *per se*. Even when a remedy is not done, and the complaint is argued, it is with, for example, an "affirmative repeat" of the initial product-item, and not, for example, with a questioning repeat of the questioning repeat, for one, because such an object does not exist in this culture.

Consider the following fragment, a telephone call for which A is a female at a private residence, B is male:

> A: Hello,
> B: "He*llo : :*"?!
> A: Yeah. "He*llo*."
> B: Wuh—Is this 293-4673?
> A: No it's 293-4637.
> B: Oh I'm awfully sorry.[34]

Here it might be briefly noted, with reference to earlier considerations of the differentiatability of the questioning repeat from similar and dissimilar objects (p. 295 ff), that "hello" as an appropriate next item, for a first "hello" might cause some difficulty in hearing that the object which follows this first "hello" is a questioning repeat and not a return. However, there is apparently no such problem. The object was instantly recognized as a questioning repeat and, as it turns out, was correctly recognized, since, when it is challenged with the affirmative repeat, B then requests information that will tell him whether his complaint was legitimately challenged; that is, whether he has reached the number he intendedly dialed.

Moreover, the interchange continues with:

> A: Am I supposed to be a business firm?
> B: Yes. That's right. That's exactly right. I'm calling my office. They *nev*er answer with "he*llo : :*".

This suggests that independent of issues of "correctness," the remedial procedure generated by the questioning repeat is operative. Although in her particular case A correctly used "hello," she can nevertheless locate a way in which the complaint is legitimate which she offers to B, in effect finding that his action was but incidentally incorrect, since as far as B knew he was correctly applying the questioning repeat to an occurrence at his office.

The fact that some item can be "wrong" in such a way that how it is possibly "right" is available (in the environment of a residence, "Hello" is right, "He*llo : : ?!*" is wrong; in the environment of an office, "Hello" is wrong, "He*llo : : ?!*" is right, and B can check to see if he has contacted a residence and A can check to see if B was calling his office), suggests that it is insufficient to say, for example, that "eleven" is noticed to be wrong because it *is* wrong, and that its correction is accomplished by replacing it with "seven" because "seven" is the correct item in the ten-count. A hypothetical description of how Steven's count might be "right" is if it were a quotation of something he encountered on television the night before; it would then be a perfect quotation, recognizable as such by someone who had also seen the program. The "correction," then, would be a matter of his finding that for this environment his quotation was a *non sequitur*.

Further, for any given product-item of a questioning repeat there might be more than one problem, since for any spoken object one problem can always involve pronunciational issues. Nevertheless recipients of questioning repeats select an issue and provide a remedy by reference to that issue. The selection of the issue intended by the one who noticed a problem may have to do with a convergence of the noticer's intentions and relevancies provided by the on-going activity. This might be outlined with a hypothetical example. If an umpire in the midst of a baseball game says "Strike t'ree!" and the batter turns and exclaims "*'T'ree : :' ?!*", the umpire will perhaps feel obliged to respond to that, to affirm or correct his utterance. However, the problem the umpire selects may not be something which the noticer can control, but something which the on-going activity—the baseball game—will control; that is, the umpire may not hear that the batter is taking issue with his pronunciation of "three," but will more likely hear that perhaps he should have said "Strike two."

The following interchange might stand as a version of the situation offered above. It takes place on a two-way radio talk show, A is the caller, B is the moderator.

```
A:  . . . and I want to know what you think about it.
B:  I am appalled.
A:  Yer—((pause)) a paul?
B:  That's right sir, I am appalled.
A:  Yeh. Uh ((pause)) what's that?35
```

B's hearing of "Yer—a *paul*?" seems to have been controlled by the on-going activity, which for two-way radio shows is frequently "argument." A questioning repeat occurring in the course of an argument may be an expression of "surprise" at some stated point of view, initiating remedial procedures involving that B explain why he is "appalled" at something about which A (and presumably everybody else) is "delighted." By producing an affirmative repeat B is "challenging a questioning repeat" where perhaps he ought to have been responding to a request for information. And it is in a sense incidental that A actually intended a request for information. The procedure generated by a questioning repeat, controlled by the on-going activity, has yielded for B that he has been "argued with."

Not only, then, are such items as questioning repeats subsidiary to the particular utterances from which they draw their sense, which serve as their source, via a relationship to which they have their completeness as actions; but they are subsidiary to the on-going activity of which those utterances are a part.

Still another sense of the term "subsidiary," as a descriptive term for side sequences, can be arrived at in the following way. It was noted at the outset, and is perhaps directly observable in some of the conversation fragments, that upon the occurrence of such things as the questioning repeat, the on-going activity is halted. There are other ways to halt an on-going activity, for example, by initiating what will be called "competitive" activities. These are things that—intendedly or consequentially—not only halt the on-going activity but terminate it. A model of a "competitive" event is found in this excerpt from a report of a baseball game which has been in progress for some thirty minutes:

> *32'18"* ((The pitcher)) turns and throws another ball in to ((the batter)).
> ((The batter)) swings for strike two.
> The ball is thrown back out to ((the pitcher)).
> ((The runner)) takes another long lead and teases ((the pitcher)), trying to get him to throw the ball to ((the baseman)).
> ((The pitcher)) just looks, however.
> *32'35"* Mrs. Turner blows the whistle, signalling the termination of the recess period.
> The game ends suddenly. The children turn away, and many of them run eagerly for the schoolroom.[36]

Termination of an on-going sequence occurs frequently in conversation, although on a less dramatic scale. It is not necessary for a crowd to disperse or dead silence to occur for it to be a noticeable fact that an on-going activity has terminated. There can be, for example, a "change in topic" or, on a finer scale, within a recognizably "same topic," a shift of focus. These provide to varying degrees that what has been on-going is now no longer on-going. Such termination can be observed to be at least asso-

ciated with the occurrence of competitive activities at juncture points in conversation. A particular sense of the term "competitive" may be seen in the very production of talk at such junctures; specifically, utterances belonging to two different sequences occur simultaneously, where one of the sequences is picked up and the other is terminated. Following are two instances of that sort of event:

> A: Yeah, it's been a rough week, I—everbuddy is—yihknow,
> B: Mm—
> A: —talkin about it, 'n everbuddy, course *I* don't know whether it's that, er just thet we're just—completely bogging down et work, ·hhhhm
> A:→Er⌈WHAT a WAYtuh—waytuh take, my finals?
> B: ⌊oh : : : well ev'rybody's sa : d.
> B: *Oh : :*! Howjuh *do* with yer finals.³⁷

and

> A: They wan'tuh git me in the r-*swing* a' things hnh
> B: →How-how⌈old were you wh'ny'first went.
> A: ⌊by th'time i'm nineteen 'm a genuine neurotic. heh! hh heh
> B: How old were you when y'first went.
>   (0.3)
> A: *Oh : :*, I'd say about, thirteen,³⁸

(the fragment at footnote 15 might also be examined for this issue.)

A characteristic feature of competitive activities is that the two simultaneous utterances each go to completion. This can be directly contrasted with a case of the subsidiary type of utterance, in this case the questioning repeat which is perhaps a request for information (p. 303). Here, the utterances may start simultaneously, and at least one of them—specifically for this issue, the utterance for which "You declined—" is a subsidiary object—stops, permitting the other to continue:

> A: I didn' get tuh vote I declined tuh state this time, when I registered, so, I just uh, didn't get tuh vote fer president so,
> B: you⌈declined—
> A: ⌊i think i—
> B: What—whaddiyou mean.

To enrich the description of "competitive" events, it might be noted that the occurrence of a stressed *"Oh : :"* in each of those fragments might be specifically accountable as affiliates to competitive talk. It appears that for cases of competitive simultaneous talk, the one whose talk is part of the terminated sequence not only, then, responds to the talk of the other with a "continuation" of that other sequence, but demonstrates that he

sees its legitimacy as a competitive object to his own. The stressed *"Oh : :"* is then, similar to other expressions of "special interest" or "special attention," like "Oh *really*?". Such items frequently appear at juncture points which consist of simultaneous competitive talk.

