On co-operative modalities in the formulation of Mandarin Chinese turn-continuations

Lim, Ni-Eng

2019

Lim, N.-E. (2019). On co-operative modalities in the formulation of Mandarin Chinese turn-continuations. In X. Li, & Y Ono (Eds.), *Multimodality in Chinese Interaction* (pp. 213-254). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783110462395-009

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/145804>

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110462395-009>

© 2019 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston. All rights reserved. This book is made available with permission of Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 19:28:02 SGT

Ni-Eng Lim

On co-operative modalities in the formulation of Mandarin Chinese turn-continuations

1 Introduction

There is now clear recognition that natural face-to-face interaction is essentially multimodal. Starting from the mid-1970s, the Goodwins (C. Goodwin 1979, 1980, 1981, 2003, 2007; M.H. Goodwin 1980) have consistently shown how gaze, as well as the rich semiotic structures of our material environment,¹ are vital for participation in social interaction. Streeck's work on gestures (1992, 1993, 1994, 2009) also brings into focus how gestures within embodied interaction are regularly coordinated as legitimate communicative devices in tandem with gaze and utterances, and can make projections of talk and action. In the professional workplace, Heath (1986), Heath and Luff (1992), Heath et al. (2002) and Mondada (2006, 2007, 2011) demonstrate how publicly available cultural objects (such as computers and maps) and embodied practices are finely coordinated to build interactional actions and achieve intersubjectivity in collaborative activities (Forceville & Urios-Aparisi 2009; Nuñez, Edwards & Matos 1999; Hidalgo-Downing & Mujic 2013).

But even in a singular modality, it can be seen that there exist multiple channels within that modality that can function as discrete semiotic resources. For instance, the visuospatial modality can be said to include channels such as gestures, facial expressions and body postures (Cienki 1998; Cienki & Müller 2008; Kappelhoff and Müller 2011, McNeill 2013; Hassemmer & Winter 2016). Stiver and

---

¹ By semiotic structure of our material environment, we refer to how our physical context, and the material things that exist within this environment, provides the necessary resources for speakers to utilize when structuring their talk. For instance, when issuing a command to "Go there!", the speaker may point at a particular direction. For adequate understanding of such a vocal command, a participant in the conversation may have to look at the speaker's gaze to establish himself as the proper recipient, use the pointing finger as a deictic tool, as well as locate an actual and viable physical destination in the general direction of the point. But the environment also includes the non-physical, such as what has been said before (c.f. sequential organization) or our socio-cultural understanding of situations, which are also integral to understanding others' talk as well as formulating our own turns-at-talk. In this sense then, what is available in our environment provides as well as restricts how we may be able to structure our talk. C. Goodwin (personal communication) likens this to be like a web of semiotic resources that speakers pluck from the immediate and situated environment to build actions.

Sidnell (2005) have also referred lexico-syntax and prosody as two channels in the vocal modality, each of which can perform distinct communicative functions. But others have simply referred to these channels as modalities themselves, such as Selting (2013) who take syntax, prosody and bodily-visual conducts to be part of the verbal, vocal and visual modalities, or Ford, Thompson, and Drake (2012) referring to any sort of bodily-visual behaviors as modalities. Here, we take multimodality broadly and simply to mean the various forms or ways in which information is encoded, and how action is formed through multiple semiotic resources, hence viewing these semiotic resources as modalities in and of themselves.

An important observation in face-to-face interaction is that various modalities are observed to be working in a highly integrated manner. Take for instance, the classic conversation analytic (CA) issue of how interactants are able to precisely time the start of their talk immediately after the end of the last turn. Various studies have all pointed out that *syntax*, *prosody*, *pragmatics* and *bodily-visual behaviors* work together to cue recipient of possible completion point of a turn, such that a next speaker can begin his/her turn with minimal gap (Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Oreström 1983; Wilson and Zimmerman 1986; Local and Kelly 1986; Ford, Fox, and Thompson 1996; Schegloff 1996; Ford and Thompson 1996; Fox 2001; Hayashi 2005; Mori and Hayashi 2006; Local and Walker 2012; Keevallik 2013; Li 2014). However, as noted by Stivers and Sidnell (2005) in their introduction to a special volume on multimodal interaction, “*relatively little is understood about how these two channels (prosodic and lexico-syntactic) work together*” (Stivers and Sidnell 2005: 4), and that “*(i)f we are to move towards a theory of social interaction, we will need to understand not only how the vocal modality works but how the different channels and modalities work together as well as the mechanics that underlie such co-operation*” (Stivers and Sidnell 2005: 15). This paper represents an effort towards furthering such an understanding by looking at a less explored sort of turn construction practice, that of extending a unit of talk within the turn after it has been marked as possibly complete by the speaker (or termed *turn-continuations*), and how different modalities may work cooperatively to such “continuations”.

In this report, I turn towards Mandarin Chinese (henceforth Chinese) interaction, and argue that such Chinese turn-continuations are also essentially multimodal (see also Ford, Thompson, and Drake 2012), but more importantly, how such interplay of modalities are organized in a structured and cooperative manner. Specifically, the crafting of further talk as “continuations”, as opposed to simply being a new turn-constructional unit (TCU), requires a complex (re) configuration between the syntax of Chinese grammar and its prosodic delivery. This is most persuasively demonstrated via two contrasting features of Chinese turn-continuations: (1) the interplay between syntactically discontinuous

constituents after possible completion, and the combination of prosodic cues (i.e. rush-throughs, lack of pitch reset, and declining intonation contour) that nonetheless marks it as “continuing”; and (2) the proliferation of syntactically continuous constituents as turn-continuation in cases where further talk comes after clear prosodic disjunction (such as a gap of silence, or after talk-by-others).

2 Cross-linguistic construction of turn-continuations

What exactly are turn-continuations? And how are they recognized by interlocutors of a particular language? In a nutshell, turn-continuations are units of talk that speakers “append” after the possible completion point of a TCU, that is not a new TCU in itself, but analyzably part of, and modifies, the just preceding utterance in some way. In their seminal paper on turn-taking, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) establish that turns are incrementally built out of successions of TCUs, where “each TCU is recognizable as a coherent and self-contained utterance, recognizable in context as being ‘possibly complete’” (Clayman 2013: 51)². By this, it means that a turn of talk may end after just a single TCU, or the speaker may build the turn using multiple TCUs. Regardless, the end of each TCU represents an opportunity for a next speaker to begin his/her turn, or when there is a lack of uptake, for the current speaker to issue another TCU. Thus the end of a TCU is also termed a transition-relevance place (henceforth TRP), where a change of turn becomes relevant. However, besides a next speaker beginning a new turn or the current speaker starting a new TCU, another possibility at TRP is the current speaker (or other co-participants) *fashions further talk as continuing from the preceding TCU* (i.e. turn-continuation).

In English, these “further talk” have been found to be most frequently administered by added units that syntactically “continues” the prior talk (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007), thus the term *increments* first posited by Schegloff (2016) to

---

² Though Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) (henceforth SSJ) has indicated that unit types (i.e. TCUs) in English “include sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical constructions (SSJ 1974: 702)”, this does not mean that TCUs are unilaterally defined through syntax as sentences, clauses, phrases and lexical items. This is because a core purpose of identifying turn-constructive units (TCUs) is to locate spaces within an utterance where a turn may have ended and a next speaker can come in. While syntactic completion (thereby making the unit seem coherent and self-contained) is one core indicator of such completion, SSJ also emphasize the importance of ‘sound production (i.e. phonology, intonation etc.)’ (SSJ 1974: 721) to how recipients monitor for possible completion, thereby making the operational definition of TCU more holistic.

describe one type of *post-possible completion* that constitute extensions to a TCU.³ Take for instance, Bee's account of her grandmother's medical condition in a telephone conversation where she produces not once, but twice, continuations after points of possible completion (Schegloff 2016: 240).

- (1) Bee: Becuz they're gonna do the operation on the teeuh duct.
f[fi: rs]t. Before they c'n do t[he cata]ract]s.
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 “*fffi:rs|t*”), 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. Here, the label *turn-continuations* will be adopted in place of *increments* to generically reference all types of “continuations”.

There are a variety of reasons why speakers produce “continuations”. One recurrent formulation is that turn-continuations are often deployed to pursue lack of recipient’s uptake (Heath 1984; Pomerantz 1984; Ford, Fox, and Thompson 2002). Schegloff (2016) demonstrates that other possibilities include intensifying an action, or termed *up-ing the ante* (Schegloff 2016: 243), backing down, projecting a telling, or even to convert inter-turn (or TCU) gap into intra-turn pause to eliminate possible negative resonances (Schegloff 2016: 244). How turn-continuations are formulated can be linked to its interactive function. As Schegloff (2016) suggested, the positioning of turn-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 turn-continuation is doing interactionally. However, the delivery of Chinese turn-continuations via multiple semiotic resources is the focus here, and a detailed explication of what they may be doing within interactional talk is beyond the scope of this paper.

