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1. Introduction

Chinese adverbs such as dou 'all', you 'again', ye 'also', jiu 'if/when ... then ...', and cai 'only if/when ... then ...' are deemed adverbs primarily because they occur, syntactically, between the subject/topic and the verb phrase (Chao 1968; Alleton 1972; Li & Thompson 1981). Each of these words forms a modification relationship with other linguistic constituents in the same sentence, where the linguistic constituents can be part of the matrix VP, the whole VP, or linguistic constituents outside of the VP. The problem of describing this modifier-modified relationship is essentially a matter of interpreting the occurrence of these adverbs in relation to the discourse where they appear.

What I would like to do in this paper is to conduct a case study of one of these words, namely you. If you is a modifier, how exactly does it modify a linguistic constituent? How many kinds of linguistic constituents can be modified by you? Since you and the modified constituent form yet an even larger linguistic constituent, what is their role in relation to the other linguistic constituents in the sentence or the discourse where they occur? How is the grammatical function of you subject to factors arising from the discourse containing the you sentence? By attempting to answer these questions, I intend to use this micro-study of you to further our understanding of the triangular relationship among lexical/grammatical meaning, discourse, and pragmatics.

In the following, I begin by suggesting that the concept of “operator” may be borrowed from logic and mathematics to characterize the grammatical function of you. Briefly, you is an operator that, when applied to an
entity, has the function of accumulating different yet relevant properties of that entity. — "Entity" and "property" here are terms representing abstractions of a variety of linguistic forms. These two terms are not used in as strict fashion as they are defined in the model-theoretic framework. Rather, they are borrowed to represent, metaphorically, theoretical concepts in text/discourse analysis that are equivalent to those to which they literally refer in the original semantic framework. — You operates on an entity so that one property of the entity is asserted and, in the mean time, (an)other property/ies relevant to this asserted property is/are implicated. In this way, the accumulating function of you hinges upon the coexistence of the assertion and the conventional implicature (Grice 1975) that you carries.

Because of its accumulating function, you acts as a connective in discourse for text-building, connecting relevant comments made with respect to the same conversational topic. Two modes of text-building can be differentiated: the "objective accumulation of relevance" and the "subjective accumulation of relevance". The objective accumulation of relevance concerns empirically verifiable text-building processes, which can be further divided into local text-building and global text-building. The subjective accumulation of relevance concerns text-building processes (either local or global) based upon the speaker's counting on the addressee's linguistic knowledge.

The subjective mode of accumulation of relevance is commonly referred to as the emphatic usage (e.g. Ding 1979, Lü 1980). Except for being taxonomized as one sub-use of you in Alleton 1972, this emphatic usage has not been examined in detail in past literatures on you or on Chinese adverbs in general. In the latter part of this paper, I provide an analysis of this use (i.e. the subjective accumulation) in terms of its relationship with the objective mode of accumulation by introducing frameworks of politeness and of language use in social interactions. Finally, I conclude that all uses of you, including the emphatic one, are contextual variations of its grammatical function, with the "entity" and the "property" contained in linguistic constituents of varying sizes.

My data for this study are drawn primarily from the following sources: (1) you sentences already cited in grammar books such as Chao (1968) and Lü (1980), (2) some occurrences of you with their larger (con)texts in the various contemporary Chinese literary works that I was reading at the time of research, and (3) when these sources do not provide the kinds of exam-
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ple I need for demonstration, I construct them myself.² I hasten to acknowledge that the examples given in grammar books and the language of fictional writing tend to be prefabricated and therefore better-formed than the language of improvised daily speech. Thus, the idealized nature of my data may lead to restrictions on the empirical applicability of the results of my analysis. I hope that this drawback can be improved in future research.

2. Previous treatments

As grammatical markers with multiple uses that cut across the traditionally categorized “parts of speech”, Chinese adverbs such as cai, jiu, you, ye and dou have yet to receive extensive and systematic analysis within a linguistic framework that offers an explanatory account. Chao (1968) provides a sketch of the multiple functions of these adverbs but does not address the theoretical issue of why these diverse functions intersect in the use of one lexical item. For example, Chao points out that you is an adverb of time (784) and it is also a coordination/correlative conjunction marker in some contexts (269, 792-794). (1) and (2) demonstrate these two uses.

(1) Ta shuo bu zai lai le, keshi houlai you lai
3S say NEG again come PRT but later come le.
PRT
‘(S)he said that (s)he wouldn’t come again, but later (s)he came again.’

(2) Ta you bu chi tang, you bu chi yen.
3S NEG eat sugar NEG eat salt
‘(S)he doesn’t eat sugar or salt.’

The emphatic use of you, however, is ignored in Chao. Chao’s discussion is a representation of the early treatments of these adverbs.

