

6 Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy¹

GAIL JEFFERSON
University of York

HARVEY SACKS
Late of University of California, Irvine

EMANUEL SCHEGLOFF
University of California, Los Angeles

‘Laughter does not seem to be
a sin, but it leads to sin.’

St John Chrysostom

Laughter as a Socially Organised Activity

This chapter considers laughter as a systematically produced, socially organised activity. As a first approach, laughter can be treated as a non-speech sound among others produced by co-participants to a conversation, vocally or in other ways; sounds which may or may not show up in a transcript, and, if they show up, tend to be described rather than transcribed. Many of these can be profitably transcribed; that is, a transcription of non-speech sounds can make available systematic features of the sound’s production, and can permit observation of how the talk might accommodate the occurrence of such sounds.

So, for example, in a conversation in which one participant is hammering, it appears that the hammering is produced as a pulsed burst, tending to start with a light tap and end with a wallop, and a co-participant appears to be monitoring for completion of a burst of hammering before producing talk directed to an utterance which preceded the burst.

(1) [Frankel:US:II:15]

- 1 **Joe:** But they never called us back.
 2 (.)
 3 **Mike:** ekhheh =
 4 = ((buk bang bang bang bang bang bang))
 5 (.)
 6 **Vic:** Who. =
 7 **Mike:** = Mayer.

(2) [Frankel:US:II:17]

- 1 **Joe:** En dih, guy with duh-eh
 2 (0.2)
 3 ((buh))
 4 **Joe:** [[ea:rdrum:kem i:n. =
 5 = ((bang bang bang BANG BANG)) =
 6 **Mike:** = Guy wit dee eardrum?

About these fragments it can also be noticed that the hammering appears to be fitted to the talk. For example, in Fragment 1 the hammering starts up after a recipient of hammerer's utterance (line 1) has produced a form of comment (a laugh, line 3), and in Fragment 2 a soft tap accompanies the searched-for and found word 'eardrum', a burst of hammering starts up on completion of hammerer's utterance, and, once recipient's talk is underway the hammering does not start up in its course.

In the following fragment, someone starts to cough while another is talking (lines 17–24). The cough occurs in three pulsed bursts, the first two perhaps marked as components of an uncompleted cough with an inbreath ('hhh', lines 18 and 20), which can be heard as preparatory to a next burst, the third perhaps marked as completed with the final particle 'hn' (line 22). Speaker appears to be monitoring, correctly, for completion of the serially produced cough.

(3) [Friedell:Alt:9]

- 1 **Hank:** e-He went to: one mixer, et some,
 2 (1.3)
 3 **Sheila:** Are mixers et girl'schools better th(h)'n mixers et-
 4 (.)
 5 **Sheila:** yihknow. Ri:ce'n,
 6 (.)
 7 **Sheila:** oh: [gra:d mixer]::s a(h)n;
 8 **Hank:** [Definitely.] [Definitel]y. =
 9 **Hank:** = Mixers et girl'schools usually have about::t 'hh en
 10 ev'n ratio.
 11 (0.7)
 12 **Hank:** °()° [There'r of]ten more girls'n boys.
 13 **Sheila:** [R e a lly?]

- 14 (0.9)
 15 **Sheila:** What a sa:d state fer th'gi:rls.
 16 (2.0)
 17 **Hank:** End he went to one et some, ^{(Catholic girl'} school.
 18 **Sheila:** _{[ukhh-hnh ekhhh]' hhh}
 19 (.)
 20 **Sheila:** Kehh-huh kuhh! ' hhh
 21 (0.3)
 22 **Sheila:** EKKHH-huuh, ikhh-hn
 23 (.)
 24 **Hank:** now knows four'r five girls including one eez probly
 25 going tuh take out.

As in Fragments 1 and 2, not only does the talk accommodate the non-speech sounds, but the cough seems attentive to the talk. For example, the cough starts at a point in a current utterance (line 17) at which, in a prior version of that utterance there had been a pause (line 1 and 2). And, for example, the cough may be produced to be as unobtrusive as possible, each burst increasing in force when a prior, less obtrusive cough was ineffective. Finally, it appears that cougher is attentive to speaker's attention to the cough series' uncompleted status. That is, the second burst follows the first after a silence of less than two-tenths of a second (indicated by the period in parentheses, line 19). Given that the second burst occurs in the clear, cougher may take it that speaker has understood the inbreath as preparatory to a next burst and has relinquished the floor. Thereafter cougher takes (and speaker permits) a longer pause before the next, projected-by-an-inbreath burst (lines 20–22).

And in the following fragment, while a speaker and a laughter appear to be pursuing their own activities independently of, and perhaps competitively with, each other's, each pursues his activity with an orientation to the other's (lines 13–24).

(4) [Krakowski:LSD:excerpt 0046]

- 1 **Ed:** And most a'the people who write about it are more- are
 2 y'know straight- sorts'v people who- arn't- too:,
 3 (0.3)
 4 **Ed:** y'know,
 5 (.)
 6 **Nora:** screwed up?
 7 (0.4)
 8 **Ed:** 'hh We:ll who- are-
 9 (0.7)
 10 **Ed:** not used to,
 11 (0.2)

- 12 **Ed:** profound things I guess er some thing.
 13 **Nora:** {hhmhhh} hh{hhhhhhh} hih heh ha, =
 14 **Ed:** = ha ha ha =
 15 **Nora:** = ha ha ha =
 16 **Ed:** = No w't I'm saying is t h e t =
 17 **Nora:** {hhhh} {heh-hn},
 18 **Ed:** = Well like thi-
 19 **Nora:** = {{heh, 'heh, heh'} heh heh, =
 20 **Ed:** = {{One ri:l, }
 21 **Nora:** = {{hhhe:::h
 22 (.)
 23 **Nora:** heh heh =
 24 **Ed:** = thing y'know "I discovered love through LSD" =
 25 **Nora:** {hhhe:hhhhhh}
 26 **Ed:** = en this wz a successful businessman en,
 27 (0.4)
 28 **Ed:** y'know things were going alright b't . . .

Like the hammering and coughing, the laughter occurs as a pulsed burst. In this case, it appears that speaker is attentive to sub-units of pulses within the bursts, placing his talk with an orientation to those units as possibly completed laugh-bursts. For example, at two points in the transcript speaker starts to talk just as laughter stops (lines 15–16 and 23–24); that is, speaker starts talking in the clear. At lines 15–16, while the total burst may be seen as 'hhmhhhhh hih heh ha, ha ha ha', it may also be subdivided into three discrete units: 'hhmhhhhh' + 'hih heh ha', + 'ha ha ha', the onset of the second unit marked by an increase in amplitude and raise in pitch, unit-completion marked with the intonation indicated by the comma. Speaker may be using features of the second unit to find a completion point in the third; that is, both have three pulses or particles. A similar sort of attention may be operating at lines 19–24. Laughter has produced a two-particle sub-unit after speaker has stopped (line 19, 'heh heh, '), and speaker may be monitoring for completion via two-particle units by reference to which he positions his talk (lines 20 and 24). And at one point in the transcript, laughter appears to be attentive to the talk. That is, having produced what might be a laugh-terminal inbreath in overlap with an utterance-beginning (lines 20–21),² finding that speaker has stopped such that a silence is occurring (line 22), laughter produces a next unit of laughter (line 23), and thereafter produces what turns out to be a laugh-terminal inbreath (line 25).

The foregoing considerations have treated laughter as one among various sorts of non-speech sounds such as hammering and coughing, which occur during, and might constitute possible disruptions of, ongoing talk. Observation of detailed transcripts suggest that the sounds have systematic productional features which can be used by speakers, who can accommodate

their talk to the occurrence of such sounds in orderly ways. There are also indications that the sounds are produced with some attention to the talk which they may be disrupting. That is, some of the productional features of the non-speech sounds are interactionally based.

However, laughter may be distinguished from other non-speech sounds in that it has, for participants, the status of an official conversational activity. It can be a relevant, consequential next action to some prior (see Jefferson, 1979). And it can be named as a response given to a quoted utterance in a report of a prior conversation (as, for example, someone can report 'I said X and he agreed,' someone can report 'I said X and he laughed.'). For example:

(5) [Labov:BG:]

- 1 **Alice:** I says I w'like to have some ni:ce, fresh, pardon the
 2 expression horseshit. hhmh! huh _[huh huh huh, 'hhh]
 3 (): _[hhOh my goo'ness]
 4 (.)
 5 **Alice:** Well they die:d laughin.

(6) [SBL:2:2:3:]

- 1 **Chloe:** So I said wz wondering did yuh
 2 (.)
 3 **Chloe:** bust w _[.n ri:ght] 'n the (h)no(h)_[se, eh! 'hhhhh] =
 4 **Claire:** _[u 'hnhhh] _[hnhh 'hnh- 'hnh] =
 5 **Claire:** = _[h n h]
 6 **Chloe:** = _[En she]:laughed

Thus, a speaker who is talking in orderly ways by reference to laughter is perhaps best seen as co-ordinating his conversational activities with another relevant conversational activity, rather than accommodating merely disruptive non-speech sounds. And it is empirically observable that in general, the transition from talk to laughter to talk is done in an orderly fashion. The following fragments display a range of orderly transitions, and, as an extra fillip, indicate that not only can speech be co-ordinated with laughter, but that multiple laughers co-ordinate their laughter, producing coherent, monitorable units.

In Fragment 7, the transition is utterly clean, the laugh burst consisting of synchronous simultaneous onset particles ('ehh' and 'nkh'), a simultaneously begun and co-terminous pulsed burst, each with stressed initial particles ('heh' and 'hih'), and terminal inspiration ('hhhhh' and 'nh 'nh'), immediately after which, a next speaker starts up in the clear.

(7) [Zimmerman:TA:FT:alt:1]

- 1 **Al:** Wuhyih wan'talk about. $\{nkh\}_{h\dot{h}i\dot{h}-hunh, hunh\ hunh, \dot{h}nh\ \dot{h}nh\} =$
 2 **Bev:** $\{ehh\}_{\dot{h}eh-\dot{h}eh-huh-ehh-huh.} hhhhh\} =$
 3 **Bev:** = How wz yer day,

In Fragment 8 there are simultaneous onset particles ('e' and 'ih') and coterminous pulsed bursts. In this case, one party produces a terminal inbreath, and almost simultaneously, both start to speak; i.e. in this case each attempts to occupy the projected post-laugh position with speech.

(8) [Frankel:GS:JP:11:r]

- 1 **Sara:** He rilly didn't have too much 'v a pro:duc'tuh sho::w. =
 2 **Sara:** = $\{[e-\dot{h}uh\ huh\ heh\ heh\ huh\ huh]\}$
 3 **Mary:** = $\{[ih\ hhhhhh\ heh\ \dot{h}ah\ \dot{h}a:h\ ah\ \dot{h}ihhhh\} =$
 4 **Sara:** = C_i'n y'see-
 5 **Mary:** We hed a guy in the airplane the other day . . .

In Fragment 9 the initial start on speech (line 6) may be produced by reference to the two-part sub-units of the ongoing laughter (line 3 'hhhm hhhm', line 4 'mih-hih', line 5 'haa-haa' + 'haa-haa', line 6 'eh-heh!'), and after dropping out by reference to the fact that two others are still laughing, a next start on speech (line 7) occurs at a *next* two-part sub-unit completion (line 4 'hee-hee' and line 5 'a-ha:'). Further, it is perhaps by reference to the initial attempt to speak that it turns out that the two laughers have stopped, the next start on speech occurring in the clear.

(9) [Goodwin:AD(b):7:r]

- 1 **Delia:** Here'e comes, here'e comes be quiet,
 2 **Bart:** $\{[e-\dot{h}uh\ huh\ heh\ heh\ huh\ huh]\}$ "Here'e comes, [be quiet"] =
 3 **Sandra:** $\{hhhm\ hhhm\}$
 4 **Bart:** = Wuhdjih say $\{ab(h)\ out\ mih-hih-\dot{h}ee-\dot{h}ee,\}$
 5 **Jill:** $\{[haa-haa\]\} haa-haa\ \{[a-haa:] \dots =$
 6 **Delia:** $\{eh-\dot{h}eh!\}$ Y u'll-
 7 **Delia:** = Yu'll hear later . . .

And in fragment 10 a cohesive single burst is constructed with one laugher producing continuous pulses (Jill, lines 3 and 6) as another drops out (Sandra, line 2) and still another joins in (Art, lines 4-5). While continuing laugher produces an unbroken series of pulses, the laugher appears to be attentive to the juncture; specifically to the entry of a new laugher. That is, the two sub-units of the continuous burst are quite distinctive (line 3 'haa' vs. line 6 'ah'), and the second sub-unit starts up just after new laugher has

joined in (lines 4–6). Such a phenomenon suggests that ongoing laughter can, for a variety of reasons be renewed and thus the occasion of laughing together can be extended.

(10) [Goodwin:AD(b):8:r]

- 1 **Lenny:** ((mock fag)) Now cut tha:t ou: t Ba:::rt,
 2 **Sandra:** {m-hm-hm:eh-hahhh hh {u h h }=
 3 **Jill:** {a-ha-ha-ha-haa-haa- {h a a }=
 4 **Cal:** {e-heh }=
 5 **Cal:** = [hehh e-heh e-huh e-huh e-huh ha]
 6 **Jill:** = [ah 'ah 'ah 'ah 'ah 'ah 'ah 'ah]
 7 **Lenny:** { Y'(de:::vi:l)

Not only is laughter produced in an orderly fashion, but it appears that an occasion of laughing together is an activity in its own right, an achievement of various methodic procedures. For example, in the following fragment, the telling of a joke is recessed for an extended laughing-together. Some details of the constructedness of the event can be observed. At lines 3–4, an initial burst may be terminating; that is, one laugher has produced an intonation contour captured by a period (possible terminal intonation), the other has produced a terminal inbreath. Each thereafter produces at least one next laugh pulse (lines 5 and 6);³ i.e. each, at a possible termination, provides for extension. A third participant simultaneously provides a different device whereby the laughing-together may be extended, a lexical reference to the prior joke segment (line 7 ‘Oops!’), which, reinvoking the joke, provides official impetus for more laughter by reference to the joke itself. Thereafter, all three laugh (lines 8–11).

