

## SEQUENTIAL ORGANIZATION OF POST-PREDICATE ELEMENTS IN KOREAN CONVERSATION: PURSUING UPTAKE AND MODULATING ACTION<sup>1</sup>

Kyu-hyun Kim

### Abstract

In this paper, various interactional features of turn-constructual unit (TCU) continuation as realized in Korean conversation through post-predicate elements are analyzed from a conversation-analytic perspective. Formulated as increments, post-predicate elements serve as re-completers by expanding the host TCU after it has reached a possible point of completion, which is explicitly marked by the utterance-final verb predicate. In many contexts of TCU continuation, the host TCU tends to be allusively constructed (e.g., in the form of a verb predicate with unexpressed arguments) and saliently indexical of the speaker's affective stance, and post-predicate elements, mostly taking the form of 'insertables', elaborate the host TCU. TCU continuation is often realized when the action of the allusive host TCU is 'disjunctively' executed, with the interactional import of being potentially interruptive of the current talk-in-progress. Such an intrusive deployment of the host TCU, which is implicated in the practice of foregrounding the speaker's collusively motivated responsive stance (e.g., in a confirmation request), is demonstrably oriented to by the speaker, who produces a post-predicate element as a methodic way of mitigating the disjunctive initiation of the prior action. The recipient also orients himself/herself to the potentially topic-derailing import associated with such a disjunctive initiation of action by way of initiating repair and/or promptly resuming his/her talk. As such, the production of a post-predicate element itself, mostly as an insertable that is grammatically and semantically related to the host, may not be directly attributed to interactional contingencies per se; it is often sequentially occasioned by practices geared towards enlivening the sequence being wrapped up, initiating or continuing an assessment sequence by way of highlighting the speaker's evaluative stance turn-initially, or building the current turn on the prior turn through turn-tying operations. The interactional feature of post-predicate elements 're-doing the completion point as a transition-relevance place' is partially manifested in the way the prosodic contour of the final or whole component of the host TCU is repeated and matched by that of the post-predicate elements.

**Keywords:** Turn-constructual unit (TCU); Post-predicate element; Increment; Insertable; Replacement; Sequence; Re-completer; Stance; Repair; Transition-relevance place (TRP); Prosody; Syllabic beat.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Yoshi Ono and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen for the opportunity to present an earlier version of this paper at the symposium they organized at the 8<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatic Conference held in Toronto, Canada, in July 2003. I am also grateful to Sandy Thompson for her insightful comments and suggestions, and for the opportunity to present a revised version of the paper at the LISO Colloquium at University of California, Santa Barbara, in October 2003. I also thank Gene Lerner, Geoff Raymond, Mary Bucholtz, and other participants at the LISO Colloquium for their helpful suggestions and criticisms. This work was supported by Kyung Hee University in 2003, and by the lecturing/research Fulbright grant in 2003.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, I report findings from the analysis of a practice in Korean conversation by which turn-constructual units (TCUs)<sup>2</sup> are continued past a point of possible completion by the addition of a post-predicate element. Various aspects of TCU continuation are examined from a conversation-analytic perspective (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974) with reference to the sequential contexts in which they are situated and the interactional import they have for organizing actions. Attending to some of the grammatical features of Korean that shape turn formations, the role of a post-predicate element is illuminated in relation to the interactional work accomplished by the host TCU, whose elliptical or allusive turn design warrants a further elaboration by a post-predicate element.

In spontaneous conversation, turns are constructed out of single TCUs, the completion of which can mark the end-point of a turn by audibly signaling that the unit is complete grammatically, intonationally, and pragmatically (Ford & Thompson 1996; Ford, Fox, & Thompson 1996, 2002). One of the options the speaker has at a point of possible completion is to continue to speak by extending the TCU that has just reached a point of completion, i.e., by adding a post-positioned element such as an increment (Schegloff 1996, 2001).<sup>3</sup>

In examining various aspects of TCU continuation in English, previous research has identified the practice of adding ‘increments’ to a TCU in progress. For instance, Ford, Fox, & Thompson (2002) provide a definition of a turn increment as a nonmain-clause continuation after a possible point of turn completion, which is based on prosody, syntax, and sequential action. One type of increment is identified as an ‘extension’ (Schegloff 1996). Extensions are “increments that can be heard as syntactic constituents of the immediately prior turn, which may take a variety of syntactic types, including NPs, adverbs, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, relative clauses and adverbial clauses” (Ford et al. 2002: 18). Instances of extensions as a type of increment in English conversation are given in examples (1), (2), (3), and (4). The extensions are marked in boldface:

- (1) I think everybody’s had her hmhhh! **for something**,
- (2) Have you been to New Orleans? **ever?**
- (3) We could’a used a little marijuana. **to get through the weekend**.
- (4) It drips on the front of the cars? (.) **if you park in a certain place?**

The TCU-continuing practice in English contrasts with that of Korean in the way the constituent formulated as an increment is grammatically related to its host TCU. Turns in Korean conversations are often constructed allusively, with a pre-verbal noun

<sup>2</sup> As initially noted in Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974), a TCU can be a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence, out of which a turn can be constructed.

<sup>3</sup> At a point where a turn is possibly complete, there are options made available by the turn-allocation rule, as proposed by Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974). First of all, a point of grammatical, intonational, and pragmatic completion constitutes a transition-relevance place (TRP) where turn transfer can occur, either by the speaker nominating the next speaker, or by the next speaker volunteering to speak next. Another option is for the current speaker to continue to speak. If the current speaker opts to do so, he/she has further sub-options; he/she can do this by adding a new TCU, or by extending a prior TCU, hence continuing the current turn, i.e., by adding an element to the prior TCU that has reached a point of completion. It is this last sub-option of continuing the current turn by extending the prior TCU that I am focusing on in this study.

argument being marked lightly (e.g., formulated as a zero-form or a demonstrative). Since Korean is a verb-final language with the ‘canonical’ S-O-(ADV)-V word order, such a turn design tends to warrantably offer the possibility of continuing the current TCU and retroactively elaborating the allusive aspect of the prior turn unit after its possible completion as signaled grammatically by a sentence-final modal suffix. Consider (5), (6), (7) and (8):

- (5) *mikwuk -iya:;, suthail-i.*  
America-COP:IE style -NOM  
“It is (just like department stores in) America, **The style (is).**”
- (6) *keki -se haycwu -ci -anh -na? kulen -ke?*  
there-LOC do:for:you-COMM-NEG-NONCOMM like:that-thing  
“Don’t (they) do (that) for you there? **Things like that?**”
- (7) *il -ha-kosip-eyo. (.) kakey-eyse.*  
work-do-want -POL store -LOC  
“I want to work. (.) **In the store.**”
- (8) *mal -un chama mos ha-keyss-e. (2.5) khun ay-tul-i -ntey.*  
telling-TOP not:have:the:heart not:able do-MOD-IE big kid-PL-COP-CIRCUM  
“I didn’t have the heart to tell them. (2.5) **Given that they are big (grown-up) kids.**”

Examples (5), (6), (7), and (8) illustrate cases in which constituents that could have been placed in a ‘canonical’ pre-position (e.g., pre-verbal position) (i.e., subject, object, a locative phrase, and an adverbial clause respectively) are produced as post-predicate elements. Note that they are added at the end of a sentence, whose end-point constitutes a point of a ‘highly plausible’ completion by virtue of being grammatically marked by sentence-final modal markers, such as the informal ending *-a/-e* in (5) and (8), the non-committative *-na* in (6), and the politeness marker *-yo* in (7) (cf. Lee 1991, 1993; Choi 1995).<sup>4</sup>

Korean post-predicate elements are thus different from English increments, in that the latter are mostly constituted by constituents that regularly occur at the ends of turns when they are produced as part of uninterrupted TCUs. From a typological perspective, this prototypical ‘increment’ (or ‘extension’) found in English conversation can be categorized as what Vorreiter (2003) calls ‘glue-ons’, a type of increment grammatically fitted to or symbiotic with the host TCU’s end. In Korean, what is added after a point of possible completion tends to take the form of an ‘insertable’, which, though not grammatically fitted to the host TCU’s end, expands the prior TCU by way of complementing the grammatical construction with which the prior TCU had apparently come to closure (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume). As we can see in examples (5)–(8), turns may be constructed with zero-forms or ‘light’ reference forms such as demonstratives (e.g., *ku* ‘that’ or *keki* ‘there’). Such a turn design offers the likelihood that post-predicate elements will be formulated as ‘insertables’ or ‘replacements’, which

<sup>4</sup> One of the language-specific grammatical features that makes the Korean TCU-continuing practice distinct from that of English is that, Korean being a strictly verb-final language, the single most salient point of grammatical completion is explicitly marked, and post-predicate extensions normally occur after the endpoint of a sentence or a clause that is heavily marked by utterance-final elements, i.e., by sentence-final suffixes and other modal markers, aspect markers, or honorific markers, which are attached to the verb. In this respect, whereas in English conversations one can speak past a number of more or less equally possible points of completion, in Korean one is likely to speak past at least one distinctively salient point of possible completion marked by the sentence-final morphology that is attached to a sentence or a clause, which is normatively and grammatically the most salient and the most probable transition-relevance place.

replace some part of the host, for the purpose of retroactive elaboration (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume, Kim 1999, 2001a).<sup>5</sup> In this paper, I will use the more general term ‘post-predicate elements’ interchangeably with the terms ‘increments’ or ‘insertables’ for referring to those post-predicate additions that retroactively elaborate the allusively constructed host TCU following a prosodic break.

The data used for this study include a set of audio-recorded informal conversations: *After Dinner* is a conversation between couples. *Lunch Talk* is a conversation between graduate students studying in the U.S. *TA Meeting* is a loosely structured TA meeting conversation between Korean TAs who are graduate students studying in the U.S. *Y & S* is an informal telephone conversation between female friends. *Park S.-H. data* is a collection of informal face-to-face conversations between graduate students studying at a university in Korea.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 analyzes the interactional features of TCU continuation in terms of the role that post-predicate elements play in modulating the action and affect organized by the host TCU as the speaker deals with a variety of interactional contingencies. In Section 3, the sequential contexts in which allusively formulated confirmation questions are followed by a post-predicate element are examined with reference to their disjunctive placement, which has the import of foregrounding the speaker’s collusive and responsive stance. In Section 3.1, the production of a post-predicate element is analyzed as a sequentially occasioned practice geared to mitigating the way the prior action (i.e., confirmation request) is disjunctively implemented. In Section 3.2, the tendency of those collusive confirmation questions to be followed by repair initiation is noted and analyzed as an embodiment of the co-participant’s orientation to the disjunctive deployment of confirmation questions. A patterned distribution of post-predicate elements in repair sequences, which can be observed in terms of their absence in the recycled turn, is analyzed in terms of their association with a position in which the display of affect and responsiveness towards the preceding talk is sequentially relevant. Section 4, which includes three sub-sections, is devoted to the analysis of three additional aspects of the sequential contexts which contribute to the production of post-predicate elements: Sequence re-initiation, assessment initiation/continuation, and tying operations. The analysis suggests that post-predicate elements, mostly formulated as ‘insertables’, may be occasioned by a range of sequential work other than interactional contingencies. In Section 5, the prosody of post-predicate elements is analyzed in terms of its affinity with that of the host TCU or the final component thereof. Finally, Section 6 presents concluding remarks.

