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This article presents a principled and systematic analysis of pragmatic markers in Chinese. Markers of this sort (and a range of interconnected categories including discourse particles and the like) in other languages have been the subject of intensive investigation in recent years. However, a systematic description of similar expressions in Chinese has hitherto not undertaken. In this article, I will define, delimit, categorize and characterize this class of expressions. Inspired by Locke (1959[1690]) view on particles and Frege’s (1952[1892]) insight into the meaning of language, I define a pragmatic marker as syntactically dispensable, truth-conditionally irrelevant, but indicative of the speaker’s thought with respect to the propositional content. It displays some general properties, which help exclude some discourse markers from the domain of pragmatic markers. I conclude by presenting a typology of Chinese pragmatic markers.

Pragmatic markers (and a range of interconnected categories including discourse particles and the like) in English and some other languages have been the subject of intensive investigation in recent pragmatic research. However, markers of this sort in Chinese (especially those which have been termed as non-conceptual pragmatic markers in this paper) have been largely ignored. The objective of this paper is therefore to present a detailed and systematic description of pragmatic markers in Chinese. We define, delimit, categorize and characterize this class of expressions. We also offer some ways to identify their properties, to justify why some lexical expressions which have been included in the domain are actually not pragmatic markers, to validly distinguish conceptual pragmatic markers from non-conceptual ones, and to identify the semantic, formal, and structural properties of each subtype of conceptual and non-conceptual pragmatic markers.
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1. Introduction: terminology

In English and perhaps all other languages, there is a class of expressions which has been generally characterized as semantically non-truth-conditional and syntactically peripheral. Prototypical members are connectives like so in English and donc ‘so’ in French. In many studies (e.g., Fraser, 1996; Rouchota, 1998), parenthetical expressions like fortunately in English and heureusement ‘fortunately’ in French are also included. A
multiple array of terms have been used for this class of expressions. This terminological diversity has continued up to the present moment. However, recently it seems to be narrowing down to ‘pragmatic markers’ or ‘discourse markers’.

‘Pragmatic markers’ and ‘discourse markers’ (and a variety of others) have been competing for roughly the same class of expressions. It is Fraser (1996) who assigns each of them a different range of reference. On his account, the former is an umbrella term encompassing all linguistically encoded clues which do not contribute to the propositional content of the sentence but signal the speaker’s potential communicative intentions. Under this umbrella are four subtypes: (i) basic markers (e.g., sentence mood and performative expressions) which signal more or less specifically the force of the basic message of the sentence, (ii) commentary markers (e.g., *frankly*, *reportedly*) which comment on some aspect of the basic message, (iii) parallel markers (e.g., titles, vocatives) which signal an entire message in addition to the basic message of the sentence, and (iv) discourse markers (e.g., *however*, *therefore*) which mark the relationship between the message they introduce and the foregoing message. This account enjoys the advantage of assigning different ranges of reference to ‘pragmatic markers’ and ‘discourse markers’, though the term ‘pragmatic markers’ is too inclusive.

Following Fraser (1996, 1999, 2006), I take discourse markers as a subset of pragmatic markers with connectivity being the characteristic that distinguishes the former from the other. To put it another way, while a discourse marker is connective in nature, a pragmatic marker does not necessarily connect discourse segments. This agrees with the general understanding that a discourse is a unit of text (both spoken and written) consisting of more than one sentence or connected speech/writing above sentence level, and a discourse marker is a cohesive device functioning to create local or global coherence (see Schiffrin, 1987, Risselada and Spooren, 1998). I opt for the term ‘pragmatic markers’ for the expressions under consideration not merely because many of them occur with single utterances but primarily because they do not affect the truth conditions of the sentence that hosts them. In other words, their contribution is what pragmatics as a discipline is supposed to deal with. However, ‘pragmatic markers’ in this article has a narrower scope than in Fraser (1996), as we will see shortly.

2 Other terms include ‘discourse operators’ (e.g., Redeker, 1990, 1991), ‘parenthetical phrases’ (e.g., Crystal, 1988), ‘phatic connectives’ (e.g., Bazanella, 1990), ‘pragmatic connectives’ (e.g., van Dijk, 1979; Stubbs, 1983; Lamiero, 1994), ‘pragmatic expressions’ (e.g., Erman, 1987), ‘pragmatic particles’ (e.g., Östman, 1982, 1995), and ‘pragmatic function words’ (e.g., Risselada and Spooren, 1998).

3 Fraser (1996) assumes that sentence meaning can be divided up into two separate and distinct parts: (i) the propositional content, which is the basic message of the sentence, (ii) the non-propositional content conveyed by pragmatic markers, linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker’s potential communicative intentions.

4 Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 1-3) give ten definitions to discourse, which fall into three main categories: (i) anything beyond the sentence, (ii) language use, and (iii) a broader range of social practice that includes non-linguistic and non-specific instances of language (also see Schiffrin et al, 2001: 1-10).
2. Defining pragmatic markers

A pragmatic marker is a lexical expression which enjoys the following general properties.

(1) General properties of pragmatic markers
   (i) They show the speaker’s comment on the propositional content of the matrix but do not affect its truth conditions.
   (ii) They operate on the proposition(s) of the matrix clause rather than its constituents.
   (iii) They are syntactically dispensable from the matrix clause.
   (iv) They are parasitic on the propositional content of the matrix clause.

2.1. Non-truth-conditionality

A pragmatic marker conveys the speaker’s personal comment on the proposition or his personal perception of the link between the propositions. But it is external to the proposition(s) in the sense that it does not affect the truth-conditions of the propositional content. Non-truth-conditionality is crucial (but not sufficient) for determining whether or not a lexical expression is a pragmatic marker.\(^5\) Consider, for instance, *lingrenjingya* ‘amazingly’ in the utterances of (2).

(2) a. *Lingrenjingya deshi, na ge haizi shi sui shang le daxue.*
    amazingly, that CL child ten year enter PFV university
    ‘Amazingly, the child entered university at the age of ten.’

   b. *Lingrenjingya de shi na ge shi sui de haizi.*
    amazing NOM be that CL ten year MM child
    ‘What was amazing is that ten-year-old boy.’

   c. *Na haizi shi sui shang daxue zhen lingrenjingya.*
    that child ten year enter university really amazing
    ‘It was amazing that the child entered university at the age of ten.’

All the utterances in (2) contain the same lexical item *lingrenjingya* ‘amazing’. However, while non-truth-conditional in (2a), it is truth-conditional in (2b) and (2c). In (2a), the lexical expression, combined with *deshi*, does not affect the truth/falsity of the utterance. In other words, the truth/falsity of (2a) depends on whether or not there is a child in the world and the child entered university at the age of ten rather than whether or not the speaker is amazed. In (2b), the same expression, nominalized by *de*, does affect the truth/falsity of the utterance. (2b) will be false if what is amazing is not the ten-year-old boy but somebody or something else. In (2c), the same lexical item, does count in

\(^5\) Disputes still remain as to the non-truth-conditionality of evidentials such as *reportedly* and *obviously*. For discussion, see Ifantitou (2001) and Carston (2002). See also Higginbotham (1989) for a different point of view.
determining the truth/falsity of the utterance. (2c) is true provided that there is such a child in the world and his entry into university at the age of ten did amaze people (probably the speaker as well). Therefore, only in (2a) does the same lexical item acquire the status as a pragmatic marker. The distinction between (3a) and (3b) can be made in a parallel manner.

(3)  

a. Ta₁ hen pijuan, zheyang ta₁ jiu zao zou le.  
3PS very tired, so 3PS EMP early go PFV  
‘She was very tired. So she left early.’

b. Wo xiang yeshi zheyang.  
1PS think also so  
‘I think so too.’

Zheyang ‘so’ in (3a) is non-truth-conditional, whereas it is truth-conditional in (3b). To put it more precisely, the truth/falsity of (3a) depends solely on whether or not the two propositions (She was very tired and she left early) are true rather than whether or not the consequential relation between them holds. The same lexical form zheyang in (3b) will affect the truth conditions of the utterance, once its reference is fixed. Therefore, zheyang is a pragmatic marker in (3a), but a mere demonstrative pronoun in (3b).

2.2. Propositional scope

A pragmatic marker operates on the propositional content of the sentence in which it occurs. In other words, wherever a pragmatic marker occurs, it takes scope over a proposition, rather than a sentence constituent. Some pragmatic markers indicate the speaker’s commitment or attitude to the propositional content, others foreground the speaker’s personal conception of the connection between the propositions (stated, implied or observed).

(4)  
Wokan, zhe chang bisai hen jingcai.  
I think this CL game very wonderful  
‘I think this game is very wonderful.’

(5)  
Yihandeshi, Wang Hong huijia le.  
unfortunately Wang Hong go home PFV  
‘Unfortunately, Wang Hong went home.’

(6)  
Jiaoshuo bashier, keshi qizi ershiba.  
professor eighty-two but wife twenty-eight

There is a diagnostic which has been used to test whether a certain linguistic element is truth-conditional. This diagnostic is often referred to as the conditional test or scope diagnostic. According to this test, the contribution of an element is truth-conditional if it falls under the scope of a conditional, non-truth-conditional if it lies outside. For discussions of the test, see Cohen (1971), Lyons (1977), Palmer (1990), Nuyts (1993), Cinque (1999), Feng (2006) and Huang (2007).
‘The professor is eighty-two years old, but his wife is twenty-eight.’