(11) [Goodwin:AD:56:r]

- 1 **Cal:** Lits heah i t one tahm fe r Li:::za!
 2 **Bart:** {mmh, {e-huh-rilly ya a:::y!
 3 **Cal:** {he:uh he:uh hu:eh hu:eh.
 4 **Bart:** {eh-hih 'hhh }hh=
 5 **Bart:** = {hihh }
 6 **Cal:** = {heh-he:h {he:h, }
 7 **Len:** = {Oo::oo:: {ps,ss, }
 8 **Bart:** {he:uh {he uh-h a }
 9 **Cal:** {he:ha : {ah ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha } hhh {he,he }h=
 10 **Len:** {ah!ah! {ah!ah!ah!ah!ah!ah!ah!ah! } ah!a! {a! }
 11 **Bart:** {ah'hh }

At the end of lines 9–11, only one participant is laughing (line 9). As he starts a next pulse; i.e. provides for continuation, another produces a second lexical reference to the joke (line 13), which, again, serves as impetus for

another round of laughing together. It can be noted about lines 1–16 that although participants are entering and exiting the event, there is a continuous flow of laugh pulses.

12 **Cal:** = he₁:h he-ehh₁e-he-he-₁e-₁hhee₁hh₁{e:::a::yee: {°ee::° }
 13 **Bart:** Oo:::ps,₁ n-he {u-h u h {eh! {uh!ah!ah!ah! {°ehhhh₁hh° }
 14 **Len:** {eh! {uh!ah!ah!ah! {°ehhhh₁hh° }
 15 **Bart:** {°ehhhh₁hh° }
 16 **Len:** {°uhhhh₁h° =

At the end of lines 12, 15 and 16 there is a marked diminution of volume (indicated by the degree signs). Once again, the laughing-together is potentially terminating. At this point, joketeller provides a lexical token indicating preparation to return the joke’s telling (line 17 ‘So:.’). Teller does not move directly into the telling’s continuation. There is a brief silence (line 18) followed almost simultaneously by teller’s moving into a next joke segment (line 20 ‘They-;’) and a third reference to the prior segment (line 19 ‘Ooops’). Not only does teller defer to the lexical reference to the prior segment and drop out, but he joins in the next round of laughter for which the reference has recognisably served as impetus (line 22).

17 **Cal:** = So:.
 18 (.)
 19 **Len:** Oo:::p(h)s =
 20 **Cal:** They-
 21 **Bart:** = neghh-₁heh₁heh₁
 22 **Cal:** huh₁ha-₁ha: ha: ha: ha: ha a h ah ah! }°a!°
 23 **Len:** {e!e! {e!e!a! }
 24 **Bart:** {hgheh-heh }

It is after this third extension of the laughing-together that the joke’s telling is resumed (data not shown).

The foregoing considerations suggest that laughter can be an achieved product of methodic, co-ordinated processes, with occasion of laughing together oriented to, produced, extended, as an event in itself. However, it appears that in some characterisable situations laughing together occurs as an *accessory* activity, performed as a way to arrive at some specifiable outcome. It thus becomes not only a relevant, consequential response to a prior utterance, but has a significant bearing on a, or some next action(s). The next section focuses on laughter in such a type of situation, considering its systematic, socially organised aspects by locating it as a component of a particular type of sequence: the expanded affiliative sequence.

Laughter as a Component of a Sequence

In the course of ongoing talk someone may say something which breaches conventional standards of courtesy, propriety, tact, ethics, commonality, etc. etc., the breach in conventional standards at least potentially being offensive to other parties to the interaction. While there are various ways to breach conventional standards, the major focus here will be on such obvious breaches as rudeness and obscenity.

The introduction of 'improper' talk⁴ may have an interactional basis. That is, it is a convention about interaction that frankness, rudeness, crudeness, profanity, obscenity, etc., are indices of relaxed, unguarded, spontaneous; i.e. intimate interaction. That convention may be *utilised* by participants. That is, the introduction of such talk can be seen as a display that speaker takes it that the current interaction is one in which he may produce such talk; i.e. is informal/intimate. Further, the introduction of such talk may be, not only a display of a perception by one party of the status of the interaction, but a consequential, programmatic action. By introducing such talk, a speaker may be initiating a move *into* intimate interaction from a status he perceives as non-intimate so far. Speaker may be offering an invitation to his co-participants to produce talk together whereby they can see themselves as intimate; together they will be constructing intimacy.

If that is so, then recipient treatment of such talk may be produced by reference to its invitational properties; a recipient, then, not merely deciding whether the object itself is attractive or repugnant (in general or for this recipient in particular), but may be seeing an invitation which is to be accepted, rejected, or otherwise managed. Such a characterisation of improper talk provides a framework which leads to examination of talk following the impropriety; to an investigation of recipient treatment of an invitation to intimacy.⁵

A collection of actual responses to improper talk can be made, and instances of such response can be arranged on a hypothetical continuum ranging from rejection to enthusiastic acceptance, from disaffiliation to escalation.

In the following fragment, recipient of an impropriety (line 2) *disaffiliates* (line 6).

(12) [Cole:I:5:r]

- 1 Jo: Uh:m, (0.2) make su:re, evrything i:s, (0.4) organic
 2 and orgasmic.
 3 (0.4)

(15) [Goldberg:JG:1:3]

- 1 **George:** We came ho:me'n (0.4) screwed arou:n' ((clears throat))
 2 Literally, °uhh'hhh, hhhhh°
 3 **Hap:** Well I'll be da::rned.

(16) [Labov:BG:5]

- 1 **Joan:** a load of shit.
 2 (·)
 3 (): eh h hnh huh huh! hnh!

In the following fragment, a recipient *affiliates* by replicating the impropriety in his own next utterance, and thus accepts the invitation offered by the impropriety.

(17) [Labov:TA:11]

- 1 **Daniel:** 'hh en halfway ho:me all'v a sudden I's threw up. dry:.
 2 (1.0)
 3 **Daniel:** 'n I pulled duh car o, ver'n I wz covered with sweat.
 4 **Arlene:** [khh! Wul(h)wuun throw up wet'n nat new car!

And in the following fragment, a recipient *escalates* the impropriety. That is, not only does he accept the invitation to intimacy, but himself adopts the position of an offerer, inviting acceptance of an invitation to still deeper intimacy. The fragment is excerpted from a sensitivity training session for prison guards (recorded in 1963) in which the members are being encouraged by the group leader to name things as disgusting to them as a homosexual inmate. There is a gradual progression (not shown) from 'Oh I can't think of a particular thing right now' to 'things . . . that don't uh – follow in the social acceptance of society – I guess.' to 'Someone who'd take off their shoes and put 'em up on the table–'. Thereafter, the following occurs:

(18) [Ward, Kassebaum:II:25]

- 1 **Donnelly:** I can give you a good example. I was getting ready to go
 2 back to the ship one night, and this one fellow who worked
 3 for me, he was a little bit drunker than usual and he kept
 4 going on a crying tear, and lying on the fence there, and
 5 when we had to go back to the ship, "Ain't you gonna help
 6 me back?" and then he would heave, and roll around in it –
 7 That ain't exactly disgusting. Sickening maybe–
 8 **Arlett:** I'll go for that.
 9 **Donnelly:** You have all the puke and vomit from him, and he rollin
 10 around in it, and keep on crying and needs help back to the
 11 ship and all that–

- 12 **Falker:** I would feel about the same way about that man that I would
 13 about a queen. Thanks, Mr. Donnelly. Disgusting.
 14 **Arlett:** I'd feel the same way about something like that, or how
 15 about a handful of shit.
 16 **Baines:** Or how about some guy drinking his piss or something like
 17 that after a twenty mile hike or something like that.
 18 **Benson:** We got a couple of queens over there in my building that
 19 disgust me in that same way. Now the rest of them, no
 20 trouble whatsoever.

The instance of a disgusting thing is arrived at via a story, and the transcript shows a pause thereafter (the double dashes, end line 6); i.e. no recipient has offered a response. Perhaps by reference to an observable declination to respond, offerer starts to disaffiliate from his own position (line 7), but is overlapped by recipient's assertion (but not demonstration) of affiliation (line 8; in this transcript a dash at the end of an utterance indicates it is overlapped by a next utterance). Thereafter, and perhaps by reference to the asserted affiliation, offerer reasserts the improper component (lines 9–10) and another recipient asserts (but does not demonstrate) affiliation (line 12). The initial affiliator (Arlett) now provides another assertion of affiliation (line 14) and moves to an escalation (line 15), to which still another recipient affiliates, now by demonstration (line 16). The series is terminated with yet another member of the group asserting affiliation (lines 18–19) while shifting focus from a search for apt comparisons to the troublesomeness of particular queens.

While actual instances of the various response-types were arranged on a hypothetical, perhaps arbitrarily ordered continuum, Fragment 18 indicates that at least a portion of that continuum, may reflect an actual type of progression: *Affiliation* followed by *escalation* (e.g. lines 14–15). It turns out that various segments of the continuum do occur in sequence. A regularly occurring progression is: *Disattention* followed by *appreciation* followed by *affiliation*. Three extended fragments are shown and the sequences within them are minimally sketched.⁷

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

- 1 **Gene:** Are yih avoiding me like the plague, =
 2 **Maggie:** = nNo::: of wahl yih nah you know better th'n,t h a t }
 3 **Gene:** I'm not syphletic, =
 4 **Maggie:** = 'hhh No { I know yer no {t, h h h h } 'h h }
 5 **Gene:** () {heh, he-heh }-heh- heh- {heh- {heh }
 6 **Maggie:** h h {heh } heh huh =
 7 **Maggie:** = 'hhhhh, I keep running te:sts onyuh I know yer not. =
 8 **Gene:** ()
 9 **Gene:** = eh h he- {heh- {heh- {heh- {heh- }°hn° =
 10 **Maggie:** {h h h h h }

- 11 **Maggie:** = UH:::hhhhhhhh No Gene I've just hh ' hhhhhh been in en been
 12 out'n sometimes hhh y'know the pa:ths 'hhh cro:ss, bu:t uh
 13 th'ti:me is ba:d,
 14 (0.7)
 15 **Gene:** Ye:h. What's happ'ning.

(20) [NB:III:2:R:5]

- 1 **Ted:** No we c'm in fr'm the beach'n then we c'm in'n to take a na::p
 2 yih kno::w, it's, really, [we really get-] =
 3 **Guy:** Ye:h [y o u : : ,] =
 4 **Ted:** = [[' hhhh
 5 **Guy:** = [[screw in arou:n there uh:,]
 6 **Ted:** Ye : : : uh: 'n then we t-k-
 (0.9)
 8 **Guy:** W'n [a'those k]ids- [come, s in'n dih ((f)) da:ddy. mummy:
 9 **Ted:** [h e v a 'bee:::r,
 10 (.)
 11 **Guy:** ((f)) daddy =
 12 **Guy:** = hhhhe [h-heh-heh-#h-#h:::;,]
 13 **Ted:** eYe:::: h hhe:h u- [hu:h]
 14 **Guy:** [he:h] uh'hhh, hhh
 15 **Ted:** [hu-uh,
 16 (.)
 17 **Guy:** °huh-e-hu, h. °
 18 **Ted:** [nn (ff) Get outta the:re. =
 19 **Guy:** = he:h heh [heh heh heh hu:h hu-uh] hhhahhhhh,] =
 20 **Ted:** [huh huh hnuh heh-huh- °uh-uh-°uh°] =
 21 **Ted:** = 'hh, hhh,]
 22 **Guy:** Aah w' l (that's th'way it goes)]
 23 **Ted:** [N o : : : n o h a n k y panky.
 24 (.)
 25 **Guy:** °No hanky pan, ky. °
 26 **Ted:** [No::: hanky panky.
 27 (0.3)
 28 **Guy:** Well have a good time.

(21) [NB:HT:2:r]

- 1 **Emma:** W'l Martha? No, w I'd love tuh have you join us,
 2 **Martha:** ()
 3 (.)
 4 **Emma:** If you:: feel ez though you'd like t'come over,
 5 (.)
 6 **Martha:** u-Well thank you dear I don't think so I had my little 'hh
 7 he:n, [a:nd uh,] =
 8 **Emma:** [°Mm hm, °] =
 9 **Martha:** = 'hh I'm looking forward to just uh: 'hh having a: ('hh) a
 10 little:: (0.4) ti:me tuh myself, =
 11 **Emma:** = °A::r ight, °
 12 **Martha:** [I've lo'ok'forward t(h)o(h)i(h)t s(h)o l(h)o- 'hh] =
 13 **Emma:** ((ff)) Oh:::

- 14 **Emma:** = [{":::": "*oh::"}]
 15 **Martha:** = [{"Yihknow", "like-"}] Garbo, 'hkhh, hh
 16 **Emma:** = [{"y: Yehh", "hheh"}] =
 17 **Martha:** = [{"ehh"}]
 18 **Martha:** = [{"heh-heh"}]
 19 **Emma:** = [{"Ah", "wagh", "nt t'be alo", ":::": "ne."}]
 20 **Martha:** = [{"Bu:t uh", "hh", "An' Gil-"}] =
 21 **Emma:** = [{"hh-"}]
 22 **Martha:** = [{"An' Guy", "got do:wn."}] =
 23 **Emma:** = [{"hhhh", "Ye:s", "he", "wz", "he::", "re after I:", "came", "ho:me"}] . . .

In Fragment 18, a same speaker (Arlet, line 14) might be characterised as preparing the way for escalation with an affiliation. Specifically, he is demonstrating that his obscenity is occasioned by a prior and occurs as part of an acceptance of the prior's invitation to intimacy. In Fragments 19, 20 and 21, a similar characterisation might be applied to two participants. That is, in these cases the participants are collaboratively preparing the way for affiliation, providing a display of its sequential occasioning and its character as an acceptance of an invitation. Thus, the sequences can be treated as arrivals at affiliation which, when it does not occur in a recipient's *next* utterance, as it regularly can (see e.g. Fragment 17 lines 1 and 4 and Fragments 18 lines 6 and 8, 9 and 12), then it can be achieved over a series of internal expansions of the base sequence (Jefferson & Schenkein, 1977). The expansions in the three fragments under consideration run off in three discrete steps, as follows:

Impropriety followed by disattention

In each fragment, although an acknowledgement is done, there is no explicit uptake of the impropriety.