3 Schegloff (1996: 90) acknowledges another type of post-possible completion that “do not represent extensions of the prior talk, but rather retrospective or retroactive alignments towards it”, termed ‘*post-completion stance markers*’. However, how these two types defer from each other (or if they defer at all) is debatable.

What is exemplified in Bee's successive turn-continuations shown in (1), is that syntactic continuity may be the modality that English speakers frequently, and perhaps most naturally, draw upon to denote turn-continuations. However, it has been found that there is a range of other linguistic (and non-linguistic) resources (i.e. different modalities) with which different languages can choreograph further talk in contrastive ways, yet similarly conveying a sense of "continuation" from a host-TCU (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007; Luke and Zhang 2007; Ford, Thompson, and Drake 2012). Cross-linguistic typological analysis has shown that different forms of turn-continuations do exist in other languages, and that the recognition of turn-continuations should be language-dependent, as "different languages provide different lexical, grammatical and prosodic resources for continuing turns at talk" (Vorreiter 2003: 4). That is to say, the narrow definition of "*increments*" (i.e. syntactically continuous segments after possible completion) is the result of an English language bias (Vorreiter 2003; Auer 2007; Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007). After comparing English, German and Japanese conversational data, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007) proposes a schema for distinguishing different forms of turn-continuations⁴ based on their syntactic, semantic and prosodic "relatedness" to the possibly complete prior talk. Although there is a body of literature on turn-continuations in Chinese, these studies by Chinese researchers (Lu 1980, Zhang 2001, Liang 2005, Zhou 2010) have almost exclusively been syntactically framed as "post-positioned elements" in the sentence (易位句 *yíwei jù*), and focuses on their information structure or phonological features. Valuable exceptions are Luke (2000, 2005) that takes talk-in-interaction as the starting point. Luke and Zhang (2007), using Chinese conversational data, also outline a schema where four interlocking strands may be used to identify "*increments*", namely: syntactic continuity vs. discontinuity, main vs. subordinate intonation, retrospective vs. prospective orientation, and information focus vs. non-focus. A natural extension of this understanding is that practices of turn-continuation is language-specific, and the types of modalities employed to do "continuation" would "have to take into account, not only prosody and semantics, but also action structure and pragmatics at large" (Auer 2007: 657). It is argued that syntactic continuity as a resource to denote turn-continuations 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 verb, adjective or nominal constituent. As such, it is unsurprising that the majority of Chinese turn-continuations are not necessarily syntactically fitted materials. How then do Chinese speakers formulate and recognize additional

---

4 In their paper, turn-continuations refers to the broad range of units of "further talk" that could occur after possible completion of a TCU, even including new TCUs.

talk at TRP, such that co-participants to the conversation understand them to be “continuations”, or be a part of, what has previously been a possibly complete TCU?

In the following sections, while I will be showing examples of Chinese turn-continuations. It is not the intention of this report to provide a typology or categorical list of how turn-continuations may be done,⁵ instead the aim is to illustrate how different modalities may be enlisted to index continuation in a structured, organized and co-operative manner.

3 Data

The data exemplified in this paper comes from both audio and video recordings of unscripted conversational Mandarin Chinese. Approximately 8 hours of video recordings, consisting of 15 sessions of two- or three-party face-to-face conversations, were collected from two sources. The first source of data consists of 11 video recordings of two-party face-to-face conversation in a recording studio. The participants were mostly Mainland Chinese graduate students, from various regions of China, all studying at a university in Hong Kong. Regardless of their diverse regional background, all the participants are native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. With only an instruction to engage in casual conversation, the participants were filmed doing unscripted Chinese conversation. The second source of data consists of 4 video recordings of three-party face-to-face conversation. Again, selected participants were Mainland Chinese graduate students from different regions of China, studying in a university in Singapore, and have native proficiency in Mandarin Chinese. The setting is largely lunchtime conversation, where the three participants were seated around a table having a casual conversation. A third source of data used to amass our collection of Chinese turn-continuations consists of 4 hours of audio recordings from 8 telephone conversations, primarily between two native speakers of Mandarin Chinese from Mainland China. These conversations were culled randomly from the CallFriend Mandarin Chinese-Mainland Dialect Corpus (www.talkbank.org), provided by the Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC) of the University of Pennsylvania. This corpus originally consisted of 60 unscripted telephone conversations, where Mainland Chinese graduate students in a U.S. university would call their family members back home. The decision to collect from both video and audio sources of data stems from how the presence (or the absence) of bodily-visual conducts may potentially contribute to the analysis of turn-continuations.

---

⁵ For a more thorough typological description of Chinese turn-continuations, interested readers may refer to Lim (2014).

The above 3 sources add up to approximately 12 hours of conversational data, forming our core corpus of data from which a collection of turn-continuations were identified and analyzed. The interactions in the collection were then transcribed based on the transcription system developed by Jefferson (2004). I have chosen to present my Chinese data in four lines transcripts. For each example, the first line contains standard Chinese orthography, with gross prosodic features marked using the Jefferson transcription system (See Appendix A for transcription conventions). A second line is followed where the Chinese utterances are romanized according to the Pinyin system and italicized. The Pinyin romanization are phonograms which allows for a more detailed marking of the prosodic features in the data, also using the Jefferson transcription system. Immediately following the Pinyin transcription, morpheme-by-morpheme glosses are provided in the third line (see Appendix B for abbreviation of linguistic components). In the fourth and last line, English translations of the Chinese are presented within single parenthesis. Finally, arrows (→) after the line numbers on the left side of the transcription point to focal TCUs or turns in the transcript.

4 Multi-modalities in constructing Chinese turn-continuations

Just as upcoming TRP in Chinese conversations may be projected via an amalgam of syntactic, prosodic, pragmatic and non-vocal features,⁶ how further talk is marked as not something “new”, but “continuing” from what has just been completed, can also be accomplished through multiple modalities. However, how different modalities are calibrated in any particular turn-continuation can defer case-by-case. Nonetheless there are statistically more dominant types of Chinese turn-continuations than others, whose features we will now describe.

4.1 Prosodic features of syntactically discontinuous turn-continuations

The predominant type of turn-continuations in our Chinese data are instances where the appended talk cannot be seen as being “syntactically fitted” with the

---

⁶ See Li (2014) for a detailed account of TRP projection and turn-taking in Chinese conversations.

just prior TCU (also see Lim 2014). This is, of course, in opposition to what Schegloff (2016) suggested, that is, continuation is done “most robustly by making it grammatically fitted to, or symbiotic with, that prior TCU, and, in particular, to its end (Schegloff 2016: 241)”. One crucial reason for this “syntactic discontinuity” is that adverbials of various sorts (e.g. to clarify time, location and topic; to qualify stances; to inject subjectivity) turns out to be a highly productive class of word(s) that Chinese speakers often append as “continuations”.⁷ A few examples are given below:

Ex.(2a) Singular Adverbs (NTU-1 [41:12-41:19])

Lin: 现在 没了 吧. 好像.
xianzai mei-le ba. haoxiang.
 now NEG-CMP SFP. **seem.**
 ‘Not anymore now. (it) seems.’

Ex.(2b) Prepositional Phrases (Graduate Dilemma [21:38-21:43])

Matt: 不 冷 啊. 在 这边.
bu leng a. zai zhebian.
 NEG cold SFP. **at DEM-side**
 ‘It’s not cold. over here.’

Ex.(2c) Adverbial Conjunctions (Graduate Dilemma [22:52-23:44])

Matt: 你- 啊 你- 比 我 早 一 年 买.
n- a ni- bi wo zao yi nian mai.
 2SG INJ 2SG compare 1SG early one year buy.
 <↓而且 是.
 <↓*erqie shi.*
 <↓**furthermore COP**
 ‘y- oh you bought it a year earlier than me. ↓as well.’

⁷ The semantics of adverbials seem to be most suited to accomplish the sort of interactional work that TCU-continuations do (i.e. retroactive modification of the just completed turn), and thus also seem to be the most prolific unit of TCU-continuations in other languages as well (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007).

Ex.(2d) Adverbial Disjuncts (NTU-2 [39:57])

Tao: 现在 哪里 看 啊. ↓请 问.
 xianzai nali kan a. ↓qing wen.
 now where-LOC see Q. ↓please ask.
 ‘Where to find that out. if I may ask.’