The most detailed study of these adverbs since then is, undoubtedly, Alleton’s taxonomical work (1972). In particular, she distinguishes three “meanings” for you: (i) ‘encore’, ‘de plus’, (ii) ‘a la fois’, ‘en meme temps’, and (iii) ‘quand meme’, ‘meme (pas)’/‘donc’ (+ conditional ou subjonctif) (84-99). This descriptive treatment examines both the syntagmatic concurrences of these adverbs with other constituents in the same sentence, and the paradigmatic differentiations among these adverbs themselves. The empha-
tic use of each of these adverbs, if there is one, is given due notice. In the case of you, the third use listed above corresponds to the emphatic use.

Alleton (1972) is a pioneering work for the understanding of the multifunctionality of these adverbs. I believe, however, that after the various uses of one adverb are taxonomized, the next step ought to be to develop an explanatory framework that can account for the interrelationship among the uses arising from the same lexical item. Moreover, since multifunctionality is a phenomenon observed in more than one adverb, the explanatory framework should be able to account for multifunctionality in all of these adverbs in a systematic way.3

Although a detailed systematic account is premature and beyond the scope of this paper, I do keep this goal in mind while developing the analysis for you. The multiple functions of you are dealt with in terms of conventional implicature, proposition vs. discourse, and the interactive aspect of conversation. This analysis is further incorporated into a theory of polysemy, which integrates semantics and pragmatics in treating issues arising from discourse.

3. Objective accumulation of relevance

To begin our analysis, let me first point out that the implicature in the use of you is far more interesting than the truth-condition that you represents. Consider the sentences in (3). Following the traditions for characterizing conventional implicatures developed in studies of the English even and only (Horn 1969; Karttunen & Karttunen 1977; Karttunen & Peters 1979; Rooth 1985) and on Chinese adverbs (Paris 1979; Biq 1987), I work out the semi-logical notations in (4), which I call Generalization I (GI), to represent what you contributes to each sentence in (3). The values in (3a) are used to exemplify the variables in GI.

(3) a. Ni you sheng-wode-qi le.
   you angry:at:me PRT
   ‘You are mad at me again.’

(3) b. Haimian-shang you qi wu le.
   sea:surface:on arise fog PRT
   ‘Fog arose from the sea surface again.’
(3) c. Zhei-ge ren zuotian lai guo, jintian you
   this:M person yesterday come ASP today
   lai le.
   come PRT
   ‘This person came yesterday. (S)he came again today.’

(4) Generalization I:
   \( \text{you} \ v_t(s) \iff v_t(s) \land \exists v_{t-1}[v_{t-1}(s)] \) \( v_t, v_{t-1} \in V \)
   \( V = \{ v_{t-m}, \ldots, v_{t-1}, v_t, v_{t+1}, \ldots, v_{t+n} \} \)
   \( s = ni \ ‘you’ \)
   \( v = sheng-wode-qi \ ‘mad at me’ \)
   \( t = \text{NOW} \) (speech time)

A paraphrase of GI is something like the following: you signals not only an
assertion of a certain entity \( s \) having certain property \( v \) at time \( t \), but also an
implicature that the same entity \( s \) had the same property \( v \) at a time prior
to \( t \). In plain English, GI simply indicates a repetition of the same action
carried out by the same agent over time. The pattern ‘\( V_i \ le you \ V_i \)’ in (5)
exhibits the same repetitional meaning.

(5) a. xi le you xi
   wash PRT wash
   ‘wash again and again’

(5) b. lian le you lian
   practice PRT practice
   ‘practice again and again’

The repeated linguistic constituent in this pattern, however, does not
have to be a verb. It can, for example, be a measure word for a VP, or a
measure word for an NP that is the subject or the object of that VP, as in
(6).

(6) a. yi-ci you yi-ci
   one:time one:time
   ‘time after time’

(6) b. yi-tian you yi-tian
   one:day one:day
   ‘day after day’

(6) c. yi-qun you yi-qun
   one:flock one:flock
   ‘flock after flock’
Since you in these examples still conveys a repetition of some action over time, the characterization in (4) remains adequate.

Quite often, however, you is used to establish a relation between two properties that are not of the same action repeated over time. Consider the examples in (7).

(7) a. Lu Laoshi shi xianli-de mofan jiaoshi,
    Lu teacher be county's model teacher
   you shi remin daibiao.
    be people representative
    ‘Mr./Ms. Lu not only is the county's model teacher, but also is the people's representative.’

(7) b. Ta shi congming ren, you ken nuli.
    he be intelligent person willing:to work:hard
    ‘He not only is intelligent, but also works hard.’