## 2. Dealing with interactional contingencies: Modulating prior action and pursuing reciprocity

Previous findings on English turn increments show that they are produced in the service of continuing and modulating the action done by the prior turn unit, often in pursuit of recipient’s uptake (Ford et al. 2002). In the same vein, post-predicate elements in Korean conversation are also found in a wide range of contexts where they are added to modulate

---

<sup>5</sup> This typological feature makes the occurrence of glue-ons very rare in Korean, due to the explicit marking of syntactic completion. As in Japanese, the glue-on category in Korean seems to be limited to the case in which what is added (e.g., a complementizer) makes the just-completed utterance a complement clause (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume).

the action done by the prior TCU, often in the context of eliciting reciprocity. Fragment (9) is a case in point. This conversation is from an informal conversation during a TA meeting of graduate students teaching Korean at a university in the U.S.:

- (9) (TA Meeting)
- 1 J: *samsip pwun -ul cwu-nikka ay -tul com (.) nacwungey*  
 thirty minute-ACC give-REASON kid-PL a:little later
- 2 *mak sinmwun po -ko kule -tay,*  
 without:reservation newspaper see-CONN do:like:that-HEARSAY
- 3 *etten ay(h)-nun,*  
 some kid -TOP  
 “I gave them 30 minutes and I’ve found that the kids (finished the quiz early and) went about reading the newspaper during the quiz, **some kids(h)**,”
- 4 M: *kule -lkke -eyyo.*  
 like:that-MOD-POL  
 “I guess that should be the case (=That’s not surprising).”

In lines 1-3, J complains that, in the class he is teaching, the students finish the quiz early and then read the newspaper. He produces the sentence-final hearsay marker *-tay* in line 2 by which his personal observation is presented as a reported fact whose newsworthiness is to be appreciated by the recipient. Produced in a slightly rising, response-eliciting intonation,<sup>6</sup> the utterance is extended by the post-predicate element *etten ay-nun* ‘some kids’. This post-predicate element complements the prior TCU by further explicating the subject; the subject *ay-tul* ‘the kids’ in line 1 is retroactively revised as *etten ay* ‘some kids’.<sup>7</sup> The addition of the post-predicate element serves to mitigate the prior complaining action by narrowing down the scope of the student population in J’s class reading the newspaper during a test, i.e., from ‘the kids’ to ‘some kids’, thus making the potentially face-threatening act of complaining less intensive.

Also consider (10). In lines 1-3, J is talking about his students cheating during a test, and in lines 4-5, M criticizes J’s way of handling the problem. Two instances of a post-predicate element are found (line 3 and lines 4-5):

- (10) (TA Meeting)
- 1 J: *nameci ay -tul-hanthey yenghyang-i ka-lkkapoa*  
 rest kids-PL-DIR influence -NOM go-lest
- 2 *mal -un chama mos ha-keyss-e.*  
 telling-TOP not:have:the:heart not:able do-MOD-IE
- 3 (2.5) *khun ay -tul-i -ntey.*  
 big kid-PL-COP-CIRCUM  
 “I didn’t have the heart to tell them not to cheat because it may affect the rest of the class. (2.5) **Given that they are big (grown-up) kids.**”
- 4 M: *kulekhey-- kule -nikka te mwuncey-ci -yo. ta khun*  
 like:that do:like:that-REASON more problem -COMM-POL all grown:up
- 5 *ay -tul -i (.) kulen cis ha-ko issu-un//ikka.*  
 kid-PL-NOM like:that (bad) conduct do-PROG -REASON

<sup>6</sup> Note that while in J’s report the final component of the host TCU (*kule-tay*.) is produced in a slightly rising intonation (as represented by a comma), it marks a point of possible completion, i.e., in such a way that the recipient is prompted to appreciate the newsworthiness of what is being reported (also see (17) and (19)). Note that this prosodic pattern is repeated through the post-predicate element, which is also produced in a slightly rising intonation (*etten ay-nun*.). The prosodic affinity between the final component of the host TCU and the post-predicate element will be discussed in Section 5.

<sup>7</sup> In this sense, this post-predicate element can be categorized as a ‘replacement’, a type of add-ons that replaces some part of the host TCU (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume, Vorreiter 2003).

“Like that-- That’s what makes it more problematic. **Because grown-up kids are doing such a thing.**”

6 J:

[  
uhh .h

In lines 1-3, as his report of some students cheating during the test is not taken up by the interlocutors and a 2.5 sec.-long pause follows in line 3, J produces an increment in the form of a clause (‘Given that they are big (grown-up) kids’), which constitutes a self-justifying and collaboration-seeking account for why he did not rebuke the cheaters. However, this account provides grounds for one of the interlocutors, M, to dispute J’s position (lines 4-5). Note that M’s turn also contains a post-predicate element, an increment produced in the form of a post-positioned adverbial clause of reason (‘Because grown-up kids are doing such a thing’), which in turn provides grounds for her counter-argument.

Given that utterance-final elements located in the often turn-final verb predicate in Korean include an array of face-managing and stance-indexing markers, the work that post-predicate elements do attains a particularly important interactional import. In modulating the action implemented by the turn-in-progress, post-predicate elements offer themselves as a sort of buffer in the aftermath of the delivery of an action whose face-impinging upshot is often heavily imbued with the speaker’s displayed affect. They thus manage turn transition by rendering the completion point of the current turn less affect-laden than it would have been if no post-predicate element had been added.<sup>8</sup>

The affect-managing role of post-predicate elements is well illustrated in the context in which they are produced after a negative interrogative, which tends to constitute a potentially face-threatening or non-aligning action in the form of a confirmation request (see Section 3.1). In this context, the host TCU is expanded by a post-predicate element usually without any pause in between but with a clear prosodic break, with the post-predicate element inheriting the prosodic features of the utterance-final component of the host TCU (see Section 5). Consider fragment (11). In line 4, M adds an adverb (*wenlay* ‘originally’) to her negative interrogative in the context of making a counter-argument against S’s claim that things are more expensive in the student store than in the department store:

(11) (TA Meeting)

((In this conversation, J, S, and M are talking about holiday sales where things can be purchased at lower prices. In the preceding context, S has claimed that she finds the student store on campus to be more expensive than a local department store, and J has raised doubt about her claim.))

- 1 S: *te pissa -yo talun mwulken mwunpangkwa-to*  
more expensive-POL other stuff stationery -ADD  
2 *hwuelssin pissa -yo.*

<sup>8</sup> The fact that I am using only audio data for this paper severely constrains the analytic potential, and I cannot show how the production of an increment as a particularly contingent practice is motivated by the need to elicit reciprocity or address any emerging visual symptom adumbrating a dispreferred response from the recipient (e.g., frowning or headshaking) (Ford 1993; Ford et al. 2002; Goodwin 1979, 1981). Even though the lack of video data does not allow us to examine whether the production of a post-predicate element is contingent upon the speaker’s noticing some potential problem emerging in the course of talk, we have a sense that, with the action being organized in a step-wise fashion, the TCU continuing practice furnishes the speaker with the resources for negotiating the ground on which the upshot of the host TCU is to be collaboratively taken up by the recipient. Such negotiation for collaborative uptake would be lost if those elements formulated as post-predicate elements were used in their so-called ‘unmarked’ pre-verbal position.

- much:more expensive-POL  
 “It’s more expensive (at the student store). Other stuff like stationery is much more expensive too.”
- 3 M: *ku -ke hangsang ku-- ceki yosay -nun ilum*  
 that-thing always that there these:days-TOP name
- 4 *tuleka-myen kulehkey pissa -ci anh -ayo? wenlay?*  
 go:in -COND like:that expensive-COMM NEG-POL originally  
 “That thing, that--, I mean, isn’t it the case that those with brand names are always expensive?  
**Originally?** (=regardless of the place where they are sold)”
- 5 (.)
- 6 S: *ah kuntey cham ippu -te -lakwu -yo ku -key*  
 DM by:the:way very pretty-RETROS-QUOT-POL that-thing:NOM
- 7 *ilen pathang -ulo toy -e -iss -kwu hayan*  
 like:this background-INSTR become-CONN-exist-CONN white
- 8 *pathang -i toy -e -iss// -nuntay -yo,*  
 background-NOM become-CONN-exist-CIRCUM-POL  
 “Oh, by the way, it (the shirt) is very pretty, that thing. It has this kind of background and against this white background, ...”
- 9 M: [ *eh::*  
 “I see.”

Note that M’s negative interrogative is not produced as an information-seeking question but as a device by which the speaker asserts an opinion (Heritage 2002). In this sense, fragment (11) illustrates an exemplary case in which the addition of a post-predicate element becomes particularly relevant and warranted by the face-threatening nature of the strongly opinionated counter-argument. Here, the adverb *wonlay* ‘originally’, produced as a post-predicate element, serves to frame M’s counter-argument not as something that is based on her own personal view, but as a fact that can be commonsensically agreed upon on the basis of shared world knowledge, thus mitigating the extent to which M’s argument is attributed to her opinion as asserted by the host TCU.<sup>9</sup> From the perspective of turn-taking, the utterance-final component *-ci-anh-ayo* (committal-negative particle-politeness marker) of M’s negative question (line 4) constitutes a possible completion point, and, with this first opportunity for uptake having been passed, the post-predicate element creates a bit of additional leeway for the recipient to appreciate its import as a counter-argument and prompts her to be responsive at the point of re-completion.<sup>10</sup>

In the same vein, consider fragment (12), which shows a stretch of informal after-dinner conversation between couples. In the preceding context, J has been complaining that he is too busy to take care of his car problem, i.e., having run out of windshield wiper liquid. In line 4, R (J’s wife) asks a confirmation question, suggesting a place where J can go to fix the problem. Formulated as a negative question, R’s turn begins with a demonstrative *keki-se* ‘there’. As a type of allusive reference, this

<sup>9</sup> Note in lines 6-8 that S avoids answering M’s negative question by bringing up a different topic (i.e., a pretty shirt she has found at the store). This backing-off on the part of S suggests that S treats M’s negative interrogative as the assertion of opinion strongly imbued with a critical stance.

