

## **From collocation to idiomatic expression: The grammaticalization of hao phrases/constructions in Mandarin Chinese\***

Yung-O Biq

National Taiwan Normal University  
162 Heping East Road, Section 1  
Taipei, TAIWAN  
YBIQ@cc.ntnu.edu.tw

Submitted on 15 September, 2003 Revised and Accepted on October 10, 2003

---

### **Abstract**

Some recent studies concerning language use have shown the significance of frequency/routinization and collocation in the evolution of language structure and grammaticalization. Repeated daily (spoken) language use is believed to be the shaping force of linguistic structure. Linguistic contiguity is further proposed as one of the important sources leading to grammaticalization. In response to these interests in the relationship between syntagmatic association and grammaticalization, we conduct a synchronic case study of hao 'good' in Mandarin as it is used in modern spoken and written Chinese. Specifically, we examine the ways hao is used as a part of some constructions that convey stance. We argue that in these phrases/constructions hao has de-categorized from being of a major lexical category (stative verb), and the phrases/constructions have grammaticalized into processing units with fixed prosodic and/or morphosyntactic coding, idiomatic meaning, and specific interactional function. This case study calls attention to collocates, constructions, and phrasal expressions, whose prominent presence blurs the distinction between lexicon and syntax, and demands reconsideration of the model for mental grammar.

### **Keywords**

grammaticalization, collocation, construction, frequency, idiomatic expression, Mandarin hao

---

---

\* This is a revised and expanded version of the paper presented at the XVII International Congress of Linguists, held at Prague in July 2003. I am grateful for a grant from the National Science Council of Taiwan (NSC91-2411-H-003-043), which funded the research reported in this study. I would also like to thank Hongyin Tao for his suggestions on an earlier draft, which helped me in revising the paper to its present form. Of course, I am solely responsible for any remaining errors and inadequacies in the paper.

## 1 Introduction

Some recent studies concerning language use have shown the significance of frequency/routinization and collocation in the evolution of language structure and grammaticalization (e.g., Bybee & Hopper 2001). Repeated daily (spoken) language use is believed to be the shaping force of linguistic structure (Hopper 1988). Linguistic contiguity is further proposed as one of the important sources leading to grammaticalization (Biq 2001, 2002; Hopper & Traugott 1993; H. Tao 2001; 陶 [Tao] 2003; L. Tao 2002; Thompson & Mulac 1991; Traugott & Dasher 2002). In response to these interests in the relationship between syntagmatic association and grammaticalization, we conduct, in this paper, a synchronic case study of *hao* ‘good’ in Mandarin as it is used in modern spoken and written Chinese. Specifically, we examine the ways *hao* is used as a part of some constructions that convey stance. We argue that in these phrases/constructions *hao* has de-categorialized from being of a major lexical category (stative verb), and the phrases/constructions have grammaticalized into processing units with fixed prosodic and/or morphosyntactic coding, idiomatic meaning, and specific interactional function.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Past studies of *hao*

*Hao* ‘good’ is a lexical item with multiple meanings, versatile functions, and high occurrence frequency whose importance is recognized by probably everyone working in Chinese linguistics. However, while the word is always discussed in grammar survey books, it is usually not an object for in-depth study. 吕 [Lü] (1980) probably gives the most comprehensive description of the various functions *hao* can serve from the traditional, structure-oriented point of view. It surveys the various meanings that *hao* can convey as an adjective, an adverb, an auxiliary, and a noun. It also lists several additional entries in which *hao* is part of the expression/construction.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Miracle (1991) supplements what traditional descriptive works lack, i.e., an account from the discourse-pragmatic point of view. He addresses the functions *hao* serves at the discourse, rather than sentential, level, which mainly concerns textual organization or the management of social acts. He notes that these discourse functions are, however, closely related to the various intra-sentential grammatical functions of *hao*, which include, most importantly, as a stative verb denoting ‘good, well, satisfactory’ and as a post-verbal resultative expressing satisfactory completion of the action (denoted by the V).

As a matter of fact, *hao* can be used to signal a variety of interactional functions at the

---

<sup>1</sup> such as in the lexical expression, *haoxiang* ‘seem, appear’, or in the construction, *X ye hao, Y ye hao, Z* ‘No matter whether X or Y, (it is always) Z’

discourse level. Occurring alone, *hao* can not only terminate a topic, but also express the speaker's acknowledgement or agreement regarding what the interlocutor has said. Combined with other linguistic elements, *hao* can express an even wider range of communicative functions, including greeting (e.g., *Ni hao!* 'How are you?') and negotiation of various sorts, e.g., *Hao de!* for assent; *Hao ba!* *Hao la!* Or *Hao ma!* – all indicating concession to various extents. These discourse meanings/functions are largely unexplored.<sup>2</sup>

## 2.2 Objective, methodology, and database

The development in corpus linguistics in the past few decades has brought our attention to the contiguous relationship between linguistic elements (e.g., Biber et al. 1999; Sinclair 1991; Stubbs 2002). On the other hand, sequentiality, especially frequent and routinized sequentiality in spoken language, has been hailed as an important source for language change by functionalists who believe that language use influences language structure (e.g., Ochs et al. 1996; Bybee & Hopper 2001). Inspired by these current trends in linguistics, this paper examines the behavior of *hao* from the perspective of (intra-clausal) contiguity and (discourse) sequentiality, employing notions and methodologies from both corpus linguistics and the discourse-pragmatic approach to grammar. We hope to be able to shed new light on some of the uses that *hao* exhibits by examining “the company it keeps most often”. Thus, we will first find out which linguistic elements are the most frequently co-occurring items on the left and on the right side of *hao*. Next, narrowing down to one such element on each side, we conduct a detailed study for each case. In particular, we address the co-occurrence of *hao* + *le* and of *hai* + *hao*. Our analysis of these two cases pays attention to the polysemous readings or pragmatic inferences that each pattern displays. In identifying these meanings or inferences, we draw upon the basic analytical principles of conversation analysis (Sacks et al. 1974; Levinson 1983) and insights from studies of pragmatic strengthening and subjectification in semantic change (Traugott 1988, 1989; Traugott & Dasher 2002), of the relationship between discourse patterns and grammaticalization (Thompson & Mulac 1991; Tao 2001; 陶 [Tao] 2003), and of the expression of evaluation and stance in language (Hunston & Thompson 2000; Scheibman 2002). In examining the structural relationship between *hao* and its neighbor, we question whether their co-occurrence is based on the open choice principle or the idiom principle (Erman & Warren 2000; Sinclair 1991), and whether the co-occurrence has evolved into some idiomatic expressions with a stabilized constructional frame (Fillmore et al. 1988). To find out whether spoken language is more “progressive” than written language in terms of grammaticalization, we follow recent corpus linguistic studies of lexical semantics (Biber et al. 1999; Stubbs 2002) in making cross-text-type comparisons.

