i

'Information Sequencing in Modern Standard Chinese'

by

Thomas Andrew Kirkpatrick

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the Australian National University.

February 1993

i

Statement

This thesis is entirely my own work.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank those who have been involved at various times in the supervision of this theses. They include Dr TA Shopen (Linguistics) and Dr Wong Yin-wai (The China Centre). Above all, I would like to thank Dr AV Diller for all his encouragement, help and advice over the past three years.

I would also like to thank Professor Bill Jenner and Dr Tony Backhouse for their encouragment and advice.

I owe a special debt of thanks to Yang Tiejun for writing in the characters.

Abstract

This study sets out to elucidate principles of information sequencing in Modern Standard Chinese (MSC). It focuses on interrelationships within four areas:

(i) Modifier - modified sequencing.

After a review of treatments of information sequence in Chinese sentence structure, the principles behind the sequencing of clauses in complex sentences in MSC are sought. It is shown that the preferred unmarked sequence in these sentences is subordinate clause - main clause and it is argued that the 'TOPIC-COMMENT' sequence is not being followed in these sentences. The general term 'the BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is given to this modifier - modified principle. The circumstances under which the marked sequence can or must be used are also discussed.

(ii) Sequence and persuasion

The order in which speakers of MSC sequence information in spoken discourse, particularly when they are giving what they hope will be a persuasive answer to a question, is analysed using data from a seminar and three press conferences. It is shown that the modifier - modified 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' is also followed at this level of discourse.

(iii) Sequence and requesting

The order in which writers sequence information in informal letters of request is analysed. It is shown that the preferred sequence places the reason(s) for the request(s) before the requests. The letters of request therefore also follow the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. In addition, the preferred overall schema being followed in these letters is also described.

(iv) Sequence and induction

Methods of reasoning in Chinese are discussed and examples of reasoning in Chinese analysed to show that Chinese prefers an inductive method of reasoning. It is argued that this method of reasoning also follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. Reasons for this preference are also suggested.

A discussion concerning the implications of the differences between the findings for MSC and English concludes the thesis.

CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Statement	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Introduction	1
1 The problem	1
2 The purpose of the study	3
3 The approach	4
4 The data	6
5 Organisation	7
6 Caveats	8
7 Potential applications	8
8 Notation conventions	9
Chapter 1. Information Sequence and Sentence Structure	10
Introduction	10
1.1 Given / old - new information	10
1.2 Theme - rheme	13
1.3 Grounds / subordinate - main statement / main clause	13
1.4 Topic - comment	16
1.4.1 Topic as 'What the sentence is all about'	16
1.4.2 Topic as sentence frames	17
1.4.3 Topics and 'Pragmatic aboutness'	20
1.5 Information sequence in Chinese sentences	21
1.5.1 Topic - comment equated with subject - predicate	21
1.5.2 Topic - comment distinguished from subject - predicate	23
1.6 Topic - comment or modifier - modified	28
1.7 MSC and modifier - modified sequencing	30
1.8 Summary of terms	33
1.9 Topic - comment or modifier - modified (2)	34
1.10 Summary	37
Chapter 2. Clause Sequencing in 'Pianzheng Fujū'.	39
Introduction	39
1 Clause sequencing in 'pianzheng fujū'	40
1.1 The normal, unmarked sequence of 'pianzheng fujū'	40
1.2 The marked sequence and its uses	44
1.3 Limitations on the use of the marked MC - SC sequence: use of connectors	50
2 Parataxis and hypotaxis	51
2.1 Western and Chinese definitions	52
2.2 Is Chinese paratactic?	55
2.2.1 The case in Classical Chinese	55
2.2.2 The case in MSC and influence from the West	57
2.3 Parataxis and markedness in MSC	62
2.4 Use of connectors outside the hypotactic construction	64
2.4.1 As an aid to understanding	64
2.4.2 Stylistic reasons	66
2.5 Parataxis v hypotaxis: summary	68

3	The use of 'pianzheng fuju' in a specific genre	68
3.1	The influence of genre	69
3.2	'Pianzheng fuju' in letters of request	71
3.2.1	Clause sequence and the use of 'cause' connectors	71
3.2.2	Clause sequence and the use of 'effect' connectors	77
3.2.3	The incidence of parataxis	79
4	Summary	81

Chapter 3. Information Sequencing in a Genre of Extended Spoken Discourse 83

	Introduction	83
1	The data	83
1.1	The collection and description of the data	83
2	The scope of the analysis	85
3	The analysis of the data: the talk at ANU	90
3.1	General background	90
3.2	The data analysed	93
3.2.1	'Because' connector 'yinwei' as a discourse marker	99
3.2.2	'Therefore' connector 'suoyi' as a signaller of a summary statement	102
3.3	Summary	104
4	The analysis of the data: the press conferences	105
4.1	General background	105
4.2	The Military Training Press Conference (MTPC)	107
4.2.1	General background	107
4.2.2	The data analysed	107
4.3	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Conference (MFAPC)	115
4.3.1	General background	115
4.3.2	The data analysed	116
4.4	Li Peng's Press Conference (LPPC)	119
4.4.1	General background	119
4.4.2	The data analysed	120
5	Summary	126

Chapter 4. Information Sequencing in a Written Genre 128

	Introduction	128
1	The analysis of requests	129
2	The notion of schema	132
2.1	Schema defined	132
2.2	Cross cultural schemata and requests	133
3	The data	138
3.1	The collection of the data	138
3.2	The variables	139
4	The analysis of the letters	142
4.1	General findings	142
4.2	The analysis of individual letters	149
4.2.1	Letter A	150
4.2.2	Letter B	153
4.2.3	Letter C	155
4.2.4	Letter D	158
4.2.5	Letter E: a request fronted letter	162
4.2.6	The remaining request fronted letters	164
5	Summary of findings	166

Chapter 5. Information Sequencing and Reasoning in Chinese	169
Introduction	169
1 The inductive East and the deductive West?	170
2 Reasoning in Chinese	174
2.1 Classical Chinese reasoning	174
2.1.1 Chain reasoning	174
2.1.2 Reasoning by analogy and historical example	177
2.1.3 Reasoning by deduction	181
2.2 Contemporary Chinese reasoning	182
2.2.1 Inductive reasoning	183
2.2.2 Deductive reasoning	186
2.2.3 Other types of reasoning	188
3 Reasoning, rhetoric and status: the effect of audience	192
3.1 Audience and genre	192
3.2 Traditional concerns with the audience	194
3.3 Textual examples of indirect language	198
3.3.1 A letter of request	198
3.3.2 A political polemic	200
3.4 Language and society	202
4 Summary	205
Chapter 6. Findings for MSC Contrasted with English: Implications	207
Introduction	207
1 Summary of findings	208
1.1 Findings for information sequencing in complex sentences	208
1.2 Findings for information sequencing at discourse level: sequence and persuasion	209
1.3 Findings for information sequencing in text: sequence and politeness	210
1.4 Findings for information sequencing and reasoning: sequence and induction	211
1.5 General findings	212
2 Findings for MSC contrasted with English	212
2.1 Information sequencing and complex sentences	212
2.2 Information sequencing and discourse: sequence and persuasion	219
2.3 Information sequencing and text: sequence and politeness	222
2.4 Information sequencing and reasoning: sequence and induction	224
3 General conclusions	224
Appendices	227
Appendix 1. Chinese character versions of the seminar and press conferences. (Chapter 3).	227
Appendix 2. The Chinese letters of request. (Chapter 4).	229
References	
Western Language Sources	235
Chinese Language Sources	249

Introduction

1 The problem

Gumperz (1990) has shown that the communication difficulties in interethnic relations that occur in key situations such as committee meetings, job interviews and industrial disputes are due to different perceptions and interpretations of discourse and rhetorical conventions.

"...neither participant knows enough about the strategies employed by the other to maintain conversation and to reliably evaluate the attitudes and abilities of the other..." (p 236-7).

The transfer of the rhetorical conventions of the first language to a second language can therefore cause serious breakdowns in communication. In the context of language learning, Odlin (1989) notes that:

"If native language patterns influence language learners in inappropriate ways, then language that a learner uses may seem impolite or incoherent." (p 48).

The impetus for this study comes from several years working with Chinese speakers in a variety of contexts, but primarily in education in Mainland China, Hong Kong and Singapore. It represents a desire to explain cross cultural breakdown and stereotyping between speakers of English and Chinese in terms of differing rhetorical and discourse conventions. For example, I have noted Chinese speakers are often stereotyped by speakers of English and their speech conventions can occasion comments such as 'they never get to the point', 'they are too passive', 'they are too deferential'. Interestingly, this prejudice is often reinforced by contact with Chinese speakers. Contact with speakers of Chinese strengthens rather than weakens the stereotype.

Evidence for this stereotyping is not entirely anecdotal. Below are two examples where communication between Chinese speakers of English and English speakers can be seen to have broken down. These examples both come from my own work and the

first example presents the dialogue between a Chinese police constable (CPC) of the Royal Hong Kong police and his senior expatriate (English) officer (EO). The interaction took place in the office of the senior officer in a Hong Kong police station. The constable wants to request a day's compassionate leave to take his sick mother into hospital.

CPC:	Sir
EO:	Yes, what is it?
CPC	My mother is not very well sir.
EO	So?
CPC	She has to go into hospital sir.
EO	Well, get on with it. What do you want?
CPC	On Thursday sir.
EO	Bloody hell man, what do you want?

(At this point, the police constable mumbled something like 'Nothing sir' and left the office.)

While questions such as rank and sensitivity may have been important in explaining this breakdown in communication, equally as important was the apparent, in the mind of the EO, inability of the CPC to get to the point. For when asked how he would prefer someone to ask for a day's leave, the EO said he would want him to ask first and explain later. In other words, the EO would have preferred the interaction to have followed this sequence:

CPC:	I'd like to request a day's leave for Thursday this week please sir
EO:	Why?
CPC:	Well, my mother has to go into hospital on that day and I'd like to go with her to make sure that everything is all right.

The most obvious difference between what the CPC actually said and what the EO indicated he would prefer is the sequence in which the request is carried out. In the Chinese PC's version, the request comes at the end. In the English EO's version, the request comes at the front. Clearly then, the problem is not simply lack of knowledge of the language. The problem stems from the sequence in which the language is presented and not from grammatical structure.

The second example comes from a seminar on China given at the Australian National University. The speaker, a senior lecturer in economics, is a native speaker of Chinese but he has been living and teaching in Australia for many years. His topic is

'The Current Financial Policy' (of Beijing). Each speaker knows that they have only 20 minutes in which to speak, so after some 20 minutes the Chairman of the session passes the speaker a note to say that his time is up. The final few lines of the tapescript of this talk reads:

"under the central planning board then they would give money to enterprise but er now er now in the name of competition they would give er er money to whoever might er give er er well er what they call *ren qing da ban* er collection loans er is er predominant er personal favours er are the primary consideration er since (the Chair) has given me the final ultimatum to stop er I think I will just perhaps leave the final discussion on the alternatives to this er financial austerity programme and whether the Chinese government can er salvage the er financial stability with er er without really a **which is really the main point I want to make** but I'll stop here."

(The speaker sits down but is clearly distressed that he has been forced to stop speaking at this point.)

In this example, we can see that the speaker had planned to make his main point at the end. In the event, he was not given enough time in which to make his main point and this made him very upset. As in the first example, the obvious difference between the way this native Chinese speaker has structured his talk and the way native English speakers might have expected the talk to have been structured concerns sequence. The native Chinese speaker has decided to place the main point of his talk at the end of it. In the same context, one would expect a native English speaker to identify his main point towards the beginning of his talk. We provide an example of this in chapter 6.

Sequence, therefore, appears to be an important variable and sequencing conventions between Chinese speakers of English and English speakers appear to differ. These differences are significant for successful cross-cultural communication as the wrong use of conventions can, as we have seen, lead to communication breakdown. (Gumperz op cit, Gumperz and Roberts 1980).

2 The purpose of the study

This study sets out to elucidate principles of sequencing in Modern Standard Chinese (MSC) and to discover the extent to which sequencing is an important variable in MSC. In this context, it investigates:

- a) the principles of information sequencing in Modern Standard Chinese at the levels of sentence, discourse and text and across a range of genres.
- b) to what extent these principles of information sequencing are constant across levels of discourse and genre and how they must be modified dependent upon discourse level and genre.

As the purpose of the study involves the clarification of which aspects of information sequencing are normative and explicit, and which are covert and implicit, the work of a substantial number of Chinese scholars will be reviewed and discussed. As a large number of works in Chinese have been consulted, for ease of reference the bibliography is divided into two parts - Western language sources and Chinese language sources.

3 The approach

The study, which is data based, is concerned with information sequencing across discourse levels and genres. The data for the study, therefore, comprise a variety of genre types. These include a formal written genre represented by the writings of the Chinese scholars; an informal written genre, represented by Chinese letters of request; and a genre of extended spoken discourse that ranges in formality and which is represented by press conferences and a seminar all of which were conducted in MSC.

Within this study information sequencing focuses on interrelationships within four areas.:

(i) Modifier - modified sequencing.

In this area, the study concentrates on the sequence of clauses in complex sentences in MSC. These complex sentences, described in English grammar (Quirk et al 1985) as sentences with a main clause and at least one subordinate clause, are known as 'piānzhèng fùjù' (偏正复句) in MSC. Chinese linguists (Wang Li 1958)(Ni Baoyuan 1983) (Lin Yuwen 1983) show that the preferred sequence of

clauses in these complex sentences in MSC is subordinate clause to main clause. However, the circumstances in which a marked sequence can or must be used will also be considered. Once these can be established, the implications of this for the sequencing of information at discourse and text levels will be examined.

Comparisons with English will be made and the influence of Western languages upon certain genres of Chinese in this context and the extent to which there is evidence of language change due to this contact will be considered. This will include a discussion of parataxis and hypotaxis as it is argued that a linguistic preference for paratactic or hypotactic constructions is significant for the sequencing of clauses and information.

(ii) Sequence and persuasion

Chen Ping (1986) has shown that the relative order of propositions is crucial for the understanding of interpropositional relations in MSC. This is in contrast to the relatively free propositional order in English. (Thompson and Longacre 1985).

The order, therefore, in which speakers of MSC sequence information in extended spoken discourse will be analysed, particularly when they are giving an answer to a question that they hope will be persuasive. For example, if a MSC speaker wishes to convince a listener that an explanation is sound, does the speaker place the grounds and justifications for the explanation before or after the explanation? Furthermore, what effect, if any, does the relative formality of the occasion or the relative spontaneity of the answer have upon the way the information is presented and the order in which it is sequenced in MSC?

(iii) Sequence and requesting

Scollon and Scollon (1991) have observed that, in Asian conversation, a series of lesser topics are mentioned before the main topic. The study will consider to what extent a similar phenomenon exists in a genre of informal written Chinese - letters of

request - and seek to discover principles of information sequencing at work within the genre.

(iv) Sequence and induction

The study will seek preferred methods of reasoning in Chinese. Several scholars (Oliver 1962) (Tyler and Davies 1990) (Samovar and Porter 1991) have argued that 'Asian' reasoning is 'inductive' while 'Western' reasoning is 'deductive'. The study will analyse examples of Chinese reasoning to see whether the preferred method of Chinese reasoning can be classified as 'indirect' and inductive. Linguistic features and cultural factors - such as the effect that hierarchical relationships between speakers and hearers have upon the order in which information is presented - will be taken into consideration.

4 The data

The data used in this study almost entirely comprises naturally occurring authentic Chinese. It includes:

a) Some 5 hours of transcripts that I made of audio tapes representing three Mainland Chinese press conferences and the question and answer session of a seminar given in MSC at the Australian National University by a speaker from Mainland China. This data forms the basis for the analysis of extended spoken persuasive discourse which is carried out in chapter 3.

b) 40 letters of request written by Mainland Chinese to Radio Australia. These form the basis for the analysis of the informal written genre carried out in chapter 4. They are also cited, where relevant, in chapter 2.

c) The writings of the Chinese scholars that have been consulted in this study. This formal written style provides data for the sequencing of clauses in complex

sentences analysed in chapter 2. In addition to their actual writing, some of the examples they use are also cited. It is possible that some of these examples under consideration by the Chinese scholars were made up by them and so do not represent naturally occurring Chinese.

d) Examples of Chinese reasoning, both classical and contemporary, analysed in chapter 5.

Details about each set of data and what it represents are given in the relevant chapters. Where feasible, the data is presented in this way: the Chinese character version is followed by the pinyin, which is glossed. The translation occurs after the gloss. However, when the data is represented by large chunks of discourse, as in chapter 3, or by entire texts, as in chapter 4, the Chinese character versions of the data are not included in the text but can be found in appendices 1 and 2 respectively.

5 Organisation

The argument put forward in this study follows these stages. In Chapter 1, a brief review of relevant research on information sequence in sentences by both Western and Chinese scholars is presented. Specifically, the work of Chao Yuanren (1968), Lu Shuxiang (1942/1990), Li and Thompson (1981), Tai (1985) and Young (1986) is summarised and discussed. In chapter 2, complex sentences in Chinese ('piānzhèng fùjù') are analysed with reference to the work of several Chinese scholars. In chapter 3, the information sequencing of extended spoken MSC discourse is analysed while in chapter 4 the analysis of Chinese letters of requests is presented. Preferred Chinese methods of reasoning are examined in chapter 5 and suggestions for this preference, both linguistic and cultural are provided. In chapter 6, the concluding chapter, the main findings of the study are summarised and a contrast with these and English is made. A discussion concerning the implications of the differences between MSC and English conclude the chapter and the study.

6 Caveats

Two caveats need to be stressed. The first is that almost all the MSC data used in this study is taken from speakers and writers from Mainland China. This has been deliberate as I wanted to restrict the data base, as far as possible, to one standard of MSC. As Bradley (1992) shows, Chinese is a pluricentric language and the Chinese of Singapore, Taiwan and the Mainland contain important differences. This is not to suggest, however, that the MSC(s) spoken by Mainland Chinese represents some 'monolithic' standard. Nor is it to say that Mainland Chinese MSC has suffered no external influence - indeed it will be argued in chapter 2 that the influence of Western languages upon certain genres of mainland MSC has been significant. As with English, there are many varieties of MSC spoken both across the world and within Mainland China. The caveat also warns that while some of the findings of this study may be true of other Chinese dialects such as Cantonese, no such generalisability is being claimed by this study.

The second caveat is highlighted by the already frequent use of the word 'preferred' in this study. No claims that MSC only sequences information in one way and no other will be made. Rather, it will be argued that MSC, although possessing preferred and unmarked sequences also has a wide range of options available to it.

7 Potential applications

The main emphasis of this study concerns commonly occurring discourse patterns with a particular focus on information sequencing across a number of discourse levels and genres. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be useful in helping to explain and thus remedy problems of cross cultural 'miscommunication' of the type mentioned earlier in this introduction that occur in interactions between speakers of MSC and English speakers. In addition, we hope that the findings of this study will prove helpful for translators and interpreters. Finally, it is hoped that the findings of this study will be useful for language and culture teaching and provide

insights both for those involved in the learning of Chinese by English speakers and in the learning of English by Chinese speakers.

8 Notation conventions

The notation conventions used are as follows:

A: Aspect (excluding experiential)
 BA: Ba construction
 Cl: Classifier
 COM: Comparison
 E: Emphatic
 EXP: Experiential (aspect)
 FUT: Future
 HON: Honorific Form
 M: Modifier
 N: Negative
 NOM: Nominaliser
 P: Particle
 Pl: Plural
 R: Resultative Complement

/ indicates a pause

{?} indicates that the speaker's word(s) are indistinct at this point on the tape.

o when placed in front of a token indicates that it was not used overtly in the text. For example:

o BECAUSE means no 'because' connector was used.

± when placed in front of a token indicates that its use is optional. For example:

± BECAUSE means the use of the 'because' connector is optional.

Superscript ⁿ means more than one. For example:

Becauseⁿ means that the 'because' connector controls more than one reason.

Chapter 1. Information Sequence and Sentence Structure

Introduction

In this chapter we first briefly review and analyse the proposed relationships between the following binary distinctions in an attempt to discover concepts suitable for the analysis in this study:

given information vs new information and theme vs rheme.

grounds / subordinate clause vs main statement / main clause

topic vs comment

After a review of these relationships we then look at information sequence and sentence structure in MSC and review how a number of Chinese scholars have analysed sentence structure in Chinese. We then propose that certain sentences in MSC traditionally analysed as following a topic - comment sequence, particularly those with sentence initial adverbial clauses (Chao 1968) are, in fact, exhibiting the principle of modifier - modified sequence rather than the topic - comment sequence. In this context, we discuss the work of Tai (1975, 1985) and then consider the typological parameter of Principle Branching Direction. The chapter concludes with an analysis of Young (1986) as we propose that the modifier - modified relation better accounts for her data than the topic - comment relation that she suggests.

1.1 Given / old - new information

The definition of 'given information' and 'new information' has been the subject of debate among linguists. For example, Prince (1982) has shown that the notion 'given' has been defined differently by different linguists. Halliday (1967) describes 'given' as presenting information that is recoverable from some source or another and 'new' information as information that is not recoverable from the preceding discourse. This is a notion of 'givenness' that Prince describes as having predictability.

For Chafe (1976), on the other hand, 'given' information represents knowledge that the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance and 'new' information is information that the speaker assumes is not in the consciousness of the hearer. Prince attributes this type of 'givenness' with having a sense of saliency which she describes :

"**Givenness:** The speaker assumes that the hearer has or could appropriately have some particular thing/entity/...in his/her CONSCIOUSNESS at the time of hearing the utterance." (p 228)

A third type of givenness is represented by Clark and Haviland (1977). They call information the speaker believes the listener already knows and accepts as true as 'given'. 'New' information, on the other hand, is information that the speaker thinks that the hearer does not already know. Prince describes this type of 'givenness' in the sense of shared knowledge.

Prince, herself, proposes the term 'assumed familiarity' to replace the binary distinction between given and new. She describes a taxonomy of 'assumed familiarity' that is much more sophisticated than the simple 'given - new' division. For example, she distinguishes between 'brand new' where the hearer has to create a completely new entity and 'unused' where the hearer has the knowledge of the entity but has not needed to refer to it in the discourse until it is introduced by the speaker. So the italicised NP's in these examples taken from Prince are 'brand new' and 'unused' respectively.

A guy I work with says he knows your sister. ('brand new')

Noam Chomsky went to Penn.(unused, at least among linguists etc)(p 233).

Prince further divides the concept of 'brand new' into 'anchored' and 'unanchored' where an 'anchored' discourse entity is linked to some other discourse entity so that '*A guy I work with*' is 'brand new anchored' as the '*a guy*' is linked in the hearer's mind with '*I*'. In contrast, the italicised NP in '*I got on a bus yesterday*' is 'brand new unanchored'.

While Prince's taxonomy of 'assumed familiarity' is more developed than the 'given - new' distinction, it is complex. (I have only reviewed her distinctions within

'new' information but 'given' information is also divided into two types - 'inferrable' and 'evoked' - which themselves are further subdivided). In addition, the differing definitions of 'given' and 'new' summarised above make the concepts difficult to work with. For example, Prideaux (1989) has found that it was sometimes difficult to decide between given and new in his analysis of novels in English.

A further problem with the given - new distinction is that many complex sentences contain information that is only really new as in 'Several people got sick because they ate the oysters in this restaurant last week.' In certain situations it is clearly often impossible to determine from the text alone which information is given and which is new as only the people actually engaged in the conversation at the time can know this. As Brown and Yule have pointed out, information status is determined "not by the structure of discourse but by the speaker". (1983 p 189).

This leads to treatments of 'given' and 'new' as 'presupposition' and 'assertion'. What is presupposed by the speaker can, in certain circumstances, be determined from the text. For example in (1a), taken from Sperber and Wilson (1986), the information that Bill has a twin sister is presupposed or treated as given, whereas in (1b) it is asserted or treated as new.

- (1a) Bill's twin sister lives in Berlin.
- (1b) Bill has a twin sister who lives in Berlin. (p 202)

Similarly, whether the hearer accepts the speaker's presupposition can also be determined from the text. In (2a) the hearer accepts the presupposition that Bill has a twin sister, whereas in (2b) he questions it.

- (2a) How long has she lived there?
- (2b) I didn't know Bill had a twin sister.

For the objectives of this study, it was found in a preliminary analysis that it was sometimes very difficult to distinguish satisfactorily between 'given' and 'new' in

MSC. We have therefore chosen not to try to describe information primarily in terms of 'given' and 'new'.

1.2 Theme - rheme

In Halliday's analysis, (1967) the unit that comes first in a clause is called the theme. It is assigned initial position in the clause and all that follows is called the rheme. His definition of theme, however, is very similar to the definitions of topic considered below and it seems to encompass two notions as "what is being talked about" is equated with "the point of departure for the clause as message".

"The theme is what is being talked about, the point of departure for the clause as message." (p 212).

We shall meet this apparent contradiction of a theme being two qualitatively different entities in the discussion of topic and comment later in the chapter.

1.3 Grounds / subordinate clause - main statement / main clause

In his analysis of subordination in English, Winter (1982) has argued that the role of adverbial clauses is to present the basis for the deduction or conclusion in the main clause. In working out the "knownness" or "taken-for grantedness" of the information in the adverbial clause, Winter divides the sources of information for the adverbial clause into three kinds: a) the information already known outside the text by the readers; b) what is taken for granted as true; c) information that is traced back to a preceding topic. (p 117) In his analysis, clause sequence is not relevant as far as information sequence goes as "no matter what the sequence of the adverbial clause is, it still signals the basis for which the main clause is deduction." (p 118).

There is an apparent contradiction here between Winter's claim, Clark and Clark's (1977) suggestion that unmarked clause order in complex sentences in English is main clause to subordinate clause and Sperber and Wilson's observation (1986) that it is natural for given information to come before new. Sperber and Wilson's observation reflects Halliday's argument that there is a "partial congruence" between

'given ' and 'new' and 'theme' and 'rheme'. In Halliday's view there is a tendency towards left to right organisation with "given, if present, preceding new".(1967 p 205).The contradiction is that if subordinate clauses contain given or known information and the main clauses contain new information, as Winter argues, and if the unmarked order in complex sentences in English is main to subordinate, as Clark and Clark suggest, this would give an unmarked order in English of new to given rather than given to new as suggested by Halliday.

Winter does, however, argue that front or end position of the adverbial clauses is significant for the type of reasoning being engaged in. He sums up the difference between front and end position of the adverbial clause:

"With front-position, the emphasis is on deductive reasoning; with end-position the emphasis is on inductive reasoning."(p 118).

While accepting the basic point that Winter is making here, I propose a different perspective. Rather than being deductive as suggested by Winter, it could be argued that adverbial clauses placed before the main clause signal inductive reasoning, as inductive reasoning proceeds from example or grounds to conclusion, and in Winter's analysis, the adverbial clause contains the grounds and the main clause contains the conclusion. By the same argument, therefore, placing the main clause before the adverbial or subordinate clause, would signal deductive reasoning rather than Winter's inductive , as the main clause contains the conclusion and occurs first. In this study, the term inductive will be taken to mean presenting a series of specific examples or grounds leading up to a conclusion and deductive reasoning will be taken to mean presenting the main point or thesis at the beginning of the argument and then backing up the argument with a series of examples or grounds¹.

It will be argued that clause sequence in MSC complex sentences of the type that comprise adverbial clauses and main or principal clauses is of extreme significance for information sequencing as sentence initial adverbial clauses can set the framework

¹The distinction between inductive and deductive reasoning is treated in chapter 5.

for the main clause or present the "basis" for the main clause; and we shall argue that their function here is a modifying one for the proposition in the main clause.

The role of an adverbial clause in setting the framework for the main clause also appears in Li and Thompson's discussion on the semantics of conditional sentences. A conditional sentence is one that "sets the conditions under which another proposition would be true." (1981 p 646). Haiman (1978) argues along similar lines when he says:

"conditionals, like topics, are givens which constitute the frame of reference with respect to which the main clause is either true (if a proposition), or felicitous (if not)." (p 564).

Haiman argues that conditionals are topics in the sense that topics provide the given or old information in the sentence and he provides this definition of topic:

"The topic represents an entity whose existence is agreed upon by the speaker and his audience. As such, it constitutes the framework which has been selected for the following discourse." (p 585).

He argues that this definition of topic and the following definition of conditional "define identical categories." (p 585).

"A conditional clause is (perhaps only hypothetically) a part of the knowledge shared by the speaker and his listener. As such, it constitutes the framework which has been selected for the following discourse." (p 583)

The definition of topic here is incorporating two things. It is defined as both representing an entity and constituting a framework. Conditionals, on the other hand, in Haiman's definition, merely constitute a framework.² We prefer to argue that, as a topic represents an entity and a conditional constitutes a framework, conditionals are, therefore, not topics. We develop this argument in the next section of this chapter. Furthermore, as we shall see in the next section, the equation of topics with given information, as proposed by Haiman above, has been questioned (Reinhart 1982).

²It is hard to see how the "entity" that Haiman refers to in his definition of topic can be in an identical category to "a part of the knowledge shared by the speaker and listener" that he refers to in his definition of conditional.

1.4 Topic - comment

1.4.1 Topic as 'What the sentence is about'

Hockett (1958) draws a link between topic and comment and predicative constructions, suggesting that topic and comment generally characterise the immediate constituents (ICs) of these constructions. "The speaker announces a topic and then says something about it." (p 201). In discussing Chinese, however, Hockett points out that many Chinese comments themselves consist of both a topic and a comment. In this way, a Chinese sentence can be built up of predication within predication. Hockett's example of this is:

我今天城里有事

Wo jintian cheng-li you shi.

I today town-in have thing

I have business in town today. (p 202)

As Hockett points out, the topic 'wǒ' can be deleted leaving the sentence 'Jīntiān chénglǐ yǒu shì' where, in Hockett's view, 'jīntiān' now becomes the topic. Similarly, the sentence can be further reduced to 'chénglǐ yǒu shì' where 'chénglǐ', in the town, becomes the topic. Even 'yǒu shì', there is business, which has no topic, can stand as a complete sentence. The relationship between topic and comment is much looser, syntactically, therefore, than the relationship between subject and predicate.

Li and Thompson (1976) classify Chinese as a topic prominent language, that is, a language in which the basic structure of sentences favours a description in which the grammatical relation 'topic-comment' plays a major role.³ In defining topic, Li and Thompson say that the topic of a sentence "is what the sentence is about."

"It always comes first in a sentence and it always refers to something about which the speaker assumes the person listening to the utterance has some knowledge." (1981 p 15).

³Topic prominent languages are contrasted with a) subject prominent languages where the grammatical relation subject-predicate plays the major role; b) languages that are both subject prominent and topic prominent, and c) languages that are neither subject prominent nor topic prominent.

They therefore use both syntactic and semantic criteria in their definition of topic. As an example of a topic-comment sentence, they give:

- (3) 这棵树叶子很大
Zhe-ke shu yezi hen da
This-Cl tree leaf very big

This tree, (its) leaves are very big. (p 15)

Topic is here distinguished from subject by stressing that 'zhè-kē shù' is the topic and has no direct semantic relation with the verb. 'Yèzi', however, is the subject as it is the one that is very big.⁴

They also say that the topic must either be definite or generic and further define topic as "typically a noun phrase (or verb phrase) that names what the sentence is about, is definite or generic, occurs in sentence initial position, and may be followed by a pause or pause particle." (1981 p 87).

1.4.2 Topics as sentence frames

Although Li and Thompson say that topics are typically noun or verb phrases, they later argue that sentence initial time and locative phrases should also be seen as topics. For example:

- (4a) 那年他 很紧张
nei nian ta hen jinzhang (p 95)
that year he (was) very anxious
- (4b) 信封里 装不进 这些 照片
Xinfeng-li zhuang bu jin zhe xie zhaopian
Envelope-in fit N enter this several photo

These photos won't fit in this envelope. (p 95)

Li and Thompson classify these time and locative phrases ('nèi nián' and 'xìnfēng-lǐ' respectively) as topics because:

⁴Chao Yuanren gives a sentence with two 'comment' clauses: 'Zhè-kē shù yèzi dà, huā shǎo' (This tree, leaves big, flowers few) (1968 p 97).

Li and Thompson classify these time and locative phrases ('nei nian' and 'xinfeng-li' respectively) as topics because:

"they set the frame within which the rest of the sentence is presented, they are definite, referring to places and times about which the hearer already knows, and they may be followed by a pause particle." (p 95).

There is a difference here, however, and I suggest a significant one, between this definition of topic and the one given earlier. Earlier, topic has been defined as "what the sentence is about" (p 15) and "names what the sentence is all about" (p 87). Here, however, topics "set the frame within which the sentence is presented."

There is, surely, a qualitative difference between something that states what the sentence is about and something that sets the frame within which the sentence is presented. It is hard to argue that 'in the envelope' is what this sentence is about. 'In the envelope' *is*, however, arguably setting the frame within which the sentence is being presented. If we can accept that it may be setting the frame but is definitely not what the sentence is about, then we have to conclude that Li and Thompson are trying to classify two qualitatively different things as the same thing. This gives rise to a problem in sentence topic identification. For example, following Li and Thompson, the topic of (5a) is 'this year' not 'this tree' whereas in 3 it was 'this tree'. Intuitively, however, (5a) is 'about' the tree.

- (5a) 今年, 这棵树叶子很大了
Jinnian, zhe-ke shu, yezi hen da-le
This year, this-C tree, leaf very big-A

This year, the leaves on the tree have become large.

In the same way, we have difficulty identifying the topic in (5b), although Li and Thompson would say that 'that year' is the topic as in (4a) above.

- (5b) 那年 考试他很紧张
Neinian, kaoshi, ta hen jinzhang.
That year, exams, he very anxious

He was very anxious about his exams that year.

Intuitively, however, (5b) is about 'exams' and its topic should be 'exams', therefore, and not 'that year'.

prominent languages provide the "frame within which the sentence holds" (p 51) and that they set "a spatial, temporal or individual framework within which the main predication holds".(p 50).

Again we meet the problem of two qualitatively different concepts being defined as if they were the same thing.

Her (1991) proposes that topic should not be defined semantically but should "strictly refer to a syntactic notion" and that "the topic of a sentence, being always preverbal and before the subject, usually encodes the semantic/discoursal frame."(p 4-5). He then argues that the semantic relation between subject (topic) and predicate (comment) in Chinese is that of *frame* and comment. In other words, Chafe's definition of topic quoted above, now becomes, in Her's analysis, a definition of *frame*, with the term topic being reserved for its grammatical function. This however, still leaves the problem of the definition of these frames, which are encoded by topics. Frame is now semantically defined as topic was defined. Again we have two distinct and different definitions for what is purported to be the same concept. The problems associated with the semantic definition of topic now surface for the semantic definition of frame.

The problem of topic definition gets even more complex. Chao Yuanren⁵ categorises all temporal, locative, and concessive, causal and conditional clauses as subjects (topics) (1968 p 120). Among his reasons for classifying all these clauses as subjects are that they can have a pause after them and before the principal clause; and that they occur at the beginning of sentences unless they are an afterthought. As will be shown in chapter 2, however, these clauses may occur after their principal clauses for a number of reasons, of which being an afterthought is only one, so they are not as restricted to sentence initial position as suggested by Chao. Chao's acknowledgement that these adverbial clauses are not the principal clauses in these sentences suggests their role is more a modifying one for the principal clause rather than being topics. Thus, for our purposes, we will adopt this notion and not classify them here as topics.

⁵We discuss Chao Yuanren's work in more detail below.

1.4.3 Topics and 'Pragmatic aboutness'

Reinhart (1982) argues that the topic of a given sentence is determined both by linguistic structure and by pragmatic considerations. Yet, despite the attention given to the notion of topic by linguists "there is no accepted definition of it".(p 53).

There are, following Reinhart, two main approaches to the study of topic. One defines topic as what the sentence is about; the second defines it as the expression representing old information. Furthermore, these two definitions of topics are often used interchangeably. In other words, what the sentence is about is assumed to be the referent for old information. However, Reinhart argues that topics cannot be defined in terms of old information. She uses the example below to demonstrate this:

(The speaker has been talking about the fact that his grandson is difficult to please. He gives as an example oatmeal cereal.)

"And its got good taste. It's good. And the cereal, grandma don't like cereal but she finished (it) to the last (dish). And I enjoy ... I like it too. It's tasty! And I uh ..*He didn't want the cereal. (he) doesn't eat (it).* I said "Todd it wouldn't kill ya, taste it!"(p 73).

The sentence topic of the first sentences is the cereal. This is highlighted by its "left dislocation" or preposing at the beginning of the third sentence. Yet the topic of the italicised sentence is not the old information of cereal. '*He*', the topic of the sentence, refers to the speaker's grandson. Note that Reinhart is dealing with sentence topics and not discourse topics. This example, however, merely shows that referents for old information need not be topics. It does not show that referents for new information can be topics. For '*He*', the topic of the italicised sentence is also the discourse topic. It is therefore not a referent for new information.

Another example provided by Reinhart, however, does show that the referent for new information, which thus cannot be called topic by the old information criterion, seems to be the topic following the 'aboutness' criterion. The referent in question is italicised.

"When she was five years old *a child of my acquaintance* announced a theory that she was inhabited by rabbits." (p 66).

'*A child of my acquaintance*' is obviously new information yet it seems to be what the sentence is about.

In view of the problems in defining topics as old information, Reinhart therefore proposes that they should be defined in terms of "pragmatic aboutness". (p 78). This requires, among other things, that the background and purpose of the utterance need to be taken into consideration.

Let us now suggest, therefore, that when something is what the sentence is 'about', it can be called a topic. But when something merely sets the frame within which the sentence is presented, we shall not here call it a topic. Time phrases, locative phrases and adverbial clauses, therefore, will not here be classified as topics, even though they occur at the beginning of the sentences.

We now turn to the analysis of information sequence in Chinese sentence structure by Chinese scholars.

1.5 Information sequence in Chinese sentences

1.5.1 Topic - comment equated with subject - predicate

The 'Ma Shi Wen Tong' by Ma Jianzhong (1845 - 1900) is considered by many to be the first Chinese study of Chinese grammar (Zhang Dihua et al 1986). It was published towards the end of the 19th century. While most of the book is concerned with the analysis of language at the level of the word, the final chapter discusses sentences. Importantly, however, it is clear that Ma was heavily influenced by Western grammars, especially those of Latin and English. Indeed, Peverelli points out that Ma's grammar "was completely modelled on the Latin school grammar." (1981 p 165). This explains why, even though his data is taken from classical Chinese, Ma describes sentences as having subject (qǐ cí 起詞), verb (dòng cí 動詞) and object (zhǐ cí 止詞). This use of Western grammatical terms to describe Chinese grammar was to meet with criticism from certain Chinese linguists as we shall see later in this section.

In his analysis of Chinese sentence structure, Chao (1968) says that Chinese sentences are made ^{up} of subject and predicate, but goes on to say that the "grammatical meaning of subject and predicate in a Chinese sentence is topic and comment, rather than actor and action". (p 69). Although actor and action do occur they can be classified as topic and comment, as in the sentence 'Gǒu yǎo rén', (Dog bites man). Therefore, when Chao defines subject as the subject matter to be talked about and predicate as what the speaker comments on when a subject is presented to be talked about, it can be assumed that he would also define topic and comment in these terms.

Chao states that most Chinese grammarians divide full sentences - ie those that have a subject (topic) - predicate (comment) structure - into narrative, descriptive and judgement sentences. Chao points out that these sentences correspond approximately to sentences that have verbal, adjectival and nominal predicates respectively. For example:

- (6a) (Narrative sentence with a NP subject or topic and a verbal predicate or comment⁶.)

那个消息早发表了
Neige xiaoxi zao fabiao-le
That news early publish-A

That news has long been published.

It is interesting that Chao classifies (6aa) below in the same way, although this looks much more like a subject - predicate sentence than (6a).

- (6aa) 人人都知道这件事
ren ren dou zhidao zhe-jian shi
people all know this-Cl thing

Everybody knows this.

⁶In these examples, taken from Chao, the subjects/topics are all NP's. However, as later examples will show, he does not restrict topics to NP's alone.

- (6b) (A descriptive sentence with a NP subject/topic and an adjectival predicate/comment.)

我热.

Wo re

I hot (I'm hot).

- (6c) (A judgement sentence with NP subject/topic and with a nominal predicate/comment⁷.)

这个人好人

zhe-ge ren hao ren

This-CI man good man

This is a good man.

Wang Li's analysis (1957) is similar to Chao Yuanren's, although Wang Li uses the expression 'gǔ gàn' (骨干) or backbone to describe predicate. For example, a narrative sentence is said to be a sentence that has a verb as 'gǔ gàn'. (p 91). Adjectives and nouns are the 'gǔ gàn' of descriptive and judgement sentences respectively.

1.5.2 Topic - comment distinguished from subject - predicate

Lǚ Shuxiang's analysis (1942/1990), however, differs in important ways from both Chao Yuanren's and Ma Jianzhong's. For example, Lǚ suggests four basic sentence types. They are:

Narrative (xushi ju 叙述句); declarative (biaotai ju 表态句)⁸;
judgement (panduan ju 判断句); and existential (youwu ju 有无句).

In his analysis, Lǚ also rejects the terms suggested by Ma Jianzhong (op cit) arguing that, as declarative and most judgement sentences do not have verbs, the terms used to

⁷ Zhe-ge rén shì hǎo rén (This man is a good man) is also possible and Chao would classify this as a narrative sentence rather than a judgement sentence, as its predicate/comment is now seen as a verbal predicate rather than as a nominal one.

⁸ This is Chao's descriptive sentence. A major problem in any discussion on the work of Chinese linguists and grammarians is that, in many contexts, there is no standardisation of terms. For example, Wang Li's term for a narrative sentence is 'xùshù jù' (叙述句). Chao may have taken his terms from Wang Li who has 'miáoxiè jù' (描写句) - descriptive sentence and 'pànduan jù' - judgement sentence. (1957 p 91)

describe subject and object are only appropriate in the description of narrative sentences. They are thus inappropriate for describing the sentence components of other sentences. So, in rejecting the terms 'qǐ cí' (subject) 'dòng cí' (verb) and 'zhǐ cí' (object) except to describe subject verb and object in narrative SVO sentences in Chinese as in 'Māo zhuō lǎoshǔ' (Cats catch mice), Lü is, in effect, highlighting the inappropriacy of these terms for SVO for describing all but narrative sentences in Chinese. In contrast, according to Lü, declarative and judgement sentences are made up of two parts. These two parts are a 'what' (shénme 什么) and another what (shénme) or a 'what about it' (zěnmeyàng 怎么样). For example, (7) is a sentence that is made up of 4 declarative sentences juxtaposed one after the other, 4 'whats' followed by 4 'what about its'.

- (7) 山 清 水 秀 柳 暗 花 明
 Shan qing, shui xiu, liu an, hua ming. (p 55).
 Mountain clear, water excellent, willow green, flower bright

The mountains and waters are beautiful and the willows and flowers lush and in bloom.

In this sentence Lü does not call the four NP's (mountain, water, willow, flower) subjects (qi ci) but uses another term 'zhǔyǔ' (主语). The adjectives are called 'wèiyǔ' (谓语). These terms, 'zhǔyǔ' and wèiyǔ are now commonly translated as subject and predicate respectively, but, in my view, they could be translated as topic and comment in the context in which they are used above by Lü, with the topic being the 'shénme' or what and the comment the 'zěnmeyàng' or what about it.⁹

Lü therefore distinguishes the subject of an SVO narrative sentence ('qǐ cí') from the zhǔyǔ or topic of declarative and judgement sentences. Further evidence that Lü sees the subject of narrative sentences ('qǐ cí') as being conceptually different from 'zhǔyǔ' comes from his analysis of (10). (1990 p 35).

⁹ Lü actually preferred the terms 'jù tóu' (句头) and 'jù shēn' (句身) or sentence head and sentence body but chose not to use them as they were not in current use (1990 p 54).

- (8) 这件事我记得, 而且很清楚
 Zhe-jian shi wo jide, erqie hen qingchu
 This-CI thing I remember, moreover very clear

I not only remember this but remember it very clearly.

In his analysis, the 'zhǔyǔ' of this sentence is 'this thing' and it is also, as Lü points out, the object or 'zhǐ cí'. By saying that an object 'zhǐ cí' can be a 'zhǔyǔ', Lü is clearly distinguishing 'zhǔyǔ' from subject ('qǐ cí'). His argument is that a declarative and judgement sentences are not SVO but follow a 'zhǔyǔ-wèiyǔ' structure, which I have translated as a topic-comment structure in this context. As he points out:

"we shouldn't model ourselves on English and take these words as subjects but might as well, when dealing with these subjectless existential sentences call them the 'zhuyu' (or topic)". (p 64-65).

This reflects the rejection of English terms for Chinese grammar. As we mentioned earlier, there was a reaction against the adoption of Western grammatical terms and the imitation of Western models in the analysis of Chinese grammar as in Ma Jianzhong's 'Ma Shi Wen Tong'. For example, writing in the late 1930's, Zhang Shiliu says that the 'Ma Shi Wen Tong':

"should be overthrown" and "We should start again to create a system of Chinese grammar based on the essential characteristics of Chinese grammar." (1958 p 69).

Lü continues his analysis of Chinese sentences with the fourth sentence type, the 'youwu ju' or existential sentence.¹⁰ This can occur with or without a subject ('qǐ cí'). (9) is an example of a subject-less existential sentence.

- (9) 有人于此
 You ren yu ci (p 64)
 have person here

There's a person here.

¹⁰This sentence type is also known as a 'cúnzài jù' (存在句) (existing sentence).

Lǚ argues that this sentence should not be analysed as though person was the subject ('qǐ cí') of 'you' but more like its object ('zhǐ cí'). Even when these NP's precede the verb, as in (10) below, they cannot be considered subjects (qǐ cí).

- (10) 晚饭有了, 可送不送
 wan fan you-le, ke song bu song? (p 65)
 evening food have-A, may bring N bring?

Supper's ready, can I bring it?

In his analysis of existential sentences with subjects, Lǚ distinguishes three types - those with 'possessive' subjects (lǐngshǔ 领属); sentences with time place ('shí dì' 时地) subjects, and those with 'denominator' subjects ('fēnmǔ' 分母). An example of each of these sentences is provided by (11a), (11b) and (11c)

- (11a) 我有一本书
 Wo you yi-ben shu (p 67)
 I have one-Cl book

I have a book.(possessive)

- (11b) 一九三一年有一次大水灾
 yi jiu san i nian you yi-ci da shuizai (p 66)
 1 9 3 1 year have one-Cl big flood

There was a great flood in 1931.(time/place)

Here, Lǚ classifies the date 1931 as being a 'quasi' subject ('zhǔn qǐ cí' 准起词). 'Roses' in (11c) is also similarly classified as a 'pseudo' subject ('jiǎ xìng qǐ cí' 假性起词).

- (11c) 玫瑰花有红的有白的
 Mei gui hua you hong-de you bai-de (p 66)
 Rose flower have red-M have white-M

There are red and white roses.(denominating)

Hu Fu and Wen Lian (1957) also distinguish 4 types of sentences in Chinese (p 110 ff). The first they call nominal predicate sentences (míng cí wèiyǔ jù 名词谓语句) as in 'Jīntiān guó qīng rì', 'Today (is) National Day'. Interestingly, they also include sentences that contain the copula 'shì' as in 'wǒ shì xuéshēng' 'I am (a) student'. Like Chao, however, they distinguish sentences with adjectival predicates from those with

verbal predicates. They therefore distinguish 'tā tài háiziqì', 's/he (is) too childish' from 'tā nǔlì xuéxí', 's/he studies very hard'.

They also identify a fourth sentence type which they call a 'zhǔyǔ wèiyǔ jù' (主谓谓语句) which can be translated as subject-predicate but which I prefer to translate in this context as topic-comment. (12) is their example of such a sentence where 'Zhōngguó', China, is the 'zhǔyǔ'.

- (12) 中国地大物博
Zhongguo di da wu bo (p 112)
China land large things many

China is large and has an abundance of 'things'.¹¹

They argue that 'zhǔyǔ' can only be defined according to both structural and semantic criteria. The structural criterion is that of position in the sentence, but this alone is not enough. Otherwise, in their view, the following sentence could be incorrectly analysed as having 'we' ('wǒmen') as its 'zhǔyǔ'.

- (13) 我们学校开学了
women xuexiao kai-xue-le (p 114)
we school open study-A

Our school has opened.

In addition to positional criteria, therefore, semantic criteria have to be considered. They summarise the semantic definitions of 'zhǔyǔ' and 'wèiyǔ': "zhǔyǔ (dùixiàng) states the object of the sentence while the 'wèiyǔ' explains what the sentence is about." (p 113).

They then pose the question whether time and locative phrases that occur at the beginning of sentences can be classified as their 'zhǔyǔ', as they occur at the beginning

¹¹Chao Yuanren (op cit) classifies this sentence as an example of a sentence that has a predicate which is itself a full subject - predicate sentence. 'Zhōngguó', in Chao's analysis, is the main subject, while 'dì' and 'wù' are both clause subjects.

of the sentence. Their answer to this is sometimes. For example, they argue that the time phrase in (14a) is a 'zhǔyǔ' but it isn't in (14b), as in (14b) 'afternoon' does not explain what the sentence is about but is rather a 'modifying phrase' ('xiūshì yǔ' 修饰语).

(p 116).

- (14a) 一九五二年快过去了
yī jiǔ wǔ èr nián kuài guò qu le
1 9 5 2 year quick-pass go-A

1952 went quickly.

- (14b) 下午我们开会
Xiawu women kai hui
Afternoon we open meeting

We'll have a meeting this afternoon.

