

9. The fact that Mathew may have produced what might qualitatively appear as an impoverished possible topic initial does not account for the fact that Jenny does not topicalize it, for it is not bereft of topicalizable features. That is, although it might seem, as a qualitative matter, insubstantial, it is, nevertheless, topicalizable.

10. This extract is briefly introduced elsewhere (Button forthcoming a) though the points made here move beyond Button's observations.

11. This is not the place to provide an extended elaboration on topic nominations. It can be noted, however, that they can take the form of sequence initials that are oriented to the generation of topic. Their decisive feature seems to be whether or not the sequence initial utterance can provide for extended talk over a number of turns, or just provide for the immediate next turn. Thus in the example that follows in the text, the next speaker could respond in one of two forms. She could respond minimally with a positive or negative item or she could respond elaboratively. In the latter case she could display an orientation to a prior turn as a topic-nominating turn. A minimal answer, however, could curtail the topic potentiality of the prior turn. Topic nomination is given more comprehensive coverage elsewhere – Button and Casey (forthcoming). See also Casey (1981).

## 9. On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters

GAIL JEFFERSON  
*University of Manchester*

### 1. Introduction: disjunctive movement from a troubles-telling

In one of his unpublished lectures (April 9, 1976, p. 9) Harvey Sacks proposes that some topics (he mentions "embarrassing" and "controversial" topics) pose a particular sort of problem for conversation. To get off them and to go anywhere else from them, one has specifically to do "getting off of them."

In the course of an SSRC-funded project focusing on conversations in which various troubles are talked about, it became clear that talk about a trouble poses the sort of problem for conversation considered by Sacks. Indeed, it appears that a primary orientation to a troubles-telling is that from it, there is nowhere else to go; that getting off a troubles-telling is tantamount to getting out of the conversation itself.

That is, a massively recurrent device for moving out of a troubles-telling is *entry into closings*. Following are two prototypical instances, in which the entry into closings is offered with a reinvocation of prior arrangements. (See Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:317; and for a consideration of a phenomenon similar to that of fragment (2) lines 2–3, see p. 313; and G. Button, forthcoming a; forthcoming b.)

(1) [JG:I(S):X15:6]

1 P: 'hhh But I think it'll iron itself out,

2 M: I sure hope [so.

3 P: → I'll see you Tuesday.

(2) [Rahman:B:1:(11):5]

1 A: Never mind it'll all come right in the end,

2 J: → Yeh. Okay you go and get your clean trousers on.

3 A: [Yes.

4 J: → =ehh hhhh(h)I'll see [you in a few] minutes

5 A: [See you then]

As it happens, these two conversations, and many others, do rapidly .erminate. However, as Graham Button's work on close-sequences shows (forthcoming a, b), entry into closings does not automatically provide for termination, and further (and substantial) conversation can emerge. What is being noticed here is the *orientation* to a troubles-telling as constraining subsequent introduction of other matters, that orientation exhibited by the recurrent phenomenon of post-troubles-telling entry into closings.

Another troubles-telling exit device may be seen as a close associate of entry into closings. It involves *reference to getting together*, a matter that can entrain the making of arrangements. The making of arrangements is an activity recurrently associated with, and strongly implicative of, conversation closure.

## (3) [Frankel:HB:LL:12]

- 1 J: So: m-everything 'll be good and—  
 2 P: =That's good.  
 3 J: + M: aybe t'hh maybe next weekend if you  
 4 and Freddy want to come up,

## (4) [W:PC:III:1:3]

- 1 S: Oh: God we had the (.) police round all (0.2)  
 2 ni:ght, hh it was hectic. 'hnh So [I hardly got  
 3 = [any wo:rk done.  
 4 = [beep beep beep 13 X)  
 5 S: So: consequently I didn't get any wo:k done hardly.  
 6 (0.6)  
 7 S: Anyway.  
 8 (2.0)  
 9 D: → So you think— Can you come out for a drink tonight.

The matters in fragments (3) and (4) that are introduced following a troubles-telling may be characterized as *initial* references to matters which in fragments (1) and (2) are being *reinvoled* to provide for entry into closings.

Whereas the recurrent device for moving out of talk about a trouble, that is, entry into closings, and its related activity, reference to getting together, exhibits an orientation to such talk as drastically constraining the introduction of other matters, there is a device that stands in strong contrast. This device, in effect, provides *carte blanche* for subsequent talk. Nevertheless, it may be seen to exhibit an orientation to the prob-

lem posed by a troubles-telling for movement to other matters. This device is the *conversation restart*.

In his discussion of problematic topics cited earlier, Sacks proposes that a prototypical way to *do* getting off a problematic prior topic is to produce something that specifically marks that a new topic is going to be done; something that proposes "let's start a new topic"; for example, "So what have you been doing?"

Just such a device is recurrently used as a way to move out of talk about a trouble. Such a device may be characterized as not merely proposing to start a new topic, but as proposing to start the conversation afresh; thus the name "conversation restart." Following are two instances.

## (5) [JG:II:(a):3-4]

- 1 M: But anyway I figure that maybe he can, hh give me  
 2 something to: uh (.) you know bring this do:wn.  
 3 Cause God I can't afford to you know. (0.2) get  
 4 like tha:t?  
 5 (0.3)  
 6 S: °Ye:ah°  
 7 (0.6)  
 8 M: → 'hnh tch How are you,

## (6) [W:PC:1:(1):3]

- 1 J: I mean it's not good e<sub>nough</sub>. [ 'hh ( ) -  
 2 M: [It isn't. It isn't.  
 3 J: No:;  
 4 M: → 'hnh And what've you been doing this last week

In effect, a new conversation is begun with a "How are you"-type utterance; an utterance that massively occurs, and may be said to have its home just after the greetings that start off a conversation. Thus, other matters will not occur as a next topic to a troubles-telling, but as a first topic in a distinctive, freshly started conversation.

A close associate of the conversation restart is the *introduction of pending biographicals*, which may be characterized as a specific version of the restart's "How are you"-type inquiries.

## (7) [NB:IV:14:7]

- 1 E: 'hnhhhhh But hell if it costs five hundred bucks  
 2 I'm gonna get- we:ll,

- 3 L: Well don't you have insurance on that? <sup>Huh?</sup>  
 4 E: [Yeah.]  
 5 =Yeah.  
 6 L: Oh:  
 7 (0.3)  
 8 L: → So you're coming down in Ma:rch hu:h?

(8) [W:PC:1:(1):35:S]

- 1 M: 'hh Well you never know do you sometimes you  
 2 feel as if you don't want to stay in the same  
 3 place, 'hh that where you've been with your  
 4 parents: 'hh  
 5 Ye:s.  
 6 (.)  
 7 M: Mh:  
 8 J: [But uh:: anyway,  
 9 (0.3)  
 10 J: 'mptlk ( )  
 11 M: → car:d [By the way Janet did you get my anniversary  
 card?

A weak and general characterization of the range of troubles-telling exit devices displayed in the foregoing array is that they are *topically disjunctive*. Whatever happens after a troubles-telling does not emerge from it, is not topically coherent with it, but constitutes a break from it. Another feature that can be observed across the array may be characterized as *interactional cohesiveness*. Specifically, the one who proposes to depart from talk about a trouble does so with talk that is other-attentive. Whether blandly conventional – “I’ll see you Tuesday” and “How are you” – or designed for this particular recipient – “Okay you go and get your clean trousers on . . .” and “Janet did you get my anniversary card?” – the talk that breaks from a troubles-telling exhibits attention to the coparticipant.