The focus of this study lies in the co-occurrence patterns containing *hao* and their respective interpretations in casual conversation, a speech mode that is characteristically spontaneous and interactional. Our spoken database consists of about 15 hours of recordings of naturally occurring Mandarin conversation spoken in Taiwan.<sup>3</sup> Some of the

<sup>2</sup> but cf. recent research in conversational Mandarin, such as Wang (2002).

<sup>3</sup> All recordings are transcribed in terms of intonation unit (each line in the transcription standing for one intonation unit), which is defined roughly as ‘a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour’ (Du Bois et al. 1993: 47). The gloss conventions for the grammatical roles are: 2P – second person plural, 2S – second person

narrative works by some 20<sup>th</sup> century Chinese writers are checked for comparison's sake.<sup>4</sup> We also consult an online database of contemporary expository written Chinese.<sup>5</sup> Although these two written databases are relatively small, they allow access to the neighboring texts of a token occurrence of the key item, which is essential for checking the discourse functions we aim to investigate here.

In the following, we first present in Section 3 a preliminary survey of *hao*'s frequently co-occurring linguistic elements in interactional discourse. Then, in Section 4 we focus on *hao + le* and in Section 5 *hai + hao*. Section 6 is the conclusion.

### 3 *Hao* in interactional discourse

If we look at our data from the collocational perspective, i.e., examining which linguistic item co-occurs with which other linguistic item, we get very different pictures about how these items work with each other in different modes of communication. In this section, we conduct a preliminary survey of how *hao* is used in the company of other linguistic elements in spoken, interactional discourse.

It is important to note that the token numbers provided in this section are just rounded-up numbers from a rough check before "problematic" tokens are discarded – such as tokens that cannot be interpreted (i.e., analyzed) because of truncated speech or false start, etc.

We have found about 1700 tokens of *hao*. This excludes tokens of *hao* occurring as part of a word, such as in *haoxiang* 'seem, appear'. First, given that intonation unit (IU) is the basic speech unit in our analysis framework, we check if *hao* occurs independently in an IU, i.e., whether *hao* singly occupies an IU or not. Indeed, there are about 100 such tokens. They are used either as a response to a request or as a marker for topic transition (see discussion of similar function by *hao le* below).

Before we proceed to survey the left and right collocates of *hao*, we should mention that there are about 80 tokens of *hao bu hao* 'OK?'. Such an impressive frequency is surely due to the fact that in interactional discourse it is used as a device for negotiation between speakers.

Now let us consider *hao* and its favorite right collocates. First, there are about 280 tokens of *hao* occurring immediately before an IU boundary without any linguistic element to its right (but with some other linguistic elements to its left). Then, the most frequent right collocating linguistic element is *le*, which can be an aspect marker or a sentence final particle. There are about 150 tokens of *hao le*. In addition, there are, in descending order, *hao la* – 90, *hao de* – 80, *hao a* – 70, and *hao ba* – 40. Most of these favorite right collocates – *le*, *la*, *a*, *ba* – are sentence final particles expressing various subjunctive moods (Li & Thompson 1981; 劉[Liu et al.] 1983/1996; 呂[Lü] 1980). *De*, on the other hand, is

---

singular, 3S – third person singular, ADV – adverbial marker, CLFT – *shi...de* cleft construction, ING – progressive, INT – intensifier, ITJ – interjection, M – measure word, MOD – modification relation, NEG – negation, OBJ – preposed-object marker, PFT – perfective marker, Q – question marker.

<sup>4</sup> The writers include Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書 (1910-1998), Zhang Ailing 張愛玲 (1920-1995), Gao Yang 高陽 (1922-1992), Qiong Yao 瓊瑤 (1938-), and San Mao 三毛 (1943-1991).

<sup>5</sup> This is the online archive of the past issues (1996 to early 2003) of *Sinorama*, a Taiwanese magazine of general interests (<http://db.sinorama.com.tw/ch/search>).

one of the most frequently used linguistic elements in Chinese. The expression, *hao de*, has several functions. In addition to expressing assent in interaction, as mentioned in Section 2.1, it could be an attributive modifying the immediately following noun; it could also be the predicate part in the cleft *shi...de* construction.

Next, let us take a look at the left collocates that *hao* most frequently occurs with. We find about 200 tokens of *bu hao*. *Bu* is a negation marker. Its high collocation rate with the frequently used stative verb *hao* is not surprising. In fact, a closer look reveals that the 200 tokens include 80 tokens of the *hao bu hao* expression mentioned earlier and 30 tokens of another expression, *gao bu hao* (literally, ‘if things get out of control’; idiomatically, ‘maybe’), which is often used in colloquial speech. In other words, the real “NEG + *hao* (SV)” construction has about 90 tokens at most.

The most favorite left collocate is the intensifier *hen* ‘very’. There are about 160 tokens of *hen hao*. Since the relationship between the intensifier and the stative verb it modifies is already of a constituency relation, this collocation is within our expectation and does not interest us as much as the following ones. The next favorite left collocate is the degree adverb *hai* ‘still, moderately’; there are about 120 tokens of *hai hao*. Another adverb, *jiu* ‘then’, comes in the third place; there are about 90 tokens of *jiu hao*.

Of course, the collocational patterns do not stop here, since when the left and right collocates of *hao* are “strung up” the interworkings of these linguistic elements become more complicated. Furthermore, we have only considered the n+1 and the n-1 positions. Collocational relations do not stop at the distance of one position each way. However, we think the quick sketch given above has sufficiently shown us the companies that *hao* is most closely associated with in interactional discourse.

In the remainder of this paper, we will discuss two specific collocation cases, i.e., *hao + le* and *hai + hao*. Originally, we are interested in taking a further look at them simply because of their outstanding frequency. Our further examination subsequently reveals that both cases are polysemous constructions and indeed deserve our close attention. We will discuss *hao + le* in Section 4 and *hai + hao* in Section 5.