(7) c. Nei-yi tian zhenghao shi Sanfude di-yi tian,
    that:one day just be Sanfu:poss first day
   you shi zhongwu, you meiyou feng.
    be noon NEG:have wind
    ‘That day happened to be the first day of Sanfu (the hot season), and it was noon, and there was no breeze.’

Here, the two properties at issue are no longer the same action implemented at two points in time but rather two different, yet pragmatically related, properties attributed to the same entity, with one being asserted and the other being implicated.

For any entity, the members of the set of properties are not necessarily relevant to one another beyond their membership. Only when the criteria for relevance are pragmatically established can one divide these properties into two subsets, $V_r$ and $V_r^c$. The members of $V_r$ are all relevant to one another in terms of those pragmatically established criteria, while $V_r^c$ is the complement of $V_r$. Thus, in view of the examples in (7), we can modify GI into GII in (8), with all the variables exemplified by values used in (7a).
(8) Generalization II:

\[ \text{you } v(s) \leftrightarrow v(s) \& \exists w[w \neq v, w(s)] \]
\[ V = \{ v, w, \ldots \} \]
\[ = \{ V_r : \text{set of relevant properties} \}, V_c : \text{set of irrelevant properties} \]

\[ s = \text{Lu Laoshi} \text{ ‘Mr./Ms. Lu’} \]
\[ v = (shi) \text{ renmin daibiao} \text{ ‘the people’s representative’} \]
\[ w = (shi) \text{ xianlide mofan jiaoshi} \text{ ‘the county’s model teacher’} \]

As an expansion of G1, GII can adequately represent the two common English glosses for you, i.e., ‘again’ for the repetition of the same property, and ‘also’ for the accumulation of relevant properties. Repetition of the same property can be seen as a type of accumulation of different properties in a set, if that set is not anchored solely in the temporal dimension. Implementations of the same property at different times are now considered different properties. Thus, the old \( v_{t-1} \) in G1 is adequately represented by the \( w \) in GII.

In Chinese, you can occur together with \textit{ji} to form the ‘\textit{ji} A you B (you C)…’ pattern. On the other hand, there is the ‘you A you B (you C)…’ pattern denoting essentially the same meaning, with you occurring not only with the sequential member(s) of the accumulated group of properties but also with its first member. Examples are given in (9).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{ji} ganjing you qingbian
    \begin{itemize}
      \item not:only clean light
      \item you ganjing you qingbian
    \end{itemize}
    ‘not only clean but also light’
  
  \item \textit{ji} jingji you shihui
    \begin{itemize}
      \item not:only economical substantial
      \item you jingji you shihui
    \end{itemize}
    ‘not only economical but also substantial’
\end{enumerate}

Since you can occur with the first member, there should be no implicational ordering among the accumulated properties. In other words, no order should be established between \( v \) and \( w \) in GII, as long as \( v \) and \( w \) are members of \( V_r \).

A further revision of our Generalization with respect to you results from considering the following examples:
In order to account for occurrences of *you* like these in (10) the entity $s$ in GII has to be defined as the conversational topic in discourse whose linguistic representation may not occur within the *you* sentence. On the other hand, the properties $v$ and $w$ can be propositions represented by full sentences. In other words, although *you* always occurs between the subject/topic and the verb phrase in a sentence, it can “operate” on some entity outside of that *you* sentence, and the whole *you* sentence generates the function of accumulating relevant properties for that entity.

Taking (10a) as an example, it can be seen that the entity $s$ is *zhei ge miyu* ‘this riddle’, which is outside of the *you* sentence. The asserted property $v$ is *didi cai cuo le* ‘the younger brother guessed (it) wrong’, while the implicated relevant property $w$ is *gege cai cuo le* ‘the older brother guessed (it) wrong’. Both propositions are pragmatically relevant properties of the conversational topic, *zhei ge miyu* ‘this riddle’, because they contribute to the establishment of the following (evaluative) summary with regard to this topic, *zhei ge miyu ke nan le* ‘this riddle is surely difficult’.

In view of examples like those in (10), we realize that the grammatical function of *you* may run over sentence boundaries in spite of its syntactic stability (that is, the fact that it is always embedded in a sentence). The
entity on which you operates does not have to be a linguistic constituent within the same sentence. In fact, the relationship between you and this entity bears not so much on the linguistic structure at the sentence level as on the idea structure in a discourse (Schiffrin 1986; also cf. the notion of ‘idea unit’ in Chafe 1982, 1985). In particular, the grammatical function of you bears on the establishment of a conversational topic by “pulling together” various comments about this topic as its properties, which are pragmatically relevant to one another.

