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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In traditional approaches to Chinese linguistics the scope of investigation has been largely limited to the study of phonology and syntax, linguistic phenomena which can be explained within sentence boundaries. Y. R. Chao succinctly summarized this point of view when he wrote, "The sentence is the largest language unit that is important for grammatical analysis" (1968:57). Ever since the publication of Ma Shi Wen Tong (1898 by Ma Jian Zhong), this sentence-based focus has dominated the field of Chinese linguistics. Yet even in some of the most traditional grammars, there is reference to and cognizance of the influence which the surrounding discourse has upon sentence-based phenomena. Wang (1959:44-5) in his discussion of demonstrative pronouns cites the use of sheiyang 'this way' and name 'like that' to form a connecting link between what precedes and follows them. In his examples these linguistic items are found in the sentence-initial position requiring the reader to look beyond the sentence boundary. In the same vein, Chao (1968:791-2) discusses the "macrosyntactic use" of danshi 'but' when it is used to begin a sentence. These grammars, grounded in the structuralist tradition and using examples created by the linguist, hinted that discourse might indeed be important, while at the time
insisting that their analyses remain firmly focussed within the boundaries of the sentence. In the late 1960's and 1970's the emphasis in the study of Chinese syntax shifted from the structuralist perspective to that of generative grammar, but the lack of interest in discourse and the reliance on artificial data remained the same. The sentence continued to constitute the largest unit of analysis and fabricated examples remained the basis for linguistic proof.

In the late 1970's and 1980's linguists working with Chinese began to look to discourse as a source of evidence in an attempt to resolve issues at the sentence level that remained controversial. The issue of pronominalization and anaphora was the first to force Chinese linguists outside the confines of the sentence. As Tai (1978), Li and Thompson (1979) and Chen (1966) all realized, the surrounding discourse had to be included in any viable account of pronominalization in Mandarin Chinese. They also moved away from the invented example as a source of evidence and instead used written narrative discourse to support their arguments.

Tsao (1978) in his pioneering work included analysis of the surrounding discourse in the study of topic in Mandarin Chinese. The title, *A Functional Study of Topic in Chinese: The First Step Towards Discourse Analysis*, suggests that the analysis of discourse is the object of this study. In fact discourse is used as a tool for the study of topic. Significantly, Tsao uses naturally occurring conversation (in this case telephone conversations) as the base for much of his analysis. Again information and evidence is brought to bear on the solution of an issue within the sentence, what is a topic and what is a subject.
The explanation of the function of the grammatical particle le also caused Chinese linguists to look to discourse for evidence. Spanos (1979) took segments of written and conversational discourse, removed the occurrences of the particle le, and then asked his subjects to add le where they felt it was necessary. Li et al. (1982) base their analysis of le largely on actual conversations while Chu and Chang (1987) base their analysis on written texts. Finally Sun and Givon (1985) use a quantitative survey of both written and oral narrative discourse to argue that Mandarin is typologically a Verb-Object language. In all of these studies, evidence largely from written discourse is brought to bear on unresolved, primarily sentence-based issues.

More recently linguists studying Chinese have begun to look specifically at spoken discourse as an area worthy of study in itself. Using naturally occurring spoken language they have attacked numerous issues in Chinese linguistics from the perspective of the overall discourse, rather than from the perspective of the sentence. Biq (1984, 1988b, 1990) has studied the role of indirect speech acts and the function of the markers shei ge 'this,' nei ge 'that,' shen ma 'what,' and na (me) 'so, then' in Mandarin conversation. Miracle (1989a and b) has begun the investigation of the markers hao 'okay, alright' and na (me) utilizing radio plays from Taiwan and a movie from mainland China. Hickman and Liang (1990) have investigated clause-structure variation in the spoken discourse of children and adults. Tai and Hu (1991) utilize spoken data gathered in Beijing in their study of inverted sentences. Sanders (1991) examines naturally occurring conversation gathered in Taipei and Peking from a sociolinguistic perspective in his analysis of markers of
modality. Hu (1987) utilizes conversational data gathered in Peking to provide a preliminary sociolinguistic description of colloquial Peking Mandarin. Based on the earlier work in syntax, these studies have attempted to broaden the field of Chinese linguists to include aspects of discourse analysis, pragmatics and sociolinguistics which have heretofore been largely unexplored in the study of the numerous varieties of Chinese.

The need to broaden the study of Chinese linguistics beyond the sentence can be seen from the following example (this example and discussion are taken from Miracle (1989a:214))

(1)
L: ba, ma, na women zou ba
father mother then we walk PART
Mom, Dad, then let's go.

Z: hao ba, Wang xiansheng, zhei zhen buhaoyisi
hao PART Wang Mr. this real embarrassing
Fine, Mr. Wang, this is really embarrassing.

->B: hao le, hao le, bu yong keqi le.
hao PART hao PART neig use politeness PART
Fine, fine, no need to be polite. (IUP 1984:20)

In Chao's (1968) analysis, B in the above exchange would consist of three "minor sentences." Regarding this type of sentence Chao states the following,

A minor sentence is not in the subject predicate form. It occurs more frequently in two-way conversation and in speech interposed or accompanied by action than in connected discourse. (Chao 1968:60)

The above example then would consist of the "minor sentences," a) Hao le., b) Hao le., and c) Bu yong keqi le. While this explanation may be adequate from the perspective of syntax, the role that hao le plays in the discourse structure is overlooked. As we shall see below, hao is
used here to mark the closure and satisfactory completion of this
request sequence. The following example from Tai and Hu (1991:14) is
also instructive.

(2)
A: Zhe shi, zhe zhe, xiangji shi ban sha bu sha.
   This be this this camera be half foolish NEG foolish
      'This camera is semi-automatic.'
B: Ban sha.
   Half foolish
      '(It is) semi-automatic.'
->C: Ban sha bu sha ba, ni xiang.
   Half foolish NEG foolish PRT you think
      '(It is) semi-automatic, you know.'
B: Ban sha bu sha.
   half foolish NEG foolish
      '(It is) semi-automatic.'

Chao's (1968) analysis would suggest that ni xiang in turn C is an
afterthought. Based upon the surrounding discourse, however, Tai and Hu
(1991:15) argue that this inverted structure is due to "thematization"
which puts the theme of the conversation at the beginning of the
utterance and,

     in order to keep his speech relevant and cohesive to what is
     under discussion, C places the echoing message before 'you
     think', which would normally occur at the sentence-initial
     position.

Analyses which focus on the sentence, in cases like those above, will
fail to include issues which are revealed only when the surrounding
discourse is taken into account.

The purpose of this current project is to continue to broaden the
perspective of Chinese linguistics in this manner (focussing on
discourse) by carrying out an in-depth analysis of a selected group of
linguistic items in Mandarin Chinese, which I will call discourse
markers following the terminology of Schiffrin (1987), that operate on a level above that of the sentence. Discourse markers include such items as well, okay, now, and y\'know in English and items such as hao, dui, jiushi, keshi, danshi, buguo, shi a, and name in Chinese. These markers, if Schiffrin\'s research can be seen as conclusive, "contribute to the integration of discourse - to discourse coherence" (1987:315).

2.0 Related Studies of Varieties of Chinese

While the role of discourse markers in natural conversation has attracted considerable attention from linguists working with English (Goldberg 1980, James 1974, Östman 1981, 1982, Schiffrin 1982, 1987, and Schourup 1983\(^5\)), this subject has been largely ignored by researchers in Chinese. Some work has been done regarding the use of sentence final particles in Mandarin (Alleton 1981) and in Cantonese (Bourgerie 1987 and Luke 1990). To date, however, with the exception of Liao\'s (1986) work, the studies of Mandarin discourse markers have been limited to individual markers (Biq 1988a regarding you, Biq 1990 and Miracle 1989b regarding na(me), and Miracle 1989a regarding hao\(^5\)).

Liao (1986) attempts a comprehensive study of what he calls "discourse connectives" in written discourse. While his focus is on written texts, he frequently mentions spoken discourse suggesting that he feels that his study has relevance in that area as well. Studies in English, however, have shown that there are clear differences between spoken and written discourse\(^4\). They have different motivations and different forms and more importantly for our purposes here, written language is generally planned while spoken language is largely unplanned
(Stubbs 1983:34). The primary aim of Liao's study is to delineate and
categorize the connective units used in discourse. For this purpose he
distinguishes among those connective units which are used exclusively in
sentences to connect smaller syntactic units, connectives which are used
both to connect units in sentences and larger discourse units, and those
connectives which are used exclusively to connect discourse units. His
study focusses on these two latter types of connectives units. Using
both functional and positional criteria, Liao identifies two basic
categories of connectives used in discourse, those which express time
relationships between or among the connected units and those which
express logical relationships between or among the connected units. He
then meticulously subdivides each category, placing the connectives that
he has identified into the appropriate category and gives representative
text examples of each category. Following this exercise he points out
distinguishing features of discourse connectives including, 1) some
connective relationships which are expressed by discourse connectives
are in fact not expressed by sentence-internal connectives and vice
versa; 2) when expressing the same connective relationship, in some
cases different connective units are used within sentences and in
discourse; 3) discourse connectives can generally be followed by a
pause; 4) discourse connectives generally connect adjacent units al-
though they can connect units across sentences or paragraphs, while
connectives in sentences basically connect adjacent units; and 5)
discourse connectives can all be found in the sentence-initial position
and are basically sentence-initial (426). From his categorization and
distinguishing features Liao concludes that discourse connectives must
be studied from the perspective of the surrounding discourse, that the units connected by discourse connectives are not language units but rather the persons, issues or things that these language units express. He then suggests areas for further study.

Liao's categorizations are a necessary first step in the study of these connectives, but more in-depth study of individual connectives is needed. The distinguishing features of discourse connectives which he identifies and the conclusions which he draws are largely impressionistic and do not appear to have any significant data base to support them. As noted above, the focus of the study is on written discourse rather than spoken discourse. For these reasons, Liao's work is of only limited relevance to the present study. Regarding the discourse markers in this study, Liao categorizes na(me) as one of the connectives which expresses the logical relationship of continuance, marking the consequent, stressing a neutral condition or conditions. He categorizes buguo, danshi and keshi as connectives expressing the logical relationship of contrast and a turn in the course of events. He fails to include hao in his categorization. We will see in the chapters to follow that these categories capture only a small portion of the functions of these markers.

3.0 Goals

In the following chapters the discourse markers hao, na(me), danshi and keshi will be investigated in some depth with the aim of discovering their various uses, and from these uses determine a 'core' function for each marker. This knowledge will not only add to our store
of knowledge regarding Mandarin Chinese, but will also have practical value for those of us studying and teaching Chinese, particularly when constructing natural sounding dialogues and teaching advanced conversation. While completion of the above task is the primary goal of this study, this research will also serve to test and refine the theoretical models used here (see Chapter II for a detailed presentation) across a wider range of language data. In the case of Geis' (1989a and b) model of social actions, this project will determine whether that model, which is still being developed, has applicability to Mandarin Chinese.

Yet another goal of this project is to determine what characteristics found in discourse markers in English are consistent with the characteristics of discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese, a typologically unrelated language. Schiffrin (1987) has suggested a number of specific and general characteristics of discourse markers including the following,

1) markers do not create discourse relationships, rather they select and display particular relationships from among the possible relationships (318);

2) markers which retain their semantic meaning will operate primarily in the ideational structure (see Chapter II for details) of discourse while they will be freer to operate in other aspects of the discourse structure as they lose this semantic meaning (319);

3) while markers may have various functions in particular contexts, each marker will have only one "indexical function," (325) what I have been calling the core function; and
4) the following conditions will allow a linguistic unit to be used as a discourse marker,

- it has to be syntactically detachable from a sentence
- it has to be commonly used in initial position of an utterance
- it has to have a range of prosodic contours
  e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction
- it has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse, and on different planes of discourse ... (328)

In the conclusion of this study we will see whether these characteristics hold for the Mandarin Chinese discourse markers studied here. In this regard this work will also add significantly to our knowledge of general linguistic theory in the areas of discourse structure and analysis.
NOTES

1. The examples cited all utilize the following abbreviation conventions: aspect marker (ASF), classifier (CL), interjection (INT), negative (NEG), nominalizer/genitive function (NOM), particle - grammatical or discourse (PART), plural (PL), progressive aspect (PROG), resultative suffix/infix (REG), and rhetorical question marker (RHET).

2. Reviews of these and other earlier studies of discourse markers in English can be found in Schiffrin (1982: Chapter 2) and Luke (1990: Chapter 6). Relevant aspect of these studies will be discussed in the following chapters.

3. The aspects of these earlier studies relevant to this current investigation will be discussed in the chapters to follow.

4. See Brown and Yule (1983) for a more detailed discussion of these differences.

5. The issue of planned versus unplanned discourse and its relationship to discourse markers is discussed more fully in Section 6.0 of Chapter II.

6. This concept derives from Light's (1989) "core-meaning analysis" which assumes that "each morpheme has a fundamental semantic content and that all uses and functions are derived from that semantic content" (131). In this study I will seek a "core" function for each of these markers that is fundamental to all the uses of that marker.
Chapter II

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

1.0 Introduction

The theoretical framework and methodology utilized in this study draws upon several traditions in two different disciplines engaged in the study of naturally occurring conversation. From the discipline of sociology I have been strongly influenced by the work of those scholars working in the area of conversation analysis. Within the discipline of linguistics this work draws heavily from the field of sociolinguistics generally and more specifically from the work of Schiffrin (1982 and 1987) and Geis (1989a and b, 1991) regarding the organization of everyday conversation. I utilize Schiffrin’s framework in the analysis of the discourse structure and the role of discourse markers in that structure. My definition of discourse marker draws upon the work of Ostman (1981 and 1982) as modified by Bourgerie (1987) and Schiffrin (1987) to be discussed below. The method of discourse parsing utilized in this project is drawn primarily from the model proposed by Geis (1989a and b, 1991) in his effort to synthesize the work of the conversation analysts, the philosophers of language and the discourse analysts. I expect to forge a workable synthesis of these models that will pave the way for further, more empirical, analysis of naturally occurring language.
2.0 Discourse Marker - Definition

The first issue to be addressed here is one of terminology. While Schiffrin (1982 and 1987) discusses "discourse markers," these same phenomena are called "discourse particles" by Goldberg (1980) and Schourup (1983) and "pragmatic particles" by Ostman (1982). In the study of Chinese, Bourgerie (1987) has used the term "discourse particle" while Luke (1988, 1990) has used the term "utterance particle" in their investigations of Cantonese particles. I have adopted the terminology of Schiffrin in part because I have utilized her model of discourse investigation, but primarily because the term "particle" seems too restrictive for the linguistic units under investigation. While some discourse markers are clearly included in this category of linguistic units, items like danshi, keshi, you meiyou, name, and others, being polysyllabic and containing significant phonetic content, do not fit the label "particle." The use of the term "particle" is particularly troublesome in the study of Chinese because this term has traditionally been use to refer specifically to sentence final particles, exclusive of what I will call discourse markers which are found in sentence-initial and sentence-internal positions.

Schiffrin (1987:31) defines discourse markers as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk." The key terms in this definition are "sequentially dependent" and "units of talk." "Sequentially dependent" is used to indicate that discourse markers operate on an extra-sentential level and are not wholly dependent on the sentences in which they occur. That is to say that the positioning of discourse markers relative to some preceding segment of talk and some following
segment of talk plays a significant role in the functioning of the
discourse marker. "Units of talk" is an intentionally broad term used
to include speech acts, utterances, turns, sentences and smaller
syntactic units, and discourse markers can be used at different times to
"bracket" all of these units. With respect to particular sentences,
then discourse markers can occur sentence initially, finally and within
sentences, depending on the sentence's relationship to the relevant
"unit of talk." Ostman (1982:149) approaches the definition of "prag-
matic particles" in a rather different manner. He defines the pragmatic
particle in prototypical terms as follows,

Typically, a pragmatic particle would be (a) short, and (b)
prosodically subordinated to another word. It would (c)
resist clear lexical specification and be propositionally
empty (i.e., it would not be part of the propositional
content of the sentence). Furthermore it (d) would tend to
occur in some sense cut off from, or on a higher level than,
the rest of the utterance, at the same time as it tends to
modify the utterance as a whole.

As Bourgerie (1987:43) points out regarding discourse particles in
Cantonese, the criterion addressing prosodic dependence does not neces-
sarily hold across languages. One should also note that this is a
definition of the prototypical discourse marker and, as such, deviations
from this ideal should be expected. Again as Bourgerie (1987) has noted
for Cantonese, the final criterion, that the marker operate on a level
higher than the utterance, appears to be the crucial test for discourse
markers.
3.0 Conversation Analysis

The field of conversation analysis developed within sociology as an application of the theory and methods developed by Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman for the study of everyday social phenomena. Their framework is known as ethnomethodology. Garfinkel (1967:11) himself defines ethnomethodology as "the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life." Indexical expressions are those phenomena whose understanding and interpretation are inextricably tied to the context in which they appear. Rather than shy away from indexical expressions in his study and theorizing, Garfinkel argues that all social phenomena are inherently indexical and thus indexical expressions should be a prime focus of sociological study (Sharrock and Anderson 1986:43). The investigative methodology can be described as follows,

(1) treat activities as reflexively accountable; (2) treat settings as self-organizing and commonsense as an occasioned corpus of knowledge; (3) treat social actors as inquirers into those settings and accounts. (Sharrock and Anderson 1986:38)

Activities are "reflexively accountable" in that the means by which members of a society produce, organize and manage a set of actions is identical to the means by which they themselves understand that activity (Garfinkel 1967:1).

Based on the foundation of ethnomethodology, conversation analysis is the application of this theoretical orientation and methodology to the study of everyday conversation, a particular type of everyday social
activity. The primary goal of researchers in conversation analysis is described succinctly by Heritage and Atkinson (1984b:1).

The central goal of conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction. At its most basic, this objective is one of describing the procedures by which conversationalists produce their own behavior and understand and deal with the behavior of others.

Heritage (1989:22) provides a further explication of the foundations of conversation analysis.

The basic orientation of conversation analytic studies may be summarized in terms of four fundamental assumptions: (1) interaction is structurally organised; (2) contributions to interaction are both context-shaped and context-renewing; (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail in conversational interaction can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental or interactionally irrelevant; and (4) the study of social interaction in its details is best approached through the analysis of naturally occurring data.

This initial assumption is based on the observation that participants in a conversation (or any sort of social activity) are able to make sense of their interaction, hence this behavior has an organizational basis, one which is accessible to the participants and the outside observer as well. Assumption (2) is based on the observation that a participant’s contribution to conversation is influenced or shaped by the preceding talk (context-shaped) while at the same time influences or shapes the subsequent talk (context-renewing). The following assumption, (3), takes the form of a methodological directive; do not overlook any aspect of the conversation, no matter how seemingly trivial. As researchers we cannot know prior to our investigation what aspects of conversation are relevant to our understanding of its organization; this knowledge can
only come a postaerori. The last assumption, (4), is also of considerable methodological import and is closely tied to (3) above. As Sacks (1984:25, cited in Luke 1990:19) has aptly pointed out,

... however rich our imaginations are, if we use hypothetical, or hypothetical-typical versions of the world we are constrained by reference to what an audience, an audience of professionals, can accept as reasonable. ... We will be using observations as a base for theorizing. Thus we can start with things that are barely imaginable, by showing that they happened. We can then come to see that a base for using close looking at the world for theorizing about it is that from close looking at the world we can find things that we could not, by imagination, assert were there. We would not know that they were "typical." Indeed, we might not have noticed that they happen.

The other point to be made is that with recordings of naturally occurring data, detailed and repeated analyses can be made affording the opportunity not only for other researchers to duplicate and empirically verify one's work but also for the data to later be reanalyzed in light of new empirical and theoretical findings. This focus on naturally occurring data, not data manufactured for and/or manipulated by analysts, is shared by both Geis and Schifferin as well.

These last methodological points and what counts as evidence within conversation analysis, are of more direct relevance to this present study. Primary among the types of evidence used in conversation analysis as listed by Wootton (1989:244) are the following,

... the relationship of the device to just prior turns; co-occurring evidence within a turn; subsequent treatment of the device in question; discriminability of the device; and deviant cases in the use of the device.

Unfortunately if we limit ourselves to just the above types of evidence, we are in danger of missing important generalizations which can derive from a more systematic view of the general organization of conversation.
This point will be made clearer in the discussions below of Geis' and Schiffrin's view of the organization of conversation.

4.0  Geis' Model of Speech Acts and Social Actions

Geis (1989a and b, 1991) has proposed a new theory of speech acts in which he attempts to synthesize the work of the conversation analysts and of the speech act theorists, John Austin and John Searle. He argues that what have traditionally been called speech acts, because their illocutionary force is determined by "nonreferential, social aspects of context" (1991:19) rather than by linguistic factors are, in fact, fundamentally social rather than linguistic in nature. Geis thus uses the term 'social action' rather than 'speech act.'

Within this framework Geis describes three types of meaning. I-meaning, or the speaker intention, includes the locutionary, perlocutionary and illocutionary intent of the speaker, a distinctly private matter for the speaker that is not necessarily readily accessible to the hearer or the analyst. L-meaning or literal meaning is based on truth-conditional meaning, as well as conventional implicature and aspects of deixis. Finally we have s-meaning which derives from the l-meaning of the utterance, contextual information, background knowledge and common-sense reasoning. Corollary to these different types of meaning are types of acts, l-acts, l-acts and s-acts, intentional acts, literal acts and social acts respectively. These latter acts, l-acts and s-acts, are the focus of Geis' theorizing. Regarding l-acts Geis (1991:39) states "in uttering a sentence, one necessarily performs an l-act (making an assertion, making an inquiry, or issuing a directive) which is
conventionally associated with the type of sentence uttered." Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between the sentence type uttered and the \( I \)-act performed, e.g. declarative sentences assert propositions, interrogative sentences inquire about the value of a variable, and imperative sentences call upon the addressee to perform an action (Geis 1991:40). Unlike the case of \( I \)-acts, there is no direct correlation between utterance and the \( S \)-act performed, rather \( S \)-acts are a property of conversational sequences. Thus Geis (1991:13) states, "illocutionary force (especially from the perspective of the addressee) is an emergent property of conversational sequences."