(19)

- 3 **Gene:** I'm not syphletic, =
 4 **Maggie:** = 'hhhh No I know yer not,

(20)

- 3-5 **Guy:** Ye::h you::, 'screwin arou [::n there uh::,]
 4-6 **Ted:** = [{"hhhh", "Y e :: :"}] uh::'n then we t-k-
 7 (0.9)
 9 **Ted:** hev a bee:::r,

(21)

- 9 **Martha:** 'hh I'm looking forward to just uh: 'hh having a: ('hh) a
 10 little:: (0.4) ti::me tuh myself, =
 11 **Emma:** = °A::right, °

(19)

3 **Gene:** I'm not syphletic,
((laughter))

7 **Maggie:** 'h h h h h I keep running te:sts onyuh I know yer not.

In Fragment 20, affiliation is done by producing a next activity in the falsetto-voiced enactment.

(20)

8 **Guy:** W'n a'those kids- comes in'n dih (ff) da:ddy. mummy:

9 (.)

10 **Guy:** ((f)) daddy
((laughter))

18 **Ted:** ((f)) Get outta the:re.

And in Fragment 21, the affiliation is done with the Garbo signature.

(21)

15 **Martha:** Yihknow like- Garbo,
((laughter))

19 **Emma:** Ah waghnt t'be alo:::ne.

In each case, the affiliation not only follows laughter, but laughter by both parties (F.19 lines 5–6, F.20 lines 12–17, and F.21 lines 16–17); i.e. the affiliation occurs within an occasion of laughing together, an event which can be constructed and expanded in its own right (see p. 158ff). And a standard way in which such an event is expanded is by one of the participants producing lexical reference to the talk out of which the laughter was initially generated (see pp. 158–59), where contributions to the occasion can be and are made by others than the initial speaker, as in Fragment 11 and the following, in which there is alternation of two speakers as next contributor (lines 15, 20 and 24).

(22) [GTS:II:2:90:r]

1 **Roger:** Hey ah'll bring in a gi:rl hhh:h 'ehh heh- 'nhh =

2 **Ken:** = Yah.Less all bring inna gir-

3 **Roger:** 'We won'get much 'a,cco:m]plish' [hih] =

4 **Al:** 'E Y. [Hey] =

5 **Ken:** = Let's all bring inna [g i r l next week.]

7 **Al:** 'Tell'er it's a da:te.

8 (.)

9 **(Jim):** hhih-hhi]h

10 **(Ken):** 'ek]hnhh

11 **Roger:** 'heh-HA HA 'hhehh] 'hehh] =

12 **(Al):** 'hnhh]

- 13 **Roger:** = It's nchi(h)pe(h)h'hheneh =
 14 **(Jim):** = hhhh 'hehh =
 15 **Al:** = W'r goin Du:tch.
 16 (.)
 17 **Roger:** hha-hha ₁ha °ha°-#|_ah
 18 **Ken:** ₂ehh hjh ₃hn
 19 **(Jim):** = 'hhhh We're GOING GROU::P, =
 20 **Roger:** = 'hhhh We're GOING GROU::P, =
 21 **Al:** ()
 22 **Roger:** = 'hheh hjh-e ₁'hheh-ih °nhh° 'hhhh =
 23 **Al:** ()
 24 **Al:** = Goin group'n the group's Du:tch y'know ₁(w't I mean?)
 25 **Roger:** = h h - heh-heh
 26 **(Jim):** = mhhhhh hjh-hjh

The occasion of laughing together can serve as an environment in which recipient, to contribute to its extended occurrence, might properly produce a lexical reference to the source of the laughter; i.e. to the impropriety. And, as shown in Fragment 22, any next contribution may be tightly related to its prior, may work off it, play with it in a range of ways, and may thus demonstrate an understanding of the impropriety itself (rather than the at best equivocal tokens which occur in the disattention component of the sequence). By producing such an object, recipient thus becomes implicated in the sort of mentality which produces such talk; i.e. affiliates to the impropriety.

The occasion of laughing together also provides a restricted field. That is, while the affiliation implicates recipient in the mentality which produced the impropriety, it has as its specific, local, sequentially appropriate job, the extension of the occasion of laughing together (in contrast, perhaps, to such direct affiliation as that in Fragment 17).

In the fragments under consideration, the laughing-together may be characterised as *pre-affiliative*. It provides an environment which simultaneously urges for and restricts the domain of an activity (affiliation) which might relevantly have occurred earlier but has been withheld pending just such negotiations as would provide that its eventual occurrence is both sought after and restricted in its domain. In this sense, laughter is not merely a particularly apt next event following recipient disattention to an impropriety, but may be specifically relevant, given the occurrence of disattention, as a way to arrive at affiliation. That is, laughter systematically occurs as a mid-component in an expanded sequence of which the base sequence is Impropriety followed by Affiliation.

Further, in the fragments under consideration it appears that the occur-

rence of affiliation completes a sequence. In each case it can be observed that soon after affiliation is achieved the laughing-together is terminated.

In Fragment 19, offerer produces a next laugh-burst (line 9) and on its completion (a diminished laugh particle, cf. Fragment 11 lines 12, 15, 16) recipient provides an answer (lines 11–13) to the question to which the impropriety was an appendation (line 1 ‘Are you avoiding me like the plague?’, line 3 ‘I’m not syphletic,’), and offerer takes up the return to business (line 15). That is, while offerer proposes to extend the laughing-together after affiliation has been achieved, recipient moves to terminate it.

In Fragment 20, offerer initiates and recipient joins in a next laugh-burst (lines 19 and 20). Thereafter both move to terminate the laughing-together, offerer with a closing assessment ‘Aah well that’s the way it goes,’ (line 22), recipient with a denial of the initial characterisation of his activities (line 23, *vis-à-vis* lines 3–5).⁸ That is, the laughing-together is extended, but at a point where a next lexical contribution is due, both move to terminate the occasion.

And in Fragment 21, offerer shifts topic as the affiliative utterance approaches its projected completion (lines 19 and 20–22), and recipient immediately takes up the proffered new topic (line 23). That is, just as affiliation is achieved, offerer moves to terminate the laughing-together.

In each case, closure is activated subsequent to affiliation with no further lexical contributions to the laughing-together. In Fragment 19 it is recipient who moves to terminate, in Fragment 20 it is both parties who move to terminate, and in Fragment 21 it is offerer who moves to terminate. The activity-identities offerer and recipient appear not to matter for the termination of such a sequence. One way to account for the placement of the moves to terminate (i.e. prior to the point at which a next lexical contribution is due), and for the irrelevance of the categories recipient and offerer for the move to terminate, is to characterise the sequence in terms of the continuum proposed earlier (p. 160ff). In each of the three fragments, three response-types occur in the order proposed for the continuum (disattention, appreciation and affiliation). The response-type proposed as last on the continuum (escalation) does not occur in these fragments, and may be characterisable as not, *yet*, having occurred (see, e.g. Fragment 18, lines 7–9 and 14–15 for the relevance of affiliation to escalation). That is, termination of the expanded affiliation sequence cum laughing-together may be activated by reference to avoiding a lexical contribution which might well turn out to be an escalation. The prospect of escalation might serve as an impetus for either or both participants to terminate an otherwise valued and methodically constructed event (both laughing-together in its own right, and the

- 11 **Emma:** = I bet'n the moonlight'n the beautiful stars the wind blew
 12 terribly thou:gh,
 13 (.)
 14 **Lottie:** Ye::ah the wind blew down there en the wind blew t'day b't
 15 oh God comin home through the canyon tihnight oh man it was
 16 horrible.

First mention (line 5) is observably precipitate in its delivery. For one, it veers off a topic which offerer had just taken up (line 1).¹⁰ Secondly, it disattends that the prior utterance (line 3) is a request for confirmation (a request which, when subsequently reissued and attended (fourth mention, Fragment 30, lines 13–22) generates extended talk), and utilises mention of the swimming pool as an occasion for mention of the nude swimming. It is possible that first mention is an instance of 'triggered' or 'touched off' talk.¹¹ Further, participants to the reported activity are introduced as 'we' (line 5). In general, participants to a reported event tend to be identified rather than initially pronominalised (and in particular, in these materials, nominalised introduction is done, cf. Fragment 27 line 20). The pronominal introduction here may be attendant to the precipitate delivery. And it may be problematic. It is not that recipient would be unable to infer from 'we' who the participants to the activity were, but that an inference could be made which would tend to enhance the impropriety. That is, the 'we' has a candidate complement of three, the guest and host couple, one of whom is male, and there has been reference to the couple in immediately prior talk (data not shown) which may contributed to a tri-partite sense of 'we'. It is observable that reported absence of the male is a recurrent feature of subsequent mentions (cf. Fragment 27, lines 16–21, Fragment 29, line 4 and Fragment 31 line 30). It is possible then, that a byproduct of the precipitous introduction of the impropriety is an unintended aggravation of its possible offensiveness.

There is a momentary break in speech following delivery of the impropriety (lines 5–6) ' . . . we swam in the nude 'hh . . . '). While the break is momentary, it may be consequential; recipient silence at that point constituting a potential disinclination to respond.¹² It is possible that subsequent talk by offerer is oriented to, and remedial of, that declination. Specifically, it appears that an 'offerer's correlate' of recipient disattention to an improper component is produced. First, a continuer (in this case ' . . . Sunday night . . . ')¹³ and thereafter a de-escalated alternative to the impropriety which preserves reference to the activity and re-offers it as a responsible (in this case an alternative description of ribald fun, ' . . . until about two o'clock.'). A similar sequence is found in Fragment 17 (p. 162), in which there is a substantial silence following the impropriety. That is, a potentially offensive description of illness (line 1 ' . . . I just threw up. dry. ') is followed

by a one second silence (line 2).¹⁴ Following the silence is a continuer (line 3 ‘. . . and I pulled the car over . . .’) and a de-escalated alternative description of illness (‘. . . and I was covered with sweat.’). Such a sequence may be characterised in the following way: In the absence of response to the offensive component, offerer provides talk which serially (a) retroactively displays that no response was required; i.e. that this is not an instance of a proffered improper responsible to which a recipient declined to respond, but rather, merely a non-problematic item, with further talk simply continuing, and (b) remedies the fact that absence of response to the improper *component* has also constituted absence of response to the reported *activity/event*, by re-offering the activity/event, now cleansed of impropriety.¹⁵ It is the availability of the same type of responsible without its improper aspect which makes this sequence an offerer’s correlate of recipient disattention. And in the cases under consideration, recipient responds in the course of the cleansing sequence; in Fragment 17 with affiliation (line 4), and in first mention with a possible pre-affiliation, laughter (line 8).

However, recipient’s laughter in this particular case may constitute disattention to the improper component rather than appreciation of it. It is positioned in such a way as to display *anticipation* of the *projected* (de-escalated alternative) responsible. Specifically, it starts at a point in the continuing utterance at which the projected naming of a late hour is ‘due’. In general, due-point is a standard locus of overlapping talk (see Jefferson, 1973), and in the following fragments laughter is initiated at, or around, due-point.¹⁶

In Fragment 24, a first anticipatory appreciation occurs at due-point for ‘box’ (line 2), a next occurs at due-point for the contents of the box (line 4).

(24) [Labov:BG:5]

- 1 **Joan:** ‘hhh She wrapped u:p in a very ni(h)cely gift wrapped, =
 2 **Betty:** = [ss:::
 3 **Joan:** = [bo(hh)o:k
 4 **Doris:** [hn-hnn hn-hnn hn-hmnnn, =
 5 **Joan:** [bo:x, ‘hh
 6 **Joan:** = a load of shit.
 7 (.)
 8 (): ehh hnh huh huh! hnh!

In Fragment 25, two recipients start almost simultaneously at due-point for the object which will constitute a joke’s punchline.

(25) [Goodwin:AD:58:r]

- 1 **Cal:** ‘I gotta git outta dih mood befo’ I c’n git outta

- 2 d, i , h cah, ”
 3 **Lenny:** a { h ha ha } ha ha ha ha
 4 **Bart:** u-hu-huh } hu:h hu:h hu:h

The laughter in first mention has a similar configuration *vis-à-vis* due-point for the projected late hour.

(23)

- 7 **Lottie:** u(h)ntil about t
 8 **Emma:** e hhh { hih h } huh { huh { ha : ; ha :
 9 **Lottie:** two uh { clo : : : ck.

Further, in Fragment 25 and the following fragment, the laughter is escalated at or near completion-point of the anticipated component.¹⁷

(26) [Goodwin:AD:63:r]

- 1 **Bart:** “. . . ’n took mhhy fif, t(h)y c(h)e(h)ents”
 2 **Cal:** hnn-hnn-hnn- hah- } ha:h-ha:h

That is, there are increases in pitch and amplitude, and/or stretchings and/or openings of the shape of the particles (in Fragment 25 from ‘ha’ to ‘ha’ and from ‘huh’ to ‘hu:h’, in Fragment 26 from ‘hnn’ to ‘hah’ to ‘ha:h’, and, see Fragment in note 16, from ‘heh’ to ‘ah!’ It can also be noted about Fragment 24 that while the anticipatory laughter stops and the anticipated object is delivered in the clear, the laughter which appreciates it is distinctive from the anticipatory sounds). The same is true of first mention, the laughter shifting from ‘huh’ to ‘ha:’, as the stretched ‘clo::ck’ arrives at completion.¹⁸

Methodically, then, via placement and sound-shifts, the recipient of first mention’s laughter is produced as anticipatory to, and subsequently appreciative of, the late hour until which the activity took place, thereby disattending the improper component. In effect, the laughter collaborates in the cleansing sequence undertaken by offerer.