In the “normative” syntax of Chinese, various forms of adverbials (e.g. disjuncts, prepositional phrases, relative clauses) and other modifiers are usually placed *before (or to the left of)* the head verbal, adjective, or nominal element (i.e. right-headed syntax).⁸ For instance, the examples from Ex.(2a) to (2d) would normatively be *haoxiang xianzai mei-le ba*, *zai zhebian bu leng a*, *erqie shi ni bi wo zao yi nian mai* and *qing wen xianzai nali kan a* respectively, where the adverbials *haoxiang* ‘seem’, *zai zhebian* ‘at this side’, *erqie shi* ‘furthermore’ and *qing wen* ‘please ask’ would come before the main predicate. Therefore appending adverbials (as a turn-continuation) after a possibly complete predicate in Chinese often results in it being “grammatically unfitted” with the prior (Luke and Zhang 2007). In contrast, English syntax allows adverbials and prepositional phrases to be appended grammatically right after a just-completed sentence (i.e. *left-headed syntax*); take for instance, Bee’s consecutive TCU-continuations of “*first*” (time adverbial) and “*before they can do the cataracts*” (prepositional phrase) in (1). An important implication of this is that, due to the linguistic typology of Chinese grammar, it is often not possible for Chinese speakers doing turn-continuations to index “continuation” using syntax as a modality. Yet, Chinese speakers clearly do, and in fact frequently, break such syntactic “decorum” by extending a TCU with adverbials, or other kinds of syntactically discontinuous constituents.

Despite syntactic discontinuity, Chinese speakers are nonetheless able to index turn-continuations by producing the appended element with certain prosodic features, contextualizing it as “continuing” from the prior and not something new. To illustrate the role of prosody in indicating turn-continuation in Chinese, a TCU that comes to possible completion, and is subsequently appended with a turn-continuation, is shown in line 04 of Ex.(3). In a telephone conversation between two friends, Faye comments on the inconsequentiality of being a second author of an academic paper in her school at line 04. Our focal TCU is the second TCU of this turn.

⁸ Li and Thompson (1981: 172-183) and Lu (1999: 18-19). 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 (Li and Thompson 1981: 397-413).

Ex.(3) Graduate Dilemma [9:21-9:26]

03 Matt: 诶:. 好歹 试 一下 啊.

ei: hao-dai shi yi-xia a.

INJ. good-bad try one-CLF INJ

‘Oh... But (you) should try nonetheless.’

04 → Faye: 没用. 我们 那儿 第: 第 二 作者 都 不

meiyong. women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu

NEG-use. 1PL DEM rank rank two author all NEG

算. <↓现在.

suan. <↓xianzai.

count. <↓now.

‘It’s useless. Over here a second author is not even counted. now.’

05 (.)

06 Matt: 是 吗.

shi ma.

COP Q

‘Is that so?’

In the second TCU of line 04, after *women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan* ‘Over here a second author is not even counted’ comes to a possible turn completion, 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. As a time adverbial, *xianzai* cannot be seen as grammatically fitted with the prior, yet several features of this appended item marks it as being a “continuation” rather than a new TCU in and 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 necessarily retrospectively-oriented and dependent upon its host-TCU for semantic and pragmatic completeness. However, as we now know, by taking *xianzai* as a time adverbial placed at the end of the utterance to modify the host-TCU, there is a

Figure 1: Acoustic analysis of line 04 in Ex.(3).

marked syntactic discontinuity (Luke and Zhang 2007: 609–610) between *women naer di: di er zuozhe dou bu suan* and *xianzai*. As mentioned, the “normative” syntactic position of time adverbial in a Chinese clause is before the main verb. The point here is that the appended constituent of *xianzai*, as with many other frequent adverbial turn-continuations in Chinese, cannot be seen as “syntactically” continuing from the just-completed TCU.

Consequently, an alternative modality, namely prosody, is provided by the speaker for recognition of a syntactically discontinuous Chinese turn-continuation. Figure (1) is produced below with a focus on *xianzai* to illustrate how some of its prosodic qualities contribute to a reading of “continuation”. The 4-tiered graph (Figure 1) below is produced using the speech analysis software Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2016), providing the spectrogram, pitch trace (dotted line) and intensity (solid line), waveform, and a Pinyin transcription of the utterance. Subsequent acoustic graphs are shown in a similar fashion.

As can be seen, the production of *xianzai* is marked by a cluster of prosodic features which marks it as a “continuation”. The first would be the *lack of pitch reset* at the start of articulating *xianzai*, otherwise typically seen on the onset of new TCUs (Du Bois et al. 1993: 47). The initial syllable of new TCUs typically achieves a pitch peak that is contrastively higher than at the end of the last syllable in the preceding TCU. As a TCU progresses, its overall pitch contour can be seen to decline over the projected length of the TCU, such that a declination trend can be perceived (otherwise known as a declination unit [henceforth DU]).⁹ This declination of pitch is perceivable despite pitch fluctuations along the overall intonation contour of the TCU caused by individual syllabic tonal contours, or other intonational modifications denoting stances such as attitudes/emotions. Here, although a possible turn completion point has been reached at *suan* (exhibiting not only “turn-final” pitch characteristics, but also marked by the temporal extension on *suan*), the pitch trace in Figure 1 shows that the pitch onset of *xianzai* (at a peak of 166 Hz), is actually lower than the preceding syllable *suan* (at a peak of 223 Hz). Compare this with how the same speaker, Faye, begins her TCU with *women*, produced at a peak of 370 Hz. Also, the elongated syllable *suan* declines to a minimum pitch of 147 Hz around its end, which is also not much lower than the pitch peak of 166 Hz at the beginning of *xianzai*. In fact, taken in its entirety, the intonation contour of the host-TCU together with its turn-continuation *xianzai* can be seen to follow a downward declination trend, resembling a single DU.

⁹ Schuetzu-Coburn (1991); Du Bois et al. (1993); Tao (1996). Tao (1996: 48) defines DU as “a general declination trend (slope) describing the gradual fall in F_0 (fundamental frequency) over time during a period of speech”

Another phonetic characteristic of *xianzai* is that it is perceived to be *unstressed* (Figure 1). First of all, *xianzai* is produced with an extremely low pitch and becomes “creaky voice” (Figure 1). Also, *xianzai* is articulated with a *lower intensity* (i.e. loudness) than most other syllables in its host-TCU (Figure 1). These two prosodic features are part of what was figuratively termed “*subordinate intonation*” by Luke and Zhang (2007: 610–611), suggested to be an amalgamation of prosodic features which recipients orient to in recognizing upcoming Chinese turn-continuations.

A final notable phonetic feature of *xianzai* is that it is heard to be produced quickly after the closing of the prior syllable *suan*, or termed “*latching*” where there is no hearable beat of silence between two parts of a turn by the same speaker (Zhang 2012: 170). This is indicated with a “less than” symbol (<) before *xianzai* in Ex.(1). By latching onto the last syllable of the just-completed preceding TCU, the next bit of talk (i.e. turn-continuation) thereby minimizes the gap between turn-continuation and host-TCU. One obvious result of a “latched” production is that the current speaker is more likely to be able to implement a turn-continuation without having to compete with the onset of talk by next speaker.

While the lack of pitch reset, together with unstressed and latched production are common prosodic/phonetic features of syntactically discontinuous Chinese turn-continuations, this is not always the case. There are other variants of prosodic production on appended units of talk that can similarly be heard as “continuing” from the prior despite syntactic discontinuity. One such method is to have the turn-continuation produced as prosodically non-disjunctive (i.e. through-produced) from the host-TCU. This means that the syntactically discontinuous element and host-TCU is “in maximally close temporal proximity to each other”, and exhibits some similar features to “continuous voicing” (see Local & Walker 2004: 1394–1396). This is illustrated in Ex.(4) below, which shows a short segment from a sequence where Faye is 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.(4) Graduate Dilemma [19:31-19:37]

- 19 Matt: [那: 又- 又 不是 说 有- 有 什么 东西
           ne:i yo- you bushi shuo yo- you shenme dongxi
           DM also also NEG-COP say have have what thing
           可以 告诉
           keyi gaosu
           can tell
           ‘Then- it’s not as if there’s something you can tell’

20   他   呀.   [反正   也   没   东西.
               ta   ya.   [fanzheng   ye   mei   dongxi.
               3SG   SFP.   anyway   also   NEG   thing
               ‘him.   There’s nothing (to say) anyway.’

21 → Faye: [对   >因为<   查   不着   关键   是.
                                   [*dui   >yinwei<   cha   bu-zhao   **guanjian shi.***
                                   yes   >because<   check   NEG-CTP   **critical   COP.**
                                   ‘yea. Because (I) couldn’t find it, that’s the critical point.’