> LOUISE: ... I *hate* it. Twelve and a half years old and I—seventeen and a half we look the same.
>   (2.0)
> KEN: You know, my brother and I have come to one a- mutual agree⌈ment that—that we—
> LOUISE: ⌊SHE'S TALLER THAN I AM TOO.
> KEN: She *is*? She's taller'n you?[39]

In this case, after a two-second pause and a fairly well-established utterance in what might be a new sequence, Louise overlaps—and turns out to have interrupted—Ken's talk with a proposal that she is "still talking." Ken demonstrates the legitimacy of her proposal with an utterance which, by "expressing heartfelt interest" in what she has said, "urges" her to continue.

"Competitive" sequences seem to yield readily to description. On the other hand, "subsidiary" sequences might appear to be characterizeable only after the fact—that is, perhaps anything that gets started could go on for some amount of time, over an indeterminate number of actions, and if it turns out that a given sequence at some point is no longer going on, that does not warrant giving it a name that implies at least a structural potential for closure such that the on-going sequence will be guaranteed its resumption. As a first step in developing a description of "subsidiary" sequences it can be noted that for formal events such as games there is frequently an alternative to the on-going activity which is not a competitive activity, does not result in termination of the on-going sequence. That alternative resides in the various sequences called "time-outs."

Time-outs are formal subsidiary sequences. They are known to be, are set up to be, and are initiated by virtue of the fact that, at the very least, they are of shorter duration than the game itself, by actual clock time, or because they consist of a nameable sequence with a set of parts, and specifically with a recognizable "last part." So, for example, the sequence generated by an injured player on the field has as its last part the action "player is removed from field," whereupon, expectably, the on-going sequence will resume.

Time-outs also have a recognizable "first part" by which the subsidiary sequence is generated. It can be found that conversationalists have access to "first parts" of specifically subsidiary sequences. For example, an object like "By the way" or "Oh incidentally" when it occurs at the end of a conversation, can be readily observed to be a "first part" of some subsidiary

sequence. "By the way" can specifically signal that the "goodbyes" will be halted and will resume when the matter at hand has been dealt with. It is at least a promise that the sequence it will generate will be a subsidiary sequence and not a competitive sequence. So, in this fragment from a two-way radio talk show, "By the way" is placed in following-adjacency to a "goodbye":

```
A:  F'give me sir, I'm gunnuh haftuh go.
B:  O:kay.
A:  Nice // talkin tuh you.
B:  I enjoyed talking.
A:⎡⎡Thank yeh very much.
B:⎣⎣Thank y'very much. Okay,
A:  Buh bye.
B:→ Uh—by the way : : :, Have a-a—Good luck in the hospit'l.
A:  Thank you.
B:⎡⎡Okay buh bye.
A:⎣⎣Mm buh bye.⁴⁰
```

It is by way of this fragment that a key point about side sequences in particular, and perhaps interactional phenomena in general, is raised. That is, "goodbye" would seem to be—if anything is—a structural part which is specifically a "last part." That "By the way" can be placed in following-adjacency to, and as a replacement for, "goodbye" suggests that there is a distinction between structural provisions and participants' work; where a given segment of talk is the result of the cooperation of those two; that is, is the result of participants' work in carrying out structural provisions. This point will be developed below.

Data has been used to locate places in which participants are engaged in "side sequences." These are demonstratedly subsidiary sequences for some on-going sequence, at least insofar as the objects that generate them are subsidiary objects. They are also possibly subsidiary sequences in that on-going sequences frequently can be found at some point, to pick up again. It remains to be seen if there are ways in which this second sense of "subsidiary" is a built-in feature of the relationship of side sequences to on-going sequences. One way to find that it is "built-in" is to find that there is a cooperating of structural provisions and participants' work.

Returning to the initial data, the verbatim report of the Marco Polo incident, it appears to be at least an *observer's* accomplishment that he found something he could call a "resumption" of the on-going sequence. Whatever did happen next, the observer's work has been to formulate it as a "resumption." This piece of observer's work will be used to suggest that "resumption" is an accomplishable object—that is, that there might be a kind of conversational work which provides for side sequence closure so that the on-going sequence can "resume."

A series of fragments will be examined by reference to the possibility of "resumption of an on-going sequence" as participants' work. These fragments are presented as cases of the same phenomenon that occurs in the initial data, with one difference—the ensuing events are available for examination. Thus, a possibility that could only be an observer's assertion in the initial data is something that can be looked for as an activity by participants.

To begin with, the structural provisions will be considered. What will be looked for is a triplet structure, analogous to the (s)–(m)–(c) triplet in the Misapprehension Sequences. As with the (s)–(m)–(c), ordered letters will be used to mark a possible "sequence" where, then, it will remain to be shown that something more than arbitrary notation is involved; that these "sequences" are mechanisms in which orientation to parts and to the relationship of these parts is involved.

The "sequence" here will be (O)–(S)–(R): On-going sequence, side-sequence, return to on-going sequence. Again, in order to more clearly exhibit the processes, liberties will be taken with the transcripts. Complete versions will be built up in the course of the discussion, and intact extended versions are supplied in the appendix.

I
A: Wouldju call somebody like that a *nut*?
B: No,
A: O Whaddiyuh *call* 'em. You can't say they're nuts,
B: He's a person who's well illuminated.

..
C: . . . "Well illuminate(hh)d"?
.. . . .
.. . . .
.. . . .
.. S . . .
B: Well eh well he's freed from all the eh inhibitions society imposes on him.

A: R Listen. When he had the responsibility—when he had the responsibility to take—take charge of—he was second in charge of the dorm . . .[41]

II
A: O They crank this thing down at th'bottom. 's funny lookin.
(1.0)
B: But the *air's* gotta come in there and the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.

..
C: S . . . "*Pixy* dust"!?
.. . . .
.. . . .
D: "Radioactivity" I *think* is what he means.

C: ⌊ (hh)Oh. Okay.

. .   ⌈ . . .

C: I don't see what a bomb shelter—

. .   R   . . .

C: Ey you know I don't see—I think it would be a great feeling
            ⌊ y'know sit around there . . .[42]

III A: ⌈ An' everybody's askin 'im t'dance.

B: An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna dance in private til he
       O learns how.

A: ⌊ And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and asks you, y'know,

B: ⌈ "Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"

. .   S   . . .

C: Well it's happened a lotta times,

B: ⌊ Okay okay go ahead.
           (1.0)

B: ⌈ So he says "no."
           (1.0)

B: R   Cause he's scared to admit that he can't dance an' he's scared to
          ⌊ *try.* Cause he's gonna make a fool of himself.[43]

That participants orient to such things as (O)–(S)–(R) as "parts," and parts in relation to one another, might be initially suggested by pointing out the use of items like "Oh. Okay" (II); items that can signal "satisfactory termination" of the action they follow. That the satisfactory termination of *an* action provides for the initiating of another action, and that participants produce actions according to that fact, might be seen via the "By the way" fragment (p. 315), where "Okay" is something like a "pre-final" object—that is, it at least *occurs* immediately prior to "Buh bye." That it is *placed* immediately prior to "Buh bye," i.e. provides for the initiating of "goodbyes," can be observed in that both parties use it that way, in one case one party using the other's "Okay" to provide for his "buh bye":

B: Thank y'very much. Okay,
A: Buh bye

. .   . . .

. .   . . .

B: Okay buh bye.

In (III) "Okay okay go ahead" not only signals satisfactory termination, but instructs that there now be a return to the on-going sequence.

Terms like "Oh, Okay" are so frequently associated with these side sequences that they might be included into the sequence as a potential component. Such a four-part sequence occurs in the initial data:

1) One, two, three, ((pause)) four five six, ((pause)) eleven, eight, nine, ten.
2) "E*le*ven"?—eight, nine, ten?

..   ...

..   ...

3) Seven, eight, nine, ten.
4) That's better.

It occurs in (II):

1) But the *air's* gotta come in there, and the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.

..   ...

2) "*Pi*xy dust"!?

..   ...

3) "Radioactivity" I *think* is what he means.
4) (hh)Oh. Okay.

and in the fragment below:

1) He likes that waiter over there.
2) Wait-"*er*"?
3) Waitress. Sorry.
4) That's better.[44]

The four-part version occurs in side sequences generated by other objects, for example in the Percy fragment:

1) If *Per*cy goes with—Nixon I'd sure like that.
2) *Who*?
3) Percy. That young fella thet uh—his daughter was murdered.
        (1.0)
4) Oh *yea : : h. Yeah.*

Where there is *not* a four-part sequence there may be characterizable reasons for its non-occurrence, and those will be considered shortly.

