Title
Retroactive Operations: On 'increments' in Mandarin Chinese conversations

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/46n0r97c

Author
Lim, Ni Eng

Publication Date
2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation
Retroactive Operations:
On ‘increments’ in Mandarin Chinese conversations

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics

by

Ni Eng Lim

2014
ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Retroactive Operations:
On ‘increments’ in Mandarin Chinese conversations

by

Ni Eng Lim
Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics
University of California, Los Angeles, 2014
Professor Charles Goodwin, Co-Chair
Professor Hongyin Tao, Co-Chair

An important contribution of Conversation Analysis (CA) to interactional linguistics is in its treatment of naturally occurring linguistic phenomena as systematic practices that deals with the problems of moment-by-moment talk-in-interaction. Under this analytic framework, speakers’ language use is not only analyzed as a vehicle for pursuing various social actions, but also as linguistic resources for managing the contingencies of producing emergent interactive talk. One well established mechanism for managing such contingencies is the organization of repair (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977; Schegloff 1979; Kitzinger 2013), which can technically be implemented anywhere within a turn-at-talk (or even after turns-at-talk), thereby allowing speakers to address various sorts of ‘errors’ in their preceding talk. In this dissertation, I look at a particular sort of ‘repair’ termed TCU-continuations (or otherwise known increments in other literature) in Mandarin Chinese, broadly defined as speakers producing further talk after a
possibly complete utterance, which is fashioned not as a new turn-constructional unit (TCU) in itself, but as a retrospectively oriented continuation of the preceding TCU.

Based on data from American English conversations, Schegloff (1996, 2000, 2001) specifies that TCU-continuations (a.k.a. increments) are “grammatically fitted, or symbiotic with, that prior TCU”. However, turning to cross-linguistic data, it is found that grammatically-fitted TCU-continuations are less prototypical in other languages (Vorreiter 2003, Auer 2007, Luke 2007), specifically Mandarin Chinese (henceforth “Chinese”). Despite having a variety of grammatical constituents that typically appear before the head element under a normative syntactic structure in Chinese, Chinese speakers do in fact frequently break syntactic “decorum” by extending a TCU with a syntactically discontinuous constituent. On the other hand, syntactically continuous TCU-continuations are also abundantly found in Chinese conversations, formulated via grammatical environment specific to the Chinese language. Hence, TCU-continuations, in its broadest and core sense of the term, is a practice of conversation instantiated in American English primarily through syntactic coherence, but can possibly take on quite different trajectories in Chinese. This empirical study details the typology of Chinese TCU-continuations following the classificatory categories set out by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007).

In terms of what TCU-continuations may be doing, though often characterized as “afterthoughts”, a growing body of literature has shown that they are not the results of “sloppy” production, but may constitute a systematic practice performing a variety of interactional actions (Goodwin 1979; Ford, Fox & Thompson 2002; Kim 2007). While an exhaustive list of possible interactional functions may not be possible, it is found that Chinese TCU-continuations are primarily engaged in downgrading/qualifying or upgrading/intensifying particular stances
conveyed in its host-TCU. Other major functions include clarifying/disambiguating, reformatting/reformulating the sequential action and securing/pursuing recipient’s uptake. A key finding is that these interactional functions may be pursued using different types of TCU-continuations. As such, though there may be preferential types of constituents or TCU-continuations for certain functions, there is little to suggest a strict form-function relationship. In other words, speakers are unconcerned with questions of form-function relationship, but utilize the constituent most germane to the required interactional function at that moment of unfolding talk for indexing ‘continuation’.

Finally, what we now know about TCU-continuations based on American English could well be revisited given how “incrementing” is done, and what they can do, in Chinese conversations. This dissertation concludes with some discussion on the how TCU-continuations as a form of ‘transition-space repair’ impacts on its shape and delivery at transition-relevance place; the relationship between TCU-continuations and a general preference for progressivity; as well as the theoretical implications on Emergent Grammar and Interactional Linguistics given the practice of TCU-continuations in conversation.
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Lifelong journalist and writer for magazines, William Zinsser, had this to say on getting a written sentence right the first time round. The point is, it usually does not. If formulating what you want to say on paper to achieve intersubjectivity is already so fraught with problems (despite having the luxury of time to (re)inspect our thoughts and words), how much more precarious can talk-in-interaction be, given the pressure to maintain smooth flowing exchanges at a (relatively) break-neck speed.

So, we don’t often produce what we want to say on our first attempt, at least not exactly the way we want it. Or we could have changed our mind (motivated by continual self-inspection or input by co-participants) midway into our utterance, rendering what was just publicly said in some way deficient. However, the temporality of on-line, moment-by-moment unfolding talk-in-interaction does not allow us to literally ‘wipe the slate clean’ when a problematic piece of talk has already been heard and displayed, and neither do we want to constantly apologize and re-do our utterances from scratch. Furthermore, such errors can theoretically occur (and be realized by the speaker) anywhere in a turn at talk: at the beginning, in the middle, or near the end of our utterance. Therefore, what is needed is a built-in conversational ‘mechanism’ that allows speakers to pin-point a ‘trouble-source’, effect reparative work locally, and resume talk from where it was left off to do the error correction. Indeed, such a mechanism is available in conversation, and is now well documented in a huge corpus of research under the term

Yet, another place in the stream of talk where the need for corrective actions may be realized is just after a turn has hearably come to completion. The speaker may, of course, also elect to apply the entire mechanism of repair at this juncture; but in most cases, something else more covert actually occurs.\(^2\) *It is found that speakers, on coming to a possible completion point in their own talk, regularly ‘append’ another unit of talk that is analyzably part of, and modifies, the just preceding utterance in some way.* While such ‘appended’ units do not seem to be overtly repairing specific ‘trouble-sources’ in the preceding talk, they are nonetheless doing some sort of further modification on the ostensibly complete prior unit, hence the notion of *retroactive operations*. Therefore, retroactive operations do not refer to specific forms or “techniques”, but to the functional activity that is retroactively imposed by the speaker upon a possible complete unit of talk. In English, these retroactive operations have been found to be most frequently administered by added units that syntactically ‘continues’ the prior talk (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007), thus the term *‘increments’* first posited by Schegloff (1996a) to describe one type of *post-possible completion* that constitute extensions to a turn-constructional unit (TCU).\(^3\) However, such retroactive operations may not prototypically come in the form of syntactically continuous units in other languages, though all of them do ‘continue’ the prior talk in some sense, as they are still analyzably part of the preceding unit. Here, the label *TCU-continuations* will be adopted to

---

1. Repair can, of course, be initiated and/or performed by interactants other than the speaker of the trouble-source in later turns. But the overwhelming majority of repairs are self-repairs within the confines of the trouble-source turn (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977).

2. Self-repair just after completion of an utterance is termed *‘transition-space repair’* in the literature. Its relationship to the focal phenomenon of our study is discussed in the concluding chapter of this dissertation.

3. Even in Schegloff (1996a), he acknowledges another type of post-possible completion that “do not represent extensions of the prior talk, but rather retrospective or retroactive alignments towards it” (pp. 90), termed *‘post-completion stance markers’*. 
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generically reference all such ‘continuations’ (including increments).

This study closely examines how the possibly universal necessity to do ‘continuations’ in natural talk-in-interaction is accomplished by Chinese speakers, and the types of retroactive modifications that can be done with TCU-continuations. Employing conversation analysis (CA) as the analytical and methodological framework, the dissertation aims to provide the first in-depth large scale study of TCU-continuations in Mandarin Chinese, and contribute to the existing literatures on TCU-continuations as a prevalent conversational phenomenon.

1.1. On TCU’s possible completion and transition relevance place (TRP)

As CA has shown, one important locus of organization in the midst of conversation comes near the possible completion of a turn-at-talk, or near the possible completion of any TCU. As demonstrated by the turn-taking organization of talk-in-interaction (Sacks et al. 1974), the possible completion of any TCU is attended to by all conversational participants for the relevance of speaker-transition; or simply, if and when another speaker might take a turn at talk. Hence the space within which such concerns become relevant (namely, immediately after possible completion of a TCU) is known as a transition relevance place (TRP). The list of organizational issues involved at TRP might be: how smooth transition to next speaker can be accomplished without too much gap, who is to be selected as next speaker, or how is current speaker to hold on to the turn to produce further talk without interruption.

A few typical organizational outcomes may come to pass at TRP. One of the most common is a prototypical successful turn transition, namely another speaker begins to talk (either through selection by self or by others) in the next beat after the prior turn has ended, resulting in
a smooth change of speakership with no overlap in talk. Another possible outcome is that at TRP, no other speaker is primed or ready to begin a next turn, resulting in extended silence and/or the current speaker self-selecting to begin another TCU. Yet, other types of talk, as opposed to a new TCU (by current or other speakers), can also occur at TRP. Amongst the possibilities that current speaker (or co-participants to the conversation) can pursue at the possible completion of a turn-so-far (or TCU) is to fashion further talk as a continuation of the preceding TCU. Using American English as an exemplar, take for instance Bee’s account of her grandmother’s medical condition where she produces not once, but twice, continuations after points of possible completion:

Bee: Becuz they’re gonna do the operation on the teeuh duct.
     [fiːs ɪt. Before they c'n do t[he cata]ract js.
Ava: [Mm-hm,] [ Right.]Yeah,

A point of possible completion is projected right after “teeuh duct”, given that the turn-so-far is prosodically, grammatically and pragmatically complete. Such completion is also evidenced by the next speaker, having parsed the turn-in-progress, decidedly starts to talk after “teeuh duct” (indicated by the overlap brackets in “ff[s]’e”), and thereby overlapping with Bee’s further talk. Our interest, however, is the manner in which Bee produces further talk after TCU’s possible completion and at TRP. Here Bee twice produces further talk by adding “first” and then “before they can do the cataracts” which are analyzably continuations of the preceding TCU-so-far (also known as the host-TCU), and in effect, re-completes the TCU in progress. As early as the (by now famous and foundational) Sacks et al. (1974) paper on “A simplest

---

4. Current speaker may continue to hold the floor after a TCU’s possible completion through practices informing other participants to the conversation that the current speaker is going to be engaged in a multi-TCU turn.
systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation”, same speaker continuing with something other than a new TCU at TRP was already recognized as a rationale for the occurrence of brief overlaps in the turn-taking system. In the paper, these were termed as “articulatory extensions and optional post-completion elements after first possible transition place” or “post-completers”\(^5\), such as tag questions (e.g. havenche or “haven’t you”) and terms of address and etiquette (e.g. dear or sir), and were construed as “exit devices” relevant to the management of turn-taking. However, these “addition of optional elements which can specifically go after first possible completion” were deem to be done “without intending continuation”\(^6\), and hence in this sense, not fashioned to be real continuations of the just complete TCU. The phenomena of continuing a possibly complete TCU was again alluded to as “added segments” by C. Goodwin (1981) and M. Goodwin (1980), in argument of the interactional nature of on-line speech production. Later, in traditional conversation analytic literature, such TCU-continuations (otherwise known as ‘increments’) became the focus object of study in a series of seminal papers by Schegloff (1996, 2000, 2001a). But why is such a phenomenon of interest, not only to the analyst, but more importantly, to the interactional participants themselves?

First of all, how a TCU-continuation may be produced is a technical accomplishment in itself. By its very positional nature (i.e. at transition relevant place (TRP) of a turn), TCU-continuations are lodged within the “analytical space” where interlocutors’ turn-taking practices occur, thereby making them “a key element of the organization of turn-taking practices”\(^7\). Therefore, besides formulating TCU-continuations to be hearably a continuation of what has come before, speakers may have to incorporate features within their talk to deal with the

\(^{5}\) Sacks et al. (1974), pp. 719.
\(^{6}\) Sacks et al. (1974), pp. 707.
\(^{7}\) Schegloff (2004), pp. 11.
possibility of next speaker transition. Secondly, there is the question of what the TCU-continuation is doing (and why do it) in terms of its interactional functions. Though TCU-continuations have often been characterized as “afterthoughts” (Chao 1968, Givón 1976, Keenan 1977), a growing body of literature has shown that they are not the results of “sloppy” production, but may constitute a systematic practice that perform a variety of interactional actions (Goodwin 1979; Ford et al. 2002; Schegloff 2004). For instance, Schegloff (2004) observes that increments (i.e. TCU-continuations) can be produced immediately within the beat following possible completion (next beat increments), after a registrable length of silence (post gap increments), or even after the next speaker’s intervening talk (post-other-talk increments). Crucially, where increments are positioned after possible completion is indicative of the kinds of interactional problems such increments are produced to address, highlighting the systematicity of doing “continuation” after possible completion.

In fact, “continuing” a possibly complete TCU is “a nearly generic possibility in conversation” that may be implemented to deal with “[a]s many things, perhaps, as there are interactional junctures to be managed”\(^8\). Suffice to say that an in-depth understanding of what constitutes TCU-continuations, how they are implemented, and what they are deployed to do or do do, will advance our knowledge of the linguistics resources available in dealing with the many contingencies in the production of on-line human interaction.

1.2. TCU-continuation as a language-dependent conversational practice

However, defining what counts as TCU-continuations, even within a single language,
remains a complex problem (Auer 2007). The crux of the matter seems to be: How do co-
participants to a conversation parse bits of talk after TCU’s possible completion as “continuing”
the prior talk? What are the dimensions that have allowed an interpretation of continuation for
the recipient, and thereby make relevant and consequential the import of TCU-continuations? Is
it prosody, semantic, syntax or informational? Again, through investigating American English
data, Schegloff (2004) suggests that continuation is done “most robustly by making it
grammatically fitted to, or symbiotic with, that prior TCU, and, in particular, to its end”, hence
the term “increments”. Yet, Ford et al. (2002), on the other hand, takes some forms of further talk
that cannot be grammatical constituents of the host-TCU also as instances of continuing the prior
talk, termed Free Constituents (most notably unattached NPs). For example, Curt, in displaying
his ‘outrage’ on the offer made for an antique car (known as a Cord) produces:

Curt: That guy was (dreaming).

\textbf{fifteen thousand dollars} \textbf{[for an original Co:rd},

After “that guy was dreaming” came to a syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically
complete position, Curt added the noun phrase “fifteen thousand dollars for an original Cord”,
which cannot be a possible syntactic constituent of the prior TCU. Here, the added noun phrase
can only be adequately understood as Curt’s expression of “disbelief”, an action argued to be just
priorly pursued in “that guy was dreaming”. Although Ford et al. (2002) did not overtly specify
what makes Free Constituents interpretable as “continuing” the preceding TCU, a close reading
of the article suggests two points. Firstly, their definition of “increments” as “non main-clause
continuations after a point of possible turn completion”; and secondly, *Free Constituents*, like other “*increments*”, also cannot be “interpretable as standing on its own; that is, neither can be taken in context as the beginning of a new and independent clause”\(^9\). Therefore, Ford et al. (2002) seem to suggest that non-independence (of semantic interpretation?), possibly deriving from the non main-clause status of *Free Constituents*, is a crucial dimension for its sense of continuation from the preceding TCU. From the above brief discussion, we can surmise that the recognition of TCU-continuations, turns upon how various linguistic and paralinguistic parameters (e.g. prosody, syntax, semantics, pragmatics) may afford themselves to be construed as continuations of the prior.

This matrix is made even more complex (and compelling) by the differing linguistic resources available when languages other than English are taken into consideration. Cross-linguistic typological analysis has shown that different forms of TCU-continuations do exist in other languages, and that the recognition of TCU-continuations should be language-dependent, as “different languages provide different lexical, grammatical and prosodic resources for continuing turns at talk”\(^11\). That is to say, the narrow definition of “*increments*” (i.e. syntactically continuous segments after possible completion) is the result of an anglocentric basis, specific perhaps only to English (Vorreiter 2003, Auer 2007, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007). In an attempt to tease out the possible dimensions that TCU-continuations may be doing “continuations”, Luke & Zhang (2007), using Mandarin Chinese (henceforth “Chinese”) conversational data as illustrations, outlines a schema where four interlocking strands may be used to identify “*increments*”, namely: syntactic continuity vs. discontinuity, main vs. subordinate intonation,

\(^9\) Ford et al. (2002), pp. 16.  
\(^10\) Ford et al. (2002), pp. 18.  
\(^11\) Vorreiter (2003), pp. 4.
retrospective vs. prospective orientation, and information focus vs. non-focus. A natural extension of this understanding is that practices of TCU-continuation is language-specific, and an over-arching typology would “have to take into account, not only prosody and semantics, but also action structure and pragmatics at large”\textsuperscript{12} to account for this complex phenomenon.

In the preliminary but seminal study by Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) comparing English, German and Japanese conversational data, which itself is an expansion of Vorreiter (2003), a schema for distinguishing different forms of Turn Continuations\textsuperscript{13} was proposed; based on their syntactic, semantic and prosodic “relatedness” to the possibly complete prior talk. In their concluding remarks, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) gave a rallying call for “all linguists to explore the nature of continuing talk past possible completion in the spoken interaction of languages they are familiar with”, and “progressively illuminate the eminently pragmatic question of how language form impacts upon language use and, vice versa, how language use shapes language form”\textsuperscript{14}. This dissertation has benefitted much from the classificatory efforts and analysis in this paper, and will be speaking directly to, as well as continuing the “actions” of this important work.

On one end of the proposed schema by Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) are new TCUs, further talk which are syntactically, semantically and prosodically completely independent from what came before, and possibly constitutes a new action in itself. On the other end are various types of TCU-continuations, materials that are analyzably dependent on the host-TCU, but differentiated by how such “relatedness” is established through

\textsuperscript{12} Auer (2007), pp. 657.
\textsuperscript{13} Turn continuations refers to the broad range of units of “further talk” that could occur after possible completion of a TCU, including new TCUs.
\textsuperscript{14} Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 549.
a combination of syntactic, semantic and prosodic features. TCU-continuations are regarded to be continuing the prior action of the host-TCU. Free Constituents within this schema is construed as an intermediary type between new TCU and TCU-continuation, as it is syntactically independent but is somehow semantically or pragmatically related to the unit that precedes it. Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) illustrates the relationship between Turn Continuations as a continuum, reproduced in Figure (1) below:

Figure (1): Syntactic & semantic dependence on prior unit

In describing the difference between TCU-continuations from Free Constituents and new TCUs, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) strictly appealed to their syntactic and semantic dependence on the prior unit, but made no mention of prosodic dependence until the examination of various types of TCU-continuations. Perhaps based on their English, German and Japanese conversational data, syntax and semantic were sufficient as parameters to distinguish between the above three categories. By this, I mean that the Free Constituents and new TCUs in their data may have been analyzed to be necessarily independent in prosody, whereas this is not the case in TCU-continuations. However, my data will show that Chinese Free Constituents, while similarly related to the prior unit in terms of semantics and pragmatics, can also be prosodically marked in varying degrees to index “continuation”. Therefore, the analysis in this dissertation does not

categorically separate *Free Constituents* from TCU-continuations, but takes one (*Free Constituents*) to be a sub-set of the other (TCU-continuations).

TCU-continuations are further differentiated into Non-add-ons and Add-ons, depending on the degree of their prosodic dependence on the prior unit. *Non-add-ons* are materials that are “through-produced” in a “single perceptual (auditory) gestalt”\(^{16}\) without any form of prosodic break after possible completion. Although prosodically a singular unit, the added materials is not seen to be a natural constituent of the prior as it is somehow syntactically unfitted with the host-TCU within the “normative” syntax of the language. Nonetheless, as *Non-add-ons* are produced in a “single melodic and rhythmic gestalt”\(^{17}\), this strongly suggests that the non-add-on material may have been planned from the outset in producing the TCU, and could be seen as some sort of *marked construction* in the language. It is interesting to note that almost all the examples of *Non-add-ons* in English, German & Japanese provided by Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) are constituents that can be “re-inserted” or “moved” back into a syntactic slot in the prior where it should “belong”.\(^{18}\) *Add-ons*, in contrast, are further talk that are hearably separate from the host-TCU via a prosodic break. By prosodic break, this can mean anything from a change in pitch, loudness, tempo/rhythm to a registrable pause of silence after possible completion, in effect any form of phonetic features that marks the TCU-continuation as not belonging to the prior unit’s intonational whole. Based on their degree of syntactic “relatedness” with the host-TCU, *Add-ons* can further be grouped into *Replacements*, *Insertables* or *Glue-ons*. *Replacements* are

\(^{16}\) Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 515.

\(^{17}\) Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 528.

\(^{18}\) In this sense, the *Non-add-ons* shown are much like the *Insertables* described later. Prosodic continuity or breakage seems to be their only distinguishing feature. Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) shows a single example in English where the *Non-add-on* is not to be “re-inserted”, but done to specify or “replace” a core constituent in the prior.
prosodically and syntactically disjunctive further talk, that can nonetheless be seen as a “continuation” as they are analyzably “replacing” some parts of the host-TCU. Though Free constituents are also prosodically and syntactically disjunctive, they are seen to be relatively more independent\textsuperscript{19} than Replacements, and cannot be analyzed as replacement materials in the prior unit. Additionally, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) notes how Replacements are “repair-like” in terms of its operation on a trouble-source in the prior unit.\textsuperscript{20} Insertables are also prosodically marked and syntactically unfitted further talk, but differ from Replacements in that the added material is analyzable as a priorly missing constituent, and hence can be syntactically re-inserted back into the host-TCU. In generative linguistic literature, such phenomenon where re-insertable constituents come after syntactic closure is known as “Right-dislocation (RD)”. As the term suggests, RD theorizes that the syntactically unfitted right-hand constituent as being “dislocated” from its default position somewhere left-wards within a static well-formed sentence. Finally, Glue-ons are prosodically disjointed further talk, but produced as syntactically fitted and continuous materials after possible completion. Hence, Glue-ons most resembles what Schegloff (2004) calls “increments”. Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), however, takes both Glue-ons and Insertables to be “Increments” proper, thereby discarding the grammaticality constraint of Schegloff (2004) while preserving that Increments are syntactically dependent materials not previously found in the host-TCU.\textsuperscript{21} I further note that although Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) only takes Replacements as being a repair phenomenon, both Glue-ons and Insertables are

\textsuperscript{19} As mentioned, in terms of prosody and syntax, Free constituents are seen to form their own intonation unit, and are by themselves a complete syntactic whole (i.e. neither replacing some part nor adding on to the prior).

\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) opined that “Replacements are a subcategory of same-turn self-repair, comprising those instances where the self-repair is carried out during the transition space following a turn's possible completion.” (pp. 519).

\textsuperscript{21} By this I mean that both Glue-ons and Insertables are syntactically new constituents not found in the host-TCU, regardless of whether they are grammatically fitted or not.
equally viable to be seen as categories of operations within the framework of repair. The relationship between TCU-continuation and Repair will be expanded on further in later chapters. In summary, the following chart (reproduced from Vorreiter (2003) as Figure (2)) serves as an illustration of how Turn Continuations may be sub-categorized according to the differing syntactic, semantic and prosodic relationship it has with the prior TCU.

Figure (2): Categories of Turn-Continuations by Vorreiter (2003)

It must be noted, however, that the boundaries between categories of turn-continuations are fuzzy at best. When speakers feel the need to “continue” the TCU after coming to possible

---

22 In Schegloff (2013), “replacing” and “inserting” are the foremost two types of repair operations described. In this respect, Glue-ons can be taken as “inserting” additional materials at the end of a TCU.
completion, they do not concern themselves with choices in “types” of turn-continuations; as much as doing the continuation with the most appropriate material, in the most appropriate manner possible, to accomplish the interactional objective at that moment in unfolding talk. Hence, it is unsurprising that empirical investigation of turn-continuations consistently points towards various ambiguities in categorizing actual instances of “further talk”. In Vorreiter’s (2003) comparison of English, German & Japanese data, she notes that there are “instances where features from more than one category are intermixed and potentially constitute a new type of increment”, and that it may be more helpful to think of TCU-continuations as being different points on a “continuum”. On examining the Finnish use of että-clauses, Seppänen & Laury (2007) argues that että can function both as a turn-initial particle as well as a conjunction. Therefore, many että-clauses are “intermediate or ambiguous and could be analyzed as either Glue-ons or Free Constituents”. Furthermore, on comparing the sequential treatment of lexicosyntactically marked and unmarked forms of causal clause combinations in English, Couper-Kuhlen (2012) also doubts that a clear distinction can even be made for TCU-continuations and new TCUs; and questions if “the analytic distinction between TCU-continuation and new TCU is worth maintaining in universal terms”, especially for “pro-drop” languages (such as Chinese). Due to the skewing between categories of TCU-continuations in cross-linguistic classification, it may be better to think about categories of TCU-continuations (or even the idea of turn-continuation itself) as non-discrete labels without clear boundaries. Perhaps a more productive construal of “further talk” (i.e. continuations after possible completion) is a continuum where types of TCU-continuations (and turn-continuations) differ (on a gradable scale) in terms of their

23 Vorreiter (2003), pp. 21-22.
grammatical relation with the prior unit. This view takes the phenomenon of TCU-continuations as being interconnected with grammaticalization, and each instance of TCU-continuation instantiates (un)grammaticized or grammaticalizing constituent of the prior unit.

The point driven home by this body of literature is that TCU-continuations as a conversational phenomenon, though possibly universal in nature, is nevertheless pursued through a range of practices dependent upon the linguistic resources provided by the relevant speech community. Such a perspective is congruent with conversation analysis’ (C.A.) tradition of an emic approach (Schegloff 2009), in the sense of recognizing that individual speech communities with differing linguistic resources provide for organization of conversational practices that is relevant and consequential for the speakers of that community. From an etic standpoint, investigating TCU-continuations in Chinese data will also provide insights into how some ostensibly universal organizational issues and contingencies of interaction can be dealt with from a non-American English perspective, as well as possibly revealing other such organizational issues and contingencies of interaction as may be underwritten by the particularities of different languages and/or societies.

1.3. Points of interest in Mandarin Chinese TCU-continuations

Our premise is that the practice of doing TCU-continuations, defined as the production of further talk after possible completion, designed to be heard as a continuation of the prior talk, is an obligatory feature of any conversational system. Furthermore, such practices are necessarily language-dependent and systematic, in terms of the grammatical resources available in the given language. This dissertation aims to investigate the conversational phenomenon known as TCU-
continuation using Chinese as the conversational data source, namely how they are being done, and what they are doing. Using Chinese as a point of departure for analysis of how TCU-continuations is being done is potentially illuminating from a typological perspective, as English and Chinese are arguably languages on two extreme ends of a spectrum of linguistic parameters.

An example of how linguistic typology may constrain practices of “continuations” can be clearly seen from their differing default syntactic structure. In English, various forms of constituents can be appended grammatically right after a just-completed sentence (i.e. after the verb phrase) in its “normative” syntax to provide further information on time, place or manner (cf. left-headed syntax). These constituents are typically prepositional phrases or adverbials such as in Ex.(1):

\textbf{Ex.(1)}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. And how are you feeling. \textit{these days}.
\item b. I’m much better this afternoon. \textit{than I was}.
\item c. How much did your momma give you. \textit{for allowance}.
\end{enumerate}

However, in the “normative” syntax of Chinese, adverbials of time, manner and place are to the left of the verb phrase (cf. right-headed syntax). Prepositional phrases, adverbs and other modifiers (i.e. relative clauses) also appear left of their head element, as in the following:

\textbf{Ex.(2)}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. 然后我从小吃醋.
\textit{ranhou wo cong xiao chi cu}.
then 1SG from small eat vinegar.
\textit{So I’ve taken vinegar since young}.
\end{enumerate}
b. 你们老板不是马上就走。
    *imen laoban bu shi mashang jiu zou.*
    2PL boss NEG be immediate DM walk.
    *Your supervisor isn’t leaving immediately.*

c. 现在心情不好。
    *xianzai xinqing bu hao.*
    now feeling NEG good
    *(Her) mood is not good right now.*

In the Chinese examples above, all clausal modifiers (in bold), such as *cong xiao* (since young), *mashang* (immediately) and *xianzai* (now), appear before the main clause they modify, *chi cu* (eat vinegar), *zou* (leave) and *bu hao* (not good) respectively. More importantly, these modifiers, if placed after the main clause in Chinese, would be deemed syntactically “ungrammatical”. However, looking at the English translations, it is clear that such modifying constituents can normatively occur after the main clause in proper English syntax. In sum, while a variety of constituents can appear unproblematically after an English head element as modifiers, given the generic syntactic structure of Chinese, these constituents will typically come before the head element in Chinese.

What this means for the *online production and formulation* of TCU is that the English speaker in coming to a possible completion point in his utterance, often has the option of extending his talk (and thus do “continuation”) with a multitude of modifiers *without breaking syntactic coherence*; whereas the Chinese speaker in coming to possible completion, *often would not have such “reserved” positions* to append adverbials and other constituents due to the syntax of the language (Luke & Zhang 2007). In other words, while the practice of TCU-continuations can oftentimes be naturally accomplished through syntactic continuity (i.e. *Glue-ons*) in English, such an option is not always available given the default syntax of Chinese.
Nonetheless, given the possibly universal need to retroactively modify or add supplementary talk in the service of performing a variety of interactional functions, Chinese speakers do in fact frequently break syntactic “decorum” by extending a TCU with a syntactically discontinuous constituent, which in its typical syntax would be placed well before the possibly complete TCU. Moreover, these elements consist of almost every kind of constituents such as subjects, verbs, complements, objects, modifiers, adverbials, conditionals & other clauses. The frequency of such practices is extremely high in Chinese, as opposed to English (Luke & Zhang 2007, Givón 2001, Biber 1999, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007), lending further evidence that “continuations” may be pursued through means that are not syntactically continuous. Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) has also noted the high frequency of Non-add-ons and Insertables (i.e. syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations) in both German and Japanese, in comparison to English. Given the prevalence of “asyntactic formulations” (especially Non-add-ons) cross-linguistically, serious doubt can be raised on what counts as “normative” syntax in spoken language use. The empirical study of Chinese TCU-continuations, therefore, constitutes an examinable locus that can illuminate the relevance (or irrelevance) of prescriptive syntax based on written-language norms for the description of naturally occurring everyday spoken interaction.

Another aspect of potential interest lies in the interactive function of TCU-continuations, which is an ongoing research even in English (Schegloff 2000b, 2004). One recurrent formulation is that TCU-continuations are often deployed to pursue lack of recipient’s uptake (Heath 1984, Pomerantz 1984, Ford et al. 2002). Schegloff (2004) demonstrates that other

\[\text{Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 546.}\]
possibilities include intensifying an action (up-ing the ante), backing down, projecting a telling, or even to convert inter-turn (or TCU) gap into intra-turn pause to eliminate possible negative resonances. As mentioned earlier, Schegloff further suggests that the positioning of TCU-continuation within transition space (i.e. TRP), whether in the “next beat”, “post gap” or even “post-other-talk”, is consequential in terms of what the TCU-continuation is doing interactionally. Nonetheless, a common denominator in the functions mentioned is the use of TCU-continuations to resolve problems stemming from interactional contingencies. To further complicate the problem is how TCU-continuations may also be used to deal with issues stemming from other paralinguistic variables of conversation such as the number of participants. This is most poignantly seen in Goodwin (1979) where the motivation to do ‘continuations’ stem directly from the change in reified recipient, and the status of that recipient in relation to the speaker, within a multi-party conversation framework. In his seminal paper on “The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation”, Goodwin (1979) demonstrates how in face-to-face interaction, a speaker’s reified gaze towards a recipient, as well as the relationship of the recipient to the speaker, can be directly consequential to the moment-by-moment construction of a “sentence” in progress. In particular, through a video analysis of John’s utterance “I gave up smoking cigarettes. one week ago today. actually”, he shows how the TCU-continuations “one week ago today” and “actually” are recipient-designed formulations appended after a possibly complete TCU (i.e. I gave up smoking cigarettes), ostensibly done in concert with gaze shift, to locate a recipient that exhibits proper recipiency (i.e. mutual gaze).

Here, TCU-continuations is used to deal with the contingencies that arises only in multi-party participation framework, namely to restructure (by re-completing) an utterance such that it
is adequately suited for an alternative recipient different from the one the utterance was originally meant for. It is then naturally conceivable that such a function of TCU-continuations would not surface within a 2-party interactional framework where the recipient of a speaker remains constant throughout every intersection of the conversation. Therefore, what a particular TCU-continuation does or can do is also implicated by a myriad number of factors, such as the semantic formulation of the TCU-continuation, the sequential context in which it occurs, where within the transition space it occurs (Schegloff 2004), or even the number of participants in a given conversational framework.

Examining conversational data of other languages may further uncover unknown functions of TCU-continuations, or actions that are specific to a particular speech community. Preliminary studies of TCU-continuations in languages other than English have shown this to be a possibility. Kim (2007) suggests that TCU-continuations in Korean are often motivated by the allusive nature of the host-TCU. In other words, practices of ‘continuations’ in Korean may be used to address problems of turn design rather than problems of recipiency or uptake. Field (2007) in a study of TCU-continuations in Navajo, an American Indian language, further proposes that eliciting uptake may not even be a factor in this speech community, given its cultural difference in language use. In sum, the explication of what TCU-continuations are doing, similar to how TCU-continuations are formulated, maybe language-dependent. A study of TCU-continuations in Chinese then holds great promise, given its typological difference with English, both linguistically and culturally.

Though the study of Chinese TCU-continuations may come to have consequential import for the understanding of TCU-continuations as a coherent category within talk-in-
interaction in general, this investigation of TCU-continuations in Chinese is undertaken on its own merit. By this I mean to emphasize the importance of examining practices of conversational talk within individual speech communities as an independent enterprise, without the “lens” imposed by prior studies of other languages, or a comparative cross-linguistic perspective (Schegloff 2009). In so far as Chinese provides distinctive linguistic resources for doing ‘continuations’, then it is of interest to students of the Chinese language to know how TCU-continuations are being done, and what are its possible functions within this speech community. Contributions from a detailed study of Chinese TCU-continuations to an overall typology of TCU-continuations are therefore seen as a natural “by-product” of this dissertation.

1.4. On terminology

This dissertation uses the term “TCU-continuations” to denote the conversational phenomenon that has been described. Though many other studies have proposed labels in lieu of TCU-continuations, I contend that this term provides the most generic description based on our broad definition of the phenomenon, namely the practice of speakers appending additional talk at TRP that is analyzably “continuing” from the just-possibly-complete TCU. Other labels used to describe TCU-continuations have been made in the context where the specific features that make them “continuations” have been emphasized, and thereby “overburdening” the labels with potentially language-specific constrains.

An example of this is, of course, the term “increments”, a highly common and popular label. However, as priorly mentioned, increments have been used in the context where TCU-continuations are syntactically continuous with its host-TCU. While this may be the case for
most “continuations” in American English, syntactic continuity may not be the primary aspect with which “continuation” is recognized in other languages. And even within American English, FFT (2002) have found it fit to categorize “Free Constituents”, ostensibly syntactically non-continuous but semantically related constituents, to also be constitutive of the phenomenon of “increments”. Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), after considering relevant studies based on various languages, provides an in-depth discussion on the difficulties in synthesizing the various types of TCU-continuations (or even turn-continuations) under a single label. This dissertation has also earlier suggested that TCU-continuations (and turn-continuations at large) should be thought of as non-discrete entities on a continuum of syntactic, semantic and prosodic “relatedness” to the prior unit. Therefore, to refrain from imposing any unnecessary interpretive premise on what the forms that do “continuations” in Chinese are, this dissertation adopts the broad and inclusive label “TCU-continuations” (which also includes elements such as Free Constituents) to denote our focal phenomenon.

Outside the research traditions of CA, two other terms are deserving of mention in relation to TCU-continuations, namely “right dislocation (RD)” and “afterthoughts”. RD is a well-documented syntactic phenomenon in traditional linguistic literature (Keenan 1977, Givón 1990), referring to the atypical syntax of having a constituent (usually the subject noun phrase) displaced/dislocated to the end (i.e. to the right) of the sentence. Hence, certain TCU-continuations (i.e. Insertables), when removed from its sequential and interactional context, appears to be structurally very much similar to a RD construction, in that the TCU-continuation (positioned at the end of the TCU) is seen to be syntactically unfitted to its host-TCU, but can be retrospectively re-inserted and thus seen as a “continuation”. The phenomenon of RD holds
particular relevance to Chinese TCU-continuations as the “default” syntactic structure of Chinese lends itself naturally to having speakers produce syntactically non-continuous TCU-continuations, a point priorly mentioned in section (1.3.). Studies on dislocation have also suggested that RD construction occur much more frequently in Chinese conversation than in English (Chao 1968, Packard 1986, Tai & Hu 1991, Biber 1999, Givón 2001, Luke 2004, Luke & Zhang 2007, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007). Nonetheless, RD remains to be a terminology more suited in the discipline of transformational grammar, as the term suggests that the “right-dislocated” constituent (seen as TCU-continuation in this dissertation) is a structural movement from a premised a priori grammar, and where its analysis is divorced from actual speech production and discourse context.

Finally, earlier studies have also often used “afterthoughts” as a functional account for RD (Chao 1968, Givón 1976, Keenan 1977), in that “afterthought forms are basically regarded as a form of repair (cf. transition space repair) for omission errors made in the prior speech under time and psychological pressures.” Though the focal phenomenon studied in this dissertation is definitely in some sense a form of conversational repair (see section (5.1.)); but as earlier mentioned, TCU-continuations may have less to do with afterthoughts and omission errors than as a systematic practice to deal with interactional contingencies that may present themselves as talk unfolds incrementally in moment-by-moment conversation.

---

27 Most Chinese adverbial used as TCU-continuations (i.e. after the main clause) are often seen as syntactically discontinuous from the host-TCU, because the “default” syntactic position of adverbs in Chinese is to the left of the main clause.

1.5 DATA

The data collected and used in this dissertation constitute a representative corpus of conversational Mandarin Chinese based on both audio and video recordings. Video recordings of two- or three-party talk-in-interactions were collected during meal-time face-to-face conversations or any other random activities, where the participants are within each others’ visual presence and interactional participation framework for a substantial period of time. Audio recordings refer to telephone conversation, primarily between two interactants, in the absence of other para-linguistic modalities besides talk. The decision to collect from both sources of data stems from how different semiotic resources (or the absence of) potentially affects analysis of what the situated TCU-continuation is doing in terms of interactive functions.

As before-mentioned, one recurrent formulation is that TCU-continuations work to pursue recipient’s uptake, usually after a delayed or dispreferred response. Though such delayed or dispreferred-ness may be shown through gaps of silence or turns that are semantically built as disagreements, the provision of additional visual modality as a semiotic resource can also work to project a recipient’s possible dispreferred response, such as the lack of agreement nods, an eye flash or any other “uncooperative” facial expression. In other words, the motivations for doing TCU-continuations may originate from para-linguistic but nonetheless communicative factors that would remain unexplored in audio-only data. Visual recordings capture the (almost) full interactive experience of participants and the multi-model semiotic resources available for interactional actions, data that will be crucial for an adequate analysis of TCU-continuations in action. However, it is also a fact that TCU-continuations also frequently occur in the relatively “pure” context of audio-only telephone conversation, evidencing that a singular modality such as
talk-in-interaction in itself is sufficient for speakers to do “continuing the TCU”. Indeed, the earliest work of CA were done on telephone or co-present audio-only data, leading to findings of conversational practices that still stand today in the face of burgeoning video data (Schegloff 2009). Furthermore, according to Schegloff (2009), the analysis of telephone conversation, where the interactants are devoid of any other semiotic resources besides talk, is a way to “finesse” the issue of multi-modality; and possibly a way to uncover more fundamental patterns how TCU-continuations in Chinese are done.

Therefore, the audio and video data for this study are collected from 3 different sources, representing 2-participants telephone conversation, 2-participants face-to-face conversation and 3-participants face-to-face conversation respectively. Regardless of the sources, most of the participants in these conversations are overseas Chinese graduate students from different cities in mainland China. I shall now describe the 3 sources of conversational data in my collection:

1) Our first source of data consists of 8 audio recordings of 2-party telephone conversation, culled randomly from the CallFriend Mandarin Chinese-Mainland Dialect Corpus (www.talkbank.org). This corpus, provided by the Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC) of the University of Pennsylvania, originally consisted of 60 unscripted telephone conversations, lasting between 5 and 30 minutes, where both the caller and callee are native speakers of Chinese from Mainland China (Canavan & Zipperlen 1996). The 8 telephone conversation used in our collection are each about 30 minutes in length, amounting to 236 minutes or about 3.9 hours of data, as illustrated in Table 1 (next page).
2) The second source of data consists of 11 video recordings of 2-party face-to-face conversation, collected and owned by Kang Kwong (K.K.) Luke. The participants were mostly Mainland Chinese graduate students, from various regions of China, at the University of Hong Kong (HK University) in the year 2005. Regardless, all of them are native speakers of Chinese. With only an instruction to engage in everyday talk, the participants were filmed doing unscripted Chinese conversation in a recording studio. The length each video clips range from 12 to 28 minutes, amounting to another 3.9 hours of conversational data, as illustrated in Table 2 (next page). The researcher has directly consulted K.K. Luke and obtained permission to use this corpus of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Name</th>
<th>Length (min.)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherly Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swear Talk</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL Talk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Dilemma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CallFriend Corpus (LDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>236 (3.9 hrs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) The third source of data consists of video recordings of 3-party face-to-face conversation, recorded by the researcher in 2011 at Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore. Again, selected participants were mostly Mainland Chinese graduate students from different regions of China in the university, and have native proficiency in Chinese. The setting includes lunchtime conversation, and other context where 3 participants are seated around a table doing everyday talk. I have videotaped and digitized four clips (NTU-1, NTU-2, NTU-3 & NTU-4) amounting to 227 minutes (or 3.8 hours) of 3-party face-to-face conversation, illustrated in Table 3 (next page). All of the data collected are approved by University of California, Los Angeles, Office of the Human Research Protection Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Name</th>
<th>Length (min.)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-01</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-05</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-M-11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>HK University (K.K. Luke data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (3.9 hrs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above 3 sources adds up to about 11.6 hours of conversational data, forming our core corpus of interactional data from which TCU-continuations are identified and analyzed. The interactions in the collection were transcribed with the transcription system developed by Jefferson (2004). I have chosen to present my Chinese data in two types of transcript. For each exemplar, a transcript in standard Chinese orthography, with gross intonational features marked using the Jefferson transcription system (See Appendix A for transcription conventions), will first be provided. This is to provide readers proficient in Chinese easier access to the data. A second corresponding transcript is followed where the Chinese utterances are romanized according to the Pinyin system and italicized in the first line. The Pinyin romanization provides a more detailed marking of the intonational features in the data, also using the Jefferson transcription system. Immediately following the Pinyin transcription, a morpheme-by-morpheme glossary is provided in the second line (see Appendix B for abbreviation of linguistic components). In the third and last line, English translations of the Chinese are presented in bold. Arrows along the left side of the transcription (⇒) are also used to call attention to specific lines of the transcript and exchanges between participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Name</th>
<th>Length (min.)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTU-1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Personal Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU-2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Personal Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU-3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Personal Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU-4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Personal Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>227 (3.8 hrs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6. OVERVIEW OF DISSERTATION

This dissertation consists of three core analytical chapters. Initially, a short analytical discussion in Chapter 2 will deal with the intricacies and considerations needed in defining what TCU-continuations are in Chinese. After a brief introduction to highlight the different mechanics of doing “continuations” (section (2.1.)), section (2.2.) then considers how Chinese TCU completion (or TRP) may be projected by Chinese speakers. The final section (2.3.) examines the complexities involved in interpreting Chinese TCU-continuations, and proposes some of its defining features.

A second analytical discussion in Chapter 3 provides a detailed typological critique of Chinese TCU-continuations. To provide an adequate overview on this issue, this chapter is further divided into 5 sections. The initial introduction (3.1.) provides a broad survey on the forms of Chinese TCU-continuations found in our data, and how they relate to the schema outlined by Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007). Specifically, prototypical instances of Insertables (3.2.1.), Replacements (3.2.2.) and Non-add-ons (3.2.3.) are discussed in section (3.2.). Glue-ons are examined in section (3.3.), while Free Constituents will be shown in section (3.4.). The analysis of these types of TCU-continuations focuses on the linguistic environment and semantic units that these TCU-continuations are formulated upon. A final section (3.5.) summarizes and discusses these findings in relation to how they inform our understanding of Chinese TCU-continuations as a whole.

The third analytical discussion in Chapter 4 gives detailed analysis of Chinese TCU-continuations in its sequential environment, categorizes some key interactional functions and
discusses the form-function relationship of Chinese TCU-continuations. Its 6 sections include an introduction and the major interactional functions found for Chinese TCU-continuations. After a brief introduction in section (4.1.), the second section (4.2.) documents how the majority of TCU-continuations can be seen to be modifying some sort of stance found in the host-TCU. These can either be downgrading/qualifying (4.2.1.), or upgrading/intensifying (4.2.2.) a prior stance. Chinese TCU-continuations have also been found to frequently do clarifying/disambiguating some constituent(s) in the prior unit, described in section (4.3.). A less talked about function of TCU-continuation, reformatting/reformulating the sequential action is also illustrated in section (4.4.). Considerations outside the field of talk can also motivates the use of TCU-continuations, as is shown in the analysis of “I gave up smoking cigarettes. one week ago today. actually.” in Goodwin’s (1979) paper. Such a phenomenon is also found in our Chinese data, and is discussed under securing/pursuing recipient’s uptake in section (4.5.), where the video analysis demonstrates how participation framework can influence the emergence of further talk. Similarly, a final section (4.6.) closes off our findings on the interactional functions, and their relations to the forms of TCU-continuations.

I conclude the dissertation in Chapter 5 with a summary of our findings on Chinese TCU-continuations, and its implications on both the study of doing retroactive operations with turn-continuations, as well as interactional linguistics. Towards this end, I discuss 3 interlocking strands or ideas as seen through the conversational practice of doing TCU-continuations. Based on the “technology” used in producing Chinese TCU-continuations, we postulate in section (5.1.) how the interactional concerns of TCU-continuations may be subtly different from another important conversational practice at utterance-final position, namely transition-space self-repair.
In section (5.2.), some key observations on how and why TCU-continuations are formulated is brought to bear on the principle of *progressivity* in interactional talk as initially proposed by Sacks (1987) and Schegloff (1979). Finally, we end with some comments in section (5.3.) on how the study of TCU-continuations contributes to the notion of an *Emergent Grammar* (Hopper 2011a, 2011b; Pekarek Doehler 2011), specifically how TCU-continuations may be seen as an *emergent grammatical unit* that is contingently produced to address problems in moment-by-moment interactional talk.
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING TCU-CONTINUATIONS IN MANDARIN CHINESE

2.1. Introduction to Chapter 2

As discussed in sections (1.2.) and (1.3.), there is a range of linguistic parameters with which different languages can choreograph further talk in contrastive ways, but nevertheless similarly conveying a sense of “continuation” from a host-TCU. It has also been alluded that while English speakers can frequently, and perhaps do most naturally, draw upon syntactic continuity as a resource to denote TCU-continuations; such resource, however, is relatively limited in Chinese due to its default syntactic order, where various forms of adverbials and modifiers can only grammatically appear before the head clause. As such, it is unsurprising that while Chinese speakers also do “continuations”, a large number of Chinese TCU-continuations are not necessarily syntactically fitted materials. How then do Chinese speakers formulate and recognize completion, or design additional talk at TRP, such that co-participants to the conversation understand them to be “continuations”, or be a part of, what has priorly been a possibly complete TCU? This analytic chapter is thus concerned with examining the mechanics of possible completion (section (2.2.)) and doing “continuation” in Mandarin Chinese (section (2.3.)). A point to note is that the purpose of adding a “continuation” may be to “hide” that it was in the first place a “continuation” at all. In other words, the primary goal of adding an element may be to retroactively disguise that a possible completion point had, in fact, just priorly been projected; in effect, “deleting” a TRP and any of its relevant interactional import. This is most convincingly demonstrated in Goodwin (1979) where the speaker ostensibly added “continuations” in a manner that transform the utterance, but at the same time, conceal that the
utterance might have been possibly complete just before the “continuation” was added. Or as C. Goodwin puts it, “adding something might be a way of creating a field of action without visible disruption or juncture”\textsuperscript{29}. As it turns out, a key argument of this dissertation is that TCU-continuations are in essence “embedded” forms of transition-space repair (Jefferson 1983), and “continuations” are specifically formulated to minimize “disconnect” from the host-TCU (see section (5.1.)). Therefore, in describing the features that exemplifies Chinese TCU-continuations as “continuations”, there is no suggestion that recipients will necessarily perceive such features to indicate their disjunctive status after a completion point. In fact, as will be seen, features of TCU-continuation are designed to downplay their visibility as something new, and provide some sense of contiguity from the prior.

2.2. Projecting for possible TCU completion in Chinese

Before we (or more accurately, participants to a conversation) can discern TCU-continuations, possible TCU completion must first be projected and recognized; for even in its broadest sense, a TCU-continuation refers to “continuation” after a possibly complete TCU. In Sacks et al. (1974) seminal paper, the projectability of an upcoming TRP was emphasized as the crucial component within the turn-taking system:

“\textit{Organization (of turn-taking) appears to key on one main feature of the construction of the talk in a turn - namely, that whatever the units employed for the construction, and whatever the theoretical language employed to describe them, they still have points of possible unit completion, points which are projectable before their occurrence.}”\textsuperscript{30}

Furthermore, the “unit-type” of the TCU was key to what provides for such projectability:

\textsuperscript{29} Personal communication with Charles Goodwin
\textsuperscript{30} Sacks et al. (1974), pp. 720.
“Unit-types for English include sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical constructions... Instances of the unit-types so usable allow a projection of the unit-type underway, and what, roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed. Unit-types lacking the feature of projectability may not be usable in the same way.”