In (4), *wokan* ‘I think’ operates on the proposition that the game was fabulous. In (5), *yihandeshi* ‘unfortunately’ makes a comment on the proposition that Wang Hong has gone home. In (6), *keshi* ‘but’ links the two propositions: the professor is eighty-two years old and his wife is twenty-eight years.

A pragmatic marker can occur with sentences which are syntactically incomplete but encode full propositions. (7) - (9) are a few illustrative examples.

(7)  *

(8)  *

(9)  *

All the utterances above encode full propositions in spite of the fact that their syntactic subjects are not formally represented. The proposition of each utterance can be fully captured because their syntactic subjects can be contextually retrieved. The subject of (7) is the topic being talked about. In (8), who lost the penalty is mutually known to the speaker and the hearer. In (9), it is the speaker’s side that was beaten.

### 2.3. Syntactic dispensability

A pragmatic marker is syntactically dispensable. Direct evidence comes from the fact that to remove a pragmatic marker does not render ungrammatical the sentence to which it is attached. For instance, when *xingyundeshi* ‘fortunately’ in (10) below is taken away, the grammaticality of the sentence remains unaffected and its proposition untouched.

(10)  *

There is indirect evidence as well. The first piece of such evidence is the fact that the negation of the sentence does not apply to the pragmatic marker. For instance, (11) does not yield the interpretation that it is unfortunate that Zhang Hua did not change to the next flight.

(11)  *
Fortunately, Zhang Hua did not change to the next flight.’

The second piece of indirect evidence is the fact that a pragmatic marker does not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements with which it is associated. In other words, even when a pragmatic marker is omitted, the relationship which the speaker perceives may still be available to the hearer, though it is no longer explicitly marked. For example, (12) and (13) may well be understood roughly the same way.

(12) Qita tongxue qu Xizang, dan wo qu Hainan.
other students go Tibet but 1PS go Hainan
‘Other students are going to Tibet. But I am going to Hainan.’

(13) Qita tongxue qu Xizang, wo qu Hainan.
other students go Tibet 1PS go Hainan
‘Other students are going to Tibet. I am going to Hainan.’

Syntactic dispensability of a pragmatic marker has been widely acknowledged (e.g., Brinton, 1996; Schourup, 1999). It is true that to remove a pragmatic marker does not affect the grammaticality of its host clause and in some cases the semantic relation may well be available to the hearer without it.7

2.4. Semantic dependency

By semantic dependency is meant that a pragmatic marker is parasitic on the propositional content of the matrix clause to which it is attached. In other words, it cannot stand by itself as an utterance. The use of a pragmatic marker presupposes the existence of a propositional content. In some cases, it presupposes that the speaker is committed to the truth of the propositions it links. In others, it indicates the speaker’s comment on the content of the proposition with which it is in construction. Consider (14) and (15).

But
b. Xila meiyou yiliu qiuxing, raner, tamen yingde le jiangbei.
Greece NEG first-class football star but 3PP win PFV trophy
‘Greece has no first-class football stars, but they won the trophy.’

(15) a. *Xingyundeshi.
fortunately
b. Xingyundeshi, Zhang Hua yudao le hao laoshi.

However, this does not mean that it is redundant and useless from a pragmatic point of view. As I have explicated in Feng (2006), a pragmatic marker in a given context gives rise to a component of speaker meaning, which is subjective in nature. If this is the case, it is not dispensable because leaving it out will deprive the utterance of this component.
Fortunately, Zhang Hua has met an excellent teacher.

(14a) is not only grammatically incomplete but also functionally useless as the pragmatic marker 'raner 'but' has no propositions to connect. The same lexeme in (14b), by contrast, is an indication of the speaker’s personal conception of a contrastive relation between the proposition that Greece has no first-class football players and the proposition that they won the European Cup in 2004. As an utterance, (15a) is meaningless as the pragmatic marker 'xingyundeshi 'fortunately' has nothing to comment on, while the presence of the same expression in (15b) indicates the speaker’s positive comment on the proposition that Zhang Hua has met an excellent teacher.

2.5. Linguistic expressions that are not pragmatic markers

Given that pragmatic markers enjoy the above properties, the following categories of linguistically encoded expressions which are usually included in the domain of pragmatic markers can be counted out.

2.5.1. Utterance modifiers

First comes the category generally referred to as ‘utterance modifiers’ (e.g., Bach 1999), and alternatively as ‘pragmatic adverbs’ (e.g., Bellert, 1977), ‘style disjuncts’ (e.g., Hoye, 1997), ‘speech-act adverbials’ (e.g., Cinque, 1999), and ‘speech-act predicationals’ (e.g., Ernst, 2002). Members of this category in Chinese include laoshishuo/jiang ‘honestly speaking’, keqideshuo/jiang ‘politely speaking’, yansudeshuo/jiang ‘seriously speaking’.

They differ from pragmatic markers in that while pragmatic markers are indications of the speaker’s stance towards the propositional content or the connection between the propositions, they only specify the way the speaker is presenting the propositional content (the style or manner of saying). This is self-evident in Chinese utterance modifiers, which normally take the form of ‘adjective+shuo/jiang’. Shuo and jiang are grammaticalized variants of the verb meaning ‘to speak’. Both of them can in many cases be fronted to yield the form of ‘shuo/jiang+adjective+hua’, in which the adjective specifies the manner of presenting the message. It literally means ‘say+adjective+words’. Shuo and jiang are interchangeable unless conventionalized. The utterances in (16) and (17) can serve as examples.

(16)  a. Laoshi shuo/jiang ta you hun wai qing.

   honest speak 3PS have marriage out love
   ‘Honestly, he is having an affair.’

   b. Shuo/jiang laoshi hua ta you hun wai qing.

---

8 Similarly, English utterance modifiers are formally realized in two ways: (i) by an adverb (in this case, the act of speaking is left implicit), and (ii) by a construction consisting of an adverb and a verb of telling either in its infinitive or gerund form. For example, frankly can be replaced by to speak frankly, frankly speaking, or speaking frankly and precisely by to speak precisely, precisely speaking, or speaking precisely.
The distinction between utterance modifiers and pragmatic markers is not difficult to identify. In the first place, the adjective within an utterance modifier can be used as an adverbial of manner (in many cases together with the adverb marker *de*) modifying a verb of telling, while the same lexical form as a pragmatic marker cannot be used as such. Consider the utterances in (18) and (19), among which (18b) is a natural utterance, while (19b) sounds anomalous.9

9 Similarly, utterance modifiers in English have homophonous verb-phrase adverbial counterparts, while pragmatic markers do not. Look at the utterances in (1) (due to Levinson, 1983: 255) and those in (2).

(1) 

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>Frankly, you are a swine.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I tell you <em>frankly</em>, you are a swine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>John told Bill <em>frankly</em> that he was a swine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) 

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>Fortunately, we got the equalizer.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>I tell you <em>fortunately</em>, we got the equalizer.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>John told Bill <em>fortunately</em> that they got an equalizer.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the third place, utterance modifiers can occur with questions, in which they are oriented to the hearer, whereas pragmatic markers are unable to take questions in their scope. For the distinction, consider the utterances in (21).

(21)  a. *Laoshi shuo, Zhang Hua kaoshi zuobi le ma?*  
   ‘Honestly, did Zhang Hua cheat in the exam?’

b. *Laoshi shuo, Zhang Hua kaoshi zenyang zuobi?*  
   ‘Honestly, how did Zhang Hua cheat in the exam?’

c. *Xingyundeshi, Zhang Hua zuo zuqi jiaolian le ma?*  
   ‘Fortunately, has Zhang Hua become a football coach?’

d. *Xingyundeshi, Zhang Hua zai nali zuo zuqi jiaolian?*  
   ‘Fortunately, where is Zhang Hua doing the job as a football coach?’

The italicized expression *laoshi shuo* ‘honestly’ in (21a) and (21b) is an utterance modifier. It sits comfortably with questions (both yes-no questions and WH-questions). The italicized expression *xingyundeshi* ‘fortunately’ in (21c) and (21d) is a pragmatic marker, whose presence renders both utterances unacceptable. Why doesn’t a pragmatic marker favour questions? For an answer, see 4.1.

2.5.2. Domain adverbials

Domain adverbials such as *(cong)jingjishangjiang* ‘economically’, *(cong)huaxuejiaodu jiang* ‘chemically’, *(cong)zhengzhijiaodu jiang* ‘politically’, and *(cong)luojijiaodu jiang* ‘logically’ are also excluded on the basis of the following two facts. Firstly, a domain adverbial does not comment on a propositional content, but rather specifies the domain with respect to which the proposition is said to hold. For example, the inherent import of *(cong)jingjishang jiang* ‘economically’ restricts the truth of the upcoming proposition within the domain of economy. Secondly, a domain adverbial affects the truth conditions
of its host clause: when it is used with a proposition, the truth value of the proposition is valid only within the given domain. For example, an utterance of (22) is natural.\(^{10}\)

(22) \textit{Zhengzhishangjiang, Zhongguo} \textit{1 shi qiang guo, jingishang jiang,} 
politically speak China be CL powerful country economically speak 
ta1 hai bu shi qiang guo. 
3PS yet NEG be powerful country 
‘Politically, China is a powerful country, economically, it is not yet.’

