Grammaticalization of Connectives in Mandarin Chinese:
A Corpus-Based Study[*]

Chueh-chen Wang
National Taiwan University

Lillian M. Huang
Shih Chien University

This paper probes into the grammaticalization of three connectives in Mandarin Chinese, namely *yinwei* 'because,' *suoyi* 'so,' and *ranhou* 'then.' In accordance with Traugott's (1995a:1) adverbial cline, we examine the three connectives' paths of grammaticalization, and show how their polysemous uses in the present day fall within the prediction of her adverbial cline. Moreover, for further explanation of their functions as discourse markers which serve communicative purposes, we explicate the concept of subjectification and intersubjectification proposed by Traugott (1995b, 1999) and Traugott & Dasher (2002) and Blakemore's (1988, 1992) relevance-based framework.

Key words: connective, grammaticalization, subjectification, intersubjectification

1. Introduction

The present study, based on natural spoken data, aims to investigate the grammaticalization of three connectives in Mandarin Chinese (henceforth MC): *yinwei*, *suoyi*, and *ranhou*. By the term **connective** we refer specifically to lexical items which primarily serve the grammatical function of linking discourse units. Though running the risk of terminological proliferation, we prefer to refrain from adopting the more popular term *conjunction*, which is generally associated with grammatical structures within the sentential level. That traditional term soon becomes less than satisfactory, if not contradictory, when we go beyond the confines of sentences. For one thing, due to the lack of explicit verbal conjugations and morphosyntactic markings, the syntactic criteria for unambiguously determining subordination in Mandarin are never easy to come by,

---

not to mention the fact that the traditional rigorously defined distinction between main clauses and subordinate clauses crumbles when spoken data is brought into consideration.

Even in the past studies, which relied predominately on decontextualized examples, the elusive nature of connectives (discussed mostly using the term *conjunction*) in MC has been well documented. Due to their omissibility when given sufficient contextual information, connectives show an ostensible defiance against clear-cut classification regarding their parts of speech. As this study draws on spoken discourse, it can be reasonably expected that their categorical indeterminability will only become even more obvious. Therefore, it would not be part of our goal to assign the three connectives under discussion to any particular grammatical category.

However, it is perhaps noteworthy that the three connectives in MC, *yinwei*, *suoyi*, and *ranhou*, are overwhelmingly regarded as adverbials in the past literature. According to Chao (1968:790), Tsao (1988:46) and Chu and Ji (1999:61, 243), MC connectives are often derived from or closely interrelated with adverbials, and thus they are hardly distinguishable from each other. In fact, the three highly frequent connectives examined in this study are also categorized by Chao (1968:792) as adverbial conjunctions. In their groundbreaking book on Chinese grammar, Li & Thompson (1981:637, 653) also term the three connectives as adverbial forward/backward-linking elements. Moreover, the adverbial nature of the connectives is well reflected in the fact that—though they serve to link clauses—they can be omitted when the connection can be inferred from the context (Tsao 1988:44, 46). Chu & Ji (1999:61) further explain that the term "conjunction/ connective" being used, instead of "adverb", is due to the fact that unlike other adverbials, they can only occur in clause-initial positions. The status of connectives as adverbials is far from implausible or uncommon if we consider the corresponding situations in other languages. In her survey of different languages, Mithun (1988:336) notes that, with regard to coordination, a large number of languages lack any morphological or lexical indications of conjunction whatsoever. Even among those that contain highly grammaticalized markers of syntactic coordination, only certain kinds of coordination are overtly marked; and in many, coordinating conjunctions are optional (ibid). Instead, juxtaposition and intonation alone are considered sufficient to signal conjunction (Mithun 1988:337). Again, although we have justifiable reasons to believe that the three connectives in question should be viewed as adverbials in nature, the issue is beyond the scope of the present study.

In recent decades, grammaticalization (a term coined by French linguist Antoine Meillet) has been drawing increasingly more linguists' attention and been subjected to various interpretations. Despite divergence of opinions on how exactly it should be defined and its boundaries with some other linguistic changes, grammaticalization generally refers to the linguistic process whereby lexical items become more grammatical

and grammatical items assume new grammatical functions over time (Lehmann 1985: 303, Traugott 1988:406, Hopper & Traugott 1993:xv, Bybee et al. 1994:4-5, Diessel 1999:116, Heine & Kuteva 2002:2, Traugott & Dasher 2002:81). Among the hottest debated issues regarding grammaticalization nowadays is the cross-linguistic validity of its unidirectionality, the directional asymmetry of linguistic constructions becoming increasingly grammatical, but not vice versa. On top of several clines she had proposed earlier regarding unidirectionality, Traugott (1995) further argues for an adverbial cline of grammaticalization, as shown below:

clause-internal adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle[1]

As presented by the cline above, the semantic scope of adverbials which falls within clauses may widen into the clausal level, and later possibly into the discourse level to create textuality and discourse coherence.

The corpus of this study comprises ten segments of tape-recorded radio programs in July, 2003 (approximately 100 minutes in total), nine of which are carried out by the anchorpersons interviewing the guests. All recording materials are transcribed according to the Pinyin Romanization system.[2]

2. Literature review

In the past, not much research discussed coordination and subordination in MC; and, as noted by Chu (1998:356), the issues were largely overlooked in grammar books. It was only in the past decade that intersentential elements like *yinwei*, *suoyi*, and *ranhou* started to emerge as a central topic in the search for their discourse functions. In the following, we shall examine separately the literature of the three connectives.

2.1 *Yinwei*

Chao (1968:115, 792) takes *yinwei* as an adverbial conjunction encoding cause or reason along with *suoyi*, and seemingly equivalent to *because*, and in some contexts as a coverb (or preposition), as in the sentence {他因為什麼緣故不能來？(ta yinwei shenme yuangu bu neng lai?) "For what reason can she not come?"} (Chao 1968:762). Lü (1999:623) also shares similar views with Chao, claiming that when acting as a

---

[1] As also mentioned in Traugott (1995a), within this cline, discourse markers are considered a subtype of discourse particle.

