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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

There are many international students studying in the United States. One great difficulty they have studying in the English environment is in listening comprehension. As a foreign student myself majoring in teaching English as a second language, I can relate to their problems and have been paying attention to this issue and wanting to find out why they should have such trouble and what would be a solution.

As a matter of fact, some research has already been done to investigate this issue (Richards, 1983; Chaudron & Richards, 1986; Ruetten, 1986; Decarrico & Nattinger, 1988). Their findings show that a proper use of discourse markers by the speaker and an understanding of these discourse markers helps nonnative speakers' listening comprehension.

When the internationals take on the responsibility of being a teaching assistant in a US university, they often cannot satisfy their students who are mostly native speakers of English because they have difficulty making themselves understood. There has also been research done on this issue (Rounds, 1987; Tyler, et al., 1988; Allen & Rueter, 1990; Dalle & Inglis, 1990; Tyler, 1992; Tyler & Bro, 1992; Williams, 1992; Hoekje & Williams, 1994). They discovered that those ITAs who used discourse markers were more comprehensible than those who did not try to use discourse markers. As a result, these researchers suggested that ITAs should try to use appropriate discourse markers in lecturing and that these discourse markers be added to ITA training programs.

Although these two problems nonnative speakers have do not seem to be connected to each other, the researcher does sense some connection between the two.
If it is true that these problems have something to do with nonnative speakers' unfamiliarity with discourse markers in the target language, then what functions do discourse markers have in terms of indicating the structure of a lecture?

Discourse analysis is a branch of the field of linguistics, in which linguists began to investigate language beyond the sentence level and focus on language in use. Some even narrowed their focus down to the structure of lectures only (Cook, 1975; Coulthard & Montgomery, 1981). It has been proved that lectures in each discipline have their own structure (Shaw, 1994).

So far, only the structure of lectures delivered in English has been studied. Therefore, there are two directions waiting to be investigated: the discourse structure of different disciplines and the discourse structure of lectures in different languages. This study takes up both issues by focusing on music and art history lectures given in Chinese.

The study begins in Chapter Two with a review of the literature and previous research on discourse markers and discourse structure. Chapter Three first introduces three lectures including information about the lecturers and the procedures used to obtain the data, and then in the analysis section two issues are discussed: one deals with internal content criteria which define units and the other deals with the external signals which indicate unit boundaries.

Chapter Four discusses the results obtained. It explores the extent to which the three lectures on music and art history share a common discourse structure. It also considers the use of seven discourse unit boundary markers and investigates their relative effectiveness as cues for the hierarchical structure of lectures.

Chapter Five discusses the implications of this study to discourse structure and second language teaching/learning.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Discourse Analysis**

The study of discourse has been a major focus of linguistics since around 1970. While some researchers refer to the study of spoken discourse as "discourse analysis" and the study of written discourse as "text linguistics", usually "discourse analysis" includes both written and spoken discourse.

Discourse analysis is a quite vague term, and only a few linguists have tried to define it. Brown and Yule (1983) state that:

*the analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs* (p. 1).

Stubbs (1983) thinks that discourse analysis:

*attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units...It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers* (p. 1).

McCarthy (1991) believes that discourse analysis is "concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used" (p. 5). Synthesizing the definitions above, we can define discourse analysis with He's (1992) words:

"Discourse analysis is the study of language in use from a functional perspective" (p. 2).

Discourse analysis deals with "the organization of texts, ways which parts of
texts are connected, and the devices used for achieving textual structure" (O'Grady, Dobrovolsky & Aronoff, 1993, pp. 455-456). What does "text" here refer to? Halliday and Hasan (1976) define it as "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole...A text is a unit of language in use" (p. 1). Since a text is the unit of language in use, it is the corpus on which discourse analysts base their research.

Cohesion

The next issue concerns what the properties of a text are, or, how a text can be identified as such. Halliday and Hasan believe that a text has texture and that cohesion both helps to create text and also provides texture: "The concept of cohesion is a semantic one, it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text" (p. 4).

According to Reinhart (1980), Ehrlich (1988), and Hoekje and Williams' (1994) interpretation of "cohesion", we know it is a text's connectedness; it is manifested by linguistic devices; and it signals relations between sentences. Halliday and Hasan include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion as linguistic devices which provide cohesion. Furthermore, they classify conjunction into four subcategories. The conjunctive relations are presented as below:

a. additive: and, or, in addition, I mean, that is
b. adversative: but, nevertheless, in fact, on the other hand, in any case
c. causal: so, because, in the case, otherwise, to this end
d. temporal: then, next, finally, at this moment, secondly (pp. 242-243)

Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) call the conjunctions listed above "logical connectors": "words or phrases whose function it is to show some logical relationship between two or more basic sentences" (p. 323). They believe logical connectors are important in both production and comprehension of discourse because
listeners cannot get the intended message if the speakers use logical connectors inappropriately, whereas people are still able to understand what the speakers mean when grammatical errors such as the omission of articles occur. Since the use of logical connectors is not universal, it is a challenging task for nonnative speakers.

While elaborating on the concept of cohesion, Reinhart (1980) comments on Halliday and Hasan's theory. First, she combines the three devices for cohesion: reference, conjunction and lexical repetition, under the term "referential link" (p. 168). Then she asserts that lexical repetition does not function as a cohesive device at all: "...lexical repetition behaves like a cohesive device it is [sic] because of the referential repetition it implies. Lexical repetition alone is not a cohesive link" (p. 170). Furthermore, she argues that in order to be cohesive, each adjacent pair of sentences in a text must be "either (1) referentially linked, or (2) linked by a semantic sentence connector" (p. 168). Ehrlich thinks that Reinhart's new definition is better than Halliday and Hasan's because she attempts to clarify the necessary and sufficient (that is, the minimal) conditions for a cohesive text while Halliday and Hasan only provide the different devices which can be found in cohesive texts.

Although speaking highly of Reinhart's research, Ehrlich tries to supplement it with some restrictions on the referential link and semantic connector conditions on cohesion. First, she refutes Reinhart's argument that using a referential link is a sufficient condition for achieving cohesion by stating that not just any noun phrase from the succeeding sentences can conform to the referential link requirement. Compare the following two passages:

(1) (a) The antibiotic which was discovered by Sir Alexander Fleming caused a great disturbance in the medical community.

(b) He was busy at the time investigating a certain species of germ.
(2)  (a) The first of the antibiotics was discovered by Sir Alexander Fleming in 1928.

(b) He was busy at the time investigating a certain species of germ. (Danes, 1974. cited in Ehrlich, 1988, p. 113)

The two passages exemplify referential linking since the pronoun he refers back to the NP Sir Alexander Fleming. However, passage (1) cannot be interpreted as being cohesive because the referent NP in (1) (a) occurs in a subordinate clause instead of occurring in a main clause as in sentence (2) (a). So Ehrlich stresses that the NP which is referred to by the second NP must be contained in a dominant clause of the previous utterance. Here, the dominant clause refers to the part in a sentence with which the speaker tries to attract the listener's attention. Usually, it is determined by discourse context. When it comes to the semantic connectors, Ehrlich again imposes the same restriction on the distribution of participating NPs. Consider passages (3) and (4):

(3)  (a) The antibiotic which was discovered by Sir Alexander Fleming caused a great disturbance in the medical community.

(b) At the same time, he discovered a new species of germ.

(4)  (a) The antibiotic which was discovered by Sir Alexander Fleming caused a great disturbance in the medical community.

(b) At the same time, it caused chaos in the universities across the country. (p. 115)

The lack of cohesion of passage (3) is due to the fact that, although it has the semantic connector at the same time, the first NP which is connected to the pronominal is contained within a non-dominant clause of the adjacent sentence. Thus, it is not just the presence of cohesive ties which creates coherence, position is also important. Ehrlich's
conclusion is that "the mere counting of cohesive devices...does not provide an accurate measure of cohesion" (p. 117).

Ehrlich's theory can explain the findings of some problematic studies of cohesion in English. One such study, Connor (1984), uses Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy to examine NSs' and NNSs' writing. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the use of lexical and referential cohesive ties between the two groups. A similar study by Norment (1982) investigated the use of cohesive devices in the written English produced by native Chinese, English and Spanish speaking students. Again, Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy was used to identify the cohesive elements appearing in the data. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the percentages of devices used by each group. The problem with these two studies lies in the assumption that the cohesion of a text is determined by the frequency of cohesive devices used in the text. According to Ehrlich's argument, cohesion cannot be measured by just counting the cohesive devices in the text without considering their restrictions. Thus, we cannot decide whether the NSs and NNSs' writing presents the same degree of cohesion by just counting the frequency of cohesive devices; we must determine how these devices are used in their text.

Ehrlich's study shows that the mere presence of cohesive devices does not achieve cohesion. However, the correct use of cohesive devices does increase the cohesion of the text and make it more comprehensible. This was further exemplified by Round's (1987) study, whose purpose was to identify the different features in the teaching discourse of TAs who were judged to be more successful and those who were less successful. Five TAs' (including both native-speaking TAs and nonnative-speaking TAs) teaching performances were videotaped and analyzed. Among other results, there was a difference concerning cohesion. The more successful TAs tended to use repetition to make cohesive links between ideas while the less successful TAs failed to do so.
Smith and Frawley (1983) were interested in the use of cohesive ties across different genres in written English. They tried to investigate one type of cohesive tie, conjunction, in four different English genres: fiction, journalism, religion and science. Their assumption was, if conjunction is really an important cohesive device, and cohesion is crucial to a text, then different modes of texts should use conjunctions differently. They adopted Halliday and Hasan's (1976) inventory of conjunctions (namely, additive, adversative, causal, and temporal) and supplemented it with one more: hypothetical, which was represented by "if".

The results show that when conjunctions were considered as a cohesive device in texts, that is, when they occurred in sentence initial position and revealed intersentential relationships, the percentage of their occurrence was very low across genres. With respect to the distribution of the conjunctions across genres, fiction and journalism used more coordinating conjunctions than subordinating conjunctions, while the opposite was true for religion and science. Smith and Frawley also found that in each individual genre, different types of conjunctions (i.e. additive, adversative, causal, temporal and hypothetical) and different specific conjunctions (e.g. and, or, if) were dominant. For example, fiction used adversatives cohesively more often than the other types of conjunctions. Among adversatives, but and yet were used most frequently.

Science, the genre which least appealed to conjunctions as a cohesive device, preferred additive to other types. Although it had a relatively low overall frequency of occurrence, and played the most important role in the scientific genre.

In this section, we have discussed several studies which focused on cohesive markers. As we have seen, Halliday and Hasan presented five linguistic devices which can provide cohesion. Of these, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman took conjunctions as logical connectors and believed that their use was crucial in making one's spoken discourse comprehensible. On the other hand, Smith and Frawley focused on the use of conjunctions in written discourse and found that different genres used conjunctions
differently. However, Reinhart commented that what Halliday and Hasan presented was only a necessary but not sufficient condition for cohesion. She put some restrictions on adjacent pairs of sentences. Later on, Ehrlich further restricted the position of the referents. According to her, the mere presence of cohesive devices did not achieve cohesion. With this in mind, it is not surprising to know the results of both Connor and Norment's studies, which showed that there was no difference in the frequency of use of cohesive devices between native and nonnative speakers. Once the cohesive devices are used correctly, Rounds proved that they did help to form better texts.

In addition to the five cohesive devices advocated by Halliday and Hasan (1976), there is another type of device which is called "discourse markers". Schiffrin (1987) defines discourse markers as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (p. 31). Here, "talk" refers to conversational discourse, which is Schiffrin's focus. She believes that discourse markers add to coherence, and that coherence helps "to make overall sense out of a particular segment of talk" (p. 22). In her model, she proposes that conversational discourse has five planes. They are the information state, participation framework, ideational structure, action structure and exchange structure. Ideational structure reveals three different relations between ideas: cohesive relations, topic relations, and functional relations. For example, \textit{and} has different functions in three planes. It can connect different levels of idea units within a text (the ideational structure); it is also a marker of speaker-continuation (the exchange structure), and it has both ideational and interactional functions at the same time (the action structure). In its ideational function, since \textit{and} can link various levels of idea units, it has both a cohesive and a structural role, depending on whether it connects sentences or units larger than sentences. So, discourse markers have functions in more than one level of discourse, and one of their functions is serving as cohesive ties. The discourse markers discussed by Schiffrin include particles such as \textit{oh}, and \textit{well}; conjunctions such as \textit{and},
but, or, so, and because; time deictics such as now and then; and lexicalized clauses such as y’know and I mean.

Fraser (1988, 1990) is interested in discourse markers, too. He concentrates on the characteristics, the meaning, and the classification of English discourse markers. He assumes that each sentence has two kinds of meaning: content meaning (the basic message) and pragmatic meaning (the speaker’s intention). The pragmatic information is signaled by three types of pragmatic markers: basic, commentary and parallel pragmatic markers.

