

Reprinted From:  
STUDIES IN THE ORGANIZATION  
OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERACTION  
© 1978, Academic Press, Inc.  
New York San Francisco London

chapter 9

---

*Sequential Aspects  
of Storytelling  
in Conversation*<sup>1</sup>

GAIL JEFFERSON

In an investigation of stories told in conversation, Labov and Waletzky (1966) have shown that spontaneous stories can be subject to formal analysis, and under such analysis can be found to have a range of formal properties. While that study focuses on the story as the analytic unit, it suggests the relevance of "social context" to a story's telling (cf., e.g., Labov & Waletzky, 1966, pp. 12-13 and p. 34).

In a series of investigations, Harvey Sacks has focused on the contexted occurrence of stories told in conversation, and has made preliminary observations which indicate that stories are sequenced objects articulating with the particular context in which they are told.<sup>2</sup> For example, storytelling can involve a story preface with which a teller projects a forthcoming story, a next turn in which a coparticipant aligns himself as a story recipient, a next in which teller produces the story,<sup>3</sup> and a next in which story recipient talks by reference to the story. Further, the story preface can have consequences for the story's reception, and thus a rather extended series of turns at talk can be seen as a coherent conversational unit (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 2).

This chapter focuses on story beginnings and endings, sketching out two features via which a story can be seen to articulate with turn-by-turn talk: Stories emerge from turn-by-turn talk, that is, are *locally occasioned* by it, and, upon their completion, stories re-engage turn-by-turn talk, that is, are *sequentially implicative* for it.<sup>4</sup>

### STORIES ARE LOCALLY OCCASIONED

In general, the occurrence of an utterance at a given moment is accountable, and a basic account is that a next utterance is produced by reference to the occurrence of a prior, that is, is occasioned by it (cf, e.g., Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 4 and Sacks, 1971, April 9). The local occasioning of a story by ongoing turn-by-turn talk can have two discrete aspects: (a) A story is "triggered" in the course of turn-by-turn talk. That is, something said at a particular moment in conversation can remind a participant (speaker or hearer) of a particular story, which may or may not be "topically coherent" with the talk in progress.<sup>5</sup> (b) A story is methodically introduced into turn-by-turn talk. That is, techniques are used to display a relationship between the story and prior talk and thus account for, and propose the appropriateness of, the story's telling.

In the following fragments, both aspects are readily observable. (a) An element of ongoing talk triggers a story which is (b) methodically introduced into that ongoing talk.

- [GTS:II:2:64] (1)
- ROGER: The *cops* don't do dat, don't gimme that shit I live in  
the Valley. 1  
(0.5) 2  
3
- KEN: The cops, *over* the hill. There's a place up in  
*Mulholland* where they've— where they're building those  
hous ing projects? 4  
5  
6
  - ROGER: [ *Oh* have you ever taken them *Mulhollan'* time trials? 7  
'hh You go up there wid a girl. A buncha guys'r up there 8  
an' [STORY] 9
- [Schenkein:I:7] (2)
- ELLEN: Tuh relax er during this last illness, on top a' the  
antibiotics, 1  
(1.0) 2  
3
- BEN: W—well on top a'thee, *cough* medicine. 4
  - ELLEN: Yeah, and the cough medici— *incidentally*. Did I tell you? 5

BILL:	No.	6
ELLEN:	That the d- he told us t'give uh Snookie a third of a teaspoon of uh:: <i>cough</i> medicine. Cheracol, is there a-	7 8
	<i>Is there a cou gh me dicine call'Cherac'l=</i>	9
	[	
BILL:	Yeah,	10
	[	
BEN:	Yeah,	11
ELLEN:	= 'hhh We happen'tuh have Vic's Forty Four [STORY]	12
[NB:IV:7:51]		(3)
LOTTIE:	'hh (hh)en so 'hh when Duane lef tuhday we took off ar	1
	s- 'hh suits yihknow en, eh- <i>Oh</i> en she gave me the most	2
	<i>beautiful swimsuit</i> you've ever seen in yer life.	3
EMMA:	<i>Gave</i> it to yuh?	4
LOTTIE:	Yeah,	5
EMMA:	Aww:: ::	6
	[	
LOTTIE:	A twunny two dollar one.	7
	[	
EMMA:	Aww:::	8
	(0.6)	9
EMMA:	Well you've given <i>her</i> a lot in uh yer day Lottie,	10
LOTTIE:	I know ut. En when we <i>looked</i> w-one et Walter Clark's	11
	you know wir were gonna <i>buy</i> one cuz [STORY]	12

The technique used in these fragments consists of two discrete devices produced consecutively: (a) a 'disjunct marker' such as "*Oh*" (F.1.L.7 and F.3.L.2)<sup>6</sup> and "*incidentally*" (F.2.L.5) signals that the talk to follow is not topically coherent with the adjacent prior talk, and (b) an 'embedded repetition' locates, but does not explicitly cite, the element of prior talk which triggered the story ("*Mulholland*," F.1.L.5. and 7., "*cough medicine*" F.2.L.4, 5, and 8, and "*suits*"/"*swimsuit*," F.3.L.2 and 3).

This appears to be a version of an explicit Speaking of X format in which a marked repeat (cf. Jefferson, 1972, pp. 295-296) cites a component of prior talk as the source of the story being introduced.<sup>7</sup>

[GTS:II:2:50:r:2]		(4)
ROGER:	Speakin about <i>forties</i> . I worked on a k-o::n	1
	Morganelli's Forty.	2
[SBL:2:5:12]		(5)
BEA:	Saying dahlias, I just cut some fresh dahlias	1
	at my neighbor's this evening. . .	2

Fragment (3) is of particular interest for the methodic construction of a disjunct plus repetition format. Assuming that speakers monitor their own talk (cf. Sacks, 1972b, Lecture 2) and assuming the "s-" in (L.1-2) ". . . we took off ar s-" is the beginning of the word "suits" (cf., e.g., Jefferson, 1974, pp. 185-188), then it is possible that having started to say "suits" speaker finds she has a story and cuts off, preparatory to introducing the story. Thereafter, to set up a disjunct plus repetition, she produces the word in full, ". . . we took off ar s- 'hh suits. . ." and subsequently produces the display of sudden remembering, the disjunct marker "Oh" followed by the embedded repetition (L.1-3) ". . . we took off ar s- 'hh suits yihknow en, eh- Oh en she gave me the most beautiful swimsuit. . . ."

The combined devices of disjunct and embedded repetition signal that the matter now being talked of, while not topically coherent with prior talk, had that talk as its source, that is, is a direct product of monitoring that talk. This stands in contrast to a story triggered at a particular moment but not by ongoing talk, for example:

- [J:FN] (6)
- ((three people walking together; someone passes them wearing a photograph teeshirt))
- NETTIE: Oh that teeshirt reminded me [STORY] 1

The two devices need not occur in combination. A disjunct marker can be followed by something other than a repetition (cf. F.25.L.26), and an embedded repetition can follow something other than a disjunct marker. In the following fragment, a story is introduced as a topically coherent next utterance,<sup>8</sup> with a version of the once-upon-a-time format; that is, it starts with a temporal locator (F.7.L.7) "New Years we. . . ." Subsequently an embedded repetition of the trigger word occurs (L.13, cf. L.1 and 4).