Social actions (or \( S \)-acts) are subject to felicity conditions which play a crucial role in determining 1) the illocutionary significance of an utterance, 2) the relationship of adjacency pairs, and 3) the relationship among sets of adjacency pairs in larger conversational sequences (Geis 1991:12). Utterances are "meant to be taken literally in conversation" with the illocutionary force of an utterance being calculable given,

- the literal meaning (\( I \)-meaning) of the sentences (which includes truth-conditional aspects of meaning, presuppositions, conventional implicature, and most aspects of deixis)
- contextual information (including what has preceded conversationally, aspects of the social context, and epistemic context)
- shared background knowledge
- a set of conditions on social actions
- common sense reasoning of the Gricean sort
- principles governing the conduct of conversation, e.g., turn taking rules. (Geis 1989a:55-56)

Social actions are not necessarily or even normally accomplished in a single speaker (Sp) turn but are rather accomplished over a series of Sp turns and addressee (Ad) responses in which it is often the case that no
one utterance can be seen to have performed the social action. The various turns that comprise a single social action typically involve negotiation to satisfy the felicity conditions associated with that social action. The individual utterances (utilizing the various sentence types available in a particular language) which comprise a social action sequence contribute their literal meaning to the sequence, while the \( s \)-meaning of an utterance reflects what it contributes to the satisfaction of the felicity conditions on the \( s \)-act performed through the conversational sequence (Geis 1991:13). Participants to the conversation can then respond either to the \( l \)-meaning or the \( s \)-meaning (or both) of an utterance. When all of the felicity conditions are met, either implicitly through inference from the speech situation, the social relationship of the interlocutors, etc., or explicitly through the basic utterances, then the social action is successfully completed. As Geis (1991:84) puts it,

... conversation is made possible by the fact that understanding the conditions on social activities allows us to recognize what sort of social activity a given speaker may be initiating on any given occasion and allows us sufficiently to predict the course of such activities to generate strong expectations about what others are likely to be trying to say to us at any given stage in conversation and how they are likely to say it.

The following example\(^1\) should serve to make this conceptualization more clear. The social action "proposal" can be seen to be subject to the following conditions,

\[ \text{Sp felicitously proposes that Ad join Sp in doing A if and only if Sp conveys some proposition } P \text{ and} \]

Propositional Content Condition:

- \( P \) predicates a future action of both Sp and Ad

Essential Condition:

- Conveying \( P \) counts as an attempt by Sp to cause Ad to do A with Sp
Preparatory Conditions:
c. Sp believes that Ad may be willing to do A
d. Sp believes that Ad may be able to do A

Sincerity Conditions:
e. Sp wants Ad to do A
f. Sp intends to do A (Geis 1991:85)

Now let us consider the following example,

(1)
L1: ni kan, naban you ge kanxiangde, women look that-side have CL tell-fortune-NOM I-PL
Look over there, there's a fortuneteller, let's go

guoqu qiaoqiao, hao bu hao
go-over see good NEG good
over and take a look, ok?

C1: ei, suan la, ai, ni bu jide women xiaohou INT forget it INT you NEG remember I-PL little time
Aw, forget it, hey, don't you remember when we were

chang na lai kaiwanxiaode naju hua often take come joke-NOM that-CL talk
little that joke we used to say?

L2: shenme hua
what talk
What joke?

C2: you ming suan dao mei ming
have fate calculate to NEG fate
Figure your future so often that you have no future.

L3: alya, fanzheng shi chulai guang jie, sha shijian ma INT anyway be come-out wander street kill time PART
Aw, anyway we came out to wander around and kill time!

C3: ei, HAO ba
INT hao PART
Oh, ok. (Miracle 1988a:223)

This entire sequence on Geis' analysis comprises a proposal social action. The propositional content and essential conditions are made explicit in turn L1. Speaker L suggests that L and C go see the fortune teller. From this we can conclude that she wants the hearer C to
perform this action and her use of the 1st person plural pronoun women implies that she intends to carry out the proposed action, thus satisfying conditions (e) and (f) above. The turns C1 through L3 can now be seen to be a negotiation between Sp and Ad regarding Ad’s willingness to carry out the action (condition c). The context provides us with the information that both Sp and Ad are young people perfectly capable of walking across the street to see the fortunes teller satisfying condition (d). Finally in turn C3, after all the felicity conditions have been met, speaker C marks the completion of the social action with the discourse marker hao. We can see that numerous sentence types have been uttered in the performance of this single social action. Within the first turn alone, the three basic sentence types are represented, i.e., Ni kan, (Imperative); nabian you ge kanxiang de, (Declarative); and women guoqu qiaoqiao, hao bu hac? (Interrogative). From this example it should be clear that various sentence types can be used to perform a social action and that the completion of a social action consists of the satisfaction of the felicity conditions which are associated with that social action.

5.0 Discourse Structure – Schiffrin’s Model of Discourse Coherence

Schiffrin (1987) describes coherence in discourse as deriving from the interaction of different structures, frameworks and states in which the persons involved in a discourse participate. These different realms of discourse are the action structure, the exchange structure, the ideational structure, the information state and the participation framework.
The action structure is that structure in which speech acts (social actions in Geis's framework; I will use the term social action structure) are situated. Schiffrin defines this structure as revolving around the fulfillment of the "ritual requirements of talk,"

...the management of oneself and others so as not to violate standards regarding either one's own demeanor or deference for another;.... (Schiffrin 1987:25)

From example 1) we can see how the marker hao operates in the action structure of discourse to signal the completion of a particular social action.

The exchange structure is the turn structure to which the conversation analysts attend which establishes "conditionally relevant adjacency-pair parts" such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, etc.. Schiffrin defines this structure as,

...the outcome of the decision procedures by which speakers alternate sequential roles and define those alternations in relation to each other. (Schiffrin 1987:24)

We can see from example (1) above that, in a certain sense, turns C1 and C2 must be answers to the preceding questions (or at least must be marked in some manner to show that they are not the answers which would otherwise be expected). Schiffrin also notes that these two structures are not linguistic per se, although they are certainly of importance to linguists studying discourse. Similar to Geis, she sees these structures as primarily social in nature.

The ideational structure (what I will call the idea structure) involves the organization of semantic units, propositions and ideas within the discourse. This structure includes the relationship between old information and new information, descriptive background and the main
Consider the following segment of speech.

(2) (xwge:1)

renli bu zu fangmian, yinwei na shi bianzhi
manpower NEG sufficient aspect because that be organization
As for insufficient manpower, because that's an organizational

wenti, xiang Pingdong xian, neige Pingdong shi, xian e
problem like Pingdong county that-CL Pingdong city county PART
problem, like Pingdong County, Pingdong City, County, uh, that

Pingdong shizhang, ta,..., dangxuan yihou, ta ba suoyoude
Pingdong mayor s/he be-elected after s/he take all-NOM
mayor, after he was elected, he eliminated all of the temporary

linshi renyuan dou gei ta quxiaodiao meiyou zai zengjia
temporary personnel all give s/he eliminate NEG-have again increase
personnel, he didn't increase them again. The result was that he

jieguo ta shi bande hen hao suowi bing bu shi shuo
result s/he be manage-PART very good therefore also NEG be speak
did very well, so that doesn't mean all temporary personnel,...,

linshi renyuan dou,...biaoshi shuo women bu neng shixian
temporary personnel all show speak I-PL NEG can implement
shows that we can't implement it.

In line 4 xiang is used to mark an example which supports a preceding
general statement. Jieguo (line 13) marks what follows it as the result
of what precedes it. Suowi (line 13) is likewise used to mark the
following talk as the culmination of the preceding segment of talk. All
of these items, while not necessarily discourse markers, function in the
ideational structure of this discourse, in the organization of the ideas
presented.

The participation framework includes the relationship between the
speaker and hearer deriving from their respective social status, the
speech situation, etc. and the relationship between the interlocutors
and their utterances. As an example of this former aspect of the
participation framework, in Chinese culture we would expect that the speech used between students and their teacher in the classroom would be different from that used between those same students outside of the classroom. Similarly we would expect that adults might use a style of speech, in many cases even a different code (in the case of Taiwan often a regional dialect rather than Mandarin) when speaking with their parents, different from that which they would use among with their peers. The latter aspect of the participation framework includes a speaker’s commitment to his utterance, his willingness to fight for or relinquish a turn, etc. Consider the following example,

(3) (clr:7)
ye jiu shi shuo, ta zai xue yuyan de shihou, gen also just be say s/he PROG study language NOM time with 3
That’s just to say, when they study language, with children 4
xiao haizi tamen ye bu shi shuo dou shi cuowu, ye shi you yige child(ren) they also NEG be say all be mistake also be have one-CL 5
they’re not all mistakes. When they’re carrying on (language 7
pattern zai jinxing. NA zheige keneng yanjiuchulai yibou pattern PROG carry on na(me) this-CL probably research-out-come after 9
learning) they also have a pattern. So after you discover it, 10
ni keyi dui neige a foreign language teaching you bangzhu. 11
you can toward that-CL a foreign language teaching have assistance 12
it can probably be very helpful in foreign language teaching. 13

In line 7 na(me) may be signalling a shift in the speaker’s orientation toward the material being presented, i.e., at this point the speaker shifts from presenting information to an evaluation of the material presented.

Finally, the information state is used to describe the speaker-hearer interactions regarding their respective cognitive states and their organization and management of knowledge and meta-knowledge.
Knowledge here is what the speaker/hearer knows while meta-knowledge is what they know or believe about their shared knowledge, i.e., the other’s knowledge. Schiffrin (1987:28) points out that "information states are constantly evolving over the course of a conversation." We can see the evolution of the information state in the following example:

(4) (cl:2)
E: ...luoanguo, ni shuo de shi neige, dui le
     luoanguo you say NOM be that-CL correct PART
     luoanguo (a kind of Chinese medicine), you mean that, right

C: [shi bu shi you yizhong] dongxi jiao shenme dongxi
    [be NEG be there-be one-kind] thing call what thing
    Isn’t there something, what’s it called?

F: pengdahai
   pengdahai
   Pengdahai (a kind of Chinese medicine)

B: a, pengdahai, na shi lingwai yizhong la
   INT pengdahai that be other one-kind PART
   Oh, pengdahai, that’s another kind.

In turn B above, a can be interpreted as marking a change in the information state in that speaker B is signalling to the other participants that pengdahai is a part of her knowledge. She is thus now a participant in this shared knowledge.

Discourse markers operate in one or more of these structures, frameworks or states at the same time. Schiffrin argues that in this manner they tie together these different levels of discourse structure and thereby participate in the creation of discourse coherence.
6.0 Methodology for Data Collection

Ostman (1982) has correctly argued that while discourse markers are present in all forms of language, they are most prevalent in and perhaps characteristic of impromptu speech. For this reason, an in-depth study of Chinese discourse markers can most efficiently and reliably derive from the analysis of a considerable body of natural conversation in Mandarin Chinese. The data gathering experiences of Labov (1984) and Milroy (1987) and their respective associates have shown that the most effective means of recording vernacular speech are through participant observation and the use of group recordings. These methodologies afford the researcher access to natural, informal speech which is relatively unburdened by the influence of the observer.

The collection of such a body of data can pose considerable difficulty for linguists working with Chinese, particularly if the researcher is an outsider and a foreigner. Within Chinese culture distinctions between insiders and outsiders are particularly clear. A foreigner would be the most extreme form of outsider. The data utilized in this study, therefore, derives from several different approaches to data collection. The bulk of the data utilized here were recorded by 16 different native Chinese speakers recruited to record data in a variety of settings including the home, the student dormitories, restaurants, and the student activities center. These recordings were made primarily by graduate and undergraduate university students among their peers and families. To supplement this data, recordings were made in a university classroom setting and additional recordings were made of more formal discussions of current social issues broadcast on local television in
Taiwan. While these two latter types of conversation are more formal and thus the speakers were presumably more conscious of their speech, these data all share the crucial feature that the speech is created "on the spot." This extemporaneous quality, as mentioned above, is particularly conducive to the use of the discourse markers which are the subject of this study. All of these data share the characteristic of being "natural language" in the sense that they were produced by native speakers for the purposes of conducting their everyday lives - they were not produced for the use of linguists or other analysts.
NOTES

1. All of the examples cited are naturally occurring language and, unless otherwise noted, are taken from the data collected in the manner described in the Section 6.0 of this chapter.

2. [ ] represents a segment of speech where two or more speakers are speaking at the same time.
Chapter III

Hao: Marking Closure and Transition

1.0 Introduction

The lexical item hao in Mandarin Chinese has a variety of related functions and meanings as a review of several dictionaries and grammars will show. A Concise Chinese-English Dictionary, compiled in the People’s Republic of China for use by foreigners learning Chinese, defines hao as follows:

Adjective: 1) good, well, having the desired quality; 2) friendly; 3) of a high level; 4) beneficial, useful, efficient; 5) healthy, sound;
Used as a resultative complement: 1) indicates that something is ready to be used; 2) in proper order;
Indicates approval or agreement;
That’s enough, stop;
Adverb: 1) used with an exclamatory sense before an adjective to indicate high degree; 2) quite; 3) used before verbs to indicate that sth. is easy; 4) used before the predicate of the second clause of a compound sentence to introduce the purpose for which one does something. (ELI 1982:224 - emphasis added)

I will focus on the use of hao as described in the portion of the definition highlighted above, i.e., "indicates approval or agreement; that’s enough, stop." Other reference works designed for the use of Chinese also recognize these uses of hao. The Groveu Ryhbaw Tsyrdosan, compiled in Taiwan, states that hao is a "word which expresses approval and permission; expresses conclusion or stopping; contrary to expectation."
(He 1974:198-99). *Xiandai Hanyu Cidian*, published in the People's Republic of China, states that Hao "expresses a tone of approval, agreement or conclusion" (Linguistics Research Institute 1984:445). Finally, Lü Shuxiang comes closest to capturing the use of Hao as I see it.

Expresses several kinds of mood. When used alone, it resembles an interjection.
- a) expresses agreement
- b) expresses conclusion, ... (Lü 1980:226)

While the above definitions do capture the essence of the meaning of Hao they do not begin to explain the use of this lexical item in discourse.

### 2.0 The role of Hao in discourse

In an earlier study of Hao (Miracle 1989) it was found that it functioned primarily as a marker of closure of social actions and secondary, within the turn structure of discourse as the answer to a question, the appreciation (acknowledgement and/or agreement) of a statement, or the assent to a command. That study also suggested that the use of Hao might be limited to commissive/requestive social actions (commands, requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, etc.), those social actions that required a commitment of the participants to action following the closure of the social action. While that analysis was valid, the small size of the body of data and the fact that the data was somewhat artificial (radio plays produced from a script), limited the scope of that analysis.

This current study is based on a much larger body of data that was spontaneously produced by native speakers in the Taipei area. A more thoroughgoing analysis reveals that Hao not only 1) plays a role in the
development and closure of commissive/requestive social actions, but also 2) acts as an appreciation of assertions and marks the transition to a new topic or social activity, 3) marks the closure of telephone calls or other physical activity, and 4) used within a particular speaker's turn, functions as a marker of idea management signalling the completion of a prior topic or activity and the transition to another topic or activity.

2.1 Commisive/Requestive Social Actions

Searle (1979:14 from Austin (1962)) describes commissive illocutionary acts as those which commit the speaker to a course of action. Directive illocutionary acts, including commands, requests, and invitations, on the other hand, are attempts to commit the hearer to a course of action (Searle 1979:13). These two types of illocutionary acts share an important property in Searle's classificatory framework; they have the same "direction of fit between words and the world" (Searle 1979:3). They both are attempts to cause "the world to fit the words," i.e., to cause a change in the world. Hancher (1979), in his review of Searle's taxonomy of illocutionary acts, faults Searle for inadequately dealing with the group of illocutionary acts which he calls "commissive directives" (Hancher 1979:6). These acts, including offers and invitations, at the same time commit the speaker to a course of action and attempt to move the hearer to action. Geis (1991:13) suggests that we may need to consider request-promise sequences combining both of these types of illocutionary acts (his s-acts).
Within commissive/requestive social actions, hao can mark the final closure of the social action or the completion of various smaller chunks of activity necessary to the completion of the overall action. A closer look at an order (s-act) sequence will illustrate this point.

(1) (cm56:6)
C1: nimen qu zu luyingdai, zule ye shunbian zhuan qu, you-PL go rent videotape rent-ASP also conveniently turn go You go and rent a video, rent it and then go over and buy

[ qu mai cai ] ni mai cai guangwanle, shiyidian le, = [ go buy food ] you buy food stroll-RES-ASP 11:00 ASP groceries, after you've bought groceries and strolled around,

B1: [ Dinghao mai cai]
[ Dinghao buy food]
Buy groceries at Dinghao.

C2: = women shiyidian kaishi nong cai, nong dao shierdian, 1-PL 11:00 begin cook food cook to 12:00
11:00, at 11:00, we'll start cooking, cook until 12:00,

ni mama huilaile you mother back-come-ASP
then your Mom will come back.

->A1: HAO
 hao
Okay.

->B2: HAO
 hao
Okay.

A2: NA ni mama jiu gandong, ayo, ni zemme zheime lihai
 na you mother then moved INT you how so formidable
Then your mother will be moved, wow, how'd you get so good!

In this example two college students, speakers A and B, are at B's home with her father, C, discussing plans for their dinner. This excerpt is the conclusion of a longer discussion regarding their trip to the market. In the marked turns A1 and B2, A and B use hao to assent to the order of B's father. The distinction between an order and a request
hinges on the social relationship of the interlocutors. In this instance the relationship between the father and the daughter is such that this series of exchanges can be viewed as an order. The disparity between the ages of the father and the boyfriend and their close relationship, within Chinese culture, can also justify labelling this sequence as an order sequence from the point of view of the boyfriend. Following this exchange a new social action begins. The use of *na* (to be discussed in Chapter 5) in turn A2 also serves to mark the transition to the new social action. *Hao* thus marks the completion of the *s*-act order, and the stage is set for the beginning of a new social activity. Earlier within this same order sequence we can see *hao* functioning to mark the completion of smaller chunks of the conversational work involved in the completion of this activity.

(2) (cm56:4)
C1: ..., mai shenme cai, nimen xihuan chi yu ne, jiu mai  
    buy what food you-PL like eat fish PART just buy  
    ... what food (should we) buy, you like to eat fish, so  
yitiao yu jiu haole  
one-CL fish then alright-PART  
buy a fish and be done with it.  
                        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18
B1: jiali you meiyou yu  
home have NEG-have fish  
Do we have any fish in the house?  
C2: meiyou, mai yu zhengde la  
NEG-have buy fish steam-NOM PART  
No, buy a fish, steamed (we’ll steam it).  
B2: zhengde yu a  
steam-NOM fish PART  
steamed fish  
C3: jian de (??), jian de ye keyi  
pan-fry-NOM (??) pan-fry-NOM also alright  
Fried (??), fried is okay too.
A1: HAO a
   hao PART
   Okay.

B3: chi jiane haole
   eat pan-fry-NOM alright-PART
   Let's eat fried (fish).

A2: shenme yu yu
    what fish PART
    What kind of fish?

B4: youyu
    squid
    Squid.

C4: changyu a
    cuttlefish PART
    Cuttlefish!

B5: changyu, HAO
    butterfish hao
    Butterfish, okay.

C5: ni bu shi xihuan chi changyu ma
    you NEG be like eat butterfish PART
    Don't you like to eat butterfish?

A3: HAO
    hao
    Okay.

B6: changyu, HAO
    butterfish hao
    butterfish, okay.

A4: HAO
    hao
    Okay.

C6: mai dian, mai dian changyu, yu, a, zai chao
    buy bit buy bit butterfish fish PART again stir-fry
    Buy a little, buy a little butterfish, (we’ll) cook
    liangge cai,
    two-CL food
    two more dishes, ...

Before the participants could reach any final closure of this activity,
they had to first determine what they would cook in order to decide what
they would need to buy at the market. In turn C1 a suggestion is made by the father in such a manner that no discussion of the issue, whether or not to eat fish, is engendered. The following discussion regarding the way to cook the fish (lines 10-16) is brought to a conclusion through the use of hao. In turn A1 (line 19) hao is used as an appreciation of the preceding l-act assertion and as an agreement with the mention of an alternative. The following speaker, B3, confirms the agreement to the alternative. Finally in turns B5, A3, B6 and A4 hao is used to mark the completion of the discussion of the type of fish to be bought (lines 25-31). Both speakers reiterate their remarks, changyu, hao and hao, to signify closure of this portion of the work involved in the overall s-act order. In the following turn, C6 (line 49), the agreement is restated and an new portion of the work needed to complete the order sequence is begun.

Social actions revolving around offers also occasion the use of hao as we can see in the following example.

(3)  (cm56:14)
(telephone rings)

C1:  dianhua
telephone
Telephone.

A1:  wo lai jie
I come receive
I’ll get it.

->B1: HAO, ni lai jie
hao you come receive
Okay, you get it.