[2] Please refer to Appendix for transcription notations.

preposition, *yinwei* conveys reasons, as in the sentence {因為這件事，小田還受到表揚。(yinwei zhejian shi, xiaotian hai shoudao biaoyang.) "Because of this matter, Xiaotian even got rewarded."} As a causal connective, *yinwei* leads clauses placed before or after the main clause (Lü 1999:623). Li & Thompson (1981:635, 653) define it as both an adverbial forward-linking and backward-linking element and typically pairing up with another clause led by *suoyi*. While previous studies focus mainly on the syntactic level without further probing into its discourse functions in natural, face-to-face interaction, Wang (1998a) applies Ford's (1993, 1994) model for analyzing adverbial clauses in her data analysis of *yinwei*. According to Wang (1998a), *yinwei* is actually found with a much wider variety of syntactic distributions: initial causal clauses, final continuing causal clauses, and final ending causal clauses—each kind characterized by different conversational functions. When *yinwei* leads the initial causal clause, it presents explanations in answering questions in interaction, introduces accounts for asking questions and provides a reason or support for judgments and evaluative statements (Wang 1998a:212). In a final continuing causal clause which is intonationally connected with the preceding clause, *yinwei* acts less as a causal conjunction and more as 'not only a marker of elaboration but also a marker of continuation, which indicates that the speaker has more to say' (Wang 1998a:220). In other words, its semantic core as a causal linking element is weakened and, instead, it functions merely as a floor-holder, which has little to do with a causal relationship. *Yinwei* also occurs in final ending causal clauses for self-editing functions and negotiation between the interlocutors (Wang 1998a:227). As to the latter function, *yinwei*-clauses stating reasons for disagreement are generally favored over a potentially face-threatening negative response. Based on the Gricean maxim of Relation (Grice 1975:46), the addressee can grasp the pragmatic inference of the seemingly inappropriate *yinwei*-clause and make sense of it. Another negotiation function raised by Wang is the mitigating effect of a *yinwei*-clause attached after a negative reply, in that it alleviates a "dispreferred" feeling caused by a face-to-face encounter (Wang 1998a:229). As for the self-editing function which ranks the highest in Wang's data for all final post-completion extensions, the *yinwei*-clause is attached immediately after a complete clause either to provide explanations to clarify prior texts due to the speaker's perception of the addressee's confusion, or to summarize and self-edit the preceding texts in a clearer way (Wang 1998a:230-231). The addressee may even initiate his/her turn with a *yinwei*-clause stating further reasons or assentient remarks in agreement and support for what the other speaker just said. In other words, the *yinwei*-clause is applied for joint productions emerging through interactional negotiation. To sum up, Wang's study shows us that a full account of the functions of *yinwei* must go beyond a simple causal relationship and that its various interpretations and uses are context-sensitive as well as communication-driven. In other words, *yinwei* has stripped

its causal linking sense in order to be molded into part of the conversational strategies.

2.2 *Suoyi*

The discussion of *suoyi* in Chao (1968) is pretty much bound up with that of *yinwei*, as Chao (1968:115, 792) sees both as adverbial conjunctions and usually forming a connective pair. Lü (1999:521) holds the same view, noting the "corresponding" relationship between the two connectives that often go hand in hand. Similar remarks are also found in Li & Thompson (1981); that is, they regard the two connectives as one of the most common pairings of the linking elements (Li & Thompson 1981:637-638), while labeling *suoyi* as an adverbial backward-linking element (Li & Thompson 1981: 653). It should be noted that the aforementioned studies are mostly based on the written language—Mainland Mandarin specifically—whereas our study will focus on the interclausal level to tackle the discourse functions of *suoyi* in Taiwan Mandarin.

2.3 *Ranhou*

The connective, *ranhou*, as Su (1998:171) notes, is used canonically to mark an interclausal temporal relationship between adjacent clauses. Its discourse uses, however, expand into non-temporal domains including consequence, conditionals, concessions, filler, and topic succession. Its consequentiality apparently arises from temporal sequentiality via pragmatic inference. The list-use of *ranhou* is non-temporal in the sense that listing is based on descriptive unity rather than temporal unity (Su 1998:173). As a marker of topic succession, *ranhou* is inserted between different discourse units or turn-initial positions as if the whole conversational frame is viewed as a list and the segments of the discourse and turn-taking are separate items on a list. *Ranhou* is also used as a filler, reflecting a "conceptual planning operation" that is translated into linguistic form (Su 1998:167). In sum, the basic temporality of *ranhou* is exploited for discourse uses, as it grammaticalizes from temporal to non-temporal, from textual linking to conversational cohesion and discourse marker. Wang (1998b:381) also points out that the core meaning of the various uses of *ranhou* is {what is next/and next}, marking continuation. When making an interclausal temporal connection, *ranhou* conveys sequentiality of the speaker's event time, whereas its nontemporal use refers to the speaker's discourse time (Wang 1998b:396). In other words, *ranhou* assumes the functions of both a temporal connective and a discourse marker.

3. Findings and discussions

The following sections will present the three connectives in MC respectively, in accordance with the statistical results of our data analysis.

3.1 *Yinwei*

In our data, the largest share of tokens of *yinwei* goes to its status as a final adverbial clause following ending intonation, different from what Li & Thompson (1981) have claimed. Based on presumably written or self-constructed examples, Li & Thompson (1981:635, 653) note that *yinwei* can be either a forward or backward linking adverbial to code a causal relationship between two clauses. Our spoken data, however, paints quite a different picture. According to our statistics, while the forward and backward linking functions of *yinwei* account for only 51.8% of its total occurrences (see Table 1 below), an astonishing 44.58% goes to its clause-initial adverbial function following a falling intonation of the previous discourse—a finding more or less similar to Wang's (1998) study. Example (1) below shows the typical use of *yinwei*:

Table 1: Statistics of the different uses of *yinwei*

	number of tokens	percentage
1. causal connective (initial adverbial clause)	26	31.32
2. causal connective (final adverbial clause)	17	20.48
3. final adverbial clause following ending intonation	37	44.58
4. joint production by the other speaker	3	3.61
TOTAL	83	100.00

(1) (A is the male anchor of a radio program, and B is a female singer who is interviewed by A.)

