Ritualization in Evolving Pragmatic Functions:
A Case Study of *DUI*[*]

Kawai Chui

National Chengchi University

Ritualization brings about linguistic changes through routine repetition of utterances in daily use. The purpose of this study is to investigate the process of ritualization in developing the discourse particle *dui* from the verb in spoken Chinese.

Dui originates from a verb conveying the speaker's belief that what has been uttered is true. The speaker can also negotiate truth with the addressee in the form of a question tag, *dui-bu-dui* 'true-not-true'; the addressee's habituated response is *dui*. Such adjacency pair of question-answer constitutes a conversational routine for ritualization, in that the addressee commits to the truth of the other's speech spontaneously, even though the other speaker does not ask for it. The particle *dui* further evolves a pragmatic function of agreement, as a result of conventionalizing the conversational implicature that commitment to the truth infers agreement with the content.

Another line of development concerns the speaker's own utterance. Though *dui* is not the main verb, it still maintains an assertive meaning for the speaker to claim explicitly that what has been talked about is true, or to confirm that what follows is the right information to utter, as a result of ritualizing a conversational routine: after the speaker has uttered a proposition, the addressee may ask for truth confirmation by *zhende-ma* 'true-QST marker; Really?' or *shi-ma* 'copula-QST marker; Is that so?'; the speaker's response toward his or her own prior utterance is the habituated *dui*. As these repeated utterances are ritualized, the speaker strengthens truth spontaneously without the addressee's request.

Key words: ritualization, language change, pragmatic functions

1. Introduction

As a free lexical verb, *dui* bears the assertive meaning that what has been uttered is right or true. In conversational excerpt (1), speaker W talks about some software. The

---

predicate *dui* suggests her belief that the product does cost one hundred and ninety-nine dollars.

(1)   W: ...ta   gen=,_
        3.SG   with
       ...na   yi   ge   xuexiao   de   jiaoshou   hezuo   de.\
       which one CL school ASSC   professor   cooperate   PRT

→   ...(1.9)fanzheng jiushi **yi bai**   **jiushijiu** [**kuai** jiu   **dui** la].\
          anyway   that is one hundred ninety-nine dollar EMP right PRT

        W: '(We) cooperated with a professor at which school (to write) it? Anyway, (it) costs one hundred and ninety-nine dollars.'

At the beginning of a turn, *dui* can be used to commit to the literal truth of the information uttered by another speaker. In (2) by using *dui*, H agrees to L's opinion about the relationship between writing and computer documentation, since he also believes that people who write in an ugly way cannot print out lovely documents.

(2)   L: ...(2.1)keshi wo   juede xiezi   chou de   ren   o=,_
             but   1.SG feel writing ugly ASSC people PRT
       ...yin   chulai <L2 document L2> ye   bu   hui hen piaoliang.\
       print   out   document   also NEG will very be.pretty

→ H: ...(1.6)<P **dui**   a= P>.\
           right PRT

        L: 'But I think for people whose writing is ugly, (their) printed documents are also not pretty.'
        H: 'Right.'

Instead of the other participant's utterance, *dui* also indicates the truth of the speaker's own, as illustrated in (3). The occurrence of *dui* enables speaker A to confirm to the addressee that her cousins' being twins is true.

(3)   A: ..wo   de   biaoge,_
         1.SG ASSC   male cousin
       ..shi [shuangbaotai,_
       COP twins
       ...wo   de   biaojie   yeshi shuangbaotai.\
       1.SG ASSC female cousin also   twins

→   ...(1.)**dui**   a],_
          right PRT

        A: 'My male cousins are twins. My female cousins are also twins. Right.'

Different from the predicate function in (1), *dui* in (2) and (3) is a discourse particle rather than the main verb. Its meaning is not solely assertive; it has developed additional pragmatic functions. *Dui* thus undergoes semantic and morphosyntactic change, and various interactional functions are evolved in the process. Despite the fact that the particle form has many other functions, this paper just focuses on the two illustrated in (2) and (3), because they both result from ritualization through routine repetition of utterances in daily use (Haiman 1994). The issues to be discussed include: What are the conversational routines that give rise to ritualization of *dui*? How does the process take place in the speaker-addressee negotiation of meaning? What pragmatic functions are evolved?