This recurrent other-attentiveness may constitute a special warrant for the activities that follow a troubles-telling. In effect, a breaking away from talk about a trouble exhibits deference to it by preserving the interactional reciprocity that is a feature of such talk.

In the current corpus of troubles-tellings there are only two cases of talk that break away from a troubles-telling but are not other-attentive; that is, self-attentive disjuncts.

(9) [Frankel:TC:1:1:17-18]

- 1 G: I mean there wasn't nuh- anything that didn't  
 2 happen, that could've happened.  
 3 S: Right

- 4 G: 'hhh  
 5 (0.2)  
 6 G: So,  
 7 S: → I'm not surprised. 'hhh Listen, u-something very  
 8 very: cute happened last night at the Wherehouse.

(10) [NB:II:4:10:r]

- 1 E: Ah::, (0.2) it's not worth it to be on my feet.=  
 2 =you-know  
 3 N: [Ye:ah. Ri:ght.  
 4 (.)  
 5 N: Ah hah?  
 6 (0.2)  
 7 N: → 'hhhh Oh I was just out wa:shing window:ss: e-a:nd  
 8 ah (.) my mother called so I came in I thought well  
 9 while I'm in here and I looked at the clo:ck and  
 10 it's eleven thirty and I thought well: (.) they're  
 11 'hhhh they're un- surely they're U:P. you know I  
 12 knew it was kind of a:: sleep in da:y=  
 13 E: [Yeh  
 14 N: =but uh I didn't get home t:ll 'hhhh two last night  
 15 → I met a very,h very, n:ni:ce gu:y.

First, each of these instances may be seen to be exhibiting a version of a special warrant for the introduction of other matters after a troubles-telling. It happens that each of the only two self-attentive disjuncts in the current corpus are introduced with superlative assessments; something being characterized as “very very X.” In fragment (9), “something very very: cute happened last night,” and in fragment (10) “I met a very,h very, n:ni:ce gu:y.”

Second, in fragment (10), in the lead-up to the self-attentive new topic, are features that may be seen to orient to the appropriate post-troubles-telling procedures. There is a version of a restart (in this case, not the “How are you” -type utterance, but another object that recurs, and may have its home, at conversation openings, a report of “how I came to call you”),<sup>1</sup> and an exhibit of other-attentiveness in the making of the call (where the reported encounter may be a crucial item on the agenda of this call).

Thus, all of the disjunctive exits from a troubles-telling in the current corpus may be seen to be orienting in one way or another to the problematic character of a troubles-telling for the introduction of new topics.

A question raised by the foregoing array and its characterization is, what sort of talk would be specifically inappropriate after a troubles-telling? The following two fragments are offered as instances of such talk. In these cases a matter is introduced following talk that has not

been produced as a troubles-telling. The new matter is disjunctive and self-attentive, and is in no way processed to exhibit any particular war-rant for its occurrence here and now.

(11) [Rahman:B:2:(14):8]

- 1 G: I was gonna take it in for you and get the ticket.=  
 2 L: Oh no- it doesn't matter Gwe-ah actually I think it's one on Vera's ticket anyra,te I think it's]=  
 5 G: =in the name of Manners=  
 6 L: [Oh ye- hhhh] heh heh 'eh:-:  
 7 G: =([but I'm not su're, but one of them are:=  
 8 L: 'hhhhhhhh This i s th-  
 9 G: =([you know,] [So- I'll take them all in,  
 10 L: an:d uh:m [Mn,  
 11 G: [Ye:s:.. (0.3)  
 12 L: check them  
 14 L: → ([I'm gonna do some spaghetti an:d (.) n-eh::m  
 15 G: meatballs for tea for this lot now,  
 16 L: Oh lovely.  
 17 G: Cause they didn't have u they only had fish fingers and chips for dinner,

(12) [TCI(b):16:59-66]

- 1 J: I went with uh::m (.) Fay one day, ahndh iht was really wierd. 'hh I went in there because she wanted to get some clothes for her little (.) girl.=  
 4 L: =Ye-ah,  
 5 J: [for her doll for Christmas. 'hhhh And so we go i::n and she starts looking through them and I start looking through them  
 6 . ((ca. 65 lines omitted re finding all sorts of nice gifts for her own children))  
 74 J: Oh I came outta there and here I was only going in with her and I came out with almost nine dollars hh=  
 75 L: =Yhhhh-hhhh [↑'h u :h] 'h u 'ehh  
 76 L: =worth of s]t(h)u(h)u(h)u [↑huh-huh]-huh 'hhh Just those thi(h)i(h)ngs. 'huh 'he:hah'h  
 77 J: those thi(h)i(h)ngs. [↑'h [ 'n  
 78 L: [O h [ : : : : : ]  
 79 L: [A:ow!:]  
 80 bo::y, 'h,hhhh and I] charged it=  
 81 L: [M m : : : : : ]  
 82 J: =and if Jack °ever finds out I'm gonna be

- 84 L: murdered.° hh-h hhhh  
 85 L: hbeh-hbeh-hbe h  
 86 J: = 'hhhh]hh Right on the spo:t. uh-huh heh huh=  
 87 J: =knhhhh-hhhh-hhh-hh  
 88 L: . . .  
 . . . ((ca. 20 lines omitted re managing it so that Jack won't find out, by being first to pick up the mail))

- 111 J: But I thought well I'll go ahead, and, 'hh and pay for it when it comes and °he'll never kno:w.°=  
 112 L: =Ye:h, =  
 113 J: =°(we, [got anything]°) heh-heh-huh=  
 114 L: =°(we, [hbeh huh ehuh]°) heh-heh-huh=  
 115 L: =°(we, [hbeh huh ehuh]°) heh-heh-huh=  
 116 L: =°(we, [hbeh huh ehuh]°) heh-heh-huh=  
 117 J: =°(we, [hbeh huh ehuh]°) heh-heh-huh=  
 118 J: Except when Christmas comes a-a-] and 'hhhh=  
 119 L: [°Oh°° [Ye a h h]  
 120 J: =he says where'd you get all thahheh heh [hh huh]=  
 121 L: =huh hu h huh°huh°°hn°  
 122 J: =huh hu h h h h]Santa Claus.hhheh-h,eh  
 123 L: Clause brought it. (in his sle::d).=  
 124 J: =hn]hh [hn-hn--hen huh=  
 125 L: [Ye : a h. [°hh  
 126 L: =Uh:::°m, [°hhhhhhhhhh° ( )°.  
 127 J: [I found a recipe: that I'm gonna try., (0.5)  
 128 L: O think,  
 129 L: (.)  
 130 J: [°Uh huhm°  
 131 L: [It's u h ], for popcorn balls that you make it with 'hb-'hh you melt butter: an:::d miniature marshmallows.=  
 132 J: =°Oh:::° [And then you [ a d ] just one package of raspberry flavor Jello.  
 133 L: (.)  
 134 J: °hhhh° [°Oh:::°] [You just sprinkle that in there. [D[ry] ]  
 135 L: . . . ((ca. 30 lines omitted re the recipe))  
 175 L: So I thought oh that'd be fun I think I might, let LeAnne do it. You know . . . and help her.