At this stage we note that our use of the terms “entity” and “property” has been much looser than their traditional use in the model-theoretic framework. In the original semantic framework, the term “entity” refers to the sense represented by a linguistic sign. Generally speaking, the proposition of a sentence concerns properties of an entity that is represented by a proper name or a noun (phrase). Here, “entity” is borrowed to refer to the conversational topic that is expressed by a string of linguistic signs, whose constituents may be more than just a proper name or a noun (phrase). The present usage and the original usage are related only metaphorically.

GIII in (11) is a revision based upon these observations, and values in (10a) are used to exemplify the variables.

(11) Generalization III:

\[
\text{you} \ v(s) \leftrightarrow v(s) \& \exists \ w[w \neq v, w(s)] \quad v, w \in V_r \\
V = \{v, w, \ldots\} \\
V_r : \text{set of relevant properties} \\
V_c : \text{set of irrelevant properties} \\
s = \text{CONVERSATIONAL TOPIC} \ (\text{zheige miyu} \ ‘\text{This riddle}’) \\
v = (\text{didi cai cuo le} \ ‘\text{The younger brother guessed (it) wrong}’) \\
w = \text{gege cai cuo le} \ ‘\text{The older brother guessed (it) wrong}’
\]

Once the operating function of you runs across sentence boundaries, its significance can be further appreciated from the viewpoint of text-building. Building a text involves the organization of ideas: which is to be expressed first, which next; which is subordinate and supportive, and which is dominant and thematic. Schiffrin (1986) distinguishes two kinds of text-building: local text-building and global text-building. According to her, local text-building is concerned with the relationship between individual propositions, or the structure of immediately neighboring linguistic sequences. Global text-building is, on the other hand, concerned with the relationship between sets of propositions, or the overall structure of the
whole text. The examples in (10) demonstrate the grammatical function of *you* with respect to local text-building, because the conversational topic on which *you* operates may be discovered from the immediate neighborhood of the *you* sentence.

In the novel, *Er Hu (A tale of two Hu's)*, by one of the renowned Chinese contemporary writers, Chen Ruoxi, there are numerous examples of *you* used to build local textual cohesiveness. The excerpts in (12) are only two examples.4

(12) a. ... *jianzhi chuchu bu shunli.* Zicong maile dao simply every place *NEG* smooth since buy *PRT* to *Shanghaide Zhongguo Minhang jipiao yilai, dianhua* Shanghai poss China Airline ticket since telephone *gongsi nong cuo le tade zhang, wuduan* company make mistake *PRT* his/her bill with no reason *gei ta jiale yidadui changtu* to *3S* add *PRT* a lot *long-distance dianhuafei;* meidian gongsi yao ta yu fu phone-bill utility company want *3S* in advance *pay xia ge yue feiyong, fouze yao qieduan* next *M* month expense otherwise want cut *gongying;* fangdong ye yao ta yu liu supply landlord also want *3S* in advance leave *fangzude zhipiao, haoxiang huaiyi ta keneng zhiliu* rent-poss check seem suspect *3S* may delay *bu gui, laile tade fangzu shide. Jintian zai NEG* return repudiate his/her rent seem today at *menkou you bei qiangle qian.* entrance *PASS* rob *PRT* money (Chen, 5)

‘... simply nothing goes right. Since he bought the China People’s Airline ticket to Shanghai, the telephone company messed up his bill, billing him for a lot of long distance phone calls without any reason. The utility company wanted him to pay the bill for next month, otherwise the supply would be cut off. The landlord also wanted him to pay the rent in advance, as if suspecting that he might stay there and not come back and thus not pay his rent. **On top of all this,** he got robbed in front of his own house today!’
Uncle, you must have known that, during the past thirty years, I always wanted to come to visit Aunt, but the situation really did not allow for it. When the situation became better, it was (but) again delayed and forgotten.'

The series of incidents in (12a) are all about the misfortunes that the main character of the novel, i.e. Old Hu, has encountered since he bought the airline ticket to Shanghai. The troubles that the telephone company, the utility company, and the landlord gave him are grouped together in the discourse to form one kind of misfortune, which we may call “domestic misfortunes”. On top of all of these things, Old Hu was also robbed that morning. *You* is used here to relate the robbery to those domestic misfortunes as an additional type of misfortune. The various kinds of misfortunes are accumulated as properties of the topic of this local narrative unit, “the old man’s life since he bought the airline ticket to Shanghai”.

When *you* is used at the global level to operate on a conversational topic to derive the accumulation of its relevant properties, those accumulated properties are not expressed in immediately neighboring linguistic sequences. In Chen Ruoxi’s *Er Hu*, there are also numerous examples where *you* is used in this particular fashion. (13) is only one of them.

(13)  
*Diling! Diling!*

*ring  
You shi sheide dianhua ne?  
be whose telephone  
*Chen, 24]*

‘Rring! Rring! Whose call is this *again*?’

