

K K Luke

My presentation is divided into two parts. The first part consists of a review of past research on turn continuation and is intended to serve as a point of reference for subsequent discussion during the workshop. Interest in the phenomenon of turn continuation goes back a long way to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's classical paper on turn-taking (SSJ, 1974). In a series of papers in the 1990s, Auer and Schegloff presented two analyses of 'rightward expansions' and "increments" respectively. Selting, in re-visiting the concepts of TCU and TRP, proposed a distinction between prosodically integrated and prosodically exposed expansions. Interest in turn continuation intensified in the 2000s, with researchers offering data from of languages other than English and German -- notably Japanese (Tanaka) and Chinese (Luke), as well as elaborations on Schegloff's notion of 'increment' (e.g. Ford, Fox and Thompson's "free constituents"). In the most recent collection on the topic (a special issue in *Pragmatics* edited by Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007), two typologies were proposed to address the issue of universality and variation in turn continuation (Vorreiter, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, and Luke and Zhang).

The second part of my talk is my small contribution to the present workshop using data from Cantoese, and is entitled "Post-Turn-Completion Constituents in Cantonese: Forms and Functions". The term 'post-turn-completion constituent' (PTCC) is used to refer to one or more constituents occurring after a recognizable turn-end, but is designed to be heard, in spite of the recognizable turn-end, as a continuation of that turn. These constituents have been referred to in the literature as increments, add-ons, etc., and their forms and functions have been analyzed in several different languages, including English, German, Japanese and others. Previous studies of PTCCs in Cantonese have tended to focus on their syntax, i.e., how they may be related, syntactically, back to their "hosts". However, it turns out that, in terms of syntax, virtually any constituent can take the PTCC position, making it extremely difficult to draw any conclusions about them as a class of objects. It is proposed that in spite of this great syntactic variety, PTCCs can be grouped into seven or eight categories in terms of their pragmatic and social interactional functions, and defined as a natural class under the umbrella of 'afterthought'.