The utterances that are located as disjunctive and self-attentive introductions of new topics with no particular warrant for their introduction here and now are, in fragment (11): "I'm gonna do some spaghetti and (.) n-eh::m meatballs for tea" (lines 15-16) and in fragment (12): "I found a recipe: that I'm gonna try:" (lines 130-131).

The bland introduction of such matters may exhibit/propose the topical non-problematicness of the prior talk, that is, may exhibit/propose that *any* next topic is appropriate here and now.

It is just this sort of blandly self-attentive topical disjunct that in the current corpus is absent from, and may be generally constrained from, the next position to a troubles-telling.

## 2. Stepwise transition from a troubles-telling

Whereas exit from a troubles-telling is for the most part done by means of other-attentive topical disjuncts, there is an alternative troubles-exit device; one that is not disjunctive and thus does not abruptly boundary off the talk about a trouble, but that *gradually disengages* from it over a span of talk. This device operates in what Harvey Sacks talks of as a stepwise fashion. He proposes:

A general feature for topical organization in conversation is movement from topic to topic, not by a topic-close followed by a topic beginning, but by a stepwise move, which involves linking up whatever is being introduced to what has just been talked about, such that, as far as anybody knows, a new topic has not been started, though we're far from wherever we began. (lecture 5, spring 1972, pp. 15-16)

Several instances of stepwise transition out of troubles-tellings are evident in the current corpus. Of those, three have been selected that have in common a particular sort of work this device can accomplish.

In one of his discussions of stepwise movement, Sacks notes that it can be exploited to introduce otherwise "unconnected" matters: "If you have some topic which you can see is not connected to what is now being talked about, then you can find something which is connected to both, and use that first" (lecture, February 19, 1971, pp. 15-16).

Just such a procedure may be used in the two following fragments to arrive at matters that may not merely have no particular topical connection, but that may be inappropriate next topics to a troubles-telling.

(13) [NB: IV:10:18-21]

- 1 E:1→ If I'd just gone down there and spent my  
2 Thanksgiving like, Tillie wanted me to, why

## On stepwise transition

3 I would of had no problems, and hell with the  
4 Thanksgiving dinner. I'm through. I'm not gonna  
5 do anything anymore.  
6 (0.6)

7 L: Yeah.  
8 E: [[I'm n- ... I'm not gonna plan things anymore. I

9 mean this is ridiculous, course I know Mister  
10 Cole's sick, let's God let's hope he gets well, but  
11 'hhhhh I know the problem hhh you know, hh

12 L:3→ What does he ha:ve.

13 E: 'hh Oh he's got this gallbladder, and uh, they-  
14 he's vomiting and everything they took him to the  
15 hospital and I don't know how long he's gonna be  
16 in or what the t- well he's gonna be eighty four:r.  
17 (1.0)

18 L: Yea:h. Well-

19 E: [And he's quite a playboy, you know,

20 L:4→ Yeah, you just got to be caref-well see, 'hh Dwight  
21 only has- one gall bladder?

22 (1.0)

23 E: Mm hm,

24 L: He had- and then he has to be careful what he eats,  
25 he can't eat anything greasy or anything you know,

26 E: Mm hm,

27 L: Co:d what a ma:n. He was out there this morning and  
28 he- they have these great big olive trees all over  
29 you know,

30 E: Mm hm,

31 L: And the wind was so bad that the-the-th- the  
32 branches were hitting the house, and God, (0.3) uh,  
33 I got up about well, it was about eight o'clock,

34 E: Mm hm,

35 L: [and here he's up there sawing those off, you  
36 know,

37 E: Mm::: wonderful.

38 L: [M a n he's ( )-

39 E: [God he's about sixty seven or  
40 eight.

41 L: Yeah. Sixty seven.

42 E: God love him.

43 L: But man, I mean they really, They've really got ul-  
44 oh: God what a house. You have no idea.

. . . ((ca. 11 lines omitted re the house))

56 E: 'hhhh eh: Is the swimming pool enclosed with the  
57 gla:ss bit?=  
58 L: =No::, it's uh: ou:ts- (.) eh no outside the big  
59 (.)

60 E: [Mmhm,]

61 L: [uh::: ] gla:ss doo:rs.  
62 E: [hah,°

- 63 L: y-I got that wrong,  
 64 E: On that's, that's okay, ] hhhhhhh ] the water is, eighty  
 65 L: f i : : v e .  
 66 E: [On I know it. Isn't it gorgeous, =  
 67 L: -But you know when you get out it's kind of co:ld.=  
 69 E: [(Ch: oh) y a : h ]  
 70 L: 5→ =[[Well it was, ] two o'clock in the morning and  
 then last night.  
 71 E: [°huh]haw h'awh ha].w.°  
 72 E: [(Oo I(h) bet, that was (fu:n.) ]  
 74 L: [°n h h h h h ]-hn-hn-hn with no: ]c-  
 75 L: 'hh\_hh  
 76 E: ['hhh 'hh  
 77 L: ]clothes on God it's good., hu-uh huh, huhh ]  
 78 E: [°aaaaaa: : : : : : ] I s n 't that ]=  
 79 L: 'hh  
 80 E: =excit:ing,  
 81 L: Uh: ]:?  
 82 E: [Q: that's wonderful,  
 83 L: had so much fun in my li:fe.  
 84

(14) [NB:IV:14:12-14]

- 1 L: 1→ But eh-it's-its terrible to keep people ali:ve and  
 2 you know and just let them suffer, day in and day=  
 3 E: Right,  
 4 L: =out, it's-  
 5 E: [They don't do that with an animal.((sniff))  
 6 (0.5)  
 7 E: (You know:w,)  
 8 L: Yeah.  
 9 E: Oh well, bless his heart Well, we don't know what=  
 10 L: ((sniff))  
 11 E: =it's all about I g-I-((sniff)) Don't get yourself=  
 12 L: [O h I' m n o t . I j u s t - y o u k n o w I w i s h ]=  
 13 E: =[[Honey you've got to get aho:ld of your- I know ]=  
 14 L: 2→ =I'd- I'd kind of liked to gone out there but I was  
 15 afraid of the fog I was gonna drive him in:-- l-'hh  
 16 last night. but,  
 17 E: 3→ [°hn Oh it was terrible coming down even this=  
 18 L: But-  
 19 E: =morning.((sniff))  
 20 L: But San Diego? I c- I couldn't believe it last  
 21 night. We left there about, hh eleven thirty (. )  
 22 and it w- (. ) it was clear all the way up until we=  
 23 hit, (1.0) y-uh: the, thē uh Fashion Square here  
 24 L: in Balboa. I couldn't believe it, and we went into, =  
 25 in Balboa. I couldn't believe it, and we went into, =  
 26

- 27 L: =you couldn't even see:.  
 28 E: 4→ Oh God it's terrible. ((sniff)) That's why well we  
 29 didn't get home til two o'clo:ck. Got it's-  
 30 (0.2)  
 31 E: beautiful-  
 32 L: [[It was ter'rible in to:wn?  
 33 E: 'hhh\_hh  
 34 L: ((snort))  
 35 E: 'h Oh we just got into bed at two: . I wasn't gonna  
 36 (. ) go down, wait let me turn this fa-uh:  
 37 (0.5)  
 38 E: 5→ You know we w-this par:ty and then we went to  
 39 another little party a:fterwards and ch I met so  
 40 many f:fa:bulous pees- (. ) people and danced with  
 41 my poor old toes with no t(h)enails and I was  
 42 in- 'hhh hh(h)igh (h)h(h)uels and 'hhhh and ch: =  
 43 L: [°rnh hmh  
 44 E: =we (. ) just had a (. ) beautiful time.