However, specifically what features within the “unit-type” allow for such projection was not clarified. Various earlier and recent studies on English conversation have contributed significantly to the exploration of this question, pointing to aspects of syntax, prosody, and pragmatics that can work to cue recipient of impending TRP (Oreström 1983, Levinson 1983, Wilson & Zimmerman 1986, Local & Kelly 1986, Goodwin & Goodwin 1987, Levelt 1989, Schegloff 1996a, Fox 2001, Local & Walker 2012). In their carefully coordinated study of how syntactic, intonational and pragmatic completion may actually lead to speaker transition in English conversation, Ford & Thompson (1996) shows that nearly half of all speaker change in their data (47.5%) occurs at points where all three aspects of completion converges to form a “complex” transition relevance place (CTRP). Another 21.1% of those CTRP occurs in environments where the next speaker is already talking in overlap. This could be instances where the next speaker has projected upcoming transition relevance place (based on CTRP) and began talking before current speaker has come to actual completion; or where current speaker continues talking pass an earlier CTRP (as in producing a TCU-continuation) where speakership has already transitioned, resulting in a later CTRP by current speaker overlapping with next speaker’s ongoing talk. In this sense, the convergence of syntactic, intonational and pragmatic completion can actually account for 68.6% of how next speaker projects and locates points of TCU completion. While there remains 31.4% of CTRP where no accompanying speaker change

occurs, we must remember that in the turn-taking model described (Sacks et al. 1974), transition is in fact optional, locally managed by the current speaker selecting a next, and the next speaker acquiescing to take the turn. Current speaker can, and do, continue talking through self-selection after producing a CTRP (such as producing a TCU-continuation when no speaker transition is seen), hence the term a “possible” completion. The key point here is, how possible completion of a TCU may be recognized or projected (by recipients and analyst alike) is not a straightforward matter. Although how projecting an upcoming TRP in English is not fully understood, it does seems that such an indication is strongest when all three parameters of syntax, prosody and pragmatics are analyzably complete at any given moment of talk.

Furthermore, there are evidences that projection of TRP can also differs cross-linguistically. The most well studied case of this is in Japanese (Fox et al. 1996; Hayashi 2003; Tanaka 1999, 2000), where it is argued that the language has “delayed” or “limited” projection due to the normative “syntactic practices” of Japanese speakers. These include having flexible word order, use of post-positions, the prevalence of zero anaphora (subject and object), and the availability of utterance-final particles that can retroactively transform the constituents to which they attach. Nonetheless, Japanese speakers do project upcoming TRP (since the turn-taking system is also evidently at work in Japanese). The difference lies in its language-specific linguistic resources providing for alternative means of projection (Tanaka 2001, Hayashi 2004). Naturally, with any other different language, the determination of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion will have to be dependent on the specific grammatical configuration of the language in use. We note that this was also earlier postulated in Sacks et al. (1974):

“Since (projection of TRP) is the better part of what the turn-taking system asks of the language materials from which its turns are fashioned, it will be compatible with a system of units which has this feature.”

For the purpose of gathering TCU-continuations in our data, what constitutes possible completion of TCU in Chinese would also have to be operationalized. While further talk after a possible completion is most convincingly evinced (given CA’s emic perspective) by having a next-speaker transition at TRP, and overlapping the added material of current-speaker; the lack of such an occurrence does not mean that a possible completion did not occur, as next-speaker (selected or not) can delay uptake or choose not to talk after completion. The absence of speaker transition at TRP could also be due to strategies that current speaker exercises to avoid actual completion, such as speeding up near a projectable TRP with a “rush-through” (Schegloff 1982, 1987, 1988, 1996). This dissertation therefore adopts the above-described position in operationalizing our identification of possible completion points, namely Chinese TRPs are also projected via aspects of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion. Needless to say, features of the Chinese language that projects for syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion can be cross-linguistically different. Some of these characteristics are outlined below.

**Syntactic Completion:** While recognizing that the notion of a fixed syntax is controversial and unstable, it is argued that there is nonetheless a “normative” form of syntax that Chinese speaker orient to when projecting for syntactic completion. These patterns of “normative syntax” are well described in seminal works such as Li & Thompson (1981) and Lu (1999). Summarily, Chinese

---

34 A significant number of Chinese TCU-continuations in our collection has been found to have this feature.
is considered to be a prototypical isolating language (i.e. lacking in inflections), and therefore
derivational morphemes are not usually found for projecting the end of a clause. In terms of
word order, there are difficulties in defining Chinese though it is still basically a SVO (subject
verb-object) language. However, opposed to English, referential subjects/agents are often
omitted in actual talk when the discourse context makes the required constituent clear (i.e. null-subject language). Also unlike English, Chinese is argued to be a topic-prominent language
where its syntax emphasizes a topic-comment structure (as opposed to a subject-predicate structure). Various forms of Chinese adverbials (e.g. disjuncts, prepositional phrases, relative clauses) and other modifiers are usually placed before the head (verbal or nominal) element (i.e. right-headed syntax), and their occurrence therefore strongly projects for an upcoming predicative constituent. Yet, the acceptability of placing certain adverbials (such as locative prepositional phrases) before or after the head element can be fuzzy in natural talk-in-interaction. Nonetheless, Chinese speakers are able to use certain features of the normative
structure described to project for points of syntactic completion. The lexicon of Chinese also
crucially offers a relatively large number of utterance final particles, such as “a (啊)”, “ou (哦)”, “la (啦)”, “ne (呢)”,”ma (嘛)” etc., encoding various stance nuances (Wu 2004), and
more importantly, act as a clear grammatical indicator of ending (i.e. strong synthetic closure) for
a significant number of Chinese utterances. Additionally, it bears reminding that the
identification of syntactically complete utterances is monitored as the talk unfolds, and therefore

38 Li & Thompson (1976) and Li & Thompson (1989), pp. 15-16.
40 Li & Thompson (1981), pp. 397-413.
multiple points of syntactic completion can be created before actual TRP, by “incrementally” extending the utterance using various grammatically fitted constituents. Another notable point is syntactic completion in our context is clearly unrelated to the idea of “well-formed sentences” used for grammatical judgement in formal linguistic literature, but is based on contextualized natural data where the utterance is considered as part of a sequence of actions. Therefore, syntactic completion may occur (within the right context) as a word, a phrase, a clause, or even after multiple clauses.

**Prosodic Completion:** Prosody encompasses a wide range of acoustic features such as rhythm, loudness, stress, tempo, pitch, or in effect the overall intonation of speech. Though pitch-accent is recognized as having a significant role in the projection of TRP (Schegloff 1996), Local & Walker (2012) has shown that a variety of non-pitch related acoustic features (such as durational lengthening, aspiration in word-final position and audible out-breath), may also be at play in projecting possible turn transition. Intonation which signals finality is, of course, another widely observed feature that projects for prosodic completion, such as a marked fall or rise in pitch at the end of an utterance, denoted by the period and question mark in the Du Bois et al. (1993) and Jefferson (2004) transcription system. However, the tonal system of the Chinese language calls for further elaboration on how prosodic completion may be projected in Chinese talk-in-interaction. To do this, a common TCU completion and TCU-continuation in Chinese is illustrated in Ex.(3) at focal lines 04, where the speaker, Faye, comments on the inconsequentiality of being a second author of a paper in her school.

\[43\] Local & Walker (2012) terms these as “turn-projecting features”
Ex. (3) Graduate Dilemma [9:21–9:26]

03 Matt: 这次，好歹试一下啊。
04⇒ Faye: 没用。我们那儿第：第二作者都不算。<↓现在。
05 (. )
06 Matt: 是吗。

03 Matt: ei'i. hao-dai shi yi-xia a.  
INJ. good-bed try one-COM INJ
Oh... But (you) should try nonetheless.

04⇒ Faye: mei yong. women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan.<<xianzai.  
NEG use. 1PL there number number two author all NEG count.<<now. 
It’s useless. Over here a second author is not even counted. now.

05 (. )
06 Faye: shi ma.  
be QP
be QP

In the second TCU of line 04, Faye first produces a host-TCU “women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan (Over here a second author is not even counted)” which comes to a syntactic completion point. As it turns out, Faye continues to rush-through with another constituent “xianzai (now)”, which is analyzably a TCU-continuation, or more specifically an Insertable. Our focus here is to look at some measurable prosodic characteristics near the juncture of possible completion at the end of “dou bu suan (not even counted)”, which is captured in the following graph (next page) using the speech analysis software Praat. The top tier of the graph shows the compact waveform of the talk, where height of the wave corresponds to the intensity (i.e. amplitude or loudness) of the produced sound, and length of the wave can also grossly denote the time period at which certain segments of talk is stretched. The middle tier converts Fo into pitch tracks, indicative of the utterance’s intonational contour. The bottom tier of the graph shows the piece of talk analyzed through the Pinyin transcription of Mandarin Chinese.
From both syntactic and pragmatic perspective, the focal host-TCU “women naer di: er zuo\(\text{zh}\)e dou bu su\(\text{an}\)” (Over here a second author is not even counted)” is complete after the monosyllabic word “s\(\text{u}\)an (count)”. Prosodically, it can also be seen in the top tier of the graph that the last syllable “s\(\text{u}\)an (count)” is lengthened relative to other monosyllabic words such as “d\(\text{u}\) (all)” and “b\(\text{u}\) (NEG)”. Furthermore, a general downward intonation contour can also be observed from the beginning of “women (we)” till the end of “s\(\text{u}\)an (count)”, though along certain segments of the TCU, intonational rises can be seen due to rising syllabic tonal contours of individual words in the language. While a terminal falling intonation (for non-interrogative actions) can generally be taken to be projecting possible completion in English, in a tonal language like Chinese, each syllable\(^{44}\) possesses its own tonal contour which interplays with the larger global intonation contour of the utterance (Chao 1968), resulting in either rising or falling intonation as distinct possibilities in a final intonation contour regardless of the utterance’s

\(^{44}\) Orthographically, a single character in the Chinese script denotes a single syllable.
function\textsuperscript{45}. Nonetheless, a bundle of other prosodic cues are available in Chinese for the interlocutor to project for TRP, such as:

i) **Lengthening of “last” syllable:** In utterances where no final particle is produced (or even when the last syllable is the final particle), the last syllable (or monosyllabic Chinese word) before TCU completion tends to be lengthened, as is typical of intonation units\textsuperscript{46} and verified in Local & Walker (2012). In utterances where the last Chinese word is bi-syllabic, then the lengthening can occur either on the last (i.e. 2\textsuperscript{nd} character of bi-syllabic word) or second last (i.e. 1\textsuperscript{st} character of bi-syllabic word) syllable, depending on the specific bi-syllabic word used, thus allowing for early projection of TCU completion.

ii) **Declination unit (DU):** Probably, the most crucial factor for the projection of prosodic completion for Chinese interlocutors is probably the perception of an overall “declination unit (DU),” defined as “a general declination trend (slope) describing the gradual fall in $F_0$ (fundamental frequency) over time during a period of speech\textsuperscript{47}, whose boundaries are found to coincide with an overwhelming majority of intonation units or IUs (Schuetzu-Coburn 1991, Du Bois et al. 1993, Tao 1996). As mentioned above, though the final intonation contour of a Chinese TCU may end with either a rising or falling intonation, the unit will nonetheless exhibit an overall declination trend. Typically, a single TCU will begin with the onset of a pitch reset\textsuperscript{48},

\textsuperscript{45} Tao (1996), pp. 45-47.
\textsuperscript{46} Du Bois et al. (1993), pp. 47.
\textsuperscript{47} Tao (1996), pp. 48.
\textsuperscript{48} Du Bois et al. (1993), pp. 47.
usually manifested in the rising of pitch⁴⁹ at the beginning of the TCU in contrast to the end of the preceding TCU. As the TCU is produced moment-by-moment, the rate of pitch declination is then partially regulated by the speaker according to the projected length of the TCU, such that an overall declination trend can be perceived, despite irregular pitch fluctuations along the body of the TCU caused by individual syllabic tonal contours or other intonational modifications denoting stances such as attitudes/emotions. It has been suggested that tracking of DU constitutes the crucial factor for identification of final intonation at the boundaries of Chinese TCU⁵⁰, and thus can be used by interlocutors to project for TCU completion.

Although certain features of the IU are shared by TCU, it bears highlighting that TCU and IU are not mutually interchangeable concepts. For one, IU is based upon the concern of information flow in natural speech, and how that is packaged within a natural prosodic unit; whereas TCU stems from the organization of turn-taking and the identification of TRP. But more importantly, the projection of TCU completion does not depend on prosodic determination alone, but upon the agreement of completion of all three factors (i.e. syntactic, prosodic & pragmatic). In sum, prosodic features specific to the language are also available to Chinese speakers as resources for projection of TRP. But as with any other language, it has to be reiterated that the identification of prosodic completion is clearly an auditory, perceptual matter (for the recipient, as well as for the analyst).

**Pragmatic Completion:** The notion of conversational “action” figures prominently in how pragmatic completion is to be construed. However, the complication here is, what constitutes a

⁴⁹ “Pitch”, as used in this proposal, refers to the known perceptual and subjective property of acoustic speech, which is otherwise measurable as fundamental frequency (F₀).
complete conversational action has to be contextually determined based on the interactional sequence at hand (see, inter alia, Goodwin 1979, 1981; M.H. Goodwin 1980; Goodwin & Goodwin 1987, 1992; Schegloff 1996), independent of the lexical forms used to pursue such actions. The short extract shown below illustrates how a unit that is syntactically and possibly prosodically complete is nonetheless not coming to a TRP due to it being pragmatically incomplete.

**Ex. (4) ES-M-01 [10:47-10:49]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Han: 他的现在几岁.&lt;两岁多吧．</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05‒‒</td>
<td>Lee: 小孩::(.)↓我家小孩现在是::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>西岁:八个月多一点．</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Han: 哦::[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Han: ta xianzai ji sui.&lt;liang sui duo ba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>3SG now how-many age. two age more QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05‒‒</td>
<td>How old is he now? Should be two plus, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05‒‒</td>
<td>Lee: xiaoha::i (.) ↓wo jia xiaohai xianzai shi::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>kid 1SG home kid now BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>(The) child... My kid is now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>liang sui ba ge yue duo yi dian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>two age eight CL month more one bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>two years and eight months, and a bit more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Han: o::[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>CFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Oh……</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this extract, Han initiates an interrogative first pair part (FPP) in line 03, asking Lee the age of her child, before rushing through with a guess of “liang sui duo (two plus)”, and ending with a final particle “ba” that strongly make a next action conditionally relevant. After a 0.3 second pause, Lee starts at line 05 with a lengthened lexical noun “xiaoha::i (child)”
followed by a micro pause. In conversational discourse, a single lexical word, such as “xiaohai”, can be synthetically complete given the right context (as in No! or What?). Furthermore, durational lengthening on the last syllable of “hai” followed by the micropause of silence give further suggestion that prosodic completion may also be achieved. However, simply stating a referential noun (my child) can in no way be construed as a possible next second pair part (SPP), or an answer, to the prior interrogative FPP (at line 03) that asked for an age. Thus, “xiaohai (the child)” cannot be pragmatically complete, nor is a TRP reached, within this sequential context; and the recipient did not initiate a next turn though the micropause presented such an opportunity. In fact, the micropause acts as a repair initiator for Lee to replace “xiaohai (child)” with “wo jia xiaohai (my kid)” before going on to state the age of “liang sui ba ge yue duo yi dian (two years eight months and a bit more)”. It was upon completion of this valid SPP action that speaker transitioned at line 07.

In addition, the notion of a valid action in conversation is separate from “speech act” theory (Searle 1969) where a limited closed class of “actions” is determined a priori to the empirical analysis. Schegloff (1980), for instance, shows how a speaker’s action may also extend to concerns of sequence management, as opposed to pure illocutionary forces. The range of conversational actions that can be pursued through turns of talk is hence an ongoing enterprise. What this means in essence, is that the operationalization of pragmatic completion has to be (similar to prosodic completion) an intuitive and provisional endeavor. Nonetheless, given that an upcoming completion is multiply projected using a configuration of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic features, the efficacy of Chinese speakers in recognizing TRP (and our operationalization of possible TCU completion) is undiminished.
2.3. Identifying Chinese TCU-continuations

Upon coming to a possible completion in a TCU, further talk by same speaker is monitored for its relevance as a new TCU in itself, or some form of “continuation”. However, just as TCU completion can be projected via a number of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic features, how further talk is marked as not something “new”, but “continuing” from what has just been completed, can also be accomplished through multiple strategies. From our discussion in section (1.2.), it is evident that a singular definitional category based on certain linguistic parameters would not do justice to the full spectrum of how TCU-continuations may be achieved. Yet, there are statistically more dominant types than others. This section now turns towards a description of some highly frequent features in Chinese TCU-continuations, as well as a couple of cases which do not fit in those descriptions, but are nonetheless also analyzable as continuing the prior talk.

Focal line 04 of Ex.(3) would again be used as an illustration of a common Chinese TCU-continuation. After the host-TCU “women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan (Over here a second author is not even counted)” comes to a possible TCU completion (denoted by the period after “suan (count)”), the speaker Faye rushes through (denoted by the “less than” symbol (<)) to produce a single lexical word “xianzai (now)” before the onset of any speaker transition. Several features of this appended item marks it as being a “continuation” rather than a new TCU in of itself. It is first noted that the end of “xianzai” constitutes another hearable prosodic completion due to its terminal falling intonation, thereby signaling the formulation of “xianzai” as the next unit of talk after “women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan”. However, within this sequential context, this new material cannot be adequately understood without recourse to the just-prior
TCU (i.e. host-TCU); namely “xianzai (now)” only makes sense when treated as a time adverbial restricting the scope of the clause “a second author is not even counted”. In other words, although a time word such as “xianzai” may suffice as an independent TCU in certain sequential environments, within this context, it is semantically and pragmatically dependent upon its host-TCU. By adopting a retrospective orientation\textsuperscript{51} to “xianzai”, it is thus treated as a time adverbial to the prior TCU, and sequentially a TCU-continuation. Although having a retrospective orientation is a major defining feature of TCU-continuations, it is nonetheless not a reliably operational criterion for identification purposes. As Luke & Zhang (2007) points out, all utterances are retrospective in some sense, as “proper interpretation (of next utterance) always depends to some extent on previous utterances”\textsuperscript{52}. Furthermore, in terms of the on-line parsing of moment-by-moment talk, understanding further talk as being retroactively oriented can only be achieved after the further unit of talk has come to some form of completion for proper interpretation. Therefore such retroactive understanding and recognition of TCU-continuation do not seem to be in line with the necessity to project possible TCU-continuations near its onset, and thus cannot be effectively utilized by recipients of talk to project further talk as “continuations” before their completion.

In terms of “grammatical fittedness”, by taking “xianzai” as a time adverbial placed at the end of the utterance to modify the host-TCU, there is a marked syntactic discontinuity\textsuperscript{53} between “women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan” and “xianzai”. The “normative” syntactic position of time adverbial in a Chinese clause is before the main verb, therefore “xianzai (now)” is seen as being retroactively re-inserted back into the host-TCU (cf. Insertables) to be read as

“women naer xianzai di er zuozhe dou bu suan (Over here a second author is not even counted now)”.

While syntactic continuity may be a frequent feature of TCU-continuation in English (cf. Glue-ons), our collection of Chinese TCU-continuations reveals that a large majority of appended items at TRP, which are hearably and understandably “continuations”, do so in a manner that is not “grammatically fitted” to the host-TCU. Therefore, as opposed to English, and similar to German and Japanese (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007), grammatical fittedness cannot be a core feature of Chinese TCU-continuations. On the other hand, a sizeable number of TCU-continuations in our Chinese data have also been found to be syntactically continuous with the host-TCU (i.e. Glue-ons). Hence, the linguistic parameter of syntax does not seem to figure significantly in the formulation of Chinese TCU-continuations.

Consequently, it is proposed that a major dimension for recognition of Chinese TCU-continuations rest upon its prosodic cues. To illustrate the common prosodic qualities of Chinese TCU-continuations, Graph (1a) is reproduced below as Graph (1b) with a focus on the TCU-continuation “xianzai”.

Graph (1b): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(3) – Identifying TCU-continuation
As can be seen, the production of “xianzai” as a TCU-continuation is marked by two prominent prosodic features. The first would be the lack of pitch reset at the start of articulating “xianzai”, otherwise typically seen on the onset of new TCUs. The pitch track in the middle tier shows that “xianzai” did not begin on a fundamental frequency that is substantially higher than the end of the preceding TCU, but at about the same frequency of the prior and “continues” the downward contour throughout the TCU-continuation. In fact, taken in its entirety, the intonation contour of the host-TCU together with its TCU-continuation “xianzai” can be seen to follow a downward declination trend, resembling a single DU. A second prosodic feature of “xianzai” is that it was articulated at a notably lower intensity (i.e. loudness) than its host-TCU. These two features are major constituents of what can be termed subordinate intonation, which I suggest is a crucial amalgamation of prosodic features that recipients orient to in recognizing upcoming Chinese TCU-continuations. A third and often seen feature of Chinese TCU-continuations in our collection is for it to be produced with a “rush-through”, as is with “xianzai” in Ex.(3), latching onto the possibly complete preceding TCU to minimize gap between TCU-continuation and host-TCU. However, as our later exemplars will show, this is not always the case. There can be TCU-continuations done rhythmically in the next beat, after a noticeable gap or even after talk-by-others (see discussion on “next beat increment”, “post gap increment” and “post-other-talk increment” in sections (1.1.) and (1.3.)), which can be consequential in terms of the TCU-continuations’ interactional function (Schegloff 2004). Nevertheless, the postulation of subordinate intonation as a core attribute of Chinese TCU-continuations is rooted in two key

observations:

i) The two components of subordinate intonation, namely *lack of pitch reset* and *lowered intensity*, are indicators that allows for early projection or recognition of TCU-continuation right from its onset.

ii) *Subordinate intonation* is a ubiquitous salient feature found in our collection of further talk that are hearably and understandably “continuations”. This feature is frequently found across the various typological types (as discussed in section (1.2.)) in our Chinese data, such as *Insertables, Replacements, Glue-ons* and *Free Constituents*.

While *subordinate intonation* is a common attribute in Chinese TCU-continuations, by no means is it a necessary feature in further talk for it to be interpretable as “continuing” from the prior TCU. It is now useful to examine some recurrent instances that do not show such prosodic cues, but are nonetheless analyzably TCU-continuations in their own rights. A clear exception to having subordinate intonation as an index to TCU-continuation is the category of *Non-add-ons*, which by definition refers to elements that are prosodically non-distinct (i.e. through-produced) from the host-TCU. As *Non-add-ons* continues the intonation contour without any form of prosodic break, there is no dichotomy between the intonation of the host-TCU and a subordinate intonation of the TCU-continuation to speak of. This is illustrated in Ex.(5) below (next page), which shows a short segment from a sequence where Faye was complaining to Matt about a friend’s difficult request. Earlier in the talk, Faye informs about the friend’s request to
locate an academic article in an unfamiliar field, and her lack of success in the attempt. As such, Faye has been feeling uneasy about returning the friend’s call, and Matt begins to console her at line 19.

Ex.(5) Graduate Dilemma [19:31-19:37]  
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

19 Matt: [ne:i yo- you bu shi shuo yo- you shenme dongxi keyi gaosu]  
DM have have also NEG be say have have what thing can tell  
[Then- it’s not as if there’s something you can tell]  

20 ta ya. [fanzheng ye mei dongxi.]  
3SG SFP. [anyway also NEG thing him. [There’s nothing (to say) anyway.]  

21⇒ Faye: [dui @ >yinwei< cha bu-zhao guanjian shi.]  
[yes >because< check NEG-CTP critical BE. [yea. Because (I) couldn’t find it, that’s the critical point.]

1SG NEG know [where] check down-COM  
I don’t know [where] else to look (for it).  

23 Matt: [dui a.]  
[right SFP]  
[yeah.]  

The focus is at line 21, where Faye says “cha bu-zhao guanjian shi (The point is that I can’t find it)”. The constituent of interest is a compound of two lexical item “guanjian shi”, literally “the critical point is…”, produced at the end of the utterance. Firstly, “guanjian shi” is a disjunct, whose function is to frame some propositional content as being “the main point”, and hence is by itself semantically dependent. Secondly, in normative syntax, “guanjian shi” should
occur before the propositional content it frames (marked by @ in the transcript). Therefore, if the proposition it modifies is “cha bu-zhao (can’t find it)”, then the speaker’s production of “guanjian shi” is retrospectively oriented and syntactically discontinuous. While it is also positionally possible that “guanjian shi” may be produced to frame the upcoming talk instead of the preceding one (meaning “guanjian shi” is produced to frame “wo bu zhidao na: cha xia-qu (I don’t know where else to look for it)”), the speaker has made such a reading prosodically impossible. Graph (2) below provides an acoustic analysis of Ex.(5).

Graph (2): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(5)

Though syntactically and pragmatically complete, not only does “cha bu-zhao” fail to end with a final intonation or downwards declination trend, but as shown in the pitch tracks of Graph (3), the intonation contour continues seamlessly into “guanjian shi”. Therefore, the recipient, through parsing the moment-by-moment talk, will first interpret that “cha bu-zhao” has not actually come to possible completion, and thereby project further talk (i.e. “guanjian shi”) to be part of this TCU. In contrast, a point of possible TCU completion (and TRP) actually occurs
after the next bit of talk in “guanjian shi”, indexed by its falling intonation and the extended lengthening on “shi”. This is further evidenced by Matt’s slightly late turn transition at line 23 (“dui a (yeah)”), running into overlap with Faye’s next TCU “wo bu zhidao na: cha xia-qu”. Hence, it is unambiguously clear to the recipient that “guanjian shi” has been prosodically produced to be part of “cha bu-zhao” as a single TCU. Yet as mentioned, “guanjian shi” is not grammatically fitted at the end of the utterance where it appears, and thus interpretable as some form of TCU-continuation. Crucially, “guanjian shi” is a syntactically discontinuous constituent that is “through-produced” together with “cha bu-zhao” without any form of prosodic break, marking it as a prototypical instance of a Non-add-on type of TCU-continuation. The point here is, the prosodic profile of “guanjian shi” does not fit that of a subordinate intonation. From Graph (3), it can be seen that the onset of “guanjian shi” is done with a high pitch level, characteristic of a pitch reset, and on an intensity level that is not significantly lower than “cha bu-zhao”. This suggests that prosodic cues (namely subordinate intonation), similar to syntax, are neither a necessary nor sufficient feature for the recognition of TCU-continuations.

Even when the TCU-continuation is not “through-produced” as a Non-add-on, it is also possible for further talk after possible completion to be analyzed as continuing from the prior without subscribing to subordinate intonation, such as the case of an Insertable TCU-continuation shown in Ex.(6) below (next page). A bit before the start of the exemplar, Faye was enquiring about the status of Matt’s wife, and whether she was pursuing a masters or doctoral program. Line 17 in the transcript begins after Matt confirms his wife as a masters student.
Ex.(6) Graduate Dilemma [00:17-00:24]
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

17 Faye: hhh 那快啦哦?
18 Matt: 呃::但愿如此吧.
19 (.)
20⇒ Faye: z- @ 是几年呢.<大纲 (. ) 两年.
21 (0.4)
22 Matt: 应该两年吧.

17 Faye: hhh na kuai la o?
hhh DM fast SFP SFP
It should be soon then?

18 Matt: e:: danyuan ru ci ba.
AGR hopefully resemble this SFP
Yeah. Hopefully that’s the case.

19 (.)

20⇒ Faye: z- @ shi ji nian ne.<dagai (. ) liang nian.
be how-many year SFP.<approximately. (. ) two year.
How many years should it be. approximately. Two years?

21 (0.4)

22 Matt: yinggai liang nian ba.
should two year SFP
Should be about two years.

At focal line 20, Faye started something but immediately abandoned that initial formulation, adopting instead a straightforward interrogative “shi ji nian ne (How many years should it be)”, sequentially understandable to mean how much time would it take to graduate from the masters program (pursued by Matt’s wife). Audibly, this TCU follows a general downwards declination cline, but end with a slightly higher pitched syllable in “ne” (see Graph (4) below). Although the ideal declination cline is not seen in “shi ji nian ne”, the TCU ends with a sentence final particle “ne”, indexing strong syntactic closure, and hence a possible completion. An adverb “dagai (approximately)” then latches on to the end of the host-TCU with a “rush-through”, itself coming to a possible completion with a downward intonation contour. Similar to
“guanjian shì” in Ex.(5), “dagai” is semantically dependent as an adverb to some form of verbal element. Also similar is that positionally, “dagai (approximately)” can modify the next bit of talk “liang nian (two years)” as a grammatically fitted constituent; or retroactively modify the earlier “shi ji nian ne (How many years should it be)” as a syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuation. But again, this is made unambiguous through prosodic cues, which only allows a reading that “dagai” continues from the prior unit. Different from “guanjian shì”, however, is that “dagai” is not “through-produced” but comes after a clear possible completion of a TCU. In addition, “dagai” can be synthetically re-inserted back into the host-TCU (in the position marked by @), thus making this case an instance of an Insertable TCU-continuation. Our focus though is the prosody with which “dagai” is produced, illustrated in the acoustic analysis of Graph (3) below.

Graph (3): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(6)

Clearly, “dagai” is not done with a prototypical subordinate intonation. As seen in the
graph, though “dagai” did not start with a significantly higher pitch level than the end of the preceding TCU (i.e. *pitch reset*), the volume with which it was produced was much higher than “shi ji nian ne”, which is not typical of the profile of subordinate intonation. Nonetheless, other indicators were sufficiently present to mark “dagai” as a bona fide TCU-continuation. Firstly, the terminal intonation on “dagai” followed by a micro-pause before “liang nian (two years)” strongly signal that it has come to possible completion, and not part of what is to follow. Secondly, the “rush-through” production and lack of pitch reset on “dagai”, which is a semantically dependent but synthetically discontinuous constituent, also allows for the reading of a retrospectively oriented Insertable TCU-continuation. As for why an increased intensity in the production of “dagai”, we can only presume it serves some sort of discourse-pragmatic function in the flow of talk.

The identification of TCU-continuations is made even more complex by the fact that even when the further talk constitutes an independent prosodic unit on its own (i.e. complete intonation or declination unit), that in itself is also no guarantee that it can in no way be seen as a “continuation”. The analytic problem here is to what degree can the further talk be adequately understood without recourse to the preceding TCU. As mentioned, no further talk (even subsequent new TCUs) can honestly be said to be pragmatically divorced from the immediate prior talk; as all units of subsequent talk in a situated context, to some extent, depend on the prior talk for proper interpretation. However, there are some forms of further talk that make little sense sequentially, despite possessing a full and complete intonation contour, unless grasp in conjunction with a prior TCU. This can be seen in the case of a *Free Constituent* exemplified in

---

Ex.(7) below, which occurs after talk by others (cf. post-other-talk increment). Before the exemplar begins, Lian has been commenting on how girls generally start to speak earlier than boys, as is seen in the case of her own daughter who started to speak at 8 months of age. She then continues to tell a story of how she met someone who had a 4 year-old child beside him, and what this person had said to her.

Ex.(7) ES-M-01 [16:46-17:01]

04 Lian: .hh [然后他还说:他说 .h=  
05 Chen:  [mm  
06 Lian: =他的小孩两岁才开始说.  
07 (.)  
08 Chen:  [mm  
09⇒ Lian: =那男孩.  
10 Chen:  [mm.  
11 Lian:  他说两岁才开始讲话.  

04 Lian: .hh [ranhou ta hai shuo ta shuo .h=  
05 Chen:  [mm  
06 Lian: =他的小孩两岁才开始说.  
07 (.)  
08 Chen:  [mm  
09⇒ Lian: =那男孩.  
10 Chen:  [mm.  
11 Lian:  他说两岁才开始讲话.  

At line 04 and 06, Lian reveals that the person she met tells her that his 4 year-old child
only started to speak at around 2 years of age. This is immediately following with a micro-pause at line 07, and then some form of acknowledgement or a non-committal continuer “mm” at line 08. Unsatisfied with such a response, Lian then produces in focal line 09 “nei nan hai (that boy)”, thereby highlighting the gender of the child as the relevant information to consider, as well as pursuing for a more adequate uptake. However, this is again met with the unsatisfactory “mm”, leading Lian to repeat her TCU again from Line 06 in Line 11. The acoustic analysis for Lines 06-09 is shown below as Graph (4).

Graph (4): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(7)

From the graph, it is clear that “nei nan hai” does not conform to the two core aspects of subordinate intonation, namely it is done with a pitch reset and its intensity is not relatively lower than the surrounding TCUs. Crucially, compared with Ex.(5), the unit is separated from its prior TCU by the same speaker (Lian) with talk by others (Chen’s “mm”). Therefore, by all prosodic measures, it is in fact an independent intonation unit (IU) or declination unit (DU) in its
own right. From the point of syntax, there are no empty syntactic slots in the prior TCU for “nei
nan hai” to be “re-inserted” back into as a noun phrase Insertable; nor can it “replace” the
original noun phrase subject as a Replacement. This is because “tade xiaohai” existed within the
frame of a reported speech where someone else is principally responsible for the utterance, while
“nei nan hai” is clearly produced with Lian as its author (Goffman 1981). Furthermore, “nei nan
hai” is not syntactically continuous with Line 06 for it to be seen as a Glue-on. In a nutshell,
neither syntactic nor prosodic cues mark “nei nan hai” as possibly “continuing” from some prior
talk.

Yet “nei nan hai (that boy)” does not make any pragmatic sense, unless jointly
understood with the prior Line 06 as a characterization of the subject “tade xiaohai (his child)”. Therefore, the strong sense of “continuation” here rests squarely on the difficulty in semantically
and pragmatically understanding “nei nan hai” as an independent TCU within this sequential
context. The most appropriate category for this TCU-continuation under the framework proposed
by Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) would be as a Free Constituent. Despite
the illustration of a prosodically independent Free Constituent shown here, it must be pointed out
that most Free Constituents in our data do exhibit subordinate intonation or varying level of
prosodic dependence.

The upshot from the above discussion is, though subordinate intonation is quite an
ubiquitous feature of Chinese TCU-continuations in our data, there is no fundamental or
structural need for all continuations to have this feature; or for prosodic dependence of the TCU-
continuation to be strictly defined within the profile of subordinate intonation. In short, prosodic
dependence is not a necessary criterion for further talk to be interpreted as “continuing” from a
prior unit. Speakers can, and do, index further talk as “continuations” using variable configurations of linguistics (and possibly para-linguistics) resources available in a situated moment of interaction.

To highlight the diverse and intricate nature of how “continuing” prior talk may be done, a final exemplar in Ex.(8) is shown below where, not one, but two contrastive TCU-continuations are produced consecutively, all within a single TCU. In focal lines 02-03, Faye describes how her husband (Ye Jingyi) had a restless night due to a difficult decision the couple had to make, in “you yi tian ye (jingyi) mei shui-zha:o<jiu. (.) wan-shang duo. (One day, Ye Jingyi didn’t even sleep for the entire night)”. The acoustic analysis for the focal lines is then shown in Graph (5) on the next page.

Ex.(8) Graduate Dilemma [6:07-6:16]
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Faye:  =en. tsh 但你说我们怎么办呢. ehh hh eh hh
02 .hhh 我-我们俩就是(>就是<)-有一天叶(敬义)
03⇒ @ 没睡着:<就.(.)晚上都.
04 想这事儿很烦.

Ex.(8) Graduate Dilemma [6:07-6:16]
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Faye:  =en. tsh dan ni shuo women zenme ban ne. ehh hh eh hh
AGR. But 2SG say 1PL how solve SFP.
Yes. But what do you think we should do? ((laugh tokens))

02 .hhh wo-women liang jiushi (>jiushi<)- you yi tian ye(jingyi)
1SG-1PL two-person DM (>DM<)- have one day NM
.hhh I-We’re just- just- One day, Ye Jingyi didn’t

03⇒ @ mei shui-zha:o<jiu. (.).wan-shang dou.
NEG sleep-CTP DM. (.). night-COM all.
didn’t even sleep. (.). the whole night.

04 xiang zhe shier hen fan.
think this matter very worry
Considering this is very frustrating.
The first component of interest here is the commonly known adverbial modifier “jiu (DM)”, placed after the main clause “mei shui-zhao (didn’t sleep)”. Although there is a hearable lengthening and stress on the syllable “zha:o” (an aspect marker for “shui (sleep)”) that projects an upcoming TRP, “jiu” was quickly latched on (indicated by <) before “ye (jingyi) mei shui-zha:o (Ye Jingyi didn’t sleep)” could come to actual possible completion. Prosodically then, “jiu” is heard as being “through-produced”, merging seamlessly within a single intonation contour with the prior syllable, and therefore an integral part of the entire TCU. However, “jiu” is also a commonly known adverbial modifier which is typically placed before the main verb in normative syntax, as in “ye (jingyi) jiu mei shui-zhao (Ye Jingyi didn’t even sleep)”, marking the sleeplessness as an “unexpected” event. Therefore, as with “guanjian shî”, “jiu” is interpretable as being retrospectively oriented (i.e. dependent upon the just-prior TCU for adequate interpretation) and syntactically discontinuous, and an instance of a Non-add-on TCU-continuation. It should be reiterated here that a crucial dimension of how Non-add-ons are seen to be “continuations” despite being “through-produced” as a singular perceptual auditory unit, is
due to their lack of grammatical fitted-ness and somehow an unnatural constituent when placed retroactively\(^{57}\) (see section (1.2.)).

After this first “host-TCU + TCU-continuation (you yi tian ye (jingyi) mei shui-zha:o<jiu)” comes to possible completion, a micro-pause of silence occurred with no recipient uptake. Following this, a second TCU-continuation was produced in the form of “wan-shang dou (the whole night)”, which is a semantically dependent compound adverbial, consisting of two lexical items “wan-shang (night)” and “dou (all)”. Therefore, after the speaker (Faye) marks her husband’s sleepless night as an extraordinary event with “jiu”, she continues to upgrade the stance invoked through that description by further emphasizing the prolonged duration in “wan-shang dou”\(^{58}\). Note that in contrast to the earlier “jiu”, “wan-shang dou” did not latched onto (i.e. rush-through production) or form a single intonation contour with the host-TCU, but was done after a hearable gap of silence. It was produced **after** a possible TCU completion and with subordinate intonation (note lack of pitch reset and relatively lowered intensity in Graph (5)). However, similar with “jiu”, the default syntactic position for “wan-shang dou” is before the main verb, as in “ye (jingyi) wan-shang dou mei shui-zhao (Ye Jingyi didn’t sleep the whole night)”. The above points to an additional further talk after possible completion, that is also retrospectively oriented and syntactically discontinuous, thereby indicating this as an instance of an Insertable TCU-continuation.

Besides the fact that different types of TCU-continuations can be incremented consecutively to achieve a cumulative understanding, it is interesting to note how these two

\(^{57}\) This evidently calls attention to what “normative” syntax (traditionally based on written genres) is for spoken Chinese discourse, to its unsatisfactory role as a yardstick for determining “continuations”; and if the category of Non-add-ons are, in any real sense, “continuing” after some boundary point. An alternative treatment of Non-add-ons will be discussed in later sub-section (3.2.3.).

\(^{58}\) This is a core interactional function of TCU-continuations that will be further discussed in a Chapter 4.
TCU-continuations “structurally” relate to their common host-TCU and to each other. While prosodic markings (i.e. “jiu” as within a single intonation contour, and “wan-shang dou” having subordinate intonation) have index these two added materials as “continuations”, their syntactic status as re-insertable or “displaced” constituents of the host-TCU has also undeniably contributed to their interpretation as belonging to the prior talk. Yet, though both constituents are able to occupy the same syntactic slot in the host-TCU (marked by @), they are unable to do so **concurrently** within the default structure of normative syntax; which means a statement like “*ye (jingyi) jiu wan-shang dou mei shui-zhao*” is problematic. This creates a theoretical dilemma if we are to strictly think of TCU-continuations (such as Insertables and Non-add-ons) as added materials that can be structurally re-inserted back into the host-TCU as they appear incrementally. In other words, if the Non-add-on “jiu” is construed to be retroactively occupying its default syntactic slot on its first occurrence (marked by @), then in what sense is the subsequent “wan-shang dou” an Insertable since there are no syntactic slots for it to be re-inserted to in “ye (jingyi) jiu mei shui-zhao”?

What this suggests is, while categorical terms (such as Insertables, Non-add-ons, Replacements, Glue-ons and Free Constituents) implicates a certain precise organization on parameters of syntax and prosody; in actual fact, a speaker’s main concern when producing TCU-continuations is to retroactively add meaningful bits of talk in whatever linguistic (or para-linguistic) configurations that may signal it as further talk that continues from what has just preceded. In this sense then, the proposed categories (that we unavoidably have to use in a typological exercise) are little more than a sort of “statistical generalization” that do not orient/regulate/constrain speakers in any ways when they are producing all manners of “continuations”
in actual talk-in-interaction. In sum, the above discussion highlights the point that though semantic and pragmatic dependence (i.e. retrospective orientation), syntactic discontinuity, and subordinate intonation (or even rush-through production) are prototypical of Chinese TCU-continuations, how a speaker may index continuation (or how a recipient perceives a continuation) cannot be restricted, quantified or prioritized within a fixed set of criterions. The identification and perceptual recognition of TCU-continuations has to be firstly generically inclusive, and then determined on a case-by-case basis.
CHAPTER 3: TYPOLOGY OF TCU-CONTINUATIONS IN MANDARIN CHINESE

3.1. Introduction to Chapter 3

In discussing some instances of Chinese TCU-continuations in the previous chapter ("xianzai" and "dagai"), it should be evident that Chinese TCU-continuations can come in many shapes and sizes. In this chapter, an empirically based and detailed overview of the typology of Chinese TCU-continuations is provided, through examining segments of actual Chinese conversation. Based on the classification by Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), it is found that a great majority of Chinese TCU-continuations are Insertables discussed in sub-section (3.2.1.), in the sense that they are appended components that can be positionally “re-inserted back” into the host-TCU to form a syntactically cohesive whole. Some other types of Chinese TCU-continuations may not be re-inserted back into the host-TCU because the “default” syntactic position of the TCU-continuation is already occupied by similar constituents. However, due to semantic similarities between the TCU-continuation and its corresponding unit in the host-TCU, they can be seen to be “replacing” the original constituent as Replacements, illustrated in sub-section (3.2.2.). There are also a good number of instances where normatively “syntactically unfitted” elements which appear at the end of an utterance are nonetheless prosodically fitted, or form a single intonation gestalt with its host, and thus can be seen as Non-add-ons, illustrated in sub-section (3.2.3.). Interestingly, almost all the Non-add-ons found in our data can be “moved” or “re-inserted back” into an earlier syntactic position, or are repetitions of some earlier constituents in the TCU. All the above TCU-continuations have as a common feature some form of linear syntactic discontinuity, but can nonetheless be seen as being
syntactically part of the host-TCU, thus they are grouped under the heading “Synthetically discontinuous but dependent TCU-continuations”.

As much as syntactic discontinuous TCU-continuations do constitute a norm in Chinese, syntactically continuous (and therefore also syntactically dependent) TCU-continuations (or Glue-ons) are neither unused nor rare in Chinese conversations. The normative structures of Chinese grammar allows for a variety of TCU-continuations to be produced after possible completion of a TCU, and still be recognized as syntactically coherent. The exemplars and structural environments of these Chinese TCU-continuations will be explored in section (3.3.), titled “Synthetically continuous and dependent TCU-continuations (Glue-ons)”. While syntactic continuity of further talk definitely contributes to a sense of “continuation”, such units are not necessarily TCU-continuations. Instances of further talk that are syntactically continuous with the preceding TCU, but are nonetheless not “continuations” of the prior unit (primarily due to their prosodic character), will also be briefly discussed in this section.

Section (3.4.) then examines some less frequent instances of TCU-continuations that are synthetically unrelated to the prior TCU (i.e. not linearly continuous nor seen to be a synthetic part of the host-TCU), but nonetheless can only be adequately understood in conjunction with the prior unit, and thus analyzed as a “continuation” from the prior. The term “Synthetically non-dependent TCU-continuations”, instead of “synthetically independent”, used for the heading, also reflects the nature of these further talk as often being less than a full clause that is still connected to the prior TCU semantically or pragmatically, and hence resembles Free Constituents.

The decision to implement the categorical distinction between syntactically continuous,
discontinuous, dependent or non-dependent TCU-continuations in this chapter is based on, and naturally follows from, the terms set out under the classificatory system by Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007). Be that as it may, there are also analytic merits in categorizing TCU-continuations on the basis of their syntactic relationship with the host-TCU, as the parameter of syntax offers the clearest variations with which “continuations” may be done in our Chinese data. Another point to note is, although sub-categories for syntactically discontinuous but dependent TCU-continuations (Insertables, Replacements and Non-add-ons) may outnumber syntactically continuous TCU-continuations (Glue-ons), this does not reflect a statistically significant difference in the frequency of their occurrences. Instead, the more varied categories of syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations is the result of grammatically unfitted materials being able to attach themselves to prior talk in more varied ways using prosody (Insertables vs. Non-add-ons) or syntactic roles (Replacements vs. Insertables), and still be seen as being “continuations” despite their “syntactically dis-attached” status59. In other words, there is no claim of a Chinese TCU-continuation “prototype” based on syntactic (dis)contiguity.

We end off this chapter in section (3.5.) with a discussion of our findings on the typology of Chinese TCU-continuations, and the resulting implications of what it means to do retroactive operations at TRP in the Chinese language.

All the examples shown subsequently in this dissertation have been analyzed and examined to be TCU-continuations following the considerations outlined in section (2.2.) and (2.3.). As such, in the following sections, we will refrain from complicating our discussion with superfluous explication on how their status of a TCU-continuation is determined, unless

59 For instance, it is argued in a later section that a syntactically continuous element produced in the prosody of a Non-add-on is simply part of the TCU, and cannot analyzably be seen to constitute a category of TCU-continuations.
necessitated by analysis. Discourse-functional explanations of what these TCU-continuations may be doing interactionally, based on detailed sequential analysis, will also be suspended till the next analytic chapter.

3.2. Syntactically discontinuous but dependent TCU-continuations

There are a large number of “continuations” in our Chinese data where the appended talk cannot be seen as being “syntactically fitted” in its placement after possible completion of the prior TCU within the normative structures of Chinese grammar. However, upon analysis, these elements can nonetheless be construed to be syntactically part of what they are a “continuation” of, hence the heading “syntactically discontinuous but dependent TCU-continuations”. These can take the form of Insertables, where the added elements can be “re-inserted” back into an otherwise “empty” syntactic slot in the host-TCU; Replacements, where the further talk are seen as retroactively “replacing” a parallel constituent in the host-TCU; or Non-add-ons, where the added materials are “through-produced” in a single perceptual (auditory) gestalt, but due to their “syntactically unfitted” character, are seen as more “continuations” than a natural part of the TCU. As almost all of the Non-add-ons in our Chinese data can be “moved back” into an earlier syntactic position, or are repetitions of some earlier constituents in the TCU, they are thus also “syntactically discontinuous but dependent TCU-continuations”.

3.2.1. Insertables

One of the most common form of TCU-continuations found in our data are various types of constituents that can be “re-inserted” back into a default syntactic slot in the host-TCU, or
what has priorly been discussed as *Insertables*. Additionally, assortments of adverbials constitute the major class of *Insertable* TCU-continuations, working to modify the just possibly completed TCU in some way. By adverbials, we mean to include words, phrases or clauses that either modifies the main verb or the entire utterance. These can range from singular adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, conjunctions, prepositional phrases, complement-taking predicates to conditional clauses. As adverbials are inevitably bounded constituents (i.e. syntactically and semantically incomplete without the main clause), their occurrences at the end of a possibly complete utterance necessitate a retrospective orientation (i.e. taken to be a “continuation” of the prior talk) for adequate interpretation. Crucially, as mentioned in section (1.2.) & (1.3.), various forms of adverbials in Mandarin Chinese typically occupy a syntactic position before the main clausal verb (these positions are indicated by @ in the exemplars below), as seen in a right-headed syntax. Hence, its occurrence after possible completion of a clausal utterance is usually grammatically unfitted (or syntactically discontinuous); and if the adverbial constituent is not also seen in the host-TCU, can therefore be interpreted as an *Insertable*. These adverbial-type *Insertables* are exemplified from Ex.(9) to Ex.(14) in the following discussion.

The largest group of adverbials found as *Insertables* are simply single word adverbs that specifies the time, degree or manner of the main verb in the host-TCU. As these adverbs are optional items (or termed adverbial adjuncts) that do not add to the prepositional content of the host-TCU, they can often be found to be attached after the core predicative content of the utterance has been produced, as illustrated in Ex.(9a-e) below (next page).
Ex.(9) Singular Adverbs (Adverbial Adjuncts)
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(9a) Graduate Dilemma [9:21-9:26]
01 Faye: 我们那儿第2作者 @ 都不算.<xianzai.
women naer di: di er zuozhe @ dou bu suan.<xianzai.
1PL DEM number number two author all NEG count.<now.
Over here a second author is not even counted. now.

Ex.(9b) NTU-1 [41:12-41:19]
03 Lin: 现在 @ 没了吧.好像.
xianzai @ mei-le ba. haoxiang.
now NEG-CMP SFP. seem.
Not anymore now. (it) seems.

Ex.(9c) Graduate Dilemma [00:17-00:24]
20 Faye: z- @ 是几年呢.<dagai.
z- @ shi ji-nian ne.<dagai.
BE how-many year SFP.<approximately.
How many years should it be. approximately.

Ex.(9d) ES-M-03 [15:55-16:21]
11 Zhan: 内地记者他们 @ 集体沉默.<jiushi°.
neidi jizhe tamen @ jiti chenmo.<jiushi°.
inland reporter 3PL group silent DM
China’s reporters, they’re all silent. really.