Fraser exemplifies this relationship as:

```
{Content Meaning

Sentence Meaning

Pragmatic Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Pragmatic Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary Pragmatic Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Pragmatic Markers (p. 386)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Discourse markers, which belong to commentary pragmatic markers, indicate how the speaker wants to interpret the relationship between the current and the prior discourse.

Fraser then describes the characteristics of discourse markers in the following way: (1) Discourse markers do not belong to any grammatical category. They come from different grammatical sources: adverbials (now, then, still); literally used phrases (to repeat, what I mean to say); idiomatic phrases (while I have you, still and all); verbs (look, see); interjections (well); coordinate conjunctions (and, or); subordinate conjunctions (so, however); and terms such as anyway and OK. (2) When an expression is used as a discourse marker, it can only function as a discourse marker in the sentence. For example, now cannot be a time adverb and a discourse marker at the same time. (3) Usually, discourse markers appear at the beginning of a sentence. There are exceptions, however. For example, however can occur in utterance-initial, utterance-internal, or utterance-final positions. (4) Unlike other commentary markers, discourse markers do not produce meaning. They only guide the hearer. In the following two examples:
but, or, so, and because; time deictics such as now and then; and lexicalized clauses such as y’know and I mean.

Fraser (1988, 1990) is interested in discourse markers, too. He concentrates on the characteristics, the meaning, and the classification of English discourse markers. He assumes that each sentence has two kinds of meaning: content meaning (the basic message) and pragmatic meaning (the speaker’s intention). The pragmatic information is signaled by three types of pragmatic markers: basic, commentary and parallel pragmatic markers.

Fraser exemplifies this relationship as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sentence Meaning} & \quad \text{Basic Pragmatic Markers} \quad \text{Commentary Pragmatic Markers} \\
\text{Content Meaning} & \quad \text{Parallel Pragmatic Markers (p. 386)}
\end{align*}
\]

Discourse markers, which belong to commentary pragmatic markers, indicate how the speaker wants to interpret the relationship between the current and the prior discourse.

Fraser then describes the characteristics of discourse markers in the following way: (1) Discourse markers do not belong to any grammatical category. They come from different grammatical sources: adverbials (now, then, still); literally used phrases (to repeat, what I mean to say); idiomatic phrases (while I have you, still and all); verbs (look, see); interjections (well); coordinate conjunctions (and, or); subordinate conjunctions (so, however); and terms such as anyway and OK. (2) When an expression is used as a discourse marker, it can only function as a discourse marker in the sentence. For example, now cannot be a time adverb and a discourse marker at the same time. (3) Usually, discourse markers appear at the beginning of a sentence. There are exceptions, however. For example, however can occur in utterance-initial, utterance-internal, or utterance-final positions. (4) Unlike other commentary markers, discourse markers do not produce meaning. They only guide the hearer. In the following two examples:
(1) A: Mary left.
B: John stayed.

(2) A: Mary left.
B: Well, John stayed. (p. 390)

The presence of the discourse marker well actually does not change the underlying discourse relationship between sentence A and sentence B, but it can help the listener to clarify the speaker's communicative intention. (5) Discourse markers are different from other classes of commentary pragmatic markers (e.g. certainly, frankly, amazingly), interjections (e.g. man, ouch, uh-uh), and vocatives (e.g. Darling, Mom, Waiter) (pp. 388-391).

Fraser further discusses the controversial issue of whether discourse markers have content meaning or not. Refuting Schiffrin's view, which proposed that discourse markers have their own core meaning which does not change from use to use, Fraser insists that discourse markers do not have content meaning. They only have pragmatic meaning "which captures some aspect of a speaker's communicative intention" (p. 393). For example, being a discourse marker, so can be interpreted in various ways depending upon the context. But the interpretation can be done with the limitation of the content meaning of so. Some of Fraser's examples are listed below:

(1) John was tired. So he left early.
(2) Attorney: And how long were you part of the clear-up crew?

Witness: Five years.

Atty: So you were employed by G for roughly 5 years?

(3) Son: My clothes are still wet.

Mother: So put the drier on for 30 minutes more. (p. 393)

So is interpreted as "a reasonable result" in (1), "I conclude" in (2), and "in that case you should" in (3) respectively. As for whether so has a core pragmatic meaning in each instance, Fraser's answer is positive. However, the core pragmatic meaning does not
indicate necessary result. It only signals the consequential relationship between the proceeding and following messages.

Fraser then divides discourse markers into three types: topic markers (signaling the change of or refocusing on the topic), discourse activity markers (signaling the relationship between the current discourse and the foregoing discourse), and message relationship markers (signaling the relationship between the current basic message and the prior message). Although both Schiffrin (1987) and Fraser elaborate on discourse markers, they have different focuses. Whereas Schiffrin emphasizes the distribution of discourse markers in conversation and their integrative functions, Fraser tries to characterize and define discourse markers from the pragmatic point of view.

We have introduced discourse markers and their function in increasing cohesion by looking at some theoretical studies. Now we will see how discourse markers are investigated in experimental studies concerning discourse. Chaudron and Richards (1986) focus their research on discourse markers in their study of foreign students' comprehension of university lectures. They take the view that the two cognitive processes of listening comprehension, top-down and bottom-up processing, are supported by the speaker's use of discourse signals. The discourse signals which are used to confirm the discourse organization, and so constitute "signals of high-level information" are termed "macro-markers" (p. 116). They are clauses or phrases such as *What I'm going to talk about today is..., Let's go back to the beginning ..., The next thing is..., Another interesting development was..., and This is not the end of the story* (p. 127). "Micro-markers" refer to discourse signals, which function as the signal of intersentential relations or as filled pauses, such as *well, so, now* and *OK*, giving the listeners more time to do the bottom-up processing, and so are used as "signals of lower-level information" (p. 116).

Comparing the discourse markers proposed by Schiffrin, Fraser, and Chaudron and Richards, we find some differences between their classifications. Schiffrin's
"discourse markers" include only Chaudron and Richards' "micro-markers". Fraser has a different taxonomy, but we can find both Chaudron and Richards' "micro-markers" and "macro-markers" in his taxonomy.

Chaudron and Richards then constructed a study, trying to find out whether the two different discourse markers affect foreign students' comprehension. They used a natural lecture presented to ESL students as the baseline version. Micro-markers and macro-markers were inserted separately into the baseline version to form the second and third versions, and the final version included both micro-markers and macro-markers. The results showed that the macro-markers did facilitate the learners' retention of the lecture content, while the micro-markers did not. They propose three possibilities to explain the results. First, maybe the meaningless micro-markers could not make the subsequent information more salient. Second, the micro-markers were inserted into the baseline version of a natural lecture, so instead of helping the learners, they might just have made the lecture fragmented or disconnected. Third, the baseline lecture version was already slow enough, so the use of filled pauses seemed to be unnecessary.

Cohesion versus Coherence

In discussing their results, Chaudron and Richard discussed the distinction between cohesion and coherence. According to Chaudron and Richards, macro-markers do not increase cohesion. In fact, they are linguistic devices which help to create coherence.

Cohesion and coherence are concepts which are often confused. Some linguists even use them interchangeably. However, as regards the study of text, they are two related but different concepts. Several text linguists (Reinhart, 1980; Ruetten, 1986; Ehrlich, 1988; McCarthy, 1991; Hoekje and Williams, 1994) elaborate on the distinction between the two concepts. Reinhart (1980) states that cohesion "is the label for overt linguist [sic] devices for putting sentences together, and coherence...is a matter of
semantic and pragmatic relations in the text" (p.163). Ehrlich (1988) has a similar description: "Cohesion refers to a text's formal connectedness as manifested by overt linguistic devices signaling relations between sentences, while coherence refers to the unity of a text's underlying semantic relations and their appropriate contribution to the overall discourse theme" (p. 111). Both of them claim that cohesion is a required but not sufficient condition to form a coherent text.

The difference between cohesion and coherence is exemplified in the following passage from Giora (1985): "Mira lives near Rona. Rona has a moustache. She went on a trip yesterday. Yesterday was a rainy day" (p. 700). Giora explains that although the passage is cohesive, it is not coherent because it lacks an underlying discourse theme or topic. So, a text should not only be cohesive but also coherent. First, all the sentences must be put together to form cohesion. Then, globally, all the semantic units must be connected to form an overall coherence. Both of them play an important role in the production and comprehension of discourse.

The studies above demonstrate that there are two methods of forming cohesion. One is through the five linguistic devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical repetition. The other is by means of discourse markers. As for coherence, Schiffrin (1987) believes that the ultimate purpose of using discourse markers is to increase coherence, although they also help to achieve cohesion. The macro-markers which were coined by Chaudron and Richards (1986) are also an important device to form coherence. They appear with different names in later studies, playing a crucial role in discourse coherence.

Coherence: Discourse Markers in the Comprehension of Discourse

Much research has been done on discourse coherence. Some is devoted to the comprehension, and the rest to the production of the discourse. We will discuss these studies separately, first the comprehension and then the production.
With more and more nonnative speakers going to school here in America, discourse analysts have become interested in the NNSs' problem of comprehending academic lectures. Richards (1983) suggests that listeners can improve their listening comprehension by employing certain techniques. He thinks that the presentation of meaning in spoken discourse is quite different from that in written discourse because the former is produced in ongoing time. Cues such as *talking about that, reminds you of...*, and *by the way* are important signs for the listeners to identify directions in topic development.

In their book for teaching assistants, Allen and Rueter (1990) also emphasize the importance of using transitions to make their lectures more comprehensible to their students. The transitions are taken as "structural signposts" of the lectures and are divided into three types: signal words (e.g. *first, next, on the other hand*), rhetorical questions (e.g. *Where do we go from here?*), and linking phrases (e.g. *Now that we understand the policy, let us begin to consider its consequences*).

Allen and Rueter categorized discourse markers according to their different functions. This issue was elaborated on in greater detail by Ruetten (1986). She argues that when students listen to a lecture, they expect the lecturer to give some cues to show the relationship between ideas and between parts of the lecture. One of the cues is "logical connectors". According to Ruetten, a logical connector can be a word, a phrase or a sentence which "shows the logical relationship between the idea before it and the idea following" (p. 10). Ruetten does not categorize the different logical connectors, but she does try to exemplify their various functions. The functions and their examples which are extracted from pages 10 to 107 are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to give examples</td>
<td>Let me give you an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A good example of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to signal definitions</td>
<td>Let's give a more formal definition to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can define X as...

The second characteristic...

Another...

I'd like to discuss...

Let's look at...

There are several characteristics...

The four types...

In other words...

That is...

This means that...

So what we're saying is...

As a general rule...

In general...

We can ask at this point...

Why, you might ask...

As I said...

As we noted earlier...

To conclude...

In fact...

However...

While Ruetten takes the cues as linear connectors, Decarrico and Nattinger (1988) view similar cues from the structural point of view in a larger framework. They first introduce them as "lexical phrases": phrases like let me start with, and that is, OK, same way here and so on, the length of which varies. They are the same things as what Nattinger (1986, p. 3) describes as "conventionalized structures that occur more
frequently and have more idiomatically determined meaning than language that is put together each time" (cited in Decarrico and Nattinger, 1988, p. 92). With the help of lexical phrases, listeners need not pay attention to each single word and so they can focus on the larger structure of discourse.

By investigating the lexical phrases which actually occurred in some natural lectures in different disciplines, Decarrico and Nattinger categorized them into eight functional categories: topic markers, topic shifters, summarizers, exemplifiers, relators, evaluators, qualifiers, and aside markers. While admitting that the function of these lexical phrases was the same as that of the macro-markers proposed by Chaudron and Richards, they invented a new term "macro-organizers" to describe them in order to emphasize their effect in helping the listeners organize the lecture when it proceeds.

Decarrico and Nattinger then divided the eight categories into two levels: global macro-organizers and local macro-organizers. The former includes topic markers, topic shifters and summarizers, "those that indicate the overall organization of the lecture" (p. 94); the latter includes the other five categories, "those that also highlight sequencing or importance of information, but do so at specific points within the overall framework set by the global organizers" (p. 94). This division is important because it helps to distinguish the main topics from those which support them. The categories of macro-organizers can be put in a hierarchical framework as below:
Here we can compare the taxonomy of Decarrico and Nattinger with that of Fraser (1988). Fraser divides discourse markers into three types first and then subclassifies them. His classification is exemplified below:

- **topic markers:** Back to my original point, speaking of, turning now to
- **refocusing on the present topic:** here, now, OK, indeed
- **clarifying:** by way of clarification, to clarify
- **conceding:** admittedly, after all, anyway
- **explaining:** to explain, by way of explanation
- **interrupting:** if I may interrupt, to interrupt
- **repeating:** once again, to repeat
- **sequencing:** finally, next
- **summarizing:** to sum up, so far
- **parallel markers:** and, also, or
- **contrastive markers:** but, instead, well
- **elaborative markers:** for example, namely, besides
- **inferential markers:** accordingly, hence, so
We can find differences between the two taxonomies. Although both Decarrico & Nattinger and Fraser classify the discourse markers according to the different functions they fulfill, the former view the discourse markers as devices to signal an explicit structure of spoken discourse, and the latter treats them from a pragmatic viewpoint.

As far as listening comprehension is concerned, discourse markers which increase coherence play an important role in helping the listeners comprehend discourse. Since we are already aware of the importance of appropriate discourse markers in improving audience comprehension, it seems even more important to know how to produce discourse which is coherent by employing discourse markers in a suitable manner.

Coherence: Discourse Markers in the Production of Discourse

We have mentioned that more and more nonnative-speaking students go to college in the USA nowadays. On one hand, they have difficulty understanding lectures delivered in English; on the other hand, when the nonnative-speaking graduate students serve as teaching assistants, their spoken discourse is often considered incomprehensible by their undergraduate students. Some studies (Gumperz, 1982; Green, 1989; Tyler et al., 1988) show that although pronunciation and grammar are important factors, discourse-level patterns of language use also affect the listeners' comprehension.

When Hoekje and Williams (1994) researched the "ITA problem", they focused on communicative competence. They argue that the communicative competence of ITAs includes not only the knowledge of the language but also the ability to use it, as they notice that most ITAs have enough content and language knowledge, yet they fail to communicate effectively only because they do not know how to convey their knowledge. So communicative competence must contain minimally "the presentation of information in comprehensible form, a familiarity with the speech situation and the roles of participants, and the development of styles of speech and interaction" (p. 12).
There are four components under communicative competence: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (p. 12). Of these, discourse competence is the ability to produce and interpret discourse cohesively and coherently. Three devices can be used to achieve discourse competence: the use of connectors such as "and" and "so", the use of repetition and rephrasing, and the use of discourse markers. Supported by the results of many studies, Hoekje and Williams propose that the use of discourse markers is a crucial element which affects ITAs' discourse. Because of its great importance, the use of discourse markers is again regarded as one factor in strategic competence. In order to compensate for the deficiencies in other components of competence, it is advisable for the ITAs to use some verbal or nonverbal strategies to increase communicative effectiveness. Among them, the use of discourse markers is an efficient skill to make ITAs' discourse more comprehensible.

Rounds (1987) also values the use of discourse markers and views it as an important characteristic which distinguishes better from worse spoken discourse. While comparing the different behaviors between more successful and less successful TAs, she found frequent use of "information chunking" in the transcripts of the former. For example, OK is used to indicate a change of thought. Rounds proposes that information chunking can mark topic shifting and so help to construct explicit organization.

Another study concerning ITAs' spoken discourse was conducted by Dalle and Inglis (1990). They regard discourse markers as guideposts of learning which signal the direction for the students when they listen to lectures. They point out that in the ITAs' training programs, international teaching assistants' teaching presentation improved after they had been instructed in teaching techniques. Among them, Dalle and Inglis believe that the use of discourse markers is the most effective one. Discourse markers have the functions of "separating ideas, indicating temporal relationships and causation, and providing emphasis and contrast" (p. 1).
A similar focus on discourse markers was revealed in a study by Tyler, Jefferies and Davies (1988). They wanted to find out why NNSs' English discourse is considered incoherent by NSs. Based on the conclusions drawn in previous research, they hypothesized that native speakers use some kinds of devices to indicate the interrelationships among different ideas and their relative importance. In other words, the speakers orient the listeners to interpret the discourse coherently by providing them a set of cues. Some contrastive analysis has revealed that different languages use different "information structuring devices" (p. 102) to inform the listeners. Tyler et al. tried to locate the sources of communication difficulty for nonnative speakers' academic spoken discourse from the viewpoint of native speakers of English.

Eighteen Korean and Chinese TAs' teaching demonstrations were analyzed, and the results showed that the NNSs either did not use or misused most of the cues which occurred in NSs' spoken discourse. They included prosodic patterning, subordinating syntactic structures, and lexicalized discourse markings. Among them, Tyler et al. argue that lexicalized discourse markers are the most evident and effective set of devices to indicate the overall structure of the discourse. These markers are "specific lexical items or phrases which announce the organization of major segments of the discourse and signal more relationships among ideas" (p. 107) such as however, now, so, let's turn to the next point, and that is. The problems with the NNSs can be classified into three categories: substitution, overuse, and exclusive use of the lexicalized discourse markers. The Chinese and Korean speakers tended to choose the wrong markers so that they misled the listeners and produced confusion. Also, they used overly and exclusively some markers without paying attention to whether they were appropriate. This made their speech choppy, amorphous, and hence violated the listeners' expectations.

In order to further investigate the discourse-level patterns of NNS' production, Tyler (1992) compared a native Chinese TA's spoken discourse with that of a NSTA. She made a qualitative analysis of both texts, concentrating on the use of discourse
One of the findings shows that the difference between the ITA and NSTA's English was in the use of lexical discourse markers. Tyler believed that the appropriate use of lexical discourse markers could help the listeners construct an overall structure of the information. However, she found that the Chinese speaker used the markers unexpectedly and self-contradictorily. The listeners were thus misled and could not interpret the discourse coherently.

Some studies have attempted to discover which hypotheses account more for the incomprehensibility of NNSs' discourse: the ordering of the ideas or the interpretive cues of the text. Tyler and Bro (1992) support the latter, while Young (1982) supports the former. Young analyzed some Chinese speakers' English spoken discourse and argued that there was a substantial difference between Chinese and English in the discourse level structure: the ordering of the ideas. When presenting one's ideas, a Chinese speaker prefers to adopt a topic-comment format: "the relationship of the main point to the rest of the discourse is in the order of the semantic relationship of topic to comment" (p. 115). So, a Chinese speaker's position is presented only after all of the supporting information has been given, which is in sharp contrast to the style of an English speaker. This is what Young believes to be the main source that causes comprehension difficulty for native speakers of English. Also, it is because of this different discourse tactic that English listeners cannot get Chinese speakers' point at the beginning of their utterance and thus lose the cues to understand the overall direction of discourse.

Tyler and Bro do not agree with Young's argument. Supported by Tyler's previous findings, they believe the reason for the perception of the incoherence of the Chinese speakers' English discourse is a set of miscues at the discourse level, one of which is lexical discourse markers. Their assumption is that when people communicate, the listeners expect the speakers to use some discourse-structuring cues to indicate how ideas are integrated and the relevant relationship among them. If the cues are not
provided by the speakers or are used in unusual ways (e.g. nonnativelike ways), the listeners have difficulty interpreting the discourse and therefore judge it as incoherent.

Tyler and Bro conducted a study to test the two competing hypotheses. They constructed four versions: (1) the original version of Young's materials; (2) the original version with order of ideas reversed; (3) the original version with discourse-structuring cues reconstructed; (4) the combination of (2) and (3). One hundred and fifteen native English-speaking undergraduates were asked to read the four versions and rate their comprehensibility. The results show that there was no significant effect of order of ideas, whereas the effect of discourse miscues was highly significant. Tyler and Bro concluded that while the order of ideas might have some minor effect on comprehension, miscuing at the discourse level was the main factor that produces the perception of incoherence in the nonnative English discourse.

Being concerned about the comprehensibility problem of ITAs and inspired by the findings obtained from previous studies on listening comprehension, Williams (1992) tried to determine two issues: whether the degree of planning involved in production affects the use of discourse markers and whether the use of discourse markers affects the comprehensibility of NNSs' production. The discourse markers studied by Williams are "macro cues", which include the same things as Chaudron and Richards' (1986) macro-markers. They are used to signal key statements such as definition, example, restatement, introduction, summary and so on. Videotapes of 24 ITAs' planned and unplanned presentations were played to NSs and an evaluation of comprehensibility was given by them. The results supported the researcher's assumption. The planned presentations did contain more explicit marking, and they were judged more comprehensible than the unplanned ones.

Up to now, I have introduced discourse markers and their importance in discourse analysis. Discourse markers are a group of lexical expressions which do not belong to any grammatical category. They appear in various lengths, that is, they could
be words, phrases, or clauses. Discourse analysts research them by calling them different names such as "discourse markers" (Schiffrin, 1987), "transitions" (Allen and Rueter, 1990), 'logical connectors" (Ruetten, 1986), "macro-organizers" (Decarrico and Nattinger, 1986), "information chunking" (Rounds, 1987), "lexical discourse markers" (Tyler et al., 1988; Tyler, 1992; Tyler and Bro, 1992), "macrocues" (Williams, 1992), or "macro-markers and micro-markers" (Chaudron and Richards, 1986). After cautious comparison and analysis, I propose that discourse markers have different functions at three levels. At the lowest level, discourse markers signal intersentential relations and hence increase cohesion. They are the ones discussed by Schiffrin (1987) as well as what Chaudron and Richards (1986) named "micro-markers". I would like to term these discourse markers "micro-markers" so as to emphasize their specific function. At the highest level, discourse markers are those which are used to cue topic shifting and so to indicate the overall structure of the text. We can call them "global macro-markers". There is still one type of discourse marker whose function is in between the two functions mentioned above. This kind of discourse marker is used to signal key statements such as definitions, examples or to indicate relationship among ideas. However, the level of their function is lower than that of the macro-markers, and therefore they only perform their duty within the overall framework set by macro-markers. In order to distinguish them from macro-markers, I borrow a term from Decarrico and Nattinger's (1988) taxonomy and call them "local macro-markers".

So we have three kinds of discourse markers: micro-markers, local macro-markers, and global macro-markers. While the major function of micro-markers is to create cohesion, the other two help to establish coherence only.

**Discourse Structure**

In addition to the use of discourse markers, the structure of discourse also contributes to coherence. In fact, when we say that discourse markers help to create
coherence, it is because they signal the relative importance of and the interrelationships among ideas. While discourse markers are discourse structuring cues, the ideas themselves form the structure of the text. Tyler et al. (1988) describe the relationship between discourse markers and discourse structure by commenting that "...the most obvious and salient [means] a speaker can use to orient the listener to the overall structure of the discourse is...the use of lexicalized discourse markers" (p. 107). If a text without appropriate discourse markers is difficult for the listener to understand, a text which has no structure at all would be impossible for one to comprehend.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) state that the cohesive relation is not the only necessary condition in constructing a text. There are other components of texture. One of them is the "macrostructure" of the text, that is, the structure of discourse. Halliday and Hasan state: "By this we mean the larger structure that is a property of the forms of discourse themselves: the structure that is inherent in such concepts as narrative, prayer, folk-ballad, formal correspondence..." (pp. 326-327). What Halliday and Hasan mean is that discourse structure is what distinguishes different genres of discourse; in other words, every genre of discourse has its own discourse structure. As for the definition of "genre", Swales (1990) interprets it as communicative events which share the same communicative purposes, have a similar discourse structure and are restricted in terms of content and style. Some informal and spontaneous genres such as conversation and the personal experience story might be considered as not having structure, but this is not true. Sacks et al. (1974) and Labov (1972) have proved that both of them are highly structured.

One example of a particular discourse structure within a genre is the monologue. When Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) analyzed a monologue in a radio interview, they noticed that the speaker himself sets up an organization for his utterance by using discourse markers. Put into a hierarchical framework, these discourse markers look like this (p. 32):
Several major areas concerning the
unions...require to be considered----> There's first the question...

Now the second big area/
two fundamental principles...--------> first of all
secondly

At the beginning of the utterance, the speaker predicted that "several major areas
concerning the unions...require to be considered". So the listener knew there would be
more than one point in this utterance. When "There's first the question" and "Now the
second big area" appeared, the listener identified them easily as the two points. Also,
the second point included "two fundamental principles", which were then signaled by
such discourse markers as "first of all", "secondly". This example exemplifies how
discourse markers indicate the overall structure of the text and how both discourse
markers and the structure of discourse help to form coherence.

Discourse Structure of Lectures

Given the importance of structure in discourse, here we will talk about the
structure of the genre of spoken discourse which is the primary focus of this study: the
lecture.

The objectives of lectures have been defined and their effectiveness investigated
by some researchers. Bligh (1972) argues that one main objective of lectures is to
transmit information. Chaudron and Richards (1986) also state "the function of lectures
is to instruct, by presenting information in such a way that a coherent body of
information is presented, readily understood, and remembered" (p. 114). In order to
understand the effectiveness of lectures, Dubin and Taveggia (1968) reviewed ninety-
one studies comparing different teaching methods. The findings summarized in Bligh
suggest that "lectures are as effective as other methods for teaching information, but not
more so" (p. 21). Although not showing superiority over other teaching methods, lecturing is always the dominant teaching method in colleges.

In her research on how to comprehend academic lectures, Ruetten (1986) first discussed the characteristic of an ideal lecture. She proposes that in an ideal lecture, the lecturer has a clear purpose or topic. The lecturer also has a main idea (or ideas) which is "the point that the lecturer wants to make about the topic" (p. 6). The lecturer then develops the main ideas with supporting information such as examples, definitions or explanations.

Ruetten argues that the organization of a lecture can help the listeners to understand the purpose and the main ideas. She divides the organization into three parts: introductory remarks, body, and summarizing remarks. Usually, the lecturer announces his purpose or topic in the introductory remarks, classifies and develops the main ideas in the body, and summarizes the main ideas in the last part.

What Ruetten describes is only a very general organization of lectures. In fact, it can also be applied to other genres in spoken discourse such as speeches or sermons. It can even be used in some genres of written discourse, for example, expository writing. As for lectures, there is a more specific and detailed description of their structure. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) are the first ones to research the structure of classroom discourse. By carefully observing and analyzing classroom interaction, they set up a hierarchically-ordered framework of specific units as the structure of classroom discourse. From the lowest rank to the highest rank, the units are acts, moves, exchanges, transactions and lessons. According to Sinclair and Coulthard, acts are "typically one free clause, plus any subordinate clauses, but there are certain closed classes where we can specify almost all the possible realizations which consist of single words or groups" (p.23). Totally there are twenty-two discourse acts. They are: marker, starter, elicitation, check, directive, informative, prompt, clue, cue, bid, nomination, acknowledge, reply, react, comment, accept, evaluate, silent stress, meta-
statement, conclusion, loop, and aside (pp. 40-44). Sinclair and Coulthard argue that the relationship between acts and moves is similar to that between morphemes and words in grammar. While a bound morpheme cannot constitute a word by itself, a bound act cannot form a move. For example, the bound act "markers" are a closed class of items such as O.K., well, now, good. They serve to indicate boundaries in the discourse, and they occur only as the head of opening, focusing and framing moves. On the other hand, the free act "reply" can contain only a word Yes to respond to an "elicitation" and realize answering moves. There are five classes of move: framing, focusing, opening, answering and follow-up. Of these, the first two belong to boundary exchanges, and the last three make up teaching exchanges. Above exchange, there are three types of transaction: informing, directing, and eliciting. Each contains several exchanges. The highest unit is lessons, which are made up of a series of transactions. Composing all these units of different levels, the structure of classroom discourse thus shapes up.