Orientation to "parts" and their relationship might be most directly observable on the larger part-scale of the (O)–(S)–(R), in the relationship of (R) as specifically a "third part" to (S) as a "second part." It is not merely that there *occurs* a return to the on-going sequence, but that to return to the on-going sequence from (S) is a task performed by participants, resulting in a sequence-part (R). It is performed in distinctive, characterizable ways.

Specifically, (R) is either attempted as a "resumption" or a "continuation," each of which is an apparatus with distinctive components and

techniques, which provide that—and which—return procedure is being initiated. In (I) and (II) there is an attempted "resumption," with "Listen" and "Hey you know" as first terms in utterances which in various ways implicate the talk constituting the on-going sequence. Such objects are regularly "attention getters" and signal, for example, that something that has been going on will now be re-attended. In (III) there is an attempted "continuation" with "So" as first term in the utterance which implicates the on-going sequence.

Where "resumption" might readily be seen to be of some interactional interest, the workings of "continuations" are such that they provide for their own interactional uninterestingness; that is, "resumption" *marks* that there is a problem in accomplishing a "return," while "continuation" is specifically directed, for example, to "covering up" the problem. In (III), however, that a "continuation" is an interesting matter becomes observable in that it is, in a strong sense, B's particular task to return to the on-going sequence; that is, he brought it to a halt, and apparently without good grounds, and he is now attempting to accomplish a return as a "continuation." In a sense, with the "continuation," he is attempting to "delete" the side sequence and tie directly to the on-going sequence.

Other data can then be examined for the occurrence of "continuation" as someone's attempt to get something done, where otherwise it simply appears that some sequence is continuing as a matter of course and not as the result of a particular technique. So, for example, a fragment introduced as an instance of the "affirmative repeat" yields an (O)–(S)–(R) structure with the (R) accomplished by the "continuation" apparatus, with the term "and" as a component. A glance at the fragment on page 318 will probably suffice to see the (O)–(S)–(R) structure; what will be shown here is the working of the device "continuation."

A: Uh she asked me to stop by, she bought a chest of drawers from um

. . . . .

A: Helen, um

. . . . .

. . . . .

A: Helen Brady.

. . . . .

A: And she—she says she's uh never had a new bedroom set so she's fixed this . . .

The work of "continuation" is specifically to incorporate the *content* of the side sequence into the syntax of the on-going sequence, but in effect deleting the *sequence* in which, for example, the name Helen Brady was found. In an exchange such as the Helen Brady fragment, this work is not readily seen, as compared to (III) where the intendedly deleted sequence involves a challenge. And perhaps "continuations" are differentiatable

from "resumptions" in the sense that, had A for the Helen Brady fragment used "Listen" or "Hey you know," she might be seen to be overdoing her return to the on-going sequence; a "continuation" is sufficient in that case, a "resumption" unnecessary; and the B for "Gi(hh)rl asks you to—", by using a "continuer" might be seen to be improperly using a "continuer," where "resumption" was appropriate; that is, "acting as if" the sequence had proceeded:

A: An' everybody's askin 'im t'dance.
B: An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna dance in private til he learns how.
A: And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and *asks* you, y'know,
.. ...
.. ...
.. ...
B: So he says "no." Cause he's scared to admit that he can't dance an' he's scared to *try*.

Again, note that the content of the side sequence (for which "And a goodlooking girl comes up to you . . ." is in a sense, the first unit) is preserved, while the syntax of the on-going sequence is invoked via the switch back from "you" to "he."

It may then be seen that a "return" to the on-going sequence is a task which, for alternative contingencies, is accomplished with alternative devices: "resumption," "continuation"; where the availability of such devices provides for manipulation of the talk in the sense that by using "continuation" participants can be proposing that there is no trouble, i.e. no "resumption" necessary, where that may not be the case. (cf. p. 300, where the first case may be an attempt to avert termination by proposing that talk is "continuing"; and p. 314, the issue of "still talking.")

Having raised "return to the on-going sequence" as a possible task, it can be noted that certain tasks have an assigned doer. Earlier the phenomenon of "time-outs" was mentioned. It can be further noted that for games that have formal time-outs it is specifically the task of an official to resume the game, in independence of the potential for closure within a time-out sequence. The game is resumed on an official's signal and resumed, for example, despite anybody or everybody's continuing interest in an injured player, beyond the moment when the player has been removed from the field.

That is to say, the potential for closure of the time-out sequence is enforced by someone whose task it is to accomplish a return to the on-going sequence, where in the first place the termination of the time-out may not be convergent with, for example, that the player has recovered. For game-activities, the issue is that he has been removed from the field of play. (And so it is for side sequences in conversation. The issue is to

"resolve the problem," and that is done by going through a certain sort of sequence. Although this procedure is strictly an abstract, formal procedure —that is, does not involve inquiries into why someone said a thing like "Pixy dust" or whether they are likely to say it again—it will be shown shortly that no such inquiries are necessary, no promises need be elicited. The procedure appears to be effective beyond its immediate occurrence.)

One way to locate the enforcer of side sequence closure, i.e. the assigned doer of the return to the on-going sequence, might be to apply a notion of "relative status" to the data, using items like "big sister"–"little brother," "therapist"–"patient," etc., to see if, for example, it is the higher status or lower status category which applies to the person who did a return, and whether there is any consistency across fragments. However, on some of the fragments there is insufficient information to set up such categories.

An alternative procedure would be to examine the materials at hand to see if there is some orderliness in the relationship of the return—and any given doer of it, to other action-units of the sequence and doers of them. A set of letters can be assigned to retain information on "which person," i.e. as a direct replacement for his name; a separate set of letters can be assigned to action-units within the (O)–(S)–(R) sequences, analogous to the (s)–(m)–(c) units within the Misapprehension Sequence.

This device will be applied to the three sequences initially selected as being "identical" to the Eleven fragment. In this case the action-units will not be "named," but will be designated simply "a" and "b." Thus, for example, A*a*(O) will indicate that person A is doing action-unit "a" for sequence-part (O). There is reason for separately designating speakers and actions in that it can be found that more than one person is doing what appears to be an "a" or "b" action for some sequence-part. For example, in (III):

A*a*(O):   An' everybody's askin 'im t'dance.
B*a*(O):   An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna dance in private til he learns how.
A*a*(O):   And a goodlooking girl. . . .

and (as will eventually be shown), in (I):

A*a*(O):   Whaddiyuh call 'im. You can't say he's nuts,
B*b*(O):   He's a person who's well illuminated.

D*b*(O):   He'll do anything for kicks.

For better accessibility, the utterances accompanying the lettered designations will be supplied.

I   Aa(O):   Wouldju call somebody like that a *nut*?
     Bb(O):   No,
     Aa(O):   Whaddiyuh *call* 'em. You can't say they're nuts,
     Bb(O):   He's a person who's well illuminated.

     Ca(S):   "Well illuminate(hh)d"?

     Bb(S):   Well eh well he's freed from all the eh inhibitions society imposes on him.
     Aa(R):   Listen. When he had the responsibility . . .

II   Aa(O):   They crank this thing down at th'bottom. 's funny lookin.
     Bb(O):   But the *air's* gotta come in there and the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.

     Ca(S):   "*Pi*xy dust"!?

     Db(S):   "Radioactivity" I *think* is what he means.
     Ca(S):   (hh)Oh. Okay.

     Ca(R):   Ey you know, I don't see what a bomb shelter . . .

III   Aa(O):   An' everybody's askin 'im t'dance.
     Ba(O):   An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna dance in private til he learns how.
     Aa(O):   And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and *asks* you y'know,
     Ba(S):   "Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"

     Cb(S):   Well it's happened a lotta times,
     Ba(S):   Okay okay go ahead.
     Ba(R):   So he says "no."

Glancing over the lettered sets *vis-à-vis* the doer of the return to the on-going sequence, it can be noted that: For (I) A is "a" for (O) and A is "a" for (R); for (II) C is "a" for (S) and C is "a" for (R); for (III) B is an "a" for (O), B is "a" for (S), and B is "a" for (R). Considering that for each of these exchanges there are co-present at least four possible speakers, that one person is found to do the "a" for (O) or (S) and the "a" for (R) seems to be the result of an orderly relationship between those sequence-parts and the doers of them.