#### 4 “CLAUSAL SUBJ + *hao le*” as a recommendatory construction

The first set of collocation we want to discuss is *hao plus le*. *Le*, aspect marker for perfectivity and discourse marker for relevance to speaking situation, is one of those indispensable grammatical words in everyday talk (Li & Thompson 1981; 劉 [Liu et al.] 1983/1996; 呂 [Lü] 1980). Its high occurrence frequency in both spoken and written Chinese is beyond the question. The collocation of these two highly frequent words has created more than one uses.

##### 4.1 Types of *hao + le*

There are several ways in which *hao* is juxtaposed with *le*. In terms of the grammatical functions that *hao* serves, the following *hao + le* collocation types are identified in our spoken database.

First of all, *hao* and *le* often occupy an intonation unit without other linguistic elements. Typically, this type of *hao le* is an expression marking discourse boundary in topic transition. Consider the following example, in which *hao le* signals the speaker’s intention to terminate the current (sub-)topic.

- (1)
- T: 不過妳可以看他怎麼寫的。  
Buguo ni keyi kan ta zeme xie de  
Bu 2S may see 3S how write CLFT
- S: Mhm.
- T: 看他討論了些什麼東西。  
Kan ta taolun le xie shenme dongxi  
See 3S discuss PFT some what thing
- > 好了,  
hao le  
HAO LE  
回去再重新想想看。  
huiqui zai chongxin xiang xiang kan  
return again again think think see
- T: But you can take a look at how he wrote it.
- S: Mhm.
- T: See what things he's discussed.
- > **All right.**  
Go home and think about it again.

The second way *hao* and *le* are juxtaposed stems from a canonical use of *hao*, i.e., as a post-verbal resultative expressing perfectiveness immediately following the main verb. *Le* is the sentence final particle marking perfectivity – relevance to speech situation. Consider the following example:

- (2)
- 我已經錄好了,  
wo yijing lu hao le  
I already record HAO LE  
'I have got (it) recorded.'

The third way *hao* and *le* run into each other arises from another canonical use, i.e., *hao* as a stative predicate, meaning 'good' (or 'well' when referring to health/well being). *Le* is again a sentence final particle marking perfectivity – relevance to speech situation. Consider the following example:

- (3)
- 那時候我覺得我英文夠好了,  
na shihou wo juede wo yingwen gou hao le  
that time I feel my English enough HAO LE  
'At that time I thought my English was **good** enough.'

The fourth way *hao* and *le* collocate with each other takes place when *hao* serves again as a predicate, takes a clausal or verbal subject, and is preceded by the adverb *jiu*. Together, these elements form a (sufficient) conditional construction: CLAUSAL (VERBAL) SUBJ +

*jiu + hao + le*. *Jiu* is well known as a marker of sufficient condition relation (Biq 1988; Liu 1997; Lai 1999). In this construction, the clausal or verbal subject forms the premise part while *hao le* constitutes the conclusion part. Consider the following examples:

(4)

所以你以後都搭公車就好了。

Suoyi ni yihou dou da gongche jiu hao le

So 2S later all take bus then HAO LE

‘So it’ll be all set as long as you take the bus from now on.’

(5)

可是我覺得可以賺錢就好了。

Keshi wo juede keyi zhuanqian jiu hao le

But I feel can make-money then HAO LE

‘But I thought it’s OK as long as there is profit.’

The last type of *hao le* collocation occurs when, again, *hao* is the predicate and it takes a clausal subject (but there is no *jiu*). It is a construction to express the speaker’s suggestion for an option. It is often an equivalent of ‘why don’t you/we’ in English. Consider the following example:

(6)

你們吃完你們先過去就好了。

Nimen chi wan nimen xian guoqu hao le

2P eat finish 2P first go-to HAO LE

‘Why don’t you head over there first when you finish eating (and don’t wait for me)?’

Since what is said in the clausal subject is always the option/solution endorsed or recommended by the speaker, this type is called the “CLAUSAL SUBJ + *hao le*” recommendatory construction in this paper.

In our spoken database, the distribution of the five types of *hao + le* collocation is given in Table 1. The recommendatory construction is the most frequent type (41.6%), followed by the conditional use (29.5%).

The distribution pattern emerging from our conversational data is quite different from those found in the narrative and expository written data, given in Tables 2 and 3 respectively. In written data, the recommendatory construction no longer dominates (21.7% in narrative and 10% in expository). Instead, the most frequent types are the canonical “resultative” use (29.2% in narrative and 40% in expository).

| SENSE/FUNCTION           | NUMBER    | PERCENTAGE   |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Topic transition         | 11        | 7.1%         |
| <i>Hao</i> = resultative | 13        | 8.3%         |
| <i>Hao</i> = SV          | 21        | 13.5%        |
| Conditional              | 46        | 29.5%        |
| <b>Recommendatory</b>    | <b>65</b> | <b>41.6%</b> |
| TOTAL                    | 156       | 100.0%       |

TABLE 1. The various senses/functions of *hao + le* found in conversational data

| SENSE/FUNCTION           | NUMBER     | PERCENTAGE   |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Topic transition         | 169        | 20.3%        |
| <b>Hao = resultative</b> | <b>243</b> | <b>29.2%</b> |
| Hao = SV                 | 188        | 22.6%        |
| Conditional              | 52         | 6.2%         |
| Recommendatory           | 181        | 21.7%        |
| TOTAL                    | 833        | 100.0%       |

TABLE 2. The various senses/functions of *hao+ le* found in narrative written data

| SENSE/FUNCTION           | NUMBER    | PERCENTAGE |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Topic transition         | 4         | 5%         |
| <b>Hao = resultative</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>40%</b> |
| Hao = SV                 | 16        | 20%        |
| Conditional              | 20        | 25%        |
| Recommendatory           | 8         | 10%        |
| TOTAL                    | 80        | 100%       |

TABLE 3. The various senses/functions of *hao+ le* found in expository written data

While there are many interesting points worthy of our attention in this cross-text-type comparison, we will concentrate on examining the recommendatory use in the following discussion (and will cite examples from conversation only).

#### 4.2 The grammaticalization of the “CLAUSAL SUBJ + *hao le*” construction

As has indicated in the discussion in 4.1, in both the fourth (conditional) and the fifth (recommendatory) uses, *hao* is the predicate in the main clause. In terms of *hao*'s grammatical function, these two types are just like the third type, in which *hao* is also the main predicate. However, we feel the recommendatory construction is worthy of our further attention from the interactional point of view. We have seen one example of this type above (example 6), which is a suggestion offered by the speaker to her addressee. In the following example, we see that the recommendatory use can be a commissive representing the speaker's stance towards what s/he is talking about:

(7)

那我乾脆以後寫 4 就這樣子寫好了。

Na wo gancui yihou xie si jiu zheyangzi xie hao le

Then I might-as-well later write four just this-way write HAO LE

'So I might as well write "4" like this in the future.'