Although they provide quite a thorough description, Sinclair and Coulthard focus on the structure of interactive classroom discourse, which is not identical with that of a lecture. A model more specific to lectures was proposed by Cook (1975). This model has a set of hierarchical units similar to that of Sinclair and Coulthard. The units of both models are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sinclair &amp; Coulthard</th>
<th>Cook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between these two models is that episode replaces exchange and exposition replaces transaction. On one hand, Cook's model stresses the functions of
individual propositions; on the other hand, it puts these propositions within an organized framework. However, it is somewhat too complicated and detailed. First, the structure for some of the ranks is too complicated. For example, the structure for episodes is "Episode = F E (E2...n) C" [F is focus; E is extension; C is conclusion; E is one or more moves other than focusing or concluding; ( ) means an optional condition]. The structure for expositions is "Exposition = (P) D O (D2...n) T (T2...n)" [P is expectation; O is focal; D is developmental; T is closing]. Second, his classification is too detailed. For example, the number of classes of moves is more than double that in Sinclair and Coulthard. Besides, he makes subclasses for acts, and the number of them is double the total number of the classes of acts themselves. Murphy and Candlin (1979) comment on this point in this way: "...we find that they [the classes] do not achieve a generality of structure of the significance which can be claimed for Sinclair & Coulthard"(p.18).

Furthermore, Murphy and Candlin criticize the criteria Cook used for identifying the acts as being invalid. For example, "marker" is one kind of act. It is subdivided into "marker of transition" and "marker of contrast". The former contains words such as well, O.K., now, and its function is to mark boundaries. The latter, however, realized by conjunctions like but, yet, however, functions as a cohesive device. It is obvious that the two kinds of markers are defined by two different kinds of criteria.

Following the work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) propose another set of models for the structure of lectures in which there are three units: transaction, sequence and member. A transaction is a topic unit which "is identified by the focusing activity that occurs at its boundaries" (p. 33). The focusing activity refers to two kinds of focus: a prospective focus at the beginning to open the transaction and a retrospective focus at the end to close the transaction. A sequence is a sub-topic unit and is identified by phonological criteria. It begins with a relatively high pitch and ends with a relatively low one. A member is quite similar to Sinclair and Coulthard's discourse move. It is a free clause with or without its bound
Coulthard and Montgomery found two kinds of members when they analyzed lectures: "Some discourse members are mainly oriented towards the subject matter of the discourse, others towards the reception of this subject matter" (p.35). The former, which is termed "main discourse member", describes particular phenomena. The latter, which is termed "subsidiary discourse member", explains, develops, or comments on the former. These two different kinds of discourse members form two separate planes within discourse: main discourse and subsidiary discourse. Look at the following examples:

(1) (a) and er these er buds in general have the characteristic of indefinite growth  
(b) once they begin to develop they go on and on (p.35).

This example consists of two different members: (a) is the main discourse member, and (b) is the subsidiary discourse member, which reformulates the first one.

The subsidiary discourse members can be subclassified into two classes: glosses and asides. Glosses are furthermore divided into three types: restates, qualifies, and comments. We can understand different glossing members through examples below:

(2) (a) is there a cheaper solution  
(b) in other words can you use a cheaper device

(3) (a) all these equivalent circuits are experimentally determined  
(b) at least they have a basis in experiment

(4) it may seem very trivial just telling you how to write things down. (p. 37).

The utterance in (2)(b), restates, repeats, or explains the proceeding member in (2)(a). Discourse markers such as "in other words", "that is", "for example" often occur between the two members. Led by items such as "actually", "in reality", "at least", qualifies try to limit or modify the general appropriateness of the immediately prior
member, as exemplified in (3). Comments show the speaker's attempt to evaluate what is being said from the audience's standpoint, as we can see in the example in (4).

Asides are quite different from glossing members. Glossing members constitute an essential part of subsidiary discourse and maintain a close relationship with the main discourse by expounding, limiting, modifying, and evaluating it. Asides are only weakly related to the main discourse. Coulthard and Montgomery regard glossing as typically anaphoric and asides as typically exophoric (p. 37). Glossing creates an anaphoric relation in which its interpretation refers back into the text; asides make reference to the context of situation, but not to the text. Nevertheless, the main discourse is contextualized by the presence of asides in some way. For example, science and engineering lecturers often use supplementary visual displays such as diagrams or blackboard calculations. This kind of "paradiscourse" is related to the main discourse by the use of procedural asides. This is exemplified in (5):

(5) MAIN /in the stem er the situation is different because the xylem and the phloem are on the same radius

/now if you have a stem with separate vascular bundles like this and so on

ASIDE just show xylem and phloem and phloem for simplicity-

//xylem here phloem towards the outside (p. 38).

Within the three similar but different models mentioned above, the one proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) is for classroom discourse, which contains more interaction between the teacher and students, and so is not appropriate for lecture discourse. Cook's (1975) model, although a thorough one, has its weakness which has been pointed out above. Coulthard and Montgomery's (1981) model shows precision in observation, analysis and description of lectures. They abandon the use of rank scale, the defect of which is the difficulty "to specify ordered arrangements of classes of unit at lower ranks which would combine together in predictable ways to form structures at the
rank above" (p. 39). What is more important is their distinction between main discourse and subsidiary discourse. While the former points out the subject matter, the latter helps the listener understand it. This distinction gives lecture discourse the feature of differentiation. More than that, the operation of the subsidiary members demonstrate the lecturer's attempt to incorporate the listeners' reaction into his lecturing.

With the models of the discourse structure of lectures in mind, we want to find out if the structures of lectures in different disciplines vary or whether different disciplines share the same discourse structure. Shaw (1994) gave a negative answer by stating: "A physics lecture, for example, will have particular discourse structure not necessarily found in mathematics or economics classes" (p. 28). He analyzed engineering and business lecture discourse, with the following findings. First, he constructed an internal structure for problem-solving transactions, which are common forms in engineering classes. It is listed below:

- prospective focusing member
- sequence 1: posal
- sequence 2: solution
- sequence 3: evaluation
- retrospective focusing member (p. 35).

While problem-solving transactions are typical forms in engineering discourse, concept-based or topic-based types of transactions are the dominant form in business and management discourse. The internal structure for concept-based transactions can contain the following elements, although Shaw reminds us that not all of the elements listed below were required for each transaction and some might be omitted depending upon the situation:
Shaw's most important contribution is that he established the discourse structure for business lectures. The hierarchical system consists of topic, subtopic, transaction and sequence:

Figure 1

**Discourse structure of a business lecture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective focus</td>
<td>Prospective focus</td>
<td>Prospective focus</td>
<td>Prospective focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1</td>
<td>Subtopic 1</td>
<td>Transaction 1</td>
<td>Formal account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Topic 2)</td>
<td>(Topic 2)</td>
<td>(Transaction 2)</td>
<td>Informal account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Topic n)</td>
<td>(Topic n)</td>
<td>(Transaction n)</td>
<td>Interaction/Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Evaluation</td>
<td>Interaction/Evaluation</td>
<td>Interaction/Evaluation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective focus</td>
<td>Retrospective focus</td>
<td>Retrospective focus</td>
<td>Retrospective focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prospective Focusing Member:

now

Orientation:

you don't like to think of it this way but banks are profit making corporations so certainly paramount in any (2.4) discussion of what banks are up to

Prospective Focus:

profitability has to be the number one item on the list

Definition:

banks have to be profitable

Informal account:

if they're not this low return lower than average return will cause resources to flow to other sectors of the economy and no corporation can afford to constantly have resources flowing away from it it limits its ability to acquire new capital it limits the ability to grow basically impossible kind of situation you've got essentially to be earning a return at least equal to other alternatives in society

Retrospective Focusing Member:

OK

Recapitulation:

So profitability has to be the number one concern (p. 42)

The purpose of Shaw's proposal of the discourse structure of the business lecture is to offer useful information to help improve the ITAs' communicative competence with regards to setting teaching tasks and training for lesson planning. In fact, Shaw's contribution is significant not only in pedagogy but also in discourse analysis. In the area of general lecture structure research, he further narrows his focus by limiting himself to lecture structures in specific disciplines.

Discourse structure is a branch of discourse analysis, which is just in the developing stage. The work waiting to be done can be divided into two focuses: one is
further work in the discourse structure of different disciplines; the other is the discourse structure of lectures in different languages. This study takes up both issues by focusing on music and art history lectures given in Chinese.

Up to now no research has been done on the structure of lectures in Chinese. It is possible that such research may reveal underlying differences based on linguistic and cultural factors. We know that Chinese is a language which is quite different from English. Also, Chinese culture is quite different from western culture. Tyler (1992) points out that different languages have different ways to signal information structure. Miscommunication arises when the listener's expectation for specific information structuring cues cannot be matched. Therefore, it would be interesting to engage in contrastive discourse analysis in this field.

**Contrastive Discourse Analysis**

Within the limited contrastive discourse analysis which has been done between Chinese and English, I am going to cite only three studies that are relevant to the present study. The first is about spoken discourse and the other two are about written discourse.

Scollon and Wong-Scollon (1991) argue that the way to introduce topics in conversations is different between Asians (Chinese, Korean, Japanese) and westerners. Westerners use a "call-answer-topic" sequence while Asians use a "call-answer-facework-(topic)" sequence. In the former situation, the person who starts the talk is supposed to be the one who introduces the topic. He begins the exchange with the "call". The person who is spoken to then makes the second move by the use of "answer". After that, the caller introduces the topic. This sequence is taken as natural and logical by westerners, but actually it is only a culture-bound behavior. For Asians, there is some small talk after the first two moves. This kind of facework helps to establish a good atmosphere for the conversation. Once this function has been fulfilled,
the topic may be introduced. If the facework does not succeed in its purpose, the caller may choose not to introduce the topic at all. Scollon and Wong-Scollon thus term the western pattern a deductive one and the Asian pattern an inductive one.

Obviously the distinction revealed above is due to a difference in cultural backgrounds, which also forms the basis for the next study, which was conducted by Mao (1993). Mao elaborates on the different use of metadiscourse markers in the western and Chinese rhetorical contexts. He defines metadiscourse markers as "various kinds of linguistic tokens that an author employs in her text to guide or direct her reader as to how to understand her, her text, and her stance toward it" (p. 265). By examining letters written in English, he found that westerners like to use what Beauvais calls "simple expositive acts" (cited in Mao, 1993, p.273), such as I believe, I state or I am of the opinion. However, when he observes the letters written by Chinese, except for some "text connectives" like but, thus, consequently, no other metadiscourse markers are used. Instead, the Chinese authors tend to appeal to the past and get support from ancient practices and authoritative figures.

According to the two studies, there are differences between Chinese and English both in the way of speaking (conversation) and the way of writing (letter-writing). We must admit that conversation and letter-writing are quite culture-bound communicative activities, so it is not surprising to find differences between two quite different cultures in these two genres. However, can we find differences in genres which are less culture-bound? Taylor and Chen (1991) concentrated on quite a complicated issue in writing for academic purposes. They tried to identify the possible sources of variability in discourse structure by examining the introductions to papers of related disciplines written in English (by native English speakers and native Chinese speakers) and in Chinese (by native Chinese speakers). The reason that they asked Chinese speakers to write in both English and Chinese is that they wanted to avoid the concept of "culturo-linguistic system" proposed by Kaplan (1978, p. 69). In other words, they tried to avoid
positing a strong link between language and culture. The model of discourse structure of the introduction they adopted was proposed by Swales (1984). The structure includes four moves: (1) stating the current knowledge in this field; (2) presenting the relevant previous research; (3) pointing out the slot in the previous research that the present research is put into; (4) specifying the purpose of the present research. The results showed that although not all of the four moves were present in all the papers, each of the four moves was employed by all three groups (Anglo-American/English, Chinese/English, and Chinese/Chinese). So there may be a universal structure for introductions to academic papers in different languages, cultures and disciplines. This is not to say that there are no differences between the groups. The two Chinese groups tend to avoid elaboration, use only certain patterns, write at less length, and cite fewer references. What Taylor and Chen try to emphasize, however, is that, there is no uniquely "Chinese way" of writing introductions to scientific papers. Furthermore, culture was not the only factor which caused differences in the structure of writing; the differences found were due to either culture or discipline.

Of the three studies discussed above, the first one talked about differences in informal face-to-face conversation, and it was mostly concerned with interaction. Therefore, the results may not apply to the formal lectures in this study. The second one dealt with the different styles in Chinese and English letter-writing. The non-academic nature of the content and writing as a channel versus speaking do not indicate any common ground between this study and the lectures in mine. On the other hand, however, lectures may have something in common with the expository writing examined in the last study because both of them are academic. Thus, they may share some of the same features.

In addition to the three studies which concern contrastive discourse analysis, there is one study which deals with discourse markers in Mandarin Chinese. In this study, Miracle (1991) investigates the functions of hao (OK), na(me) (well, so, then),
ke³shi⁴ (but), dan⁴shi⁴ (but), and bu²guo⁴ (but) when they are used as discourse markers. Miracle argues that each of these markers has various uses, and from these uses, a core function can be determined. For example, hao³ has different functions in various aspects of discourse as indicated in the following quotation:

...hao not only 1) plays a role in the development and closure of commissive/requestive social actions, but also 2) acts as an appreciation of assertions and marks the transition to a new topic or social activity, 3) marks the closure of telephone calls or other physical activity, and 4) used within a particular speaker's turn, functions as a marker of idea management signalling the completion of a prior topic or activity and the transition to another topic or activity (p. 32).

The core function which is common to all of these functions is closure and transition. Similarly, depending on the aspects of the discourse structure, na⁴me serves a variety of functions, while it remains a marker of continuation. As for the disjunctive markers ke³shi⁴, dan⁴shi⁴ and bu²guo⁴, Miracle states that their uses resemble those of "but" described by Schiffrin (1987) as marking "referential contrast, functional contrast, and contrastive actions" (p. 177). In the various uses of the disjunctive markers in idea structure, social action structure and turn structure, they maintain a core function of marking contrast. This study was the first one which investigated the functions of Chinese discourse markers in different aspects of discourse.

Discourse analysis deals with language in use. Text is the unit of language in use and the corpus analysts base their research on. A text must be both cohesive and coherent; cohesion constructs the linear structure, and coherence the hierarchical structure. Both of them play an important role in the production and comprehension of discourse. Cohesion can be attained by using either linguistic cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan or micro-markers labeled by Chaudron and Richards. Coherence
can be realized by both discourse structure and its signals: macro-markers. Discourse structure is a new interest of discourse analysts in which the structure of lectures is one of the genres studied the most. Different models of lecture discourse structures have been established. Some researchers have even extended their research scope to specific disciplines. There are just a few studies in contrastive discourse analysis, and one study in Chinese discourse markers. However, no research has been done comparing and contrasting lectures in English and in Chinese. As a matter of fact, no research has been done on lectures in Chinese.

Many interesting questions remain to be answered: What is the discourse structure of lectures delivered in Chinese? What is the role discourse markers play in lecture discourse? What are the other factors which help to signal the structure? The present study is intended to address these questions. In order to do so, we will first examine three spoken lectures in Chinese on music and art history to discover a unifying discourse structure. Then we will ascertain how the structure is signaled.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Based on the literature review, we know that in English discourse markers are the most salient device for signaling the structure of the discourse by marking the boundaries of each unit. However, no studies have been done on the discourse structure of lectures in Chinese. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate two issues: the structure of lectures in Chinese and the effect of discourse markers in indicating their structure. At the same time, other devices which had the same functions were also examined. The data were three Chinese lectures delivered in a college in Taiwan, Republic of China. In order to make the purpose more definite, the study was limited to focus on similar disciplines: the history of music or art. The basic hypothesis for this study states that there is a structure for music and art history lectures in Chinese, and both discourse markers and other factors help to signal that structure.

SUBJECTS

Three courses were chosen within similar disciplines: History of Western Art, History of Western Music, and History of Chinese Music. The three courses are obligatory courses for the students of the Art Department and Music Department respectively in an arts college in Taiwan. Originally, permission was asked of lecturers of seven related courses to video-tape their classes. However, three lecturers declined for different reasons. The four classes left were observed and video-taped. The result of the video-taping of one of the four classes was bad because of ongoing construction work during the class. So, finally there were three left. The three lecturers of these
classes are full-time teachers in the college. Their backgrounds are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
LECTURERS' PERSONAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Studied Abroad</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>History of Western Art</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>History of Western Music</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>History of Chinese Music</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The names reported in this study are fictitious names used to preserve the anonymity of the lectures.

This table shows that two of the lecturers were female and one was male. All of them were in their forties. Both Lin and Wong got their doctorate degrees in Art History and Philosophy in Austria, while Chen got her master's degree in Music in Taiwan. The teaching experience refers to the period they have taught the very courses in which they were observed. In order to easily refer to the three lectures throughout the rest of this paper, the lecture by Lin which is on History of Western Art is labelled Lecture A; the lecture by Wong on History of Western Music is labelled Lecture B; and the lecture by Chen on the History of Chinese Music is labelled Lecture C. The number of the students in each class is around 30 to 35. The time of each class is 100 minutes. Lin gave a break in the middle but the other two did not.
PROCEDURES

The lecturers were told that the purpose of the observation and video-taping was to collect data for a thesis. They only knew the thesis was about the styles of lecturing. They were asked to lecture just as naturally as they usually did. Since the lecturers had told the students that that class would be observed and video-taped by a researcher, the students did not show much curiosity.

The materials used to conduct this study were a video camera with a microphone and a tape recorder. The reason for using the tape recorder was to make sure no part of the lecture would be missed when the videotape had to be replaced. The video camera had been set up at the back of the classroom before class began. The tape recorder was given to a student who sat near the lecturer and turned over the tape when this was necessary.

After all three classes had been video-taped, they were transcribed into Chinese characters first. Then each of them was transcribed into Chinese pinyin, which is an alphabetic system. The five tones of Chinese are represented by the superscript number: 1, 2, 3, 4, and nothing (to indicate a neutral tone) at the upper right-hand side of each character. The outlines of the three lectures are listed in Appendix A. Since the objective was to analyze teachers' lecturing, the students' utterances were not transcribed. (It was also because the students' utterances were not loud and clear enough, and so were difficult to understand.)

ANALYSIS

Two issues are discussed in this section. One deals with how the lectures are divided into small units. The other one investigates what kinds of external features signal the boundaries of the units.
Internal content criteria to define units

In order to analyze the structure of the lectures, each lecture was first divided into units according to its content. The decision on unit boundaries was primarily based on the main topic of the unit. The criteria used to define units in different situations are exemplified below. Examples of the units are given in Appendix B.

(A) Standard Unit:

An example of a standard unit is given as Example (1) in Appendix B on pages 169-170. This example comes from Lecture B which is on History of Western Music. At the beginning of (1), Wong announced that he was going to introduce the second composer of the Notre Dame School. He also commented on the contribution of Lenoninus, the focus of the last class. This is clearly the preview and review part of the lecture. Then on Line 6, he asked the students to open their textbooks to page 113 and began to introduce organum quadruplum. The change of topics is quite obvious, and so they are divided into two units:

The first unit (Lines 1-5): reviewing Lenoninus; previewing Perotinus
The second unit (Lines 6-24): introducing organum quadruplum

(B) Digression:

Example (2) in Appendix B on pages 170-174, shows how digressions were treated. This example comes from Lecture A, which is on History of Western Art. In (2), Lin first introduced the medieval style, which was one of the artistic styles in early Middle Ages. Then from Line 22 she began to say something which had nothing to do with the history of Western Art. She told the students that the Middle Ages was a difficult period for Asian students to understand and so advised them to do some analyses after class. From Line 36 she began to introduce the Christianization Period in Europe, which was the background for manuscript illumination. In this situation, the
second topic is something which just occurred to the teacher on the spot. It does not correlate with either the first topic or the third topic. It forms a digression and is treated as one isolated unit. Thus there are three units here:

The first unit (Lines 1-21): introducing the second artistic styles in early Middle Ages: medieval style

The second unit (Lines 22-35): reminding the students of the difficulties in learning about the medieval period and advising them to study harder

The third unit (Lines 36-63): introducing the background for manuscript illumination: the Christianization Period in Europe

(C) Insertion:

In another situation, different topic or topics are inserted into an ongoing topic. This situation is different from the preceding one in that the topics mentioned here are not digressions. An example of this is given as Example (3) in Appendix B on pages 174-179. This example, like the previous one, also comes from Lecture A. In (3), after Lin had begun to introduce Painting 1 for a little while, she looked at her notes for five seconds and then from Line 10 she started to explain how and where the illuminated manuscripts were produced. After she finished the topic, (See Line 45) she started to go through slides quickly with the students to give the students the idea of the two different styles in the Early Middle Ages. After another five-second pause in line 61, she returned back to Painting 1 and began to analyze it. Without clear examination, this text might be taken as one unit because the beginning part and the end part share the same topic. However, the middle part contains two independent topics (Lines 10-44 and Lines 45-59), so there are three topics within this text. Further, although the beginning part and
the end part of the text talked about Painting 1, it was split and formed two units. Therefore, I decided to count this text as four units. This can be exemplified as below:
The first unit (Lines 1-9): introducing Painting 1
The second unit (Lines 10-44): explaining how and where the illuminated manuscripts were produced
The third unit (Lines 45-59): going through slides quickly to show the two different styles in the paintings
The fourth unit (Lines 60-73): returning to and analyzing Painting 1

This phenomenon is easy to explain. The lecturer just forgot to explain the origin of illuminated manuscripts and to view the slides before she went on analyzing Painting 1.

(D) Interruption:

A fourth category which affected the segmentation of units was interruption. This is exemplified in Example (4) in Appendix B on pages 179-185. This example comes from Lecture C, which is on History of Chinese Music. In (4), first, Chen said that there were two kinds of classification of Feast Music: one based on its content and the other one on its styles of performance. Just as she wanted to talk about the first kind of classification, she found that one student had a question (in Line 13). After answering the question, some more questions were asked (in Line 19, another student asked a question; from Line 22 still another student asked three questions and answered one clarification question asked by Chen). Finally, from Line 57, she resumed her topic. Although the middle part was the students' questions and what the teacher said was just to satisfy the students, it was defined as one unit. The reason is that these questions were different from the other questions asked by the students. The other questions asked by the students in the three lectures were asked one at a time. The four questions asked by three students were asked one by one and took more than 40 lines. After
answering the questions, the lecturer needed a transition to resume her previous topic. Thus, it was taken as a unit. This text is exemplified as below:

The first unit (Lines 1-12): classifying Feast Music according to its content
The second unit (Lines 13-56): answering the students' questions
The third unit (Lines 57-102): resuming the previous topic

External signals to indicate unit boundaries

After the criteria for defining units had been set up and the units had been identified, the next step was to examine how the boundaries of the units were signaled, that is to say, I tried to look at the formal devices used to mark the boundaries of the units. Brown and Yule (1983) argue that "our interpretation of what a speaker is talking about is inevitably based on how he structures what he is saying" (p. 94). That was what I intended to examine for this section. Seven different devices were found. They are discourse markers, pauses, rhetorical questions, retrospective phrases, topicalized phrases, volume and pitch, and kinesics. Of these, discourse markers have been discussed thoroughly and in detail in Chapter 2. All the others will be discussed briefly in each section.

(A) Discourse markers

In Chapter II, the results of a great number of studies showed that the use of discourse markers was the most evident and efficient device to indicate the overall structure of the discourse in English. Similarly, various discourse markers appeared in the three Chinese lectures in this study.

Discourse markers in English were divided into three categories in Chapter II: global macro-markers, local macro-markers and micro-markers. According to their definitions, global macro-markers are most effective in indicating the boundaries of the
topics. A list of global macro-markers in English which were proposed by different researchers is shown below:

Chaudron and Richards (1986):

What I'm going to talk about today is...
The next thing is...
Another interesting development was...
To begin with...
Now where are we...

Ruetten (1986):

I'd like to discuss...
Let's look at...
The second characteristic...
Another...
There are several characteristics...
The four types...

Decarrico and Nattinger (1988):

Today we're going to hear...
So let's turn to...
You can see...

Fraser (1988):

Back to my original point...
Speaking of...
Turning now to...

In Chinese lectures similar global macro-markers were found. Some of the examples are listed below:

(5) jie¹ xia⁴ qu⁴ wo³ men kan⁴ dao⁴ ...
Next we will look at...
What we're going to introduce today is...

So, today before we enter the next phase...

The second point we're going to cover...

In Chinese, *guan'yu* (with regard to, concerning) is also a macro-marker because it indicates a new topic. Its function is just like "speaking of". Therefore, Example (9) contains a macro-marker.

After Wong had introduced the term *Ars Nova*, which represented the music in the fourteenth century, he supplemented the opposite term of *Ars Antique*. After answering a student's question, he started to introduce the content of a treatise, from which the term *Ars Nova* was derived, by uttering what is in (9).

There is a special kind of macro-marker in Chinese. Whenever the lecturers say "*wo3men kan4 dao4*..." (we look at...) or "*ni3men kan4 dao4*..." (you look at...), it is taken as a macro-marker. This is because what the two utterances mean is "Let's look at...". This kind of macro-marker occurred mostly in Lecture A, when the lecturer asked the students to look at the paintings. Usually they occurred with micro-markers *xian4zai4* (now) or *ran2hou4* (and). This is exemplified in Example (10):
In addition to global macro-markers, in English some micro-markers can also be used to mark the unit boundaries. Micro-markers are divided into five subcategories in Chaudron and Richards' (1986) taxonomy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>segmentation</th>
<th>temporal</th>
<th>causal</th>
<th>contrast</th>
<th>emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>at that time</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>you can see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>after this</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>for the moment</td>
<td></td>
<td>on the other hand</td>
<td>obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>eventually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unbelievably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naturally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 127)

As for their functions, Chaudron and Richards described these as "markers of intersentential relations, framing of segments, and pause fillers" (p.117). Therefore, one of the functions of the micro-markers is to signal divisions. It does not mean that every micro-marker has this function. In general, the ones under the heading of "segmentation" serve the purpose best. McCarthy (1991) takes the micro-markers such as right, now, so, okay, as a set of useful transaction markers which teachers use to segment a lesson into sections. Actually, these micro-markers mentioned by McCarthy constitute one kind of act, which is "markers," as defined by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), and their function is to indicate boundaries in discourse.

Integrating the arguments on English micro-markers of Schiffrin (1976), Chaudron and Richards (1986), and Fraser (1988, 1990), the Chinese micro-markers found in the three lectures were classified into five categories in Chaudron and Richards' taxonomy:
Some items listed above have more than one usage. For example, "ran'hou" can be a temporal conjunction or a causal conjunction. Besides, it also has the function of segmentation. In this situation, its literal meaning is reduced.

One example of using micro-makers as unit boundary markers is exemplified below:

(11)