Further, there are two specifically observable "non-occurrences": (1) No non-speaker-so-far is "a" for (R), and (2) no "b" speaker for (S) does the "a" for (R). It may be that the workings of who shall do the return to the on-going sequence are more delicate and particular than has

been sketched, but *vis-à-vis* the locating of whose task (R) might be, it is roughly and at least, a person who has done some "a" and has not become the doer of a "b" for (S).

Having as a possibility that "return to the on-going sequence" is a designatable task for some particular person, then it must be inquired whether it is a task that matters for its doer, i.e. is he "responsible" for its accomplishment. That might be suggested by noting that in each case the one who does the return gets it done "despite" some difficulty—that is, it apparently matters to the doer—if the amount of effort he is willing to expend to get it done is any measure. In none of the cases is the return simply and readily accomplished. In (I) and (II) the resumer works through competing talk, and in (III) the continuer works through others' silence, that silence following his instruction to "go ahead."

I   Bb(O):   He's a person who's well illuminated.
      Aa(O):   Well, he's—
      Ca(S):   "Well illuminate(hh)d"?
      Bb(S):   hehhehh
      Aa(R):   *Waita minute. When he—
      Db(O):   He'll do anything for kicks.
      Aa(R):   *No! No listen.
      Bb(S):   Well eh well he's freed from all the eh inhibitions society imposes
             on him.
      Aa(R):   *Listen. When he had the responsibility . . .

II   Db(S):   "Radioactivity" I *think* is what he means.
      Ca(S):   (hh)Oh. Okay.
      Db(S):   hmh hmh
      Ca(R):   *I don't see what a bomb shelter—
      Bb(S):   From that big bonfire in the sky hehh
      Ca(R):   *Ey you know, I don't see . . .

III   Ba(S):   Okay okay go ahead.
              (1.0)
      Ba(R):   So he says "no."
              (1.0)
      Ba(R):   Cause he's scared to admit that he can't dance an' he's scared to
              try. Cause . . .

An extensive consideration of how a task can be seen to "matter" to its doer will not be attempted here. However, Sacks has offered some preliminary remarks, by reference to the doing of "introductions"[45] as the sort of task for which there is some designatable doer, which is taken up by someone who finds that he is the one who ought to do it—without hesitation, without deliberation, and without any further "motivation" than that he is the one who ought to do it; that is, that the social organization that provides for his finding that it is his task to do "introductions"

may also provide that the doing of it should matter to him. "Return to the on-going sequence" might be considered analogously; that is, for the purposes of this essay it will be suggested that however it has come about that a task can be an assignable task for some person, so it has come about that the task will matter to him, specifically in the sense that having initiated it, or having done a single attempt is not sufficient, but he will attempt to accomplish it.

Having the person who does an "a" for (O) and/or (S) as the "responsible party" for (R) guarantees that there will be a return, in the same way that having an official present guarantees a return to the game after a time-out. In the case of games, the official is hired for a job that includes doing returns; in conversation the "official" is locally selected and is in a sense, self-selected—is, so to speak, a volunteer.

That the doer of the return is presented with difficulty in the accomplishing of the return is an issue that requires some consideration, and which may come about in the following way. As far as can be seen by examining long series of transcripts, for example, the group therapy sessions from which these particular side sequences were excerpted, which consist of five consecutive two-hour sessions, it can be noted that for various sorts of events there is recurrence of talk with reference to them, over the course of one session, or across sessions. These might be specifically nameable events—for example, "the time Al got into an argument with Ken." In general, one consequence of such a reference is that the argument may be re-generated. Such is not the case for the side sequences generated by a questioning repeat. Once the side sequence is terminated, i.e. once the on-going sequence is successfully resumed, there is no recurrence of talk with reference to the side sequence. Once terminated, it is done with, once and for all.

That may be consequential for events within a side sequence, in that one result of a side sequence generated by a questioning repeat is that the particular item dealt with is extinguished for that environment. It ought not—and in these data does not—occur again. And it may be noted that talk with reference to some prior event can be done with a single term, say, a "key" term. For example, in the fourth of the taped therapy sessions, reference to an event in the first is done with a single word, "Beatle."

ROGER: . . . I mean we don't have claws, or fangs or fur,
JIM: Some // do hhhehhh!
ROGER: —so we have guns.
KEN: hheh
ROGER: heh
KEN: You don't have // fur?
ROGER: I'm speakin of th'average human.
KEN: Hey—you don't have fur? Wh-what's that on yer head?

ROGER: Oh, n-n-
    KEN: D'you call that a mop?
    JIM: Yeah
ROGER: →It's a Beatle.
    KEN: "It's a Beatle." Ohh *no(hhhh)o*![46]
                (4.0)

If a single word can do that sort of work, then it is unlikely that the non-recurrence of the words dealt with in side sequences can be explained with, for example, that it is just one single word among the multitude of words which were produced in some ten hours of talk. Instead, its non-recurrence may be an accomplished fact.

Difficulty in accomplishing a return to an on-going sequence from a side sequence may derive from the issue of extinguishing the product-item of a questioning repeat in the following way: As long as the side sequence is in progress there might be a possibility that the one who did that item can provide that it is, in fact, acceptable, and may then recur. If the side sequence is terminated and acceptance has not been granted, then that item is extinguished. This would provide good reason for the "b" speaker in a side sequence to attempt to keep the sequence open, perhaps resulting in talk that overlaps the first attempt at a return to the on-going sequence. Consider (II) in which C performs action "a" for the side sequence and action "a" for the return, where B is observably proposing that he is "still talking" (cf. p. 314), such that the "a(R)" is initiated before B, the selected "b" for the side sequence has "finished."

Bb(O):   But the *air's* gotta come in there and the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.

      . .   . . .

Ca(S):   "*Pixy* dust"!?
Bb(S): →YOU KNOW FROM THE BIG BOOM?
Ca(S):   "*Pixy* dust"?
Db(S):   "Radioactivity" I *think* is what he means.
Ca(S):   (hh)Oh. Okay.
Db(S):   hmh hmh
Ca(R): →I don't see ⌈what a bomb shelter—
Bb(S):   ⌊FROM THAT BIG BONFIRE IN THE SKY hehh
Ca(R):   Ey you know, I don't see. . . .

That is to say, the item C selects as "Okay," and via its being acceptable initiates the return, is D's replacement for "pixy dust," "radioactivity"— and not B's whimsical explication "You know from the big boom?" Possibly, had "(hh)Oh, Okay" been placed after "You know from the big boom?", it would provide that "pixy dust" was, for example, accepted in light of B's explication, and therefore might recur in this place among

these people. Instead, a second questioning repeat is placed there, is "correctly" followed by an acceptable remedy which is followed by "Oh okay." And it can be noted that the term "pixy dust" does not recur. B's equally whimsical "continuation" of his explication, "From that big bonfire in the sky hehh," which overlaps C's attempted return to the on-going sequence may be produced specifically as an attempt to avert the closure of the side sequence so that "pixy dust" can be found to be, after all, acceptable.

The task of returning to the on-going sequence appears then to be not only a matter of "getting things going again," but also of enunciating whether some problematic object, after having been processed, is or is not acceptable for the given environment. Note, for example, in (III), the challenge having been done, it is in effect interrupted by the same speaker attempting to retract the uncompleted challenge with an acceptance.

```
Aa(O):   And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and asks you, y'know,
Ba(S):   "Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"
Ba(S):→ALRIGHT,
Cb(S):   Well it's happened a lotta ti⌈mes,
Ba(R):                                  ⌊OKAY OKAY GO AHEAD.
              (1.0)
```

Despite the attempted retraction, an appropriate "b" for (S) occurs, and B's "Okay okay go ahead" is characterizably not an acceptance of "Girl asks you to dance" after consideration of supporting material, for example; it is part of the attempted retraction. One possible reason for the noticeable balking of the others at taking up B's offered "continuation" return to the on-going sequence might be that, having been initiated the side sequence ought to have been gone through, and *then* a finding (acceptable / not acceptable) delivered.

It can be seen, then, that the one who initiates a side sequence is not thereby in a position to control certain features of it. As was mentioned earlier, he cannot control what will be made of some noticing of a prior item, where that is controlled by the on-going sequence of which that item is a part (p. 311). Here it is observed that co-participants may, by their talk or their silence, have some effect on the working out of a side sequence which the initiator did not necessarily intend, nor directly provide for.