While the speech act functions may slightly differ from case to case, the recommendatory use basically conveys the speaker's endorsement of what is said in the subject clause. Thus, a strong sense of subjectivity is expressed in this use. Several expressions often accompany this construction. Expressions such as *gancui* 'might as well' (as exemplified in (7) above), *na* '(given...) then' (8) and *buran* 'alternatively, otherwise' (9) co-occur because consideration of alternatives is involved here. The strongly evaluative expressions *wo juede* 'I feel/I think' (10) and *wo kan* 'I see/I think' (11) co-occur because of



the subjectivity.

(8)

那我明天再打給他好了。

Na wo mingtian zai da gei ta hao le

Then I tomorrow again call to 3S HAO LE

'Then I'll give him a call tomorrow.'

(9)

不然我把外面的窗戶關起來好了。

Buran wo ba waimian de chuanghu guan qilai hao le

Otherwise I OBJ outside MOD window close up HAO LE

'Or I can close up the window facing outside.'

(10)

我覺得還是去一下好了。

Wo juede hai shi qu yixia hao le

I feel still be go one-bit HAO LE

'I think it's better that I go (rather than not go).'

(11)

這種我看由你來講好了。

Zhe zhong wo kan you ni lai jiang hao le

This kind I see from 2S come talk HAO LE

'(In my opinion,) why don't you talk about this (thing)?'

A crucial point about the recommendatory use is that, as the *hao le* part expresses the speaker's subjective stance (i.e., endorsement), it in fact does not alter the "propositional content" of the utterance. In other words, (6'), with *hao le* omitted, conveys essentially the same as (6), and the same applies to all other examples.

(6')

你們吃完你們先過去。

Nimen chi wan nimen xian guoqu

2P eat finish 2P first go-to

'Head over there first when you finish eating.'

Of course, there is still some difference. (6') can be uttered by a speaker with a variety of moods. For example, s/he can say this as a command. However, when *hao le* is added, as in (6), the tone of voice is softened, and what is said in the clausal subject is presented as the speaker's suggestion.

It is whether the *hao le* part constitutes part of the propositional content or not that differentiates the recommendatory type of *hao le* from the conditional type of *hao le* (i.e., the 'CLAUSAL/VERBAL SUBJECT + *jiu* + *hao* + *le*'). In the conditional type, *hao le* constitutes the predicate (i.e., conclusion) and is indispensable to the completion of the sentential meaning (i.e., premise-conclusion). While the *hao le* part in the conditional type very often conveys the speaker's subjective judgment as to what is "OK, satisfactory, or good", it is not necessarily always personal. In many examples, the *jiu hao le* part

conveys an “objective” judgment, reflecting socio-cultural standards or norm. The construction simply specifies the sufficient conditions required for obtaining the desired satisfactory “consequence”. There is not necessarily personal endorsement involved. Thus, in contrast to the recommendatory *hao le* construction, the conditional *jiu hao le* construction is not “epistemic” in the sense that the meaning of the construction is still part of the conveyed message, rather than about how the message is conveyed.

When grammar and discourse are taken into consideration at the same time, the recommendatory construction becomes interesting because the grammatical main predicate does not contribute to the propositional but rather the epistemic part of the “message” of the whole utterance. This is reminiscent of the *I think* type of epistemic phrases found in many languages that are highly recurrent in interactional discourse. These epistemic phrases illustrate ‘the type of grammaticization in which a governing or head element is reanalyzed as a governed or dependent element’ (Thompson & Mulac 1991: 323). In our case, it is the main predicate (stative verb plus sentence final perfective marker) turning into something like a stance adverb. This is of course the de-categorialization phenomenon characteristic of grammaticalization (Hopper 1991), in which major lexical categories (e.g., noun and verb) shift towards secondary categories (e.g., preposition and adverb). Furthermore, as pointed out above, the recommendatory use of *hao le* is only one of the subtypes of how *hao* as a stative verb can be used. The recommendatory construction actually requires that the subject be a clause. Other subtypes of *hao le* as the main predicate taking other types of subject are still widely used at the same time. Thus, we see in the case of *hao le* another characteristic of grammaticalization, i.e., layering – the regular, canonical uses and the newer, grammaticalized uses co-exist with each other.

### 4.3 Summary

To sum up, in this section we have distinguished five ways that *hao* and *le* can co-occur in terms of the grammatical functions of *hao*. Their distributions in spoken interactional discourse and in narrative and expository written discourse are quite different. We examined the “CLAUSAL SUBJ + *hao le*” construction in spoken discourse in detail because it is distinguished from other types of *hao + le* collocation by the subjectivity it conveys. It is a recommendatory construction to express the speaker’s commitment (endorsement) to what is said in the clausal subject. In this construction, *hao le* has decategorized from being a stative verb (plus the perfective marker) into something close to an epistemic adverb expressing stance. It is thus a grammaticalized epistemic construction mostly seen in interactional discourse.<sup>6</sup>

### 5 *Hai hao* as an evaluative phrase

In this section, we study the second set of collocation, *hai + hao*. *Hai* ‘still/even, also, moderately’ is an adverb indispensable in characterizing degree, duration, and comparison (Li & Thompson 1981; 璿 [Liu et al.] 1983/1996; 呂 [Lü] 1980; Yeh 1998).

---

<sup>6</sup> Note that the percentage of the evaluative use in our narrative database is not a minority (21.7%). As a matter of fact, all the tokens of such use are found in the quoted speech attributed to the characters in the story.

### 5.1 Three types of *hai* + *hao*

The collocation of the adverb *hai* and *hao* is frequent in both spoken and written Chinese. The two words manifest at least three types of collocation relationship according to how they are combined. In the first type, the two words are strung together through the choice principle and they independently contribute meaning to the meaning of the whole sentence. In the following example, *hai* is a sentential adverb, meaning ‘furthermore’ and *hao* is an intensifier modifying the stative verb, *re* ‘hot’.

(12)

- G: 這種夏天裡面能住嗎?  
 Zhe zhong xiatian limian neng zhu ma  
 This kind summer inside can live Q  
 -> L: 而且還好熱喔.  
 Erqie hai hao re o  
 Furthermore still INT hot ITJ

G: Can this kind (of place) accommodate people in the summer?