22   <我   不   知道   [哪:]   查   下去.
               wo   bu   zhidao   [na:]   cha   xia-qu.
               1SG   NEG   know   where   check   down-go
               ‘I don’t know where else to look (for it).’

23   Matt: [对 啊.]
                                   [*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 items *guanjian shi*, literally ‘the critical point is...’, produced at the end of the utterance. Firstly, *guanjian shi* is an adverbial 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. 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 (Luke and Zhang 2007: 611–612) 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’) (line 22), such a reading is prosodically impossible for the recipient. Figure 2 below provides an acoustic analysis of line 21 in Ex.(4).

Though syntactically and pragmatically complete, not only does *cha bu-zhao* end with a rising pitch movement, but its pitch contour continues seamlessly into *guanjian shi*. Though “continuous voicing” (Local & Walker 2004: 1394–1396) into the beginning of *guan* does not seem possible due to the initial voiceless consonant [g], there is still audibly a sustained voicing on the last vowel [u] of *zhao* right into the beginning of *guan*, resulting in very little pause between

Figure 2: Acoustic analysis of line 21 in Ex.(4).

the two syllable. This is indicated by the bracketed areas on the spectrogram and speech waveform in Figure 2. In other words, *guanjian shi* is a syntactically discontinuous constituent that is heard as being “through-produced” from the end of *cha bu-zhao* without any form of prosodic break. 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 anticipate 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 temporally extended *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 clear to the recipient that *guanjian shi* has been designed to be part of *cha bu-zhao* as a single TCU.

The prosodic profile of *guanjian shi* here is somewhat different from *xianzai* in Ex.(3). Firstly, as opposed to *xianzai* whose intensity is lower than the rest of its host-TCU, the intensity on *guanjian shi*, peaking at 74 dB, is quite comparable to its prior units where intensity peaked on *cha* and *zhao* at 79 dB and 77 dB respectively. Also, whereas there is a clear point of completion at the end of *suan* before *xianzai* is “latched” onto it, the production of *guanjian shi* is “through-produced” without a discernable break in the talk, much akin to a “rush-through”.¹⁰ Although the prosodic profile of *guanjian shi* is different from *xianzai*, the point here is that it is still a syntactically discontinuous element from the prior that is prosodically marked as a ‘continuation’, by virtue of being “through-produced”.

A third variant of prosodic production that marks “continuation” is shown in Ex.(5) below. A bit before the start of the example, Faye was enquiring about the status of Matt’s wife, and whether she was pursuing a master’s or doctoral program. Line 17 in the transcript begins after Matt confirms his wife as a master’s student.

Ex.(5) Graduate Dilemma [00:17-00:24]

- 17 Faye: hhh 那 快 啦 哦?
           hhh na kuai la o?
           hhh DM fast SFP SFP
           ‘It should be soon then?’

¹⁰ Different from the typical description of a *rush-through* though, the just prior syllable before completion here (i.e. *zhao*) is not compressed, but in fact temporally extended. For a concise discussion on the difference between *latching* and *rush-through*, see Zhang (2012: 169–172).

- 18 Matt: 呃:: 但愿 如此 吧.
e:: danyuan ruci ba.
 AGR hopefully resemble.this SFP
 ‘Yeah. Hopefully that’s the case.’

19 (.)

- 20 → Faye: z- 是 几 年 呢. <大概. (.) 两 年.
z- shi ji nian ne. <dagai. (.) liang nian.
 COP how.many year SFP. <approximately. (.) two year.
 ‘How many years should it be. approximately. Two years?’

21 (0.4)

- 22 Matt: 应该 两 年 吧.
yinggai liang nian ba.
 should two year SFP
 ‘Should be about two years.’

At focal line 20, Faye starts something but immediately abandons 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 master’s program (pursued by Matt’s wife). Audibly, the intonation of this TCU follows a general downwards declination cline, but ends with a slightly higher pitched syllable in *ne* (see Figure 3 below). Furthermore, the TCU ends with a sentence final particle *ne*, indexing strong syntactic closure, and hence marks a possible completion. A single adverb *dagai* ‘approximately’ then latches on to the end of the host-TCU, itself coming to a possible completion with a downward intonation contour. Similar to *guanjian shi* in Ex.(4), *dagai* ‘approximately’ is an adverb whose meaning is semantically dependent to some form of verbal element. Also similar is that positionally, *dagai* ‘approximately’ can either modify the next bit of talk *liang nian* ‘two years’ as a grammatically fitted constituent (line 20); or retroactively modify the earlier *shi ji nian ne* ‘How many years should it be’ as a syntactically discontinuous turn-continuation. But again, this is made unambiguous through prosodic cues, which only allows a reading of *dagai* as continuing from the prior unit, despite its syntactic discontinuity.

Different from *guanjian shi*, however, is that *dagai* is not “through-produced” but is latched onto *ne* (again indicated by the “less than” symbol [<]) after the clear possible completion of the prior unit. The phonetic features of *dagai* are illustrated in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Acoustic analysis of line 20 for Ex. (5).

As seen in Figure 3, though *dagai* is produced at an intensity (peaking at 68 dB on the first syllable *da*) higher than *shi ji nian ne* (where each syllable peaked at 60 dB, 58 dB, 52 dB and 63 dB respectively), it does not start off at a significantly higher pitch level than the end of the preceding TCU (i.e. *lack of pitch reset*). The peak pitch of *dagai* (at 231 Hz) though slightly higher than the peak pitch of *ne* (at 211 Hz), is still significantly lower than the beginning of the turn at *shi* (which peaked at 356 Hz). Furthermore, other prosodic indicators are sufficiently present to mark *dagai* as a bona fide turn-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 latching of *dagai* and its lack of pitch reset, still allows for the reading of a retrospectively oriented turn-continuation that “continues” from the prior though being a synthetically discontinuous constituent.

From Ex.(3) to Ex.(5), it can be seen that the use of prosody to index some elements as “continuing” in syntactically discontinuous Chinese turn-continuations is not strictly confined to specific prosodic parameters, but can be molded by the speaker to fit the situated context of talk. Nonetheless, what the above three extracts exemplify is that forms of prosody that clearly subjugates the appended constituent to its prior, is quite a ubiquitous feature in Chinese turn-continuations which are frequently syntactically discontinuous. In other words, for syntactically discontinuous Chinese turn-continuations, the modality of prosody is often seen to “operate” upon the appended element when the right-headed syntax of Chinese makes it difficult for “continuation” to be marked by the modality of syntax. It is also interesting that while most Chinese turn-continuations do have certain prosodic features in common (such as the lack of pitch reset, or having the turn-continuation and host-TCU produced to be maximally close to each other),¹¹ speakers do not orient to strictly marking all turn-continuations with such features as if it is a fundamental or defining criterion for doing “continuation” in Chinese. There are in fact cases where the appended constituents do not have any form of prosodic “continuation” at all, but are nonetheless analyzable as turn-continuations due to other semiotic resources, such as its sequential or grammatical context. This suggests that a speaker’s main concern when producing turn-continuations is to retroactively add meaningful bits of talk using whatever configuration of linguistic (or para-linguistic) modality that may signal it as further talk that continues from what has just preceded, rather than to follow some *a priori* structure. In the examples that we have just examined, this configuration involves the precise albeit flexible interplay between modalities of syntax and prosody. In other words,

11 Such as latching or being “through-produced”.

while the right-headed syntax of Chinese has *ab initio* led to usages of adverbials as turn-continuations to be syntactically discontinuous, Chinese speakers are routinely seen to utilize various forms of prosodic production to strengthen a reading of “continuing” from the prior. Hence, in a sense, it is the normative grammar of Chinese (i.e. right-headed syntax) that has led to speakers’ use of alternate modalities to signal interactional intent (i.e. continuation from the prior).

4.2 Syntactic features of prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations

From the previous sections, it is clear that prosody has been “recruited” as another modality by Chinese interlocutors to both index and recognize turn-continuations. Specifically, Chinese adverbials appended after possible completion are often marked with some form of “continuing” prosodic features, that characterize them as turn-continuations despite their syntactic discontinuity. One common feature is to have these units latched-on to the just-prior possibly complete TCU, minimizing the gap between host-TCU and turn-continuation, and thereby signaling their status as “belonging” to the prior. However, in certain interactional contexts, speakers may realize the need to add further talk only after a noticeable gap has occurred after possible completion. Indeed, the very occurrence of a gap in turn-transition could prompt speakers to pursue a relevant uptake from recipients by adding further talk, in effect providing another opportunity for turn-transition by re-completing the TCU. In other cases, further talk may be triggered by recipient’s talk after possible completion, resulting in a turn-continuation separated by the recipient’s turn at talk. As mentioned, these forms of turn-continuations have been labelled as “post-gap” or “post-other-talk” by Schegloff (2016).

