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Abstract

This article investigates how speakers and hearers who are referentially clear are designated anaphorically in Mandarin face-to-face conversation. Although anaphoric production involves both structural and functional factors, it is proposed that functional demands, which include social needs and pragmatic requirements, are the crucial determinants that decide the surface manifestations of anaphoric substitutes. Morphologically those anaphoric forms that imply social connotations can be divided into two categories—simple forms (including nouns, pronouns, and zero form) and compound forms (deriving from the structures of ‘noun+pronoun’ and ‘pronoun+noun’). In the functional dimension, social distance that originates in power and solidarity is an impetus to evoke the need to display markedness in anaphoric representations, a feature that in turn determines whether pragmatic principles should be exploited or violated and which pragmatic strategies should be employed. In conclusion, it is suggested that social contribution to anaphoric production is more fundamental than pragmatic contribution.
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1. Introduction

The concept of speech markers was introduced into the domain of sociolinguistics over thirty years ago. However, this concept has not been closely studied in the realm of Chinese sociolinguistics. This paper attempts to offer a framework to examine the displacement of social markers in Mandarin Chinese through anaphoric choice for accommodation of social distance.

Most languages, if not all, carry the property that noun phrases which can be understood from linguistic and/or nonlinguistic context may be substituted by pronouns or need not be expressed verbally at all in subsequent speech. However, as Li and Thompson (1981:662) point out, it is inadequate to say that whenever a referent can be understood or figured out, a zero form can be used, because there are times when a referent, which is referentially clear and can be omitted verbally, is actually expressed overtly. So, if all anaphoric substitutes are structurally applicable for co-reference, how does a speaker decide which form to take?

Anaphoric production involves both structural and functional factors. However, it is frequently found, especially in face-to-face conversation, that structural constraints, both syntactic and semantic, do not prohibit the occurrence of those anaphoric forms that violate structural restrictions or overrule structural preference. For this reason, the present paper is concerned with how functional factors may join to explain a speaker’s decision on anaphoric choice.

In the functional dimension, “social context” is offered as an explanation for Mandarin interpersonal anaphoric choice. In the present paper, this social factor is further delimited as “social distance” between interlocutors, which originates in power and solidarity deriving from age and ranking differences.

The goal of this paper is to investigate how, under the constraints of social distance, Chinese interlocutors are designated anaphorically in face-to-face
conversation. In the following sections, the author will first define and
describe the various types of interpersonal anaphora. Next, she will demon-
strate how social distance can be achieved, negotiated and perpetuated through
different anaphoric choices. Finally, she will illustrate how social and prag-
matic factors may collaborate with each other in determining the surface forms
of anaphora.

2. Types of Mandarin Interpersonal Anaphora

In Mandarin, interpersonal anaphoric substitutes range widely, and mor-
phologically they can be divided into two categories: simple forms and com-
 pound forms. The simple category consists of nouns, pronouns and zero form;
compound anaphora are those forms derived from two morphological struc-
tures: noun+pronoun and pronoun+noun. In the following units of this section,
the researcher will concentrate on defining the basic types of Mandarin inter-
personal anaphora through categorization of their meanings (namely, denota-
tional vs. connotational) and their morphological structures (namely, simple vs.
compound). Table-1 given below is a distribution of these anaphoric forms.
Detailed discussions and examples of these different types of anaphora will be
given in Section 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Anaphoric Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Canonical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><em>wo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee</td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1. Meanings of Interpersonal Anaphora

2.1.1. Canonical Meanings

Anaphoric substitutes, when used for interpersonal reference, are usually formalized through simple pronouns or zero form. Among the pronouns, there are wo (first-person singular pronoun), women (first-person plural pronoun), ni (second-person singular pronoun), nimen (second-person plural pronoun), and nin (honorific form of second-person singular pronoun). Normally wo and women are pronomialized forms that designate the speaker-party; while ni and nimen are pronouns that refer to the hearer-party. Nin, the honorific variant of ni, is used in non-reciprocal relationships to address the hearer, with the superior giving ni to the inferior and receiving nin (if not zero form or noun) from the inferior.