<sup>10</sup> Given that S’s claim has already been challenged by another participant, J, in the preceding context, there is a sense in which M’s negative interrogative constitutes an upgrade of J’s previous challenge, and the placement of the post-positioned adverb mitigates the force of M’s counter-argument while preempting the projected dispreferred response foreshadowed by there being no immediate uptake from S, as signaled by the micro-pause in line 5.

expression evokes a place presumably known by J and prompts him to identify it.<sup>11</sup> This question is then followed by a post-predicate element (*kulen-ke?* ‘Things like that (kind of service)?’):

- (12) (After Dinner)
- 1 J: *.h e i -ke mwe -ka mwncey-ka sayngki*  
uh this-thing something-NOM problem-NOM came:about
- 2 *-ess -nun -ke -n cal al -keyss-nuntey, ai (.)*  
-PST-ATTR-NOML-TOP well know-MOD-CIRCUM DM
- 3 *keki -kkaci nay-ka sinkyeng ssu-key sayngki -ess-e?=*  
there-DEL I -NOM attention use-COMP come:about-PST-IE  
“h uh I know that there is some kind of problem, but I can’t afford to pay attention to such a thing.”
- 4 R: *=keki-se haycwu -ci -anh -na? kulen -ke?*  
there-LOC do:for:you-COMM-NEG-NONCOMM like:that-thing  
“Don’t (they) do (that kind of service) for you there? **Things like that (kind of service)?**”
- 5 (0.4)
- 6 J: *mwe.*  
what  
“What.”
- 7 R: *//caki ku -ke ha-n -tey -se.=*  
you that-thing do-ATTR-place-LOC  
“At the place where you had it done.”
- 8 J: *e--*  
“uh--”
- 9 J: *=ai ku -ke -n na-- na-to ha-lswuiss-ulkkeya. ...*  
DM that-thing-TOP I I -ADD do-can -MOD:COP:IE  
“Well, that I-- I probably can handle it myself. ...”

The allusively constructed negative question furnishes R with a resource for bringing up her point in a ‘collusive’ way by proposing that knowledge of the place she is talking about is shared by J. When R uses the demonstrative form *keki* ‘there’ turn-initially in suggesting a place where J can have his car repaired, she is demonstrably making a claim that the place being referred to is known to the recipient.<sup>12</sup> The allusive feature of the host TCU in R’s turn, as well as the manner in which the turn latches onto J’s prior turn (lines 3-4), contributes to formulating it as an immediate response to the on-going talk, with the confirmation question serving as a vehicle by which the speaker’s responsive stance is disjunctively but efficiently inserted in J’s complaint in progress.

Note that what R is doing here by her confirmation request is to basically offer a ‘pragmatic’ solution to J’s problem by proposing a place where J can go to fix the car problem (i.e., the lack of windshield wiper liquid). At first glance, this pragmatically oriented question seems collaborative enough. However, by virtue of the sequential place where it is produced, it has the interactional import of possibly derailing the course of talk J has been engaging in, i.e., by not aligning with his self-commiseration but proposing a solution instead.<sup>13</sup> The post-predicate element, which is added as a retroactive

<sup>11</sup> As discussed in Kim (2001a), confirmation questions are also frequently observed in topic-initial positions, where an allusive aspect of the TCU, often marked by the demonstrative *ku* ‘that, near the addressee’, tends to index a high degree of collusiveness.

<sup>12</sup> For a more detailed analysis, see Kim (2001a).

<sup>13</sup> The potentially disjunctive import of R’s confirmation request is immediately oriented to by J, who treats R’s contribution as being out of line with the whole point of his talk, the upshot of which is that he is so busy with his study that he does not have the time to have his car problem fixed. J’s stance is displayed



elaboration of the previously unexpressed object (*kulen-ke* ‘things like that (kind of service)’), serves to mitigate the potentially presumptuous act of proposing a solution by way of being formulated as a reference to a ‘type’ (i.e., ‘things like that’) rather than to a specific referent.

As fragments (11) and (12) show, the interactional work achieved through the production of post-predicate elements includes not only the modulation of the level of displayed affect but also the mitigation of the manner in which the prior action (i.e., confirmation request) is ‘sequentially’ brought up in the middle of an extended turn by the other speaker. TCU continuation in this context thus embodies the speaker’s orientation to the interactional need for dealing with the disjunctive and interruptive way in which his/her prior action is implemented. The production of post-predicate elements, in this sense, provides the speaker with a methodic way of mitigating the disjunctive and potentially interruptive manner in which the prior action is sequentially initiated.

In the following sections, this sequence-managing role of post predicate elements is further examined with reference to how the participants demonstrably orient themselves to the sequential intrusiveness associated with the deployment of confirmation-seeking questions.

### 3. Collusively motivated confirmation request

#### 3.1. *Mitigating the disjunctive sequential placement of prior action*

As illustrated by fragments (11) and (12) examined above, an allusively constructed confirmation question, which tends to be extended with a post-predicate element retroactively modulating the prior action, is often asked as a way of displaying a responsive stance that has the interactional import of challenging the speaker’s point. In many contexts, confirmation questions are deployed as a device for displaying collaborative reciprocity towards the current talk, with the other speaker being positioned as the primary speaker, as illustrated by fragments (13) and (14) below. While in such contexts they often serve as a collusive inquiry in which interest and involvement in the current talk is turn-initially displayed, the way they are brought up is still disjunctive and is oriented to by both the speaker and the addressee as being potentially topic-derailing and interruptive of the current talk (as in (11) and (12)).

Consider fragment (13) first. This fragment illustrates a case in which TCU continuation is practiced as a way of taking up and appreciating the delivery of news collaboratively. This conversation takes place in a situation where the participants are talking about the Korean modal marker *keyss*. One of the participants, S, is considering this as a research topic, and in the preceding context, she asked H if he can provide her with any information about it. In lines 1-2, H mentions that one of their mutual friends

---

by the ‘dispreferred’ way in which he responds to R’s confirmation request, i.e., by the emergence of the 0.4 second-long gap in line 5 and a repair initiation in line 6. Also note that, as R performs repair in line 7 by clarifying the trouble source, J initially starts his turn in competition with R’s repair turn. He then latches a disagreeing turn (line 9) that downgrades the point raised by R. The discourse marker framing J’s turn in line 9, *ai*, which has been translated here with ‘well’, has the interactional import of downgrading or denying the relevance or appropriateness of a prior point towards the theme of the current talk (also see J’s turn line 2, where the same discourse marker is used). As will be discussed later, J’s repair initiation can be taken as evidence suggesting that he also orients himself to the disjunctive import of R’s confirmation request.

(‘Mr. Jin Sung-Soo’) knows a lot about the subject, and in line 3 S accepts the referred-to person as a future source of reference. After a pause in line 4, another participant, K, comes in and takes H’s advice as news and asks an inference-based question about whether the referred-to person, Mr. Jin Sung-Soo, wrote his M.A. thesis on *kyess* (lines 6-7). In this turn, the subject of the utterance, ‘Mr. Jin Sung-Soo’, is not initially expressed in the host TCU but is produced as a post-predicate element preceded by a micro-pause (line 7):<sup>14</sup>

- (13) (Lunch Talk)
- 1 H: *cin seng -swu-kwun-i tto ku manhi al -kkel*,  
Jin Sung-Soo-Mr. -NOM again that much know-MOD
- 2 *kyess -ey tay/hayse*,  
‘keyss’ -about  
“Mr. Jin Sung-Soo should know (about it) a lot, about the modal marker *keyss*.”
- 3 S: [ *kylay -yo? eh yeyccwu -e -po -aya -toy*  
like:that-POL DM ask-HONOR-CONN-see-NECESS-become
- 4 *-keyss-ney*.  
-MOD-FR  
“Really? Then I should ask him.”
- 5 (1.2)
- 6 K: *maysthe nonmwun-ul ku -ke -llwu*  
master thesis -ACC that-thing-INSTR
- 7 *sse -ss -eyo? (.) cin-seng-swu-ssi -ka?*  
write-PST-POL Jin Sung-Soo-Mr.-NOM  
“Did (he) write his M.A. thesis with that thing (=about that topic)? **Mr. Jin Sung-Soo?**”
- 8 (1.8)
- 9 H: *ung?*=  
yes  
“Huh?”
- 10 K: *=maysthe nonmwun-ul sse -ss -eyo? ku -ke -llwu?*  
master thesis -ACC write-PST-POL that-thing-INSTR  
“Did he write his M.A. thesis? With that thing (=about that topic)?”
- 11 (0.9)
- 12 H: *ani*,  
no  
“No.”

Characterized by allusive turn design features (e.g., subject not explicitly mentioned), the host TCU in this question provides a format through which K expresses his interest and surprise towards the information that H has just given. As such, the speaker’s appreciative stance is initially displayed.

Even though K’s inference-based, confirmation-seeking question is apparently produced as collaborative uptake, i.e., news receipt, it has the potential of possibly derailing the course of the ‘advice-giving’ talk in progress due to its nature as a factual inquiry. Preoccupied with a factual detail (i.e., whether Mr. Jin Sung-Soo wrote his master’s thesis about *keyss*), K’s inquiry is not totally aligned with the kind of action (i.e., advice-giving) being constituted by H’s announcement.<sup>15</sup> K demonstrably orients to this

<sup>14</sup> In (13), we find 3 instances of a post-predicate element (lines 2, 7, and 10). Due to limited space, I will focus on the one in line 7. The one in line 10, which takes place in a turn following a repair-initiating turn in line 9, will be briefly addressed in Section 3.2.

<sup>15</sup> Actually, the way H brings up the topic about ‘Mr. Jin Sung-Soo’ in lines 1-2 suggests that H is oriented not so much towards highlighting the newsworthiness of the information itself as towards bringing into

disjunctive and possibly topic-derailing import of his confirmation question by adding a post-predicate element, which allows him to produce another point of completion at which the recipient is prompted to respond on the basis of his initial take on the stance displayed through the host TCU. The recipient (H), for his part, also orients himself to the intrusiveness of K's confirmation question by way of initiating repair (line 9) (see Section 3.2).

In the same vein, consider fragment (14) below. In the context preceding this conversation, L has been telling the story of a movie about a Japanese concentration camp in Manchuria during World War II where the Japanese army allegedly conducted experiments using humans as subjects. In line 2, K, one of the story recipients, produces a confirmation-seeking question, whose presupposed subject (*keki-ka* 'that place') is not initially expressed in the host TCU but is added as a post-predicate element:

(14) (Lunch Talk)

((L has been explaining the content of a movie about a Japanese concentration camp in Manchuria during World War II.))

- 1 L: *silhem ta hay -po -ass -ulkke -ya.*  
experiment all do:CONN-see-PST-MOD-COP:IE  
"I figure they did all kinds of experiments."
- 2 K: (*kulem*) *wonlay seykywun mantu-nun -tey -eyyo? keki -ka?*  
then originally germs make -ATTR-place-COP:IE there-NOM  
"Then, originally is (that) the place where they made germs? **That place?**"
- 3 L: *ney?*  
yes  
"Pardon?"
- 4 K: *seykywun mantu-nun -tey -eyyo?*  
germs make -ATTR-place-COP:IE  
"Is (that) the place where they made germs?"
- 5 L: *sekywun. (.) kulayackwu .....*  
germs so  
"Germs. (.) So ....."