1B: *wo zai   chang zhe   shou ge   de   shihou,   zai luyinjian,*
      1P DUR sing   this CL   song ASS   moment in   recording studio

2   *zheng ge   ren   haoxiang   yao   zhuakuang yiyang,* =
      whole CL   person   seem like   be about to   go crazy   the same

3A: [*ei:*]
                                                              uh

4B: =*yinwei   juede zhe shou ge   key   ye   hen   gao,   ranhou* =
       because feel   this   CL   song <L2 key L2> also   very   high   and

5A: [*en:*]
                                                              umh

6B:　=*changfa*　　　 *you　yao…　 hen　kuazhang,　 zuiba　 dou　yao*
　　　 the way to sing　also　have to　very　exaggerated　mouth　all　have to
7　　*zhang de　 hen　da,　hen　da,　hen　da,　da　dao　bu　xing　　 ei:*
　　　 open　ASS　very　big　very　big　very　big　big　till　NEG　possible　P
8A:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 [@　　　　　　　　 @]

B:　　 When I was singing in the recording studio, I myself was almost going crazy,=
A:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 [uh]
B:　　 =because I thought that the key of this song was very high and the way of =
A:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 [uh]
B:　　 =singing it was also very exaggerated. I had to open my mouth very wide, very =
A:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 [@　　　　　 @]
B:　　 =wide, as wide as possible.

When appearing clause-initially after a preceding falling intonation, *yinwei* also links the following clause with the preceding one as providing either associated elaboration or self-editing of the previous discourse. However, the clause led by *yinwei* is a syntactically independent one, though it is semantically connected to the prior one. The relatively numerous occurrences of this kind can be explained by the fact that amid natural conversation, interlocutors have less time to organize their speech in the cause-result order; thus, reasons or elaborations more often than not come later in a proposition. The speaker can also initiate his/her utterance in collaboration with the other speaker to develop the current topic by helping the other speaker finish his/her statement or by providing reasons supporting the other speaker's argument.

3.2 *Suoyi*

Previous studies have categorized *suoyi* as an adverbial conjunction denoting the result, typically accompanied by a foregoing clause possibly led by a corresponding *yinwei* to explain reasons (Chao 1968:792, Li & Thompson 1981:653, Lü 1999: 521-522). Our statistical results (see Table 2 below), however, bring to our attention three other different uses that exhibit varying degrees of extension from its original resultative connective function; namely, paraphrasing function, resumptive opener, and topic-initiator.

Table 2: Statistics of the different uses of *suoyi*

	number of tokens	percentage
1. consequential connective	25	45.45
2. paraphrasing use	4	7.27
3. resumptive opener	5	9.09
4. topic-initiator	21	38.18
TOTAL	55	100.00

The first one is used not to deliver the result, but rather to rephrase or summarize the preceding discourse. Though *suoyi* in this case is basically non-informative in the sense that no new information is involved, the speaker can effectively reconfirm the conveyed messages by essentially repeating the previous talk to ensure no misunderstanding in perception—a conversation-oriented use. Another piece of evidence marking its distinction from the resultative connective is that it can be used to initiate one's turn to make sure of one's comprehension of prior talk, especially in the absence of a preceding clause stating reasons. A typical example is shown in (2) below:

(2) (A is the female anchor of a radio program, and B is an orchard owner being interviewed by A.)

1B: *wo men qing.. ye   you   qing yuanzhumin. wo men ba   jiuye*
     1S PL   hire also PRF hire aboriginals 1S PL   ACC job

2   *jihui   hai shi ranggei wo men yuanzhumin a:. shi.*
     opportunity still COP yield to 1S PL   aboriginals P   right

3A: [*oh*]   *yi*
                                                        oh   one

4   *ge shuimitao de.. umh.. zhege...wo men kan dao de,   wo juede*
     CL peach   GEN umh this   1S   PL   see RVC ASS 1S feel

5   *hen gandong ou, jiushishuo, dao   le   shuimitao de   na   ge...*
     very touched P   that is   arrive PRF peach   ASS that CL

6   *umh guoyuan qu   ou, cai   kan dao mei   yi   zhi shuimitao dou*
     SP   orchard go   P   then see RVC every one CL   peach   all

7   *yao   gei   ta   feichang jingxinde taoshang yi ge baise de   taozi,*
     must give   3S   very   exquisitely put on   a   CL white ASS cover

8   *hai   gei   ta   yong dingshuji, dingshuzhen ba   ta ding hao, suoyi* =
     even ive   3S   use stapler   stapler pin   ACC 3S staple well therefore

9B: [*dui   dui*]
                                                        right   right

10A: =*mei yi ke shuimitao, ni men dou yong feichang hehu*
      every one CL peach   2S PL all use very pampering

11   *xiaoxin de xinqing dui ta ou:.*
      careful ASS manner treat 3S P

12B: *dui dui dui.*
      right right right

B: We hire..also hire aboriginals. We yield job opportunities to our aboriginals. Right.

A: [oh]

    A peach's..umh…this..we see…I feel really touched. That is, not until arriving at the peach farm did I see that every peach has to be exquisitely covered with a white cover and stapled well with staplers. So to every peach, you treat it in a very pampering, =

B: [right]

A: =careful way.

B: Right, right, right.

In line 8, A uses *suoyi* to sum up her preceding talk, because the two clauses linked by *suoyi* are not in consequential relationship. The prior discourse before *suoyi* describes how B takes good care of his peaches by carefully putting covers on them, and the latter either paraphrases or summarizes the former, simply putting A's idea in a different and more succinct fashion. Therefore, it appears that *suoyi* does not encode a cause-result linkage, but sums up the prior discourse.