2.1.2. Social Rhetoric

Although the overt forms of Mandarin interpersonal anaphora are limited in number, their meanings are flexible and submissive to social needs. Mandarin anaphoric substitutes, when serving social functions, are not 'neutral' in their reference; instead, they may shift and display temporary or persistent deviance in order for the speaker to accommodate the social distance between him and his hearer.

2.2. Forms of Interpersonal Anaphora

2.2.1. Nominal anaphoric substitutes

In terms of redundancy and foregrounding, the recurrence of a referent should be encoded as zero form or pronouns, not as nouns. However, repetition of nouns (or nominal variants) for a referentially clear referent is functionally significant, although structurally redundant. First, the use of nouns, instead of pronouns or zero form, may create the effect of impersonalization, and thus produce indirectness, which in turn may bring forth politeness. It is

---

1 The word “neutral” is borrowed from Wales (1996: 50). According to Wales, interpersonal pronouns, beyond their canonical meanings, may display social connotations because their referents (prototypically human) have a wide variety of social roles.
this evoked politeness that may serve as a means to describe the interlocutors’ attitudes toward each other and the asymmetrical relationship between them. Also, the surface lexical meaning of a nominal anaphora can actually tell the social relationship between the interlocutors, on which the speaker may imprint his attitudes.

2.2.2. Shifting of persons and number

The complexity of the interpersonal relationship is also reflected in the use of women ‘we’ and ni ‘you.’ The core denotational (or decontextualized) meaning of women ‘we’ may refer either inclusively to speaker and hearer or exclusively to speakers. However, the inferential meaning of women is functionally more complicated. In interactional context, it may refer only to the hearer(s). Such shifting of person and number is a means for the speaker to show camaraderie or empathy, which in turn may serve as a marker of hearer-oriented solidarity.

Following the same line, ni ‘you,’ instead of referring to the hearer, is used by the speaker to refer to himself, especially when the speaker is in the face of adversity. Similar to the extended function of women ‘we,’ this usage can be taken as speaker-oriented invitation of solidarity.

All of these pronominal anaphoric forms with their persons and/or number shifted are designated as “shifter,” and will be so called in this paper.

2.2.3. Compound anaphora

Compound anaphoric substitutes include those forms that derive from the morphological structure of noun+pronoun and pronoun+noun, such as laoda-jie-ni ‘elder-sister-you’ and wo-Chan-huichen ‘I-[proper name].’ Compound anaphora violate not only the conomy principle but also the informative principle. However, it is the markedness of such usage that enables the speaker to transmit his attitudes and helps the hearer to disclose the speaker’s intention.

In the structure of noun+pronoun, the nominal part plays the role of mitigator to alleviate the directness and potential rudeness that is caused by the pronominal part. On the contrary, in the structure of pronoun+noun, the nomi-
nal part functions as an amplifier to strengthen the directness and contempt brought by the pronominal part. In the former case, the use of compound anaphora aims at affinity and rapport; while in the latter case, the use of compound substitutes points at antipathy and antagonism.

3. Social Constraints on Mandarin Anaphoric Selection

3.1. Social Distance

It is a fact that whenever we speak, we signal our social characteristics, mark our relative position in dyadic interactional relations, and reveal our attitudes towards our interlocutors and the relationship between them and ourselves. Anaphoric choice is one of the most effective linguistic devices to serve these social purposes.

According to Peccei (1999:102), it is primarily through language that cultural values and beliefs are transmitted from one generation to another, and the use of pronouns is one linguistic reflection among many that describes the way that a particular culture views the world and decides which part of the social structure is held to be important. Chinese culture’s high regard for age and personal achievement is the major source of social distance, and it is such distance that has cultivated complicated anaphoric use. That is, a Chinese speaker may choose one anaphoric form to demonstrate solidarity which derives from similarity in age and equality in ranking, and thus shorten the distance; or he may select another form to manifest power which originates in age and ranking differences, and thus increase the distance.