- [GTS:II:2:87:r] (7)
- AL: ((To Roger)) Probly poured *glue* over it. 'F I know you:, 1  
(0.4) 2
  - KEN: 'hhhhh No:, yih gotta be careful evry so often 'e takes 3  
that cup'n 'e takes a deep whiff he's gotta tube a'glue 4  
in it. 5  
(0.7) 6
  - ROGER: New Years we:: split up the *dues* so we each hadda buck 7  
fifty tuh buy *booze* with fer the New Years party? 8
  - AL: Mm hm, 9

ROGER: So w`wen`around the room they were takin orders. `hh So 10  
 Lance k- So:, one guy bought a, dollar f`fty worth a` 11  
 Ripple, `hh next guy b(hh)ought a dollar fifty worth a` 12  
 glue:, uhh! 13  
 ( ): `hhh= 14  
 KEN: =heh huh- h u h 15  
 AL: [ he-eh hehh he hh 16  
 ROGER: [ `hhh!`ufff ff 17  
 AL: [ `hihhh! 18  
 (JIM): hheh= 19  
 ROGER: =`Pl(h)anning on gittin ga:ssed. Huh La(h)nce.` 20  
 AL: [ (V e r y ) ]= 21  
 ROGER: hh `uhh hyihh `hhh h 22  
 AL: =[[ (good Roger) ] [ `he::h. 23  
 (1.0) 24  
 ROGER: They were progressively gittin worse, ez we went 25  
 aroun` 26  
 the circ(h)le, 27  
 KEN: m-hhmh( ) 27  
 AL: [ he:h hehh`uh` hh nh 28  
 KEN: [ (That's a true ), 29  
 ROGER: [ I ordered rum'n 30  
 thought it wz ba:d y'(h)kno(h)ow 31

The story is not produced as a sudden remembering, but as continuous with prior talk. It appears that the procedure used to introduce the story is consequential for the story's structure on this occasion of its occurrence. Specifically, the repetition does not occur as part of the introduction (cf. F.1-6), but as a component of the story's punch line (L.12-13). Some details of the fragment suggest that the repetition's punch line positioning is accompanied by a condensing of the story, with the repetition-bearing punch line occurring sooner than it might have, given the story's events.<sup>9</sup>

Subsequent to the punch line is a series of commentaries, one of which proposes an order in which the events occurred (L.25), one of which offers an event which might have occurred prior to that which constitutes the punch line (L.30-31). That is, the order of events might

have been: They went around the room taking orders (L.10), progressively getting worse as they went around the circle (L.25); one guy ordered Ripple (L.11-12), Roger ordered rum and thought it was "ba:d" (L.30-31) until someone ordered glue (L.12-13 and 20).<sup>10</sup>

There are, then, a variety of devices and combinations of devices by which a triggered story can be appropriately introduced. The observable relationship between a story and prior turn-by-turn talk is a product of methodic displays, fitted to the talk so far and to the story to be told. Further, it appears that the particular circumstances under which a story is entered can have consequences for the structure of the actually told story, which itself is fitted to the manner of its introduction.

Entry into a story from turn-by-turn talk can be done economically or elaborately. So, for example, in the following fragments, entry is achieved via a conventional story-prefixed phrase.<sup>11</sup>

[Actors' Group:13] (8)

- JOE: If they're supposed to hate you up there, they *do*. 1  
 B.J.: eehaha ha 2  
 JOE: You kn ow, 3  
 [ Tha ss- 4  
 ● DARCY: [ They hold a grudge. 5  
 B.J.: Yeah! 6  
 AMY: heh-heh-heh-heh 7  
 ● DARCY: Thass true now th-uh Hal's roommate Ron Bender [STORY] 8

[GTS:III:1:19] (9)

- KEN: He was terrific the whole time we were there. 1  
 LOUISE: I know what you mean. Wh'n they- my sister and her  
 boyfriend [STORY] 3

[Adato:III:21] (10)

- VINNY: The guy at the top's gonna make sure no one- knocks  
 im off. 2  
 STAN: The guy in the middle is playin both of 'em against  
 the other, so *you* know, *whaddiyou* got. 3  
 JAY: hih! huh huh Ki(hh)nd of a me(hh)ess, 5  
 ● STAN: *Really* when you consider it. It's- it's like uh I  
 heard Senator Kennedy [STORY] 7

[Reilly:9] (11)

- FRAN: I feel sorriest for Warren hh hh how he sits there an'  
 listens to it I don'know? But, um. 2

HOLLY: Well he must've known what she was like before 'e married 'er.	3
	4
FRAN: <i>I</i> guess. And-	5
• HOLLY: <i>He</i> can be a bastard too, he uh one- one day we [STORY]	6
[Carey:Bar:I:1]	(12)
FRANK: What'r these freaks mostly?who'r goin t'this,=	1
GEORGE: = <i>No</i> : They're perfectly legitimate- 'hh d- ezza	2
• mattera fact the g- 'hh the <i>guy</i> [STORY]	3
[Frankel:US:I:4]	(13)
PHIL: ( <i>Yeh</i> ) en the guy who broke it should c-certainly, clean it <i>up</i> .	1
	2
VIC: But it don't <i>happen</i> that way becuss nine chances outta	3
• ten matter a'fact I know duh, u-dih guy [STORY]	4
[D.A.:17]	(14)
ANN: But nobody fought with huh like <i>I</i> fought with huh.	1
(1.4)	2
• ANN: Uhb-uh fer example, uh d-oh about two weeks before she [STORY]	3
	4
[Goldberg:II:I:23]	(15)
MAGGIE: Very rarely do I get a Saturdee off, I mean I haf to like	1
• plan a <i>month</i> in advance for the Suh- for the <i>Saturdees</i> off, ez a matter a'fact I've [STORY]	2
	3

The more elaborate procedures have a story emerging through longer stretches of turn-by-turn talk. The story emerges not only as topically coherent, as in fragments (8)-(15), but with coparticipant(s) specifically aligned as story recipients.

In the following fragment, a display of story triggering is produced (F.16.L.24-32) with a marked repeat (L.29) "And they *are* stars" which cites an element of prior talk (L.24) as the story trigger, and is followed by an embedded repetition (L.31-32; cf. also note 7). However, it appears that the story is actually triggered earlier, via a slightly more complex process than the one displayed here (cf. F.1-6).

[Labov:Battersea Park:B:3:r]	(16)
LADY: It's <i>dying out</i> yihkno:w,=	1
• PARKY: = <i>Oh</i> : ye::s, Well they <i>got</i> s'm new,hh (·) new=	2
• PARKY: =They <i>got</i> th' <i>dolphins</i> in the:h=	3
MAN: =Mm.	4

- TRACY: They *do* :. 5
- PARKY: [ Fl ippah, hh 6
- LADY: [ B't even := 7
- PARKY: =la hk you av i n Ameriker on the fi:lm, 8
- LADY: [ s o : : . ] [ 9
- TRACY: [ 'h h h h h h h [ O h : . Oh ye:s.= 10
- MAN: =Ye:h, them.= 11
- PARKY: =Well we got s ome in *the*:h. 12
- LADY: [ P e e- 13
- TRACY: I'll *b e* da:::ned. 14
- LADY: [ People uh co mplaining a'the *pri*:ce.= 15
- PARKY: Ye:s th'pri:ce, Well et *Oxf*'d Street they've got'em *the*:uh. 16
- (0.2) 17
- MAN: Ye :h. 18
- TRACY: [ Hhuh. 19
- PARKY: And uh ther very *good* et *Oxf*'d Stree:t, 20
- TRACY: *Hhu*:h. 21
- PARKY: They've got *fo*'ovuh *the*:h, 22
- (0.4) 23
- PARKY: You see *two*: *trainee*:s, 'n then you see the two *sta*:hs. 24
- ( ): [ I- 25
- (0.2) 26
- ( ): hhhh 27
- (0.2) 28
- PARKY: En theh *ah* *stah*:s my. Gawt.(·)I 'm *sittin* up e'the *fro*:nt= 29
- ( ): [ Ah- 30
- PARKY: =wiv, (mah two guhl), 'hhh Un:d uh h- all et once one a' 31
- these *stah*s wen'up'n the ay didn'alf go up too.'n w'n 'e 32
- c(h)ome do:wn gow cracky I wz *saturaite* d. 33
- MAN: [ h-hheh 34
- hhehh hheh= 34
- MAN: h e h, 35
- =[[ 35
- PARKY: 'E *co me* right this *e*:nd. 36
- TRACY: [ h a h a! 37

PARKY:	<i>F a : : c t,</i>	38
	[[ ]	
MAN:	(Yeh that's) good.	39
	[[ ]	
(LADY):	(M m m m m m M m m Yuh)	40
	[ ] [ ]	
TRACY:	<i>u::h h u h h a , h a , h a , 'ha?</i>	41
	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	
PARKY:	' E dunnit <i>pu:r</i> posel y :	42
	[ ]	
MAN:	Mm.	43

It appears that in the course of disputing a prior utterance which has proposed that amusement parks are dying out, a speaker is starting to invoke a general category—something like “new attractions” or “new acts” (L.2). Starting on that, he is reminded of an incumbent of that category, a particular new attraction (L.3) “the dolphins,” about which he has a story to tell. And he proceeds in much the same fashion as does speaker in fragment(3) (L.1–2) “. . . we took off ar s-`hh suits. . .”; that is, he stops prior to completion of the unit “new-” and then starts to recycle it (L.2.) “. . . they got some new,hh (·) new. . . .” Thereafter he takes a different tack, abandoning the entire sentence-so-far and replacing it with (L.3) “They got the dolphins in there.” His subsequent talk may specifically “mask” the fact that a story has been triggered; that is, reference to the dolphins is preserved through turn-by-turn talk without a repetition of that word (L.6–8, 12, 16, 20, 22, 24). Rather, the particular new attraction is used as a base for topical talk, with teller proposing a special interest that one of his coparticipants might have in talk about dolphins (L.6–8) “Flipper. . . like you have in America. . . .” coparticipant producing tokens of special interest (L.10) “`hhhhh *O h:: Oh ye:s.*” With these tokens, while coparticipant does not herself offer topical talk about dolphins, she displays herself as receptive to talk on that topic; that is, she aligns herself as a recipient.