Another unconventional use is the resumptive opener. After digression of an old topic, the speaker begins his/her turn with *suoyi* to signal a resumption back to it and to prevent further departure into currently irrelevant issues, as demonstrated in (3):

(3)   (A is the female anchor of a radio program, and B is a female aboriginal writer who is interviewed by A about her new book.)

1B: *youguan tuteng de bufen, ta dangran you cankao shuo paiwan*
     about totem ASS part 3S of course have consult COMP PN

2   *zu guoqu yizhi you zai shiyong de tuteng. na weile* =
     tribe past all the time PRF DUR use ASS totem that for

3A: [*en*]
                                         yeah

4B: =*jiushishuo rang zhe ge tuteng kan qilai geng huopo, ta*
     that is have this CL totem see RVC more lively 3S

5   *you   shaowei   zuo   yixie: gaibian.   dui.   danshi   na   ge* =*
       PRF   a bit   make   some   change   right   however   that   CL

6A: [*en*]
                                 uh

7B: =*tuteng   de   jiben   ne,   ta jiben   de   tuxing,   xiang..   shewen   a:,*
       totem   ASS   basic   P   3S basic   ASS   pattern   like   snake vein   P

8   *xiang paiwan zu   jiu hui   yong le   daliang   de   she,   baibushe,*
      like   PN   tribe   just will   use   PRF   many   ASS snake PN

9   *yinwei   baibushe   shi   wo   men   de   shouhushen:.*
      because   PN   COP   1S   PL   GEN   tutelary god

10A: [*zhe*] *shi… umh suoyou*
                                       this COP SP   all

11   *yuanzhumin   de   shouhushen,   hai   shi   paiwan   zu   de?*
     aboriginals   GEN   tutelary god   or   COP PN   tribe   GEN

12B: *paiwan   zu.*
      PN   tribe

13A: *zhe   paiwan   zu.*
      this PN   tribe

14B: [*paiwan*] *zu.   dui   dui   dui.*
          PN   tribe right right right

15A: [*en*]   *en:*
                       yeah   yeah

16B: ***suoyi***   *ne, ta   jiu   hui   yong le   paiwan zu   de   tuan   a:.*=
    therefore P   3S   then will   use   PRF PN   tribe GEN pattern P

17A: [*en*]
                             hum

18B: =*ranhou   taiyang ye   shi   wo men   de   tuteng zhi yi.   dui.*=
     moreover sun   also   COP   1S   PL   GEN   totem   of   one   right

19A: [*en*]
                             uh

20B: =*suoyi ye   yong le   hen   duo   taiyang de   secai.*
     so   also   use   PRF   very   many   sun   GEN   color

B: As to the totem, she surely also consulted the totems which were always used by the Paiwan tribe in the past. And in order to make the totems look more lively, she=

A: [uh]

B: =made some changes. However, the basic patterns, such as snake veins; the

> Paiwan tribe uses a lot of snakes, Hundred-pace Snake, because Hundred-pace Snake is =

A: [uh]

B: =our tutelary god.

A: [this] is..uh the tutelary god of all aboriginals or only the Paiwan tribe?

B: The Paiwan tribe.

A: This, the Paiwan tribe.

B: [Paiwan] tribe. Right. Right. Right. Therefore, she would use the =

A: [yeah]

B: =Paiwan tribe's totems. Moreover, the sun is also one of our totems. Right. So =

A: [uh]

B: =she also used a large amount of the sun's color.

In line 16, B initiates her turn with *suoyi* to resume the old topic about the illustrator of her new book after A asked her whether the Hundred-pace Snake is the tutelary god of all aboriginal tribes, successfully putting the digression to an end. The resumptive opener use of *suoyi* enables the speaker to keep the progress of conversation under control and from drifting into less important topics. In other words, *suoyi* becomes more like a discourse marker to implement conversational strategies, than simply a connective.

The last use is the topic-initiator function. Completely irrelevant to consequentiality, this use serves to mark topic shifts instead. This use somehow resembles *ranhou* in that it treats segments of the discourse as items on a list, linking one with another and not specifying the relation between them, as is illustrated in (4) below:

(4)   (A is the male anchor of a radio program, and B is a caller in the listening audience.)

1A: *ni   shi   na   yi   fangmian   de   gongzuo?*
        2S   COP   which   one   aspect   ASS   job

2B: *en: wo   shi   guoxiao   laoshi.*
        SP   1S   COP   elementary school   teacher

3A: *guo:xiao: laoshi   zeme   hui   bu   manyi   ne?   xianzai   bu*
        elementary school   teacher   how   will   NEG   satisfied   Q   now   NEG

4   *shi   zai   fang   shujia   ma?*
        COP   DUR   have   summer vacation   Q

5B: [@   @]   *danshi   hai   shi   yao..   yao*
                                              but   still   COP   must   must

6   *qu   xuexiao   a:*
        go   school   P

7A: *hai   shi   yao   qu xuexiao   shangban. xu   bu   xuyao   bian*
    still COP must go school   work   need   NEG   need   compile

8B: [*dui   a:*]
                                    yeah   P

9A: =*jiaocai   a:?*
    teaching material   Q

10B: *yao.*
    need to

11A: *yao   bian   jiaocai.   suoyi   jibenshang…tongxue   fang* =
    need   compile   teaching material   thus   basically   students   have

12B: [*dui   a:*]
                    yeah   P

13A: =*shujia,   laoshi   meiyou   genzhe   xiu*
    summer vacation   teacher   NEG   follow   rest

14B: *meiyou,   meiyou.*
    NEG   NEG

15A: <L2oh: okL2> **suoyi** *xianzai de   xuesheng hao   bu   hao   jiao?*
        oh   ok   so   now   ASS students good NEG good   teach

16 *ni   shi   jiao   ji   nianji?*
    2S   COP teach which grade

17B: *wo   shi…   san   nianji.*
    1S   COP   third   grade

A: What kind of job do you have?
B: I am an elementary school teacher.
A: An elementary school teacher. Then why are you not satisfied? Isn't it summer vacation now?
B: [@ @]   But I still have to go to school.
A: You still have to go to school to work. Do you need to compile teaching =
B: [yeah]
A: =materials?
B: Yes, I do.
A: You need to. So basically, while the students are having their summer vacation, =
B: [right]
A: =teachers don't have it.
B: No, no.
A: Oh, okay. So are the students easy to teach nowadays? Which grade do you teach?
B: I teach third grade.

