

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/29022> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Lin, Chin-hui

Title: Utterance-final particles in Taiwan Mandarin: contact, context and core functions

Issue Date: 2014-10-02

Chapter 5 The UFP *ê* in Taiwan Mandarin

5.1 UFP *ê* [ɛ] and its variant *ye* [jɛ]

Similar to *a*, the onsetless particle *ê* can likewise link with the ending of the preceding word and generate different liaison consonants. For instance, when it occurs after a word ending with [n], a liaison consonant [n] may be produced, so the sentence *tā shì rìběnrén ê* [t^ha ʃì zì pən zən ɛ] ‘he is Japanese’ is pronounced as [t^ha ʃì zì pən zən nɛ]. Aside from words ending with consonants, high front unrounded vowels [i] and [y] can generate a liaison consonant [j] with *ê*: the sentence *hěn piányí ê* [xən p^hiɛn ji ɛ] ‘(it is) very cheap’ is pronounced as [xən p^hiɛn ji jɛ].

However, similar to the discussion in 3.1, the liaison rule can only explain part of the occurrences of *ye* [jɛ] in my data. Except for [i] and [j], some occurrences of *ye* are preceded by vowels such as [ɤ] and [ɛ], which is hard to account for with the liaison rule (as shown in examples (1a–c)):

- (1) a. Unrounded back vowel [ɤ]:

bù xiǎodé ye!
NEG know PRT
‘I don’t know!’

- b. Unrounded high central vowel [i]:

wǒ yě shì ye!
1_{SG} also be PRT
‘Me too!’

- c. Unrounded low-mid front vowel [ɛ]:

tā shì nǐmen de nà ge xuéjiě ye!
3_{SG} be 2_{PL} DE that CL senior.schoolmate PRT
‘She is an alumna of your department!’

According to my Taiwan Mandarin informants, all the instances of *ye* in examples (1a–c) can be replaced by *ê* without sounding unnatural or even unacceptable. In fact,

examples (2a) and (2b) are found in my data, showing that when *ê* occurs after [ɣ] or [i], it can but does not necessarily have to turn into *ye*.¹

(2) a. Unrounded back vowel [ɣ]:

bù xiǎodé ê!
 NEG know PRT
 ‘I don’t know!’

b. Unrounded high central vowel [i]:

wǒ bú huì xiǎng zài kàn dì'èr cì ê!
 1_{SG} NEG will want again see second CL PRT
 ‘I don’t want to see it a second time!’

Given the fact that *ê* and *ye* are largely interchangeable and seem to share the same function, it may be reasonable to assume that they are “free variations of the same word,” as Shie (1991: 16) proposes. However, when comparing the examples (1a–b) and (2a–b), some of my Taiwan Mandarin informants feel that the attachment of *ye* sounds more emphatic than the *ê*-attached utterances. For instance, they indicate that (1a) sounds “stronger” than (2a) (*ye* can even be prolonged to strengthen the emphatic effect). If this is the case, I thus hypothesize that the epenthesis of [j] in (1a) and (1b) (which cannot be explained by the liaison rule) may carry an extra pragmatic function, and is not simply a “free variant” of *ê*.

In order to examine my hypothesis, I asked my Taiwan Mandarin informants to compare the following examples involving two other Mandarin onsetless particles *a* [a] and *o* [ɔ] and their counterparts *ya* [ja] and *yo* [jɔ]. Significantly, this emphatic connotation was confirmed with regard to the two *y*[j]-initial forms ((3b) and (3d) vs. (3a) and (3c)).

¹ In my data, there is one instance of *ye* occurring after a low-mid front unrounded vowel [ɛ], but no UFP *ê* in the same position. The non-occurrence of *ê* in this position can be explained in analogy to Lü’s (1992) observation with regard to Mandarin UFP *a*. According to Lü (ibid.: 263), a medial *i* (i.e. [j]) is inserted when the particle *a* occurs after a word ending with [a], in order to “break from the preceding word.” Likewise, [j] may also be inserted to break the UFP *ê* [ɛ] and a preceding word ending with [ɛ], as in *zhè shì wǒ de xié ye* [tʂɿ ʂi ʊɔ tə ɛjɛ jɛ] ‘This is my shoe’.

- (3) a. hěn kù a.
 very cool PRT
 ‘It’s very cool.’
- b. hěn kù ya.
 very cool PRT
 ‘It’s very cool.’
- c. hěn kù o.
 very cool PRT
 ‘It’s very cool.’
- d. hěn kù yo.
 very cool PRT
 ‘It’s very cool.’

Following Chen’s (2007: 331) general claim that an “[e]mphatic tone of a speaker is associated with pitch range and longer durations, rather than amplitude,” I believe that the use of *y[j]*-initial forms (i.e. *ya*, *yo* and *ye*) involving syllable lengthening has an “emphatic” connotation. As mentioned in chapter 3, Wang and Liu (2010: 4) claim that the use of any variant of *a* is “a matter of preference rather than a rule.” My proposal may provide an explanation for this “preference”: when a speaker intends to make an emphasis, s/he tends choose to use the *y[j]*-initial forms instead of the onsetless forms, regardless of the ending of the preceding word.

In addition to this extra pragmatic function, according to my informants, *ye* appears to be used more often by female speakers and children. This is similar to Wei’s (1984: 70) observation that *ye* is rarely used by male speakers. Wei suggests that the UFP *ye* is linked with a style of *sājiāo*, which is defined by Yueh (2012: 1) as “persuasive talk that generally means *to talk or behave like a child for persuasive purposes*” (original emphasis). Shie (1991) likewise claims that *ye* “possesses strong feminine connotations” (ibid.: 16), and that male speakers are almost always inclined to use *ê*. This is in line with the attestations of *ê* and *ye* in my data: In the total 150 occurrences of *ê* and *ye*, there are only seven occurrences of *ye*. Among these seven occurrences of *ye*, five are used by female speakers. Since this small figure is quantitatively insignificant, I also checked another public Taiwan Mandarin corpus: the NCCU corpus of spoken Chinese (Chui and Lai 2008). I found that 55 out of 227

utterance-final *ye* are employed by male speakers and the remaining 172 by female speakers. Since *ye* appears to carry some extra connotations and is used by different speakers according to sex or age, I conclude that *ye* and *ê* are not in free variation. In other words, the use of *ye* in Taiwan Mandarin cannot be explained in purely phonetic terms (i.e. liaison rule) and is indeed “a matter of preference” of the speaker (cf. Wang and Liu 2010: 4).²

After a review of Shie’s (1991) study on Taiwan Mandarin *ê* in section 5.2, I will propose a new hypothesis concerning the core function of *ê* in Taiwan Mandarin in section 5.3. My hypothesis will be tested in 5.4, followed by a conclusion in 5.5.

5.2 Previous study: Shie (1991)

Shie (1991) appears to be the only study providing an analysis of the UFP *ê* in Taiwan Mandarin. As mentioned above, he argues that *ye* and *ê* are free variations of the same word. He uses one written graph 呷 [jɛ] to represent both *ê* and *ye* in his examples. Shie’s original examples are presented in Chinese characters, I use the form *ye* in my transcription of these original examples. The examples in this section are all selected from Shie (1991).³

Shie (ibid.: 155) claims that the basic function of *ye* is “marking a piece of information as new and impressive and usually highly relevant to the present situation”; it can be used to “correct other’s false belief by calling their [i.e. the other conversants’] attention to the existence of some conspicuous information which sheds new light into the argumentation” (ibid.). In addition, *ye* can be tagged to negative or vague answers, to show the speaker’s “willingness to comply with the question despite their [i.e. the speaker’s] inability to do so” (ibid.).

In example (4), speaker D uses the *ye*-attached utterance in lines 3-4 to show her surprise since she suddenly realizes that the national flags of Taiwan and mainland China are different, a fact she had not been aware of before.

² The extra pragmatic connotation does not have any significant influence on my analysis; I will use both *ê* and *ye* in the following discussion according to the recorded pronunciation.

³ In Shie’s data, most of the occurrences of *ye* are followed by an exclamation mark. As I have no access to Shie’s original recordings, I do not add an upward arrow (↑) and a downward arrow (↓) to indicate the high- and low- pitch.