A2:  wo lai jie, wo lai jiejue tamen, ...
I come receive I come resolve s/he-PL
I’ll get it, I’ll settle them. ...
This example involves the same speakers that we have been discussing above, C, the father; B, his daughter; and A, the daughter’s boyfriend. In turn B1 the daughter is accepting A’s offer to answer the telephone. This utterance is prefaced by hao which acts in the turn structure as an appreciation of the prior 1-act assertion and in the social action structure to accept and initiate closure of the offer sequence. Example (4) demonstrates the use of hao as part of an 8-act suggestion.

(4) (cm47:19)
C1: ..., (4 sec) a, zenne hai meiyou wan  
    PART how still NEG-have finish  
    ..., (4 sec) hey, how is it hasn’t finished yet?
B1: lu dao nali h a  
    record to where-PART PART  
    How long does it record?
A1: hao [ man ne ]  
    very [ slow PART ]  
    How [ slow! ]  
    [ ]
C2: [ dagai ] yao shifenzhong  
    [ about ] need 10-CL-clock  
    About 10 minutes.

->A2: HAO, ni keyi xixide, xi yifule  
    hao you can wash-wash-NOM wash clothes-PART  
    Okay, you can wash, wash clothes.

->B2: HAO, meiyou, women chifan  
    hao NEG-have I-PL eat  
    Okay, no, we can eat.

A3: dui a, yaoburan ni dou hui women lianggede shengyin  
    right PART otherwise you all will I-PL two-CL-NOM voice  
    Right, otherwise you’ll only have our two voices.

In this example speakers A, B, and C are university coeds talking in their dorm room. Hao in turn B2 follows an 1-act assertion in the turn structure and acts as an appreciation of that assertion. Within the social action structure the assertion in A2 specifies the essential
condition of the s-act suggestion and thus hao acts as the acceptance of that suggestion. Hao can also play a role in request social actions.

(5) (cm1.1:11)
C1: ha (1 sec) ei CYT =
   INT INT name
   Oh, (1 sec) hey CYT =
A1: en
   INT
   hmm

C2: = ni zhidaow wo dianhua ma
   you know I telephone PART
   Do you know my phone number?
A2: you a, zai wo (??) shang a
   have PART on I (??) on PART
   Yes, on my (??)

->C3: Hao a, ni da dianhua gei wo a
   hao PART you dial telephone give I PART
   Okay, give me a call.
A3: en
   INT
   hmm

C4: ni shenme shihou hui, keyi ludedao diyi juan gei wo ho
   you what time can can record-success first CL give I PART
   When can you, can you record the first tape and give (it to) me?
A4: bu zhidaow
   NEG know
   I don´t know.

C5: libaiyi shang ke neng bang wo lu yixia
   Monday attend class can help I record a little
   When you go to class Monday can you help me record a little?
B1: libaiyi you meiyou shuxue
   Monday have NEG-have math
   Monday do you have math?
A5: Hao meiyou shuxue, libaiyuer you shuxue, libaiyuer
   hao NEG-have math Tuesday have math Tuesday
   Okay, I don´t have math, Tuesday I have math, Tuesday?

C6: libaiyuer keyi lu, shi a, NA wo libai, NA wo libaiyuer wanshang
   Tuesday can record be PART na I week na I Tuesday evening
   You can record Tuesday, right? So, I, Tues, so Tuesday evening
The above example is part of a request sequence (s-act) where an older female graduate student, C, is asking two female high school students, A and B, to do some recording for her. Within the overall request activity we can see that the issues of transmission of the tapes and the participants in the recording need to be settled. Hao in turn C3 follows an l-act assertion and, within the turn structure, acts as an appreciation of that assertion. This assertion is the answer to a question, 'do you know my phone number?,' which addresses one of the felicity conditions on the request sequence, e.g., the ability of the addressee to comply with the request (see note #2 above, preparatory condition d). Following hao is an imperative sentence. Hao thus marks the completion of the preparatory work and sets the stage for the following utterance, ni da diaohua gei wo a which makes explicit the propositional content condition of the s-act. In turn C7 hao is again used to mark completion of a portion of this request sequence. Preceding hao is a minimal response marker, en, indicating agreement with the preceding assertion, setting the time for the exchange of tapes. Following
hao we find the beginning of yet another issue which is subordinate to
the overall request social action, the confirmation of the parties to be
recorded. As in the case discussed above, hao closes one subsidiary
issue and sets the stage for the introduction of another subsidiary
issue.

We have seen from these examples that hao can function in
comissive/requestive social actions to mark final closure of the
activity or to mark closure of smaller chunks of action which are subor-
dinate to the primary activity. This use of hao is remarkably similar
to that of 'okay' in English as described by Merritt (1984). She found
that in service encounters 'okay' has the following functions,

(1) that of signifying approval, acceptance, confirmation;
(2) that of providing a bridge, a linking device between two
stages or phases of the encounter. In these cases, use of
the term OK seems to signify that the speaker suggests the
termination of the phase that has just preceded and agrees
to take the initiative in continuing with the next phase (or
be satisfied with termination). (144)

While the cases we have seen above are not service encounters, the type
of social activity in service encounters, primarily requesting, is
similar to the social activity we have examined. The issue of initia-
tive mentioned by Merritt does not appear to be operative in the data
discussed here. In a number of instances, the initiative to further the
conversation or start a new social activity has shifted from the Sp (the
person who used hao) to the Ad. This fact may just be a function of the
open-ended nature of the speech situations encountered in these data.
This conclusion is supported by work done by Condon (1986) concerning
the discourse functions of OK. Her findings support those of Merritt
regarding the function of OK, but there is no indication from her data that the Sp has the initiative to further the interchange.

2.2 Appreciation of Statements

We have seen above in our discussion of the role of hao in commissive/requestive social actions that hao can act as the appreciation of an l-act assertion within this context. The marker hao can also function as an appreciation l-act assertions within a variety of s-act statements (simply conveying information), announcements, affirmations, assessments, etc. In this framework, then, hao can act as the appreciation of assertions which have a variety of different implications (s-meanings). Within these various s-acts hao functions to mark the transition from one issue or sub-activity to the next.

As an appreciation of an assertion, hao can operate in s-act inquiry sequences and in other settings where clarification is being sought. Consider the following example,

(6) (cm21:4)
C1: zenne ban, wo jintian xiawu yao zu fangwen xiaoahizi
    how do I today afternoon need go visit child
    What should I do? I have to go see some kids today.

->B1: HAO a, haowan
    hao PART fun
    Okay, that's fun.

C2: ei, nimen gen xiaoahizi jiang hua, nimen dou zenne jiang a
    INT you with child talk speech you all how talk PART
    Hey, when you talk with kids, how do you talk?

The speakers in the above example are college coeds talking in their dormitory. In turn B1 hao follows an announcement and acts as an appreciation of that announcement within the context of the s-act
inquiry initiated in the prior turn, C1. Following *hao* speaker B offers an assessment of the situation presented by speaker C. Because no answer is forthcoming to the question posed by C in C1, *hao* also can be seen to clear the way for the addition of more specificity to the question of C. Related to this use of *hao* are the following,

(7)  (cm1.1:3)
B1:  quanbu dou shi Guoyu ma
total all be national-language (Mandarin) PART
All (of the situations) are the Mandarin.
A1:  Guoyu a, ni hen shao jiang Taiyu de, shi bu shi?
Mandarin PART you very seldom speak Taiwanese NOM be NEG be
Mandarin, you rarely speak Taiwanese, right?
B2:  dui a
correct PART
Right.

->A2: HAO, NA jiu tan Guoyu, ...
hao na then talk Mandarin
Okay, so then it’s speak Mandarin, ...

In this example the speakers, A (a graduate student) and B (a high school student), are discussing filling out a form regarding their language use in different settings. *Hao* is used in turn A2 as an appreciation of the prior assertion B2. Speaker A thus acknowledges B’s answer to her question and closes this side issue of clarification. The ground is then cleared for A to give her advice to B, her junior, that she should just mark the form as *guoyu*. *Na(me)* cooccurs with *hao* here and also serves to mark this transition.

(8)  (cm1.1:1)
B1:  (???) shi shenme dongxi
(???) be what thing
What is (???)?
A1:  shenme dongxi?
what thing
What thing?
C1: maikefeng
microphone
Microphone.

→A2: HAO, bu yao guar ta, women jiu suibian liaotian hao NBG need bother-about it I-PL then casual chat Okay, don’t worry about it, we’ll just chat.

In example (8) above we see yet another situation in which hao follows the answer to an inquiry. This example is drawn from the same recording as (7) above in which speaker A is a graduate student and speakers B and C are high school students. In this example speaker A seeks clarification of B’s utterance, this clarification being provided by speaker C (turn C1). Speaker A then acknowledges this clarification using hao (turn A2), marking end of the clarification and using this information for the basis for her furtherance of the conversation with the subsequent j-act imperatives. This ground-clearing function of hao can also be seen in the following example.

(9) (cm47b:1)
A1: wo bu shi gen ni jiangguo xuemeide neijian shi, I NBG be with you talk-ASP classmate (younger) that-CL matter Didn’t I tell you about that business concerning my younger (female) classmate?

jintian xuemei (??), bu shi gen ni jiang xuemei (??) today classmate (??) NBG be with you talk classmate (??) Today her, (??) didn’t I tell you her (??), I mean, I mean,

jiushi, jiushishuo ta neige, neige lianzide shi a just-is just-is-say s/he that-CL that-CL necklace be PART her, that, that necklace, is, ...

C1: [(???) ]
[(???) ]
[(???) ]
[
[

B1: [zai zhong] jiang, wo meiyou tingdao [PROG kind] talk I NEG-have hear-RBS Talking like that, I didn’t hear (it).
C2: dui a
right PART
Right!

->A2: HAO a, jiushi ta, ta xuejie, dasi xuejie a, 
hao PART just-is s/he s/he classmate (older) senior classmate PART
Okay, it's just that her, her, classmate, the senior, she,
ta dasi xuejie songgei ta yige hen piaoliangde lianzi,
s/he senior classmate give s/he one-CL very pretty-NOM chain
the senior classmate gave her a very pretty chain,

ranhou ...
afterward
and then ...

Speakers A, B, and C are college coeds chatting in their dormitory.
Turn A1 is a prelude to a story telling, what Polanyi (1985:187) has
called "entrance talk." Speaker A is checking to see whether her
listeners have heard this particular story before. In response to her
inquiry, her listeners, B and C, confirm that they have indeed not heard
the story. She acknowledges their response with the use of hao (turn
A2), an appreciation of the 1-act assertion (turn C2). At the same time
she clears the ground for the telling of the story which proceeds in
turn A2. In all of these cases hao has operated as an appreciation
marker within the turn structure while at the same time clearing the way
for the continuation of the conversation at the s-act level (the social
action structure).

In the context of appreciation of assertions, hao can also be used
to mark the closure of a side issue or topic and the beginning or return
to the main issue.

(10) (clr:8)
M: ...jiu rang ni [ yang-mei-tu-qi ]
...then let you [feel-proud-and-elated]
... that'll let [ you feel proud and ] elated.
In this example male (speakers F and A) and female (speakers M and T) graduate students are bantering with each other during class. This banter is brought to an end through the use of hao (turn A) which acts as an appreciation of the prior I-act assertion (turn T) and at the same time closes the banter, moving the activity to the presentation of a report. The movement back to the main topic can be seen yet more clearly in the following example.

(11) (cm47a:9)
B1: jiushi xuesheng zenyang, ta dou, yongyuan zai xiao-mi-mide, just-is student how s/he all always PROG smiling-PART It’s just that no matter how the students are, he’s always ranhou yongyuan shi, hen wenroude yige laoshi ye, zhende afterward always be very gentle-NOM one-CL teacher PART really smiling, and always, a very gentle teacher, really very gentle yige hen wenrou, hen you xuezhe fengdude yige laoshi, one-CL very gentle very have scholar demeanor-NOM one-CL teacher (and calm), a teacher with scholarly demeanor, but while he (can)
danwei suiran jiao, laoshi bu hui ting ma but although teach teacher NEG can listen PART teach, he can’t listen (take advice?)
A1: bu hui a, ta bu hui ting NEG can PART s/he can listen (He) can’t, he can’t listen.

->B2: HAO, jiushi hen haode yige laoshi, ta shuo yihou, wo hao just-is very good-NOM one-CL teacher s/he talk after I So it’s just that he’s a very good teacher, he said that if I
In this example we have two female classmates chatting in their dorm.

Speaker B is relating a description of one of her teachers to her friend. Speaker A (turn A1), echoing B's statement, offers a confirmation of the opinion expressed by B (turn B1) regarding the teacher. Hao (turn B2) acts as an appreciation of the confirmation while at the same time closing that aside and marking the transition back to the original topic.

Closely related to the use of hao in the closure of asides is its use in the closure or termination of complaints and disagreements.

(12)

B1: ..., tai lanle, zemme ban, wo yidian nian shude yuwang too rotten-PART how do I one-bit study book-NOM desire ..., it's too awful, I don't have any desire to study,
dou meiyou, wo xiang hui jia
don't NEG-have I like return home
I'd like to go home.

A1: hai xiang hui jia, ni cai gang cong jiali lai, still like return home you just just from home come You still want to go home, you just now came back from home,

ni hai xiang hui jia
you still like return home
you still want to go home!

B2: dui a, bu xiang dai zai Taibei, juede hao fan correct PART NEG like stay at Taibei, feel very annoyed Right, I don't want to stay in Taibei, I feel real annoyed.

→A2: HAO ba, NA ba Taida qian dao Zhanghua qu, ni renwei ruhe,

dao PART na take NTU move to Zhanghua go you consider how Okay, so move National Taiwan Univ. to Zhanghua, what do you

hehehe
(laughter)
think?
 Speakers A and B in this example are classmates. A uses hao to cut off
B’s complaint about going to school in Taipei. The transition is also
made to the facetious suggestion that follows, "move Taida (NTU) to
Zhanghua.” Because of the positive semantic value of hao we can call it
an appreciation of the preceding I-act assertion despite the fact that
the closure of the s-act complaint sequence is not necessarily a posi-
tive action from the point of view of the preceding speaker. Also
similar to this use of hao is its function in closing of disagreements.

(13) (cm1.1:23)
C1: nimen dou kaowanle ma, kaode you meiyou hen
you-PL all test-RES-PART PART test-PART have NEG-have very
Have you all finished testing? Did you do poorly in the
lan
rotten
testing?

A1: meiyou, zheici kaode bijiao jiandan
NEG-have this-time test-PART relative simple
No, this time the testing was pretty easy.

B1: shenme bijiao jiandan, shi yinwei ni you nian, ni you
what relative simple be because you have study you have
What was easy! It’s because you studied, it was only because
niandao cai jiandan, ni meiyou nian jiu nan ma
study-RES only-then simple you NEG-have study then difficult PART
you studied that it was easy, if you didn’t study it was hard!

-A2: HAO ma, wo cuole. dui bu dui
hao PART I wrong-PART right NEG right
Okay! I’m wrong, right?

B2: zheyangzi
this-kind
That’s how it is.

The speakers in this excerpt are three females, a graduate student (C)
and two high school students (A and B). Once again hao (turn A2)
functions as an appreciation of an I-act assertion. Within the social
action structure *hao* serves to bring to a close the disagreement between speakers A and B in turns A1 and B1. The emphatic particle *ma* following *hao* adds a somewhat sarcastic tone to A’s agreement with B as we can see from B’s next turn (B2), also emphatic. The close relationship between these speakers (classmates) makes this type of sarcastic banter possible. The use of *hao* to close disagreements is not always successful as we can see from the following example.

(14) (cm56a:2-3)
C1: ... mai yihe wandou, wo lai chao, chao, chao, rouding buy one-CL pea I come stir-fry stir-fry stir-fry meat-cube ..., but a container of peas, I’ll stir-fry, stir-fry the meat cubes.

B1: yao bu yao kede want NEG want shell-NOM
Do you want the shelled ones?

C2: a [kede (???)] =
PART [shell-NOM ]
Oh, [ shelled ] =
[
]
A1: [ wandou ]
[ peas ]
[ Peas ]

C3: = bu haode NA (??), o, o, douzi bu xing a, NA douzi NEG good-NOM na (??) PART PART beans NEG alright PART na beans That’s no good, so, uh, uh, beans aren’t alright, uh, beans

B2: bu shi, wandou jiushi gen yiqian nage [ (???) ]
NEG be peas just-be with before that-CL [ (???) ]
No, peas, that’s like those before (???)[ ]

->A2: [HAO, HAO, meiyou ]
[ hao hao NEG-have ]
Okay, okay, it doesn’t
guanxi, chihaole, [meiyou guanxi ]
bearing eat-RES-PART [NEG-have bearing]
matter, eat (it), it [doesn’t matter ]
[ ]

B3: [ bu shi ] ma bu shi you shuo,
[ NEG be ] mother NEG be have say
[ No ] Mom, didn’t she say
jiushi nage dinghao maide, shenme, hongluobo, yushushu just-be that-CL Dinghao buy-NOM what carrot corn that the ones (we) bought at Dinghao, what, carrots, corn,

[ (???) ]
[ (???) ]
[ (???) ]
[ ]
C4: [ dui, dui, dui ] neige, neizhong meiguanxi a [right right right] that-CL that-kind NEG-bearing PART [ Right ] those, that kind, it doesn't matter.

Here we again have the father C, his daughter B, and her boyfriend A that we have seen in examples (1-3) above. Again hao (turn A2) is used as an appreciation of the preceding I-act assertion (turn B2). At the s-act level, however, a disagreement has developed over whether to buy wandou 'peas' or douzi 'beans' (turns C1 through B2). The boyfriend attempts to cut off his girlfriend, the daughter, and bring the disagreement to a close. As we can see from turn B3, this attempt is unsuccessful, and the disagreement is finally resolved by the father and daughter (turns B3 and C4). In all of the examples above involving the closure of complaints and disagreements, the interlocutors have a very close personal relationship suggesting that hao is most appropriately used in this manner among social intimates or by a person in a higher social position.

2.3 Completion of Physical Activities

The closure of physical activities can also be marked by hao. In these instances hao marks the closure of the physical activity, but transition is not necessarily made to another social activity. Consider the following example.
A: dui, dui, keneng shi bingguo
correct correct probably be refrigerate-ASP
Right, right, it was probably refrigerated (frozen).

->B: zhei bijiao xin a, HAO, wo baowanle, ni kan wode
this relatively fresh PART hao I wrap-RES-ASP you look me-NOM
This is pretty fresh, Okay, I'm finished wrapping, look at my
shouyi
skill
handiwork.

Here speakers A and B, the college students (the boyfriend and
girlfriend) that we have seen earlier, are now cooking dinner. B
interrupts the train of their talk with an aside regarding her comple-
tion of the wrapping that she has been doing. HAO marks the completion
of the wrapping which is reaffirmed by B's statement, "I've finished the
wrapping." This type of closure can also be seen in the following
example.

(16) (cm56a:18)
A: ni zhi hui zuo yumí nongtang, wo zhi hui zuo
you only can make corn thick-soup I only can make
You can only make thick corn soup and I can only

-> Guangdong zhou (sound of chopping ends) HAO ba
Canton rice porridge hao PART
make Cantonese rice porridge, (sound of chopping ends), Okay.

(6 sec)

B: yige ren zong yao you yige zhuanchang ma
one-CL person always need have one-CL speciality PART
A person always needs to have a speciality!

Once again we see hao marking the end of a physical activity, this time
chopping (turn A). Following a pause, the speakers resume their
original topic. The following example is of the closure of a telephone
conversation.
(17)  (cm56a:14)
A:  (on the telephone) ... NA ni shenme shihou yao huilai?

na you what time will come back
So when will you come back?

->    HAO, mei guanxi, HAO, HAO, NA baibai
hao NEG bearing hao hao na goodbye
Okay, it doesn't matter, okay, okay, goodbye.

In example (17) hao is used to mark the closure of the conversational
work of the phone conversation which is confirmed by baibai. In this
example and the few other examples in the data of telephone calls, hao
is followed by either baibai or zaijian 'goodbye.' While I have no
examples in my data, it is not uncommon, from this author's experience,
to have a repetition of hao close the conversation with no subsequent
utterance. These examples demonstrate that hao can be use to mark the
closure of physical activities, related or unrelated to the conversa-
tional topic at hand.

2.4 Turn Internal Use of hao

Finally hao can operate within the turn of a particular speaker as
a marker of information management. Hao serves to close one topic or
issue and marks the transition to the next topic. The new topic may or
may not be related to the prior topic. This use of hao may be related
to the completion of some sort of mental activity on the part of the
speaker although empirical evidence for this proposal is difficult to
find. Consider the following example.

(18)  (cm56a:17)
->A:  zheme lihai, HAO, wo lai, wo lai, wo lai kankan ni
so formidable hao I come I come I come look you
How great, okay, I'm coming, I'm coming, I'm coming to see whose
gen wo bade shouyi, neige hao, wo ba ye hui zuo
and I father-NOM skill which-CL good I father also can make
skill is best, yours or my Dad’s, my Dad can make it too.

In example (18) there is a shift in social activity from assessment to
assertion. Hao occurs following the assessment sequence (in this case
only one turn) and prior to the following assertion sequence. A brief
pause, a fraction of a second, also precedes hao. It appears that hao
is not only marking the transition from one s-act to another, but also
signalling that some sort of mental deliberation has occurred and has
been completed. Schourup (1982) in his study of discourse particles in
English argues that these particles (markers) are "evincives" that
signal that "the speaker is engaged in or has just been engaged in
thinking, ..." (14). The following example will further demonstrate
this point.