Ex.(9e) ES-M-08 [0:34-0:42]
04 Gu: 台风:::诶我 @ 挺喜欢: (0.5) 就是下雨的.<daoshi.
taifeng::ei wo @ ting xihuan: (0.5) jiushi xia-yu de.<daoshi.
typhoon INJ 1SG quite like DM rain GEN actually
Typhoon, oh I quite like it, the raining type. on the contrary.

Ex.(9a) is a re-production of Ex.(3) priorly examined, and shows an instance of a temporal
adverb “xianzai (now)” that restricts the truth-value of the host-TCU’s assertion to a current time
period. The TCU-continuation “haoxiang (it seems)” in Ex.(9b) constitutes a modal adverb,
denoting a lower epistemic certainty to the prior proposition. Ex.(9c) is also seen in Ex.(6),
where “dagai (approximately)” qualifies the precision with which the question “shi ji-nian ne
(how many years)” was asked. The focus adverb “jiushi (exactly)” in Ex.(9d) exerts a tone of forcefulness. Finally, Ex.(9e) shows a conjunctive adverb “daoshi (though)” which demonstrates the speaker’s understanding that typhoon is not usually a welcomed event. It should be noted that almost all the Insertables shown above are produced as “rush-throughs”, though they can also be done after a hearable gap of silence as later examples will show.

Insertables are also consistently found in the form of prepositional phrases that indicates location or the scope of the prior predicate. These are also considered to be adverbial adjuncts that add peripheral information to the main predicate, illustrated in Ex.(10a-b).

Ex.(10) Prepositional Phrases (Adverbial Adjuncts)
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(10a) Graduate Dilemma [21:38-21:43]

03 Matt: @ 不冷啊. 这边. 
   @ bu leng a. zai zhe-bian. 
   NEG cold SFP. at DEM-side 
   It’s not cold. over here.

Ex.(10b) ES-M-03 [12:50-13:26]

13 Zhan: hh 但是 @ 影响不好啊. [“在社会上”.] 
   hh danshi @ yingxiang bu hao a. [“zai shehui-shang”.] 
   but influence NEG good SFP at society-LOC 
   But its influence isn’t good. in society.

Both Ex.(10a) and (10b) introduce locative adverbials in the form of prepositional phrase “zai zhe-bian (at here)” and “zai shehui-shang (in society)”, seeking to clarify the scope of “bu leng a (It’s not cold)” and “yingxiang bu hao a (its influence isn’t good)” respectively. Again, these Insertables not only exhibit subordinate intonations, but are also done as relatively quick “next beat” TCU-continuations after possible completion.
Another frequent type of Insertables is a group of adverbial conjuncts that discursively relate the host-TCU to some prior talk. These conjuncts can come in the form of a single lexical word or in a phrase. As conjuncts seek to connect some new piece of information to a prior discourse, they are also normatively found at the beginning of an utterance. By producing conjuncts as TCU-continuations, the speaker is seen to be retroactively framing the just completed talk as rationally following from its prior. Some exemplars are illustrated in Ex.(11a-d) below.

Ex.(11) Adverbial Conjuncts
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(11a) NTU-2 [0:37-1:02]

12 Tao: @ [这边它的::印度] sss-菜还不错啦.↓其实.
@ [zhe-bian ta de:: yindu] sss-cai hai bu cuo la.↓qishi.
[DEM-side 3SG GEN Indian dish still NEG wrong SFP.↓actually.
[The Indian food] there is not bad... Actually.

Ex.(11b) Graduate Dilemma [22:52-23:44]

49 Matt: @ 你-啊你- 比我早一年买.<↓而且是.
@ n-a ni- bi wo zao yi nian mai.<↓erqie shi.
2SG- INJ 2SG- compare 1SG early one year buy.<↓furthermore BE y- oh you bought it a year earlier than me. ↓as well.

Ex.(11c) Graduate Dilemma [13:54-14:25]

15 Faye: @ 我做得很干净.↓反正是.
@ wo zuo de bu gaojing.↓fanzheng shi.
1SG do GEN NEG clean. in-any-case BE.
I didn’t do it cleanly (enough). Anyway.

Ex.(11d) ES-M-08 [3:19-3:38]

10 Gu: @ Ag[nes 就一直] 让我在::=
11 Wen: [ Mmm. ]
12 Gu: =(. ) 不断-不停地做.<↓那实际上.

10 Gu: @ Ag[nes jiu yizhi] rang wo za::i=
NM DM always let 1SG at
Agnes has always been asking me to
Ex.(11a) shows a single word conjunct “qishi (actually)” as a TCU-continuation, thereby framing the statement “zhe-bian ta de yindu cai hai bu cuo (The Indian food here is not bad)” as a disaligned response to a prior assessment. Ex.(11b) and (11c) illustrates that conjuncts can also come in the form of a “conjunction + shi (BE)” phrase. Ex.(11b) uses “erqie shi (furthermore)” to index the host-TCU as an additional factor for some argument (this exemplar is discussed in detail as Ex.(56) in a later section). Ex.(11c) uses “fanzheng shi (anyway)” to mark “wo zuo de bu ganjing (I didn’t do it cleanly)” as a sort of closing statement to some prior longer narrative. Finally, conjuncts can also be in other form of complex phrases, such as in Ex.(11d), where “na shiji-shang (In actual fact)” works to present the host-TCU as a reason to some priorly described result. Again all the adverbial conjuncts positioned as Insertables shown here have been produced as “rush-throughs” or as “next beat” TCU-continuations, after possible completion.

Besides adjuncts and conjuncts, adverbial disjuncts of various forms also constitute another highly frequent form in Chinese Insertables. Disjuncts are deemed to be linguistic materials that do not modify the main verb per se, but act to impose the speaker’s subjective stance on the entire utterance. One particularly recurrent format of adverbial disjuncts found as Insertables are what Thompson (2002) calls complement-taking predicates (CTPs). Different from the adjuncts and conjuncts shown, CTPs are actually full matrix, but dependent, clauses that are grammatically formulated to take another clausal complement after it. Hence
positionally, CTPs are normatively found at the beginning of an utterance, yet in Insertables, these constituents have been prosodically designed to be appended after possible TCU completion. These CTPs often comes in the form of a pronoun (I or you) followed by a verb of cognition (feel or know) or speech (say or heard), as in “pronoun + verb of cognition or speech”, and retroactively frames the just completed TCU in some sort of speaker’s stance. “Wo Juede (I think)” and “Wo Ganjue (I feel)” are two recurrent forms of CTPs that often occurs as Insertables, as shown in Ex.(12a-e).

Ex.(12) Complement-Taking Predicate [Wo Juede & Wo Ganjue] (Adverbial Disjuncts)
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(12a)  ES-M-03 [15:35-15:55]
10 Zhan:  @ 没有-公正. @ 没有良心.<“我觉得”.=
@ mei you- gongzheng. @ mei you liangxin.<“wo juede”.=
NEG have justice NEG have conscience.<1SG feel
(There’s) no justice. (They have) no conscience. I think.

Ex.(12b)  ES-M-06 [11:15-11:28]
07 Yuan:  @ [这个]专业很好-很好.[我觉得.mm]
@ [zhege] zhuanye hen ha- hen hao.[wo juede.mm]
this profession very good very good. [1SG feel]
This profession is very good... very good. I think.

Ex.(12c)  ES-M-02 [4:23-5:06]
20 Pan:  @ 作用不是会- 不会很大.[“我觉得”.
@ zuoyong bu shi hu- bu hui hen da.[“wo juede”.]
effect NEG BE will NEG will very big.[1SG feel]
The effect will not be... it wouldn’t be too big. I think.

Ex.(12d)  ES-M-05 [18:36-18:52]
09 Liu:  @ 以后不会讲究(.)太多了.<“我感觉”.
@ yihou bu hui jiangjiu (.) tai duo le.<“wo ganjue”.
after NEG will particular too many CRS.<1SG feel
(They) will not be too particular next time. I feel.
06 Pan: < @ 缺点反过来就是优点.
07 (0.3)
08⇒ Pan: °我感觉°.
06 Pan: < @ quedian fan guo-lai jiushi youdian.
  fault turn cross-come DM  merit
Disadvantages can sometimes also be advantages.
07 (0.3)
08⇒ Pan: °wo ganjue°.
  1SG feel.
  I feel.

Ex. (12a-e) illustrates instances where speakers produce “Wo Juede (I think)” or “Wo Ganjue (I feel)” as Insertables to retroactively mitigate a prior assertion. Of interest is Ex.(12e) where the TCU-continuation “wo ganjue (I feel)” is produced after a 0.3 second gap of silence after possible completion. While most Insertables are done as “rush-throughs”, as exemplified from Ex.(9) to Ex.(11), Ex.(12e) shows that Insertables (as well as other types of TCU-continuations to be shown later) can also be done after a noticeable gap of silence, or what Schegloff (2004) terms “post-gap increments”. Other forms of CTPs in the “pronoun + verb of cognition or speech” format are, of course, also possible as adverbial disjunct forms of Insertables. These are illustrated in Ex.(13a-d).

Ex. (13) Complement-Taking Predicate [Others] (Adverbial Disjuncts)
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)
Ex. (13a)  ES-M-07 [19:12-19:30]
09 Chai: [不知道去干嘛?< @ 去干嘛::.<你说.
  [bu zhidao qu: gan ma?< @ qu gan ma::.<ni shuo.
NEG know go do QP  go do QP.  <2SG say
What’s the purpose? (Why are) we going!? You tell me!}
In Ex.(13a), the speaker uses “ni shuo (you tell me)” as an Insertable to re-emphasize her strong sense of disinterest in going to pubs as a form of social gathering. In Ex.(13b), the speaker interestingly ascribe a stance of inquiry “ni yao zhidao (you want to know?)” to her interlocutor at the end of an utterance (i.e. as an Insertable), interestingly, to clarify that the prior clause (“chi shenme cai a (what are the dishes we had)”) is a piece of information that her recipient had previously required. Before the line in Ex.(13c), the interlocutors in the extract were wondering about the time, and had reached a consensus that they were all unwise not to have worn their watches as the room did not have a clock. Yet one of the participants later directly asked for the time from Tao, to which he responded incredulously with “xianzai na-li kan a? (Where to find
that out?)”, and then adds “qing wen (I kindly ask)” to convey a sense of indignation. In Ex. (13d), Faye latches on with “wo ting ta de yisi shi shuo (I gathered from what he said)” to lower her own epistemic status on her just completed TCU that a couple known to the participants did not actually organize a wedding. Clearly, these adverbial disjuncts also work to retroactively convey some sort of stance (speaker or recipient) as *Insertables*.

Another common adverbial disjunct found in *Insertables* are various forms of conditional phrases, usually beginning with subordinating conjunctions such as “ruguo (if)” or “yaoshi (on the premise that)”. As opposed to English, these phrases are not normatively placed at the end of an utterance in Chinese syntax, but are found at the beginning. Thus they can also be re-inserted back into the host-TCU. Ex.(14a-b) illustrates two examples.

**Ex.(14) Conditional Phrases (Adverbial Disjuncts)**
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

**Ex.(14a) Graduate Dilemma [10:11-10:39]**

01 Matt: @ 我想应该没问题.<如果是:
   @ wo xiang yinggai mei wenti.<ruguo shi:.
    1SG think should NEG problem.<if BE
     I think, I think it should be okay.<if that’s the case.

**Ex.(14b) Graduate Dilemma [5:00-5:21]**

20 Faye: @ 我是肯定是算的.<如果我过去.
   @ wo: shi kending shi suan de<ruguo wo guo-qu.
    1SG BE definite BE count SFP.<if 1SG cross-go
     I’ll definitely be considered (their student).<if I go.

Both Ex.(14a) & (14b) uses a conditional clause, “ruguo shi (if that’s the case)” and “ruguo wo guo-qu (if I go)” respectively, to qualify a just completed statement, thereby lowering the speaker’s epistemic stance on the truth value of those statements.
As seen from Ex.(9) to (14), adverbials constitute the major class of constituent that can be produced as Insertables, which itself is a major type of TCU-continuation in Chinese. The reasons for such a distribution can be complex. It is often observed that a speaker blurts out the core action/focus/meaning of his or her predicate first, before rushing in to add on peripheral modifiers after possible completion. In other words, the less-than-obligatory status of adverbials in the construction of fully coherent clauses may have played a part in its productivity as retroactively produced elements, and hence the greater number of adverbial-type Insertables as TCU-continuations. The semantics of adverbials as a class of modifiers that works to “color” and refine the clause also often lends itself to being an expedient choice as “continuation of the prior”, for they can retroactively “tweak” the just completed utterance in some way to achieve particular interactional function needed at that moment of talk. In sum, the range of adverbials found as Insertables suggests that the practice of attaching a retroactive modifier in Chinese is unconstrained by grammar (i.e. syntax), lexical class, or the format of a constituent. Virtually all kinds of adjuncts, conjuncts and disjuncts can be found as Insertables to serve interactional needs at a TRP juncture. Also markedly apparent is that most of the adverbials found in the above exemplars are produced as “rush-throughs”. However, as Ex.(11e) highlights, this is not an obligatory requirement of TCU-continuations.

Turning from adverbials, noun phrases (NPs) and pronominals are also regularly seen as Insertables, construed to be “re-insertions back into” the prior utterances’ subject or topic position, and often acts as a form of clarification or reminder for an omitted referent at the beginning of the host-TCU. The noun phrases and pronominals are usually recognitional terms of
reference on a topic or subject that has been previously presented in earlier discourse. One possible reason for the large numbers of NPs and pronominals seen as Insertables might be due to the “pro-drop” status of the Chinese language, which allows for grammatical subject or topic to be omitted if the referent is clear from the conversational context. This provides the structural environment for the production of re-insertable NPs after possibly completion of the utterance. These are illustrated in Ex. (15a-e).

Ex. (15) Noun Phrases & Pronominal
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex. (15a) Graduate Dilemma [22:00-22:25]
22 Faye:  @ 真是怪吼.<zhè zhòng shíqìng> really BE strange SFP.<DEM type matter
It’s really strange, right? this type of thing.

Ex. (15b) ES-M-03 [17:25-17:45]
05 Wang: .hhh @ 就麻烦大了.<zhè ge shí(h)>.
DM trouble big CRS.<this matter.
Then it’s going to be bad. this problem.

Ex. (15c) ES-M-09 [6:03-6:27]
16 Wei:  [不 那西:班牙 @ 上了多少]课啊.<tāmen>
NEG DEM Spain attend-CMP more-less lesson QP.<3PL.
No… I mean how many lessons were taken. by them.

Ex. (15d) ES-M-07 [7:31-7:42]
14 Deng: @ 没关系啊.[nàge]
NEG relation SFP. [that.]
(It) doesn’t matter. that thing.

60 Sacks & Schegloff (1979)
Ex.(15e)  ES-M-06 [9:59-10:03].

07 Yuan: [@ 我在家里呆了(.)将近]二十天.
08 (0.3)
09⇒ Yuan: [春节的时候.]

07 Yuan: [@ wo zai jia-li dai-le(.)jiangjin] ershi tian.
1SG at home-LOC stay-CMP (. ) almost twenty day
I stayed at home for about twenty days.
08 (0.3)
09⇒ Yuan: [chun-jie de shihou.]
Spring-Festival GEN period
(during) the period of the Spring Festival.

Ex.(15a) and (15b) illustrate two instances of pronominal phrases, “zheng zhong shiqing (this type of thing)” and “zhenge shi (this problem)” respectively, as Insertables. Both can be seen to be the omitted and “re-insertable” subject of the host-TCU, referring to topics mentioned earlier in the discourse. Ex.(15c) and (15d) shows two simple pronouns, “tamen (they)” and “nage (that)”, as Insertables, also “re-insertable” into the subject position of the prior TCU. Lastly, in Ex.(15e), the noun phrase “chun-jie de shihou (the period of Spring Festival)” is produced retroactively to further define the period of the speaker’s home-stay as during a festive occasion. It is interesting to observe that the temporal noun phrase produced as an Insertable in Ex.(15e) could also be categorized as a time adverbial phrase, as it modifies the host-TCU by adding in the seasonal context where the predicative event (i.e. stayed at home for about twenty days) took place. Again, as with adverbial forms of Insertables, we observe that most of the noun phrases and pronominals Insertables here are also produced as “rush-throughs”. However, similar to Ex. (12e), the example shown in Ex.(15e) demonstrates another case where the Insertable is done after a noticeable gap of silence.

Besides adverbials and pronominals (or noun phrases), other less common form of
Insertable can also be found. Ex.(16a-c) below illustrates a few exemplars where, incredibly, verbal clauses appear as Insertables. These verbal clauses may be “re-inserted” back into the host-TCU as the priorly missing topic, an added modal auxiliary verb or even as the previously omitted main verb.

**Ex.(16)** Verb Phrases
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

**Ex.(16a)**  ES-M-09 [3:44-3:53]
05 Wei: [不- @ 责任心很大咯.] 带学生.
NEG responsible heart very big SFP.[bring student
No... (I mean) it’s a big responsibility. Supervising students.

**Ex.(16b)**  ES-M-01 [8:57-9:02]
03 Lian: .hh 是[: 就 @ 肉乎乎的.<觉得.
.hh shi[: jiu @ rouhu hu de.< juede.
BE DM chubby GEN.< feel
Yes... (A small baby is) chubby. (I) think.

**Ex.(16c)**  Graduate Dilemma [12:35-13:03]
15 Matt: 补牙就: (0.2) @ 二十五块钱.↓花了.
bu ya jiu (0.2) @ ershiwu kuai qian.↓hua-le.
fix teeth DM (0.2) twenty-five dollar money. spend-CMP
A dental surgery is only (0.2) twenty-five dollars. (I) paid.

Ex.(16a) shows how the topic-comment structure common in the Chinese language can work to allow a variety of clausal phrases to appear retroactively as Insertables. In Ex.(16a), the participants were talking about the reasons why some faculties in the university did not like to be involved in following students on university study trips abroad. At line 05, Wei interrupted her interlocutor who suggested that it was the hard work needed to make the trip that was causing the

---

81 Similarly, the topic-comment construction readily found in Chinese also provides the grammatical structure for a “comment” constituent to appear as a syntactically continuous TCU-continuation after speaker completes TCU simply with a “topic”. This is further discussed in section (3.3.).
general reluctance, proposing instead an alternative reason that it has to do with the trip being a “big responsibility”. The clausal phrase “dai xuesheng (bringing student)” appended as an Insertable, clarifies what the “big responsibility” pertains to, and can be “re-inserted” positionally into the topic position at the beginning of the utterance. In Ex.(16b), a singular model auxiliary verb “juede (feel)” is produced as an Insertable to retroactively lower the speaker’s epistemic claim that “chubbiness” of younger babies renders them to be more adorable.

Lastly, the host-TCU in Ex.(16c) demonstrates another topic-comment structure, consisting of the topic “bu ya (dental surgery)”, an adverb “jiu (only)”, followed simply by an object “ershiwu kuai qian (twenty-five dollars)” that acts as the ‘comment’, literally translatable as “dental surgery only twenty-five dollars”. Therefore, the single verb with an aspectual suffix “hua-le (paid)” can be, and is seen, as an Insertable produced retroactively as the main clausal verb in the host-TCU.

Finally, full clauses are also viable as Insertables in Chinese, as seen in Ex.(17a-b) below, where they act as retroactively inserted adverbial temporal markers and conditionals.

Ex.(17) Full Clauses
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(17a) ES-M-01 [18:41-19:01].
17 Lian: =那 @ 你笑什么呢.<我刚才问你.
=na @ ni xiao shenme ne.<wo gangcai wen ni.
DM 2SG laugh what QP.<1SG just-now ask [2SG
Then... what were you laughing at? (When) I asked you just now.

06 Wang: 这样的话 @ 就::很不稳定
07⇒整个社会.*时间久了*.
Before line 17 In Ex.(17a), Lian had asked the other participant in the conversation, Chen, if she would be going to her regular badminton session later on, to which Chen replied affirmatively and then giggled conspicuously. This prompted Lian to further enquire (with a smiling tone) about with whom she’ll be playing badminton with, to which Chen unabashedly listed some names of male and female fellow students. Possibly due to the “unproblematic” or non-sensitive tone of Chen’s reply, Lian then proceeded to ask at line 17 with “ni xiao shenme ne (what were you laughing at)”, before retroactively adding the full clause “wo gangcai wen ni (I asked you just now)” that can be “re-inserted” into the host-TCU to clarify the context of the inquiry. As it turns out, Chen was simply amused at Lian looking at her watch earlier, which indicates her eagerness to end their conversation session. In Ex.(17b), the participants were talking about the impact of income inequality on society. At lines 06-07, Wang asserts that this would cause instability for the whole of society, before quickly adding the full clause “shijian jiu le (a long period of time passes)” to qualify his statement. “shijian jiu le” can be “re-inserted” back into the host-TCU as a conditional to the assertion, and hence seen to be an Insertable.

The exemplars from Ex.(9) to (17) have demonstrated Insertables as a highly diverse group of TCU-continuations in Chinese, ranging from different adverbials, noun phrases, pronominals, verb forms to full clauses. This is further complicated by how Insertables may also be produced as a compounded chunk made up of more than one constituent. Two exemplars are
shown in Ex.(18) below.

Ex.(18) Compounded Insertables
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(18a) Graduate Dilemma [5:21-6:31]

60 Faye: 有一天叶(敬义) @ 没睡着:<就.(.)晚上都. you yi tian ye(jingyi) @ mei shui-zha:o<jiu.(.) wan-shang dou. have one day NM NEG sleep-CTP DM (.) night-LOC all. One day, Ye Jingyi didn’t even sleep. the whole night.

Ex.(18b) ES-M-08 [0:24-0:29]

01 Gu: 有点饿了 @^2.<好像吼. have bit hungry CRS.<resemble QP. (I’m) a bit hungry. It feels like, doesn’t it.

The example in Ex.(18a) has previously been examined as Ex.(8) in section (2.3.). The focus here is on the form “wan-shang dou (the whole night)”, which is made up of two separate adverbs “wan-shang (night)” and “dou (all)” compounded to form the Insertable. Another example of a compounded constituent as Insertable is seen in Ex.(18b), where “haoxiang hor (resemble + QP)” is made up of a modal adverb “haoxiang” which lowers the epistemic claim of the speaker, and the utterance final particle “hor” which adds to the interrogative tone of the TCU. Interestingly, though the Insertable appears to be (and is prosodically produced) as a single phrase, when “re-inserted” back into the just completed utterance, “haoxiang” and “hor” occupy different syntactic slots (@^1 and @^2 respectively) in the host-TCU. This clearly demonstrates that an accurate description of how TCU-continuations are understood should not be construed as mechanical cognitive operations performed by conversational participants. A more tenable explanation is that recipients are not only able to determine the retrospective orientation of a
TCU-continuation upon its onset, but also interpret, moment-by-moment as each piece of semiotic linguistic resource is produced, how they might possibly be coherently understood with the host-TCU. Thus, it is important to remember that Insertables, as well as other terms used in this study (i.e. Replacements, Non-add-ons, Glue-ons etc.), are simply convenient categorial devices for our analytic purposes, and that do not hold actual relevance for interlocutors in their production (and interpretation) of TCU-continuations.

Chinese speakers not only produce complex compounded constituents as Insertables, they may also produce more than one Insertable successively to retroactively modify the host-TCU. These consecutive Insertables may also take different constituent forms, as shown in Ex. (19) below.

Ex.(19) Consecutive Insertables
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(19a) ES-M-08 [Video Pre-Tape 1:38-1:42]
12 Gu: = 哦… 那个 Yip @1 说要: 有两张 票 @2: 当时. 给我. =
13⇒

Ex.(19b) ES-M-09 [17:00-17:13]
03 Ceng: 基本上也是一万块— 以上的 @1 @2 啦．
04 (0.4)
05⇒ Ceng: 飞机票．来[ 回．
03 Ceng: jiben-shang ye shi yiwan kua— yishang de @1 @2 la. basic-LOC also BE ten-thousand dollar- above GEN SFP. Basically, it’s also about ten thousand dollars and above.
04 (0.4)
In Ex.(19a), two Insertables “dangshi (that time)” and “gei wo (give me)” are produced consecutively. The first is a temporal adverb specifying that the reported event (i.e. Yip’s articulation of his offer) had transpired some time ago; and the second a verbal phrase further stating the speaker as the promised beneficiary of Yip’s tickets. Similarly with Ex.(17b), the two Insertables here can be seen to occupy two separate syntactic slots in the host-TCU, with “dangshi” in @1 and “gei wo” in @2. In Ex.(19b), the two consecutive Insertables are produced after a gap of silence at line 04. The first with a noun phrase “feiji-piao (plane ticket)” specifying what the price of ten thousand dollars pertains to; and the second with a verbal phrase “laihui (to-and-fro)” that actually modifies the first Insertable as an attributive to plane tickets. Hence, “feiji-piao (plane ticket)” and “laihui (to-and-fro)” occupy the syntactic slots of @2 and @1 in the host-TCU respectively.

In this sub-section, we have conducted a detailed examination into the possible ways with which a particular group of TCU-continuations, namely Insertables, can be achieved in Chinese. As a recap, Insertables are appended constituents after possible completion of a TCU that do not grammatically fit at the end of the just prior TCU, but can analyzably be “re-inserted” back into an unoccupied syntactic slot in the host-TCU. We note four salient observations upon empirical investigation of Insertables in our data:

62 Had “gei wo” been produced immediately after possible completion of the host-TCU, then this verb phrase would be syntactically continuous (and possibly a Glue-on) as Chinese allows serial verb construction. It is seen as an Insertable here as it occurs as a second TCU-continuation linearly separated by “dangshi”.

---

05⇒ Ceng:  
feiji-piao. laihui.  
plane-ticket. come-return.  
(for) a plane ticket. (that’s) round trip.
i) *Insertables* constitutes the predominant class of Chinese TCU-continuations in our collection. Furthermore, the manner in which *Insertables* may be produced after possible completion in terms of quantity and types is highly adaptable, as evidenced in Ex.(18) and (19). This naturally raises the question: **why do Chinese speakers most frequently use *Insertables* to perform retroactive operations; or more accurately, why is the Chinese language more "susceptible" to *Insertables* (as a type of TCU-continuation) when retroactive operations are required?** We argue that one key reason has to do with adverbials being a productive semantic class for retroactive operations of various kinds (e.g. to clarify time, location and topic; to qualify stances; to inject subjectivity), and how the availability of "reserved" syntactic positions after the verbal clause for adverbials are relatively limited in normative Chinese syntax (i.e. right-headed syntax). Furthermore, the "semantic strength" of adverbials to accomplish the variety of needed retroactive interactional functions seem to have "overridden" grammatical constraints, leading to the frequent breaking of grammatical "decorum" to do *Insertables*.

ii) As seen in our exemplars, *Insertables* are characterized as being syntactically discontinuous, and frequently mark their "continuation" prosodically with subordinate intonation (i.e. lack of pitch reset and/or lowered intensity). However, TCU-continuations can, and do, differ in terms of when they begin after possible completion of a host-TCU. Such as in Ex.(12e) and Ex.(15e) where the *Insertable* occurs after a noticeable gap of silence. Nonetheless, it is notable that **our collection of *Insertables*, as well as in *Replacements*, *Non-add-ons* & *Free Constituents* (with the exception of *Glue-ons*) seen in later sections, are all overwhelmingly
done by latching onto the prior TCU (i.e. rush-throughs), or with no gap of silences. We argue that this has implications for TCU-continuations as a form of repair and their preference for progressivity, later discussed in section (5.1.) and (5.2.).

iii) Although Inserts are to a large extent made up of all manners of adverbials, almost all other types of constituents can also be used as an Insertable to retroactively modify the host-TCU. This ranges from noun phrases and pronominals, to verb phrases to full clauses. In other words, not only does Chinese TCU-continuations seem unconcerned with “grammatical fitted-ness” (as evidenced in Inserts being the predominant form), what can occur as an Insertable also seem to be unrestricted by the added element’s semantic word class.

iv) Finally, despite the apparent disregard for grammatical structure in Chinese Inserts, there are evidences to suggest that there is still a strong connection between the normative utterance structure (i.e. grammar) and the typology of TCU-continuations found in a language (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007). Firstly, as argued, the right-headed syntax of Chinese has ab initio led to usages of adverbials as TCU-continuations to be syntactically discontinuous, and hence in a sense “preordained” their status as Inserts. Additionally, we have also proposed that the topic-comment structure, in concert with the null topic/subject status of the Chinese language, can often lead to omission of key constituents that could later turn up as Inserts in the form of noun phrases pronominals and verb phrases. The propensity for Chinese speakers to produce TCU-continuations as Inserts is therefore unsurprising.
3.2.2. Replacements

*Replacements* are also appended constituents after possible completion that retroactively modifies the host-TCU. However, unlike *Insertables*, this form of TCU-continuations may not be “re-inserted” back into the prior utterance as its “normative” syntactic slot in the host-TCU is already occupied by a similar constituent (these replaced constituents are indicated between *…….* in the exemplars below). The TCU-continuation is thus seen as retroactively “replacing” a parallel constituent in the host-TCU, hence the term *Replacements*. While describing the types of TCU-continuations, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) calls *Replacements* a “subcategory of same-turn self-repair, comprising those instances where the self-repair is carried out during the transition space following a turn's possible completion”63. It is unclear why *Replacements* were singled out in their study as a form of repair in comparison to other forms of TCU-continuations, other than stating “*some (TCU-continuations) replace a part of the host and are thus repair-like*”64. Based on this, it seems that the authors had ascribed stronger “repair” features to *Replacements* by virtue of the particular type of retroactive operation it performs. However, if we were to take a broader perspective on conversational repair, there is no merit in favoring *Replacements* over other TCU-continuations (such as *Insertables*) as being more “repair-like”. In fact, in characterizing the types of operations that “same-turn self-repair” can perform, Schegloff (2013) includes “replacing”, “inserting”, “recycling” and others as the core types of operations speakers employ in same-turn repair to deal with a trouble-source. It is therefore our position that all types of TCU-continuations are forms of transition-space repair, in that they all act to retroactively operate or add on to the host-TCU in some fashion. This issue will be taken up in

---

more details later in section (5.1.).

For now, this sub-section will illustrate the kinds of constituents seen in Chinese Replacements. The large majority of these Replacements consist of nominals phrases that can be seen as “replacing” the topic, subject or object constituent in the host-TCP. Usually the “replaced” item is itself a nominal phrase whose referent is either the same as, or is semantically associated with, the TCU-continuation. Ex.(20) below shows a few exemplars of such Replacements.

**Ex.(20) Nominal Phrases as Replacements**
(*……* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

Ex.(20a)  **ES-M-02 [5:29-5:55]**

13 Lin: 他: (. ) 他我觉得*他*比较真实。*你老公*。
3SG ta: (. ) ta wo jue: *ta* bijiao za:shi.*ni laogong*.
3SG 3SG 1SG feel 3SG compare steady. 2SG husband.
He’s… I think he’s more down-to-earth. Your husband.

Ex.(20b)  **ES-M-01 [17:34-17:40]**

01 Chen: 但我想一下我很有可能还是要到*南京*。
02 Lian: 哦：[
03⇒ Chen: 但南京师范大学。
01 Chen: dan wo xiang yixia wo hen keneng haishi yao dao *nanjing*.
but 1SG think a-bit 1SG very possible still want reach Nanjing.
But in consideration I probably still have to go to Nanking.
02 Lian: o:
CFM
Oh……
03⇒ Chen:  [nanjing shifan daxue.
   Nanjing Normal University.
   Nanjing Normal University.

Ex.(20c)  **ES-M-03 [5:08-5:31]**

07 Wang: [挣钱]也不能h挣这个贫困生的呀。
08⇒ *这个:**有问题.*<"这样的话". 
In Ex.(20a), Lin initiates a compliment of her recipient’s husband as being “more down-to-earth”, but the TCU started first with a locally subsequent reference form (i.e. third person pronoun) “ta (he)” as the subject, as the participants had already been talking about and provided a locally initial recognitional descriptor earlier in the talk (Sacks & Schegloff 1979, Schegloff 1996b). For some reason, immediately after the host-TCU at line 13, Lin appends the nominal possessive “ni laogong (your husband)”, which is easily seen to refer to and “replace” the earlier third person pronoun. Besides further clarifying the referent of the pronoun, the speaker may have also formulated “ni laogong” to highlight the special relationship the recipient has with the person who she had just overtly praise for his virtue. In Ex.(20b), Chen informs her interlocutor, Lian, that she would still probably need to travel to Nanking to do data collection at line 01. After Lian acknowledges this at line 02, Chen quickly provides a single nominal phrase “nanjing shifan xuebao (Nanking Normal University)” in partial overlap at line 03. Again, this is clearly seen to be “replacing” the earlier “nanjing” with a more specific location within the city where the speaker will be doing her research. In Ex.(20c), the participants were talking about the critical need for more psychological counseling centres in China’s universities, when Wang’s interlocutor comments that more of such centres are now charging for their services. This leads to line 07 where Wang critiques this practice as unethical due to the difficult financial situation of undergraduate students. He then reiterates and definitively states in line 08 that this is “you wenti
(questionable)” or “problematic”, where the situation or subject is encapsulated simply with the demonstrative “zhege (this)”. Perhaps realizing that he did not actually have the epistemic authority to claim that Chinese universities did indeed charge for psychological counseling, Wang immediately added a non-independent conditional in the form of a nominal phrase “zhe yang de-hua (If this is the case)”65 after possible completion of the host-TCU, thereby indexing the indeterminate nature of the topic. This “replaces” the subject “zhege” to form “zhe yang de-hua you wenti (If this is the case, it’s questionable)”, and hence seen as a Replacement.

Technically, “zhe yang de-hua” can also be “re-inserted back” to the beginning of the host-TCU to form “zhe yang de-hua zhege you wenti (If this is the case, this is questionable)” as an Insertable, though such an utterance would seem cumbersome and less in tune with the forcefulness that the speaker had priorly displayed. But more crucially, it bears to reiterate that categorizing TCU-continuations as “Replacements” or “Insertables” are not questions that speakers deal with at the moment of their production. For the speaker, as long as the “continuation” accomplishes the interactional work needed at that moment in talk, the strict delineation of operations or forms with which the “continuation” is done is of little consequence. In other words, while we are not free from the task of categorization as analysts, there is no real value in marking the boundaries of ambiguous cases such as Ex.(20c) within an emic perspective.

Other less frequent, but equally valid, types of Replacements can appear as various complex blends of constituents that are usually semantically non-independent. These compounds, as a whole, can then “replace” major constituents in the host-TCU, such as the

---

65 The conditional marker “de-hua”, literally meaning “this kind of talk”, can be seen as an suffix that comes after pronominal and nominal phrases depicting objects and situations.
subject or the main verbal clause. Ex.(21) below illustrates a couple of these complex phrases as

*Replacements.*

**Ex.(21) Complex Phrases as Replacements**

(*……* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

Ex.(21a)  
**NTU-1 [36:06-36:15].**

03 Hao: 

然后*我*从*小吃醋.*家里人都.

ranhou *wo* coing xiao chi cu.<**jia-li ren dou.**

then 1SG from small eat vinegar.<**home-LOC people all**

So I’ve taken vinegar since young.<**everyone in my family.**

Ex.(21b)  
**ES-M-03 [15:55-16:21].**

05 Wang: 

. h *也是*这种目标啦.<**应该是.**

. h *ye shi* zhe zhong zhibiao la.<**yinggai shi.**

also BE DEM type standard SFP.<**should BE.**

(Tey) also have (to reach) this type of target. *(It) should be.*

In Ex.(21a), Hao was providing a justification to a participant’s previous comment, that Hao really like to take vinegar with his food. In the exemplar, he started by stating that he has taken vinegar since young, but upon first possible completion, quickly adding “**jia-li ren dou** (my family members all)” which is a combination of a nominal phrase “**jia-li ren** (my family members)” and the hanging adverb “**dou** (all)”. As a unit, “**jia-li ren dou**” is semantically incomplete, but cannot be “reinserted” into the host-TCU as the subject position is already taken up by “**wo (I)**”. It can, however, be seen to be “replacing” the subject in the host-TCU, with an addition of the adverb “**dou**”, thereby retroactively giving a reading of “**jia-li ren dou coing xiao chi cu** (Everyone in my family has taken vinegar since young)”. This works to expand the scope of the subject from just himself to include all his family members, and thereby also strengthens his justification of loving vinegar. In Ex.(21b), before line 05, Wang claims that the journalistic
integrity of reporters in China has been compromised because they are forced to meet various
newspaper sales targets, generate advertisement revenues and other such targets set by the news
company. This leads to him claim definitively in line 05 that, like any other “more business-like”
establishments, reporters are also, or “ye shi (also is)”, subjugated to this type of benchmarking
or “zhe zhong zhibiao (this standard)”. However, upon completion, Wang latches on with
“yinggai shi (should be)” which is the combination of a modal verb “yinggai (should)” and the
copular verb “shì (is)”. Similarly, “yinggai shì” is semantically incomplete and does not have an
“empty” syntactic slot in the host-TCU to be “re-inserted” into. It is therefore interpretable to be
“replacing” its parallel constituent of “ye shì” to hedge Wang’s statement as being less certain.

Finally, we’ll talk about a special form of “Replacements” where the replaced item and
its replacement are one and the same. This happens when the TCU-continuation is an exact
lexical replica of another constituent in the host-TCU (the constituents being repeated are
indicated between #…….# in the exemplars below). As such, the added element is not so much
“replacing” the original item in the prior TCU, as it is repeating a select constituent for some
interactional effect. This form of repetitions is quite prevalent in Cantonese, especially for
pronouns66, and has also been documented in Luke (2012) as a way of adding “extra force” or
emphasis to the action carried out by the TCU.67 In our Mandarin exemplars shown in Ex.(22)
below (next page), such repetitions can come in the form of pronouns (i.e. demonstratives),
modal verbs and adverbs.

66 Personal communication with Kang-Kwong Luke.
Ex.(22) Repetitions as Replacements
(#......# marks portion that the “further talk” is repeating)

Ex.(22a)  ES-M-03 [18:46-18:52]

02 Wang: 唉..<没法办.<他们会慢慢改的.
03 ⇒ #这个#肯定会.<“这个”.

02 Wang: ai:.<mei banfa.<tamen hui man-man gai de.
INJ NEG idea 3PL will slowly change GEN.
((sigh)) The’s no solution. They’ll change gradually.

03 ⇒ <#zhege# kending hui.<“zhege”.
   this sure will.<this.
   This will surely change. This (matter).

Ex.(22b)  ES-M-03 [16:48-17:05]

11 Wang: 总:体来看这应该#算是#一个
社会进步.<“算是”.

11 Wang: zo:ngti lai kan zhe yinggai #suan-shi# yi-ge
overall come see DEM should count-BE one-CL
Overall, this should be considered an

12 ⇒ shehui jinbu.<“suan-shi”.
society improve.<count-BE.
improvement for society. (It) can be (considered as such).

Ex.(22c)  ES-M-03 [4:21-4:35]

08 Wang: [.hhh 那我们]学心理学的#现在#-
不就:吃香了嘛.<“现在”.

08 Wang: [.hhh na women] xue xinli-xue de #xianza-#
DM 1PL learn psychology GEN now
Then for people like us who are majoring psychology,

09 ⇒ bu ji:u chixiang le ma.<“xianzai”.
NEG DN popular CRS SFP.<now.
we’ll be in demand now right? In this time now.

In Ex.(22a), the demonstrative “zhege (this)” in Wang’s talk refers to the strict regulatory control
of online postings that is being implemented in China’s higher educational institutes, and is
repeated in line 03. In Ex.(22b), Wang is again talking about how politically scandalous news is
now gradually appearing in online media (as opposed to governmental cover-ups), and that this
phenomenon in itself should be generally seen as a social improvement. In line 12, the modal verb “suan-shi (should be)” is repeated as a TCU-continuation. Before the excerpt in Ex.(22c), Wang’s interlocutor talks about a book that analyzes a famous psychopath’s motives for killing, but resulted in many readers lamenting on the author’s lack of training in psychology. In lines 08-09, Wang then jokingly responds by saying that being the case, psychology majors like them should be in demand. The temporal adverb “xianzai (now)”, though not fully verbalized in the host-TCU at line 08, is clearly repeated as a TCU-continuation in line 09. It is difficult to pin down what exactly the repetitions might be doing in these exemplars, but there is also a perceivable sense that they may be attenuating the strength of the declarative statements (either intensifying or qualifying) by highlighting (via repetition) key constituents in the host-TCU. In this regard, the semantic nature of the repeated constituent seems to play a part in what the TCU-continuation is doing. In Ex.(22a), the repetition of a demonstrative “zhege (this)” places an additional focus on the subject matter (i.e. strict regulatory control of online postings) as something that will definitely be reviewed eventually. In contrast, the repetition of the modality “suan-shi (should be)” in Ex.(22b) does not intensify Wang’s statement that proliferation of online news is a social improvement, but lends an additional layer of qualification to the claim instead. Lastly, the repetition of the temporal adverb of “xianzai (now)” in Ex.(22c) emphasizes the conditional nature of claiming that psychology majors are in demand, contingent upon the veracity of the previous speaker’s claim (i.e. the greater interest in psychology as a current trend).

As an interim summary, Replacements, as compared to Insertables, does seem to be more restricted in terms of the types of constituents that it can take. Most of the
Replacements clearly works to clarify earlier constituents with a more well defined nominal phrase, such as in Ex.(20a) and (20b). They can also intensify or qualify earlier actions via “replacing” some prior constituent with other complex phrases, such as in Ex.(21a) and (21b). Then there are appended elements that simply repeat an earlier constituent in the host-TCU. To be precise, these could have been presented under another category of TCU-continuations (Repetitions?), but we have chosen to examine them under the label of Replacements to reduce “messiness” in our analysis. Part of this “messiness” is because repetition of constituents also occurs in Non-add-ons (which we will be illustrating in the next sub-section), but is produced as a single prosodic whole with the host-TCU. However, similar to Insertables, a key observation is that most Replacements (including repetitions) are done as “rush-throughs”, or with no gap of silences. In our exemplars above, only Ex.(20b) is an exception, where the Replacement comes after talk-by-others.

3.2.3. Non-add-ons

To recap, Non-add-ons are materials that are “through-produced” in a “single perceptual (auditory) gestalt”\textsuperscript{68} without any form of prosodic break after possible (syntactic) completion, which means that there is no dichotomy between the intonation of its host-TCU and a subordinate intonation of the TCU-continuation to consider in the case of Non-add-ons. But more crucially, Non-add-ons differ from other TCU-continuations in a more fundamental way, and that is, there is possibly no TRP (transition relevance place) to speak of before Non-add-ons. While there may be strong syntactic closure before a Non-add-on (i.e. such as in the use of an

\textsuperscript{68} Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 515.
utterance final particle), it has been previous mentioned that prosody (specifically the monitoring of a *declination unit* (DU) discussed in section (2.2.)) plays a critical role in the interpretation of possible TCU completion for Chinese speakers; therefore leaving much doubt that recipients of a *Non-add-on* utterance will project a strong TRP just before the *Non-add-on*. Hence, there is great difficulty in seeing *Non-add-ons* as actual “continuations”, defined as appended elements AFTER possible completion of the TCU. Nonetheless, this is a category of “TCU-continuations” that has received serious treatment in Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007). Our investigation has also found *Non-add-ons* to be a regular feature in Chinese, and therefore includes this phenomenon for further discussion.

Despite being a singular prosodic unit with the preceding talk, there is still a sense that the added element (i.e. *Non-add-on*) is not a natural part of the prior as it is somehow syntactically unfitted with the “host-TCU” within the “normative” syntax of the language. In other words, the status of *Non-add-ons* as a “continuation” of a priorly completed unit, as opposed to being a natural constituent of the unit, is heavily dependent upon its asyntactic relationship with what has just priorly been said. This sub-section now details the types of constituents seen in Chinese *Non-add-ons*. Interestingly, the constituents that are most produced as *Non-add-ons* are also various forms of singular adverbs that can be “re-inserted back” into an earlier syntactic slot in the “host-TCU”. In other words, apart from how they are prosodically produced, a good majority of *Non-add-ons* highly resembles adverbial-type *Insertables*. Ex.(23) below (next page) demonstrates the wide range of single adverbs that can be produced as *Non-add-ons*. 
Ex.(23) Adverbs
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(23a) Graduate Dilemma [5:21-6:31]
60 Faye: 有一天叶(@ 敬义)@ 没睡着:<就(. )晚上都.
you yi tian ye(jingyi) @ mei shui-zha:o<jiu (. )wan-shang dou.
have one day NM NEG sleep-CTP DM (. ) night-LOC all.
One day, Ye Jingyi didn’t even sleep. the whole night.

Ex.(23b) Drilling [1:28-1:53]
01 Mum:  那事儿:(. )太气人了.<给我 @ 气腾了@ 都.
na shi:r (. ) tai qi-ren le.<gei wo @ qi-meng le dou
that matter too angry CRS give 1SG anger-giddy CRS all
That thing. (It’s) too infuriating,
made me so angry (to that extent).

Ex.(23c) ES-M-08 [00:48-1:03]
14 Gu:  =.hh 就[ @ 打得起来]还.=
=.hh jiu[ @ da de qi-lai] hai.=
(They) just fought it out even.

Ex.(23d) ES-M-03 [2:01-2:24]
09 Zhan: .hhh 学生安全 @ 那个:: 危机啊 现在.
=weishi anquan :: nege:: weiji-chao a xianzai.
student safety that danger-wave SFP now.
Lack of student safety measures, that’s the crisis, currently.

Ex.(23e) ES-M-06 [1:22-1:27]
05 Yuan:  我有一个同学 @ 在那里 好像.
wo you yi-ge tongxue @ zai neli haoyan.xiang.
1SG one-CL classmate at there resemble.
I have a classmate there, I think.

Ex.(23f) ES-M-02 [19:39-20:55]
14 Pan: [.h 你想他们是:: .hh 好像是也 @ 是
15⇒ 七十年代的人吧 应该.
14 Pan: [.h ni xiang tamen shi:: .hh haoxiang shi ye @ shi
SG think 3PL BE resemble BE also BE
Imagine, they’re… (they) seem to be… (they’re) also
15⇒ qi:shi niandai de ren ba yinggai.
seventy generation GEN people QP should.
(portraying characters) from the seventies, right? They should be.
The exemplar shown is Ex.(23a) has been previously discussed in Ex.(8) and Ex.(18a). Here, the focus is on the adverb modifier “jiu (DM)” which is “through-produced” after “mei shui-\(zha:o\) (did not sleep)” to further emphasize gravity of the situation. In Ex.(23b), the adverb “dou (all)” (also produced in Ex.(23a) after “wan-shang (at night)” generally has a similar function to “jiu”, and adds to the degree of anger that is being conveyed by the speaker. In Ex.(23c), yet another different adverb “hai (still)” is “through-produced” to highlight the serious nature of the matter that has led to a fight. All three of these adverbs (“jiu (DM)”, “dou (all)” and “hai (still)”) are commonly found as Non-add-ons in Chinese, and work to intensify the stance conveyed by the TCU. In Ex.(23d), a temporal adverb “xianzai (now)” is produced without prosodic breakage after the utterance final particle “a (SFP)” (which clearly indicates syntactic closure) to denote the “news-worthiness” of the claim (i.e. that there is a current crisis in matters of student safety). In Ex.(23e), “haoxiang (resemble)” is a modal adverb, produced retroactively to denote a lower level of epistemic certainty about having a former classmate that resides in a particular place. And finally, in Ex.(23f), another modal adverb “yinggai (should)” is used after the final question particle “ba (QP)” (also signaling strong syntactic closure) to further hedge the speaker’s epistemic stance on the time period that actors in a movie are portraying.

Besides singular adverbs, some compound phrases acting as adverbial disjuncts that retroactively adds some sort of speaker’s stance on the predicative clause in the TCU are also frequently found as Non-add-ons. In normative Chinese syntax, these disjuncts are usually turn-initial matrix clauses that take some other predicative clause as a complement. Ex.(24) below (next page) shows two exemplars where the speaker positions these disjuncts at the end of the

\[\text{Note that the speaker has already earlier displayed a lack of confidence with “haoxiang shi (seem to be)”}\]
TCU instead.

**Ex.(24) Adverbial Disjuncts/Complementizers**
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(24a)  
Graduate Dilemma [19:31-19:37]

21 Faye:  
[ 对 @ >因为<查不着 关键是.  
[dui @ >yinwei< cha bu-zhao guanjian shi  
[AGR >because< check NEG-CTP critical BE  
[yea. Because (I) couldn’t find it, that’s the critical point.

Ex.(24b)  
NTU-3 [6:02-6:05]

01 Cong:  
[ 打 @ >那儿< 被拖:死 了 简直要.  
[wa: zai nar @ bei ty:o-si le jianzhi yao  
INJ at there BEI pull-COM CRS practically want  
((sign)) I was bored to death there, literally.

The exemplar in Ex.(24a) has also been priorly discussed as Ex.(5) in section (2.3.). The compound phrase “guanjian shi” is made up of an attributive noun “guanjian (critical)” and a copular verb “shi (BE)”, and acts as an adverbial disjunct or complementizer to frame some upcoming propositional content as being “the main point”. In our exemplar, however, “guanjian shi” is produced as a single prosodic gestalt after “cha bu-zhao (can’t find it)” and therefore acts as a Non-add-on to encapsulate “cha bu-zhao” as the crucial point of the talk. In Ex.(24b), the compound “jianzhi yao (literally)” consists of an adverb “jianzhi (practically)” and a modal verb “yao (will)”, which is also commonly used in turn-initial position to frame some upcoming description as exaggerated but at the same time indexes the speaker’s strong affective stance on some matter. This is used much the same way as “literally” is being used in everyday vernacular English to “to acknowledge that something is not literally true but is used for emphasis or to
express strong feeling”\textsuperscript{70}, such as “I’m literally dying from this workout”. Here, “jianzhi yao” is prosodically “through-produced” after “bei tu:o-si le (being bored to death)” (which ends with the utterance final element “le (CRS)” to signal syntactic closure), thereby making “jianzhi yao” a clear Non-add-on. Again, both these disjuncts can be “re-inserted back” into a turn-initial slot in the TCU, and therefore also resembles Insertables in this sense.