\textbf{2.5.3. Temporal connectives and ordinals}

The third category which is excluded from the domain of pragmatic markers includes temporal connectives such as \textit{ranhou} ‘then’, \textit{zuihou} ‘finally’, \textit{zuixian} ‘at first’, \textit{ciqian} ‘before that’, \textit{houlai} ‘after that’, \textit{yucitongshi} ‘at the same time’ and ordinals such as \textit{diyi} ‘first’, \textit{dier} ‘second’, \textit{qici} ‘next’ and so on and so forth.\(^{11}\)

Temporal connectives are truth-conditional because they describe actual sequences of events or sequential orders of narration in terms of time. Subtypes include succession (e.g., \textit{ranhou} ‘then’, \textit{jiezhe} ‘after that’, \textit{houlai} ‘later’), simultaneity (e.g., \textit{yucitongshi} ‘meanwhile’), and anteriority (e.g., \textit{ciqian} ‘before that’). The truth/falsity of these actual sequences can be checked in the same way the truth/falsity of world affairs is checked. An example in point is (23).

(23) \textit{Women shouxian qu chaoshi mai dongs, ranhou qu le tushuguan.} 
1PP first go supermarket buy thing then go PFV library 
‘We first went shopping at the supermarket. Then we went to the library.’

It should be noted at this point that events are normally described in the actual order of occurrence (cf. Grice’s maxim of manner). In this case, temporal connectives seem redundant. However, they are required when the narration is not in a chronological order.

(24) \textit{Li Min 1996 nian qu le Yingguo, cizhian zai Meiguo dai guo san nian.} 
Li Min 1996 year go PFV UK before that in US stay EXP three year 
‘Li Min went to the UK in 1996, before that, he had stayed in the US for three years.’

\(^{10}\) Chinese does not have simple adverbs to express domains. Instead, it uses longer phrases which literally mean ‘speaking from an x’s perspective’, in which x specifies the domain.

\(^{11}\) In some circumstances the use of temporal connectives and ordinals may imply an order of importance. For instance, \textit{shouxian} ‘first’ may have the function of implying that the speaker thinks that the message involved is the most important, whereas \textit{zuihou} ‘finally’ can have the function of implying that the speaker thinks that the message involved is the least important. However, in many other cases, speakers prefer to save the most important message for the final position. Therefore, as is argued by Jacobson (1978), the idea of importance does not belong to the conventional content of temporal connectives and ordinals (positional connectives in his terminology) since it is only present in certain situations.
The temporal order of Li Min’s staying in the States and his going to the United Kingdom would be unclear if the sequential connective ciqian ‘before that’ is removed in Chinese, a language which lacks morphological aspect realizations on verbs.

An ordinal is used to tell the hearer explicitly how the fragmented pieces of information are organized. As recognized by Erman (2001), the basic function of ordinals is to move the text forward and ensure that the hearer gets a coherent picture of what is being communicated.

2.5.4. Second-person forms

The fourth category that is excluded from the domain of pragmatic markers constitutes what we call second-person forms such as ni shuo ‘you say’, (ni) gaosu wo ‘tell me’. They are so called for the reason that they contain the second person pronoun ni ‘you’ in the syntactic subject position or object position. Instead of marking the speaker’s comment on the proposition expressed, a second-person form serves to explicitly announce what sort of effect the speaker intends to have on the hearer or “to oil the wheels of conversational exchange” (Fitzmaurice, 2004: 428). It is a locutionary performative belonging to a kind of meta-language. Unlike a pragmatic marker, it is devoid of comment on the proposition. It has, instead, an interactive discourse function, which is indexed by a second-person marking. Commonplace examples include (ni)xiang ‘you think’, (ni)shuo shuo kan ‘tell me/us’, (ni)xiang xiang ‘you think’, (wo)jinggao ni ‘I warn you’, (ni)ting wo shuo ‘listen to me’, (wo)feng quan ni ‘I advise you’, wo wen ni ‘I ask you’ and so on and so forth.

2.5.5. Other categories

Also excluded are the following categories.

(i) Modal verbs such as bixu ‘must’ and keyi ‘may’ are excluded for the fact that they are of a grammatical category similar to aspect, tense, number, gender, etc., which are highly integrated into a grammatical structure. Furthermore, they may be truth-conditional: they have deontic, dynamic and epistemic readings which are so indeterminate that even the context may fail to exclude one of the possible meanings.  

(ii) The four pure connectives he, yu, gen, ji ‘and’ are out of the domain on the grounds that they operate on sentence constituents rather than propositions.

12 For more discussions on modal verbs see Halliday (1970), Palmer (1986/2001), Hoye (1997) and Verstraete (2001), among many others.

13 Note that these four connectives can only be partially equated with and. The former are simple pure logical connectives while the latter may carry temporality and causality, as shown in the following two utterances.

(1) The floor was wet and Mary fell (causality).
Digressives such as *huangehuati* ‘to change the subject’ and *yanguizhengzhuan* ‘to come back from the digression’ are excluded on the grounds that they indicate that the speaker is moving away temporarily from the topic or coming back from something irrelevant to the topic.

*Hao* ‘well’ is excluded on the grounds that it is used, like *well* and *now* in English, to mark boundaries between verbal activities and “to ensure that the channel is open between interlocutors” (Erman, 2001: 1339), rather than comment on the propositional content.

### 3. Conceptual and non-conceptual pragmatic markers

Though pragmatic markers form a coherent pragmatic domain united by the general characteristics mentioned above, individual differences help to identify two types: conceptual and non-conceptual.

This distinction is made on the basis of the inherent semantic import of the pragmatic markers rather than their contribution to the host clause. A conceptual pragmatic marker encodes certain conceptual information. For example, *xingyundeshi* ‘fortunately’ invokes the concept [FORTUNATE]. Pragmatic markers of this type provide the speaker with linguistic means to express his personal opinions about what he is saying in actual situations. Though the conceptual message is not the key information of the utterance of which it is a part, it underpins the speaker’s attitude to the key information. Syntactically, this category of pragmatic markers is claimed to be the highest class of adverbs or the most peripheral or syntactically optional elements (see Cinque, 1999 for a discussion of a hierarchy of adverbs). In the literature, they are often referred to as modal adverbs or adverbs of mood or modal adjuncts that take a whole clause into their scope. Non-conceptual pragmatic markers encode no conceptual messages. For example, *danshi* ‘but’ does not encode the concept [BUT]. It is just an indication that the speaker conceives a certain contrast holding between the adjoining propositions explicitly stated or contextually implied. As a detailed characterization will be given shortly, at this point the utterances in (25) and (26) suffice for an initial idea of the distinction.

(25)  
*Rangrenjingyadeshi*, Xīlā huo de 2004 Oužhoubei guanjun.  
'amazingly' Greece win 2004 Euro Cup championship  
‘Amazingly, Greece won the European Cup in 2004.’

(26)  
[A sees his wife coming back laden with bags]  
A: *Kanlai*, nǐ bā qián hua guāng le.  
so you BA money spend over PFV  
‘So, you’ve spent all the money.’

*Rangrenjingyadeshi* ‘amazingly’ in (25) encodes a concept of its own, though it does not affect the truth conditions of the proposition that Greece won the 2004 European Cup.

---

(2) The old king died and a republican was founded (temporality).
Kanlai ‘so’ in (26) encodes a sort of inferential connection between the proposition that A’s wife has spent all the money and the other proposition that his wife has bought loads of things, which is an observation.

The distinction between conceptual and non-conceptual pragmatic markers is not difficult to identify. Whereas the lexical form of a conceptual pragmatic marker can be used in other contexts to contribute truth-conditional information to an utterance, the lexical form of a non-conceptual pragmatic marker can never do so. For example, the lexical item *haowuyiwen* ‘undoubtedly’ in (27a) is truth-conditionally irrelevant, but when relocated in (27b) it is of relevance to the truth-conditions of the utterance. By contrast, the lexical item *keshi* ‘but’ can never be used as a descriptive predicate, as shown in (28b).

(27)  a. *Haowuyiwen*, jintian Yao Ming shi Huojian de diyi gongchen.
    no doubt today Yao Ming be Rockets MM first hero
    ‘No doubt, Yao Ming is the hero of the Rockets today.’

   b. Jintian Yao Ming shi Huojian de diyi gongchen shi *haowuyiwen* de.
    today Yao Ming be Rockets MM first hero be no doubt MM
    ‘It is not doubt that Yao Ming is the hero of the Rockets today.’

(28)  a. Zhang Hua hen you qian, *keshi* xianzai hai zhu yi jian xiao wu.
    Zhang Hua very have money but now still live one CL small room
    ‘Zhang Hua is very wealthy, but he is still living in a small room.’

   b. *Zhang Hua hen you qian, xianzai hai zhu yi jian xiao wu shi keshi.
    Zhang Hua very have money now still live one CL small room be but.
    ‘*Zhang Hua is very wealthy, he still lives in a small room is but.’

4. Pragmatic markers in Chinese: a typology

4.1. Conceptual pragmatic markers

As stated above, a conceptual pragmatic marker is a lexical expression which makes observable the speaker’s personal opinion about what he is saying in an actual situation. Conceptual pragmatic markers in Chinese are characterized by the following properties.