In line 15, after discussing with B about the fact that teachers actually do not have summer vacation, A then shifts into another topic regarding B's students and teaching. The use of *suoyi* punctuates the end of the prior topic as well as the start of a new one—a discourse marker in nature.

Based on our statistical results, we observe that in terms of serving functions related to textuality establishment, *suoyi* is more deeply entrenched than *yinwei*, as is evidenced by the resumptive opener and topic-initiator roles that *suoyi* assumes. This phenomenon prods us to question why *suoyi*, semantically opposite to *yinwei*, displays a higher degree in the development into a textual coherence device. The reason, we suspect, is to a large extent attributable to both its syntactic and semantic structures.

From a syntactic perspective, *suoyi* (unlike *yinwei*, which conjoins a subordinate clause) normally leads a coordinate clause which boasts a syntactic status equal with the normally preceding clause. Here, a comparison with the English connective *so* is informative: as noted by Schiffrin (1987:191), compared with *because*, *so* is a complementary marker of main idea units, and therefore is functionally and referentially less dependent on a larger textual unit of talk. Thus, the clauses led by *suoyi* are likewise structurally less dependent, and, when semantically bleached, open the door to discourse manipulation.

From a semantic-pragmatic perspective, the clauses led by *suoyi* typically denote consequences arising from the states or events described in the preceding clauses, and thus are laden with heavy semantic focus. In addition, *suoyi*-led clauses chiefly introduce new information, while the more topical preceding clauses often state old given information, set the background, and provide explanations or justification. As a result, it would be most natural for *suoyi* to evolve into a marker of new information, and later, discourse marker of multiple functions.

3.3 *Ranhou*

The five different uses of *ranhou* purposed by Su (1998) are all borne out in our data, each taking up a certain proportion of occurrences. In addition, two other uses are also discovered in our data, both of which have gone largely unnoticed in previous studies, though they are indirectly touched on in Wang (1998b) but not fully explored. One is, as is the same case with *suoyi*, the *resumptive opener*, while the other is what I would call the *additive* use.

When functioning as a resumptive opener, *ranhou* does not establish a sequential interclausal relationship, but rather resumes an old, digressed topic. (5) gives an example of it:

(5) (A is the female anchor of a radio program, and B is a female aboriginal writer who is interviewed by A about her new book.)

1B: *suoyi   ne, ta jiu   hui   yong le   paiwan zu   de   tuan   a:.=*
    therefore P   3S then will use PRF PN   tribe GEN pattern P

2A: [*en*]
                                              uh

3B: *=ranhou   taiyang   ye   shi   wo   men de   tuteng zhi yi.   dui.=*
    moreover sun   also COP   1S   PL   GEN totem   of   one   right

4A: [*en*]
                                            hum

5B: *=suoyi   ye   yong   le   hen   duo   taiyang de   secai. dui.=*
    so   also use   PRF   very   many   sun   GEN color   right

6A: [*dui   dui*]
                                          right right

7B: *=na:*
    and

8A: [*erqie*] *na   taiyang zhende hao   piaoliang ou:. hao   xiang=*
    besides that sun   really very   beautiful P   very   feel like

9B: [*mei   cuo*]
                                        NEG   wrong

10A: *=ba   ta   yi   kou   chi   diao   ou:.*
    ACC   3S   one bite eat   up   P

11B: [@   @] ***ranhou   hongse han   heise shi=***
                                   moreover red   and   black COP

12A: [*dui*]
                         right

13B: *=wo   men   de   ji..   jiben   yanse. dui.*
    1S   PL   GEN basic basic   color   right

B: Therefore, she used a large amount of the sun's color. Right. And..
A: [And] the sun is so
   beautiful, so that I feel like eating it up in one bite.
B: [yeah]   [@   @] Besides, red and black are =
A: [right]
B: =our basic colors. Right.

In line 11, B senses a potential digression caused by A and begins her turn with *ranhou* which guides the conversation back to the previous main topic about her book and the

illustrations inside. The fact that both *suoyi* and *ranhou* possess the resumptive opener function, as shown in our data, directs us toward the inquiry of the common basis shared by the two backward linking connectives. Aware of the shaping force of conversational implicature, we speculate that since the canonical uses of the two connectives presuppose a foregoing clause to establish either consequential or sequential relation with the following clause, the appearance of either of the two connectives naturally prods the addressee to search backward beyond the immediately preceding discourse, to go back to the original, major topic from which the conversation digressed and on which interclausal connection can be sensibly made. It is exactly via conversational implicature that *ranhou* and *suoyi* become exploited to resume old topics and end digression. In Wang (1998b), she points out the possibility for *ranhou* to "serve as frame marking device signaling a switch reference (387)," emphasizing how *ranhou* conveys successive ideas in event time. However, what we encounter here is a case where *ranhou* serves as a strategic device by which the speaker can effectively end digression and resume old topics; in other words, *ranhou* functions to connect discontinuous discourse units, which is somewhat different from Wang's (1988) description.