(19) (cm2.1:10)
A: ..., ranhou wo jiu shuo, keshi wo fenxi gei ni ting ha, 1
    afterward I just say but I analyze give you hear PART 2
    ..., then I’ll tell you, but I’ll analyze it for you, 3

    jintian jiaru shuo, shi yige sanshisuide nanhaizi, yi ta 4
today if say be one-CL thirty-year-NOM boy regarding he 5
today, say if there is a thirty year old guy, and with 6

    zheyangde waixing, gen tade tiaojian lai shuo,7
this-type-NOM appearance regarding he-NOM qualification come say 8
his appearance, and his qualifications, 9

    ni shuo ta meiyou nüpengyou zai shenbian, ni yiding hui 10
you say he NEG-have girlfirend at body-side you certain will 11
you say he doesn’t have a girlfriend at his side, you’ll 12

    juede hen qiguai, jiashi shuo, tade tiaojian ge fangmian 13
feel very odd if say he-NOM qualification each aspect 14
certainly think it’s wierd, if say, all aspects of his 15

    dou peihe, baokuo ta ye hui jiang hua de-hua, NA 16
all coordinate include he also can talk talk PART-talk na 17
qualifications fit, including savvy in talking, so, you see (if)18
ni shuo ta meiyou nüpengyou, ni yiding juede hen huaiyi, you say he have girlfriend you certain feel very suspicious
he doesn’t have a girlfriend, you’ll definitely be suspicious, -> NA, HAO, jiu suan ta meiyou nüpengyou, keshi ta
na hao then consider he have girlfriend but he
so, okay, figure he doesn’t have a girlfriend, but he’s
sanshisui er meiyou jiehun er meiyou jiaoguo nüpengyou, thirty-year and NEG-have marry and NEG-have meet-ASP girlfriend
thirty and isn’t married, and has never had a girlfriend,
ni juedui juedi shege nanhaizi yiding nali you wenti,...28 you absolute feel this-CL boy certain somewhere have problem 29
you’ll definitely think this guy has a problem somewhere, ...

The speaker, A, in this example is giving his views on the subject of unmarried males to his friend. The argument can be seen to be structured as follows,

(19a) Intent: give you an analysis (line 1)

Situation (1): male, 30 years; his (good) appearance and qualifications; no girlfriend (lines 3-10)

Result (1): you’ll think it’s odd (lines 11 & 13)

Situation (2): his qualifications all fit, even his savvy in talking; no girlfriend (lines 13-19)

Result (2): you’ll be suspicious (line 19)

na, hao (line 22)

Situation (3): no girlfriend; but 30 years; and not married; and never had a girlfriend (lines 22-25)

Result (3): you’ll think the guy has a problem (line 28)

Conclusion/Opinion (not included)

What we have here is the supporting evidence portion of an argument with the conclusion and opinion to be supported (not included here) after this excerpt. After repeating essentially the same evidence twice, the speaker evidently decides that his point is still not sufficiently
clear. Hao, and na (see Chapter 5) as well, indicate that this sort of internal deliberation occurred with hao signifying that this deliberation is completed. Thus hao marks the transition from one presentation of evidence to yet another presentation of evidence in support of an argument (operating in the idea structure). Related to this use of hao in managing ideas and idea units within discourse is the following.

(20) (clr:9)
A: ..., jiushi shuo, zai bu tongde changhe, bu tongde jiaose, just-is talk at NEG same-NOM setting NEG same-NOM role ..., that is to say, in different settings, different roles,

→ tamen dou hui you zheiyangde bu tong, HAO NAME zheipian they all will have this-kind-NOM NEG same hao name this-CL they will have that kind of difference, okay so the author zuozhe, ta jiu jieshao shuo, mm jiushi shuo, ta kankan. a writer he just introduce talk INT just-is say s/he look PART he just introduced, hmmm, that is, he looked at, uh,

zheige middle class American cultures, ranhou, ...
this-CL afterward
the middle class American cultures, and then, ...

Here we see hao mark a shift in topic within a report given by a student. The completion of the prior topic is marked by hao as is the transition to the following topic. Another related topic follows and is elaborated after the excerpt you see above. In the following example we will see a situation where hao is used to mark the transition from one activity to the next.

(21) (cm22a:2)
A: ..., NA YF, ni yao haohaode jilu, (2 sec) HAO a, na name you must carefully-PART record hao PART ..., so YF, you have to take minutes well, (2 sec) okay,

xianzai kaishi, (3 sec), ...
now start
let's start now, (3 sec), ...
The speaker in this example is the head of a university student organization and is conducting a meeting, thus he is in a position of authority relative to his classmates. In (21) *hao* marks the transition from the secondary issue of recording the minutes to the primary activity at hand, the committee reports.

In this section we have seen that *hao* can function within a given speaker’s turn as a tool for idea management to mark the closure of one topic or activity and the transition to the next topic or activity. We have also seen that in each of these instances, *hao* was preceded by a pause suggesting that the marker may be serving an evincive function as well.

3.0 Summary

From the above examples and discussion it should be clear that the marker *hao* has a number of different, but ultimately related functions in Mandarin conversation. Within commissive/requestive social actions, *hao* can both mark the closure of small chunks of the conversational work as well as mark the closure of the s-act itself. In this respect *hao* is operating primarily in the social action structure of the discourse. Within the turn structure of the discourse, *hao* can act as the appreciation of l-act assertions which are a part of numerous different social actions, including conveying information, announcing, inquiring, disagreeing and complaining. In this context we have seen that *hao* has a ground-clearing and closure function that paves the way for the subsequent continuation of the conversational work at hand or the transition to another social action. *Hao* can also operate to mark the completion.
of physical activities which may or may not be related to the social activity which is the object of the ongoing talk at the time. Finally *hao* can act as an aid to idea management (operating in the idea structure) marking the completion of one issue or action and the transition to the next. In this role the marker *hao* also appears to have an evincive function, marking that some sort of relevant mental activity on the part of the speaker has been completed.

Table 1: Discourse Use of *hao*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Discourse</th>
<th>Function (Marking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Action Structure</td>
<td>closure $s$-act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>closure physical act ($s$-act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completion of subsidiary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Structure</td>
<td>appreciation of assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Structure</td>
<td>completion of idea - transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information State</td>
<td>completion of internal deliberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout this discussion of the multiple uses of *hao* there have been several commonalities. In all of its usages, in the various aspects of the discourse structure, *hao* remains a marker of closure and transition. This core function of closure can be seen to be directly related to the use of -*hao* as a resultative complement conveying the idea of satisfactorily finishing something.
NOTES

1. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

2. To understand this distinction, the felicity conditions on an order in Geis’ (1991:34-5) framework are as follows,

   Sp felicitously orders Ad to do A if and only if Sp conveys some proposition P and
   Propositional Content Condition:
   a. P predicates a future action of Ad.
   Essential Condition:
   b. Conveying P counts as an attempt by Sp to cause Ad to do A.
   Preparatory Condition:
   c. Sp believes that Ad is under an obligation to perform A-type acts of the sort predicated in P if Sp desires.
   Sincerity Condition:
   d. Sp wants Ad to do A.

   while the felicity conditions on requests are,

   Sp felicitously requests Ad to do A if and only if Sp conveys some proposition P and
   Propositional Content Condition:
   a. P predicates a future action of Ad.
   Essential Condition:
   b. Conveying P counts as an attempt by Sp to cause Ad to do A.
   Preparatory Condition:
   c. Sp believes that Ad may be willing to do A.
   d. Sp believes that Ad may be able to do A.
   Sincerity Condition:
   e. Sp wants Ad to do A.

We can see that the distinguishing feature of these two social actions lies in the preparatory conditions and hinges on the "obligation" of the Ad from the point of view of the Sp. In Chinese society in Taiwan today, a person in a position such as the father's in our example would normally feel that his daughter's boyfriend would be under obligation to carry out tasks of the type described here.

3. The symbols (??) and (???) indicate a segment of speech which is unclear, with (???) indicating a longer segment than (??).
4. An s-act suggestion is subject to the following felicity conditions, Sp felicitously suggests to Ad that Ad do A if and only if Sp conveys a proposition P and
Propositional Content Condition:
   a. P predicates a future action of Ad
Essential Condition:
   b. Conveying P counts as an attempt by Sp to cause Ad to do A.
Preparatory Conditions:
   c. Sp believes that Ad faces some problem P.
Sincerity Condition:
   d. Sp believes that Ad’s doing A may enable Ad to solve P (Geis 1991:35).

5. This particle, borrowed from Southern Min, is used in the Mandarin spoken in Taiwan to call forth agreement from the addressee. The vowel o is nasalized (Kubler and Ho 1984:12).
Chapter IV

Contrastive Markers: *keshi*, *danshi* and *buguo*

1.0 Introduction

The study of the disjunctive or concessive conjunctions *buguo*, *danshi* and *keshi* in Mandarin Chinese has been largely been confined to their use as conjunctions within the boundary of the sentence. Conjunctions, however, while clearly playing a role in the syntax of sentences, are also uniquely tied to the surrounding discourse. Stubbs (1983:78) has aptly noted,

> Almost by definition, conjunctions cannot be fully dealt with within syntax, since they are not really part of the structure of syntactic units. They have rather a sequencing function of relating syntactic units and fitting them into a textual or discourse context.

In the last chapter the use of *hao* as a discourse marker was shown to be only distantly related to its more commonly studied use as an adjective, adverb and resultative complement. In the case of *buguo*, *danshi* and *keshi* we will see that their use as discourse markers is very closely tied to their use as conjunctions and can in fact be seen to derive directly from this use.

The standard grammars of Mandarin Chinese all address the sentence internal use of these conjunctions and some also make mention of their connection to the surrounding discourse. Lü (1980:122-3) describes *danshi* as a conjunction that "expresses contrast, draws forth a meaning
opposite of the prior text, or limits, supplements the meaning of the
prior text. The main point to be expressed follows the conjunction." 
Regarding the use of *danshi* in discourse he mentions that it can be used
to connect both sentences and paragraphs. *Keshi* and *buguo* are described
in a similar manner with the additional notes that *keshi* can appear
either before or after the subject of the sentence (301) and that *buguo*
is generally used in casual speech (80). Zhu (1984:217-8) puts *danshi*
and *keshi* in the category of conjunctions which occur in the second
clause of conjoined sentences and specifically in regard to *keshi* points
out that it can be used in response to another speaker or in the turn of
a speaker in the sentence-initial position. In this position *keshi*
creates "a mutual meaning relationship which surpasses sentence bound-
aries" (218) and connects the preceding with the following talk. Y. R.
Chao also recognized the dependence of these linguistic units on pheno-
mena outside the sentence in which they occur when he discussed the
"macrosyntactic use" of conjunctions (1968:791-2). Among the conjunc-
tions that he included as being subject to this type of use were *danshi*
and *keshi*. He noted that in addition to its syntactic use, *danshi* can
be used to "begin a sentence... after completing a previous sentence or
in commenting on something another person has said" (791). Li and
Thompson (1981:651-3) place *buguo, danshi* and *keshi* in their class of
"adverbial backward-linking elements" which appear in clause-initial
position. With regard to these "backward-linking elements" they state
that the clause can be either linked to "the speaker's own previous
clause or to a clause that someone else has just said" (651).
By far the most comprehensive study of the contrastive conjunctions buguo, danshi and keshi can be found in the work of Ross (1978). She distinguishes these three items in several ways finding that keshi is the most versatile of the three. While danshi and keshi are used in both spoken and written discourse, keshi is the more colloquial of the two with danshi being preferred in written discourse. She notes though that this distinction may be disappearing in Taiwan due to the influence of the Southern Min dialect spoken natively by the majority of the population (200). These items also are distinguished by the type of contrast found in the conjuncts that they join. Danshi and keshi are preferred in cases of "oppositional" contrast, where there is a close similarity in the syntactic and semantic relationship of the conjuncts, while buguo is preferred in situations of "non-oppositional" contrast where the semantic and syntactic relationships of the conjuncts are more distant and not parallel (202-2). She concludes that danshi, keshi, and buguo all conventionally imply a common topic and contrast, but that in the case of keshi the conventional implicature is oppositional contrast, while with buguo the conventional implicature is one of non-oppositional contrast.

The corpus of data in this study contains only a few examples of buguo, and for this reason the emphasis will be placed on danshi and keshi with only tangential mention of buguo. Analysis of the data does not reveal any significant differences among the functional uses of buguo, danshi and keshi. It does appear, however, that keshi is more likely to be used in informal speech settings while danshi is more likely to be used in more formal speech settings. In this chapter I
will explore those "macrosyntactic" uses of buguo, danshi and keshi, i.e., I will explore their function as discourse markers and show that their use as discourse markers flows directly from their use as conjunctions.

2.0 Analysis

From the frame of reference of the surrounding discourse, the analysis of the disjunctive markers buguo, keshi and danshi can be divided into two categories. The first category to be discussed will be those markers which occur within a single speaker’s turn. The second category will be those disjunctive markers which are used to initiate the turn of a particular speaker. A turn here is meant to be the speech of one speaker bounded by the speech of other speakers. This division is made for clarity and ease of explanation as well as to show how the use of these markers derive from their use as conjunctions. We will see that the two categories have marked similarities. One would expect that those markers used within the turn of a single speaker would bear the closest resemblance to the sentence-internal use of these items, while those used turn-initially would tend to deviate from that use. In fact we will see that their functions are remarkably similar.

2.1 Turn-internal keshi and danshi

As noted above, Lü (1980) describes danshi as a conjunction which: expresses a turn in the course of events, draws forth a meaning opposite of that expressed previously or limits, supplements the meaning of the prior text. (122)
He gives the same explanation for the function of *keshi* (301). We can see in the following discussion that while these explanations may be useful for *danshi* and *keshi* as conjunctions, they are woefully inadequate in explaining these linguistic units as discourse markers.

Consider the following example.

(1) (xwgc:1)
Z: DANSHİ zheige tingzhang shuo, tebie qiangdiao jiushi na shi
danshi this-CL minister say special stress just-be that be
But the director said, (he) particularly stressed, that that is
weilai qushi minqunde zheige yiyuan
future trend people-NOM this-CL wish
a future trend, the people’s desire,

→ DANSHİ bu shi xian, xian jieduande
dan NEG be current current stage-NOM
but (it) isn’t the current stage.

In (1), with the highlighted use of *dan* (an alternate form of *danshi*), we see an example of what Ross (1978) called “oppositional” contrast. The two conjuncts of *dan* are parallel in syntactic structure, ‘is a future trend, the people’s desire’ vs. ‘isn’t the current stage.’ The meanings of the two conjuncts are also very closely related, differing only in negation and the noun phrase used. Here *dan* is operating to connect the contrasting ideas expressed in the two clauses. The following example shows a contrast in the content of the two connected phrases without the syntactic parallel seen above.

(2) (xwgc:2)
A: zheige gei gongwuyuan fangbian,
this-CL give public-official convenient
that’s convenient for the officials,

→ DANSHİ... dui minzhongde qiagong zaocheng bu bian
danshi toward public-NOM carry-out-business create NEG convenient
but, for the public conducting business, it’ll create inconvenience.
In this instance there is a clear semantic contrast between the proposition expressed prior to and subsequent to danshi; the policy is convenient for the officials but inconvenient for the public. This marker is used here in the idea structure to mark a contrast between the two propositions. We will see later exactly how this marker operates in the construction of this particular argument.

The following examples present a less clear-cut example of the idea contrast marked by keshi and danshi.

(3) (cm18a:29)
A: dui a, ta shuo keyi zhu
   right PART s/he say can live
   Yeah, she said you can live there,

   -> KESHI yao kaoshang yanjiusuo
   keshi must test-up graduate school
   but you have to be admitted to graduate school

   jiu keyi zhu
   then can live
   then you can live there.

In this example we can see that keshi is used to introduce a condition on the preceding statement. The following example shows danshi marking an idea contrast in which a qualification of the prior clause is found in the following clause.

(4) (xwgc:8)
zhei shi youde, DANSHI jixiao bufen
this be have-NOM danshi extremely-small part
(You) have this, but it's a very small part.

In the following examples we will see the idea contrast become even less straightforward.

(5) (cm18a:25-26)
erqi, ta meitian, ta neiyang 1
   moreover s/he every-day s/he that-way
   Furthermore she's like that every day,
   2

   Furthermore she's like that every day,
wo jue de ta bu keneng neiyang a
I feel s/he NEG probably that-way PART
I don’t think she can be like that!
piru shuo, wo zai shui jiao o wo hui shengqi
for example I PROG sleep PART I will angry
For example if I were sleeping, I’d get mad,

-> DANSHI yin wei shi ouer shui, ye bu shi meitian
danshi because be occasional sleep also NEG be every-day
but it’s occasional, it isn’t an everyday thing,
zheiyang shi ba women quan bu shenghao daoguolai, ni
that-way be take I-PL complete life turn-upside-down you
that’s turning our whole lives upside down,
zhidao ma?
know PART
you know?

NA nandao women jige ren, sange, sige yao pei he
na RHET I-PL several-CL people 3-CL 4-CL need accommod ate
So do we, the three, four of us have to accommodate

ta ma
s/he PART
her? (rhetorical question)

In the above example danshi is used to contrast a hypothetical situation with a real one. Once again the contrast is one of ideas with danshi operating in the idea structure to organize these ideas. This function can be seen from examining the argument structure in (5) in some detail.

(5a) Position: she’s like that everyday and shouldn’t be (lines 1-4)

Support (1): if I were sleeping I’d get mad (line 7)

DANSHI it’s occasional, not everyday (line 10)

Support (2): it’s turning our lives upside down (line 13)

NA Position restatement: why should we accommodate? (lines 19-22)

We can see that danshi precedes a conjunct which mitigates the prior conjunct. Support of an argument is offered and then qualified through the use of danshi. Consider the following example.
(6) (cm18a:12)
A: ni zhidaoma
you know PART
Do you know,

wo jintian liudian gang chu men o
I today 6-o’clock just exit door PART
today at 6:00 when I had just come out,

you yiliang chezi
have 1-CL car
there was a cab.

KESHI ta jiushi yijing bu shi zai zhanpai wang qianmian
keshi it just-is already NEG be at stand-sign toward front
but it was already, it wasn’t at the cab stand, it was a little

yidian
one-bit
in front (of the cab stand).

In (6) above the contrast signalled by keshi is not overt but must be
deduced from the shared knowledge of the speaker and hearer in this
conversation, i.e., that a cab is expected to be at the cab stand. From
this example and examples (1) through (5) above we can see danshi and
keshi operating at the local level of the argument structure in marking
idea contrast with the immediately preceding segment of talk. We can
see in (5a) how this function can fit into the overall organization of
an argument.

In the examples that follow we will explore the functions of
danshi and keshi that go beyond the local level of organization in
discourse. Consider the following example.

(7) (xwegc:2)
A: tongshi wo geren renwei, yige libai xiuxi liangtian shi,
same-time I individual think one-CL week rest two-day be
At the same time, I think two days off in one week is,

zheige shi bian guan er bu li min
this-CL be convenient official but NEG benefit people
it’s convenient for the officials but not for the people.
er yinwei women dou xiaode, women zhengfu wei min
further because I-PL all know I-PL government for people
And because we all know, government is to serve the people

fuwu gei minzhong geng duode fangbian,
serve give public even more-NOM convenience

to make things more convenient for the public,

gei minzhong geng duode liyi
give public even more-NOM benefit
to be more beneficial to the public,

zhei shi womende tianshi
this be I-PL-NOM duty
that's our duty.

-> DANSHI, zheige, women zhengfu, zidongde jianshao
But, this, if our government, on it's own reduces the
gongwuyuan shangban shijian a,
public-official-NOM attend-work time PART
public servants working hours,

zheige gei gongwuyuan fangbian,
this-CL give public-official convenient
that's convenient for the officials,

-> DANSHI... dui minzhongde qiagong zaocheng bu
but, for the public conducting business, it'll create
bian, dui minzhongde quanyi, hui zaocheng
convenient toward public-NOM rights-interests will create
inconvenience, it'll hurt the public's interest.

hen dade shanghai
very large-NOM harm

suoyi wo geren renwei maoran shishi, keneng shi
therefore I individual think rashly try probably be
So in my opinion to rashly try (this system) is probably

bian guan er bu li min
convenient official but NGO benefit people
convenient for the officials, but it doesn't benefit the
public.

The structure of the above argument can be interpreted as follows:
(7a)
Position: two day weekend is good for officials, not public
(lines 1-4)

ER Support (1): government is to serve the people (line 7)
Expansion (1): give the people more convenience (line 10)
Expansion (2): give the people more benefit (line 13)
Summary: this is our duty (line 16)

DANSHI Support (2): reducing hours is convenient for officials
(lines 19-25)

DANSHI Expansion (1): inconvenient for public business
(line 28)
Expansion (2): hurts people's rights and interests
(line 31-34)

SUOYI Restatement of Position: try two day weekend rashly is good
for officials, not the public (lines 36-39)

In this argument danshi is used at a local level to create a contrast
between two items expanding support for the position (line 28) and at a
more global level to mark the contrast between two different supporting
arguments (line 19). At this level danshi is also marking the struc-
tural contrast between the immediately prior summary (line 16) of the
preceding the position and the subsequent second item in support of the
argument. Keshi can be used in a similar fashion.

(8) (clr:10)
A: NAME yiban role play, jiushi shuo, yongde fangfa
   name general role play just-be say use-NOM method
   So generally role play, that is, the main method
   zhuyao shi yong role play
   main be use
   used is role play,
   -> KESHI yiban role play jiushi shuo rang xuesheng
   keshi general role play just-be say make student
   but generally role paly, that is, has students talk
jiang shidi  
talk on-the-spot  
on the spot,  
piru shuo ei, jintian ni yan baba, ni yan mama  
for-example say PART today you play dad you play mom  
for example, today you play mom, you play dad, 

-> KESHI hai renwei shuo, zheiyang you yige quedian, ...  
keshi still consider say this-kind have one-CL fault  
but still, this method has a problem, ...

