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Abstract

This dissertation carries out a linguistic analysis of three selected morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese using a corpus of spoken data. It aims to contribute to a better understanding of Mandarin Chinese grammar by making two quite different contributions to the body of research.

Firstly, it provides a reconceptualised analysis of the existing literature on morpho-syntactic language change in Modern Standard Chinese, which is presented both diagrammatically and in textual form. The reconceptualisation of previous findings reveals some important and interesting correlations and connections that were not immediately obvious from the existing literature, owing to the disparate and ad hoc nature in which they have often been presented. It is hoped that a flow-on effect of this unified classification schema will be to encourage a more systematic, organised and manageable approach to conducting and reporting on future research into Chinese morpho-syntactic language change.

The second contribution is a detailed grammatical analysis of selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese, which is carried out using a corpus of spoken data assembled especially for the purposes of this research. The corpus consists of transcripts of the chat show ‘A Date with Luyu’ broadcast between January and September 2011, and totals over 500,000 characters in size. The three features selected for this study are the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. These three features have been the topic of a substantial quantity of previous research; however, it was felt that certain aspects of their use had not been explored or explained sufficiently. And indeed, the data analysis in this thesis shows that previous analyses of the use of the three morpho-syntactic features under investigation have generally been incomplete or inadequate in some way. It is hoped that the fine-grained analysis of empirical data undertaken in this thesis will add to the growing body of corpus-based and data-driven research in encouraging other linguists interested in exploring issues in Mandarin grammar to conduct further research adopting a similar approach.

Careful and systematic examination of the data reveals that the particular linguistic features under discussion are both less sensitive to a number of constraints outlined in the mainstream literature and, at the same time, more responsive to a range of different
contextual factors, many of which seem to have been overlooked in previous treatments of Mandarin grammar. In particular, it is found that many non-grammatical factors play a role in determining the behaviour of the three selected morpho-syntactic features. The analysis also demonstrates that spoken data can reveal interesting insights into the complexity of the grammatical system, insights that may possibly not be so readily apparent on the basis of written texts alone. This suggests that other morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese could likewise benefit from a detailed analysis of their behaviour in spoken interactions.
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1. Introduction

From the late nineteenth century and especially in the last 70 years, there have been many treatments of Mandarin Chinese grammar.¹ Some of the better known and more influential contributions to our understanding of Mandarin Chinese grammar include, in chronological order, Ma Jianzhong’s *Ma Shi Wen Tong (Mr Ma’s Grammar)*, appearing in 1898; Wang Li’s *Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa (Modern Chinese Grammar)* and *Zhongguo Yufa Lilun (Chinese Grammar Theory)*, with the first editions of both titles published in 1943; Lü Shuxiang’s *Zhongguo Wenfa Yaolüe (An Outline of Chinese Grammar)*, first appearing in 1944; Chao Yuen Ren’s *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*, published in 1968; and Li and Thompson’s *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*, released in 1981. In recent decades, there has been a burgeoning interest in specific grammatical features, and a range of publications dealing with various aspects of the morphology and syntax of Mandarin Chinese have appeared. This does not mean, however, that the overwhelming majority of definitions, classifications and analyses presented in the literature on Mandarin Chinese grammar – or more generally Chinese grammar – have been uncontroversial. On the contrary, numerous key issues are still largely unresolved, for instance on the questions of whether Chinese is essentially a monosyllabic or polysyllabic language (cf. DeFrancis, 1984; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; Lin, 2001; Norman, 1988); whether the fundamental structure of Chinese sentences is topic-comment or subject-predicate (cf. Kubler, 1985b; LaPolla, 1995; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; Lin, 2001; Ross, 2011; Tsao, 1979); whether certain frequently used morphemes in derivational processes should be classified as affixes, affixoids, combining forms or common compositional components (cf. Jun Ding, 2012); whether the word class of adjectives is appropriate to describe Mandarin Chinese or whether such words would be more properly defined as adjectival verbs or even stative verbs (cf. Chao, 1968; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; Paul, 2010; Ross, 2011). Nor does it mean that questions regarding the behaviour of individual morpho-syntactic elements and structures have necessarily been explored and answered to the complete satisfaction of those concerned. The morpheme *le*, to cite one well-known example, is notorious for defying all attempts to describe its function or functions adequately. Variousy described as a sentence particle, a change-of-state marker, a

¹ Note that these grammatical analyses did not always specifically refer to the language under discussion as Mandarin Chinese. Quite often, it was simply referred to as Chinese.
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verb-final suffix, a marker of actual aspect or actuality, a completive aspect marker, a perfective aspect suffix, a perfective marker and even an imperfective marker (cf. C.-C. Chen, 2009; Klein, Li, & Hendriks, 2000; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; Mangione & Li, 1993; Smith, 1991; C. Sun, 2006; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004), linguists are yet to come up with a satisfactory account of its behaviour in all contexts. The ubiquitous structural particle de is another example of a Chinese grammatical enigma. Notwithstanding the fact that it is extremely useful in linking modifiers of various kinds to the head noun in noun phrases, there is no general agreement on the most appropriate terminology or classifications to apply either to de itself or to the structures it is instrumental in forming, nor is there even consensus on how many different types of de there are (cf. Cheung, 2012; Jun Ding, 2012; C. Feng, 1990; Yen-Hui Audrey Li, 2012; Lu, 2003; Paul, 2012; Ross, 1983; Shi, 2008; Simpson & Wu, 2002). Considering that Modern Standard Chinese is the official language or one of the official languages of several countries, including the most populous nation on earth, and considering that Mandarin Chinese boasts more native speakers than any other language in the world, these are fairly fundamental issues that have yet to be resolved.

Before discussing the research questions and the methodology for this particular research project, it will be necessary to set the scene by providing some background information about the “genetics” and typology of the Chinese language and about Chinese philological and linguistic research.

1.1. Background

This introductory section starts by clarifying the place of Chinese in the family tree. This includes an explication of the genetic relationship of Chinese to other languages, as well as a discussion of the internal structure of the Chinese language family, including Chinese and its many subvarieties. The section goes on to elucidate some details relevant to the typology of Chinese. It also includes a brief outline of the history of Chinese philology before providing an overview of the current state of research within the narrower field of the morphology and syntax of Mandarin Chinese.

1.1.1. The place of Chinese in the family tree

Chinese is generally considered to be a member of the Tibeto-Burman language family, sometimes referred to as the Sino-Tibetan family (P. Chen, 1999, p. 1; DeFrancis, 1984, pp.
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It is thus genetically related to Tibetan, Burmese and a number of other languages in and around the southern and southwest border region of present-day China. Of these, it is generally held that Tibetan is its closest linguistic relative. Although many lexical borrowings from Chinese can be found in other East-Asian languages, notably Korean, Japanese and Vietnamese, these are not genetically related to Chinese (DeFrancis, 1984).

In recent decades there has been some discussion as to whether the term “Chinese” refers to a single language of many dialects or to a family of languages. Traditionally, sinologists both in China and in the West have tended to refer to the major Chinese varieties such as Mandarin and Cantones as “dialects,” often without even acknowledging that the degree of linguistic variation amongst different Chinese “dialects” is significantly greater than that encountered within almost any other single language that is likely to be familiar to the reader. And in fact, a number of Western linguists have chosen to view Chinese as a language family rather than a single language (e.g. Bloomfield, 1933; Hock & Joseph, 1996, p. 107; Kubler, 1985a, pp. 17-18; Ramsey, 1987, p. 7). This has drawn criticism in China from a number of notable linguists (DeFrancis, 1984, p. 227).

There has been much discussion about the correct terminology to use in referring to the many different varieties of Chinese (e.g. P. Chen, 1999; Forrest, 1973; Norman, 1988). For the purposes of the present research, it has been decided for both practical and theoretical reasons to consider Chinese a language family, rather than a single language. Thus, the term “Sinitic languages” is used to distinguish between the major subgroups of Chinese, of which Beifanghua (or Mandarin), Yue (or Cantonese), Wu (the branch that includes Shanghainese),

---

2 Bloomfield (1933, p. 44) stated that “the term Chinese denotes a family of mutually unintelligible languages”. Even more pointedly, Hock and Joseph (1996, p. 107) noted that “[a]lthough it is customary to speak of ‘the’ Chinese language, in fact there are numerous Chinese languages (often, but erroneously, called dialects) which in their spoken form are mutually unintelligible.” Similarly, Kubler (1985a, pp. 17-18) observed that “given a different political or geographic situation, they could just as easily be termed ‘languages’ (compare the Chinese situation with French and Italian, on the one hand, or with German and Dutch, on the other, neither of which is more divergent from the other than are any of the Chinese ‘dialects’ from each other).” This comment was echoed by Ramsey (1987, p. 7) who wrote that “[f]rom a linguistic point of view, the Chinese ‘dialects’ could be considered different languages, just as French and Italian are”, while at least one Chinese linguist has conceded that “it is no wonder that they are more often than not referred to as separate languages by linguists” (P. Chen, 1999, p. 204 endnote).

3 In fact, Mandarin is more correctly a translation of the Chinese Guanhua (“official language”). However, the term Mandarin is now used more commonly in English to refer to the main subgroup of Chinese spoken predominantly in the north of the country, namely that subgroup referred to in Chinese as Beifanghua.
Min (a southern variety of which is also spoken in Taiwan and is often referred to as “Taiwanese”) and Kejia (or Hakka) are probably the best known. Within each Sinitic language, there are of course a number of different dialects, each with its characteristic pronunciation, vocabulary, idioms and even (to a lesser extent) word order and syntax. Thus, for example, the Beifanghua spoken in Tianjin is quite similar to that spoken in Harbin but very different from that spoken in Chengdu.

It was decided to use the term Mandarin to refer to all varieties of Beifanghua and to modify it with descriptors to make it clear which variety of Mandarin is being referred to. For example, local varieties will be referred to as Beijing Local Mandarin (aka. Beijing fangyan), Chengdu Local Mandarin, Taiwan Local Mandarin (aka. Taiwan Guoyu) etc. Standard varieties will be referred to as Mainland Standard Mandarin (aka. Putonghua), Taiwan Standard Mandarin (aka. Guoyu), Singapore Standard Mandarin (aka. Huayu) etc.

The practical reasons are that this simplifies the terminology used to refer to the different varieties of Chinese, at the same time making it possible to contrast differences between dialects on the one hand with differences between languages on the other. Thus, for example, differences between Harbin Local Mandarin, Kunming Local Mandarin and Shandong Local Mandarin or differences between the southern Min spoken in Fujian province and that spoken in Taiwan are, according to the definition applied here, dialectal ones. As might be expected, dialectal differences in pronunciation and vocabulary, although frequently considerable, nevertheless do not generally pose an insurmountable barrier to communication. Of course, mutual intelligibility is not always a necessary precondition for the establishment of a dialectal relationship. Just as a speaker of Jamaican English and a speaker of Scottish English might experience considerable difficulty communicating with one another, so too a Mandarin-speaking traveller from Taipei encountering someone from Chengdu might find oral communication well nigh impossible, even though both, according to the definition applied here, speak dialects of the same language (Mandarin, or Beifanghua). By contrast, differences between Mandarin and Cantonese or between Shanghainese and Hakka for

---

4 There is some controversy with regard to the number of subgroups or Sinitic languages that should be distinguished; however, it is not necessary to discuss that question in detail here.

5 The designations preferred for these three varieties of Chinese in the present study are Tianjin Local Mandarin, Harbin Local Mandarin and Chengdu Local Mandarin respectively. The reader is referred to the discussion in the following paragraph for further clarification.
instance, being (according to the current definition) differences between languages, are linguistically greater and manifest themselves not only in the phonology and lexicon but also in the grammar: sentence structure, word order, use of measure words etc. As might be expected, speakers of different Chinese languages are rarely able to communicate with each other in their own language but must instead resort to some version of standard Mandarin or even English if they are to avoid spending the entire conversation tracing Chinese characters in the air.

The theoretical justification for treating Chinese as a language family is in part based on the type and extent of linguistic variation across the Chinese-speaking region (as indicated in the discussion of the practical reasons above) and in part on the refutation of considerations often given in support of the analysis of Chinese as a single language. To begin with, the term “Chinese” is used in the vernacular in much the same way as Japanese, Vietnamese, English etc., reinforcing the tacit assumption that Chinese, too, is a single language. However, this is merely a matter of convention and is of no linguistic relevance. Also, it is an undisputed fact that all varieties of Chinese evolved from a common origin. Again, from a linguistic point of view, this consideration has no bearing on the issue. Romance languages like French, Spanish, Italian and Romanian are all descendents of a common ancestor (Latin), yet this does not lead people to claim that they are today still dialects of the same language.

One aspect which is often explicitly raised in linguistic discussions on the topic (e.g. P. Chen, 1999; Lin, 2001) is the supposedly uniform writing system, with some authors claiming that all varieties of Chinese share a common writing system and others claiming that only Mandarin, as the standard language, has a writing system while the remaining Chinese varieties do not. There are three points that might be raised in response to this. Firstly, because Chinese script is not phonetic, it is possible for many different spoken varieties to use the same writing system, “allowing the Chinese to look upon the Chinese language as being more uniform and unchanging than it actually [is]” (Norman, 1988, p. 1). In fact, even Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese made use of the Chinese writing system for several centuries before developing their own system of writing either to augment or to replace the Chinese characters. Clearly, it would be absurd to claim that Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese are or ever have been dialects of Chinese. Secondly, it has been observed that the system of writing employed in Hong Kong in certain genres, notably pornography and some comic books, is quite different from written Modern Standard Chinese (Shi, 2006). Even
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Some quite mainstream, major newspapers sometimes make use of different, non-standard characters. Not only are many syntactic structures different, numerous new characters have also been devised to express in writing Cantonese words for which there is apparently no equivalent in Mandarin (Shi, 2006, p. 300). This throws into doubt the claim that there is only one writing system in Chinese (cf. also J. Liu & Tao, 2012). Thirdly, in some cases there is not even a generally accepted way of representing some varieties of Chinese in characters, even within the particular speech community itself. For example, although Southern Min as spoken in Taiwan can be represented using a combination of standard and non-standard orthographic elements, this representation is not completely formalised or standardised, even within Taiwan. Moreover, written forms of Southern Min sometimes have to resort to phonetic representations (either characters used purely for their phonetic value or other phonetic symbols) that contravene the semantic-phonetic or phono-logographic principle underlying most standard Chinese writing.

All in all, there are many arguments which might lead one to conclude that “[t]he modern Chinese dialects are really more like a family of languages” (Norman, 1988, p. 1). In the remainder of this thesis, Mandarin, Cantonese, Shanghainese etc. will be treated as distinct Sinitic languages belonging to one language family (i.e. Chinese) and Mainland Standard Mandarin, Taiwan Standard Mandarin, Beijing Local Mandarin etc. as dialects of the same language (i.e. Mandarin).

In an additional clarification of terms under discussion, Mainland Standard Mandarin is defined in this study as the spoken standard promoted by the central government in Beijing, often referred to as Putonghua. As P. Chen (1999) points out, different groups of people aspire to attaining different levels of proficiency in Putonghua, or Mainland Standard Mandarin. Only a relatively small proportion of the population in certain professions like television and radio newsreaders aim for the highest, most standard level of proficiency. School teachers of Chinese would normally be satisfied with the second level of proficiency, while those wishing merely to communicate with speakers of other Chinese varieties generally content themselves with the third level of proficiency (cf. P. Chen, 1999, p. 45). In

---

6 According to Jun Wang (1995), the official 1956 definition of Putonghua read as follows: “Putonghua takes Beijing pronunciation as its standard pronunciation, the Northern dialects as its base dialect, and exemplary literary works in Baihua (“vernacular literary language”) as its grammatical model.”
this study a slightly narrower definition of the term Mainland Standard Mandarin is employed, such that it is understood to apply only to the first two levels of proficiency of *Putonghua*.\(^7\) The third level of proficiency is designated “Local Mandarin” (cf. P. Chen (1999, p. 42) “local *putonghua*”). Thus, Mainland Standard Mandarin is contrasted with a number of other kinds of Mandarin, such as Beijing Local Mandarin, which features extensive use of rhotacisation as well as some local slang (P. Chen, 1999; Q. Zhang, 2005); Shanghai Local Mandarin, which displays significant non-standard pronunciation influenced by the local Wu language (P. Chen, 1999); and Taiwan Standard Mandarin, which recommends different pronunciations (tonal and/or phonetic) of certain characters (P. Chen, 1999) and distinguishes itself lexically from Mainland Standard Mandarin in some technical and everyday terminology (P. Chen, 1999).

The designation Modern Standard Chinese has come to be used quite widely in the literature in place of what would previously have been called Mandarin, *Putonghua* or *Guoyu*. In educational institutions the term tends to be used for both the spoken and written standards; this is the sense in which it is used here. However, in line with general usage, the term is employed more loosely than the designations for purely spoken varieties.\(^8\) Allowing for relatively minor variations across the large geographical area in which it is used, written Modern Standard Chinese has reasonably standardised lexicon, morphology and syntax, with the greatest variation probably observable in the lexicon. In spoken Modern Standard Chinese there are additional standards governing pronunciation.

### 1.1.2. Typology of Chinese

Classical Chinese is generally considered to have been the epitome of an isolating or analytic language: not only was there no grammatical morphology, there was hardly any derivational

---

\(^7\) In that sense, MSM could be likened to the particular version of *Putonghua* known in Mainland China as *Biaozhun Putonghua* (“standard common language”).

\(^8\) While this study distinguishes in the spoken standard between, for example, Mainland Standard Mandarin, Taiwan Standard Mandarin (aka. *Guoyu*) and Singapore Standard Mandarin (aka. *Huayu*), it is assumed with P. Chen (1999) that all three are acceptable – if not equally weighted – versions of spoken Modern Standard Chinese. Likewise, it is assumed that the written standards in Mainland China and Taiwan are similar enough for both to be subsumed under the designation of Modern Standard Chinese. In fact, even standard written Chinese in places like Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia, although in some cases diverging more substantially from the standard upheld in Beijing, would nevertheless generally be considered to be versions of Modern Standard Chinese (cf. P. Chen (1999) “Modern Written Chinese”). This of course implies that Modern Standard Chinese can be written using traditional or simplified characters.
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morphology either, resulting in a language in which almost all the words were monomorphemic (P. Chen, 1999, p. 68; Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 22-25; Norman, 1988, p. 84). Owing to the close correspondence between the morpheme and the syllable, this also meant that Classical Chinese was monosyllabic. Modern Chinese can be described, if not as monomorphemic or monosyllabic, at least still as basically morpho-syllabic; that is to say, although not all words are monosyllabic, almost all morphemes are (Norman, 1988; cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 442). The evolution of the language has resulted in Modern Chinese possessing numerous possibilities for derivational morphology; nevertheless it remains true that there is very little inflexional morphology (Karlgren, 1971[1929]; Norman, 1988, p. 159; Ramsey, 1987, pp. 49-51). In other words, although affixes are frequently used to change or modify meaning, they generally do not function as grammatical markers (cf. Norman, 1988, p. 159). Thus word order is critical in determining the grammatical function of sentence elements (Karlgren, 1971[1929]; Ramsey, 1987, p. 66).

1.1.3. History of interest in Chinese linguistics

As regards the history of Chinese philology, while phonology, lexicography and orthography have long been important focuses of study, grammar has only relatively recently started to attract scholarly interest (cf. Norman, 1988, p. 152). Prior to the nineteenth century, evidence of Chinese preoccupation with phonology is to be found in the printing of various rhyme books and with lexicography and orthography in the publication of dictionaries, which initially (i.e. up to the early Han period) contained only lists of synonyms and later (from the late Han) included pronunciation as well.

The earliest western influence on the study of Chinese grammar probably came from western missionaries like Francisco Varo; his Arte de la lengua mandarina (Grammar of the Mandarin Language), published in 1703, provided an analysis of Chinese on the basis of Latin grammar. Another influential grammarian was Georg von der Gabelentz, who published Chinesische Grammatik (Chinese Grammar) in 1881. However, it was not until 1898 that the first major publication of Chinese grammar written by a Chinese person appeared: Ma Shi Wen Tong (Mr Ma’s Grammar). Ma Jianzhong and his brother were the first Chinese grammarians to attempt to categorise the Chinese lexicon into different word

9 L. Wang (1984[1943]-b, p. 442) cites transliterations as the major exception to this.
classes (in the western sense). They did so by analysing sentence examples from texts written in Classical Chinese, that being the standard written language in the nineteenth century. It is only since then that Chinese linguists have concerned themselves with the question of Chinese word classes, a problem which has turned out to be anything but straightforward (Norman, 1988, p. 157). The Ma brothers’ analysis was strongly influenced by traditional Western grammar (Norman, 1988, p. 152). Indeed, most early analyses of Chinese grammar were heavily influenced by grammatical analyses of European languages, tending on the whole to merely supplant the more – and even less – common European word classes and grammatical structures onto Chinese sentences. This early approach has proved hard to shake off entirely, and there has been a pervasive western influence on most Chinese interpretations of Chinese grammar since.

It is against this background of the typology of Chinese and its genetic relationships to the languages around it that we now turn to recent research into Chinese syntax and morphology. Note that the last one hundred years of Chinese linguistics is here treated in three phases after Hu (2006, p. 53), who divides research in this field into the early, middle and late periods: 1914-1949, 1950-1990 and 1991 to the present.

It was in the years immediately following World War I that recent developments in Chinese syntax and morphology first became a topic of general interest in Chinese linguistic circles (W. Chen, 2005, p. 85; Hu, 2006, p. 53). Although new developments in Chinese language use had been observed as early as the second half of the nineteenth century, it was not until these trends accelerated rapidly in the wake of the May Fourth Movement as part of the Baihua Movement that morpho-syntactic change in Chinese came to be an active field of research (W. Chen, 2005, p. 85; Hu, 2006, p. 53). The early period saw an emphasis on the so-called “Europeanisation” of Chinese grammar, with a focus on literature as the arena of language change. At that time, the developments observed were the subject of lively debate, with most linguists apparently embracing the changes and even arguing for faster and more widespread adoption of linguistic features typical of European languages (W. Chen, 2005, p.

---

10 The May Fourth Movement was a cultural, political and nationalistic movement triggered by student protests in Beijing on 4th May 1919 that were ostensibly a response to the Chinese government’s cowed acceptance of unfavourable conditions set out in the Treaty of Versailles. The movement repudiated many traditional Chinese cultural values, especially Confucianism, urged the selective application of western ideas and challenged the authority of the political and intellectual elites. The Baihua (lit. ‘plain speech’) Movement promoted the use of a vernacular writing style in place of the Classical literary language known as Wenyan.
Introduction

By the latter years of the republic, the now accepted fact of the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar was a matter of some controversy, with some linguists welcoming this phenomenon and others bemoaning it (W. Chen, 2005, p. 85).

One of the most influential researchers in the field of Chinese language change, even today, came from this early period. Wang Li first published Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa (Modern Chinese Grammar) and Zhongguo Yufa Lilun (Chinese Grammar Theory), two treatises on contemporary Chinese grammar, including recent developments in Chinese, as early as 1943, with later editions published in 1950, 1954 and 1985. Another ground-breaking work that first appeared in the 1940s was Lü Shuxiang’s Zhongguo Wenfa Yaoliüe (An Outline of Chinese Grammar). In contrast to the Ma brothers, neither Lü nor Wang tried to squeeze Chinese into the classical Western mould, but instead analysed Chinese grammar on its own terms. Both linguists highlighted the unique features of Chinese grammar, and both proved very influential (Norman, 1988, pp. 152-153). Selected aspects of Wang Li’s contribution to the field will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. In 1948 Chao Yuen Ren’s Mandarin Primer became the first English-language treatment of Chinese grammar written by a Chinese person. A Chinese-language version of the same was published under the title Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Jianghua (Introduction to Modern Chinese Grammar).

Research during the middle period saw a slight shift in research focus while maintaining the same source of language examples. Although the interest in Chinese linguistics broadened in the early decades of the Communist era to include lexical developments, linguists continued to turn in the main to literary works as the medium in which these changes could be observed (cf. Hu, 2006, p. 53). Chao Yuen Ren improved on his earlier English-language publication with the even more comprehensive reference work A Grammar of Spoken Chinese, which appeared in 1968.

In the most recent period, research into morpho-syntactic developments in Chinese, although continuing to make advances, has been outpaced by research into loanwords, which are being studied with increasing enthusiasm (Hu, 2006, p. 53). This research emphasis has coincided with a substantial wave of lexical borrowings in the last 30 years since the introduction of the ‘open door’ policy of economic and social reform (cf. Jianchuan Ding & Hao, 2002; H. Guo, 2002b; W. Guo, 2005; Jiang, 1999; Z. Tang, 2003). The main source of language examples is no longer literature but newspaper articles and increasingly cyber language, and there has even been a move towards quantitative statistical analysis (Hu, 2006, p. 53). The
investigation of morpho-syntactic changes in Modern Standard Chinese continues to excite much interest and controversy in linguistic circles, with some linguists and grammarians welcoming the observed linguistic trends and others bemoaning them. Chinese experts on historical linguistics are as divided on the question of the causes as they are on the felicity or otherwise of the results: some have tried to explain the developments primarily in terms of the internal evolution of Chinese; others have looked first to external influences, i.e. contact with other languages.

Despite the preoccupation in the Chinese-language literature with language change in general and loanwords in particular, a substantial number of synchronic analyses of various aspects of Mandarin Chinese syntax and morphology have appeared in Chinese and western languages in the last three decades, along with numerous Chinese grammar textbooks (e.g. Loar, 2011; Ross & Ma, 2006; Yip & Rimmington, 2006). Some of these studies have used language corpora – mostly of written data, but occasionally also of spoken data – as the basis for their analysis. This research has contributed significantly to our understanding of how and why Modern Standard Chinese grammar functions as it does; how it fits into general linguistic models and theories; and what makes it unique. Nevertheless, it has been observed that the overall picture of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax remains “piecemeal and limited” (Lin, 2001, p. 121).

In summary, numerous morpho-syntactic observations of language use during the twentieth century have been noted, discussed and analysed in the literature on Chinese linguistics, with the majority of studies on the topic published in Chinese but an increasing number published in non-Chinese languages (Iljic, 2001; Klein et al., 2000; Paul & Whitman, 2008; Ross, 1998; Simpson & Wu, 2002; R. Xiao, McEnery, & Qian, 2006 and many others). One interesting feature of the Chinese-language literature is the prevailing tendency towards prescriptivism. It is quite common to find linguists passing judgment on the observations they make and contributing their mite to discussions on language planning. Another interesting feature of the literature in general is that only in the last two decades or so has research into spoken Chinese started to attract any significant interest within the field; however, the overwhelming majority of publications on the topic of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax continue to draw their examples either from written texts or from native speaker introspection.
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1.1.4. Need for research into the spoken language

It can be seen from the preceding discussion that there is a significant body of research on morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese. However, research into this field has to date concentrated predominantly on the written language. Although it is not entirely clear why this should be the case, there are a number of possible explanations for this emphasis in the literature on Chinese linguistics. Firstly, written Chinese is more or less standard across a large geographic area; it is used (with minor variations) throughout Greater China and the diaspora, while the spoken language includes many varieties, a large number of which are mutually unintelligible.\textsuperscript{11} Secondly, the written language is generally considered by most Chinese speakers as in some sense superior to or more important than the spoken language, a view which may have something to do with the long, continuous, recorded history of the written language and the wealth of venerable works that form part of China’s literary tradition.\textsuperscript{12} As such, the written language tends to be deemed by Chinese linguists a more worthy object of research than the spoken language.

Whatever the reasons may be, there has been relatively little investigation to date of morpho-syntactic features of spoken Modern Standard Chinese. Notwithstanding the widely held reservations in this respect, there is an obvious need for this oversight to be remedied.

There are several reasons why it is important to conduct research into the spoken as well as the written language. Firstly, spoken language is at the forefront of language usage. It is probably fair to say that spoken interactions are (still) the primary arena of language use: spoken forms are uttered every day by everyone in the speech community. As such, the spoken language is certainly representative of real-life language use and thus a valid object of research. Crowdy (1993) states that “the importance of conversational dialogue to linguistic study is unquestionable: it is the dominant component of general language both in terms of language reception and language production.”

\textsuperscript{11} The term “variety” is used here in preference to “language” or “dialect”. As discussed in section 1.1.1 above, the orthodox view within China itself is that Chinese is a single language, with one version of Mandarin (i.e. Putonghua, or Modern Standard Chinese) being the standard language, whilst all other types of Chinese (e.g. Cantonese, Hokkien, Hakka etc.) are dialects. Amongst non-Chinese linguists, the more widely held view is that Chinese is a family of languages, with Mandarin, Cantonese, Hokkien, Hakka and several others all having the status of independent but related languages.

\textsuperscript{12} Refer to the discussion in section 2.1.2 on the unifying role of written Chinese in Chinese culture.
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Perhaps for this reason, spoken language is, indeed, the primary object of linguistic research in many other languages. It would thus seem out of keeping with the general trend in linguistics for research in Mandarin Chinese to concentrate on the written language almost to the exclusion of the spoken language. Focusing more on the spoken language will bring the literature on Chinese linguistics into line with research in other languages.

At the same time, analysis of the morpho-syntax of spoken Modern Standard Chinese will bring the research in this field up-to-date with respect to Mandarin Chinese as it is used in the twenty-first century. It has been pointed out that when differences can be perceived between written and spoken language use, more often than not it is the spoken, not the written form that represents an innovation (Collins, 2011; cf. D. Wu, Qin, & Ng, 2004). Closely related to this general principle is the observation that many languages are currently undergoing “colloquialisation”; that is, the written language is becoming more similar to the spoken language, both lexically and grammatically. This implies that for linguists to concentrate on written Modern Standard Chinese to the exclusion of its spoken form(s) is to remain forever a step or two behind the latest stage of development. Conversely, a shift in focus within the field of Chinese linguistics will expand the context of research not only to reflect more accurately current language use within the speech community across a wider range of situations, registers and styles, but also to promote a better understanding of the direction in which new linguistic trends might possibly be progressing.

Last but not least, it goes without saying that although the written and spoken forms of any given language are closely related and in most cases quite similar, they are in fact not exactly the same. There will always be some differences between written and spoken language use, and it is precisely on account of these differences that it is essential for linguists to recognise the impossibility of gaining a comprehensive overview of the operation of any language (any language, that is, that has a writing system) without studying both written and spoken usage.

---

13 In a paper presented at the Free Linguistics Conference 2011, Peter Collins pointed out that “speech to writing ratios provide some insight as to what might be happening diachronically”. The inference was that, in cases where there were significant differences between the frequencies of a given linguistic feature in the spoken and the written data, the spoken data demonstrated a later evolutionary stage and the written data an earlier evolutionary stage of the language in question. Again, extrapolating from this statement, it was to be supposed that the written use of the particular feature under examination might well soon develop to the stage represented by the spoken data. Whether the same assumptions can be made in the case of Mandarin Chinese is a question that requires further investigation.
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1.2. Statement of the problems

There is a clear need to gain a better and more up-to-date understanding of how the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese works. This entails a more fine-grained analysis of certain selected morpho-syntactic structures in a range of contexts and across a range of genres.

In order to understand how the analysis of individual morpho-syntactic features fits into the overall picture, however, it is necessary to gain a comprehensive overview of the type and the extent of the morpho-syntactic observations that have been made in Modern Standard Chinese in recent years. Thus the first question to be addressed in this thesis is the extent to which the morphology and syntax of Modern Standard Chinese in both its spoken and written forms have been investigated in recent decades, and what findings have been brought to light. Particularly within the subfield of morpho-syntactic language change it is noticeable that although numerous researchers have attempted to categorise the linguistic developments they have observed, there has to date been no single overarching system that has been generally adopted. Thus, there is an obvious problem in that since the introduction of the ‘open door’ policy in the People’s Republic of China roughly 30 years ago (which is the time period which has seen the most intense interest in this field), although a large quantity of material has been published, it is not easy for newcomers to the field to gain a clear and up-to-date overview of the most important and most relevant research findings.¹⁴

The second and overriding problem is that touched on above, namely that the description and analysis of individual morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese contained in the mainstream literature seem in many cases to be somewhat less than adequate. That is, the treatment in authoritative grammar references of certain key features and grammatical structures of Modern Standard Chinese does not always explain all aspects of their behaviour in all situations and contexts. Clearly, if the goal is to gain a better understanding of the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese in toto, an important first step is to embark on a more detailed and insightful analysis of the individual features that make up that grammar.

¹⁴ This particular time period has been chosen because of the (sometimes underlying, sometimes overt) assumption in the literature that more significant linguistic changes have taken place in line with the significant social, political and cultural upheavals that have ensued (e.g. H. Guo, 2002b; W. Guo, 2005; Ye He, 2004; cf. J. Liu & Tao, 2012). Hence, the last three decades not only represent a historically discrete phase, they have also borne witness to linguistic developments that distinguish themselves from earlier periods in kind and/or extent.
1.3. Research questions

The central aim of this thesis is to contribute to a better understanding of the morpho-syntax of Modern Standard Chinese, and in particular of the way Mandarin Chinese grammar operates in spoken interactions. To this end, three morpho-syntactic features of interest have been selected: the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. These three features were chosen because although they have each been the subject of a considerable amount of research already, it seemed that certain questions remained unresolved, and it was thought that findings from spoken data might be able to make a useful contribution to the ongoing discussion.

This thesis sets out to provide solutions for and/or answers to the following questions:

1. How can the morpho-syntactic findings contained in the literature on Modern Standard Chinese language change over the last 30 years best be classified and organised?
2. To what extent does the linguistic behaviour of three selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese, as observed in spoken contexts, conform to or deviate from the analysis of these features in standard grammar references, and what are the possible explanations for any such discrepancies?
3. What are the implications of the morpho-syntactic findings arising from this research (a) for the study of Mandarin Chinese grammar and (b) for various branches of linguistics?

1.4. Methodology

This thesis sets out in the first instance to devise an overarching system of categorisation for the morphological and syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese that have been noted by previous researchers over the past 30 years, since the implementation of China’s ‘open door’ policy. The second broad aim is to conduct original grammatical research in identifying, describing, categorising and analysing the behaviour of selected morpho-syntactic features evident in Modern Standard Chinese.

The starting point for investigation will be the morpho-syntactic observations noted by previous researchers with respect primarily to the written language; it is hoped that it will be possible to complement some of these by conducting research into spoken data. The identification, description, categorisation and analysis will be carried out on a systematically collated corpus of spoken language data, thus providing a methodologically and theoretically
Introduction

sound foundation upon which to make observations and draw conclusions. For the purposes of this research, the source of spoken Modern Standard Chinese language examples is chat shows produced in Beijing in 2011.

This thesis starts by developing a comprehensive framework for analysing morphological and syntactic developments in written and spoken Modern Standard Chinese. On the basis of a number of gaps and inconsistencies brought to light by the morpho-syntactic schema proposed, the thesis then goes on to analyse specific features of spoken Mandarin in an attempt to supplement the body of findings already in existence in a targeted and systematic way.

1.4.1. Step one: morpho-syntactic schema

1.4.1.1. Why the need for documentation and reconceptualisation of previous research findings?

A substantial proportion of the observations and findings of previous researchers pertaining to morpho-syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese has been presented in an ad hoc, disorderly fashion. Although numerous interesting points are made, it is often difficult or at least tedious to sift through the data to find them. There is clearly a need for an overarching, unified system of classification that incorporates all the observations to date.

Individual researchers, particularly those working in the specialised field of morpho-syntactic language change, tend to use their own categories and classifications, which may on occasion be inconsistent, irrelevant, illogical or incomplete.\(^{15}\) Again, there is a need for existing classification systems to be reconceptualised so that they can be applied in a uniform manner to all existing research findings, as well as to any new findings that may emerge.

This thesis will draw from previous approaches in proposing a more comprehensive morpho-syntactic schema. The grammar of Mandarin Chinese is a fascinating and fruitful field of study, and it is obvious that morpho-syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese have generated a great deal of interest amongst linguists, judging by the wealth of

\(^{15}\) Refer to the discussion in section 1.4.1.2 for examples of inconsistency, irrelevance, illogicality and incompleteness in the recent literature on morpho-syntactic structures in Modern Standard Chinese. As a matter of interest, these criticisms are even more justified in relation to the literature on recent lexical observations (Cook, in press).
Introduction

information available and the significant number of articles published on the subject. However, since the extremely thorough and detailed work of Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b) seventy years ago, no updated version of a systematic analytical framework or overarching classification system has been developed, on which further research can be based. Without such a framework, future research in this field is likely to remain ad hoc and unsystematic.

1.4.1.2. Principles underlying a reconceptualisation of previous research

It goes without saying that it is crucial for investigators to be able to piece together all the parts of the jigsaw that make up the current state of the art of research in their field. Where there are only a small number of scholars and the body of research is relatively small and/or cohesive, this should not present too much of a challenge. Where there is an established approach to data analysis, a unified classification scheme and a research culture of building systematically upon previous studies, it is generally not too difficult to find relatively informed overviews of the current literature or, indeed, to write an up-to-date summary of the existing body of research oneself.

Such is not, however, the case with the study of morpho-syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese. Anyone game enough to venture into this field is confronted with a large number of publications dealing with morpho-syntactic developments in written Chinese, as well as a much smaller number of publications investigating the syntax and morphology of spoken Mandarin. From this disparate collection of ad hoc, disjointed, piecemeal and often apparently unrelated information, linguists must endeavour to glean a picture of the entire sum of observations that is cohesive, systematic and overarching. This is essential if they are to comprehend the full impact and significance of all the research to date. It is a vital prerequisite to enable researchers to approach the data with a sufficient degree of scholarly appreciation and critical analysis, so that they will be in a position not only to spot any gaps or inconsistencies, but also to see any regularities and patterns that may emerge.

Within the subject of Chinese language change, numerous publications have endeavoured to present a structured overview of the current state of research in the field, from which it can be deduced that many linguists have felt the need for such a contribution. By far the greatest number of attempts to provide a systematic categorisation of recent linguistic developments in Chinese have been in the area of the lexicon (e.g. H. Guo, 2002a; Jiang, 1999; Jin, 2005;
Introduction

Y. Liu, 2001; Shi & Zhu, 2005). A certain number of linguists have summarised changes in Chinese grammar, i.e. morphology and syntax (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo, 2002b; Ye He, 2004), while only a very few have attempted to provide an overview – however incomplete – of developments in all three areas of lexicon, morphology and syntax (e.g. H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). Regardless of which types of language change are encompassed, the categorisation systems tend to be summaries of a few (often apparently more or less arbitrarily chosen) linguistic developments of interest to the author; they are frequently illogically structured (or if logic is applied, it is not immediately obvious to the reader); they often contain internal inconsistencies; and a cursory glance at the literature is sufficient to apprise the reader of their incompleteness. The last person to succeed in providing a comprehensive scaffold for analysing and categorising grammatical language change in Modern Standard Chinese was Wang Li, which probably explains why his analysis remains so authoritative and why, seventy years later, many studies of language change in Modern Standard Chinese still take his work as their starting point.16

The significance of Wang Li’s contribution to Chinese linguistics cannot be underestimated. Whatever minor shortcomings might be revealed, his work was, by the standards of the day and even in comparison with much of the research of the present day, systematic, structured and thorough. He is also to be commended for his attempt – not always as successful as one might have wished – to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. All in all, Wang Li’s system of classification has for many decades provided a solid framework to use as a starting point for linguistic analysis. In fact, few Chinese historical linguists have made significant contributions to research in the areas of morphological and syntactic change since Wang Li; the majority seem rather to have selected from the wide range of linguistic developments noted by him one or two for more detailed comment in the light of recent data. Even in the area of lexical developments, significant contributions have been limited largely to research into so-called “lettered words,” of which the bulk has been conducted in a rather perfunctory

16 Wang Li’s stated aim was to refrain from praising or criticising the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar and to confine himself to a purely descriptive analysis of linguistic developments (1984[1943]-a, pp. 433-434; 1984[1943]-b, p. 460). However, reading between the lines, it is difficult to avoid the impression that he regretted some of the changes that had occurred during his lifetime as unnecessary or even inadvisable (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 433-502; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 460-517). Indeed, at the end of several sections there are exercises to assist the reader in recognising and avoiding Europeanised structures!
manner, making use of ad hoc examples, often with little consideration as to thoroughness, systematic analysis, or organised structure.

A fundamental prerequisite of contributing effectively to the advancement of research in any field is for researchers to be able to gain a clear, logical and structured view of the overall situation to date before they can see where and how their own findings fit into the picture. Otherwise, any efforts in this direction will be at best ad hoc and unsystematic and at worst misguided and ineffectual. For these reasons, it is of vital importance that a unified reconceptualisation of previous research be made available to linguists interested in studying morpho-syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese.

Any classification system is built on some (specified or unspecified) underlying approach to distinguishing between various categories. For the morpho-syntactic schema proposed in this thesis, classification systems based on the dichotomies of internal change vs. external change and grammaticalisation vs. degrammaticalisation were considered in turn. The former was rejected as being too difficult to decide in many cases on account of multiple causality;\textsuperscript{17} the latter was rejected as covering only a minority of morpho-syntactic developments. In the end, a system of classification was chosen that, broadly speaking, represents a scale or gradation of changes ranging from least significant to most significant in terms of typological impact.

When designing a system of classification, there are a few standards or criteria to be kept in mind. Although one is unlikely to find any classification system that is complete in every aspect, the proposed theoretical framework should aim to satisfy the following criteria:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[a)] In an ideal classification system, the categories should be exhaustive, as judged by the capacity of the system to cover all the linguistic developments in Modern Standard Chinese over the past three decades documented thus far by previous researchers.
  \item[b)] Ideally, the categories should be mutually exclusive, as judged by the capacity of the system to assign each linguistic development to one and only one category.
  \item[c)] In addition, the categories should aim to be relevant to Modern Standard Chinese, as judged by their semantic, syntactic, psychological or other validity with respect either to the language itself or to the native speakers of that language.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{17} Despite extensive discussion in the Chinese-language literature on the question of which of the morphological developments observed are a response to “natural” internal forces operating on Chinese and which are the result of contact with other languages, no consensus has been reached (cf. Hu, 2006, pp. 54-56).
Finally, the system should endeavour to be flexible, as judged by its capacity for expanding or adapting to incorporate potential future linguistic developments.

As intimated above, these criteria are goals rather than prerequisites. The fact that it is well nigh impossible to satisfy all the criteria fully does not mean one should not strive to do so.

1.4.2. Step two: data analysis

1.4.2.1. Some relevant theories and approaches

Two divergent approaches to the investigation of linguistic phenomena, each of which has its vocal proponents and critics, are corpus linguistics and intuition-based linguistics. Most previous treatments of Mandarin Chinese grammar have relied primarily on intuition and introspection (e.g. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; D. Li & Cheng, 1988; Loar, 2011; Ross & Ma, 2006; Yip & Rimmington, 2006). One notable exception is Xiao and McEnery’s (2004) work, which makes use of corpus data to investigate the behaviour of grammatical aspect in Mandarin Chinese.

This study has chosen to apply an approach based on corpus data and supplemented by native-speaker intuition, as advocated by R. Xiao et al. (2006). There are several benefits resulting from the fact that the methodology is based in the first instance on the analysis of attested speech examples (cf. Collins, 2011; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004, pp. 4-5). Firstly, whereas the intuition of individual researchers is liable to be influenced by their own dialect, sociolect or even idiolect (i.e. personal linguistic preferences), corpus data are more reliable and objective in that they represent the language use of a wider cross-section of the speech community. Similarly, a sentence composed by a linguist for the purpose of illustrating a particular point may not necessarily be typical of general language use. Another issue is that because intuition does not lend itself to measurement or observation, conclusions reached solely on the basis of introspection cannot easily be verified. By contrast, language examples drawn from corpora are spontaneous examples of real-life and typical language use that, by definition, have already been authenticated, substantiated and corroborated. Moreover, corpus data can not only reveal fine distinctions that might remain opaque to introspective analysis, corpora also provide information that can be quantified and analysed statistically.

Thus, an increasingly popular method is to make use of pre-existing language corpora. Where suitable pre-existing corpora are not available, however, the linguist may find it necessary to construct her own corpus of spoken language samples. One solution that has been adopted by
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a number of researchers (e.g. Cook, 2011, 2012b; Tagliamonte & Roberts, 2005; Van de Velde, 1996; Van de Velde, van Hout, & Gerritsen, 1997) is to make use of archived radio and television broadcasts. It has been suggested that the spoken language in radio and television programs is, to a greater or lesser degree, constrained by the setting and medium and thus unlikely to be as spontaneous and unaffected as language use in informal personal interactions and interviews. On the other hand, one could equally argue that language use in a personal interview is also constrained by the mere presence of the interviewer or other particular interactants (cf. Milroy & Milroy, 1992). The general consensus seems to be that provided the existence and potential influence of external factors such as the setting, medium, genre and style of production are acknowledged, studying archived records of radio and television broadcasts is a valid method of investigating the behaviour of a range of linguistic features in spoken contexts and, moreover, one that has yielded some very interesting observations.

1.4.2.2. Data set for analysis

It was decided not to use previously collected data from language corpora for this study because the corpora of Modern Standard Chinese already in existence were found to be unsuitable for various reasons. Some contain only written data, such as the Lancaster Corpus of Mandarin Chinese and the UCLA Corpus of Written Chinese (both balanced corpora representing various genres), or the PDC 2000 (a corpus of newspaper texts only). Some corpora of spoken data are simply so small (e.g. the Chinese Pear Stories and the Chinese Spoken Corpus for the Stance Project) that one can hardly expect to find sufficient numbers of relevant examples of all the structures of interest to enable satisfactory comparison and analysis, particularly if those structures include ones that occur relatively rarely. Other spoken databases are part of a larger corpus of Chinese (e.g. the corpus developed by the Centre for Chinese Linguistics at Peking University and the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese), of which spoken material unfortunately makes up only a negligible proportion of the total. The Mandarin News Text Corpus, while large enough for the relatively small percentage of spoken texts still to represent a sizable database, is a specialised corpus representing a particular genre, of which the spoken material is not spontaneous and is in any case already 20 years old. Similarly, the Callhome Mandarin Chinese Transcripts, which contain 300,000 words of spoken unscripted telephone conversations, consist of data collected in the early to mid-nineties. Other corpora contain
data collected from a geographic area outside the framework of this study, such as Taiwan (e.g. the NCCU Corpus of Spoken Chinese and the Mandarin Conversational Dialogue Corpus). The Lancaster Los Angeles Spoken Chinese Corpus, while it comprises nearly one million words of spoken data from a range of genres and sounds from the description provided to be extremely useful, has at the time of writing not yet been made available to the public.

The Leiden Weibo Corpus, comprising as it does 100 million characters of microblog entries, all posted in January 2012 on China’s premier microblogging site, could certainly be expected to include examples of even quite rare constructions. Language usage in microblogs resembles spoken language in that it is typically very informal, highly colloquial and features a lot of short, pithy comments, with entries often not being “complete” sentences in the traditional sense. On the face of it, it could persuasively be argued that microblog language use is a reasonable substitute for spoken language. This view should be treated with caution, however. Due to orthographic and other characteristics of the medium in which they appear, microblogs are often quite different from spoken language. In the modern world, microblogging is a discourse type of its own, complete with its own rules of interaction, its own conventions and fashions. Although there is undoubtedly some overlap with the prevailing fashions in more traditional written and spoken genres, there are nevertheless some differences. Another consideration is that very short entries offer less contextual information, meaning that it may be difficult to work out why a particular linguistic variable has one realisation in one entry and a different realisation in another. It would certainly be of interest to supplement the findings of the present research project with observations from the Leiden Weibo Corpus, not least because data on the language usage in microblogging may well reveal additional insights into spoken Mandarin. In some cases, indeed, the language use in microblogs may possibly give an indication of future trends in speaking and writing. Nevertheless, it is seen as important to first gain an understanding of how certain morpho-syntactic structures operate in spoken interactions.

18 Although the microblogs were posted by users all over China, information regarding the geographical region is available for individual entries, so it should be possible to control for dialectal influences in usage. Thus, the indiscriminate geographical range should not necessarily be regarded as a drawback.
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For this particular research project it was decided to use archived transcripts of television chat shows held in the library of the privately owned Hong Kong based broadcaster, Phoenix Television. Phoenix Television was deemed to be a suitable broadcaster for a number of reasons. Firstly, it has a number of subsidiary offices, including one in Beijing. Consequently, many of its television shows are produced in the nation’s capital and are thus more likely to reflect either relatively educated and mainstream spoken language or language use in and around Beijing, which is generally recognised as being widely comprehensible, as well as being not too far removed from Modern Standard Chinese. In other words, there are likely to be relatively few dialectal influences compared with many of the local television stations. This was felt to be important because there has to date been so little research into the morpho-syntax of spoken Mandarin that it was thought desirable to obtain information on relatively standard Mandarin before turning to less standard varieties for data that will, at some time in the future of Chinese linguistics research, undoubtedly also provide fascinating and revealing insights. Secondly, the style of production favoured by Phoenix Television tends to be more relaxed and less closely censored than the official broadcaster, CCTV, but more formal and more structured than many regionally based broadcasters. Thus, its television productions tend to be characterised by less local flavour: they often feature content of more general interest and more widespread appeal, at the same time providing a better picture of general language use in mainland China. While the somewhat more formal approach has the drawback of slightly cramping the free expression and relaxed style more common in the productions of regionally based Chinese broadcasters, it also has the advantage of ensuring conditions conducive, once again, to eliciting spoken language use that does not deviate too far from Mainland Standard Mandarin.

Several considerations converged to make the chat show Luyu You Yue (“A Date with Luyu”) an obvious choice for this study. Firstly, the host, Chen Luyu, as a long-time resident of Beijing educated to tertiary level, herself exemplifies quite standard Mandarin language use. Secondly, most guests on the show are of a certain professional and educational calibre; that is, they also tend to employ reasonably standard language use. Thirdly, the production style is relaxed and personal enough to be conducive to casual, informal, relatively “natural” language use, but at same time not so low-brow and colloquial as to contain a high proportion either of slang terms unfamiliar to mainstream Chinese society or of language use displaying strong regional influences.
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The time point selected for data collection was 2011. The quantity of data collected totalled 757,585 characters from episodes broadcast between January and September of 2011, all of them able to be accessed via the official Phoenix website. An estimated 25-30% of the material contained in the transcripts was deemed unsuitable for the present study on the grounds of its being either unspoken or scripted (i.e. non-spontaneous spoken) material. This material included titles, headings, background information and the names of speakers. Nevertheless, this still left a total of in excess of half a million characters of useful raw data. The transcripts from 2011 were accessed via the official Phoenix Television website and downloaded for processing and analysis. Interviews with non-native Mandarin speakers were generally excluded, unless the speech of said interviewees was deemed to be of native speaker standard. A number of shorter interviews were also excluded from the database, partly to ensure greater consistency of interview style and partly because the ratio of scripted to unscripted material appeared to be higher in the shorter interviews.

The transcripts in question were prepared by Phoenix Television employees at the time of production to appear as subtitles during the broadcast, a common practice in China. As such, it is impossible to guarantee the perfect accuracy of the television transcripts. The potential introduction into the transcripts of mistakes, distortions, omissions and even “corrections” (unwitting or otherwise) cannot be ruled out entirely. On the other hand, Tagliamonte and Roberts (2005), who based their study of language change in spoken North American English on soap opera scripts, were able through spot checks of randomly selected episodes to ascertain an extremely high degree of correlation between the written material and the spoken utterances. Likewise, Cook (2004) found in a study of spoken Mandarin in Taiwanese variety shows that the transcripts used as primary data tended to omit some repetitions and errors self-corrected by the speaker and to render some loanwords in Chinese characters but were otherwise extremely accurate, with only the odd typographical error, generally easily recognisable as such from the context. For reasons of copyright and bureaucratic protocol, it was not feasible within the limitations of this project to obtain access to audiovisual copies of the television broadcasts used for data collection. Thus, it was not possible to carry out

19 [http://www.phoenixtv.com/](http://www.phoenixtv.com/), Phoenix New Media Limited were contacted about this project and gave their permission for written data from their website to be used for academic analysis.

20 One example of a non-native Mandarin speaker who has attained a sufficiently high level of proficiency in Mandarin to be of interest for this study is the Canadian-born long-term resident of Beijing who goes in China by the name of Dashan.
random checks to determine if there were any discrepancies between the transcripts and the actual spoken dialogue. However, as explained above, it seems reasonable to assume a high degree of accuracy, particularly as regards the morphology and syntax. Even if there may be the occasional inaccuracy, it was deemed unlikely to significantly affect the overall research results.

**Why use data from chat shows?**

Studies of spoken language use often aim to obtain samples of unaffected, “natural”, spontaneous utterances. One of the most popular ways to achieve a close approximation of this is for the researcher to conduct interviews with a carefully selected group of respondents. However, this method is extremely time-consuming and generally produces a relatively small quantity of usable data. Another approach is to analyse speech examples from language corpora. However, as discussed above, there was unfortunately no publicly available corpus suitable for the purposes of the present research project. Instead, this study opted to use transcripts of Chinese chat shows as its primary source of spoken data.

Chat shows, by their nature, take place within the parameters of a constructed setting of a certain type and with certain goals. A number of factors contribute to this environment and mean that the data are not as spontaneous as, say, a dialogue between two friends chatting in a café. The stage setting, the cameras, the make-up and lights, as well as the live audience privy to the conversation all have the potential to reduce the spontaneity of the interaction, not to mention the fact that there is presumably a certain amount of pre-interview discussion, preparation and agreement on the rough content to be covered, even perhaps a quite detailed discussion of some of the questions to be posed. On the other hand, very few situations are as relaxed and informal as a spontaneous conversation between close friends. Even the standard method of interviewing a respondent on a topic close to the heart (e.g. family, childhood, hometown) is slightly contrived. It is difficult to eliminate the interviewer effect entirely, and few researchers have managed to achieve the ideal. Although chat shows are subject to certain pressures liable to produce on occasion more formal or affected language use from some participants, they probably elicit more natural and spontaneous speech than any other television genre, and can thus provide useful examples of everyday language phenomena.

Pertinent to the design of the present study is the fact that despite a certain degree of collusion between interviewer and interviewee prior to filming on the structure and content of
the interview, this is unlikely to have a noticeable impact on the use of the particular morpho-
syntactic features investigated in this project. It seems highly improbable that the majority of
participants would plan the exact wording of their responses down to the fine detail of
specific syntactic structures and morphological endings on words.

In relation to the accuracy of the transcripts, an issue that has been touched on above, it is
worth observing that the employees commissioned to transcribe Chinese television shows are
generally very experienced at what they do. Unlike television broadcasts in the west, the
majority of Chinese productions across the full gamut of genres require the preparation of
transcripts before going to air; these then appear on the screens of the viewing public around
the nation as subtitles.

Furthermore, although this is rather speculative, it seems reasonable to assume that if the
official transcribers do deviate from the spoken word, they are likely to do so in a way that
makes the utterance more rather than less standard. So, for instance, one can imagine a
transcript writer ironing out a few false starts, stutters or inconsistencies to make the
transcript read as a slightly more polished version of the original. However, it seems less
likely that a professional transcript writer would use morpho-syntactic features in a non-
standard way where the speaker had used them in a standard way. Thus, in a study like this
one, where we are primarily interested in non-standard, novel and innovative usage, or uses
that deviate from the descriptions of standard Mandarin grammar, we are more likely to get
false negatives than false positives. That is to say, the picture gleaned from data published as
transcripts is likely to be, if anything, closer to the accepted norms of standard Mandarin than
the original spoken texts themselves.

One obvious advantage of using pre-existing transcripts of oral interviews as the primary
source of data is that it is possible to assemble a large database relatively quickly and easily.
This then enables the collection and analysis of relevant examples in sufficient numbers to
make interesting observations and comparisons. In the case of the current study, it was
decided that it was worth accepting a slightly less informal speech register in return for ease
of access to a large quantity of data, which enabled verification and validation of
observations which would not have been possible on a smaller scale.
Why use data from ‘A Date with Luyu’?

The television production chosen as the main source of spoken data was Luyu You Yue ‘A Date with Luyu’, which lends itself to a study of this kind. The setting, although it might strike a non-Chinese viewer as somewhat contrived, is relaxed enough by Chinese television standards to encourage a great deal of lively interaction between interviewer and interviewee, conducive to eliciting reasonably informal, spontaneous speech. This is underpinned by the host’s empathetic, personal style: she gives her guests her undivided attention and shows genuine concern as they discuss their opinions and heartfelt feelings.

‘A Date with Luyu’, which first went to air in 1998, is arguably one of the most popular and best known of all talk shows in mainland China. Originally broadcast weekly, since 2004 it has been aired daily. It is one of the most popular chat shows in China, with a viewing audience averaging nearly 150 million people per episode. The host, Chen Luyu, graduated from the Foreign Languages Department of Beijing Broadcasting College in 1993. Ms Chen is a poised and sophisticated woman who is able to draw her guests out to talk in depth about quite personal topics. Over the fifteen years the talk show has been running, she has hosted over 1,500 episodes and interviewed twice that number of guests from all walks of life, including many of China’s rich and famous.

In a typical production, both interviewer and interviewee are seen sitting on long couch facing the audience in a television studio. Behind them is a huge screen; from time to time old photos, television and film excerpts or prerecorded interviews are shown on screen behind the two protagonists. There is also an additional stage for performance (singing, dancing, etc.), if needed. The interviews are often with guests who are associated with current affairs and news items of great moment. Programmes are planned around themes of community, national or merely everyday interest and do not shrink from controversial issues that are avoided by official media channels. Indeed, interviews with Chen Luyu have been known to sway public opinion and influence social trends. Although guests on the show are often celebrities or people with rather exceptional life experiences, generally topics of conversation are chosen that are of interest to the man on the street. All in all, it is perhaps not surprising that Chen Luyu is sometimes referred to as “the Oprah of the East” or “China’s answer to Oprah”. Indeed, there is some evidence of inspiration from Oprah in the interview style, the structure of individual episodes and the physical setting, including seating.
arrangements, positioning of the stage in relation to the cinematic screen and the audience, and even the decor.

Approximately eighty episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ were downloaded from the official Phoenix Television website, those episodes comprising almost the entire selection of publicly available transcript material between the months of January and September 2011. The primary data from this study thus come from quite a substantial group of participants. Moreover, the selection of particular episodes was random in the sense that beyond determining a suitable timeframe and setting basic criteria such as interview length and fluency of spoken Mandarin (as discussed above), no further selection or deliberate culling was undertaken. It is thus hoped that the data collected may be reasonably representative of the general adult population. On the other hand, from the point of view of the chat show producers, the selection of participants was not at all random, nor was there any conscious attempt on the part of the television broadcaster to invite a group of interviewees representing a cross-section of demographic characteristics, including a range of age bands and different socio-economic backgrounds. Thus, due care should be taken when generalising the results of this study and making claims for the broader Mandarin-speaking population.

1.4.2.3. Methodology for data analysis

The first step was to download a sufficient number of transcripts from the official Phoenix Television website and collate them into a single dataset to enable easier and more efficient searches of the linguistic features being investigated. Before commencing data analysis, three morpho-syntactic features of interest were decided on. These were chosen based on reading of the literature and the results of previous investigations. Transcripts of the spoken text of eighty-odd episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ were studied and all occurrences of the three selected morpho-syntactic features isolated.

The features selected for this study were the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. Searches of the relevant variables in specific and clearly defined linguistic contexts were carried out, after which lists of all the examples of the use of these morphemes in the relevant structures were compiled from the data. These included the use of the plural suffix *men* with nouns, the use of the passive marker *bei* with verbs and the use of the copula *shi* in two contexts of interest: with predicative adjectives in the construction [NP COP HEN AdjP] and in combination with the locative *zai*. 
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Then followed a fine-grained analysis and comparison of language examples, the focus of which were quantitative and qualitative observations of usage patterns. All examples of the use of the structures under discussion were analysed in context to determine similarities and differences across the full gamut of speech examples, patterns of linguistic behaviour and reasons for use in particular environments. In addition, the analysis involved looking for triggers or cues of a lexical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic or other nature. In investigating the use of each morpho-syntactic feature, the standard grammatical analysis of the morpheme in question (as presented in the mainstream literature on Mandarin Chinese grammar) was taken as the starting point, with the description of the functions of the linguistic feature in the literature being compared with its actual use in the corpus of spoken language data collected for the purposes of this research. Relevant speech samples were carefully analysed to determine to what extent they conformed to the grammatical constraints stipulated in the literature on Chinese grammar. The goal of this comparison was to assess how well the standard grammatical analysis was able to explain the data and account for all the attested language examples in the corpus.

It should be noted that in order to ensure consistency of speech register for the purposes of comparison, all narrated passages were excluded from the data analysis, leaving only the interview material filmed live as the sole source of speech samples. It was felt to be methodologically unsound for the purposes of this research to include the full gamut of speech registers found in chat shows in the data for analysis. A narrated interlude is often more formal than the spontaneous speech of a live interview. However much it may have been written to sound relaxed, intimate and informal, it is clear that a narrator’s speech is scripted and rehearsed, whereas the individual utterances of the interviewer and interviewee(s) are relatively spontaneous – even if the general tenor and direction of the interview have been agreed upon in advance. This separation of the different speech registers within the chat show genre had the added advantage that the language examples used as primary data were relatively spontaneous and “natural”, and thus (presumably) reasonably representative of language use amongst the wider speech community.

---

21 In this context, quantitative observations are understood to refer to the frequency of use of a particular linguistic variable, while qualitative observations refer to other characteristics of the behaviour of a morpheme, for example grammatical function, context of use, meaning etc.
Instances of the morpho-syntactic features under investigation that were excluded from the overall tally on the grounds of not being examples of spontaneous spoken speech included those occurring during renditions of songs, utterances by the narrator, recitations of poetry, the reading out loud of comments posted online etc. Sometimes use of the selected morpho-syntactic features occurred during the initial cut-and-paste summary of the interview making up the first 30 seconds or so of each episode. In such cases, only the later (original) occurrence during the full interview was counted.

In applying a fine-grained analysis to the data, it was felt necessary on occasion to consult native speakers of Mandarin Chinese for confirmation of the intuitions of the author, a non-native speaker. Indeed, in some cases, quite different interpretations of the function and/or affect of the morpho-syntactic features under investigation were proffered by native speakers. Thus, although this thesis is a discourse-based descriptive study with observations backed up by empirical data from television chat shows, much of the discussion and judgement in it relies necessarily on opinions other than – or in addition to – the author’s own.

1.5. Thesis structure

The remainder of the thesis is divided into seven chapters.

A summary of the findings and theories in the literature to date, as they relate to this particular research topic, is provided in chapter 2. The chapter presents an overview of the current literature, including a critical analysis of gaps and shortcomings therein which point to the desirability of a study such as this one being conducted.

Chapter 3 proposes a reconceptualised system of classification capable of incorporating all the major morpho-syntactic developments relating to spoken and written Modern Standard Chinese over the last 30 years. This overarching framework aims to be exhaustive, flexible, logical and structured.

The data analysis is presented in chapters 4 to 6, which describe the results of the current empirical investigation into and analysis of language usage in Chinese chat shows. These chapters cover three major topics: the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. 
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Chapter 7 highlights the discrepancies between descriptions in authoritative grammar references of the morpho-syntactic features selected for investigation and their actual use in the attested spoken data contained in the present corpus. Possible reasons, motivations, stimuli, catalysts etc. accounting for the discrepancies noted, including language variation, contact and change, are explored in this chapter.

The conclusion is presented in the final chapter, chapter 8, which presents a summary of the findings of the present study. This chapter highlights the practical implications, uses and benefits of the research findings across a range of areas, as well as examining the theoretical implications of these results for various academic fields. Other points of discussion such as limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are also covered.
2. Recent research into Mandarin Chinese syntax and morphology

This chapter provides an overview of the field of Mandarin Chinese morphology and syntax, including both Chinese and Western literature on the topic. In Modern Standard Chinese as in most languages, there is a close relationship between the grammar of the spoken language and the grammar of the written language. By the same token, there are some differences that do necessitate slightly separate treatments of certain points (cf. Shengli Feng, 2009). The discussion in this chapter takes morpho-syntactic observations in written Chinese as its starting point before moving on to features of the spoken language, of which the latter bears more direct relevance to the present research topic. The reason for this order of progression is twofold: written Chinese was historically the earlier focus of studies in Mandarin Chinese morphology and syntax, and even today this branch accounts for the bulk of research in this field.

2.1. Background

This section will explain the shift in the written standard from Wenyan to Baihua almost a century ago and discuss the cultural and historical importance of the written language in Chinese society. It is against this background that the relationship between written and spoken forms of Modern Standard Chinese will be examined. This section will also trace the historical development of Putonghua over the last century, highlighting some of the social, historical and linguistic factors contributing to the status accorded the spoken standard today. The section will conclude with a discussion of the linguistic variation between different spoken standards of modern Chinese.

2.1.1. History of Wenyan and Baihua

The written language in use up until the beginning of the twentieth century, known as Wenyan, was based on the Classical Chinese of the ancient philosophers and had hardly

---

1 The written language used for more than two millennia in dynastic China was known as Wenyan. It was the standard for almost all written genres, from legal edicts and official proclamations through scholarly treatises to personal correspondence. Some literary works, however, made use of a written style known as Baihua (lit. ‘plain speech’) that was less far removed from contemporary spoken Chinese and included some vernacular influences.
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evolved at all over a period of more than 2000 years (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 67-68; Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 26-28; Norman, 1988, pp. 1-2; Ramsey, 1987, p. 4).\(^2\) Other forms of the written language besides *Wenyan* (e.g. vulgar vernacular literature) did exist, although they were much less prestigious (Norman, 1988, p. 246). Naturally, the fact that only the Chinese upper and middle classes had the time and opportunity to master *Wenyan* added to its status (Norman, 1988, p. 245) but did nothing to increase its usefulness. Despite the high prestige associated with *Wenyan*, the drawbacks of having a written language so far removed from any version of the spoken language currently in everyday use and able to be used by only a small proportion of the population were obvious and became increasingly to be viewed as a handicap to modernisation. After the 1919 May Fourth Movement, calls for literary reform included calls for a new written standard, *Baihua*, based on the *Baihua* classics, which included such well-known literary works as *Shui hu zhuan* (*Outlaws of the Marsh*, also translated sometimes as *Water Margin* or *All Men Are Brothers*) and *Hong lou meng* (*Dream of Red Mansions*) (Norman, 1988).\(^3\) Interestingly, one of the ways in which modern *Baihua* was adapted for use in contemporary society was by adopting many grammatical structures from European languages (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 76-77). It is worth noting that the action to promote *Baihua* in place of *Wenyan* was mostly initiated not by the government but by individuals (Norman, 1988, p. 255). The upshot of this was that from the twenties through to the forties *Baihua* gradually replaced *Wenyan* in all areas of use: literary, technical, political, journalistic, academic, bureaucratic and personal correspondence (Norman, 1988, p. 247).

Although this essay does not focus on orthography, it is perhaps of interest to note that script reform was carried out by the Communist government in 1956 and 1964. In all, over 2500 characters were simplified, many taken from simplifications that had crept into unofficial use over the centuries, especially during the Ming and Qing dynasties, a period when a particularly conservative attitude towards character writing prevailed (Norman, 1988, p. 80). The effects of these reforms were first felt in the mainland and later found their way into the

\(^2\) The term “Classical Chinese” is used to refer to the standard written language in use during the Zhou dynasty (first millennium BC) and is often applied by extension to standard written Chinese from that time up until the early twentieth century.

\(^3\) *Baihua* originated a little over 1000 years ago during the Tang dynasty and remained in use until the Qing period. Originally used for Buddhist writings, folk literature and opera, by the late Qing dynasty there were also newspapers, magazines and even textbooks published in *Baihua*. That is to say, its spheres of use expanded over the centuries from purely low culture towards high culture (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 68-70).
written standards of Singapore and Malaysia. Taiwan and Hong Kong continue to use the traditional characters.

2.1.2. Cultural and historical importance of the written language

In relation to the cultural and historical significance of written Chinese, Coulmas (1999, p. 399) points out that

“… writing plays a major role in the linguistic culture all over East Asia. Popular notions of language strongly depend on writing to the extent that writing is often confused with language. Writing is at the core of Far Eastern cultures and dominates popular conceptions of language that regard the spoken word as an imperfect rendition of an ideal written norm.”

In Chinese culture, the written language is also inextricably linked with the continuity of Chinese civilisation (Karlgren, 1971[1929]; Norman, 1988). Norman (1988, p. 1) marvels at

“… the profound unity of Chinese culture that has been transmitted in an unbroken line beginning from the third millennium BC and continuing down to the present day. Even in periods of political disunity at various times in the past, the ideal of a single, culturally unified Chinese empire has never been forgotten. The Chinese language, especially in its written form, has always been one of the most powerful symbols of this cultural unity.”

One of the reasons that it is the written, rather than any spoken form of the language that has been particularly well equipped to symbolise the unity of Chinese culture and ethnicity is that up until the beginning of the twentieth century the standard written language, known as Wenyan, was the only common language used nationwide (P. Chen, 1999, p. 68; Karlgren, 1971[1929], p. 28; Norman, 1988, p. 245). Other forms of written language did exist, although they carried much less prestige (Norman, 1988, p. 246). In fact, all early Chinese dictionaries from the pre-Han period (more than 2000 years ago) up until the twentieth century concerned themselves solely with the classical literary language: virtually no elements of the spoken language were considered by lexicographers to be of interest, not even characters drawn from vulgar vernacular literature (Norman, 1988, p. 172). Other factors adding to the unrivalled prestige of Wenyan were that only a small percentage of the Chinese population (the upper and middle classes) were educated enough to master it (Norman, 1988, p. 245), that it boasted a large pool of literature covering areas such as history, philosophy, poetry etc. (Karlgren, 1971[1929]; Norman, 1988) and that applicants for
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positions in the imperial civil service were tested on their literary knowledge of Classical Chinese (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 67-68).

Even today, Classical Chinese continues to exert a significant influence on the modern language in the areas of the lexicon, morphology and syntax, especially in its written form (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 83-86; Norman, 1988, p. 109). Also, the written form of calques and other neologisms is often taken from Classical Chinese morphemes (Norman, 1988, p. 109). “Classical Chinese is deeply rooted in Chinese culture and will inevitably continue to play an important role in future Chinese linguistic development”, writes Norman (1988, p. 110).

Having set the scene by outlining some of the points relevant to written Chinese, let us now turn to the modern sociolinguistic environment in which Mandarin is spoken, including some cultural, historical and linguistic aspects of its use. Of importance for this thesis is a basic understanding of some of the linguistic differences between varieties of Modern Standard Chinese spoken in different regional centres. Before broaching this topic, it is necessary to explain the relationship between written and spoken Chinese and the evolution of the spoken standard, Putonghua.

**2.1.3. Relationship between written and spoken forms of Chinese**

As with all languages, standard written Chinese does not mirror the spoken standard exactly. With Chinese, however, the dissimilarities are more marked than in most languages (P. Chen, 1999, p. 67). One major difference is that lexical and grammatical influences of Classical Chinese are still felt more strongly in the written language (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 83-86). Another disparity, related to the first, is the contrast in word length: partly because Chinese uses a logographic script and partly because the gradual attrition of phonemic distinctions over the centuries has led to a preponderance of homophonous characters, the written language tends to make use of more monosyllabic words, whereas polysyllabic words are more common in the spoken language (P. Chen, 1999, p. 140; cf. Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 22-24; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 44; Lin, 2001, pp. 7-10). That is to say, homophones that in spoken Modern Standard Chinese can be differentiated from one another only by means of the addition of one or more syllables to produce a compound or affixed word are, by virtue of the logographic script, readily distinguishable in their written form, where they more often appear as monomorphemic, monosyllabic words, resulting in a written standard
that is considerably more concise than the spoken standard (cf. P. Chen, 1999, p. 67; Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 26-27).

Although there are still many remnants of Classical Chinese in the standard written language, the modern written standard can be mastered to a reasonable level of proficiency without reference to the Classical language. Thus, while lexical and grammatical differences between the written and spoken forms of Chinese are still more significant than, say, between written and spoken forms of English, it is nevertheless possible to decipher most modern written texts on the basis of a sound knowledge of the various registers of the modern spoken standard – provided, of course, that one is able to recognise Chinese characters.

2.1.4. Evolution of *Putonghua* and its status today

For more than 2000 years there was throughout China one recognised written standard, *Wenyan*. Because the written standard scarcely evolved over two millennia (as discussed in section 2.1.1), the disparity between *Wenyan* and any spoken variety of Chinese increased over time to the extent that by the dying years of dynastic China it was impossible for a Chinese native speaker to understand the written language merely by learning to recognise Chinese characters. Entirely new vocabulary and rules of grammar had also to be mastered; the effort required was comparable, in fact, to learning a foreign language (DeFrancis, 1984; cf. Ramsey, 1987, p. 4). The new written standard that was introduced about 90 years ago, *Baihua* (see section 2.1.1), was much closer to the spoken dialect of the capital, Beijing (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 70-72; Karlgren, 1971[1929], p. 27; Norman, 1988; Ramsey, 1987, p. 10). Around the same time serious attempts to establish a nationally recognised spoken standard first started to take effect (P. Chen, 1999; Norman, 1988; Ramsey, 1987, pp. 8-11).

Although there had been various officially or at least socially sanctioned spoken standards prior to the twentieth century, these were limited to certain social and intellectual circles and did not acquire a significant number of speakers nationwide (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 7-13; cf. Norman, 1988, p. 133). Notably, there was for many centuries a hybrid of various dialects, spoken by the Mandarins gathered from around the country in the nation’s capital who needed a common mode of communication (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 10-12; Kubler, 1985b, p. 51; Norman, 1988). In fact, a koine had arisen as early as the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368), probably based on the northern dialects; this spoken language, which came to be known as *Guanhua* (‘official language’), was used for administrative and bureaucratic purposes (P.
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Chen, 1999, pp. 10-11; Norman, 1988, pp. 5-6; Ramsey, 1987). As Guanhua developed out of the need for people speaking different Chinese varieties to communicate with each other, it could be viewed as a kind of administrative lingua franca (P. Chen, 1999, p. 12; Kubler, 1985b, p. 51; Norman, 1988, p. 133; Ramsey, 1987, pp. 4-5). It should not be assumed that because Guanhua was not officially recognised that it had no status within Chinese society. In fact, the various forms of the spoken language were associated with varying levels of prestige. For example, the koine based on the dialect of the capital, i.e. Guanhua, was the most prestigious. Then followed the dialects of the regional business and administrative centres (e.g. Guangzhou, Suzhou, Xiamen etc.). The lowest-ranking were the local dialects, which carried no overt prestige at all (Norman, 1988, pp. 246-247).

In the wake of the first Opium War in the mid-nineteenth century heated discussion had ensued as to the desirability of a standard spoken language and the form it should take (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 13-16). However, it was not until 1909 that the first attempts were made to teach any spoken standard, known at that time as Guanhua, in schools (Norman, 1988, p. 134). About ten years later this new standard came to be known as Guoyu (“national language”), making it in effect the first officially recognised standard spoken language in Chinese history with clearly defined norms and a broad base of instruction (cf. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 22-23; Norman, 1988, p. 134). In what appears to have been an attempt at democratisation of the phonological system, the standard pronunciation of Guoyu was initially an artificial amalgam of several varieties of spoken Chinese (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 18-19; Norman, 1988, p. 134; Ramsey, 1987, p. 9). However, by the early 1930s it had been decided that Beijing pronunciation should form the basis for the standard (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 19-22; Kubler, 1985b, p. 52; Norman, 1988, pp. 134-135; Ramsey, 1987, p. 10). After the Communists came to power in 1949, language reform was carried out with increased intensity (P. Chen, 1999, p. 23), and further discussion resulted in the renaming of the standard in 1955 as Putonghua (“common language”). Putonghua was further defined as employing the lexicon of the Northern Mandarin dialects and the grammar of the Baihua classics (P. Chen, 1999, p. 24; Ramsey, 1987, p. 14). Despite the name changes, Guanhua, Guoyu and Putonghua were essentially based on the dialects of northern China and, apart

4 In the Republic of China on Taiwan the spoken standard continues to go by its old name of Guoyu; in Singapore it is known as Huayu.
from a brief interruption in the early part of the twentieth century, the pronunciation continued to be based on the dialect of the capital (Norman, 1988, p. 135).

Among the spoken forms of Chinese, *Putonghua* is intended to fill the equivalent role and functions performed by *Baihua* in the written language (cf. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 23-27; Norman, 1988, p. 247) – although the consistency with which this policy has been implemented and the success it has met with vary considerably from region to region (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 27-30). Throughout Mainland China, *Putonghua*, although not necessarily heard in homes, on the street or in workplaces, is supposed to be used in all official and semi-official contexts, such as education, government and the public service, television and radio broadcasts (P. Chen, 1999, p. 27; Norman, 1988, p. 248; Ramsey, 1987, pp. 27-29).

In view of the widespread existence of diglossia, it is hardly surprising that in practice *Putonghua* varies considerably. In fact, *Putonghua* is usually not learned or spoken perfectly except in and around Beijing; elsewhere it is realised as a kind of cross between the local dialect and the standard language, with imperfections in its acquisition especially noticeable in rural areas and amongst lower socioeconomic groups (cf. DeFrancis, 1984; Norman, 1988, p. 247). Thus the establishment of *Putonghua* as the standard language has led to the development of dialects of Mainland Standard Mandarin resulting from interference from the local Sinitic languages (cf. Yuanjian He, 2006, p. 282; M. Zhou, 2006, p. 160). It is partly because of these regional variations in the realisation of *Putonghua* that it has been decided to use the term Mainland Standard Mandarin to refer to the standard spoken language, with terms such as Beijing Local Mandarin, Chengdu Local Mandarin, Shanghai Local Mandarin etc. referring to the actual realisation of *Putonghua*, coloured by local influences (primarily at a phonemic, tonal and lexical level), in different regions (see also discussion in section 1.1.1).

It has been observed that “the Chinese throughout most of their history have been conspicuously uninterested in their spoken language” (Norman, 1988, p. 2). Even now, when the spoken standard has been officially recognised for almost a century, its status is still not assured. In fact, it is possible to trace a range of attitudes towards the spoken standard over time and across geographical regions.⁵

---

⁵ For instance, Taiwan Standard Mandarin previously enjoyed higher status and was considered more desirable or even superior to other varieties of Chinese spoken in Taiwan. Now, however, Taiwan Local Mandarin and
2.1.5. Linguistic variation between different spoken standards

In a situation not dissimilar to that pertaining with spoken English, which features numerous standards (British, US, Australian etc.), each with its own sphere of influence, Mandarin Chinese is also governed by a number of different standards. This section will concentrate on variation between the two most significant spoken standards in Mandarin, highlighting the major differences between Mainland Standard Mandarin (hereinafter MSM) and the spoken standard in Taiwan.