The other newly discovered use of *ranhou* is what we call the *additive* use, and it links "successive ideas in discourse time" (Wang 1998b:387-391). Though it is nowadays widely used in daily conversations, its exact nature is in fact the hardest to pinpoint among all its uses; in one sense, *ranhou* expresses definitely not sequentiality, but rather more like "piling" new information onto old—disputably a semantically weakened, loosened extension use of its original sequentiality. As Li & Thompson (1981:631) remark, sentences spoken in close succession by one speaker or by several speakers will be related; otherwise, communication will break down. The additive use of *ranhou* is intended to make more explicit the connection between successive sentences and thus establishes cohesion in conversation, subsuming the linked sentences under the same topic. From another point of view, *ranhou* links together a series of related events or actions, each of which is encompassed within a larger discourse frame. Therefore, the sentences linked by *ranhou* are related in theme and definitely not just randomly juxtaposed, as the semantic decoding of the sentences headed by *ranhou* are strictly dependent on their prior discourse as indispensable background knowledge. Examples (6) and (7) below are two examples:

(6) (A is the male anchor of a radio program, and B is a female singer who has recently released her new album and is interviewed by A.)

1A: *ei: ni weishenme yao zhe yang chang a:?*
       SP   2S   why   want this   way   sing   P

2B: *qishi   zhe shi   zhizuoren   gen   wo   juede zhe   shou ge…   shi*
    actually this COP   producer   and   1S   feel   his   CL   song COP

3   *bijiao   yaogun:.   **ranhou**, wo men xiwang ba   ta   chengxian*
    comparatively rock-and-roll and   1S PL   hope ACC 3S present

4   *weidao shi   bijiao   kuazhang   de.*
    flavor   COP comparatively   exaggerative ASS

5A: *oh:*
    oh

A: Why do you want to sing this way?

B: Actually, this is because the producer and I thought that this song is more rock-and-roll, and we wanted to present it with a more exaggerative flavor.

A: Oh.

(7)   (A is the female anchor of a radio program, and B is an orchard owner who is interviewed by A.)

1A: *mei   yi   nian   shenme shihou shuimi:tao kaishi zhang guozi?*
    every one year   what   time   peach   start   grow   fruit

2B: *zhang guozi shi: sanyue ershihao, chabuduo mei   nian   de*
    grow   fruit   COP March   twentieth around   every year   ASS

3   *sanyue ershihao zuoyou, ta   hui   xiaxun   na   duan   shijian*
    March   twentieth or so   3S   will   last ten days that period   time

4   *jiu   kaishi..kaishi kaihua.   **ranhou**, wo   men   you… you   fen =*
    just   start   start   blossom   and   1S   PL   PRF   PRF   divide

5A: [*en*]
                                               uh

6B: *=na ge: zao   sheng de,   jiushi   wo   men   you   zhong yi   ge*
    that CL   early grow   ASS   that is 1S   PL   PRF   grow   one   CL

7   *hongguojian de   pinzhong.*
    PN   GEN   breed

A: When do peaches blossom each year?

B: Blossoming is on March the twentieth, around March the twentieth each year. It will start to blossom during the last ten days of that month. And we divide them =

A: [yeah]

B: =into early growing ones; that is, we have grown the Hongguojian species.

    In line 3 of Example (6), B explains to A that she sings in a rather special way to

add to the song an exaggerative flavor. In line 4 of Example (7), in addition to answering A's question as to the time when the peach trees will start to blossom, B goes on to provide more details regarding the species they grow. In either case, the basis for *ranhou*'s connective function clearly depart from sequentiality into marking loose connection among a series of conceptually-related events or actions—*loose* in the sense that no tangible, absolute interclausal relationship between the propositions can be found. The additive function of *ranhou* therefore verges on supplying new information, the decoding of which hinges on the formerly conveyed one. Wang (1998b:387, 394) notes that such a use of *ranhou* is due to "the speaker's definition of his/her own upcoming utterance as a continuation of the developing content and structure of an interaction." Again, this also supports Wang's (1998b:381) remark that the core meaning of *ranhou* is to mark continuation.

Chu (1998:357) points out that coordination in MC seems to depend more on parallelism and lexical cohesion in the absence of many formal devices. Besides, according to Wu (2002), the establishment of temporal reference in MC relies more heavily on the inherent semantics of the verbs deployed, rather than overt temporal markers. The previous factors could possibly contribute to the development of *ranhou* from a canonical coordinative connective toward non-temporal usage, as it could be relieved of its coordination purpose.

As to its most prominent use, the additive use of *ranhou* manifests the ultimate bleaching of its propositional temporal meaning. Again, a comparison here with the English conjunction *and* is informative. As Schiffrin (1987:150) notes, "All *and* displays is continuation and/or coordination: more precise identification depend on discourse content and structure." Similarly, Chafe (1988:11, 25) also notes that *and* signals nothing more than that the idea expressed in the second unit moves forward in some way from the idea expressed in the first. As a result, the major function of *and* nowadays has become a marker of continuation, and thus very much resembles that of *ranhou* whose token ranks the highest in our data analysis; in other words, the additive use of *ranhou* renders *ranhou* a maximally general connective, and contributes nothing to the clausal proposition, but only marks the continuity of the ideas in two adjacent clauses.

As shown in Table 3 below, *ranhou* boasts not only a larger number of tokens but a more impressive collection of functions as well than the other two adverbial connectives, which testifies its prevalence in natural daily speech. Much to our surprise, its additive function has somehow topped our daily uses of *ranhou*, leaving the other more canonical uses tailing behind in frequency of use.