Regardless, a clear consequence of producing “post-gap” or “post-other-talk” turn-continuations is their ostensible disjunction in prosodic production from its host-TCU. In other words, just as syntactic discontinuity is seen as a barrier towards recognizing turn-continuation, it is also difficult to see how a prosodically disjunctive unit can be part of a prior TCU. Yet, it is found that a majority of these prosodically disjunctive units are quite easily recognizable as turn-continuations in Chinese conversation. One reason for this is, of course, that many of these prosodically disjunctive units can still be produced with other prosodic features of “subordinate intonation” despite having a noticeable gap with the preceding TCU. But more interestingly, a majority of these prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations have been linearly appended to the prior TCU in a syntactically coherent way, thereby strongly marking them as “continuing”. Significantly, in our collection of Chinese turn-continuations that are syntactically continuous,

about 70% were instances where the appended unit was produced either after a gap of silence, or after talk-by-others; making it apparent that there is a correlation between the use of syntactically continuous turn-continuations and “continuing” utterances after clear breakages in the flow of talk.¹²

Naturally, for this to be a systematic practice, there must exist a sizable number of structural/grammatical environments in Chinese which *provide for* certain constituents or phrases produced after possible completion to be construed as syntactically continuous. Just as adverbials (and certain other constituents) appended after possible completion are seen to be syntactically discontinuous in a right-headed syntax language; there also has to be some constructions in Chinese where an utterance can first be seen to be syntactically complete, and then further talk still viably analyzed as being syntactically continuous. It is *through* these distinctive Chinese grammatical structures or constructions that various forms of prosodically disjunctive turn-continuation can still be construed as “grammatically fitted”, and thereby “continuing” from the prior. In this section, we will illustrate with four examples how Chinese speakers, though producing prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations, can nonetheless utilize certain grammatical structures to index continuity. As the focus here is on relevant grammatical structures in the Chinese language and not on the prosodic profile of the turn-continuation, detailed phonetic description of the appended constituent and corresponding Praat graphs will not be provided.

4.2.1 Serial verb construction

One syntactic environment of Chinese where prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations can frequently be produced in a syntactically continuous manner is the serial verb construction, where clausal phrases (VPs) may be structurally strung together without the need for conjunctions (Li and Thompson 1981: 594–622). Additionally, Chinese is also commonly known as a “pro-drop” language, where the subject noun phrase (NP_s) of a clausal sentence may be “dropped” or omitted provided that it can be found, traced and understood from the preceding context. Schematically the construction is seen as:

$$\{ \text{NP}_{s_1} + \text{VP}_1 + ((\text{NP}_{s_2}).\text{VP}_2) + ((\text{NP}_{s_3}).\text{VP}_3) \dots + ((\text{NP}_{s_n}).\text{VP}_n) \}$$

¹² Naturally, a more equitable way of doing this quantification would be to see how many prosodically disjunctive TCU-continuations are, in fact, syntactically continuous.

Given that follow-up clauses in Chinese (that have 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 syntactically continuous from the preceding TCU, via the serial verb construction framework. Ex.(6) below exemplifies such an instance of a prosodically disjunctive turn-continuation that is, nonetheless, syntactically continuous.

Ex.(6) ES-M-01 [10:39-10:43]

- 01 Chen: 他 喜欢 上学 哦.=
ta xihuan shangxue o.=
 2SG like attend-school SFP
 'He likes to go to school, huh?'
- 02 Lian: =喜欢.
 =xihuan.
 like
 'He really likes it.'
- 03 (.)
- 04 Chen: 学校 肯定 有 很 多 小 朋友.
xuexiao kending you hen duo xiao pengyou.
 school sure have very many small friend.
 'There must be a lot of children in the school.'
- 05 (0.3)
- 06 → Chen: 跟 [他 玩儿.]
gen [*ta wanr.*]
follow 3SG play.
 'to play with him.'
- 07 Lian: [好 玩儿.]
 [*hao wanr.*]
 good play
 'It's fun (for him).'

In Ex.(6), two graduate students in a university, Chen and Lian, are chatting about their respective children. At one point, Lian starts a story on how her son

has been unwell and absent from school for the past few days; but felt much better that morning and proactively requested to go to school. One interactional issue here is that Lian begins her telling without clearly prefacing the point of her story, leaving for her recipient, Chen, to make her own inferences. At line 01 of the extract, Chen then picks up on the child's proclivity for attending school, and requests verification from Lian by saying *ta xihuan shang xue o* 'he likes to go to school, huh?'. This is met with agreement almost immediately and most emphatically by Lian in line 02, but receives no further elaboration on possible reasons for the child's enthusiasm in going to school. In line 04, Chen adds that *xuexiao kending you hen duo xiao pengyou* 'there must be a lot of children in the school', which can sequentially be seen as proposing a candidate reason. This is however, in contrast to line 01, met with a 0.3 second gap of silence in line 05. Possibly to clarify what she meant by 'lot of children in school' as a reason, Chen then further appends a verbal clause *gen ta wanr* 'to play with him' in focal line 06, as a turn-continuation from line 04. With the gap of silence in line 05, this is an instance of a "post-gap" turn-continuation, where the production of further talk is done in a prosodically disjunctive manner. However, by producing the prepositional phrase *gen ta* 'with him' followed by the verb *wanr* 'play', Chen has added another verbal clause (VP) that can be seen to be a resultant predicate that stems from the first verbal clause (i.e. there must be a lot of children in the school), thereby instantiating the structure of a Chinese serial verb constructions, and syntactic contiguity between the host-TCU (*xuexiao kending you hen duo xiao pengyou*) and turn-continuation (*gen ta wanr*).

4.2.2 Topic-comment structure

Another common syntactic environment where prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations can be produced as grammatically fitted constituents 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 and Thompson 1976; Li and Thompson 1981: 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:

{ TOPIC_Nominal Phrase + (COMMENT_Clausal Phrase) }

Given that Chinese is an isolating language, a topic is without morphosyntactic markings, and its topical status must be inferable from the discourse situation. 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, though prosodically disjunctive, can still be seen as syntactically continuous under the topic-comment structure of Chinese. An instance of such a turn-continuation is illustrated in Ex.(7) below. The interlocutors in this extract are again Chen and Lian. This time, they are having a discussion on the best time in the year to have a baby, such that (s)he 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.

Ex.(7) ES-M-01 [13:13-13:25]

- 01   Chen: 那   这么   说   小孩   几   月   份
               na   zheme   shuo   xiaohai   ji   yue   fen
               DM   this.way   say   children   how.many   month   CLF
               出生   比较   好   呢?
               chusheng   bijiao   hao   ne?
               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   (.)
- 04   Lian: [uh: <几   月   份   出生   啊:]>.
               [uh: <*ji   yue   fen   chusheng   a:]>.
                       how.many   month   CLF   born   SFP
               ‘Mmm... with regards to which month would be better...’*

- 15   好像   比较::   比较   好。
               haoxiang   bijia::o   bijiao   hao.
               seems   compare   compare   good.
               ‘that seems to be better.’

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 six-year-old in a cohort. Ex.(7) begins with Chen positing the question on the best month for a child to be born, given the school admission policy in China. 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 from line 02 to line 13 in the extract, where Lian first audibly produces a lengthened in-breath, best described as the sort of response cry when one is thrown into a quandary, and then repeats part of her interlocutor’s question in line 04 (*ji yue fen chusheng a*: ‘with regards to which month would be better...’) and line 11 (<*jiu yue fen*> ‘September...’), or mutters inaudibly to herself in between. Seeing Lian’s dilemma in coming up with an answer, Chen attempts to “trouble-shoot” and clarifies her question, first at line 05 with the turn *ruguo shuo xiang- xiaohai jiushi shuo liu shui* ‘If we wanted to... for children... I mean, to be six years old?’. As it turns out, this attempt at clarifying what it means by “best” month (such that the child turns six and is still within the school registration period) in line 01 runs into overlap with Lian’s repeat at line 04, and is further met with more gaps in line 06. Seeing that attempts at clarifying the question in line 05 did not yield an answer, Chen changes tack and moves into a new action by proposing *jiu yue fen yihou?* ‘After September?’ as a candidate solution with try-marked prosody in focal line 07. With no forthcoming acknowledgement in line 08 occupied by a gap of half a second, she further pursues the missing verification with a “post-gap” turn-continuation *chu-sheng hao yi-xie* ‘better to give birth’ in line 09, thereby retroactively transforming *jiu yue fen yihou?* ‘After September?’ into a host-TCU. Again, though being prosodically disjunctive, the turn-continuation is marked by the modality of syntax as “continuing” from the prior. With the earlier time period *jiu yue fen yihou* in line 07 as the topic, *chu-sheng hao yi-xie* then comments upon it as a verbal clause, utilizing the topic-comment structure common in Chinese.