1 yin'ci...zheng'ge qu'zi wo'men ting' de shi'hou hui fei' chang de
2 liu'chang, wo'men jue'de ta' shi cong tou zhe yang'zi guan' chuan'
3 dao'xi de, bu'hui you' na'zhong yi'ge duan'luo yi'ge duan'luo de
4 gan'jue... hao, ge'wei', wo'men xian'zai', wo xiang wo'men jiu'lai'
5 ting'ting liu'shi'ba ye' de zhe'ge motetus...

Therefore, when we listen to the melody, we feel it goes very smoothly from the
beginning to the end. We don't have the feeling of going from segment to segment. OK, everybody, now, let's listen to the motetus on page 68.

Here, in the previous utterance, Wong was explaining the features of motets. When he finished this topic, in Line 4, he stopped for a few seconds, and moved to the following activity by using two micro-markers hao and xianzai.

With the macro-markers and micro-markers (which have the functions of indicating the unit boundaries), I will count their occurrence first at the unit boundaries and then within the units and compare the two to determine whether they are good devices for indicating unit boundaries.

(B) Pauses

Richards (1983) argues that in natural human speech, pauses and hesitations may occupy about 30% to 50% of speaking time. The time is made use of for the selection and planning processes. Rounds (1987) divides silence in classroom into three categories: administrative, strategic and empty silence. Of these, strategic silence is the one teachers make use of to produce rhetorical or dramatic effect. For example, teachers may pause just before a major point is made or salient information given. Rounds emphasizes the importance of teachers' classroom discourse being smooth and having pauses at phrase boundaries. Dalle and Inglis (1990) also point out that "silence acts as a frame for important points and occurs before and after significant terms" (p. 4). Therefore, according to the argument of the researchers, pauses have two functions in lectures. One is to signal phrase boundaries, and the other is to indicate important information. Besides these two functions, pauses have quite a crucial function, which is proposed by Brown and Yule (1983). Brown and Yule point out that pauses can be used to identify unit boundaries. Although the number and duration of pauses vary from person to person, nevertheless, the advantage of using pauses is that they are readily identifiable and measurable. Brown and Yule divide pauses into three types according to
their length: extended pauses, long pauses, and short pauses. By analyzing an extract, they claim that extended and long pauses can be used to indicate unit boundaries.

Now, we will see the function of pauses as indicating unit boundaries in the Chinese lectures. Like Brown and Yule, I also divided the pauses into three types: extended pauses (the pauses range between 3 and 55 seconds, which is the longest pause in the three lectures), long pauses (the pauses range between 1 and 3 seconds), and short pauses (the pauses last within one second). We can take a look at Example (2) in Appendix B on pages 170-174, which is on History of Western Art. This extract includes three units, which I have explained on pages 43-44. Each unit is distinguished by an extended pause (Line 21 and Line 35). Within each unit, most pauses are short, and some are long. There is only one extended unit-internal pause which occurs on Line 7. When the lecturer mentioned the word "icon", she hesitated for a little while, trying to find the appropriate translation in Chinese. It took her three seconds to find the right words, and then she continued.

The pauses at the unit boundaries will be observed and classified. Also, the extended and long pauses which occurred within units will be counted and compared with those at the unit boundaries so that we can decide whether or not pauses are good indicators of unit boundaries.

(C) Rhetorical questions

Ruetten (1986) points out that the rhetorical question is a common device used by the lecturers to signal main ideas. She defines rhetorical questions as questions "the lecturer asks in order to focus discussion or introduce a main point" (p. 11), such as "What is...?", "What do I mean by...?". When asking a rhetorical question, the lecturer does not expect the students to answer it. Instead, the lecturer is both "the inquirer and the formulator" (Mason, 1983, p. 82). By asking a question, the lecturer brings up the topic which he/she will focus on for the following period of time. Myers (1994) has a
similar argument. While investigating ITAs' discourse in science lab, she divides their questions into two categories: echoic and epistemic questions. Again, epistemic questions are broken up into three types of questions: referential, evaluative, and rhetorical questions. Of these, rhetorical questions are those which are asked and answered by the teacher, and function "more like discourse markers in the ITA's speech than as true questions meant to engage the student" (p.97).

In the Chinese lectures, we can find rhetorical questions at the unit boundaries. For example, in Lecture C:

(12)

1. suo²yi³ wo³men yao⁴ dui⁴yu² ta¹de zhe⁴zhong³ te⁴bie²de xing²shi⁴ yao⁴you³
2. liao⁴jie³, gai²nian¹shang⁴ yao⁴ qing¹chu³...wo³ wei²she²me yao⁴ cong²zhe⁴li³
3. kai¹shi³ jiang³ ne⁵? yin¹wei⁴, en...sui²tang² de yan⁴yue⁴ a, ji¹hu¹ jiù⁴jiù⁴
4. zhu³zai³ le zhe⁴ge sui²tang² yin¹yue⁴ de zhe⁴ge fa¹zhan³ jiù¹shi⁴ ji¹hu¹ ke³yi³
5. shuo¹shi² ta¹ de quan²bu⁴,

So, we must understand its special form. We must have a clear concept. Why did I start teaching from here? Because, uh, Feast Music was the most important development in Sui Tang music, which is to say that Feast Music was all there was in Sui Tang music.

In the preceding unit, Chen did some reviewing of the last class and then previewed briefly what was going to be covered for this class. In Line 2, after an extended pause (six seconds), she began a new unit by asking a question. This is a rhetorical question because, first, after the question, there was only a long pause which was not enough for the students to answer; and the second, after the long pause, Chen gave the answer herself. Therefore, the question is obviously a rhetorical question which the lecturer used to indicate a new topic for a new unit.

Since rhetorical questions are not true questions, that is to say, the teacher does not expect the students to answer, there is a criterion by which to judge whether a
question is a rhetorical question or not. If there is a short or long pause after the question, and then the teacher answers the question by himself/herself, that is definitely a rhetorical question. According to this criterion, all the rhetorical questions which occur at the unit boundaries and within the units will be counted so that we can determine whether rhetorical questions are good boundary markers.

(D) Retrospective signals

Using retrospective signals to signal unit boundaries is different from using other methods in that retrospective devices mark the end of a unit instead of the beginning. This device is taken from Coulthard and Montgomery's (1981) framework, in which a retrospective focus occurs at the end of a transaction to close the unit. So when we hear an utterance which is a summary or conclusion, we are quite sure that the ongoing topic is going to end and that a new topic will start soon. Coulthard and Montgomery did not explain the retrospective focus in detail. Adopting their configuration for analyzing lecture discourse, Shaw (1994) only stated that a retrospective member provided closure for a transaction. However, from the examples given by Shaw, we can obtain a clearer idea. The retrospective focus can be a statement which is a conclusion: "so that's part two" (p. 36), or it can be the lecturer's behavior: "Professor scans notes, moves overhead projector slide" (p. 40). Shaw even inserted another element before or after the retrospective focusing member: the recapitulation sequence. In one of his examples: "OK, so profitability has to be the number one concern" (p. 42), "OK" was taken as the retrospective focusing member, and "so profitability has to be the number one concern" was taken as the recapitulation.

In this study, however, the retrospective signal is defined as any utterances which function as either a conclusion or a summary of a topic. The non-verbal behaviors will be counted as a separate category. In the Chinese lectures, this kind of retrospective
signals was found at the end of some units. The following example which is adopted from Lecture C contains a conclusion of a unit:

(13)

1 zhe\textsuperscript{4} shi\textsuperscript{4} wo\textsuperscript{3}men sui\textsuperscript{2}tang\textsuperscript{2} yin\textsuperscript{1}yue\textsuperscript{4} fa\textsuperscript{1}zhan\textsuperscript{3} de yi\textsuperscript{4}dian\textsuperscript{2}dian\textsuperscript{3} gai\textsuperscript{4}kuang\textsuperscript{4}.
2 na\textsuperscript{4}me xian\textsuperscript{4}zai\textsuperscript{4} ne, wo\textsuperscript{3} jiu\textsuperscript{4}yao kai\textsuperscript{1}shi\textsuperscript{3}lai\textsuperscript{2} jin\textsuperscript{4}ru dao\textsuperscript{4} sui\textsuperscript{2}tang\textsuperscript{2}yin\textsuperscript{1}yue\textsuperscript{4} hen
3 zhong\textsuperscript{4}yao\textsuperscript{4} de yi\textsuperscript{2}ge zhong\textsuperscript{4}dian\textsuperscript{3},

This is the general situation of the development of Sui and Tang music. So, now, I would like to start on a very important point in Sui Tang music.

After the one-sentence conclusion at the end of a unit, in which the lecturer was describing the development of music in Sui and Tang Dynasties, from Line 2, Chen started introducing a new topic: Feast Music, the major feature of Sui Tang music.

In Example (14), which is found in Lecture B, the retrospective signal is a summary of the unit:

(14)

1 hao\textsuperscript{3}, ge\textsuperscript{4}wei\textsuperscript{4} zhe\textsuperscript{4}ge shi\textsuperscript{4}, wo\textsuperscript{3} xiang\textsuperscript{3} wo\textsuperscript{3}men jiu\textsuperscript{4} ju\textsuperscript{3} zhe\textsuperscript{4}yang\textsuperscript{4} de yi\textsuperscript{2}ge li\textsuperscript{4}zi.
2 liao\textsuperscript{2}jie\textsuperscript{3}, xi\textsuperscript{1}wang\textsuperscript{4} ge\textsuperscript{4}wei\textsuperscript{4} neng\textsuperscript{2} ji\textsuperscript{4}zhu\textsuperscript{4}, Perotinus zai\textsuperscript{4} Lenoninus zhi\textsuperscript{1}hou\textsuperscript{4}.
3 ta\textsuperscript{1} zui\textsuperscript{4}da\textsuperscript{4} de gong\textsuperscript{4}xian\textsuperscript{4} qi\textsuperscript{2}shi\textsuperscript{2}, duo\textsuperscript{1}ban\textsuperscript{4} zhi\textsuperscript{3}shi\textsuperscript{4} zai\textsuperscript{4}yu\textsuperscript{2} sheng\textsuperscript{1}bu\textsuperscript{4} de
4 kuo\textsuperscript{4}chong\textsuperscript{1} er\textsuperscript{2}yi\textsuperscript{3}...na\textsuperscript{4}me 4 wo\textsuperscript{3}men zai\textsuperscript{4} jin\textsuperscript{1}tian\textsuperscript{1} yao\textsuperscript{4} kai\textsuperscript{1}shi\textsuperscript{3} jin\textsuperscript{4}ru\textsuperscript{4}
5 xia\textsuperscript{4}yi\textsuperscript{2}ge, jie\textsuperscript{1}duan\textsuperscript{4} jiu\textsuperscript{4}shi\textsuperscript{4} yao\textsuperscript{4} tan\textsuperscript{3}dao\textsuperscript{3} na\textsuperscript{4}ge Ars Nova zhi\textsuperscript{1}qian\textsuperscript{2}, wo\textsuperscript{3}men lai\textsuperscript{2}
6 kan\textsuperscript{4}kan\textsuperscript{4} wo\textsuperscript{3}men pu\textsuperscript{3}li\textsuperscript{4} li\textsuperscript{4}mian\textsuperscript{4} de liang\textsuperscript{2}shou\textsuperscript{3} jing\textsuperscript{1}wen\textsuperscript{2}ge\textsuperscript{1}.

OK, everybody, I think one example is enough to help us understand. I hope everybody can remember that Perotinus's greatest contribution after Lenoninus lies in the enlargement of the voice. So, today, before we start the next phase, let's have a look at two motetus.

Wong was explaining the features of \textit{organum quadruplum}. Finally, he used a summary to conclude this unit and then started another topic.
All the retrospective signals which occurred in the three lectures will be counted. Next a comparison between different positions will be made to determine how precisely retrospective signals can signal topic shifting.

(E) Topicalized phrases

Brown and Yule (1983) argue that in a speaker/writer's production, he/she encounters the linearization problem, which means that he/she has to select a starting point, and consequently, the hearer/reader's interpretation of the discourse is influenced. Brown and Yule demonstrate this by adopting examples from the sentence level.

a. John kissed Mary.

b. Mary was kissed by John.

c. It was John who kissed Mary.

d. It was Mary who was kissed by John.

e. What John did was kiss Mary.

f. Who John kissed was Mary.

g. Mary, John kissed her. (p.127)

Although having the same propositional content, these sentences are interpreted differently because of the ordering. For example, in (a), "John" is a subject in the grammatical structure and a topic in the information structure. In (g), "Mary", which is the object in (a), becomes the leftmost constituent of the sentence, which indicates that she is the topic and the focus of the sentence.

Applying this to the discourse level, the speaker/writer also confronts the same problem. He/she must organize his/her utterance/text carefully so that his/her intended message can be conveyed correctly. This is called "thematisation" by Brown and Yule (p. 133). They further argue that the use of the title of the discourse is an effective thematisation device. However, the use of titles and sub-titles is a device which is only possible in written text. In spoken discourse, it is awkward to pronounce the title at
each point of topic-shift. Usually what the speaker does is to choose alternative devices such as using global macro-markers to introduce the topic (e.g. What I'm going to talk about today is the political leadership in the modern age.) or using micro-markers to indicate the topic (e.g. Okay, let's go to the next chapter.).

However, in the Chinese lectures, there are a few examples which demonstrate the use of the equivalent of spoken titles at the unit boundaries. Let us have a look at the following examples which are adopted from Lecture C:

(15)  
zhe⁴ xie¹, fen¹ lei⁴, zhe⁴ xie¹, yin¹ yue⁴, de nei⁴ rong², wo³ men ke² yi³ cong²  
liang³ ge fang¹ mian⁴ lai² liao² jie³ ta¹,  
The classification, the content of the music, we can understand from two aspects.

In order to indicate the topic of the unit, Chen moved the two noun phrases: "zhe⁴ xie¹ fen¹ lei⁴" (the classification) and "zhe⁴ xie¹ yin¹ yue⁴ de nei⁴ rong²" (the content of the music), which should be the object of the sentence, to the sentence-initial place.

(16)  
yan⁴ yue⁴ li³ bian¹ suo³ yong⁴ dao⁴ de yue⁴ qi⁴... wo³ jin¹ tian¹ zao³ shang⁴ gei³ le  
ni³ men liang³ zhang¹ de tu², kan⁴ dao⁴ le mei² you³?  
The musical instruments used in Feast Music, I gave you two handouts this morning. Did you see them?

Here, what the lecturer meant was: "Did you see the two handouts I gave you this morning, in which the instruments used in Feast Music are shown?" However, since what she was going to do in the unit was to introduce the various musical instruments through pictures (in the handouts), she drew out the noun phrase "yan⁴ yue⁴ li³ bian¹ suo³ yong⁴ dao⁴ de yue⁴ qi⁴" (the musical instruments used in Feast Music) and put it into the first place of the unit.
Chinese is a topic-prominent language, in contrast to English, a subject-prominent language (Richards et al., 1985, p. 279). Therefore, the topic-comment structure is a usual sentence type in Chinese. The use of topicalized phrases is to foreground a topic or a main idea. It is quite natural that sometimes the speaker adopts the device when he/she just starts a topic. In this situation, the topicalized phrases have both an emphasizing and boundary-marking functions.

The topicalized phrases which occur both at unit boundaries and within units will be compared so that we can understand whether they are dependable boundary markers.

(F) Volume

Brown and Yule (1983) argue that the equivalent units of paragraphs in spoken discourse are "paratones" (p. 100). They also suggest identifying the start and end of a paratone by intonational cues: "...the whole of the first clause or sentence in a paratone may be uttered with raised pitch. The end of a paratone...can be marked by very low pitch" (p. 101). Unlike English, Chinese is a tone language, in which pitch is not very distinct. As a result, instead of pitch, volume is used to indicate the start and the end of a paratone.

We can take a look at Example (3) in Appendix B on pages 174-179, which is on the History of Western Art. Lin decreased her volume at the end of Line 9, and uttered the first clause in Line 10 with increasing volume, which marked the topic-shifting.

Each of the three Chinese lectures was listened to carefully by three native speakers of Chinese: the researcher and two other raters. All the rising and falling volumes were recorded so that we can find out whether volume is a decisive factor in determining unit boundaries.
Kinesics, or paralinguistics, is defined as "the study or use of non-vocal phenomena such as facial expressions, head or eye movements, and gestures, which may add support, emphasis, or particular shades of meaning to what people are saying" (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985, p. 206). English (1985) emphasizes the importance of kinesics in academic listening, especially in second language instruction. In her study, she found that the non-verbal cues for changing topic might be "turning body", "looking down", or "changing position" (p.169). Murphy and Candlin (1979) were also interested in examining the role that kinesics played in engineering lectures. They argued that kinesics could signal discourse boundaries. When a speaker was delivering his concluding remarks, he looked at his audience for a while, then stopped the eye contact and moved to the podium and consulted his notes. After that, he moved away from the podium and started a new topic. Of course, what they described was only one series of possible non-verbal behaviors occurring at the topic-shifting boundary, but both their study and English's study suggested a possible relationship between unit boundaries and kinesics.

While examining the three Chinese lectures, the following non-verbal behaviors of the lecturers were detected by the researcher: looking at the students, looking down, scanning notes, turning on the slide projector (or the television set, the video machine, the stereo), changing the slides, writing on the blackboard, and referring to the slides or the blackboard. These behaviors were recorded and then the relationship between them and unit boundaries was analyzed in order to evaluate their precision in signaling unit boundaries.

Thus, in order to analyze the structure of the lectures, the first step was to break the lectures into small units according to their content; that is to say, there was a major topic for each unit. Then, I examined the way the unit boundaries were marked. Seven
devices were found. They are discourse markers, pauses, rhetorical questions, retrospective signals topicalized phrases, volume, and kinesics. One thing must be emphasized here, that is, the relationship between unit boundary and the unit boundary markers is not an absolute one. Therefore, the occurrence of one of the unit boundary markers does not mean there is going to be a new unit; on the other hand, the lack of the unit boundary markers does not indicate the absence of a new unit. Brown and Yule (1983) argue well on this point: "although we can regularly identify such structural markers, their appearance in discourse should not be treated in any way as 'rule-governed'. They represent optional cues which writers and speakers may use in organizing what they want to communicate" (p. 106). With this concept in mind, the percentage of these devices used within and between units will be examined to determine how effective these markers are.

The results of these analyses will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Summing up the studies which focus on discourse markers, we can draw the following conclusions: Discourse markers are regarded as the most effective device which denotes the organization of the discourse and signals the relationships between ideas. Native speakers use discourse markers unconsciously in their utterances. The discourse of some nonnative speakers is incomprehensible because they either do not use discourse markers or use them inappropriately. However, research on discourse structure has come up with a further issue: Each genre has its own discourse structure; and with regard to the structure of lectures, different disciplines have their own structures. With these two arguments in mind, the present study tries to find out firstly whether Chinese lectures have a particular discourse structure; and then the role discourse markers play in indicating that structure. In addition to discourse markers, other devices which have the same functions are also investigated.

In Chapter III, three Chinese lectures were analyzed. They were broken down into units according to their different topics. Various devices which have the function of signaling the unit boundaries were observed. In this chapter, we will look at the results in the following two areas: the discourse structure of the lectures and the devices signaling the unit boundaries.

**Discourse structure of the lectures**

General information about each lecture is shown in Table 2 below.
TABLE 2
GENERAL INFORMATION FOR EACH LECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Lecture A</th>
<th>Lecture B</th>
<th>Lecture C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing time</td>
<td>83 minutes</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>96 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total words</td>
<td>6092</td>
<td>7892</td>
<td>10047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean words per unit</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The outlines of the three lectures are listed in Appendix A.)

Although the time for each class period is 100 minutes, the actual lecturing time for each of the three lectures is: 83 minutes for Lecture A, which is History of Western Art; 90 minutes for Lecture B, which is History of Western Music; and 95 minutes for Lecture C, which is History of Chinese Music. In Lecture A, Lin gave the students a break. One student asked her some questions. Then she talked to the researcher for a few minutes, so the break lasted for more than 15 minutes. In Lecture B, the time taken playing music was not included. Also the teacher waited several minutes for the students to get to the classroom because they had had a concert the night before. In Lecture C, Chen spent several minutes preparing the slides at the beginning. The number of words for each lecture (including Chinese words and foreign words) are 6092, 7892, and 10047, respectively. There is a distinction between Chinese words and Chinese characters. For example, "wo³men²", which means "we", represents one term but contains two characters. It is counted as one word instead of two characters in this study.
Each of the three lectures was divided into units according to the content criteria outlined in Chapter 3. The number of units for the three lectures are 23, 26, and 20. In Lecture A, the lengths of units in words range from 96 words for the smallest unit to 465 words for the largest unit. In Lecture B, the lengths of units in words range from 59 words for the smallest unit to 1218 words for the largest unit. In Lecture C, the lengths of units in words range from 55 words for the smallest unit to 1542 words for the largest unit. The mean number of words per unit for each lecture is 265, 304, and 502.

Each of the lectures was then analyzed, and a rough structure for each lecture was revealed. Each of these will be discussed individually.

The structure for Lecture A is presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary for Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reviewing two historical periods: Early Christian and Middle Ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>introducing one of the artistic styles in the early Middle Ages: classical style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>introducing the other artistic style in the early Middle Ages: medieval style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>advising the students to study harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>introducing the background to manuscript illumination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>introducing Painting 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary for Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>explaining how and where the illuminated manuscripts were produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>going through some slides quickly and explaining the two different styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>resuming the previous topic in Unit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>reminding the students of the importance of having correct concepts, and explaining how the syllabus was decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>introducing the Carolingian revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>prelude to comparing paintings from the Carolingian era with medieval paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>reminding the students of the importance of distinguishing the two styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>analyzing Painting 10 and comparing it with Painting 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>introducing architecture as the topic for next class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 3 we can find that at the beginning of the lecture, there is a review, in which the lecturer re-explained the two historical periods that were mentioned in the lecture two classes before (According to the lecturer, the class which preceded Lecture A was a review class). At the end of Lecture A, the lecturer briefly touched upon architecture in the Carolingian Dynasty, which would be the topic of the following class. Between the first and the last units, each of the units focuses on one of the following functions: "artistic background", "topic", "example", or "digression". These will be defined and explained in more detail later, but a brief description with examples is given here. The unit "artistic background" provided the historical context and the social setting in which the artistic works were produced. Usually before the "topic", there is some general background on time and place, and after the general background some more detailed information on the origin and the production of the works may occur.

In Lecture A, the reason why no "artistic background" was given before the "topic" (in Units 2 and 3) was that the lecturer had introduced the artistic background in the preceding lecture, as she indicated in Unit 1. Three of the units were devoted to artistic background in Lecture A. One example can be seen in Example (2) in Appendix B on pages 170-174. In this example, from Line 36 to Line 63 was Unit 5. In this unit, Lin introduced the Christianization Period as the background for the discussion of illuminated Bible manuscripts. After Constantine the Great approved Christianity as a legitimate religion, Christianity spread rapidly. As a result, Bible manuscripts were produced and spread. This unit described the historical background in which the illuminated manuscripts were produced, and so it is the "artistic background". Unit 7 is also an "artistic background", which can be seen in Example (3) in Appendix B on pages 174-179. In this unit, Lin explained the details of where and how Bible manuscripts were produced. They were produced by the monks in a very special way: different parts of the paintings were drawn by different groups rather than by a certain person. The last "artistic background" is Unit 14. In this unit, Lin introduced the so-called "Renaissance
of Carolingian Dynasty. After Charles the Great was crowned as the emperor of Rome by the Pope around 800 A.D., he tried to re-invigorate classicism by inviting foreign scholars and artists to Aachen and made this place a cultural center. Therefore, classicism prevailed again during that short period of time. This information offers the origin of the second artistic style: classical style, and so served as the function of "artistic background".

Topics are the main points of a lecture. In Lecture A, there are four "topic" units: Units 2, 3, 8, and 15. They are the two different artistic styles which existed in the Early Middle Ages: the classical style and the medieval style, and the comparison between them. We can have a look at Unit 3, which is Lines 1-21 of Example (2) in Appendix B. In this unit, Lin defined and explained the medieval style. This style focused on the icon by using only two-dimensional expressions and did not express the personality of the figures at all.

There are many more units which served as "examples" than units introducing "artistic background" and elaborating on "topics". The examples in Lecture A were paintings presented in slides. By analyzing the paintings, the lecturer concretized the abstract concept. Example (3) in Appendix B on pages 174-179 illustrates what an "example" should look like in this study. Line 1 to Line 9 was Unit 6, and Line 60 to Line 73 was Unit 9. Both are "examples". In these two units, Lin introduced the time and place of Painting 1; explained its theme and original motive; and analyzed its style.

In addition to the three functions between the "review" unit and the "preview" unit, another kind of information was found in the lecture. In Unit 4, Lin told the students that the Middle Ages was a difficult period for Asian students and so advised them to study harder. In Unit 13, which was the beginning of the second period of the class, Lin emphasized the importance of having correct concepts of the styles. She also explained that since she had to teach three thousand years' worth of western art in four semesters, she could only choose the most important information. Then, in Unit 18,
noticing that some students were chuckling, Lin delayed the next unit and reminded the students of the importance of distinguishing the two styles. The information expressed in the three units was not completely relevant to the content of the lecture and was labelled as a "digression".

The structure of Lecture B is presented in Table 4.

### TABLE 4

**DISCOURSE STRUCTURE OF HISTORY OF WESTERN MUSIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary of Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and preview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reviewing Leoninus; previewing Perotinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>introducing <em>organum quadruplum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>explaining the origin of the melody of <em>organum quadruplum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>commenting on Leoninus and Perotinus' contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>playing a piece of <em>organum quadruplum</em> with a tape recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>evaluating <em>organum quadruplum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>further explaining the features of <em>organum quadruplum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>introducing motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>defining motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>explaining the features of motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>playing a piece of motetus with a tape recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>explaining the second motet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>playing the second motet with a tape recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>summarizing the Notre Dame School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary for Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>introducing the background of <em>Ars Nova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>summarizing what has been taught so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>introducing the time and place of <em>Ars Nova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>reminding the students of the fact that sacred and secular music could exist at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>returning to the time and place of <em>Ars Nova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>introducing the origin of the term of <em>Ars Nova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>supplementing the term of <em>Ars Antique</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>introducing <em>de Vitry's</em> treatise: <em>Ars Nova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>summarizing the main points in <em>de Vitry's</em> treatise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>talking about <em>Ars Nova</em> in Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>elaborating on an important musical document: <em>Le Roman de Fauvel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>briefly touching upon one motets from <em>Le Roman de Fauvel</em> which will be talked about in the next class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4, we can see that this lecture contains almost the same sections as shown in Table 3 for Lecture A. In Unit 1, the lecturer not only reviewed briefly but also announced what was going to be taught, not for the whole class, but for the first part of the class. Since the lecturer mentioned at the beginning of Unit 1 that he was going to introduce the second composer of the Notre Dame School, we can assume that he had talked about the artistic background in the previous class. However, before another topic, *Ars Nova*, was introduced, there were three units (Unit 15, 17, and 19)
which served as artistic background. When we examined this point carefully, we found that there were two main themes in the lecture: One was the Notre Dame School and the other was *Ars Nova*. Therefore, the lecturer summarized the Notre Dame School in Unit 14 and offered three units as artistic background before he started to elaborate on *Ars Nova*. The examples in the lecture are the selections of music played by the lecturer with a tape recorder.

Again, there were two digressions in the lecture. One was Unit 16 and the other one was Unit 18. In the preceding unit, Wong introduced the artistic background of *Ars Nova*. When he mentioned that the feature of *Ars Nova* was polyphonic secular music, he stopped for 22 seconds and started to summarize what topics had been taught throughout the semester until then. The purpose of the unit was to let the students review what had been taught so that they could understand the place of the current topic in the syllabus. Although it was some kind of review of all the major topics taught during the semester, it was not taken as a review for this lecture because it did not conform to the definition of a review in the study. In the study, the content of the review is limited to what has been taught in the last class or in this class, and the content of the preview is limited to what will be taught in this class or in the next class. Usually, there are two review and/or preview parts in a lecture: one at the beginning and the other at the end of a lecture. The former is a lead-in, in which the lecturer reminds the students what has been taught in the last class and what will be taught in this class. The latter usually includes what has been taught for this class and what will be taught in the next class. In this study, the review and preview section sometimes contain either a review or a preview or sometimes both. Depending on what appears, the name of the section may be review, preview, or review and preview. Since the function of Unit 16 was not the same as what has been defined above, and its content did not fit into the mainstream of the lecture, it is taken as a digression.
The other digression, Unit 18, was inserted into an ongoing topic and split it into two units. While Wong was introducing the artistic background of *Ars Nova* in Unit 17, he suddenly changed the topic and started to remind the students of the fact that sacred music and secular music could exist at the same time. This digression was signaled by a ten-second pause and a conjunction "but". Between the digression and Unit 19, which was the continuation of the previous topic, there was a twelve-second pause, and a micro-marker *na*ˈ*me* (well, so).