Table-2 given on next page presents the relationship between power/solidarity and age/ranking distinctions. As this table shows, age and ranking distinctions may cause power differences. However, the concept of solidarity is basically applicable to all people addressed, even in the realm of power.
Table-2: Components of social distance by power and solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>social features</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (generation, seniority)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the rest of this section, the author will present how social distance, on the basis of power and solidarity originating from age and ranking, may be achieved, negotiated, or perpetuated through Mandarin anaphoric selection.

3.2. Power

Power derives from asymmetrical and non-reciprocal relationships between people (Brown and Gilman 1960, Tannen 1986). One person is said to have power over another in the sense that he is able to control or to influence the other person’s behavior. Among various personal attributes, only some of them may imply a difference of power. In Chinese culture, power originates primarily from differences in age and ranking, two distinctive features of the Chinese mentality.

3.2.1. Age

In Chinese culture, age distinction, whether in terms of generation or seniority (i.e. relative age within the same generation), is a crucial factor in inducing anaphoric variation. For younger people addressing older people, anaphoric choices include common nouns, titles, status names, kinship terms, compound anaphora, and pronominal shifters. For older people addressing younger ones, the canonical pronoun ni ‘you’ and zero form are frequently used; however, when serving social functions, nominal substitutes (especially kinship terms) are also used for interpersonal reference. For example,

(1) Jie, zheli women keyi zheyang zuo....
    Elder sister here we can this way do
    “Sis, we can solve this problem this way....”

In this example, the speaker, who is the addressee’s younger brother, is
helping the addressee solve a computational problem, and he uses inclusive women 'we,' instead of ni ‘you,’ to refer to the addressee. This shifting of person and number in pronoun serves as a device to show empathy (i.e. the speaker’s willingness to share the hearer’s problem), which may in turn function as a marker of hearer-oriented solidarity. From another angle, the age difference between the two interlocutors stands for a power gap which may require the speaker (the power inferior) to use an ‘indirect’ anaphoric substitute to designate the hearer (the power superior) so that the indirectness obtained may help prevent the hearer from losing face.

Of course, the deviant anaphoric choice presented in example (1) may also be taken as an anaphoric manifestation of ranking difference, which is another kind of power gap. Anaphoric choices that are suitable for encoding age distinction are also applicable for reflecting ranking difference.

3.2.2. Teknonymy

One of the reasons why Chinese speakers (especially when speaking with younger addressees) use nouns, not pronouns, to refer to themselves is teknonymy, i.e. adult speakers follow children in vocatives to refer to themselves and to each other. Feng (1936) indicates that in Chinese culture an adult speaker, when in the presence of a child, often uses a noun (usually a kinship term), which the child uses to address him, to refer to himself and to identify the relationship between him and the child. Consider the following example:

(2) buxing, buxing,
    No, no,
    gugu gen ni shuo,
    aunt with you say
    ni, zheyang shui hui dao chulai.
    you, this way water will spill out
    “No, no. I [ =Aunt ] tell you, you, [if you do it] this way, the water will spill out.”

In this example, the speaker (i.e. the hearer’s aunt) takes the hearer’s
stance and uses the noun gugu 'aunt,' not a pronoun or zero form, to refer to herself. By doing so, the speaker clearly depicts the relationship between herself and her addressee: first, they are relatives, and, therefore, there is a bond between them; secondly, there is generation difference between them, and both parties must thus act appropriately. The former aspect of this relationship allows the speaker to send out a message of concern; the latter makes it possible for the speaker to imply to the hearer, who is from a younger generation, to take advice from her, a person from an older generation.

Teknonymy is also adopted by Chinese speakers to refer to addressees of lower class (or lower status). Discussions on such usage are presented in 3.2.3. Ranking (or relative authority)

Tannen (1986: 93) indicates that power has to do with registering social status, because superior status entails the right to control and to resist being controlled. Chinese society assigns very heavy stress to personal achievement, which in accumulation may result in social status. Since social status is a very important component of Chinese mentality, this particular social feature is recorded intricately in Mandarin anaphoric use.