4.2.3 Unexpressed nominal argument structure

Yet another environment where prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations can appear to be syntactically continuous is in a clause where the nominal argument

(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 object may be left unexpressed when the referent can be deduced from prior discourse (Li and Thompson 1981: 657–676); the second is, of course, the SVO typology of Chinese where the object argument 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.

$$\{ \text{NP}_s + \text{VP} + (\text{NP}_o) \}$$

However, a more common form of nominal-object type turn-continuations is usually seen after a possibly complete nominalizer-DE construction (Li and Thompson 1981: 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 as grammatical subject, object or other arguments. 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 (e.g. Chinese). Schematically speaking, this is seen as:

$$\{ \text{Attributive/Possessive Modifier} + \text{DE} + (\text{Head Noun}) \} \text{Nominal Subject/Object/Other Arguments}$$

Therefore, when used as a nominal argument 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 the unexpressed head noun as a turn-continuation. Ex.(8) below illustrates an example where the prosodically disjunctive turn-continuation can be syntactically seen as part of a nominalizer-DE construction.

Before the extract begins, Deng has been chiding Cai (Deng and Cai are both female students in the University of Hong Kong (HKU)) for not accepting her previous invitations to a night club with a group of friends. Cai defends herself by asking 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. Deng 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”. Cai awkwardly laughs at this response, and probes if Deng goes out with an all-girls group. Deng then empathetically confirms that it is indeed an all-girls group. The extract begins with Cai further enquiring if the girls Deng went out with were all from Hong Kong. Orientating to the possibility

that the profile of this group of friends is going to significantly impact on whether Cai would join the group for future outings, Deng proactively endeavors to provide more information on this group in the sequence below.

Ex.(8) ES-M-07 [19:41-19:55]

01 Cai: [你 上次 跟] 你 去 他 是- 都 是 (.)
 [ni shang-ci gen] ni qu ta shi- dou shi (.)
 2SG previous-CLF with 2SG go 3SG COP- all COP (.)
 香港 的.
 xianggang de.
 NM GEN.
 ‘When you went last time, he... they were all Hong Kong-ers?’

02 (0.3)

03 Deng: >没 [有<. <上次] 我 没 去.
 >mei [you<. <shang-ci] wo mei qu.
 NEG have previous-CLF 1SG NEG go.
 ‘No. I didn’t go the last time round.’

04 Cai: [°香港-°]
 [°xianggan-°]
 NM
 ‘Hong Kong...’

05 Cai: 啊 你 没有 去 啊.=
 a ni meiyou qu a.=
 INJ 2SG NEG-have go SFP.=
 ‘Oh! You didn’t go.’

06 Deng: =就是:: (0.3) 上次:: 但是: 他们
 =jiushi:: (0.3) shang-ci:: danshi: tamen
 DM (0.3) previous-CLF but 3PL
 有:: 五 个 人 去 啦..
 you:: wu ge ren qu la..
 have five CLF person go SFP.
 ‘I mean... Last time... but they had five people that went.’

07 (0.4)

- 08 Cai: °>这么 多<°.
 °>*zheme duo*<°.
 >so many<.
 ‘That many?’
- 09 (0.5)
- 10 Deng: 都 是:- 对.
dou shi:- dui.
 all COP right
 ‘they’re all... yeah.’
- 11 (.)
- 12 Deng: 呃- 都 是 港大 的.
e- dou shi gangda de.
 AGR- all COP NM GEN.
 ‘Uh-hmm... they’re all from the University of Hong Kong.’
- 13 (0.4)
- 14 → Deng: °女[生°.]
 °*nu[sheng°]*
female.
‘(and all) female students.’

After Cai initiates another enquiry on the profile of the group (‘they were all Hong Kong-ers?’) at line 01, a 0.3 second gap ensues in line 02. Deng then reveals at line 03 that she did not actually participate in the last outing. At line 06, Deng further conveys that five individuals from the all-girls 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 our focal host-TCU *e- dou shi gangda de* ‘Uh-hmm... they’re all from the University of Hong Kong’, 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 turn-continuation *nu sheng* 'female students'. Note that this appended constituent is done after a noticeable gap of silence, and hence in a prosodically disjunctive manner. Yet as the prior utterance in line 12 ended with a nominalizer-DE construction (*dou shi gangda de* 'all from the University of Hong Kong-DE'), the addition of an appropriate nominal argument (*nu sheng* 'female students') in line 14 thereby renders the turn-continuation as grammatically fitted, where *gangda* 'University of Hong Kong' before the *de* particle is retroactively turned into the attributive element of *nu sheng* 'female students'.

An interesting observation pertaining to the nominal-object type of turn-continuations is that *it is exactly the right-headed syntax of Chinese that has allowed syntactic continuity* when an unexpressed nominal argument is added retroactively, or when the appended head noun takes the previous nominalizer-DE construction to be its modifier. In a sense, although right-headed syntax has *ab initio* led to most adverbial turn-continuations to be syntactically discontinuous, given other structural norms such as the "pro-drop" status of nominal arguments, "right-headedness" can also provide the grammatical environment for other sorts of syntactic continuous turn-continuations to appear.

4.2.4 Verb-resultative complement construction

A final syntactic environment we want to highlight where prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations can be appended in a syntactically continuous manner is as a complement that modifies the prior 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 (Li and 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.

{ NP_s + VP + (Resultative Complement) }

Hence, in certain situations where the TCU comes to possible completion after a verb, Chinese speakers will then have the option to produce turn-continuations as syntactically continuous post-verbal complements. This is illustrated in our final example below, which also shows the resultative complement added as a "post-other-talk" type of prosodically disjunctive turn-continuation.

Ex.(9) below is a video recording of three Ph.D. students (Jie, Wei and Tao) having a snack and chatting around a table. Before the start of our example, 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. However, as the conversation progresses, Jie does not appear to show enthusiasm in accepting Wei’s recommendation after it was revealed that the mutton is cooked in curry. The extract shown begins with line 12, where Tao joins in to collaboratively persuade Jie on the merits of the Indian food stall.

Ex.(9) NTU-2 [0:37-1:00]

- 12 Tao: [这边 它 的:: 印度] (sss-) 菜 还 不 错
 [zhebian ta de:: yindu] (sss-) cai hai bu cuo
 DEM-side 3SG GEN Indian dish still NEG wrong
 啦. 其实.
 la. qishi.
 SFP. actually.
 ‘The Indian food there is not bad... actually.’
- 13 Wei: 是 啊.=
 shi a.=
 COP SFP.=
 ‘Yeah.’
- 14 Tao: =canteen B 也 就 那个. hh 不过 我们 因为
 =canteen B ye jiu nage. hh buguo women yinwei
 NM also only DEM-CLF. but 1PL because
 ‘And that the only place in Canteen B with... It’s just that we’re’
- 15 很 少 吃 印[度 的 东西.]
 han shao chi yin[du de dongxi.]
 very little eat Indian GEN thing.
 ‘not accustomed to having Indian food.’
- 16 Wei: [对 对] [对.]
 [dui dui] [dui.]
 right right right
 ‘yea yea yes’

- 17 Jie: [不 是.]
[*bu shi.*]
NEG COP.
'It's not that.'
- 18 那个 印度 的 那个 咖喱 我: <不 能 吃::>.
nage yindu de nage kali wo: <bu neng chi::>.
DEM-CLF Indian GEN DEM-CLF curry 1SG: <NEG can eat>
'It's that curry, Indian curry exactly, that I'm unable to eat.'
- 19 Wei: 为什么 呢.
weishenme ne.
why SFP
'why?'
- 20 (.)
- 21 Wei: [哈.]
[*ha.*]
Q
'huh?'
- 22 → Jie: [多.] 就是 它 [味道 很] 重.
[*duo.*] *jiushi ta [weidao hen] zhong.*
much. DM 3SG smell very heavy.
'much. It's just the flavor is too strong.'