However, offerer’s activities appear directed to exploiting the fact that the appreciation of the de-escalated responsible is done with laughter (in contrast, e.g. to a lexical which specifies that which response is directed to). Roughly, offerer at some point stops talking and starts laughing, and thus contributes to a laughing-together which (cf. Fragment 19 lines 3–7 and Fragment 20 lines 5–18) can eventuate in affiliation. Offerer’s laughter provides that the laughing-together is a single, rapidly escalating burst. That is, it reproduces the shift in particle-shape via which recipient escalated (line

9 ‘huh’ to ‘ha:: ha:’), simultaneously re-escalating via increased amplitude (line 10 ‘HUH’ to ‘HA HA:::.’). The result is a display of, not merely laughing at the same time, but laughing in the same way.¹⁹

But just as offerer initiates the laughter which will constitute a laughing-together, recipient stops laughing and starts to talk, whereupon offerer stops laughing (lines 8–11). And recipient’s talk now specifically attends the de-escalated aspect of the carrier-utterance; i.e. attends that the activity took place late at night, with a continuation of the earlier dream motif (line 3 ‘I bet it’s a dream’) with lines 10–11 ‘Oh I bet in the moonlight and the beautiful stars . . .’. That is, systematically in its productional details and as subsequently lexically demonstrated, recipient’s laughter disattends the improper component.

And latched to the utterance which demonstrates an ongoing attention to innocuous aspects of the carrier-utterance, recipient offers a shift in topic (lines 11–12) which is accepted by offerer (line 14), who uses the topic shift to close the report (lines 15–16).

First mention, then, consists of a disattended impropriety with the carrier-topic mutually abandoned (cf. Fragments 13 and 14, p. 161).

Second Mention

Recipient disattends improper component and tends to disaffiliate.

(27) [NB:PT:14:r] [Time: ca. 11:25–12:15]

- 1 **Lottie:** I left theh:: (.) restr’n exacy a qarter tuh ei:ght, =
 2 **Emma:** = [[Mm hmmm,m
 3 **Lottie:** = [[hhhhhh]En I called– Isabel et twunny five minutes tuh te:n
 4 that’s in s_i:– i: n uh]Pa:lm Spr_i:ngs. =
 5 **Emma:** (en got there.)
 6 **Emma:** = °*aOh:::w’l that’s wonderf_iul.°
 7 **Lottie:**]En then:: uh tha’wz eighteen
 8 miles so ’e siz w’l jis come on down suh:– til yuh see the
 9 tiki lights::]’n I’ll be]the:re.
 10 **Emma:**]M m m hm,
 11 (.)
 12 **Emma:** Mm hm,
 13 (.)
 14 **Lottie:** So I drove on they were waiting for m’went home– ’hhhhh =
 15 **Emma:** = °A_ih hah.°
 16 **Lottie:**]En the’:n, course Dwight hadtuh get up (0.2) uwul’e
 17 u–he got up et (0.2) si:x.
 18 (.)

- 19 **Emma:** M₁mm h₂mm:]
 20 **Lottie:** th'next]_morning, so Isabel'n I en(h)w(hh)e swam in
 21 th(h)at pool until two uh'cl(h)o₁ck in the]_morning. =
 22 **Emma:** O₁h : : ,
 23 **Lottie:** = i(h)]_in the n₁u:de. =
 24 **Emma:** G o : d.
 25 **Lottie:** = 'hh₁u-(h)o₁(h)oh Go₁d ih wz₁ : :
 26 **Emma:** 'Isn't s h e c u : : :te, =
 27 **Lottie:** = fun. =
 28 **Emma:** = 'hh She still d₁rinkin er liddle dri₁ngs?
 29 (0.4)
 30 **Lottie:** Ye:ah'n,then-]_we swam a:ll day t'day =
 31 **Emma:**]_oYeah, o]
 32 **Lottie:** = I d-I never, (.) well I got out about erry (.) five
 33 minutes er so,'n then 'n]_take,a-
 34 **Emma:**]_oOh I betch' e r]_ta:nned.
 35 (.)
 36 **Lottie:** 'hh Y₁eah. Ki:n'a.Y₁ea:h. =
 37 **Emma:** = Mm h₂mm: , =
 38 **Lottie:** = 'hhh En the:n, ah left there et uh:::: (0.5) ex₁actly et
 39 three o'clock. 'pt 'hhhh En I didn'git inna any traffig
 40 e'all . . .

Second mention (lines 20–23) has a series of features which stand in contrast to features of first mention, which may constitute revisions in response to first mention's reception. (1) In contrast to the off-topic, triggered, precipitous first mention, second mention emerges out of a chronologically marked course-of-events narrative (lines 1–23), as a next event in that narrative.²⁰ (2) While first mention refers to the event's participants with a pronoun which does not exclude a candidate male participant (Fragment 23 line 5), second mention first implicates his absence (lines 16–20) and then specifies that the participants were the two females (line 20). (3) While in first mention the location of the event is implicit or to be understood by reference to the trigger-component 'swimming pool' in the prior utterance (Fragment 23, line 3), in second mention there is a place formulation 'in that pool' (lines 20–21) which may operate both interactionally and sequentially. That is, it is a 'recipient-designed' formulation, acknowledging or proposing recipient's familiarity with the object,²¹ and such a formulation as 'that X' can mark a candidate topic,²² offering, by reference to the shared familiarity with the object, the possibility of some extended talk about this particular segment of the ongoing narrative. (4) While in first mention the impropriety is delivered immediately (Fragment 23 line 5), in second mention there is a progression. The activity is initially formulated innocuously in a possibly complete (and intonationally completed) sentence/utterance (lines 20–21 '. . . we swam in that pool until two o'clock in the morning.') and the improper component is latched as a post-completion 'kicker' (line 23 in the

nude.').²³ Attendant to this progression from the innocuous to the improper, there is a replicated format, 'in the X', which in first mention carried the improper component 'nude' (Fragment 23 line 5), which in second mention initially carries an innocuous term 'morning' (line 21) and subsequently carries the improper component 'nude' (line 23).

In a range of ways then, the second mention is artfully arrived at and presented as a something to talk about. Further, it is presented as a something to laugh together about, with a series of within-speech laugh particles (lines 20–21).

Recipient, however, pursues the innocuous, declining the invitation to laugh with a lexical appreciation of the late hour (line 22). A next invitation (line 23) is likewise declined with a recognisable continuation of the lexical appreciation of the late hour (line 24).

While declining to appreciate the improper component, recipient may be recognisably *hearing* it. Specifically, the initial token and the continuation only partially overlap the 'in the X'-formatted phrases, giving clearance to their key terms.

- 21 **Lottie:** until two uh'cl(h)o_{ck} in the_l [X]. =
 22 **Emma:** = i(h)_h : : ,
 23 **Lottie:** = i(h)_{in the} [X].
 24 **Emma:** = i(h)_{G o : d} .

While one resource in the management of overlap is the stretching of a word, and while both of recipient's appreciations are stretched, they may be characterised as, not merely stopping prior to the other party's stopping,²⁴ but as stopping at due-point for the 'X' of the 'in the X' format, a term which, in first mention was 'nude', and in second mention is, first 'morning' and then 'nude'. It appears that recipient is, twice in succession, producing talk which simultaneously appreciates the innocuous and gives clearance to, listens for, hears, the impropriety.

By appreciating the innocuous while listening for the impropriety, recipient's talk may be equivocal *vis-à-vis* the possibility of forthcoming affiliation. And in simultaneous next utterances (lines 25–26) each part offers an alternative direction. Both utterances are assessments, but offerer's is appreciative and recipient's, while it is conceivably appreciative, tends to disaffiliate. As in first mention, offerer reproduces the object with which recipient appreciated the innocuous aspect of the carrier-utterance (line 25 'Oh God,' cf. line 22–24, cf. Fragment 23 line 8–9 'huh ha ha'), in effect applying recipient's appreciation of the innocuous toward appreciation of the impropriety with 'Oh God it was fun'. Simultaneously, recipient

is in the course of applying the object to an alternative assessment; i.e. is producing a continuous utterance 'Oh God isn't she cute,' (lines 22, 24–25). While the assessment term 'cute' might be appreciative, the utterance tends to disaffiliate in that it selects for assessment, not the activity itself, nor a relevant alternative assessable, the co-participant to the activity who is this conversation's co-participant, but the co-participant to the activity who is non-present third party in this conversation.

The two simultaneous assessments, then, are competitive alternatives occurring in overlap. A series of overlap-management techniques are deployed via which each assessment is designed to outlast the other. Recipient starts to stretch the assessment term and offerer stops prior to completion, thus potentially yielding the turnspace, whereupon recipient brings the stretched term to completion.

25 **Lottie:** `hh₁u-(h)o₁(h)oh Go₁d ih wz₁::
26 **Emma:** Isn't₁ s₁ h e₁ c u₁:::te,

Offerer thereupon latches with a continuation (and completion) of the discontinued utterance.²⁵

25 **Lottie:** `hh₁u-(h)o₁(h)oh Go₁d ih wz₁::
26 **Emma:** Isn't₁ s₁ h e₁ c u₁:::te,=
27 **Lottie:** = fun.

At line 27 both utterances have reached completion and offerer's has outlasted recipient's. Via turn-taking systematics, recipient expectably will talk next (see Sacks *et al.*, 1974), and via the organisation of assessments, will expectably produce an acknowledgement/response for that 'first' assessment. (See Pomerantz, this volume, Chapter 9.)

However, while recipient takes next turn, a procedure characterisable as 'skip-connecting' is employed, via which a next utterance is produced by reference to current speaker's own prior rather than by reference to a co-participant's immediately prior utterance.²⁶ In this case, recipient produces a question (line 28) which locates recipient's own third-party assessment (line 26) as its base. The question provides a disaffiliative candidate account for the activity being assessed by proposing it to be one of a series of cute-typable activities third party is wont to engage in, the second (drinking) constituting a condition under which the first (nude swimming) might routinely occur.²⁷

26 **Emma:** isn't she cu:::te,
27
28 **Emma:** `hh She stil drinkin er liddle dri:inks?

Further, the question contains a ‘still X?’ format. While the ‘that X’ format (e.g. lines 20–21) refers to mutually familiar matters, the ‘still X?’ format refers to a mutually familiar matter which requires updating, where that updating might permit or require extended talk. Thus, the introduction of a ‘still X?’-formatted question can serve as a topic initiator. So, for example, in the following fragment, a possible lapse in the ongoing talk is followed by a ‘still X?’-formatted question and extended topical talk ensues (data not shown).

(28) [Goldberg:II:2:5]

- 1 (1.2)
 2 **Maggie:** Are y’still all teaching school,
 3 **Gene:** Yah. (‘hhhhhhhh) Yeah we’re teaching (in uh:) Oh I gotta–
 4 I don’t know th’las’time I talked (t’yuh) I’m out here et
 5 Kroft Highschool (now),

In second mention the candidate topic is updated with a minimal token answer which itself receives a minimal token acknowledgement. Latched to the token answer is a return to the course-of-events narrative (line 30–33). The return, however, is not to the nude swimming, but to a next event in the chronologically organised narrative,²⁸ and that next event is presented in innocuous form.²⁹

Thus, while declining to engage in extended talk on the topic proposed by recipient (the hostess’s drinking habits), offerer accepts the fact that a change has been requested; i.e. talk about nude swimming is discontinued. Subsequent talk addresses conventional aspects of swimming (lines 32–37) and thereafter, offerer terminates the report with a component fitted to the start of the narrative (lines 38–39 ‘I left there at uh (0.5) exactly at three o’clock.’, cf. line 1 ‘I left the restaurant exactly a quarter to eight,’).

Second mention, then, consists of disattention followed by disaffiliation, with carrier-topic abandoned, as in first mention, with closure of the report (cf. Fragment 23, lines 15–16).

Third Mention

Innocuous, possibly allusive reference; recipient appreciates.

As at the end of second mention, third mention’s reference is innocuous. It occurs in the course of a story in which it serves as a partitioning device. That is, mention of swimming provides a situation in which two of three otherwise co-present story characters are talking privately.³⁰

(29) [NB:PT:17:r] [Time:13:45–13:55]

- 1 **Lottie:** en I told im– uh so when she wen' t'the re:stroom I siz boy
 2 there goes a (.) great gal'n 'e siz boy I sure l:love 'er 'n
 3 I hope I g'n make'er happy so (.) when–'hh we came home why
 4 he wentuh bed'n then we went swimming again,
 5 (.)
 6 **Emma:** [l^oMm hm,^o
 7 **Lottie:** [l^ofore we(h'h)nt t'bed. 'h^hh^h]
 8 **Emma:** [Oh:–:, Go'd isn't at fu: [:::]n, =
 9 **Lottie:** [ehhh'he
 10 **Lottie:** = Yeah. 'hh So 'hh
 11 (0.2)
 12 **Lottie:** I told Isabel'e said'at 'e sez yAw yer a liar. I sz well
 13 no: that– he said . . .

Like 'she went to the restroom' (line 1), 'he went to bed . . . we went swimming' (line 4) operates as a partitioning device for an ongoing story.

The latter partition's two elements are themselves separated. 'We went swimming' is introduced as a discrete event with 'and then' (see note 28), and is followed by a silence (line 5). That is, it is set off as, not merely a story-partitioning device, but a responsible on its own. Further, it is tied to the prior night's 2:00 a.m. activity with 'again'.³¹ The combination of features (that it is set off from the current story, and that it is tied to a prior mention) may constitute a recognisable allusive evocation of the manner in which that activity was explicitly said to have occurred; i.e. 'in the nude.'

After the momentary break, both parties start to talk simultaneously; recipient with a minimal acknowledgement (line 6) which treats the reported activity as part of the story and prepares to hear further story events (cf. e.g. second mention, Fragment 27 lines 8–20), teller with a continuation which preserves focus on the reported activity and invites laughter by reference to it (line 7). Again, then, two alternative directions are taken; recipient, hearing in the silence that a comment is due, provides a comment which disattends the possible allusive aspects of the responsible, while offerer, hearing in the silence a potential declination to respond, preserves reference and invites response.

While recipient's next utterance declines to laugh (line 8), it constitutes a shift in response-type; i.e. it now appreciates the activity as a discrete responsible. In its details, the response may acknowledge the allusive character of 'we went swimming again'. The appreciation is initiated with the terms with which 'in the nude' had been listened for (while officially disattended) and the assessment term is that with which offerer had appreciated the impropriety ('Oh God . . . fun' cf. F. 27 lines 21–27). The recur-

rence here of objects which had figured in the delicate negotiations by reference to an explicit formulation, occurring as they do here, by reference to a possibly allusive reference, may, then, allusively appreciate the activity which has been invoked.

Offerer starts to laugh at a 'recognition point' in recipient's assessment term.³² In that the laughter is produced by reference to a possible appreciation of an alluded-to impropriety, it may potentially activate a laughing-together in the course of which affiliation may eventuate. However, perhaps by reference to a series of factors (that there is a story in progress, that the impropriety here is merely alluded to, and that recipient, by stretching the assessment term across offerer's laughter (lines 8–9), is recognisably again declining to laugh), offerer consecutively (1) terminates the invitation to laugh together, with an acknowledgement token (line 10),³³ (2) indicates preparation to return to the story's telling with 'So' (line 10, cf. Fragment 11 line 17), and (3) provides a place for recipient to opt for laughter (line 11, cf. Fragment 11 lines 17–24). In this case, then, the possibility of a laughing-together is offered, the offer terminated, but the possibility left open. That is, it may specifically be displayed that it is upon recipient's option that the story be continued now, or, alternatively, that the discontinuation for appreciation of 'swimming again' and its allusive reference to swimming in the nude be expanded.

Recipient declines the option to expand (line 11) and offerer returns to the story's telling with no further reference to swimming (lines 12–13 and subsequent data not shown).

Third mention, then, consists of innocuous reference which, over a series of negotiations, may achieve the status of allusive reference; that allusive reference itself allusively appreciated, and the carrier story-discontinuation is abandoned with a return to the ongoing story out of which it emerged.

Fourth Mention

Familiarised impropriety, recipient appreciates.

Fourth mention appears to rely upon second mention's listened-for (although officially disattended) explicit reference and third mention's allusively mentioned and allusively appreciated reference. That is, fourth mention treats the nude swimming as a matter of record between the current co-participants to this conversation.

(30) [NB:PT:19:r] [Time: ca. 15:45–16:45]

- 1 **Lottie:** Oh: God what a house. You have no idea.
 2 (.)
 3 **Lottie:** I mean it wz jist (.) furnished yihknow =
 4 **Lottie:** = you jus' w_o alk in: to it'n, 'hh ih wz a model home =
 5 **Emma:** _oYeah.
 6 **Emma:** = [°M m h m, °]
 7 **Lottie:** = [with all the furniture 'n evry thing 'n, 'hhhhh i:t's jis:t =
 8 **Emma:** = [°M m hm :°]
 9 **Lottie:** = oh yihknkow liddle (.) the flower pots :° =
 10 **Emma:** = [Is the swih-]
 11 **Lottie:** = now'n the :n yihknow how they d_o,
 12 **Emma:** = [°Yea:::h.°] _oYah,° =
 13 **Emma:** = 'hhhh eh: Is the swimming pool enclosed with the th'gla:ss bit? =
 14 **Lottie:** = No::, it's uh: ou:ts- (.) eh no outside the big (.) [uh:::°]
 15 **Emma:** = [°Mmhm,°]
 16 (.)
 17 **Lottie:** gla:ss doo_ors.
 18 **Emma:** = [°Ah:hah,°]
 19 (.)
 20 **Lottie:** u-I got that wro:ng,
 21 (.)
 22 **Emma:** Oh that's, that's _o[kay,] 'hhhhhhhhh
 23 **Lottie:** = [m But the wahter is, eighty fi:::ve.]
 24 **Emma:** = [oh I know it. =
 25 **Emma:** = Isn't it gorgeous, =
 26 **Emma:** = [(°)°]
 27 **Lottie:** = [But yihknow when yih git out it's kin'a co:ld. =
 28 **Emma:** = [(Oh: oh:) ya:]h. =
 29 **Lottie:** = [Wul ih was,
 30 **Lottie:** = two uh'clock in the morning en _o[then las' night°] :w. =
 31 **Emma:** = [°huh' haw h'awh ha :w. =
 32 **Lottie:** = [n h h h h [hn-hn-hn] =
 33 **Emma:** = [Oo I(h)bet that w'z
 34 **Emma:** = [(fu:n.)
 35 **Lottie:** = [with no: k- 'hh, hh
 36 **Emma:** = [hh, hh
 37 **Lottie:** = [cloze on, God it's good.
 38 **Emma:** = [(f) aa aaaaaaaaaaaaaa] =
 39 **Lottie:** = [hu-uh huh [huhh] 'hh
 40 **Emma:** = [I sn' t that] exci:ting,
 41 (.)
 42 **Lottie:** Uh: :?
 43 **Emma:** = [Oh: that's wonderf'l,
 44 **Lottie:** = [Oh:: God we had. We, I never had so
 45 much fun m_oy li:fe.]
 46 **Emma:** = [Oh: I'm gladju went. GOD Lottie I wish you
 47 c'd meet somebuddy like that.
 48 (0.4)

- 49 **Lottie:** God I wz tellin Isabel we talked about the thing yihknow
 50 en she siz well it's probly ih lotta yer fault too you sh'd
 51 make up t'him en errything en, I sz well I jus' ca:n't.
 52 **Emma:** ^loMm hm,

As in first mention, the impropriety is occasioned by recipient's question (lines 10 and 13, cf. Fragment 23 line 3). Unlike first mention's precipitate introduction (Fragment 23, line 5), the impropriety is approached gradually, via talk in which the two participants are comparing notes on matters familiar to them both (lines 23–28). The talk shifts from the general (line 27 'But you know when you get out it's kind of cold.') to the particular (lines 29–20 'Well it was, two o'clock in the morning'), with the time element which locates the first night's nude swimming (cf. Fragment 23, lines 5–9 and Fragment 27 lines 20–23). The temporal locator is followed by recipient's laugh-burst, a series of particles whose shapes are recognisably 'hearty' (line 31). By producing such a laugh for such an object, recipient can be demonstrating that the reference so far is thoroughly sufficient, and, as a correlate, that more explicit reference is unnecessary.

In overlap with recipient's 'hearty' laugh, offerer produces an introduction to a next, separate event (line 30 'and then last night', see note 28). The event, however, goes untold;³⁴ there is a marked drop in amplitude in the introduction's last component ('^onight^o'), and a momentary silence by offerer as recipient's laugh is completed (lines 30–31). The discontinued next event is replaced with a laugh (line 32). This laugh is not fitted to the prior laugh (cf. Fragment 23 lines 9–10 for intensely fitted laughter). Rather, it appears that the particles are of a shape which regularly occurs in anticipatory laughter.³⁵ Thus, although laughter is followed by laughter, two distinctive and alternative activities may be occurring; recipient 'heartily' appreciating a prior and thereby proposing that no elaboration is necessary, offerer anticipating and thereby projecting the imminent occurrence of, something more.

The anticipatory laugh occurs in overlap with an assessment by recipient (lines 33–34), which, although it is appreciative, tends to disaffiliate. That is, it is a prototypic no-access assessment (in contrast, e.g. to the prototypic access assessment *vis-à-vis* the heated water at lines 23–25) (see Pomerantz, this volume, Chapter 9). Latched to the anticipatory laugh, and still in overlap with the assessment, offerer produces the anticipated 'kicker' (lines 35–37, see pp. 125–26 and note 23) 'with no clothes on'. This phrase departs from that used so far ('in the nude', cf. Fragment 23 line 5 and Fragment 27 line 23), and the informality it displays is particularly appropriate for the familiarised manner in which the talk is now being conducted.

The impropriety, produced in overlap competition with recipient's no-access assessment, appears to have successfully overridden it. Specifically, recipient who has indicated that no explicit reference to the offence is necessary, who has issued a no-access assessment for the allusively referred-to activity, now, for the first time, officially hears, acknowledges, responds to the improper component (lines 35–38) with a falsetto semi-shriek, semi-song. The impropriety is now officially *received*.

However, the reception may be equivocal; it might constitute some version of appreciation and it might express shock (cf. Fragment 5 line 3 for an ambiguous lexical). Perhaps by reference to the equivocal status of the impropriety's reception, offerer pursues an especially appreciative assessment across overlap with the response. The 'it'-formed assessment 'God it's good' (line 37) is of a type found routinely, not in the reporting of an activity, but in the partaking, and in the inviting of another to co-participate.³⁶

Offer's invitational assessment and recipient's equivocal response to the impropriety are co-terminous (lines 37–38), and simultaneously thereafter, offerer invites laughter (line 39) and recipient provides an assessment (line 40 'Isn't that exciting') which disambiguates the prior response. As in second mention, one party to an overlap appears to be giving clearance to, listening for, a projected key word. In this case, offerer's laughter stops at due-point for recipient's assessment term (lines 39–40, cf. Fragment 27 lines 21–24). Upon the occurrence of the assessment term 'exciting', the impropriety is, for the first time, unequivocally and officially appreciated.

Thereafter, while an opportunity may be available and offered to recipient for affiliation (lines 41–42), recipient provides another appreciative assessment (line 43) and may thus indicate disinclination to proceed further in the affiliation sequence.³⁷ Perhaps by reference to recipient's indication of disinclination to proceed, offerer provides a standard closing assessment (see Jefferson, 1978), initiated with a series of restarts (lines 44–45) which arrive at a pronoun replacement ('I' for 'we') which may be the product of a sensitivity to the fate of second mention's reference to the non-present third party (cf. Fragment 27 line 20 and lines 26–28).

While offerer's closing assessment may, via its positioning, refer specifically to the nude swimming, recipient's subsequent closing assessment, while it appreciates offerer's prior, expands reference in such a way as to embed the improper activity into, as but a sub-event of, an ongoing report of the entire sojourn (line 46 'Oh I'm glad you went.'). It thus tends to select innocuous aspects of the carrier-topic, as does the talk following the impropriety in first mention (Fragment 23 lines 10–11). And, as in first mention,

recipient latches with a topic switch (lines 46–47, cf. Fragment 23 lines 11–12), which offerer accepts (line 49ff, cf. Fragment 23 line 15–16).

Fourth mention, then, consists of an official appreciation of the explicitly formulated impropriety, with an indication of disinclination to proceed further, and the carrier-topic mutually abandoned.

Fifth Mention

Re-issued impropriety, recipient affiliates. Offerer escalates, recipient appreciates and affiliates. Offerer re-escalates, recipient disaffiliates.

(31) [NB:PT:51:r] [Time: ca.39:35–41:58]

The transcript fragment starts in the midst of an elaborate description of the house in Palm Springs (see note 38 for prior data).

- 1 **Lottie:** Oh::: yea::h en the s:unken ba:tthuh I never took a ba:(_l)_(_t) =
 2 **Emma:**
 3 **Lottie:** = bezuz th_(_e) pool's so clean. =
 4 **Emma:** = [huh huh]_(_o)
 5 **Emma:** = [I kno:w:_(_o)
 6 **Lottie:** = [The sunke'n baa-'hhh en then the toilet's way off in a liddle
 7 **Emma:** = [Yeah,_(_o)
 8 **Lottie:** = cubbyhole yihkno:w en with a oh::: [G o d:_(_t)
 9 **Emma:** = [Yeah_(_o) With the la'vatories in the
 10 bedroom I spoze with (.) basins in the bedroom,
 11 (.)
 12 **Lottie:** Yeah let's see she's got_(_o) °hmhh°
 13 **Emma:** ()
 14 (0.4)
 15 **Lottie:** four bathrooms.
 16 (0.2)
 17 **Emma:** °Oh my Ghhod.°
 18 (0.2)
 19 **Lottie:** e-en:: she eehh (.) She's a grea:t person a'run arou:n naygid
 20 yihkno:w hhuh! 'hh Well yih can there nobuddy yihknow great
 21 big walls nobuddy kin: see over'r anything_(_o) [yihkno:w:_(_o)] =
 22 **(Emma):**
 23 **Emma:** = [heh-heh-heh
 24 **Lottie:** = [hhh k- [Christ yih kin: 'hh (hh)en so 'hh when Dwight le:f
 25 tihday we took off ar s- 'hh suits yihknow en, əoh en she gave me
 26 the (.) most beau:tiful swimsuit chu've ever seen in yer life.
 27 [STORY OMITTED]
 28 **Lottie:** en, it's jst beautiful. =
 29 **Emma:** Mm hm,
 30 **Lottie:** = So then when Dwight le(h)v we(h)e took the suits off(h) en swam

Fifth mention occurs approximately 40 minutes into the call, at a temporal distance of some twenty-three minutes from fourth mention.³⁸ The impropriety is offered as if anew (lines 24–25 and lines 30–33, cf. Fragment 23 lines 6–10 and in particular Fragment 27 lines 18–23 for an in-the-course-of-events introduction, in contrast to Fragment 29 lines 27–37), and is received as if anew, with a response-type of a different order than those which had so far been offered, a ‘second story’ (lines 34–42, in contrast to Fragment 23 lines 9–13, Fragment 27 lines 22–28, Fragment 29 line 8, and Fragment 30 lines 30–43).³⁹

Although fifth mention is distanced from the other mentions, and although the impropriety is offered and received as if anew, the story which receives it is fitted to prior mentions in range of ways. For example, as did the prior mentions (except the precipitous first and the familiarised fourth), the story indicates the absence of men (lines 35–36, cf. Fragment 27 lines 16–20, Fragment 29 line 4 and Fragment 31 lines 24–25 and 30–31). For example, as recipient’s selection of non-present participant to the event for assessment can have indicated, it matters that the activity was instigated by another (line 35, cf. Fragment 27 lines 26–28), and, for example, attention is paid to whether anyone could see (lines 37–39, cf. lines 20–21). In its course, the story selects prim aspects of the activity and of prior mentions to the activity. Further, it is introduced as something its teller ‘used to do’ (line 35), which, in general, claims that one does not do it anymore. Thus, in various ways, the story tends to disaffiliate.

While the story’s assessment (lines 41–42) tends to affiliate, its placement is problematic. That is, while there is explicit reference to taking the suits off (line 40), the activity itself is not ‘swimming in the nude’, but an innocuous version of that ‘in the X’ format, ‘and swim around in that river’ (lines 40–41). Further, the occurrence of ‘that’ marks a possible topic (cf. Fragment 27 lines 20–21 and note 22), with the topical possibilities enhanced thereafter (line 41 ‘that uh Colorado River’). The assessment, then, might conceivably refer to swimming in the river, not to swimming in the nude. And it appears that this possibility is relevant for the interaction. In general, response to an assessment occurs very quickly, with no gap or minimal overlap.⁴⁰ In this instance there is a silence (line 43), within which storyteller (recipient of the initial impropriety) may be awaiting, and story-recipient (offerer of the initial impropriety) withholding, a response. And in the absence of response, storyteller offers an unequivocal affiliation to the impropriety (line 44).

At precisely the point at which affiliation has become utterly unequivocal; i.e. at the point in the ‘in the X’ format at which it is not anything

else but, recognisably, ‘in the nude’, response occurs (line 45, see note 32). The response takes the form of a claim of affiliation (cf. e.g. Fragment 18 line 8 and 12). The claimed affiliation may be well designed by reference to its prior. That is, to that point offerer might have been, and has been treated by recipient as an initiate to nude swimming, with non-present co-participant as instigator. Similarly, the story presents recipient in such a position. Now a claim of longstanding, ongoing enjoyment (if not practice) of the activity is made. Thus, an escalation has been offered (by recipient of the initial offence) and its recipient (offerer of the initial offence) has affiliated.

Latched to the affiliation is a precipitously initiated escalation⁴¹ by the initial offerer (lines 45–49, cf. Fragment 23 line 5 for precipitous talk). Its language is designed for two parties familiar with the phenomenon (cf. Fragment 30 lines 23–34). And it is followed by a perfect display of intimacy. The escalation gets laughter which is particularly exquisitely constructed, and in the following text it is decomposed for careful inspection.

The improper component is first anticipated with laughter by its recipient (arrow 1) and thereafter appreciated with escalated laughter (arrow 2) (cf. Fragment 23 lines 8–10 and p. 173).

49 **Lottie:** 'n yis feels like yer, ta | kin | a | dou: | che. |
 50 **Emma:** | eh | -uh | -uh | -uh | -a | h- | ahh | ← (2)
 (1) →

Offerer joins the laughing-together with a next escalation (arrow 1) (cf. Fragment 23 lines 8–10).

49 **Lottie:** | ta | kin | a | dou: | che. |
 50–51 **Emma:** | eh | -uh | -uh | -uh | -a | h- | ahh | -ahh | ah |
 52 **Lottie:** | hhh | HHU: | H |
 (1) →

Recipient initiates a laugh termination, with a de-escalated particle (arrow 1) and an inbreath (arrow 2) while offerer continues in the escalated register (arrow 3).

51 **Emma:** | ahh | -ahh | ah- | ← (1) | ← (2) | hhh |
 52 **Lottie:** | hhh | HHU: | H | HHUH |
 ← (3)

Recipient’s potentially laugh-terminal inbreath becomes a pre-continuation inbreath (see note 3) and renewed laughter is produced in the form of an escalation of recipient’s own prior laughter (arrows 1) which is

fitted to offerer's escalation (arrow 2) (cf. the fittedness in Fragment 23, lines 9–10). Offerer is continuing in same register (arrow 3).

51 **Emma:** ahh[_ahh ah-] ⁽¹⁾ 'hhh HUH
 52 **Lottie:** hhhHHU:H [HHUH] HHU:H ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾

Immediately after recipient's fitted escalation (arrow 1) there is a re-escalation, by recipient (arrow 2).

51 **Emma:** ahh[_ahh ah-] ⁽¹⁾ 'hhh [HUH-HA] ⁽²⁾
 52 **Lottie:** hhhHHU:H [HHUH] HHU:H

Immediately thereafter, offerer matches recipient's re-escalation (arrows 1).

51 **Emma:** ahh[_ahh ah-] ⁽¹⁾ 'hhh [HUH-HA] ⁽¹⁾
 52 **Lottie:** hhhHHU:H [HHUH] HHU:H [HA:h] ⁽¹⁾

Recipient continues in the same register (arrow 1) while offerer initiates de-escalation (arrow 2). Recipient follows suit (arrow 3).

51 **Emma:** ahh[_ahh ah-] ⁽¹⁾ 'hhh [HUH-HA] [HA-AHh] [a h h] ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾
 52 **Lottie:** hhhHHU:H [HHUH] HHU:H [HA:h] [ha] [e-u-e] ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾

Thereafter, offerer fits the shape of the de-escalative particles to recipient's (arrows 1). Each produces a terminal particle (arrows 2), and the display of hearty laughing with each other is marked as completed with an emphatic inbreath by recipient (arrow 3) (see note 2).

51 **Emma:** ahh[_ahh ah-] ⁽¹⁾ 'hhh [HUH-HA] [HA-AHh] [a h h] [ah] [agh] [uh] ['hhuhhh] ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾
 52 **Lottie:** hhhHHU:H [HHUH] HHU:H [HA:h] [ha] [e-u-e] [ah] [ah] [e' h] ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾

Both start to speak, almost simultaneously (lines 53–54, cf. Fragment 8 lines 3–5); offerer with an indication that the report is continuing ('And we-'), recipient affiliating to the escalated impropriety.

51 **Emma:** `hhuhhh=
 53 **Lottie:** = E_[n we-]
 54 **Emma:** I } C'N SEE YOU TWO KI:DS

This affiliation is of the type considered throughout the chapter, in contrast to the ‘second story’ at lines 34–42. However, it may be characterised as a weak version of affiliation, presenting recipient as merely a witness (although willing and able), rather than participating; that is, it is closer to the claimed affiliations seen in Fragment 18 at lines 8 and 18–19 than the displayed affiliations in Fragments 17 line 4, 19 line 7, 20 line 18 and 21 line 9. While it affiliates, it carries some potential for estrangement.

It turns out that the escalated impropriety is a prefatory abstract, the details of the scene yet to be explicitly depicted. Having started in overlap with the affiliation (lines 53–54), having cut off to permit recipient’s talk to continue in the clear (lines 53–54), offerer restarts at a completion point in that utterance (lines 54–55). Both the initial and the restart are formed as continuations of prior talk, specifically as intra-segmentally linked to an ongoing course-of-events description (line 53 ‘And we–’, line 55 ‘And she was on one end . . .’, cf. note 28). That is, both via its placement and its lexical components, the explicit depiction of the scene is produced as a continuing part of an utterance which had been discontinued for laughter; the laughter now serving as a pivotal appreciation/anticipation.

But while offerer is intensifying the intimacy, recipient is activating the estrangement potential of the prior affiliation (lines 57 and 58). That is, simultaneously offerer produces an intimate assessment (‘and Jesu(h)s it felt so good’) followed by laughter, and recipient produces a *sotto voce* assessment like that in second mention (‘^oOh God is she cute,^o’ cf. Fragment 27, lines 22–27), once again declining intimacy by assessing the activity via its non-present co-participant. In various ways this segment is similar to second mention. Latched to recipient’s declination (both to laugh and to affiliate), offerer pursues the invitation to intimacy (line 59). In second mention the latched continuation is the assessment term ‘fun’ (Fragment 27 line 27) and in this fragment it is a de-escalated laugh unit.⁴² And, as in second mention, the pursuit of the invitation to intimacy is met with pursuit of declination (line 60). While in second mention the declination consists of initiation of a potentially topic-shifting question which also makes a connection between nude swimming and drinking (Fragment 27 lines 27–28, cf. note 22 and p. 178 and note 27), in this case it consists of an escalated recycle of the prior assessment (see note 37).

The diverging treatments of the escalated impropriety (offerer’s pursuit of intimacy versus recipient’s pursuit of distance) are now into a second,

recycled round (lines 57–58 and lines 59–60). And, at least inasmuch as laughter is extendable, the fact that offerer stops laughing while recipient continues talking (lines 59–60) and, that offerer, having started to talk on completion of recipient's reiterated assessment (line 61) cuts off as recipient starts (line 62), indicates that offerer is prepared to yield to recipient. And there may be specific grounds for offerer to yield. The observable similarities between this fragment and second mention may be available to the participants. And in second mention, offerer's pursuit of intimacy (Fragment 27 lines 25–27) was met with the disaffiliative topic switch 'She still drinkin her little drinks?'

As it turns out, the utterance at onset of which offerer has cut off (lines 61–62) is a milder version of second mention's disaffiliation. 'God she's uninhibited' is milder sequentially, in that it does not offer a potential new topic but maintains focus on the carrier-topic, and is milder interactionally, in that it is not an indictment but a compliment which, however, carries a sense of estrangement/disaffiliation.⁴³

There is a momentary silence (line 63, see note 40) which both participants move to resolve; recipient with a start on still a next third-party assessment (line 64), offerer with an acknowledgement token (line 65) which, by addressing recipient's prior utterance indicates that the pursuit of intimacy is relinquished (a version of the deployment of acknowledgement tokens in situations of overlap, see note 33).

And, perhaps in part by reference to the fact that offerer has relinquished, recipient discontinues the next assessment.⁴⁴ The two utterances are almost co-terminous and a brief silence ensue (lines 64–66). And again, almost simultaneously, both parties occupy the silence with talk; offerer with a recycle of the prior acknowledgement token (line 67, see note 37), recipient with a closing assessment which officially abandons the series of disaffiliative third-party assessments but also proposes that the carrier-topic be terminated (line 68). Thereafter, recipient produces a topic shift (line 71) which offerer accepts with a re-issue of an offer made prior to introduction of the carrier-topic (line 79, cf. Fragment 61 lines 6–11, note 38).

An overview of the materials in this section shows an enormously elaborate working out of a simple procedure: A target impropriety (the obscene play at the hot water inlets) is arrived at via introduction of, and after recipient-affiliation with, a lesser impropriety (nude swimming), and is introduced at just the moment that an optimum condition for its introduction has been achieved. It is in fifth mention that the optimum condition is achieved, with a base sequence: Impropriety followed by Affiliation. The affiliation is followed immediately by an escalation (the target impropriety),

3. On page 155, see note 2, it was proposed that inbreaths after a burst of laughter are oriented-to as laugh-terminal objects. It is the case for these objects, as for other oriented-to features of interaction, that they are not inevitably and automatically that. While an inbreath *can* mark termination of laughter, and is routinely oriented-to as marking termination of laughter, it can also constitute the catching of breath to laugh some more. Thus, a laugh which may have been intendedly completed, marked as completed with an inbreath, may retroactively be renewed, depending upon contingent activities.
4. A weak catchall term, 'impropriety', is used throughout the chapter to identify the various instances of the range of interactional breaches under consideration.
5. Throughout the chapter, participants will be identified in terms of this invitational characterisation of impropriety. The speaker who produces the invitation to intimacy is identified as 'offerer' and the co-participant to whom the invitation is directed is identified as 'recipient'.
6. Appreciation provides no explicit indication that the one who is appreciating another's utterance is implicated in the mentality, situation, etc., exposed by that utterance. This is evidenced in the following fragment in which an assertion is appreciated with laughter (lines 11–13). The appreciative laughter is followed by an explicit query as to laugher's status *vis-à-vis* the asserted situation (line 14).

(34) [TC:II:14:excerpt]

Two men, complaining together about an acquaintance's shady business procedures.

- 1 **J.R.:** He always comes out smelling well though. That's what
 2 gets me:.
 3 **Seth:** We:ll? (maybe it's) the way he treat's 'em.
 4 **J.R.:** Yih-
 5 **J.R.:** Yeh I, I gue:ss, I:, I'm not₁()
 6 **Seth:** (It's) like thee: uh
 7 (.)
 8 **Seth:** two inspectors no:w er (.) great pals'v iz.
 9 (0.5)
 10 **J.R.:** Oh:?
 11 **Seth:** Well one of'm looks et iz pornographic movies. I've never
 12 seen a pornographic movie (dis) in my li:fe. =
 13 **J.R.:** = uhh hihh uhh
 14 **Seth:** Hev you:?
 15 **J.R.:** No I ha:ven't.
 16 **Seth:** We:ll,
 17 **J.R.:** I'm ready any ti:me b't I've never been seen one,

7. While the first two fragments have the sorts of objects so far considered as types of impropriety (i.e. crude or obscene language or reference), the third is a matter of rudeness. Although presented 'tactfully', the rejection of an invitation, specifically on grounds of preferring one's own company to that of inviter, is a potential offence.
8. That an assertion about one party by another is not denied outright, but follows appreciation of the assertion seems to be a systematic occurrence. It may have to

do with such issues as, if the assertion is denied immediately, the denial may be seen as produced by reference to the assertion's interactive features (e.g. is declining to be intimate with the asserter) or by reference to the in-principle deniability of the assertion, rather than by reference to the assertion's actual truth or falsehood. A solution to such a problem is to interact about it first, indicate that it is not in principle a thing recipient would deny, and then deny it. For example, in each of the following fragments, a participant characterised as (1) miserly, and (2) a procrastinator, initially appreciates the characterisation and subsequently rejects it.

(35) [Goldberg:II:2:8]

- 1 **Maggie:** 'hh Wul knowing you you'd have thirty one en, (.) thousan
 2 e:nd a nickel,
 3 **Gene:** hhh!
 4 (0.2)
 5 **Gene:** hheh-heh-heh-heh-(heh)
 6 **Maggie:** 'Shih yuh I think y'got the original nickel.
 7 (.)
 8 **Gene:** 'hh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh, =
 9 (): = 'hh =
 10 (): = 'hh =
 11 **Gene:** = [()-
 12 **Maggie:** = [You en ol' man Bla:ck.
 13 (.)
 14 **Gene:** No: [t_h 'qui:te.]=
 15 **Maggie:** [t_h 'h hhh-hhh]=
 16 **Maggie:** = hhha-hha-[hah] hhh]
 17 **Gene:** [heh]-heh' (heh)
 18 **Maggie:** (Oh(h)oh). hh He's got the original
 19 two'nna half cents'n you got the ba:lance. =
 20 **Gene:** = eh-h-heh-heh-heh-heh-he:h-eh =
 21 **Maggie:** = ((dainty snort)) =
 22 **Maggie:** = 'hhh [Eoh:::G o : d.]
 23 **Gene:** → No I'm not like tha:t. =
 24 **Maggie:** = ['hhhh
 25 **Gene:** = [No::: the hell with it.
 26 (.)
 27 **Maggie:** mmWhata you kids been doing for excitem'n.anything?

(36) [Frankel:HB:II:15:Simplified]

- 1 **Pat:** I'm gl:d that yer a procrastinater es far, ez
 2 **Penny:** = gYehhh-hh-hheh-'hh =
 3 **Penny:** = gYehhh-hh-hheh-'hh
 4 (.)
 5 **Penny:** → Waidaminit, uhhh-hu,h
 6 **Pat:** [huh-huh-hu]h-huh 'nh'hh! h h] =
 7 **Penny:** = 'enhhh Dez not-
 8 **Pat:** = No,I guess [yih not real(h)ly] =
 9 **Penny:** = n- eh!

- 10 **Penny:** = [[hhh! r-
 11 **Pat:** = [[(It's too e(h)a(h)rl(hh)y₁that's w h a t I]=
 12 **Penny:** = [[dehhh! huh-right.]=
 13 **Penny:** → = We're not puh- we're relaxed about it. =
 14 **Penny:** = [[We're not procrastinatih ehh - huh.
 15 **Pat:** = [[(That's it relaxed I didn't get it righ(h)t.)]

9. The participants are sisters in their early sixties. One of them has taken a trip to Palm Springs to visit a friend and her newly-acquired husband, also in their sixties. The phone call occurs on the night of the return home.
10. Specifically, taken up, rather than initiated. Recipient has already inquired about the house, and that inquiry gets 'Oh God Emma. Jesus how lucky. You have no idea' (cf. Fragment 23, line 1), and is followed by area-locational talk and discussion of how the host couple is spending the upcoming Thanksgiving vacation.
11. For some consideration of triggered or touched-off talk, see Sacks, unpublished lecture, April 17, 1968, p. 16 (mimeographed), and Jefferson (1978).
12. While Fragment 13 is a dramatic instance, other possible declinations to respond can be seen, for example, in Fragment 12, in which recipient silence (line 3) eventuates in disaffiliation (line 6), and in Fragment 14, in which recipient silence (lines 6–8) eventuates in disattention to the improper component (lines 9–11).
13. Technically, continuation provides that the break is an intra-utterance pause, not an inter-utterance gap. See Sacks, Schegloff & G. Jefferson (1974). Interactionally, the continuation proposes the inconsequence of the break; i.e. no declination to respond has occurred since the utterance is still underway and response is not yet due.
14. While the silence which follows the impropriety (lines 1–2) constitutes and is treated by offerer as recipient's declining to respond (cf. Fragment 13), it appears that in this case the problem is not recipient's unwillingness to affiliate, but, specifically, an initial inability to find an appropriate affiliative response. It appears that in the course of offerer's continuation (line 3), an object occurs which solves the problem for recipient; i.e. the word 'car'. Just after the word 'car' has been uttered, recipient produces an explosive inbreath 'khh!' (line 4) and then and there launches the affiliative utterance. For a consideration of 'discovery points' in ongoing talk, marked by such things as inbreaths, see Jefferson (1978).
15. Once the retroactive cleansing sequence is initiated, it goes to completion. In Fragment 17 (lines 3–4) and first mention (Fragment 23 lines 6–9) it goes to completion in competition with recipient response. In the following fragment, recipient starts to appreciate just after onset of the continuer (line 4), offerer takes the continuer to completion and follows with a de-escalated alternative (line 6, in this case a description of feistiness).

(37) [Goodwin:GR:40]

- 1 **Jan:** So I said look Gurney, yer just a big ass kisser,
 2 (0.4)
 3 **Jan:** en₁yer getting yer wa:y,
 4 **Beth:** AAHh hah-uh hah-uh huh] =

5 **Beth:** = [hhhhhhhhhhhh]
 6 **Jan:** [I(h) ju(h)st] laɪd it a: ɪll on,
 7 **Beth:** [h h a h]
 8 (.)
 9 **Beth:** ehh huh uh-huh uh-huh

16. Anticipatory laughter can occur in a range of relationships to an anticipated object. For example, in the following fragment, laughter precedes a projected next utterance in which a particular component might occur (line 4 *vis-à-vis* lines 1–3 and 5). The utterance occurs but the component does not (line 5) and the one who laughed in anticipation now provides the anticipated component (line 7).

(38) [Schenkein:II:36]

1 **Bill:** So you walked all the way up t'the Chinese theater.
 2 **Ben:** Didje get- like stop in a restaurant or something? Have
 3 summing t'eat?
 4 **Ethel:** eh hee hee heh!
 5 **Max:** Stopped inna Shell station.
 6 **Lori:** Where's the Chinese restaurant.
 7 **Ethel:** tih go- pee pee.

And in the following fragment, anticipatory laughter starts before due-point (arrow 1). At due-point the anticipated component is produced simultaneously by ongoing speaker and anticipatory laughter (arrow 2).

(39) [Frankel:US:98]

1 **Joe:** B't he wannid duh dawg tuh bite iz wife.
 2 (0.4)
 3 **Joe:** So he come s home one night'n the sonofa, bitc bit hi:m.
 4 **Carol:** [heh heh heh heh heh heh] [bit hi:m, ah!ah!]
 (1) → (2) →

17. Fragment 26 is an instance of 'recognition-placement' rather than due-point placement. For a consideration of recognition-placement as a systematic device, see Jefferson (1973).
18. While the escalated laughter in Fragments 26 and first mention may be initially seen as more-or-less at completion, it may be the case that it is *targeted* to occur precisely at completion but an ongoing word is stretched beyond its anticipated completion (Fragment 26 'c(h)e(h)ents,' Fragment 23 'clo::ck.').
19. Such laughter may have especially strong affiliative import. See, for example, Fragment 31 lines 49–54 and p. 46–68.
20. For a consideration of temporally organised course-of-events narratives, see Sacks, Lecture 9, November 3, 1971.
21. For a consideration of recipient-designed place formulations, see Schegloff (1972). In this case, the 'that X' formulation may specifically invoke recipient's earlier expression of interest in the swimming pool (Fragment 23 line 3) and/or may invoke a mutual interest in the swimming pool apparently expressed in prior conversations (see Fragment 30 lines 13–22).

22. For a consideration of topical aspects of 'that X', see Maynard (1975). It appears that this formulation can mark not only topic initiation, as in Fragment 40 line 3 (a re-transcribed version of a fragment which appears in Maynard's thesis), but can mark a move into a sub-topic for an ongoing topic, as in Fragment 41 line 7.

(40) [Zimmerman:TA:FT:alt:4]

- 1 **Al:** hhhheh hhih-ih 'hhhh hh- 'hh-hhhhh 'hhhhhh hhhhhhhhhhh
 2 (1.4)
 3 **Al:** That sna:ke wz kinda neat et work the other da:y. =
 4 **Al:** = Cz_lotta th'k_ijds had'n ever seen a sna:ke?
 5 **Bev:** Was it?

(41) [NB:PWT:2]

- 1 **Emma:** Oh honey that was a lovely luncheon I shoulda called you
 2 s:soo:ner but I: l: lo:ved it. Ih wz just delightfu [: l.]=
 3 **Penny:** ((f)) 'Oh :::: : ()° Well
 4 **Penny:** = I wz glad y o u (came).
 5 **Emma:** = I wz glad y o u (came).
 6 **Penny:** = Oh :::: : it wz:
 7 **Emma:** e-That P a:t isn't she a do: :ll?
 8 **Penny:** iY e h isn't she pretty,

23. Although the activity has been mentioned before, in the same words, it is methodically offered here as a surprise, a 'kicker', the best of it. Routinely, kickers are positioned after a possible completion point in talk which in no way has projected that there is more to come. Two fragments are shown in which recipients treat a story as completed (Fragment 42 lines 5 and 7, Fragment 43 line 5) and are met with a kicker to the story (Fragment 42 lines 8-13, Fragment 43 line 6).

(42) [Labov:CP:3]

- 1 **Ardiss:** . . . and then he just battered her to get her 'andbag.
 2 .
 3 **Ardiss:** They said she was like a battered cucumber when they took
 4 her into the infirmary,
 5 **Brenna:** Was she-uh=
 6 **Ardiss:** = [[And the-
 7 **Brenna:** Is she out,=
 8 **Ardiss:** =The best of it wa:s.
 9 **Brenna:** ()
 10 **Ardiss:** Her husband's an ambulance dr- uh, a lorry driver, a
 11 driver for the, (the kashizin) infirmary, 'hh an' he
 12 had t'git the trolley'n wheel his own wife off the
 13 ambulance.

(43) [Labov:TA:4:r]

- 1 **Rita:** She had a:, (0.3) a broi:led hambuhrger, (0.6) with no:
 2 (.) gravy awnnit, (0.5) she hadda serving of cabbage, 'n

- 3 she hadda salad.
 4 (0.3)
 5 **Marge:** Very- (·) It's terriffic I because I'm tellin yih-
 6 **Rita:** En she couldn' ev_{en} fini-ish:: i(h)t,

24. When deployed for overlap management, stretches tend to persevere until overlap is resolved by co-participant's either dropping out or reaching completion and stopping.

(44) [NB:PWT:3]

- 1 **Emma:** Oh evrything's workin out so pretty he_{re} with ar,
 2 **Penny:** O h : : : : : i'nnat good.

(45) [GTS:I:84]

- 1 **Ken:** Heck, a lotta
 2 **Roger:** Les:::::try it!

(46) [Rose:II:5]

- 1 **Donna:** En Donna,
 2 (·)
 3 **Karen:** Tha: t's what they sa:y,
 4 **Donna:** will soo::::::::::n learn.

(47) [Frankel:US:I:9]

- 1 **Mike:** . . . all th_{at} junk is in the chair.
 2 **Vic:** W o : : : : : w I didn' know tha:t?

25. Although the elapsed time between the sentence parts is brief, the criterion for treating the talk as a series of separated activities is structural, not temporal. The following fragment is similarly structured, but the elapsed time between sentence-parts is substantial (lines 5–7), and thus transparent for the step-by-step competitive constructedness of the utterance in progress.

(48) [HG:II:18]

- 1 **Sandy:** Hadiyou feel, t_{ired}?hh
 2 **Marna:** hh
 3 (·)
 4 **Sandy:** [[hhh
 5 **Marna:** [[NO I wz very: (0.3) pleased that I c_{accomplish}'_·
 6 **Sandy:** You really a c_{complished} a lo:t =
 7 **Marna:** = so much. =
 8 **Sandy:** = What got intih yhou.

26. For a consideration of skip-connecting in an environment of competing topical directions, see Sacks, unpublished lecture, April 9, 1970, p.2 ff (mimeographed).
 27. It appears that some activities have drinking as a prior activity. So, for example, in the following fragments, stories are told about 'mooning', a sport in which a car is driven around public places with one of the participants' naked buttocks sticking out the window.

(49) [Goodwin:M:1]

- 1 **Cal:** 'n Donnegan wz bombed, well we were all bo:mbed. Donnegan
 2 (said) we'll go moo:nin' yihkno:w?

(50) [Goodwin:M:7]

- 1 **Lenny:** You w'r th'driver.
 2 (0.4)
 3 **Cal:** No: I wz:: in the front, s e a t HI:D' n.
 4 **Bart:** ey(h)he u-he wz 'hidin'? =
 5 **Bart:** = heh, hah hoh ha:h ha:h ha-u-huh-a-ha.
 6 **Cal:** → () l.hhh(h)Ah wz': drunk =
 7 **Cal:** = b't ah wa(h)sn'that dro(h)nk,

(51) [Goodwin:M:8]

- 1 **Bart:** ((story about on the way home from school on a bus)) the
 2 whole (0.7) uh:: buncha the guys filled up the ba:ck
 3 there. (0.2) An' th'n evrybuddy else wz up front. (1.0)
 4 So w(h)e're goin dow:n uh- (0.9) I don' know some main
 5 highway out there I d'know where the hell it wa:s. (0.9)
 6 → We 'ad s'm bee:r, (1.2) A:n uh (1.0) I ed mooned a lotta
 7 people b'fore [that.
 8 ()]: [Mm-h] m,° =
 9 **Bart:** = Yihknow ah mean theh (.) th'guys knew it'n they,
 10 (0.2)
 11 **Lenny:** Yah, Sta:n to:ld me about it,
 12 **Bart:** S'mbody said 'Grozak you 'haven'gotta hair on yer a:ss
 13 'nless you (0.7) unless you moon that car buhind us.

28. That the talk will no longer be about nude swimming is displayed at onset of this utterance, with 'and then . . .'. Roughly, course-of-events descriptions seem to be subdividable into segments which can package multiple possible discrete events into sub-units of a single, larger event. So, for example, while departure from home and arrival at destination may include a collection of separable events, it is presented as a single unit with an intra-segmental 'and' (lines 1–4). On the other hand, while departure from home and arrival at destination may be a single event, the arrival at the target city and arrival at the target household are presented as separate events with an inter-segmental 'And then' (lines 7–14). At second mention's line 30, 'and then' projects, and subsequent talk delivers, no further talk about the night's activities.
29. It is not that, following recipient's disaffiliative utterance, an innocuous *event* is reported, but that an improper event is reported innocuously. As it turns out, the activities reported as 'And then we swam all day today' were performed in the nude. In fifth mention, 'today's' swimming is reported as follows: (Fragment 31 lines 24–25) 'And so when Dwight left today we took off our suits you know and . . .' (the report is discontinued for a parenthetical story and then taken up again at lines 30–31), '. . . when Dwight left we took the suits off and swam around in the nude.'

30. For a consideration of these materials *vis-à-vis* storyteller's tracking of presences and absences of story characters, see Sacks, unpublished lecture 7, May 28, 1970 (mimeographed).
31. An examination of the entire transcript permits the following itinerary to be worked out: The 2:00 a.m. swim occurs on a Sunday night following Lottie's arrival. The events which form the story in which 'swimming again' is introduced as a partitioning device occur the next night. The all day swimming and sun-bathing occurs on the following day, and on that same day, Lottie returns home.
32. In this case, that the laughter is recognition-placed (see note 16) may be utilising the prior occurrence of the word 'fun' to find that the word now underway is a possible recurrence, its recurrence enabling recognition prior to completion. It turns out that a standard locus of recognition-placed overlap is in rather more local occurrences of a repeated word. For example:

(52) [SBL]

- 1 **Bea:** Still, when yer in a tour, traveling in a bus for six
 2 weeks, the same group, why that too is loh- plenty of
 3 → opportunity I should think, I've never done it,
 4 **Maude:** Mm hm,
 5 **Bea:** But I should think that would be plenty of oppor_tunity.
 6 **Maude:** . . . ↑ Yeah . . .