The structure of Lecture C is presented in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**DISCOURSE STRUCTURE OF HISTORY OF CHINESE MUSIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary of Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and preview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reviewing the development of musical rules from Qin and Han to Sui and Tang and previewing music in Sui and Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>explaining the origin of Sui and Tang music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>introducing the music from the Western Region in the Northern Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>describing the flourishing of music in the Tang Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>introducing the development of music in the Tang Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>defining Feast Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic background</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>explaining the reason for the popularity of Feast Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>classifying Feast Music according to different periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>classifying Feast Music according to its content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic Summary of Each Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>answering the students' questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>resuming the previous topic in Unit 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>classifying Feast Music according to its styles of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>previewing the rest of the class and next class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>mentioning Tang Imitation Music in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>introducing various musical instruments through pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>introducing different kinds of musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>showing slides of the musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>playing a video of some Japanese musicians' performing Feast Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digression</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>commenting on the importance of borrowing foreign music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>summarizing the lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Lecture C, we can find review and preview at the beginning and the end of the lecture. As in the other two lectures, there are artistic background, topics, and examples. We can also find two digressions which are Unit 14 and 19. In addition to these, there are two more features in Table 5: There is an interruption, and there is a preview which occurs neither at the beginning nor at the end of the lecture. The interruption has been discussed in detail in Chapter III. A series of questions asked by three students formed Unit 10 and divided an ongoing topic into two units: Unit 9 and
Unit 11. The "preview", Unit 13, was defined so because it was different from Unit 16 in Table 4. In the preceding unit, Chen classified Feast Music according to its styles of performance. Then, she stopped for four seconds, recapped the dry board marker, and started to explain what she was going to do for the rest of the class and what she would teach for the next class. This part can be divided into two. The first half should be put in Unit 1 as a preview for this class, and the latter half should be put in the last unit, Unit 20, as a preview for the next class. Since the content of Unit 13 conforms to the definition of the review and/or preview part in this study, its inappropriate position does not disqualify it from being a review and/or preview part.

By comparing and analyzing these discourse structures for each lecture, the common structure shared by all three is summed up in Figure 2:

**FIGURE 2**

**DISCOURSE STRUCTURE FOR MUSIC AND ART LECTURES**

Forming a hierarchical system, a lecture on music or art history consists of three sections: review and/or preview, main themes, and review and/or preview. At the beginning of a lecture, the lecturer previews what has been taught in the last class and announces what will be taught in this class. Then he/she starts the body part, which is
termed as "main theme(s)" in this study. At the end of the lecture, the lecturer might summarize what has been taught and/or mention the topic for the next class. The main themes are made up of five elements: artistic background, topics, examples, digression and interruption. Of these, artistic background, topics, and examples are required and usually appear in a fixed order; digression and interruption are optional and can occur at any position within the lecture.

From the studies discussed in Chapter II, we know that a lecturer has a purpose or topic for his/her lecture. He/she also has main ideas which are "the points that he/she wants to make about the topic" (Ruetten, 1986, p. 6). The main ideas are then developed with the supporting information. The "main theme(s)" in this study refers to the purpose for the lecture, and the "topics" refer to the main ideas proposed by Ruetten. A lecture can have one main theme (the main theme for Lecture A is the artistic styles in Early Middle Ages; and the main theme for Lecture C is the Feast Music in the Tang Dynasty) or more than one (the main themes for Lecture B is the music of the Middle Ages and late medieval music). As for the "artistic background" and "examples", they are supporting information. "Artistic background" is the historical context and the social setting in which the works were produced. Usually the general historical background occurs before the "topics" to provide a setting of time and place, and the more specific background appears either before or after the "topics".

"Examples" are the actual art works such as paintings or music. The former is usually presented through slides and the latter by a tape recorder. "Digression" and "interruption" are optional elements in a lecture. The content of a digression might be the lecturer's comments on the content of the lesson which do not fit into the mainstream theme in the lecture, his/her advice for the students, or something which has nothing to do with the lecture (e.g. what happened to him/her on his/her way to school that morning). " Interruption" seldom occurs in a lecture. Usually it is a series of questions asked by the students one after another which inevitably interrupt the process of the
lecture. There are other possibilities. For example, a student feels not well and interrupts the lecturing by asking to be excused. The only example of "interruption" which occurred in the three lectures was questions asked by the students. Theoretically, "digression" and "interruption" can occur at any place within a lecture.

The skeleton discourse structure for the three lectures is presented in a hierarchical system, and some of the elements in Figure 2 were further divided into smaller units. Except for the main theme as shown in Figure 2, all the other elements are taken as units in this study. That is to say, different functions of the units give them different titles and put them in different levels in Figure 2. Each unit has its topic and is signaled by boundary markers.

In order to find the structure of the Chinese lectures, each of the lectures was first broken down into units according to content. The three lectures had 23, 26, and 20 units respectively. Then, the function of each unit was analyzed. Different functions were found. They were review and/or preview, artistic background, topics, examples, digression and interruption. Of these, the first three constituted the main theme, which was the core part of the lecture. They were required and usually appeared in a fixed order. Digression and interruption were optional elements and could appear at any position.

From Tables 3, 4, and 5, we have two findings. First, Lecturer A and Lecturer B did not have a fixed plan. They stopped when time was up and continued the unfinished topic in the following class. That explained why there was no artistic background before the topics, which had been introduced in the preceding class. Secondly, the importance of examples was not the same across the three lectures. In Lecture A, there were 11 units which served as examples. By analyzing the paintings in the slides, the lecturer could illustrate the style clearly. In Lecture B, there were two units in which the lecturer played motets with a tape recorder so that the students could understand what it sounded like. In Lecture C, only one unit served as the example section, in which the
lecturer played a video, letting the students see and hear Feast Music played by Japanese musicians. In fact, we do not think the lack of this unit would have affected Lecture C, but the lack of the example section would have in Lecture A.

In the following section, I will show the results concerning the unit boundary markers and then discuss them.

Unit boundary markers

In this section, the results of the seven unit boundary markers (discourse markers, pauses, rhetorical questions, retrospective signals, topicalized phrases, volume and pitch, and kinesics) will be presented and discussed.

(A) Discourse markers

(a) Macro-markers

Macro-markers were found both at unit boundaries and within units. All the macro-markers which occurred at the unit boundaries are listed below:

Western Arts

Unit 2:  zhi4yu2shuo1dao4...
         speaking of...

Unit 4:  zhi4yu2shuo1dao4...
         speaking of...

Unit 5:  ran2hou4 wo3men xian4zai4 shuo1dao4...
         And now we talk about...

Unit 6:  na4 wo3men xian4zai4 kan4dao4 de...
         Well, what we see now...

Unit 8:  hao3 rang4 wo3men liu2lan3 yi2xia4...
         OK, let's browse through this...

Unit 9:  wo3men kan3dao4 zhe4ge...
Let's look at this...

OK, the one we'll see next...

What we are seeing now...

Similarly, let's look at...

Now, what we are going to see...

What we see is...

Next, let's look at...

What you see now...

OK, now let's continue to look at...

The two paintings you see now on the left...

Next, we'll see...

Today we will continue to introduce...
And, today, we, everybody, please turn to page 113.

OK. Well, concerning Perotinus' *organum quadruplum, sederunt*...

Well, today before we start the next phase, *Ars Nova*, let's look at the two motetuses in our score book.

OK. Everybody, now, we, let's listen to...

OK, with regard to this motetus...

What we are about to introduce today is...

What we will mention is...

OK, I think, first let's take a look at the origin of this name...
Unit 21:  
haō³, zài⁴shé⁴lì³ wò³ fù⁴dài⁴ bu³chōng¹ yī²xià⁴. 
OK, here I want to add one point.

Unit 22:  
haō³, en, guān¹yù² de Vitry zài⁴ tā¹ de Ars Nova zhe⁴pían¹ lún⁴wén² 
lí³biàn¹ tā¹ suò³ shé⁴jì² de dao⁴di³ shí⁴ shèn²mé nei⁴róng²? 
OK, well, concerning de Vitry, in his treatise on Ars Nova, what did he 
talk about?

Unit 25:  
haō³, ge⁴wéi⁴, zúi⁴hòu⁴ wò³ zài⁴ bu³chōng¹ yī²diàn³... 
OK, everybody, finally I want to add one more point...

Unit 26:  
haō³, ge⁴wéi⁴ guān¹yù² zhè⁴ yì²gé... 
OK, everybody, with regard to this (motet)...

Chinese Music

Unit 4:  
qí²cì⁴ ne, zài⁴ suí²táng² shèng⁴shī⁴ yì³hòu⁴ ne... 
Next, after the prosperous Sui and Tang...

Unit 6:  
nà⁴mé xiàn⁴zài⁴ ne, wò³ jiù⁴yào⁴ kǎi¹shí³ lái² jǐn⁴rú⁴ dào⁴ suí²táng² 
yīn¹yuè⁴ hén³ zhòng⁴yào⁴ de yì²gé zhòng⁴diàn³. 
OK, now I am about to start a very important point in Sui Tang music.

Unit 7:  
dì²ér⁴ge wò³méng yào⁴ ti³dào⁴shuō¹ tā¹ wèi⁴shèn²mé huì¹xíng¹shèng⁴ ne, 
Secondly, we want to talk about why it was able to prosper.

Unit 8:  
dì²sān¹ wò³méng yào⁴ duì⁴ zhé⁴gé yàn⁴yuè⁴ yǒu³suò³ rèn⁴shì⁴ ne, 
Thirdly, if we want to know something about Feast Music...

Unit 9:  
zhé⁴xiè... fén¹lèi⁴, zhé⁴xiè... yǐn⁴yuè⁴ de néi⁴róng², wò³méng kē²yì³ cóng² 
liáng³gé fāng¹mian⁴ lái² liáolìè³ tā... 
These categories, the content of this music, we can understand from two 
aspects.

Unit 11:  
xìān⁴zài⁴ wò³méng bā³ zhé⁴gé en, yàn⁴yuè⁴ de zhé⁴gé, cóng² néi⁴róng² 
shàng⁴ lái² kàn⁴ ne...
Now, let's look at Feast Music from its content...

Unit 12: hao³, ru²guo³ wo³men cong² biao³yan³ de xing²shi⁴ shang⁴ lai²kan⁴ ne...
OK, if we look from the point of view of styles of performance...

Unit 16: hao³, xian⁴zai⁴ wo³ lai² rang⁴ ni³men liao³ jie³ yi¹xia⁴...
OK, now I want to let you understand...

Unit 17: xian⁴zai⁴ ne wo³ rang⁴ ni³men lai² kan⁴ yi²xia⁴...
Now, I want you to take a look at...

Unit 18: hao³, xian⁴zai⁴ wo³ gei³ ni³men kan⁴ yi¹ xiao³ duan⁴...
OK, now I'll show you a short piece...

From the list, we can find that the macro-markers in Lecture A are different from those in the other two lectures. This is because most of the units are examples, which are paintings in the slides. So the macro-markers of most of the units are clauses such as "wo³men kan¹dao⁴" (Let's look at...), or "ni³men xian⁴zai⁴ kan¹dao⁴ de..." (What you see now...). The lecturer also used two phrases zhi¹yu² shuo¹dao⁴ (speaking of). On the other hand, most of the macro-markers in Lecture B are long clauses which indicate the start of a new topic. There is only one phrase which occurred in three units as a macro-marker: guan¹yu² (concerning, with regard to). In Lecture C, the lecturer used the sequential adverbs such as qi²ci⁴ (next), di⁴er⁴ge (secondly), and di⁴san¹ (thirdly) in addition to some clausal macro-markers.

The macro-markers found within units included: zhi¹yu² shu¹dao⁴ (speaking of), guan¹yu² (with regard to, concerning), jie¹xia¹lai² (next), di⁴yi¹ge (first), di⁴er²zhong³ (the second kind), di⁴san¹zhong³ (the third kind), "hao³, xian⁴zai⁴, jiu² qing² ge⁴wei⁴ kan¹ yi²xia⁴..." (OK, now, please look at...), "hao³, wo³men xian⁴zai⁴ kan¹ yi²xia⁴..." (OK, now, let's have a look at...), "hao³, wo³ xiang³ xian⁴zai⁴ wo³men da'jia¹ yi¹qi³ lai² kan¹ yi²xia⁴..." (OK, I think, now, let's have a look at...), and "xian⁴zai⁴ wo³ yao⁴ kai¹shi³ lai² jiang³..." (now I'm going to talk about...). Comparing these with the ones
at unit boundaries, it seems that long clauses occurred mostly at unit boundaries and phrases and sequential adverbs appeared more frequently within units.

The frequencies of all macro-markers which occurred at unit boundaries and within units for each lecture are listed in Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

MACRO-MARKERS AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Unit Boundary</th>
<th>Within Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/ Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>66 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the frequencies of macro-markers at the unit boundaries for the three lectures are 16, 15, and 10, and their frequencies within units are 5, 7, and 9. In Lecture A, 76 percent of macro-markers occurred at the unit boundaries and 24 within the units. In Lecture B, 68 percent were between units and 32 percent within units. In Lecture C, 53 percent were between units and 47 within units. The average frequency percentages of macro-markers at the unit boundaries and within units for the three lectures are 66 and 34.

Although the occurrence of macro-markers at the unit boundaries is about three-fourths of the total macro-markers in Lecture A, the average frequencies of macro-markers at unit boundaries for Lecture B and Lecture C are 68 percent and 53 percent of the total macro-markers, which suggests that the macro-markers do not always clearly signal unit boundaries.
From Table 6 we know that there were altogether 62 macro-markers in the three lectures of which 66% occurred at unit boundaries and 34% occurred within units. By comparing the frequencies of use of macro-markers to indicate unit boundaries in the three lectures, we can find that the deliverer of Lecture A generally preferred to use macro-markers to signal new topics, because 16 out of 23 units were marked by macro-markers. The teacher of Lecture C used macro-markers to change topics the least: only 10 out of 20 units were signaled with macro-markers.

From Ehrlich’s (1988) study, we get the idea that the mere counting of appearances does not provide meaningful information. Therefore, the functions of the macro-markers which occurred within units were examined and three functions were found. The first function was signaling sub-topic. Usually, one unit has one topic. Within the topic, there might be some sub-topics to support or to constitute it. We can have a look at Example (1):

1) hao³, en, guan¹yu²...de Vitry zai⁴ta¹ de Ars Nova zhe⁴yi¹pian¹ lun⁴wen² li³bian¹ ta¹ suo³ she⁴ji² de dao⁴di³ shi⁴ shen²me nei⁵rong², ju⁴ti³ de lai²shuo¹ shi⁴ di³xia⁴ de zhe⁴ji³dian³, di⁴yi¹ge...hao³, jie¹zhe di⁴er⁴dian³...jie¹zhe di⁴san¹dian³... OK, well, concerning de Vitry, in his treatise on Ars Nova, what did he talk about? Specifically, it contained the following points. First...Next, the second point... Next, the third point...

his is in Unit 22 of Lecture B. The topic for this unit was the content of de Vitry’s treatise. The lecturer used the macro-markers di⁴yi¹ge (first), di⁴er⁴dian³ (second), i⁴san¹dian³ (third) lead the three sub-topics. For the last two points, he also used jie¹zhe (next) to emphasize the sequence.

The second function was focusing. Some of the macro-markers were used to attract the students’ attention to the new information that the lecturer was going to give.
In Lecture A, all the macro-markers within the units were used for focusing. In Lecture B, 4 were used for signaling the sub-topics, 1 for re-focusing, and 2 for focusing. In Lecture C, 7 served as indicating sub-topics, and 2 indicating re-focusing. Totally, 11 macro-markers were used for signaling the sub-topics, 7 for focusing, and 3 for re-focusing.

Two findings were notable here. First, of the 21 macro-markers which occurred within units, most frequent function was to signal the sub-topics. Secondly, in Lecture A, the five macro-markers which had the same function were the same macro-marker: *zhìyuǎnshuōdào* (speaking of). No other lecturers used the same macro-marker for the same function. This is obvious evidence of idiomatic usage.

In order to examine the relation between different functions and the types of macro-markers within units, let us look at the list below.

Signaling sub-topic:

- *dìyīgè* (first) *2 times*
- *dìèrzhǒng* (the second kind) *2 times*
- *dìsānzhǒng* (the third kind) *3 times*
- *hào, wǒmen xiān zài kàn yīxià...* (OK, now, let's have a look at...)
- *jiéliá* (next) *3 times*

Focusing:

- *zhìyuǎnshuō* (speaking of) *5 times*
- *guăn yú* (with regard to, concerning) *2 times*

Re-focusing:

- "*jiù qǐng ge* wei kàn yīxià..." (OK, now, please look at...)
- "*xiānzhài wǒ yào kāi shì lái jiāng...*" (now I'm going to talk about...).
- "*hào, wǒ xiāng xīnzhài wǒmen dàjiá yī qǐ lái kàn yīxià...* (OK, now, I think, let's look at...)
counted, each micro-marker was counted as one. For example, if the lecturer said, "\textit{hao}', \textit{na}'me..." (OK, then...), it was counted as two markers. Their occurrences at the unit boundaries and within the units for each lecture are shown in Table 8.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Distribution} & \textbf{# of Unit} & \textbf{Unit Boundary} & \textbf{Within Units} \\
Lecture & Unit s & Frequency & Percentage & Frequency \\
\hline
Lecture A & 23 & 14 & 14 \% & 85 & 86 \% \\
Lecture B & 26 & 37 & 21 \% & 141 & 79 \% \\
Lecture C & 20 & 14 & 8 \% & 158 & 92 \% \\
Total & 69 & 65 & 14 \% & 384 & 86 \% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{MICRO-MARKERS AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS}
\end{table}

Table 8 shows that the frequencies of micro-markers at the unit boundaries for the three lectures are 14, 37, and 14. The frequencies of micro-markers within units are 85, 141, and 158. In Lecture A, 14 percent of the micro-markers occurred at the unit boundaries and 86 percent within the units. In Lecture B, 21 percent of the micro-markers occurred at the unit boundaries and 79 percent within the units. In Lecture C, 8 percent of the micro-markers occurred at the unit boundaries and 92 percent within the units. The average percentages of frequency of the micro-markers at the unit boundaries and within the units for the three lectures are 14 percent and 86 percent.

The results show that micro-markers occurred much more frequently within the units than at the unit boundaries. This is quite reasonable because the function of most of the micro-markers is to indicate intersentential relationships. Only when micro-
markers are used for the purpose of "segmentation" (see taxonomy in p. 46), are they used to signal change of topic. In Table 8, we also find individual variation. The lecturer of C used the fewest micro-markers to signal the change of topic (8% of all the micro-markers she used). The lecturer of A used more (14%), and the lecturer of B used the most (21%). As for the frequency of each micro-marker, we can have a closer examination of Table 9.
# TABLE 9

**FREQUENCIES OF MICRO-MARKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-markers</th>
<th>Lecture A</th>
<th>Lecture B</th>
<th>Lecture C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hao³ &quot;OK&quot;</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>na⁴ me</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;well, so&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>xian⁴zai⁴</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;now&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jin¹tian¹</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;today&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ran³hou⁴</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and, then&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yin¹wei⁴</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;because&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>suo²yi³</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;therefore&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tong²yang⁴de</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;similarly&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ke³shi⁴ &quot;but&quot;</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qi²shi² &quot;in fact&quot;</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage of the first two most frequently used micro-markers is indicated in parentheses. Each percentage shown in the table above is that of a particular macro-marker in relation to all the macro-markers shown in that column.

*UB: at unit boundaries; WU: within units
Table 9 offers very detailed information about the micro-markers which occurred in the three lectures. It lists the frequency of each of the micro-markers which occurred at unit boundaries and within units. The percentages of the first two most frequently used markers in each column were listed in parentheses. In Lecture A, \( xian^4zai^4 \) (now) occurred 7 times, \( hao^3 \) (OK) occurred 3 times at unit boundaries. Within units, \( ran^2hou^4 \) (and, then) occurred 47 times. In Lecture B, \( hao^3 \) (OK) occurred 18 times and \( na^4me \) (so, then) 11 times at the unit boundaries. The former appeared 43 times and the latter 37 times within units. In Lecture C, \( xian^4zai^4 \) (now) occurred 5 times, \( hao^3 \) (OK) occurred 4 times at the unit boundaries. Within units, \( hao^3 \) (OK) and \( na^4me \) (so, then) occurred respectively 46 times and 33 times.

Table 9 provides us with three findings. First, each lecturer has his/her favorite micro-markers. Of all the micro-markers, Lin (Lecture A) preferred to use \( xian^4zai^4 \) (now) to indicate the changing of topic. For the same function, Wong (Lecture B) liked \( hao^3 \) (OK) better. And Chen (Lecture C) used both as transition markers. Within the units, while Lin used \( ran^2hou^4 \) (and, then) 47 times, Wong and Chen both chose \( hao^3 \) (OK) and \( na^4me \) (so, then) as their most frequently used micro-markers.

The second finding shows that the micro-markers which were used most frequently at the unit boundaries and within units were almost the same. Table 9 shows that the top two transition markers between units were \( hao^3 \) (OK), and \( na^4me \) (well, so). \( xian^4zai^4 \) (now) and \( jin^1tian^1 \) (today) were the next on the list. Within the units, \( hao^3 \) (OK) and \( na^4me \) (well, so) were still the most frequently used two, followed by \( ran^2hou^4 \) (and, then), \( yin^1wei^4 \) (because), and \( ke^3shi^4 \) (but). The question is: Why were the most frequently used transition markers also used most frequently within the units? Miracle's (1991) argument can be used to answer that question. According to Miracle, Chinese discourse markers have different functions. The primary function of \( hao^3 \) is to signal a topic change. Since there are sub-topics within each topic, it is natural that \( hao^3 \) appears within the units. As for \( na^4me \), it can be used to mark a variety of different relationships
between units of talk in discourse. In addition to marking topic related units, it can also mark the consequence of condition or cause (Miracle, 1991). Therefore, \textit{na\textsuperscript{t}me} occurred frequently within the units.

The third finding confirms the taxonomy of Chinese micro-markers listed on page 50 in Chapter III. Taking \textit{ran\textsuperscript{2}hao\textsuperscript{4}} (and, then) as the dividing line, we can find that the micro-markers above it are the ones under the heading of segmentation, and the ones below are not. The results correspond to the division. The respective percentages of \textit{hao\textsuperscript{3}} (OK), \textit{na\textsuperscript{t}me} (well, so), \textit{xian\textsuperscript{t}zai\textsuperscript{4}} (now), and \textit{jin\textsuperscript{1}tan\textsuperscript{1}} (today) at unit boundaries was higher than that within units. This proves that they do have the function of signaling topic change and that they can mark unit boundaries. On the other hand, although \textit{yin\textsuperscript{1}wei\textsuperscript{4}} (because), \textit{suo\textsuperscript{2}yi\textsuperscript{3}} (therefore), \textit{tong\textsuperscript{2}yang\textsuperscript{de}} (similarly), \textit{ke\textsuperscript{3}shi\textsuperscript{4}} (but), and \textit{qi\textsuperscript{2}shi\textsuperscript{2}} (in fact) did occur at the unit boundaries, each only occurred once. This indicates that generally they are not used to lead to a new topic. As for the one serving as the dividing line: \textit{ran\textsuperscript{2}hou\textsuperscript{4}}, it is a special one. On one hand, it is a transition marker. On the other hand, it can be a temporal or causal conjunction. When we examine its distribution, we can find that it occurred only once at unit boundaries and 69 times within units. There is a reasonable explanation for this situation. Although it can be used to signal topic shifting, this marker was mostly employed to indicate the change of sub-topics. We can have a look at Example (2), which is extracted from Lecture A:

(2)

\ldots ran\textsuperscript{2}hou\textsuperscript{4} zai\textsuperscript{4} shen\textsuperscript{t}i\textsuperscript{3} yi\textsuperscript{1}zhuo\textsuperscript{2} de biao\textsuperscript{3}xian\textsuperscript{1}...(155 words)...ran\textsuperscript{2}hou\textsuperscript{4} zhe\textsuperscript{4}ge yan\textsuperscript{3}jing\textsuperscript{1} xiang\textsuperscript{4} yi\textsuperscript{2}ge xing\textsuperscript{4}ren\textsuperscript{2}...(83 words)...ran\textsuperscript{2}hou\textsuperscript{4} jiao\textsuperscript{3} fang\textsuperscript{4}zai\textsuperscript{4} zhe\textsuperscript{4}ge bao\textsuperscript{3}zuo\textsuperscript{4} de tai\textsuperscript{2}zuo\textsuperscript{4} tai\textsuperscript{2}ji\textsuperscript{1}shang\textsuperscript{4}...

\ldots And on the expression of body and clothing...And the eyes look like apricot kernel...And the feet were on the platform of the throne...

In Unit 16, Lin was analyzing a painting. After introducing the origin and the subject of the painting, she started describing the figure in the painting. The three "ran\textsuperscript{2}hou\textsuperscript{4}" (and)
were clearly not temporal or causal conjunctions but were used to indicate transition within a topic.

From Table 8 and Table 9, we do find that some micro-markers have the ability to indicate the change of topics. Of these, some were used more frequently than the others. However, we cannot say that the micro-markers are good indicators of unit boundaries because of their low percentage of occurrence at the unit boundaries. The reason is that within all the micro-markers, only some of them are capable of indicating topic changes. And even those were still used more often within units.

(B) Pauses

All the pauses in the three lectures were divided into three types: extended pauses (pauses longer than three seconds), long pauses (pauses ranging between one and three seconds), and short pauses (pauses not exceeding one second). The pauses which occurred at the unit boundaries are listed in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10</th>
<th>PAUSES AT THE UNIT BOUNDARIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauses</td>
<td>Short Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At unit boundaries, Lecture A contained no short pauses. The number of long pauses and extended pauses were 7 and 16. Lecture B had 3 long pauses and 23 extended pauses at unit boundaries. The numbers of short, long, and extended pauses for Lecture C were 5, 4, and 11 respectively. At the boundaries of the 69 units in the three lectures, 50 boundaries were signaled by extended pauses, 14 by long pauses, and 5 by short pauses.

From this table, it seems that extended pauses and long pauses are good boundary indicators because before the beginning of each unit, 93% of the boundaries were signaled by either extended pauses or long pauses. However, before we make this conclusion, we must take into consideration the pauses which occurred within the units.

Within the units, the pauses were found in three different situations. The first type is a pause which indicates grammatical completion. When people are speaking, they stop naturally at clause or phrase boundaries. This kind of pause could be short, long, or extended. Since the short pauses were too numerous to count, only the long and extended pauses were counted under the term "completion" in Table 11. The second type of pause was the result of the lecturers' hesitation. During the lecturing, the lecturers sometimes stopped when they were not supposed to do so. Judging from their expressions and their moods, we knew they hesitated because they were in the process of thinking and trying to figure out what to say in the spontaneous speaking required in a lecture. This kind of pause included long and extended pauses only. The third kind of pause was done for the students' sake. For example, when the lecturer asked a question, he/she usually left time for the students to answer; or when the lecturer asked the students to look at some information in their textbooks or look at the slides, he/she also stopped for a little while so that the students had time to follow instructions. Like the pauses of hesitation, the pauses for students contained long and extended pauses only.

Let us have a look at Table 11 and Table 12, which show the functions and frequencies of the extended and long pauses which occurred within units.
Table 11 shows that in Lecture A 94 pauses were used for indicating completion, 67 for hesitation, and 25 for students. In Lecture B, the frequencies for the same functions were 203, 41, and 63. In Lecture C, 76, 29, and 24. Totally, there were 622 pauses. Of these, 60 percent of them were used to signal the completion, 22 percent were used for hesitation, and 18 percent were used for waiting for the students.

From this table, we can find that of all the pauses that occurred within units, the most important function was used for indicating grammatical completion. This was true for all the three lecturers. We can examine the same functions again in Table 12 to understand whether there is any difference between the long pauses and the extended pauses.
### TABLE 12
EXTENDED AND LONG PAUSES WITHIN UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Long Pauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Extended Pauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C*: pauses of completion; *H*: pauses for hesitation; *W*: pauses for the students.
*Long*: long pauses; *Extended*: extended pauses

Table 12 shows that for Lecturer A there were 125 long pauses and 61 extended pauses. Of these, 63 long pauses and 31 extended pauses were pauses of completion; 53 long pauses and 14 extended pauses were pauses for hesitation; and 9 long pauses and 16 extended pauses were for the students. In Lecture B, there were 154 long pauses and 153 extended pauses. Of these, 83 long pauses and 120 extended pauses were for completion; 33 long pauses and 8 extended pauses were for hesitation; and 38 long pauses and 25 extended pauses were for students. In Lecture C, there were 115 long pauses and 14 extended pauses. Divided by function, there were 76 long pauses of completion; 26 long pauses and 3 extended pauses were for hesitation; and 13 long pauses and 11 extended pauses for students. Totally, 394 long pauses and 228 extended pauses occurred within the units.

These tables show two findings. One is about the functions of pauses within the units. The other one is about the individual variation. Of the three functions of pauses which occurred within the units, the most important one was obviously to indicate the completion of phrases or clauses. The percentage of occurrence was 60 percent out of
all the pauses. When the pauses were used for this function, the lecturers usually
stopped for less than rather than more than 3 seconds (222 long pauses vs. 151 pauses,
which is 3 to 2). When it comes to pauses for hesitation, the proportion of the long
pauses and the extended pauses was in line with what we would expect, (112 long
pauses vs. 25 extended pauses, which is 4 to 1) since people do not usually need much
time to find the right words when speaking. As for the individual divergence, the three
lecturers had different preferences for the length of pauses. Chen (Lecture C) did not
stop long when she paused (115 long pauses vs. 14 extended pauses, roughly equaling 9
to 1). Lin (Lecture A) employed a greater number of long pauses than extended pauses
when she completed an utterance or hesitated, but when she asked the students to
observe a painting, she gave them longer time to do that (9 long pauses vs. 16 extended
pauses, which equals 4 to 6). Different from them, Wong (Lecture B) used the two
equally (154 long pauses vs. 153 extended pauses). What caused this difference was his
use of extended pauses instead of long pauses, which are usually long enough to indicate
the completion of an utterance.

Now, we can turn to the issue of whether pauses are good boundary indicators.
Although pauses within the units have three functions, we only have to compare the
pauses which were used to indicate completion of utterances with the pauses at the unit
boundaries. The reason is that the function of the latter was the same as that of the
former. The students had the ability to distinguish the functions of pauses, so when the
lecturer stopped for hesitation, they would not interpret it as meaning the completion of
an utterance. Only the pauses which were used to indicate completion (no matter within
the units or at the unit boundaries) had the possibility of suggesting the unit boundaries.
Since the short pauses were countless, and because of the hypothesis that long and
extended pauses could mark the unit boundaries, only the long and extended pauses at
the unit boundaries and within units were compared in Table 13.
TABLE 13
PAUSES AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture Distribution</th>
<th>Lecture A</th>
<th>Lecture B</th>
