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ABSTRACT
The present study investigates Mandarin Chinese chufei (‘only if’ or ‘unless’) constructions in both spoken and written discourse. The results show that most chufei instances fall into the type q, chufei p in the spoken data, whereas the written data indicate the most common pattern to be chufei p, fouze (‘otherwise’) ~q. In the data, chufei can be viewed as a kind of predictive conditional, which predicts that if a desired action is/is not carried out or a desired condition is/is not fulfilled, the desired/undesired consequence would occur. In particular, chufei clauses have a recapitulative function in that they summarize what has come before. We demonstrate that speakers/writers express a particular stance of desirability versus undesirability toward a particular event through chufei constructions, based on their subjective evaluation of reality. As a marker of hypotheticality, chufei constructions are used to perform several discourse-pragmatic functions such as suggesting possibilities, giving supplementary information for emphasis or clarification, and conveying effects in expressing attitudes and opinions.

1. Background of the study
A conditional construction usually contains two parts: the protasis, a factual implication or hypothetical situation that sets the condition under which another proposition would be true, and the apodosis or consequence. Languages use a variety of constructions and verb forms to express whether the truth of a conditional is verified (factual/predictive) or unverified (hypothetical or counterfactual). For example, in English, conditions are typically introduced by if or unless and the verb forms in the protasis are marked morphosyntactically. Specifically, the presence of if or unless in the protasis instructs the hearer to treat the assumption as not being asserted by the speaker in the usual way and the verb forms in the protasis
and apodosis are used to express assumptions which the speaker is not treating as factual (Dancygier, 1993). In particular, subjunctive and counterfactual sentences signal the speaker’s negative commitment to the proposition. The use of verb forms in subjunctive and counterfactual sentences (viz. irrealis) is described as an instance of the use of distanced forms, which are widely used in English to mark hypotheticality (Dancygier, 2002). On the other hand, predicative conditionals which contain unmarked, indicative verb phrases are assumed to be interpretable along with straightforward, non-conditional indicative declaratives (Dancygier, 1993:405). In English, unless-constructions have often been compared with if conditionals. Quine (1972) argues that unless is directly related to if–not–then. However, Geis (1973) maintains that the meaning of unless is more similar to except if than to if. Similarly, Fillenbaum (1976, 1986) proposes only if as the preferred understanding for unless sentences. In a word, some unless-constructions can be paraphrased only with if not, whereas others only alternate with except if (Dancygier, 2002).

Different from English, Mandarin Chinese makes no such grammatical distinctions in the verb forms in conditionals (Li and Thompson, 1981). The type of message conveyed by a Chinese conditional construction is closely related to the context in which it occurs and the background knowledge of the hearer. A Chinese conditional clause can be introduced by jiaru, ruguo and yaoshi (similar to English ‘if’), or chufei (parallel to English ‘unless’), all of which can occur before or after the matrix clause (viz. apodosis).

The meaning of the connector chufei has been notoriously difficult to define. Early in the 1920s, there were debates on its meaning. Some viewed it as a negative conjunction, akin to English unless or if not, while some described it as a positive one, similar to Chinese zhiyou ‘only if’ or chule ‘except’ (Zhang and Liu, 2010). During the past three decades, the unique characteristics of chufei constructions have attracted Chinese linguists’ attention. Most of them have focused on the types of chufei constructions and their usage. Lu (1999) observes that chufei mainly has two meanings: chufei1 parallels to zhiyou ‘only if’ and chufei2 to ruguo bu/meiyou (‘if not’). Chufei, conveys a necessary condition, i.e., it introduces the only necessary precondition, whereas chufei2 is exclusive, consistent with Dancygier’s (2002) analysis of the English unless. The two most prominent types of chufei-structures noticed by Chao (1968), Lü (1980 [2004]), Eifring (1993), Lu (1999), Zhang (2003), and others, are concerned with the chufei clause (protasis) occurring before its matrix clause (apodosis), as shown in (1)–(2):

(1) Chufei ni qu, ta cai qu.  
Unless 2SG go, 3SG only go  (taken from Lü, 2004:125)  
‘Only if you go, will he go.’

(2) Chufei ni qu, (fouze) ta bu qu.  
Unless 2SG go (otherwise) 3SG not go  (taken from Lü, 2004:125)  
‘Unless you go, he won’t go.’  
‘You must go, otherwise he won’t go.’

In both (1) and (2) the chufei clause precedes its matrix clause, but in (1) the matrix clause contains the adverb cai (‘only’), while in (2) it can be introduced by fouze, buran, and yaoburan, similar to English ‘otherwise’, or ‘else’, or ‘if not’, which can be omitted, and it is a negative counterpart of the matrix clause in (1). Lü (1980 [2004]) holds that (1) and (2) are interchangeable. The construction schemas for (1) and (2) can be presented as Types I and II in (3) and (4) respectively:

(3) Type I: Chufei p, cai q  
(4) Type II: Chufei p, (fouze/buran) ~q*

* Lu (1999) and Chen (2009) treat this type as two types: one with fouze in the matrix clause, the other not.

To illustrate, the chufei-utterance/clause prefaces an antecedent and the utterance/clause containing cai introduces its consequent, but when signaled by fouze or buran introduces its opposite consequent. However, the interpretation of Types I and II is not determined solely by their syntactic forms. In Type I, the propositions in p and q are not in opposition, whereas in Type II, they are; i.e., the consequent in q in Type I is positive but in Type II it is negative. Chen (2009) observes that the construction chufei p, q could be ambiguous, as shown in (5).

(5) Chufei you yiwai, wo qu.  
Unless have accident, 1SG go  (taken from Chen, 2009: 51)  
‘Unless there is an accident, I will go.’

According to Chen, chufei p, q can be reversed as q, chufei p, without changing the meaning and logic. The presupposition of (5) is (6):

4 Although Geis (1973) and Dancygier (1998) do not agree that q unless p is equivalent in meaning to q if not p, Fujita (1987) notes that when unless constructions occur counterfactually, they may be considered parallel to sentences with if ... not. Actually, unless is similar in meaning to if ... not and can be used in meaning to if ... not. But it can be used instead of if ... not in certain types of conditional sentences. For example, unless with present tenses is often used when one refers to the future. Additionally, unless cannot be used in questions; it cannot be used with would to talk about unreal future situations; it cannot be used with would have to talk about unreal situations in the past, either. (retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/grammar/learnit/learnitv272.shtml on November 12, 2013).
(6) (Wo yiban hui qu,) chufei you yiwei, wo cai bu qu, 1SG usually will go unless have accident 1SG only not go
fouze, wo dou hui qu. (taken from Chen, 2009: 51)
otherwise 1SG all will go
‘I usually go, unless there is an accident, I won’t go; otherwise, I will go.’

Hence, in terms of q, chufei p, depending on the context the interpretation of (6) could be ‘I will go except when there is an accident’ (for more examples, see (15)–(17) below). As such, interpreting chufei constructions relies heavily on contextual information and implication (Yang, 2007).

In addition, Types I and II can combine and generate an extended construction (Zhang, 2003), as in (7):

(7) Type III: Chufei p, cai q; fouze/buran(,) ~q

The example for Type III is shown in (8):

(8) Chufei ni qinzi dao ta jia qu qing,
Unless 2SG by yourself to 3SG house to invite
ta cai hui lai,
3SG only will come
fouze, ta shi bu hui lai de.
Otherwise 3SG COP not will come DE
(taken from Zhang, 2003: 103)
‘Unless you go to his house to invite (him) by yourself, he won’t come, otherwise, he will come.’
‘He will only come if you go to his house to invite him, otherwise he won’t come.’ *a

*a ‘Unless’ is usually collocated with ‘not’ phrases, not positive ones in English. We cannot really directly translate it from the Chinese.

Chufei clause can occur after the matrix clause (Lü (1980 [2004]); Zhao and Liu, 2006), as shown in (9):

(9) Yao xiang rang ta qu, chufei ni qu qing ta.
 want think make 3SG go unless 2SG go invite 3SG
(lit.) ‘(If you) want him to go, invite him.’
(taken from Zhao and Liu, 2006:17)

Another example that fits into this pattern is the common saying (10):

(10) Ruo yao ren bu zhi, chufei ji mo wei.
If want people NEG know unless self NEG do
‘If (you) don’t want people to know your wrongdoing, you yourself should not do it.’