Thereafter, two of teller’s three coparticipants produce tokens of appreciation/understanding as the talk moves toward the storytelling (L.11, 14, 18, 19, 20). These two may be relevantly identified as “potential story recipients.” The third, however, competes with the talk out of which the story is emerging, overlapping both teller (L.6–8 and 12–13) and one recipient (L.14–15) with a single coherent sentence continuing the ongoing dispute (L.7–9, 13–15) “But even *so:: . . . Pee- . . . People are complaining of the *pri:ce.*” (cf. Sacks, 1967b, Lecture 13, and 1972, Lecture 4).*

The disparate alignment of coparticipants prior to the story’s telling

seems to have consequences for its reception. The two recipients produce laughter (L.34–35, 37, 41.) while the disputer does not—that is, the positions taken by coparticipants prior to the story's telling are preserved in its reception. Thus, the elaborated turn-by-turn emergence of a story from topical talk may be methodically constructed, not only by reference to its appropriate, locally occasioned occurrence, but by reference to its projected reception.

### STORIES ARE SEQUENTIALLY IMPLICATIVE

In general, an utterance "projects for the sequentially following turn(s), the relevance of a determinate range of occurrences. . . . It thus has sequentially organized implications." Further, there are ways of "methodically providing for such implicativeness [Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 296]." The re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk at a story's completion is a matter of sequential implicativeness in both senses; that is, at a story's ending two discrete aspects similar to those observed for local occasioning can be found. (a) A story can serve as a source for triggered or topically coherent subsequent talk, and (b) a range of techniques are used to display a relationship between the story and subsequent talk—techniques which provide that the story is implicative for subsequent talk and thus propose the appropriateness of its having been told.

As an initial approach to sequential implicativeness, an instance is shown in which it is absent. Here, a story (F.17.L.17–29) may have been triggered by an element of prior talk, the word "Brentwood" (L.13) which is being used to refer to a mental hospital (L.15–16), it happening that the hospital is located in a high-income suburb (cf. L.17–18). The story is introduced as continuous with prior talk (L.17; cf. F.7.L.7) and is elaborately told, but when its telling stops (L.29), ongoing talk is picked up where it left off (L.30). For clarity, the transcript has the story indented.

- [GTS:IV:1:12] (17)
- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| DAN:   | Alright, except that again, you're—you're—you're using an | 1 |
|        | example of maybe one or two individuals,                  | 2 |
| ROGER: | Yes,  | 3 |
| DAN:   | Uh::m and saying well look what these people did. And the | 4 |
|        | other idea is that most schizophrenics, most psychotics   | 5 |
|        | are not really able to produce very much of any thing.    | 6 |
| ROGER: | [   |   |
|        | I'm not   | 7 |
|        | saying don't cure schi— I'm taking it as an individual    | 8 |

	case. I'm taking this individual and referring to <i>only</i> =	9
	[	
DAN:	Mm hm, it's <i>true</i> -	10
ROGER:	=this individual.	11
DAN:	'S true, and I'm sure that his artwork uhm all you have to	12
	do is go over t'Brentwood and see some very interesting	13
•	artwork I find it interesting.	14
	[	
ROGER:	Where at the hospital?	15
DAN:	That's right,	16
• KEN:	Yeah and you c'n also go into some of these	17
	millionaires' hou-homes. And they've bot- boughten	18
	some of these uh artworks from different places in	19
	the world? You c'n look at 'em and- I mean I don't	20
	know anything about art, I can't-I can't draw that	21
	well, I can draw cars, and junk like this when I	22
	want to, but uh::go into some of these houses and	23
	they-it looks like somebody took a squirtgun with	24
	paint in it an'just squirted it. Justa buncha <i>lines</i>	25
	goin every which way an' "Oh isn't that terrific?"	26
	"Yeah. What is it." Y'kno(h)w? "Didjer child have	27
	a good time when he was drawing that?" "Whad-diyuh	28
	<i>mean</i> that cost me-" Y'know hhh	29
DAN:	See but the other al- the alternative that you're giving	30
	me is to say well look, m-m-maybe uh maybe a person has	31
	to be sick in order to be able to see these things,	32
ROGER:	No, this man-	33
	[[	
DAN:	And I don't think-	34
DAN:	And I don't think that's true.	35
ROGER:	I don't think so either. But this man. . .	36

This is a dramatic instance; the story is treated as utterly irrelevant to the ongoing talk and is sequentially deleted.<sup>12</sup> More routinely, the relationship of a story to subsequent talk is negotiated between teller and recipients. For example, recipients will not actively move to delete a story, but will withhold talk which demonstrates the story's sequential implicativeness, and teller will search for ways to elicit recipient talk, deploying story components as story exit devices.

In the following fragment a story reaches a point of possible completion (F.18.L.3) and is followed by a pause (L.4). Thereafter is a series of postscripts and commentaries, each followed by a pause (L.5-8 and 9, L.10-12 and 13, L.14-16 and 17). Finally, a commentary is followed by

turn-by-turn talk (L.22–25 and 27 ff.). Across the series of story components there is an observable progression away from the story, toward tangential and more general, but yet recognizably related, issues. And it is at the point where teller offers a general topic that recipients engage in turn-by-turn talk (L.22 ff.).

- [GTS:II;2:64:r] (18)
- ROGER: [STORY] 'n were *back t' the pizza joint we started from.* 1  
 Y'know, En we spend a whole night *doin that, 'n waste a* 2  
*lotta money on gas'n, 'hh Buh we hadda ba:ll.* 3  
 (0.8)
- ROGER: En there's only *two guys t'each car. That's th' thing* 5  
[ ] =
  - DAN: *mkhhh* 6
  - DAN: *mkhhhm, ((throat clearing))* 7  
= [[ ]]
  - ROGER: *y'know?* 8  
 (0.5) 9
  - ROGER: *Ih wz during the su:mmer en we do it lo:tsa times yuh* 10  
*know, W'call it a crui:se y'know, En the club enjoys* 11  
*doing that.* 12  
 (1.0) 13
  - ROGER: *'hhh B'd now most'the guys in th'club through 'hh one* 14  
*method'r another are either not driving'r don't have a* 15  
*ca:r. 'k-ghh?* 16  
 (1.2) 17
  - ROGER: *So,* 18  
 (KEN): *hhhh* 19  
 DAN: *hmh, hm.* 20  
 (0.9) 21
  - ROGER: *'hhhhh Kids don't drive long. They start off w't their si-* 22  
*by the time- when they're sixteen b'the time they're* 23  
*eighteen they're back wa-alking:hh::: ehh-eh th(h)rough* 24  
*c(h)irc(h)umsta(h)a(h)nces. =* 25
  - ROGER: *'uffffffff* 26  
= [[ ]]
  - AL: *beyond their con tro::::::l.* 27  
[ ]
  - DAN: *beyond their c'n tro ::l.* 28  
[ ]
  - ROGER: *Uh!hhY(h)e(h)s. =* 29
  - ROGER: *'ihhh'uh =* 30

AL:	= 'uhhh hh	31
ROGER:	[ hhh <i>Hot</i> rodders (don't)	32
AL:	[ Bec'z it's a:ll th'cops'f ault,	33
ROGER:	[ Now the <i>Soshes</i>	34
	keep <i>drivin'</i> . Daddy's car'n evrythin:g y'know, 'hh=	35
( ):	( )-	36
	=[[	
DAN:	'T's all the cops' fault.	37
AL:	Yeah it's not ours. We're pri--=	38
ROGER:	=I t's the insurance companies'n the cops.	39
	[ We're <i>be tter</i> ( )	40
AL:	<i>Damn right.</i>	41

A prototypical display of story completion, a return 'home' (L.1.) " 'n were back t'the *pizza joint* we started from," is followed by commentary (L.2-3) and a secondary ending, now not of the story, but of the storytelling; an assessment (L.3) "'hh Buh we hadda *ba:ll*." There is no talk whatsoever at completion (L.3 and 4), nor over three recycles of a "transition-relevance place [ Sacks *et al.*, 1974, p. 703 ]," a place at which turn-by-turn talk might be re-engaged (L.5-8 and 9, 10-12, and 13, 14-16, and 17), and a request for recipient comment (L.18) "So,"<sup>13</sup> receives minimal tokens of appreciation (L.19 and 20) which, although they acknowledge and are occasioned by prior talk, are not themselves implicative for subsequent talk. These are followed by still another pause (L.21). The absence of recipient talk is dramatic.