The best known and most influential standard of spoken Mandarin outside mainland China is the Taiwanese standard, referred to here as Taiwan Standard Mandarin (hereinafter TSM). Although there may be other standards, such as Singapore Standard Mandarin, the Taiwanese standard carries more authority for a number of reasons relating, amongst other factors, to speaker numbers, economic clout, media dominance and cultural pervasiveness. This last refers primarily to the success of Taiwanese popular culture, including pop songs, television shows and movies. All these factors mean that the influence of Taiwan’s spoken standard is carried beyond its borders to permeate the far reaches of the diaspora. Of particular relevance for the present study is the fact that some aspects of Mandarin language usage conventionally associated with Taiwanese speakers are even gaining an increasingly strong foothold in mainland China. While TSM distinguishes itself from MSM most strikingly in the prosody, phonology and lexicon, there are also a few syntactic differences. These are discussed in turn in the following paragraphs.

The rhythm of TSM has been described as less fluid and more “stilted” than MSM (Kubler, 1985a). With regard to the suprasegmental phonological feature of tone, it has been observed that tones in TSM are somewhat “flatter” than those in MSM (Kubler, 1985a). That is to say, there is greater pitch variation in the tones in MSM. The so-called neutral tone, largely absent from Taiwan Local Mandarin, is officially present in TSM in more words than in Taiwan Local Mandarin – although still with a noticeably lower incidence than in MSM (P. Chen, 1999, p. 47; Kubler, 1985a). The mainland spoken standard is also characterised by more rhotacisation (P. Chen, 1999, p. 47).

even southern Min are favoured and to a certain extent advantageous in some contexts and among some speakers, not least because they are associated with a “Taiwanese” identity (M. Zhou, 2006, pp. 160-161).
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While the phonemes themselves are very similar in the two standards, the retroflex consonants have a slightly more frontal place of articulation in TSM than in MSM and thus sound slightly less retroflex.\(^6\) One noticeable difference between TSM and MSM is that the standard reading of some characters is different (P. Chen, 1999, p. 46). With some characters, this affects only the tone, so that qi ‘period’, for instance, is read in the first tone in MSM and the second tone in TSM. With other characters, the phonetic realisation, too, may be different. For example, a commonly used morpheme meaning ‘include’ in Mandarin is pronounced kuo in the fourth tone in MSM and gua in the first tone in TSM. Interestingly, in most cases of deviation between the official standards of pronunciation, Taiwanese pronunciation is the more conservative of the two (P. Chen, 1999, p. 47).

As far as the lexicon is concerned, there are of course socially, politically and historically conditioned differences in vocabulary usage (cf. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 106-107). A striking illustration of this point is the preponderance of Communist vocabulary still in use in spoken Mandarin in the People’s Republic, especially in officialese. In addition, there are the well-known and oft-cited differences in autochthonous vocabulary. For example, the word for ‘bicycle’ is zi-xing-che (self-go-vehicle) in MSM and jiao-ta-che (foot-tread-vehicle) in TSM. Likewise, the word for ‘taxi’ is chu-zu-che (out-hire-vehicle) in MSM and ji-cheng-che (record-distance-vehicle) in TSM (cf. P. Chen, 1999, p. 106). There also seem to be more loanwords used in standard spoken Mandarin in Taiwan than in the mainland China. One example of this is the Taiwanese preference for the transliteration yimei’er ‘email’ rather than the official term in MSM, dianzi-you-jian electronic-post-letter ‘email’. Then again, there are the different realisations of loanwords current on opposite sides of the Taiwanese Strait. The transliteration for ‘disco’ has been borrowed into mainland China as disike and into Taiwan as disigao.

Turning now to syntactic differences between the two main standards, probably the most striking disparity is the prevalence of you (EXST; ‘have’) in TSM, where the morpheme is capable of performing a number of functions not ascribed to it in MSM (cf. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 97-98). One of these is as a marker of perfective or completive aspect, so that it is not uncommon for an utterance that in mainland China would require the use of the postverbal

\(^6\) Note that in contrast to Taiwan Local Mandarin, TSM retroflex consonants are indeed realised as retroflex, not as alveolar.
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perfective aspect marker le to be formulated with the preverbal you in Taiwan (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 97-98). A second function performed by you is that of an all-purpose marker of stress or assertion (cf. P. Chen, 1999, p. 98). Both of these additional functions are said to have been adopted into TSM from Southern Min (P. Chen, 1999, pp. 97, 98).7 Another syntactic difference between the two spoken standards is the more widespread use of certain Classical Chinese formulations in TSM than in MSM, such as the frequent use of the comparative construction with yu ‘more than’ in sentences with the structure [NP Adj YU NP].8 This perhaps reflects the more obvious influence of Classical Chinese on written Chinese in Taiwan than in mainland China.9

2.2. Research into the morpho-syntax of written Modern Standard Chinese

While there has been a certain level of interest in morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese for at least a century now, the last two decades or so have seen a profusion of articles on the topic. This section begins by introducing some of the major researchers and their contributions to the field of Chinese grammar and goes on to outline some significant recent morpho-syntactic findings. This will include a discussion of some of the limitations apparent in much of the research that has been conducted to date.

2.2.1. Major researchers in the general field of Chinese grammar

Wang Li’s works, Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa (Modern Chinese Grammar) and Zhongguo Yufa Lilun (Chinese Grammar Theory), mentioned in section 1.1.3, are significant early comprehensive studies of Chinese grammar which encompass linguistic analyses relevant to Chinese language use in the first half of the twentieth century. This was an era that witnessed great historical, political and social upheavals, covering a period, roughly speaking, from the establishment of the republic and the May Fourth Movement to the beginning of the

7 However, it is possible that the influence of English has also played a role (cf. also discussion on contact-induced grammaticalisation in section 7.2.3.5)

8 The frequent use of this and other Classical Chinese constructions was observed by the author during her three-year stay in Taiwan.

9 Although one factor behind this difference is indubitably the preference for more conservative language use in a formal context in Taiwan than mainland China, another factor could be the influence of Southern Min, which is spoken widely in Taiwan and which is said to be closer to Classical Chinese than Modern Mandarin.
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Communist era. Against this socio-political backdrop it is perhaps not surprising that the same period saw significant changes in the language (cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 435). Writing as he was a mere 20 years after the introduction of Baihua as the new written standard, Wang Li was in a good position to comment on the many structural borrowings from European languages in “modern Baihua” (cf. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 76-77).

Although his original research was conducted 70 years ago, Wang Li’s contribution to the field of Chinese linguistics cannot be underestimated. He offered a detailed and thorough analysis of a wide range of morpho-syntactic structures in the written language and provided a framework for categorising linguistic observations of Chinese language use and language change (see also discussion in section 1.4.1.1). He also recognised the role that language contact has played in the evolution of Chinese. In so doing he laid the foundation for all subsequent work in this area. Wang Li’s two publications, together with Lü Shuxiang’s (1944) Zhongguo Wenfa Yaolüe (An Outline of Chinese Grammar), combine to give us a rounded synchronic picture of the grammar of Modern Chinese around the middle of the twentieth century.

Several decades later, Lü Shuxiang (1980) edited a very important Chinese-language contribution to Chinese grammar studies, Xiandai Hanyu Baibai Ci (800 Words of Modern Chinese). Around the same time, Charles Li and Sandra Thompson (1981) also compiled a very useful reference work on the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese entitled Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar. Spanning as they do a period of four decades, the several references mentioned here together provide a solid foundation against which morphological and syntactic usage that does not seem to conform to more traditional structures can be compared.

A later researcher who was inspired by Wang Li and who is still cited by modern Chinese linguists (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Hu, 2006) is Cornelius Kubler. His master’s thesis, published nearly 30 years ago as a monograph under the title A Study of Europeanized Grammar in Modern Written Chinese, is still considered a seminal work in the field, partly because of the rigorous research methods used. Kubler, who is one of a surprisingly small number of researchers in the field of Chinese language change to have conducted quantitative research into morpho-syntactic change in Modern Standard Chinese using language corpora (see also discussion in section 2.2.2.1 below), found evidence of the influence of European languages on the syntax and morphology of written Chinese literature.

It has been pointed out that there are two major approaches to grammatical analysis in China (Lin, 2001, pp. 120-121). Firstly, there is grammatical analysis in the traditional Chinese mode, which eschews theory and places great emphasis on real examples, whereby “real” in the context of this tradition is understood to mean that generally only language examples from written texts are cited, mostly taken from publications by renowned and authoritative writers. Proponents of this approach include Lü (1951, 1980) and L. Wang (1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Secondly, there is grammatical analysis in the western tradition, which conducts theory-driven research in the quest for linguistic universals and which considers anything acceptable to native speaker intuition as a language example worthy of analysis. This school aims to understand human language in general and hopes to contribute to the overall picture through the detailed theoretical analysis of individual languages, often working within the generative grammar framework or its various sub-camps. Examples of researchers from this tradition include C.-T. J. Huang (1987, 1988), Yen-hui Audrey Li (1990, 1998); Yen-Hui Audrey Li (2012) and C. N. Li and Thompson (1981). The different goals and different areas of interest of the two linguistic traditions have led not only to a “piecemeal and limited” understanding of Mandarin grammar (Lin, 2001, p. 121), but also to a lack of attention to spoken data.
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It is important to acknowledge that much research has been carried out within various schools of linguistics and that such work is of significant interest and great value to the linguists operating within those particular disciplines. This thesis, however, aims to provide an overview of the literature relevant to researchers studying the morpho-syntax of Modern Standard Chinese, regardless of which school of linguistics they may be attached to. There are a number of reasons for taking this approach. Firstly, while it is relatively easy for linguists working within a particular tradition to gain an overview of their field and of the literature specifically relevant to their line of research, it is much more difficult to gain an overview of the general state of research, and few researchers have attempted it. Consequently, there is a need for a general review of the recent literature relevant to the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese, which does not appear to have been satisfied. Secondly, bearing in mind that the vast majority of research to date on the morpho-syntax of Modern Standard Chinese has concentrated on the written language, it was felt that keeping the focus of the literature review as general as possible offered the greatest likelihood of bringing to light information that might be relevant to spoken Mandarin as well.

2.2.2. Contributions to an understanding of specific morpho-syntactic structures and processes

This subsection outlines some of the valuable contributions made by linguists researching the grammar of written Modern Standard Chinese over the last three decades. The observations and analyses presented here can be roughly divided into contributions to methodology, contributions to theories and models of grammar, and contributions to our understanding of how and why grammatical innovations arise, be they developments in morphological or syntactic structures. These topics will be discussed in turn in the following three subsections.

2.2.2.1. Contributions to methodology

As mentioned above in section 2.2.1, one of the reasons Kubler’s (1985b) work has been so influential is that his findings were underpinned by solid, quantitatively analysed empirical data. Although quantitative data analysis has not in the past been a prominent feature of research into the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese, there have certainly been appeals in recent years for a more empirically based approach (e.g. Hu, 2006, p. 53). Whether in response to calls from Chinese linguists or as part of a more general trend, in the last decade or so there have been some indications that slightly more interest is indeed being shown in
quantitative methodologies (e.g. Siewierska, Xu, & Xiao, 2010; C.-c. Wang & Su, 2012; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004, 2008; R. Xiao et al., 2006). Both the databases and the technical capabilities available to linguists have undergone rapid improvements in the last few years. As language corpora have expanded almost exponentially in size and as software and search algorithms have made significant advances, corpus linguistics has come into its own. Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that within the field of Chinese linguistics the favoured empirically based approach of the moment seems to be quantitative analysis of corpus data.

2.2.2. Contributions to grammar theory

Grammatical systems

One topic in Mandarin Chinese grammar that has been the subject of several studies is what might be referred to as “wordhood”. Questions addressed here include the definition of “word” as it applies to Chinese; boundaries between morphemes, words and phrases; principles of word formation, including the extent to which the rules of syntactic structure are reflected in the principles of word structure; whether or not Modern Standard Chinese makes use of affixation; and whether it is valid to treat compounding and derivation as two distinct phenomena (cf. Jun Ding, 2012; Packard, 1998; Ross, 1998; San, 1998; Y. Sun, 2000). Although many of these questions remain controversial, the very fact that they have been explicitly formulated represents significant progress in Chinese linguistics. One noticeable characteristic of much of the research in this area is that it is generally based on the unarticulated underlying assumption that “affixation” in the context of Modern Standard Chinese applies only to derivational affixation; many researchers omit to make explicit the fact that only one type of affixation is being considered (e.g. Packard, 1998; Y. Sun, 2000). Alternatively, they may consider examples of both derivational and grammatical affixation but fail to distinguish between the two different types (e.g. Jun Ding, 2012).

Aspect has been one of the most frequently studied and hotly debated topics in Chinese grammar, not least because Mandarin Chinese is, in comparison with many other languages, quite rich in the range of possibilities it possesses for encoding aspectual information. Issues addressed in studies specifically conducted into Mandarin Chinese aspect include the distinction between tense and aspect; the relationship between aspect and aktionsart in Modern Standard Chinese, including the interplay of morpho-syntactic and semantic factors in expressing aspect and aktionsart; more fine-grained classifications of aspect; how many...
different aspect markers and aspectual structures there are in Modern Standard Chinese and the most appropriate terminology to describe them; a detailed analysis of individual aspect markers; and the interaction of various combinations of different aspect markers and aspectual structures (cf. Chappell, 1988; Dai, 1997; Klein et al., 2000; Mangione & Li, 1993; Ross, 1995; Shen, 2004; Smith, 1994; J.-S. Wu, 2005, 2007; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004; G. Yang, 2009). Although many treatments – either of what the particular study claims to be the entire aspectual system of Modern Standard Chinese or of selected parts of it – have been published, the analyses and classification systems presented have not always met with widespread acceptance. One significant advance to our understanding of aspect in Modern Standard Chinese in recent years has been the realisation that aspectual information is encoded not just in so-called aspect markers, but also in a range of other structures (e.g. R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004).

**Particular word classes**

Measure words, also known as classifiers, have also been the subject of several studies (e.g. Corver, 2009; Esteva, 2008; Yen-hui Audrey Li, 1998; Liao & Wang, 2011). The focus of research has covered syntactic restrictions on their use; interactions with other sentence constituents, including co-occurrence with other measure words; the role they play in information structure; and the relevance of universal classifying categories to the Chinese classifying system.

Another word class that has had its share of interest is adjectives. Following Zhu’s (1956) major contribution, many other linguists have investigated various aspects of this word class more recently (e.g. Cheung, 2012; Grano, 2012; Paul, 2010; G. Zhang, 2000). Apart from attempting to come up with an acceptable definition of the class of adjectives in the context of Mandarin Chinese, researchers have also elucidated various subclasses of adjectives; determined constraints on their use; investigated adjectival ordering; and examined ambiguities in their referential scope.

As a language without articles, Modern Standard Chinese nevertheless has possibilities for distinguishing between definite and indefinite noun phrases. A number of researchers have attempted to delineate the structural conditions under which a noun phrase in a Mandarin Chinese sentence is understood to be definite vs. indefinite and to determine the contributions of various sentence constituents to the interpretation of (in)definiteness, e.g. in the case of a
noun phrases in an existential sentence, or when a noun phrase is modified by a quantifier (cf. C.-T. J. Huang, 1987; Luo, 2011).

Specific constructions

Passive constructions with *bei* have excited more remark than many other topics in Chinese linguistics; nevertheless, there are still several areas of controversy surrounding the passive marker. These include structural and semantic constraints on its use; the implications or overtones of *bei* and the extent to which its use is associated with verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning; as well as the most appropriate word class classification of the morpheme *bei* (cf. Cao, 2003; Chappell, 1983; Hashimoto, 1988; Sugimura, 2003, 2006; S.-W. Tang, 2001; Y. Wu, 2013; R. Xiao et al., 2006). More recently, its use to signal irony has also been noted (Q. Xiao & Link, 2013). It is interesting to observe that studies on this topic rarely contain any reference to or comparison with the disposal *ba* construction, even though these two grammatical markers tend to be grouped together in traditional analyses of Mandarin Chinese grammar. Chapter 5 contains a more complete and detailed discussion of the existing literature on the *bei* construction, as well as findings of the present study relating to the passive marker.

Another construction that bears many similarities to the *bei* construction and whose treatment often overlaps with that of the passive marker in traditional analyses of Mandarin Chinese grammar is the disposal *ba* construction. This has also aroused a considerable amount of interest in linguistic circles. There have been several attempts to describe the precise meaning and function of the object-raising grammatical marker *ba* and to elucidate the semantic and structural constraints on its use (cf. Chappell, 1991a; Jing-Schmidt & Tao, 2009; F.-H. Liu, 1997; B. Zhang, 2002).

Individual morphemes

The grammatical marker *men*, variously described as a plural suffix, a plural morpheme and a collective marker, has been investigated by a number of researchers (e.g. Iljic, 1994, 2001; Yen-Hui Audrey Li, 1999; Maury, 1992), amongst whom there is still some disagreement as to whether it is more appropriate to refer to *men* as a suffix or simply as a morpheme or a marker, and whether it signals primarily plurality or something else, such as collectivity. These researchers have frequently cited examples of grammatically acceptable vs. infelicitous sentences in an attempt to ascertain and illustrate the various restrictions purportedly applying
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to its use. Sometimes its interaction with other constituents to signal the plural reference of
the noun phrase has also been examined. The behaviour of *men* and its representation in the
literature will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

The small, unstressed, seemingly insignificant structural particle *de* is another grammatical
feature that has excited considerable interest in linguistic circles (e.g. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng,
Ross, 1983; Shi, 2008; Simpson & Wu, 2002). Researchers have endeavoured to tease out the
full range of functions of *de* and to discriminate between different uses of *de*; they have
enumerated and investigated all possible constructions involving *de*, including as part of the
so-called focus or cleft *shi…de* construction; they have debated the most appropriate word
class assignment for *de*, including suggestions that *de* may be a suffix or a clitic or an
independent morpheme; they have examines the internal structure of *de* constructions and
discussed whether *de* should be analysed as belonging to the modifier or the head, or whether
indeed *de* itself should be taken as the head. Many of these questions have yet to be answered
definitively.

The copula *shi* has also been investigated by a number of linguists, who have studied its use
in several different structures and with different functions, including emphatic *shi* and the
*shi…de* construction (e.g. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng, 2008; Paul & Whitman, 2008; Shi, 1994;
Teng, 1979; Tham, 2008). Some of the issues covered include a discussion of the most
appropriate terminology for the constructions in question and any distinctions between them,
including focus construction, cleft sentence or pseudo-cleft sentence; a contrastive
comparison of the meaning, functions and restrictions on the use of the *shi ... de* construction
vs. emphatic *shi* on its own; a discussion of most appropriate descriptive terminology for *shi*:
emphasis, focus, marker of special affirmation, association with focus etc. These points will
be discussed in more detail in chapter 6.

**Miscellaneous**

The order of constituents within a sentence has received some attention in the literature on
the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese (cf. LaPolla, 1995; Yen-hui Audrey Li, 1990;
Zuoyan Song & Tao, 2009; C. Sun & Givón, 1985). One of the earlier issues regarding
constituent order was whether word order in Modern Standard Chinese is fundamentally SVO
or SOV, although the jury seems now to have come down quite conclusively on the side of
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SVO. In more recent years, discussions have centred around marked and unmarked word order; semantic and pragmatic factors that determine word order in Mandarin Chinese; and contextual factors contributing to a different order of main and subordinate clauses.\textsuperscript{10}

General comments

It is interesting to note that one not uncommon approach within the field of Modern Standard Chinese grammar research is to study equivalent or similar structures in other varieties of Chinese, or morpho-syntactic patterns constructed around a cognate of the Mandarin morpheme being investigated, to see if that can reveal any insights into the behaviour and/or most appropriate analysis of the morpho-syntactic structure in question in Modern Standard Chinese (Lisa L.-S. Cheng & Sybesma, 2005; Yen-Hui Audrey Li, 2012). For this methodology to have any claim to validity, the tacit underlying assumption behind it must surely be that all varieties of Chinese are essentially dialects of the same language. This assumption has been criticised in section 1.1.1 of this thesis.

Although the slant of many of the publications mentioned in the preceding paragraphs is rather abstract and theoretical in nature, it must in all fairness be conceded that some of them do indeed investigate two major points of more concrete and practical interest, namely (a) why a particular morpho-syntactic feature or construction appears when it does (and, conversely, why it is omitted when it is), as well as (b) all the functions of a particular morpho-syntactic feature or construction. However, even amongst the papers that attempt a thorough investigation of these two questions, from the standpoint of the student of Modern Standard Chinese – particularly the non-native learner – who wishes to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the grammar of the language there are two apparent shortcomings. Firstly, these questions are usually not examined primarily from the point of view of the speaker or writer of Modern Standard Chinese, but rather from the point of view of theoretical justification, explanation and classification. It seems that the aim of such papers is less to consider the psycholinguistic relevance of the behaviour of the morpho-syntactic

\textsuperscript{10} There are, of course, other topics in Chinese linguistics that deserve a cursory mention even if they have not necessarily been the subject of such intense interest. These include reduplication; ellipsis; comparative constructions; and complement constructions, including resultative verb compounds. Some of these overlap with each other and/or with the topics mentioned above. Needless to say, many of the topics outlined briefly in this section have been dealt with to varying degrees of thoroughness in the general grammar references mentioned in the preceding section.

Angela Cook 14/02/2014
feature undergoing analysis for the user of the language and more to consider how best to account for all the relevant constructions within the theoretical framework adopted by the particular author. As part of these discussions, there is rarely any mention of the relative frequency of the various patterns and structures, nor is there generally more than a perfunctory attempt to rank the various uses in terms of a hierarchy of core to peripheral functions. The other relatively obvious shortcoming, which is related quite closely to the first, is that there is a pervasive tendency when investigating the latter question to concentrate on functions that are essentially morpho-syntactic in nature, and to neglect or play down the importance of semantic, pragmatic, discourse and other considerations. Although there are some notable exceptions to this approach (e.g. Chappell & Thompson, 1992; LaPolla, 1995; H. Tao, 1999; R. Xiao et al., 2006; B. Zhang, 2002), the trend is noticeable enough for the emphasis placed on formal or structural properties in western syntactic analyses to have sparked criticism from some Chinese linguists, who have argued for greater consideration to be given to other linguistic and contextual factors (cf. Lin, 2001, pp. 125-126). Similarly, a central contention of the present thesis is that factors that are neither syntactic nor morphological in nature can and do play an important role in determining the behaviour of linguistic features that are themselves classified as morpho-syntactic.

2.2.2.3. Morpho-syntactic change

It has been pointed out that the prevailing view in Chinese historical linguistics is that most morpho-syntactic change in the history of Chinese has been a result of – or at least related to – grammaticalisation (Yue-Hashimoto, 1993). A review of the contemporary literature reveals that although grammaticalisation has certainly played a part in many of the morpho-syntactic developments observed in Modern Standard Chinese over the last three decades, it has not been the only or even necessarily the main factor behind the majority of changes observed.

A significant number of publications on morpho-syntactic developments in written Chinese have appeared in recent years. The remainder of this section is devoted to summarising some

---

11 Most of the phenomena outlined in this section are discussed in more detail under various subheadings of sections 0 and 3.3.
of the major observations relating to changes in grammatical structures. For ease of comparison, this section has the same internal organisation and makes use of the same subheadings as the preceding section, 2.2.2.2 “Contributions to grammar theory”.

Grammatical systems

Section 2.2.2.2 above highlighted, amongst other issues, some of the more prominent observations in relation to word formation, in particular affixation. Within the subfield of morpho-syntactic language change in Modern Standard Chinese, similar topics have also exercised considerable fascination over the researchers in the field, although the areas of greatest interest may have been slightly different. Broadly speaking, the recent changes in word formation noted in the literature can be discussed under the subheadings of derivational morphology and inflexional morphology.

As a general observation, many linguists have drawn attention to the trend towards polysyllabism in written Modern Standard Chinese. Generally it has been observed that the proportion of disyllabic and polysyllabic words is increasing significantly (P. Chen, 1999; Hu, 2006). This tendency has been present in written Chinese for many centuries, possibly even millennia, but has been more marked from the beginning of the twentieth century, when it has been accelerated by contact with other languages (Hu, 2006, pp. 54-55). A number of sinologists have commented on the historical shift of Chinese from a monosyllabic to a polysyllabic language (e.g. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 138-139; Forrest, 1973, pp. 59-61; Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 12-15).

One factor contributing to increasing numbers of disyllabic and multisyllabic words in recent decades is a range of word formation strategies that can be subsumed under the heading of derivational morphology. Compounding, for example, has been a productive process of word formation for many centuries but now plays a significantly more important role in the modern language (cf. Cook, in press; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Affixation is another type of derivational morphology that is becoming increasingly common (B. Zhang, 2005). To

12 It is interesting to note that in the Chinese-language literature so-called “lettered words” are often classified as a morphological innovation, whereas in the present study it has been chosen to consider this phenomenon as primarily affecting the lexicon. Of course, the adoption of “lettered words” entails the adoption of new graphology and can be associated with the adoption of new phonemes and even new morphemes; nevertheless, its most immediate impact is felt in the lexicon (cf. Cook, in press).
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what extent these trends are a response to changing socio-political conditions and language-
internal forces for change, and to what extent they are a result of contact with other
languages, is a matter for debate in the literature. One limitation of the research in this area is
that studies on affixation have often focussed on only a small subset of affixes, either chosen
ad hoc by the particular researcher or based on a selection in more traditional analyses by
previous researchers. Furthermore, although the distinction is not always made clear in the
Chinese-language literature, from the perspective of historical linguistics it is instructive and
enlightening to distinguish between those morphemes that are primarily word class markers
and those that primarily have a semantic function. The former we can term affixes and the
latter affixoids or common compositional elements. Most, if not all, Chinese affixes started
life as “free” morphemes and passed through a phase of increasing popularity and
concomitant loss of morphological freedom and increase in boundedness to become common
compositional elements before undergoing significant semantic bleaching to reach the status
of affixes. Because this process of grammaticalisation is quite common in Chinese (as,
indeed, in many languages of the world) and because many Chinese morphemes currently
find themselves at various points along the cline, it can be difficult to draw a clean line
between affixes and common compositional elements. Most affixoids will have undergone at
least some degree of semantic bleaching, and it can be a tricky matter to determine at what
stage the grammatical function takes over from the semantic function as the primary one.

Another factor contributing to the observed tendency towards polysyllabism in modern
Chinese is the increasing use of a range of inflexional markers. To maintain consistency with
the previous section of this chapter, changes within the aspectual system are discussed here,
while the plural suffix is discussed at a slightly later point. The overall picture within the
aspectual system is one of increased frequency of use of a number of morphemes generally
referred to as aspect markers, as well as some qualitative changes in the usage of these
grammatical particles. In particular, there is evidence of changes in the use of the experiential
aspect marker guo, the perfective aspect marker le and the continuous aspect marker zhe (cf.
Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a).

**Particular word classes**

Chinese has traditionally been described typologically as not possessing articles. However, in
recent times a number of linguists have made observations of contemporary language use that
are in keeping with the hypothesis that this word class may be starting to emerge. There are
indications that the indefinite article could be grammaticalising from the word for ‘one’, while the definite article seems to be grammaticalising from the distal demonstrative. Specifically, the most commonly occurring [numeral + CL] expression for ‘one’, yi-ge, and the most commonly occurring [DEM + CL] expression, na-ge, are both being used with increasing frequency (cf. Hu, 2006; Shi, Zhu, & Wang, 2003; Tsao, 1978; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, pp. 488-490). These more or less simultaneous developments show some characteristics typical of grammaticalisation, such that it is not unreasonable to postulate that a nascent word class of articles may be emerging in Modern Standard Chinese. There are suggestions that other [yi ‘one’ + CL] and [DEM + CL] combinations may simultaneously be undergoing grammaticalisation in the direction of articles (cf. Cook, 2004; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, pp. 488-489); however, the extent to which this is happening remains a matter for further research.

Specific constructions

One construction that has been observed to be undergoing change is the passive bei construction. Several linguists have noted the increasingly common occurrence of this construction (e.g. Hu, 2006, p. 56; Tsao, 1978; K. Wang, 2002; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 460-462; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 488-489; Xie, 2001). Moreover, the preference for using bei with verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning seems to be less marked than it once was (Chao, 1968, p. 703; P. Chen, 1999, p. 94; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 462).

Individual morphemes

The increased frequency of use of the plural suffix men in written Modern Standard Chinese has drawn comment in the literature (cf. H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Kubler, 1985b, pp. 45-48; Si, 1996, p. 65; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 489). Recent linguistic developments have resulted in the plural marker men becoming more widespread with human nouns, even appearing occasionally with non-human and inanimate nouns (H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, p. 19). The influence of European languages generally is held to be responsible for these developments (Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a).

Quantitative and qualitative innovations in the use of the copula shi have drawn comment from several researchers (e.g. Hu, 2006, p. 55; Shi & Zhu, 2000; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 474-476; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 447-448; Xie, 2001). The copula has been observed to be
appearing not only more frequently but also in different contexts and/or with different functions.

In recent years structural changes have been noted in the use of the coverbs dang ‘become’ and zai ‘be.at’, both of which are now being used as conjunctions meaning ‘when’ (Shi & Zhu, 2000, pp. 202-203). Although Shi and Zhu (2000) were investigating Hong Kong Written Chinese, their work has been cited by mainland Chinese authors, who clearly feel that their observations are of relevance to linguistic developments in mainland China.

In what is arguably the most exciting development currently taking place in MSC morphology, at least one inflexional morpheme has been adopted from English. A number of sources have commented on the suffixation of Chinese verbs and verb phrases by means of the English progressive aspect marker -ing. The use of this loan suffix does not seem to have spread much beyond the internet genres of microblogging, chatting and emailing. Nevertheless, as a linguistic innovation it has attracted enough attention to be included in at least one dictionary.

Miscellaneous

Constituent order has received some attention not only in synchronic studies of Chinese grammar, but also in diachronic studies (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; Hu, 2006; Shi & Zhu, 2000; K. Wang, 2002). For example, the increasing tendency to position the subordinate clause after the main clause has been noted by a number of researchers (e.g. Shi & Zhu, 2000, pp. 3-4; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, pp. 494-495; Xie, 2001). Some have commented on the fact that sentence adverbs are now found in both sentence-initial and sentence-final position, and that some prepositional phrases are placed after the verb (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 496). A change in constituent order that could potentially have more dramatic typological implications is the introduction into written Chinese of certain right-branching structures (Shi & Zhu, 2000; Shi et al., 2003).

A number of researchers have commented on the increased length and grammatical complexity of modifiers in Modern Standard Chinese in recent decades (Ye He, 2004; Hu, 2006, p. 55; Shi & Zhu, 2000; K. Wang, 2002; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b; Xie,

---

Shi and Zhu (2000) rightly follow Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, p. 478) in pointing out that the increased length and complexity of clauses as a whole is primarily a function of the increased length and structural complexity specifically of modifiers and adverbial phrases. Other researchers (e.g. Ye He, 2004; K. Wang, 2002; Xie, 2001) have not necessarily made this relationship so clear.

Another tendency that has been observed in written Chinese is increased explicitness, which refers to the inclusion of sentence elements that previously would have been more commonly omitted if they could be deduced from the context (cf. Shi & Zhu, 2000; Shi et al., 2003; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a; Xie, 2001). Unfortunately, studies on explicitness have often focussed on the increased frequency of occurrence of one or two types of sentence elements (be they transition signals, grammatical subjects, conjunctions or adverbials), without putting their observations into the broader context. That is, research on this topic has sometimes concentrated on a few aspects of the phenomenon without mentioning that the particular pattern or patterns under discussion represent part of a general trend towards increased explicitness in Modern Standard Chinese.

Conversion has also featured quite prominently in the literature on morpho-syntactic language change in Modern Standard Chinese (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Hu, 2006; Shi & Zhu, 1999). Numerous examples of nouns that have undergone verbalisation, verbs and adjectives that have undergone nominalisation, and nouns and verbs that have undergone adjectivisation in recent years have been cited in the literature, as well as shifts in word subclasses. Chen Wanhui, who has studied the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar over the 20 odd years from the introduction of the open-door policy to the early 2000s, came to the conclusion in his investigation of newspaper texts that conversion is one of the major linguistic developments in Modern Chinese (2005, p. 88).15 The influence of English is often cited as one reason, possibly even the most salient reason, for the blurring of distinctions between word classes and subclasses in Chinese language use in both mainland

---

14 Chinese terminology does not distinguish between “sentence” and “clause.” In fact, the suggestions provided by (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 480-481) for de-Europeanised versions of Europeanised sentences show clearly that it is not the sentence length, but rather the clause length that is at issue for some researchers.


**General comments**

For several decades now a popular approach in Chinese-language papers with a focus on morpho-syntactic analysis has been to take one or two aspects of Wang Li’s research and investigate what developments these features are undergoing in current language use. The data forming the basis for the conclusions reached by such studies tend to be a relatively small number of often seemingly arbitrarily selected language examples. That is, this style of research is characterised by two problems: a lack of new angles and approaches, coupled with a lack of quantitative analysis. As a general observation, the former shortcoming seems to be more glaring in publications from mainland China, where the research into morpho-syntactic change in Mandarin Chinese is often rather unimaginative in its focus, methodology and analysis. The research in Taiwan and Hong Kong, by contrast, tends to be somewhat more original and insightful.\(^\text{16}\) The latter shortcoming is gradually being redressed as a burgeoning interest is being shown in quantitative linguistic studies. However, most quantitative research into Mandarin Chinese to date has been synchronic in its focus.

Generally, language contact is considered a major factor contributing to grammatical change in Chinese. A surprisingly large number of morpho-syntactic developments are generally portrayed in the literature as due to, triggered by or at least accelerated by language contact, usually with European languages and most often with English. Developments that are generally portrayed in the literature as being examples of contact-induced language change include increased explicitness; conversion; the grammaticalisation of prepositions to conjunctions; changes in the use of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*; increased sentence length and complexity; repositioning of sentence adverbs; and the emergence of right-branching structures. Literal translations of foreign language texts are

\(^{16}\) It is interesting to note that in Hong Kong research into Chinese syntax and morphology, in particular contact-induced language change, has frequently been more ground-breaking than that in mainland China. One can speculate as to why that might be. It is possible that the prevailing attitude amongst the inhabitants of Hong Kong, a Cantonese-speaking region, is less protective towards Mandarin. They may be less inclined to believe in the supposed “purity” of the language and therefore better able to recognise language change when it does occur, on account of being more open-minded and having fewer preconceptions. Also, having experienced a century or more of colonialism, they may be more comfortable with outside influence in general.
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Although foreign language influence in written Chinese has often been attributed primarily to the widespread use of translated texts, some commentators have concluded that Chinese would have been influenced – albeit to a lesser degree – by foreign languages even without the influence of translations (e.g. Hu, 2006; K. Wang, 2002). The extent to which the syntax and morphology of written Modern Standard Chinese may have been influenced by contact with European languages, in particular English, will be discussed and evaluated in section 7.2.3.6.

A few researchers have commented specifically on the influence of English on the syntax of Hong Kong Written Chinese, (e.g. Shi, 2006; Shi & Zhu, 2000, 2005; Shi et al., 2003). Interestingly, it appears that some syntactic patterns originating in English may have entered Modern Standard Mandarin via contact with Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan (W. Chen, 2005, p. 86). As a general observation, new syntactic trends have frequently been observed first in Hong Kong, e.g. the blurring of distinctions between word classes and sub-classes (Hu, 2006), as well as some innovative uses of the copula shi (cf. Shi & Zhu, 2000; Shi et al., 2003) (see also discussion in section 6.3). The more advanced stage reached by some contact-induced changes in Hong Kong is hardly surprising, given the social, political and historical context in which they have occurred, in particular the long-term relatively intensive contact between English, Cantonese and Mandarin in the former British colony.

2.3. Research into the morpho-syntax of spoken Modern Standard Chinese

The grammar of spoken Mandarin is a field of research boasting only rather sparse and sporadic research findings. Interest in this area seems to have been sparked only in very recent times and may be related to the advent of corpus linguistics. Within the area of written Chinese grammar, the topic of morpho-syntactic language change seems to have excited a considerable degree of interest in recent years; however, the parallel situation does not seem to hold for research into spoken Mandarin.

---

17 It should be noted that literal translations are additionally mentioned by a number of other researchers (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; Ye He, 2004; K. Wang, 2002; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 461) as a prime contributor to Chinese language change in general.
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All in all, there has to date been less linguistic interest in spoken Modern Standard Chinese than one might expect. Admittedly, some Chinese linguists have called for more research into the spoken language (e.g. L. Tao, 2006), in particular research using quantitative methods (e.g. Hu, 2006). Judging by the ratio of research into written Chinese compared with research into the spoken language, however, the traditional attitude that the written language is a more valid representative of language as a whole and thus a more valid object of research continues to prevail in mainstream Chinese linguistics. Why this should be so is not clear; however, a number of linguistic, historical and cultural reasons can be postulated (refer to 2.1.2 “Cultural and historical importance of the written language” above for a detailed discussion of some of these reasons).

Written Chinese has an impressively long history stretching back thousands of years. So many great philosophical and literary works have been written in this language that it carries with it the weight of centuries, even millennia, of tradition. From the standpoint of this great literary tradition, it is perhaps not surprising if a discussion about “the Chinese language” conjures up the immediate association of the written language in the minds of most Chinese speakers.

The study of spoken Chinese is complicated by the fact, mentioned before (see section 1.1.1), that Chinese is considered by many western and some Chinese linguists to be not a single language, but rather a family of languages (cf. Norman, 1988, p. 1; M. Zhou, 2006, p. 160). Even if one accepts the conventional Chinese view of Chinese as a single language with a number of distinct dialects, the fact is that numerous different varieties of spoken Chinese, closely related as they are, are nevertheless mutually unintelligible. On the other hand, there is generally held to be only one system of writing.¹⁸ Thus, while spoken Chinese is realised in many different ways, the writing system is what unifies the language (family) community and binds it together. As such, it is perhaps only natural that linguists interested in Chinese have tended to look first to the written language.

¹⁸ This may be slightly oversimplifying the case. Shi (2006) makes the point that there is, for example, a written form of Cantonese used primarily in low-brow vernacular genres such as pornography and comics. This writing system mirrors spoken Cantonese, following Cantonese sentence structures and making use of many characters not used in standard written Chinese.
2.3.1. Major researchers in the field of spoken Mandarin grammar

Chao Yuen Ren’s (1968) publication, *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese* (mentioned in section 1.1.3), is a seminal work in this field. When it first appeared nearly half a century ago it was ground-breaking in many ways, and even today it remains unmatched for thoroughness and comprehensiveness. Chao’s decision to focus primarily on spoken rather than written texts as the object of grammatical analysis was revolutionary. By his own admission he did use introspection as a major source of “spoken” material; however, he also used recordings of natural, spontaneous speech, as well as notes jotted down on the spot over many years of casual observation. These were supplemented on occasion by other sources, such as excerpts from scripts of contemporary plays. Chao spurned prescriptivism and made a conscious and concerted effort to maintain a descriptive approach to linguistic analysis. All later efforts in the field of spoken Mandarin grammar are indebted to his pioneering work.

C. N. Li and Thompson (1981), in their grammatical treatise *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar* (mentioned in section 2.2.1), also based much of their discussion and analysis on speech examples drawn from real-life conversations. Thus, their work can likewise be considered at least as much a treatment of the spoken as of the written grammar of Modern Standard Chinese.

There have been numerous treatments of Mandarin grammar since the 1980s (see section 2.2.1 for a discussion of a few of the better known ones), many of which cover a range of structures that are common in speech and relatively informal writing styles, as well as structures that are considered somewhat more formal. However, relatively few books are dedicated solely to the analysis of the grammar of spoken Modern Standard Chinese. One exception is Tao Hongyin’s (2011) *Working with Spoken Chinese*, which is targeted at non-native students of Mandarin who already have a foundation in the spoken language and wish to improve their command of grammar and vocabulary, and their general ability to engage in spoken interactions. Another is Huang Shuanfan’s (2013) soon to be released *Chinese Grammar at Work*. 
2.3.2. Contributions to an understanding of specific morpho-syntactic structures and processes

Although recent years have seen an increasing interest in various aspects of spoken Modern Standard Chinese, studies specifically examining morpho-syntactic features of spoken Mandarin are still comparatively rare. It remains more common to use written than spoken data when conducting linguistic research into Modern Standard Chinese. Even when linguists do investigate the spoken language, they often see it as an opportunity to focus on a multitude of other topics in preference to grammar, such as phonological variation (e.g. Q. Zhang, 2005, 2006, 2008); the pronunciation of Mandarin in various regions, for instance rhotacisation and neutral tones in Beijing Local Mandarin or particular characteristics of Taiwan Local Mandarin (e.g. Biq, 2007; Chung, 2006a, 2006b; C. Zhou, 2003); the expression of linguistic identity (e.g. S. Huang, 2000; J. Liu & Tao, 2009); language and cognition (e.g. S. Huang, 2004); aspects of non-verbal communication, including gesture and the negotiation of turn-taking in conversation (e.g. Chui, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; P. Yang, 2011); lexical features (e.g. Z. Tang, 2003); diglossia and dialect contact (e.g. Y. Guo, 1990; Yuanjian He, 2006; M. Zhou, 2001); semantic and pragmatic analysis of Mandarin modal particles (e.g. Chappell, 1991b; R.-J. R. Wu, 2004, 2005); and numerous aspects of child language acquisition of Mandarin Chinese in a monolingual (e.g. C.-C. Huang, 2004; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1977; R. Li, Shi, & Hu, 2012) or multilingual (e.g. Chang-Smith, 2010; R. Qi, 2011; H.-Y. Yang & Zhu, 2010) environment. It is pleasing to see that many of these researchers have discussed the importance of conducting research into spoken as well as written Chinese.

Despite a growing interest in various aspects of spoken Mandarin, the field of morpho-syntactic analysis of spoken Mandarin remains underrepresented vis-à-vis research into the grammar of the written language. Nevertheless, there have been a few forays into this area (e.g. Biq, 2007; Cook, 2012a; M. Fang, 2005a; M. Fang, 2005b; S. Huang, 1999; Siewierska et al., 2010; L. Tao, 2006; Thompson & Tao, 2010), including several that highlight the

---

19 Many of the Chinese linguists who have chosen to conduct research into the spoken language have studied so-called fangyan, i.e. non-standard dialects of Mandarin or other Sinitic languages, often looking at the relationship between Putonghua and the fangyan spoken in a particular region (cf. P. Chen, 1999, p. 45). In other words, a considerable degree of interest has been shown in the influence of local Sinitic languages and dialects on standard Putonghua in various regions. Some of these comparative studies look beyond the pronunciation and the lexicon to investigate some morpho-syntactic features as well.
interplay of other linguistic factors – whether characterised as discourse, register, information flow, semantics or pragmatics – in determining the behaviour of the morpho-syntactic structures under discussion (e.g. Biq, 2004a, 2004b; Chappell, 1986; Chappell & Thompson, 1992; Cook, 2012b; Zuoyan Song & Tao, 2009). Perhaps surprisingly, within the relatively small body of literature specifically dealing with the synchronic analysis of morpho-syntactic features of spoken Mandarin, a significant proportion have focussed on a variety of Chinese other than the mainland standard.

This subsection highlights some of the areas of research focus and interesting observations made in relation to the grammar of spoken Modern Standard Chinese over the last three decades. Once again, the findings presented here are divided into contributions to methodology, contributions to theories and models of grammar, and contributions in the areas of morphological and syntactic change.

2.3.2.1. Contributions to methodology

The author’s own master’s thesis (Cook, 2004), which investigated recent influences of English on Mandarin in Taiwanese variety shows, applied quantitative methods of analysis to language corpora. Many of the observations in the literature pertaining to developments in the written language (see section 2.2.2.3) were taken as a starting point for morphological and syntactic investigations of spoken data. In addition, innovations and trends in the lexicon of the spoken language over a six-year period, such as borrowed words and code-switching, were also reported on. Although many of the linguistic developments described had already been noted in the written language, this work was ground-breaking in that an attempt was made to collect evidence for and describe, both quantitatively and qualitatively, morpho-syntactic changes in the spoken language. Since then, a number of other studies have also made use of corpus data to conduct quantitative analysis of spoken Modern Standard Chinese language use and to investigate the grammar of spoken Mandarin (e.g. Biq, 2004b; Siewierska et al., 2010; Zuoyan Song & Tao, 2009; Thompson & Tao, 2010; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2008; R. Xiao et al., 2006). Nevertheless, it is still relatively unusual to come across studies of morpho-syntactic change in spoken Mandarin that are based on the quantitative analysis of corpus data.

20 Note that some of the studies cited have made use of both written and spoken data in their analysis.
2.3.2.2. Contributions to grammar theory

Grammatical systems

None seem to have been commented on in relation to spoken Modern Standard Chinese.

Particular word classes

Thompson and Tao (2010) have studied the word class of adjectives in spoken discourse. They investigated the lexicalisation of [Adj+N] collocations and the significance of repetition in achieving different cognitive representations of such combinations.

R. Xiao and McEnery (2008) have studied negation in both written and spoken texts. On the basis of corpus data they were able to investigate a range of structures, including double negation, rhetorical questions and redundant negation; to delineate the differences between the negators bu and mei more clearly; and to describe their interaction with various aspect markers.

Specific constructions

The passive bei construction is another grammar point, the analysis of whose use in spoken dialogue has revealed some interesting insights. R. Xiao et al. (2006) have analysed occurrences of bei in corpora of both written and spoken data to identify various structural and semantic constraints on its use; its interaction with aspect and aktionsart; and the relative distribution in written and spoken genres of long vs. short passives. A comparison of their findings with earlier literature on Mandarin Chinese grammar reveals that the passive marker bei is frequently used in a number of syntactic environments not condoned by traditional grammatical analyses. Similarly, in a recent conference presentation (Cook, 2012a) attested speech examples from mainland chat shows were given in which the passive marker bei exhibited behaviour in contravention of several well-documented semantic and morpho-

21 From careful reading of this source one can calculate that although the Callhome Mandarin Chinese Transcripts consulted for this study comprise approximately 300,000 words of spontaneous conversational data, the frequency of the passive marker bei was given as 6 times per 100,000 words (one or two orders of magnitude less than for the written genres), making an estimated total of only 18 spoken occurrences. Thus, the conclusions drawn from this study are in fact reliant primarily on written data.
syntactic constraints. The data also contained one example of the use of so-called “ironic” or “satirical” bei to signal the inaccuracy of the information reported and/or speaker distance from the content of the utterance (Q. Xiao & Link, 2013) (refer also to discussion in section 2.2.2.2 above). These points will be covered in greater depth in chapter 5.

**Individual morphemes**

Contemporary use of the plural morpheme *men* in spoken Mandarin is interesting for a number of reasons. It appears to be capable of performing a range of different semantic, pragmatic and structural roles within utterances, apart from merely indicating or emphasising plural number (Cook, 2012b). Thus, there are several different factors that determine the likelihood of the plural suffix being appended to a noun with human reference in a given context (Cook, 2012b). These points will be discussed in more detail in relation to the data from this study in chapter 4.

In a study of the use of general nouns in spoken Mandarin in Taiwan (Biq, 2004b), it was found that *ren* ‘people’, *shi(qing)* ‘matter’ and *dongxi* ‘thing’ varied as to their referential specificity, as well as their propensity for forming fixed expressions and stabilised constructions. The research investigated co-occurrences and collocations of these three words, particularly with different measure words and verbs, and highlighted a number of idiomatic expressions involving general nouns. It also described various roles played by *ren*, *shi(qing)* and *dongxi* in discourse and information structure.

**Miscellaneous**

There have been a few other isolated studies of various aspects of Mandarin grammar in spoken interactions. Siewierska et al. (2010), for example, have looked at the behaviour of splittable compounds in both spoken and written texts.

Constituent order, in particular the placement of causal clauses in relation to the main clause, has also been investigated in spoken Mandarin. Despite the fact that the preferred clausal ordering traditionally stipulated by grammar references is for the subordinate clause to occur

---

22 These included the use of bei with inanimate agents; its redundant use to explicitly coerce a passive reading of utterances that would have been interpreted as passive even in the absence of any overt grammatical marking as such (for a more detailed discussion of so-called “notional passives”, the reader is referred to section 5.2.1.4); and its use in conjunction with the durative aspect marker.
before the main clause, attested speech examples in fact often show a preference for sentence-final position over sentence-initial position. Research by Zuoyan Song and Tao (2009) suggests that analysis of the two different sequences as performing two different linguistic functions (namely information-sharing and interactional) can help explain divergent distributional patterns in different registers.

**General comments**

In general linguists working in the field of spoken Mandarin morpho-syntax have chosen to study topics that have likewise been dealt with in relation to written Chinese grammar. Nevertheless, the differences between the two fields are quite striking. Overall the research into morpho-syntactic features of spoken Modern Standard Chinese is quite piecemeal and significantly smaller in quantity than that focussing on the written language.

**2.3.2.3. Morpho-syntactic change**

It was pointed out in the introduction to section 2.3 above that the language examples on which studies of morpho-syntactic change in Chinese have been based have rarely been sourced from spoken texts; rather, they have tended to be taken from literary works, newspapers and other written texts. As mentioned in section 2.1.2 above, native speakers of Mandarin Chinese have thus far evinced less academic interest in the spoken form of their standard language and in particular in the grammar of their spoken standard than speakers of many other languages. Moreover, what interest they have shown has been hampered by such preconceived notions as the inferiority of the spoken language vis-à-vis the written language, the irregularity and inconsistency of speaker performance, the lack of logic and systematicity in spoken utterances etc. Thus, with a few notable exceptions, there have generally only been a relatively small number of isolated studies investigating particular morpho-syntactic features of interest and their changing behaviour in spoken Mandarin. It is only in the last few years that structural change in the spoken language has become the subject of linguistic analysis. Insightful research into the grammatical developments in spoken Mandarin has recently been carried out by such linguists as Tao Hongyin and Richard Xiao.

---

23 Most of the phenomena outlined in this section are discussed in more detail under various subheadings of sections 0 and 3.3.
In addition to questions of status, prestige, and cultural and ethnic symbolism discussed above in sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.4, which may contribute to a lack of interest in spoken forms of Chinese, there seems to be a general assumption amongst Chinese historical linguists that language change occurs first in the written language, then in the spoken (e.g. Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Thus, Chinese historical linguists are understandably more likely to evince an interest in the spoken language. Interestingly, this assumption runs contrary to the accepted wisdom amongst Western language change experts, which states that language change, in particular grammatical change, is likely to manifest itself in the spoken language some time before it filters through to the written language (cf. Collins, 2011; Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 250).

**Grammatical systems**

Tentative changes noted in derivational morphology in recent years include the more frequent and more productive use of the nominalising suffix *du* and the functional shift of *xing* from a nominalising to an adjectivising suffix. Both of these have been cautiously observed in spoken data from Taiwanese variety shows (Cook, 2004).

**Particular word classes**

A number of linguists have investigated the emerging class of determiners in spoken Mandarin, both in synchronic studies (Biq, 2007; M. Fang, 2005a; S. Huang, 1999) and in a diachronic study of language use in Taiwanese variety shows (Cook, 2004). Researchers focussing on different varieties of Mandarin, including Beijing Local Mandarin, Taiwan Local Mandarin and Taiwan Standard Mandarin, have come to similar conclusions, namely either that both the proximal demonstrative *zhe* and the distal demonstrative *na* are grammaticalising to definite articles or that only the latter is undergoing some change in usage. The fact that demonstrative pronouns occurred with surprisingly high frequency in the data under investigation and in many cases apparently redundantly has been repeatedly remarked on. Whether the emerging class of definite article(s) consists of the monosyllabic *na*, comprises the disyllabic DEM + CL combination *na-ge*, or encompasses a range of forms in which *na* combines with different classifiers depending on the noun in question, is a matter for discussion.

Some studies are suggestive of the possibility that an indefinite article may also be emerging. Cook (2004) found that in spoken data from Taiwan the expression *yi-ge* (one-CL) was often
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used where it would not have been required or expected according to traditional analyses of Modern Standard Chinese grammar. Meanwhile, the results of other research into Beijing Local Mandarin (L. Tao, 2006, 2009) have shown that the lexeme for ‘one’, yi, is being used not only with increasing frequency, but also – significantly – often without a classifier where traditionally one would have been expected according to the requirements of standard Mandarin Chinese grammar. Another interesting finding from this investigation of usage related language change is the interaction of phonology and syntax, which manifests itself in the “frozen” rising tone realisation of yi even in the absence of the classifier ge that originally provided the environment for the tone sandhi.

The high frequency of occurrence of both types of expression (definite and indefinite quasi-articles) in the studies cited, combined with the occasional description of their use as “redundant” or “unnecessary”, seems to imply a degree of semantic blending consistent with the observation noted in section 2.2.2.3 in relation to written Chinese that the category of articles may be emerging. Corroboration of these trends has been found in other spoken varieties of Chinese apart from Mandarin (e.g. Lisa L.-S. Cheng & Sybesma, 2005)

Research into the use of measure words in spoken discourse may also be relevant to the emergence of definite and indefinite articles. Analysis of both spoken and written data from mainland China has revealed that classifiers may perform the pragmatic function of highlighting the salience of a noun phrase to the discourse (W. Li, 2000).

Specific constructions

Frequency analysis of the bei passive in a diachronic study of Taiwanese variety shows pointed to the stabilisation of this form after the model of European languages (Cook, 2004). The main point of interest was that the preference for using bei with verbs with an adverse meaning appeared to be becoming weaker.

Individual morphemes

Studies of language use in television shows offer interesting insights into historical change in the use of the plural suffix men. Firstly, data from Taiwan suggest that, as with written Chinese (cf. section 2.2.2.3), in spoken discourse the plural suffix may also be occurring with increasing frequency (Cook, 2011). Secondly, data from both Taiwan and mainland China indicate that several of the old restrictions governing its use seem gradually to be breaking
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down (Cook, 2004, 2011, 2012b). Thirdly, it has been suggested that the plural marker *men* might be adopting an additional pragmatic function as a diminutive suffix and – in a possibly related development – that it occurs more often with expressions denoting female persons than with those denoting male persons (Cook, 2004, 2011). Finally, it has also been suggested that the use of the plural suffix may be spreading via lexical diffusion (Cook, 2012b).

In the same study of spoken data from Taiwanese variety shows, it was observed that the copula *shi* was used “redundantly” between the subject and the predicate a number of times, without any obvious contribution to the emphatic force of the utterance (Cook, 2004). Moreover, there were tentative indications of the copula *shi* taking on the function of a marker of progressive aspect (Cook, 2004).

Miscellaneous

One type of word order change apparently taking place in spoken Modern Standard Chinese involves the position of prepositional phrases. Spoken data from Taiwan reveal many examples of locative, temporal and benefactive prepositional phrases after the object (Cook, 2004), rather than their more traditional placement before the verb.

General comments

There are very few studies in the field of morpho-syntactic change in spoken Mandarin. Although several points of interest have been noted in the literature, they have appeared in only a very small number of separate publications, only two of which used real-time methodology: Cook (2004) and Cook (2011). Both of these diachronic studies were based on the same corpus of spoken data collected from Taiwanese variety shows at two sampling points in 1996 and 2002. It is certainly true that some interesting data came to light regarding the changing patterns of use of certain morpho-syntactic features. Bearing in mind the limited scope of the two studies and the short period of time covered, however, it is clear that more needs to be done in this area before definitive conclusions can be drawn. Many of the findings of the two studies were in line with similar observations of morpho-syntactic developments in written Chinese. Nevertheless, there were also some new and/or different discoveries, in particular pertaining to the use of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. 
2.4. **Summary and current research trends**

The overall impression to be gleaned from the sum of morpho-syntactic observations presented in the literature is one of a language that is in a state of flux. Some Mandarin Chinese words are being used with novel syntactic functions; a few innovative structures have appeared; several existing structures have increased in popularity and frequency or are being used in slightly different ways; and new word patterns are emerging. This leads one to suspect that traditional accounts of Mandarin Chinese grammar may in many cases not necessarily reflect the way the language is currently being used.

As far as methodology is concerned, there is a relative paucity of studies based on quantitative research. This contrasts with research into western languages, where quantitative analysis of morpho-syntactic features has been a popular approach for some time (e.g. Van de Velde et al., 1997). It is comparatively rare to find well-grounded quantitative analyses of morpho-syntactic features of Chinese. One method enabling highly controlled quantitative research on a large scale is to establish a language corpus, and it is pleasing to note that this strategy is increasingly being adopted. Some researchers, publishing both in Chinese and in western languages, have begun venturing into corpus linguistics (e.g. Siewierska et al., 2010; R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004, 2008; R. Xiao et al., 2006). Several well-known corpora of written Chinese, including the Peking University Language Corpus of Modern Chinese (maintained by the Centre for Chinese Linguistics) and the Lancaster Corpus of Mandarin Chinese, are now being maintained. As language corpora lend themselves to a number of investigative purposes, not all corpus-based studies have a morpho-syntactic focus; indeed, to date only a very few scholars have published research within the narrow but important field of corpus-based morpho-syntactic studies (e.g. R. Xiao & McEnery, 2004, 2010).

With regard to the data used, there is generally a dearth of research into spoken Chinese. A significant proportion of the non-Chinese literature on morpho-syntactic features of various languages has concentrated primarily on or at least included examples of the spoken language. This approach contrasts starkly with the Chinese-language literature on syntax and morphology, which has shown a marked tendency to focus on the written language.

This thesis aims to go some way towards addressing all three of these issues, as outlined in the research questions (cf. section 1.3). Through the construction of a framework for analysing and classifying morpho-syntactic change in Modern Standard Chinese, this thesis
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will enable researchers to ascertain what grammatical developments are currently taking place, if and how these developments are interrelated, and what the focus of future research should be. By carrying out quantitative analysis of spoken data to investigate the operation of selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese in spoken interactions, it is hoped that the observations will contribute both to a shift in the types of data used and to a shift in the types of methodological approaches employed. As previous research has tended to neglect spoken data, this study aims to draw attention to the importance of spoken data in morpho-syntactic analyses. Likewise, as previous research has not always made use of up-to-date methodology, this study will use quantitative analysis of corpus data.

From the critical analysis of the literature presented in this chapter, it should be obvious that there are more serious shortcomings within the field of Modern Standard Chinese morpho-syntactic change than with synchronic analyses of Modern Standard Chinese grammar. There seems to be a need for a reconceptualised analysis of the findings discussed in the existing literature in order to enable further research into morpho-syntactic developments to achieve targeted progress. At the same time, however, there is also a need for more detailed, thorough analysis of synchronic language use of selected features, preferably backed up by solid empirical evidence. This must happen before genuine progress in language change research can be made, for the simple reason that if the synchronic descriptions of the various morpho-syntactic features are incomplete, it is very difficult to see whether changes are occurring or not. Thus, it is important to bear in mind that a comprehensive, detailed and thorough descriptive (synchronic) analysis is a prerequisite for a valid study of (diachronic) language change.

This thesis aims to pave the way for later research into morpho-syntactic language change in spoken Mandarin. It hopes to achieve this with a two-pronged approach: firstly, by providing a reconceptualised analysis of the research to date; and secondly, by providing more detailed, thorough analysis of synchronic language use of selected morpho-syntactic features.24

---

24 Note that there is a precedent for this approach. Wang Li also provided a framework for analysing and categorising contact-induced language change (so-called “Europeanised grammar”) within a more general treatment of Chinese grammar (refer to discussion in section 1.4.1.1). This thesis aims to do something similar, except that the morpho-syntactic changes observed over the last 30 years are not necessarily all contact-induced, and the treatment of Chinese grammar presented here will focus only on three selected features.
3. **Morpho-syntactic schema: A reconceptualised analysis of morpho-syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese**

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter a reconceptualised framework will be proposed for classifying the major morpho-syntactic features that have been investigated in relation to language change in Modern Standard Chinese in the past three decades. The goal is to develop a scaffold that is logical, systematic and relevant to spoken Mandarin. In addition, it should be flexible enough to be able to accommodate new information as that comes to light. Although it is probably not possible for any research to be absolutely comprehensive, this chapter aims to be as thorough in its treatment of the field as possible.

The morpho-syntactic schema proposed in this chapter is divided first of all into the two broad categories of morphology and syntax. Within the two main categories there are a number of subcategories. Each of the subcategories is described in detail, with examples given to elucidate where necessary. Although there are doubtless some other areas in which observations regarding Mandarin Chinese language change have been made in recent years, such as in the lexis, phonology, style and discourse structure, these fall outside the range of the present discussion. This schema is designed to classify morpho-syntactic developments that have been the subject of academic investigation in Modern Standard Chinese over the last three decades; different observations may be relevant to other varieties of Chinese.¹ In devising the present morpho-syntactic framework, categories have been defined according to their linguistic form and selected according to their relevance to the modern written and spoken standards. The parameters are observations that have been made in the last 30 years – or, if made earlier, that are relevant to recent linguistic developments and/or current language usage.

---

¹ Note that only morpho-syntactic language change is considered here. The reader is referred to Cook’s (in press) work for an overview and reconceptualisation of the lexical developments of the last 30 years observed in Modern Standard Chinese.
3.2. Morphological schema

This section presents the author’s own system of classification for recent morphological developments in Modern Standard Chinese. The schema has been designed to ensure that it retains maximum flexibility as well as options for extension and modification as new data are analysed.² Recent morphological developments noted in the literature are discussed under the following two headings: derivational morphology and inflexional morphology.³

Figure 1: Morphological schema

² It is interesting to note that in the Chinese-language literature so-called “lettered words” are often classified as a morphological innovation, whereas it was decided in this study to consider the phenomenon as primarily affecting the lexicon. Of course, the adoption of “lettered words” entails the adoption of new graphology and can be associated with the adoption of new phonemes and even new morphemes; nevertheless, its most immediate impact is felt in the lexicon.

³ This is the author’s own classification system: the various classes and subclasses described here are not necessarily referred to as such by all the authors cited as sources.
One topic that has been explored at length in the Chinese-language literature on morphological change is polysyllabism.\(^4\) Generally, it has been observed that the number of polysyllabic words in Modern Standard Chinese is increasing (P. Chen, 1999; Forrest, 1973; Hu, 2006; Karlgren, 1971[1929]; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a). It is further claimed that this tendency has been accelerated by contact with other languages (cf. Hu, 2006, pp. 54-55; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 467). A number of sinologists have commented on the historical shift of Chinese from a monosyllabic to a polysyllabic language (e.g. P. Chen, 1999, pp. 138-139; Forrest, 1973, pp. 59-62; Karlgren, 1971[1929], pp. 12-16). For over two thousand years from the establishment of the Qin dynasty in 221BC up until the end of the Qing dynasty in 1911, the percentage of monosyllabic words in written Chinese dropped gradually from 96% to 90%; in the first three decades of the Republic monosyllabic words accounted for just over 60% of written texts; by the time the open-door policy was being implemented during the 1980s this figure had fallen to below 50% (P. Chen, 1999, p. 139). The dramatic shift in the last century can be explained partly by the introduction of a new written standard, Baihua, based on the language of the Baihua classics and much closer to the vernacular Mandarin spoken in Beijing (refer to discussion on the history of Wenyan and Baihua in section 2.1.1. However, this factor cannot account for the entire shift, and it is certainly possible that language contact has provided additional impetus for change.

It is interesting to observe that studies on polysyllabism often focus on the overall effect of the linguistic process without paying separate attention to two major factors contributing to it: derivational affixation and compounding.\(^5\) In fact, recent years have seen both increasing numbers of compounds of free morphemes and increasing numbers of neologisms formed by means of derivational affixation (cf. Cook, in press). In that sense, polysyllabism is not an independent morphological development, but rather is largely the result of the various developments (i.e. the increase in derivational affixation, compounding and – to a lesser

\(^4\) Another linguistic development receiving frequent mention and reasonably detailed treatment in the Chinese-language literature on morphological change is so-called “segmentation”, not only of loan words but also of autochthonous vocabulary (e.g. W. Chen, 2005, p. 88; H. Guo, 2002b, p. 3; Hu, 2006, p. 54). In keeping with the classifications and definitions generally employed in the western-language literature on language change (cf. Cook, in press), it was chosen to classify this phenomenon not as a morphological but rather as a lexical development.

\(^5\) Strictly speaking inflexional affixation also contributes to polysyllabism. However, such examples are almost invariably omitted from the discussion entirely, leading the reader to assume that grammatical affixes may even be counted as separate morphemes in the processes of data collection and statistical analyses underpinning treatments of polysyllabism (e.g. P. Chen, 1999; Norman, 1988).
extent – inflexional morphology) described in the following section. These are discussed separately and in more detail in the following two subsections.

### 3.2.1. Derivational morphology

Traditional Chinese grammar has classified morphemes as “free” or “bound”. As these terms imply, free morphemes are capable of standing alone to form an independent word, whereas bound morphemes must be attached to another morpheme. Following from the traditional grammatical analysis, it is possible to consider morphological derivations as falling into one of two categories: compounds of free morphemes or affixation. Both strategies are discussed separately below.

#### 3.2.1.1. Compounds of free morphemes

The principles governing the formation of Chinese compounds (e.g. Adj-N, V-N, Adj-Adj, V-V; cf. Lin, 2001, pp. 62-69) have been in existence for many centuries and are not an innovation of the last 30 years. Perhaps it is for this reason that compounds do not figure large in the recent literature on Modern Standard Chinese morphology, although the topic was treated extensively by Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Interestingly, a number of researchers have discussed the phenomenon obliquely by treating the products of this morphological process, namely the lexical compounds resulting from it. Notwithstanding this general oversight, it is clear that this morphological process is quite productive as new compounds of free morphemes continue to be formed (Cook, in press). One example of this type is *wai-lai-hu* outside-come-household ‘internal immigrant’, a term coined to fill a lexical gap that has arisen due to the particular socio-economic conditions prevailing in mainland China in recent decades; other terms have been coined in response to technological and political developments (Cook, in press). Some new compounds even make use of homophonous character combinations as a kind of play on words. An example of this kind is *qi-guan-yan* wife-control-strict ‘henpecked husband’, which is homophonous with the much older expression *qi-guan-yan* wind-pipe-inflammation ‘tracheitis’ (Cook, in press).

#### 3.2.1.2. Affixation

At the same time, a number of morphemes have shown an increasing degree of morphological productivity and concomitant semantic bleaching in their grammaticalisation.
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towards the status of affixes and affixoids, the number of which has risen dramatically in the
last 30 years (cf. H. Guo, 2002b, p. 3; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, p. 19). Some researchers
attribute this trend to the influence of English on Chinese (e.g. H. Guo, 2002b; Xie, 2001);
others believe that the process predominantly reflects a tendency inherent in the Chinese
language (e.g. Peyraube, 2000; D. Wu, 2001).

Some prefixes and prefixoids mentioned in the literature include *ban-* ‘semi-’ (e.g. *ban-daoti*
semi-conductor ‘semiconductor’); *chao-* ‘super-’ (e.g. *chao-yinsu* super-speed.of.sound
‘supersonic’); *duo-* ‘multi-; poly-’ (e.g. *duo-meiti* multi-media ‘multimedia’); *fen-* ‘sub-’ (e.g. *fen-xitong* sub-system ‘subsystem’) and *wei-* ‘pseudo-’ (e.g. *wei-kexue* pseudo-science
‘pseudoscience’). Suffixes and suffixoids mentioned in the literature include *-du* ‘degree; -ity’ (e.g. *touming-du* transparent-ity ‘transparency’); *-hua* ‘ate; -ise; -ation; -isation’ (e.g. *diannao-hua* computer-isation ‘computerisation’; *yaomo-hua* demon-ise ‘demonise’); *-jia* ‘expert’ (e.g. *yuyanxue-jia* linguistics-expert ‘linguist’); *-xing* ‘-ity’ (e.g. *kedu-xing* readable-
ity ‘readability’) and *-zhuyi* ‘-ism’ (e.g. *wuzhengfu-zhuyi* anarchy-ism ‘anarchism’). As a
general rule, derivational morphemes that have completed grammaticalisation into affixes
distinguish themselves from mere affixoids or common compositional elements not only by
the primacy of their grammatical function but also in their overall incidence, their
productivity (as measured by the frequency with which neologisms are coined with their
assistance) and often even in the length (as measured by the number of syllables) of the
derivations thus formed.

A number of the suffixes mentioned above were noted by Wang Li (1984[a, 1984[b]), who as early as the 1940s referred to them as “word class markers”. In view
of the brief description above of the process of grammaticalisation taking place here, it is
perhaps not surprising that although these suffixes have undergone significant semantic
bleaching, they are not (yet) purely markers of grammatical category, but still – in most
cases, at least – contribute some semantic content.

---

To cite some specific examples, the increased frequency of use of nominalising and verbalising morphemes
such as *du, hua, xing und zhe* has been commented on in the literature (cf. Jun Ding, 2012; Kubler, 1985b, p. 15;
According to some analysts the trend towards explicit clarification of the word class of more and more Chinese
lexemes by means of suffixes exists only since increased contact with European languages (Si, 1996, pp. 63-64).

Note that the suffix *-hua* can have a nominalising or verbalising function.
3.2.2. Inflexional morphology

Although Chinese, by world standards, has a limited range of options for inflexional morphology, there are nonetheless a handful of inflexional morphemes, nearly all of which seem currently to be undergoing some degree of change in usage. This section discusses several autochthonous inflexional morphemes, used to indicate aspect and number, before moving on to a brief but fascinating discussion of a borrowed inflexional morpheme.

3.2.2.1. Aspect markers

There have been a few indications in the literature that the use of a number of aspect markers may be changing. Comments have focussed on one or more of the following: the experiential aspect marker *guo*, the perfective aspect marker *le* and the continuous aspect marker *zhe*. In relation to the third inflexional morpheme in this class, as early as the 1940s Wang Li (1984[1943]-b, pp. 491-492) claimed that the continuous marker *zhe* was being used more frequently, to the extent that it sometimes occurred redundantly in situations where there was no apparent continuous or durative meaning, i.e. that it was merely functioning as a verbal suffix with no real significance. Cornelius Kubler (1985b) used Wang Li as the starting point for his case study of the influence of European languages on Chinese, focussing on morphological and syntactic influences in his work *A Study of Europeanized Grammar in Modern Written Chinese*. Kubler (1985b) made the claim that the aspect markers *guo*, *le* and *zhe* all occur with increased frequency in modern Chinese as a result of the influence of western languages. Indeed, the developments noted in the literature with respect to the changing use of aspect markers are generally held to be a sign of the influence of western languages, especially English (cf. Cook, 2004; Shi & Zhu, 2000; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b).

3.2.2.2. Plural marker *men*

Contemporary use of the plural morpheme *men* in written Chinese and spoken Mandarin is interesting for a number of reasons. Firstly, it seems to be occurring with increasing frequency (Cook, 2004; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 489). Secondly, several of the old restrictions governing its use seem gradually to be breaking down (Cook, 2011, 2012b; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). Thirdly, it seems to be capable of performing a range of different semantic, pragmatic and structural roles within utterances, apart from merely indicating or emphasising plural number (Cook, 2012b).
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The most central role performed by the plural suffix *men* is that of a marker of plurality and collectivity (Chao, 1968, p. 244; Cook, 2012b, p. 137; DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 40; Ross & Ma, 2006; Yip & Rimmington, 2006). Another reasonably common role is to convey overtones of cuteness, endearment, familiarity and intimacy, similar to the sorts of meanings typically associated cross-linguistically with diminutive suffixes; this is attested in spoken data both from Taiwanese variety shows (Cook, 2004, 2011) and mainland chat shows (Cook, 2012b). Moreover, the similarity to diminutive suffixes is reflected also in the occasional contribution of the plural suffix to belittling, pejorative or derogatory connotations (Cook, 2012b). Other roles performed by the plural morpheme are related to information structure and result in noun phrases with plural reference that are preceded by lengthy modifiers being comparatively predisposed to take the plural ending; this may be either because speakers wish to balance the structure of the phrase or because they feel a need to mark the end of a long and complex syntactic construction (Cook, 2012b). Occasionally the plural marker *men* may even clarify a critical semantic distinction between a noun phrase with general vs. exceptionless applicability; this has been observed to date only with the noun *ren* ‘person; people’ (Cook, 2012b). Finally, it has been suggested that the use of the plural suffix may be spreading via lexical diffusion (Cook, 2012b).

Cornelius Kubler (1985b) echoed Wang Li’s (1984[1943]-b, p. 489) claim that the plural marker *men* occurs with increased frequency in modern Chinese as a result of the influence of western languages. The increased frequency of occurrence of the plural morpheme *men* and the broadening of its use from nouns denoting only persons to nouns denoting non-humans and even inanimate objects has been commented on in at least one study (H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, p. 19).

3.2.2.3. Borrowed inflexional morphemes

Although borrowed inflexional morphemes are very rare in Mandarin and do not yet appear to have gained widespread currency, the few examples that have been observed to date are certainly of interest and definitely worthy of discussion. The two that will be discussed in this section are the plural suffix *-s* and the progressive marker *-ing*, both borrowed from English.
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Plural suffix -s

Many examples of Chinese sentences incorporating the English plural suffix have been observed. However, on closer analysis, it appears that the use of the plural suffix -s may be confined to a single English loanword, fans. That is, there has (to the author’s knowledge, at least) not yet been any recorded instance of the borrowed plural suffix -s attached to an autochthonous Chinese lexeme. Nor is there any concrete evidence in the literature to date of its being appended to any other borrowed expressions apart from the English word fan – although it is certainly possible that the use of the borrowed English plural morpheme might be slightly more widespread than hitherto suspected and that it may have restricted application amongst a small number of relatively widespread English loanwords.

One rather interesting point relating to the use of the plural suffix -s is worth making. Although it is certainly true that the English loanword fan can appear in both singular and plural forms in Mandarin Chinese sentences, it is by no means the case that the plural form of the loanword consistently has plural reference (refer to section 4.2.3 for further discussion of this point). That is, as explained in chapter 4, investigation of the use of the English loanword fans in context points to the conclusion that the English lexeme may have been reanalysed as transnumeral, in line with autochthonous Mandarin Chinese nouns.

Progressive marker -ing

The other borrowed inflexional morpheme of interest is the progressive suffix -ing, again borrowed from English. As mentioned in section 2.2.2.3 above, its use appears to be restricted thus far to emails, chat rooms, microblogging and other internet forums. Despite the as yet relatively restricted field of use, this is, of course, a fascinating development and one whose significance for the evaluation of the breadth, scope and potential for morphological developments in Mandarin should not be underestimated.

3.3. Syntactic schema

This section presents the author’s own system of classification for recent syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese. The schema has been designed to ensure that it retains maximum flexibility as well as options for extension and modification as new data come to light.
Recent syntactic developments

Ellipsis

Conversion

Verbalisation

Adjectivisation

Nominalisation

Shifts in word sub-classes

Transitivisation of intransitive verbs

Transitivisation of V-O compounds

Absolute Adj → Adj of degree

Grammaticalisation

Conjunctions

Quasi-articles

Definite articles

Indefinite articles

Noun phrases

Length and complexity of modifiers

New types of head nouns

Verb phrases

Use of the copula

Passive constructions

Sentence structure

Clause length and complexity

Order of sentence elements

Sentence adverbs

Prepositional phrases

Subordinate clauses

Right-branching structures

Figure 2: Syntactic schema
The recent syntactic observations noted in the literature are discussed under the following headings: ellipsis, conversion, grammaticalisation, noun phrases, verb phrases and sentence structure. Although there are undoubtedly many ways in which recent syntactic findings could be classified, two main principles have been adhered to in the decision to present the observations in this order: firstly, to categorise similar findings under the same general heading; and secondly, to present observations in the order of increasing impact on the language typology of Mandarin Chinese. It is worth observing that the second group of syntactic developments, conversion, is treated by some western linguists not as syntactic change but as a type of lexical change. In the Chinese-language literature, however, it seems to be more common to classify conversion as syntactic change (cf. Cook in press), and it was chosen to do the same here, as it was considered justifiable to classify a change in the word class function performed by a word as a type of syntactic change. With regard to grammaticalisation, only recent observations which unequivocally fall under this heading have been included in the relevant section. Some aspects of the recent analyses pertaining to the use of the passive marker bei and the copula shi seem to be related to grammaticalisation; however, it was chosen to discuss these developments separately because they cannot be explained entirely satisfactorily on the principles of grammaticalisation alone.

3.3.1. Ellipsis

Typologically, Chinese is often described as permitting the ellipsis of a range of sentence elements when these can be deduced from context. In modern language use, however, it seems that although such omissions are still acceptable, they are becoming rarer. There are comments in the literature to the effect that transition signals, grammatical subjects, time and frequency adverbials, and conjunctions (both coordinating and subordinating), all of which were commonly omitted in the past, are now being made explicit in more and more contexts.

Some commentators seem to feel that the desire for increased explicitness in the Chinese texts they have studied is due, at least in part, to the influence of European languages, especially English (e.g. Shi & Zhu, 2000; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a; Xie, 2001).

---

8 This is the author’s own classification system: the various classes and subclasses described here are not necessarily referred to as such by all the authors cited as sources.

9 Whether these are all genuine examples of ellipsis, in the sense in which the term is understood in the context of European languages, is a tricky question. It seems that many of these sentence elements have simply never been considered necessary in Chinese.
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For example, Chinese is generally considered to allow ellipsis of the subject when this can be understood from context. However, the non-omission of non-compulsory grammatical subjects seems to be becoming more common (Xie, 2001). As another example of a manifestation of increased explicitness, the more frequent use of connecting words and transition signals has been remarked upon (Xie, 2001). The widespread use of adverbial phrases of time and frequency has also been noted (Hu, 2006, p. 56; Shi et al., 2003), as has the increasing popularity of subordinating conjunctions such as *yinwei* ‘because’ and *ruguo* ‘if’ (Hu, 2006, p. 55; Xie, 2001).

There is a range of coordinating conjunctions available for use in Chinese. These include *he* ‘and’, *erqie* ‘moreover’, *you* ‘in addition’ and *ji* ‘as well as’, all of which seem to be active participants in Chinese language change. L. Wang (1984[a]) cited the increasing frequency of conjunctions the first three conjunctions above as examples of the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar. His claims were echoed by Shi and Zhu (2000, p. 203), who went on to study recent changes in the use of the fourth coordinating conjunction, *ji* ‘as well as’ in more detail. They found that not only was it being used more frequently, but also with a slight shift in meaning. Whereas previously this conjunction had been used to attach an item of lesser importance to the end of a list, by the end of the twentieth century it was often being used to conjoin items of equal importance. This shift, according to Shi and Zhu (2000), had taken place under the influence of the English conjunction ‘and’.

In addition to the examples of ellipsis discussed in this subsection, a number of Chinese linguists have dealt under the heading of syntactic change with a range of other sentence elements and construction types, and their shifting popularity in recent years. It is true that a change in the relative frequency of different variants (i.e. different realisations of a particular variable), if sufficiently significant, may necessitate a change in the general grammatical description of a language. Nevertheless, it was decided that most of the remaining observations of this type probably relate more to the stylistic preferences of individual writers and speakers than to any syntactic guidelines, as the structures described in the literature are

---

10 Although Shi and Zhu (2000) were investigating Hong Kong Written Chinese, their work has been cited by mainland Chinese authors, who clearly feel that their observations are of relevance to linguistic developments in mainland China.
not new to Mandarin Chinese, but merely used with greater frequency now than a few decades ago.\textsuperscript{11}

### 3.3.2. Conversion

Conversion refers to the grammatical evolution of a word to be capable of functioning as a word class different from the one to which it was traditionally assigned in standard dictionaries without undergoing any morphological change.\textsuperscript{12}

There were very few words with fixed word classes in Classical Chinese. In practice this meant that most nouns, for example, could, given the right context, take on a verbal, adjectival or even adverbial function as well. Although for some words there was indisputably a primary meaning that was clearly associated with a particular word class, for others it was not at all obvious which of the many possible meanings was the primary one, such words being used with equal frequency in, say, the nominal and verbal senses (Norman, 1988, p. 87). Indeed, some sinologists even claim that there was no word class at all in Classical Chinese and that the word class function could be deduced only from the word order in the sentence (e.g. Kennedy, 1964).\textsuperscript{13}

Be that as it may, many Chinese words are occurring more and more frequently with different word class functions from those listed under the dictionary entries for those words or traditionally filled by those words (cf. H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, pp. 20-22). Some of the observed word class transformations are between completely different word classes, while others are between different subclasses. Conversion lends itself to analysis as verbalisation,

\textsuperscript{11} Observations pertaining to the frequency of certain syntactic structures comprise a number of types. Parenthetic comments, modal expressions and other structures conveying possibility, and comparative constructions all fall under this heading (cf. Hu, 2006; Shi & Zhu, 2000; Tsao, 1978; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Admittedly, there is often a fine line between stylistic choice and syntactic features; however, all of these could reasonably be considered to be a question more of style than of syntax.

\textsuperscript{12} There is a certain lack of consensus in the language change literature regarding the classification of conversion. While Chinese linguists tend to deal with it under the more general heading of syntax, many western sources treat conversion not as syntactic change, but as lexical change. As a third option, Hock and Joseph seem to consider it rather as derivational morphology (i.e. Ø-derivation), commenting that “… while English developments like the introduction and generalization of the adverbial suffix -ly constitute steps toward a more complex, agglutinating system of derivational morphology, in its inflectional morphology English has rather tended toward the isolating type” (1996, p. 183).

\textsuperscript{13} This would imply that the trend towards assigning a particular word class to Modern Chinese words may be the result of contact with English and other European languages (cf. Norman, 1988, p. 87).
adjectivisation, nominalisation and shifts in word subclasses, which last group can in turn be divided into transitivisation of intransitive verbs (including verbs ending in -hua), transitivisation of V-O compounds and the recent trend to use absolute adjectives as adjectives of degree.

3.3.2.1. **Verbalisation (N and NP → V)**

Verbalisation can be said to have occurred when an expression that previously functioned as a different word class comes to be used as a verb. In Modern Standard Chinese, the literature tends to cite specifically examples of nouns or noun phrases used in a verbal sense (cf. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). Two relatively recent examples of this type of phenomenon are the verbal use of *biaoqian* (‘label (n.)’ → ‘label (v.)’) and *dingyi* (‘definition’ → ‘define’).

3.3.2.2. **Adjectivisation (N and V → Adj)**

In the Chinese context, adjectivisation generally refers to the use of nouns and verbs as adjectives, which seems to be a widespread trend in Modern Standard Chinese (cf. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). One group of expressions currently undergoing this shift is placenames. Examples of this type of new vocabulary use include *hen zhongguo* very China ‘very Chinese’, *hen xifang* very the.West ‘very western’ and *shifen ouzhou* extremely Europe ‘extremely European’. Examples of verbs making the shift are *shifen xiyin* extremely attract ‘extremely attractive’, *hen zhenhan* very shock ‘very shocking/shocked’ and *hen fengci* very make.sarcastic.remarks ‘very sarcastic’.

3.3.2.3. **Nominalisation (V and Adj → N)**

In the context of Chinese, nominalisation tends to refer to the use in a nominal role of expressions previously fulfilling a verbal or adjectival function (W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). Examples of this kind of language change in Modern Standard Chinese are

---

14 The reader is advised to refer to H. Guo and Zhou (2003, p. 20) for examples of complete sentences incorporating the new expressions.
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tiaozhan (‘challenge (v.)’ → ‘challenge (n.)’), chengdan (‘bear [responsibility etc.]’ → ‘commitment’) and mingan (‘sensitive’ → ‘sensitivity’).

3.3.2.4. Shifts in word subclasses

While clearly less significant than shifts in word classes, shifts in word subclasses are nevertheless of linguistic interest and have been the subject of scholarly investigation in recent years (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). In this section we consider two categories of minor conversion relating to verbs and one relating to adjectives.

Transitivisation of intransitive verbs

A relatively common category of minor conversion is the changing use of what were formerly intransitive verbs, many of which are gradually being seen performing a transitive function (W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003). Examples of this development are fuwu ‘serve’, tiaozhan ‘challenge’, yuehui ‘meet; date’, huihe ‘meet’ and jiechu ‘have contact with’, all of which were previously used with prepositions but are now seen increasingly frequently with direct objects.

A particular class of verbs currently undergoing the process of transitivisation is the verbs ending in -hua ‘-ise’. The traditional rule for verbs ending in -hua used to be as follows: monosyllabic Adj + -hua produces a transitive verb; disyllabic Adj + -hua gives rise to an intransitive verb. It is claimed that this linguistic development is due to the influence of English on Chinese, in particular as manifested in English-to-Chinese translations. The culprit is said to be the class of English verbs ending in ‘-ate’ and ‘-ise’, under whose influence all Chinese verbs ending in -hua can now be transitive, e.g. fuzahua ‘complicate’ and yaomohua ‘demonise’ (cf. W. Chen, 2005, p. 88; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, p. 21).

15 Like W. Chen (2005), H. Guo and Zhou (2003) cite tiaozhan as originally a verb, now used as noun, but the several dictionaries consulted also list the nominal use. This points to the nominalisation of tiaozhan having occurred at an earlier date and being now so widespread as to be considered standard.

16 Both H. Guo and Zhou (2003) and W. Chen (2005) distinguish between intransitive verbs and verb of mutual direction (e.g. ‘meet’, ‘have contact with’). As it was not felt necessary to make this distinction, any supposed changes with so-called verbs of mutual direction were omitted from the discussion.
Transitivisation of verb-object compounds

Another type of minor conversion that seems to be spreading with startling rapidity amongst verbal phrases is the transitivisation of verb-object compounds. Although still considered incorrect by some sticklers, the use of V-O compounds as transitive verbs is now so widespread as to have attained the status of standard language use (W. Chen, 2005, pp. 87-88). Examples of this kind of use include dong-yuan move-troops ‘mobilise’, deng-lu reach-land ‘land (at)’, luo-hu settle-home ‘settle down (in)’, cha-shou put:in-hand ‘get involved in’ and tou-zi invest-capital ‘invest in’. A number of researchers attribute this development to the influence of English on Chinese (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003).17

Absolute adjectives → adjectives of degree

The final type of minor conversion to be considered here is the transformation of some adjectives from absolute adjectives to adjectives of degree, capable of being modified by an adverb of degree such as hen ‘very’ or shifen ‘extremely’. Examples of adjectives that seem to have made the transition include fumian ‘negative’, lengxue ‘cold-blooded’ and zhuanye ‘professional’ (cf. H. Guo & Zhou, 2003, p. 21).

3.3.3. Grammaticalisation

The section on grammaticalisation first traces recent developments in the use of the prepositions dang and zai as conjunctions. Then the emergence of quasi-articles is discussed, which covers two cross-linguistically common processes: the grammaticalisation of demonstratives into definite articles and the grammaticalisation of the expression for ‘one’ into an indefinite article.

3.3.3.1. Emergent conjunctions

Shi and Zhu (2000, pp. 202-203) provide convincing examples of the reduction of dang ... (de) shi(hou) at ... (ATT) time ‘at the time of ...; when ...’ and zai ... (de) shi(hou) at ... (ATT) time ‘at the time of ...; when ...’ to dang ‘when’ and zai ‘when’ (i.e. omitting the head

17 Like H. Guo and Zhou (2003), W. Chen (2005) cites the transitive use of the Chinese deng-lu (reach-land “land (at)”), luo-hu (settle-home “settle down (in)”) and other similar compounds as examples of English influence, but in fact the equivalent expressions are not unequivocally transitive in English.
noun at the end of the phrase) respectively.\textsuperscript{18} In other words, the morphemes *dang* and *zai*, which were formerly considered to be verbs, coverbs or prepositions, are now being used – analogously to the English temporal conjunctions “when” or “as” – to introduce clauses.\textsuperscript{19} This is a clear indication that both morphemes are undergoing grammaticalisation, at least in some sociolinguistic contexts.\textsuperscript{20}

\subsection*{Emergent articles}

Articles are not generally considered to form part of the repertoire of Modern Standard Chinese grammar. Nevertheless, recent observations of certain grammatical constructions suggest that this word class may be starting to emerge. Studies of grammaticalisation (e.g. Heine & Kuteva, 2005) have shown that it is cross-linguistically quite common for demonstratives to develop into definite articles and for the lexeme for ‘one’ to develop into an indefinite article. In the case of Modern Standard Chinese, there are indications that these two cross-linguistically common processes of grammaticalisation may be taking place simultaneously.

\textbf{Definite articles}

When investigating the grammaticalisation of demonstratives to definite articles, it is worth considering a number of factors common to grammaticalisation processes generally, including the overall frequency of the expressions in question, the degree of semantic bleaching and even the degree of phonetic reduction. Shi et al. (2003) mention the widespread use of demonstrative pronouns as a feature of modern written Chinese usage (cf. Hu, 2006, p. 56). The high frequency and redundant usage of demonstrative pronouns in spoken Mandarin have also been commented on (Cook, 2004); the fact that demonstrative pronouns were described as being used “redundantly” seems to imply a degree of semantic

\textsuperscript{18} Although Shi and Zhu (2000) were investigating Hong Kong Written Chinese, their work has been cited by mainland Chinese authors, who clearly feel that their observations are of relevance to linguistic developments in mainland China.

\textsuperscript{19} As a matter of interest, the words *dang* and *zai*, referred to by various authors as coverbs or prepositions, themselves grammaticalised from verbs. Again, this is a cross-linguistically common process.

\textsuperscript{20} Note that seventy years ago Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, p. 471) commented when discussing the use of *dang* and *zai* clauses that if this were an example of pure Europeanisation, then *shi* and *de shihou* should not appear at the end of the clause, and that “Europeanisation has not yet reached that level”.
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bleaching. Interestingly, demonstratives in their apparent function as definite quasi-articles were frequently used in conjunction with English loanwords (Cook, 2004).

**Indefinite articles**

In relation to the development of a new indefinite article in Mandarin, Tsao (1978) has commented on the increased frequency of occurrence of the character yi ‘one’ in written Chinese (cf. Hu, 2006, p. 56), which is in line with the grammaticalisation of this morpheme to an indefinite article or quasi-article. Similar observations have been made with regard to spoken Mandarin (Cook, 2004). In particular, the indefinite quasi-article yi-ge (one CL) was used redundantly in verb-noun collocations and in conjunction with verbs of becoming and being, as well as being used indiscriminately in place of a large number of available expressions for ‘one’ constructed using different measure words (Cook, 2004). In this context, it has elsewhere been remarked that the expression yi-ge one-CL ‘one’ is being used increasingly as a one-size-fits-all solution without regard for the conventional grammar rules which require different classifiers for different objects.

3.3.4. Noun phrases

Recent observations in the literature regarding noun phrases are of two main kinds: those focussing on the length and complexity of attributes modifying nouns and those investigating different types of head nouns. These two subtopics will be dealt with separately.

3.3.4.1. Length and complexity of modifiers

A number of researchers have commented on the increased length and/or grammatical complexity of attributes in Modern Standard Chinese in recent years (e.g. Ye He, 2004; Hu, 2006; K. Wang, 2002; Xie, 2001). In fact, this is having such a noticeable impact on standard written usage that it is apparently contributing significantly to an increase in overall clause length, both in Hong Kong (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 201) and in mainland China (Ye He, 2004; cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, pp. 485-486) (see also section 3.3.6.1 below).

---

21 Owing to the fact that Mandarin Chinese is a classifier language in which the appropriate choice of classifier depends on the noun in question, the situation is slightly more complex than may appear at first glance. The focus was on the most common demonstrative pronouns zhe ge DEM CL and na ge DEM CL; however, the variants zhe zhong DEM CL and na zhong DEM CL were also mentioned (Cook, 2004).
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More specifically, the increase in clause length has been attributed to the use of more complex modifiers and adverbial phrases with the internal structure of clauses and predicates (Ye He, 2004; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 478). With regard to Europeanised attributes, the information now appearing in long attributes preceding the noun would, before extensive contact with European languages, have been included in separate clauses, generally in the form of a predicate following the noun in question (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 481). It is interesting to note that many of the so-called Europeanised attributes cited by Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, pp. 452-453; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 480-481) are translations of relative clauses, a structure which does not necessarily have an exact equivalent in Chinese (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 451). As far as the cause of lengthening modifiers is concerned, it has been claimed that longer pre-nominal attributes may be a result of translations from European languages into Chinese (Ye He, 2004, p. 131).

3.3.4.2. New types of head nouns

Traditional Chinese grammatical conventions do not permit the modification of proper nouns or pronouns with an immediately preceding descriptive phrase or clause conjoined to the head noun by means of the attributive particle de (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a). However, the increasing prevalence of such structures has been noted by a few researchers (e.g. Ye He, 2004, p. 132; Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 201). In a quantitative study of proper nouns and pronouns modified by attributes, it was found that the incidence of both structures increased during the latter half of the last century (Ye He, 2004, p. 132). The types of modifiers observed included adjectival phrases and relative clauses, sometimes even complex relative clauses (Ye He, 2004, p. 132).

Another recent development with respect to head nouns is the observation that it seems to be becoming acceptable for proper nouns, in particular place names, to be modified by an

---

22 Although this development is often attributed to the influence of English (e.g. Ye He, 2004, p. 132; Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 201), some linguists have pointed instead to Japanese sentence structure as a more likely model. Certainly it must be conceded that in the examples given by the authors cited, a direct translation into English of the form *‘He, who is accustomed to speaking English on a daily basis, can nevertheless …’ or **‘He, who still has several months to go before he regains his freedom, plans in the meantime …’ would be considered infelicitous by many native speakers. From that point of view it may be difficult to justify the claim that an increase in the frequency of pronouns functioning as head nouns is attributable to the influence of English.

23 Figures for the three sampling years of 1956, 1982 and 2000 were 2, 14 and 41 respectively for proper nouns and 0, 2 and 14 respectively for pronouns functioning as head nouns.
attribute. Again, this development is often attributed to the influence of English (e.g. Ye He, 2004, p. 132; Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 201).

3.3.5. Verb phrases

This section deals with two interesting types of verb phrases: those containing the Mandarin copula *shi* and those containing an explicit passive marker. These two types of verb phrases are discussed separately.

3.3.5.1. Use of the copula *shi*

In conventional Mandarin Chinese language use, the copula *shi* performs a different set of functions from those performed by the copula in, say, English. Unlike the English copula, traditionally the Mandarin copula, although appearing in NP COP NP constructions, was not used in simple descriptive or declarative sentences to link the grammatical subject (or topic) of the sentence with a predicative adjective. It could, however, be used in so-called assessment sentences in conjunction with the nominalising particle *de* (represented in the structures here as *DE*) in a bracketing construction around the predicate to form sentences with a range of structures. It could also be inserted between the grammatical subject and the predicate or even placed before the subject in sentence-initial position to produce emphatic sentences with a variety of structures.

A number of linguists have commented on a range of developments in the use of the copula *shi* (e.g. Cook, 2004; Hu, 2006; Shi & Zhu, 2000; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b; Xie, 2001). In modern written Chinese in Hong Kong, the emphatic sentence structure with the copula *shi* immediately preceding the predicate (the so-called “marked form”) is becoming the norm and is used even when no emphasis is intended, a development which is apparently a result of the influence of English (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 202). In addition, it seems that Modern Standard Chinese is making more frequent use of the *shi*…*de* construction (Hu, 2006; Si, 1994; Xie, 2001). It is not clear from the literature whether this is because Chinese writers are, in fact, using more assessment sentences or whether they are simply employing this grammatical structure more frequently without doing the associated assessment necessarily implied by traditional grammar rules.

The grammaticalisation of *shi* from assessment marker to focus marker and more recently to word-internal component has also been a topic of academic research. This development has
been observed particularly with conjunctions and adverbs, leading to the creation of a number of new words in recent years, including the conjunction huozhe-shi or-SHI ‘or’ and the adverbs jiben-shi basic-SHI ‘basically’, qishi-shi actually-SHI ‘actually’ and zhende-shi really-SHI ‘really’ (Dong, 2004; cf. A. Y.-R. Wu & Biq, 2011). As Dong (2004) points out, this is an ongoing process; thus, the so-called new conjunctions and adverbs have solidified in usage to varying degrees, with some expressions probably more properly referred to as “conventionalised forms” rather than according them the full status of new words.

3.3.5.2. Passive constructions

There are, in fact, a range of options for marking passive voice in Mandarin Chinese, including bei ‘cover; suffer’, gei ‘give’, jian ‘see’, jiao ‘call’ and rang ‘let’, all of which have grammaticalised to a greater or lesser degree from the full verbs whose meanings are glossed here to markers of the passive. Of these, bei is by far the most common – although this has not always been the case.

According to traditional Chinese grammar, most verbs can have a passive or active interpretation depending on context, so that there is often no need for explicit grammatical marking of passive voice. The increased frequency of the grammatical marking of passive voice has been commented on by a number of researchers (e.g. Hu, 2006, p. 56; Tsao, 1978; K. Wang, 2002; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 460-462; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 488-489; Xie, 2001). In addition to this quantitative development, some qualitative changes in its use have been observed, the most salient one being the decreasing association between the passive marker and verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning, leading to the extended use of the passive marker bei with verbs with a neutral or even positive meaning (Chao, 1968, p. 703; P. Chen, 1999, p. 94; Cook, 2004; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 462; 1984[1943]-b, p. 488). In other words, it seems that some of the semantic constraints on the use of this construction may be weakening.

3.3.6. Sentence structure

New sentence structures are divided into changes in clause length and sentence complexity, changes in the order of sentence elements and the introduction of certain right-branching
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structures. This last refers to the recent appearance in written Chinese of post-nominal subordinate clauses of the kind whose equivalents in English would be described as relative clauses and post-nominal infinitive clauses. Structures of this type have been documented for written Chinese and may also be found in spoken Mandarin. These are developments that appear of sufficient significance as possibly to have an impact on the typology of Chinese.

3.3.6.1. Clause length and complexity

Several linguists have commented on the increasing length of Chinese sentences (e.g. Ye He, 2004, pp. 130-131; Hu, 2006, p. 56; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 451-453; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 478-486; Xie, 2001). Many of the researchers commenting on increased sentence length have at the same time observed that Chinese sentences, in particular attributes, are generally becoming grammatically more complex (Ye He, 2004; Hu, 2006; K. Wang, 2002; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b; Xie, 2001) (refer also to discussion in section 3.3.4.1 above). There is a general sentiment in the Chinese-language literature that the predilection for longer Chinese sentences may be attributable to the influence of English.25

In a study of newspaper language use, it was found that sentence length increased significantly during the latter half of the twentieth century, with the three years of sampling being 1956, 1982 and 2000. In round figures, the average sentence length increased from 38 to 48 characters for news items and from 32 to 45 characters for other newspaper articles during this period, with a significant increase in the last two decades of the reference period (Ye He, 2004, pp. 130-131).26

3.3.6.2. Order of sentence elements

In addition to the increased length and complexity of Chinese clauses and the widespread acceptance of new types of head nouns, there also seem to have been some changes in the

24 Kubler (1985b) came to the conclusion during his investigation of the Europeanisation of written Chinese syntax that under the influence of English, Chinese sentence structure was changing from topic-comment to subject-predicate. Although a fascinating claim if it could be substantiated, this possible development has not been discussed here owing to a lack of concrete examples and detailed analysis in the literature as a whole and in the work of Kubler (1985b) in particular.

25 Chinese terminology does not distinguish between “sentence” and “clause.” In fact, the suggestions provided by Wang Li (1984[1943]-b, pp. 480-481) for de-Europeanised versions of Europeanised sentences suggest that it is not the sentence length, but rather the clause length that is at issue here.

26 Note that these figures have been reported incorrectly elsewhere.
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order of sentence elements (cf. W. Chen, 2005, p. 88; Hu, 2006, p. 55; K. Wang, 2002). Observations that may affect the typological classification of Modern Standard Chinese are treated separately elsewhere (see section 3.3.6.3 below); this subsection deals only with syntactic observations relating to word order that have no impact on the typology of Mandarin Chinese. These include more flexible positioning of sentence adverbs, postposed prepositional phrases and postposed subordinate clauses.

**Position of sentence adverbs**

According to well-established Chinese grammatical conventions, sentence adverbs such as *kexi de* ‘unfortunately’, *wuyi de* ‘undoubtedly’ and *dangran* ‘certainly’ are expected to be placed between the subject and the verb. However, it seems that such adverbs were appearing in both sentence-initial and sentence-final position as early as the 1940s, apparently under the influence of European languages (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 496).

**Postposed prepositional phrases**

Another type of word order change that may currently be taking place involves the position of prepositional phrases. Place adjuncts usually occurred after the verb in Classical Chinese (Norman, 1988, p. 103). Interestingly, this seems to be happening again in Modern Chinese, or at least in spoken Mandarin in Taiwan (Cook, 2004). However, prepositional phrases containing locative information are not the only ones prone to repositioning. Prepositional phrases containing, for example, temporal or benefactive information can also be found after the object (Cook, 2004; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 496). Interestingly, Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, p. 496) particularly mentioned that benefactive prepositional phrases introduced by the preposition *wei* "for" were prone to postposition. This corresponds to the more modern use of benefactive prepositional phrases introduced by the preposition *gei* "for," which are also often tacked on after the verb in spoken Mandarin (cf. Cook, 2004).

**Postposed subordinate clauses**

Another change in word order is the increasing tendency to position subordinate clauses after the main clause (Shi & Zhu, 2000, pp. 203-204; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 494-495; Xie, 2001; Zhao & Tang, 1998). Traditional Chinese grammar stipulates that subordinate clauses should come before the main clause (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 494). English, by contrast, is more flexible in this regard, allowing subordinate clauses to occur before or after the main
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clause. It is apparently owing to the influence of English that as early as the 1940s it was already possible to find examples of aberrant Chinese sentence structures with conditional, concessive and temporal clauses following the main clause (cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 494-495); in modern usage the range of subordinate clause types found after the main clause seems to be even greater. According to Zhao and Tang (1998), the “marked” word order (i.e. with the subordinate clause following the main clause) often reflects the chronological sequence of events or arises when the subordinate clause is added as an afterthought or explanation. By contrast, Shi and Zhu (2000) claim that in Hong Kong the “marked” word order is subject to no such restrictions, nor is it associated with any “marked” meaning.27

3.3.6.3. Right-branching structures

Having discussed a number of relatively superficial syntactic observations relating to word order in Modern Standard Chinese, we now turn to a change in the ordering of sentence elements which has more far-reaching implications than the findings discussed thus far and may in fact have an impact on the typological classification of Mandarin Chinese. At least two publications (Shi & Zhu, 2000; Shi et al., 2003) have supplied some fascinating examples of right-branching sentence structures, which they claim show the influence of English on Chinese. The sentences analysed include constructions whose English counterparts would be classified as post-nominal subordinate clauses and post-nominal infinitive clauses. These examples were taken from Hong Kong publications; the structures of interest appear to date to have been observed only in Hong Kong Written Chinese. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that such usage could spread to mainland China (Shi et al., 2003, p. 12). This particular type of linguistic observation is highly significant for language change, language contact and the typological classification of Mandarin Chinese; in more conventional Chinese sentence structure the noun would succeed rather than precede the subordinate clause.

Another point of interest in relation to the examples cited in the literature is the preponderance of sentences of this type that pivot about a word relating to the semantic field of “time” (including words like “date” and “opportunity”). At this juncture it is worth considering the possibility that right-branching structures are entering Mandarin “at a point of

27 Note that Zuoyan Song and Tao (2009) have provided an explanation for different patterns of causal clause sequencing in different contexts.
weakness” (Aitchison, 2001) and that they may continue to spread out from this semantic field to affect a wider range of nouns. It will be interesting to trace the future progress of this innovative development, as its course may well follow a pattern typical of the lexical diffusion observed in the progressive spread of phonological features (cf. Aitchison, 2001).

It is important to note that Modern Standard Chinese is described typologically as a modifier-head language. Certainly it is true that in Classical Chinese, modifiers always occurred before the corresponding modified elements, e.g. Adj + N, Adv + V (Norman, 1988, pp. 104, 160). Even in contemporary usage, the modifier is expected to precede the head in the vast majority of structures. If the new right-branching structures illustrated above were to attain the status of standard use, this development might well have implications for the typological classification of Chinese.28

3.4. Summary

Because much of the research to date into Chinese language change has been conducted on an ad hoc and small-scale basis, it is often difficult to work out where all the isolated observations (many of which are very interesting and quite insightful) fit in to the general scheme, or how they relate to each other. Therefore, it is important to have some kind of cohesive, systematic, overarching framework, like the one presented in this chapter, into which the findings of various studies can be slotted. Instead of having to wade through a morass of disjointed, piecemeal and unsystematic observations as is currently the case, linguists will then be able quickly and easily to glean an overall picture of the state of the art of morpho-syntactic change in Modern Standard Chinese. Only then will researchers be in a position to scrutinise the data carefully and to make worthwhile observations of a more far-reaching nature: to perceive irregularities and inconsistencies; to notice some common aspects of different findings across a wide range of morphological and syntactic developments; or to comment on the relevance of the morpho-syntactic observations in Mandarin Chinese to various linguistic models and theories. Only then will the breadth and depth of research in this important field be able to be enhanced in a systematic way.

28 In this context it is interesting to note that recent research into spoken interactions in Mandarin Chinese (Luke & Zhang, 2007) has revealed that despite the typological classification of Modern Standard Chinese as a modifier-head language, it is in fact not uncommon for retrospective turn continuations to take the form of additional modifying information after the head has already been mentioned in the main utterance.
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The subsequent data analysis chapters present three “case studies” of the grammar of spoken Mandarin. Chapters 4 to 6, which deal with the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*, build on the framework in chapter 3 by presenting a detailed analysis of corpus data relevant to selected morpho-syntactic features. The three morphemes in question were chosen as potentially offering interesting insights into the morpho-syntax of Modern Standard Chinese and thereby contributing both specifically to the schema proposed here and more generally to our understanding of Mandarin Chinese grammar.
4. The Plural Suffix *men*

This chapter presents the results of investigations into contemporary usage of the plural marker *men* in spoken Mandarin. After outlining standard grammatical analyses of the use and functions of the plural suffix, some more detailed findings pertaining to its use that have appeared recently in the language change literature are elucidated. The particular observations drawn from the present database are then presented and analysed in some detail. Finally, the research findings of the present study are compared and contrasted with existing grammatical analyses, as well as with previous findings presented in recent publications.

4.1. Conventional accounts of the plural suffix *men*

The early records of Classical Chinese from 2000 years ago or more reveal no use of a morphological plural marker (Norman, 1988, p. 120). That is, although plural meaning could be expressed by means of various adjectives and adverbs, there was no inflexional distinction between the plural and singular forms of nouns or pronouns in Classical Chinese. The suffix *men*, which has been evolving as a marker of grammatical number for several centuries now (Maury, 1992; Norman, 1988), started by attaching itself to personal pronouns, thereby effecting the transformation of the pronouns *wo* 1SG, *ni* 2SG and *ta* 3SG into their plural equivalents *women* 1PL, *nimen* 2PL and *tamen* 3PL.¹ From there it was a relatively small step to develop into a nominal suffix; however, this process is not (yet) complete in that not all Chinese nouns are eligible candidates for grammatical pluralisation. The following paragraphs provide a summary of conventional accounts of the use of the plural marker *men* in standard grammar references.

The use of the morpheme *men* as a plural suffix with personal pronouns and certain nouns has been described by a number of grammarians (e.g. Chao, 1968, pp. 244-245; DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419; Kubler, 1985b, pp. 45-47; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 12; Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; Si, 1994, p. 76; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 9), most of whom have discussed its use in the written language while a few have focussed primarily on the spoken language. It is true there are some minor discrepancies between the various accounts; nevertheless, these differences do not appear from the literature to be primarily ones of written vs. spoken usage.

¹ Refer to Appendix 1 for an explanation of grammatical abbreviations used. In Modern Chinese grammatical marking of number is obligatory with 1st and 2nd person pronouns and common with 3rd person pronouns.
Thus, the discrepancies will simply be treated on an ad hoc basis as they arise in the discussion.

As discussed elsewhere (Cook, 2011, 2012b), several constraints are alleged to apply to the use of the plural suffix, the most oft stated and unequivocally formulated of these being the exclusion of nonhuman and inanimate nouns from plural inflexion (Chao, 1968, p. 244; DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419; Kubler, 1985b, pp. 45-51; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 12, 40; Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; Si, 1996, pp. 65, 116; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 14). Another commonly stated prohibition is the use of the plural marker with a specified number (Chao, 1968, p. 245; DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419; Kubler, 1985b, p. 54; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 19; Lin, 2001, pp. 98-99; Norman, 1988, p. 159; Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 14). Significantly more restricting are the assertions that the plural suffix can only be attached to polysyllabic, not monosyllabic nouns (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 40), and even that nouns cannot be inflected for grammatical number if they are already modified by a plural quantifier such as *hen duo* ‘many’ (cf. Kubler, 1985b, pp. 54-55; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 19; Lin, 2001, pp. 98-99; Si, 1994, p. 76) or, indeed, in any other way (Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23).² The latter claim is clearly contentious, as one source expressly sanctions the use of the plural marker in conjunction with the plural demonstrative *na xie* ‘those’ (Chao, 1968, p. 245). The overall picture of grammatical marking of number in Chinese is that of a discretionary and rather rare event (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 12, 40; Norman, 1988, p. 159; Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; cf. Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 13).

In view of the fact that grammatical pluralisation in Chinese is described in the literature as non-obligatory, it is worth considering the justifications offered by the various commentators for using the plural suffix when it does appear (see also Cook, 2011, 2012b). Li and Thompson’s (1981, p. 40) explanation is that grammatical inflexion for number is ‘generally … used only when there is some reason to emphasise the plurality of the noun’. Chao (1968, p. 244) and (DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419) both have similar interpretations of the effect of pluralisation, the former describing an inflected noun as ‘a collective noun’ and the latter describing it as having ‘a general collective meaning’. Ross and Ma (2006, p. 23) develop this theme further when they state that a noun to which the plural suffix has been appended

---

² According to Ross and Ma (2006, p. 23), a construction like *women de tongxue-men* 1PL ATT classmate-PL ‘our classmates’ is thus ungrammatical.
‘conveys a sense of inclusion and is sometimes used when addressing an audience’. Yip and Rimmington (2006, p. 14) echo this in their comment on the predilection for using plural nouns ‘when groups of people are addressed’, noting that there is often some associated ‘implication of familiarity’.

In addition to rating a brief mention in many grammar textbooks, the morpheme *men* has been the subject of a few more specific studies. Maury (1992) analysed the behaviour of the plural suffix and found, in common with many of the authors mentioned in the previous section, several restrictions applying to its use. These included its exclusive application with nouns denoting humans and its incompatibility with the explicit mention of a specific number. She also found that it could not be appended to a noun functioning as a predicate following a copular verb such as *shi* ‘be’ or *chengwei* ‘become’ (cf. Kubler, 1985b, p. 55). In investigating the functions performed by the plural suffix, Maury (1992) again noted that it was frequently used when addressing a group of people. Additionally, she found that it can often emphasise the totality of the group or the fact that a particular attribute applies without exception to all members of the group rather than merely to the majority. She concluded that its use was not likely to undergo further expansion.

H. Guo and Zhou (2003), in their investigation of the influence of English on written Chinese, found numerous instances of the use of the plural marker *men* used in contravention of traditional constraints. It appeared with monosyllabic nouns, e.g. *bing-men* soldier-PL ‘soldiers’, *zei-men* thief-PL ‘thieves’ and *guan-men* cadre-PL ‘cadres’. It was also used to pluralise animate nonhumans, e.g. *gou'er-men* dog-PL ‘dogs’. Even more surprisingly, the plural suffix was appended to nouns denoting inanimate objects, e.g. *che-men* car-PL ‘cars’, *hua-men* flower-PL ‘flowers’, *shu-men* book-PL ‘books’ and *diannao-men* computer-PL ‘computers’.

In recent research investigating the behaviour of the plural morpheme *men* in spoken Mandarin in Taiwan (Cook, 2011) and mainland China (Cook, 2012b), several interesting aspects of its use were found. Examples were found of the plural marker violating many of the structural restrictions described by earlier researchers. In addition, there were indications that the morpheme might, in some contexts, be capable of expressing pragmatic nuances typically associated in other languages with diminutive suffixes. The plural marker was also observed to perform a variety of other roles, including specifying that the scope of reference of a noun was limited to a particular subgroup (with *men*) rather than applying to all members.
of the entire class (without *men*); this was found specifically in relation to *ren* ‘person’ vs. *renmen* ‘people’ (Cook, 2012b). At other times the plural suffix contributed to discourse structure and information flow, either by signalling the end of a long and complex noun phrase or by improving the balance of a noun phrase (Cook, 2012b). Finally, it was concluded that, contrary to the representation of *men* hitherto, its use was not always optional; rather, in certain contexts and for a range of possible reasons it could sometimes be considered obligatory (Cook, 2012b).

4.2. Research findings

This section starts by presenting an overview of the frequency of the noun types that appeared in the plural form in the corpus, highlighting certain points of interest (section 4.2.1). There follows one subsection discussing speech examples in clear contravention of the guidelines for the use of the plural suffix *men* (section 4.2.2). Each of the next four subsections (sections 4.2.3 to 4.2.6) focuses on a particular factor that seems to contribute to the likelihood of a given speaker choosing to explicitly mark a noun phrase denoting a plural entity with the grammatical inflexion for number. All of these four subsections elucidate various roles of the plural suffix, with the sequence of these subsections being arranged roughly in order from most common to least common function.

4.2.1. Frequency analysis

Overall, the traditional analysis of the plural suffix *men* in standard grammar reference works seemed to account perfectly well for around two thirds of all cases involving its use with nouns. However, in a significant proportion of examples the standard analysis was found to be inadequate.

The data from mainland China are in some respects similar to the data from Taiwanese variety shows (cf. Cook, 2004, 2011) and mainland Chinese chat shows (cf. Cook, 2012b) analysed previously and outlined in the Introduction to this article, but they also offer some new insights. The use of the plural marker *men* in the database comprising around 80 episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ from 2011 is summarised in Table 1. Types are listed in decreasing order of frequency.

---

3 Refer to Appendix 2 for a list of all examples of the use of the plural suffix *men* with nouns in the present corpus.
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Table 1: Use of the Plural Suffix *men* in Episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ from 2011 (Total = 148)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin Chinese word</th>
<th>Morpheme by morpheme gloss</th>
<th>English translation in context</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zhanshi-men 战士们</td>
<td>soldier-PL</td>
<td>soldiers; warriors</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ren-men 人们</td>
<td>person-PL</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haizi-men 孩子们</td>
<td>child-PL</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongxue-men 同学们</td>
<td>classmate-PL</td>
<td>classmates; fellow students</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pengyou-men 朋友們</td>
<td>friend-PL</td>
<td>friends</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongzhi-men 同志们</td>
<td>comrade-PL</td>
<td>comrades</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guanzhong-pengyou-men 观众朋友们</td>
<td>audience-friend-PL</td>
<td>audience members; viewers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hair-men 孩儿们</td>
<td>child-PL</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jie-mei-men 姐妹们</td>
<td>older.sister-younger.sister-PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhanyou-men 战友們</td>
<td>comrade.in.arms-PL</td>
<td>comrades-in-arms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mama-men 妈妈们</td>
<td>mother-PL</td>
<td>mothers; mums</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-xiong-men 弟兄們</td>
<td>younger.brother-older.brother-PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fensi-men 粉丝们</td>
<td>fans[tr.-]-PL</td>
<td>fans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ge-mi-men 歌迷们</td>
<td>song-fan-PL</td>
<td>fans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laoshi-men 老师们</td>
<td>teacher-PL</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongshi-men 同事们</td>
<td>colleague-PL</td>
<td>colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiao-pengyou-men 小朋友们</td>
<td>little-friend-PL</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xueyuan-men 学员们</td>
<td>student-PL</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baba-mama-men 爸爸妈妈们</td>
<td>dad-mum-PL</td>
<td>mums and dads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chengke-men 乘客们</td>
<td>passenger-PL</td>
<td>passengers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-jiejie-men 大姐姐们</td>
<td>big-older.sister-PL</td>
<td>older girls; older friends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er-nu-men 女儿们</td>
<td>son-daughter-PL</td>
<td>children; sons and daughters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ganbu-men 干部们</td>
<td>cadre-PL</td>
<td>cadres</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang-Tai-ju-xing-men 港台巨星们</td>
<td>Hong.Kong-Taiwan-mega-star-PL</td>
<td>megastars from HK &amp; Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gege-men 哥哥們</td>
<td>older.brother-PL</td>
<td>older brothers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guniang-men 姑娘们</td>
<td>girl-PL</td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huoban-men 伙伴们</td>
<td>partner-PL</td>
<td>partners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Types of the form *ge-men* (sometimes realised as *ge-menr*) elder.brother-\textit{MEN}(-\textit{DMN}) ‘mate; bloke’, *ye-men* (or *ye-menr*) paternal.grandfather-\textit{MEN}(-\textit{DMN}) ‘old geezer’ etc. were not included in the analysis because they were considered to be different in kind from other examples of the use of the morpheme *men* with nouns. (For this reason the morpheme *men* is here not treated as a plural suffix but simply glossed as \textit{MEN}.) Note that *ge-men(r) and ye-men(r)* do not necessarily denote the plural. Moreover, when the diminutive suffix -\textit{er} is used, it appears after *men* rather than before it. Thus, it is clear that *men* is not a marker of plural number in these instances. In fact, it is doubtful whether the syllable *men* can even be considered a separate morpheme in words like *ge-men* and *ye-men*. 
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In all, the 60-odd episodes studied elicited 148 tokens of 51 different types. The nouns to which the plural affix was appended ranged in length from one to seven syllables, with all but two noun types being two to four syllables in length and disyllabic nouns being the most popular candidates for morphological pluralisation. Apart from zhanshimen ‘soldiers’, all 22 tokens of which were uttered during the course of a single interview, the most common plural form was renmen ‘people’, which occurred 20 times. This was roughly twice as common the next most popular plural noun forms, haizimen ‘children’ (11 occurrences), tongxuemen ‘classmates’ (11 occurrences) and pengyoumen ‘friends’ (10 occurrences). If we consider semantic groupings, it can be seen that pluralised compounds containing the element tong ‘same; fellow’ (including tong-xue-men same-study-PL ‘classmates’, tong-zhi-men same-
will-PL ‘comrades’ and tong-shi-men same-matter-PL ‘colleagues’) taken together made up the most significant group with a total of 21 occurrences, while ‘children’ (haizimen, hairmen and xiaopenyoumen) were mentioned 17 times with the morphological plural ending.\(^5\) The data could be construed as suggesting a slight gender imbalance in using the plural marker; this is evident from a comparison of both types and tokens. The plural marker is used with eleven different feminine nouns, as opposed to only five masculine types. Similarly, there are seventeen feminine tokens compared with only eight masculine ones.\(^6\)

### 4.2.2. Use with explicit number

The unacceptability of the use of the plural marker men in conjunction with an explicit number is the second most strongly worded restriction in the literature.\(^7\) A significant number of researchers (e.g. Chao, 1968; DeFrancis, 1963; Kubler, 1985b; D. Li & Cheng, 1988; Lin, 2001; Maury, 1992; Ross & Ma, 2006; Yip & Rimmington, 2006), in analysing both the written and the spoken language, have stated categorically that noun phrases like *san ge xuesheng-men three CL student-PL ‘three students’ and *ji ge pengyou-men several CL friend-PL ‘several friends’ are ungrammatical. Although previous studies (Cook, 2004, 2011, 2012b; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Iljic, 1994, 2001; Yen-Hui Audrey Li, 1999; Maury, 1992) have failed to discover any noun phrases of this structure in the databases consulted, two examples of this kind of usage were found in the corpus for the present study. These are given below.

\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{我跟几个孩子们和隔辈人都说过我这话。} \\
& \quad (\text{Li Moran, 12/04/11}) \\
& \quad \text{Wo gen ji ge haizi-men he ge-bei-ren dou shuo-guo wo zhe hua.} \\
& \quad 1SG with several CL child-PL and remove-generation-person all say-EXP 1SG DEM words. \\
& \quad \text{‘I've said that to several children and grandchildren.’} \quad \text{8}
\end{align*}

\^5\ In fact, nouns referring to soldiers achieved a greater overall frequency; however, as explained above, this figure was distorted by the inordinately high token count of a single type during a single interview.

\^6\ Once again, the unusually high token count of one type, zhanshimen ‘soldiers’, has been excluded from analysis, as all tokens were from the same interview.

\^7\ The most strongly worded one being the claim that only nouns denoting humans can undergo morphological pluralisation (cf. discussion in section 4.1).

\^8\ Literally: ‘… and people of my grandchildren’s generation.’ In this and subsequent example utterances, the noun(s) undergoing plural inflexion, as well as any other elements of interest, are highlighted in bold.
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(2) 我光干活了，没有啦，没编呢，但是连长说了我就发晕了，五百多个战士们哗啦哗啦鼓掌。（Li Shuangjiang, 09/08/11）

\[\begin{align*}
Wo & \text{ guang ganhuo-le, mei you la, mei bian ne, danshi lianzhang shuo-le wo jiu fayun-le, wu-bai duo ge zhanshi-men huala-huala guzhang.} \\
1\text{SG only work-PFV, NEG PFV MP, NEG organise MP, but company.commander say-PFV 1SG then dizzy-PFV, five-hundred more CL soldier-PL crash-REDUP applaud.}
\end{align*}\]  

‘All I did was work, I didn’t do anything, I didn’t organise it, but when the company commander said that, I felt dizzy, and there was thunderous applause from 500-odd soldiers.’

The plural noun phrase in (1) is modified by the quantifier *ji* ‘several’, and in (2) by *wu-bai duo ge* ‘500-odd’. Thus, the two examples above are clear contraventions of the prohibition on the use of the plural suffix with an explicit number. Of course, the fact that this particular restriction was contravened only twice in a corpus of over half a million characters does mean that the possibility must be countenanced that the utterances in question were occasional speech errors, or slips of the tongue.

### 4.2.3. Collective marker

In more than half the utterances the plural marker merely seems to be underlining the plurality and/or group feeling of the noun. This function is particularly common in imperatives and direct addresses. This usage is exemplified in (3) and (4) below, in which particular groups of people are addressed directly. Note that sentence (4) also illustrates the well-known fact that a single occurrence of the plural suffix can apply simultaneously to two nouns.

(3) 但是，观众朋友们，你不要觉得说，潘长江特别溺爱他的女儿。（Pan Changjiang, 22/04/11）

\[\begin{align*}
Danshi & \text{ guanzhong-pengyou-men, ni bu yao juede shuo,} \\
Pan Changjiang & \text{ tebie ruo’ai ta de nü’er.}
\end{align*}\]  

But audience-friend-PL, 2SG NEG want feel say, Pan Changjiang especially spoil 3SG ATT daughter.  

‘But, viewers, don’t think that Pan Changjiang spoils his daughter rotten.’

(4) 谢谢今天所有台前幕后的老师同学们，你们会支持我吗？（Li Yuchun, 09/06/11）

\[\begin{align*}
Xiexie & \text{ jintian suoyou tai-qian-mu-hou de laoshi-tongxue-men,} \\
nimen & \text{ hui zhichi wo ma?}
\end{align*}\]  

Thanks today all stage-in.front-screen-behind ATT teacher-classmate-PL, 2SG will support 1SG Q?
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‘Thanks today to all the teachers and students in front of the stage and behind the scenes, will you support me?’

This usage conforms to the standard explanation for the use of *men*, as discussed in section 4.1 above; similar examples are provided by a number of standard grammar references (e.g. Maury, 1992; Ross & Ma, 2006; Yip & Rimmington, 2006). However, a number of instances in the present database lend themselves to alternative or supplementary explanations, as will be discussed in this and the following sections.

The importance of *men* not just to indicate plural number but as a marker of collectivity is thrown into relief when the morpheme is used with the transliteration of a plural word borrowed from English. The neologism *fensi* ‘fans’ obviously already contains the English plural -s phoneme in the Mandarin Chinese transliteration. Thus, one might be excused for assuming that the reference of *fensi* is likewise inherently plural. However, it seems that this is not necessarily the case, as demonstrated by the following two examples.

(5) 我无论是演什么样的作品，我首先第一点我要对得起支持我的，全国我的忠实粉丝们，我要对得起他们。

(Wo wulun shi yan shenme yang de zuopin, wo shouxian di yi dian wo yao duideqi zhichi wo de, quan-guo wo de zhongshi fensi-men, wo yao duideqi tamen.)

I.SG regardless COP perform what kind ATT production, 1.SG first ORD one point 1.SG want be.worthy.of support 1.SG ATT, entire-country 1.SG ATT loyal fan-PL, 1.SG want not.let.down 3.PL.

‘Regardless of what kind of production I’m performing in, my first priority is I want to be worthy of the loyal fans around the country who support me, I want to do them proud.’

(6) 加油、加油，我们都非常的支持你，然后你自己要开心就好，然后也谢谢所有的那些粉丝们对她的支持跟爱护。

(Jiayou, jiayou women dou feichang zhichi ni, ranhou ni ziji yao kaixin jiu hao, ranhou ye xie xie suoyou de na xie fensi-men dui ta de zhichi gen aihu.)

Good.luck, good.luck I.PL all extremely support 2.SG, then 2.SG self want happy just good, then also thank all ATT DEM CL.PL fan-PL to 3.SG ATT support COM love.

‘Good luck, good luck, we’re all right behind you, as long as you yourself are happy that’s fine, and also thank all the fans for their support and love.’

The use of the word *fensi-men* fans[tr.]-PL ‘fans’ in the two examples above is rather interesting as it suggests either that the primary function of the suffix *men* in these instances is something other than that of marking plural number or that the transliteration *fensi* ‘fans’
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does not necessarily refer to a plural entity. In fact, both of these explanations are feasible. As
the following example from the corpus demonstrates, the loanword in question can clearly be
used in the singular sense.

(7) 我记得最尴尬的一次是我第一次做签售然后被一个粉丝就是强吻。

(Wei Chen, 20/09/2011)

Wo jide zui ganga de yi ci shi wo di yi ci zuo qianshou ranhou bei yi ge fensi jiushi qiang-wen.

ISG remember SUP embarrassing ATT one time COP ISG ORD one time do autograph then PASS one CL fan just violent-kiss.

‘I remember the most embarrassing time was once when I was signing autographs, and I was violently kissed by a fan.’

It should be noted the etymology of *fensi* ‘fan(s)’ is more complex than that of a straightforward transliteration. When the English word ‘fans’ was first borrowed into Mandarin Chinese, it was mapped onto the existing compound *fen-si* powder-thread ‘vermicelli’, in what was clearly intended as a kind of pejorative pun. Thus, it could be argued that the plural “ending” on the transliteration *fensi* ‘fans’ was, from the point of view of many native speakers of Mandarin, psycholinguistically irrelevant from the start.

In terms of cross-linguistic comparisons, the reanalysis of a lexical borrowing to denote a different grammatical number from the model word in the donor language calls to mind the example of the Swahili loanword *madigadi* ‘mudguards’, based on the model of its English equivalent (Aitchison, 2001, p. 142). Swahili plural forms are constructed according to different principles depending on the class to which the noun belongs, and *madigadi* has been assigned to the class of nouns whose plural is formed by adding the prefix *ma*-. This has produced by reanalysis the corresponding singular form *digadi* ‘mudguard’.

4.2.4. Diminutive connotations

As with previous data from Taiwanese variety shows (see Cook, 2004, 2011) and mainland Chinese chat shows (see Cook, 2012b), there is some indication in the data used for this study of pragmatic overtones typically associated with diminutive suffixes. Diminutives generally convey the meaning of smallness or unimportance and, by semantic extension, express qualities (of the object denoted) or attitudes (of the speaker towards said object) such as

---

9 It has been observed before that Mandarin speakers have a playful approach to language use (e.g. Cook, 2004, in press).
youthfulness, familiarity, intimacy, affection, tenderness, endearment, and even contempt or derogation (Bakema & Geeraerts, 2000). In fact, this ties in quite nicely with Yip and Rimmington’s (2006, p. 14) observation that pluralised nouns often imply a degree of familiarity. This function of the plural marker *men* is demonstrated in sentences (8) and (9) below.

(8) 朋友这都是我的儿女们，每到逢年过节的时候，哎呀，问候，电话，真的，他们一这么说，我心里感到高兴，幸福的笑啊。 (Peng Yu, 24/03/11)

Pengyou zhe dou shi wo de er-nü-men, mei dao fengnianguojie de shihou, aya, wenhou, dianhua, zhende, tamen yi zhe me shuo wo, wo xinli gandao gaoxing, xingfu de xiao a.

Friend DEM all COP 1SG ATT son-daughter-PL, every arrive New.Year’s.Day.or.other.festivals ATT time, oh, greeting, telephone, really, 3PL as.soon.as thus speak 1SG, 1SG at.heart feel glad, happy ADJ smile MP.

‘My fans are all my children. At every festival and at Chinese New Year, oh, greetings, phone calls, really… Whenever they talk about me like that, it makes me happy inside, and I smile for joy.’

(9) 其实不仅是女演员，几乎各行各业所有的妈妈们，都要面临生活和工作的压力，多少对孩子都会感到有一些歉疚，因为不能时时刻刻陪伴在孩子身边。 (Chen Luyu, 24/03/11)

Qishi bujin shi nü-yanyuan, jihu gehanggeye suoyou de mama-men, dou yao mianlin shenghuo he gongzuo de yali, duoshao dai haizi dou hui gandao you yixie qianjiu, yinwei bu neng shi-shi-ke-ke peiban zai haizi shen-bian.

Actually not.only COP female-actor, almost all.walks.of.life all ATT mum-PL, all must confront life and work ATT pressure, somewhat towards child all will feel have some guilt, because NEG can time-REDUP-moment-REDUP accompany LOC child body-side.

‘Actually it’s not only actresses, almost all mums from all walks of life, they all have to confront the pressure of private life and work, and they all tend to feel a degree of guilt towards their children, because they can’t be at their children’s side every moment of every day.’

Note that in Mandarin compounds consisting of two juxtaposed nouns with opposite meaning, such as *fu-mu* father-mother ‘parents’, *nan-nü* male-female ‘men and women; girls and boys’ and *er-nü* son-daughter ‘sons and daughters; children’, can only be understood in the plural sense. Obviously the plural suffix in (8) does not provide any new semantic information. Likewise, *mama* ‘mum’ is already modified by *suoyou* ‘all’ and thus does not require the suffix *men* to clarify its plural reference. At the same time, the tone with respect to
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the children in (8) and the mothers in (9) is familiar and affectionate. Of course, the mere use of *ernü* ‘children’ (without the plural marker) itself could convey the same overtones in the context of example (8), since the speaker is clearly referring to adults, while the choice of *mama* ‘mum’ in preference to *muqin* ‘mother’ likewise contributes to the flavour of the sentence in example (9). On the other hand, the affectionate, intimate and tender tone of both utterances does indeed seem to be underscored by the plural marker.

It is a well-known fact that diminutives can convey a range of pragmatic overtones. Thus, it is perhaps worth considering at this juncture another example of the use of the plural suffix which, however little it may appear at first sight to be related to the use in sentences (8) and (9) above, on closer inspection benefits from comparative analysis with the preceding two examples.

(10) 别紧张，你们这些没煮过饭的少女们。 (Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/11)
    Bie jinzhang, nimen zhe xie mei zhu-guo fan de shaoni-men.
    Don’t nervous, 2PL DEM CL.PL NEG cook-EXP rice ATT young.girl-PL.
    ‘Don’t be nervous, you young things who’ve never cooked a meal before.’

In contrast to the affectionate tone of examples (8) and (9), the style of addressing the listeners in sentence (10) as ‘young girls’, while also familiar, is more jocular than affectionate, and even has belittling and pejorative overtones. Although the tone of the utterance would be slightly derogatory even without the addition of the plural suffix, the pragmatic affect is enhanced by the plural marker. Interestingly, this is also a function of diminutives in other languages. For example, the German words *Büb-chen* boy-DMN ‘boy’ and *Jung-chen* boy-DMN ‘laddie’, both formed with the diminutive suffix *chen*, are often used to refer pejoratively to grown men behaving in a childish way.

If the present analysis is correct and the plural suffix in (10) does indeed contribute to the pejorative affect of the utterance, then it seems reasonable to interpret example (10), like examples (8) and (9), as lending support to the hypothesis that the plural marker *men* can sometimes perform the functions of a diminutive affix. Note that Yip and Rimmington’s (2006, p. 14) claim regarding familiarity has less explanatory power than the diminutive hypothesis since it not only fails to explain the secondary function of the plural suffix in sentence (10), but also fails to capture the similarities underlying its use in that and the preceding two examples.
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4.2.5. Information structure

Ways in which the morpheme *men* can be employed to signal the organisation of discourse and information structure are discussed in two separate subsections. The first deals with structures involving rather long modifiers of noun phrases, these modifiers being of the type commonly described as relative clauses in grammatical analyses of Mandarin. The second deals with stylistic issues of balance and parallelism.

4.2.5.1. Relative clauses

As mentioned in section 4.1 above, most grammar reference works state that Chinese nouns are not generally inflected for number (DeFrancis, 1963, p. 419; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 12, 40; Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 13). Where the plural number is grammatically marked, some references claim that it is as a rule sufficient to mark it once only (cf. Kubler, 1985b, pp. 54-55; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 19; Si, 1994, p. 76). However, double marking of the plural, as in sentence (10), where the plural suffix occurred in combination with the plural demonstrative *zhe xie* DEM CLF.PL ‘these’, was found several times in the data. A similar construction appears below in sentence (11).

(11) 采访郭晓冬是在 2007 年，因为一期有关艺术类考生的节目，当时郭晓冬作为一个过来人给那些醉心于要投身演艺圈的应届高中毕业生们一些经验和意见。

(Chen Luyu, 09/09/11)

The structural context of *yingjie-gaozhong-biyesheng-men* high school seniors is interesting, not only because it is preceded by the plural demonstrative *na xie* ‘those’, but also because there is a rather long attribute separating the demonstrative and the plural noun. Interestingly,
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the noun *yingjie-gaozhong-biyesheng* next.round-high.school-graduate ‘high school senior’, consisting, as it does, of seven syllables, would not normally be a favoured environment for adding the plural suffix (refer to discussion in section 4.2.1 above). Moreover, the phrase *na xie yingjie-gaozhong-biyesheng* DEM CL.PL next.round-high.school-graduate ‘those high school seniors’ (without the plural suffix *men*) would be far more acceptable than the same simple construction with the plural suffix. However, in the case of a long and complex NP such as the one in sentence (11), adding the plural *men* actually seems to improve the grammaticality of the phrase. In other words, morphological marking of plural number, although apparently preferred in NPs with a long intervening attribute, is not necessarily preferred in shorter NPs without an additional modifier. Further examples of similar constructions are given in sentences (12) and (13).

(12) 我们这个团队就是踏踏实实地一年做一部戏，对得起所有支持我们的观众朋友们，这就是我们最奢侈的一个想法。
(Pan Changjiang, 22/04/11)

*Women zhe ge tuandui jiushi ta-ta-shi-shi de yi nian zuo yi bu xi, duideqi suoyou zhichi women de guanzhong-pengyou-men, zhe jiu shi women zui shechi de yi ge xiangfa.*

1PL DEM CL.troupe just reliable~REDUP ADV one year do one CL production, be.worthy.of all support 1PL ATT audience-friend-PL, DEM just COP 1PL SUP extravagant ATT one CL thought.

‘Our troupe just reliably produces one show per year, so we can do the right thing by all the viewers who support us; that’s our most extravagant thought.’

(13) 但是我每当又看到，我毕竟还有这么多人在爱我，有这么多我的歌迷，……还有那些喜欢我的叔叔阿姨们，我身上又还有一种责任和动力在，因为我还没有完成我要为这个社会做的事情。
(Han Hong, 08/09/11)

*Danshi wo mei dang you kan-dao, wo bijing hai you zheme duo ren zai ai wo, you zheme duo wo de ge-mi, ... hai you na xie xihuan wo de shushu-ayi-men, wo shen-shang you hai you yi zhong zeren he dongli zai, yinwei wo hai mei you wancheng wo yao wei zi she shui zuo de shiqing.*

But 1SG every time again see-RES, 1SG actually still have so many person PROG love 1SG, have so m any 1SG ATT song-fan, ... also have DEM CL.PL like 1SG ATT uncle-aunt-PL, 1SG body-on even also have one kind responsibility and impetus exist, because 1SG still NEG PFV complete 1SG want for DEM CL society do ATT matter.

‘But every time I see it again, I actually have that many people who love me, that many fans … and those uncles and aunts who like me, I even have a sense
of responsibility and impetus, because I still haven’t completed what I want to do for this society.’

It seems that, for many native speakers, adding the plural suffix actually improves the grammaticality of one or more of the sentences (11) to (13). By contrast, relatively simple [quantifier + N-PL] constructions like na xie yingjiegaozhongbiyeshengmen ‘those high school seniors’, suoyou de guanzhongpengyoumen ‘all the viewers’ and na xie shushu-ayimen ‘those aunts and uncles’ (i.e. without the intervening attributes in the original speech examples) are likely to be considered at best optional and at worst grammatically dubious. That is, it appears that with these shorter phrases many native speakers would be more likely to content themselves with single grammatical marking of plural number in the form of the plural quantifier and to omit the plural suffix. This corroborates findings of previous studies (Cook, 2011, 2012b), which on the basis of data from both Taiwan and mainland China revealed a comparative preference for double grammatical marking of plural number in the case of noun phrases modified by a relative clause and a comparative reluctance to use a plural quantifier in conjunction with the plural suffix when there was no intervening attribute modifying the noun.

Overall, the present study revealed no obvious reluctance to use the [quantifier + N-PL] construction with a number of the more popular nouns. Corpus data included the following examples: na xie haizimen ‘those children’, zhe xie pengyoumen ‘these friends’, hao duo tongzhimen ‘many comrades’ and yi xie tongshimen ‘some colleagues’.

Nevertheless, it appears that there is a contrast between the preference for the base form of certain nouns immediately preceded by a plural quantifier and the attested occurrence of the inflected form of the same nouns likewise preceded by a plural quantifier but with an intervening additional modifier. This fact points to the influence of distance on native speaker intuitions of grammaticality: that is, the farther a quantifier is placed from the noun it modifies, the more likely the construction is to be deemed grammatical (cf. Cook, 2011, 2012b). This difference can manifest itself in two ways. On the one hand, nouns whose inflected form is questionable immediately following a plural demonstrative or quantifier may be considered perfectly acceptable with the plural suffix after the same demonstrative or quantifier as long as there is another modifying phrase separating the two. On the other hand, in the case of nouns that are felt to be equally grammatical in the base and inflected forms immediately following a plural demonstrative or quantifier, there may be a strong inclination...
to append the plural suffix if the NP is made longer and more complex by the insertion of an additional modifier, even to the extent that the base form is no longer considered grammatically acceptable by some native speakers.\textsuperscript{10}

There are at least three possible explanations for this. Firstly, a collocation that is of questionable grammaticality in a short construction may nevertheless be deemed perfectly acceptable in a longer, more complex construction – and vice versa. Secondly, even if there is general consensus that a particular combination of structural elements is infelicitous, this ungrammaticality may be more likely to strike listeners (and, indeed, speakers) when the elements are in close proximity with one another. Thirdly, the plural suffix \textit{men} could conceivably serve a bracketing function with the quantifier or demonstrative (i.e. closing the bracket opened by the plural quantifier or demonstrative) when the noun is modified by a long attribute, the purpose of this being to signal to the listener that the head noun has been reached and that this particular structural segment is completed.

Of these three hypotheses, the third seems to have the greatest explanatory value. The first hypothesis is too ad hoc to be entirely satisfactory, and overlooks an important correlation captured by the third hypothesis. The second, while it explains half of the phenomenon (the group of nouns strongly favouring the base form immediately after a plural demonstrative or quantifier but considered equally acceptable in the inflected form after an intervening attribute), fails to shed any light on the other half (the group of nouns strongly favouring the inflected form after a long modifier even though both inflected and uninflected forms are acceptable immediately after a plural demonstrative or quantifier). The third hypothesis, on the other hand, does seem to offer a plausible and enlightening explanation for the behaviour of both groups of nouns, assuming it is taken not as a hard-and-fast rule, but as one of a number of factors determining native speaker judgments of grammaticality. Thus, if we suppose that for any given noun there is a certain level of resistance to inflexion for number immediately after a plural demonstrative or quantifier, then the third hypothesis explains why the resistance to pluralisation will be lower in a construction containing the same head noun

\textsuperscript{10} For descriptive brevity the manifestation of the phenomenon is here depicted in a somewhat simplified way, as though there were only two groups of nouns, as though these groups were clearly delineated, and as though the particular demonstrative or quantifier in question had no bearing on the matter. In fact, of course, there seems to be an array of possible constellations. The reader is referred to previous studies by Cook (2011, 2012b) for a more detailed discussion of this phenomenon.
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and introduced by the same demonstrative or quantifier but with an intervening modifier. That is, the third hypothesis explains why, all other things being equal, the plural marker *men* would be expected to occur more often in longer, more complex NPs. More specifically, it goes some way to explaining why in certain contexts, such as sentence (12), a noun like *guanzhongpengyou* ‘viewer’, containing as it does the element *pengyou* ‘friend’ with a naturally low resistance to pluralisation, might feel to some native speakers as though it required the addition of the plural suffix *men* to make the sentence grammatical. What the third hypothesis does not explain is why some nouns have a naturally lower resistance to inflexion for number in the first place, nor which nouns are likely to fall into that category. That will be discussed in section 4.3.3 below and in further detail in the Discussion and conclusions section.

4.2.5.2. *Balance and Parallelism*

Other occurrences of nouns with plural inflexion that are modified by long attributes may require an alternative explanation that is also related to discourse and information structure. One example is given in sentence (14) below.

(14) 所以有一位山东德州老乡，他呢就把《话说运河》里的，德州那一集弄到手了，所以他就要求，也是在世界各地的亲属们，每年在团聚的时候，首先是看德州这一集。

    Suoyi you yi wei Shandong Dezhou laoxiang, ta ne jiu ba women “Hua shuo yun he” li de, Dezhou na yi ji nong-dao shou le, suoyi ta jiu yaoqiu, ye shi zai shijie gedi de qinshu-men, mei nian zai tuanju de shiou, shouxian shi you Dezhou zhe yi ji. (Chen Duo, 14/02/11)

    So EXST one CL Shandong Dezhou villager, 3SG MP just OBJ 1PL. “Hua shuo yun he” in ATT, Dezhou DEM one episode get-RES hand CS, so 3SG just demand, also COP LOC world every.place ATT relatives-PL, every year LOC gather ATT time, first COP have Dezhou DEM one episode.

    ‘So there was this villager from Dezhou in Shandong province, well he managed to get hold of the episode from our show “Hua shuo yun he” that was about Dezhou, so he demanded – and there were relatives from all over the world – that when they got together every year, the first thing they did was to watch that episode about Dezhou.’

Once again, it is clear from the context and the fact that these relatives are from all over the world that we must be dealing with several relatives rather than only one. Moreover, the Mandarin word *qinshu* ‘relatives’ in its base form is a collective noun that can only have
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plural reference. The utterance without the plural morpheme would be perfectly clear; nevertheless, it seems that some speakers prefer to add the suffix *men* to balance the phrase. In other words, some speakers apparently feel that a noun phrase preceded by a rather long modifier – in this case *zai shijie ge di de* ‘from all over the world’ – sounds better with an additional syllable appended to it. The justification often given for this stylistic choice is to avoid *tou zhong jiao qing* head heavy foot light ‘imbalance between the beginning and end’ (in this case, of a phrase). Of course, it is often difficult to tease out separate influences operating on speakers’ decisions to formulate their utterances one way in preference to another. In this case, as *qinshu-men* relatives-*pl* ‘relatives’ is preceded by a relative clause, one could argue that the most salient factor here is that of signalling the end of a complex noun phrase (as discussed in section 4.2.5.1 above). Nevertheless, it seems that, for some native speakers at least, considerations both of the overt marking of internal syntactic structure and of balance within a phrase are separate (if sometimes related) factors.\(^{11}\)

Another stylistic consideration – and one which, incidentally, plays an important part in Chinese writing – is that of so-called parallelism, or the use of parallel structures in successive phrases. One example of a context in which this might come into play is (15) below.

(15) 《难道》，每一次唱都会有一个理由，这次把《难道》第一次送给台下以外的观众朋友吧，应该送给一直陪伴羽·泉在音乐的道路上，辅助我们，然后支撑我们、鼓励我们、帮助我们的所有合作过的伙伴们、老师们、前辈们。

(Chen Yufan, 18/04/11)

“Nandao”, every one time sing all will have one CL reason, DEM time OBJ “Nandao” ORD one time give BEN stage-below outside ATT audience-friend MP, should give BEN continually accompany ATT-Quan LOC music ATT road on, assist IPL, then sustain IPL, encourage IPL, help IPL ATT all cooperate-EXP ATT partner-PL, teacher-PL, older-generation-PL.

---

\(^{11}\) Note that one or both of these factors may well also have played a role in the formulation of sentence (5), in which *fensi-men* ‘fans’ was preceded by a rather long and complex modifier.
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“*Nandao*”, whenever we sing it we have a reason, this time for the first time let’s dedicate “*Nandao*” to the viewers not present in person, we should dedicate it to the **partners, teachers** and **elders** who have continually accompanied Yu and Quan on their musical road, who have assisted us, who have sustained, encouraged and helped us, to all those with whom we have worked together.”

This sentence, of course, contains three plural noun forms: *huobanmen* ‘partners’, *laoshimen* ‘teachers’ and *qianbeimen* ‘seniors; elders’, all of which are further defined by the extremely long modifying phrase that starts *yizhi peiban…* '[who] have continually accompanied… and finishes ...*hezuo-guo* ‘...[with whom we] have worked together’. Although it is not uncommon to find the plural morpheme attached to the nouns *laoshi* ‘teacher’ and *huoban* ‘partner’, the grammatical pluralisation of *qianbei* ‘senior; elder’ is a comparatively rare event. Nevertheless, it appears that the plural form *qianbeimen* ‘seniors; elders’, rare though it is, is the only acceptable option in this particular context. Interestingly, the justification for appending *men* does not seem to depend entirely on the modification of the noun in question by an extremely long attribute, as discussed above. Rather, it seems to be underscored by the fact that in this context *qianbeimen* ‘seniors; elders’ is immediately preceded by two other pluralised nouns. This line of reasoning has less to do with deep syntactic structures and much more to do with rhythm and parallelism. In other words, the use of the plural marker *men* with the noun *qianbei* ‘senior; elder’ in example (15) is considered necessary primarily for stylistic reasons.

### 4.2.6. Semantic distinction

The argument for retaining the plural inflexion in *renmen* ‘people’ in sentence (16) below is a different one: namely, that the plural suffix here is necessary for semantic reasons other than those of specifying grammatical number.

(16) 这时候不是光欣赏他的歌, 还有看到他的精神可嘉, 这捐款我认为这不是对他的一个施舍, 而是对他们的感谢, 对吧, 感谢叫**人们**的精神得到升华。

(*Audience member, 07/07/11*)

*Zhe shihou bu shi guang xinshang ta de ge, hai you kan dao ta de jingshen kejia, zhe juankuan wo*

---

12 The expression *nandao* is used to ask rhetorical questions and can be approximately rendered into English as ‘who would’ve thought; you can’t be serious’.

13 The original transcript contained the character 教 *jiao* ‘teach’. As it was suspected that this was a typo, it was replaced with 叫 *jiao* ‘make’.
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renwei zhe bu shi dui ta de yi ge shishe, ershi dui
tamen de ganxie, dui ba, ganxie jiao ren-men de
jingshen dedao shenghua.

DEM time NEG COP only enjoy 3SG ATT song, also PFV
see-RES 3SG ATT enthusiasm praiseworthy, DEM donation 1SG
think DEM NEG COP for 3SG ATT one CL charity, but for
3PL ATT thanks, right MP, thank make person-PL ATT
enthusiasm receive raise.a.level.

‘At that time it wasn’t just a case of enjoying his songs, I also noticed his
praiseworthy enthusiasm, so that donation, I didn’t view that as offering him
charity, but rather as a way of thanking them, yeah, thanking them for taking
people’s enthusiasm to a different level.’

(17) 拉登的死也造成了另外一方面的恐慌，从这个角度上来讲，恐怖主义真的是
已经到了一个空前绝后，达到了某种高度，他活着制造恐慌，他死了依然会
引发人们更多的想象。

Laden ATT death also cause-PFV other one aspect ATT
terror, from DEM CL angle-on come speack, terrorism
really COP already reach-PFV one CL unprecedented-not.recurring,
reach-PFV certain kind height, 3SG live-PROG create terror,
3SG die-PFV still can stimulate person-PL more much ATT
imagination.

‘Bin Laden’s death also resulted in a different kind of terror. From that
perspective, terrorism really has already reached an unprecedented… it’s
reached a certain level. While he lived he created terror, in death he can still
stimulate people’s heightened imagination.’

The uninflected form, *ren* ‘person; people’, would in these context be interpreted as a general
designation applying to all human beings without exception, whereas in fact the speaker in
each case clearly wishes to include many (but by no means all) people within the referential
scope of the noun phrase. Another way of formulating much the same line of reasoning is to
say that the plural suffix is semantically necessary in the phrases *renmen de jingshen*
‘people’s enthusiasm’ and *renmen de xiangxiang* ‘people’s imagination’ because omitting the
plural morpheme in these instances would mean something closer to ‘human enthusiasm’ or
‘human imagination’, thus implying a contrast between human enthusiasm / imagination and,
for example, animal enthusiasm / imagination – which is clearly not the intention of the
speaker in either case.
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The analysis of *renmen* ‘people’ in examples (16) and (17) above suggests that the use of the plural suffix might be obligatory in some cases. That would be a very interesting claim if it could be substantiated, since in the literature on Chinese grammar inflexion for number is quite clearly portrayed as optional (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 40; Norman, 1988, p. 159; cf. Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 13).

Although examples of this kind of semantic distinction were not found with other nouns in the present corpus, sentences in which the plural suffix clearly resolves a semantic ambiguity of a different kind have been found in other contexts. Consider example (18) below:

(18) 南昌地区的烤鸭们，注意了！！！

*Nanchang diqu de kao-ya-men, zhuyi-le!!!*  
‘Attention, IELTS candidates in the Nanchang region!!!’

At first glance, it is not at all obvious how or why an expression referring to a traditional Beijing delicacy could be used to address students taking an English test. This example requires some explanation. The Mandarin word for IELTS is 雅思 *ya-si* (refined-thought ‘IELTS’), which is a transliteration or, to be precise, a phonosemantic match of the English expression. The expression 考雅思 *kao yasi* (sit.a.test IELTS ‘sit the IELTS test’) can be abbreviated by means of clipping to 考雅 *kao ya* (‘sit the IELTS test’), which is homophonous with 烤鸭 *kao-ya* (roast-duck ‘roast duck’). This pun has such widespread appeal that it is now possible to find many IELTS training centres and websites making use of the expression in this sense. In order to clarify the fact that *kao-ya* is being used to refer to humans, not a specialty dish, it is very common to find it modified by the plural suffix *men* when used in this sense.

---


15 The term ‘phonosemantic match’ was coined by Zuckermann (2003, 2004) and is used in the Chinese context to refer to transliterations that make use of characters that have not only a similar pronunciation to the model word in the donor language, but also a similar – or at least related – semantic denotation.

16 Lexical changes of this nature are treated by Cook (in press) as types of semantic change (here an example of bifurcation, or semantic split, since the expression originally denoting a Chinese dish has acquired a secondary meaning).
4.3. Discussion

Standard texts and grammar reference works imply or state explicitly that the use of the plural marker *men* in Modern Standard Chinese (a) is subject to certain structural and semantic constraints, (b) serves primarily, if not solely, to emphasise the plural number, collective meaning and inclusiveness of the noun and (c) is entirely optional. My data, by contrast, indicate that the use of the plural morpheme (a) is subject to fewer constraints than has been suggested, (b) can perform many functions, only one of which is to highlight the collective meaning of the noun and (c) is often strongly preferred and occasionally even obligatory. In other words, there are a multitude of factors – structural, semantic and pragmatic – influencing the use of the plural marker, many of which have not previously received attention in the literature. These factors are discussed separately below.

4.3.1. Syntactic and semantic constraints on the plural marker *men*

The data examined in this study point to the finding that there are fewer structural restrictions governing the use of the plural suffix than grammarians have proposed. The stipulation that *men* could not be used with a noun modified in any other way (Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 23) was violated repeatedly. The constraint (implied or explicit) that *men* should not be used with quantifiers like *suoyou* ‘all’, *hen duo* ‘many’ and *yi xie* ‘some’ that already have an inherent plural meaning (cf. Kubler, 1985b, pp. 54-55; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 19; Si, 1994, p. 76) was also contravened repeatedly. Even the structural restriction that nouns modified by a specific number cannot take the plural suffix was violated more than once. That is, there is reason to suspect that structures of the form *[Number + CLF + N-PL]* (e.g. *san ge haizi-men* three CL child-PL ‘three children’) might be becoming grammatically more acceptable.

Previous written data from mainland China (see H. Guo & Zhou, 2003) have revealed that even the semantic restriction prohibiting the use of the plural marker *men* with nonhuman nouns is occasionally violated. By contrast, the data in this study concurred with those from a previous study of mainland Chinese spoken language use (see Cook, 2012b) in not including any such usage. In view of the fact that the use of the plural suffix *men* with animate nonhuman and inanimate nouns was exceedingly rare even in the studies which found isolated examples of this kind, it is possible that this difference is merely a function of the
statistical infrequency of this usage. On the other hand, it is equally possible that there are regional and/or register variations in the use of the plural suffix.\textsuperscript{17}

4.3.2. The many and varied functions of the plural marker \textit{men}

Two factors influencing the use of the plural suffix that are posited in the literature are the desire to give particular weight to the plurality of a noun and the sense conveyed of the group as a whole rather than the individuals in it. While it is certainly true that these factors play a role in a large number, perhaps even a majority, of occurrences of the plural marker \textit{men}, it is nevertheless worth observing that a number of other constraints (semantic, pragmatic and structural) also seem to operate, constraints which appear to have been largely overlooked in the literature to date.\textsuperscript{18}

Firstly, there are indications that the plural marker \textit{men} may be adopting some of the characteristics of a diminutive suffix, including pragmatic connotations of intimacy, affection, endearment and even depreciation. It would be worthwhile testing this hypothesis further, as cross-linguistically this appears to be a rather unusual process of development. Numerous other studies of diminutives in a variety of languages mention the grammaticalisation of nouns to diminutive suffixes (e.g. Bakema & Geeraerts, 2000, p. 1051) – which, indeed, has been the process undergone by the two well established diminutive suffixes in Mandarin Chinese, \textit{er} ‘son’ and \textit{zi} ‘child; son’. Few, if any, document the development of the functions of a diminutive by a plural marker. Closely linked to this diminutive function is the apparent marginal preference for appending the suffix \textit{men} to nouns denoting females, a preference which is attested by data from both mainland China and

\textsuperscript{17} It is perhaps not surprising that one genre that tends to provide more examples of the plural suffix used with non-human referents is children’s books, in which animal protagonists are frequently portrayed as having human characteristics. Similarly, a television production like CCTV’s \textit{Dongwu Shijie ‘World of Animals’}, hosted by Zhao Zhongxiang, is said to contain examples of this kind of usage. The reasons for this may be related to the humanising effect of the plural morphological ending and the desire on the part of presenters to arouse increased interest in the topic.

\textsuperscript{18} Note that several of the observations summarised in this section have been reinforced by comparing them with Taiwanese data (see Cook, 2004, 2011) and data collected from mainland Chinese speakers (cf. Cook, 2012b). The informants consulted for their native speaker responses to and grammaticality judgments about the data likewise came from both regions. Many of the observations made with respect to synchronic patterns of use seem to hold true for mainland Chinese speakers and Taiwanese speakers of Mandarin Chinese from different educational and professional backgrounds and across an age range of early twenties to late eighties. That is, the developments in the use of the plural suffix \textit{men} described in this study seem as a general rule to be observable across a broad cross-section of the speech community and do not appear on the limited data available to be restricted to any particular demographic characteristics.
Taiwan (cf. Cook, 2011, 2012b), albeit with insufficient numbers of cases to be conclusive at this stage. Further corroborating evidence for the morpheme *men* contributing to a pragmatic affect of intimacy and affection is provided by the relatively high frequency of occurrence in the data for this study of pluralised compounds containing the element *tong* ‘same’, including *tongxuemen* ‘classmates’, *tongchuangmen* ‘classmates’ and *tongshimen* ‘colleagues’.

Secondly, the plural suffix sometimes contributes to the organization of discourse and information structure. Some speakers seem to feel that considerations of balance and parallelism play a role in determining whether or not a NP requires the addition of the plural suffix. Similarly, the plural marker *men* may be adopting an additional structural function, namely that of signalling the close of longer NPs. This can be seen particularly in NPs containing a long attribute modifying the head noun, which finally appears at the end of the phrase. Relevant to this is the fact that a number of Chinese linguists have made the observation that Chinese sentences are becoming longer (H. Guo, 2007, p. 22; Ye He, 2004, pp. 130-131; Hu, 2006, p. 56; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, pp. 478-486; 1984[1943]-b, pp. 452-453; Xie, 2001), and that this is especially due to the increasing length and grammatical complexity of attributes preceding noun phrases (Ye He, 2004, pp. 130-131; Hu, 2006, p. 56; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 478). It seems feasible, therefore, that the use of the plural marker *men* appended to nouns modified by complex attributes to signal the close of the NP may be one strategy for facilitating the processing of information.

Finally, there appears to be a clear semantic distinction between the singular and plural forms of a noun in certain contexts. One semantic function of the singular form is its use as a general designation with exceptionless application; therefore, the plural inflexion tends to be used to avoid this implication in situations where that is not the intended meaning. Attested examples in the data of this particular function of the plural suffix have to date been found only with the noun *ren* ‘person’.

### 4.3.3. Lexical diffusion

Previous researchers have observed that the use of the plural suffix *men* is increasing in frequency, possibly owing to the influence of European languages, in particular English (H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Kubler, 1985b). It has further been suggested that the use of *men* may be spreading by lexical diffusion and that this may play a role in determining when the plural suffix is used to explicitly mark the grammatical number of a noun with plural reference
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(Cook, 2012b). A popular explanation for the spread of linguistic developments, lexical diffusion has been used to explain the transmission of both phonological and morpho-syntactic change (e.g. Aitchison, 2001; M. Y. Chen & Wang, 1975; cf. McMahon, 1994). The lexical diffusion model essentially claims that a linguistic innovation is initially associated with one or two isolated words or expressions and gradually expands its area of application by attaching itself to more and more lexical items. That this might hold true for sound change is relatively easy to imagine. But grammatical change too, it is claimed, is frequently associated with – or triggered by – particular lexical items (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 105-107). The theory is that speakers grow accustomed to a certain new, reinterpreted or extended syntactic structure by hearing it often in conjunction with a few common words and that later it spreads to new contexts (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 107-110).

One example of the spread of morpho-syntactic change by lexical diffusion comes from Tok Pisin, a creole spoken in Papua New Guinea. The use of *ol* with plural nouns (presumably functioning as a quantifier or determiner in a kind of double marking of the plural form) started with names of tribes, nations and places; progressed to nouns denoting humans; and finally appeared with nouns denoting inanimate objects (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 105-106). Interestingly, this has some parallels with the development of the plural marker *men* in Chinese. The plural affix was originally used only with pronouns, later spreading to nouns denoting humans. Recent years have seen the Chinese plural affix *men* used with nonhuman and even inanimate nouns (H. Guo & Zhou, 2003).

If we accept that the popularity of the suffix *men* is on the rise and if we likewise accept that lexical diffusion may be the mechanism by which its use is spreading, then we would expect to find a marked difference in the frequency with which various nouns undergo morphological pluralisation.

In order to test this hypothesis, it was necessary first to select the nouns to be included in the scope of comparison. Rather than try to rely on guesswork, it was decided to include all human nouns appearing on page 3 of each of the transcripts numbered 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61 and 71.¹⁹ Bearing in mind that the lower the token count is, the less reliable the frequency

---

¹⁹ The following expressions were excluded from data collection for this exercise as they were deemed to be too similar to pronouns in their behaviour and semantic designation: *bieren* ‘other person; other people; others’, *dajia* ‘everyone’, *renjia* ‘other people; they; someone’. The noun *ren* ‘person’ was also excluded on the grounds...
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percentage is likely to be, it was decided to retain for comparison only the nouns that were used in a plural sense more than 20 times in the corpus. Of course, it was not always possible with every base form occurrence of every noun type to determine conclusively if the speaker had intended it to be understood as having plural reference; therefore, in line with a cautious approach to data analysis, only those tokens where the plural reference was reasonably certain were counted. The relevant data for the nouns satisfying these criteria are summarised in the table below, with types listed in decreasing order of frequency of occurrence with plural meaning.

**Table 2**: Proportion of times plural meaning is signalled by plural suffix with selected human nouns in episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ from 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin Chinese word</th>
<th>English gloss</th>
<th>Tokens with plural meaning</th>
<th>Tokens with plural suffix</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pengyou 朋友</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haizi 孩子</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongxue 同学</td>
<td>classmate</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guanzhong 观众^20</td>
<td>viewer</td>
<td>74^21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yanyuan 演员</td>
<td>actor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiaohai 小孩</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gemi 歌迷</td>
<td>song fan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laoshi 老师</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geshou 歌手</td>
<td>singer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiongdi 兄弟</td>
<td>brothers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yingmi 影迷</td>
<td>movie fan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xuesheng 学生</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the contrast between its base form and plural form being of a slightly different nature from that pertaining to other human nouns (refer also to section 4.2.6).

^20 The noun guanzhong ‘audience; viewer’ tends to be used in the plural or collective sense, presumably on account of containing the morpheme zhong ‘throng; crowd’. However, it can also be used in the singular sense, as demonstrated by the fact that the phrase yi ge guanzhong one CL viewer ‘a viewer’ appeared in the corpus four times in three different episodes.

^21 In order to facilitate comparison of nouns used in similar ways, it was decided to include only occurrences of this type that seemed to be referring to viewers as multiple individuals rather than the audience en masse. Applying this distinction as carefully as possible yielded 74 tokens of guanzhong in the sense of ‘viewers’ and 68 tokens of guanzhong in the sense of ‘audience’. In fact, however, this distinction made no difference to the overall percentage count.
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The table reveals that, as a general tendency, nouns that are used more frequently overall are also more likely to attract the plural ending. Note that this is an important aspect of the lexical diffusion model, which states that linguistic change is likely to attach itself first to the most popular lexical items and spread by degrees to less popular lexical items.

The table also reveals quite a stark contrast between the frequency of morphological pluralisation for the three nouns occurring most commonly with the plural ending, *haizi* ‘child’, *pengyou* ‘friend’ and *tongxue* ‘classmate’ (refer also to discussion in section 4.2.1 above), and the equivalent frequency for the rest of the nouns in the table, taken as a whole. Interestingly, *haizimen* ‘children’ occurred relatively frequently in the corpus, whereas the plural form of *xiaohai* ‘child’ did not occur at all. More data are required before one can ascertain whether this was a mere statistical aberration or if there is some other factor – perhaps relating to the different internal compositions of the two words – that can account for this difference satisfactorily. Likewise, a more substantial database and a higher token count are needed to determine whether nouns like *laoshi* ‘teacher’ and *xuesheng* ‘student’ should be categorised as favouring or disfavouring morphological pluralisation. One suspects that, all other things being equal, nouns like *guanjun* ‘champion’, *rencai* ‘talented person’ and *zhuchiren* ‘host’ – all of which were included in the initial terms of reference for the comparative exercise above but discarded because of their low token count – would be even less likely than most of the nouns appearing in Table 2 to occur in the plural form.

Overall, the corpus data indicate that some human nouns when used in a plural sense may be more likely to attract the plural suffix than others. It can thus be seen that the analysis in this subsection provides tentative support for the hypothesis that the use of the plural suffix may be spreading by lexical diffusion. This is an interesting claim, as it seems that few researchers have to date drawn upon the lexical diffusion model to explain morphological phenomena. Lexical diffusion is widely accepted as a model for phonological change and has also been used to help explain syntactic change. Although lexical diffusion has been proposed more generally as a model for morpho-syntactic change, few studies have as yet satisfactorily demonstrated its application specifically to morphological change. The data in this study, although by no means conclusive, do at least suggest that it is worth investigating this question further.
4.3.4. Optional or obligatory?

The claim in the literature that Chinese nouns are unmarked for number (Ross & Ma, 2006, p. 22; Yip & Rimmington, 2006, p. 13) and that the use of the plural suffix *men* is “entirely optional” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 40) or “not obligatory in any context” (Norman, 1988, p. 159) does not seem to stand up to investigation – or at least not in spoken Mandarin. In some contexts explicit marking of the plural sense is quite definitely preferred, whether for pragmatic or structural reasons. In a very small number of situations we have seen that it may even be obligatory for semantic reasons. There are also suggestions that for a small number of nouns used in certain reasonably clearly defined constructions and/or with particular pragmatic emphasis, it no longer seems to be the case that inflexion for number is optional when the plural meaning is intended.

As discussed in the preceding section, the fact that the plural suffix seems to occur more frequently with certain nouns, or that certain nouns appear to lend themselves readily to plural inflexion, points to the conclusion that the use of *men* may be spreading via lexical diffusion. It is suggested that this process is most advanced in the case of *ren* ‘person’ vs. *renmen* ‘people’, where the singular and plural forms seem to have the most clearly delineated spheres of use – although even here there remains some overlap in the terms. A similar stage of development might soon be reached by words like *haizi(-men)* ‘child(ren)’, *pengyou(-men)* ‘friend(s)’ and *tongxue(-men)* ‘classmate(s)’. It may be that as a noun is used increasingly frequently with the plural inflexion, it then progresses to a stage in which inflexional marking for number becomes preferred. If a noun favouring pluralisation occurs in a syntactic context (e.g. after a long attribute, cf. section 4.2.5.1) and/or a pragmatic context (e.g. expressing overtones of affection, endearment etc., cf. section 4.2.4) that likewise favours explicit marking of plural number, the preference for appending the plural suffix *men* induced by a congruence of factors may become so strong that it feels almost obligatory to some native speakers. This is interesting because it concurs with earlier research into the use of the structural particle *de*, which likewise found that several factors converge to determine the likelihood of *de* being used in a syntactically optional environment to connect two noun phrases (Chappell & Thompson, 1992)

4.3.5. Summary
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There is clearly a contrast between the findings of this study, based on spoken data, and conventional analyses of the plural marker *men*, most of which have focussed on the written language. This study has confirmed – or at least provided corroborative support for – many of the hypotheses and tentative analyses presented in previous research (Cook, 2012b) conducted using a smaller data set. These include the findings that morphological pluralisation in Mandarin Chinese plural suffix *men* is apparently influenced by a range of semantic, pragmatic and structural factors and that *men* is sometimes capable of performing multiple roles simultaneously. Moreover, depending on how many considerations come into play in a given sentence and how binding they are, the use of the plural suffix is not always completely optional. As is often the case in studies of this sort, although the present database of over half a million characters is of a reasonable size for a corpus of spoken data, there are still questions that have yet to be answered conclusively. It is hoped that this may be achieved in the future with recourse to larger data sets and/or diachronic comparisons.

---

22 Interestingly, the results of this analysis also point to the conclusion that so-called native speaker “grammaticality” judgements are sensitive to the complex interplay of a range of factors. That is, in assessing the grammatical felicity or otherwise of a sentence, native speakers take into consideration not only morpho-syntactic well-formedness, but also their sense of the “naturalness” of the utterance, which encompasses aspects such as rhythm and prosody, phrasal balance, information flow and overall comprehensibility.
5. The Passive Marker *bei*

This chapter presents the results of investigations into contemporary usage of the passive marker *bei* in spoken Mandarin. The chapter begins by outlining standard grammatical analyses of the use and functions of the passive marker, including some recent observations pertaining to its use that have appeared in academic and non-academic publications. The particular observations drawn from the present database are then presented and analysed in some detail. Finally, the research findings of the present study are compared and contrasted with existing grammatical analyses, as well as with previous findings presented in recent publications.

5.1. Conventional accounts of the passive marker *bei*

Chinese has over the last two millennia or so always possessed at least one mechanism for explicitly indicating that a passive interpretation of the verb was intended. In the Classical Chinese of around two thousand years ago, this could be done by inserting the verb *jian* ‘see’ or the verb *shou* ‘receive’ immediately before the main verb (Norman, 1988, p. 101). Likewise, there has always been a means of highlighting the agent of an action. In Classical Chinese, an agent could be marked by means of one of two prepositions, *yu* or *wei*, immediately preceding it (cf. Norman, 1988, p. 101; C. Sun, 1996, pp. 23-37). However, these constructions are generally not analysed as passive structures in the literature, with most sources claiming that Classical Chinese made no grammatical distinction between active and passive voice. In other words, verbs intended to have a passive meaning were not necessarily explicitly marked as such. That is, contextual clues and the speaker’s/reader’s knowledge of the world often played a role in determining whether a sentence was meant to have a passive or an active interpretation (Norman, 1988, p. 101); as a general rule, most verbs were assumed to be active unless a passive reading made more sense in the situation of the particular spoken or written text. In practice, of course, this sometimes meant that certain sentences were ambiguous as to an active or passive reading. This section takes as its starting point conventional accounts of the use of the passive marker *bei* in Modern Standard Chinese as provided in standard grammar references, and then moves on to highlight a number of recent insights into and novel approaches to the analysis of the passive marker, as well as new developments in its use.
Before entering into a description of the use of the passive marker *bei*, it is worth noting that there are also other ways to explicitly mark the passive in contemporary Mandarin usage. In fact, *bei* is one of several options that have evolved for indicating the passive in Modern Standard Chinese, the other passive markers in relatively common use being *gei*, *jiao* and *rang*. However, *bei* is the only passive marker that is employed across all registers of language use and the only one that allows omission of the agent (K. Wang, 2010, p. 19). Apparently it is only fairly recently (i.e. in the last few decades or, at most, in the last 100 years) that *bei* has come to be the most commonly used passive marker in Mandarin Chinese.

It should also be acknowledged at this point that the use of the term “passive marker” to refer to *bei* is by no means uncontroversial in the literature. Indeed, *bei* has also been analysed in a number of different ways: as a coverb (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981), a preposition (Chao, 1968; D. Li & Cheng, 1988), a verb (Hashimoto, 1987; S.-W. Tang, 2001), an adverb (Cao, 2003) and an “acategorical grammatical word” (C. Li, 2007), amongst other possibilities. It has also been claimed that the use of *bei* does not even constitute a passive construction, but rather, that it is a topic-comment structural marker (Loar, 2011) or a “topic affectedness marker” (LaPolla, 1988). While acknowledging the potential usefulness of many of these accounts, it was decided for the sake of simplicity to adhere in this thesis to the term “passive marker”, which seems to conform to a significant proportion, if not the majority of analyses in the literature on Mandarin Chinese grammar.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, some aspects of the use of the passive marker *bei* in Modern Mandarin appear to be related to language use in Classical Chinese. For one thing, passive structures generally are not as common in Chinese as in European languages. In fact, overt marking of the passive is not always obligatory in Mandarin Chinese (Chao, 1968, p. 702; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 512; Loar, 2011, p. 320; Norman, 1988, p. 164) and may sometimes even be inappropriate or unidiomatic to the point of ungrammaticality (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 498; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 512). This is related, at least in part, to the historical fact that in Classical Chinese verbs generally were not marked as passive or active, but interpreted appropriately depending on context. Again, unlike many European languages, not all – or even most – declarative sentences containing a transitive verb can be passivised (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 488). In fact, it is quite common to omit any overt syntactic indication of the passive when a passive reading is intended. Similar to extant Classical Chinese texts, which contain many sentences in which the verb can legitimately be
interpreted as having an active or a passive meaning, even in modern usage this problem can also arise. Thus, the well-known example yu chi-le fish eat-PFV can famously be interpreted depending on context either as ‘the fish has eaten (it)’ or ‘the fish has been eaten’ (Chao, 1968, p. 75; cf. Lin, 2001, p. 125).¹

The morpheme bei that is currently used as a passive marker in the spoken and written Mandarin of the twenty-first century has developed over the last two thousand years or so from a full verb meaning ‘cover’ or ‘suffer’ in Classical Chinese. Even today, there is still a carryover of negative connotations from this time (cf. C. Sun, 1996, p. 35), and most grammar references state that the preferred usage of bei is with verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning (Chao, 1968, p. 703; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 493; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 506; Loar, 2011, pp. 319-320; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 460) – verbs with a “disposal” meaning in this context essentially being those describing an action in which the agent controls, manipulates or deals with the patient, usually intentionally and often forcefully.² For example, verbs cited in standard Mandarin grammar reference works as being typically used with the passive marker bei include da ‘hit’, ma ‘scold’, pian ‘deceive; cheat’, piping ‘criticise’, qiang ‘steal’ and shasi ‘kill’ (cf. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; D. Li & Cheng, 1988; Loar, 2011).

Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 460), writing in the first half of the twentieth century, devoted considerable space and energy to emphasising that in “proper” usage (i.e. in Chinese that was unsullied by the influence of European languages) the passive marker bei should be used only with verbs expressing an unhoped for, unwished for or undesirable event. The reader should note that this was, in effect, an admission that such “impure” influences were already creeping into the language. In other words, Wang Li had already observed the use of the passive marker bei with verbs expressing a more positive meaning several decades ago; moreover, he was of the opinion that these structures were a result of language contact between Chinese and European languages and that such usage was (from his perspective) relatively recent and definitely not recommended (1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 462). Although a few historical linguists have demonstrated that bei has been used with non-adverse verbs for more than 1500 years (e.g. Peyraube, 1989; H.-L.

¹ Refer to Appendix 1 for an explanation of grammatical abbreviations used.
² Loar (2011, p. 320) refers to these as verbs of “high transitivity”.
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Yang, 2006), other linguists have been quick to point out that the use of the passive marker *bei* with verbs with a non-adverse meaning is on the rise, especially in the written language, and that the change in distribution of positive vs. negative passivised verbs can be attributed to the increased influence over the last century of European languages, especially Russian and English (e.g. Chao, 1968, p. 803; P. Chen, 1999, p. 93; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; Norman, 1988, p. 165; R. Xiao et al., 2006, p. 19). In what can be seen as corroboration of this, Li and Thompson (1981, p. 497) observe that the use of *bei* to mark the passive explicitly is more common “with verbs representing usages borrowed or introduced into the language during the modern age”. The increasing acceptance of the passive marker *bei* with non-adverse predicates has spread from translations of European works to the broader range of written Chinese texts, with such usage now quite common in written Chinese generally (Chao, 1968, p. 703; P. Chen, 1999, p. 94; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 462). A number of sources mention that this relatively recent development is spreading from the written to the spoken language, or otherwise imply that the use of *bei* with a neutral or positive verb is still less prevalent in spoken Mandarin (cf. Chao, 1968, p. 703; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 497; Norman, 1988, p. 165; R. Xiao et al., 2006, p. 19).

Recent research by the Japanese scholar Sugimura (2003, 2006) has suggested that the passive marker *bei* may be associated primarily not with a meaning of adversity, but with an element of surprise. Sugimura (2003, 2006) argues that adverse events are not only undesirable but generally unexpected as well, and that the use of the passive marker *bei* with non-adverse verbs generally serves to highlight the unanticipated (if pleasurable) nature of the action. Thus, according to this analysis, the common factor in the vast majority of *bei* clauses is the element of unexpectedness.

According to the standard literature, the passive marker *bei* can be used in a number of related structures: directly after the patient and preceding the verb being passivised in the structure [NP BEI V]; directly after the patient and preceding the agent in the structure [NP₁ BEI NP₂ V]; or directly preceding the agent, with the verb introduced by another syntactic particle – either *suo* or *gei* (here glossed simply as SUO/GEI) – that reinforces or intensifies the passive construction, in the structure [NP₁ BEI NP₂ SUO/GEI V] (cf. Loar, 2011, p. 321;
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C. Sun, 1996, p. 37; R. Xiao et al., 2006). These three possibilities can be summarized in the following structure: \([\text{NP}_1 \text{ BEI} (\text{NP}_2 (\text{SUO/GEI})) \text{ V}]\), where \(\text{NP}_1\) is the patient, or recipient of the action, and \(\text{NP}_2\) is the agent, or doer of the action.

Notwithstanding the general disinclination of Mandarin speakers to use passive constructions, there is a particular kind of usage that is becoming increasingly common in internet language for which no precedent has been found in English. What is referred to here is the rather fascinating use of the passive marker *bei* by Mandarin speakers to signal irony, an application which has been elucidated rather nicely by Yao, Song, and Singh (2013) and more briefly by Q. Xiao and Link (2013). They describe this interesting recent development in the use of the passive marker to indicate that the subject is being acted upon not only against his/her will, but often indirectly, resulting in a misrepresentation of the facts in official media channels. Termed “satirical” or “ironic” *bei*, the passive marker is often found performing this function in texts expressing political dissent and/or criticism of the Chinese government. This development has also received attention in a large number of online articles, most of them non-academic.

More detailed semantic, pragmatic and morpho-syntactic constraints on the use of the passive marker *bei* are described in the following section. Most of the sources consulted had based their analyses on written Chinese texts and/or introspection; a few had concentrated on or at least included attested spoken examples. Although there were some discrepancies between the various analyses, these seemed to depend less on whether the publication dealt with written or spoken data and more on the particular research angle, focus or approach adopted by the individual linguist.

5.2. Research findings

This section is organised according to different sets of restrictions or conditions on the use of the passive marker *bei*. First semantic and pragmatic, then morpho-syntactic constraints on its use will be discussed. At the end of each subsection, a frequency analysis of the use of *bei* in the textual database used for this research will be undertaken to enable detailed comparison

---

3 Note that C. Sun (1996, p. 37) claims that the structure \([\text{NP}_1 \text{ BEI} \text{ NP}_2 \text{ SUO} \text{ V}]\) “fell out of fashion” many centuries ago. My data, however, lend only qualified support to this claim, as there are two examples of this structure in the chat show data forming the basis of this research.
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of the patterns of actual usage in spoken Mandarin with the structures and conventions outlined in the literature on Chinese grammar.\(^4\)

Note that transgressions of rules governing the use of the passive marker *bei* were generally only analysed and discussed if they occurred repeatedly. That is, if a certain pattern of usage was found at least five or six times in the corpus, it was considered to be more than just a slip of the tongue. If, on the other hand, there were only one or two isolated examples of a particular convention being violated, that was usually deemed to be less significant and not necessarily worthy of comment.

This section will focus on highlighting real-life examples of the passive marker used in an ungrammatical, questionable or otherwise non-standard way, taking the descriptions of *bei* in standard grammar references as the starting point for discussion. The distribution of examples conforming to, compared with those violating the semantic and morpho-syntactic constraints proposed in the literature on Mandarin grammar will then be statistically analysed and discussed. Based on this analysis, it will be possible to comment on the accuracy and validity of the claims pertaining to the conditions of use of the passive marker *bei* as they relate to typical usage in spoken Mandarin.

5.2.1. Semantic and pragmatic constraints on the use of *bei*

As mentioned in section 5.1 above, the overwhelming majority of grammatical treatises dealing with the distribution of *bei* in Modern Standard Chinese, whether discussing written or spoken forms, note a strong predilection for its use with verbs with an unfavourable meaning (Chao, 1968, p. 703; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 493; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 506; Loar, 2011, pp. 319-320; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 488; 1984[1943]-b, p. 460; R. Xiao et al., 2006, p. 19). This is by far the most common restriction on the use of the passive marker *bei* mentioned in the literature.

Moreover, Chinese linguists state that, in contrast to most European languages, it is not the case that the majority of Mandarin Chinese declarative sentences in the active voice can be converted to passive sentences by the simple expedient of rearranging the components and adding the passive marker *bei*. According to the literature, verbs belonging to certain

\(^4\) Refer to Appendix 3 for a list of all examples of the use of the passive marker *bei* in the present corpus.
semantic groups are not eligible for grammatical passivisation. Some of these categories are similar to verbs that are ungrammatical or highly questionable when passivised in English, such as existential verbs and verbs expressing no change, e.g. shi ‘be’, you ‘have’ and zai ‘be located’; and verbs expressing direction, e.g. jin ‘enter’, chu ‘exit’, lai ‘come’ and qu ‘go’ (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 498). Other semantic groups can be passivised in English but not in Mandarin. These include mental states, such as xihuan ‘like’, pa ‘fear’ and taoyan and hen ‘hate’ (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 501; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 498); verbs of commencement, continuation or conclusion, e.g. kaishi ‘start’, jixu ‘continue’ and jieshu ‘finish’ (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 498); as well as verbs expressing physical position, e.g. zuo ‘sit’, zhan ‘stand’ and tang ‘lie’ (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 498).

Although explicit mention of the agent is optional (as explained in section 5.1 above), one standard reference stipulates that if it is mentioned, the agent must be animate or, if inanimate, something that is capable of initiating an action and being responsible for causing an event (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 504-505). Examples of the kind of inanimate object that can perform the role of agent introduced by bei in a passive sentence in Mandarin Chinese without exciting controversy include forces of nature such as shui ‘water’, feng ‘wind’ and huo ‘fire’. Furthermore, it is considered unacceptable to construct a sentence of the form [NP₁ BEI NP₂ V] in which the second noun phrase names the instrument of the action expressed by the verb, rather than the agent. An example of such ungrammatical usage might be, for example, *men bei yaoshi suo-le door PASS key lock-PERF ‘the door was locked with a key’ (cf. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 504-505).

In addition, there are certain constructions known as “notional passives” that are automatically understood to have a passive interpretation even without any overt passive marker. These include examples such as jiu song-lai-le alcohol PASS bring-come-PERF ‘the wine was brought out’ and baoguo ji-zou-le package PASS send-go-PERF ‘the package was sent off’ (cf. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 498-499; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 512; Loar, 2011, pp. 330-331). The critical point here is the semantic relationship between the grammatical subject, or topic of the sentence and the verb. The patient, or grammatical subject of the sentence is typically non-human, often inanimate, and thus not considered capable of initiating action; on the other hand, our knowledge of the world informs us that it is frequently a recipient of the action named, which may explain why it is easy to interpret the verb as passive even when it is not explicitly marked as such. According to the standard
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Mandarin grammar texts, such sentences are ungrammatical or at best stylistically undesirable if they appear with the passive marker *bei*, as it is redundant in these cases.\(^5\)

5.2.1.1. **Satirical use of *bei***

This new and rather fascinating use of the passive marker has stimulated much comment in online articles, but as yet very little in the literature on linguistics, and has received only oblique reference in authoritative texts on Mandarin grammar (Y. Wu, 2013, p. 70). So-called “ironic” or “satirical” *bei* is used to signal distancing of the speaker/writer from the source of information, at the same time casting doubt on the accuracy of the content conveyed. Of the 215 instances of the use of *bei* as a passive marker in the corpus for this study, only one example of this usage was found. The relevant utterance is cited in (19) below, together with some context provided by the narrator to clarify the precise meaning intended by the speaker.

(19) 这已经是结婚三年来第三次被传离婚。 (Narrator, 13/07/2011)
    [……]就三年就被离三次婚。 (Wen Zhang, 13/07/2011)

*Zhe yijing shi jiehun san nian lai di san ci bei chuan lihun.*

[……] *Jiu san nian jiu bei li san ci hun.*

DEM already COP marry three year since ORD three time PASS rumour divorce.

‘That was already the third time in three years of marriage that they had been rumoured to have got divorced.’

[……] ‘So I was made out to have got divorced three times in the space of three years.’

In this usage, the morpheme *bei* is much more than merely a passive marker; it is used to indicate that although a person or people have been represented in the media in a particular light, this representation is not, in fact, accurate. It cannot be translated into English by means of a single morpheme, but is probably most concisely rendered in English as ‘be made out to …’. In other words, the morpheme *bei* here is not just acting as a passive marker. It has significant semantic and pragmatic weight, meaning roughly ‘be represented in the media in a certain way,’ the implication being that this representation is incorrect.

\(^5\) Note that R. Xiao et al. (2006), in their analysis of corpus data supplemented by native speaker intuition, do not seem to consider the redundant overt passive marking of sentences that would otherwise be interpreted as notional passives to be universally infelicitous.
For comparison, two examples of the satirical use of *bei* taken from online sources are included below. Because of the prevalence of this usage of *bei* in articles that are critical of the Chinese media and/or government, this function seems to bear some resemblance to a marker of political dissent. The following examples illustrate this usage.

(20) 我们不要“被幸福”

Women *bu yao* “*bei xingfu*”

‘We don’t want to be made out to be happy (when we’re not).’

(21) 我们似乎已经生活在一个“被繁荣”、“被和谐”的完美社会中。

Women *sihu yijing shenghuo zai yi ge “bei fanrong”*

‘It seems we are already living in a perfect society that has been “prosperously” and “harmonised”.’

In recent years it has become an object with the PRC government to publish statistics indicating that the Chinese population is generally becoming happier or more content as living conditions for the masses improve. The adjective, or stative verb *xingfu* ‘happy’ has appeared frequently in news articles dealing with this subject matter. However, in a usage that, it is hardly necessary to point out, is considered ungrammatical according to the traditional conventions of Mandarin syntax, in online texts and discussion forums the relevant adjective is frequently preceded by the passive marker *bei*. The point of this seems to be to indicate that the writer casts doubt on the true happiness of the people surveyed and suspects they have merely been ‘made happy’, ‘forced into happiness’ or ‘happiness-ified’ for the purposes of the collection and publication of favourable statistics (cf. Q. Xiao & Link, 2013).

Similarly, the adjective *xiaokang* ‘moderately well off’ has also been used with the passive marker *bei* when discussing government reports of household income to imply that the statistics were falsified to give the distorted impression that many more people were living in comfortable financial circumstances than was really the case.

---
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commonly appears with satirical *bei* is *hexie* ‘harmonious’, illustrated in example (21) above. In an additional ironic twist, the two characters for *hexie* ‘harmonious’ are frequently replaced by the near-homophonous characters *he-xie* river-crab ‘river crab’, an oblique reference to Chinese folk stories that evoke the devious sideways motion of a crab known for bullying creatures weaker than itself (Q. Xiao & Link, 2013).

However, it is not only adjectives that undergo “involuntary passivisation”, to use Xiao and Link’s (2013) terminology. The verb-object compound *jiuye* ‘obtain employment; get a job’ has appeared with the passive marker in discussions relating to employment statistics for new graduates, the inference being that many graduates achieve official employed status before they have actually found a job.\(^\text{10}\) This can have more serious ramifications for individual graduates than the mere pacification of the masses through statistical enhancement, as those registered as employed may no longer be eligible for government subsidies available to unemployed persons. Even the intransitive verb *zisha* ‘commit suicide’ has been passivised in texts in which the writer wished to insinuate that there did not appear to be any satisfactory suicide motive and that the verdict of suicide, although accepted and promulgated in the official media channels, was highly controversial.\(^\text{11}\) Thus it can be seen that in the socio-political climate of the People’s Republic of China Mandarin speakers are increasingly using *bei* as a means of voicing political criticism and dissent (cf. Q. Xiao & Link, 2013), a function which is quite possibly unique amongst the passive markers of the world’s languages.

It is interesting to note that the ironic force of *bei* often seems to be signalled by the use of the passive marker in a syntactically marked context, i.e. a context which contravenes traditional grammatical conventions, such as its use with an intransitive verb, a verb-object compound or an adjective. Moreover, as soon as a Mandarin word which would not traditionally have appeared with *bei* (e.g. an adjective, an intransitive verb or a verb-object compound) is used with the passive marker, it takes on the function of a transitive verb in that context. In other words, adjectives become verbalised, and intransitive verbs become transitivised. It seems that this flouting of the syntactic conventions may contribute to the “activist” flavour of such

\(^\text{10}\) E.g. http://hi.baidu.com/webhouse/blog/item/2cdab51bd2196f108718bf7e.html; http://man.qm120.com/gozfi/rkrrv/2009072874318.htm.
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sentences. Note that there is still a strong causative sense of the passive marker bei in these contexts, and the outcome is still considered undesirable by the patient. Thus, there is a sense in which the behaviour of “ironic” bei conforms to many of the precepts set out in the standard references on Mandarin grammar.  

5.2.1.2. Verbs with non-adverse and/or non-disposal meaning

Overall, 215 tokens of the passive marker bei were found in the corpus of over half a million characters of spontaneous spoken data. Although there were numerous instances of bei being used with a neutral or positive outcome, as anticipated there was nevertheless a strong tendency for the passive marker to appear with predicates expressing a negative meaning. The most common adverse and disposal verbal meanings used with the passive marker bei in the database comprising around 80 episodes of ‘A Date with Luyu’ from 2011 are summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Chinese verb(s)</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>打死 da-si; 害死 hai-si; 击毙 jibi; 砍死 kan-si; 杀 sha; 淹死 yan-si</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheat; deceive</td>
<td>陷 pian</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit; attack</td>
<td>打 da; 打击 daji; 砍 kan; 打打 qiada</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steal</td>
<td>盗 dao; 抢(走) qiang[-zou]; 偷 tou</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abuse; swear at</td>
<td>骂 ma</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force</td>
<td>逼 bi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frighten</td>
<td>吓(到) xia(-dao)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publish</td>
<td>爆(出来) bao(-chulai); 公开 gongkai</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reject</td>
<td>拒绝 jujue</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prominent amongst the meanings listed here are death, physical injury and other strongly negative outcomes, a semantic distribution that was not unexpected, given the descriptions of bei in the standard grammar references. The meaning of ‘publish’ might look fairly harmless, but it is worth remembering that a significant proportion of the people interviewed by Chen Luyu were in the entertainment business, so ‘publish’ in the context of these conversations usually implied what was (to the interviewees) an unwelcome revelation of some deep, dark secret from their past.

---

12 I am indebted to Kenny Wang for several of the ideas expressed in this paragraph as well as, more generally, for comments and feedback relating to this chapter.
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Verbs with non-adverse meaning

The verbs listed in Table 1 above account for over 70 instances of *bei*, or approximately one third of all 215 tokens of the passive marker *bei* in the corpus. Another one third, or slightly more, were verbs and predicates with other adverse meanings. The remainder, or approximately one quarter of all occurrences, was with a neutral or positive predicate. Some of the more common non-adverse verbs used with *bei* in the corpus included *gandong* ‘move (emotionally)’ and *kanhao* ‘value; see good prospects for’.

Some examples of passivised verbs with quite a positive meaning are provided in sentences (22) to (25) below.

(22) 余男和电影结缘特别早，三四岁的时候，就被导演选中去演一部电影《舞恋》。

*Xu Nan’s connection with film started very early. As young as three or four he was chosen by a director to act in the movie “Dance Love”.*

Note that in classifying a *bei*-phrase as expressing an adverse or non-adverse outcome for the patient, the meaning of the entire phrase was taken into consideration, not merely the meaning of the verb in isolation. The sentence below, taken from the corpus used for this study, is a clear example of an utterance containing a verb that would under normal circumstances be considered positive but which was here classified as adverse owing to the context.

Because I was just thinking, suppose on the off chance I scored a mark that wasn’t high or low, it would be too tragic to be accepted by a really bad school.’

As it can be difficult to draw precise boundaries between positive, neutral and negative meanings, an attempt was made to err on the side of a conservative assessment, i.e. to err on the side of assessing verbs as more rather than less adverse, since this is the usage that has been described as standard in traditional grammar references.
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(23) 他说按我们家的传统，考上大学就算被社会承认了，也算你长大了。

(Zheng Jun, 24/02/2011)

(Ta shuo an women jia de chuantong, kaoshang daxue jiu suan bei shehuichengren-le, ye suan ni zhangda-le.
3SG say according.to 1PL family ATT tradition, pass.the.entrance.examination university just count PASS societyrecognise-PFV, also count 2SG grow.up-PFV.

‘He said according to family tradition, getting into university means being recognised by society, and it also means you're grown up.’

(24) 这是我们中华的一种民俗艺术，能够被大家喜欢，能够让那个节奏这么可爱，大家喜欢，就表示它抓住我们的心灵。

(Liu Tang, 12/09/2011)

(Zhe shi women Zhonghua de yi zhong minsu yishu, nenggou bei dajia xihuan, nenggou rang na ge jiezou zheme ke'ai, dajia xihuan, jiu biaoshi ta zhua-zhu women de xinling.
DEM COP 1PL China ATT one CL folk art, able.to PASS everyone like, able.to make DEM CL rhythm so cute, everyone like, just prove 3SG grasp-RES 1PL ATT spirit.

‘It’s a kind of Chinese folk art; if it’s capable of being liked by everyone, if you’re able to make the rhythm so cute that everyone likes it, then that proves it’s captured our hearts.’

But I now know, you… often if you see some kind of social phenomenon, and you think it needs fixing, you’ll just post it on a micro-blog, then it can be solved very quickly, right?’

It should be noted that most commentators who have written about the passive marker bei from the time of Wang Li to the present have observed an increased frequency in its use. A few of these (e.g. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 497) have pointed out that its use with verbs of neutral or positive meaning is more common with verbs introduced into Mandarin in the last century, or at least with verbs whose use has become popularised or more widespread in modern times, i.e. in the last 100 years. Examples of this kind of verb cited in the literature include fanyi ‘translate’, jiefang ‘liberate’ and xuan ‘choose; elect’. The verb in (22) above
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falls into this category, being a relatively recent addition to the lexicon of Mandarin that has only attained widespread use during the course of the twentieth century. The verb in sentence (24), on the other hand, has been in common use for much longer. Thus it can be seen that the spoken data used for this research provide not only examples that fit into the class of accepted divergences from the rule-of-thumb usage, but also some that are less typical violations of the semantic convention pertaining to adversity.

Note that in example (24) an idea that was originally expressed in the passive (*bei dajia xihuan* ‘be liked by everyone’) was subsequently paraphrased in the active voice (*dajia xihuan* ‘everyone likes (it)’). This suggests that the speaker may not have been entirely convinced of the felicitousness of the passive construction in this instance. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these were not isolated examples of the use of the passive marker *bei* in conjunction with verbs expressing a non-adverse and in fact quite positive meaning.

One further example of a grammatically passivised verb describing a highly desirable outcome for the patient is given in (26). It is treated separately from the four preceding examples because of its slightly different pragmatic overtones, as we shall see.

(26) 誰能被邀請了誰能參加了。
(Wei Wei, 16/09/2011)

Shei neng bei yaoqing-le shei neng canjia-le.
Who can PASS invite-PERF who can attend-PERF.
‘Whoever can get invited can attend [the party].’

This utterance seems to imply that some effort may be required on the part of patients wishing to achieve the positive outcome denoted by the verb, i.e. by those hoping to receive an invitation. An idiomatically appropriate, alternative rendering into English might be something like the following: ‘If you can score an invite, you can go.’ This suggests a much more active interpretation of the passive (if one can formulate it thus) than hitherto seen. It can also be seen as supporting the interpretation of *bei* proposed by Sugimura (2003, 2006), according to which the passive marker underscores the surprising or unexpected nature of the event (as discussed in section 5.1).

**Verbs with non-disposal meaning**

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, a number of previous researchers have observed that *bei* is typically used with verbs expressing an undesirable outcome for the patient and that these verbs generally have a disposal meaning as well, rather than simply expressing a negative meaning without disposal (e.g. ‘hate’, ‘fear’) (cf. Chao, 1968, p. 703;
C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 501; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 498). Although approximately three quarters of instances of the use of the passive marker in the corpus were with an adverse meaning, not all of these simultaneously expressed a disposal meaning. The textual database used for this study in fact contained a number of passivised verbs expressing an adverse but not a disposal meaning. These included verbs like hushi ‘ignore; overlook’, wuhui ‘misunderstand; misconstrue’ and wujie ‘misunderstand; misread’, whose use is exemplified in sentences (27) and (28) below.

(27) 你就可以很坚决的那种眼神，我没有这样，因为常常都会被别人误解嘛，很多事情。

(Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011)

Ni jiu keyi hen jianjue de na zhe yang yanshen, wo mei you zhe yang, yinwei chang~chang dou hui bei bieren wujie ma, hen duo shiqing.

‘You can [use] that sort of resolute expression in your eyes, I didn’t do it, because I’m frequently misunderstood by others, you know, in a lot of things.’

(28) 每天不停地告诉自己不可以做这个,不可以做那个 […] 怕被人们误会。

(Fan Bingbing, 09/09/2011)

Mei tian bu ting de gaosu ziji bu keyi zuo zhe ge, bu keyi zuo na ge […] pa bei renmen wuhui.

‘Every day I told myself repeatedly, you can’t do this, you can’t do that […] I was afraid I’d be misunderstood by others.’

While the outcome of these predicates is undesirable for the patient concerned, the verbs do not express a disposal meaning in that they are not deliberate, controllable, forceful actions on the part of the agent. Thus, they do not represent accepted usage with the passive marker bei, as stipulated in standard grammar reference works. It is interesting to compare the use of bei with the verbs in (27) and (28), and the use of the preverbal object marker ba with the same verbs. According to the standard analysis (e.g. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; D. Li & Cheng, 1988), similar restrictions apply to verbs that are compatible with bei and ba. However, in modern vernacular usage, clearly many speakers are happy to use non-disposal verbs like wujie ‘misunderstand’, wuhui ‘misunderstand’ and hushi ‘ignore’ with the passive marker bei even though they may not feel comfortable using the same verbs with the object marker ba.
5.2.1.3. **Inanimate agent/instrument**

Contrary to the descriptions in the standard grammar references consulted for this study (refer to discussion in 5.2.1 above), the passive marker *bei* appeared repeatedly governing inanimate noun phrases of various kinds. Four examples of inanimate NPs governed by *bei* are given here, the first three featuring inanimate objects and even some quite abstract concepts in the role of agent, the fourth a weapon in the role of instrument.

(29) 小陈就这样被希望和失望交织折磨着。 (Chen Luyu, 31/05/2011)

```
Xiao Chen jiu zhe yang bei xiwang he shiwang jiaozhi zhemo-zhe.
Xiao Chen just DEM way PASS hope and despair mix torture-DUR.
```

‘So Xiao Chen was tormented by hope and despair.’

(30) 然后到那儿以后我们每个人都被那个场景所震撼，就整个一个大的广场全部是鲜花和这个这个花圈。

(Yan Weiwen, 09/08/2011)

```
Ranhou dao nar yihou women mei ge ren dou bei na ge changjing suo zhenhan, jiu zhengge yi ge da de guangchang quanbu shi xian-hua he zhe ge zhe ge hua-quan.
Then arrive there after 1PL every CL person all PASS DEM CL view SUO stir, just whole one CL big ATT square entire COP fresh-flower and DEM CL DEM CL flower-wreath.
```

‘Then when we got there every one of us was stirred by the view, just the whole of a big square was all [covered in] fresh flowers and… er… floral wreaths.’

(31) 都忘记了，因为被喜悦冲昏头脑了。

(Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011)

```
Dou wangji-le, yinwei bei xiyue chonghun tounao le.
All forget-PFV, because PASS happiness confuse head CS.
```

‘I forgot about it, because I was made dizzy with happiness.’

(32) 我见过有人被啤酒瓶砍到头，但我没有看到过自己用啤酒瓶打自己，而且我没有看过女孩这样的。

(Chen Luyu, 09/09/2011)

```
Wo jian-guo youren bei piju-ping kan-dao tou, danshi mei you kan-dao-guo ziji yong piju-ping da ziji, erqie wo mei you kan-guo nü-hai zhe yang de.
ISG see-EXP someone PASS beer-bottle cut-RES head, but NEG PFV see-RES-EXP self use beer-bottle hit self, besides ISG NEG PFV see-EXP female-child DEM way NOM.
```

‘I’ve seen someone get cut on the head with a beer bottle, but I’ve never seen anyone hit themselves with a beer bottle, and I’ve certainly never seen a woman do that.’

Some of the noun phrases belonging to this group of examples included *ai* ‘love’, *jingshen* ‘spirit’, *langsong* ‘recital’, *ranshaodan* ‘incendiary bomb’, *shoufenggín* ‘accordeon’ and *yingpian* ‘movie’. In total, 18 of the 215 examples, or 8% of occurrences of the passive
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Marker *bei* in the corpus were found to be governing an inanimate noun phrase.\(^{14}\) That seems to suggest that this usage is widespread enough to be considered grammatical in contemporary Mandarin Chinese.

5.2.1.4. Notional passives

As explained above, overt marking of notional passives is unnecessary, i.e. the use of the passive marker *bei* in such sentences is considered to be redundant. This means that sentences like ??? *jiu bei song-lai-le* alcohol PASS bring-come-PERF ‘the wine was brought out’ and ??? *baoguo bei ji-zou-le* package PASS send-go-PERF ‘the package was sent off’ are deemed at best stylistically questionable and at worst ungrammatical (refer to discussion in section 5.2.1). However, several such examples were found in the chat show transcripts, 12 to be precise, or around 6% of the tokens in the corpus. Three such examples are given below.

(33) **Suoyou de boli-men, da-men quanbu dou bei ji-po-le.**
All ATT glass-door, big-door entire all PASS squash-break-PFV.

‘All the glass doors and main doors were smashed.’

(34) **Hen duo hui you yi ci wanshang, qian bu zao cun hou bu zao dian, che luntai bei zha-le, mingtian zaoshang wo jiu huijia-le, zhe bu shi ren de shengluo, jiu zhe yang.**

Very many time EXST one CL evening, front NEG touch village behind NEG touch shop, car tyre PASS burst-PFV, next.day morning ISG just return.home-PFV, DEM NEG COP person ATT life, just DEM style.

‘[It happened] many times, but one evening there wasn’t a village or shop in sight, and the care tyre had burst, so the next morning I just went home. That was no life, that’s how it was.’

(35) **Women de shexiangshi pai-le yi zhang Wei Chen jieshou caifang**

---

\(^{14}\) When categorizing agents as animate or inanimate, borderline cases like *shehui* ‘society’ (which could be understood to refer to general mass of people making up society), *xuexiao* ‘school’ (which could be understood to refer to the teachers or authorities at the school), *meiti* ‘media’ (which could be understood to refer to the mass of journalists and reporters employed in the media) and *jingche* ‘police car’ (which could be understood to refer to the occupants of the car) were classified as animate and human rather than inanimate and nonhuman.
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de zhaopian, fa zai zijī de wei-bo-shang, duan~duan de ji fenzhong zhinei zhe tiao wei-bo jiù bei zhuanfa-le shang qian ci.

1PL ATT cameraman take-PFV one CL Wei Chen receive interview ATT photo, put LOC self ATT mini-blog-on, short~REDUP ATT few minute within DEM CL mini-blog just PASS forward-PFV multiple thousand time.

‘And within a few short minutes that mini-blog had been forwarded thousands of times.’

In all three examples above, the sentences would have been grammatical, comprehensible and (to many native speakers) preferable without the passive marker *bei*. Even without the passive marker, the predicates would still have been understood as having a passive interpretation. This type of sentence structure, known as the “notional passive”, is discussed in a number of grammar reference works (e.g. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 498-499; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 512; Loar, 2011, pp. 330-331), where it is explicitly claimed as a distinguishing feature of Mandarin grammar.

It may be relevant to consider an example from Kubler’s (1985b) study of the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar. This study compared two different editions of the novel *Jia (Family)*, the first published in 1931 and the second in 1957. Many years after the first edition had appeared, in a very different social and political climate from that prevailing in 1930s China, the author Ba Jin personally revised the novel to sound less Europeanised. One of the points made by Kubler (1985b) was that the later edition of the novel *Jia (Family)* featured less frequent use of the passive construction with *bei*. An example of the kind of editing undertaken is given in (36) below.

(36) a) 上身的衣服完全被打湿了。
   *Shang-shen de yifu wanquan bei da-shi-le.*
   Upper-body ATT clothing completely PASS hit-wet-CS.
   ‘The clothing on the upper body was completely wet through.’

b) 上身的衣服完全打湿了。
   *Shang-shen de yifu wanquan da-shi-le.*
   Upper-body ATT clothing completely hit-wet-CS.
   ‘The clothing on the upper body was completely wet through.’

As can be seen, the example here was revised a quarter of a century after it was first written to appear without the passive marker – without changing the meaning of the original. This particular example of a notional passive serves to illustrate two points made in this section. Firstly, the explicit use of *bei* with constructions that are in any case capable of being
interpreted as notional passives without any overt grammatical marking as such is not only redundant but actually dispreferred by some speakers. Secondly, the redundant use of the passive marker in this and similar contexts was felt nearly 60 years ago to be an indication of the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar. Hence, it is not unreasonable to postulate that the influence of English and other European languages on modern Chinese morpho-syntax may likewise help explain the repeated occurrence of similar structures in the corpus data for the present study.

5.2.2. Morpho-syntactic constraints on the use of bei

Having presented a number of findings relating to semantic and pragmatic constraints on the use of bei, we turn now to structural constraints on its use. Generally speaking, the verb in a Mandarin sentence with bei is complex (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, pp. 508, 511; Loar, 2011, pp. 320-324); that is, it usually contains an additional element such as a complement (of degree, result or direction), an aspectual marker (perfective le or experiential guo), a second verb in series, a prepositional phrase or even a direct object. While the use of the passive marker bei with a bare compound (i.e. disyllabic) verb is condoned, its use with a bare monosyllabic verb is considered ungrammatical by some sources (cf. Chao, 1968, p. 705; D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 511; Lin, 2001, pp. 150-151). Although this seems at first glance to offer a wide range of possibilities, there are nevertheless some restrictions on the constructions allowed, as discussed in the following paragraph.

Complements of possibility are incompatible with overt syntactic passivisation (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 502), as is the post-verbal marker of durative or continuous aspect, zhe (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 511). There is no explicit mention in the literature of the grammaticality or otherwise of the preverbal marker of progressive aspect, zai, in conjunction with bei; however, it seems reasonable to assume that it is also deemed to render a verb ineligible for passivisation, for reasons similar to those that apply in the case of the durative aspect marker.

Overall, Chinese grammarians note a general reluctance on the part of Mandarin speakers in comparison with their English-speaking counterparts to employ the passive voice (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 499). One reason for this, as discussed in sections 5.1 and 5.2.1 above, is the fact that Chinese verbs can often be interpreted as passive even without any overt grammatical marking as such. Another reason is the existence of a specialised grammatical
structure to highlight the agent of the action. Whereas in English the passive voice can be used to emphasise either the patient (by placing it in the foreground at the beginning of the sentence) or the agent (by stressing it at the end of the sentence), these two intentions tend to be realised as two different grammatical structures in Mandarin Chinese. Li and Thompson (1981, p. 499) observe that often when an English speaker would use a passive construction to focus on the agent, Mandarin speakers make use of the shi ... de nominalising construction instead. Thus, a statement such as ‘the letter was written by the Prime Minister’ would be realised in Mandarin as xin shi zongli xie de letter COP prime.minister write NOM, not as xin bei zongli xie le letter PASS prime.minister write PFV (cf. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 499-500).

5.2.2.1. Durative aspect

Despite the prohibition on the use of the durative, or continuous aspect marker zhe with the passive marker bei, seven examples of this structure were found in the database. Mostly the continuous aspect marker zhe occurs alone, as in (37); once in combination with the progressive aspect marker zai, as in (38).

(37) 从小到大一直就是被爱包围着。 (Liu Fengzhi, 22/03/2011)
Cong xiao dao da yi zhi jiushi bei ai baowei-zhe.
From little to big always just PASS love surround-DUR.
‘I was always surrounded by love from the time I was little.’

(38) 我一上海人突然被很多人用京骂着。 (He Jing, 11/07/2011)
Wo yi Shanghai ren turan bei hen duo ren yong Jing-ma zai ma-zhe.
1SG one Shanghai person suddenly PASS very many person use Beijing-cursePROG abuse-DUR.
‘As a single person from Shanghai, I suddenly found myself being cursed in Beijing slang by a whole lot of people.’

Although the number of tokens of the aspect marker zhe with the passive marker bei was relatively small, the examples of this type were uttered in seven different episodes by five different speakers. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that the sentences were more than merely a slip of the tongue and that the structure [NP1 BEI NP2 V-DUR] is acceptable to many native speakers. This confirms the findings of previous research into both written and spoken...
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data (R. Xiao et al., 2006), in which a number of examples of the use of *bei* with verbs modified by the durative aspect marker *zhe* occurred.¹⁵

### 5.2.2.2. Bare monosyllabic verb

As mentioned above, the use of a bare monosyllabic verb with the passive marker *bei* is considered by some Chinese grammarians to be ungrammatical.¹⁶ However, in the corpus of spontaneous natural speech used for this research, the use of *bei* with a bare monosyllabic verb was found to be quite common, accounting for 29 out of a total of 215 instances of the passive marker, or 14% of tokens. Two examples of bare monosyllabic verbs are given in (39) and (40).

(39) 我从小就喜欢被人骗。 (Liu Gang, 28/02/2011)

\[
\text{Wo cong xiao jiu xihuan bei ren pian.} \\
\text{1SG from little just like PASS person fool.} \\
\text{‘From an early age I was easily fooled.’}
\]

(40) 因为在纽约你要学会被抢。 (Liu Tang, 13/09/2011)

\[
\text{Yinwei zai Niu Yue ni yao xuehui bei qiang.} \\
\text{Because LOC New York 2SG should get used to PASS rob.} \\
\text{‘Because in New York you have to get used to being robbed.’}
\]

Interestingly, a significant number of bare monosyllabic verbs occurred after a modal or other verb, as in the two examples just cited. In (39), the *bei* phrase is preceded by the verb *xihuan* ‘like’, in (40) by the verb *xuehui* ‘get used to’. This finding is similar to that presented in a previous investigation of passive *bei* constructions in both written and spoken texts (R. Xiao et al., 2006, p. 18), namely that the passive marker, when it occurs with a bare verb, is frequently preceded by a modal auxiliary.

In addition, many of the bare monosyllabic verbs occurred within other embedded structures, such as relative clauses and ‘when’ temporal clauses. In Mandarin Chinese these two types of clauses share a similar structure in that they are both followed by the attributive particle *de* and an additional noun phrase. Thus, they both take the form [BEI V ATT NP], where the noun phrase in the case of a relative clause is the noun modified by the relative clause and in

---

¹⁵ The study cited did not separate the findings relating to written data from those relating to spoken data.

¹⁶ Note that Chinese grammarians, although generally in favour of additional elements with the passive marker *bei*, are by no means unanimous in this view. Li and Thompson (1981), for example, not only make no mention of the requirement that *bei* be used with a complex predicate, they actually include two example sentences with a bare monosyllabic verb, the verbs in question being *da* ‘beat’ and *xiao* ‘laugh at’ (1981:495).
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the case of a ‘when’ temporal clause is *shihou* ‘time’. Two examples of bare monosyllabic verbs occurring within embedded structures are given in (41) and (42): the first features a relative clause and the second a ‘when’ temporal clause.

(41) 那是我有史以来被摸的第一次。 (Fan Changjiang, 22/04/2011)

\[ Na \; shi \; wo \; youshiyilai \; bei \; mo \; de \; di \; yi \; ci. \]

DEM COP 1SG ever PASS touch ATT ORD one time.

‘That was the first time I’d ever been touched up.’

(42) 我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好。 (Wu Guoqing, 03/08/2011)

\[ Wo \; tebie \; kandao \; na \; xie \; xiaohai \; bei \; sha \; de \; shihou, \; xinqing \; a \; hen \; bu \; hao. \]

1SG especially see DEM CL.PL child PASS kill ATT time, mood SP very NEG good.

‘Especially when I saw those children being killed, I felt… ah… very bad.’

Overall, it was observed that in spoken Mandarin bare monosyllabic verbs – and, indeed, bare disyllabic verbs – used in combination with the passive marker *bei* seem to be more common within an embedded structure. Within the two embedded structures discussed here, the ratio of bare verbs (both monosyllabic and disyllabic) to complex predicates was 15:4, compared with approximately 80:130 for the entire corpus. In other words, embedding the passive marker *bei* within a relative clause or ‘when’ temporal clause increases the likelihood of a bare verb from less than 40% to nearly 80%. This suggests that native speaker intuition regarding the grammaticality of complex vs. simple predicates with the passive marker *bei* is influenced by the embedding of the *bei*-phrase within another grammatical structure, in particular within relative clauses and ‘when’ temporal clauses. This in turn implies that just as prosodic constraints have been found to affect the grammatical acceptability of bare verbs with the disposal *ba* construction (S. Feng, 2001; X. Wen, 2012), so rhythmic or prosodic considerations may play a role in determining when additional elements are added to a passivised verb.

5.2.2.3. Shi … de nominalising construction

The use of the passive marker *bei* with the *shi … de* nominalising construction was surprisingly common, in view of Li and Thompson’s (1981, p. 499) analysis, mentioned in section 5.2.2 above. Altogether, there were 13 occurrences of the structure [NP COP PASS V NOM] in the present corpus, accounting for around 6% of the tokens of the passive marker.
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(43) 我是被一位老中医救活的。 (Li Moran, 12/04/2011)
Wo *shi bei yi wei lao-zhongyi jiu-huo de.*
1SG COP PASS one CL old-Chinese.doctor save-life NOM.
‘I was saved by an old Chinese doctor.’

(44) 原来我自己是被别人拐的。 (Wang Yanggang, 31/05/2011)
Yuanlai wo ziji *shi bei bieren guai de.*
Actually 1SG self COP PASS other.person abduct NOM.
‘Actually I myself was abducted.’

It is important to bear in mind that in the standard literature the *shi ... de* construction is presented as an alternative realisation in Mandarin of the use of the passive in English (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 499) or even as an alternative passive construction (K. Wang, 2010, pp. 16-17), when the intention is to highlight the agent of the action, rather than the affectedness of the patient or the action itself (cf. Loar, 2011). The implication in the literature is that these two structures are mutually incompatible. However, the real-life spoken data do not support this analysis.

5.3. Discussion

Careful analysis of the spoken data in the present corpus leads to the conclusion that the analysis of the passive marker *bei* in standard grammar texts may be incomplete. Although there are many aspects of its use that conform to the guidelines set out in the reference works consulted, there are also a number of ways in which its use is at variance with the purported constraints. This section discusses the implications of the research and highlights the new findings presented in this chapter.

5.3.1. Implications of semantic and pragmatic findings

In total this chapter looked at 25 corpus examples of various categories of usage of the passive marker *bei* that were considered atypical for considerations of a semantic and/or pragmatic nature. Some of the examples, indeed, were not merely atypical, they represented

17 Li and Thompson (1981, p. 499) write that one “situation in which English uses a passive and Mandarin does not is when the focus is on the agent of the transitive action verb.” They then give the example of an English sentence in the passive (‘This book was written by my mother.’) and go on to say that its most appropriate rendering into Mandarin is in the form of “a *shi ... de* construction … but not … a *bei* passive construction.”

18 Loar states that the *bei* passive is “used to highlight the affectedness of the receiver of an action” (2011, p. 320), that “the resultative state of the Patient is highlighted” (2011, p. 323) and that “the verb phrase occupies the end position, hence it is highlighted as a piece of new information” (2011, p. 329).
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unambiguous contraventions of the guidelines for its use as set out in the standard reference works. One new function of *bei*, as well as constraints operating on verbs, agents and patient-verb combinations will be discussed in turn.

The ironic or satirical use of *bei* seems to be a novel function that has gained popularity over the last five years or so. It is frequently used to express dissatisfaction with Chinese politics and/or official media representations of events and situations. This particular usage is still under-researched in scholarly publications: there is no mention of “ironic” *bei* in the grammar texts consulted, and the author is aware of only one academic journal article to date dealing with this function of the passive marker. Moreover, all the articles viewed – scholarly and otherwise – that comment on the new development in question have referred to this usage of *bei* specifically in online texts and Internet language, whereas the data used for this research provide evidence that it is also a feature of spoken Mandarin.

The use of the passive marker *bei* with a non-adverse meaning is quite common, even in spoken Mandarin. Even though adverse meanings are three times as frequent, non-adverse predicates are by no means rare. Thus it appears that the trend observed by commentators in the written language may be reflected in the spoken language as well (cf. C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 497; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 462).

Mental states no longer seem to be ineligible for passivisation, despite the claim that “[v]erbs that can not govern or influence normally can not act as the predicate in a 被-sentence” (D. Li & Cheng, 1988, p. 510). According to Li and Cheng (1988, p. 498), such verbs include “[t]hose that express mental activity”, like *pa* “fear” and *xihuan* “like”. This accords also with Li and Thompson’s (1981, p. 501) assessment of *bei* *hen* PASS *hate* “be hated” as ungrammatical for similar reasons. However, the data in this study included several examples of the passive marker *bei* used in conjunction with such verbs, including *ai* ‘love’, *kanhao* ‘value’, *renke* ‘approve’, *wuhui* ‘misunderstand’ and *xihuan* ‘like’. With several instances of passivised mental states in the corpus, one wonders if it is an accurate reflection of current language use to claim, as some grammarians do, that the use of *bei* with verbs expressing mental states is ungrammatical.

The description of inanimate agents as ungrammatical with the passive marker *bei* is even more likely to be a misrepresentation of contemporary language use, as 18 instances, or around 8% of tokens in the corpus made use of inanimate agents. In addition, there were three
instances of the noun phrase slot governed by bei being filled by an instrument. However, as two of the three sentences featured the same instrument (pijiuping ‘beer bottle’) and were uttered by the same speaker, it is difficult to know whether this is a significant finding.

There were about a dozen instances of passive structures that would have been interpreted as passive even without the passive marker bei (in which case they would have been classified as notional passives), but which appeared in the corpus with the explicit grammatical passive marker used – in these cases – redundantly. Thus, the redundant use of bei appears to be considerably more common in actual Mandarin usage than recommended by Chinese grammarians.

5.3.2. Implications of morpho-syntactic findings

The spoken data used for the present study confirm that in Mandarin Chinese complex predicates are preferred but not essential when explicitly marking a verb as passive. Resultative complements were very common, occurring around 50 times with bei, while complements of direction and degree were less so, scoring about 10 tokens each. Similarly, the perfective aspect was much more common with around 60 occurrences than the durative and experiential aspect markers, which appeared about seven times with bei. The combination V-RES-PERF (e.g. da-po-le ‘broken’, xia-dao-le ‘frightened’, dang-zhu-le ‘blocked’) was also quite a common structure amongst passivised verbs. Other combinations, including verb series and verb plus prepositional phrase accounted for around 40 instances of the passive marker.

In violation of the restrictions set out in the standard grammatical analysis, the durative aspect marker zhe does occur occasionally with bei in spoken Mandarin. Although its use does not achieve a high frequency in this context, it nevertheless seems common enough to justify the assumption of grammatical acceptability to large numbers of native speakers.

Bare monosyllabic verbs were found to undergo grammatical passivisation quite frequently and are clearly acceptable to native speakers with the passive marker bei. Interestingly, bare monosyllabic verbs appeared in the corpus with a noticeably higher frequency in embedded structures and after modal verbs, which suggests that native speaker intuition regarding the passivisation of monosyllabic verbs may be affected by the syntactic or even prosodic environment in which the verb occurs. If it is true that Mandarin speakers are somewhat
reluctant to use a bare monosyllabic verb with bei in a non-embedded structure, then that may help to explain why D. Li and Cheng (1988) and Lin (2001) were tempted to propose as a constraint something which clearly does not hold when formulated as a general prohibition.

The passive marker bei occurs quite frequently within the shi ... de nominalising construction. The fact that the two structures are clearly not mutually exclusive suggests that the pragmatic functions of bei and shi ... de may likewise not be mutually incompatible. This calls for a slightly different representation of their contrasted usage with respect to the passive in English than is currently found in the literature.

5.3.3. Summary

The data examined in this study point generally to the finding that although there have been recent developments in the range of verbs used with the passive marker bei, it still tends to be used more frequently than not with verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning. That is to say, even from this distance in time, the semantic shadow of the Classical Chinese full verb bei ‘suffer’ stretches its long tendrils over the passive constructions of Modern Standard Chinese. From a morpho-syntactic perspective, verb phrases in the corpus that are marked as passive by means of bei conform to the constraints proposed in the literature inasmuch as they are significantly more likely to be complex than simple. The utterances in the corpus of spoken data also show that the bei clause conforms to some other relevant rules. In particular, guidelines relating to word order, including the placement of negatives and adverbs, are rarely contravened.

On the other hand, the data also reveal a number of deviations from conventional patterns of use. New violations of restrictions governing the use of the passive marker bei not previously noted in the literature on Chinese grammar or on Chinese language change are outlined in the following paragraphs.

An interesting development from both a semantic and a pragmatic perspective is the use of so-called “satirical” bei to indicate mistrust of and/or disagreement with officially disseminated information, and even to express political dissent and criticism. Although this usage is well documented in cyberlanguage and has stimulated much comment in online articles, sentence (19) above may well be the first example in the literature of the use of bei in spoken Mandarin to signal irony.
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In relation to semantic restrictions on the passivised verb, the relatively frequent occurrence of non-disposal verbs expressing a mental state points to the widespread acceptance amongst native speakers of this semantic class in passive constructions. The overall impression gleaned from these observations is that the patterns of usage of *bei* and *ba* (a preposed marker of the direct object) seem to be somewhat divergent. In the past, both grammatical markers have tended to be described in terms of the similarities between the constraints operating on the verbs that can combine with them; in future, more space may need to be dedicated to describing the differences between them.

As for semantic restrictions on the agent in a passive clause, this role was performed often enough by an inanimate object for the suspicion of grammaticality in current usage likewise to be entertained. It seems that it may even be becoming more acceptable for the noun phrase immediately preceded by *bei* to be filled by the role of instrument. Meanwhile, in regard to the semantic relationship between the patient or recipient of the action and the action performed, the data show that the redundant use of *bei* in the overt marking of so-called notional passives is not uncommon in spoken Mandarin.

Two main morpho-syntactic observations were of primary interest. Firstly, the passive marker appeared a number of times in conjunction with the marker of durative or continuous aspect, *zhe*. Secondly, it also occurred quite often within the *shi ... de* nominalising structure. Thus, it seems that the representation in much of the literature of the *shi ... de* construction as an alternative to the *bei* construction does not reflect current usage, since the two are not mutually exclusive but can occur together.

In short, although there are doubtless many restrictions that continue to apply to the use of the passive marker *bei* in Modern Standard Chinese, a number of constraints proposed in the literature would more accurately reflect current usage if they were formulated as preferences, trends or statistical probabilities rather than hard-and-fast rules. Taken as a whole, the use of the passive marker *bei* in a wider range of semantic and morpho-syntactic contexts than that stipulated in the standard grammar references lends support to the commonly expressed observation in the literature (e.g. Chao, 1968, p. 803; P. Chen, 1999, p. 93; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; Loar, 2011, pp. 319-320; Norman, 1988, p. 165) that this particular grammatical morpheme is, overall, being used with increasing frequency.
6. The Copula *shi*

This chapter presents the results of investigations into contemporary usage of the copula *shi* in spoken Mandarin. The chapter begins by outlining standard grammatical analyses of the use and functions of the copula before investigating some ways in which it is used in the corpus for the present study. In the discussion section several key discrepancies between conventional accounts of the copula *shi* and its actual usage as revealed in the corpus data are highlighted. Various possibilities for explaining the structures and usages brought to light by the data are then compared and discussed in chapter 7.

6.1. Conventional accounts of the copula *shi*

This section incorporates views from a number of renowned and lesser known linguists. Although the terminology used by the different grammarians varies, it is clear that the structures in which the Mandarin copula *shi* appears and the functions it is described as performing are by and large the same. As with the plural suffix *men* and the passive marker *bei*, there are some discrepancies in the explanations of copula use in the standard literature; in fact, the discrepancies are, if anything, more noticeable with *shi*. Like both the morphosyntactic features examined in the previous two chapters, however, the differences in the accounts of *shi* do not array themselves neatly on either side of the speaking / writing divide. Rather, they seem to be more a factor of the level of detail of the analysis provided.

In their grammatical analysis of the copula *shi*, Li and Thompson (1981, pp. 147-155) isolate three separate functions. Firstly, there is what they term simple copula sentences. These are equational sentences of the structure [NP COP NP], such as *ta shi laoshi* 3SG COP teacher ‘s/he is a teacher’.¹ Note that examples of the copula used in this structure to express a much less clearly defined association between the two noun phrases – sometimes referred to by other researchers as “illogical” copula sentences – are merely classified by Li and Thompson (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 150) and Lü (1980, p. 435) as special cases of simple copula sentences. An example of this subtype is *wo shi bing kafei* 1SG COP ice coffee, which, in the

---

¹ Refer to Appendix 1 for an explanation of grammatical abbreviations used. In fact, it is acknowledged in the literature that the copula can be used to link a variety of structures, not just two noun phrases (e.g. D. Li & Cheng, 1988, pp. 614-615; Lü, 1980, pp. 434-440). However, there is generally a sense in which the alternative structures used in place of one or other of the noun phrases in the most basic copular construction (e.g. adjectival phrases, verb-object constructions, even entire clauses) seem to undergo a certain degree of nominalisation.
context of two friends sitting in a café, might be understood to mean ‘I ordered the iced coffee’ or ‘the iced coffee is for me’. A number of linguists have observed that in Mandarin Chinese many examples of the copula in this structure do not lend themselves readily to direct translation into other languages owing to the highly contextual interpretation of the meaning.\(^2\)

Secondly, the copula can be used for emphasis, or, as it is described in the literature, as a “marker of special affirmation” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981), “focus marker” (Xu, 2010) or “association with focus” (Paul & Whitman, 2008). In this case, the copula most typically appears immediately after the grammatical subject and (in the absence of undue intonational stress) can be roughly rendered into English as ‘it is true that …’ or ‘it is the case that …’, thereby lending weight to the entire clause. However, the copula și can also be used at the beginning of a Mandarin sentence, in which case it is understood to emphasise not the entire clause but specifically the grammatical subject that it immediately precedes. In sentences in which the copula is used in this way with significant intonational stress, the emphatic meaning is somewhat stronger. Thus, for example, ța și mei qian 3SG COP not.have money ‘it’s true s/he’s poor’ would mean ‘s/he really IS poor’ if the copula were stressed. Regardless of whether the copula și as a marker of special affirmation receives intonational stress or not, sentences of this type can be “used only to affirm what had been said earlier or what had been suspected or inferred by the speaker and the hearer” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 151). Moreover, “sentences with the și signaling special affirmation always affirm a statement in the preceding or following discourse” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 151).

Thirdly, the copula și is used in what Li and Thompson (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, p. 154) term presentative sentences and Lü (1980, p. 434) describes as existential sentences. These are sentences of the structure [AdvP COP NP], where the adverbial phrase denotes a place or a time. Examples of this usage include qianmian și lubiantan in.front COP street.stall ‘there’s a street stall ahead’, xia ge xingqi și muqinjie next CL week COP Mother’s.Day ‘it’s Mother’s Day next week’ and ța manshen și ni 3SG whole.body COP mud ‘he’s got mud all over himself; he’s covered in mud’.

\(^2\) In fact, an English speaker in a similar situation may well utter the structurally and semantically equivalent ‘I’m the iced coffee’ (as discussed in the pragmatics literature on deixis). Nevertheless, this type of structure with the copula expressing a very loosely defined and highly context-dependent relationship seems to be much more common in Mandarin Chinese.
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In addition, Lü (1980, p. 437) identifies as a subtype a further structural environment that is not explicitly itemised by other researchers, namely when the copula is used to connect a clause with a prepositional phrase. An example of this is *wo zuihou yici jiandao ta shi zai Shanghai* 1SG last.time once see 3SG COP LOC Shanghai ‘the last time I saw him was in Shanghai’. Unfortunately, no more detailed analysis of the purpose or function of this particular structure is provided.

Finally, the copula also occurs very commonly in conjunction with the sentence-final grammatical particle of dubious status, *de*. Generally treated in the literature as a focus or cleft construction, sentences of the *shi ... de* type have the effect of highlighting the element immediately following the copula. A similar construction with a similar function occurs when the sentence-final *de* is omitted, leaving only the sentence-medial *shi*, which in such cases is often referred to as a contrastive focus marker or simply a focus marker. Note that the role of the copula in such sentences differs from the marker of emphasis or assertion described above, in that it is not the entire predicate that is highlighted, but only the element immediately following the copula. Linguists are divided on the question of how to classify this particular structure and function of the copula, with some viewing it as a variation on the cleft construction (e.g. Zhan, 2012) and others treating it as a separate structure in its own right (e.g. Dong, 2004; M. Fang, 1995; Teng, 1979).

The reader will have observed that, according to conventional accounts of the morpheme *shi*, the Mandarin copula is not used in a number of structures in which the English copula commonly appears, two of which are highly relevant to the present research. Firstly, the copula *shi* is not used predicatively to link a noun phrase with an adjective in sentences of the structure *[NP COP Adj]*. Instead, standard practice is to append the adjectival phrase directly to the noun phrase or – more often – link the two by means of an intensifier such as *hen* ‘very’ (here glossed simply as *HEN*) in the structure [NP (*HEN*) Adj]. Thus, instead of saying *ta shi piaoliang* 3SG COP pretty ‘she is pretty’, it is standard usage to say *ta hen piaoliang* 3SG very pretty ‘she is pretty’. Secondly, the copula *shi* is not used in combination with a locative preposition in the structure *[NP COP LOC NP]* to express the location of something. Rather, the locative full verb *zai* ‘be at/on/in’ (here glossed simply as *ZAI*) is used in the structure [NP *ZAI* NP]. Thus, rather than saying *wo shi zai jia* 1SG COP LOC home ‘I’m at home’, one can say *wo zai jia* 1SG LOC home ‘I’m at home’.
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## 6.2. Research findings

This section is organised according to the two main groups of findings relating to the use of the copula in the two structures mentioned in the last paragraph of the previous section. First the predicative use of the Mandarin copula *shi* with adjectives in the traditionally prohibited structure *[NP COP Adj]* is investigated. Then examples of the use of the copula *shi* in combination with the locative preposition *zai* in the likewise impermissible structure *[NP COP LOC NP]* are analysed.¹

### 6.2.1. The use of the copula with adjectives

Before commencing with an analysis of the data, it is worth making a quick comment regarding the methodology used specifically for this particular point. As there were over 15,000 instances of the copula *shi* in the corpus, it was not feasible to check and analyse the syntactic structure of every single one of these to determine which were relevant to the present investigation. Instead, it was decided to search for the combination *shi hen* COP very ‘BE very’, which in many instances was immediately followed by an adjective.² Some of the instances of this usage were then followed by the nominalising particle *de*. As these utterances were examples of the so-called *shi ... de* construction (also known as a focus or cleft construction), which is used to perform specific pragmatic functions and which is well documented in the literature on Mandarin grammar (cf. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng, 2008; Paul & Whitman, 2008; Shi, 1994; T.-C. Tang, 1983; Teng, 1979), they were excluded from analysis. Thus, all utterances cited in this subsection are of the grammatical structure *[NP COP HEN Adj]*.

After excluding all examples of the *shi ... de* focus construction, a total of 45 tokens of the copula *shi* with the adverbial intensifier *hen* ‘very’ followed by an adjective were found in the corpus of over half a million characters of natural spoken data. One possibility is that the copula in these sentences was serving as a marker of emphasis, focus or special affirmation,³

---

¹ Refer to Appendix 4 for a list of all examples of the use of the copula *shi* with predicative adjectives in the structure *[NP COP HEN Adj]* in the present corpus. For a list of all examples of the copula *shi* used in conjunction with the locative *zai*, refer to Appendix 5.

² Note that the Mandarin *hen* has undergone considerable semantic bleaching and does not generally equate to the level of intensification of the English word ‘very’ unless it receives intonational stress. Note also that the term “adjective” is disputed by some Chinese linguists, who prefer to group Mandarin adjectives and stative verbs together in a single class.
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in line with the second of the three functions of *shi* discussed in section 5.1 above. And certainly, there were a number of examples of the structure [NP COP *HEN* Adj] for which this explanation seemed perfectly satisfactory. Example (45) demonstrates this kind of usage.

(45) A: 我现在觉得，我写的歌确实有点高。
B: 是的，你的歌基本上我们都在心里面的都会唱，但唱出来的确很难。

(Chen Luyu, 18/03/2011)

A: Wo xianzai juede, wo xie de ge queshi youdian gao.
B: Shide, ni de ge jibenshang women dou zai xin limian de dou hui chang, dan chang-chulai digne shi hen nan.

A: 1SG now feel, 1SG write ATT song indeed a.bit high.
B: Yes, 2SG ATT song basically 1PL all LOC mind in ATT all can sing, but sing-DIR indeed COP very difficult.

A: ‘I now feel that the songs I write are actually a bit too high.’
B: ‘Yes, basically we can all sing your songs in our head, but singing them out loud really is quite difficult.’

In this example, speaker B more or less paraphrases what speaker A has just said. Thus, speaker B’s statement can be viewed as a repetition of information already stated or at least implied in the conversation. This usage conforms to the descriptions of the affirmation function of *shi* described in the literature.

On the other hand, there were also many instances in which the emphatic contribution of the copula was far less obvious. Three examples of this kind of usage are given in sentences (46) to (48) below. In order to clarify the precise function of the copula in these utterances, additional contextual material has been provided.

(46) 然后他本来就是有点儿胖胖的，然后还没有，还没有开始他在后台等的时候，他已经全身都已经湿了，然后他说怎么办，我现在好像要滑出去的这样子，因为塑胶料是很滑嘛，如果是吸雨后，所以那天他很紧张。

(Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011)

Ranhou ta benlai jiu shi youdian pang~pang de, ranhou hai meiyou, hai meiyou kaishi ta zai houtai deng de shihou, ta yijing quan-shen dou yijing shi-le, ranhou ta shuo zemne ban, wo xianzai haoxiang yao hua-chuqu de zhe yangzi, yinwei suijiao-liao shi hen hua ma, ruguo shi xi ju hou, suyi na tian ta hen jinzhang.

Then 3SG actually just COP a.bit fat~REDUP NOM, then still NEG.PFV, still NEG.PFV start 3SG LOC backstage wait ATT time, 3SG already whole-body all already wet-CS, then 3SG say how do, 1SG now seem will slide-DIR ATT DEM appearance, because plastic-material COP very slippery MP, if COP absorb rain after, so DEM day 3SG very nervous.
The Copula *shi*

‘Actually he was a bit fat, and before it’d… before it’d started and he was still waiting backstage, he was wet all over, and he said, “What’ll I do? I feel like I’m about to slide out,” because plastic is slippery, you know, if it’s been rained on, so he was quite nervous that day.’

(47) 反正有些也是很保护自己的，我也很头痛，一开始我就先找他吧，因为这个男主角很重要，你真的要他舒服，你肯定有交流的东西，要不然你很客气，就没有什么得演。

(Liu Weiqiang, 13/05/2011)

*Fanzheng you xie ye shi hen baohu ziji de, wo ye hen toutong, yi kaishi wo jiu xian zhuo ta ba, yinwei zhe ge nan-zhuojiao shi hen zhongyao, ni zheng yao ta shifu, ni kending you jiaoliu de dongxi, yaoburan ni hen ke~qi~qi, jiu mei you-de yan.*

Anyway EXST CL.PL also COP very protect self NOM, 1SG also very headache, as soon as start 1SG then first look for 3SG MP, because DEM CL male-lead COP very important, 2SG really want 3SG comfortable, 2SG definitely have communicate ATT thing, unless 2SG very polite~REDUP, just NEG EXST-COMP perform.

‘Anyway, some of them really protect themselves, which was a headache for me. So right at the beginning I approached him first, because the male lead is important. You really have to make him feel comfortable. You’re bound to have stuff to communicate, so unless you’re ultra polite, there’ll be no performance.’

(48) 那时候还在念书嘛，去学校找她，然后当着面她还说，我就是不想跟你在一起了，因为我觉得没有感觉了，因为我太烦了你知道吗，因为我控制欲跟掌控性是很强，那个时候了，就是会疑神疑鬼的，对方，年轻女孩子又喜欢出去玩，就会受不了。

(Liu Qian, 13/06/2011)

*Na shihou hai zai nianshu ma, qu xuexiao zhuo ta, ranhou dang-zhe mian ta hai shuo, wo jiushi bu xiang gen ni zai yiqi le, yinwei wo juede mei you ganjue le, yinwei wo tai fan le ni zhidao ma, yinwei wo kongzhi-ya gen zhangkong-xing shi hen qiang, na ge shihou le, jiu shi hui yi-shen-yi-gui de, duifang, nianqing niuhaizi you xihuan chuqu wan, jiu hui shou-bu-liao.*

DEM time still PROG study MP, go school look for 3SG, then face-CONT face 3SG even say, 1SG just NEG want with 2SG LOC together CS, because 1SG feel NEG have feeling CS, because 1SG too annoyed CS 2SG know Q, because 1SG control-desire and dominate-nature COP very strong, DEM CL time CS, just COP used to suspect-spirit-suspect-ghost NOM, partner, young girl on the other hand like go out play, just used to bear-NEG-able.

‘At that time I was still studying, I went to uni to look for her, and she just said to my face, I just don’t want to be with you, coz I don’t have any feeling for you any more, coz I’m just sick of it, you know. Because my desire for domination and control was quite strong, back then, and I used to be over-suspicious. And my girlfriend, of course young girls like going out, she just couldn’t stand it.’
These three examples and other similar ones appearing in the corpus are open to a number of different interpretations. Opinions may well be divided as to the function of *shi* in the examples cited. Although it might be tempting to assume that the morpheme is used to add weight or emphasis to a particular component of the utterance, consideration of the wider context in fact also opens up the possibility of interpreting it as merely demonstrating a function performed by the copula in many other languages, namely to link the grammatical subject to a predicative adjective.

Interestingly, this is very similar to findings by Shi and Zhu (2000), who investigated several features of written Mandarin Chinese in Hong Kong, including the use of the copula *shi*. They observed that sentence structures in which *shi* is inserted between the grammatical subject and the predicate of a sentence, instead of being marked for emphasis or affirmation in contemporary usage, are becoming unmarked and are increasingly being used in contexts in which no additional emphatic force is intended. Three of the examples they cited are given in (49) to (51).

(49) 自由经济是非常重要。 (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 202)

*Ziyou jingji shi feichang zhongyao.*

Free economy COP very important.

‘A free economy is very important.’

(50) 整篇故事都是真实。 (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 202)

*Zheng pian gushi dou shi zhenshi.*

Entire CL story all COP true.

‘The whole story is true.’

(51) 智利声称, 说皮诺切特不享有外交豁免权是荒谬。 (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 202)

*Zhili shengcheng, shuo Pinuoqiete bu xiangyou waijiao huomianquan shi huangmiu.*

Chile claim, say Pinochet NEG enjoy diplomatic immunity COP absurd.

‘Chile claimed that to say that Pinochet did not enjoy diplomatic immunity was absurd.’

Given that this development in the use of the Mandarin copula has been in observed in Hong Kong, it is not beyond the realms of possibility to suppose that it might also be creeping into mainland Chinese usage. Despite the fact that it is not possible to determine with absolute certainty the speaker’s precise intention in sentences (46) to (48) discussed above, several rather interesting conclusions can nevertheless be drawn. The most obvious conclusion is that it seems incontrovertible that the copula *shi* is being used in a wider range of contexts than
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those demarcated by Chao (1968), Li and Thompson (1981) and Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). The most conservative analysis in keeping with the data is that *shi* is frequently used to highlight or lend weight to utterances in a way that is similar to, but not exactly the same as the description in the standard Mandarin grammar references. Note that even if *shi* is interpreted as highlighting or giving contrastive prominence to the utterances above, it is difficult to view it as performing the same role as the “marker of special affirmation” described by Li and Thompson (1981) or the “association with focus” proposed by Paul and Whitman (2008). More specifically, it appears that *shi* can be used to mark the prominence of a certain element in a sentence in contrast to a range of other possible values that might be expected to occur in this context, according to the speaker’s and listener’s knowledge of the world. As such, many examples taken from the database fail to conform to the linguistic environment stipulated by Li and Thompson (1981, p. 151), who state that “sentences with the *shi* signaling special affirmation always affirm a statement in the preceding or following discourse” and that *shi* is “used only to affirm what had been said earlier or what had been suspected or inferred by the speaker and the hearer”.

Actually, the fact that the corpus contains many examples like the three cited here, which are somewhat ambiguous and which do not provide a definitive answer to the question as to whether *shi* (when it is not functioning as a copula in the traditional Chinese mould) always performs an identifiable pragmatic function or whether it is sometimes structurally, semantically and pragmatically redundant, is interesting in itself. It suggests that the use of *shi* as a copula connecting a grammatical subject with a predicative adjective is a real possibility. In other words, even if it is not the only viable analysis and even if not all native speakers would subscribe to the same interpretation, it is at least conceivable that the three speech examples above demonstrate the use of the morpheme *shi* not for any particular emphasis, not as a marker of special affirmation, but merely as a grammatical link between a subject noun phrase and a predicative adjectival phrase. If it could be established beyond reasonable doubt that this was the case, it would be a fascinating observation. As explained in section 6.1, this usage is not condoned by standard texts on Mandarin grammar, which permit the use of the copula only a) to link two noun phrases in so-called simple copula sentences, b)

---

5 This ambiguity, this range of different interpretations and analyses apparent from the data itself, was confirmed in informal discussions with a number of native Mandarin speakers from both mainland China and Taiwan.
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to function as a marker of emphasis or special affirmation, or c) to indicate the physical or temporal location of something in presentative sentences.

Irrespective of any potential ambiguity in the interpretation of specific speech examples, there are three interesting points to be made in relation to the observation of frequent predicative use of the copula in the natural, spontaneous speech in the corpus for the present study. Firstly, this usage was conspicuously absent from the non-spontaneous data in the corpus. The reader will remember that the corpus for this research was collated from publically available transcripts of chat shows. Each of these, in addition to the record of the (relatively) spontaneous interview conversation between the host Chen Luyu and her guest or guests, also contained other written or spoken information not deemed appropriate for inclusion in the present study. Examples of inappropriate corpus data included the title of the episode, various subheadings, the text of any songs sung or poems recited during the show, as well as a significant quantity of narrated material. What distinguished the grammatical feature under investigation here (i.e. the use of the copula with adjectives) from the morpho-syntactic features studied in the previous two chapters (i.e. the use of the plural suffix and the use of the passive marker) was the distribution of the relevant feature within the corpus. When collecting data for the previous two chapters, a large quantity of interesting examples had to be discarded on account of not meeting the research requirements for natural, spontaneous speech. By contrast, when collecting data on the predicative use of the copula with adjectives, not a single example of this structure was excluded on these grounds. In other words, not a single example of this usage was found amongst the non-spontaneous corpus material. Considering that the non-spontaneous spoken and/or written data accounted at a rough estimate for an additional 200,000-odd characters, or between one third and one half as much data as the spontaneous speech, this is somewhat surprising.

Secondly, amongst the adjectives used in this construction there seemed to be a preponderance of adjectives expressing an intrinsic or permanent quality, rather than a temporary quality that might be subject to change. Adjectives favoured in this syntactic environment included *gandong* ‘moving’, *nan* ‘difficult’, *piaoliang* ‘pretty’, and *zhongyao* ‘important’. It is interesting to observe that a number of other languages also make a distinction between the use of the copula with intrinsic and non-intrinsic adjectives. For example, Spanish requires a copula to link the subject with an adjective when the adjective
expresses an intrinsic or permanent attribute, but not when it expresses a non-intrinsic or impermanent attribute.

Thirdly, in a significant proportion of the examples of this structure the copula was immediately preceded by a verb or adverb modifying the definiteness or certainty of the speaker’s knowledge, such as haoxiang ‘seem; apparently’, kending ‘definitely’, keneng ‘possibly’, qishi ‘actually’, queshi ‘indeed’, yinggai ‘should; supposedly’ or zhen(de) ‘really; truly’. Indeed, the use of several of these markers of epistemic modality in conjunction with the copula has become so frequent that it is tempting to analyse some of them at least as conventionalised forms, even if they are not yet deemed to warrant independent dictionary entries. Examples of this type are given in (52) to (54).

(52) 她那种想法我觉得其实是很难改变, 其实像有一技之长的这种孩子, 往往就业是非常非常顺利的。 (Zhen Wen, 24/05/2011)

Ta na zhong xiangfa wo juede qishi shi hen nan gaibian, qishi xiang you yijizhichang de zhe zhong haizi, wangwang jiu ye shi feichang feichang shunli de.

3SG DEM CL opinion 1SG feel actually COP very hard change, actually like have professional skill ATT DEM CL child, always employed COP extremely extremely smooth NOM.

‘Her view of things actually is hard to change, I think. Actually a child with a technical speciality like that, if they’re continually employed, then that’s very, very lucky.’

(53) 我当然就不敢了, 当然不敢了, 因为那个其实真的蛮危险的, 小时候真的是很调皮。 (Tao Zhe, 17/08/2011)

Wo dangran ju bu gan le, dangran bu gan le, yinwei na ge qishi zhende man weixian de, xiao shihou zhende shi hen tiaopi.

1SG certainly just NEG dare CS, certainly NEG dare CS, because DEM CL actually really quite dangerous ATT, small time really COP very cheeky.

‘Of course I just didn’t dare, of course I didn’t dare, because that was actually really quite dangerous, when I was young I really was pretty cheeky.’

(54) 她觉得花了那么多钱给你买的钢琴, 那个时候在那个年代应该是很贵, 然后你都没有好好地珍惜你现在所有的东西, 然后还不好好练, 我经常, 她把我锁在那个平房里练琴嘛。 (Fan Bingbing, 09/09/2011)

6 Dictionary entries for haoxiang ‘seem’ and yinggai ‘should’ list them as verbs with the meanings given here; however, in context they would often be rendered into English by the adverbs ‘apparently’ and ‘supposedly’ respectively.
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*Ta juede hua-le name duo qian gei ni mai de gangqin, na ge shihou zai na ge niandai *yìnggài shì* hen gui, ranhou ni dou mei you hao~hao de zhenxi ni xianzai suoyou de dongxi, ranhou hai bu hao~hao lian, wo jingchang, ta ba wo suo zai na ge pingfang-li lian qin ma.*

3SG feel spend-PFV so much money give 2SG buy ATT piano, DEM CL time LOC DEM CL era should COP very expensive, then 2SG even NEG PFV good~REDUP ADV value 2SG now all ATT thing, then still NEG good~REDUP practise, 1SG often, 3SG OBJ 2SG lock LOC DEM CL bungalow-in practise instrument MP.

‘She thought, I’ve spent that much money buying a piano for you – at that time in that era it must have been pretty expensive – and you don’t even value all your possessions properly, and you don’t even practise… I often… she locked me inside the bungalow to practise the piano.’

The predilection for appending the morpheme *shi* to epistemic modifiers suggests that in utterances of this type the copula itself may also be contributing in some way to the epistemic modality of the statement. Although it is not absolutely clear what linguistic processes are at work here or why, it is interesting to speculate that the apparent frequency correlation between the structure [NP COP HEN Adj] and the use of markers of epistemic modality may be related to the second function of the copula *shi* described in section 6.1 above (i.e. as a marker of special affirmation). This point is addressed at greater length in section 6.3 below.

**6.2.2. The use of the copula with the locative *zai***

The second structure to be investigated in this chapter is the use of *shi* immediately preceding the locative *zai*. The morpheme *zai* started life as a full locative verb, or locative copula, and has grammaticalised to a locative preposition, also treated as a locative coverb by some grammarians. It has also further grammaticalised to a marker of progressive aspect. In Modern Standard Chinese it appears in all three functions: as a full locative verb, as a locative preposition and as a preverbal progressive aspect marker.

As with the use of the copula immediately preceding adjectives, in some cases *shi* was clearly being used in accordance with the standard analysis of its role as a marker of special affirmation when preceding *zai*. However, this explanation did not always seem to be satisfactory.
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For example, there were a number of sentences containing the disyllabic combination *shi zai* in place of the locative copula in which *shi* appeared to contribute little or nothing to the emphatic force of the utterance. Two examples of this type are given in (55) and (56) below.

(55) 其实我觉得男人 *是在* 一个事业的巅峰的时候，你身边的真的另外一半，你所有朋友跟你分享的喜悦都不及你另外一半跟你分享的那感觉，因为这是一个那么多年支持你的人终于在那个时候得到了那个掌声，她应该是在你旁边的，你没有见到她。 (Su Yongkang, 02/09/2011)

Qishi wo juede nan-ren *shi zai* yi ge shiyi de dianfeng de shihou, ni shen-bian de zhende lingwai yi ban, ni suoyou pengyou gen ni fenxiang de xiyou dou buji ni lingwai yi ban gen ni fenxiang de na ganjue, yinwei zhe *shi* yi ge name duo nian zhichi ni de ren zhongyu zai na ge shihou dedao-le na ge zhangsheng, ta yinggai shi zai ni pangbian de, ni mei you jian-dao ta.

Actually 1SG feel male-person COP LOC one CL career ATT peak ATT time, 2SG body-side ATT real other one half, 2SG all friend COM 2SG share ATT happiness all inferior.to 2SG other one half COM 2SG share ATT DEM feeling, because DEM COP one CL so many year support 2SG ATT person finally LOC DEM CL time receive-PVF DEM CL applause, 3SG should COP LOC 2SG side NOM, 2SG NEG PFV see-RES 3SG.

‘Actually I think when a man **is at** the peak of his career, the person at your side who is really your other half, the happiness that all your friends share with you is not as good as the feeling of your other half sharing it with you, because that’s the person who’s supported you for so many years and when you finally receive approbation, she should be at your side, but she’s not there.’

(56) 整个摔得都是，因为那个地上都是沙粒，我 **是在** 咱们家后面那个斜坡嘛，我下去了，那刹不住车，然后我又要打小转，所以我到现在都跟人家讲说我会骑脚踏车，但我不会转弯。 (Liu Tang, 12/09/2011)

Zheng ge shuai de doushi, yinwei na ge di-shang dou shi shali, wo *shi zai* zamen jia houmian na ge xiepo ma, wo xiaqu-le, na shu-bu-zhu che, ranhou wo you yao da xiao zhuan, suoyi wo dao xianzai dou gen renjia jiangshuo wo hui qi jiaotache, dan wo bu hui zhuansuan.

Entire CL tumble COMP all.in.a.mess, because DEM CL ground-on all COP sand, 1SG COP LOC 1PL home behind DEM CL slope MP, 1SG go.down-PVF, well brake-NEG-stop vehicle, then 1SG also want make small turn, so 1SG until now always COM people say 1SG can ride bicycle, but 1SG NEG can turn.a.corner.
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‘I went arse over tit, because the ground was covered in sand – I *was on* the slope behind our home, you know. I went down it, well I couldn’t brake, and I wanted to go round a curve, so to this day I always tell people I can ride a bike, but I can’t turn corners.’

Like examples featuring the use of the copula with adjectives (discussed in section 6.2.1 above), the two examples cited here and others in a similar vein drawn from the corpus appear to be open to range of interpretations. Once again, the precise function of the copula in the contexts given here is likely to be a moot point. While it is possible that it was used to emphasise the time (example (55)) or confirm the location (example (56)) of the event, the broader context renders that interpretation less than certain. It seems at least equally likely that the copula is not performing any particular function in these utterances. In other words, once again we are confronted with the possibility – this time in the combination *shi zai COP LOC ‘be in/on/at’* – that *shi* is in some instances semantically, pragmatically and structurally redundant. Another way of expressing this is to say that the locative copula *zai* can on occasion be replaced by the combination *shi zai* without any apparent change in meaning or emphasis.

In other examples taken from the database, it seems more obvious that the insertion of *shi* before the locative *zai* adds extra weight of some kind to the utterance; nevertheless, it does not seem to be performing precisely the same function as that described in the standard grammar references. Examples of this kind are given in (57), (58) and (59) below.

(57) A: 这也跟你的想法不谋而合吧?
B: 我希望她还是有自己的工作，但是重心是在家里。

(Tian Liang, 10/06/2011)

A: *Zhe ye gen ni de xiangfa bu-mou-er-he ba?*
B: *Wo xiwang ta haishi you ziji de gongzuo, danshi zhongxin *shi* zai jiali.*

A: DEM also COM 2SG ATT idea NEG-consult-but-agree MP?
B: 1SG hope 3SG still have own ATT work, but focus COP LOC family.

A: ‘Did that coincidentally align with your plans?’
B: ‘I hoped she would still have her own job, but that the focus *would be on* the family.’

(58) 随后双峰塔倒塌之后，我当时本身是在一楼之隔的美国证券交易所，当时整个楼里是乌烟瘴气……

(Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011)

*Suihou* *shuang-feng-ta daodie zhi hou, wo dangshi benshen* *shi zai* *yi lou zhi ge de Meiguo*

Angela Cook 14/02/2014 Page 168
Soon afterwards double-peak-tower collapse ATT after, 1SG at.that.time my self COP LOC one building ATT separation ATT America stock-exchange, at.that.time entire CL building-in COP black-smoke-thick-air … 

‘Soon afterwards, after the Twin Towers collapsed, at that time I myself was in the US Stock Exchange two doors away, at that time the atmosphere in the whole building was absolutely foul …’ 

(Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011) 

But DEM one moment MP, 1SG want understand go experience 3SG ATT pressure, 3SG ATT pressure MP COP left-right neighbour ATT pressure, 1SG feel DEM CL left-right neighbour DEM CL.PL idle-words-idle-speech ATT attack very terrifying, maybe 2SG could LOC here 3SG COP LOC there COM 3SG ATT friend talk, 2SG NEG PFV see-RES DEM CL, DEM CL who A-xiang, Luo Zhixiang 3SG happen DEM CL matter how can DEM way MP, just COP DEM way ATT DEM CL mood. 

‘But at that moment, I wanted to empathise with the pressure she was under, her pressure, it was the pressure of the neighbours on all sides. I think that kind of aggression from the idle gossip of neighbours on all sides is terrifying. Perhaps while you were here she was over there talking to her friend. “Didn’t you see that, that whatshisname A-xiang, Luo Zhixiang, he did such-and-such, how could he do that?” It was just that kind of mood.’ 

There were a number of examples like the three above in which shi appears to highlight some kind of contrast or lend prominence to a particular sentence element. In example (57) the contrast is between work and home/family, while in example (58) the element receiving prominence is the US Stock Exchange and the information highlighted is its proximity to the
scene of the action.\textsuperscript{7} In example (59) \textit{shi} functions as a contrastive marker to explicitly draw attention to the immediate and striking contrast between \textit{zheli} ‘here’ and \textit{nabian} ‘there’.\textsuperscript{8}

It is worth repeating the fact that, once again, we find examples of \textit{shi} being used to add weight, focus, prominence or otherwise emphasise the content of utterances – albeit not in precisely the same way as that described by many of the better known grammarians. As well as using \textit{shi} to reiterate a point made or implied elsewhere in the conversation, it appears that speakers often use it to enhance the contrastive prominence of a particular sentence element or relatively small detail, and they seem to feel comfortable using \textit{shi} for this purpose even when that element or detail is not mentioned or implied elsewhere.

In addition to utterances in which the disyllabic combination \textit{shi zai} occupied the syntactic position of the locative copula, a number of examples were found in which the combination \textit{shi zai} was used where, structurally, the locative preposition would have been expected. Two such examples are provided in (60) and (61) below.

(60)  
\begin{quote}
A:  好，谢谢宗琮。我们再转到华盛顿现场，宏敏刚刚还有个最新的消息，包括了希拉里有些谈话，相关内容是什么，弘敏。
B:  好的，一虎，希拉里刚刚\textit{是}在白宫发表了讲话，她表示美国击毙本.拉登是正义的伸张，不过他也强调，美国对于这个基地组织及恐怖组织的斗争是不会结束，美国也会继续在阿福汗对于塔利班以及它的盟友继续进行打击的行动。  
\end{quote}

(Li Hongmin, 02/05/2011)

\begin{quote}
B:  Haode, Yilu, Xilali gang-gang \textit{shi zai} Baigong fabiao-le jianghua, ta biaoshi Meiguo jibi Ben Ladeng shi zhengyi de shenzhang, buguo ta ye qiangdiao, Meiguo duiyu zhe ge jidi zuzhi ji kongbu zuzhi de douzheng shi bu hui jieshu, Meiguo ye hui jixu zai Afuhan duiyu Taliban yiji ta de mengyou jixu jinxing daji de xingdong.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{7}Interestingly, the feeling one gets with example (58) is that the inclusion of \textit{shi} is, if anything, preferable to its omission in this context. This may be in part because of the presence of \textit{benshen} ‘myself’ before the verb, which adds weight to the subject noun phrase and seemingly calls for additional weight in the predicate to balance the clause. The violation of stylistic principles caused by the omission of \textit{shi} in this instance is known as \textit{tou-zhong-jiao-qing} head-heavy-foot-light ‘imbalance between head and foot / beginning and end’.

\textsuperscript{8}In fact, there is an alternative syntactic analysis of this utterance, according to which the main verb is \textit{jiang} ‘speak’ and the disyllabic combination \textit{shi zai} replaces the locative preposition rather than the locative copula.
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A: Good, thank you Zongcong. IPL again turn-to Washington live, Hongmin just now~REDUP still have CL SUP-new ATT news, include-PVF Hilary have CL.PL discussion, related content COP what, Hongmin.

B: Okay, Yilu, Hilary just now~REDUP COP LOC White.House make-PVF speech, 3SG express America assassinate Bin Laden COP justice ATT uphold, although 3SG also emphasise, America against DEM CL fundamental organisation and terrorist organisation ATT struggle COP NEG will finish, America also will continue LOC Afghanistan against Taliban and 3SG ATT ally continue carry.out attack ATT operation.

A: ‘Good, thank you Zongcong. We cross live to Washington again, where Hongmin just now has the latest news, including that Hilary has had some discussions, with the related content being what, Hongmin.’

B: ‘Okay, Yilu, Hilary has just made a speech at the White House, in which she claimed that America’s assassination of Bin Laden was a case of upholding justice, although she also emphasised that America’s struggle against fundamental organisations and terrorist organisations would not cease, and that America would continue to carry out aggressive operations against the Taliban and its allies in Afghanistan.’

Example (60) illustrates rather nicely the use of *shi* to highlight a particular element that does not receive mention elsewhere in the dialogue. Seen in context, it is clear that person A is already aware that Hilary Clinton made a speech of some description, but when person B responds, the place where the speech was made is presented as new information, and
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moreover as information that is worthy of receiving prominence, perhaps contrasted with other possible venues in the minds of the speaker and listener.

In example (61) it is less obvious what exactly is being contrasted or given prominence – or if, indeed, any element at all is meant to be highlighted.\(^9\) It could perhaps be argued that the listener’s attention is being drawn to the location of the list, but that would seem to be stretching a point. In fact, it is not at all clear what function *shi* is performing in this sentence.\(^10\)

6.3. Discussion

This section will discuss a range of different functions performed by the morpheme *shi*, as brought to light in this chapter and illustrated by the speech examples cited herein. For a discussion of various hypotheses explaining how and why these functions have arisen, the reader is encouraged to refer to chapter 7.

6.3.1. Marker of contrastive prominence

It would be entirely uncontroversial if we could establish that all examples of the two structures [NP COP *HEN* Adj] and [NP COP *LOC* NP] contained in the corpus are sentences in which the copula is functioning as a marker of emphasis or special affirmation. Unfortunately, this is not borne out by the context in which many of these utterances occur. Although precise interpretation of the pragmatic nuances of the relevant examples is to some extent hampered by the fact that audio-visual recordings of the episodes in question are for the most part not publically available, careful study of the extended context in which the

---

\(^9\) I am grateful to Liang Haiyan for bringing to my attention a poem by Xu Zhimo, published in 1928. The following three lines of the poem, repeated in each of the six stanzas, feature two uses of the copula *shi* with the locative *zai*: *Wo bu zhidao feng / shi zai na yi-ge fangxiang chui – – – / wo shi zai meng zhong* ‘I don’t know / [in] which way the wind is blowing – / I’m in a dream’. The first of these *shi zai* combinations appears where, syntactically, the locative preposition would suffice, while the second appears where the locative copula is required. In neither case is the copula syntactically necessary, nor does it appear to make a readily identifiable contribution in any other way.

\(^10\) This assessment was corroborated by informal conversations with a number of native speakers, many of whom were likewise at a loss to describe the function of *shi* in this utterance. One suspects that another kind of methodology or approach may be required to elucidate the function of *shi* in cases where it appears redundant. It must be borne in mind that the fact that native speaker intuitions cannot identify the function of a particular linguistic feature or construction does not necessarily mean that there is none. One possibility is to adopt an interactional linguistics or conversation analysis approach, as these have in the past proven useful in elucidating functions of seemingly elusive usages.
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structures of interest occur reveals that in a significant number of cases it was highly unlikely, if not impossible that the copula was being used for emphasis in precisely the way described by Chao (1968), Li and Thompson (1981) and Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b).

On the contrary, the spoken data in the current corpus demonstrate that the morpheme *shi* is frequently used with a weaker affirmation or focus function than that described in much of the literature, whereby the epithet “weaker” is understood to refer to two aspects of its use. Firstly, it is not necessarily used to reiterate or affirm a point made or inferred elsewhere in the conversation; on the contrary, *shi* can draw attention to a piece of information that is mentioned once only. Secondly, rather than being used to emphasise the entire predicate, *shi* is often used with the extent of the contrastive or highlighting effect applying only to the single sentence element – sometimes a relatively minor detail – immediately following it. This finding is supported by the analyses of a number of previous researchers (e.g. Dong, 2004; M. Fang, 1995; Teng, 1979). Although this was a possible explanation or contributing factor in many of the examples cited in this chapter, it is perhaps most obvious in examples (59) and (60).

6.3.2. Extended copula function

There are indications that *shi* may be used sometimes in the copula function not only to link two noun phrases, but also to link a noun phrase with an adjectival phrase. This was noted specifically in relation to some examples of the structure [NP COP HEN Adj].

Let us consider in turn a range of possible explanations for the data observed in relation to the use of the copula in the structure [NP COP HEN Adj]. The easiest and most straightforward explanation is that *shi* is being used to mark either special affirmation (as described by C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; cf. Paul & Whitman, 2008) or contrastive prominence (as discussed in 6.3.1 above). Although this possibility cannot be ruled out entirely, it seems that a number of examples from the corpus, including several cited in this chapter, may require a rather forced interpretation to support this view.

Secondly, there is the possibility that all examples of the structure [NP COP HEN Adj] contained in the corpus – or perhaps all those not satisfactorily explained by the first hypothesis – are mere slips of the tongue, or occasional speech errors. This hypothesis can be discarded on the grounds that the number of utterances of this identical structure must surely
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be more than a coincidence.\(^{11}\) Thus we are obliged to acknowledge the possibility that in everyday conversational Mandarin the copula *shi* may occasionally be used predicatively to link noun phrases with adjectives.

It is worth comparing these findings with an authoritative analysis dating back several decades. Wang Li (1984[1943]-a, pp. 474-476) noted a number of cases of copula usage deemed by him to be incorrect and/or redundant in Chinese. He started by drawing a distinction between so-called descriptive sentences and judgement sentences, which in Chinese have the structure [N Adj] and [N COP Adj NOM] (or [N *shi* Adj *de]*) respectively (cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 474). He then went on to observe that some of his contemporaries, confusing judgement sentences with descriptive sentences, produced utterances of the form *ta de qizi *shi* *hen hao* de* 3SG ATT wife COP very good NOM ‘his wife is good’* instead of *ta de qizi *hen hao* 3SG ATT wife very good ‘his wife is good’* (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 474; cf. L. Wang, 1984[1943]-b, p. 447). This, in Wang Li’s view, constituted a grammatical error. Some people took this process one step further and omitted the *de*. That is, the descriptive sentence structure [N Adj] was replaced by the judgement sentence structure [N COP Adj NOM], which in turn became [N COP Adj] (L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, p. 474; 1984[1943]-b, p. 448). The resulting Chinese sentence structure thus corresponded exactly to the sentence structure used in many European languages, including, of course, English. According to Wang Li, this last kind of sentence structure had formerly been used only for emphasis; that is, the function of *shi* had been not so much syntactic (i.e. that of copula) as pragmatic (i.e. to emphasise a particular fact or point of view). Wang Li was of the opinion that it was particularly inappropriate to use the structure [N COP Adj] with an adjective negated with *bu* ‘not’ (1984[1943]-b, p. 448) or preceded by an adverb of degree such as *hen* ‘very,’ *tai* ‘too,’ *feichang* ‘extremely’ etc. (1984[1943]-a, p. 476). He nevertheless cited examples of these structures from contemporary literary works and newspapers (1984[1943]-a, pp. 475-476).

It is interesting to observe that the adverbial intensifier *hen* ‘very’ has also been termed a “quasi-copula” in the literature because of its propensity to appear between a grammatical

---

\(^{11}\) Moreover, the weight of data frequency is corroborated by explicit native speaker grammaticality judgments, since a significant proportion of the native speakers consulted with regard to the relevant examples were prepared to accept them as grammatical and well formed.
subject and a predicative adjective. As is typical in processes of grammaticalisation, the adoption of a more grammatical role has been accompanied by semantic bleaching, so that hen in context frequently retains little if any of the semantic function of intensifying the meaning of the adjective it precedes. Thus, viewed from this perspective, there is a sense in which the use of shi to conjoin a noun and a predicative adjective is not so much a case of the insertion of a copula where previously none was used as perhaps the replacement of a quasi-copula with a full copula.

6.3.3. Replacement of locative copula

It seems there may be some cases when shi is used in combination with the locative preposition zai in place of the monosyllabic locative verb zai without contributing any emphatic force to the utterance. As with the extended copula function (refer to section 6.3.2 above), the quantity of examples of this type and the contexts in which they occurred are sufficient grounds for viewing askance the suggestion that all occurrences of this structure can be satisfactorily explained by one or other of the two hypotheses discussed above: namely, that they are either occasional speech errors or examples of shi being used as a “marker of special affirmation” in the traditional sense or a “marker of contrastive prominence” in the sense described in this chapter.

Rather, in these instances contextual information from real-life dialogues suggests that the combination shi zai is sometimes used to perform the same function as the English ‘be at/on/in’. Whether, psycholinguistically, speakers conceive the combination as also having a similar internal structure to its English equivalent, or whether they understand it to function as a single lexical unit, namely as a disyllabic locative copula, is a question which requires further investigation.

6.3.4. Conventionalised forms

There appears to be some correlation between the modification of the epistemic value of an utterance (discussed in section 6.2.1 above) and the emphatic function of the copula, as described in conventional accounts of Mandarin grammar and summarised in section 5.1 above. Certainly it is true that by their very nature, markers of epistemic modality have a high likelihood of occurring in the same sentence in which a copula is used as a marker of special affirmation. Thus, it is hardly surprising that many – but by no means all – of the examples of
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the co-occurrence of an epistemic modifier and the copula used predicatively with an adjective are indeed utterances in which the speaker seeks to emphasise or affirm the content. On the other hand, it is also feasible that the common use of markers of epistemic modality in conjunction with the copula in its function as marker of special affirmation has led (by frequent association) to the appearance of an epistemic adverb in a sentence somehow triggering the use of the copula – even when it is not necessarily the speaker’s intention to imbue the utterance with additional emphasis or affirmation. This could help to explain how so-called “conventionalised forms” like *haoxiang-shi* ‘seem; apparently’, *keneng-shi* ‘possibly’ and *qishi-shi* ‘actually’ may have arisen (cf. Dong, 2004; A. Y.-R. Wu & Biq, 2011).

In this context, Kubler’s (1985b) findings from his investigation of the Europeanisation of Chinese grammar in two separate editions of the novel *Jia (Family)* (see also section 5.2.1.4 above) may once again be of interest. Consider the following pair of sentences (taken from Kubler, 1985b, p. 93):

(62) a) 我也许 是太自私了，也许是被别的东西迷住了眼睛。

   (1931 edition)

   Wo yexu *shi* tai zisi le, yexu *shi* bei biede dongxi mizhu-le yanjing.

   1SG maybe COP too selfish CS, maybe COP PASS other thing bewitch-PFV eyes.

   ‘Perhaps I *was too selfish*, or perhaps my eyes were bewitched by other things.’

b) 我也许 太自私了，也许是别的东西迷了我的眼睛。

   (1957 edition)

   Wo yexu tai zisi le, yexu *shi* biede dongxi mizhu-le wo de yanjing.

   1SG maybe too selfish CS, maybe COP other thing bewitch-PFV 1SG ATT eyes.

   ‘Perhaps I *was too selfish*, or perhaps other things bewitched my eyes.’

As mentioned above (see section 5.2.1.4), Kubler’s point was that the later edition of the novel featured less frequent use of the passive construction with *bei*. Thus, it can be seen that the second clause, which in the earlier version contained the passive marker, was reformulated in the active voice in the later version (cf. discussion on the increasing frequency of use of *bei* passives in section 5.3.3). What went unremarked in Kubler’s (1985b) study, however, is that in the process of revising the sentence in question Ba Jin also deleted

---

12 Note that the English translation sounds more natural when formulated in the passive voice.
the copula *shi* from the first clause. Presumably this was because at some level – whether 
conscious or unconscious – the author felt that the sentence sounded less Europeanised 
without it. This is rather interesting for a number of reasons. Firstly, it proves that Chinese 
sentences of the structure [NP COP INT AdjP] were being used by native speakers as much as 
80 years ago.\(^\text{13}\) Secondly, it suggests that in at least some sentences of that structure the 
morpheme *shi* was redundant and did not contribute anything to the expressive power of the 
sentence – otherwise why would the author have deleted it? In other words, this is an 
example of the use of *shi* which the author himself has apparently judged as not performing 
any emphatic role such as that of a “marker of special affirmation” (cf. C. N. Li & 
Thompson, 1981) or “association with focus” (cf. Paul & Whitman, 2008), but as being used 
purely and simply as a copula linking a noun phrase with a predicative adjective. Thirdly, it 
indicates that this particular usage of *shi* was considered Europeanised at the time. By 
analogy, the repeated occurrence of *shi* in similar structural contexts in the data for the 
present study may also be an indication of the influence of European languages. Finally, it is 
interesting that in the 1931 edition of the novel, the morpheme *shi* is immediately preceded 
by the epistemic adverb *yexu* ‘maybe’. Thus, there is at least a possibility that contexts that in 
modern usage increase the likelihood of *shi* appearing where it is not, strictly speaking, 
grammatically necessary are similar to those that encouraged its increased use in the heady 
days of the early Republic.

### 6.3.5. Summary

The analysis of the Mandarin copula in the literature, according to which *shi* performs only a 
limited and clearly defined set of functions, does not seem to stand up to methodical 
investigation. In addition to its traditional roles as a standard copula linking two noun phrases, 
as a copula in presentative sentences and as a marker of focus or emphatic force (cf. Chao, 
1968; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981; Paul & Whitman, 2008; L. Wang, 1984[a][1943]-a, 
1984[a][1943]-b), the corpus data show that it is also found in spoken Mandarin in novel 
structures and with novel functions not described elsewhere.\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Here, the abbreviation *INT* stands for intensifier. Elsewhere in this chapter the structure investigated has made use of the intensifier *hen* ‘very’; in Ba Jin’s sentence the intensifier is *tai* ‘too’.

\(^{14}\) Note that the standard analysis is here summarised in a slightly simplified way. Indeed, it has been pointed out that the copula can link other combinations of structures apart from two noun phrases, as discussed in Footnote 1 above.
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The first of these hitherto overlooked functions is what has been referred to in this chapter as a marker of contrastive prominence. In this function, *shi* is used to highlight one specific detail, often in contrast to other possible values, which may be mentioned in the immediate or extended context or of which the speaker and listener may simply be aware owing to their knowledge of the world and of the particular situation. This differs from the focus or emphatic function described in the standard literature in two important ways. It can be used to highlight a single mid-sentence element of an utterance, rather than highlighting the entire predicate (when occurring after the topic or grammatical subject) or only the subject (when occurring in sentence-initial position). Also, it is not necessarily information that is mentioned or inferred either previously or subsequently in the conversation.

The second novel function is potentially as a copula combining a noun phrase with predicative adjective, a structure which is familiar to us from many European languages but has not thus far been considered standard usage in Mandarin. The apparent predilection for using the copula *shi* predicatively with adjectives expressing an intrinsic or permanent quality is of interest and deserves further investigation.

The third putative innovation is the use of *shi* in combination with the preposition *zai* to function as a locative copula. Another way to express this development is to say that *zai*, in its capacity as a full locative verb, may sometimes be replaced by a disyllabic construction consisting of the same morpheme *zai* – this time in its capacity as a locative preposition – immediately preceded by the standard copula *shi*. Once again, this structure is familiar to us from European languages but is considered non-standard in Mandarin.

Of these three functions, the first not only calls for more minor modifications to the standard analysis of the Mandarin copula, it is also probably the least controversial conclusion that can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter. By contrast, the other two functions both represent more significant departures from the standard analysis of *shi* and are at the same time based on more controversial interpretations of the data. That is, although it is indeed possible to interpret the corpus data as being suggestive of the second and third functions described above, there are other (possibly equally valid) interpretations of the data that do not necessitate recourse to these conclusions.

The question then arises: have the usages investigated here been around for a long time, or are they relatively new? Some might argue that the fact that they do not rate a mention in any
The Copula *shi*

of the grammar references consulted can be adequately explained by Chinese grammarians’ overriding interest in written rather than spoken forms of Modern Standard Chinese and their preoccupation with laying down “correct” formal standards of language use rather than describing more informal, colloquial usage. Another possibility is that the predicative use of the copula with adjectives and the use of the disyllabic combination *shi zai* to function as a locative copula are relatively recent linguistic innovations in Mandarin Chinese. In this context it is worth highlighting the imbalance in the distribution of the structures [NP COP HEN Adj] and [NP COP LOC NP] with respect to spontaneous vs. non-spontaneous data within the corpus, as the uneven distribution of these structures supports the hypothesis that these are comparatively new syntactic patterns that are starting to establish themselves in colloquial speech but have not yet found acceptance in more formal registers of the spoken or written language. How and why these usages have crept into the language and gained currency – at least in spoken Mandarin – is a matter for further discussion. These and other questions will be discussed further in chapter 7.

This chapter has studied the use of the Mandarin copula in a few selected constructions. Overall, it was found that within the quite specific parameters of investigation, *shi* did not always behave in accordance with the descriptions of its use typically found in Mandarin grammar textbooks. Rather, the copula sometimes performed one of a number of identifiable additional functions. As is often the case with linguistic classifications, the borderlines between the various functions were frequently fuzzy, and *shi* occasionally seemed to be fulfilling multiple roles simultaneously. Whether or not the copula behaves as expected in other linguistic environments is a matter for further investigation.
7. Issues in Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax and the broader implications thereof

This chapter draws the threads of the preceding three data analysis chapters together, as well as the morpho-syntactic schema proposed in chapter 3, to present a cohesive picture of the significance and implications of the findings presented in this thesis. First the findings of this particular research project are compared and contrasted with previous analyses in the literature. This flows into a discussion in which the similarities between the behaviour of the three features investigated in this study are highlighted. Several common themes emerge, which will form the basis of further discussion of the relevance, impact and significance of the findings in chapter 8. In order to account for some of the observations, a number of explanations are suggested. These are discussed in varying degrees of depth and detail in section 7.2 of this chapter. The chapter concludes by summarising various issues in Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax and the broader implications of these.

7.1. Overview of the findings

In chapter 4 we saw that the patterns of use of the plural marker *men* cannot be explained entirely adequately by the descriptions contained in the standard literature. It is true that the Mandarin plural suffix behaves in accordance with the traditional analysis insofar as it is appended almost exclusively to nouns denoting humans and nearly always serves to emphasise the plurality or group feeling of the noun thus pluralised. However, a number of other factors – either not mentioned at all in the standard grammar references or referred to only tangentially – were shown also to play a part in determining when a noun was likely to be marked explicitly for plural number by means of the plural suffix *men*. These additional linguistic roles ranged from clarifying a semantic distinction through satisfying structural requirements of balance and parallelism or the overt marking of complex noun phrase structure to conveying diminutive connotations of intimacy and endearment. At the same time, a number of structural constraints on the use of *men* posited in the literature were found not to be particularly relevant to the spoken corpus data used for this research. Interestingly, although the use of the plural marker is portrayed in the literature as optional or at the discretion of the speaker, careful analysis of the data points to the conclusion that this is not always the case. Finally, there were indications that the use of the plural suffix *men* might be spreading by lexical diffusion.
The analysis presented in chapter 5 demonstrated that the passive marker *bei*, while still used predominantly with verbs with an adverse and disposal meaning, appears in spoken interactions with verbs with a neutral or positive meaning more often than suggested in the literature. There also seems to be quite a noticeable tendency to use *bei* with verbs (whether adverse or non-adverse) without the associated disposal meaning, in particular non-disposal verbs expressing a mental state. In this respect its patterns of use deviate significantly from those of the marker of preposed direct object, *ba*, with whose analysis it is frequently paired. The behaviour of *bei* in the corpus was also found to repeatedly contravene a number of structural constraints posited in the literature, such as the use of an overt passive marker with so-called notional passives and in conjunction with the marker of continuous aspect. Another interesting feature of the use of *bei* revealed by the data is that it is much more likely to appear in combination with a bare monosyllabic or disyllabic verb when it is used within an embedded structure in which the verb is immediately followed by the attributive marker *de*. This implies that rhythmic or prosodic considerations may play a role in determining when additional elements (e.g. verbal complements, aspect markers, prepositional phrases) are added to a passivised verb. A further fascinating finding was that the passive marker *bei* could be used to signal the speaker’s distancing herself from the information contained in the utterance, or even indicate her calling into question the accuracy of such information. Owing to the prevalence of this use in texts critical of the current socio-political conditions prevailing in the PRC, this function has been referred to as a “marker of political dissent”.

The behaviour of the copula *shi* in spoken Mandarin, certain aspects of which were analysed in chapter 6, likewise showed some patterns of use that did not conform to the traditional analysis. These included the use of the Mandarin copula to link a subject noun phrase with a predicative adjective, as well as its use in conjunction with the locative preposition *zai* to form the disyllabic combination *shi zai*, which performed the role of a locative copula. According to traditional analyses, the Mandarin copula *shi* is redundant in both of these functions unless it is being used as a so-called “marker of special affirmation” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981). A number of examples taken from the corpus pointed to the conclusion that the copula was frequently used in spoken interactions in mid-sentence position to highlight the prominence of a particular sentence element, a linguistic role which has not previously received attention in the literature. Another interesting finding was the high frequency of occurrence of the copula in conjunction with markers of epistemic modality, a
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pattern of use which seemed to be related to a certain extent to its function as a marker of contrastive prominence.

A number of common themes emerge from these findings. All three morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese investigated in this study revealed patterns of behaviour that differed to varying extents from the descriptions in the standard literature. These discrepancies manifested themselves in a number of ways. Firstly, the three selected features were all found to perform additional functions or linguistic roles (whether semantic, pragmatic, structural or other) apart from those described in the standard literature. Secondly, in all cases some of the structural constraints on the use of the particular morpho-syntactic feature stipulated in the literature were found to be too strongly worded or in some cases largely immaterial for a sound descriptive analysis of the spoken corpus data used for this study. Thirdly, assuming that one of the aims of a thorough and comprehensive grammatical treatment of any language is to be able to predict when certain constructions or sentence elements are obligatory or likely to occur, as opposed to when they are ungrammatical, infelicitous or unlikely to occur, then it is worth noting that all three morpho-syntactic features under discussion are apparently responsive in spoken interactions to a number of factors (semantic, pragmatic, prosodic or otherwise discourse related) not previously highlighted in the literature.

Overall, the conclusion is inescapable that the use of these linguistic features of Mandarin Chinese is more complex than has been allowed for in previous studies. By “more complex” is meant on the one hand that the features in question may appear in a wider range of grammatical contexts (i.e. be subject to fewer grammatical constraints) and on the other hand that their overall pattern of usage seems to be determined by more factors than have previously been allowed for. An additional manifestation of the complexity of their behaviour – undoubtedly related to the two aspects already mentioned – is that all three morpho-syntactic features are capable of performing more functions or roles, or of contributing in more ways to the expressive power of Mandarin Chinese than have previously been recognised.

7.2. Explaining the findings

This section starts by considering what factors may account for the most general finding presented in this chapter, namely the significant discrepancies observed in this study between
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linguistic theory (in this case the description of Mandarin grammar) and linguistic practice (i.e. actual usage in real-life speech contexts). It then goes on to discuss a range of possible explanations relating both to general findings and to some of the more detailed findings presented in the three data analysis chapters.

7.2.1. Discrepancies between descriptive analysis and actual practice

As we saw in section 7.1 above, the behaviour of the three selected morpho-syntactic features investigated in this study is more complex than has been acknowledged in previous research. That is to say, the use of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* in spoken Mandarin deviates somewhat from the guidelines for and descriptions of their use set out in standard grammar references and linguistic analyses. This subsection will explore a number of possible explanations in an attempt to account for why some of the complexities of their use may have eluded discovery in the past.

Of course, it is almost inevitable that actual usage in real-life speech contexts will differ from descriptions of the standard use of just about any language. On the other hand, the sorts of deviations described in this study are significant enough in quantity and kind to present a compelling case for the discrepancies being due to more than merely occasional speech errors. So, how do we account for this?

Perhaps the first explanation that springs to mind is that previous analyses have not been sufficiently fine-grained; that is, they may not have investigated these features in enough detail to be able to observe some of the finer nuances of usage. While not wishing to rule out this possibility entirely, it seems a rather flippant suggestion and a somewhat belittling evaluation of the work of a considerable number of eminent and highly respected linguists in the field of Chinese grammar. Thus, it is likely that other factors have played much more significant role in bringing about the mismatch between linguistic theory and practice evident from this study.

Highly relevant to the importance of the present research and the significance of the findings is the fact that this dissertation studied a sizable corpus of spoken data. Previous analyses of morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese have not been based on systematic searches of spoken corpora. Indeed, only a relatively small proportion of previous grammatical analyses have been based on methodically collected and systematically analysed
empirical data of any description. That is, grammarians have tended to rely at least in part on introspection as a source of examples and a foundation for their analyses. This may have led in some cases to descriptions of Mandarin grammar, the details of which are in several instances somewhat removed from actual usage.

As has already been noted several times in this thesis, Chinese linguists have to date displayed surprisingly little interest in spoken forms of their standard language. This may be because previous researchers have not appreciated the significant differences between written and spoken Modern Standard Chinese. Alternatively, they may have acknowledged that there are significant differences between the two but not have considered spoken language a worthy subject of investigation. In fact, as we know, spoken data are likely for a range of discourse and interactional reasons to reveal more complexity than written data. Indeed, some aspects of the use of the three selected morpho-syntactic features studied in this thesis may not occur in written texts or may play such a negligible role in written genres that they are barely worth mentioning. Aspects of the use of the three morpho-syntactic features that one can imagine occurring more often in spoken than written language include the following: the use of the plural suffix *men* to convey overtones of intimacy and endearment, as well as to signalise information structure in the form of overt marking of the end of complex noun phrases (see chapter 4, sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.1); the use of the passive marker *bei* in conjunction with the continuous aspect marker (see chapter 5, section 5.2.2.1); and the use of the copula *shi* with markers of epistemic modality (see chapter 6, section 6.3.4). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that a number of points raised in the analysis presented here have not appeared in previous accounts of Mandarin Chinese grammar.

Another aspect of the prevailing attitude amongst Chinese linguists that may have contributed to such oversights (if oversights they are) is the tendency towards prescriptivism noticeable in much of the research published throughout the twentieth century and even today. Linguists working in the field of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax often seem to feel a need to stipulate more formal, “correct” usage, rather than to provide a description of the way the

1 For a more detailed discussion of the lack of quantitative, empirically based research, the reader is referred to sections 1.1.3, 2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.3, 0 and 0.
2 For a more in-depth analysis of the preoccupation within the field of Chinese linguistics on written at the expense of spoken forms of the language, the reader is referred to sections 0, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.3, 2.3.2.3 and 0.
3 For further examples of the tendency towards prescriptivism, the reader is referred to sections 1.1.3 and 0.
language is actually used in everyday contexts. Of course, this point relates back to the prevalence of intuition-driven research in preference to data-driven research discussed earlier in this section.

Whatever the reasons behind the discrepancies between descriptive analysis and actual practice brought to light by this study, the fact remains that treatments of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax in the standard reference works and grammatical analyses fail to explain adequately certain important aspects of the behaviour of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*. Overall, the outcome seems to be that many descriptions of Mandarin Chinese grammar have evinced a tendency to err on the side of presenting and analysing examples that are rather formal and standardised, and perhaps of depicting the grammar as more logical or systematic than it really is.

There is, however, another possibility that has the potential to explain many of the omissions noted in the work of previous researchers. And that is that some of the new aspects of usage highlighted in this investigative analysis may not have been observed by previous researchers simply because they did not exist. That is, they may be innovative developments in language use. In other words, many of the functions, roles and linguistic structures described and analysed in the data analysis chapters of this study may in fact be examples of novel usage that have only become popular and reasonably widespread in recent years. It is possible that the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* were not used in non-standard ways (i.e. in ways that diverge from the descriptions in standard grammar references) even as recently as a decade or so ago. Or if they were, they may have occurred in the constructions and roles described here so rarely that they were merely dismissed as occasional speech errors. As the data presented here are synchronic, it is not possible on the basis of the corpus material used for this study to test the hypothesis of language change. We have no evidence that any of the hitherto undescribed patterns of linguistic behaviour analysed in this study really are examples of recent linguistic innovations. Nevertheless, it is worth bearing in mind as a possible explanation for at least some of the novel uses described in this thesis.

The following subsections (7.2.2, 0 and 7.2.4) touch on several general themes arising from the observations noted with respect to each of the three morpho-syntactic features investigated. The first of these is the phenomenon of language variation, which, it has often been acknowledged, is a precondition for linguistic change of any kind. The second is the issue of language contact, which specifically examines the possibility that contact with
European languages, notably English, has influenced the use of a range of morpho-syntactic features in Modern Standard Chinese. The third topic is language change itself. Under these broader headings, a number of subsidiary accounts that attempt to explain some of the finer details of the corpus data for the present study relating to the use of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* will also be discussed.

### 7.2.2. Linguistic variation

Linguistic variation refers to variation in the language output within a given speech community. This variation manifests itself in any and quite frequently all of the four areas of lexicon, phonology, morphology and syntax, as well as some other areas such as pragmatics. Linguistic variation is often related to sociolinguistic factors such as geographical region, socioeconomic stratification and social context, the resulting language production in each case being known as different dialects, sociolects and registers respectively. Other demographic factors like age and sex have also been shown to have an impact on speech production. It is important to remember that even the language output of a single speaker can vary significantly across a range of styles, showing marked lexical, phonological and structural differences according to the sociolinguistic setting.

These days, it is generally accepted in the field of historical linguistics that an understanding of linguistic variation can contribute much to our understanding of language change and that the two are inextricably intertwined (Bynon, 1977, p. 171; McMahon, 1994, p. 225). However, that view has not always prevailed. In the following sections a brief history of research into linguistic variation will precede an explanation of how linguistic variation is measured, including a discussion of linguistic variables and their pivotal role in analysing linguistic variation. The section will conclude by discussing the diachronic implications of synchronic variation, through which it will become clear that linguistic variation is a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite for language change.

---

4 Bynon (1977) seemed to be presenting this case quite strongly as if fearing opposition, but in fact this relationship has since been accepted by many linguists.
7.2.2.1. **Explanatory value of linguistic variation**

As mentioned above, the significance of linguistic variation in understanding language change has not always been appreciated. In fact, it is probably fair to say that the very existence of linguistic variation was largely overlooked by mainstream linguistics for well over a century (cf. Aitchison, 2001, p. 42; Bynon, 1977, p. 198; Henry, 2002). All three major schools of the last 150 years – Neogrammarians, Structuralists and Generativists – concentrated their research on an idealised synchronic state of the standard language and more or less ignored actual language use, or considered it only insofar as it gave them insights into the idealised standard language that was their real interest (McMahon, 1994, p. 225).

One of the consequences of the neglect of language variation studies has been that it is only comparatively recently that a significant number of linguists have come to realise that language change can be observed in progress (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 42-43). In concentrating their study of language on some idealised norm, a practice advocated a century ago by the Structuralists, historical linguists overlooked or deliberately ignored language variation, failing to realise that it was precisely there that evidence of language change was to be found (Aitchison, 2001, p. 43). The stated aim of descriptive linguists to write a grammar designed to produce all and only the well-formed sentences of a language has been criticised as fundamentally flawed because this approach requires that linguists must gloss over or ignore two important characteristics of language, namely language variation and language “fuzziness,” or borderline acceptability (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 42-51). That is, language variation and language fuzziness are where language change can be observed in progress, but it was precisely these areas that were ironed out of descriptive linguistic observation for the better part of the twentieth century and, for that matter, nineteenth century historical linguistics (Aitchison, 2001, p. 42). It is only since the seventies that linguists have become aware of the possibility of observing language change in progress (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 42-43). This realisation is largely due to the work of one man.

The linguist who finally brought variation into the linguistic limelight was William Labov. He not only refuted the Neogrammarian claim that sound change could not be observed (cf. 5

---

5 Interestingly, much of contemporary Chinese linguistics seems likewise to focus on an idealised “standard”.
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McMahon, 1994), he also established that language variation and language fuzziness can be empirically tested and statistically analysed (cf. Aitchison, 2001, pp. 43-49). Labov’s (1972) ground-breaking work highlighted two different types of language variation, the first operating across social groups and the second within the speech of individuals; that is, he found on the one hand a correlation between social status and the distribution of certain linguistic features, and on the other a correlation between speech register (e.g. formal vs. casual) and the percentage occurrence of linguistic variables (cf. Bynon, 1977, pp. 199-202). In fact, Labov (1972) demonstrated convincingly that where stylistic and class variation are present, language change is occurring (cf. Aitchison, 2001).

7.2.2.2. Factors that correlate with linguistic variation

As a prelude to examining indications of linguistic variation in the data for this study presented in chapters 4 to 6 (see section 7.2.2.4), some of the factors correlating with linguistic variation are discussed in this section.

Central to sociolinguistics is the concept of the linguistic variable, which is a linguistic feature (usually lexical, phonological or morpho-syntactic) with several different realisations, known as variants (Feagin, 2002, p. 33; McMahon, 1994, p. 234). Labov (1972) showed that the distribution of these variants, when subjected to statistical analysis, shows correlation with various social, stylistic and/or linguistic parameters (cf. also Aitchison, 2001; Chambers, 2002; Feagin, 2002; McMahon, 1994). Social factors include geographical region, age, sex, socioeconomic class, level of education, ethnic background etc., while stylistic parameters here refer to different speech registers used in different social contexts. The former determine variation across members of the speech community, while the latter condition variation within the speech of individuals. Initially it was assumed that register was a function of the care taken with or attention paid to speech (Labov, 1972); however, that view is now considered somewhat simplistic by many variationists, who see register as more complex than merely variation along a scale from informal to formal (e.g. Feagin, 2002). These days increasing numbers of researchers believe that although style shifting can occur unconsciously, it can also be consciously or even self-consciously manipulated (e.g.
That is, speakers do not merely respond passively to external stimuli: they use speech actively to create impressions, express identities and mould social interactions (Schilling-Estes, 2002). It is generally accepted that any given speaker has a range of language varieties and styles – be they different languages, dialects or registers – in her repertoire (e.g. Bourdieu, 1977, 1991; Doran, 2004; Giampapa, 2004; Huffines, 1980; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). The current thinking is that the choice of which of these varieties and styles to employ in a given interaction is determined (consciously or subconsciously) by the social identity the speaker wishes to assume in that situation (Bull, 1995, p. 32; Huffines, 1980, p. 44; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004, p. 27). Several of the major factors correlating with linguistic variation are discussed in turn below, including geographic region, age, sex and socioeconomic class.

Linguistic variants that show a strictly geographic distribution are an indication of dialectal variation. In a slightly different application of terminology, the term “dialect” is sometimes understood in variationist studies to refer to a language variety spoken by a particular ethnic group within the speech community.

Language output may also vary noticeably across different age groups. Such a high degree of correlation between linguistic variation across age brackets and language change over time has been observed that age-dependent language variation is often taken to be an indication of language change (Chambers, 2002). This relationship is explored in more detail in section 7.2.2.5 below.

Sociolinguistic studies have repeatedly shown that, at least in Western countries, women use more prestigious, less stigmatised variants than men (Aitchison, 2001, p. 75; Chambers, 2002, pp. 352-355; cf. Labov, 1972). Thus it is generally claimed that female speech is consistently more standard than male speech (e.g. McMahon, 1994, p. 231). Note, however, that Labov’s (1972, p. 243) statement that “women ... are more sensitive than men to the

---

6 Actually the term “style” seems to be understood by different researchers to cover different linguistic phenomena. In fact, there is a whole body of literature on linguistic styles, style shifting and stylistic variation. In that particular specialised field, the term “speech styles” refers to codes employed by different speakers (dialects) in different social contexts (registers) but also in a range of highly ritualised forms (genres) (cf. Schilling-Estes, 2002).
prestige pattern” implies that in the rare cases where some language variety other than the official standard carries the most overt social prestige, non-standard variants are likely to find favour amongst women. Specifically, Labov (1972) found that lower middle class women are most sensitive to overt prestige, while working class men are most sensitive to covert prestige.

Variation that is a function of socioeconomic stratification manifests itself as different sociolects. The term “socioeconomic class” has been variously defined in linguistics. One commonly used definition equates it with occupational status, while others incorporate a range of further factors such as level of education, income, assets, family background, circle of friends and even social deportment (cf. Ash, 2002). Socioeconomically conditioned phonological variation is generally due to different distinctions being made in different social classes (although the range of phonemes and even of allophones is usually the same) and often results in different distributional frequencies of the same linguistic variants. Variation in syntax (e.g. double negatives) and morphology (e.g. ain’t), on the other hand, tends to be more clear-cut, with certain patterns present in one class but absent in another. In other words, phonological features are graded markers of social class whereas morpho-syntactic features are categorical markers (Chambers, 2002).

7.2.2.3. The rise of a new sociolect

One linguist who has conducted research into linguistic variation with implications for language change in Mandarin Chinese is Zhang Qing, who studied phonological developments in Mainland Standard Mandarin (MSM). Zhang (2005, 2006) investigated patterns of occurrence of four phonological features in the spoken Mandarin of 28 informants from Beijing, half of whom worked for state-owned enterprises and half for foreign-owned enterprises, with equal numbers of women and men in each group. All informants had grown

---

7 This is presumably not the case in speech communities where, for example, only men are educated (see Holmes, 1992).

8 In fact, this ties in well with Zhang’s (2005, 2006) findings with regard to “Cosmopolitan Mandarin,” a newly emerging variety of Mandarin which she studied in Beijing.

9 Refer to the discussion of overt vs. covert prestige in section 7.2.2.5.

10 In fact, Zhang’s respondents did not speak pure MSM (as indeed, very few Chinese people do). Like the vast majority of their compatriots, their spoken Mandarin was coloured to a greater or lesser degree by linguistic features typical of the local area in which they live – in this case Beijing.
up and spent most of their lives in Beijing. Informants were invited to talk about two different topics: one work related, the other related to their hometown, i.e. Beijing. The variable patterns of occurrence of the four phonological features in question were then analysed for statistical significance against differences in sex, topic and place of work.

Broadly speaking, Zhang found that the speech of professionals in foreign-owned companies was characterised by the use of more non-local – but not necessarily more standard – features, and that this difference between the speech of employees of state-owned and foreign-owned companies was more marked when discussing their work than when talking about their hometown (Beijing). That is, she found that with respect to the three phonemic features investigated there was a shift under certain conditions away from Beijing Local Mandarin in the direction of more standard pronunciation.\textsuperscript{11} By contrast, with respect to the one tonal feature there was a shift under the same conditions away from both Beijing Local Mandarin and MSM pronunciation, and towards tonal patterns more typically found in the Mandarin spoken in Hong Kong and Taiwan.\textsuperscript{12} Zhang’s conclusion was that these two opposing shifts, one towards standard pronunciation and one away from it, could be more neatly described as both being a shift in the same direction – and the apparent contradiction in the observations thereby resolved – if one accepted the postulation of the existence of a new prestigious form of Mandarin, which she denoted “Cosmopolitan Mandarin.” Zhang’s thesis (2005, 2006) was that the observations she made could not be explained in terms of movement along the local-standard continuum and must instead be explained in terms of another supra-national language form operating in addition to the standard language and exerting different pressure on the speech of MSM speakers or, as she put it, offering different rewards in the linguistic marketplace.

Zhang’s definition of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” combines elements from various sources and is characterised by phonological and lexical features from several varieties of Chinese.

\textsuperscript{11} The phonemic features selected were rhotacisation of the syllable final (e.g. the pronunciation of zhe “here” as zher and mubiao “goal” as mubiaor), lenition of retroflex obstruents (e.g. the pronunciation of xuesheng “student” as xuereng, huasheng “peanut” as huareng, tongzhi “comrade” as tongri and paichusuo “police station” as pairusuo) and interdental realisation of dental sibilants (e.g. the pronunciation of xianzai “now” as xianthai, baicai “cabbage” as baithai and haizi “child” as haithi), all of which are typical features of Beijing Local Mandarin but in MSM are considered non-standard, or are sanctioned only to a limited extent.

\textsuperscript{12} The tonal feature was the realisation of the neutral tone in a weakly stressed syllable as a full tone, which is a characteristic neither of Beijing Local Mandarin nor of MSM, but is typically found in the speech of people from Hong Kong and Taiwan.
including Beijing Local Mandarin, Taiwan Mandarin and Hong Kong Cantonese. According to Zhang, this variety of Mandarin projects an image of a cosmopolitan, urbane, sophisticated person, and it is used in a new linguistic market that has emerged as a result of China’s participation in the transnational Chinese market and the global economy (Q. Zhang, 2005, pp. 450-451, 462). Zhang sees this new sociolect as the linguistic reflection of a transnational Chinese identity. To be more precise, it is assumed that a new transnational Chinese identity is emerging (K. Liu, 2004; Nonini, 1997; Ong, 1997; Ong & Nonini, 1997; M. M.-H. Yang, 1997) and hypothesised that this finds linguistic expression in the particular language variety denoted “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” (cf. Q. Zhang, 2005, 2006).

Interestingly, another difference not explicitly investigated by Zhang but nevertheless noted by her was more frequent use of code-switching amongst the employees of foreign-owned enterprises. This opens up the possibility that a more detailed analysis of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” might reveal additional clearly definable linguistic features. This could, for instance, include – besides lexical items borrowed from Taiwan and Hong Kong usage – lexical borrowings from English and other languages (notably Japanese), as well as a range of distinctive morpho-syntactic features.

13 The reader may wish to refer to Bourdieu’s (1991) model of negotiating profit and loss in a linguistic market (cf. also Bourdieu, 1977; Huffines, 1980; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

14 In the current environment of economic and cultural globalisation, the Chinese diaspora has started to play an increasingly important role in trade, finance, culture and social networking. It is against this background of strengthening economic and cultural ties that a transnational Chinese identity has begun to emerge (K. Liu, 2004; Ong & Nonini, 1997). There are a number of factors behind the recent development of a transnational Chinese identity. Firstly, popular culture and the media have played a significant role. The proliferation of television shows, films and pop music throughout the Chinese-speaking world, as well as easy accessibility to Internet blogs and chat rooms have made it possible for a sense of a new Chinese identity that transcends old administrative, political and geographical borders to evolve (cf. K. Liu, 2004; M. M.-H. Yang, 1997). Secondly, business and trade links have also made an important contribution to building up and consolidating networks around the Chinese diaspora. These economic ties now bind all corners of the Pacific Rim with each other (Ong & Nonini, 1997). Thirdly, a significant jump in emigration in recent years, particularly from Mainland China, has led to an increase not only in the number of Chinese people living abroad but also in the number of residents of Mainland China with friends or relatives overseas. Thus, the level of personal contact between and identification with various Chinese-speaking communities around the globe has also intensified (cf. M. M.-H. Yang, 1997). Fourthly, although the present author has not come across this factor in the literature, it is possible that international students may also have had a part to play. The fact that students are leaving Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong in droves to study overseas (particularly in North America and Australia) has not only increased contact amongst Chinese-speaking people around the diaspora, it may also have encouraged the evolution of a broader sense of “Chineseness” in contrast to the “locals” in each area.

15 The examples of “code-switching” listed by Zhang (2006) include business world, integration, Mandarin, overseas Chinese, communicate and education. It is not clear from the information provided whether these are in fact all examples of code-switching or whether it would be more accurate to classify some as established loanwords or ad hoc borrowings. In view of the general tendency in Chinese linguistics to apply the term “code-switching” more broadly than in western linguistics, the latter is a distinct possibility.
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Zhang’s analysis seems also to be relevant to the situation with the three morpho-syntactic features investigated in this study in the context of chat show data, especially in view of the variation in grammaticality judgements and interpretations seen with respect to the use of the copula *shi* (refer to section 7.2.2.4 below). The variety of Mandarin referred to by Zhang (2005, 2006) as “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” has been described primarily in terms of several phonological features. However, there is no reason to suspect that a sociolect like “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” would not also be able to be characterised in terms of other linguistic features. Theoretically at least, one assumes that it should be possible for certain morpho-syntactic features to be associated with “linguistic capital”. If that premise were taken as a starting point for further research into the defining characteristics of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin”, then it may well be a profitable exercise to investigate the use of the morpho-syntactic features studied in this thesis to see if they demonstrate similar profiles of variation to the phonological features studied by Zhang (2005, 2006) and to see if they likewise qualify as defining features of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin”. Many of the guests in the episodes of the chat show ‘A Date with Luyu’ contained in the present corpus are mainland Chinese celebrities who are similar to the “waiqi professionals” in Zhang’s (2005, 2006) study in that a) they are in frequent and/or long-term contact with speakers of other Chinese varieties; and b) they are likely to view the projection of a “sophisticated”, “cosmopolitan”, “transnational Chinese” image as advantageous for their career prospects.

It behoves us to question what cultural, historic or sociolinguistic factors might facilitate the evolution of a transnational form of spoken Chinese. One possibility is that traditionally, standard spoken Chinese (whether referred to as *Guanhua*, *Guoyu* or *Putonghua*) has been viewed in the first instance as a lingua franca. It has not been associated with such high prestige or held in such high regard as the spoken standard in France or the United Kingdom, for example, and has traditionally not been “necessary for upward social mobility and access to elite status” (Q. Zhang, 2006, p. 226). Because the standing of MSM is not as established as that of other spoken standards, depending as it does on only one facet (i.e. common communication) of what is usually a multifaceted claim to linguistic superiority, it may be more susceptible – at least in some linguistic markets – to rivalry from other varieties of Chinese vying with MSM for status and prestige. Moreover, the evolution of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” has no doubt been facilitated by the fact that MSM has in recent times come into increased contact not only with other dialects of Mandarin, including non-mainland dialects,
but also with other languages, most notably English (Q. Zhang, 2006, p. 216) (refer also to section 7.2.3.2 below).

7.2.2.4. **Indications of linguistic variation in the present study**

Linguistic variation within the speech community in the use of the morpho-syntactic variables investigated in this study was probably most obvious in the case of the copula *shi*. There were also some indications of variation with regard to the use of the passive marker *bei*. The corpus data were less suggestive of variation in the use of the plural suffix *men*.¹⁶

The first point to be made with respect to language variation involving the specific morphemes under discussion here is that it seems that a number of the speech examples presented in the data analysis chapters featuring the copula *shi* and the passive marker *bei* may elicit quite disparate grammaticality judgements within the Mandarin Chinese speech community. Indeed, there is reason to suspect that while many of the sentences from the corpus containing *shi* and *bei* used in constructions of interest to this research project clearly are considered grammatical by some native speakers (otherwise they would presumably not appear with such frequency in the corpus), they may be deemed ungrammatical or infelicitous by others.¹⁷ For the purposes of elucidation and easy reference, two examples from chapter 6, both demonstrating the use of the copula with a predicative adjective, are here given again.¹⁸

(63) 一开始我就先找他吧，因为这个男主角是最重要的，你真的要他舒服……

*Liu Weiqiang, 13/05/2011*

Yi kaishi wo jiu xian zhao ta ba, yinwei zhe ge nan-zhujiao shi *hen* zhongyao, ni zhende yao ta shufu ...  
As soon as start 1SG then first look for 3SG MP, because DEM CL male-lead COP very important, 2SG really want 3SG comfortable ...

‘So right at the beginning I approached him first, because the male lead is important. You really have to make him feel comfortable ...’

¹⁶ For a feature to qualify as a linguistic variable, it must have at least two variants. In the case of the three morpho-syntactic variables investigated in this research, where there were suggestions of variation, it is generally assumed that the two possibilities were the variant named (*men, bei* or *shi*) and the null variant. That is, the morpho-syntactic variables could in many cases be realised as the particular morpheme under discussion or be omitted from the utterance altogether.

¹⁷ This suspicion was confirmed in informal discussions with a number of native speakers of Mandarin Chinese.

¹⁸ These two sentences appeared as speech examples (47) and (48) in chapter 6.
Some speakers may judge one or both of these to be ill-formed in the context in which they occurred, whereas others may find them both acceptable. In other words, opinions may well be divided as to the grammaticality of the utterances. Two more examples from chapter 6, this time demonstrating the use of shi in conjunction with the locative preposition zai, are likewise presented again for the reader.\(^{19}\)

\[(64)\quad \because \text{因为我控制欲跟掌控性 是很强，那个时候了，就是会疑神疑鬼的……} \quad (\text{Liu Qian, 13/06/2011})
\]

\[\ldots \text{ because 1SG control-desire and dominate-nature COP very strong, DEM CL time CS, just COP used.to suspect-spirit-suspect-ghost NOM } \]

\[\ldots \text{ ‘Because my desire for domination and control was quite strong, back then,}
\]

\[\text{and I used to be over-suspicious …’} \]

\[(65)\quad \text{随后双峰塔倒塌之后，我当时本身是在一楼之隔的美国证券交易所，当时整个楼里是乌烟瘴气……} \quad (\text{Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011})
\]

\[\text{Soon.afterwards double-peak-tower collapse ATT after, 1SG at.that.time myself COP LOC one building ATT separation ATT America}
\]

\[\text{stock-exchange, at.that.time entire CL building-in COP black-smoke-thick-air } \]

\[\text{‘Soon afterwards, after the Twin Towers collapsed, at that time I myself was in the US Stock Exchange two doors away, at that time the atmosphere in the whole building was absolutely foul …’} \]

\[(66)\quad \ldots \text{可能你会在这里她是在那边跟她的朋友讲，你没有看到那个，那个谁阿祥，罗志祥他发生那种事情怎么会这样啊……} \quad (\text{Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011})
\]

\[\ldots \text{ ‘Perhaps while you were here she was over there talking to her friend, “Didn’t you see that, that what this name A-xiang, Luo Zhixiang, he did such-and-such, how could he do that?” …’} \]

\(^{19}\) These two sentences appeared as speech examples (58) and (59) in chapter 6.
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Sentence (66) is likely to be quite controversial, with some readers possibly deeming the utterance with shi ungrammatical, infelicitous or otherwise non-standard, and others considering the inclusion of shi correct, perhaps even preferable to its omission. Some may feel that the contrast between zheli ‘here’ and nabian ‘there’ is so immediate and so striking that it calls for the use of an explicit contrastive marker. Others may find the use of shi in this instance redundant precisely because the contrast is already so obvious, or they may be uncomfortable with the use of the morpheme in question to highlight this particular grammatical element (a place adverbial), especially such a short and non-specific one. Taking sentence (65) as a point of comparison, Meiguo zhengquan-jiaoyisuo ‘the US Stock Exchange’, while also a place adverbial, is of course much more specific and content-heavy than nabian ‘there’.

Turning to the use of the passive marker bei, it appears that certain uses of bei that occurred reasonably frequently in the corpus data might nevertheless, in the view of some native speakers, be of questionable grammaticality. These include the use of the passive marker in conjunction with inanimate agents and with the durative marker zhe. Both of these constructions are demonstrated in the following utterances (67) and (68), which are a replication for the reader’s convenience of three examples taken from chapter 5.20

(67) 小陈就这样被希望和失望交织折磨着。 (Chen Luyu, 31/05/2011)
Xiao Chen jiu zhe yang bei xiwang he shiwang jiaozhi zhemo-zhe.
‘So Xiao Chen was tormented by hope and despair.’

(68) 从小到大一直就是被爱包围着。 (Liu Fengzhi, 22/03/2011)
Cong xiao dao da yizhi jiushi bei ai baowei-zhe.
‘I was always surrounded by love from the time I was little.’

The corpus data used for this particular study were less revealing when it came to the question of variation in the use of the plural suffix men. When previous research is taken into account, however, there are indications of variation in the use of that morpheme as well. This is especially the case with respect to a number of sentences cited by (Shi & Zhu, 2000, p. 202), who found examples of the plural suffix appended to nouns denoting non-human

20 These three sentences appeared as speech examples (29) and (37) in chapter 5.
entities and even inanimate objects. It is unlikely that the majority of native speakers would be comfortable with this usage.

The not insignificant number of utterances like the seven speech examples above in the present corpus, coupled with relevant examples taken from the literature, point to the likelihood of a certain level of acceptance amongst the Mandarin speech community of such structures as grammatical. Nevertheless, there is reason to suspect that a few – or even many – speakers may consider some of the structures investigated here infelicitous. This is a strong indication of language variation within the speech community with respect to the use of these morpho-syntactic features. Whether this variation correlates most closely with geographic region, age, sex, socioeconomic status, register or some other factor(s) is a matter for further investigation.

The second point is that many of the corpus examples of the use of the copula *shi*, including many of those cited in chapter 6, are open to a range of interpretations. In sentences like (63) or (64) above, for instance, some speakers may interpret *shi* as performing a role similar to the English copula in simply linking a predicative adjective to the noun phrase to which it refers; others may interpret *shi* as highlighting the particular adjective chosen in contrast to a range of other possible adjectives that might have been selected to fill that position; and still others may interpret *shi* as behaving – or at least as trying to behave, or being supposed to behave – in the manner of a so-called “marker of special affirmation”, as described in traditional grammar analyses.

The fact that the function of the copula is open to so many different interpretations implies that the use of *shi* in the structures examined in the data analysis may vary significantly from speaker to speaker. The ambiguity apparent from the data also suggests that the use of *shi* in some contexts and/or with some functions may not be particularly stable.

---

21 As intimated above, these suspicions were confirmed in informal conversations with a number of native speakers of Mandarin Chinese.

22 Once again, the range of different interpretations available to the listener was confirmed in informal discussions with native speakers of Mandarin Chinese.
Overall, the picture is one of variation in grammaticality judgements, variation in interpretation and presumably also variation in usage.\textsuperscript{23} This suggests that Mandarin Chinese is in a state of flux with respect to the use of the copula *shi*, the passive marker *bei* and the plural suffix *men*. In view of the close correlation between language variation and language change (refer also to discussion in section 7.2.2.5 below), one can surmise that there is a possibility that we are witnessing language change in progress. And of course, this is precisely what a number of Chinese linguists have claimed, particularly in the cases of *bei* and *men*. The observation that the use of the passive marker *bei* and the plural suffix *men* is increasing in frequency has been made repeatedly in the literature. Moreover, a number of qualitative changes with respect to both morphemes have been pointed out, such as the fact that the passive marker is being used more frequently with non-adverse verbs and the plural suffix is occasionally appended to non-human nouns.

Given that a certain amount of language variation is discernible with respect to the use of the three morpho-syntactic features investigated in this thesis, then it is worth asking (as intimated above) what factors might play a role in determining the pattern of variation across the speech community. One possibility that has been touched on before in this thesis is that of regional variation in usage (cf. sections 6.2.1 and 7.2.2.3). To cite just one example, there seems to be some indication of geographical region playing a role both in speakers’ tolerance of the structure [NP COP HEN Adj] (as illustrated in examples (63) and (64) above) and in their interpretation of the function of the copula in this structure. To be specific, the usage most unequivocally at variance with the standard analysis appears to be more common in the speech of people from Hong Kong and Taiwan. This is supported both by the corpus data, which provide numerous such speech examples uttered by interviewees from these two regions, and by the author’s own observations over a number of years.\textsuperscript{24} Working on the widely accepted hypothesis that synchronic variation often reflects diachronic change (refer also to discussion in section 7.2.2.5 below), this suggests that innovative use of the copula *shi* may currently be in the process of spreading from Hong Kong and Taiwan to mainland China. Although geographical region perhaps plays a less obvious role in the grammaticality

\textsuperscript{23} The assumption of variation in usage was likewise confirmed in informal discussions with native speaker informants, some of whom stated that they themselves would be likely to use the structures in question, while others stated they would not.

\textsuperscript{24} It was also supported by unsolicited comments from native speakers consulted about the speech examples.
judgements and interpretations of most of the other structures investigated here, it should not be overlooked as a potential factor in any discussion of this kind.

It goes without saying that Mandarin Chinese, spoken as it is over a very wide geographic area stretching from Harbin in the north-east across 5000km of lush forests and arid deserts, rocky mountains and grassy plains to Kunming in the south-west, as well as in some economically, politically and technologically quite disparate regions outside mainland China, displays a significant amount of linguistic variation in its various spoken forms. To what extent this geographic (i.e. dialectal) variation is stable and to what extent increased contact between different varieties of Mandarin Chinese may be a factor contributing to language change, is difficult to determine precisely. As a first step, more research is required before one can say with a degree of certainty backed by statistical evidence whether or not the use of the three morpho-syntactic features investigated in this study shows geographic variation.

7.2.2.5. The diachronic implications of synchronic variation

Before discussing in section 0 the phenomenon of language contact and how it relates to the findings of the present study as presented in chapters 4 to 6, this section examines briefly the relationship between linguistic variation and language change.

Sapir (1921) recognised in the early twentieth century that all linguistic change has its origins in synchronic variation (cf. Aitchison, 2001, p. 84; Bynon, 1977, p. 4; Jones & Singh, 2005, p. 26). This does not mean that variation leads inexorably to change; it does, however, provide an environment which is conducive to change (Aitchison, 2001, p. 99). That is, variation is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for change (Bynon, 1977, p. 199).

The literature on linguistic variation distinguishes between two different types of language change. Changes from above are those of which speakers are consciously aware and therefore tend to involve prestigious forms. Variation of this kind usually correlates both with register and with social factors (most typically class and sex); such variables are known as “markers”. Changes from below, on the other hand, occur at a subconscious level. These variables, known as “indicators”, show no correlation with register but only with social factors.

---

25 This is particularly true of stylistic variation, which can exist for generations without entailing language change (Aitchison, 2001, p. 90).
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(McMahon, 1994, pp. 244-245). The distribution of markers and indicators is depicted graphically below (after McMahon, 1994, p. 245).

Figure 3: Distribution of indicators across socioeconomic classes

Figure 4: Distribution of markers across socioeconomic classes
The graph of indicators shows four horizontal lines across different styles for the four class divisions upper middle class (UMC), lower middle class (LMC), upper working class (UWC) and lower working class (LWC). The graph of markers shows four rising lines across different styles for the four class divisions UMC, LMC, UWC and LWC, potentially with the trajectory of the LMC line rising so steeply at the formal end of the graph that it may even overtake the UMC line.

Language change is more often via markers than indicators (McMahon, 1994, p. 245). Should an indicator start to spread, it will often attract attention and thereby incur stigmatisation (assuming it is a lower class variant). Conscious awareness then generally halts and reverses the incipient popularisation of the variant (McMahon, 1994, pp. 245-246).

Conscious change, motivated as it is by overt prestige, tends to move towards the standard and is typically led by LMC female speakers. It results in variation both across classes and across styles, such that the formal speech of all classes is similar to UMC speech, with LMC speakers typically manifesting the greatest range of the variable in question (Aitchison, 2001). Unconscious change, which is motivated by covert prestige, tends to move away from the standard and is typically led by WC males. It usually results in variation across classes without concurrent stylistic variation (Aitchison, 2001).

Thus it can be seen that there is a close correlation between conscious and unconscious change on the one hand and overt and covert prestige on the other. Overt prestige exerts pressure that may result in changes from above; markers correlate both with register and with demographic factors (age, sex, class, etc.). Covert prestige, on the other hand, is a factor leading to changes from below; indicators correlate only with demographic factors. This helps explain how linguistic variation is often a reflection of language change in progress.

7.2.3. Language contact

One important catalyst for the process of language change is contact with other languages. Indeed, it is surely no exaggeration to say that “[t]here are no fully unmixed languages”

26 Note that this is a tendency rather than a law. For example, Cheshire’s (1982) study of morphological variation in Reading, in particular of the occurrence of the non-standard -s ending on verbs, did show stylistic variation.
Chinese is no exception: in the course of its long history Chinese has come into contact with numerous other languages and has been influenced considerably by these (Jiang, 1999; Kubler, 1985b; Norman, 1988; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b) (cf. also observations in sections 0 and 3.3 and various subsections thereof relating to contact-induced morpho-syntactic change).

Two languages are said to be in contact with one another insofar as they exist simultaneously in the grammars of individual speakers (Kubler, 1985a, pp. 19-20; Sankoff, 2002; after Weinreich, 1953). In other words, the prerequisite for language contact is a degree of bilingualism, the corollary of this being that the arena in which language contact occurs is in the mind or grammar of the bilingual speaker. Bilingualism, in turn, is defined as “the co-existence within a single speaker’s competence of more than a single grammar” (Bynon, 1977, p. 172). Bilingualism ranges from knowledge of one word to native-speaker competence in both languages. As a general rule, the more bilingual speakers and the better their competence, the more linguistic transference will take place (McMahon, 1994).

7.2.3.1. Explanatory value of language contact

In the Neogrammarian, Structuralist and Generative schools, internally motivated change was of primary interest and was considered more important than externally motivated change (Jones & Singh, 2005, p. 3). However, externally motivated changes now play an increasingly important role in modern research into historical linguistics (Jones & Singh, 2005, p. 3).

Language contact, although only one of a range of possible factors contributing to language change, has for some time been an important field in its own right. One of the earliest significant researchers in the field of language contact was Weinreich, whose 1953 publication Languages in contact: Findings and problems was the first major publication in the field and is still considered a standard work in this area. However, for two or three decades after Weinreich, very little progress was made in the area of contact linguistics (Mühlhäuserl, 1985). It was not until the 1970s and 1980s that language contact as a separate branch of linguistics first began to attract widespread interest, a development that was linked

---

to the rise of the social sciences (Nelde, 2002, p. 235). Indeed, there is today an abundance of literature on the general topic of contact-induced language change.

Although modern researchers into language contact no longer advocate a Darwinist analysis, contact linguists for a long time held the view that a contact situation favours the survival of the “fittest” language – or the “fittest” feature, form or structure (Mühlhäusler, 1985). In a possibly related approach, traditionally language change was explained as the optimisation of rational communication goals, by, for example, maximising the communication radius or simplifying the learning process (cf. Boretzky, 1991, pp. 3-5; Lüdtke, 1980, p. 5). Working from this assumption, earlier theories of contact-induced language change were concerned primarily with determining a range of borrowing restrictions (cf. Aitchison, 1995, p. 1; Bickerton, 1981, p. 50; Weinreich, 1974, pp. 43-44). For several decades it was, for example, a matter of controversy whether morpho-syntactic features could be transferred at all (Heine & Kuteva, 2005; Kubler, 1985b). Weinreich (1953) himself had claimed that transference could occur only if the structure of the feature borrowed from the source language was compatible with structures in the recipient language. The renowned Chinese linguist Wang Li seemed also to subscribe to this belief (1984[1943]-b, p. 435).

Thomason and Kaufman (1988), whose work Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics has been described as “important and influential” (Sankoff, 2002, p. 640), achieved a breakthrough in this field of research by demonstrating with the use of numerous substantiated examples what Bynon (1977) had suspected a decade previously, namely that any linguistic feature of a language can be transferred to another language. In fact, it has since been shown that the effects of language contact manifest themselves not only in the areas of phonology, lexicon, morphology and syntax, but also in pragmatics, discourse and style (Nelde, 2002, p. 326). It is now generally acknowledged that “given a certain intensity and duration of language contact, there is nothing that may not be diffused across language boundaries” (Bynon, 1977, pp. 255-256) (cf. Aitchison, 2001, p. 140).

Thus, most modern contact linguists look askance on hypotheses of borrowing restrictions, sometimes citing the example of Ma’a, a Cushitic language which has adopted the entire noun and verb morphology of its neighbouring Bantu languages (e.g. Aitchison, 2001, pp. 28

28 See also Meillet (1921), cited in Thomason (1986, p. 261).
A number of linguists have come to the conclusion that while there seem to be no linguistic features which are completely immune to contact-induced substitution, the area that has generally proven most resistant to linguistic transference has been the basic vocabulary referring to essential human activities and needs (Bynon, 1977, p. 256; Hock & Joseph, 1996; McMahon, 1994, p. 204; cf. Whitney, 1971[1867], pp. 62-63). By contrast, most languages readily borrow abstract or specialised terminology, often technical vocabulary, as well as words for new cultural artefacts (Hock and Joseph 1996:258; cf. Whitney 1971[1867]:62). The relative susceptibility of various aspects of language to linguistic transference is explored in more detail in section 7.2.3.4 below.

With reference specifically to the Chinese situation, throughout the twentieth century and into the present era language contact has been recognised by Chinese linguists as an important factor in, if not the primary catalyst for language change (cf. Hu, 2006) (see also discussion of various morpho-syntactic features in subsections of 0 and 3.3). In fact, the majority of the articles consulted on the subject of Chinese language change cited language contact as one factor, if not the main factor contributing to linguistic developments in Chinese. It seems to be widely accepted in Chinese linguistic circles that European languages, in particular English, have exerted a tremendous influence on modern Mandarin Chinese language use, especially in the lexicon (e.g. C. Chen, 2005; Y. Gao, 2002; Jiang, 1999; H. Wang, Wu, Du, & Zheng, 2004; Y. Wang & Li, 2003; H. Zhou, 1999). Others have emphasised the influence of English and other European languages on Mandarin Chinese grammar (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Ye He, 2004; Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b; Xie, 2001), while yet others have highlighted the influence of English on both the lexicon and the morpho-syntax of Modern Standard Chinese (e.g. H. Guo, 2002a, 2002b; D. Wu, 2001). Moreover, it is widely recognised that other varieties of Chinese have exerted and continue to exert an influence on Mainland Standard Mandarin. This is a result of increased economic, trade, social and cultural ties between mainland China and other Chinese communities, and is made easier by modern technology, especially satellite TV and the Internet (Q. Zhang, 2006, p. 218).

29 Hock and Joseph (1996) list the following examples of basic vocabulary: eat, sleep, sun, moon, do, have, be, this, that, the, and, if, when. Whitney (1971[1867], pp. 61-63) clearly considers numbers less than ten, personal pronouns and close kinship terms to be core elements of a language’s lexical nucleus.
7.2.3.2. Types of language contact situations

The literature refers to many different types of contact situations (cf. Bynon, 1977, p. 216), the most superficial of which is probably trading situations, where only the few people directly involved in import and export know only a few words of the language of their trading partners, these consisting primarily of the names of the particular products being traded. The other end of the spectrum is occupied by bilingual (or multilingual) communities with complex and intimate social and cultural networks, all of whose members speak at least two languages fluently and use these languages more or less interchangeably in a wide range of everyday interactions. These include work, home, school, leisure activities, shopping etc. – although the home language is more likely to be non-negotiable. Language contact situations also cover colonial contact, immigrant communities in a new country and situations of diglossia, where two languages or dialects coexist with clearly demarcated functions and/or different spheres of use in everyday life.

In addition, a few important distinctions are made in the terminology used to discuss language contact situations. One is the distinction between extensive bilingualism and intensive bilingualism. The former refers to the number of speakers affected, while the latter refers to the number of language functions affected. That is, a speech community is said to be extensively bilingual if more or less every member has a command of both languages, while an intensively bilingual speech community is one in which L2 is used for most everyday functions.

Another important distinction is that between adstratum, substratum and superstratum. In fact, these terms have been used with slightly different definitions in the literature. It was decided in the context of this study to employ the definitions that appear to be most relevant to the Chinese situation. In this thesis, substratum is understood to refer to an L2 in a language contact situation that is less prestigious than the L1, while a superstratum enjoys higher prestige. An adstratum is thus a language of similar prestige. These distinctions are relevant to the discussion of different types of linguistic transference (see section 7.2.3.3 below).

7.2.3.3. Borrowing vs. interference

Sarah Thomason and Terrence Kaufman (1988) provided a detailed analysis of the process of contact-induced language change in their work *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic*
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*Linguistics*. Thomason (2001) developed these ideas further in her later work *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Amongst their major contributions (cf. Sankoff, 2002) is the realisation that it is not linguistic, but rather social factors that largely determine the direction and process of contact-induced language change; that is, there is a strong correlation between the extent of linguistic transference and the level of pressure exerted by one language on the other. Another important insight of theirs (cf. Sankoff, 2002) is that contact-induced language change covers two quite distinct processes: borrowing and interference. Other linguists since have made a similar distinction (e.g. Aitchison, 2001; Johanson, 2002).  

According to this widely accepted classification, borrowing occurs when a speech community retains its own language but gradually adopts various features of another language. When, on the other hand, the native speakers of language A lose their own native language and adopt a new language B, then interference, or substratum transference in language B can result. This phenomenon typically occurs when the number of native speakers of A significantly outweighs the number of native speakers of B, so that the linguistic imperfections (pronunciation, sentence structure etc.) in the learning of language B amongst the native speakers of A are transferred to the whole speech community, including the original native speakers of B.

A relevant consideration here is the relative prestige of the two languages in question. In a language contact situation characterised by extensive borrowing, linguistic features are often borrowed from a superstratum language, that is, a language with higher prestige. An example of this is the lexical borrowing from English (a high prestige language) by a large number of the world’s languages. Interference, on the other hand, more often describes a situation in which one language is influenced by another lower prestige or substratum language. Thus, for example, the unique features of Indian English are the result of phonological and syntactic interference from Hindi and other Indian languages that is evident even in the speech of those Indians whose first language or mother tongue is English. The distinction can be elucidated nicely with reference to the language contact situation in Taiwan, where both processes,

---

30 Note that the same distinction has not been made by all contact linguists, nor has the same terminology been used even where the distinction has been made. (For example, Aitchison (2001) distinguishes between borrowing and substratum transference, while Johanson (2002) distinguishes between adoption and imposition.) The term interference, in particular, has been understood to apply to a wide range of different phenomena. Weinreich (1953), for example, uses “interference” to refer to any transfer from one language to another.
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borrowing and interference, are occurring simultaneously. The influence of southern Min on Taiwan Local Mandarin is categorised as interference, while linguistic developments in both Taiwan Local Mandarin and Taiwan Standard Mandarin that have their origin in English or Japanese are borrowing phenomena.

Clearly, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors play an important role in contact-induced language change (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). Three motivations for linguistic borrowing have been highlighted: need, social pressure and expressive power (Hock & Joseph, 1996; McMahon, 1994). The first of these refers to the need for a means of expressing new objects and concepts, most typically of a cultural or technological nature; the second refers to prestige; while the third refers to replacing an obsolete or inexpressive autochthonous word (cf. Hock & Joseph, 1996; McMahon, 1994). In a similar analysis, Heine and Kuteva (2005) isolate after Johanson (2002) two main factors influencing linguistic transference: the relative attractiveness and the relative social pressure of the linguistic variants in question. They claim that either may provide a sufficient reason for language change on its own, or both may operate together (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). Although social pressure presumably refers to prestige, it is not entirely clear from their discussion what exactly is meant by “attractiveness”. Nevertheless, in the context of the broader literature on the subject it is not unreasonable to interpret the term as referring to the ability of the transferred feature to satisfy a cultural or technological need, or to improve the expressive power of the L1. The term could also be understood to refer to some qualities of the borrowed linguistic variant enabling it to be readily adopted for language-internal reasons, which would relate to Aitchison’s (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 143-145) observation that structures bearing some similarity to already existing features are more easily transferred.

By contrast, interference has in the past generally been held to be the result of imperfect language learning, affecting probably most noticeably the phonology, but also the lexicon (as when, for example, lexical items are assigned an “incorrect” semantic value or so-called “false friends” are equated with each other), morpho-syntax, pragmatics and possibly other areas. However, it is worth mentioning that some linguists (e.g. Heine & Kuteva, 2005) object to the use of terms such as “imperfect language learning”, “interference”, “simplification”, “overgeneralisation” etc. because such terms denigrate speakers’ language use, when in fact, as they point out, linguistic transference is often a creative process (cf. Cook, in press).
To sum up, the following factors can all play a role in linguistic transference (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 35): the sociolinguistic setting, the structure of L1, the structure of L2, the cultural values of L1 and L2 speakers, the communicative needs of the speakers and the creative use of language. In general, linguistic transference does not cause a dramatic disruption to the fundamental nature of a language; rather, borrowed features often fit in with language-internal pressures for change and are less likely to stimulate entirely new developments than to accelerate those already in progress (Aitchison, 2001, p. 145).

7.2.3.4. Linguistic transference scales

It has often been remarked that although any component or feature of a language can undergo change as a result of contact with other languages, some features seem inherently more likely to respond to external influence than others (e.g. McMahon, 1994, p. 209). This section looks at a number of investigations into the susceptibility of various linguistic elements to contact-induced transference and attempts to draw them into a cohesive whole. The type and extent of linguistic influence depends to a large degree on the type of contact situation, its duration, intensity, socio-political and cultural setting (cf. Jones & Singh, 2005, p. 30). Other factors, such as the genetic relationship and typological similarity of the languages in contact, may also play a role. Many previous studies have searched for patterns, general or specific, revealed in the data: the aim of this section is to summarise these trends.

As a general rule, it has often been observed that contact-induced language change manifests itself primarily in the lexicon and the phonology, and that these two linguistic components are susceptible to foreign influence even if only a small proportion of speakers are bilingual (cf. Bynon, 1977, p. 216; McMahon, 1994, p. 209; Sankoff, 2002; Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, pp. 74-75). Under conditions of sufficiently intensive and extensive language contact, transference of syntactic features may result (cf. Bynon, 1977, pp. 239-241; Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, pp. 74-75; Wilkins, 1996). There seems to be a degree of uncertainty in the literature as to the level of susceptibility of the morphology to linguistic transference, with some scholars placing it between the phonology and the syntax (e.g. Bynon, 1977, pp. 239-241; McMahon, 1994, p. 209) and others ranking it last (e.g. Hock & Joseph, 1996; Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, pp. 74-75). This lack of consensus may be due in part to insufficient care taken in distinguishing between different types of contact situations, in particular between borrowing and substratum interference (refer to discussion in section 7.2.3.3 above). It may also be due
in part to a failure to make a clear distinction between derivational and inflexional morphology. Amongst those scholars who have made this distinction, the one morphological tendency upon which most contact linguists who have proposed universal borrowing scales are able to agree is that derivational morphology is more readily transferred than inflexional morphology (e.g. Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Whitney, 1971[1882]; Wilkins, 1996).

As one can see, previous research shows “that in situations of contact, linguistic constituents characterised by structural autonomy and/or referential stability are more likely to be affected by contact than structurally dependent and/or referentially less stable constituents” (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 8). This rather neatly formulated general principle helps to explain not only the relative susceptibility to linguistic transference of the major linguistic components of lexicon, phonology, syntax and morphology but also the oft-cited preference for borrowing content words over function words and even for borrowing nouns before verbs or adjectives.

An early attempt to categorise or predict which elements of language were more or less likely to participate in linguistic transference was made by Weinreich (1953). Because Weinreich did not distinguish between borrowing and interference, his generalised observations could, in fact, be taken to apply to either situation. More recent analyses of linguistic transference have tended to distinguish between the two processes (see also discussion in section 7.2.3.3 above), as it has been found that the sequence of language change in contact situations involving borrowing is different from those characterised by substratum transference. Generally speaking, the effects of borrowing are more consistent across different contact situations than the effects of substratum transference, which can vary considerably (Aitchison, 2001, p. 141). Nor is it always easy to differentiate between borrowing and interference in retrospect, especially in the case of bilingual children, who tend to mix both processes (Aitchison, 2001, p. 141).

Because of the potential relevance to observations in this study pertaining to the use of the three selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese, Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale is here clearly summarised and presented in point form. Thomason (2001) distinguishes four levels of borrowing, based on intensity of language contact and cultural pressure. This borrowing scale, a slightly modified version of the one proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988, pp. 74-75), is characterised by the following linguistic processes:
1. **Occasional contact**: only lexical borrowing – content words, usually not basic vocabulary.

2. **Slightly intensive contact**: slight structural borrowing – for instance in the lexicon function words like conjunctions and particles; in the phonology new phonemes adopted in loan words; in the syntax less important structures with new functions copied, as well as word order rules that do not result in any typological changes in L1.

3. **Quite intensive contact**: larger structural borrowings – for instance in the lexicon function words like pronouns and adpositions; in the morphology derivational affixes, as well as new inflexional affixes (adopted with loan words); in the phonology allophones from the contact language are phonemised, prosody and syllable structure adopted; in the syntax further word order features copied.

4. **Very intensive contact**: strong morpho-syntactic borrowings that can result in a typological change in L1.

Despite certain points of general agreement within the field of contact linguistics, much remains to be determined. Heine and Kuteva (2005), for example, claim that grammatical replication has been largely overlooked in the literature on language contact and that this phenomenon is much more common that is generally acknowledged. Nor should the possibility be ignored that cross-linguistic generalisations as to the ease of transferability of linguistic elements may not necessarily hold true in all contact situations. It is always possible that the susceptibility of linguistic features to transference might be influenced by so many different factors, such as the genetic and structural (dis)similarity of the languages in contact, the sociolinguistic setting, speaker attitudes towards linguistic transference, language planning policies etc., that it might not be feasible to establish more than very general cross-linguistic tendencies. In fact, a number of contact linguists have conceded that the order in which linguistic transfer occurs is related to sociolinguistic factors (e.g. Mühlhäusler, 1985, p. 59; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988).

### 7.2.3.5. Structural transference

Because the focus of this research is on morpho-syntactic observations, in considering the effects of linguistic transference this section omits the phenomena of lexical and phonological transference (both very common in language contact situations) and concentrates instead on structural transference.

As mentioned above, many linguists believed for a long time that grammar was not significantly influenced by language contact and that it was subject only – or at least primarily – to internal pressures for change (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). Although a few linguists
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remain unconvinced that syntactic structures can be transferred from one language to another and favour other explanations, such as language universals, typological similarity and the interplay of internal and external factors, the majority of historical linguists accept that syntactic transference can occur as a result of language contact. By contrast, (Sankoff, 2002, p. 657) notes the “relative paucity of documented cases of contact-induced morphological change”. Interestingly, this contrasts somewhat with the assessment of many Chinese historical linguists, as discussed in chapter 3 particularly in reference to polysyllabism (cf. section 0), affixation (cf. section 3.2.1.2), aspect markers (cf. section 3.2.2.1) and the plural suffix *men* (cf. section 3.2.2.2).

Even within the realm of contact-induced syntactic change, discord reigns. Although syntactic change due to substratum interference is well established, the borrowing of syntactic features is still controversial (cf. Hock & Joseph, 1996, p. 4; Sankoff, 2002, p. 652). The dissenting voices interpret syntactic change in a borrowing situation as a “consequence of lexical or pragmatic interinfluence” (Sankoff, 2002, p. 652). Sankoff (2002) implies that contact-induced syntactic change is more likely to take place as a result of substrate influence than borrowing, and concludes that syntactic borrowing is rare.

Heine and Kuteva (2005), on the other hand, believe that some types of morphological and syntactic transference, or linguistic convergence, are far more common than has to date been recognised and that their neglect in the general literature may be due to the fact that they are not as obvious as some other types of linguistic transfer. They focus on a class of contact-induced linguistic phenomena which in the broader literature have been referred to as (or under) a number of different headings, including grammatical calquing, loan shift, syntactic interference and structural borrowing, and which they term grammatical replication, or replica grammaticalisation, and which they claim is possible even where languages have very different typologies and grammatical structures (Heine & Kuteva, 2005).\(^ {31}\) As with other kinds of linguistic transference, grammatical replication is most likely when both extensive and intensive bilingualism have obtained for an extended period (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 31) Further examples of other relevant terminology include congruence, code-switching, convergence, indirect morpho-syntactic diffusion and attrition (Heine & Kuteva, 2005).
The conspiracy of language-internal and language-external factors\(^{32}\) in almost every example of contact-induced grammaticalisation is acknowledged (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 243).

The main aim of Heine and Kuteva’s (2005) work is to show that grammatical meanings and structures can be transferred from one language to another and that this process is governed by universal principles of grammatical change. They suggest four possible explanations for a given grammaticalisation process, of which they refer to the last three as “contact-induced grammaticalisation” (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 32). Firstly, it may have arisen due to a universal strategy of grammaticalisation and would in that case be unrelated to language contact. Secondly, one language may have provided a model for a grammatical structure, which the other replicated. Thirdly, the process might be caused by a universal strategy of grammaticalisation but catalysed by exposure to an appropriate modelling language. Finally, the process might be due in the first instance to language contact but accelerated by universal grammaticalisation tendencies. Heine and Kuteva’s (2005) findings are particularly interesting in the present instance because of their apparent relevance for contact-induced morpho-syntactic change in Mandarin Chinese. The reader is referred to various subsections of 0 and 3.3, in particular those dealing with affixation (cf. section 3.2.1.2), conversion (cf. section 3.3.2) and grammaticalisation (cf. section 3.3.3), among others. Note that research into Chinese varieties other than Mainland Standard Mandarin has also revealed examples of grammatical replication induced by contact both with other varieties of Chinese and with non-Sinitic languages (Dede, 2007).

Heine and Kuteva (2005) highlight four characteristic processes in grammaticalisation: semantic extension, semantic bleaching, morpho-syntactic loss and phonetic reduction. They write that “[g]rammaticalisation is primarily a semantic process but ... it can also have remarkable mophosyntactic consequences” (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 158). It is cross-linguistically common for nouns to develop into adpositions, verbs into prepositions, verbs of certain semantic classes into future markers, prepositions into conjunctions etc. (Heine &

\(^{32}\) Language-internal factors here include cognitive and communicative needs, as well as universal grammaticalisation tendencies. Language-external factors refer to contact-induced transfer.
Some functional categories are more likely to develop than others: examples include new tense and aspect markers, adpositions, case markers, conjunctions, discourse markers and articles (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). It should be emphasised that grammaticalisation is 90% unidirectional; that is to say, developments in the other direction are not unheard of, but are very rare (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). The principle of directionality applies in contact situations too; for example, a language without articles is likely to gain them in contact with a language with articles, whereas a language with articles is unlikely to lose them in contact with a language without (Heine & Kuteva, 2005). Once again, this is relevant to the situation with Mandarin Chinese (cf. also section 3.3.3.2 on emergent articles).

It is worth emphasising that new patterns of use do not generally arise ex nihilo (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 45) (cf. repeated comments to this effect by Aitchison, 2001) and that much contact-induced language change makes use of existing linguistic structures but uses them more frequently and/or in novel ways (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 45). In their analysis of contact-induced grammaticalisation, Heine and Kuteva (2005) distinguish between minor use patterns and major use patterns. They point out that under conditions of language contact a structure of the former type can develop into the latter type; that is, an existing structure may start to occur more frequently, in new contexts, with a new (usually more generalised) meaning or possibly with a new grammatical function (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, pp. 65-67; cf. Kubler, 1985b). In the long term, the increased frequency of uncommon use patterns can have a morpho-syntactic impact on the structure of the replica language (Heine & Kuteva, 2005).

Another classification of interest is the so-called incipient grammatical category (cf. Heine & Kuteva, 2005). Heine and Kuteva (2005) list a number of characteristics of incipient categories. Firstly, the meaning is ambiguous: it could be the original denotation or the new meaning. Secondly, use of an incipient category is optional; that is, marking of the new grammatical meaning is not obligatory and therefore less frequent than in the model language. Further, it has the same morpho-syntactic and phonological characteristics as the source category. Finally, it has no official recognition as a grammatical class, especially not by purists, and is therefore not officially taught. Examples of incipient categories, all taken

33 Typically, de-volitive (‘want’), de-allative (‘go’) and de-ventitive (‘come’) verbs may develop into markers of future tense.
from Slavic languages that are geographically contiguous to German-speaking regions, include demonstratives used as definite articles, the numeral ‘one’ used as an indefinite article and the use of ‘have’ as a marker of the perfect aspect (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, pp. 71-74). It is worth noting that all of these have parallels in the overall picture of morpho-syntactic language change in Mandarin Chinese and are of particular interest in view of the fact that similar developments in Mandarin Chinese have been ascribed to the influence of English (cf. section 3.3.3.2 on emergent articles and section 2.1.5 on the difference between Taiwan Standard Mandarin and Mainland Standard Mandarin).

7.2.3.6. Indications of contact-induced language change in the present study

The literature on Modern Standard Chinese provides a wealth of material highlighting lexical, morphological, syntactic and, to a lesser extent, phonological developments that have been observed by previous researchers in recent decades and that are claimed by the various authors to be related in some way to language contact. The bulk of the literature concentrates on the written language, but there is also some material on changes in various spoken varieties of Chinese. Certainly, there can be no doubt that language change in Chinese over the past 30 years has been fast, one might even say dramatic, and that Chinese offers a fertile field for research in this area.

Thomason (2010, p. 34) has set out a number of steps in the process of identifying contact-induced language change. These include locating one or more shared linguistic features in the putative “donor” and “recipient” languages, as well as proving both the existence of said feature(s) in the donor language and the non-existence of said feature(s) in the recipient language prior to contact. Taking a slightly different approach, Heine and Kuteva (2005) propose two criteria for determining whether a given linguistic development is in fact contact-induced or not: 1) evidence of transfer, which implies knowledge of the language prior to contact, and 2) the impossibility of the innovation occurring without contact. Although this is more generous than Thomason’s analysis in that it does not exclude the possibility of language contact precipitating a change that does not directly mirror a form or structure in the model language, both approaches are nevertheless equally strict in apparently

34 See, for example, W. Chen (2005); Cook (2004, 2011, in press); H. Guo (2002a, 2002b); H. Guo and Zhou (2003); Ye He (2004); Jiang (1999); Jin (2005); Y. Liu (2001); Qu (2006); Shi and Zhu (2005); Q. Zhang (2005, 2006).
excluding developments that involve an alteration in the frequency of occurrence of a particular form or structure rather than the introduction of an entirely new feature. On the other hand, several linguists within the field of Chinese historical linguistics (Kirkpatrick, forthcoming; Kubler, 1985b) have emphasised the importance in ascertaining the effects of language contact of considering not only the existence or non-existence of a particular linguistic feature but also its relative frequency of use before and after contact. In the literature on Chinese language change, increases in the frequency of use of both the plural suffix *men* (Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a) and the passive marker *bei* (Chao, 1968, p. 803; P. Chen, 1999, p. 93; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; Loar, 2011, pp. 319-320; Norman, 1988, p. 165) have been attributed to the influence of English. Thus, if one adopts the prevailing view in Chinese historical linguistics, there is certainly possibility that contact with European languages, notably English, may have influenced the use of the three morpho-syntactic features studied here and contributed to the introduction and/or increase in frequency of a number of structures found in the corpus and documented in this thesis.

Several categories of syntactic change observed in Mandarin Chinese are cross-linguistically relatively common. These include conversion in all the forms described in chapter 3 – verbalisation (cf. section 3.3.2.1), adjecitivisation (cf. section 3.3.2.2) and nominalisation (cf. section 3.3.2.3) – and the emergence of new conjunctions (cf. section 3.3.3.1) and articles (cf. section 3.3.3.2) through a process of grammaticalisation. Even some of the developments noted with respect to the passive marker *bei* – the loss of restrictions pertaining to its use, as well as its further semantic bleaching and possible further grammaticalisation – are, from a cross-linguistic perspective, not atypical. There is a school of thought in historical linguistics that would on this basis recommend considering these developments to be primarily a result of universal linguistic processes, or language-internal pressures. On the other hand, some historical linguists might be inclined to view the changes as multi-causational, ascribing the underlying cause to a universal linguistic tendency but the immediate trigger to language contact (cf. also 7.2.4). Certainly, a number of publications in the field of Chinese language change have attributed many of the aforementioned syntactic developments at least in part to the influence of English. This subsection will focus on selected aspects of the observations presented in chapters 3 to 6 and highlight their relevance to theories of language change.

Previous studies (e.g. H. Guo & Zhou, 2003; Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a) have found evidence of the more frequent use of the plural suffix *men* in recent times; some of
these have claimed that this is the result of increased contact with European languages, in particular English. Clearly, this is a hypothetical possibility since morphological marking of plural number is in many European languages (including, of course, English) obligatory in all contexts and therefore much more frequent than in Mandarin Chinese. Meanwhile, the preponderance of occurrences of the plural marker *men* with *haizi* ‘child’, *pengyou* ‘friend’ and *tongxue* ‘classmate’ lends support to the lexical diffusion hypothesis (cf. section 4.3.3), at the same time also lending support to the hypothesis that the plural marker *men* often performs some of the functions of a diminutive suffix, including expressing intimacy, familiarity, affection and endearment (cf. section 4.2.4). Perhaps one can tentatively predict that the use of the plural marker *men* is likely to continue to spread by lexical diffusion and that it is likely, at least in the initial stages, to attach itself more readily to certain nouns in particular contexts where it is able simultaneously to indicate plural number and to perform one or more secondary roles, whether related to diminutive connotations (cf. section 4.2.4), information structure (cf. section 0) or semantic distinction (cf. section 4.2.6).

Many of the findings presented in chapter 5 related to observations that the passive marker *bei* appeared in the corpus data in a wider variety of semantic and/or structural contexts that those stipulated in the relevant grammar references. This could be interpreted as indirect support for the oft expressed finding in the literature on Chinese language change that the use of *bei* is becoming increasingly widespread. As mentioned above, the higher frequency of occurrence of passive constructions in Modern Standard Chinese, especially with *bei*, has been attributed to the influence of European languages, in particular English (Chao, 1968, p. 803; P. Chen, 1999, p. 93; C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981, pp. 496-497; Loar, 2011, pp. 319-320; Norman, 1988, p. 165). As it is well known that almost any English sentence in the active voice can be rewritten in the passive voice, this hypothesis is certainly feasible.

Turning now to findings presented in chapter 6, the apparent predilection for using the copula *shi* predicatively with adjectives expressing an intrinsic or permanent quality suggests a particular sequence or perhaps a mechanism by which language change may be taking place (cf. sections 6.2.1 and 6.3.2). It may be that this is an initial phase in the popularisation of a novel grammatical structure and that at some stage in the future the copula will expand its predicative usage to a wider range of adjectives. On the other hand, the Mandarin copula may, like the Spanish copula simply satisfy itself with intrinsic adjectives and not extend its dominion any further.
Another hypothesis that applies specifically to the use of the copula in conjunction with the locative is that the morpheme *shi* and the locative *zai* (whether in its capacity as a locative copula or in its capacity as a locative preposition) are lexicalising to form the single word *shi-zai* (cf. sections 6.2.2 and 6.3.3). In relation to the disyllabic combination under discussion, this hypothesis has one advantage over the preceding one. The lexicalisation hypothesis offers a potential explanation as to why there are also quite a few examples of *shi-zai* apparently functioning as a locative preposition (as opposed to a locative full verb) in the corpus (cf. section 6.2.2). In other words, if there is a disyllabic lexical item *shi-zai*, then it is apparently capable of functioning both as a locative copula (i.e. as a locative full verb) and as a locative preposition. It is a simple step from postulating the existence of a lexicalised form *shi-zai* that functions as a locative copula to postulating the role of the same lexicalised form as a locative preposition. In fact, from the perspective of standard texts on grammaticalisation and cross-linguistic comparison with relatively common paths of grammaticalisation, it is not at all surprising that a locative copula – in this case *shi-zai* – should grammaticalise to a locative preposition, especially in view of the fact that this is precisely the route followed by its predecessor, the humble monosyllabic *zai*.

To provide some evaluation of the extent to which the morpho-syntax of written Modern Standard Chinese has been influenced by English, we refer to a well-known borrowing scale from the literature on contact-induced language change (Thomason, 2001). Some new sentence structures in Mandarin Chinese show evidence of Thomason’s (2001) second level of borrowing, associated with “slightly more intensive language contact”, in that they affect word order rules that do not result in any typological changes in L1. These include postverbal adjuncts (cf. section 3.3.6.2), which are native to English and are found quite commonly in Hong Kong and Taiwan and increasingly also in mainland China.

35 If we suppose this hypothesis to be correct, then the most logical assumption with respect to the path of lexicalisation is that the lexicalised form *shi-zai* started to function first as a full verb before it came to be used as a preposition; however, this hypothesis can unfortunately not be tested solely on the basis of the current synchronic database.

36 Another example of level two borrowing – this one phonological, rather than morpho-syntactic – is the pronunciation of English loanwords in spoken Mandarin. The question of whether there are any new phonemes or phonemic combinations (such as consonant clusters and new C-V or V-C combinations) in loanwords in Mandarin Chinese is a complex one. The answer seems to depend upon the individual speaker, with speakers fluent in English more likely to try to pronounce loanwords with some approximation to the way they are pronounced in their language of origin. Speakers not fluent in the language from which the loanword is
Analysis of the morphological influence of English on Modern Standard Chinese shows some indications – albeit rather tentative ones – that English morphology is being borrowed in certain clearly delineated contexts. According to Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale, the restricted use of a borrowed inflexional morpheme with loanwords represents an earlier stage of integration in the borrowing process than the use of a borrowed inflexional morpheme with autochthonous lexemes. That is, the use of the English progressive marker *-ing* attached to Mandarin Chinese verbs (cf. section 3.2.2.3) is indicative of a greater degree of language contact than the use of the English plural suffix *-s* attached to English loanwords (cf. section 3.2.2.3). The borrowing of inflexional morphology used to mark aspect represents level three on Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale. According to Thomason (2001), the prerequisite for this level is “somewhat more intensive language contact”.

Other new sentence structures likewise show evidence of third level borrowing, in that they involve larger structural borrowings with more far-reaching implications for word order. These include certain right-branching structures discussed in section 3.3.6.3.37 It is important to bear in mind that even though it has been predicted that these could spread to mainland usage (Shi et al., 2003, p. 12), as yet they have been observed in the literature only in relation to Hong Kong Written Mandarin.

In relation to the classification of recent morpho-syntactic developments in Mandarin Chinese according to Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale, one interesting point to be made is that many of the innovations – if, indeed, they are genuinely induced by contact with other languages, as has been suggested in the literature – are apparently indicative of a more intensive degree of contact between English and Mandarin than is actually the case. As discussed above, some of the recent morpho-syntactic observations in the literature are classified as examples of level three borrowing on the scale proposed by Thomason (2001). However, it is doubtful whether the language contact between Modern Standard Chinese and English really qualifies as “somewhat more intensive”. Although it is certainly true that in recent years many millions of Chinese school children have been exposed to English from an early age, there are still several generations of Chinese nationals who have had negligible

---

37 In fact, there is even a possibility that these might be examples of level 4 borrowing, if they were to become so widespread as to have an impact on the typological classification of Mandarin Chinese.
contact with English. Moreover, the generally accepted definition of “intensive” in relation to language contact implies the use of L2 in a variety of spheres of private and professional life, not merely the study of L2 as part of the school curriculum (as discussed in 7.2.3.2). This raises questions for the validity of the intensity of linguistic contact required for a given degree of borrowing, as set out in Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale.

7.2.4. Language change

The previous two sections (7.2.2 and 0) highlighted the relevance of linguistic variation and language contact to this particular study. As explained elsewhere (see section 7.2.2.5 above), linguistic variation is a necessary precondition for language change. Language contact, while not a necessary precondition for change, can often trigger, hasten or otherwise contribute to language change. Hence, in a situation where indications of both linguistic variation and language contact are found, there is definitely a possibility that language change may be occurring. To return to a point made earlier in this chapter (see section 7.2.1), there is thus a case for arguing that some findings of this study relating to previously unrecorded uses of men, bei and shi may be genuine innovations. In other words, it is certainly plausible that language change may play a role in explaining some discrepancies between mainstream accounts of Mandarin Chinese grammar and the concrete evidence presented in this thesis.

Many researchers have highlighted a range of causes, triggers or contributing factors behind linguistic developments, which they have variously categorised as internal vs. external or psycholinguistic vs. sociolinguistic (e.g. Aitchison, 2001; Bynon, 1977; Heine & Kuteva, 2005; Jones & Singh, 2005; Lass, 1980; Lightfoot, 1999; McMahon, 1994; Mufwene, 2008; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). However, these should not be seen as operating independently of each other. In fact, many linguists explicitly discourage the approach to historical linguistics whereby only a single cause of change is isolated when in fact multiple causes are possible; they emphasise that it is the rule rather than the exception for several different factors to contribute – simultaneously or in sequence – to causation (e.g. Aitchison, 2001, pp. 151-152; Heine & Kuteva, 2005; Jones & Singh, 2005, pp. 28, 52-54; McMahon, 1994, pp. 209-211; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p. 57). As Aitchison (1991, p. 162) says, “[i]t is essential to realize that language is both a social and a mental phenomenon in which sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors are likely to be inextricably entwined.” On a slightly different note, Heine and Kuteva (2005) highlight throughout their work the interaction between universal and language-specific principles in language change. Aitchison
(1991, p. 161) summarises these various aspects nicely when she writes that “[c]ausality needs … to be explored on a number of different levels. The immediate trigger must be looked at alongside the underlying propensities of the language concerned, and of human languages in general.”

Another way of looking at the simultaneous operation of various factors is to contrast underlying causes with superficial triggers (cf. Aitchison, 2001, pp. 151-152). According to this analysis, an underlying cause is the prerequisite that creates a situation in which a language is ready for change, while a superficial trigger sets the change in motion (cf. Aitchison, 2001, p. 151). Linguists adopting this view have generally considered language-internal (i.e. psycholinguistic) factors to be the prerequisites that prepare a language for change, and social or contact-induced (i.e. sociolinguistic) factors to be the immediate causes that trigger or accelerate the change (Aitchison, 2001; Heine & Kuteva, 2005). In the case of Mandarin Chinese, this distinction can be elucidated using the example of the phenomenon of polysyllabism (cf. section 0). This development can be explained as being motivated by an underlying language-internal trend towards disyllabism (as discussed in section 2.1.3), coupled with the immediate trigger of contact with polysyllabic languages like English, which provides opportunities for calquing and morphological replication (see also discussion on grammatical replication in section 7.2.3.5).

As far as the spread of change through the language is concerned, generally speaking language change tends to proceed at a sufficiently slow rate to preserve intergenerational communication (McMahon, 1994, pp. 5-6). Although this may not always be the case (Lightfoot, 1999), there is a widespread belief in the field of historical linguistics that the internal grammar of one generation is only marginally different from that of the preceding and succeeding generations (cf. Lightfoot, 1999; McMahon, 1994). Linguistic change can be said to be gradual in two senses (cf. C.-J. N. Bailey, 1985, p. 3). One aspect of gradual change is that both the traditional and innovative forms occur concurrently for a period, with the proportion of new form occurrences gradually increasing. The second aspect of slow change is that the occurrence of the new form spreads gradually to other contexts.

One popular explanation for the spread of linguistic developments through the language is lexical diffusion, which has been used to explain the transmission of both phonological and morpho-syntactic change (e.g. Aitchison, 2001; McMahon, 1994). The lexical diffusion model essentially claims that a linguistic innovation is initially associated with one or two
isolated words or expressions and gradually expands its area of application by attaching itself to more and more lexical items. That this might hold true for sound change is relatively easy to imagine. But grammatical change too, it is claimed, is usually associated with – or triggered by – particular lexical items (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 105-107). The theory is that speakers grow accustomed to a certain new, reinterpreted or extended syntactic structure by hearing it often in conjunction with a few common words and that later it spreads to new contexts (Aitchison, 2001, p. 107).

It is also interesting to consider the rate at which change occurs. Investigations have revealed that linguistic change does not proceed linearly. Rather, if the progress of change is depicted graphically, with time on the X-axis and the percentage occurrence of the linguistic feature in question (i.e. the percentage of the lexicon or utterances affected) on the Y-axis, then it is obvious that there is a slow onset, followed by a rapid rise and then a tailing off (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 91-92; Chambers, 2002). This is shown in Figure 5 below:
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Figure 5: The S-curve pattern of language change

This indicates that for any linguistic change, it generally holds that the innovation is slow to catch on, gathers momentum after a period of time and then slowly peters out; this is referred to as the S-curve pattern of language change (Aitchison, 2001; Chambers, 2002; Lightfoot, 1999; McMahon, 1994). Interestingly, this pattern has been shown to apply both to the individual speaker and to the speech community as a whole (McMahon, 1994). Although
most of the research relating to the S-curve pattern of language change has been conducted in relation to sound change, there are indications that syntactic change also follows an S-curve (Aitchison, 2001, pp. 105-107).

In the case of the previously unremarked and potentially new morpho-syntactic findings presented in this thesis, it is likely that most of these changes (if changes they are) are near the beginning of the S-curve. With regard to the postulated lexical diffusion of the plural suffix *men* (see section 4.3.3), for example, it is clear that even amongst nouns denoting human referents the majority are far more likely to appear in base form even when the plural meaning is intended. When it comes to the use of the passive marker *bei* with non-adverse, non-disposal verbs, on the other hand, while there may still be a few residual positively nuanced verbs that are resistant to grammatical passivisation, given the right environment most seem to be acceptable when used in conjunction with the passive marker. As this is a trend that has been well documented for several decades now, it is hardly surprising that it seems to have progressed significantly further along the S-curve.

7.3. Summary

This study used a corpus of spoken data to examine the use of three selected morpho-syntactic features of spoken Mandarin. Careful analysis of the data revealed that the behaviour of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* is more complex than hitherto allowed for.

In attempting to explain the discrepancies between previous accounts and everyday usage, it was suggested that one factor might be the different data sources used. Although a small proportion of previous research has focussed on the spoken language, most has relied primarily on written texts and/or introspection as the source of examples. Thus, some aspects of the behaviour of the three morphemes in question might have gone unnoticed. Moreover, even those researchers who claim to have studied spoken usage have, with very few exceptions, not carried out systematic searches of large corpora. In other words, previous research into Mandarin Chinese grammar has been characterised by a lack of empirical analysis. Another factor that might have hampered the revelation of additional complexities of usage is likely to have been the rather prescriptive approach of many Chinese linguists, particularly those working in the area of grammar. Finally, it is possible that ongoing language change, which has been commented on by many researchers in relation to a range of
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morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese, may have taken place in recent years specifically with respect to *men*, *bei* and *shi* and might feasibly have contributed to the divergence observed between mainstream grammar descriptions and actual usage.

It is worth emphasising the fact that this thesis has, so to speak, presented three “case studies” of selected features of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax. One assumes that if there is a noticeable deviation between the behaviour of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* in spoken discourse and their grammatical treatment in mainstream literature, then it is reasonable to suspect that there may be many other morpho-syntactic features of Modern Standard Chinese whose actual usage likewise diverges somewhat from the standard analysis.
8. Conclusion

8.1. Summary of main findings

By carrying out a careful and detailed analysis of three selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese in natural, spontaneous speech contexts, a number of interesting aspects of their use have been brought to light. Some of these pertain to new, as yet undescribed functions of the features in question; some relate to a relaxation of the constraints on their use; while other observations have simultaneous implications for both innovative linguistic roles and modified linguistic constraints.

With regard to the plural suffix *men*, it was found that this affix is capable of performing a number of roles not mentioned previously by other researchers. These include the semantic impact of differentiating between possible referents of the noun to which it is appended (cf. section 4.2.6), pragmatic overtones typically associated with the use of diminutive suffixes (cf. section 4.2.4), and tasks relating to the organisation and structuring of information (cf. section 0). Examples of the plural suffix used with nouns modified by a numerical quantifier were also found (cf. section 4.2.2). Moreover, it was established that there is a significant likelihood that the use of the morpheme is spreading by lexical diffusion and that it is thus more likely to appear with some nouns than with others (cf. section 4.3.3). Although it has generally been stated as a rule that eligible candidates for grammatical pluralisation in Mandarin Chinese are restricted to animate, human nouns, previous researchers have failed to point out that even amongst nouns denoting humans, there seems to be a hierarchy of attraction to the plural suffix *men*.

As far as the use of the passive marker *bei* is concerned, it was ascertained that this grammatical morpheme is frequently used with non-adverse verbs in spoken conversation and sometimes also with non-disposal verbs (cf. section 5.2.1.2). Thus, the constraint proposed in much of the literature on Chinese grammar, namely that *bei* is used – particularly (according to the grammar references) in spoken Mandarin – primarily with verbs with an adverse, disposal meaning, is perhaps not as strong a constraint in actual usage as grammarians would have us believe. The passive marker was sometimes found to govern a noun phrase denoting an inanimate agent or instrument (cf. section 0) and was frequently used redundantly in sentences that would
Conclusion

automatically have been accorded a passive reading even without any explicit grammatical marking as such (cf. section 5.2.1.4). The passive marker also appeared repeatedly in a number of constructions not condoned in some traditional treatments of Mandarin Chinese grammar, including in conjunction with the durative aspect marker zhe (cf. section 5.2.2.1) and with bare monosyllabic verbs (cf. section 0). Another very interesting finding pertaining to the use of the passive bei was that it can on occasion function as a marker of irony (cf. section 5.2.1.1). Although the use of the so-called “ironic” or “satirical” bei has been noted in the written language, this is the first time it has been observed in spoken Mandarin.

The third morpho-syntactic feature studied was the copula shi. The investigation of this verb in two very specific contexts revealed that it often seems to be used to highlight contrastive prominence in a manner similar to, but nevertheless slightly different from its role as a “marker of special affirmation” (C. N. Li & Thompson, 1981) or “association with focus” (Paul & Whitman, 2008) described by previous researchers (cf. section 6.3.1). Moreover, the fact that in the structure [NP COP HEN AdjP] it is frequently open to interpretation as a simple copula without any emphatic affect implies that it may be developing a new copular function in addition to its traditional use between two noun phrases, namely also that of linking a noun phrase with an adjectival one (cf. section 6.3.2). The fact that shi often appeared in the corpus immediately preceding the locative zai and apparently functioning in conjunction with zai as a locative copula, again often without any noticeable emphatic impact, suggests that some speakers may find it acceptable in some contexts to substitute for the full locative verb zai the V-Prep combination shi-zai and that this disyllabic combination may be lexicalising to a full locative verb (cf. section 6.3.3). Similarly, the frequency with which shi occurred immediately following various markers (both verbal and adverbial) of epistemic modality points to the lexicalisation or at least conventionalisation of some of these expressions (cf. section 6.3.4).

Taken as separate observations these findings may not seem significant. Indeed, many of them appear to differ only marginally from the stipulations and recommendations set out in the standard grammar texts on Mandarin Chinese. It may even be tempting in some cases to dismiss the discrepancies between the corpus data and the standard descriptions as ones of minor deviations in frequency or idiosyncratic variations in
Conclusion

interpretation. Taken as a whole, however, they present a reasonably convincing picture of a spoken language – and, in fact, not just any spoken language, but the most widely spoken first language in the world – whose use is at variance with the descriptions of it contained in authoritative texts.

8.2. Contributions to the field

This research project set out to ascertain whether the behaviour in spoken discourse of three selected morpho-syntactic features, the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi*, conformed to the standard treatment of these three features. For the purposes of facilitating research into Chinese morpho-syntax, it also aimed to summarise in a clear, logical and systematic way recent syntactic and morphological developments pertaining to Modern Standard Chinese, as described in the large body of literature dealing with Chinese language change.

Chapter 3 introduced a systematically structured overview of morphological and syntactic developments in Modern Standard Chinese over the last three decades, which was presented not only in textual but also in diagrammatic form for ease of comprehension and accessibility. This concise structured reconceptualisation enables current researchers to gain a much clearer overview of the current state of research into grammatical change in Modern Standard Chinese. Moreover, it is hoped that this reconceptualisation will also help ensure that future research into morpho-syntactic features of Chinese can progress in a more targeted and systematic fashion. Ideally, researchers will collaborate to fill in the gaps and add to the existing knowledge base without repeating or reinventing previous studies, at the same time being aware themselves and taking care to point out to their readers the context in which their research is conducted and how it contributes to the overall picture of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntactic language change.

The data analysis was presented in chapters 4 to 6, which dealt with each of the three selected morpho-syntactic features in turn. One common point of discovery was that in all three cases there were noticeable discrepancies between the descriptions of the use of the linguistic feature in question and its actual use in real-life speech situations (as discussed in section 8.1 above). The inescapable conclusion is that descriptions of the three morpho-syntactic features selected for this research in most standard grammar
Conclusion

references on Mandarin Chinese are either incomplete or not up-to-date. Thus, this research has highlighted the need generally to conduct more detailed investigations into the use of various Mandarin grammatical structures.

Another major contribution of the research analysis is that it made use of spoken data, which is not only unusual in the field of Chinese grammar studies, but also afforded several obvious research benefits. Firstly, it helped to ensure that the body of literature on the grammar of Modern Standard Chinese does not lag behind the literature on other languages. Secondly, it demonstrated that, contrary to widespread underlying assumptions in the field, spoken data certainly can reveal interesting insights into Mandarin grammar. Thirdly, it indicated that spoken data can in all likelihood also reveal interesting facts about language variation, contact and change in Mandarin Chinese. Finally, this project enhanced linguists’ knowledge of the most popularly spoken first language in the world by ensuring that descriptions of Mandarin grammar more accurately reflect language use in everyday contexts.

Some of the findings pertaining to hitherto undescribed functions of the morphemes investigated, in particular those relating to the organisation and structuring of information, are likely to be more relevant to oral discourse. That being the case, one of the reasons these linguistic features have not previously been noted in the literature on Modern Standard Chinese grammar may be that they are not felt by language users to be as necessary or as useful in written communication, and thus it is likely that they have found more widespread application in the spoken language and may conceivably not even have spread to written genres yet. In other words, some of the findings of the current research may genuinely apply only – or at least primarily – to spoken rather than written Modern Standard Chinese (cf. also section 7.2.1). This being a possibility, it clearly behoves linguists to devote more time and energy to the careful, detailed and systematic investigation of spoken Mandarin.

A further contribution of this thesis has been to provide fine-grained analysis of language examples based on a systematically collated corpus. Careful and detailed analysis of empirical data has until relatively recently not been a feature of research into Mandarin Chinese grammar but is imperative for a rigorously academic overview of the field, not least because corpus data can often reveal insights that are inaccessible to native speaker intuition.
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In contrast to an observable trend in some branches of Chinese linguistics but in line with the prevailing style of linguistic research into other languages, this study has adopted a descriptive approach to the analysis of Chinese grammar, confining itself to objective observations and analysis of the data. Such an approach enables the analyst to spot things that may have been overlooked by previous researchers, or at least to analyse similar linguistic developments from a slightly different vantage point. It is hoped that this thesis may contribute to providing an impetus for a shift in style in Chinese linguistics from the prescriptive to the descriptive, from the subjective to the objective.

As well as providing responses to the research questions posed in chapter 1, the findings of the current research obviously have broader implications for Chinese morpho-syntax; these are explored in section 8.3 below. In addition, the findings of this study are expected to have implications for other fields. These include but are not limited to Chinese language pedagogy, translation and interpreting, and language planning, as discussed in more detail in section 8.4.

8.3. Theoretical implications

This section begins by discussing some implications of the findings of this research both for the study of Chinese morpho-syntax and for the study of grammar in general. It then goes on to explore some of the potential implications for models and theories of language change.

8.3.1. Implications for the study of grammar

The analysis presented in chapters 4 to 6 of this thesis has demonstrated that in the case of the three specific features selected for this study – the plural suffix men, the passive marker bei and the copula shi – all exhibit linguistic behaviour that is more complex than previously acknowledged. If a careful and detailed analysis of the use of three selected morpho-syntactic features of spoken Mandarin can reveal a greater degree of complexity in their use than has previously been recognised, then it is reasonable to assume that a careful and detailed analysis of other morpho-syntactic features of spoken Mandarin may likewise reveal a greater degree of complexity than that allowed for in conventional grammatical treatises. Thus, it may be useful to proceed from a
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working assumption that while existing treatments of Mandarin Chinese grammar are extremely useful and form an excellent starting point for more in-depth analyses, they are not yet complete and for some purposes may not even be entirely adequate.

Another important realisation is that spoken grammar and written grammar are two related but different beasts.¹ This has a number of implications. Firstly, it is absolutely critical that spoken data are not neglected, as they can reveal linguistic information that is not apparent from the study of written data. Indeed, the results of this study indicate that detailed analysis of spoken data will enable us to gain insights into Modern Standard Chinese language use that may not be possible on the basis of written texts alone. Secondly, it is imperative that spoken grammar be analysed on its own terms, not merely as a derivative or subsidiary of written grammar. This approach will enable linguists to be open to new possibilities that they might not otherwise be prepared to countenance. Bearing in mind that Mandarin Chinese is the most widely spoken first language in the world and the native tongue of an estimated 900 million people, or roughly 14% of the world’s population, it clearly behoves us to acquire a better understanding of Mandarin Chinese as it is used in everyday speech contexts.

As intimated above, the findings presented in the data analysis chapters reveal that the behaviour of the three morpho-syntactic features selected cannot be explained satisfactorily in purely morpho-syntactic terms, i.e. without reference to other linguistic considerations, including semantics, pragmatics, prosody and information structure (cf., for example, sections 4.3.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 6.3.1). That is to say, the morpho-syntax of Mandarin Chinese cannot be studied entirely independently of other branches of linguistics. That suggests that any grammatical treatment of Mandarin Chinese that hopes to be comprehensive must take the interplay of such factors into consideration. It is necessary to cast the research net wider if we want to achieve a more complete understanding of the way these features operate in spoken interactions. In other words, it is advisable for researchers to take a broad range of factors into consideration and to remain open to the possibility of these features being capable of performing more

¹ It is worth noting that H. Tao (1999) has posed the question whether it is possible to describe a general grammar of Modern Standard Chinese – or, indeed, of any language – that applies to the full range of discourse types, or whether it makes more sense to assume that different grammar rules may apply in different genres.
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linguistic roles than hitherto acknowledged. In order to analyse morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese satisfactorily, there is a need for linguists to free themselves from the structural straitjacket and build semantic, pragmatic and other constraints into the account. As LaPolla (1995, p. 323) pointed out nearly twenty years ago, “in order to understand syntactic structures in Chinese, we need to make clear the role of pragmatic and semantic relations, and the interactions between them, in determining those structures.”

8.3.2. Implications for language variation, contact and change

Although the analysis presented in chapters 4 to 6 of this thesis was based on synchronic data, some of the findings both from the data analysis chapters and from chapter 3 had a direct or indirect bearing on issues relating to historical linguistics. Some potential implications of this research for theories and models of language variation, contact and change have been touched on in chapter 7. These implications will be explored further here.

Chapter 4 explored the possibility that the plural suffix *men* may be spreading by lexical diffusion (see section 4.3.3.3). This has implications for theories of language change. It has frequently been demonstrated that phonological change can spread by lexical diffusion. Some studies have also shown that syntactic change can spread by lexical diffusion. However, it is comparatively rare to find examples in the literature on historical linguistics of morphological features that have been found to be spreading by lexical diffusion. This finding provides support for a more general applicability of the model of lexical diffusion within language change, as well as demonstrating that morphological change may be subject to and/or respond to some of the same pressures as other types of language change.

Some of the findings from the reconceptualised schema of morpho-syntactic change proposed in chapter 3 of this study are suggestive of quite rapid language change. If this really is the case, then it could have significant implications for a number of models and theories in historical linguistics. Within the subfield of contact-induced language change, the issue, touched on in section 7.2.3.6, of matching the intensity of language contact with the level of linguistic borrowing likely to occur is a critical one. There are some indications from the present study that, in the case of contact between
Mandarin Chinese and English, the types of linguistic transference that have taken place and are likely to occur in the future may exceed the predications of historical linguists based on their observations of other language contact situations (e.g. Thomason’s (2001) borrowing scale; cf. also section 7.2.3.4). In other words, there is reason to suspect that speakers of Mandarin Chinese may be prepared to borrow structures from other languages, in particular English, before the degree of language contact between their own and the donor language has attained the level of intensity specified in models of language change. If this suspicion were to be confirmed through carefully targeted research, then it would have far-reaching implications for language contact models and theories. Whether one would be tempted to infer that the models and theories require some modification, or whether the suggestion would be that the language contact situation between mandarin Chinese and English is in some way atypical and therefore leads to atypical borrowing patterns, is a matter for future research to determine.

There is one quite important general implication for research into language variation, contact and change in Modern Standard Chinese that can be drawn from this thesis. That is that any proper investigation of language variation, language contact or language change must be preceded by a data-driven study of spoken language use that supplements existing studies of written language use. The purpose of such research should include the quantification of relative frequencies of variables and/or constructions, the classification of different types and functions, and the identification of extant complexities in the use of the linguistic features under investigation.

8.4. Practical implications

There are a number of fields of endeavour that might find a practical application for some of the rather theoretical insights presented in this thesis and on which the findings could have a noticeable impact. Three of the more obvious fields include Chinese language pedagogy, translation and interpreting, and language planning. The practical implications for these areas are discussed separately below. A brief final section highlights some practical implications for linguists generally.
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8.4.1. Implications for Chinese language pedagogy

As well as incorporating some of the data revealed and conclusions drawn by this research into academic discussions of Mandarin Chinese morpho-syntax, it is hoped that some of the findings of this research may be added to grammar textbooks and teaching materials. This would enable language teachers to present a more complete and rounded view of the behaviour of certain morpho-syntactic structures. With increasing numbers of non-native speakers showing an interest in studying Mandarin Chinese, it is hoped that future trends in Chinese language pedagogy will promote a less simplistic teaching of Mandarin grammar, as this approach tends to be counter-productive in the long run. Especially at the more advanced levels of language learning, it is important for students to have some understanding of the complexity of Mandarin grammar and of the multiplicity of factors that play a role in constructing and interpreting utterances. Thus, students learning about the plural suffix *men*, for instance, should have access to information that explains in more detail its patterns of use, as analysed and presented in chapter 4. They should be able to learn not only that this morpheme is generally appended only to personal pronouns and nouns denoting humans, but also that within the class of animate human nouns there is a hierarchy of attraction to the plural suffix, with frequently used terms denoting close and intimate relationships (such as words like *haizi* ‘child’, *pengyou* ‘friend’ and *tongxue* ‘classmate’) much more likely to undergo morphological pluralisation when plural reference is intended than most other nouns (cf. section 4.3.3).

Within Chinese language pedagogy, it might be useful to encourage a less formulaic, more flexible and more creative approach to language learning and language production. The conclusions of this study suggest that it may be preferable to teach aspects of Mandarin Chinese grammar not as rigid rules, but as general tendencies or guidelines. A teaching approach that places greater emphasis on the critical nature of a wide range contextual cues (cf. discussions in sections 0, 5.3 and 6.3), as well as on the importance of listening to native speakers and observing how language is used in a range of interactional settings, at the same time placing less emphasis on the acquisition of inflexible grammar rules, may well be of long-term advantage to large numbers of students.
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8.4.2. Implications for translating and interpreting

Of course, any research that reveals similarities or differences between two languages is of interest to translators and interpreters working with the two languages in question. Although a direct comparison between Mandarin Chinese and English was not the main focus of this research, points of comparison and contrast did arise on a number of occasions throughout the data analysis sections of this thesis. On the other hand, as much of the research involved teasing out the subconscious factors at play in the production and interpretation of utterances, there is a reasonable chance that skilled interpreters and translators would respond appropriately to those factors even without having them brought to their conscious attention. With machine translations, however, it is a different matter. There, one could imagine some of the data from this research feeding nicely into the development of new software. For example, an algorithm that gives each noun a “pluralisation weighting” as a measure of the likelihood of attracting the plural suffix *men*, depending on the simultaneous interplay of a number of factors both inherent and contextual, might be useful in determining which plural nouns in an English or other language text would be appropriately translated into the morphological plural form in Chinese.

8.4.3. Implications for language planning

Without in any way wishing to advocate the practice of language planning or to promote the attitude of prescriptivism that underpins it, it is undeniable that some of the findings of this research could be of interest to language planners in the People’s Republic of China. Judging by numerous comments in Chinese-language academic articles dealing with a range of phenomena within the field of Chinese historical linguistics, the topic of language planning, and in particular the maintenance of the so-called “purity” and “health” of the Chinese language, is an issue of burning concern in modern China. This is obvious from the fact that many Chinese linguists, although ostensibly focussing on some aspect or other of language change, have devoted a considerable portion of the final section of their papers to a discussion of the ramifications of their research for Chinese language planning (e.g. Chai, 2005; W. Chen, 2005; Gan, 2004; W. Qi, 2002; C. Wang, 2002; G. Wang, 2002; H. Wang et al., 2004; Y. Wang & Li, 2003; Z. Wen & Liu, 2004). That being the case, there is reason
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to suspect that some of the conclusions in this thesis might also provide language planners with food for thought.

8.4.4. Implications for general linguistics

Finally, whether they are working in the field of syntax, morphology, lexicology or historical linguistics, linguists with an interest in Modern Standard Chinese should be encouraged to conduct more empirically based research. This includes, amongst other methods, consulting language corpora of both written and spoken Chinese. The findings presented in this study clearly demonstrate that spoken data from language corpora are capable of revealing exciting new insights supported by solid empirical evidence. To overlook this data or minimise its importance is to slow the potential progress of new linguistic research.

8.5. Limitations of the study and directions for future research

Although the current research has produced some very interesting findings, some of the inferences drawn from it are rather speculative in nature. From the point of view of advancing scholarly research in the field, it is thus highly desirable to conduct additional studies to ascertain whether or not all the conclusions are borne out by further research data. Some possibilities are explored further in the following subsections.

8.5.1. Language variation

It is well recognised amongst Chinese variationists and historical linguists that there is a considerable degree of mutual influence amongst different varieties of Chinese and that many of the recent developments apparent in Modern Standard Chinese have become popular in mainland China only after gaining currency in Hong Kong and/or Taiwan (e.g. W. Chen, 2005; Hu, 2006; cf. Shi & Zhu, 2000; Shi et al., 2003). In some cases, these are linguistic innovations that had their origin in Hong Kong or Taiwan; in other cases, they are contact-induced changes adopted initially by Hong Kong or Taiwanese speakers from English, Japanese or elsewhere and later by mainland speakers. That being the case, it might well be of interest to compare data from mainland China with similar data from Hong Kong and/or Taiwan.
Another avenue for further investigation is to test the more general hypothesis of variation in use with respect to the three linguistic features under discussion (cf. section 7.2.2.4). This could be done by conducting smaller scale studies with carefully selected respondents covering a range of demographic characteristics (age, sex, geographic region etc.), and with questions designed to elicit as many examples as possible of the structures in question. Such a study could be augmented by a written or oral questionnaire to ascertain the grammaticality judgements of native speakers with regard to some of the relevant speech examples that are elicited. Any information that can be obtained on patterns of linguistic variation will shed light on the possible paths and progress of development in the usage of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* in spoken discourse.

It would also be interesting to follow up on Zhang Qing’s ground-breaking work with a more thorough investigation of other linguistic features of the posited new variety of Chinese known as “Cosmopolitan Mandarin” (cf. section 7.2.2.3), including lexical and grammatical indicators. Taking the present research as a point of inspiration, a number of morpho-syntactic features could be postulated that might also be associated with an urbane, sophisticated, cosmopolitan image and thus contribute to “linguistic capital” in a transnational Chinese marketplace. Several structures examined in the present study might qualify as potential markers of “Cosmopolitan Mandarin”, the most obvious one arguably being the use of the copula with predicative adjectives (cf. 6.2.1 and 6.3.2). Other structures worth investigating could include the use of 有 *you* as a marker of perfective aspect (cf. section 2.1.5), as well as the use of a range of sentence-final modal particles, including 啊 *a*, 啦 *la*, 嘛 *ma*, 哦 *ou*, and 呀 *ya*. As with Zhang Qing’s research (cf. section 7.2.2.3), two groups of respondents would have to be selected, such that the target group of interest could be compared with a control group with a very similar demographic profile. Again, respondents could be invited to speak on two different topics, one work-related and one family or hometown related. It would be fascinating to discover whether any of the morpho-syntactic features investigated displayed similar patterns of distribution to the phonemic indicators selected by Zhang Qing.
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8.5.2. Language change

One of the possible explanations offered in chapter 7 for the discrepancies between traditional accounts of the plural suffix *men*, the passive marker *bei* and the copula *shi* and their attested behaviour in natural speech is that some aspects of their use may be innovations; that is, they may only have come into popular use in recent years (cf. section 7.2.3.6). This provides a starting point for further investigation. It would be interesting to test the hypothesis of language change with respect to the three morphosyntactic features investigated here more thoroughly and systematically using multiple data sets of spoken material from similar or different sources. Even two corpora, each of a similar size to the one used for the present research, but taken from two different time points a sufficient distance apart, could reveal interesting data. Unfortunately, as there appear to be very few publically accessible language corpora of spoken Mandarin Chinese, compilation of appropriate databases is likely to involve considerable work. One of the aims of such research could be to see whether the analysis presented in this thesis and the explanations offered here are borne out in large scale, diachronic studies.

The hypothesis that the use of the plural marker *men* is spreading by lexical diffusion (cf. section 4.3.3) undoubtedly lends itself to further investigation. One worthwhile venture is the development of a cline of use showing which nouns are more or less likely to undergo morphological pluralisation. That would involve more rigorous and extensive statistical analysis of a broader range of nouns. Once a cline has been proposed, a further interesting step would be to suggest classification (semantic or otherwise) of the nouns at various points along the cline. Integral to the lexical diffusion model is the S-curve graph of spreading change (cf. section 7.2.4). Thus, one could test the S-curve hypothesis in relation to the increasing use of the plural marker *men*: Is it following the “slow-quick-quick-slow progression” (Aitchison, 2001, p. 92) revealed by other investigations into language change associated with lexical diffusion?

For many historical linguists, cross-linguistically less common phenomena are of special interest, particularly (in the case of Modern Standard Chinese) the borrowing of the English progressive aspect marker *-ing* (cf. section 3.2.2.3), as well as those innovations in sentence structure that may be having an impact on the typology of Mandarin Chinese, i.e. the appearance of so-called right-branching structures (cf. section 3.3.6.3). These need to be investigated further to obtain a clearer picture of...
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what exactly is happening; the extent to which each structure is widespread or localised; which types of structures are being affected in what contexts; as well as the internal and external factors contributing to the changes (i.e. the underlying causes and immediate triggers).

Interestingly, in the field of historical linguistics spoken language use is generally believed to lead, not to follow written language use (Collins, 2011; cf. D. Wu et al., 2004). Admittedly, it is well established that, owing to a variety of social, political and linguistic factors, in the last 100 years – a time of rapid change in Mandarin and presumably many other varieties of Chinese as well – some linguistic developments in Modern Standard Chinese undoubtedly have been led by written language use (cf. Kubler, 1985b; L. Wang, 1984[1943]-a, 1984[1943]-b). Nevertheless, when the body of literature on spoken Mandarin finally encompasses the breadth and depth of that on written Chinese, the cross-linguistically common observation that spoken language change is generally in advance of written language change may well be found to hold true in the context of Mandarin Chinese as well. This, of course, is yet another reason for undertaking study into language change in spoken Mandarin. If Modern Standard Chinese behaves like other languages in that new linguistic developments manifest themselves in the spoken language before showing up in the written language, then clearly the previous emphasis on the written language will have resulted in a perpetual time lag in the current state of research in this field. If, on the other hand, Modern Standard Chinese behaves differently from other languages in that the written language is indeed the primary arena of language change, then that in itself is a very interesting phenomenon that deserves to be highlighted.

8.5.3. More detailed grammatical analysis

This study has demonstrated that the use of three selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese is more complex than has previously been allowed for in traditional analyses of Mandarin grammar (see sections 0, 5.3 and 6.3). In view of the fact that this research has brought to light a number of discrepancies between the standard grammatical descriptions of these features and their actual use in spoken discourse, it might be profitable to carry out a more detailed grammatical analysis along similar lines of a wider range of morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese. Data from the present corpus and/or from other corpora could be examined to see if other linguistic
features of spoken Mandarin likewise display some patterns of behaviour that are at variance with the standard grammatical treatment. Now that a few tentative steps in the direction of a more empirical, corpus-based approach to the analysis of Mandarin Chinese grammar have been made, it would be pleasing to see this approach continued. It is also worth reiterating a point that has been made several times before, namely that the use of spoken data is critical in furthering our knowledge in this area, not least because such data afford more complex, fine-grained insights into some aspects of language use.

In order to provide practical support to more empirical linguistic research in Mandarin Chinese, it is essential to promote the establishment of more extensive language corpora. Several of the monolingual Chinese corpora currently in existence are still in the process of being assembled. Moreover, the proportion of spoken material in said corpora (based on character count) makes up only a very small fraction of the total. For this reason, it was found necessary to put together a sizable corpus of spoken Mandarin specifically for the purposes of this study. However, the work involved in building up such a corpus is very time-consuming, and the type and range of spoken material available is of necessity rather limited. In the long term, it would be a far better solution to fund the development of substantially sized corpora of spoken Mandarin and to make these accessible to the public.

Some of the points raised in the data analysis chapters bear further investigation. For example, the relatively high frequency of occurrence of the passive marker bei within the shi ... de nominalising construction (cf. section 5.2.2.3) poses some interesting questions relating to the precise function of the two structures, to what extent these functions overlap and to what extent they are mutually exclusive or incompatible. It may be worth investigating these questions further. Generally speaking, the use of the copula shi, highly complex as it is, offers itself to more detailed examination. One approach that could be worth pursuing is a more detailed exploration of the putative copular function of shi with predicative adjectives in the structure [NP COP (HEN) AdjP] (cf. section 6.3.2), including a comparison of the structure both with and without the adverbial modifier hen ‘very’, and perhaps broadening the scope of sentence patterns to include other intensifiers such as tai ‘too’ and feichang ‘extremely’.
Another interesting and productive line of attack is the variationist approach, in the mould of studies conducted by the likes of Travis and Torres Cacoullos (2012). This methodology has the advantage of being able to state with an impressive degree of statistical certainty (given sufficient numbers of tokens and sufficiently high quality of data input) the extent to which any one of a number of factors influences a speaker’s choice of linguistic variable in context. Thus, for example, recent studies have shown in a pro-drop language like Spanish, in which speakers have a choice of making pronouns explicit or of omitting them from an utterance, that a number of factors play a role in speakers’ split-second decision-making processes and, moreover, that these factors are weighted differently (Travis & Torres Cacoullos, 2012). One can imagine a similar methodology providing invaluable insights into the use of various morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese in context. In the case of the plural suffix, for instance, it seems that men is capable of performing a number of different roles relating to pragmatics, semantics and information structure; however, which of these functions are most salient in speakers’ minds and at what point a congruence of different factors renders the use of men obligatory, is very difficult to say on the basis of the data to hand. By using the variationist approach, it might be possible to provide more definitive answers to some of these questions. Likewise, the use of the copula shi appears also to be subject to a range of possible considerations.

Where to now for research into the morpho-syntact of spoken Mandarin? There are still a lot of gaps in the research and unanswered questions, as well as misconceptions and flawed approaches. Clearly, much remains to be ascertained with respect to the use of morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese in spoken discourse. Not all of the findings presented in this preliminary study are necessarily conclusive. Yet it is hoped that they will provide an impetus for further research in this area.

8.6. Concluding remarks

This research has contributed to a better understanding of how Mandarin Chinese grammar operates within spoken discourse. It has examined the use of three selected morpho-syntactic features of Mandarin Chinese and demonstrated that their behaviour in spoken interactions is more complex than previously allowed for. The fine-grained analysis of the phenomena presented in this study represents an important step in
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acquiring more comprehensive knowledge of what structures are used when in spoken Mandarin and why. It is hoped that these insights will be used to inform discussions on Chinese language pedagogy and in the preparation of teaching materials for non-native speakers. In addition, it is hoped that this research will stimulate further more detailed investigations into the grammar of spoken Mandarin, in particular applying more empirical, corpus-based methods similar to the ones that have proved so insightful in the present research.
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Appendix 1: Glossary of grammatical abbreviations

The following abbreviations were used in the word-for-word / morpheme-for-morpheme translations of the examples of Mandarin Chinese provided in this thesis to indicate meanings and grammatical functions:

1PL     first person plural pronoun
1SG     first person singular pronoun
2PL     second person plural pronoun
2SG     second person singular pronoun
3PL     third person plural pronoun
3SG     third person singular pronoun
ADV     adverbial
ATT     attributive
BEN     benefactive
CL      classifier
COM     comitative
COP     copula
DEM     demonstrative pronoun
DMN     diminutive
DUR     durative
EXP     experiential
EXST    existential
FP      final particle
## Appendix 1

- **IMP**: imperative
- **INT**: intensifier
- **LOC**: locative
- **MP**: modal particle
- **NEG**: negation
- **NOM**: nominaliser
- **OBJ**: object
- **PASS**: passive
- **PFV**: perfective
- **PL**: plural
- **PROG**: progressive
- **REDUP**: reduplication
- **RES**: resultative
# Appendix 2: The plural suffix *men*

This appendix contains a list of all occurrences of the plural suffix *men* with nouns in the present corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example utterance</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：《图雅的婚事》让余男一下子拿到了国际国内三个影后大奖，我想余男的成功应该是说，她是一个很有天分的演员，还有她就是一个特别勤奋的演员，她在拍《图雅的婚事》之前，去内蒙古阿拉善体验生活，差不多3个多月的时间，和牧民们生活在一起，穿他们的衣服，和他们一起学着怎么样去放羊，骑马，驯骆驼，可她说她本人特别特别怕动物，她还学习怎么样扬奶茶，要知道扬奶茶一举手，一投足，别人能够知道你是不是一个真正的道地的蒙古族的牧民。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 12/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：余男当时拍《惊蛰》的时候，在影片当中扮演一个陕北农村妇女二妹，她就去一个陕北人家里面体验生活，住了20多天，到后来那家人每天就会特别自然地喊，二妹去打水，二妹去扫地，这部电影在2003年参评金鸡奖的时候，很多评委们拒绝余男评奖，理由是她就是当地的一个农民，不是专业的演员。我想评委的这种误会本身已经是一个特别高的奖励了。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 12/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：比如说我们小时候，跟同学之间聊天，小朋友们就会讲，我长大了想干吗，我长大了想干吗，我知道您当时想的，跟别的小朋友想的都不一样，你想干吗当时？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 18/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>腾格尔：孩子们经常玩的一种游戏，比如说互相就说是我是你爸，我是你爸。就是可能好多孩子们，都会经过这么个经历，您互相这么玩，就是我说我是你爸，他就是你爷爷，完了我就说我是毛主席。</td>
<td>Teng Ge’er, LYYY 18/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>腾格尔：孩子们经常玩的一种游戏，比如说互相就说是我是你爸，我是你爸。就是可能好多孩子们，都会经过这么个经历，您互相这么玩，就是我说我是你爸，他就是你爷爷，完了我就说我是毛主席。</td>
<td>Teng Ge’er, LYYY 18/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>张军：叫藤棍。然后现在的孩子们，我们现在小班的这些学员们，已经老师已经不能打了，因为这是新时代了，你老师如果打学生的话，学生要投诉老师要下岗的。</td>
<td>Zhang Jun, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>张军：叫藤棍。然后现在的孩子们，我们现在小班的这些学员们，已经老师已经不能打了，因为这是新时代了，你老师如果打学生的话，学生要投诉老师要下岗的。</td>
<td>Zhang Jun, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>张军：要打要骂随便你们。然后我们就开始了漫漫征途，黑暗的没有边际的日子就开始了，现在孩子们不能打了，但是我也发觉挺有意思的，现在孩子们这个功力，就不如我们以前这么好了。</td>
<td>Zhang Jun, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>张军：要打要骂随便你们。然后我们就开始了漫漫征途，黑暗的没有边际的日子就开始了，现在孩子们不能打了，但是我也发觉挺有意思的，现在孩子们这个功力，就不如我们以前这么好了。</td>
<td>Zhang Jun, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>罗永浩：但愿在未来的日子里，让抛弃了我的人们始终坚信，他们的决策是正确的。</td>
<td>Luo Yonghao, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>罗永浩：让后我说但愿在未来的日子里，让抛弃了我的人们，注意很多人抛弃过我，所以用了复数的人们。</td>
<td>Luo Yonghao, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>罗永浩：让后我说但愿在未来的日子里，让抛弃了我的人们，注意很多人抛弃过我，所以用了复数的人们。</td>
<td>Luo Yonghao, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>罗永浩：说但愿在未来的日子里，让抛弃我的人们始终坚信，他们的抉择是正确的，就是我说我诗写的很烂，肯定不能，跟艾米莉迪金森这种大诗人。</td>
<td>Luo Yonghao, LYYY 20/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>陈铎：不漂亮，同志们。</td>
<td>Chen Duo, LYYY 14/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>陈铎：不漂亮，同志们。</td>
<td>Chen Duo, LYYY 14/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>陈铎：那时候台湾跟我们没有像现在，这么通啊，我们的《话说长江》节目，在他们的底下是偷偷地传着看的，所以有一位山东德州老乡，他呢就把我们《话说运河》里的，德州那一集弄到手了，所以他就要求，也是在世界各地的亲属们，每年在团聚的时候，首先是看德州这一集，看了之后就是为了念祖不忘家乡，这一家子人都得抱头痛哭流涕，思念家乡，完了再吃再干吗干吗。</td>
<td>Chen Duo, LYYY 14/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：陈铎老师现在工作还是很忙，当然也有很多爱好，听听你的朋友们是怎么说的，这回有男性朋友了。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 14/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>李春波：完了我就跟那个陈小奇他们说，我说能不能不去了，我说感冒特别严重，他说你去吧，那个同学们挺热情的，都知道你要去，哪怕你不唱呢，你唱不了你说几句话也行，结果那天就我说那去吧，去了以后同学们特别热情，热情我说那就唱吧。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, LYYY 23/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>李春波：完了我就跟那个陈小奇他们说，我说能不能不去了，我说感冒特别严重，他说你去吧，那个同学们挺热情的，都知道你要去，哪怕你不唱呢，你唱不了你说几句话也行，结果那天就我说那去吧，去了以后同学们特别热情，热情我说那就唱吧。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, LYYY 23/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>李春波：对，因为当时我住得比较远，所以一个是怕迟到，就出发得就比较早，所以基本上都是提前，四十分以后到学校，我先吃早点，吃完早点同学们，还没来呢，基本第一个到。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, LYYY 23/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>郑钧：然后初一的时候报到的第一天，就跟人打起来了，就有同学打我，然后初二转学到了另外一个新学校，我转过去的学习成绩很好，大概平均分都是 97、98 分吧，然后老师表扬了我，然后呢，女同学们投以了赞许的目光，紧接着早操时间我就被人打了。</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, LYYY 24/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>郑钧：很多的家长在这个送行的时候，很多家长都哭啊，然后同学们也哭，然后还有很多家长送孩子去大学，我就自己背个包，然后我冲底下我妈跟我哥招手，特别开心地招手，完全没笑的，没有哭的理由。</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, LYYY 24/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>郑钧：到晚上同学们回来了，下课回到晚上，一熄灯，同学们睡觉，我就拿着吉他到水房里面，然后有人骂的时候我就回去了。就这样重复了差不多一两个学期这样的生活，然后学业都荒废了。</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, LYYY 24/02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>郑钧：到晚上同学们回来了，下课回到晚上，一熄灯，同学们睡觉，我就拿着吉他到水房里面，然后有人骂的时候我就回</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, LYYY 24/02/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
去了。就这样重复了差不多一两个学期这样的生活。然后学业都荒废了。

25. **郑钧:** 所以呢，我妈说什么，我们就，哎呦，你不听，你不听，所以老是打击的这种态度，所以呢我妈妈说，就特别委屈，有时候说我在大学我好歹也是个教授，**同学们**、**学生们**对我特别尊重，怎么回到家里，我怎么什么都不是呢。

26. **郑钧:** 所以呢，我妈说什么，我们就，哎呦，你不听，你不听，所以老是打击的这种态度，所以呢我妈妈说，就特别委屈，有时候呢我在大学我好歹也是个教授，**同学们**、**学生们**对我特别尊重，怎么回到家里，我怎么什么都不是呢。

27. **郑钧:** 姑娘们在前面跳草裙舞什么的，我在后边弹着琴。

28. **郑钧:** 温暖这首歌呢，其实是我妈妈姓温，**同学们**都叫她温老师，所以我妈妈妈家的孙子辈里边没有，没有男孩，所以我就妈妈其实有两个儿子，本来想如果我能姓温的话，就挺好，我说我如果姓温的话，我给自己起的名字就叫温暖。献给你们。

29. **旭日阳刚:** 北京，北京，如果有一天，我不得不离去，我希望人们把我埋在这里，在这我能感觉到我的存在，在这有太多让我眷念的东西。

30. **范冰冰:** 这些演员们，然后我就好想死。

31. **陈鲁豫:** 我记得那个时候，在我看来比我大的那些**大姐姐们**，她们都梳这样的头发，就是前面烫成那样子的。

32. **陈鲁豫:** 好，我们来听那时候你的**同事们**，他们怎么形容那个时候，他们眼中的徐俐什么样子？

33. **吴小莉:** 我会把他们当孩子，就是说**姐姐们**搞不定我妈的地方，我就会打电话去骂她，她会听我的。

34. **潘玮柏:** 手都借给我，**朋友们**，我想保护你，但我算什么，要努力爱你，我能做什么，这世界很美丽。

35. **陈鲁豫:** 今天，我想说一说关于妈妈的故事，**人们**都说一个女人只有生了孩子，当了妈妈之后，才算是拥有完整的人生，而一个家呢，只有妈妈在，才是一个完整的家庭。

36. **陈鲁豫:** 其实不仅是女演员，几乎各行各业所有的**妈妈们**，都要面临生活和工作的压力，多少对孩子都会感到有一些歉疚，因为不能时时刻刻陪伴在孩子身边，可是孩子们慢慢长大之后，也会理解妈妈的苦衷，有一天，他们也会离开妈妈，会组建自己的家庭，会经历妈妈们曾经经历过的，所有的无奈和幸福，这就是人生，孩子们长大了，离开了妈妈的羽翼，去组建自己的家庭有自己的孩子。

37. **陈鲁豫:** 其实不仅是女演员，几乎各行各业所有的**妈妈们**，都要面临生活和工作的压力，多少对孩子都会感到有一些歉疚，因为不能时时刻刻陪伴在孩子身边，可是孩子们慢慢长大之后，也会理解妈妈的苦衷，有一天，他们也会离开妈妈，会组建自己的家庭，会经历妈妈们曾经经历过的，所有的无奈和幸福，这就是人生，孩子们长大了，离开了妈妈的羽翼，去组建自己的家庭有自己的孩子。

38. **陈鲁豫:** 今天，我想说一说关于妈妈的故事，**人们**都说一个女人只有生了孩子，当了妈妈之后，才算是拥有完整的人生，而一个家呢，只有妈妈在，才是一个完整的家庭。
要面临生活和工作的压力，多少对孩子都会感到有一些歉疚，因为不能时时刻刻陪伴在孩子身边。可是孩子们慢慢长大之后，也会理解妈妈的苦衷，有一天，他们也会离开妈妈，会组建自己的家庭。会经历妈妈们曾经经历过，所有的无奈和幸福，这就是人生，孩子们长大了，离开了妈妈的羽翼，去组建自己的家庭有自己的孩子。

39. 陈鲁豫：其实不仅是女演员，几乎各行各业所有的妈妈们，都要面临生活和工作的压力，多少对孩子都会感到有一些歉疚，因为不能时时刻刻陪伴在孩子身边。可是孩子们慢慢长大之后，也会理解妈妈的苦衷，有一天，他们也会离开妈妈，会组建自己的家庭。会经历妈妈们曾经经历过的，所有的无奈和幸福，这就是人生，孩子们长大了，离开了妈妈的羽翼，去组建自己的家庭有自己的孩子。

40. 彭玉：我无限幸福，真的。朋友这都是我的儿女们，每到逢年过节的时候，哎呀，问候，电话，真的，他们一这么说，我心里感到高兴，幸福的笑啊。

41. 袁泉：打一场球赛，还能打平，就知道他们的能力有多强，所以当时大班的师姐们，就想尽各种办法要干扰他们，所以那场球赛的时候，党昊正好穿着一个，黄色的小短裤，然后，对，然后。

42. 陈鲁豫：姐妹们，有心跳的一天还有希望，加油，杨千嬅。

43. 杨千嬅：然后回家我想再听一遍，他的歌声，全都是我自己的声音，很惨那天，我录下来的两个小时都是我自己的声音，我就很生气，所以我相信每一个学生，同学们都会经历过那种，疯狂的岁月。

44. 李默然：好好。弟兄们，吉野是倭寇的旗舰，如果将它击沉，敌人的船队将不战自灭，我北洋水师将转败为胜，开足马力，撞沉吉野。

45. 李默然：人们都说金斗是回族，有一次我就问了他，他说我不是，我说人家都说你是回族，你跟我一个同族，他说他不是。

46. 李默然：我跟几个孩子们和隔辈人都说过我这话。

47. 李默然：我们两个是 1950 年八月十五结婚，她去世在去年的八月初十，还有五天就整整六十年，概括起来呀，简单说就是这样，她不仅仅是我这个家里边的一个好母亲、好主妇，还有一个最重要的任务，就是教师，我坦白地跟同志们讲，我对我的三个孩子，老大是女儿，老二老三是男孩和我的隔辈人，我不是一个好父亲，也不是一个好爷爷，说得好听一点儿叫忙于工作，说得真实一点儿，有这么一个靠山，所以一谈起她来，就显得语无伦次了，总而言之吧，半年刚刚过去，去年的九月十七早晨离开了我们。

48. 李龙吟：颐养天年，高高兴兴地这个享受现在我们国家这形势发展的这个好的成果，把人们对他的尊重和期望是吧，落实到自己养好身体这样行动上，就是我们的幸福。

49. 陈鲁豫：好，我觉得今天其实得感谢很多人才行，刚才其实已经感谢了乐队，我觉得把乐队主要的那个李延亮给大家介绍一下，可能歌迷都知道，从羽泉最初到现在，一直在合作，应
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>陈羽凡：《难道》，每一次唱都会有一个理由，这次把《难道》第一次送给台下以外的观众朋友吧，应该送给一直陪伴羽泉在音乐的道路上，辅助我们，然后支撑我们、鼓励我们、帮助我们的所有合作过的伙伴们，老师们，前辈们。</td>
<td>Chen Yufan, LYYY 18/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>陈羽凡：《难道》，每一次唱都会有一个理由，这次把《难道》第一次送给台下以外的观众朋友吧，应该送给一直陪伴羽·泉在音乐的道路上，辅助我们，然后支撑我们、鼓励我们、帮助我们的所有合作过的伙伴们，老师们，前辈们。</td>
<td>Chen Yufan, LYYY 18/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>陈羽凡：《难道》，每一次唱都会有一个理由，这次把《难道》第一次送给台下以外的观众朋友吧，应该送给一直陪伴羽·泉在音乐的道路上，辅助我们，然后支撑我们、鼓励我们、帮助我们的所有合作过的伙伴们，老师们，前辈们。</td>
<td>Chen Yufan, LYYY 18/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>陈羽凡：年长一点的哥哥们，他们都是大牌，其实真的很感动。</td>
<td>Chen Yufan, LYYY 18/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>周华健：我当天后来演出的时候，其实我是比较卖力的，因为我知道羽·泉来了，然后不能给一个听我歌长大的朋友们让他失望，所以那一天我的那个演出其实是整个水平是提升了。</td>
<td>Zhou Huajian, LYYY 18/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>潘长江：有一次我到外地去演出，在剧场演出，我看那小朋友，前面一排、两排、三排那小朋友全梳我这头型，完了我就挺开心的，我突然发现第三排有一个七十多岁老大爷，也梳我这头型。</td>
<td>Pan Changjiang, LYYY 22/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：刚才那个上场前，潘大哥说，说今天这期节目应该叫潘长江和他的女人们。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 22/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>潘长江：我想想我现在已经火了20多年了差不多，真的，你想我这个个体格火这么多年，挺不容易的一件事情，我无论是演什么样的作品，我首先要对得起支持我的，全国我的忠实粉丝们，我要对得起他们。我每一年，每两年，我要拿出来一部让自己满意，领导满意，让我们这个团队满意，最主要让观众满意的一部力作，他觉得哦，潘长江这两年真的没有白演，没有白费劲。</td>
<td>Pan Changjiang, LYYY 22/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>潘长江：但是，观众朋友们，你不要觉得说，潘长江特别溺爱他的女儿，作为你，如果这事安到你们身上换位思考，你做一个父亲的你女儿这样的话心里跟我是一样的，因为我是她父亲。</td>
<td>Pan Changjiang, LYYY 22/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：还想干什么的干成了这十年，已经做了很多事了，啥也不想干了，我觉得真的很累，我们这个团队就是踏踏实实地一年做一部戏，对得起所有支持我们的观众朋友们，这就是我们最奢侈的一个想法。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 22/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>倪萍：电视机前的观众朋友们，在这新年伊始的时候，《综艺大观》作为大家的老朋友又和您见面了。</td>
<td>Ni Ping, LYYY 25/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>倪萍：这就是我们这个职业的特点，就人们光看到表面，实际上我哪有那么多好，她说的这根本就不是我，水晶心哪有啊，善良。</td>
<td>Ni Ping, LYYY 25/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>倪萍：姥姥说你是真能欺负人，你幸亏不当领导，当领导你这个同志还不受老罪了，同志们要受老罪了，我有时候在想，可能一个企业家做成一笔生意，李嘉诚谈成了以后，然后李嘉诚会说，我今天我算了一下这是一亿港元……</td>
<td>Ni Ping, LYYY 25/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>短语</td>
<td>附录2</td>
<td>来源</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>倪萍：姥姥说你是真能欺负人，你幸亏不当领导，当领导你们这些领导们还不受罪呢， 同志们要受罪了，我有时候在想，可能一个企业家做成一笔生意，李嘉诚谈成了以后，然后李嘉诚会说，我今天我算了一下这是一亿港元……</td>
<td>Ni Ping, LYYY 25/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>朱洁：他们出去玩嘛，带着我一起出去，就是人家都那么高，然后就我这么小， 人们也会问说，哎，你们，就是你带的是你们家小孩呀，或者是谁家的小孩呀，是妹妹吗？</td>
<td>Zhu Jie, LYYY 27/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：小莉团长拿的这些照片，就是当年所有的学员们来。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 27/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>朱洁：对呀。而且人们都说我们俩很配呀。</td>
<td>Zhu Jie, LYYY 27/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：所以我们说就是一个人，他不管处于什么样的情感的过程当中，心情是什么样的，听你的歌都是适合的，你的歌迷们他们能够做到，把这些带爱字的歌曲能够都唱出来，你能够做到吗？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 28/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>张晓东：这样一个问题所引发的，我们可以看到本·拉登（Bin Laden）活着制造了很多的恐怖活动，给人造成心理上的恐慌，在社会造成很大的隐患，拉登的死也造成了另外一方面的恐慌，从这个角度上来讲，恐怖主义真的是已经到了一个空前绝后，达到了某种高度，他活着制造恐慌，他死了依然会引发人们更多的想象，包括是不是有更多的组织报复，包括刚才谈到的，是不是欧洲有一个核装置，谈到这种真实性，我是比较怀疑的，因为核装置不是一个随便随便说一个人你有，就可以有的东西，它是一个比较在技术上应该说是资金、技术各个方面有相当的积蓄，才能去做这样的事情。</td>
<td>Zhang Xiaodong, LYYY 02/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>庞哲（凤凰卫视驻纽约记者）：是，我身后大家可以看到，十年前是双峰非常高，而且显示资本主义制度发达的世贸大厦，当然十年前的9月11号，被两架飞机撞完之后，这个地方就成为人们悼念，而且是各种感情，愤恨，甚至是一些悲伤，甚至是埋怨，各种各样的感情都充满的一个地方。</td>
<td>Pang Zhe, LYYY 02/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>高晓松：听一下，清华的同志们，都是这么研究问题的。</td>
<td>Gao Xiaosong, LYYY 03/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>高晓松：而且你在那儿没有光荣感，因为大家都比你学习好，什么时候开始对母校就是家是另外一回事了，就是对母校这事儿有了崭新的认识，就是到了三十多岁以后，你突然发现你再社会上原来你是一个清华人你挺光荣的，而且你发现周围的精英们这个成功了，那个成功了一问都是清华的，然后你这时候才开始觉得，原来当时在那儿熬过那些，幽暗的，黑白的那些。</td>
<td>Gao Xiaosong, LYYY 03/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>刘佩琦：有一次吴军，我们车在那等着，准备要进去，军人们戴着钢盔，戴着白色的袖章跟执法队似的，在那指挥车辆，我们摄制组的车就全在那停着，然后吴军就说，这还能拍吗？我说是呀，不行我找导演谈谈，咱们撤吧，然后我就到了导演车旁边，我一看导演在那正在吃鸡蛋呢。</td>
<td>Liu Peiqi, LYYY 04/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>郑亚旗：可能只有在跟外人聊天的时候他才是我爸，因为我跟朋友聊天的时候我不能跟他说郑渊洁，因为郑渊洁还没有名到 说所有人都知道郑渊洁是谁嘛？然后我就跟人说郑渊洁，人们说郑渊洁是谁，我还得跟人解释是我爸，所以我只有跟朋友在</td>
<td>Zheng Yaqi, LYYY 05/05/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>周迅：对，其实现在自闭症的那个数字，目前已经是99个婴儿里面有1例，那所以其实我们可能坐在的朋友们当中。周迅，LYYY 03/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>李宇春：十八首歌，代表十八岁学习音乐，曾经一度人们告诉你，说你是未来的主人翁。第一次自弹自唱，留在你们，只要你们真心，拿爱与我回忆，什么都愿意。“WHY ME演唱会”第三年谢谢你们给我的爱，谢谢爱让你，在我身边守护我的未来。李宇春，LYYY 09/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：然后老师的评语特别好玩，你们都是优点很多，热爱劳动，热爱集体，积极参加各项活动，尊敬师长，团结同学，学习努力，哇，全都是优点，常常协助老师带领同学们打扫清洁卫生，只有几个希望，就是希望多读课外书籍，希望学习更加努力刻苦，来这个送给你吧。陈鲁豫，LYYY 09/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>李宇春：谢谢今天所有台前幕后的老师同学们，你们会支持我吗？谢谢，那我，最后讲一句，我爱你们，谢谢你们，我爱你们，谢谢。李宇春，LYYY 09/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>刘谦：然后我说朋友们仔细看，这个信封从刚刚都没有动过，然后我拿过来，谢谢大家，结果上面写30。刘谦，LYYY 13/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：你的朋友们对你真的是很了解。陈鲁豫，LYYY 21/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：来听听你的朋友们怎么说。陈鲁豫，LYYY 21/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>范玮琪［小S］：对，我们是我不讲那种感觉，很多人会觉得，我们这个行业很难交到真心的朋友，可是我真的很自豪地可以讲说，我在我身上没有发生这件事，我跟我的姐妹们都真的是真心地对待彼此，嗯，对。范玮琪，LYYY 21/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>张惠妹：我想我们这一群姐妹，知道范范她终于决定说，要嫁给黑人了，黑人终于要娶她了，我们真的，姐妹们都非常地开心。张惠妹，LYYY 21/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>范玮琪：没有我就拿了我那一枝，就我的邻居们都一起过了情人节。范玮琪，LYYY 22/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>梁静茹婆婆：刚开始的时候最欣赏的歌就是《勇气》，那时候因为唱的时候还不知道是她的歌，可是我欣赏歌里的歌词，里面的内容，感觉，我都非常的喜欢，所以有的时候我们会去唱，就是一群太太们去唱歌的时候会唱她的歌。梁静茹，LYYY 27/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>梁静茹婆婆：加油、加油，我们都非常的支持你，然后你自己要开心就好，然后也谢谢所有的粉丝们对她的支持跟爱护。梁静茹，LYYY 27/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>李素丽：今天我也向我的同事，领导和乘客们，说一句藏在我心里多年的话，我永远属于我的乘客，我的岗位。李素丽，LYYY 04/07/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>观众：这时候不是光欣赏他的歌，还有看到他的精神可嘉，这捐款我认为这不是对他的一个施舍，而是对他们的感谢，对吧，感谢教人们的感情得到升华。观众，LYYY 07/07/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：那我们再来听听你的朋友们，对你说一些什么，来。陈鲁豫，LYYY 11/07/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>张惠妹：对，只有一面，反面是白的，忽然间就飘出一个人，都没有声音的，她就这样飘出来，我们所有人都停下来，然后看着她，妈妈你还没睡，她大发脾气，因为我们家里是不准有张惠妹，LYYY 19/07/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
时候玩牌呀，赌钱呐什么的，就一直跟她解释那是好玩的，因为她瞄到了钱你知道，她就说，她的观念会说你们现在是姐妹们玩，等上瘾了之后，你就会出去跟人家赌，然后赌这种东西就不好了，你就会出事情。

90. 罗志祥：八岁，然后遗弃了，因为那时候我妈妈跟我讲，我也觉得怎么可能你八岁怎么生存啊，可是因为我妈妈是原住民，那原住民她本人第一个本能就是能够自己生存嘛，那我妈妈就是一个人在海边然后就生存，然后去捡一些破铜烂铁，然后拿去卖，然后就一个人这样生活，到后面然后经过很多事情，所以她的社会的经验的，很多的道理，可能有一些专家就怎么不认同，但是在妈妈所遇到这些事情的时候，她跟我讲完之后，我觉得哎挺有道理的，妈妈还说什么，你说话如果你没做的话，你说话就可以比别人大声，这是一个很简单的一句话，但是它真的遇到很多事情的时候呢，钱是不是你拿的，是不是你偷的，我没有，你就可以很坚决的那种眼神，我没有这样，因为常常都会被别人误解嘛，很多事情，唉，这话是不是你讲的，不是我，是我，是我，有时候会心虚嘛，但是妈妈就告诉你，你说没做的话，你就可以很大声说你没有做。

91. 罗志祥：别紧张，你们这些没煮过饭的少女们。

92. 乌国庆：还有的一些场面呢，你比如说有的案子是满门抄斩，我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好，好多同事们家里现在你们都知道就只有一个孩子，独生子，有的那个你们可能看到过像贵州那县长全家被杀，六口，一家六口被杀，那个小孩当时在上边，在他姥姥睡那边，姥姥在地上给打死抢东西了，小孩还在睡觉，完了犯罪分子杀了人以后呢，就去翻东西，正在这个床下面翻东西时候，这个小孩就爬起来，瞪眼、瞪眼看那犯罪分子，在那儿翻东西，犯罪分子一看他还活着呢？

93. 乌国庆：还有的一些场面呢，你比如说有的案子是满门抄斩，我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好，好多同事们家里现在你们都知道就只有一个孩子，独生子，有的那个你们可能看到过像贵州那县长全家被杀，六口，一家六口被杀，那个小孩当时在上边，在他姥姥睡那边，姥姥在地上给打死抢东西了，小孩还在睡觉，完了犯罪分子杀了人以后呢，就去翻东西，正在这个床下面翻东西时候，这个小孩就爬起来，瞪眼、瞪眼看那犯罪分子，在那儿翻东西，犯罪分子一看他还活着呢？

94. 乌国庆：你要想这一辈子干这个工作破案呐，那已经就是把这个整个破案已经融入了我的全部生活，你说刚才说百分之多少、多少，实际上我这整个的一天想了你现在这样，你说今天身上现在没有案子，如果我现在有案子，那我要吃饭也想这个，就跟人家说话也问这个，总是想这个，都是这样的每个案子，所以就说破案呢它不是像人们想的，它要吃透了，他把情况都弄明白才行。

95. 乌国庆：可以休息，他们当然我一些同事们对我都特别好，他们从来不这样看，但我自己要这样现在你说组织上对我照顾什么的，对吧你像我这个因为我花钱最多的，就整天坐飞机跑，花钱最多的。

96. 丁广泉：他那个接到的这些女孩子们的信恐怕得拿麻袋装。
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97. 大山：为什么呢因为这事情是我夫人拍板，再一个是我们管孩子叫孩儿们。然后我们每次写一个微博我们说孩儿们怎么怎么样了，大家都说你到底是《西游记》还是哪儿。</td>
<td>Da Shan, LYYY 04/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. 大山：为什么呢因为这事情是我夫人拍板，再一个是我们管孩子叫孩儿们。然后我们每次写一个微博我们说孩儿们怎么怎么样了，大家都说你到底是《西游记》还是哪儿。</td>
<td>Da Shan, LYYY 04/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. 大山：为什么呢因为这事情是我夫人拍板，再一个是我们管孩子叫孩儿们。然后我们每次写一个微博我们说孩儿们怎么怎么样了，大家都说你到底是《西游记》还是哪儿。</td>
<td>Da Shan, LYYY 04/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. 陈鲁豫：我们小时候看大闹天宫都是孩儿们。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 04/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. 大山：就喜欢叫孩儿们。</td>
<td>Da Shan, LYYY 04/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. 李双江：我说我不能到连里吃，他说你住到连里嘛，我说我也不住连，那个连的门口那个门槛是条河，你要在班里呢就是弟兄们，就是战士，你要到班里，到连部里呢就是干部了，我说我我愿意当兵。</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, LYYY 09/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. 李双江：这个打砖坯那个事，阿里是三千八百到四千五百公尺，我们就生活在一个塑料口袋一样的地方。战士们要修营房要打砖坯，早上要起来以后很早就把那个土啊松开，然后把这个土，把那个土松开，挑上水，和上泥，然后这个砖坯有的有差不多两公斤半，五斤砖的大砖坯，一个人的定额大概是八十多块，我要打个二十块，我就得上气不接下气，但是我想出个办法来，我就唱歌我每唱一首歌，每个班给我十块砖，到晚上一算吧，我能弄二三百块砖，全班，全连最好的。</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, LYYY 09/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. 李双江：没有交通工具，没有任何好的办法，所以那个油呢是最困难的，那个油呢是吃菜的，战士们为了生命为什么呢，因为那个帐篷里面如果要是不点灯，阿里的狼，阿里狼，那是吃人的狼，不是那个朝鲜的那个阿里郎，就会从帐篷底下钻进去，把战士叼走。</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, LYYY 09/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. 李双江：所以这个点油灯比这个吃更重要，所以五十多个帐篷，一个帐篷里头两个大油灯，消耗的油是二斤油，所以这个在高原上呢，大家吃的那个煮的那个东西很快这个，这个八十度的水就开了，煮的饺子成面片，煮的那个面条呢成糊糊，所以只有油煎的油炸的是最好的食品。但是那个油呢都点了灯了，所以连长呢就说了李双江，你编一个歌，叫节油歌，让大家早上起来把灯给我吹了，我就那么应承着，但是这个礼拜就要过去了，到了礼拜六连长要让我交节油歌了，我拿不出来，但是干活的时候呢战士们都是陕西兵，甘肃兵，能吃苦。他们唱家乡的调调，唱的那个家乡的歌，那天点了篝火，等着我来唱这个歌，礼拜六嘛，全体战士们在那儿等着我，连长出来喊，李双江你的节油歌给大家唱一下，大家欢迎你嘛。</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, LYYY 09/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. 李双江：所以这个点油灯比这个吃更重要，所以五十多个帐篷，一个帐篷里头两个大油灯，消耗的油是二斤油，所以这个在高原上呢，大家吃的那个煮的那个东西很快这个，这个八十度的水就开了，煮的饺子成面片，煮的那个面条呢成糊糊，所以只有油煎的油炸的是最好的食品。但是那个油呢都点了灯了，</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, LYYY 09/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

所以连长呢就说李双江，你编一个歌，叫节油歌，让大家早上起来把灯给我吹了，我就那么应承着，但是这一个礼拜就过去了，到了礼拜六连长要让我交节油歌了，我拿不出来，但是干活的时候呢战士们都是陕西兵，甘肃兵，能吃苦。他们唱家乡的调调，唱的那个家乡的歌，那天点了篝火，等着我来唱这个歌，礼拜六嘛，全体战士们在那儿等着我，连长出来喊，李双江你的节油歌给大家唱一下，大家欢迎你嘛。

107. 李双江：我光干活了，没有啦，没编呢，但是连长说了我就发晕了，五百多个战士们哗啦哗啦鼓掌，哎呀，我想，反正跟他们干活的时候有，那么一个调调，他们唱的歌反正我就编，我说出前门只觉得脊背朝后，这都是陕西人的歌，没料想肚子放在前头，没成想肚子走在前面了。高板凳低桌子都是木头，一头牛两头驴都是牲口，你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，唱到这儿吧他们该接不下去，该编节油呢，战士们很高兴哇哇哇，听说李双江待会儿怎么结尾，我想他们那个往下走，走一步退一步当没走，还没有节油啊，我看连长在那儿运气，我突然想换一个不要这个，这是，这是酸曲儿，我唱迷糊，天黑点灯，天黑点灯费油，有了。

108. 李双江：我光干活了，没有啦，没编呢，但是连长说了我就发晕了，五百多个战士们哗啦哗啦鼓掌，哎呀，我想，反正跟他们干活的时候有，那么一个调调，他们唱的歌反正我就编，我说出前门只觉得脊背朝后，这都是陕西人的歌，没料想肚子放在前头，没成想肚子走在前面了。高板凳低桌子都是木头，一头牛两头驴都是牲口，你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，唱到这儿吧他们该接不下去，该编节油呢，战士们很高兴哇哇哇，听说李双江待会儿怎么结尾，我想他们那个往下走，走一步退一步当没走，还没有节油啊，我看连长在那儿运气，我突然想换一个不要这个，这是，这是酸曲儿，我唱迷糊，天黑点灯，天黑点灯费油，有了。

109. 李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完蛋了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌嘛，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁了，坏了肠梗阻了，有病了。

110. 李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完蛋了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹
唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌嘛，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹嗒嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒嗒嗒，起床号一吹你听那战士们你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，就穿衣服啊，走一步退一步全当没走，天黑点灯，天明点灯费油，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，所以一下子就节省了二十多公斤油。连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还行啊你，把这些油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵，战士们切土豆早上是土豆丝，中午是土豆片，晚上土豆块，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁，坏了，肠梗阻了，有病了。

111. 李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌嘛，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹嗒嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒嗒嗒，起床号一吹你听那战士们你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，就穿衣服啊，走一步退一步全当没走，天黑点灯，天明点灯费油，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，所以一下子就节省了二十多公斤油。连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还行啊你，把这些油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵，战士们切土豆早上是土豆丝，中午是土豆片，晚上土豆块，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁，坏了，肠梗阻了，有病了。

112. 李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌嘛，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹嗒嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒嗒嗒，起床号一吹你听那战士们你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，就穿衣服啊，走一步退一步全当没走，天黑点灯，天明点灯费油，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，所以一下子就节省了二十多公斤油。连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还行啊你，把这些油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵，战士们切土豆早上是土豆丝，中午是土豆片，晚上土豆块，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁，坏了，肠梗阻了，有病了。

113. 李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹
唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹嗒嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒嗒嗒，起床号一吹你听那战士们你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，就穿衣服啊，走一步退一步全当没走，天黑点灯，天明点灯费油，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，所以一下子就节省了二十多公斤油。连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还有啊，你，把这油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个半月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵，战士们切土豆早上是土豆丝，中午是土豆片，晚上土豆块，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁了，坏了肠梗阻，有病了。

李双江：连长一听生气了，李双江你小子下去我还不知道天黑点灯，天明点灯费油嘛，把我撵下去啦，我也很难过那天那个晚会就完蛋了，但是战士们对我很好，哎呀，李双江你唱得比我爹唱得好，就是比我爹唱得好，我哼家乡调我在地里干活都是唱这首歌，好听，第二天早晨发生了奇效，一吹嗒嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒嘀嗒，起床号一吹你听那战士们你大舅我二舅都是舅舅，就穿衣服啊，走一步退一步全当没走，天黑点灯，天明点灯费油，战士们噗噗噗把灯都吹灭了，因为战士们太苦了。那个高原哪，走路都费劲，不愿意去吹那个油灯，所以一下子就节省了二十多公斤油。连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还有啊，你，把这油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵，战士们切土豆早上是土豆丝，中午是土豆片，晚上土豆块，战士们晚上睡觉放的是土豆屁，但是闻着这个土豆屁就高兴，如果战士们不放屁了，坏了肠梗阻，有病了。

所以战士们一说哎呀，今天空气不太好，但是肚子好着呢。所以跟战士们在一起这十年的过程当中，在阿里待了七个月，直到离开那个阿里二十多年了，连队的战士还挺怀念我。
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117. 李双江：所以战士们一说哎呀，今天空气不太好，但是肚子好看呢。所以跟战士们在一起这十年的过程当中，在阿里待了七个月。直到离开那个阿里二十多年了，连队的战士还挺怀念我，为什么呢，天天给他们唱歌，他们很苦，又没有电视，又没有广播，广播都听不见，一天我就像个录音机一按我就唱，所以一欢迎我就唱，那时候嗓子也不知道哑，一天唱，得唱上百首歌，后来战士们走了，战士们告诉我都二十多年过去了说是你走了，我们每天晚上都说你一次名，然后让今天表现好的一个战士答一声到。

118. 李双江：所以战士们一说哎呀，今天空气不太好，但是肚子好看呢。所以跟战士们在一起这十年的过程当中，在阿里待了七个月。直到离开那个阿里二十多年了，连队的战士还挺怀念我，为什么呢，天天给他们唱歌，他们很苦，又没有电视，又没有广播，广播都听不见，一天我就像个录音机一按我就唱，所以一欢迎我就唱，那时候嗓子也不知道哑，一天唱，得唱上百首歌，后来战士们走了，战士们告诉我都二十多年过去了说是你走了，我们每天晚上都说你一次名，然后让今天表现好的一个战士答一声到。

119. 李双江：所以战士们一说哎呀，今天空气不太好，但是肚子好看呢。所以跟战士们在一起这十年的过程当中，在阿里待了七个月。直到离开那个阿里二十多年了，连队的战士还挺怀念我，为什么呢，天天给他们唱歌，他们很苦，又没有电视，又没有广播，广播都听不见，一天我就像个录音机一按我就唱，所以一欢迎我就唱，那时候嗓子也不知道哑，一天唱，得唱上百首歌，后来战士们走了，我走了，战士们告诉我都二十多年过去了说是你走了，我们每天晚上都说你一次名，然后让今天表现好的一个战士答一声到。

120. 李双江：连长说双江你不要打砖坯了，你到炊事班去养一下，去做做饭吧，炊事班就不用在那个冰冷的天气里边，那战士们对你确实是，包括干部们对你那种真诚。

121. 李双江：连长说双江你不要打砖坯了，你到炊事班去养一下，去做做饭吧，炊事班就不用在那个冰冷的天气里边，那战士们对你确实是，包括干部们对你那种真诚。

122. 蔡国庆：我当兵第一年啊，那个时候1993说实话那会儿挺红的啊，当时就是部队的战士们知道说蔡国庆去当兵了，都特别想看到你在战士们当中唱歌。一年三百六十五天，那一年1993年的那一年我演出有纪录，大家猜猜那一年我演了多少场下部队。

123. 蔡国庆：我当兵第一年啊，那个时候1993说实话那会儿挺红的啊，当时就是部队的战士们知道说蔡国庆去当兵了，都特别想看到你在战士们当中唱歌。一年三百六十五天，那一年1993年的那一年我演出有纪录，大家猜猜那一年我演了多少场下部队。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124. 蔡国庆：两场接得特别紧，然后中间的吃饭就不会让你回到什么餐厅啊去好好吃，<strong>士兵们</strong>就把那个快餐的盒饭全部送到你的演员那个大帐篷。军队帐篷那个休息室里，别人可能就吃两包 子，垫补、垫补吧，饱吹饿唱，但是我一看那鱼做的好吃，得 ，我除了吃两包子之外我又来了一条鱼。谁也没想到就真的就 一根鱼刺就卡在我的这儿了，哎呀，难过至极，我就想去医疗 所，但是事情就是这样的，当你听到<strong>战友们</strong>欢呼声的时候，就像是战场的号角一样。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. 蔡国庆：<strong>士兵们</strong>给战士们唱歌的时候我印象特别深的那就是跟总政歌舞团去新疆见到边防军的战士，我们也是那个时候好多时候可能会想象那样的经历，他们都有过，但对我来说太新鲜了，你无法想象就是那个新疆的，那个叫唐古拉山口吧，唐古拉山口。海拔大概得有四五千，我们上到四千的时候喘不过气来根本 没有法唱，但是在更高的还有哨所在那里，然后底下有这个指挥 部，手摇把的电话。我们拿着这个电话话筒就给<strong>战友们</strong>你要听 我唱哪首歌，哦《三百六十五个祝福》，“一天有三百六十五个 日出，我送你……”，就是你倒着气要给他唱，然后那边摇着的 电话他在山顶上那个哨所可以听得到，那个时候唱完之后你真 的是满含着泪水，在山顶上就是两个战士，所以当你从哨所跑 出来，你再看到那个哨所飘扬着五星红旗的时候，你看到 哨所的两位战士朝你打着军礼跟你挥手的时候，你满眼都是泪水，你才知道他们永远是我心中最值得尊敬的人。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. 蔡国庆：给<strong>战友们</strong>唱的歌时候我印象特别深的那就是跟总政歌舞团去新疆见到边防军的战士，我们也是那个时候好多时候可能 会想象那样的经历，他们都有过，但对我来说太新鲜了，你无法想象就是那个新疆的，那个叫唐古拉山口吧，唐古拉山口。海拔大概得有四五千，我们上到四千的时候喘不过气来根本 没有法唱，但是在更高的还有哨所在那里，然后底下有这个指挥 部，手摇把的电话。我们拿着这个电话话筒就给<strong>战友们</strong>你要听 我唱哪首歌，哦《三百六十五个祝福》，“一天有三百六十五个 日出，我送你……”，就是你倒着气要给他唱，然后那边摇着的 电话他在山顶上那个哨所可以听得到，那个时候唱完之后你真 的是满含着泪水，在山顶上就是两个战士，所以当你从哨所跑 出来，你再看到那个哨所飘扬着五星红旗的时候，你看到 哨所的两位战士朝你打着军礼跟你挥手的时候，你满眼都是泪水，你才知道他们永远是我心中最值得尊敬的人。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. 蔡国庆：给<strong>战友们</strong>唱的时候我印象特别深的那就是跟总政歌舞团去新疆见到边防军的战士，我们也是那个时候好多时候可能 会想象那样的经历，他们都有过，但对我来说太新鲜了，你无法想象就是那个新疆的，那个叫唐古拉山口吧，唐古拉山口。海拔大概得有四五千，我们上到四千的时候喘不过气来根本 没有法唱，但是在更高的还有哨所在那里，然后底下有这个指挥 部，手摇把的电话。我们拿着这个电话话筒就给<strong>战友们</strong>你要听 我唱哪首歌，哦《三百六十五个祝福》，“一天有三百六十五个 日出，我送你……”，就是你倒着气要给他唱，然后那边摇着的 电话他在山顶上那个哨所可以听得到，那个时候唱完之后你真 的是满含着泪水，在山顶上就是两个战士，所以当你从哨所跑 出来，你再看到那个哨所飘扬着五星红旗的时候，你看到 哨所的两位战士朝你打着军礼跟你挥手的时候，你满眼都是泪水，你才知道他们永远是我心中最值得尊敬的人。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. 蔡国庆：因为我们为了汶川的这个慰问演出，可以说是非常地辛 苦，所以那个战士，刚才阎老师讲真的是被活活累死的，他不 断地在废墟上扒，不断地在找寻着，有没有新的生命，有没有</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遗体不断地找，是活活累死的。然后在整理，首长们和战友们整理他的遗物的时候，就发现在他的军挎包里啊，除了有他的笔记本，还有他的一个 CD 唱碟，还发现了就是阎维文老师的磁带和唱片。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. 蔡国庆：因为我们在汶川的这个慰问演出，可以说是非常地辛苦，所以那个战士，刚才阎老师讲真的是被活活累死的，他不断地在废墟上扒，不断地在找寻着，有没有新的生命，有没有遗体不断地找，是活活累死的。然后在整理，首长们和战友们整理他的遗物的时候，就发现在他的军挎包里啊，除了有他的笔记本，还有他的一个 CD 唱碟，还发现了就是阎维文老师的磁带和唱片。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. 陈鲁豫：人大了以后就是爸爸妈妈们变成了小孩了，就是小孩已经是大人了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. 苏永康：安仔俱乐部，赶快上楼，把那他配完服装，我就，哎姐姐，哥哥们，我就闪了，那个人多得，三十几人，那个很大的一个聚会，家庭的凝聚力很重要。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. 谭纪雄：人质被我们战友们冲过来解救了出来，就这样。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. 陈鲁豫：七年以后成龙再次来到北京进入演播室，再次接受我们节目的采访，而这个时候他的身份有了一些改变，除了拍电影之外，人们会说成龙是慈善家，是华人代表，而他说他的改变来自于社会的教育。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. 韩红：你刚才问的，刚好就戳在我心上，我确实觉得自己太累了，就是脑袋随时都在紧绷着一根弦，就是每天不停地告诉自己不可以做这个，不可以做那个，不可以出去吃饭，因为怕被拍，怕被人们误会。不可以做什么事情，不可以去自由地说话，因为我是军人，又是当官的，挺压抑的。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. 韩红：但是我每当又看到，我毕竟还有这么多人在爱我，有这么多我的歌迷，还有那些一直都非常关爱我的人，还有那些喜欢我的叔叔阿姨们，我身上又还有一种责任和动力在，因为还没有完成我要为这个社会做的事情。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. 邓亚萍：等不及，你不像现在，饿一点扛一扛稍微，等一等，再忍一忍稍微，现在，一旦怀孕时候，我觉得肯定好多我们的这个观众都有这种感受啊。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. 陈鲁豫：采访郭晓冬是在 2007 年，因为一期有关艺术类考生的节目，当时郭晓冬作为一个过来人给那些醉心于要投身演艺圈的应届毕业生一些经验和意见。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. 郭晓冬：我复试我要说的一点，就是我复试有首歌，就是你要用，有个声乐嘛，我单独选了一首歌，叫《再也不能这样活》，我要告诉我自己不能再像以前那样去生活，可能老师们不懂，他不知道就是我自己有这个心态。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 139. 郭晓冬：我为什么选择在老家去结婚，是因为我觉得这个婚是结给我们自己的，我也没有请任何人，包括崔老师我也没跟 }
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：提起中国的演艺圈，恐怕一定会提到范冰冰，第一次采访是在 2008 年，当时她刚刚做制片人，推出了第一部电视剧《胭脂雪》，生活中的她有着很严格甚至是严苛的家教，很腼腆，很谨慎，和人们想像当中的她不太一样。你妈管你，脾气急不急？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 09/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>刘轩：那时候刚生出来然后抱出来我就拿出照相机要给她照相的时候她那手本来是握着拳头的嘛，然后就这样，然后，然后就，变这样了，然后我就，啊，真的，我就照她这张照片你看，然后还有点微笑的那个时候，然后后来我的朋友们看了那照片说，怎么可以孩子刚生出来就把她的手扳成那样，我说我没扳呐，她就是这个样子，她好像跟我说，老爸，放心，我出来了。</td>
<td>Liu Xuan, LYYY 13/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>韦唯：三里屯这外国人的区域已经是传为佳话了，所有的这些青年，就是这些 少年人们，就把赛赛的这个生日 party，谁能被邀请了谁能参加了，就是一个特大的荣耀。那些孩子们都是去，像赛赛今年是俄罗斯家里，特别有钱的那个孩子，特意从俄罗斯定制的西服，那天空运过来，就要穿它参加，因为老大是从来喜欢穿西服革履，就是要求大家都要正装，男人都要正装。</td>
<td>Wei Wei, LYYY 16/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>韦唯：三里屯这外国人的区域已经是传为佳话了，所有的这些青年，就是这些 少年人们，就把赛赛的这个生日 party，谁能被邀请了谁能参加了，就是一个特大的荣耀。那些孩子们都是去，像赛赛今年是俄罗斯家里，特别有钱的那个孩子，特意从俄罗斯定制的西服，那天空运过来，就要穿它参加，因为老大是从来喜欢穿西服革履，就是要求大家都要正装，男人都要正装。</td>
<td>Wei Wei, LYYY 16/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：今天现场有很多是邓超的影迷，是闫妮的影迷，他们有歌要唱，要唱给邓超长唱给闫妮当然也唱给导演，先是让邓超你的这些 朋友们来唱。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, LYYY 22/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>郭德纲：用太平歌词的方式唱这个就不太平了就，这样吧，身后有好多的 观众朋友们，今天是《鲁豫有约》十周年生日，咱们一块唱个歌热闹热闹好吗？</td>
<td>Guo Degang, LYYY 26/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>张铁林：张铁林就是我，最近我会参与主持一个新的节目叫《相聚凤凰台》。有的 港台巨星们齐聚在这黄埔江边为这明星城做一个动土的奠基典礼。</td>
<td>Zhang Tielin, LYYY 26/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>张铁林：我看着 孩子们长大。</td>
<td>Zhang Tielin, LYYY 26/09/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>张铁林：一言难尽，从第二年开始招了学生到今年已经是第二届毕业生了，所以当你看到毕业生在那照毕业合影的时候，你突然间意识到辛苦了这么多年，把进来什么都不懂得 娃娃们培养得有模有样的，出去要为社会做事情的时候，还是有几分心理上的安慰。</td>
<td>Zhang Tielin, LYYY 26/09/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: The passive marker *bei*

This appendix contains a list of all occurrences of the passive marker *bei* in the present corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example utterance</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：因为那个凹的地儿，是<strong>被</strong>很多人坐的。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 10/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>吴秀波：然后恰好有一种行业能把这个变成跟其他人沟通的方式，所以就<strong>被</strong>大家认可了。</td>
<td>Wu Xiubo, 10/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>吴秀波：有好多练武的人，小的时候怕<strong>被</strong>欺负。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>余男：我也很怕在当时我会<strong>被</strong>换掉，说真的，因为机会挺难得的。</td>
<td>Yu Nan, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：余男和电影结缘特别早，三四岁的时候，就<strong>被</strong>导演选中去演一部电影《舞恋》。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：她第二次<strong>被</strong>导演选中，是上高中的时候。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：<strong>被</strong>老师叫去批评的时候，她特别不服气，一直跟老师据理力争。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>贾樟柯：诗写的像模像样吧，可以此诗献给谁谁谁，我献了好多，因为每次<strong>被</strong>拒绝了，就再献另一个。</td>
<td>Gu Zhangke, 20/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：听说你们的演唱组特别火，全上海滩什么什么酒吧什么，<strong>被</strong>你们平趟。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>吴君如：他很怕<strong>被</strong>人家拒绝的个人，所以他不允许自己去做一些什么给你惊喜啊，送你礼物，他怕人家看到他送的东西不喜欢。</td>
<td>Wu Junru, 20/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>吴君如：比如说我拍《金鸡》他当监制，在现场不停在，哇，我<strong>被</strong>他逼疯了，喂，这个表情不感动，你可以有没有好一点。</td>
<td>Wu Junru, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>吴君如：他很怕<strong>被</strong>人家拒绝。</td>
<td>Wu Junru, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>吴君如：他很坦白跟我说，<strong>被</strong>逼去专一，因为没办法，因为一定要有孩子，有家庭，然后一定要好像很专一的对着一个女人。</td>
<td>Wu Junru, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：<strong>被</strong>逼着去专一。吴君如：<strong>被</strong>逼去专一，因为没办法，因为一定要有孩子，有家庭，然后一定要好像很专一的对着一个女人。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：那我们就来看看，对比一下，看看您十八岁时候的照片，因为从脖子以下，都<strong>被</strong>手风琴挡住，我们能看到就是一个特别细，特别长的脖子。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：哇，周老师，您的个儿也好高啊，那个时候都是<strong>被</strong>人介绍的是吧？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>郑钧：我转过去的学习成绩很好，大概平均分数都在97、98分吧，然后老师表扬了我，然后呢，女同学们投以了赞许的目光，紧接着早操时间我就<strong>被</strong>人打了。</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, 24/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>郑钧：但是比较让我觉得，比较惊喜的是，考上大学的那一天晚上</td>
<td>Zheng Jun, 24/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上，我哥就突然改变了，变了一个人一样，他觉得按我们家的传统，考上大学就算被社会承认了，也算你长大了，从今以后我再也不会打你，你这所有的决定，全部由你自己做决定。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 19. | 陈鲁豫：我从小愿意相信那些不可能的事情，我在草丛中寻找过小精灵，在星光下等待过飞碟，想像着被它们接走，或者绑架去做实验。 | Chen Luyu, 24/02/2011 |
| 20. | 郑钧：所以呢就是有的时候被我们气哭了。 | Zheng Jun, 24/02/2011 |
| 21. | 主持人：你们旭日阳刚组合已经被推选上今年的春节联欢晚会了。 | Host, 28/02/2011 |
| 22. | 刘刚：我从小就喜欢被人骗，一个人背着琴搁街上走。 | Liu Gang, 28/02/2011 |
| 23. | 陈鲁豫：那等于什么都没给你最后，那你是被人骗了，我发现王旭你是个特别老实，很容易被骗的人，是不是？ | Chen Luyu, 28/02/2011 |
| 24. | 陈鲁豫：那等于什么都没给你最后，那你是被人骗了，我发现王旭你是个特别老实，很容易被骗的人，是不是？ | Chen Luyu, 28/02/2011 |
| 25. | 王旭：我从小就喜欢被人骗。 | Wang Xu, 28/02/2011 |
| 26. | 陈鲁豫：我觉得王旭特别容易被人骗，刘刚你呢？你第一份工作有工资吗？ | Chen Luyu, 28/02/2011 |
| 27. | 邻居：刘刚你还记得这是什么地方吗？你看这个天桥，以前我们每次回家的时候，都要从这个天桥，回到我们自己的村庄自己的家，然后你看那边，咱们原来住的地方都已经被夷为平地，高楼大厦都已经盖起来了。 | Neighbour, 28/02/2011 |
| 28. | 陈鲁豫：我见过有人被啤酒瓶砍到头，但我没有看到过己用啤酒瓶打自己，而且我没有看过女孩儿这样的。 | Chen Luyu, 01/03/2011 |
| 29. | 范冰冰：其实因为我觉得如果我这个职业，然后我每天被关注，然后如果你是一个普通人的话，你会很害怕你，就是你的生活里面都是那个受关注的那种眼光，然后一来二去，全都是身边很多人围着，然后你的那个生活里面，就没有生活的真实的那种质感，都是那个泡沫跟光环。 | Fan Bingbing, 01/03/2011 |
| 30. | 陈鲁豫：对吧，在普通老百姓看来，会觉得你挺牛的，就你能够采访那么多重要的人物，当然对于一个做新闻的来说，其实每一个被采访者都是挺重要的，而且有一点，我们会觉得采访别人就挺难的，但你现在坐在这，是不是觉得其实被采访，也一样是挺难的？ | Chen Luyu, 11/03/2011 |
| 31. | 陈鲁豫：他的父亲很有福，生了六个千金，所以她们家就传说中的七公主，加上她妈，这个，完整万事万物，你看问题你从两面去看，好的就会觉得你爸爸很有福气，被这么多女人包围着，但是不好的，你爸爸可能内心会觉得，我想要个儿子，可能还能继承我的衣钵。 | Chen Luyu, 11/03/2011 |
| 32. | 吴小莉：反过来是我妈，因为主要是我妈已经帮四个女孩，扮漂亮以后呢，她到了我就不愿意把我扮漂亮了，从小帮我剪的非常短的头发，穿了个短裤，我姐姐以前头发是长发，而且都编成小辫子，只有我，每一个人穿过的衣服的轮到我穿，她们的长裤我就剪成短裤，所以我被当男孩养，这样养起来，我的性格也就比较像男孩。 | Wu Xiaoli, 11/03/2011 |
| 33. | 陈鲁豫：在你成长过程当中，包括你的姐妹成长的过程当中，你 | Chen Luyu, 11/03/2011 |
爸爸一定是最紧张的那个，家里六个女孩，可能都长得很漂亮，他会随时担心，会被那些不靠谱的男孩抢走？

吴小莉：我都忘了我们家老公那时候长这样。
陈鲁豫：他现在也就是这样啊。
吴小莉：现在被我圈养的比较好，有点发福。

吴小莉：其实我在生出她的时候，因为我是半身麻醉，所以生她的时候，她第一声哇那个哭声的时候，你就会震撼，你知道是一个生命，因为在你肚子里，你只是听到她心跳，当你听到一个生命，在你身体里头出现以后，你就知道那个感觉是，你不能把她塞回去了。

罗凤枝：没有一家公司愿意要我，我当时记得投简历的时候，像有的那素质高的，就会说你放下吧，我们回去研究研究再商量商量，但有的素质要是低一点儿，就是说，你一个残疾人能干什么了，快回去吧，当时那种自尊心一下就受到伤害，但是我也就没有就是要放弃，所以我一直找一直找，后来，我就记得有一段时间，还被那个传销骗去了。

陈鲁豫：就像我们看电视里面说的那种，去到一个地方被关起来，是那样的传销组织吗？

罗凤枝：嗯，对，当时就是那个组织，已经骗，后来骗了两千多块钱，已经加入，后来又想回，后来我们就都跑了。

罗凤枝：真的是，其实我现在常常就是，怀着一颗感恩的心，我就觉得在一路走过来，经历多少的事情，真的是，我要特别感谢就是我爱人，还有我的父母，还有我同学、朋友，还有那些未曾谋面的朋友，真的是特别感谢他们，那些就是一次都没见过你，但是真的是要帮你的那种朋友，我常常就是，就是，感觉自己反正就是好像，从小到大一直就是被爱包围着。

文章：我女儿当时出生之后，她黄疸，特别严重的黄疸。我女儿就得被迫去烤那个紫外线灯，烤了二十四小时，我们俩当时就崩溃了，俩人坐在床上就看我女儿，在那个灯箱里面烤，戴一小眼罩，可怜死了。当时两个人坐那抱头痛哭。

袁泉：对。幸福的要命他。就是，因为那两天，哈哈就一直在叫爸爸，对，然后，那两天突然，因为他回到家，大概待了两三天之后，我闺女就开始比较黏他，然后有的时候会爬到他脚底下，然后扶着他的腿站起来，爸爸，爸爸，对，所以，我估计他是真的被感动了。

杨千嬅：对呀，可能是时间太快了，刚刚好像签名，CD签名的速度而已呀，所以很快就签完了，虽然那种感觉很奇怪，反而就是回香港以后呢，那天因为别人被爆了，然后我就跟着他们被爆出来，我心里面想的是，他们结婚这么多年才被爆，我们结婚只是一个礼拜就被爆了。

杨千嬅：对呀，可能是时间太快了，刚刚好像签名，CD签名的速度而已呀，所以很快就签完了，虽然那种感觉很奇怪，反而就是回香港以后呢，那天因为别人被爆了，然后我就跟着他们被爆出来，我心里面想的是，他们结婚这么多年才被爆，我们结婚只是一个礼拜就被爆了。
Appendix 3

44. 杨千嬅：对呀，可能是时间太快了，刚刚好像签名，CD 签名的速度而已呀，所以很快就签完了，虽然那种感觉很奇怪，反而就是回香港以后呢，那天因为别人被爆了，然后我就跟着他们被爆出来，我心里面想的是，他们结婚那么多年才被爆，我们结婚只是一个礼拜就被爆了。
Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011

45. 杨千嬅：对呀，可能是时间太快了，刚刚好像签名，CD 签名的速度而已呀，所以很快就签完了，虽然那种感觉很奇怪，反而就是回香港以后呢，那天因为别人被爆了，然后我就跟着他们被爆出来，我心里面想的是，他们结婚那么多年才被爆，我们结婚只是一个礼拜就被爆了。
Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011

46. 李默然：我是被一位老中医救活的，所以我十岁才开始上小学，念到十四岁，家庭环境就不行了，念不起书了……
Li Moran, 12/04/2011

47. 李默然：假如我是一只鸟，我也应该用嘶哑的喉咙歌唱，歌唱这被暴风雨打击着的土地，这永远汹涌着我们的悲愤的河流，这无止息的吹刮着的激怒的风，和那林间无比温柔的黎明。
Li Moran, 12/04/2011

48. 陈鲁豫：很受感动，被您的朗诵感动了。
Chen Luyu, 12/04/2011

49. 潘长江：接下来还得介绍我们，也是我们农民工媳妇，非常泼辣的这么一个人，我在这个戏里我没少被她掐打，冯巩的学生，相声演员宋宁。我们这戏里几乎是美女如云，女演员 12 个，男演员我自己。
Fan Changjiang, 22/04/2011

50. 潘长江：我就从那门出来，两边全是观众，完了我就往出走，我不知道你们看没看过，那周星弛上哪儿演出去，上哪儿去什么，开新闻发布会的时候帽子被人抢走了，我不知道你们看没看，我那次就是，我正往前走呢，帽沿低往前走，上来一个大手，扣我脑袋上，帽子走了，哎我这一回头，完了不知道哪个观众就掏我私处……
Fan Changjiang, 22/04/2011

51. 潘长江：当时我那火腾一下就起来了，我说你摸我哪儿都行，决不允许你摸我私处，我说我看你我非掏你一把不可，那是我有史以来被摸的第一次，我的纯洁已经被，提起这事儿我很伤心。
Fan Changjiang, 22/04/2011

52. 吴小莉：结果我在上海的时候，我收到了秦学士的一个短信，秦学士说，他说小莉姐我这次来面试没有被录取，因为没有才艺我跟我们的老总说，我说中国有八百多万袖珍人，有一点才艺的会说普通话的很多很多，但是要像秦学士这样有五年的这种本科教育的，这个袖珍大夫在中国也许全世界都不容易找到。
Wu Xiaoli, 27/04/2011

53. 陈鲁豫：哇，哎，但这个很难学士，一般人一般人稳不住，他会怕错过了，万一错过了被别人抢了先机怎么办。
Chen Luyu, 27/04/2011

54. 张信哲：我们这一群，这个不被看好的人，我们常说，常常聚在一起，那说我们一定要努力，我们一定要想办法做一些成绩出来，我是根本上不了任何可以见到脸的媒体。
Zhang Xinzhe, 28/04/2011

55. 陈鲁豫：还有一点，我相信每一个人，一定在不同的时候在唱张信哲的歌，或者在听张信哲的歌的时候，曾经因为自身的经历，还有歌的魅力被感动得掉眼泪，或者难过掉眼泪，每个人都会有这样经历。
Chen Luyu, 28/04/2011

56. 张信哲：对，对，那个这个是我其实我很难想像的一个场面，尤其是那个时候，我真得被北京的观众吓到。
Zhang Xinzhe, 28/04/2011

57. 张信哲：对，因为我一开始的时候就已经被严重的警告，北
京的歌迷很直接，如果你唱不好他们会叫你下去吧，下去吧。我那时候。

58. 张信哲：那时候被吓得半死，然后但是没想到真的那一回的两个演唱会的现场大家是这样子地。

28/04/2011

59. 陈鲁豫：他们还以什么样的方式表达他们很喜欢你？然后你被他们的热情觉得，哇，真是太厉害了。

28/04/2011

60. 张信哲：我觉得我比较害怕的是有一次那个我的应该是签售会，还是签名会，整个被取消。

28/04/2011

61. 张信哲：对，那个时候我觉得，还蛮遗憾的，因为我知道那个正个百货大楼的一层，所有的玻璃门，大门全部都被挤破了，然后我就很怕有人受伤，那就是也是因为这个场面没办法控制所以呢根本没有办法办这个演唱会，我根本是直接在后台完全不让我出门。对呀。

28/04/2011

62. 陈鲁豫：你还记得有一次被你说你被警车送走的。

28/04/2011

63. 张信哲：我什么车都坐过啊，警车已经不算什么了，我被法院的那个囚车送。

28/04/2011

64. 张信哲：因为他们还怕警车不够力，他们用囚车，就是法院，对，法院的囚车，然后然后我就很怕有人受伤，那就是也是因为这个场面没办法控制所以呢根本没有办法办这个演唱会，我根本是直接在后台完全不让我出门。对呀。

28/04/2011

65. 陈鲁豫：那你现在回过头去看，就是每个歌手他都会经历从出道一个下歌手，然后有一天因为一首歌，一张专辑，或者慢慢慢慢被大家认可，很红了，他这种心态的转变，你都经历过。

28/04/2011

66. 张信哲：对，我觉得我自己，说实在地，我的出道的过程，并不是特别地顺利，然后也并不是特别地被看好，因为我是不被看好的艺人，所以呢他们就把我分给新来的宣传。没有经验的一些团队，那就，所以我记得我们那个时候呢，真得是，我们这一群，这个不被看好的人，我们常常会说，常常聚在一起，那说我们一定要努力，我们一定要想办法做一些成绩出来，那尤其是像我第一张专辑，我是根本上不了任何可以见到脸的媒体。

28/04/2011

67. 张信哲：对，我觉得我自己，说实在地，我的出道的过程，并不是特别地顺利，然后也并不是特别地被看好，因为我是不被看好的艺人，所以呢他们就把我分给新来的宣传。没有经验的一些团队，那，所以我记得我们那个时候呢，真得是，我们这一群，这个不被看好的人，我们常常会说，常常聚在一起，那说我们一定要努力，我们一定要想办法做一些成绩出来，那尤其是像我第一张专辑，我是根本上不了任何可以见到脸的媒体。

28/04/2011

68. 张信哲：对，我觉得我自己，说实在地，我的出道的过程，并不是特别地顺利，然后也并不是特别地被看好，因为我是不被看好的艺人，所以呢他们就把我分给新来的宣传。没有经验的一些团队，那，所以我记得我们那个时候呢，真得是，我们这一群，这个不被看好的人，我们常常会说，常常聚在一起，那说我们一定要努力，我们一定要想办法做一些成绩出来，那尤其是像我第一张专辑，我是根本上不了任何可以见到脸的媒体。

28/04/2011

69. 张信哲：对，我觉得我自己，说实在地，我的出道的过程，并不是特别地顺利，然后也并不是特别地被看好，因为我是不被看好的艺人，所以呢他们就把我分给新来的宣传。没有经验的一些团队，那，所以我记得我们那个时候呢，真得是，我们这一群，这
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>张信哲：那，但是，我觉得我很庆幸的就是说，有跟我一起，努力挣扎起来的一群工作伙伴，他们在我还被不看好时候，他们就很努力地跟我一起成长。</td>
<td>Zhang Xinzhè, 28/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>胡一虎：今天快要过去了，但是明天开始世界真的会更加的安全吗，本·拉登被击毙了，这个过去十年反恐正义看待多年的消息一旦成为事实后，今天为什么有许多人还在更加的担心报复性的恐惧会不会随之登场。</td>
<td>Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>胡一虎：不仅是英国，不仅是美国今天向民众提高了全球旅游的警戒，特别值得注意的是，就在上周维机解密也刚好透露基地组织早已经决定，只要本·拉登被抓或者被击毙，那么基地成员将会立刻引爆暗藏在欧洲的一颗核弹，这是基地组织早就刻意制造的心理战，还是反恐正应如临大敌，下一个战场已经开始。</td>
<td>Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>胡一虎：不仅是英国，不仅是美国今天向民众提高了全球旅游的警戒，特别值得注意的是，就在上周维机解密也刚好透露基地组织早已经决定，只要本·拉登被抓或者被击毙，那么基地成员将会立刻引爆暗藏在欧洲的一颗核弹，这是基地组织早就刻意制造的心理战，还是反恐正应如临大敌，下一个战场已经开始。</td>
<td>Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>胡一虎：奥巴马亲口说拉登死了，而同时表示他的遗体已经海葬了，即使如此来讲许多的阴谋论现在还是在传播，比如说在巴基斯坦当地的媒体出现了这样的照片，这样的照片到现在为止，在网络上散发的拉登死亡的照片，结果您可以看到，包括中间旁边这些的被专家证实是伪造的，在今天这么一个敏感的时刻，为什么巴基斯坦会放出这样的一个伪造的照片，也因此在其他的各国当中表示，这里面还大有学问跟阴谋论。</td>
<td>Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>李弘敏：的确，一虎，现在有很多的阴谋论，因为在不到 24 小时之内，美国人宣布说本·拉登被打了，DNA 也验完了，同时他的遗体现在也已经海葬了，那么到底美国要怎么样向国际社会来证明说，在昨天的这场行动当中击毙的真的是本·拉登本人……</td>
<td>Li Hongmin, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>胡一虎：谢谢弘敏在华盛顿补充，待会还有最新消息，我们再跟弘敏连线，立刻再回到伊斯兰堡的现场，因为我们曾经在过去这段时间派驻在当地的时候，也曾经去采访过一个地点，这个地方就是今天拉登被击毙的那个主要的城市，也就是阿伯特巴德这个地方。</td>
<td>Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>张晓东（中国社科院西亚非洲研究所国际关系室主任）：第一，对于“9.11”那天在天上，在地下，还有在房子住的那些死去的人和他的家属来讲，本·拉登被击毙可以说是有所交待，对这些逝去的亡灵，对他们的家属来讲，从美国国内政治方面来讲，可以说是有了一个比较差不多十年之后，有了这样的结果，这是一个方面。</td>
<td>Zhang Xiaodong, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>张晓东：另外一方面，作为基地的头号人物，被击毙了，从战争目标来讲应该说已经实现了，从这两个方面来讲，我觉得从国际和国内，美国人可以讲在阿富汗的任务已经完成了。</td>
<td>Zhang Xiaodong, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>严明：是的，我想本·拉登之死，不论是利比亚还是对整个北非，都会有深刻的影响，我们知道我们所处的地区是北非基地组织活动非常猖獗的地方，在这利比亚的反对党派武装之内，有很多的</td>
<td>Yan Ming, 02/05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 80. 胡一虎：在拉登被打死之后,“9.11”受害者还有家属的心情是如何的呢,我们立刻连线曾在纽约采访的记者,十年前的时候,在“9.11”发生的时候,其实我们在第一线也跟庞哲在连线,在某方面来讲,她也是间接的受害者,纽约人的心情我想庞哲你最懂,跟我们分享你的感受,好吗？  
Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 81. 庞哲：我当时本身是在一楼之隔的美国证券交易所,当时整个楼里是乌烟瘴气,完全电源全部都被切掉,而且整个人好像是被埋在土里,比咽不过来的感受……  
Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011 |
| 胡一虎：在拉登被打死之后,“9.11”受害者还有家属的心情是如何的呢,我们立刻连线曾在纽约采访的记者,十年前的时候,在“9.11”发生的时候,其实我们在第一线也跟庞哲在连线,在某方面来讲,她也是间接的受害者,纽约人的心情我想庞哲你最懂,跟我们分享你的感受,好吗？  
Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 83. 庞哲：我当时本身是在一楼之隔的美国证券交易所,当时整个楼里是乌烟瘴气,完全电源全部都被切掉,而且整个人好像是被埋在土里,比咽不过来的感受……  
Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011 |
| 胡一虎：在拉登被打死之后,“9.11”受害者还有家属的心情是如何的呢,我们立刻连线曾在纽约采访的记者,十年前的时候,在“9.11”发生的时候,其实我们在第一线也跟庞哲在连线,在某方面来讲,她也是间接的受害者,纽约人的心情我想庞哲你最懂,跟我们分享你的感受,好吗？  
Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 84. 庞哲：当时我们也成为第一个能直接报道现在世贸中心直播方式发生的恐怖袭击的事情,十年之后再回到这个地方,我刚才在来的路上也看到了警察是戒备森严,当然本.拉登本人已经被击毙了,但是基地组织还会有很强烈的,很有组织的报复行动……  
Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011 |
| 胡一虎：在拉登被打死之后,“9.11”受害者还有家属的心情是如何的呢,我们立刻连线曾在纽约采访的记者,十年前的时候,在“9.11”发生的时候,其实我们在第一线也跟庞哲在连线,在某方面来讲,她也是间接的受害者,纽约人的心情我想庞哲你最懂,跟我们分享你的感受,好吗？  
Hu Yihu, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 85. 庞哲：但是也有人认为这个恐怖袭击不会因本.拉登本人被击毙而就此结束,我在来的过程中也看到路上也有很多人在沉痛悼念在十年前在这里殉难的自己的亲人,还有人继续点着蜡烛,继续搬着自己亲人的照片。  
Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 86. 庞哲：但是也有人认为这个恐怖袭击不会因本.拉登本人被击毙而就此结束,我在来的过程中也看到路上也有很多人在沉痛悼念在十年前在这里殉难的自己的亲人,还有人继续点着蜡烛,继续搬着自己亲人的照片。  
Pang Zhe, 02/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 87. 高晓松：那个时候的体制是文工团体制,就是你得上艺校,然后上完艺校进文工团,然后在团里面你每年被考核各种,然后才能去电视台什么的。  
Gao Xiaosong, 03/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 88. 宋柯：他快毕业之前的那会儿,被我们打击的够呛。  
Song Ke, 03/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 89. 孙葆洁：就是有一次他上足球课的时候,他去守门去了,我就仔细看,怎么他来了球后,左扑右挡非常职业,一般往往这守门员的位置,不是所有人都愿意去做的,因为它[sic]是不能进球,老被进球。  
Sun Baojie, 03/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 90. 陈鲁豫：五月六号和我们见面,那作为这部影片的主创,在影片跟大家见面之前,你们肯定会有一些希望想对观众说的话,想对观众,让我们来看这部戏的理由,杨博你先说。  
Ming Jiang, 04/05/2011 |
| 基地分子现在已经搀进了本.拉登本来是他们的精神领袖,一旦他被美军击毙,原来想借欧美和北约推翻卡扎菲的这些搀和进了基地组织成员,会有什么动作反映值得我们关注。 | 91. 陈鲁豫：但是我现在知道,你经常你看到一个什么现象,你觉得需要解决的,你就会发到微博上,然后很快能够被解决是吧?都能够得到解决。  
Ming Jiang, 05/05/2011 |
| 92. | 郑渊洁：哦，那是没见过，在郑州。他们也是亚旗这个游戏上的居民，然后就聊起来了，开始问是上小学几年级，他说都工作了，说要结婚了，后来咱们在那个，网络游戏里结婚，说的就好像没人做过这样的事情，后来就结，我证的婚。然后这件事情报几家媒体报道，人民网、新华网，什么凤凰网什么等等。都报道了，然后但是我还从来没见过，你说的是新郎新娘都来了吗？ | Zheng Yuanjie, 06/05/2011 |
| 93. | 郑渊洁：他做过一件很不合情理的事儿，郑亚旗他参加一个朋友的婚礼，人家上了鱼翅了，他站起来就走了。然后我说：我觉得我不想被那个一桌子鱼翅，那个不能说买单吧，反正我觉得不太好。 | Zheng Yaqi, 06/05/2011 |
| 94. | 郑渊洁：比如说我是 1992 年去的郑州签售，当时一个特火的商场叫亚细亚，当时是排队排得挺长的嘛，然后签到最后的时候，来了一个二年级的女生，小学生，签完名了，我以为她就走了，我就问下一位读者。她说她说郑叔叔我长大了我能到你身边去工作吗？我说可以呀，因为我觉得是对孩子只能做一件事成年人，就是鼓励。我说可以呀，但是说完了以后，我又多了一句话，我说我身边的助理就缺会英文的，我说别的都有了，我说你要学好了英文比如说，因为我跟外国人谈版权老吃亏嘛，我以为他给我一万美元呢，其实是一美元，一，我就吃亏，所以我就需要。结果她说，那你给我写在这个书上吧，我就写上了，长大以后学好英文到我这儿来，写完了，她走了，我忘了。这个女孩在班上学习成绩是比较，就是是比较靠后的，但是白纸黑字这么一写，就这么几秒钟，很快就全班第一了。 | Zheng Yuanjie, 06/05/2011 |
| 95. | 舒淇：那时候他们就是拿着一把吉他，在到处唱歌骗女孩子的那种。刘伟强：哎，我不是。是。舒淇：被女孩子骗？刘伟强：对。舒淇：比较斯文。 | Shu Qi, 13/05/2011 |
| 96. | 郑雯：对，现在想好像有点叛逆，当时我在高考的时候属于这种第一个交卷的孩子，不是说我答得有多好，是我语文只写了一个作文，然后写完了，打铃了，我就交卷了，就所有其他的题都没有填，然后第二天考数学的时候，我也是把后面的这些大题都做了，然后做完之后我又开始划，为什么呢，因为我就在考虑，说万一要是考了一个分，又不高不低，被一个特别不好的学校录取了就太悲惨了。 | Zheng Wen, 24/05/2011 |
| 97. | 许生会：肯定担心啦，当时那个心里面，就像一坨石头在这个心里面，不知怎么着，反正就是特别难受，当时那个心就快要落下来，然后还不由得心里面那种感觉吧，然后回来嘛，假如是找回来，鞋子，就是这些鞋子，穿的这个鞋都走破，到处去捉，找回来，坐着就哭，哭了又去找，那种心理嘛真的没有人能够体会。我们家那些朋友啊，那些亲戚都跟着找嘛，人家有一个，他有一个朋友，那个家里面跟着找嘛，晚上没回家，家里面第二天那个东西都被盗了，什么发动机，那个打沙的发动机都被人家盗了，到现在都没，没找着那个发动机，然后还有一个朋友嘛，他骑的 | Xu Shenghui, 31/05/2011 |
98. 许生会：肯定担心啦，当时那个心里面，就像一坨石头在这个心里面，不知怎么着，反正就是特别难受，当时那个心就快要落下来，然后还不由得心里那种感觉吧，然后回来呢，假如是找回来，鞋子，就是这些鞋子，穿的这个鞋都走破，到处去捉，找回来，坐着就哭，哭了又去找，那种心理真的没有人能够体会。

我们家那些朋友啊，那些亲戚都跟着找嘛，人家有一个，他有一个朋友，那个家里面跟着找嘛，晚上没回家，家里面第二天那个东西都被盗了，什么发动机，那个打沙的发动机都被人家盗了，到现在都没，没找着那个发动机，然后还有一个朋友嘛，他骑的那个摩托车嘛，还以为他是骑摩托车出车祸了，当时还认为，然后去证实嘛，没有，都把我们吓死了那几天真的，找这个孩子真的是，反正就是，一言难尽真的是，真的是一言难尽。

Xu Shenghui, 31/05/2011

99. 许生会：还没干，就是鲜血，当时看见是鲜血，然后他奶奶马上 就坐在那里哭吧，爷爷奶奶就哭，我当时 我那几天我就麻木了，我都哭不出来了，我只是知道找孩子，哪里有孩子我赶快就去找，赶紧去找，我都麻木了，我没有哭，他们还传那个谣言说，我们家孩子都 被人家害死了。

Xu Shenghui, 31/05/2011

100. 汪阳刚：就是那个邻居嘛，就是去亲戚家走动啊，吃饭，他们聊天的时候我听到了，去亲戚家吃饭的时候，人家就会问，你以前 买回来的儿子长这么高了，他们在厨房聊天嘛，然后我就听到了，然后那时候，从那天开始那我就去想，我去想就是说，原来我自己是 被别人拐的。

Wang Yanggang, 31/05/2011

101. 汪阳刚：就是怀疑自己是 被人家拐卖的嘛，那种心情，因为在我 们福建那边，你不是自己亲生的，你就没地位，你就，反正别人 都会，用一种歧视的眼光看你嘛，就这样，我那时心情很矛盾。那时候像我也想跟他们，养父母他们闹翻了，但是我怕，如果我这边的父母找不到，那我以后就没家了。

Wang Yanggang, 31/05/2011

102. 陈鲁豫：几次寻亲都没有结果，小陈就这样 被希望和失望交织折磨着，可是一个新的很重要的人物出现，又给小陈带来了希望，事情会不会从此就出现转机呢？

Chen Luyu, 31/05/2011

103. 陈鲁豫：2011 年春节之后小陈到广州去打工，3 月 16 号这一天 小陈上网，他输入了拐卖儿童四个字，于是就看到了《反拐行动 —大爱寻人》网，小陈上了这个网的接待群，碰到了志愿者仔仔，在仔仔的启发下，小陈很多幼时的记忆 被唤醒了。

Chen Luyu, 31/05/2011

104. 汪阳刚：这里有一个坑，我掉进去了，回去了 被你骂，还是被你 打，你帮我洗澡。

Wang Yanggang, 31/05/2011

105. 汪阳刚：这里有一个坑，我掉进去了，回去了被你骂，还是 被你 打，你帮我洗澡。

Wang Yanggang, 31/05/2011

106. 周迅：……然后我就忘记了，这个也是自闭症的一种反映，自闭症的小孩是没有恨的，哎，我怎么，赶快走，对，对，你们去看 那个纪录片里面有一集，就是叫 《我叫蔡杰》，然后他爸爸就有 说过一句这样的话，就是说他爸爸 被他儿子 感动，就是他，就他 爸爸一直希望，就是蔡杰是一个可以表达情绪的人，他可以记住 东西的人，他就一直在努力，一直在强迫蔡杰，要让他记得东西，要让他记得东西，那突然有一天，他可能太着急了，所以就骂

Zhou Xun, 03/06/2011
<p>| 107. | 陈鲁豫：对，很，对对，通常受伤的人就是光有能力没有智慧，这样才能很容易受伤，但是，我觉得人在爱的时候，还要要使劲去爱，就是你不能怕，因为怕被伤害就不敢去爱，那是件很惨的事情。 | Chen Luyu, 03/06/2011 |
| 108. | 周迅：没有，因为我在学校二年级就被，就被挑去拍戏。 | Zhou Xun, 06/06/2011 |
| 109. | 李宇春：也有还在车上的，有一首歌就是《淹死的鱼》，然后呢？是听收音机……听到那收音机在播一些新闻，说那个地方死了多少鱼，然后我就想，我就突然自己想到说，鱼有没有被淹死的，然后我就记下了《淹死的鱼》，这个名字，然后回去写的这首歌。 | Li Yuchun, 09/06/2011 |
| 110. | 刘谦：没有，因为她躲在休息室里面，然后我在下面，就是在跟导演沟通这些动作，然后到她，她就下来做，做完就又回去这样，神出鬼没，我根本就，就走掉了，根本没有办法跟她讲到话，我记得很好笑的一件事情，张惠妹很好，那时候她在道具里面被变出来了，然后变出来，她没有出来，她躲在机关夹层里面，然后你怎么样，她说我裤子掉了。 | Liu Qian, 13/06/2011 |
| 111. | 陈鲁豫：为什么会掉啊，被勾住了吗？ | Chen Luyu, 21/06/2011 |
| 112. | 刘谦：他其实不是被我挑，因为我那时候用随机的方式挑观众，我丢个飞盘下去，接的人上来。 | Liu Qian, 21/06/2011 |
| 113. | 范玮琪：大家好，星星带我许过愿望，那一年的夏，我的梦好长，你就带我飞翔，星星陪我看懂了迷惘和希望，那就带我疯狂，那就带我狂，我就追到了天堂。暮光燃烧了太阳，推着我浪迹天涯，爱是一道不灭温暖的光，暮光灿烂了晚霞，直到夜都被照亮。我用微笑迎接美丽的光。暮光燃烧了太阳，推着我浪迹天涯，爱是一道不灭温暖的光，暮光灿烂了晚霞，直到夜都被照亮。我用微笑迎接美丽的光，我找到了你们肯定的目光。谢谢大家，谢谢你们。 | 13/06/2011 |
| 114. | 陈鲁豫：被女孩喜欢的女孩，就说明她真的是一个人缘很好的一个女孩，你知道吗。 | Chen Luyu, 21/06/2011 |
| 115. | 范玮琪：对呀，而且以后真的被人家讲出来，我就不会承认，管它呢？哎哟，没有啦。 | Fan Weiqi, 21/06/2011 |
| 116. | 范玮琪：我就会说没关系吃一点，她就会被骂，而且她吃素，所以她比较吃的东西方面她很讲究。 | Fan Weiqi, 21/06/2011 |
| 117. | 张惠妹：那我们一直觉得，她是姐妹里面最容易跟别人相处的，她跟每一个，每一位姐妹都很好，对，我在团体里面，我跟她都是容易被捉弄的。 | Zhang Huimei, 21/06/2011 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118. 张惠妹：……然后黑人来接我，我一上车，然后黑人就开车，就是一件非常平常的事情，然后我以为车上只有黑人跟我，那车子开到某个阶段，某一段路的时候，我跟黑人正聊得很投入的时候，很专心在聊天的时候，忽然间，你知道范范，是一个非常白的女孩，然后又瘦，然后头发放下来，那她就从我背后默默地飘出来，我真的不夸张，她飘出来那一刹那，我差一点点那个门打开，要跳出去，我整个被吓得一身冷汗，因为她飘出来的方式太恐怖了，她是直接贴着我的脸，从背这面这样贴出来这样，你看他们两个，这两个，然后就吓得我，我记得我回去还做噩梦什么的，因为我真的被吓到了，所以你看他们多喜欢捉弄我，她跟她老公，没办法。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. 张惠妹：……然后黑人来接我，我一上车，然后黑人就开车，就是一件非常平常的事情，然后我以为车上只有黑人跟我，那车子开到某个阶段，某一段路的时候，我跟黑人正聊得很投入的时候，很专心在聊天的时候，忽然间，你知道范范，是一个非常白的女孩，然后又瘦，然后头发放下来，那她就从我背后默默地飘出来，我真的不夸张，她飘出来那一刹那，我差一点点那个门打开，要跳出去，我整个被吓得一身冷汗，因为她飘出来的方式太恐怖了，她是直接贴着我的脸，从背这面这样贴出来这样，你看他们两个，这两个，然后就吓得我，我记得我回去还做噩梦什么的，因为我真的被吓到了，所以你看他们多喜欢捉弄我，她跟她老公，没办法。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. 范玮琪：一开始有，有一点因为，因为我们两个都是公众人物，所以就是有一点压力，一开始说在想不晓得，这样的消息被公开之后，它会有什么的效应。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. 李李仁：真的吗？真的没有人吗？对，我觉得尤其是像我们，做我们这个行业的，我觉得一定会被公开出去，如果你有做过什么事的话，不要以为大家不知道，我觉得早晚都会知道，所以我觉得还是要洁身自爱，知道自己要什么比较重要。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. 陈鲁豫：我要，我要说明一下，这个被采访的是李李仁，然后采访他的是就陶子自己，所以哪有。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. 梁静茹：对，而且很多的那个轻松的通告都被取消。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. 梁静茹：那时候我记得，上陶子姐的节目，娱乐新闻嘛，一上去以前还没有，就直播以前进广告，然后先坐好，她就很严肃地跟我讲说，等一下千万记得不能够随便笑喔，会被骂，所以我觉得我拿着我的新专辑，终于过了两年发了，但是一到那个棚内很紧张，反正想说大家都说……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. 李素丽徒弟：她每天都要提前一个多小时到单位，我记得那会儿实习的时候是冬天，冬天的时候我们那会儿特别老的公共汽车，她都要就是加热水，头天晚上把凉水，怕机器被冻了，把凉水放了……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. 喻磊：没有，当时就感觉他唱歌唱的特别好，被他那种精神感动，就说感觉他残疾得这么严重，那么坚强，唱歌的时候又唱得那么好。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. 陈州：对，她因为不像大老爷们一推，有的时候推推不着，一蹲就这样。很多回有一次晚上，前不着村后不着店，车轮胎被扎了，明天早上我就回家了，这不是人的生活，就这样。但是总的来</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
讲这么多年过来，还是挺那个的。