(29)  Properties of Chinese conceptual pragmatic markers

   (i)  Compositionality: They can be semantically simple, or interact with other words to form a complex, and therefore can be analyzed compositionally (e.g., *shifen/wanfen/feichang/tebie* ‘very’ can be added to *yihandeshi* ‘unfortunately’ to render it into a complex

---

14 In English, such expressions are generally termed as ‘attitudinal disjuncts’ by grammarians (e.g., Greenbaum, 1969; Quirk et al, 1985).
The grasp of the concept of a pragmatic marker is related to the grasp of the meaning of its parts.

(ii) Multi-categoriality: They are not from a single grammatical category. Rather, they are coded in a range of lexical categories and grammatical constructions (e.g., single adverbs, adjective phrases, noun phrases, prepositional phrases, finite subordinate clauses). Examples are *queshi* ‘actually’, *feichangbuxing* ‘very unfortunately’, *haowuyiwen* ‘no doubt’, *yibanqingkuangxia* ‘in normal circumstances’ and *wxiang/kan/renwei* ‘I think’. Besides, many Chinese conceptual pragmatic markers are formed by an adjective plus *deshi*. Many of them can be prefixed with *lingren/rangren* ‘making one’ (e.g., *yihandeshi* ‘unfortunately’ has a variant *lingrenyihandeshi*, and *beishangdeshi* ‘sadly’ has a variant *lingrenbeishangdeshi*).

(iii) Multi-functionality: The lexical form does not function exclusively as a pragmatic marker. In other words, the homophonous form can function truth-conditionally in other contexts, as shown in the utterances in (30).

(30)  
(a)  Xila *feichangxingyun* de bikai le Faguo.  
Greece very fortunate AdvM avoid PFV France  
‘Greece was fortunate to have avoided France.’

(b) *Feichangxingyun*, Xila bikai le Faguo.  
very fortunate Greece avoid PFV France  
‘Fortunately, Greece avoided France.’

The lexical form *feichangxingyun* ‘very fortunately’ in (30a) is an adverb phrase which functions as an adverbial modifying the main verb. In (30b) the same form functions syntactically upon the whole proposition. It is structurally marginal with its semantics reduced to a degree at which its contribution is irrelevant to the truth/falsity of the whole sentence.

The use of the same lexical expression as a truth-conditional predicate and as a pragmatic marker is unlikely to cause any confusion. Therefore, I see no basis for positing conceptual pragmatic markers as a separate syntactic category. Rather, they should be posited as a heterogeneous pragmatic class, heterogeneous in that they belong to different grammatical categories such as adverbs, adjective phrases, noun phrases, and finite clauses. The various formal realizations of conceptual pragmatic markers can be exemplified by those in the utterances (31) – (34).

(31)  *Queshi*, ta qude zheyang de chengji hen bu rongyi. (adverb)  

---

15 To my knowledge, *xingkui* ‘fortunately’ and *xinghao* ‘fortunately’ are the two which lack compositionality.
indeed 3SG get this MM achievement very NEG easy
‘Indeed, it is not easy at all for him to have achieved this.’

(32)  
Feichangbuxing, ta wu sui shiqu shuangqin. (adjective phrase)
very unfortunate 3SG five year lose parents
‘Very unfortunately, he lost his parents at the age of five.’

(33)  
Haowuyiwen, jintian Yao Ming shi Huojian de diyi gongchen. (noun phrase)
no doubt today Yao Ming be Rockets MM first hero
‘Undoubtedly, Yao Ming is the hero of the Rockets today.’

(34)  
Wokan, ta zai tushuguan dushu. (finite clause)
I see 3PS in library read
‘He is reading in the library, I think.’

Structurally, conceptual pragmatic markers do not occur naturally with questions demanding information. This is because to use such a question implies that the speaker is not sure whether the propositional content is true or not, but the use of a conceptual pragmatic marker presupposes the speaker’s commitment to the factuality of the propositional content. It is this contradiction that renders the whole utterance awkward. For example, to change (31) – (34) into questions (either yes/no questions or WH-questions) will result in awkward utterances.

(31’)  
?Queshi, ta qude zheyang de chengji hen bu rongyi ma?
indeed 3PS get this MM achievement very NEG easy Q
‘?Indeed, is it difficult for him to have achieved this?’

(32’)  
?Feichangbuxing ta wu sui shiqu shuangqin ma?
very unfortunate 3SG five year lose parents Q
‘?Very unfortunately, did he lose his parents at the age of five?’

(33’)  
?Haowuyiwen, jintian shui shi Huojian de diyi gongchen?
no doubt today who be Rockets MM first hero
‘?Undoubtedly, who is the hero of the Rockets today?’

(34’)  
?Wokan, ta zai nali kanshu?
I think 3PS in where read
‘?I think, where is he reading?’

Conceptual pragmatic markers enjoy a high degree of mobility within the utterances where they occur. They can occur initially, medially or finally with a comma in writing and/or a pause in speech. This can be illustrated by the occurrences of woxiang ‘I think’ in the utterances in (35).

(35)  
a.  
Woxiang, ta xianzai zai tushuguan dushu.
I think 3SP now in library read
‘I think, he is reading in the library at the moment.’

b.  
Ta xianzai, woxiang, zai tushuguan dushu.
3PS now I think in library read
‘He is, I think, reading in the library at the moment.’
c. Ta xianzai zai tushuguan dushu, woxiang.
3PS now in library read I think
‘He is reading in the library at the moment, I think.’

In simple utterances, wherever it occurs, a conceptual pragmatic marker takes into scope the whole sentence to which it is attached. However, as has been observed by Ifantidou (2001: 139), in complex utterances the position of the marker (‘parenthetical’ in her terminology) does affect the scope and consequently the meaning of the whole utterance. Consider the utterances in (36).

(36)  a. Ta xianzai zai tushuguan, dan bushi dushu, woxiang.
3PS now in library but NEG read, I think
‘He is now in the library, but he is not reading, I think.’

b. Ta xianzai zai tushuguan, woxiang, dan bushi dushu.
3PS now in library I think but NEG read
‘He is now in the library, I think, but he is not reading.’
c. Ta xianzai zai tushuguan, dan woxiang, bushi dushu.
3PS now in library but I think NEG read
‘He is now in the library, but I think, he is not reading.’

(36a) is ambiguous. The marker at the sentence-final position can take either the whole sentence or just the second segment into its scope. The same marker in (36b) takes only the first segment into scope, while in (36c) it takes only the second segment into scope. Different positions give rise to different interpretations.

Semantically, conceptual pragmatic markers can be grouped into two subtypes: epistemic and evaluative. Both types express a certain opinion of the speaker with respect to the propositional content. They stand in opposition in that while an epistemic pragmatic marker relates to the speaker’s commitment to the factuality of the propositional content, an evaluative pragmatic marker indicates the speaker’s evaluation of the proposition. Let me address them in turn.

4.1.1. Epistemic pragmatic markers
An epistemic pragmatic marker is essentially an indication of the speaker’s commitment to the degree of certitude (possibility, probability, certainty, actuality, reliability or

---

16 Within the framework of Functional Grammar, Nuyts (1993) further divides them into three main subclasses: content-oriented (e.g., hopefully), event-oriented (e.g., fortunately) and participant-oriented (e.g. wisely).
limitations) of the propositional content\textsuperscript{17}. To put it slightly differently, it displays the speaker’s confidence or lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition expressed by the utterance. Consider the following examples.

(37) _Yexu_, Zhang Hua wang le ta na tian shuo de hua.  
perhaps Zhang Hua forget PFV 3PS that day say MM word  
‘Perhaps, Zhang Hua has forgotten what he said the other day.’

(38) _Haowuyiwen_, Zheng Jie shi Zhongguo da jin Fawang de diyi ren.  
no doubt Zheng Jie be China play into French Open MM first person  
‘Undoubtedly, Zheng Jie is the first Chinese player who has got through into the 3rd round of the French Open.’

_Yexu_ ‘perhaps’ in (37) is an indication of the speaker’s lack of confidence in the proposition that Zhang Hua has forgot what he had said the other day. _Haowuyiwen_ ‘no doubt’ in (38) indicates that the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition that Zheng Jie is the first Chinese tennis player who has got through into the third round of the French Open. The following are some more examples.

(39) _Shishishang_, women bei tamen pian le.  
in fact 1PL BEI 3PL cheat PFV  
‘In fact, we were cheated by them.’

(40) _Xianran_, Xila dui de fangshou zui chuse.  
obviously Greece team MM defending most excellent.  
‘Obviously, Greece had the best defending.’

(41) _Jushuo_, Wang Hong de shangsu bei bohui le.  
it’s said Wang Hong MM appeal BEI turn down PFV  
‘It is said that Wang Hong’s appeal has been turned down.’

_Shishishang_ ‘actually’ in (39) brings onstage the speaker’s commitment to the actuality of the proposition. It affirms what is said as a matter of fact. _Xianran_ ‘obviously’ in (40) and _jushuo_ ‘it’s said’ in (41) are both concerned with the indication of the evidence that reveals the degree of the speaker’s commitment to the truth of a proposition. They are what Palmer (1986/2001) dubs ‘evidential modality’.\textsuperscript{18} The following two are also examples of epistemic pragmatic markers.