A less common type of Non-add-ons involves the use of demonstratives at the end of the TCU as a kind of “discourse deixis” to encompass (and in a sense, recapitulate) some earlier description or statement. As the demonstrative abstractly summarize a prior topic, it cannot be “re-inserted back” into the TCU (unlike adverbs and adverbial disjuncts as Non-add-ons) nor “replace” an earlier constituent. In this sense then, demonstratives as Non-add-ons appears to be distinctive from other types of Non-add-ons previously mentioned, as it is syntactically non-dependent or syntactically “unrelated” to the prior talk. Interestingly, this is very similar to some forms of Free Constituents (to be illustrated in section (3.4.)) where syntactically non-dependent demonstratives are also used to refer back to a previously mentioned topic or subject. The difference being Free Constituents comes after a clear possible completion point (i.e. TRP) whereas demonstratives as Non-add-ons are produced as a singular prosodic unit with preceding talk. For now, we will focus on demonstratives as Non-add-ons with two exemplars in Ex.(25) below.

Ex.(25) Demonstratives

Ex.(25a) ES-M-06 [4:17-4:35]

11 Yuan: <因为他 (. ) 他在战场上 (0.4) 把一千多个  
12⇒ (0.3) 日本人 ( . ) 斩首了那个.

\textsuperscript{70} This is the latest definitional addition to “literally” in the Oxford and Merriam-Webster English Dictionary.
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Before the excerpt in Ex.(25a), Yuan was relating to his interlocutor three famous persons in history that came from his county in China. While his interlocutor (Jiang) was aware of the first two mentioned by Yuan, she was unfamiliar with the third mentioned character, a famous general in the Sino-Japanese War. To justify the general’s celebrated status, and possibly to jolt Jiang’s memory, Yuan related the event that cemented the general’s fame in lines 11-12 as “yinwei ta zai zhan-chang-shang ba yiqian duo ge riben ren zhan-shou le (Because he beheaded more than a thousand Japanese soldiers on the battlefield)”. Following the utterance final element “le (CRS)”, Yuan “through-produced” a distal pronominal “nage (that)”, referring back to this historical event, thereby also possibly ascribing additional significance to the general’s action. Turning to Ex.(25b), before this excerpt, Zhan was talking about how Chinese journalists are now fond of reporting misdeeds of other provinces in China, leading to a regulation that reporters are only allowed to report news from their own locale. He then summarizes the actions of reporters as “huxiang di gongji gongkai gong-dou le ma (mutually attacking each other, and openly fighting in public)” in line 14, ending with the utterance final particle “ma (SFP)”. But this is followed
with a “through-produced” proximal demonstrative “zhege (this)”, which encapsulates the earlier
described situation of reporters reporting and shaming each other’s provinces, as well as
providing added emphasis to Zhan’s assessment of the situation (i.e. an ugly case of mutual and
open public fighting).

Apart from the demonstratives above, almost all of the Non-add-ons found in our
collections are adverbs and adverbials that can analyzably be “re-inserted/moved” back to a
syntactic slot earlier in the TCU, much like Insertables. It is illuminating that almost all the
examples of Non-add-ons in English, German & Japanese provided by Couper-Kuhlen & Ono
(2007) are also constituents that can be “re-inserted” or “moved” back into a syntactic slot in the
prior where it should “belong”, and that such “constructions” are observed to be “frequent” in
German and Japanese71. And even for demonstrative-type Non-add-ons where “re-insertion” of
the further talk is not viable, there are still structural similarities with another form of TCU-
continuation, namely Free Constituents, in which demonstratives are also used to retroactively
index a prior topic or subject (to be shown in section (3.4.)). Therefore, the majority of Non-add-
ons are very much like Insertables (and some of them like Free Constituents), with prosodic
continuity or breakage as the only differentiating factor. Given this resemblance, we should
entertain the possibility that some Non-add-ons are actually Insertables or Free Constituents in
operation, but have simply been formulated by the speaker early enough, after onset of the TCU,
to avoid prosodic disfluencies. Another possibility is (as Non-add-ons are produced in a “single
melodic and rhythmic gestalt”72) that the Non-add-on material may have been planned from the
outset (i.e. not retroactively formulated) in producing the TCU, and could be seen as some sort of

marked construction (Croft 2001) in the language, often found near the end of a climatic story-telling sequence (see Ex.(23b), (24b), (25a) and (25b)) or in a pre-telling (see Ex.(23a)) to index some form of heightened stance by the speaker (K.K. Luke, personal communication, May 2011).73

From a diachronic perspective, both types of Non-add-ons (i.e. formulated after onset of TCU or from the outset) can surface in language use and are not in conflict, but simply represent two points on a distinctive grammaticalization cline for semantic units typically found as Non-add-ons. To be precise, Chinese Non-add-ons may initially simply have been adverbs, adverbials or demonstratives that are retroactively produced as Insertables or Free Constituents at the end of the utterance, to do some form of stance modification or clarification work (later shown to be a core function of Free Constituents). However, due to their highly frequent occurrence in a specific discourse-functional environment, these Insertables (or end-of-utterance adverbs/adverbials) or Free Constituents (or end-of-utterance demonstratives) have gradually grammaticalized to become fixed constructions. As part of the grammaticalization process, prosodic production of these adverbs/adverbials Insertables and demonstrative Free Constituents also gradually becomes more fluid, merging with the overall TCU intonation contour, thereby appearing as adverbs/adverbials/demonstratives Non-add-ons. The lack of prosodic disfluencies between Non-add-ons and the rest of the TCU represents a form of phonetic reduction that is symptomatic of re-analysis in grammaticalization theory. The proposed grammaticalization

73 Chinese Non-add-ons reminds me of what Schegloff (1996a) calls “post-completion stance-markers”. In his article, Schegloff discriminates between “extensions to the TCU” (later termed increments); while post-completion stance-markers “do not represent extensions of the prior talk, but rather retrospective or retroactive alignment towards it, or consequences of it” (pp. 90). However, what he had in mind were mostly non-lexical items such as “noding, facial expressions (e.g., smiles or grimaces), shrugs, posture shifts, disclaimers (“I dunno”), laugh tokens, coughs, exhalations and sighs, in-breaths” (pp. 92).
As a grammaticized construction, adverbs/adverbials/demonstratives *Non-add-ons* may also have undergone the process of *semantic bleaching* (Sweetser 1988) and/or *specialization* (Hopper 1991), in which types of *Non-add-on* constructions gradually become standard fixtures for expressing certain stances. In any case, the examination of Chinese *Non-add-ons* presents another focal case where the boundaries between categories of TCU-continuations (*Insertables/Free Constituents* vs. *Non-add-ons*) appear to be non-discrete, and further evidence (see section (1.2.)) for seeing “continuations” after possible completion as a continuum of relations to the host-TCU (as opposed to discrete categories).

Interestingly, some of the “through-produced” elements in *Non-add-ons* are also replication of items in the TCU, much like repeated constituents examined under the category of *Replacements*, except that there’s no prosodic breakage in between. Recalling the types of repetitive elements found in the ‘repetition’ type of *Replacements*, there were adverbs, modal verbs/adverbials and pronouns/demonstratives. Similarly, most of the repeated *Non-add-ons* are found to be singular adverbs or pronominals. Ex.(26) (in the next page) documents some of these repetitions done as *Non-add-ons*.  

---
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The types of repeated adverbs as Non-add-ons ranges from the commonly found modifier “jiu (DM)” in Ex.(26a) and “dou (all)” in Ex.(26b), to temporal adverb “xianzai (now)” in Ex.(26c).
These adverbs have all appeared as Non-add-ons in Ex.(23a), (23b) and (23d) respectively, without replication in the TCU. More importantly, we have also previously seen a case in Ex. (22c) under the category of Replacements, where the adverb “xianzai (now)” was repeated at the end of an utterance. The key difference being there was a clear prosodic separation between “xianzai” and the rest of the host-TCU in Ex.(22c), whereas the repeated “xianzai” in Ex.(26c) is “through-produced” as a prosodic whole. From Ex.(26d) to (26f), we see a range of repeated pronominals produced as Non-add-ons, from demonstrative “zhege (this)” in Ex.(26d), first person singular pronoun “wo (I)” in Ex.(26e) to interrogative pronoun “shenme (what)” in Ex. (26f). The correlation between adverbials and pronominals as the two major classes of words found as “through-produced” Non-add-ons is striking. Even in the construction format of repeated constituents as Non-add-ons, there is similarly a sense that the construction here is used to index strong feelings or some form of heightened stance at the end of a story-telling sequence.

The discussion above highlights a few points on Non-add-ons. Firstly, as “continuing” after a point of possible completion goes, there are fundamental reservations in seeing Non-add-ons as actual TCU-continuations, primarily due to the lack of prosodic disfluencies before a Non-add-on, which would be indicative that the added material was not originally formulated at the outset of the host-TCU. Yet there is also trouble in seeing Non-add-ons as part of the TCU due to their asyntactic placement at the end of the utterance. Naturally, this begs the question of what can be “normative” syntax in natural spoken language. In any case, most of the Non-add-ons in Chinese surface as single adverbs, compound adverbial disjuncts, and to a lesser extent, demonstratives. There are also repetitions of adverbial and pronominals already found in the TCU as Non-add-ons. Highly similar repetitions of adverbial and
pronominals have also been found, not as Non-add-ons, but appended to the end of an utterance as prosodically distinct TCU-continuations (see sub-section (3.2.2.) on Replacements). Secondly, due to the relatively restricted types of constituents found as Non-add-ons in our data, the sense of a coherent discourse-function that such constructions may be conveying, as well as structural similarities between Insertables, Free Constituents and Repetitions with Non-add-ons, there are strong arguments for seeing Non-add-ons as a marked construction that may have grammaticalized from a process of retroactive operations or “continuations”. In this process, adverbials and pronominals Insertables (see Ex.(9) and (15)), demonstrative Free Constituents (see Ex.(38) in later section), Repetition as TCU-continuations (see Ex.(22)), and Repetitions as Non-add-ons (see Ex.(26)) may possibly represents different “transitional” phases in the grammaticalization pathway of Non-add-ons as a construction. Further investigations into specifically how and why Non-add-ons are produced during interaction may provide additional evidence to the discourse-functional environment that has fostered the formation of such constructions. However, questions of grammaticalization processes do not fall within the scope of this dissertation, and is left for future investigations.

3.3. Syntactically continuous and dependent TCU-continuations (Glue-ons)

Turning from syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations (i.e. Insertables, Replacements, and the contentious Non-add-ons), this section deals with “continuations” that are syntactically fitted to the end of a possibly complete TCU, or termed as Glue-ons. In addition to prosodic cues such as subordinate intonation, Glue-ons are further marked as “continuations”
because they are linearly appended to the prior unit in a syntactically coherent way. It is in this sense that they are “dependent” upon the prior unit, for evidence of syntactic contiguity. However, it does not necessarily follow that *Glue-ons* are incomplete and dependent syntactic structures by themselves. While some types of *Glue-ons* are syntactically bounded and dependent (such as verbal auxiliaries, complements and tag questions), there are also *Glue-ons* that can appear to be syntactically well formed TCUs on their own. Naturally, these syntactically well-formed and continuous further talk will have to be inspected closely for their status as “continuations” (i.e. *Glue-ons*); or something more independent from the prior unit (i.e. new TCUs). A key differentiating factor is usually how they are produced prosodically, or if there was subordinate intonation involved to further strengthen an interpretation of continuation. A few key exemplars of these cases will be provided later in this section. For now, 6 key structural/grammatical environments in Chinese where *Glue-ons* can be produced will be enumerated, detailed and illustrated. These are namely (1) the serial verb construction\(^{74}\), (2) the topic-comment structure\(^{75}\), (3) the omitted nominal object structure\(^{76}\), (4) adding tag questions, (5) adding conjunctive clauses, and (6) the verb-resultative complement construction\(^{77}\).

It has to be emphasized that the Chinese grammatical structures or constructions detailed in this section are simply the environment which has *provided for or allowed for* certain constituents or phrases produced after possible completion to be construed as syntactically continuous *Glue-ons*. It does not mean that these grammatical structures or constructions are necessarily instantiations of TCU-continuations. Indeed, most instances of such structures or

---

\(^{74}\) Li & Thompson (1981), pp. 594-622.
\(^{75}\) Li & Thompson (1981), pp. 85-103.
\(^{76}\) Li & Thompson (1981), pp. 657-675.
\(^{77}\) Li & Thompson (1981), pp. 54-68 and Lu (1999), pp. 23 & 35.
constructions in Chinese discourse are prototypically formulated from the outset to be complete without retroactive operations performed on a “host-TCU”. The key point here, however, is that it is through these distinctive grammatical structures or constructions in Chinese that various forms of further talk after possible completion can be construed as being “grammatically fitted” in a normative syntax. Therefore, despite being a right-headed syntax language (see section (1.3.)), Chinese do have other grammatical resources where a variety of Glue-ons may be produced. Naturally, there is an even stronger preponderance to see syntactically continuous “continuation” as being part of the host-TCU ab initio (i.e. the speaker did not retroactively produce the syntactically continuous “continuation”). A legitimate question to ask is: how are recipients (and ourselves as analyst) to discern an instance of talk to be a Glue-on (i.e. “continuation” retroactively produced after a TRP); or simply part of the prototypical grammatical structures or constructions formulated from the outset by the speaker? Talk produced after a gap of silence, or after talk-by-others, is certainly a clear indication that the speaker did not have the later part of a syntactically continuous structure or construction in mind from the outset; and that the grammatical structure or construction was designed retroactively (in fact, as will be shown, most Glue-ons in our collection actually do occur after noticeable gaps or talk-by-others). But more crucially, as argued in section (2.2.) and (2.3.), the prosodic character of a turn-in-talk is central to how Chinese speakers index and recognize both possible completion of a TCU (i.e. TRP), and TCU-continuation. While possible completion may be strongly signaled through a multitude of utterance-final particles in Chinese (seen in some exemplars in this section), we argue it is the monitoring of a prosodic declination unit (DU) that constitutes the key resource through which a TRP is determined, and inferably marks further talk after a TRP to
possibly be a “continuation”. Similarly, Chinese TCU-continuations are also ubiquitously marked with *subordinate intonation* after possible completion to index their status as separate but “belonging” to the prior. Our exemplars of *Glue-ons* have been determined to be TCU-continuations based on these features. Furthermore, we agree with Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) that a more productive construe of TCU-continuations is not as discrete categories, but as a continuum of differing grammatical relation with the prior unit.\(^7\) From this perspective, *Glue-ons* produced without clear prosodic breakage are certainly instances of further talk closer to being part of the TCU than most other TCU-continuations due to their syntactic continuity. On the other hand, the exemplars of *Glue-ons* shown below may be construed as less prototypical instances on a continuum of typicality of common Chinese grammatical structures or constructions.

(1) **Serial verb construction**

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, there are certain structural environments provided for in Chinese syntax, in which speakers would have the option to pursue TCU-continuations in a syntactically continuous manner. One of those structures in the syntactic environment of Chinese where *Glues-ons* are predominantly found is the **serial verb construction**, where clausal phrases (VPs) may be structurally stringed together without the need for conjunctions (Li & Thompson 1981, pp. 594-622). Additionally, Chinese is also commonly known as a **“pro-drop” language**, where the subject noun phrase (NP,) of a clausal sentence may be “drop” or omitted provided that it can be found, traced and understood from the

\(^7\) See section (1.2.) for arguments for seeing TCU-continuations as non-discrete categories.
preceding context. Schematically the construction is seen as:

\[
\{ \text{NP}_1 \text{VP}_1 + ((\text{NP}_2 \text{VP}_2) + ((\text{NP}_3 \text{VP}_3) \ldots + ((\text{NP}_n \text{VP}_n)) \}
\]

Given that follow-up clauses in Chinese (with a clear referent in its earlier discourse) need not begin overtly with a subject NP, pronoun or a dummy subject, adjacently placed clauses are structurally more amenable to be seen as a syntactically continuous “continuation” of the preceding TCU in a serial verb construction, given the right prosodic and pragmatic conditions. Ex.(27) below exemplifies instances of Glue-ons that are syntactically continuous based on the serial verb construction.

Ex.(27)  Verbal Clause in Serial Verb Construction

Ex.(27a)  ES-M-02 [2:17-2:48]

17  Lin:  晚上时候带他回家。[睡觉].
      wanshang de shihou dai ta hui jia:. [shuijiao].
      night GEN period bring return home. [sleep].
      (then we) bring him back home in the evening. to sleep.

Ex.(27b)  NTU-2 [39:57]

01  Jie:  去看看时间去.再进来.
        qu kan-kan shijian qu. zai jinlai
        go see-see time go. again enter
        Go take a look at the time. then come back in.

Ex.(27c)  ES-M-01 [10:39-10:43]

04  Chen:  学校肯定有很多小朋友.
05  (0.3)
06  ⇒  Chen:  跟[他玩儿.]
04  Chen:  xuexiao kending you hen duo xiao pengyou.
         school sure have very many small friend.
         There must be a lot of little buddies in school.
05  (0.3)
06⇒ Chen:  
*gen [ta wanr.]*
*follow [3SG play.]*
*to play with him.*

Ex. (27d)  
**ES-M-01 [5:00-5:12]**

03 Lian:  
[我就:::把d- 我就把:那个 .hhh

04 uhh 我们学校寄给我的 newsletter]

05 Chen:  
[mm m]mm

06⇒ Lian:  
uhh 给他:::拿了一份儿.[让他作cuo- 参考.=

03 Lian:  
[wo ji:::u ba d- wo jiu ba: nage .hhh
1SG DM BA d- 1SG DM BA that
I then took... I then took the...

04 uhh women xuexiao ji gei wo de newsletter
erm... the newsletter our school sent to me

05 Chen:  
[mm m]mm

06⇒ Lian:  
uhh gei ta::: na le yi-fenr. [rang ta zuo cuo- cankao.=
give 3SG hold-CMP one-CL. [let 3SG do cuo- reference.=
and... kept a copy for him. for him to keep as reference.

Ex. (27e)  
**ES-M-02 [2:58-3:14]**

03 Lin:  
<下午:又两三点的时候就去 .hh 医院那里.

04 (.)

05⇒ Lin:  
jie tamen hui-lai.
fetch 3PL return-come.
to fetch them back (home).

Ex. (27f)  
**ES-M-05 [11:26-12:10]**

19 Li:  
.hh 然后他就[m就穿:专门]请了美国=

20 Liu:  
[( ((咳嗽)))]

21 Li:  
=一个 .hh 很有名的翻译密码的专家.

22 (0.7)

23⇒ Li:  
来一起协助破案.

19 Li:  
.hh ranhou ta jiu [m jiu chu:an zhuanmen] qing-le meiguo=
then 3SG DM DM wear specialize invite-CMP America=
He then specially invited from America
Ex.(27a) and (27b) show a singular verb (“shuijiao (sleep)”) and a verb pre-modified by an adverb (“zai (again)” + “jinlai (enter)” ) as serial verb Glue-ons. Ex.(27c) and (27d) are two instances where the Glue-ons are verbal clauses pre-modified by prepositional phrases. In Ex. (27c), Chen produces the prepositional phrase “gen ta (with him)” followed by the verb “wanr (play)” as a Glue-on; while in Ex.(27d), Lian produces the prepositional phrase “rang ta (let him)” followed by the verb-object construction “zuo cankao (to be used as a reference)”. Lastly, in Ex.(27e) and (27f), the Glue-ons are themselves serial verb constructions. In Ex.(27e), the Glue-on consists of the verb-object construction “jie tamen (fetch them)” followed by the verb-complement “hui-lai (return)”; and in Ex.(27f), the Glue-on is the combination of a verb-complement “lai yi-qi (come together)” first followed by a verb-object construction “xiezhu po-an (help solve the case)”. As in all serial verb constructions, the appended Glue-ons in the above instances serves to further specify the temporal next action or a resultant action stemming from the prior verbal clause. As mentioned priorly, the subject NP of an utterance can be omitted in a “pro-drop” language like Chinese, and hence there is also a case to be made for syntactically continuous serial verb clauses (without the initial subject constituent) that occur after possible completion of the prior to be a new TCU by itself, and not necessarily a “continuation”. While it
is more difficult for some form of serial verbs to be pragmatically seen as an independent TCU, others will have to be further examined for additional displays of “continuation” from the prior, such as subordinate intonation as a prosodic feature. An interesting observation is that there are significantly more *Glue-ons* produced after a noticeable gap of silence than other types of TCU-continuations (i.e. *Insertables*, *Replacements* or even *Free Constituents* in the next section). Out of the six exemplars above, half of them (Ex.(27c), (27e) and (27f)) are what Schegloff (2004) calls “post-gap increments”.

(2) **Topic-comment structure**

Another syntactic environment where syntactically continuous *Glue-ons* is a common option is immediately after nominal phrases that can act as topics for further comments. The topic-comment structure is argued to be the default sentence structure in Chinese, and hence Chinese is deemed a *topic-prominent* language (Li & Thompson 1976; Li & Thompson 1981, pp. 85-102). A “topic” in this structure is independent of the syntactic category of subject or object. By this, it means that any nominal constituent in the “topic” position (i.e. utterance-initial) can be followed by a “comment” (usually a clause, or a full clause with its own subject) that treats the nominal constituent as its subject, object or any other relevant nominal arguments. In other words, the topic-comment structure is a valid syntactic structure in Chinese where the semantic relations between the “topic” constituent and the “comment” constituent can be very loosely defined. A schematic representation of the topic-comment construction is given below:

---

70 This usually depends on the semantic and pragmatic relationship between the adjacent serial verb constructions. For instance, in Ex.(27a), the addition of the verb “*shuifornia (sleep)*” after possible completion is clearly and simply a next sequential activity for the referent after being brought home “in the evening”, and cannot in anyway seen to be pursuing a different interactive action from its host-TCU.
Given that Chinese is an isolating language, a topic is without morphosyntactic markings, and its topical status must be inferable from the discourse situation. In terms of retroactive operations, this means that any TCU made up by a nominal phrase is amenable to be retroactively “made into” a topic with further talk that comments on the nominal phrase relevantly as a topic. Hence, a clausal “continuation” of this type can be seen as a syntactically continuous *Glue-on* under the topic-comment structure of Chinese. Exemplars of these *Glue-ons* are seen in Ex.(28) below.

**Ex.(28) Verbal Clause in Topic-Comment Structure**

Ex.(28a)  
ES-M-06 [2:12-2:30]

08  Jian:  .hh 呶<将军县>. 你听过吗.
    .hh e- <jiangjun xian>. ni ting-guo ma.
    INJ- <general county>. 2SG listen-EXP QP.
    Erm... the General’s County. Have you heard of it?

Ex.(28b)  
ES-M-02 [5:19-5:28]

01  Pan:  [就]是他考虑事情的那个角度.
02  Lin:  Mm mm=
03⇒ Pan:  =还是有一点差别.

01  Pan:  [jiu]shi ta kaolu shiqing de nage jiaodu.
        DM 3SG consider matter GEN that angle.
        (I mean) the perspective from which he considers things.

02  Lin:  Mm mm=
03⇒ Pan:  =haishi you yi-dian chabie.
        still have one-dot different.
        is still a bit different.

Ex.(28c)  

05  Ceng:  [大概]—一万块钱.
06 (0.4)
07  Wei:  .hh 因为[ 当时<去英 ]国的时候的话呢=
08⇒ Ceng:  [↓买(的一)张机票.]
05 Ceng:  【dagai y- yiwan duo kuai qian.】
approximate y- ten-thousand more dollar money.  
(It's) about... ten thousand dollars or more.

06

07 Wei: .hh yinwei [ dangshi <qu ying ]guo de shihou de hua ne=
because [ then <go England GEN period GEN-talk TP=
Because if we were to go to England during that period...

08⇒ Ceng:  【mai (de yi) zhang ji-piao.】
【buy (GEN one) CL plane-ticket.】
that (I) paid for a plane ticket.

Ex.(28d) ES-M-02 [15:58-16:21]

15 Pan:  >qishi< dui nimen lai shuo zhen-de shi::
actual to 2PL come say real-GEN BE
Actually for all of you, it really is

16 xian na-dao yi-ge shuoshi.
first hold-reach one-CL Masters.
first obtaining a Masters degree.

17 (.)

18⇒ Pan:  "haishi bijiao hao de".
still compare good GEN.
(that is) the better option comparatively.


07 Chen:  九月份以后?

08 (0.5)

09⇒ Chen:  出生好一些.

07 Chen:  jiu yue fen yihou?
nine month CL after?
(Maybe) after September?

08 (0.5)

09⇒ Chen:  chu-sheng hao yi-xie.
out-born good a-bit.
(as the) better (time) to give birth.
Ex.(28a), (28b) and (28c) illustrate three exemplars where the host-TCU first comes to possible completion with a noun phrase, before a clause is appended that retroactively transforms the utterance into a topic-comment structure. In Ex.(28a), Jian first produces a proper noun “jianjun xian (general’s county)” that informs his interlocutor of the nickname for his hometown, and then follows with the full clause “ni ting-guo ma (have you heard of it?)” after possible completion that takes the just prior noun as the object of enquiry. The full TCU is thus retroactively seen as “jianjun xian [topic] + ni ting-guo ma [comment]”. In Ex.(28b), Pan starts the TCU with a discourse marker “jiushi (that is)” before providing the noun phrase “ta kaolu shiqing de nage jiaodu (The perspective with which he considers things)”. After possible completion evinced by the recipient’s acknowledgement at line 02, Pan continues with “hai shi you yi-dian chabie (still a bit different)” that clearly treats “the perspective” in the host-TCU as the topic of this comment. In Ex.(28c), Ceng first provides the estimate cost of a trip with a noun phrase “dagai yi wan duo kuai qian (about ten thousand dollars)” in line 05, then follows up with the clause “mai de yi zhang ji-piao (paid for a plane ticket)” in line 08 after a noticeable gap and talk-by-other, detailing what the earlier cost is specifically about. But besides noun phrases, clauses can also retroactively act as topics. In Ex.(28d), Pan first laboriously frames her suggestion with a trio of qualifiers in line 15, namely “qishi (actually)”, “dui nimen lai shuo (for you all)” and “zhen-de shi (it really is)”, before she ends with the clause “xian na-dao yi-ge shuoshi (first get a Masters degree)” in line 16. After a noticeable micro-pause, this suggestion is turned into a topic and further evaluated at line 18 with the comment “haishi bijiao hao de (still a better option)”. In Ex.(28e), we see an interesting case of how a speaker pursues a request of information with a Glue-on. Before the extract in Ex.(28e), the interlocutors were debating on
the most favorable time to have a baby such that it can enter the school system in mainland China at the youngest age possible. In line 07, Chen initially proposes the time period “jiu yue fen yihou (After September)” with a try-marked prosody as the most opportune time. After a gap of a half second, she appends a clausal Glue-on “chu-sheng hao yi-xie (better to give birth)” that clearly takes the earlier time period as the subject (or topic) of comment, thereby transforming an initial try-marked candidate option to a more declarative statement for the interlocutor to affirm. Finally, as with serial verb Glue-ons, it is also observed that a large number of the comment-type Glue-ons did not occur immediately after possible completion, but after some intervening gap or talk. This happens in four out of the five exemplars above. Ex.(28c), (28d) and (28e) are Glue-ons after a noticeable gap of silence; while in Ex.(28b), the Glue-on comes after a minimal acknowledgement token “Mm mm”.

(3) **Omitted nominal object structure**

Yet another environment where syntactically continuous TCU-continuations can appear is in a clause where the nominal object (NP_{o}) is “dropped” or missing. Two features of the Chinese language contribute to this possibility: the first is the pro-drop tendencies of Chinese where either the nominal subject or, more importantly, the object may be omitted when the referent can be deduced from prior discourse (Li & Thompson 1981, pp. 657-676); the second is, of course, the SVO typology of Chinese (see section (2.2.)) where the object constituent naturally comes at the end an utterance, resulting in syntactic continuity when a nominal object is appended after possible completion of an object-less clause. This is represented in the schema below (next page).
{ NP, + VP + (NP,) }

But a more common form of nominal object *Glue-on* is usually seen after a possibly complete **nominalizer-DE construction** (Li & Thompson 1981, pp. 575-593). The nominalizer-DE refers to the grammatical particle placed after some attributive or possessive elements, such that the entire construction constitutes a nominal used in a grammatical subject or object position. This, however, means that the formulation of nominalizer-DE construction may be seen as the omission of the head noun on the right in a right-headed syntax language. Schematically speaking, this is seen as:

{ Attributive/Possessive Modifier + DE + (Head Noun) }Nominal Subject/Object

Therefore, when used as the grammatical object placed after a verb in a SVO language, the end of a nominalizer-DE construction may be a possible completion point of the utterance; and furthermore, allows for the syntactically continuous appendage of a nominal object as a TCU-continuation. Ex.(29) below illustrates some exemplars where the *Glue-on* is either the full nominal object or part of the nominalizer-DE construction.

**Ex.(29)  Nominal Object**

Ex.(29a)  ES-M-09 [10:42-10:56]  
12  Wei:  >因为<我也不太清楚。他这个。  
> *yinwei* < *wo ye bu tai qingchu.* "*ta zhege*".  
because 1SG also NEG too clear. 3SG this.  
Because I’m also not too sure. *(about) his stuff.*
Ex.(29b)  ES-M-01 [6:24-6:44].

13 Chen: <他能发动 (.) 很多. (. ) [很积极]人.
<ta neng fadong (.) hen duo. (. ) [hen jiji de] ren.
3SG can mobilize (. ) very many. (. ) [very active GEN] people.
He can mobilize many. very active participants.

Ex.(29c)  ES-M-07 [19:41-19:55]

12 Deng: 呃~都是港大的.
13  (0.4)
14⇒ Deng: °女[生°.]

12 Deng: e~ dou shi gangda de.
AGR- all BE NM GEN.
Yes... they’re all from HK university.

13  (0.4)

14⇒ Deng: °nu[sheng°.]
female.
(and all) female students.

Ex.(29d)  ES-M-09 [8:51-9:02]

10 Wei: [不~ 但是一月底]有没有新年:..<zhi 类．
[b~ danshi yi yue di] you-mei-you xinnia:n.<zhi lei.
NEG- but one month bottom have NEG have New-Year.<GEN type.
No... But at the end of January, is there the Lunar New Year.
and other kinds of holidays.

Ex.(29a) and (29b) show two exemplars of nominal object Glue-ons that are produced after object-less clauses. In Ex.(29a), the host-TCU comes to a possible completion point at “wo ye bu tai qingchu (I’m also not too sure)” where the grammatical object of what the speaker is unsure about is omitted. The speaker then continues to softly append a nominal object Glue-on in the form of a compound pronoun “ta zhege”, literally “his + this”, after possible completion. In Ex. (29b), Chen justifies the selection of a student representative by saying “ta neng fadong hen duo (he can mobilize many)” but did not specify exactly who can be mobilized upon possible completion. After a micro-gap of silence, Chen adds the nominal phrase “hen jiji de ren (very
active people)” as a nominal object Glue-on, which comes into overlap with the next speaker’s turn. Ex.(29c) illustrates a prototypical example of nominal object Glue-on after a nominalizer-DE construction. In the extract, the speaker, Deng, who is a student in the University of Hong Kong (HKU), answers a question with regards to who was in a group of five that went out to a night club a few nights ago. At line 12, Deng first produces the nominalizer-DE construction in “dou shi gangda de (all from HKU-DE)” where “gangda (HKU)” constitutes the attributive element before the “de” particle, and the nominal object after “de” is left omitted but clearly deducible as being “students”. Up till this moment, Deng focuses on the group’s association with the university (HKU) as the relevant index for identification. However, after a gap of silence in line 13, Deng softly appends the nominal object Glue-on with “nu sheng (female students)”, thereby further specifying the gender of all five students that night. The last exemplar Ex.(29d) is an interesting case of nominal object Glue-on after nominalizer-DE construction, where the Glue-on includes the grammatical particle “zhi (GEN)”, a classical Chinese genitive case marker with similar functions to DE. Before the example in Ex.(29d), Wei and her interlocutor were discussing the best time to organize overseas exchange programs with partner universities. At line 10, Wei comments that the end of January may be untenable as students will want to stay home during the Lunar New Year, and other such kinds of festive periods. This is done through first highlighting the possibility of the Lunar New Year holiday with the question “danshi yi yue di you-mei-you xinnia::n (Will the Lunar New Year fall on the end of January?)” which comes to possible completion. However, Wei then continues to “rush-through” with “zhi lei (GEN + type)” as a Glue-on to the noun phrase “xinnian (Lunar New Year)”, thereby producing “xinnian zhi lei (categories of things like the Lunar New Year)”, and retroactively subjugating “xinnian” as just
an attributive constituent and an illustrative type of holiday that may occur at the end of January. Similarly, we like to highlight that in terms of when nominal object *Glue-ons* are produced, we once again see a relatively sizable number of them occurring after a clear and noticeable gap of silence, as seen in Ex.(29b) and (29c).

An interesting observation pertaining to nominal object *Glue-ons* is that it is exactly the right-headed syntax of Chinese that has allowed syntactic continuity when an omitted nominal object is added retroactively, or when a new nominal object takes the previous noun phrase to be its modifier. In a sense, although right-headed syntax has *ab initio* led to most adverbial TCU-continuations to be syntactically discontinuous (cf. *Insertables*), given other structural norms such as the “pro-drop” status of nominal objects, “right-headedness” can also provide the grammatical environment for other sorts of syntactic continuous TCU-continuations to appear.

(4) **Adding tag questions**

As with English, *tag questions* (e.g. “……, right?”, “……, isn’t it?” etc.) may also be attached to a possibly complete clause as a syntactically continuous *Glue-on* in Chinese. While Schegloff (1996) has described “tag questions” as an element that is “specifically designed for post-possible completion position”\(^80\), the tag-question format, however, may also appear as part of the TCU\(^81\), depending on how it was produced prosodically. In Chinese, such ‘tag questions’ can appear as “*shi-bu-shi* (BE-NEG-BE)” or “*shi-ba* (BE-QP)” that are “through-produced” with their affiliated statements or claims, and so there is no points of possible completion before their

---

80 Schegloff (1996), pp. 91.
81 In endnote (36) of Schegloff (1996, pp. 121), he notes that “some so-called ‘tag questions’ in American English are not designed as post-completion elements, but are indigenous parts of the construction of the clause to which they are appended, as in "You're not leaving, are you?" The familiar term "tag question" may thus refer to usages whose structural character and positioning are diverse.”
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production. In terms of their function, one common usage seems to be as ‘markers’ within a multi-TCU turn where recipients will appropriately provide a continuer (e.g. mm-hm, uh-huh) after speakers produce the ‘tag question’ as part of the TCU. Ex.(30) below shows one such exemplar where Yuan in describing to Jian how she journeyed from her hometown to the airport, utilizes an intra-TCU tag question at an appropriate juncture, and elicits the recipient’s continuer.

**Ex.(30) Tag Questions as part of TCU**

ES-M-06 [8:04-8:13]

04 Yuan: 我从家里出来时坐那种 (. ) 长途 =
05⇒ =(. ) 公 - (. ) 长途大巴 是不是 =
06 Jian: =哦 : [ 哦 mm mm] 合肥 .hh 从合肥 (. ) 打得到机场 .
07 Yuan: [ 去车 - ] 合肥 .hh 从合肥 (. ) 打得到机场 .

04 Yuan: wo cong jia-li chulai shi zuo na zhong (. ) chang-tu =
When I left from home, I took that type of … long-distance…
05⇒ =(. ) go - (. ) chang-tu da-ba shi-bu-shi .=
Public… long-distance big-bus BE-NEG-BE .
Public… Long distance coach bus, yeah ?
06 Jian: =o: [ o mm mm]
CFM CFM
uh-huh uh-huh mm .
07 Yuan: [ gu ch- ] hefei .hh cong hefei (. ) da de dao jichang .
go car NM from NM ride PCM reach airport
Then by cab… Hefei… umm From Hefei, it’s possible to reach the airport by cab .

But given that utterance-final is the natural syntactic position for tag questions to occur, they may also be produced after a possible completion point of a predicative clause as a syntactically continuous TCU-continuation. This is represented in the schema below.

{ Predicative Clause + (Tag Question) }
Besides how they are produced prosodically, a clear difference between tag questions done as part of the TCU and as *Glue-ons* is that the latter are retroactive operations, by virtue of their occurrence after the possible completion of a TCU. One clear and common function of such tag questions found in the data is to invite for corroboration on the prior statement, proposition or claim that is possibly disaligned with that of the recipient. In doing so, the speaker may also be retroactively hedging the host-TCU, and thereby lowering his/her epistemic stance. This is often done in response to and after recipient’s non-uptake (i.e. gaps of silence) following the speaker’s statement, proposition or claim in the host-TCU, which prefaces possible disagreement (Pomerantz 1984a). Ex.(31) below shows the range of tag questions that can occur in Chinese *Glue-ons*, and how they may be produced immediately after possible completion, after a gap or after talk-by-others in Chinese.

**Ex.(31)  Tag Questions as Glue-ons**

**Ex.(31a)  ES-M-06 [12:30-12:45]**

03 Jian:  
[读但是].h转它肯定有个考核;吧.是不是.=  
[SIP but] transfer 3SG sure have CL test QP. BE-NEG-BE.  
Oh but... to change (majors), there should be a test, *isn’t it?*

**Ex.(31b)  ES-M-01 [1:59-2:02]**

03 Lian:  
[肃华-- 收~嗯你收到肃华:的email了.[↑是吧.  
[suhua- sho- en ni shou-dao suhua: de email le. [↑shi-ba.  
[NM- receive- SIP 2SG receive-reach NM GEN email CRS.[BE-QP.  
Suhua... umm... you’ve received an email from Suhua, *right?*

**Ex.(31c)  ES-M-02 [5:10-5:24]**

02 Pan:  
[我觉得: m::]这个男女差异还是挺大的.  
03  
(0.3)  
04⇒ Pan:  
是吧.
I think... (the issue of) gender difference here is still quite significant.

Right?

So your current good friends are all from high school.

It’s an international brand...

you know, right?
Ex.(31f)  ES-M-05 [9:02-9:22]

08 Liu: >(那n-)<(0.4)>(qishi) jiu gen you yi-
09 有一种精神寄托差不多啊。
10  (0.4)
11 Li:  差不[ 多吧。]
12⇒ Liu:  [“对吧”]

08 Liu: >(DM n-)<(DM n-)< gishi< jiu gen you yi-
> actual DM with again one-
Then…  Actually, it’s again like the...

09  you yi zhong jingshen ji-tuo cha-bu-duo a.
have one type spirit send-entrust differ-NEG-many SFP.
it’s a type of spiritual sustenance more or less.

10  (0.4)

11 Li:  cha-bu-[ duo ba. ]
differ-NEG[-many QP.
Yes, something like that.

12⇒ Liu:  [“dui ba”]
[“right QP]
Right?

Ex.(31a) and (31b) show the tag questions “shi-bu-shi (BE-NEG-BE)” and “shi-ba (BE-QP)” respectively, produced not as part of the TCU, but in the next beat after a possible completion of the prior unit as a Glue-on. The possible completion of host-TCU in both Ex.(31a) and (31b) are not only marked prosodically, but also signaled through the use of utterance-final particles “ba (QP)” and “le (CRS)” indexing strong syntactic closure respectively. In Ex.(31a), Jian attempts to confirm with her interlocutor that to change majors in his department, one should undergo an evaluation test; while in Ex.(31b), Lian enquires if her interlocutor has received an expected email. It is observed that both predicate clauses in Ex.(31a) and (31b), before the tag question Glue-ons, are actions of inquiry on matters that the recipient obviously has more direct access to than the speaker, and that the tag question Glue-ons clearly work to position the speaker as
deferential to the recipient’s higher epistemic status. Ex.(31c) and (31d) continue with tag questions “shi-ba (BE-QP)” and its variation “shi-ma (BE-QP)” as Glue-ons, but this time produced after a hearable gap of silence or after talk by others. In Ex.(31c), Pan first posits the opinion, tentatively framed with epistemic marker “wo juede (I think)” (Lim 2011), that gender difference plays a significant role on a certain issue at line 02. Upon receiving no uptake in line 03 (0.3 seconds gap), Pan then goes on to append the tag question “shi-ba (BE-QP)” at line 04 to further mobilize corroboration from the recipient. In Ex.(31d), Liu articulates a presumption that all of Li’s good friends were from her own high school at line 07. This received no acknowledgement at line 08 (0.5 seconds gap), and also causes Li to do a contemplative level intonation “mm,” at line 09, followed by another micro-pause at line 10. Possibly due to the multiple difficulty displayed in achieving agreement, Liu adds the tag question “shi-ma (BE-QP)” softly at line 11 as a form of back-down from her stronger statement at line 07. Finally, in Ex.(31e) and (31f), two other tag questions “zhidao ba (know QP)” and “dui ba (right QP)” are illustrated as Glue-ons, also after noticeable gap or talk by others. In comparison to earlier tag questions Glue-ons, “zhidao ba” and “dui ba” do not so much signal the speaker’s own epistemic uncertainty, but assume a stance that some sort of common knowledge or understanding has been predicated in the host-TCU, and the Glue-on is simply appended to request acknowledgement of such facts. In Ex.(31e), Liu states simply that a certain label is an international brand name in line 05. After a 1.2 second gap without any form of acknowledgement in line 06, Liu pursues uptake with the tag question “zhidao ba” in line 07. In Ex.(31f), Liu opines at lines 08-09 that some of the illicit activities taken up by unemployed but well-to-do females in their forties fill a void in their lives, and is a source of “spiritual sustenance” for these group of people. This is met
with 0.4 second of silence at line 10 before her interlocutor begins to give a mitigated form of agreement in “cha-bu-duo ba (something like that)” in line 11. It is interesting that Liu jumps in with the tag question Glue-on “dui ba” at line 12 after the first two syllable of “cha-bu-duo (more or less)” has been articulated, which is projectably coming to a less-than-full agreement to Liu’s prior opinion. There is a strong sense in both Ex.(31e) and (31f) that the speaker is not so much interested in reaching a consensus with her recipient, as is to inform her interlocutor what she knows to be true. Nonetheless, all the tag question Glue-ons shown works to increase response relevancy (Stivers & Rossano 2010), and garner the recipient’s uptake on a prior statement, proposition or claim. Therefore, it is unsurprising that four out of the six exemplars above, namely Ex.(31c-f), are again Glue-ons that occur after gaps of silence prefacing problems with uptake.

(5) Adding Conjunctive clauses

As previously demonstrated, adjacently placed clauses without linking conjunctions can be syntactically continuous in Chinese under the serial verb construction given the right pragmatic context, as seen in Ex.(27). It goes without saying then, that clauses linked by conjunctive elements are also grammatically fitted. Therefore, a fifth structural environment for Glue-ons occurs when an appended clause is syntactically linked with a conjunct after the possible completion of a prior clause. This is represented schematically below.

\{ Clause + (Conjunct + Clause) + (Conjunct + Clause) + …… \}

These conjunctive clauses as Glue-ons can be predicative or adjunctive in nature, and can also
be verbal or nominals. Two such exemplars are provided in Ex.(32) below.

**Ex.(32) Conjunctive Clauses**

**Ex.(32a) ES-M-06 [0:33-0:39]****

01 Yuan: [就是-] .hh 就看你本科的GPA.

02 (0.4)

03 Jian: 喔:[明[白了. ]


05 Jian: [嗯:. ]

06⇒ Yuan: =.h [然后你的推荐]信.

07 Jian: [嗯: mm:.. ]

01 Yuan: [jiush-] .hh jiu kan ni benke de GPA.

[DM-] DM see 2SG undergraduate GEN GPA

That is... just looking at your undergraduate GPA.

02 (0.4)

03 Jian: o:: ming[bai-le. ]

INJ understand-CMP.

Oh... I see.

04⇒ Yuan: [he ni- he] ni de [benke de] chengji.=


and your... and your undergraduate grades.

05 Jian: [ e:n. ]

CFM.

Uh-huh.

06⇒ Yuan: =.h [ranhou ni de tuijian]-xin.

after 2SG GEN recommend-letter.

and then your recommendation letter.

07 Jian: [ e:n mm:.. ]

CFM.

Uhmm mm...

**Ex.(32b) ES-M-01 [0:46-0:59]****

11 Chen: =因为中秋节的时候: ( .)

12 它这肯定也不能带家属吧.

13 (0.8)

14⇒ Chen: [因为韶华来了嘛．]

11 Chen: =yinwei zhong-qiu-jie de shiho:u ( .)
because mid-autumn-festival GEN period

Because during the Mid-Autumn Festival...
Before the start of Ex.(32a), Jian asks Yuan what were the criterions assessed by his department for his doctoral program application to be approved. At line 01, Yuan begins by saying that it was based on “just looking at your undergraduate GPA”. This received no uptake at line 02 resulting in a 0.4 second gap, and possibly prefacing some trouble in the acceptance of such a singular criterion. Though Jian did provide some sort of acknowledgement in line 03, Yuan decides to provide more details on the criterions in line 04 with a conjunctive clause Glue-on. As Line 04 begins in overlap with line 03, Yuan re-starts the turn beginning with the conjunction “he (and)” as a clear link with his prior TCU, before stating “ni de benke de chengji (your undergraduate grades)” as an additional factor. As this Glue-on comes to possible completion, Yuan adds a second conjunctive clause Glue-on in line 06, this time with the conjunction “ranhou (after)” to signal further continuation before the third criterion “ni de tuijianxin (your recommendation letter)”, which also comes into overlap with another acknowledgement in line 07. Both Glue-ons in this exemplar were formulated by starting with a conjunct and then adding a nominal phrase to act as an adjunctive clause. The other case of a conjunctive verbal clause Glue-on is seen in Ex. (32b). Before the start of Ex.(32b), Chen was asked by her interlocutor if she intended to participate in an upcoming school event, to which Chen responded by saying she was unable to attend. Beginning with line 11 in Ex.(32b), Chen then accounts for not participating by saying
that since family members were not explicitly invited, she wants to spend time with her husband (Shaohua, who had just arrived) during the Mid-Autumn Festival, which clashes with the day of the event. At line 11, Chen begins her formulation of a new TCU with the causal conjunction “yinwei (because)” and the mention of the Mid-Autumn Festival, but seems to abandon this by the end of the line. She then restarts at line 12 by stating that family members are surely not invited to the event, which comes to possible completion with the utterance-final question particle “ba (QP)”. After a 0.8 second gap with no uptake in line 13, Chen appends another causal verbal clause “yinwei shaohua lai le ma (Because Shaohua is already here)” as a Glue-on, to strengthen her justification for non-participation. Notice that as with line 11, the Glue-on here also begins with the causal conjunction “yinwei (because)”, but is done as a “continuation” from line 12. Similar with the serial verb constructions, there is a distinct possibility for syntactically continuous causal clauses (with or without causal conjuncts) after possible completion to be produced as independent new TCUs instead of TCU-continuations. Couper-Kuhlen (2011, 2012) specifically addresses this possibility in English conversation as well. This issue will be taken up in more details at the end of this section. Regardless, it is again interesting that both exemplars in Ex.(32) have Glue-ons that are produced after a noticeable gap of silence.

(6) Verb-resultative complement construction

A final syntactic environment we want to highlight where syntactically continuous Glue-ons can occur is as a complement that modifies the verb. While most verbal complements in Chinese appear to the left of the verbal phrase (e.g. adverbials denoting time, place and manner), in a verb-resultative complement construction (Thompson 1973), the resultative complement
is positioned to the right of the verbal constituent, denoting some sort of state that is the result of
the action of the verb. The schematic structure of the verb-resultative construction is provided
below.

\{ \text{NP, + VP + (Resultative Complement)} \}

Hence, in certain situations where the TCU comes to possible completion after a verb without an
object constituent, Chinese speakers will then have the option to produce syntactically continuous
\textit{Glue-on} in the form of post-verbal complements, on the basis of the Verb-Resultative
Complement Construction. Although such TCU-continuations are uncommon in our data, Ex.
(33) below illustrates one such example.

\textbf{Ex.(33) Verb-Resultative Complement Construction}

\begin{quote}
NTU-2 [0:37-1:00]

Jie: \textit{那个印度的那个咖哩我: <不能吃>::. …((talk-by others))… 多. nage yindu de nage kali wo: <bu neng chi::>. …((talk-by others))… duo that Indian GEN that curry 1SG: <NEG can eat> much} \\
\textit{It’s that curry, Indian curry exactly, that I’m unable to eat. much.}
\end{quote}

Here, after “wo: <bu neng chi::> (I’m unable to eat)” has come to possible completion, other
speakers actually orient to such a TRP by taking next turns (omitted in example), hence reifying
“wo: <bu neng chi::>” to be a syntactically, pragmatically and prosodically complete. However,
the initial speaker (Jie) then re-completes the original by producing the degree complement “\textit{duo}
(much)” as a \textit{Glue-on} later in the sequence, whose end constitutes another possible completion
itself. “\textit{Duo}” in this context is only understandable as the resultative complement to the earlier
verb “chi (eat)”, thereby resulting in a syntactically continuous “wo bu neng chi duo (I’m unable to eat much)”, changing what could initially have been absolute (i.e. unable to eat at all) to a matter of degree (i.e. cannot eat much, but a little is fine). What is also notable in this example, similar to other Glue-ons in this section, is its position. Specifically, this Glue-on was not produced immediately after possible completion (next beat), or after some noticeable silence (post-gap), but after speaker transition (post-other-talk).