-> L: **And/furthermore** it is **so** hot (in there).

In the second type of collocation relation, the two words form a compound, *haihao*, with its fully lexicalized meaning ‘luckily, fortunately’. Consider the following example:

(13)

- A: 還好我沒去,  
 Haihao wo mei qu  
 Fortunately I NEG go  
 A: **Fortunately** I did not go.

In the third type, the two words form a phrasal expression, in which the internal relationship between the two words are tighter than that in the first type but not as lexicalized as that in the second type. In terms of their grammatical function, *hao* should be taken as the stative predicate meaning ‘good, satisfactory’ and *hai* is the adverb modifying it, meaning ‘still, barely, moderately’. The pair starts out as a straightforward ADV + SV combination, and primarily expresses a neutral-to-good evaluation, ‘It’s OK/It’s not bad/It’s acceptable’, and is optionally followed by interjections such as *la*, *ba* or *a*. For example:

(14)

- C: 我是日文研究所畢業的。  
 Wo shi Riwen yanjiusuo biye de  
 I be Japanese grad-school graduate CLFT  
 A: Oh, 那就是很懂囉。  
 Oh na jiu shi hen dong lo  
 ITJ then just be INT understand ITJ

-> C: 還好啦。

Hai hao la  
 HAI HAO ITJ  
 馬馬虎虎.  
 Mamahuhu  
 so-so

C: I had an advanced degree in Japanese.

A: Oh, that means you know it (Japanese) very well.

-> C: **It's OK/Well.**

So so.

We recognize this particular use as a phrasal type (coded as *hai hao* with a space in between the two words) because it has occurred highly frequently in spoken discourse and has been used to convey a set of subtly differentiated meanings, which we will discuss below. The high occurrence frequency of *hai hao* in conversation discourse is due to the fact that speakers sometimes opt for vague or neutral rather than absolute or specific evaluative comments in social interaction. There is one more reason *hai hao* is recognized as a phrase rather than just an ADV + SV combination: the majority of the tokens (with the optional interjections *la/ba/a*) we found in our conversation data are immediately followed by an IU boundary. The first two types of *hai + hao*, on the other hand, rarely occur right before an IU boundary (unless there is a restart) but are always followed by some other lexical elements. Thus, the distinction between the phrasal use and the other two types of *hai + hao* is prosodically and sequentially clear.

In our conversational database, the phrasal *hai hao* far exceeds the other two types of collocation in terms of frequency, as seen in Table 4. On the other hand, our two written databases show different pictures about how *hao* is used, as seen in Table 5 and Table 6.

| SENSE                               | NUMBER    | PERCENTAGE |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>hai</i> (adv) + <i>hao</i> (adv) | 9         | 8%         |
| <i>haihao</i> (compound)            | 13        | 12%        |
| <b><i>hai hao</i> (phrasal)</b>     | <b>86</b> | <b>80%</b> |
| TOTAL                               | 108       | 100%       |

TABLE 4. The various senses/functions of *hai+ hao* found in conversational data

| SENSE                               | NUMBER     | PERCENTAGE       |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| <i>hai</i> (adv) + <i>hao</i> (adv) | 42         | 17%              |
| <i>haihao</i> (compound)            | 75         | 31%              |
| <b><i>hai hao</i> (phrasal)</b>     | <b>108</b> | <b>45%</b>       |
| (X <i>hai hao</i> , Y               | 16         | 7%) <sup>7</sup> |

<sup>7</sup> The X *hai hao*, Y 'X (situation) is OK, but Y (situation) (is not OK)' construction, as exemplified in the following constructed example, is a minority in the narrative written data.

Ta bu gongzuo *hai hao*, yi gongzuo jiu touteng.

3s NEG work HAI HAO once work then headache

'It's OK if he is not working, but once he starts working he gets headaches.'

|       |     |      |
|-------|-----|------|
| TOTAL | 241 | 100% |
|-------|-----|------|

TABLE 5. The various senses/functions of *hai+ hao* found in narrative written data

| SENSE                               | NUMBER    | PERCENTAGE |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>hai</i> (adv) + <i>hao</i> (adv) | 3         | 9%         |
| <b><i>haihao</i> (compound)</b>     | <b>21</b> | <b>64%</b> |
| <i>hai hao</i> (phrasal)            | 9         | 27%        |
| TOTAL                               | 33        | 100%       |

TABLE 6. The various senses/functions of *hai+ hao* found in expository written data

While in all three text types the combination of *hai* and *hao* by the choice principle is the minority, in the expository written database the compound use is the most conspicuous type (64%) but in both the conversational and the narrative written databases the phrasal use dominates (80% and 45% respectively). Again, we will focus on the phrasal *hai hao* in the following discussion (and cite only conversational examples).

## 5.2 Further analysis of *Hai hao*

In this paper, we call the phrasal use of *hai hao* an evaluative phrase. However, in treating our data, we make a further distinction: the phrasal *hai hao* can be used either in an evaluative turn or in a counter-evaluative turn. The latter is the current speaker's reaction to the evaluation just offered by the prior speaker. In our database, the phrasal *hai hao* is distributed almost evenly in these two subtypes – 53% (n=46) in evaluative turns, and 47% (n=40) in counter-evaluative turns.

From the literal meaning of the two words, *hai* 'still' and *hao* 'good', it should be most reasonable that when *hai* and *hao* are combined, the expression means 'still good', i.e., 'good, but not that good'. We call it "low positive", i.e., the ranking is "low positive/neutral" on the evaluative scale. In interactional discourse, however, occurrences of *hai hao* can also be interpreted as "mild negative" – worse than neutral but not that bad. These alternative interpretations are pragmatically derived mostly because the speaker also gives some other positive, or negative, remarks along with the use of *hai hao*.

Whether the evaluative *hai hao* is interpreted as low positive/neutral or mild negative, an evaluative scale is implied. A further extension of the evaluative use, however, turns out to be a denial of such a scale. In such cases, *hai hao* means 'nothing in particular, nothing remarkable', or it is even used to indicate negation.

In the following, we discuss how *hai hao* is used positively and negatively in evaluative turns in 5.2.1. In 5.2.2 we discuss how it is used positively and negatively in counter-evaluative turns. In 5.2.3 we discuss the extensional use of *hai hao* that flouts the evaluative scale as it expresses 'nothing remarkable' or even indicates negation.