The structure for this example can be seen as follows,

(3a)  
NAME Situation: role play usually used (lines 1-4)  

KESHI Specification of the situation: students talk on the  
spot (lines 7-10)  

Example: you play mom, you play dad (line 13)  

KESHI Qualification of the situation: this method has problem  
(line 16)

The contrast marked by keshi in line 7 is that between the general and  
the specific; there is no clear contrast of ideas. Rather, the contrast  
is between the structural roles of the two utterances within this  
argument, e.g., the utterance preceding keshi in lines 1-4 presents a  
general statement of the situation while the utterance following keshi  
presents a more specific realization of the situation. Keshi in line 16  
marks a structural contrast at a higher level of this segment. There is  
no idea contrast with the immediately prior segment of talk, but rather  
with the initial utterance in line 1, a contrast which is contrary to  
the expectation of the participants. In this context, one would expect  
that the manner of research that is "generally" used (lines 1-4) would  
be without problems. Keshi (line 7) here marks the structural movement  
in this segment from the general to the more specific and then (line 16)
marks the move back to the general. Thus we have seen in examples (7) and (8) that \textit{danshi} and \textit{keshi} can be used at different levels in the idea structure to mark idea contrast as well as structural contrast. This contrast tends to highlight the subsequent argument or portion of an argument. This type of highlighting is particularly apparent in the following example.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{(9) (xwgc:3)}
\item \textbf{H:} \\
\textit{dang quan shijie, zheige keji jinbu, jingji just-at whole world this-CL science-technology advance economy} \\
\textit{Just when the whole world, after science and technology has fazhan yihou, gongzuo shijian hui jianshao, daiyu hui tigao,} \\
\textit{develop after work time will reduce salary will rise} \\
\textit{advanced, the economy has developed, time needed for labor will} \\
\textit{shehui fuli, dou yinggai tigao,} \\
\textit{society welfare all ought rise} \\
\textit{decrease, salaries will rise, social welfare, all ought to rise,} \\
\item \textbf{DAN} \\
\textit{wenti shi ni jingji fazhan dao shenme chengdu} \\
\textit{dan problem be you economy develop to what level} \\
\textit{but the problem is to what level should your economy develop} \\
\textit{(before this happens)?}
\end{enumerate}

In this example, the contrast is one that Ross (1978) would describe as “non-oppositional.” The contrast derives from the expectation that there would be no problem with the advance of science and technology, economic development, etc. The introduction of a problem following \textit{dan} is thus contrary to the hearer’s expectation. This contrast and perhaps the “looseness” of the contrast, i.e., the contrast is not direct and readily apparent, serves as a rhetorical device to place stress on the point following the marker. This rhetorical effect of focusing attention and thus emphasizing the point following the marker can also be seen in the following example.
(10) (xwgc:2-3)

women hen danxin de shi, women gongwujiguan shishi zhihou, 1
I-PL very worry-NOM be I-PL public-offices carry-out after 2
What we’re worried about is, after public offices carry this out, 3

chanye jiu genjin 4
industry then follow 5
industry will then follow. 6

zheige shihou keneng dique zhe hui zaocheng gangcai Lin 7
this-CL time probably certainly this will create just-now Lin 8
At this time this would probably, certainly create what Minister 9

tingzhang suo jiangde 10
minister that-which talk-NOM 11
Lin has just mentioned. 12

NAME women hen keneng chanyejiede, neige shengchan,13
name I-PL very probably industrial-sector-NOM that-CL production14
So our industrial sector will likely, the production volume 15

liang, hui shoudao yingxiang 16
volume will receive influence 17
will be influenced. 18

-> NAME, DANSHI wo weisherme hui bijiao qingxiang shuo xianzai 19
name danshi I why will relatively favor say now 20
So, but why do I tend to favor saying that we should now 21

women shi yinggai lai kaoli. NAME cong zheige, e si 22
I-PL be should come consider name from this-CL PART four 23
consider, say beginning from this system of one day rest 24

zhou yi xiu zhidu kaishi ne 25
week one rest system start PART 26
every four weeks? 27

yinwei ruguo women bu caiqu jianjinde fangshi hen keneng 28
because if I-PL NEG adopt gradual method very probably 29
Because if we don’t adopt a gradual method, we will very likely,30

rang womende qian chanyejiie yizhi weichi zai 31
cause I-PL-NOM money industrial-sector all-along remain at 32
our money, industrial sector, will continue to remain 33

yige tigao shengchangliang er bu shi tigao 34
1-CL raise production-volume but NEG be raise 35
focussed on raising production output but not on raising 36

shengchanglide zheiyangde guanlian 37
productivity-NOM this-kind-NOM connection 38
the production capacity, that kind of connection. 39
The use of *danshi* in line 19 above does not mark any clear informational contrast. If there is any contrast at all, it is between the relevant and the irrelevant. The speaker uses *danshi* to reestablish contact with his overriding concern, i.e., the need to move gradually. Here *danshi* is operating in the social action structure to mark the reintroduction of the main topic. The rhetorical effect of this move is accentuated by the use of *danshi* and the established expectation, from the conventional implicature of contrast and a common topic (discussed in section 4.0 above), that something immediately relevant will be forthcoming. This expectation serves to emphasize what follows. In fact the speaker does go on to establish the relevance of this rhetorical question in the remainder of the excerpt.

Within a given turn, we have seen that *danshi* and *keshi* function in the idea structure of the discourse much as they do as conjunctions, connecting and marking a contrast between an immediately preceding clause and subsequent clauses. These idea contrasts can be either immediately apparent or can be derived from the expectations and information shared by the participants. *Danshi* and *keshi* can be used at different levels of the idea structure in this fashion. In this final example we have also seen that *danshi* can act in the social action structure without marking any clear idea contrast to reestablish a connection with an earlier topic which is not recoverable from the
immediately surrounding discourse. The expectation of contrast and a common topic, deriving from the conventional implicature carried by these markers, forces the listener to seek the relevant connection.

2.2 Turn-initial 

As we have seen with turn-internal danshi and keshi, the use of these markers in the turn-initial position can mark varying degrees of closeness of information contrast in the idea structure of the discourse. They can also be used to establish a connection with and make reference to prior positions in the social action structure of the discourse. Unlike danshi and keshi when used turn-internally, in turn-initial position they can also mark the introduction of new topics or issues in the social action structure. This function derives from their conventional implicature of contrast and a common topic and Grice’s (1975:46) maxim of relation, “be relevant.” A new dimension of the function of danshi and keshi is also revealed, their function in the turn structure of the discourse marking dispreferred responses.

As is the case with turn-internal danshi and keshi, in the turn-initial position these markers can mark an idea contrast between the following talk and the immediately preceding talk, in this case another speaker’s turn.

(11) (cm18a:18)
B1: libailiu, zheige libailiu shi meiyou shi la Saturday this-CL Saturday be NEG-have business PART Saturday, this Saturday is free.

A1: hen su o very plain PART How boring!
->B2: **KESHI** wo hen nan shuo, you-shihou xiang yao qu nali jiu
**keshi** I very difficult say sometime think want go anywhere then
But that's hard to say, sometimes I want to go somewhere and I

hui qu nali
will go anywhere
just go there.

In the above example, while the syntax is not parallel, there is a
direct contrast in the content of the two turns, A1 and B2, i.e., it's
boring vs. it might not be. In turn A1 speaker A offers an assessment
of B's earlier turn. Within the turn structure, preference organization
would call for an appreciation of that assessment. Instead **keshi**
introduces an dispreferred response. I should point out here, as
Levinson (1983:307) does, that preferred and dispreferred as I am using
the terms refer to linguistic rather than to social or psychological
preference. We will see that this notion of dispreferred response,
introducing disagreement, is basic to the use of **danshi** and **keshi** in a
turn initial position. Now consider the following example.

(12) (cm18a:19)
D: ruguo wo xian dao wo yiding hui xian shanglaide
   if I first arrive I certainly will first up-come-PART
   If I get there first, I'll certainly come up first.

->A: **KESHI** ruguo yidian dian jiu bu xuyao la
   **keshi** if one-bit bit then NEG need PART
   But if it's just a little bit (you) don't need to.

In this example there is again a direct contrast in the informational
content of the turns, I'll come up vs. you don't need to. In the turn
structure of the discourse, following the specification of the essential
condition on an s-act offer in turn D we would expect an acceptance in
turn A. Once again a dispreferred response, a rejection, is received
and is preurbed by *keshi*. *Keshi* is operating in the turn structure to mark a dispreferred second turn.

(13) (cm18a:8)
A: aiyó, ruguo ye suan shi, jiushi hen chengshide ren,
  INT if also consider be just-be very upright-NOM person
  Hey, if she’s considered a very upright person,
  NA ta he ta nanpengyou zhu na bu shi ye hen mafan
  na she and her boyfriend live that NEG be also very troublesome
  then she and her boyfriend live (together), isn’t that a lot of
  trouble?

→D: **Keshi** women bu keneng shuo neiyang ma
  keshi I-FL NEG probably say that-way PART
  But we wouldn’t talk that way!

In D above we can see that *keshi* serves several different functions.

Within the social action structure it introduces an opinion, a contrast-
ing challenge to the position expressed by A, i.e., we wouldn’t talk
like that. There is a clear contrast between the content of A’s initial
turn and the content of B’s challenge. *Keshi* also functions in the turn
structure of this segment. In terms of the preference organization of
these two turns, the question in A requires an answer in D. Because D
does not answer the question, *keshi* thus introduces a dispreferred
response. *Danshi* is also used to mark the types of “oppositional”
contrast seen above.

(14) (xwgc:1)
Zu: ..., suoyi yinggai shi zui xinde ziliao, bu shi jianglaixingde
  therefore ought be most new-NOM data NEG be future-type-NOM
  ..., so it should be the latest data, not what will be.

→Z: **Danshi** zheige tingzhang shuo, tebie qiangdiao jiushi na shi
  danshi this-CL minister say special stress just-be that be
  But the director said, (he) particularly stress, that that is

  weilai qushi minqunde zheige yiyuan
  future trend people-NOM this-CL wish
  a future trend, the people’s desire,
The latter portion of this example (turn Z) was cited earlier as example (1). Here *danshi* prefaces a direct contradiction of the prior talk, ‘it’s the latest data, not what will be’ vs. ‘it’s a future trend.’ In the turn structure an appreciation is expected, but instead a disagreement is forthcoming, a dispreferred response, marked by *danshi*.

In the following examples we will see that, as was the case with the turn-internal use of *danshi* and *keši*, the content contrast of the two utterances involved is not always as clear and direct as we have seen in the previous examples.

(15) (cm47a:10b)
B: nazhong ren shi zhende hen pa shou shanghaide, ta that-kind person be really very fear receive injury-NOM s/he That kind of person really is afraid of getting hurt, he’s

bijiao te-li-du-xing, bu yi zai zhei fangmian tuchu ziji relative independent NEG easy at this respect project-out self pretty independent, it’s not easy for him to push himself forward.

->A: dui **KEŠI** ruguo shuo ta yijing liaojie women jiu keyi right *keši* if say s/he already understand I-PL then can Right, but if he already understands us, the he can try

shizhe ba zijide...
try-PROG take self-NOM (talking about) himself...

In this example *keši* marks the idea contrast of actual vs. hypothetical. Again the response in A is dispreferred, disagreement with, rather than appreciation of, the preceding assertion. A yet more loose idea contrast is found in the following examples.
(16) (cm18a:27)
D1: NA neige fangzi shi, jiushi sanfangdong, neiyang, 1
    na that-CL house be just-be sublet that-way 2
Now that place, it's a sublet, like that, 3
    NA neige shi wai guoren, 4
    na that-CL be foreigner 5
and he's a foreigner, 6
    NA ta yao leisi jiao, jiaohuan yuyan neiyang 7
    na s/he want similar exchange language that-way 8
and he wants to exchange language too, that kind of thing. 9

C1: mm, NA ni keyi a 10
    INT na you can PART 11
Hm, so you can do that. 12

→D2: KESHI haishi yao fu neige fang, neige fangzu a 13
    keshi still need pay that-CL house that-CL rent PART 14
But you still have to pay that, the rent. 15

C2: fangzu yao duoshao 16
    rent need how-much 17
How much is the rent? 18

There is no clear information contrast between turns C1 (line 10) and turn D2 (line 13), rather the contrast must be deduced from the context and the shared information of the participants, in this case the fact that in Taipei all college students want to learn English and would jump at the chance to practice more. Speaker D contradicts this expectation by introducing a problem associated with the situation initially described by herself in lines 1, 4 and 7. In the social action structure here keshi prefaces a shift in the immediate topic, while in the turn structure it once again introduces a dispreferred response (it was not an appreciation of C1 (line 10)).

(17) (cm47a:11b)
A1: dui a, wo shi juede wo bu xihuan zai nabian gen ta 1
    right PART I be feel I NEG like at that-side with s/he 2
Right, I don't like to intrigue against him. 3
    gou-xin-dou-jiao
    intrigue-against-each-other
The two speakers are university coeds who have been belittling a male classmate of theirs. The position presented in B1, in providing some justification of this student’s behavior, is thus contrary to the expectations that have been developing between these coeds in their earlier discussion. Here keshi marks this more distant contrast while at the same time in the turn structure introducing a dispreferred response to speaker A’s assessment. Danshi can also be used in marking this type of loose contrast.

(18) (cm18a:30)
D1: Zhonghe, ni hai mei tingdao zai nali shi bu shi, zai Zhonghe Zhonghe you still NEG hear-RES at where be NEG be at Zhonghe Zhonghe, you still haven’t heard where it is, right? It’s in Zhonghe.

B1: hao yuan o very far PART
So far!

D2: Danshi xianzai zai Taipei fangzi dou hen gui a danshi now at Taipei house all very expensive PART
But now in Taipei all housing is expensive.

In this example two university coeds are discussing an apartment one of them is considering renting. Here we have another example in which the
contrast marked by danshi is one which is contrary to the Ad’s expecta-
tion. Zhonghe is generally considered rather far from Taipei so the
addition of another argument in support of this place to rent and the
consequent lack of an agreement with the assertion in B1 is unexpected.
In terms of linguistic preference, in the turn structure danshi marks
the dispreferred response in D2; it is not an appreciation of the
preceding assessment.

The idea contrast marked by these disjunctive markers is not
always found between the immediately preceding and subsequent segments
of talk. The following example illustrates this point.

(19) (cm47a:8b)
A1: ..., qishi kaode fenshu, ta zhi kan ni zongfen, ta
... actually test-NOM grade s/he only look you overall-score s/he
... actually the test grade, he only looked at your total, he

genben bu kan ni[ de ] shijian zenme [ tiaopei ]
simply NEG look you[ -NOM ] time how [ arrange ]
really didn’t look [ at how ] your time was [ spent. ]
[ ]
[ ]
B1: [ dui a, ] [a wo qianmian]
[right PART] [PART I front ]
Right. Before I,

jiu meiyou, qianmian jiu meiyou...
just NEG-have front just NEG-have
just didn’t, didn’t before...

→A2: BU GUO ye hao, ye bu yiding a, ni yizhi xie
bu guo also good also NEG certain PART you all-along write
But alright, not for sure, if you write the whole time

shuobuding dou gaicuo, ...
perhaps all change-wrong
you might change (it) incorrectly, ...

In example (19) speaker A uses bu guo to mark an idea contrast, not with
the immediately prior turn (B1), but rather with her own prior turn
(A1). She initially argued that a longer time period spent writing
would have a positive influence on one's grade, but then in turn A2 contradicts this position suggesting that this might not always be the case. Speaker B agrees with her initial position, but A contradicts herself nonetheless. The marker buguo marks this dispreferred response in the turn structure.

Yet another capacity of danshi and keshi to operate across turn boundaries can be seen in the following examples. These examples are related to the preceding ones in that they return to the speaker's prior turn for contrast. In these cases the return is more distant, i.e., the return is not necessarily to the speaker's immediately prior turn. As Li and Thompson (1981) have aptly pointed out, these items are backward linking, but not necessarily to the immediately prior segment of talk. In addition stress is placed on the segment immediately following the markers. This function has been noted by Lü (1980) as well.

(20) (cm47b:18b)
B1: kandao zheige wo jiu xiangdao yiqian zai ni chuangshang look-RES this-CL I then think-RES before on you bed-on
When I looked at this, I thought of, before on your bed

bu shi you yizhi hei heide...
NEG be have one-CL black black-NOM
didn't you have a black one...

C1: xingxing, KESHI na yizhi hen keai ei orangutan keshi that one-CL very cute PART
Orangutan, but that one (stuffed animal) is real cute.

->B2: dui a, DANSHI wo kandao tade yanse jiu hui xiangdao right PART danshi I look-RES s/he-NOM color then will think-RES
Right, but when I looked at the color I thought of that one.

nazi
that-CL

->C2: dui a, KESHI zheizhi hen keai a right PART keshi this-CL very cute PART
Right, but this one is real cute.
Here we see both danshi (turn B2) and keshi (turn C2) acting in an identical fashion. There is no idea contrast between either turns C1 and B2 or B2 and C2. Unlike the previous examples danshi and keshi here follow another marker, dui a. Dui a is used as an appreciation of the prior statement, softening the contrast which follows danshi. Thus the dispreferred nature of the content of the statement following danshi is ameliorated by the use of dui a. Danshi and keshi also function to mark a return to the speakers prior turn and the contrast with those turns.

In both cases the restatement of the assertion and the use of the disjunctive markers both serve to place emphasis on the segment of talk following the markers. Related to this example are the following examples. We will see that this return to an earlier point can follow a multi-turn interval.

(21) (cm18a:29)

D1: xianzai shi hai bu tai queding la
    now be still NEG too definite PART
    Now it's still not too definite.

B1: meiyou, women zheibian bu shi hai you yige dasi
    NEG-have I-CL this-side NEG be still have 1-CL senior
    No, don't we still have a senior,

    jiushi hai you yige
    just-be still have 1-CL
    still have a ...

D2: keyi...
   can
   (you) can (stay?)

B2: zai nian yiniande hua, xuexiao yiding hai keyi zai
    PROG study 1-year-NOM speech school certainly still can PROG
    When you're in your freshman year, you can certainly continue

    zhu a
    live PART
    to live at school.
The use of *danshi* in D3 (line 19) above, as we have seen in earlier examples, marks an informational contrast between what follows and the immediately preceding turn, i.e., certainty vs. uncertainty. The function of *danshi* in the social action structure of this excerpt is, however, somewhat unique here. By looking at this longer segment we can see that *danshi* looks backward and makes a connection with the earlier topic of this discourse, the main point (line 1).

In this example once again there is no idea contrast to be found between the segments of talk immediately prior to and subsequent to *keshi*. The use of *keshi* is unrelated to the prior request or command sequence in the turn structure. Rather *keshi* marks a return to an earlier issue, the question in turn A1, while at the same time marking the subsequent segment of talk as a dispreferred response to that question. Thus
keshi marks a return to an earlier turn following an interruption, an aside unrelated to the current topic.

(23)  (clr:4-5)
E1:  ruguo ni yao pinyin [yao pin, juedui ] meiyou cuo
     if you need spell [need spell certain ] NEG-have mistake
     If you need romaniza[tion, it's certainly] not wrong.
     [ ]
T1:  [ particles, (???) ]
     [ particles (???) ]
     Particles, (???)

F1:  keyi Yingwen jieshi ma
     can English explain PART
     Can (we) use English to explain?

E2:  ye keyi
     also can
     That's okay too.

F2:  Yingwen jieshi ma
     English explain PART
     Can (we) use English to explain?

M1:  dui, Yingwen jieshi [ shi a ]
     right English explain [ be PART ]
     Right, use English to [explain is uh]...
     [ ]
F3:  [ bu yao ba ]
     [NEG need PART]
     You don't need to.

->E3:  DANSHI qianwan, bu yao zhi pinyin, meiyou Zhongwen,
     danshi must NEG must only spell NEG-have Chinese
     But definitely don't just use romanization,
     ou, zheiyangde hua, kanbudong ei
     PART this-kind-NOM talk read-NEG-understand PART
     oh, in that case, I couldn't understand it.

Once again in this example there is no local idea contrast marked by the use of danshi. The idea contrast marked by danshi is found between turns E1 and E3, a qualification of the earlier assertion. This is the same type of contrast seen earlier in the discussion of the syntactic use of these conjuncts and in the turn-internal use of these markers.
In this case *danshi* not only marks this idea contrast, but also serves to focus the listener's attention backward in order to find the connection of the following utterance with the prior discourse. In these cases the conventional implication of contrast and a common topic place the burden on the Ad to find this earlier connection.

The final examples will show further how this backward looking feature of the markers *danshi* and *keshi* can be utilized in conversation. In these examples there is no idea contrast to be found. The expectation of contrast and a common topic, carried by the conventional implicature found in these markers, is utilized to give the very loosely related or unrelated topics or issues which follow the markers the appearance of cooperation and relevance in the Gricean sense. If there is any contrast to be found it is between the immediately prior unrelated issue and the following issue which is related to a much earlier topic and issue.

(24) (cm18a:32)
C1:  NA nimen zhende xiang banchuqu a  
     na you-PL really want move-out PART  
     So do you really want to move out?  

B1:  wo cong, ei LL, ruguo nimen you yinxiang, wo cong bu zhidao  
     I from PART name if you-PL have impression I from NEG know  
     I've from, hey LL, if you remember, from I don't know what  

     daji jiu yizhi zai ban na  
     large-how-many just all-along PROG shout PART  
     year (of college), been telling you all along!  