Having mentioned the work of those co-participants who are not initiators of the side sequence, a further observation on the initial data can be made: that Nancy did not immediately, also, query Steven's "eleven." This can be proposed as an observable feature of the interaction in that people do produce simultaneous talk, and in the footnotes there is an instance of simultaneous production of a questioning repeat:

The first boy gets up and says, "If I'm elected vice-president I'll keep the room quiet, I'll be a good sport, and I'll help other people, and I'll ask questions . . ." finishing lamely.

several children say with disbelief, "*Ask* questions, *ask* questions!"[47]

The issue is somewhat more interesting than that perhaps Nancy does not do a questioning repeat when she should or could. It will be proposed that Nancy is doing a "continuation" of the on-going sequence. Again, the initial data is not transparent in this respect, since Nancy's appropriate action happens to be her silence—that is, her present game action is to be silent and stay away from Steven. Her next game action will be to yell "POLO!" when Steven has yelled "MARCO!" Therefore there is nothing to look at to see that by saying nothing she was doing something, specifically a "continuation of the game sequence." The excerpts under consideration, however, provide something to look at such that "continuation" can be a directly observable activity, as a "continuation" in contrast to a "break."

I   Aa(O):   You can't say they're nuts,
    Bb(O):   He's a person who's well illuminated.
    Aa(O):   °WELL HE'S—
    Ca(S):   *"Well illuminated(hh)d"?

        ..   . . .

        ..   . . .
    Db(O):   °HE'LL DO ANYTHING FOR KICKS.

        ..   . . .
    Bb(S):   Well eh well he's freed from all the eh inhibitions society imposes on him.

II   Bb(O):   But the *air's* gotta come in there an' the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.
    Aa(O):   °DOESN'T BOTHER ME ANY, ⌈I AIN'T GONNA LIVE IN IT,
    Ca(S):   *   ⌊"*Pixy* dust"!?
    Bb(S):   You know from the big boom?

III   Aa(O):   And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and *asks* you, y'know,
    Ba(S):   *"Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"

        ..   . . .

        ..   . . .
    Ba(R):   °So he says "no."

IV   (Not submitted previously as it is not a case of the "questioning repeat")
    Aa(O):   Like yesterday there was a track meet at Pallisades. Rees was there. Isn't that a reform school? Rees?
    Bb(O):   Yeah.
    Cb(O):   Yeah.
    Aa(O):   Buncha niggers an' everything?
    Cb(O):   °YEAH.

Aa(O):   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'—
Ba(S): *   ⌊YOU MEAN "NEGRO", DON'CHA?

(Note for this case the issue discussed on p. 297, of an adjacency-lapse permitting the one who is currently speaking to do an unsolicited remedy.)

Co-occurring within each fragment are two sorts of utterances, each of which stands as a possible "second" to the same prior utterance:

I)   "Well, he's—", "He'll do anything for kicks" : : "Well illuminated?"
II) "Doesn't bother *me* any, I ain't gonna live in it" : : "*Pi*xy dust!?"
III) "So he says 'no'" : : "Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"
IV) "Yeah" : : "You mean 'Negro' don'cha."

And in these terms, events in the initial data might be set down as: ((proper next game action)) : : "'E*le*ven'?—eight, nine, ten?"

The co-occurrence of provision for continuation and provision for break does not mean that (a) there is ambiguity as to whether or not something "wrong" occurred, or that (b) one hearer heard something wrong and another did not. The alternative actions are available to someone who *did* hear something wrong. It can at least be suggested that these are "either-or" options for someone who did hear something wrong; that doing a provision for continuation does not necessarily derive from not hearing something wrong, by noting that in the initial data Nancy provides a seconding of Susan's questioning repeat, i.e. says "E*le*ven?", and in (II) the replacement item for "pixy dust" is provided by one who is not selected to do the "b" for (S), i.e. D says "Radioactivity I *think* is what he means." In these cases, a participant other than the one who initially provided for a break in the on-going sequence, and who is at the very least by an omission providing for continuation, demonstrates his hearing of something wrong. In (III) some other than the selected "b" offers an explication—in this case supporting the contended utterance, ·"Well it's happened a lotta times"—but in doing so, he demonstrates that without further talk he knows what the issue is (cf. the "Hello" fragment, p. 328).

Since the focus of this paper has been the generating and terminating of side sequences, the issues involved in the availability of "continuation" as a pervasive alternative to the questioning repeat are somewhat ancillary. They are, however, relevant, and will be briefly sketched.

Hopefully the foregoing discussion will warrant a replacing of the terms "provision for continuation" and "provision for break" (and "questioning repeat," etc.) with the terms "pass" and "challenge" as more transparent and readable than the terms they are replacing. It can be suggested that one of the things a conversationalist must consider upon the occurrence of something he feels he ought to challenge is the task he

will be imposing on himself and his co-participants. That is to say, the choice of whether to pass some item or to challenge it is not a matter of selecting from among two equivalent actions. Decision to challenge is something conversationalists can know to be a matter of immediate consequence, in contrast to a decision to pass. Further, this is known—in the same way it is known by other participants—by the one who produces the item which, then, is either challenged and/or passed.

In looking over the data one might have a feeling that for some of the incidents, that item which becomes the product-item of a questioning repeat was, in the first instance, done "on purpose." A warrant for that feeling might be arrived at in the following way. Earlier it was proposed that such objects as the questioning repeat can select a product-item "despite" an adjacency-lapse (p. 297, ff). In examining the four fragments, one thing that is observable is that the adjacency-lapse is either minimal or non-existent, i.e. "utterance-adjacency" turns out to be, also, "item-adjacency":

I Bb(O): . . . well illuminated.
   Aa(O): °Well, he's—
   Ca(S): *"Well illuminate(hh)d"?

II Bb(O): . . . pixy dust.
    Aa(O): °Doesn't bother *me* any,
    Ca(S): *"*Pi*xy dust"!?

III Aa(O): . . . girl comes up to you and *asks* you, y'know,
     Ba(S): *"Gi(hh)rl asks you to—"

IV Aa(O): Buncha niggers an' everything?
    Cb(O): °Yeah.

It can be briefly noted that objects like "y'know" and "an' everything" are standard completion signals, whereupon someone else may speak. In effect, then, in each of the four cases the problematic item happens to occur at the end of the utterance. And in (IV), participants' orientation to the uses of an adjacency-lapse, to permit an unsolicited remedy, may be seen in that A, upon an initial "passing" of the term "nigger," is exhibiting the consequences of that term's being passed—that is, he is not merely then "using" that term again, but can be seen to be "pushing" it, specifically, for example, by correcting the term "guys" to "niggers": ". . . an' all the guys, an' y'know all these niggers are . . ." Note in the appendix that upon being challenged he re-corrects "niggers" to "guys." In effect he is using what is not an empty place to talk, but somebody's adjacency-lapse, to demonstrate that he takes "Yeah" as an acceptance of the term "nigger," and will not provide an unsolicited remedy.

This does not directly demonstrate that such items are being *set up* to

be challenged, but, for one, there are ways to do something wrong which are not so readily challenged; some utterance might require picking apart piece by piece (cf. the extended version of IV in the appendix). A corollary note is that to propose to be providing for a correction by repeating an error rests on an assumption that the one who did the error knows what constitutes its correction. Further, it might be asked, since there is at least someone who is willing to "continue," why does the "wrongdoer" not talk to that one, and perhaps provide that the challenge will be bypassed in the interests of the on-going activity (cf. p. 311).

In a sense, the production of an item which is not only wrong but is challengeable is a task which someone might accomplish. It provides for the relevance of a challenge where there is an available device for doing the challenge, for which there is a pervasive alternative—pass—and where a choice must be made, that choice being, so to speak, weighted in favor of not doing a challenge by virtue of the immediate consequences that will have—the initiating of a side sequence that sets up the problem for the challenger of accomplishing a return to the on-going sequence. (Here, "immediate" consequences in contrast to "long range" consequences," i.e. to pass some heard-as-wrong object, to not initiate procedures directed to extinguishing it, may result in later difficulties.)

The issue at the moment of the occurrence of a "challengeable" is: Will it be passed (and this appears to mean specifically, not challenged by anyone) or will it be challenged. Since it is available to all participants including the one who produces a challengeable, what sort of work a challenge will involve, this can be a way to discover, to measure, the import of any such item for a given environment, insofar at least as what is said in a place, among people, is a component of environment.