Most roughly, although each fragment starts up in the course of a troubles-telling, at its end a coparticipant is reporting a very good time. In fragment (13), starting with a troubles-teller's "I'm through. I'm not gonna do anything anymore," the talk somehow arrives at a point where the coparticipant is reporting "I never had so much fun in my life." In fragment (14), starting with a troubles-teller's "But eh-it's- it's terrible to keep people alive and, you know, and just let them suffer day in and day out," the talk somehow arrives at a point where the coparticipant is reporting "Oh: we (. ) just had a (. ) beautiful time."

Whereas in fragments (9) and (10) a shift from a troubles-teller's "I mean there wasn't nuh- anything that didn't happen. that could've happened" and "Ah::, (0.2) it's not worth it to be on my feet" to a coparticipant's "something very very: cute happened" and "I met a very, h very, n:ni:ce gu:y" occurs disjunctively, as the introduction of a new topic, in fragments (13) and (14) the report of a good time is worked in such that, as Sacks has it, "a new topic has not been started, though we're far from wherever we began" (lecture, April 9, 1971, p. 9).

The latter pair of fragments exhibit features in common; features by which the "somehow" arrival at a report of a good time may be seen to be systematically achieved.

Following is a rough sketch of a series of moves that can be located in each fragment. Across the series, a troubles-telling may be seen to be itself moving away from the trouble per se, and the movement provides a resource that is taken up by the coparticipant and turned to the introduction of otherwise inappropriate materials.

(1→) The fragments start up in the course of a troubles-telling at a point that might be characterized as *summing up the heart of the trouble*: In fragment (13) lines 1–9, “If I’d just gone down there and spent my Thanksgiving like, Tillie wanted me to, why I would of had no problems . . . I’m not gonna plan things anymore. I mean this is ridiculous,” in fragment (14) lines 1–13, troubles-teller’s “But eh-it’s-it’s terrible to keep people alive . . . etc.” through troubles-recipient’s “Honey you’ve got to get ahold of your (I know).”

(2→) *The troubles-teller turns to matters that*, although on-topic with and part of the trouble, are not at the heart of the matter, but *are ancillary*: In fragment (13) lines 9–11, “course I know Mister Cole’s sick . . .” (In this case, Mister Cole’s illness stands as a possible obstacle to the problematic Thanksgiving dinner that is being produced, in part, to reconcile a rift between the troubles-teller and her husband.) In fragment (14) lines 14–15, “I’d kind of liked to gone out there but I was afraid of the fog I was gonna drive him in . . .” (In this case, the troubles-teller’s husband’s mother is dying and he has flown out to be with her; troubles-teller is accounting for not having driven him to the airport.)

It is possible that the combination of (1) summing up the heart of the trouble and (2) turning to ancillary matters constitutes a recognizable movement by the troubles-teller toward closure of the troubles-telling. If that is so, then the recurrent and perhaps most appropriate sequel to troubles closure is projected; that is, termination of the conversation itself. Although there are other options, that is, the troubles-recipient can find some other-attentive pending biographical with which to sustain the conversation, or might hope that the troubles-teller will produce an other-attentive restart, such as inquiring into the troubles-recipient’s circumstances, a most local and elegant resource is taken up.

(3→) Perhaps specifically at a point where the talk is recognizably moving toward closure of a troubles-telling, the *troubles-recipient* produces talk that *topically stabilizes the ancillary matters*: In Fragment (13) line 12, by reference to Mister Cole’s illness, the question “What does he ha:ve”; in fragment (14) lines 17–19, by reference to the fog constraining the troubles-teller from driving her husband to the airport, “Oh it was terrible coming down even this morning.”

Whereas each of these utterances can be seen to be working on behalf of a telling in progress and its teller, fragment (13)’s “What does he ha:ve” soliciting further talk, and fragment (14)’s “Oh it was terrible . . . etc.” warranting the troubles-teller’s disinclination to drive in the fog, each of them *potentiates further talk by the troubles-recipient*.

The ancillary stabilizer of fragment (13) is a question. In various lec-

tures Harvey Sacks proposes that it is not merely that a question sequentially implicates an answer, but that following the answer, the questioner has the right/obligation to talk again (to comment, to ask another question, etc.).<sup>2</sup> That is, a question projects not only a next slot occupied by talk of the answerer, but a post-answer slot in which the questioner will talk.

The ancillary stabilizer of fragment (14) “Oh it was terrible coming down even this morning” invokes the relevance of the troubles-recipient’s own experiences, via which she was enabled to make such an observation.

So far, then, it can be observed that a troubles-recipient may be taking up an opportunity to topically stabilize a troubles-telling at a point where it has moved away from the heart of the trouble but has not yet arrived at closure of the telling (such closure being potentially problematic for further conversation or for the introduction of other materials), that is, to sustain conversation at some distance from the trouble *per se*, and, further, to potentiate talk by the troubles-recipient.

(4→) *The troubles-recipient produces a pivotal utterance*; one that, though recognizably on topic, has independent topical potential: In fragment (13) lines 20–21, by reference to the troubles-teller’s report of Mr. Cole’s gallbladder condition, “Well see, ‘hh Dwight only has-one gall bladder” (Dwight being a member of the couple with whom the troubles-recipient has just spent a vacation),<sup>3</sup> in fragment (14) lines 28–29, by reference to the troubles-teller’s report of last night’s unbelievable fog, “That’s why well we didn’t get home till two o’clock.”

In each case the pivotal utterance constitutes the talk potentiated by the ancillary stabilizer. In fragment (13) it occupies the post-answer slot projected by the prior question, and in fragment (14) the troubles-recipient’s own experience, invoked by her warranting of the troubles-teller’s fears, now begins to emerge.

Thus, move (3), the ancillary stabilizer, may be seen as a possible move toward some other matters, and move (4), the pivot, as a possible emergence of those matters. In move (3) each fragment is strongly other-attentive. The inquiry of fragment (13) constitutes a display of special interest; the warranting of the troubles-teller’s fears in fragment (14) constitutes an affiliation with her.

What may be an initial move from a troubles-telling toward other matters, then, is produced with the interactional cohesiveness of the transparently disjunctive shifts considered earlier. In like manner, the strong other-attentiveness observable in this pair of fragments may constitute an orientation to the problematicness of the shift now under way.

(5→) Thereafter, matters that may specifically constitute the *target* of a series of moves are arrived at. In fragment (13), someone with a similar condition having been mentioned, he is focused upon, "Go:d what a man:" (line 27); his activities *vis-à-vis* the house are mentioned (lines 27-36); the house itself is focused upon, "God what a house" (lines 44), with its various facilities, including the swimming pool (lines 56-68), and mention of the swimming pool leads to mention of nude swimming (lines 70-77) about which the assessment is produced, "Oh:: God we had. we, I never had so much fun in my li:fe" (lines 83-84).