This analysis of the adverbial performing a modifying function is interesting. Hu and Wen are saying that certain types of adverbial that occur sentence initially are not topics but modifiers of some sort. They give (15) as a further example of a sentence initial adverbial that is functioning as a modifier and not as a topic.

- (15) 后来又来了许多人
Houlai you lai-le xuduo ren (p 117)
Afterwards also come-A many people

Afterwards more people came.

In this sentence, according to Hu and Wen, 'hòulái' functions as a modifier 'xiūshì yǔ'. In their view, position alone is therefore insufficient for identifying sentence topics. Semantic criteria also have to be considered.

1.6 Topic - comment or modifier - modified

Perhaps the distinction being made between topics that are what the sentence is about and adverbial clauses that set the frame for the sentence will be made clearer by considering (16), (3) and (17) below. (16) and (3) are taken from Li and Thompson. (op cit p 15).

- (16) 张 三 我 已 经 见 过 了

Zhangsan wo yijing jian-guo-le
Zhangsan I already see-EXP-A

Zhangsan, I've already seen him

- (3) 这 棵 树 叶 子 很 大

Zhe-ke shu yezi hen da
This-CI tree leaf very big

This tree, (its) leaves are very big.

The topic in both these sentences can be identified without controversy. In (16) the topic is 'Zhangsan' and in (3) the topic is 'zhè-kē shù'. It makes sense to say that these topics are what their respective sentences are about.

Two further points are of interest here. The first is that both these sentences have subjects as well as topics and that these are also easy to identify. In (16) the subject is 'wǒ' and in (3) it is 'yèzi'. The second point is that both subjects, 'wǒ' and 'yèzi' have a semantic relationship with the verbs and with the topics of these sentences. But their semantic relationship with their topics is different. The relationship between 'wǒ' and 'Zhangsan' is one between actor and patient, and Zhangsan looks like an example of what Foley and Van Valin call the "preposed topic construction (PTC) of topicalisation" (1984 p 130). In the other example of a PTC, the relationship between 'shù' and 'yèzi', however, is not one of actor to patient but of whole to part, where the leaf is part of the larger whole.¹²

Now let us consider (17), which is a cause-effect 'piānzhèng fùjù' complex sentence.

- (17) 因 为 风 太 大 所 以 比 赛 改 期 了
yinwei feng tai da, suoyi bisai gaiqi-le
because wind too big, therefore competition change time-A

Because the wind was too strong, the competition was postponed.

This sentence is not about the strength of the wind, in the same way that (16) was about Zhangsan or (3) was about the tree. Despite its place at the beginning of the

¹²Foley and Van Valin's Mandarin example of a PTC also displays a whole - part relationship between topic and subject. 'Nèi-xiē shù shùshēn dà, Those trees, their trunks (are) big' (p 129).

sentence and despite Chao's assertion that causal clauses are all subjects (topics), it is argued here that, by semantic criteria, this initial adverbial clause cannot be the topic. Surely the topic in this sentence, with topic being defined as what the sentence is about, is the competition?

It is suggested therefore that (17) is not a topic-comment sentence like (16) and (3). It is, rather, a sentence whose principal clause is preceded by a clause that sets the framework for it and it follows a modifier - modified sequence. The sentence structure of this sentence is not topic-comment, therefore, but modifier-modified or subordinate-main, as indeed is acknowledged by the Chinese term for these complex sentences 'piānzhèng fùjù'. The 'yīnwei' adverbial clause is, as Winter has argued for English, providing some information that helps explain the proposition in the main clause. It is acting in subordinate relationship to the main clause and is following a subordinate-main sequence, a fact, it will be argued, of great importance for the sequencing of information in MSC.

1.7 MSC and modifier - modified sequencing

Further evidence that MSC exhibits a modifying - modified sequence is provided by Tai (1975). While arguing that the word order of locatives in Chinese can be explained in terms of their semantic function¹³, Tai points out that both preverbal and post-verbal locatives were placed after the main verb in classical Chinese. However, prior to the word order change that affected locatives, Tai states that classical Chinese had already exhibited the feature of modifier preceding head in that relative

¹³Pre-verbal locatives denote the locations of actions and states of affairs while post-verbal locatives denote the locations of participants of actions. For example 'zai yinhang-li' (*in the bank*) indicates the location where the agent took the action of depositing the money in the first example, but indicates the location of the money in the second example.

'ta zai yinhang-li ba qian cun-le
 he in bank-in Ba money deposit-A
 He deposited the money (when he was) inside the bank.

'ta ba qian cun zai yinhang-li
 He deposited money in the bank (Tai 1975 p 157)

clauses, possessives and adjectives all preceded nouns as they do in modern Chinese. The shift from post to preverbal locatives was patterned after this modifier - head sequence.

In a later article on word order in Chinese (1985), Tai argues for the 'Principle of Temporal Sequence' (PTS) which he defines as:

"the relative word order between two syntactic units is determined by the temporal order of the states which they represent in the conceptual world." (p 50)

For example, when 2 Chinese sentences are conjoined by certain temporal connectives, the first sentence always takes place before the second. This is exemplified in (18):

- (18) 我吃过饭, 你再打电话给我
 wo chi-guo fan, ni zai da dianhua gei wo
 I eat-A food, you then phone give me

Call me *after* I have finished the dinner. (p 50)

The constraint of temporal sequence does not operate in English as clause order is not determined by the sequence of events. Tai also shows that PTS holds in a number of other constructions in Chinese such as action - result patterns and in serial verb constructions where no overt connectors are used.¹⁴

Tai extends PTS to include the Principle of Temporal Scope (PTSC). PTSC is:

"If the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit X falls within the temporal scope of the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit Y, then the word order is YX." (p 60).

He then suggests that PTSC is part of an even more general principle in Chinese which is that constituents with a larger scope precede those with a small scope in both time and space. As an example of this he points out that the only acceptable way to

¹⁴For example, compare 'Zhangsan dao tushuguan na shu' 'Zhangsan went to the library to get a book' with 'Zhangsan na shu dao tushuguan' 'Zhangsan took the book to the library'.

report a time in Chinese is '1980 year, December, 22nd day, morning, 10 o'clock'. This 'big to small' sequence looks very much like the whole preceding part principle that operates in topic-comment constructions as in (14) above.

As Tai points out, PTS seems to suggest that the essential strategy of Chinese grammar is to knit together syntactic units according to some concrete conceptual principles. Chinese is iconic, in Tai's view, and thus presents a case where word order corresponds to thought flow "in a genuinely natural way" (p 64). Chinese word order is, therefore, in Tai's terms, natural rather than salient, where '*Because John went walking in the freezing rain he caught cold*' is in natural order but '*John caught cold because he went walking in the freezing rain*' is in salient order.

We shall be looking in detail at complex 'pīanzhèng fùjù' sentences such as these in chapter 2, but it is worth noting that the natural order in this example sentence requires that the modifying/subordinate clause precede the modified/main clause, while salient order allows the reverse.

What is of great interest in these two articles by Tai is that he has identified two criteria for sequencing in Chinese. In the second, he shows how PTS operates and that it includes the principle, that in time and space, constituents with a larger scope precede those with a small scope. I have suggested that this might also account for the whole-part principle and account for topic-comment constructions as in (14). In the first article, Tai shows that the modifying - modified sequence is exhibited in Chinese and it is argued here that it is this modifying - modified pattern that the SC to MC sequence of complex sentences follows. They are not following the topic-comment pattern.

This modifying - modified sequence is also consistent with the left branching nature of MSC. MSC is principally left branching as opposed to English which is principally right branching. The so-called Principle Branching Direction (PBD) of a language refers to structures such as relative clauses, adverbial subordinate clauses and sentence complementation and the way they are generated in relation to a head. (Flynn 1984) So, by describing MSC as a principally left branching language and English as a principally right branching language we are saying, for example, that MSC prefers a

clause sequence in complex sentences of subordinate - main, while English prefers a sequence of main - subordinate clause. This distinction between PBD is not absolute, however, and is subject to variation. For example, Japanese is also a left branching language but the clause order of subordinate clause to main clause is rigid. (Kuno 1973, Talmy 1978). As we shall see in the next chapter, MSC, in contrast to Japanese, is flexible as it allows a marked main clause - subordinate clause sequence for a number of pragmatic purposes. On the other hand, Thai, like English is a right branching language, but, like Japanese much more rigid than English, in that modifiers must follow the head. Nor is PBD easily predicted by word order. Japanese is an SOV language and is left branching. English is an SVO and principally right branching. And although there has been debate about word order in MSC (See Mallinson and Blake 1981), it has been established that MSC is more SVO than SOV. (Sun and Givon 1985) Japanese, then, is SOV and left branching. Thai is SVO and right branching. MSC is SVO and principally left branching. English is SVO and principally right branching.

This study will not go into the parameter of PBD in any depth, although we mention it again in the final chapter. Here we merely note that the left branching nature of MSC is in accordance with the modifier - modified sequencing principle of MSC.

1.8 Summary of terms

We have argued that while topic - comment is an important sentence type in MSC and is significant in determining ways of sequencing information at sentence level, it is not the only sentence type. In addition, the modifying - modified sequence, which is expressed by the subordinate clause to main clause sequence in complex sentences, is also an important information sequencing principle in MSC.

In the final section of this chapter we examine data analysed by Young (1986). We show that the principle of modifier - modified sequence better accounts for the way the information is sequenced in her data than the principle of topic - comment that Young herself proposes.

1.9 Topic - comment or modifier - modified?(2)

In her investigation into Chinese discourse, Young (1982,1986) relies primarily, but not exclusively, on data gained by recording Chinese speakers engaged in discussions in English and often in role play situations. In her stimulating study she makes several judgements about the characteristics of Chinese discourse based on this data. She suggests that the use of the pair of connectors 'because' and 'so', that occur frequently in the data, appears to play an important role in discourse sequencing and management. They signal, Young suggests, the topic-comment relationship working at the level of discourse. "Connective pairs such as 'because/as' and 'so/therefore' signal a topic-comment relationship between the parts of the ideas or events that they tie together." (1986 p 161). She also suggests that these two connectors operate the whole - part principle. However, in arguing that 'because' and 'so' signal transition in the phases of argument she says:

"The choice of 'because/as' to mark the introduction of one's case and 'so/therefore' to indicate a shift to the main point are examples of such transition markers." (p 150).

Once again, we have evidence of the notion of topic being used to describe two different concepts. On the one hand, the 'because' connector is said to signal a topic and the whole, while the 'so' connector is said to signal the comment and the part. On the other hand, the 'because' connector is said to signal the introduction of one's case and the 'so' marker signals the transition to the main point. In other words, the 'because' connector is claimed to be signalling these three items: the topic; the whole of a whole-part relationship; and the introduction of one's case. We have seen earlier that the whole of a whole-part relationship can be classified as topic.(see example (3)). But it seems that the 'because' connector that signals the "introduction to one's case" can only be signalling a topic, if topic is defined as something that sets the framework in which the rest of the sentence is presented. We propose, therefore, that the 'because' connector that introduces one's case is not signalling a topic but is signalling modifying

or subordinate information from which the proposition in the principal clause can be understood, signalled by the 'so' connector.

Let us take some of Young's data and examine whether the 'because' markers are indeed signalling topics or whether they are signalling subordinate information; and whether the 'so' markers are signalling comments or a transition to the main point. In other words, is the sequence one of subordinate/modifier to main/modified rather than one of topic-comment?

The data here "comes from an audiotaped role play enacted in Hong Kong as part of a classroom discussion among members of Hong Kong's police force" (p 190). There are five participants in the role play, one of whom is a white male, "a guest speaker to the classroom from the United States" (p 191). He plays a member of the public. The police, working in pairs, have the task of stopping the American from approaching and going into his office because there has just been a fire in the building. Below are some excerpts (see Young p 196).

(a) American: What's the matter? This is my office.

Chinese: Oh, because this on fire and this area is closed.

(b) American: Well, can you -- can you call the other officer? You call the other officer and tell him that I have to get into my office. Can you do that?

Chinese 1: I'm afraid I can't do it. I'm afraid....

Chinese 2: Or....or we suggest you uh....Because it is by the court order closed it, Close it by court order.

(c) American: But uh I have to find out what happened to my office. Uh, I--I've got to get in there.

Chinese 3: Uh, I'm sorry uh because this cl--this building is closed by court order uh I can't help you.

(d)¹⁵ American: But why...Why can't...I just want to go into my office. I have some important papers there.

Chinese 4: I'm sorry. Because the building is in a dangerous condition...

American: Well...

¹⁵This is, in fact, the sixth excerpt looked at by Young. (p 200).

Chinese 4: Nobody allowed to enter the building.

In her analysis of the data, Young suggests that the Chinese police officers are transferring their native discourse patterns into English. While this may be true, it is hard to argue that the utterances of the Chinese police are following a topic-comment structure when topic is defined as what the sentence is about. What all these 'because' initial clauses are doing is setting a framework within which to present the main point of the sentence or the principal clause of the sentence. Each of these 'because' sentences provides information that will help to explain the information in the principal clause. The information presented by the Chinese police follows, therefore, a sequence that moves from subordinate to main. What appears to be confusing the American is that he is expecting the information to follow a sequence that he is more familiar with in this context and which would be from main to subordinate. In other words, the American might have been more prepared to accept what the police were saying had they sequenced their information in the following way:

Chinese: This area is closed because it is on fire

Chinese 2: (You can't go in I'm afraid) because the building is closed by court order.

Chinese 3: I'm sorry I can't help you because this building is closed by court order.

Chinese 4: I'm sorry, nobody is allowed to enter the building because the building is in a dangerous condition.

In the original excerpts, the American is confused by the use of 'because'. As Sperber and Wilson (1986) have pointed out, the hearer anticipates possibilities for the overall structure of an utterance based on what he has already heard. In this context, the American is not expecting 'because' to signal the framework for which the principal clause can be presented. He is not expecting it to foreshadow the main point. Evidence of this is that he interrupts the Chinese policemen immediately after they have said the 'because' clause and thus does not allow them to get to the main point of what they

want to say. These points are also made by Young herself when she summarises the opinions of the American informants whom she consulted over the above interactions.

"..to issue a firm statement by beginning with a reason or qualification clause gave the statement the appearance of an afterthought and also provided an opening for the American interactant to interrupt and dispute the situation." (p 209).

So, while Young's analysis of this interaction is that the Chinese police are transferring their native discourse patterns of topic - comment to English, it is suggested here these discourse patterns are not those of topic-comment in this instance. Rather the discourse pattern being followed here appears to adhere to a subordinate - main or modifying - modified information sequence.

In the following chapters we come to the analysis of the data of Modern Standard Chinese. We shall examine the use of the Chinese 'because' and 'so' connectors ('yīnwei' and 'suǒyǐ' respectively) and consider their role in both complex sentences, discourses and texts.

1.10 Summary

In this chapter we provided a brief review of various distinctions such as 'given - new' and proposed that this distinction is difficult to establish in MSC. We have also argued that scholars have overgeneralised the definition of topic as being both 'what the sentence is about' and providing a 'frame within which the sentence holds'. We have proposed that, for the purposes of this study, the semantic definition of topic be limited to 'what a sentence is about'.

We have further argued that adverbial clauses of Chinese - in providing a framework for the main clause - are, therefore, not topics. Rather they have more of the function of a modifier for the main clause. Evidence from several scholars writing in both Chinese and English was presented in support of the proposition that this modifying - modified sequence is a fundamental unit of sequencing in Chinese. To test this, we considered some of Young's data and proposed that the modifying - modified

sequence better accounted for the information sequencing in the data than the topic-comment sequence argued for by Young herself.

In the following chapters we examine authentic Chinese data, first to establish that the preferred sequence of clauses in MSC complex sentences is subordinate clause - main clause and then to consider whether this preferred sequence operates at levels above the sentence. It is hypothesised that the Chinese data will demonstrate a preference for what we call 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequencing in complex sentences and that this manifests itself at levels above the sentence. In other words, the hypothesis is that subordinate - main or modifying - modified sequence will prove to operate at a number of levels in MSC. Moreover, this sequence will, in several contexts, be able to explain the principles behind information sequencing in Chinese at levels above the sentence more satisfactorily than topic - comment.

Chapter 2. Clause Sequencing in 'Pianzheng Fuju'

Introduction

This chapter considers the sequencing of clauses and the use of connectors in sentences that are called in MSC 'piānzhèng fùjù' and which I shall translate as 'complex sentences'. The term 'pianzheng' is actually used to describe the modifier-modified relationship as in the phrase 'xīn sùshè' (new dormitory) and has been extended to describe sentences that have a 'modifying' clause followed by a 'modified' clause (Ma Zhong 1983 p 234). MSC also calls these sentences 'zhǔcóng fùjù' (主从复句) where 'zhǔ' means main and 'cóng' means subordinate.

The use of the term subordinate clause, with reference to the components of a sentence, has been questioned for English (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988) (Schleppergel 1992), and the very nature of Chinese often makes it difficult to distinguish between subordinate and main clauses. Nevertheless, for ease of reference and because they approximate to the terms employed by Chinese linguists, the clauses in these complex sentences will be called subordinate clause (SC) and main clause (MC).

This chapter begins with a review of what many Chinese linguists have had to say about 'piānzhèng fùjù'. We will deal with the preferred MSC clause order in these complex sentences. The reasons for using the marked sequence in MSC will also be discussed and the more frequent use of this marked sequence in contemporary Chinese will be given as an example of language change due to contact with other languages, in the case of MSC due to its contact with Western languages. In this context, although there has been an increase in the use of conjunctions in MSC due to the influence of Western languages, it is argued that MSC still remains a more paratactic language than English. This discussion on parataxis comprises the second major part of the chapter.

The third and final section of the chapter analyses the use of 'pīanzhèng fùjù' as they occur naturally in a genre of written Chinese - letters of request - and examines to what extent this data supports the claims made by the Chinese linguists.

1 Clause sequencing in 'pīanzhèng fùjù'

1.1 The normal, unmarked clause sequence of 'pīanzhèng fùjù'

Lin Yuwen (1983) points out that the normal order in 'pīanzhèng fùjù' sentences is that the 'pīan' clause or the subordinate clause precedes the 'zhèng' or main clause. For example:

- (1) 因为风太大, 所以比赛改期了
 Yinwei feng tai da, suoyi bisai gaiqi-le (p 1)
 Because wind too big, therefore competition change time-A

Because the wind was too strong, the competition was therefore postponed

Example (1) is a cause-effect sentence with the *yīnwei* (because) of the subordinate clause being balanced or picked up by the *suoyi* (therefore) of the main clause.

A point worth making at this early stage is this. The English translation of (1) above, itself seems marked. To make the English translation neutral, the clause order of the Chinese needs to be changed to give:

'The competition was postponed because the wind was too strong'.

In other words, the clause sequence in the unmarked Chinese version is the same as the clause sequence in the marked English version. For a discussion on main clause - subordinate clause order as the unmarked sequence in English see, for example, Prideaux (1989), Quirk et al (1985 p 1037 ff), Kruisinga (1932) and Schiffrin (1985). The question is also treated later in this chapter and in chapter 6 where

examples are provided of unmarked SC - MC ordering in MSC being incorrectly translated into English as though it was marked in some way.¹

Here is a second example of an unmarked Chinese complex sentence taken from Lin (ibid).

- (2) 如果再烧一会, 水就会开的
Ruguo zai shao yihui, shui jiu hui kai-de. (p 1)
 if again warm a little, water then can boil-P

If you warm it a little more the water will boil.

In this conditional sentence, the *rúguǒ* (if) of the subordinate clause is balanced or picked up by the *jiù* (then) of the main clause.

(3) is an example of a contrastive sentence that follows the MSC unmarked order of SC - MC. This example is taken from the Hanyu Yufa Xiuci Cidian (The Dictionary of Chinese Grammar and Rhetoric- (DCR) op cit p 572).

- (3) 他虽然年纪小, 但是胆子不小
Ta suiran nianji xiao, danshi danzi bu xiao.
 He although age little, but guts N small.

Although he's young, he's got guts.

In this contrastive sentence, the *suirán* (although) of the subordinate clause is balanced or picked up by the *dànshì* (but) of the main clause.

Lin Yuwen discusses two types of contrastive sentences, the 'heavy' ('zhòng') and the 'light' ('qīng') He suggests that the heavy type of adversative sentences are those, as in (3), that contain paired connectors, one in the subordinate clause and the other in the main clause. Light adversative sentences, on the other hand, only contain one conjunction or connector. For example:

¹Unmarked refers to the more widely distributed option and marked refers to the less widely distributed option of opposing structural entities. In the context of clause sequence in complex sentences, however, it is not suggested that the marked sequence is in any way more 'difficult' than the unmarked sequence. (Moravcsik and Wirth 1986).

- (4) 这篇文章写得很好, 不过有一两处
 Zhe-pian wenzhang xie-de hen hao, buguo you yi liang
 This-C article write-P very well, but have one two
 处 要稍加修改
 chu yao shao jia xiugai. (p 35)
 place want little add correction.

This article is very well written *but* there are one or two places that need a little correction.

Lin terms this sentence light because the only conjunction is the *bùguò* (but) of the main clause. He suggests that *bùguò* is less emphatic than *dànshì* and also suggests that the addition of *suirán* (although) into the subordinate clause in (4) would be inappropriate².

A fourth type of these complex sentences is the concessional sentence. For example

- (5) 尽管困难很多,
 jinguan kunnan hen duo,
 even though difficulty very many,
 我们还是要按时完成任务
 women haishi yao anshi wancheng renwu (DCR p 328)
 we still want on time complete task

Even though there are very many difficulties, we *still* want to complete the task on time.

Here the *jǐnguǎn* (even though) of the subordinate clause is picked up or balanced by the *haishi* (still) of the main clause.

Lin lists these four - the cause and effect, the conditional, the adversative and the concessional - as the main complex sentence types. There are, of course, others. For example, Wang Li (1955) lists seven types adding time, purpose and result clauses

²Li and Liu (1958) make a similar distinction between 'light' and 'heavy' contrastive clauses. They agree that the conjunction *dànshì* is more emphatic than *bùguò* and suggest that 'heavy' contrastive clauses introduced by *dànshì* completely oppose ('xiangfan') the proposition in the subordinate clause, while those introduced by *bùguò* merely correct or alter ('xiūzhèng') the proposition in the subordinate clause. For a full discussion of this, see Li and Liu pp 919-930.

to these four. However, for the purposes of this study, we will be mainly concerned with the four main types itemised by Lin.

The claim that the normal unmarked order in Chinese complex sentences is SC - MC is not controversial and is well documented as this chapter will show. For this reason, together with our concentration on 'cause and effect' sentences and sequencing in later chapters, we use the term 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequencing as a general description of SC - MC sequencing.

Further evidence that SC - MC sequencing is the normal order in MSC is provided by the various ways in which linguists have classified these adverbial / subordinate clauses. In chapter 1, it was pointed out that Chao Yuanren (1968 p 120) classifies these adverbial clauses as "subjects" (topics) as they are naturally in initial position. Li and Thompson (1981) suggest that they are topics because they set the frame for the rest of the sentence. Thompson and Longacre (1985) also propose that they are topics while Matthiessen and Thompson (1988) mention the thematic use of adverbial clauses such as these when they are in initial position. We have earlier stated that we shall not term these adverbial clauses in MSC topics. The point we wish to make here is simply that subjects, topics and themes normally precede their predicates, comments or rhemes.

1.2 The marked sequence and its uses

Ni Baoyuan (1983) also states that the normal clause order in these complex sentences is subordinate clause - main clause. He points out, furthermore, that this order is relatively rigid. Ni uses the term 'cháng' (normal) to refer to the unmarked order; and the term 'biàn' (change) to refer to the marked order. He extends the analysis of marked and unmarked order to include Subject - Predicate order, Verb - Object order and Modifier - Modified order. Ni states that these sequences are the unmarked, normal orders. Conversely, therefore, marked order in Chinese is:

Predicate - Subject
Object - Verb
Modified - Modifier
Main Clause - Subordinate Clause.

Li and Zhang (1984), too, argue that these sequences identified above by Ni, are the unmarked and marked orders respectively. They suggest that the marked order is used to give emphasis or prominence. As an example of marked Predicate - Subject order they give (6), a sentence taken from Lu Xun:

- (6) 去吧野草 连着我的题辞
Qu ba, ye cao, lian-zhe wo-de tici (p 77)
Go P wild grass, join-A I-M foreward.

Go, wild grass, together with my foreward.³

The authors suggest that the moving of the predicate (qù ba) to the front of the subject (yě cǎo) emphasises Lu Xun's hope for the swift decay of the 'wild grass', a hope he has also expressed a few lines earlier in the foreword.

³ This example is taken from the foreword of Lu Xun's collection of prose poems 'Wild Grass', published in 1927. The example sentence is the final line of his foreword to the poems.

To exemplify the marked object - verb order, Li and Zhang give:

- (7) 水生不相信地问：“谁？”
 A Shuisheng bu xiangxin-de wen: "Shei?" (p 78)
 Shuisheng N believe-M ask: "Who?"
 “阿秀！”阿秀小声回答
 B "Ah Xiu!" Ah Xiu xiao sheng huida.
 "Ah Xiu!" Ah Xiu small sound reply

A Shuisheng unbelievably asked: "Who?"
 B "Ah Xiu" Ah Xiu whispered in reply.

The authors claim that the opening line of the dialogue follows the unmarked order with 'shéi' (who) being the object of 'wèn' (ask). They then argue that the second line of the dialogue follows a marked order with the object 'Ah Xiu' preceding the verb 'huida' (ask).

The authors provide further examples of the marked object-verb order in sentences that are interrogatives or negatives as in example (8).

- (8) 新媳妇 哭了一天一夜，头也不梳，
 Xin xifu ku-le yitian yiye, tou ye bu shu,
 New daughter-in-law cry-A one day one night, hair also N comb
 脸也不洗，饭也不吃
 lian ye bu xi, fan ye bu chi. (p 79)
 face also N wash, food also N eat.

The new daughter-in-law cried all day and night, she didn't even comb her hair, wash her face or eat anything.

In this example, the marked object - verb order is clearly used for emphasis. The marked order is also repeated three times - hair not comb ('tóu bù shū'), face not wash ('liǎn bù xǐ'), food not eat ('fàn bù chī') - for heightened emphasis.

In addition to providing emphasis, Li and Zhang also suggest that a marked order can be used to prevent the sentence becoming too 'sluggish' ('tuōtā'). This is particularly the case when the modifier is very long. Then the normal unmarked sequence of modifier - modified becomes inelegant. (9) is an example of a sentence that

uses the marked order of modified - modifier. The modified (the animal) is in bold and is followed by the modifying phrases.

- (9) 大致 - 看, 屋子里还是空虚, 但偶然,
 Dazhi yi kan, wuzi-li haishi kongxu, *dan* ouran
 Roughly once look, room-in still empty, but by chance
 看到地面却盘旋着一匹小小的
 kan-dao dimian, que panxuan-zhe yi-pi xiaoxiao-de
 look-to floor, but circle-A one-Cl small-small-M
 动物 瘦弱的, 半死的, 满身尘土的
 dongwu shouruo-de, bansi-de, manshen chentu-de
animal, thinweak-M, halfdead-M, all-body dust-M...(p 80)

With his quick first look, the room still seemed empty, but, by chance he looked at the floor, where going round and round was a tiny animal, thin and weak, half dead and covered with dust....

Li and Zhang, therefore, suggest that this marked order of modified - modifier is used for two reasons. First, to emphasise the modifying phrases. Second, to provide stylistic elegance.

Li and Zhang also consider clause ordering in complex sentences and give two reasons for using the marked main clause - subordinate clause order. The first is for emphasis, to provide prominence for the end placed subordinate clause⁴.

- (10) 这不但 是 杀害, 简直是虐杀,
 Zhe budan shi shahai, jianzhi shi nuesha,
 This not only be murder, simply be cruel murder,
 因为棍棒的伤痕
 yinwei gunbang-de shanghen. (p 81)
 because cudgel-M scar.

This is not just murder but murder of great cruelty *because* of the scars made by the cudgel.

The marked order here, as the authors point out, stresses the evidence of the scars. Had the unmarked order been used, the cruel nature of the death would have been stressed (as in 10a).

⁴It will be remembered from chapter 1 that Chao Yuanren stated that the placing of the subordinate clause after the main clause represented an afterthought. However, this is clearly not the case in these examples.

- (10a) 因为身体上 还有棍棒的伤痕,
 yinwei shenti-shang hai you gunbang-de shanghen,
 because body-on still have cudgel-M scar,
 所以这不但 是杀害, 简直是虐杀。
 suoyi zhe budan shi shahai, jianzhi shi nuesha.
 therefore this not only be murder, simply be cruel murder.

Because the body still has the scars from the cudgel, this therefore is not a simple murder but a murder of great cruelty.

Zong Tingu et al (1985) agree with Li and Zhang in saying that the marked order, MC - SC, gives prominence to the subordinate clause. (11) is an example of a complex sentence that follows the unmarked order, and (11a) of one that follows the marked order.

- (11) 虽然自己不富裕, 还周济和照顾
 Suiran ziji bu fuyu, hai zhouji he zhaogu (p 295)
 although self N wealthy, still help and consider
 比自己更穷的亲戚
 bi ziji geng qiong-de qinqi.
 than self even poor-M relative.

Although he is not wealthy, he still helps and is considerate to those of his relatives who are even poorer than he is.

And the marked MC - SC sentence:

- (11a) 他的性格在我的眼里和心里是伟大的
 Ta-de xingge, zai wo-de yan-li he xin-li shi weida-de
 He-M nature, in I-M eye-in and heart-in be great-E
 虽然他的姓名并不为许多人
 suiran ta-de xingming bing bu wei xuduo ren
 although he-M name indeed N to many people
 知道
 zhidao
 know.

(p 295)

In my eyes and to my mind he has a great character, although his name is certainly not well-known to many people.

In (11a) the marked order is used, according to Zong, to stress the information in the subordinate clause. He sums up clause movement in this way: "The function of normal order is to emphasise the original logical sequence of an event; the function of inverted order is to emphasise the less important or latter part within a logical sequence." (p 296)

The second reason Li and Zhang give for using the marked MC - SC order is that the subordinate clause is fulfilling an explanatory function ('shuōmíng zuòyòng'. (p 81). By this they mean that the marked subordinate clause provides additional information for the justification for the proposition or event in the main clause. For example:

- (12) 一种极哀伤的声音 从她的口里
 yi-zhong ji aishang-de shengyin cong ta-de kou-li
 one-Cl very distressed-M sound from her-M mouth-in

发出来了, 低细而且断续, 独有
 fa-chulai-le, dixi erqie duanxu, du you
 emit-outcome-A, low and intermittent, only have

稻草人听得出, 因为他听惯了
 Dao Caoren ting-dechu, yinwei ta tingguan-le
 Dao Caoren hear-R, because he, hear accustomed-A

夜间的一切
 ye-jian-de yiqie. (p 81)
 night-in-M everything.

A very distressed sound emitted from her mouth. It was both low and intermittent and only Dao Caoren⁵ heard it, *because* he was used to listening for anything at night.

In (12) the subordinate clause beginning *yinwei* (because) justifies how Dao Caoren and no one else was able to hear the sound. "In order to emphasise the explanation for Dao Caoren's having such good hearing, the subordinate clause....is placed after the main clause." (p 81).

This then demonstrates the so-called explanatory function of the subordinate clause when placed in the marked order, that is, after the main clause.⁶

It is significant for the discussion of marked ordering that the marked order in predicate-subject, and object-verb is said to stress the predicate and object respectively.

⁵Dao Caoren or Straw Man is a character in Chinese fairy tales.

⁶The explanatory function of the subordinate clause when placed after the main clause is also given as a reason for using this marked order in MSC by a number of well-known Chinese linguists including Li Jinxi (1924), Ding Shengshu, Lü Shuxiang and Li Rong (1963) and Zhu Dexi (1984).

This thus demonstrates front weighting. Conversely, however, the marked order of modified-modifier and main clause-subordinate clause is said to stress the modifier and the subordinate clause respectively. This thus demonstrates end weighting. It is interesting that both end weighting and front weighting appear to be being used for the same purpose. It is perhaps, rather the change in order itself that signifies the markedness. Whether the change in the order places something at the front or at the end of a sentence is not as important as the actual change in the normal order.

Ni Baoyuan (op cit) gives further reasons for adopting a marked order in 'piānzhèng fùjù'. In addition to prominence and emphasis, Ni points out that a marked order can be used for clarity or rhythm. In the examples below, Ni takes a sentence that was originally marked, following a main-clause subordinate clause order (13), and turns into the unmarked sentence, (13a). Ni claims that the unmarked version reads more fluently ('liúchàng') than the original marked version.⁷

- (13) 离开了满妖 自己组织 汉族的 朝廷
Likai-le manyao, ziji zuzhi hanzu-de chaoting.
Leave-A Manchu devils, self organise Han race-M palace

南京立刻 便可以让渡给 曾家 军
Nanjing like bian keyi rang dugei zengjia jun,
Nanjing at once then may hand over Zeng family army

假如这条件 能够 成立
jiaru zhe tiaojian nenggou chengli. (p 72)
if this condition can establish

(If) he left the Manchu devils and organised his own Han dynasty, then Nanjing would at once be handed over to Zeng's army, *if* this condition were met.

⁷The 'Manyao' in example (13) refers to the Manchu dynasty that were the rulers of China at this time (mid 19th century). Nanjing was the capital of the Taiping rebel forces. The family Zeng refers to Zeng Guofan, a famous general and statesman.

- (13a) 离开了满妖, 自己组织汉族的朝廷
 Likai-le manyao, ziji zuzhi hanzu-de chaoting.
 Leave-A Manchu devils, self organise Han race-M palace.

假如这条件 能够 成立
 jiaru zhe tiaojian nenggou chengli,
 if this condition can establish,

南京立刻 便可以让渡给曾家 军
 Nanjing like bian keyi rang dugei zengjia jun
 Nanjing at once then may hand over Zeng family army.

(If) he left the Manchu devils and organised his own Han dynasty, if this condition were met, then Nanjing would at once be handed over to Zeng's army.

To sum up the uses of marked MC - SC order in MSC, Chinese linguists have given three reasons for using this marked sequence: to give the subordinate clause prominence; for the subordinate clause to provide some additional information to justify the proposition or event in the main clause (the so called explanatory function); and for stylistic reasons.

1.3 Limitations on the use of the marked MC - SC sequence: use of connectors

Lin Yuwen (op cit) points out, however, circumstances where using the marked MC - SC sequence is not possible. This is particularly the case when there are no conjunctions or logical connectors in the sentence. He gives (14), which he calls a conditional 'pianzheng fujū', as an example.

- (14) 谁个子高, 谁排 第一
 Shei gezi gao, shei pai diyi (p 8)
 Who stature tall, who line up first

Whoever is the tallest stand at the end of the line.

The clause order here is fixed with the 'pian' clause 'shei gezi gao' having to come before the 'zheng' clause. 'Shei pai diyi, shei gezi gao' is impossible. The clause order is fixed, Lin suggests, because there are no logical connectors to show the reader what the logical relations between the two parts of the sentence are. The clauses must

therefore follow the unmarked SC - MC order for the reader to be able to interpret the sentence correctly.

There does seem a problem here, however, in assigning the terms subordinate and main to the two clauses in (14). The sentence has a balance, and although neither clause can stand on its own, the two clauses appear to have a more coordinate relationship than a subordinate - main one. Hashimoto (1971) calls this type of sentence "correlative" and (15) is her example of this sentence type.

- (15) 谁力气大, 谁拿行李
 shei qili da, shei na xingli (p 114)
 who strength big, who take luggage

Whoever is strongest, take the luggage.

This correlative sentence type has also been noted by Lehmann (1988). He places what he calls these "correlative diptych" sentences halfway between parataxis and hypotaxis on the continuum that has independent clauses as most paratactic and embedded clauses as most hypotactic.⁸ We turn now to a discussion of parataxis and hypotaxis.

2 Parataxis and hypotaxis

The distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis is a distinction commonly made in any discussion on clause combining. There appears to be, however, some disagreement over the meaning of these terms in English. There is, in addition, a problem over the translation of these terms into Chinese in that what the Chinese mean by parataxis ('yihéfǎ' 意合法) and hypotaxis ('xínghéfǎ' 形合法) does not precisely parallel Western definitions of these terms. As the concepts of parataxis and hypotaxis are significant for this discussion of clause ordering in MSC, these concepts

⁸Lehmann gives this example from Hittite as an example of a correlative diptych, with the connector 'nu' occurring in both halves of the sentence.

Nu kwit Lugal-u-s tezzi nu apat iyame.
 And what the king says, that I do.

are discussed in this section of this chapter. First, a brief review of the way Western and Chinese linguists have defined these terms is presented.

2.1 Western and Chinese definitions

A source of disagreement over the definitions of these two terms by Western linguists stems from the importance attached to the use or non use of conjunctions as a criterion for distinguishing between parataxis and hypotaxis. On the one hand Crystal (1985) defines parataxis as a term that refers to "constructions which are linked solely through juxtaposition and punctuation/intonation and not through the use of conjunctions. Paratactic constructions are opposed to hypotactic ones where conjunctions are used." (p 221).

Crystal, then, clearly distinguishes paratactic and hypotactic constructions on the grounds of conjunction use. Lehmann (op cit), on the other hand, claims that the presence or absence of conjunctions has nothing to do with the distinction between hypotaxis and parataxis. Parataxis is defined by Lehmann as the coordination of clauses. It may be syndetic or asyndetic, by which he means the coordination may be explicitly signalled by the use of conjunctions or may not be so signalled. In contrast, hypotaxis is defined as the subordination of clauses and "the presence or absence of a connective device between two clauses has nothing to do with parataxis vs hypotaxis." (p 210).

Lehmann, then, distinguishes paratactic constructions and hypotactic ones on the grounds of coordination or subordination while Crystal sees conjunction use as the determining factor.

Halliday (1985) defines parataxis as the "linking of elements of equal status" and hypotaxis as the "binding of elements of unequal status." (p198). The use of the terms 'equal status' and 'unequal status' shows Halliday agrees with Lehmann's coordinate vs subordinate distinction. However, Halliday also uses the two different terms of 'linking' and 'binding' and this suggests that the way the elements of equal status are linked differs from the way the elements of unequal status are bound. In his

discussion of 'enhancing hypotaxis', which is the term he gives to those constructions that traditionally contain adverbial clauses and are thus similar to the constructions being considered in this chapter, he says that finite enhancing hypotactic clauses are introduced by a hypotactic (subordinating) conjunction where the conjunction serves to express both the dependency and the circumstantial relationship. Indeed, the role of the conjunction is crucial here, as, according to Halliday, a finite clause is, in principle, independent, and can become dependent "only if introduced by a binding (hypotactic) conjunction." (p 216-7).

Halliday argues, therefore, that the coordinate vs subordinate distinction determines the difference between parataxis and hypotaxis. But he also stresses the importance of conjunctions in 'enhancing hypotactic' constructions.

Curme (1931) helps put the parataxis vs hypotaxis debate in historical perspective. In his discussion on parataxis, Curme remarks that sometimes there is no apparent formal link that binds the elements of a sentence together since the logical connection forms a sufficient tie. Yet, one of the propositions often stands in some relation to the other such as an adverbial relation of cause, purpose, result, concession or condition. For example:

(16) 'Let him talk (concession), it'll do no harm.' (p 170).

Curme argues that such sentences represent an older order of things. In the earliest stages of the languages from which Indo-European languages have come "there were no subordinating conjunctions as now." (p 170). "This placing of a subordinate proposition alongside of a principal proposition without a formal sign of subordination is called parataxis." (p 170). He goes on to say that the development of a formal way of signalling subordination, either through relative pronouns or through conjunctions - hypotaxis - is "characteristic of a later stage of language life." (p 170).

Curme, then, argues that parataxis can be seen as the juxtaposition of a subordinate proposition against a main proposition without the use of conjunctions. In other words, therefore, Curme is suggesting that it is, in the first instance, conjunction use and not the coordinate vs subordinate distinction that determines hypotactic constructions.

Curme is supported by Murray in his definition of parataxis. In his 'A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles' (1905), Murray defines parataxis as: "the placing of propositions or clauses, one after the other without indicating by connecting words the relation (of coordination or subordination) between them." Both Murray and Curme, then, see parataxis as the juxtaposition of propositions and clauses both when they are in a coordinate relation and when they have a main - subordinate relation. The key criterion for distinguishing parataxis from hypotaxis is the presence or absence of conjunctions.

This is interesting as the Chinese translation of these terms - 'yìhéfǎ' (method of combination by meaning) for parataxis and 'xínghéfǎ' (method of combination by form) for hypotaxis seem close to Murray's, Curme's and Crystal's definitions. Furthermore, there is evidence that the person who is credited with the coining of the word 'yìhéfǎ', Wang Li, had read Curme⁹. The Dictionary of Chinese Grammar and Rhetoric defines the term 'yìhéfǎ' as follows: "a complex sentence that has no connectors between the separate clauses but whose combination is established by a meaning relation and when this relation can be understood, is paratactic ('yìhéfǎ'). (p 482).

Further evidence that Wang Li takes the presence or absence of connectors as the key to distinguishing between parataxis and hypotaxis comes from his classification of coordinate (compound) sentences and subordinate (complex) sentences. He says

⁹ Wang Li cites Curme in his own work. See, for example, Wang Li Wenji, Vol 1 'Zhongguo yufa lilun' (A Theory of Chinese Grammar) page 86, footnote 1. As for crediting Wang Li with the coining of the term 'yìhefa', the Hanyu Yufa Xiuci Cidian (The Dictionary of Chinese Grammar and Rhetoric - DCR) states that Wang Li first used this term in his 'Hanyu Yufa Gangyao' (See DCR 481-482)

both coordinate and subordinate sentences can be classified as paratactic or as having connectors.¹⁰

In this discussion, therefore, we will adopt the 'historical' or Chinese view and take parataxis to mean the juxtaposition of clauses and propositions, both coordinate and subordinate, without the use of connectors; we will take hypotaxis to mean the subordination of one proposition to another by use of subordinating conjunctions. With this in mind, we now proceed to a discussion of parataxis and hypotaxis in MSC.

2.2 Is Chinese paratactic?

2.2.1 The case in Classical Chinese

This study does not treat classical Chinese in detail. However, as many of the Chinese linguists in the following discussion argue that contemporary Chinese has been influenced to the point of change by contact with Western languages, it is as well to establish certain relevant facts about classical Chinese. In this way, the comments that follow can be seen in perspective. It is not the case, for example, that classical Chinese was completely paratactic and nor is it the case that the use of connectors was unknown. As Ma Zhong (1983) has shown, compound sentences made up of coordinate clauses allowed freedom of clause movement without affecting the meaning. In 'pīanzhèng fùjù', on the other hand, the clause order was much more rigid and followed the subordinate clause - main clause sequence. The meaning of these sentences was primarily established by the relationship between the two clauses with the clause carrying the main point coming at the end. Connectors, however, could be

¹⁰See footnote 4 p 145 in the 1957 edition of 'Hanyu Yufa Gangyao'.(Essentials of Chinese Grammar)

used¹¹. Example (17) shows the use of the therefore marker 'gù' being used in the main clause of a classical cause-effect 'piānzhèng fùjù' taken from 'The Analects'¹².

- (17) 其言不让，是故哂之
 Qi yan bu rang, shi gu shen zhi (p 183)
 This language N modest, be *therefore* laugh him

His language was very boastful and so I laughed at him.¹³

On occasion, paired connectors could be used in both clauses. This was particularly true of conditional sentences such as (18). Ma Zhong explains this use of paired connectors by saying they provided stylistic balance or 'qián hòu hūyǐng',

(前后呼应) literally 'front-back echo'.

- (18) 若弗与，则请除之
 Ruo fu yu, ze qing chu zhi (p 226)
 If N bestow, *then* request eliminate him

If you do not mean to give it to him, allow me to put him away.¹⁴

As for whether marked MC - SC order was possible in classical Chinese, Li Ruonan and Li Renxiao (1985) say that the use of the marked order MC - SC was rare 'hǎnyǒu'. And although (19), taken from Ma Zhong (op cit) looks like an example of a sentence following the marked MC - SC order, it actually has an SC embedded within the MC. Note that in (19) 'sui' does not mean *although* but something like *even if*.

¹¹In a study of Middle Chinese texts of the late Tang and early Sung (ie circa 900 AD), Sawyer (1969) has shown that a subordinate clause is always marked by either a final adverb or by a pre-verbal adverb, such as 'ruo' (if) or 'sui' (even though).

¹²The date of the compilation of the Analects of Confucius is uncertain but they were probably not compiled until at least one century after his death in BC 479. (18) is taken from the 'Tso Commentary' which was probably compiled in the 3rd century BC. (19) comes from the 'Records of the Historian', written by Sima Qian (?145 - ?90 BC). (Burton Watson 1962).

¹³Ma Zhong 'translates' this sentence into contemporary Chinese as:

Tā-de huà tài bù qiānxùn, sǔoyǐ wǒ xiào tā.
 He-M speech too N modest, *therefore* I laugh him

His speech was very boastful so I laughed at him.

It is interesting to note that the 8 characters of classical Chinese become 12 in the contemporary version.

¹⁴This translation is taken from James Legge's 'Chinese Classics' Vol 5, The Tso Commentary, Year 1 of the Duke of Yin.

(19) 推 此 志 也
Tui ci zhi ye,
Advance this ambition P,

虽 与 日 月 争 光 可 也
sui yu ri yueh zheng guang ke ye.
even if with sun moon compete brightness can P (p 218)

Advancing this ambition, *even if* he competes with the sun and moon for brightness, is OK.

These examples from classical Chinese have been included to show that, with its use of connectors, contemporary Chinese has not taken on a completely new grammatical structure. Furthermore, the use of the marked MC - SC clause sequence in 'piānzhèng fùjù' was, although rare, possible. MSC has, however, seen a substantial increase in use of these structures for reasons discussed below.¹⁵

2.2.2 The case in MSC and influence from the West

Wang Li (1958) argues that, in general, word order in Chinese is fixed. In particular, in Chinese conditional, concessive and cause and effect sentences, the subordinate clause traditionally came before the main clause. In English, on the other hand, Wang Li points out that the so-called 'if' clauses, the 'because' clauses, the 'though' clauses and the 'when' clauses can go before or after the main clause. In Chinese, as we have seen, these clauses most frequently precede the main clause; and on occasion, must precede them. So, for example, (20) is possible but the same sentence following the marked sequence of main clause - subordinate clause is not (20a). Both sequences are possible in English.¹⁶

¹⁵Diller (1988) has noted a similar phenomenon in the development of Thai with the degree of marked subordination increasing over time.

¹⁶One of Greeberg's universals - number 14 - states: "In conditional statements the conditional clause precedes the conclusion as the normal order in all languages." (1966 p 84). However, English allows more flexibility than MSC.

(20) 若你们家一日 糟蹋这么一件
 Ruo nimen jia yiri zaota zhema yi-jian,
 If you Pl family one day destroy so one-Cl
 也不是值什么
 ye bu shi zhi shenma
 also N be worth what

If your family treats that so badly each day, it can't be worth anything to them.

(20a) 也不是值什么
 *Ye bu shi zhi shenma
 Also N be worth what
 若你们家一日 糟蹋这么一件
 ruo nimen jia yiri zaota zhema yi-jian.
 if you Pl family one day destroy so one-Cl

It can't be worth much (to them) if your family treats it so badly each day.
 (Wang Li 1984 p 251)

Wang Li then argues that this comparatively rigid SC - MC clause order of Chinese means that connectors are not really necessary. In Chinese, when two sentences are juxtaposed, even though there are no connectors, "we still know that the first sentence includes meanings such as 'although', 'if', 'because', etc, because the subordinate component must come at the beginning." (1984 p 97). Curiously, though possibly for the stylistic balance of 'front-back echo' mentioned earlier by Ma Zhong in the context of classical Chinese, in a sentence (21) in which he mentions the frequency of parataxis in Chinese, Wang Li actually uses the paired conjunctions 'yīnwei - suǒyǐ', (because - therefore)¹⁷.

(21) 因为中国的复合句
 Yinwei Zhongguo-de fuheju
 Because China-M complex sentences
 多数是 parataxis
 duoshu shi 'parataxis'
 many be parataxis
 所以句的界限 不 很分明
 suoyi ju-de jiexian bu hen fenming (p 97)
 therefore sentence-M dividing line N very clear

Because complex sentences in Chinese are mostly paratactic, therefore the dividing line between sentences is not very clear.

¹⁷The possibility that two connectors are used in 'piānzhèng fùjù' to provide stylistic balance is discussed later in the chapter.

Wang Li also makes clear that, while it is a more paratactic language than English, Chinese has been influenced by English and other Western languages, especially since the Chinese literary revolution of the May 4th Movement in 1919. At this time, enormous numbers of Western works were being translated into Chinese and published in China. Not only did this provide large numbers of influential works written in a kind of Europeanised Chinese, but their influence was also seen in the styles of contemporary Chinese writers.

For example, since the May 4th movement, subordinate clauses appearing after their main clauses in the writings of Chinese authors have become frequent. Wang Li (1958) gives this example from the Chinese writer, Lao She, of a marked subordinate clause order in a conditional sentence.

- (22) 可是我得省些钱 万 -
 Keshi wo dei sheng xie qian, wanyi
 But I must save some money 10,000-1

妈妈叫我走我可以跑
 mama jiao wo qu,...wo keyi pao
 mum tell me go, I can run,

假如我手中有钱
 jiaru wo shou-zhong you qian.
 if I hand-in have money. (p 372)

But I must keep some money on the off chance that Mum tells me to go,.....I can run if I have some money.

Here, the conditional clause introduced by 'jiarú' (if) comes after the main clause. Note the use of the conjunction in the marked subordinate clause and the absence of one in the main clause. This use of a single conjunction in the subordinating clause in complex sentences that follow the marked MC - SC sequence, and without a 'balancing' conjunction in the main clause, is representative of this 'new' phenomenon of Chinese hypotactic constructions.