Section 2 will analyze the process of ritualization in the development of *dui*. The results will be discussed in section 3, followed by concluding remarks in the last section.

2. Ritualization of *dui*

Ritualization of *dui* is comprised of two lines of development, giving rise to various pragmatic functions in the speaker-addressee interaction. As 'ritual language is born from repetition of ordinary language' (Haiman 1994:23), this section examines the evolving of pragmatic functions from conversational routines in spoken Chinese.

2.1 Assertiveness

Dui starts out as a full-fledged verb.[1] Syntactically, it functions as the main predicate of the clause; semantically, it conveys the assertive meaning that 'has to do with the speaker's assessment of the truth of the proposition' (Traugott 1989:44). Its occurrence indicates that the speaker believes the information in question is correct or true, as clearly shown in example (1). In excerpt (4) below, the topic of conversation concerns lobsters. Speaker W negates the predicate *dui*, suggesting that the season to eat lobsters is not right.

---

[1] The verbal *dui* can form compound verbs, such as *ying-dui* 'to answer' and *dui-fu* 'to deal with'. This is a separate line of development of *dui* that does not take part in the process of ritualization.

(4)   Z: ...buguo ta   shuo?/
               but   3.SG say
               ...(.7)a=,_
                     PRT
               ...hai bu   ^suan   haochi   de   na=?/
                 still NEG count   delicious ASSC   that
               ...[na   ge   qingxing],_
                   that   CL   situation
        W: [jiushi   women,_
                that is 1.PL
→   ..jijie] **bu**   **dui**.\
            season NEG   right

        Z: 'But she said (the lobsters) were still not counted as delicious.'
        W: 'That is, it was not the right season for us (to eat lobsters).'

2.2 Assertiveness and assent

Besides asserting whether the message is true or not, the speaker can use *dui* to form a question tag, *dui-bu-dui* 'right-not-right', negotiating with the addressee the literal truth of the conveyed information.[2] In (5), speaker C mentions that the boy that speaker B talks about is the one B met at primary school. The question tag enables C to negotiate such truth with the addressee. B then provides a positive reply, again, by virtue of *dui*.[3] The next nominal phrase *guoxiao na ge nande* 'the boy at primary school' further re-assures the boy's identity.

(5)   C: ..o,/
               PRT
               ..<A ni   na   shi A> guoxiao,_
                    2.SG that COP   primary school
→   ..**dui** **bu**   **dui**?/
            right   NEG right
→   B: ...^**dui**.\
               right
→   ...<DIM **guoxiao**   **na**   **ge**   **nande** DIM>,_
                     primary school that CL male

        C: 'You are talking about the one (you met) at primary school, right?'
        B: 'Right. The boy (I met) at primary school.'

---

[2] Chen and He (2001) have discussed the non-literal pragmatic functions of *dui-bu-dui*. This question tag can also be attached to clausal fragments to function as a pause filler. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these various functions.

[3] The non-lexical replies performing the same function can be *m*, *uh huh*, or *he-a*.

On the other hand, if the information is not true, *dui* can be negated directly in the addressee's reply. However, *bu dui* 'not-right' is face-threatening. The preferential response is to correct the information without using the negative form, just like what C does in (6). She only mentions the color of the tortoises (i.e., a little bit orange), which is different from the one proposed by A (i.e., completely green), without overtly denying A's inaccurate information.

(6)   A: ...(1.2)nimen na   zhong%,_
               2.PL   that   kind

→   ...shi **quan** **lu**   de   **dui**   **bu**   **dui**?\
             COP all   green PRT   right NEG   right

→ C: ...(.9)**you**   **yidiandian**.\
           have   a little bit

        ...nage,_
         PF

→   ...(.6)**juse**   **de**.\
          orange   PRT

    A: 'The kind (of tortoises) you (have) are all green, right?'
    C: '(They) are a little bit…orange.'

In fact, negotiating the literal truth of information between the speaker and the addressee in form of the question tag *dui-bu-dui* is the usual linguistic behavior in Chinese conversation. In direct reply, the negation of *dui* is face-threatening; thus, the positive form expressing the personal commitment to the truth of the information becomes most frequently occurring. It is this positive *dui* that takes part in ritualization.