This phone call (which appears on p. 24 in the novel) is the second phone call received by Old Hu in one afternoon. The first phone call occurred in the novel between p. 15 and p. 17. Between the two phone calls is Old Hu’s remembrance of things past, which by itself is a smaller narrative unit inserted in the larger discourse about things occurring to the old man at the
present. The two phone calls are pulled together by the use of you here as two relevant properties attributed to the life of Old Hu's in that afternoon. In particular, the overall textual cohesiveness is enhanced by you, since this connective relates these two phone calls by cutting across the smaller remembrance narrative unit that interrupts the main narrative line.

In this section, we have demonstrated that, because of its conventional implicature, you is used as a connective to build textual cohesiveness. Although its syntactic occurrence is always positioned after the sentence subject/topic and before the matrix VP, you is semantically an operator, placing focus on the conversational topic whose linguistic realizations can range from an NP to a whole sentence. You operates on such a conversational topic so that comments made about this topic in the discourse are accumulated as its relevant properties. This accumulating function of you is accomplished through the co-existence of the assertion and the implicature that you brings to the text. On the one hand, the modified linguistic constituent under the scope of you consists of the property that you asserts. On the other hand, the implicature you conveys is the existence of another property similarly attributed to the same conversational topic.

We have examined data ranging from within-sentence examples, to cross-neighboring-sentences examples, to cross-narrative-unit examples, thus confirming the text-building role of you. The focused entity (i.e. conversational topic) and its relevant properties (i.e. accumulated comments) are referentially identifiable in the text/discourse. Their relationships with each other are verifiable in terms of external, empirical means (cf. Traugott 1986, ms). Therefore, this accumulating function of you is determined to be objective. Obviously, the notion of the objective mode of accumulating relevance makes sense only when there is the opposite subjective mode of accumulating relevance. We now turn to this notion.

4. From objective accumulation to subjective accumulation

As opposed to the objective mode of accumulation, the subjective mode of accumulation concerns the accumulation of properties whose relevance to one another is conceivable or justifiable from the speaker's point of view. With this mechanism, the speaker can express his/her (strong) evaluative attitude toward the issues at hand. The relevance among the accumulated properties and their relationship with the focused conversational topic may not be empirically established in the structure of the text/
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discourse. However, the subjective mode is found to be used only in conjunction with special types of linguistic structures conventionalized for achieving certain communicative ends. Thus it is interesting to examine the special “environments” in which the subjective mode dwells, the ways these environments give rise to the subjectivity in the use of you, and the difference (and similarities) between the subjective mode and the objective mode. We consider two sets of examples. In the first we study you in rhetorical questions; then we turn to the use of you in sentence refutation.

4.2. Rhetorical question

Consider the following examples:

(14) a. Customer: Dianhua ling xiang shijian hui you telephone ring ring time can have changduan bu tong ma? length NEG same QUES
   ‘Is it possible that the length of phone rings can be different?’
   Operator: Bu hui ba.... Ouran you xie bu NEG can PRT occasional have some NEG tong, you you shenme quanxi? same have what relation (Zhang, 64)
   ‘No, I don’t think so.’ ... ‘So what even if there is an occasional difference?’

(14) b. Ruguo Qihua ai zhangfu er yuanyi fangqi if Qihua love husband then willing to give up hunyin, ziji ai Lixing you hebi jianchi marriage self love Lixing why have to insist hunyin ne? marriage PRT (Chen, 244)
   ‘If Qihua is willing to give up her marriage because she loves her husband, then why do I have to insist on marriage when I love Lixing?’

All of these sentences are rhetorical questions in form. Rhetorical questions function as forceful statements in discourse: a positive rhetorical question suggests a strong negative assertion, whereas a negative rhetorical question suggests a strong positive one. A rhetorical question is thus a type of indi-
rect speech acts, in which the primary illocutionary act (statement, assertion) is performed indirectly by way of the secondary illocutionary act (question) (Searle 1975/1979).

The motivation for speakers to abandon direct ways of saying what they mean and to opt for indirect speech acts has been explained by the desire to achieve politeness. Based upon the assumption that competent, rational adult members of a society all want to claim a “face” — a public self-image — Brown & Levinson (1978) suggest that, in order to save the addressee’s face, and thus maintain smooth social interactions, speakers tend to use a number of linguistic strategies to minimize the difficulties of face-threatening acts (disagreements, rejections, etc.). Conventionalized indirect speech acts form one of these strategies.