<th>Lecture C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Boundary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Units</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that in Lecture A, there were 23 long or extended pauses (7 long pauses and 16 extended pauses) at unit boundaries, and 94 long or extended pauses (63 long pauses and 31 extended pauses) within the units. In Lecture B, there were 26 long or extended pauses (3 long pauses and 23 extended pauses) at unit boundaries, and 203 long or extended pauses (83 long pauses and 120 extended pauses) within the units. In Lecture C, there were 15 long or extended pauses (4 long pauses and 11 extended pauses) at the unit boundaries, and 76 long pauses within the units. Altogether, there were 64 long or extended pauses at the unit boundaries and 373 long or extended pauses within the units. Their percentages were 15 percent and 85 percent respectively.

Table 10 tells us that in Lecture A and Lecture B, all the unit boundaries were indicated by long or extended pauses, which suggests that long or extended pauses had high accuracy on predicating unit boundaries. However, in Table 14, this kind of pause only made up 15 percent of all the long or extended pauses having the function of indicating completion of utterance in the three lectures. Therefore, the long or extended pauses alone were not clear boundary indicators.
(C) Rhetorical questions

All the lecturers' questions in the three lectures were checked based on the definition of rhetorical questions described in Chapter 3. Two examples below extracted from Lecture B demonstrate the criterion of judgment.

(3)

Look, the picture on the top. Have you seen it? This fauvel is in here. OK, well, the person who created the word was very clever. Why? Because it mentions below. In fact, the word "fauvel" is a combination of six letters, each is the first letter of a word.

(4)

Do you know what "flaterie" means? What does "flaterie" mean? Flattery, it means flattery, toadying, flattery.

In Example (3), after asking the students to see the picture of the "fauvel", which was a horse or an ass, the lecturer paused for several seconds. Then he raised a question by first stating that the person who created the word was clever and then asking why. We can prove that this is a rhetorical question for the following reasons. First, the lecturer did not leave any time for the students to answer the question. There was only a short pause after the question. Secondly, after the question, the lecturer spent about 550 words to explain what each letter in the word "fauvel" represented. That shows that the question sparked off a sub-topic which was the lecturer's focus for the following period.
of time. On the other hand, the question in Example (4) is not classified as a rhetorical question. The lecturer asked the students what the Latin word "flaterie" meant. He paused for two seconds and then gave the answer himself. This might be a real question because the students could have guessed the meaning of the Latin word by looking at its similar spelling with the English equivalent "flattery". On the other hand, this might not be a real question but only a device to attract the students' attention, instead of telling them the meaning directly. In this case, it was not a rhetorical question. After the question, the lecturer only told the students the meaning of the word and how to write it in Chinese (because this word was a little difficult for the students). It was too trivial and too brief to be a topic or a main point, which was one essential condition for the rhetorical question.

All the rhetorical questions were counted and are listed in Table 14.

TABLE 14
RHETORICAL QUESTIONS AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit Boundary</th>
<th>Within Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>22 (81%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Lecture A, no rhetorical questions occurred at the unit boundaries and 2 occurred within the units. In Lecture B, there was one rhetorical question at a unit boundary and 7 within units. In Lecture C, the frequencies of rhetorical questions at unit boundaries and within units were 4 and 13 respectively. There were 27 rhetorical
questions totally in the three lectures. Of these, 19 percent occurred at unit boundaries and 81 percent within units.

One thing is sure: the use of rhetorical questions as a device to bring up a topic was not common in lecturing. We also find that the proportion of rhetorical questions between the two different positions in the unit is consistent for each of the three lecturers. The lecturer who generally used more rhetorical questions than the other two also had more rhetorical questions at the unit boundaries than the other two and vice versa. Since the percentage of rhetorical questions at the unit boundaries is very low (19%), it cannot be taken as a decisive factor in determining unit boundaries.

(D) Retrospective signals

Retrospective signals are utterances which function as either a conclusion or a summary of a topic. Their occurrence indicates that the current topic is going to end and a new topic is going to start. The frequencies of the retrospective signals at the unit boundaries and within the units are shown in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit Boundary</th>
<th>Within Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (69 %)</td>
<td>8 (31 %)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Lecture A and Lecture B, the number of retrospective signals at the unit boundaries were 3 and 11 respectively. In Lecture C, there were 4 retrospective signals at the unit boundaries and 8 within the units. Totally, there were 18 retrospective signals at the unit boundaries, which was 69 percent, and 8 within the units, which was 31 percent.

The results show individual discrepancies. While the lecturers of A and B used all of their retrospective signals at the unit boundaries, the lecturer of C used twice as many retrospective signals within the units as at the boundaries.

It has been mentioned in Chapter 3 that the function of retrospective signals is to indicate the end of a topic. Similarly, the retrospective signals within the units had the same function. The only difference was that they only indicated the end of a sub-topic within the units. There was an interesting finding here: Most of the retrospective signals were started by the micro-markers *suo²yi³* (therefore). We can first look at Table 16 to see the classification of the retrospective signals according to their first words.

**TABLE 16**

CLASSIFICATION OF RETROSPECTIVE SIGNALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Lecture A</th>
<th>Lecture B</th>
<th>Lecture C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>suo²yi³</em> (therefore)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17 (65 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na⁴me</em> (well, so)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ke³shi⁴</em> (but)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hao³</em> (OK)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-micro-markers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the 26 retrospective signals, 17 were led by the micro-marker *suō†yi³* (therefore), two by *nâ/me* (well, so), one by *ke²shi⁴* (but), one by *hao²* (OK), and five by words which were not micro-markers. The high frequency of *suō†yi³* (therefore) deserves some observation.

When *suō†yi³* is used as a causal conjunction, it is the effect of a cause. However, when it is used as a micro-marker, the indication of cause and effect is decreased. It indicates that the following message is the conclusion of the proceeding message. Consider the following example:

(5)  
wei²shen²me wo³ shuo¹ gen¹ zhong¹guo² de chuan²tong³ de min²jian¹ yin¹yue⁴ jie²he² ne? gang¹cai² wo³men² shuo¹ zai⁴ zhe⁴ge shi²hou ne, gang¹cai² wo³men shuo¹ zai⁴ zhe⁴ge shi²hou ne, qian¹ yi²duan⁴ shi²qi¹ zai⁴ guo²jia¹ de jian⁴she⁴ mei²you³ fei¹chang² de...mei²you³ hen³hao³ de jian⁴she⁴ de shi¹hou, ya³yue⁴ de xi¹tong³ shi⁴ lun²wang² de shi⁴ sang⁴shi¹ de, *suō†yi³* ta¹ cun² de qi²shi² shi⁴ zhong¹guo² de min²jian¹ de chuan²tong³ yin¹yue⁴...zhe⁴yang⁴ liang³zhong³ yin¹yue⁴ jia¹ qi³lai...jie²he² qi³lai man⁴man de zhuang⁴da⁴ le..jiu⁴ cheng²wei² sui²tang² yin¹yue⁴ de yi²ge chu²xing², yi²ge ji¹chu³, yi²ge pei²tai¹, *suō†yi³* zhe⁴ liang³ge shi⁴ sui²tang² yin¹yue⁴ de shi²hou yi²ge ji¹chu³, fei¹chang² zhong⁴yao⁴ de ji¹chu³ wo³men bi¹xu¹ you²suo³ ren¹shi⁴...  

We mentioned just now that at that time, when the country was not well-established, the classical music was lost. Therefore, what it had was folk music. These two kinds of music (the Chinese folk music and the music from the Western Region) got together and integrated. They became strong gradually and formed the embryonic form and basis of Sui Tang music. Therefore, these two were the basis of Sui Tang music, a very important basis. We must understand this.
This example was adopted from Unit 2 of Lecture C. The topic of this unit was the origin of Sui Tang music. The lecturer first introduced the music from the Western Region, and then introduced Chinese traditional music. The first *suo³yi³* (therefore) was obviously a causal conjunction: Since the classical music was lost, the music which existed at that time was actually folk music. However, the second *suo³yi³* (therefore) was a micro-marker. We could find almost no relationship of cause and effect between the utterances or before and after it. It was only the conclusion of the topic. However, due to some more information about the Western Region which followed, this retrospective signal could only be taken as the conclusion of a sub-topic.

Two conclusions can be made here. First, all the retrospective signals in Lecture A and Lecture B occurred at the unit boundaries. This suggests that the retrospective signals might be good indicators in some lectures. Second, since the retrospective signals begun by the micro-marker *suo³yi³* (therefore) constituted a high percentage of all the retrospective signals, we can assume that it is a good signal of the end of a unit.

(E) Topicalized phrases

A topicalized phrase is the sentence-initial noun phrase which should be at the end of the sentence because it is the object of the verb or a noun phrase which is not the subject of the sentence but highlights the topic of the sentence. This was a technique found in the Chinese lectures to indicate the start of a new topic. The occurrence of the topicalized phrases in the three lectures is shown below.
### TABLE 17

**TOPICALIZED PHRASES AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit Boundaries</th>
<th>Within Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 (13 %)</td>
<td>26 (87 %)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Lecture A, there were 1 topicalized phrases at the unit boundaries and 7 within the units. In Lecture B, 1 was found at the unit boundaries and 12 within the units. In Lecture C, 2 were found at the unit boundaries and 7 within the units. Out of the 30 topicalized phrases, only 13 percent occurred at the unit boundaries.

We can have a closer observation of the functions of the topicalized phrases in Table 18.

### TABLE 18

**FUNCTIONS OF TOPICALIZED PHRASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Emphasizing</th>
<th>Signaling Sub-topic</th>
<th>Signaling Topic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 (50 %)</td>
<td>11 (37 %)</td>
<td>4 (13 %)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The frequencies for the function of emphasizing for the three lectures were 4, 8, and 3 respectively. The frequencies for the function of indicating sub-topics were 3, 4, and 4. And the frequencies for the function of indicating topics were 1, 1 and 2. The percentages of the topicalized phrases for the three different functions were 50 %, 37 %, and 13 % respectively.

In order to demonstrate the different functions between emphasizing and signaling the sub-topics (The example of the topicalized phrases at the unit boundaries to signal the start of a new topic has been given in Chapter 3.), two examples are provided below:

(6)

suo³yi³, chen⁴zhe zai⁴ jin⁴ru⁴ zhong¹gu³ de she²hou zhe⁴ yi²duan⁴..fen¹xi¹ da'jia¹ jiu⁴ zi'ji³ duo¹ hua¹ yi³dian³ gong¹fu ke⁴wai⁴ du²wu⁴ zi'ji³ qu⁴ kan⁴yi²kan⁴, ran²hou⁴ tu²li⁴ duo¹ zhao³yi³zhao³,

Therefore, as we enter the Middle Ages, this analysis, please spend more time, other related materials, you can try to read, and the examples of paintings, you can try to find.

(7)

ran²hou⁴ tu²zhong¹zhe⁴li³ de ren²wu⁴, ni³ ke³yi³ kan⁴dao⁴ shi⁴ yi³ qiang²lie⁴ de li³ti³gan³, lai² biao³xian⁴, yong⁴ hei¹bai² jiu⁴ ke³yi³ kan⁴chu¹ ta¹ zhe⁴zhong³..biao³xian⁴ chu¹ qiang²lie⁴ de zhe⁴zhong³ zi⁴ran²zhu³yi³ de yi³zhong³ lu⁴tu² le.biao³xian⁴ le,

And the figure in the painting, you can find, was expressed by three-dimensional effect. Even though this painting was drawn in black-and-white, it expressed strongly the flavor of naturalism.

These two examples are adopted from Lecture A. Example (6) was a part of Unit 4, in which the lecturer tried to advise the students to study harder. She moved two noun phrases ke⁴wai⁴ du²wu⁴ (materials other than the textbooks) and tu²li⁴ (the examples of
paintings), which should be the objects of two sentences, to the beginning of the utterances. By doing this, these two noun phrases became the topic of the utterance and therefore were emphasized. However, they did not introduce a new discourse topic. In Example (7), again, the lecturer used the same device to make "the figure" the topic of the utterance. However, this time, this topic lasted for more than one minute and formed a sub-topic in the unit.

Now, let us turn back to Table 19. The results suggest that the primary function of the topicalized phrases was to emphasize. Only when the noun phrase which is the focus becomes the main idea of a sub-topic or topic, does it have the functions of signaling sub-topic or topic shifting. The low frequency of the occurrence of the topicalized phrases at the unit boundaries compared to the frequency within units made them a poor device for signaling unit boundaries.

(F) Volume

The hypothesis was that a lecturer's volume might decrease at the end of a unit and increase when the new unit began. However, when this device was observed, the occurrence of one did not necessarily indicate the presence of the other. That means that rising and falling volume can occur independently. When volume changes were observed, the rising volume and the falling volume were found to have different functions. We will discuss them separately.

(a) Rising volume

Rising volume had four functions: emphasizing, re-focusing, signaling conclusions, and signaling a new topic or sub-topic. They are illustrated below. Words uttered with rising volume are in bold type.

(8)

wo3men xian4zai4 jie1zhe xia4qu kan4 de jiuxi4 zai4 ka3luo4lin2 wang2chao2
zhe4ge zheng4quan2 zhipian4 zhan3xian4 chu1lai2 de yi4shu4 feng4mao4, ran2hou1
wo³men xian¹ ba³ sheng⁴ jing¹ shuo³ xie³ ben³ na² chu¹ lai² zuo⁴ li⁴ zi, ran² hou⁴ bi⁹ jiao⁴ yi³ xia wo³ men qian² ban⁴ tang⁴ ke⁴ jiang³ de . zhe⁴ xie¹ ying¹ ge² lan² di⁴ qu¹ de, ni³ jiu¹ ke³ yi³ kan⁴ dao⁴ ta¹ men zhi¹ jian¹ jie² ran² bu⁴ tong² de yi⁴ zhong³ feng¹ mao⁴. Now what we're going to see was the artistic features developed in Carolingian Dynasty. And we first take the Bible manuscripts as examples, and then compare them with the ones we discussed in the last period so that you can see the totally different features between them.

The first function of emphasizing was illustrated in Example (8), which was in Unit 15 of Lecture A. The lecturer told the students that she was going to explain the classical style through the paintings and then compare it with the medieval style also through the paintings so that the students could find the difference between the two. In order to emphasize the difference, she uttered jie² ran² bu⁴ tong² (the totally different) with a higher voice.

(9)

wo³men kan⁴ dao⁴ zhe⁴ ge shi⁴ bao³ zuo⁴ shang⁴ de ye¹ su¹ ... wo³men kan⁴ de shi⁴ zhe⁴ yi⁴ zhang¹, you³ dian³ bu² tai⁴ qing¹ chu, yin¹ wei⁴ zuo³ bian¹ zhe⁴ ge ji¹ qi jin¹ tian¹ buº zhi¹ ze³ me gao³ de tiao² bu² ta⁴ qing¹ chu... gang¹ cai² yi³ jing¹ jiang³ dao⁴ zhe⁴ ge you² cha¹ li³ man⁴ da⁴ di⁴ gong¹ ting² hua⁴ yuan⁴ suo³ huiº zhi⁴ de Goldescalc sheng⁴ jing¹... shou³ xie³ ben³ de cha¹ hua⁴,

The one we're looking at was "Jesus in the throne". We're looking at this one. It is not very clear because there is something wrong with the projector on the left today. Just now we mentioned the illustration from Goldscalc Bible manuscript drawn by the Palace School of Charles the Great.

Example (9) exemplifies the function of re-focusing. In Unit 16 of Lecture A, the lecturer asked the students to look at a painting on a slide. Then she explained that the slide was not clear because the projector had something wrong with it. This explanation
was made with a softer voice. Then she spoke with great volume to bring the topic back again.

(10)

ran²hou⁴ zhi¹wai⁴, ta¹ hai²yao⁴ weि'chuan²jiao⁴ lai² zuo⁴ zhe⁴xie¹ hui²zhi⁴
sheng⁴jing¹ shou³gao³ de shi⁴, ran²hou⁴ zhe⁴xie¹ sheng⁴jing¹ shou³gao⁴
chang²chang² jiu⁴shi⁴ zi⁴ shi⁴ mo³xie¹ ren², yi²ge group qu⁴ xie³ de, ran²hou⁴ tu²
de bian¹kuang¹ you² mo³xie¹ group qu⁴ xie³ de, zhi⁴yu² shuo¹dao⁴ zhong¹jian¹
de tu² jiu⁴ ke³neng² you² ling⁴wai⁴ yi⁴xie⁴ group qu⁴ xie³ de...
And besides, they still had to draw bible manuscripts for spreading the gospel.
And the bible manuscripts were often drawn in the following way: The words were written by one group; the frames of the paintings were drawn by another group; and the paintings inside were done by another group.

Example (10) contains the function of signaling a sub-topic. Before the example, the lecturer of Lecture A mentioned that the Bible manuscripts were created by the monks of the monasteries. She described the obligation of the monks, which was a sub-topic in this unit, for some time. Then she started another sub-topic by uttering zhe⁴xie¹
sheng⁴jing¹ shou³gao³ (the Bible manuscripts) with a rising tone and began to explain how the Bible manuscripts were created by the monks.

(11)

zhi³you³ zhe⁴ san¹ ci⁴, ou, suo³yi³ ne, ke³jian⁴ wo³men jin¹tian¹ yao⁴ kai¹shi³
jiang³ de Ars Nova shi⁴ duo¹me de zhong⁴yao⁴ le..jian⁴dan¹ de shuo¹
There were only three times. Therefore, we can understand how important Ars Nova was, which we're going to talk about. In short...

This is an example of signaling conclusions. In Unit 15 of Lecture B, Wong mentioned that in music history there were three times that the term "new music" was used. After introducing them separately, he made a conclusion by uttering suo³yi³ (therefore) with a rising volume.
The frequency for each of the four functions of the rising volume which occurred within units is shown in Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Emphasizing</th>
<th>Sub-topic</th>
<th>Re-focusing</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58 (67%)</td>
<td>22 (25%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Lecture A, the frequencies of the rising volume which functioned as emphasizing, sub-topic indication, and re-focusing were 27, 6, and 2 respectively. In Lecture C, they were 25, 14, and 1. In both Lecture A and Lecture C, rising volume was not used to signal conclusion. In Lecture B, rising volume was used for emphasizing 6 times, sub-topic indication 2 times, re-focusing 2 times, and conclusion 2 times.

From this table, we know the main function for rising volume within units was to emphasize information. It was also used to signal new sub-topics, but with considerably lower frequency.

(b) Falling volume

The falling volume found within units had three functions. It could be used to indicate the end of sub-topics, to indicate the presence of conclusions or to emphasize some information by repeating. Let us exemplify these functions in the following examples. (Words spoken in falling volume were underlined)
(12) 

zai⁴ Utrecht zhe⁴li³ de xiu¹dao⁴yuan⁴ hui⁴zhì⁴de...tong²yang⁴de zhe⁴li³ ye³ biao²xian⁴ chu¹le yi⁴zhong³ qiang²lie⁴ de gu³dian³ wan³qi² de hui⁴hua⁴, feng¹ge²..gen¹ ji⁴fa³...

(It) was drawn at the monastery in Utrecht. Similarly, it expressed strongly the style and technique of late classicism.

Lin analyzed Painting 9 in Unit 21 of Lecture A. He first introduced the time and place in which the painting was produced. And then he started to analyze its style. Before he started the new sub-topic the beginning of which was marked by "tong²yang⁴de" (similarly), he used falling volume, and he used rising volume at the beginning of the new topic.

The second function of falling volume is that it indicates the beginning of a conclusion in the following clause. For example, Example (11) on page 106 shows that before Wong made a conclusion in Unit 15 of Lecture B, he decreased his volume at the last sentence "zhi³you³ zhe⁴ san¹ ci⁴" (There were only three times).

The third function of falling volume is to emphasize some information by repetition. This is shown in Example (13).

(13) 

zhe⁴zhong³ passacaglia wo³men qi²shi² you³ shi²hou⁴ ke³yi³ ba³ ta¹ kan⁴cheng² yi⁴zhong³ bian⁴zou⁴qu³, zhi³shi⁴ zhe⁴zhong³ bian⁴zou⁴qu³ shi⁴ ta¹men you³ yi²ge gong⁴tong¹ de yi²ge di¹yin¹ zhu³ti², you³ yi²ge gong⁴tong² de di¹yin¹ zhu³ti²..

This passacaglia, in fact, we can regard it as a variation. However, this kind of variation shares the same bass tune, shares the same bass theme.

In Unit 8 of Lecture B, Wong mentioned passacaglia when he explained motets. As he pointed out that one feature of passacaglia was that there was a common bass tune, he repeated the sentence with a falling volume. We assume the reason for repetition was to
emphasize the information. But since it was a repetition, he did not use the same volume as in the first sentence.

The functions of falling volume which occurred within units are shown in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>End of Sub-topic</th>
<th>Before conclusion</th>
<th>Emphasizing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Falling volume used for indicating the end of a sub-topic appeared 9 times, indicating the following conclusion 1 time, and emphasizing the information 3 times in Lecture A. The same functions in Lecture B were 3, 6, and 16 times. In Lecture C, the lecturer used falling volume to signal sub-topic shifting 3 times and to emphasize 3 times.

Since the lecturers were found to use repetition to emphasize what they said, and tended to use falling volume for the repetitive phrases or clauses when they did so, falling volume had the function of indicating emphasis. This is an interesting result.

Another discovery was obtained when Table 19 and Table 20 were compared. Unlike the other lecturers, the lecturer of B had more falling volume than rising volume. Whether this was a gender difference (Wong was male and the other two were female) could not be confirmed.
While comparing Table 19 and Table 20, we found a difference between the two tables. There was more variation in Table 20 than in Table 19. This suggests the three lecturers used falling volume in different ways. The lecturer in Lecture A used the falling volume to indicate the end of sub-topics most frequently. The lecturer in Lecture B tended to use it for emphasizing information. The lecturer in Lecture C used it for both emphasis and end of sub-topics. This was not the case for rising volume where all three lecturers used it mainly for emphasis, followed by sub-topics.

Now we can have a look at the frequency of both rising volume and falling volume which occurred at the boundaries and within the units in Table 21.

**TABLE 21**

**VOLUME AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN THE UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Lecture A</th>
<th>Lecture B</th>
<th>Lecture C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Volume</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling Volume</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Lecture A, the frequencies of the rising and falling volume were 10 and 13 at the unit boundaries, and 35 and 13 within the units. In Lecture B, the rising and falling volumes were 14 and 12 at the unit boundaries, and 12 and 25 within the units. In Lecture C, the rising and falling volumes were 8 and 8 at unit boundaries, and 40 and 6 within the units. Altogether, there were 65 rising or falling volumes at the unit boundaries and 131 within the units.
When we compared volume at unit boundaries and within units, we found that the average percentage of rising and falling volumes was 33 percent. The percentage of falling volumes was 43 percent, whereas that of rising volumes was only 29, which indicates that the latter was a better unit boundary indicator than the former. However, because the highest percentage was only 43, we cannot rely on these cues as a precise device to distinguish unit boundaries.

(G) Kinesics

All the non-verbal behaviors at the unit boundaries were: scanning notes, changing the slides, writing on the blackboard, turning on the slide projector (or the television set, the video machine, the stereo), looking down, looking at the students, and referring to the slides or the blackboard. All these behaviors at unit boundaries were recorded, and the same behaviors which occurred within the boundaries were also recorded so that a comparison could be made between them. One thing must be pointed out here. The so-called "non-verbal" behaviors mean not only that they were not verbalized but also that they were not accompanied by verbal utterances. For example, the behavior of "looking at the students" means that the lecturer looked at the students without saying any words. The results are listed in Table 22.
**TABLE 22**  
**KINESICS AT UNIT BOUNDARIES VS. WITHIN UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movements</th>
<th>Scan notes</th>
<th>Change slides</th>
<th>Write board</th>
<th>Turn on...</th>
<th>Look down</th>
<th>Look at Ss</th>
<th>Point at...</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture A UB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B UB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture C UB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UB</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UB: at unit boundaries; WU: within units

Lecturer A scanned her notes 13 times, changed the slides 5 times, and wrote on the blackboard 3 times at the unit boundaries. At the beginning of the class and after the break, she turned on the slide projector and looked at the students respectively.

Lecturer B scanned his textbook 18 times, looked at the students 4 times, looked down 3 times, and turned on the tape recorder one time. Lecturer C scanned her notes 7 times, looked at the students 5 times, wrote on the blackboard 4 times, turned on the slide projector or the television set 2 times and pointed to the blackboard 2 times.

Totally, there were 68 actions at the unit boundaries and 338 actions within the units.

Of all the non-verbal actions, scanning their notes or textbooks at the unit boundaries was common among all three lecturers. However, what deserves more
attention is that they looked at the notes or textbooks very often even within the units. Lecturer A sat at the lecture table and looked at her notes most of the time during her lecturing. It looked as if she was reading the notes. Lecturer B taught with textbooks (every student has a set of two). He had the habit of pausing and scanning his textbook very often. However, he had been teaching the course for about 10 years and one would have thought that he should not have needed to consult the textbook all the time. When the video tape was reviewed carefully, it was found that the lecturer did not read the textbooks every time when he looked at them. It looked as if he just intended to make the tempo slower. This is also supported by his high frequency of looking at the students. Whether it was because he wanted to give the students more time to take notes or it was just his habit was unsure. Compared with them, Lecturer C was the one who depended on the notes the least. On the contrary, she was the one who wrote on the blackboard the most.

Besides scanning notes and writing on the blackboard, looking at the students, changing the slides, looking down, and turning on whatever equipment was needed, such as a television, slide projector, or a tape recorder, were all the possible physical movements to indicate a new unit. However, when we see the much higher frequency of the similar behaviors within the units, we still cannot argue that kinesics is a good indicator of a change of units.

So far, the results of all the seven devices for indicating unit shifting have been shown and discussed. It seems that none of them alone could signal the change of units precisely because of the low percentage of their occurrence at unit boundaries when compared to their occurrence within units. We can get this information from Table 23 below:
TABLE 23
PERCENTAGES OF BOUNDARY MARKERS
AT UNIT BOUNDARIES AND WITHIN UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Macro-</th>
<th>Micro-</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>Rheto-</th>
<th>Retro-</th>
<th>Topical</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UB: at unit boundaries; WU: within units

*Macro: Macro-markers; Micro: Micro-markers; Rheto-: Rhetorical questions; Retro-: Retrospective signals; Topical: Topicalized phrases.

The percentage of retrospective signals at unit boundaries is 69 percent within all the retrospective signals. The percentage of other devices are: macro-markers, 66 percent; volume, 33 percent; Rhetorical questions, 19 percent; kinesics, 17 percent; pause, 15 percent; micro-markers, 14 percent; and topicalized phrases, 13 percent.

The best indicators seem to be the retrospective signals and macro-markers. The worst indicators seem to be topicalized phrases, micro-markers, pauses and kinesics, with volume falling in between. However, even with a percentage of nearly 70, we cannot say that retrospective phrases or macro-markers are good indicators of unit shifting, let alone the other devices whose percentages are lower than 33 percent. Therefore, we can consider this issue from another perspective: If we put them together, what results can we obtain? Each of the following tables displays all the occurrences of the boundary markers for each lecture.

There were seven types of devices used to signal unit boundaries. However, two of these types were divided further. Discourse markers included macro-markers and micro-markers, and both of them had the function of indicating unit boundaries. Also, rising volume and falling volume could each indicate the unit changing independently. Therefore, each of these was counted as one, giving us nine different markers.
Table 24 presents the number of markers at each of the unit boundaries for Lecture A.

### TABLE 24

**OCCURRENCE OF THE BOUNDARY MARKERS IN LECTURE A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>Rheto</th>
<th>Retro</th>
<th>Topical</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>Rheto</th>
<th>Retro</th>
<th>Topical</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R*: rising volume; **F**: falling volume

Lecture A had from 2 to 6 boundary markers at each unit boundary. The average number of boundary markers for this lecture is 4.3. Most of the units were marked by at least three different markers. If we assume that a unit with three or more boundary markers can be regarded as well-indicated, then only four units in Lecture A (Units 1, 13, 14, and 18) were not indicated clearly. We can examine these units closely. Unit 1 was the beginning of the lecture, and Unit 13 was the beginning of the second period. It is understood that unit boundary markers should not be crucial in these cases because everybody knows that a new topic is about to start. Unit 18 was a digression. Since a digression was an unplanned unit, it was natural that it should sound a little abrupt because of the lack of unit markers to mark the sudden change. Unit 14 is an artistic background. However, we could not find any good reason to explain its lack of boundary markers.

Table 25 presents the number of markers at each of the unit boundaries for Lecture B.
TABLE 25

OCCURRENCE OF THE BOUNDARY MARKERS IN LECTURE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>Rheto</th>
<th>Retro</th>
<th>Topical</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this lecture, all of the units were signaled with at least 3 boundary markers. The number of boundary markers ranged from 3 to 7 for each unit. The average number of markers for this lecture is 4.96. No units were marked inadequately.

Table 26 presents the boundary markers by unit for Lecture C.

Table 25 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Pause</th>
<th>Rheto</th>
<th>Retro</th>
<th>Topical</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Pause</td>
<td>Rheto</td>
<td>Retro</td>
<td>Topical</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Kinesics</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Lecture C the unit boundaries were marked by from 1 to 6 different markers. The average number of markers for this lecture is 4.15. Only 2 units had fewer than three markers: Unit 10 had only one unit boundary marker and Unit 13 had two unit boundary markers. Unit 10 was an interruption. The lecturer heard some noises from the students when she was writing on the board, so she asked: "you3 shen2me wen4ti2 ma?" (Are there any questions?). In this situation, it was natural that there were almost no unit boundary markers. Unit 13 was a preview, but it was inserted into the lecture as supplementary information, which can be judged from its irregular position. This explains why it did not have enough evidence of boundary markers.

The combined frequencies of occurrence of boundary markers for all three lectures are listed in Table 27.

TABLE 27

FREQUENCY OF THE OCCURRENCE OF THE BOUNDARY MARKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Markers</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows that 1 unit had only one device to signal the boundary; 5 units had two markers; 10 units had three markers; 16 units had four markers; 20 units had five markers; 14 units had six markers; and 3 units had seven markers. The average number of markers for the three lectures is 4.50.

We assumed that a unit with three or more than three boundary markers at the beginning is signaled clearly. According to this criterion, 6 out of the 69 units were not marked adequately. Of these six, two were at the beginning of the lectures, one was an
interruption, one was a digression, and one was a preview which was inserted in the lecture. There was only one artistic background which lacked unit changing signals, which we cannot explain reasonably. From these results we might draw this conclusion: Although each of the boundary markers alone was not precise enough to indicate the shifting of units, when we take all of them into consideration, 91 percent of the units were marked clearly.

Here, I want to point out one thing. If we compare different units, we may find that the same number of boundary markers does not necessarily mean the unit boundaries are marked with the same degree of clarity. This is because of the different accuracy levels of the various boundary markers. For example, a unit with a macro-marker and a retrospective signal should be much better indicated than a unit with a pause and a topicalized phrase.

In this chapter, first, we found that the Chinese lectures studied have a common structure. After examining the units of the lectures which were defined according to their contents, a common structure shared by the lectures was revealed. Although it did not seem to be as hierarchical and complicated as the one Shaw (1994) found for business structure, the music and art history lectures delivered in Chinese do have a clear structure. In addition to the review and preview sections which occurred at the beginning and the end of the lectures, the main theme(s) section included five parts: artistic background, topics, examples, digression and interruption. Of these, the first three were required and the latter two were optional. So, basically, a lecture on art or music history in a college level course in Taiwan contains the following elements: review and/or preview, artistic background, topics, and examples. Although digression and interruption are optional, we found digression in each of the three lectures but only found one example of interruption in all three lectures.

Within the structure, we found some differences between history of art and history of music. In Lecture A (History of Western Art) there were 11 units which