Under the principle that indirectness makes it possible to control others without appearing to, person and number of Mandarin anaphora may shift and manifest deviance in order for the speaker to accommodate the distance between him and his interlocutor. Therefore, a Chinese speaker may use the addressee’s title, instead of ni ‘you,’ to denote the asymmetrical and nonreciprocal ranking relationship between them. For example,

(3) women dou yao qu e,  
we all want go  
zhuren bu lai ma ?  
director not come Q  
“We all are going [to the potluck party]. Aren’t you [= Director] coming?”
A: ni wen guo jiang-laoshi le ma?
You ask EXP last name-teacher PFV Q
B: you.
EXP
Jiang-laoshi shuo laoshi jueding jiu xing le
last-name-teacher say teacher decide okay CRS

“A: Did you ask teacher Jiang?”
B: Yes. Teacher Jiang said that it’s up to you [=teacher].”

Both the speaker in example (3) and speaker B in example (4) chose nominal substitutes (namely, titles), instead of ni ‘you,’ to refer to their hearers. In either case, the ranking distinction seems to be too persistent to be removed; therefore, the two speakers chose nouns, not pronouns, for reference. As mentioned in 2.2.1, in terms of redundancy and foregrounding, using nominal anaphoric forms to designate referentially clear referent is structurally unnecessary, but functionally significant. These nominal forms produce impersonalization, and thus indirectness, which in turn may bring forth politeness. It is this politeness that fully describes the ranking gap between the two interlocutors.

Chao (1956:339) points out that Chinese speakers may also adopt teknonyms in speaking to people of lower class. That is, kinship terms are another kind of nominal anaphora that reflect the power gap aroused by ranking difference. Example (5) given below is an illustration of this usage.

A-xin, laoshi zhe-feng-xin hen ji,
proper name teacher this-classifier-letter very urgent
ni neng xian bang laoshi pao-yi-tang ma?
you can first help teacher run-one-CL Q

“A-xin, this letter of mine is very urgent, could you run an errand [to mail it] for me immediately?”

---

2 Here “lower class” means lower status or ranking.
In this example, the speaker (a teacher), in asking the hearer (his student) to mail a letter for him immediately, takes the student's point of view and uses a noun laoshi ‘teacher,’ instead of a pronoun or zero form, to refer to himself. This anaphoric choice allows the speaker to identify the relationship between him (the superior) and his hearer (the inferior), and thus enables him to impose the hearer to run errands for him.

Moreover, even among people of equal footing, deviant (i.e. non-canonical) anaphoric forms are frequently used. In example (6) given below, speaker B and her colleagues were celebrating her birthday, and one of her colleagues, speaker A, proposed that speaker B sing a song:

(6) A: shoupo chang-ge ba.
   Birthday-girl sing-song SA
B: zeme shoupo chang-ge,
   Why birthday-girl sing-song
Nimen chang cai dui a
   You sing then right RF
“You: Birthday girl [=you] sing a song!
B: Why should birthday girl [=I] sing a song?
   It is you who should sing a song.”

In this example, it is speaker B’s repetition of speaker A’s use of nominal anaphora that forms an interpersonal duet, which clearly reveals that speaker B is trying to reinforce the humor and harmony that speaker A adds to the interpersonal relationship in the immediate context. If speaker B switches back to canonical ‘I,’ the social distance between them will hence increase.

As mentioned previously, a speaker may shift the number of anaphora in order to accommodate the distance between him and his addressee.

Wales (1996: 55) noticed that NPs, rather than pronouns, can also be used to designate third person deference to an addressee, and she points out that in English NPs that serve such function are commonly titles or status terms. In Mandarin, this third person deference through nominal substitutes can be used
not only to address the hearer but also to refer to the speaker himself. For example,

(7) daxiaojie jintian pao-cha le ma?
    madam today make tea PFV Q
    “Have [you] made tea today?”

(8) A: wa, Chan Hui-chen tsan le.
    Oh, speaker B’s name miserable CRS

B: wa, Chan Hui-chen tsan le.
    Oh, speaker B’s name miserable CRS
    “A: Oh, you [=Chan Hui-chen] are in a big trouble.
    B: Oh, I [=Chan Hui-chen] am in a big trouble.”

(9) Chan Hui-chen jintian zhuan le liang-wan.
    speaker’s name today earn PFV two ten thousand
    “I [=Chan Hui-chen] earned twenty-thousand dollars.”

In example (7), speaker A uses a status noun daxiaojie ‘madam,’ instead of pronoun ni ‘you,’ to refer to the hearer. In example (9), contrary to example (7), the speaker uses a personal name, instead of wo ‘I’ to refer to herself. In example (8), speaker A uses speaker B’s full name to address her, and speaker B, in repeating what speaker A said, uses exactly the same nominal expression to refer to herself. In all of these examples (especially example (8)), we see a picture of anaphoric use similar to that in example (6). Each speaker in these examples tries to create a more casual atmosphere and establish a more friendly and affinitive relationship with the addressee.

Also, in example (8), speaker A, by using speaker B’s proper name to address her, calls for indirectness, which in turn may weaken the loss of face that may threaten speaker B. Speaker B, on the other hand, uses the same linguistic device for self-mocking and hence reduces the potential embarrassment caused by loss of face.

3.3. Solidarity

Solidarity is the drive to be friendly, similar to what is called rapport
Contrary to power, it is symmetrical and reciprocal. According to Brown and Gilman (1960: 258), the concept of solidarity is potentially applicable to all people addressed. Even in the realm of power, superiors may be close (as parents) or remote (as president of a university); inferiors, likewise, may either be close (as children) or distant (as a newly hired servant).

Solidarity and power are two sides of the same coin. Similar to the effect of power on people’s anaphoric production, solidarity also invites anaphoric variation that conveys empathy and politeness, and it can also be obtained through nominal anaphoric choice. In Chinese society, there is a common practice of using kinship terms to refer to non-kinship acquaintances (or even strangers). The main purpose of such usage is to shorten the social distance between speaker and addressee, and thus attain solidarity between them. Example (10) given below, a dialogue between two good friends with mild seniority difference, is an illustration of this usage. In this conversation, speaker A, the senior one, is telling the addressee, the junior one, about the car accident she just had. Since speaker A was threatened by the other driver, speaker B immediately displays sympathy and empathy, and promises to help her solve the problem.

(10) A: [talking about the car accident just encountered]

B: nei jiahuo genben jiushi ge fengzi,

That guy indeed be CL maniac
kan laodajie-ni shemeshihou yao qu,
see old-sister-you when want go
wo pei laodajie qu
I company old-sister go

“That guy is a maniac.
Whenever [you] want to go [to deal with him],
I’ll go with [you].”

The two interlocutors are from the same generation, although speaker A is
about five years older than speaker B. In addressing speaker A, speaker B chooses a noun (namely, a kinship term) and a compound nominal anaphora (namely, a combination of a kinship term and a second person pronoun ni) to replace ni ‘you.’ In either case, the lexical meaning of the kinship term is a marker that signals the close relationship with speaker A and his respect for speaker A. In the compound form laodajie-ni ‘elder-sister-you,’ as stated in 2.2.3., the nominal part (i.e. the kinship term laodajie) functions as a hedge to blunt the directness and thus avoid potential rudeness caused by the pronominal part (namely, ni ‘you’). Again, the consideration of politeness is evoked by the asymmetrical power relationship derived from seniority difference.

Empathy, according to Kuno (1987), is a device to express speakers’ attitude of involvement, which in turn may yield rapport and respect, especially when the addressee is in an adverse situation. Therefore, women (which literally means inclusive ‘we’), for example, may be used by the inferior speaker to refer to the superior hearer(s) to show empathy. The use of pronominal shifter to convey upward empathy is expected to be interpreted as respect and politeness because the inferior speaker has to take the superior hearer’s face into consideration. It is this marked usage that implies the asymmetrical power relationship between the two interlocutors. Example (1) in 3.2.1 is an illustration. Also, in example (11), the speaker asks her colleagues, who are leaving the conference room after a meeting, to lower their voices because there is another meeting taking place in the next room.

(11) ni, women shi bu shi yao xiaosheng yidian?

you, we be not be want lower down voice a little

gebi hai zai kaihui.

next door still asp. having a meeting

“Could you, we [= plural you] lower down your voice a little bit?

[People in ] the next room are still having a meeting.”

In example (11), the speaker repairs the original pronominal choice of ni ‘you’ and substitutes it with women ‘we’ to refer to the hearers. In repairing
her original anaphoric choice, pronominal shifting is adopted as a means to express involvement that, in consequence, may weaken the force of the command.

Another shifter worth mentioning is *ni*. It is common for speakers to use *ni* to refer to him-/herself. In this case, only the person, not the number, of the original pronoun is shifted. Most interestingly, the result of using this kind of shifter is completely opposite of that given in example (11). Take the following example for comparison:

(12) A: yikaishi ta jiu gaosu ni shuo
from beginning he then tell you say
ta bu dasuan gen ni zai-yiqi yi-beizi,
he not plan with you together one-life
hai jiao ni bie tai renzhen
also tell you not too serious
B: ni buhui gen ta chao a?
you unable with him fight RF
A: you sheme yong,
Have what use
Ta cai bu guan ni-Wu-xiuhui tong-bu-tongyi
He then not care you-Wu-Xiuhui agree-not-agree

“A: From the very beginning [when we were together], he told you [me] that he’s not going to stay with you [me] for life. And he also told you [me] not to be too serious [about this relationship].

B: Why don’t you argue with him?
A: It’s useless. He doesn’t care whether you-Wu-xiuhui [=I] agree him or not.”

In this example, speaker A and speaker B are close friends, and speaker A is telling speaker B how badly her boyfriend has treated her. Throughout the
dialogue, ni ‘you’ actually refers to speaker A herself. It seems that in doing so, she is fishing for sympathy. That is, through the use of shifter ni ‘you’ to stand for the speaker herself, speaker A is trying to draw her hearer to her side, and hence build up a tie with the hearer so that the hearer may stand as an ally to condemn speaker A’s boyfriend for being unfaithful to her. In addition to this invitation for camaraderie, the use of the shifter ni for ‘I,’ speaker A creates indirectness, which may thus reduce the embarrassment of being dumped by her boyfriend, so that speaker B will not despise her. Also, the repetition of so many shifter ni’s seems to represent the agony and despair in speaker A’s heart. It is speaker A’s request for camaraderie and invitation to share her inner feelings that strengthens the relationship between the two interlocutors.

Also, in the last line of example (12), speaker A uses a “pronoun+noun” compound anaphora to substitute the simple canonical pronoun wo ‘I.’ As mentioned in 2.2.3., the nominal component of the compound form functions as an amplifier to strengthen the antipathy and antagonism expressed in the pronominal part of the form. In this example, speaker A’s contempt and anger toward her boyfriend is expressed through the pronominal component of the expression, and is reinforced through its nominal component.

4. Social Motivation as an Impetus to Activate Pragmatic Principles

In the literature (Sacks and Schegloff 1979, Givon 1983, Leech 1983, Geluykens 1991, Huang 1994), the principle of economy (or efficiency) and clarity (or effectiveness) are said to be crucial factors in determining the surface representation of discourse anaphora. Communicative effectiveness results from repetitions of nouns (in forms of original nouns or their nominal variants), while communicative efficiency is achieved through omission (i.e. the formation of zero form). According to those scholars, when these two principles are in competition with each other, it is effectiveness that overrides efficiency.
Horn (1984: 22) proposes that the use of a marked (i.e. relatively complex and/or prolix) expression, when a corresponding unmarked (i.e. simple and less effortful) alternative is available, is likely to interpreted as conveying a marked message, which the unmarked option would not or could not have done. Following the same line, Li and Thompson (1981) offer highlighting as an explanation to the marked use of pronouns to designate referentially clear referents. Although they argue that the real difference between using and not using the pronoun is a matter of highlighting, it is a fact that such anaphoric use may be implicationally ambiguous. Without the help of social context, it is uncertain whether these marked forms should be interpreted as cues of rapport and respect or as signs of animosity and antagonism.

In this case of anaphoric production for interpersonal reference, it is the markedness of the speaker’s anaphoric choice (such as the use of shifters, nominal substitutes, and compound anaphora) that transfers the speaker’s intentions (i.e. to identify his social characteristics, to locate his position in the dyadic relation with the hearer, and to express his attitudes toward the hearer and the relationship between them) into the hearer’s onus to locate the relevant anaphoric substitutes, to detect the markedness embedded in them, and thus to determine which interpretive principles and inferential strategies to exploit (or to violate). However, it is more important to note that it is social causes that evoke this concept of “markedness.”

Figure-1 given below is a flow chart representation of the derivational process of anaphoric production, which may serve as a tentative explanation to the production of interpersonal inferential anaphora.

As Figure-1 shows, it is proposed that the production of interpersonal inferential anaphoric substitutes starts with the speaker’s need to convey his message — to identify and react to the social distance between the speaker and the addressee. This social distance comes from the power difference and the strength of solidarity displayed in the dyadic relationship between the two interlocutors; while such power and solidarity can be taken as accumulation of
similarity or difference in the two interlocutors’ personal traits.

Then, with the need to identify social distance and to show his attitudes toward it, the speaker, consciously or subconsciously, evokes the concept of “markedness” and the idea of imprinting it onto the surface manifestations of anaphora. It is this call for “markedness” that drives the speaker to inspect which pragmatic strategies are applicable to serve this purpose, and how pragmatic principles (or maxims) should be implemented to reach this goal. (Table-3, following Figure-1, provides a better presentation of the relationship between the concept of “markedness” and pragmatic factors.)

It was not until pragmatic considerations are fulfilled that the appropriate linguistic devices are located and executed.

In short, in this case of anaphoric production, social, pragmatic and linguistic dimensions are in linear order, with social motivations coming prior to pragmatic considerations which in turn is followed by linguistic implementation.3

5. Summary and Conclusion

Anaphoric production involves both structural and functional factors. However, structural constraints do not fully explain the occurrence of anaphoric forms that are structurally restricted or redundant. In the functional dimension, “social context” is offered as a cause of the marked use of anaphoric forms.

In this paper, the scope of “social context” is delimited to social distance between speaker and hearer, which derives from difference of power and strength of solidarity, two social variables originating from discriminations in

3 It has been noticed that social distance is not the only social factor that may influence the formation of interpersonal anaphoric substitutes; other social factors (such as situational genre and formality) may join to determine the surface representations of interpersonal anaphor. That is, the process of such anaphoric production may not necessarily be linear. However, for current discussion of the impact of social distance as a social determinant on anaphoric choice, this linear model is proposed.
age and ranking. Data from face-to-face conversations reveal that the existence of social distance and the strength of the need to accommodate social distance are the crucial determinants in evoking the use of inferential (or non-canonical) anaphoric substitutes.

Under the pressure of power and the yearning for solidarity, pragmatic strategies (such as politeness and empathy) are activated; and these strategies
may further induce competition between communicative effectiveness and communicative efficiency. Therefore, in the functional dimension, social distance is the impetus in evoking the need to display markedness in anaphoric representations, a feature that in turn determines which pragmatic strategies should be activated and how pragmatic principles should be implemented (i.e. to be exploited or to be violated). In conclusion, social contribution to anaphoric production seems to be more fundamental that pragmatic contribution.

Conventions used in glosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>currently relevant state (le)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>experiential aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective aspect marker (le)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>reduce forcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>sentence final particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>solicit agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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社會情境中的照應詞擇用分析

詹 惠 珍

摘 要

本文旨在探查說話者如何在指涉無虞的交談情境中，使用照應詞來指稱自己與交談對象，並以之描述或調整雙方之間的社會差距。文內將行使此種社會功能之照應詞依構詞結構分為兩類，一類為單詞（包括代名詞、零代名詞、以及名詞），另一類為複合詞（包括以「名詞+代名詞」和「代名詞+名詞」兩種形式構成的詞彙）。這些照應詞的表指和實指之間的不對應性，即其社會功能意涵所在之處。作者指出，社會需求是引發照應詞的詞面意義與實際指涉對象脫離的理由，而語用原則的選擇與執行方式，則是引導說話者將此種脫離現象入碼的策略。換言之，在功能的層面上，社會功能的考量似較語用功能更為深層。

關鍵詞：照應詞、代名詞、社會距離、權力、內聚力、顯著性