Previously in Ex.(19a-b), we have seen how synthetically discontinuous Insertables may be consecutively produced in complex ways. Similarly, syntactically continuous Glue-ons may also occur in a consecutive fashion to address produced contingencies in interactive talk. We submit Ex.(34) below as a closing example of how consecutively produced Glue-ons may be creatively used in Chinese.

**Ex.(34) Consecutive Combinations of Glue-ons**

ES-M-01 [5:39-5:50]

02 Lian: <我觉[得是我们: .hh 那个负责:::-=  
03 Chen: [mm  
04⇒ Lian: ==学生::[工作的那个老师::.组织的人::.  
05 Chen: [mm [mm mm  
06 Chen: ==噢:[噢:  
07⇒ Lian: [来:来::写的.==

02 Lian: <wo jue[de shi wome:n .hh nege fuze:::-=  
1SG feel BE 1PL that responsible=-  
    I think it’s that teacher of ours that is  
03 Chen: [mm  
04⇒ Lian: ==xueshe::ng [gongzu: de nage laoshi::. zuzhi de ren::.=  
    student [work GEN that teacher. [organization GEN people.=  
    in charge of student affairs. The people in his group.  
05 Chen: [mm [mm mm
Before the extract in Ex.(34), Chen enquired about who should be responsible for the department’s student newsletter. Lian initially states that it should be the faculty that is in charge, but later on also proposes that it is the students who are responsible, before finally concluding that it should be a collaborative project between faculty and students. This is done with lines 02-07, where Lian attempts to reconcile her seemingly conflicting account by saying that the newsletter is written by a group of students under the supervision of a particular teacher. From line 02 to the middle of line 04, Lian’s initial TCU was “wo juede shi women nage fuze xuesheng gongzuo de laoshi (I think it’s that teacher of ours that is in charge of student affairs)”, which seems to finger a certain teacher as being responsible for the newsletter. However, upon a possible completion point after “nage laoshi (that teacher)”, a nominal object Glue-on “zuzhi de ren (people in the organization)” was added, thereby retroactively changing the object from “nage laoshi (that teacher)” to “nage laoshi zuzhi de ren (people in that teacher’s organization)”. Similar to Ex.(29c) and (29d), this syntactically continuous Glue-on retroactively subjugates the earlier “nage laoshi” to be a possessive modifier of “zuzhi de ren“, a new nominal object instead of “nage laoshi”. But a second Glue-on is further appended at line 07 after “zuzhi de ren” comes to another possible completion. This time a verbal clause “lai xie de (to write (the newsletter))” is added, acting as the predicate of the entire earlier nominal phrase “women nage fuze xuesheng gongzuo de laoshi zuzhi de ren (people in the organization lead by that teacher in charge of
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student affairs)” as its subject. The entire TCU thus becomes a subject-predicate structure, framed by the utterance-initial epistemic marker “wo juede (I think)”. A possible reason for the second Glue-on, which highlights that it is the students (“zuzhi de ren”) who physically “write” the newsletter, is to set up a contrast with the faculty member (“nage laoshi”) who supervises the work82.

As promised, we now turn to some instances of further talk that are syntactically continuous, but are analyzably not produced as TCU-continuations despite the grammatical coherence. In the categories explicated above, it is clear that some Glue-ons are syntactically bounded and dependent upon the host-TCU (e.g. nominal objects, tag questions and resultative complements) for adequate understanding within the given sequential context. However, given that nominal subjects or topics may be omitted in Chinese (i.e. pro-drop), there are other Glue-ons that appear to be perfectly meaningful as syntactic units on their own (e.g. serial verb clauses, predicative comments and conjunctive clauses), thus raising the possibility that they may in fact be new TCUs. What this means is that some instances of syntactically continuous further talk may look like TCU-continuations but may not analyzably be so. On examining clause combinations (specifically causal clauses) in English, Couper-Kuhlen (2011, 2012) came to the conclusion that both lexically marked (cf. conjunctive clauses) and unmarked (cf. serial verb clauses) clause combinations may be TCU-continuations or instances of a multi-unit turn, and that “in languages where clauses are hard to distinguish from phrases (e.g., in languages where so-called “zero arguments” abound), the prediction would be that TCU continuations and new TCUs would be all the more difficult to distinguish”83. Furthermore, she suggests that “prosodic

82 Some of this contrast may also be seen in the use of “lai (come)” in the verbal clause.
linking” may constitute a key factor in differentiating the two. From section (2.3.), it is clear that for Chinese TCU-continuations, how further talk is produced prosodically is also a crucial criterion for identification of “continuation”, meaning that further talk with subordinate intonation will further strengthen an interpretation of “continuation”. Almost all of the exemplars given above (from Ex.(27) to (34)) have adhered to this criterion. We shall now examine a few examples where syntactically continuous components are nonetheless not analyzable as TCU-continuations.

The first case presented illustrates a syntactically continuous causal clause with a clear conjunction produced as part of the TCU, as opposed to being a “continuation” after possible completion. Ex.(35) shown below continues the topic of newsletter production described in Ex. (34). Here, Lian talks about providing a sample newsletter from her previous university as reference for the student-in-charge of crafting the newsletter in her current university. From lines 01-04, Lian states that she did not provide much help (besides offering a newsletter template) to the student-in-charge because she does not have much experience in such editorial work.

**Ex.(35) Synthetically Continuous Causal Clause as part of TCUs**

```
ES-M-01 [5:58-6:06]

01 Lian: [嗯我没有sh-没有给他
02 .hh 在信中具体说[应该怎么做:=
03 Chen: [mm
04⇒ Lian: =~因为我们也没有经验.=

01 Lian: [en wo mei you sh- mei you gei ta
AGR 1SG NEG have sh- NEG have give 3SG
Yeah, I did not... did not tell him

02 .hh zai xin zhong juti shuo [yinggai zenme zuo:=
at letter middle specific say [should how do=
concretely in the letter on what should be done
```

Couper-Kuhlen (2012) takes “common pitch declination” as a feature in identifying TCU-continuations (pp. 290).
While Ex.(35) is structurally similar to Ex.(32b), as both exemplars end with casual clauses initially marked with the causal conjunction “yinwei (because)” that are produced as justification for a prior action, the “yinwei” here in line 04 does not come after possible completion nor is it done with some form of subordinate intonation (i.e. lack of pitch reset or lowered intensity), but is “through-produced” from the earlier clause within a singular intonation contour. This is shown in the acoustic analysis of Graph (6) below.

Graph (6): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(35)

Given that a possible completion point did not occur before the causal clause in line 04 of Ex. (35), it is relatively unproblematic in seeing how this syntactically continuous component does not constitute a Glue-on, but was produced as part of the TCU from the outset of the utterance.
However, even when there is a possible completion point before a synthetically continuous component, that in itself does not necessarily mean that a TCU-continuation has occurred. Syntactically continuous further talk after possible completion may also be a new TCU on its own. This is illustrated in Ex.(36) below, where Chen informs her interlocutor that a class representative has written to invite students to an organized event.

**Ex.(36) Synthetically Continuous New TCUs**

```
04  Chen:  [他给我们写信. 问我们愿不愿意去.
            ta gei women xie xin. wen women yuan-bu-yuanyi qu.
            3SG give 1PL write letter. ask 1PL willing-or-not go.
            He wrote to us. He asked if we were willing to attend
            (the event).
```

The TCU in Ex.(36) first comes to possible completion with “ta gei women xie xin (He wrote to us)”, before a second clause “wen women yuan-bu-yuanyi qu (asked if we were willing to go)” is added. Two factors contribute to a strong sense of contiguity between the clauses. Firstly, the subject and agent of the verb “xie (write)” in the initial clause, and “wen (ask)” in the subsequent clause, are one and the same person indexed by the pronoun “ta (he)” at the start of the turn. Hence the subject in the subsequent clause is omitted given Chinese’s “pro-drop” status. Furthermore, as the content of “asking if we were willing to go” is in a sense the temporal/logical next action to “writing the email”, the two clauses in Ex.(36) are syntactically continuous within the serial verb construction of Chinese. However, the subsequent clause can also be a “well-formed” and independent syntactic unit apart from the first (as null subject is common and acceptable in Chinese), raising the possibility that it is a new TCU by itself. In the end, we have
not taken Ex.(36) as an instance of *Glue-on* due to the prosodic quality of its subsequent clause after possible completion. Graph (7) below shows an acoustic analysis of the turn.

While the intonation contour of the initial clause (drawn by Praat) does not show a clear declination unit (see section (2.3.)), the end of the clause is nonetheless clearly recognizable by native speakers as a possible completion point. A piece of evidence that the initial clause did come to completion is the beat of silence (not transcribed as being a micro-pause or longer) that occurred before the subsequent clause was produced. Additionally, the last syllable of the initial clause “xin (letter)” was significantly lengthened (see section (2.2.)) to project an upcoming possible completion point. More importantly, also seen in Graph (7) is that the subsequent clause lacks all features typical of subordinate intonation, as its intensity was not relatively lower than the initial clause nor did it start without a pitch reset. As such, we submit that it is more apt to see
the initial clause “ta gei women xie xin (He wrote to us)” and the subsequent clause “wen women yuan-bu-yuanyi qu ((He) asked if we were willing to go)” as separate TCUs performing individual actions. By this, it is proposed that the core action in Chen’s first TCU was to inform her interlocutor that an email has been sent, while the second TCU conveys the content of that email. In all, the analysis of syntactically continuous “further talk” here demonstrates again how prosody, specifically subordinate intonation, plays a crucial role in indexing some unit as “continuing” from the prior.

As an interim summary, our examination of Chinese Glue-ons has turn up three key observations on the use of TCU-continuations in Chinese:

i) It is immensely striking that relative to all other categories of TCU-continuations (i.e. Insertables, Replacements, Non-add-ons, and later in Free Constituents), our collection of Glue-ons contains significantly more instances of TCU-continuations done after a noticeable gap of silence (cf. post-gap increment) or after talk by others (cf. post-other-talk increment). In the 23 exemplars provided above, a total of 16 exemplars (about 70%) were examples of either post-gap or post-other-talk Glue-ons, making it apparent that there is a correlation between the use of syntactically continuous Glue-ons and “continuing” utterances after clear breakages in the flow of talk. This suggest that there may be some form of compensatory mechanism through the use syntactic contiguity in further talk in Chinese conversation, to index an additional sense of “continuation” when progressivity has been lost via prosodic disfluencies. In other words, in cases of recipient’s lack of uptake (i.e. occurrence of gaps of silence) or when intervening talk by others is projectably disaligned,
speakers seem to be more oriented to pursue uptake or “re-complete” the TCU using syntactically continuous *Glue-ons*, in effect trying to “disguise” the prior completion point as not actually being “complete” or to “sequentially delete”\(^85\) the import of other’s talk.

ii) Secondly, from the exemplars above, it should be clear that **syntactically continuous TCU-continuations (or Glue-ons) are also abundantly found in Chinese**. Although we are unable to offer specific statistical measures to quantify their difference, the overview of *Glue-ons* and its many structural environments examined in this section, gives an indication of the numerical significance of syntactically continuous TCU-continuations in the Chinese language. Taken together, this differs from the mutually exclusive distribution between syntactically continuous TCU-continuations (i.e. *Glue-ons*) from other syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations (i.e. *Insertables* and *Non-Add-ons*) illustrated in Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007).\(^86\) In their article, the differing frequencies of syntactically continuous and discontinuous TCU-continuations within a language was taken as “*conversational evidence for the grammatical distinction of right vs. left syntactic headedness*”\(^87\); and that languages with left-headed syntax (e.g. English) will be able to add optional elements (i.e. adjuncts and complements) “*ad libitum*” as “the construction emerges ‘with’ time”, while languages with right-headed syntax (e.g. Japanese) will naturally have optional elements ‘out of place’ as their placement “takes place ‘against’ time”.\(^88\) **We are in general agreement with the above analysis, given that the majority of Chinese TCU-continuations (a right-headed syntax language) found are also syntactically discontinuous**

\(^85\) This term is taken from Schegloff (2004).
\(^86\) Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 545-547.
\(^87\) Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 546.
\(^88\) Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 547.
*Insertables*. However, the range of Chinese *Glue-ons* shown here illustrates the point that the structural environments needed for syntactically continuous TCU-continuations may also be provided for by means other than a “left-headed syntax”. Language-specific constructions and conversational practices such as serial verb constructions, verb-resultative complements constructions, topic-comment structure and null anaphora of nominal objects are all rich environments for grammatically fitted “continuations” to take place. Indeed, “right-headed syntax” itself may also turn out to be a resource for other sorts of syntactically continuous TCU-continuations to occur, as illustrated in nominal object *Glue-ons*.

iii) Thus, in terms of how retroactive operations may be done, the close relationship between the “grammar” of a language and the demands of moment-by-moment interactional talk is nonetheless observed, despite our reservations on “left-headed syntax” (such as in English) being an essential condition for systematically doing “continuations” in a syntactic continuous manner. This can be inductively inferred from our description of how various grammatic structures in the Chinese language (e.g. topic-comment structure, serial verb construction, verb-resultative complement construction, etc.), as well as how certain structures can “conspire” (e.g. pro-drop and “right-headed syntax” in doing nominal object *Glue-ons*), to offer the necessary environment for syntactically continuous TCU-continuations to take place.

### 3.4. Syntactically non-dependent TCU-continuations (Free Constituents)

We now come to our last category, *Free Constituents*, which are the least common type of TCU-continuations found in our data. *Free Constituents* are further talk that are syntactically
unrelated to the prior TCU, but nonetheless semantically and pragmatically dependent upon the prior for adequate understanding, hence our heading “syntactically non-dependent TCU-continuations”. Compared with the TCU-continuations in section (3.2.) and (3.3.), Free Constituents are syntactically unbounded in any way to the host-TCU (though they may sometimes be syntactically incomplete by themselves), whereas Insertables, Replacements, Non-add-ons and Glue-ons can all be seen to be retroactively added syntactic constituents of the prior unit. It is in this sense (i.e. syntax) that Free Constituents are “free” and syntactically non-dependent (in contrast with being independent). Due to their syntactic non-dependence to the host-TCU, there is little in the parameter of syntax that will mark Free Constituents as “continuing” from the prior. Therefore the recognition of Free Constituents as “continuations” after a possibly complete TCU (as opposed to a new TCU) stems from how Free Constituents are heavily dependent on the preceding utterance for adequate semantic or pragmatic understanding. In other words, Free Constituents are semantically or pragmatically dependent on its host-TCU. Admittedly, all utterances are to a certain extent more or less dependent on previous utterances (i.e. retrospectively oriented) for proper interpretation\(^9\), however Free Constituents are fundamentally different from new TCUs as they are not analyzably pursuing a separate action on their own, but extends the from what the prior utterance is doing.

Furthermore, while some Free Constituents may be prosodically independent (such as Ex.(7) in section (2.3.) where it has an independent intonation unit (IU) or declination unit

\(^9\) Luke & Zhang (2007) explains this succinctly by saying that “all utterances (except the first one and the last one in a discourse) are at once prospective and retrospective: On the one hand, their proper interpretation always depends to some extent on previous utterances (hence retrospective); on the other hand, the raison d’être of an utterance is that it helps move the discourse forward, e.g. developing an argument or a narrative (hence prospective)”. (pp.611)
(DU)), most Free Constituents are still produced with subordinate intonation (and with “rush-through” or without gap), thereby signaling prosodic “continuation”. Recalling Figure (1) in section (1.2.), Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) takes Free Constituents to be some sort of intermediary type between new TCUs and TCU-continuations, due to their syntactic non-dependence (as opposed to other categories of TCU-continuations) while being semantically or pragmatically related with the host-TCU. Our collection of Chinese Free Constituents, however, shows that the majority of them are also prosodically marked in varying degrees to index “continuation”. Hence we take Free Constituents to simply be another category of further talk that are interpretable as “continuations” from the prior utterance, and see no merit in making a further distinction between Free Constituents and other sorts of TCU-continuations (i.e. Insertables, Replacements, Non-add-ons and Glue-ons). Nevertheless, given the syntactic non-dependence of Free Constituents, there are grounds for seeing this “further talk” as being grammatically less “related” to the host-TCU than other TCU-continuations, just as Non-add-ons and Glue-ons may be seen to be more “related” to the prior utterance due to their prosodic and syntactic continuity with the host-TCU respectively.

The most common form of Free Constituents found are lone-standing nominal phrases (NPs) after a possibly complete TCU, or what Ford et al. (2002) call Unattached NPs. As a “continuation”, these unattached NPs cannot be adequately understood unless a retrospective orientation is taken, which means it has to be seen in the light of what the prior utterance is doing. In our data, they oftentimes work to highlight or clarify the topic (or some nominal argument) that the host-TCU is commenting on. Some exemplars are provided in Ex.(37) below (next page).
In Ex.(37a), Jian expressed surprise after her interlocutor informs that he had switched majors during the course of his undergraduate studies. Jian does this in line 06 by first questioning if about the possibility of switching a major while in the midst of a program with “ni keyi zhongjian zhuan ma (Can you switch mid-way?)”. After possible completion is marked by the utterance-final question particle “ma (QP)”, Jian continues to add a proper noun “keda (NM)” in subordinate intonation, which is known to be the abbreviation of her interlocutor’s undergraduate university from earlier turns. Taken together, what Jian has done with the addition of “keda” is to specify (or clarify) that her prior question does not seek to understand if switching undergraduate
majors is a generic possibility, but is specifically inquiring about the policies at “keda”. However, given the sentence structure in the host-TCU and the lack of a preposition before “keda” to introduce a locative argument, this TCU-continuation cannot be seen to be a syntactic omission or replacement for the prior utterance, hence its status as nominal phrase Free Constituent. Note that it is sequentially impossible to understand what “keda” is doing unless it is taken to be part of the action pursued in the prior talk. With the next extract in Ex.(37b), Lian’s interlocutor has just commented that her own baby was getting progressively thinner since having “grown up”. Lian then enquires about the age of her interlocutor’s baby, to which it was revealed to be about a year old. After some delay and verbal disfluencies prefacing upcoming disalignment, Lian then attempts to disagree with her interlocutor previous assessment (i.e. that her baby has “grown up”) with “na yinggaie bu shi tebie da ya (that’s not supposedly very old either)” at line 09. Again, after possible completion is marked by the utterance-final particle “ya (SFP)”, Lian then appends the TCU-continuation “yi sui ya” in subordinate intonation, where “yi sui (one year of age)” is the nominal phrase followed by the same utterance-final particle “ya”. If the utterance-final particle “ya” was not produced as part of the TCU-continuation, then the nominal phrase “yi sui” could be seen as an Insertable that retroactively introduces the topic back into the host-TCU, as in “na yi sui yinggaie bu shi tebie da ya (but a year old is not supposedly very old either)”. However, given that the utterance-final particle was produced as part of the TCU-continuation, “yi sui ya” is only viably seen as a Free Constituent. Here, the addition of “yi sui ya” highlights the factual basis of Lian’s disagreement (i.e. it is difficult to characterize her interlocutor’s baby as being “grown up” as the baby is only a year old), and works to re-issue and emphasize the action pursued in the prior utterance. Finally, in Ex.(37c),
Faye comments on her supervisor’s impending move to another university, how that decision has affected her situation, and groused that it is unavoidable that her supervisor would primarily consider his own interest in such matters. At line 09-10, Faye first articulates “ta (he)”, abandons that formulation with a cut-off, then prefaced a new formulation with “jiushi shuo (that is to say)”, before coming to possible completion with “ta kending shi wei ta ziji kaolu de (He’s sure to have his own interest in mind)”. After possible completion, a single nominal phrase “zhe zhong shi (this matter)” is added with subordinate intonation. Similarly, it is syntactically non-dependent with the prior utterance, but clearly requires the host-TCU for adequate semantic or pragmatic interpretation, and is hence a Free Constituent. Here, specifying “this matter” (i.e. moving to a new university) as the issue where Faye’s supervisor is having his own self-interest at heart, is seen to be a retroactive clarification that not taking a student’s (i.e. Faye) welfare into consideration is perhaps no cause for criticism, particularly in matters such as a faculty’s (i.e. Faye’s supervisor) career move.

There are, of course, other less common forms of Free Constituents. One particular kind of Free Constituents alluded to earlier in our discussion on Non-add-ons (see sub-section (3.2.3.)) is the appending of demonstratives without a head element (e.g. “this, “that”) after possible completion, which serves as a generic anaphoric index to some earlier topic, subject, concept, etc. Obviously, the attachment of a single demonstrative after a possibly complete TCU cannot be understood as an action on its own, and have to take a retrospective orientation. These types of Free Constituents also seem to be doing some manner of clarification work by virtue of using the demonstrative to retroactively “rehash” a previous topic. A couple of exemplars are shown in Ex.(38) below (next page).
Before the extract in Ex.(38a), Faye had informed Matt that she is having difficulties after agreeing to a request by a mutual friend, who had tasked her to look for papers on a particular chemical compound. As she could not locate the relevant materials, Faye was feeling apologetic and did not know how to respond to the friend. At line 11, Matt then tries to console her by postulating that the friend probably did not have much confidence that the task could be successfully achieved in the first place. After “wo jue de ta ye mei you bao duo da de xi wang (I think he also didn’t have much hope)” comes to possible completion, Matt attaches the distal
demonstrative “nage (that)” in subordinate intonation, ostensibly to refer to the task of finding relevant materials. Prior to the extract in Ex.(38b), Ceng and her interlocutor, instructors at a university, were discussing the merits of organizing an overseas exchange trip to England for their students. From line 11-14, Ceng agrees her interlocutor that the quality of teachers at the exchange university is definitely an attraction, but worries about how a schedule could be worked out between both universities, as well as the possibility of prohibitive cost. After the agreement at line 11, Ceng begins her articulation of other concerns (i.e. time and money) from lines 12-14, but obviously had problems in finding the right formulation, evidenced by multiple cut-off and pauses in the turn. In the end, she muses at line 14 on the cost of such a trip with “duo-shao qian (How much money)” which comes to possible completion, before adding the proximal demonstrative “zhege (this)” in subordinate intonation. Here, “zhege” refers the proposed overseas exchange trip to England. In both these examples, the demonstratives are clearly “continuations” that points back to some previously discussed topic or issue that the host-TCU is commenting or predicing on.

Finally, in the last exemplar of this section, we illustrate how a clausal phrase may also be used as a Free Constituent, as shown in Ex.(39) below (next page). The extract is a continuation of the extract in Ex.(28e), where the interlocutors, Chen and Lian, were talking about the most favorable time to have a baby to fit the education system in mainland China. As revealed in their discussion, a child has to be no less than six years of age before the school term starts (around late September) to be admitted for primary education. Therefore, Chen opines that giving birth in early September would be most opportune as that will allow the child to enter the school system at the earliest age possible.
Ex.(39)  Clause as Free Constituent

Just before the extract begins in Ex.(39), Chen had sought to validate her opinion by telling a story about a friend whose child was born just a few days after the stipulated date of admission into primary school. As the child was a few days short from reaching 6 years of age by the deadline for enrollment, the school administration did not allow admission. At lines 09-10, Chen then spells out the “cost” of not being able to enroll under such circumstances in “shiji-shang zai yi deng jiu kuai dao qi sui le (Actually, a slight delay and (the child) will soon be seven)”. After possible completion, the TCU-continuation “deng dier nian de shihou (delayed till the next year)” was attached as a “rush-through” with subordinate intonation, where “deng (wait)” is a transitive verb taking a complex nominal phrase “dier nian de shihou (the second year period)” as its object. As this clausal phrase is semantically incomplete, and cannot be readily “inserted back” or “replace” any constituent in the host-TCU, it is most aptly seen as a Free Constituent.

While “deng dier nian de shihou” may also technically replace “zai yi deng” in the prior utterance to form “shiji-shang deng dier nian de shihou jiu kuai dao qi sui le (Actually, by delaying till the next year, (the child) will soon be seven.)” (i.e. to be seen as a Replacement),
however as “yi (一)...jiu (就)...” (as in “shiji-shang zai yi deng jiu kuai dao qi sui le” in the host-TCU) is a fixed construction in Chinese that works to convey a certain stance by the speaker, there is difficulty in seeing how the TCU-continuation can viably “replace” part of an established component of a construction without changing the action originally pursued in the host-TCU. Using a TCU-continuation to restructure or change the action in the prior utterance is of course a possibility (see section (4.4.)), but such an analysis less justifiable within the sequential context of Ex.(39). A possible function that is served by such a “continuation”, is that the abstracted duration of “a slight delay” in the host-TCU is fully clarified by “deng dier nian de shihou (delayed till the next year)”.

Though being a relatively less common form of TCU-continuation, our Chinese data agrees with Ford et al. (2002) that most Free Constituents are unattached NPs. Nonetheless, given the right context, demonstratives and even clausal phrases may also be appended as Free Constituents such that they can only be adequately understood by taking a retrospective orientation. In terms of its interactional function, using Free Constituents to retroactively specify/clarify a topic, issue, subject or argument unavailable in the host-TCU (see Ex.(7), (37a), (37c), (38a), (38b) & (39)) appears to be a common operation for this type of TCU-continuation. A possible relationship between the form (i.e. Free Constituent) and function (i.e. specification/clarification) here, is that the lack of a syntactic slot in the host-TCU for articulation of certain topic, issue, subject, etc. naturally leads to the deployment of a syntactically “unrelated” Free Constituent to specify/clarify such content when the speaker deems it necessary. Another key observation of Chinese Free Constituents is that in contrast with Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) where prosody was given scant treatment, the great majority of
Free Constituents in our collection are done with subordinate intonation (primarily by a lack of pitch reset). In fact all of the exemplars above are prosodically marked as “continuations”. Furthermore, almost all of our Free Constituents are found to be produced as “rush-throughs” or in the next beat after possible completion of the host-TCU. A singular exception is seen in Ex.(7) under section (2.3.) where the Free Constituent occurs after talk-by-others. In other words, though they may be syntactically non-dependent and unrelated to the prior utterance, most Chinese Free Constituents are marked by a strong prosodic profile of “continuation”, much like the Insertables, Replacements and Glue-ons in our data, and hence seen to be a type TCU-continuation equal to the others. On the other hand, it is undeniable that on the continuum of grammatical relations or scale of “contiguity” with the prior utterance, Free Constituents are necessarily less connected (in comparison with other TCU-continuations) to their host-TCU by virtue of their lack of syntactic “related-ness”.

3.5. Discussion

Even without delving too deeply into the interactional function of Chinese TCU-continuations through detailed sequential analysis, the typological study of how “continuations” may be done in the Chinese language has uncovered a variety of structural preferences, contributing directly to our understanding of how retroactive operations at transition-relevance place (TRP) can be done. In coming up with a typology of TCU-continuations, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) highlights the fact that besides syntax, other linguistic parameters can be enlisted to signal “continuation”, and therefore argue for “a classification of ‘increment’ types which goes

---

90 Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) takes Free Constituents to be in a category on its own, separate from other TCU-continuations, due to their syntactically more “-independent” status.
beyond English-based Glue-ons”. Specifically, their study “attributes a central role to prosodic delivery (prosodic separation vs. integration between 'host' and 'increment') and to a usage-based distinction between marked and unmarked word order”.91 Our collection of TCU-continuations in Mandarin Chinese endorses such a view of ‘increments’ as all the classificatory categories of TCU-continuations proposed by Vorreiter (2003) and Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) are clearly attested in Chinese conversation. Furthermore, our study shows that questions on how “continuations” may be produced and recognized, the types of constituents that can be found in different TCU-continuations, as well as their relative distribution, is a deeply language-dependent issue.

For Mandarin Chinese, the prosodic delivery of a turn not only plays a part in the classificatory efforts of TCU-continuations, but also is the ubiquitous distinguishing feature of Chinese TCU-continuations. For Chinese speakers, the prosodic character of a turn not only greatly determines a TCU’s possible completion (i.e. declination unit), but also how TCU-continuations are recognized to be “continuing” from the prior (i.e. subordinate intonation). In terms of “usage-based distinction”, syntactically discontinuous Insertables in the form of various singular adverbs and adverbials (normatively found before the verb clauses in Chinese) constitute the most frequent type of TCU-continuations, lending credence to the argument that the “right-headed syntax” of languages such as Chinese leads to a prevalence of “grammatically unfitted” TCU-continuations92 (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007, Luke & Zhang 2007). Yet, we have also found an abundance of syntactically continuous Glue-ons in Chinese conversations. A detailed examination of these Glue-ons shows that, despite being a “right-headed language”, the

92 “In fact, it may be the demands of real time production and comprehension which are responsible for the tendency of right-headed languages to develop post-positional elements.” (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007, pp. 549).
grammatical structures of Chinese (such as serial verb constructions, topic-comment structure, pronoun-dropping, etc.) has provided a rich variety of other structural environment where “grammatically fitted continuations” can be produced.

Another interesting finding is that there is possibly a preference structure in the categorical-type of Chinese TCU-continuations used in relation to where (after possible completion) the “continuation” is needed. Schegloff (2004) brings attention to how “increments” may be produced “in the next beat”, “post-gap” or “post-other-talk”, and that there is significant interactional import to be gained from noticing where the TCU-continuation is positioned. With our discussion on categories of Chinese TCU-continuations, it is clear that the great majority of “continuations” in Insertables, Replacements and Free Constituents (excluding Non-add-ons and Glue-ons), are done as “rush-through” and to a lesser extent “in the next beat” after possible completion. It is argued that the propensity for speakers to expeditiously latch-on TCU-continuations has to do with omni-relevance of speakership transition after possible completion, as “rush-through” is clearly a feature of talk that specifically addresses (i.e. impedes or prevents) the possibility of next speaker transition. An exception is the category of Glue-ons where most of the “continuations” are found in “post-gap” or “post-other-talk” positions. It seems that when Chinese speakers determine that a “continuation” is expedient after a gap of silence or after talk-by-others, then syntactically continuous Glue-ons seems to be the “preferred” type. A possible explanation for this distribution is that doing “continuations” in a syntactically continuous manner may be used as a structural mechanism (at least for languages such as Chinese, where syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations is commonplace) to compensate for increased disfluency in the progressivity of talk.
Nonetheless, the prevalence of both syntactically continuous and discontinuous TCU-continuations are clearly linked to the grammatical structures available (or unavailable) in Mandarin Chinese. On one hand, various structures have afforded the possibility of syntactically continuous *Glue-ons*; while on the other hand, the “right-headed syntax” of Chinese may have necessitated much-needed adverbials to appear as syntactically discontinuous *Insertables*. In other words, how “continuations” are done, or the types of TCU-continuation found in a language, is essentially driven by its “grammar”; yet the commonplace practice of grammatically unfitted TCU-continuations in Chinese also points towards how retroactive operations as a necessary interactional mechanism supersedes even the maintenance of *syntactic decorum*. On this point, I can do no better than to quote Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) words:

> “Thus, grammar and interaction are closely interlocked. On the one hand, grammar impacts upon the practice of TCU continuation by providing for (or constraining preference for) the different types of continuation. On the other hand, the practice of TCU continuation impacts upon the grammatical resources of a language by requiring that it be possible to talk beyond a point of possible (syntactic) completion.” (pp. 549)

It is also suggested that if TCU-continuations are by strict definition “continuations” after possible completion, then there is a strong case for *Non-add-ons* to be seen, not as “continuations”, but some form of marked construction in the language. The evidence for this turn upon the prosodically “through-produced” character of *Non-add-ons*, which indicates that the speaker may have formulated the entire TCU from the outset. The striking overlap in forms of constituents (i.e. adverbs, adverbials and demonstratives) found between *Non-add-ons* and *Insertables/Free Constituents/Repetitions*, and a coherently specialized discourse-function (i.e.
stance-marker) in Non-add-ons, also points towards Non-add-ons being a grammaticized construction as opposed to being a true “continuation”. On the other hand, we accept that Non-add-ons may also occur when a speaker is able to formulate a “continuation” early enough, but after onset of the TCU, such that a prosodically continuous (i.e. through-produced) TCU-continuation can be produced. Both types of Non-add-ons (i.e. formulated after onset of TCU or from the outset) are theoretically possible scenarios in language use.

The case of Non-add-ons demonstrates that there is a level of intra-category ambiguity, in terms of how “related” the “continuation” is to the host-TCU; as a Non-add-on formulated from the outset is necessarily part of the TCU, whereas it is less “attached” if the Non-add-on was formulated after onset of TCU. In fact, the problem of ambiguity sometimes also exists on an inter-category level, where the boundary between categories becomes fuzzy for select instances of TCU-continuations. Ex.(40) below shows one such TCU-continuation where the distinction between Replacement and Free Constituent is difficult to determine.

**Ex.(40) Ambiguous TCU-continuations (Replacement or Free Constituent?)**

(*…..* marks portion that the “further talk” may be replacing)

**ES-M-01 [15:41-15:46]**

01 Chen: 还好我们那小外甥是九月六号.
02 (0.3)
03 Lian: 哦::[:
04 => Chen: [*九月六号*刚好.<差不多开学的时候.

01 Chen: hai hao women na xiao waisheng shi jiu yue liu hao.
still good 1PL DEM small nephew BE nine month six number.
_Luckily, our little nephew is (born on) September 6th._

02 (0.3)

03 Lian: o::[:
CFM
Oh......
At line 04, Chen first states that her nephew’s date of birth on September 6th is “just right” (gang hao), as it is just before the start of an academic year, thus allowing the child to enroll as soon as the age requirement is met (see Ex.(28e) and Ex.(39) for background). She then attaches a nominal phase “cha-bu-duo kai xue de shihou (the period when school is about to start)” which clearly elaborates the significance of September 6th in its association with the schools’ academic calendar. It is recalled that nominal phrases are common constituents in both Replacements and Free Constituents. One sort of retroactive operation is to have the nominal phrase “replace” the specific date to form “*cha-bu-duo kai xue de shihou* gang hao (The period when school is about to start is just right)”. Such an interpretation sees the speaker as doing a “double-take” on stating the birth date being “just right”, and decides instead to be less specific on the date and use a descriptive time period (which has more explanatory power). This interpretation is congruent with Replacement as a retroactive operation. However, though “cha-bu-duo kai xue de shihou” is strongly retrospective in orientation (i.e. clarifies September 6th), the nominal phrase is also semantically complete and independent, and thus can be seen as a Free Constituent. This interpretation would then see the speaker, not so much trying to “replace” the specific date with something else, as simply retroactively adding a rationale for her claim that that September 6th is a most opportune date. Another sort of evidence for the “continuation” being a Free Constituent comes from its prosodic analysis illustrated in Graph (8) below (next page). From the graph, it is equivocal if “cha-bu-duo kai xue de shihou” was produced with subordinate intonation as the
“continuation” displays high intensity and a partial pitch reset, thereby prosodically relegating the added item to be somewhat less “related” to the host-TCU, and more like a *Free Constituent* than a *Replacement*.

**Graph (8): Acoustic analysis for Ex.(40)**

In a sense, the manner in which retroactive operations can be performed on a possibly complete utterance seems to be (by and large) unrestricted, as long as the added element is adequately marked to be recognizable as a “continuation” from the prior. To further illustrate the elasticity of Chinese TCU-continuations, two exemplars in Ex.(41) are submitted below (next page), where it is shown that different categories of TCU-continuations can be deployed consecutively in differing fashion at the possible completion of an utterance.
Ex.(41) Combinations of Chinese TCU-continuations
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

Ex.(41a) Graduate Dilemma [5:21-6:31].
60 Faye: 有一天叶(敬义) @ 没睡着:<就.(.)晚上都.
you yi tian ye(jingyi) @ meishui-zha:o<jiu.(.)wan-shang dou.
have one day NM NEG sleep-CTP DM (. ) night-LOC all.
One day, Ye Jingyi didn’t even sleep. the whole night.

Ex.(41b) ES-M-01 [15:10-15:37].
07 Lian: @ 他:(.)又:符合规定.但是又是
08 班级中:呃= 最小的嘛.
09 Chen: Mm
10 (0.5)

07 Lian: @ ta:(.) you fuhe guiding. danshi you shi
3SG again suit regulation. but again BE
He’ll fulfill the requirements as well. But he’ll also be

08 banji zho:ng e- zhui xiao de ma.
class middle INJ- most small GEN SFP.
ermmm... the youngest in his class.

09 Chen: Mm
10 (0.5)
right-NEG-right?<want at [NM GEN-talk.
Right? If the situation is in Hong Kong.

Ex.(41a) has been described multiple times in this thesis, first in Ex.(8), then in Ex.(18a) and Ex. (23a). The point is that Faye had first used a “through-produced” but syntactically discontinuous adverb modifier “jiu (DM)” as a Non-add-on to emphasize her husband’s sleepless night as an extraordinary event; and then further upgrades such a stance after a micro-pause of silence with an Insertable in the form of compound adverbs “wan-shang dou (the whole night)”. In Ex.(41b), two different TCU-continuations are again used, but to seemingly accomplish separate objectives. From lines 07–08, Lian concludes that if a child is born within a particular month, he
will not only satisfy the minimum age criteria for school enrollment, but also be the youngest child in class. However, this assessment is met with a lackluster response in Chen’s minimal acknowledgement at line 09, and half a second gap at line 10. As this prefaces possible upcoming disagreement, Lian, at line 11, then first appends the tag question “dui-bu-dui (right?)” as a Glue-on, not only to increase response relevancy (Stiver & Rossano 2010) but may also work to lower her own epistemic stance. This is further followed up with an Insertable in the form of a conditional disjunct “yao zai xianggang de hua (if it was in Hong Kong)” to qualify her initial conclusions.

What the intra- and inter-category ambiguities demonstrate is that permeable boundaries within or across categories is an inherent property of retroactive “continuations”. This is in agreement with the findings of various studies in other languages where the distinction between types of TCU-continuations, or even the characteristics within a single type, is constantly being challenged by actual instances of data (Vorreiter 2003, Seppänen & Laury 2007, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007, Couper-Kuhlen 2012). The flexible manner with which “continuations” are attached after possible completion also highlights the point that speakers are unconcerned with “types”; as much as signaling retroactive operations with the most appropriate materials in the most appropriate manner at that moment in unfolding talk. As an interactional mechanism, TCU-continuations are then not stative concepts to be defined by a particular form or operation at the end of an utterance, but is more accurately construed as non-discrete labels on a continuum of further talk that can be produced to be more or less “connected” with the prior TCU using various linguistic parameters (i.e. syntax, semantics, prosody, pragmatics). On one end of the continuum are “continuations” that
appear to be very much part of the TCU (e.g. *Non-add-ons*), while on the other are
“continuations” that almost look like a new TCUs (e.g. *Free Constituents*). Alternatively, we may
also think of various TCU-continuations as differing on a scale of grammaticalization with the
host-TCU. For Mandarin Chinese, such a cline of grammatical relation may look like Figure (3)
below.

**Figure (3): “Connected-ness” with host-TCU**

An evident insight gleaned from our collection of Chinese TCU-continuations is that
“continuations” can be signified via diverse strategies, and accomplished in highly flexible
manners, even in a single language. This suggest that it may be more accurate to think of TCU-
continuations as an approach or strategy that each individual language has, based on its linguistic
resources, to deal with the contingencies of doing retroactive operations within the confines of
transition relevance place (TRP); as opposed to prescribing a universal pedantic definition of
what TCU-continuations is, or is not.
CHAPTER 4: INTERACTIONAL FUNCTIONS OF TCU-CONTINUATIONS

4.1. Introduction to Chapter 4

From how TCU-continuations are done, we now transition into what TCU-continuations may be doing in Chinese conversations. Chapter 3 has detailed how the ‘mechanics’ or ‘technology’ of TCU-continuations in Chinese differs considerably from English and possibly other languages. In this following chapter, we will take a closer look at the interactional functions that Chinese TCU-continuations can perform within actual sequential context. It will be shown that Chinese TCU-continuations can also perform a multitude of functions that may generically be termed as stance modulation, clarification or pursuing recipient’s uptake (Schegloff 2000b, 2001a, 2004; Ford et al. 2002; Seppänen & Laury 2007; Goodwin 1979; Luke 2012). On top of these already known functions, our analysis has also uncovered other possible functions or nuances that TCU-continuations may be used to perform, such as reformatting/reformulating the sequential action.

However, we take seriously the view that “continuations” may be deployed to deal with “[a]s many things, perhaps, as there are interactional junctures to be managed”93, and an undertaking to circumscribe all possible functions of TCU-continuations is neither feasible nor desirable. This methodological point is well argued in Schegloff (1996c), where more nuanced actions such as “confirming allusions” underscores the granularity and multifariousness of action-types. To strictly parse TCU-continuations to be in pursuance of only a few compartmentalized functions, is to undermine the flexibility and creativity with which speakers

can mobilize “continuations” to address moment-by-moment interactional contingencies within specialized sequential contexts. In addition, more than one “task” or function may be concurrently and subtly accomplished with the use of a singular TCU-continuation. A previously alluded example is in Ex.(20a), where it is shown how the speaker deploys a nominal phrase Free Constituent “ni laogong (your husband)” to clarify/disambiguate the pronoun subject of a compliment in the host-TCU, but at the same time work to highlight a special relationship (i.e. recipient’s husband) possibly to build solidarity with her interlocutor. Another example will be later described in Ex.(49), where a Free Constituent that ostensibly specifies a referent can also function to “upgrade” the stance of its host-TCU. The duplex functions of TCU-continuations may be termed first- and second-order operations as noted by Schegloff (2013), where “(f)irst-order operations are the basic operations a speaker may bring to bear on the TCU-in-production at any moment in its development” or the “basic, prima facie job done on the TCU-or-turn-in-progress”; and second-order operations are “repairs which could be understood in the terminology of the first-order operations, but whose analysis would have missed the point if left at that”\footnote{Schegloff (2013), pp. 64.}. Therefore, our overview of interactional functions of TCU-continuations in this chapter is only representative of the most commonly attested “gross” functions that can be distilled into generic labels, and makes no claim towards an exhaustive description of what TCU-continuations can do.

A central goal of this chapter is then to demonstrate that any single interactional function (albeit a “gross” one) may be accomplished via different types of TCU-continuations given the right structural context, though some types of TCU-continuations
may be more suited to (and hence more frequently found to be performing) certain functional roles. In other words, our data does not seem to support a direct form-function relationship in terms of how TCU-continuations are used. Naturally, the exemplars used for illustrations of interactional functions in the next few sections conform to our definitional specifications of Chinese TCU-continuations detailed in Chapter 2. Thus most of the exemplars taken to be TCU-continuations exhibit what we have termed a “subordinate intonation”, characterized by the lack of a pitch reset and hearable as an appended element which continues the intonation contour after possible completion; and/or cannot be analyzed as being semantically and pragmatically independent from the host-TCU. Furthermore, for each interactional function described in the sections, we have taken care to display a selection of exemplars illustrates more than one type of TCU-continuations, as well as different positions of TCU-continuations (cf. next beat increments, post gap increments and post-other-talk increments). As such, it will be shown that the question of form-function relationship for TCU-continuations can be a complex one, as there is no one-to-one connection. While it is argued that certain functions are more inherently “susceptible” to be accomplished through particular types of TCU-continuations, this is to be understood as a statement of probability and not necessity. In the end, we will attempt to provide an initial overview of how TCU-continuations constitute a crucial resource in spoken Chinese for the organization and management of interactional contingencies.

4.2. Modifying Stances

The great majority of what TCU-continuations are retroactively doing in our data can be
generically termed *modifying stances*, grouped into either *downgrading/qualifying* or *upgrading/intensifying* the just possibly complete prior utterance. Admittedly, though the concept of “stance” has been a generated much interest in the recent decade (Scheibman 2002, Fitzmaurice 2004, Wu 2004, Kärkkäinen 2006, Englebretson 2007, Du Bois 2007; Lim 2011, Du Bois & Kärkkäinen 2012), it remains an abstruse definition across many studies concerned with the use of interactive language. One reason for this abstruse-ness is that “stance” is often used as a cover term for a range of related phenomenon, such as *subjectivity* (Benveniste 1971, Lyons 1981, Langacker 1985, Traugott 1995), *evidentiality* (Chafe & Nichols 1986, Willett 1988, Fox 2001), *epistemicity* (Heritage & Raymond 2005, Simon-Vandenbergen 2008) or *evaluation* (Hunston & Thompson 2000). Nevertheless, it is widely agreed that the display of “stance” is a core feature of interactional talk. By *modifying stances*, I mean to capture generically the multifaceted and diverse ways in which TCU-continuations may be able to *downgrade/qualify* or *upgrade/intensify* some aspect of the speaker’s “attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment”⁹⁵ as reflected in the host-TCU.

4.2.1. **Downgrading/Qualifying**

In the following exemplars, we will first demonstrate how TCU-continuations are used to achieve a variety of “downgradings”. Ex.(42) below (next page) is an extract of a telephone conversation between two former classmates Matt and Faye, who at the time of the conversation are graduate Ph.D. students at different universities. Before line 01, Faye was complaining to Matt about an issue troubling her recently, namely her supervisor is considering moving to

another college, and that she might have to move along with him as well. This presents a host of challenges affecting Faye’s future plans, such as the prestige of the new university, a new location and living condition, as well as possible physical distance from her husband who is also at the time a Ph.D. student in her department. In this extract, however, the context leading up to line 01 involves Faye informing Matt on one of two possible universities that her supervisor is interested in moving to, with Matt giving a preliminary assessment of the possible move.

Ex.(42)  Adverbial Insertable (Graduate Dilemma [2:26-2:51])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Matt: 那: 那不算很好啊;
02 Faye: (要 ̣) 胡老师原来最早出[国(也就)
03 Matt: [对. 我知道那个:
04 Faye: 又. 那肯定比我们学校名次高一点. hh hh hhh 那.
05 Matt: >我觉得:< .hh 不n: 那个:: Socrates @ 挺好的.<现在.
06 Faye: 诶. 我们现在排名:我今天我看到我们学校报
07 就是那个:美国的那个:科学院的>下属一个<
08 机构排. .hhh 我们学校:: 你们学校好像也没
09 看见前四名没你们的. 你是哪个系的.
10 <你是 pharmacology 是吧.="

01 Matt: na: na bu suan hen hao a.
DM DM NEG count very good SFP
Hmmm that’s not considered a very good (school).

02 Faye: (yao ̣) hu laoshi yuanlai zui zao chu [guo (ye jiu)
want Hu teacher original most early out country also only
( ) When Teacher Hu originally left [the country, he also only
03 Matt: [dui. wo zhidaon nage:
dui. 1SG know that
Yes. I know that.

04 buguo ye hai keyi na difang.
but also still can that place
Actually that place is still okay.

05 Faye: dui.<na kending bi women xuexiao mingci gao yi-dian. hh hh hhh na
yes.<DM sure compare 1PL school rank high one~COM. hh hh hhh DM
Yes. Surely its ranking is a bit higher than my school. ((laugh)

167
Matt: >wo juede:< .hh bu n: nage:: Socrates @ ting hao de.<xianzai
>1SG feel< .hh NEG n: that NM quite good SFP. now.
I think .hh no… well… Socrates University is quite good. now.

Faye: ei.women xianzai paimi:ng wo jintian wo kan-dao women xuexiao bao
INJ. 1PL now ranking 1SG today 1SG see-COM 1PL school report
Oh. Do you know our school’s ranking… Today I saw a school report

jiushi nage: meiguo de nage: kexue yuan de >xia shu yi ge<
DM that America GEN that science institute GEN down belong one CL
that says… A ranking by a subsidiary of the National Academy of

jigou pai. .hhh women xuexia::o nimen xuexiao haoxiang ye mei
organization rank. .hhh 1PL school 2PL school seem also NEG
Sciences… it says our school… I think I didn’t see your school

kan-jian qian si ming mei nimen de. ni shi nage xi de.
see-COM front four name NEG 2PL GEN. 2SG be which department GEN
in the top four, it didn’t appear. Which department are you from?

<ni shi pharmacology shi ba.=
<2SG be pharmacology be SFP.
You’re from Pharmacology, right?

The announcement of the university that Faye may be transferring to prompts an initial
assessment by Matt at line 01. However, this assessment is critical, seen not only in the predicate
“bu suan hen hao (not considered very good)”, but also in the delayed onset of the turn
(Pomerantz 1984a, Schegloff 2007) instantiated by the protracted repetition of the pronoun “na”.
An interpretation of line 01 as critical may have brought about Faye’s accounting at line 02. The
most natural reading of line 02, where Faye mentions Teacher Hu’s first university after leaving
China as also being the one she’s possibly going to, is an attempt at giving more credence to the
said university than Matt had accorded at line 01. This minor disagreement was quickly picked
up by Matt even before the completion of line 02, resulting in the overlap at line 03-04 where he
first acknowledges the information provided by Faye in line 03, and then quickly makes a “U-
turn” from being critical at line 01 to being more approving at line 04 with an assessment of “hai

96 The recognitional address term of “laoshi” points towards Teacher Hu as possible a respected former teacher of both Matt and Faye.
keyi (still okay)”. This change in trajectory from outright disapproval to a qualified endorsement is of course indicative of Matt’s orientation to preferential organization of sequences (Pomerantz 1984a, Schegloff 2007). The change is then seen to be aligned with Faye’s intentions at line 02, given Faye’s confirmatory token of “dui (right)” at line 05. Nonetheless, possibly due to Matt’s earlier disapproval, Faye latches on after “dui” to continue further accounting on why she thinks going to this university is still a viable option. The reason she produces here at line 05 is that regardless of how the new university is rated, its ranking is definitely higher than her current university. Though accounting may be the action pursued here, the contents of this turn can also be seen as a self-deprecatory remark. A further insinuation is that no matter how critical Matt may be of the new university in question, its ranking is still, technically and officially, above that of her current university; which in turn suggests Matt’s is possibly less-than-approving and also critical of her current college. This is not only self-deprecatory, but also hints at how Matt may have inadvertently committed a “face-threatening” act. The complex undertones of this one turn is further evidenced/signaled by Faye’s laugh tokens at the end of line 05, often produced to indicate less-than-serious talk or “touchy” issues (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff 1977; Jefferson 1984).