A1:  dui a  
     right PART  
     Right.  

->CZ:  ei, KESHII BB ni bu shi yao hui qu le ma?  
     INT keshi name you NEG be need return go PART PART  
     Hey, but BB don't you have to go back (home)?
In this example, _keshi_ along with the marker/interjection _ei_, causes the listener to hark back to the earlier appeal issued by the speaker in C1 (line 1). After an extensive discussion regarding the logistics of moving out, A appears to have become resigned to the fact that B does intend to move, but in C2 (line 13) the speaker, with the assistance of the markers _ei_ and _keshi_ launches a new challenge to her resolve. _Keshi_ does not mark any idea contrast except in the most abstract sense. Rather it is used in the social action structure to begin anew the earlier assault on the resolve of her listener in an attempt to dissuade her from moving out.

(25) (cm47a:11)
A1: dui ma, youqi shi xiang women xuexiao nian yingyuxi nanzi
   right PART especially be like I-PL school study Eng.-dept. man
   Right, especially like the men studying in our English department.

B1: ta jia shi zhong nong, zhong-tiande
   s/he home be grow farming farm-NOM
   His family is farm, farmers.

A2: o
   PART
   Oh.

(3 sec.)

->B2: dui a, hai you, jiushi shuo, e, o, _KESH_ wo jiu shuo
   right PART still have just-be say PART PART _keshi_ I just say
   Right, still, that's, uh, but I say if you are chosen,

   ruguo ni xuanshang de-hua, jiushi yao biande bijiao
   if you choose-RES NOM-talk just-be need chang-PART relative
   then you have to get pretty self-seeking, pretty crafty, ...

   jian, bijiao jiaohua e, ...
   self-seeking relative crafty PART

Here the speakers are the two university coeds seen earlier in (17) who have been discussing the kind of men who are students studying English at their school and one of their male classmates in particular. Again
there is no idea contrast being marked by keshi. As was the case above, keshi marks a connection with an earlier issue in the conversation, moving from the particular back to the general. In fact keshi here marks a shift in the topic. The speaker B uses the expectation of contrast and a common topic to move cooperatively to a new but related topic.

3.0 Summary

From the above discussion we have seen that keshi, danshi and buguo, operating as discourse markers, have a variety of uses. Central to all of these various uses is the semantic notion of contrast that is also basic to their use as conjunctions. In the idea structure of discourse keshi, danshi and buguo can be used at both the local level and at a more global level of arguments to mark idea or propositional contrasts and contrasts in the structural roles within arguments. These propositional contrasts can be readily apparent or they may require the analyst or listener to draw upon contextual and cultural information to establish the connection; the linguistic units contrasted can be both immediately adjacent and further removed. Within the social action structure of discourse keshi, danshi and buguo are used to introduce conflicting positions and to reestablish the relevance of an earlier topic or concern. This backward reaching function of these markers within the social action structure utilizes the expectation of contrast and common topic deriving from the conventional implicature these items carry to establish the relevance of the subsequent talk, even when that relevance is not in fact there. Finally we have seen that in the turn
structure of discourse, *danshi* and *keshi* mark linguistically dispreferred responses, a function closely tied to the expectation of contrast which comes with the use of these disjunctive markers.

**Table 2: Discourse Use of *keshi*, *danshi* and *buguo***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Discourse</th>
<th>Function (Marking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Structure</td>
<td>idea contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contrast from expressed ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contrast from context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structural contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Action Structure</td>
<td>introduction of disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reintroduction of topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Structure</td>
<td>introduction of dispreferred response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The uses of the disjunctive markers *keshi*, *danshi* and *buguo* described above bears a marked resemblance to the discourse use of *but* described by Schiffrin (1987:Chapter 6). In her study she found that *but* could be used to mark "referential contrast, functional contrast, and contrastive actions" (177). She uses referential contrast to refer to the type of contrast I have described above as idea contrast, functional contrast to describe the contrast seen between functional units in the idea structure described above, and contrastive actions to refer to the return of a speaker to an earlier point following an interruption, challenge, etc. All of these uses of *but* have parallels in the use of *keshi*, *danshi* and *buguo*. 
NOTES

1. If the classroom situation and the television debate settings are taken to be formal speech situations and the discussions among friends and family members are taken to be informal speech settings, there is a statistically significant difference (significant at the .01 level using a chi squared test) between the use of danshi and keshi in these settings. This finding is statistically significant even if the classroom setting is considered an informal setting. The language background (with regard to Mandarin and Southern Min) of the speakers is not taken into account in this finding.

2. The term argument is used in this study, not with the technical linguistic sense of the term, but rather with the non-technical sense of offering reasoning for or against a particular position or point of view.

3. "Dispreferred" responses are structurally marked and in English are usually issued,
   (a) after some significant delay; (b) with some preface marking their dispreferred status, often the particle well; (c) with some account of why the preferred second cannot be performed (Levinson 1983:307).

4. The felicity conditions on an s-act offer are as follows,
   Sp felicitously offers to do A for Ad if and only if Sp conveys a proposition P to Ad and
   Propositional Content Condition:
      a. P predicates a future action A by Sp.
   Essential Condition:
      b. Conveying P counts as an expression of willingness by Sp to make a commitment to Ad to do A by way of satisfying some need Sp believes Ad may have.
   Preparatory Condition:
      c. Sp believes that Ad may wish A to be done.
   Sincerity Conditions:
      d. Sp is able to do A.
      e. Sp is willing to do A. (Geis 1991:30)

5. The speakers in this excerpt are the father, C, his daughter, B, and her boyfriend, A, that we saw earlier in Chapter 3. These i-act directives, in turns B1 and C1, thus have specify the essential condition of a request and command respectively.
Chapter V

Na(me) and Continuation

1.0 Introduction

Traditional approaches to the description of na(me) have largely focussed on its use as a sentential conjunction. The Xiandai Hanyu Cidian defines na(me) as follows,

expresses (something) following from or in the same direction as the topic of the prior text/speech, stating the result which ought to follow (the prior text/speech can be from the other interlocutor or can be an issue or hypothesis brought up by the speaker himself) (LRI-CSSI 1984:813).

The Groveu Ryhbaw Tsvrdean defines na(me) as a "continuing conjunction" (He 1974:843). Lü (1980:358) in his Xiandai Hanyu Babai Ci describes na(me) as a "conjunction - continues prior text/talk, introduces a phrase which indicates a result or assessment." A Concise Chinese-English Dictionary (BLI 1982), written for foreign learners of Chinese, defines na(me) as a conjunction meaning "in that case" (397). In all of these examples the definitions are restricted to the sentential use of na(me), and the sentence examples used for illustrative purposes all have na(me) used with another conjunction, ruguo 'if,' jiran 'since,' or yaoshi 'if.' Chao (1968) in his Grammar of Spoken Chinese makes the only reference to na(me) in sentence initial position giving us a hint of its significance in the surrounding discourse. He glosses na(me) as 'so, thus' and 'in that case' and observes that it "is often followed by
a pause or a pause particle, thus making it a free conjunction rather
than an attributive adverb" (658). As we will see below, the reference
works cited above do not give an adequate description of the use of
na(me) in spoken discourse.

2.0 Prior Treatments of na(me)

Biq (1988 & 1990) has begun the work needed to determine the role
of na(me) in conversation by distinguishing the various functional
usages of na(me). She has observed that na(me) is used in both a
sentential context and in the context of the surrounding discourse
(i.e., the function of na(me) cannot be understood by looking only at
the sentence in which it appears). As a clausal connective na(me) is
used in "if...then" conditionals. This same conditional usage, accord-
ing to Biq, is found in the connection of sentential units; "na(me) can
be used to connect the antecedent (premise) and the consequent
(conclusion) of a conditional relation, with na(me) preceding the
This conditional relationship between the first segment of talk and the
following segment of talk can either be marked by other conditional
markers, i.e., ruguo ..., ... dehua, jiran ..., etc., in the initial
clause or by na(me) alone. Biq argues that in this usage na(me)
prefaces the upcoming segment of talk and marks it as a consequence of
the preceding segment of talk.

Biq goes on to observe that na(me) functions as a discourse
connective to relate or connect "topic related segments of talk." In
this role, Biq initially argued (1988), that na(me) is used 1) to
connect topically parallel units of talk, 2) to connect two units of
talk where the second unit is part of the first, i.e., an elaboration of
the first, 3) to introduce topic return, i.e., to return to a main topic
upon completion of a subtopic, or 4) to introduce a new topic (in this
role it marks a connection with the previous talk while moving away from
it). In her later work Biq (1990) argues that in its use as a discourse
connective, in addition to marking conditional relationships, na(me) can
mark both topic succession and topic change. As a marker of topic
succession na(me) can connect immediately related segments of talk, e.g.
 Immediately adjacent segments produced by the same or a different
speaker, or distantly related segments, connecting the segment following
na(me) with a prior, but not immediately prior, segment of talk (195-6).
In all of these cases na(me) marks a “continuation” relationship as
noted previously by Miracle (1989b). Biq’s research does not, however,
address the “evincive” use of na(me) to be discussed below.

When na(me) is used to mark topic change Biq states that this
continuation relationship is played out in the interactional aspect of
discourse with na(me) signalling the continuation of “the formerly
established feature of other-attentiveness, ...” (1990:200). Thus the
new topic introduced by na(me) must in some manner demonstrate this
“other-attentiveness.” As examples of this phenomena she cites
situations in which the new topic derives from the shared knowledge of
the Sp and the Ad, questions addressed to the Ad, and conventional and
semi-conventional pre-closing moves which attend to the Ad. She further
notes that the deictic aspect of the demonstrative pronoun na `that` is
reflected in the all of these discourse uses of *na(me)*, in that it points to both the prior and upcoming segments of talk (202).

In my earlier study of *na(me)* (Miracle 1989b) I argued that *na(me)* is used in the idea structure of discourse to organize idea or topic units, i.e., to mark parallel topics, the continuation of a prior topic and the return to an earlier established topic. In the social action structure of discourse *na(me)* can be used to introduce new social actions and mark these new s-acts as related to the earlier discourse. *Na(me)* is used in the information state of discourse to signal that thought has occurred in the private world of the speaker and to make that thought partially available in the speaker and hearer’s shared world. The connection to the prior discourse occurs internally within the speaker’s private world, and s/he externalizes that connection through the use of *na(me)*. In all of these instances the unifying function of *na(me)* is to establish the connection of and thus the relevance of the following unit of talk to a prior unit of talk. We will see in the remainder of this chapter how the above descriptions fall short of a comprehensive explanation of the role of *na(me)* in discourse.

3.0 Analysis

As we have seen earlier in the discussion of *hao, danshi* and *keshi*, much of the use of the marker *na(me)* in Chinese discourse is closely related to its use as a demonstrative pronoun and conjunction. In this section we will explore the variety of functions of *na(me)* including its use to mark the consequent segment of talk, to mark
succession in time of discourse units, to mark topic related units, and finally as a pause marker. All of these uses are rather closely connected to the sentence internal uses of na(me). For the purposes of this analysis I will consider na and name to be variants of the same marker. From a functional perspective they appear to be in free variation. In the data examined in this study, name and na both appear in the formal speech settings (the television debate and the classroom) while na clearly predomnates in the informal settings (name is rarely used in these settings).

3.1 Conditional Use of na(me)

As earlier studies of na(me) have shown, this marker is used sentence internally to mark the consequent portion of 'if..., then...' conditionals. When used in this manner, na(me) marks the consequent clause while the antecedent clause can be marked by ruguo... 'if..., jiashe... 'if...,... dehua 'in the case of..., etc. as we can see in the example below.

(1) (cm18a:8, cited earlier)
A: aiyo, ruguo ye suan shi, jiushi hen chengshide ren, INT if also consider be just-be very upright-NOM person
Hey, if she's considered a very upright person,

−→ NA ta he ta nanpengyou zhu, na bu shi ye hen mafan
na she and her boyfriend live that NEG be also very troublesome
then she and her boyfriend live (together), isn't that a lot of trouble?

Here two coeds are discussing a friend of theirs in their dormitory.

With the pattern ruguo..., na..., 'if..., then..., we can see clearly that in this conditional sentence the second clause is a consequence of the satisfaction of the condition stated in the initial clause. That
na(me) is used to mark the latter clause as the consequent clause can be seen from the sentence itself without recourse to analysis of the surrounding discourse.

(2) (cm47a:20b)
A: ..., ruguo bu xing-dehua zai, zheige a,  
if NEG alright-NOM-talk again this-CL PART  
..., if it's not alright, then, this,  

-> NA wo jiu kaishi gen ta jiepou yixie daoli, ...  
na(me) I then start with s/he dissect several reason  
then I'll start explaining reason to him, ...

In this example both ruguo and dehua mark the conditional clause while na(me) again marks the consequent clause. In some cases the conditional relationship is not marked in the first clause.

(3) (xw6c:2)
K: ..., zheige shihou hen keneng, dique zhei hui zaocheng  
this-CL time very likely indeed this will create  
..., (if) at that time, it's likely, certainly will create  
gangcai Lin tingzhang suo jiangde  
just-now Lin minister all say-NOM  
what Minister L has just said,  

-> NAME women hen keneng chanye jiede neige  
na(me) I-PL very likely industrial-sector-NOM that-CL  
then the industrial sector, the manufacturing volume,  
shengchan liang hui shoudao yingxiang, ...  
manufacture volume will receive influence  
will very likely be influenced, ...

In (3) the conditional relationship is not overtly marked except by na(me), and the analyst must rely on his interpretation of the meaning of the respective utterances and their interrelationship to posit the "if..., then" relationship.

(4) (cm56:6, cited earlier)
C1: nimen qu zu luyingdai, zule ye shunbian zhuang qu,  
you-PL go rent videotape rent-ASP also conveniently turn go  
You go and rent a video, rent it and then go over and buy
B1: [ dinghao mai cai]
[ Dinghao buy food]
Buy groceries at Dinghao.

->C2: = women shiyidian kaishi nong cai, nong dao shierdian,
I-PL 11:00 begin cook food cook to 12:00
at 11:00, we´ll start cooking, cook until 12:00,

ni mama hualaile
you mother back-come-ASP
then your Mom will come back.

A1: HAO
hao
Okay.

B2: HAO
hao
Okay.

->A2: NA ni mama jiu gandong, ayo, ni zenme zheime lihai
na you mother then moved INT you how so formidable
Then your mother will be moved, wow, how’d you get so good!

The conditional relationship discussed above can also carry across
different speakers’ turns. In this example the antecedent conditional
situation is expressed in turn C2, we’ll cook until 12:00, and
presumably the cooking will be finished. “If” that happens, “then” your
mother will be moved. In turn A2 both na(me) and jiu are used to mark
the consequence. Jin (1988:132) has argued that jiu in fact is the
conjunction marking the consequent clause while na(me) is a pronoun
whose antecedent is the prior clause.

3.2 Na(me) Marking the Consequent

Na(me) can be used to mark the consequence not only in conditional
relationships, but also in causal relationships. This fact is true of
the use of *na(me)* as a sentential conjunction (it was earlier noted that *na(me)* is often used with *jiran* ‘since’) and as a marker as well. Schiffrin (1987, Chapter 7) in her discussion of the use of *because* and *so* distinguishes three different types of causal relationship relevant to the study of these markers.

A **fact-based** causal relation between *cause* and *result* holds between idea units, more precisely, between the events, states, and so on, which they encode. A **knowledge-based** causal relation holds when a speaker uses some piece(s) of information as a warrant for an *inference* (a speaker inference), or when a speaker intends a hearer to do so (a hearer inference). An **action-based** causal relation holds when a speaker presents a motive for an action being performed through talk – either his/her own action or an interlocutor’s action. (202)

She uses the following example sentences to illustrate these distinctions.

(5)  
   a. John is home because he is sick.  
   b. John is home because the lights are burning.  
   c. Is John home? Because the lights are burning. (202)

The fact-based causal relation (5a) exists in the idea structure (her ideational structure), the knowledge-based causal relation (5b) in the information structure and the action-based causal relation (5c) in the social action structure (her action structure). These same distinctions and causal relations are relevant to the analysis of the use of *na(me)* in Chinese.

3.2.1 **Cause and Result in the Idea Structure**

In the idea structure *na(me)* can be use to mark “result” segment of talk following a “cause.”
(6) (cm60a:1b)  
A: ..., yinwei mingtian ni yao shang di-si-tang,  
   because tomorrow you will attend number-4-class  
   ..., because when you’re attending the fourth class tomorrow,  
  wo cai shang di-san-tang,  
  I then attend number-3-class  
  I’ll only be attending the third class,  

-> NA ni xian xuede, ...  
   na(me) you first study-PART  
   so you’ll attend first, ...  

Here the causal relationship is overtly marked in both the antecedent  
segment of talk and the consequent segment. Yinwei marks the cause  
while na(me) marks the result. This cause-result relationship is not  
always marked in the antecedent segment.

(7) (cm47a:3b)  
A: ..., wo jiu gen xuemei jiang yixia,  
   ... I just with elder-classmate (female) talk one-bit  
   ..., I just talked with my classmate,  

-> NA xuemei shi ba wo lieru dangran  
   na(me) elder-classmate be take I enter-into certainly  
   so/then she entered me as the certain candidate, ...  
   renxuan, ...  
   candidate  

In this example na(me) marks the following segment of talk as a direct  
consequence of the prior segment, i.e., I talked to her so she entered  
my name. A fact-based causal relationship can also be seen in the next  
example.

(8) (cm60a:5a)  
B: ..., ta jiu, dui, ta shuo ni keyi cai you  
   s/he then right s/he say you can step-on oil  
   ..., then he, yeah, he said you can step on the gas,  

-> NA wo jiu cai.  
   na(me) I then step-on  
   so/then I stepped on (it).
This type of causal relationship was relatively infrequent (four of 129 tokens, 3%) in my data.

3.2.2 Warrant and Inference in the Information State

The use of na(me) in the information state to mark the "inference" segment of talk based on a prior "warrant" segment of talk is more common than the fact-based causal relation discussed above, but it is still not common (15 of 129 tokens, 12%). Consider the following example.

(9) (xwgc:6)
K: ..., zheige changshang, yuangongde, zheige gongzuo
   this-CL firm personnel-NOM this-CL work
   ..., these firms, the personnel, their working hours

shijian chaoguo wushige xiaoshi
time exceed 50-CL hour
exceed 50 hours,

--> NAME hen xianran womende zidonghua chengdu xiangdangde di
    na(me) very obvious I-PL-NOM automation level quite-PART low
    so obviously our level of automation is quite low,

--> NAME yinzi yixiazi juranr de caigu zheige
    na(me) therefore at-once suddenly-PART adopt this-CL
    so, because of this to suddenly, at one stroke, adopt this

zhou-xiu-liang-tiande zheige fangshide, wode zheige
week-rest-two-day-NOM this-CL way-PART I-NOM this-CL
two day weekend, this way, our industry then couldn’t

chanye jiu shoubuliao, ...
industry then tolerate-NEG-RES
tolerate it, ...

In this example the "warrant" is presented in lines 1-4 with the first inference drawn in line 7, marked by na(me). Lines 1-7 can then be seen as the warrant for the second inference drawn in lines 10-16, again preceded by na(me). The nature of this inference is additionally
demonstrated by the use of yinci `therefore, because of this' which also precedes the conclusion that is drawn.

(10) (clr:7, cited earlier)

ye jiushi shuo, ta zai xue yuyan de-shihou, gen also just-be say s/he PROG study language NOM-time with That's just to say, when they study language, with children

xiaohaizi tamen ye bu shi shuo dou shi cuowu, ye shi you yige child they also NEG be say all be mistake also be have one-CL they're not all mistakes, when they're carrying on (language

pattern zai jinxing,
pattern PROG carry-on
learning) they also have a pattern,

-> NA zheige keneng yanjiuchulai yihou ni keyi na(me) this-CL probably research-out-come after you can so after you discover it, it can
dui neige a foreign language teaching you bangzhu, ... toward that-CL have assistance probably be very helpful in foreign language teaching, ...

Again in this example we see na(me) marking the inference drawn based upon the immediately prior segment of talk. In the above examples the speaker is drawing the conclusions. In the following example the speaker utilizes a rhetorical question to call upon the Ad to draw the inference based on the previously presented information.

(11) (cm18a:25-26, cited earlier)

A: erqi, ta meitian, ta neiyang
moreover s/he every-day s/he that-way
Furthermore she's like that every day,

wo juede ta bu keneng neiyang a I feel s/he NEG probably that-way PART
I don't think she can be like that!

piru-shuo, wo zai shuijiao so wo hui shengqi for-example I PROG sleep PART I will angry
For example if I were sleeping, I'd get mad,

DANSHI yinwei shi ouer shui, ye bu shi meitian danshi because be occasional sleep also NEG be every-day but it's occasional, it isn't an everyday thing,
As we saw in the previous chapter, the above argument can be analyzed as
follows,

(11a)

Position: she’s like that everyday and shouldn’t be (lines 1-4)

Support (1): if I were sleeping I’d get mad (line 7)

DANSHI it’s occasional, not everyday (line 10)

Support (2): it’s turning our lives upside down (line 13)

NA Conclusion: why should we accommodate (i.e., we shouldn’t accommodate)? (line 19-22)

From this segment it can be seen that the 'warrant, the basis for the conclusion, drawn in lines 19-22 is presented in lines 7-15. Na(me) here operates in the information state marking a conclusion that the Sp wishes the Ad to draw; he attempts to make this conclusion part of their shared information, their shared world.