In fragment (14) the arrival at the target matter is achieved rapidly once the fact that "we didn't get home til two o'clock" is introduced, with the report of the event that accounts for that late arrival (lines 38-42), about which the assessment is produced, "we (.) just had a (.) beautiful time" (line 44).

In these two fragments, as Sacks proposes, the coparticipants are "far from where they began," but there has been no point at which someone has started a new topic. Rather, there has been a "linking up" of two unconnected topics via materials related to both.

### 3. An exploration of a single problematic instance

A third instance of stepwise transition from a troubles-telling will be elaborately considered. Its features are remarkably similar to those of fragments (13) and (14) but at a point they part company. Specifically, the sort of material that, in fragments (13) and (14), have been identified as the possible target of some prior stepwise movement; that is, the report of a very good time, is produced, not by the troubles-recipient who has done moves (3) and (4), but by the troubles-teller.

The troubles-recipient has been working toward another sort of talk that may be constrained from occurrence in the next position to a troubles-telling, the blandly self-attentive type of material instanced in fragments (11) and (12). In various ways, however, the environment is so nicely ripe for the introduction of otherwise inappropriate materials that such talk is produced by the troubles-teller, preempting and delaying the introduction of the matter toward which the troubles-recipient has been moving.

(15) [Rahman: 1:4-6]

- 1 G: And [Danny] didn't get in so I didn't go: typing  
2 last ni:ght, =

- 3 L: =Didn't y<sub>ou</sub>:  
4 G: 1→ [↑No: I ca- I thought well I c<sub>an</sub>'t leave=  
5 L: [O h : : : : :  
6 G: =him for two hours if I'm if he's crying when I've=  
7 L: n:No.  
8 G: =left him for one.  
9 (.)  
10 L: Oh: dear me.  
11 G: So: I euh you know as I say I didn't get  
12 t o t y p i n g .  
13 L: [Oh::: you're well tie:d dow:n aren't you.  
14 G: [Well I am  
15 rea: lly: °Yah, °  
16 L: [°Ye: h, °  
17 G: Ye:s you know [cause he do<sub>e</sub>sn't he f<sub>h</sub>ates being in=  
18 L: [°y e a : h °  
19 G: =on his ow:n for some pec<sub>u</sub>liar reason and I mean=  
20 L: [y e : h ?  
21 G: =he always kno(h)ws: where I'm going and [okh! °hh  
22 L: [y: : Ye:s.  
23 L: [↑you know approximately what time I'll be, [y e s °  
24 G: [Ye:s.  
25 L: Cause Norman said in the morning would I take him  
26 G: 2→ to Saltbern and I said well uh'hih hi don't kno:w  
27 the roads are so ba-ad I(h) mi(h)ght not (.) make  
28 fi:t.=  
29 =No:°? No- Were they very ba:d, Gwenni<sub>e</sub>, ( )  
30 L: [Emm, - no it  
31 G: wasn't it's just that you can't go: so fas:t=  
32 =you kno<sub>w</sub>-you-You kn<sub>ow</sub> you just have to: be that=  
33 G: [N o : : : : N o .  
34 L: =little bit more ca:  
35 G: =I think it's that little bit  
36 L: 4→ wa: rmer toni:ght i:sn't it  
37 [Oh it is i't's not so, bad it's: : ]=  
38 G: =[[really n o t ]  
39 L: [qui:te as se'vere toni:ght, n ]=  
40 G: [M m : : . No, but it's  
41 L: it's eh (.) melted, but I th- if it freezes tonight  
42 G: it'll be wo: rse tomor<sub>ro</sub>w mor:ning I think, ]  
43 only thing, y e:s,  
44 [Ye:h,  
45 L: Well I think I'll stay in bed in the mor:ning  
46 [Ye: h  
47 G: =I do<sub>n</sub>'t bla:me you?  
48 L: [nhh hnh hnh ]beh he h 'hk  
49 G: [h h h e y ]listen 'hhh  
50 G: You should have come on Tue:sd<sub>ay</sub>,  
51 L: [h h h e y ]listen 'hhh  
52 G: (5)→  
53





- 6 those hours ing projects?  
 7 R: → Oh have you ever taken them Mulholland  
 8 time trials? 'hh You got there with a girl . . .

In the following two fragments the occasioned item appears in close proximity to the utterance in which the occasioning item has occurred. In the following fragment, one participant has momentarily gone "off line" to talk to her child.

(17) [TCI(b):16:41-42]

- 1 L: → Honey you have to put a shirt on with that.  
 2 (.)  
 3 L: Not just [n' t'ha:t.  
 4 J: → Oh: Shirt. 't'hhh I have a red  
 5 shirt,  
 6 (0.2)  
 7 L: Uh hu:h?  
 8 J: [Si:::ze,hh (0.3) four?]

(18) [SBL:2:1:5:12]

- 1 T: But uh then when I found out the water was off, and  
 I saw everything just (drooping) its head, even  
 3 the dahlias,  
 4 B: Uh huh,  
 5 T: I thought well good lord, I can't let the yard do  
 6 that, so-  
 7 B: [Saying-  
 8 B: → Saying dahlias, I just cut some fresh dahlias at my  
 9 neighbor's this evening, and had fresh flowers m-  
 10 all fixed up for you.

The relationship between the occasioning item and that which it occasions can be rather less concrete as, for example, in the following fragment.

(19) [BH:IA:17:ST]

- 1 B: Don't they have those new snaggies, or, you know,  
 2 non-snaggies?  
 3 S: Mesh?  
 4 K: I'm gonna get me ( )  
 5 S: → If you, uh, if you, uh put them, they run up, they  
 6 don't run down.  
 7 B: Oh boy!  
 8 S: → But if you, you know rip it here it runs up -- and  
 9 then it doesn't run down.

- 10 B: → Oh say! I've got something I want you to do,  
 11 running, up, running down, that reminds me

Recently, the fact of occasioning is not announced; the occasioned materials are simply presented as an appropriately introduced next matter.

(20) [SBL:2:1:8-3]

- 1 B: → I still haven't my dishes done, I'm right in the  
 2 middle of doing them, but I stopped [Well I worked  
 3 J: → on my- medicine cabinet again, I'm so mad at that  
 4 painter,  
 5

(21) [Rahman:C:1:(16):8]

- 1 J: → I've been cleaning [bedrooms and things so:  
 2 I: [Yes I've  
 3 done the bedrooms and the living room,

(22) [Frankel:TC:I:1:26] ((re their respective boyfriends))

- 1 G: → He'll be down here for Christ m a s .  
 2 S: [hh [Good. m'aybe we can  
 3 get together for dinner.  
 4 G: Mn-um?  
 5 (.)  
 6 G: [Su:re.  
 7 S: [hh You know Michael's in the midst of  
 8 moving this weekend.