It is towards these insinuations at line 05 that Matt is attempting to deflect at our focal line 06. The awkwardness of the situation and the difficulties in formulating an appropriate response is also seen in the fumbling and multiple restarts at the beginning of line 06 by Matt, before finally producing a positive assessment of Faye’s current university in “Socrates ting hao de (Socrates University is quite good)”. However, immediately after “ting hao de” where a TRP is possible, Matt appends an Insertable in the form of a time adverbial “xianzai (now)”. The
added element here is interpretable as a TCU-continuation both semantically and prosodically. Semantically, “xianzai” is dependent upon the host-TCU for it to be properly understood as a time adverbial restricting the predicate of “ting hao de”. Prosodically, xianzai is done with subordinate intonation. In default syntax, xianzai would have to be placed before the predicate, as in “Socrates xianzai ting hao de (Socrates University is now quite good)”. The retroactive introduction of xianzai into the TCU sets up a comparative time frame between Socrates University of “the present” with that of the past”, with the insinuation that “xianzai ting hao de (now quite good)” pertains only to the present. Although content-wise, the speaker is saying that Socrates University has improved; but from an interactional standpoint, the TCU-continuation is functioning to “qualify” the host-TCU’s original assertion. What xianzai has pragmatically introduces is a qualification on “ting hao de”, in that Socrates University has not always been well regarded, but is now becoming better, or is now much improved. By appending xianzai as an adverbial Insertable, Matt has retroactively mitigated the positive assessment at line 06 from Socrates University being well regarded in general, to it being well regarded within a specific time frame, and thereby functions to qualify the just prior assessment.

As to why this was done retrospectively, a possible reason is that while there is impetus for Matt to quickly dismiss Faye’s self-deprecatory remark within a preference organization of actions (Pomerantz 1984a), the factual information in line 05 (that Faye’s current university ranks lower) also contradicts an “all out” compliment of Faye’s current university, especially given that Matt had already been critical of another university that was ranked lower in line 01. Therefore, in the midst of conflicting motivations, Matt may have jumped the gun to provide a positive assessment in line 06, but almost immediately realized the need to mitigate an “all out”
compliment lest it sounded too disingenuous to the recipient. In this sense, the production of the Insertable “xianzai”, which immediately latches on to the host-TCU “Socrates ting hao de”, is addressed to concerns of recipient-design, where the speaker is doing online formulation of an interactionally appropriate action. In any case, Faye continues the topic of school and departmental ranking from line 07-11, which later turns out to be informing Matt on how well her department has done in a recent ranking exercise.

In Ex.(43) below, we see another common type of adverbial Insertable that is frequently used to downgrade a prior action, namely using the adverbial disjunct “wo juede (I think)”. In this video recording, three friends and Ph.D. graduate students (Jun, Lin and Hao) are having lunch bought for them by the researcher, consisting of Jiao-zi (Chinese dumplings) and other dishes. In the middle of the meal, Jun commented that he might have been “canton-ized” as he thinks all the dishes are too salty. Both Lin and Hao then disagree with Jun’s evaluation of the dishes by saying that they think the dishes were just right in terms of saltiness. From lines 01-04, Jun continues this topic of how taste in food is related to the region you’re from in China, by relating a story about one of Lin’s fellow-townmen.

Ex.(43) Adverbial Insertable (NTU-1 [15:14-15:27])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Jun: (个)那个(.).hh 你的老乡;那个.东北的.
02 (0.5)
03 Jun: 每次很热情试-做两个菜非要拿给我吃.
04 (.)我说这咋吃(啊 ). 我实在吃不下了.(我说).
05 Lin: @ 你: : :( .)吃的很清淡的呀.
06 (0.2)
07⇒ Lin: 我觉得.
08 Jun: 嗯:. 

97 Jun studied in Canton (Guangdong) for his undergraduate degree, and Cantonese food is popularly known to be “light” in taste, consisting mostly of steamed dishes with little salt content.
98 Lin hails from Northeast China where the food is popularly known to be “heavy” in taste, often deemed to be greasy and salty.
At line 01, Jun relates the story by first providing Lin with initial recognitional descriptors (Sacks & Schegloff 1979, Stivers 2007) to the story’s protagonist, in “ni de laoxiang (your fellow-townsmen)” and “na ge dongbei de (the one from Northeast)”. This, however, receives no uptake from Lin at line 02. In spite of this, Jun continues at line 03-04 by describing how the fellow countrymen from Northeast China (where Lin comes from) will often “excitedly” prepare dishes for Jun to try, only to be rejected. Though Jun did not explicitly mention why he was unable to eat the prepared dishes in line 04, it is inferable from the context that Jun was probably referring to the high salt content of the dishes. Firstly, this story follows immediately from the sequence where Jun commented on the saltiness of the dishes on the table and his
“Cantonese-ness”; as such, the story acts as further demonstration of how he is disinclined to take prototypical food types from other Chinese regions. Furthermore, by invoking the region where the story’s protagonist is from (Northeast China) as the relevant recognitional descriptor, Jun also provides the contextual clue as to why he “really can’t eat this”. But most importantly, “saltiness” is also what the story’s recipient, Lin, orients to as the reason behind Jun’s rejection of the dishes. Indeed, Lin’s summation of the “morale” of the story is that Jun’s “taste in food is very bland” at line 05.

Though Lin was responding to the story told by Jun from line 03-04, line 05 also constitute an initial direct assessment of Jun’s taste in food. The TCU-continuation of our focus “wo juede (I think)” occurs here, after the syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically complete TCU “ni:::: (.) chi de hen qingdan de ya. (Your taste in food is very bland)”. Following this assessment, a gap of 0.2 seconds occurs at line 06 where a possible turn-transition could have occurred but did not. After which, Lin follows with “wo juede (I think)” at focal line 07, an adverbial Insertable quite different from Ex.(42). While xianzai (now) in the previous example is an adjunct, defined as a semantically non-independent constituent which modifies the verbal predicate; wo juede (I think) is typically known as a pre-posed disjunct or a complement-taking phrasal predicate (CTP) (Lim 2009), which is also semantically non-independent but laminates the entire utterance with a particular stance instead. Similar to xianzai, the appended wo juede was produced with a subordinate intonation, and could not be properly understood unless taken retrospectively with its host-TCU at line 05, hence its status as a TCU-continuation. Furthermore, wo juede is also known to be a highly frequent epistemic stance-marker that prototypically appears at the beginning of an utterance as a hedging device to accomplish various
interactional functions (Lim 2011; Tomoko 2010). Therefore, under normative Chinese syntax, line 05-07 should have been formulated as “wo juede (0.2) ni::: (.) chi de hen qingdan de ya. (I think your taste in food is very bland.)”. As shown, however, wo juede could also be used post-posed to the utterance as a TCU-continuation. Nonetheless, it still functions as a stance-frame, by which the “wo juede” at line 07 imposes a mitigative stance on the just prior utterance at line 05, thereby downgrading it (in terms of its epistemic value). As for a pragmatic reason to why line 05 was mitigated or downgraded retroactively with a TCU-continuation, it could be that Lin realized as an “afterthought” that she had overstep her “epistemic primacy” by assessing Jun’s taste FOR Jun (Heritage & Raymond 2005), and therefore downgraded her own epistemicity with an adverbial disjunct Insertable.

However, it is noted that as opposed to Ex.(42), the TCU-continuation here did not occur latched upon the prior TCU, or on the next beat (cf. next beat increment), but after a gap of 0.2 second at line 06 (cf. post gap increment). This observation is crucial, not only because it provides further evidence that “wo juede” was retroactively added and not pre-conceived as a post-posed element from the outset (as in Non-add-ons), but also points to the “continuation” at line 07 as possibly a result of, or is oriented to, the lack of uptake after the initial assessment at line 05 (Schegloff 2004). Furthermore, Lim (2009, 2011) has demonstrated that wo juede, as a discourse chunk, often acts as a response-mobilizing device or a “joint-assessment initiator”. In this sense, the “continuation” here may also function to “pursue recipient’s uptake” (Heath 1984, Pomerantz 1984b, FFT 2002b), specifically using wo juede at line 07 to increase the response relevancy of the initial assessment at line 05. From this perspective, the Insertable here is then prompted by the lack of any uptake at line 06, and interactionally functions to rectify such a
situation. As expected, Jun then provides a minimal agreement token at line 08 after the TCU-continuation. In any case, regardless of whether wo juede interactionally functions to hedge the prior utterance or to pursue uptake, or both, it is clear that the addition of an adverbial disjunct Insertable “wo juede” first performs a downgrading action on the host-TCU as a vehicle to accomplish other possible actions.

While the first two exemplars may have been Insertables that function to downgrade or qualify the prior utterance, in Ex.(44) below, it is shown that Replacements may also be used to “downgrade” an otherwise more certain stance. Ex.(44) is actually the expanded instance of a Replacement shown in Ex.(20c). As a recap, the interlocutors here were talking about the critical need for more psychological counseling centers in China’s universities due to increasing stress levels among Chinese undergraduates, leading to instances of violence on campus. Before the extract begins, Zhan had opined to Wang that even if counseling centers were available, the problem persists as students felt embarrassed to be seen going to a counselor, and that certain schools charges unaffordable fees for counseling services, even though it was the financially disadvantaged students which required the most psychological help.

Ex.(44)  Noun Phrase Replacement (ES-M-03 [5:08-5:31])
(*……* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

01 Wang: =故我以前听说是免费的.
02 啊现在都收费了.
03 Zhan: 有啊<收费：
04 (.)
05 Zhan: 教授现在都挣钱了..hhh hh hh
06 [ hh]
08⇒ *这个：*有问题.<“这样的话”.
09 (0.8)

Lim (2011) has argued that hedging and increasing response relevancy are often complimentary and simultaneous functions.
At line 01-02, Wang expressed surprise on receiving the information that school counseling services were chargeable, by first stating that he was under the impression that
counseling services used to be free with “wo yiqian tingshuo shi mia:nei de (The last I heard it was free)” in line 01, and then started a new TCU in line 02 with an exclamatory particle “a (wow)” before saying “xianzai dou shou fei le (Now they’re all charging fees)”. This leads to Zhan re-confirming in line 03 the information he had priorly provided, emphasizing that come schools were indeed charging for counseling services. After a micro-pause at line 04, Zhan insinuates at line 05 that a possible reason for charging fees for a previously free service could be that “jiaoshou xianzai dou zheng qian le (Professors are now all into making money)”, albeit in a non-serious manner evidenced by his laughter at the end of the utterance. Wang then joins in at line 07 to critiques this practice as being unethical given the difficult financial situation of undergraduate students, before definitively stating in line 08 that this is “you wenti (questionable)” or “problematic”, where the situation or subject is encapsulated simply with the demonstrative “zhege (this)”. Our focal TCU-continuation, in the form of a conditional nominal phrase “zhe yang de-hua (if this is the case)” is then “latched on” to the end of line 08. Besides being a semantically dependent conditional that requires the prior host-TCU for adequate understanding, “zhe yang de-hua” was also produced with lowered intensity and a lack of pitch reset (i.e. subordinate intonation), all indicative of its status as a “continuation” of the prior utterance. As a retroactive operation, “zhe yang de-hua” then “replaces” the subject “zhege” to form “zhe yang de-hua you wenti (If this is the case, it’s questionable)”, and is therefore a nominal phrase Replacement. As previously discussed in Ex.(20c), though “zhe yang de-hua” can also be “re-inserted back” to the beginning of the host-TCU to form “zhe yang de-hua zhege you wenti (If this is the case, this is questionable)” as an Insertable, such an utterance would seem cumbersome and less in tune with the forcefulness that the speaker had priorly displayed in
In any case, with the retroactive addition of a conditional (via a *Replacement*) to the prior assertion, Wang had effectively change a definitive statement of “*zhege you wenti* (That’s unacceptable)” to a more qualified stance of “*zhe yang de-hua you wenti* (If this is the case, it is questionable)”. As for why a retroactive qualification with a TCU-continuation was done, it is possible that having initially made a strong claim of some situation as being unacceptable (“*zheng qian ye bu neng zheng zhege pingkun sheng de ya* (You can’t profit from poor students even if it’s business!)”), Wang then realizes that he did not actually have the epistemic authority to claim that the schools were charging for counseling services, nor that professors were charging poor students because they wanted to make money. Indeed, both assertions were initially posited by Zhan, and not by Wang, in the prior discourse. Furthermore, Zhan’s musing at line 05 that professors charged for counseling services to make financial gains was clearly done as a non-serious matter (Schegloff 2001b). Therefore, in coming to an evaluative stance (i.e. “*zhege you wenti* (That’s unacceptable)”) based on information just priorly unknown to himself, and perhaps in deference to these assertions having been made by Zhan, Wang then retroactively appends a nominal phrase conditional *Replacement* to index the indeterminate nature of the situation (i.e. schools and professors charging poor students for financial gains) to him.

Besides syntactically discontinuous *Insertables* and *Replacements*, downgrades or qualification may also be accomplished using syntactically continuous *Glue-ons*. A prime example of this would be the range of *tag-questions* as discussed in section (3.3.) under Ex.(31). To simply recap, it was shown in Ex.(31a) and (31b) how tag questions *Glue-ons* clearly works to position the speaker as deferential to the recipient’s higher epistemic status. In Ex.(31d), a tag
question was also deployed after a gap of silence as a form of back-down from a prior stronger statement. A common functionality of doing tag questions as TCU-continuations (or Glue-ons) is to retroactively position oneself as being of a lower epistemic status than your interlocutor (i.e. downgraded epistemic stance), and in turn pursue a response from the recipient via the interrogative format of such an action (Pomerantz 1980).

But other forms of Glue-ons can also be found doing the retroactive downgrade of stance. This is specially illustrated in our fourth exemplar in this section, which also shows that Glue-ons functioning to downgrade its host-TCU can also occur after talk by others (cf. post-other-talk increments). The exemplar shown here is the extended extract of Ex.(33) in which the Glue-on appears as a resultative complement of a verb. Ex.(45) below (next page) is a video recording of three other Ph.D. graduate students (Jie, Wei and Tao) having a snack and chatting. Before the start of our exemplar, Jie laments about the difficulty in finding “yangrou (mutton)” in school, a red meat frequently eaten in North China. Wei then recommends an Indian food stall in the canteen that does sell mutton. This seems to peak Jie’s interest as she continues to ask Wei about the pricing and portion given. Line 01 of Ex.(45) then begins with Wei’s assurance of the sizable portions given, as well as informing Jie that the mutton is cooked with curry.

**Ex.(45) Resultative Complement Glue-on (NTU-2 [0:37-1:02])**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Wei:</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Jie:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>我觉得[还不少]. 然后它是咖喱的.</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>[嗯. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>但我[不知道]你能吃不能吃.</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>[哦. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>[咖喱]. 土豆.=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>[咖喱]</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>=呢.=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>=还有羊肉.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>([哦;我是:: ])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wei: 是啊.=
Tao: =canteen B 也就那个. hh 不过我们因为很少吃印[度的东西.]
Wei: [ 对 对 ] [ 对 .]
Jie: [ 不是 .]
Tao: 那个印度的那个咖哩我:<不能吃::>.
Wei: 为什么呢.
( .)
Wei: [ 哈 .]
Jie: [ 多 .] 就是它[味道很]重.
Wei: [ 上火 .]
Jie: [ 不是上火 .] [ 跟上火没关系 .]
Wei: [ 对对对 .] [ 咸 .]
Jie: =就是=我=觉得=吃:完了就觉得=
Wei: [ _ 咸 .]
Jie: =吃:完了就觉得[浑身一]股咖哩[啊 .]=
Tao: [ 嗯嗯 .] [ 嗯 .]
Jie: [=从头到尾 .]
Wei: wo juede [hai bu shao]. ranhou ta shi ka:li de.
1SG feel [still NEG little]. Then 3SG be curry GEN
I think it's [still substantial]. And it's made with curry.
Jie: [ en . ]
CFM
[Mmm]
Wei: dan wo [bu zhida] ni neng chi bu neng chi.
but 1SG NEG know 2SG can eat NEG can eat
But I [don ' t know] if you can take that?
Jie: [ o . ]
CFM
[Mmm]
( .)
Wei: [kali]. tudou.=
[curry]. potatoes.=
[(It has) curry], potatoes,
Jie: [kali]
[curry]
[curry]
Jie: =e.=
CFM
Yea...
Wei: =hai you yangrou.=
=still have mutton
and mutton as well.
Jie: [ (o: wo s:: ) ]
[ (CFM 1SG ) ]
[ (Yea... I’m ...) ]

Tao: [zhe bian ta de:: yindu] sss-cai hai bu cuo la.qishi.
[The Indian food] there is not bad... actually.

Wei: shi a.=
be SFP.=
Yeah.

Tao: =canteen B ye jiu na ge. hh buguo women yinwei
Canteen B also only that CL. but 1PL because
And that the only place in Canteen B with... It’s just that we’re

han shao chi yin[du de dongxi.]
very little eat In[di...]
not accustomed to having [Indian food.]

Wei: [ dui dui ][ dui. ]
[right right] [right]
[yea yea] [yes]

Jie: [bu shi.]
[NEG be.]
[It’s not that.]

nage yindu de nage kali wo: <bu neng chi::>.
that Indian GEN that curry 1SG: <NEG can eat>
It’s that curry, Indian curry exactly, that I’m unable to eat.

Wei: weishenme ne.
what SFP
why?

Wei: (.)

Wei: [ha.]
[ QP ]
[huh?]

⇒ Jie: [duo.] jiushi ta [weidao hen] zhong.
[much.] DM 3SG [smell very] heavy.
[much.] It’s just the flavor is too strong.
Wei: [shang huo.] up fire (It’s) heaty.

Jie: [bu shi shang huo][gen shang huo] mei guanxi. = [NEG be up fire] [with up fire] NEG relation. Not that it’s heaty. Nothing to do with heatiness.

Wei: [dui dui dui. ][ e. ] [right right right] [INJ] yes yes yes… mmm

Jie: =jiushi shuo [wo juede] chi: wan le jiu juede= DM say [1SG feel] eat end CRS DM feel I mean... I feel that after eating I feel

Wei: [ e. ] [INJ] mmm

Jie: =[hun shen yi] gu kali [a. ]= [whole body one] CL curry [SFP] my whole body has a strong smell of curry.

Tao: [ en en. ] [en.] [AGR AGR ] [AGR] yes yes yea.

Jie: =[cong tou dao wei.] =[from head to tail] from head to toe.

Immediately following the revelation that the mutton is cooked with curry at line 01, Wei self-selects to continue the turn at line 03, expressing concern over the acceptability of the dish to Jie. Such concern is understandable given that Indian cuisine is relatively unfamiliar to most Chinese from Mainland China. Additionally, curry, being a particularly strong and spicy dish, may pose a problem to some diners. Indeed, as it turns out later in the sequence, Jie conveys difficulties in taking too much Indian curry. Though Jie provides a receipt token at line 04 at the news that the mutton is cooked with curry, Wei’s question posed at line 03 did not

100 The term “shang huo (up fire)” does not refer to the taste of food as being spicy or hot. Traditionally, Chinese conceptualizes the essence of different food as being yin (cooling) or yang (heating), and consuming either type in excess is bad for health. By “shang huo”, Wei is conveying the idea that Indian curry may be too “yang”, and hence the translation “(It’s) heaty”.
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receive an immediate response, leading to a slight micro-second gap at line 05. Perhaps sensing that Jie needed more information on what’s in the dish to respond to her recommendation, Wei launches into a list of ingredients at line 06 and 09. Yet, another micro-second gap ensues at line 10, foreshadowing possible upcoming disagreement, or Jie’s difficulty in aligning with Wei’s recommendation. But just as Jie starts to formulate a response at line 11, the other participant in the conversation, Tao, self-select to support Wei’s recommendation in line 12 and 14-15, resulting in an overlap and Jie dropping out from the turn. Tao first endorses the recommendation by saying the Indian food at the stall is actually “not bad” at line 12, then further tries to assuage Jie’s reluctance at line 14-15 by acknowledging unfamiliarity with Indian cuisine as a possible but surmountable obstacle. Note also that Tao’s endorsement is met with enthusiastic agreement by Wei at line 13 and 16. Up till this point in the sequence, it is clear that both Wei and Tao have, in a sense, collaboratively offered a recommendation to Jie with little indication of recipient’s acceptance, leading Tao to postulate unfamiliarity with Indian food as a possible reason. It is towards this postulation that Jie overtly rejects at line 17, before stating her specific misgivings at our focal line 18.

In this first focal turn at line 18, Jie points out that it is specifically Indian curry that she has difficulties with in “na ge yindu de na ge kali wo: <bu neng chi::>. (It’s that curry, Indian curry exactly, that I’m unable to eat.)”. The end of this TCU is clearly taken as a TRP, as Wei jumps in the next turn questioning at line 19, and pursues this again at line 21 with a shorter question particle which runs into overlap with line 22. After talk by others, the focal Glue-on in this exemplar then occurs in the third subsequent turn at the beginning of line 22, simply with “duo (much/many)”, an adverbial adjunct that qualifies *chi* (eat) in line 18. This TCU-
continuation is again semantically marked as being dependent, requiring its host-TCU to be properly understood; and also prosodically marked with a subordinate intonation. However, in contrast to the last three exemplars, the occurrence of duo (much) after chi (eat) is arguably “grammatically fitted” in normative Chinese syntax, presenting itself as a syntactically continuous verb complement, as in “wo bu neng chi-duo (I can’t eat much)”. Effectively, by extending “wo bu neng chi (I’m unable to eat)” at line 18 to “wo bu neng chi-duo (I’m unable to eat much)” by line 22, Jie has mitigated from a total inability to eat Indian curry to a partial one of having limited ability to stomach the dish, hence “downgrading” her strong stance of rejection to one of partial acceptance. Also different from the previous exemplar is the position in which the TCU-continuation occurs, namely in the third turn after talk by others (cf. post-other-talk increment). As Schegloff (2004) argues, a TCU-continuation that occurs after talk by others is “normatively prompted by or addressed to” the actual ensuing talk of the host-TCU and its import. Indeed, it is analyzable how Wei’s question at line 19 may have prompted Jie to “re-structure” line 18 with a Glue-on at line 22. By the end of line 18, Jie has produced a definitive and total rejection of eating Indian curry. If such a stance is upheld, then an adequate answer to Wei’s question “wei shenme ne (Why?)” at line 19 would pragmatically require extremely well-founded reasons to justify total rejection, reasons that Jie did not veritably have, and the ensuing trajectory of talk might turn out to be problematic. As it turns out from line 22-28, the real reason lies in Jie’s contention with the scent from eating Indian curry, a rationale incompatible with total rejection, as opposed to reasons such as health or religious concerns. Thus, it is upon the conditional relevancy of providing an interactionally appropriate response after talk by others at line 19, that Jie “downgrades” from “unable to eat” at all to “unable to eat much” at line 22.
Interestingly, besides prosodic and sequential evidence that the \textit{Glue-on} here was done as an appended element, the video recording provides further visual evidence of a TCU-continuation produced as a process prompted by, or addressed to, talk by others. At possible turn completion by Jie at line 18 and throughout Wei’s turn at line 19, Jie’s gaze is firmly fixed towards Wei, reifying Wei as the main recipient of her talk (see Figure (4a) below). Jie is seated in the middle while Wei is to the left of the figure.

But immediately after Wei’s question at line 19 and in the midst of the micro-second gap of line 20, Jie retracts her gaze from Wei to look upwards into space, characterizable as a “contemplative” look (see Fig. (4b) on next page) while producing the turn-continuation “duo”.
The concurrent execution of *duo* and the upward gaze into space constitutes a full embodiment of a process where TCU-continuation is visibly done as an appended element addressed to the contingencies presented after talk-by-others.

As an interim summary, this section has shown four exemplars of different types of TCU-continuations doing the work of “downgrading” or “qualifying” some sort of stance of its host-TCU. In sub-section (3.2.1.), we might have hinted at the semantic class of adverbial *Insertables* as a highly productive group of TCU-continuations particularly apt at “qualifying stances” (see pt. (i) in sub-section). The suitability of adverbials to do stance modification (downgrade or upgrade) is naturally understandable as adverbials, by definition, are constituents that modify the verbal clause of a predicate. However, other types of TCU-continuations are clearly equally capable of doing “downgrading” or “qualifying” given the right context. Additionally, such “downgrading/qualifying” by TCU-continuations can be done in positions immediately after possible completion by latching on to its host, after a registrable silence where turn transition
could have occurred but did not, or after actual talk-by-others. The exemplars have also argued how such positions are relevant in understanding how the TCU-continuations is deployed to do “downgrading/qualifying” as an interactionally intersubjective elements that are sensitive to the recipient. The next sub-section (“upgrading/intensifying” by TCU-continuations) will provides four more exemplars where the host-TCU’s “stance” can be modified by with even more complex forms of TCU-continuations.

4.2.2. Upgrading/Intensifying

In this sub-section, another four exemplars will be discussed as illustrations of TCU-continuations doing the work of “modifying stance”, but in term of “upgrading” or “intensifying” the prior utterance. Ex.(46) below (next page) is another extract from the telephone conversation between Matt and Faye already seen in Ex.(42), and also an expansion of Ex.(8) and (18a). Recalling the context of Ex.(42), Faye was grousing/complaining about a possible school transfer due to her supervisor changing university. One of the complications involved is how Faye’s relationship with her husband, Dave, might be affected should a long-distance relationship have to occur. This is because, as mentioned, Dave is also a Ph.D. graduate student in Faye’s department albeit working under another professor/supervisor. One of the solutions proposed by Matt is that Dave leaves with Faye as well to the new university (shown later in Ex.(49)). However, this would leads to further complications for Dave, such as the need to re-start his Ph.D. program or a possible change of supervisor. The sequence in Ex.(46) thus begins at line 27 where Matt tries to elicit more information on Dave’s status in his current university.
Ex. (46) Compound Insertable (Graduate Dilemma [5:21-6:32])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

27 Matt: 他现在定老板了吗。
28 Faye: 他当然定了. 他一进来就定了.
29 Matt: 你们跟我们不一样.
            27 Matt: ta xianzai ding laoban le ma.
            3SG now book boss CRS QP
            Has he decided on his supervisor yet?
    28 Faye: ta danran ding le. ta yi jin-lai jiu ding le.
            3SG definite book CRS. 3SG one enter-COM DM book CRS
            Of course he has. It’s been decided since the start
            of the program.
    29 Matt: o nimen gen women bu yi yang.
            INJ 2PL with 1PL NEG one appearance
            Oh… Your program is different from ours.
    30 nimen yi- jin-lai jiu yao ding le shi [ma:.
            2PL one- enter-COM DM want book CRS be [QP
            You all have to decide immediately upon entering, is it?
            ....(lines 31-57)....

58 Faye: =en. tsh dan ni shuo women zemne ban ne. ehh hh eh hh .hhh wo-
      AGR. But 2SG say 1PL how solve SFP.
            1SG- Yes. But what do you think we should do? ehh hh eh hh .hhh I-
            women liang jiushi (>jiushi<)- you yi tian Dave @ mei
            1PL two-person DM (>DM<)- have one day NM NEG
            We’re just- just- One day, Dave didn’t

59 shui-zha:o=jiu. (.)wan-shang dou. xiang zhe shier hen fan.
            sleep-CTP=DM. (.) night-COM all. think this matter very worry
            even sleep. (.) the whole night. It’s frustrating thinking
            about it.

61 (.)

62 Faye: [(    )]
Matt: [ta huan laoban- xianzai bu xing ma. huan dao nimen laoban naer] [3SG change boss– now NEG okay QP. change to 2PL boss there go] Can’t he change a supervisor now? Switch to your supervisor.

gu. jiu zai nimen xuexiao .hhh xian huan (weizhi). nimen laoban go. DM at 2PL school .hhh first change (position). 2PL boss Do it at your school, switch supervisor first. Your supervisor

bu shi mashang jiu zou. dui ba. hai you [yi nian.]
NEG be immediate DM walk. right SFP. still have [one year. isn’t leaving immediately, right? You still have a year.

At line 27, Matt tries to determine the possibility of a change in supervisor for Dave by asking Faye if Dave has confirmed his choice of mentor. Faye responds by saying that not only has Dave decided on his supervisor, but this was done the moment he entered the Ph.D. program in their department. This leads to Matt enquiring about structural issues in Faye’s department at line 29-30. From omitted lines 31-57, Faye and Matt continue to talk about how advancement to Ph.D. candidacy is determined in Faye’s department as well as some of Matt’s recent classes. Then at line 58, Faye re-opens the topic of college transfer and the problems Dave might have, by first lamenting “dan ni shuo women zenme ban ne (But what do you think we should do)” before illustrating how affected Dave is at focal lines 59-60. After abandoning an initial formulation “women liang jiushi (We’re just...)”, Faye reports on how Dave could not sleep during one particular night with “you yi tian Dave mei shui-zhao jiu (One day, Dave didn’t even sleep)”, due to the problems mentioned above. Following a micro-second pause, Faye then appends an Insertable “wan-shang dou (the whole night)”, which is a compound adverbial consisting of a time adverb “wan-shang (at night)” and a grammatical adverb indicating total inclusivity “dou (all)”. Again this appended element is semantically dependent, requiring that the host-TCU be retrospectively taken into account for it to be understood, and also prosodically
done in subordinate intonation. As an Insertable, wan-shang duo should have come before the main verb in normative Chinese syntax, as in “you yi tian Dave wan-shang duo mei shui-zhao jiu (One day, Dave didn’t even sleep for the entire night)”.

But most importantly, what the Insertable has functionally achieve here is to “upgrade” the severity of Dave “one-time” insomnia, from not being able to sleep for an unknown length of time, to one where Dave could not sleep for the entire night. The reason is provided subsequently in “xiang zhe shier hen fan (It’s frustrating thinking about it)”. As the description of Dave’s insomnia was done in service of portraying level of “affect-ness” the problems caused by impending school transfer has upon the family, upgrading the severity on Dave’s symptoms pragmatically also upgrades the degree of “frustration” conveyed by Faye. We suggest that one possible motivation for this upgrading may lie in the attribution of appropriate “complainability” to the situation at hand (Schegloff 2005). By upgrading their level of “affected-ness” and frustration, Faye may be interactionally oriented to recipient-design a portrayal of her situation for Matt as normatively “complainable”. Regardless, it is analyzable that the TCU-continuation, via a compound adverbial Insertable, has worked to upgrade the stance of the host-TCU.

Again, besides Insertables, Replacements may also be used to do “upgrading” or “intensifying” of stances, as seen in Ex.(47) below (next page), an expansion of Ex.(21a). In Ex. (47), we return to the lunch conversation between the three friends Ph.D. graduate students, Jun, Lin and Hao, previously shown in Ex.(43). This extract appears later in the conversation, when they again return to talk about taste preference in food of people from different regions of China. Before line 01 of this exemplar, Hao was narrating a story on how he would add huge amount of vinegar to whatever dishes his mom makes, and then proceeds to drink it from the plate after the
main contents of the dish were eaten.

Ex.(47) Complex Phase Replacement (NTU-1 [36:06-36:15])
(*……* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

01 Lin: 那你喜欢吃醋-醋是吧。
02 Hao: 那个:我爷爷那边是山西的嘛。
03⇒ 然后*我*丛:小吃醋.<家里人都.
04 (.)
05 Lin: 挺好的啊.
06 Jun: 嗯.

01 Lin: na ni xihuan chi c-cu shi ba.
DM 2SG like eat vinegar be SFP
So you like to take vinegar right?

02 Hao: nage: wo yeye na bian shi shanxi de ma.
that 1SG grandfather that side be Shanxi GEN SFP
Ummm Because my grandfather’s family from Shanxi.

03⇒ ranhou wo co:ng xiao chi cu.<jia-li ren dou.
then 1SG from small eat vinegar.<home-COM people all
So I’ve taken vinegar since young.<everyone in my family.

04 (.)

05 Lin: ting hao de a.
quite good SFP SFP
That’s quite good.

06 Jun: en.
AGR
Mm hm.

Upon hearing this, Lin then asks Hao if he likes vinegar in general at line 01. Hao first responds by providing a relevant piece of background information in terms of his lineage, revealing that his paternal grandfather’s (yeye) family comes from Shanxi, famed for their noodles and locally produced vinegar. Following that in focal line 03, Hao then accounts for his taste for vinegar. Line 03 begins with a discourse marker “ranhou (then)”, signaling that the upcoming talk logically follows from the prior TCU, before asserting “wo co:ng xiao chi cu.
(I’ve taken vinegar since young)”, which points to the revealed lineage at line 02 as the context for his habit of eating vinegar. Also observable in this utterance is the stress on “

cong (from)”, emphasizing that the habit is already well-developed since a young age. Immediately latched upon the possible completion of this assertion, is the focal Replacement of this exemplar “jia-li ren dou (everyone in my family)”. Again, the TCU-continuation component is semantically dependent, requiring a predicate to explain what “everyone in my family” does; as well as prosodically having a subordinate intonation. However, this TCU-continuation consists of an agentive subject noun phrase “jia-li ren (family members)”, and the inclusive grammatical adverb “
dou (all)” which works to encase and highlight jia-li ren as a large group. Therefore, what we have here looks like a truncated piece of utterance (i.e. not a constituent) acting as a TCU-continuation. As such, while the compound constituent in the prior TCU-continuation can be retroactively “inserted” back into the host-TCU, “jia-li ren dou” cannot as the host-TCU already possesses an agentive subject in the first person pronoun “

wo (I)’. To have this entire TCU-continuation work in concordance with the host-TCU would necessitate a change of subject (i.e. from “

wo (I)” to “jia-li ren (family members)”) and the addition of an adverbial (i.e. “
dou (all)”), from “

wo cong xiao chi cu. (I’ve taken vinegar since young)” to “jia-li ren dou cong xiao chi cu. (Everyone in my family has taken vinegar since young)”. Hence it’s status as a complex phrase Replacement.

While this may “technically” be a case of Replacement as TCU-continuation, it is analyzable that the “continuation” is not really pragmatically functioning to substitute or replace “wo (I)” with other agents that take vinegar since young, but is using the TCU-continuation to expand the range of agentive subjects besides those mentioned in the host-TCU. In fact, what
Hao has done is to “piggyback” the action pursued in line 03 by saying not only has he himself been taking vinegar since young, but his entire family has also been doing so, pragmatically “upgrading” the forcefulness of the explanation for his love of vinegar. It is difficult to understand what the “upgrade” does interactionally, but in keeping with providing strong accounts for his extreme liking of vinegar, the TCU-continuation may be recipient-designed to provide greater justification through “upgrading” the scope of family members that do drink vinegar since young.

Similarly, as with the exemplars in “downgrading/qualifying”, synthetically continuous Glue-ons may also be used to do “upgrading/intensifying”. This third exemplar is an expansion of the example seen under nominal object Glue-ons in Ex.(29d). Before the extract begins in Ex. (48) below, both Chen and Wei, who are instructors at a Hong Kong university, were discussing the best time to organize overseas exchange programs with a partner university in London. A particular problem encountered is in scheduling the best possible time to visit, such that the duration of the visit avoids holiday periods as well as the busy academic terms, in order to minimize interruption to the partner university.

Ex.(48) Nominal Object Glue-on (ES-M-09 [8:51-9:02]).

01 Chen: =我觉得中间好像有三四句。hh 三四个礼拜：
02 sh:: zi- 对啊，<差不多一个月时间
03 是closed[的。
04 Wei: [((咂嘴))].hh= 
05 Chen: =.h所以j我就[ 说其实— ]
06 Wei: [这会是一个问]题
07 [ 哈， "嘿啊嘿啊" ]
08 Chen: [一月底：比较好一]点。
09 <二no—二月份他m[ 上学嘛。] }
10 Wei: [不— 但是一月底]有没有
11= 新年::.<↓之类.<你—有没有查过那个
12 calen[dar.是新]年的话，=
13 Chen: [还没有。]
Wei: =[就会麻]烦。

Chen: [所以要-]

Chen: 要去>现在-< 所以我觉得第一步。.hh 是我先知道
hhh erm:(.)大概是怎么样的.[然后去-

Wei: [.hhh 不- 你要看

这边的那个学期.<还有〔那边的学期。=]

Chen: [m hm

Wei: =<你要看看[两边]那个时[间啊。]

Chen: =wo juede zhongjian haoxiang you san si- .hh san si ge libai:i
1SG feel middle like have three four .hh three four CL week
I think there's three to four... three to four weeks in between

sh:: zi- dui a.<cha-bu-duo yi ge yue shijian
right SFP.<estimate one CL month time
Yea... for about a month

shi closed [de.
BE closed [SFP
that it’s closed.

Wei: [t’zh .hh=

Chen: =.h suoyi j-wo jiu [    shuo gishi- ]
so 1SG then [say actually]
so that’s why I say that actually...

Wei: [zhe hui shi yi ge wen]ti
this will BE one CL problem
That’s going to be a problem.

[ lo. °hai a hai a° ]
SFP °right SFP right SFP°
yea... yea...

Chen: [yi yue di: bijiao hao yi]dian.
[one month bottom compare good a-bit
It’s better during the end of January.

<er no- er yue fen ta m[    kaixue ma. ]
<two NEG- two month portion 3SG [open-school SFP]
Feb... erm no... February, that’s when they start the school term.

Wei: [bu- danshi yi yue di] you mei you
[NEG- but one month bottom] have NEG have
No... But at the end of January, is there

xinnia::n.<<zhi lei<<ni- you mei you cha-guo nage
New-Year. <GEN type.<2SG- have NEG have check-EXP that
the Lunar New Year.and other kinds of holidays.
You... have you checked the
calendar. If it’s the Lunar New Year...

Chen: [hai mei you.]
still NEG have
I haven’t (checked).

Wei: =[jiu hui ma] fan.
them will trouble
then there’s a problem.

Chen: [suoyi yao-]
so need
So (we) need...

Chen: yao gu >xianzai<- suoyi wo juedi diyi bu. .hh shi wo xian zhidao
need go >now<- so 1SG feel first step. .hh BE 1SG first know
(we) now need to... so I think the first step is for me to find out

. hh erm: (.) dagai shi zenme yang de.[ranhou gu-
about BE how image GEN. [then go-
erm... how the situation is in general. And then...

Wei: [.hhh bu- ni yao kan
NEG- 2SG need see
No... You need to check

zhe-bian de nage xueqi.<hai you [na-bian de xueqi.=
here GEN that semester.<still have [there GEN semester.=
(the timing) of our (academic) semester, as well as theirs.

Chen: [m hm
AGR
mm hmm...

2SG all have see.see [two side] that time SFP.
You have to check the dates for both sides.

From lines 01-03, we can see Chen verbalizing her consideration with regard to
avoidance of holiday periods. In particular, she feels that the period between December and
January might be unsuitable as there is “cha-bu-duo yi ge yue shijian shi closed de (about a
month that it [partner university] is closed)”. This prompted some vocalization (t’zh), or an
expression of exasperation, in line 04 by Wei; followed by a strong validation of Chen’s
considerations in lines 06-07, where Wei agrees that “zhe hui shi yi ge wenti lo (That’s going to be a problem)”. At lines 05 and 08, Chen continues from her reasoning at lines 01-03 by concluding that an exchange visit to the partner university scheduled during the end of January would be a better option (as that would bypass the holiday period). Then at line 09, Chen first “latches on” with “er (two)” that is projectably going for “er yue (February)”, but quickly checks herself with a truncated negator “no-“ before verbalizing her other consideration, namely that “er yue fen ta kaixue ma (February, that’s when they start the school term)”. Thus, it is clear that given multiple considerations, Chen opines that the end of January would be the most appropriate period to conduct the exchange trip, as it would circumvent both the peak holiday period as well as the start of a new semester for the partner university in London. However, beginning from line 10 to our focal line 11, Wei brings up the issue of having to also consider the scheduling from the perspective of their own university in Hong Kong. She does this by signaling some disalignment with Chen’s opinion with the truncated negator “bu- (no)”, and then questions “danshi yi yue di you-mei-you xinnia::n (Is there the Lunar New Year at the end of January?)” which comes to possible completion. The argument here is that “the end of January” might also clash with the “xinnian (Lunar New Year)” period in Hong Kong, an important family holiday where students would want to stay home instead of traveling to a foreign country. Wei then “latches on” with a type of nominal object Glue-on “zhi lei (GEN + type)” to the noun phrase “xinnia::n (Lunar New Year)” at line 11, thereby producing “xinnian zhi lei (categories of things like the Lunar New Year)”, and retroactively subjugating “xinnian” as the attributive constituent which illustrates just one type of holiday that may occur at the end of January. As described in Ex.(29d), “zhi lei (GEN + type)” consists of the grammatical particle “zhi (GEN)”, a
classical Chinese genitive case marker, and the noun “lei (type)”, thereby making it a semantically dependent constituent, and requires the prior “xinnian (Lunar New Year)” as the attributive component for complete understanding. Prosodically, “zhi lei” was also produced without pitch reset (i.e. subordinate intonation), marking it as a “continuation” from the prior utterance; and in this case, a type of nominalizer-DE Glue-on. In terms of the action pursued in lines 10-11, by using the Glue-on “zhi lei”, the speaker (Wei) retroactively increases the range of potential holidays in the Hong Kong calendar (besides Lunar New Year) to consider, thereby also “intensifying” the host of potential problems that might cause an obstacle in planning for an exchange trip at the end of January. A possible reason for the TCU-continuation is that Lunar New Year, being the major holiday in the Chinese calendar, might have been the most obvious holiday to spring to mind; though as an “afterthought”, Wei realizes that other kinds of holidays might also appear “at the end of January” to cause additional complications to the scheduling, and thus highlights this possibility with the Glue-on “zhi lei”. The rest of the extract (lines 12-21) is provided as evidence that the Wei’s action in the focal lines 10-11 is to ensure Chen has also considered the academic calendar from their own university.

Finally, in the last exemplar of this sub-section, we shall examine another type TCU-continuation that can also do “upgrading/intensifying” of stance, namely a Free Constituent in the form of an Unattached NP (noun phrase). It has been argued that Unattached NPs do the work of pursuing recipient’s uptake by providing a second TRP at which the recipient can display proper recipiency (Ono & Thompson 1994, FFT 2002b), but in Ex.(49), we will attempt to show how Unattached NPs can also function in other ways. Ex.(49) below (next page) is another extract of the telephone conversation between Faye and Matt that occurs a little after the
extract shown in Ex.(42). Recall that Ex.(42) ended with Faye starting to talk about college and departmental rankings, leading into a long sequence in which Faye and Matt comment on how both their schools did respectively. Right after Matt closes that sequence and just before the start of Ex.(49), Faye re-opens talk on problems in college transfer at line 01, which leads to Matt suggesting that her husband, Dave, should transfer to her supervisor’s new college as well.

Ex.(49) Free Constituent (Graduate Dilemma [3:58-4:19])

01 Faye: 我老板都不想呆了呀.
02 Matt: 那怎么啊. [你跟他走呗.]
03 Faye: 我现在我跟他走我们Dave不惨了. uh hh hh hh hhh
04 Matt: Dave也跟他走呗.
05 Faye: 我们Dave他老板挺好的.<我们系主任.>
06 Matt: 那你就别走. 你就呆在那儿换一个老板.

01 Faye: 我老板都不要呆了呀.
1SG boss all NEG think stay CRS SFP
My supervisor is not even considering staying on!

02 Matt: 我呢我们老板不好的.<我们系主任.>
DM 2SG how do SFP. 2SG with 3SG walk SFP
What do you intend to do then? Why not leave with him.

03 Faye: [我也不知道] a:
1SG NEG know SFP
I don’t know...

04 wo xianzai wo gen ta zou women Dave bu can le. uh hh hh hh hhh
1SG now 1SG with 3SG walk 1PL NM NEG pitiful CRS. ((laugh))
If I leave with him now, wouldn’t Dave be in a terrible state ((laugh))

05 Matt: Dave ye gen ta zou bei.
NM also with 3SG go SFP
Why don’t Dave leave with him as well?

06 Faye: 我们Dave> women > wome::n< women laoban bu xihuan
(>1PL<) NM >1PL< 1PL boss NEG like
Dave- Our- Our supervisor don’t like
At line 01, Faye reiterates that her supervisor is not willing to stay on in their current university any longer. Although Matt encourages her to leave with her supervisor at line 02, his suggestion is met with resistance as Faye informs that this will cause problems for Dave at line 04. It is at this point that Matt suggests that Dave leaves with Faye as well at line 05. Faye’s response to Matt’s suggestion comes in two parts, the first from lines 06-07, where she rejects the possibility of Dave switching to her current supervisor, as the supervisor does not approve of couples working together. After a long gap of 0.8 seconds, Matt produced a long in-breath at line 09, best characterized as expressing affiliation with Faye on the “thorniness” of the issue. Faye then provides further grounds for rejecting Matt’s suggestion in the second part at focal line 10. Beginning with the discourse marker “ergie (furthermore)”, Faye prefaches this turn as providing a second additional reason for the rejection, before commenting that Dave’s current supervisor (different from that of Faye) is “quite nice”. While the first reason stems from the possibility that Faye’s supervisor may be reluctant to accept Dave, the second reason suggests that Dave himself may also be reluctant to switch supervisor. At the first possible completion point of line 10 after “Dave ta laoban ti:ng hao de (Dave’s supervisor is quite nice)”, Faye latches on the focal Free
Constituent in the form of an unattached NP “women xi zhuren (Our department chair)”, thereby further specifying the subject referent in the host-TCU (“Dave ta laoban (Dave’s supervisor)”). As an Unattached NP, the TCU-continuation is obviously semantically complete on its own, and syntactically unrelated to the host-TCU (i.e. it cannot be seen as an omitted part of the prior utterance, as the “women xi zhuren” is already referenced in the host-TCU as the agentive subject “Dave ta laoban (Dave’s supervisor)”). Yet prosodically, it is produced with a subordinate intonation, and pragmatically, the referent and action pursued by “our department chair” cannot be adequately understood without retrospectively taking the host-TCU into account, thereby its status as a Free Constituent. But most importantly, if we take the speaker’s prior sequential actions into account, then how a Free Constituent that is ostensibly functioning to specify a referent can also function to “upgrade” stance becomes clear. Observe that at lines 06-07, and then further at line 10, Faye is oriented to providing reasons that account for rejecting Matt’s suggestion at line 05. Taking “continuations” as part of and thereby continues the action of its host-TCU, then it is understandable how specifying Dave’s supervisor as also being the department chair might contribute to Dave’s reluctance to switch supervisor. As mentioned, “Dave ta laoban ti:ng hao de” at line 10 provide the justification for Dave’s commitment to his current supervisor. By appending this justification with an immediate TCU-continuation that specifies this “nice” supervisor’s status as also being the department chair, Faye brings to the justification an added forcefulness, as it is indeterminable what intangible benefits such a supervisor might provide. Therefore, Ex.(49) demonstrates a case where a Free Constituent can not only specify a referent in the host-TCU (cf. Free Constituents regularly being used to clarify nominal arguments), but through such specification act to “upgrade” the action or stance the
host-TCU pursues. Similar with Ex. (47), such “upgrading” may interactionally function to provide strong and convincing justifications for the recipient. As expected, when presented with the reasons at lines 06-07 and 10, Matt “backs down” from his original suggestion of Dave tagging along, and alters to suggesting that Faye stays at her current university instead at line 11.

As an interim summary, our collection reveals that “modifying stances” constitute the majority of what TCU-continuations are doing. While it may be difficult to pin down what sort of “stances” is being modified, our exemplars have explicated in detail how the TCU-continuations are accomplishing some sort of “downgrading” or “upgrading” work. This is congruent with Schegloff’s (2004) proposition that “increments” may work to “up the ante” or “backdown”, and Luke’s (2007) findings that “incremental sentences” may be in the service of “intensification” or “qualification”. As mentioned, while adverbials may be a grammatical class semantically well-suited for the job of stance modification (see Ex.(42), (43), (45) & (46)), and hence do regularly appear as TCU-continuations (primarily in the form of Insertables) to “downgrade” or “upgrade” the prior utterance, there is by no means an exclusive form-function relationship between adverbials TCU-continuations (or Insertables) and the function of modifying stances. In our exemplars, noun phrase and complex phrase Replacements (see Ex. (44) and (47)), nominal object Glue-ons (see Ex.(48)) and unattached NP Free Constituents (see Ex.(49)) can all be used to do “downgrading” or “upgrading” of stances. Furthermore, in terms of when the “continuation” is appended after possible completion, TCU-continuations that occur as “rush-throughs” or in the next beat (see Ex.(42), (44), (47), (48) & (49)), after a hearable gap (see Ex.(43) & (46)) and after talk-by-others (see Ex.(45)) were all found to be possibly doing stance modification. This suggests that the motivation for retroactive “downgrading” or
“upgrading” of stances can be due either to a self-initiated “afterthought” process, or induced by the lack of appropriate responses by co-participants.