The adjacency pair of question and answer constitutes a conversational routine for negotiation. While the tag and the simple positive response are constantly repeated in daily use, ritualization takes place on the grounds that the addressee habitually expects the tag and then replies with *dui*. As a result of ritualization, the addressee commits to the truth of the other's speech spontaneously, even though s/he is not asked for it. In the following excerpt (7), C merely makes a statement about a person's perfect image in the mind of the addressee B, and does not negotiate its truth by the tag. Nevertheless, it is still habitual for B to employ *dui* to assert that C's information is correct.

(7) C: ...ta   zai   ni   de%.. nao   zhong,_
          3.SG at   2.SG ASSC brain in
          ..xingxiang yizhi   shi   ^feichang wanmei   de,_
          image   always   COP   very   be.perfect PRT
→   B: ..**dui**,\
          right

     C: 'In your mind, his image is always very perfect.'
     B: 'Right.'

The morphosyntactic status of the ritualized *dui* in (5) and (7) is no longer a verb, but a particle at the beginning of a turn. According to the classification in Clancy et al. (1996), *dui* is a type of reactive token 'produced by an interlocutor who is playing a listener's role during the other interlocutor's speakership, and do not in themselves claim the floor' (1996:356). Being a short non-floor-taking lexical word, *dui* is thus categorized as a 'reactive expression'. But, in fact, it can also function as a 'resumptive opener'—another category in their classification, since *dui* can be followed by a full turn. In short, whether *dui* is a reactive expression or a resumptive opener by no means indicates its semantic relationship with the utterance(s) in the prior turn.

Wang (1998) regards *dui*, among others, as an 'agreement marker', just like the sign of assent *right* in English (Haiman 1994). This is borne out in (2) and (7). However, the particle form does not necessarily function to agree; what B does in (5) is just to confirm that the identity of the person in question is true. In other words, the original assertive meaning is retained along with the assent function.

The evolving of this pragmatic function results from conventionalizing a conversational implicature (Traugott and König 1991): since committing to literal truth implicates agreement with the content, *dui* usually, but not always, suggests assent. The semantic development of *dui* thus increases the speaker's informativeness concerning his or her attitude towards the conveyed information.

2.3 Assertiveness, truth strengthening, and self-confirmation

The functions of committing truth and assent mentioned in the previous section are subject to the other participant's utterance. *Dui* involves another line of development concerning the speaker's own utterance, rather than the other's. The place where the word appears also differs; instead of turn beginning, it typically occurs at the end of the turn. In (8), C is doubtful about a mutual friend going to Oxford. B tries to explain, but then he remembers that the friend has not told him about that. The occurrence of *dui* at the end of the turn assures the addressee C that what B has just uttered is true.

(8)   B: [ta]   qu   niujin./
            3.SG go   Oxford
            ...(.8)he.\
                 PRT
        C: ...ziji   qu   ma?/
             self   go   QST
            ..bushi,\
             NEG
            ..<A suisuibianbian A> jiu   keyi jinqu de   ye.\
                  be.easy   EMP can   go to   PRT PRT
        B: ...(.6)ta%,\
                  3.SG
            ...(.9)ta   shi,\
                  3.SG COP
            ...zenme jiang,_
             how   say
            ...ta   ye   mei   gen   wo   jiang shuo=,/
             3.SG also NEG with 1.SG say   COMPL
            ...ta   shi <DIM ruhe neng jinqu de DIM>,\
             3.SG COP   how   can   go in PRT
→   ...**dui**%,\
             right

        B: 'He went to Oxford.'
        C: 'Did (he) go by himself? It's by no means easy to go (to Oxford).'
        B: 'He…he…how to say (this)? He also didn't tell me how he could go (to Oxford). Right.'

    Despite the fact that the assertive meaning still holds, *dui* in (8) does not perform the predicate function, as it does in (1) and (4); it is a particle at the end of the turn. This line of development also results from ritualizing a conversational routine in form of question-answer, but the negotiation initiator is the addressee. In (9), C informs A that a friend merely gave her a small amount of strawberry toothpaste while the friend had bought a whole box of strawberry toothpaste. The addressee A asks for truth confirmation by uttering *zhende* 'true; Really?'. C's response toward her own prior utterance is, of course, the positive *dui*.