\textsuperscript{17} This group of pragmatic markers is traditionally introduced as a type of hedging whose job is to make things more or less fuzzy (e.g., R. Lakoff, 1975) or studied within the scope of epistemic modality in semantics (e.g., Lyons, 1977; Palmer, 1986/2001).

\textsuperscript{18} This is a controversial group. Evidentiality can be understood in a narrow and a broad sense. In a broad sense (Chafe, 1986: 271), it is defined as marking speaker’s attitude towards his knowledge of reality, and in a narrow sense it is defined as marking the specific source of such knowledge. We include them as pragmatic markers here because, as Mithun (1986) says, evidentials specify not only the source of information, but also the degree of precision or truth, the probability of the truth and the expectations
Wokan, Liu Xiang de chenggong guiyu ta de jiaolian. I think Liu Xiang’s success owes to his coach. ‘Liu Xiang’s success is due to his coach, I think.’

Daduoshuqingkuangxia, shouji zhi yonglai tonghua. ‘In most cases, mobiles are used for phones only.’

Wokan ‘I think’ in (42) is used to show the speaker’s degree of confidence in the truth of the proposition that Liu Xiang’s success is due to his coach. Daduoshuqingkuangxia ‘in most cases’ in (43) is used to mitigate the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition that mobiles are used for phones only.

Structurally, epistemic pragmatic markers fall into two subcategories: epistemic clausal pragmatic markers and epistemic adverbial ones. The former category displays the following formal properties.

Formal properties of Chinese epistemic clausal pragmatic markers

(i) They do not co-occur with aspect particles zhe (progressive), le (perfect) and guo (simple past).
(ii) They do not co-occur with time adverbial expressions.
(iii) The verb involved cannot be repeated within the same phrase.
(iv) They cannot be negated by bu ‘not’.

Let me illustrate them with wokan ‘I think’.

This marker is morphologically formed with the first-person pronoun wo ‘I’ and the verb kan, which literally means ‘to look’ or ‘to view’. However, when the verb is combined with wo ‘I’ and followed by a propositional clause, it no longer indicates a physical event of sight. The distinction is not difficult to observe in the utterances in (45).

Wo kan zhe Wang Hong de zhaopian. ‘I am looking at Wang Hong’s picture.’

Wokan, zhe jian shi bu nan ban. ‘This matter is not difficult to handle, I think.’

Semantically, the lexeme italicized in (45a) encodes the action of looking at a picture of Wang Hong. It expresses a sense perception. Syntactically, it is a predicate verb. The same lexeme loses its literal meaning in (45b). Combined with the first-person pronoun concerning the probability of a statement. Variations of jushuo ‘it’s said’ include juchuan, juxi, juwen. See also Fitneva (2001) for a different point of view.
wo ‘I’, it gains the status as a pragmatic marker indicating that the speaker is in a mental state with respect to the proposition expressed by the utterance. A simple test for the difference is to see if it can take an aspect particle or if the single lexeme kan ‘see’ can be repeated. If yes, it is a simple subject-predicate structure. Otherwise, it is a pragmatic marker. Consider the utterances in (46).

(46)  
   a. Wo kan le Wang Hong de zhaopian.  
       1PS see PFV Wang Hong MM picture  
       ‘I have seen Wang Hong’s picture.’  
   b. Wo kan guo Wang Hong de zhaopian.  
       1PS see EXP Wang Hong MM picture  
       ‘I saw Wang Hong’s picture.’  
   c. Wo kan kan Wang Hong de zhaopian.  
       1PS see see Wang Hong MM picture  
       ‘Let me have a look at Wang Hong’s picture.’  
   d. *Wo kan le zhe jian shi bu nan ban.  
       1PS see PFV this CL thing NEG difficult handle  
       ‘*I have seen that this matter is not difficult to handle.’  
   e. *Wo kan guo zhe jian shi bu nan ban.  
       1PS see EXP this CL thing NEG difficult handle  
       ‘*I saw that this matter is not difficult to handle.’  
   f. *Wo kan kan zhe jian shi bu nan ban.  
       1PS see see this CL thing NEG difficult handle  
       ‘*Let me see that this matter is not difficult to handle.’

Notice that (46a-c) are fully acceptable utterances, where the lexeme kan ‘see’ is a verb of perception which takes an aspect particle or is repeated. In this circumstance, a combination of the verb with the first-person pronoun wo ‘I’ loses its status as a pragmatic marker, but gains the status as a subject-predicate structure, which requires a concrete object. The utterances in (46d-f) are unacceptable because kan ‘see’ as a verb of perception in each of them is followed by an epistemic concept rather than a concrete object.

When an epistemic clause co-occurs with a time adverbial, it loses its status as a pragmatic marker as well. For instance, woxiang ‘I think’ is a pragmatic marker, but when it is inserted by a time adverbial (e.g., wo dangshi xiang ‘I then thought’) it merely reports a mental action at a certain time in the past.

For one thing, the same morphological form can be followed by a noun phrase. In this case, the verb in the expression is transitive. The noun phrase that follows it is the object of the sentence, as shown in (46a-c).

For another thing, when they are followed by a sentence, they are syntactically and prosodically separated from the sentence in which they occur. Otherwise, they are main clauses, which can be questioned and negated. For the distinction, consider the utterances in (47) and (47').

\[(47)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Wo renwei Wang Hong shi dongbei ren.} \\
& \quad 1\text{PS think Wang Hong be northeast people} \\
& \quad \text{‘I think Wang Hong is from the northeast.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Wang Hong shi dongbei ren, werenwei.} \\
& \quad \text{Wang Hong be northeast people, I think} \\
& \quad \text{‘Wang Hong is from the northeast, I think.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(47')\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Wo bu renwei Wang Hong shi dongbei ren.} \\
& \quad 1\text{PS NEG think Wang Hong be northeast people} \\
& \quad \text{‘I don’t think Wang Hong is from the northeast.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{?Wang Hong shi dongbei ren, wo bu renwei.} \\
& \quad \text{Wang Hong be northeast people, 1PS NEG think} \\
& \quad \text{‘?Wang Hong is from the northeast, I don’t think.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(47a) can be negated as (47’a), whereas (47b) cannot be negated as (47’b). This is because the structure \textit{wo renwei} ‘I think’ in the first case is a subject-predicate construction, while in the second case it is a pragmatic marker. The change from a subject-predicate structure to a pragmatic marker is a typical process of subjectification (see Traugott, 1995a, 1995b for a discussion).

However, as has been observed by Quirk et al (1985: 1112-13), when epistemic clausal pragmatic markers occur initially, it becomes hard to distinguish them from their counterparts as main clauses. The only notable difference is that epistemic clauses occur in a separate tone unit and are signalled by an intonational pause. Semantically, they do not have any specific expressive aspects by themselves. The expressive aspects are not acquired until the clauses are attached to a propositional content in concrete utterances.

Epistemic adverbial pragmatic markers constitute a smaller set. They mark the speaker’s affirmation of, or emphasis on the factuality of the proposition. In other words, by using an epistemic adverbial pragmatic marker, the speaker shows a degree of commitment to the truth of the proposition. They can be further divided into two types according to the degree of commitment: those which indicate the speaker’s certainty, and those that mark the speaker’s reservation or doubt. Prototypical members of the first type include \textit{qishi} ‘actually’, \textit{dangran} ‘certainly’, \textit{dique} ‘indeed’, \textit{kending} ‘definitely’, \textit{queshi} ‘indeed’, \textit{xianran} ‘obviously’ and so on. Examples of the other type include \textit{dagai} ‘probably’, and \textit{yexu/huoxu} ‘perhaps’.
4.1.2. Evaluative pragmatic markers

An evaluative pragmatic marker is essentially the speaker’s indication of his attitude, feeling, value judgement, or expectation with regard to the proposition expressed according to its effect on the speaker. A noticeable formal property of evaluative pragmatic markers in Chinese is that they are composed of an adjective stem and a combination of an adjective marker de with the copula shi, as shown in (48) and (49). This is different from their English counterparts, which share homonymous forms with their correspondent manner adverbs.


(49) Buxingdeshi, Zheng Jie zai bisai zhong shoushang le. ‘Unfortunately, Zheng Jie got hurt in the middle of the match.’

In (48), jinqideshi ‘amazingly’ indicates that the speaker thinks it amazing that Zheng Jie got through into the third round in her first participation in the French Open. In (49), buxingdeshi ‘unfortunately’ is an indication that the speaker thinks it unfortunate that Zheng Jie got injured during the match.

At this point, it is important to note that not all adjectives can be suffixed by deshi to gain the status of an evaluative pragmatic marker operating on the propositional content. For instance, factive adjectives which denote purely physical properties cannot be suffixed so as to be converted into pragmatic markers. The following are a few examples.

(50) Examples of adjectives which cannot be suffixed with deshi
a. xunsu ‘quick’ → ?xunsudeshi
b. huanman ‘slow’ → ?huanmandeshi
c. qihei ‘dark’ → ?qiheideshi
d. mingliang ‘bright’ → ?mingliangdeshi

Semantically, an evaluative pragmatic marker consistently entails the truth of the proposition expressed by the utterance, while an epistemic pragmatic marker does not. For instance, the use of buxingdeshi ‘unfortunately’ in (49) entails that Zheng Jie got injured during the match, while the use of wokan ‘I think’ in (42), repeated here as (51), does not entail that Liu Xiang’s success is due to his coach.