### 5.2.1 In evaluative turns

As an evaluative, *hai hao* is typically used to cast a neutral evaluation – not too positive, nor too negative. This usually conveys the speaker's non-committal stance. Consider

---

The construction is not found in the other two databases, perhaps due to their relatively small size.

the following example, where speaker B says his classmates' evaluation of a movie is 'so so'. Note that speaker A double checked by asking if the viewer thought it was actually lousy, but speaker B only committed to a neutral 'so so'.

(15)

- A: 你同學有人去看呀?  
Ni tongxue you ren qu kan ya  
2S classmate have person go watch ITJ
- B: 好像有人去看.  
Hoaxing you ren qu kan  
Seem have person go watch
- A: 好不好看?  
Hao bu hao kan  
Good NEG good watch
- B: 他們就說- ,  
Tamen jiu shuo  
They just say  
-> 還-好-吧.  
Hai hao ba  
HAI HAO ITJ
- A: 還好?  
Hai hao  
HAI HAO
- B: 對呀.  
Dui ya  
Right ITJ
- A: 他他沒有說很難看嗎?  
Ta ta meiyou shou hen nan kan ma  
3S 3S NEG-have say INT bad watch Q
- B: 他就說那個什麼 ,  
Ta jiu shuo na ge shenme  
3S just say that M what  
-> 難看-倒-還好-啦 ,  
nan kan dao hai hao la  
bad watch contrary HAI HAO ITJ
- A: You've got classmates who saw it?
- B: (It seems) some people saw it.
- A: Any good?
- B: They just said,  
-> (It's) so so.
- A: So so?
- B: Yeah.
- A: Didn't he say it's lousy?
- B: He just said--,  
-> Lousy(?)- well so so,

Nonetheless, many *hai hao* occurrences are used as a euphemism for negative evaluation. The negative, rather than neutral, interpretation arises from the co-occurrence of *hai hao* and other negative remarks in its immediate sequential context. In the following example, ‘not really that fun’ immediately follows *hai hao*, rendering a mild negative interpretation of speaker A’s stance towards his trip to a scenic spot.

(16)

B: 啊你有去嗎?  
A ni you qu ma  
ITJ you HAVE go Q

A: 我有去啊!

Wo you qu a  
I have go ITJ

-> 可是我覺得還好,  
keshi wo juede hai hao  
but I feel HAI HAO

-> 沒有很好玩,  
meiyou hen hao wan  
NEG INT good play  
就回來了.

Jiu hui lai le  
Then return come PFT

B: Did you go?

-> A: Yeah – I did. But I thought it was **OK**. It’s **not that fun**. So I came back.

### 5.2.2 In counter-evaluative turns

In addition to being used to cast the speaker’s evaluation towards what is being evaluated at the time of speaking, *hai hao* in counter-evaluative turns also displays the interpersonal negotiation in interactional discourse. *Hai hao* in counter-evaluative turns typically occurs when the (current) speaker disagrees with the prior speaker’s opinion. As an evaluative that does not commit its speaker any strong preference either way, *hai hao* is often used to show one’s disagreement with the interlocutor in a tactful way.

First of all, when what is being evaluated is a third party, *hai hao* can be used by the current speaker to indicate a low positive evaluation when the prior speaker’s evaluation is perceived as too negative. Consider the following example:

(17)

-> B: 師大一點特色都沒有.  
Shida yidian tese dou meiyou  
NTNU a-bit characteristic all NEG

-> A: @ o, ... 還好啦,  
O hai hao la  
ITJ HAI HAO ITJ  
它中間,

ta zhongjian  
 it middle  
 ..中間那樣樓梯那樣旋轉上去還是有一點點  
 Zhongjian nayang louti nayang xuanzhuang shangqu hai shi you yi diandian  
 Middle that-way stairs that-way curve up still be have one bit  
 特色.  
 tese  
 characteristic

- > B: **The NTNU campus has no characteristic.**  
 -> A: @ Oh, ... **well it's OK (i.e., not that bad).** In the middle, .. in the middle (of the entrance hallway) the way the stairs curve up, that is still some special feature.

*Hai hao* can also work the other way round. When the interlocutor's evaluation is perceived as too positive, *hai hao* is used as a downtoner to mitigate the evaluation to low positive or neutral. Consider the following example:

(18)

- > B: 台大是真的好大喔.  
 Taida shi zhende hao da o  
 NTU be really INT big ITJ  
 -> A: 還好,  
 Hai hao  
 HAI HAO  
 習慣了.  
 Xiguan le  
 accustomed PFT

- > B: **The NTU campus is really big.**  
 -> A: **Well (not really that big).**  
 I'm used to it.

Second, when the target of the evaluation is the prior speaker (or any person/object/event "identified" with him/her, given the context), the current speaker typically uses *hai hao* to indicate a mild disagreement about the prior speaker's negative evaluation about him-/her-self. A disagreement notwithstanding, the current speaker's *hai hao* upgrades the evaluation to the "middle ground", which satisfies the politeness requirement. Consider the following example, in which speaker A thinks that she has got obsessive-compulsive disorder, and speaker B tries to tone down the seriousness of the matter by saying *hai hao* to suggest that things are not that bad.

(19)

- > A: 我可能有潔癖, 我在想.  
 Wo keneng you jiepi wo zai xiang  
 I probably have clean-compulsion I ING think  
 B: 你有潔癖?  
 Ni you jiepi



You have clean-compulsion

A: 有一點點,  
You yi dian dian  
Have one bit bit  
跟我媽一樣.  
Gen wo ma yiyang  
with my mother same

→ B: 還好啦.

Hai hao la  
HAI HAO ITJ

A: (7 seconds) 我不停的擦擦擦,  
Wo bu ting de ca ca ca  
I NEG stop ADV wipe wipe wipe

→ A: **I probably have obsessive-compulsive disorder for cleaning**, I think.

B: You have obsessive-compulsive disorder for cleaning?

A: A little bit,  
just like my Mom.

→ B: **Well you're OK.**

A: (7 seconds) I can't stop wiping around,

Thirdly, when the target of evaluation is the current speaker (or any person/object/event "identified" with him/her, given the context), *hai hao* is also used to negotiate the disagreement between interlocutors. When the prior speaker's evaluation is positive, the current speaker uses *hai hao* to downgrade the evaluation (to low positive/neutral) – perhaps out of politeness in many cases. Example (14) is repeated here as (20), in which the current speaker is being complimented at.