Rhetorical questions are indirect speech acts, and thus less face-threatening than direct statements/assertions because, on the surface — or, to use Brown & Levinson’s term, “on record” — they leave the making of choices to the addressee, and thus do not create the imposing atmosphere of statements/assertions. The addressee’s freedom to choose an answer is, however, eliminated by the “off record” conversational implicatures: provided the context, the answer to the rhetorical question is apparent (Grice 1975). I would suggest that you is used in conjunction with rhetorical questions to reinforce the appearance of the implied answer.

Note that all of the above examples would remain the same with respect to both truth-conditions and sentence meanings if the you is omitted. In the objective accumulation discussed in section three, when you is omitted, the truth-conditions remain unchanged but the repetitional or accumulating sense is left unsignaled. Now we see that in rhetorical questions, the lack of you not only does not cause changes in truth-conditions, but also leaves the meaning of the whole sentence unaffected. What is missing is only the emphatic force indicating the speaker’s attitude toward the issue at hand.

Speakers use you to convey their attitude toward the issue at hand by manipulating you’s conventional implicature. Recall that you implicates that, for the same entity s, there exists a property w which is relevant to the asserted property v. In rhetorical questions, the entire question (or the implicated forceful statement) is under you’s scope, thus constituting the property v. By implicating the existence and relevance to v of a property w, you indicates that v is just one argument in an array of arguments provided by the speaker to support his/her point with regard to the conversational
topic, s. In other words, based upon his/her (tacit) linguistic knowledge of the conventional implicature of you, the hearer is left with an impression, upon hearing you, that there is an accumulation of speaker's arguments. Since the rhetorical question is only one of these arguments, it appears less abrupt, more legitimate, and the forcefulness imposed by the questioning is outstanding.

Note that the existence of the implicated property w may not be empirically proven in the discourse, nor is w's relevance to the asserted property v necessarily demonstrable. Take (14a) as an example. In this case, the operator's intended message, i.e., "the occasional difference in telephone ringing length is trivial", is the asserted v embedded in the rhetorical question with you. The operator subjectively relates this triviality with the improbability of difference in telephone ringing length, although these two matters are not correlated with each other either logically or empirically. However, from the operator's subjective point of view, both of her comments substantiate her impatience with the customer and eagerness to dismiss his inquiry.

4.2. Sentence-refutation

Before we go on to examine you in sentence refutation, let us discuss the role of you in negation. Teng (1974) distinguishes three types of negation in Chinese: constituent negation, sentence negation, and sentence refutation. Sentence refutation in Mandarin consists of the negation marker bu and the copula shi. It is used to reject what is asserted or assumed in previous discourse. (15a) has an ordinary sentence negation, whereas (15b) demonstrates sentence refutation.

(15) a. Zhangsan bu yao qu.
   Zhangsan NEG want go
   'Zhangsan does not want to go.'

(15) b. Zhangsan bu shi bu yao qu.
   Zhangsan NEG be NEG want go
   'It is not that Zhangsan does not want to go.'

What is interesting to us is the scope relationship between sentence-refutation and you. For all of the occurrences of you discussed in section three, we see that sentence refutation (S-ref) has a wider scope over you, whereas you has a wider scope over sentence-negation (S-neg). These relationships
are represented in (16).

(16)  \[ S \text{-ref} > you > S \text{-neg} \]

When S-ref is combined with a you sentence, ambiguities arise because more than one constituent in the original sentence comes under the scope of bushi. Consider (17), which is a refutation of (3a).

(17)  \[ Bu \ shin \ ni \ you \ sheng-wode-qi \ le. \]
\[ \text{NEG} \ be \ you \ mad:at:me \ PRT \]
\[ 'It \ is \ not \ that \ you \ are \ mad \ at \ me \ again.' \]

With the contrastive stress falling on different words, there are at least four possible interpretations for (17): (i) ‘It is not you who is mad at me again — it is someone else’, (ii) ‘It is not at me that you are mad again — it is at someone else’, (iii) ‘It is not that you are mad at me again — you like me again’, and (iv) ‘It is not that you are mad at me again — this is only the first time’. It is in the fourth interpretation that you is under the scope of bushi.

The examples of you in the following, however, have a different scope relationship with S-ref. They tend to co-occur with (sentence-) negation. Consider examples provided in (18).

(18)  a. Zhangsan you bu zhidao, zenme neng guai ta?
\[ \text{Zhangsan} \ \text{NEG} \ \text{know how can blame} \ 3S \]
\[ '(\text{But}) \ \text{Zhangsan didn't know (about it). How can he be blamed?}.' \]

(18)  b. Lisi you mei zhang-chibang, zenme hui bu jian le?
\[ \text{Lisi} \ \text{NEG} \ \text{grow wing how can NEG see PRT} \]
\[ '(\text{But}) \ \text{Lisi didn't have wings! How can he have disappeared?}.' \]

(18)  c. Ta you bu shi gui, ni pa shenme?
\[ \text{3S} \ \text{NEG} \ \text{be ghost you fear what} \]
\[ '(\text{But}) \ \text{he is not a ghost! What are you afraid of?}' \]

Notice that in these examples, you conveys meanings that cannot be translated by ‘again’, nor by ‘also’, nor by any other similar gloss for repetition or accumulation. If this emphatic reading remains unchanged, none of the you sentences from (19a) to (19c) can be included in the scope of S-ref.