Appendix

1.a (GTS:2:2:7)

KEN: 'N I'm gonna keep *my* same place,
      (1.5)
AL: Oh, that's good. Glad fer you, showing yer authority.
KEN: Yah. Told Daddy I wanted it.
AL: You tol' Daddy. Big Daddy. *Mm* hm.
KEN: Daddy almost beat me up!
      (1.5)
AL: ⌈Good!
KEN: ⌊"Yuh c'n have it if yuh wannit. Damn kid," mhh
DAN: Are you serious, or are you—kidding?
KEN: No I'm serious. He said I could have the room if I wanted it, he didn't kid me,
DAN: No I mean uh // about beating you up.
AL: ((sung)) How dry I am,
KEN: Oh no hehhehh He just said uh,
      (1.0)
AL: I heard a real nasty // joke.
KEN: "I don't care, if you wannit you can have it."
ROGER: Hey you know I d-almost didn't make it here this morning.
      (1.0)
AL: Too bad,

1.b (GTS:1:2:15)

DAN: Well you seem as*toun*ded t'find that somebody could be that involved in something.
      (1.0)
KEN: hhheh hh In *the:m*?
      (1.5)
LOUISE: Some people *like* them,
ROGER: ((deep breath))
KEN: Wuh-d- // her whole *room* jus' got it wallpapered.
ROGER: ((cough))
      (0.7)
KEN: She jus'—she jus' got done rewallpapering it about a *month* ago,
      (0.3)
LOUISE: —with the pictures of the Beatle//s.
KEN: No. A-a month ago Mom had it done in this gra:sscloth, like junk *yih*know it looks like //Hawaiian—
LOUISE: Yeh I know we have it.
KEN: She came in there the other night with *Scotch* tape, an' (0.5) *Every* inch of the room. (0.3) You couldn'—the *roof* I think she's got done, in Beatle pictures.

2.a   (GTS:1:2:31)

KEN: Oh I-I-I never saw it before cause I was on the *ranch* when it—
          first came *out*. And it was so fun//ny,

ROGER: Do you own a ranch too?
               (0.7)

KEN: Well my father, *doesn' own* it, No it's just uh,
               (1.5)

KEN: —at a frien//d's (   )

AL: —just owns the state.
               (0.3)

LOUISE: ehhh t'heh
               (0.2)

KEN: ehheh No.
               (0.5)

KEN: No. 'e // jus'—he owns the—

ROGER: Does he own my hou//se?

(KEN):   hhhh
               (0.5)

(ROGER): heh//heh! hh hh // hh heh

AL: hhh! hhhh!

KEN: Yeh he bought it last—// (a week ago),

AL: hhh hhh
               (0.5)

KEN: I don't know,
               (0.7)

KEN: Prob'ly does.
               (0.6)

KEN: In fact I'm (al//ready)—

DAN: Wha//t're you expretting at Roger?

AL: Whh : : : : :
               (0.7)

ROGER: *No*thing. Every week 'e tells us something else h(h)e owns. 'r i-is
          in*vol*ved in y'know, an' ih—
               (1.3)

KEN: What. Seeing a movie? I don' *own* it. I cross my heart.

ROGER: Well i : : z (*dumb*) yihknow there's a lotta factories aroun' my
          house yihknow,
               (0.7)

ROGER: An' then I meet Ken an' founds out 'is father *ow(h)ns* 'em
          a(hh)ll hh/hehh!

(KEN):   hehheh

ROGER: hmhh He owns muh whole neighbuhood y'know heh hhh!

KEN: They've *all* got Norman Goss an' Com//p'ny written in big
          black wr—letters on 'em.

ROGER: Kind of—petrifyin'.
               (1.5)

KEN: And my *grand*father finally stepped out,
               (1.5)

2.b (GTS:2:2:16)

KEN: You wanna hear muh—eh my sister told me a story last night.
ROGER: I don't wanna hear it. But if you must,
(1.0)
AL: What's purple an' an island. Grape—Britain. That's what 'is sis//ter—
KEN: No. To stun me she says uh there was these three girls an' they just got married?
ROGER: ehh/hehh hhh hhh // Hey waita se(h)cond.
KEN: An' uh—
KEN: ( )—
AL: heh!
ROGER: Drag tha(h)t by agai(h)n hehh//hehh
KEN: There—there was these three *girls*. And they were all *sisters*. An' they'd just got married to three *brothers*.
ROGER: You better have a long talk with your sis//ter.
KEN: Waita—waita min//ute.
ROGER: Oh. // Three brothers.
AL: eheh
AL: eh//heh!
KEN: And uh— // so—
AL: The brothers of these sisters.
KEN: No they're different—mhh//hh
AL: You know *different* families. // (No link up.)
ROGER: 'S closer th'n be*fore*, // hhh
KEN: So—
AL: heh! hh hh
KEN: *Qui*et.
AL: hh hh // hhhh
KEN: So, first of all, that night . . .

3.a (GTS:1:1:35)

LOUISE: Hm—Now they're not even sure. You know there was another bullet? A little colored kid was brought in, you know when this happened I was watchin it, a little colored kid was brought in to the hospital with a bullet wound. And they never said anything after that.
ROGER: Why should it? It's in Dallas. heh (y'know?)
KEN: hhh
LOUISE: heh//heh
ROGER: Bullets are *intended* for little colored kids hehhehh
KEN: heh heh
ROGER: To keep 'em from growing up into big colored *men*.
LOUISE: heh
KEN: heh heh
LOUISE: No but I wonder what hap—why didn't they do anything about that bullet cause that was another wound. And // they said the only bullets had been—

ROGER: Well what are they gonna do about it? —Except remove it.
LOUISE: No! But that means that there was another bullet from a different direction, shot. That he // there was only two bullets could be *shot* from his gun.
KEN: Man, a colored kid?
ROGER: They rationalized it. They say heh heh
LOUISE: "It wasn't there it was all i(h)n his imagination."
ROGER: "It's a colored kid so somebody else was shootin' 'im" you know,
　　　　　　(2.0)
ROGER: Just so happens somebody was out coon hunting at the time.
KEN: hehhehhh You know in uh—
ROGER: Which is forgivable in Dallas.
KEN: In—
LOUISE: "For*give*able"? You get an honor.
KEN: In Vegas I heard . . .

3.b   (GTS:1:1:47)

AL: You know what Roger does he comes to a um—
ROGER: I must do something, // (   ),
AL: Yeah well you don't shave every once in awhile I think it's to show that you're older than us, isn't it?
ROGER: No, that's not I shave that's not I shave around Saturday night y'know cause going out Saturday night hhh // I mean—
LOUISE: You-you know—the rest of the week you don't shave but Sa(h)turday night.
ROGER: No I mean I usually shave in the morning except on Saturday when I shave at // night.
LOUISE: Mm
　　　　　　(2.0)
ROGER: Does it look bad?
AL: ⎡⎡heh heh it looks terrible!
LOUISE: ⎣⎣heh heh
KEN: hehh
ROGER: hehh I'll shave for you next // week.
KEN: ⎡⎡You dirty grub!
LOUISE: ⎣⎣You look like a common slob.
ROGER: Anybody got // a razor on 'em? hehhh
AL: He's gotta lotta company hehh
DAN: Well this fear, this fear of not being distinct . . .

I   (GTS:4:22)

KEN: No but—I mean—people like this—wouldju call somebody like that a *nut*?
ROGER: No
KEN: Whaddiyuh *call* 'em? You can't say they're // nuts,
ROGER: He's a person who's well illuminated.

KEN: Well // he's—

DAN: Well—"Well illuminate(hh)d"?

ROGER: hehhehh

KEN: Waita minute // when he—

JIM: He'll do anything for *kicks*.

KEN: No! // No listen.

ROGER: Well eh well he's freed from all the eh // inhibitions society imposes on him.

KEN: Listen. When he had th' responsibility—

KEN: When he had th' responsibility to take—take charge of—he was second in charge of the dorm. When I'd leave that j-dorm // that dorm would act perfect. No shit he-he'd rule with an // iron hand. Waita minute.

ROGER: hhh heh!