Nevertheless, while admitting that contemporary Chinese uses more connectors than did classical Chinese, Wang Li argues that contemporary Chinese is still a far more

paratactic language than English. It is his view that parataxis is 'abnormal' ('biàntài) in Western languages but 'normal' ('chángtài') in Chinese. (1958 p 90).

In this, Wang Li is supported by Cheng Zhenqiu (1980) who states that, generally speaking, Chinese uses parataxis ('yìhéfǎ') and does not use connecting words between sentences. English, in contrast, uses connectors in both coordinate and subordinate constructions, so the organisational requirements of English are quite different from those of Chinese.

Xie Yaoji (1989) also points out that Chinese commonly uses parataxis in the construction of complex sentences and argues that these sentences can be understood because of their rigid word order. It is the word order that shows the logical relationships that exist between the component parts of such sentences. Word order must therefore be relatively fixed, and the use of conjunctions or logical connectors is correspondingly uncommon. Traditionally, Xie points out, a pause while speaking or a comma in writing, rendered conjunctions unnecessary. He agrees with Wang Li that it is Western linguistic influence, primarily the influence of the translation into Chinese of Western works, that has increased the use of conjunctions in Chinese. This, in turn, has given rise to marked MC - SC clause ordering in MSC¹⁸. Xie gives these examples to demonstrate the recent use of conjunctions. These examples are all taken from Chinese works written since the May 4th Movement¹⁹. Xie is suggesting that the use of the pair of conjunctions 'yīnwèi' and 'suǒyǐ' in (23), a complex sentence that follows the normal unmarked order, is also the result of Western influence.

¹⁸Gunn (1991) has suggested that although clause transposition (anastrophe) would have appeared strikingly new in Chinese in print in the 1920's, and although it was undoubtedly inspired by foreign language texts "the forms themselves probably existed in spoken Chinese already." (p 40). It was pointed out earlier in this chapter that this structure was also possible in classical (written) Chinese.

¹⁹(23) comes from Yu Dafu's 'Gei yiwei wenxue qingnian de gongkai zhuang' (An open letter to an educated youth), (24) from Jin Yi's 'Zao che de ren' (The Cart Maker) and (25) from Lu Xun's 'Zhege yu Neige' (This and That).

- (23) 我因为还要去教书, 所以没有
 Wo yinwei hai yao qu jiaoshu, suoyi meiyou
 I because still want go teach, therefore N have

许多工夫和你聊天
 xuduo gongfu, he ni tantian. (p 92)
 much time, with you chat.

Because I still have to go and teach, I *therefore* haven't much time to chat to you.

(24) and (25) represent examples of complex sentences following the marked sequence

- (24) 他仍然是贫苦的, 虽然他每天
 Ta rengran shi pinku-de, suiran ta meitian
 He still be poverty stricken-M although he each day
 都是勤苦的工作着
 dou shi qinku-de gongzuo-zhe. (p 87)
 all be hard-M work-A.

He's *still* poverty stricken *although* he works hard every day.

- (25) 应和的也是情有可原的
 Yinghe-de ye shi qing you keyuan-de,
 response-M also be situation have pardon-M,
 因为世界本来大概就这样
 yinwei shijie benlai dagai jiu zheyang. (p 87)
 because world originally probably then thisway.

The response is pardonable *because* the world was probably like that in the beginning anyway.

Interestingly, Xie claims that the marked order in (24) and (25) does not stress the subordinate clause but stresses the main clause.²⁰ This is, perhaps, further evidence that it is the change in the order itself that counts, not the position in the sentence.

Xie's point is that sentences such as (23), (24) and (25) above would have been rarely seen in classical Chinese as Chinese prefers parataxis and a relatively rigid word order, as in (26).

²⁰The view that clause movement of this type stresses the main clause is shared by Li Ruonan and Li Renxiao (1985). They also agree that the increased possibility of constructing complex sentences following this marked sequence is a result of foreign influence since the May 4th movement. We have already stated their view that the marked 'zhèng' (main) to 'pián' (subordinate) order was rare in classical Chinese. (see Li and Li p 377 ff).

- (26) 努力 读书, 你 - 定 会 进 步
 Nuli dushu, ni yiding hui jinbu. (p 91)
 Diligent read book, you definite can progress.

If you study diligently, you will definitely make progress.

Consider also these examples which, in addition to being paratactic - free of connectors - also fulfil the Chinese criterion for linguistic balance or parallelism.

- (27) 有 - 分 热, 发 - 分 光
 You yifen re, fa yifen guang. (p 91)
 Have one-C heat, give out one-C light.

If you have any spark you should create a blaze.

- (28) 有 钱 出 钱, 有 力 出 力
 You qian chu qian, you li chu li (p 92)
 Have money put out money, have strength put out strength

If you've got money, spend it, if you have strength, expend it.

2.3 Parataxis and markedness in MSC

The notion of a relatively rigid word or clause order in Chinese, that has been previously mentioned, is discussed by Chen Ping (1986). He argues that when there are no explicit conjunctions in Reason, Concession and Condition Predicates, the order he calls "adjunct preceding nucleus" (p 103) is crucial for a clear indication of nucleus (main) vs adjunct (subordinate) status of the propositions subsumed within the relational predicate. On the other hand, however, when connectives are present, the order is less rigid. In other words, then, paratactic constructions in complex sentences in Chinese will follow the subordinate - main clause order. The use of a subordinating conjunction allows the use of the marked MC - SC clause order.

This point - that paratactic constructions in complex sentences require the subordinate - main clause order while hypotactic constructions with a subordinating connectives allow the marked order - is also made by Ding Shengshu et al (1963).

(29) and (29a) are the examples that they use to demonstrate this.

- (29) 明天不下雨我一定来
 Mingtian bu xia yu, wo yiding lai. (p 137)
 Tomorrow N down rain, I definitely come

If it does not rain tomorrow, I'll definitely come.

As they point out, (29) is an example of a paratactic construction, which thus has no connectors and the subordinate ('piān') clause at the front and the main ('zhèng') clause at the end. If however, the clause order main - subordinate ('zhèng - piān') is followed, the subordinate clause has the function of providing a supplementary explanation, and "parataxis cannot be used" ('bù néng yòng yìhéfǎ') so the conjunction *yaoshi* is obligatory in (29a).

- (29a) 我一定来要是明天不下雨
 Wo yiding lai, yaoshi mingtian bu xia yu. (p 137)
 I definitely come, if tomorrow N down rain.

I'll definitely come, if it does not rain tomorrow.

Lin Yuwen (op cit) also states that the use of at least one conjunction is obligatory when the marked order is used in complex sentences. When the unmarked order is followed, on the other hand, as in (30) and (31), the use of *yīnwei* (because) in the subordinate clause and *suoyi* (therefore) in the main clause is optional. Thus both can be used, either one can be used, or neither need be used.

- (30) 他因为身体很好, 平日很少生病
 Ta yinwei shenti hen hao, pingri hen shao shengbing
 He *because* health very good, normally very little get ill.

Because his health is very good, he seldom gets ill.

- (31) 他平日很少生病, 所以身体很好
 Ta pingri hen shao shengbing, suoyi shenti hen hao
 He normally very little get ill, *therefore* health very good

He seldom gets ill and *therefore* his health is very good.

As we can see, in (30) the *yīnwei* is present in the subordinate clause and there is no *suoyi* in the main clause. In (31), on the other hand, there is no *yīnwei* in the subordinate clause, but *suoyi* is present in the main clause. The point Lin is making is that when we turn these sentences into their marked versions, (30a) and (31a), then a

conjunction in the subordinate clause becomes essential. No conjunction is required in the main clause, however. So:

- (30a) 他平日很少生病, 因为身体很好
Ta pingri hen shao shengbing, yinwei shenti hen hao
He normally very little get ill, because health very good.

He is hardly ever ill *because* his health is so good. (p 25)

- (31a) 他身体很好, 因为平日很少生病
Ta shenti hen hao, yinwei pingri hen shao shengbing.
He health very good, *because* normally very little get ill.

His health is very good *because* he seldom gets ill.

In (30a) and (31a) respectively, the *yinwei* (because) of the marked subordinate clauses is obligatory. Marked ordering, therefore, requires hypotactic constructions.

2.4 Use of connectors outside hypotactic constructions

2.4.1 As an aid to understanding

When should connectors be used apart from in the subordinate clause of marked sentences? Lin (op cit) argues that, in general, when the meaning of the sentence is clear and only open to one interpretation, there is no need to use connectors. Similarly, there is no need to use a connector when the shared background knowledge of both speaker and hearer ensures there can be no misunderstanding. However, when there is a possibility of misunderstanding, then a connector should be used. For example, Lin argues that the sentence (32) is unclear as it stands.

- (32) 他到过上海, 不认得路
Ta dao-guo Shanghai, buren-de lu. (p 59)
He go-A Shanghai, N know-M road.

In Lin's view, the meaning of this sentence can only be made clear with the introduction of connectors as in (32a).

- (32a) 他虽然到过上海, 但是不认得路
Ta suiran dao-guo Shanghai, danshi buren-de lu.
He *although* go-A Shanghai, *but* N know-M road.

Although he's been to Shanghai, he didn't know the way.

In other words, then, connectors need to be used when the logical relations between the clauses in a complex sentence are unclear. Here Xie Yaoji (1989) agrees with Lin. Xie, arguing that Chinese prefers parataxis, nevertheless does concede that there are occasions when the use of what he calls "English hypotaxis" (p 105) can help clarify meaning in certain contexts. (33) is the sentence Xie chooses to demonstrate this.

- (33) 大家同意我们行动
 Dajia tongyi, women xingdong. (p 106)
 Everybody agree, we act

As Xie points out, as it stands, this sentence could be interpreted as a conditional or as a cause and effect sentence or as a concessional sentence. For example:

If everyone agrees, we'll go ahead. (conditional)
 Because everyone agrees we'll go ahead. (cause-effect)
 Even though everyone agrees, we'll go ahead (concessional).

Xie feels that even within a context, possibilities for misunderstandings can arise and therefore does not see 'Western' influence in the use of conjunctions in a purely negative light. Conjunctions are needed when misunderstanding is possible.

Lu Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi (1953) are not completely opposed to the Westernisation of Chinese either. They feel that, while Chinese should not blindly Europeanise its language, the correct use of aspects of Western grammar can increase the 'yánmìxíng' of Chinese (p iv).²¹

²¹ 'Yánmìxíng' is difficult to translate. It can mean something like accuracy but here, I think, means precision in the sense that precise language is only open to one possible interpretation. Documents that have to avoid ambiguity are said to have this quality of 'yanmixing'. So, Lu and Zhu are arguing for the use of 'Western' connectors to help Chinese become more precise and less ambiguous.

2.4.2 Stylistic considerations

Earlier it was established that a connector is obligatory in the subordinate clause in a complex sentence that follows the marked MC - SC sequence and that no connector is needed in the main clause of such sentences. It was also established that in complex sentences that follow the unmarked SC - MC sequence, any of these three options are possible:

- a) no connectors in either clause
- b) a connector in either clause
- c) a connector in both clauses

We now consider to what extent these three options are equivalent or interchangeable.

Shen Kaimu (1987) states that the use of both pairs of conjunctions in the normal unmarked SC - MC order is rare. It is much more common, according to Shen, to have only one conjunction, and that in the subordinate clause.

However, in several of the examples he gives throughout his book, 'paired' conjunctions are in fact used. For example, of the 8 cause and effect examples he gives (p 128-130), half use both 'yīnwei' and 'suǒyǐ'. And, of the remaining four examples that use only one conjunction, three follow the marked order and use yīnwei in the end placed subordinate clause. There is only one instance in 5 examples, therefore, of a single conjunction appearing without its pair in sentences that follow the unmarked subordinate-main clause order. The other 4 examples all contain 'paired' conjunctions.

It is curious that while most of these Chinese linguists argue that Chinese is a paratactic language, they themselves seem to use a high number of conjunctions in their own language and in their own examples. One possible answer to this apparent paradox is the very fact that, when Chinese writers do decide to use conjunctions in complex sentences that follow the normal unmarked sequence, they tend to use both

conjunctions of the pair. The use of both of the 'paired' conjunctions, whether it be, for example the use of both 'yīnwei' and 'suǒyǐ' or 'suīrán' and 'dànshì', provides the sentence with structural balance. If we look once more at the first three example sentences at the beginning of this chapter, we see that all three of these unmarked complex sentences use both conjunctions of the pair. The three sentences, one cause-effect, one conditional and one adversative, are reproduced below.

- (1) 因为风太大, 所以比赛改期了。
 Yinwei feng tai da, suoyi bisai gaiqi-le.
Because wind too big, *therefore* competition change time-A

Because the wind was too strong, the competition was *therefore* postponed.

- (2) 如果再烧一会水就会开了。
 Ruguo zai shao yihui, shui jiu hui kai-de.
if again warm a little, water *then* can boil-P

If you warm it a little more, the water will boil.

- (3) 他虽然年纪小, 但是胆子不小。
 Ta suiran nianji xiao, danshi danzi bu xiao.
 He *although* age little, *but* guts N small.

Although he's young, he's got guts.

An explanation for this common use of both connectors in these unmarked complex sentences is that, by using both connectors, the sentences achieve the balance which is one stylistic criterion of Chinese sentence structure. Traditionally, Chinese would have used no connectors at all in sentences such as these. The logical relations expressed in the sentences are clear and the absence of connectors naturally provides balance. It may be that, with the relatively recent exposure to Western languages and the resultant influence of this exposure upon Chinese, Chinese has adopted the use of connectors in these traditionally paratactic sentences. But, it is rare to find English sentences that contain a conjunction in both the main and the subordinate clauses. We would expect either, for example:

He felt ill and *so* he went to the doctor, or,

Because he felt ill, he went to the doctor.

However,

Because he felt ill, *so* he went to the doctor,

feels stylistically awkward. It would seem unlikely, therefore, that this use of both conjunctions in Chinese sentences of this type was brought about by the influence of Western languages. What seems more likely is that the influence of Western languages caused Chinese to start using conjunctions so that they could adopt hypotaxis and thus use the marked sequence of main - subordinate clause in complex sentences. The use of paired conjunctions, however, in what are traditionally paratactic sentences, reflects a Chinese traditional and stylistic desire for balance. It makes these sentences appear very like the "correlative" sentences of Hashimoto or the "correlative diptyches" of Lehmann that we considered earlier in this chapter. We tentatively suggest that the use of paired conjunctions is a stylistic device found in formal written style. Some support for this view is given by Ma Zhong (op cit) who, as earlier mentioned, says that the unusual use of paired conjunctions in Classical Chinese displayed a type of stylistic cohesion, known literally in Chinese as 'front back echo' (qiánhòu hūyǐng)²².

2.5 Parataxis v hypotaxis: summary

To sum up the use of connectors in both unmarked and marked complex sentences: - while the three options for connector use listed earlier all are possible in complex unmarked SC - MC sentences, option a) - no connector in either clause - and option c) connectors in both clauses - are more frequent than option b) - a connector in only one clause as an analysis of the example sentences used in this chapter bears out. Only **four** unmarked SC - MC complex sentences, (4) (17) (29a) and (30a), use only one conjunction, and (4) was an example of a so-called 'light' adversative sentence in which, by definition, only one conjunction would appear and (29a) and (30a) were

²²These and similar terms are commonly used to describe techniques of textual organisation and cohesion in rhetoric and composition. For example, Wang and Wu (1985) describe the techniques of 'shǒu wěi zhāo yǐng' (head tail coherence) and 'qián hòu zhāo yǐng' (front back coherence) by which topics are mentioned at the beginning and ending of pieces of text to provide cohesion.

used as example sentences of this phenomenon. (17) represented a sentence of Classical Chinese. On the other hand, **ten** example sentences, (1), (2) (3), (5), (10a), (18), (20), (21), (23) and (32a) use connectors in both clauses.

The use of parataxis is also frequent, however, with a total of **nine** sentences using no connectors in either clause, (14), (15), (26), (27), (28), (29), (32), (33), (34). Sentence (34) appears at the end of the next section.

Of the 8 example sentences that follow the marked MC - SC sequences, all **eight**, (10), (11a), (12), (24), (5), (29a), (30a), (31a), have a conjunction in the subordinate clause but only **one** (24) also has a connector in the main clause. This bears out Lin Yuwen's contention that a conjunction in the subordinate clauses of these sentences is obligatory. A conjunction in the main clause of these sentences is rare, however.

We now turn to the final section of this chapter in which we analyse data taken from a specific genre of Chinese - letters of request. This will give us the chance to measure the claims of the Chinese linguists outlined above against naturally occurring MSC data.

3 The use of 'piānzhèng fùjù' in a specific genre

3.1. The influence of genre

While it has been argued that the increased use of connectors and hypotactic constructions stems from the influence of Western languages upon Chinese, it would be wrong to consider that this increased use of connectors has been uniform throughout all genres. Rudolph (1989) has shown that certain spoken German texts have more conjunctions than written ones. A similar point is made by Tomlin (1985) when he says that an increase in planning time increases the use of dependent clauses and vice versa. Diller (1988) has noted that marked clauses of condition and cause etc. occur in, for example, traditional legalese in Thai and that this style is distinct from other, especially

oral, styles. Cheng Zhenqiu (op cit p 157) notes that written texts are tighter ('jǐnyán') and oral texts are looser ('sōngsǎn'). The distinction may not simply be between oral and written styles, however. For example, Lehmann (op cit) suggests that the length of a passage is significant, with large passages needing explicit linking to form a cohesive text. Rudolph (op cit), after a study of causality across several languages, states that certain types of texts can happily exist without conjunctions - poetry and descriptive pieces for example - while other types of texts need them - argumentative discourses, for example. Similarly, Lu Shuxiang (1990) suggests that connectors are more frequent in expository ('yìlùn') texts in Chinese than in narrative ('jìxùxǐng') texts.

In this section, the use of complex sentences - 'piānzhèng fùjù' - within a specific genre of Chinese is analysed. In particular, cause and effect sentences are considered. The genre in question is letters of request and the corpus of data to be analysed contains forty of these letters. These letters were written by Mainland Chinese to Chinese broadcasters of the Chinese Language Section of Radio Australia (RA). The letter writers requested a variety of items, from programme schedules and calendars - to English language teaching materials and photographs of pop stars. They were, in the main, young men and women in their late teens and early twenties and came from all over Mainland China. The letters of request are analysed in full and at a textual level in chapter 4 where a full description of the data and how it was collected is provided. In this section, the analysis is of 'piānzhèng fùjù' sentences taken from the letters. By analysing the complex sentences in these letters, it is hoped that some of the points made by Chinese linguists about 'piānzhèng fùjù' can be judged against authentic data taken from a specific genre. The analysis concentrates on the use of cause and effect 'piānzhèng fùjù'; the function of postposed subordinate clauses in sentences that follow a marked MC - SC sequence; and the use of the cause and effect connectors. (The 'cause' connector's 'yīnwèi' and 'yóuyú' and the 'effect' connectors 'suǒyǐ', 'gù', 'yīncǐ' and 'wèicǐ')

3.2. 'Piānzhèng fùjù' in letters of request

3.2.1 Clause sequence and the use of 'cause' connectors

In the 40 letters of request, there are 17 uses of 'yīnwei' (because). Only 6 (36%) of these uses of 'yīnwei' occur in sentences that follow the unmarked SC - MC sequence and only 3 of these 6 uses occur with 'suǒyǐ' (therefore). In other words, 64% of the incidences of 'yīnwei' in these letters occur in sentences that follow the marked sequence of MC - SC. So, only some 36% of the incidences of 'yīnwei' occur in sentences that follow the unmarked SC - MC sequence and only 50% of these occur together with a 'suǒyǐ' in the main clause. These uses of 'yīnwei' are given in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The 17 Uses of 'yīnwei' in the Letters of Request

(R1)²³ below is an example of a complex cause and effect sentence that follows the unmarked SC - MC sequence. This is one of only three occurrences where both 'yīnwei' and 'suǒyǐ' are present as a pair.

- (R1) 但是因为中央 人民广播电台
 Danshi yinwei zhongyang renmin guangbo diantai
 But because central people broadcast station
 英语节目 比较 深奥
 yingyu jiemu bijiao shenao,
 English programme comparatively abstruse
 不适合我学习所以我一直 从贵台的
 bu shihe wo xuexi, suoyi wo yizhi cong guitai-de
 N suitable I study, therefore I always from noble station-M
 英语节目里 得到听力
 yingyu jiemu-li dedao tingli
 English programme-in gain listen strength

But because the Central Broadcasting Station's English programmes are rather abstruse they are not really suitable for me (and) *therefore* I get all my practice in listening comprehension from RA's English programmes.

(R2) is an example of 'yīnwei' occurring in a clause in unmarked position but with no 'suǒyǐ' present in the main clause. There are only three such sentences in the data.

- (R2) 因为对于繁体字 我 可是
 Yinwei duiyu fantizi wo keshi
 Because towards complex characters I but
 看得出来写不来我想您 有同感
 kan-de-lai xie-bu-lai, wo xiang nin you tonggan?
 see-R write-N-R I think you (HON) have sympathy?

Because I can only understand but not write complex characters, I hope you will be sympathetic?

The letter from which (R2) is taken contains 4 of the 17 'yīnwei's in the letters. The other three uses of 'yīnwei' in this letter all occur in marked MC - SC sentences. (R3) below provides an example in which the SC in marked position is explanatory in

²³The notation (R1), meaning request 1, is used so that these examples from the letters of request can be distinguished from the other data.

function. This so called explanatory function where the marked subordinate clause is providing additional information to further justify the request in the main clause is the most common role for the marked subordinate clauses in this data. 9 of the 11 postposed clauses fulfil this function. The role of one of the two remaining marked subordinate clauses is hard to determine and is included as (R4) below. The second of these clauses is clearly postposed for emphasis (R5).

- (R3) 我們也很喜歡收集明星們的
 Wo-men ye hen xihuan shouji mingxing-men-de
 I-Pl also very like collect star-Pl-M
 簽名照片, 聽說你這次旅程弄到
 qianming zhaopian, tingshuo ni zhe-ci lucheng nongdao
 sign photo, hearsay you this-C trip get
 一些, 我很希望得到若能得到
 yi-xie. Wo hen xiwang dedao ruo neng dedao
 one-Pl. I very hope obtain if can obtain
 我真是感謝您了 因為我們這里
 wo zhen shi ganxie nin-le yinwei wo-men zheli
 I really be thank you (HON)-A because I-Pl here
 除了買磁帶時偶然 附有
 chule mai cidai shi ouran fuyou,
 except buy tape time by chance enclose
 就弄不到這種照片
 jiu nong-bu-dao zhe-zhong zhaopian
 then get-N-R this type photo

We also like collecting autographed photos of stars (and) heard that you got some on your trip. I would really like some (so) *if* (I) could get some, I would be really thankful *because* except if a tape happens to include (one) when we buy a tape (we) can't get hold of photos like these.

As mentioned earlier, the marked '*yinwei*' clause in (R3) is performing an 'explanatory' function. Its role in (R4) is not quite so clear, however.

- (R4) 当然我希望各位不要笑我是个
 Dangran wo xiwang ge-wei bu yao xiao wo shi ge
 Of course I hope each-C N want laugh me be C
 永远不满足的家伙,因为我太喜欢
 yongyuan bu manzu-de jiahua, yinwei wo tai xihuan
 for ever N satisfied-M fellow, *because* I too like
 你们的节目了
 nin-men-de jiemu le
 you (HON)-Pl-M programme A

I naturally hope that you won't all laugh at me for being a chap who's never satisfied *because* I'm really fond of your programmes.

The writer here is perhaps explaining or justifying the many requests he has made over the years to RA on the grounds that he is an ardent 'fan' of RA. In (R5), the role of the postposed 'yinwei' clause is clearer as it is being used to provide emphasis. This is the only example in the data of a postposed 'yinwei' clause being used for this purpose.

- (R5) 我喜欢澳广 不知道为什么但
 Wo xihuan Ao guang bu zhidaoweishenme dan
 I like Australia broadcast N know why but
 不只是因为喜欢听澳广的节目
 bu zhi shi yinwei xihuan ting Ao guang-de jiemu
 N only be *because* like listen Australian broadcast-M programme

I like RA (and) I don't know why *but* it's not only *because* I like RA's programmes.

Although there are only 17 instances of 'yinwei' being used in these 40 letters, another 'cause' connector 'yóuyú' is also used. There are 7 instances of 'yóuyú'. All of these occur in sentences that follow the unmarked SC - MC sequence. 6 of these occur on their own with no paired connector; one co-occurs with 'suǒyǐ' (R7). The uses of 'yóuyú' are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: The 7 uses of 'yóuyú' in the Letter of Request

(All in unmarked SC - MC complex sentences)

6 uses with no connector in the MC.

1 use with 'suǒyǐ' in the MC.

'Yóuyú' is similar in meaning to 'yīnwei' but it can also be translated as 'owing to' or 'because of'. But, as (R6) and (R7) demonstrate, in many contexts it is synonymous with 'yīnwei'. There is, however, one very important difference in the uses of 'yóuyú' and 'yīnwei' and that is 'yóuyú' only ever occurs in the modifying clause when it is following the unmarked sequence. In other words, 'yóuyú' never occurs in an SC in a sentence that follows the marked MC - SC sequence.

- (R6) 由于我高考落榜以来生活总是
 Youyu wo gaokao luobang yilai, shenghuo zongshi
 Because I high exam fail since, life always
 动荡不安也就没有机会收听
 dongdang bu an, ye jiu meiyou jihui shou ting
 upset N calm, also then N chance listen
 您的节目
 nin-de jiemu
 you (HON) programme.

Because my life has been upside down since I failed the university entrance exam, I haven't had a chance to listen to your programmes.

As 6 of the 'yóuyú' s in this data occur alone, (R7) provides a rare example of 'yóuyú' occurring with a connector in the main clause, in this case, 'sǔoyǐ'.

- (R7) 由于我是喜欢学习英语
 Youyu wo shi xihuan xuexi yingyu
 Because I be like study English
 所以我对这方面的电台节目
 suoyi wo dui zhe fangmian-de diantai jiemu
 therefore I to this aspect-M station programme
 比较 注意
 bijiao zhuyi
 comparatively pay attention.

Because I like studying English I therefore follow those station's programmes closely.

To sum up, there are 17 instances of 'yīnwei' in the 40 letters and 64% of those occur in sentences that follow the marked MC - SC sequence. This supports the contention of the Chinese linguists discussed earlier that complex sentences following the marked MC - SC sequence are becoming common and that, when such a sequence is followed, the connector must be present in the postposed subordinate clause.

Second, almost all these postposed 'yīnwei' clauses are fulfilling an 'explanatory' role for the proposition in the main clause. In this data, therefore, this role is more common than the other 2 roles - emphatic and stylistic - identified by these linguists.

There are therefore only six instances of 'yīnwei' occurring in normal unmarked SC - MC sentences and this supports the argument that connectors are not essential in unmarked 'piānzhèng fùju' sentences. The fact that only 3 instances of 'yīnwei' co-occur with 'sǔoyǐ' may suggest that the use of paired conjunctions is more likely to occur in more formal written texts than these letters of request represent as their use was more common in the writings of the Chinese linguists. This is supported by only 1 of 7 uses of 'yóuyú' co-occurring in unmarked SC- MC complex sentences with a connector in the main clause. Otherwise, 'yóuyú' occurs alone.

3.2.2 Clause sequence and The use of 'effect' connectors

In the 40 letters, there are only 8 instances of the therefore connector 'sǔoǔyǐ' and all these occur in unmarked SC - MC complex sentences. We have noted above that three of these instances co-occur with 'yīnwei' in the subordinate clause and one co-occurs with 'yóuyóu' in the subordinate clause. A further instance of 'sǔoǔyǐ' co-occurs with with the noun 'yuányīn' (reason). There are thus three occasions where 'sǔoǔyǐ' is used on its own, and all three of these occur in sentences that also follow the unmarked SC - MC sequence. These uses of 'sǔoǔyǐ' are given in Figure 3.

Figure 3: The 8 uses of 'sǔoǔyǐ' in the Letters of Request

(All in unmarked SC - MC complex sentences)

(R8) is an example of 'sǔoyǐ' being used on its own with no connector in the subordinate clause.

- (R8) 但我不知道这报名时间
 Dan wo bu zhidao zhe baochu shijian,
 But I N know this announce time,
 所以请你寄一份节目时间表
 suoyi qing ni ji yi-fen jiemu shijianbiao
 therefore please you send one-C programme schedule

But (as) I don't know the times, could you *therefore* please send me a programme schedule.

There are three other effect connectors that occur in these letters. They are 'gù', 'yīncǐ', 'wèicǐ'. 'Gù' (therefore) occurs twice, once with 'yīnwei' (as 'gù cǐ') and once on its own²⁴. Both 'yīncǐ' and 'wèicǐ' also occur twice each. Both these connectors can be translated as *thus*. They can also come at the beginning of a new sentence and can have a discourse function of referring back to a sizeable amount of text. (R9) provides an example of 'yīncǐ' being used in this way. This letter also provides an example of 'yīnwei' and 'sǔoyǐ' being used together in an unmarked SC - MC complex sentence.

- (R9) I am an old friend of and listener to RA (and) *because* [yīnwei] the local transmitter has broken down, it is *therefore* [sǔoyǐ] a long time since I heard RA's broadcasts (if) I happen to hear a broadcast, it's not very clear and I feel very upset. Recently a new listening group here has developed and they have appointed me their representative and (we) have formed a youth club. (We meet) every evening to listen to RA. *Thus* [yīncǐ] could RA grant me a small request and send two calendars.....?'

This discourse use of connectors such as 'yīncǐ' will be considered in the analysis of the data presented in chapter 3. To sum up the sentence level use of the connectors 'sǔoyǐ' and 'gù', there are 10 instances of these in the data. 'Sǔoyǐ' co-occurs three times with 'yīnwei', once each with 'yóuyóu' and the noun, 'yuānyīn' (reason), and three times on its own. 'Gù' co-occurs once with 'yīnwei' and occurs

²⁴Note this use of the 'archaic' connector 'gù'. This was translated into 'sǔoyǐ' by Ma Zhong in his rendering of classical Chinese into contemporary Chinese. (see this chapter, footnote 13).

once on its own. There are no instances in this data of either 'suoyi' or 'gu' occurring in a marked MC - SC complex sentence.

3.3 The incidence of parataxis

The use of 'because' and 'therefore' connectors in the corpus of letters has now been examined. We now turn to consider the use of parataxis, which in this context is taken to mean the use of cause and effect complex sentences that use neither a 'because' nor 'therefore' connector. In (R 10), the writer has been praising certain programmes.

He then writes:

- (R10) 可惜 时间太短 远不能满足
 Ke xi shijian tai duan, yuan bu neng manzu
 Unfortunately, time too short, far N can satisfy
- 听众的要求, 在此 我建议
 tingzhong-de yaoqiu, zai ci, wo jianyi
 listener-M request, at this point, I propose
- 是否 可以增加多 一点时间
 shifou keyi zengjia duo yidian shijian
 whether or not may increase more a little time

Unfortunately (*because*) their [the programmes] time is too short and are (*therefore*) far from able to complete the listeners' requests, (*so*) at this point I (would like to) propose whether the time (given to these programmes) could be increased a little.

I have included in brackets connectors that could have been included in the Chinese. (R 11) provides a further example of a paratactic cause-effect structure.

- (R11) 今年三月一日是我的二十三岁生日
 Jinnian 3 yue 1 ri shi wo-de 23 sui shengri.
 This year 3 month 1 day be I-M 23 year birthday
- 我想在您 主持的 节目中
 Wo xiang zai nin zhuchi-de jiemu-zhong
 I want on you (HON) direct-M programme-in
- 点一首
 dian yi-shou
 play one-C

(*Because*) March the first is my 23rd birthday. I (*therefore*) would like you to play, in your programme, a song.....

It is not easy to decide, in any precise way, the number of these paratactic constructions that occur throughout the data. The main point is that, given the Chinese linguists above have argued that Chinese remains a more paratactic language than English, they do occur and they appear direct or even aggressive in English if at least some connectors are not added. For example, (R 11) reads literally 'March the first is my 23rd birthday. I want you, in your programme to play a song..'

This same point is made by Li Duanyuan (1980) translating a passage of paratactic Chinese into English.

- (34) 这人姓王名冕
 Zhe ren xing Wang, ming Mian,
 This man surname Wang, first name Mian
- 在诸暨县乡村里住
 zai Zhuji xian xiangcun-li zhu.
 in Zhuji county village-in live.
- 七岁上死了父亲,他母亲做些针黹
 Qi sui-shang si-le fuqin, ta muqin zuo xie zhenzhi
 Seven age-on die-A father, he mother do little sew
- 供给他到村学堂里去读书
 gonggei ta dao cun xuetang-li qu dushu.
 provide he to village school-in go study

Li translates this passage into English by adding several connectors (in italics):

His name was Wang Mien *and* he lived in a village in Zhuji county. *When* he was seven his father died, *but* his mother took in sewing *so that* he could study at the village school. (p 68)

This frequent use of parataxis in comparison with English in these examples, supports the claim made by, among others, Wang Li and Cheng Zhenqiu, that Chinese remains a more paratactic language than English. In chapter 3, we examine in detail the use of connectors in another genre and one which incorporates extended spoken discourse.

4. Summary

In this chapter, the work of several Chinese scholars has been surveyed. Their work has shown that the normal unmarked sequence for complex sentences in Chinese ('piānzhèng fùjù' or 'zhǔcóng fùjù') is subordinate clause - main clause. I have given a general term to this sequence calling it the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence.

These Chinese scholars have also argued that Chinese has been influenced by Western languages, especially since the May 4th Movement of 1919, and this influence has brought about an increased use of the marked MC - SC sequence in Chinese, a sequence that was possible but rarely used in classical Chinese

Three reasons for using this 'new' MC - SC sequence were discussed. They were:

- a) for the subordinate clause to provide what the Chinese linguists described as an 'explanatory function' for the main clause. In other words, the postposed subordinate clause provides additional information to justify the proposition or event in the main clause.
- b) to provide prominence or stress for either the subordinate clause or the main clause
- c) for stylistic reasons

It was also argued that this increase in use of the marked MC - SC sequence has been accompanied by an increase in the use of connectors in Chinese. The circumstances under which the use of one or more connectors are determined have been discussed and the conclusions drawn that complex sentences that follow marked MC - SC have to be hypotactic in that a conjunction in the subordinating clause is obligatory. On the other hand, the choice of using either both or neither conjunction in so-called paratactic constructions is stylistic, with the examples in this chapter showing a slight preference for 'true connector free' parataxis. The use of only one conjunction in these sentences is rarer.

Despite the increase in use of connectors in Chinese, however, most Chinese scholars are of the opinion that Chinese remains a more paratactic language than English.

Finally, the points raised by these Chinese scholars have been tested against their own written Chinese and against example sentences taken from the specific genre of letters of request. It was found that the evidence of the data supported the claims made by Chinese scholars.

Chapter 3. Information Sequencing in a Genre of Extended Spoken Discourse

Introduction

In the previous chapters we have shown that the preferred clause sequence in complex sentences in MSC is modifying to modified or SC - MC. We have given this principle of clause sequencing the general term of 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing.

In this chapter, we analyse data taken from a genre of extended spoken discourse to see whether this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' principle for sequencing is also exhibited at this level of discourse.

In this chapter, we also consider the effect that the relative informality and spontaneity of the extended spoken discourse has on information sequencing patterns. This includes an examination of the use of connectors at this level of discourse, in particular, the use of 'because' and 'therefore' connectors.

The chapter begins with a description of the data and then proceeds to the analysis of it.

1. The data

1.1 The collection and description of the data

The data in this chapter comes from the following four sources:

(i) an audio recording of a question and answer session that took place after a talk given in the China Centre of the Australian National University (ANU). The talk was given by a man from Mainland China and the entire proceedings were conducted in MSC.

(ii) The other three sources of data are audio recordings of three press conferences, all of which were given in the People's Republic of China by Chinese to Chinese and international journalists. The three press conferences are:

- a) A press conference given jointly by the President of Beijing University and the General of the Shijiazhuang Military Academy. The topic deals with compulsory military training for Beijing University students. (MTPC)
- b) A press conference given by a spokesman from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (MFAPC)
- c) A press conference given by the Chinese Premier, Li Peng. (LPPC)

The data is presented with the pinyin and a gloss. The translation of each piece of data is presented as a whole beneath it. As this chapter is concerned with an analysis of extended spoken discourse, much of the data in this chapter therefore comprises relatively long chunks of discourse. Despite its length, however, it was thought important to include this data in the main text rather than in an appendix, where, however, a Chinese character version of the data is located.(appendix 1).

These four sources represent a kind of continuum from informal and unplanned to more formal and planned interaction. Generally speaking, the talk given at ANU occupies the least formal end of this continuum. The press conference of Li Peng, the Chinese Premier, the most formal. For this reason, the data has been presented in this unplanned to planned order and a more complete introduction to each set of data is provided as it is met.

2 The scope of the analysis

The analysis of the data is limited to the following four points:

1. The extent to which MSC prefers the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence at this discourse level.
2. The use of an opening or summary statement.
3. The extent to which the relative formality / spontaneity affects information sequencing and the use of discourse markers.
4. The way information is sequenced within the overall structure of a piece of discourse.

2.1 The extent to which MSC prefers the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence at this discourse level.

Schleppergrell (1991) argues that the English connector 'because' plays an important role in thematic structure as it can signal both forward and backward links. Her examples, however, are exclusively of 'because' signalling backward links. Our MSC data will show that, when being used as a discourse marker, in contrast to English, the MSC 'because' connector 'yinwei' exclusively signals forward links. This suggests that 'yinwei' is following the same sequencing principle at discourse level as it does at sentence level and that its function is to set the frame for the following discourse.

Chen Ping (1986) has also hinted at this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing phenomenon, using a different level of analysis in his discussion on the relative order of propositions in Chinese. As we saw in chapter two, he suggests that the relative order is crucial for the understanding of interpropositional relations. To quote him:

'Thus it may be vital to the success of communication that, for some of these relational predicates, their clauses should have a fixed order in the absence of explicit lexical items specifying their relationship. For instance.....the.....adjunct-preceding-nucleus order in the Reason, Concession, and Condition Predicates are crucial for a clear indication of nucleus vs adjunct status of the proposition subsumed within the relational predicate,..' (103)

The importance that MSC attaches to the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is in sharp contrast to English where, as Thompson and Longacre (1985) point out, a paragraph can express reason either before or after the nucleus, depending upon whether it is a reason or result paragraph¹. They summarise this in a diagram, reproduced below, and point out that the linear order of what they term 'reason margins' and nucleus is 'irrelevant'.

This sequencing preference of English has also been noted by Schiffrin (1987). She has shown that, in English, the sequencing of what she calls 'motive' and 'action' relations, which include 'request and account', compliance and justification and claim and grounds', tend to follow a 'action' to 'motive' sequence. For example, her data concerning request and account show that the accounts follow the requests, as exemplified in (1) where Zelda is asking Schiffrin to continue with the interview although Irene has left.

- (1) Can you work any of this with just the two of us, or
y'have t'wait for Irene.
Cause I don't know how long she'll be. (1987 p 207)

Here Zelda makes a request - can we do this without Irene - and then accounts for the request, or gives a reason for it. So the information sequence here is:

¹See also chapter 1 pp 13 ff where we discussed Winter's proposition that the subordinate clause contained grounds for which the main clause provided the conclusion but that the order of clauses was not relevant.

Requests in MSC are the concern of the next chapter. The data in this chapter is relevant to the information sequencing in Schiffrin's compliance and justification and claim and grounds, and what shall be called here simply justification and statement. As we can see from this example taken from Schiffrin (1987), Henry justifies his statement after he has made the statement.

- (2) Now that doesn't mean I hate.
Because the Jewish people are the most liberal minded people in the world.
 There ain't nobody more compassionate, and more generous,
 and more eh -
 we give more money - we give more money for donations, than
 any other nationality in the world!
 D'you know that?

The information sequence here is:

Statement
 |
 Justification(s) for Statement.

The MSC data shows that there is a preference for following the opposite sequence.

So, in MSC, the preferred information sequence is:

Justification(s) for Statement (or Suggestion etc)
 |
 Statement or Suggestion.

2.2 The use of an opening summary or framing statement.

Schiffrin's data also demonstrates the important role played by an opening statement in English. For example, in (3) below (taken from Schiffrin op cit p 193)

Zelda says:

- (3) Well we were going up t'see uh...my-our son tonight
 but we're not
cause the younger one's gonna come for dinner
cause he's working in the neighborhood.
 So that's out.

Here Zelda first states the main point - that they are now not going to see their son tonight. Then she gives two reasons - note that the second reason is 'subordinate' to the first reason. Finally, she restates the main point, with 'that' referring to going to see their son tonight. The information sequence of this piece of discourse can thus be presented as follows:

Elsewhere, Schiffrin (1985) argues that what she calls the marked use of the English sequence 'because X,Y' is, in fact, an example of the sequence just outlined above. Her argument states that the sequence of talk

I says you're a bum
 (X) cause Bubby and Zede was here
 (Y) I says you're no good

is not a 'because X, Y' sequence but actually a 'Y because X, Y' sequence as in:

(Y) I says you're a bum
 (X) cause Bubby and Zede was here
 (Y) I says you're no good. (ibid p 283)

The role of the framing statements in these examples is crucial in English as they focus the main point that the speaker is going to make for the hearer.

A question examined in this chapter is whether the framing statement plays a similar role in MSC. Young (1982) has pointed out that the opening lines of her Chinese speakers' English discourse contain no statement which would indicate the

speakers' main point to the listeners. In other words, there is no opening or framing 'content' statement in the English of Chinese speakers.²

This would leave us with an unmarked information structure of 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' (or 'because X,Y') at discourse level in MSC as in:

Reason (s)

↓
'So' - summary statement or statement of main point.

The question of framing and opening statements is discussed later on in this chapter. A distinction is made between an opening statement that is letting the listeners know what the speaker feels about a particular topic and an opening statement that is letting the listeners know something about the structure of the ensuing talk. The first we call an opening content statement, and the second an opening structure statement.

2.3 The extent, if at all, the level of formality and spontaneity affects the information sequencing of the discourse and the use of discourse markers within it.

The hypothesis, following Sacks et al (1974), is that embedding and the use of low-level connectors will be common in unplanned spontaneous speech. More planned speech, on the other hand, will contain more co-ordinate and paratactic structures.

Furthermore, as 'adjunct - preceding' nucleus order is relatively fixed in MSC, we would expect that the interpropositional discourse relation of 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' can be understood without explicit discourse markers. It is the fixed sequence of these interpropositional relations that allow them to be understood and therefore overt linguistic markers to signal these relations should not be necessary.

It should be noted that the data in this chapter comprises speech. We have noted in chapter two, that the use of connectors can be used in formal written Chinese for

²Interestingly, Choi (1988) found that, while the English essays of native speakers invariably presented the main point or thesis statement in the first part of the essay, this was not always the case in essays written by Korean native speakers.

stylistic reasons, to provide 'qiánhòu hūyǐng' or 'front-back echo'. This stylistic use of these paired connectors in written Chinese, however, is limited to sentence level.

2.4 The way information is sequenced within the overall structure of a piece of discourse.

In addition to looking at how the 'because' and 'therefore' markers are used at discourse level and the importance of the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence as a whole, we are also interested in the way information is sequenced within the overall structure of a piece of discourse. In other words, we show how other relations are expressed within the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. This can perhaps be understood by seeing the overall 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence as the 'pregnant mother' unit encompassing other relationships enveloped within it.³

3. The analysis of the data: the talk at ANU. Informal and unplanned

3.1 General background

This data is taken from an audio recording of the question and answer session that took place after a talk given at ANU in April 1990. The talk, delivered in MSC by a native speaker from Mainland China, was entitled 'The Peking Student Movement of 1989. A Bystander's View'. The talk was attended by some thirty people. Although some of those who attended were not native Chinese speakers, all present were able to speak MSC and the entire proceedings - the talk and the question and answer session that followed it - were conducted in MSC.

³ This is not the same as the pregnant sentence or 'bāoyùn jù' discussed by, for example, Li Jinxi and Liu Shiru (1957) and Chao Yuanren (1968). Chao classifies the sentence 'wǒ měi xiǎngdào nǐ wàng le' (I N expect you forget-A), as a pregnant ('bāoyùn') sentence with the first clause (I didn't expect) as the mother clause and the second clause (that you'd forget) as the child clause (p 108). My use of this term is the same as Lu Bingfu's and Jin Lixin's (1988) where, for example, they analyse a sentence as: Gúrán (rúguǒ-jiù), dànsì (rúguǒ-jiù), with the conditional sentences (in brackets) being enveloped within the main sentence.

The atmosphere was informal. The speaker was not acting in any official capacity and was certainly not there to give the official line of the events of June 4th (the so-called Tiananmen Massacre). Furthermore, the speaker had personal friends in the audience. Although a long time resident of Beijing, the speaker now lives in Australia and has an Australian wife.

It was decided to analyse the question and answer session rather than the talk itself as the question and answer session was spontaneous in the sense that the speaker had no foreknowledge of any of the questions that he was asked. The speaker's answers therefore provided good examples of unplanned spontaneous spoken discourse.

The length of the answers throughout the data appears comparatively long, even after noting that the speaker's turns are all, in a sense, 'pre-allocated' rather than 'locally' allocated, to use Sacks et al's terms (1974). Although I have done no quantitative research on the question, I have noted that Chinese speakers are allowed much more 'floor time' than English speakers would be in similar circumstances. Almost all of the discussions that I have recorded that involve Chinese speakers alone have shown that there is remarkably little turn stealing or interruption. This is in sharp contrast to discussions in which English speakers are present as these are characterised by turn stealing and interruption. The result is that, in Chinese meetings, speakers are allowed a much longer turn than English speakers would be in equivalent circumstances. It is very tempting to suggest that one reason for this might be that the Chinese rhetorical structures follow a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. This requires listeners to wait patiently for the 'punchline' or main point. English speakers, who are used to the main point being expressed early in such interaction, are not so patient. In other words, then, the answers in this question and answer session and in the press conferences are much longer than they might have been in a 'Western' one. This, in

turn, allows a speaker to develop the points he is making and thus provides for the analysis of information sequencing.

Before giving the speaker's answer to the questions he was asked, either a paraphrase or the full question has also been quoted. Clearly, in question and answer exchanges of the type analysed throughout the data, the question is, in a pragmatic sense, tied to the answer. It provides the context for the answer, and answers cannot be analysed in isolation from the questions which occasioned them.

3.2 The data analysed

The first extract is taken from the speaker's answer to a question asking whether the Chinese students welcomed foreign participation in the Chinese student movement. This has been chosen because it shows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence operating at 'sentence' level. But as we shall see in the analysis of a second extract taken from this answer (5), this 'sentence' level 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence can itself be part of a piece of discourse whose overall sequence is also 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE'.

(4) occurs 13 lines into the answer dealing with foreign involvement. In the previous 12 lines, the speaker has pointed out that some students were in favour of foreign involvement and that others were against it. He has raised the legal question but has also said that the law is a "fascist" one. He then says:

- (4) *yīnwei* wǒmen méiyǒu miànduì zhège wèntí /
 because we N face this question,
 wǒ hé wǒde tàitai dōu yǒu běijīng hùkǒu /
 I and I-M wife both have Beijing residence permit,
 suǒyǐ wǒ zhège wèntí méiyǒu gèng xiāngxì-de kǎochá /
 therefore I this question N more close-P study,

because we haven't faced this question, I and my wife both have Beijing residence permits, *therefore* I haven't more thoroughly investigated this problem.

The speaker explains that he has not thought very much about the question of foreign participation in the student movement because he and his wife are not foreigners. (Actually his wife is an Australian but, as he explains, she has a Beijing residence permit, so, for the purposes of the question presumably doesn't count as a foreigner). Note that 'I and my wife both have Beijing residence permits' is itself a reason for why they have not faced the question of foreign participation. The '*suǒyǐ*' is linking with the '*yīnwei*' in line one of the example and is separated from it by the secondary reason. This shows that '*suoyi*' can refer back to reasons separated from it

by other information. As we shall see, 'suoyi' often operates as a discourse marker across lengthy texts. Note also that the information sequence follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. Note also that the subordinate - main clause sequence is operating here at a level above the clause. This information sequence, with its overt and 'covert' discourse markers, can be represented as:

<u>Sequence</u>	<u>Connectors</u>
Reason	yīnwei
Reason for Reason	o (no overt marker)
'suoyi'	sūoyi

The second extract, (5) comes from this same answer. It demonstrates a more complex information sequence that includes a 'pregnant mother' 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' unit which incorporates, among others, a concessional structure and lower level because-therefore structures. This excerpt follows a few lines after (4). The significant connectors are in italics. Where connectors in the English translation are placed in brackets, it signifies that they are not present in the Chinese.

- (5) dàn yīnwei wǒ méiyǒu yùdào zhège wèntí /
but *because* I N meet this question,
- 2 sūirán wǒ-de / àiren shì àodàliya rén / dànshì tā dāngshì
although I-M, wife be Australia person, but she then
- 3 zài zhōngguó yǒu / běijīng hùkǒu / sūoyi tā kěnéng-ne
in China have, Beijing permit, *therefore* she can-P
- 4 bǐfang shuō shènzi gēn yóuxíng duìwǔ zǒu yī zǒu {?} /
for example even with parade troops walk one walk,
- 5 yīnwei tā jùyǒu běijīng shìmín shēnfēn
because she have Beijing citizen status
- 6 zhège wǒmen méiyǒu jìn yī bù tántǎo
this we N enter one step discuss
- 7 wǒ méi bànfa zài shēnrù huídá duìbuqǐ-le
I N way again deep reply sorry-A.

but *because* I haven't come across this question, (*because*) although my wife is Australian she had in China at the time a Beijing residence permit *therefore* she might for example even walk with the parading marchers *because* she has Beijing citizen status (*so*) we haven't further discussed this (*so*) I have no way in replying in any more depth, sorry.

The 'mother' 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' unit starts with the 'yīnwei', because, in line 1. The 'this question' that the speaker mentions is the original question concerning foreign participation in the Chinese student movement. The 'therefore' part of this 'because' is not stated until lines 6 and 7. That is to say because the speaker and his wife haven't come across the question, so they haven't discussed it, and so the speaker cannot give an in depth reply to the question. The reader will notice that there are no overt connectors introducing the 'therefore' part of the discourse unit in lines 6 and 7. The translation provides (*so*) in brackets.

Within this pregnant 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' unit lie:

a) a concessional 'suīrán', although, - 'dànshi', but, construction. (line 2) This follows the normal unmarked sequence of subordinate clause - main clause. The pair of connectors 'suīrán' and 'dànshi' are both present.

b) In line 3 there is a 'suǒyǐ'. This represents the 'therefore' part of a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sentence level construction. The 'yīnwei', which could be placed either before or after the 'suīrán' in line 2, is not present. I have inserted (*because*) in the English translation. Notice how the 'because' is restated in line 5. The marked MC - SC sequence is used here as the speaker is emphasising the importance of his wife's Beijing residence status and citizenship.

c) a 'for example' clause in line 4 that is in parenthesis within the 'suǒyǐ' clause in line 3.

These few lines of data provide a complex information sequence is presented as Figure 1, below.

Figure 1

What this shows is that the discourse 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence can include within it, at lower levels of textual hierarchy, a complex of other propositions, among which can be lower level 'because-therefore' relations⁴. That is to say, the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence can be realised at any level and that the lower level units can lie within the mother unit.

Figure 1 also shows that (5) is characterised by what we are calling 'enveloping'. This provides a clue that the answer is unplanned as enveloping often signals spontaneous speech. This confirms the point made by Sacks et al (1974) in their discussion on turn-size. They point out that turn-size, defined as the length of time a speaker can speak in any one turn, increases "with increasing degrees of pre-allocation on the linear array." (p 730). What this means is that if the sequence of turns is known before, for example, a discussion begins, or if a chairperson of a meeting makes clear who is going to speak and in what order, then the turn-size of each speaker will be larger than in a meeting or conversation where the decision about who speaks next is

⁴See also (2) in chapter 3 for a further example of this.

made turn by turn, or is 'locally' allocated. What is interesting for the enveloping-as-a-clue-to-spontaneity argument is that they then go on to say that "increasing internal complexity within single (or minimised) sentence units is the central role for local-allocational systems." (730). In other words, enveloping is common in speech where a speaker's turn is determined only immediately prior to his turn, and the speech is, therefore, unplanned. While the speaker of (5) clearly knew that he was going to get the next turn after the question had ended, the amount of enveloping in his answer shows that he had not planned his answer beforehand.

Sacks et al (ibid) also state a significant corollary of this, i.e. that a planned or pre-allocated turn will contain a "multiplication of sentence units" (p 730). If this is indeed true, then we would expect a planned answer to be comparatively free of enveloping and follow a more coordinately structured and recursive format. We might also expect an unplanned answer, by virtue of its enveloping nature, to contain more overt connectors in the text. On the other hand, a planned answer which followed the normal 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence might not require many overt connectors in the text as the sequence of interpropositional relations would be enough for the meaning to be clear. We would expect, therefore, that the data from the talk at ANU to provide us with a comparatively high number of examples of speech interspersed with overt connectors. On the other hand, we would expect the data from the more formal press conferences to provide us with more examples of coordinate structures with relatively few overt connectors and we shall be examining that data with this in mind. Existence of embedded speech and a large number of overt low-level connectors in a formal setting would be evidence of unplanned answers in that setting.⁵

⁵See also the discussion in chapter 2, section 3.1, on the influence of genre where, for example, Tomlin (1985) points out that an increase in planning time increases the use of dependent clauses and vice versa.

In addition to supplying the 'therefore' summary statement for the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' discourse unit in (5), the final lines of the answer also provide the summary statement for the entire answer. The entire answer is quite long so here a simple paraphrase is provided so that the reader can see how the final statement of the answer acts as a summary statement.

The speaker first thanks the questioner for the question - about how foreign involvement in the student movement was viewed by the students. He then says that one group of students feel pleased by the involvement of foreigners, but that another group feel that foreign involvement could bring trouble. He then raises two more issues, one that there might be a law concerning foreign involvement and the other that the law is a fascist one.

It is at this stage that he then says 'because we haven't faced this question...' which is the first line of example (4). What the speaker has done here is to provide background information concerning foreign involvement in the student movement before actually saying that because he hasn't faced the question - because he and his wife are not foreigners - he is thus unable to answer the question. The final remark of the entire answer (line 7 of example 5) is:

'(so) I have no way in replying in any more depth, sorry'

Although this final remark both explains the result of the speaker not having come across the question and also signals the summary statement for the whole answer, yet it is not expressed in the text. So, even when the 'therefore' connector is doing two jobs, it need not be overtly expressed here for the meaning to be understood.

3.2.1 'Because' connector 'yīnwei' as a discourse marker

The 'because' connector 'yīnwei' can act as a discourse marker. For example, in (6) below the 'because' connector controls a series of reasons that precede the 'so' summary statement. Here, the speaker is answering the question 'Why are you a bystander and not a playmaker?' The speaker initially responds by laughing and saying that 'this is a very good question'. It is possible that he feels a little defensive about this as it would have been possible to infer that the questioner is disapproving of the speaker's role of mere bystander. As a result, the speaker feels that he is being called upon to justify his role. He then says that there are 'two reasons...', two points, the first point.....

- (6) yīnwei-ba / wǒ-ne zài zhōngxué shídài-ba / shì zài nàge./
 because-P, I-P at middle school period-P, be at that,
- 2 zhōngguó yě hǎo shìjiè yě hǎo-ba / jiù hóngwēibīng
 China also good world also good-P, then little red guards
- 3 fāyuán-de lǐbian / zhǎngchulai-de xuéshēng /
 source-M in growing up-M students,
- 4 wǒ jiùshì dú zhōngxué-de shíhou,
 I then read middle school-M time
- 5 yǐjīng jiù mùji-guò wūdòu yě cānjiā-guò
 already then see-EXP armed struggle also participate-EXP
- 6 xiǎo guīmó-de wūdòu / wǒ yě nàge shíhou yǐjīng yě
 small scale-M armed struggle, I also that time already also
- 7 zài qiānggshàng zhōng tǎnkè xià shēnghuó-guò /
 in rifle in in tank under live-EXP,
- 8 wǒ yǒu-guò nàyang yīduàn shēnghuó jīnglì /
 I have-EXP that kind one-M life experience,
- 9 wǒ kěnéng ba yīxiē shìwù tèbié yīxiē dōngxi
 I perhaps NOM some things special some things
- 10 kàn-de-dàn-le yīdiǎn / zhège yīge wèn
 see-R-trivial-P little, this one ques(tion)

'(the first point,)

because, the time I was at middle school was then, China was fine, the world was fine, the little red guards started, and students growing up, when I was at middle school I had already seen armed struggle and had taken part in small scale armed struggle, and also at that time I had lived with guns and tanks, I have had that experience of life, (so) I possibly trivialise things a little, that's one question.....

In answer to the question of why he is a bystander and not a playmaker, the speaker says that there are two points to bear in mind. (6) gives his account of the first point which consists of a series of reasons why the speaker tends to trivialise things (and thus is content to be a bystander at the current time rather than a playmaker). The *because* connector 'yīnwei' controls a whole series of reasons that are listed here from lines 1 to 8.

There is no overt discourse marker here that signals the start of the summary 'so' statement. Let us also note that there is no framing content statement that lets the listener know what the first of the speaker's reasons is. However, he does use a framing structure statement, an advance organiser. He merely says 'the first point, because....' and he does not say, at this stage, what the first point is.

The information sequence of (6) can therefore be represented as follows:

Because ⁿ (where n means any number of reasons)

 |
Therefore

Here we have an example of what Schiffrin calls a 'motive and action' relation. But, clearly, the sequence being followed here has the reasons (or grounds, or justification) preceding the explanation (or claim or compliance). This is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2

In Schifffrin's English data, this sequence is reversed, with the claim preceding the grounds for it.

Having stated the first reason for why he is a bystander and not a playmaker, the speaker goes on to provide the second reason. His basic point is that he did not say that he was going to tell all in his talk - the inference being that he perhaps did play some active role, although he did not mention it in his talk. Having said this he comments:

- (7) *suǒyǐ-ne zhège wèntí shéi zhīdao wǒ sīrén hé qítā rén-de*
 therefore-P this question who knows I myself and other people-M
- 2 *yīge yīge wèntí*
 one one question
- 3 *yīncǐ wǒ méiyǒu cānjiā zhège zhèxiē xuéshēng yùndòng-de*
 thus I N participate this these student movement-M
- 4 *rènhe kàngyì huódòng*
 any protest activity

therefore this question, who knows, is a question for myself and other people, (and) *so* I didn't take part in this, in any of these student protest movements.....

In (7) here, the speaker first provides the summary statement for his second reason for being a bystander. This is signalled by the use of the therefore marker 'suǒyǐ'. He then goes on to provide the summary statement of his entire answer to the question 'Why are you a bystander and not a playmaker?'. This, in turn, is signalled by another therefore marker 'yīncǐ'. Figure 3 represents the overall information sequence of this answer.

Figure 3

Question: Why are you a bystander and not a playmaker?

Answer: 'Good Question'

Two Reasons...Two Points

[Becauseⁿ - o Therefore]

+

[o Because - Therefore]

+

[Therefore]

What this shows is a recursive information sequencing pattern of 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' occurring throughout the answer. This also prefaces the final summary 'therefore'. The speaker, in attempting to justify his role as a mere bystander, uses the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence at several levels of hierarchy, thus following a justification for statement - statement sequence.

In the next section we analyse in more detail the role of 'sŭoŭi' as a signaller for a summary statement.

3.2.2 'Therefore' connector 'sŭoŭi' as a signaller of a summary statement

The use of discourse marker 'therefore' to signal the summary statement of an entire piece of discourse rather than the immediately preceding argument(s) can also be seen in (8) and (9) below⁶. For (8), the speaker has been answering a question concerning the power of dialogue in the present situation in China. The questioner wants to know whether the speaker thinks that dialogue has a chance of success in the Chinese political climate of the time. In a long answer running to more than thirty lines of tapescript, the speaker cites several reasons why he thinks that dialogue has little chance of success in China at the moment. The main reason he gives is that, for

⁶In (5) earlier in this chapter, the 'therefore' connector was not present in the text.

dialogue to succeed, there has to be a workable balance of power between the parties.

He cites several historical examples to back this up. He then ends his answer by saying:

- (8) xiànzài yīncǐ-ne wǒ bù rènwei zhèxiē duìhuà nénggòu chénggōng
 now thus-P I N think these dialogue can succeed
- 2 yīnwei bù cúnzài yīge píngděng duìhuà-de jīchǔ
 because N exist one equal dialogue-M base
- 3 shì zhèyàngzi.
 is this way.

thus I don't think that these dialogues can succeed *because* an equal base for dialogue doesn't exist, that's the way it is.

Here, the 'therefore' marker 'yīncǐ' is signalling the summary statement for the whole answer and its 'low-level' communicative purpose is to let the audience know that the answer is coming to a close. Interestingly, it is coupled with a 'because' clause in the marked sequence of main clause - subordinate clause. The speaker has included this final because clause to emphasise the main point of the argument he has been making throughout the answer. He feels the point is of sufficient import to be restated and to be marked in this way. In general, however, the speaker's answer here provides another example of reasons preceding the statement, or of grounds preceding the claim.

The final piece of this data (9) represents the closing words of the speaker's final answer. Here the 'therefore' connector 'suǒyǐ' is being used to signal the summary statement, not just of the answer that the speaker has been giving, but of the entire session. Remember that the talk was entitled 'The Beijing Student Movement of 1989. A Bystander's view'.

- (9) zhège wǒ suǒyǐ shì guāncháo-zhe /
 this I *therefore* be bystander,
- 2 zhège zhège suǒ shuō-de jiùshì zhèyàngzi /
 this this NOM say-M E this way,
- 3 gèwèi gèwèi hái yǒu shénme?
 anybody anybody still have what?

this, *therefore* I'm a bystander, all this I've said is (about) this.
 Does anyone have anything else?

That nobody does raise a further question and the chairman of the meeting then calls the meeting to a close, suggests that the audience recognised the speaker's final summary statement for what it was.

3.3 Summary

This analysis of the ANU talk has shown:

(i) that the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is a common way of sequencing information. This means, for example, that the speaker often precedes a statement or claim with the grounds for that statement or claim.

(ii) that enveloping occurs with unplanned speech and that a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' unit can therefore act as a pregnant mother unit to a number of lower level units.

(iii) while MSC uses opening or framing structure statements, it does not often use opening or framing content statements.

(iv) that the connector 'yīnwei' can function as a discourse marker as in (6) where it signals or controls a number of reasons spanning several lines of tapescript.

(v) that the connector 'suǒyǐ' can signal a summary statement as in (9). On occasion when acting in a summarising function it need not be lexically marked, as in (5).

We now turn to an analysis of the press conferences to see how the points made in this summary of the ANU seminar can be confirmed or refined.

4. The analysis of the data: The press conferences.

4.1 General background

In each press conference, in addition to the people actually giving the press conference, and, of course, the audience, there is also a Chinese interpreter. His task is twofold. On the one hand he has to translate into English everything that is said in Chinese. This not only includes translating what the holders of the press conferences say, but also translating the questions of the Chinese speaking journalists. On the other hand, he has to translate into Chinese all the questions that are asked in English. The questions and answers can follow either of these two patterns. Either 'Chinese question - English translation of question - Chinese answer - English translation of answer' or, 'English question - Chinese translation of question - Chinese answer - English translation of answer'. This format is followed throughout all three of the press conferences. The translations of the data are mine, however, unless otherwise stated.

A second point worth making is that, very often, the role of the people giving the press conference is to express the official Chinese government line. By the same token, these people do not welcome what they consider to be 'impertinent' questions. There are several strategies that the givers of the press conferences can adopt to prevent much time being allocated for the asking of difficult questions. These strategies include:

a) the interpreter will stress at the beginning that there is not much time, so will request that all questions be brief and concise. (See (10) below for an example of this.)

b) the holder(s) of the press conference can take up a substantial amount of time by stating the official view on a variety of topics before taking any questions.

c) the first question is often given to a member of the official Chinese press who will ask a suitably vague and wide ranging question that will allow the spokesman ample opportunity to answer at inordinate length.

I have already pointed out that the average length of response to questions throughout this data is comparatively long. One way of letting the listeners know that an answer is going to be of particular length is by the use of what Clyne (1987) has called 'advance organisers' (AO's). As mentioned earlier, these act as opening statements that give listeners an idea of the structure of the answer. They do not act as opening or framing statements for the content of the answer. A good example of this occurs with the opening question and answer of the Li Peng press conference (see (16) below).

The use of 'because, first' as an AO tells the listeners that 'I-am-going-to-give-several-reasons-and-you-must-wait-until-I-have-finished-before-you-can-ask-me-any-questions'. Incidentally, implicit in this use of AO's is the speaker's knowledge that he has the power and right to speak for a long time without interruption. Equally implicit is the listeners' knowledge that the speaker has this right and power. Thus, the speaker is never interrupted during one of these extremely long answers.

A fourth strategy that can be used to prevent difficult questions is by refusing to answer them. Again, implicit here is the knowledge, shared by both speaker and listener, that the speaker has the power / right to refuse to answer difficult questions.

What these four strategies are designed to do is to forestall passing on information. This means that, on occasion, the purpose of the very act of communication is to prevent communication. In other words, the communicative purpose of an inordinately long explanation of an official line is not so much to communicate to the listeners what that official line is but rather to deny to those listeners the opportunity to ask difficult questions. So we have a communicative purpose whose aim is to fill in time in order to prevent subsequent communication.

4.2 The Military Training Press Conference (MTPC)

4.2.1 General background

The first of the press conferences to be analysed here was given to a group of Chinese and international journalists in Beijing in late 1989. The press conference was held by the President of Beijing University and the army General in charge of the Shijiazhuang Military Academy. The purpose of the press conference was to explain the nature of the year's military training that had recently been imposed upon all students at Beijing University. The tone of the press conference was friendly and informative. While not as informal as the talk at ANU, it was the most informal of the three press conferences. When I talked about the press conference to some of the English journalists who attended it, they all said that they had found it quite enjoyable, in sharp distinction to the vast majority of press conferences that they had attended.

4.2.2 The data analysed

The press conference on military training (MTPC) starts with the interpreter setting the ground rules. He explains that the conference will last an hour and then requests:

- (10) *yīnwei* shíjiān bǐjiào duǎn *yīncǐ* yāoqiú xīnwén-de jìzhě
because time comparatively short *therefore* request journalists
- 2 zài tí wèn shí jǐnliàng jiǎnduǎn míngliǎo
 at raise question time strive brief clear

The interpreter himself interprets this as:

as we are all working under time constraints so we advise our correspondents to raise their questions in a very concise and brief manner.

Although this is a sentence level example, I have chosen to analyse this short extract for a number of reasons. First, it demonstrates a simple low level 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence being used to make a request. Notice that the reason for the request thus precedes the request.

Second, the 'therefore' marker '*yīncǐ*' being used where one would normally expect to find '*suǒyǐ*'. It is more usual for '*yīncǐ*' to act more as a solitary discourse

marker rather than as a low level partner to 'yinwei'.⁷ However, in this example it is partnering 'yīnwei'. There are other examples in the data of this low level 'yīnwei'-
'yīncǐ' pairing⁸.

Third, this small piece of data represents a nice example of Chinese conciseness (possibly influenced by the request for brevity that the data represents) and liking for balance or parallelism. No subject appears in the 'yīncǐ' clause, for example, even though the subject of the 'yīncǐ' clause is not the same as the subject of the 'yīnwei' clause. Notice however, that the interpreter's translation makes 'we' the subject of both clauses, while in Chinese the subject of the 'yīnwei' clause is 'time' and of the 'yīncǐ' clause an unstated 'I', or possibly a 'royal we'. Note further that the translation has to include the coordinating conjunction 'and' to link concise with brief. The Chinese requires no connector here. The normal time marker 'de shíhou' has been shortened to 'shí' which itself is attached to a short form of 'wèntí' giving us 'tí wèn shí' rather than the more informal 'tí wèntí-de shíhou'. Finally, the interpreter uses 'so' in the English translation, thereby faithfully but unnecessarily reproducing the balance of the Chinese 'yīnwei' 'yīncǐ' pairing.

Having said that time is short, the interpreter then says that the press conference will start with the General giving a 'short introduction'. An indication that this is going to be a relatively informative press conference is gained from the length of the General's 'short introduction', as it is indeed short.

To place the next piece of data, (11), in context, I shall quote the interpreter's translation of the question to which (11) is the first part of the answer. The question has been asked by a Japanese journalist and it is answered by the President of Beijing University.

⁷For example, see chapter 2, p 78, example (R9).

⁸See, for example, (16).

'His question is that I understand that the number of the recruitments of the 1989 of the Beijing University is much reduced is about one third of the normal figure, I want to ask whether in 1990 you will still cut down the number of recruitment of the students and if this figure is resumed to the normal level which is about 2,000 students will all those 2,000 students be brought down to the Military Academy for military training, and when the 1989 students return to Beijing University, are they going to complete their studies in Beijing University in 3 years or in another 4 years?'

The University President answers:

- (11) gēnjù běijīng dàxué jiàoyù gǎigé-de tànsǔo /
according to beijing university education reform-M explore
- 2 nàme wǒmen zhāoshēng-de rénshù-ne yào shè zài
TS⁹ we enrol-M number-P want set up
- 3 jūnxiào nénggòu jiēshòu-de / hé jūnxiào nénggòu
military school can accept-M and military school can
- 4 jiēshòu-de chéngdù xiàng xiánjiè / suǒyǐ qùnián wǒmen-de
accept-M level mutual dovetail, therefore last year we-M
- 5 zhāoshēng rénshù shǎo yīdiǎn / jīnnián / yě jiùshì jiǔ líng nián-de
enrol number less little, this year, also E nine zero year-M
- 6 zhāoshēng yī qiān liù bǎi /
enrol one thousand six hundred,
- 7 yě jiùshì bǐ qùnián zēngjiā yībèi [I]¹⁰
also E COM last year increase one time [I]

In accordance with the furtherance of educational reform at Beijing University, the enrolled number of students will equal the number that the Military Academy can accept, *therefore* the numbers we enrolled last year were a little down, this year, the enrolment for 1990 will be 1,600 students, double that of last year.

Here the speaker, the University President, gives an answer to the first part of the question which was concerned with the level of future enrolment figures. The tone or rhetorical aim here is neutral in that the President is just supplying a set of figures, and there seems to be no reason for him to either be evasive or embarrassed about providing them. The information sequence here follows the common order of the

⁹ Yung-O Bik (1990) identifies three uses of 'nàme'. 'Nàme' can be used as it is here which is as a marker of topic succession (TS). It can also be used as a conditional marker (C) in the main clause, in much the same way as 'jiù'. An example of this use occurs in (13) below. And it can also be used as a marker of topic change (TC), as in (12) below.

¹⁰(I) means that that the speaker pauses at this point to allow the interpreter to interpret.

'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence at the highest level of hierarchy that includes, within it, other clausal relations among which are 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' propositions.

The information sequence in the President's answer is:

BECAUSE	→	THEREFORE
No. of students = Military Academy nos.		a) last year nos. down b) this year nos. up

This also shows that the 'therefore' marker 'suǒyǐ' can control a series of statements based on previously cited reasons in much the same way that the 'because' marker 'yīnwèi' can control a series of reasons. (see (6) above).

The President now continues his reply which is given in (12) below.

- (12) nàme / zhè jīnnián jūnxiào jiéyè-de xīnshēng
 TC, this this year military school complete-M freshmen
- 2 huí dào Běijīng dàxué yǐhòu yào chéngdān sìnián /
 return to Beijing University after need undertake 4 year,
- 3 zhūanyè-de xuéxí [I] tāmen hé / qùnián tāmen tóngshí shàng dàxué-de
 special-M study [I] they and, last year they same time to university-M
- 4 xiàng bǐ yīdìng huì yánqí yīnián [I] dànshì-ne / qítā-de xuéshēng
 like COM must can delay one year [I] but-P, other-M students
- 5 bìyè yǐhòu / tā yě xūyào jiù yīnián jiànxiqí /
 graduate after, he also must then one year probation,
- 6 běida zhè yīpī xīnshēng bìyè yǐhòu tāmen zìjué cānjiā
 beida this one batch freshmen graduate after they free join
- 7 wǒmen gōngzuò méiyǒu jiànxiqí [I]
 we work N probation [I]
- 8 suǒyǐ tāmen-de shíjiān hé qítā-de xuéshēng yīyàng.
 therefore they-M time and other-M students same.

so, after this year's group of freshmen complete their courses and return to Beijing University, they still have to undertake four years of academic work.[I] They will (*therefore*) graduate one year after those last year students who went to university at the same time they did. [I] But, after those other students graduate they have to do a year's probation, after this group of Beijing University freshmen graduate, they can go to any

job they want without any probation, *therefore*, the time (they take) is the same as for the other students.

The basic point that the President is making here is that the students at Beijing University who have to do military training will not be disadvantaged though their course will take an extra year because other students at other universities have to do a year's probation after they graduate, something that the Beijing University students will not have to do. His argument is quite complex and his rhetorical aim is now to persuade the listeners that doing military training will not disadvantage the Beijing University students vis a vis students at other universities. But again, the information sequencing of the President's argument follows the basic 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' order:

o BECAUSE students do 4 years

o THEREFORE they graduate later

+

o BECAUSE a) other S have year's probation THEREFORE they take the same time
 b) Beijing Univ S do not

While the President's logic might be questioned here, he is still following the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence in the presentation of his argument. Notice that there is only one overt 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' connector in this part of the President's reply and that this is the therefore marker 'sǔoǔyǐ' in line 8 of (12). This would suggest that this answer has been well-planned. It is likely that the President of the University has had to rehearse the answer to this type of question several times and is therefore used to answering this question.

The overall pattern of the whole answer, taking (11) and (12) together can be represented as following the sequence shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4

The final piece of data that to be analysed from this press conference (MTPC) is the answer given by the University President to a local Chinese journalist, the China Daily correspondent. In order to put the President's reply into context, the interpreter's English version of the question is given.

'He's the China Daily correspondent, his question is he has two questions, one is in case some freshmen do not wish to come down to the Academy for military training what are you going to do about those students? The second question is some people believe that the military training is organised as a punitive measure against the students who participated in the June 4th incident and with the passage of time and the development of the situation in China is Beijing University going to change its practice of sending down students for military training?

(13) is the first part of the President's answer.

- (13) zhège xuéshēng cānjia jūnxùn /
this students participate military training,
- 2 shì zuòwéi běidà-de xuéshēng / zhīyào nǐ dào běidà lái
be make beida-M students / provided that you to beida come
- 3 yuànyì dào běidà lái xúexi nàme dōu yào dōu yào
wish to beida come study C all need all need
- 4 cānjia zhè jūnxùn / hái yǒu rúguǒ shuō tā bù yuànyì
participate this military training, still have if say he N wish
- 5 dào běidà lái / nàme tā yě kěyǐ bù cānjia jūnxùn /
to beida come, C he also may N participate military training,
- 6 cóng zhège jiùshì shuō jìshì zìyuàn-de / yě shì bù zìyuàn-de /
from this that's to say since voluntary-M, also be N voluntary-M,
- 7 zhège rúguǒ tā yuànyì shàng běidà / tā yě bìxū jūnxùn /
this if he wish on beida, he also must military training,

- 8 *ér tā dāngrǎn kěyǐ xuǎnzé qítade dàxué /*
 but he of course may choose another-M university,
- 9 *jiùshì qítā bù cānjiā jūnxùn-de dàxué*
 E other N participate military training-M university
- 10 *qù jìxù xuéxi / dànshì / běijīng dàxué bìjīng shì yīsǔo /*
 go continue study, but, beijing university indeed be one-Cl,
- 11 *zài guójì-shàng zài guónei guójì dōu xiāngyǒu*
 in international-on in at home international both enjoy esteem
- 12 *shēngyù-de xuéxiào /*
 great fame-M school
- 13 *sǔoyì xuéshēng háishi bù yuànyì fàngqì zhège xuéxiào.*
 therefore students still N wish give up this school.

these students taking part in military training are Beijing University students and *if* you come to Beijing University and want to study at Beijing University you must take part in this military training, *if* someone doesn't want to come to Beijing University *then* he doesn't have to take part in military training, that's to say it's voluntary, (*but*) *if* he wants to go to Beijing University, he must do military training, *but* he, of course, can choose to continue studying at another university, another university that doesn't take part in military training, *but*, Beijing University is indeed famous with a national and international reputation, *therefore* students are unwilling to give up (the chance of going to) this school.

This is the President's answer to the first part of the question which asked what happened to students who did not want to do military training. The basic point in the President's answer is that the question does not arise as all students at Beijing University have to do military training. He appears to be a little on the defensive here as he does not admit to the possibility that some students might not want to do the military training. The opening part of his answer, therefore, evades the question and presents information that is shared by the journalist's present - they all know that it's compulsory (as the President points out, it's voluntary only in the sense that a student doesn't have to go to Beijing University!). And although there are several low-level connectors here, there is, as one might expect in the part of an answer that repeats shared information, no enveloping. That's not to say that there is no repetition. Then, once he's stated this old information - what we might call waffle - he comes up with an argument why students will still be attracted by Beijing University: it's famous. Notice,

however, that he has not answered the question at all. Notice, furthermore that the argument he uses is again sequenced following the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' order. Notice also that there is no overt 'because' marker in the text.

The information sequence of this part of the answer is:

Statement of Shared Information
+
o BECAUSE - THEREFORE

The rest of the President's answer to this question is long so I paraphrase the part of his reply that precedes the final summary statement - which is given (14).

The President says that the notion of military training being a punishment is illogical and says that the students are well treated at the Academy. He then turns to the final part of the question that asked whether the training programme would continue. He says that :

- a) the training is part of educational reform
- b) it has so far shown tangible results

sǔoyǐ wǒ xiǎng wǒmen hái huì jìxù-xià.
therefore I think we still can continue.

Here the 'therefore' connector 'sǔoyǐ' is acting not only as a summary marker for the reasons mentioned at a) and b), where once more the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is preserved, but also as a marker for the summary statement of the entire answer. Figure 5 shows the information sequence of the answer.

Figure 5

Shared Information

+

o BECAUSE - THEREFORE

+

THEREFORE

+

o BECAUSE³ - THEREFORE

4.3 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Conference (MFAPC)

4.3.1 General background

The next two press conferences from which the remaining data of this paper is taken are more formal than the ANU seminar and the MTPC just discussed. Of these two, the press conference given by Premier Li Peng is the more formal. The premier's press conference has become an annual event. It is televised and broadcast live across China. However, while some of the answers have been carefully prepared, the press conference does allow for a number of questions that demand a spontaneous response.

Before discussing data from the Li Peng press conference, however, some data taken from the press conference given by a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is discussed and analysed. Such press conferences are common and this is a typical example of one. It differs from the other conferences and the talk at ANU in that many of the answers that the spokesmen gives are very short, if indeed they can be called answers at all in any real sense. Often, the spokesmen refuses to answer a question as this translated excerpt of the exchange between a Canadian correspondent and the spokesman shows. The Canadian correspondent wants to know how many of those arrested after the June 4th incident are still in Beijing prisons.

- Spokesman: This question should not be answered by a spokesman from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
 Canadian: Why not?
 Spokesman: You may put your question to the department concerned.
 Canadian: I didn't get a satisfactory answer, that's why I'm asking you.

There then follows an eleven second pause broken by a new question. The atmosphere at this conference is therefore more strained than at the others.

4.3.2 The data analysed

This press conference starts with the spokesman welcoming the journalists. Then, applying the strategy of speaking in order to take up question time, he says:

- (14) zài huídá gèwèi wèntí yǐqián
 at reply everyone question before
- 2 wǒ yǒu jǐtiáo xīnwén yào fābù
 I have several-M news want release

Before answering your questions, I have several items of news that I want to release.

'Several items of news' is being used here as an advanced organiser (AO). This informs the journalists that they will have to wait for some time before they are going to get a chance to ask any questions. The spokesman, in fact, issues three items of news, or rather puts forward the official line on three questions of topical interest. The third item concerns the prospect of a direct airlink between Taiwan and the Soviet Union, a prospect that the official line strongly opposes. The spokesman is here making a statement that has been prepared beforehand, so these comments (15) are not spontaneous.

Although (15) is not a response to a specific question, the spokesman introduces the topic of a possible Soviet-Taiwan airlink by mentioning that many journalists have been asking about this. Notice that the spokesman has to repeat line 10 which is the start of his summary statement, because the interpreter does not interpret it.

When the spokesman does repeat his summary statement, he now prefaces it with 'suǒyǐ' to signal that it is his summary statement. To show this, I have used the interpreter's translation of the answer.

The spokesman begins his answer by saying: 'My answer to this question is:

- (15) wǒmen yīguān-de lìchǎng shì / táiwān / shì zhōngguó
we all along-M standpoint be, Taiwan, be China
 - 2 lǐngtǔ-de / yībùfēn / shì zhōngguó-de yīge shěng / [I]
territory-M, one part, be China-M one province, [I]
 - 3 wǒmen / jiānjúe fǎnduì / tóng wǒ jiànjāo-de guójia /
we, resolute oppose, with I diplomatic relations-M country,
 - 4 tóng táiwān / jiànlì guānfāng guānxi /
with Taiwan, set up official relations,
 - 5 huòzhě jìnxíng guānfāng-de guólái {?} [I]
or start official-M communication {?} [I]
 - 6 wàiguó-de hángkōng gōngsī / bùguǎn shì guānfāng-de /
foreign-M airline company, no matter be official-M,
 - 7 háishi mínjiàn-de / fǎn yaòyu táiwān tóng háng /
or people-M, on the contrary want Taiwan with air,
 - 8 dōu bù shì yībān-de / mínjiàn jīngmào
all N be general-M, people trade
 - 9 ér shì / shèji zhōngguó zhǔquán-de / zhèngzhì wèntí /
but be, involve China sovereignty-M, political question,
 - 10 bìxū dōu bìxū shìxiān / yǔ wǒ shāngliang [I]
must all must in advance, with me discuss [I]
- (The interpreter fails to translate line 10, so the spokesman repeats it but adds a therefore marker)
- 11 suǒyǐ dōu bìxū shìxiān yǔ wǒ shāngliang [I]
therefore all must in advance with me discuss [I]
 - 12 xīwàng yǒu guān guójia zài zhè shì-shàng shènzhòng xíngshì
hope have concern country in this thing-on prudent conduct.

(my answer to this question is) it is our consistent position that Taiwan is a part of the territory, China and one of its provinces. We (are) resolutely opposed to the establishment of official relations or official contacts with Taiwan by countries which have diplomatic relations with China. To start an air service with Taiwan by any foreign air company, governmental or non-governmental is by no means non-governmental economic and trade relations in an ordinary sense but rather a political issue involving China's sovereignty.

[The interpreter stops here and so the spokesman repeats his penultimate comment as in line 11. The interpreter then continues:]

therefore consultation with China is a must before such a decision is taken. (The spokesman then adds his final comment, line 12, and the interpreter translates.) We hope that the countries concerned will act with prudence on this matter.

The spokesman's comments follow the familiar 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. The first part of his comments is structured in this way:

o BECAUSE
Taiwan is a part of China

o THEREFORE
Oppose others dealing with Taiwan.

The second part of his comments is similarly structured.

o BECAUSE
opening an airlink with Taiwan is
not private trade but is political)

o THEREFORE
China must be consulted
People act prudently.

His comments end with the hope that all concerned parties will act prudently. I take this to be a paraphrase of the previous statement about consulting China before doing anything rather than a separate final summary statement.

The spokesman's justification of the official line and his attempt to persuade journalists that the official line is correct follows this information sequence:

o BECAUSE - o THEREFORE

+

o BECAUSE - o THEREFORE

This provides another example of the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence being followed. In this case, however, the argument that follows this sequence has been planned beforehand. We know this because these comments are part of the spokesman's opening remarks. The planned nature of the remarks can also be seen

from the deliberate way in which they are made, signalled by the large number of pauses. More importantly for our analysis, however, is that here we have a substantial unit of discourse following the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' pattern but with no overt because or therefore discourse markers. Interestingly, and perhaps because of this, the interpreter fails to translate what the spokesman intended as the main summary statement i.e. that consultation with China is essential. Significantly, when the spokesman rephrases his comments, he includes the therefore connector 'suoyi', as if to emphasise the nature of this comment. The point to be made here is that (15) represents the most highly planned and pre-prepared piece of discourse in the data. This planned piece of discourse follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence and contains no overt 'because therefore' connectors. Furthermore, this format is used in both parts of the answer leading to the final summary statement which again is not overtly marked. In addition, there is no enveloping here. These facts therefore support the hypothesis that more formal planned speech does not use as many 'because therefore' discourse markers as more unplanned informal speech. The 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence itself is enough to make the meaning clear. The lack of enveloping in these formal planned statements also means that few low-level connectors are needed.

4.4 The Li Peng's Press Conference (LPPC)

4.4.1 General background

The final set of data to be analysed in this chapter comes from a press conference given by Premier Li Peng. As mentioned earlier in this paper, this represents the most formal end of the continuum. The press conference was held in 1990 after the 3rd session of the 7th National People's Congress. In addition to Li Peng himself and the interpreter, three vice-premiers were also present and answered some of the questions.

4.4.2 The data analysed

The press conference starts with Li Peng welcoming the journalists and saying he would like to answer any questions of interest. Typically, the first question of the press conference is asked by a local Chinese journalist from the People's Daily. The question asks Li Peng to evaluate the just completed National People's Congress. Again typically, this question is broad enough to allow Li Peng to reply at some length. I analyse the first part of his answer (16) because it shows some slight variation from the other data. Remember that this answer has almost certainly been planned beforehand and that Li Peng is being televised, live, as he makes it.

- (16) duì gāngāng jiéshù-de liǎnghuì / zuòwéi guóowùyuàn-de shǒunǎo /
 to just complete-M two session, as State Council-M head,
- 2 wǒ gǎndào mǎnyì / yīnwèi dìyì / huìyì pīzhǔn-le
 I feel satisfied, because first, conference approve-A
- 3 zhèngfǔ gōngzuò bàogào./.....
 government work report,.....
- 4 yīncǐ wǒ rènwéi zhècì huìyì shì yīcì / gǔrénxīn-de huìyì /
 thus I feel this conference be one, inspiring-M conference,
- 5 shì / dòngyuan quánguó rénmin tóngxīn tóngdé
 be, arouse whole country people same heart same mind
- 6 jiù wánchéng / zhèngzhì / jīngjì / shèhuì /
 then fulfil, political, economic, social,
- 7 wèndìng fāzhǎn-de / yīcì huìyì
 stable develop-M, one conference.

(the in line 3 indicates that I have excluded the details of the government work report)

I am satisfied in my position as Head of the State Council with the just concluded two sessions *because* first the conference has approved the government work report.....*thus* I believe that this conference has been an inspiring one and is a conference that will motivate the Chinese people to work single mindedly to achieve political, economic and social stability and development.

The first thing to notice is that Li Peng repeats a part of the question and says that he is satisfied with the conference. In other words, Li Peng's answer begins with an opening or framing content statement, which is rare in the data. He next uses an

AO, or opening structure statement, by saying 'because, first..', suggesting that there are going to be several reasons for his satisfaction, as indeed there were. Realising this, the interpreter translated this part of his answer as:

'I'm quite satisfied...for the following reasons...', turning 'because, first' into 'following reasons'.

After his framing content statement and the AO, Li Peng then reverts to the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence for the remainder of this part of this answer. The overall information sequence of this answer is:

Framing Statement - Satisfied
+
AO - Several Reasons
+
BECAUSE(report passed) - THEREFORE(inspiring conference)

Despite the suspected planned nature of the reply, both a 'because' and a 'therefore' discourse marker are used, with the 'therefore' marker 'yīncǐ' acting with the 'because' marker 'yīnwei'. This use of the discourse markers in a planned piece of discourse seems to throw doubt on the hypothesis that discourse markers are used less in planned than in unplanned speech. However, the 'yīnwei' here is being used as an AO, as well as a discourse marker to signal the opening part of the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. Second, the 'therefore' connector 'yīncǐ' is being used to signal the summary statement of the entire answer. Third Li Peng's use of these 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' discourse markers is remarkably limited throughout this press conference. He only uses the 'therefore' connector 'suǒyǐ' twice: first, to signal the summary statement of the first part of his answer ('so these people are misinformed') when answering the fourth question he is asked; and second, to signal the summary statement of his answer to the fifth question ('therefore, in order to avoid wasting time, I suggest you reread my report'). He uses a sentence level 'yīnwei' - 'yīncǐ' pairing

when answering the ninth question, but the 'yīncǐ' is also acting as a signal for the summary statement of the whole answer. So, on the four occasions that Li Peng uses a 'therefore' connector, whether it be 'yīncǐ' or 'suǒyǐ' it is always being used to signal the summary statement of an answer.

Despite the surface formality of this press conference, however, Li Peng is quite willing to take questions. Indeed at one stage he says that too many local journalists are asking questions and that he wants to take questions from "the foreign correspondents and those from Hong Kong and Macao".

The final piece of data analysed in this chapter represents Li Peng's final comments in answer to such a question by an English journalist. The journalist has asked whether Li Peng thinks his chances of remaining in power have been increased or decreased by the events of June 4th. In a long reply, the first part of which I paraphrase, Li Peng says:

(i) that it is difficult to answer speculative questions.

(ii) that he was elected Premier for a five year term in 1988, and that he can't predict whether he'll be re-elected in 1993.

(17) below is the rest of his answer.

- (17) shùnbian shuō yíxià jiùshì zài zhèci rénmin dàibǎo
in passing say once E in this people representative
- 2 dǎnghuì zhīqián-ne / zài xiānggǎng-de xǔduō bàozhǐ-shàng
party conference before-P, in Hong Kong-M many newspapers-in
- 3 guānyú zhōngguó-de rénshì-de wèntí yǒu xǔduō cāicè /
concerning China-M personnel-M question have many guess,
- 4 wǒ xiǎng yěxǔ nǐ zhège wèntí shì cóng nàxiē cāicè-lái-de /
I think perhaps you this question be from those guess-R-M,
- 5 bùguò wǒ xiànzài kěyǐ gàosu dàjiā zhège cāicè
but I now may tell everybody this guess
- 6 dōu shì hěn bù zhèngquè-de /
all be very N correct-M

- 7 *jǐngguān* *xīanggǎng shì* / *hǎoxiàng* / *zhèzhǒng fāngmiàn*
although Hong Kong be, like, this type aspect
- 8 *hěn kāifàng hěn zìyóu* / *dànshì nǐ rúguǒ yòu wánquán jùtǐ*
 very open very free, *but* you if also complete concrete
- 9 *xīangxìn zhèxiē* / *cāicè* *xīangxìn nà*¹¹ *kǒngpà* /
 belief these, guess belief, C perhaps,
- 10 *bù yīdìng yǒu hǎo-de jiéguǒ* /
 N definite have good-M result,
- 11 *bù yīdìng dōu shì nénggòu shì zhèngquè-de* /
 N definite all be can be correct-M,
- 12 *wǒ yīnggāi fùzé-de* *gàosu {?}* / *dàjiā* / *xiànzài yǐ* *Jiāng Zémín*
 I should responsible-M tell {?}, everybody, now with Jiang Zemin
- 13 *wéi zǒngshūjī* *zhōngguó zhège lǐngdǎo héxīn-ne* /
 as General Secretary China this leader core-P,
- 14 *shì tuánjié-de yǒu qiáng yǒu lì-de* / *yě érqǐe* /
 be unified-M have power have strength-M, *also moreover*
- 15 *wǒ xīangxìn tā yě shòudào-le rénmin-de yōnghù* /
 I believe it also receive-A people-M support,
- 16 *wǒmen jǐngguān yǒu kùnnan* / *dànshì wǒmen yǒu xìnxīn* /
 we *although* have difficulty, *but* we have faith,
- 17 *bǎ zhōngguó shìqing dǎ-hǎo*.
 BA China affair do-good.

The interpreter has to translate this entire stretch, and does so as:

'I want to mention in passing that shortly before convening of this session of the NPC, there were many guesses in the Hong Kong press about the personnel arrangements and changes in China so I suppose that your question comes from those guesses, *but* now I can tell you that those guesses are not accurate *although* Hong Kong is quite open and free in this respect, I don't think that you can fully believe in those reportings *because* many of them are guesses and *if* you entirely rely on them you won't get good results and what you get won't be all that accurate, now I can tell you in a responsible way that the core of leadership in China with General Secretary Jiang Zimin as the nucleus is united, it is strong and I believe that it commands the support of the Chinese people, *so, in spite of* the difficulties that we are now facing I'm sure that we can do a good job in all fields in China.'

There are several low-level connectors in Li Peng's answer. There are two 'although - yet' (*jǐngguān* - *dànshì*) pairs in lines 7 to 8 and in line 16 respectively. There

¹¹ 'nà' is a short form of 'nàme'. See the footnote in example (11) for comments on 'nàme'.

is a conditional (rúguǒ - nà) in lines 8 to 9. There is also a 'but' (bùguò) in line 5 and a 'moreover' (érqiě) in line 14. This, together with the embedding that I have represented below, is evidence that this answer was not planned. There are, however, no overt 'because' or 'therefore' connectors, at either discourse or sentence level, in the text. Interestingly, the interpreter adds three such connectors to his translation. He uses two 'so's', one in line three of the translation and one in the penultimate line of it. He also adds a 'because' towards the middle of the translation.

The first 'so' links with the reason (o yīnwei in the text) that follows the sequence: BECAUSE many guesses - THEREFORE you guess.

The second 'so' (o suǒyǐ in the text) signals the summary statement for the whole answer.

The 'because' clause isn't in the Chinese at all, and has been added by the interpreter to make what Li Peng is saying clearer.

What we seem to have here is a combination of a planned and an unplanned answer. The enveloping and the use of low-level connectors suggests the unplanned nature of the answer. The lack of overt 'because' and 'therefore' markers in the text, on the other hand, suggests a planned answer. And a close look at the answer suggests this might be right. Li Peng starts the first part of this answer by mentioning the guesses that have been cropping up in the Hong Kong press. This is the part of the answer that includes most of the connectors. It is spontaneous, being almost as it were, in parenthesis to the main part of this answer which is (because), the leadership is united, (therefore) it will do a good job. The main part of the answer is prefaced by the announcement 'I can tell you in a responsible way'. And after this preface to the main part of his answer, Li Peng follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence, albeit including an enveloped concessional. Figure 6 represents the overall structure of this answer.

Figure 6

PART I

Want to say	{	O because 'guesses'	O therefore 'you guess'
		(before conference)	

BUT 'Say guess wrong' [although (if)]

PART II

Responsible say	{	O because 1stable 2 support	O therefore
		(although)	(good job)

This can be simplified to give:

say	{	O because	O therefore	O because	O therefore
		(time)	+ But say [()]	+say (concession)	

This shows the combination of enveloping and the use of the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence with no overt connectors. The part of the answer that contains the most enveloping - the 'But say [()]' - should be more spontaneous and unplanned than the second half of the answer, which contains only a concessional clause, if the hypothesis is to hold. And this seems to be the case. The second half of the answer that states that because the government is stable and has people support, it will do well, reads like a slogan. The heavily enveloped part of the answer which

argues that, although free, the Hong Kong Press is neither accurate nor credible has a certain rambling quality and seems spontaneous. Li Peng's answer here, then, is a combination of spontaneous and planned slogan-like speech. The former is characterised by the use of low level connectors and enveloping and the latter by a lack of connectors. The whole answer, however, follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence.

5. Summary

In section 1.2 of this chapter we limited the scope of the analysis of the data to four points: the use of the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence at discourse level; the effect of relative spontaneity upon the information sequence and the use of connectors; the use of opening statements, either structure or content; and the way information is sequenced within the overall structure of a piece of discourse.

With these points and the earlier summary of the ANU seminar data in mind, we can summarise the findings of this chapter as follows:

1 The 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence operates at levels of discourse as well as at sentence level. It represents an important sequencing principle in MSC. For example, when MSC speakers are justifying a claim, they commonly posit the reasons for the claim before making it. This is in contradistinction to English speakers who commonly make a claim and then give the reasons/justification for it.

2 The 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence can be recursive. This discourse structure is more likely to occur in planned speech than in spontaneous speech. Although, in more planned speech, the use of the because and therefore connectors is comparatively uncommon, a therefore connector, either 'suoyi' or 'yinci' is common, but not obligatory, when its communicative purpose is to signal a summary statement.

This discourse structure is represented in the diagram.

3 In more spontaneous speech, what we have called enveloping is likely. When this occurs a 'BECAUSE THEREFORE' unit can act as a 'pregnant mother' unit and contain a number of lower level units within it. These lower level units can themselves be lower level 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' units. In more spontaneous speech, where there is enveloping, connectors are more common.

This structure is represented in the diagram.

± BECAUSE [LOWER { LEVEL } UNITS] ± THEREFORE

4 The structures in 2 and 3 can be used in combination.

5 In addition to acting as sentence level connectors, both the because and the therefore connectors can act as discourse markers. They can introduce and control a series and BECAUSEⁿ and THEREFOREⁿ are possible sequences.

6 MSC does not often use opening or framing statements that are content statements. On the other hand the use of opening or framing statements that are structure statements, such as Advance Organisers, is common.

Chapter 4. Information Sequencing in a Written Genre

Introduction

In chapter 2, work of Chinese linguists was reviewed and this review showed that the normal unmarked clause sequence in complex sentences was subordinate clause - main clause. I gave a general term to this principle of MSC sequencing, calling it the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. In chapter 3 evidence was provided to show that this 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence operated above the level of the complex sentence and it was shown that this sequence was systematically used in extended spoken discourse. In this chapter, chapter 4, principles of information sequencing that operate at a textual level will be considered.

The genre analysed in this chapter comprises letters of request. The chapter begins with a review of some of the problems that occur in the analysis of requests. In the second section of the chapter a discussion of schema is provided as this is an important concept in this analysis of the letters of request. The collection of the data is described and variables discussed in section three. The analysis of the letters themselves is given in section 4.

In addition to analysing the genre for the occurrence of 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing in the information sequencing patterns of the letters, the letters will also be analysed as integral texts. It will be proposed that the shapes or schemata of these letters constitute, in themselves, a crucial variable that carries communicative effect and meaning. And as these letters are clearly meant to be persuasive and not written to offend, they provide authentic and reliable data from which to make general conclusions. We believe that the comments quoted below made by Cherry about the English letters of request that he analysed can equally be applied to these Chinese letters of request:

"conclusions about the relationship between rhetoric and politeness based on the data can be made with some confidence." (1988 p 68)

1 The analysis of requests

The main data for this chapter comprises 40 letters of request written by Mainland Chinese to the China service of Radio Australia, which is based in Melbourne, Australia. This data will be analysed to see whether the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is significant in these letters of request. The ways of framing these requests will be considered to see whether the preferred rhetorical structure for these requests follows the sequence:

or whether the preferred rhetorical structure follows the reverse sequence of:

These letters will also be analysed to see whether the rhetorical structure of the letters follows a schema that prefaces any reasons for any request and the request itself with predictable items of information. Scollon and Scollon have observed (1991) that, in 'Asian' conversation, a series of lesser topics are mentioned before the mention of the main topic. The function of these lesser topics is to act as "hints" for the conclusion of the main topic in the end and they act as a kind of "extended facework".

"If you consider that to introduce your topic is to make an imposition on the other person, then the small talk is a kind of extended facework." (p 116).

In the context of these letters of request, the making of a request can be seen as an imposition upon the recipient, however light or routine the request may be. If therefore, the requests in these letters are preceded by some sort of preamble, the preamble may be acting like the lesser topics of Scollon and Scollon's conversational analysis, and would then have the function of acting as a kind of extended facework.

To put this in a different way, these requests are not going to be examined merely at the level of the linguistic realisation of the requests. In addition, their schemata will be taken into account. The argument is that the overall schema of these

requests will have significance for determining their communicative effect. If this is indeed shown to be true, then this has obvious implications for the cross-cultural study of speech acts. It may not be enough to try and elicit what a native speaker or learner would say in response to some cue as done in, for example, the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). For, if the actual language used to form the actual request in these letters of request could be analysed as being direct, then the researcher who failed to consider the overall context in which the request was made and who did not analyse the schema of which the request was a part, might conclude that Chinese are direct when making requests. The argument put forward in this chapter also, therefore, includes the proposition that a cross-cultural comparison of the communicative effect of schema needs to be considered in a cross-cultural study of speech acts.

Faerch and Kasper (1989) make the important point that the way a request is mitigated is of significance for the way that request is viewed. They point out that a request may be modified, either internally or externally or both, and the use of modification strategies differs across cultures. A request may be modified internally by the use of softeners, such as *please*, in the request itself. It may be modified externally by providing reasons or justification for the request¹. For example, they show that in the same situation - asking for a lift - native speakers of English typically phrase their request as:

Could you possibly give me a lift?

Native speakers of Danish, on the other hand, typically phrase their requests that translate into English as:

Hallo could I perhaps go with you I did not reach my bus and the next one is first in an hour? (p 239).

¹For a useful summary of analyses that can be carried out on requests, see Ellis (1992).

In other words, Danish speakers tend to use much more external modification to mitigate their requests than do English speakers. Indeed, they show that English speakers, along with German speakers, modify only a small percentage of their requests.

A question we examine in this chapter is whether Chinese speakers are similar to English or Danish speakers in their use of external modification for their requests. And whether, like Danish speakers, they place any external modification of requests after the requests or whether they place any external modification of requests before the requests.

The need to consider requests in their entirety is stated by Blum-Kulka and House (1989) but their method of data collection, which involves the Discourse Completion Test, and an example of which is given below, denies them the possibility of considering a request in its entirety. Only the the language of the response and the request itself can be analysed.

Example of a DCT

At the University:

Ann missed a lecture yesterday and would like to borrow Judith's notes.

Ann: (to be completed by informant)

Judith: Sure, but let me have them back before the lecture next week. (Blum Kulka et al p 14).

Further problems with the DCT are that it requires a written response to an oral interaction and that it includes the response of the person of whom the request is being made. Rintell and Mitchell (1989) used the DCT in oral role plays and also removed the 'requestee's' response when eliciting written data and showed that there was no significant difference in the length of native speaker oral and written responses. Unfortunately, however, they do not say whether there was any significant difference in the length of the responses they obtained compared to the responses obtained in the original CCSARP study.

When we analyse the letters of requests in their entirety and as integral texts the notion of schema is important. Therefore, before we move onto the description of the data and the analysis of the letters, the notion of schema is discussed.

2 The notion of schema

2.1 Schema defined

Bartlett (1932) used the term schema in his work on psychology². He defines it:

"Schema refers to an active organisation of past reactions, or of past experiences, which must always be supposed to be operating in any well-adapted organic response. That is, whenever there is any order or regularity of behaviour, a particular response is possible only because it is related to similar responses which have been serially organised, yet which operate, not simply as individual members coming one after another, but as a unitary mass." (p 201).

This notion of the serial organisation of responses is of great importance, for

"in order to maintain the schema as it is...(movements) *a, b, c, d* must continue to be done *in the same order*."(p 201)(my italics).

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) emphasise the importance of this serial organisation in their definition of schema: "Schemas are global patterns of events and states in ordered sequences linked by time proximity and causality."(p 90).

Schema theory thus "suggests that the knowledge we carry around in our head is organised into interrelated patterns." (Nunan 1991 p 68). These patterns help us to make sense out of new experiences and to predict what is likely to happen in given contexts.

While Bartlett used the term schema in the context of the psychological debate in the 1930's, the term has been adopted (and its meaning changed to some degree) by scholars in other fields such as cross-cultural communication and linguistics. Robinson (1985) has said that schemata may be regarded as "cognitive structures through which people interpret information". (p 52). This information may be about events, settings

²Bartlett, in fact, said "I strongly dislike the term schema" as it had been "already widely used in controversial psychological writing" and preferred the term "organised setting" yet decided to continue to use the word schema "when it seems best to do so." (pp 200-201).

and other people. We form our ideas about people through schemata that we have learned within our own culture. They are, therefore, culturally determined and thus biased. People of one culture expect certain people to behave in certain ways in certain settings because they share these culturally determined schemata. Since schemata vary from culture to culture, in order to become 'multicultural', a person, therefore, needs to learn the schemata of another culture and how to use them.

Schemata can be divided into content and formal, or linguistic, schemata. Content schemata comprise background knowledge of the content area of, for example, a text. (Or even the normal sequence of moves when ordering a meal in a restaurant.) Formal schemata, on the other hand, comprise knowledge of the rhetorical structures of different types of text (Carrell and Eisterhold 1988). People possess a range of these schemata and use them to make sense out of language. For example, one way that people are able to comprehend what they are reading is by selecting the schema that best accounts for the text.

"The schema employed to comprehend a text acts like an outline which guides the reader in organising the text during the process of reading." (Carrell 1984 p 447).

In the same way that content schemata differ from culture to culture, so do these formal, linguistic schemata differ from language to language. Inappropriate use of schemata will lead to a breakdown or misunderstanding in cross-cultural communication.

2.2 Cross cultural schemata and requests

Gumperz and Roberts (1980) have pointed out that many of the communication difficulties that arise between Indian speakers of English and English speakers from the United Kingdom cannot be adequately explained by difference in accents or by grammatical mistakes, but rather stem from what they call different "conventions"³.

³Conventions here would include, I think, the use of schema.

"People from different cultural backgrounds may speak a variety of English characterised by certain conventions. It is when attitude and meaning are conveyed through one set of conventions and interpreted through another that breakdowns in communication may occur."(p 1).

An example of an Indian English schema being used within a British English environment and causing communication difficulty comes from this tapescript of a student participating in a role play at the National Centre for Industrial Language Training (NCILT) in London. The student is offering an explanation to his work supervisor of why he wants the day off tomorrow.

"Two months ago, somebody accident on the road
but I am a witness
but I received a letter yesterday
because my address change
but I am going to court in the morning
but I day off tomorrow
But I am sorry I can't working tomorrow
I want to leave for tomorrow."

The reason why this is not an effective piece of communication in this context in British English is not so much its non-standard grammar but because there is an apparent lack of focus and the wrong order is followed. Note also that this speaker follows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence in that he explains the reasons for his inability to come to work before actually saying this. The schema that British English would prefer here follows this rhetorical structure:

Focus:	I'm sorry I can't come to work tomorrow
Justification (i)	I have to go to court, because two months ago there was an accident on the road and I was a witness.
Justification(ii):	I couldn't let you know before because I only received the letter today, because I've changed my address. (NCILT 1978:11)

In other words, the Indian speaker follows a schema that places the reasons or justifications for his request before the request itself. The schema seen as appropriate in British English in this context, however, places the the reasons or justifications for the request after the request.

Evidence that the Indian speaker of English is transferring his first language schema and conventions into English comes from Gumperz (1990). After translating

Indian English transcripts into Punjabi, the tape recording of the translation was played to Punjabi speakers who classified the transactions on the tape as normal and fluent talk.

A further example of a request schema that prefaces the request with reasons for it comes from my own work in Hong Kong (1984) and which I have already referred to in the introduction to this study. I repeat the example in the text below so that the reader need not refer back to the introduction. Here, a Chinese police constable (Cantonese speaking) comes into the office of a senior expatriate (English) officer. He clearly uses a schema that states the reasons for the request before making the request and he thus also follows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. By so doing, he also allows the person of whom he is making the request to signal to him whether the request is going to be granted or not. In other words, the use of this schema also provides the person of whom the request is being made the opportunity to grant or refuse the request before it has actually been made, thus rendering the face threatening acts of actually making and then having to refuse the request unnecessary. For such a schema to be used successfully would require that both people engaged in the exchange share the same linguistic conventions. As will be seen, this was not the case here. It will be remembered that the constable wants to request a day's leave to look after his ill mother and that he leaves the room before actually making his request.

Chinese Police Constable (CPC)

Expatriate Officer (EO)

CPC

EO

CPC

EO

CPC

EO

Sir

Yes, what is it?

My mother is not very well sir.

So?

She has to go into hospital sir

Well, get on with it. What do you want?

On Thursday sir.

Bloody hell man, what do you want?

While questions such as rank and sensitivity may have been important in explaining this breakdown in communication - an expatriate senior officer more sensitive to Cantonese conventions might well have understood the meaning behind the constable's utterances - equally as important was the use of a request schema that was

inappropriate in English in this context. On being asked how he would expect someone to ask for a day's compassionate leave (this was what the CPC wanted), the EO said that he would want the person to ask first and explain later. An appropriate communicative exchange might therefore have followed this sequence:

CPC:I'd like to request a day's leave for Thursday this week please sir

EO:I see. Why?

CPC:Well, my mother has to go into hospital on that day and I'd like to go with her to make sure everything is all right."

A third example comes from Lin (1988). Lin's example is in Chinese and I translate it in the clause sequence in which it occurs in Chinese. Note that both speakers in the exchange follow the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence and provide reasons before making and refusing the request. Speaker B, indeed, does not even directly refuse the request, but simply gives a reason why the request cannot be granted.

A:'My mother has just telephoned from the airport, my car is not yet repaired, can I borrow your car?

B:'Sorry I have an appointment I have to go to.' (so I can't lend you my car - unstated)

As a contrast to this, Lin cites an English letter of request taken from *The New Business Letter Writer* (D Hall ed.1985) as an example of the correct way to make a request in English. The letter opens with the request:

Dear Mr Nichols

I would be grateful to receive your permission for me to absent from work next week.

The letter then provides the reasons for the request.

These examples suggest that the unmarked or preferred schema of requests in English places the request at the beginning. It follows the rhetorical structure of:

Furthermore, this schema follows the same sequencing patterns and rhetorical structure of the motive action pairs in "action structures" such as grounds before claim

mentioned by Schifffrin (1987) and discussed in chapter 3. This schema, however, is by no means universally preferred. The word 'preferred' is used deliberately. There is no suggestion in this argument that Chinese never uses the preferred English schema nor is the suggestion that English never uses the preferred Chinese schema. Both languages can use both these, and other schemas. The differences lie in the contexts in which the schemas are used. The use of a preferred Chinese schema in an English context, as in the example above, is seen as inappropriate for that particular context.

A possible reason for the English preference for a request fronted schema is that a person's time is regarded as valuable. Wolfson (1988) has shown that middle class Americans see time as very valuable and they therefore feel obliged to apologise for keeping people waiting or wasting their time. So, by making the request early and coming straight to the point, the person making the request does not take up the other person's time. In Chinese, on the other hand, a person's status and 'face' is regarded as the key variable. By prefacing a request with the reasons for it, a person avoids making a direct request of somebody. Furthermore, structuring a request in this way allows the person of whom the request is being made two options. First he can signal that the request cannot be granted even before the request is made. For example, in the case of the police constable's request, the senior officer, realising that a request for a day's leave was coming and being unable to grant such a request, could have said something like "We're very busy this week" and by so doing would have intimated to the police constable that his request could not be granted. Alternatively, if the Senior Officer were able to grant the request, he could have granted the request before it was made by saying something like "Would you like some time off to look after your mother?" This way of sequencing requests thus respects the face of both parties. The request maker preserves 'face' by not making a request that will not be granted. The request 'granter' preserves 'face' by not having to refuse a request or gains face by being able to offer to grant a, as yet unstated, request.

We now turn to a description of the data and then to the analysis of the Chinese letters of request to see if they show that the preferred request schema in MSC follows this alternative rhetorical structure of:

Reasons / Explanations / Justifications (for Request)

Request

3 The data

3.1 The collection of the data

Radio Australia (RA) kindly allowed me to select as many letters as I wanted from the bag of letters that is regularly sent to them from Mainland China. The particular bag from which my selection was made held some 2,000 letters. Of these 400 were read (or, more correctly 'skimmed') and then a corpus of 40 were selected from this set of 400. In deciding which letters to select, the following criteria were used:

a) The letters needed to be letters of request. This ruled out a large number of the letters and as it was just after Chinese New Year, many of the letters merely wished the RA announcers a happy new year.

b) Letters that represented a variety of requests were needed. RA offers calendars and programme schedules to its listeners as a matter of course, and many of the letters requested these items. In addition, listeners commonly write in to request the playing of a particular song over the radio. Besides these straightforward requests, letters that requested more unusual items were required. Tables 1 and 2 below give a breakdown of the types of requests and the number of requests per letter.

Table 1: Types of request and items requested in the 40 letters.

<u>Items Requested</u>	<u>No of Letters</u>
specific songs	18
programme schedules	16
calendars	15
photographs (of announcers / pop stars)	15
specific information	6
materials, eg language teaching materials	6
song lyrics	5
gifts - these had been offered by one of the announcers	3
a diary	1
magazines	1
stamps	1
help in entering language school	1

Table 2: Number of requests per letter.

<u>No of Requests</u>	<u>No of Letters</u>
1	12
2	14
3	7
4	4
5	1
6	1
7	1

c) The third criterion was a practical one. All the letters were handwritten, some more legibly than others. Generally speaking, the more legible ones were chosen.

3.2 The variables

Below a brief account is given of some of the variables that may have had an effect upon the way in which the letters were written. These variables include the part of China the writers came from, their sex and age, the relative imposition of the requests and the social distance between the letter writers and the recipients.

3.2.1 Origin

The letter writers came from all over Mainland China with the Southern Province Guangxi providing the most with 5.

3.2.2 Age

Of the 23 writers who said how old they were or gave some indication of their age, 14 were students and 9 were older but mainly in their twenties. It is safe to assume that most of the other writers were also either students or quite young, although one who was a middle school teacher could well have been older. The fact that the majority of these letter writers were quite young may have been significant for the way in which they wrote their requests as they would have thought the recipients to be older than themselves, and thus, in Chinese culture, worthy of respect

3.2.3 Sex

The gender split was about half and half and was not significant in determining the way in which the letters were written. Many Chinese names can be neutral with regard to gender. In those letters where it was possible to determine the sex of the writer, 15 were men and 13 women.

3.2.4 The relative imposition of the requests

As shown in tables 1 and 2 above, the most commonly requested items were for songs to be broadcast, and for programme schedules, calendars and photographs. Given the context of a radio station, none of these requests could be considered unusual or excessive. Furthermore, the relative imposition of the majority of the remaining requests is also light, with possibly only the request for help in entering language school providing a heavy imposition.

The relative imposition of the requests is further discussed in sections 3 and 4 where the findings are described and individual letters analysed.

3.2.5 Social distance

Although the social distance between the writers of the letters and the announcers and producers at Radio Australia might seem large, certain circumstances help to reduce this social distance. First, and most importantly, the vast majority of these letters (33 out of the 40) are written to individuals rather than to the institution of

Radio Australia. The individuals to whom the letters are written are cited by name in the salutations, the most common formula being 'Name - Sir / Miss - Nín hǎo!' Thus, although the letter writers do not personally know the people they are writing to, they are not complete strangers either. They will be familiar to the letter writers in their roles as programme hosts. A second point of significance for measuring the amount of social distance between the letter writers and the recipients is that they are all Chinese. Third, the letter writers will see the people they are writing to as being sympathetic to them, being literally 'on the same wave length'.

The letter writers, then, are not writing to some impersonal foreign institution, but rather to fellow Chinese with whom they have some 'airwave' rapport and the social distance is therefore less than might be expected.

However, this relative lack of social distance should not imply that the letter writers will be writing to the RA announcers as equals. The concept of hierarchy, in all personal relationships, has a long tradition in China. For example, Ebrey (1985) discusses the 'shu-i' or guides on the etiquette of letter writing of the Tang dynasty (618-907). She points out that these developed from the tradition of codifying ritual and etiquette. In these guides, the category 'general public' is subdivided by seniority with 'very superior', 'slightly superior', 'slightly inferior' and 'inferior' being typical subdivisions with suggested variations in phraseology dependent upon the status of the letter writer and the recipient. Significantly, given the conclusions we reach in this chapter, Ebrey notes that :

"Generally speaking, the business of the letter, if there were any, would come before the last paragraph." (p 605)⁴.

It is inevitable, therefore, that these letter writers will envisage themselves as being in an inferior position to the people they are writing to, especially, as noted earlier, the majority of the letter writers are young. While the social distance between the two groups may not be as far as might have been expected, the RA personnel will

⁴Ebrey also points out that popular books of etiquette survive from the fourteenth century and many of these included actual letters by famous writers to be used as models.

be seen as being superior to the letter writers and as Scollon and Scollon (1983) have pointed out:

"The way a person speaks will always reflect underlying assumptions about the relation of distance and power between himself and his listener." (p 170).⁵

To sum up this section of the chapter, the variable that is most likely to have affected the way in which these letters have been written is that the letter writers will have perceived themselves to have been inferior in some way to the recipients. The perceived status between the writers and the receivers of these letters is 'recipient dominant'.

4 The analysis of the letters

4.1 General findings

When analysing the letters, the answers to these six questions were sought.

- 1 Where was the request placed in the letter? At the beginning, end or middle?
- 2 Did the requests include supportive moves such as reasons or justifications for the requests⁶.
- 3 Did the supportive moves precede the request or follow it?
- 4 If the request came at the end, what information preceded it and its supportive moves?
- 5 How was the request realised linguistically? Was the language direct or were any softeners or downtoners used?
- 6 Was the relative imposition of the request(s) heavy or light and did this have any significance for where the request was placed?

⁵The concepts of hierarchy and power and their effect upon language use is discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

⁶Supportive moves "mitigate or aggravate" a request (Blum Kulka et al 1989 p 287). They can occur either before or after the request itself.

1 Where was the request placed in the letter?

Only **2 out of the 40** letters followed the preferred 'English' schema identified above and placed their requests at the beginning of the letter and before giving any reasons for the request. A third letter placed the request at the beginning of the letter but prefaced the request with the reason /justification for it ("I hear that you at Radio Australia have a 1990 calendar [justify] and I would like one very much [request]). The remaining **37 letters** placed their requests towards the end of the letters.

2 Did the requests include supportive moves?

36 of the letters of request contained supportive moves of some kind, leaving **only 4** that did not. 25 letters included specific reasons. For example: "I do not know the transmission times (of RA's programmes), so please send me a programme schedule." 9 letters did not give such specific reasons for their requests but justified them by writing, for example: "I hear that you have the 1990 calendar, and want to bother you to send me one. I would feel great honour." More examples of these requests and justifications can be seen in the analysis of individual letters in section 4 below.

3 Did the supportive moves precede the request or follow it?

In **34** letters, the reasons for the request or the justification for the request preceded the request. In 34 letters, therefore, the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence was followed. 6 of these 34 letters also included additional reasons for the request after the request. These post-placed reasons commonly took the form of purpose clauses as in: "And I want a programme schedule in order to receive your programmes." These final purpose clauses are acting very like final purpose clauses in English (Thompson 1985). They simply serve to state the purpose for which the request in the preceding clause has been made and their scope is limited to the immediately preceding main clause. In only **2** letters are there only post-posed supportive moves.

4 What information preceded the requests and the supportive moves?

Preceding the requests (and the reasons for them) came a preamble containing a number of set topics that I have classified as extended facework (Scollon and Scollon 1991). This facework comprised the following topics:

a) An expression of praise for Radio Australia in general or of a particular programme or programme announcer. This proved the most common topic in the facework part of these letters. 22 writers included this type of praise. For example, someone writes:

"I feel the programmes you broadcast are sincere and moving and make me feel that although Australia is separated (from me) by oceans and seas, through your broadcasts, the distance is reduced."

Further examples can be seen in section 4.

b) A description of the writer's history as a listener to Radio Australia. 20 writers included this information. A simple example of this is: "I am a loyal listener to RA and have been for a long time". Further and more detailed examples of this can be seen in the analysis of the individual letters in section 4.

c) An introduction to the writer him/her self. 19 writers included some personal details. Letter 32 which is analysed in section 4 provides an example of this.

d) Best wishes of some sort. 11 writers included these in the facework part of the letter. For example, one letter begins:

"First let me wish you and all those who work in the China Section a happy new year, success at work and peace at home!"

It was at the time of the Chinese New Year when these letters were written and this may have increased the incidence of wishes in the facework.

e) 4 letters include thanks (for broadcasting a song, for example,) as part of the facework.

It should be noted that of the 35 letters that include facework of some sort before the supportive moves and requests, 29 contain at least 2 of the above topics with 18 including two topics and 11 including three topics. **Only 4** contain only one topic. Of these four letters that only contain one topic, 3 praise Radio Australia.

This adds up to only 33 out of the 35 letters. Two letters proved hard to analyse for facework. The first, a short letter of 83 characters (no 28) starts:

"Time passes really quickly, and by the time you receive this letter you will have been producing your programme for more than a month."

The writer then requests that a song be broadcast. The preamble does not fit any of the categories outlined above. The second letter (no 2) begins:

"I am a common citizen and I sometimes listen to your station's programmes. But I feel that your programmes are not as interesting as those of Voice of America."

The writer then goes on to request a programme schedule but it is hard to classify the preamble here as facework as such!

Table 3 below shows the contents of the preambles of each of the letters.

Table 3 : Make-up of preamble/facework by letter

Letter	RA and me	Praise RA	Wishes	'Me'	Other	Total
1	x	x	x			3
3		x				1
4	x			x		2
5		x		x		2
6	x					1
8				x		1
9		x	xx	x		3
10	x	x	x			3
11	x	x	x			3
12		x		x		2
13		x		x		2
14		x		x		2
15	x		x			2
16	x	x	x	x		4
17		x		x		2
18	x	x(p)		x(p)		1
19		x		x		2
20	x			x		2
22		x			x	2
23				x	x	2
24	x	x		x		3
25			x		x	2
26	x		x	x		3
29	x			x		2
30	x	x	x			3
31	x				x	2
32	x	x		x		3
33	x(p)	x				1
34		x			x	2
35	x			x		2
36	x				x	2
37	x	x	x			3
38	x	x	x			3
39				x	x	2
40	x	x		x		3
Totals	20	22	11	19	8	

The two crosses (xx) under wishes in letter 9 indicates the writer expressed his wishes on two separate occasions within the facework. This has only been counted as one token, however. (p) in brackets after a x (eg in letter 18) indicates that this took place after the request. These have not been counted as part of the facework as they occur after the request. Letters 7, 21 and 28 contain no facework and are thus not listed in table 3. Letters 2 and 28 are not listed for reasons I have given.

5 Was the language of the requests direct?

The language of the requests appears relatively direct and commonly avoids the use of softeners and downtoners. For example, the use of the politeness marker 'please' (qǐng) is comparatively rare. 'Qǐng' only occurs in 17 of the 40 letters. One

explanation for this relatively infrequent use is that 'qǐng' can mark an imperative in Chinese as it can represent a demand from someone in authority⁷. Much more common are requests introduced by language such as:

我想能得到
wo xiang neng dedao
I want can obtain

and

希望能得到
xiwang neng dedao
hope can obtain

I wish to obtain

I hope to obtain

While this language appears quite direct in English, it is 'softer' in Chinese. In particular, the phrase above - 'xīwàng néng dédào' - sounds polite to a Chinese speaker.

The implications of this use of relatively direct language - in particular the consequent need to analyse the overall schema in which a request takes place rather than simply the language the request itself is expressed in - has already been considered. A clearer picture of direct language being used in what native speakers consider to be a very polite letter of request can be seen in the analysis of the individual letters in section 4 below.

In addition to the linguistic realisations of the requests themselves, the question of the politeness of the salutations used at the beginning of the letters was also considered. 3 letters (and one of these is analysed as Letter E in section 4) used the very polite salutation of:

尊敬的 xxx 先生 您 好
'Zunjing - de XXX xiansheng. Nin hao
Respected-M NAME first born. You (HON) good.

Respected Mr X. How are you?

⁷Lee-Wong (1992) has noted that 'qǐng', as a politeness marker, "fails to perform its role convincingly in most cases." (p5).

A fourth letter also used the term 'zūnjìng' in its salutation but then went on to address a group of people rather than an individual: "Respected Radio Australia producers". This letter is analysed in section 4 as Letter A.

The most common form of salutation in these letters takes the form:

Personal Name, Sir/Miss, You (HON) good.

21 letters use this form with another 12 using the same formula but without the honorific form of the second person pronoun, using 'Nǐ' rather than 'Nín'.

As far as forms of third person address is concerned, 8 writers use the formal word 'nǚ shì' for Miss or Madam, while 6 use the less formal 'xiǎojiě' (Miss). Other forms of address include the rather out of date 'comrade' (tóngzhì) (2), 2 salutations written in English, 1 'elder brother' ('dà gē') and 7 general inclusive terms, such as 'Radio Australia personnel'

6 Did the relative imposition of the requests have any significance for where the request was placed?

The three letters that followed the schema of placing the requests at the beginning of the letters all contained requests whose imposition was relatively light. They included requests for calendars, programme schedules, and for songs to be broadcast. All these can be seen as routine type requests. However, the majority of the letters contained requests whose impositions were similarly light but they followed the schema that placed the request towards the end of the letters. The relative imposition of requests is further discussed in the analysis of the individual letters in section 4.

4.2 The analysis of individual letters

5 letters are analysed in detail below⁸. A translation of each letter is followed by a description of the letter's rhetorical structure. This is, in turn, followed by comments about the letter and by judgements made by native speakers about the letters. These native speaker judgements are included because only native speakers of Chinese could provide reliable opinions concerning which of the letters were the best written and concerning the relative politeness of the letters. In all, 12 native speakers were consulted (7 from Mainland China, 4 Cantonese MSC speakers from Hong Kong and one from Taiwan). Their opinions were elicited in three ways. First, individual native speakers were asked for their reactions to the letters, including which ones they thought to be the most polite and least polite and why. Second, a group of these native speakers was asked to divide the letters into three groups - polite, impolite and 'strange'. They were also asked to write down the reasons for their decisions, especially if they thought a particular letter was striking in some way. Third, another group of five of these native speakers was asked to rank the three best and the three worst letters. They did this part of the task individually. Once they had completed this task, they compared their findings and discussed their results with each other with a view to compiling a group ranking of the three best and worst letters. Their discussion was audio taped. Summaries of the judgements of the native speakers are included as the final comment in the 'comments' section of the analysis of each letter.

It has been rightly argued that native speaker intuitions about language can be inadequate. (Wolfson, Marmor and Jones 1989). This inadequacy refers to the inability of native speakers to describe accurately what they or other people might say in a given situation or what they themselves actually did say (Labov 1972). In this study, however, only native speaker judgements about the appropriacy and politeness of the letters of request are sought. It would seem unlikely, therefore, that native speakers would make false judgements about such issues, especially when the entire context in which the letters were written is known to them.

⁸Copies of the letters in Chinese are in appendix 2.

4.2.1 Letter A (no 32)

- 1 Respected Radio Australia producers.
 2 I have been a loyal listener to Radio Australia's English teaching programmes
 3 and to 'Songs You Like' for several years. I consider both programmes to be extremely
 4 well produced.
 5 Let me describe myself a little: I am a middle school student, I am eighteen and
 6 my home is in XXX, a small border city. The cultural life really isn't too bad. *Because*
 7 I like studying English, I *therefore* follow those programmes closely. *But because* the
 8 Central Broadcasting Station's English programmes are rather abstruse, they are not
 9 really suitable for me and *therefore* I get all my practice in listening comprehension and
 10 dialogue from Radio Australia's English programmes. This practice has been of great
 11 benefit. As I progress, step by step through the course, I am keenly aware that not
 12 having the teaching materials presents several difficulties. *Because of this*, I have taken
 13 time to write this letter to you, in the hope that I can obtain a set of Radio Australia's
 14 English programme's teaching materials. Please let me know the cost of the materials.
 15 In addition, I hope to obtain a radio Australia calendar. Wishing Radio
 16 Australia's MSC programmes even more interest.
 17 Listener XX (date)

Letter A: (32) Structure

Salutation

Intro 'Me and Radio Australia ' (RA); Praise RA

Intro 'Me'

Reasons RA good and RA good for me (191 characters)

Explain 'because no teaching materials' (31 characters)

Request 1 (therefore) hope can obtain (35 characters)
 one RA English programme materials

Offer Pay(10 characters)

Request 2 'in addition hope obtain RA calendar' (32 characters)

Sign off / date.

(The letter has 303 characters overall)

Comments

1 The request itself is not begun until the writer has taken 191 characters of a letter of 303 characters in introducing herself and praising Radio Australia. In other words, more than 60% of the letter is written before the actual request - in the form of justification for the request and what Faerch and Kasper (op cit) call "external modification" - begins.

2 The contents of this preamble or facework to the request comprises: 'Introduction to history of self and RA', 'Praise for RA', 'Introduction to self including an explanation as to how RA has been of benefit to self'. For example, the writer praises RA by saying that RA programmes are extremely well produced. (lines 3-4)

3 The main request - for teaching materials - is preceded by the reason for the request following the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. A paraphrase of the main request reads:

Because difficult without materials, (*therefore*) hope can obtain materials' (lines 12 ff). [(*therefore*) indicates that the *therefore* connector is not in the Chinese text, although it could be.]

The main request is followed by a request for a calendar. No reasons for this are given and nor is the request justified. The imposition of this request is, however, extremely light as RA have offered to give a calendar to listeners who write in for one. Furthermore, the facework that preceded the main request operates for this request also.

4 The schema of this letter is, therefore:

Salutation
Facework
Reason For Request
Request (s)
Sign Off

5 There are two sentence level 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequences in the body of the letter that follow the normal unmarked sequence. Interestingly, four out of a possible five 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' connectors are present in the text.

a) '*Because* I like studying English, I *therefore* follow those programmes closely.' (line 7)

b) '*But because* the Central Broadcasting Station's English programmes are rather abstruse, they are (*therefore*) not really suitable for me and *therefore* I get all my practice'(lines 8-9)

6 The salutation 'Respected Radio Australia Producers' is very polite using the term 'zūnjǐng' and the impersonal third person.

7 The linguistic form of the requests is realised as follows:

希望 能 得到 一本
xiwang neng dedao yi-ben....
hope can obtain one-M...

in the hope that I can obtain a set...(lines 14-15)

and

另外 我 希望 得到
lingwai, wo xiwang dedao
In addition, I hope obtain

In addition I hope to obtain...(line 17)

Notice that there are no softeners or downtoners used here - no internal modification - and the language of the requests looks very direct. However, as mentioned in section 3 above, the language is 'softer' in Chinese than it is in English.

8 The relative imposition of the request is light. The letter requests two items - RA's English Language teaching materials and a calendar. RA would not find it onerous to send these two items, and the letter writer also offers to pay for the teaching materials.

9 The letter is 303 characters long which makes it slightly longer than the average length of the letters which is 275 characters.

10 This is one of the two letters judged most polite by the *native speakers*.
Among native speaker comments on this letter were: "The style is absolutely right";
"pretty good"; "very polite and honest".

We now turn to the analysis of the second letter.

4.2.2 Letter B (19)

1 Miss XXX
2
3 How are you!
4 By chance opportunity, I heard Radio Australia's Cantonese programmes. I
5 really liked them! *Because* I, the lover of Cantonese and Cantonese songs, have finally
6 found a fine teacher and good friend!
7 Now I listen to your programme every day and my Cantonese has greatly
8 improved. I am very happy, and at the same time feel great affection for Radio Australia
9 and all its producers. I shall always remember that at 11800 kilohertz, I have a good
10 friend, and that friend is recommended by me!
11 Here, I want for my good friend XXX and you XXX and all personnel, a Li
12 Keqin song (or any other song you choose on my behalf). Also heartfelt wishes for
13 happiness to all listeners to Radio Australia!
14 In addition, I would like to ask for a programme schedule for Radio Australia's
15 Cantonese programmes, (but) do not know if there is one or not? Many thanks!
16 Wishing you happiness at work
17 Loyal Listener XXX
18

1990.1.8

Letter B (19) Structure

Salutation

Intro 'Me and RA' ; Praise RA

(123 characters)

Request 1 'Song'

(43 characters)

Request 2 'Cantonese programme schedule'

(24 characters)

Wishes / Sign off

(The letter has 225 characters overall)

Comments

1 The first request here is not made until 130 characters of a 225 character letter.

In other words more than 50% of the letter is written before the actual request begins.

2 The first 130 characters are taken up with salutation and preamble similar to the preamble in letter A above. In this letter, the writer explains how he came to listen to

particular programmes and how much he liked them "I really liked them"(line 5). This preamble, consisting of praise for RA some information about himself, is again performing the function of facework and lays the groundwork for the imposition of the upcoming request(s).

3 The first request is for a song to be played. The reasons for the writer's request for a song is stated early in the letter. "I, the lover of Cantonese songs....."(line 5)

The second request - for a Cantonese programme schedule - is prefaced by reasons for it that are implied in the opening facework; ie that the writer has started to listen to the Cantonese programmes. In other words, the facework in this letter also provides reasons for the requests and the letter follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence.

4 The schema for this letter is, therefore:

Salutation
Facework / Reasons for Requests
Requests
Sign Off

5 The *Because* sentence (lines 5-6) occurs in the marked position after the main clause. It is fulfilling an explanatory function for the main clause as it explains why the listener really enjoys listening to RA's Cantonese programme. The 'because' connector, 'yinwei' is present in the letter. This is to be expected in a marked main clause - subordinate clause sequence.

6 The salutation follows the formula of Name+Miss (formal *nǚ shì*) + 'Nín hǎo' (using the honorific form of the second person pronoun.)

7 The linguistic realisation of the requests is similar to Letter A's, with no softeners or downtoners being used.

我要为好友点播
wo yao wei hao you.... dianbo
I want for good friend broadcast

I want for my good friend...(line 11)

and

另外我想索取一份
lingwai, wo xiang suoqu yi-fen
In addition, I want ask for one-M

In addition I would like to ask for a...(line 14)

8 The relative imposition of the requests is light. Although the letter contains three requests, the first two can hardly be considered as bearing any imposition at all given the context of a radio station, while the third - for the programme schedule - is also a standard straightforward request.

9 All the *native speakers* judged this letter to be polite, with 5 of them considering it the most polite of the letters.

4.2.3 Letter C (29)

1 Listeners' Letterbox:
2 How are you!

3
4 I am a loyal listener to Radio Australia, and I listen every day to the programme
5 'Listeners' Requests', and particularly like the songs of Qi Tai, Wang Jie, Pan
6 Meizhen, Tong Ange, and sometimes go to the tape shop to buy photos of them. But
7 every time I am disappointed *because* they do not sell photos of them!

8 Yesterday I listened to your programme and heard you say that you have photos
9 of them there. *Therefore* (I) am specially writing this letter to ask, *if* you have (them),
10 please could you send me some, apologies for bothering you.

11
12 Loyal Radio Australia Listener XXX

13
14 Best wishes

15
16 1990.1.8

Letter C (29) Structure

Salutation

Intro 'Me and RA'

Explain 'like X, X, X and X but can't get photos' (92 characters)

Explain 'hear you have photos' (21 characters)

Request '*therefore*' send me some (21 characters)

Apologies

Sign Off

(The letter has 163 characters overall)

Comments

1 The request is made 113 characters into a 163 character letter. In other words nearly **70%** of the letter is written before the actual request begins.

2 The request is preceded by facework where the writer explains that he listens to RA every day.

3 This facework is followed by the reason for the request, which is that the writer would like some photos of his favourite singers but can't get them. The writer also justifies his request before making it by saying that "Yesterday I listened to your programme and heard that you have photos of them there".(lines 9-10). The '*therefore*' in line 10 introduces the request. The request can therefore be paraphrased:

(*because*) I would like photos of X (*and because*) I can't get them here, (*and because*) I hear you have some, *therefore*. send some..'

The 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is once again followed.

4 The schema for Letter C is, therefore:

Salutation
Facework
Reason(s) for Request
Justify Request
Request
Sign Off

5 The 'because' in line 7 is in the marked position as it follows the main clause. The because clause here is providing additional information concerning the writer's disappointment. The 'because' connector 'yīnwei' is present in the text as would be expected in this marked main clause - subordinate clause sequence.

6 The salutation is slightly different from those in the previous letters as the writer uses the unmarked and thus non-honorific form of the second person pronoun ('nǐ' rather than 'nín')

7 The linguistic realisation of the request is:

请 你们 给我 寄 几 张 来, 烦 你们]
qīng nimen gei wo ji ji-zhang lai, fan nimen le
Please you (pl) give me send several-M come, bother you (Pl) A

please could you send me some, apologies for bothering you. (l 11)

There is a difference here between this and the language used in Letter A and Letter B as the writer uses the Chinese word for please ('qīng') and is using it as a softener.

8 The relative imposition of the request is comparatively light. The writer is asking for something that he knows RA has, and it is common for RA to send photos of this type to their listeners. As table 2 showed, 15 people requested photographs.

9 The *native speakers* judged this letter as "polite and honest"; "normal"; with most considering it to be normal. One person, however, said "The request is a bit strange but the style is fine".

4.2.4 Letter D (30)

1 Radio Australia personnel

2 How are you!

3 I am a student and while studying often listen to your programmes to while
4 away the time. Gradually I have come to like your programmes more and more, *for*
5 *example* the easy listening music programmes and Radio Australia's English
6 programmes are also very good. *In short*, Radio Australia's programmes add fulfilment
7 to my life and give me happiness. *Therefore* I want to wish the staff of Radio Australia
8 best wishes and a happy new year!

9 I was listening to a programme last night (Jan 7) and heard the news that a lady
10 colleague who had returned from Singapore was offering new year gifts, this excited
11 my interest. I hope that I can obtain some gifts and a photograph of herself, *but because*
12 I rudely have forgotten her name, I hope you can take the trouble, apologies,
13 Soory.(sic - this word written in English)

14 From the programmes you broadcast and from books and television, I am
15 gradually coming to get to know about Australia, and know that Australia has many
16 special and rare animals, koalas, kangaroos....I am very fond of animals and am
17 particularly interested in those animals that I have not seen with my own eyes, and hope
18 to be able to obtain posters or calendars of all these animals, *if* there are stamps that
19 would be even better (*because* I collect stamps), please grant my requests!

20 This time I'll stop here.

21 Wishing everyone happiness at work and best wishes!

22 XXX 90.1.8

23 (Soory (sic) the correspondence address is my father's, he also likes Radio
24 Australia.)

Letter D (30) Structure

Salutation

Intro 'me and RA'; Praise RA (98 characters)

Wish 'happy new year' (27 characters)

Explain 'last night - (because) offer gifts' (45 characters)

Request 1 'hope can get new year gifts' (22 characters)

Request 2 'because forgotten name, you pass message on' (20 characters)

Apologies

Explain 'understanding Australia' (40 characters)

Explain 'because fond of animals' (22 characters)

Request 3 'hope can obtain posters/calendars and stamps' (24 characters)

End / wishes / name/ date / PS

(The letter has 365 characters overall)

Comments

1 The rhetorical structure of this letter is similar to those of Letters A, B and C. The requests themselves only begin after 170 characters of a 365 character letter. In other words, nearly **50%** of the letter is written before the actual requests begin. The 'percentage of preamble' is less than in the earlier three letters. However, this letter is longer than the others and contains more requests than the others.

2 The facework includes an introduction to the history of the writer and RA and praise of RA: "the easy listening programmes and Radio Australia's English programmes are also very good" (lines 5-6). The writer also includes wishes in the facework. "*Therefore* I want to wish the staff of Radio Australia best wishes and a happy new year!" (lines 8-9).

3 The first request - for gifts and a photo - are preceded by a justification for it: "I heard the news that a lady colleague...was offering gifts and this excited my interest" (lines 10-12).

The second request - that the recipient of the letter pass on the request to the third party concerned is preceded by the reason for it: "*because* I have rudely forgotten her name, I hope you can take the trouble....."

The third request - for posters etc of 'rare' animals - is preceded by a justification and reasons for it: I know that Australia has rare animals....I am particularly interested in those animals.."(lines 16-20) Within this request for posters and calendars is also a request for stamps. This request is explained or justified by a '*because*' clause in marked position following the request: "*because* I collect stamps" The brackets around this clause, which are present in the original letter, suggest that it was an afterthought included to add further justification for the request for stamps.

Generally speaking, the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' reason for request - request sequence is again being followed.

The schema of this letter is, therefore:

Salutation
Facework
Reason for Requests
Requests (gifts/photo)
Reason for Request
Request (pass on message)
Reason for Requests
Requests (posters etc)
Sign Off

5 The '*because*' connector 'yinwei' in line 21 is present in this marked main clause - subordinate clause sequence.

6 The salutation uses the impersonal 'Radio Australia Personnel, and proceeds 'nimen hǎo!', using the unmarked non-honorific form of the second person pronoun.⁹

7 The language of the request is very similar to the language used in Letters A, B and C. No softeners or downtoners are used. For example, we have:

我希望能得
wo xiwang neng de
I hope can obtain (line 12) and

希望能得到
xiwang neng dedao
hope can obtain (line 20)

The writer then ends her request by saying:

请满足我的要求
qing manzu wo-de yaoqiu
please satisfy my request

please grant my requests (line 22)

This looks rather direct and imposing, especially with this use of 'qǐng', but the native speakers did not think that this was particularly impolite.

8 The relative imposition of the requests requests is 'heavy'. As can be seen from the rhetorical structure and schema above, the writer makes a large number of requests. The final request is, in fact, for several items - posters, calendars and stamps. These are preceded by requests for gifts, a photo and for the recipient to pass on a message. Importantly, the recipient's degree of obligation in carrying out some of the requests and the writer's degree of right in issuing them differ here¹⁰. For example, asking the recipient to pass on a request to a third party and asking the recipient to send

⁹One explanation of this use of the non-honorific form might have been that the writer also uses the plural form of the second person pronoun, ('nimen') and that the honorific form might not be used with this plural form. Several other letters, however, do use the honorific 'nin' with the plural form to give 'ninmen'.

¹⁰The hearer's degree of obligation in carrying out a request and the speaker's degree of right in issuing a request have been identified as significant social dimensions in requests. (Blum-Kulka and House 1989).

some stamps, places a heavier imposition upon the recipient than is usual in these letters. Both these requests will require some specific action on the part of the recipient if they are to be fulfilled.

9 The *native speakers* were divided in their judgements about this letter but with only 3 classifying it as polite. Typical native speaker comments about the letter included: "OK but a bit wordy"; "If I was at Radio Australia I would think how can I get you a stamp!"; "A bit excessive but the style is OK"; "Excessive" ('guofen').

It was, therefore, the relative imposition of some of these requests that caused native speakers to classify this letter as being impolite. In particular, they felt that asking for stamps (not a normal RA item) and for the recipient to pass on a message was asking too much.

On the other hand, they felt that the style of the letter was fine. In other words, the schema that this letter followed was judged to be all right.

We now turn to the analysis of request fronted letters.

4.4.5 Letter E (21) A request fronted letter.

Respected Mr X

How are you! (I) hear that you at Radio Australia have a 1990 calendar and I would like one very much, and hope that you will send me one to Guangxi.....and address it to me in person. When convenient, I would also like a programme schedule, with heartfelt thanks to your colleagues at Radio Australia.

Best wishes (signed and dated)

Letter E (21) Structure

Salutation	(10 characters)
Explain 'Hear RA has a calendar'	(10 characters)
<u>Request 1</u> 'calendar'	(6 characters)
<u>Request 2</u> 'programme schedule'	(13 characters)
Thanks	(15 characters)
Wishes / sign off	(The letter has 80 characters overall)

Comments

1 The request is made at the beginning of the letter. In fact, less than 10% of the letter is written before the request - in the form of external modification - begins.

2 This letter contains no facework before the request.

3 The request is preceded by a justification for it; "I hear that you at RA have a 1990 calendar..", and this follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence.

4 The schema for this letter is, therefore:

Salutation

Justification for Request

Request

Thanks

Sign Off

5 The salutation uses the extremely polite:

尊敬的 XXX 先生 您 好
 zunjing-de XXX xiansheng. Nin hao.
 respected-M Name first born. You (HON) good.

6 The linguistic realisation of the request is direct and the letter uses no softeners or downtoners:

索要一份

suo yao yi-fen
 ask want one-M

I would like one

A further point of interest about the language of this letter is the register in which the letter is written. Unlike the other letters, this letter is written in a formal register. For example, the letter continues after the opening salutation:

得 悉 您 贵 处
De xi, nin gui chu
Obtain knowledge, you (HON) honourable place

有 1990 年挂历 特此索要 一份
you 1990 nian guali, teci suo yao yi-fen,
have 1990 year calendar, special ask want one-M

Despite this letter writer's ability to use this formal register, however, he does make a 'spelling' mistake when he later uses the character 'chén' (陈) instead of the correct 'chèn' (趁) writing 'chénbian' (陈便) rather than 'chènbian' (趁便).

7 The relative imposition of the requests it makes is light. Radio Australia will send calendars and programme schedules to listeners as a matter of course. To request these items would not, therefore, be seen as making a heavy imposition.

8 This letter was the letter that the *native speakers* judged to be the least polite with eight classifying it as impolite. Of the remaining four native speakers, one said it was "OK" and one said that it was "direct...not too impolite".

The letter was written by someone from the South of China (Guangxi is a southern province) and it was suggested that Southerners would be more likely to think this letter more polite than Northerners. However, there were four other letters written by people from Guangxi and these all followed the rhetorical structure which places the request at the end of the letter. In addition, the four native speakers from Hong Kong, and thus also Southerners, all classified this letter as being impolite.

Recalling that the salutation in this letter is extremely polite; that it is written in a formal register; and that the relative imposition of the request is light, all strongly suggest that it is the schema of this request letter, which dispenses with facework and places the request at the beginning, that is the factor that has caused the native speakers to judge this letter impolite.

4.2.6 The remaining request fronted letters

As mentioned earlier, only three out of the 40 letters were request-fronted and the question was therefore whether the native speakers also found the remaining two

request-fronted letters impolite. And each of these letters were judged impolite by at least some of the native speakers. Of the first, 6 native speakers found it impolite but 6 found it "direct but clear", "OK". The letter reads:

Respected Mr XXX
How are you!

I am writing to you in the hope that you will send me two 1990 coloured calendars and I also want you to broadcast some songs for my friend. I am confident you will fulfil my hopes and grant my requests. Thankyou!
Happy new year and best wishes!

xxx
(date)

The songs to be broadcast:

1 Please (qǐng) on the evening of the 22nd day of the first month....
(3 songs are listed and 'qǐng' is used with each.)

The requests appear normal and can not be construed as representing an onerous imposition. Furthermore, this letter is one of only 4, along with Letters A and E above, that includes the polite term 'zūnjīng' (respected) in its salutation. It also uses the politeness marker 'qǐng'. All this again suggests that it is the schema, which here dispenses with both the facework and the reasons or justifications for the request, that has caused native speakers to judge it impolite.

The third request fronted letter was found to be: "OK", "Good, direct and to the point" by 8 of the native speakers while only four found it impolite. This letter starts "Radio Australia" and then asks for a calendar. The writer then provides a reason for the request which is; "...so that I can better understand Australia's places of historic interest and its scenery". This makes it one of only two letters that follow a schema that does not place any reasons for the request before the request but places them after the request. This is a rare example, therefore, of external modification of a request following the request.

The writer then offers to pay for the cost of sending the calendar, and this offer coupled with the lightness of the request is what caused the majority of the native speakers to classify it as "direct" but "OK". Interestingly, however, four native speakers still classified this letter as impolite.

What is clear from this is that letters that have their requests placed at the beginning are considered to be direct and the question becomes whether directness is considered polite or not¹¹. And at least some native speakers found each of these direct requests impolite, even though the relative imposition of the requests in them were considered 'light' and that two of them used a very polite form of salutation. The evidence is very strong, therefore, for saying that it is the schemas with a request-fronted rhetorical structure that is the key variable that cause native speakers to judge these letters impolite.

This is supported by the length of these three letters. They are the three shortest letters in the data and are of 80, 82 and 83 characters length respectively. They are thus much shorter than the average length of 275 characters.

5 Summary of findings

1 The letters that the native speakers classified as normal and polite all include facework. This facework precedes both the reasons for the request and the request itself.

2 The letters that the native speakers classified as normal and polite all prefaced their requests with reasons and/or justifications for them. In Faerch's and Kasper's terms, these letters, unlike in the case of their English and German requests, all contained external modification. And this external modification, unlike in the case of their Danish requests, preceded the requests.

This sequence of reasons / justification for request - request allows the unmarked 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence and demonstrates that this sequence is also operating at this level of text.

¹¹ Blum-Kulka (1987) has shown that politeness is not always expressed by indirectness. Nevertheless, indirectness remains a common way of expressing politeness.

3 The three request-fronted letters were all considered impolite by at least some of the native speakers, yet two of these letters used a very polite form of salutation and one used a more formal register. Furthermore, all three letters contained light, straightforward requests. However, none of these letters included any facework and two of them did not state the reasons for the request before the request. One of these did not mention the request at all and the other stated the reason after the request. This suggests that request fronting and dispensing with facework are seen as impolite by speakers of MSC.

4 The use of softeners or downtoners - internal modification - was not significant. Letters that used none were judged polite by the native speakers. This is in sharp contrast to the findings presented by Faerch and Kasper (op cit) who discovered "a pervasive preference of internal over external modification".(p 243) This may demonstrate the importance at looking at the overall transaction in which a request takes place.

5 Although Letter D, which the native speakers classified as impolite, also follows the schema that proceeds 'facework - reasons for request - request', some native speakers found it impolite. However, it was the relative imposition of the requests that the native speakers found "excessive". They had no criticism of the style of the letter.

We conclude, therefore, that the most important criterion by which the letters were judged was their rhetorical structure and schema. The preferred and polite way to form a request of this type in Chinese requires the request to follow the rhetorical structure outlined in this idealised schema:

Idealised Schema for MSC Letters of Request

Salutation

Facework

Reason(s) for Request(s)

Request(s)

Sign off

This way of framing requests appears formalised and it is for this reason we call this structure a schema. That is to say, native speakers are able to identify these requests as well written, normal and polite requests long before they come to the requests themselves because they are so familiar with the structure of requests and the sequence in which the parts of the request are ordered. It is as if the whole formalised letter has the illocutionary force of request. Each section of the request - the salutation - facework - reasons for request - request - sign off - is an integral part of the request and must be presented in this order for the request to be identified as normal and polite, although we have seen an example of the reasons for the request being included in the facework. Changing the order, dispensing with the facework, moving the request to the front and altering the normal 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence, identifies the request as marked in some way, being seen as direct and possibly impolite.

Chapter 5. Information Sequencing and Reasoning in Chinese

Introduction.

In chapters 2, 3, and 4, information sequencing in MSC has been considered at various levels and across a variety of genres. Chapter 2 explored clause sequencing at sentence level and showed the MSC preference for following the subordinate - main sequence in complex sentences. This included 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequencing in unmarked cause - effect sentences. In chapter 3, propositional sequencing in extended spoken answers was considered and it was shown that the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence was also followed at this level of extended discourse in both informal, unplanned and in more formal and planned samples of speech. Chapter 4 analysed the structure of requests in MSC, in particular the structure or schema of letters of request. The MSC preference for making a request only after providing the reasons for it also demonstrated a preference for 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequencing.

In this chapter we move on to discuss reasoning in MSC. The chapter begins with a review of the notion that reasoning in Asian languages and cultures is 'inductive' and in some way 'indirect' as opposed to the 'deductive' and 'direct' reasoning attributed to Western languages and cultures. In the second section of the chapter reasoning in Chinese is discussed. This includes methods of reasoning common in Classical Chinese, such as chain reasoning, reasoning by analogy and reasoning from historical precedent. We also consider reasoning in contemporary Chinese and examine to what extent the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' propositional sequence is demonstrated in Chinese reasoning in general and compare the information sequence in these texts with the information sequence in the texts we presented in chapter 3.

In the final section of the chapter the issue of the effect that an audience can have on information sequencing is raised. We review what Chinese authorities have had to say on the subject of winning over an audience; and we present Chinese texts that are considered to be fine examples of Chinese norms. We compare the relationship between 'facework' and interaction and the schema of a 'classical' letter of request with

the schemata of the letters of request analysed in chapter 4. Finally, it is argued that societal influence is extremely significant for language use and the way reasoning is structured.

1 The inductive East and the deductive West?

The notion that Western cultures use a deductive method of reasoning or argument, while Eastern cultures use an inductive method of reasoning has been commonly expressed. For example, Scollon and Scollon (1991) talk about an "Asian inductive" pattern that delays the introduction of topics within a conversation and contrast this with a "deductive pattern" in which Westerners introduce topics early into a conversation (p 113). Samovar and Porter claim that most North Americans use the deductive method of reasoning while, in Korean culture, the inductive method is used. They also claim that Western thought stresses logic and rationality and is based on Aristotelian methods of reasoning while Eastern thought is more intuitive¹. They quote Culick (1962):

"The one (Eastern thought) begets a culture of courtesy, the other a culture of realism." (1991 p 93).

A similar distinction between American and Korean modes of reasoning is made by Tyler and Davies (1990). In their analysis of an interaction between a Korean teaching assistant and one of his American students, they show that the Korean teacher presented his argument in small increments in the hope that he and the student would be able to reach agreement at each point, "so that in the end both interlocutors would have essentially created the conclusion." (p 400). Tyler and Davies name this the "inductive/collaborative" approach. This step by step approach leading to a conclusion approach recalls the way the Chinese police constable went about making his request recounted in chapter 4.

¹It is perhaps helpful to see 'intuitive' as something a hearer has to be when the speaker is following 'inductive' reasoning.

The American student, however, was not expecting this 'Korean' approach to reasoning. The student was used to a deductively organised argument and therefore expected that the teacher would begin by providing an overall statement of the problem or topic - what I called a content framing statement in chapter 4 when commenting on the lack of such statements in Chinese speakers' discourse. Tyler and Davies call the approach expected by the student a "deductive/assertive approach" and make a distinction, therefore, between this and the "inductive/collaborative" approach of the Korean.

Indirectness in Chinese discourse has been the subject of much comment by Westerners. AH Smith (1894) contrasts the "Anglo-Saxon" habit of going directly to the point with the Chinese habit of indirection. He says:

"Next to a competent knowledge of the Chinese language, large powers of inference are essential to anyone who is to deal successfully with the Chinese...."(p 66)

Scholars have also drawn attention to a direct/indirect disparity between certain English and Oriental writing. Kaplan drew attention to the indirect approach of some Oriental (Chinese and Korean) writing, saying:

"In this kind of writing, the development of the paragraph may be said to be turning and turning in a widening gyre....., such a development in a modern English paragraph would strike the English reader as awkward and unnecessarily indirect." (1966 p 10).

Kaplan's analysis has been questioned by Mohan and Lo (1985) who reject Kaplan's claim that oriental writing is indirect or circular. They provide an example of a deductive paragraph taken from the Analects of Confucius as evidence that not all Chinese writing is circular. It is here, I think, that the concept of preference is very important. At this stage, we merely wish to point out that the notion that Oriental reasoning is somehow inductive and indirect and that Western reasoning is deductive and direct has been put forward by a variety of scholars.

Another way of seeing this direct/indirect dichotomy has been put forward by Hinds (1987) where he makes a distinction between languages that are writer or speaker responsible and those that are reader or hearer responsible. For example, he

points out that the desire to write or speak clearly is an integral and historically long standing part of English culture. In other words, in English culture, it is the responsibility of the speaker and writer to make the message clear. He cites this aphorism for public speaking in support of his point:

"Tell 'em what you're going to tell 'em, tell 'em, then tell 'em what you told 'em." (p 144).

In certain Asian cultures on the other hand - and he gives Japanese, Classical Chinese and Korean as examples - it is not the responsibility of the speaker to communicate his message in a clear and direct way. It is the responsibility of the listener or reader to understand what the speaker or writer intended. In Japanese this apparently requires people to be able to read between the lines. Hinds quotes Yoshikawa:

"What is often verbally expressed and what is actually intended are two different things. What is verbally expressed is probably important enough to maintain friendship....but what is not verbalised counts most..... Although it is not expressed verbally, you are supposed to know it by *kan* - intuition" (p 144).

Clancy (1990) has expressed a similar view, calling Japanese communication "intuitive" and "indirect". (p 28).

In writing this difference between writer and reader responsibility is also reflected in the amount of time writers spend over the preparation of a text. In Japan, according to Hinds, Japanese authors often compose only one draft which then becomes the finished product. This contrasts dramatically with English where

"rhetoric is concerned primarily with a creative process that includes all the choices a writer makes from his earliest tentative explorations of a problem in what has been called the prewriting stage of the writing process, through choices in arrangement and strategy for a particular audience, to the final editing of the final draft." (Young, Becker and Pike 1970 p xii).

In the continuum of writer responsible languages and reader responsible languages, Hinds places Modern Chinese nearer English, calling it a writer-responsible

language. This assessment is based, however, on a comparison of a single Classical Chinese text and its present day translation (taken from Li and Thompson 1982). While it is agreed that MSC is more writer responsible than Classical Chinese, we shall argue in the course of this chapter, that MSC remains a more reader responsible language than English.

Clyne (1987) makes a similar point when suggesting that cultural determinants rather than linguistic typologies underlie the degree of linearity in discourse. Importantly, he shows that there is variation among so-called Western cultures. For example, he provides analyses of academic German and English and argues that the onus is on English writers to make texts readable. In German, on the other hand, the onus is on the readers to make the effort to understand the texts.

In a comparison of Asian and Western rhetorics, Oliver (1971) notes points of general difference between them. These include their function, which in Asia is, according to Oliver, to promote harmony while in the West its function is to promote the welfare of the individual. Thus the discourse of Asian rhetoric tended to avoid argument and persuasive fervour. What was persuasive for Asian rhetoric(s)

"was appeal to established authority buttressed by analogical reasoning which sought to clarify the unfamiliar through comparison with the familiar." (p 263).

Smith (1983) sees the language as the significant factor in Chinese indirectness. In noting that Chinese thinkers often showed a marked preference for intuition he suggests that the brevity and subtlety of Classical Chinese encouraged an intuitive approach. He quotes AC Graham's observation that the Chinese have always been impressed by:

"the aphoristic genius which guides thought of the maximum complexity with the minimum of words." (p 88).

This point is addressed by Tsao Fengfu (1982) who argues that Chinese speakers dislike structure that is too direct and that this might explain why their writing seems indirect to speakers of English.

The high value that cultures such as Japanese and Korean place upon indirectness may influence the adoption of linguistic ways of indirectly specifying reference. These include, for example, a widespread use of zero anaphora. This has led Foley and Van Valin to call the system of discourse cohesion practised by such languages the "inference system". (1984 p 324).

There is also a substantial body of evidence to show that reasoning and rhetoric in Arabic is likewise indirect and proceeds differently from 'Western' reasoning. (Johnstone 1983, 1986, 1989) (Hatim 1991).

We have noted that there seems to be consensus among scholars that a number of Asian languages and cultures are indirect when compared with English. Some have suggested cultural reasons for this, others linguistic. The next part of this chapter examines the notion expressed above that reasoning in Asia is more inductive and indirect than 'Western' reasoning with reference to reasoning in Chinese. We first consider reasoning in classical Chinese.

2 Reasoning in Chinese

2.1 Classical Chinese reasoning.

2.1.1 Chain reasoning

Sinologists have long argued that Chinese thinkers rarely used deductive reasoning and did not frame conceptualisations in a hypothetico-deductive form (Garrett 1983). Instead they used argument by analogy, comparison and preferred a form of chain-reasoning. Wyatt (1990), quoting Munro, states that Confucian thinkers usually employed one of three types of argumentation: "the rhetorical chain argument, argument by appeal to antiquity and argument by analogy." (p 46).

In this section, we shall concentrate on chain reasoning. Garrett (op cit) distinguishes two types of chain-reasoning common in Chinese argument, one which

relates propositions and one which relates terms within propositions. Below is an example of the first type, interpropositional chain-reasoning.²

"If the people are farmers then they are naturally simple. If they are naturally simple then they are easy to use. If they are easy to use then the borders of the state will be secure and the position of the chief will be honoured.

If the people set aside the base (farming) and serve the peripheral then they will be fond of being intelligent. If they are fond of being intelligent then they will be deceptive most of the time. If they are deceptive most of the time then they will cleverly twist the models and commands and take right as wrong and wrong as right."(p 128)

(The original example is much longer, comprising six paragraphs of which I have reproduced only two, the first and the last.)

This type of chain-reasoning clearly follows the sequence of if p then q. However, Garrett says that she has found no clear cut case in this text nor in other similar texts of the same period in which the writer drew the expected conclusion. Instead, the final consequent is always omitted. She quotes Chmielewski's explanation that

"the omission of the final consequent....is due to the fact that the consequent was felt as *evidently implied* by the chain of particular implications actually expressed."(p 131)(my italics).

But as Garrett says, one would expect the final consequent to be mentioned occasionally, but it never is. And

"Conversely, I have not found a conclusion of the form $p_1 \supset p_n$ followed by a chain of propositions which supports it." (p 131)(my italics).

As the sequence of conclusion followed by a chain of propositions supporting it is the sequence of deductive reasoning, Garrett is, in fact saying that she has found no examples of deductive reasoning in these texts.

As an example of the second type of chain-reasoning, the one that relates terms within propositions, Garrett gives:

² These examples come from the 'Lu Shih Chunqiu' or the 'Spring and Autumn Annals of Master Lu' which was written around 240 BC. Garrett considers this to be the "best representative of those works which used argument by comparison and chain-reasoning."(p 15).

"Before the time of Ch'ih Yu [a mythical rebel] the people did definitely whittle pieces of wood to do battle with, and those who won became the leaders. The leaders still were not sufficient to put the people in order, *so* (*gu*~~故~~) they set up rulers. Again, the rulers were not sufficient to put them in order, *so* (*gu*) they set up the emperor. The setting up of the emperor comes from the rulers, the setting up of the rulers comes from the leaders, and the setting up of the leaders comes from the conflict." (p 130).

In this type of chain-reasoning or so-called sorites, Garrett says she has only found one instance in the texts of the period which explicitly links the first and last terms of the propositions. The conclusions to be drawn are, therefore, implicit. The reader is expected to be able to make these without any direct help from the text. This has significance for the use of connectors and she also comments on the use, or lack of use, of connectors in Classical Chinese:

"Classical Chinese may and often does dispense with the conjunction and expresses the protasis/apodosis relation by simple juxtaposition of sentences." (p 131-132)³.

The connector '*gu*', which we also noted being used as a 'therefore' connector in the letters of request in chapter 2 (p 78), seems sometimes to signal a logical inference and to be equivalent to 'therefore'. In many cases, however, the implications are only denoted in a very loose way and it is best translated simply as 'so'. And while Garrett claims that the relations between these terms in the sorite above are not those of causation, it seems to me that, implicitly, causation is the relationship between them. We could set up a propositional structure of this passage that would look remarkably like the recursive 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequences presented in chapter 3:

o BECAUSE (leaders not sufficient) - THEREFORE (set up rulers)

+

o BECAUSE (rulers not sufficient) - THEREFORE (set up emperor)

+

o THEREFORE

(emperor comes from rulers etc.)

³See chapter 2 pp 55 ff for a brief discussion of connectors in Classical Chinese.

In other words, therefore, certain characteristics of the chain-reasoning described by Garrett are common to the reasoning analysed in chapter 3 and both display a preference for 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequences. Consider also this example of chain reasoning that follows the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence. This is translated by Graham (1986) and taken from the 'Huai-Nan Tzu'.⁴

"The Way of Heaven one calls 'round', the Way of Earth one calls 'square'. It is primary to the square to retreat to the dark, primary to the round to illuminate. To illuminate is to expel '*ch'i*', for which reason fire and sun cast the image outside. To retreat to the dark is to hold '*ch'i*' in, for which reason water and moon draw the image inside. What expels '*ch'i*' does *to*, what holds '*ch'i*' in is transformed *by*. Therefore the 'Yang' does *to*, the 'Yin' is transformed *by*." (p31).

To sum up this section, we have seen from these examples that the information sequence in this type of chain-reasoning is suited to the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence and that this sequence is commonly found in it.

2.1.2 Reasoning by analogy and historical example

In addition to chain-reasoning, reasoning by analogy or comparison is common in the 'Spring and Autumn Annals'. In reasoning or argument by comparison:

"the use of accumulation, that is, the stringing together of several similes or analogies to increase the force of the comparison at issue is also quite common." (Garrett op cit p 133).

Smith (op cit) suggests that this Chinese preference for argument by analogy can partly be explained by the structure of the language itself, its stylistic requirements and "the penchant for relational thinking". (p 92).

⁴The 'Huai-Nan Tzu' is a work of 21 essays on a number of subjects that were presented to the Emperor Wu in 139 BC (Roth 1992).

In a discussion on ethical argumentation in the works of the Confucian philosopher Xunzi (?298-?238 BC), Cua (1985 a) argues that the methods of explanation ('shuo') and justification ('bian') involve the comparison of kinds of things and analogical projection. In a way that appears to define much of the contents of the 'facework' of the letters that were analysed in the previous chapter, Cua defines analogical projection as reasoning that:

"involves a number of complex considerations that lead to a terminus....the different considerations are not necessarily connected with one another, forming, as it were, a chain of premises leading to a single outcome. Thus, the knowledge of the application of the standards of the past, information concerning the present circumstance, appreciation of the problem at stake, and the variety of archetypes that aid in selecting the baseline for analogy between past and present circumstance, all together converge on a terminus that constitutes the judgement, which represents the solution to the problem at hand." (p 93).

In support, Cua cites Richards (1932) where Richards argues that the notion of reasoning in Mencius is not an inference from explicit premises to a definite conclusion according to specific rules, but the placing of a number of observations in an intelligible order.

Kroll (1985) quotes Xunzi as saying that "by inferring by analogy one commits no errors" and that inferring by analogy is the art of a wise man. (p 120).

Crump (1964) calls this type of reasoning the progressive analogy, and suggests that the information sequence is from subordinate to main as the progression is from the:

"far away and inconsequential toward the important and near at hand, until, at the end, the persuader applies the whole set of analogies, which then has the force of a sorites or chain-syllogism, to the case at hand." (p 50).

Argument by historical example(s) is also very common. This use of argument by historical examples as opposed to deductive argument is well summed up by Butterfield and quoted in Cua:

"philosophy meant a kind of wisdom that is necessary for the conduct of life, particularly the conduct of government" and "it sought to exercise persuasive power on princes, and....resorted, not to deductive reasoning, but to the exploitation of historical examples." (1985 b p 133).

As an example of this argument by analogy and historical precedence I quote an excerpt from 'The Discourses of Salt and Iron' (Yan Tie Lun), translated by Gale (1931). These were written by Huan Kuan (fl 75BC) and the book is written in the form of a debate between the 'worthies and scholars' and the Lord Grand Secretary. The debate concerns the government monopoly on salt and iron and the reasoning used in the debate provides excellent examples of Chinese reasoning.

"The Literati: Confucius observed that the ruler of a kingdom or the chief of a house is not concerned about his people being few, but about lack of equitable treatment; nor is he concerned about poverty, but over the presence of discontentment. *Thus* the Son of Heaven should not speak about much and little, the feudal lords should not talk about advantage and detriment, ministers about gain and loss, but they should cultivate benevolence and righteousness, to set an example to the people, and extend wide their virtuous conduct to gain the people's confidence. Then will nearby folk lovingly flock to them and distant peoples submit to their authority. *Therefore*, the master conqueror does not fight, the expert warrior needs no soldiers; the truly great commander requires not to set his troops in battle array. Cultivate virtue in the temple and the hall, then you need only show a bold front to the enemy and your troops will return home in victory. The Prince who practices benevolent administration should be matchless in the world; for him what use is expenditure." (pp 4-5)(my italics).

Note how the propositional structure of the argument in this example of reasoning by historical precedent also lends itself to the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. It can be represented as:

o BECAUSE (Confucius-discontentment) - THUS (Son of Heaven-benevolence)

+

o BECAUSE (Son of Heaven benevolent) - o THUS (people support)

+

THUS

(do not fight but cultivate virtue))

Consider also this example taken from Sunzi's 'The Art of War' which was written sometime between 480 to 221 BC and which follows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. This example is taken from the final part of chapter 12 'Attack by Fire'.

Do not move unless it is advantageous
Do not execute unless it is effective
Do not challenge unless it is critical.

An intense View is not a reason to launch an opposition
An angry leader is not a reason to initiate a challenge.

If engagement brings advantage, move.
If not, stop.

Intensity can cycle back to fondness.
Anger can cycle back to satisfaction.
But an extinct organisation cannot cycle back to survival.
And those who are destroyed cannot cycle back to life.

Thus, (gu) a brilliant Ruler is prudent;
A Good leader is on guard.

Such (ci 此) is the Tao of a Stable Organisation and a Complete Force.

(Translation by RL Wing 1988)

There are several points of interest here. The first is that the English translation of the first three lines of this extract follows a main clause - subordinate clause sequence. In the original Chinese, however, the sequence is subordinate clause - main clause which again suggests that the unmarked clause orders in MSC and English differ. The second is that the reasoning here follows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence with the reasons explaining why prudence and being on guard are qualities of a leader preceding the statements to that effect. The third is the use of a final summary statement which is introduced by 'ci'. The function of 'ci' here is similar to the function of 'suǒyǐ' signalling a final summary statement that we identified in chapter 4. The final line reads and could be translated:

此 安 国 全 军 之 道 也
'Ci an guo quan jun zhi dao ye
In this way safe country whole army M way be

Thus the state is kept secure and the army preserved

We have seen how argument by analogy and by historical example also follow the propositional BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence. We now turn to consider the use of reasoning by syllogistic and hypothetico deduction in Classical Chinese.

2.1.3 Reasoning by deduction

Although chain-reasoning, reasoning by analogy and historical precedent is common in Classical Chinese, argument by syllogistic deduction or hypothetical deduction, on the other hand, is rare. Indeed Garrett (op cit) argues that the only people who used hypothetico-deductive reasoning in Classical China were the Mohists.⁵ She explains this curious fact by suggesting that, as the Mohists were artisans, they were used to working with machinery and this allowed them to develop notions of mechanical cause and effect. Working in these types of occupations allowed the growth of concrete and formal operational thought. That is to say, she considers the environment to have been the major factor in giving rise to this variation in cognitive development. However, for reasons not yet adequately explained, the influence of the Mohists soon waned and

"their deductive patterns of argument seem to have exerted remarkably little influence on their contemporaries and even less on the later historical tradition." (p 9).

The uniqueness of the Mohists in the Chinese context has interested many sinologists. Graham (1989) points out that while logic has always been central for Western thought, the same was never true for China. Only the Mohists considered that problem solving without a useful purpose was anything but frivolous.

"We might sum up the Chinese attitude to reason in these terms: reason is for questions of means; for your ends in life listen to aphorism, example, parable and poetry." (p 7).

Sivin (1992), while pointing out that rational debate started with Mo Tzu also points out that dispute was not a pivotal activity in Chinese philosophy as it was in

⁵ Named after Mo Tzu, the Mohists flourished in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC.

Greece. Chinese schools were organised to preserve and transmit authoritative written texts. Neither research nor the pursuit of knowledge were their goals.

"The innovative systematic knowledge-ordering project of the later Mohists vanished with hardly a trace. What business was it of any other school?" (p 28).

Nevertheless, this is not to say that there was no debate at all and, as Kroll (op cit) shows, the arguments between the Confucians and the Mohists mark the beginnings of philosophical disputation. Mote (1971) states that Confucius and his school disdained highly developed and formal argumentation and that they preferred to construct arguments based on "chains of contingencies". (p 43). He further argues that both Confucian and Taoist thinkers shared an essential "Chineseness".

"Both display the same predilection for concepts by intuition rather than by postulation, for suggestive rather than explicit language, for similitude rather than syllogism." (p 70).

We have seen how a number of Western sinologists have described reasoning in Classical China. The main point they make is that chain-reasoning and reasoning by analogy and historical example are common but the hypothetico-deductive type of reasoning based on logic so common in the West is only seen in Mohist texts; and that this type of reasoning had very little influence on other Chinese both contemporary or later.

We have also seen that chain reasoning and reasoning by analogy and historical example is well suited to following the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' propositional sequence.

We now turn to discuss the work of some contemporary Chinese linguists and their analyses of Chinese reasoning, both classical and contemporary.

2.2 Contemporary Chinese reasoning

A full discussion on reasoning in expository texts, 'yilun', is provided by Wu Yingtian (1988). He applies his analysis to both classical and modern Chinese. He

argues that there are 4 ways of constructing 'yìlùn': by following inductive reasoning; by following deductive reasoning; by following a combination of both; and by following what he calls 'fēnlùn xìng' which is a type of chain-reasoning made up of placing a series of individual arguments in a list or chain.

Here we first summarise his comments on induction.

2.2.1 Inductive reasoning

Wu defines inductive reasoning as follows:

"The organisation of induction always places the material first, discusses the argument 'lǐyóu', and then puts forward the conclusion, making the thesis unequivocally clear." (p 124).

To exemplify inductive reasoning, Wu uses this summary of a contemporary essay by Lu Xun. In this instance, the Chinese is presented in full before the pinyin and the gloss.

希特拉跟秦始皇比是低级的 (一)

希特拉跟秦始皇比是可耻的 (二)

希特拉跟秦始皇比是更短命的 (三)

(而低级、可耻、短命是可悲的)

所以, (希特拉比之秦始皇是可悲的)

然而希特拉在中国的干儿们都为希特拉上台而兴高采烈

(四)

所以, 希特拉在中国的干儿们是高兴得太早了! (五)

Xitela gen Qin Shihuang bi shi diji-de
Hitler and Qin Shihuang than be low-M

Xitela gen Qin Shihuang bi shi kechi-de
Hitler and Qin Shihuang than be shameful-M

Xitela gen Qin Shihuang bi shi geng duanming-de
Hitler and Qin Shihuang than be even short-lived-M

(er, diji, kechi , duanming shi kebei-de)
(and low, shameful, short-lived is lamentable)

Suoyi, (Xitela bi zhi Qin Shihuang shi kebei-de)
Therefore (Hitler than Qin Shihuang be lamentable-M)

raner Xitela zai Zhonguo-de ganr-men dou wei
but Hitler in China-M follower-Pl all for

Xitela shang tai er xinggao cailie
Hitler gain power as happy delirious

Suoyi, Xitela zai Zhonguo-de ganr-men
Therefore, Hitler in China-M followers-Pl

shi gaoxing-de tai zao-le
be happy-M too soon-A (124)

Hitler was of a lower status than Qin Shihuang. He was more shameful and he didn't even live as long as Qin Shihuang. (Now) being of low status, shameful and short lived is tragic and *therefore* Hitler was a more tragic figure than Qin Shihuang. Yet Hitler's followers in China were deliriously happy at his accession to power. They were *therefore* happy too soon.

The reasoning here runs that because Hitler is lower, more shameful and short lived (historically) than Qin Shihuang (the first emperor of China), he is therefore more pitiful. But because Hitler's followers in China were deliriously happy when Hitler assumed power, their happiness was therefore premature.

What is of interest here is that the reasons precede the conclusion and the argument follows a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. We can represent this piece of inductive reasoning in this way.

Inductive Reasoning

Individual Arguments ('fēnlùn')

o Because ¹	
o Because ²	
o Because ³	
o Because ⁴	Therefore
o Because ⁵	Therefore

This can be summarised as:

o BECAUSE 1-4 - THEREFORE
 +
 o BECAUSE 5 - THEREFORE

This provides an example of inductive reasoning in contemporary Chinese. The 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is followed and its propositional structure is similar to the propositional structures of the discourse and text presented in earlier chapters.

The next question is, therefore, whether inductive reasoning is common in Chinese and whether Chinese prefers to use inductive reasoning to using deductive reasoning. We have seen that Chinese uses chain-reasoning and reasoning by analogy and historical precedent in preference to hypothetico-deductive reasoning. We have also seen that the propositional structures of arguments following these methods of reasoning have many similarities to the propositional structures of the examples of extended spoken discourse analysed in chapter 4. The argument here is that chain-reasoning is very similar in its propositional structure to inductive reasoning and we would thus expect Chinese to show a preference for inductive reasoning. As Sivin (op cit) has pointed out, rational thought can be either inductive or deductive or a combination of both. In contrast to this flexibility, however, we argue that chain-reasoning, by its very nature, can only ever be inductive. It can never be deductive,

using, as it does, a number of examples or pieces of information to establish a generalisation or conclusion. In its preference for chain-reasoning and reasoning by analogy and historical precedent, Chinese exhibits a consonant preference for inductive reasoning.

The Chinese preference for inductive reasoning over deductive can also be inferred from Zong Tinghu et al (1985) and their review of studies of Chinese rhetoric of the first half of this century. They cite He Juesan as saying that the main goal of rhetoric is to use the most effective method of getting ideas and feelings across. There are, according to He, two ways of doing this, by comparison and by induction. Induction is described as "seeking a common principle from several separate facts".(p497-498). The deductive method is not mentioned.

2.2.2 Deductive reasoning

By suggesting that Chinese demonstrates a preference for inductive reasoning, we are not claiming that Chinese never uses deductive reasoning. What we do propose, however, is that when deductive reasoning is used, it is being used for a special purpose. In the same way, therefore, that the main clause - subordinate clause sequence is marked in MSC, so is deductive reasoning marked in some way. And as deductive reasoning is virtually the opposite of inductive and follows the basic sequence of conclusion or general statement to supporting arguments, it is often used when the speaker or writer deliberately wants to be direct, as the example below shows. This example represents the structure of a Chinese essay that uses deductive reasoning⁶. It is Wu Yingtian's skeletal summary of an essay, 'Ding Gui', or 'Conclusions about Ghosts', which was written by Wang Chong (ad 27-100). For this example, I have omitted the Chinese and pinyin and provided only my translation.

⁶I should make it clear that I am not talking about recent scientific reasoning in China. One would expect to find deductive reasoning in writings about science. For example, as Shi Youwei (1988) points out, a reasoning style comprising a combination of both inductive and deductive reasoning is very common in the natural sciences.

Deductive Reasoning

General Statement: ('zōnglùn')

ghosts and spirits are the illusions of sick minds.

Individual Arguments ('fēnlùn')

- 1 sick people are terrified of death and so they see ghosts.
- 2 sick people seeing ghosts is just like Bo Le looking over a horse or Pao Ding (a chef) looking over a cow.⁷
- 3 when a sick man is in pain, he sees or thinks ghosts are hitting him.
- 4 sick people seeing a ghost are but dreaming.(p 165)⁸

Interestingly, Wu brings in political criteria here when discussing the sequencing of this argument. As Wu points out, the time that Wang Chong was writing was a period of 'feudal theocracy' 'fēngjiàn shénquán' - perhaps feudal spiritocracy would be a better translation. To propose, therefore, a theory that ghosts and spirits were merely the products of sick minds as Wu argues that Wang did, would have been extremely controversial⁹. Wu then argues that the use of this deductive reasoning suited the polemical nature of Wang Chong's argument. It is direct and establishes the author's point of view at the beginning and Wu is right to suggest that deductive reasoning of this type does indeed suit polemical argument. This polemic use of deductive reasoning, however, raises the question concerning Wang Chong's use of it at this time. For, given the political nature of the times, it would have been wiser for Wang Chong to have followed inductive reasoning to present his controversial argument. Inductive reasoning is less direct, providing as it does a number of reasons pointing towards a conclusion before actually making the conclusion. This type of reasoning would therefore seem more suited to the autocratic nature of the times. The

⁷ Bo Le and Pao Ding (a chef) are legendary figures mentioned by Zhuangzi (fl 360 BC). When Bo Le was learning about horses, everything he saw took the form of a horse. When the chef was learning to cut up cows, he saw all cows as dead ones. The point is, I think, that seeing ghosts became second nature for the sick. Everything looked like a ghost to them.

⁸ In fact, Wu only provides a skeletal summary of the first part of this essay. For a translation of the full essay, see Forke (1962 pp 239 ff).

⁹ Actually Wang Chong did believe in ghosts but was dismissive of the views of his contemporaries and their explanations of ghosts.(Forke op cit p 58).

deductive style of reasoning Wang Chong actually used would seem very likely to cause offence.

Wang Chong, however, was noted for being highly outspoken, and his ideas were considered revolutionary and shocking¹⁰. It is for this reason that Wang Chong is now considered something of a hero in contemporary China. For example, Feng Youlan calls him "the great atheist and materialist philosopher"(1984 p 238) which, in the context of Chinese communist society, are terms of approbation.

The main point to be made here, then, is that, by using a marked sequence represented by deductive and more direct reasoning, Wang Chong is deliberately being provocative and outspoken.

This provides more evidence to suggest that the inductive, 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' type of reasoning was considered less abrupt and direct; and given the nature of the times, one would have expected it to have been used more often than the more direct deductive style. We shall have more to say about the influence of politics and power when we consider the effect that the presence of an audience can have upon language later in this chapter. At this stage we simply suggest that the relative hierarchy or status of a speaker vis a vis the hearer can affect the type of language used in any interaction between them.

2.2.3 Other types of reasoning

To turn now to other ways of reasoning in 'yìlùn' that Wu puts forward. The first of these he calls 'yǎnguīxìng' which is simply a combination of inductive and deductive reasoning. This type of reasoning can be represented as follows.

¹⁰There is no shortage of evidence on this point. See, for example, Forke (op cit p 7), Tokei (1971 p 35) and Wyatt (1990 p 48). It is no accident, then, that Wu Yingtian chooses the essays of Wang Chong to analyse in this way.

Deductive/Inductive Reasoning ('yǎnguī')

1 General Statement ('zōnglùn')

2 Individual Arguments ('fēnlùn')

3 Conclusion ('jielun')
(adapted from Wu p 130)

The fourth and final type of reasoning discussed by Wu is called 'fēnlùnxìng' or 'individual (or separate) arguments'. This occurs when the overall topic is divided into two or more sub-topics. Each of these sub-topics, or separate arguments, can occupy a co-ordinate relation within the context of the overall text. At the same time, however, each separate argument is complete in itself and can follow inductive, deductive reasoning or a combination of them. This structure of this type of reasoning can be represented thus.

'Fēnlùnxìng'

1 Individual Argument (any reasoning style)

2 Individual Argument (any reasoning style)

n Individual Argument (any reasoning style)
(adapted from Wu p 133)

In his discussion of the systematic patterns of these four reasoning styles, Wu says:

再由于事实上是先因后果
Zai youyu shishi-shang shi xian yin hou guo,
Again *because* reality-in be first cause after effect,

所以论因摆在前头也是合乎逻辑的
suoyi linyin bai zai qiantou, ye shi hehu luoji-de.
therefore reason place at front, also be accord to logic-M (p135)

And again, *because* in real life cause precedes effect, *therefore* to place the reason at the front (of the argument) also accords with logic.

I have glossed this statement from Wu because of its structure. Notice the 'yóuyu' (*because*) - 'sǔoyǐ', (*therefore*) sequence, the unmarked subordinate - main clause sequence. What Wu is saying here is that there is a general reason - conclusion structure and that the consequent 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is logical. In other words, Wu is agreeing with Tai¹¹ in arguing that Chinese is iconic and follows a natural word order. Inductive reasoning is felt to be 'natural'. Deductive reasoning, on the other hand, requires an information sequence that goes against natural sequence. Its use in Chinese can be seen as marked.

Xia and Liu(1983) discuss reasoning by comparison or analogy ('leituì') and provide examples that are more contemporary than the examples of analogy that we saw earlier. They define analogy as: "the method of inferring similar examples based on an already known example." (p 55). A similar definition is given by Shen Kaimu (1985) where he says: "Analogical reasoning is the process whereby a new concept can be inferred from several already known concepts." (p 2). In other words, analogical reasoning proceeds from old information, concepts already known and understood, to new information, or new concepts. It seems to me that this type of analogical reasoning follows an implicit 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence and to demonstrate this I translate Xia and Liu's example of analogy below:

The earth is a planet of the sun, it has air, water, a changing climate and life.

(This is the already known 'example')

Mars is a planet of the sun, it has air, water and a changing climate.

(This is the similar 'example')

Therefore Mars has life. (This is the conclusion)(p 55).

¹¹See chapter 1 pp 30 ff.

Xia and Liu then discuss the various types of evidence ('zhèngjù'), that can be used in 'yìlùn'. Interestingly, they consider cause and effect to be the most common way of presenting evidence. There are other ways, however, including the use of examples and 'pìyù'. 'Pìyù' can be translated as metaphor, simile or even analogy. For example the following is argument by 'pìyù'.

象蒸汽机关的 运转需煤一样
 Xiang zhengqi jiguan-de yunzhuan xu mei yiyang,
 As steam mechanism-M revolution need coal same,

生物在生活上 也需食物
 shengwu zai shenghuo-shang ye xu shiwu.
 animals in life-in also need food. (p 59)

Just as steam operated machinery needs coal to make it turn, so do animals need food to live.

As Xia and Liu point out, this method of argument was very popular in classical times and is still very popular today. Again notice that the overall sequence of this type of argument could also be represented as following a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence.

The fourth method of presenting evidence, in addition to cause and effect, example, and analogy, the authors call 'fuhao' which literally means symbol. This method of argument seeks to make a conclusion from an accepted fact and also therefore follows an inductive and 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. Seeing ice and inferring that the temperature is freezing, or seeing students asleep in a classroom and concluding that the lecturer is boring would be examples of this type of argument.

These four ways of itemising what they call evidence is summarised in an unusual example, given below, concerning a murder and the possible ways of identifying the murderer.

1 A had a grudge with B over money. (This shows that A had a reason for killing B and this is the cause and effect 'evidence')

2 Although A was level headed, he was indignant and his disposition was altered, just as calm water can be stirred up by an unexpected gale. (This helps people believe that a calm person could kill and this is the analogy 'evidence')

3 In the past, calm people have, through motives of anger and money, killed people. (This encourages people to believe that precedent means A could have killed B and is evidence by example.)

4 Bloodstained clothing was found at A's house. Moreover, at the time of the murder, A was not at home. (This is the concrete evidence that A could have killed B as is the fourth type of evidence 'fúhào'.)

In this section, we have briefly looked at the work of a number of contemporary Chinese linguists and their work on reasoning in Chinese. In the next section, we extend the discussion and introduce the idea of reasoning or rhetoric in the sense of persuasive reasoning. In this context, the role of the audience and the relative status of speaker and hearer become important variables. We might therefore think of the reasoning so far considered in this chapter as product while in this next section we are more concerned with process, although we shall be providing textual examples - products - of reasoning and rhetoric.

3 Reasoning, rhetoric and status: the effect of audience

3.1 Audience and genre

In his discussion on 'yòudǎo wén' (诱导文) or writing that seeks to persuade the reader and alter his views, Chen Wangdao (1922) argues that the success or failure of such texts depend on being able to fulfil these seven conditions:

- 1 Do not use too much abstract language.
- 2 Speak tactfully, be mild and indirect.
- 3 Be serious but not overly so.
- 4 Do not be overelaborate.
- 5 Make sure your choice of language suits the readers.
- 6 Avoid monotony, use variety.
- 7 Use a 'light' ('qīng') to 'heavy' ('zhòng') sequence (p130).

Clearly the reader - the person to be persuaded - is taken into great consideration and this supports Hinds' notion discussed earlier that MSC is a more writer responsible language than Classical Chinese. However, as we shall see, the audience was also considered important in traditional China. These seven points could be summed up as recommending that the author be tactful, constantly consider the reader, and keep the important part of the argument until last. This has obvious significance for the sequencing of texts.

The importance of the audience has also been stressed by Zhou Zumo (1988). He feels that a crucial factor in determining where and how a writer should make his points is the relationship that exists between the writer and the 'receiver'. The text must be written in a way that befits the status of both writer and reader. The way an article or piece is written should be decided by "the relationship that exists between the writer and receiver or readers." (p 7). That the relative status of reader and writer is important is further evidenced by the distinction between 'up writing' and 'down writing' in contemporary Chinese genre classification. Dai Lei (1988) distinguishes three types of official document. Those that are written by superiors to inferiors ('xiàxíng gōngwén'), those written among equals ('píngxíng gōngwén') and those written by inferiors to superiors ('shàngxíng gōngwén'). The names of the genres reflect these distinctions. For example, a report written by a superior to an inferior is a 'tōnggào' while a report written by an inferior to a superior is a 'bàogào'. Zhu Zinan et al (1986) define these two genres as follows:

Tōnggào: an official document that an organisation distributes to a specified group of people or a subordinate organisation concerning information that needs to be observed or made known. (A 'tōnggào' is different from a 'tōngzhī' - which is also a top-down genre- in that it is usually open while a 'tōngzhī' is secret.)

Bàogào: A report to a superior organisation reflecting the situation or making a proposal..., a progress report. (This differs from a 'qǐngshì' - which is also a bottom-up genre - in that a 'bàogào' reports about work already begun while a 'qǐngshì' is written before work has begun.) (p 176 - 177).¹²

These distinctions recall the points made by Ebrey which we cited in the previous chapter.(p 141).She pointed out that the phraseology of letters written in the Tang Dynasty was dependent upon the status of the writer and the receiver. This concern with the audience is clearly not a new phenomenon so we now turn to traditional concerns with the audience.

3.2 Traditional concerns with the audience

Recent Western writing on rhetoric has shown a resurgence of interest in the importance of winning the audience as a measure for judging the success of reasoning and argument.

"argumentation is a social, intellectual, verbal activity serving to justify or refute an opinion , consisting of a constellation of statements and directed towards obtaining the approbation of an audience." (Van Eemeren et al 1987 p 7).

In 'The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation', Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) also argue that argumentation is designed to have a particular effect on a particular audience. In this respect, the new rhetoric is much the same as classical rhetoric and this Aristotelian approach contrasts with strictly logical analyses of argument that examine argument in isolation from any audience.

¹² For a history of Chinese genres, see Zhu Binjie (1990).

This concern with the audience and the relative status and power of the writer vis a vis the receiver(s) has a long tradition in China. The Book of Rites (Li Ji)¹³ describes the proper conduct - including ways of speaking - in maintaining the five relationships. These relationships are those that exist between: prince and minister; father and son; husband and wife; elder and younger; and between friends. It is important to note that four of these relationships are hierarchical and unequal with the second mentioned member of each pair being considered in some way inferior to the first mentioned.

The keeping of these relationships was thought essential for an orderly society. This often meant that individual expression had to be harnessed. The motivation to communicate was severely inhibited and the proper use of language was vital for social order. In this nice example of chain-reasoning taken from the Analects of Confucius, a case for the correct use of language is made:

"If language is not rectified, then speech will not be smooth. If speech is not smooth, then what is to be done will not be accomplished. If what is to be done is not accomplished, then *li* and music will not flourish. If *li* and music do not flourish, then punishment will not be just. If punishment is not just, then people will not know how to move their hands and feet." (Bao 1990 p 206).

The Confucian concept of ethical argumentation saw argumentation as the reasonable persuasion of a particular audience with the prime aim of altering the audience's attitude. It was not a contest.

"Contentious words merely shift the attention from the fundamental to the superficial make people tricky and disputatious and damage social harmony" (Mote 1971 p 95).

The great Confucian philosopher and younger contemporary of Mencius, Xunzi (?298-?238 BC), like Confucius, also believed that the correct use of language was vital for the realisation of an ethical, well-ordered and harmonious society. His essay 'Rectifying Terms' includes a chapter entitled 'The Nature of Argumentative Discourse'. Xunzi ascribes three desirable qualities to the scholar or superior man. He should possess a humane mind, a receptive mind and an impartial mind.

¹³ The Book of Rites is one of the 5 Confucian Classics.

"With a humane mind, he explains his ideas to others, with a receptive mind he listens to their words, and with an impartial mind he makes a judgement. He is not moved by censure or praise of the mob; he does not try to bewitch the ears and eyes of his observers; he does not cringe before the power and authority of eminent men...he honours what is fair and upright and despises meanness and wrangling.' (Cua 1985 a p 12).

Those who did try to communicate - those who practiced persuasion - were considered destabilisers of the status quo as this quote from Confucius shows:

"Few who are filial and fraternal would want to offend their superiors; and when they do not like to offend their superiors, none would be fond of stirring up social disorder." (Wang Gungwu 1979 p 13).

Indeed, the Li Ji required automatic execution for those who "split words so as to break the force of the laws", and who "confound names so as to change what has been definitely settled". (Legge 1967 Vol 1 p 237).

The consequences of this were straightforward. Ordinary people were discouraged from speaking their minds. They naturally obeyed their 'superiors'. Any persuasion that was done had to be done with careful and intricate planning and this required intimate knowledge of the mind of the audience. The extent to which this was so can be seen from these excerpts taken from 'On the difficulties of Persuasion' written by the legalist, Han Feizi.¹⁴

"On the whole, the difficult thing about persuasion is to know the mind of the person one is trying to persuade and to be able to fit one's words to it." (Burton Watson 1967 p 73).

"The important thing in persuasion is to learn how to play up the aspects that the person you are talking to is proud of, and play down the aspects he is ashamed of" (ibid p 75).

"Make sure there is nothing in your ideas as a whole that will vex the listener." (ibid p 76).

¹⁴Han Feizi was born in circa 280BC and became the perfecter of the legalist school, whose main concern was with the preservation and strengthening of the state.

"Men who wish to present their remonstrances and expound their ideas must not fail to ascertain their ruler's loves and hates before launching into their speeches.....If you gain the ruler's love, your wisdom will be appreciated and you will enjoy favour as well. But, if he hates you, not only will your wisdom be rejected but you will be regarded as a criminal and thrust aside.....The beast called the dragon can be tamed and trained to the point where you may ride on its back. But on the underside of its throat it has scales a foot in diameter that curl back from the body, anyone who chances to brush against them is sure to die. The ruler of men too has his bristling scales. Only if a speaker can avoid brushing against them will he have any hope of success" (ibid p79).

A Minister or subordinate therefore assumed a very high stake in persuading. A persuader had to be willing to flatter given that the political climate in China ensured that pleasing the listener, or at least not offending him, was the prerequisite of being listened to. Jenner (1992) notes that the wise official:

"did not take a strong position in the audience on matters that might bring a frown to the dragon countenance. That a few did is a mark of their personal courage." (p 41).

Further advice on the delicate question of how an inferior should try and persuade a superior comes in a treatise on persuasion attributed to Gui Guzi.¹⁵ Gui Guzi is heavily influenced by yin-yang duality and he considers persuasion from below (yin) to above (yang) as a disturbance of the natural order of things. Persuasion from people in inferior positions to people in superior positions is yin and therefore requires special effort:

"Yang (ie persuading from above to below) encourages straightforward speaking. Yin (ie persuading from below to above) encourages speaking in forked tongue." (Tsao Ding-Ren 1985 p 103).

The ideal persuader has these qualities: he is quick and very perceptive; he is in control of himself and the situation; he is resourceful; he can assess people well; he can safeguard himself; and he can shepherd people.

"Speaking is like fishing. If the bait, language, is appropriate to the situation, then the human fish can be caught." (ibid B:5 128).

¹⁵Gui Guzi's precise dates are uncertain but he lived at the time of the Warring States (ie sometime between 481-221 BC).

The feeling for the situation is considered the foundation of persuasion and this includes knowledge about the audience.

"Information of the audience and the situation is essential to persuasion." (ibid B:10 140).

While the excerpts above show that different schools of thought have different views on the role and methods of argument, they are agreed on the effect of status, power and hierarchy upon language use and on the importance of speaking to the audience. It is a point that has also been well made by Li Xilan (1988). He points out that when the weak are dealing with the strong, they should use indirect and diplomatic language.

"Use indirect and tactful ('wěiwǎn') language to broach the crucial point and thus preserve yourself and obtain a diplomatic victory." (p 15).

3.3 Textual examples of indirect language

3.3.1 A letter of request

As an example of 'indirect and tactful language' a letter written by a certain Li Mi (225-290) to the Jin emperor Sima Yan is presented below. In this letter Li Mi turns down an appointment at court that the emperor has offered him on the grounds that he has to look after his ailing grandmother. However, as the Jin emperor has just defeated Li Mi's native State of Shu, he has other reasons for not wanting to become a servant of the 'enemy'. The translation is by David Knechtges.¹⁶

Li Mi: Memorial Expressing My Feelings

Your servant Mi states: Because of a parlous fate, I early encountered grief and misfortune. When I was an infant of only six months my loving father passed away. When I was four my mother's brother forced my mother to remarry against her will. Grandmother Liu took pity on this weak orphan and personally cared for me. When young, I was often sick, and at nine I could not walk. Solitary and alone I suffered until I reached adulthood. I not only had no uncles, I also had no brothers. Our family was in decline, our blessings were few, and thus only late in life have I had offspring. Outside the household, I have no close relatives whom I can mourn; inside, I have not even a boy servant to watch the gate. All alone I stand, my body and shadow console

¹⁶This is taken from 'Renditions' Nos 33 and 34 1990 pp 75-77.

each other. Grandmother Liu long has been ill and is constantly bedridden. I serve her medicinal brews, and I have never abandoned her or left her side.

When I came into the service of this Sage Dynasty, I bathed in your pure transforming influence. First Governor Kui sponsored me as Filial and Pure. Later Inspector Rong recommended me as a Flourishing Talent. But because there was no one to care for grandmother, I declined and did not take up the appointment. An edict was especially issued appointing me Place gentleman. Not long thereafter I received imperial favour and was newly appointed Aide to the Crown Prince. I humbly believe that for a man as lowly and insignificant as I to be deemed worthy of serving in the Eastern Palace is an honour I could never requite you for even by giving my life. I informed you of all the circumstances in a memorial, and I again declined and did not go to my post. Your edict was insistent and stern, accusing me of being dilatory and disrespectful. The commandery and prefectural authorities tried to pressure me and urged me to take the road up to the capital. The local officials approached my door with the speed of shooting stars and fiery sparks. I wanted to comply with your edict and dash off to my post, but Grandmother Liu's illness daily became more grave. I wished temporarily to follow my personal desires, but my plea was not granted. Whether to serve or retire truly was a great dilemma!

I humbly believe that this Sage Dynasty governs the empire by means of filial piety, and all among the aged and elderly still receive compassion and care. How much more needful am I whose solitary suffering has been especially severe! Moreover, when young I served the false dynasty, and I have moved through the various gentleman posts. I originally planned to become illustrious as an official, but I never cared about my reputation and character. Now I am a humble captive of an alien state. I am utterly insignificant and unimportant, but I have received more promotions than I deserve, and your gracious charge is both liberal and generous. How would I dare demur, with the hope of receiving something better? However, I believe that Grandmother Liu, like the sun going down, is breathing her last breaths. Her life has reached a precarious, delicate stage, and one cannot predict in the morning what will happen in the evening. Without grandmother I would not be alive today. Without me grandmother will not be able to live out her remaining years. Grandmother and grandson have depended upon one another for life. *Thus*, simply because of my own small, selfish desires I cannot abandon or leave her. I am now in my forty-fourth year, and Grandmother Liu is now ninety-six. *Thus*, I have a long time in which to fulfil my duty to Your Majesty, and only a short time in which to repay Grandmother Liu for raising me. With all my filial devotion, I beg to be allowed to care for her to her final days. My suffering and misery are not only clearly known by the men of Shu and the governors of the two provinces, they have been perceived by August Heaven and Sovereign Earth. I hope Your Majesty will take pity on my naive sincerity and will grant my humble wish, so that Grandmother Liu will have the good fortune to preserve the remaining years of her life. While I am alive, I shall offer my life in your service. When dead, I shall "knot a clump of grass" for you.¹⁷

With unbearable apprehension, like a loyal dog or horse, I respectfully present this memorial to inform you of my feelings.

I have chosen to include this long memorial, not only because it represents a nice example of 'bottom - up' persuasion but also because it is a request. And the schema of this request is remarkably similar to the ones in the requests analysed in the preceding chapter. Li Mi's request starts with an introduction to himself and his situation. He then describes his association with the present 'Sage Dynasty' and these

¹⁷'Knotting grass' is an expression meaning to repay a favour after death.

two sections of his letter provide what we have termed 'facework' in the previous chapter. Towards the end of paragraph three, he gives a series of reasons why it is important for him to stay and look after his grandmother. These reasons are also acting as reasons for the request that he finally makes and the information sequence here clearly follows the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence. I have underlined the request - that he be allowed to care for her. This of course is an implicit request not to have to serve the emperor. The schema of this letter, which recalls the schemata of the letters of request in chapter 4, therefore is:

Schema
 Facework
 Reasons for Request
 Request
 Sign Off

It is this type of strategy of using an indirect approach to persuasion when there is an unequal balance of power between persuader and listener that Kao has called the art of "criticism by indirection" (p 121). This art becomes important in circumstances where persuasion is 'bottom - up' and is manifested in the persuasions of the political counsellors as they advise or criticise their rulers' policies throughout Chinese dynastic history.

Kroll (op cit) has pointed out that many of the rhetorical devices employed in chain reasoning and reasoning by analogy were ideal for indirect criticism. For example, the devices of "joining objects of the same kind" (lién lèi) and 'comparing things' creates possibilities for the indirect communication of ideas."(p 125). The political polemic below provides a textual example in which these devices are used.

3.3.2 A political polemic

Di Chen (1984) provides an excellent example of a piece of indirect criticism of this type. The piece, a famous one, was written by Gong Zizhen in 1839 when he was

in his forties. He had just returned South after being dismissed from his post. The text is written following the 'qǐ chéng zhǔan hé' ('opening, continuing, turning, concluding) pattern.¹⁸ I translate the entire text so that the structural pattern may become clearer.

'A Sanitarium For Sick Plum Trees'

Qǐ. Longpan Mountain in Jiangning, Dengwei Mountain in Suzhou and the Western banks of West Lake in Hangzhou all have an abundance of plum trees.

Chéng. It is said: the beauty of the branches of a plum tree lie in their crooked shape, there being no charm in ramrod straightness; their beauty lies in their jagged angles, as being upright and straight is not pleasing to the eye; their beauty lies in their sparseness, as dense abundance has no definition. This has long been so. Scholars and artists believe this in their hearts but do not openly shout aloud these criteria for the judgement of plum trees, nor can they tell those cultivators of the plum tree that, by hacking them into shape, by viciously cutting back their abundant foliage and by lopping off branches, they can turn prematurely dead or diseased plum trees into a profitable enterprise. The tortured crookedness and bare sparseness of the plum branches is not caused by those who, as soon as they sense profit, can use their skill to obtain it. But, someone has explained in clear terms this unsocial desire of the scholars and artists to the sellers of plum trees. These, then, to obtain a higher price for their trees, cut off the straight branches and tend the crooked ones, cut back dense foliage and destroy delicate buds and uproot and kill off any plum trees that grow straight. And so the plum trees of Jiangsu and Zhejiang have all become ill and deformed. What a serious disaster have these scholars and artists brought about!

Zhǔan. I bought three hundred pots with plum trees in them and they were all sick; not a single pot contained a completely healthy plant. I grieved for them and wept for three days and then vowed that, to cure them, I should indulge them and let them grow freely. I destroyed the pots, planted all the plum trees in the ground and cut free their encompassing and binding twine. I still need five years to restore the plum trees to their original state. I have never been a scholar or an artist and am happy to have scorn heaped upon me, but I want to build a sanitarium for sick plums where I can place these plum trees.

¹⁸For the purposes of this study, I have not provided a history of or an analysis of composition structures such as the 'qǐ, chéng, zhǔan, hé' pattern and the so called 8 Legged Essay or 'bā gǔ wén'. However, I have elsewhere discussed the origins of these patterns and considered their significance upon contemporary Mainland Chinese composition structure (Kirkpatrick 1993 a). See also Hinds (1983) for a discussion of the use of the 'qǐ, chéng, zhǔan, hé' structure in contemporary Japanese.

Hé. Ai!. How I wish I had the free time and the idle land so that I could gather in the sick plum trees of Jiangning, Hangzhou and Suzhou, and within my lifetime, cure them!

Following Di Chen's analysis, the first paragraph is the 'qǐ' of the text and is the beginning of it. The second paragraph describes the underhand schemes of the scholars and artists and recounts how they have oppressed the growth of the plum trees. This is, of course, an analogy, with the scholars and artists representing the reactionary feudal classes. It lays bare the crimes of the Qing dynasty rulers in destroying men of talent. This is the 'chéng' and it continues and explains the topic, elaborating the opening sentence. The third paragraph recounts how the author opposes all this and this is the 'zhǔan', and represents a change, a change from one view of the situation to another. The fourth paragraph describes the author's desire to cure the sick plum trees. This is the 'hé', the conclusion of the piece. It demonstrates the author's resolve to fight to change society.

The whole piece demonstrates the use of analogy as a weapon of indirect criticism being directed against tyrannical and corrupt dynastic government and shows a relationship between language and society which we discuss in more detail in the next section.

3.4 Language and society

The point that language can be a sign of the political times is made by Zong Tinghu et al (1985) when they cite Chen Jiebai's assertion that each society makes its own rhetoric. For example, feudal society produces a rhetoric in which 'top-down' methods of expression such as commands and orders ('mìnglìng') are important, and capitalist society provides an environment in which a 'romantic' ('làngmàn') style of rhetoric develops.

In the context of Imperial Chinese society, Johnson (op cit) has identified nine separate social-cultural groups in Late Imperial China based on the categories of education and literacy on the one hand and dominance and subordination on the other. The most dominant group are those who were educated in the Classics and had certain

legal privileges. The least dominant were the illiterates who were dependent upon others for survival. Johnson argues that the position of a person largely determined the manner in which he expressed attitudes about his lot in life.

"In short, the members of each group defined above had a characteristic sense of where they stood in the *great structure of dominance and subordination*, and also a *distinctive style* in which they expressed the ideology that reflected that sense." (p 70)(my italics).

Laswell argues along similar lines when discussing a contemporary Western context:

"When non democratic attitudes prevail in a community, initiatives from below are phrased in somewhat laboured language. Elaborate words and gestures are used by a subordinate to show that he is not presuming to transgress the prerogatives of his superior. By contrast with the self assurance of the superior, he represents himself as somewhat uncertain of judgement." (1949 p 30-31).

Paechter et al (1944) in determining the effect that Nazi rule had over the German language say this when describing the language of the power holders rather than the downtrodden.

"A society built on the idea of a hierarchic structure will...deny both inter-action between subjects and the evolution of ideas and values.....The predicate will not be an answer to a question put by the subject, but will be a commentary on it. Word symbols will not stand for things but will tend to become things in their own right.....

In this evocative and magic language the ideal sentence is the slogan. When thousands...chant in unison "Ein Reich, ein Volk, ein Fuhrer", they do not think of any verb or action. A ritual is performed; three nouns, suggesting an order of the world, evoke acceptance of the structure thus laid out." (p 6).

Bloch (1975) argues that, by analysing people speaking to each other, it is possible to determine the relative status of the speakers. So, by closely looking at what is said and done, the way control is exercised can be determined. Furthermore, in Bloch's view, there is

"a striking recurrence of very similar patterns of speech norms for politics in totally different cultures." (p 5).

This view that speech acts are rigid, predetermined and are, therefore, predictable, has been challenged (Paine 1981, for example). Nevertheless, it seems possible to make the generalisation that, in a society where hierarchy plays a fundamental role, the persuasion of a superior by an inferior will be expressed in an

indirect way. In other words, the relative status and hierarchy between speaker and audience directly effects language use. Wolfson (1988) has shown that middle class Americans speak very differently to people depending upon how friendly they are with them and their relative status. When dealing with nonintimates, greater negotiation - some of which might be classified as facework - is felt to be necessary.

The idea that society can structure the orders of discourse is discussed in depth by Fairclough (1989). As he says:

"How discourses are structured in a given order of discourse, and how structures change over time, are determined by changing relationships of power at the level of the social institution or of the society." (p 30).

He also makes the important point that, while being determined by social structures, discourse also has effects upon social structures, and control over discourse is one factor that maintains power in the hands of the powerful.

This notion of change over time is an important point. In the context of Mainland China, society, despite periodic upheavals such as the communist revolution of 1949, has been hierarchical for millenia and criticism by indirection has indeed become an art. For example, given the political climate in the People's Republic in the late nineteen fifties and early sixties, it was not possible to criticise the leadership by using direct language. Those who sought to criticise the leadership resorted, therefore, to a variety of well known and well tried ways of doing so. These included the writing of historical plays and analogously portraying contemporary figures as historical figures. Consequently, several 'new historical plays' were published in the People's Republic at this time¹⁹. These plays were seen as attacks on the system, the Communist Party and even Mao himself. Many of them centred around the career of a Ming dynasty official called Hai Rui. The most famous was '*Hai Rui baguan*' or '*Hai Rui Dismissed from Office*' and it was criticism of this play that is said to have been the first 'shot' fired in the Cultural Revolution.

¹⁹For a detailed and informative account of these plays, see Wagner (1990).

And in the same way that critics in hierarchical societies are skilled in methods of indirect criticism, so are educated members of the public skilled in seeing the implications of indirect criticism of this type. Otherwise, of course, there would be no point in engaging in it.

The suggestion being made in the latter part of this chapter is that the autocratic and hierarchical nature of Chinese society has influenced the language. This is not the place for a detailed comparison between the societies of Classical Greece and China. However, it is significant that Greek rhetoric had its origins in the law courts where the citizens enjoyed equal status and where proof and facts were of importance. This contrasts tellingly with the political origins of Chinese rhetoric where people did not enjoy equal status and the primary function of rhetoric was the persuasion of superiors by their inferiors as to their future conduct²⁰. The former situation encouraged directness (but not necessarily always). The latter encouraged indirectness (but not necessarily always). For, when people of lower status have to communicate with people of a higher status and who have power over them, they will normally use language that is indirect. Persuasion and argument in such an environment will therefore tend to adopt methods of reasoning that are also indirect, methods such as chain-reasoning and reasoning by analogy, which themselves are far more suited to patterns of inductive reasoning than to the directness of deductive reasoning. And, as these modes of reasoning all lend themselves to a 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence, this may help explain why the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence is a fundamental unit of sequencing in MSC Chinese.

4 Summary

This chapter began by reviewing what a number of Western scholars have said concerning a basic difference between Asian and 'Western' modes of reasoning. There seemed to be consensus that Asian reasoning was somehow more indirect than

²⁰This is not to say that disputation in courts was unknown in early China. This took place when a judicial official heard legal cases. (Kroll op cit).

'Western' and that Asian reasoning preferred the use of inductive or analogical reasoning. The chapter then considered Chinese reasoning and argued that, although perfectly able to reason deductively, Chinese reasoning does indeed prefer a form of chain-reasoning and that this form of reasoning lends itself to inductive reasoning. Furthermore, the preference for this pattern of inductive reasoning is consonant with a preference for 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequencing in propositional argument, as is the preference for analogical reasoning. The propositional structures of the reasoning presented in this chapter are therefore remarkably similar to those presented in chapter 3. Deductive reasoning, when used, is used for a specific purpose, especially for directness.

The chapter then suggested a possible societal reason for this preference for inductive reasoning. Chinese society is, and has always been, a hierarchical society both at a family and political level. This means that argument and persuasion, when it occurs at all, has been from an inferior to a superior, or bottom up. This, in turn, has generated a need for and required the adoption of a method of expression that is indirect. We considered, for example, a 'classical' letter of request and found its schema to be remarkably similar to the schemata of the letters of request analysed in chapter 4.

It is perhaps no accident, therefore, to find that Chinese has shown a preference for 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing as this pattern is well suited to chain-reasoning, reasoning by historical example and analogy and to indirect methods of expression.

Chapter 6. Findings for MSC Contrasted with English : Implications

Introduction

This study set out to discover how information sequencing functions as an important feature of MSC discourse and whether information sequencing in MSC is characterised certain dominant principles. To do this, methods of information sequencing in a number of genres and across a number of levels from sentence to textual were investigated.

We first argued that , while topic - comment was an important sequence in MSC sentences, the modifier - modified sequence was an equally important sequencing principle in MSC and that this sequence was not constrained to adjective - noun relationships but was also exhibited in the clause order of complex sentences in MSC, the 'piānzhèng fùjù'. We argued that MSC being a left branching language was significant. We identified a general principle of unmarked subordinate (modifying) clause and main (modified) clause sequence, calling this the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence. We then argued that this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence operated at levels above the sentence. We saw this principle of information sequencing working within and upon data that included samples of extended spoken discourse, letters of request and reasoning. In this concluding chapter we first list a summary of findings and then contrast these findings with English. This involves a comparison of the sequencing principles identified for MSC in this study with those of English that we have touched upon throughout the course of the study. We suggest that the findings of such a comparison has important implications and potential applications in a number of fields. These include theoretical issues of linguistic typology, translation from between English and MSC, the teaching of the languages and cultures of both MSC and English and cross cultural understanding.

1 Summary of findings

1.1 Findings for information sequencing in complex sentences

1.1.1 MSC prefers to follow the sequence of subordinate clause - main clause in 'piānzhèng fùjù' (complex sentences with subordinate clauses).

1.1.2 While the marked sequence main clause - subordinate clause is now common, historically this sequence was rare. This syntactic shift appears to have been affected by contact with and the subsequent influence of European languages upon Chinese.

Three uses of the marked MC - SC sequence in complex sentences in MSC were identified. They were:

- a) to add emphasis to either the front placed main clause or the end placed subordinate clause.
- b) for the end placed subordinate clause to provide additional information or further justification for the proposition or event described by the main clause.
- c) for stylistic reasons, in particular, the end placement of unusually long modifying phrases.

In addition to these three uses, an end placed subordinate clause can represent an afterthought. However, this is not considered to be a deliberate use of the MC - SC sequence.

1.1.3 When the unmarked subordinate clause - main clause sequence is followed, the use of connectors is optional. Their use is possible, however, and sentences may contain a connector in either clause or in both. When both connectors are used, this signals stylistic formality in written language and fulfils the MSC linguistic criterion for 'balance'.

1.1.4 When the marked main - subordinate sequence is followed, on the other hand, the use of a connector in the end placed subordinate clause is obligatory but the use of a connector in the front placed main clause is rare.

1.1.5 The increase in the use of connectors is a second result of MSC's contact with European languages. MSC uses more hypotactic constructions than did Classical Chinese.

1.1.6 The preference of SC - MC sequencing exhibited in complex sentences is an example of the MSC information sequencing principle of modifier - modified.

1.2 Findings for information sequencing at discourse level: sequence and persuasion

1.2.1 The MSC preference for modifier / subordinate - modified / main sequence is also manifested at levels of discourse. In particular, the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence represents a common principle in sequencing information at higher levels of discourse.

1.2.2 In a genre of extended spoken discourse, it was shown that this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence was followed in both unplanned informal and planned formal speech. This means that, generally speaking, MSC speakers will place the grounds and justifications for any statement before the statement.

1.2.3 A difference in the use of enveloping and the use of connectors between unplanned informal and planned formal speech was, however, observed. The more informal the speech, the more likely the use of enveloping and connectors. The more formal the speech, the more likely the use of top-down and recursive sequencing and the omission of connectors. This distinction is captured in these two figures:

Figure 1. Information Sequencing in Formal, Planned Speech

Figure 2 Information Sequencing in Informal, Spontaneous Speech

$\pm$ BECAUSE [LOWER { LEVEL } UNITS] $\pm$ THEREFORE

1.2.4 In pursuing argument and/or engaging in speech acts such as suggesting and requesting, MSC commonly dispenses with a focus statement or framing statement of content. In more formal and planned speech, however, a framing content statement can be used.

1.3 Findings for information sequencing in text.: sequence and politeness in requests

1.3.1 The 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence also occurs in speech or communicative acts such as suggesting or requesting.

1.3.2 When framing written requests, MSC exhibits a preference for stating the reasons for a request before the request itself. This gives an unmarked structure for requests of:

Reasons for Request ('BECAUSE') - Request ('THEREFORE')

1.3.3 When framing written requests, MSC commonly prefaces the reasons for the request and the request itself with extended facework. Taken with the sequence identified above and adding salutation and the 'sign off', this gives an idealised schema of an unmarked written request as:

Salutation

Facework

Reasons for Request ('BECAUSE')

Request ('THEREFORE')

Sign Off

1.3.4 Requests that dispense with facework are considered impolite. Facework is seen as an integral part of the request.

1.3.5 Requests that are request fronted and either dispense with reasons for the request or place the reasons for the request after the request are considered less polite than those that follow the schema in 6.1.3.3.

1.4 Findings for information sequencing and reasoning: sequence and induction

1.4.1 Historically, Chinese developed methods of reasoning such as chain reasoning and reasoning by analogy and historical precedent. These types of reasoning follow a 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence.

1.4.2 In Classical Chinese, this reasoning regularly leaves the final consequent implicit and unstated.

1.4.3 While examples of deductive and inductive methods of reasoning exist in Chinese, of the two, Chinese prefers to use inductive reasoning. This follows an information sequence similar to the types of reasoning outlined above. It also therefore follows a 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence, with a series of arguments leading to a final conclusion. This can be represented as:

Individual Arguments ('Fēnlùn')ⁿ ('BECAUSE')ⁿ - Conclusion ('THEREFORE')

1.4.4 A suggested explanation for MSC's preference for this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing is that an argument or persuasive schema that follows this propositional structure permits an 'indirect' way of constructing an argument or persuasion. This is seen as culturally appropriate in a society where hierarchy in relationships between people has long been of great relevance.

1.5 General finding

The 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence is a principle of information sequencing for MSC that operates at several levels that include complex sentences, discourse, texts and reasoning.

2 Findings for MSC contrasted with English

2.1 Information sequencing and complex sentences

2.1.1 Modifier - modified vs modified - modifier.

The translation of long subordinate clauses or modifying expressions from English into MSC can result in what Wang Li has called the Chinese 'Europeanised'

long sentence' (1955 p 281) and this has led to new style characterised by an increase in sentence length in MSC. This point has also been made by Cheng (1992). The cause of this is the modifier - modified principle of information sequencing that operates in MSC. This means that MSC will naturally place these long subordinate clauses or long modifying expressions before the main clause or the head. As an example of this Wang Li takes an example sentence of English that has a long relative clause and demonstrates how this has been translated into Chinese first in a 'European' way then in a 'non European' way. (3) is the original English sentence, (3a) the 'European' Chinese translation and (3b) the 'non European' Chinese translation. Instead of giving the Chinese translations, I give my translations of the Chinese, (3a) and (3b), and they follow the sequence of the Chinese. The long modifying clause is given in italics. It is interesting to note that the so-called 'European' version (3a) requires a dummy subject, 'those' in MSC. The head, 'people' is preceded by long modifying clauses. In the original English, of course, these modifying clauses follow the head. The so-called 'non European' translation (3b), however, places the modifying clause after the head. This provides a further example of the MSC marked modified - modifying sequence being used to accommodate modifying clauses that are very long. (see also chapter 2 examples (9) p 46 and (13) p 49).

(3) People who disregard literary taste simply as an accomplishment, and literature simply as a distraction, will never truly succeed either in acquiring the accomplishment or in using it half-acquired as a distraction. (Bennett, Literary Taste)

(3a) Those *BA*¹ *literary taste consider simply a kind of accomplishment, BA literature consider simply a kind of distraction* M people.....

(3b) A man, *if BA literary taste consider simply a kind of accomplishment, BA literature consider simply a kind of distraction*.....

Wang Li himself is clearly not in favour of the new style as exemplified in (3a). He complains that the longer the sentence the less 'smooth' ('shùnkǒu') it is. Choice

¹BA represents the Chinese BA construction.

between the two styles exemplified by (3a) and (3b) respectively, depends, however, upon prevailing custom' ('fēngshàng').(ibid p 283).

What this shows is that an L1 can have an effect upon an L2 through the translation of the L1 into L2. In this case, the translation of English into Chinese has given rise to a new style of Chinese characterised by long modifying clauses or expressions preceding the head. Traditional Chinese prefers to handle these long modifiers by using the marked modified - modifier sequence.

2.1.2 SC - MC vs MC - SC

Several scholars have pointed out that the normal unmarked order in complex sentences in English is MC - SC. (Prideaux 1989, Quirk et al 1985, Kruisinga 1932). Clark and Clark (1977) have pointed out that the first adverbial clauses that English speaking children use are consistently attached to the end of the main clause. The children appear to follow the principle "Assume the first clause is the main clause" (p 358). This ties in with the fact that English is a right branching language (Kuno 1973, Flynn 1984). It will be recalled from Chapter 1 that the Principal Branching Direction (PBD) of a language is evaluated with regard to major recursive structures such as relative clauses and adverbial subordinate clauses and that Chinese, unlike English, is a left branching language.

The difference in branching directions between languages raises interesting questions about second language acquisition. Do children from all language backgrounds follow the principle identified by Clark and Clark above that assumes the first clause is the main clause? Or is it just children with right branching L1's that do this?

Flynn (op cit) hypothesised that where the PBD of the L1 was the same as that of the L2, then the acquisition of the complex sentence structures of the L2 would be facilitated. Conversely, where the PBD of the L1 was different from that of the L2, acquisition of L2 complex sentence structures would take longer. To test this hypothesis, Flynn studied the acquisition of English complex sentence structures of

two groups of learners. The first group were L1 Spanish speakers whose L1 is a RBD language like English. The second group were L1 Japanese speakers whose L1 is an LBD language. She found that the Spanish speakers imitated the English complex structures significantly more easily than the speakers of Japanese. She concluded that:

"both processing and acquisition of complex sentence structures have been found to be predicted to a significant degree by the PBD typology." (p 85).

Lust and Chien (1984) report similar findings in a study based on one RBD language, English, and two LBD languages, Chinese and Japanese.

These findings have clear implications for language teaching (see also White 1986) but it is the implication of contrastive markedness that we mentioned briefly in Chapter 1(1.7) and now wish to highlight and discuss its implications for translation. For if the unmarked order in MSC is SC - MC but is MC - SC in English, then it follows that any translation from one language to the other that observes the clause sequence of the original will turn a marked sequence into an unmarked one or an unmarked sequence into a marked one.

To demonstrate this, examples from the work of Cheng Zhenqiu (1980) 'Fanyi wenti tansuo' ('Explorations into the Problems of Translating') are provided. In this book, Cheng discusses the problems that he has encountered in studying translations of the works of Mao Zidong into English.

(1) is the Chinese pinyin version of the Mao passage given below. (1a) is the poor translation of this passage into English and (1b) is the good one. The excerpt in the Chinese that has the dotted lines under it is represented in both the pinyin and the English translations in italics.

在这一年至两年内可能发生两种情况：一种是我们团结多数孤立少数的上层统战政策发生了效力，西藏群众也逐渐靠拢我们，因而使坏分子及藏军不敢举行暴乱；一种是坏分子认为我们软弱可欺，率领藏军举行暴乱，我军在自卫斗争中举行反击，予以打击。

(p 120).

- (1) Zai zhe yi nian zhi liang nian nei keneng fasheng liang zhong qingkuang: yi zhong shi women tuanjie duo shu guli shaoshu de shangceng tongzhan zhengci fasheng le xiaoli, xizang qunzhong ye zhujian kaolong women, yiner shi huai fenzi ji zangjun bu juxing baoluan; yi zhong.....
- (1a) Two things could happen in the next year or two: one is that our united front policy towards the upper stratum, a policy of uniting with the enemy, will take effect and that the Tibetan people will gradually draw closer to us, *so the bad elements and the Tibetan troops will not dare to rebel*; the other.....
- (1b) Two things could happen in the next year or two: One is that *the bad elements and the Tibetan troops will not dare to rebel* as our united front policy towards the upper stratum, a policy of uniting with the enemy is taking effect and the Tibetan people are drawing closer to us; the other.....

The first of the translations, (1a) follows the Chinese sequence. This follows the unmarked 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence which places the subordinate clause(s) before the main clause. So the English translation (1a) follows the Chinese propositional sequence of 'BECAUSE our united front policy is taking effect, THEREFORE the bad elements and the Tibetan rebels will not dare to rebel.' Cheng criticises this translation on the grounds that it does not provide the readers with the main point of the argument first, *as preferred in English* (my italics). This is why he recommends altering the order as it occurs in the Chinese and translating the passage as in (1b), where the main point - the fact the the Tibetans won't dare rebel - is placed at the front and thus follows the preferred English placement.

In other words, then, the English translation in (1a) follows the normal Chinese unmarked 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence. This results in a translation in which the main point of the piece - that the bad elements and the Tibetan rebels will not dare to rebel - gets placed after subordinate detail. For a more effective translation, the sequence of the propositions as expressed in Chinese needs to be reversed when translated into English, as in (1b). This ensures that the main point occurs towards the beginning of the piece, its normal unmarked position in English.

(2) provides a further example of the need to reverse the normal unmarked Chinese 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence when translating Chinese into English. The

main point, which occurs towards the end in the normal Chinese order, needs to be moved to the front to provide an accurate English translation (2a). The excerpt in the Chinese that has the dotted lines under it is represented in italics in both the pinyin version and the English translation.

老中农中间的下中农,由于他们的经济地位原来就不富裕,有些则因为在土地改革的时候不正当地受了一些侵犯,这些人在经济地位上和新中农中间的下中农大体相似,他们对于加入合作社一般地感到兴趣。

(p 122)

- (2) lao zhong nong zhongjian de xia zhong nong, youyu tamen de jingji diwei yuanlai jiu bu fuyu, youxie ze yinwei zai tudi gaige de shihou bu zhengdang de shou le yixie qinfan, zhaxie ren zai jingji diwei sheng he xin zhong nong zhongjian de xia zhong nong da ti xiang si, *tamen duiyu jiaru hezuoshe yiban de gandao xingqu.*
- (2a) *They (The lower-middle peasants) are generally interested in joining the co-operatives, because in economic status they are more or less similar to the lower-middle peasants among the new middle peasants, as they were not well off to start with and the interests of some were improperly encroached upon at the time of the agrarian reform.*

The original Chinese follows the 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence of: 'BECAUSE the economic status of the lower-middle peasants was similar to the lower middle peasants among the new middle peasants,....THEREFORE they are interested in joining the co-operatives.'

The English translation follows the opposite sequence, however, and needs to transpose the final part or main point of the Chinese text to the front in order to get the correct balance. For, if an English translation were to follow the original Chinese sequence it would have the main point at the end and preface it with a great deal of subordinate information. It would read:

The lower middle peasants among the old middle peasants, because their economic position was not prosperous, and some (of them) because they suffered oppression at the time of the land reform, (therefore) their economic

status was more or less similar to the lower middle peasants among the new middle peasants, (therefore) *they are generally interested in joining the cooperatives.*

This translation, that follows the clause sequence of the original, clearly shows the unmarked MSC 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence being followed throughout the text. Moreover, one 'BECAUSE-THEREFORE' sequence - (because some suffered oppression - therefore economic status similar) - is enveloped within another - (because economic status not prosperous - therefore interested in cooperatives).

We also have evidence here that the sequencing principle for complex sentences that was mentioned by Ma Zhong (op cit) and cited in chapter 2 (2.2.1) - that the clause carrying the main point comes at the end - also operates at a level above the sentence.

To sum up, the difference between MSC and English preferred sequencing of complex sentences has implications both for second language acquisition, language teaching and translation. On the one hand, Chinese speaking learners of English will take longer to acquire the English right branching pattern of MC - SC than will learners whose L1 is also right branching. Perhaps more importantly, however, Chinese speaking learners who transfer their own unmarked SC - MC patterns into English will be using a marked sequence in English. The same is true of English speakers who transfer the sequencing of patterns of English into Chinese and continue to use them when speaking Chinese.

Furthermore, care needs to be taken in the translation of these sequences from one language to the other to ensure that the marking of the original language is preserved. Otherwise, a key goal of translation - to present the same message to speakers of the target language as was presented to speakers of the original language - will be lost.

2.1.3 Differences in the use of connectors

We have summed up the use of connectors in MSC above and noted that the increase in their use in MSC is partly attributable to influence from English and other Western languages.

The discourse use of connectors is likely to cause more problems for both Chinese speaking learners of English and for English speaking learners of Chinese and we mention these below (6.2.2.1).

2.2 Information sequencing and discourse: sequence and persuasion

2.2.1 The use of 'Because' connectors and discourse sequencing patterns

In chapter 3 (3.1.2.1) we cited Schleppergrell (1991) on the role that 'because' plays as a signaller in discourse in English. And although she argued that 'because' can signal both forward and backward links in English discourse, her examples were all of 'because' signalling backward links. Schifffrin's examples of 'motive' and 'action' relations, presented in chapter 3 (pp 86 ff), also showed 'because' signalling backward links. For example, when Zelda was explaining why they were not going to see their son that night, she says:

Well we were going up t'see uh....my-our son tonight
but we're not
cause the younger one's gonna come for dinner
cause he's working in the neighborhood
so that's out. (previously quoted in chapter 3 p 87).

Here the two 'because' connectors explain the statement, already made, that Zelda is not going up to see her son that night. In other words, Zelda first makes the statement and then gives reasons for it.

This is in stark contrast to MSC where our data has shown that 'yīnwei', when used as a discourse marker, exclusively signals forward links. This appears to be connected with the right branching direction of English and the left branching direction of Chinese. The implications of these different uses in cross cultural communication are clear. A Chinese speaker who transfers the MSC use of 'yīnwei' as a signaller of forward links and so uses 'because' in this way when speaking English is liable to be

misunderstood. And indeed, the data we quoted from Young (1986) in Chapter 1 (1.7) provided examples of this type of misunderstanding. We here provide an excerpt from another sample of Young's data (p 198).

Chinese: Uh because this road is blocked..was bl
American: But why is it blocked?

We are now in a position to explain the American's misunderstanding of the Chinese policeman's message. When the Chinese policeman used 'because' he was transferring the use of his L1 'yīnwei' and thus using it to signal forward links. The American, however, interpreted this use of 'because' as an L1 speaker of English and understood it, therefore, to be signalling backward links. He thus assumed that the Chinese policeman was referring back to something he had previously said and so interrupted him. By interrupting him, the American thereby denied the Chinese policeman the opportunity to say what he was going to. Yet, a fellow Chinese speaker would have understood the Chinese speaker's use of 'because' as a forward signalling device and would have therefore allowed him to continue talking.

This contrastive use of 'because' and 'yīnwei' as, respectively, backward and forward signalling devices in discourse also has implications for language teaching. It would suggest that authentic stretches of MSC discourse such as the data analysed in Chapter 3, could be used in the classroom with advanced students of Chinese. For example, students could be asked to plot simple information sequencing 'maps' to train them in recognizing the use of 'yīnwei' as a forward marker.

2.2.2 The use of opening content and structure statements

We have pointed out that, although MSC uses opening structure statements, it does not often use opening content statements. English, on the other hand, often uses an opening content statement as we saw in Schifffrin's data in Chapter 3 (3.1.2.2) and an example of which we again presented above. As a further example of the use of both opening content and structure statements in English, let us consider the opening lines of a talk given by a North American academic at a seminar on China which took place at

the Australian National University. This talk was given at the same seminar as the talk given by the native Chinese speaker we quoted on page 2 of the Introduction to this study. The Chairman of the session introduces the speaker as follows:

"firstly we have XXX and he will talk on China's place in the world with regard to sanctions."

The speaker native English speaker then begins:

"In dealing with my topic er China's place in the world, I'd like to do *three things* ehm the *first* is to give an overview of the political and economic situation in China since June fourth, and *then* based on that overview to make some comparisons between what has been happening in China during the past decade and what has been going on in Eastern Europe and *then third and finally* to talk about specifically sanctions and the influence of sanctions in the present situation, *first* with regard to the domestic situation in China....."(my italics)

In this opening segment of his talk, the speaker uses a number of opening structure statements (italicised). In addition, however, he has also used an equivalent number of content statements. In other words, he not only says he is going to do three things but he also says what those three things are. Notice also that he repeats the phrases "China's place in the world" and "sanctions" from the Chairman's introduction. It is instructive to compare this with the data presented in chapters three and four above where the use of opening content statements was found to be rare. Compare this also with the opening lines of the native Chinese speaker's talk at the same seminar. The speaker's words follow on from the sessional Chairman who has introduced him by saying:

"Thank you. Our second speaker this afternoon is XXX and he's going to talk on current financial policy."

The speaker then begins:

"ehm ehm the er question of whether China's present leadership will continue reform can be looked at from this er rather er dramatic change in the monetary situation in China the instability that has been er quite conspicuous in the last couple of years now the reform of the last decade have really transformed the country's financial relationship in the sense that the relationship between the different levels of government between the enterprise and the government and between....."

The speaker here does not use an opening structure statement at all but appears to go straight into his topic. Nor is there any clearly signposted opening content statement. Furthermore, this speaker does not use any phrases from the Chairman's introduction.

The implications of these different sequencing patterns and the different use of discourse conventions between MSC and English discourse are wide. There are clear implications here for cross-cultural communication which, in turn, have implications for language teaching and learning. Any native MSC speaker who transfers the use of these L1 discourse conventions to English is liable to be misunderstood. Furthermore, misunderstanding can lead to hurt as we saw in the case of the Chinese speaker in the Introduction who was interrupted by the English speaking Chairman before he had been able to make his main point. In addition to the need for MSC speakers who have to use English to learn the discourse conventions of English, it is also important for native speakers of English who have contact with MSC speakers to learn something about the discourse conventions of MSC. And serious students of MSC need to be given exposure to authentic texts such as those analysed in Chapter 3 so that they can become familiar with and thus follow the sequencing patterns and correctly interpret the discourse conventions of MSC.

2.3 Information sequencing and text. sequence and politeness in requests

In the Introduction of this study, we cited the case of a Chinese police constable in Hong Kong making a request of his English senior officer. We saw how the senior officer interrupted the constable before he actually made his request. From our analysis of the requests in Chapter 4, we can now see that the Chinese constable was transferring the discourse conventions of his L1 into English and thus modified his request by listing the reasons for his request before making it. We also assume that the English senior officer interpreted the Chinese constable's discourse as though he were following English conventions. He thus interpreted the Chinese constable's behaviour as being tentative and being unable to get to the point. Evidence in support of this

comes from the way that the senior officer would have preferred the request to have been sequenced. He wanted the request first and then the reason.

We also noted, in Chapter 4, the research by Faerch and Kasper (1989) where they show that native speakers of English support or externally modify only a small percentage of their requests.

The implications for this also seem clear. In order to avoid cross cultural misunderstanding when dealing with requests, speakers of MSC and English need to learn and become aware of the each other's L1 request conventions. For, had the English senior officer been familiar with the sequencing conventions and schema of requests in Chinese, he surely would have understood what the Chinese constable was trying to say. By the same token, of course, had the Chinese constable been aware of sequencing conventions in requests in English, he would have been able to use a request fronted schema when making his request.

These contrastive request schemas need to be taught to language learners. It is extremely unlikely that language learners will acquire these culturally specific conventions unless they are taught explicitly. Ellis (1992) has shown that, even in a second language environment, language learners only learn basic requests for classroom purposes and do not learn to control a broad range of request types. It seems, therefore, that these need to be taught and one way of teaching these request conventions and schemas to students of MSC is to use authentic requests - such as those analysed in Chapter 4 - as teaching material. (Kirkpatrick 1993 b). In this way, students can learn to identify different request schemas and conventions. In addition, a contrastive approach to the study of speech acts and discourse patterns can increase learners' awareness of differing cultural and linguistic conventions. This awareness should incorporate the understanding that preferred request schemas are simply that - preferred. In other words, other schemas can be used but their communicative effect will be different. For example, the transfer of the preferred 'English' request fronted schema into Chinese, although possible, is marked and signals directness. Similarly,

the transfer of the preferred Chinese request schema into English, although possible, is marked and can signal tentativeness.

2.4 Information sequencing and reasoning: sequence and induction

In Chapter 5 we presented evidence to show that Chinese preferred to use inductive reasoning over deductive reasoning and quoted a number of scholars who argued that 'English' prefers to use deductive reasoning. This distinction between an 'indirect' Chinese and a 'direct' English also has implications but they need to be treated with caution. We suggested that one reason for indirectness in Chinese reasoning was that hierarchy and status considerations require a subordinate to use indirect methods of reasoning when attempting to persuade or give advice to a superior. We also noted that certain genres of Chinese were classified according to whether they were 'top - down' or 'bottom - up' or whether they communicated between people of equal status. While this strongly suggests that a wise man should be aware of the role of hierarchy and status in Chinese society and use his language accordingly, it also suggests of course, that it would be foolish to say that the Chinese language was somehow indirect. It is the people who use the language that are indirect not the language itself. One would expect, therefore, that in Chinese communities where status and hierarchy were not so important, reasoning would become correspondingly more direct. Similarly, in Western societies where status and hierarchy are more important than in others, one would expect to find an increasing use of indirectness.

3 General Conclusions

The purpose of this study as set out in section 2 of the Introduction was to investigate:

- a) the principles of information sequencing in MSC at the levels of sentence, discourse and text and across a range of genres.
- b) the extent to which these principles of information are constant across levels of discourse and genre.

We conclude therefore by proposing:

a) the principle of information sequencing that operates upon complex sentences in MSC is the modifying - modified sequence. This is linked to the typological parameter of Principle Branching Direction, which, in MSC is left branching. This modifying - modified sequence in complex sentences means that the unmarked clause order in these sentences is subordinate clause - main clause. We gave the general term 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequencing to describe this sequencing principle.

This sequencing principle is in contrast to English, a right branching language, whose unmarked clause order is main clause - subordinate clause.

b) The 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' principle of information sequencing is also evident at levels of discourse and text. This incorporates the notion that the MSC 'because' connector 'yīnwei', when functioning at a discourse level, invariably signals forward links. This is again in contrast to English, where 'because' being used at discourse level, usually signals backward links. This also incorporates the phenomenon that the unmarked sequence of so-called 'motive' and 'action' pairs is, in contrast to English, grounds before claim. In the specific case of requests, this means that the unmarked sequence is for the reasons for a request to precede the request.

c) The 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' principle of information sequencing is also evident in the modes of reasoning preferred in Chinese. In particular, the preferred Chinese pattern of inductive reasoning is well suited to presenting propositions following this 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence.

d) This principle of information sequencing is constant, therefore, across a wide range of genres and at a number of levels from complex sentence to text. We have seen the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence operating in complex sentences in the formal written style of Chinese linguists and in the letters of request written by young Mainland Chinese. We have seen the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence operating at levels of extended spoken discourse in the genre of extended spoken answers and along a continuum ranging from informal and spontaneous to formal and planned. Any modifications to this sequencing principle have been within the principle - the use or

non use of connectors, for example. These modifications do not represent a new or alternative principle of information sequence. And we have seen the 'BECAUSE - THEREFORE' sequence operating at a textual level in the genre of written requests.

A major consequence of this principle of information sequencing in MSC is that subordinate or modifying information precedes the main information. Thus we see that the main point that the speakers make in answering questions comes at the end of the answer. We see that the actual requests come towards the end of the speech acts of requests. This contrasts with English, where the tendency is to mention the main information towards the beginning. Thus we see the use of opening content statements in English in extended spoken discourse; and we see requests that are request fronted. The case of the native Chinese speaker leaving the main point of his talk until the end and then being denied the chance to make it by the English speaking Chairman serves as a sad example of cross cultural misunderstanding caused by the transfer of this MSC L1 sequencing principle into English.

We end this study by emphasising that, like communication, miscommunication is a two way affair. We hope that this study will therefore be of value to both speakers of English and speakers of MSC in that it describes the information sequencing patterns and rhetorical conventions of MSC and points out areas of difference between them and those of English. We hope that awareness of these differences will reduce the number of breakdowns in communication between speakers of English and MSC.

We leave the final word of this study to the great Chinese linguist Wang Li. We hope that this study will have gone some way in explaining his assertion that:

"In Western languages the main component ('bufen') comes at the beginning and the subordinate component comes at the end. In Chinese, the main component comes at the end and the subordinate component comes at the beginning." (1984 p 96).

Appendix 1: The Chinese character version of the seminar and press conferences

- (4) 因为我们没有面对这个问题，我和我的太太都有北京户口，所以我这个问题没有更详细地考察。
- (5) 但因为我没有遇到这个问题，虽然我的爱人是澳大利亚人，但是他当时在中国有北京户口，所以她可能呢，比方说甚至跟游行队伍走一走。因为她具有北京市民身份，这个我们没有进一步探讨。我没办法再深入回答，对不起啦。
- (6) 因为吧，我呢，在中学时代吧，是在那个，中国也好世界也好吧，就红卫兵发源的里边长出来的学生，我就是读中学的时候，已经就目击过武斗，也看见过小规模武斗，我也那个时候已经在枪声中坦克下生活过。我有过那样一段生活经历，我可能把一些事物，特别（是）一些东西看得淡了一点，这一个一个问（题）。
- (7) 所以呢，这个问题，谁知道我私人和其他人的一个一个问题，因此我没有参加这个这些学生运动的任何抗议活动。
- (8) 现在，因此呢，我不认为这些对话能够成功。因为不存在一个平等对话的基础，是这样子。
- (9) 这个，我所以是观察者，这个这个所说的就是这样子。各位各位还有什么？
- (10) 因为时间比较短，因此要求新闻记者在提问时尽量简单明了。

(11)

根据北京大学教育改革的探索，那么我们招生的人数呢，要设在军校能够接受的/和军校能够接受的程度相衔接。所以去年我们的招生人数少一点，今年，也就是九零年的招生(人数)一千六百，也就是比去年增加一倍。

(12)

那么，这今年军校结业的新生回到北京大学以后，要承担四年专业的学习，他们和去年他们同时上大学的相比，一定会延期一年，但是呢，其他的学生毕业以后，他也需要就(受?)一年见习期。北大这批新生毕业以后他们自决(觉?)参加我们工作，没有见习期。所以他们的时间和其他的学生一样。

(13)

这个学生参加军训，是作为北大的学生，只要你到北大来，愿意到北大来学习，那么都要都要参加这军训，还有比如他不愿意到北大来，那么他也可以不参加军训，从这个(意义上说)，就是说既是自愿的，也是不自愿的。这个如果他愿意上北大，他也必须军训，而他当然可以选择其它大学，就是其它不参加军训的大学，去继续学习。但是，北京大学毕竟是一所在国际上，在国内国际都享有盛誉的学校，所以学生还是不愿意放弃这个学校。

(14)

在回答各位问题以前，我有几条新闻要发布。

(15)

我们一贯的立场是，台湾，是中国领土地一部分，是中国的一个省。我们坚决反对同我建交的国家同台湾建立官方关系，或者进行官方的往来(往来?)。外国的航空公司，不管是官方的还是民间的，反要与台湾通航，都不是一般的民间经贸，而是涉及中国主权的政治问题，必须都必须事先与我商量。

(16)

对刚刚结束的两会，作为国务院的首脑，我感到满意，因为第一，会议批准了政府工作报告……因此我认为这次会议是一次鼓人心的会议，是动员全国人民同心同德就完成政治，经济，社会稳定发展的一次会议。

(17)

顺便说一下，就是在这次人民代表大会之前呢，在香港的许多报纸上(对)关于中国的人事的问题有许多猜测。我想也许你这个问题是从那些猜测来的，不过，我现在可以告诉大家，这个猜测都是很不正确的。尽管香港是，好象这种方面很开放，很自由，但是你如果又完全具体相信这些，猜测相信(猜测相信?)那恐怕不一定有好的结果，不一定是能够是正确的。我应该负责地告诉大家，现在以江泽民为总书记中国这个领导核心呢，是团结的，~~二~~有强有力的，也而且我相信它也受到了人民的拥护。我们尽管有困难，但是我们有信心，把中国事情打(做)好。

Appendix 2: The Chinese letters of request

Letter A (No. 32)

尊敬澳广节目主持人：

我作为贵台英语教学节目和《〈你喜爱的歌〉》的节目忠实听众已有好几年的历史了。我认为贵台的这两个节目办得非常好。

请让我做个自我介绍：我是一名中学生，今年十八岁，我的家乡—— ，是一个边疆小城，文化活动办得也不错。由于我是喜欢学习英语，所以对这方面的电台节目比较注意。但是因为中央人民广播电台的英语节目比较深奥，不适合我学习，所以我一直从贵台的英语节目里得到听力，会话能力的训练。这种训练使我受益非浅。随着课程难度一步步的提高，我深感没有一本教材，学习会遇到许多困难。因为这个原因，我抽出时间给贵台写这一封信，希望能得到一本贵台英语节目的教材。教材的费用请来信告知。

另外，我希望得到贵台印制的年历，并祝澳广的普通话节目办得更加有趣。

听众：X X X

1990.1.4.

Letter B (No. 19)

X X X 女士:

您好!

在一个偶然的机会里,我收到了“澳广”广东话节目。我欣喜万分!因为,一直深爱着粤语,粤语歌的我,今天终于找到了一个良师益友!

现在,我每天都收听你们的节目,粤语水平也大有长进。我非常之高兴,同时也深深地爱上了“澳广”以及每一位主持人。我要永远记住,在 11800 千赫,我有一位好朋友,并把他向我的好友推荐!

这里,我要为好友 Johnny,小文,也为您,以及所有工作人员点播一首李克勤的歌曲,(或者其它你为我选的歌),并衷心地祝愿每一位“澳广”听友愉快!

另外我想索取一份“澳广”广东话节目时间表,不知有否? 多谢!

祝工作愉快!

忠实听友: X X X

1990.1.8. 晚

Add: 中国江苏省如皋县
邮政编码:

Letter C (No.29)

澳广听众信箱负责人：

你好！

我是你们“澳广”的忠实听众，你们每天播放的“听众点歌”固定节目，我每天都听，特别喜欢听，齐秦，王杰，潘美辰，童安阁的歌，有时我到磁带店去买他们的画，可是每次都是扫兴而归，因为没有他们的画买呀！

昨天，我听了你的节目，听说你们那儿有他们的像片，所以特来信问一问，如果有，请你们给我寄几张来，烦你们了。

此致

敬礼！

一位澳广的忠实听众：X X X
于：1990.元.8.

Letter D (No. 30)

澳广电台的工作人员：

你们好！

我一名学生，在学习之余常常以收听你台节目来消遣，渐渐地我越来越喜欢你台的节目，如那使人清心悦耳的歌曲节目，还有你台的英语学习节目也很好。总之，你台节目丰富了我的课余生活，得到了快乐，因此我要向你台的所有工作人员祝以新年问候，祝各位新年快乐！

我于昨天晚上（1月7日）在收听节目时，听到一位刚从新加坡回去的小姐赠送新年礼物的消息，引起我的兴趣。我希望能得一份新年礼物，以及一张那位小姐的照片，可是由于粗心，没有记住她的芳名，望您多多费心，抱歉，Sorry！

从你台播出的节目中，以及从课本，电视中我渐渐了解澳洲，知道澳洲有很多特有的珍稀动物，卡奇拉，袋鼠……我对动物着迷，对这些没有亲眼见过的动物更感兴趣，希望能得到印有这些动物的卡片或挂历，如果是邮票更好（因为我集邮），请满足我的要求！

这次就写到这里。

祝大家工作快乐，万事如意！

（Sorry，信封地址是我父亲的，他也喜欢澳广）

90.1.8.

〈澳广春节抽奖〉

Letter E (No. 21)

尊敬的 X X X 先生：

您好！得悉您贵处有 1990 年挂历，特此索要壹份，希望寄到：广西：苍梧县
宾志刚本人收即可。 阵便要壹份贵台的节目时间表，对此向您台的同志表示衷心的感谢

致

敬礼

广西苍梧县

1990.元.2.

REFERENCES

WESTERN LANGUAGE SOURCES

CHINESE LANGUAGE SOURCES

WESTERN LANGUAGE SOURCES

- Allinson, Robert E (ed.).(1989). Understanding the Chinese Mind. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Ames, Roger T.(1990). The Art of Rulership.Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Au TK-F.(1983). Chinese-English counterfactuals: the Sapir Whorf hypothesis revisited. Cognition 15: 155-187.
- _____(1984). Counterfactuals:In Reply to Alfred Bloom. Cognition 17: 289-302.
- Bakker, Egbert J.(1991). Foregrounding and indirect discourse: temporal subclauses in a Herodotean short story. Journal of Pragmatics 16: 225-247.
- Bao Zhiming.(1990). Language and world view in ancient China. Philosophy East and West Vol xl (2): 195-219
- Bartlett, FC.(1932). Remembering. A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology. Cambridge University Press.
- Bateson, G.(1979). Mind and Nature. A Necessary Unity. New York: Bantam Books.
- Bauman, R and Sherzer, J (eds.).(1974). Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, Michael (1987). Arguing and Thinking. Cambridge University Press.
- Biq Yong-O.(1990). Conversation, continuation and connectives. Text 10(3): 187-208.
- Bloch, Maurice (ed.).(1975). Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society. London: Academic Press.
- Bloom, Alfred (1981). The Linguistic Shaping of Thought:A Study in the Impact of Thinking in China and the West. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- _____(1987). Linguistic labels: catalysts, conveyors and triggers of thoughts. In Henry Kao and Hoosain (eds.).
- Blum-Kulka S, Danet, B and Gherson, R.(1985). The language of requesting in Israeli society. In JP Forgas (ed.).
- Blum-Kulka, S and House, J.(1989). Cross cultural and situational variation in request behaviour. In Blum Kulka, House and Kasper (eds.).
- Blum-Kulka S, House J, Kasper G.(eds.).(1989). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Norwood: Ablex.
- Bodde, D.(1981). Essays on Chinese Civilisation. Princeton University Press.
- Bradley, David (1992). Chinese as a pluricentric language. In M Clyne (ed.).
- Brick, Jean (1991). A Handbook in Intercultural Education. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Britton, BK and Pellegrini, AD.(eds.).(1990). Narrative Thought and Narrative Language. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brockman J.(ed.).(1977). About Bateson. New York: EP Dutton.
- Brown, G and Yule G.(1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press.

- Brown, P and Levinson, S.(1987). Politeness: Some Universals of Language Use. Cambridge University Press.
- Burton Watson.(1967). Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsun Tzu and Han Fei Tzu. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____(1971). Chinese Rhyme Prose. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Butterworth, B.(1978). Maxims for studying conversation. Semiotica 24: 317-339.
- Carrell, Patricia L.(1982). Cohesion is not coherence. TESOL Quarterly 16: 479-488.
- _____(1984). The effects of rhetorical organisation of ESL readers. TESOL Quarterly 18: 441-469.
- _____(1987). Text as interaction: some implications of text analysis and reading. Research for ESL composition. In Ulla Connor and RB Kaplan (eds.).
- Chafe, Wallace (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and points of view. In Charles Li (ed.).
- _____(1990). Some things that narratives tell us about the mind. In BK Britton and AD Pellegrini (eds.).
- Chappell, Hilary (1991). Strategies for the assertion of obviousness and disagreement in Mandarin: a semantic study of the modal particle 'Me'. Australian Journal of Linguistics 11 (1) :39-65.
- Chao Yuan-ren.(Yuen Ren Chao) (1968). A Grammar of Modern Spoken Chinese. University of California Press.
- Chen Hsuan-chih and Tzeng, Ovid JL.(eds.).(1992). Language Processing in Chinese. North Holland: Elsevier Science Publishing.
- Chen Ping.(1986). Referent introducing and tracking in Chinese narratives. Ph D dissertation. UCLA.
- Chen Shou-yi.(1961). Chinese Literature. A Historical Introduction. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Cheng Chin-chuan.(1992). Chinese varieties of English. In Kachru, Braj (ed.).
- Cheng, Peggy Geok Poh.(1985). An analysis of contrastive rhetoric: Chinese and English expository prose. Pedagogical implications and strategies for the ESL teacher in the 9th grade curriculum. Ph D dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.
- Cherry, Roger D.(1988). Politeness in written persuasion. Journal of Pragmatics 12: 63-81.
- Chien Yu-chin.(1992). Theoretical implications of the principles and parameters model for language acquisition in Chinese. In H-c Chen and Ovid Tzeng (eds.).
- Choi, Yeon Hee.(1988). Text structure of Korean speakers' argumentative essays in English. World Englishes 7 (2): 129-142.

- Ch'u Chai and Winberg Chai.(1974). A Treasury of Chinese Literature. New York: Thomas Y Crowell.
- Clarke, David P.(1983). Language and Action. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Clyne,Michael (1987). Cultural differences in the organisation of academic texts. Journal of Pragmatics 11: 211-247.
- _____(ed.).(1992). Pluricentric Languages. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cohen, Paul and Goldman, Merle (eds.).(1990). Ideas Across Cultures. Essays in Chinese Thought in Honour of Benjamin I Schwartz. Harvard University Press.
- Cole, Peter (ed.).(1981). Radical Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
- Connor, Ulla and Kaplan RB.(eds.).(1987). Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text. Reading MA: Addison-Welsey.
- Connor, Ulla and Lauer, Janice (1988). Cross-cultural variation in persuasive student writing. In Alan C.Purves (ed.).
- Conte ME, Petofi, JS and Sozer, E.(eds.).(1989). Text and Discourse Connectedness. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Corcoran, Paul E.(1979). Political Language and Rhetoric. Queensland University Press.
- Crosswhite, James (1989). Universality in rhetoric: Perelman's universal audience. Philosophy and Rhetoric. 22 (3): 157-173.
- Crump, J.(1964). Intrigues: Studies of the Chan-Kuo Tse. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.
- _____(1979). Chan-Kuo Tse. San Francisco: Chinese Materials Centre Inc.
- Cua, AS.(1985a). Ethical Argumentation. A Study in Hsun Tzu's Epistemology. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- _____(1985b). Ethical uses of the past in early Confucianism: the case of Hsun Tzu. Philosophy East and West Vol xxxv (2): 133-155.
- Curme, GO.(1931). A Grammar of the English Language. Vol 111 Syntax. Boston: DC Heath and Company.
- De Beaugrande, R and Dressler, WU.(1981). An Introduction to Text Linguistics. New York: Longman.
- Diller, AV.(1988). Thai syntax and 'National Grammar'. Language Sciences 10 (2): 282-299.
- Ebrey, Patricia (1985). T'ang guides to verbal etiquette. Harvard Journal of Asian Studies 45 (2): 581-613.
- Eckman, Fred (1977). Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. Language Learning 27 (2): 315-330.

- Eckman, Fred, Beel, LH and Nelson, Diane (eds.).(1984). Universals of Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Eckman, Fred, Moravcsik, E and Wirth, W.(eds.).(1986). Markedness. New York: Plenum Press.
- Edelsky, C.(1981). Who's got the floor? Language in Society 10: 383-421.
- Edmondson, Willis (1981). Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis. London: Longman.
- Eggington, William E.(1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: implications for effective communication. In Ulla Connor and RB Kaplan (eds.).
- Eifring, Halvor (1988). The Chinese counterfactual. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 16 (2): 193-218.
- Ellis, Rod (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 14 (1): 1-23.
- Faerch, C and Kasper, G.(1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realisation. In Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (eds.).
- Fairclough, Norman (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.
- Fine, Johnathon (ed.).(1988). Second Language Discourse: A Textbook of Current Research. Norwood: Ablex.
- Finley, MI.(1983). Politics in the Ancient World. Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, Suzanne (1984). A universal in L2 acquisition based on a PBD typology. In Eckman, Beel and Nelson (eds.).
- _____(1987). A Parameter Setting Model of L2 Acquisition. Dordrecht, Holland: D Reidel Publishing.
- _____(1988). Nature of development in L2 acquisition and implications for theories of language acquisition in general. In Flynn and O'Neil (eds.).
- Flynn, Suzanne and O'Neil, Wayne (eds.).(1988). Linguistic Theory in Second Language Acquisition. : Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Foley, William A and Van Valin, Robert D.(1984). Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar. Cambridge University Press.
- _____(1985). Information packaging in the clause. In T Shopen (ed.).
- Forgas, JP.(ed.).(1985). Language and Social Situations. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Forke, A.(1901-1902). The Chinese sophists. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.(North China Branch) Vol xxxiv: 1-100.
- _____(1962). Lun-Heng. Philosophical Essays of Wang Ch'ung. New York: Paragon Book Gallery.
- Fox, Barbara (1987). Discourse Structure and Anaphora. Written and Conversational English. Cambridge University Press.
- Freese, JH.(1947). Aristotle 'The Art of Rhetoric'. Heineman.

- Gale, EM.(1931). Discourses on Salt and Iron. Leyden: EJ Brill.
- Garrett, Mary Margaret (1983). The "Mo-Tzu" and the "Lu-Shih Ch'un-Ch'iu": A case study in classical Chinese theory and practice of argument. Ph D dissertation. University of California ,Berkeley.
- Givon, T.(ed.).(1979). Syntax and Semantics 12:Discourse and Syntax. New York: Academic Press.
- _____(1983). Topic Continuity in Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____(1990). Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction. (Vol 2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givon, T and Sun Chao-fen.(1985). On the so-called SOV word order in Mandarin. A quantified text study and its implications. Language 61 (2): 329-351.
- Goffman, Erving (1981). Forms of Talk. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Graham, AC.(1981). Chuang Tzu. The Inner Chapters. London: Unwin
- _____(1986). Yin-Yang and the Nature of Correlative Thinking. Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies.
- _____(1989). The Disputers of the Dao. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.
- Greenberg, JH.(1966). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In JH Greenberg (ed.).
- _____(ed.).(1966). Universals of Language. MIT Press.
- _____(ed.).(1978). Universals in Human Language Vol 4 Syntax. Stamford University Press.
- Grimes, Joseph E.(1975). The Thread of Discourse. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gumperz, JJ.(1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge University Press.
- _____(ed.).(1982). Language and Social Identity. Cambridge University Press.
- _____(1990). The Conversational analysis of interethnic communication. In Scarcella et al (eds.). Reprinted from Eleanor Ross (ed.), (1977) Interethnic Communication: Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society. University of Georgia Press.
- Gumperz, JJ and Hymes, Dell (eds.) (1972). Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Wilson.
- Gumperz, JJ, Jupp, TC, Roberts, Celia (1979). Crosstalk. London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training.
- Gumperz , JJ and Roberts, Celia (1980). Developing Awareness Skills for Interethnic Communication. Singapore: Occasional Paper no 12. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Gunn, Edward (1991). Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth Century Chinese Prose. Stanford University Press.
- Haiman, John (1978). Conditionals as topics. Language 54 (3): 564-589.

- _____. (1985a). Natural Syntax. Iconicity and Erosion. Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (ed.). (1985b). Iconicity and Syntax. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haiman, John and Thompson, Sandra (eds.). (1988). Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, MAK. (1967). Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English.
 Part 1 Journal of Linguistics 3: 37-81.
 Part 2 Journal of Linguistics 3: 199-244
 Part 3 Journal of Linguistics 4: 179-215
- _____. (1985). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, MAK and Hassan, Ruqaiya (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- Hansen, Chad (1983). Language and Logic in Ancient China. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hashimoto, Anne Y. (1971). Mandarin Syntactic Structures. Princeton: Unicorn (Chi-Lin) No 8.
- Hatim, Basil (1991). The pragmatics of argumentation in Arabic: the rise and fall of a text type. Text 11 (2): 189-199.
- Her, One-Soon. (1991). Topic as a grammatical function in Chinese. Lingua (84): 1-23.
- Hightower, JR. (1965). Topics in Chinese Literature. Harvard University Press.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. Text 3: 183-95.
- _____. (1983). Topic continuity in Japanese in T Givon (ed.).
- _____. (1986). Japanese. Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars. Croom Helm.
- _____. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In Ulla Connor, and RB Kaplan (eds.).
- Hockett, CF. (1958). A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: MacMillan.
- Hong Fincher, Beverly (ed.). (1985). Chinese Language Use. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Houppert, Joseph W. (1975). John Lyly. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Hsiung, James C. (1969). Chinese ways of thinking and the Chinese language. Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association vol iv (2): 41-54.
- Hu Shih. (1932). Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China. Shanghai: Oriental Books.
- Hulsewe, AFP. (1985). Remnants of Qin Law. Leiden: EJ Brill.
- Ichisada Miyazaki. (1976). China's Examination Hell. (Translated by Conrad Schiorkauer). New York: John Weatherhill.
- Idema, WC. (ed.). (1981). Leyden Studies in Sinology. Leiden: EJ Brill.
- Jamieson, Kathleen M. (1975). Antecedent goal as rhetorical constraint. Quarterly Journal of Speech 61: 406-415.

- Jenner, WFJ.(1992). The Tyranny of History. London: Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.
- Johnson, David (1985). Communication, class and consciousness in late Imperial China. In Johnson, Nathan and Rawski (eds.).
- Johnson, David, Nathan, Andrew J and Rawski, Evelyn (eds.).(1985). Popular Culture in Late Imperial China. University of California Press.
- Johnstone, Barbara (1983). Presentation as proof: the language of Arabic rhetoric. Anthropological Linguistics 25: 47-60
- _____(1986) Arguments with Khomeini: rhetorical situation and persuasive style in cross-cultural perspective. Text 6 (2): 171-187.
- _____(1989). Linguistic strategies and cultural styles for persuasive discourse. In Ting-Toomey and Korzeny (eds.).
- Kachru, Braj B.(1992).(2nd Edition). The Other Tongue. University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, Y.(1988). Writers in Hindi and English. In Alan C.Purves (ed).
- Kao, Henry SR and Rumjahn Hoosain (eds.)(1986). Linguistics, Psychology and the Chinese Language. Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong.
- Kao, Karl KS.(1986). Rhetoric. In William H Nienhauser (ed.).
- Kaplan, RB.(1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language Learning 16: 1-20.
- _____(1972). The Anatomy of Rhetoric:Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric. Philadelphia: Centre for Curriculum Development.
- _____(1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In Ulla Connor and RB Kaplan (eds.).
- _____(1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning. In Alan C Purves (ed.).
- Kennedy, George (1963). The Art of Persuasion in Greece. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- _____(1969). Quintillian. New York: Twayne.
- Kinney, Anne Behnke (1990). The Art of the Han Essay:Wang Fu's Ch'ien-fu Lun. Arizona State University: Centre for Asian Studies.
- Kirkpatrick, TA.(1984). Communicative language teaching in Singapore schools. Paper given at the RELC conference, Singapore 1984.
- _____(1993 a). Chinese composition structure: ancient or modern? Conference Proceedings of the 9th Biennial National Languages Conference: 189-205. Darwin: Northern Territory Department of Education.
- _____(1993 b). Schemata, authentic texts and cross-cultural communication. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, Special Series 10.(forthcoming).

- _____(1993c). Information sequencing in Mandarin in letters of request. Anthropological Linguistics.(forthcoming).
- Knechtges, David (1990). Han and 6 dynasties parallel prose. Renditions. 33-34: 63-110.
- Kroll, JL (1985-7). Disputation in ancient Chinese culture. Early China 11/12: 118-145.
- Kruisinga, E.(1932). A Handbook of Present Day English.Part 2. Groningen: Noordhoff.
- Kuno, S.(1973). The Structure of the Japanese Language. MIT Press.
- Labov, W.(1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Laswell, Harold D, Laswell, Nathan and Dwight, Harold (1949). The Language of Politics. Studies in Quantitative Semantics. New York: Steward.
- Legge, James (1967). Li Chi Vol 1. New Hyde Park, New York: University Books.
- Lehmann, Christian (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In Haiman and Thompson (eds.).
- Lehmann, Winfred P.(ed.).(1978). Syntactic Typology. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Leslie, Donald (1964). Argument by contradiction in pre-Buddhist Chinese reasoning. Occasional Paper 4. Canberra: Centre for Oriental Studies., Australian National University.
- Levinson, S.(1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Charles (ed.).(1976). Subject and Topic. London: Academic Press.
- Li, Charles and Thompson, Sandra (1976). Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In Charles Li (ed.).
- _____(1978). An exploration of Mandarin Chinese. In Winfred Lehman (ed.).
- _____(1981). Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar. University of California.
- Li, Cherry Ing (1985). Participant anaphora in Mandarin Chinese. PhD dissertation. University of Florida.
- Light, Timothy (1979). Word order and word order change in Mandarin Chinese. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 7 (2): 149-180.
- Liu, LG.(1985). Reasoning counterfactually in Chinese: are there any obstacles? Cognition 21: 233-270.
- Liu Mingchen.(1989). The discourse pattern of a Chinese text. La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics 2: 205-226.
- Longacre, Robert E.(1985). Sentences as combinations of clauses. In T Shopen (ed.).
- Loveday, L.(1983). Rhetorical patterns in conflict: the sociocultural relativity of discourse organising processes. Journal of Pragmatics 7: 169-190.

- Lust, B and Chien, Y-C.(1984). The structure of coordination in first language acquisition of Mandarin Chinese. Cognition 17: 49-83.
- Mallinson, G and Blake, B.(1981). Language Typology. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing.
- Marney, John (1977). A Handbook of Modern Chinese Grammar. San Francisco: Chinese Materials Centre Inc.
- Matalene, Carolyn (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: an American writing teacher in China. College English 47 (8): 789-808.
- Matthiessen, Christian and Thompson, Sandra (1988). The structure of discourse and subordination. In Haiman and Thompson (eds.).
- McClaughlin, M.(1984). Conversation. Newbury Park: Sage.
- McGuire, Michael (1990). The rhetoric of narrative: a hermeneutic, critical theory. In Britton and Pellegrini (eds.).
- Michel, Andrew John (1988). A case study of the composing processes of advanced Spanish, Chinese and Arabic ESL learners. Ph D dissertation. University of Kansas.
- Minford, John (1980). The last 40 chapters of the Story of the Stone. A literary reappraisal with an appendix on Gao E. Ph D dissertation. Australian National University.
- Mohan, B and Lo WA-Y.(1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: transfer and developmental factors. TESOL Quarterly 19: 513-534.
- Mote, FW.(1971). Intellectual Foundations of China. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Moule, the Reverend (1869-1870). The provincial exam of Chekeang and sample of an essay. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (North China Branch) New series no vi: 113-123.
- Mulkay, Michael (1985). Agreement and disagreement in conversation and letters. Text.5 (3): 201-227.
- Nienhauser, William H.(1986). The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature. Indiana University Press.
- Nunan, David (1991). Language Teaching Methodology. Prentice Hall International.
- Nwoye, Onuigbo G.(1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. Journal of Pragmatics. 18: 309-328.
- Odlin, Terence (1989). Language Transfer. Cambridge University Press.
- Okurowski, Mary Ellen (1986). Textual cohesion in modern standard Chinese. Ph D dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Oliver, Robert T.(1962). Culture and Communication. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas.

- _____. (1971). Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China. Syracuse University Press.
- Ostler
- Owen, Marion (1989). A review of Schiffrin's 'Discourse Markers'. Journal of Linguistics. 25 (1): 255-7.
- Paechter, Heinz, Hellman, Bertha, Paechter, Heidwig and Packel, Karl (1944). A Glossary of Contemporary German Usage. New York: Frederick Ungar. Also in Laswell et al. (eds.). (1949).
- Paine, R.(ed.).(1981). Politically Speaking: Cross-Cultural Studies of Rhetoric. Philadelphia Institute of Human Issues.
- Payne, John R.(1985). Complex phrases and complex sentences. In T Shopen (ed.).
- Perelman, Chaim and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969). The New Rhetoric. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Peverelli, Peter J.(1981). The grammatical theory of Fu Donghua. In WC Idema (ed.)
- Plato (1960). Gorgias Translated and with an Introduction by Walter Hamilton. London: Penguin.
- Prince, Ellen F.(1981). Toward a taxonomy of given new information. In P Cole (ed.).
- Pollard, David E.(1973). A Chinese Look at Literature. London: Hurst and Co.
- Poutsma, H.(1904). A Grammar of Late Modern English. Groningen: Noordhoff.
- Purves, Alan C.(ed.).(1988). Writing Across Languages and Cultures. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Prideaux, Gary (1989). Text data as evidence for language processing principles: the grammar of ordered events. Language Sciences 11 (1): 27-42.
- Quirk, R, Greenbaum, S, Leech, G and Svartvik, J.(1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.
- Reinhart, T.(1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. Philosophica 27: 53-93.
- Richards, IA.(1932). Mencius on the Mind. London: Kegan Paul.
- Richards, JC and Schmidt RW.(eds.).(1983). Language and Communication. London: Longman.
- Rintell, EM and Mitchell, CJ.(1989). Studying requests and apologies. An inquiry into method. In Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (eds.).
- Robinson, Gail L Nemetz (1985). Cross Cultural Understanding. Pergamon.
- Rose, Kenneth R.(1992). Speech acts and questionnaires. The effect of hearer response. Journal of Pragmatics 17: 49-62.
- Roth, Harold D.(1992). The Textual History of the Huai-Nan Tzu. The Association for Asian Studies. University of Michigan.

- Rudolph, Elizabeth (1989). The role of conjunctions and particles for text connexity. In ME Conte et al.(eds.).
- Ryckmans, Pierre (1986). The Chinese attitude to the past. 47th Geroge Ernest Morrison Lecture on Ethnology. Canberra: Australian national University.
- Sacks H, Schegloff, E, and Jefferson G.(1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn taking in conversation. Language 50.(4): 696-735.
- Sacks, H and Schegloff, E.(1973). Opening up closings. Semiotica : 289-327.
- Samover, Larry A and Porter, Richard (1991). Communication Between Cultures. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Saunders, ANW.(1970). Greek Political Oratory. London: Penguin.
- Sawer, Michael (1969). Studies in middle Chinese grammar: the language of the early Yeuluh. Ph D dissertation. Australian National University.
- Scarcella, RC, Andersen, Elaine and Krashen, SD.(eds.).(1990). Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Schegloff, E.(1972). Sequencing in conversational openings. In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.).
- Schiffrin D.(1985). Multiple constraints on discourse options: quantitative analysis of causal sequences. Discourse Processes 8 (3) pp 281-303.
- _____(1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.
- Schleppegrell, Mary (1991). Paratactic Because. Journal of Pragmatics 16: 323-337.
- _____(1992). Subordination and linguistic complexity. Discourse Processes 15 (1): 117-131.
- Scollon, R.(1991). Eight legs and one elbow: stance and structure in Chinese English compositions. Paper presented at the Second North American Conference on Adult Language and Adolescent Literacy.
- Scollon R and Scollon SBK.(1981). Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication. Norwodd, New Jersey: Ablex.
- _____(1983). Face in interethnic communication. In Richards and Schmidt (eds.).
- _____(1991). Topic confusion in English-Asian discourse. World Englishes 10 (2): 113-125.
- Shao, Paul Youg-shing (1981). Liu Hsieh as literary theorist, critic and rhetorician. Ph D dissertation. Stamford University.
- Shi Dingxu.(1989). Topic chain as a syntactic category of Chinese. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 17 (2): 223-261.
- Shih, Vincent (1959). The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons by Liu Hsieh. Columbia University Press.
- Shopen TA.(ed.).(1985). Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol 1 Clause Structure Vol 2 Complex Constructions. Cambridge University Press.

- Simon, Harry (1985). Surface marking features and event and discourse related categories. In Beverley Hong-Fincher (ed.).
- Sivin, Nathan (1992). Ruminations on the Tao and its disputers. Philosophy East and West Vol xlii (1): 21-29.
- Smith, Arthur Henderson (1894). Chinese Characteristics. New York: Fleming H Revell.
- Smith, Richard J.(1983). China's Cultural Heritage. The Ch'ing Dynasty. Boulder, Colorado: West View Press.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1986). Relevance. Harvard University Press.
- _____(1992). Introduction. Lingua 87: 1-10.
- Stoddard, Sally (1991). Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion. Norwood: Ablex.
- Swales, John M.(1990). Genre Analysis. Cambridge University Press.
- Swearingen, C Jan.(1990). The narration of dialogue and narration in dialogue: the transition from story to logic. In Britton and Pellegrini (eds.).
- Talmy, Leonard (1978). Relations between subordination and coordination. In JH Greenberg (ed.).
- Tannen, Deborah (1984). The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. Applied Linguistics 5(3): 189-195.
- _____(1984). Conversational Style. Norwood: Ablex.
- Tai, James HY.(1973). A derivational constraint on adverbial placement in Mandarin Chinese. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 1 (3): 397-413.
- _____(1975). On two functions of place adverbials in Chinese. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 3 (2/3): 154-179.
- _____(1985). Temporal sequence and Chinese word order. In J Haiman (ed.).
- Tao, H and Thompson Sandra (1991). English Backchannels in Mandarin. Journal of Pragmatics 16: 209-223.
- Taylor, Gordon and Chen Tingguang.(1991). Linguistic, cultural and subcultural issues in contrastive discourse analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. Applied Linguistics 12 (3): 316-336.
- Thomas, J.(1985). The Language of power: towards a dynamic pragmatics. Journal of Pragmatics 9 (6): 199-216.
- Thompson, Sandra (1985). Grammar and written discourse: initial vs final purpose clauses in English. Text 5 (1/2): 55-84.
- Thompson, Sandra and Longacre, Robert (1985). Adverbial clauses. In T Shopen (ed.).
- Thompson, Sandra and Mann, William C.(1988). Toward a functional theory of text organisation. Text 8 (3): 243-281.

- Ting-Toomey, Stella and Korzeny, Felipe (eds.).(1989). Language, Communication and Culture. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Tokei, Ferenc (1971). Genre Theory in China in the 3rd to 6th Centuries. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.
- Tomlin, Russell S.(1985). Foreground and background information and the syntax of subordination. Text 5 (1/2): 85-122.
- Tomlin, Russell S and Ming Ming Pu.(1991). The management of reference in Mandarin discourse. Cognitive Linguistics 2 (1): 65-93.
- Tsao Ding-ren.(1985). The persuasion of Kuei Ku Tzu. Ph D dissertation. University of Minnesota.
- Tsao Feng-fu.(1979). A Functional Study of Topic in Chinese. Taipei Student Book Company.
- _____(1982). Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: contrastive studies: English and Chinese. IRAL, Rowley MA: Newbury House.
- Tu Ching-yi.(1974 -5). The Chinese examination essay: some literary considerations. Monumenta Serica. Journal of Oriental Studies. Vol xxxi : 393-406.
- Tyler, Andrea and Bro, John (1992). Discourse structure in nonnative English discourse. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 14 (1): 71-85.
- Tyler, Andrea and Davies, Catherine (1988). The effect of discourse structuring devices on listener perceptions of coherence in non-native university teacher's spoken discourse. World Englishes 7 (2): 101-110.
- _____(1990). Cross-linguistic communication missteps. Text 10 (4): 385-411.
- Van Eemeren, Frans, Grootendorst, Rob and Kruiger, Tjark (1987). Handbook of Argumentation Theory. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris.
- Wang Gungwu.(1979). Power, rights and duties in Chinese history. 40th George Ernest Morrison Lecture on Ethnology. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Wagner, Rudolph G.(1990). The Contemporary Chinese Historical Drama. University of California Press.
- Ward, Gregory L.(1988). The Semantics and Pragmatics of Preposing. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Wei Hsiu-ming.(1989). Word order of Mandarin Chinese. Ph D dissertation. Michigan State University.
- White, Lydia (1986). Markedness and parameter setting: some implications for a theory of adult second language acquisition. In Eckman, Moravcsik and Wirth (eds.).
- Whorf, BL.(1956). Language, Thought and Reality. MIT Press.
- Wible, David Scott (1990). Subjects and the clausal structure of Chinese and English. Ph D dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

- Wing, RL.(1988). The Art of Strategy. A New Translation of Sun Tzu's Classic 'The Art of War'. New York: Doubleday.
- Winter, EO.(1982). Towards a Contextual Grammar of English. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1985a). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. Journal of Pragmatics 9: 145-178.
- _____(1985b). A semantic metalanguage for a cross-cultural comparison of speech acts and speech genres. Language in Society 14 (4): 491-515.
- _____(1987). English Speech Act Verbs:A Semantic Dictionary. Sydney: Academic Press.
- _____(1990). Cross-cultural pragmatics and different values. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics 13 (1): 43-76.
- Wolfson, Nessa (1988). The bulge: a theory of speech behaviour and social distance. In J Fine (ed.).
- Wolfson, Nessa, Marmor, Thomas and Jones, Steve (1989). Problems in the comparisons of speech acts across cultures. In Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (eds.).
- Wu Zhaoyi.(1989). Exploring counterfactuals in English and Chinese. D Ed dissertation. University of Massachusetts.
- Wyatt, Don J.(1990). A language of continuity in Confucian thought. In Cohen and Goldman (eds.).
- Young, Linda Wai-ling.(1982). Inscrutability revisited. In JJ Gumperz (ed.).
- _____(1986). Unravelling Chinese inscrutability. Ph D dissertation. University of California at Berkeley.
- Young RE, Becker, Alton L and Pike, Kenneth L.(1970). Rhetoric: Discovery and Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

CHINESE LANGUAGE SOURCES

- Beijing Daxue Zhongguo Yuyuan Wenxuexi Hanyu Jiaoyanshi (北京大学语言文学系
汉语教研室) (ed.). (1964). Xiezuo Zhishi. (写作知识) (Composition).
Shanghai Yinshuguan Chubanshe.
- Beijing Renmin Guangbo Diantai. (北京人民广播电台) (ed.). (1981). Yuwen
Jichu Zhishi. (语文基础知识) (Fundamentals of Language).
- Chen Jianmin. (陈建民) (1979). Shuo He Xie. (说和写) (Speaking and
Writing). Guangdong Renmin Chubanshe.
- Chen Lizhang. (陈立章) (1991). Mofang zai xiezuo jiaoxue-zhong-de diwei he
yinyong. (模仿在写作教学中的地位和应用) (The
place and use of models in the teaching of composition). Xiezuo Vol 2: 6-7.
- Chen Wangdao. (陈望道) (1958). Zhongguo Wenfa Gexin Luncong. (中国文法
革新论丛) (Collected articles on innovation in Chinese grammar).
Beijing: Zhongguo Shuju Chubanshe.
- _____. (1980). Chen Wangdao Yuwen Lunji. (陈望道语文论集) (Collected
Works on Language by Chen Wangdao). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- _____. (1985). Chen Wangdao Xiuci Lunji. (陈望道修辞论集) (Collected
Works on Rhetoric by Chen Wangdao). Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- _____. (1988). Xiucixue Fafan. (修辞学发凡) (An Introduction to Rhetoric).
Xianggang Daguang Chubanshe. (First published: 1922).
- Cheng Zhenqiu. (程镇球) (1980). Fanyi Wenti Tansuo. (翻译问题探索) (An
Exploration into the Problems of Translation). Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Dai Lei. (戴磊) (1988). Lun yuti-de fenlei. (论语体的分类) (A discussion
on the classification of styles). Xiuci Xuexi. Vol 1: 5/6/21.
- Di Chen. (邸臣) (1984). Pianzhang xiuci chutan. (篇章修辞初探) (A
preliminary discussion on the rhetoric of text). In Chinese Rhetoric Society's
Xiucixue Lunji (Collected Works on Rhetoric) Vol 2: 289-306. Fujien Renmin
Chubanshe.
- _____. (1990). Xiuci jiaoxue bixu yi yuti wei 'jing' ge xiuci yaosu wei 'wei'.
(修辞教学必须以语体为经各修辞要素为纬) (The teaching
of rhetoric must take genre as the 'warp' and separate key rhetorical factors as
the 'woof'). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 2: 12-14
- Ding Shengshu, Lu Shuxiang, Li Rong (et al.). (丁声树、吕叔湘、李荣) (1963).
Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Jianghua. (现代汉语语法讲话) (Talks on Contemporary Chinese Grammar). Shangwu Yinshuguan.

- Dou Guangyu and Zhu Shixin. (窦光宇、褚士心) (1990). Zuowen Tongbu Zhidao. (作文同步指导) (A Guide to Composition). Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe.
- Feng Guangyi. (冯广艺) (1989). Cong tongyi jiegou chufa-de juzi xiuci yanjiu. (从同义结构出发的句子修辞研究) (A rhetorical study of anacoluthon - sentences of different structures but with similar meanings). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 4: 20-21.
- Feng Youlan. (冯友兰) (1984). Zhongguo Zhexue Shi Xinbian Vol 3. (中国哲学史新编) (A New History of Chinese Philosophy). Renmin Chubanshe.
- Fu Li. (傅力) (1984). Qianhou jiegou huyingju-de xiuci xiaoguo. (前后结构呼应的修辞效果) (The rhetorical effect of 'back-front' coherence). Xiuci Xuexi. Vol 4: 38-39.
- Gu Wen, Zhang Zhigong and Zhang Shoukang. (顾问、张志公、张寿康) (1989). Hanyu Xiuci Ge Da Cidian. (汉语修辞格大辞典) (A Dictionary of Chinese Rhetoric). Zhongguo Guoji Guangbo Chubanshe.
- Hao Zhangliu. (郝长留) (1983). Yudian Zhishi. (语段知识) (Sentence Groups). Beijing Chubanshe.
- Hu Fu and Wen Lian. (胡附、文鍊) (1957). Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Tansuo. (现代汉语语法探索) (Explorations in Contemporary Chinese Grammar). Shanghai: Xin Zhishi Chubanshe.
- Hu Mingliang. (胡明亮) (1991). Qiantan hanyu cixu de pianzhang gongneng. (浅谈汉语词序的篇章功能) (A basic introduction to the textual function of Chinese word order). Yuyan Jiaoxue Yu Yanjiu Vol 3: 81-87.
- Hu Wenshu. (胡文淑) (1960). Xiezu Jichu Zhishi. (写作基础知识) (Fundamentals of Composition). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Hua Hongyi. (华宏仪) (1986). Lianci-de xiuci zuoyong. (连词的修辞作用) (The rhetorical function of connectors). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 5: 20-21.
- Hua Zhang. (华章) (1987). Pianzhang xiuci-de jige wenti. (篇章修辞的几个问题) (Several questions on the rhetoric of text). Xiuci Xuexi. Vol 3: 39-41.
- Huang Qingxuan. (黄庆萱) (1975). Xiuci Xue. (修辞学) (Rhetoric). Taipei: Sanmin Shuju.
- Huang Yongwu. (黄永武) (1986). Ziju Duanlianfa. (字句锤炼法) (Methods of Refining Words and Sentences). Taiwan: Hungfan Shudian Chubanshe.
- Jiang Jinlong. (蒋金龙) (1981). Yanjiang Xiucixue. (演讲修辞学) (Lectures on Rhetoric). Liming Wenhua Shiye Gufen Youxian Gongsi.

- Jiang Ming.(蒋明)(1986). Wenxue fanyi-de hanhua wenti. (文学翻译的汉化问题) (The problem of Chinese-isation in the translation of literature). Xiuci Xuexi, Vol 2: 39-41.
- Kong Deming.(孔德明)(1988). Hanyu xiucixue shi shuolue. (汉语修辞学史说略) (A brief discussion about the history of Chinese rhetoric). In Zhang Zhigong (ed.).
- Li Duanyan.(李端严)(1980). Han yi ying zengjian ciyu wenti-de tantao. (汉译英增减词语问题的探讨) (An inquiry into the question of the addition or omission of words in Chinese-English translation). Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Fuyin Baokan Ziliao, Vol 3: 67-80
- Li Jiayao.(李嘉耀)(1987). Gudai xiuci zhuzuo jianjie. (古代修辞著作简介) (An introduction to works on classical rhetoric). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 1: 21-23.
- Li Jinling and Yi Pu.(李金苓、易蒲)(1987). Wo guo gudai xiuci lilun-de tedian. (我国古代修辞理论的特点) (Characteristics of Chinese classical rhetorical theory). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 1: 18-20.
- Li Jinxi.(黎锦熙)(1924). Xinzhu Guoyu Wenfa. (新著国语文法) (A New Grammar of the National Language). Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Li Jinxi and Liu Shiru.(黎锦熙、刘世儒)(1955). Zhongguo Yufa Jiaocai. (中国语法教材) (Teaching Materials on Chinese Grammar). Wushi Niandai Chubanshe.
- _____(1957a). Hanyu fujie xueshuo de yuanliu he jiejie wenti de fangfa. (汉语复句学说的源流和解决问题的方法) (Methods for the question of the origin and explanation of Chinese compound sentences). Zhongguo Yuwen 60: 9-13
- _____(1957b). Hanyu fujie xintixi de lilun. (汉语复句新体系的理论) (Theory of a new system for Chinese compound sentences). Zhongguo Yuwen 62: 20-24.
- _____(1958). Lianhe Cizu He Lianhe Fujie. (联合词组和联合复句) (Combining Words and Compound sentences). Xin Zhishi Chubanshe.
- Li Xilan.(李锡兰)(1985). Weiqu wanzhuan mianli cangzhen. (委曲婉转 绵里藏针) (Indirectness and diplomacy - a needle hidden in silk). Xiuci Xuexi, Vol 3: 14-16/24.
- Li Yunhan and Zhang Weigeng.(黎运汉、张维耿)(1984). Xiandai Hanyu Xiucixue. (现代汉语修辞学) (The Rhetoric of Contemporary Chinese). Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Li Zuonan and Li Renxiao.(李作南、李仁孝)(1985). Gujin Hanyu Yufa Bijiao. (古今汉语语法比较) (A Comparison of Classical and Modern Chinese Grammar). Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe.

- Lin Chengzhang.(林承璋)(1987). Tanhua hua-de lianguan. (谈话话的
连贯) (Talking about the linking of talk). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 2: 59-62.
- Lin Yuwen.(林裕文)(1983). Pianzheng Fujie. (偏正复句) (Compound
sentences). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe. (first published 1956).
- Lu Bingfu and Jin Lixin.(陆西甫、金立鑫)(1988). Guanyu duozhong fujie-
de cengci wenti. (关于多重复句的层次问题) (Concerning
the question of hierarchy in compound sentences). Hanyu Xuexi Vol 5: 4-7.
- Lu Jiaxiang and Chi Taiting.(陆稼祥、池太宁)(eds.)(1990). Xiuci Fangshi
Lijie Cidian. (修辞方式例解词典) (A Dictionary of
Rhetorical Figures). Zhejiang Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Lü Shuxiang.(吕叔湘)(1989). Lü Shuxiang Zi Xuanji. (吕叔湘自选
集) (Self-Selected Works of Lü Shuxiang). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
_____(1990). Lü Shuxiang Wenji. (吕叔湘文集) (The Collected
Works of Lü Shuxiang). Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Lü Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi.(吕叔湘、朱得熙)(1953). Yufa Xiuci Jianghua.
(语法修辞讲话) (Talks on Grammar and Rhetoric). Zhongguo
Qingnian Chubanshe.
- Ma Zhong.(马忠)(1983). Gudai Hanyu Yufa. (古代汉语语法) (Classical Chinese Grammar). Shandong Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Ni Baoyuan.(倪宝元)(1983). Lianju. (炼句) (Refining Sentences).
Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe
- Ni Xianghe.(倪祥和)(1982). Lun pianzhang jiegou-de xiuci. (论篇章结构的
修辞) (A discussion on the rhetoric of text structure). In Xiucixue
Yanjiu (Studies in Rhetoric) Vol 1: 285-295. Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
_____(1983). Xiuci shoufa yu pianzhang. (修辞手法与篇章) (Rhetorical figures and text). In Xiucixue Yanjiu (Studies in Rhetoric) Vol 2 pp
347-361. Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Pu Kan and Wei Qun.(濮侃、蔚群)(1983). Shilun wo guo gudai xiuci yanjiu-de
tedian. (试论我国古代修辞研究的特点) (An exploratory discussion on the characteristics of the study of classical
Chinese rhetoric). In Xiucixue Yanjiu (Studies in Rhetoric) Vol 2: 111-124.
Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Shen Kaimu.(沈开木)(1985). Duanluo qiantan. (段落浅探) (A brief discussion on paragraphs). Hanyu Xuexi Vol 2: 1-5.
_____(1987). Juduan Fenxi. (句段分析) (An Analysis of Paragraphs).
Yuwen Chubanshe.
- Shi Wen.(施文)(1988). Lianju xitong-de jufa xiuci yanjiu. (炼句系统的句法

修辞研究

(A study of the rhetoric of systematic sentence choice).

Xiuci Xuexi Vol 4: 36-7

Shi Youwei.(史有为)(1988). Guanyu guina he yanyi, yufa he yuyi. (关于归纳和演绎、语法和语义) (On induction and deduction, grammar and meaning). In Zhang Zhigong (ed.).

Song Guangzhong.(宋光中)(1987). Butong shuxin-de butong yuti fengge. (不同书信的不同语体风格) (The different styles of different letters).

Xiuci xuexi Vol 2: 16-17.

Song Zhenhua.(宋振华)(1986). Paibi-de jiegou ji qita. (排比的结构及其它) (The structure of parallelism etc). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 6: 37-38.

Sun Hongwen and Sun Yonglin.(孙洪文、孙永麟)(1986). Liang pian duanwen-de huayuxinxi tujie. (两篇短文的话语信息图解) (An information graph of the language of two short pieces). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 5: 47-48.

Sun Yishan.(孙移山)(1968). Wenzhangxue. (文章学) (The Study of Text). Dangan Chubanshe.

Tang Tao.(唐弢)(1980). Wenzhang Xiuyang. (文章修养) (Mastering Essays). Xianggang Wenxue Yanjiushe.

Wang Dechun.(王得春)(1983a). Xiandai xiucixue-de fazhan qushi. (现代修辞学的发展趋势) (Development trends in contemporary rhetoric). In Xiucixue Yanjiu (Studies in Rhetoric) Vol 2: 72-83. Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

_____(1983 b). Xiucixue Tansuo. (修辞学探索) (An Exploration into Rhetoric). Beijing Chubanshe.

Wang Guangzu and Yang Yinxu.(王光祖、杨明许)(1988). Xiezu. (写作) (Composition). Huadong Shifan Daxue Chubanshe.

Wang Jianlun.(王健伦)(1988). Duozhong fujie-de cengci fenxi yu jianyan. (多重复句的层次分析与检验) (An analysis and examination of hierarchy in compound sentences). Hanyu Xuexi Vol 3: 17-20.

Wang Kaifu and Wu Jilu.(王凯符、吴继路)(1990). Xiezu. (写作) (Composition). Beijing Daxue Chubanshe.

Wang Li.(王力)(1955).(2nd edition). Zhongguo Yufa Lilun. (中国语法理论) (A Theory of Chinese Grammar). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

_____(1957). Hanyu Yufa Gangyao. (汉语语法纲要) (Essentials of Chinese Grammar). Shanghai: Xin Zhishi Chubanshe.

_____(1958). Hanyu Shigao. (汉语史稿) (A Historical Introduction to Chinese). Kexue Chubanshe.

- _____. (1962). Gudai Hanyu. (古代汉语) (Classical Chinese). Beijing: Zhongguo Shuju.
- _____. (1984). Wang Li Wenji. Vol 1 Zhongguo Yufa Lilun. (王力文集 中国语法理论) (The Collected Works of Wang Li. Vol 1 Theory of Chinese Grammar). Shandong Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Wang Xiaoping. (王晓平) (1988). Leibi lunzheng-de yuyan jiegou tese. (类比论证的语言结构特色) (Characteristics of the linguistic structure of analogical argument). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 4: 13-15.
- Wang Yuen. (王聿恩) (1985). Mantan jiejufa. (漫谈接句法) (An informal discussion on ways of sentence connection). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 3: 23-24.
- Wang Zhonglin and Wang Zhibin. (王钟林、王志彬) (1982). Xiuci Yu Xiezu. (修辞与写作) (Rhetoric and Composition). Nei Menggu Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Wu Yingtian. (吴应天) (1988). Wenzhang Jiegouxue. (文章结构学) (The Structure of Text). Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Chubanshe.
- Xia Mianzun. (夏马尊) (1919). (1st edition). Ruhe Xiehao Zuowen. (如何写好作文) (How to Write Good Essays). Xinfeng Wenhua Shiye Gongsi.
- Xia Mianzun and Liu Yanzi. (夏马尊、刘) (1983). Wenzhang Zuofa. (文章作法) (Writing Texts). Zhejiang Wenyi Chubanshe.
- Xia Mianzun and Ye Shangtao. (夏马尊、叶圣陶) (1983). Wenzhang Jianghua. (文章讲话) (Talks on Text). Zhejiang Wenyi Chubanshe.
- _____. (1983). Wenxin. (文心) (The Heart of Language). Zhejiang Wenyi Chubanshe.
- Xie Yaoji. (谢耀基) (1989). Xiandai Hanyu Ouhua Yufa Gailun. (现代汉语欧化语法概论) (An Outline of Western Grammar in Contemporary Chinese). Xianggang: Guangming Tushu Gongsi.
- Xing Fuyi. (邢福义) (1990). Wenhua Yuyanxue. (文化语言学) (Cultural Linguistics). Hubei Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Xu Bingchang. (徐炳昌) (1986). Pianzhang Xiuci. (篇章修辞) (The Rhetoric of Text). Fujian Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Xu Qinting. (徐青庭) (1970). Xiucixue Fawei. (修辞学发微) (An Introduction to Rhetoric). Taiwan: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Yue Zhangjiang. (越章江) (1989). Lijie Gaokao Zuowen Deshi Litan. (历届高考作文得失) (Examples of Good and Bad School Leaving Essays). Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe.

- Zhang Dihua (张涤华) (ed.). (1986). Hanyu Yufa Xiuci Cidian. (汉语语法修辞词典) (A Dictionary of Chinese Grammar and Rhetoric). Anhui Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Zhang Shilu. (张世禄) (1958). Yin wenfa wenti tandao wenyan baihua-de fenjie. (因文法问题谈文言白话的分界) (A discussion on the dividing line between classical and vernacular Chinese). In Chen Wangdao (ed.).
- Zhang Shoukang. (张寿康) (1984). Pianzhang xiucixue fangshi chuyi. (篇章修辞学方式多议) (Humble thoughts on patterns in textual rhetoric). In Xiucixue Lun Wenji (修辞学论文集) (Collected Articles on Rhetoric) Vol 2: 262-268. Fujien Renmin Chubanshe.
- _____. (1985). Wenzhangxue Gailun. (文章学概论) (An Outline of the Study of Text). Shandong Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Zhang Shoukang and Huang Hongxu. (张寿康, 黄宏煦) (1987). Xiuci-de Lilun Yu Shixian. (修辞的理论与实践) (Theory and Practice of Rhetoric). Yuwen Chubanshe.
- Zhang Songyue. (张嵩岳) (1987). Xiou diyibu xiuci xuemingzhu. (西欧第一部修辞学名著) (Western Europe's first famous rhetorical work). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 2: 62-65.
- Zhang Yuanhong. (张远宏) (1987). Pianzhang xiuci yanjiu-zhong-de yige wenti. (篇章修辞研究中的一个问题) (Several questions on the study of textual rhetoric). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 6: 52-53.
- Zhang Zhigong. (张志公) (1957). Hanyu Yufa Changshi. (汉语语法常识) (Basics of Chinese Grammar). Xin Zhishi Chubanshe.
- _____. (ed.). (1982). Xiandai Hanyu. (现代汉语) (Contemporary Chinese). Renmin Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- _____. (ed.). (1988). Yuwen Lunji. (语文论集) Vol 3. (A Collection of Essays on Language). Waiyu Jiaoxue Yu Yanjiu Chubanshe.
- Zheng Wenzhen. (郑文贞) (1982). Duanluo-de yuqi. (段落的语气) (Paragraph tone). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 3: 21-22.
- _____. (1983). Duanluo-de bolan. (段落的波澜) (Paragraph climax). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 3: 27.
- _____. (1984). Pianzhang-de xiuci wenti. (篇章的修辞问题) (Questions of textual rhetoric). In Xiucixue Lun Wenji (修辞学论文集) (Collected Articles on Rhetoric) Vol 2: 269-288. Fujien Renmin Chubanshe.
- _____. (1985). Pianzhang yu guanlian ciyu. (篇章与关联词语) (Text and connectors). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 3: 20-22.

- _____(1985). Duanluo-de Zuzhi. (段落的组织) (The Organisation of Paragraphs). Fujien Renmin Chubanshe.
- _____(1986). Ciyu yu pianzhang. (词语与篇章) (Words and texts). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 6: 37-38
- Zhou Fagao. (周法高) (1961). Zhongguo Gudai Yufa. (中国古代语法) (A Historical Grammar of Ancient Chinese - Part 1, Syntax). Taipei: The Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publications No 39.
- Zhou Zumo. (周祖谟) (1988). Xiezuo yu xiuci. (写作与修辞) (Rhetoric and composition). Xiuci Xuexi Vol 1: 7-8.
- Zhou Zhenfu. (周振甫) (1991). Wenzhang he wenzhang xue (shang). (文章和文章学(上)) (Text and the study of text) (part 1). Xie Zuo Vol 3: 21-22.
- Zhu Binjie. (褚斌杰) (1990). Zhongguo Gudai Wenti Gailun. (中国古代文体概论) (An Outline of Classical Chinese Genres). Beijing daxue Chubanshe
- Zhu Boshi. (朱伯石) (1991). Kaituo gudai xiezuo lilun yanjiu-de xin lingyu. (开拓古代写作理论研究的新领域) (New horizons in the study of classical composition theory). Xie Zuo Vol 1: 16-17
- Zhu Dexi. (朱得熙) (1984). Yufa Xiuci Zuowen. (语法修辞作文) (Grammar, Rhetoric and Composition). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Zhu Zhengpeng and Yang Jingping. (朱正鹏、杨经平) (eds.). (1991). Gaokao Zuowen Xunlian. (高考作文训练) (The Study of School Leaving Essays). Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe.
- Zhu Zinan. (朱子南) (ed.). (1986). Zhongguo Wentixue Cidian. (中国文体学辞典) (A Dictionary of Chinese Genres). Hunan Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Zong Tinghu. (宗廷虎) (1985). Xiuci Xinlun. (修辞新论) (A New Theory of Rhetoric). Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.