(53) [SBL]

- 1 **Anne:** → I'll bet she wishes she was a little more cooperative
 2 **Joslyn:** Yes, because she has less chance there then she would
 3 have if she'd of cooper_ated a little bit,
 4 **Anne:** ↑ Uh huh,

In third mention, the recognition-placed laughter may, by catching the recurrence of 'fun', catch also its possible allusiveness to the prior occasion of its occurrence i.e. the explicit mention of nude swimming.

33. A standard configuration for speech-speech overlap is a discontinued utterance followed by an acknowledgement token. With the acknowledgement token, a speaker withdraws his own utterance and retrieves the other's.

(54) [SBL]

- 1 **Martha:** . . . because she w- you know, was_{in the house}
 2 **Bea:** . . . so near- Yes.

However, the withdrawal may be temporary. It can be followed by a self-retrieval.

(55) [TG]

- 1 **Ava:** [[A'ri:::ght?
 2 **Bee:** [[I'll see 'wt's-
 3 (.)
 4 **Bee:** Yeah. See what's going o:n.

And, crucially for the purposes of the current consideration, it can be followed by an other-retrieval by the initially retrieved speaker. In the following fragment, a Gaston-Alphonse other-retrieval series is resolved with a repetition by one speaker of the other speaker's term.

(56) [Reilly] ((transcribed by Suzanne Reilly, University of Pennsylvania, 1973))

- 1 **Loren:** . . . people thet jus' come en leave their little kids et the
 2 skating rink's appalling.
 3 (pause)
 4 **Loren:** Y'know, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{drops them} \\ \text{dump them} \end{array} \right\} =$
 5 **Kate:** = Yeah.
 6 **Loren:** = Yeah.
 7 **Kate:** Yeah.
 8 **Loren:** Yeah dump. Y'know. These car pools just pour out five and
 9 ten kids.

34. There is a possibility that the event which goes untold at this point is the escalation which occurs in fifth mention (Fragment 31 lines 47–49). That it goes untold at this point may have to do with the fact that 'affiliation to the initial impropriety has not yet occurred. That it is almost told at this point may be the consequence of a trigger in the prior talk (see note 10). Specifically, there has just been talk about 'eighty five degree' water (line 23); i.e. reference has been made to the fact that the pool is heated. As it turns out, the escalation has to do with some playful obscenity at the 'two places where the hot water comes in' (Fragment 31, lines 47–48). The mention of the heated water may trigger an introduction to an event which is not yet to be told, and the introduction is withdrawn.
35. Following are some instances of 'hn'-formed anticipatory laughter.

(24) [Labov:BG:5]

- 4 **Doris:** → hn-hnn hn-hnn hn-hmnnn, =
 6 **Joan:** = a load of shit.

(26) [Goodwin:AD]

- 1 **Bart:** . . . 'n took mmhy fif { . . .
 2 **Cal:** → $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hnn-hnn-hnn} \end{array} \right\}$

(57) [NB:PWT:9]

- 1 **Penny:** W'l you know i-yuh a:lmost say a-yih almost af:::raid dih-
 2 ihh heh huh =
 3 **Emma:** → =nhh, $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hhunh} \\ \text{hhhh} \end{array} \right\}$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{-hhhn-} \\ \text{'h} \end{array} \right\}$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{'hn} \\ \text{hh s} \end{array} \right\}$ poo =
 4 **Penny:** =Dyih know uh y'know wuh I mea:n? hh =
 5 **Penny:** =Dyih know uh y'know wuh I mea:n? hh =
 6 **Emma:** =Ye:uh.

36. So, for example, in the following fragment, Ethel and Ben are eating herring, Max is not. The various assessments of the herring are attendant to invitations to Max to have some.

(58) [Schenkein:I:16:r]

- 1 **Ethel:** MMmmm.
 2 (0.3)
 3 **Ethel:** Ooo Max have a piece.
 4 (.)
 5 **Ben:** This₁uh be), the bes₁t you ever tasted.
 6 **Ethel:** Gesch m a c h t.
 7 (.)
 8 **Ethel:** MMmmm.
 9 (2.0)
 10 **Ethel:** 't Oh it's delicious =
 11 **Ethel:** = Ben w'dju hand me a napkun please,
 12 (.)
 13 **Bill:** Lemme cut up a'little pieces a'brea:d.
 14 (2.5)
 15 **Ben:** Is'nat good? =
 16 **Ethel:** = It's duh:::licious.
 17 (0.2)
 18 **Ethel:** It's geschmacht Max.
 19 (0.4)
 20 **(Max):** [()
 21 **Ben:** [()].
 22 (.)
 23 **Ethel:** Geschma:::cht,
 24 (1.0)
 25 **Ethel:** Max, one piece.
 26 (0.2)
 27 **Max:** I d'want.

37. In general, repeated assessments (and other recognisably reiterated responses) appear designed to close down the talk by reference to which they are produced. The following fragment is excerpted from the same conversation in which the nude swimming story occurs. Lottie is describing the purchases she made at a roadside stand on the way home.

(59) [NB:PT:7:46]

- 1 **Lottie:** . . . en I got some casaba'n then I bought uhs:: uh Anna
 2 back a box a'dates₁cz,
 3 **Emma:** Oh at's ni₁ce.
 4 **Lottie:** yihknow. =
 5 **Lottie:** = [she-
 6 **Emma:** That's nice Lottie,
 7 **Lottie:** sh'fed the ca:t₁'n,
 8 **Emma:** That's beaufiful.

In fragment 59 it appears that the specific sort of talk being attemptedly closed down is an explanation (here, of a gift to someone else — and it appears that no such gift was made by Lottie to Emma). In the following fragment, an explanation is received with a series of acknowledgement tokens.

(60) [Dietrich:Alt:1]

- 1 **Billie:** en I'm jis saying thet- thet any question thet we =
 2 **Darlene:** = mm₁hm,
 3 **Billie:** theh we sh'd take. I₁think,
 4 **Darlene:** Okay.
 5 (0.7)
 6 **Darlene:** [O k a : y .
 7 **Billie:** [I think we sh'd take it from the group's perspective.
 8 (0.2)
 9 **Bobbie:** if we're in₁ here tuh learn somethin.
 10 **Darlene:** Right.
 11 (0.3)
 12 **Bobbie:** Y'know yer nah listenin tuh me.

38. Fifth mention is a last attempt to achieve affiliation before the conversation closes. Prior to fifth mention, pre-closing arrangements are underway (see Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), see below, lines 1–19. Offerer returns to talk about the trip in competition with co-participant's efforts to close (see, e.g. lines 27–29 and lines 40–41, in particular the repeated 'I'm so happy for you', twice overlapped prior to completion by more talk about the trip). In passing, a sequence similar to those noted in note 36 can be seen, lines 16–24.

(61) [NB:PT:49:r]

- 1 **Emma:** Well ah'll get that tih₁morrow.
 2 **Lottie:** [You git't tha:t Y e a h .
 3 **Emma:** [I'll go up₁ the =
 4 **Emma:** = [drugstore t'mo₁rro₁w.
 5 **Lottie:** = [o₁Y- 'hh Yee-°] Yih sure yih don'wan'me tuh come down'n
 6 getcha en take yih dow₁n e:-
 7 **Emma:** [N o :] sweetie =
 8 **Emma:** = [Ah: 'll-
 9 **Lottie:** = [the byu-
 10 **Emma:** = 'hh₁hh
 11 **Lottie:** [beauty₁parl?]
 12 **Emma:** [You-
 13 (.)
 14 **Emma:** No: you go getcher hair ↑fixed↑ if you wanna drive down'n
 15 see me ah'd love tuh see yuh, 'hhh₁'hhh
 16 **Lottie:** [Okay₁ well I gotta luh few
 17 thing I₁got- m₁y blou:se₁ s₁tuh iron₁e- Cuz I₁got₁ =
 18 **Emma:** [I : : kno:w*:: I : : kno:w .
 19 **Lottie:** = Well uruu-run reas'n why I told Isabel I came 'ome cuss::
 20 Thursdee'll be a lo:ng day₁[yihknow₁] 'll be, bout =
 21 **Emma:** [Y e a h .
 22 **Emma:** = Ye,ah₁
 23 **Lottie:** [ni₁'ne ten hours s₁o-
 24 **Emma:** [Yah, =
 25 **Lottie:** = 'hhhhh I wanduh I'm not a bit tire'tuhn₁ight though. =
 26 **Lottie:** = °hhoh₁hhhhh° ((sounds like a yawn))
 27 **Emma:** [Oh:: I'm so gladje hadda good ti:me, =

- 28 **Emma:** = hhI' [m so happy °for you, °
 29 **Lottie:** [Eh- En Mondee I kept s: sleepin I thought
 30 Jeez I can't sleep'nymore I din'hear Isabel around er anything
 31 en finally et ten uh'clock I got up en I: si:z: (.) e*: : en
 32 then I yelled in et'er (tuh) Is'bel'n God shhhe'd p(h)in up
 33 ffer hou:rs yihdow en she's g'n, na be, quiet fer [me: : =
 34 **Emma:** °Oh°
 35 **Lottie:** = 'h, h-
 36 **Emma:** [o* Oh° =
 37 **Lottie:** = hunh, 'hh
 38 **Emma:** [o* bless her hea:rt. °Whadda *gal.
 39 (.)
 40 **Emma:** Well I'm so happy fo [r yuh
 41 **Lottie:** [°Ghhhho'd you sh'd see° the be:d sprea:ds
 42 you kno:w, en these gr:eat big 'hhhhh king si[ze(b)
 43 **Emma:** [°M m: 'l: : °
 44 **Lottie:** [beds yihknow =
 45 **Lottie:** = with a:ll the(p) pillows on these gr::eat big l:la:mps yihkno:w
 46 [en 'hhhh
 47 **Emma:** [Like a movie s:set.
 48 (0.3)
 49 **Lottie:** Cheeziz en- (.) en a:ll the lights yihknow en the air
 50 c'nditioneen en goes o:n in [thee: [uh:]
 51 **Emma:** Inter [co: m I suppose,
 52 **Lottie:** [u-
 53 (.)
 54 **Lottie:** uHu:h?
 55 (.)
 56 **Emma:** Interco:m?
 57 (0.4)
 58 **Emma:** y'g'n talk from one room [°t'the other?°
 59 **Lottie:** [hyu- [O h : : :] yea:h en the s:sunken ba:thtuh

It is at this point that the segment designated 'fifth mention' in the text begins.

39. For consideration of the 'second story' as a device for showing understanding of prior talk, see Sacks, unpublished lecture, April 30, 1970 (mimeographed).
 40. For a consideration of the relationship between assessments and assessment responses, see Pomerantz (this volume, Chapter 9). The occurrence of overlap appears to be a consequence of both participants' work; i.e. assessor extends the utterance slightly beyond completion point, thus providing a broader target, while recipient aims at and hits the initial projected completion point.

(41) [NB:PWT:2]

- 7 **Emma:** e-that Pa:t isn't she a do: [l:l?
 8 **Penny:** [i-Ye'h isn't she pretty,

(61) [Goldberg:II:2:5]

- 1 **Maggie:** W'my God it sound marvelous Gene,
 2 **Gene:** Yeah it is, it's a it's a good deal,

Sensitivity to the expectable occurrence of assessment-response within or upon completion of an assessment term may be seen in the following fragment in which a slightly stretched assessment term ('cra:p') goes to completion in the clear and is followed by a series of expansions.

(62) [Goldberg:II:2:8]

- 1 **Maggie:** W'wuh w'd that involve. More schooling?
 2 **Gene:** Oh:: yea:h. Jista bunch cra:p. Y'know? Maggie en it's,
 3 (0.4)
 4 **Gene:** I uh::
 5 **Maggie:** Wul is the money there though Gene tuh compensate, you?

41. The escalation skip-connects to the course-of-events narrative which preceded the second story (lines 30–33) with an inter-segmental link ('and then', see note 27), which offers a forthcoming event as a next in an ongoing series. In this entire forty-five minute conversation, the escalated impropriety is never explicitly temporally located. The 'and then' here might be treated as evidence that the event occurred as part of today's nude swimming and sunbathing. However, there is some indication that the event took place the preceding night (e.g. that was the big night out, with much drinking and friskiness, data not shown). The point is, one would not say with assurance that *because* it is introduced via 'and then' the activity took place as part of the course-of-events it is thereby proposed as linked to. In this case, the inter-segmental link may be deployed for local sequential work, as a way to provide the relevance of and account for the here and now occurrence of a report which has become interactionally appropriate to deliver, now, for the first time in this conversation. Its 'nextness', then, is by reference to local sequential considerations and not to chronological fact.
42. See note 24. In this case, the two discrete actions are latched. That is, while in Fragment 48 there is a substantial distance between them, and in Fragment 27 lines 25–27 there is very little distance between them, in Fragment 31, lines 57–59 there is no distance between them. While it is possible that the laughter simply started to de-escalate at some point, independent of other activities, it is also possible that the de-escalation, as a next activity, was initiated by reference to its overlapmate's arrival at completion.
43. While an assessment like 'uninhibited' can occur as an admiring compliment, when affiliation/disaffiliation is at issue the assessment addresses features of its referent which do not belong to the assessor and thus tends to disaffiliate. Recipient is proposing that non-present third party, co-participant to the event, is someone who does things recipient does not (and perhaps would not) do. Attendant to the activity of estrangement from the assessed party, recipient provides an acoustic display of estrangement; i.e. the word is especially carefully, clinically pronounced; is produced as a layman using psychological diagnostic terminology to characterise alien behaviour.
44. Following is a candidate account of recipient's stopping just after initiation of a next third-person assessment. (1) The overlapping acknowledgement token by offerer is potentially not a complete utterance, but an utterance-initial term (see Fragments 41 and 42, note 39 for 'Yeah +' in the environment of assessments). (2) The utterance initiated by the token might be an assessment fitted to the current series of third-person assessments (again, see note 39). That is, recipient

may stop by reference to the possibility that offerer is in the course of volunteering a type-fitted assessment; i.e. recipient may cancel a next of a series to permit a first response to prior components of that series, a response which may affiliate with, not merely acknowledge, the series of assessments.