4.3. Clarifying/Disambiguating

Another common function found in our collection of TCU-continuations is to clarify or disambiguate the prior utterance by appending “continuations” that contain additional information. Frequently, it is an ill-defined referent or nominal argument within the just-completed clause that is the element in need of clarification or disambiguation, and therefore unsurprising that \textit{Replacements} and \textit{Free Constituents} are regularly found to be the types of TCU-continuations performing this sort of interactional work.\textsuperscript{101} As previously mentioned in subsection (3.2.2.), the majority of \textit{Replacements} found are \textit{nominals phrases} that can be seen as “replacing” the topic, subject or object constituent in the host-TCU, and work to clarify the earlier constituents with a more well-defined nominal phrase. Similarly, in section (3.4.), we see how \textit{Free Constituents} are predominantly Unattached NPs (noun phrases) that clarifies with more content when there is a lack of syntactic slots in the host-TCU for articulation of certain topic, issue, subject, etc. To recall some of these exemplars, Ex.(50) below (next page) re-prints select examples from previous discussions on \textit{Replacements} and \textit{Free Constituents} to illustrate how clarifying or disambiguating is done with these types of TCU-continuations.

\textsuperscript{101} It seems that less than specific verbal elements in the prior clause can be readily modified or “clarified” with a range of adverbial \textit{Insertables} that are not seen to be “replacing” the verb in the host-TCU, whereas nominal items have to be “replaced” entirely by the new nominal item in a TCU-continuation position.
**Ex.(50) Replacements and Free Constituents**

**Ex.(50a) Replacement: ES-M-02 [5:29-5:55]**
(*….* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

13 Lin: 他:: (. ) 他我觉得*他*比较[私: 实.*你老公*.
ta:: (. ) ta wo juede *ta* bijiao za:shi.*ni laogong*.
3SG 3SG 1SG feel 3SG compare steady. 2SG husband.
He’s… I think he’s more down-to-earth. Your husband.

**Ex.(50b) Replacement: ES-M-01 [17:34-17:40]**
(*….* marks portion that the “further talk” is replacing)

01 Chen: 但我想一下我很有可能还是要到*南京*.
02 Lian: 哦[:]
03 Chen: | 南京师范大学.


06 Jian: 你可以中间转吗:?: 科[大:] 
ni keyi zhongjian zhuan ma?: ke[da:].
2SG can middle transfer QP? NM
Can you switch mid-way? (in) your university.

Ex.(50d) Free Constituent: ES-M-01 [13:44-14:00]

09 Chen: 实际上再一等就快到七岁了.
10 Chen: shiji-shang zai yi deng jiu kuai dao qi sui le.
practical-LOC again one wait DM fast reach seven age CRS.
Actually, a slight delay and (the child) will soon be seven.

Ex.(50a) and (50b) are taken from Ex.(20a) and (20b) in our discussion on nominal
phrases as *Replacements*. Here, the nominal possessive “ni laogong (your husband)” and the proper noun “nanjing shifan xuexiao (Nanking Normal University)” are seen to be “replacing” the third person pronoun “ta (he)” and the city location “nanjing” respectively. Clearly, both these *Replacements* add more specificity to the subject, object or topic in question, and works to clarify or disambiguate any possible misconception. In the case of Ex.(50a), by clarifying the person receiving praise to be the recipient’s husband (as opposed to other possible ways of reference), the speaker may also be using *Replacement* as a vehicle to engage in some positive face work (Levinson 1983) and display solidarity. Ex.(50c) is an instance of a nominal phrase in the form of *Free Constituent*, taken from Ex.(37a). In Ex.(50c), Jian expresses surprise that her interlocutor had switched majors mid-way into his undergraduate studies, as this is usually against policy. The addition of the nominal abbreviation “keda (NM)” after “ni keyi zhongjian zhuan ma (Can you switch mid-way?)” clarifies that the prior question seeks to specifically understand policy matters at *keda*, which is the recipient’s undergraduate university. Ex.(50d), taken from Ex.(39), is also another case of using *Free Constituent* to clarify/disambiguate, but using a clausal phrase instead. In Ex.(50d), Chen points out the consequence of being unable to enroll a child that is just a few days short of the age stipulation under China’s primary school enrollment policy. The *Free Constituent* comprises of the transitive verb “deng (wait)” taking a complex nominal phrase “dier nian de shihou (the second year period)” as its object, which clarifies that the “zai yi deng (to wait again)” in the host-TCU simply refers to just transitioning into the next year for the child to be seven years of age.

While *Replacements* and *Free Constituents* are particularly apt TCU-continuations for doing clarification or disambiguation of ill-defined nominal arguments, this does not exclude the
possibility of using other types of TCU-continuations from doing this sort of interactional work. In the next two exemplars, it will be shown that nominal phrases can also occur in the form of Glue-ons and Insertables to clarify/disambiguate. The next exemplar in Ex.(51) below is expanded from Ex.(29c), and illustrates a nominal object Glue-on that further specifies a nominal object in the host-TCU. Before the extract begins, Deng has been chiding Cai (both female students in the same university) for not accepting her previous invitations to a night club with a group of friends. Deng defends herself by questioning if the outing had to take place so late into the night, and also conveys her lack of understanding (perhaps even apprehension) on the activities that goes on in the night club. Cai then responds by saying night clubs only opens at around 9 p.m. at night, and that they are simply there to drink, dance, listen to music and “to look at guys”. Deng awkwardly laughs at this response, and probes if Cai goes out with an all-girls group. Perhaps orientating to the gender profile of the group as key to Cai accepting future invitation, Deng then empathetically confirms that it is indeed an all-girls group, and attempts to continue with what an all-girls group “allows” them to do. However, this further explication was cut off by another question from Cai on the group’s profile, which is where line 01 in Ex.(51) begins.

Ex.(51) Nominal Object Glue-on (ES-M-07 [19:41-19:55])

01 Cai: [你上次跟]你去他是-都是(.)香港的.
02 (0.3)
03 Deng: >有<>上次]我没去.
04 Cai: [ ^香港=^ ]
05 Cai: 啊你没有去啊.=
06 Deng: =就是:::(0.3)但是:他们有:::五个人去啦:.07 (0.4)
08 Cai: ^=>这么多<=.
09 (0.5)
10 Deng: 都是:- 对.
When you went last time, he… they were all Hong Kong-ers?

No. I didn’t go the last time round.

Oh! You didn’t go.

I mean… Last time… but they had five people that went.

That many?

They’re all香港的.

Uh-hmm… they’re all from HK university.

(and all) female students.
In line 01, Cai initiates another enquiry on the profile of the group (they were all Hong Kong-ers?) that Deng hang out with in her last outing. After a 0.3 second gap in line 02, Deng reveals at line 03 that she did not actually participate in the last outing. Although Cai did not probe further at line 05 (Oh! You didn’t go.), the conversation till this point makes it quite clear that the profile of this group of friends is going to significantly impact on whether Cai would join the group for future outings. Orientating to this possibility, Deng proactively endeavors to provide more information on this group from lines 06-14. At line 06, Deng conveys that five people from the group participated in the last outing. Following another 0.4 second gap in line 07, Cai receives this information with an unenthusiastic and softly produced “zheme duo (that many?)” in line 08, perhaps hinting that strength in numbers did not particularly appeal to her as a pull-factor towards joining the group. This was possibly picked up by Deng as well, as another gap in the talk prefacing “disalignment” ensues in line 09, before she attempts to formulate another piece of information at line 10. Here, Deng begins with “dou shi (they’re all)” before cutting herself off to produce an agreement “dui (yeah)”, ostensibly in response “zheme duo (that many?)” in line 08. She re-starts at line 12 again with “e- dou shi gangda de (Uh-hmm… they’re all from HK university)”, harking back to Cai’s initial question at line 01. When this was again met with more gaps of silence in line 13, Deng re-introduces the gender profile of the group in the form of a nominal phrase Glue-on “nu sheng (female students)”. Note that this appended constituent was done with lowered intensity and in subordinate intonation. Furthermore, as the prior utterance in line 12 ended with a nominalizer-DE construction (“dou shi gangda de (all from HKU-DE”)”, the addition of an appropriate nominal argument (“nu sheng (female students)”) constitutes a synthetically continuous Glue-on, where “gangda (HKU)” before the
“de” particle is retroactively rendered the attributive element of “nu sheng (female students)”. But most importantly, in the context of this sequence of talk, the appending of “nu sheng” as a Glue-on was done after non-uptake by recipient in line 13, and evidently works to further specify/clarify a gender profile on top of other already provided information on the group of friends.

Nominal phrases that clarifies or disambiguate may also occur in TCU-continuations as Insertables, as is shown in Ex.(52) (next page). This exemplar returns to the video recording shown in Ex.(45) where Ph.D. graduate students, Jie, Wei and Tao, are having a snack and chatting. This segment of the recording occurs later in the conversation, in which they talk about a linguistic professor, Teacher Gao, known to all three of them. A relevant ethnographic detail here is that both Wei and Tao are from the Department of Chinese Studies (the department that Teacher Gao works in); whereas Jie is not. Furthermore, though within the same department, Wei works on a linguistic topic whereas Tao is interested in theatre. Additionally, Jie had previously taken a linguistic class conducted by Teacher Gao, in which she observed the very limited number of students in her class. Much earlier in the segment, Jie started the topic by enquiring from Wei on how Teacher Gao has been doing. This is because Wei, being a linguistic student, should have greater epistemic access to Teacher Gao’s status. Wei then reveals that Teacher Gao has been involved in creating and teaching a series of translation classes for professionals outside of the university, a discipline that Teacher Gao was not originally trained for.102 This then leads to the start of Ex.(52) where Jie comments on Teacher Gao’s ostensible switch in research direction.

102 Teacher Gao holds a doctoral degree in Cognitive and Psycho-Linguistics.
Ex. (52) Noun Phrase Insertable (NTU-2 [6:19–6:40])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Jie: 不是，我是说：我想她这样转(．)就是
转到搞这个也是不是因为-人太少嘛。
02 [(   )]  03
04 Wei: [倒：也应]该[ 不是 ]。[ 也不是 ]
05 Tao: [也还好啦]。[也][语言]学的。
06 Wei: 对。因为那个：比如说：
07 我们语言学还有潘老师嘛。
08 Tao: =对对对。
09⇒ Jie: 哦:: @ 不一样嘛。研究领域。[潘老师不是]
10 Wei: [ u:::h ]  11 Jie: 古代汉语吗。
12 Wei: 他是历[史语言][学吧。]
13 Tao: [(   )] [ 对。 ] 其实潘老师：很多
14 方而[还][行。]
15 Wei: [对：对。][语法啊。][历史语言]学。 hh
16 Jie: [ 哦：: ]

01 Jie: bu shi. wo shi shu:o wo xiang ta zhe yang zhua:n (．) jiu shi
NEG be. 1SG be say 1SG think 3SG this way transfer (．) DM be
No. I mean I think she switched (research direction)… meaning
zhuan-dao gao zhe ge ye shi bu shi yinwei- ren tai shao ma.
transfer-LOC do this CL also BE NEG BE because- people too little SFP
is the switch to do this because of… insufficient people.
02 [(   )]  03
04 Wei: [da:o ye ying]gai [ bu shi ]. [ ye bu shi. ]
[turn also should] [ NEG be ] [ also NEG be ]
I don’t think so. Not really.
05 Tao: [ye hai hao la]. [ (ye you) yuyan]xue de.
[also still good SFP]. (also have) linguistic SFP
It’s still okay. There’re still linguistic professors around.
06 Wei: dui. yinwei nage: xiang biru shu:o
right. because that resemble example DM
yea. Because it’s like…
07 women yuyanxue hai you Pan laoshi ma= 1PL linguistic still have Pan teacher SFP= (Our) linguistic (section) still has Teacher Pan.
08 Tao: =dui dui dui.
right right right
Yeah.
09⇒ Jie: o:: @ bu yiyang ma.yanjiu lingyu. [Pan laoshi bu shi]=
INJ NEG same SFP.research field. [Pan teacher also be]=
Oh… but that’s different. in terms of field.
[Isn’t Teacher Pan doing]
From lines 01-03, Jie wonders if Teacher Gao’s shift in research agenda had something to do with the insufficient people (students and faculties) working in linguistics from her own department. This line of reasoning is rejected, albeit partially, first by Wei at line 04, and then by Tao’s overlapping turn at line 05. Tao further comments at line 05 that there are still people working on linguistics in the Department of Chinese Studies. Wei affirms this fact at line 06 and then provides an example of this in Teacher Pan, another professor of linguistics in the department, at line 07. Tao quickly corroborates this piece of information at line 08. As it turns out, Teacher Pan is also not unknown to Jie, but due to differing disciplinary fields of study, Jie did not consider him (Teacher Pan) to be a part of the linguistic camp. Analyzing focal line 09, Jie first provides a preferential token acknowledgement “o:: (Oh)” on the reality of Teacher Pan.
in the department, but immediately stresses that “that’s different” (*bu yiyang ma*).\(^{103}\) This TCU ends with a sentence final particle and thus unequivocally points to a TRP for the recipients. However, at this point of the conversation, it remains unclear what “different” specifically refers to, possibly impeding progressivity of talk later in the trajectory (Sacks 1987, Stivers & Robinson 2006). On one hand, Jie could be referring to Teacher Pan as being “different” in some way, such that his “difference” excludes him from being part of the linguistic camp. On the other hand, from the trajectory of talk, “*bu yiyang ma*” could also be used to do a generic counter rejection of Wei and Tao’s initial rejection (lines 04-08) to Jie’s proposed reasons at lines 01-03. In which case, “*bu yiyang ma*” could simply be conveying something like “I don’t think mentioning Teacher Pan invalidates my initial suggestion (that Teacher Gao switch research agenda due to a lack of linguistic colleagues)”. Possibly due to the ambiguity of “*bu yiyang ma*”, Jie produces a TCU-continuation in the form of a noun phrase “*yanjiu lingyu* (field of research)” in the next beat of talk. Within this sequential context, this nominal constituent cannot be adequately understood unless taken together with the just-prior utterance, and it also carries a subordinate intonation. Furthermore, “*yanjiu lingyu*” can be “re-inserted back” into the host-TCU as an *Insertable* in a default syntax, as it introduces a subject that was missing and unspecified in the first place, thereby re-constituting “*yanjiu lingyu bu yiyang ma* (But their field of linguistics is different)”. In any case, it is relatively clear that the nominal phrase *Insertable* here is doing clarification of an otherwise ambiguous utterance, illuminating for the recipient that “that’s different” refers specifically to Teacher Pan’s field of study. Indeed, immediately after the “continuation”, Jie follows up with another TCU at lines 09 and 11 that further displays her

\(^{103}\) Note that in the actual Chinese utterance, the demonstrative pronoun “that” doesn’t occur before “different”, as dummy subjects are unnecessary in Mandarin Chinese.
concern with specifying Teacher Pan as being involved in “gudai hanyu (classical Chinese)”\textsuperscript{104}, instead of linguistics. Wei and Tao then corrects this misconception of Teacher Pan at lines 11-15, with Wei stating that it is historical linguistic that he specializes in, while Tao further adds that Teacher Pan is sort of a “jack of all trades” in terms of language and linguistics.

Replacing, adding or “re-inserting” original nominal arguments in the host-TCU with nominal phrase “continuations” certainly is a commonly seen retroactive operation that clarifies or disambiguate the understanding of a turn. Nonetheless, non-nominal constituents as “continuations” can also be used to resolve ambiguities inherent in certain expressions. The next two exemplars will again show \textit{Insertables} that clarifies or disambiguate, but this time in the form of \textit{adverbials}, and even \textit{verbal phrases}. Ex.(53) below (next page) shows a sequence that occurs a little after that of Ex.(49). As can be recalled, Faye and Matt were discussing some of the reservations that Faye’s husband, Dave, harbors should he need to transfer to a new university together with Faye and her supervisor. This exemplar continues that topic in which the two friends talk about another contingency of school transfer. Just before this segment in Ex.(53) begins, Faye reveals that one of the two possible colleges her supervisor is transferring to happen to be a prestigious university. Matt concurs that this would be a “good” transfer should it occur. However, Faye then informs that they (Faye and Dave) have looked up the requisites toward a Ph.D. degree at this new university, which Dave considers to be too difficult. Furthermore, Dave is also concerned about the possibility of having to re-do a new Ph.D. program under the new requirements. The sequence below then begins at line 13 where Matt questions the need to repeat a program when a student follows a supervisor into a new university.

\textsuperscript{104} “The understanding of ‘classical Chinese’ as a field of study is that it deals with the hermeneutics of classical texts, which does not necessarily involve a scientific study of language.
Ex. (53)  Adverbial Insertable (Graduate Dilemma [5:00-5:21])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

13  Matt: [hhh 诶. 博士怎么会
14          要重读呢. (. ) 你跟着老板过去.
15          你反正还是算：:
16 (0.6)
17  Faye: 就看我们老板要不要他(来    ).
18  Matt: 对啊 . hh 你反正还是上Socrates{的呀.
19  Faye:  [ @ 我: 是肯定
20⇒              是算的.<如果我过去.<我不管去哪儿.
21 ( . )
22  Faye: 我都是Socrates的学生.
23 (0.4)
24  Matt: 对. Dave 也可以转啊.<反正他现在已经
25          考qualify啊.
26 (0.8)
27  Faye: 对哦.

13 Matt: [hhh ei. boshi zenme hui yao
[ INJ. Ph.D. how will need
Hey... Why would there be a need

14 chong du ne. (. ) ni gen-zhe laoban guo-qu.
repeat study SFP. 2SG with- this boss cross-COM.
to repeat the Ph.D. program. When you follow a supervisor,

15 ni fanzheng hai shi su::an
2SG anyway still be count
you’ll still be considered...

16 (0.6)

17 Faye: jiu kan women laoban yao bu yao ta (lai      )
DM see 1PL boss want NEG want 3SG (come      )
It’ll all depends if my supervisor wants him to come.

18 Matt: dui a. hh ni fanzhe:ng haishi shang Socrates {de ya.
Right SFP. hh 2SG anyway still attend Socrates {GEN SFP
Right. You’ll still be attending Socrates (University) anyway.

19 Faye:  [ @ wo: shi kending
[ 1SG be definite
[ I’ll definitely

20⇒             shi suan de.<ruguo wo guo qu.<wo bu guan qu naer.
be count SFP.<if 1SG cross go.<1SG NEG care go where
be considered (their student).<if I go.
<It doesn’t matter where I go.

21 ( . )
22 Faye: wo dou shi Socrates de xuesheng.
1SG all be Socrates GEN student
I’ll still be a student of Socrates (University).

23 (0.4)

24 Matt: dui. Dave ye keyi zhuan a.<fanzheng ta xianzai mei you right. NM also can switch SFP.<anyway 3SG now NEG have
Right. Dave can transfer as well. He hasn’t taken his
test qualify SFP
qualifying exams anyway.

25 (0.8)

26 (0.8)

27 Faye: dui o.
right SFP
Yea, that’s true.

In Matt’s turn from lines 13-15, he first starts with an interjection (ei) prefacing a sudden and unanticipated new trajectory of talk (Tsai 2008), before proclaiming, “why would there be a need to repeat the Ph.D. program”. This is further followed by Matt’s generalization of the situation, in “ni gen-zhe laoban guo-qu. ni fanzheng haishi su::an (when you follow a supervisor, you’ll still be considered…)”. It is hearable that the 2nd person pronoun “ni (you)” used by Matt here does not specifically refer to Faye, but as a generic you, meaning anyone “tagging along” with a supervisor should not need to repeat a Ph.D. program. Further evidence for such an interpretation come at line 17, where Faye, the recipient herself, demonstrates her understanding of lines 14-15 as being generically referenced. By taking “you” in lines 14-15 as a generic reference and not referring to herself, Faye is then able to interpret Matt’s comments to be referencing Dave’s situation, and therefore counters with “it all depends if my supervisor wants him (Dave) to come…” in line 17. Admittedly, the relatively long 0.6 second gap at line 16 (where a TRP could have occurred), suggests that the receipt of lines 13-15 presented some sort
of interactional trouble for Faye, in that she either disagrees with it or that the understanding of lines 13-15 pose difficulties. In any case, Faye responds at line 17 in a manner that treats lines 13-15 to be suggestive of a line of action for Dave. At line 18, Matt continues to push his agenda from lines 13-15, as seen in his partial recycling of “ni fanzheng haishi su::an” at line 15 into “ni fanzheng haishi shang Socrates de ya (You’ll still be attending Socrates (University) anyway.)”, thereby treating Faye’s line 17 to be somewhat inadequate as a response. Possibly due to Matt’s interpretation of line 17 as inadequate, this time round, Faye takes Matt to be referencing herself instead as being the one that would “still be attending Socrates (University)”, and responds accordingly from focal lines 19-20, as well as in line 22. At lines 19-20, Faye first accedes that she’ll be a student of Socrates regardless, in “wo: shi kending shi suan de (I’ll definitely be considered)”, which at possible completion is then quickly followed by a TCU-continuation in the form of a conditional phrase “ruguo wo guo qu (If I go)” produced in subordinate intonation. As a conditional phrase, it is by definition semantically dependent, and in default syntax occurs before the host-TCU as in “ruguo wo guo qu wo: shi kending shi suan de (If I go, I’ll definitely be considered)”. Hence, it is seen as an adverbial (i.e. conditional disjunct) Insertable. Crucially, the conditional phrase “if I go” pragmatically provides the background information for its host-TCU to make sense, for “wo: shi kending shi suan de (I’ll definitely be considered)” taken on its own does not provide the necessary context for its production as Faye is still currently attending “Socrates University”. This is one sense in which this “continuation” can be taken to be an exemplar of doing clarification. Another possible sense of doing clarification can be gleaned if we consider the turn from lines 19-22 in its entirety. It is observed that at the very start of the turn at line 19, Faye stresses the first personal pronoun “wo: (I)”, thereby
emphasizing that “I’ll definitely be considered” is in contrast with others, and in this context, specifically with reference to Dave. This emphasis on herself as being an exception is then pursued throughout the formulation of the turn, first through the adverbial *Insertable* “if I go”, followed by two additional TCUs at line 20 “it doesn’t matter where I go”, and at line 22 “I’ll still be a student of Socrates (University)”. Notably, the Chinese first person pronoun “wo” is optional in these TCU but is nonetheless produced. From this perspective, the TCU-continuation “ruguo wo guo qu (if I go)” is one of the many formulations in this turn that aims to highlight that her status might not be applicable to Dave. Regardless, the adverbial *Insertable* is still seen as functioning to do “clarification” of Matt’s generalization at lines 13-15 and at line 18, where he suggests that Dave may also follow the same path as Faye. As it turns out, Matt may be right, for at lines 24-25, he continues to pursue his line of thought by clearly spelling out how this may be done (in that Dave may also switch to Faye’s supervisor since he has not taken his qualifying exams), which is then agreed upon by Faye at line 27.

The final exemplar of this section demonstrates how a **verbal constituent** in a TCU-continuation form (i.e. *Insertable*) may also function as a clarifying or disambiguating resource. Ex.(54) below (next page) is another later segment of the telephone conversation between Faye and Matt. However, in this extract, the topic turns to a tennis game accident where Faye’s husband, Dave, chipped off a piece of his front tooth, and is now in need of dental surgery. Line 01 of the extract begins with Matt asking if the medical insurance (probably referring to a mandatory school insurance policy) Faye and Dave has covers dental surgery.
Ex.(54) Verbal Phrase Insertable (Graduate Dilemma [12:40-13:03])
(@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Matt: 这边牙医-你那边保吗.
02 Faye: 我们不保啊． 烦死[ 我们- 要不 ]
03 Matt: [那( )怎么办． ]
04 Faye: 那只好去补::啊．
05 (. )
06 Matt: 我们这边补牙费嗯． 有中:中国(牙-医)．
07 (0.4)
08 Matt: 牙医． hhh=
09 Faye: =真的啊．
10 Matt: uh h(h)uh [hh
11 Faye: [ hh 他不是全:的．
12 他就门牙有-嗑掉一块儿．
13 (0.2)
14 Matt: 我-(.)对呀．我们这边我上次也是牙: hhh (. ) 补牙
15⇒ (0.2) @ 二十五块钱．(花了．
16 Faye: [哦.这么便:宜啊．
17 Matt: 中:国的嘛．

01 Matt: zhe bian yai- ni na bian bao ma.
      this side dentist- 2SG that side insured QP
      The dentists here… Is dental insured over there?

02 Faye: women bu bao a. fan-si [wome- yao bu ]
      1PL NEG insured SFP. trouble-die [1PL- want NEG
      We’re not insured. It’s so frustrating, that’s why we…

03 Matt: [na ( ) zenme ban ]
      DM how do
      What’s are you to do then?

04 Faye: na zhi hao qu bu:: a.
      DM only good go patch SFP
      No way around it, we’ll have to go (see the dentist).

05 (. )

06 Matt: women zhe bian bu ya fei wo. you zho: zhongguo (ya-yi).
      1PL this side patch tooth expensive SFP. have China (dentist)
      Dental bills here are expensive. But we have a (dentist) from China.

07 (0.4)

08 Matt: yayi. hhh=
      dentist. hhh
      A dentist.

09 Faye: =zhen de a.
      real GEN SFP
      Really!

10 Matt: uh h(h)uh [hh

217
Faye:  

[hh ta bu shi qu:an de.  
[hh 3SG NEG be all SFP.  
[But his (damage) is not complete.  

But his (damage) is not complete.  

Matt:  

wo-(.) dui ya. women zhe bian wo shang ci ye shi ya: hhh (.)  
1SG-(.) yes SFP. 1PL this side up time also be teeth hhh (.)  
I-(.) Yea. Here, I also previously had a teeth- (.)  

[F] bu ya ji:u (0.2) @ ershiwu kuai qian. [hua-le  
fix teeth DM (0.2) twenty-five dollar money. [spend-CMP  
a dental filling is only (0.2) twenty-five dollars. [I paid.  

Faye:  

[0. zheme pia:nyi a.  
[INJ. so cheap SFP  
[Oh. It’s that cheap?  

Matt:  

zhongguo de ma.  
China GEN SFP  
Because it’s a Chinese dentist.  

At line 01, Matt enquires about Faye and Dave’s medical insurance, to which Faye reveals at line 02 that it does not cover dental surgery, a matter causing certain frustration to the family. Even though this is the case, Dave will still have to see the dentist to get his tooth fixed, as mentioned by Faye in line 04. This leads to Matt disclosing from lines 06-08 that although dental fees are expensive in his state, he has access to a “dentist from China”, much to the surprise of Faye at line 09. After Matt confirms this at line 10 with the affirmation token “uh huh”, Faye reiterates at lines 11-12 that Dave did not completely damage his teeth, but simply chipped a piece off his front tooth. It is difficult to be certain why Faye considers this piece of information to be relevant at this juncture, but a possible reason might be to lower the estimation of cost of this upcoming dental surgery, as Matt has brought up this issue earlier at line 06. This
is further evidenced at focal lines 14-15 where Matt, as the recipient of lines 11-12, also orients to dental surgery fees as the main consideration of its prior turn. At line 14, Matt first recounts how he also previously went to the dentist to do minor mending, before informing that it was only “ershiwu kuai qian (twenty-five dollars)” at line 15. The end of this phrase constitutes a TRP, as evidenced by the overlap onset at line 16 on the TCU’s first possible completion point. In the next beat after TRP, however, Matt continues with a grammatically unfitted verbal constituent “hua-le (spent)” analyzable as a TCU-continuation. Again, the verbal constituent was produced with a subordinate intonation, and is semantically dependent, only understandable when taken retrospectively with the host-TCU. In default syntax, the verb is “re-insertable” into the host-TCU, reconstituting “bu ya jiu hua-le ershiwu kuai qian (The dental surgery just cost me twenty-five dollars)”, thereby making it an Insertable. But most importantly, the added verbal constituent clarifies a possibly ambiguous TCU. By itself and without the Insertable, “bu ya jiu ershiwu kuai qian (The dental surgery is only twenty-five dollars)” could also convey that the total charge/fee of the dental surgery is only twenty-five dollars, as opposed to having only cost Matt twenty-five dollars after insurance coverage. By provision of the “continuation” in the form of a verbal constituent “hua-le (spent)”, Matt clarifies that the “twenty-five dollars” is what he has spent, and not what the total cost of the dental surgery is. Prior mentioning of dental insurance at line 01 provides further substantiation that the verbal phrase Insertable produced by Matt is aimed at clarifying/disambiguating a possibly ambiguous turn.

In summary of this section, we have shown that another frequent interactional function of TCU-continuations is to do clarifying or disambiguating. While our collection points towards Replacements and Free Constituents (particularly in the form of nominal phrases) to be the
predominant type of TCU-continuations that do clarification or disambiguation, the exemplars in this section clearly demonstrates that other types of TCU-continuations (Glue-ons and Insertables) are equally capable of performing this sort of interactional work. Again, while there may be preferential (or felicitous) constituents and TCU-continuations that can regularly clarify or disambiguate turns in a retroactive manner, there is no exclusive form-function relationship, a finding similar to the non one-to-one relationship of modifying stances with adverbial TCU-continuations.

4.4. Reformattting/Reformulating the sequential action

The last two sections ((4.2.) and (4.3.)) have been devoted toward illustrating the most common functions of TCU-continuations found in our collection. In this section and the next, we turn to less frequent but equally plausible other functions that Chinese TCU-continuations may have. Here, another possible function of TCU-continuations, that of restructuring or continuing a sequential action, will be discussed. By this, we mean to suggest that some TCU-continuations may be retrospectively produced to either change an initial action in the host-TCU, or link the action pursued by its host-TCU to be part of a larger chain of action sequences. Either function pertains to the reformattting or reformulating of an action-type in the host-TCU via retroactive operation. Such a function has not been documented, as far as I know, in the extant literature on TCU-continuations.

The first exemplar in Ex.(55) below (next page) is expanded from Ex.(28e), and illustrates how a Glue-on can be used to tweak the original action in the just-prior TCU. Again,

105 “Securing/Pursuing recipient’s uptake” discussed in the next section has often been documented as a core function of TCU-continuations. However, this may have to do with how other first-order operations are seen as ancillary to “pursuing recipient responses”. 
the context here is about two friends, Chen and Lian, having a discussion on the best time in the year to have a baby, such that it would be able to enroll into the primary school system of mainland China at the youngest age possible. The dilemma here is: if the child does not reach the biological age of six by the final date for primary school admission (even if it is just by a day), he or she will not be allowed to enroll till the next academic year. Before the extract, the interlocutors have agreed that it is best for a child to enter into the formal education system earlier than later. Hence the month in which a child is born becomes a relevant point of discussion, as this will directly affect his/her ability to enroll as one of the youngest in a cohort. Ex.(55) begins with Chen positing the question on the best month for a child to be born, given the school admission policy in China.


01 Chen: 那这么说小孩几月份出生比较好呢?
02 Lian: .hhhh
03 (.)
04 Lian: [ uh:<几月份出身啊: ]
05 Chen: [如果说想-小孩儿就是说六岁.
06 (0.4)
07 Chen: 九月份以后?
08 (0.5)
09⇒ Chen: 出生好一些.
10 (1.3)
11 Lian: ((contemplative tone))<九月[份]. ]
12 Chen: [或者是]:::就是说:::
13 (0.5)
14 Lian: 对.九月份::<我觉得是九月份左右
15 好像比较:::比较好.

01 Chen: na zhe-me shuo xiaohai ji yue fen chusheng bijiao hao ne?
   then this-way say children how-many month CL born compare good SFP?
   If that’s the case, when will you say is a better month to give
   birth to a child?

02 Lian: .hhhh
03 (.)
After Chen initiates the question in line 01, the recipient (Lian) finds it difficult to provide an accurate assessment, possibly due to the various complex issues in determining the “best” month for a child to be born. This is seen in line 02 where Lian audibly produces a lengthened in-breath, best described as the sort of response cry when one is thrown into a quandary. Further evidence of Lian having difficulty in answering the question is seen in the
video data, as she turn her gaze sky-wards immediately after Chen’s question, displaying a look of contemplation as she verbalizes the in-breath (see Figure (5) below). In fact, this upward gaze was maintained from line 02 to line 13 in the extract, when Lian repeats part of her interlocutor’s question in line 04 (“ji yue fen chusheng a: (with regards to which month would be better)”) and 11 (“<jiu yue fen> (September)”), or mutters inaudibly to herself in between. This embodied display makes it clear (to us as well as to the conversationalists) that Lian was engaged in working out “the sums” privately in her own thoughts in order to adequately answer Chen’s question at line 01 (“xiaohai ji yue fen chusheng bijiao hao ne? (when is a better month to give birth to a child?)”). At the same time, it is indisputable that Lian was also able to keep track of Chen’s contributions between lines 02-13, as evidenced in line 11 as she repeats part of Chen’s talk at line 07.
Seeing Lian’s dilemma in coming up with an answer, Chen attempts to “trouble-shoot” and clarify her question at line 05 with “ruguo shuo xiang- xiaohai jiushi shuo liu shui (If we wanted to… for children… I’mean, to be six years old)”, which runs into overlap with Lian’s repeat at line 04. When this is further met with more gaps in line 06, Chen then proposes “jiu yue fen yihou? (After September?)” as a candidate answer with try-marked prosody in focal line 07, which is also the host-TCU in this exemplar. With no forthcoming acknowledgement in line 08 occupied by a gap of half a second, she continues with “chu-sheng hao yi-xie (better to give birth)”. Although this “continuation” was not done with subordinate intonation, the added constituent is both semantically and syntactically incomplete, clearly marking it as structurally dependent upon the just prior utterance. As such, with the earlier time period “jiu yue fen yihou” as the subject (or topic), “chu-sheng hao yi-xie” then comments upon it as a verbal clause Glue-on, utilizing the topic-comment structure common in Chinese. Crucially, in terms of interactional function, whereas Chen was offering a candidate answer with its try-marked prosody in “jiu yue fen yihou”, the addition of the TCU-continuation to form “jiu yue fen yihou chu-sheng hao yi-xie (It is better to give birth after September)” ends with a falling terminal intonation, therefore reformatting or reformulating the original host-TCU from a more interrogative action into a declarative statement (albeit one that the recipient still has to affirm).

In the next relatively longer exemplar, it will be demonstrated how an adverbial conjunct “erqie shi (furthermore)” in the form of a Insertable is arguably re-formulating its host-TCU to continue a sequence of affirmative endorsement on a interlocutor’s “investment decision”. Ex.(56) (next page) is another segment of the telephone conversation between Faye and Matt, seen in Ex.(42), (46), (49) and (53). This time, however, they have turned to a more
“light-hearted” topic, namely the comparison of second-hand motor vehicles that both participants have purchased recently. In this extract, it will be seen how Faye asked Matt a series of probing questions such as the model, manufacture date, mileage, as well as the price Matt paid for the vehicle, before revealing the corresponding specifications of her own second-hand purchase. What is interesting in this exchange is how a suitable assessment (of whether the second-hand purchase was a “good buy”) is worked out between the participants after the long “question-and-answer” session has concluded. The transcript starts with Matt providing some sort of consolation to Faye (due to her problems with school transfer) in the form of a common Chinese proverbial saying “che dao shan-qian bi you lu (The road will be there once the car reaches the mountain)” at line 01, conveying the sense that problems will naturally be resolved when the time is ripe. Faye, however, innovatively recycles the format of this saying at line 03 by fronting “you lu (have roads)” before “bi you (surely)”, and then changing the nominal object into “fengtian che (Toyota)”, thus reformulating the utterance to mean something like “There’ll be a Toyota there once there’s a road”. Following this clever initiation of a new topic, she then announces the news that her family drives a Toyota sedan.

Ex.(56)  Adverbial Insertable (Graduate Dilemma [22:52-23:45])
(}@ marks the slot where the “further talk” might be in “normative syntax”)

01 Matt: =车到山前必有路.
02 (0.7)
03 Faye: 有路必有丰田车.<我们家开丰田.
04 (0.2)
05 Matt: 你们家是丰田啊.
06 Faye: 你们家买车没有.
07 (.)
08 Matt: 我买了.
09 Faye: 真:的啊.
10 Matt: 呀.
11 Faye: 哪什么>时候<买的.
12 (0.3)
Matt: 我们家也是丰田，Toyota 是丰田吗。
Faye: uh huh. Toyota 什么. [corolla.
Matt: [tercel.
Faye: [tercel.]
Matt: [没:有买]corolla.
Faye: 我们家是 (0.2) corolla.
Matt: 你们是corolla啊.
Faye: 嗯.<你是哪年的.
Matt: 八七hh hh.
Faye: 八七啊. 多少钱啊.
Matt: 两千三.
Faye: 两千三-<八七.<跑多少 mile 啦.
Matt: 一万二-<十二万.
Faye: 十二万啊 那::: 那是蛮厉害的.
Matt: [是吗.
Faye: [我是八八的.
Matt: 嗯.
Faye: 买的时候跑了十万.
Matt: 嗯.
Faye: u:::h 三千二吧.
Matt: 哦:::.
Faye: 哦::: hh hhh
Matt: 对.<那个corolla是挺贵的.
Faye: corolla的车是很经跑的:::.=
Matt: =>但是我觉得你那个是买得挺好的<.
Faye: 对. 我们～我们买得还行.
Matt: 你-啊 @ 你-比我早一年买.<而且是.
Faye: 对. 我:是在dealer那儿买的.
Matt: =che dao shan-qian bi you lu.
car reach mountain-front sure have road
((Idiom)) The road will be there once
the car reaches the mountain.
Faye: you lu bi you fengtian che.<women jia kai fengtian.
have road sure have Toyota car.<1PL home drive Toyota
Toyota will be there if there’s a road. We drive a Toyota.

Matt: nimen jia shi fengtian a.  
2PL home be Toyota SFP 
Oh your family has a Toyota.

Faye: nimen jia mai che mei you.  
2PL home buy car NEG have 
Have you all bought a car?

( )

Matt: wo mai le.  
1SG buy CRS 
I’ve bought one.

Faye: zhe:n de a.  
real GEN SFP 
Really!

Matt: e.  
CFM 
mm hmm.

Faye: ei:.shenme >shihou< mai de.  
INJ. what >period< buy GEN 
Oh! When did you get it?

(0.3)

Matt: women jia ye shi fengtian. Toyota shi fengtian ma.  
1PL home also be Toyota. be Toyota QP 
We also got a Toyota. “Fengtian” is Toyota, right?

Faye: uh huh. Toyota shenme. [corolla.  
What. 
Uh huh. What type of Toyota. A Corolla?

Matt: [tercel.  

(0.5)

Faye: [ tercel. ]

Matt: [me:i you mai c]orolla.  
[NEG have buy c]orolla 
I didn’t get a Corolla.

Faye: women jia shi- (0.2) corolla.  
1PL home be- corolla 
We got a… corolla.

(0.3)

Matt: nimen shi corolla a.  
2PL be corolla SFP 
Oh, you all got a Corolla.
Faye: a.<ni shi na nian de.
   AGR.<2SG be which year GEN
   Yea. When is your car made?

Matt: ba qi(hh) hh.
   eight seven
eighty-seven

Faye: ba qi a. duoshao qian a.
   eight seven SFP. how-much money SFP
   Oh, eighty-seven. How much is it?

(0.2)

Matt: liang qian san.
   two thousand three
   Two thousand three hundred dollars.

(0.2)

Faye: liang qian sa<-ba qi.<pao duoshao mile la.
   two thousand three<eight seven.< run how-many mile SFP
   Oh, two thousand and three... eighty-seven... How many miles
   has it ran?

(0.2)

Matt: yi wan e-<shi-er wan.
   one ten-thousand two< twelve ten-thousand
   Twelve thousand- A hundred and twenty thousand.

Faye: shi-er wan a. na:- na shi man lihai de.
   twelve ten-thousand SFP. DM DM be quite potent GEN
   Oh, hundred and twenty thousand. Then... that's quite a lot...

(0.6)

Matt: [shi ma.
   be QP
   Is it?

Faye: [wo shi ba ba de.
   1SG be eight eight GEN
   Mine is a eighty-eight.

Matt: e.
   CPM
   mm hmm

Faye: mai de shihou pao le shi wan.
   buy GEN period run CMP ten ten-thousand
   It ran ten thousand miles when I bought it.
Given that Faye and Matt, former schoolmates who are now doctoral students at different universities, may not have been in contact for a significant period of time, an
announcement of having made an investment in a motor vehicle may be newsworthy. However, Faye’s turn-design at line 03 not only implicates having acquired a car, but specifically points towards having acquired a Toyota, leaving for the recipient the question of “why that now”. One highly probable reading of why the brand name of the car is specially mentioned at this sequential juncture, is that Faye is initiating invitation to do comparison. As it turns out in Faye’s next turn at line 06, she further pursues this agenda by categorically asking if Matt has bought a vehicle yet. However, as the sequence plays out, Matt can be seen to be resisting such attempts, though unsuccessfully, at making comparison of second-hand vehicle purchases.

After Faye’s announcement that her family drives a Toyota at line 03, a split-second gap elapsed (line 04) before Matt gives a somewhat lackluster response at line 05, in the form of a recycled format of line 03 and ending the utterance with the final particle “a (SFP)”, resulting in “nimen jia shi fengtian a (Oh your family has a Toyota)”. Observe that this was not taken to be a re-confirmation request from Matt by Faye, but more of a disinterested closing statement. This is evidenced in her next turn at line 06 where she follows up with a more direct question, analyzably due to the lack of reciprocal information from Matt. Again at line 07, another micro-second beat of gap occurred after Faye’s question “nimen jia mai che mei you (Have you all bought a car)” at line 06, before Matt’s nominal answer of “wo mai le (I’ve bought one)” at line 08. Faye then responds enthusiastically to this news, as seen in the heightened pitch and stress during the onset of “zhe:n de a (Really!)” at line 09, which is followed by another nominal affirmation token by Matt at line 10. Faye continues to probe at line 11, enquiring when Matt made the purchase, but instead of providing a relevant next answer, Matt announces that his

106 Brand-name is a specification category relevant to making informed decision on vehicle purchases.
family also drives a Toyota at line 13, after another gap of silence at line 12.

As can be seen, the interaction between Faye and Matt up till this point has been plagued with continual difficulties, most prominently seen in the multiple gaps between turns, and Matt’s responses which can be grossly characterized as being uninvolved and reluctant. This paradigm of Faye initiating a probing question and Matt responding with deadpan tokens after some gap continues throughout lines 14-30, where a series of inquiries were made on the specification of Matt’s second-hand car, such as the model, year made, mileage and the purchasing price. Also observe that throughout this segment of the talk, while Faye has repeatedly probed into Matt’s “affairs”, Matt has made no reciprocal attempts to enquire about the specifications of Faye’s purchase. Note also that at line 28, Faye begins verbally listing relevant categories for vehicle assessment such as the purchase price (“liang qian san (two thousand three hundred)”) and year of manufacture (“ba qi (eighty-seven)”) of Matt’s car, before asking about the mileage, thereby bringing to the surface her concern with assessing Matt’s purchase decision, and ultimately comparing it with her own.

Finally at line 31, Faye produces the first critical assessment of Matt’s car in that a mileage of 120,000 miles on the vehicle is “man lihai de (quite potent/a lot)”. The disfluency displayed in the elongation of “na::(then)” and its restart at the onset of this TCU also shows Faye’s orientation to this unfavorable assessment as being dispreferred (Pomerantz 1984a, Schegloff 2007). Yet, after a long 0.6 second gap at line 32, Matt still maintains his stoic stance by not strongly contesting Faye’s critical assessment of his vehicle, but simply registering it with “shi ma (Is it?)” at line 33, running into overlap with Faye’s self-selected turn at line 34 (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974, Jefferson 1986, Schegloff 2000c). Interestingly, even though Matt
did not attempt any inquiries into the corresponding specifications of Faye’s vehicle, she nonetheless produces them categorically from lines 34 to 41. Again, these announcements were met with minimal confirmation tokens by Matt in the forms of “e (CFM)” at line 35 and 37, or with “o:: (CFM)” at line 41. From the above analysis, it is clear that throughout the sequence, Faye has been continually prompting and pushing Matt to initiate mutual comparison of their purchase decision on second-hand vehicles, only to be resisted/impeded by Matt’s uncooperative/perfunctory next turn at every juncture. This trouble-filled sequence then comes to a head at line 42 when Faye simply mimics/lampoon Matt’s perfunctory acknowledgement token “o:: (CFM)” with laugh tokens at line 41, signaling strongly to Matt that such responses are deemed to be grossly inadequate as second paired parts (Schegloff 1990). As such, Matt also provides the first assessment of Faye’s purchase at line 43 with “nage corolla shi ting gui de (The corolla is quite expensive)”. Though semantically, this statement is unambiguous; action-wise, two almost conflicting interpretation could have been pursued here. One interpretation, by taking the referent (corolla) to generically mean cars of the Corolla model, is that Matt is attempting to reassure Faye. By saying that the Corolla model is generally more expensive, Matt is then validating Faye’s decision in having to pay a higher price for her Toyota Corolla (relative to his Toyota Tercel). The other interpretation takes a specific reading of the referent to mean Faye’s Corolla, which then implies that Matt has also requited an unfavorable assessment by saying Faye has paid too much for her car. It is the latter interpretation that Faye takes to be the case in line 45, evidenced by how she indignantly provides a justification in “corolla de che shi hen jingpao de: (But the corolla model is very durable)” with heightened stress on its onset.

---

107 Matt has earlier revealed that his Toyota Tercel cost $2300 at line 26, whereas Faye later says her Toyota Corolla cost $3200 at line 39.
Following this strong disagreement, Matt then quickly latches on at line 46 to clarify in quick pace that the purchase was a “good buy” despite being costly. It is unclear if Matt’s explication at line 46 is a “backdown” due to Faye’s disagreement in the just prior turn, or a genuine clarification of the action pursued in line 43 (which then bears resemblance of a third POSITION repair (Schegloff 1992, 1997b)). In any case, Faye then accepts Matt’s “reformulated” assessment/compliment in line 46 with a “downgraded” agreement of her own in “women mai de hai xing (the car we bought was a reasonable buy)” at line 47.

After a short beat of silence in line 48, we finally arrive at our focal turn in line 49 where Matt first produces a syntactically, prosodically and pragmatically complete TCU in “n-a ni-bi wo zao yi nian mai. (oh you bought it a year earlier than me)”. This is quickly followed with our focal TCU-continuation “erqie shi (as well)” in the form of a semantically dependent adverbial conjunct “erqie (furthermore)” plus a copula “shi (BE)”, produced in subordinate intonation. Additionally, in normative syntax, the conjunct “erqie” would be positioned initial to the utterance, as in “erqie ni-bi wo zao yi nian mai. (furthermore, you bought it a year earlier than me)”, thereby making the “continuation” a Insertable. More importantly, “erqie (furthermore)” as a discourse marker links the host-TCU to its prior context, such that “ni-bi wo zao yi nian mai (you bought it a year earlier than me)” is then understood to be an additional point/reason/justification relative to an earlier point/reason/justification in the sequence. As a TCU-continuation, “erqie shi” continues to act in the capacity of a linkage device, retroactively positioning the host-TCU as a continuation of a line of action or actions previously instantiated. In the context of this exemplar, the Insertable “erqie shi” has then retroactively reformulated the action in line 49 to be construed as a continued agenda of either Faye’s line 47 or Matt’s line 46,
both of which aims to validate Faye’s purchase decision of the Toyota Corolla. Pragmatically speaking, line 49 is further validating Faye’s “good buy” by pointing out the fact that she has bought a 1988 car (as opposed to Matt’s 1987 car) a year earlier than Matt, and thereby has technically acquired a newer vehicle for use at an earlier date. Note that had the TCU-continuation not been produced, the TCU “n-a ni-bi wo zao yi nian mai. (oh you bought it a year earlier than me)” on its own would appear to be a simple statement of sudden realization with little interactional import. The Insertable “erqie shi” has thus retroactively taken the host-TCU and placed it within a larger sequential context of providing validation of Faye’s purchase after Matt’s initial “mistake” at line 43, in a sense re-organizing the host-TCU to serve a more interactional function. As for why the TCU-continuation was done, it is possible that this exemplar is another case of the speaker quickly producing “new” content information, only to register other contingencies (such as the need to locate the turn within a sequence of providing validation) near possible completion of host-TCU, which is then followed by a TCU-continuation to rectify interactional deficiencies.

In summary, this section has described two exemplars where TCU-continuations can be used to reformat or reformulate the sequential action of the host-TCU. Again, the type of TCU-continuation and constituent used to accomplish such function can vary, with a verbal clause Glue-on in the first exemplar and an adverbial conjunct Insertable in the second. Furthermore, while further talk in the first exemplar was produced as a “post-gap” TCU-continuation, the TCU-continuation in the second exemplar was done as a “rush-through”. Though reformatting/reformulating the sequential action is not a function as frequently found relative to other TCU-

108 Observe that the “a (INJ)” in line 49 is doing the work of “Oh” in English, conveying some sort of change-in-state (Heritage 1984) in the speaker.
continuation practices (in comparison to modifying stances and clarifying/disambiguating), it is nonetheless an equally valid and analytically plausible function that addresses interactional contingencies. In our final section on interactional functions of TCU-continuations, another less frequent but highly interactional practice will be explored.

4.5. Securing/Pursuing recipient’s uptake

In this last section on interactional functions of TCU-continuations, we shall explore an exemplar which gives clear indication that the practice of TCU-continuations is interactionally motivated, whose function is in its very core addressing interactional contingencies. One frequently documented function of TCU-continuation is that of pursuing recipient’s uptake (Heath 1984, Pomerantz 1984b, FFT 2002b), where the provision of a specifically formulated TCU-continuation is seen to be providing an additional transition relevance place (TRP) for the recipient to respond, particularly in the event of a gap occurring in the first TRP (or after possible completion of host-TCU) indicating some sort of obstacle towards proper uptake. Technically speaking, the production of any TCU-continuations after a gap will in effect provide another TRP, and in this sense, can always be seen to be providing another opportunity for recipients to respond. In fact, this seems to have been the primary way with which previous studies have analyzed TCU-continuations, such that other interactional functions previously described in sections (4.2.) and (4.3.) are seen as subsidiary roles or subordinated under the function of “pursuing recipient’s uptake”. In characterizing “turn extensions” found in their data, Ford & Thompson (1996) discusses the function of “pursuing recipient responses” in the following manner (comparisons bolded and in parenthesis are my own additions):
“In pursuing recipient responses, speakers may simply recomplete the previous turn, thereby recreating a transition relevance point. They may add on a tag question, calling more clearly for recipient uptake. They may soften some claim or communicate uncertainty, thus revising the context for agreement or disagreement (cf. downgrading/qualifying). They may add support to some prior claim, thereby strengthening the potential for agreement (cf. upgrading/intensifying). Or they may treat the lack of response as a failure of understanding, addressing that failure by adding specification or elaboration (cf. clarifying/disambiguating). Such extensions fill in what could be the development of problematic gaps. In one way or another, an extension past a point of completion provides an additional opportunity for smooth speaker change.”