(20)

C: 我是日文研究所畢業的。  
Wo shi Riwen yanjiusuo biye de  
I be Japanese grad-school graduate CLFT

-> A: Oh, 那就是很懂囉。  
Oh na jiu shi hen dong lo  
ITJ then just be INT understand ITJ

-> C: 還好啦。  
Hai hao la  
HAI HAO ITJ  
馬馬虎虎。  
Mamahuhu  
so-so

C: I had an advanced degree in Japanese.

-> A: Oh, **that means you know it (Japanese) very well.**

-> C: **It's OK/Well (not really).**  
So so.

On the other hand, there are also cases where the interlocutor's evaluation about the current speaker is negative, and the current speaker uses *hai hao* to upgrade the evaluation. This is a linguistic “gesture” of defiance. Consider the following example:

(21)

- B: 他有時候也很搞笑，  
Ta youshihou ye hen gaoxiao  
3S sometimes also INT funny  
→ 你都不了解他內心搞笑的——  
ni dou bu liaojie ta neixin gaoxiao de  
2S all NEG understand 3S inside-heart funny MOD  
-> A: 還好，  
Hai hao  
HAI HAO  
我跟你講，  
wo gen ni jiang  
I with 2S say  
其實他們這種人哦，  
qishi tamen zhe zhong ren o  
actually they this kind people ITJ

-> A: Sometimes he's funny, too. **You don't understand how funny he could really –**

-> B: **Well (I'm not what you think).** I'll tell you what, people like him are actually ...

### 5.2.3 From unenthusiastic evaluation (“nothing remarkable”) to negation

A further step towards semantic bleaching for *hai hao* is the stripping off of evaluation and the presumed scale for evaluation. We found cases in which *hai hao* is used to suggest “unremarkableness”, i.e., there is nothing worth being evaluated about or worthy of the attention. The following example demonstrates how *hai hao* is used in its evaluative sense while a negation reading can be pragmatically derived. In this example, speaker A asks speaker B if anything interesting has happened in B's class. It is a yes-no question and there is supposedly no evaluation involved. However, speaker B utters *hai hao* in response to the key term, ‘interesting’, suggesting a downtoning “low positive to neutral” evaluation – ‘nothing particularly interesting is happening’. The interlocutor, who posed the original yes-no question, can pragmatically infer a negative answer to the question, i.e., ‘there is nothing interesting happening’. Thus, in the context where a yes-no question demands an answer about the truth condition, *hai hao* is used as a hedge – expressing ‘nothing remarkable’ – that indirectly conveys negation.

(22)

- A: eh 那你們，  
Eh na niman  
ITJ then 2P  
→ 班上啊有沒有發生一些比較有趣的事情啊？  
Banshang a youmeiyou fasheng yixie bijiao youqu de shiqing a  
Class ITJ HAVE-NEG-HAVE happen some relatively interesting MOD thing

- ITJ  
 B: 我們班喔，  
 Women ban o  
 Our class ITJ  
 → 其實還好耶，  
 qishi hai hao ye  
 actually HAI HAO ITJ  
 大家就可能是剛那個認識的啊，  
 dajie jiu keneng shi gang nage renshi de a  
 everyone just probably be just-now that get-to-know CLFT ITJ  
 所以沒有幾天吧，  
 suoyi meiyou ji tian ba  
 so NEG several day ITJ  
 所以都不太熟啊，  
 suoyi dou bu tai shou a  
 so all NEG INT familiar ITJ  
 就好像也沒有比較活潑的，  
 jiu hoaxing ye meiyou bijiao huopo de  
 just seem also NEG relatively outgoing MOD  
 可是可能以後知道吧，  
 keshi keneng yihou zhidao ba  
 but probably later know ITJ  
 現在還不知道這樣子。  
 Xianzai hai bu zhidao zheyangzi  
 now still NEG know this-way

- > A: So are there anything **interesting** happening in your class?  
 -> B: Our class? **Well actually so so (i.e., nothing that I've noticed).** It's probably because we just got to know each other. It's been just a few days. So we are not that familiar with each other yet. It seems nobody's outgoing. But maybe we'll know (who is) later. (It's just that) we don't know now. (That's it!)

The following excerpt is another example in which *hai hao* is further bleached of its evaluative meaning. Speaker B asks speaker A whether A and A's friend study together these days. It is again a yes-no question with no evaluation involved. However, in his answer, speaker A uses *hai hao* as a hedge before he finally got the firm negative answer out. Different from the last example, *hai hao* in this example cannot be literally referring to any positive, nor negative, value. It is an expression roughly meaning something like 'there is nothing in particular that is worth commenting on', or 'there is nothing remarkable'. Its co-occurrence with the following negation, *meiyou* 'no', further strengthens its semantic extension toward a pure negative.

(23)

- B: 那你們兩個現在有在一起唸書嗎？  
 Na nimen liangge xianzai you yiqi nian shu ma  
 Then 2P two-M now have together study book Q  
 A: 唸書哦，

Nian shu o  
 Study book ITJ  
 一起 , em ,  
 yiqi em  
 together ITJ  
 → 還好 ,  
 hai hao  
 HAI HAO  
 沒有 a.  
 meiyou a  
 NEG ITJ

B: So do you two study together now?

A: Study?

Together? Em,

→ well (not really),  
 no.

### 5.3 *Hai hao* and grammaticalization

To sum up, in this section we have distinguished three ways that *hai* and *hao* can co-occur in terms of how the two words are combined. Just as the case of *hao + le*, the distributions of these *hai + hao* types in spoken interactional discourse and in narrative and expository written discourses are quite different. We examined the phrasal *hai hao* in detail because of its high frequency in spoken discourse and the pragmatic inferences it can give rise to when the phrase is situated in its sequential context.<sup>8</sup> The phrase can express what is closest to its literal meaning, i.e., low positive/neutral. However, it can also suggest the speaker's mild negative stance if in the sequential context there are other remarks indicating a negative attitude. In interactive discourse, it is often used as a hedge to counter the interlocutor's evaluation, from positive to negative and vice versa. Furthermore, in contexts where evaluation is not in question, *hai hao* suggests "nothing is remarkable". In its sequential association with negation markers such as *mei* or *bu*, the interpretation of its occurrence is further bleached to something like 'nothing' or even to negation. The semantic shifts involved in here are, in a nutshell, (1) from low positive/neutral to mild negative, (2) from neutral to unremarkable, and (3) from unremarkable to negation. Just like the "CLASUAL SUBJ + *hao le*" construction discussed in Section 4, the phrasal *hai hao* is an example of grammaticalization, where category shifts can turn a more lexical element into a more grammatical one through semantic bleaching. In this case, the adverb *hai* and the stative verb *hao* have turned into a (phrasal) marker of mood indicating the speaker's stance or even something close to a negation marker. The only difference between our case and the classic grammaticalization cases is that we are dealing with a phrase rather than a single lexical item. Nonetheless, it has been established in recent grammaticalization studies that frequent collocations create

<sup>8</sup> The evaluative use is actually also the top one in the narrative data (45%). Just like the recommendatory *hao le*, the evaluative *hai hao* tokens are all found in the characters' quoted speech.

syntagmatic association, which often triggers semantic change of the lexical items involved in the collocation (Thompson & Mulac 1991; Traugott & Dasher 2002).