(4) (Shie 1991: 156, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- 1 D jiù shì yǒude shíhòu zǒu zài jiē shàng,
 just be some time walk at street on
- 2 D zǒu zhe zǒu zhe hūrán tái tóu yī kàn,
 walk ASP walk ASP suddenly rise head one look
- 3 D ei? nǐmen de guóqí zài nǎlǐ=
 PRT 2_{PL} DE national.flag at there
- 4 D =gēn wǒmen bù yíyàng ye!
 with 1_{PL} NEG same PRT
- 5 D wǒ cái juéde, e:
 1_{SG} just think uh
- 6 D wǒ bú shì zài táiwān, wǒ shì zài dàlù.
 1_{SG} NEG be at Taiwan 1_{SG} be at mainland

D1-6: It's...sometimes I walked on the street, and I look up- "oh, your national flag is different from ours!" And then I realize...uh...I am not in Taiwan, but in mainland China.

Shie argues that in the case above, the new information introduced by *ye* "happens to the speaker unexpectedly and has no obvious connections to its context" (ibid.: 157). In some cases, as Shie further argues, the *ye*-attached utterances can serve to show the "newness of the information" (ibid.: 158).

(5) (Shie 1991: 158, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- 1 D shénme jīpísuànmáo de shì dōu yào nǐ tóngyì a?
 what trivial DE matter all must 2_{SG} agree PRT
- 2 D wǒ shì dǎoyǎn ye!
 1_{SG} be stage.director PRT

D1-2: Any trivial matter has to be approved by you? It's me who is the stage director!

Here, speaker D is challenging the boss of his film company. Although the information attached by *ye* in (5) is actually nothing new either to the speaker or the hearer, Shie argues that the purpose of using *ye* is to “direct hearer’s attention to the newly-introduced information, and invite the hearer to reconsider some old information.”

Shie (1991: 159) claims that when *ye* is used in a long speech, it is often used to “mark a prominent conclusion or commentation, which is usually in strong contrast to what has been said previously,” as in (6). In line 4, the utterance attached by *ye* is the speaker’s own comment to what she has just said.

(6) (Shie 1991: 159, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 1 C | suǒyǐ wǒ bìng bù jízhè-
so 1 _{SG} rather NEG hurry |
| 2 C | jiù shì shuō xiànzài liúxíng shénme dōngxì,
just be say now popular what thing |
| 3 C | gǎnkuài gēnzhe cháoliú.
hurry follow trend |
| → 4 C | wǒ juéde yǒude shíhòu xiāngfǎn cháoliú hěn nán jiǎng ye!
1 _{SG} think some time contrary trend very hard say PRT |
| 5 C | nǐ zìjǐ hěn yǒu xìnxīn-
2 _{SG} self very have confidence |
| 6 C | hěn yǒu yī ge- hěn yǒu chuàngyì de xiǎngfǎ dehuà,
very have one CL very have originality DE idea if |
| 7 C | zhè shuōbùdìng yě shì cháoliú.
this maybe also be trend |

- D1-7: So I am not in a rush to...it is, when something is popular now, I go with the tide. In my opinion, sometimes, on the contrary, the trend is hard to define! When you are very confident...you have a very original idea, this idea is perhaps also a trend.

In some cases, *ye*-attached utterances are used to correct the misconception of the previous speaker by introducing some information the speaker believes to be “new or neglected” by the previous speaker (Shie 1991: 160). In (7), J and W are in a restaurant. J, the stingy husband, wants to order a cheap Chinese dish upon the inquiry of the waiter (S). W, the indignant wife, uses a *ye*-attached utterance to remind J that they are now in a western-style restaurant.

(7) (Shie 1991: 160, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- | | | | |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 1 S | xiānsheng nǐ yào diǎn shénme? | | |
| | mister | 2 _{SG} want a.little what | |
| | | | |
| 2 J | xiārén dàn chǎofàn. | | |
| | shrimp egg fried.rice | | |
| | | | |
| → 3 W | zhèlǐ shì xīcāntīng | ye! | |
| | here be western-style.restaurant | PRT | |
| | | | |
| S1: | What do you want to order, sir? | | |
| J2: | Fried-rice with shrimps and eggs. | | |
| W: | This is a western-style restaurant here! | | |

In line 3, according to Shie, W uses a *ye*-attached utterance to call J’s attention to the neglected fact that it is not proper to order a cheap dish in such a high-end restaurant. Shie (1991: 164) also argues that when *ye* is used with an answer tagged to a question, it shows “the speaker’s willingness to comply with the request of providing an answer even if he is not able to provide a satisfactory one.” In this case, the *ye*-attached utterances do not contain any substantial new information, as in examples (8) and (9). In example (8), the speaker W responds to H’s question with a positive *ye*-attached answer *huì* ‘will’.

(8) (Shie 1991: 165, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- 1 H nà nǐ dài jiǔ le yǎnjīng huì bú huì hóng ne?
 that 2_{SG} wear long PRT eye will NEG will red PRT
- 2 W huì ye!
 will PRT
- 3 W shēntǐ bǐjiào lèi de shíhòu a,
 body more tired DE time PRT
- 4 W yǎnjīng bǐjiào róngyì chōngxiě.
 eye more easy congested

H1: When you wear [contact lenses] long, will your eyes become red?

W2-4: Yes! When I am tired, I get red-eyed easily.

Shie (1991: 165) suggests that the deployment of *ye* here shows “W’s realization that H’s inquiry provides some new perspective to the conversation.” In other words, it shows “the speaker’s willingness in catering to the other interlocutor’s mood and in complying with the conversational need.” Shie claims that this function of *ye* is more evident when it is attached to a negative answer, where *ye* seems to “balance the speaker between his willingness to cooperate and his problem in supplying a positive answer” (ibid.: 166), as example (9) shows.

(9) (Shie 1991: 166, my transcription, glosses and translation)

- 1 H bǎobāo qǐlái le méi?
 baby get up ASP NEG
- 2 W bù zhīdào ye!... nǐ jiào tā qǐlái a!
 NEG know PRT 2_{SG} call 3_{SG} get up PRT

H1: Did our baby get up?

W2: Don’t know...you go and wake him up!

Here, speaker *W* is unable to supply a satisfactory answer to the first speaker's question, and she provides an unsatisfactory answer with *ye*. Shie (1991: 167) argues that the elaboration following *ye* in line 2 supports his claim since the new information is relevant, showing the speaker's "effort to make his response sound less curt and more cooperative." That is why when *ye* is attached to a disagreeing utterance, it can also serve to "mitigate the force of the objection on a participation level" (ibid.).

On the basis of the examples provided above, Shie (1991: 169) concludes that *ye* is a marker "accompanying the discovery of some new information." It can also be used to "correct the interlocutor's misconception by offering some neglected truth treated as new information." It can furthermore "fill the conversational needs by showing the speaker's willingness to cooperate."

Although Shie (1991) provides ample examples of the use of *ye* (i.e. *ê*) in Taiwan Mandarin, most of the examples do not include the interlocutor's responses in the turns following *ye*-attached occurrences. The responses, however, would arguably contribute to a better understanding of the pragmatics of the UFP *ê* in different interactional environments. Moreover, it is problematic to determine the conversational devices and strategies (for example, whether a pause occurs after the *ye*-attached utterances) the speakers use in Shie's description because Shie does not provide this information in his transcription.

Nevertheless, if we examine the examples (4)–(9) provided by Shie (1991), a general conclusion can be drawn: it appears that the use of UFP *ye* is triggered by something in the context that deviates from a previous assumption. In example (4), *ye* occurs with an utterance indicating the speaker's realization that the national flags of Taiwan and China are different, which is different from the speaker's assumption. In the case of examples (5) and (6), due to the lack of previous context it is difficult to confirm this claim. There are two explanations for the occurrence of the *ye*-attached utterance: first, it may be directed to another speaker, who assumes that "everything should be approved by me." Second, it may be used to indicate the situation is counter the speaker's own assumption (i.e. as he is the stage director, he is supposed to have the rights to decide everything without another's approval). In both cases, the *ye*-attached utterance is uttered against a previous assumption. In example (6), *D*'s utterances can also be regarded as a counterview to a previous assumption in lines 1–3 (which is, to go with the tide when something is popular).