3.2.3 Motive and Action in the Social Action Structure

The most prevalent use of the marker na(me) found in my data is that in which it marks a consequent action based upon an previously presented motive (47 of 129 tokens, 36%). The antecedent action can be
either the speaker’s own action or another speaker’s action. In all of
these cases na(me) marks the initiation of a new social action and marks
this initiation as connected to, the result of, some prior action.

Consider the following example.

(12) (cm56a:2)
B1: ma bu shi you rousi, meiyou a,
mother NEG be have meat-shred NEG-have PART
Didn’t Mom have shredded meat, no huh,

-> NA wo qu dinghao mai
na(me) I go Dinghao buy
then I’ll go to Dinghao to buy (some).

C1: dui a
right PART
Right.

->B2: o, NA wo ji yixia
INT na(me) I record a-bit
Oh, I’ll write it down (the grocery list).

In this example we see the father C and daughter B whom we have seen in
earlier chapters. Based upon the determination that they do not have a
needed ingredient for their dish, shredded meat, the daughter offers (in
turn B1) to go to the market to buy it. The I-act declarative following
na(me) can be seen as an instantiation of an s-act offer in this
setting and is accepted by the father in turn C1. The s-act assertion
in turn B2, again marked by na(me) is based on the need established in
turns B1 and C1, going to the market and the resultant need to make a
list. In the following example na(me) is used with an s-act proposal
and s-act orders.

(13) (cm22a:1-2)
D1: ni shi kaihu yihou cai xie, haishi xianzai xie
you be meet after then write or now write
Do you want to write the minutes now or wait until after the
meeting?
The setting for this segment of talk is a meeting of a university student association. Speaker B is the leader of the group and thus in a position of relative authority. For this reason the I-act directive in turn D2 specifies the essential condition of a proposal (D being one of
the members of the group) while the marked directives in turn B1 specify the essential conditions of orders. The new s-act proposal initiated in D2 (line 8) is marked by na(me) establishing it as a consequence of the preceding discussion by the other participants in the conversation, an action with the motive preceding it. The I-act directives in turn B1 (lines 28 and 37) have the illocutionary significance of orders and are again marked by na(me). Based upon the completion of the discussion regarding the recording of the minutes marked in line 25 by hao, the group leader proceeds to the business at hand. Na(me) marks the subsequent talk as a causal consequent of the earlier action and introduces the new action in the action structure. In this case and the case of the directive in line 37, the new social actions initiated are based upon earlier actions of the Sp. S-act directive sequences marked by na(me) can also be based upon the actions of another speaker.

(14) (cm1.1:3, cited earlier)
B1: quanbu dou shi guoyu ma
total all be national language (Mandarin) PART
All (of the situations) are the Mandarin.

A1: guoyu a, ni hen shao jiang taiyu de, shi bu shi?
Mandarin PART you very seldom speak Taiwanese NOM be NEG be
Mandarin, you rarely speak Taiwanese, right?

B2: dui a
correct PART
Right.

->A2: HAO, NA jiu tan guoyu, ...
hao na then talk Mandarin
Okay, so then it's speak Mandarin, ...

In this example na(me) is again used in conjunction with the marker hao. Hao marks the closure of the previous s-act inquiry, while na(me) introduces the following s-act order² marking it as a consequence of
their earlier discussion, specifically B’s confirmation of fact that she seldom speaks Taiwanese.

S-act inquiries can also be introduced by na(me) connecting them to the prior talk (action). Once again the earlier action can be that of the same speaker or of another speaker.

(15) (xwg:10)
Z: ..., jiushi ruguo weifande, zheige, zhengge sheng, just-be if violate-PART this-CL whole province ...
    ..., it’s just that if you violate the whole province’s,

    zhongyangde mingling de-hua, keneng hui daozi yu, central-NOM order NOM-talk probably will lead to the central government’s order, it will probably lead to

    zheige chezhi jiguo a, shenme jiang xin ne, this-CL dismiss record-demerit PART what drop salary PART dismissal, a black mark, a drop in salary, or something,

    → NA ni mianlin zheige wenti de-hua, ni caiqu lichang
    na(me) you face this-CL problem NOM-talk you choose position so faced with this problem, what is your position, or

        shi shenme, haishi yong-wang-zhi-qian
        be what or advance-bravely
        is it march forward courageously?

In this example the s-act inquiry sequence following na(me) is marked as a consequence of the situation presented by the same speaker earlier in the turn. Na(me) establishes the connection in the social action structure between the prior assertions and the following inquiry.

(16) (cm47a:1)
A1: kaoshide fanwei a, nimen kao nali a? test-NOM scope PART you-PL test where PART The scope of the test, what will you test?

B: kao, kao women ye bu xiaode kao nali, fanzheng, test test I-PL also NEG know test where at-any-rate Test, test, we don’t know what we’ll test either, at any rate,

    jiushi hu ce just-be idle guess
    it’s just idle speculation.
Here the s-act inquiry initiated in turn A2 is marked by na(me) as a consequence of the assertions of the prior speaker, B; since the contents of the test can only be speculation, do you have information regarding the volume of the testing? In this section we have seen that na(me) can be used to introduce a variety of s-acts in the social action structure, marking them as the consequence of earlier s-acts and thus establishing their connection to the prior discourse.

3.3 Succession in Time Marked by na(me)

Just as the demonstrative pronoun na when used in time expressions such as nashiou ‘that time’ can indicate relative time, na(me) when used in discourse can also be used to mark time relationships. Schiffrin (1987:229), in her analysis of the discourse markers now and then, distinguishes between event time indicating “the temporal relationship between propositions” and discourse time indicating “the temporal relationship between utterances in a discourse.” Event time refers to the time relationship between the events described in a discourse while discourse time refers to the sequential relationship of the utterances themselves. Both of these types of time relationships can be marked by na(me). Consider the following example in which na(me) marks a consecutive relationship in event time.

(17) (cm47a:3b)
A: ..., wo jiu gen xuemei jiang yixia,
I just with elder-classmate (female) talk one-bit
..., I just talked with my classmate,
The use of na(me) in this example marks the events described in the discourse as related to one another and occurring in consecutive order. In the idea structure these events are consecutive; first I talked with her, then she entered my name, and then I said fine. Na(me) can also be used as a marker of discourse time to mark essentially parallel events which are of equal importance in the idea structure.

(18) (cm47a:20a)
B: ..., jiu jiceng gongzuo renyuan hui juede lei ma just basic-level work staff will feel tired PART ...
..., is it just the lower level workers that’ll feel tired,

-> na(me) other ought NEG will much tired PART the others shouldn’t feel too tired, should they?

In this example two questions are juxtaposed (the lower level workers vs. the others) with na(me) being used to mark the second question, explicitly establishing its connection with the prior question. This same type of juxtaposition can also be marked by na(me) when it is embedded in an argument.

(19) (xwgc:6)
Z: ..., NAME ni kandao muqian women guonei, yibande na(me) you see-RES now I-PL country-inside general-NOM ...
..., so now you see in our country, generally in the neige minjianqiye, dagai genju yige zongji, this-CL private-business approximate according-to one-CL statistic private sector, about, according to one statistic,
jiu baifenzhiershi, shi meige libai shang ban. Wu tian de just 20-percent be each week attend work five day-NOM only 20 percent work five days a week.

NAME jiangjin bashi yishang a. hai shi meige libai shang
na(me) almost 80 over PART still be each week attend
now almost, over 80 percent still work five and a half days

ban wu tian ban, ... work 5 day half
per week, ...

Here na(me) marks the consecutive and parallel relationship between what is prior, only 20% work five days, and what follows, 80% still work five and a half days. A series of parallel propositions placed consecutively in a discourse can also be marked by na(me).

(20) (cm18a:27, cited earlier)
D1: bu shi, ta xianzai zhao dao yige fangzi a
NEG be s/he now find-RES one-CL house PART
No, now she’s found a house.

C1: o, dui
INT right
Oh, right.

D2: NA neige fangzi shi, jiushi sanfangdong, neiyang,
na that-CL house be just-is sublet that-way
Now that place, it’s a sublet, like that,

NA neige shi waiguoren,
na that-CL be foreigner
and he’s a foreigner,

NA ta yao leisi jiao, jiao huan yuyan neiyang
na s/he want similar exchange language that-way
and he wants to exchange language too, that kind of thing.

C1: mm, NA ni keyi a
INT na you can PART
Hmm, so you can do that.

In this excerpt the propositions presented in turn D2 are all marked by na(me) establishing their sequential connection in discourse time. This temporal relationship in discourse time may have been instrumental in
Biq's (1990) labelling na(me) used in this manner as examples of "topic succession." In these cases and the ones below, na(me) marks not only the progression through discourse time, but also the successive development of the topic in the idea structure.

3.4 Topic Related Talk

Closely related to, and often indistinguishable from, the above discussed use of na(me) marking the progression through discourse time is the use of na(me) to connect "topic related segments of talk." The connected segments of talk can be 1) consecutively related parallel idea units as we saw above, 2) loosely related idea units where the second segment is in fact a related shift from the earlier topic, or 3) the same topic with na(me) marking the reintroduction of the previously established topic. By establishing the connection between the two units of talk na(me) serves to smooth the transition from the prior talk to the subsequent talk. This function is particularly important in the cases of topic shift and topic return to assist in the smooth flow of the conversation.

3.4.1 Topic Development

Na(me) can be used to mark the successive development of a topic in the idea structure of discourse. Consider the following example.

(21) (xwsc:3)
H: ..., xianzai piru-shuo meigu, ta ge liangwanyi, now for-example USA it CL 21,000 ...
    ..., now for instance, in the US, their $21,000,

    women jintian zai qiqianwu, dui bu dui,
    I-PL today at 7500 right NEG right
today, we're at $7500, right?
NA deng yige jiating ne, ni zhuan liangwanyi bi jiating, na(me) wait one-CL household PART you earn 2100 CL household so when a household, a household earning $2100,

NA ta you, hen haode jiankang, you zhu han haode fanzi, na(me) it have very good-NOM health also live very good-NOM house so it (the household) has good health, also lives in a nice house,

chi han haode dongxi, ...
eat very good-NOM thing

eats well, ...

Here na(me) marks the progressive development of the general topic, the average annual household income. Na(me) reiterates the connection between these propositions and ties the argument together. Even when another speaker's turn intervenes, na(me) can be used to establish this progressive relationship.

(22) (cm47a:21a)
B1: wo juede bandai fan'er meiyou shenme shi zuo
I feel classrep on-the-contrary NEGB-have any work do
I think the class rep, on the contrary, doesn't have any work.

A1: dajia mei you shenme shi zuo
everyone NEGB have any work do
Nobody has any work to do.

B2: dui a, NA dang bandai gua yige
right PART na(me) act-as classrep be-covered one-CL
Right, so being class rep is getting an undeserved

xuming zai nali, hebi ne
underserved-reputation at there why-necessary PART
reputation, why is that necessary?

In this example the utterances in B1 and B2 are progressive developments of the same topic, the discussion of the class representative. Here na(me) marks the immediately subsequent assertion as connected to the assertion in the speaker's earlier turn. In spite of the intervening turn, an assertion by speaker A and the subsequent appreciation of that assertion by B, na(me) establishes the connection with the earlier
utterance, turn B1. This relationship can also be seen in the following example.

(23) (cm18a:27, cited earlier)
D1: bu shi, ta xianzai shaodao yige fangzi a
    NBG be s/he now find-RES one-CL house PART
    No. now she's found a house.

C1: o, dui
    INT right
    Oh, right.

->D2: NA neige fangzi shi, jiushi sanfangdong, neiyang,
    na that-CL house be just-is sublet that-way
    Now that place, it's a sublet, like that,

Again the idea units in turns D1 and D2 are successive developments of
the same topic, the house or apartment being discussed. Na(me) marks
the second utterance as connected to the earlier utterance by the same
speaker, in spite of the intervening turn by the other interlocutor.

3.4.2 Topic Shift

Na(me) can be use to introduce an idea unit that marks a shift,
related while at the same time divergent from the earlier established
topic.

(24) (clr:9-10, cited earlier)
A: ..., ta renwei shuo, haizi, ha, haizi keneng, keneng
    s/he consider say child PART child probably probably
    ..., he says, children, y’know, children probably

    zai hen xiaode shihou, jiu yijing, jiu yijing kaishi acquire
    at very small-NOM time just already just already begin
    when they’re very small have already started acquiring

    this kind of, uh, ability, to use the appropriate register, or
    this kind of, uh, ability, to use the appropriate register, or

    language, ha,
    PART
    language, y’know,
The speaker in the above excerpt is a graduate student presenting a
review of a paper that the students have read. In lines 1-9 and earlier
he has been explaining the hypothesis of the author of the paper. In
line 12, following na(me), there is a shift in the topic from the
hypothesis to the research methodology. Na(me) marks this shift in
topic and establishes the connection of the prior talk with the sub-
sequent talk; na(me) maintains the connection while the idea units
diverge.

3.4.3 Topic Return

Related to the use of na(me) in the development and shifting of
the topic of talk in the idea structure is its use in reestablishing an
previously established topic.

(25) (cm47a:3)
A1: núhaizi gen nanhaizi jiu bu tong
girl and boy just NEG same
Girls and boys are just different.

B1: dui a
right PART
Right.

A2: núhaizi xiang chulai, ai, you buhaoyisi la piao
girl think out-come PART but embarassed seek vote
Girls think of coming out, but they’re embarassed to ask for
qishi ta ye xiang dang
in-fact s/he also thing act-as
votes, in fact she’d also like to be elected,

→ NA nanhaizi jiu bu tong, ...
na(me) boy just NEG same
well, boys just aren’t the same, ...
In this example na(me) is used in turn A2, along with the repetition of the statement of the topic itself, to reestablish the topic found earlier in turn A1. The earlier topic is readily recoverable from the prior talk in this case. In the following example the earlier topic is not readily recoverable.

(24) (xwg:2-3, cited earlier)
K: women hen danxinde shi, women gongwujiguan shishi zhihou, I-PL very worry-NOM be I-PL public-offices carry-out after What we’re worried about is, after public offices carry this

chanye jiu genjin
industry then follow
out, industry will then follow.

zheige shihou keneng dique zhei hui zaocheng gangcai Lin this-CL time probably certainly this will create just now Lin At this time this would probably, certainly create what Minister

tingzhang suo jiangde
minister that-which talk-NOM
Lin has just mentioned.

NAME women hen keneng chanyejiede, neige shengchan, I-PL very probably industrial-sector-NOM that-CL production So our industrial sector will likely, the production volume

liang, hui shoudao yingxiang
volume will receive influence
will be influenced.

-> NAME, DANSHI wo weishenmo hui bijiao qingxiang shuo xianzai name danshi I why will relatively favor say now So, but why do I tend to favor saying that we should now

women shi yinggai lai kaolu, NAME cong zheige, e si I-PL be should come consider name from this-CL PART four consider, say beginning from this system of two days rest

zhou yi xiu zhidu kaishi ne, ...
week one rest system start PART
every four weeks? ...

The highlighted use of na(me) in this example, along with the marker danshi (discussed in Chapter 4) mark the following segment of talk as
topically connected to the earlier discourse, in this case a position expressed by the speaker a short while earlier in the discourse and related to the immediately prior topic.

(25) (cm47a:5b)
A1: ..., erqie wo tingshuo baosongde yinggai shi, hui bijiao moreover I hear-say recommend-NOM ought be will relative ...

... what's more I'd heard that those recommended should be nianqing, ta shuo meiyou, ta xuanshang de-hua, yao qu young s/he say NEG-have s/he select-RES NOM-talk need go relatively young, (but) he said no, if you're selected you have jixun gather-train to go for training.

B1: shei zhidao who know
Who knows?

A2: shei a who PART
Who?

⇒B2: bu xiaode, NA ni xianzai kandao shetuande you meiyou NEG know na(me) you now see-RES organization-NOM have NEG-have I don't know, so when you see a member now, do you shaowei da yixia zhaohu slightly send one-bit greet say hello a bit?

Here the use of na(me) in turn B2 marks a return to a much earlier topic. The speakers had earlier (over a minute earlier) been discussing a situation in which A ran into a member of their group, said hello, and got no response. Since that time the topic of their conversation had diverged significantly. In the context of the immediate talk, this return could be considered an entirely new topic of conversation. The use of na(me) eases the topic transition at this point by marking the connection to the earlier talk.
3.5 *Na(me)* Marking New Topics

*Na(me)* can also be used to mark the introduction of new topics. Biq (1990) observed that when used in this fashion, the statement of the new topic exhibited an "other-attentiveness" feature in the interactional sphere of discourse. We have seen above that in the case of topic return, the "new" topic calls forth information that is part of the shared world of the Sp and the Ad. Below we will once again see this feature of "other-attentiveness."

(26) (cm56a:16b)
A1: weishenme yao qie zheiyang
   why need cut this-way
   Why do you need to cut (it) that way?

C1: zhei genben yao qiediao ma
   this simply need cut-RES PART
   You just have to cut that out!

A2: o
   INT
   Oh.

(20 sec)

->A3: **NA** nimen xianzai yao jiu ni zui ben, ni bu hui zuo (???)
   *na(me)* you-PL now need save you most stupid you NEG can do (???)
   So now you have to save your stupidest, you can’t do (???)

In (26) above *na(me)* is used to introduce a completely new topic. It is not at all related to the earlier talk, but it does possess the other-attentiveness feature. The 1-act imperative following *na(me)* in turn A3 explicitly (using the 2nd person pronoun *nimen*) involves the other participants in the conversation. Here the connection that is marked by *na(me)* is in the interactional sphere (what Schiffrin (1987) calls the participation framework). Regarding this use of *na(me)* Biq (1990:200) has argued,
Since the prefaced new topic possesses the other-attentiveness feature, and na(me) indicates continuation, it appears that whatever came before na(me) has always possessed the other-attentiveness feature. Since both the preceding talk and the following talk are now characterized by other-attentiveness, the topic transition between talk units becomes smooth, and discontinuity is lessened.

Again na(me) marks the connection to the prior talk while at the same time moving away from it.

3.6 The Evincive Use of Na(me)

Miracle (1989b) argues that related to the connective function of na(me) is its use as an evincive. Schourup (1983:14) has defined evincive as follows,

a linguistic item that indicates that at the moment at which it is said the speaker is engaged in, or has just been engaged in, thinking; ...but does not completely specify its content.

Na(me) can be used to indicate that the speaker is carrying on some type of internal deliberation and signal to the hearer that the Sp has established a connection between the prior and following talk. Used in this manner na(me) acts as a pause marker indicating that the Sp intends to continue his/her turn. Huo (1958:12) has noted that “the wording in conversation is thought of as it is spoken.” He mentions na(me) as one of the “pet phrases” used by speakers when they have not thought out what they are going to say sufficiently well.

(26) (cm1.1:11, cited earlier)

->C: libaier keyi lu, shi a, NA wo libai, NA wo libaier wanshang Tuesday can record be PART na I week na I Tuesday evening You can record Tuesday, right? So, I, Tues, so Tuesday evening

tai ni lianluo
give you contact
I’ll contact you.
Here *na(me)* is used in a restart of a sentence indicating that the speaker will continue but is in the process of determining what will follow.

(27) (xwgc:3)
K: NAME, DANSHI wo weishenmo hui bijiao qingxiang shuo xianzai name danshi I why will relatively favor say now So, but why do I tend to favor saying that we should now

-> women shi yinggai lai kaolu, NAME cong zheige, e si I-PL be should come consider name from this-CL PART four consider, say beginning from this system of two days rest

zhou yi xiu zhidu kaishi ne week one rest system start PART every four weeks?

In (27) *na(me)* is used at a possible turn transition point to indicate that, in spite of the prior pause, the speaker is not prepared to relinquish his turn and intends to continue.

(28) (xwgc:6)
K: ..., yinci wo hai shi geren zhuzhang, zheige si-zhou, therefore I still be individual advocate this-CL 4-week ..., therefore I myself still advocate this, rest one day

*NA, xiu yi tian, weishenme ne, ... na(me) rest one day why PART each week, why? ...*

*Na(me)* in this example does not appear at a possible turn transitional point, but rather in the middle of a constituent. Once again *na(me)* signals for the hearer that the Sp is carrying on internal activity and does in fact intend to continue.

4.0 **Summary**

In this chapter we have seen that *na(me)* can be used to mark a variety of different relationships between units of talk in discourse. It can be used to mark the consequent segments of talk, to mark the
succession in time of discourse units, to mark topic related units, and to mark pauses when the speaker is intending to continue.

Table 3: Discourse Use of na(me)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Discourse</th>
<th>Function (Marking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea Structure</td>
<td>consequent of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement through time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discourse time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>event time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parallel - developing idea units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topic shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reintroduction of topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Action Structure</td>
<td>reintroduction of topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduction of new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introduction of s=act (based on motive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information State</td>
<td>inference (based on warrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing internal deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Structure</td>
<td>holding turn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these uses share the characteristic of marking continuance that has earlier been noted by Miracle (1989b) and Biq (1990). Biq (1990:201-2) has noted the semantic connection between the marker na(me) and the distal demonstrative na arguing that the deictic function and the distal semantic value are instrumental in the development of na(me) as a discourse marker. That in English, a demonstrative pronoun with distal reference as is na, also "looks backward in discourse time" (Schiffrin 1987:229). This backward-looking feature of na(me) can
account for its ability to establish connections as we have seen above. Even the evincive use of \textit{na(me)} has a deictic function pointing to the internal thought process of the speaker. Thus we can again see how the discourse use of this marker can be traced to its sentence-based use.
NOTES

1. Geis (1990:30) has described the felicity conditions on an s-act offer as follows,

   Sp felicitously offers to do A for Ad if and only if Sp conveys a proposition \( P \) to Ad, and

   Propositional Content Condition:
   a. \( P \) predicates a future action A by Sp.