## 6 Conclusion

This paper has attempted to analyze some of the frequently occurring usage patterns involving *hao* in Mandarin spoken discourse. We took a corpus linguistic approach to check our conversation data for the frequent collocates occurring on each side of *hao*. We identified the “CLAUSAL SUBJ + *hao le*” and the phrasal *hai hao* as two collocational patterns that show outstanding frequency in spoken discourse (but not necessarily so in narrative and expository written discourses). There is a good reason for their relative high frequency in spoken discourse: these two patterns are used to express stance and to negotiate views and values, both being common activities speakers engage themselves in doing in interactional discourse. As *hao* shifts from a stative verb to markers of mood and subjectivity, we have a case of grammaticalization. However, this grammaticalization process involves not just a single lexical item but collocates that, because of their high frequency, have become stabilized constructional or phrasal units.

It is interesting that when asked, ‘What is the meaning of *hao*?’, native speakers always offer the “canonical” senses (e.g., ‘good’, etc.) as answer, although our conversational data have shown that the occurrence rate of these senses are not as high as those of the evaluative senses. This suggests that the latter type of senses is not entirely tied to *hao* but rather to *hao* and its respective collocate as a whole. Isn’t it, then, reasonable to postulate that in our mental grammar, these routinized collocates are actually not subsumed under the lexical entry of *hao*, but rather have acquired the status of a processing unit on their own?

In this study, we hope to have accomplished the following points. First, we hope to have demonstrated that corpus linguistic techniques are very useful in identifying frequency, collocation, and sequential patterns, which are important linguistic facts for understanding the relationship between language use and language structure. Second, we hope to have shown, through the examination of the various ways *hao* and its neighboring elements are combined, that both “constructions with open-slots” and idiomatic phrasal expressions should receive equal amount of our attention as syntax and lexicon do because they are all modes of linguistic coding who differ from one another only in degrees of conventionalization. Finally, we hope that our case study of *hao* has illustrated that the syntagmatic association between linguistic elements (typically defined as observable at intra-clausal level) and their sequential association (typically defined as observable at discourse level) both contribute to grammaticalization and the inception of semantic change in a systematic way. In recognizing the importance of the syntagmatic/sequential relationship between linguistic elements, we are only beginning to understand how discourse patterns may shape linguistic structure.

## References

- Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, & E. Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Biq, Yung-O. 1988. From focus in proposition to focus in speech situation: *cai* and *jiu* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 16: 72-108.
- Biq, Yung-O. 2001. The grammaticalization of *jiushi* and *jiushishuo* in Mandarin

- Chinese. *Concentric* 27.2: 103-24.
- Biq, Yung-O. 2002. Classifier and construction: the interaction of grammatical categories and cognitive strategies. *Language and Linguistics* 3.3: 521-542.
- Bybee, Joan, & Paul Hopper (eds.). 2001. *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Du Bois, John, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino, and Susanna Cumming. 1993. Outline of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards and M. D. Lampert (eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding Methods for Language Research*, 45-89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Erman, Britt, & Beatrice Warren. 2000. The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text* 20.1: 29-62.
- Fillmore, Charles, Paul Kay, & Mary Catherine O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomatity in grammatical constructions: the case of *let alone*. *Language* 64:501-538.
- Hopper, Paul. 1988. Emergent grammar and the a priori grammar postulate. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Linguistics in Context*, 117-134. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Hopper, Paul. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, vol. I, 17-35. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunston, Susan & Geoff Thompson (eds.). 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lai, Huei-ling. 1999. Rejected expectations: the scalar particles *cai* and *jiu* in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics* 37.4: 625-661.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Reference Grammar*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Liu, Mei-chun. 1997. From motion verb to linking element: Discourse explanations for the grammaticalization of *jiu* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 25: 258-289.
- 劉月華等 [Liu, Yue-hua], et al. 1983/1996. 實用現代漢語語法 [*Shiyong Xiandai Hanyu Yufa*] (*Practical Modern Chinese Grammar*). 台北 [Taipei]: 師大書苑 [Shida Shuyuan].
- 呂叔湘 [Lü, Shuxiang]. 1980. 現代漢語八百詞 [*Xiandai Hanyu Babaici*] (*800 Words in Modern Chinese*). 北京 [Beijing]: 商務 [Shangwu].
- Miracle, Charles. 1991. Discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese. Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff, & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Scheibman, Joanne. 2002. *Point of View and Grammar: Structural Patters of Subjectivity in American English Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, Michael. 2002. Two quantitative methods of studying phraseology in English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 7.2: 215-244.
- Tao, Hongyin. 2001. Discovering the usual with corpora: the case of *remember*. In R. Simpson & J. Swales (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics in North America*, 116-144. Ann Arbor:

- University of Michigan Press.
- 陶紅印 [Tao, Hongyin]. 2003. 從語音，語法，話語特徵看“知道”格式在談話中的演化 (Phonological, grammatical, and discourse evidence for the emergence of *zhidao* constructions). 中國語文 [*Zhongguo Yuwen*] 2003: 291- 302.
- Tao, Liang. 2002. Phono-syntactic conspiracy and beyond: grammaticalization in spoken Beijing Mandarin. In: I. Wischer & G. Diewald (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*, 277-292. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, vol. II, 313-329. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. *BLS* 14: 406-416.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English. *Language* 57: 33-65.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Yu-Fang. 2002. “Hao” in Chinese spoken discourse: Relevance and coherence. Paper presented at the 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Chinese Linguistics, Japan, August 2002.
- Yeh, Meng. 1998. On *hai* in Mandarin. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 26.2: 236-280.