In example (7), *ye* occurs with an utterance directed against *J*'s assumption that it is possible to order fried-rice with shrimps and eggs in any restaurant. In example (8), the *ye*-attached answer can be analyzed as indicating that *H*'s question

is counter W's expectation concerning the upcoming utterance: he did not expect this question. Finally, in example (9), W's *ye*-attached answer is an indication that the answer is counter H's assumption (which is, H may expect that W can provide a satisfactory answer, however, W is unable to do so).

Against the backdrop of this analysis, I will make a new proposal regarding the core function of \hat{e} in the following section. My analysis aims to provide another perspective on the use of \hat{e} , based on complete conversational sequences, including the interlocutor's responses.

5.3 Core function: inviting a collaborative move by foregrounding

Based on Shie's (1991) data, I argue that the use of UFP \hat{e} may be triggered by a situation in which something deviates from a previous assumption. The occurrences of \hat{e} in my own data also confirm this preliminary observation. However, some occurrences of \hat{e} are attached to a piece of new information or assessment, which is not related to a "counter-assumption." I notice that almost every occurrence of \hat{e} in my data is followed by a response, or, at least, some "evidence of understanding" (Clark and Schaefer 1989: 267) including the following types (here, B is the recipient, and A is the speaker, original italics) (ibid.):

- (i) *Continued attention*. B shows he is continuing to attend and therefore remains satisfied with A's presentation.
- (ii) *Initiation of the relevant next contribution*. B starts in on the next contribution that would be relevant at a level as high as the current one.
- (iii) *Acknowledgement*. B nods or says "uh huh," "yeah," or the like.
- (iv) *Demonstration*. B demonstrates all or part of what he has understood A to mean.
- (v) *Display*. B displays verbatim all or part of A's presentation.

Against this backdrop I argue that the function of \hat{e} is to invite the hearer to make a collaborative move by foregrounding the utterance to which \hat{e} is attached. That is, with the deployment of \hat{e} , the speaker explicitly informs the interlocutor that the \hat{e} -attached utterance needs to be registered and that s/he expects the interlocutor to respond (i.e. take the turn) or at least provides some evidence of understanding, in order to accomplish a successful interaction. In some cases, the deployment of \hat{e} also conveys the speaker's own collaborative attitude.

In chapter 4, I argued that the core function of simplex *la* is to elicit the hearer's attention and ensure the hearer has received and understood the adjustment.

This leads to the question of how to distinguish between “inviting a collaborative move” (i.e. providing some evidence of understanding) and “eliciting the hearer’s attention.” Or, to be concrete, what is the difference between the core functions of *la* and \hat{e} ?

The simplex *la*, as mentioned in chapter 4, is related to the speaker’s belief. The *la*-attached utterance usually serves to make the adjustment prominent and does not aim at an active response from the hearer (although the hearer may give one). Contrastively, the “invitation” implied by \hat{e} -attached utterances involves space for the hearer to respond. In other words, compared to \hat{e} , the simplex *la* is “by nature self-centered” (cf. Shie 1991: 84).

Let us turn to example (4). According to my informants, it is not acceptable to replace \hat{e} with the simplex *la* in this case. Note that the \hat{e} -attached utterance is prefaced by *ei*, an utterance-initial particle which “projects the upcoming talk to involve in some kind of shift and to be something unanticipated” (Tsai 2008: 1025). As simplex *la* occurs with utterances conveying the speaker’s belief, it is reasonable that the deployment of the simplex *la* does not fit this situation.

In example (7), if the UFP \hat{e} is replaced with simplex *la*, the resulting *la*-attached utterance *zhèlǐ shì xīcāntīng la* ‘this is a western-style restaurant here’ leads to a different interpretation: it is an indication that W believes that J’s previous claim in line 2 needs to be adjusted. Compared to the \hat{e} -attached utterance, which shows W’s intention to create space for J to adjust his claim, the *la*-attached utterance sounds more assertive, like a correction.

In chapter 6, I will discuss the distinction of the three UFPs in detail. In the remainder of the current chapter, I will test my proposal for \hat{e} with more examples from my Taiwan Mandarin data.

5.4 UFP \hat{e} in Taiwan Mandarin

As mentioned previously, the UFP \hat{e} is usually attached to a piece of information or to the speaker’s assessment. In some cases, it can also be attached to phrases such as *bù xiǎodé/bù zhīdào* ‘I don’t know’, or *wàngjì le* ‘I forgot’ and the likes, which indicate the speaker’s insufficient knowledge. It occurs in four types of contexts: (i) storytelling/reporting; (ii) topic-introduction/topic-shift; (iii) qualified disagreements/upgraded agreements, and (iv) answers.

5.4.1 *ê* in storytelling/reporting

When the UFP *ê* occurs in a story-telling/reporting turn, it serves to foreground a piece of information, or the speaker's assessment in the speaker's own talk and to invite the current hearer to respond to the foregrounded information or assessment. Examples (10)–(13) demonstrate this use. In these four examples, *ê* is attached to a piece of information or an assessment; its use is triggered by something which deviates from the speaker's assumption.

In example (10), G tells his younger sister J that he was very shocked when he heard about the September 11 attacks. G attaches *hoNn* in lines 1, 3 and 5. In her study on UFPs in Southern Mǐn, I. Li (1999: 79) suggests that when UFP *hoNn* is used in reporting turns, it serves to “involve the addressee in his reporting, in order to make sure that what he says will be properly received, and that he has the audience's attention, among other things.” This analysis of *hoNn* in Southern Mǐn can be applied here. J's deployment of two backchannels *mhm* and *en* in line 2 and 4 can be regarded as signals of her reception.

- (10) 1 G e: fāshēng nà ge ei: kējī bèi jiéchí hoNn,
uh happen that CL uh aircraft BEI hijack PRT
- 2 J mhm.
BC
- 3 G ránhòu nà ge zhuàng- zhuàngjī de shìjiàn hoNn,
then that CL hit air.crash DE event PRT
- 4 J en.
BC
- 5 G en: jiù shì shūo, gāng kāishǐ de shíhòu hoNn,
uh just be say just start DE time PRT
- 6 G hǎoxiàng túrán tīng dào zhè zhǒng xiāoxí-
seem suddenly hear arrive this kind news
- 7 G zhēnde shì bù néng xiāngxìn ê.
really be NEG can believe PRT

8 J a nǐ shì yòng tīng de o?
 PRT 2_{SG} be use hear DE PRT

G1: The aircraft was hijacked,

J2: Mhm.

G3: ...and then that air crash...

J4: Uh-huh.

G5-7: ...that is, when all of a sudden I heard this kind of news I just
 couldn't believe it...

J8: Oh, so you heard it?

J's two backchannels *mhm* and *en* in lines 2 and 4 not only show her attention to G's reporting, but also indicate that she has no intention of disrupting G's speakership. Significantly, J does not take the floor until G attaches *ê* to his utterance in line 7.

In example (11), speaker F reports to her friend C what she has learned from a book she read several days ago. Prior to this excerpt, F has told C that according to the book she read, entrepreneurs seem to have more time than ordinary people because they always make the whole company work for them. F takes the famous Taiwanese entrepreneur Wang Yung-ching (Wáng Yǒngqìng) as an example to support her argument.

(11) 1 F nǐ xiǎng xiǎng kàn o,
 2_{SG} think think see PRT

2 F Wáng Yǒngqìng tā yǒu sì wàn de yuángōng o,
 PN 3_{SG} have four ten.thousand DE employee PRT

3 C mhm.
 BC

→ 4 F nà tā de shíjiān jiù shì wǒmen de jǐ bèizi le ê.
 that 3_{SG} DE time just be 1_{PL} DE several life ASP PRT

5 C mhmhmhm.
 BC

- 6 F suǒyǐ wèishénme rénjiā zhuàn de qián bǐ wǒmen hái duō.
 so why 3_{SG} earn DE money than 1_{PL} still more
- 7 C mhmhmm.
 BC
- 8 F duì bú duì?
 right NEG right
- 9 C duì a↑.
 right PRT

F1-2: Consider Wang Yung-ching; he has forty thousand employees.

C3: Mhm.

F4: The time he has is equal to several of our life times.

C5: Mhmhmm.

F6: So (that's) why he makes much more money than we do.

C7: Mhmhmm.

F8: Right?

C9: Right.