ROGER: Well then he was well in command of his—eh situation and all of his faculties and he knew when to ac' like an asshole an' when to uh
       (1.0)

KEN: Well I don' know

ROGER: uh sober up, an' he—an' // he had his own feelings of right an' wrong,

JIM: He-he—

II (GTS:2:2:19)

ROGER: I-*I* been thinkina buildin a fallout shelter.
       (1.0)

KEN: hh

ROGER: But I'd just throw parties th(hh)ere anywa(hh)ys hehh it'd be a fall *in* shelte(h)r heh//hh

AL: heh

KEN: Hey—
       (0.5)

AL: heh

KEN: Have you seen some a' these—fallout shelters?

ROGER: Yeah, I've seen so : : me,
       (1.0)

ROGER: Be a // *nas*ty place tuh hide fro(h)m the // co(h)ps

KEN: The lady—

KEN: Well— // the lady up the street just-just had one put in? About four days ago?

AL: hehh hh hh hhh! ha

(DAN): Mm hm?

KEN: And there's so // many—

ROGER: An' she threw a house war//ming! hh!

KEN: Waita minute

( ): ((cough))

AL: heh heh

KEN: Waita minute

ROGER: hh a // *bomb*! hehh hh hehh hh

KEN: She's gotta *gun* in it.

KEN: She's gotta gun hangin' there? And I said what's the gun for she said in case any a' my *neigh*bors wanna come in. // Yuh know?

AL: heh

ROGER: hehhh An' she invi(h)tes you i(h)n to // see it. hehh

KEN: Y'know?

KEN: I s'd—well— // well you know, / all yer neighbors 've gotta do is just put a little *mud* in that little air hole up there in the top an' *yer* all done. eheh

AL: Oh : :

AL: ("Come to my *nest*.")

     (1.0)

ROGER: That's wonderful little air hole an' all the radi//ation comin inna li'l ai(h)r // hole,

(DAN): ((clears throat))

KEN: No they *crank* this thing down at the bottom. It's funny lookin.

     (0.5)

ROGER: But the *air's* gotta come in dere an' the air is sorta infiltrated with little uh pixy dust.

     (1.0)

KEN: Doesn' bother *me* any,

AL: *Pi*//xy dust!?

KEN: *I* ain't gonna live in it,

ROGER: Y'know from the big boom?

     (2.0)

DAN: Ra//dio—

AL: *Pi*xy dust,

KEN: heh hh

DAN: Radioactivity I *think* is what he means,

AL: (hh)OH. Okay,

KEN: hh

     (2.5)

DAN: hmh hmh

AL: *I* don't see // what the bomb shelter's—

ROGER: From that big bonfire in the sky heh

AL: 'Ey you know I don't see—I think it'd be a great feeling y'know, // sit around there while everybody—

ROGER: It's a : : sinine.

ROGER: It's really *a*sinine, I (swear).

AL: I s—I do *too* because i-uh just think. It—*I* don' wanna walk out there you know, an' see all these—I wanna come out there, an'— might as well have one final bla : st you know,

III (GTS:5:37)

DAN: Well what about the guy that gets up on the dance floor, who feels that he can't dance.

ROGER: He's sca : red,

     (2.0)

ROGER: *Oh : :* wait. Mayb—he-he can't really dance. An' he doesn't wanna make an ass of himself.
    (1.0)
JIM: He wants to // dance but he can't dance.
ROGER: He doesn't want pee—
ROGER: Yea//h. An' he's—
JIM: An' everybody's askin' 'im t'dance.
ROGER: An' because he's scareda dancing he's gonna dance in private til he learns how.
JIM: And a goodlooking girl comes up to you and *asks* you, y'know,
ROGER: Gi(hh)rl asks you to—
ROGER: Alright,
KEN: Well it's happened a lotta ti//mes,
ROGER: Okay okay go ahead.
    (1.0)
ROGER: So he says "no."
    (1.0)
ROGER: Cause he's scared to admit that he can't dance, an' he's scared to *try*. Cause he's gonna make a fool of himself.
KEN: *I* can't dance, and—hell every time, every time the-the dance play—er every time there's a dance I'm always at it, an' I'm always dancin',
ROGER: An' yer al—yer dancing?
KEN: Sure. I can't dance worth shit, I just move around hehh 's all you gotta do,
DAN: There *are* images, evidently that any—every one of you have about yourselves though at any rate.

IV (GTS:4:23)

JIM: Like yesterday there was a track meet at Pallisades. Rees was there. Isn't that a reform school? Rees?
ROGER: Yeah.
KEN: ⎡⎡Yeah.
JIM: ⎣⎣Buncha niggers an' everything?
KEN: Yeah.
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, don'cha?
JIM: Well an' they're // all—
KEN: An' Jig // hehh
JIM: They're-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?
KEN: *Some* of 'em, yeah.
JIM: Some of 'em, // yeah, but when they get in groups look out uh you know? heh

KEN: The others would just as soon slash yer face as see yuh.

JIM: He // gets up there, an'

ROGER: W-why d'yuh put 'em all in one group? "I think—Negroes are cool guys."

JIM: I do *too*.

ROGER: Y-you // wait. You just said y—

JIM: But, *some*. But some *whites*'re a lotta, y'know, // some—

KEN: Yeah, some whites//'ll come up an' slash yer face.

ROGER: Well they're individuals. You // *know* that.

JIM: Yeah! They're *cool*. They're—bitchin guys.

ROGER: "Negroes are cool people and some of 'em are bad."

JIM: Y'know, some *whites* are bad, an' some— // are cool, so?

ROGER: Well—they're just individuals.

JIM: Yeah?

    (4.0)

KEN: But—Really. What wouldju call somebody like that. Wouldju call 'im a nut?

ROGER: No, I wouldn't.

JIM: No.

KEN: No—I mean—from what we've said. What wouldju call it.

[1] This fragment is excerpted from a collection of field notes made several years ago. Data designated FN are from that collection.

[2] The following fragments were excerpted from transcribed tape-recorded conversations between middle-aged women. This particular corpus is designated S. Data designated DA and NB are also from conversations between middle-aged women. The participants vary within a corpus as well as among them.

It is interesting to note that the apparent alternative to not mentioning some "trivial" matter is not an action which is appropriately described as equally trivial, i.e. "just mentioning it," but involves for example, "hurting someone's feelings."

S:2:2:3:15 B: But y-uh see, when we get used to people we'll just realize with Elaine she's gonna *do* this.

           A: Mm hm,

           B: *I* don't care,

           A: I don't ei // ther.

           B: I don't care a *bit*. I mean I wouldn't say anything to her for the *world*. And hurt her feelings.

S:1:12:28 B: And she *did* enc*ou*rage me, but uh she said she uh she says "W'l I just had to push Jean into buying that house."

           A: Uh(hhh)

           B: But uh I—so I never correct her, I // think "What difference does it make, // really," but,

           A: Uh huh,

           A: No : :

           A: None.

S:2:2:2:40 B: But uh she does, and uh she was doing that to me, But I don't pay any '*ten*shun // to her,

           A: Mm hm,

      . . . . .

      . . . . .

           B: Or I såy you know, . . . I say "What'n the hell're you talkin about,"

           A: hehhh hehhh hhhehh hh heh

[3] Barker and Wright have collected volumes of materials by following children through a day and recording what they say and do. The materials include observers' characterizations of the actions, and these characterizations were purposefully done as "lay" work. Among the actions specifically characterized were "repeats."

Margaret left her mother and ran to Mrs. Thomas. Margaret asked, "Where's Ellen?" Mrs. Thomas said, "She's at the show." HER VOICE SHOWED THAT THIS WAS A REPETITION.

(Roger G. Barker and Herbert F. Wright, *Margaret Reid: A Full Day Record*, p. 318, 1949, unpublished manuscript.)

She asked seriously and with a soft voice, "Is Ellen coming out?" I DIDN'T HEAR AT FIRST and asked her what it was she said. SHE REPEATED HER QUESTION, "Is Ellen coming out?"

(Ibid., p. 263.)

[4] Sacks has provided some discussion of the phenomenon of the "partial repetition form" as a "locator," specifically by reference to occurrences such as:

> A: I wanna fast car so bad,
> B: You wanna what?

(Cf. Sacks, Lecture 12, November 14, 1967, p. 2 ff.)

[5] NB:1:10.

[6] "Recognizable complete utterance" is a technical term developed by Sacks. For the purposes of this essay no more is intended by the use of that name than that an utterance appears to be completed. For the issues involved in "recognizable complete utterance" see the transcribed lectures, for example, Lecture 3, October 12, 1967, p. 6 ff.