Table 3: Statistics of the different uses of *ranhou*

	number of tokens	percentage
1. temporal connective	28	23.33
2. listing use	7	5.83
3. consequential use	4	3.33
4. topic succession use	7	5.83
5. filler	19	15.83
6. additive use	51	42.5
7. resumptive opener	4	3.33
TOTAL	120	100.00

4. Traugott's adverbial cline

In accordance with Traugott's (1995a) adverbial cline, the three adverbial connectives, *yinwei*, *suoyi*, and *ranhou*, all start as sentential adverbials which occupy the second stage in her cline of grammaticalization. When put to discourse use, to quote Traugott's (1995a:6) words, they "allow speakers to display their evaluation not of the content of what is said, but of the way it is put together, in other words, they do metatextual work." Therefore, one can attach a clause expressing afterthought with *yinwei*, ensuring the addressee will not miscomprehend the messages conveyed. Likewise, one can signal a resumption back to previously digressed topics or intention to open a new one, by initiating one's turn with *suoyi* and *ranhou*. Synchronically, the three connectives have trod down the grammaticalization path and appear heading toward the last stage of the adverbial cline—discourse particle—though judging from our statistical analysis, they somehow differ in their degrees of being "grammaticalized." As shown in Table 4 to Table 6, *ranhou*, with as high as 76.67% of its token functioning as a discourse particle, ranks as the most grammaticalized of the three, and *suoyi* comes in second with 54.55% of discoursal use, which leaves *yinwei* as the least grammaticalized, canonical connective use of which still accounts for over half of its tokens.

Table 4: Different uses of *yinwei* corresponding to Traugott's adverbial cline

	sentential adverbial		discourse particle	
	number of token	percentage	number of token	percentage
1. causal connective (initial adverbial clause)	26	31.33%		
2. causal connective (final adverbial clause)	17	20.48%		
3. final adverbial clause following ending intonation			37	44.58%
4. joint production by the other speaker			3	3.61%
TOTAL	43	51.81%	40	48.19%

Table 5: Different uses of *suoyi* corresponding to Traugott's adverbial cline

	sentential adverbial		discourse particle	
	number of token	percentage	number of token	percentage
1. consequential connective	25	45.45%		
2. paraphrasing use			4	7.27%
3. resumptive opener			5	9.09%
4. topic-initiator			21	38.18%
TOTAL	25	45.45%	30	54.55%

Table 6: Different uses of *ranhou* corresponding to Traugott's adverbial cline

	sentential adverbial		discourse particle	
	number of token	percentage	number of token	percentage
1. temporal connective	28	23.33%		
2. listing use			7	5.83%
3. consequential use			4	3.33%
4. topic succession use			7	5.83%
5. filler			19	15.83%
6. additive use			51	42.50%
7. resumptive opener			4	3.33%
TOTAL	28	23.33%	92	76.67%

5. Subjectification and intersubjectification

In the light of many studies devoted to the unidirectionality of grammaticalization and its counterexamples, Traugott (1995b) proposes a modification to the clines and three tendencies of grammaticalization, and presents a strong case for subjectification as a major factor in grammaticalization. To quote her definition (Traugott 1995b:32), "... subjectification is the development of a grammatically identifiable expression of speaker belief or speaker attitude to what is said." Traugott (1999:1) gives a more complete and detailed definition, as shown below:

Subjectification is the semasiological process whereby meanings come over time to encode or externalize the SP/W's[3] perspectives and attitudes as constrained by the communicative world of the speech event, rather than by the so-called "real-world" characteristics of the event or situation referred to.

Furthermore, aware of the fact that linguistic communication crucially involves the speaker's attention to AD/R as a participant in the speech event, Traugott (1999) goes on to propose the development of intersubjectification from subjectification, emphasizing the correlated and parallel relationship between the two. She defines intersubjectification as follows (Traugott 1999:3):

Intersubjectification is the semasiological process whereby meanings come over time to encode or externalize implicatures regarding SP/W's attention to the "self" of AD/R in both an epistemic and a social sense.

In a sense, as the SP/W communicates with some specific AD/R in mind as the intended targets for information conveyance, intersubjectification refers to the process of change in meanings of utterances as more specifically modified toward the AD/R as well as the immediate speech situations.

The results of our data analysis attest to Traugott's claim for the critical roles that subjectification and intersubjectification play in grammaticalization, for several linguistic phenomena emerging from our data are much better accommodated or receive further explanation by the two concepts than by the cline and three tendencies of grammaticalization. For example, subjectification manifests itself in the fact that the uses of the three adverbial connectives become increasingly associated with the speaker's attitude, especially attitude toward discourse flow; thus, by the deployment of the adverbial connectives, the speaker explicitly encodes how he/she intends to manage the discourse structure as well as the relationship between discourse units, be it afterthought, resumption of previous topics, or initiation of new topics. In this case, we see how subjectification exerts a shaping force on the level of the speaker's discourse organization, not lexical encoding.

As to intersubjectification, Traugott & Dasher (2002:23) list three typical characteristics of intersubjective expressions, the second of which states "explicit markers of SP/W attention to AD/R, e.g. hedges, politeness markers, and honorific titles." In order to avoid speech overlap, which is generally considered embarrassing at best and rude at worst, the speaker employs *ranhou* as a conversation device to explicitly signal

---

[3] SP/W and AD/R refer to the usual two ends of speech communication: speaker and writer versus addressee and reader.

to the addressee that he/she intends to hold the conversation floor because of more to say in addition to what has been said. This enables the speaker to effectively manage to save the addressee's face in social interaction, underlining the speaker's attention to the addressee's role as a speech participant, and thus is quintessential of intersubjectification.

6. Blakemore's relevance-based framework

Based on Sperber & Wilson's (1986) Relevance Theory, Blakemore (1988) elaborates on the notion of relevance in discourse processing, arguing that, given the concept that the speaker aims to yield maximum contextual effect for the minimum cost in processing, the English connective *so* represents the minimum token efforts by the speaker to constrain the addressee's contextual processing. In other words, with the connective *so*, the speaker manipulates the addressee's search for relevance, channels the addressee's comprehension toward the intended direction, and thus achieves maximal contextual effects.