served as "examples", while in the other two lectures (History of Western Music and History of Chinese Music), there were only 3 and 1 examples respectively. On the other hand, the latter two had more units on "topics" (History of Western Music had 16 and History of Chinese Music had 8) than the former (History of Western Art had 4). This might indicate that although similar disciplines share a common structure, each one has its own emphasis: History of Music depends upon the explanation of topics, and History of Art depends upon the analysis of the examples. However, it is also possible that the differences may be due to variations in the individual styles of the lecturers. Further research must be done before we can make any conclusion.

Along with this structure, seven devices were used by the lecturers to signal the unit boundaries. They were discourse markers, pauses, rhetorical questions, retrospective signals, topicalized phrases, volume, and kinesics. Of these, the two most reliable markers were macro-markers and retrospective signals. For all of the other markers, due to the relatively low percentage of their occurrence at the unit boundaries compared with their frequency within units, none of them alone were able to indicate the change of units precisely. However, when we looked at all the markers in combination, 91 percent of units were signaled by three or more unit boundary markers, which we already assumed to be sufficient for signaling a topic change.

Several findings are worth mentioning. First, certain types of macro-markers were used more frequently at unit boundaries and others within units. When we distinguished them by type, we got a clearer insight as to which macro-markers were better indicators of unit changing. For example, almost all the clausal macro-markers were used to signal topic shifting. If we can prove this with more data, we might argue that macro-markers are fairly good boundary markers in Chinese lectures. Secondly, when the boundary markers were used within units, some of them were found to have the function of signaling the sub-topics. If we can further break down the units into sub-units and investigate the relationship between boundary markers and topics and sub-
topics, we might find a closer correspondence between macro-markers and units and sub-units. Thirdly, the use of retrospective signals as an indication of unit shifting, which was only a minor device in English lectures (It was only mentioned a few times in all the literature I have read so far, so I assume it is a minor device in English lectures.), was the most effective one in Chinese lectures compared with the other devices. Their percentage at unit boundaries was 69 percent of all the retrospective signals.

Furthermore, two of the three lecturers did not use them within units (see Table 15 on page 98). If this phenomenon can be investigated with more data, we can be more sure that this device is a good boundary marker.

The implications of these results will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V
IMPLICATIONS

This study addresses two issues. The researcher tries to understand whether there is a common discourse structure shared by lectures in similar disciplines. Secondly, if so, how is the structure signaled? In these two issues, the first one only deals with one category in the scope of discourse analysis: structure of lectures, whereas the second one involves both discourse and second language learning.

The results show that the music and art history lectures delivered in Chinese do have a common structure, although it was neither as general as the one proposed by Ruetten (1986) nor as complicated as that found for business lectures by Shaw (1994). This finding is significant because it reveals two facts. First, the Chinese lectures have their structures, just as the English lectures have theirs. This study demonstrated that although there are cultural differences between Chinese-speaking people and English-speaking people, they do not change the fact that academic lectures do have their discourse structure, no matter what languages they are delivered in. This is easy to understand: only with a structure can the main ideas of the lectures be expressed systematically. Second, different disciplines have their own discourse structures, so the structure of music and art history lectures is different from that of business lectures. What is more, although the three lectures shared a common structure, their emphases were different because they belonged to two different disciplines.

The results for the second issue show that the structure of the lectures could be signaled by seven devices: discourse markers, pauses, rhetorical questions, retrospective signals, topicalized phrases, volume, and kinesics. The best indicators
seem to be the retrospective signals and macro-markers, with 69 and 66 percent of occurrence at unit boundaries respectively. The percentages of all the other devices were lower than 33%. In this situation, we cannot say that any of them alone were able to indicate the change of units precisely. However, when we looked at them in combination, 91 percent of units were signaled by three or more unit boundary markers, which we assumed was a clear enough indication of topic changing. With these results, we can be sure that the three Chinese lecturers did not use only one device to signal the change of topic. That means that the students could not depend upon any one of the seven devices to understand the structure of the lectures, by which the main ideas were revealed. They had to do all the following things when they listened to a lecture: pay attention to the content of the teacher's utterances, notice whether there were pauses or change of volume, and watch the teacher's movement.

All the research focused on discourse markers has argued that native speakers of English use discourse markers to indicate the structure of their utterances while many nonnative speakers fail to do so adequately. The results of this study might have revealed part of the reason: discourse markers were not the only device used by the Chinese lecturers to orient the students. Various devices such as pause, volume, nonverbal behaviors, rhetorical questions, retrospective signals, or topicalized phrases were all possible indicators for unit changing. In this situation, Chinese students did not need to rely on discourse markers when they listened to lectures. The question remains open whether NSs of English also use this variety of devices since previous studies have not examined all of these factors. If further study reveals that English NSs do rely more heavily on discourse markers while Chinese lectures use a variety of devices, then this may explain why Chinese students have difficulty understanding lectures when they study in the USA.

What is the application of the information obtained in this study? The results of the study can be applied to two fields. First, the information can benefit teachers in
higher education. Since we have found that different disciplines have their own
discourse structures, teachers can give clear and systematic lectures by putting their
main ideas into the structure of that specific discipline.

Secondly, this information can be helpful to Chinese students who study in the
USA or English-speaking students who study in Taiwan and possibly in other Chinese-
speaking environments as well. Although we have found that the discourse structure of
the Chinese lectures and the way of signaling it was different from that of English
lectures, there are two possible reasons for this phenomenon. One possible reason is
culture-based: it has to do with Chinese lecturing style vs. English lecturing style. The
other possibility is genre-based: it is because of the differences in the disciplines. If the
differences we have found in the lecturing styles are due to the differences between
Chinese and English lecturing styles, then Chinese students who study here in America
should try to adjust their listening habits and rely more on the technique of decoding
discourse markers. If they become TAs, they should learn to give lectures in the correct
framework by employing appropriate discourse markers. On the other hand, when non-
native speakers learn Chinese, this information can help them to understand the way
Chinese teachers give lectures.

Some of the findings in the study were interesting and deserve further research.
First, of the 69 units in the three lectures, there were six which were considered as not
being signaled clearly. Of these six, two were at the beginning of the lecturers, one was
an interruption, one was an digression, and one was a preview which was inserted in the
lecture. There was only one artistic background unit which caould not be explained
reasonably. This might indicate that the external situations not directly considered in this
study may affect the degree of signaling the unit boundaries. Units such as interruption,
digression, or units which occurred at the beginning of a lecture were already indicated
by the external situations, so the boundary markers were not needed. This is an issue
which should be investigated further.
The second finding was that there are differences among the specific macro-markers and micro-markers in how well they signal topic shifting; within each category different makers were used to perform different functions. In macro-markers, clausal macro-markers were mostly used to indicate new main topics when compared with phrasal macro-markers such as the ordinal numbers, which indicate sub-topics. In micro-markers, some of the micro-markers such as $hao\,^3$ (OK) and $nte\,me$ (well, so) were used to indicate the topic shifting much more than the others. This has not been pointed out by the studies which focused on English discourse markers, and is an issue which deserves further research.

The last interesting finding concerns the volume and speed of utterances. In Lecture A, Lin uttered the three "digressions" more naturally and faster, while she delivered the rest of the lecture by frequently referring to her notes and seemingly reading from them. We know from this that it is possible that when a person is not reading, he/she may use a more natural voice. Softer voice occurred in the "asides" (e.g. at the beginning of Unit 16, after Chen asked the students to look at a painting on a slide, she explained that the slide was not clear because there was something wrong with the projector. This explanation was an "aside"). More research needs to be done on the correlation between volume and asides. In Lecture C, Chen used a soft voice in one of the two digressions: Unit 14, but not in the other one: Unit 19. In Unit 14, Chen asked the students whether they had been to mainland China and seen the Tang Imitation Music, and in Unit 19 she commented on the importance of integrating foreign music into the national music. It is not clear whether the difference between Unit 14 and Unit 19 occurred because the former was less related to the mainstream topic and so was more like an aside but the latter was not. This issue deserves further research.

One of the limitations of this study is that there is only one lecture for art history and two lectures for music history. With this small amount of data we can not determine whether the differences between the two similar disciplines were due to the differences
in the disciplines or only to individual differences. A replication of this study with more subjects is needed to find the answer.

The other limitation is that the study only focuses on Chinese lectures. If the results of the study can be compared with those for English lectures in similar disciplines, it is believed that some more interesting and significant discoveries would be found.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF LECTURES
Outline of Lecture A: History of Western Art

Unit 1

Number of words: 271
Topic summary: reviewing briefly what had been taught and clarifying a few important historical periods
First clause: shang⁴ yi¹tang² ke⁴, fu⁴xi²,
Last class, we had a review.
Last clause: zhe⁴ge shi⁴ suan⁴shi⁴ zao³qì¹ ji¹du¹ han⁴ zhong¹gu³ de jie⁴ye³.
This is, considered to be the boundary between the Early Christian Period and the Medieval Period.

Unit 2

Number of words: 185
Topic summary: introducing one of the artistic styles in the early Middle Ages: Classicism
First clause: zhi¹yu² shuo¹dao⁴, zheng³ge⁴ zhe⁴ge jie⁴ye³ zhong¹jian¹ ran²hou⁴ jin⁴ru⁴, zhong¹gu³, zao³qì¹, zhe⁴ zhong¹jian¹ yi⁴shu⁴ feng¹ge² shang⁴mian⁴ wo³men yi³jing¹ shuo¹dao⁴ le, jiu⁴ you³ liang²zhong³ feng¹ge²,
Speaking of, between the Medieval Period and the early Christian Period, as to the artistic style in this period, we have mentioned two styles.
Last clause: ran²hou⁴ zhi¹yu² yi³hou⁴ yao⁴zou³ shen²meyang⁴ de lu⁴zi na⁴ jiu⁴ kan⁴ ge⁴ yi⁴shu⁴jia¹ de, zhe⁴zhong³ zi⁴ji³ de xin¹zhong¹ de li³nian⁴.
Then, which way to go depends on each individual artist's inner beliefs.

Unit 3
Number of words: 201
Topic summary: introducing the other artistic style in the early Middle Ages:
medieval style
First clause: zhi4yu2 dao4 de feng1ge2, suo3wei4 de zhong1gu3
feng1ge2 jiu4shi4 yi4zhong3..xiang4zheng1xing4..tu2xiang4
xing4zhi2, er2qie3, nei4rong3 zhong4yu2 xing3shi4 de zhe4zhong3
lu4,
Speaking of the medieval style, the so-called medieval style was a
symbolic, visual style, which put more emphasis on content than
on form.
Last clause: ye3 jiu4shi4 wo3men zhe4tang2 ke4 xian4zai4 yao4 jiang3dao4 de
li4zi..
That is just what we are going to cover in this class.

Unit 4
Number of words: 140
Topic summary: reminding the students of the difficulties in learning about the
Medieval Period.
First clause: xiang4 gang1cai2 jiang3 de zhe4 ji3ge ding4yi4, ni3men ruo4shuo1
hui2qu4 ba3 zhe4 fen1cheng2 yi1 er4, ran2hou4 zhe4zhong3 dui4bi3,
ran2hou4 zha04zhe wo3 na2chu1 de ji3ge li4ju4, hui2qu4 zai4
kan4kan4 shu1shang4 qi2ta1 wo3 mei2you3 na2chu1 de li4ju4 ni3men
ke3yi3 zha03de2dao4 de zi4ji3 xiang4 ban4fa3 qu4 fen1xi
Like the definition we talked about just now, if you go home and divide them up and compare them, then look for other examples in the book which I didn't mention, following the examples I used, you can find a way to analyze.

Last clause: ru² you³ bu⁴dong³ de hua⁴ ke³yi³ sui²shi² lai² zhao³ wo³..

If there is anything you don't understand, you can come and see me any time.

Unit 5

Number of words: 279

Topic summary: introducing the background of manuscript illumination

First clause: ran²hou⁴ wo³men xian⁴zai⁴ shuo¹dao⁴ shuo¹ zai⁴ ou¹zhou¹ de ji¹du¹jiao⁴hua⁴ shi²qi¹,

And now we talk about, in the Christianization period in Europe...

Last clause: ye³ yin³jin⁴ le, cong² chuan²tong³ de jiu⁴shi⁴ wo³men chang²shuo¹ de gu³dian³ de zhe⁴zhong³ sheng⁴jing¹ shou³gao³ zhong¹, bu⁴jin³ shi¹ sheng⁴jing¹ shou³gao³ jiu⁴shi⁴ ta¹men yi⁴xie¹ shou³hua⁴ben³ de zhe⁴xie¹ zhong¹jian¹ de yi⁴xie¹ ren²xiang⁴ de hui⁴hua⁴ dong⁴ji¹...

It also imported the traditional, which is what we often say the classical Bible manuscript, not only the artistic motive in the Bible manuscript but also in some portraits in the manuscript illumination.

Unit 6

Number of words: 96

Topic summary: introducing Painting 1
First clause: na⁴ wo³men xian⁴zai⁴ kan⁴dao⁴ de, xian⁴zai⁴ you⁴shou³bian¹ kan⁴dao⁴ de wo³ shi⁴ liang³ge tu² yi¹qi³ da³ chu¹lai, ni³ yao⁴ kan⁴ de jiu⁴shi⁴ zhe⁴ge shi¹zi.

Well, what we see now on your right hand side, I'm projecting two paintings now, what you need to see is this lion.

Last clause: zhe⁴ shi⁴ yi²ge di¹ming², Echternach, zhe⁴ge di¹fang¹...

This is a place name. Echternach, a place.

Unit 7

Number of words: 414

Topic summary: explaining how and where the illuminated manuscripts were produced

First clause: ta¹men yin¹wei² zhe⁴ shi²hou⁴ de sheng⁴jing¹ shou³xie³ben³ jiu⁴shi¹, ta¹ bu²shi¹ shu³yu² mo³ yi²ge, hua¹jia¹ huo⁴ mo³ yi²ge te⁴ding⁴ de yi²ge...shuo¹shi¹ hui⁴zhi¹zhe³ lai² hua⁴ de,

They, because at this time the Bible manuscript did not belong to any individual painter or a specific painter.

Last clause: suo³yi³ na³yi²ge xian¹ hua⁴ na³ yi²ge hou⁴ hua⁴ zhe⁴ dou¹ bu⁴ yi²ding⁴ de mei²you³ yi²ding⁴ de ci⁴xu⁴.

Therefore, which one to paint first, which one to paint last was not definite. There was no fixed order.

Unit 8

Number of words: 178

Topic summary: going through slides quickly with the students

First clause: hao³ rang⁴ wo³men liu³lan³ yi²xia kan⁴ yi²xia ni³men jiu¹ zhi¹dao⁴ zhe⁴ yi¹tang² ke⁴ ni³men yao⁴ zhi¹dao⁴ de shi¹ na³xie¹,
OK, let's browse through this so that you'll know what we need to learn in this class.

Last clause: 

dui⁴ bei³ou¹ren² lai² jiang³ ta¹men hui⁴ kang⁴yi⁴ de..

If you say this to the Northern Europeans, they would protest.

Unit 9

Number of words: 311

Topic summary: returning to and analyzing Painting 1

First clause: 

wo³men kan⁴dao⁴ zhe⁴ge ma³ke³ de xiang⁴zheng¹wu⁴..shi¹yi²ge shi¹zi,

We can see that the symbol for Mark is a lion.

Last clause: 

you² zhe⁴xie¹ ni³ ke³yi³ kan⁴chu¹ hen³duo¹ yuan²su⁴ mo³xie¹ zuo⁴hua⁴ yuan²su⁴ bu²shi³ chuan²tong³ gu²dian³ li³mian⁴ suo²you³ de..

From these you can see that many elements, some elements in these paintings are not traditional or classical.

Unit 10

Number of words: 283

Topic summary: analyzing Painting 2

First clause: 

hao³ jie¹ xia⁴qu⁴ wo³men kan⁴dao⁴ zhe⁴ yi²zhang¹ shi¹, ye³shi⁴ di⁴qi¹ shi³ji¹mo⁴ de ling⁴wai⁴ yi²zhang¹..

OK, the one we'll see next is, is also from the end of the 7th century.

Last clause: 

ni³men qu⁴ bi³jiao⁴ yi²xia bo¹si¹ di⁴tan³ kan⁴kan⁴ ta¹men zhe⁴zhong³ gou⁴tu² dong¹ji¹ shi¹ bu² shi⁴ fei¹chang² lei⁴jin⁴..
You go to compare this with Persian carpets and see if the motives of forming the patterns are very similar.

Unit 11

Number of words: 318

Topic summary: analyzing Painting 3

First clause: xian\^4zai\^4 wo\^3men jie\^4xia\^4qu\^4 kan\^4 de zhe\^4ge tu\^2, shi\^4 ba\^1 shi\^4ji\^4 mo\^4 de,

What we are seeing now is a painting from the end of the 8th century.

Last clause: ying\^1guo\^2 zhe\^4bian\^1 jiu\^4 gei\^3 ren\^2 gan\^3jue\^2 jiu\^4shi\^4 yi\^4zhong\^3 yi\^4zu\^2 feng\^1wei\^4 de, er\^2qie\^3 shi\^4 yi\^4zhong\^3 zhan\^3xin\^1 de yi\^4zhong\^3 mian\^4mao\^4..

England gave us a feeling, which was a different ethnic style, a completely new feature.

Unit 12

Number of words: 460

Topic summary: analyzing Painting 4

First clause: tong\^2yang\^4 de wo\^3men kan\^4dao\^4 di\^4ba\^1 shi\^4ji\^4 mo\^4 tong\^2yang\^4 ye\^3shi\^4 Kells zhe\^4ge sheng\^4jing\^1 shou\^3xie\^3ben\^3 zhong\^1jian\^1 de yi\^2ge cha\'hua\'ye\^4,

Similarly, what we see now is also one of the pictures inside the Kells scripture manuscript from the end of the 8th century.

Last clause: wo\^3xiang\^3 dao\^4 zhe\^4li\^3 wo\^3men zhan\^4shi\^2 xiu\^1xi\^2 yi\^2xia\^4..

I think we should take a break now.
Unit 13

Number of words: 131

Topic summary: reminding the students of the importance of having correct concepts, and explaining how the syllabus was decided

First clause: qǐchuāng² le..

Wake up.

Last clause: zǐjī³ huìjia¹ qu⁴ jia¹qiang² zhe⁴ fāng¹mian⁴...

You should learn more in this area on your own.

Unit 14

Number of words: 462

Topic summary: introducing Carolingian revival

First clause: hài²you³ wò'men qian² yi⁴tang² ke⁴, shang⁴ shang⁴ yi⁴tang² ke⁴
ti²dao⁴ de ka³luo⁴lin² wang²chao² de cha²li³man⁴ da⁴di⁴ zai⁴
xi¹yuan² ba¹bai³ nian² qian²hou⁴, bei⁴ jiao⁴huang² jia¹mian³ wei² huang²;
Also, we mentioned two classes ago that Charlemagne of the Carolingian Dynasty was crowned as an emperor by the pope around 800 A.D.

Last clause: zhe⁴ yi²xian⁴ bu⁴fen zhe⁴li³ shì⁴ Aachen jiao⁴tang² ben³shén¹,
ran²ho zhe⁴ yi²bian¹ huang²gōng¹ de bu⁴fen⁴..
This part is the Aachen Church, and this side is the royal palace.

Unit 15

Number of words: 156

Topic summary: preparing to compare paintings from Carolingian with medieval paintings
What we are going to see is the kind of artistic style represented in the Carolingian Dynasty.

So usually this term is only associated with Germany.

What we see is Jesus in the throne.

But it pretty much, in terms of style, it pretty much followed the classical procedures.

Next, we see a painting from Ada.
The other is a symbolic style using one-dimensional patterns.

Unit 18

Number of words: 109

Topic summary: explaining the importance of distinguishing the two styles

First clause: da'jia bu yao xiao,

Please don't laugh.

Last clause: zhe dui ni men chuang zuo you yong chu de, bu shi yao bi ni men kao shi si bei de...

This is good for your creation, but not to memorize for exams.

Unit 19

Number of words: 465

Topic summary: beginning to illustrate the characteristics of late classicism through Painting 7.

First clause: ni men xian zai kan dao de...

What you see now...

Last clause: da jia zhe yi kan zhe yi zhang tu jiu ke yi liao jie dao
da hou su qiang diao de suo wei dian wan qi de
defeng ge gen zhong gu de feng ge shi bu yi yang de xing shi de..

If you pay attention to this painting, you will learn that the so-called late classicism is different from the medieval style.
Unit 20

Number of words: 152

Topic summary: continuing to explain late classicism through Painting 8.

First clause: hao³ xian⁴zai⁴ wo³men jie¹zhe kan⁴ you⁴bian¹ zhe⁴ yi⁴zhang¹
tu²,
OK, now let's continue to look at the painting on the right.

Last clause: zhe⁴zhong³ you³yi⁴..zou³hui² zi⁴ran² de lu⁴zi de
zhe⁴zhong³..zuō⁴hua⁴ ji⁴fa³..
(You can see) this technique of painting tries to go back to nature
on purpose.

Unit 21

Number of words: 306

Topic summary: continuing to explain late classicism through Painting 9

First clause: xian⁴zai⁴ ni³men kan⁴dao⁴ zuo³bian¹ zhe⁴ liang³zhang¹ you⁴
ling⁴wai⁴ yi⁴zhong³ gan³jue²..
The two paintings you see now on the left have a different feeling.

Last clause: zhe⁴ er⁴ san¹shi² nian² nei⁴ yi⁴zhong³ jin⁴zhan³ de qing²xing²,
(It represents) the progress within the twenty, thirty years.

Unit 22

Number of words: 278

Topic summary: comparing Painting 7 and Painting 10 to reveal the development
of classicism over time

First clause: jie¹zhe wo³men kan⁴dao⁴ Ebo de zhe⁴ yi⁴zhang¹ sheng⁴jing¹
shou³hui⁴ben³ de cha¹hua⁴..
Next, we'll see a painting from the manuscript illumination from Ebo.

We can say that they were from the same era, but they revealed different phenomena due to the difference in technique.

Unit 23

Number of words: 119

Topic summary: mentioning classicism in architecture and previewing the topic for the next class

First clause: jian⁴zhu² fang¹mian⁴..

In the area of architecture...

Last clause: xia⁴ tang² ke⁴ jiu⁴ jin⁴xing² zhe⁴ge ka³luo⁴lin² wang²chao² shi²hou⁴ de jian⁴zhu²...

In our next class, we are going to carry on with the architecture in the Carolingian Dynasty.
Outline of Lecture B: History of Western Music

Unit 1

Number of words: 59

Topic summary: reviewing Lenoninus; previewing Perotinus

First clause: wo³men jin¹tian ji°xu⁴jie⁴shao⁴ na⁴ge Notre Dame xue²pai⁴ de,
di⁴er⁴wei⁴zuo⁴qu³jia¹.. Today we will continue to introduce the second composer of the Notre Dame School.

Last clause: ye³jiu¹shì¹shuó¹ ta¹yong⁴ fù¹yín¹ de shòu³fā³lái²..chū⁴lǐ³..lái² fā¹zhàn³, yuán²bèn³ shì⁴dàn¹yín¹ de yìn¹yue⁴.. That is to say that he employed the technique of polyphony to process, to improve the monophony.

Unit 2

Number of words: 262

Topic summary: introducing the features of Perotinus's organum quadruplum

First clause: na⁴mo wo³men jin¹tian wo³xiāng³qìng³ge⁴wei⁴tóng²xué² fān¹kài¹yì⁴bài³yì¹shì²sān¹ yè⁴, wo³men de shù¹de yì⁴bài³ yì¹shì²sān¹ yè⁴.. And, today, we, I think, please turn to page 113, page 113 in our book.

Last clause: zhe⁴lǐ³jìu¹shì¹yì²ge Perotinus de organum quadruplum de lì⁴zi... Here is an example of Perotinus's organum quadruplum.

Unit 3

Number of words: 320
explaining how Latin words show the origin of an organum melody

del zai\(^4\) de zhe\(^4\) ge jing\(^1\) wen\(^2\) ge\(^1\). huo\(^4\) zhe\(^3\) organum
de zui\(^4\) di\(^3\) xia\(^4\) de sheng\(^1\) bu\(^4\) hui\(^4\) kan\(^4\) dao\(^4\) ju\(^4\) da\(^4\) de yin\(^1\) fu\(^2\), shi\(^4\)
bu\(^2\) shi\(^4\)?

In most motet and organum, we see a huge musical note under the last voice, right?

Put it this way, do you understand?

Unit 4

Number of words: 65

comparing Lenoninus and Perotinum's contributions

Perotin de gong\(^1\) lao\(^2\) mei\(^2\) you\(^3\) Lenoninus na\(^4\) me da\(^4\)...

OK. As a matter of fact, in terms of reform, Perotinus's contributions were not as great as those of Lenoninus.

Lenoninus's contributions were, of course, much greater.

Unit 5

Number of words: 129

playing a piece of organum quadrup/um with a tape recorder, reminding the students to pay attention to certain features
First clause: hao³, na⁴me, guan¹yu² zhe⁴ge Perotinus de zhe⁴ge sederunt
zhe⁴shou³, organum quadruplum, wo³ xiang³ wo³men xian⁴zai⁴
ting¹ yi²xia⁴,
OK. Well, concerning Perotinus's organum quadruplum,
sederunt, let's listen to it.

Last clause: ta¹ bu²shi⁴ wan²gu⁴ di¹yin¹...
It is not a real bass.

Unit 6
Number of words: 77
Topic summary: evaluating organum quadruplum
First clause: hao³, fei¹chang² de chao³za²,
OK. Very noisy.

Last clause: na⁴me zai⁴, ye³ jiu³shi⁴ you³ xiang⁴ Lenonin huo⁴ Perotin ta¹men
zhe⁴zhong³ xian¹qian² de zhe⁴zhong³ zuo⁴fa³, hou⁴lai² de fu⁴yin¹
yin¹yue⁴ cai²hui⁴ fa¹zhan³ de na⁴me de wan²mei³, na⁴me de
cheng²shu², shi⁴ bu² shi⁴?
So, in, that is, there was such practice as that of Lenonisus and
Perotinus, therefore, later on polyphony developed and perfected,
right?

Unit 7
Number of words: 299
Topic summary: further explaining the features of organum quadruplum
First clause: xiang⁴ gang¹cai² de zhe⁴ge li¹zi wo³ xiang³ ge⁴wei⁴ zhu⁴yi⁴ dao⁴ le
yi⁴dian³ fei¹chang² ming²xian³ de jiu⁴shi⁴ mei²you³ jing¹wen²..
Like the example above, I think everybody has noticed the fact that there is no lyrics.

Last clause:  
xi¹wang⁴ ge⁴wei⁴ neng² ji⁴zhu⁴ Perotinus zai⁴ Lenoninus zhi¹hou⁴ ta¹ zui⁴da⁴ de gong⁴xian⁴ qi²zhi²..duo¹ban⁴ zhi³shi⁴ zai⁴yu² sheng¹bu⁴ de kuo⁴chong¹ er²yi³...

Hope everybody can remember that Perotinus's greatest contribution after Lenoninus actually lies in the enlargement of the voice.

Unit 8

Number of words: 644

Topic summary: introducing motets in general, with emphasis on one motets

First clause:  
na⁴me, wo³men zai⁴ jin¹tian¹ yao⁴ kai¹shi³ jin⁴ru⁴ xia⁴yi²ge..
jie¹duan⁴ jiu⁴shi⁴ yao⁴ tan²dao⁴ na⁴ge Ars Nova zhi¹qian², wo³men lai² kan⁴kan⁴ wo³men pu³li⁴ li³mian⁴ de liang²shou³ jing¹wen²ge¹..

Well, today before we start the next phase, Ars Nova, let's look at the two motetu in our score book.

Last clause:  
na⁴me, wo³ zhi³shi⁴ zai⁴ zhe⁴li³ gen¹ ge⁴wei⁴ ti² yi²xia⁴ ta¹ de guan¹xi huo⁴zhe³ cong² jing¹shen² shang⁴ lai² kan⁴ shi⁴ hen³ lei¹si⁴ de, dui⁴ bu² dui⁴?

So, I only want to mention their relationship, I just wanted to point out to everybody that they are very similar in spirit, right?

Unit 9

Number of words: 386

Topic summary: defining motets
OK. This motetus, I think you should have a concept, "mot" means "word".

Don't be affected by this.

While we are listening to this motetus, I think here I want to remind everybody.

Therefore, when we listen to the melody, we feel it goes very smoothly from the beginning to the end. We don't have the feeling of going from segment to segment.

playing a motet with a tape recorder, reminding the students to pay attention to certain features.
First clause: hao³, ge⁴wei⁴, wo³men xian⁴zai⁴, wo³ xiang³ wo³men² jiu⁴ lai² ting¹ting¹ liu⁴shi²ba¹ ye⁴ de zhe⁴ge motetus...
OK, everybody, now, let's listen to the motetus on page 68.

Last clause: bu²yao⁴ ba³ suo³you³ de jing¹wen²ge¹ dou¹ xiang³cheng² shi¹ zong¹jiao¹ de...
Don't think that all motetus is sacred.

Unit 12
Number of words: 603
Topic summary: explaining the second motet
First clause: na⁴me, guan¹yu² zai⁴, en, qi¹shì²er⁴ ye⁴ de zhe⁴ yi¹shou³...zai⁴ shu¹ shang, qing³ ge⁴wei⁴ fan¹dao⁴ yi²bai³ er⁴shi²wu³ ye⁴,
And, concerning the one on page 72, please turn to page 125 in your book.
Last clause: zhe⁴ge shi⁴, zhe⁴ liu⁴ge jie²zou⁴ mo²shì⁴ zai⁴ zhong¹shì³ji⁴ de fu⁴yin¹ yin¹yue⁴ li³bian¹ shì¹, you³ fei¹chang² zhong⁴yao⁴ de di⁴wei⁴ de...
This is, these six rhythm models were extremely important in the medieval polyphony music.

Unit 13
Number of words: 117
Topic summary: playing the second motet with a tape recorder and reminding the students to pay attention to certain features.
First clause: hao³, wo³men xian⁴zai⁴ lai² ting¹ting¹ zhi⁴ yi²duan⁴..motetus,
OK. Let's listen to this motetus.
Last clause: ta¹men shì⁴ chu³zai⁴ na⁴zhong³ yi²ge, yi²ge wei³da⁴ de yi⁴shu⁴ de
They were in the era before the appearance of a great art, it was in that era.

Unit 14

Number of words: 147

Topic summary: summarizing the Notre Dame School

First clause: hao³, na⁴me, guan¹yu² zhe⁴ge motetus wo³ xiang³,
zhù¹shàng..zài⁴ yì⁴bài³ ér⁴shì² yè⁴ kǎi¹shì³ zhe⁴lì³ yóu³ hén³duo¹
de guān¹yu² motetus de zhe⁴ge bu³chóng¹, xù⁴shū⁴,
OK, with regard to this motetus, I think starting on page 120 in our book there is a lot of supplement to and narration of motetus.

Last clause: ní³mén yào⁴ yòu³ zhé⁴yáng⁴ de yì²ge gài⁴nián⁴...
You have to have such a concept.

Unit 15

Number of words: 1481

Topic summary: introducing the period of Ars Nova and its background

First clause: wò³mén jīn¹tiān¹ kǎi¹shì³ yào⁴ jí²shào⁴ de shì⁴ yì²ge, zài⁴
yìn¹yuè³shì³ shàng⁴ yě³shì⁴ fěi¹chāng² zhòng³yào⁴ de yì²ge shì²qí¹,
What we are about to introduce today is a very important era in the history of music.

Last clause: yě³jiù⁴shì³shuò¹ shì³su² yìn¹yuè⁴ de fù⁴yín¹huà⁴, dà⁴liàng⁴ de shì³su² yìn¹yuè⁴ de fù⁴yín¹huà⁴...
That is to say, the polyphonization of secular music, a lot of secular music.
Unit 16

Number of words: 126

Topic summary: summarizing the period of the history of music which has been taught so far

First clause: hao³, ge⁴wei⁴, na⁴me ru²guo³ wo³men².zhe⁴ge xue²qi¹kai¹shi³
jiang³ xi¹yang² yin¹yue⁴ shi³ wo³men² xian¹ jiang³ le shen²me,
OK. Everybody, what have we covered since the beginning of this semester about western music?

Last clause: di⁴ shi²si¹ shi³ji³ shi³ Ars Nova de shi²dai⁴
The fourteenth century was an era of Ars Nova.

Unit 17

Number of words: 60

Topic summary: introducing the time and place of Ars Nova

First clause: wo³men suō³ yao⁴ ti²dao⁴ de jiu⁴shi⁴ Ars Nova suō³ she³ji² de san¹ge di⁴qu¹,
What we are going to mention is the three regions where Ars Nova happened.

Last clause: qing³ ji¹zhu¹ wo³men² jiang³ Ars Nova wo³men² shi⁴ yao⁴ jiang³ fa³guo² de, yi⁴da⁴li⁴ de, ying¹guo² de, yin¹wei² zai⁴ zhe⁴ san¹ge di⁴fang¹.shi³su² yin¹yue⁴ de fu⁴yin¹hua⁴ zui⁴ ju⁴ dai⁴biao³xing⁴,
zui⁴ che⁴di³...
When talking about Ars Nova, we are going to cover France, Italy, and England because in these three places the polyphonization of secular music was the most representative and thorough.
reminding the students of the fact that sacred and secular music could exist at the same time

ke³shi⁴, ao, xi¹wang⁴ ge⁴wei⁴ ye³ you³ yi²ge gai⁴nian⁴

But I hope that you can have a concept.

yin¹ci³ zai⁴ Ars Nova shi²qi¹, chu²le shi⁴su² yin¹yue⁴ zhi¹wai⁴

wo³men² dang¹ran² ye³ ke³yi³ ting¹dao⁴ hen³ jing¹cai³ de,

zong¹jiao⁴ yin¹yue⁴, hai²shi you³ de, zhi³shi⁴ zhe'shi⁴ yi²ge
te⁴dian³, ao⁴...

Therefore, in the period of Ars Nova, there was excellent sacred music as well as secular music, but the characteristic of this period was secular music.

returning to the time and place of Ars Nova

na⁴me zai⁴ zhe⁴ san¹ge di⁴qu¹ li³bian¹, ge⁴wei⁴, zhe⁴ge⁴ shi⁴, wo⁴
duo²de² shi⁴ jian⁴ren²jian⁴zhi⁴ de

And, in these three areas, everybody, I think there has been some disagreement as to how to divide the areas.

suo³yi³ ne, wo³men² ba³ ta¹ dang¹zuo⁴ shi⁴ shi²si⁴ shi²ji⁴ zhe⁴

zheng³ge yi⁴bai³ nian², shi⁴ yi²ge Ars Nova de shi²dai⁴...

Therefore, we see the whole 14th century, the 100 years, as the era of Ars Nova.
Unit 20

Number of words: 331

Topic summary: introducing the origin of the term of Ars Nova.

First clause: hao³ naʻme, wo³ xiang³, shou³xian¹ wo³men² lai²kan⁴ yi²xia⁴
zhe⁴ge ming²cheng¹ de you²lai²,

OK, I think, first let's take a look at the origin of this name.

Last clause: shi²si⁴ shì³jì³ shì³ yì²ge Ars Nova de shì³jì³ zhe⁴ge ming²cheng¹
shi³ zhe⁴yang⁴zi lai² de...

The 14th century was the era of Ars Nova. This is how it got its name.

Unit 21

Number of words: 120

Topic summary: supplementing the origin of the term of Ars Antiqua.

First clause: hao³, zai⁴ zhe³li³ wo³ fu⁴dai⁴ bu³chong¹ yi²xia

OK, here I want to add one point.

Last clause: dui⁴, jiu⁴ shì³ jì³ yì³shu⁴ shì³qi¹, jì³ yì³shu⁴ shì³qi¹, dui⁴...

Yes, it was Ars Antiqua, Ars Antiqua, yes.

Unit 22

Number of words: 1218

Topic summary: introducing de Vitry's treatise on Ars Nova

First clause: hao³, en, guan¹yu²..de Vitry zai³ ta¹ de Ars Nova zhe⁴ yì³pian¹
lun⁴wen² li³bian¹ ta¹ suo³ shē³jì² de dao⁴di³ shì³ shèn²me
nei⁴rong²?

OK, well, concerning de Vitry, in his treatise on Ars Nova, what
did he talk about?
Last clause: zai⁴ _Ars Nova_ na⁴ge shì⁴ hou⁴...ta¹ men² dui⁴ jie² zòu⁴, dui⁴ na⁴ge yìn¹ zhi² de na⁴ge de na⁴ge yì³ jìng¹ fēi¹ chǎng² de qìng¹ xi⁴ le, suàn⁴ shì⁴ yì³ jìng¹ hén³ shèn¹ rú⁴ le... In the era of _Ars Nova_, they, about rhythm and voice quality, they had a clearly and deep understanding.

Unit 23

Number of words: 114

Topic summary: summarizing the three main points in de Vitry's treatise

First clause: hào³, gē⁴ wéi⁴, zhe³ ge jù⁴ shì⁴ wǒ³ men² suǒ³ tí² dao⁴ de, zai⁴ ta¹ de, zhe⁴ ge, en, zai⁴ Vitry de zhe⁴ ge _Ars Nova_ zhe⁴ pían¹ lún⁴ wen² lì³ biàn¹, shè² jì² dao⁴ de nei⁴ róng²,

OK, everybody, this is what we have mentioned, what he covered, in his, well, in Vitry's treatise on _Ars Nova_,

Last clause: nǐ³ men jì⁴ zhū⁴ le jìu⁴ hào³ le...

It would be good if you can remember.

Unit 24

Number of words: 213

Topic summary: talking about _Ars Nova_ in Italy

First clause: hào³, nà⁴ me, rú² guò³ wǒ³ men zhè⁴ ge, jiāng³ _Ars Nova_ de huá⁴ dang¹ ran² wǒ³ men huì¹ xian¹ jiāng³ fā³ guò², ran² hòu⁴ zài⁴ jiāng³ yì⁴ dà¹ lì¹, ran² hòu⁴ zài⁴ jiāng³, zhé⁴ ge yīng⁴ guò²,

OK, if we talk about _Ars Nova_, of course, we will talk about France first, then Italy, then, England.

Last clause: jiāng³ yì⁴ dà¹ lì¹ de shì² si⁴ shì² jì⁴ wǒ³ men zuì⁴ hào³ yōng⁴ zhé⁴ yì² ge zi⁴ Trecento zhé⁴ ge zì⁴...
Talking about the 14th century in Italy, we'd better use the word Trecento.

Unit 25

Number of words: 1027

Topic summary: elaborating an important musical document: *Le Roman de Fauvel*

First clause: hao³, ge⁴wei⁴, zui⁴hou⁴ wo³ zai⁴ bu³chong¹ yi⁴dian³,

OK, everybody, finally I want to add one more point.

Last clause: ji¹hu¹ yi¹wu²shi⁴chu⁴ dui⁴ bu² dui⁴?

Almost everything is bad, right?

Unit 26

Number of words: 109

Topic summary: briefly touching upon one motet from *Le Roman de Fauvel* which

will be talked about in the next class.

First clause: hao³, ge⁴wei⁴, guan¹yu² zhe⁴ yi²ge, wo³men, ni³men kan⁴ yi²xia

pu³zi qí¹shi²wu³ ye⁴, yue⁴pu³ qí¹shi²wu³ ye⁴,

OK, everybody, about this, you read page 75, page 75 in the score book.

Last clause: wo³men xia⁴ke⁴ le

Class is over.
Outline of Lecture C: History of Chinese Music

Unit 1

Number of words: 256

Topic summary: reviewing the development of music rules from Qin and Han to Sui and Tang and previewing music in Sui and Tang

First clause: hao³ le xx ta⁴yao²niang² shi⁴ shen²me yi⁴si?

OK, xx, what does tayaoniang mean?

Last clause: suo²yi³ wo³men yao⁴ dui⁴yu² ta¹ de zhe⁴zhong³ te⁴bie² de xing²shi⁴ yao⁴ you³ lia⁴jie³, gai⁴nian⁴ shang⁴ yao⁴ qing¹chu³...

So we should have some understanding of its special form, should have a clear concept.

Unit 2

Number of words: 587

Topic summary: describing the influence of history on the combination of the Western Region music and Chinese folk music, which formed the basis of Sui and Tang music.

First clause: wo³ wei⁴shen²me yao⁴ cong² zhe⁴li³ kai¹shi³ jiang³ ne?

Why should I start teaching from here?

Last clause: er³ bu²shi⁴ zhi⁴you³ wo³men dao⁴ na⁴ge qu⁴ xue²..

It is not just us going over there to learn.

Unit 3

Number of words: 470

Topic summary: introducing the music from Western Region in Northern Dynasty

First clause: na⁴me zhe⁴xie¹ cong² xi¹yu¹ chuan² jin⁴lai² de yin¹yue⁴ zai⁴ zhe⁴ge
Then, what about this music imported from the Western Region at this time? In Northern Dynasty, what kinds of music were there?

Last clause: gao1 chang1 da4yue1 shi4 zai4 zhou1 de shi2hou4chuan2 jin4lai2 de...
Gaochang was imported in Zhou Dynasty.

Unit 4

Number of words: 453

Topic summary: analyzing the effect of political stability and economic prosperity on the flourishing of music in Tang Dynasty

First clause: qi2ci4 ne, zai4 sui2tang2 sheng4shi4 yi3hou4 ne..
Next, what about after the prosperous Sui and Tang?

Last clause: chang2an1 jiu4 bian4cheng2 yi2ge guo2ji4xing4 de yin1yue4 du1shi4..
Chang'an then became an international music city.

Unit 5

Number of words: 293

Topic summary: summarizing the development of music in Tang Dynasty

First clause: na4me wo3men shuo1 zhe4yang4zi de fa1zhan3 dang1ran2 ta1 yi2ding4 hui4 lei3ji1 xia4lai2 yi4xie1 dong1xi
And we say that this kind of development must have been able to accumulate some stuff.

Last clause: zhe4 shi4 wo3men sui2tang2 yin1yue4fa1zhan3 de yi4dian3dian3 gai4kuang4..
This is just a brief overview of the music development in Sui Tang.

Unit 6
Number of words: 199
Topic summary: introducing and defining Feast Music: the major feature of music in Tang Dynasty
First clause: na^me xian^zai^ ne, wo^ jiu^yao^4 ka1^shi^3 lai^2 jin^ru^ da0^ sui^2tang^2 yin^yue^ hen^ zhong^yao^ de yi^ge zhong^dian^3,
OK, now I am about to start a very important point in Sui Tang music.
Last music: zhe^4 shi^4 ta^1 de ding^yi^...
This is its definition.

Unit 7
Number of words: 55
Topic summary: explaining the reason for the popularity of Feast Music in Tang Dynasty
First clause: di^er^ge wo^men yao^ ti^dao^shuo^ ta^ wei^shen^me hui^ xing^4 ne,
Secondly, we want to talk about why it was able to prosper.
Last clause: suo^yi^3 hui^ xing^4 Therefore, it prospered.

Unit 8
Number of words: 1109
Topic summary: describing the variation in classifying Feast Music in different
periods in Sui and Tang Dynasties.

First clause: 

Thirdly, if we want to know something about Feast Music, we must know that after it came into China, it was categorized.

Last clause: 

Then Gaochang was added.

Unit 9

Number of words: 120

Topic summary: classifying Feast Music according to its content

First clause: 

These categories, the content of this music, we can understand from two aspects.

Last clause: 

Then if we look at the content,

Unit 10

Number of words: 538

Topic summary: including a digression of students’ asking questions and teacher answering them

First clause: 

Do you have any questions?
This all showed very clearly in music in Tang.

Unit 11

Number of words: 567

Topic summary: resuming to the topic in Unit 9

First clause: xian⁴zai⁴ wo³men ba³ zhe⁴ge en, yan⁴yue⁴ de zhe⁴ge, cong² nei⁴rong² shang⁴ lai⁴kan⁴ ne, ke²yi³ ba³ ta¹ gui¹lei⁴...

Now we, from the content, can categorize Feast Music.

Last clause: suo²yi³ bing⁴ bu⁷shi⁴ dao⁴ zhe⁴ge shi²hou yi³jing¹ bu²shi⁴ chun²cui⁴ de min⁷jian¹ yin¹yue⁴ le..

So it was not, it was not pure folk music by this time.

Unit 12

Number of words: 739

Topic summary: classifying Feast Music according to its styles of performance

First clause: hao, ru²guo³ wo³men cong² biao²yan³ de xing²shi⁴ shang⁴ lai²kan⁴ ne, cong² biao²yan³ cong² biao²yan³ de xing²shi⁴ shang⁴ lai²kan⁴ en, zhe⁴ge.. zhe⁴ge yan³zou⁴ de fang¹shi⁴ ne, ke²yi³ gui¹wei² liang³ da⁴ lei¹,

OK, if we look from the point of view of styles of performance, from performance, from styles of performance, this, this manner of performance, can be classified into two big categories.

Last clause: zhe⁴yang⁴ ye³ ke²yi³ kan⁴de²dao⁴ ta¹men de qu¹bie²...

This way we can see their differences.
Unit 13

Number of words: 183

Topic summary: previewing the rest of the class and next class

First clause: wo³ xiang³ deng³ yi²xia⁴ wo³ shao¹wei¹ ba³ zhe⁴ge zhe⁴yang⁴ yi²ge sheng⁴da⁴ de huo⁴zhe³ shuo¹ ke³yi³ shuo¹ wo³ ren⁴wei² zhe⁴me zhong⁴yao⁴ de yi²ge sui²tang² de yan⁴yue⁴, zhe⁴me duo¹zhong³ zhe⁴me duo¹ bu⁴tong² de shao¹wei¹ jiang³ yi²xia⁴, I think in a little while I will briefly talk about this great, or what I think was very important music in Sui and Tang, Feast Music, these various different kinds (of musical instruments).

Last clause: zhe⁴yang⁴ lai² liao²jie³ zhe⁴xie¹ ke³neng² de yan³zou⁴ xing²shi¹ gen¹ xiao⁴guo³, da⁴gai⁴ hui⁴ bi²jiao⁴ bu²hui⁴ jue²de li² ni³men ta¹ yuan³.. Understanding these possible styles of performance and their effects this way, you probably would not feel that it is too far from you.

Unit 14

Number of words: 63

Topic summary: mentioning Tang imitation music in China

First clause: jin¹tian¹ dao⁴ da⁴lu⁴ guan¹guang¹ fang³wen⁴ de ren², chang²chang² hui⁴ kan¹dao⁴ yi⁴zhong³ biao²yan³ xing²shi¹ jiao⁴zuo⁴ "fang³tang² yue⁴wu³" de zhe⁴ge fu⁴gu³ de zai¹xian⁴, Today, people who go to visit mainland often see a performance style, which is called "Tang imitation music," the reappearance of old Tang music.
Last clause: suo³yi³ ta¹men zuo⁴ le hen³duo¹ de yan²jiu⁴ ba³ ta¹ zai⁴
cheng²xian⁴ chu¹lai...
So they did a lot of research to re-present this.

Unit 15
Number of words: 1317
Topic summary: introducing various musical instruments through pictures
First clause: yan⁴yue⁴ li³mian⁴ suo³ yong⁴dao⁴ de yue⁴qi⁴..
The instruments used in Feast Music...
Last clause: ni³men ye³ ke³yi³ kan⁴ yi²xia⁴,
You can also take a look.

Unit 16
Number of words: 768
Topic summary: introducing different kinds of musical instruments
First clause: hao³, xian⁴zai⁴ wo³ lai² rang⁴ ni³men liao²jie³ yi²xia⁴,
OK, now I want to let you understand...
Last clause: hai² mei²you³ jie²shu⁴
It is not finished yet.

Unit 17
Number of words: 1542
Topic summary: showing slides of the musical instruments
First clause: xian⁴zai⁴ ne wo³ rang⁴ ni³men lai² kan⁴ yi²xia⁴ wo³men gang¹cai²
suo³ ti²dao⁴ de zhe⁴ yi³xie¹ yin¹yue⁴, zhe⁴xie¹ yue⁴qi⁴..
Now, I want you to take a look at these music, these musical
instruments we just mentioned.
Last clause: ran²hou⁴ ta¹men jiu⁴ zuo⁴zai⁴ xi²zi shang⁴ xiang³shou⁴ ta¹men de, ke³neng² shi⁴ dian³xin zhi¹lei⁴, And they sat down on the mat to enjoy their, probably some sort of snack.

Unit 18
Number of words: 377
Topic summary: playing a video of some Japanese musicians performing Feast Music
First clause: hao³, xian⁴zai⁴ wo³ gei³ ni³men kan⁴ yi⁴ xiao³ duan⁴...
OK, now I'll show you a short piece.
Last clause: ni³men xian⁴zai⁴ yao⁴ gen¹ ni³ ben³lai² bu⁴ zhi¹dao⁴ zhe⁴ge you³ shen²me te⁴bie² de yao⁴ you³ yi⁴dian³ bu⁴tong²... When you watch it now, you should watch it with a different eye from before when you didn't know anything about it.

Unit 19
Number of words: 217
Topic summary: commenting on the importance of borrowing foreign music
First clause: suo³yi³ you³ yi²ge hua⁴ti² wo³ jue²de hen³ zhi²de², you³ yi²ge ti²mu hen³ zhi²de da¹jia¹ xiang³yi⁴xiang³, So there is an issue I think everybody should think about.
Last clause: fang¹xiang³.. Fangxiang (a kind of musical instrument mentioned by the teacher while watching video)
Unit 20

Number of words: 194

Topic summary: summarizing the lesson

First clause: wo3men jin1tian1 jiang3 de shi4 shen2me ne?

What have we talked about today?

Last clause: hao3, xie4xie da4jia1

OK, thank you, everybody.
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES FROM THE LECTURES
Example 1 (From History of Western Music)

*extended pause is marked by "..."; long pause is marked by ".."; short pause is marked by ","*

1. wo'ren jin'tian ji4xu4 jie4shao4 na'ge Notre Dame xue2pai4 de, di4er4 wei4
2. zuo4qu3jia1...wo3men shang4ci4 jiang3 de na'ge Lenoninus, guan1yu2 Lenoninus ta1
3. zai4 xi1yang2 yin1yue4 shi3 shang zui4da4 de gong4xian4 jiu4shi4, ta1 ba3, yi2shi4,
4. zong1jiao4 yi2shi4 de yin1yue4, fu1yin1hua4, ye3 jiu4shi4shuo1 ta1 yong4 fu3yin1 de
5. shou3fa3 lai2...chu4li3 lai2, fa1zhan3, yuan2ben3 shi4 dan1yin1 de yin1yue4..
6. na4mo wo3men jin'tian wo3 xiang3 qing3 ge4wei4 tong2xue2 fan1kai1 yi2bai3
7. yi1shi2san1 ye4...zai4 yi1bai3 yi1shi2san1 ye4 zhe3li3 qing3 ge4wei4 kan4 yi2xia4,
8. zhe3shi4 ti3dao4 Perotinus de Organum..kan4dao4 le ma? na1me, ta1 de te4dian3
9. wo3 xiang3 zai4 di4yi1, jiu4shi4 hou4ban4 de di4er4 duan4 zhe3li3 ta1 ti3dao4 zhe4ge4
10. Perotinus..ta1 tong1chang2, zai4 di4er4 duan4 di4san1 hang2 zhe3li3 ta1 ti3dao4,
11. tong1chang2 ta1 xi3huan yong4 di4wu3 ge gen1 di4san1 ge de jie2zou4 mo5shi4,
12. kan4dao4 ma? jiu4shi4 yi1bai3 yi1shi2san1 ye4 zui4hou1 yi2duan4 de di4san1 hang2,
13. zhe3li3 ta1 ti3dao4 de zhe4 yi2ge te4dian3..guan1yu2 zhe4ge jie2zou4 mo5shi4 qing3
14. ge4wei4 zai4 fan1kai1 yi1bai3 ling2 liu4 ye4...shu1 de yi1bai3 ling2 liu4 ye4, wo3men
15. ceng2jing1 yi1qian2 ti2guo4 de, xian3zai4 zai4 zhe3li3 gui1na4 zhe4yang4 de liu4ge
16. mo5shi4..hao3, na1me, qi2shi2 Perotinus gen1zai4 Lenoninus zhi1hou4, ji3xue4
17. fa1yang2guang1da4, ta1 de fu4yin1hua4 de shou3fa3..bi2jiao4 te4bie2 de jiu4shi4
18. zhe4ge, Lenoninus ta1 zai4...wo3men zai4 ta1 de zhe4ge, fu3yin1 zuo4pin3 li3mian4
19. duo1ban4 zui4duo1 fa1xian4 dao4 san1ge sheng1bu4 dui4 bu2 diu4? ke3shi4 ta1
20. zhi1hou4 de zhe4ge Perotinus, duo2ban4 hui4 ba3 ta1 fa1zhan3 cheng2wei2 san1ge
21. huo4zhe3 si4ge sheng1bu de organum..na1me zhe4yang4 de organum wo3men jiu4
22. cheng1 ta1 zuo4, jiu4shi4 yi4zhong3 organum quadruplum..qing3 ge4wei4 fan1kai1
23. yi2xia4 wo3men de pu3li4..zai4 wu3shi2ba1 ye4, qing3 kan4 pu3li3 wu3shi2ba1 ye4,
Today we continue to introduce the second composer of the Notre Dame School. Last time we talked about Lenoninus. His most important contribution in the history of western music is that he polyphonized religious ritual music, which is to say that he employed the technique of polyphony to process, to improve monophony.

Then, today, please open to page 113 in our textbook. On page 113, please note Perotinus's *organum*. Did you see it? Its features, I believe the first one is... It is in the second paragraph on the lower page. It mentions Perotinus, he usually... In the three lines of the second paragraph, it mentions that usually he likes to use the fifth and the third rhythmic modes. Did you see it? It is in the third line of the last paragraph on page 113. This feature was mentioned in the book. With regard to the rhythmic modes, please turn to page 106, 106 in the book. What we have mentioned before is divided into six patterns. OK. So, in fact, Perotinus followed Lenoninus and continued to develop his polyphony. The difference is in Lenoninus's works, he... we can find in his polyphony works, at most, three parts at most, right? But after him, Perotinus developed *organum* into three or four parts, so this kind of *organum*, we call it *organum quadruplum*. Everybody, please turn to page 58, 58 in our score book. Here is example of Perotinus's *organum quadruplum*.

Example 2 (From *History of Western Art*)

1. zhii'yu^2 shuo^2 dao^4 zhong^1 gu^3 de feng^1 ge^2, suo^3 wei^4 de zhong^1 gu^3 feng^1 ge^2
2. jiu^4 shi^4 yi^4 zhong^3... xiang^4 zheng^1 xing^4... tu^2 xiang^4 xing^4 zhi, er^2 qie^3 nei^4 rong^2
3. zhong^4 yu^2 xing^2 shi^4 de zhe^4 zhong^3 lu^4, dang^1 ran^2 suo^3 wei^4 nei^4 rong^2
4. zhong^4 yu^2 xing^2 shi^4 de hua^4, zhe^4 ge ding^4 yi^4 mei^3 ge chao^2 dai^4 you^4 bu^4
5. yi^4 yang^4, zai^4 xiang^4 wo^3 men xian^4 zai^4 jiang^3 dao^4 zhong^1 gu^3 zhe^4 ge xing^2 shi^4
6. ta^1 duo^1 ban^4 qu^3 de shi^4 lai^2 zi^4 bai^4 zhan^4 ting^2 de zhe^4 zhong^3
...
gang'cai2 jiang3 guo4 de, ru2 you3 bu4 dong3 de hua4 ke3 yi3 sui2 shi2 lai2 zhao3
wo3...
ran2 hou4 wo3 men xian4 zai4 shuo1 dao4 zai4 ou1 zhoul1 de ji1 du4 jiao4 hua4
shi4 qi1, suo3 wei4 de ji1 du4 jiao4 hua4 shi2 qi1 jiu4 shi4 cong, jun1 shi4 tan1 ding1
da4 di4 ba3 luo2 ma3, jiu4 shi4 zai4 luo2 ma3 jing4 nei4 de ji1 du4 jiao4.. ba3 ta1
feng4 wei2 he2 fa3 de gong1 jiao4 shi3 ta1 he2 li3 hua4, ji1 du4 tu2 ke3 yi3 kai1 shi3
gong1 kai1 chuan2 jiao4, ran3 hou4 jun1 shi4 tan1 ding1 da4 di4 dao4 le hou4 lai2 zi ji3
ye3 ling3 xi3 le, cong2 na4 yi3 hou4 zhe4 zhong3 ji1 du4 jiao4 jiu4 xun4 su4 de
kuo4 zhan3 kai1 lai2, sui2 zhe zhe4 ge ji1 du4 jiao4 de pu3 ji2, zhe4 zhong3
sheng4 jing1 shou3 xie2 ben3, zhe4 zhong3 shou3 xie3 ben3 li3 mian4 chang2 chang2
jiu4 you3, ta1 men yi3 qian2 mei2 you3 na4 zhong3 wo3 men zhe4 zhong3 yin4 shua1
zhi4 qian2, ta1 men shi4 yi2 ge zi4 yi2 ge zi4 de qu4 xie3 chu1 lai2 de, suo3 yi3 ta1
na4 ge shang4 mian4 de sheng4 jing1 yi3 ge zi4 yi2 ge zi4 qu4 xie3, cha1 tu2 ye3 shi4
yi4 fu2 yi4 fu2 yong4 shou3 qu4 hui4 zhi4 de.. zhe4 zhong3 sheng4 jing1
shou3 hui4 ben3 hai2 you3, sheng4 jing1 hua4 mian4 de zhe4 xie1 xiang4 ya2 diao1 ke4
wo3 men, shang4 shang4 yi4 tang2 ke4 kan4 dao4 de na4 zhang1 tu2 jiu4 shi4 ta1 men
xiang4 ya2 hua4 mian4 de diao1 ke4 hai2 you3 zhuang1 dian3 zhe zhe4 zhong3
sheng4 jing1 tu2 xiang4 de sheng4 qi4, zhe4 xie1 sheng4 qi4 dang4 ran2 shi4 ta1 men
zai4 ji1 du4 jiao4 li3 mian4, jiu4 shi4 tian1 zhu3 jiao4 li3 mian4 zhe4 ge mi2 sa yong4 de
yi4 xie1 sheng4 jue2, gen1 yi4 xie1 sheng4 wu4 zhi1 lei4 de.. zhe4 xie1 jiu4 man4 man
de wang4 ou4 zhou1 de, bei3 fang1 chuan4 bu4 kai1 lai2.. dao4 le di4 qi1 shi4 ji4 de
mo4 qi1, zai4 ying1 guo2 jing4 nei4 wo3 men kan4 dao4 le xian4 zai4 wo3 men
kan4 dao4 de zuo3 bian1 na4 yi4 zhang1 tu2 (adjusting the slides). jiu4 zai4
ying1 guo2 chu1 xian4 di4 yi1 sheng4 jing1 shou3 xie3 ben3, zhe4 xie1 shou3 xie3 ben3
li3 mian4, de yi4 xie1 cha1 tu2 ye4, chu2 le bao3 you3 ying1 ge2 lan2, hai2 you3
ai1 er3 lan2 dang1 di4 de yi4 xie1 zhuang1 shi4 xing4 tu2 an4 yang4 shi4 yi3 wai4, ye3
yin3 qi3 le, cong2 chuan2 tong3 de jiu4 shi4 wo3 men chang1 shuo1 de gu3 dian3 de
When talking about the style of the Middle Ages, the so-called the medieval style was a kind of symbolic, iconic style, which emphasized content more than form. Of course, the definition of emphasis on content more than on form varies from dynasty to dynasty. The medieval form which we are talking about now was originally taken from the Byzantine art form. It totally focused on the icon and did not express the personality of the figures in the paintings at all. It neither expressed naturalism nor realism, nor expressed three dimensions at all. It was formalistic art, using only two-dimensional expressions. From the early Christian to the entire Middle Ages, often in a painting, of course, the so-called medieval style, what I mentioned the second, is the most clear and unique style. However, often two different styles blended in a painting or were parallel in a painting. That is to say, in one painting some parts showed medieval style, and the other parts showed classical style. Of course, there were paintings which were completely in the medieval style, showing the iconic and two-dimensional flavor. This is what we are going to talk about in this period.

Like the definitions mentioned just now, after class, you should divide it into two and contrast them just as I did in class. You should also try to look at examples from your book, I have not brought out for you, to analyze other examples which you can find. I believe on this you'll understand better as we move along. Generally speaking, Asian students have problems when they get into Middle Ages. Following the Middle Ages was Goethe Period, which showed a more complicated style. Therefore, as we enter Middle Ages, this analysis, please spend more time, read at other materials, try to find more examples of paintings. The most important thing is the concept, we just mentioned. If you have any questions, you can come to see me any time.
Then we'll talk about the Christianization Period in Europe. The so-called Christianization Period started from Constantine the Great who received Christianity in Rome as the legitimate religion. Christians could preach in public. Then, later, Constantine himself was baptized. From then on Christianity was spread rapidly. As a result of the popularization of Christianity, bible manuscripts, in these manuscripts...They didn't have that, our printing technique, before, they copied word by word. Therefore, in their bibles, words were copied, and the illustrations were painted by hand. This kind of bible manuscripts and the ivory carvings for the cover of the bible, what we saw two classes ago was an ivory carving. Also, these holy paraphernalias bearing paintings of bible stories, of course, used in Christian...Catholic mass. These gradually spread to the northern parts of Europe. The painting on the left was found in England at the end of the seventh century. This painting was from the primary bible manuscripts. The illustrated paintings not only maintained the decorative painting styles from England and Ireland but also imported the traditional, that is, classical bible manuscripts, not only motives of portraits from bible manuscripts but also from other hand paintings.

Example 3 (From History of Western Art)
yin wei zhe shi hou de sheng jing shou xie ben jiu shi, ta
bu shi shu yu mo yi ge, hua jia huo mo yi ge te ding de yi ge shuo
shi hui zhe lai hua de, er shi yi ge di fang, ta jiu shi you zhe
yi ge di fang de xiu dao yuan ji ti chuang zuo de, zhe ge xiu dao yuan
tai qian de xiu dao yuan de zu hui jiu shu, zhe ge xiu dao yuan
de xiu shi you wei jiao hui lai hui zhi yi xie, sheng jing shou xie ben
shen me zhe xie de yi wu zhe shi ta men jiao gui li mian chang chang
fu you de yi dian, suo yi zai na li de xiu dao yuan ta men chu le
nian jing dao gao, hai you yi xie ri chang gai zuo de qu chuan jiao
bu dao, ya o bu ran jiu qu zuo hu li fang mian qu yi hu, bu guan
shi xin li huo, shen ti fang mian de ji bing, zhe xie gong zuo yi wai,
ta men you shi hou hai yao zi ji gong gen, zi ji zu zhe yang,
ran hou zhi wai, ta men hai yao wei chuan jiao lai zuo zhe xie hui zhi
sheng jing shou gao de shi, ran hou zhe xie sheng jing shou gao
chang chang jiu shi zi shi mo xie ren, yi ge group qu xie de, ran hou
tu de bian kuang you mo xie group qu xie de, zhi yu shuo dao
zhong jian de tu jiu ke heng you ling wai yi xie group qu xie de,
jiu shi ta men jiu shi xun lian chu yi pi yi pi de zhu man ren ren xie
de, ran hou zhe ge kuang ke neng shi ling wai yi ge ren hua de,
ran hou zhe ge tu zai ling wai yi ge ren ba ta tian shang de jiu shi
bu shi wan quan yi ge ren de shou bi, jiu shi shuo ni men kan dao
zhe ge de hua ni men hui jue de shuo, mei yi ge de shou bi shi shi bu tai
yi yang de, zhi yu shuo dao ta men zhe yi zhong hui hui zhe yi zhong
sheng jing de bian kuang de ji fa (A student asked a question.), na yi ge
ao na shi wo yong de wen de jian xie shi ji de yi si, yi ji xie xie xie guan
le shun shou jiu xie shang qu le di qi shi ji mo de yi si, ru yi hou wo
zai shun shou zhe yang xie shang qu ni men jiu zhi dao le xiang
zhè\(^4\)zhòng\(^3\), wò\(^3\)bù\(^4\)zhī\(^1\)dào\(^4\)wò\(^3\)jǐn\(^1\)tiān\(^1\)nà\(^2\)chū\(^1\)lái de lì\(^4\)zì niú\(^3\)yòu\(^3\)méi\(^2\)yòu\(^3\)

na\(^4\)zhòng\(^3\)kuāng\(^4\)hèn\(^3\)míng\(^2\)xiān\(^3\)de...hào\(^3\)niù\(^3\)mén xiān\(^1\)kàn\(^4\)dào\(^4\)xiāng\(^4\)

zhè\(^4\)yáng\(^4\)zì, zhè\(^4\)gè kuāng\(^4\), xià\(^4\)yì\(^2\)gè zì\(^4\)gèn\(^1\)tóng\(^2\)zhòng\(^1\)jiān\(^1\)zhè\(^4\)yì\(^2\)gè tóng\(^2\)

yì\(^2\)gè, zuò\(^4\)zhè\(^3\)huà\(^4\)de tā\(^1\)kè\(^3\)nèng\(^2\)yòu\(^2\)yì\(^4\)pí\(^1\)rèn\(^2\), zhè\(^4\)yì\(^4\)pí\(^1\)rèn\(^2\)jiù\(^4\)shì\(^4\)

xiāng\(^4\)wò\(^3\)mén nià\(^4\)zhòng\(^3\)shèng\(^1\)chān\(^3\)xiān\(^4\)yì\(^2\)yáng\(^4\), dào\(^4\)zhè\(^4\)lì\(^3\), tā\(^1\)shì\(^4\)

zhuan\(^1\)mén\(^2\)huà\(^4\)zhè\(^4\)gè kuāng\(^4\), dào\(^4\)nà\(^4\)lì\(^3\)qu\(^4\)tā\(^1\)jiù\(^4\)zhuan\(^1\)mén\(^2\)xiè\(^3\)nà\(^4\)gè zi\(^4\),

rán\(^2\)hòu\(^4\)dào\(^4\)nà\(^4\)lì\(^3\)qu\(^4\)tā\(^1\)jiù\(^4\)zhuan\(^1\)mén\(^2\)huà\(^4\)zhè\(^4\)gè tu\(^2\), suǒ\(^3\)yì\(^3\)nà\(^3\)yì\(^2\)gè

xiān\(^1\)nà\(^3\)yì\(^2\)gè hòu\(^4\)zhè\(^4\)dōu\(^1\)shì\(^4\)bù\(^4\)yì\(^4\)dǐng\(^4\)de méi\(^2\)yòu\(^3\)yì\(^2\)dǐng\(^4\)de cì\(^4\)x...
Then we see, we see on the right, I'm projecting two pictures here. What you want to see is the lion. Look at the lion. This is a pattern of a lion, it represents a leaping lion, it talks about a symbol of Mark, one of the four apostles. The symbol for Mark is this lion. As for the place where the manuscripts originated, I now write on the blackboard. This is a name of a place: Echternach.

They, because the bible manuscripts at this time, that is, they were drawn not by a certain artist or painter but by a place, by the monks of a certain monastery. The monastery, the motive of monasteries before, is that the monks had the obligation to draw the bible manuscripts, which was often written in the canon. So, in those monasteries, they, in addition to reading the bible, praying, daily preaching, or nursing patients with physical and mental problems, they sometimes had to plow to support themselves. Besides, they still had to draw bible manuscripts for spreading the gospel. The bible manuscripts were often drawn in the following way: The words were written by one group; the frames of the paintings were drawn by another group; and the paintings inside were done by another group. That is to say they trained many groups of monks who exclusively specialized in one part. For example, as you can see here, the words were possibly written by some
people; the frames might have been drawn by another person; the painting by another one. That is to say each painting was not done by one person. So when you see this painting, you would feel that this is not the work of one person. Speaking of the technique for drawing the frame...(A student asked a question.) Which one? Oh, that is the German abbreviation of the word "century." Since I'm used to writing it this way, I wrote it subconsciously. It means the end of the seventh century. If I write the word again, you'll understand it. Like this...I don't know whether I brought paintings where the frames are very clear. OK. Look here. Like this. This frame was not necessarily drawn by the same person who drew the painting inside. There might have been a group of people working like a production line. Here one person drew the frame; there another person wrote the words; there another person drew the picture. So which was drawn first, which was drawn later, this was not fixed. There was no fixed order.

OK. Let's take a look at these paintings so that you know what we are going to see in this class. They might look odd, but this is the medievel, classical style in Middle Ages. Here shows the most strong flavor of classicism; here has an expressive touch. Look here. This is the pure representation of medieval patterns. But we can tell that it came from England. The so-called non-traditional is non-classical, and the non-classical means not belonging to the branch of Greece or Rome. This is the division between traditional and non-traditional. It is because starting from the beginning the history of art took Italy as orthodox that the non-Italy branches were taken as non belonging to the main stream, non-traditional. However, this concept should be corrected today. Otherwise, if we take the Italian viewpoint and believe the whole Middle Ages were a dark period and didn't have culture, then how about the culture developed in North Europe? The north Europeans would protest.

We can see the symbol of Mark is a lion. It was an illustration in the bible manuscripts in Enchternach at the end of the seventh century. This, the illustration of this pattern of a lion, a leaping lion as the major image, the major theme, was enclosed by
geometric lines. You can see the geometric design of the background which is very obvious. According to the textural research, also if you have seen Persian arts and contrast it with this expressive style, you will find that there are similar motives.

Therefore, this painting might originate from Persian arts which have already been lost or have been kept. We know Persia had its own illustrations and manuscripts. From these, you can find many elements which are not classical.

Example 4 (from History of Chinese Music)

1. zhe^4 xie^1 ..fen^2 lei^4, zhe^4 xie^1 ..yin^4 yue^4 de nei^4 rong^2, wo^3 men ke^3 yi^3 cong^2 liang^3 ge
2. fang^1 mian^4 lai^2 liao^3 jie^3 ta^1, yi^2 ge shi^4 ta^1 zhe^ge nei^4 rong^2 shang^4 ne ke^3 yi^3
3. zen^3 me gui^1 lei^4, yi^2 ge shi^4 ta^1 de biao^2 yan^3 xing^2 shi^4 shang^4 lai^2 kan^4 ta^1 you^3
4. shen^2 me bu^2 tong^2, suo^3 yi^3 xian^4 zai^4 wo^3 lai^2 jie^4 shao^4 yi^2 xia^4 ... you^3 mei^2 you^3
5. na^3 ge tong^2 xue^2 yi^3 jing^1 shi^4 xian^1 kan^4 guo^2 you^3 guan^1 zhe^4 bu^4 fen, zhe^4 ge shi^2 qi^1
de yin^4 yue^4 de fa^1 zhan^3 de zi^1 liao^4 you^3 mei^2 you^3 ren^2 xian^1 qu^4 zha^3 guo zi^1 liao^4,
6. kan^4 guo zhe^4 ge zi^1 liao^4 you^3 mei^2 you^3? you^3 mei^2 you^3? xx you^3 mei^2 you^3? (a
student answered) yin^1 wei^3 wo^3 zhi^4 dao^4 ni^3 men de bei^4 jing^3 duo^1 ban^2 shi^4 cong^2
7. xi^1 fang^1 yin^1 yue^4 de xue^2 xi^2 kai^3 shi^3, su^3 yi^3 wo^3 mei^2 you^3 gei^3 ni^3 men hen^3 duo^1
de, yi^4 kai^3 shi^3 mei^2 you^3 gei^3 ni^3 men ma^3 shang^4 jiu^4 tao^3 lun^4, bu^2 guo^4 wo^3 xiang^3
8. ying^1 gai^1 zhe^4 yang^4 de yi^2 ge fa^1 zhan^3 de qing^2 xing^2 hai^2 shi^4 ke^3 yi^3 hen^3 kuai^4 de
9. liao^3 jie^3 de, na^4 me cong^2 nei^4 rong^2 shang^4 lai^2 kan^4,
you^3 shen^2 me wen^2 ti^2 ma? wen^4 wo^3, bi^2 jiao^4 qing^1 chu, (Student A asked a
10. question) ao^4, yan^4 yue^4 ji^4, qing^1 shang^1, xi^1 liang^2, qiu^1 ci^2, shu^1 le^4, keng^1 guo^2,
an^1 guo^2, ran^2 hou^4 jia^1 shang^4 yi^2 ge fu^2 nan^2, shi^4 yue^4 nan^2 de na^4 ge fu^2 nan^2,
hai^2 you^3 gao^1 li^4 yue^4, zu^4 hou^4 yao^4 wan^2 bi^4 de shi^2 hou^4 you^3 yi^2 ge li^3 bi^4 yue^4,
11. qing^1 chu ma? (Student said something) zhe^4 yang^4 you^3 shi^1 ge shi^4 bu^2 shi^4? yi^1,
er^4, san^1, si^4 zhe^4 yang^4 shi^4 shi^2 ge shi^4 bu^2 shi^4, hao^3, deng^3 yi^2 xia^4 wo^3 zai^4 zha^3
shi² duo¹ lena³ yi²ge hao³ bu⁴ hao³, (Student B asked a question) da⁴ ye⁴.

sui² tang², shi⁴ bu² shi⁴, sui² tang² de jiu³ bu⁴ ji⁴ ha, qing¹ shang¹ ji⁴, xi¹ liang² yue⁴,

qiu¹ ci² yue⁴, shu¹ le¹ yue⁴, kang¹ guo² yue⁴, an¹ guo² yue⁴, tian¹ zhu² yue⁴, gao¹ li¹ yue⁴,

li³ bi¹ yue⁴. (Student C asked a question) zhe⁴ ge shun⁴ xu⁴ bu² shi⁴ na⁴ me gu⁴ ding⁴
de, bu² shi⁴ fei¹ chang² gu⁴ ding⁴ de, gen¹ ju¹ wen² xian⁴ de ji¹ zai³ yan² ju¹
diu¹ shuo¹ bu² shi⁴ zha⁰ bi³ ru² shuo¹ gang¹ cai² na⁴ ying⁴ de yi² ge shun⁴ xu⁴,

bu² guo⁴ you³ ji³ ge ke³ neng² bi³ jiao³ gu⁴ ding⁴ bi³ ru² shuo¹ na⁴ ge li³ bi¹, ta¹ shi⁴ zai⁴

hen³ duo¹ duan⁴ yi³ hou¹ chu¹ xian⁴ de li³ bi¹ yue⁴, ran² hou¹ zhe⁴ ge yan⁴ yue⁴ you⁴

ke³ neng² shi⁴ chu¹ xian⁴ zai⁴ di⁴ yi¹ ge, zhe⁴ liang³ ge ke³ neng² bi³ jiao⁴ gu⁴ ding⁴
dan⁴ qi² ta¹ de bing¹ bu² shi⁴ fei¹ chang² gu⁴ ding⁴, (Student C asked another

question) wo³ xiang³ shi³ hui⁴ you³ de, deng³ yi² xia⁴ wo³ hui⁴ jie⁴ shao⁴ dao⁴

yin¹ wei² wo³ shuo¹ xian⁴ zai⁴ wo³ jiu⁴ yao⁴ cong² nei¹ rong² shang⁴ lai² kan⁴ ta¹

you³, zhe⁴ xie¹ lei¹ bie² shang⁴ you³ xie¹ shen² me te⁴ dian³, huo⁴ zhe³ shuo¹ cong² ta¹

biao³ yan³ shang⁴ lai² kan⁴ ta¹ you³ shen² me te⁴ dian³, shi⁴ hui⁴ you⁴, wo³ men ye³

ke³ yi¹ cong² na⁴ ge chang² shi² shang⁴ lai² pan⁴ duan⁴, ru² guo³ yi² ge hen³

chang² duan⁴ de yin¹ yue⁴ de jin¹ xing², ta¹ yi² ding⁴ yao⁴ you³ yi² xie¹ dui² bi¹ de

chu¹ xian⁴, shi⁴ bu² shi⁴, dui² bi³ de chu¹ xian⁴ hui⁴ xi¹ yin³ ren², na⁴ me, bu² guo⁴

zhe⁴ yi² ge, ni³ wen⁴ dao⁴ de qi² shi² shi⁴ yi² ge hen³ zhong⁴ yao⁴ de shi² qing,

bu² guo⁴ wo³ bu⁴ zhi¹ dao⁴ ni³ de yi¹ si shi⁴ hao³ ji³ bu⁴ ji⁴ zhe⁴ yang⁴ yi¹ lian² chuan⁴

he² qi³ lai² zai⁴ mei³ yi² bu⁴ de zhe⁴ ge su⁴ du⁴ shang⁴ you³ shen² me cha¹ bie²

huo⁴ zhe³ shi⁴ shuo¹, yi² ge, yi² duan⁴ de yin¹ yue⁴ li³ bian¹ ta¹ zhe⁴ ge su⁴ du⁴ shang⁴

you³ shen² me yang⁴ de cha¹ bie², wo³ xian⁴ zai² bu⁴ zhi¹ dao⁴ ni³ de yi¹ si shi⁴

na³ yi² zhong³, (Student C answered) zhe⁴ ge ru² guo³ shuo¹ you³ shi¹ bu⁴ ji⁴ bu⁴

yi² ding⁴ shi² bu⁴ mei³ yi² ci⁴ dou¹ shi¹ bu⁴ ji⁴ dou¹ yan³ zou⁴ shi² bu⁴, (Student C

asked the third question) hui⁴ de, dui⁴ de, bi³ ru² shuo¹ kan⁴ shen² me yang⁴ de

chang³ he², kan⁴ shen² me ai³ hao⁴, zhe⁴ ge yin¹ yue⁴ feng¹ ge² bu⁴ tong², ta¹ hui⁴
tao1xuān3, yin1wei2 zhe4xie1 yin1yue4 ye3 shi2ji4shang4 shi4 ge ge1wu3 de yin1yue4,
zhe4 shi4 yi2ge qian2ti2, na2me ling4wait4 jiu4 cong2 na4ge yin1yue4 yin1yue4
dan1du2 bu4fen ben3shen1 lai2 shuo1, ta1 ye3 you3 zhe4ge an1pai2 de fei1chang2
hao3 de dui1bi1, zhe4 jiu4shi4 tang2dai4 yin1yue4 li3mian4 hen3 zhong4yao4 de,
wo3men yao4 tan2dai4 de da4qu3 yin1yue4 de jie2guo4, zhe4 li3mian4 jiu4 fei1chang2
qing1chu jiu4shi4shuo1 bu4jin3 ta1 de qu3shi4 fei1chang2 wan2zheng3, ta1 zhe4ge
su4du4, ze3meyang4 cong2 san3pai1 jin4ru4 dao4 you3 jie2zou4, ze3meyang4 cong2
shen3me shi2hou4 jiu4 bi1xu1, xiang4 wo3men jin1tian1 xi1fang1 yin1yue4 suo3
zhi1dao4 de zhe4ge guo4du4duan4, tui1yi2, ze3meyang4 jin4ru4 dao4 kuai4 de
jie1duan4, ran2hou4 jin4ru4 dao4 ji2kuan4, zu4hou4, yao4 xie1pai1 le jiu4yao4 ting2
le, zhi1qian2 ta1 hui4 ze3meyang4 an1pai2 ta1 de su4du4 ao4, zhe4ge dou1 zai4
tang2dai4 de zhe4ge yin1yue4 li3bian1 you3 fei1chang2 qing1chu de, cheng2xian4
chu1lai2, xian4zai4 wo3men ba3 zhe4ge en, yan4yue4 de zhe4ge, cong2 nei4rong2
shang1 lai2 kan4 ne, ke2yi3 ba3 ta1 gui1lei4...ni3 ke2yi3 fa1xian4 dao4 ta1 you3 liang3
da4 lei4,
er2qie3 zhe4 liang3 da4 lei1 zai4 zhe4ge shu4liang4 de bi3li4 shang4 lai2shuo1 shi4
wa1guo2 yin1yue4 bi3 ben3guo2 yin1yue4 hai2yao4 duo1, yin1wei2 wo3 gang1cai2
you3 shao1wei2 ti1dao4 qing1shang1yue4 gen1 xi1liang2yue4 shi4 ben3guo2 de
chuan2tong3 yin1yue4, qi4ta1 de dou1 shi4 wai4zu2 yin1yue4, yin1ci3 ni3 ke2yi3
kan1dao4 jiu4shi4, shao3shu4 min2zu2 de yin1yue4, you3 bao1han2 shao3shu4
min2zu2 de yin1yue4...wai4zu2 hu4shiu4 wai4guo2 de, shao3shu4 min2zu2 de yin1yue4
bi3ru2shuo1, qiu1ci3yue4 la, gao1chang1yue4 le...zhe4xie1 wo3men tong1chang2
cheng1wei2 hu2yue4 de zhe4ge bu4fen, na2me ye3 you3 yi4xie1 shi4 wai4guo2
yin1yue4 zhe4xie1 nei4rong2 ne, wo3men ke2yi3 kan4 de2 chu1lai2 you3 yi4xie1 shi4
wai4guo2 yin1yue4, na3xie1 wai4guo2 yin1yue4 ne, bi3ru2shuo1 tian1zhu2 a, shi4 bu2
shi4? bu2guo4 zhe4ge wai4guo2 yin1yue4 li3bian1 hai2you3 yi2ge te4dian3 wo3men
ye3 yao4 te4bie2 qing1chu, wo3 zai4 qian2mian4 shao1wei1 jiang3dao4 qiu1ci2 de
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shihou jiu4 shao1 wei1 qiang2 diao4 le yi2 xia shuo1, qiu1 ci2 yin1 yue4 dui4 tang2 dai4

yin1 yue4 de fa1 zhan3 you3 hen3 zhong4 yao4 de ying3 xiang3 shi4 bu2 shi4? na4 me

zhe4 shi4 zen3 meyang4 yi2 ge ying3 xiang3 ne? chu4 le, ta1 ben3 lai2 de na4 ge

yin1 yue4 ben3 lai2 de mian4 mao4 zhe4 ge tang2 chao2 de ren2 hen3 xihuan zhi1 wai4

ne, zhe4 ge wai4 guo2 yin1 yue4 a, hen3 duo1 de wai4 guo2 yin1 yue4 chuan2 dao4

zhong1 guo2 lai2 de shi4 hou dou1 ben3 shen1 jiu4 yi3 jing1 xian1, jie2 shou4 dao4 na4 ge

qiu1 ci2 yin1 yue4 de ying3 xiang3, yin1 wei2 gang2 cai2 wo3 men ye3 ti2 dao4 guo4 shuo1

zhe4 ge chao2 dai4, fo5 jiao4 fei1 chang2 de fa1 da2 dui4 bu2 dui4? fo5 jiao4 yin1 yue4 dui4

zhe4 xie1, fo5 jiao4 de yin1 yue4 dui4 zhe4 xie1 di4 qu1 de yin1 yue4 ying3 xiang3 dou1

hen3 da4, ran2 hou4 sui2 zhe fo5 jiao4 zhe4 yang4 chuan2 ru4 dao4 zhong1 guo2, zhe4 xie1

di4 qu1 de yin1 yue4 ye3 shou4 dao4 fo5 jiao4 yin1 yue4 hen3 da4 de ying3 xiang3

ran2 hou4 zai4 chuan2 dao4 zhong1 guo2 suo3 yi3 jiu4 shi1 shuo1, ta1, chu4 le zhi2 jie1

chuan3 jin1 lai ying3 xiang3 dao4 zhong1 guo2 de yin1 yue4 zhi1 wai4, ta1 zai4 ta1 men

de ben3 di4 ye3 tong2 shi2 shou4 dao4 zhe4 ge qiu1 ci2 yue4 gen1 xi1 liang2 yue4 dou1 shi4

hen3 zhong4 yao4 de... di4 san1 ge, qing1 shang4 yue4 gen1 qing1 yue4 ao4, wo3

xiu1 zheng4 yi2 xia wo3 gang1 cai2 shuo1 de you3 yi2 ge cuo4 wu, xi1 liang2 yue4 bu2

shi4 ben3 guo2 yue4, wo3 guo2 gu4 you3 de yin1 yue4 zhi3 you3 liang3 ge, yi2 ge shi4

qing1 shang4 yue4, yi2 ge shi4 qing1 yue4 ao4, qing1 shang4 yue4 gen1 li3 bi4 yue4,

qing1 shang4 yue4 gen3 li3 bi3 yue4...hao3, na4 me gang1 cai2 na4 xie1 jiang3 de

duo1 bu4 ji4 li3 bian1 ti2 dao4 ji3 ge ming2 ci2 ke2 neng2 ni3 hai2 shi4 bu4 dong3, wo3

shao1 wei1 jiang3 yi2 xia jiu4 shi4 guo2 ji4, you3 mei2 you3 ti2 dao4 guo2 ji4 ne, zai4

ji3 bu4? na3 yi2 ge chao2 dai4 de ji3 bu4 ji4 ne, (Students...) sui2 kai1 huang2 chu1 nian2

de shi2 hou dui4 bu2 dui4? zhe4 ge guo2 ji4 ne, ta1 ben3 lai2 ye3 shi4 qiu1 ci2 yue4, na4 me

zai4 wei4, tai4 ping2 de shi2 hou, wei4 tai4 wu3 zhe4 ge nian2 jian1 he2 ping3 he2 xi1,

ran2 hou4 na4 ge shi2 hou jiao4 ping2 he2 xi1 de shi2 hou jiao4 zuo4, de2 dao4 zhe4 ge

yin1 yue4 jiao4 zuo4 xi1 liang2 yue4, deng3 dao4 wei4 guo2 de shi2 hou, cai2 cheng1 wei2

guo1 ji4, suo3 yi3 ta1 yuan2 lai2 de lai2 yuan2 hai2 shi4 gen1 qiu1 ci2 yue4 you3 guan1 xi,
These classifications, the content of the music, we can understand from two aspects: by content and by performing style. Now I will introduce this. Has anyone read this part? Has anyone looked for and read materials on the development of music in this period? Read the material? Yes or no? Yes or no? xx, have you read it? (Student...) Since I know most of you started from learning western music, so I didn't give you a lot of, I didn't give you the chance to discuss. However, I believe this kind of development will be understood quickly. Then, as to the content...

Are there any questions? Ask me. It's better to ask me. (Student A asked a question) Oh, yanyue, qingshang, xiliang, qiuci, shule, kangguo, anguo, plus funan, referring to Viet Nam, and gaoli, and libi as the last. Is that clear? (Student...) There are ten altogether, right? One, two, three, four. There are ten, right? OK. Later I'll find out which one should not be included. OK? (Student B asked a question) Daye in Sui, right? The nine kinds of music of Sui. Qingshang, xiliang, qiuci, shule, kangguo, anguo, tianzhu, gaoli, libi. (Student C asked a question) The order is not fixed, not very fixed. According to records and research, they were not played in the order I mentioned just now. However, some kinds had a more fixed order. For example, libi appeared at the end, and yanyue was more likely to appear at the beginning. I just mentioned, in the early years of Zhenguan Period in Tang, yanyue was likely to appear at the beginning. These two were more fixed, but the others were not so. (Student C asked another question) I think that was possible. I will introduce, I said that I would classify the music by content and by performance. Are there any special characteristics to each class? Or are there any special features in terms of performance? Yes, it is possible. We can also judge with common
sense. In a long piece of music, it should contain some contrasts, right? The occurrence of contrasts appeals to the audience. But your question was an important one. But I don't understand what you meant by this question. Did you mean whether there is any difference in the speed of the series of music which contains many sections or did you mean a difference in the speed in one section? I'm not sure which one you meant.

(Student C answered) Well, at each performance, not every kind of music was presented.

(Student C asked the third question) Yes, you are right. For example, it depends on the situations or the tastes of the audience. Because different kinds of music had different styles, the audience could choose what music they preferred. The music was in fact for dancing. This is a prerequisite. Then, as for the music itself it had well-arranged contrasts, which were the structure of daqu, a very important melody in Tang music. This structure is quite obvious in daqu. It not only has a complete framework but also a well-arranged speed: It went from no rhythm to rhythm, it is easy to see how it gets through various transitions, as in today's western music, goes to high speed, the highest speed, and when it is about to stop, how it arranges its speed before it stops. All these were presented clearly in Tang music.

Now we classify Feast Music by content. You will find it contains two classes. These two classes in quantity, foreign music was more than domestic music. I have mentioned that qingshang and xiliang were traditional music, whereas all the others were foreign music. Therefore, you can see there was music of minority groups, for example, qiuci and gaochang, the ones which we usually call northern music. There was also foreign music. We can tell there was foreign music from the content. Which foreign music? For example, tianzhu, right? However, there is a feature concerning foreign music we must understand. When I mentioned qiuci, I emphasized briefly that the music of qiuci had a significant influence on Tang's music, right? Then what kind of influence? In addition to the fact that people in Tang Dynasty liked qiuci, the music of other countries had been influenced by qiuci before they entered China. I have mentioned that Buddhism
was very popular in Tang, right? Buddhist music, Buddhist music had great influence on the music, these regions. Then after Buddhism entered China, the music of these regions also entered China after having been influenced by Buddhism. So besides the direct influence of qiuci on music in China, the foreign music was also influenced by qiuci, that is to say, it had been greatly influenced by the Indian cultural system. We should understand this. Among all the foreign music, qiuci and xiliang were the most important. Thirdly, qingshang and qing, oh, I'll correct a mistake I made. Xiliang was not domestic music, and the domestic music was two: qingshang and qing, oh, qingshang and libi, qingshang and libi. OK. So, maybe you still don't understand some terms which I mentioned just now. I'll explain them. Guo, have we mentioned guo? In which kind of music? In which dynasty? (Students...) Guo of the early years of Kaihuang in Sui, right? Guo was originally qiuci. In Taiping of Wei Dynasty, Taiwu of Wei, Hexi was conquered. Then, when conquering Hexi, got the music and called it xiliang. In Wei, it was called Guo. So originally it had a relationship with qiuci. As for qing, it was the folk music of China, which was qingshang sandao, qingshang music. But gradually it became aristocratic, so at that time it was not pure folk music.
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