Equally dramatic is the manner in which turn-by-turn talk is re-engaged. Teller himself provides a topical utterance which demonstrates the sequential implicativeness of the story (L.22-25). If recipients talk by reference to it, then the story will have re-engaged turn-by-turn talk. In the course of that utterance, he produces an object which can provide for the utterance's implicativeness and thus for the story's implicativeness; that is, teller offers a first half of an idiom (L.24-25) "through circumstances. . . ." It appears that he has specifically offered a first half; that is, immediately thereafter he produces, not its second half, but a form of laughter (L.26. cf. F.7.L.17). The second half of the idiom is produced by two recipients (L.27 and 28), and it is a second half fitted to the entire utterance; that is, ". . . beyond *their* control" (emphasis added) understands and talks by reference to the prior "Kids . . . they . . . they're . . ." and so on (L.22-24). This is a powerful demonstration of an

object's sequential implicativeness, with multiple parties producing a second part, given the occurrence of a first—the utterance has not merely implicated “a determinate range of occurrences,” but a single one, and a single one for more than one coparticipant. The fuguelike tumble thereafter might well be seen as a celebration of the re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk, of a return to a state of talking together.

A range of materials, in which it initially seems that a teller is indulging in story expansion, can be seen via sequential analysis as a teller searching for recipient talk by reference to the story, using story components as exit devices. In the following fragment it may be as a by-product of such a pursuit that teller provides a series of statements which progress from excoriation of an individual (F.19.L.4 and 10) to a denouncing of his entire family (L.15).<sup>14</sup>

[Goldberg:II:2:23:r]	(19)
MAGGIE: [STORY] A::n uh: I guess once <i>wz enough</i> .	1
GENE: Yeah. (·) Yeah.	2
(1.0)	3
MAGGIE: 'tlk But ez far ez <i>I'm</i> concerned he [ex-husband] hez,	4
shown his <i>color::s</i> to the point where:: 'hhh n: <i>nobody</i>	5
in iz right <i>mi:nd</i> who's even got a: <i>decent</i> breath left	6
<i>in</i> them. 'hhh wou:ld think that he <i>wz</i> <i>exce:ptable</i> .	7
GENE: Yeah.	8
(0.7)	9
• MAGGIE: 't En it's a sure damn thing that whenever:: this <i>kid</i>	10
[her son] grows <i>up</i> he'll have n: <i>nobuddy</i> tuh thank fer	11
<i>anythaing</i> . 'hh uh: of <i>that</i> family [ex-husband's].	12
GENE: Yeah. (·) Yeah.	13
(1.0)	14
• MAGGIE: I wouldn't spit on the best side of'm en I've yet t'	15
see the best <i>si:de</i> .	16
GENE: hhhehh heh-heh-heh 'hhhh Well how <i>about</i> the rest	17
a'the fam'ly. . .	18

Following an assessment (L.1) “And I guess once was *enough*” (cf. F.18.L.3), and over two cycles of a transition place (L.4–7 and 10–12) there is token acknowledgment by recipient (cf. F.18.L.19 and 20) followed by a pause (L.2 and 3, 8 and 9, 13 and 14). A third cycle (L.15–16) is followed by appreciation (L.17.; cf. F.16.L.34.ff. and F.18.L.18–20) and thereafter by an object which formally re-engages turn-by-turn talk; that is, a question which is observably occasioned by the prior utterance and itself implicates at least a next utterance.<sup>15</sup>

While re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk may be the primary issue upon a story's completion, there are other matters to which a storyteller may be oriented. Specifically, there may be orientation to what a recipient makes of the story and thus what the story has amounted to. Following is a dramatic instance in which recipient displays appreciation and understanding of a story at a possible completion point (F.20.L.2-4). It turns out that only a story segment has been completed and were the storytelling to stop at that point, recipient would be left with a misapprehension of the events being reported. That is, following recipient's response (L.4.) is a story component which contradicts the sense to be made of the story so far (L.1-2 and 6-7).

- [MC:I:15] (20)
- HARMON: I said "And-and-and-" "What ih-" "Is her boyfriend a nice 1  
 ma:n Joey?" He sz "Oh he's very nice, he's a colored man." 2  
 hhhhhh HAH hah! 3
- [
- LIL: Oh no::: the poor kid yer kidding. 4
- [
- HARMON: I said- 5
- HARMON: No waita second I said "Joseph, that's, not your mother's 6  
 boyfriend. That colored man is the man ( ) she- 7  
 eh he takes her tuh work every day. 8
- LIL. Uh huh. 9
- HARMON: This colored man. ( )- 10
- [
- LIL: Sure- What *difference* does it make, sure. 11

A generalizable feature of this fragment is that tellers can propose and recipients accept that a response was premature, that there is more story to come, and that upon a next completion point, recipients have a next opportunity to respond via their corrected understanding of the story.

Such a feature can serve as a resource for negotiations as to what a story shall have amounted to. Roughly, talk which demonstrates a story's implicativeness may be tangential to it, as is teller's commentary and subsequent turn-by-turn talk in fragments (18) and (19). In those fragments the tangential talk is clearly alternative to and remedial of recipient *silence*. When recipient *talk* follows directly on story completion, then silence may not be a relevant alternative; rather, the relevant alternatives are two types of talk—tangential talk as observably contrastive to talk which is directly continuous with and fitted to the story.

Storytellers do not explicitly challenge or complain of tangential

recipient talk (as they do not complain of recipient silence). Instead, they propose that the story was not yet completed by offering a next story component. Upon completion of that component, a next point occurs at which the story can be responded to (cf. F.20), and thus, at least an opportunity for, and perhaps an invitation to, a different order of response—in the case of tangential talk, a more fitted response—is provided by an added story component.

In the following fragment a story reaches a point of possible completion (F.21.L.5–7) and a recipient initiates tangential talk (L.9 and 12–13). In overlap with that talk, teller provides two recognizable next story components (L.10–11 and 14).

- [Labov:T.A.:4:r] (21)
- RITA: She didn't have time tuh cook yesterday she got home *la;te*, 1  
(0.4) 2
- RITA: So ah met'er et (*Promptiers*). 3  
(0.2) 4
- RITA: She had a:, (0.3) a broi:led hambuhrger, (0.6) with no: 5  
gravy awnnit, (0.5) She hadda serving of cabbage, 'n she 6  
hadda salad. 7  
(0.3) 8
- MARGE: Very— It's terrific I bec ause I'm tellin yih— 9  
[ ]
- RITA: E n she couldn' ev en= 10
- RITA: =*fni*-ish :: i(h) t, = 11  
[ ]  
There's 12
- MARGE: =*E*:vrybody's e ncouraging her there. <sup>16</sup> 13  
[ ] [ ]
- RITA: Enna *cuppa* ca:wf e e. 14

And in the following, story-tangential talk (F.22.L.2.) which overlaps a story commentary (L.1.) is met with an added story component (L.5.).

- [Rose:I:1] (22)
- COLEY: Really Har ry pulled a *gun* on me. 1  
[ ]
- MICKEY: We wanna bring a suit against im fer 2  
discrimination. 3  
(0.3) 4
- COLEY: An' *plus* he, he— he hit me inna mou:th. 5

It appears that added story components can be deployed for a range

of contingencies. So, for example, in the following fragment a recipient wisecrack in the course of a story (F.23.L.3) is met with an added story component (L.6).

- [Gaye:A:4:r] (23)
- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| LEN:   | [STORY] go getta- (0.2) cuppa co:ffee'n, (0.7) have a | 1 |
|        | c igare::tte 'n, hnh                                  | 2 |
|        | [   |   |
| RAY:   | Smoke twelve ci garettes uh!                          | 3 |
|        | [   |   |
| LEN:   | n-hn  | 4 |
| RAY:   | 'hh hh  | 5 |
|        | [   |   |
| • LEN: | 'n have another cuppa co:ffee 'n::                    | 6 |

And in the following, an interchange between two parties (F.24.L.2-3, 5 and 6) who have so far been recipients of an ongoing story (data not shown) is overlapped by an added story component (L.7.).

- [Freas:A:4:r] (24)
- |         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| LORI:   | [STORY] And- heels or loafers: or, s a d d l e- | 1 |
|         | [   |   |
| BILL:   | ((whispered)) Shouldn' you check=               | 2 |
| BILL:   | the   | 3 |
|         | =[[   |   |
| LORI:   | oxfe rds,                                       | 4 |
|         | [   |   |
| JAN:    | Hm?   | 5 |
| BILL:   | ((w)) Shouldn't you check the ( )?              | 6 |
|         | [   |   |
| • LORI: | And pony tails,                                 | 7 |

In a fragment shown earlier (see below, F.16a), following a completion point (L.33), teller produces two recycles (L.36) "He come right this e:nd" and (L.38-42) "Fa:ct, . . . He done it *purposely*" although recipients are offering appreciation (L.34-35, 37, 39, 40, and 41). Since appreciation of a prior does not itself implicate subsequent talk, when the appreciation stops the storytelling will have its sequential implicativeness yet to be demonstrated (cf. F.18 and 19). The second recycle may constitute one solution to that problem, providing materials for (and perhaps specifically designed to elicit) a query by recipient (L.48) "*Purposely?*" However, the query does not occur immediately after, and it appears that a secondary solution is offered; that is, teller proposes a return to the dispute with (L.45) "*No: Oxford Street,*". When recipient offers the

query (L.48), thus formally re-engaging turn-by-turn talk (cf. fragment F.19); the initial solution is, after all, successful and teller abandons the dispute, providing a response to recipient's query (L.50) "YE::S. . . ." In this case, the response leads to a next story segment (L.50-58).

- [Labov:Battersea Park:B:3:r] (16a)
- PARKY: . . .gow cracky I wz *saturaite* d. 33
- MAN: [ h-hheh hhehh hheh= 34
- MAN: h e h, 35  
= [[ ]
- PARKY: 'E *co me right* this *e:nd*. 36
- TRACY: [ h a h a! 37
- PARKY: *F a : : c t*, 38  
[[ ]
- MAN: (Yeh that's) good. 39  
[[ ] ]
- (LADY): (M m m m m m M m m Yuh) 40
- TRACY: [ 'u::h h u h h a , h a , h a , 'ha? 41  
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- PARKY: ' E dunnit *pu:r pose* l y : . = 42  
[ ]
- MAN: M m. 43
- ( ): =( )= 44
- PARKY: =*Nao: Ox 'n S treet*, 45  
[ ] [ ]
- MAN: In *O xf'd S tre et*. = 46  
[ ] [ ]
- TRACY: huh-ha hu- 47
- TRACY: =h h h h *Pu: rpose ly?* 48  
[ ]
- PARKY: *Pa:r-* 49
- PARKY: *YE::: S::T h e- t h e* 50  
[ ] [ ]
- MAN: Yes they're uh they're very good= 51
- MAN: (dolphin acts) 52  
= [[ ]
- PARKY: The bloke 'oo gives'em thee- *instru:ction* on th'wissowl= 53
- PARKY: = n :: 54  
[ ]
- TRACY: Ah hah? 55  
(0.2) 56
- MAN: ( ) 57  
[ ]
- PARKY: This thing *come up'n eez ovuh* theh [NEXT SEGMENT] 58

Thus, a series of utterances which can be extracted from a conversation and identified as parts of "a story" can be sequentially analyzed as parts of "a storytelling," with recognizable story components deployed as story-entry and -exit devices, providing transition from a state of turn-by-turn talk among conversational coparticipants into a story told by a storyteller to story recipient(s), and a return from the latter to the former state of talk. Conversely, utterances which might not otherwise constitute parts of "a story" can be sequentially analyzed as parts of "a storytelling," with recognizable topical talk used to engage conversational coparticipants as story recipients, and to negotiate whether, and how, the story will be told, whether it is completed or in progress, and what, if anything, it will have amounted to as a conversational event.

### A STORYTELLING

In this section, resources considered so far are turned to a partial analysis of a single extended fragment in which a storytelling is approached through turn-by-turn talk, where features of the story's emergence are consequential for its reception and its sequential implicativeness.

[GTS:II:2:50:r2]	(25)
AL: I'm gonna'z thinkin about building that Healey up to competition <i>u:se</i> .	1 2
((door slides open))	3
ROGER: Good <i>lu:ck</i> .	4
((door slides shut))	5
(KEN): Hi-i:,	6
(0.3)	7
ROGER: I'll <i>te'yuh</i> . hh	8
[ ]	
( ): ( )	9
(.)	10
• ROGER: <i>I</i> wanna bui:ld, (.) the <i>hottest</i> street machine in West L.A.	11 12
(0.2)	13
AL: <i>I'd</i> like to do that too.	14
[ ]	
• ROGER: N <i>challenge</i> Voodoo to a race I	15
<i>mean</i> the <i>hell</i> with <i>drag</i> strips you gotta have ten	16
thous'n bucks ready t'spe- 'hh <i>I</i> wanna build a <i>hot</i>	17
street machine.	18
(0.7)	19

- ROGER: I mean- 20  
 [ ]
- AL: ( ) dz- a hundred'n fo:rtly in the stree :ts, 21  
 [ ]
- ROGER: Pull into 22  
 A 'n W, hhhehh'hh en challenge, anybody to a go, heh 23  
 • 'hh th'Road Runner Voodoo hehh'khh "C'm on"  
 y'know,= 24
- AL: Ey wuh- 25  
 =[[ ]]
- ROGER: 'hhhhhh Oh there's a twenny sev'n- 26  
 [ ]
- AL: What's the Voodoo, 27  
 (·) 28
- AL: I've heard about it. 29  
 (·) 30
- ROGER: Oh *that* is a ru- it's uhm:: (0.3) a *myth*. Ih-it- Well 31  
 the Voodoo is the *fastest* car, I've ever seen, inna 32  
 streets. 33  
 (0.3) 34
- AL: What *is* it. 35  
 (0.4) 36
- ROGER: It's a *fifty five* Chevvy. It's *bright orange*, (0.5) and 37  
 it has, (·) it *ha:d* 'hh u-lemme tell y'bout this car. 38  
 'hh A *three twunny seven*::(·) *Vet* in it. (uhyih) an' if 39  
 wuz uh, 'hh *dual* quads, 'hh hadda *full roller cam* (0.3) 40  
 four speed neon hydrostick, four f'fty six positraction, 41  
 (·) big slicks, 'hh An' it wuz *thee* fastest car. I've 42  
 ever seen in th'streets. 43  
 (·) 44
- ROGER: 'hh I'll tell y'something there wz a big *drag* (in out'n) 45  
 th'Valley? 46  
 (·) 47
- ROGER: Y'know *wa::y* out there ih wz: hhh bout *ni:nety* miles, 48  
 ( ) : hhhh= 49
- ROGER: =So, (·) We *all* the whole b-evrybody met et Scott's'n we 50  
 went out there it wz a (·) *big* caravan. 51  
 (·) 52
- ROGER: So the Voodoo doesn', it has the-p-*grill* blanked 'o:ff. Y' 53  
 know, 'hh so it couldn'git'ny *air* in the rad'er. So on the 54  
*freeway*, (·) he *overheats*. 55  
 (0.2) 56
- ROGER: Y'know. 'hh *Big* water shoot'n out, 'hh He's been *driving* 57

fer <i>two hours</i> mindja on the freeway. 'hh He overheats. Well	58
we figured scratch one Voodoo.	59
(0.2)	60
• ROGER: Y'know cz izzih-(·)ih wz overheated. So we left widout im,	61
(0.4)	62
ROGER: So th'drag starts,	63
(0.7)	64
ROGER: u-Everybody hear a <i>big</i> loud, n-noi:se like a cannon. 'hh	65
<i>Here</i> comes Voodoo windin end a puffin up there, 'hh We	66
thought he ez dead fer sure-He doesn't shut off the	67
engine. 'hh He jus' keeps on going, (·) One after another	68
'e shuts down e:vry car (offa) Valley. <i>Superstock</i> anything	69
they had. 'hh He didn' shut off iz engine 'n- 'hh polished	70
'em o:ff. one after another,	71
(0.3)	72
ROGER: Turns aroun'n goes home.	73
(0.4)	74
( ): hhmh	75
(0.3)	76
ROGER: I gained a lotta respect fer <i>that</i> car.	77
(·)	78
( ): hhhh	79
(·)	80
ROGER: 'hh Y'know what <i>happened</i> once? 'hh He wz tunin the car.	81
<i>little</i> tiny screw dropped down the ju:g. 'hh lodged in	82
the valve en (then) went the engine. 'hh=	83
AL: =(N: n o s h i t.)	84
[ ]	
ROGER: So'e dropped in a four sixty sev'n. <i>Do:dge</i> .	85
(0.6)	86
(ROGER): Whhhew.	87
(0.5)	88
AL: There wzay uh:m (0.3) u-u-Bill <i>Reilly</i> rode in a car uh,	89
en he toh-wz telling me about it. I've seen it. <i>arou:nd</i> .	90
• it's 'a:, sixty one <i>For:d</i> with a three ninety bored out	91
tuh four ten <i>two</i> four barrels (·) straight (differn) cam	92
'n all this, four speed close'spline, 'hh four fifty si:x.	93
big slicks,	94
(·)	95
ROGER: Speakin about <i>forties</i> .	96
(0.2)	97

ROGER: I worked on a k-o::n Morganelli's Forty.	98
(.)	99
( ): ( )=	100
ROGER: =The guy's a (trip) but yihkno:w,	101
(.)	102
ROGER: He's sorta wierd.	103
[ ]	
AL: (Hey.)	104
(.)	105
AL: D'you know ( )-	106
[ ]	
ROGER: He's gotta forty Fo:rd,	107
[ ]	
AL: (Hey.)	108
(0.4)	109
ROGER: He took outta- (.) t-uh: two ninety six Chrysler'n put	110
inna three: (uh) fifty Chrysler with dual qua:ds?	111
(.)	112
ROGER: Eh he:- He hates drag strips. Y'll never find im etta	113
drag strip,	114
(.)	115
ROGER: 'S one a'these street me:n y'know, =	116
KEN: =( )	117
[ ]	
AL: 'hh hk	118
[ ]	
ROGER: Run 'n fm th'fu:zz' hh That car's pretty fast,	119
(.)	120
ROGER: Then I also worked o:n, w't is pobly.(.) ↑ thee fastest <sup>17</sup>	121
• car.faster'n Voodoo.	122
(.)	123
ROGER: He acshlly doesn't live around here. 'e lives in Manha-u-	124
uh:in uhm. (0.3) Y'know where Lance I fergot th'name a'	125
th'place.	126
(.)	127
ROGER: Well it's uhm twenny sev'n Tee with a full blown	128
Chrysler in it. (.) (Dual) quads. An' he dyives it in	129
the stree:t.	130
(0.3)	131
ROGER: Guy's'n asshole. I mean he c'd i:dle et thirty miles	132
'n hour.	133

The story appears to be triggered via a mechanism similar to that described for fragment (16); that is, the naming of a category evokes an

incumbent of it. In the course of turn-by-turn talk a participant produces a description of a car he would like to build (L.11-12) "the *hottest* street machine in West L.A." In his next utterance he names a car against which his would compete for such a status (L.15) "'N *challenge* Voodoo to a race." And the story is about the car called Voodoo (L.45-77). It is possible that the descriptive phrase is specifically a title—a category which at any given time has a single current incumbent, determined by means of contest, and Voodoo is that category's current incumbent, such that the category, used as a descriptor, has evoked a story about its incumbent.

With the premise that the Voodoo story is triggered at lines 11-12, a series of approaches to and veerings away from a storytelling can be sketched in which it appears that the story will not be told unless coparticipant aligns himself as recipient of talk about Voodoo.

While the naming of Voodoo (L.15) might serve as a basis for topical talk (cf. F.7 and F.16.L.3ff.), or set up a same-speaker story introduction via a disjunct plus embedded repetition (cf. F.2 and F.3) or a version of the Speaking of X format (cf. F.16.L.24ff.), features of the next several utterances suggest that in this case teller provides a trigger for his *coparticipant* and thereafter, consecutively, produces talk by reference to (a) the potential initiation of further talk about Voodoo by coparticipant, and (b) its nonoccurrence.

(a) Latched to the sentence in which Voodoo is named is a next sentence which embeds the naming into ongoing topical talk.(L.15-17) "I *mean the hell with drag strips. . .*" is topically coherent with prior talk, proposing a contrast between dragstrip racing (cf. L.2. "competition use") and street racing (L.11.; cf. also L.113-116).

The positioning of this sentence is systematically vulnerable to overlap by coparticipant, since triggered talk by a noncurrent speaker routinely is initiated in overlap with the utterance-part adjacent to the trigger word. So, for example, fragment (1) contains an overlapping disjunct plus repetition story introduction (L.6-7) and the following fragment has an overlapping disjunct plus repetition query (F.26.L.7) which is followed not only by further talk about the triggered topic (L.8) but by a story (L.9).

[MC:I:14]

(26)

LIL: I still say that the sewing machine's quicker,  
 HARMON: Oh it c'n be quicker but it doesn' do the jo:b,

1  
 2

- |           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| LIL:      | Oh really, We:ll,  | 3 |
|           | [  |   |
| HARMON:   | Not- Not like I c'n do it,                                 | 4 |
| LIL:      | Well I, I ( )  | 5 |
|           | [  |   |
| • HARMON: | with my little ha:: nds,                                   | 6 |
|           | [  |   |
| • LIL:    | Say how's yer little boy,                                  | 7 |
| HARMON:   | <i>Oh</i> he's <i>fi:ne</i> . He's just fine ( he's-) hheh | 8 |
|           | something. 'hh I, I bought im a pair'v underpants          |   |
|           | [STORY]  | 9 |

(b) Coparticipant offers neither story nor query in the course of the continuing utterance. If this utterance reaches completion, a transition-relevance place will occur, a place where coparticipant can produce a next utterance, one which is topically coherent with the prior (in this case, e.g., further talk about competition versus street racing).

Just prior to completion, teller cuts off (L.16-17) "... you gotta have ten thous'n bucks ready t'spe-." A cutoff in a nonoverlapped utterance is a recognizable initiator of self-repair (cf. Jefferson, 1974, pp. 185-188 and Schegloff *et al.*, 1976, pp. 9-10), which means that a repair of an error in the utterance-so-far will follow. As a consequence of the repair, transition will be delayed beyond its initially projected point, and thus coparticipant should delay initiation of his next utterance.

Latched to the cutoff is, not a repair, but a new sentence (cf. F.17.L.7-9), a reissue of a prior utterance (L.17-18; cf. also L.11-12) "'hh I wanna build a hot street machine.'" <sup>18</sup> Thus, in the absence of coparticipant-initiated further talk about Voodoo, teller returns to the point at which the story was triggered, and thereafter, Voodoo is named again (L.23-24) "... en challenge, anybody to a go, heh'hh th'Road Runner Voodoo hehh. . . ." <sup>19</sup>

Again, it appears that teller offers coparticipant a chance to initiate further talk about Voodoo and thereafter consecutively talks by reference to (a) the potential nonoccurrence and (b) the actual occurrence of such an initiation.

(a) Latched to the sentence in which Voodoo is renamed is a disjunct plus story introduction in which a car is identified. The car is not Voodoo. If it were, then the slot in which identification is occurring—i.e., (L.26) "... a twenny sev'n. . ." would contain a repetition of "Voodoo" (cf. F.1.L.8, F.2.L.8, F.3.L.3, F.4.L.2, F.5.L.1, and F.16.L.29). That is, teller is recognizably initiating another story, perhaps specifically as a substitute for, and literally in the place of, the Voodoo story. Again, this

utterance is vulnerable to overlap by coparticipant, should he, now, choose to initiate further talk about Voodoo.

(b) Simultaneously with the substitute story, coparticipant initiates a disjunct plus query (L.25.; cf. also F.26.L.7) "Ey wuh-," cuts off as teller produces a prespeech inbreath (cf. note 10), and recycles and completes the query (L.27) "What's the Voodoo," at a 'recognition point' in the identification component (cf. Jefferson, 1973, pp. 56-69 and F.2.L.9-11) thus, aligning himself as a recipient of information about Voodoo. Thereupon, teller abandons the substitute story (L.26) and initiates a response to recipient's request (L.31, cf. F.16a.L.45-50).

While the response to recipient's query might constitute a piece of information, it is also a 'superlative assessment' (L.32-33) ". . . the Voodoo<sup>20</sup> is the fastest car, I've ever seen, inna streets." Superlative assessments belong to a class of objects which can elicit a "newsmark" or "solicit" from a coparticipant (cf. Terasaki, 1975). Recipient may produce general tokens like "Really?" "No kidding," etc., or tokens fitted to a prior utterance, for example, (F.16a.L.42 and 48) "He done it *purposely*." "Purposely?" Such tokens align coparticipant as a recipient of whatever is to follow. So, for example, in fragment (3), a similarly structured superlative assessment<sup>21</sup> receives a fitted newsmark/solicit.

LOTTIE: . . . she gave me the most *beautiful swimsuit* you've ever seen in yer life.

EMMA: *Gave* it to yuh?

However, recipient does not offer such a token. Instead, he recycles his request for information (L.35; cf. L.27) "What is it," thus aligning himself, not as a recipient of whatever is to follow, perhaps a story (cf. F.26), but as a recipient of information. And teller produces information about Voodoo, an elaborate technical description of the car's features (L.37ff.). Teller caps the description with an escalated recycle of the superlative assessment (L.42-43; cf. L.32-33) "An' it wuz *thee* fastest car. I've ever seen in th'streets."

This can constitute a next chance for recipient to offer a solicit (cf. L.24 vis-à-vis L.15), and again, teller's subsequent talk may be produced by reference to the potential occurrence or nonoccurrence of a delayed solicit (cf. L.25-27). Following the escalated recycle of a story prefatory superlative assessment is a secondary preface (L.45) "'hh I'll tell you something." Should recipient overlap with a solicit, the secondary preface can be abandoned. Should he not, the secondary preface is one of a range of utterances which serve as story prefixes (cf. F.8-15)<sup>22</sup> and the

story can appropriately occur with no observable absence of a solicit, directly thereafter.<sup>23</sup> Recipient offers no solicit and, upon completion of the secondary preface, teller initiates the story proper (L.45) “. . .there wz a big *drag* (in out'n) the Valley?”

Thus, over a series of utterances, coparticipant is aligned as teller's recipient, but not as a story recipient. When the story is told, it is told on a volunteer basis, and this may have consequences for the story's sequential implicativeness.

At the story's completion, teller engages in a search for recipient response. He produces a prototypical story-ending device (L.73; cf.F.18.L.1) “Turns around and goes home.” This is followed by a pause (L.74), a token of appreciation (L.75) and another pause (L.76). Thereafter, he offers a prototypical telling-ending device, an assessment (L.77; cf.F.18.L.3) “*I* gained a lotta respect fer *that* car” which is followed by a token of appreciation (L.79). Over a series of recycled completion points, then, turn-by-turn talk has yet to be re-engaged; the story's sequential implicativeness is yet to be demonstrated.

Teller produces a story tag (L.81–85) which is topically coherent with, and upon its occurrence can be seen to have been projected by, the sort of technical talk which preceded the story (L.37ff., particularly L.37–38 “and it has, it *ha:d*. . .”). Recipient's subsequent talk is consistent with the story tag's technical aspects (L.89–94). Although it is *consistent with* and thus demonstrates a sequential implicativeness of the story tag, and via the tag, of the story itself, recipient's talk is *intensely fitted to* the utterance elicited by his recycled request for information (cf. L.37–42).

Both utterances follow the same format. Both start with a car's year and make (L.37) “It's a fifty five Chevy” and (L.91) “It's a sixty one Ford” and both run through a list of components in identical order: *engine* (L.39) “a three twenty seven *Vet*” and (L.91–92) “a three ninety bored out to four ten,” *carburetor* (L.40) “dual quads” and (L.92) “two four barrels,” *cam* (L.40) “full roller cam” and (L.92) “straight (differr) cam”, *transmission* (L.41) “four speed neon hydrostick” and (L.93) “four speed closed spline,” *traction* (L.41) “four fifty six positraction” and (L.93) “four fifty six,” and *tires* (L.42) “big slicks” and (L.94) “big slicks.”<sup>24</sup> Thus, it is the utterance specifically requested by recipient to which his subsequent talk is fitted; that is, his alignment prior to the story's telling is powerfully preserved in his response to it. Further, the response tacitly disputes Voodoo's status; that is, the story, which depicts an unsurpassable combination of car and driver in action, is encapsulated by technical talk in which a car is adequately characterized as a set

of components, and via such a characterization, recipient's "sixty one Ford" is comparable, perhaps equivalent, to teller's "fifty five Chevvy."

It appears that teller's subsequent talk, at least in part, disputes recipient's treatment of the story and its protagonist. Voodoo is mentioned once more; this time as a basis for comparison with yet another car, a "twenty seven Tee" (L.128; cf. L.26), which is announced as "faster than Voodoo" (L.122). While the comparison proposes Voodoo as the lesser car by reference to one feature—speed—it establishes a context in which implicit comparison is provided for two other features relevant to Voodoo's status; that is, relevant to incumbency in the category The Hottest Street Machine in West L.A. By reference to those two features, the twenty seven Tee is not a candidate incumbent. It is neither from the relevant area (L.124–126) "He *actually* doesn't live around here," nor, crucially, is it a proper street machine, but a competition car illegitimately driven in the streets (L.129–133) "And *he* drives it in the *stree*:ts. Guy's an *asshole*." By implicit comparison, Voodoo re-emerges as best in its class, where, further, its class is to be seen as the better class (cf., e.g., L.113).

These sorts of considerations yield an extended fragment of conversation as heavily occupied by activities relevant to the telling of a story, where the story itself occupies but a portion of that fragment.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of a paper presented at Seminars in Ethnomethodology, Graduate Center, City University of New York, April 1973. Great appreciation is extended to Doug Maynard, Candy West, Tom Wilson, Don Zimmerman, and Roger Mandlebaum.

<sup>2</sup> Several of Harvey Sacks' unpublished lectures deal with storytelling in conversation, for example. Lectures 1–8, Spring 1970 and Lectures 1–16, Fall 1971. (A version of Lectures 9–12, Fall 1971, appears in this volume under the title "A Technical Consideration of a Dirty Joke.") There are numerous references to Sacks' work in this paper. These are best treated, not so much as support for an argument, but as pointers to very interesting talk.

<sup>3</sup> There is preliminary evidence that a story not only articulates with turn-by-turn talk at its edges, but throughout. Roughly, a story is not, in principle, a block of talk, but is constructed of "segments" via which teller's talk can alternate with recipient's. The segmental construction of the story itself will be considered in a later report.

<sup>4</sup> The pair of features, local occasioning and sequential implicativeness, are regularly present in a single utterance; that is, a methodic display of local "occasionedness" is also a demonstration of the sequential implicativeness of a prior. Since this paper tends to treat the story as protagonist, focusing on its emergence from and re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk, the *interrelationship* of prior talk to story to subsequent talk is obscured.

<sup>5</sup> Topical coherence is roughly defined as a current utterance standing in an appropriate, continuous relationship to ongoing talk; cf. Sacks (1968, April 17).

<sup>6</sup> Abbreviations refer to fragments (F) contained in this chapter and their respective line numbers (L).

<sup>7</sup> Routinely, the marked repeat is followed by an embedded repetition. It appears that the disjunct marker and the Speaking of X device perform a similar task, and *placement* is criterial to selection between the two. The disjunct is used prior to completion of the utterance containing the trigger word (cf. F.1-3) and a Speaking of X is used after completion of that utterance (for F.4. cf. F.25.L.96, data not shown for F.5., see also F.16.L.24).