The allusive turn format of the host TCU enables K to ask a confirmation question to show interest and display a collaborative stance towards L's story in progress in a highly topic-continuous way (Givón 1983).<sup>16</sup> However, at the sequential point where K's question is produced, i.e., immediately after L has initiated a side-sequence (Jefferson 1972) by offering a self-assessment of his own story (line 1: "I figure they did all kinds of experiments."), K's confirmation-seeking question has the interactional import of being disjunctive and overly inquisitive about factual details and thus as having the potential of possibly bringing about a shift in the current course of talk. K's production of the

---

relief his own status as an advisor. Such an orientation seems to be subtly displayed by the way H's reference to Mr. Jin is formulated in line 1. Note that the referred-to person 'Mr. Jin Sung-Soo' is introduced with the title *-kwun* 'Mr.', which is a title normally used in a highly 'formal' context where an announcement is made or where an older person addresses a much younger person. Given that H is referring to his friend (who is younger than him by only about four years) in a highly informal context, this anomalous use of *-kwun* evokes a 'formal announcement' context that frames H as the official provider of needed advice.

<sup>16</sup> The basically collaborative nature of K's confirmation question is partly shown by the fact that its content is based on an inference readily made from the prior talk, so the point it raises tends to be something that is likely to be easily confirmed by the story-teller, even though the sequence may not play out like that in cases where the inference is not correct (see fragment (13)).

post-predicate element, then, can be taken as displaying his orientation towards the need to mitigate the sequentially disjunctive import of his own confirmation question.

That the recipient L, who is positioned as the story teller, is also treating K's confirmation question as being disjunctive is demonstrated by the fact that he initiates repair (*ney?* "Pardon?")<sup>17</sup> and prompts K to clarify what his confirmation question is about (line 3) (also see (12) and (13)). Furthermore, note that after K's repair turn in line 4, he simply registers it with an extremely minimal acknowledgment done in passing in the form of a bare noun phrase (*sekywun* 'germs') and proceeds to continue his story with the resumption marker *kulaykaciko* 'so' (line 5). That L resumes his story promptly with minimal response further suggests that he is oriented to the disjunctive character of the preceding talk by way of attempting to delete or cover up the intervening repair sequence that was triggered by K's disjunctive confirmation question.

### 3.2. Post-predicate elements and the recycled turn

As I noted in the preceding section with respect to fragments (12), (13) and (14), confirmation questions extended with a post-predicate element are followed by the primary speaker's next-turn repair initiator (NTRI) (*ney?* "Pardon?" or *ung?* "Huh?") (see line 6 in (12), line 9 in (13), and line 3 in (14); also see line 8 in (19) in Section 4.2), which initiates a repair sequence (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977). As discussed earlier, such a tendency can be accounted for as an embodiment of the speaker's orientation to the disjunctive way in which the other speaker brings up an allusively constructed confirmation question. The practice of initiating repair in response to TCU continuation provides an interactional space in which the speaker can launch into a process of 'catching up' with what is indexed by the other speaker's allusive trouble-source turn in the course of appropriately aligning (or disaligning) with his/her displayed stance.

With respect to the distribution of post-predicate elements in a repair sequence, it should be noted that post-predicate elements tend not to be recycled in the repair turn, where the content of the trouble-source turn is repeated for clarification. That is, components previously produced as post-predicate elements in the trouble-source turn tend to be omitted or relocated to pre-verbal position in the recycled turn (i.e., repair turn) (also see fragment (19)). For instance, in (14), the post-predicate element *keki-ka* 'there-NOM' in line 2 is not present when the turn is repeated in response to L's repair initiation. The recycled turn is marked by a double-headed arrow:

- (14) (Lunch Talk)
- 1 L: *silhem ta hay -po -ass -ulkke -ya.*  
experiment all do:CONN-see-PST-MOD-COP:IE  
"I figure they did all the experiments."
- 2 K: (*kulem*) *wonlay sekywun mantu-nun -tey -eyyo? keki -ka?*  
then originally germs make -ATTR-place-COP:IE there-NOM  
"Then, originally is (that) the place where they made germs, **that place?**"
- 3 L: *ney?*  
yes  
"Pardon?"
- > 4 K: *sekywun mantu-nun -tey -eyyo?*

<sup>17</sup> L's repair initiation prods K to repeat his question in line 4. Notice that the question in the repair turn, repeated for clarification, does not contain the post-predicate element *keki-ka* 'that place', which was present in the trouble-source turn in line 2. I will return to this point in Section 3.2.

germs make -ATTR-place-COP:IE  
 “Is (that) the place where they made germs?”

Likewise, we find in (13) that the subject of the utterance (‘Mr. Jin Sing-Soo’), which was previously expressed as a post-predicate element in line 7, is not present when the turn is recycled in line 10:

- (13) (Lunch Talk)
- 6 K: *maysthe nonmwun-ul ku -ke -llwu*  
 master thesis -ACC that-thing-INSTR
- 7 *sse -ss -eyo? (.) cin-seng-swu-ssi -ka?*  
 write-PST-POL Jin Sung-Soo-Mr.-NOM  
 “Did (he) write his M.A. thesis with that thing (=about that topic)? **Mr. Jin Sung-Soo?**”
- 8 (1.8)
- 9 H: *ung?*=  
 yes  
 “Huh?”
- > 10 K: *=maysthe nonmwun-ul sse -ss -eyo? ku -ke -llwu?*  
 master thesis -ACC write-PST-POL that-thing-INSTR  
 “Did he write his M.A. thesis? **With that thing (=about that topic)?**”

In the recycled turn in line 10, a noun phrase marked with the instrumental case marker (*ku-ke-llwu* ‘with that thing’), which was initially located in a pre-verbal position (line 6), is formulated as a new post-predicate element. K’s successive use of a post-predicate element suggests that he is repeatedly asserting his affective stance (i.e., being inquisitive) and continuing to orient himself to the interactional need to mitigate the disjunctive way his confirmation action was initiated.<sup>18</sup>

That post-predicate elements tend not to be recycled in the repair turn seems to provide further evidence that a post-predicate element is motivated as a way of mitigating the sequentially disjunctive way in which the confirmation request is initially made. In a recycled turn, the speaker would be removed from the earlier position where the interactional work of modulating the disjunctive import of the prior action and affect display associated with it was sequentially relevant with respect to the immediately preceding talk (cf. Schegloff 1987). As the main business of a recycled turn (i.e., a repair turn) is to clarify the referential content of the trouble-source turn *per se*, with little or no need to re-display responsiveness and highlight affect towards prior talk, there would be much weaker motivation for the speaker to re-initiate the post-completion space

<sup>18</sup> When K repeats most of his trouble-source turn in the repair turn in line 10, there is a delicate sense in which the turn is constructed to continue the trouble-source turn rather than directly respond to the repair-initiating turn:

... *cin-seng-swu-ssi-ka* (line 7) [*ung?*] *maysthe nonmwun-ul sse-ss -eyo? ku-ke-llwu?* (line 10)

“... Did **Mr. Jin Sung-Soo** write his master’s thesis? With that thing (=about that topic)?”

The post-predicate element (*cin-seng-swu-ssi-ka* ‘Mr. Jin Sung-Soo’), which is marked by the subject marker *ka*, is used as a pivot linking the current turn to the next; as the subject of the utterance, it is also grammatically linked forward to the next turn as its subject. A similar pattern is observed in (14), where the subject added as the post-predicate element in K’s turn in line 2 (*keki-ka?* ‘That place?’) also serves as the subject of his repair turn in line 4:

... *keki-ka* (line 2) [*ney?*] *seykywun mantu-nun-tey-eyyo?* (line 4)

“... Is **that place** the one where they made germs?”

This inter-turn ‘cross-over’ phenomenon can be analyzed as an aspect of the sequential operation employed by the speaker of the trouble-source turn to delete the intervening repair-initiating turn (see Kim 2001b for further discussion).

management or re-engage the recipient in the response elicitation process performed earlier *in situ* in the trouble-source turn.

The association of TCU continuation and affect display is also saliently observed in the context in which the speaker expresses surprise over new information, and we find the same pattern in which a recycled turn does not contain a post-predicate element. Consider fragment (15). A post-predicate element is found in line 7, which is produced as a replacement (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, this volume):

- (15) (Y & S)
- 1 S: *ya pelsse mwusun yey -nun cwunghaksayng*  
VT already what this:kid-TOP middle school student
- 2 *kekceeng-ul ha-ni o haknyen-pakkey*  
worry -ACC do-QUES five grade -outside
- 3 *//an toy -ess -nuntey.*  
NEG become-PST-CIRCUM  
“Hey, why are you so worried about choosing a middle school already? Your daughter is only a fifth grader.”
- [
- 4 Y: *ung sam kay-- cikum sa kaywel*  
yes three now four month
- 5 *nam -ass -e wuli ttal::.*  
remain-PST-IE our daughter  
“See, she is only three-, four months away from being a middle school student, my daughter.”
- 6 (.)
- 7 S: *kay ywuk haknyen-i -nya? //kay -ka?*  
that:kid six grade -COP-QUES that:kid-NOM  
“She is a sixth grader? **She (is)?**”
- [
- 8 Y: *(sam kaywel)-i -ci::.*  
three month -COP-COMM  
“Actually (three months) away.”
- > 9 S: *ywuk haknyen-i -nya?*  
six grade -COP-QUES  
“She is a sixth grader?”
- 10 Y: *o haknyen-ttay -hako ywuk haknyen-ttay-hako -n emma maum-i*  
five grader -time-with six grader -time-with-TOP mom mind -NOM
- 11 *wancen//hi (tal) -tela.*  
completely different-RETROS:IE  
“I’ve found that being the mother of a fifth grader is totally (different) from being the mother of a sixth grader.”
- [
- > 12 S: *eng:: cham pelsse ywuk haknyen-i -ni?*  
I:see DM already six grade -COP-QUES  
“I see. Wow, she is already a sixth grader?”

Throughout the preceding conversation, S has assumed that Y’s daughter is only a fifth grader. Given the news that she is actually going to be a middle school student in three or four months (lines 4-5),<sup>19</sup> S expresses surprise in line 7 through an inference-based confirmation question, where the subject of the sentence (*kay* ‘she’) is

<sup>19</sup> We also find that Y’s turn in lines 4-5 contains a post-predicate element (*wuli ttal* ‘our daughter’). Note that this turn, by which Y refutes S’s rebuke, interrupts S’s turn-in-progress that she is responding to (lines 1-3). Y’s production of the post-predicate element, in this sense, serves to mitigate the disjunctive way her prior action is sequentially executed towards S’s turn.

repeated as a post-predicate element, marked by the subject marker *ka* (*kay-ka?* ‘‘She (is)?’’).

The TCU continuation practiced in this context further confirms our observation that the turn format containing a post-predicate element is geared towards mitigating the disjunctive initiation of the prior action (i.e., expressing surprise). Note that, when S repeats her confirmation question successively in lines 9 and 12 with a decreased level of affect and responsiveness, the subject that was produced as a post-predicate element in her original question in line 7 is not recycled. Also note that Y does not explicitly take up S’s confirmation request but simply continues her turn (lines 8, 10, & 11). That Y is not demonstrably distracted by S’s fact-finding confirmation question suggests that she is also oriented to the disjunctive way S’s confirmation question has been initiated, as embodied in her attempt to delete and cover up S’s inquiry (see earlier discussion of (14)).