(9)   C: ..[ta]   gei   wo% --
            3.SG give   1.SG
            ..zheme   yi% --
             so   one
            ..^zheme xiao   de   caomei   yagao,_
             so   small ASSC strawberry toothpaste

```
           ..ta     mai  le <MRC  yi  xiang MRC> ye,\
           3.SG buy  PRF        one  box          PRT
→   A:  ..zhende?/
           really
→   C:  ...dui.\
            right
```

C: 'He gave me such a…such a small amount of strawberry toothpaste. He had
    bought a box (of strawberry toothpaste).'
A: 'Really?'
C: 'Right.'

In excerpt (10), speaker A first mentions that her father's hair is very greasy. C
questions its truth with *zhende ma*; A's habituated reply with *dui* is further
accompanied by partial repetition of the negotiated information—her father's greasy
hair, re-assuring that what she has said in the first turn was true.

```
(10)→  A:  ..yinwei  wo  ba,\
             because  1.SG father
  →          ..<L4 masi L4>,\
                  also
  →          ..^feichang  youxing,\
              very       be.greasy
             ..ta% --
              3.SG
             ..<F ^zongshi F>,_
                 even though
             ..ta     jin% --
              3.SG  REPAIR
             ..jintian cai  ganggang  xi    le,_
              today   EMP  just       wash  PRF
             ..guobujiu,\
              a while later
             .. aiya,_
               PRT
             ..you  juede,_
              again  feel
             ..kanqilai  youyou  de.\
              look       greasy   PRT
  →   C:  ...<P zhende  ma P>?/
               really    PRT
  →   A:  ..dui   a,\
             right  PRT
```

652

→   ..**wo**   **ba**   **doushi**   **ji**   **you**   **de**,_
       1.SG   father   also   extremely   be.greasy   PRT

    A: 'Because my father('s hair) is also very greasy. He…even though he has just washed (his hair), a while later, (it) looks greasy again.'
    C: 'Really?'
    A: 'Right. My father('s hair) is extremely greasy.'

Besides *zhende(-ma)*, the negotiation initiator can also use *shi-ma* 'copula-QST marker; Is that so?' to fulfill the same function, as B does in (11). Speaker A's response with *dui* confirms what she has said in her own prior turn, i.e., that some fish eggs are really delicious.

(11)   A: …(1.9)<A youde A> yu% --
                    some   fish
         …yuluan,\
          fish egg
        ..hen   haochi._
         very   be.delicious
→ B: ..**shi**   **ma**?/
         COP   QST
→ A: ..**dui**   a._
         right   PRT

    A: 'Some fish…fish eggs are very delicious.'
    B: 'Is that so?'
    A: 'Right.'

Just like the question tag and the simple positive commitment of *dui* mentioned in section 2.2, it is also usual linguistic behavior for the addressee to ask for truth confirmation when what the speaker has talked about is not in the addressee's state of belief or knowledge, and the speaker's response toward his or her original utterance is always the habituated positive *dui*. As these repeated utterances are ritualized, the speaker confirms truth spontaneously without the addressee's request. Take (12) for instance. The subject of conversation is TV programs. By using *dui*, B asserts that French TV programs are what he intends to talk about.

(12)   B: ..xiang xian% --
         like   REPAIR
        ..xiang xianzai nage=,_
         like   now   that
        …youxiandianshi a,_
         cable TV   PRT

```
      A:  ..<P m= P>,_
                PRT
      B:  ...dui    a,_
             right  PRT
          ...chule    yingwen,_
             besides  English
  →       ...hai    you   ^fawen._
             also   have  French
  →       ...(.9)^dui%,\
                  right
  →       ...fawen,/
             French
```

B: 'Like…like the cable TV now,'
A: 'Mm.'
B: 'Right, besides the English (programs), (it) also has French (programs). Right, French (programs).'

Dui in the previous examples appears at the end or near the end of the turn. In the following example (13), it rather takes place in the middle, confirming the truth of the information just conveyed, i.e., that it is impossible for a certain kind of boy to like the speaker.

```
(13) →  C:  ..<A  wo    juede   ^shuo% A>,_
                   1.SG  feel    COMPL
     →      ...na    zhong  nansheng,\
                that   kind   boy
     →      ..bu   keneng       hui   xihuan  wo    zhe yi  xing=,_
              NEG  be.possible  will  like    1.SG  this one style
            ..<A  ni      zhidao A>?/
                  2.SG    know
     →      ...dui,\
               right
            ...ranhou,\
               then
            ...(.8)gang  kaishi      dou   juede   ta%,/
                   just  beginning   all   feel    3.SG
            ..hui%,\
              will
            ..zhuyi  wo,_
              notice  1.SG
```

C: 'I thought it's impossible for that kind of boy to like my kind (of girl), you know. Right. Then, at the very beginning, (I) always thought he would notice me.'