(51) Wokan, Liu Xiang de chenggong gui yu ta de jiaolian.
I think Liu Xiang’s success is due to his coach, I think.'

Like epistemic pragmatic markers, evaluative ones can occur initially, medially, and finally. They normally take an initial position, but in spoken discourse they can be moved to utterance-medial or utterance-final positions, as shown in (52).

(52)  
a. Yuchundeshi, Zhang Hua yizhi zai mai jia huo.  
   stupidly       Zhang Hua always DUR buy fake product  
   ‘Stupidly, Zhang Hua has been buying fake products.’

b. Zhang Hua yizhi zai mai jia huo, yuchundeshi.  
   Zhang Hua always DUR buy fake product stupidly  
   ‘Zhang Hua has been buying fake products, stupidly.’

c. Zhang Hua, yuchundeshi, yizhi zai mai jia huo.  
   Zhang Hua stupidly       always DUR buy fake product  
   ‘Zhang Hua, stupidly, has been buying fake products.’

d. ?Zhang Hua yizhi, yuchundeshi, zai mai jia huo.  
   Zhang Hua always stupidly    DUR buy fake product  
   ‘Zhang Hua has been stupidly buying fake products.’

(52a) is perfect both in written and spoken form. To place the marker in the middle or at the end of the utterance renders (52b) and (52c) somewhat unnatural in writing, but both are quite natural in speech. These examples demonstrate that Chinese evaluative pragmatic markers seem to display more restricted behaviour than their English counterparts, which allow a wide range of possible positions. For example, to place yuchundeshi ‘stupidly’ within a complex predicate renders the sentence rather awkward, as shown in (52d), whereas to put its English counterpart in the same position is acceptable, as shown in (53), according to Ernst (2002: 2).

(53)  
   (Stupidly,) they (stupidly) have (stupidly) been (stupidly) buying hog futures (stupidly).

Evaluative pragmatic markers can be subcategorized into event-oriented and agent-oriented types. The two types can be formally distinguished. When the evaluation carried by the marker is oriented to the event narrated, it can be prefixed with lingren/rangren ‘making people’ or lingwo/rangwo (making me). For example, (48) above can be changed to (54) without any alteration of its meaning.

(54) Lingrenjingyadeshi, Zheng Jie diyi ci canjia Fawang da jin  
    amazingly       Zheng Jie first time participate French Open play into  
    disan lun.  
    third round
‘Amazingly, Zhen Jie got into the 3rd round in her first appearance in the French Open’

By contrast, when the evaluation is oriented to the agent with respect to what he/she has done, the marker indicating the evaluation cannot be prefixed with lingren/rangren or lingwo/rangwo. For example, the prefix lingren renders (55) unacceptable.

(55) *Lingrenbuxingdeshi, Zheng Jie zai bisai zhong shou shang le.
unfortunately Zheng Jie in match middle get hurt
‘Unfortunately, Zheng Jie got hurt in the middle of the game.’

It seems to me that agent-oriented pragmatic markers have two arguments, one being the agent, which is usually the subject of the sentence, and the other being the event represented by the immediate discourse. The agent is judged as such (what the adjective specifies) with respect to the event narrated. For instance, in (56a), Zhang Hua is judged as clever in as far as that he sold his company two years ago. It is important to note that agent-oriented pragmatic markers must have the agent involved as the subject of the sentence and that the event concerned must be under the agent’s control (he is able to choose to do or not to do it). This explains why utterances in (56b-c) sound odd.

(56)  a. Congmingdeshi, Zhang Hua liang nian qian ba gongsi mai le.
cleverly Zhang Hua two year before BA company sell PFV
‘Cleverly, Zhang Hua sold the company two years ago.’
  b. ?Congmingdeshi, gongsi liang nian qian ji mai le.
cleverly company two year ago EMP sell PFV
‘?Cleverly, the company was sold two years ago.’
  c. ?Congmingdeshi, Zhang Hua bixu ba gongsi mai le.
cleverly Zhang Hua must BA company sell PRT
‘?Cleverly, Zhang Hua has to sell the company.’

The oddity of (56b) results from the fact that the agent to whom the pragmatic marker is oriented does not appear in the subject position. (56c) is awkward because bixu ‘must’ indicates an obligation, which is outside the control of the agent, Zhang Hua. To further illustrate the difference between the two subtypes of evaluative pragmatic markers, consider (57) and (58), which remain perfect with lingren/rangren or lingwo/rangwo as prefix to the markers, and (59), which is unacceptable due to the presence of the same prefix.

(57) Lingrengaoxindeshi, baba mai le hen duo katong shu.
happily father buy PFV very many cartoon book
‘Happily, my father bought a lot of cartoon books.’
(58) Lingrensangxindeshi, liang ge haizi de xialuo zhijin bu ming.
sadly two CL child MM whereabouts to date NEG clear
‘Sadly, the whereabouts of the two children is still unknown.’

(59) *Lingrenyuchundeshi, ta ba mima xiezai xinyongka shang le
stupidly 3PS BA pin number write credit card on PFV
‘Stupidly, he wrote the pin number on his credit card.’

Other members of the event-oriented evaluative pragmatic markers include xingfudeshi ‘happily’, tongkudeshi ‘sadly’, jingyadeshi ‘amazingly’ and qiguaideshi ‘bizarrely’ and so on and so forth. Other examples of the agent-oriented evaluative pragmatic markers include huajideshi ‘ridiculously’, jixiedeshi ‘mechanically’, buheluojideshi ‘illogically’, huangtangdeshi ‘ridiculously’, mingandeshi ‘sensitively’, yingmingdeshi ‘wisely’ etc.

As mentioned above, some conceptual pragmatic markers can be prefixed with lingwo/rangwo. However, the same expressions lose their status as pragmatic markers if they have in them the presence of a second or third person. For example, in contrast to the pragmatic markers in (57) and (58), the italicized parts in (57’) and (58’) are mere statements rather than indications of the speakers’ attitudes towards or evaluations of the propositions expressed. In (57’) the speaker states that the children were happy because their father had bought them a lot of toys. In (58’) the speaker states that the woman was sad because the whereabouts of her two children was still unknown.

(57’) Ling haizi men gaoxingdeshi, baba mai le hen duo wanju.
make child PLM happy father buy PFV very many toys
‘The children were happy that their father had bought them a lot of toys.’

(58’) Ling ta shangxindeshi, liang ge haizi de xialuo zhi jin bu ming.
make 3PS sad two CL child MM whereabouts till now NEG clear
‘She was sad that the whereabouts of her two children are still unknown.’

4.2. Non-conceptual pragmatic markers

Non-conceptual pragmatic markers are lexical items which indicate the speaker’s personal conception of the relations holding between propositions. Non-conceptual pragmatic markers in Chinese display the following general properties.

(60) Properties of non-conceptual pragmatic markers
(i) Non-compositionality: They do not interact with other words and thus defy compositional analysis. They enjoy a stable form, i.e., they cannot be semantically simple or complex.
(ii) Connectivity: They suggest a relation between messages. They are grammatically realized as lianjiechenfen or guanlianci ‘connecting unit’.
(iii) Mono-functionality: They are associated with a single use. In other words, the same orthographic form cannot be used for other
Among these properties, connectivity is the most disputed in the literature. Proponents of relevance theory (e.g., Rouchota, 1998; Blakemore, 2002) argue for a total abandonment of connectivity based on the observation that non-conceptual pragmatic markers (discourse markers in their terminology) do not necessarily connect discourse segments. Proponents of discourse approaches (e.g., Schiffrin et al, 2001), by contrast, insist that connectivity is a vital property, though they have not reached a complete agreement as to what is connected.

As have been clearly remarked in the introduction, connectivity is a necessary requirement for discourse markers as a subset of pragmatic markers, but it cannot be taken as necessary for pragmatic markers as a group. Nor is it required for the distinction between conceptual and non-conceptual pragmatic markers. On the one hand, empirical studies (e.g., Lewis, 1999; Thompson and Zhou, 2000) have shown that conceptual pragmatic markers (epistemic adverbs and evaluative disjuncts in their terminology) also have a structuring role indicating coherence relations. They suggest a specific kind of connection when they are used with more than one proposition, either explicitly stated or contextually implied. On the other hand, not all connecting units are pragmatic markers. Those which connect simple noun phrases (e.g., he, gen, yu ‘and’) are out of the domain because they do not function as indications of the speaker’s own conception of the relations between propositions or messages. It seems to me that debates over the nature of connectivity are unavoidable if pragmatic markers are approached from a discourse perspective.

Connecting units in Chinese constitute a large number. It should be noted that they can be viewed from either a static or a dynamic perspective. From a static perspective they are conjunctions which are generally classified according to the relations they mark (e.g., temporal, logical). From a dynamic perspective, they are pragmatic markers which indicate the speaker’s personal conception of the relations holding between propositions. It merits mention here that a single pragmatic marker can be used to indicate different degrees of speaker involvement in the conception. The utterances in (61) – (64) can serve as illustrative examples.

(61)  Wang Hong caidao xiangjiao pi, suoyi shuaidao le.
Wang Hong stepped on a banana peel, so he fell down.
(62)  Wang Hong jia liang zhe deng, suoyi ta zai jia.
Wang Hong yanked the handle, so he returned home.