The tendency of the post-positioned argument to be deleted or placed in the pre-verbal position (also see fragment (19) in Section 4.2) in the recycled turn suggests that the ‘unmarked’ (Subject)-(Object)-Verb word order may be a constitutive feature of the context in which focus is given to an explication or clarification of referential content, rather than to an expression of the speaker’s responsive stance made relevant by the prior context.

#### 4. Other sequential motivations

The preceding discussions suggest that that, even though there are certainly many contexts in which the production of post-predicate elements is very much contingent upon the need to address lack of the recipient’s uptake, we also find a sense in which many of them are sequentially occasioned by the speaker’s practice of organizing actions and sequences, e.g., addressing the disjunctive and potentially topic-derailing way the prior action is implemented through the host TCU. In this section, I examine three additional aspects of the sequential contexts which motivate the production of post-predicate elements: Sequence re-initiation, assessment initiation/continuation, and tying operations.

##### 4.1. *Re-initiating sequences*

Fragment (16) below illustrates a context in which TCU continuation is motivated by the sequential operation in which a sequence being terminated is re-initiated. This is a context in which TCU continuation takes place in a second pair part in response to a sequence-initiating action constituted by its first pair part (Lerner 2003). In lines 1-2, J asks K, a TA coordinator, whether an answer key to a language lab worksheet is available. This question is done as a pre-request, i.e., as an indirect act of making a request (Levinson 1983). In line 3, K responds that the answer key is available, but he adds that they may not need it on that day. After checking the day when they are supposed to use the answer sheet, J withdraws his request in line 8. However, K tells J that he is going to give him the answer key anyway, and offers it. This sequence, then, is organized as a request-offer adjacency pair with an insert sequence intervening:

(16) (TA Meeting)

1 J: *kuntey ah cham onul lab worksheet-twu (.) hay-cwu-eya-*

- by:the:way DM RM today lab worksheet-ADD do -give-NECESS  
 2 tway -yo? tap -i nawa -ss -eyo?  
 become-POL answer-NOM come:out-PST-POL  
 “Oh, by the way, are we supposed to use the lab worksheet too in class today? Is the answer key available?”
- 3 K: *cham lab worksheet-i -yo? ce- tap -un iss -nuntey*  
 RM lab worksheet-COP-POL that answer-TOP exist-CIRCUM  
 “Oh, you mean the lab worksheet? Well, the answer key is available, but,”
- 4 (.)
- 5 J: *ku onul--*  
 that today  
 “That, today--”
- 6 K: *//onul due-eyo? we-- we-- welyoilnal due-ketun-- //due-- due-ntey,*  
 today due-COP:POL Monday due-INFOR due due-CIRCUM  
 “Is it due today? You know--, that is due on Mon-- Monday.”
- 7 J: [ ( ) ] *hanpen po -ca.*  
 one:time see-PROP
- 8 *welyoilnal ha-ci -yo kulem.( )*  
 Monday do-COMM-POL then  
 “Let’s see. ((checks the schedule)) Then I’ll do it on Monday. ( ).”
- 9 K: *tuli -lkkey -yo. cikum tap.*  
 give:HONOR-MOD-POL now answer  
 “I’ll give (it) to you. **Now, the answer key.**”
- 10 (2.4)
- 11 M: *hangsang kim min-ki ssi -nun cwunpi -ka tway-iss -e.*  
 always kim min-ki Mr.-TOP preparation-NOM OK -exist-IE
- 12 (0.5) *ttak meli sok -ey (i -key) ttak*  
 precisely head inside-LOC this-thing:NOM precisely
- 13 *mwe -ka nao -a hangsang.*  
 something-NOM come:out-IE always  
 “Mr. Kim Min-Ki is always ready. (0.5) He has his mind prepared and set to deal with any contingency at the right moment. Always.”
- 14 S: *(maynnal--) kulen -ke(h)kat(h)-ci, hh*  
 everyday like:that-seem -COMM  
 “(Everyday--) You may think so (=but actually he is not like that). hh”

In line 9, K’s offer is made by an allusively constructed TCU, which presents the upshot of his imminent, cooperative action in the form of a verb predicate (*tuli-lkkey-yo* ‘I’ll give’). This is followed by two post-predicate elements (*cikum tap* ‘now, the answer key’), which specify the time and the object of his offer respectively. Notice that K’s turn-initial verb predicate contains the modal component *-lkkey*, which expresses the speaker’s willingness to act for the benefit of the hearer (“I’ll give (something good for you)”). With K’s cooperative stance being turn-initially foregrounded, this turn configuration is aligned to the preference structure and enhances contiguity with J’s pre-request in lines 1-2.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> K’s turn is oriented to by the participants as the one whose main interactional upshot is to display the speaker’s cooperative stance, i.e., through the turn-initial positioning of the allusive TCU (*tuli-lkkey-yo* ‘give:HONOR-I’ll-POL’). The examination of the subsequent context confirms this. Even though K’s turn is not met with a response from J in the form of a verbal appreciation of K’s offer, another participant (M) comes in and praises K for the readiness and efficiency instantiated by his offer (lines 11-13). M’s appreciation of K’s displayed stance as an instantiation of his character is then established as the subsequent topic, as another participant, S (K’s wife), comes in and jokingly disputes M’s positive assessment of K (line 14).



It should be pointed out that, in a typical request-offer adjacency pair, the use of the verb predicate alone in the second-pair part would be normatively more appropriate, with the referents present in the first-pair part warrantably missing in the immediately following second-pair part. What is special about (16) is the presence of an elaborate insert sequence (lines 3-8), which is brought to a close by J's withdrawal of his request (line 8). Given that the withdrawal of request nullifies the need to produce the second-pair part (offer or rejection), K's offer in line 9 has the interactional import of re-opening and enlivening the sequence that is being wrapped up at the initiation by the interlocutor. This sequential feature seems to warrant the explicit mention of the object and time of the offer, but not at the turn-initial position, because, in the face of the interlocutor's withdrawal of the request, the speaker (K) need to strongly display his cooperative stance turn-initially as he attempts to disjunctively re-open the sequence on the brink of being terminated.<sup>21</sup>

#### 4.2. Assessment sequence

The presence of allusive features in the host TCU, which are often sequentially shaped and functionally motivated to maintain topic/action continuity (Givón 1983), furnishes the speaker with a resource by which he/she can weave into the on-going talk on-line his/her affectively-loaded, stance-revealing uptake in the course of initiating or sustaining an assessment sequence. Fragment (17) illustrates a context in which a highly allusive TCU, constructed with a verb predicate with unexpressed subject (*mikwuk-iya* 'It is (just like department stores in) America'), furnishes the speaker with the means by which she can foreground her affectively loaded evaluative stance towards a department store mentioned earlier as she initiated the assessment sequence. The subject of the utterance is then elaborated in the form of a post-predicate element (*suthail-i* 'the style (is)'):

- (17) (Y & S)
- 6 S: *apkwuceng-iya talu -ci apkwuceng-tong*  
 Apkujeong -COP:NECESS different-COMM Apkujeong-district  
*keki -nun ki -cwuk-ese mos ka-keyss -tela.*  
 there-TOP spirit-die -CAUS not:able go-MOD-RETROS:IE  
 "Apkujeong district is of course different. (The department store in) Apkujeong district is so overwhelming that I don't dare to go there."
- 7 Y: *ung:://::*  
 "I see."
- 8 S: [  
*na han-pen ka-ss -nuntey mikwuk -i -tela mikwuk.*  
 I one-time go-PST-CIRCUM America -COP-RETROS:IE America  
 "I went there once, and I found it was just like in America, I mean, America."
- 9 Y: *hhhhhhhhhhhh/hhh*
- 10 S: [  
*mikwuk -iya::, suthai//l-i.*  
 America-COP:IE style -NOM  
 "It is (just like department stores in) America. **The style (is American).**"
- 11 Y: [  
*(keki) apkwuceng-tong ...*  
 there Apkujeong-district

<sup>21</sup> It should also be pointed out that positing the two phrases produced as post-predicate elements (*cikum tap* 'now, the answer key') in pre-verbal position, i.e., in the word order of Adverb-Object-Verb (e.g., *cikum tap tuli-lkkey-yo* 'now, the answer key, I'll give'), would not be appropriate in this context because it would accord unnecessary contrastive emphasis to the referents.

“(There) Apkujeong district....”  
 ((Y talks about the department store at issue.))

The host TCU (*mikwuk-i-ya* ‘It is (just like department stores in) America.’), which takes the form of an identificational structure with the format of ‘A is B’, is formulated as a metaphoric descriptor assessing the given target referent, i.e., a department store located in Apkujeong district, a wealthy area of Seoul. The term ‘America’ in the host TCU is being used here as a descriptor for this target referent, which is assessed as being overwhelmingly luxurious – just like an American department store.

Actually, S used the same descriptor (*mikwuk* ‘America’) in her preceding turn (line 8) in assessing the department (*mikwuk-i-tela* ‘I found it was just like in America.’). There is a sense that, as Y responds to her assessment with laugh tokens in line 9, thus suggesting that S’s assessment is being taken as a joke or as an overstatement, S repeats the same assessment in line 10 with an upgraded level of affect; the turn-initial placement of the descriptor being repeated in the host TCU serves to orient the hearer to the speaker’s evaluative stance being re-asserted and further elaborated with the post-predicate element (*suthail-i* ‘The style’) (see Section 4.3). As signaled by the stretching of the final sound of the sentence-final modal component *-ya* (copula plus informal ending) and by a slightly rising intonation, the host TCU is produced in a fashion that elicits the recipient’s appreciation in the course of sustaining the assessment sequence (see footnote 6). Formulated as a short, single TCU, it makes relevant the recipient’s immediate reappraisal of the speaker’s displayed stance.

It is to be noted that the host TCU is allusively constructed and quickly delivered such that the recipient does not have enough time to respond at its completion point. The addition of the subject as a post-predicate element then provides a space for the speaker to tone down the level of affect displayed in the assessment made in the host TCU<sup>22</sup> and for the recipient to formulate a response on the basis of the uptake of the speaker’s displayed stance. Notice, in this respect, that, in (17), Y responds to S’s assessment in partial overlap with the post-predicate element (lines 10 and 11).

In the same vein, consider fragment (18), where B’s turns contain a post-predicate element (lines 50, 55 and 57). In this conversation, the participants are female graduate students talking about a mutual female friend (Su-Hee) whose voice has been analyzed by a speech analysis program:

- (18) (Park S.-H. Data)  
 49 B: *kunkka swuhi enni -ka cham kulehkey kkaykkutha-tay -yo*,  
 I:mean Su-Hee older:sister-NOM really like:that clean -HEARSAY-POL  
 “I mean, I’ve heard that Su-Hee is so clean.”  
 → 50 //ikey (1.0) *moksoli cachey-ka*.  
 this:NOM voice itself -NOM  
 “**This**, (1.0) (**her**) **voice itself** (is so clean).”  
 [  
 51 C: *u:ng*  
 yes  
 “Right.”