The information prior to the occurrence of *dui* need not be a complete thought. The information being confirmed in the turn below (14) merely includes the preposed object *yingwenzuoye* 'English homework'. The function of *dui* is to assure that 'English homework' is the right kind of information that C wants to mention.

(14)   C: ...mei   ge   libai,\
        every CL week
        ...(.7)zhouji,\
          weekly diary
        ..wo   yao   shou=,_
        1.SG have to   collect
        ...(.9)ranhou%,_
           then
→   ...**yingwenzuoye**,\
        English homework
→   ...<P **dui** P>,\
          right
        ..yeshi wo   yao   shou,_
        also   1.SG have to collect

        C: 'Every week, the weekly diaries, I had to collect (them). Then, the English homework, right, I also had to collect (it).'

Instead of committing to the truth of what has been said, *dui* has evolved another pragmatic function concerning the information to be conveyed. In (15) *dui* occurs immediately after the conjunctive constituent *daole* 'when it comes to'. For the speaker to confirm the truth of a conjunction is implausible. *Dui* rather functions to self-confirm that the following clauses about her classmates being upset before class segregation are the right information to utter.

(15)   C: ...(.7)guosan   shihou,\
          the third year at junior high school   time
        ..<A hen   haoxiao A>,\
           very   be.funny
→   ...**daole**%,_
         when it comes to
→   ...^**dui**%,\
          right
        ..kuaiyao fenban   zhiqian% A>,\
        soon   segregate before
        ..women dou hen   nanguo.\
        1.PL   all   very be.upset

C: 'During the third year in junior high school, it's funny, when it came to (the time), right, (we) would be segregated soon, we were all very upset.'

In (16) C talks about the trademarks of two kinds of Sassoon shampoo, and she is about to express a negative opinion by uttering *bushi shuo* 'it is not that'. But she abandons the topic and starts questioning about the kind of shampoo speaker B uses for her greasy hair. The occurrence of *dui* after the negative constituents *bushi shuo*, again, confirms on the part of the speaker that what follows is the right topic to discuss.

```
(16)    C:  ..ta      yeshi   gen%,_
            3.SG      also    with
            ..hongse saxuan   yiyang   de  <L2  ^mark L2>.\
            red      Sassoon  same     ASSC  trademark
        B:  ...(.7)m=,/
                PRT
        C:  ..ye   hai   hao       la,\
            also  still  be.okay   PRT
            ...<P  zheyang P>,\
                like this
    →       ..bushi   shuo%,/
            NEG       COMPL
    →       ...(.8)dui    a,\
                 right    PRT
            ..zheyang,\
            like this
    →       ..^a       ni    dou   yong  shenme%?/
              PRT     2.SG   all   use   what
    →       ...ni    toufa   doushi  pian=,/
            2.SG     hair    also    tend
    →       ...you._
            be.greasy
```

C: 'It also has the same trademark with the red Sassoon.'
B: 'Mm.'
C: '(It) is okay. It's not that ... right …What kind (of shampoo) do you use? Your hair also tends to be greasy.'

Dui in the examples of this section is not the main verb, but a particle. Its occurrences in (8), (12), (13), and (14) confirm truth toward the speaker's own uttered information. Why does the speaker express truth explicitly while s/he is supposed to convey true information in communication, as Grice's maxim of Quality (Grice 1975) suggests? *Dui* has evolved the function of pragmatic strengthening which 'largely

concern[s] strategic negotiation of speaker-addressee interaction and, in that connection, articulation of attitude' (Traugott 1989:51). What *dui* strengthens is the speaker's subjective belief-state about the truth of what has been asserted.