The construction schema of (9) and (10) can be represented as (11):

(11) Type IV: (Ruo/Ruguo) Yao/Xiang (~,q, chufei p

In addition to Type IV, there is another postposed chufei clause, which appears after its matrix clause; however, its preceding clause is not marked by a conditional marker, as schematized in (12):

(12) Type V: (~,q, chufei p

The examples for (12) are given in (13) and (14) respectively:

(13) Ta bu hui qu, chufei ni qu qing ta.
3SG not will go unless 2SG go invite 3SG
(taken from Zhao and Liu, 2006:17)
‘He will not go, unless you go to invite him.’

(14) Ta you zige dangxuan wei weiyuan, 3SG have qualification elected as committee member
chufei ta bu yuanyi.
unless 3SG not willing
(taken from Lu, 1999: 61)
‘He is qualified to be a committee member unless (= except if) he is not willing.’
In addition to the classification of *chufei* constructions, Zhang (2003) argues that the clause marked by *chufei* is a necessary condition. Different from Zhang, Eifring (1993) suggests that *chufei* constructions express necessary modality rather than a necessary condition. Similarly, Y. Zhang (2004) notes that the clauses *chufei* marks can have more than one alternative, forming *chufei* p1, *houze* (or ‘or’) p2. On the other hand, Chen (2009) holds that the clause marked by *chufei* could be a necessary condition, a sufficient condition, or both. As for the functions of *chufei* constructions, Zhan (2008) points out that *chufei* constructions can convey a variety of meanings, such as emphasizing the importance of the condition which it introduces or the non-changeability of its result in the second clause (i.e. the apodosis), offering a possible suggestion, presenting an exception as an elaboration, making an inference to express the speaker’s subjectivity, and the like. However, Zhan’s analysis does not consider the position of *chufei* clauses with respect to their matrix clauses, for the proposed (occurring before the matrix clause) or postposed (occurring after the matrix clause) *chufei* clauses may perform different functions. In examining the pragmatic functions of *chufei* constructions, Zhao and Liu (2006) classify *chufei* constructions into three types. The first type puts an emphasis on the necessity of the condition; the second, on the absoluteness of the consequent, and the third, on the universality of the consequent. When a *chufei* clause introduces a unique, necessary condition, it emphasizes the uniqueness and necessity of the condition for fulfilling the consequent. When it indicates the absoluteness of the consequent, it implies that the condition cannot be achieved and that the occurrence of the consequent is impossible or highly improbable (i.e. irrealis). But if it marks the universality of the consequent, it means the occurrence of the consequent is possible under an exception introduced by *chufei*, though the possibility is rather low. Zhao and Liu further argue that if the *chufei*-structure is used to emphasize the universality of the result in a real contingent condition, it has three syntactic forms, as in (15)–(17), taken from Zhao and Liu (2006:22):

(15) *Chufei* linshi you shi, (fouze) ta yiding hui lai.  
‘Unless temporarily have things otherwise 3SG certainly will come’

(16) Ta yiding hui lai, *chufei* linshi you shi.  
‘He will certainly come, unless temporarily have things (otherwise, he won’t).’

(17) *Chufei* linshi you shi, ta cai hui bu lai.  
‘Only if he happens to have something else to do, will he not come (otherwise, he will).’

According to Zhao and Liu, (15)–(16) can be interchangeable without changing the meaning.

As for the grammaticalization of *chufei*, both Hu and Lei (2007) and Xi (2010) point out that *chufei* acts as both a preposition and a conjunction. *Chufei* is a grammaticalized product of the preposition *chu* (‘except’) plus the negative *fei* (‘not’). According to Hu and Lei, when it acts as a preposition, it is similar to *chu(le) ‘apart from…’ or ‘except for…’. *Chufei* developed into a conjunction in the late Tang Dynasty (836–907 AD) and the patterns of *chufei* . . . *bu* (‘not’) and *chufei* . . . *cai* (‘only’) came from the negative and positive forms of the same structure with the same meaning in its diachronic development. Some previous studies argue that *chufei* . . . *bu* (‘not’) is equal to *chule* (‘except’), introducing a sufficient condition, while *chufei* . . . *cai* (‘only’) is equal to *zhiyou* (‘only if’), introducing a necessary condition. But Hu and Lei contend that such an argument is incorrect; rather, they hold that both patterns introduce necessary and sufficient conditions. Similarly, Xi (2010) maintains that *chufei* p, *bu* (‘not’) q came from *chufei* p, *cai* (‘only’) q, and *chufei* p, *fouze* bu q is used when the negative result is emphasized.

Different from the previous studies, Yang (2007) takes such cognitive approaches as information structure, Construction Grammar (Fillmore et al., 1988; Goldberg, 1995), and Theory of Mental Spaces (Fauconnier, 1985, 1994) to investigate *chufei* constructions, which are termed ‘exceptional conditionals’ like English *unless* constructions. An exceptional conditional tracks two sequences of events; the event expressed in p (the protasis), introduced by *unless* or *chufei*, which is an exceptional situation and the proposition described in q (the apodosis) which is the effect of the default (unmarked or normal) situation. For example, in (18):

(18) Unless it rains tomorrow, the game will not be cancelled.  
(taken from Yang, 2007: 107)

the rain event, as conveyed in the protasis, is an exceptional situation causing the cancellation of the game; however, the proposition expressed in the apodosis is the effect of the default situation in which it does not rain tomorrow. Yang observes that Mandarin exceptional conditional constructions have to be marked by a pair of linking devices in both the protasis and the apodosis, not just the protasis alone as in English. She analyzes two types of *chufei* conditionals. In one type, the apodosis linker *cai* emphasizes the consequence caused by the protasis, as shown in (19):

(19)
Here, the *chufei* *p*, *cai* *q* construction indicates that *p* is an exceptive situation and *q* happens only because of *p*, i.e., *p* is the unique condition to *q*. The second type of exceptive constructions uses the apodosis linker *fouze* or *buran* to highlight the effect in the exceptive situation, as in (20):

(20) Chufei women like zuo hao yesheng dongwu
    CHUFIEI we immediately do well wild animal
    baoyu gongzuo, conservation job
    fouze jingji zhicai suishi hui jianglin.
    otherwise economic sanction anytime will fall upon

‘Unless we do a good job of wild life conservation immediately, economic sanctions could hit us sometime soon.’

In (20), *fouze* shows that the event described in the apodosis (*q*) is an effect of a default situation. According to Yang, the use of *cai* can emphasize the uniqueness of a situation, while that of *fouze/buran*, the defaultness of a situation. In terms of figure-ground alignment, *chufei* . . . *cai* . . . foregrounds the exceptive situation caused by *p*; and *chufei* . . . *fouze/buran* . . . foregrounds the default situation that is not caused by *p*.

In a similar vein, Liu and Zhang (2011) look at *chufei* *p*, *cai* *q* and *chufei* *p*, (*fouze*) *q* from a perspective of Focus Theory and Scalar Model, as proposed by Ducrot (1973), Fauconnier (1975), Fillmore et al. (1988), Kay (1990), and Israel (2001). Liu and Zhang observe that there are two meanings in *chufei* constructions: a necessary condition and an excluding condition, in terms of semantic events from Frame Semantics. For example, (21) below can have two readings if it is used to describe two different events:

(21) Chufei gua feng, mingtian bu bisai.
    CHUFIEI blow wind tomorrow not contest
    ‘Only if the wind blows heavily, will the contest be cancelled/ held tomorrow.’

If it refers to an outdoor badminton contest, (21) can be interpreted as ‘If the wind blows, the contest will not be held’. However, if it refers to a flying kite contest, (21) can be interpreted as ‘If it does not blow, the contest will not be held.’ In the semantic event of an outdoor badminton contest, the *p* (*gua feng* ‘wind blows’), which is a necessary condition for *~q* (*bu bisai* ‘not hold the contest’), will not be held. In the semantic event of a kite flying contest, the *p* (*gua feng* ‘blow winds’) is an excluding condition for *~q* (*bu bisai* ‘not hold the contest’). According to Liu and Zhang (2011), the two main types of the logic relations between *p* and *~q* (necessary and excluding conditions) can be further divided into three subtypes under each of the two main types: *p* is a necessary, sufficient, or both necessary and sufficient condition for *~q*, according to Focus Theory and Scalar Model.