In lines 1–2, F first uses two *o*-attached utterances, to “register a heightened sense of newsworthiness of the event being reported” (P. Wu 2005: 983). In line 4, F attaches the UFP *ê* to her concluding remark. Acknowledging C’s second backchannel *mhmhmm* in line 5, which shows that she is not willing to take the floor at this moment, F continues her turn by making a further elaboration and then makes her second attempt: deploying a question *duì bú duì* ‘right’ to directly invite C to take the floor, i.e. to answer the question. F’s request is then accepted by C, who finally takes the turn and gives a preferred answer *duì a* ‘right’ in line 9.

In contrast to examples (10) and (11), example (12) shows that the UFP *ê* can be attached to a piece of information which is prominent or noticeable. Here, speaker D tells the interlocutor K what he knows about the reaction of Americans to the September 11 attacks.

- (12) 1 D Měiguó rén yǒu yìxiē mán búcuò de biǎoxiàn,
 U.S. person have some quite not.bad DE performance

- 2 D xiàng nà ge- nà ge shéi a↓,
like that CL that CL who PRT
- 3 D nà ge fènghuángǔ a↓,
that CL Julia.Roberts PRT
- 4 D wa tā yī juān hǎoxiàng shì yì bǎi wàn=
PRT 3_{SG} one donate seem be one hundred ten.thousand
- 5 D =háishì liǎng bǎi wàn měijīn ê.
or two hundred ten.thousand dollar PRT
- 6 K mhmhumhum.
BC
- 7 D on wǒ juéde zhè- zhè- zhè ge- zhè ge rén de=
PRT 1_{SG} think this this this CL this CL person DE
- 8 D =biǎoxiàn jiù xiāngdāng búcuò.
performance then quite not.bad
- D1-5: Americans have done some quite good things. For example,
that...what's her name again? Julia Roberts. Wow! She apparently
donated one or two million dollars in one go.
- K6: Huhhuh.
- D7-8: That was really good.

Here, we can see that D's *ê*-attached utterance in lines 4–5 foregrounds a piece of information, which obviously contradicts his expectation.⁴ As K rejects D's invitation to take the next turn, D makes a following elaboration containing a piece of information that is relevant to what he has just said. In line 7, D's elaboration contains a series of the “pause markers” *zhè* ‘this’ and *zhège* ‘this’ (cf. Huang 1999: 88). This can be seen as evidence that K's reaction is counter to D's expectation and he is not fully prepared to continue his own turn.

⁴ This utterance is prefaced by the interjection *wa*, indicating the speaker's surprise. It is similar to *wow* in English.

Although the use of *ê* in (10)–(12) is a way to create a space for the interlocutor to respond in a long informing turn, the interlocutor always has the possibility to accept or reject the speaker's invitation. A comparison of the three examples presented above reveals the following: in (10), the interlocutor J accepts the invitation and takes the floor by asking a question that is relevant to the *ê*-attached information. However, in (11) and (12), the backchannels of both hearers (line 5 of C in (11) and line 6 of K in (12)) show that they are aware of the invitation but want to pass the opportunity to take the floor at that moment. Acknowledging the rejection, the speakers (F in (11) and D in (12)) take different measures to manage this problem: In (11), the speaker F takes another turn-allocation technique (i.e. asking a question) and invites C again to take the floor. In (12), the speaker D continues his turn by making a further elaboration.

So far I have demonstrated how *ê* is used to foreground a piece of information in a reporting turn and how it is related to the interlocutors' interaction. Example (13) demonstrates how *ê* is attached to the assessment by the speaker when occurring in his/her own reporting turn. Prior to excerpt (13), speaker M has told the interlocutor K about a terrible experience of one of his customers who parked his car in an underground parking garage. During a flood in the summer, the customer's car was submerged in water for seven days.

- (13) 1 M bāokuò wǒ kèhù nà yí dòng yě shì,
 include 1_{SG} customer that one CL also be
- 2 M a jī shuǐ qī tiān, yīnwèi láibují-
 PRT accumulate water seven day because too.late
- 3 K nà chēzi yòu tuō bù chūlai, pào zài lǐmiàn
 that car again drag NEG out sink at water
- 4 M duì a↑, nǐ xiǎng kànkàn yī bù chē pào qī tiān,
 right PRT 2_{SG} think see one CL car soak seven day
- 5 M wa nà- nà bùdéliǎo ê.
 PRT that that terrible PRT
- 6 M duì a↑. suǒyǐ- (smack)
 right PRT so

7 M zhè yī bùfèn wǒ shì juéde shì bú shì-
 this one part I_{SG} be think be NEG shì

M1-2: And then this building where my customer lives, the water came in for seven days, because it was too late to...

K3: The cars could not be dragged out and drowned.

M4-7: Right. Imagine, a car being soaked for seven days. Wow, that's amazing...right, so, I wonder whether this...

In line 5, M uses a *wa*-prefaced assessment to show his surprise to what he has reported in lines 1–2 and 4. Here, his own assessment is attached by *ê*, as to invite the hearer K to respond (for example, make another assessment). However, K does not respond as hoped by M. M's following turn in line 6 (containing a token of self confirmation *duì a* 'right', an incomplete turn initiated with *suǒyǐ* 'so', a few pauses and then a smack) signals that K's reaction is counter to his expectation and he is not yet prepared to continue his own turn.

The following example demonstrates that sometimes the UFP *ê* can be attached to phrases showing the speaker's insufficient knowledge such as *bù xiǎodé/bù zhīdào* 'I don't know' or *wàngjì le* 'I forgot'. In (14), Y and B are talking about the aforementioned sexual scandal involving a Taiwanese politician. Before this excerpt, B has told her colleague Y that she underwent a surgery when this scandal broke out, so she missed most of the discussions on TV and in the office.

- (14) 1 Y a zhīhòu hěn duō xīnwén bāguà shènzhì nà ge-
 PRT after very many news gossip even that CL
- 2 Y Lǐ Tāo nà jiémù dōu zài jiǎng a↑.
 PN that program all at say PRT
- 3 B duì a↑. fǎnzhèng hǎoxiàng nà yí duàn shí-
 right PRT anyway seem that one CL time
- 4 B nà yí duàn shíjiān-
 that one CL time

- 5 B *bù xiǎodé ê,*
 NEG know PRT
- 6 B *tiāntiān hǎoxiàng- tiāntiān de xīnwén dōu shì-*
 everyday seem everyday DE news all be
- 7 B *dōu shì tā de xīnwén jiù shì le.*
 all be 3_{SG} DE news just be PRT
- 8 Y *qíshí tā yǒu ge yánxùxìng,*
 actually 3_{SG} have CL continuity
- Y1-2: Later it was mentioned in many news programs, entertainment news; even the program of Li Tao had it.
- B3-7: Right. Anyway, it seems that at that time, at that time, ... don't know, apparently every day- you can watch news report about her, everyday, (it's) just like that.
- Y8: Actually it had a certain kind of continuity...

Phrases such as *bù xiǎode/bù zhīdào* 'I don't know' usually indicate that the speaker does not have sufficient knowledge to answer a certain question, or, in the words of Baumgarten and House (2010:1194) "the inability to supply information." In her study of *I don't know* in English, Tsui (1991: 621) claims that "in prefacing a statement with a declaration of insufficient knowledge, the speaker signals that s/he is not committed to the truth of the proposition expressed, hence leaving room for him/herself to retreat from the original position, if challenged." I think Tsui's claim can also be applied to the use of similar phrases in Mandarin. Note that B's agreement turns in lines 3–4, which contains *hǎoxiàng* 'seemingly', the restart and the pause after this repeated phrase *nà yí duàn shíjiān* 'at that time', already reveals her uncertainty about what to say. In line 5, B's insertion of the *ê*-attached utterance *bù xiǎode ê* 'I don't know' not only highlights her uncertainty about her assertion, but also shows her intention to offer an opportunity for the hearer Y to contribute, even though this is part of her own informing turn. As the hearer Y does not respond to this invitation immediately, B continues with her turn. However, we can see that in lines 6–7, B's following elaboration contains *hǎoxiàng* 'seemingly', a few restarts and *jiùshì le* 'just like that'. This not only shows that she is still uncertain about this

topic and not prepared for an answer, but also displays her intention to close the current topic.⁵

5.4.2 ê in topic-introduction/topic-shift

Some ê-attached utterances occur in contexts where the speaker intends to introduce a new conversational topic or to shift the current topic to another. In this kind of context, by attaching ê to a piece of newly-introduced information (see (15)–(17)) or to his/her own assessment on what has been talked about in prior context (see (18) and (19)), the speaker expects the interlocutor to make a relevant next turn to this ê-attached utterance (i.e. new topic).

The following excerpt is taken from the same conversation as example (1) in chapter 1. Speakers D and L in example (15) were classmates when they were in junior high school. Before this excerpt, they have exchanged experiences about private tutorial classes. L told D that she joined a mathematic tutorial class when she was in junior high school.

- (15) 1 D shùxué o? nǐ yǒu bǔ shùxué o?
 math PRT 2_{SG} have coach math PRT
- 2 L mhm.
 BC
- 3 D wǒ zěnmē bú jìdé?
 1_{SG} how NEG remember
- 4 D nǐ shì guóyī de shíhòu?
 2_{SG} be seventh.grade DE time
- 5 L wǒ bú jìdé shénme shíhòu bǔ de.
 1_{SG} NEG remember what time coach DE
- 6 D wǒ kàn nǐ guó'èr hǎoxiàng yě méi yǒu-
 1_{SG} see 2_{SG} eighth.grade seem also NEG have

⁵ In her study of the use of *jiùshì* in Taiwan Mandarin, Huang (2010: 62) claims that *jiùshì* can be used to reveal the speaker's intention to "close the current topic," "shift to another topic" or "close the conversation."

→ 7 L wǒ yě bǔ guò yīngwén ê.
 1_{SG} also join ASP English PRT

8 D yīngwén(.) shì shéi?
 English be who

D1: Math? Have you ever taken math tutorial classes?

L2: Mhm.

D3-4: How could I not remember that? Did you take the class when you
 were in seventh grade?

L5: I don't remember when I took the class...

D6: I think when you were in eighth grade, you didn't take-

L7: I also took the English tutorial class!

D8: English? Who was it [the teacher]?

Both speakers are talking about L's personal experience. Obviously, compared to D, L has a better access to this issue. She has a higher "epistemic authority" (Heritage and Raymond 2005, Raymond and Heritage 2006). D's questions in line 1 and line 4, as well as the utterance *wǒ zěnmě bú jìdé* 'how could I not remember that' in line 3 reveal the fact that she does not have the same access to the referent *bù shùxué* 'taking math tutorial class' as L. However, D's following assessment in line 6 implies that she is very familiar with L's personal past, in this case even more than L herself. This in turn can be seen as a challenge to L's epistemic authority, since their conversation is related to L's own experience. D's assertion is soon interrupted by L's *ê*-attached utterance, which introduces a piece of new information about her own personal experience. This shifting of the current topic to another is a "disaffiliative act" signaling the "lack of interest in the current speaker and the topic" (Makri-Tsilipakou 1994: 409). As demonstrated in the previous section, the UFP *ê* serves to invite the interlocutor to respond.

I argue that the deployment of *ê* here not only foregrounds the *ê*-attached information, but also invites a further move of collaboration. That is, by adding *ê*, the speaker creates a space for the interlocutor to respond to this *ê*-attached information. In this way, the speaker L can downgrade the impact of her move in line 7 (i.e. an interruption in combination with a claim of her own epistemic authority). The attachment of *ê* can be regarded as a kind of mitigation strategy: the speaker challenges the hearer and, at the same time, offers space to be re-challenged. D's fol-

lowing turn in line 8 shows that D receives L's invitation by posing a question related to the *ê*-attached information. The current conversation is thus smoothly shifted to the new topic (i.e. English tutorial class).

Note that although the speaker can put his/her offer of space for response on the table with the deployment of *ê*, it is up to the interlocutor to decide whether s/he will accept or reject this offer. In some cases, the *ê*-attached utterance is combined with other turn-allocation techniques in order to make sure that the collaboration is accomplished, as shown in (16). A few minutes prior to this excerpt, speakers H and L had been discussing a video released by a Taiwanese tabloid, then they started another topic about politics. Just before the beginning of this excerpt, H has told L that she has no interest in politics. In line 1, H's explanation is interrupted by L's *ê*-attached utterance, with a piece of new information related to the preceding topic (the video) they have discussed a few minutes ago.

- (16) 1 H qíshí zhèngzhì rénwù dàbùfèn dōu-
 actually politics figure mostly all
- 2 L wǎnglù shàng hái yǒu fēnxī ê. nǐ zhīdào ma?
 internet up still have analyze PRT 2_{SG} know PRT
- 3 H fēnxī shéi?
 analyze who
- 4 L jiù shì fēnxī shénme @@ hěn hǎoxiào.
 just be analyze what (laughter) very funny
- H1: Actually most of the politicians are...
- L2: There was some analysis on the Internet. Do you know that?
- H3: Analysis of whom?
- L4: Analysis of the...(laughter), very funny.

As Sacks et al. claim, "an addressed question selects its addressee to speak next" (1974: 716). The phrase *nǐ zhīdào ma* 'do you know that' in line 2 can be regarded as an additional strategy to ensure that the hearer makes a collaborative move. Here, H's response (i.e. a question related to the *ê*-attached information) in line 3 shows her acceptance of L's invitation to take the floor and discuss the topic L has introduced.

The following dialogue exemplifies a case in which the *ê*-attached utterance is prefaced by a turn-initial particle *ei* with rising contour. Just before this excerpt, the daughter P has reported the contents of her university courses. In lines 1–2, P explains why the study load is heavier in the second semester. Her mother W, however, introduces a new piece of information attached by *ê* and thereby shifts the current conversation topic to the next.

- (17) 1 P suǒyǐ xià xuéqí huì bǐ shàng xuéqí gèng máng,
so next semester will compare up semester even busy
- 2 P yīnwèi wǒmen hái yào jiān- jiān nà zhǒng
because 1_{PL} still must double double that kind
- 3 P [zhìzuòrén de gōngzuò.
producer DE work
- 4 W [ei↑ wǒ kàn dào bào shàng jiǎng shuō hoNn,
PRT 1_{SG} see arrive newspaper up say say PRT
- 5 W àoměi gōngguān hoNn, yǒu yī ge-
PN public.relation PRT have one CL
- 6 P mhm.
BC
- 7 W tā bù zhīdào shì dào- dào shénme zhǔguǎn le,
3_{SG} NEG know be arrive arrive what director PRT
- 8 W tā shì nǐmen de nà ge xuéjiě ye.
3_{SG} be 2_{PL} DE that CL senior.schoolmate PRT
- 9 P xuéjiě? jiào shénme míngzi?
senior.schoolmate call what name

P1-3: So I will be even busier in the second semester than in the first semester, because we will have to be producers [apart from being a journalist].

- W4-5: Ei, I have read in the newspaper that there is one person in Ogilvy & Mather...
- P6: Mhm.
- W7-8: She...I am not sure what kind of leading position she holds...she is a senior student at your department!
- P9: A senior student? What's her name?

Note that W's turn from lines 4–5 to lines 7–8 is prefaced by a turn-initial particle *ei* (with rising contour). As mentioned earlier, Tsai (2008: 1025) claims that this turn-initial *ei* with a rising contour “projects the upcoming talk to involve in some kind of shift and to be something unanticipated.” As *ê* serves to foreground the information to which it is attached and to invite the interlocutor to respond, the attachment of UFP *ê* is compatible with this kind of *ei*-prefaced utterance, because it can mitigate the impact of this kind of “disaffiliative move.” In other words, it shows the speaker's collaborative intention to ensure a successfully accomplished interaction regardless of the unanticipated information. As we can see in line 8, P accepts the invitation by requiring more information about the new topic provided by W. The conversational topic is thus shifted smoothly.

Examples (15)–(17) again show how the speaker introduces or shifts the conversational topic with an *ê*-attached information. The examples show that the *ê*-attached assessment can also be used to introduce or shift the topic. This use is quite similar to what we have discussed above. It sometimes occurs when the speaker thinks that something in the prior talk deviates from her assumption or expectation. In example (18), the speaker L is an English teacher who works at a private English school. D, her junior schoolmate, asks her about the number of students in her class.⁶

- (18) 1 D a tāmen- yī ge dàgài- zhōngbān-
 PRT 3_{PL} one CL probably middle.class
- 2 D xiàng zhōngbān nàme dà=
 like middle.class that old
- 3 D =xiǎopéngyǒu jǐ ge- jǐ ge rén yī ge bān?
 children how.many CL how.many CL person one CL class

⁶ In this excerpt, *zhōngbān*, lit. ‘middle group’, refers to the second group in kindergarten.

- 4 L wǒmen bān yǒu shísi ge.
 1_{PL} class have fourteen CL
- 5 D ei↓ shísi ge hěn duō ê.
 PRT fourteen CL very many PRT
- 6 L hěn duō a↑. duì a↑.
 very many PRT right PRT

D1-3: Eh, they- one- probably- pre-kindergarten...the kids at the age of pre-kindergarten...how many students are there in one class?

L4: There are fourteen students in my class.

D5: Fourteen? That's a lot!

L6: That's a lot, yeah.

In line 5, D first deploys a turn-initial particle *ei* (with falling contour) to get L's attention,⁷ then attaches *ê* to foreground her assessment of a part of the information provided by L in line 4, which is to D's surprise. As L takes the floor and makes a relevant next turn, the focus of this conversation is shifted from "the number of students" to "the huge number of student per class." The co-occurrence of *ei* at the beginning of the utterance in line 5 and the deployment of *ê* at its end is therefore by no means coincidental. First the speaker draws the hearer's attention to an upcoming piece of information. This piece of information is then foregrounded with *ê*, which also invites the hearer to respond.

Example (19) is taken from the same example as (18). Here, D asks L about her students' age. After hearing L's response that she also teaches pre-kindergarten kids, D deploys an *ê*-attached assessment to show her surprise and invites L to respond. Since L's response *mhm* shows that she is not willing to take the floor, D explicitly elaborates the contrast between her own expectation and the information given in the preceding talk in lines 6–7. After the failure of her first invitation in line 4, D changes her tactic in line 6–7 by directly requiring L to respond to what has been foregrounded.

⁷ I follow Tsai's argument that the particle *ei* with a falling contour can be seen as an "attention getter" (2008: 1023).

- (19) 1 D ei↓ shì duō dà de xiǎopéngyǒu?
 PRT be many big DE kid
- 2 L wǒ cóng zhōngbān dào guó'èr dōu yǒu.
 1_{SG} from pre-kindergarten arrive eighth.class all have
- 3 L duì a↑. jiù shì bùtóng de-
 right PRT just be different DE
- 4 D zhōngbān hěn xiǎo ê.
 pre-kindergarten very small PRT
- 5 L mhm.
 BC
- 6 D yòuzhiyuán jiù yǒu zài bǔxí yīngwén o?
 kindergarten just have at tutor English PRT
- 7 D bú shì xuéxiào jiù huì jiāo?
 NEG be school just will teach

D1: How old are the kids at school?

L2-3: From pre-kindergarten kids to eighth class. Right, they are in different-

D4: Pre-kindergarten kinds? So young!

L5: Mhm.

D6-7: The kids in kindergarten already have English tutorial classes?
 Isn't that taught in primary school?

One instance of *ê* usage that is not attested in my data but that, according to my observation, nonetheless exists is the opening of a new conversation without any previous context. A typical situation would be the following: Two persons are watching TV. One person turns the head, looks outside the window and realizes that it is raining. It would be quite natural to inform the other person about this observation with the *ê*-attached utterance: *xià yǔ le ê* 'it's raining'. Compared to its *ê*-less coun-

terpart *xià yǔ le* ‘it’s raining’, the deployment of the *ê*-attached utterance shows the speaker’s expectation to receive a response.

Thus far I have demonstrated how the UFP *ê* is used in storytelling/reporting sequences and topic introduction/shift. I propose that its use is two-fold: on the one hand, it can foreground the information/assessment to which it is attached, i.e. to inform the interlocutor that the *ê*-attached information/assessment needs to be registered; on the other hand, it invites further collaboration, i.e. offers a chance for the hearer to produce a next turn relating to the information/assessment attached by *ê*). In the following sections, I will show the occurrences of *ê* in two other types of contexts in responsive positions.

5.4.3 *ê* in qualified disagreement/upgraded agreement

When *ê* is used in a disagreeing responsive turn, it is usually attached to a piece of newly-introduced information (see (20)–(22)) or the speaker’s disagreeing assessment (see (23)). That is, when the speaker thinks that something in the prior conversation may have been misconceived because a piece of information has not been presented or foregrounded, s/he will attach *ê* to this missing information, hoping that the misconception can be reconsidered or corrected. Or s/he will attach *ê* to his/her own assessment, in order to provide another point of view on the issue in question. As *ê* implies an invitation for the interlocutor to respond, the *ê*-attached disagreement is qualified (i.e. less strong) and sounds more negotiable, or even like a reminder, as if saying: “Here is something you may have missed/here is what I think, what is your opinion?”

Prior to the conversation in (20), J and F have been talking about their own experiences when taking exams in junior high school. F tells her elder sister J about her experience that the class next door would discuss the answer of the same test loudly so that students in her class could directly write down the answers. She asks her sister whether she had a similar experience.

- (20) 1 J nǐ shuō zài gébi bān o?
 2_{SG} say at next.door class PRT
- 2 F duì a↑.
 right PRT
- 3 J bù kěnéng ba.
 NEG possible PRT

- 4 J wǒmen bān(.) kǎo de dōu bǐ biérén duō,
 2_{PL} class test DE all than other.person many
- 5 J suǒyǐ wǒmen zài kǎo de shíhòu, tāmen-
 so 2_{PL} at test DE time 3_{PL}
- 6 F wǒmen yǒu fāshēng zhè zhǒng qíngxíng ê.
 2_{PL} have happen this kind situation PRT
- 7 J hoNn.
 BC
- 8 F jīhū yíban yǐshàng dōu yībǎi.
 almost half above all hundred
- J1: You mean the class next door?
 F2: Yes.
 J3-5: That's impossible. My class always had more tests than others. So
 when we took our tests, they...
 F6: We had this kind of experience!
 J7: Oh.
 F8: Almost half of the class got 100 points.

In line 3, J's assertion *bù kěnéng ba* 'that's impossible' and the following elaboration are interrupted by F's *ê*-attached information in line 6. Here, by foregrounding the information related to her own experience, F indicates that J's assertion might be wrong and at the same time invites J to make a relevant response (for example, to reconsider her misconception or adjust her assertion). However, J's response *hoNn* in line 7 is only a backchannel⁸ and shows that J is not willing to take the floor for the moment. F thus makes a relevant elaboration about the *ê*-attached information herself.

Prior to the dialogue in excerpt (21), the daughter D and her mother M have been discussing a plan to run a restaurant near the famous department store

⁸ I. Li (1999: 73) states that the free-standing *hoNn* is used as a backchannel, which shows the speaker's intention to play a listener's role during the other interlocutor's talk.

jīnghuáchéng ‘Living Mall’ in Taipei. In line 1, D asks M what she would sell if she runs such a restaurant. M then says that she wants to sell traditional Taiwanese snacks such as thin oyster noodles (*o5a2mi7suann3*) or rice noodle soup (*bi2hun2thng1*), which are easily produced.

- (21) 1 D nà nǐ xīwàng mài shénme?
 that 2_{SG} hope sell what
- 2 M a(.) yuè jiǎndān yuè hǎo a↑.
 PRT more simple more good PRT
- 3 M [< S o5a2mi7suann3 la bi2hun2thng1 na S> @@
 oyster.thin.noodles PRT rice.noodle.soup PRT (laughter)
- 4 D [hoNn. @@
 PRT (laughter)
- 5 M nà ge zui- zui kuài de zui jiǎndān de la↓.
 that CL the.most the most fast DE the.most simple DE PRT
- 6 D zài jīnghuáchéng ê.
 at PN PRT
- 7 M duì a↑. nà biān yǒu a↑. yǒu nà zhǒng xiǎodiàn la↓.
 right PRT that side have PRT have that kind small.shop PRT
- D1: Then what do you want to sell?
M2-3: Something that is easy to make. For example, thin oyster noodles
 or rice noodle soup (laughter).
D4: Oh (laughter).
M5: The faster, the easier, the better
D6: In LIVING MALL!
M7: Right. There are many such shops there.

In line 6, D attaches *ê* to her utterance. As both M and D know what kind of big department store “Living Mall” is, the *ê*-attached information is not new. However, by foregrounding this *ê*-attached information (i.e. reiterate the name of the depart-

ment store), D not only shows that M's proposal is not what she expected, but also expresses the hope that M can correct this misconception by herself on the basis of the presented information (i.e. running a restaurant selling cheap food in the neighborhood of a big department store is not appropriate). In other words, with the deployment of *ê*, D creates a space for M to justify her claim. In line 7, M receives D's invitation to make a relevant response (i.e. providing an account for her previous utterances in lines 2–3 and 5).

Example (22) shows how a speaker tries to invite the interlocutor to reconsider his/her misconception by deploying a series of *ye*. Before this segment, the male speaker M has told the female speaker F that he saw many female university students wearing high heels on campus and he found it odd. The female speaker F has told him that there was nothing strange about it.

(22) (Chui and Lai 2008, modified transcription, glosses and translation)

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------|------------|------------|-------------------|------|-----|------|-----|--------|------|
| 1 M | | hóngsè | zhènhóngsè | gāogēnxié= | | | | | | | |
| | | red | bright.red | high.heels | | | | | | | |
| 2 M | | =nǐ | shàng | kè | zhèyàng chuān ma? | | | | | | |
| | | 2 _{SG} | attend | class | this.way wear PRT | | | | | | |
| 3 F | | yǒu | a↑. | | | | | | | | |
| | | have | PRT | | | | | | | | |
| → 4 M | | nà | ge | hóngsè | ye. | | | | | | |
| | | that | CL | red | PRT | | | | | | |
| 5 F | | yǒu | la↓ | yǒu | la↓ | | | | | | |
| | | have | PRT | have | PRT | | | | | | |
| → 6 M | | nà | ge | hóngsè | ye. | | | | | | |
| | | that | CL | red | PRT | | | | | | |
| 7 F | | yǒu | la↓ | yǒu | la↓ | yǒu | la↓ | yǒu | la↓ | zhēnde | la↓. |
| | | have | PRT | have | PRT | have | PRT | have | PRT | really | PRT |

- 8 M chuān qù shàng kè ye.
 wear go attend class PRT
- 9 F méi yǒu guānxi a↑
 NEG have relation PRT
- 10 M kěshi hěn guài a↑.
 but very strange PRT

- M1-2: Red, bright red high heels...do you wear them in class?
 F3: Yeah.
 M4: Those are RED!
 F5: Yeah, yeah.
 M6: Those are RED!
 F7: Yeah, yeah...yeah, yeah...really.
 M8: In CLASS?
 F9: That doesn't matter.
 M10: But it's strange!

Here, M deploys three instances of *ê*-attached information to invite F to re-adjust her position. He first presents the information *hóngsè* 'red' in lines 4 and 6, expecting F to make a collaborative move. Acknowledging that F insists on her own position, and that she even strengthens her stance by producing four times *yǒu la* 'yes' and *zhēnde la* 'really' in line 7, M foregrounds another piece of information "(wearing red high heels) in class," trying to challenge the issue with this piece of newly-introduced information. However, F still refuses to make a collaborative move (i.e. adjust her view). In line 10, M finally makes a strong assessment, to show his disagreement of this behavior.

Example (23) illustrates the use of UFP *ê* attached to a speaker's assessment, signaling a qualified disagreement. Prior to the excerpt, L and H have been talking about a TV hostess. In line 1, L makes a negative assessment by saying that she thinks this hostess looks very artificial. Acknowledging H's question-formulated disagreement *huì ma* 'really', L repeats her assessment in line 3. In line 4, H attaches *ê* to her two disagreeing assessments.

- (23) 1 L tā chāo <S ke2 S> de hǎo bù hǎo!
 3_{SG} super fake DE good NEG good
- 2 H huì ma?
 will PRT
- 3 L duì a↑. tā chāo <S ke2 S> de!
 right PRT 3_{SG} super fake DE
- 4 H wǒ juédé tā hěn tiánměi ê.
 1_{SG} think 3_{SG} very sweet PRT
- 5 H tā xiào qǐlái hěn tiánměi ê.
 3_{SG} laugh up very sweet PRT
- 6 L tā nǎ yǒu, hǎo chǒu, érqǐě-
 3_{SG} where have good ugly besides

L1: She is super artificial, please!

H2: Really?

L3: Yes, she is super artificial!

H4-5: I think she is sweet. She has a sweet smile.

L6: No way, she is ugly, besides-

Unlike H's disagreement in line 2, which directly questions the credibility of L's assessment, her two *ê*-attached disagreements in lines 4 and 5 on the one hand underscore the assessment; on the other hand, they create a space for possible negotiation. Note that H rephrases her second disagreement in line 5: she adds *xiào qǐlái* 'the way she smiles'. This additional information presents another judgment of the referent. Compared to its "*ê*-less" counterpart, these *ê*-attached disagreeing assessments sound less strong, as if saying: "This is what I think, maybe you would like to consider this and reconsider your assessment?" In other words, this kind of disagreement is qualified and less direct.

The UFP *ê* can also be attached to utterances indicating the speaker's agreement, but there are only three examples in my data. In contrast to a disagreeing sequence, when *ê* is attached to an agreement, it usually strengthens the force of the

agreement. This is not surprising, since the core function of *ê* is to invite a collaborative move, the “invitation” itself also conveys the speaker’s collaborative attitude.

Prior to excerpt (24), the speakers C and F have been talking about environmental protection. In line 1, C tells F that she never leaves any litter on the street. In line 2, F first deploys a low-pitch utterance-initial particle *ei* to call C’s attention, then utters an *ê*-attached agreement *wǒ yě shì ê* ‘me neither’.

- (24) 1 C wǒ- wǒ juéduì bú zài wàimiàn luàn diū lèsè.
 1_{SG} 1_{SG} absolute NEG at outside messy throw rubbish
- 2 F ei↓ wǒ yě shì ê.
 PRT 1_{SG} also be PRT
- 3 F [wǒ lián- wǒ lián yī zhāng <E memo E> zhǐ o,
 1_{SG} even 1_{SG} even one CL memo paper PRT
- 4 C [hèn. zhè yī diǎn wǒ-
 PRT this one point 1_{SG}

C1: I- I never drop my litter on the street.

F2-3: ME NEITHER, even a memo note, I...

C4: Right, about this I-

In this excerpt, the use of *ê* not only highlights the positive response, but also invites a further collaborative move. F’s following supportive move in line 3 (i.e. adding an example to support F’s agreement) overlaps with C’s response in line 4. This can be seen as C’s acceptance of this invitation. Note that in line 3, F upgrades her agreement by adding a topic-related example, which show her strong collaborative attitude.⁹

⁹ Pomerantz (1984: 66) points out that “[u]pgraded agreements often occur as parts of clusters of agreements, or agreement series.”

5.4.4 ê in answers

The *ê*-attached utterances often occur in responsive position in a question-answer pair. In my data, most of these utterances are attached to a dispreferred response, for example, a “non-answer” such as *bù zhīdào* ‘I don’t know’ or a refusal.¹⁰

As I have discussed in relation to example (14), *ê* can be attached to phrases indicating the speaker’s insufficient knowledge such as *bù xiǎodé/bù zhīdào* ‘I don’t know’ or *wàngjì le* ‘I forgot’ in the speaker’s own informing turn. When *ê* occurs in a response to a question, it can likewise follow such phrases. This displays the speaker’s inability to supply a satisfactory answer. Example (25) illustrates this kind of use. Prior to this excerpt, L has told D that she plans to make use of her boyfriend’s apartment to run a language school in Xīnzhūāng, a district of New Taipei City. In this example, D asks L where precisely the school is located.

- (25) 1 D xīnzhūāng shénme lù?
 PN what road
- 2 L xīnzhūāng.
 PN
- 3 D @@ shénme lù?
 (laughter) what road
- 4 L bù zhīdào ê. kào jìn fūdà.
 NEG know PRT near Fujen.University
- 5 L [kào jìn fūdà.
 near Fujen.University
- 6 D [han tā- o tā jiā yǐqián jiù=
 PRT 3_{SG} PRT 3_{SG} home before just

¹⁰ According to Stivers and Robinson (2006: 371), non-answer responses either “display an orientation to the relevance of an answer but satisfy only the technical two-part structure of a sequence (e.g., *I don’t know*),” or “impede the progress of the sequence (e.g., initiations of repair or counters).” They claim that “although a non-answer response is a normatively viable action in response to a question, it is a dispreferred alternative.”

7 D [[=zhù zài nà fùjìn o?
 live at that neighborhood PRT

8 L [[duì a↑ duì a↑ duì a↑
 right PRT right PRT right PRT

D1: Which street in Xīnzhūāng?

L2: Xīnzhūāng ...

D3: (laughter) Which street?

L4-5: Don't know. Somewhere near Fujen University, near Fujen.

D6-7: What he- oh, he lived somewhere near (the university) before?'

L8: Right, right, right.'

In line 4, L uses *ê* to indicate her inability to provide a satisfactory answer. Her subsequent imprecise elaboration *kào jìn Fūdà* 'near Fujen University' also reveals her inability to supply accurate information. Meanwhile, by using *ê*, L also shows her wish to invite D to contribute to the progress of the conversation, for example, by taking the next turn, as if saying: "I don't know, maybe you do?"

Note that in line 4, there are two pauses. One is after the *ê*-attached utterance; the other is after the subsequent elaboration. These two pauses reinforce the speaker's invitation for the hearer's collaboration. In line 8, L's deployment of three agreeing tokens *duì a* 'right' overlaps with part of D's utterance in line 6 (note that L starts to give the positive response before D finishes her statement. This move reveals L's belief that she understands what D intends to say). Following Pomerantz's (1984: 69) claim that "when agreement is invited, strong or upgraded agreements are performed with a minimization of gap (in fact, frequently in slight overlap)," I argue that L's move in line 8 expresses her cooperative attitude and strong agreement with the truth of the proposition of D's utterance.

This brings us back to example (9) (here repeated as (26)), which is quoted from Shie (1991: 166). The wife W attaches *ye* to her answer *bù zhīdào* 'I don't know'. Similar to example (25), with the deployment of *ye*, W not merely shows her inability to supply sufficient information, but also marks her invitation to make some further collaborative moves. W also shows her intention to solicit H's support (for example, take the floor and make a next turn). As H does not respond after the *ê*-attached utterance, W continues her turn and makes a request, showing her efforts to maintain interaction.

- (26) 1 H bǎobāo qǐlái le méi?
 baby get up ASP NEG
- 2 W bù zhīdào ye!... nǐ jiào tā qǐlái a!
 NEG know PRT 2_{sg} call 3_{sg} get up PRT
- H1: Did our baby get up?
 W2: I don't know...you go and wake him up!

Example (27) demonstrates another kind of dispreferred response. Prior to the segment, the daughter P, who studies journalism at the university, has told her mother W that one of her assignments is a candidate for the “best report” competition, which is selected by vote of all the classmates. In this excerpt, W asks P whether she knows the result of this competition.

- (27) 1 W suǒyǐ nǐ shuō- hòulái piàoxuǎn shì zěnyàng?
 so 2_{SG} say after vote be how
- 2 P piàoxuǎn o, méi yǒu- wǒ méi yǒu qù kàn ê.
 vote PRT NEG have 1_{SG} NEG have go see PRT
- 3 P [wǒ méi yǒu qù kàn jiéguǒ.
 1_{SG} NEG have go see result
- 4 W [mhm.
 BC
- W1: So you said- how about the competition?
 P2-3: The competition? No- I haven't checked it. [I didn't check the result.
 W4: Mhm.

Similar to (25) and (26), P's *ê*-attached answer in this example displays her inability to provide the preferred answer: checking the result. With the attachment of *ê*, speaker P shows the imbalance between her intention of making a collaborative move and her own failure, as if saying: “I wanted to give a satisfactory answer, but here is all the information I have, what do you think?” W's immediate backchannel *mhm*

(which overlaps with P's following elaboration) actually can be seen as evidence of understanding of this move.

Example (28) demonstrates a case of *ê*-attached refusal. In this excerpt, the speaker K asks T whether she wants to see an exhibition of Van Gogh paintings. In line 2, T's "lack of commitment" is attached by *ê*. As *ê* indicates the speaker's intention to cooperate, this use makes the "refusal" sound less strong. Note that there is a 1.3 second pause after the *ê*-attached answer, which shows the speaker's attempt to invite K to take the turn.

(28) (Chui and Lai 2008, modified transcription, glosses and translation)

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|-----------------------------------|----------|------|-------|------|----------|-------|
| 1 K | um. | nǐ | yào | qù | kàn | nà | ge | fāngǔ | ma? |
| | Um | 2 _{SG} | want | go | see | that | CL | Van.Gogh | PRT |
| → 2 T | (0.8) | hái | zài | kǎolù | ê. | | | | (1.3) |
| | | still | at | consider | PRT | | | | |
| 3 T | wǒ | juédé | rén | kěnéng | huì | hěn | duō. | | |
| | 1 _{SG} | think | person | perhaps | will | very | many | | |
| 4 K | yīnwèi | cái | zhǎn | jǐ | tiān | éryǐ. | | | |
| | because | just | exhibit | several | day | just | | | |
| K1: | Um... | do you want to see the exhibition of Van Gogh? | | | | | | | |
| T2-3: | ... | I am still thinking... | I think maybe it will be crowded. | | | | | | |
| K4: | Because the exhibition only lasts a few days. | | | | | | | | |

The last examples show that the UFP *ê* can also be attached to the preferred answer to a question. One of the few examples in my data is example (29). J asks L, who has watched a certain movie in the past, whether the movie is nice. In line 2, L attaches *ê* to his assessment on this movie.

(29) (Chui and Lai 2008, transcription, glosses and translation modified)

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|-------|------|------|----------|----|
| 1 J | <S | cit4 | chut4 | kam2 | ho2 | khuann3? | S> |
| | PRT | this | CL | PRT | good | see | |

- 2 L hái bú cuò ê. hěn gǎndòng.
 still NEG bad PRT very touching
- 3 J a zhǔjiǎo jiào shénme míngzi?
 PRT leading.actor call what name
- J1: Is this a good movie?
 L2: Not bad actually. It's very touching.
 J3: What's the name of the main actor?

I argue that L creates an opportunity for a further collaboration (for instance, discussion) by foregrounding his assessment. Note that there is a pause after the *ê*-attached answer. If the speaker does not add *ê* here, the utterance sounds more assertive.

As we have seen in example (8) (here repeated as (30)), quoted from Shie (1991: 165), the speaker W responds to H's question with a positive *ye*-attached answer *hui* 'will'.

- (30) 1 H nà nǐ dài jiǔ le yǎnjīng huì bú huì hóng ne?
 that 2_{SG} wear long PRT eye will NEG will red PRT
- 2 W huì ye!
 will PRT
- 3 W shēntǐ bǐjiào lèi de shíhòu a,
 body more tired DE time PRT
- 4 W yǎnjīng bǐjiào róngyì chōngxiě.
 eye more easy congested
- H1: When you wear [contact lenses] long, will your eyes become red?
 W2-4: Yes! When I was tired, I got red-eyed easily.

Shie (1991: 165) suggests that the deployment of *ye* shows W's realization that H's inquiry provides some new perspective to the conversation. Without a prior context, it is hard to judge how this claim is justified. Here, I propose a different explanation: This answer can be seen as an agreement with the proposition carried by the

question. Similar to example (24), the use of \hat{e} not only highlights the positive response, but also invites a further collaborative move. By adding a supportive elaboration, W upgrades her agreement and shows her strong collaborative attitude.

5.5 Conclusion

The core function of \hat{e} is to induce a collaborative move (either due to the \hat{e} speaker him/herself or elicited from the interlocutor) by foregrounding the utterance to which it is attached. The use of \hat{e} is usually triggered when something in the previous context is counter the speaker's assumption, or when the speaker believes something in the previous context has been misconceived because some information is missing.

With the deployment of \hat{e} , the speaker makes the utterance prominent and offers an opportunity for the interlocutor to respond. Hence, \hat{e} can mitigate a negative effect when it occurs with dispreferred moves, such as topic-shift, disagreement, or a refusal. When it occurs in a reporting turn or in preferred responses such as agreement, it enhances the interaction and strengthens the positive effect of these moves.