On the other hand, the function of *dui* in (15) and (16) is different. First, it is subject to what is going to be talked about. Second, the particle *dui* is used by the speaker to self-confirm that what follows is the right information to say, when s/he is engaged in some kind of verbalizing difficulty, as clearly evidenced by self-initiated repairs like the abandonment of a topic in (16). The problem in (15) can be cognitive or linguistic, in that the speaker, for whatever reason, does not remember the information to be uttered, or s/he lacks the right words to express the idea.

3. Discussion

Ritualization of *dui* reflects the linguistic behaviors of Chinese speakers in verbal communication, in that it is habitual to negotiate truth between the speaker and the addressee in question-answer form. Since the negotiator can either be the speaker or the addressee, *dui* is comprised of two lines of development.

First, when the speaker initiates a negotiation, the question tag *dui-bu-dui* is employed to ask the addressee whether the information just conveyed is correct or not. The direct reply is often the positive *dui*; the face-threatening negative reply *bu dui* tends to be avoided. The question tag and the positive reply together constitute a conversational routine. On the other hand, for the information that is not in the addressee's belief state, the addressee might question its truth by *zhende(-ma)* or *shi-ma*. The reply concerning one's own prior utterance is always *dui*. This adjacency pair becomes another conversational routine in negotiating truth.

As habituated behaviors constitute linguistic routines with recurrent verbal representation, ritualization takes place: *dui* represents the addressee's truth commitment, strengthens truth toward the speaker's own utterances, or self-confirms that the speaker's following utterances are the right information to convey, even without being asked for it. It is 'decline in the tendency to respond to stimuli that have become familiar due to repeated or persistent exposure' (Haiman 1994:7). Moreover, frequency of use is crucial in linguistic change. The positive form is ritualized because, just like the degree adverb *hen* 'very' taking part in morphologization (Chui 2000), *dui* is the frequently occurring constituent. In Tseng's (2001) study of Chinese discourse particles, she finds that *dui* is one of the most frequently used words in spoken dialogues. It is also one of the ten most frequently used words at the turn-initial position.

As a result of ritualization, the morphosyntactic status of *dui* changes into a particle. For a verb to become a particle is typical of grammaticalization. However, at the present stage of development, instead of semantic weakening or bleaching, the grammaticalized particle form still retains the originally assertive sense that is subject to the literal truth-conditional meaning: to confirm the truth of the other participant's utterance at the turn beginning, or to suggest that one's own utterance is the right information to convey. Along with the assertive meaning are various pragmatic functions evolved in ritualization.

The pragmatic functions of *dui*—'assent' and 'strengthening truth'—evidence conventionalization of conversational implicatures. 'One of the mechanisms for semantic change in grammaticization is the conventionalization of implicature, by which a frequently occurring inference that an addressee is licensed to make beyond the explicit meaning of an utterance becomes part of the explicit meaning' (Bybee 1994:240). In the case of *dui*, the implicatures arise in the context of negotiating truth. First, for the addressee to claim that the other participant's utterance is true usually implicates the subjective attitude of agreement. On the other hand, while the speaker is supposed to abide by Grice's maxim of Quality, the explicit commitment to truth implicates the strengthening effect in conveying the information. These changes bear out Traugott's (1989, 1991) Tendency III: 'Meanings tend to become increasingly based in the speaker's subjective belief state/attitude toward the proposition' (Traugott and König 1991:209).

The development of *dui* clearly reflects changes in spoken language. Ritualization arising from repetition of ordinary language gives rises to pragmatic functions from different manifestations of conversational routines in respect of question-answer, negotiation of truth between the speaker and the addressee, and conventionalization of conversational implicatures.

4. Conclusion

The present study has shown that grammaticalization is motivated by speaker-addressee interaction (Hopper and Traugott 1993), and changes result from ritualizing the repetition of ordinary language (Haiman 1994). In other words, the linguistic development reflects the usual linguistic behavior of the speech community. As semantic shift is largely motivated by language use, the discourse data in real interaction is pertinent to understanding the pragmatic motivation for linguistic change.

Finally, while the ritualized *dui* can be subject to the other participant's utterance or to the speaker's own utterance, whether the two lines of development are separate, or whether one is developed from the other is worth considering for future study.