Although both Yang’s (2007) and Liu and Zhang’s (2011) analyses are illuminating, they do not consider the position of *chufei* constructions with respect to their matrix clause. That is, they do not differentiate between clauses that are preposed and those that are postposed to their associated clauses, for preposed clauses may perform a different job in discourse than postposed ones. Additionally, though some of the previous studies have used authentic written discourse data for their analysis of *chufei*-conditionals from semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive perspectives, none of them have taken an interactional approach based on spoken data in a larger context.

2. Purpose of the study and research questions

Taking the view that the way in which information is arranged within a(n) utterance/clause will be affected by the pattern of the constructions within the discourse as a whole, the present study attempts to explore the functions of these different types of *chufei* constructions. With reference to previous studies on Chinese *chufei* and on English *unless*, this study aims at examining the distribution of *chufei* constructions across two different discourse modes: daily conversation and news reportage articles, which occur in informal and formal speech situations separately. The research questions addressed here are as follows:
(1) What are the common properties or functions of chufei shared in all the different types of usage?
(2) What are the discourse-pragmatic functions of the various types of the chufei-constructions, particularly when they occur before or after their associated clause?
(3) Do differences in text type (spoken or written) play a role in the distribution (and function) of chufei-constructions, since such differences may influence their distribution and occurrence in relation to their associated clauses?

3. Data and procedure

Since language is a social institution, one of its important functions is to maintain social networks and sustain interest in verbal interaction. The field of Conversation Analysis (CA) aims to provide a systematic account of the way in which talk-in-interaction is constructed and understood by the speakers. According to CA, the meaning of a particular utterance in interaction is indexical to a specific context and purpose (Sacks et al., 1974). To be more specific, this indexicality locates utterances not just in a world of social relations, but also in another world of discourse. Speakers produce utterances assuming that hearers can make sense of them by the same kind of practical reasoning and methodic contextualizing operations that they apply to social conduct in general (Schiffrin, 1994). CA studies the social organization of conversation, or talk-in-interaction, by detailed inspection of tape recordings and transcriptions to determine how speakers locally organize turn-taking in conversations, and searches for recurrent patterns, distributions, and forms of organization in large corpora of talk (Sacks et al., 1974). We believe that through CA, we may discover the cognitive and social factors underlying the structure of language. Based on this, the spoken corpus in this study comes from naturally occurring two-party or multi-party conversations. All the conversations are between adults. The diverse parties in these conversations include students, colleagues, and housewives, and the situations occur at home, at a dormitory, and at work. The total length (of the recordings in the data) is 73 h and 10 min and 4 s and the data were taped via audio cassettes and transcribed into intonation units, i.e., sequences of words combined under a single unified intonation contour, usually preceded by a pause (Cruttenden, 1989; Du Bois et al., 1993).

Even though writing and speech are two totally different systems, written data are a good contrast to daily conversation: the two genres occupy the two opposite poles of a continuum of text types in terms of their gradation of "editedness" and "plannedness", which both deserve careful investigation (Biber, 1988). The written data came from UDNDATA, a newspaper database of the United Daily News group, the largest news group in Taiwan, including the United Daily News, Economic Daily News, and United Evening News. The corpus could be considered a hybrid genre as it contains both spoken and written genres, with newspaper discourse often mixed with interviews, and quotations. To examine the various constructions of Chinese chufei in written Chinese discourse, we searched for them among the texts in UDNDATA from September 1, 2012 to October 31, 2012.

Since the interpretation of the chufei constructions depends much on context rather than on form only,⁵ in this study, we use p to stand for the proposition introduced by chufei and q for its matrix clause. We did not intentionally indicate the negative or affirmative sentence in q and adopted the chufei formula often mentioned in previous studies, for some utterances/clauses may not have an overt negator but they convey an opposite meaning to their chufei-utterance/clause. The chufei instances in the spoken and written data were categorized into the following types based on the previous studies mentioned above and on the data in this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Chufei p, cai q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>Chufei p, fouze ~q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iib</td>
<td>Chufei p, buran ~q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iic</td>
<td>Chufei p, yaoburan ~q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iid</td>
<td>Chufei p, ~q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Chufei p, cai q; fouze/buran ~q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>(Ruo/Ruguo) Yao/Xiang (~)q, chufei p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(~)q, chufei p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of each type of the construction are given in Appendix A.

4. Results

The data yielded 444 occurrences of chufei instances (54 from the spoken data and 390 from the written data), as shown in Table 1. Among them, 11 instances are in the preposed position with respect to their associated utterance and 43 are in the postposed position in the conversation data, accounting for 20.4% and 79.6% respectively, while 329 chufei clauses are preposed and 61 are postposed in the written data, making up 84.3% and 15.7%, respectively.

---

⁵ Chinese grammar is pragmatically oriented in a sense that it is more sensitive to pragmatic factors, such as contextual environments and pragmatic inferences (Li and Thompson, 1981; Hu, 1995).
The data reveal that postposed *chufei* tends to occur more frequently in spoken discourse and preposed *chufei* tends to occur more frequently in written discourse. The occurrences of different types of *chufei* constructions in the two sets of data are also summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 reveals that most *chufei* instances are postposed utterances in the spoken data, especially the construction (*~/C24*)q, *chufei* p, accounting for 77.7%. In contrast, the written data show the most common pattern to be *chufei* p, *fouze*/*buran*/*yaoburan* ~/C24* q, accounting for 54.6%. The second, third and fourth most common patterns are (*~/C24*)q, *chufei* p, *chufei* p, *cai* q, and *chufei* p, ~/q, making up 15.2%, 14.9% and 12.3%, respectively. Type II has four variants, that is, Type IIa, IIb, IIc, and IId. If we combine these four variants in the written data, we get 270 instances in total, accounting for 69.1%. Given the results, two questions then arise: what motivates the appearance of high numbers of Type V *chufei* constructions in spoken discourse and Type II in written discourse, and what are their discourse roles? In the following section, we will discuss the functions of preposed and postposed *chufei* utterances/clauses and focus on the constructions that occur most often in the data.

5. Discussion

5.1. The properties of *chufei* constructions in the data

Investigating spoken data, Ford and Thompson (1986) and Ford (1993) find that English conditionals tend to occur in the initial position (i.e. preposed). Similarly, Wang (1999, 2002, 2006) also finds that Chinese conditionals predominantly occur in the initial position. Comrie (1986) observes that it is more common cross-linguistically for the protasis to precede the apodosis. However, the present study on *chufei* constructions suggests that most of them are postposed (i.e. Type V) in conversations and that they restrict the associated material, similar to *unless* clauses, termed ‘exceptive conditionals’ by Traugott (1997:162). Simply put, unlike other Chinese conditional clauses, the *chufei* clause tends to occur after its associated clause in the spoken data. In our data, postposed *chufei* utterances have the function of appending additional information to the main clause rather than providing a condition under which the fulfillment of the main clause depends, as manifested in (22):

(22) (G consults B, a medical intern, about her eyes problem.)

G: .. Ranhou zhende shi jiemyon yenmeban?/ and really COP conjunctivitis what to do

B: .. jiemyon_conjunctivitis
    .. jiemyon_conjunctivitis actually NEG what

Table 1
Preposed vs. postposed *chufei* utterances/clauses in the spoken and written corpora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Spoken corpus</th>
<th>Written corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Distribution of *chufei* constructions in the spoken and written corpora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text type/discourse mode</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I: <em>Chufei</em> p, <em>cai</em> q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IIA: <em>Chufei</em> p, <em>fouze</em> ~/q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IIB: <em>Chufei</em> p, <em>buran</em> ~/q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IIC: <em>Chufei</em> p, <em>yaoburan</em> ~/q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IID: <em>Chufei</em> p, ~/q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III: <em>Chufei</em> p, <em>cai</em> q; <em>fouze/buran</em> ~/q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV: (<em>Ruo/Ruguo</em>) <em>Yao/Xiang</em> <del>/</del>/q, <em>chufei</em> p</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type V: ~/q, <em>chufei</em> p</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data reveal that postposed *chufei* tends to occur more frequently in spoken discourse and preposed *chufei* tends to occur more frequently in written discourse. The occurrences of different types of *chufei* constructions in the two sets of data are also summarized in Table 2.
G: ‘And if I get conjunctivitis, what should I do?’
B: ‘Conjunctivitis, conjunctivitis is actually nothing (serious).’
G: ‘It doesn’t matter. Right?’
B: ‘Right.’
G: ‘I won’t go blind, (if I get it).’
B: ‘You won’t, unless you are inflected with some kind of terrible bacteria (in your eyes).’

G consults B, a medical intern, about her eyes problem. G worries that she will have conjunctivitis because of an eye inflammation. B tells her that conjunctivitis is not a disease serious enough to cause blindness, and that her eye inflammation will not lead to blindness, adding an explanation that conjunctivitis which causes blindness will result only from a serious bacillary infection. This is introduced by a chufei conditional clause. In the conversation data, most of the instances of Type V chufei are uttered by the same speaker as an extension of his/her prior proposition. There are only three instances of Type V chufei appearing from different speakers, which serves as an elaboration on the preceding utterance uttered by his/her participant.

Similarly, in (23), the chufei utterance is added with the new information supplemented after the preceding utterance.

(23) (The excerpt is from an article which suggests that parents should not intervene in their children’s career choice.)
Qingchun, yongyuan hui ziji zhao chulu,
Youth forever will self find way out
chufei darenmen cong zao dao wan gaosu haizi tamen mei xiwang.
unless adults from morning to night tell children 3PL NEG hope
(News article)
‘Youth will always find a way out, unless the adults tell their children all day long that they have no hope at all.’

Here the chufei clause/utterance is backgrounded and expresses the sense of being an afterthought, i.e. an extension or elaboration. It is syntactically dispensable or loosely attached to the syntactic structure. As pointed out by Yang (2007), the non-canonical apodosis–protasis order often occurs in a situation where a speaker uses the protasis to provide supplementary information for clarification or emphasis. Actually, the chufei-utterances in (22) and (23) can be treated as an ellipsis of Type II (Y. Zhang, 2004). For example, in (22) the chufei-utterance may be extended as chufei shi na zhong= hen kepa xijun ganran, cai shi jiemoyan ‘unless you get a terrible bacillary infection (in your eyes), your eyes will get conjunctivitis.’ Also consider (24) below:

(24) (A tells B that a child is so stubborn that it is hard to influence him.)
A: ..Ta mama yinggai guanbudong ta, 3SG mother might cannot discipline 3SG
B: .. um?/
 um
A: @@@
B: .. Guanbudong?/
cannot discipline
A: ..Yinwei ta shi yi ge, Because 3SG COP one CL
.. jiu ziji xiang zuo shenme,..
ADV self want do what
.. chufei
  unless
.. ta
  3SG only will change
(4) chufei <H ni you feichang chongfen H> de liyou,..
  unless 2SG have very sufficient DE reason
.. jiushi
  3SG feel such right in case
B: ... um...
A: ... Erqie ta ziji ye yao yuanyi._
  And 3SG self also want willing
(Conversation)
A: ‘His mother may be unable to discipline him.’
B: ‘Um?’
A: @@@
B: ‘Unable to discipline (him)?’
A: ‘Because he is a, that is, (a person) who wants to do whatever he wants.
  Only if he wants to change his own mind will he do it. Unless you have very sufficient reasons, that is,
  and he feels that the reasons are right.’
B: ‘Um.’
A: ‘And he also needs to be willing to (be changed).’
The omitted apodosis of the second chufei utterance can be the one in the first chufei utterance ta cai hui gai ‘he will (then) change’.

Although English unless and if not propositions are often seen as very tightly related, Geis (1973) disagrees with the identification of unless with if not. Rather, he offers a gloss for unless p, q as ‘under all circumstances except p, q’ or ‘in any event other than p, q’. Similarly, in our data, postposed chufei, especially Type V, introduces an exception to the statement one just made, meaning ‘except on the condition that’ or ‘except under the circumstances that’. This kind of clause order strategy may also give the sentences/utterances a personal touch, and help establish a “voice” for the speaker (Craig, 2006:162), which might be one of the reasons why postposed chufei utterances are prevalent in casual conversation.

By contrast, in written discourse in our data Type II chufei occurs most frequently, manifesting similar preferences from the conditionals with respect to clause order. According to Ford and Thompson (1986) and Ford (1993), the preposed conditionals function to form pivot points in the development of talk and present explicit background for the material that follows. In contrast, the postposed conditionals serve primarily to qualify what precedes. In Wang’s corpus-based studies of Chinese adverbial clauses (1999, 2002, 2006), the distribution of the conditional clause in Chinese discourse is iconically motivated, similar to English conditionals (Haiman, 1978, 1985). That is, in the real world, a condition needs to be set up so that the situation described in the main clause would exist. This distribution is apprehensible if we regard it as a topic-comment construction (Chao, 1968; Tsao, 1990). In other words, the preposed conditionals are prototypically topics and their main clauses comments. To summarize, the preposed conditionals are used to form pivotal points in the development of talk and present explicit background for the main clause that follows, whereas the postposed conditionals are employed for completing a unit of information or introducing elaboration (Ford, 1993). So sentence-initial if-conditionals qualify or hedge the previous step, setting up a precondition for an alternative (but not optional) sequence of actions.

However, probably because of its core meaning of exclusivity, most of the instances of Type II chufei-clauses in our data are not typical preposed conditionals, which are used to set up a large pivotal frame. Instead, fouze, (yao)buran (‘otherwise’), or other discourse markers like the contrastive marker danshi (‘but’) have a wider scope of modifying than chufei does, as shown in (25).

(25) (The excerpt is concerned about a policewomen policy in Taiwan, proposed in Year 2004)
Jingzhengsu shi zai erlinglingsi nian tichu nüjing zhengce,
National Police Agency COP in 2004 year present policewoman policy
zunian zengzhao nüjing,
year by year recruit policewoman
tongshi ye jiantao
at the same time also review service
guiding nannü ‘xinbing’ yilü danfu waiqin.
'National Police Agency presented the Policewomen Policy in 2004, recruiting policewomen year by year and also reviewing service dispatch (CAD), specifying that male and female police novices all must serve field work. Policewomen, once pregnant, can transfer to office(-based) work, but after labor they have to return to their original post. Otherwise, unless one gets a major disease, s/he must combat crime on the street.'

In (25), the Type II chufei clause repeats information of the previous proposition and frames the subsequent comment. It has a recapitulative function in that the Type II chufei summarizes what has come before. That is, the Type II chufei functions to emphasize the preceding proposition, which is sometimes subjunctive and contingent. In our written data, Type I and Type II chufei constructions often occur after the end of a paragraph as concluding remarks. Actually, a closer observation of the data shows that the preceding utterance is the associated clause of Type II chufei and the following part serves as an extension or elaboration.

On the other hand, according to Ford (1993), with the hypotheticality as the core interpretation of if-conditionals, the main function of the preposed conditional is to indicate alternativeness or possibilities. That is, it is commonly used as a strategy for presenting an option by the speaker to display an interpretation of prior talk. When we look at our authentic data, we also observe that chufei . . . fouze . . . can be used after a suggestion, advice, order, or warning to show what the result will be if the addressees do not follow, as illustrated in (26).

(26) (The excerpt talks about how to dress with a style of construction or deconstruction aesthetics.)

Chuanzhua jiegou, jiegou meixue shijie, fengge de fuzhuang, most important COP should master simplicity DE clothes.

Chufei you gaochao de zaoxing gongli, unless have outstanding DE shaping technique.

Fouze bu yuan yi yu qita fuzhuang hunda, otherwise NEG suggest with other clothes mash up.

Yimian pohuai le jiegou meixue de meili, yun huo xiantiao.

Lest destroy ASP construction aesthetics DE beautiful contour or streak line.

(News article)‘What is most important is to observe ‘the maxim of simplicity’ when you are dressed in clothes with a style of construction or deconstruction aesthetics. It should be a single color so that it will not become motley. Unless you have an outstanding shaping technique we do not suggest that you mix with other clothes, lest it (should) destroy the beautiful contour or streak line of the construction aesthetics.’

In a study on English unless based on the written data from Wall Street, Taub (1991, cited in Dancygier and Sweetser, 2005:183) found that there is a high percentage of postposed unless-clauses (27 out of 28), which seems rather different from our results on chufei in the written data. However, since our data reveal that although the syntactic properties of Type I and Type II chufei constructions are like preposed conditionals, their discourse functions are more like postposed ones, and from the perspective of discourse coherence, their preceding clause is also associated with them, for discourse contains sequential dependent units. We infer that ‘unless’ or chufei clauses tend to serve as extensions in a text, a conclusion that awaits further investigation. In addition to the differences between chufei clauses and other conditional clauses, Type IV (Ruo/Ruguo) Yao/ Xiang q, chufei p is also unique, because the chufei clause serves as the apodosis.
To sum up, in the data, *chufei* clause usually expresses a hypothetical future event which is to occur in the future. Both preposed and postposed *chufei* constructions (especially Type II and Type V) serve as extensions of their previous utterance, particularly, in that they negate it and imply the possibility of the proposition introduced by *chufei* is not high. Given these results, we argue that *chufei* constructions are different from other Chinese conditionals, such as the clauses introduced by *ruguo/jiaru/yao*shi (*‘if’*).

5.2. Exclusivity, contingency and exceptionality

In logic, a conditional statement (material implication) is an *if–then* statement in which *p* is an antecedent and *q* is a consequent, which we read *‘if p, then q’ or ‘p implies q’*. According to Van der Auwera (1986), if *p*, then *q* means *p* is a sufficient condition of *q*; i.e., “the realization of the event or state of affairs described in the protasis is a sufficient condition for the realization of the event or state of affairs described in the apodosis” (Sweetser, 1990:114), as in (27).

(27) If Mary goes, John will go. (taken from Sweetser, 1990:114)

Example (27) means that if the real-world state of affairs includes Mary’s going, then it will also include John’s going. That is, the conditional in (27) conveys that the situation in the apodosis is directly contingent on that of the protasis. Logically speaking, the event (or the state) described in the protasis is the sufficient condition for the realization of the event (or state) described in the apodosis. However, a common reading of *if–then* conjunction is one wherein *p* is taken as being not merely a sufficient but also a necessary condition for *q*, which is often read as *if and only if* *(iff) Comrie (1986)* holds that this *‘if and only if’* reading of *if is a not a part of the semantics of *if*, but is rather a conversational implicature which easily follows from the sufficient-conditionality use of *if*. Take (27) for example; its interpretation is that (a) John will go if Mary goes, and (b) he won’t go if Mary doesn’t. According to Comrie, (b) follows conversationally from the statement of (a) in many circumstances. The antecedent (*p*) is sometimes also called the ‘sufficient condition’, while the consequent (*q*) may be called the ‘necessary condition’. Therefore, a biconditional *‘if and only if’* requires a stronger link between protasis and apodosis. In terms of the logical relationship between *p* and *q*, the connection between them may be a causal one (Sweetser, 1990). Take (27) as an example again. Mary’s going might bring about John’s going, or vice versa. Therefore, conditionals and causals are related (König, 1986). Conditionals involve a causal relation from protasis to apodosis; the content of the protasis can be interpreted as a cause of the content of the apodosis (Comrie, 1986). Hence, the order of protasis preceding apodosis has a strong cause-effect relationship.

On the other hand, according to Athanasiadou and Dirven (1997), the *unless* construction is semantically very close to *only if*. The difference is that with *unless* the main clause tends to be negated, while with *only if* this is not the case, cf.:

(28) a. Only if I went bald, would I shoot myself.
   b. Unless I went bald, I wouldn’t shoot myself.

(taken from Athanasiadou and Dirven, 1997:80)

(28a) means that *p* (*‘I went bald’*) can only ever be true when *q* (*‘I shoot myself’*) is true. That is, *q* is necessary for *p* to be true. In (28b), *unless* presents a unique condition under which *q* will not occur. In addition, Comrie (1986) argues that English *unless* has a similar biconditional interpretation, though with negation of the protasis, as in (29):

(29) Unless you leave immediately, you’ll be late (taken from Comrie, 1986:79)

Example (29) has the interpretation ‘If and only if you do not leave immediately, you will be late’. In a word, English *unless*-clause indicates a limitation or condition.

Akin to *unless*, manifested in examples (28) and (29), Chinese preposed *chufei* also has such properties, expressing that only if a certain condition is met will the result follow. This is the reason why some scholars argue that *chufei* involves a unique (both necessary and sufficient) condition, while others observe that it introduces a necessary condition. Literally meaning *chu’ ci jie fei* ‘except this and the others not’, *chufei* as a focus particle with a notion of restriction identifies or specifies the particular focus value under discussion (König, 1986), so, like the preposition *chule* ‘apart from’, it can be used to introduce an exception to a statement which is otherwise general. Specifically, *chufei*, which means restriction by taking out something that would otherwise be included, excludes all alternatives except the current one. During restriction, only an entity or a limited number of entities are included in a proposition and the majority of them are excluded or negated, which results in the exclusive sense. Accordingly, *p* introduced by *chufei* is implicated as the exclusive condition under which the apodosis proposition is asserted to hold, akin to *unless* (Schwenter, 1999:154). Based on this premise, previous studies have argued that *chufei* . . . *cai* . . . introduces a unique condition. In particular, some Chinese dictionaries and grammar books also give *‘only if’* as one of the

---

6 In logic, a compound statement consisting of two other propositions joined by *if and only if* *(iff)* is called a biconditional (Geis and Zwicky, 1971), asserting that the existence or occurrence of one thing (*p*) or event depends on, and is dependent on, the existence or occurrence of another (*q*) or expressing the idea that the presence of some property is a necessary and sufficient condition for the presence of some other property. The biconditional *(p iff q)* is defined to be true whenever both propositions have the same truth value (i.e., when either both are true or both are false). Put simply, it is a statement that combines a conditional and a converse if they are both true, which can be connected by using ‘if and only if’. The only difference from a conditional is the case when the antecedent is false but the consequent is true. In that case, in the conditional, the result is true, yet in the biconditional the result is false.

7 *Chu* was a verb, meaning ‘exclude’ in old Chinese.
glosses for chufei and interpret it as a marker of necessary condition (Eifring, 1993). Because of the meaning of cai, the content of the p space is a unique condition for the q space (Yang, 2007). The unique condition marked by cai entails that something will never be accomplished unless the condition in p is fulfilled. Therefore, cai indicates that the condition is highly required and it marks a more demanding situation. Its negative counterpart, fouze/buran/yaoburan/ø (jiu)... indicates that the event or state in the protasis, implied in fouze/buran/yaoburan/ø (i.e. meaning 'if not', which refers to the non-restrictive alternatives), is the sufficient condition for the realization of the event or state described in the apodosis.

However, we find that although a high proportion of instances of chufei may introduce a unique condition (as manifested in examples (25) and (26) above), the condition may not be only one, as shown in (30):

(30) (The excerpt is concerned with money investment.)

Miandui tongpeng riyi zenggao de yali,
Encounter inflation gradually increase DE pressure
xian jieduan xunze touzi guandao,
current stage choose investment channel
jianyi reng yi fangdichan jiao ju baozi,
suggest still PREP real estate more possess value-preserving
kang tongpeng xiaoyi,
resist inflation effect
bijing gushi podong qifu buding,
after all stock market fluctuate rise and fall unstable
chufei xuandui jiyougui gie changqi chiyou,
unless choose rightly blue chip and long term keep
fouze duanjinduanchu, fengxian tai da.
otherwise in and out in a short term risk too big

(News article)

‘In the face of the increasing inflation pressure, we suggest that you invest on the real estate, which is more value-preserving and infection-proof, if you want to choose an investment channel at the current period of time. After all, the stock market is fluctuating and unstable, unless you rightly choose blue chip stocks and are able to keep them for a long period of time; otherwise, buying and selling them in a short time is too big a risk.’

In this example, there are two conditions introduced by chufei. Note that the two conditions are combined by qie ‘and’. This example also echoes Eifring’s (1993) argument that a chufei construction expresses necessary modality; the clause of which it is a part is a clause of necessity. That is, it expresses non-conditional necessity rather than necessary condition.

In addition, similar to Y. Zhang’s (2004) argument that the clause introduced by chufei functions to introduce a hypothetical exception, we suggest that the main role of chufei in discourse, especially of the preposed chufei, is to add hypothetical exception(s), and serve to elaborate on the preceding proposition. Simply put, the utterance/clause prefaced by chufei presents a hypothetical exception by means of elaboration on the preceding statement. Furthermore, as pointed out by Y. Zhang, the elaboration marked by chufei does not necessarily contain only one hypothetical exception; sometimes it has more than one, of which the second can be prefaced by qie as in (30) above, or it can prefaced byhouze/houshi ‘or’ indicating alternatively, as in (31):

(31) (The excerpt is from an article talking about the value system of education in Taiwan, influenced by Confucian thoughts. In particular, Taiwan society values one’s education backgrounds, which causes people to pursue higher education.)

Zai Xifang, hen duo guojia de kanfa,
in western very many countries on
gao xueli de DE de kanfa,
high education background DE opinion
dique bu xiang Rujia chuantong yingxiang
indeed not like Confucian tradition influence
xia de Huaren shehui chongman misi.
xia de Huaren shehui chongman misi.
LOC DE Chinese society full of enigma
Suiran yiban zhongchan jieji duo juyou
Though average the middle class usually possess
yigai nian daxue de qixu,
should study college desire
zhe far college desire
fouze zhen you xingqu congshi xueshu yanjiu
should study college desire
chufei zhen you xingqu congshi xueshu yanjiu
We have seen in example (31), that “p1 or p2” is true if p1 is true, or if p2 is true, or, as in example (30), if both p1 and p2 are true. A condition can be either necessary or sufficient without being the other, or it can be both necessary and sufficient. P introduced by chufei could be (i) a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for the consequent (q), (ii) a sufficient, but not a necessary, condition for the q, or (iii) both a necessary and a sufficient condition for the q.

Traditional descriptions of conditional constructions usually make use of such oppositions as open vs. closed conditions, real vs. unreal, or real (open) vs. hypothetical vs. counterfactual, referring to various degrees of hypotheticality of the truth of the propositions involved (Comrie, 1986). However, Comrie (1986) suggests that hypotheticality is a continuum, with no clear-cut boundary between the two or three types. Similarly, accounts of chufei conditions may also make a neat bipartite or tripartite division. For example, Lu (1999) suggests that chufei mainly has two meanings: chufei, parallels to zhiyou ‘only if’ and chufei, to ruguo bu/meiyou ‘if not’. Zhao and Liu (2006) classify chufei constructions into three types: the necessity of the condition, the absoluteness of the consequent, and the universality of the consequent. Echoing Comrie, we propose different degrees of probability of realization of the situations referred to in the chufei clause from greater probability (or lower hypotheticality) to lower probability (or greater hypotheticality), as illustrated in examples (25)–(26) and (30)–(31). Nevertheless, chufei is often used to express non-satisfaction with possible, probable, or necessary conditions, especially chufei p, (fouze/buran/yaoburan) ~q, as van Dijk (1989:78) puts it, “[u]nless p, q, or, q unless p, is satisfied in an epistemically inaccessible world, where the antecedent is false (or rather: where the negation of the antecedent is true) and a sufficient condition for the truth of the consequent.” The present study suggests that the conditionality chufei constructions convey is a gradient phenomenon ranging from being more necessary and sufficient to being more necessary or sufficient.

Nonetheless, chufei-clauses usually convey contingency and exceptionality through negating the preceding proposition or presenting a hypothetical situation or event as an exception, implying that the situations, incidents, or events they introduce are marked, unusual and only very rarely likely to happen. In chufei …., cai … construction, the cai-clause conveys that a result occurs only if the contingency happens, emphasizing the result of the restrictive, focus entity. On the contrary, in chufei …., fouze/buran/yaoburan … construction, the fouze/buran/yaoburan-clause renders the opposite effect if the contingency does not happen, which stresses the result of the non-restrictive (unmarked) entities. Both exclusivity and exceptionality have something in common: they both signal that what follows chufei corrects or replaces some comparable element in the preceding proposition or context. A chufei construction qualifies the preceding statement(s) by adding other information. This information either corrects some statement or replaces one option with another since chufei expresses occurrence of a future action or event, provided the contingency or exceptionality in the chufei-clause is fulfilled. The contingency or exceptionality in the chufei-clause can be followed by a stipulation (see (25)), prediction (e.g. (33)), or suggestion (see (26) and (32)).

5.3. Desirability vs. undesirability

Generally, evaluation contains an assessment with the speaker’s positive and negative viewpoint associated with the “likely accuracy of claims” and “judgment of probability” (Hyland and Diani, 2009:5). By assessing something as “good” or “bad,” the speaker publicly commits himself to a particular evaluation of what s/he has witnessed, known, or believed, and is now communicating to others (Özyürek and Trabasso, 1997). Chinese chufei is used to introduce a hypothetical case in which an exception may exist. More specifically, chufei introduces a nonexistent assertion or a future event whose possibility of occurrence is quite low. Proposed chufei clauses are used to express the occurrence of an (un)expected or inevitable event. The typical proposed chufei-clause refers to the conditional part of the sentence and not the result, whereas the apodosis linkers cai and fouze refer to the result. Similar to conditional threats (Limberg, 2009), the conditional form includes the speaker’s (implicit) injunction, introduced by chufei and the prediction of possible undesirable consequences which may introduced by fouze or (yao)buran as a result of non-compliance.

Our written data show the most common pattern to be chufei p, fouze ~q. Actually, the complete construction of chufei is the schema: chufei p, cai q, fouze/buran/yaoburan (= if ~p, ~q, which in most of the instances in the data can be construed as P [DESIRABLE], because if not P, then not Q [UNDESIRABLE], as proposed by Akatsuka (1997). Chufei can be viewed as a kind of predictive conditional, which predicts that if a desired action is/is not carried out or a desired condition is/is not fulfilled, the desired/undesired consequence will occur. In most of the instances in our data, the construction chufei p, fouze ~q tends to emphasize that if a desired action is not carried out or a desired condition is not fulfilled, the undesired consequence will
occur, as in (26). Conversely, *chufei* *p*, *cai q* renders the opposite consequence; i.e., if a desired action is carried out or a desired condition is fulfilled, the desired consequence will occur, as manifested in (32).

(32) (M tells his recipient that if an inpatient did not pay up all of his/her fees while s/he was hospitalized, s/he cannot be allowed to make an appointment with his/her doctor at an outpatient department when s/he was discharged from hospital.)

M: .. Ranhou huozhe shi ruguo ni zhuyuan you=, and then or COP if 2SG hospitalized have ..you qie fei de,\ have owe debt DE ..na ni jiu bu neng kan menzhun_, then 2SG ADV NEG can see outpatient department .. <A chufei ni xian qu ba qian jiaoqing A>, unless 2SG first go BA money pay up .. ni cai neng kan menzhun_, 2SG only can see outpatient department (Conversation) M: ‘And or if you did not pay up all of the fees while you were hospitalized, then you could not make an outpatient appointment with your doctor after you are discharged from hospital. Unless you pay up all the fees, you cannot make an outpatient appointment (Only after you pay up all the fees are you allowed to make an outpatient appointment).’

However, the (un)desirability conveyed by *chufei* constructions often depends on the context. In some instances in the data, *chufei* introduces an undesired condition and *fouze*, a barely satisfactory, goodish consequent, as shown in (33):

(33) (The excerpt analyzes the current economic condition in Taiwan. Prior to it, the author reports that the Taiwan Central Bank will hold rates, which will not interfere with the stock market to such an extent as to make fluctuation of the New Taiwan Dollar (NTD) currency. Then the author raises an exception prefaced by the *chufei* construction to predict that the NTD currency rate will not rise much.)

Chufei

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jingji</td>
<td>chule</td>
<td>hen</td>
<td>yanzhong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unless</td>
<td>economics</td>
<td>borne out</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houze</td>
<td>zjines</td>
<td>daliang</td>
<td>waitao,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>huge</td>
<td>flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fouze</td>
<td>duanqi</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>XintaiBi</td>
<td>huiLu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otherwise</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>New Taiwan Dollar</td>
<td>currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hen</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>dafu</td>
<td>bianzhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>greatly</td>
<td>devalue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Unless some serious problem appears in the economy, or huge capital flight occurs, it might be very difficult for the exchange rate (between New Taiwan Dollar and other currencies) to have motive force to devalue greatly in the near future.’

Prior to (33), the author reports that compared with other European and Asian countries, the economic situation in Taiwan in 2012 was average and further predicts that the current state in Taiwan economics in 2013 will remain the same, except if some serious problem appears in the economy or a great deal of capital flight occurs. Here, *chufei* predicts some possible problem or crisis, and *fouze* signals that the current state will still remain.

According to Dancygier (1993), prediction in conditionals is a type of reasoning which contains setting up a hypothetical (typically future) mental space and attempting to predict its consequences based on awareness of typical cause-effect chains and general world knowledge. What a predictive conditional asserts is the causal dependency and correlation between the events or states of affairs described by its clauses (Dancygier and Sweetser, 2000). Chinese *chufei* *p*, *cai q*, *fouze/buran/yaoaburan* (= if ~p), ~q can be seen as a conjunction of two conditional statements. In the first conditional (i.e. *chufei* *p*, *cai q*), *p* is the condition or hypothesis and *q* is the consequence or conclusion. In the second conditional (i.e. *fouze/buran/yaoaburan* (=if ~p), ~q), ~p is the cause and ~q is the effect. Specifically, *chufei* . . . , *cai* . . . emphasizes the focused, exclusive condition to offer a possible solution (e.g. (24)) or predict a future trend, but the possibility of its occurrence is quite low. *Chufei* . . . , *fouze/buran/yaoaburan*/ø often emphasizes a bad outcome (an unfortunate consequence of such a state of affairs), in order to express a warning or threatening. It is a cause-consequence relation in which the second proposition might be an unforeseen outcome of the first proposition introduced by *chufei*. As mentioned above, logically speaking, in *chufei* . . . , *fouze/buran/yaoaburan*/ø . . . , the event or state
in the protasis (viz. if \( \neg p \)) is the sufficient condition for the realization of the event or state described in the apodosis (\( \neg q \)). Accordingly, the first conditional \( \text{chufei} \ldots, \text{cai} \ldots \) may indicate a necessary condition and the second, \( \text{chufei} \ldots, \text{ouze/buran/yaoburan}/\varnothing \ldots \), a sufficient condition. Nevertheless, from the perspective of pragmatics, \( \text{chufei} \) constructions are related to the notion of (un)desirability. In terms of Akatsuka’s (1997) modal, the whole construction can be schematized as P [DESIRABLE], because if not P, then not Q [UNDESIRABLE].

5.4. \( \text{Chufei} \) constructions in spoken and written discourse

As noted by Lehmann (1974), it is necessary for discourse participants to gain common ground in a step by step manner. In this process, a conditional protasis represents a disjunctive situation in which there are two possibilities (namely, \( p \) and \( \neg p \)), and before communication can progress, it is necessary for the speaker to establish which of the disjuncts is to be considered. Only then can the argumentation proceed. From this perspective, the order of protasis preceding apodosis is iconic to the sequence of steps in argumentation (Comrie, 1986). In general, the more referentially oriented the interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker. In the present study, the written data (i.e. news reportage articles) can be defined as transactional-oriented, because they have a definite purpose, usually to get something done, and it is important that the message be understood; i.e., it matters that the reader gets it right. The spoken data (i.e. casual conversations) can be labeled as interactional language where language is used to open, close, and maintain conversations. Transactional discourse may exhibit more directness, and interactional discourse may exhibit more indirectness and sensitivity to the relationship between the interlocutors. The written news reportage data in the present study are information-oriented and tend to be transactional discourse. As Lorenz (1999:55) puts it, “[a]mong other characteristics, writing differs from face-to-face interaction in the way coherence is constructed. … One way of doing this is to carefully signal logical relations and thereby ‘signpost’ the path to coherence for the reader.” Our data indicate that the frequency of Type II \( \text{chufei} \) construction is higher in the written corpus than in the spoken corpus. The main function of news reports is the expression of content and the transaction of factual information rather than to exchange ideas. They therefore have to build argumentation with strong rhetorical force, which results in the frequent use of Type II \( \text{chufei} \) construction. To be more specific, Type II plays a crucial role in the construction of persuasion in discourse, especially newspaper discourse. Frequently employed in the form of protasis preceding apodosis (antecedent–consequent) to ensure a logical and cohesive discourse, it helps express an event in an objective and explicit way, which is essential to the overall persuasive effect of a text. It can give appropriate interpretation and evaluation in order to avoid subjective assertion and leaves more room for the reader to comprehend the message (Hyland, 1998). Particularly, in written discourse such as news reports or stipulations, precision is important, and accordingly, they observe Grice’s (1975) maxim of quantity (i.e. giving as much information as is needed). Furthermore, Type II constructions, in which \( \text{fouze/buran/yaoburan}/\varnothing \neg p \) highlight an effect of a default situation (Yang, 2007) to indicate a bad/negative result, are more often used than Type I by the authors in the news reportage articles to emphasize the seriousness of the consequence if the condition prefaced by \( \text{chufei} \) is not fulfilled, for example when they report a stipulation, make a suggestion or warning, and the like. In contrast, conversation requires a great deal of negotiation (rather than unilateral announcements or reports) between participants, and it is ordinarily not argumentation-centered. Violating or flouting Grice’s maxim of quantity to generate conversation implicatures is prevalent between intimates or acquaintances in casual conversation. Therefore, a large number of Type V \( \text{chufei} \) constructions serve the function of elaboration or afterthought in daily conversation. They are associated with speaker-recipient negotiation and the extension of turns in the pursuit of agreement or common understanding.

5.5. Multiple mental space-builders in \( \text{chufei} \) constructions

Fauconnier (1985) observes that conjunctions like English \( \text{if} \) set up a particular kind of mental space, distinct from our base space. Specifically, the main function of \( \text{if} \) is to prompt the set-up of a mental space, namely conditional or hypothetical space, within which the speaker makes a prediction about an alternative state or event in the apodosis (Dancygier, 1993). A conditional marker \( \text{if} \) not only sets up a space consisting of the situation described in the protasis but may also build an alternative space where the condition of the protasis is not met. Therefore, the conditional sentence ‘if \( A, (\text{then}) B \)’ creates two spaces, called foundation (hypothetical) space and expansion (extension) space, distinct from the base space. The foundation (condition) space is a hypothetical space relative to the base space set up by the space builder \( \text{if} \) and the expansion space is set up by the space builder \( \text{then} \) (Evans and Green, 2006). That is, the protasis provides a background for a prediction represented in the apodosis. If the conditions in the foundation space hold true, the expansion space follows. In a similar vein, both Su (2005) and Yang (2007) treat Chinese conditional markers as mental space builders. Likewise, in this study, \( \text{chufei} \) is also regarded as a mental space builder.

---

8 We may call it ‘syntactic detachability’ (Ran, 2013), the syntactic non-restriction and semantic non-composition of an expression in use, for “some constructions represent optional cues which writers and speakers may use in organizing what they want to communicate” (Brown and Yule, 1983:106). Simply put, it is an optional linguistic choice. Its appearance is neither grammatically obligatory nor syntactically restricted and its deletion does not cause syntactic or grammatical unacceptability of the utterance/sentence where it appears.
In our data, we observe that *chufei* ..., *fouze/buran/yaoburan* ('if not so')... is like English *unless* ... *otherwise* ..., which has a negative meaning. However, *unless* conditionals seldom occur with *then*, indicating their non-causal function (Dancygier, 1985). Unlike the apodosis in *unless* conditionals, *jiu*, the Chinese counterpart to *then*, in *chufei* ... *fouze/buran/yaoburan* ... can occur in the apodosis, as shown in (34):

(34) (B tells her recipient about her attitude towards her son.)

B: *Chufei* ni zhende dui ta=,_,
\[\text{Unless 2SG really toward 3SG}\]
.. hen you xinxin_,
\[\text{very have confidence}\]
.. nayang cai keneng_,
\[\text{that so ADV possible}\]
.. dui-bu-dui?=,
\[\text{Right-not-right}\]
.. buran yiban dehua_,
\[\text{otherwise generally in case}\]
.. dou hui guadian–
\[\text{always will worry a little}\]
.. danxin jiu danxin bu wan_,
\[\text{worry then worry NEG finish}\]
(Conversation)

B: ‘Unless/only if you really have confidence in him, would it then be possible; otherwise, generally speaking, you will be worried (about him) a lot.’

Specifically, *chufei* ..., *fouze/buran/yaoburan*(), *jiu* ... is a cause–consequence relation in which the second proposition after *jiu* might be an unforeseen negative outcome of the implied proposition in *fouze/buran/yaoburan*, which indicates a condition that the proposition introduced by *chufei* is not fulfilled. Additionally, in a *chufei* conditional, there can be several mental space builders; i.e., it can be paired with other space builders, as manifested in the two constructions, *Chufei p*, *cai q*; *fouze/buran/yaoburan*, *(jiu) ~q* and *(Ruo/Ruguo) Yao/Xiang q, *chufei p*.

6. Conclusion

According to Quirk et al. (1985), with *unless*, there is a greater focus on the condition(s) as an exception. *Unless* combines condition with exception, hence has a negative meaning. Similarly, our data suggest that the typical *chufei* construction is used as a counter-conditional which functions to reverse the speaker’s conviction, which is described as the proposition in the protasis, displaying a high degree of possible irrealis of the protasis (i.e. future irrealis). Simply put, the speaker’s hypotheticality carried by *chufei* has been extended in this construction from the real world to their convic-tional world. *Chufei* can be viewed as a kind of predictive conditional, which predicts that if a desired/undesired action is/is not carried out or a desired/undesired condition is/is not fulfilled, the desired/undesired consequence would occur. In particular, *chufei* clauses have a recapitulative function in that they summarize what has come before. We demonstrate that speakers/writers express a particular stance of desirability versus undesirability toward a particular event through *chufei* constructions, based on their subjective evaluation of reality. The present study, which examines how people use *chufei* constructions in spoken and written discourse, has provided a more realistic description of language in use. The results indicate that most *chufei* instances fall into the type \(\sim q\), *chufei p* in the spoken data, whereas the written data indicate the most common patterns to be (1) *chufei p, fouze ~q*, (2) \(\sim q\), *chufei p* and (3) *chufei p, cai q*. This study shows how the *chufei* constructions reveal Chinese people’s ability in imaginative and logical thinking, which can be used to perform different discourse-pragmatic functions by conveying the hypotheticality or irrealis in discourse (Kuo, 2006). In a nutshell, *chufei* constructions, indicate hypotheticality, and perform several discourse-pragmatic functions such as suggesting possibilities, giving supplementary information for emphasis or clarification, and conveying effects in expressing attitudes and stands.
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Appendix A

The Chinese versions of the examples cited in this paper are given below:

(1) 除非你去, 他才去。
(2) 除非你去, (否則) 他不去。
(5) 除非有意外, 我去。
(6) (我一般會去; 除非有例外, 我才會去。
(8) 除非你親自去他家去請, 他才會來, 否則, 他是不會來的。
(9) 要想讓他們去, 除非你去請他。
(10) 若要人不知, 除非已為。
(13) 他不會去, 除非你去請他。
(14) 他有資格當選為委員, 除非他不願意。
(15) 除非臨時有事, (否則) 他一定會來。
(16) 他一定會來, 除非臨時有事。
(17) 除非臨時有事, 他才會來。
(18) 除非明天下雨, 比賽才會取消。
(20) 除非我們立刻做好野生動物保育工作, 否則經濟制裁隨時會降臨。
(21) 除非刮風, 明天不比賽。
(22) B: ...結膜炎...
       ...結膜炎事實上沒有什麼。
G: (0) 沒有關係,
       ... 是不是? /
B: ...對。
G: ...不會變瞎子? /
B: ...<@ 不會 @>。...
       ... 除是那種很可怕細菌感染,
       ... 但是。
       ... 一般都不是。
(23) 青春, 永遠會自己找出路, 除非大人們從早到晚告訴孩子們他們沒希望。
(24) A: ...他媽媽應該管不動他。
B: ...嗯? /
A: @@@
B: ...管不動? /
A: ...因為他是一個...
       ... 就自己想做什麼,
       ... 除非他自己改變他自己的心意,
       ... 他才會改。
       ... (4) 除非 <H> 你有非常充分 <H> 的理由,
       ... 就是他覺得這樣對的話。
B: ...嗯...
A: ... 而且他自己也要願意 ...
(25) 警政署是在二00四年提出女警政策, 逐年增招女警, 同時也檢討勤務派駐, 規定男女「新兵」一律輪流外勤, 女警懷孕可暫調內勤, 產後要立即復建, 否則除非有重大疾病, 都得上街打擊犯罪。
(26) 穿著結構, 解構美學風格的服裝, 最重要的是要掌握「簡約」的準則, 色彩最好單一, 才不致變得混雜, 除非有高超的造型功力, 否則不建議與其他服裝混搭, 以免破壞了結構美學的美麗輪廓或線條。
(30) 面對通膨日益增高的壓力, 現階段投資指標, 建議仍以房地產較具保值、抗通膨效益, 畢竟股市波動起伏不定, 除非選對標的股且長期持有, 否則短進短出, 風險太大。
(31) 在西方, 很多國家對高學歷的看法, 儘管不像儒家傳統影響下的華人社會充滿迷思, 雖然一般中產階級多具有應該念大學的期許, 但拿到大學文憑後, 除非真有興趣從事學術研究或專業訓練, 年輕人才會繼續碩士博士的課程。
(32) M: ... 然後或者是你住院有...
       ... 有欠費的。
       ... 那你就不能看門診。
       ...<A 除非你先去交錢缴费 A>。
       ... 你才能看門診。
(33) 除非經濟出了很嚴重的問題，或者資金大量外逃，否則短期內新台幣匯率恐怕很難有大幅貶值的動力。
(34) B: ... 除非你真的對他 ...
       ... 很有信心。
Appendix B

Types of chufei constructions in the data:

Type I Chufei p, cai q
(1) M: ...然後或者是如果你住院有=..._
   ..有欠費的\n   ..不\n   ..A 除非你先去把責任清 A>..._
   ..你才能看門診\n   ..類似是這樣子的做\n   (會話)

Type IIA Chufei p, zouze ~q
(2) 江立峰說，黃金不是合併其他不舒服感覺，除非大規模、海內外眼中風壓迫，才會眼壓高漲、疼痛，這時即使就醫治療，對視力恢復已很有限。【2012-10-25/聯合晚報/A12版/醫療】

Type IIB Chufei p, buran ~q
(3) 穿著結構、解構美學風格的服裝，最重要的是要掌握「簡約」的準則，色彩最好單一，才不致變得混雜，除非有高超的造型功力，否則不建議與其他服裝混搭，以免破壞了結構美學的美麗輪廓或線條。【2012-10-13/聯合報/G05版/生活周報流行生活美學】

Type IIC Chufei p, yaoburan ~q
(6) 除非馬總統願意公開把他的用心說明清楚，要不然，這樣的兩岸協商人事調整，怎麼看都是難以令人釋懷的敗筆啊！【2012-09-20/聯合晚報/A2版/話題】

Type IID Chufei p, ~q
(7) 國際貨幣基金（IMF）上周將2012年全球經濟成長預測從3.5%調降至3.3%，創下2009年金融海嘯來新低，拖累全球股市應聲走跌。
   IMF警告，除非美國與歐洲官員對於經濟威脅能對症下藥，經濟擴張甚至會更慢。【2012-10-14/經濟日報/A8版/國際財經】

Type III Chufei p, cai q; zouze/buran ~q
(8) 之前就有派出所收容了一隻流浪狗，動保處想塞回處置，引起地方發起搶救行動。 「就怕流浪狗被安樂死，李朝全无奈說，除非狗有重大疾病，重大傷殘等，經專業評估後不得不做，才會安樂死，否則獸醫也是人，『哪有人自願要執行安樂死？』」
   請外界不要誤解。【2012-10-31/聯合報/B2版/大台南綜合新聞】

(9) A: ...我覺得你對小朋友很好啊。\nB: ...可是不要我來罵啊@\nA: ...嗯=對沒錯[但是]—\nB: ...[耐心]他們好喻...\nA: ...不會談...\n   ..大小聲或者情緒不穩。\nB: ...情緒不稳不會...
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