<sup>22</sup> We find a subtle sense that, compared with the host TCU that intensively delivers an affectively loaded action (*mikwuk-i-ya* ‘It’s America.’), the post-predicate element (*suthail-i* ‘the style’), which evokes a notion according to which the target is being assessed, serves as a more referentially oriented turn-final component that is specialized for modulating the prior action and managing turn completion/transition (also see fragments (18) and (19) below).

- 52 A: *etten moksoli-i -ntey -yo?*  
 what:kind voice -COP-CIRCUM-POL  
 “What is her voice like?”
- 53 B: *eh kikyey -ey nao -lttay kikyey -ka--*  
 machine-LOC come:out-when machine-NOM  
 “uh when it comes through the machine, the machine--”
- 54 A: *tut -ki -ey -nun an nanglangha-ntey?*  
 hear-NOML-LOC-TOP NEG resonant -CIRCUM  
 “But it’s not resonant when you actually hear (her voice)?”
- 55 B: *nanglanghay. (.) //tut -ki -ey -twu.*  
 resonant:IE hear-NOML-LOC-ADD  
 “It is resonant. (.) **To our ears as well (=When you actually hear her voice as well).**”  
 [
- 56 C: *ung. ung.*  
 yes yes  
 “Right. Right.”
- 57 B: *nanglangha-ci -yo? swuhi enni moksoli ha-myen.*  
 resonant -COMM-POL Su-Hee older:sister voice do-COND  
 “It’s resonant, isn’t it? **If you do (=analyze) Su-Hee’s voice.**”
- 58 (1.0)
- 59 C: *nanglangha-ci.*  
 resonant -COMM  
 “It sure is resonant.”

In lines 49-50, B makes an assessment of her friend’s voice in an allusive way (“I’ve heard that Su-Hee is so clean”), and the specific target of the assessment is produced as two post-predicate elements (*ikey* (1.0) *moksoli cachey-ka* ‘This, (1.0) her voice itself’). In lines 55 and 57, B’s assessment continues as she consecutively uses the descriptor *nanglangha* ‘resonant’ turn-initially, with the information that frames that assessment being added as a post-predicate element (*tut-ki-ey-twu* ‘to our ears as well’ in line 55 and *swuhi enni moksoli ha-myen* ‘if you do (=analyze) Su-Hee’s voice’ in line 57). In line 55, B sustains the assessment sequence in the course of responding to A’s inquiry in line 52. In line 57, she continues the assessment sequence as she asks C a confirmation question, which leads C to further sustain the sequence by making a co-assessment aligned with A’s evaluative stance (line 59). Also note in lines 50 and 55 that, as in (17), the recipient’s collaborative uptake is elicited in overlap with the post-predicate element.

The TCU format furnished by TCU continuation provides the speaker with the means of initiating or sustaining an assessment sequence in such a way that the recipient is oriented to the evaluative stance of the speaker. With the speaker’s evaluative stance being initially displayed, the post-predicate element, while elaborating and supporting the host TCU and its action import, does the job of toning down the level of displayed affect and creating a transition space where the recipient can display appreciation or make a co-assessment. The sense of managing the post-completion space in these fragments seems to be particularly salient because the information or the referent mentioned in the post-predicate element is mostly inferable from the context (see (17) and (18)).

Fragment (19) shows another case in which TCU continuation provides a turn format geared to initiating an assessment sequence in a way that maintains turn contiguity (see Section 4.3). In this conversation, C is telling his friends the name of his new-born daughter (‘Chloe’) (line 1), and as a touched-off topic, C brings up his observation that even Americans were not familiar with this name (lines 5-6). With the name ‘Chloe’ being repeated from the preceding turn (line 1) and placed turn-initially, the subject ‘American kids’ is formulated as a post-predicate element:

## (19) (Lunch Talk)

((C is telling his friends the name of his new-born baby. In the immediately preceding context, C has given the baby's Korean name.))

- 1 C: *mikwuk ilum -un khuloi*  
American name-TOP Chloe  
"Her American name is Chloe."  
((A couple of turns in side sequence are omitted.))
- 4 (2.8)
- 5 C: *khuloi-la kule -nikka cal molu-*  
Chloe -QUOT say:like:that-REASON well not:know-
- 6 *te -la, (.) mikwuk ay-tul.*  
RETROS-QUOT:IE American kid-PL  
"When I said 'Chloe,' they didn't get it, (.) **American kids.**"
- 7 (0.8)
- 8 H: *ung?*  
"Huh?"
- 9 (0.4)
- 10 C: *mikwuk ay-tul -to khuloi-la kule -nikka*  
American kid-PL-ADD Chloe -QUOT say:like:that-REASON
- 11 *cal molu -te -lakwu -yo.*  
well not:know-RETROS-QUOT-POL  
"Even American kids didn't get it when I said 'Chloe'".
- 12 H: *khuloi?*  
"Chloe?"
- 13 C: *ung. ( // )*  
yes  
"Yes."
- 14 H: [ *suphelling-i ettehkey toy -nuntey.*  
spelling -NOM how become-CIRCUM  
"How is it spelled?"
- 15 C: *si eyichi (.) eyl o i.*  
'c' 'h' 'l' 'o' 'e'  
"C-H- (.) -L-O-E."

The host TCU in C's turn (lines 5-6) does not express the subject but projects that it will be elaborated on subsequently. This allusive feature indexes the speaker's 'motivated stance', which in this case is implicated in a negative affect displayed in the host TCU as something to be explicated and grasped by the recipients. It is through this feature of the allusive TCU that we (as recipients or as analysts) are oriented towards C's particular stance with respect to his daughter's name. At the same time, the way in which C's observation is allusively formulated serves to orient the recipient to the upcoming subject as a newsworthy fact (or even as a counter-expectation). With the subject 'American kids' being post-positionally mentioned, C's observation as a whole goes beyond reporting Americans' lack of knowledge; it makes relevant a particular form of an appreciation on the part of the recipient: Viz., a grasp of C's boastful stance about himself being savvy and competent in finding a special name that even Americans allegedly do not know.<sup>23</sup>

Notice that, unlike the majority of the extracts examined in this paper, where the

<sup>23</sup> It is probably partly due to the subtlety implicated in the import of C's turn continuation that H initiates repair in line 8. As discussed in Section 3.2, the subject that was previously formulated as a post-predicate element in the trouble-source turn in line 6 ('American kids') is now placed pre-verbally when the turn is recycled as a repair (lines 10-11) in response to H's repair initiation in line 8.

post-predicate elements tend to be more or less a superfluous item, such as given or inferable information that can be retrieved from the prior context, this particular post-predicate element contains new information ('American kids'). This point provides us with the sense that the addition of the post-predicate element may not be so much contingent on the need to manage a potential lack of uptake as it is a strategically motivated turn-design feature associated with what might be called the grammar of 'insertables', which is constitutive of a particular way of bringing up a new observation as a touched-off topic and foregrounding the speaker's stance displayed in it as something to be grasped by the recipient.<sup>24</sup>

One notable pattern that is emerging through the analysis of the assessment context is that the host-TCU and the post-predicate element furnish a turn format in which an assessment (made in the former) is immediately followed by its target referent (mentioned in the latter). Observe this turn-constructional pattern ('Assessment-Target Referent') in (17), (18), and (19):

	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Target Referent</u>
(17)(Line 10)	<i>mikwuk-iya</i> ('It is (just like... in) America.')	<i>suthail-i</i> ('The style')
(18)(Lines 49-50)	<i>kkaykkutha-tay-yo</i> ('I've heard ... is so clean.')	<i>ikey, moksoli cachey-ka</i> ('This, (her) voice itself')
(19)(Lines 5-6)	<i>cal molu-tela</i> ('(they) didn't get it.')	<i>mikwuk aytul</i> ('American kids')

This turn-organizational pattern suggests that the practice of grammatically relating insertables to the host has become stabilized as a systematic way of foregrounding the speaker's evaluative stance, one that is fitted to the interactional need to engage the co-participant in initiating or sustaining a co-assessment sequence. This leads us to consider the possibility that the end-point of the host TCU may be constitutive of what might be called a 'pre-transition-relevance place', with the target referent being 'designedly' formulated as a TCU-final component specialized for *post hoc* affect-managing work.<sup>25</sup>

#### 4.3. Tying operations and TCU continuation

Some of the ways in which post-predicate elements are sequentially occasioned can be analyzed in terms of tying operations by which the current turn is tied to the prior turn

<sup>24</sup> The sentence-final element *-tela* in C's turn in line 6 characterizes the content of the turn as a quasi-self-directed 'personal' observation, which is offered as a fleeting comment touched off by his prior talk, such that any of the participants can opt to take it up. It is noteworthy, in this respect, that when C repeats the turn in lines 10-11 in response to H's repair initiation (line 8), he uses a different form of a retrospective-quotative combination (*-telakwu*), which, unlike *-tela*, is more interlocutor-directed and thus can be used with the politeness marker *-yo* (line 11). The use of the politeness marker here is understandable because C is now responding exclusively to the repair-initiating turn of H, who is senior to him. Note in passing that H's repair-initiating turn serves to establish the topic that has been raised by C in the trouble-source turn as something to be subsequently addressed (cf. Button & Casey 1984).

<sup>25</sup> This point seems to be particularly relevant when the content of a post-predicate element is not superfluous but contains new information crucial to the understanding of the turn-in-progress, as in (19).

(Sacks 1992, Heritage 1984). This sequence-organizational feature is saliently observed in assessment contexts. For instance, note in (19) that C begins his turn with ‘Chloe’ in line 5, which is tied to its prior mention in the preceding turn in line 1. This particular tying operation provides a context in which the subject of the utterance (‘American kids’), which could have been placed in the pre-verbal (and turn-initial) position, is relegated to the post-predicate position. The relevant portion of the extract is re-introduced below. The part that is repeated from the prior turn is placed in a box, and its English translation is marked by underlining:

- (19) (Lunch Talk)
- 1 C: *mikwuk ilum -un* *khuloi*  
 American name-TOP Chloe  
 “Her American name is Chloe.”  
 ((A couple of turns in a side sequence are omitted.))
- 4 (2.8)
- 5 C: *khuloi*-*la kule -nikka cal molu*  
 Chloe -QUOT say:like:that-REASON well not:know-  
 6 *te -la, (.) mikwuk ay-tul.*  
 RETROS-QUOT:IE American kid-PL  
 “When I said ‘Chloe’, they didn’t get it, (.) **American kids**.”