19 I have found no exceptions to this in Chinese. Fraser (2006) has found a few exceptions in English such as as a result, similarly, as a conclusion and in addition. For example, as a result has the same meaning but different functions in the following two utterances.
a. He didn’t brush his teeth. As a result, he got cavities.
b. The substance hardened. This wasn’t the outcome we wanted as a result.
The use of *suoyi* ‘so’ in all the utterances above indicates that the speaker has conceived an inferential relation between the propositions. However, the degree of speaker involvement in the conception varies. In (61), it is minimal because human reasoning is minimally effective in the inferential relation. What is effective is the actual state of affairs. The speaker recognizes rather than attributes an actual world causal connection (stepping on a banana peel results in one’s falling down). In (62), the degree of speaker involvement is greater because the inferential relation is an inference by the speaker. There is, in fact, no direct natural causal link between the light being on in a house and its occupant being at home. The fact that the light in Wang Hong’s house is on cannot be taken as a real-world cause for a conclusion that he is at home at the same time. It is temporary within the mental domain of the speaker. The inferential relation in (63) is even more detached from real-world causality. The degree of speaker involvement in (64) is maximal. It sounds a bit odd for many, but the speaker may have envisaged a sort of inferential relation between being poor and being honest. The more detached it is from the real world, the greater degree of speaker involvement it enjoys. Whatever degree, the relation is perceived via the mind of the speaker. This account is different from Blakemore’s (2002) account of *so* in English, in which *so* is analyzed either as a result marker indicating actual causality, or as a pragmatic marker indicating speaker inference. The advantage of this account is that there is only a single *suoyi* ‘so’, which may be used to indicate the speaker’s different degrees of involvement in the conception of the inferential relation.

Chinese non-conceptual pragmatic markers can be grouped into contrastive, elaborative, and inferential ones.\(^{20}\)

### 4.2.1. Contrastive pragmatic markers

Contrastive pragmatic markers do not constitute a large number in Chinese if we do not take into account the controversial ones (see Guo, 1999). They are indicators of the speaker’s conception that there is a sort of contrast between the two propositions. The contrast is either between the two literally expressed propositions as instantiated in (65) or between implications as exemplified in (66) or between an implication and a literally expressed proposition as illustrated in (67).

\(^{20}\) For this typology, I borrow heavily from Fraser’s (1999, 2006) typology of English discourse markers.
Zhang’s monthly income is over RMB 10,000, but he still says that he is poor.

It is winter in Beijing, but it is summer in Sydney.

She is already forty years old, but she is still very beautiful.

The contrast in (65) is between Zhang’s having a monthly income of over RMB 10,000 and his saying that he is poor. Both propositions are literally expressed. Suppose (66) is uttered as a reply to someone in Beijing who is packing a lot of winter clothes for a trip to Sydney, the contrast conceived is between two implications: you need heavy clothes in Beijing, but you do not need them in Sydney. In (67) the contrast is between an implication that a woman over forty is no longer beautiful and a literally expressed proposition that the woman concerned is beautiful.

Structurally, two subtypes of contrastive pragmatic markers can be distinguished by their locations in the sentence: the first type occurs with the second segment, while the other type with the first segment. The most typical member of the first type is dan/danshi ‘but’ (which has as its variants ke/keshi ‘but’), raner ‘however’, que ‘but’, zhishi ‘but’, buguo ‘but’, jiushi ‘but’, nalizhidao ‘however’, buliao ‘unexpectedly’, and fanzhi ‘otherwise’ etc. Prototypical examples of the other type are sui/suiran ‘although’ and its variant jinguan. Whichever type is used, the speaker puts the segment which carries greater conversational weight at the end. Therefore, the two segments are not interchangeable in terms of conversational weight. 21

In some cases, either type suffices to mark a contrast in the speaker’s mind. In others, the two types occur in combination. For an illustration, consider (68) and (69).

(68)  a. Ta tiantian duanlian, danshi shenti haishi bu hao.
    3PS every day exercise but body still NEG good
    ‘He does physical exercises every day, but he is still not in good health.’
    b. Suiran ta tiantian duanlian danshi shenti haishi bu hao.
    although 3PS every day exercise but body still NEG good
    ‘He does physical exercise every day, but he is still not in good health.’

(69)  a. Ta1 mai le da fangzi, dansgi ta1 gaoxing bu qilai.
    3PS buy PFV big house but 3PS happy NEG up
    ‘He has bought a big house, but he doesn’t feel happy.’
    b. Suiran ta1 mai le da fangzi, Danshi ta1 gaoxing bu qilai.

21 This seems to be different from its counterpart but in English, which, as Fraser (1990: 313) claims, signals a simple contrast with no particular emphasis on each of the segments it links, and therefore the two segments are interchangeable. See Blakemore (2002) for a critique.
although 3PS buy PFV big house but 3PS happy NEG up
‘He has bought a big house, but he does not feel happy.’

In some circumstances, *danshi*, *keshi*, and *raner* can be used interchangeably with *que*, as is shown in (70).

(70)  a. *Ta xue le shi nian yingyu, que bu neng he Yingguoren jiaotan.*
3PS learn PFV ten year English but NEG able with English talk
‘He has studied English for ten years, but he is unable to talk with an Englishman.’

b. *Ta xue le shi nian yingyu *danshi* bu neng he Yingguoren jiaotan.
3PS learn PFV ten year English but NEG able with English talk
‘He has studied English for ten years, but he is unable to talk with an Englishman.’

In other cases, *que* cannot be used interchangeably with *dan/danshi, keshi* and *raner*. For example, when the second segment starts with its own syntactic subject or an adverbial of time or place etc., *que* need occur after them and cannot be replaced by *dan/danshi*. The utterances in (71) and (72) are illustrative of the distinction.

(71)  a. *Ta shenshang you quedian, wo que xihuan he ta zaiyiqi.*
3PS body have shortcomings 1PS but like 3PS together
‘He has shortcomings, but I like staying with him.’

b. *Ta shenshang you quedian, wo danshi xihuan he ta zaiyiqi.*
3PS body have shortcoming 1PS but like 3PS together
‘He has shortcomings, but I like staying with him.’

c. *Ta shenshang you quedian, dan wo xihuan he ta zaiyiqi.*
3PS body have shortcoming but 1PS like 3PS together
‘He has a lot of shortcomings, but I like staying with him.’

(72)  a. *Ta pingshi koucai hen hao, zhehuier que jiejiebaba.*
3PS normally eloquence very good this moment but stammer
‘He is normally very eloquent, but he is stammering at this moment.’

b. *Ta pingshi koucai hen hao, zhehuier *dan* jiejiebaba.*
3PS normally eloquence very good this moment but stammer
‘He is normally very eloquent, but he is stammering at the moment.’

c. *Ta pingshi koucai hen hao, *dan(shi)* zhehuier jiejiebaba.*
3PS normally eloquence very good but this moment stammer
‘He is normally very eloquent, but he is stammering at the moment.’

However, *dan/danshi* and *que* can be used in collaboration in the second segment. *Dan/danshi* occurs at the beginning, *que* still occurs after the subject or the adverbial of time/place.
The examples above demonstrate on the one hand that Chinese contrastive pragmatic markers do not always occur initially, and on the other hand, that there seems to be some syntactic restrictions on their position. There are also shades of syntactic difference among contrastive markers as a class.22

4.2.2. Elaborative pragmatic markers
Elaborative pragmatic markers constitute a large number in Chinese. They are indicators of the speaker’s thought that the proposition to which they are attached is elaborative/conclusive of or more important than the previous proposition. Members of this type include *bingqie* ‘moreover’, *zaishuo* ‘moreover’, *jiazhi* ‘furthermore’, *tuierguangzhi* ‘accordingly’, *gengyoushen* ‘what’s worse’, *chucizhi* ‘in addition’, *haiyou* ‘besides that’, *budan…erqie* ‘not only … but also’, *bira* ‘for example’, *yenjiushishuo* ‘namely’, *zongeryanzhi* ‘in a word’, *(zongzhi)yijuhua* ‘in a word’, *tongyang* ‘similarly’, *tongli* ‘analogously’, *youqi* ‘particularly’, and so on and so forth.

Elaborative pragmatic markers are anaphoric in nature. In other words, the use of an elaborative pragmatic marker presupposes a previous clause. For example, *tongli* ‘analogously’ requires a previous clause to which the upcoming clause is analogous, *bira* ‘for example’ requires a previous proposition of which the upcoming proposition is an example or instance. Consider the utterances in (73) and (73’).

(73)  a. *Yejiushishuo*, Zhang Hua fangqi le zuqiu.
     that is to say  Zhang hua give up PFV football
     ‘That is to say, Zhang Hua has given up football.’
     analogously file also need copy
     ‘Analogously, a copy of the files needs to be made.’
 c. *Zaishuo*, Zhang Hua shi Jianqiao biye de.
     In addition Zhang Hua be Cambridge graduate NOM
     ‘In addition, Zhang Hua graduated from Cambridge,’
(73’) a. Zhang Hua shang daxue le, *yejiushishuo*, ta1 fangqi le zuqiu.
     Zhang Hua enter university PFV that is to say 3PS give up PFV football
     ‘Zhang Hua has gone to university. That is to say, he has given up football.’