[7] DA:3.

[8] FD:IV:77. Fragments designated FD are transcripts of tape-recorded phone calls between personnel at a large metropolitan fire department, and various civilian and professional persons.

[9] GTS:1:2:29. Fragments designated GTS are taken from transcribed tape-recorded group therapy sessions attended by teenagers and a therapist in his early thirties.

[10] Schoggen and other students of Barker and Wright have collected materials which include characterizations of objects in this essay called "questioning repeats"; these are characterized as expressing "disbelief," "real surprise," et cetera. In the following fragments it can be seen that they specifically provide for a "self-correction" from the recipient.

> The first boy gets up and says, "If I'm elected vice-president I'll keep the room quiet, I'll be a good sport, and I'll help other people, and I'll ask questions . . ." finishing lamely.
> Several children say with disbelief, "*Ask* questions, *ask* questions!"
> The speaker smiles broadly.
> He corrects himself in a self-deprecatory tone, "Answer them." He looks embarrassed though.
>
> (Schoggen et al., *Sammy Lewis*, Vol. II, 621–622, unpublished manuscript, 1962.)
>
> Patrick leans forward on the table, trying to puzzle out the score.
> He holds up his fingers, as though to count, and looks off in a preoccupied way out the window and says hesitantly, "6–8."
> "6–8?" repeats Ernie with real surprise in his voice.
> "6–4" says Patrick, correcting himself.
>
> (Schoggen et al., *Patrick Taylor*, Vol. I, 312–15, unpublished manuscript, 1962.)

In a corpus designated P356, consisting of calls to a large metropolitan police department, a "questioning repeat" is prefaced with an exclamation of disbelief:

> CALLER: She *is* in serious condition, an'—uh—and it could be, *qui*ckest way t'get *help* would be tuh take her *to* the hospital,
> DESK: Mm hm, Well ma'am, we don't have a squad available at this time, we are //
>   (   )—
> CALLER: Well I heard to beat! You don't have a *squa::d*?
> DESK: No, they're all tied up on other runs ma'am, . . . we simply do not have a squad. All of our squans 'r—squads are on runs at this time,
> CALLER: Well, I never heard to beat. Okay. Thank you.
> DESK: Yes ma'am.

[11] The term "laugh tokens" is used since it is here taken that "laughter" is a socially organized phenomenon not only in terms of its actual production, but that "laughter" is heard in contrast to, for example, "coughing." On some occasions persons apparently hear "laughter" when what has been done is "coughing," and go through an orderly laughter procedure, that procedure regularly involving that one party initiates and others "join in," i.e. overlap with their own laugh tokens:

A: heh // hehh heh heh
B: heh heh heh

This procedure can be observed where what has initiated it is in fact a cough:

A: khakhh//uhkk
B: heh heh heh

The cough can be seen to be generative of the sequence in that a second laugh token is regularly placed in overlapping-adjacency to a first. Also involved in the recognizability of laughter is that what has been on-going is (a) possibly a thing for which laughter is an appropriate next action, and (b) has proceeded far enough that it is seeable as such; i.e. coughing is not so likely to be heard as a possible laugh token when somebody has just started talking.

12 GTS:1:2:29.

13 GTS:2:2:89.

14 One of the base environments of "laughter" is following a joke, where its use demonstrates a hearer's finding that the joke has been successfully completed. Further, laugh tokens are used to signal or to attempt closure of interchanges. The familiar "curtain line" might be given a technical name like "pre-sequence terminator," and one can go through a corpus of conversations to find that quite regularly the occurrence of a curtain line and its associated laugh tokens are predictive of "goodbyes." Consider the following fragments excerpted from transcriptions of a two-way radio talk show, designated C:

C:1:43 A: Maybe he figured thet enny letter from en officer assigned t'the *Pen*tagon to a man working fer ((Radio Station)) might be suspishis en 'e better not d(hh)o (h)i(hhh)t,
      B: eh heh heh! hhh
      A: hhh
      B: Alright Tod, // (   )
      A: *Nice* talkin to // you sir.
      B: I won' holdjeh enny longer,

C:1:57 A: This is a business exchange. En that means when *you* dial hh ennything beginning with Falbrook *six* you've gotta very *good* chance of winding up talking to en empty *off*ice building.
      B: hhh! hh hmh!
      A: Mehhhhh! // *How* ever.
      B: [[(   )—
      A: [[I'm *sorry* abaht it.
          (pause)
      B: Thankyou
      A: Tha:nk you fer calling,
      B: Bye,
      A: *Good* night.
C:1:77 B: Don't talk, I've taken to vacuuming this daw(hh)g
      A: Ehhhh heh heh hah hah hahhh hah hah hah! Well that's about *it*!
      B: Okay Tod,
      A: Okay?
      B: Thank you very // very much.
      A: Thank you dear.
      B: Bye bye
      A: Mm bye bye.

15 "Assessments" very frequently occur as tag lines to anecdotes. They mark that the anecdote is completed. In the following case, an anecdote is overlapped by an announcement

that the session is over. Apparently the anecdote is then reduced to its minimal components and proposed to be complete by the addition of an assessment tag line.

GTS:3:82 KEN: Well, up at Camp Montrose one night, we went up there // (on our own)—

DAN: Well let's—

DAN: We're gonna haftuh call // it a day now.

KEN: They were havin a dance, we took the fire hoses an' washed everybody ou(hh)t. hehhh th' last night I was th(hh)ere.
(1·0)

KEN: That was fun.

DAN: Well, I'm sorry we won't be having you back.

LOUISE: I'm soh—I don' know-I-I c(h)an't—

DAN: We : : ll—

KEN: Well honey,—Goodbye.

That co-participants use the "assessment" to see that an anecdote is finished can be seen in the relationship of the pause to Dan's talk, and the relationship of Dan's talk to the assessment, where immediately upon completion of the assessment Dan initiates "goodbyes" to Louise, who is quitting the group.

[16] GTS:1:1:79.

[17] GTS:1:2:45.

[18] S:1:1:12:23.

[19] S:2:2:3:19.

[20] Schoggen et al., *Patrick Taylor*, Vol. I, 311–22, unpublished manuscript, 1962.

[21] GTS:5:29.

[22] NB:1:9.

[23] GTS:4:56.

[24] GTS:2:2:7.

[25] GTS:1:2:15.

[26] GTS:1:2:31.

[27] GTS:2:2:16.

[28] The orderliness of conversational interaction such that it can be described in terms of "rules" is an enormously generative notion developed by Sacks. It serves as a guide for observation of phenomena, for developing and testing analyses, and is a key notion for this paper.

[29] The notion of "utterance pairs" with question-answer as a prototypical instance has been rather extensively developed by Sacks. (Cf., e.g., Lecture 6, October 24, 1967.)

[30] GTS:2:2:23.

[31] GTS:1:1:35.

[32] GTS:1:1:48.

[33] See footnote 4.

[34] FN.

[35] FN.

[36] Schoggen et al., *Sammy Lewis*, Vol. II, 621–629, unpublished manuscript, 1962. The report as it appears in the manuscript uses the participants' first names as the items which, in this paper have been replaced by game-relevant designations, as follows: Pitcher—Sammy; Batter—Brian; Runner—Harry; Baseman—Craig.

[37] NB:2:4.

[38] GTS:1:2:47.

[39] GTS:3:17.

[40] C:2-22-68:62.

[41] GTS:4:22.

[42] GTS:2:2:19.

[43] GTS:5:37.

[44] GTS:1:1:23.

[45] Remarks can be found in Lectures 5 and 6, November 1968, and in one of several yet-to-be-transcribed lectures from December of 1968.

[46] GTS:4:5. In the transcript from which this was excerpted there is a footnote above Roger's "It's a Beatle" explaining that it "refers to GTS 1." This is a lay-observation derived from having heard GTS 1 and talk about the Beatles occurring in it, subsequently hearing GTS 4 with its possibly referential item, and Ken's "It's a Beatle. Oh *no(hhh)o*!" which was heard as a similar object to "Not *that* again!," i.e. recognition of the prior item's doing of reference to GTS 1.

[47] See footnote 11.

[48] GTS:4:23.

Studies
in
Social
Interaction

edited by DAVID SUDNOW

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE