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1.

Leavis (1972: 220) quotes the following lines from Shelley's (1965: 114-115) The Cenci, III, ii, 1-24.

Giacomo: 'Tis midnight, and Orsino comes not yet.
[Thunder, and the sound of a storm.
What! can the everlasting elements
Feel with a worm like man? If so, the shaft Of mercy-winged lightning would not fall
On stones and trees. My wife and children sleep:
They are now living in unmeaning dreams:
But I must wake, still doubting if that deed
Be just which was most necessary. 0,
Thou unreplenishing lamp! whose narrow fire
Is shaken by the wind, and on whose edge
Devouring darkness hovers! Thou small flame, Which, as a dying pulse rises and falls, Still flickerest up and down, how very soon, Did I not feed thee, wouldst thou fail, and be As thou hadst never been! So wastes and sinks Even now, perhaps, the life that kindled mine: But that no power can fill with vital oil That broken lamp of flesh. Ha! 'tis the blood Which fed these veins, that ebbs till all is cold: It is the form that moulded mine, that sinks Into the white and yellow spasms of death: It is the soul by which mine was arrayed In God's immortal likeness which now stands Naked before heaven's judgment-seat!
2.

Shakespeare's flame is taken to be portrayed in these lines from Othe110, V, ii, 7-13. See Shakespeare (1970b: 1149).

Put out the light, and then put out the light.
If I quench thee, thou flaming minister, I can thy former light restore,
Should I repent me; but once put out thy light,
Thou cunning'st pattern of excelling nature, I know not where is that Promethean heat
That can thy light relume.
3.

The opening paragraph of Mont Blanc to which Wellek (1937a: 380) makes reference runs as follows. See Shelley (1968: 405-406).

The everlasting universe of things
Flows through the mind, and rolls its rapid waves,
Now dark -- now glittering -- now reflecting gloom --
Now lending splendor, where from secret springs
The source of human thought its tribute brings
Of waters -- with a sound but half its own, Such as a feeble brook will oft assume
In the wild woods, among the mountains lone,

Where waterfalls around it leap forever, Where woods and winds contend, and a vast river Over its rocks ceaslessly bursts and raves.
4.

Of the opening lines of Mont Blanc, Leavis (1972: 199) says:
The metaphorical and the actual, the real and the imagined, the inner and the outer, could hardly be more unsortable and indistinguishably confused. The setting, of course, provides special excuse for bewildered confusion; but Shelley takes eager advantage of the excuse and the confusion is characteristic -- what might be found unusual in Mont Blanc is a certain vividness.
5.

Wellek's (1937a: 380-381) reply, which includes his re-write is:
I cannot see the slightest confusion in the opening paragraph of Mont Blanc. It states an epistemological proposition quite clearly. 'There is nothing outside the mind of man, the receptive function of the stream of consciousness is very much larger than the tiny active principle in mind which itself is determined by the huge flood of external impressions.' So or similarly could one state the contents in abstract terms which in Shelley are expressed in two similies: first the external impressions are compared to a huge stream ever varied into which at a secret point the active principle flows and then this active principle is compared to a feeble brook among high mountains which has seemingly a much louder voice because of the intermingling and surrounding sounds of waterfalls, winds and woods. I cannot see that the 'metaphorical and the actual', 'the real and the imagined' are confused, as you say and the 'inner' and 'outer' are confused only in the sense that according to Shelley (and all subjective idealists) there is simply no 'outer' accessible to our mind.
6.

Leavis' (1937: 68-69) reply to this is:
Nor do I attack Mont Blanc. When Dr. Wellek says, 'I cannot see the slightest confusion in the opening paragraph of Mont Blanc,' he seems to me to be betraying an inappreciation of Shelley -- an inappreciation explained by the approach intimated in his next sentence: 'It states an epistemological proposition quite clearly.' Now to me the opening paragraph of Mont Blanc evokes with great vividness a state of excited bewilderment and wonder. The obvious Wordsworthian element in the poem suggests
a comparison with Wordsworth，and，regarding as \(I\) do the two poets，not as stating epistemological propositions or asserting general conceptions，but as reacting character－ istically to similar concrete ocassions，the comparison I actually make seems to me justified．

\section*{7.}

The translation of the passage from Malraux＇s La Voie Royale is by Stuart Gilbert in The Royal Way（Malraux，1935：276－277）． Malraux＇s original and Goldmann＇s rewrite of it can be found，in the French，in Goldmann（1964a：98）：
［．．．］Perken voudrait encore arriver chez lui，mourir， là où son existence avait trouvé sa signification，même si cette signification lui est devenue étrangère：
＇．．．il savait à la fois que，chez lui，il guérirait，et qu＇il allait mourir，que sur la grappe d＇espoirs qu＇il etait，le monde se refermerait，bouclé par son chemin de fer comme par une corde de prisonnier；que rien dans l＇univers，jamais，ne compenserait plus ses souffrances passées ni ses souffrances présentes： être un homme，plus absurde encore qu＇être un mourant．．．＇
The stress is Goldmann＇s．

\section*{8.}

The full passage from Pascal（1972：非684）displays Goldmann＇s（1964b： 13）reading to be highly selective（though Goldmann also furnishes most of \(⿰ ⿰ 三 丨 ⿰ 丨 三 一\) 684）．I．e．，there is at least one reading of Pascal which would have it that reading the Scriptures is to be taken as quite a different matter from reading any other（non－Biblical）texts．It is these latter which are，on this reading，apparently fraught with contradictions，or at least they can be．

Contradiction．－－On ne peut faire une bonne physionomie qu＇en accordant toutes nos contrariétés，et il ne suffit pas de suivre une suite de qualités accordantes sans accorder les contraires．Pour entendre le sens d＇un auteur，il faut accorder tous les passages contraires．

Ainsi，pour entendre l＇Écriture，il faut avoir un sens dans lequel tous les passages contraires s＇accordent． Il ne suffit pas d＇en avoir un qui convienne à plusieurs passages accordants，mais d＇en avoir un qui accorde les passages même contraires．

Tout auteur a un sens auquel tous les passages contraires s＇accordent，ou il n＇a point de sens du tout．On ne peut pas dire cela de l＇Écriture et des prophètes；ils avaient assurément trop bon sens．Il faut donc en chercher un qui accorde toutes les contrariétés．

Therefore, Pascal is allowing for a case in which a non-Biblical author might be said, were the relevant text read as containing an enormous amount of contradictions, to have no meaning at all ('il n'a point de sens du tout'). Logically, if 'one cannot say this of the Scriptures', one may nevertheless be able to say it of some other text or texts. This possibility is emphatically not ruled out by Pascal. Insofar as he is specifically addressing those theologians who have quibbled about 'the meaning of the Scriptures' on the grounds that they can be shown to contain a good deal of contradictory passages, Pascal is arguing that where we may say of a non-Biblical author that a large number of contradictions would invite us to judge that he or she has no meaning, we cannot automatically switch this judgment to the special case of the Scriptures. They are held to be cases where this 'normal' reaction must be suspended for:

Le véritable sens n'est donc pas celui des Juifs; mais en Jésus-Christ toutes les contradictions sont accordées. (Pascal, 1972: 非684)

On the other hand, Goldmann's use of this passage would have us believe that Pascal is making a clear open-and-shut case for all texts, Biblical or non-Biblical: they all have a meaning which can be found by resolving every contradictory passage without exception. Note here that Pascal's method of resolving all contradictions is based upon faith in the Christian conception of the 'real'; likewise, Goldmann's faith in a certain Marxist conception of the 'real' (see Chapter 1, 6.5).

The following version of the poem was arrived at by opening Pierre Reverdy's Selected Poems* indiscriminately and taking the first line from that page. The second line was the second line of the poem on the following page...and so forth. The last poem of the volume began on page 83 and so a new poem was selected 'randomly'. The number of lines (14) was predecided.
page
The world is my prison ..... 79
Nothing new under the yellow sun ..... 81
The storm is calmed too late ..... 83
The lamp is a heart emptying itself ..... 23
The earth holds itself still ..... 25
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings
are white ..... 27
If the door opens ..... 29
The earth turns no more ..... 31
This pale season ..... 33
Of the attic or of paradise ..... 35
When the eyes drip like blades of grass ..... 37
Everybody there stares ..... 39
They are still back there ..... 41
Calling back your life ..... 43

\footnotetext{
* Pierre Reverdy, Selected Poems. London: Cape, 1973. Translated by Kenneth Rexroth.
}

In this exercise you will be presented with a fourteen line poem in a cumulative way so that the first sheet contains the first line, the second sheet lines one and two, and so on.

You are required to interpret the text presented on each sheet, that is elucidate what the text is saying. Anything from paraphrase to a detailed analysis of how the poem is working will be adequate.

You are free to adjust your responses to any extent you feel the accumulating text justifies.

When you have finished with a sheet ask for the next one.

First Sheet
The world is my prison

Second Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun

Third Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late

\section*{Fourth Sheet}

The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself

Fifth Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still

\section*{Sixth Sheet}

The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings are white

\section*{Seventh Sheet}

The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings
\[
\begin{align*}
& \text { are white }  \tag{6}\\
& \text { If the door opens }
\end{align*}
\]

\section*{Eighth Sheet}

The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings
are white
If the door opens
The earth turns no more

Ninth Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings are white

If the door opens
The earth turns no more
This pale season

Tenth Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings are white

If the door opens
The earth turns no more
This pale season
Of the attic or of paradise

\section*{Eleventh Sheet}

The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings
are white
If the door opens
The earth turns no more
This pale season
Of the attic or of paradise
When the eyes drip like blades of grass

Twelfth Sheet
The world is my prison
Nothing new under the yellow sun
The storm is calmed too late
The lamp is a heart emptying itself
The earth holds itself still
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings
are white
If the door opens
The earth turns no more
This pale season
Of the attic or of paradise
When the eyes drip like blades of grass
Everybody there stares
Thirteenth Sheet
The world is my prison ..... (1)
Nothing new under the yellow sun(2)
The storm is calmed too late(3)
The lamp is a heart emptying itself ..... (4)
The earth holds itself still ..... (5)
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings are white ..... (6)
If the door opens(7)
The earth turns no more ..... (8)
This pale season ..... (9)
Of the attic or of paradise ..... (10)
When the eyes drip like blades of grass ..... (11)
Everybody there stares(12)
They are still back there(13)
Fourteenth Sheet
The world is my prison(1)
Nothing new under the yellow sun ..... (2)
The storm is calmed too late(3)
The lamp is a heart emptying itself ..... (4)
The earth holds itself still ..... (5)
The pavement the sidewalks the distance the railings are white ..... (6)
If the door opens(7)
The earth turns no more ..... (8)
This pale season(9)
Of the attic or of paradise(10)
When the eyes drip like blades of grass(11)
Everybody there stares(12)
They are still back there(13)
Calling back your life(14)

Because of time limitations and subjects' differential speeds, some subjects were asked to 'skip over' some lines of the 'poem'. The following is a table of the sheets presented to each subject.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ITV } \\
& \text { S } 7 \text { ə } \quad \text { Y S } \\
& \infty \\
& \text { ち } \\
& \ddagger \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\
& \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \\
& \stackrel{\leftarrow}{\perp}
\end{aligned}
\]

In the following data, the subjects' protocols are re-typed verbatim from their hand-written answer-sheets. No attempt has been made to 'clean up' the data. Words which are difficult to make out in the hand-written forms are shown in square brackets.

\section*{SUBJECT ONE}

Sheet One
And I'm walled in this world, my son!
A metaphor that would normally be a cliche is given a deep ambiguity of meaning and tone by the word my. The 'persona' could either be a 'prisoner' or one who is a 'warder'. The line is reminiscent of 'the world is my oyster' -- Shakespeare, I think. Rather derivative but given a modern context reflecting contemporary malaise.

\section*{Sheet Two}

The poet has experienced a great deal but finds his anguish as part of the larger eternal cycle of the condition of man, suggesting the recurring cycle that man is born into, not out of.

\section*{Sheet Three}

Here there's a suggestion that the poet has grown old. The image of the storm, though hackneyed, sums up a life of turbulence and suffering, and something that must happen again and again in the sea of life. The next line could end with 'fate'.

\section*{Sheet Four}

A man buffeted by the sea of life: the image of the lamp against the storm. Despite desolation and suffering, the human heart continues surviving, life becomes a process of dying. The lamp in the storm is an old image, a universal one. It hasn't lost its freshness simply because death and life remain the fresh and urgent realities always and man's struggle, symbolised in the flickering lamp, illumin-
ates the encircling gloom.
Sheet Five
In the desolation and the burning of the human heart, the earth alone remains a non-participant. It takes the struggles of men and out of its debris the [goodness] grows again. The word 'still' reverberates with profound resonances, the still centre, which is perpetually in motion.

Sheet Six
An alienated figure in a modern metropolis, cut off from the stream of life. The images in these lines reflect the aridity of life for the poet, 'distance' implicating civilisation that has fragmented life by 'pavements', 'sidewalks', 'railings'. "White" indicates not purity but sterility. There's a certain racial tone in the words -- as if this civilisation is the creation of the 'white man'.

\section*{Sheet Seven}

The door of the 'prison' in several senses: the door of the rose garden that never opened in the Eliotian sense; the door that could imprison him forever; the door of a white castle, closed to this outcast. There's also a suggestion of possibility in this line.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

The fifth line of the poem is reinforced by this repetition, but the poet has progressed in his seeing of the world. The fifth line suggested no action, this line suggests the ending of an action that was there before. A sense of the finality of despair is contrasted with just the slight suggestion of possibility in the preceding line. Words like 'open' and 'turn' continue the now subterranean image of the prison that forms the axis of the poem.

\section*{Sheet Nine}
'Prison', 'yellow sun' are given assonance with this line. The pale word 'pale' is given a contextual signification of great intensity. The poet is now relating the image, the environment and the (his) state of being into one whole. The word 'season' indicates a connection with
nature. Thus the poet cannot be totally a pessimist as 'season' would suggest regeneration.

\section*{Sheet Ten}

The attic -- a most ordinary image is cleverly juxtaposed with a mythical image of paradise. One in its abject reality, the other in its mythical conception reflect the artist's dilemma in facing up to life -- life that is here on this earth: this is all we have, neither the ivory tower nor the paradise will come to the rescue. The world, a prison, is one single, enveloping reality.

\section*{Sheet Eleven}
[Now] the images here are "yoked by violence", they do suggest a connection between man and the earth as if the water from the eyes makes the grass grow. A deep, unbreakable relationship between man and Earth is subtly suggested. The line makes a living contrast to the attic and the paradise of the "pale season' where little grows.

Sheet Twelve
This line brings in another dimension -- of a new place, something imagined, something that gives one false hope and at the same time presents one living here. It is the now, this earth, prison though it may be, it is better than the promised paradise. The heat of the summer here is far more than the 'pale' season of those who dream of paradise or live in ivory towers.

\section*{Sheet Thirteen}

This is a marvellously ambiguous line and the word still, repeated again, suggests an affinity with the lost, dead souls. It [shows] no growth no movement wherever they are. To live in this world is to accept its pain and joys and in living it as it is we break the walls of prison: man from this world, the soul from the body. The poet would not have it otherwise.

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

The last line sums up the complex and yet simple conviction of the poet. The poet urges us to live life here and now, and not be lured by false attractions elsewhere. The voices of the sirens -- of all kinds -- trapping, bewitching people from living out their life and humanity.

Although the poem began with a negative image, the end of the poem suggests a positive view of life here, if one can escape the traps of other lives. There's just one life and it is here on this earth.

SUBJECT TWO
Sheet One
In a physical sense the world imprisons the body before and after death; it also imprisons the soul to the extent that mind and soul are contained in the body.

Sheet Two
All knowledge is, in the "fishbowl theory" contained from the beginning of time and can only be re-expressed in many variants. The author may be lamenting that he is unable to create new ideas since everything has been conceived and created before him and he cannot transcend his limitations as a human.

Sheet Three
The images of world, sun, storm accumulate to present a picture of the cosmos both limiting and fraught with anger against limitations. Perhaps the "storm" of creativity is "calmed" after the author realises that what he has said has already been said, but the realisation comes too late [to] keep the storm of emotions and outburst from disturbing the author's unfretful existence.

Sheet Four
The lamp empties itself -- the artist's passions empty themselves against a storm or in a storm which he sees as useless. The cumulative effect of each line being a vehicle of a new image, seemingly unrelated to the previous lines is one of despair and inevitability in a chaotic and yet rather bored universe.

\section*{Sheet Five}

The earth "holding itself still" seems to contradict the storm of 1.3 but the lack of movement is that of the prison -- the "nothing new under the sun" while the storm and lamp may be seen as the rather futile attempts of the author to make an impression. His golden light --
or what he sees as that -- pours out into a night which is accepting, passive and refusing to be moved by one heart.

\section*{Sheet Six}
1.6 Another image of blankness, quiet, futility, where the homogeneity of things is stressed. Neither the present or closest objects of the artist's perception -- pavement and sidewalks nor those he will reach in the future are different. Since there is nothing new under the sun the landscape and the foreground blend into a bland depressing sameness.

\section*{Sheet Seven}
1.7 Here is a promise of movement, of hope for a difference in the sameness of the world. "The" door implies a particular hope or avenue -- perhaps and insight into a new and less unaffected world.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

Up to this point I have seen the poem as expressing frustration and depression. This line substantiates it. If 'the' door -- now it can be seen to be the door of his 'prison' -- opens -- then he will no longer be contained by the world -- the earth will no longer turn since he will no longer be there to perceive its turning. This will mean a change from the stillness and lack of something new.

Sheet Nine
He seems to have left off with the notion of change, to probe no further after line 8 though I expected him to go ahead on this line. This also adds to the feeling of despair, rather than a door of hope, it is a door that leads to nothing. So that being set free of the world is no answer. With "this pale season" there is a return to the images of white, yellow, lack of difference. Even the most obvious changes of the earth -- the seasons -- are only pale.

\section*{Sheet Ten}

Equating attic and paradise, according them both "pale seasons", implies that the world which contains and stores all knowledge and things is at once musty and ever-fresh. The accumulation of knowledge may be old from its antiquity -- may have the mustiness of an attic, but it is a potential paradise for those individuals in it.

I saw lines 9 and 10 as being connected before. But now I think line 9 goes with 8 -- the earth turns no more this pale season -- if the man steps through the door. This is the result of the cumulative nature of the text; I was expecting a new image with each line and did not put pale season with earth. I think I would see lines 7-10 as one idea. Line 11 begins a new one, here there is a peopled world "eyes", "everybody" for the first time, but these are as unmoved, "staring" as the world itself at the slow sad tears of the imprisoned artist.

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

When the artist has given up cannot make the move to let life end because the people of the world keep the artist in touch with his life. Their eyes may be staring from the "fishbowl" of the world, but since he is one with them in the attic or paradise he will not leave via the "door" -- death -- Because, either through their malevolence, their unwillingness to allow escape -- in that sense they are his guards in the prison -- or through his feeling that they are one with him -prisoners -- he simply cannot leave. The world and all its people are his prisoners as he stated in the beginning. The poem does not progress, only states and restates the inevitability of his fate to twirl despairingly round the sun. When "hope" is offered -- a door, and avenue of escape -- it is not escape but an end.

\section*{SUBJECT THREE}

Sheet One
Obviously a reflection of someone's state of mind -- the poet (?) is trying to express a feeling of constraint which is most probably mental or emotional, but could also be physical. It could also be the cry of a Platonist convinced that his soul is imprisoned in the mire of the world of flesh.

Sheet Two
A state of ennui (is that how you spell it??). World weary, rather tedious sentiment. While the first line taken on its own could be imagined as perhaps leading on to an imaginative and sensitive explor-
ation of his feelings (mental, physical, spiritual or emotional, it, instead, descends into self indulgent cliche. Shakespeare did it much better in Hamlet.

Sheet Three
At this point there appears to be very little connection between lines 1, 2 and 3, (especially lines 2 and 3) I'm waiting with interest to find out why "the storm is calmed too late" -- this line like the previous one, borders on sentimental, self indulgent cliche.

Sheet Four
So far, as "poetry" (--is it?) this is nonsense: 4 entirely disconnected images, all tired and cliched. I suspect, Mr Ashcroft, that you have taken random lines from various poems (or even prose!) and put them side by side in no particular order.

Sheet Five
If you really wish me to discuss this "poem" serious7y-I will try! Each line contains an image (none of which relates to the rest, except insofar as each expresses a sense of incompleteness and dismay) which indicates (1) restriction (2) boredom (3) loss (4) perhaps loss again, but possibly something positive amid almost unrelieved dreariness -i.e. a giving in love as a lamp "gives" of itself when it lights the surrounding darkness (5) stasis -- which perhaps relates to lines 1 and 2; but could also be meant to indicate a sense of waiting for something -- perhaps with foreboding given the negative tone of the previous lines.

Sheet Six
At last the man is moving from abstractions which are meant to (presumably) depict his inner world, and looks around him. Perhaps he is going to see his inner world reflected out "there". Interesting that he links "the distance" -- essentially diffuse and bordering on the non-material with ordinary everyday objects. Also interesting that these things are "white", which could be profoundly symbolic, or mean nothing significant at all. Can't wait to find out!!

\section*{Sheet Seven}

The significance or otherwise of "distance" and "white" yet to be established. The sense of waiting which was established in line 5 is sustained by line 7 with the use [of] the subjunctive. The sense of
boredom and perhaps failure is relieved substantially by the tentative promise of action and the possibility of revelation.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

Obviously I was wrong, because the opening door leads not to renewed activity or revelation but to a stasis even more profound than before. Perhaps the man is dead or dying??? At last there is a fairly obvious link between ideas and images i.e., lines 5 and 8 (perhaps the man is a numerologist -- 5 and 8 are linked numbers with a good deal of significance attached to them?) Before, the earth was not completely static i.e. it was holding itself as if in anticipation of renewed activity -but at line 8 such expectation is frustrated. But who knows, perhaps line 9 will contradict this one!?

Sheet Nine
Just as line six established a vague sense of place amidst the welter of emotional (or should I say emotionally drained) images, so line 9 establishes a vague sense of time. Interesting that in line 6 place was defined as "white", here time is defined as "pale". Everything is washed-out? I.e. time and place reflect the man's sense of inner poverty?

\section*{Sheet Ten}

Juxtaposition of concrete place and imaginative place -- i.e. "paradise" while at its most simple level connotes an actual place of bliss can also reflect in its metaphorical sense, an experience or a state of mind. It could be that the man is waiting for his lover or perhaps his murderer -- either awaiting the ecstasy of consummation or of death. Either way, "if the door opens/the earth turns no more". Is he actually writing in an attic and will it be transformed (or he be transported) to "paradise" -- i.e. will he die or experience sexual bliss (death and orgasm often synonymous at least to poets)? Or is this too simplistic? Everything loses its colour (i.e. its flavour etc.) without the tension of love or hate.

\section*{Sheet Twelve}

Is he crying? Apparently he is not alone -- hippie in an attic commune waiting to greet his lover across a crowded room? Or perhaps he's gone from the specific to the general (i.e. back to the generalised images of the first five lines?

The man is going to commit suicide.

SUBJECT FOUR
Sheet One
Springs to mind, "I shall not want", which is true in a way, as food, shelter, clothing should be provided.
On a more reflective reading, the line is so general a statement as to seem almost trite. That is, without some sense of a context in which this line is spoken (I say "spoken" as it strikes me as dramatic rather than narrative) it has no real depth, allows for no perspective.

Sheet Two
Still strikes me as dramatic, a dramatic monologue so far. It seems to be developing into a somewhat dreary reflection on "existence as a closet" or something to that effect. "Prison" has a peculiar effect here, suggesting more strongly a literal, rather than metaphorical, reading of the word. It doesn't seem that "nothing new" necessarily occurs (or doesn't occur, those double negatives are always tricky) in a prison. That is, new things can occur in prisons but it may be that an effect of being in a prison, or even thinking of oneself in a prison, is to create the sense of nothing new ever happening. The sun isn't very often actually yellow but "the yellow sun" is a commonly used expression. The poet is perhaps trying to write as a common mind might or else he doesn't think much about the words he uses.

\section*{Sheet Three}

Glad to see a storm creep in. Gives a sense of movement now, even though the word "calmed" takes away from that movement. In fact I'm delighted that the storm was "calmed too late" as the person in prison (whether this is a prison of their making or whatever) had the diversion of a storm gone out of control. Something to think about in that changeless prison. "Is calmed" suggests that the storm is calmed by someone or something rather than the more expected feeling about storms that they calm themselves. That is "the storm calmed too late" would have a very different effect on reader. As it stands
the third line now brings into the picture a question of responsibility i.e. whose responsible for this prison, who for the sun, who for calming storms.

Sheet Four
This 4th line comes as something of a surprise. The lamp recalls the sun merely expending its given energy "emptying itself" and therefore nothing new is possible. I half expected the more cliched "the lamp is a heart burning itself out" or something to that effect, given the cliched phrase "yellow sun". The person in prison (again the sense of a literal prison becomes strong in the 4th line) is contemplating one of the few distractions within his (her) world and making rather trite reflections on it. The use of "the world", "the storm", "the lamp", or rather the accumulation of "the's", begins to anchor the poem in space and time, a particular context is being shaped. Personally I'm thankful, as I wouldn't know what the hell was happening otherwise. I think maybe that light will go out in the last line of the poem, adding some sort of narrative movement to the poem. In any case the burning lamp will stick in my mind as the poem develops. Rather interesting (in an immediate sense) turning around of the more expected "the heart is a lamp emptying itself".

\section*{Sheet Eight}

Up to line 6 an attempt to capture something like the drugged reflections of an inmate of some institution. The sterile environment, the "whiteness" everywhere, the sense of changelessness in lines 2 and 5 , the inevitableness of the lamp emptying itself, time merely winding itself out, all contribute to what I defined as the essential effect of first 6 lines. Also a very subdued sense of small or trifling or weak movement within a central staticity (if there is such a word) is dominant in first 6 lines. The "calming" of the storm, the "emptying" of the lamp, the "holding" of the earth in stillness, for example. In lines 7 and 8 the mood changes. Becomes more essentialy immediate, slightly hysterical, anticipatory. Lines 5 and 8 seem to contradict each other. If the earth is still in 5 how can it "turn no more" in 8 after someone or something opens the door?

Sheet Nine
Ah! It's winter is it? "This pale season" is perhaps winter, not only reinforcing the "whiteness" in line 6 but also radically changing my perspective on line 6. I thought the whiteness was in the speaker's mind but now it may simply be the effect of snow. "Pale", of course, can also suggest a slowly draining heart, becoming paler as it is closer to being spent. "this pale season" is a fine phrase, whatever it means, suggesting a "delicacy of thought and feeling" hitherto absent from the poem. Actually "the earth holds itself still" has a certain power which I didn't sense earlier. The feeling of forces held in tension to create the illusion of staticity (again?) is effective, particularly when balanced by "if the door opens" which also suggests a kind of "hanging in the balance". "The door" contributes to the accumulation of specifics in space. For some reason line 9 stimulated this thought.

Sheet Ten
I definitely get a strong sense of winter. "Nothing new" because nothing grows in winter. It is the season of feeling closed in, restricted to reflection on being closed in. One rummages around in the attic because it's too cold to go outside or sits and dreams of a tropical paradise. I no longer even want to follow through some heavy metaphorical train of thought in the poem. It's too boring!

Sheet Twelve
Out in a snowfall the eyelids get snowy but the flakes melt almost immediately and therefore eyes do seem to drip like blades of grass covered in dew. I wonder where "there" is, on the streets? OUTSIDE!? I like the sound of "there stares". Who knows why?

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

Again, where is there? So I would like to know! I guess the speaker's dead or in prison and all he (or she) can do is contemplate "there", "then", some other time, some other place. Lots of active verbs in this poem for a work that never seems to be going anywhere.

\section*{Sheet One}

The world ties down the soul of the human being from the point of view of "transcendent" experience -- but the world imprisons the human being too, in terms of it being, like a prison, an excessively unpleasant experience.

Sheet Two
The world is an unpleasant, limiting place too live -- everything remains a sameness of experience -- probably cruel experience. Mankind is perpetually in a state of suffering.

Sheet Three
All human existence is in the context of sameness and suffering. Offers of 'salvation' are always after the event -- no solution to 'man's inhumanity to man' -- but the poet does not seem, yet, to be desperate. The storm in the individual's mind is equally as insufficient as a response as is the storm of total existence -- the calming of that storm equally as tardy and useless. Suffering has occurred -is inevitable.

\section*{Sheet Four}

Since human suffering is inevitable, despite offers of private or universal salvation or solution, and since the individual imagination, and individual emotion therefore are universally suffering, the effect must be stultifying. The individual 'heart' must deny emotion for survival, just as that incessant "yellow sun" is shining on sameness, but gradually dying.

Sheet Five
The poet has got somewhat carried away with his cosmic imagery! Human existence remains "eternal" suffering -- the only relief for both the individual and society at large being a gradual death -- both of the mental faculties and emotions of the individuals and the gradual death of the earth itself. The earth "holds itself still" in much the same way as a frightened mouse in the face of certain death. Real progress is impossible in the face of continual chaos and certain disaster.

Sheet Six
In the midst of suffering, the only relief from which, universally and individually, is the notion of a dying sun and a dying earth, like the earth holding itself "still" as an animal faced with terror, the poet is still too -- focussing attention on objects -- but even the objects in which he has sought concrete relief (curiosity value?) are imbued with a sameness. An overall sense of gnawing, nightmarish, terror.

\section*{Sheet Seven}

The final line holds out some tiny -- but already, due to "if", insufficient hope. Adds to the despair, the dreamlike quality of the vision of universal hopelessness and immobility, in the face of dreadful inevitability.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

The hope roused and smashed in line 7, is inevitably smashed in line 8. The individual's mind -- and hence all minds -- cannot open themselves fully to the implications of the earlier part of the poem -the experience would lead to a catatonic freeze! Faced with a vision of inevitable suffering in a slowly dying world, insanity is inevitable unless the mind closes itself, most of the time, to the vision. The poet has some view to uniting personal and world horror -- reinforced by the use of everyday words, as in lines 6 and 7, combined with "cosmic" words -- earth, sun, storm. All jammed together by "prison". The old image -- of the soul being imprisoned in the body and eventually released -- is being turned in on itself. There is no release in this "nightmare"! There is no salvation -- personally or socially.

\section*{Sheet Nine}

In the light of my interpretation so far -- I have seen a concern with facing -- or an inability to face -- the inevitable realities of suffering, death, without relief, in a dying world. "This pale season" -along with "white" in line 6 and the "yellow sun" in line 2, indicates that the season is winter -- if it is, it adds another level to the irony begun in line 1. That the "prison" of the body eventually releases the soul to salvation, is an old image. I still think the poet is turning this on its ear in the body of the poem so far -- that there is really no hope. Winter, of course, traditionally connotes a certainty of new life with spring. It is possible that the poet is using this as a
reinforcement of the irony in the poem.
Sheet Ten
Line 10 confirms me in my belief that the poet is questioning the reality of images of hope. To equate the attic and paradise is to once more debunk traditional symbols of hope. To be in an attic in winter is to be almost in the weather -- but it is also the top of the house -- probably cosy therefore paradise -- in being 'ultimate' and in being warm. But paradise equated with the season winter is totally incongruous -- and paradise equated with a poky storeroom of junk is also incongruous -- the attic has walls too -- like a prison -- you can go nowhere from there except down. It all adds to the irony I have found so far in the poem.

Sheet Twelve
Lines 11 and 12 work with the interpretation I have read so far. Finding oneself in an attic -- with nowhere to go but down -- finding oneself in a paradise that is cold -- not very pleasant in a fig leaf! -can -- must -- lead to tears. (line 11) -- but even the tears are not real, they are like condensation on grass -- not out of the grass, but put there. How can an 'emptying' heart lead to real tears? How can you cry real tears over a dying world unless you die yourself? Line 12 reinforces the sense of unreality, sameness, monotony, being an uninvolved spectator -- you cannot get involved because you will go mad, or die. If you do not get involved, then you must either live falsely or as a spectator.

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

The final two lines of the poem confirm my belief that the poem revolves on irony. Hopelessness is the key note. There is no release from the 'prison' -- after the universal and personal observations of the poet -he realises that he is one of the spectators -- they call back his life in the sense of reminding him that he is one of them -- uninvolved -struggling along -- shutting out reality and turning his back on suffering. Even the last line has irony. Humanity should call back his life in the sense of making him more aware of his own humanity -- i.e. some solution in 'brotherly love' etc. But this is not the outcome. Rather it is intensified despair.

Sheet One
Limitation of self -- concept of self as chinese boxes so that one is captured within one's reality and existence, for that (i.e. in the world) is all that one is capable of being. Thus though the contradiction of expansiveness (world) and restrictiveness (prison) seems to provide a conflict of concepts/negation of negation, yet one is able to experience and be calmed by the thought that very little greater than the world is ever likely to be experienced by most people. That takes one to the thought that the other people of the world are one's prison fellows (inmates) and that somewhere there is a gaoler. The synthesis of images world/prison is suggestive of futility.

\section*{Sheet Two}

The prison warder, though enriching and life giving (yellow sun -- analogous to wealth/gold/warmth) because only able in the poet's consciousness to shine on the world, the one world/prison, is quite incapable of providing newness, even though new crops grow, yet new crops always grow -the sun is not providing anything other than an ability to continue the continuing realities of imprisonment.

\section*{Sheet Three}

The structural syallables provide dislocative staccatoes so that the third line though indicative of the ability to calm, the possibility of calm, is incongruous in interpretation. The concept of storm, and its teutonic sound -- struggle is opposite to the life that is being lived in the prison. Thus the calm that may descend on one's life struggle, death, comes later than it ought. Death is tardy, yet comes too late.

\section*{Sheet Four}

The lamp is an associative concept allied with the light of life, the light of life, the light of the world. Lux mentis, lux orbis, and the yellow sun, that life giver, as a heart muscle is the corporeal life giver, is draining of energy -- the heat death of the universe, entropy; nothing is new under the \(y\). sun, \(\therefore\) it is purposeless \(\therefore\) the sun/heart/ lamp is being drained of energy, by the ice cold of empty space.

The earth enfolds its energies that are received from the sun, to protect itself. The 'still', interpreted as 'yet' means that even though it is prison to its inhabitants, and that the sun is dying eventually, the good earth continues to look after its imprisoned with its previously [stated] sun-endowed riches, and also is laying by sustenance for the future. A more optimistic note occurs, attachable to the earth. Perhaps earth is good, world is less good, but the idea of earth seems to offer comfort; the soil warm, overlaying minerals and seeds, nurtured by rain and the prisoners for their own sustenance.

Sheet Six
Reorientation to express the same ideas in colder images. The absence of punctuation in expected locations offers some shock of non-recognition, and the sixth line attempts to symbolise a progression of movement. The individual moving walks along the sidewalks, the pavements that are layed upon his/her prison, emprisoning the prison, railing in the rails and railing in the prisoner. Yet railings are white, pristine cold, ambiguous, unemotional, perhaps with spear points. They mark one's progress on earth, through life, spatially, temporally, rattling one's blind cane against the bars. The machine-gun rattle pressages thanatos.

\section*{Sheet Seven}

Along one's passage through space/time in the prison of life/world, there are possibilities that railings/bars (on one side of pavement only) could offer an exit from the deterministic events -- introduce probabilistic chances of escape. The concept being offered could be a turn to spiritual escape being the preferred (if only because no other way out from ignorance possible) escape.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

Yes, death and spirituality are the door that would open to provide the exit from the prison treadmill, and thus the world could no longer be a prison. Thus the world, solipsistically could no longer exist, would be dead, and turn no more. Seek some eschatological exit and one's idea of prison/earth becomes manageable.

Sheet Nine
The time spent on earth is the winter of one's later existence so the yellow sun is unable to provide real warmth; a winter of discontent
is one's earthly progress and life is a pale season, humanity is an etiolated plant until released from earthly bondage.

Sheet Ten
The remotest and least lived in room under the thin roof is most susceptible to the climatic effects; in life the winter of one's existence on earth (this pale season) is likely to isolate the liver -- attic is isolation; attic is greek; paradise is greek; the neo-hellenicism of one's lack of self-determination draw together here from the preceding 9 lines, and will probably act as a catapult to fling a final quatrain of fulfilment in death at the reader.

\section*{Sheet Twelve}

The gleaming razor sharp mutually contradictory images show the eyes to be weapons and such they be, for everybody there (?) on earth scythes one with their sharpened inquisitorial looks.

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

Because the connections between people are frequently first made through eyeballing, and their tenuous threads act as those forces, which cumulatively woven, become a hawser capable of warping toward the prison haven one's [strip] of life.

And as the earth held itself still, so the fellow prisoners are also still in both senses. They are there yet, and they are in the stillness of death. So that thanatos is the end of life, life being deterministic that is one's purpose in living, and the poem and life is a teleological loop.

Sheet One
A cognate variation might be: "The world is my ashtray", i.e, two meanings at least become evident on first reading, depending on the word considered to govern the sense of the lines. Having delivered myself of profundity, let me say that the speaker might be gaoler or prisoner.

\section*{Sheet Two}

Aha! One now wants to know what comes next, because there seems only a tenuous connection between these two lines in terms of sense. An attempt, though, since I wish you well. "Yellow" being introduced turns the quality of experience being reported into something else. Abstraction \(\rightarrow\) physical phenomenon. So: the nausée of 1.1 becomes more precise because sublunary location of 1.1 now is juxtaposed with something (i.e., in this case, "the yellow sun") beyond. Dreariness of "nothing new" however, loosely connects the lines but only loosely.

\section*{Sheet Three}

It isn't a poem! A random regurgitation of spiritual bile could never, in three lines, be successfully disguised as a poem. It's confusing, but how about: these lines express something akin to the fear of having things under control -- a state in which one is insufficiently conscious of "the storm", leading to the presumption of believing that there is no storm. I'm saying this because I assume that there may indeed be a meaning to be found in what seems to be a collection, or set, of images.

\section*{Sheet Four}

Once there was a little person who sat in a room pondering upon human insignificance and the race's misplaced sense of its own importance. The little person contrasted images great and small, local and quasiuniversal (world-prison; prison-yellow sun; yellow sun-storm; storm-lamp) in which the scale flipped back and forth. If a heart emptying itself were to be represented as a lamp, a reader might consider this as an image intended to force revaluation, since it seems to locate the outpourings of a heart amongst quite mechanical physical phenomena. Yet, I suppose we ought to account for possible mystical connotations, such as that which sees the lamp as shining in the dark (God almighty!), illuminating at the expense of its own spirit (if it's not a gas lamp) the experiences of those around it. Yet, where are we going with such contrasts as the
sun-lamp matrix (11. 2, 4)? "Emptying", too, seems to preclude optimistic interpretation.

Sheet Five
Not another dimension it seems. L. 5 doesn't suggest the still point at the centre of a turning wheel, but a paralysis. But it's a selfinduced state, for 1.5 suggests voluntary action.

Sheet Six
"Neutrality" is what you (or I) want to read into "white" as a first suggestion, but perhaps there's something of a duality being reintroduced (cf. my comment on 1.1). "White" is the sum of all colours an attempt, maybe, to see the environment, physical nature and manufactured objects, as of a piece. Against this unified whole moves the speaker. Might be heroic in its nature, recognising either the enormous significance of its own consciousness -- or the opposite, but proceeding nontheless to encounter the things it perceives.

\section*{Sheet Seven}

The first conditional introduced, yet it was implied all along, if only by what seemed to be a uncompromisingly one-sided despair. This line does seem to solve one ambiguity, though: the speaker is considering the possibility of the door opening, i.e. the speaking voice is that of one imprisoned, not imprisoning, on the other hand, another ambiguity creeps in here. The speaker mayn't have the power of unlocking the door -- that may happen by chance. But the ambiguity is that perhaps the speaker wants to get in.

Sheet Eight
Yeh. Slightly existentialist (cf. the earlier note about "heroic" possibilities). The necessity of choosing in ignorance à la Rozencrantz and Guildenstern seems to lie behind the idea that if solutions were provided by the opening of the door, then there'd be no decision-making. Seems very possibly fatuous, but might be rescued by what is to come. The earth turning no more might be seen ambiguously as positive or negative (cf. comments on 1.5).

\section*{Sheet Nine}

The connotation of "pale", along with "white's" possible meanings, seems now to condition the mood from which the remarks proceed: it is
a nausé apparently. Yet "season" implies more of the positive mond that I referred to elsewhere, for "seasons" are intermeshed, cyclical.

Sheet Ten
It's a Grub St. hack writing on his bed of pain, surrounding by the gloom of his garret. Is he reaching the apex of his cone of madness or will he slip back again down its steep sides? More ambiguity of scale and of mood. But the quality of unknowing persists.

Sheet Twe1ve
The attic seems to be an image locating the poem, conveying the withdrawal of the speaker. Maybe this confirms the idea of heroism. Implicit in 1.11 is the notion that fertilisation as a process is itself two way. (The poem seems to invite such gnomic mutterings). The inaction of "staring" is consistent with the "hollow-men"-type connotations of preceding lines.

\section*{Sheet Four teen}

A confirmation of heroism, for it's now clear that the speaker is an outsider. I've suspended judgement on that point because of the ambiguities I've mentioned. The speaker can only live beyond the door; that's now plain enough. But I can't reject the idea that meaningful discovery is to be made within the world beyond the attic. The poem seems to want the reader to consider both worlds ambiguously.

\section*{SUBJECT EIGHT}

Sheet One
This is a direct, spare statement in which the writer asserts that existence or the world operates as a confining force on him/her. Actually -- the statement may not be as simple as it seems at first glance (once the next few lines are revealed). It may have metaphysical ramifications which are latent at the moment.

Sheet Two
Although the second line hasn't revealed the metaphysical associations which I expected the statement of the first line has definitely expanded. I'm not sure that the second line hasn't been taken from
another poem, but the somewhat despairing, \({ }_{[\text {[slack] }}^{[\text {static }]}\) statement extends the meaning of the first line.

\section*{Sheet Three}

Now I'm pretty (absolutely?) sure that these lines were not composed together. But the general theme of the three lines seems to be to convey a sense of boredom and confinement, a feeling of expectation unfulfilled. The monosyllabic phrases occurring one after another add to the deadening (wrong word, can't think of apt one) effect.

\section*{Sheet Four}

Each line of this "poem" so far presents a complete statement: but there does seem to be a unity in the whole. Perhaps because the monosyllabic spareness of the first line is carried through. This fourth line is a little startling though because of the somewhat fanciful image of the lamp as a heart emptying itself. I can imagine someone standing on stage slowly enunciating these words -- seeming somewhat pretentious in doing so!

Sheet Five
This line marks a sudden shift in the "poem" for the implied activity (action?) of the previous line, as well as its metaphorical fancifulness, is abandoned for a statement that articulates a cessation of action. Yet this creates a sense of expectation -- the lack of which seems to be decried in the first line. (Unless of course it is meant to denote the end of everything -- or of everything new at least). I'm not really sure what the poet is up to at the moment.

Sheet Six
This line is a surprise (not necessarily negative) for the "poem" shifts again. For the abstract nature of the earlier images gives way to direct, concrete observation and description. (Except that the description of "distance" as white can't really be considered direct observation -- a rather clever interpolation). I keep imagining this person standing somewhere (perhaps not on stage now!) intoning these lines in a deliberately laconic, maybe even worldly-wise manner. Now he/she suddenly makes a semblance of looking around and seeing the pavement etc. What the next line is going to be I don't know but I wouldn't be surprised if the poem shifts to a more "philosophic" stance. But perhaps my expectations will
not be fulfilled -- could continue description.

\section*{Sheet Ten}

The poem has surprised me again (I've got the 10 th sheet after the 6 th) and I'm commenting on the effect of the 7th line, and on what follows also. Whether or not the poem is a compilation of random sentences (I don't think it is, any more, but I'm not absolutely sure) it seems to be holding together, for ideas are carried through. The notion of the earth holding still carries on to the door opening. There is a paradox/ contradiction, here, for if the earth is holding itself still, the door opening cannot prevent/stop the earth from turning! But this is perhaps deliberate. My first impression of ennui as the "poem's" primary mood still holds. I'm not really sure what is meant by the last two lines but they seem to round off what goes before.

Sheet Twelve
Line 10 seems to have a finality about it, the "rounding off" I mentioned on my last sheet. Just responding to the work so far lines 11 - 12 seem somewhat gratuitous.

\section*{Sheet Fourteen}

I still feel that there is a random, "culled together" quality to all the lines of the "poem". What it means really I don't know but I see it mainly in terms of atmosphere, mood, tone, which is just what I said at the beginning: ennui, boredom, despair. Would like to say more but no more time.

\section*{SUBJECT NINE}

Sheet One
A statement of an emotional condition. The world = my prison. So that 'the world' defines the context of my, and 'prison' defines 'my world'. The persona may be understood to feel trapped in the hard facts of existence in "the world", to be imprisoned by those aspects of his environment which are weighing upon him, constituting the weight of a prison. A very solitary position.

Sheet Two
The persona conveys his emotions/psychic condition by projecting his feelings of bondage and sterility on the outside world -- romantic position. The hard facts of existence, of living in a world of things, and within a cosmic order -- infringe his freedom, and place him in a position of not being able to move on.

Could apply an external judgement on what is being said -- and could look at the internal position of the persona.

\section*{Sheet Three}

Line 3 introduces a dimension of rationality after a period of emotionalpsychic turbulence. BUT
is it the storm of the outside world -- which the persona feels as a threat to his freedom and creativity -- which has been through turbulence? or it it his internal state to which he refers?
The context of the objects of reference are not clearly defined -- and this results in confusion.

Sheet Four
In line 5 [[sic, Edd.]] the persona's attention focusses on a physical object directly in his line of vision -- perhaps he's sitting at his desk. (Reminds me of Coleridge's "Frost at Midnight" with the flame flickering on the hearth -- only the [move] of attention which reflects an inner state.) -- and again projects his inner state on to his physical reality. The lamp is a heart emptying itself because it pours out its life-blood (light) freely fed from another source -- and belongs to a wider cycle of movement of..

Sheet Five
In line 5 the persona's flow of thoughts is suddenly suspended as he responds to the stillness around him, and feels that the earth is consciously suspending movement or motion because as he stops and listens, there is nothing.
Again he responds to his environment by projecting his internal states on to his perception of that physical environment.

Sheet Six
Now, I can only assume that his attention has been taken by something outside the room he is in -- unless the lamp in line 4 refers to a street
lamp -- quite likely. Line 6 -- a purely descriptive statement, which has entered into persona's thoughts as his eyes move around him, and seems like the physical world is drawing him out of his emotional condition.

\section*{Sheet Seven}

Line 7 brings in a new dimension to what is happening in the poem -and what has given rise to the persona's emotional state. He now focusses thoughts on more urgent matters -- there is some decision, some action in the offing -- and the contingency introduced by this line may offer an explanation for the persona's self-projection in the previous line.

\section*{Sheet Eight}

We're given no added key to understanding the poem, in line 8, simply reinforcement of our conception that the persona is at some kind of point of despairation, and that indeed it is for some reason very important for him that a door -- somewhere in his immediate surroundings -- perhaps he is in a prison cell -- does not open.
If he is in a prison cell, it could mean that he's waiting for someone to come and take him to his death.

\section*{Sheet Nine}
'This pale season' could refer to the period of melancholy, inertia after the "storm" referred to in line 3 .
Seems there was a full-stop after line 8 -- a suspension and change of mood, from awareness of contingency, to a more speculative approach to his condition.

\section*{Sheet Ten}

The speculative note continues with line 10 -- seems that he really has got away momentarily, from his anxiety about the door opening.

The attic -- upstairs section of a house in which no one lives, but all the junk and refuse of everyday life, is thrown.
so -- 'pale season of the attic' seems plausible -- but seems to conflict with 'pale season of paradise' -- perhaps he's unsure of whether this 'pale season' will be a 'paradisal' existence or not.

Sheet Iwelve
Line 11 -- a very painful image of crying -- the suffering inducing the tears hurts -- so this pale season, the ultimate end of which the persona is unsure, is a time of tears. The image of line 11 could be taken as referring to the visual, and as such is very beautiful -- -- --
-- just realised I misread grass -- thought it was glass.
Line 12 suggests physical self-consciousness, something like Prufrock's when he talks about staring eyes. Could be descriptive..

Sheet Fourteen
I understand "they" to refer to those aspects of existence in the physical world which consistently recall him to life, call him back, because they are nice memories (or whatever) -- even in this time when he feels so strongly the weight of "the world" upon him.
Could be a description of a person's decision between life and death
(READEX)

Here is a list of sentences taken from William Golding's novel The Inheritors. As you will see, they have been jumbled up. What you have to do is to say what their original order was. So, if you think sentence \(B\) is the first sentence, write a letter B underneath number 1 in the answer-box at the bottom of the sheet, and so on.
A. He had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears.
B. There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it.
C. They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
D. The second man was unlike the others.
E. Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.
F. He was broader and shorter.
G. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.

ANSWER-BOX
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(a)
1. (D) The second man was unlike the others.
2. (F) He was broader and shorter.
3. (B) There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it.
4. (G) The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.
5. (A) He had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears.
6. (E) Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.
7. (C) They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
(b)
1. (E) Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.
2. (C) They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
3. (D) The second man was unlike the others.
4. (F) He was broader and shorter.
5. (B) There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it.
6. (G) The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.
7. (A) He had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears.

Subject 1: E C D F B A
Note: the answer sheet also shows arrows connecting D \& F, and E \& C, respectively.

Subject 2: E C D F A G B Note: the answer sheet also contains, outside the answer-box, the sequence \(D\) F \(G\) A.

Subject 3: E C D F B G A
Note: the following sequence was erased from the answer-box: D F B (A or G) (G or A) E C.

Subject 4: E C D F B A G
Subject 5: D F B A G E C
Note: the following sequence was erased from the answer-box: D F B E (G or A) A G. An arrow was drawn connecting A and D . The following conjunctions of letters were written down the left-hand side: \(\mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{D} \& \mathrm{~A} ; \mathrm{F} \& \mathrm{~B}\). The following conjunctions of letters and numerals were written down the left-hand side: E \& \(1 ; C \& 2 ; G \& 3\).

Subject 6: E C D F B A G
Note: the following conjunctions of letters were written down the left-hand side of the answer sheet: \(A \& G ; D \& B ; F \& D ; E \& C ; F \& B ; A \& G\).

Subject 7: E C A G B D F
Subject 8: D F B G A E C Note: some erasure had taken place, though only the following changes were discernible: \(B\) in cell 4 , and \(G\) in cell 5 .

The symbols used in the following transcriptions are a simplified form of those devised by Gail Jefferson. See the appendix to Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation'. Language, 50 (4), 1974: 696-735. Most notably, these transcriptions do not include timings of gaps between turns or pauses during turns. For prolonged intermissions of this type the symbol ' ((pause))' is used and for extremely lengthy silences the symbol '((long pause))'. Also, the prolongation of syllables (for which Jefferson uses repeated colons) remains un-marked in these transcriptions, except for explosive aspiration, laughter, breathlessness etc., marked by '(Hhh)' and for audible breathing, marked by 'Hhh'. In some cases, slight pauses are marked by the trancription convention:
(1) \(\mathrm{S}: \mathrm{Yes} / /(\) with that one)]

E: Oh I see]
(2) S : Yes.

S: [(with that one)]
E: [Oh I see]
where: in (2) there is a slight timable pause between S's 'Yes' and '(with that one)'. In (1) there is a complete flow on. On a timed transcription, (2) might have been presented as, for example:

S: Yes
(0.2)

S: [(with that one)]
E: [Oh I see]
The following is a list of the conventions employed.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
// - point at which following line interrupts. \\
[ - & \begin{tabular}{l} 
simultaneous utterances when bridging two lines. \\
talk) indicates point at which utterances end vis- \\
a-vis one another.
\end{tabular} \\
E - \begin{tabular}{l} 
experimenter is speaker. All other identifications \\
of speakers refer to subjects except ' \(X^{\prime}\) which \\
identifies a teacher entering during the course \\
of taping.
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular}

(1)E: save me having to do shorthand.
(2)S1: Yeh.
(3)E: Em. So what you have is the last two from the original ordering at the beginning.
(4) S1: Mm hm.
(5)E: That's and all the rest are the same as they are in the original ordering. Now, so let's see, now what I'd like to ask you is, in this case, then would be, and this is just for my information, this is that I'm not, I'm not doing a test or anything. It's just so that \(I\) can try and get a set of better tests than this, okay, in future?
(6)S1: Yeh.
(7)E: Okay? Em. Why did you er shall we say, shall we, why did you have these two at the beginning? Can you, can you think why you might've done that? Maybe if I just give you the original sheet. Can you think maybe why you, you picked those two to, to go at the start?
(8)S1: Em. It just seemed to, to be er the best way of starting the passage off, to me.
(9)E: Yes, E seemed the right one to start. And em//that, that's the one]
(10)S1: (And the other one)] seemed what it is//It's] huh sorta follows that. Well I couldn't find any one um sentence that, that I could start the, the description.
(11)E: Yeh]
(12)E: Oh I see. So you couldn't actually find one that looked like a, a beginning?
(13)S1: No hhh.
(14)E: Oh I see. Erm okay, well that's interesting. Erm why. Now that, one of the things that's happened here is that you've got \(E\) and \(C\). Now why did you have \(s-C\) to follow E? Can you remember why you, wha-, why you had C to follow E? ((long pause))
(15)E: Ha, it's a terribly simple kind of thing probably//C'n] you think why, why it, why it, why it was that you were doing that?
(16)S1: Oh well]
(17)S1: It was really. It seemed to be the only one that could describe the ears of the men.
(18) E: I see. So that, so that, so that this has to fit in?
(19)S1: Yes.
(20)S1: [(with that one)]
(21) E: [Oh I see] Erm okay now, if we just go back to the bits that, that, that are in the original ordering just for a second here//Now] you've got these D,F,B,G and A together.
(22)S1: Yeh]
(23) S1: Mm hm.
(24)E: Although you've got them in a different position in the whole. Okay, so we'll forget about these last two, okay, and we'll just look at these. Em, now, okay, given, given that you've got to sta(hh)rt with D which
(25)S1: (Great help)
(26)E: you found that that was that, that it was difficult to find what to start the passage with. Given that you've got to start with D, why. Erm now, this is a bit harder to, but it's about the same kind of question as the last one. Why em, why this order following? Can you, can you erm give me some idea of, of, of how you got to, to this erm, this particular ordering here? Erm.
(27)S1: Well if you start with D.
(28)E: Yes okay.
(29)S1: The second man was unlike the others.
(30)E: Yeh.
(31)S1: Well there he's comparing two uhm, oh he's comparing the second man to the others.
(32)E: Yes.
(33)S1: So you've gotta have a description of what he was like.
(34) E: [Oh I see]
(35)S1: LAnd he was] broader and shorter than the others.
(36)E: Yes.
(37)S1: Erm.
(38)E: I see. So you felt that should be the first one to go in there?
(39)S1: Yes.
(40) E:
(41)S1: \(\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{Er}] \\ \mathrm{Yes}\end{array}\right.\) really.
(42)E: Oh I see. Well how do you mean er. Sor-, I'm sorry to push you about it but erm how do you mean that it wouldn't fit in. I mean what would you get?
(43)S1: Well, if you put, if you put B, G, A then, then you'd have to put. Well it would seem logical that you'd put F after that and then you'd start this again.
(44) E:
(45)S1: But em] what you. You talk about his ears there sort of just.
(46)E: In A?//you mean?]
(47)S1: Yeh in A] and then it follows on from B.
(48)E: Oh I see. So that. Hang on, can, can you say that again?
(49)S1: [Ha ha]
(50) E (hhhh)]//Oh you've lost me]
(51)Sl: He had no hair on the front of his head] at all so that the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears, right. So he brings in the concept of the ears then.
(52) E: Yes.
(53)S1: So then uhm he can't sort of say he was broader and shorter and then say now for the first time Lok saw the ears of the new men.
(54)E: Oh, so you mean that if you've got ears in \(A\), you've got to have ears in E with nothing in between?
(55)S1: Yeh that. Well that's the way I.
(56)E: Yeh, so you couldn't put \(F\) in that wa-, in er that.
(57)S1: No.
(58)E: 'Cause that'd break up that.
(59)S1: Yeh.
(60)E: Okay, sup-, now suppose you put it in erm. Suppose you had D, the second man was unlike the others. B, there was much more hair, the-, there was much hair on his body erm and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it. He was broader and shorter. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.
(61)S1: Well you see that's disrupting the sequence again.
(62) E: Oh I see. So that that's. Ah well, how's, how's, how's that disrupting the sequence? I mean that I think I can see why it is but why, why, why does that disrupt the sequence between these? What if I put it in here?* What'd be wrong with that? Now this seems k-, a kind of obvious question but if you could. What w'd.
(63) S1: Uhm you mean in between \(B\) and \(G\) ?
(64)E: Yes if I put it betwee-. We tried, we tried putting it in here/lokay] Now suppose we put it in between B and G. We've put it in all the available slots, okay?
(65)S1: Yeh]
(66)S1: Yeh.
(67)E: Now there's something wrong with that you think, as well?
(68)S1: Yeh well it's just em bringing in something completely different, it's.
(69)E: From what? From. What, what does it disturb? Is what I'm asking.
(70)S1: Huh, uhm.
(71)E: Wha-, what does it disturb?
(72)S1: Well it's sort of jumping from one thing to the other, so it's disturbing the pattern that you've set up.
(73)E: Okay, well what's it jumping from then?
(74) S1: From talking about hair to uhm his build.
(75)E: I see//so you've got]
(76)S1: (and then you) get] hair again.
(77)E: Oh I see, so you get hair, build and then hair again// and] there's something wrong with doing that?
(78)S1: Yeh]
(79)S1: Yeh.
(80)E: In the sense that some. You were saying it has to flow, flow through there. Okay that sounds, that sounds right to me. So, okay, so then, the, given that, you've got to have this one next.** Okay cause we//tried] the slots.

\footnotetext{
* I.e., if I put \(F\) between \(B\) and \(G\). The experimenter is pointing to the sheet before himself and S1.
** I.e., given D, you've got to have F next.
}

So given that one, you've got to have this one next. Okay, now, see wha-, you see how I, how I'm asking the questions. I'm asking for the, for the place of each one.
(81)S1: Yeh]
(82)S1: Yeh.
(83)E: And asking what's wrong with trying it in other places, okay? So erm. Okay then, now, now that you've got D and \(F\) together. Why does \(B\) have to, and you have the same ordering here, why does \(B\) have to, to come, come right there? I mean I'm trying to get you to think why it was that you put the thing there. I mean 'cause you did, you put//B] after, after the \(F\).
(84)S1: Yeh]
(85)S1: Yeh.
(86)E: So why would B come after the F? ((long pause))
(87)S1: Well it's sort of erm introducing the hhh the next stage in his um appearance.
(88) E: I see.
(89)S1: Er like in, in having B, G, A it follows the sequence of um, like you couldn't have \(A, G, B\) sort of it wouldn't sound right.
(90)E: Well try, try reading it. See what happens if you get A, G, B, okay?
(91)Sl: Probably works//now]
(92)E: Right] okay try it then. ((S1 reads silently))
(93)S1: Well it sounds alright but then you see you can't have er, well you could but, then if you had that, that puts out your E and C following.
(94)E: Oh I see. Well you had \(E\) and \(C\) at the beginning and you ended on \(A\).
(95)S1: Yeh?
(96) E: Okay.
(97)S1: Yeh.
(98)E: So you thought that was okay. So what if you had. Just take these three together now, okay, 'cause//(they were)] B, G and A, 'cause they're the ones that are in question. Why does, why do they have to go that way? Okay? Can you think why they might have to go that way? Well, I mean I know that you've got it//(hhh)] An-, and I know why, I think I know why I'd do that. Um I don't know whether I could, I could talk about it. I think that I, I'd definitely have to put them that way. But I, what interests me is why they have to go like that. I mean there doesn't seem to be any kind of, I mean we should be able to say why that happened. Y'know?
(99)S1: Uh huh]
(100)S1: (hhh)]
(101)S1: Yeh.
(102)E: We should be able to find//a reason] for what that is//okay] Well let's try and see if we can, if we can do it.
(103)S1: We should be able to]
(104)S1: Hah hah]
((long pause))
(105)S1: I don't really know.
(106)E: You don't really know?
(107)S1: No.
(108)E: Okay. Erm.
(109)S1: (We11 I guess) you could mix them up sort of, it, and put them in a different order.
(110)E: Mm. Now, you've, okay we'll, we'll forge-, forget about your ordering and we'll just think about it in, in terms of this, okay, in terms of the way it was in the, in the, in the passage there. Erm now, so what you've got, you've got to have something con-, to connect with F and something to connect with E. Okay? If that's what you were saying before.*
(111) S1: [Oh yeh]
(112)E: That, that] that, that won't allow you to go into \(E\) and so that that's, that's, that's the, the place for A.

\footnotetext{
* See previous lines 51-59.
}

That's what you said before.
(113)S1: Yeh.
(114)E: Okay, so the question is just now really of \(B\) and \(G\). You say that's the best one because that fits there* Okay, so the question of, is, is, is, is the connection between B and G. Now can you see why they have to go that way? Just on those two sentences?
((long pause))
(115)E: Why couldn't they be reversed? ((long pause))
(116)S1: It sounds alright if you reverse them.
(117)E: It sounds okay again? He was broader and shorter. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck. There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed into it, rubbed in it. Um, well there sounds something wrong (hhh) about that to me, I don't know what it is. Erm.
(118)S1: I guess this one is more, um, \(B\) is more suitable to follow. Because it's
((pause))
(119)S1: Oh.
(120)E: Er.
((pause))
(121)E: Yeh it's difficult, isn't it?
(122)S1: Yeh]
(123)E: [(hhh)] to say what it is. But er, let's, let's, let's see if we can try and get at it. Erm.
((long pause))
(124)E: Okay. What're, what're the two sentences doing? Let's see what, let's try and see what they're doing and then maybe the, we can find some reason then. Wha-, er, what is, what is three doing?
( (pause))
(125)E: Er B rather. What, what's the sentence doing? What's it telling you?
((pause))

\footnotetext{
* I.e., A is the best one because it fits in before E .
}
(126)E: Well what's it telling you about?
(127)S1: About how much//hair he had]
(128)E: I mean you] said this was about, this was about his build.*
(129) S1: [Yeh]
(130)E: [Okay] well what's this one telling you about exactly?
(131)Sl: His appearance, er his
(132)E: His appearance, right. Erm, but can, can't you be more particular than that? Erm.
(133)S1: His facial appearance.
(134)E: There was much hair on his body?
(135) S1: [Oh]
(136)E: And] his head hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it? So it's not really his face. Or not just his face. Is it? You see I think \(I\) can get at why this is, now. I want to, I think I've got what it is and I want to see if you can, I think I've, I've it's just co-, just occurred to me what it is now that, that's going on there and why they have to be in that order. Let's see if you can
(137)S1: Well maybe it's//the fact] that he's used the word thee** hair.
(138)E: You can think]
(139)E: The word?
(140)S1: Thuh. Thee hair?
(141)E: Thuh//hair yes?
(142)S1: And he] he's, he's just talking about hair at first, any, any hair.
(143)E: [Yeh]
(144)S1: Any old] head-hair and then he says that, thuh hair, lay on the back of his neck, that//that] would be I guess thuh head-hair, the second one he used.
(145)E: Yeh]
(146)E: Yeh, I see. I mean wha- so what you're trying to say is that if you had it the other way round, it'd sound a bit

\footnotetext{
* I.e., F was about his build.
** Over the next few turns it has been necessary to distinguish between the two pronunciations of 'the'. This is done after Gail Jefferson, 'Error correction as an interactional resource'. Language in Society, 3, 1974: 181-199.
}
funny to start talking about something with thuh.
(147)S1: Yeh.
(148)E: 'Cause if I say to you something like, erm, oh, 'The man's at the door', you mi-, you might say th-, 'What man?'. But if I just say 'A man's at the door'.
(149)S1: Yeh.
(150)E: That's quite alright 'cause the-, that's, I haven-, I haven't talked about him. So what you're trying to say there is that, let's see, that, this is what, this is what I thought of, you see//(hhh)] Well I'm just trying to rationalise it again. Em, so if you, he's just mentioning general hair in \(B\).
(151)S1: (hhh)]
(152)S1: Yeh.
(153)E: Or, or all the bits of hair, the hair on the body and hair on the head. And then he says thuh hair, so wh-, what, which, so which, which bit does that go back to?
((long pause))
(154)E: You see what I mean?
(155)S1: Yeh, yeh. Uhm.
(156)E: This goes back to here.* That's what you said before//Yeh?]
(157)S1: Yeh]
((long pause))
(158) E: Oh I see, yeh, yeh you have covered that because, yeh you have covered what you said before because that means that he introduces er body-hair and head-hair and then he talks just about thuh head-hair. Is that right? That \(G\) is just// about] the head-hair?
(159)S1: Yeh]
(160)S1: Yeh.
(161)E: And it's obviously this because it's on the back of his neck. So that you have to have that ordering. Okay. Erm. Oh let's see. So what have we got so far? Now what we've got is. Oh we've, we've ordered this one, okay? And that this, \(B, G\), A. No, D, F, B, G, A seems to be okay. Okay?
(162) S1: Yeh]
(163)E: Now] why. Now let's go back to the original problem which

\footnotetext{
* I.e., the 'the' in \(G\) goes back to \(B\).
}
was that you started with, with E and C. Okay?
(164)S1: Oh.
(165)E: [Right?]
(166) S1: [Yeh]
(167)E: Erm. Now, ((tut)). If you, now that you've seen it, if you had a choice, how, how would you start it again? Okay? Now gi-, gi-, suppose that you we-, you were, you could put it into any order you liked, okay? How would you start it again? What reasons d'you think you could give for, now that you've seen it? Erm.
((long pause))
(168)E: I mean this sounds pecu-, a peculiar start doesn't it? I mean, you thought it was best to start here.*
(169)S1: Yeh.
(170)E: Yeh. Now wh-, I think there's something peculiar about starting here. Can you. I mean, I don't know. Does it sound alright or what?
(171)S1: I figure it sounds, it'd be better if they went up there.
(172)E: It sounds better if E and C went right up to the top?
(173)S1: Yeh.
(174)E: Mm. I see. Well okay. Then why, okay. Can you, can you try and tell me why you think that, that would be? That would be a good place? For it? I know it sounds better. I mean I (hh) think it sounds better too. But er. ((pause))
(175)E: Can you say why? ((pause))
(176)E: I won't be upset if you can't.
(177)S1: Ha ha.
(178)E: Just you know any//any] old sort of ideas that you might have about it.
(179)S1: Yeh]
(180)S1: Well he's sort of just starting to describe the men.**

\footnotetext{
* I.e., at E.
** I.e., in E.
}

And em.
(181)E: Yes.
(182)S1: Em. He's comparing one man to some others in//in here]* And then it//sort] of follows on//in going] through his description and then it starts again by uhm telling you that he's just, that Lok's seen some, seen the ears of the new men.
(183) \(\mathrm{E}: \quad \mathrm{Yeh}]\)
(184) E: In D]
(185)E: Yeh]
(186)E: Yeh.
(187)S1: And describes what they were like//And] it just seemed logical to me to put them up there.
(188)E: Er\(]\)
(189)E: [To put \(E\) and C] up at the top yeh.
(190)S1: [(To put them up there)]
(191)S1: Talking about some men that he's seen and then comparing. After giving you that description \(0-\), erm, the second man, comparing the second man to the ones that he's already told you about.
(192)E: Oh I see, so that, yeh. Alright yeh. That, that sounds, that sounds very plausible. Okay, I think we just, we'11 just leave it there. I don't know whether you enjoyed that or not.
(193)S1: (Hh), huh, huh.
(194)E: Erm.
(195)S1: It was interesting.
(196)E: Yeh. Okay, well I'll just. Er you don't mind if \(I\) hang on to this do you?
(197)S1: No.
(198)E: Erm now, I'11 just turn this off.

\section*{RECORDING ENDS \(\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ\)}

\footnotetext{
* I.e., he's comparing one man to some others in D (first sentence of the original ordering). Sl traces the development of the original ordering with her finger.
}
(1) E: Let's have a look.
(2) S2: Mm hm .
(3) E: Put that one over there. Now, here we have, the correct answer.
(4)S2: Ha, huh.
(5) E: So you ( ). Right there you go. Oh we'11 put it this way.
(6)S2: Oh that's how I had it the first time, D, F.
(7) E: That's how you had it.
(8) S2: Mm, oh.
(9)E: Ah, you've got a few. There's a few differences
(10) S2: Mm.
(11)E: there. Let's see what's different. The, the last two you've got the first two. Okay we'll forget about that for a minute. Then you've got. Okay we'll forget about these two.*
(12)S2: \(\quad[\mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}]\)
(13)E: [okay] And we'11 just look at these.**
(14)S2: Okay.
(15)E: Which is the same. No it's not the same as you've got// here]
(16)S2: Yeh] I see.
(17) E: Now that's got D, F, B, G, A. You've got D, F//A, G, B] You've got them the other way round here. Okay. Well all I want to do is have a yarn about that. Not erm, (hh) er just to, to try and see how, er how you got to, to that stage. Okay, this is not, this is not a, a test or anything. This is m-, this is purely for my benefit, okay?
(18)S2: The other way round, yeh]
(19)S2: [Uh huh]
(20)E: [To find] out erm how you got there. 'Cause I've got, I've got to design a, a good one of these. Okay?
(21)S2: Okay.

\footnotetext{
* I.e., E and C.
** I.e., D, F, A, G, B.
}
(22)E: Erm an-, and so I want to know the kinds of things that you had to do, okay, when you were, when you were thinking that one out. Okay. So let's talk about these three here. Oh, erm, the original has, B, G, A. And you've got A, G, B. The other way round. Okay so let's, let's try and think about why you've, you had that ordering. Okay. Suppose that those two* are taken for granted for a minute.
(23) S2:
-Okay]
(24) E: [Okay]
(25)E: So why you got, why you, so you put A next//Okay]
(26)S2: I think] it was to do with the first part** that I had, the part about the ears first, that I thought well the//next one]
(27)E: So you] had E and C first//yeh]
(28)S2: Yes] and they were talking about the ears so//I had] the next one. Oh, \(y-\), you know talking about the ears too.
(29) E: Yeh]
(30)E: Okay, so what you have is, Now for the first time Lok saw the ears of the new men. They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads. That starts it. Okay?
(31) S2: Mm.
(32)E: And then you have, D. The second man was unlike the others. And then you have, He was broader and shorter. Ok//ay?] So then you decide wha-, what was it that it made you decide to put \(A\) in after those. It was.
(33)S2: Yeh]
(34)S2: ( ) just put in there because I didn't know where else to put it (hhh) but er
(35)E: Now you were talking
(36)S2: (From that) A.
(37)E: Yeh this one. Good yeh you, you had this one next and you// said]
(38) S2: Mm ] ((pause))
(39)E: @That's it.
(40)S2: It was continued on about the ears.

\footnotetext{
* I.e., D and F.
** I.e., E, C, D, F.
}
(41) E: Oh I see.
(42)S2: Mm.
(43)E: Well okay, so that, so that you then had to put A there because it was closest to the bit about the ears.
(44)S2: Yes.
(45)E: Oh I see. Right now that, that, now that makes perfectly good sense to me. Erm. So why, if that's the case, why d'you have to have F after D? Okay why couldn't you have put A right in there? Okay? 'Cause you said it had to be about the ears.
(46)S2: Yes.
(47) E: Okay so why, why, why couldn't you bung A there in the second, in, in//to] erm, after the second man, okay? Why couldn't you, or to have straight away put A in there?
(48) S2: Mm ?]
(49)S2: Oh I did put it in but then em, He was broader and shorter was the final sentence and I didn't seem to y'know//( )]
(50)E: Oh that left youl with that at the end//then]
(51)S2: Yeh]
(52) E: So you ha-, you had D, A, G, B and then you had F left//out] and you ha-, you thought you had to put it at the end. Okay so you finaliy decided to put it there after the D?
(53) S2: Mm]
(54)S2: Yes.
(55)E: So why, why does, you know wha-, what made you think that it'd go after the \(D\) then? I mean it does//a] in the, in the answer. Erm.
(56)S2: (Sure)]
(57)S2: It was sort of a general outline, a general picture of what he, what he looked like, from there.
(58) E: If you say, it's a, it's a general thing.
(59)S2: Mm.
(60)E: Yeh. Okay so then you, so then you thought, we've had ears in \(E\) and \(C\), so we'd//be-, we'd better go] No this is a quite reasonable sort of thing. Uh, I haven't found anybody who's got this, this, I mean this bothers me a bit, they haven't got it right but they all, they've all got reasons for it and every, every, every set of reasons seems to be as good
as any other. So, okay so we had ears, so you had to bring the ears back in, in A, okay? But I'm just, I'm just trying to see if you agree with, with, with what I'm saying was// was] actually what went on, okay. But then, then you had trouble with \(F\), so you had to slot it back in.
(61)S2: Huh (hhhh)]
(62) S2: Mm hm ]
(63)S2: (hhh)
(64)E: Okay that sounds alright to me. So, okay, you've got as far as A. Now why do you get, why do you, why do you get \(G\) next and then \(B\), can you remember or//can you] think why that was?
(65)S2: We11, it]
(66)S2: 'Cause A said He had no hair on the front of his head and then.
(67) E: Mm.
(68)S2: G goes on to say that he had uh hair, that the hair, the hair lay at the back of his neck.
(69)E: Oh I see. So you went from the front.
(70)S2: Well it was mainly about the hair (head but you didn't have it there )sol/you] where it was.
(71)E: Yeh]
(72)E: I see. Okay so then, oh I see, so then, then you get a continuation from A to \(G\), okay. So the wha-, how do you get to \(B\) from there? Okay? How do you get to \(B\) from, from G? 'Cause you had B last, okay?
(73) S2: Mm.
(74)E: So how do you get from there, G, to B? ((pause))
(75)S2: It's just a continuation of talking about the hair, I think. (76) E: Mm hm. ((pause))
(77)E: The hair lay in a ball at the back of his. neck. There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it. That sounds alright to you?
(78) S2 \(\quad[\mathrm{Mm}]\) does seem to have you left up in the air a little though.
(79)E: [Yes]
(80)E: You think//it] leaves. Can you, can you tell me how that, how that, how you get that feeling about it. How come it's
(81) S2: Mm]
(82)S2: It's sort of very anti-climactic, I think.
(83)E: Oh I see, how, how d'you, how does it do that? I mean, oh (hhh). I think I know what you mean but I erm, I don't know how, how the, how the words do that.
((pause))
(84)E: Have you got an idea about that? ((pause))
(85)E: If you haven't it doesn't matter.
(86)S2: No I think it, it's just that it you know doesn't seem to have much (result) you know instead it's sort of a bad ending. If that's the right word. Erm. Just hasn't got much to do with the rest of the story. You know the fat being (hhh) looking as though the fat was rubbed in the hair.
(87)E: Yeh.
((pause))
(88)E: You had trouble putting, putting \(B\) in did you?
(89)S2: Er. No I jus-, I just sort of er did it as a series you know wha-, I just thought what sense seemed to follow on from the others.
(90)E: Yeh.
(91)S2: It doesn't seem to make much of a sto//ry]
(92)E: Okay] Oh I see, so you, oh I see, so we'll see what erm. Let's go through your ordering then, okay? Erm E, becau-, can you tell me, you got any idea why you might've wanted to put that one in there first? Erm.
(93)S2: Just, I felt (Lok) that, yes the second man was one of the new men and
(94) E: Yeh.
(95)S2: Well, Lok gives the first impression of the men he meets. Well I thought it was as if he, wuh- looking the men over and one of the things he noticed was their ears. It was (stra//nge tol him).
(96) E: I see]
(97)E: So that, so you think that's, that's, that's, that's where the first one goes,okay. So. Now this might seem a bit obvious, but why does \(C\) have to follow then?
(98)S2: Because the ears are the subject of the (hh) first one. (99)E: Yeh.
(100)S2: Explit- a, it explains the uhm part E.
(101)E: Yeh okay. Well what else, I mean where else could it have gone? Now tha (hhhhh)t's, I mean.
(102)S2: Not really anywhere, uhm, no.
(103)E: No, alright it couldn't really go/lany]where else. Erm. Okay so then you get. Okay so you've got those, you've got that* for openers.
(104)S2: No]
(105)S2: [Mm hm]
(106)E: And] you say that** can't go anywhere else. Okay, right, that sounds fair enough. So then, why, why do you get D, okay? Why do you get D after? You get E, C and why do you get D next?
(107)S2: Er well, looking a bit closer he noticed that one of them was diff-, very different from the rest. It was just sort of an extension of what he was seeing.
(108)E: Oh I//see]
(109)S2: On] looking closer.
(110)E: I see, well, well what made you decide that this, this sentence*** had to go here?
((pause))
(111)E: I mean, what's left? Uh, what you've got is all these. \({ }^{I}\) So what makes you choose this one. Okay?
(112)S2: Er.
(113)E: You got all those left. What makes you choose this one?
(114)S2: Well it's a starting point, I mean you couldn't really start
```

* I.e., E.
** I.e., C.
*** I.e., D.
I I.e., A, B, D, F, G.

```
just talking about the hair because, it, this* is talking about one particular man and the rest are also talking about one particular man.
(115)E: Oh I see, you're right okay. So that's why you get D next.
(116)S2: Mm hm.
(117)E: Okay, now we discussed why you get F.** Because you said that before didn't you? Why you get F.
(118)S2: Ahm because that was the only place it seemed to fit.
(119)E: That was the only place i-, it could go. Okay. D'you know why that might be? Why the, that, the er, ah-
(120)S2: Just sort of a general description of the man. Sort of, oh well it couldn't go in uh, between any of erm the places talking about the hair.
(121)E: You mean it couldn't go between \(B\) and \(G\) ?
(122)S2: No.
(123)E: Or G and A?
(124)S2: No.
(125)E: I see. So it really has to go there okay? Right. Then we discussed, okay we've been through these, why you got A next. And that was to do with oh, just let me get my memory together, that was to do with the ears. Okay.
(126)S2: Mm hm.
(127)E: You felt you had to get back to the ears somehow as soon as you could. Okay? And once you'd done that, you had to go from the front to the back//Okay? And then all] that was left was \(B\).
(128)S2: (Hhhh) huh]
(129)S2: Mm.
(130)E: Is that.
(131)S2: Yeh, that's about right.
(132)E: Is that about what//happened when] about how you, how you worked the thing out? I see. I mean, I, I, I fee'l a bit bad summarising it that way.
```

* I.e., D.
** See previous lines 45-59.

```
(133)S2: That's about how I did it]
(134)S2: Ha huh.
(135)E: As it, is that a fair kind of.
(136)S2: Yeh, I think that's about how it worked.
(137)E: You can't think of anything else, you uh, I mean, that you want to say about how you.
(138)S2: No 'cause I did it//( )]
(139)E: Ordered it]
(140)S2: A few attempts at it. Like my first one I did have, I started with D and F.
(141)E: Yeh.
(142)S2: But then, ahm, I think, Now. When uh, in part E, Now for the first time. It didn't seem to follow on, but, in the order that I originally, to// ) and so I thought oh that looks to, sounds as though it could be a starting point.
(143)E: Yeh]
(144)E: I see. So you thought that one. Is there anything else you want to say because, my, my su-, my, my summary of how you got that might be wrong and er, is er any, anything else you can remember about how you, how you puzzled it out? Because this is important for me (hhh).
(145)S2: [(Hhhh)]
(146)E: This is the] This is where \(I\) get, get, get information.
(147)S2: Oh I don't think. I'll have a look, I'll have a look at how \(I\), the other ways of breaking it down.
(148)E: Uh//huh]
(149)S2: It'd be]
(150)E: That's, that's your sheet//isn't it?]
(151)S2: Yes, yes] I just realised I//( )]
(152)E: Oh I] see, go and get you notes, sure.
\([((\mathrm{S} 2\) goes to get notes \())\)
(153) E: LOkay.
(154)E: I didn't know you'd been, you'd been making, you'd been @ ( )
(155)S2: Oh no, I started off with D, F @(and G). @Erm, it doesn't seem to give much (away does it).
(156)E: @That's the final one you've got//isn't it]
(157) S2: Mm hm\(]\)
(158)E: Yeh.
(159)S2: @Er it doesn't seem to tell much.
(160)E: You've got that, y-, you had a what, D, D, F.
(161)S2: D, F and//G, A]
(162)E: And uh] G, A at some point.
(163)S2: Mm.
(164)E: Oh that's interesting, 'cause, 'cause that's how it is here, isn't it?*
(165)S2: Yes.
(166)E: And then you, oh you maybe you didn't think about changing//that]
(167)S2: Ahm, oh] yeh. It didn't change from, the reason I didn't keep on with that was that erm ( E in the end ) I didn't, I didn't put E next because er. I thought he was one of the new men and in//F]
(168)E: Who's] that?
(169)S2: Erm the second man.
(170)E: Oh the second man//yeh]
(171)S2: I thought] he was y'know.
(172)E: Yes.
(173)S2: H-, he, as if Lok had seen that man and wasn't sort of satisfied with him and, s-, got some new men.**
(174)E: Oh I see yeh.
(175)S2: And he had, A, he was, he had no hair on the front of his head erm so the \(s-\), the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears.
(176)E: Yeh.
(177)S2: And then, I couldn't go on to say, erm, Lok saw the ears of the men, if I thought he was one of the new men, \(y\) 'see.
(178)E: If you thought the second man was//one] of the new men.
(179)S2: Yes]
(180)S2: Mm.
(181)E: Okay. What do you reckon Lok's doing?//I mean]
(182)S2: I think] he's in the army.

\footnotetext{
* I.e., in the original.
** Here S 2 is talking of the initial D, F, G, A reading with \(\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{C}\) at some later stage. This as against \(\mathrm{S}^{\prime}\) 's own reading which has E in initial position.
}
(183)E: You think he's in the army? That's the kind of pattern that you get. Uhm. ((knock at door))
(184)E: Come in. ((door opens))
(185)E: Hi.
(186)X: Hi.
(187)E: We're just finishing]
(188)X: Sorry to inter]rupt have you got a lesson?
(189)S2: Uhm.
(190)X: Have you got a class?
(191)S2: Oh yes.
(192)E: Then you'd better get off then.
(193)X: @( ) don't want you to be late.
(194)S2: Okay.
(195)E: [Okay]
(196)X: Who is it?]
(197)E: We'll just have to leave it there then.
(198)S2: Uhm Mrs C********
(199)X: Oh she won't mind. Yeh go on. That's alright, I'll go and tell her. Oka(hh)y?
(200)E: Okay .
(201)X: How long will you be? Ten minutes, five minutes?
(202)E: Oh probably, we're just getting to//the end]
(203)X: Yeh, that's] alright I can tell her it was something important.
(204)S2: Okay.
(205) E: Okay.
((door closes))
(206)E: So okay we got like. You think that he's in the army.
(207)S2: Mm.
(208)E: And what's he doing?
(209)S2: Aw, something like tha-, where he's choosing men for an assignment. Okay?
(210)E: Oh I see. So that's, that's, the, the idea you get?
(211)S2: Yeh ( )
(212)E: So.
(213)S2: 'Cause he seems to be looking at their appearance or uhm.
（214）E：Okay so you＇ve got，Now for the first time Lok saw the ears of the new men．They were tiny，screwed tightly into the sides of their heads．Now．
（215）S2：I don＇t think he was particularly looking at the ears，huh （hhh）．Uh＇cause they were just，they uh must＇ve been something he noticed．
（216）E：Oh I see．You don＇t think he was looking for their ears？
（217）S2：
\((218) \mathrm{E}:\)\(\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{No}] \\ \mathrm{No}]\end{array}\right.\)
（219）E：I see／／（hhh）］
（220）S2：Huh］
（221）E：And then the second man．Now how do you feel about that． Then you get \(D\) after C，right？So how d＇you feel that fits in with the，the，the army thing that you＇ve got？
（222）S2：Well，the second man was someone that I think he felt would do the job／／He＇d be one of the］men if he wanted to choose the．
（223）E：Oh I see］
（224）E：Now do you think／／the second］man is one of the new men or not one of the new men？
（225）S2：（ ）］
（226）S2：Yes I think／／he was］
（227）E：You think］he＇s one of the new men？
（228）S2：Mm．
（229）E：Oh I see，so he＇s got this bunch of new men that he＇s inspecting？
（230）S2：Mm hm．
（231）E：Right，and the second man is one of them？
（232）S2：Yes．
（233）E：I see．
（234）S2：And he seems to stand out more than the rest．
（235）E：Oh I see so that＇s the way it，that＇s the way it works．Okay， well that＇s，that＇s fine．That，that sounds great to me．Erm， I＇11 just turn this
```
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```
(1) E: That's better. You had the, the first one, uh that you wrote* was, was the original and you changed your mind.
(2) S 3: Mm hm.
(3)E: So all you've done in fact is you've switched the, you've switched E and C.
(4)S3: Yeh to the beginning.
(5) E: To the beginning from the, from the end there. Oh I see. That's, that's all you've done really then.
(6)S3: Yeh.
(7) E: Oh, that's a blow, 'cause you nearly (hhhh). Now, okay well let's see, let's try and see why it was that you did that. Can you think why?
(8)S3: Because that** was 'men' you see, and (heads). And uhm they were//talking] about, they were talking about everybody at first.
(9) E: Pardon?]
(10) E: Yeh.
(11)S3: And then he found someone specific, the second man was unlike all the others.
(12) E: Oh I see, so you get er. Okay, so you, you want E and C at the beginning because. Let me see if I've got, let me see if \(I\) can get you right on this. You get \(E\) and \(C\) at the beginning because that talks about the men.
(13)S3: Yeh.
(14)E: And then D because that's erm a particular man. Is that// what] you're trying to say? Well wha-, what is it you were trying to say about that? I'm trying to get at how you, you worked out that, okay or what, what it was you were thinking to get, to get to that point.
(15)S3: Yeh]
((long pause))
(16)S3: Well I thought that these new men were the others and then uhm. (17) E: Yeh.
(18)S 3: The second man was just not like them.

\footnotetext{
* S3 had crossed out an ordering which read D, F, B, (A or G), (G or A), E, C.
** I.e., E.
}
(19)E: Oh I see. Right. What do you think now, now that you see it?*
(20)S3: Well it looks better like that because they were probably talking about something else there and they were talking about.
(21)E: What right before the beginning of//the whole] passage?
(22)S3: Yeh]
(23)S3: And they were talking about, the \(s-\), the second man like I mean they could have been in a row or something I guess.
(24)E: Yeh.
(25)S3: And then uhm, ((tut)) he suddenly realised that he saw the ears of the new men now.
(26)E: Oh I//see]
(27)S3: (He] noticed everything)
(28)E: Yeh, okay so that then you get, you get \(E\) and \(C\) and then you go on to D.
(29)S3: Yeh.
(30) E: Okay. Right I understand. I understand how you got there. Erm.
((long pause))
(31)E: So why, okay, why does, why does \(F\) have to come after \(D\) then? In, in your, in this ordering it does and in your ordering too. Well these are the same here.
(32)S 3: Yeh.
(33)E: D, F, B, G, A and you've got it in your ordering too. So why, why do you have to have \(F\) next?
(34)S3: Because uhm, it's sort of a general. That's the first thing he saw of it, it was, he was broader and shorter and then when he looks more closely.
(35) E: Yeh.
(36)S3: He sees that there was a lot of hair on his body and uhm his uhm head-hair was sleek and then uhm I put that one.
(37)E: What's that, G?
(38)S3: No, well I.
(39) E: So.
* I.e., the original ordering.
(40)S3: I first decided that \(A\) had to go after \(G\), because he first noticed what he did have and then what he didn't sort of
(41)E: What, you think that that's the way that people notice things?
(42) S3: Mm hm.
(43)E: Okay, but why does \(G\) have to come after B?
(44)S3: Well he's talking about the hair.
(45) E: Yeh.
(46)S3: Uhm, well all three of them are talking about the hair.
(47)E: Yeh, so why do you have to have to be in that order? I mean what was your, I mean. I know that they are in the passage and I know that they are in your answer. But what was//your] I mean you didn't know tha-, the answer then so what was your, your way of reasoning that wa-, that one through?
(48)S3: Uhm] ((pause))
(49) E: All I'm asking is to just remember.
(50)S3: Well first of all uhm. That's general so that one comes after that and then he's talking//about the hair]
(51)E: What B] sorry, B comes after F?
(52)S3: Yeh.
(53)S 3: [Then] he's talking about his head-hair and uhm that's talking about well the head and the neck and the head sort of and then uhm.
(54)E: [(Go on)]
(55) E: That's G?
(56)S 3: G//yeh]
(57)E: Okay]
(58)S3: And then it has to be A.
(59)E: So it has to be A at the(hhh) end.
(60)S3: Ye(hhhhh)s.
(61)E: Oh I see, right. So what's the movement then? Er that you see there between. Okay, go back to the, sorry to press it, but go back to \(B\) and \(G\), what \(c-\), what's the, what's going on in that movement from \(B\) to \(G\) ?
((long pause))
(62)S3: Mm.
(63)E: You don't//know what] I'm talking about?
(64)S3: (Hhhhh)]
(65) S3: No.
(66)E: No, okay, right. Erm, you say that, that \(G\) has to follow B, because. Well you thought it has to follow B because erm he's talking about head-hair.
(67)S3: Right.
(68)E: Okay, so wha-, what i-, okay so what is it in \(B\) that means that it has to follow? Can you see what I mean?
((pause))
(69)S3: Well the hair on his head lay in a ball at the end of his, back of his neck.
(70)E: Yeh. Oh I see. So alright. I'm trying to, I, I, oh alright, I'd be push-, I'd be pushing too much to ask any more than that. Alright we'll leave it at that one. Erm, now, let's see, you've got @mostly, mostly the same apart from there What do you think the passage is about?
(71)S3: It's about erm someone from a different place, coming and uh, he's just arrived and he's seeing people and he's describing the people.
(72)E: He's just describing the people? Okay, so if you start with E and C, to start, if you have those two to start. with, yeh, erm, he, he talks about the new men, okay?
(73) S3: \(\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}\).
(74)E: Now is the second man one of the new men? Okay, 'cause you go E, C, D.
(75)S3: Yes.
(76)E: He is, he's just, another one of the new men?
(77) S3: Mm hm .
(78)E: And he's arri-, you, you say, who, who's arriving here? In the new place?
((pause))
(79)E: You mean that Lok is arriving in the new place?
(80)S3: Yeh.
(81) E:
(82) S3: \(\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { Is that] what you mean? } \\ \text { Oh] }\end{array}\right.\)
(83)E: Who, who's.
(84)S3:

I see, huh(hhh)//that's what I thought] it was, yes.
(85)E: What I'm trying to get at is] That's what you think is. Well, te-, tell me what.
(86)S3: Lok has come, oh. Yes. Well if it looked like that, I'd say that Lok was there.
(87)E: Okay if it was like what?
(88)S3: In this order.
(89)E: In the, in the, in the original//order?]
(90)S3: Yeh]
(91)E: Okay.
(92)S3: Lok was there and uhm, oh, the new people came.
(93)E: To him, to where he was?
(94)S3: Yeh.
(95)E: Okay. Now if you've got your order. What do you th-, what happens in your order?
(96)S3: I'd say that the new men, some people different from him sort of//you] know.
(97)E: Yeh]
(98)S3: He was still there but he was the outsider.
(99)E: I see, so he's some outsider in//some] way?
(100)S3: Yeh]
(101)E: But you don-, you can't tell me whether he's come to them or they've come to him? Have you got any ideas about that?
(102)S3: Well if//he's the] outsider he came to the, say, new planet or whatever.
(103)E: How about]
(104)E: Okay right.
(105)S3: And erm, he's just looking lost you see.
(106)E: [I see]
(107)S3: LAnd] these men approach him.
(108)E: And this is either of the, you think that's true for either of the orderings that you get?
(109)S3: Yeh.
(110)E: You think that's, that's what that, that you could read it either way, okay? Oh I see. Erm, and all that, all that, and you said before all that he's doing is describing the appearance of the, of the people that, that he sees.
(111)S3: Mm hm.
(112)E: That's a, that's all that er, it's doing, okay? Erm, right, I si-, I think that's about all that I want to ask you about that. Erm, trying to a-, see if there's any, any clever questions that I can ask//(hh) but] I don't think that there are because you, your explanation seems to totally justify the ordering that you got. I mean it really interests me why people put E and C at the \(\mathrm{b}-\), at the beginning. Now there's, the-, must be something there that we haven't got at yet, why that, why they feel that that has to go at the beginning. Erm. Can you s-, can you see now, now that you've got the correct answer why they go at the end?
(113)S3: Huh huh]
(114)S3: Well, is the second man part of the new (thing), erm pe-, people?
(115)E: Yeh. Well I th-, I think he is yeh. I mean don't ask me// (hhh)] but I th-, I think he is yeh.
(116)S3: Huh huh]
(117)S3: Well//then] Why would you talk about the new men when they were already there? And you've already talked about them?
(118)E: I think]
(119)E: Uhm maybe in a paragraph before he talked about a first man ((pause))
(120)E: whose ears he couldn't see.
(121)S3: But they were all new men you see so.
(122)E: Yeh.
(123)S3: He'd first have to talk about the new men before he looked at them specifically.
(124)E: Yes, yeh, yeh.
(125)S3: That's why I put E and//C first]
(126)E: Oh I] see. Right, so you wanted to make the whole thing a nice, in, into a nice.
(127)S3: (Hhh) (hh) yes.
(128)E: Oh, okay well what I uhm, can you see any reason why A, er E goes after A now in the, in the correct answer not in. I mean you've go-, you've got \(E\) at the beginning and \(A\) at the end. Can you see why?
(129)S3: Well after 'ears' you see.
(130)E: [Oh I see]
(131)S3: That's] why I had it like that before.
(132)E: That's why you had it like that//before]
(133)S3: Yes huh (hh)]
(134)E: So you were chasing yourself round in circles?
(135)S3: Ye(hh)s.
(136)E: In fact.
(137)S3: Huh huh (hhh).
(138)E: 'Cause you found them all c-, to connect up but you didn't know where to put. Like you had a circle and//you knew you had] to have the beginning and the end of the circle. I see.
(139)S3: Well I knew you had]
(140)S3: I knew they came together en they came together.
(141)E: Yeh.
(142)S3: Just got mixed up.
(143)E: I see so what you ha-, oh a now let, now is this fair? You, you th-, you, you could see that, that, in a s-, in a sense E could come after A?
(144)S3: Mm hm.
(145)E: You could see that because of the//ears]
(146)S3: Well] because he's looking at their face and he's, notices the hair erm//down] to the ears and then he suddenly realises that they've.
(147)E: Yes]
(148)E: [You saw that?]
(149)S3: [A11 the ears] are. Yeh, huh huh (hhh).
(150)E: And then you rejected it.
(151)S3: Yeh//because] of, they were talking in the plural and there b-, they were talking singularly.
(152)E: Okay]
(153) E: About the \(p-\), about the particular second man?
(154)S3: Mm.
(155)E: Oh I see. Erm but so that what you p-, w-, w-, what your, ((tut)) your idea was that it was more important to go from the plural to the singular.
(156)S3: Than to go from 'ears' to 'ears', huh, huh//(hh)]
(157)E: To] go from 'the ears' to 'the ears'. So that was the kind of choice that you were having to make//in] in that. And
what you plumped for was the
(158)S3: Yeh]
(159) S3: Mm hm.
(160)E: from the general, the plural thing to the particular man? And that, that seemed more important than.
(161)S3: Mm.
(162) E: Oh right. I think, I think, I think maybe I'm getting at what that problem is now beet-, er.
(163)S3: Do other people do that?
(164)E: Erm, yeh, I guess, I guess they do and they don't. There's certainly like. They s-, they say that it's obv-, a bit obvious that \(C\) has to come after \(E\), okay and those two look like, this is what people say anyway, they say that those two look like a bundle but they don't know where to put them (hhhhh). Know what I mean?
(165)S3: Yeh.
(166)E: Er, right I think, I think that's about all erm. Don-, don't tell anyone about this.
(167)S3:
(168)E: okay 'cause. Ah not, not 'cause it's secret but//because if] su-, if I get someone else in and they already know what's
 have a, it's not going to be a fair
(169)S3: (hhh)]
(170)S3: Right.
(171)E: kind of assessment that they'll make of it. Okay?
(172)S3: Okay.
(173)E: Right, thanks very much.
(1)E: Right there we go.
(2) S4: Oh hhhh.
(3)E: Right can you see the er, can you see what you've got and you see//what] what it's got? Okay now we'll just take, we'11 take that away for a minute, we'll take away the correct one and we'll talk about, we'll talk about your one, okay?
(4) \(\mathrm{S4:} \mathrm{Mm}]\)
(5) S4: Uh huh.
(6)E: Okay so we're just talking about what you've got, a-, that one doesn't matter for the minute. Erm, so, you decided that, let's start with E and C, okay? I won't ask//you] why you got that, why you got E first. Erm now this is about the general, this is about the, about how good my questions a(hhh)re so why, why, why do you have E, why do you have to have, why do you have C to follow E? Okay, that's a simple question to start.
(7) \(\mathrm{S4}\) : Mm ]
(8)S4: Because erm, it says that Lok saw the ears of the new men.
(9)E: Yeh.
(10)S4: And then it describes the ears. I thought it'd be.
(11)E: Yeh okay. That's right. That sou-, that sounds good. So then you, you've got E, so you, you've got E and C together.
(12) S4: Mm.
(13)E: Okay. Now can you, c-, why, can you say now, okay before I ask you anything else, why those, those two start the, why you have those two to start the passage?
(14)S4: Well I really wasn't sure, I could see that erm \(E\) and \(C\) went together and the rest of them went together and uh (decided) that I couldn't, I had a bit of trouble working out which were going to go first and

\section*{(15)E: I see.}
(16)S4: (other way).
(17)E: Why, why d'you pick that, why di-, why did en-. Can you think why you ended up picking E and C to erm go together there? Was there any reason//or?]
(18)S4: Why] they went together or.
(19)E: No why, why they went up there at the, at the start there.
(20)S4: Well I thought \(E\) was starting off talking about the new men and then he
(21)E: Yeh.
(22)S4: went on to des-, describe the s-, second man.
(23)E: I see, so how do you wo-, okay so then you got E and C to start and you get \(D\) next.
(24) S4: Mm hm.
(25)E: Okay, so okay what d'you, who do you think the second man is, that's sounds a bit silly but who do you think the second man is? How does, I mean, what I'm saying is how does D relate into, into, into this \(E\) and \(C\) here?
(26)S4: Well he's talking about the new men//in] E and the second man was one of those I suppose.
(27)E: Yeh]
(28)E: Yeh that's, yeh s-, yeh so that's how you th-, how you thought that to be next//ok]ay. So alright then we'll go on a bit. Why, why do you have F then. The original one here, that has, that has D and F as well. Where are we? Yes. That has D and F at the start.
(29) S4: Mm]
(30) S4: Mm.
(31)E: Okay so how d'you, why d'you, how d'you get \(F\) to, erm to come in after D there?
(32)S4: Mm it says the, the se-, the second man was unlike the others and it says he was broader and shorter.
(33)E: Yeh.
(34)S4: Mm. And it seems to follow. Starts//des]cribing him, why he was different.
(35)E: Yeh]
(36)E: I see. Oh, how do you mean different?
(37)S4: Well, oh I don't know, the.
((pause))
(38)E: You tell me how//that] one fits there. We've got. With D. Why, why does that one, why does that F have to come right next?
(39) \(\mathrm{S} 4: \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}\) ]
(40)S4: Because it, it erm, says why he was unlike, what was different about him.
(41) E
(42)S4: He ] was broader and shorter//than] the other men.
(43)E: Yeh]
(44)E: Which other men's that in//the]
(45)S4: Men] Er the new men or whatever.
(46)E: Oh I see//so] so the second man's one of the new men.
(47)S4: Oh]
(48) \(\mathrm{S4}\) : Mm.
(49)E: And he's being contrasted with them. With the, the other new men?
(50)S4: Yeh.
(51)E: Okay right, now, let's see, what did we get. You've got after, now, after, this* has got \(D\) and \(F\) like you've got it.
(52) \(\mathrm{S} 4: \mathrm{Mm} / / \mathrm{hm}\) ]
(53)E: And] then it's got B and G and A and you've got A and G, okay. So if you, oh you, you, you got B again okay. So how do you get from, from that F to B , okay, so how, how a-, how come B comes in after F ? Er it does on here.**
(54) S4: [Because]
(55) E: [And it] does in yours, okay.
(56)S4: It describes him, a little bit more, and says there's much hair on his body, and
(57)E: Yeh.
(58)S4: A11 that.
(59)E: How, okay, so why, okay suppose then it didn't. Just suppose that erm, where's the original ordering? Suppose that we, we took that*** out, okay.
(60) S4: Mm.
(61)E: What would be wrong with that? Okay.
(62)S4: Well if \(F\) wasn't in, it would all, it w'd just.

\footnotetext{
* I.e., in the original ordering.
** I.e., in the original ordering.
*** I.e., sentence \(F\).
}
((long pause))
(63)E: Yeh it's hard to describe. I//under]stand that it's hard to describe. Erm why you get that. Okay, well we'll, we'll leave it if you can-, if you can't think out that one. You go erm, you say something like that \(B\) has to go there because, \(B\) has to go after F because.
(64) S4: Mm hm ] ((pause))
(65)S4: It's going on to describe more about him.
(66) E: Oh I see//right]
(67)S4: Mm] yeh.
(68)E: More about the.
(69)S4: Second man.
(70)E: About the second man. Okay and then erm, and then you have A next. So why, why did you think that? Why do you think A after B?
(71)S4: Erm.
((pause))
(72)S4: Because erm. ((pause))
(73)S4: I don't know why I.
(74) E:
[Mm]
(75)S4: But] it seems to say oh, like, talking about his head-hair and then it, I thought that A went before \(G\) because it said you know there was no hair on the front of his head and then it said where it was, it was laid in a ball at the back of his neck.
(76) E: Oh I see, so c-//oh] well can you run through that again? Run through the, what you see as the progression there in \(B, A\) and \(G\).
(77)S4: Yeh]
(78)S4: Well in B//it says the hair]
(79)E: I'm sorry to ask you to repeat] okay?
(80)S4: Erm, B says his head-hair was sleek and then er.
(81)E: Yeh.
(82)S4: It says, says, he had no hair at the front of his head and it sort of progresses on to say, well I thought then it went on to say where the hair was, was at the back of his neck.

That's why I put it that way.
(83)E: Oh I see, so that you end up with, with \(G\) with it, with it being on the back of his neck?
(84)S4: Yeh.
(85)E: Oh I see. @Right Well that sou-, that's perfectly, perfectly kind of reasonable way of seeing it now if you look at the.
(86)S4: Mm.
(87)E: Just look at the original here. Now. Oh, before we get on to that. What, well just looking at the, the order that you had, what did you think the passage was about? ((pause))
(88)E: Oh just//a rough] idea of some of the. Any ideas er?
(89) S4: Mm]
(90)S4: Erm it sort of sounds as if, now these new men were some kind of prisoners or new recruits or something and.
(91)E: Yeh.
(92)S4: Lok was looking over them, seeing what they were like.
(93) E: Yeh.
(94)S4: Mm hm.
(95)E: And. Oh I see, right, okay so now look at, we'll now look at this one here, the, the, the way that it was in the.
(96)S4: Mm.
(97)E: In, in the book okay. So now can you see erm can you see anything different now, going on in the, in the thing, from the way that you construed it. You know//the] way that you had it. How, can you see anything different going on in this one?
(98)S4: Mm hm ]
(99)S4: ((reads))
(100)S4: Mm. Well it's hard to.
(101)S4: ((reads))
(102)S4: Oh it sounds as if the second man was different,erm, sort of going on all the others had long hair or something and it said he had no hair.
(103) E: Yeh.
(104)S4: On the front of his head and so, the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears and then he could see what the ears of the new men were like on the second man but where he, but he couldn't
sce it on the other ones because they had hair covering their ears or something.
(105)E: Oh so that you see//that] you read it a bit different now? (106)S4: Mm]
(107)S4: Yeh.
(108)E: Okay so can \(y-\), you could, I mean we discussed before why F follows from D,* okay. So we're talking about this one, now. Now, before you had \(B\), then \(A\), then \(G\).
(110) E: [Mm] different. I forget wha-, what was it e-, exactly you said that, that, that he event-, it eventually tells you where the hair is.**
(111)S4: \(\quad\) Mm
(112)E: LAnd] that's what those were doing. Now can you see them as doing anything. What are they doing now in this order?
(113)S4: Hm.
(114)E: Do you see what I mean?
(115)S4: It's going, saying er where the hair is and the he erm, it's got them round in a different order so that it goes on, follows on to talk about the ears. Where before I had the/lears first] and then ended up talking about his hair.
(116) E: Oh I see]
(117)E: So that's why you have \(A\) at the end?***
(118)S4: Mm hm.
(119)E: Okay, well what about the, that accounts for \(j-\), for \(A\) at the end//okay] why do you, and you had B at the beginning, so why do you get \(B\) and \(G\). Why, wha-, how does that one work? I mean you told me how you go from B to A//okay] in your order//how] does this one, go from B to G? Okay, how's the er, what's the connection there? Can you see that?
(120)S4: Mm]
(121) \(\mathrm{S4}\) : Mm hm ]
(122)S4: Mm]
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(123)S4: Mm.
(124)E: Ha-, how would you, I mean if you'd got that, that order, how, how do you think you'd arrive at that er, at seeing the connection there?
((pause))
(125)E: Maybe I'm not saying what I want very//well]
(126)S4: Yeh] I know, I know what you want but I'm just trying to ex//plain how I] see it.
(127)E: Yeh, oh good]
(128)E: (Hhh) (hh)//that, that seems to be]
(129)S4: ( to you)] Uhm.
(130)S4: ((reads))
(131)S4: Sort of sounds as if erm you know it says fat had been rubbed into his hair and then because of that it lay in a ball at the back of his neck or something. I dunno (hhh).
(132)E: You can't really find why it should//be like] that? You think it could be in any? I don't know.
(133)S4: No]
(134)S4: It, it follows on but I can't quite explain.
(135)E: Why.
(136)S4: Why, yeh.
(137)E: But it seemed to follow on//to you] somehow?
(138)S4: Yeh]
(139)E: Well it seemed to follow (hhh) in a way.
(140)S4: Yeh.
(141)E: As well.
(142)S4: 'S because, because I put it the other way it's hard to sort of change it around and think why it goes that way, I think.
(143)E: You've got the idea.
(144)S4: Yeh.
(145)E: Yeh.
(146)S4: I've got it stuck in my mind that it goes the other way.
(147)E: Oh I see. Oh I see, yeh.
((knock at door))
(148)E: Hi come in
(149) X : ( \(\quad * * * * * * * *\) ) could I get my purse?
(150)E: Yeh.
(151)X: In order to go and buy my lunch.
(152) E: Yeh. We're nearly through. Where are you going off to buy your Iunch?
(153)X: In the student canteen. Do you want some too?
(154)E: No I brought some here.
(155)X:
( )
(156)E: No we're nearly through now. So that you. Okay let's get back to why you get, why you get A there, okay?
((door closes))
(157)S4: (After)
(158)E: Yeh. In, in this one.
(159)S4: Uhm.
((long pause))
(160)E: Oh I guess maybe I'm asking too much//(hh) of] you here.
(161)S4: (Hhh) huh]
(162)S4: Oh erm, it's hard to exp-, explain why it goes that way.
(163)S4: ((reads))
(164)S4: I suppose it's the same sort of thing following on so, erm, you know, the hair was in the ball at the back of his neck.
(165)E: Mm.
(166)S4: Then, sort of just follows on to say that, that he had no hair on the front of his head, it was all at the back. So it you know exposed his ears.
(167)E: Oh I see.
(168)S4: Mm.
(169)E: Oh, so that, so that that just moves from the back.
(170)S4: Back to the front where//as] an, I have it//back, from the front to the back] yeh.
(171)E: Yeh]
(172)E: You went from the front to the back]
(173)E: Yeh, I see. Okay, well we'11 just. Oh, oh so di-, di-, d'you think this is, this is any different now you s-, you gave me an idea of, of what the, what you thought this one* was about, okay//the] way you had it. D'you th-, d'you, can you see any difference now, do you think it might be about anything different? In, in the way it's set out in,
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in. I mean it's not, it's not a vastly different ordering from the one//you had]
(174)S4: Mm]
(175)S4: Yeh, there's some]thing different about the, sort of the whole meaning of it but \(I\) can't, can't sort of explain what the difference is.
(176)E: Well d'you reckon this one's about uhm. I mean before you said he was looking at some new people who'd come along. For some reason//and] he was. He seemed to be, what was it you said about them? What you thought he was doing last time? In this, first one here, the one that you//got]
(177)S4: Mm]
(178)S4: Yeh] he's uhm, contrasting the second man//to the] rest of the group//sort of] picked him out.
(179)E: Yeh]
(180)E: Yeh]
(181)E: Yeh okay so what's going on//now]
(182)S4: Erm] this one's
((pause))
(183)S4: Erm, I know it sa-, it still seems the same thing.
(184)E: But he can't be doing (that)
(185)S4: @No.
((pause))
(186)E: Erm I mean that oh, can, can you still see it like that? So what's, what's he doing here?]
(187)S4: Yeh, he's saying that, I can] I still think it's the same sort of idea. I think it's because I've got the erm other idea still//in my mind]
(188)E: Oh I see] yeh.
(189)S4: Yeh that he had the new men first and.
(190)E: Yeh.
(191)S4: Like that.
(192) E: [Okay]
(193)S4: Can't] sort of concentrate on having the second man and then going on.
(194)E: I see. Okay so suppose that, that the, the-, the others, okay I'll give you a clue (hh)alright.
(195) S4: Mm.
(196)E: Suppose that the others are the new men anyway, okay? And the second man's just one of them, okay?* ((long pause))
(197)E: [Can] you see, d'you think what might be happening now? (198)S4: -Mm\(]\)
(199)S4: I can't, can't//see]
(200)E: No. Okay that doesn't matter. 'S alright. But you still think that it's something different from.
(201)S4: Yeh. From that other one but I can't.
(202)E: \(\quad\) Yeh]
(203) S4: [Mm]
(204)E: Okay alright, we'll just, we'll just give it a-, 'cause it's time for my lunch too. So we'll just give it a-
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(1)E: Okay, let's have a look and see what you've. Are we going? Yes. Let's have a look and see what you've got. D, F, alright. I'11 show you the correct answer sheet. No. That's not the correct answer sheet, that's somebody else's. Mm, that's the correct answer sheet.
(2)S5: Mm.
(3)E: Erm. There we are, D, F, B, oh, that's right apart from.
(4) S5: Oh.
(5) E: \(\quad\) Apart from] \(A\) and \(G\)
(6) \(\mathrm{S5}: \quad[(\quad)]\)
(7)S5: Yeh, oh.
(8) E: It's almost iden-, identically correct//Well] I have to tell you now that you've done better than anyone e(hhh)ise.
(Hhhh), that's the, the closest to it that er that I've got yet.
(9)S5: Mm]
(10)S5: Oh hang on I want//to] see what the two were that I got mixed up.
(11)E: Okay]
(12) E: \(\quad G\) and \(A\).
(13)S5: G, A.
((pause))
(14)E: @That's the original up there. ((pause))
(15)S5: And A was meant to be with the G?
(16)E: Yeh, G//came] before A.
(17)S5: Oh]
(18)S5: I disagree with that really.
(19)E: Okay well//te11] me about that first then 'cause that's the first thing that you have.
(20)S5: Because]
(21)E: [Okay]
(22)S5: [Oh] yeh.
(23) E: Well look.
(24)S5: No it doesn't really matter because they both, both like sort of don't really (mean), go together.
(25)E: Okay well give me, give me w-, why you have that ordering, why you have A and G//okay]
(26)S5: Okay] right.
(27)E: And then give me, w-, erm, the way it looks to you now that you've seen how it, how it is in the.
(28) S5: Mm.
(29)E: In the original.
(30)S5: Well//here] they say, right, the hair lay//in a ball]
(31) E: Okay]
(32) E: Okay, this is this is in the original.
(33)S5: [Yeh] in the original.
(34)E: Okay]
(35)E: Yeh.
(36)S5: At the back of his neck. He had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the sweep of bone s-, of bone skin came right over his ears.
(37)E:
(38)S5: [-Ykay?] right.
(39) E:
(40)S5: [We']ve got that.
(41)E: Yeh.
(42)S5: Now I've got A which was first and that was he had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the sweep of his bone skin came over his ears.
(43)E: Yeh.
(44)S5: Er. The hair lay at the, in a ball at the back of his neck. So//that] means that you've met, you see, a person front on, so right, he's got no head there, then he might, after a while, he might turn around and do something and you see the back of his head. Or alternately you might've seen the back of his head first and then he'd turn around and see the front of him.
(45) E: I see]
(46)E:
(47) S5: \(\quad\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { So you don't think it makes }] \text { any difference? } \\ \text { So it doesn't really matter }]\end{array}\right.\)
(48)S5: I don't think it makes much//difference]
(49)E: You can't] okay so you can't see, would you like to look at the original okay//up there] You can't see any reason why A would come after \(G\) ?
(50)S5: Mm] ((pause))
(51)E: In, in the original? I mean you were telling me that they're just a, it depends//on] the way you look.
(52)S5: \(\mathrm{Ah}]\)
(53)S5: Yeh well I guess maybe because you've got 'came right over his', 'the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears' and so the next statement you've got, now//he sees his] ears.
(54) E: That's E?]
(55) E: I see.
(56)S5: [So you've got] afterwards
(57)E: [So that]
(58) S5: Now he sees his ears.
(59) E:
(60)S5:
(61)E: Yeh.
(62)S5: That means that there wasn't any hair there, so that's how come you could see the ears. So next I've got because, because the hair lay at the back of his neck, therefore, for the first time then he could see the ears of the man, because of that.
(63)E: That's the way you saw it?
(64)S5: Yeh.
(65) E: Oh I see.
(66)S5: As a result of being no hair anywhere else but there, that's why he could see the ears.
(67)E: I see. Oh that's really good. Erm okay, that's, that seems to ans-, that seems, so you think that, that logically that A would go before \(G\) or, on your reading?
(68)S5: [Mm. Well when I first saw that] yeh.
(69)E: [(thought) that A would go before G]
(70)E: Okay erm how does that slot in B then? Okay, so we go back a bit okay.
(71)S5: Mm hm.
(72)E: So//you've] got \(B\) in that same place. We'll talk about those three for the minute, the third, fourth and fifth ones//B] G and A or as you've got it, B, A//and G] Okay. Can you talk about how, how those fit in together for you? Okay//in, in] your ordering then first. We'11 talk ab-, we'll talk a-, just forget about this one and talk about//your] ordering.
(74)S5: Okay]
(75)S5: and G]
(76)S5: Mm]
(77)S5: Yeh]
(78)S5: Well B was there, okay, he started talking about erm there was much hair on his body and his head hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed on it.
(79) E: Mm.
(80)S5: And erm, well it depends really when you look at someone, you might look at, sometimes you look sort of there first, sometimes you look at their heads first, you know it depends really, how tall the person is, sort of you look at the person and you stare right in his chest so it doesn't matter. But you've got B there.
(81)E: Mm hm .
(82)S5: And then A follows because they're just so close together. You know he//just] (put) that part of your neck and then your head.
(83)E: Yeh]
(84)E: Yeh.
(85) S5: And so that's why I put them like that.
(86)E: I see, why couldn't you. Okay I'll ask you a bit of a silly question. Why couldn't you start with \(G\) ? Why couldn't it go, have the first two that you've got say, and then why couldn't G come first?
(87)S5: Where here?//Right at the] beginning?
(88)E: Yes the s-]
(89)E: No after, after here. We're talking about these three. \(B / / A\) and \(G]\) What would, why couldn't you have \(G\) after \(F\) ?

Say?
(90)S5: Yeh]
(91)S5: Erm now what's ( skin)
(92)E: You've got.
(93)S5: [He was] broad and short//and then you put] G
(94)E: What's -at]
(95)E: He was broader and shorter]
(96)E: Yeh. Suppo-//what] would happen if you had that, what would, would there be something wrong with it? Do you think?
(97)S5: And it's] ((long pause))
(98)S5: Oh no not really.
(99)E: So you could have the//second man was] unlike the others, he was broader and shorter, the hair erm, the hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck. There was much hair on his body etcetera? You could do it that way?
(100)S5: ( )]
(101)S5: Mm, you could probably do it that way, it wouldn't make that much difference. You'd still be able to get the visual impression of the man.
(102)E: You don't think that, that th-, so therefore you, you don't think that the ordering of those three, \(B, G\), and \(A\), matters?
(103)S5: No, it probably doesn't as long as you, you, you know the sentences are the same, you still get the same impression of the person.
(104)E: I see and that's what matters?
(105)S5: Yeh.
(106)E: Erm okay well we, we, we'll go back to the ordering later. What do you think that the whole thing'd be about? Erm. Some, just some general ideas of the kinds of.
(107)S5: Well I guess it's erm, there'd be a group because he's talking about the second man.
(108)E: Yeh.
(109)S5: Or maybe a group or somewhere where there've been a few people and there's this person that's just sitting back somewhere and he might be erm you know looking at them and then there's this bloke here Lok.
(110)E: Yes.
(111)S5: Lok, so there's another person there. Erm, but when they say the new man, it almost sounds as if he's an alien or something// He sounds] really different.
(112)E: Where's that?]
(113)E: Where's that?
(114)S5: New man. The new//man]
(115)E: The] men.
(116)S5: Depends what//the]
(117)E: That's] an E.
(118)S5: Men//Ok]ay men//the] new men.
(119)E: Mm hm\(]\)
(120) E: Mm]
(121)E: Yeh.
(122)S5: So it looks as if it's a whole different race of people.
(123)E: Yeh?
(124)S5: And that perhaps they're lying down like on an examine ta-, examination table. And perhaps this Lok is a doctor or something.
(125)E: \(\mathrm{Mm} / / \mathrm{hm}\) ]
(126)S5: And] he's sort of observing the p-, observing the person. This new type of person.
(127)E: That was the kind of thing that you.
(128) S5: Mm.
(129)E: You thought was going on? Okay. Erm so you had. Why, okay then why pick the \(\mathrm{d}-\), the \(\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{D}\) for the, for the first, that's quite a difficult question I suppose. Have you any idea why you might have picked D for the, for the, for the first slot?
(130)S5: Because all the others didn't seem to be able to start off anything, a whole idea on their own and that was the only one which you could ki-, stick out on its own and just sort of, make a continuation of the other senten//ces] going on. And it just seemed the logical one to put, put first. Because it's//like] that's the first, second man and the, just seemed as if it all goes with a description of the person, you just have to put the description in the right//order]
(131)E: Yeh]
(132)E: Okay]
(133)E: Yeh] Oh I see. So that wha-, I mean what kind of thing is that, is that sentence then? It's erm.
(134)S5: It's just erm, it's just a statement, it's just a//state]ment. He was uh different from all the others.
(135)E: Yeh]
(136)E: Yeh.
(137)S5: And now later on he's giving all, you all the reasons, because you don't see the person unless it's a picture.
(138)E: Yeh.
(139)S5: And then he's giving you the, all the reasons why this person was so different.
(140)E: Yeh, okay, yeh I see that. So that you put it in, in that position by virtue of the fact that, of looking at the others?
(141) S5: Yeh.
(142)E: Okay.
(143)S5: Yeh.
(144)E: Do you think that's, that that's true? That you put it first because of//what] you got from the others?
(145) S5: Mm]
(146) S5: Mm.
(147)E: Erm okay. Now why, why was, does F have to follow from that? Or why di-, why did you put \(F\) to follow from that?
(148)S5: Because erm, usually when you're, when if it's just looking at someone.
(149) E: Mm.
(150)S5: It's not so much things like hair and stuff that you notice first. It's usually if the person's very short or very wide or//very] tall. That's probably the main thing which strikes, well it always strikes me first before//any]thing else.
(151) E: Mm]
(152)E: Yeh]
(153)E: Yeh. So you thought that, that had to go in the-
(154) S5: Mm.
(155)E: In the, in the second place? Erm, wd-, would you feel there was something terribly wrong if it dj.dn't go there? I mean what would be, what would be peculiar if.
(156)S5: Well it's a funny thing after you've noticed all the intricate things like he had no hair on the front of his head.
(157)E: Yeh.
(158)S5: And then sort of half an hour later, WELL, he's//a] short person.
(159)E: Yeh]
(160)E: Yeh.
(161)S5: Y'know it//just does]n't seem, it just doesn't seem that a person, the, observing all these things and then all of a sudden he just realised that it//that that] bloke's short.
(162)E: Yeh I see]
(163)E: Yeh, okay]
(164)E: Well we'll take, we'll take B, G and A as a block, 'cause we talked about those, those just a bit earlier//okay] we'll talk about those as a block of things. Okay, so why d-, so why do they come in here? Suppose you've got, you've got your D and your F to start off and you've//you've] decided why you want those to go there. Why do those three sentences in a block, okay in whichever or-, you said you could put them in any order.
(165) S5: Mm hm ]
(166) S5: Mm hm ]
(167)S5: Mm.
(168)E: But sp-, whatever order, take them as a block of sentences. Em, why di-, why would they come for you in that erm position?
(169)S5: Yeh.
(170)E: Em. Well, why did you. I'm trying to get at.
(171)S5: Yeh.
(172)E: The, the kinds of things that you were, you were doing when you put them in that, in that way.
((pause))
(173)S5: Well I guess the reason was because erm, after he was sort of taller and shorter, I mean broader and shorter, then you got B, then you got B, that there was much hair on his body and his head-hair and everything like that. Then you just, ah, it just seems that that person might've been looking front on, and that after that he had no hair on the front of his head.
(174)E: \(\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}\).
(175)S5: That, it just seems that if you're looking at the body, well I dunno, whenever you say that, you're looking at a person's chest if it's a bloke I//guess] So, that means that you'd be seeing the front of the person. So that therefore those two'd* go together 'cause you're looking at the front.
(176) \(\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Mm}\) ]

\footnotetext{
* I.e., B and A.
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(177)E: Yeh.
(178)S5: Not the back.
(179)E: Yeh.
(180)S5: You see, so that means, after all that, after you've worked out where, erm that he's got no hair on the front, so then after that you sort of work out if he's got any hair at all.
(181)E: \(\quad\) Yeh]
(182)S5: Sol that you, you know, you realise that it's there. You've got//you] know, \(G\), at the back of his neck.
(183)E: Yeh]
(184)E: Yeh. Oh I see. So that was, that was how you got those, you got those together.
(185)S5: Yeh.
(186)E: [Okay so]
(187)S5: [It was] like on one plane, you know, you see the head and then you see the, you know, the front of the body.
(188)E: So you think that, that the descirption's going in the way that, the way that he saw it?
(189)S5: Yeh.
(190)E: It follows the way that, the way that he's seeing it?
(191)S5: Mm.
(192)E: Okay so, erm. Okay I'll ask you another, I'll uh, a fairly simple question again. Why, but take the last two, E and C, why do they have to be in the order that they are?
(193)S5: Well, uh huh, E is, he's talking about the ears.
(194)E: \(\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { Yeh] } \\ \text { (195) S5 }\end{array}\right.\)
(196)E: Yeh.
(197)S5: And so, and I thought that \(C\) was a description of the ears.
(198)E: [Yes]
(199)S5: [You're] not going to say, 'They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads' and then \(y\) ' say, 'Now for the first time, Lok s-, you know, saw the ears of the new man.'
(200)E: [Yeh]
(201)S5: The new] it's, you'd probably say that, you know, ah, his ears, and this is what his ears were like, but you wouldn't make a des-, re-, people'd rarely make a description of the ears and then say, 'These are the ears.'
(202)E: Yeh, yeh.
(203)S5: You know?
(204)E: I see, so that they go that way?//Okay] now take, take the two as a bunch, now why do they ha-, why, how do they fit in after this, these three in the middle? Okay, you've got B, G and A or A and \(G\) in the mid//dle] How do you get from, from that group to these. Okay how do you get from the description of the hair to//the] to the, to the ears, to the, to the last two? \(0-\), on your, on your reading?
(205) S5: Mm]
(206)S5: Uh huh]
(207) S5: Mm]
(208)S5: Yeh.
(209)E: How does that connection make itself?
(210)S5: Well I guess in a way you could probably have it either way as long as you kept the bunches together 'cause one group's talking about the ears and the other one's talking about the hair.
(211) E: Mm.
(212)S5: So I guess it really wouldn't make, if you had F and then you had \(E\), but that wouldn't really, after, right after you're talking about how short his build, suddenly you notice the ears.
(213)E: Yeh.
(214)S5: That doesn't sort of follow. You're more likely to notice that his hair's the sleek as if it, fat had been rubbed into//it] You'd notice that more than you would the ears.
(215) \(\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Mm}]\)
(216)E: Yeh I see. So that that's why you have them, you have them in that order?
(217)S5: Mm.
(218)E: Okay. Do you think. Oh we'11 go back to the, we'll go back to the, the other thing now about the, about the \(G\) and A thing.
(219)S5: Uh huh.
(220)E: Do you think that, that the passage is any different erm having it that way?
((pause))
(221) \(\mathrm{E}: \quad\) Uhm I guess I might've asked you that before. But now that we've talked it through a bit.
((pause))
(222)S5: No, I don't think it really makes any difference at all.
(223)E: Mm hm.
(224)S5: Because they're both in a way sta-, they're both statements so it doesn't really matter. They could follow on either way. Your//first] Depends which way. You firstly notice that the person was looking at the front so you notice the ( ), you know the, the front of the person and then he noticed the back or vice versa. I don't think it really makes any difference.
(225) E: \(\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}]\)
(226) E: Yeh I see.
(227)S5: Though] you'd have to have after A, I think that, oh no that's right, yeh.
(228)E: [But]
(229)E: Well you think it's okay like that?
(230)S5: Mm. As long as you keep those two about, as long as you keep \(C\) and, \(C\) and \(E\) together.
(231)E: Yeh.
(232)S5: It//erm]
(233)E: In] in the, in the order \(E, C\) ?
(234)S5: Yeh.
(235)E: It doesn't matter?
(236)S5: No, but I don't think it'd matter that much. No.
(237)E: Ah hah//Okay]
(238)S5: But] I suppose A, I guess maybe it would've been better to have A where it was because you've noticed the ears. And there you've got three kind of on the ears.
(239)E: [Yeh]
(240)S5: LSol maybe it would've been better. 'Right over his ears' and now you've got 'for the first time he noticed the ears'. So// I] guess that might've been better that way.
(241)E: Yeh]
(242)E: Yeh.
(243)S5: But that's the only real reason. It wouldn't make that much difference, I don't think.
(244)E: You don't think it'd disrupt it if, if the, to have A somewhere else and suddenly to have to jump back to being about the ears? You know, like if you mention it here, like you've got it. Okay, you have A in here. And then you have \(G\) which is what you've got. You have to jump across.
(245)S5: E//rm]
(246)E: To] the ears again without having talked about them?
(247)S5: Uhm yeh, I guess so, but in A erm he's more talking about the bones and the hair, he's not really talking that much about the ears. He's not going into that much detail but I see what you mean and in a way I think, I agree with you there.
(248)E: Yeh.
(249)S5: To drop it would be with, otherwise you're thinking about something else and also and you gotta get back to another part of the description which is sort of not belonging there.
(250)E: Yeh.
(251)S5: Which] could, could be right, yeh.
(252)E: [Yeh]
(253)E: And you said before,* I'll just, just repeat this, just to see if I've got it right. You think that the whole passage is about, is something like er a doctor inspecting some bodies or something?
(254) S5: Yeh because the new men sounds like alien, something that perhaps someone, I dunno, I don't know if the story's science fiction or, or s-, yeh I c'd find, I don't really know but if it was, it'd probably be about someone s-, you know new or a new type of, of the men that were developed.
(255) E: [Yeh]
(256)S5: By ] someone and they're obser-, and they're observ//ing] someone else's observing someone else's, could be two doctors, you know, two scientists//and] one scientist is coming over and investigating this other bloke's crea-, creation//of a] new race.
(257) \(\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Mm}]\)
(258) E: Mm ]
(259)E: Yeh]
(260)E: Yeh. I see. And that's, that, that'd be the way you'd// you'd] see, you'd see it//as working]
(261)S5: Mm.

\footnotetext{
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(262)S5: There's nothing] very different about them, they haven't got anything out of the ordinary but you never know.
(263)E: I see. So that the, well they look like human beings?
(264)S5: Yeh. But maybe there's something in their minds that they're so different.
(265)E: I see. And you think that they're examining them to. (266)S5: Yeh//at 1-] least observing them very closely. (267)E: 'S a, 's a]
(268)E: Mm hm. And you think that's why they're doing it. Okay well we'11 just leave it at that, I think that's er, that's, that's great. That's er//I'll] turn.
(269)S5: Yeh]

(1)E: think there's a terrible, no you probably can't hear it but I can, buzzing noise. Right erm. E, C, D, F, B, A, G. I'll show you what it was like in the original. Don't.
(2)S6: Huh huh huh.
(3) E: Right. This is, this is how it was.
((pause))
(4)S6: Ah. The E, C was right and the D, F was right. And the, oh the \(B\), \(A\) wasn't. That was back to front.
(5)E: Now. Okay you see how that's, that's how it//was] to start with. Don't be annoyed about that. Erm I think it must be very difficult to get i(hh)t exactly right. Let's just// talk] about your ordering. Erm do you know why you began with the ones you did.
(6) S6: Mm]
(7) S6: Mm]
(8)S6: Erm.
(9) E: I mean I'm just trying to get some picture of.
(10)S6: Yeh, well probably because it, it explains that it's about the ears of the new men and there was something about ears.
(11)E: Yeh.
(12)S6: And, and then explains why the ears are the ears, they were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
(13)E: So that's why C goes after E?
(14)S6: Yeh.
(15)E: @So, yeh well why, why would you be, why would you, did you dec-, was there any particular reason why you decided to begin there?
(16)S6: Erm we11, I haven't read the book and it, it's sort of like a starting point. If//you] if you were writing it, that's where you'd start. If you're starting from the beginning, if you didn't know anything of what happened before.
(17) E: Mm]
(18)E: You think you'd pick that one to//start] with? @okay \({ }^{A}\) Don't, don't be a-, erm, er don't feel bad about this, this is all for my bene//fit] Okay it's absolutely for
my benefit, whatever you say is just for me. Okay so you think that that's where you start?
(19) \(56: \mathrm{Mm}]\)
(20) S6: Yeh]
(21)S6: Mm hm.
(22)E: Wi-, with E?
(23) S6: Mm.
(24)E: And then C has to follow. Okay, so you've got 'Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men. They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads'. Then you have D//ok]ay, so why do you have, why do you have D there? Aft-, after those two? Erm how did you work that one?
(25) S6: Mm]
(26)S6: Because after E necessarily follows \(C\) and then.
(27)E: Yeh.
(28)S6: There was nowhere to go from there. No, no links so you immediately take the second man. So it's sort of like, you see the picture of all the men and then you, then you sort of pick up the second man. And//it described] him.
(29) E: I see]
(30)E: So you picked this one here that's got the new men in?
(31) S6:
(32)E: LOkay] And then the second man. Okay, what d-, what d-, I mean do you have any idea what these people are or anything by this//stage?]
(33) S6: Er] erm.
(34)E: Or anything to do with that or what's going on or?
(35)S6: Er it sounds as though, I dunno, there's mutants or something similar.
(36) E
(37)S6: [Er] I, I don't, or, I don't know.
(38)E: The, they're peculiar in//in] you think in some way? Mutants.
(39)S6: Yeh]
(40)S6: I think//The Inheritors] it sounds genetic in some way, I dunno.
(41)E: I mean]
(42) E: I s(hhh)ee.
(43) S6: Ha huh.
(44)E: You don't do er biology do you or anything?
(45)S6: No.
(46) E: No, oh I see.
(47)S6: I suppose ears could be, you know//huh huh]
(48)E: Huh huh] Ha, I just wondered if that was something clouding your, oh, making you see it that way.
(49) S6: No.
(50)E: And what about Lok? 'Cause you've got him in the, in your first sentence.
(51) S6: Mm.
(52) E: Erm, is there, is there any d-, d--, what's he doing in it do you think?
(53)S6: Oo. Erm, I dunno. Well he, he's, he's obviously the, the main focal point 'cause they've named him, Lok.
(54)E: Yeh.
(55) S6: We11 one of them anyway and erm, in, he doesn't s-, he doesn't sound as though he's got small ears, tiny ears screwed tightly into the sides of his head.
(56)E: Like he's not one of the//these?]
(57)S6: Mm] He doesn't sound as though he's one of them.
(58)E: And erm, er you don't feel, you, how do you feel that he's taking part in this? In this, in this, what's going on in the passage?
(59)S6: Yeh.
(60)E: D'you know, would//you] have you any idea what he might.
(61) S6: Mm]
(62)S6: No, it sounds as though he's, he's somewhere and then you know a whole lot of new men have, he's with a group of people.
(63)E: Yeh.
(64)S6: And then er, er a new group of people have come.
(65)E: Somebody else has come to where he is?
(66) S6: Yeh.
(67)E: Yeh okay, right, so that's how you. Is that how you see the, the beginning there? Okay//right] so how's. Now we got to D , didn't we? We got the bit about the ears and the
new men and then we got the second man was unlike the others. So okay why do you pick \(F\) for the, for this, fourth place, for this next place after d-, after D?
(68)
(69) E:
(70) S6:
(71)S6: It's.
(72)E: I mean I can see that//it] fits but//I er] if there's, can you think of any reason why that might be erm, say, more than erm B?
(73)S6: Yeh]
(74)S6: Yeh]
(75) S6: Erm.
(76) E: Why \(F\) should go there rather than there was much.
(77)S6: Well.
(78)E: Hair//on his body]
(79)S6: It's, it's] a general description. It's not, that's it's starting the general there and then it's going to more localised, like there was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek.
(80)E: Yeh I//see]
(81)S6: But] he was broader and shorter gives you immediate image of what he's like. He's broader and shorter than everybody else. That//picks him] out from the rest, immediately.
(82)E: I see]
(83)E: Oh I see. So that that, that would naturally come then// And that]
(84)S6: Yeh, and] and, he's, it's, I mean I just, the shortness of it goes like. If it was long it wouldn't, it wouldn't fit as well.
(85)E: Just the length of the sentence//as] well as, as what it's saying//is] is important for you there?
(86)S6: Yeh]
(87)S6: Yeh]
(88) S6: Mm.
(89)E: Mm I see. Yeh I see what you mean so that, so that, okay then, so you've got to D and F, and//then] you've, then you've got to start on B. Okay//so] how do you. How, I c-, I can see you know you told me why C goes after E and why//F] goes after D and that seems reasonable//Why, why then did, why] d-, why do you get B next?
(90) S6: Mm]
(91)S6: Yeh]
(92) S6: Mm]
(93)S6: Is it? ( )huh huh (hhh)]
(94)S6: [Ah]
(95)E: What] did, why, how do you get from there?
(96) S6: Well.
(97)E: From F//to B?]
(98)S6: That was] that was difficult 'cause B, A and G all, all describe his hair.
(99) E:
(100)S6: LAnd so]
(101)S6: And they're not really related to each other very much. You see that doesn't relate to that* and that doesn't. really relate to any of those,** not directly I mean, they're all about his hair but.
(102)E: You couldn't find a way that that gets.
(103)S6: No.
(104)E: Gets ordered. Okay well we'll take a look at how it was here*** And then.
(105)S6: No.
(106)E: You couldn't see an ordering here okay?//Now sort of] with the, with the pa-, with the, with hindsight look at the way they are there. Okay they're \(B / / G\) and A] there. Can you see any, any reason why they might go that way okay? Again B follows F in this.
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(107)S6: Oh not particularly]
(108)S6: G and A]
(109) S6:
(110) E:
[Yeh]
(111) \(\mathrm{S} 6: ~-\mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hm}]\)
(112)E: And this has got \(B\) following \(F\), and//then it's sort of got the others back to fr-]
(113)S6: And it's the \(G\) and A that are back] to front.
(114)E: Yeh okay//but] why, why, can you see any. In, in, in this original, in the original form that it was in, can you see er//er] uh, uh, a way that they, that they fit there?
(115)S6: Yeh]
(116)S6: Erm]
((long pause))
(117)S6: Erm, I dunno, but A might be, the, the sweep of bone skin over his ears might be a lead on to something, another sentence er a different part of, you know//n-] a new subject.
(118) \(\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Mm}]\)
(119)E: You can't see any reason why that goes last there in the original? ( ) last in that group of three?
(120)S6: Erm (hhhh).
(121)E: No?
(122)S6: Er, no not really.
(123)E: You thought, you think you could swap them round more or//1ess]
(124)S6: They] could be rearranged, yeh, I think so.
(125)E: You think it could be arranged without//with]out much trouble?
(126)S6: Yeh]
(127)S6: Yeh.
(128)E: Erm, without meaning something different? Without saying something different? WOOPS.
((pause))
(129)E: Okay let's, let's, let's just read them the way, the way they are here. The way//they]'ve got it here is: 'There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.' You want to go don't you?
(130) S6: Mm]
(131)S6: Ha huh (hh).
(132)E: Erm.
(133)S6: Well not, not now a mean I've got a couple of minutes.
(134)E: [Okay]
((knock at door))]
(135)E: Come in. Hello.
(136)( ): ( )
(137)E: Yeh, okay.
(138)X: Have you got a class?
(139)S6: Yes.
(140)E: Well then.
(141)S6: ( ) he won't mind if I'm about five minutes late.
(142) X: Have you finished?
(143)E: Erm if you, well no, if you have to go, you have to go and that's it.
(144)S6: [Ha huh]
(145)X: [ ] another few minutes)
(146)S6: Oh.
(147)E: No if you have to go, please//please, please do]
(148)S6: ((laughs))]
(149)X: She wasn't monosyllabic? She actually talked to you?
(150)E: Oh of course she did yes.
(151)X: Isn't she//sweet?] Elle est gentille comme tout, uh?
(152)E: We11]
(153)S6: Ha ha.
(154)X: Okay well listen keep, keep a couple, five minutes, he wouldn't really mind.
(155)S6: Yeh, he wouldn't mind no.
(156)E: Okay? Alright.
((door closes))
(157)E: Well we'11 try the, we'll try it the way it goes here// okay] Erm, it goes from 'He was broader and shorter' to 'There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck. He had no hair on the front of his head at all, so that the sweep of bone skin came right over his ears. Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.' So that's how, that's the bit
in with, with one either side. Now suppose it'd gone, say, for instance, 'He was broader and shorter. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck. There was much hair on his head and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it.' Suppose it had gone that way? \(F\), then \(G\), then B. For inst//ance] Would there be anything wrong with, with, with swapping those two round, that you could see?
(158)S6: Yeh]
(159)S6: Yeh]
(160)S6: I can, yeh, a-, it's, it's easier to see now. But.
(161)E: Erm//oh] I'm not trying to//partic-] put some//thing there. I'm just wondering if] you, if, if there'd be a, you know if, if \(G\) was there instead of \(B\). What I'm trying to get at is whether there's something right about them.
(162)S6: Mm hm]
(163)S6: Yeh]
(164)S6: No, no, no, no, no, no]
(165)S6: Yes, that's uhm. Erm, there, the broader and shorter fits in with the hair on his body. He was broader and shorter and the hair on his body was.
(166)E: [Yeh]
(167)S6: Then ] on to his head-hair.
(168)E: Yeh.
(169)S6: And then, and then, then it goes on to his, the hair at the back of his neck//It was]
(170)E: What] from//From] from where?
(171)S6: Yeh]
(172)S6: His head-hair was sleek//as i-,] And//the hair]
(173)E: Yeh]
(174)E: Yeh]
(175)S6: [On]; his back of his neck.
(176)E: [Yeh]
(177)S6: And then he had no hair on the front of his head, which explains the front of his head.
(178)E: Yeh(hh).
(179)S6: So that the bone skin we-, came right over his ears. And then it, then it goes on to the 'Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.'
(180)E: So you see a tie between.
(181)S6: Yeh the sentences all sort of link together like a chain.
(182)E: Yeh okay. Now you were talking about what, this, your ordering might be.
(183) S6: Mm.
(184)E: Er about. Do you think looking at this one it might be any different? Do you think there might er. That, do you think the overall thing says anything, anything different now that, looking at the er.
(185)S6: Not//really]
(186)E: This] final//one] here?
(187)S6: But] the.
(188)E: Is there anything s((pause))
(189)E: Were you gonna say something (hhh)?
(190)S6: Huh huh//(hhhh)]
(191)E: (hhhh)] (hhhh) (hhh)
(192)S6: Er I dunno, it mos-, it mostly describes the, I mean, that man and his, how he's, his hair's back on his neck and it's all sweeped back//And] he's shorter and broader which you know explains that most of the men are s-, I suppose quite tall? Or they, they might not be might they? No. They might not be.
(193) E: Mm]
(194)E: N(hh)o.
(195)S6: Ah huh (hh).
(196)E: He was just broader and shorter//than (hh) they] were, yeh.
(197)S6: Yeh, heh heh, (hh)]
(198)S6: Well they're, yes, well he's different to them and they have peculiar ears. They were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
(199)E: What, all of them?
(200)S6: Yes, it seems so.
(201)E: Including him?
(202)S6: Well I suppose//so]
(203)E: They] all have, they all have//But you don't think]
(204)S6: Oh yeh] yeh I see.
(205)E: You don't//think]
(206)S6: No] yes. They are all of them//heh] huh, huh.
(207)E: Yeh]
(208)E: But you don't think there's any difference in the er, the overall position of I mean you, you had some idea of what was going on in the passage here.
(209)S6: Yeh.
(210)E: And you have, not very much a-, changed idea now//or] or// is] your idea changed//or] what?
(211)S6: No]
(212)S6: No]
(213)S6: No]
(214)S6: Not really, no-, not overall opinion of what's going on, it hasn't changed.
(215) E: You think that there's still, wha-, you said there was some new people who'd come to where he was.
(216) S6: Mm.
(217)E: And that's, he's just describing them for whatever reason?
(218)S6: Yeh.
(219)E: Yeh, okay. That, well I won't keep you any longer 'cause I know//you need] to get back to your class.
(220)S6: Yes]
(221)S6: We11.
(222) E: I'll just] turn.
(223)S6: Yeh]
(1) E: only a, a sort of aid to my memory more than, more than anything 'cause it's a pretty awful memory. Right, I'11 show you what the original ordering was.
(2)S7: Oh that should be pretty//interesting]
(3) E: Don't be] don't be intimidated by this at all. Right, have a look and.
(4) S7: Ah//ah]
(5) E: See]
(6)S7: I've mixed this up, aye. I've got those two sentences at the//very end]
(7) E: D and F] yes.
((pause))
(8)S7: Mm(hhh)ah hah.
(9)E: You've//got]
(10)S7: Oh] I've got this completely.
(11)E: But you, no, but it's, it's similar in the sense that you've got \(E\) and \(C\) at one end and \(D\) and \(F\) at the other which//this] one's got.
(12)S7: Yeh]
(13)S7: Aye.
(14)E: And you've got these three sentences in the middle.
(15)S7: Mm hm .
(16)E: In reverse order. Okay, let's just, erm, let's just forget about this, this one for a minute and look at, look at what you did, okay//when] you put this one together.
(17)S7: Yeh]
(18)S7: Mm hm.
(19)E: Okay. So erm well we'll forget about \(E\) for the minute. Why do you have \(C\) to follow E? That's a fairly simple start I think.
(20)S7: Why did I have \(C\) to follow//E?]
(21)E: Yes] That's.
(22)S7: Well because Lok saw the ears of the new men//and it] and then this, \(C\) is \(a-\), is referring to the ears.
(23) E: Yeh]
(24)E: Yes. So that in fact//it's fairly obvious it's the ears]
(25)S7: Yeh well I felt, yeh, yeh] it doesn't say it's referring to the ears but it's pretty obvious.
(26)E: That, that that//that that's about the ears?]
(27)S7: That it's referring to the ears] aye.
(28)E: Could you see anything tha-, else that it might be about that//that wa-]
(29)S7: Well] I couldn't really, like it couldn't be about his hair.
(30)E: No it'd be a bit//(tenuous )]
(31)S7: @( )]
(32)E: It's quite obvious then to you that that okay.
(33)S7: Mm.
(34)E: So why, why did you pick, okay so that we've got those two together as a bunch//okay, then] must, the-, C's got to follow E according.
(35) S7: Aye, yeh]
(36)S7: Yeh.
(37)E: To your and according to the original ordering.
(38) S7: Mm.
(39)E: Why erm, why do you pick those two to start with, okay?
(40)S7: Well I felt that, Lok saw, I felt that this, aye, I tho-, 'cause I knew it would either be D or E was//the er, at] the start.
(41)E: To start]
(42)E: Yes.
(43)S7: And I thought that Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men. And so I thought they'd be talking about the new men and then the second man that he//looked] at.
(44)E: Yeh]
(45)E: Yeh.
(46)S7: Oh that sounds unlike yours.
(47) E: Mm.
(48)S7: Yeh.
(49)E: So you had.
(50)S7: I knew it was either one of the two, you know.
(51)E: Okay, so you'd picked on E. But was there any reason why you chose it over//over D?]
(52)S7: Over D?]
(53)S7: I think it was because Now for the first time Lok saw the ears of the new men. The new men.
(54)E: Yeh.
(55)S7: It was, I think that's the only reason. I couldn't see.
(56)S7: ((reads)) @'The second man was unlike the others.' ((pause))
(57)S7: Er, er it was, I find it hard to decide whether it was \(E\) or D//@( ]
(58) E: I see]
(59)E: So it was just on.
(60)S7: Mm hm.
(61)E: A toss-up sort of thing?//Okay] So you got, you got C to follow E, okay and that, you explained why that is, that's quite reasonable. So okay then why did you go on, why did you have, then have A? Okay wa-, was there any reason why you went on to A from//there?]
(62)S7: Aye]
(63)S7: Aye] well He had no hair, he had no hair on the front of his head and s- came over his ears. I thought//this'd] be following on.
(64)E: Yeh]
(65)E: [Okay so]
(66)S7: Talking] about his ears.
(67)E: So you got from, you got from \(C\) to A through the idea of it the-, of it//being ab-] of it being about the ears.
(68)S7: Abou-, that's right]
(69)S7: Yeh, that's right//yeh]
(70)E: I] see. Well, yeh that's, that seems to be, so that you thought that that thing continued through, okay?
(71)S7: Aye.
(72)E: So erm okay well we'll go on to something in er, in a minute. I'll just, just ask you. Do you have any idea at this point about erm, of what the thing might, the whole thing might be about? Or some general ideas of.
(73)S7: Huh.
(74)E: Even very//simple]
(75)S7: Yeh] huh, it's definitely. About what the novel's about?
(76)E: Oh no, of what this//this] thing is about here, this, this passage is, what's happening here.
(77)S7: Of a-]
(78)S7: Uhm, well I don't follow you. You mean for, what the test is about? Or.
(79)E: No what the, what the passage is, is, is, is about. What's happening in the passage.
(80)S7: 0//h]
(81)E: Say] who the new men are, etcetera. Or what.
(82)S7: Mm. I'm not sure about the new men. I'm a(hhh).
(83)E: You d-, you don't know at all. You don't have much idea of what's g-, what's going on in the, in the whole thing//in the]
(84) S7: Mm]
(85)E: At this point in the novel say? Or what, you know, or what the, what the book's about and how this fits into//it]
(86)S7: I] don't know.
(87)E: You don't have any.
((pause))
(88)S7: Ah.
(89)E: General or even, ideas about it?
(90)S7: Oh fe-, you can see that it's, oh you know, someone's created a new man and.
((pause))
(91)S7: A new \(r-\), you know a new form of \(m, m, m\), person.
(92)E: Mm hm.
(93)S7: And.
((pause))
(94)S7: And that's just about all I can say.
(95)E: That's about all you think it is. What//do] you think Lok's doing in it, this, he's doing anything?
(96)S7: Aye]
(97)S7: He seems to, he's definitely not one of the new men.
(98)E: Yeh.
(99)S7: He seems to be a- like an intruder to me you know.
(100)E: Yeh. He's//outside] it somehow then?
(101)S7: A-, a-]
(102)S7: Yeh I think, aye, that's wha-, well that's what it seems to me anyway.
(103)E: Yeh. And//the] second man?
(104)S7: A-]
(105)S7: And it's. The second man? I think he's one of the new men. (106)E: He's one of the new men. Okay. Yes. Well that makes co-, that makes complete sense to me. Okay so we g-, we'll go back to, to how you got to the, if that's what you want to say//we'll go ba-] we'11 go back to the ordering. Okay, you got from C to A through the idea of, of the ears.
(107) 57 : ( ) aye]
(108)S7: Yeh.
(109)E: Okay so you've got that far. Now how do you, how do you get to \(G\) then from, from \(A\) ?
(110)S7: From A?
(111)E: Okay.
(112)S7: Uhm, er G is The hair lay at the, lay in a ball at the back of his neck. Then it says he has no hair at the front of his head.
(113)E: Yeh.
(114)S7: And so again, ju(hh)st as I was em on to C, I've, I've done the same thing.
(115)E: Yeh.
(116) S7: And I thought that it would be talking where his hair was. He had no hair on the front of//his] head.
(117)E: Yeh]
(118)E: Yeh.
(119)S7: Well I just (think) BUT the hair was at the back of his.
(120)E: So//you] employed 'but' or something there?
(121)S7: Head]
(122)S7: Yeh//some]thing like that.
(123)E: Yeh]
(124)E: So that. Oh I see right. So that then you put tha-, okay, so then how do you get from, from, from that point that you've got there, to, to \(B ? / /\) Is there]
(125)S7: To B?]
(126)E: Yeh how do you get that? From G to B?
(127)S7: There was much hair on his body.
((pause))
(128)S7: Well, I g-, I'd got this far.
(129)E: Yeh.
(130)S7: And I looked at it and I definitely know that \(C\) and, I mean sorry, that \(D\) and \(F\) were together.
(131)E: Yes.
(132)S7: And so I felt that B just had to go in there and it was going on//about the hair]
(133)E: Okay, so \(y-\) ] you'd had \(D\) and \(F\) sorted out already?
(134)S7: Aye.
(135)E: Okay.
(136)S7: That's right.
(137)E: So that, that you only had a-.
(138)S7: Mm hm, I only had the one to do.
(139)E: You only had a slot//so] you put B in there? There's//no] other reason why that, that should go in, in there?
(140)S7: Mm]
(141)S7: Mm]
(142)S7: Well again it was talking about his hair so it was.
(143)E: I see, so \(\mathrm{w}^{-}\), you had the A, A was connected by the ears, and it also told you where he had no hair?
(144)S7: Mm hm.
(145)E: Yeh//And] then you picked G because it, it told you where the hair was?
(146)S7: Yeh]
(147)S7: That's//right]
(148)E: Okay] so you implied tha- the 'But' in there.
(149)S7: Yeh.
(150)E: This, tell me if this is, this//is, this is] this is the way you, you saw it. And then you had one more thing about the hair?
(151)S7: Aye that's right, yeh]
(152)S7: That's right, yeh.
(153)E: And you just, pu-, had to put it into that blank spot?// Okay?] And then you said D and F had to go together. Why, why do \(D\) and \(F\) have to, have to go together? Any, any reason why those two. I mean it does in yours and it does in the, in the//in] the original.
(154)S7: Yeh]
(155)S7: Yeh]
(156)S7: Oh it was fairly obvious that it was either D or E that was going to start//the] passage off.
(157)E: Yeh]
(158)E: Yeh.
(159) S7: And it wouldn't go if, er, Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men. That's plural. He was broader and shorter.
(160)E: Yeh.
(161)S7: So I knew that wouldn't go.
(162)E: Because 'He' was.
(163)S7: Now it's 'He's' singular.
(164)E: Yeh.
(165)S7: HAnd the 'new men' were plural] aye.
(166)E: Because 'He' was singular]
(167) E: I see, so it couldn't g-, it couldn't say, go after E. But wha- why then does it have to go after, after \(F\) ? After, after D sorry? Why does, why does F have to go, go particularly after D?
(168)S7: Yeh.
(169)E: You think because, the, the singular?
(170)S7: Yeh.
(171)E: [Of the, thing that] you said before.
(172)S7: That's right, aye]
(173)E: Okay so those two have to go together somewhere.
(174)S7: That's right, aye.
(175)E: I//see]
(176)S7: 'Cause] it was. ((pause))
(177)S7: Oh. Oh I can see what I've done wrong here, aye.
(178)E: What's that?
(179)S7: That's he had no hair at the front of his head, aye.
(180)E: Yeh.
(181)S7: Er.
(182)E: Well what does that tell you now about//it?]
(183)S7: It] tells me that now, now that I've seen what's going on.
(184)E: Yeh.
(185)S7: If I was a bit more careful I would have seen, I would have seen that should have started it 'cause this is// (where it )]
(186)E: That D should have started] it, yeh. Because?
(187)S7: Because of it's in singular.
(188)E: Mm hm. So, well that doesn't make much difference does it, you've got singular, The second man and singular, He was broader, and singular, He had no hair.
(189)S7: Yeh.
(190)E: Is there any reason particularly why you should pick \(F\) to go after D rather than say A.
(191)S7: Uhm.
(192)E: I mean \(y-\), I mean that uhm, erm, that they all have the singular thing in them.
(193)S7: Yeh.
(194)E: I mean only, only \(E\) and \(C\) have the plural//don't they] they have men and ears.
(195)S7: We11]
(196)S7: Yeh, that's right.
(197)E: Was there any, would there be any reason say why \(F\) should follow D rather than A that you can.
(198)S7: Er.
(199)E: That you could think of? ((pause))
(200)S7: Well if you were just gi-, if you were just given uhm \(F\) and A, there'd be no reason why \(A\) wouldn't follow.
(201)E: Yeh.
(202)S7: But, if you have a look at the, oy, if you have a look at all the sentences.
(203)E: Yeh.
(204)S7: It's easy to see that uh where all the hair ties in.
(205)E: Yeh, yeh.
(206)S7: And, they all, they go together.
(207)E: So all the three sentences about the hair//( ) together]
(208)S7: Yeh you get them] together aye.
(209)E: So you wanted to, to bundle all those together in some way.
(210)S7: Yeh.
(211)E: And, and you had your reason for that here. You told me all about//how] how \(C\) goes to \(A\) and \(A\) goes to G.*

\footnotetext{
*See previous lines 61-71 and 109-123.
}
(212)S7: Yeh]
(213)S7: Yeh that's//it]
(214)E: I] see.
(215)S7: I never//realised] it, I just realised for the first time, that* was singular.
(216)E: ( )]
(217)E: Yeh.
(218)S7: Ah(hh)
(219)E: You realise that now but//not er while you were doing] you were doing the er, the test.
(220)S7: Yeh, that's right, aye]
(221)S7: Aye.
(222)E: Okay, now if I give you the, if we go back to this one** okay, we forget about your answer okay and we go back to// this] one. Okay, now you've got some, you've got some things that are very similar there. Okay. Now, now looking at that do you think that you can tell me any more about what's going on in the.
(222')S7: Yeh]
(223)S7: In the story.
(224)E: In, in the, in this passage?
(225)S7: In the passage yeh. 'The//second] man was un1ike the others. He was broader and shorter'.
(226)E: Mm hm ]
((long pause))
(227)S7: Well all this is certainly not about the new (men) \({ }_{(m a n)}^{( }\).
(228)E: The//the, the beginning, D, F, B, G]
(229)S7: ( ) it's not about the new \(\left.\begin{array}{c}(m e n) \\ (m a n)\end{array}\right]\) yeh.
(230)E: Okay, they're not about the new men//The new men only]
come in at E .
(231)S7: Yeh, that's right]
(232)S7: Mm//hm]
(233)E: You] think so.
(234)S7: They come in at the end of it.
(235)E: So the second man isn't one of the new men?
(236)S7: I don't think so//no]

\footnotetext{
* I.e., most likely A, G, B.
** I.e., the original ordering.
}
(237) E: You] don't think so, on, on that one. But you//thought so in your, in the one that you put together]*
(238)S7: But ( ) that's right yeh ( ) that one] there.
(239)E: I see. Erm. So he's, they're something separate now?
(240)S7: That's right, aye, Well//these fi-] these five sentences go together.
(241)E: I see]
(242)E: D, F, B, G and A?
(243)S7: Aye.
(244)E: Yeh.
(245)S7: No, that would start a new paragraph or something.
(246)E: That'd be something different?
(247)S7: Mm.
(248)E: The 'Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men'? I see, so that you think that, how, so what, how, wha-, how many groups are there? If Lok's, okay, Lok's different from them all.
(249)S7: It would seem that way yeh. Uhm. Yeh, I think so.
(250)E: Mm hm.
(251)S7: Well he's certainly not one of the new men.
(252)E: No//that's, that's] Yeh right. Well, wha-, I mean that, wh-, tha-, why, why would that be? Why can you, how can you tell that?
(253)S7: That's definite]
(254)S7: Well if he sai-, 'For the first time, Lok saw the//ears] of the new men.'
(255)E: Yeh]
(256)E: Right.
(257)S7: It's obvious he couldn't.
(258)E: Yeh//okay]
(259)S7: If he] was one of the new men he'd uh, a-.
(260)E: Yeh//right it's] pretty obvious//that y-]
(261)S7: I mean he'd]
(262)S7: Yeh, yeh]
(263)E: Okay, so that he's someone separate.
(264)S7: Aye.

\footnotetext{
* See previous line 105.
}
(265)E: But now you want the second man, up here, this other person// here] you want him to be different again? Does it have to be that way er, do they have to be different or?
(266)S7: Mm mm ]
(267)S7: Uh, Lok, you mean Lok and the second man?
(268)E: No, the, the new men and the second man. You said before* the second man wasn't one of the new men any more but he was in your, your ordering.
(269)S7: Yeh, that's right//aye] yeh//aye]
(270)E: Yeh]
(271)E: Yeh]
(272)E: Now do you think the same now? Now this is sort of getting a bit involved//(hhh) at the moment]
(273)S7: (Hhhh) hah, hah]
(274)E: Okay.
(275)S7: Uhm. I'm sorry, could you repeat the que(hhh)stion. I've got//tha-]
(276)E: Okay] Well before when I gave you the new sheet and you, I said is anything different now, you said that you didn't think the second man was one of the new men any more.
(277)S7: Yeh, aye//that's right, yeh because he was someone else] I put it in, aye the other order I put it//in]
(278)E: You thought he was, you thought he was someone else]
(279)E: Yeh]
(280)S7: Er.
(281)E: Now, now what do you think about the second man? Who is he? ((pause))
(282)E: Now that you see it in this er. ((pause))
(283)S7: Mm.
((pause))
(284)S7: He doesn't only seem to be a-. ((pause))
(285)S7: Like the same sort of form as Lok.
(286)E: Yeh, yeh.
(287)S7: And I, I can't see him being one of the new men.

\footnotetext{
* See previous lines 227-240.
}
（288）E：Either？
（289）S7：No．
（290）E：So he＇s someone／／different？］
（291）S7：I can＇t see him］Yeh．There are three different people on here（hh）．
（292）E：（Hhh）yeh．Okay，maybe that＇s why you，there＇s trouble．
（293）S7：＇The second man was unlike the others＇．
（294）E：Yeh．Who are the，who do you think the others might be in there？
（295）S7：Mm．
（（pause））
（296）S7：The others could be the new men．
（297）E：Yes．Yes．I understand that．So the second man gets compared with the new men then？
（298）S7：Yeh that＇s／／right］mm hm．
（299）E：Okay］
（300）E：So that＇s what you＇d be，you＇d be thinking of there？Okay right．Well I think we＇d better leave it there because． Unless there＇s something else you really want to s（hh）ay about this．
（301）S7：Uhm，not／／oh（hhh）aye，I am］oh hah hah．
（302）E：You look，you look very puzzled］
（303）S7：Er．
（（pause））
（304）S7：Yeh，I don＇t think I＇ve got anything else to say about it．
（305）E：Okay we＇ll leave it there．

READEX, SUBJECT EIGHT (D, F, B, G, A, E, C)
[S8 was shown the ordering E, C, D, F, B, G, A as 'correct']
(1)E: 'S it going? Yes. Erm. I'll show you, let's see, oh that's not the correct answer sheet, I've got one here.
(2)S8: How many people are you giving this test to?
(3) E: Oh about ten, so far.
(4) S8: Uh huh.
((pause))
(5) E: Where's my correc-, here we are. There it is.
(6)S8: ( )
(7)E: Now, there's not a lot of difference is there?
(8)S8: ((reads))
(9)E: Perhaps that should be, that should be an A shouldn't it? I'm sorry. I just typed that wrongly.* That should be an A .
(10)S8: ( )
(11)E: No. That's erm. No it's, it's the same except for, these have been swapped round. D and F are swapped with \(E\) and \(C\).
(12)S8: It makes sense both ways.
(13)E: Yes. Does, doesn't it?
(14)S8: I reckon so.
(15)E: \(0 / / k a y]\) so we'll talk about the way you made sense of it okay, we'll forget about that one for a while. Given that it can make sense both ways.
(16)S8: On the face of it]
(17) S8: Mm hm.
(18)E: Okay. So we'11 just talk about the way, the way you had it here. Erm, I only showed you that just, because you were probably wanting to know whether you'd.
(19) S8: Mm.
(20)E: How you'd got er, you'd gone. Erm so now if you, er what I want to, what I want you to do is to tell me erm how you got, the kinds of things you had to do to get to this ordering. Okay, was there any reason say, we'll sta-, naturally at the beginning, was there any reason why you

\footnotetext{
* The final letter of the sheet shown to S 8 as 'correct' was typed as ' \(E\) '. This is corrected to 'A'.
}
picked D for the, particular reason why you picked D for the erm, the first er, to start it?
(21)S8: Well it either had to be D or E because they were the only sentences which had nothing to do with any of the others. Well, which others could follow on from.
(22) E: Oh I see. Oh don't you mean, they were the only ones that, others could follow from?
(23)S8: Yeh.
(24) E: I see. I don't know what you mean by that exactly. Why, why, what's so special about \(D\) and \(E\) ? I'm just getting you to try and re-express it.
(25)S8: E//rm]
(26)E: I'm] not disagreeing, I'm//just] trying to get you to.
(27)S8: Yeh]
(28)S8: Well you can follow on from them, because the others are describing either \(D\) or E really.
(29)E: Yeh. But they don't describe anything themselves? Wha-, or they don't follow on from anything themselves? That's there?
(30)S8: Well they have to follow from \(D\) or \(E\).
(31)E: No the others have to follow from \(D\) or \(E\) but//D] or \(E\) don't follow anything?
(32) S8: Mm]
(33)S8: I couldn't see that they did, no.
(34)E: So you th-, so it had to be one of those two//So] what, is there any reason why you picked D, particularly?
(35) S8: Mm ]
(36)S8: We11 I went through them a11//and]picking D.
(37)E: Yeh]
(38) E: Rather than E?
(39)S8: Yeh, it just seemed to, sound better. You know it still flowed. Made sense. It was like a story.
(40)E: With D at the start?
(41)S8: Mm hm.
(42) E: More than E?
(43)S8: Yeh.
(44)E: Yeh. I see. What did you think the whole thing was about? The whole, this passage rather, was about?
(45)S8: The, well describing a man compared with other men, their ears and.
(46)E: Yeh. You didn't ha-, ha-, have any setting for the.
(47) S8: Oh I see.
(48) E: The, the thing? Any er.
(49)S8: No I hadn't thought about that, I was just busy getting them in order.
(50)E: You thought you could get them in order without thinking about anything like that? Oh I see okay. That's good. So, okay, well wha-, okay you got \(D\) to start with.
(51)S8: Mm hm.
(52)E: And you picked that from either D or E because, because they didn't, they didn't follow from anything but things followed from them.
(53) S8: Yeh.
(54)E: Okay right. Why did you get F next?//How, how] did you get to F? From D?
(55)S8: ( )]
(56)S8: Well they talk about two men. The second man was unlike the others, in D.
(57)E: Yeh.
(58)S8: And talking about the second man, He was broader and shorter, it just follows. The, none of the others would fit. You couldn't put 'They were tiny and screwed tightly into th-, the sides of their heads.'
(59)E: After?
(60)S8: After D.
(61)E: Oh I see. So wha-, well why couldn't you put 'He had no hair on the front of his head' after D?
(62)S8: Yeh, true. I guess I just didn't look at it.
(63)E: It was just chance?
(64)S8: Yeh.
(65)E: (Hhh). It was just chance that you put that one in there?
(66)S8: Probably. I just didn't think about the first one.
(67)E: I see. There was no reason.
(68)S8: Mm, well I thought there was. If I'd seen the other one I would have realised that there wasn't.
(69)E: Oh. You auto-, you just automatically went to \(F\) ?
(70)S8: Yeh.
(71)E: Oh, alright. (Hh). That's, that's rather peculiar I think. That that you didn't look for other candidates to go in that slot. Maybe \(y-, y-\), you just hit it and thought it was okay. But you've, you've done some rubbing out here.
(72) S8: Mm hm.
(73)E: So it looks like you might've changed your mind.
(74)S8: Yeh, I've forgotten what I had there.
(75)E: You've forgotten what you had? Okay. Why did. Okay so how did you, why did you go to B then? ((pause))
(76)E: After, after F? ((pause))
(77)S8: 'Cause in B they were just, continuing describing him. ((pause))
(78)E: Wha-, after, after 'He was broader and shorter'?
(79) S8: Mm.
(80)E: Uhm, why B rather than, than the oth-, than some of the others. 'Cause there are other sentences that continue descri//bing] him.
(81)S8: Well]
(82)S8: I put \(G\) which was another sentence which described him too.
(83)E: Yeh.
(84) S8: I could have put it where B is but after looking at B I realised that \(G\) had to be after \(B\) because.
(85)E: Okay, so you went to, to either B or \(G\) because they continued to describe him?//But] you chose B over \(G\) because?
(86) S8: Mm hm ]
(87)S8: Because they, describe his hair in B. Then they describe exactly where it was in \(G\).
(88)E: Yeh I see. So that you felt that B had to go before G?
(89) S8: Mm.
(90)E: No other reasons for that?
(91)S8: No.
(92)E: Was that actually how you thought of it when you were doing it or//did] you, you no-, or're you reconstructing it now? I mean.
(93) S8: Yeh]
(94)S8: I don't//know it's difficult. It] seemed easy enough when \(I\) was doing it but it's hard to, tell you why exactly I did all this.
(95)E: Did you actually think that way?]
(96)E: Yeh//s'pose, this is what I find]
(97)S8: Especially when I realise (what the other one says)]
(98)E: Oh this is what I find, that, that people have a very great sense of what it was they were doing, when they erm, when they were doing it but then they, they, it kind of goes. You know. Okay well we'11 try, all I want is to tr-, try and get you to go back to that okay, I know//that's] hard to do that, but if I, if I ask, if I ask about it in, in, in, in this order, then you should remember something about how you, how you were doing it. Okay, so you picked, you picked G, erm to go after B because it moved from, what was it you said?
(99) \(\mathrm{S} 8: \mathrm{Mm}\) ]
(100)S8: From B?
(101)E: Yeh, you picked \(G\) to go after B because. What was that reason//again?]
(102)S8: Well] they say 'There was much hair'.
(103)E: Yeh.
(104)S8: And then they describe THUH hair.*
(105)E: I see.
(106)S8: Which they've just described before in B.
(107)E: So if \(G\) had gone//first]
(108)S8: @(went)]
(109)E: Rather than \(B\), if it'd gone, \(G, B\).
(110)S8: It wouldn't have sounded right.
(111)E: It wouldn't have sounded right, because of the, 'There was// much hair']
(112)S8: 'Thuh hair']
(113)E: Yeh. Well what, what does that mean about thuh hair, about// the (way of) the hair]
(114)S8: That they've described] it pre//vious]ly.
(115) E: Yeh]

\footnotetext{
* See note to transcription of Subject One, line 137.
}
(116)E: So the, so, 'cause it's got 'thuh' okay, alright, yeh. So, I understand that so therefore, you had, you, you picked, let me, I'm, I'm trying to reconstruct what it was and talk back to you and you tell me if it was right. You picked, after the description, 'He was broader and shorter', you went to the, what d's, i-, did you say, more detailed or something?
(117)S8: Yeh]
(118)E: Des]cription. And then, and then it had to be either B or G.
(119) S8: Mm hm.
(120)E: You reckon. We11, or could it'd been A do you think?
(121)S8: It could've but, that was just going on with the hair description and \(I\) reckon you have to have \(G\), before \(A\).
(122)E: I see.
(123)S8: 'Cause G's more basic.
(124)E: G's more basic?
(125)S8: Mm.
(126)E: And B, what about B?
(127)S8: B, well that's the first sort of mention of the hair 'cause it was there was much hair.
(128)E: I see, right. And then \(G\) was thuh hair.
(129)S8: Mm//hm]
(130)E: Ok]ay, so then you only had, o-, okay, right, so th-, so that, that you went from, er hang on, I'm just, I'm just, get this back, you went from \(B\) to \(G\) because it went from an introduction to the hair then, a, something with thuh hair in it. Okay. Then to A. Well why couldn't it be B, A, G? Okay, there's ano(hh)ther question, why couldn't it go B, A, G? ((long pause))
(131)S8: It could but I reckon it'd sound more awkward.
(132)E: It'd sound awkward to say 'There was much hair on his body and his head-hair was sleek as if fat had been rubbed in it. He had no hair on the front of his head at all so that the, the sweep of bone came right over his ears. The hair lay in a ball at the back of his neck.' Then to E, 'Now for the//first
time, Lok saw the ears \(]\) of the new men.' That sounds wrong to you?
(133)S8: It doesn't really read]
(134)S8: No, not when you read it.
(135)E: Not when I read it. I was trying to read it without, too much into it. Okay. So suppose that you then pick. You th-, you've then got A. How, why do you then, why do you go to \(E\) then from, from, from \(A\) ?
((pause))
(136)E: Why does E come next? I know it's probably because you've only got two left (hh) (hhh) (hh) (hhh).
(137) S8: Mm.
(138)E: Why \(d-\), why does, is there any reason why E comes next?
(139)S8: Because they've finished describing one guy. And the two that are left describe a group of people compared with this one guy.
(140)E: There//was] what? There was just one of them? D'you think?
(141)S8: So]
(142)S8: Yeh.
(143)E: Yeh? You can't find any other reason why E should follow A at a11? That was, that was how you reasoned it?
(144)S8: Well why couldn't I put \(C\) there?
(145)E: You couldn't have put \(C\) there. Could you?
(146)S8: No.
(147) E: Why not?
(148)S8: 'Cause it has nothing to do with anything that's been said before.
(149)E: I see, but it has to come after E?
(150)S8: Yeh.
(151)E: Why does it have to come after E?
(152)S8: 'Cause in E you describe the ears.
(153) E:
(154)S8: And] it's just going on talking about//the ears]
(155)E: Okay] but there doesn't s-, you haven't really been able to tell me how you get from.
(156)S8: A to//E]
(157)E: Em] you've got this, you've got a sort of introduction, a D, F, right.
(158)S8: Mm hm.
(159)E: And you've got this bunch about the hair and the er the bone skin, etcetera, etcetera, and the hair in the ball at the back of his neck in, in a bunch, in the middle and then suddenly you go to E, C. Okay. I'm not thinking about the correct answer, I'm thinking about your, the way you did it.
(160)S8: Uh//huh]
(161)E: 0]kay. How do you get from \(A\) to \(E\) ?
(162) S8: Well this person has been looking at two men.
(163)E: Two men?
(164)S8: Yeh and comparing them. And then, he talked about the hair of one of them.
(165)E: Yeh.
(166)S8: Then all of a sudden he notices the ears of the other men and then describes the ears of the other men in C.
(167)E: So what's the connection between \(A\) and \(E\) ?
(168)S8: I guess there isn't one, but you would have had to have something before E because it says 'Now for the first time' well I think so anyway.
(169)E: Yeh, okay, that, that sounds quite right to me. So it's quite plausible but you can't. I mean, you can't actually find a, a link, why E has to go there at all?
(170)S8: Well it would have had to have been in number six.*
(171)E:
(172) S8: \(\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { Mr] one. } \\ \text { Or }\end{array}\right.\)
(173)E: Yeh. Why, why does it have to be six? Because of what you've got//so] far?
(174)S8: Yes]
(175)S8: Because you would have to put all those together.
(176)E: Yeh.
(177) S8: And//it was] in one in the other one, ** wasn't it?
(178)E: I see]

\footnotetext{
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(179)E: Yeh, it was in one in the other one. Erm. Oh wha-, what I was trying to get at actually was something that some other people've pointed out, was that in A he goes on to th- 'The bone came over his ears' and then in E he starts talking about ears. So that you get D, F, then you get a bunch about the//hair] and A is hair plus ears. And it goes to ears. Ears there. And then the description of//the] ears. That's a what I thought you might've, but you obviously hadn't.
(180) S8: Mm]
(181)S8: Yeh]
(182)S8: I just missed it comple-
(183)E: You hadn't ordered it for that.
(184)S8: No.
(185)E: For that reason. I'd, I just imagined that, that that was erm what you'd (hhh) what you'd done. Okay but if you, if that's, if you didn't see it that way, you didn't see it that way. That's fine. Erm so the whole thing is about, you were saying, about erm Lok, did you say, comparing two men?*
(186) S8: Mm hm .
(187)E: Okay who, who're the two men?**
(188)S8: Well we don't know what the first man was like//we know] him only because//the second]
(189) E: Okay]
(190)E: 'Cause he] starts with the second man.
(191)S8: Yeh.
(192)E: Okay. Right.

\footnotetext{
* See previous lines 45 and 162-164 although S8 does not mention Lok at either of these points.
**Fieldnotes for this recording have the following to say about the talk that starts here: Earlier [line 166] S8 has talked of the ears mentioned in E and C as if they are the ears of the new men alone and not the ears of the second man (primarily) and for this reason the ears of the new men (he being the one Lok's seeing and the one generalises from). It seemed here as if the second man was not read as one of the new men. However 58 has not objected to E's suggested A - E connection [line 179] which has the implication at least that the second man is one of the new men and, in seeing his ears, Lok necessarily sees an example of those of the new men. This questioning attempts to solve this problem (apparent contradiction). What does S8's reading here consist in?
}
(193)S8: We hear that he was broad and short.
(194)E: Etcetera, etcetera.
(195)S8: Yeh.
(196)E: Yeh, right. And then who're the, who're the new men?
(197)S8: They're the guys with the funny ears, aren't they?
(198)E: So that, so that the second man and your presumed first man that you had are some of the new men? That's what I'm trying to get at. Are they part of//the same ] group?
(199)S8: I had]
(200)S8: Two men, you only hear about the one.
(201) E: Yeh.
(202)S8: From//here] to here*
(203)E: Yeh]
(204)E: Yeh right.
(205)S8: And then//he suddenly notices]
(206)E: And then who do you get in here?]**
(207)S8: (A to) E. He looks at the other men, the new men.
(208)E: Are they different from the one and the two that you have?
(209)S8: [Yeh]
(210)E: \(\mathrm{Er}_{\mathrm{Er}}\) they're different people?
((long pause))
(211)E: You think they're different people?
(212)S8: Doesn't sound right at all.
(213)E: Doesn't?
(214)S8: You just. Yeh, they're different people.
(215)E: The one and the two aren't part of the new men?
(216)S8: No.
(217)E: Ah? I see. Alright.
(218)S8: Well could they be, from what I've said?
(219)E: With that ordering?***
(220) S8: Mm.
* I.e., from \(D\) to \(A\) in \(D, F, B, G, A, E, C\).
** I.e., in \(E\) and \(C\).
*** I.e., D, F, B, G, A, E, C.
(221)E: Er, don't know, I suppose you can read it that way but there's, say, say, the first man he was talking about, you, this man, this first man you assume, 'cause he's now talking about the second. Suppose he said 'The first of the new men was blah, blah, blah//The] second man was broader and shorter, blah, blah, blah.' He hadn't seen their ears at that time. Then the guy who he's looking over here. Okay, he notices and then for the first time he sees them. Then the//sec-] the first and second could be part of the new men. But you felt not. I mean if, initially.
(222) S8:

Yeh]
(223)S8: Yeh]
(224)S8: Yeh.
(225)E: Before I said that, did they seem like (distur-)//the first and the second and the new men]
(226)S8: Well presumably, after he says 'Now for the] first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.'
(227)E: So you think that, you think they'd be di-, different then? (228)S8: Yeh.
(229)E: From the one and the two that you had in the first place?
(230)S8: Yes well he compares them doesn't he. He says that their ears were tiny and screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.
(231)E: Yeh.
((long pause))
(232)E: But whose?
(233)S8: The new men.
(234)E: Not the, not the, not the second man?
(235)S8: No, no.
(236)E: Not the second man? So he's shifted his vision from the \(\mathrm{sec} / / \mathrm{lond}\) man] to the new men and the second man isn't one of the new men?
(237)S8: Yeh that's right]
(238)S8: No, not at all.
(239) E: Not at all?
(240)S8: No.
(241)E: I see.
(242)S8: (Hhhh) huh.
(243)E: Oh(hhh). Despite the fact that er he's talked about the, the second man's ears here.*
(244) S8: Mm.
(245)E: 'The sweep of bone skin came right over his ears' and then 'Now for the first time, Lok saw the ears of the new men.' So the stress is on 'new'. So those ears** aren't the ears of the new men? They're different ears?
(246)S8: Of course, 'cause it said 'his ears' and 'new men'.
(247)E: Oh I//see]
(248)S8: If] it was 'man' it could be 'his ears'.
(249)E: Oh I see, but there's one and two of them.
(250)S8: Uh?
(251)E: There's two of them you said, there's a first man and a second man.
(252)S8: Yeh, at the//beginning because] they'd have to be.
(253)E: Huh huh (hhhhh)]
(254)E: 'Cause//he said 'the second man']
(255)S8: Two men but] he could say 'He was broader and shorter' because it's comparing him with, I guess, one other man, although I guess he could be comparing him with a whole group, with the.
(256)E: Yeh.
(257)S8: 'Ears screwed tightly into the sides of their heads.'
(258)E: Okay, so they're somebody different? Okay, well I mean that's o-, I'm not saying that that's, that's not a plausible reason, that, that seems to be quite plausible//You] still have no idea about the \(s-\), the, the setting that this, this happens in?
(259) S8: Mm]
(260)S8: No.
(261) E: You don't have any idea about who the new men might be or, or who Lok is, or what's, what's, what's going on or?
(262)S8: No, I didn't think about it.
(263)E: Mm, I think that that's quite peculiar really that you didn't have any notion about that. You just decided it on the basis

\footnotetext{
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** I.e., the ears mentioned in A.
}
of what//was there]
(264)S8: Well you're] given no hint.
(265)E: No, not but er. I just wondered whether you had. Uhm, obviously not//You just managed to put it together]
(266)S8: Is it meant to make me think] of something?
(267)E: No, I//mean] it's not meant to make you think of anything it's just, I just wondered.
(268)S8: No?]
(269) S8: What do people say?
(270)E: What do people say?
(271)S8: Mm.
(272)E: Oh, they say er, that he's in the army or//some]thing inspecting new recruits. They say that he's a doctor looking at bodies. Ah, they say it's a man who's landed on a new planet.
(273) S8: Uh]
(274)S8: Heh, huh (hh).
(275)E: And things like that. Er those sorts of things which leads them to, to think about who the people are?//You] didn't have anything like that?
(276)S8: No ]
(277)S8: No.
(278)E: No//Then was jus-, it was just] sort of abstract categories of.
(279)S8: ( )]
(280)S8: Maybe that's why it didn't work.
(281)E: Oh it works fine. Y'know, that, that's one of the, that's a better ordering, I mean all this is together. All those are together. It's just they're swapped round. I mean that's, that's not a problem. Okay I'll just leave it at that. - ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ RECORDING ENDS \(\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ\)```
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