(23) [MC:II:36-37]

- 1 W: → You know very often Lila I-I come across uh, a  
 2 library in a- at an estate sale, 'hh where I get uh  
 3 oh a whole pile of-of Masons uh books from Masons  
 4 you know and,  
 5 L: [Really,  
 6 W: Oh yeh OH I've got the most GORGEous things. 'hh I  
 7 have Masonic poems that are just out of this  
 8 world.  
 9 L: [Really?  
 10 W: Books of poetry I mean you never never see them in-  
 11 in library shelves any [where.  
 12 L: [We::ll.  
 13 W: Just- just absolutely beautiful. I'll show you one

210 G. Jefferson

- 14 or two ( [Well- 'hh incidentally I picked up a signed  
15 L: → edition of an old man that only had a limited  
16 edition printed . . .  
17
- (24) [W:PC:1:(1):21-22]
- 1 J: → Lore:tta came, u oh: they all came over all of ] them=  
2 M: [for Easter  
3 J: =o:n uh ( )  
4 M: [Did the::y, oh: goo:d. 'hh  
5 J: here for a cup of tea in the after noon  
6 [i  
7  
8 M: Did they li:ke it?  
9 J: Oh ye::s. [Ye::s I'm ]su:re they d i d.]  
10 [Well they've bee::n befo::re,  
11 J: (0.2)  
12  
13 M: When i t was:  
14 J: [Not uh:  
15 (0.3)  
16 J: You know not when it was all the ca:rpets there ]=  
17 M: [ca:rpets  
18 M: =No::, No::,  
19 J: [NO::,  
20 M: → Oh lovely, 'hh h By: the way=  
21 J: ( )  
22 M: → I: got a nice surprize last wee:k, 'hhh  
23 J: [Ye:S  
24 M: On the Tue:sdai night. |[An old girl friend from  
London was in the area briefly and invited her  
out for dinner]]

Across the array, materials that are introduced immediately or at a bit of a distance, announced as occasioned or simply presented as an appropriate next matter, can be seen to have been occasioned by some prior talk. That relationship was proposed between "I didn't go: typing last night" and the far-distanced "We didn't go to have our hair done." Features of the intervening talk tend to support the possibility. Specifically, it appears that the troubles-recipient, who can have just had something brought to mind, is through and through attempting to provide for its introduceability.

For one, upon initial mention of "I didn't go: typing," the recipient moves to stabilize it topically, first with a news receipt, "Didn't you:..." and, upon the confirmation, with an emphatic and prolonged "Oh:...." which may specifically be competing with troubles-teller's return to talk about the trouble (see lines 1-5). If the matter of the missed typing class

can become stabilized as a topic in its own right, then perhaps the matter of the missed hair appointment can be introduced then and there (cf., e.g., fragments [20] and [21]), or when the topic has run its course as in fragments [22], [23], and [24].

The troubles-teller, however, pursues the troubles-telling, and the coparticipant aligns as a proper troubles-recipient with an expression of the sympathy, "Oh: dear me." (lines 4-10). With such an alignment of the coparticipant, the troubles-teller again offers the report, perhaps specifically not to be treated as news and as a possible topic in its own right, but for its relationship to and conveyance of the trouble. Indeed, the coparticipant, now aligned as a troubles-recipient, can be seen to be producing just the sort of response the report was, from the first, pursuing, "Oh:.... you're well tie:d dow:n aren't you" (line 13).

However, summary assessments appear to be implicative of closure for a topic, and are recurrently deployed prior to various forms of topic shift. So, for example, the following fragment, taken from an institutional setting, a suicide prevention center, instances a dramatic use of the close-implicature of the summary assessment. In this case it is used prefatory to interruption of the conversation.

(25) [SPC:10:3:9] ((re M's possibly suicidal child))

- 1 M: Cause this little guy will stand in the railroad  
2 tre-uh track and holler (.) where's the trai:n  
3 where is the trai:n.  
4 (0.3)  
5 K: Ah-ha-h, [And that's what he's done before is stand  
6 M: there (he's) standing at the last minute and  
7 jumps awa:y.  
8 (0.7)  
9  
10 K: → Oh:. Well that that that's serious kind of uh  
11 behavior and it could be extremely dangerous. 'hh  
12 'hhh Do you want to hold on half a minute? o r- 'hh  
13 [Mm hm]  
14 K: I have a booklet here and I think I could get you  
15 the extension number to the Children's Clinic.

In the following fragment, a recipient who eventually declares herself as having had something she wanted to tell a current speaker can be seen to be using a range of devices to bring some current talk to a close, including a flurry of acknowledgment tokens ("Right," lines 6, 7, 11, and 12), a summary assessment "So he's doing alright" preceding a momentary interruption of the conversation to give some information to someone else (lines 16-18), coming back on line with a more elaborate

summary assessment, "Well I'm glad to hear he's doing reasonably well," which is followed by the announcement of something to say (line 23).

(26) [Frankel:TC:I:1:24-25]

- 1 G: Bu:t, he does feel tha:t (1.0) you know, (.) he's  
 2 proud of the fact that he got into the finals.·hnh  
 3 and he doesn't ca:re if he doesn't make the finals  
 4 and go o:n ·hnh [Ri:ght.] Berkeley or wherever,=  
 5 S: → =·h h and then-  
 6 G: → [Ri:ght.  
 7 S: → (.)  
 8 become a Harvard attorney I mean he doesn't care  
 9 about ↓that. at all.↓  
 10 S: → Ri:ght.  
 11 S: → So.  
 12 G: ·hh So he's doing alright.  
 13 G: Ye:ah  
 14 S: → Two twenty Joey.  
 15 S: (0.4)  
 16 S: ·hnh Twenty after two.  
 17 S: (.)  
 18 S: → ·hh Well I'm glad to hear he's doing reasonably  
 19 well.  
 20 G: Ye:ah.  
 21 S: → ·hh Uh:m what was I gonna tell you.

In the following fragment a flurry of assessments is followed by an enormously elaborate summary assessment (lines 12-21), itself followed by a return to a matter talked of much earlier in the conversation (line 24).

(27) [NB:IV:10:46-47]

- 1 L: And then coming home I bought, they had tangerines  
 2 ten pounds for a dollar, so I got ten pounds and=  
 3 E: [Mn:....  
 4 L: =I got some casaba and then I bought uh::, uh Edna  
 5 back a box of dates cause you know.  
 6 E: → Oh that's ni'ce.  
 7 L: She-  
 8 E: → [That's nice Lottie,  
 9 L: [She fed the ca:t, and  
 10 E: → That's beautiful  
 11 (0.4)

- 12 E: → 'tch ·hnh Well, you had a beautiful-  
 13 L: [I-  
 14 E: → Now you feel like a new gal.·hnh  
 15 L: Mh-  
 16 E: [(Your ne:rves've  
 17 (0.4)  
 18 E: → You know there's so many other wonderful people  
 19 around you, ·hnh uh- it's good to get away from,  
 20 your family sometimes zhi-n-can be yourself. you  
 21 know what I mea:n?  
 22 L: lyea:uh  
 23 L: Yeah.  
 24 E: → ·hnh Uh getting back to this Viafor::- foam,  
 25 Lottie . . .

The use of summary assessments can be far more discrete and in aid of rather smaller topical shifts, as in the following fragment. An item (line 6) is followed by acknowledgment tokens (lines 11 and 12) and a shift from the speaker's activities and rationales to a request for information the recipient is interested in (line 14).