Also consider fragment (17), where S’s turn in line 10 contains the descriptor *mikwuk* ‘America’ repeated from her prior turn and turn-initially placed. Repeating the descriptor as part of the turn-initially positioned predicate occasions a TCU continuation in which *suthail-i* (‘the style (is)’), which could have been placed turn-initially as the subject of the utterance, is relegated to a post-predicate position:

- (17) (Y & S)
- 6 S: *apkwuceng-iyā talu -ci apkwuceng-tong*  
 Apkujeong -COP:NECESS different-COMM Apkujeong-district  
*keki -nun ki -cwuk-ese mos ka-keyss -tela.*  
 there-TOP spirit-die -CAUS not:able go-MOD-RETROS:IE  
 “Apkujeong district is of course different. (The department store in) Apkujeong district is so overwhelming that I don’t dare to go there.”
- 7 Y: *ung:://::*  
 “I see.”
- 8 S: *na han-pen ka-ss -nuntey* *mikwuk*-*i -tela* *mikwuk*  
 I one-time go-PST-CIRCUM America-COP-RETROS:IE America  
 “I went there once, and I found it was just like in America, I mean, America.”
- 9 Y: *hhhhhhhhhhhh/hhh*
- 10 S: *mikwuk*-*iyā::, suthai//l-i.*  
 America-COP:IE style -NOM  
 “It is (just like department stores in) America. **The style (is American).**”
- 11 Y: *(keki) apkwuceng-tong ...*  
 there Apkujeong-district  
 “(There) Apkujeong-district....”  
 ((Y continues to talk about the department store at issue.))

In the same vein, we find in fragment (18) that turns are constructed with the descriptor *nanglangha* ‘resonant’ turn-initially used consecutively (lines 55, 57, and 59), which is tied to the same term used in A’s prior turn in line 54:

- (18) (Park S-H Data 4)
- 54 A: *tut -ki -ey -nun an nanglangha-ntey?*  
 hear-NOML-LOC-TOP NEG resonant -CIRCUM  
 “But it’s not resonant when you actually hear (her voice)?”
- 55 B: *nanglanghay (.) //tut -ki -ey -twu.*  
 resonant:IE hear-NOML-LOC-ADD  
 “It is resonant. (.) To our ears as well (=When you actually hear her voice as well).”
- 56 C: [ *ung. ung.*  
 yes yes  
 “Right. Right.”
- 57 B: *nanglangha-ci -yo, swuhi enni moksoli ha-myen.*  
 resonant -COMM-POL Su-Hee older:sister voice do-COND  
 “It’s resonant, isn’t it? If you do (=analyze) Su-Hee’s voice.”
- 58 (1.0)
- 59 C: *nanglangha-ci.*  
 resonant -COMM  
 “It sure is resonant.”

A verb predicate describing the resonant quality of a human voice (*nanglangha* ‘resonant’), which is initially used in A’s question in line 54, is repeated and placed turn-initially in B’s response in line 55. This descriptor conveys B’s evaluative stance, thus enabling the speaker to achieve enhanced turn contiguity with A’s question. By virtue of the turn-initial placement of the descriptor repeated from the prior turn, the adverbial phrase (‘To our ears as well’), which could have been placed pre-verbally and turn initially, is ‘relevantly’ produced as a post-predicate element. It is noteworthy that the same pattern is repeated in B’s turn in line 57, which is now directed to another participant, C. The turn-initial repeat of the descriptor shapes a turn format in which the otherwise turn-initial conditional clause is produced as a post-predicate element (‘if you do (=analyze) Su-Hee’s voice’). Also note that the same descriptor is repeated and placed turn-initially in C’s responding turn in line 59. As noted in Section 4.2, the turn-initial placement of the repeated descriptor provides the participants with the means of aligning with each other in the course of collaboratively organizing a co-assessment sequence.

This type of turn-tying – achieved through the management of ‘lexical cohesion’ (Halliday & Hasan 1976) – is widely observed in Korean conversation. The practice enables the speaker to display his/her collaborative stance and/or immediate responsiveness towards the prior turn. With an element repeated from the prior turn being positioned turn-initially in the current turn, the responsiveness of the current action towards the prior turn is enhanced. This sequence-organizational feature of turn-tying, in which the current turn is tied to or built on the prior turn, provides for a context in which a post-predicate element is sequentially occasioned. That is, a referent or descriptor that could have been placed at a pre-verbal position may now be ‘relevantly’ relegated to the post-predicate position, where it can be employed for a range of interactional tasks in managing action modulation and turn transition *post hoc*.

These observations suggest that in Korean conversation the analysis of post-predicate elements, mostly as ‘insertables’, should be related to the allusive turn features of the host TCU, which is often sequentially shaped by and linked back to the prior turn (cf. Heritage 1984). Various context-shaped features of TCU continuation, in this respect, suggest that while the addition of post-predicate elements is often motivated by the need to address various states of reciprocity, there are contexts in which it is not so

much contingent upon the emergent state of the recipient's uptake as constitutive of a turn-design feature primarily shaped by turn-tying practices which are geared towards enhancing turn contiguity and achieving sequential linkage.

## 5. Prosody of post-predicate elements

A further indication of post-predicate elements being a prompt that re-enacts the completion point of the host TCU is provided by the way in which they are prosodically organized with reference to the host TCU. Given that Korean is a syllable-timed language, the production of a post-predicate element can be examined in terms of the organization of syllabic beats (cf. Ogden 2004).

One of the phenomena that is massively observed in the data examined in this paper is that post-predicate elements tend to display sensitivity to the preceding host TCU or a component thereof and inherit its syllabic and prosodic organizational pattern. For instance, we find in (17) that the number of syllables and the prosodic configuration of the post-predicate element are exactly fitted to those of the host TCU, as illustrated in (17') below. Each underlined part represents a syllable. A pair of asterisks represents a rhythmic beat, which is normally constituted by a syllabic unit but may be composed of two or more conflated syllabic units:

- (17') [ \*mi\*   \*kwuk\*   \*i\*   \*ya\* ] 'It is America,'  
           [ \*su\*   \*tha\*   \*il\*   \*i\* ] 'The style.'

Note that the number of syllables in the post-predicate element (which is four) matches exactly that of the host TCU.<sup>26</sup>

With some systematic variation, this tendency is observed widely in the data examined for this paper. For instance, we find in (12) that the rhythmic beats of the post-predicate element *kulen-ke?* are matched to those of the preceding component of the host TCU *-anh-na?* in spite of different number of syllables in each, as shown in (12'). The greater-than/less-than signs (> <) signal that the portion they mark is uttered with an increase in pace compared to surrounding talk:

- (12') [ \* anh \*   \*na?\* ] 'Don't ...?'  
           [ \* >ku len< \*   \*ke?\* ] 'Things like that?'

The first two syllables of the post-predicate element are conflated and pronounced faster such that they match the length of the one-syllable component *anh* as a rhythmic unit. This pattern is widely observed in cases where a post-predicate element follows a question, where the final rising intonation of the last component of the host TCU is re-done by the following post-predicate element. Fragment (11) is another case in point:

<sup>26</sup> Unlike the most of the instances of post-predicate elements examined in this paper that tend to share the prosody of the final component of the host TCU, the post-predicate element in (17') does not fully inherit the prosody of the host TCU; it is produced with final falling intonation (as represented by the period), whereas the preceding component of the host TCU is produced with slightly rising intonation (as represented by the comma), which indexes that the speaker is formulating his observation as news (see footnote 6). The finality-signaling prosody of the post-predicate element seems to index its status as a component that is produced to tone down and wrap up the affect-laden action of the host TCU (also see fragment (19)).



- (11') [ \* >anh a<\* \*yo?\* ] 'Isn't ...?'  
 [ \* won \* \*lay?\* ] 'Originally?'

Note that, in (11'), it is the first two syllables of the final component of the host TCU that are being prosodically conflated (*anh-a*).

In fragment (19), we find another interesting way in which such a tendency is played out. Look at (19'), which shows the syllabic and rhythmic organization of the post-predicate element ('American kids') and the immediately preceding component of the host TCU in C's turn ('(They) didn't get it'):

- (19') [ \*cal\* \*mo\* \* lu\* \*te\* \* la\* ] '(They) didn't get it,'  
 [ \*(.)\* \*mi\* \*kwuk\* \*ay\* \*tul\* ] 'American kids.'

Note that the number of syllables in the post-predicate element is matched to the preceding component of the host TCU by the addition of a micro-pause ((.)), which constitutes an extra beat in the post-predicate element.

An extra bit of micro-pause added before the post-predicate element may be syllabically counted as part of the host TCU, as shown in line 55 in (18). This syllabic pattern is illustrated in (18') below:

- (18') (Line 55)  
 [ \*nang\* \*lang\* \* hay\* \* (.)\* ] 'It is resonant.'  
 [ \* tut\* \* ki\* \* ey\* \* twu\* ] 'To our ears as well.'

In a way, (18') and (19') would be a mirror image of cases like (11') and (12') in which syllables are prosodically conflated.

In a similar vein, consider (13), where we find two instances of post-predicate elements in K's turns in lines 6-7 ('Did he write with that thing?, Mr. Jin Sung-Soo?') and line 10 ('Did he write his M.A. thesis? With that thing?'). First look at K's turn in lines 6-7:

- (13') (Lines 6-7)  
 [ \*ku\* \*ke-l\* \*lwu\* \*su-ess\* \* e\* \*yo?\* ] 'Did (he) write with that thing?'  
 [ \*(.)\* \* cin\* \*seng\* \* swu\* \*ssi\* \*ka?\* ] 'Mr. Jin Sung-Soo?'

We can see that the post-predicate element in line 7 is produced in such a way that it prosodically repeats the immediately preceding verb predicate component, which is constructed with six syllables (*ku -ke-l lwu ss-ess -e yo?*). The post-predicate element is constructed with five syllables (*cin seng swu ssi ka*). As in (19'), we find a micro-pause situated before the post-predicate element, and with the addition of the micro-pause constituting an additional syllabic beat, the space containing the post-predicate element as a whole maintains the same six syllabic beats as its prior host TCU component.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> A preliminary observation suggests that the tendency to match the syllabic beat of the preceding unit may not be limited to the construction of a post-predicate element and its preceding TCU or a component thereof. It may be a phenomenon that results from a syllabic organization crucially implicated in turn-organizational practice in Korean in general. For instance, in (13), K's turn in lines 6-7 as a whole is prosodically organized into three rhythmic units in such a way that each unit is comprised of six syllables:

We find in (13) another post-predicate element in K's repair turn line 10, where he repeats his previous turn in lines 6-7 in response to H's repair initiation. In this turn, the noun phrase marked by the instrumental case marker (*ku-ke-llwu?* 'with that thing?') is newly produced as a post-predicate element. It is interesting, in this respect, that this new increment, consisting of three syllables, matches exactly the syllabic beats and the rhythm of the final verb component of the host TCU, which also happens to consist of three syllables:

(13') (Line 10)

[ \*ss-ess\* \* e \* \* yo?\* ] 'Did (he) write ...?'  
 [ \* ku \* \* ke-l\* \* lwu?\* ] 'With that thing?'