Up till line 12 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 in lines 14–15 as a possible reason for rejecting their recommendation. It is towards this postulation that Jie overtly rejects at line 17, before stating her specific misgivings. 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 turn-continuation in this example 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. What is notable in this example,

similar to other prosodically disjunctive turn-continuations in this section, is its position. Specifically, this turn-continuation was not produced immediately after possible completion (next beat), or after some noticeable silence (post-gap), but after speaker transition (post-other-talk). Furthermore, the occurrence of *duo* ‘much’ after *chi* ‘eat’ is also arguably “grammatically fitted” in normative Chinese syntax, presenting itself as a syntactically continuous resultative complement to the prior verb, 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, thereby downgrading her initial strong stance of rejection to one of partial acceptance, noticeably after requests for justification were issued by Wei in lines 19 and 21.

Interestingly, besides syntactically “continuing” with the resultative complement *duo*, Jie further provides an additional visuospatial cue to mark this appended element as an “afterthought” type of turn-continuation, namely her shift in gaze.¹³ From the video recording, this bodily-visual evidence further indicates that the addition of *duo* was 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 was firmly fixed towards Wei, reifying Wei as the main recipient of her talk (see Figure 4a).

Figure 4a: Jie’s gaze on Wei during production of host-TCU at lines 18–19 in Ex.(9).

¹³ Ford, Thompson, and Drake (2012) demonstrates how bodily-visual practices can by themselves act as turn-continuations. Here, I am drawing attention to how Jie’s bodily-visual behavior works to elaborate the accompanying talk as a turn-continuation, much like how syntax and prosody can also work to index continuation.

Figure 4b: Jie's contemplative gaze while producing the turn-continuation "*duo*" at line 22 in Ex.(9).

But immediately after Wei's question at line 19 and in the midst of the micro-pause at line 20, Jie retracts her gaze from Wei and rolls her eyes to her left, characterizable as a "contemplative" look (see Figure 4b) while producing the turn-continuation *duo*.

In so far as Wei's *weishenme ne* 'why' at line 19 is a targeted response to Jie's rejection of Indian curry with *wo bu neng chi* 'I'm unable to eat' at line 18, then the subsequent backing down with a syntactically continuous resultative complement *duo*, concurrently executed with Jie's upward contemplative gaze into space, constitute a fully embodied enactment of the further talk (i.e. *duo*) as an "afterthought" that is prompted by Wei's questioning. Ex.(9) hence demonstrates a process where the turn-continuation is visibly done as an appended element addressed to the contingencies presented after talk-by-others.

The four examples in this section illustrates situated contexts where the addition of further talk were prompted by recipient's lack of uptake (displayed through occurrences of gaps of silence) or intervening talk by others (be it to clarify the prior unit in Ex.(6), pursue verification or response in Ex.(7) and Ex.(8), or to downgrade stance in Ex.(9)), thereby resulting in prosodic separation between the host-TCU and its turn-continuation. While such turn-continuations may not be prosodically "continuous", it is shown that Chinese speakers have, as a recourse, various grammatical structures in the Chinese language (e.g. serial verb construction, topic-comment structure, verb-resultative complement etc.) where appending certain constituents can be deemed syntactically continuous after a possible completion point. For Ex.(9), the bodily-visual modality (i.e. shift in gaze) was also at play in marking turn-continuation. In other words, though

prosodic disjunction may act as an impediment towards recognition of some units as “continuing” from the prior, syntax can then be called upon to rectify such units as bona fide turn-continuations. Crucially, as mentioned, a good majority of syntactically continuous turn-continuations in our data are in fact instances where further talk was appended “post-gap” or “post-other-talk”, suggesting that there may be *some form of compensatory mechanism where syntactic contiguity is enlisted to index an additional sense of “continuation” when progressivity has been lost due to prosodic disjunction.*

5 Some final thoughts

One of the central questions set in this volume is to understand the relationship between grammar and multimodality in natural talk-in-interaction. However, if by grammar, we mean an array of notions such as grammatical classes and their syntactic distribution, then it bears to remember that grammar itself is simply one of many semiotic resources that can be employed to constitute interactional practices. By taking modality to mean any system of semiotic resource that indexes a certain type of information (e.g. prosody, syntax, pragmatic or bodily-visual), then it is clear that multimodality figures significantly in the interactional practice of “continuing” past a possible completion point for Chinese speakers.

Cross-linguistically, a recurrent finding is that modalities of syntax, prosody and pragmatics (and sometimes bodily-visual behaviors) all have to be analyzably coming to an end for TRP to be maximally recognized (Ford and Thompson 1996; Tanaka 1999; Hayashi 2005; Mori and Hayashi 2006; Local and Walker 2012; Keevallik 2013; Li 2014). This also holds true for Chinese conversations. However, when it comes to constructing Chinese turn-continuations, modalities can, and often are, at odds with each other in terms of indexing some unit of talk as “continuing” from the prior. Yet, what is interesting is not that they are at odds, but that one semiotic resource can in fact be used by speakers to rectify another to achieve the intended interactional goal. On one end, though the right-headed syntax of Chinese has engendered forms of adverbial (a highly productive class for achieving the interactional functions of turn-continuations) to be syntactically discontinuous after possible completion, speakers have operated upon their prosodic delivery to sustain a reading of continuation. When the appendage of turn-continuations motivated by gaps in talk or talk-by-others has necessarily led to prosodic disjunction, Chinese speakers have also frequently exploited grammatical structures to

impose syntactic continuity. It is this finely coordinated use of multiple semiotic resources that we see as modalities not only cooperating but adaptively *co-operating* upon one another.

Goodwin (2014) and Kendon (2009) have consistently argued that human actions, including language, do not operate as isolated systems or modalities, but is constructed by bringing together different meaning-making modalities in a co-operative manner. Goodwin (2013) further described such co-operative modalities using the metaphor of lamination, where different semiotic fields are organized as layers of diverse resources. In his words, actions are built “by combining diverse resources (e.g., language structure, categories, prosody, postural configurations, the embodied displays of a hearer, tools, etc.) to perform both simultaneous and sequential transformative operations on a local, public semiotic substrate” (Goodwin 2013: 21). While traditional construal of multimodality has often treated different modalities either as self-sufficient, or working together as cumulatively ‘layered’ but semiotically discrete signs; the (re)configuration between syntax and prosody in the construction of Chinese turn-continuations has shown how multimodality in natural interaction is in fact a highly integrated gestalt, where co-operative modalities are being combined in a structured and organized manner that both constrain and mutually elaborate each other.

Appendix I: 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
↑↓	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 II: Abbreviations in Chinese gloss

1/2/3 SG	first/second/third person singular	DM	Discourse marker
1/2/3 PL	first/second/third person plural	EXP	Experiential aspect marker
AGR	Agreement Particle	GEN	Genitive Case Marker
BA	the <i>ba</i> transitivity marker	INJ	Interjection
BEI	the <i>bei</i> (and <i>gei</i>) ‘passive’ marker	LOC	Locative Complement
CFM	Confirmation Particle	NEG	Negator
CLF	Classifier	NM	Proper Name
CMP	Completion aspect marker	PCM	Potential Complementizer
COM	Verb complement	Q	Question Particle
COP	Copula	SFP	Sentence Final Particle
CRS	Current relevant state Particle	SIP	Sentence Initial Particle
CTP	Continuous aspect marker	TP	Topic Marker
DEM	Demonstrative		

Acknowledgments

This chapter is based on the research done for my yet unpublished dissertation. I thank the editors for the very detailed and insightful comments which has helped me a great deal in thinking through the phonetic and prosodic presentation and descriptions of turn-continuations. All remaining deficiencies are mine solely.

References

- Auer, Peter. 2007. Why are increments such elusive objects? An afterthought. *Pragmatics* 17(4), 647–658.
- Boersma, Paul & David Weenink. 2016. Praat: doing phonetics by computer [Computer program]. Version 6.0.22. <http://www.praat.org/>
- Chao, Yuan-Ren. 1968. *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cienki, Alan. (1998). Metaphoric gestures and some of their relations to verbal metaphoric expressions. In J-P. Koenig (ed.), *Discourse and cognition: Bridging the gap*, 189–204. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Cienki, Alan & Müller, Cornelia. 2008. Metaphor, gesture, and thought. In Raymond W. Gibbs Jr (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, 483–501. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, Steven. 2013. Turn-constructual units and the transition-relevance place. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 150–166. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Tsuyoshi Ono. 2007. ‘Incrementing’ in conversation. A comparison of practices in English, German and Japanese. *Pragmatics* 17(4), 513–552.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2013. Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 1–7.
- Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cumming & Danae Paolino. 1993. Outline of Discourse Transcription. In Jane A. Edwards & Martin D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and coding methods for discourse research*, 45–89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Forceville, Charles & Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.). 2009. *Multimodal Metaphor*. New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ford, Cecilia E. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 134–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Practices in the construction of turns: The “TCU” revisited. *Pragmatics* 6, 427–454.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson. 2002. Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*, 14–38. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Sandra A. Thompson & Veronika Drake. 2012. Bodily-visual practices and turn continuation. *Discourse Process* 49(3–4), 192–212.

- Fox, Barbara A. 2001. An exploration of prosody and turn projection in English conversation. In Margret Selting & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, 287–315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1979. The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation. In George Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, 97–118. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1980. Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3/4), 272–302.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1981. *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2003. Pointing as situated practice. In Sotaro Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where Language, Culture and Cognition Meet*, 217–241. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. Environmentally coupled gestures. In Susan D. Duncan, Justine Cassell & Elena T. Levy (Eds.), *Gesture and the Dynamic Dimensions of Language*, 195–212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2013. The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 8–23.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2014. The intelligibility of gesture within a framework of co-operative action. In Mandana Seyfeddinipur & Marianne Gullbert (Eds.), *Gesture in Conversation to Visible Action in Utterance*, 199–216. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, Charles, & Marjorie H. Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent Operations on Talk: Notes on the Interactive Organization of Assessments. *Papers in Pragmatics* 1(1), 1–54.
- Goodwin, Charles, & Marjorie H. Goodwin. 1992. Assessments and the construction of context. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 147–190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1980. Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological inquiry* 50(3–4), 303–317.
- Hassemer, Julius & Winter, Bodo. 2016. Producing and perceiving gestures conveying height or shape. *Gesture* 15(3), 404–424.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2003. Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36(2), 109–141.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2005. Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica* 156, 21–53.
- Heath, Christian. 1984. Talk and reciprocity: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 247–265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, Christian. 1986. *Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, Christian & Paul Luff. 1992. Collaboration and control. Crisis management and multimedia technology in London Underground line control rooms. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 1, 69–94.
- Heath, Christian, Marcus S. Svensson, Jon Hindmarsh, Paul Luff & Dirk vom Lehn. 2002. Configuring awareness. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 11 (3/4), 317–347.

- Hidalgo-Downing, Laura & Mujic, Blanca Kraljevic (eds.). 2013. *Metaphorical creativity across modes*. Special issue of *Metaphor and the Social World* 3(2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Kappelhoff, Hermann & Müller, Cornelia. 2011. Embodied meaning construction. Multimodal metaphor and expressive movement in speech, gesture, and feature film. *Metaphor and the Social World* 1(2), 121–153.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2013. The interdependence of bodily demonstrations and clausal syntax. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46, 1–21.
- Kendon, Adam. 2009. Language's matrix. *Gesture* 9, 355–372. DOI: 10.1075/gest.9.3.05ken
- Levelt, Willem J. M. 1989. *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. In Charles N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 457–461. London/New York: Academic Press.
- Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Li, Xiaoting. 2014. *Multimodality, interaction and turn-taking in Mandarin conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liang, Yuan. 2005. 语序和信息结构: 对粤语易位句的语用分析 *Yuxu he xinxi jiegou: Dui yueyu yiwei ju de yuyong fenxi*. 《中国语文》 *Zhongguo Yuwen* 306(3), 239–253.
- Lim, Ni-Eng. 2014. *Retroactive Operations: On 'increments' in Mandarin Chinese conversation*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles, dissertation.
- Local, John & John Kelly. 1986. Projection and 'silences': Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human studies* 9(2), 185–204.
- Local, John, & Gareth Walker. 2004. Abrupt-joins as a resource for the production of multi-unit, multi-action turns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(8), 1375–1403.
- Local, John, & Gareth Walker. 2012. How phonetic features project more talk. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 42(3), 255–280.
- Lu, Jianming. 1980. 汉语口语语法里的易位现象 *Hanyu kouyu jufa li de yiwei xianxiang*. 《中国语文》 *Zhongguo Yuwen* 154(4), 28–41.
- Lu, Shuxiang. (Ed.). 1999. *Xiandai hanyu babai ci* (Modern Chinese: 800 Words (Revised Edition)). Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Luke, Kang-Kwong. 2000. 句子成分的后置与话轮交替机制中的话轮后续手段 *Juzi chengfen de houzhi yu hualun jiaoti jizhi zhong de hualun houxi shouduan*. 《中国语文》 *Zhongguo Yuwen* (4), 303–310.
- Luke, Kang-Kwong. 2005. 说延伸句 *Shuo yanshen ju*. In Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (Ed.), 《庆祝《中国语文》创刊 50 周年学术论文集》 *Qingzhu "Zhongguo Yuwen" chuangkan wushi zhounian xueshu lunwen ji*, 39–48. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Luke, Kang-Kwong & Zhang, Wei. 2007. Retrospective turn continuations in Mandarin Chinese conversation. *Pragmatics* 17(4), 605–635.
- McNeill, David. 2013. Gesture as a window onto mind and brain, and the relationship to linguistic relativity and ontogenesis. In Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silvia Ladewig, David McNeill & Sedinha Teßendorf (eds.), *Body – language – communication*.

- An international handbook on multimodality in human interaction. Volume 1*, 28–54. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2006. Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies* 8, 117–129.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2007. Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies* 9(2), 195–226.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2011. The organization of concurrent courses of action in surgical demonstrations. In: Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin, & Curtis D. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction, Language and Body in the Material World*, 207–226. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mori, Junko & Makoto Hayashi. 2006. The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics* 27: 195–219.
- Núñez, Rafael E., Edwards, Laurie D. & Matos, Joao Filipe. 1999. Embodied cognition as grounding for situatedness and context in mathematics education. *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 39 (1–3), 45–65.
- Oreström, Bengt. 1983. *Turn-taking in English conversation*. Lund Studies in English 66. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Pomerantz, Anita M. 1984. Pursuing a response. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis*, 152–164. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In Emanuel A. Schegloff, Elinor Ochs & Sandra A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 52–133. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2016. Increments. In Jeffrey Robinson (Ed.), *Accountability in Social Interaction*, 237–263. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schuetze-Coburn, Stephan, Marian Shapley & Elizabeth G. Weber. 1991. Units of intonation in discourse: A comparison of acoustic and auditory analyses. *Language and Speech* 34(2), 207–234.
- Selting, Margret. 2013. Verbal, vocal, and visual practices in conversational interaction. In Cornelia Müller et al. (Eds.), *Body-Language-Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction* (vol. 1), 589–609. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Stivers, Tanya & Jack Sidnell. 2005. Introduction: Multimodal Interaction. *Semiotica* 156(1/4), 1–20.
- Streeck, Jürgen & Ulrike Hartge. 1992. Previews: Gestures at the Transition Place. In Peter Auer & Aldo Di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*, 135–158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Streeck, Jürgen. 1993. Gesture as communication. I: Its coordination with gaze and speech. *Communication Monographs* 60, 275–299.
- Streeck, Jürgen. 1994. Gesture as communication II: The audience as co-author. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 27(3), 239–267.
- Streeck, Jürgen. 2009. Forward-gesturing. *Discourse Processes* 4 (2/3), 161–179.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 1999. Grammar and Social Interaction in Japanese and Anglo-American English: The Display of Context, Social Identity and Social Relation. *Human Studies* 22(2/4), 363–395.
- Tao, Hongyin. 1996. *Units in mandarin conversation: prosody, discourse, and grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Thompson, Sandra A. 1973. Resultative verb compounds in Mandarin Chinese: A case for lexical rules. *Language*, 361–379.
- Vorreiter, Susanne. 2003. Turn continuations: Towards a cross-linguistic classification. In *List No. 39, Interaction and linguistic structures*.
- Walker, Gareth. 2004. On some interactional and phonetic properties of increments to turns in talk-in-interaction. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Cecilia E. Ford (eds.), *Sound Patterns in Interaction*, 147–169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Walker, Gareth. 2012. The phonetic constitution of a turn-holding practice: Rush-throughs in English talk-in-interaction. In Dagmar Barth-Weingarten & Elisabeth Reber (eds.), *Prosody in Interaction*, 51–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wilson, Thomas P., & Don H. Zimmerman. 1986. The structure of silence between turns in two-party conversation. *Discourse Processes* 9(4), 375–390.
- Zhang, Chunyan. 2001. 易位句中的语音问题 *Yiwei ju zhong de yuyin wenti*. 《汉语学习》 *Hanyu Xuexi* (4), 23–28.
- Zhang, Wei. 2012. Latching/Rush-through as a turn-holding device and its functions in retrospectively oriented pre-emptive turn continuation: Findings from Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Processes* 49, 163–191.
- Zhou, Shihong. 2010. 从信息结构角度看汉语口语中的“主谓倒装句” *Cong xinxi jiegou jiaodu kan hanyu kouyu zhong de “zhuwei dao Zhuang ju”*. 《汉语学习》 *Hanyu Xuexi* (3), 28–36.