It is illuminating that Ford & Thompson (1996) have similarly found the three main functions of “downgrading/qualifying”, “upgrading/intensifying” and “clarifying/disambiguating” in their collection of “turn-extensions”, but have treated them simply as “means to an end”. Though it is acknowledged that the deployment of any TCU-continuations will necessarily provide additional opportunity for smooth speaker change, it is also argued that subjugating these other functions to be ancillary may not be totally justifiable. This dissertation thus treats “downgrading/qualifying”, “upgrading/intensifying”, “clarifying/disambiguating” and other prima facie functions as equally valid, and may be used as a “vehicle” to pull off a second-order operation such as “pursuing recipient’s uptake”. There are, of course, instances of TCU-continuations which seem to “simply recomplete the previous turn”, and function specifically to secure or pursue recipient’s uptake without analyzably altering the host-TCU in any substantial way, except to structurally gain that additional TRP for another chance at speaker transition.

Ex.(57) of this section illustrates one such instance where two consecutive Glue-ons are produced to “secure” and then “pursue” another recipient’s uptake. Different from previously documented examples, however, is how the first TCU-continuation in this exemplar was

executed. Firstly, as will be shown, a TCU-continuation can also be utilized to provide a second TRP for a different recipient from the one selected at first TRP (or at possible completion of host-TCU), as opposed to “pursuing” the original recipient due to lack of uptake. Secondly, we can analyzably see such an orientation to “re-do” the turn for another recipient in the visible gaze shift of the speaker, done in concert with the TCU-continuation, thus mutually elaborating who and for what purpose the TCU-continuation is addressed to (c.f. see Goodwin 1979). The illustration of this exemplar also highlights the consequential nature of a multi-party participation framework on the organization of talk-in-interaction, namely the work speakers have to do to engage and maintain multiple participants within a single conversational framework.

In Ex.(57) below (next page), we return again to the lunch-time conversation between Jun, Lin and Hao, previously shown in Ex.(43) and (47). However, this segment of the talk occurred much later in the conversation, where the topic has turned from taste preferences in food to prototypical Chinese male behavior. Before line 01 of the following extract, the participants were relating to each other (mostly between Hao and Lin) various personality flaws they have seen in their family members. In particular, Lin started to talk about how his father would sometimes flare up at trivial matters, causing her mom certain distress. Line 01 then begins with Hao asking Lin if she thinks males from North-east China (dongbei) have some sort of collective character.

---

110 The term “securing” recipient’s uptake is hence proposed instead of “pursuing”, due to the change in selected recipient. However, as later analyzed, the speaker in Ex.(57) may also be “pursuing”, in the sense that what was originally meant for one recipient changes to another recipient mid-way into the production of the host-TCU, and the TCU-continuation then switches back to the original recipient at the onset of the turn.

111 Lin hails from North-east China.
Ex.(57) Glue-ons (NTU-1 [26:47-27:35])

01 Hao: 读. 东北-东北(·)男人会～有没有
02 一种:集体性格.
03 (0.5)
04 Lin: >我觉得<我爸::反正他从来不干家务.
05 Jun: 是吗.
06 Lin: 对. 就我妈::手割破了. (0.2) 然后跟我爸说
07 哎呀这两天你擦地吧.
08 然后我[ 妈也· 也不动· ]
09 Hao: [ 任何的家务都不干 ]啊.
10 (0.6)
11 Lin: 很少. 你必须得要::告诉他(一声,) 今天你必须
12 得干这个了.<因为我干不了.<或者>怎么样<.
13 <或者这个[ 东西( )
14 Hao: [ 做饭.洗衣服.收拾房子.买菜:.]
15 (0.2)
16 Lin: 菜他会被:有的时候我妈要他买.
17 他买回来的.
18 (1.3)
19 Lin: 就: (0.5) 就-就这个比如说 hhh err 然后告诉我了
20 他说啊行.我擦 hh 后来他也不会擦. (·) 然后
21 最后我妈会戴上-胶皮手套.
22 Jun: 唉=
23 Lin: ≠擦<你知道吗. .hhh
24 (·)
26 (0.4) tsk 自己(·)不对啊.或者怎么样.
27 Hao: 噢.
28 (·)
29 Jun: 嗯. ((clears throat))

01 Hao: ei. dongbei- dongbei (·) nan ren h-you mei you
INJ northeast northeast male person have NEG have
Oh... Do men from Northeast (China) have

02 yi zho:ng ji ti xing ge.
one CL collective character
a type of character collectively?

03 (0.5)

04 Lin: >wo jue< wo ba:: fanzheng ta cong l'ai bu gan jia wu
1SG feel 1SG father anyway 3SG always NEG do house work
I think my dad... anyway he will never do any household chores.

05 Jun: shi ma.
be QP
Is that so?

06 Lin: duí. jíu wo ma:: shou ge po le. (0.2) ranhou gen wo ba shuo
right. DM 1SG mother hand cut broke CRS. then with 1SG father say
Yes. Like if my mom cut her hand, and then tells my dad,
aiya zhe liang tian ni ca di ba.
INJ this two day 2SG wipe floor SFP
“Hey… Why don’t you mop the floor for these two days.”

ranhou wo [ ma ye- ye bu dong ]
then 1SG [mother also- also NEG move]
and my [mom will also not budge.]

[any GEN house work all NEG do] SFP
[(He) wouldn’t do any household chores] at all?

(0.6)

Lin: hen shao. ni bixu dei ya:o- gaosu ta (yi sheng.) jintian ni bixu
very little. 2SG must need want- tell 3SG (one voice). today 2SG must
Very little. You have to tell him specifically… “Today you must
dei gan zhe ge le.<yinwei wo gan bu liao.<huozhe >zenme zenme yang<.
must do this CL CRS.<because 1SG do NEG CRS.<or >how how appearance<.
do this.<Because I can’t do it.” Or do something (to move him).

<huozhe zhe ge [dongxi ( )]
<or this CL [thing
Or (say) this [thing…

Hao: [zuo fan. xi yifu. shoushi fangzi. mai ca:i.
[do rice. wash clothes. arrange house. buy grocery.
[(What about) cooking, washing, cleaning
or buying grocery?

(0.2)

Lin: mai cai ta hu:i you de shihou wo ma yao ta mai.
buy food 3SG will have GEN period 1SG other want 3SG buy.
He’ll buy grocery sometimes when my mom wants him to.

ta mai hui-lai de.
3SG buy return-COM GEN
He’ll buy it back.

(1.3)

Lin: jiu: (0.5) ji-jiu zhe ge biru shuo hhh err ranhou qa:osu ta le
DM (0.5) DM this example say hhh err then tell 3SG CRS
And… and for example…err when he’s been told (to mop the floor),
ta shuo a xing. wo ca. hh houlai ta ye bu hui ca. (.) ranhou
3SG say INJ okay 1SG wipe hh then 3SG also NEG will wipe (. ) then
and he said okay, “I’ll mop (it)”, but then he’ll not do it, and
zuihou wo ma hui dai-shang- jiaopi shoutao.
last 1SG mother will wear-COM rubber gloves.
in the end my mom will put on her rubber gloves.
Hao’s question from lines 01-02 elicits a response from Lin at line 04 after half a second gap at line 03. Lin’s response, however, does not directly answer Hao’s questions, but provides a characteristic of her father (“conglai bu gan jia wu (never do any household chores)”) prototypical of men from Northeast China. From the video recording, it can also be seen that although Hao asked the question, Lin’s gaze shifts from Hao to Jun by the end of line 04. Hence at line 05, Jun acknowledges this by saying “shi ma (Is that so?)”. It is debatable if this line by Jun constitutes a genuine request for further verification, or if it is simply a display of token acknowledgement. In any case, this leads to Lin continuing to provide an extended multi-turn instance of her father’s misdemeanor that starts from line 06, and ending at line 23. Interspersed within these lines, however, are attempts by Hao to interrupt the story-telling with “challenges”
to the absolute-ness of Lin’s statement at line 04 (as seen in line 09 and line 14); and Lin’s answers at lines 11-13 and lines 16-17. Lin begins her example from lines 06-08 by recounting an instance when her mom accidentally cut her own hand and then requested her dad to do the mopping for a couple of days. But as Lin moves into relating how her mom would wait for her dad to do the required work at line 08 ("my mom will also not budge"), Hao cuts in at line 09 casting doubt on Lin’s original unqualified statement at line 04, specifically on the complete disavowal of her dad doing any household chores at all, seen particularly in his use of "re:nhe (any)" and the all-inclusive adverb "dou (all)" in formulating line 09. Lin then backdown minimally from her original assertion at lines 11-13 after another gap at line 10, conceding that her dad does very little (hen shao), and even that is also contingent upon strict and detailed instructions to do the necessary work. But before Lin comes to possible completion at line 13, Hao again interrupts at line 14 by listing a number of common household chores “zuo fan. xi yifu. shoushi fangzi. mai ca:i. (cooking, washing, cleaning, buying grocery)” while gazing at Lin and counting off the items with his fingers. The action of listing household chores at this sequential juncture is interestingly hearable as a continual challenge to Lin’s statement that her dad does very little household chores, as it specifically asks Lin to verify that her dad does none of the listed items. At lines 16-17, Lin understands Hao’s listing utterance as such, and provides further concession that her dad do sometimes buy groceries for the family if her mom dictates him to do so. This time, Hao appears to have finally accepted Lin’s characterization of her father by distinctly nodding his head. Perhaps due to having been interrupted twice, Lin also maintains her gaze on Hao well after he completes his nodding gesture perhaps in anticipation of further queries, resulting in the long gap of silence at line 18. Seeing that no further query is
forthcoming, Lin then returns at lines 19-23 to continue her unfinished story from line 08.

The focal TCU-continuations in this exemplar occur in line 23. From lines 19-20, Lin first re-enacts the prior unfinished scenario where her mom will requests for help, and her dad will verbally agree with “wo ca (I’ll mop it)”. But as Lin explains, her dad will not actually do the job (houlai ta ye bu hui ca). This leads to line 21 and 23, in which Lin describes her mom eventually giving in by putting on a rubber glove to finish the chore. Lin’s formulation of this description, however, comes in two parts, a host-TCU “zuihou wo ma hui dai-shang- jiaopi shoutao (in the end my mom will put on her rubber gloves)” at line 21, and the first TCU-continuation “ca (mop)” at line 23 respectively. It is further observed that the end of “jiaopi shoutao (rubber gloves)” is oriented to by Jun as a possible completion point, as he responds with an acknowledgement token “en (CFM)” at line 22. As for the linguistic features of this first TCU-continuation, it also exhibits prototypical features such as being pragmatically dependent and prosodically in subordinate intonation. Furthermore, the serial verb construction common in Chinese grammar is utilized here to index syntactic continuity, where the first verbal phrase “dai-shang- jiaopi shoutao (put on her rubber gloves)” is followed by a second verbal phrase “ca (mop)” indicating the temporal sequence of physical action, thereby making the TCU-continuation an instance of a Glue-on.

We now turn towards an analysis of the TCU-continuation’s interactional function in this exemplar. As it turns out, what is being visibly displayed before, during and after the production of the TCU-continuation is consequential to the analysis of what the TCU-continuation is interactionally doing. Visual cues, specifically the speaker’s gaze, turns out to be crucially relevant in understanding how the practice of TCU-continuation can be utilized in
tandem with gaze to provide another TRP for recipient(s) to do uptake. During the onset of the focal TCU “zuihou wo ma hui dai-shang- (in the end my mom will put on)” and before its possible completion, the speaker’s (Lin) gaze can be seen to be fixed on Hao, selecting him to be principal recipient of her talk. However, Hao is NOT ready to be a reified participant to the ongoing talk, as his gaze and displayed posture shows him to be engaged in picking up food from the table (see Figure (6a) below).

From the transcript and recording, it can also be observed that Lin produces a vocalization that sounded like a slight cut-off, immediately after “dai-shang (put on)” came out in the clear. This slight perturbation is another reflection of Lin realizing a problem of proper recipiency, as she shifts her gaze towards Jun, the only other co-participant in the conversation, in search of another recipient. Therefore, as Hao is not sufficiently engaged to be a proper recipient to Lin’s ongoing talk, Jun is then selected to be the recipient as Lin comes to the first possible completion of the
host-TCU after “jiaopi shoutao (rubber gloves)”. From peripheral vision, Jun is able to recognize Lin’s gaze to be selecting him as recipient of her possibly complete turn, and duly notes such possible completion with a confirmation token “en (CFM)” at line 22 (See Figure (6b) below).

Having secured Jun’s response as displaying attentive-ness to her talk, Lin nonetheless then quickly latches on to the end of Jun’s token response to produce the Glue-on “ca (mop)” as she shifts her gaze back towards Hao. This visible embodiment of selecting Hao as another recipient before an upcoming second possible completion at the end of the TCU-continuation, shows that the speaker (Lin) is oriented to using the practice of TCU-continuation to provide another TRP (or in a sense, re-doing the host-TCU) for a recipient (i.e. Hao) other than the one selected at the initial TRP (i.e. Jun). It is also noteworthy that immediately after the TCU-continuation, Lin attempts to further pursue uptake from Hao by latching on with another Glue-on, this time in the form of a tag question “ni zhida ma (y’know?)”. However, even with the provision of multiple
opportunities to respond, it can be seen that Hao is still engaged with food selection and not ready to be reified participant to Lin’s talk (see Figure (6c) below).

After further non-uptake by Hao at line 24, Lin continues the story from lines 25-26 with further explication of what happened after her mom gave in to do the mopping herself, namely her dad feeling “belated” guilt. From the video recording, Hao is seen to be finally turning to face Lin in the middle of line 25, hence his long-awaited acknowledgment token is eventually delivered at line 27, followed by Jun’s at line 29.

As a summary, the above video analysis has amply demonstrated that another possible interactional function of TCU-continuation is to provide a second transition relevance place (TRP), after an initial TRP at possible completion of the host-TCU, for a recipient to display uptake. While previous studies on TCU-continuations have recurrently noted such function under the heading of “pursuing recipient’s uptake”, what appears different here in our exemplar is that
the first TCU-continuation here is used to secure uptake from a different recipient to the one selected at initial TRP (i.e. possible completion of host-TCU), and a second TCU-continuation then pursues uptake from the recipient selected (by gaze) in the first TCU-continuation. Hence, the introduction of the term “securing recipient’s uptake” aims to capture this sense of a new recipient, instead of pursuing one that has already been selected before. From another perspective, “pursuing recipient’s uptake” might also be an apt description in this exemplar as Hao began as the principal recipient of Lin’s talk on the onset of the TCU at line 21. That Lin chose to do a TCU-continuation as she gazes back at Hao may have to do with recognizing Hao as being the original recipient of her talk, who is simply ill-disposed to be a proper recipient during the progression of the TCU, leading to Lin making multiple attempts at re-engaging him into the participation framework. Regardless, the function of the TCU-continuation in Ex.(57) is clearly addressed to an interactional contingency of face-to-face conversation, namely the concern for proper recipiency at possible completion of a TCU.

4.6. Discussion

This chapter attempts to identify some key interactional functions that speakers work towards achieving in producing TCU-continuations. As shown, the types of function Chinese TCU-continuations can realize ranges from the more common downgrading/qualifying or upgrading/intensifying prior stances, and clarifying/disambiguating understanding of the host-TCU; to less common functions such as reformatting/reformulating the sequential action and securing/pursuing recipient’s uptake. These described interactional functions are, of course, not exhaustive of the type of work that TCU-continuations may be employed to do. Finer objectives
may be achieved with a particular TCU-continuation while “riding on the back” of more generic functions, such as in Ex.(50a) where clarifying a pronoun referent with “ni laogong (your husband)” can also work to build solidarity with the interlocutor. Our survey simply represents the most frequent, discernible and aggregated functions of TCU-continuations analyzable from our collection.

More interestingly, while adverbials in the form of Insertables may be the most germane type of grammatical constituent used to achieve modification of stances, such an interactional function is nonetheless not exclusively realized by adverbials and/or Insertables. Unattached noun phrases (NPs) and other sorts of compound lexical items in the form of Replacements, Glue-ons or Free Constituents have also been found to modify stances as TCU-continuations. Another common function is attaching a TCU-continuation to clarify or disambiguate an otherwise unclear host-TCU. Here, nominal phrases in the form of Replacements or Free Constituents seem to be the constituent most “fitted” to do clarifying/disambiguating, but again, other forms such as Glue-ons and Insertables with noun phrases, conditional phrases and even verb phrases, have been found to be able to accomplish clarifying/disambiguating as well. Another previously undocumented function is to reformat/reformulate the original action in the host-TCU with a TCU-continuation. This was shown to be pursued with a clausal phrase Glue-on or a conjunct Insertable in our exemplars. Finally, Chinese TCU-continuation may also be used to resolve para-language complications, such as securing/pursuing recipient’s uptake, previously demonstrated with consecutive Glue-ons using a verb and a tag question. A key insight from these analytic descriptions is: **while there may be preferential types of constituents or TCU-**
continuations for the accomplishment of certain interactional functions\textsuperscript{112}, there is no exclusive one-to-one form-function relationship to strictly adhere to.

In sum, care has been taken to present a range of exemplars that show different types of TCU-continuations (\textit{Insertables}, \textit{Replacements}, \textit{Glue-ons} and \textit{Free Constituents}) using different constituents (Adverbials, nominal phrases, verb phrases, full clauses and compound phrases), and in different positions (next beat, post gap, and post-other-talk TCU-continuations), achieving different functions. A conclusion reached, as seen in the juxtaposition of these factors, is that certain types of TCU-continuation may be \textit{more readily accessible} to be produced to achieve certain interactional functions. But should the contingencies of moment-by-moment talk-in-interaction necessitate retroactive operations in a structural environment where the “preferential” type is unavailable, other “less-prototypical” forms of TCU-continuations may also be recruited to achieve the needed interactional function. Retroactive operations using TCU-continuations is then an \textit{emergent} phenomena borne out of interactional necessity, and is not easily reducible to rigid lexico-semantic or lexico-syntactic regulations.

\textsuperscript{112} By preferential, we mean to highlight how some constituents are, by definition, semantically more apt at instantiating certain functions. For instance, adverbials are by default elements that modifies the verb in a certain way, and therefore it is unsurprising that “re-inserted” adverbials will constitute a “preferential” category for retroactive modification of stances. Similarly, as nominal arguments can be easily re-cast with a noun phrase \textit{Replacement}, or specified with a Unattached NP (\textit{Free Constituent}), these constituents will naturally be used to do clarifying/disambiguating.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

As a summary, TCU-continuations are necessary resources to address contingencies of natural talk-in-interaction. They are appended elements that can analyzably be seen as absent from the speaker’s original formulation of the host-TCU, and are hence retroactive operations. It is only at or after possible completion of the host-TCU; or after being prompted by talk-by-others, or by the absence of talk-by-others, that speaker produces an additional element interpretable as acting retrospectively, to address deficiencies of recipient-design or other interactive contingencies. Interestingly, while many exemplars in other studies focus on instances of post-gap or post-other-talk TCU-continuations (or ‘increments’), the overwhelming majority of Chinese TCU-continuations are produced as ‘rush-throughs’ or in the next beat after possible completion. In these TCUs, we often find that speakers tend to quickly produce information that is new, crucial, or pertinent to the progressivity of talk first, before realizing that additional elements may be necessary for the recipient to achieve adequate understanding.

A core argument stands out in chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation, namely the form that TCU-continuations may take is closely interconnected with the grammatical (including phonological) structures of the language used. From the detailed examination of Chinese TCU-continuations, it is clear how ‘continuations’ may be formulated is heavily dependent upon the linguistic resources afforded by the language. As a tonal language, Chinese seems to draw upon prosody as a linguistic resource more readily than other languages, not only in disambiguating lexical words, but also in the formulation of possible TCU completion and TCU-continuations. By ubiquitously using subordinate intonation as the defining feature of TCU-
continuations, grammatically “unfitted” elements may also be seen as ‘continuing’ the prior talk. In other words, though TCU-continuations may be a generic practice, what TCU-continuations look like, is fundamentally a language-specific question. This is also evident when working out the distribution of Chinese TCU-continuations in terms of Insertables, Replacements, Non-addons, Glue-ons and Free Constituents (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007), where it is observed that both syntactically continuous and discontinuous elements can be abundantly found as ‘continuations’, as structurally provided for in the grammar of Mandarin Chinese. Favored constituents for retroactive operations (such as various forms of adverbials), ‘right-headed syntax’, pro-drop, topic-comment constructions and other grammatical structures can interplay in complex ways for TCU-continuations to emerge as syntactically continuous or discontinuous. In the end, a more productive construe may simply be to see categories of TCU-continuations as non-discrete labels on a continuum of further talk that can be produced to be more or less “connected” with the prior TCU, based not only on a dichotomy of syntactic continuity, but also on other linguistic (or paralinguistic) specifications of prosody, semantics and pragmatics.

Turning to the question of what TCU-continuations can do in chapter 4, we contend as well that the possibilities may be as dynamic as each different sequential context of talk allows. Yet, on a more generic level of interactional functions, most TCU-continuations may be seen to be modifying some form of speaker’s stance conveyed in the host-TCU, either downgrading/ qualifying or upgrading/intensifying such stances. Another frequent function of TCU- continuations is to do clarifying/disambiguating of how the host-TCU may be understood. Reformatting/Reformulating the sequential action of the host-TCU through TCU-continuations is a less-known utility that we have explored. Finally, the well-documented function of securing/
pursuing recipient’s uptake was discussed, while also highlighting that this function of TCU-continuations may be often times be a second-order operation of some more *prima facie* functions. While some functions are predominantly carried out by certain type(s) of constituent or category of TCU-continuation, exemplars have been carefully selected throughout the chapter to illustrate how non-preferential types of TCU-continuations can also be employed to do all kinds of interactional functions. Thus **there are no exclusive one-to-one form-function relationships in TCU-continuations**. What this means is that speakers are not constrained to use TCU-continuations as fixed or pre-fabricated units of semiotic resources; instead, at relevant points after possible completion, speakers ‘concoct’ the most apropos morpheme, word, phrase or clause as ‘continuations’ to address the contingency at hand.

The findings on Chinese TCU-continuations have implications for some principles of conversation, as well as language and communication more generally. To conclude the study, three such areas of significance are discussed: (1) the relationship between TCU-continuations and conversational repair, or more specifically, transition-space repair; (2) how the formulation of TCU-continuations relates to the preference for progressivity in talk-in-interaction; and (3) how the systematic practice of TCU-continuations exemplifies principles of Emergent Grammar.

5.1. **TCU-continuations and Repair**

At the beginning of the dissertation, we alluded to the relationship between TCU-continuations and conversational *repair*. To recall, *repair* refers to the well-documented phenomenon in conversation analytic (CA) literature (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977; Schegloff 1979; Zhang 1999; Kitzinger 2013) where speakers utilizes “the set of practices
whereby a co-interactant interrupts the ongoing course of action to attend to possible trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding the talk”\textsuperscript{113}. Such practices are overwhelmingly self-initiated by the speaker and occur within the same TCU as the “trouble-source” or “repairable” element, but may also be other-initiated and have the repair solution carried out in later turns.

One type of repair that closely resembles TCU-continuations is the organization of repair at transition-relevance place (TRP) termed transition-space repair. Firstly, both phenomena are clearly implemented in the interactionally sensitive position of post-possible completion, where speaker transition becomes a relevant concern for all co-interactants. Secondly, both TCU-continuations and repair, in a broad sense, do perform some form of retroactive work to modify preceding talk. Indeed, as previously mentioned, Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) consider Replacements to be a “subcategory of same-turn self-repair”\textsuperscript{114}. Some have opined that “right dislocated constructions (i.e. syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations) cannot by any means be reduced to a (self) repair mechanism”\textsuperscript{115}, purportedly because these elements do other more prospective work such as providing a second TRP for pursuit of recipient responses. However, it was previously argued that there are no analytic or classificatory merits in strictly delineating TCU-continuations to be doing one job or the other. One could simply see more “repair-like” base operations (such as Replacements) as the vehicle with which more “non-repair-like” functions (such as pursuing recipient’s uptake) are carried out. This point has been well-exemplified in Drew (1997) where it is shown that the organization of repair (e.g. ‘open-class’ repair initiators) can be used to address interactional problems other than a literal lack of ‘understanding’ in the prior turn, and that trouble-sources can be “sequential

\textsuperscript{113} Kitzinger (2013), pp. 229.
\textsuperscript{114} Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007), pp. 519.
\textsuperscript{115} Pekarek Doehler (2011), pp.69. With my own comments in bold.
rather than sentential/utterance-based\textsuperscript{116}. Thus, the notion of \textit{Repair} can and should be liberally viewed to incorporate all kinds of retroactive operations on the prior utterance. Thirdly, there is a huge degree of overlap in terms of the \textit{prima facie} operations that TCU-continuations and (self) repair impose on its preceding talk. While there are “no systematic study of transition-space repairs based on a substantial collection of cases”\textsuperscript{117}, Schegloff (2013) has categorized “same-turn self-repairs” into a few core “operations”, including “inserting” (cf. \textit{Insertables}), “replacing” (cf. \textit{Replacements}), “recycling” (cf. \textit{Repetitions}) and “reformatting” (cf. reformatting/reformulating the sequential action). Hence, there are analytic merits in seeing all TCU-continuations broadly as a form of transition-space repair.

On the other hand, the established “technology” or “mechanics” that are abundantly found in the delivery of self-repair is conspicuously missing in our collection of TCU-continuations. In self-repair, the repair segment typically consists of “a repair \textit{initiation}, marking possible disjunction with the immediately preceding talk, and a repair \textit{outcome} - whether solution or abandonment of the problem”\textsuperscript{118}. Such repair \textit{initiations} are commonly marked by \textit{cut-offs} and various other hitches in speaking, including \textit{sound stretches}, \textit{silences} and \textit{delaying} productions (e.g. ‘um’ or ‘uh(m)’), which alert recipients to the possibility of upcoming repair. Also common are repair \textit{prefaces} in the form of “well”, “I mean”, “no”, “or” etc., which overtly mark some trouble in the preceding talk. The repair \textit{outcome} itself also usually includes “\textit{frames}” for recipient to locate the repairable, or “reissued words or sounds that ‘frame’ the repair solution by repeating some of the talk around the trouble-source”\textsuperscript{119}. In short, the “technologies” of

\textsuperscript{116} Drew (1997), pp. 98.
\textsuperscript{117} Kitzinger (2013), pp. 255.
\textsuperscript{118} Schegloff (2000a), pp. 207.
\textsuperscript{119} Kitzinger (2013), pp. 239.
prototypical self-repair clearly work to bring attention to the act of repair, and saliently halts the progressivity of the on-going talk.

In the process of collecting Chinese TCU-continuations, clear instances of such repairs occurring in transition-space were observed. In the three exemplars in Ex.(58) below, before the repair solution is presented, some sort of repair-initiator is provided to mark upcoming repair.

**Ex.(58) Initiations in Transition-Space Repair**

**Ex.(58a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Lin:</td>
<td>ES-M-02</td>
<td>I was prepared to come back on the twenty-sixth but...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ranhou na tian mei mai-dao (ch-) ji-piao ma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But I failed to get a co-plane ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08⇒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[啊]不是&lt;sh-车票.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05 Lin: wo yuanlai zhunbei ershiliu hao huigu ranho:u
1SG original prepare twenty-six number return then
I was prepared to come back on the twenty-sixth but...

06 ranhou na tian mei mai-dao (ch-) ji-piao ma.
then DEM day NEG buy-reach (car-) plane-ticket SFP.
But I failed to get a co-plane ticket.

Ex.(58b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Lian:</td>
<td>ES-M-01</td>
<td>Then you’ll have to re-send (the email).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Chen:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04⇒</td>
<td>Lian:</td>
<td></td>
<td>[就是]说 hh 呢：到底你去还是不去。=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Lian:</td>
<td></td>
<td>na ni [dei (. ) gei] ta fu-fa.=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Chen:</td>
<td></td>
<td>DM 2SG [must give] 3SG again-sent.=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Chen:</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; DM [say ] INJ reach-bottom 2SG go or NEG go.=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I mean, ermm, to say whether you’ll be going or not.
Ex. (58c)  

03 Jian:  

你-觉得你还挺感兴趣吗。就是这(方面)。

you feel you’re still quite interested. I mean, in this area (of study).

In Ex. (58a), Lin had initially started with “ch-” that was projectably going for “che (car)”, but ended up with “ji-piao (plane ticket)” in line 06. She then replaces “ji-piao (plane ticket)” with “che-piao (coach ticket)” again in line 08 after a gap of silence in line 07. But before the candidate repair, Lin initiates it with multiple disfluencies in her talk, first with some form of delay in “a (INJ)“, then with the preface “bu shi (no)”, before doing a cut-off with “sh-“, all clearly indicating troubled talk. In Ex. (58b), Lian parenthesizes the content of “fu-fa (re-send (email))” in line 02 at line 04 with “dao-di ni qu haishi bu qu (whether you’ll be going or not)”, after initiating the repair with a preface “jiushi shuo (I mean)” and delayed with a sound stretch on “e:n (INJ)”. Lastly, in Ex. (58c), Jian does an insertion repair by providing the grammatical subject in the form of a deictic expression “zhe fangmian (this area)”, again initiated with the preface “jiushi (I mean)”.

Frames were also observed to be a common feature in bona fide Chinese transition-space repair. Notice that the candidate repair in line 08 of Ex. (58a) also includes the post-frame “piao (ticket)” that locates the trouble-source “ji-piao (plane ticket)” in line 06, and the transition-space repair replaces “ji (plane)” with “che (car)”. Schegloff, Sacks & Jefferson (1977) note that in the vast majority of same-turn transition-space self-initiation/self-repairs, “the trouble-locating is compacted into the repair-candidate itself, both being done by a single component”

exemplars in Ex.(59) below.

**Ex.(59) Frames in Transition-Space Repair**

**Ex.(59a) ES-M-01 [17:47-18:05]**

06 Lian: [那你不是说原来要联系]
07⇒ .hh 什么北京语言学校哇。
08 Chen: =我是 (.) [联系就说-]我就准备=
09⇒ Lian: [语言大学。]
10 Chen: =自己亲自到那儿去::.

06 Lian: [na ni bu shi shuo yuanlai yao lianxi]
DM 2SG NEG BE say original want contact
Didn’t you say you originally wanted to contact

07⇒ .hh shenme beijing yuyan xuexiao wa.=
what NM language school SFP.=
some Beijing language school?

08 Chen: =wo shi (.) [lianxi jiu shu-] wo jiu zhunbei=
=1SG BE- [contact DM say-] 1SG DM prepare=
I... by contact, I mean I’m prepared

09⇒ Lian: [yuyan daxue.]
[language college]
language college.

10 Chen: =ziji qingzi dao naer qu::.
=自personally reach there go.
to appear there in person, personally.

**Ex.(59b) ES-M-01 [16:23-16:30]**

01 Chen: 现在在::>好像<会喊妈妈。
02 (0.3)
03⇒ Chen: t-不喊爸爸。
04 (
05⇒ Chen: [喊妈妈。
06 Liang: [哦:::
07 ()
08 Liang: [是吗: [::?
09 Chen: [他- [恩他喊爸爸也喊妈妈。

01 Chen: xianzai za::i >haoxiang< hui han mama.
now at seems know shout mother
Now it seems he knows how to say “mummy”.

02 (0.3)
03⇒ Chen:  
  t- bu han baba.  
  NEG shout father  
  (He) doesn’t know how to say “daddy”.  

04  

05⇒ Chen:  
  han nainai.  
  shout grandmother  
  say “grandma”.  

06 Liang:  
  o::::.  
  CFM  
  Oh.....  

07  

08 Liang:  
  o [shi ma]:??  
  CFM BE QP  
  Oh... Is that so?  

09 Chen:  
  [t-]  
  en ta han baba ye han mama.  
  2SG AGR 2SG shout father also shout mother  
  He... Yea, he knows how to say “daddy” and also “mommy”.  

In Ex.(59a), Lian replaces “xuexiao (school)” line 07 with “daxue (university)” in line 09, pre-framed by “yuyan (language)” in both the trouble-source and the repair-candidate. In Ex.(59b), Chen misspoke in line 03 with “bu han baba ((He) doesn’t say ‘daddy’)” when she actually meant that the child does not know how to say ‘grandma’ yet. This was later rectified in line 05 by using the pre-frame “han (call)” followed by “nainai (grandma)”.  

What the exemplars in Ex.(58) and (59) demonstrate is that when genuine Chinese transition-space repair do occur at TRP, they are overtly marked as such by various forms of repair-initiators, or have the repair-candidate post-/pre-framed with some repeated element in the trouble-source. However, none of our identified Chinese TCU-continuations exhibit any of these features that expressly work to signal repair or possible trouble in talk. Further talk in the form of Insertables, Replacements, Glue-ons, Free-constituents, or even Non-add-ons do not avail
themselves to be ‘repairing’ any particular trouble-source in the host-TCU. Even when the “continuation” is seen to technically operate on certain constituents or omissions in the host-TCU (such as Insertables, Replacements or Repetitions), such targeted areas of operation are not “brought to the surface” with frames, but are left to the latent understanding of the recipient.\(^{121}\) On the contrary, the most pervasive prosodic features of Chinese TCU-continuations, such as rush-throughs and subordinate intonation, are geared towards suppressing any saliency that these “continuations” are, in fact, retroactive additions after possible completion. In the case of Glue-ons, contiguity is further supported with syntactic connected-ness between the TCU-continuation and its host-TCU. The distinction here is akin to doing one sort of repair “out in the open”, whereas the other repair is maximally “hidden” as ipso facto being a form of repair. In a sense, transition-space repair and TCU-continuation are “exposed” and embedded” forms of repair (Jefferson 1983) that may respectively occur at TRP. In charting future directions for the study of repair in the Handbook of Conversation Analysis\(^ {122}\), Kitzinger (2013) notes that “(s)peakers have ways of ’correcting’ or 'disambiguating' their own talk and that of others without invoking the technology of repair…… because there are interactional reasons to avoid drawing attention either to the trouble-source or to the correction of it”, and that “(t)he various ways in which people 'fix' possible trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding, while keeping it from rising to the surface of the talk as overt repair, deserve much more exploration”\(^ {123}\). It is proposed that TCU-continuations constitute one such regular and systematic practice of “embedded” repair in everyday conversation, though the

\(^{121}\) Replacements seem to be the most conspicuous of these operations that targets specific constituents in the preceding talk for modification. Perhaps it is due to this trait that Couper-Kuhlen & Ono (2007) singles out Replacements as a subcategory of same-turn self-repair.

\(^{122}\) Sidnell & Stivers (2013)

\(^{123}\) Kitzinger (2013), pp. 256.
resources with which such “embedded-ness” can be achieved differs from language to language (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007). As “post-possible completion is also one to the structurally provided and recurrently exploited positions for initiating repair”¹²⁴, the use of TCU-continuations to facilitate flow of talk (i.e. progressivity) at TRP, while simultaneously working to modify perceived inadequacies in the preceding talk, is argued to be a generic organization at work in all languages.

5.2. TCU-continuations and the Preference for Progressivity

A range of studies has shown that interactants are pervasively oriented to progressivity (i.e. “moving from some element to a hearably-next-one with nothing intervening”¹²⁵) in talk-in-interaction, both in terms of preserving a natural flow of speech (turn progressivity) and/or a trajectory of projected sequences (sequence progressivity). The preference for progressivity influences various aspects of conversation, ranging from speaker-selection, response formulation to, of course, how repairs are being done (Sacks 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Schegloff 1979, 2006, 2007; Heritage 2007; Stivers & Robinson 2006; Bolden 2011). While the “technologies” of same-turn self-repair clearly “intervene to interrupt the progressivity of the talk”¹²⁶; on the other hand, it can be argued that the preference for same-turn self-repair (Schegloff, Sacks & Jefferson 1977) is precisely in service of avoiding possible interactional trouble (e.g. ambiguities or possible disagreements) that may disrupt sequence progressivity in

¹²⁶ Schegloff (2013), pp. 43.
the next turn. Bolden (2011) has also shown how “other”-selection in other-initiation of repair may select co-participants other than the speaker of the trouble-source, in consideration of maintaining progressivity of talk. What this shows is that the principle of progressivity impacts upon the organization of repair in many ways, and it is argued that the preference for progressivity has also fundamentally shaped how and why TCU-continuations are being used.

For a start, it has been noted in the pioneering studies on repairs that the most common placement of repairs are, by far not in the transition-space (i.e. TRP) because there is “an interest in getting repair initiated in some same (current turn) and before next turn, in order to be methodically assured, will need to be initiated before the next possible completion of the sentence or other turn-constructional unit in which the trouble-source occurs.” In other words, the omni-relevance of speakership transition (and its corresponding interactional imports) at TRP places a “mechanical” pressure to avoid any sort of repair being done in transition-space, as it risk being overtaken or disrupted (e.g. overlap) by next speaker. Indeed, Schegloff (1979) deems transition-space as “not a fully reliable resource” for doing the work of repair. Nonetheless, the need to address potential interactional problems (stemming from a just completed utterance) may sometimes be realized only after possible completion point, necessitating some sort of reparative work be done before talk by the incipient next speaker. At this point, the “technologies” of TCU-continuations (a.k.a. “embedded” transition-space repair) instantiates how a preference for progressivity can organize this particular form of repair to maximally “circumvent” the contingencies of speaker transition.

127 Schegloff (1979) suggests that successive repairs on a repairable are ordered in a series which points to an orientation to progressivity, namely each repair has made progress toward a solution of the trouble being addressed. (pp. 278)
128 Schegloff (1979), pp. 269.
129 Schegloff (1979), pp. 269. (Footnote 12)
Firstly, as argued in the previous section, there are clear differences in the delivery of TCU-continuations from actual transition-space repairs. TCU-continuations are ubiquitously marked in Chinese with subordinate intonation (i.e. lack of pitch reset and/or lowered intensity), to obscure it from being perceived as “something new”; in comparison to a full repair segment (i.e. initiation and framing) which ostentatiously shouts out “repair!” to the recipient. Furthermore, although TCU-continuation can and do occurs after gaps of silences or after talk-by-others, a vastly larger number of TCU-continuations are produced as “rush-throughs”. The apparent structural preference is for TCU-continuations to be done as soon as possible, or in a way that minimizes the gap between the end of a possible completion and the start of a TCU-continuation, arguably to get the added segment of talk “inserted in” before imminent turn-transition takes place. Kitzinger (2013) also notes that “(s)ince the transition space is vulnerable to start-up from another speaker, repairs initiated in transition space are regularly started with audible haste”\textsuperscript{130}. In fact, Schegloff (1982), (1987), (1988), (1996a) and Ford & Thompson (1996) have all discussed “rush-through” specifically as a strategy for “avoiding completion even when syntax, intonation, and pragmatics conspire to signal it”\textsuperscript{131}. So much so TCU-continuations can even be produced as Non-add-ons, where the need to retroactively modify is realized early enough (after the onset of the utterance) that “rush-throughs” may possibly be done in a “through-produced” manner, thereby eliminating any semblance of there being a TRP before the added element. Both prevalent features of TCU-continuations are hence specifically designed to overcome prosodic “breakage”, and increase turn progressivity in the flow of talk.

\textsuperscript{130} Kitzinger (2013), pp. 246.
\textsuperscript{131} Ford & Thompson (1996), pp. 165.
Secondly, even when progressivity is impeded in other ways, TCU-continuations may be designed to overcome such disfluencies. As our discussion on syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations shows, syntactic “breakage” may be inevitable given the propensity to modify a just-complete utterance with adverbials in a “right-headed syntax” language. However, these syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations are regularly produced as “rush-throughs” and with subordinate intonation. Furthermore, while it may often be necessary to produce syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations (i.e. more disruptive profile) in Chinese, in cases where there are additional hitches to progressivity in the form of gaps of silences or talk-by-others, syntactically continuous TCU-continuations, or *Glue-ons* (i.e. less disruptive profile), are used to a much larger extent. The correlation between the use of *Glue-ons* and “continuations” after clear breakages in the flow of talk suggests some form of compensatory mechanism at work, by increasing syntactic contiguity when progressivity has already been lost via prosodic disfluencies. In other words, *while speakers may not be able to always formulate the least disruptive forms of TCU-continuations due to constraints of a grammatical (e.g. right-headed syntax leading to syntactic discontinuity) or interactional (e.g. lack of uptake leading to gap in talk) nature, there is still a progressivity-driven impetus to “balance” different linguistic parameters to create an overall less disruptive form.*

Thirdly, and statistically more important, we have found *very little actual instances of transition-space repair, as compared to the myriad varieties of TCU-continuations* that can be produced at TRP in the Chinese language. This numeric discrepancy strongly points towards a systematic preference to enact TCU-continuations over the more disruptive transition-space repair, a preference that is analyzably accounted for by a heightened orientation to progressivity,
at an interactional juncture teeming with uncertain contingencies brought on by possible speakership transition.

Finally, as with all other sorts of repair, the core ‘business’ of TCU-continuations is to address problems (initiated by self or others) in the preceding talk, such that sequence progressivity is not compromised. From modifying stances to clarifying/disambiguating to securing/pursuing recipient’s uptake, TCU-continuations are ostensibly used to either retroactively correct inadequacies in the host-TCU that may hamper intersubjectivity, or actively “bridge” gaps after possible completion. Thus, both in its ‘technology’ and purpose, TCU-continuations are geared towards the promotion of turn and sequence progressivity. In the end, the practice of TCU-continuations may have essentially developed from a preference for progressivity inherent in talk-in-interaction.

5.3. TCU-continuations as an Emergent Interactional Unit

Finally, some comments are in order on what TCU-continuations tell us about language and communication. Specifically, we would like to draw attention to how a theory of ‘grammar’ as postulated by Paul J. Hopper (1987, 1998, 2011a, 2011b), termed Emergent Grammar, is manifested by the phenomenon of TCU-continuations on multiple levels. Although Hopper has always maintained that grammar comes out of discourse and is a ‘social phenomenon’132, it was not till recently (Hopper 2011a, 2011b) that themes consistent with findings in conversation analysis and interactional linguistics (turn-taking, projectability, interactional practices, etc.) have been emphasized as core axioms in this updated view of language. A few foundational

tenets of Emergent Grammar will be outlined below, together with how the systematic practices of TCU-continuations are reflective of these principles of language.

(a) Temporality

“The initial premise of emergent grammar is that linguistic structure is a process that unfolds in real time. Emergent grammar therefore moves the focus of description to exemplifying the ongoing structuration of language as events of speech communication unfold.”\(^{133}\)

TCU-continuations expresses the temporality of natural spoken talk-in-interaction. Whether as an ‘afterthought’, or as the result of changing interactional contexts (i.e. projectably disaligned response requiring modification of stance, disengaged recipient calling for pursuit of uptake, etc.), TCU-continuations are added elements after a possible point of completion. It is only with temporality as the frame of reference can TCU-continuations be understood as a natural by-product of moment-by moment, unfolding talk produced by speakers in real time. By taking the temporality and dialogicity (Linell 2009) of interactive talk seriously, emergent grammar sees the structuration of language (i.e. how previously known linguistic structures, routines, and norms will have to be interactionally generated, traded down, and reconstructed) as a dynamic ongoing process, continually (re)sedimented by repeated but spontaneous usages in familiar social-cultural and interactional settings. TCU-continuations are thus one such regular practice governed by the temporality of talk-in-interaction.

\(^{133}\) Hopper (2011a), pp. 301
(b) Incrementality

“Oral discourses are built up out of increments, out of which structure emerges as an epiphenomenon... speakers and hearers are not seen as referring to anything fixed or preformulated, but rather to something improvised, loosely modeling their utterances on utterances previously used and heard, which thereby provide a potential model for other utterances.”

TCU-continuations are quintessentially incremental in nature (which is why TCU-continuations are also known as ‘increments’ in Schegloff’s (2004) terms). They can be morphemes, words, phrases or a full clause. However, TCU-continuations are incremental not only because they are always part of some preceding unit of talk; but because TCU-continuations are essentially extensions of talk that could have ended, and thereby are incrementally produced. Detailed analysis of TCU-continuations shows how these are units that are added on after speakers have projectably completed an utterance, that they are not pre-conceived before the act of production. In other words, the study of TCU-continuations have provided unequivocal empirical evidence that the final overall structure of an utterance cannot be pre-formulated before the act of speaking, but is determined moment-by-moment as “speakers create new structure by a process of incrementation, adding bits and pieces to the utterance”\(^{135}\). Using Hopper’s metaphor, language is “a kind of pastiche, pasted together in an improvised way out of ready-made elements”\(^{136}\).

\(^{134}\) Hopper (2011a), pp. 307.
\(^{135}\) Hopper (2011b), pp. 23.
\(^{136}\) Hopper (1987), pp. 144.
(c) Grammar is epiphenomenal

“Emergent grammar inverted this premise by placing the fact of interactive communication first and seeing structure as a secondary by-product of the interaction. Emergent grammar … postulate that grammar is not a priori at all, but is epiphenomenal to the primary fact of communication.” 137

That grammar is epiphenomenal (i.e. grammar comes out of discourse) has always been the central claim of emergent grammar. The propensity for Chinese speakers to frequently disregard normative syntactic ‘rules’ and retroactively append syntactically discontinuous TCU-continuations, is here seen as an emphatic demonstration of grammatical structure being epiphenomenal to the job of addressing interactional contingencies in actual language use. Generative grammarians will, of course, maintain that such asyntactic spoken phenomenon can still be accounted for via a deep underlying structure which surface as right-dislocation (RD). However, as both Pekarek Doehler (2011) and Lim (2012) have argued, RD and TCU-continuations (or ‘increments’) are one and the same phenomena. Crucially, the final overall structure of any ‘host-TCU + TCU-continuation’ (syntactically discontinuous or not) is analyzably not determined before onset of the turn, but the result of incrementation to achieve some discourse-functional objective.

(d) Emerging & Emergent

“Grammar is emergent because inferences are not rule-like or lexicon-like entities that are preformed and predetermined, and so the relationship between a projected inference and the form of an utterance is always a function of an interactive communicative situation.” 138

137 Hopper (2011a), pp. 304.
“Grammar at the conversational level is not inscribed in a permanent form, but is the result of spontaneously creating new combinations of forms.”

Although both forms and functions of Chinese TCU-continuations have undergone categorization in this study (as necessitated by any structured analysis), it bears to reiterate that no amount of effort can successfully circumscribe and “close the case” on all possible forms and functions of Chinese TCU-continuations. This is because TCU-continuations are emergent interactional units, in the sense that each instantiation of TCU-continuation is engaged in the process of either creating a new form/function, or re-creating a priorly-known form/function of retroactive operations. Three findings in this study are reflective of the emergent status of TCU-continuations; namely (i) that category boundaries between TCU-continuations can turn out to be permeable and/or ambiguous, (ii) that interactional functions can overlap and subtler functions have to be gloss over by generic labels, and (iii) that there are no fixed form to function relationship in TCU-continuations. In the end, while retroactive operations are a systematic and regular practice in conversation, the form taken by an emerging TCU-continuation is driven by the specific interactional contingency it is used to addressed, unconstrained by prior linguistic constructs or defined functions.

Hopper (2011b), pp. 32.
APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[ or [ ] overlapping or simultaneous talk

= a “latch” sign, that is, the second speaker follows the first with no discernible silence between them. When the latch sign is between utterances by the same speaker, it indicates that the speaker’s talk is continuous even though there is another speaker in between.

(0.5) length of silence between utterances in tenths of seconds

(.) micropause

? rising intonation, not necessarily a question

, continuing intonation

¿ the inverted question indicates a rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark

! exclamatory intonation

- a cut-off or self-interruption

< the less than symbol indicates that the immediately following talk is “jump-started,” i.e., sounds as if it starts with a rush

>= the combination of "more than" and "less than" symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.

<> markedly slowed or drawn out, compared to the surrounding talk

• following talk is markedly quiet or soft

268
↑↓  mark sharper rises or falls in pitch
:::  indicates prolongation or stretching of the preceding sound (the more colons the longer the stretching)
_:  Inflected falling intonation contour
:_  Inflected rising intonation contour
hhh  exhalation, hearble aspiration, or laughter, the more “h”s, the more aspiration
(hhh)  laughter inside the boundaries of a word
hhh  inhalation
Wo(h)d  plosive aspiration within a word, which may result from breathiness, crying, or laughter
word  Underlining indicates some form of stress or emphasis
WOrd  especially loud talk
(word)  uncertainty on the transcriber’s part
(  )  something is said, but unable to do minimal deciphering
(( ))  transcriber’s description of event
APPENDIX B

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE CHINESE GLOSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2/3 SG</td>
<td>first/second/third person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/3 PL</td>
<td>first/second/third person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agreement Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>the <em>ba</em> transitivity marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEI</td>
<td>the <em>bei</em> (and <em>gei</em>) ‘passive’ marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>Confirmation Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Current relevant state Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Verb complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Completion aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>Continuous aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Experiential aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive Case Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Proper Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Potential Complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Question Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>Sentence Final Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Sentence Initial Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Topic Marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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