Likewise, the use of *suoyi* and *ranhou*, on a discourse level, could be viewed as the speaker's minimum effort to achieve maximal contextual effects as well. As Blakemore (1992:34) argues, an act of (overt) communication brings with it a presumption that there is information worth processing. Therefore, as discourse markers, *suoyi* and *yinwei* do not exist without good reason; because of *suoyi*, the addressee recognizes the speaker's shift toward a new discourse unit, whereas *ranhou* marks continuation of ideas in discourse flow. In other words, they both embody the speaker's minimum effort not only to bring maximal contextual effects, but also, more importantly, to establish relevance.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have first made a brief overview of the literature related to the three MC adverbial connectives, *yinwei*, *suoyi*, and *ranhou*. Based on our statistical results, we have also identified several unconventional uses of the named connectives, which brings to our attention their respective cases of grammaticalization. Thus, for further explanation of their discourse use, we have explicated the concept of subjectification and intersubjectification, and illustrated how their non-canonical uses reflect and supply communicative needs. Consequently, we have presented Blakemore's relevance-based framework, injecting fresh insight into how their statuses as discourse markers serve to promote the establishment of relevance in discourse.

Appendix: transcription notations

1S	first person singular pronoun
2S	second person singular pronoun
3S	third person singular pronoun
ACC	accusative marker (*ba* 把)
AGT	agent marker (*bei* 被)
ASS	associative phrase marker
CL	classifier
COMP	complementizer
COP	copula
CRS	currently relevant state
DUR	durative aspectual marker (*zhe* 著/*zai* 在)
EXP	experiential aspectual marker
GEN	genitive (*de* 的)
NEG	negator (*bu* 不/*bie* 別/*mei* 沒/*meiyou* 沒有)
P	particle (*a* 啊/*la* 啦/*ma* 嘛/*ne* 呢/*ou/ya* 呀/*yei* 耶)
PL	plurality
PN	proper noun
PRF	perfective aspectual marker
Q	question marker (*a* 啊/*ma* 嗎/*ne* 呢)
RVC	resultative verbal complement
SP	speech planning marker (*ei/uh/umh*)
=	continuous speech of the same speaker
[ ]	overlap between two speakers
:	lengthened syllable
..	short pause (less than 0.5 second)
…	long pause (more than 0.5 second)
@@	laughter
<@ @>	speech carrying laughter quality
<L2 L2>	code-switching from Mandarin to English
<L3 L3>	code-switching from Mandarin to Taiwanese

References

Blakemore, Diane. 1988. 'So' as a constraint on relevance. *Mental Representations: The Interface between Language and Reality*, ed. by Ruth Kempson, 183-195. Cambridge and New Yrok: Cambridge University Press.

Blakemore, Diane. 1992. *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, Wallace. 1988. Linking intonation units in spoken English. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, ed. by John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson, 1-27. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chu, Chauncey C. 1998. *A Discourse Grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. New York: Peter Lang.

Chu, Chauncey C., and Zongren Ji. 1999. *A Cognitive-Functional Grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. Taipei: Crane.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ford, Cecilia E. 1993. *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, Cecilia E. 1994. Dialogic aspects of talk and writing: because on the interactive-edited continuum. *Text* 14.4:531-554.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Grice, H. Paul. 1981. Presupposition and conversational implicature. *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. by Peter Cole, 183-198. New York: Academic Press.

Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, Christian. 1985. Grammaticalization: synchronic variation and diachronic change. *Lingua e Stile* 20.3:303-318.

Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lü, Shuxiang. 1999. *Xiandai Hanyu Babai Ci* [*800 Words in Modern Chinese*]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Mithun, Marianne. 1988. The grammaticalization of coordination. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, ed. by John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson, 331-359. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Su, Lily I-wen. 1998. Conversational coherence: the use of *ranhou* 'then' in Chinese spoken discourse. *Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Languages in Taiwan*, ed. by Shuanfan Huang, 167-181. Taipei: Crane.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. *BLS* 14: 406-416. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995a. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Manchester: University of Manchester.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995b. Subjectification in grammaticalization. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 31-54. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1999. From subjectification to intersubjectification. Paper presented at the Workshop on Historical Pragmatics, 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsao, Feng-fu. 1988. Duibi fenxi yu cuowu fenxi—yi zhong yingwen juzi zongti jiegou de yitong weili tan liangzhe de guanxi (xia) [Contrastive analysis and error analysis—discussing their relations through the similarities and differences between the overall sentence structures in Chinese and English (II)]. *English Teaching and Learning* 12.3:37-49.

Wang, Yu-fang. 1998a. How Mandarin Chinese use causal conjunctions in conversation. *Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Languages in Taiwan*, ed. by Shuanfan Huang, 207-242. Taipei: Crane.

Wang, Yu-fang. 1998b. The functions of *ranhou* in Chinese oral discourse. *Proceedings of the 9th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 2, ed. by Hua Lin, 380-397. Los Angeles: GSIL, University of Southern California.

Wang, Yu-fang. 1999. The information sequences of adverbial clauses in Mandarin Chinese conversation. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 27.2:45-89.

Wu, Reuy-jiuan Regina. 2002. Discourse-pragmatic principles for temporal reference in Mandarin Chinese conversation. *Studies in Language* 26.3:513-541.

Chueh-chen Wang
Graduate Institute of Linguistics
National Taiwan University
1, Sec. 4, Roosevelt Road
Taipei 106, Taiwan
r93142001@ntu.edu.tw

Lillian M. Huang
Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University
162, Sec. 1, Heping East Road
Taipei 106, Taiwan
lhuang@ntnu.edu.tw

漢語連接詞的語法化：以語料庫為基礎的研究

王玨珵　　　　　　　　　　黃美金

國立台灣大學　　　　　　　實踐大學

　　本文旨在探討漢語三個連接詞「因為」、「所以」以及「然後」的語法化現象。我們首先根據 Traugott (1995a:1) 所提出的「副詞語法化趨向」，分析三個連接詞語法化之途徑，並以這三個連接詞的多義現象，印證 Traugott 「副詞語法化趨向」之論點。再者，在討論各連接詞在語用上的不同言談標記功能時，我們也引介 Traugott (1995b, 1999) 及 Traugott and Dasher (2002) 所提出的「主觀化」與「互動主觀化」概念、以及 Blakemore (1988, 1992) 所提的「關連性理論架構」，以資佐證。

關鍵詞：連接詞，語法化，主觀化，互動主觀化