<sup>8</sup> Next positioning is a basic device for relating two utterances (cf., e.g., Sacks 1972b, Lecture 4). Disjunct-marked overlap and postcompletion Speaking of X may be used for triggered talk because without such devices the "next" positioning of an utterance can lead coparticipants to monitor it as topically coherent with prior talk; cf. Sacks (1968, April 17).

<sup>9</sup> The repetition may have been *removed* from an earlier to a later position. At lines 10-12 there is a shift in person reference. "So Lance k- So:, one guy bought a dollar fifty worth of Ripple." While the shift could be a repair of reference-type, from known-to-coparticipant to unknown-to-coparticipant (cf. Sacks, 1971, Lecture 5), at line 20 it appears that Lance is not the one who ordered Ripple, but the one who ordered glue. "Planning on gettin gassed. Huh Lance." Thus, the shift in person reference may be a matter of reorganizing the story's events and the actors associated with those events.

<sup>10</sup> "Thought" is a sequencing object, a 'first verb', which implicates a next, "realized" (cf. Sacks, 1968, May 2 and 1970, Lecture 2). Its occurrence in lines 30-31 positions speaker in a series of activities, in this case, as prior to the order of glue.

<sup>11</sup> These fragments were collected as instances of single-turn story-entry devices for next speaker (F.8-11) and current speaker (F.12-15). When the collection was examined, it was noticed that in seven of the eight cases (F.8-14) some form of *perturbation* occurred adjacent to the entry device. Schegloff is noticing regularities in the occurrence of perturbation, for example, upon resolution of overlap and at various unit-initial positions (personal communication). It appears that perturbation occurs at junctures between discrete activity types, and its presence can serve as an index to junctures between discrete activities in otherwise apparently continuous activities like 'story preface' and 'story entry'. Another phenomenon which may indicate activity junctures is the *audible inbreath* (cf., e.g., F.1.L.8; F.2.L.12; F.3.L.1; F.7.L.10,12; F.12.L.3, etc.).

<sup>12</sup> This fragment and others designated "GTS" are taken from a series of group therapy sessions recorded in 1964 with teenage patients and an adult therapist. A feature of the therapy setting which may be relevant here is that it is one in which business is done, that business superseding personal talk, but in which some forms of personal talk constitute business talk and thus the relevance and admissibility of personal talk may be problematic. In this case it appears that personal talk is superseded by nonpersonal but recognizably "therapeutic" talk.

<sup>13</sup> The 'request' operation of postcompletion "So" is among the phenomena being considered in the forthcoming report on story segmenting (cf. note 3).

<sup>14</sup> In a consideration of gossip, Sacks notes that person attributes are expandable from an individual to related others (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1967b, Lecture 2), those others being co-members of some "membership categorization device" category (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972). Fragment (19) may not only constitute an instance of such an expansion, but may locate a context in which it would routinely occur; i.e., in a series of story-exit devices. If the story is about an individual, recognizably related talk can be found by application of the device "family." Or, for example, if, as in fragment (18), a story is about a teenage car club, recognizably related talk can be found by application of the device "age group" which yields "kids" (L.22).

<sup>15</sup> A question is a prototypical Adjacency Pair first pair-part, an object which has powerful sequential implicativeness (cf., e.g., Sacks, 1972, Lectures 1 and 4).

<sup>16</sup> "There" refers to a weight-loss organization to which teller, tangential speaker, and story protagonist belong.

<sup>17</sup> The notation "↑*thee*" (F.25.L.121) is used to indicate higher pitch and amplitude than "*thee*" (L.42). It appears that the shift in intonation contour is analogous to the immediately subsequent lexical unit "Faster than Voodoo" (L.122), that is, is produced by reference to a distanced prior. Cf., for example, Sacks (1967, Lecture 13) and (1972, Lecture 4).

<sup>18</sup> A repair initiator produced just prior to possible completion, followed by a new sentence, may be one solution to the "two-sentence problem" (Sacks, 1969, Lecture 9): that is, a second sentence is produced without a first ever having reached completion.

<sup>19</sup> There is a difference between lines 17-18 and 23-24 which permits the following consideration. The second occurrence bears no traces of, and perhaps specifically masks, the trigger mechanism (cf. F.16); that is, the descriptor "a hot street machine" is not a category with an exclusive incumbent, but one which can contain multiples, and the contest is no longer with one car, which might be the prior category's exclusive incumbent, but with "anybody," with more than one instance of "anybody" provided ("the Road Runner" and "Voodoo").

<sup>20</sup> Teller, in his initial references to the car, calls it "Voodoo" (L.15 and 24). Coparticipant, in his query, calls it "the Voodoo" (L.27), and teller, in his response, calls it "the Voodoo" (L.32). Technically, this series constitutes an 'unmarked correction sequence' which has as criterial features that, for a same referent, (a) a current speaker uses a term; (b) a next speaker uses an alternate term; and (c) prior speaker uses the alternate term. The abstract format is [X]-[Y]-[Y]. It appears in actual sequences like the following: For an identification of law enforcement officers [police]-[cops]-[cops], for an identification of the ridges on a metal pipe [wales]-[threads]-[threads].

[GTS:2:2:60] (27)

KEN:	. . .the police have said this to us.	1
ROGER:	<i>That</i> makes it even <i>better</i> . The <i>challenge</i> of runnin from the <i>cops</i> !	2 3
KEN:	The <i>cops say</i> if you wanna race, uh go out at four or five in the morning on the freeway . . .	4 5

[J:FN:Hardware Store] (28)

CUSTOMER:	((examining a length of pipe)) Mm, the wales are wider apart than that.	1 2
SALESMAN:	Okay, let me see if I can find one with wider threads. ((selects another piece of pipe)) How's this.	3 4
CUSTOMER:	Nope, the threads are even wider than that.	5

The offer and acceptance of a [Y] is embedded into ongoing talk: that is, the replacement is done in unmarked form. In fragment (25), teller's acceptance of coparticipant's [Y] may be a matter of accommodating a not quite correct usage, the accommodation done by reference to the pair of relevant categories—candidate storyteller vis-à-vis candidate story recipient. Teller's accommodation of recipient's misuse is preserved in the story itself; that is, when the car is first mentioned (L.53) it is "the Voodoo," but is abandoned at the story's climax (L.66) "Here comes Voodoo," and the final reference (L.122) is to "Voodoo."

<sup>21</sup> For a consideration of assessments as sequenced objects, see Pomerantz (1975) and (1977).

<sup>22</sup> Preliminary inspection of conversational data indicates that a range of constructs like "I'll tell you something" and their request-correlate "Tell me something" occur as prefixes with no place provided for a solicit.

<sup>23</sup> While superlative assessments *can* initiate a sequence in which a storytelling is requested by recipient, that potential is not always utilized by teller, who can move directly from preface to story, for example, in fragment (16), someone attempting to talk after a superlative assessment (L.29) "And they *are* stars *my* God," finds that teller has already started the story (cf. also F.25.L.81). But there are conditions under which a preface can be seen as a failed attempt to get a solicit. For example, in fragment (14), a superlative assessment (L.1) "But nobody fought with her like *I* fought with her" is followed by a substantial pause (L.2) and a secondary preface, one which does not admit the relevance of a solicit (L.3) "for example." The secondary preface may constitute a repair of the initial preface's failure to get a solicit. Fragment (25) shares features with both fragment (16) and fragment (14): that is, while teller does not provide a place for a solicit, he does produce a secondary preface which can be abandoned if a solicit occurs or can be directly followed by the story if a solicit does not occur, with no recognizable failure present.

<sup>24</sup> These two segments, with their series of proper nouns, are a transcriber's nightmare (cf. Sacks, 1967b, Lecture 12). A noun may be heard as an unintelligible sound, for example, F.25.L.92 "straight (differn) cam," and F.21.L.3. "So I met her at (*Promptiers*)." Worse, it may be heard as perfectly intelligible and turn out to be misheard. For example, over multiple rehearings, F.25.L.41 was heard as "four fifty six poundsa traction." Rich Frankel mentioned that it ought to be "positraction." On rehearing it was, unequivocally, "positraction." Further, a name may be correctly heard, but not understood. So, for example, although the two segments were seen to be closely fitted, they did not appear to be so utterly equivalent until Frankel pointed out that (L.40) "dual quads" and (L.92) "two four barrels" have the same referent.