   Essential Condition:
   b. Conveying \( P \) counts as an expression of willingness by Sp to make a commitment to Ad to do A by way of satisfying some need Sp believes Ad may have.

   Preparatory Condition:
   c. Sp believes that Ad may wish A to be done.

   Sincerity Conditions:
   d. Sp is able to do A.
   e. Sp is willing to do A.

   In this case the preparatory condition is satisfied in the initial portion of turn B1 with the essential and propositional content conditions being satisfied in the latter portion of the turn, following \( na(me) \). The sincerity conditions can be assumed by the participants.

2. The participants in this segment are discussing how to fill out a language use questionnaire. The questionnaire has been presented to speaker B, a female high school student, by A, a female graduate student. Given their relationship, A’s assertion in turn A2 has the illocutionary significance of an order.

3. This phrase was used by Biq (1988b) to cover a broader grouping of the uses of \( na(me) \) in discourse.
CHAPTER VI
Conclusion

1.0 Summary of Findings

1.1 Discourse Use of hao

From the discussion in Chapter III we have seen that hao has a number of different, but ultimately related functions in Mandarin conversation. Operating in the social action structure, hao can be used to mark both the closure of commissive/requestive social actions and the completion of smaller chunks of the conversational work involved in the completion of the overall s-act. In this respect we have seen that hao can mark the completion of the felicity conditions associated with the social action. Hoo can also act in the turn structure of discourse to mark the appearance of an s-act assertion. These assertions may be a part of a variety of different social actions including conveying information, announcing, inquiring, disagreeing and complaining. In these situations, hao marks the closure of the prior conversational work and clears the way either for the continuation of the work necessary for completion of the s-act or for the transition to a new s-act. In this respect hao is again operative in the social action structure.

Completion of physical activities can be marked by hao as well. These activities can be related to the ongoing talk of the participants or may be unrelated to that talk. While these physical activities may
not be conversational per se, the function of hao here still has relevance in the social action structure by marking the transition back to the then current social activity. Finally we have seen that within the idea structure hao can assist in the management of ideas, marking the completion of one issue or action and the transition to the next. When operating in the idea structure in this manner, hao appears to be simultaneously operating in the information state of the discourse signalling that the speaker has just completed some type of relevant internal deliberation.

In all of the different aspects of discourse structure, the social action structure, the turn structure, the idea structure, and the information state, hao acts as a marker of closure and transition. This core function manifests itself differently in the particular environments detailed above, but remains constant throughout the use of hao as a discourse marker.

1.2 Discourse Use of danshi, keshi and buguo

As we have seen with hao, the markers danshi, keshi and buguo also operate in different aspects of the discourse structure. Within the idea structure of discourse these markers are used both at the local level and at a more global level to mark contrasting idea units and contrasting structural units in the organization of particular arguments. In some instances these contrasts are apparent from the verbally expressed ideas, while in other instances the contrast can only be understood when unexpressed contextual and cultural information is taken into account. The marked contrasts are at times between adjacent
segments of talk and at other times span not only utterances but even
turns. In the social action structure *danshi, keshi* and *buguo* can be
used to introduce conflicting positions and to reestablish the relevance
of an earlier topic. Within the turn structure, these markers are used
to mark linguistically dispreferred responses to prior turns.

Central to all of the various functions listed above is the
semantic notion of contrast that is also basic to the use of *danshi,
keshi* and *buguo* as conjunctions. The expectations of contrast and a
common topic between the connected units of talk which derives from the
conventional implicature which these items carry are instrumental to
their use as discourse markers. Though these linguistic units are used
as markers, they are not devoid of meaning.

1.3 Discourse Use of *na(me)*

*Na(me)* too operates in different spheres of the discourse struc-
ture with a variety of functions. In the idea structure *na(me)* can mark
consequent units of talk following a prior condition or cause, the
progressive movement through event time or discourse time, parallel or
developing idea units in an argument, topic shift and the reintroduction
of a topic. In the social action structure *na(me)* can mark the reintro-
duction of an earlier topic (this function occurs simultaneously in the
social action structure and the idea structure) as well as the intro-
duction of a new topic and can mark the introduction of a new social
action based upon an earlier motive. In the information state, *na(me)*
can mark an inference based upon an earlier warrant, a change in the
knowledge of the speaker. Finally, as an evincive *na(me)* operates
simultaneously in both the information state and the turn structure of discourse signifying that relevant thought is currently taking place in the mind of the speaker and thus holding the turn of the speaker.

In all of its various uses na(me) maintains a core function of marking continuation. Whether operating in the idea structure, the social action structure, the turn structure or the information state, the notion of continuation is central to the function of na(me). The notion of continuation is also basic to the use of na(me) as a connective within sentences.

2.0 Pedagogical Implications

The value of these findings for teachers of Chinese can be readily seen if we take hao as an example. Given the myriad of uses of hao, how are teachers of Chinese to handle the teaching of this discourse marker? We will first examine how current language textbooks and pedagogical grammars handle this issue and then turn to some possible alternatives. The typical approach in Chinese textbooks is to introduce the verb hao 'is good, well, fine' very early in the text, generally as part of the fixed phrase for greeting, ni hao ma 'hello, how are you.' After this initial introduction the textbook authors generally feel free to use hao liberally in its variety of uses, verbal, marker and otherwise, with an English gloss added. Hao is variously glossed as 'good,' 'fine,' 'nice,' 'very nice,' 'okay,' 'all right,' 'yes,' 'certainly,' or not glossed at all. The unstated assumption apparently is that students will inductively determine how it functions.
There are, however, some notable exceptions to this pattern. Among first year Chinese texts, *Practical Chinese Reader, Book I* (BLI 1985) published in the People's Republic of China and the *Workbook for Beginning Chinese* (Walker et al.) produced in the U.S., both attempt to address the discourse use of *hao*. In addition to introducing the verbal use of *hao*, the *Practical Chinese Reader* in Lesson 22 uses *hao-le* in the dialogue and offers this explanation in the grammar notes, "(it) is used to express the wish to discontinue an argument..." (327). It is not listed as a new vocabulary item. This type of explanation runs the risk of encouraging students to insert *hao-le* at any point where they have heard enough and thus lead them to socially inappropriate uses of *hao*. The Chinese explanation is not nearly as dangerous, "expresses a kind of tone of closure," but of course the students using this text can only read the English and are not privy to the information conveyed in Chinese characters. Unfortunately this is the only discourse use of *hao* that is given an explanation. Walker et al. in the *Workbook for Beginning Chinese* also try to give students some guidance in the discourse use of *hao*. In Unit 2 (2-42) in explanation of the dialogue in which *hao* is used to agree to a suggestion, they write that *hao"can also mean 'O.K. (I'll do that.)'" as an expansion of an old vocabulary item. In Unit 3 (3-192) they include a drill called "Confirming Suggested Action" instructing the students to agree to a suggestion they hear on the tape in the following fashion:

*Prompt:*  Wo kan ba. 'Why don't I look around.'
*Response:* Hao, ni kankan ba. 'O.K., you look around a little.'

(the students are not given a translation of the example)
Later in Unit 3 where hao is used to mark assent to a request in the
dialogue, hao is added as a new phrase, "OK; I understand" (9-79).

Earlier in the unit students are told,

    when something is explained to you, you can express the fact
    that you understand with the phrase: HAO "I understand;
    OK,"

and an example dialogue is given. While this type of handling of hao is
much more constructive, it is still insufficient to handle the various
discourse uses of hao that appear in the dialogues of the text.

Brown and Hsu (1983) in Speaking Chinese in China, an intermediate
level text, also attempt to introduce students to the discourse uses of
hao. In Lesson 3, following the use of hao to close a telephone conver-
sation, they offer the explanation,

The Chinese may finish with zaijian, but very often the
signal is nothing more that something like en en or hao hao
hao, and the American might think he was cut off. (48)

In the dialogue in Lesson 13, after the use of hao ba, hao ba as an
appreciation of an assertion (a correction of the speaker), the authors
explain,

    She uses hao ba, hao ba to get back on the right track
    (O.K., here, here...).

These explanations for the use of hao in discourse are all correct as
far as they go, but none of them are sufficient.

The grammars of Chinese offer no help to students of Mandarin on
the use of hao in discourse. Chao (1968) and Li and Thompson (1981),
the two standard Chinese grammars written in English, do not even
mention the issue. The pedagogical grammars also offer little help.
Teachers (Li et al. 1984, 1989) does not mention the discourse use of hao and Essential Grammar for Modern Chinese (Lin 1981) mentions hao only in passing in the discussion of modal particles. She notes that when hao ba is used,

showing the speaker's acceptance of a proposal, a challenge, or an offer, then a certain degree of hesitation or unwillingness is suggested. ... If the speaker is completely happy about the proposition, he would have responded "hao a!" (274-5)

This explanation is hardly sufficient to explain the multiple uses of hao in Chinese discourse.

Language teachers are faced with a dilemma when dealing with discourse items such as hao. If they avoid the use of discourse markers in elementary and intermediate texts, the dialogues which are created will sound unnatural and stilted. If, on the other hand, such complex discourse items are included, language teachers have to either explain their use and risk overloading their students or not explain them (the more popular course) and hope that students will "discover" their proper usage on their own. This latter course is the one chosen by most Mandarin Chinese textbooks. By merely giving students an English "equivalent" teachers and textbook authors are telling them that hao functions in the same way as okay or fine or whatever English word(s) is chosen as a gloss.

As an alternative, teachers can take a course similar to that followed by Walker et al. Discourse markers can be presented in an appropriate context and with a description of each new function as it appears. Listing each new use as a new vocabulary item is not likely to be productive. This type of approach only encourages students to use
the one-to-one correspondence with a native language lexical item that such a presentation requires. In the case of hao, we do not have enough empirical data about the use of possible native language equivalents, okay, sure, fine, etc., to make an informed decision on an appropriate choice. Lacking this type of information, merely glossing hao with an English "equivalent" is at best misleading, at worst, simply wrong.

In order to present hao in a manageable way to beginning and intermediate students, teachers can start with the role that hao plays in the development and closure of requests, commands, suggestions and offers, the commissive/requestive social activities. These functions are the ones that appear most commonly in the texts. Coincidentally, this use of hao is very similar to the use of okay in English as the work of Merritt (1984) has shown. Although contrastive analysis has fallen out of favor these days in pedagogical circles, I would suggest that teachers conscientiously use this similarity to our advantage in this particular instance, rather than let their students do it unwittingly. Merritt's research has shown that okay is used in service encounters to mark completion and closure of various stages of the encounter (144). Hao is found scattered throughout textbook dialogues in restaurants, when shopping, etc., in the service encounter that students are taught to handle. Realistic, communicative exercises can be designed which allow students to use hao to communicate within the limits of their linguistic abilities.

A likely next step would be the introduction of hao in closing telephone conversations. This introduction will require special care and contrastive analysis will again be important. The differences
between hao and okay will need to be stressed. As Schegloff and Sacks (1973) have pointed out, okay marks the completion of the conversational work in telephone calls and sets the stage for closing. It is not actually used in closing. In Chinese hao can serve both these functions. Teachers would want to expose their our students to these uses but might want to save their training in production for later in their study. The use of hao as an appreciation of assertions, particularly complaints and disagreements, is clearly an issue that should be saved for the more advanced levels of language study as is also the case in the use of hao in the rhetorical management of ideas.

Throughout these explanations of the various uses of hao teachers should utilize the commonalities among the uses that have been discussed earlier above, the concepts of closure and transition from one activity, issue, topic, etc. to the next. In this way students can be led to make the appropriate generalizations regarding the use of hao in discourse and can avoid wasting valuable time attempting to discover these generalizations on their own through trial and error. This type of approach should have applicability not only to the teaching of hao, but also to the teaching of discourse markers generally.

3.0 Theoretical Implications

3.1 Implications for the Study of Chinese Linguistics

The findings of this study, as summarized above, have provided significant insight into the functioning of these discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese and thus adds significantly to our store of knowledge of the Chinese language. This type of qualitative study of hao, keshi,
danshi, buguo, and na(me) is a necessary first step to a fuller understanding of the role discourse markers play in Chinese conversation.

While the findings themselves are certainly important, perhaps more significant is the utility of the method of study used here. Luke (1990) has already shown that the application of the techniques of conversation analysis to the study of Cantonese conversation can be very productive. Here we have seen that the approach of the conversation analysts enlightened by the insights of linguists, specifically Geis and Schiffrin, into the organization of conversation can yield very fruitful results when applied to the study of Mandarin conversation. This study has also shown the value of working with naturally occurring data when studying Chinese discourse. Naturally occurring data is clearly more difficult to work with. Countless hours must be spent in meticulous transcription, and an hour of tape may only contain a few tokens of the linguistic item to be studied. However, this study and others using naturally occurring data clearly demonstrate the value of this data source. Particularly when studying conversational discourse, created data cannot compare with the naturally occurring data in richness and reliability.

This study has addressed the functioning of only a small set of discourse markers used in Mandarin Chinese. No attempt has been made at the analysis of the use of shi a, dui a, fanzheng, qishi, jiushi, jiushi shuo, haoxiang, and others. Here we have merely begun the process of investigation of the discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese and demonstrated in the process a valuable methodology for that investigation.
3.2 Implications Regarding Geis' Social Action Model

The utility of Geis' model in the preceding analysis of these discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese adds more credibility to the model. Not only does this model have considerable explanatory value in English, but it can also account for similar phenomena in Mandarin Chinese, a typologically unrelated language.

We have also seen in Chapters III and V that the phenomena described by Geis, particularly social actions, are not merely theoretical constructs, but also are recognized by the participants in the conversation (recall this criteria from the conversation analysis for what makes sound theory). Please reconsider example (1) from Chapter III.

(1) (cm56:6)
C1: nimen qu zu luyingdai, zule ye shunbian zhuan qu, you-PL go rent videotape rent-ASP also conveniently turn go You go and rent a video, rent it and then go over and buy

[ qu mai cai ] ni mai cai guangwanle, shiyidian le, =
[ go buy food ] you buy food stroll-RES-ASP 11:00 ASP groceries, after you've bought groceries and strolled around,

B1: [ dinghao mai cai]
[Dinghao buy food]
Buy groceries at Dinghao.

C2: = women shiyidian kaishi nong cai, nong dao shierdian,
I-PL 11:00 begin cook food cook to 12:00
at 11:00, we'll start cooking, cook until 12:00,
	ni mama huilaile
you mother back-come-ASP
then your Mom will come back.

->A1: HAO
    hao
    Okay.

->B2: HAO
    hao
    Okay.
This is an example of an s-act order. Recall that in Geiss' framework orders are subject to the following felicity conditions.

Sp felicitously orders Ad to do A if and only if Sp conveys some proposition $P$ and

Propositional Content Condition:
- $P$ predicates a future action of Ad.

Essential Condition:
- Conveying $P$ counts as an attempt by Sp to cause Ad to do A.

Preparatory Condition:
- Sp believes that Ad is under an obligation to perform A-type acts of the sort predicated in $P$ if Sp desires.

Sincerity Condition:
- Sp wants Ad to do A. (1991:34-5)

The propositional condition of this s-act is specified and the essential condition is fulfilled in turns C1 and C2. Taking into account Grice’s maxim of quality, "Try to make your contribution one that is true," (1975:46) we can infer from turns C1 and C2 that the speaker C wants the hearers, A and B, to carry out the action of going to the store, satisfying the sincerity condition. As discussed earlier, satisfaction of the preparatory condition can be derived within Chinese culture from the relationship among the speakers, e.g., children can be expected to do shopping for their parents. From this explanation we can see that the s-act order has been completed upon the utterance of turn C2. The addressees themselves acknowledge completion of this s-act through their use of the marker hao. The use of na(me) in turn A2 is further proof that the participants see this as a unit, with na(me) referring back to this entire unit, the s-act order. This same type of confirmation was seen in Chapter V, example (12) shown below.
Recall from the discussion in Chapter V, note 1 how the felicity conditions on this s-act offer were satisfied. In this example dui a is used by the addressee, C, to acknowledge closure of the s-act. Once again we see na(me) being used to refer back to the entire s-act as a unit.

While this study does not address the entirety of Geis’ model, the utility of the model as seen in the above discussion certainly suggests that this model of social actions has considerable explanatory value in the study of conversation and certainly warrants continued development.

3.3 Implications Regarding Schiffrin’s Model of Discourse Coherence

Schiffrin’s model has been used throughout the above analysis of the discourse functioning of hao, na(me), buguo, danshi and keshi. Although in this study the names have been changed somewhat (for various reasons1), the concepts of action structure, exchange structure, ideational structure, information state and participation framework have all been found to be relevant to our understanding of the markers studied. It has been argued that hao operates in the action structure, the
exchange structure, the ideational structure and the information state; 
danshi, keshi, and buguo can operate in the ideational structure, the 
action structure and the exchange structure; while na(me) operates in 
the ideational structure, the action structure, the exchange structure 
and the information state of discourse. This relevance of Schiffrin’s 
model across languages offers additional evidence for its theoretical 
value.

As mentioned in the Introduction, Schiffrin (1987) has also 
suggested several characteristics of discourse markers. We will look at 
each of these in turn below.

1) Markers do not create discourse relationships, rather they select and 
display particular relationships from among the possible relationships 
(318).

We can see that this is the case by examining the following examples.

(3a) (cm18a:12, cited earlier)
A:  ni zhidao ma 
you know PART 
Do you know,

wo jintian liudian gang chu men o 
I today 6-o’clock just exit door PART 
today at 6:00 when I had just come out,

you yiliang chezi 
have 1-CL car 
there was a cab,

-> KESHI ta jiushi yijing bu shi zai zhanpai wang qianmian 
keshi it just-is already NEG be at stand-sign toward front 
but it was already, it wasn’t at the cab stand, it was a little 
yidian 
one-bit 
in front (of the cab stand).
This example has been discussed earlier in Chapter IV (example (6)) regarding the use of keshi. The two propositions expressed, 'there was a cab when I came out today' and 'the cab was a little in front of the cab stand,' when taken out of context do not have any predetermined relationship. Based on the context in which this segment occurred, it has been argued that the latter proposition is contrary to the expectation of the Sp. In Taipei there are areas of the city where one could reasonably expect to find cabs at a specified spot, the cab stand. There are other areas in Taipei, however, where this is not the case. In those areas you would generally expect to find cabs anywhere but at the designated spot. Consider the following example.

(9b) (created example)
A:  ni zhidaomā
    you know PART
    Do you know,
    wo jintian liudian gang chu men 0
    I today 6-o’clock just exit door PART
    today at 6:00 when I had just come out,
    you yiliang chezi
    have 1-CL car
    there was a cab,

  →  NA ta jiushi yijing bu shi zai zhanpai wang qianmian
      na(me) it just-is already NEG be at stand-sign toward front
      and it was already, it wasn’t at the cab stand, it was in front
      yidian
      one-bit
      (of the cab stand) a little.

Here na(me) marks a sequential relationship (consecutive occurrences in event time) between the two propositions. This utterance would be appropriate in either of the contexts mentioned above. The utterance could have occurred as well without a discourse marker between the
propositions. We can see that the marker does not create the relationship between the propositions, rather it "displays" a possible relationship that already exists.

2) Markers which retain their semantic meaning will operate primarily in the ideational structure of discourse while they will be freer to operate in other aspects of the discourse structure as they lose this semantic meaning (319).

All of the markers that have been studied here continue to retain significant semantic content when they operate as discourse markers. They also all play a role in the idea structure of discourse. When one discusses the issue of degree, however, Schiffrin's claim becomes very difficult to substantiate. While in the case of the contrastive markers buguo, danshi and keshi one can argue that they retain their meaning and thus operate primarily in the ideational structure, the cases of hao and na(me) are not nearly so clear. Both na(me) and hao retain much of their semantic meaning, yet they have significant roles to play in the information state, the action structure and the exchange structure. It would be difficult to argue that they have "less" meaning than the contrastive markers and thus are "more" free to operate in different aspects of the discourse structure.

3) While markers may have various functions in particular contexts, each marker will have only one "indexical function" (325).

It has been argued that hao is a marker of closure and transition, buguo, danshi and keshi mark contrast, and na(me) marks continuation. These markers all retain these "indexical functions" in the various contexts in which they are used.
4) The following conditions will allow a linguistic unit to be used as a discourse marker,

- it has to be syntactically detachable from a sentence
- it has to be commonly used in initial position of an utterance
- it has to have a range of prosodic contours
  - e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction
- it has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse, and on different planes of discourse ... (328)

All of the markers examined in this study meet the above conditions. They can be syntactically detached from the sentences that precede and follow them; they are generally found in the initial position of an utterance; they have been shown to operate both locally and more globally in discourse; and, while this characteristic has not been stressed, they all have a range of phonetic realizations, i.e., they have reduced forms, can be accompanied by a pause, etc.

This study has affirmed the characteristics of discourse markers suggested by Schiffrin. The utility of both Geis' and Schiffrin's models, developed in the study of American English, has been clearly demonstrated in the study of Chinese conversation. These facts and the similarities noted throughout this study among the discourse markers used in English and Chinese all indicate that there are needs or functions in the creation of spontaneous conversation in all languages that call for the use and thus the development of discourse markers. This proposal is certainly worthy of further study in other languages.
1. In the case of the action structure, this study has used social action structure to accommodate the inclusion of Geis' model of social actions. The exchange structure has been called the turn structure because that is the more commonly used term for that concept. In the case of the ideational structure, idea structure has been used because it is a more straightforward representation of the concept.
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