22 Syntactic differences among the contrastive pragmatic markers are not the concern of this study. For a discussion, see Xing (2001).
   key best have spare MM analogously file also best copy
   ‘We’d better have a spare copy of the key. Analogously, we’d better make a
   spare copy of the file.’

c. Zhang Hua shi boshi, zaishuo, ta shi Jianqiao biye de.
   Zhang Hua be PhD in addition 3PS be Cambridge graduate NOM
   ‘Zhang Hua has a PhD. In addition, he graduated from Cambridge.’

As can be seen, each utterance in (73) sounds incomplete due to the lack of a previous
clause but a complete idea is expressed when a previous clause is added, as shown in
(73’).

4.2.3. Inferential pragmatic markers
An inferential pragmatic marker is an indicator of the speaker’s thought that there is an
inferential relation between the propositions involved. The most typical member of this
type is *suoyi* ‘so’. It can be used either on its own or in collaboration with *yinwei*
‘because’ or the single-syllable variant *yin*, which introduces the premise. This can be
demonstrated by the utterances in (74).

(74)  a. Ta shi nüren, *suoyi* hen qinlao.
   3PS be woman so very hardworking
   ‘She is a woman, so she is very hard-working.’

b. *Yinwei* ta shi nüren, *suoyi* hen qinlao.
   because 3PS be woman so very hardworking
   ‘She is very hard-working because she is a woman.’

c. Ta shi nüren, *suoyi* ta shi qinlao.
   3PS be woman so 3PS very hardworking
   ‘She is a woman, so she is very hard-working.’

   3PS be woman 3PS so very hardworking
   ‘She is a woman, so she is very hard-working.’

e. Ta *yinwei* shi nüren, *suoyi* hen qinlao.
   3PS because be woman so very hardworking
   ‘She is very hard-working because she is a woman.’

As indicated, (74d) is grammatically incorrect. This is because syntactically, *suoyi* ‘so’
has to precede the subject of the clause, while *yinwei* ‘because’ can occur either before or
after the subject of the clause to which it is attached. *Suoyi* (especially when occurring in
 collaboration with *yinwei*) is basically used to describe an actual cause-effect relation but
it can also be used to show the speaker’s own epistemic conception (as is the case with

---

23 Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to this group as causal covering result, reason and purpose. Quirk et al
(1985) posit a distinction between inferential and resultive categories.
all the utterances in (74)). Because of this, *yinwei* can be emphasized by emphatic adverbs such as *jiu/jiushi/zhengshi* ‘just’, or corrected by *ershi* ‘but’, or negated by *bushi* ‘not’.

(75) a. Jiushi *yinwei* wo xiang haizi, wo cai huijia.
   EMP because 1PS miss child, 1PS EMP home
   ‘I went home just because I missed my child.’

b. Bushi *yinwei* wo xiang haizi, wo cai huijia, ershi *yinwei* haizi xiang
   NEG because 1PS miss child 1PS EMP home, but because child miss
   wo, wo cai huijia.
   1PS 1PS EMP go home
   ‘I went home not because I missed my child, but because my child missed
   me.’

Unlike *suoyi* ‘so’, *jiran* … *jiu* ‘since’ tends to emphasize the subjective aspect of the inferential relation. *Jiran* introduces the reason. It can occur either before or after the subject. *Jiu* introduces the inference. It precedes the subject when the clause in which it occurs has a subject.

(76) a. *Jiran* ni xiang chuguo dushu, *jiu* de sheng qian.
   since 2PS want go abroad study JIU have to save money
   ‘Since you want to go abroad to study, you have to save money.’

b. Ni *jiran* xiang chuguo dushu, ni *jiu* de sheng qian.
   2PS since want go abroad study 2PS JIU have to save money
   ‘Since you want to go abroad to study, you have to save money.’

c. *Ni* *jiran* xiang chuguo dushu, *jiu* ni de sheng qian.
   2PS since want go abroad study JIU 2PS have to save money
   ‘Since you want to go abroad to study, you have to save money.’

Another notable distinction between *yinwei* and *jiran* is that the latter can be followed by a question while the former cannot. For an illustration, consider (77).

(77) a. *Jiran* ta1 dou ren cuo le, weishenme hai da ta1?
   since 3PS already admit mistake PFV why still beat him
   Now that he has admitted the mistake, why are you still beating him?

b. *Yinwei* ta1 dou ren cuo le, weishenme hai da ta1?
   because 3PS already admit mistake PFV why still beat him
   * ‘Because he has admitted the mistake, why are you still beating him?’

Other inferential pragmatic markers include *(youci)kanlai* ‘so’, *(youci)kejian* ‘so’ and *yinci* ‘therefore’, *jucì* ‘for this reason’, and *zhemeshuo* ‘so’. Unlike the above two, these markers do not collaborate with another marker.
Before leaving the issue of typology, I would like to point out one further difference between the two types of Chinese pragmatic markers. Unlike conceptual pragmatic markers, which can take initial, medial and final positions, non-conceptual pragmatic markers normally take an inter-sentential position. When they occur sentence-initially, they are likely to pose difficulties for comprehension. The following dialogue between my wife and me is illustrative of the point.

(78)  W: Kanlai, ni gai duanlian shenti le.  
      so, 2PS should exercise body PRT  
      So, you should take some physical exercises.
H: Ni weishenme turan jiang zhege?  
    2PS why suddenly say this  
    Why do you say so?
W: Ni kan, Zhang Hua dou zai duanlian.  
    2PS look Zhang Hua EMP DUR exercise  
    Look, even Zhang Hua is doing physical exercises.
H: Wo kan yeshi.  
    1PS see so  
    Yes, I think so.

As can be seen from the dialogue, my wife’s use of *kanlai* ‘so’ made me puzzled. This is because she started the conversation with a wrong presumption that her observation that Zhang Hua was doing physical exercises was known to me. As a result, I did not affirm her remark until the observation was recognized.

However, to recognize the speaker’s conception of a certain connection would not be a problem in circumstances where the observation is accessible to the hearer without being spelt out. Consider (79), another dialogue between my wife and me.

(79)  [My wife hears me coughing]  
W: Kanlai, ni bixu jie yan le.  
    so 2PS must stop smoking PART  
    So, you must stop smoking.
H: Shide  
    Yes  
    Yeah.

Unlike in (78), in this example my wife’s observation is obvious to me, who is coughing and knows that my coughing is or may be associated with my habit of smoking. In other words, the inference suggested by *kanlai* ‘so’ comes from the emergent state of affairs (my coughing).

It is worth noting that though both *suoyi* ‘therefore’ and *kanlai* ‘so’ can be used for inferential relations, in the situation where the proposition as the premise is in the
background or is only known to the speaker, only the latter can be used. For example, in the same context (80a) is natural while (80b) is odd.

(80)  
[Seeing wife coming home laden with bags]  
  a.  Kanlai, ni ba qian hua guang le  
      so 2PS BA money spend over PFV  
      So you’ve spent all the money.  
  b.  *Suoyi/yinci, ni ba qian hua guang le  
      so 2PS BA money spend over PFV  
      *Thus/therefore, you’ve spent all the money.  

A very interesting mapping between English and Chinese can be noticed here. For inferential relations, English has so, therefore, thus, etc. In the situation where the proposition as premise is known only to the speaker, only so is appropriate, as has been illustrated in (80). However, I am not suggesting here that so and kanlai are equivalent in all uses. There are many cases where so is appropriate but kanlai is inappropriate. To illustrate the point, let us quote Fraser’s (2001: 1626) examples.

(81)  
  a.  [John, on seeing his roommate walk in smiling]  
      John: So you aced the exam.  
  b.  [Grandmother, on meeting her granddaughter for the first time in a while]  
      Grandmother: So, tell me about this young man you’re going out with.  
  c.  [Jane, on watching her lab-mate break the last test tube available]  
      Jane: So, what are you going to do now?

While so in all the three contexts is appropriately used, only in (81a) can it be substituted by kanlai, a marker which suggests that the conclusion follows from the speaker’s observation (The literal meaning of kanlai is ‘having observed … I conclude…’). Indeed, so seems to have wider applicability.

5. Conclusion

I have in this article offered a detailed description of pragmatic markers in Chinese. I started with a discussion of why the term ‘pragmatic markers’ is favoured over ‘discourse markers’. The brief discussion is related to Fraser’s (1996, 1999, 2006) use of these terms. Secondly, I have offered a definition for pragmatic markers followed by a discussion of their general characteristics. In the third place, bearing in mind the definition and the general properties, I have excluded from the domain of pragmatic markers some expressions which have been generally counted as pragmatic markers and suggested some ways of identifying the distinction. Finally, I have presented a typology of pragmatic markers in Chinese. I have made a valid distinction between conceptual and non-conceptual types on the basis of their semantic import. Specific characteristics of each type have been presented.
Pragmatic markers in English have been the subject of intense investigation. However, a detailed and systematic description of markers of this sort in Chinese has hitherto not been undertaken. This study is intended to fill this gap and to invite further study in the area.
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**Appendix: Notations and Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>an utterance which sounds awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>an utterance which is unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvM</td>
<td>adverbial marker (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>the ba marker in the ba construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEI</td>
<td>the bei marker in the bei construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>complement marker (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>complex stative construction (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative aspect marker (zhe and zai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>emphatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>experiential aspect marker (guo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future aspect marker (jiang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>modifier marker (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective aspect marker (le)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>third person plural pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>first person singular pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>second person singular pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>third person singular pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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