*Zhangsan bushi you bu zhidao.
(19) b. *Bushi Lisi you mei zhang chibang.  
* Lisi bushi you mei zhang chibang.

(19) c. *Bushi ta you bushi gui.  
* Ta bushi you bushi gui.

On the other hand, the emphatic you can have wider scope over the S-ref bushi. Consider the examples in (20).

(20) a. Zhangsan you bushi bu zhidao.  
Zhangsan NEG:be NEG know  
(But) it is not that Zhangsan didn’t know (about it)!

(20) b. Lisi you bushi mei zhang yanjing.  
Lisi NEG:be NEG grow eye  
(But) it is not that Lisi didn’t have eyes!

The fact that the emphatic you can have a wider scope over S-ref but cannot be part of the proposition refuted by bushi suggests that the emphatic you conveys an expressive meaning, encompassing the speaker’s point of view with respect to the issue at hand.

Refutation, in the terminology of conversation analysis, is by definition the second part in an “adjacency pair”, used to refute what is asserted or assumed by the first turn in a conversational turn-taking unit (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974; Schegloff & Sacks 1973). Furthermore, just like disagreements (to assessments) and non-granting (to requests), refutations (to assertions/statements) are “dispreferred second turns”, characterized by marked features such as delays, the accompaniment of the prefacing particles well or uh, or indirect speech acts that mitigate the explicit threat to face of the dispreferred response to the first turn (Pomerantz 1984; Wootton 1981).

All of the refutations in (18a) to (18c) are performed by indirect speech acts. There are two mechanisms. First, what is under the scope of S-ref (bushi) in each case is not the proposition intended for refutation, but rather the felicity condition (FC) under which that proposition (to be refuted) obtains (Searle 1975/1979). Just as a speaker asks ‘Can you pass the salt?’ to mean a request for passing the salt, the speaker of (18a) denies that Zhangsan has any knowledge about the matter, to mean a refutation of the assertion or the presumption that Zhangsan should be responsible for that matter.

The second mechanism is to employ you, just as it is used in rhetorical
questions, to create an impression that the denial of FC is only one of the arguments that the speaker has accumulated for obtaining the conclusion that what was previously asserted/assumed should be refuted. The denial of FC, the speaker suggests, is just one argument in addition to a number of others. It may not necessarily be clear, from the text, what these other arguments are. It is only from the speaker’s subjective point of view that there exist other arguments supporting his/her refutation. The speaker obtains the freedom to indulge his/her subjective point of view by manipulating you’s implicature that, in the text, there exists another argument (w), similar to the denial of FC (v), that provides a supporting evidence for the refutation (s). With the impression that his/her refutation is justified by supporting evidence from all directions, the speaker succeeds in making his/her denial of FC forceful, yet at the same time less abrupt, and thus less face-threatening.

The following excerpt from Zhang Xiguo’s short story concerns a wife in the US, who suspects that her overseas husband has some other woman, and questions him during an international phone call.

be who at you beside  
‘Who’s there with you?’

b. *Zenme jianghua lao shi tuntun-tutu-de?*  
why speak always be hesitating  
‘Why do you speak so hesitatingly?’

Husb: c. *Meiyou ma!*  
NEG have PRT  
‘No!’

d. *Jiali genben meiyou bieren.*  
at home at all NEG have other people  
‘There’s no one else at home.’

e. *Ni bu yao xia yixin, hao-bu-hao?*  
you NEG want groundlessly suspect O.K.  
‘Will you stop being so ridiculously suspicious?’

Wife: f. *Shei you xianqing-yizhi xia yixin le?*  
who have leisure groundlessly suspect le?  
‘Who has the leisure to be ridiculously suspicious?’
g. *Wo you mei you Zhaoyao-jing,*
   I \textit{NEG} have Demon-revealing Mirror
   *(Plus) I \textit{don’t} have the Demon-revealing Mirror.*

h. *Shei zhidao ni zai Taibei gan shenme?*
   who know you at Taipei do what
   ‘Who knows what you’re doing in Taipei?’

*(Zhang, 102)*

“Having a demon-revealing mirror” is a Chinese expression that means that any bad deeds will be detected immediately. Given that she is geographically separated from her husband, the only ‘felicity condition’ enabling the wife to detect her husband’s bad deeds would be to have a magical demon-revealing mirror. In (g) she denies this FC in order to assert, through a rhetorical question ((h)), that she does not have any idea about his life in Taipei. *You* is used in (g) in the subjective mode, because, on a purely objective, empirical basis, there are no other arguments that contribute to her concluding assertion in (h).

Note that (f) is only a rhetorical question that directly reacts to what the husband says in (e). The assertion indirectly made in (f), that the wife does not have time for suspicion, does not logically pertain to what is indirectly asserted in (h), i.e., that she does not have any ideas about his life in Taipei. Thus, (f) is not, on a purely logical basis, an argument prior to (g) that also contributes to the support of (h). *You* in (g) is therefore a subjective accumulation, making the denial of FC appear to be one of the (many) reasons for the forceful assertion made indirectly in (h).

5. Conclusion

In summary, I have examined, in this study, the various uses *you* has in different textual/discourse environments, and have concluded that the grammatical function of *you* is to “accumulate relevant properties for the same entity”, or for short, the “accumulation of relevance”.

*You* functions as an operator, placing focus on a conversational topic by extending its (*you’s*) own scope over the linguistic string in the same sentence that comments on the topic. The syntactic structure of both the topic and the comment varies from an NP to a whole sentence. The conversational topic, furthermore, can be located either within the same sentence, or in a neighboring sentence, or even in a sentence remotely positioned in relation to *you* and the comment.
You carries an implicature: the assertion of its scope over a linguistic string that comments on the conversational topic implicates the existence of another linguistic string in the text/discourse that also comments on the same conversational topic.

The implicated comment and the asserted comment, both attributed to the conversational topic, are further related to one another in terms of pragmatically established criteria. The co-existence of the asserted property and the implicated property results in you's function, i.e. the "accumulation of relevance". This function is represented in semi-logic notations in GIII of (11). It is this function that enables you to behave as a coordination marker at both the local phrase/clause/sentence level and the global text-building level.

The pragmatically established relevance that underlies the accumulation can be objective or subjective. Objective relevance, or the objective mode of accumulation, is a text-building process that connects properties of the same entity whose individual existences in the text/discourse are referentially verifiable and whose mutual relatedness is accountable in terms of empirical, external means.

Subjective relevance, or the subjective mode of accumulation, on the other hand, establishes the property-accumulating process by manipulating the addressee's linguistic knowledge with respect to the implicature carried by you. When the subjective mode is in use, the implicated property is not necessarily discoverable from the text/discourse. Without referential identity, its relatedness to the asserted property can, accordingly, be fictional. However, couched in you's conventional implicature, the subjective relevance can be successfully established in conjunction with special types of conventionalized linguistic structures, such as rhetorical questions and sentence refutations, for getting the speaker's expressive/evaluative message across.

In closing, this study has focused its discussion on the "internal" relationship among you's various uses. Other interesting aspects of you, particularly its paradigmatic relationship with other similar adverbs, are beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is hoped that the discussion here has proved that all of the uses of you are contextual variations of its underlying grammatical function.

The structural stability and the functional flexibility of you form a contrast. Syntactically, you is always an adverb, but functionally, it is an operator, focusing on a conversational topic that may be located beyond
the sentence boundaries. The structural flexibility of both the focused entity (the conversational topic) and its accumulated properties (the comments) results in the variety of text-building levels that you can accommodate. On the other hand, the speaker’s different primary concerns lead to different functional specializations. When the speaker’s primary concern is over the speech content, i.e. the proposition made through linguistic signs, you is used in the objective mode. When his/her primary concern is over the speech situation, i.e. the interactive aspect of conversation, you is used in the subjective mode.

Starting with different perspectives, Labov (1972, 1984) and Traugott (1982, 1986, ms), among others, have investigated the functional transitions of English grammatical words, and have developed the hypothesis that the referential, cognitive meanings of a word seem to be more primary than its evaluative, expressive meanings in both historical development and language acquisition. For future research, it would be interesting to test this hypothesis by verifying, on the one hand, the semantic developments of you and other similar adverbs over thousands of years, and on the other, the process of acquiring the polysemous uses of these words by young speakers.
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NOTES

1. There may be one or more implicated properties. However, for the sake of easy reading, I will use singular forms henceforth when I talk about the implicated property.

2. Later, when examples are cited, only those with (con)texts are given references.

3. Cf. studies on some of these adverbs other than you since Alleton (1972), such as Paris (1979, 1981), Paris & Tamba-Mecz (1984), and Biq (1987).

4. When Chinese passages containing you are translated into English, colloquial expressions are preferred to ‘also’ or ‘again’ if neither of them sounds natural in the English context. These English expressions for the Chinese you are in bold print.
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