128. 孙俪：齐步走，正步走，然后跑步，然后站队列什么都要练，我记得我们第一天没有练那种跑步，就在那个台阶边上，半个脚掌在台阶上，那样站着练军姿，但是你知道越苦吧，我觉得人就是就有时候会受刺激你知道，有一次我记得我在新兵连连写的，写的那一份检查，就是因为比如说向右看齐，不应左转向右转，有一个人我的同年兵，应该向左转，都往那转，她一下来个右转，我们俩就对上了你知道，对上就开始笑，就怎么都不停了，就开始笑了，笑了差不多有十分钟，然后被拖去写检查了。

Sun Li, 08/07/2011

129. 孙俪：因为自己那时候刚刚被选上跳这个舞蹈，一下就自己就骄傲了，就一下自己也不刻苦了也不练了，然后有一天教导员找我谈话，说所有人都说你这舞蹈跳得不好看，说你再如果不好好练的话，你就不要在再跳了，那一下就敲了一下警钟，就每天自己练，然后最后还是保住了。

Sun Li, 08/07/2011

130. 陈鲁豫：真的，你被什么大领导接见过吗，那时候？

Chen Luyu, 08/07/2011

131. 邓超：曾经在街上被人吹过哨。

Deng Chao, 08/07/2011

132. 和晶：没想到观众反弹那么大，那个时候我的同事我团队里的人，都很怕我看到那个观众留言嘛，因为那已经不是观众留言了，叫观众痛骂，就什么话都有，然后他们就觉得，他们觉得我特无辜，所以很怕让我看见以后，因为他们想我一个女孩子，然后你看到这些话，然后很多都是用人身攻击的语言，我一上海人突然被很多人用京骂在骂着，他们可能觉得我特受不了，所以我印象特别深，我们办公室当时有个观众留言的那个电脑屏幕，老是处于关机状态，我还傻乎乎地问他们，我说哎这个电脑坏了还是怎么了，然后他们说可能是这两天找人修一下，后来我才知道我去的时候那电脑那个屏幕，他们就关掉不看，然后我走了之后他们再打开，看那个观众的那个留言，我当时不叫留言，叫观众留骂，对。

He Jing, 11/07/2011

133. 文章：哎呀，那怎么了，就三年就被离三次婚，所以我就觉得就是想他们是不是下了赌注了，就说这个人三年要是离了，我们能赔多少，然后五年离了我们能赔多少，属于这种，这样不好，这样不好，我真的是别老在我这较劲了。

Wen Zhang, 13/07/2011

134. 文章：对，对，对，真的特别，特别感动，因为我跟太太在家里彼此之间没有甜言蜜语，没有像刘易阳这样天天哄太太的，没有。以前啊，以前我较她还是浪漫一些，但每次都被人家揭穿你知道吗？就比如说她每次过生日什么的，我说哎哟不行，我正拍戏呢。什么、什么的，然后过一会就去，结果她很容易就猜到了，还留门什么的。所以我就后来也就放弃了，因为跟她抖机灵基本上是没戏，就不能跟她抖机灵，所以我永远就是第一步就是缴枪，就是我是透明的，没有心眼，不抖机灵，后来就习惯了慢慢，嗯。

Wen Zhang, 13/07/2011

135. 陈鲁豫：幸福的家庭是相似的，不幸的家庭总是有着各自的不幸，今天故事的主人公就曾经经历了人生当中最大的痛苦和不幸，十二年前，他的妻子和儿子被拐走了，这之后的十二年，他一直在寻找，而其中的艰辛和坎坷，让他不堪回首。

Chen Luyu, 14/07/2011

136. 易刚久：真的是哭了两天两夜，晚上，白天就干活，一直干活，

Yi Gangjiu,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>想起来是不是，自己辛辛苦苦讨个老婆，生个小孩，三四岁了，这么活泼，三四岁了，正在活泼的时候，<strong>被</strong>人一下子搞得无影无踪了，还得了一场病，药我都吃了三盒，他们说刚久啊你不行啊，你都瘦了，干活没精神，我都吃了三盒药，真的得了一场病。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>易刚久：我是接我的老婆跟小孩，我老婆跟小孩<strong>被</strong>人贩子骗到你们山西来了，现在经济方面有一定困难，在某一方面你照顾一下嘛，是不是，便宜一点，睡得不冷就可以了，就这样，我找我老婆跟小孩都找了十二年了，今天刚刚找到。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>谢晓琦：亲生父亲我在这生活好好的，他平白无故来打搅我的生活，我原本幸福安稳温馨的家庭<strong>被</strong>他破坏了，他有什么资格说我爱我，说让我回去趟他那里，我不会跟他回去的。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>刘若英：对呀，就拿着，然后就一直跑，一直跑，然后就到隔壁一条巷子，然后那时候有四五个人，就吃，金城武真的是比较正直的，他是最后一个<strong>被</strong>我们逼的，因为我们怕他去警察局告我们，所以我们要他一定要咬一口。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>张惠妹：很想知道你近况，我听人说还不如你对我讲，经过那段遗憾，请你放心，我变得更加坚强，世界不管怎样荒凉，爱过你就不怕孤单，我最亲爱的，你过得怎么样，没我的日子你别来无恙，依然亲爱的，我没让你失望，让我亲一亲，像过去一样，我想你一定喜欢，现在的我学会了你最爱的开朗，想起你的模样，有什么错还不能够<strong>被</strong>原谅，世界不管怎样荒凉，爱过你就不怕孤单，我最亲爱的，你过得怎么样，没我的日子你别来无恙，依然亲爱的，我没让你失望，让我亲一亲像亲人一样，我最亲爱的，你过得怎么样。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>张惠妹：所以做家事最多的是我跟我大妹，那Saya呢，因为最小<strong>被</strong>逼的，<strong>被</strong>逼着一定要洗，对。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>张惠妹：所以做家事最多的是我跟我大妹，那Saya呢，因为最小</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
，那她最小，她就会装我不会，我不会，就换大妹，大妹有些时候闹脾气就会看我，那我就不知道跟谁闹脾气，因为我不敢跟姐姐，那我跟她闹脾气，她会比我更拗，我大妹，因为她的脾气就跟妈妈一样，就是不说话就是不说话，就是跟你，不讲话就是不讲话，哇，那个我受不了，我就是好，好，好，不要，不要，我来，我来。

陈鲁豫：贤慧。

张惠妹：被逼的，被逼的，被逼着一定要洗，对。

钟吉全：她就写个老钟开心，就写在香皂上面，我看见个香皂开心，就甩到楼底下去了，被弄得莫名其妙，我说老钟开心，什么开心啊，我文化又没有，文化又少，我只认得我的名字，老钟开心，什么开心啊，我就把香皂，那块香皂一甩，就甩到楼底下去了，她就气了嘛，要哄嘛。

钟艳：她现在把我妈妈气走以后，他就脾气越来越坏，越来越坏，当我妈在的时候，他脾气都那么坏，他们经常在一起打打闹闹，吵架，就是经常吵架，有时候不好了就动手，但我妈本来就好得过我爸，但我妈每次都让着我爸爸，但是我爸爸就多不理解人，我妈就应该是这一点被他气走的吧。

罗志祥：对，我妈妈叫阿兰，因为我妈妈学历不高嘛，我妈妈国小都没毕业的，那她从小就就被爸爸妈妈给，应该是被我妈妈的妈妈……

陈鲁豫：外婆、姥姥，外婆。

罗志祥：……姥姥给遗弃了。

陈鲁豫：真的八岁。

罗志祥：八岁，然后遗弃了，因为那时候我妈妈跟我讲，我也觉得怎么可能你八岁怎么生存啊，可是因为我妈妈是原住民，那原住民她本人第一个本能就是能够自己生存嘛……

罗志祥：[contd]……那我妈妈就是一个人在海边然后就生存，然后去捡一些破铜烂铁，然后拿去卖，然后就一个人这样生活，到后面然后经过很多事情，所以她的社会的，很多的道理，可能有一些科学家们就怎么不认同，但是在妈妈所遇到这些事情的时候，她跟我讲完之后，我觉得哎，挺有道理的，妈妈还说什么，你说话如果你没做的话，你说话就可以比别人大声，这是一个很简单的一句话，但是它真的遇到很多事情的时候呢，钱是不是你拿的，是不是你偷的，我没有，你就可以很坚决的那种眼神，我没有这样，因为常常都会被别人误解嘛，很多事情，哎，这话是不是你讲的，不是我，是我，是我，有时候会心虚嘛，但是妈妈就告诉你说没有做的话，你就可以很大声说你没有做。

罗志祥：跟朋友出去玩也拍，然后又说什么我跟女生怎么样，那在网路上交朋友又写我在怎么样，谁知道她会害我啊。

罗志祥：会，我看到很多视频，狗可能过马路不小心被车撞了，它的朋友狗的朋友在旁边一直守着它。

王静：所以谢谢你，谢谢你给了我这么多的感动。其实我跟高艳喜欢你很久了，你不用问我们是怎样喜欢你的，因为我们一开始就被你电到了没办法，真没有办法。

陈鲁豫：你在家老听他的歌，你爸爸是不是也跟你一起都喜欢听
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>项目序号</th>
<th>内容</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：我来给大家读几个数字吧，跟乌老有关的，您听听对不对，五十余年的办案经历，平均每年有两百多天在各地参与办案，被誉为中国当代的福尔摩斯。还有，凡是、凡是公安部挂号的大案，他几乎都参与过侦破，对吗？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>解说：从勘察案发现场得出，虽然被害人汪林包裹里的相机被盗，但现场大量钱财没有被盗取，因此乌国庆分析，凶手的目的不是抢劫杀人，与此同时，汪林双手双脚都被捆绑，几乎赤裸于床上，全身被刺二十一刀，凶手的动机是否是强奸杀人。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>乌国庆：还有的一些场面呢，你比如说有的案子是满门抄斩，我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好，好多同志们家里现在同志们都只有一个孩子，独生子，有的那个你们可能看到过像贵州那县长全家被杀，六口，一家六口被杀，那个小孩当时在上边，在他姥姥睡那边……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>乌国庆：还有的一些场面呢，你比如说有的案子是满门抄斩，我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好，好多同志们家里现在同志们都只有一个孩子，独生子，有的那个你们可能看到过像贵州那县长全家被杀，六口，一家六口被杀，那个小孩当时在上边，在他姥姥睡那边……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>乌国庆：还有的一些场面呢，你比如说有的案子是满门抄斩，我特别看到那些小孩被杀的时候，心情啊很不好，好多同志们家里现在同志们都只有一个孩子，独生子，有的那个你们可能看到过像贵州那县长全家被杀，六口，一家六口被杀，那个小孩当时在上边，在他姥姥睡那边……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>曹秀彭：我说你晚上老看那个有些真是血淋淋的那些个尸体，像那个被炸断的那个手，东一块，西一块，很害怕叫你们看到，他无所谓。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>李双江：刚才小蔡讲的时候，我们在那儿，比方说四千公尺，三千八百公尺或者是边防、海防，我们去慰问一下几天，半个月，他们要三年，我们到南沙去慰问战士，海岛说海潮来的时候他们就得站在珊瑚礁，因为那个地方有战士，那个土地就是我们的，要不然就被人抢走了，我们真是见到他们以后像亲人，走了很远了很远，还欢迎你们再来啊，那个海浪声和那个船的风的声搅在一起，战士的心，战士的情，对我们这些文艺战士来讲，我们永远都不会忘怀。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>阎维文：因为在汶川的前线我们看到了许许多多军人在那里奉献，尤其像武文斌他其实代表了许许多多的军人。他不是说意外被打败了或者是怎么，他是活在那个抗震救灾的现场是累死的，他是一个大学毕业的军人，本来是说好在家要结婚，后来接到这个任务，他赶到这个汶川地震的现场，约好了是等这次完成任务以后回去跟他的未婚妻成婚。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>蔡国庆：因为我们在汶川的这个慰问演出，可以说是非常地辛苦，所以那个战士，刚才阎老师讲真的是被活活累死的，他不断地在废墟上扒，不断地在找寻着，有没有新的生命，有没有遗体不断地找，是活活累死的。然后在整理，首长们和战友们整理他的遗物的时候，就发现在他的军挎包里啊，除了有他的笔记本，还</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>阎维文：所以我们就这么说吃饭时间，我们说把这段时间停下来，我们到烈士的灵堂去，去看望他一下，我没想到要唱歌，真是没有想到，就是说去看一下，然后到那儿以后我们每个人都被那个场景所震撼，就整个一个大的广场全部是鲜花和那个花圈，说方圆几十公里外的这个鲜花和那个花圈全部被老百姓自发地买走送到这里，就是那个时候所有的那个当地的老百姓，他对子弟兵那种、那种感激之情全倾注在他这个现场。我想没有，没有几个从事艺术的人会跑到灵堂去唱歌。我记得我从前线下来的时候，我在医院里慰问三个战士，那也是所有人都不会有这样的经历，就是我们这三位战士是被敌军的燃烧弹烧伤的，烧伤面积是百分之百，我接到命令说你一定要去，到病房去慰问战士，我说知道了那好。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>阎维文：所以我们就这么说吃饭时间，我们说把这段时间停下来，我们到烈士的灵堂去，去看望他一下，我没想到要唱歌，真是没有想到，就是说去看一下，然后到那儿以后我们每个人都被那个场景所震撼，就整个一个大的广场全部是鲜花和那个花圈，说方圆几十公里外的这个鲜花和那个花圈全部被老百姓自发地买走送到这里，就是那个时候所有的那个当地的老百姓，他对子弟兵那种、那种感激之情全倾注在他这个现场。我想没有，没有几个从事艺术的人会跑到灵堂去唱歌。我记得我从前线下来的时候，我在医院里慰问三个战士，那也是所有人都不会有这样的经历，就是我们这三位战士是被敌军的燃烧弹烧伤的，烧伤面积是百分之百，我接到命令说你一定要去，到病房去慰问战士，我说知道了那好。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>阎维文：所以我们就这么说吃饭时间，我们说把这段时间停下来，我们到烈士的灵堂去，去看望他一下，我没想到要唱歌，真是没有想到，就是说去看一下，然后到那儿以后我们每个人都被那个场景所震撼，就整个一个大的广场全部是鲜花和那个花圈，说方圆几十公里外的这个鲜花和那个花圈全部被老百姓自发地买走送到这里，就是那个时候所有的那个当地的老百姓，他对子弟兵那种、那种感激之情全倾注在他这个现场。我想没有，没有几个从事艺术的人会跑到灵堂去唱歌。我记得我从前线下来的时候，我在医院里慰问三个战士，那也是所有人都不会有这样的经历，就是我们这三位战士是被敌军的燃烧弹烧伤的，烧伤面积是百分之百，我接到命令说你一定要去，到病房去慰问战士，我说知道了那好。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：房价都是被你这样的人炒起来的。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>陶喆：是非常火爆，不是热烈，而且我妈妈耳光的时候是没有声音的，而且你也不知道你被打，你看到我妈突然她说你再说你说，然后突然，谁打的我，是你吗？是你吗？然后我妈的手已经放回去了。然后你这边三横。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>陶喆：再剪就没了，什么都没了，结果我就那样子去上学，你知道那个时候。陈鲁豫：被人笑死了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>陶喆：很多，很多，所以头发这个东西是对男人来讲是很重要的，是不能随便去这个侮辱的。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
陈鲁豫：身体发肤。
陶喆：对，我被侮辱了。

168. 陶喆：他们其实一定是前几天，是好像是哪一个单位送我爸的一个荣誉的一个什么样子一个杯这样子，我不骗你哦，我爸真的是在警察先生面前他就说发生什么事，我们在一家洗衣店里找到这个东西，然后我爸拿那个东西那个东西其实还没有碎，就可能只有已经被分尸成三块拼凑起来的，然后他就说是不是你丢的，是不是你丢的，然后就这样丢过去。

169. 谭纪雄：人质被我们战友们冲过来解救了出来，就这样。

170. 余晓敏：其实那一天我过得特高兴，和我一起读博士的一个同学，因为她身体不太好，但是那一天她答辩了，答辩了，博士毕业了，然后请我们大家一起吃饭，特高兴，可能被这件事情给冲突掉了，但是晚上回家的话，就是会有这种焦虑的感觉，开始出来了。

171. 余晓敏：对。比如说我们夏天出门时候，挺热的时候，买饮料，然后那个瓶盖子我手一伸过去，他自动地给我扭开啊，然后这个走在马路上啊就会，过马路我是不操心的，然后他负责看车啊，哎呀，反正就是特别多小细节，反正女人特别被这个打动，然后就被他骗到了。

172. 余晓敏：对。比如说我们夏天出门时候，挺热的时候，买饮料，然后那个瓶盖子我手一伸过去，他自动地给我扭开啊，然后这个走在马路上啊就会，过马路我是不操心的，然后他负责看车啊，哎呀，反正就是特别多小细节，反正女人特别被这个打动，然后就被他骗到了。

173. 陈鲁豫：有很多的网友通过微博有一些问题问问你们俩，我们来看看。为什么要选择这样一份高危的职业，是挣得多嘛？肯定是挣得多。为什么要选择这样一份高危的职业？
谭纪雄：当时嘛，就是我家被偷了。

174. 陈鲁豫：有很多的网友通过微博有一些问题问问你们俩，我们来看看。为什么要选择这样一份高危的职业，是挣得多嘛？肯定是挣得多。为什么要选择这样一份高危的职业？
谭纪雄：当时嘛，就是我家被偷了。

175. 陈鲁豫：人民警察可以这样，那后来有没有再回去再补交那钱？
余晓敏：都忘记了，因为被喜悦冲昏头脑了。
陈鲁豫：不是，那个卖面的人没被喜悦冲昏头，他应该追过来，说你们俩还没付钱呢。

176. 陈鲁豫：人民警察可以这样，那后来有没有再回去再补交那钱？
余晓敏：都忘记了，因为被喜悦冲昏头脑了。

168. Tao Zhe, 17/08/2011
169. Tan Jixiong, 29/08/2011
170. Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011
171. Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011
172. Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011
173. Tan Jixiong, 29/08/2011
174. Tan Jixiong, 29/08/2011
175. Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011
176. Yu Xiaomin, 29/08/2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>M. Lu Yu:</th>
<th>Liu Chuanpin:</th>
<th>Zhang Weijian:</th>
<th>Chen Luyu:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：不是，那个卖面的人没被喜悦冲昏头，他应该追过来，说你们俩还没付钱呢。</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：这事后证明那个开棺被检验的那个尸体是因为什么死去的？</td>
<td>刘传品：这是一个中毒的事件。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 29/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>刘传品：被人下毒。通过最后开棺以后我们进行对这个被检验过的尸体进行要拉开，我们把那个胃内的组织要取出来，要进行化验。</td>
<td>刘传品：这个人是我们进行对这个尸体要拉开，我们把那个胃内的组织要取出来，要进行化验。</td>
<td>刘传品：这是一个一起杀人案件，主要是一次性杀十个人。到这个现场一共走了六个多小时，天都已经都黑了，当时这个现场是黑压压的，周围的现场还有旁边也是焚烧了焚烧过的，里面的尸体是横七八竖的，床上、地下都是砍得五花八门的。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 29/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：是被砍死的？</td>
<td>刘传品：被砍死的，用多种凶器经过我们初步地看了一下我们清理一共杀死了十个人。</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：被砍死的，用多种凶器经过我们初步地看了一下我们清理一共杀死了十个人。</td>
<td>Liu Chuanpin, 29/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>刘传品：开始这个周围的侦察员跟我说，刘法医这个八成是被淹死的，也就是溺死的尸体，听到这个我很惊讶，因为他自己就是一个父亲，每次讲到他的家庭，他的女儿，你能清楚地从李连杰的眼睛里面看到一个只有父亲才会有的那种柔情。</td>
<td>张卫健：她当然明白，她知道我帮她套戒指，然后两只手就这样，然后对面的人就看我就不理了，不能理那么多，好不容易套上了然后她就手指伸出来一看哎哟伸回去，她说怕被人家剁手指，然后结果就这样子就求婚了，然后不过这样也好了就是一个回忆了。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 29/08/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：我记得 2008 年，我第二次采访李连杰的时候，他说以后他会有主要的精力放在慈善事业上，能做点什么就做点什么。李连杰第三次做客我的节目，为的是一部电影的宣传，就是《海洋天堂》，再拍电影其实还是为了慈善，因为这部电影讲的是一个父亲和自闭症儿子之间的故事，李连杰没有缺拍这部电影，他说他没有办法不被这样一部影片感动，因为他自己就是一个父亲，每次讲到他的家庭，他的女儿，你能清楚地从李连杰的眼睛里面看到一个只有父亲才会有的那种柔情。你的孩子就是你吗？</td>
<td>李连杰：我记得 2008 年，我第二次采访李连杰的时候，他说以后他会有主要的精力放在慈善事业上，能做点什么就做点什么。李连杰第三次做客我的节目，为的是一部电影的宣传，就是《海洋天堂》，再拍电影其实还是为了慈善，因为这部电影讲的是一个父亲和自闭症儿子之间的故事，李连杰没有缺拍这部电影，他说他没有办法不被这样一部影片感动，因为他自己就是一个父亲，每次讲到他的家庭，他的女儿，你能清楚地从李连杰的眼睛里面看到一个只有父亲才会有的那种柔情。你的孩子就是你吗？</td>
<td>Li Lianjie, 07/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
上就换一个问题，我说想，她一定不知道，你看中东为什么打仗呢？因为石油。

186. 李连杰：七岁，完了经常会跟我讲一些什么，你知道这个，我们家不有花园嘛，有些竹子，她说你知道这个竹子为什么长得高，那个竹子为什么弯着长，我又被考住了，她说那你觉得怎么样呢？她说那个长得快的它吸收的水分多它就快了，那个横着那个呢因为长不上去，没地方挤了，它就横着长。

187. 陈鲁豫：这个时候的心情跟小时候可能会有些不一样，跟一开始参加比赛被人拒绝可能不一样了，这时候心情是怎样的？

188. 韩红：没扬眉吐气，心里有点儿扬眉吐气，但压抑住了，世事的沧桑让我变成熟了。我说，谢谢你首长，我感谢在部队所有时光，给我奠定了人生的基础，现在我离开了部队，我生活到百姓中去，我也是做一个真正的明星和人，所谓真正明星和人是什么，就是可以把我自己得到的这些回馈给社会，因为我真正的土壤是老百姓，所以。

189. 陈鲁豫：其实这是互相的，就是你感动别人，别人也肯定感动你，比如说，别人一句话可能你眼泪就下来了，或者战士一句话，一个举动，肯定会有，每个人都会有这样被别人感动的时候。

190. 韩红：你刚才问的，刚好就戳在我心上，我确实觉得自己太累了，就是脑袋随时都在紧绷着一根弦，就是每天不停地告诉自己不可以做这个，不可以做那个，不可以出去吃饭，因为怕被拍，怕被人们误会。

191. 韩红：你刚才问的，刚好就戳在我心上，我确实觉得自己太累了，就是脑袋随时都在紧绷着一根弦，就是每天不停地告诉自己不可以做这个，不可以做那个，不可以出去吃饭，因为怕被拍，怕被人们误会。

192. 邓亚萍：从 1997 年被中国奥委会推荐，由萨马兰奇主席任命为国际奥委会运动员委员会委员至今，再参与到筹备的工作，一直到奥运会办完，可以说十六年的时间。那么十六年的时间，不同的角色转换，但却是一直为奥林匹克运动在发挥着中国人的一种作用。

193. 范冰冰：对，我妈觉得那个，最后被发现了，然后还有就是不愿意练琴，我觉得，她觉得花了那么多钱给你买的钢琴，那个时候在那个年代应该是很贵，然后你都没有好好地珍惜你现在所有的东西……

194. 陈鲁豫：我见过有人被啤酒瓶砍到头，但我没有看到过自己用啤酒瓶打自己，而且我没有看过女孩这样的。

195. 刘轩：压力多大啊，我三年没有见到我爸，他做的第一个，两件事情，把我带到厨房去，打开冰箱，拿出来一个一加仑的，这么大桶的牛奶，交给我，儿子，喝，喝得多，长得大，长得大不被老美欺负，然后我就，我就把那个那么大桶，喝喝喝，第二件事情就是叫我到那边弹琴，来表演一首给老爸看。

196. 刘轩：我第一天上学的时候，因为刚到美国就两个礼拜之后就被送到学校去，当初还选了很久，好像老爸那时候决定要把我送到离家里面比较近的一个私立的一个学校，这个因为听说在公立学校更容易受欺负，尤其像我这样子完完全全的 ABC 完全不会的，那第一天送我到那个校门口，就是修女出来接，因为这是一个天主教
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197. 陈鲁豫：哎，一个小孩子到了一个新的环境，尤其跟别的女孩不一样，他可能有时候会
被别的女孩欺负。

Chen Luyu, 12/09/2011

198. 刘墉：因为我在这里，我还要再捡一些什么杂草出来啊，对，这里面粪便嘛。

199. 刘墉：然后就被我骂。

Chen Luyu, 12/09/2011

200. 刘墉：这是我们中华的一种民俗艺术，能够让大家喜欢，能够让大家知道这个节奏这么可爱，

201. 陈鲁豫：现在您在家里面是不是属于重点保护对象，被保护对象？

Chen Luyu, 12/09/2011

202. 刘墉：因为在纽约你要学会被抢。

Liu Yong, 13/09/2011

203. 刘墉：不不不，他如果被抢的时候他觉得这是我爸爸送我的这么珍贵的东西，然后跟人家抗拒，

204. 韦唯：三里屯这外国人的区域已经是传为佳话了，所有的这些青年，就是这些少年人，就把赛赛的这个生日

205. 陈鲁豫：韦唯家的老二是一个特别酷的男孩儿，很少笑，但是一笑起来却显得特别帅气，特别阳光，

206. 郑爽：对，他就在签售，然后那个乐橙就很热情嘛，然后一下就过去就拍了一下魏晨脸，魏晨爽，就这样。

207. 魏晨：我记得最尴尬的一次是我第一次做签售然后被一个粉丝就是强吻。

Wei Chen, 20/09/2011

208. 魏晨：然后呢，我上了大学以后，读了四川音乐学院之后然后终于有机会我可以去一个酒吧唱歌。我那天就很开心，

Wei Chen, 20/09/2011
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>陈鲁豫:最近,我们的编导又去采访了一次魏晨,在采访的过程当中发生了一件有趣的事,我们的摄像师拍了一张魏晨接受采访的照片，发在自己的微博上,短短的几十分钟之内这条微博就被转发了上千次,我们的工作人员不得不感叹魏晨超高的人气,其实偶像的影响力远远大于我们的预期,也真的希望魏晨他们都能够坚持自己的梦想继续前进,相信他们会有更美的下一个十年。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu,</td>
<td>20/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>孙俪:我告诉你,就因为我妈爱打扮我,然后我经常被老师误会，我记得我妈给我做一套非常时髦的衣服，是拿我爸爸的皮衣改的，那时候我人很小嘛,改了一个特别时髦，现在穿都很时髦,皮短裤,那么短，然后还有个皮背心你知道吗,然后我妈那时候给我穿。</td>
<td>Sun Li,</td>
<td>22/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>陈嘉上：我是很少看自己的戏流泪的，这是第一个。那天我在日本做后期音乐，在放,然后混音在台北，我一看，哎,糟糕，我不行，然后我就找纸巾抹眼泪，我就想，干吗了我？我拍这么多年的戏竟然被自己的戏就触动了一点。</td>
<td>Chen Jiashang,</td>
<td>22/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>陈鲁豫:来，再有一首歌给闫妮，她彻底被感动了。来，你们谁起头？来，起头。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu,</td>
<td>22/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>杨云：有一次，有一次他就是非要看电视吃饭，然后他爸就有点急了，然后就说不准看，走，我们把电视关了，都进卧室，然后饭也不给你吃了，那天哭了大概有两个小时，就没停啊，就是他那种被磕疼了的那种痛和生气真哭的那种感觉是不一样的，结果哭了之后我就说，后来我都忍不住了，我说杨威给我打开吧，我都想要流泪了，我说杨威给他打开吧，杨威说不开，我说我说就开一下，让他看一下先把饭喂了再说嘛，杨威说这习惯不能惯，惯了就完了，就很严厉他。</td>
<td>Yang Yun,</td>
<td>23/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>郭德纲:真的,真的,我现在就，我这人就耳朵根子硬，能坚持下这十年来关键就是耳朵根子硬，我有我的准主意，我不被外界所困扰，有人夸我，说郭德纲你是艺术大师，你是相声大师，相声艺术家，中国相声靠你了，你拯救相声，说得我浑身都冷得慌，没有这么大的艺术造诣,就是一个普通说相声的。</td>
<td>Guo Degang,</td>
<td>26/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>姜育恒：用朋友的角度，最好离开的就是薛岳，二十年了，那时候我跟他非常非常亲，那时候我才三十多岁，然后后来陆陆续续，尤其是这几年，梁鸿志走了，谁走了。前两天又一个被摔下来摔死了。我反而让我觉得我更要好好精彩地活下去因为势必是这个样子，每个人都会变成，要经历这些事情。</td>
<td>Jiang Yuheng,</td>
<td>27/09/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 4: The copula *shi* with predicative adjectives

This appendix contains a list of all occurrences of the copula *shi* with predicative adjectives in the structure [NP COP HEN AdjP] in the present corpus.

Note that examples in which *shi* was part of or could have been analysed as being part of *danshi* ‘but’, *ershi* ‘but rather’, *haishi* ‘or’, *huoshi* ‘or’, *jiushi* ‘just; exactly’, *keshi* ‘but’, *laoshi* ‘always’, *yaobushi* ‘unless’, *yaoshi* ‘if; suppose’, *yushi* ‘therefore’, *zhishi* ‘merely; only; just’, *zongshi* ‘always’ were excluded from analysis. Utterances with a negative (i.e. *bu-shi*) are included in the table but are highlighted in pale grey and excluded from numbering on account of the possibility of *bu-shi* likewise undergoing lexicalisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example utterance</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>余男: 然后这时候舞台上就是，你知道金熊、银熊嘛，它有一个这么大的小熊，就是一个小木熊，放在旁边，然后这是最佳处女作导演，当时其实我是很尴尬，我也怕拿到那个奖。</td>
<td>Yu Nan, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>张军：所以这两件事放在我面前的时候，应该是抉择是很难，但是对我来讲，我为什么我没有选择呢？</td>
<td>Zhang Jun, 20/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>吴君如：我说你有没有跟其他演员讲话这么不客气的，我虽然是你家里的人，但是你去到现场还是当是一个演员好吗。他说那不是很假吧，我说对，也是的确很假，但是希望你的语气比较好一点好不好。</td>
<td>Wu Junru, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：那说明这个人很老实可靠，他看到女明星都没有什么感觉那不是很好吗。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：就是你出来拿个枪你不说话。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>徐文燕：他这个人就是一个很纯的人，他喜欢每一个女孩子，对我们说话非常亲切，他不像有的男孩子，声音很粗矿，或者是很愣。他很温柔，就跟着我们一起讲，他心地很纯，这个人他那个想法挺有意思的，不知道他心里头爱的是谁。</td>
<td>Xu Wenyan, 14/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>陈铎：也是撑着。但是撑过来了，而且现在不是很好吗？</td>
<td>Chen Duo, 14/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：不是有一些沉重的东西。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 24/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：我们不吃惊。我最大的感触就是时间真的是很奇妙，冰冰已经成了冰冰姐。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 01/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>张天蔚：那个时候我的形象跟现在不一样，幸亏我不是搞电视的，如果那个形象出来是真的很丑恶，就是那个时代的时尚。</td>
<td>Zhang Tianwei, 10/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：欢迎小莉，坐，我们当同事当的，真的是很难见一面。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 11/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：是的，你的歌基本上我们都在心里面的都会唱，但唱出来的确是很难。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 18/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>罗凤枝：他说，我毕竟出去找工作也不是很容易，所以我就回家又开店，</td>
<td>Luo Fengji, 22/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>萨日娜：我说完了，我就特别特别难受，就那小的时候，就感觉孩子最需要你的时候，你不在她身边，但好在那个时候，我出去的时间并不是很长，只要是三五个月的话，</td>
<td>Sa Rina, 24/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>牛莉：和她相处我会觉得好像是朋友，没有那个代沟，后来，我还跟她的大女儿合过作，然后她大女儿跟我说起来，彭玉老师的时候也是，她说你知道吗，我永远有一件新衣服，然后穿给我妈，我说妈你看我这件衣服怎么样，刚买的，很漂亮，然后我妈说，啊，是很漂亮，给我也买一件，跟你一样的，我也要穿，她是这样的。</td>
<td>Niu Li, 24/03/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：这种感觉是你的生活状态改变以后带给你的？还是年纪到一定程度之后，人自然会有这样的表现，你觉得？</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>杨千嬅：都有关系。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>杨千嬅：我觉得生活状态<strong>也很</strong>重要，我觉得就是之前都是有一点迷失，但是好的工作很稳定，然后又有房子住，有车开，然后我觉得我应该很满足，可能就是会缺少一个伴侣在身边。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：但我听以后我觉得很感慨，因为他们说他们俩在一起 13 年，分开 7 年，等于前后已经两个人的一半的时间是等于在一起分分合合这样子。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>杨千嬅：我觉得他们<strong>是很</strong>幸福，我会觉得，为什么呢？</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>杨千嬅：然后中间发生很多不同的摩擦问题，但是那些不是他的错，或者是我自己的错，可能就是大家的时间不对而已，可能思想上的那个成长节奏不一样。所以我相信他们这次可以再走一起的时候，<strong>一定是很</strong>清楚很确定，所以我就很开心，就是可以祝福他们就是开花结果。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>杨千嬅：其实都有啊，不是完全没有啊，他太夸张了，我为他做菜的时候，他是，应该<strong>是很</strong>感动。但是他口很硬，不会讲出来的。但是你看他，就是会笑笑的那种，就是蛮好了，这样子，其实他是很开心的。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>杨千嬅：就是刚刚那个，为什么 2000 年哭得那么惨，因为那个是最后一张专辑，我以为没歌可以再唱，所以那个时候<strong>真的很</strong>伤心。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>杨千嬅：然后他本来就是有点儿胖胖的，然后还没有，还没有开始他在后台等的时候，他已经全身都已经湿了，然后他说怎么办，我现在好像要滑出去的这样子，因为塑胶料<strong>是很</strong>滑嘛，如果是吸雨后，所以那天他很紧张，然后嘴巴不是那种的，是撅的这样子的，狼在叫，他整个人的力都是放在手上的，手掌那边，我们在后台说他在搞什么东西，一直在取笑他，他不知道，所以他在，他彩排反而没有，所以他就是，我们就是有一个成长路是这样子的。</td>
<td>Yang Qianhua, 05/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>李默然：因为老太太过世刚刚半年，所以一谈到她的时候，心里<strong>不是很</strong>平静，这棵大树倒了，</td>
<td>Li Heran, 12/04/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>陈羽凡：因为我在羽·泉的这个团队里，司职吉他手，我不好意思说这个手，你知道吧，然后海泉是键盘手，实际上从羽·泉一出道开始，羽·泉的音乐里面，在羽·泉还<strong>不是很</strong>成的时候，然后真的是因为李延亮的吉他和郭亮的键盘，成就了音乐上的羽·泉，而且哪哪成就了我们。</td>
<td>Chen Yufan, 18/04/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
牟宗琮：因为这个地方虽然距离阿富汗边境并不很远，但是它确实是巴基斯坦的军事重地。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18. 陈鲁豫：那我的确，我虽然可能上网不是很多，但我知道你的微博影响力特别大，
      Pu Cunxin, 09/05/2011 |
| 19. 陈鲁豫：我虽然可能上网不是很多，但我确实很熟悉你的微博，
      Pu Cunxin, 09/05/2011 |
| 20. 刘伟强：反正有些也是保护自己的，我也很头痛，一开始我就先找他吧，因为这个男主角是很重要，
      Liu Weiqiang, 13/05/2011 |
| 21. 郑雯：我跟我妈讲，但是她完全不能理解，因为她是那种，真实的她就是那种，
      Zhen Wen, 24/05/2011 |
| 22. 陈鲁豫：并不是说所有的人都要像郑雯这样，明明我考试能考好，但是我故意考不好，
      Chen Luyu, 24/05/2011 |
| 23. 许生会：孩子嘛，小时候还胖，样子长得挺可爱，然后就家里面，
      Xu Shenghui, 31/05/2011 |
| 24. 李宇春母亲：其实我还有一件事情想说，最感动的，
      Li Yuchun’s mother, 09/06/2011 |
| 25. 刘谦：那时候还在念书嘛，去学校找她，然后当着面她还说，
      Liu Qian, 13/06/2011 |
| 26. 陈鲁豫：而且观众接受也应该是平静，因为她是替的。
      Chen Luyu, 11/07/2011 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：生活中的这样人真的是很多。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 13/07/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>陈可辛：你一直在不停地叫他再考虑、再考虑，不停地等他，终于有一天他就会心软了，就算了，其实就是徐百九，就是心肠其实是很好。</td>
<td>Chen Kexin, 15/07/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>乌国庆：这个安眠药他不是很多给她的。</td>
<td>Wu Guoqing, 03/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>乌国庆：就这样，别的地方没有，再就是我生活上呢喜欢喝茶，和我这个民族有关系，但是我不抽烟不喝酒，我这一辈子没抽烟没喝酒，所以有些人一说的话好像是很难想象，这个搞刑侦的不抽烟不喝酒的少。</td>
<td>Wu Guoqing, 03/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>大山：那么后来我上电视而且在这个节目里头，也是突出这个名字嘛，很多观众因为那时候没有邮件，都是写信，很多观众写信，也不知道具体地址。</td>
<td>Dashan, 04/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>李双江：连长，连长高兴了，连长说李双江你小子还行啊你，把这油节省下来了，今天晚上吃炸油饼吧，连队里真是连队里真是很艰苦，哎呀，我最感动的就是我在阿里当了这七个月的兵，后来我还当炊事兵。</td>
<td>Li Shuangjiang, 09/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>陶喆：是一个大的投资，而且不管是钱的这个钱的投资是很大，除了那个还是时间的投入。</td>
<td>Tao Zhe, 17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：做这事真的是很辛苦，你刚才说比你拍电影拍二十年都辛苦，真的吗？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 07/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>王复蓉：他的一个制作人那时候住在我们家里啊，他能够搞笑到什么程度，那个制作人是个小胖胖很可爱，人家是英国专门念音乐的，住我们家也是很好笑，他嘛楼上楼下嘛，那个住楼下，在厕所那边刷牙，他很会哦，我儿子真的可以拍电影。</td>
<td>Wang Furon, 17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>许志安：《风继续吹》这首歌是他第一首爆红的歌曲，我刚刚进入这个公司的时候他刚走，然后后来常会碰面嘛，你知道香港的那个娱乐世界是很小嘛，有一次他说哎，其实许志安你穿衣服穿得很没有那种星的感觉，星味感觉。</td>
<td>Xu Zhi’an, 24/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：但像运动员的体质应该是很好，所以你怀孕过程应该是个比较顺利的过程吧？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>成龙：突然人家都很懒散的都不动，看着我，我就站在她面前，行了没有，好了没有，别怕啊，我拍了她，我想她是感动。</td>
<td>Cheng Long, 06/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>郭晓冬：他们心里肯定是很内疚。</td>
<td>Guo Xiaodong, 09/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>郭晓冬：对，她比如说她对我父亲的爱有多少，包括现在对我父亲有多少思念，她不会跟我讲的，她肯定不会讲的，我就在想，如果</td>
<td>Guo Xiaodong, 09/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>范冰冰：她觉得花了那么多钱给你买的钢琴，那个时候在那个年代<strong>应该</strong>是很贵，然后你都没有好好地珍惜你现在所有的东西，然后还不好好练。</td>
<td>Fan Bingbing, 09/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>范冰冰：我自己本身个性也挺男孩的，对，然后我爸我妈打我吧，这个打得<strong>确实</strong>是很狠，所以我觉得我妈是一个暴君，小的时候，但是。</td>
<td>Fan Bingbing, 09/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：我仔细一看父子俩<strong>真是</strong>是很像。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 12/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：一直很支持沈浩就是魏老师演的，魏老师您演正面人物的时候<strong>其实</strong>不是很<strong>多</strong>是吧？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 14/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>李玲玉：他说我就没出去，他也急了那个感觉，我拿那个毛巾沾了一点水，<strong>不是很</strong>重嘛，就抽了他。</td>
<td>Li Lingyu, 16/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>李晟：最辛苦的就是最难弄的可能就是睡不好觉，但是小燕子的戏又<strong>是很</strong>大哭大闹，就可能上一场戏在大哭，下场戏要大闹，再下一场戏要大笑，就是各种疯。</td>
<td>Li Cheng, 19/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>李晟：就已经熟得不得了的那种状态，然后但当时我们只拍了一个星期，就<strong>不是很</strong>熟，然后呢他又四是回民，然后回民是不能吃猪肉的，然后呢就是还是会有点尴尬。</td>
<td>Li Cheng, 19/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>钟镇涛：但是既然我能够上一个这样的节目，我如果什么都不讲，那上来干嘛呢。虽然我的表达能力<strong>不是很</strong>好，但是我尽量能够讲，我就讲，因为这个不是八卦的，就是一个，也会为自己做个记录吧。</td>
<td>Zhong Zhentao, 27/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>濑田裕子：<strong>不太</strong>喜欢那种冒险，就是从早到晚都在外面跑，哎哟，只是显示自己，不是那种，也<strong>不是很</strong>文静，就说，怎么说他要是能为我去国外结婚觉得很多人，觉得不是相信。</td>
<td>Laitian Yuzi, 29/09/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: The copula *shi* with the locative *zai*

This appendix contains a list of all occurrences of the copula *shi* used in conjunction with the locative *zai* in the present corpus. As with the table in the preceding appendix, utterances with a negative (i.e. *bu-shi*) are included in the table but are highlighted in pale grey and excluded from numbering on account of the possibility of *bu-shi* undergoing lexicalisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example utterance</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：可是你，你真的是 在 开店的时候，体重有 170 斤，留披肩长发？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 10/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>余男：有，不会不让毕业或者处分，或者怎样，但我一般都 是 在 你比 如说 19 堂的课就会处分吧，我就到 18 堂课我肯定就来。</td>
<td>Yu Nan, 12/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：比如说他们俩都很明确，他知道他在 1991 年 21 岁那时候，突然意识到自己要干什么，你 是 在 什么时间？</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 20/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>陈铎：观众里面里面有两位老人家当时来信，一个 是 在 兰州，当时已经七十多岁了，说每次看了，我们《话说长江》的播出之后，一到那天，反正就兴奋高兴，从早上开始就，坐卧不安地等着赶紧天黑，好看我们的节目，早早把饭吃完了，坐上等着，等到节目一说下回再见，他说我又开始沮丧，说还得等一个星期，就这么一位老人家。</td>
<td>Chen Duo, 14/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>陈铎：所以有一位山东德州老乡，他呢就把我们《话说运河》里的，德州那一集弄到手了，所以他就要求，也 是 在 世界各地的亲属们，每年在团聚的时候，首先是看德州这一集，看了之后就是为了念祖不忘家乡，这一家子人都得抱头痛哭流涕，思念家乡。</td>
<td>Chen Duo, 14/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>李春波：当时在广州的时候有一个，沈阳的一个发小吧，他 是 在 省歌舞团，人家是专业的歌唱演员，先给他听的，他说那个歌，悬，太土了，那名就是。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, 23/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>李春波：唱以后第一次演出 是 在 广西的南宁，我想可能离开广州之外，广州可能挺喜欢我的，我没想到广州之外的其他城市，也挺喜欢我的。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, 23/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>李春波：实际当时也没想那么多，就想尝试一下嘛，但是当时好在广州那会儿有那个，有很多那个叫新歌推介会，我记得我们那会儿 是 在 中山大学，第一次唱那个歌，唱那个歌就提前都约好时间了，结果到那天去的时候，头两天就感冒特别严重，夏天我记得。</td>
<td>Li Chunbo, 23/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>王旭：复兴门，第一次见 是 在 复兴门通道里，当时我正在唱着歌，是刚开始还是唱了一会儿了。</td>
<td>Wang Xu, 28/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：拍摄时间是夏天，地点 是 在 刘刚的家里边。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 28/02/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>现场观众：我最早那个留意到冰冰是在 六七年前吧，就是当时流言蜚语特别多的那段时间，然后当时就是冰对媒体的感觉，很是有点</td>
<td>Audience member, 01/03/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
小稚嫩，然后特别单纯。

14. 陈鲁豫：你那时候想到过，你未来的舞台是在北京吗？

15. 陈鲁豫：她是我的同事，我们做同事应该有15年，16年的时间了，不过我们很少有机会合作，她有一句口号很多人都听说过，叫大事发生时我存在，有中国人的地方就有我，平常我们看到她，都是在新闻台的主播台上，或者是在新闻事件的发生现场，她总是用自己的眼睛，带我们去看世界，而今天我们要走进她的世界，走进吴小莉的世界。

16. 陈鲁豫：她是我的同事，我们做同事应该有15年，16年的时间了，不过我们很少有机会合作，她有一句口号很多人都听说过，叫大事发生时我存在，有中国人的地方就有我，平常我们看到她，都是在新闻台的主播台上，或者是在新闻事件的发生现场，她总是用自己的眼睛，带我们去看世界，而今天我们要走进她的世界，走进吴小莉的世界。

17. 陈鲁豫：已经是个大女孩的样了，这是她最近的照片吗，还是在前一阵？

吴小莉：其实不是，这个是在前一阵，因为她父亲非常强调她的私密性，所以有一些新的照片，他就不太愿意让她出现了，这些都是她，最后长头发的那张，大概是两年前吧，两年前。

18. 汪峰：后来小伟跟我说的时候，我是真的是这样，就算我一直都在当，时也不停，这个事情也继续不了了，因为任何人，是我的老板，是我的公司，也不可能再继续这样的事情，因为它已经是在商业市场上，形成了一种冲突，它不是我关心的，我确实不关心这个。

19. 汪峰：不，你可以降调，一般，一般韩红，那英他们都是在喝大了以后，十二点以后开始点我的歌，原调。

20. 罗凤枝：对，我妈对我就是比亲女儿还亲，像别的要是有个家庭，生下一个残疾小孩，他就不愿意领出去，或者是在家关着，像我妈就不是，我妈就是不管去哪种场合，都把我就是特别骄傲地介绍给别人，所以我就在我妈的影响下，就我性格就是特别那种开朗，特别自信的那种性格。

21. 马伊琍：。所以当我发现自己怀孕的时候，我是特别沮丧，好几个晚上都是在被子里哭。

22. 田征：然后袁泉的位置呢，永远是在小花园，就是我们的，那个欧阳予倩先生的，那个铜像后面。

23. 杨千嬅：它遇到什么事情，它马上会有一些法宝在里面，就是那些都是之前，二十多年内累积出来的一些智慧，还有一些人生经历。就是人开始成长，但是还是会有一种童真，特别是在爱情方面就是还是会期待的。

24. 陈鲁豫：对，那你的确是在对的时间碰到了对的人。

25. 陈鲁豫：那可能真正的流泪，比如说在求婚，是在去签那个文件的时候。

26. 张国立：我跟她拍了两次戏，时间就是冰火两重天，一次是在拍《武十郎》的时候是在上海，是最热的一个夏天，我记得她有这么拿着扇子，她把舌头吐出来，她说终于明白狗为什么要吐舌头，她说那样，那样会，会凉快一点。

27. 陈羽凡：难道你真的没有感觉到，我的爱不需要再说什么天荒地老。
，难道你真的没有感觉到，你对我来说是多么多么的重要，难道你真的没有感觉到，我的爱不需要再说什么天荒地老，最好的兄弟是
一起工作没有费用的时候还跟着你，这些兄弟都是因为，这一次我们真的成本很低，然后所有的老师都几乎根本不谈费用，尤其是
像哪哪也好，这些。

28. 胡海泉：这个是2003年底的时候，我们做这个天津跨年演唱会的时候，那时候我表演的时候戴过一个牛仔帽，棕色的，因为我刚
刚从大阪表演回来，在那里买的，在东京买的一个很喜欢的帽子。

29. 胡海泉：因为我跟她其实见面非常非常少，这么多年也很少见过几次，第一次见面是在我们北京的某一个签售上面，好像是在 2003
年2004年还是签售的时候，然后就很多人都拿着唱片来签字嘛，然后突然就有个女生，我记得她就交给我一个东西，然后我也不知
道是什么东西嘛，我拿回家一看，哦，很漂亮的一个完全DIY的唱片，无论是从词曲创作、编曲、演唱都是在她家里自己完成，然
后歌词写得非常棒，是一个很好的诗人，然后整个唱片设计也很有感觉，我觉得这个简直是，给我感觉很震撼，哇，好有才华，她应
该也就是个高中生那个时候。

30. 胡海泉：因为我跟她其实见面非常非常少，这么多年也很少见过几次，第一次见面是在我们北京的某一个签售上面，好像是在 2003
年2004年还是签售的时候，然后就很多人都拿着唱片来签字嘛，然后突然就有个女生，我记得她就交给我一个东西，然后我也不知
道是什么东西嘛，我拿回家一看，哦，很漂亮的一个完全DIY的唱片，无论是从词曲创作、编曲、演唱都是在她家里自己完成，然
后歌词写得非常棒，是一个很好的诗人，然后整个唱片设计也很有感觉，我觉得这个简直是，给我感觉很震撼，哇，好有才华，她应
该也就是个高中生那个时候。

31. 胡海泉：因为我跟她其实见面非常非常少，这么多年也很少见过几次，第一次见面是在我们北京的某一个签售上面，好像是在 2003
年2004年还是签售的时候，然后就很多人都拿着唱片来签字嘛，然后突然就有个女生，我记得她就交给我一个东西，然后我也不知
道是什么东西嘛，我拿回家一看，哦，很漂亮的一个完全DIY的唱片，无论是从词曲创作、编曲、演唱都是在她家里自己完成，然
后歌词写得非常棒，是一个很好的诗人，然后整个唱片设计也很有感觉，我觉得这个简直是，给我感觉很震撼，哇，好有才华，她应
该也就是个高中生那个时候。

32. 陈鲁豫：第一次采访他是在2005年，六年过去了，他好像外
形没什么变化，还是很年轻，还是很可爱，当然他自己肯定会说
还是很帅，身份有一些变化，不仅仅是个演员了，还当起了导演，
今天他带着新戏来和我们见面，欢迎潘长江。

33. 倪萍：哎，春天一来，我觉得姥姥又一下活了，就那种感觉，姥姥
还真的很少生病，姥姥基本上是，我说一出生估计是在医院我俩
见的面，我出生姥姥抱，从医院把我给提溜出来，然后呢，我们最
后一次见面，姥姥满身插着管子要死了，医院问我说上不上呼吸机
，我说不上。

34. 陈鲁豫：给大家介绍一下，在青海有一个老奶奶，今年八十多，她
是在七年前应该是，当时七十三岁，她一直喜欢倪萍，一直喜欢看
她节目，突然发现这本书，她觉得我得更加了解倪萍，我得读这本
书。
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>秦学士：紧张，我都懵了那会儿，那会儿，就是，就是那会儿在台上吧，然后以前见过她妈妈的照片嘛。  陈鲁豫：也是在一个节目上她爸她妈突然出现了？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>张信哲：对，因为我觉得这些，这些可能会影响到因为本身的完美的这些东西呢，我想都是在录音的这个过程里面，一个，一次一次的慢慢地减少减少，然后，然后呢让大家听到是完美，然后我觉得那个感情，最完整的一个音乐的呈现。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>张信哲：很难忘，我第一次在演唱会其实我觉得我觉得这是很有趣的经验，那个是在新加坡，那一次呢，其实是一个垫档我记得那个时候，那次演唱会本来是张学友定下来了那个场地这样，就是新加坡的室内体育馆，但是呢我不晓得为什么就取消了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>张信哲：对，这个就，但是我觉得有一次很夸张，我觉得很好笑，我自己会想到很好笑，就是说他们因为好像是在济南吧。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>李弘敏：的确，一虎，现在有很多的阴谋论，因为在不到24小时之内，美国人宣布说本拉登被打死了，DNA也验完了，同时他的遗体现在也已经被解冻了，那么到底美国要怎么样向国际社会来证明说，在昨天的这场行动当中击毙的真的是本拉登本人，当然最好的方式是公布照片，可是我们也知道由于在昨天的行动当中，根据总统奥巴马表示说，整个过程是个近距离的攻击行动，因此本拉登是在近距离头部中弹死亡，我们也可以想象这个画面，恐怕是十分的血腥，因此美国方面现在也担忧，如果公布这一批照片，不知道是不是会引发穆斯林的激进分子，有不理性的或者有一些报复的行动产生。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>李弘敏：好的，一虎，希拉里刚刚是在白宫发表了讲话，她表示美国击毙本拉登是正义的伸张，不过他也强调，美国对于这个基地组织及恐怖组织的斗争是不会结束，美国也会继续在阿富汗对于塔利班以及它的盟友进行打击的行动。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>胡一虎：谢谢，晓东，来自北京的分析，我们再跳到另外一个现场，在画面上看到人正在利比亚附近一代的是严明，严明，你好。我们知道你现在所处的位置其实非常的特别，为什么，不仅是在北非，还包括临近的中东，现在的基地组织，根据西方媒体的观察，基地组织大肆的扩展甚至渗透其中，您在今天得到这个消息之后，当地附近您采访到有哪些新的观察，他们有哪些回应？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>庞哲（凤凰卫视驻纽约记者）：现在我们知道正在建筑，当我听到这个消息的时候，是在我们的刘总编辑昨天夜里，凌晨通知我，心情是非常非常激动，因为我没想到这一天会在整整十年之后到来，当然还差几个月。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>庞哲（凤凰卫视驻纽约记者）：今天早晨我们来到现场的时候心情也是非常激动，虽然十年前我看到第一架飞机撞到这个楼里，然后当时心情还是感觉到是不是什么样的旅行事故或者机械事故，等到第二架飞机也撞到楼的时候，才深深感到事情是相当相当的严重，随后双峰塔倒塌之后，我当时本身是在一楼之隔的美国证券交易所，当时整个楼里是乌烟瘴气，完全电源全部都被切掉，而且整个人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>好像是被埋在土里，气都喘不过来的感觉，当时我心情也是觉得一定要赶快跟香港联系，把最新情况告诉大家，我知道香港的总部编辑和高层领导，还有所有的观众都对我有很大的支持和关注。</td>
<td>45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>卢庚戌：吓跑了。然后我回来之后就跟他们每天说，我学了一种新的唱法，就是学狗叫，蛤蟆叫，他们也觉得挺有意思，也跟着我练，然后当时我记得在那个清华北门那个村口，我练到第三个月的时候，我一叫，整个的村口，那狗全跟着叫。</td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>杨亚洲：对，所有的场景都得是在那个“五·一二”地震的遗址里头，所有的东西你不能动，坍塌的教室，倒塌的这个废墟，演员进去你又不能有安全，安全的任何安全的设施，说我搭上架子这是不允许的，你破坏遗址，倪萍钻进去的时候，她出来跟我说，她说导演里面尽是孩子的铅笔盒，书包，红领巾，所以我们这个戏不仅是景是真实的，所有的服装，道具都是真实的。</td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>刘佩琦：那个时候我们都是在宣传队跳舞，天天的跳啊，跳来跳去，哎，她老是踩我的脚，踩来踩去呢。</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陈鲁豫：它统一都叫公仔，没有叫母仔的。但你这提了一个好问题，为什么都叫公仔，不能叫母的，不知道，反正都叫公仔，我也看到你的那个公仔，还挺可爱的，你就打扮得跟功夫熊猫似的，我待会儿给大家看一看，就是以郑渊洁老师形象做的，然后外面有，就是一个绒的，一个绒的一个玩具这么大，然后套了一个像功夫熊猫的一个那个熊猫的衣服，很可爱，所以所有的一切都说明你现在是半个脚在，你的身份是作家，但还有半个脚是在公众人物这边。</td>
<td>49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郑渊洁：最得意的那个皮皮鲁讲堂，是在那个soho现代城，有一次我到那个，上完课了以后，突然往窗外一看，就能看到一个，一个地方叫大望桥，下边有一个公共汽车站，是开往通县的，通州的。</td>
<td>50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郑渊洁：哦，这个鼓掌啊，不是，我说的是处长，局长，股长，然后鼓掌，所以像，我觉得那个比如，大家都应该遵守交通规则，我觉得就是说，实际上是在微博上说效果更好，比你在生活当中具体去纠正一个人效果更好。</td>
<td>51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郑渊洁：《童话大王》杂志，是每个月都要交稿的嘛，这个时候事实上他和我在一起，还是会影响我的进度的，我觉得。所以我就把他放到我父母家去了，放去以后，他就每天打过来一个电话，说的就是我爸爸告诉我说，亚旗老问你今天写了多少，因为他知道我，正常进度是一天十页嘛，结果我因为他走了，我就说写了二十页，三十页，结果有一次电话里他就不吭气了，我突然出了一身冷汗，我说怎么可以说孩子走了以后，说你反而写得多呢，他就会认为他是在，我这儿是负面的嘛，后来我爸就赶快要车把他送回来了，送回来实际上他坐在旁边，他就坐在桌子上嘛，实际上也还是影响我的这个思路的嘛，所以我的办法就是当着他抄书。</td>
<td>52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郑渊洁：我觉得这个鲁豫太神奇了，《鲁豫有约》这节目也太神奇了，因为这在虚拟世界，举行婚礼嘛，但是今天就居然让我们在现实当中就面对面了，见面了，我一直关心一个事儿，就是在网上这样的举行婚礼，会不会给你们造成一些损失？比如说份子钱还能收吗？</td>
<td>53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陈鲁豫：其实濮存昕大哥在这部戏里的造型你们，我们大家会觉得很可爱，啊，然后我最关心的一个事儿就是，他在那个《鲁豫有约》的节目里头，他不会给你造成一些损失吧？比如说份子钱还能收吗？</td>
<td>54.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
好像很颠覆，然后装了那个龅牙，这还不算我看过的最颠覆，他其实最颠覆是在舞台上，我不知道有没有人去看过《窝头会馆》，那里面造型更颠覆。

55. 陈鲁豫：这跟年纪没有关系，这是资历的问题，对对对，你们是一起成长起来的，所以我说一个秘密给你们听，就是很多人不知道，我那一天去台湾，就是要见她嘛，我们约好大概是在早上十点钟，好像九点半。

56. 刘伟强：没有出现，打电话打不通，找不到，然后最终就是找到她，是在下午五点。

57. 田亮：我希望她还是有自己的工作，但是重心是在家里。

58. 陈鲁豫：很快，我们上次见面是在三亚的那个大 S 的婚礼上，然后我们打了个招呼。

59. 陈鲁豫：嗯，很多时候那个路走了一段之后，你再回过头去看会发现，就是人很多时候是在不知不觉当中就开始出发了对吧？

60. 张惠妹：其实我觉得在姐妹之间，范范她都扮演着一个很柔和的角色，就是也许大家在那边叽里咕噜在讨论，争论一件，某一件事情的时候，你就会看她在旁边会做很多的回应，可是她的回应，总是都在那个中间那个位置，她也不会太偏激这样。

61. 陈鲁豫：我就觉得如果是在以前，可能大家会觉得十年不是一个很长的时间，但是在这个，但现在大家会觉得十年两个人在一起，真的是一段爱情长跑。

62. 陈鲁豫：我记得我们，不是生活在北京的人，其它地方的人可能听到李素丽的名字，应该是在 1996 年，1996 年当时评为全国劳模。

63. 陈州：说实话，挺惨的，改变我命运也是在，我十七岁的时候，碰到一个人，一个女孩，她给我一块钱，这女孩给我，很漂亮，给我一块钱，我下意识地去接，因为她比我高，她没有给我，她是扔给我，你不要过来，我就拿着这一块钱，捡起来，靠别人施舍是低人一等的，有这种感觉。

64. 陈州：那次太惨了，全身冻伤，在床上趴了半个月，很痛苦，因为什么，它下大雪。

65. 陈鲁豫：第二个我们俩都是在同一年上大学，1988 年。

66. 赵忠祥：嘉德小拍上，这个是在外地的一个文物商店，我第一个买到的它，这个呢应该说他们跟我讲，算应该是乾隆以后，嘉道的东西，但是它非常奇妙的就是说。

67. 陈鲁豫：讲到这个地方我提一个题外话，说题外话其实也很有意思，天佐结婚是，领证是在四月十？

68. 刘若英：我洗一三五，他洗二四六，基本因为我们都是在那个门后有一个签，就是你有洗的就要在后面签名，对，然后他都会画他自己画的那个人像在那里，代表他有洗。

69. 张惠妹：当然有好一点，因为时间可以就是让很多事情，可以医治很多事情，让它变得更，不是在那个时候的那种，特别激动的那种感觉，但在特别的时间，特别的时段，你还是如果再想起爸爸的时候，还是会，心还是会痛的，对，那当然我比我三年前的我现在更好，更能去接受这样的事情，只是特定某些时候你想到了还是会的，对。
Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>19/07/2011</td>
<td>Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>罗志祥：可是那一刻呢，我要懂得去体谅她的压力，她的压力呢是左右邻居的压力，我觉得那种左右邻居那些闲言闲语的攻击很恐怖，可能你会在这里她是在那边跟她的朋友讲，你没有看到那个，那个谁阿祥，罗志祥他发生那种事情怎么会这样啊，就是这样的那种心情。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>20/07/2011</td>
<td>Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>罗志祥：不会、不会、不会，不能想不开，很多事情你要懂得知足，有比你更多更多的人可能因为更多更多的事情，他比你变得更坚强，你怎么可以因为这样一个小小的事情而让自己想不开，那你因为这样想不开，你有没有想到对自己的父母亲，对你的教育之恩，然后你因为一些事情就想不开，妈妈爸爸再见了，你就两手一挥，吐口长气，呼，没意义，你还是要面对，因为你这样等于是在逃避事情，那你逃避的事情还是存在着，那你不如站出来，对，就是我做的，就直接一句话把这个墙给挡住了，就是我，就是我，都是我，我扛了，我说没事了，那事情就过了，那如果你今天一直逃避，我不要提这个话题，我不要、不要，它事情永远存在。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>26/07/2011</td>
<td>Luo Zhixiang, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>罗志祥：因为我爸爸在那一刻，他握手，他握着我的手，爸爸躺在医院，我站着，他说爸爸只是去外面走一走，你把你的工作还要继续做完，不要因为爸爸这样离开了，你工作就不做，爸爸只是把幕降下来了，你幕还是要往上抬，我那一刻一边难过一边低着头，那个眼泪就一直这样，忍着，然后受不了了，我就躲在病床这边，我在爸爸头的后面一直这样，一直抖，一直抖，抖得不行，然后我爸爸又用写的，说哭一哭就好了，不要哭太久，不然我心疼，他用闽南话写的，你看那个字的时候你会更，他每一字、每一行、每一句，你会到现在你还是很清楚的，一直记忆在你的脑海里面。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>26/07/2011</td>
<td>Wang Jing, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>王静：经过上一次录完《鲁豫有约》的节目之后，你知道微博，你在里面刷得很厉害的，然后我们也是在因为你而去了微博。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>26/07/2011</td>
<td>Wang Jing, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>王静：你能够也她一张签名专辑。或者是在她有时间在你有时间的时候能够给她打一个电话，完成她的心愿。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>26/07/2011</td>
<td>Wang Jing, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>王静：她住在那个应该是在西安。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>26/07/2011</td>
<td>Wang Jing, 26/07/2011</td>
<td>王静：就希望罗志祥能够跳舞的时候要注意安全。其实你刚才说的那个脚扭伤，是在红磡体育馆里面跳那个舞。然后腿受伤我看到那个事情之后很心疼。然后也觉得不管怎样辛苦，怎样努力。毕竟大家买了票都来了，而且也都那么支持你，要一直坚持，为了大家。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>04/08/2011</td>
<td>Da Shan, 04/08/2011</td>
<td>大山：对，这个大概是在一九二二年，而且据了解就是在协和医院的这个院儿里头。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>04/08/2011</td>
<td>Da Shan, 04/08/2011</td>
<td>大山：对，对，因为我知道学中文其实想的还是挺随意的，就是感兴趣、好奇。在加拿大学了两年以后，那年夏天和我哥哥一起来的，就是和蛋，和蛋一起来的，好像是在台北去快餐店点了一杯咖啡，要大的咖啡一大杯可乐，然后不知道怎么说，是杯子，Cup 是杯子，可乐，可乐我知道，是杯子大，还是大杯子，一大杯，一杯大可乐，一大杯可乐，杯大一可乐，我记得我在那柜台，所以就是说。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>04/08/2011</td>
<td>Da Shan, 04/08/2011</td>
<td>大山：对，对，因为我知道学中文其实想的还是挺随意的，就是感兴趣、好奇。在加拿大学了两年以后，那年夏天和我哥哥一起来的，就是和蛋，和蛋一起来的，好像是在台北去快餐店点了一杯咖啡，要大的咖啡一大杯可乐，然后不知道怎么说，是杯子，Cup 是杯子，可乐，可乐我知道，是杯子大，还是大杯子，一大杯，一杯大可乐，一大杯可乐，杯大一可乐，我记得我在那柜台，所以就是说。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>大山：这是在他们家里，三十平米不到，就这样学相声，其实和丁老师合作也很早，就九十年代我们是几乎是天天在一起。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>大山：我听她的呀，这好像没有文化差异是在中国还是在西方都是这样的。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>阎维文：就等啊，等啊两个小时，两个人怕我也怕，我以为就我一问，他也怕，就是最后就是到十点半的时候，大约那个时间隐隐约约能听到部队拉号子的声音了，一下那口气儿就放下了，就是那个太恐怖了。关键他刚才讲了，我们那儿又是在西藏，又是在边防，人生地不熟，就是那个时候觉得哪儿恨不得觉得哪儿都是人了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>阎维文：就等啊，等啊两个小时，两个人怕我也怕，我以为就我一问，他也怕，就是最后就是到十点半的时候，大约那个时间隐隐约约能听到部队拉号子的声音了，一下那口气儿就放下了，就是那个太恐怖了。关键他刚才讲了，我们那儿又是在西藏，又是在边防，人生地不熟，就是那个时候觉得哪儿恨不得觉得哪儿都是人了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>李双江：我有时候就想，我说双江只不过是在那儿唱唱歌，我也没在那儿干十年、八年，就给了我这么高的荣誉，二十年走了以后对我们这些文艺兵还那么不舍你，不忘你，我觉得当兵光荣，当一个文艺兵为兵服务更光荣。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>阎维文：干嘛，你们谁叠还是我呀。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>阎维文：小分队的全体同志来看你，我带他们为你演唱一首歌，歌的名字叫《心甘情愿》，人民群众有难时，你会伸出温暖的手，祖国母亲需要时，你愿把热血流淌，心甘情愿啊。心甘情愿为的是中华大地春色满园。李双江：这是在哪儿，这是在什么地方？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>阎维文：这是在汶川，汶川地震的时候，对这个，这个烈士是叫武文斌，从艺四十多年，应该说唱、演唱，从演唱水平上来讲这是我演唱最糟糕的一次，调不成调，声不成声，但是是我在演唱中最感动、最真实的一次。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>阎维文：小分队的全体同志来看你，我带他们为你演唱一首歌，歌的名字叫《心甘情愿》，人民群众有难时，你会伸出温暖的手，祖国母亲需要时，你愿把热血流淌，心甘情愿啊。心甘情愿为的是中华大地春色满园。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>陈鲁豫：我能问问你现在的梦想是什么吗？观众：也是在这个圈子里。</td>
<td>Audience member</td>
<td>17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>陶喆：我可能是在思想上面可是我内心里是有一些叛逆的，譬如说这个找女朋友的事情等等，但是有时候我真的做出什么很坏、很坏的事情，其实也没有。</td>
<td>Tao Zhe</td>
<td>07/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>陶喆：她反而真的是没那么着急，我妈可以说是在这一年到一年半才开始催婚，才开始说儿子你真的要差不多要定下来了，在这个之前真的是没有。</td>
<td>Tao Zhe</td>
<td>07/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>王复蓉：这个是她两岁的时候拍的，不到两岁的时候拍的，属于恐怖分子，对，他很皮，我是气了，我说乱打，把我气得我跟你讲有一次也是在美国，出去一会儿功夫我去菜市场买菜，他爸爸在上班，一会儿功夫厨房整个烧起来了。</td>
<td>Wang Furong</td>
<td>17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>陶喆：对，这叫负责任，担得起，我是那个时候其实那个很小，那个时候应该是可能三岁，刚刚会写自己的名字，然后我就只会写我们的姓，Tao，然后我就骑着我的这个小三轮车就到我们家附近所有的一些房子，拿着蜡笔，而且拿着不止是蜡笔而是很鲜艳的紫色，对，就写Tao，那个时候其实在美国这应该是在一九，可能1972、1973年的时候，没有那么多的中国人，尤其是我们住的那个区，不是像唐人城，唐人城这种地方，不是，不是中国城，是一个基本上都是外国人的地方，所以大家都知道陶家干的，然后可是那个时候很小了就真的是不懂事。</td>
<td>Tao Zhe</td>
<td>17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>陶喆：他们其实一定是前几天，是好像是哪一个单位送我爸的一个荣誉的一个什么样子一个杯这样子，我不骗你哦，我爸真的是在警察先生面前他就说发生什么事，我们在一家洗衣店里找到这个东西，然后我爸拿那个东西那个东西其实还没有碎，就可能只有已经被分尸成三块拼凑起来的，然后他就说是不是你丢的，是不是你丢的，然后就这样丢过去。</td>
<td>Tao Zhe</td>
<td>17/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>光良：这个现在有点困难，因为我们都在不同的唱片公司，然后据我所知其实品冠对于他自己的规划有自己的想法，然后上一次我们一起合唱是在滚石三十周年，在台北，对。</td>
<td>Guang Liang</td>
<td>31/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>品冠：喂，嗨，喂听到吗？陈鲁豫：听到了。光良：好恐怖，你是在拍戏吗？</td>
<td>Guang Liang</td>
<td>31/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>王楠：我开始也不太适应，我这个怀孕期间的这些状态，四十五天的时候我是摔了一跤，然后因为那个是在威海嘛然后下雪，等我摔了一跤以后我起来，我这样拍一拍我身上的那个雪，我就回到家，我一进门特别冷静的跟他说，我说我刚才摔了一跤，他这样看着我说，什么？</td>
<td>Wang Nan</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>郭斌：对，离的太远不行，离的太近也不行，永远是在另一个房间里待命。</td>
<td>Guo Bin</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>王楠：我们俩吵架基本上是在一天之内肯定就好。</td>
<td>Wang Nan</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>苏永康：其实我觉得男人是在一个事业的巅峰的时候，你身边的真</td>
<td>Su Yongkang</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. 陈鲁豫：比如说成龙，2003 年我第一次采访他是在香港他的一间工作室，那次采访从晚上十点钟一直到凌晨的三四点，他讲了自己儿时的经历，早年拍片时候的辛苦，那时候他的身份就是影坛巨星。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 06/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. 陈鲁豫：这些年看到成龙大哥很多时候是在一些慈善的活动，不久前我们有一次活动在一块儿，我看到他，然后当成龙大哥一拍，拍得高兴了以后，现场把自己一件衣服脱了就卖了。</td>
<td>Cheng Long, 06/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. 成龙：我说我已经在学校门口了，他说你在哪里，我说在哪里哪里，哎呀，对不起，那是小学。我说，哦，那应该是在哪里，他现在在读中学，哦，中学是在哪里哪里，我就去，我到了中学，斜坡，我看见他站在斜坡，一身汗。</td>
<td>Cheng Long, 06/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. 成龙：我说我已经在学校门口了，他说你在哪里，我说在哪里哪里，哎呀，对不起，那是小学。我说，哦，那应该是在哪里，他现在在读中学，哦，中学是在哪里哪里，我就去，我到了中学，斜坡，我看见他站在斜坡，一身汗。</td>
<td>Cheng Long, 06/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. 李连杰：可以看到 2003 年，我在台北的一次，一个对话当中我已经说过，将来会有一半的精力拍电影，将来我想一半的时间做公益，那是在海啸之前，但是理论很多感受都有了，但是还不够足够的勇气，那么海啸就这么近地离死亡擦身而过以后，你发现说，赶快做，没时间，不知道明天会不会撞车又死了，来不及做了。</td>
<td>Li Lianjie, 07/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. 陈鲁豫：一个人的成长和改变并不是一朝一夕之间形成的，要么是经历了突发事件，要么就是经过漫长时间的累积，无论是成龙还是李连杰，他们的一点一滴的变化我们都能够感受到。记得成龙曾经感叹说他的白头发越来越多，其实对于这两位银幕硬汉来说，在我们的心中，正是因为他们对于生活、对于事业的投入、热爱，那种永不消退的激情，铸就了他们不老的传说。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 07/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. 邓亚萍：现在呢，有空的时候打打羽毛球这样，但是我一开始呢我在这儿告诉大家，我一开始打羽毛球出现一些笑话，就是我一开始打球的时候当时是英国开始，因为我那儿留学。</td>
<td>Deng Yaping, 08/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. 陈鲁豫：就像郭晓冬，他的成长完全是一部非常青春励志的电视剧，甚至比电视剧还要精采，采访郭晓冬是在 2007 年，因为一期有关艺术类考生的节目，当时郭晓冬作为一个过来人给那些醉心于要投身演艺圈的应届高中毕业生们一些经验和意见。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 09/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. 陈鲁豫：所以你成长那个时代应该是在家里面，比如说经济条件相当一般的一个环境，还是说非常艰苦的一个环境。</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 09/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. 郭晓冬：我现在回想起来可能那个年代都是这样子的，对，因为首先是在山区里，然后在我的印象当中，家境那个时候的的确确是很，不是很好，因为我。</td>
<td>Guo Xiaodong, 09/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. 陈鲁豫：上一次采访的时候晓冬已经结婚了嘛那时候，然后我就问他，我说你有没有计划从两人世界变成三人世界吗？他当时就说有</td>
<td>Chen Luyu, 09/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
112. 陈鲁豫：提起中国的演艺圈，恐怕一定会提到范冰冰，第一次采访她是在2008年，当时她刚刚做制片人，推出了第一部电视剧《胭脂雪》，生活中的她有着严格甚至于严肃的家教，很腼腆，很谨慎，和人们想象当中的她不太一样。你妈管你，脾气急不急？

113. 刘轩：然后每一次呢，我们住进去的时候都是在那个地区里面的唯一一个中国的家庭，其他的全部都是白人。

114. 刘墉：还有的时候，我根本不讲话，他以前耳朵上打了一个洞，现在不知道还有没有那个洞，挂了一个，坐我对面，高中的时候，我不讲话。
刘轩：不是高中，是大学。
刘墉：no no no。
刘轩：大学，上大学，上大学第一天。
刘墉：好好好，第一天我是在家里，你是在学校。

115. 刘墉：还有的时候，我根本不讲话，他以前耳朵上打了一个洞，现在不知道还有没有那个洞，挂了一个，坐我对面，高中的时候，我不讲话。
刘轩：不是高中，是大学。
刘墉：no no no。
刘轩：大学，上大学，上大学第一天。
刘墉：好好好，第一天我是在家里，你是在学校。

116. 刘轩：然后回来的时候我就觉得奇怪，不是放在车房里面应该是在这边怎么摆了横的，然后一看老爸在那个水龙头那边洗手，在干吗呢？你摔到了。

117. 刘墉：整个摔得都是，因为那个地上都是沙粒，我是在咱们家后面那个斜坡嘛，我下去了，那刹不住车，然后我又要打小转，所以我到现在都跟人家讲说我会骑脚踏车，但我不转弯。

118. 刘轩：然后呢，当然家里有很多时候我妈可能在洗衣服啊，或者在外面照顾，我们在那边聊天或怎么样，然后就开始打电话，有的时候我妈是在外面的，在那边买东西，马上电话就来了，而且是不止一次，是可能是在。

119. 刘墉：现在已经找到工作了，但是不准我们说是在哪儿工作。她说，爸爸主张靠自己去成功，她的老板不知道……

120. 陈鲁豫：你们之间是在一起，有那种文化上的东西，文化那种冲突吗？

121. 闫妮：原来我特别小的时候，我爸倒垃圾，过去那倒垃圾是在楼道里，冲，给倒下去，他把簸箕冲下去了。

122. 郭德纲：你担心什么呢？
陈鲁豫：通常于谦站在这儿没什么好结果。
郭德纲：哎，你没明白，只要是在我身边的在哪都没好结果。

123. 陈鲁豫：这个是在网上的论坛里面。

124. 陈鲁豫：我能先向你投诉一件事吗？我跟张铁林认识超过15年，你只请我吃过一顿饭，如果我没有记错的话，那一顿饭是在1996年4月某一天的下午4点多钟，在香港九龙红磡一条小街上的，非常小的一个越南餐馆，只有三张餐桌，因为是下午的时间那顿饭是特价，三个人花了一百港币。
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1 The title of Chinese-language publications is given first in pinyin Romanisation, followed by the English translation in square brackets. In cases where an official English translation is available, this is provided unless it is deemed to be inaccurate, ambiguous or otherwise misleading, in which case – as in cases where no official translation is available – the translation provided is mine. Chinese authors’ names are given in the Romanised form preferred by the authors themselves, with the default being pinyin Romanisation if no official spelling can be found. Japanese authors’ names appear in standard Japanese Romanisation.
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