While more research would be needed to identify patterns in which syllabic beats are merged and split across the predicate element and its host of varying lengths, the syllabic and rhythmic organizational patterns observed across the host TCU and its post-predicate element provide further indication that the latter is motivated as a re-completer (cf. Tanaka 1999), which reconstitutes the point of completion prosodically just like the previous one. As a re-completer, a post-predicate element serves as a prompt that prosodically re-does the action of the host TCU in the direction of prodding and eliciting the recipient's immediate uptake. That is, through a re-doing of the prosody by the post-predicate element, the configuration of the final component of the host TCU is re-enacted, and the recipient is prompted to be responsive, with the first opportunity at the end of the host TCU being usually passed up quickly due to its allusive features (e.g., vague references, brevity in turn shape attributed to zero-forms, etc.) or due to its use mainly specialized for stance display. The prosodic affinity between the host TCU and the post-predicate element, then, would be one of the features of TCU continuation that distinguishes it from the cases in which a new TCU starts after the point of completion.

## 6. Conclusions

As a whole, we find that post-predicate elements have important implications for the way in which – via the management of post-completion transition-space – the organization of affect is brought to bear upon the organization of turn-taking. Given that in Korean the verbal predicate, which normally constitutes a turn-final element, is a place dense with epistemic and affective stance markers (e.g., sentence-final modal suffixes), adding a post-predicate element furnishes the speaker with a resource for wrapping up the current action and leveling out the affective tone in a step-wise fashion – after the main upshot of the turn has been delivered through the verbal predicate. In a wide range of sequential contexts, post-predicate elements serve as a buffer absorbing any potential inter-turn

---

(13') (Lines 5-6)

[ \*may\* \*su\* \*the\* \*non\* \*mwun\* \*ul\* ] 'M.A. thesis'  
 [ \*ku\* \*ke-l\* \*lwu\* \*su-ess\* \*e\* \*yo?\* ] 'Did (he) write with that thing?'  
 [ \*(.)\* \*cin\* \*seng\* \*swu\* \*ssi\* \*ka?\* ] 'Mr. Jin Sung-Soo?'

Further research would be needed to show whether and how this pattern is attributable to a recurrent turn-organizational practice in general, and also to the possibility that syllabic matching is done not only within a turn but also across turns (see Ogden 2004 for inter-turn syllabic matching as observed in Finnish).

turbulences or gaps that may result from the lack of quick uptake from the recipient. It is plausible that in many contexts of TCU continuation the host TCU may be designedly constructed as something whose affectively loaded upshot is to be initially grasped and appreciated, with the post-predicate element mitigating the intensity of the displayed affect while offering a space for the recipient to formulate a response.

One of the challenges the analyst faces in analyzing post-positioned elements from an empirical perspective is that their production is interactionally motivated often by a moment-by-moment orientation towards pre-empting some potential problem in talk that may actually never materialize (assuming the pre-empting job is successfully performed) (J. Mandelbaum, personal communication). In spite of this difficulty, the phenomenon will be better analyzed with video-recorded data where the analyst can observe the way the speaker produces post-predicate elements as he/she expands the turn-in-progress in response to an incipient move, verbal or gestural, by the addressee that makes relevant a certain pre-empting or modulating move (cf. Goodwin 1979, 1981).

The examination of the sequential contexts in which TCU continuation is practiced suggests that an array of allusive features in the host TCU enable the speaker to index collusiveness and immediate stance display and to elicit a reciprocal responsiveness from the recipient in the form of an immediate appreciation of the displayed stance of the speaker. Often materialized as the sequentially disjunctive action of weaving a brief, stance-displaying comment/question into the talk-in-progress, the practice of TCU continuation lends itself to the task of foregrounding of the speaker's affective stance, which is displayed initially through the host TCU, often allusively constructed and quickly deployed. An allusive host TCU retroactively elaborated by a post-predicate element thus constitutes a turn format in which a two-pronged action of stance display and reciprocity elicitation is executed.

While the host TCU, allusively constructed, furnishes the speaker with the resource for disjunctively displaying his/her affectively loaded stance, a post-predicate element offers a space where the speaker can mitigate *post hoc* the level of displayed affect or intrusiveness associated with the way the prior action was initiated. With the disjunctive import of the action being also demonstrably oriented to by the recipient (e.g., by initiating repair), the post-predicate element creates a post-completion space where the recipient can adjust himself/herself to the affectively loaded action of the speaker and respond with a relevant uptake.

The status of a post-predicate element as a re-completer and a prompt for uptake seems to be further constituted by the way in which it hearably re-does the intonation and rhythm of the final component of its host TCU. A preliminary observation suggests that a prosodic operation is at work whose tendency is towards matching the syllabic beats and their rhythmic organization in the post-predicate with those of the immediately preceding component of the host TCU. Post-predicate elements, as re-completers that redo the prosody of the final or whole component of the host TCU, provide a resource for managing the post-stance-display space and turn transition. Further research would be needed to explicate the role of prosody in the formulation of post-predicate elements, and also in the way turns are prosodically linked together (Ogden 2004). A more systematic and detailed analysis of the ways in which turn components and turns are prosodically organized promises interesting findings that will enhance our understanding of interaction, prosody (rhythm) and grammar in Korean (cf. Couper-Kuhlen 1992, 1993; Local 1992; Selting 1996).

It is important to note that, in analyzing post-predicate elements in Korean

conversation, we should explore the possibility of finding an empirically grounded, systematic means by which we can distinguish different types of post-predicate element, i.e., in terms of the extent to which they are motivated by interactional contingencies (i.e., pursuing reciprocity) or other sequence-organizational concerns. As the analysis of various sequential motivations for TCU continuation suggests, there are cases in which the formation of post-predicate elements can be analyzed basically as part and parcel of a turn design in which they 'expectably' elaborate an allusive aspect in the host TCU, which is often sequentially shaped by the prior context (Heritage 1984). For instance, post-predicate elements may be occasioned by a range of practices which, often motivated as an affect-foregrounding strategy, are geared to addressing the sequentially disjunctive import of the prior action, re-opening a sequence being wrapped up, continuing or initiating assessment, or tying the current turn to the prior turn. These practices draw upon a range of grammatical and semantic relationships that hold between the allusive host TCU and a post-predicate element, usually formulated as an 'insertable', which may be exploited for different interactional purposes and thus may ostensibly 'mask' the contingent nature of the TCU production to varying extents. This observation suggests that the completion point re-enacted by a post-predicate element may sometimes constitute a transition-relevance point that has been 'designedly' projected and foreshadowed at the completion point of the host TCU, which is possibly formulated as a 'pre-transition-relevance place'.

This consideration will bring up a range of cross-linguistic issues in the context of comparing Korean post-predicate elements with their counterpart in English, where the production of increments, mostly formulated as 'glue-ons', seems to be more substantially contingent on and is shaped by the emergent, moment-by-moment management of reciprocity. Hopefully, as we continue to explicate the interactional import of retroactive elaboration by a post-predicate element in relation to various turn and sequence-organizational features of the host TCU, we will be able to obtain additional evidence upon which we can make finer distinctions between the ways in which post-predicate elements are organized.

## References

- Button, G., and N. Casey (1984) Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 167-190.
- Choi, S.-J. (1995) The development of epistemic sentence-ending modal forms and functions in Korean children. In J. Bybee and S. Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 165-204.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1992) Contextualizing discourse: The prosody of interactive repair. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (eds.), *The Contextualization of language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 337-364.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1993) *English speech rhythm: Form and function in everyday verbal interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ford, C. E. (1993) *Grammar in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ford, C.E., B.A. Fox, and S.A. Thompson (1996) Practices in the construction of turns: The "TCU" revisited. *Pragmatics* 6.3: 427-454.
- Ford, C.E., B.A. Fox, and S.A. Thompson (2002) Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In C.E. Ford, B.A. Fox, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *The Language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 14-38.
- Ford, C.E., and S.A. Thompson (1996) Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 134-184.
- Givón, T. (1983) *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, C. (1979) The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington, pp. 97-121.
- Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., and R. Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Heritage, J. (1984) *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (2002) The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427-1446.
- Jefferson, G. (1972) Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 294-338.
- Kim, K.-H. (1999) Grammar and interaction in Korean conversation: Intra-turn unit boundaries as an interactional resource. *Human Studies* 22: 425-446.
- Kim, K.-H. (2001a) Confirming intersubjectivity through retroactive elaboration. In M. Selting and E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 345-372.
- Kim, K.-H. (2001b) Turn-constructional practice in Korean conversation: Organization of turn increments. *Language Research* 37.4: 885-922. Seoul National University.
- Kim, K.-H., and K.-H. Suh (1996) Dealing with prior talk: Discourse connective in Korean conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 5: 83-99.
- Kim, K.-H., and K.-H. Suh (2002) Demonstratives as prospective indexicals: *ku* and *ce* in Korean conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 10: 192-205.
- Lee, H.-S. (1991) *Tense, aspect, and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal affixes in Korean from a typological perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Lee, H.-S. (1993) Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information, with reference to epistemic modal suffixes in Korean. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4-2: 135-167.
- Lerner, G. H. (2003) Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society* 32: 177-201.
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Local, J. (1992) Continuing and restarting. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 273-296.

- Ogden, R. (2004) Non-modal voice quality and turn-taking in Finnish. In E. Couper-Kuhlen and C.E. Ford (eds.), *Sound patterns in interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 29-62.
- Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on conversation*, Volume I. Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1987) Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, pp. 54-69.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996) Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 70-85.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2001) Conversation analysis: A project in process – "Increments". Forum Lecture in the 2001 LSA Summer Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Schegloff, E.A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361-382.
- Selting, M. (1996) On the interplay of syntax and prosody in the constitution of turn-constructive units and turns in conversation. *Pragmatics* 6.3: 371-388.
- Tanaka, H. (1999) *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vorreiter, S. (2003) Turn continuations: Towards a cross-linguistic classification. *InLiSt [Interaction and Linguistic Structures]*, No. 39, URL: <http://www.uni-potsdam.de/u/inlist/issues/39/index.htm>

## Appendix

I have used transcription conventions developed by conversation analysts with some modifications (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974; Atkinson & Heritage 1984):

[ ]	Simultaneous utterances	.	Falling intonation	=	Contiguous utterances
,	Slightly rising intonation	?	Rising intonation	//	Interruption
(0.0)	Intervals between utterances	--	Cut-offs	(.)	Micro-pause
:	Sound stretch	( )	Words unclear	(( ))	Transcriber's remarks
hhh	Audible aspirations	.hh	Audible inhalations	Underlining	Emphasis

For morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, the following abbreviations are used (Lee 1991):

ACC: Accusative	ADD: Additive	ATTR: Attributive	CIRCUM: Circumstance
COMM: Committal	COMP: Complementizer	COND: Conditional	CONN: Connective
COP: Copula	DEL: Delimiter	DIR: Directive	DM: Discourse Marker
FR: Factual Realization	HEARSAY: Hearsay	HONOR: Honorific	IE: Informal Ending
INFOR: Informative	INSTR: Instrumental	LOC: Locative	MOD: Modal Marker
NECESS: Necessity	NEG: Negative Particle	NOM: Nominative	NOML: Nominalization
NONCOMM: Non-Commitative		ONOM: Onomatopoeia	PL: Plural
POL: Politeness Marker	PROG: Progressive	PST: Past	QUOT: Quotative
REASON: Reason	RETROS: Retrospective	RM: Realization Marker	TOP: Topic Marker

VT: Vocative