Appendix A: Abbreviations in the interlinear glosses

1.PL	first person plural
1.SG	first person singular
2.PL	second person plural
2.SG	second person singular
3.PL	third person plural
3.SG	third person singular
ASSC	associative morpheme
BA	the morpheme BA
BC	backchannel
BEI	the morpheme BEI
CL	classifier
COMPARE	compare morpheme
COMPL	complementizer
COP	copula verb
DUR	durative aspect
EMP	emphatic adverbial
EXP	experiential aspect
GEI	the morpheme GEI
INCHO	inchoactive aspect
NEG	negative morpheme
PF	pause filler
PRF	perfective aspect
PROG	progressive aspect
PRT	discourse particle
QST	question particle
REPAIR	repair phoneme(s)
SELF	reflexive morpheme
SUO	the morpheme SUO
SUPL	superlative degree

Appendix B: Transcription conventions

The transcription system was proposed by Du Bois et al. (1992).

Units

{carriage return}	intonation unit
--	truncated intonation unit
{space}	word
-	truncated word

Speakers

:	speaker identity/turn start
[]	speech overlap

Transitional continuity

.	final
,	continuing
?	appeal

Terminal pitch direction

\	fall
/	rise
_	level

Accent and lengthening

^	primary accent
=	lengthening

Pause

...(N)	long
...	medium
..	short
(0)	latching

Vocal noises

(H)	inhalation
%	glottal stop
@	laughter

Quality

<@ @>	laugh quality
<Q Q>	quotation quality
<F F>	fast tempo
<PP PP>	very soft
<MRC MRC>	each word distinct and emphasized

Specialized notations

<L2 L2>	code switching from Mandarin to English
<L3 L3>	code switching from Mandarin to Japanese
<L4 L4>	code switching from Mandarin to Taiwanese
(( ))	transcriber's comment

Relevant expressions in examples are in boldface; the lines where the expressions in question appear are marked by the arrow sign '→'.

References

Bybee, Joan L. 1994. The grammaticization of zero. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. by W. Pagliuca, 236-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chen, Yiya, and Agnes Weiyun He. 2001. *Dui bu dui* as a pragmatic marker: Evidence from Chinese classroom discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33:1441-1465.

Chui, Kawai. 2000. Morphologization of the degree adverb *HEN*. *Language and Linguistics* 1.1:45-59.

Clancy, Patricia M., Sandra A. Thompson, Ryoko Suzuki, and Hongyin Tao. 1996. The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26:355-387.

Du Bois, John W. 1986. Self-evidence and ritual speech. *Evidentials: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ed. by W. Chafe and J. Nichols, 313-333. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino, and Susanna Cumming 1992. *Discourse Transcription*. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, vol. 4. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara.

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

Haiman, John. 1994. Ritualization and the development of language. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. by W. Pagliuca, 3-28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hennemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Pagliuca, William (ed.). 1994. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65.1:31-55.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Ekkehard König. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine, 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Bernd Heine (eds.). 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tseng, Shu-chuan. 2001. Highlighting utterances in Chinese spoken discourse. Paper presented at the 15th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation. Hong Kong.

Wang, Yu Fang. 1998. The linguistic structures of agreement and disagreement in

Mandarin conversation. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the 7th International Conference on Chinese and the 10th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics. Stanford: Stanford University.

Department of English
National Chengchi University
64, Sec. 2, Chih-nan Road
Taipei 116, Taiwan
kawai@nccu.edu.tw

從「對」字之慣用看語用功能之發展

徐嘉慧

國立政治大學

　　本研究探討「對」如何在慣例化過程從動詞發展出不同的語用功能。「對」原來是動詞，說話者可用它來造附加問句「對不對」，詢問聽話者關於內容的正確性，而聽話者通常回答「對」。「對不對 → 對」的一問一答因為常出現，就形成對話慣例。慣例化的結果是即使說話者沒有問「對不對」，聽話者也慣性說「對」，以認同別人的內容。有時候「對」還表達「同意」的意義。「對」的另一個語用功能是，說話者用來確認自己話語的正確性：當聽話者聽到不確定的訊息，會以「真的嗎/是嗎」反問，而原說話者對自己剛講過的話當然回答「對」。「真的嗎/是嗎 → 對」的一問一答也形成對話慣例。慣例化的結果是聽話者就算沒有質疑，原說話者仍自動說「對」，以加強或肯定內容的正確性。

關鍵詞：慣例化，語言改變，語用功能