(28) [Heritage:I:11:3]

- 1 I: Uh::m: d-Bessy was mated um (0.3) oh about three  
 2 weeks ago::.  
 3 N: hhOh:· ( )  
 4 I: [A n d (.) Mitzi was mated about two weeks  
 5 ago::.  
 6 N: → Oh my goodness you do a sk for i,t,((suppressed  
 7 I: [eh-h e h  
 8 laughter))  
 9 I: 'h he-Well 'h I a-always feel it's best to get it  
 10 all over at the same ↑ti:me y ou know,  
 11 N: → [Well y e : : s .]  
 12 N: → Ye:s.=  
 13 I: =[[It's u h :  
 14 N: → =[[And-and who]did you go: to.

Earlier it was noted that the ancillary stabilizer utterances in fragments (13) and (14) (and fragment [15] can be included as well), which may constitute initial moves toward a topical shift, are produced with the interactional cohesiveness of the transparently disjunctive shifts. The summary assessments, which are recurrently used as pretopical-shift devices, are strongly other-attentive. It is beginning to appear that display of interactional cohesiveness is a general technique for the management of topical rupture.

In fragment (15), then, upon the reintroduction of the proposed occa-



4 P = [s:stop it.] Pammy  
 5 L: : ((ca. 15 lines omitted, L and her children))

21 L: There. You can have that one.  
 22 (.)  
 23 L: khh!  
 24 J: hh hn-hn-h-hn- [Uh::: m  
 25 L: → [hnhhhh  
 26 J: → 't'hh I didn't Oh: bo:y. That's really a lot  
 27 L: → cheaper.  
 28

A multistage process by which the interrupted talk is returned to includes a return to interaction with a little laugh by reference to the interruption (line 23), which is reciprocated by the coparticipant (line 24), followed by the floorholder "Uh:::m," which precedes and may specifically mark a "getting back to" the interrupted topic (lines 25 and 27-28).

Another sort of getting back to may be seen in the following two fragments in which some new matter is explicitly announced as having been pending. The latter fragment has already appeared as an instance of the pretopical-shift work of the summary assessment.

(30) [HG:28]

1 H: be:h huh,  
 2 (0.2)  
 3 N: 'hhh  
 4 (0.5)  
 5 N: A::nywa::y,  
 6 (.)  
 7 H: → eh-eh 'hnhhhh Uh:::m,  
 8 (.)  
 9 N: (u-Wha:t.)=  
 10 H: → 'k'k There's something else I was gonna say,

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

1 S: 'nh Well I'm glad to hear he's doing reasonably well.  
 2 G: Ye:ah,  
 3 S: → 'hh Uh:m what was I gonna tell you.

Some materials that are proposed as having been intended to be placed somewhere and having found an appropriate place to occur here, are prefaced with the floorholder. If this object works as these materials

J: hn<sup>h</sup>h<sup>h</sup>  
 L: [y e : a h .  
 and  
 G: ↑be<sup>h</sup> heh  
 L: [y e s : .

By starting to speak after the onset of laughter, a coparticipant can be recognizably (and consequentially) declining to join a laughing-together (Jefferson 1979:83-6), and thus, for example, declining to take up the topical expansion potentiated by the prior speaker.

Further, acknowledgment tokens, as has been seen, can be accomplice to topical shift. A recurrent phenomenon is the production of a token just prior to a shift, as in the details, for example, from fragment (2) and fragment (28):

(2) [Detail]

A: Never mind it'll all come right in the end,  
 J: → Yeh. Okay you go and get your clean trousers on

(28) [Detail]

I: I a-always feel it's best to get it all over at  
 the same t*i*:me y<sub>1</sub>ou know,  
 N: [Well y e : : s .  
 N: → Ye:s. And-and who did you go: to.

(3→) The acknowledgment token is, indeed, followed by a topical shift, but not immediately. It is immediately followed by a "floorholder" (in fragment [12] "Uh:::" and in fragment [15] "Eh::m").

Floorholders can be used for a range of tasks, one of which may be systematically being produced in the materials under consideration. Most roughly, such an item as "uh" can be used to mark a "getting back to" some prior talk.<sup>6</sup> For example, it frequently appears among a set of devices used to get back to interrupted conversation. Following is a single, representative instance.

(29) [TCI(b):16:15-17](J is listing items purchasable via gift parties which turn out to be cheaper in the shops)

1 J: → That's al<sup>most</sup> two and a half <sup>mo</sup>:re.  
 2 P: [YECHHHAGHHHH::: [O h ]  
 3 L: →

suggest, that is, exhibits that the matters now being introduced have been pending, then in fragments (12) and (15) it may operate to introduce a new topic, not, as earlier proposed, as any next topic, but specifically as a topic that has been pending.

In these two instances, just how these particular topics came to be pending topics may be accounted for in terms of an earlier occasioning and a delay until an appropriate opportunity for introduction.

Thus, by reference to fragment (15), a detailed examination of the talk following a candidate occasioning item ("I didn't go: *typing*") and of the talk preceding the introduction of a candidate occasioned item ("We didn't go to have our *hair done*") tends to support their respective candidacies.

In contrast, then, to fragments (13) and (14), it appears that the troubles-recipient in fragment (15) is not in the first place working toward a report of a very good time. Rather, the target of the work in this case may be the arrival at an appropriate environment for introduction of the occasioned materials.

Such an environment might consist of the sort of light conversation that precedes the blandly self-attentive, occasioned-and-delayed "I found a recipe: that I'm gonna try" of fragment (12). And indeed, just such an environment may have been arrived at with the troubles-recipient's little joke in fragment (15), "Well I think I'll stay in bed in the morning" (line 48), a joking solution to the projected hazards the morning might bring.

A story-recipient offers a similar device in fragment (12), in which a joking solution to the husband's discovery of the impulsive gift-buying and occasioned matters await introduction, that is, that the husband be informed that the gifts were brought by "Santa Claus. hhheh-heh" (fragment [12], line 123).

Whereas in fragment (12) the joking solution is expanded into a little joke-laugh series, the expansion at some point intersected by the story-recipient's introduction of her occasioned-and-pending topic, in fragment (15) a similar trajectory may be under way but it may be curtailed in a particularly interesting way.

Specifically, in fragment (15) the joking solution, with its reference to avoiding, missing out on the projected hazards of tomorrow morning, may itself occasion a matter for the troubles-teller, that is, bring to mind the recent occurrence of the troubles-recipient's having actually missed an event, the movie that turned out to be such fun.

In purposefully achieving an appropriate environment for the introduction of her own occasioned materials, the troubles-recipient has inci-

dentally (1) achieved an appropriate environment for a range of matters inappropriately introduced directly adjacent to a troubles-telling, and (2) occasioned a topic for her coparticipant, who, with an appropriate environment to work with, introduces it then and there, thus preempting introduction of the prior-occasioned, worked-toward topic.

Again, details of the relevant segment of talk tend to support such a view.

(15) [Detail 1]

- L: Well I think I'll stay in bed in the mor:ning.  
 G: [hHAI]=  
 G: =I do n't bla:me [you?] [nhh hnh hmh beh] [heh he h 'hk]  
 L: [h h h [h e y] listen 'hhh You  
 G: should have come on Tue:sdai:y.

Following the joking solution, the joke-recipient overlaps the final syllable of the joke with a single laugh particle. The laughter, the appreciation of the joke, is both early and brief, and is followed immediately by talk. First, the talk moves to curtail the possibility of an expanded joke-laughter series. Second, the talk constitutes a warranting of the coparticipant's position, "I don't blame you?" In combination, the appreciation of the joke and warranting of the coparticipant's position can be characterized as other-attentive/interactionally cohesive, and it may be not incidental that such activities are occurring just prior to a topical shift. The talk in toto produced by the joke-recipient may be analogous to the summary assessments considered earlier, and may specifically be being deployed as a topical pre-shifter.

Thus, as with the prior consideration of a candidate occasioning and the introduction of an occasioned item, but here in a drastically more condensed way, the talk following the candidate occasioning item and preceding the candidate occasioned item tends to support their respective candidacies.

Finally, the joke-teller's activities by reference to the possible pre-topical-shift activities of the coparticipant, when examined in detail, yield features that tend to support the view being developed.

At some point she herself starts to laugh. That laughter is neither immediately after her own joke (cf. the various details of fragments [12] and [15] considered earlier), nor immediately after onset of the coparticipant's laughter (cf. fragment [12] detail 2); that is, it is neither proposing a laughing-together nor joining in on one. Rather, it starts up immediately after onset of the coparticipant's talk.

(15) [Detail 2]

G: hHAH! I do n't bla:me you?  
 L: [nhh hnh hnh] heh

At the point she starts to laugh, the joke-teller may not yet have access to just what the talk is, with only "I" and the first part of "don't" to work with. But the series of activities – the early, brief laugh followed by onset of speech – may be recognizably problematic for the trajectory she is operating, and its designed arrival at the introduction of her occasioned topic. By starting to laugh at this point, she may be countering a trajectory potentiated by that series; specifically, the closure of the expansion potential of the little joking solution, and a taking of the floor by the coparticipant.

Not merely does she start to laugh at such a point, but she continues to laugh across the coparticipant's utterance; and then continues to laugh beyond completion of that utterance.

(15) [Detail 3]

G: I do n't bla:me you? h h  
 L: [nhh hnh hnh hnh] heh heh

The laughter may be specifically being deployed to outlast the talk, and to be laughing upon utterance-completion, thus (re)inviting the coparticipant to join in a laughing-together, which can be intersected, as in fragment (12), by the joke-teller's introduction of her occasioned topic. As a further detail, the laughter is escalated just prior to completion of the coparticipant's utterance; it shifts from "nhh hnh hnh" to "heh heh heh," becoming louder and open-positioned. Such an activity can constitute an appreciation of the utterance overlapped by the closed-positioned laughter (see Jefferson, Sacks, and Schegloff forthcoming); a joke-laughter series is already in progress, the coparticipant now having produced a re-reference to the initial joke, that re-reference now constituting the source of a next round of laughter.

If this is the joke-teller's strategy, however, it is defeated, since the laughter that continues beyond completion of the talk is overlapped by the introduction of the coparticipant's occasioned topic.

(15) [Detail 4]

L: heh he h hk  
 G: [h h H e y] listen

Indeed, the laughter appears to be "caught by surprise" by the precipitous introduction. Note the little hiccupping inbreath "hk" that follows the onset of the "Hey" and is the terminal particle of the prolonged string.

Thus, detailed examination of this segment yields a competition for a slot that may constitute a first appropriate opportunity for the introduction of new topics after a troubles-telling.

Fragment (15), then, may be characterized as a manifestation of the consequence of a convergence of two distinct aspects of topical talk; that (1) some topic-types are open to immediate introduction of any next topic whereas others, such as a troubles-telling, are closed, that is, constrain what sort of talk properly comes next, and (2) topics may be occasioned in the course of ongoing talk. Whereas topics occasioned in the course of a closed topic-type are properly delayed until an open environment is achieved, topics occasioned in the course of an open topic-type can be introduced immediately.

A systematically based hazard, then, for matters occasioned during a closed topic is, as in fragment (15), that the deployment of an open topic to arrive at the introduction of the occasioned matter can incidentally provide an environment ripe for introduction of other matters and, as in this case, can itself occasion other matters. Inasmuch as those matters are properly introduceable immediately, there is the possibility (again manifested in fragment [15]), of a preemption and still further delay of the introduction of the matters occasioned during the course of the closed topic.

## Notes

1. For a consideration of this fragment see the unpublished lecture of Harvey Sacks, SS 158X, February 19, 1971, pp. 17–18.
2. So, for example, in the unpublished lecture 2 (revised), spring 1966, p. 9, Sacks refers to the questioner's "reserved right to talk again, after the one to whom he has addressed the question speaks."
3. The proposal of Dwight's similar condition, that he only has one gallbladder, may be discarding facticity for local aptness; that is, if it is so that he "only has one," then what he problematically only has one of is probably a kidney.
4. Each of the pivotal utterances may be seen to be exhibiting a spurious fittedness to the talk from which it is departing. In fragment (13) there is the factually wrong but topically apt identification of a similar complaint, "Dwight only has one gall bladder." In fragment (14) there is the utterance-initial proposal of a strong relationship to the prior talk, "That's why . . ." that the relationship obscured as the utterance develops into a report of this speaker's circumstances, "well we didn't get home til two o'clock." And in fragment (15) the fragile topical relationship is augmented by a lexical echoing, that is, the prior utterance's "that little bit more careful" echoed by "that little bit warmer."



5. This fragment is taken from G. Jefferson (1978a:220). (Some consideration of the phenomenon can be found in this chapter.)
6. The oriented-to power of such an object as "Uh::m" and its capacity to mark such an activity as "getting back to" was initially noted by Graham Button in his consideration of bids to move out of a closing sequence back into a state of conversation (forthcoming a; forthcoming b).

## PART IV

# The integration of talk with nonvocal activities

Although most of the chapters in this book (and in the literature of conversation analysis more generally) report on studies of audiotape recordings of interaction, it does not follow that conversation analysts are therefore uninterested in or content to ignore the possible significance of nonvocal activities. Indeed, the widespread use that has been made of recorded telephone calls as a focus for analysis recognizes a major methodological advantage precisely in the fact that the interactants themselves cannot see each other. The analyst can thus proceed to the study of audio recordings without having to worry about how nonvocal activities may have been involved in any particular sequence. The same obviously cannot be said of interactions where the participants are copresent with one another and, for investigating these, videotapes and films can provide a much fuller record of what occurred. As the relevant technologies become more sophisticated and more readily available, then, research in conversation analysis is likely to pay more attention to issues that can be addressed with reference to an audiovisual data base, and the chapters in this part reflect some of the directions such work is taking.

The range of practical, ethical, and technical problems associated with the use of video recordings for analytic purposes cannot be discussed in detail here (but see, for example, C. Goodwin 1981a). One that becomes quickly apparent, however, from the chapters here is the difficulty of publishing visual records of the data in such a way as to permit readers easy access to the activities about which observations are being made. Anyone who has ever attempted to produce a detailed description of some sequence of bodily movements will know only too well how daunting a task it is. And anyone who has been present at oral presentations where video-recorded fragments were played and replayed will appreciate the sorts of losses that are inevitably involved in attempts to represent the data in other ways. The authors of this book are deeply