The 2022 Annual Research Forum (ARF) of The Linguistic Society of Hong Kong (LSHK)

2022 年香港語言學學會學術年會

3 December, 2022
The Hong Kong Baptist University
(zoom)

Abstract Book

Co-organizer:

Department of English Language and Literature, HKBU

The 2022 Annual Research Forum of
The Linguistic Society of Hong Kong
2022 年香港語言學學會學術年會

Date: December 3, 2022 (Saturday)
Venue: Online via Zoom

Programme

	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/95888789552 (Meeting ID: 958 8878 9552)
08:50 – 09:00	**Online Log-in**
09:00 – 09:10	**Opening Remarks**
09:10 – 10:10	**LSHK Outstanding Thesis Awards - Presentations**
10:10 – 10:20	**Break**

	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/98706509067 (Meeting ID: 987 0650 9067)	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/97963807306 (Meeting ID: 979 6380 7306)
	Session 1A **Syntax I** **Chair: Chaak Ming Lau**	**Session 1B** **Phonology / Linguistic Landscape** **Chair: Regine Lai**
10:20-10:45	**Tommy Tsz-Ming Lee** A structural account on the non-uniform information structure of right dislocation	**Ka Lai Mak and Wai Sum Lee** Production and Perception of the Korean Obstruents by Cantonese Speakers
10:45-11:10	**Ka-Fai Yip** Doubling exclusive particles in Cantonese	**Pauline Bolin Liu and Mingxing Li** The Typology of [n] vs. [l] Contrasts Across Chinese Dialects
11:10-11:35	**Anindita Sahoo and Foongha Yap** On the relationship between middle and passive constructions: Analysis of jibaa 'go' constructions in Odia, an Indo-Aryan language	**Cathryn Donohue** Language practices and linguistic vitality in Nubri
11:35-12:30	**AGM (LSHK members only)**	
12:30-14:00	**Lunch**	

	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/98068137700 (Meeting ID: 980 6813 7700)	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/97798452248 (Meeting ID: 977 9845 2248)
	Session 2A **Discourse-Pragmatics** **Chair: Winnie Chor**	**Session 2B** **Syntax/Pragmatics Interface** **Chair: Bit Chee Kwok**
14:00-14:25	**Foongha Yap and Mikyung Ahn** "Is it homonymy or polyfunctionality?"—A preliminary analysis of Korean suffix *-i* from referential to predicational domains	
14:25-14:50	**Yingxin Lu and Tiantian He** From 'No, I guess' to 'I guess not' and more: An interactional linguistic analysis of the pragmatic uses of *gwaa3* Cantonese	**Hoi Hin Timothy Lee** 句法─語用介面：官話動量詞「一下」再探
14:50-15:15	**Xuan Li** An aspectual system without perfective and imperfective: in the case of Meiba Bai	**Fay Zhuozhuo Han and Mingxing Li** The Use of lia 倆 and sa 仨 as Numeral + Classifier in Mandarin
15:15-15:40	**Chuwen Chen** Changes in Changle Dialect - From the Perspective of Kinship Terms	**吳伊婷, 陳曉彤 and 劉蘊怡** 粵語祈使句的特點
15:40-15:50	**Break**	

	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/98131717014 (Meeting ID: 981 3171 7014)	Zoom link https://hkbu.zoom.us/j/94130099968 (Meeting ID: 941 3009 9968)
	Session 3A **Syntax II** **Chair: Peppina Lee**	**Session 3B** **Language Acquisition / Learning** **Chair: Caesar Lun**
15:50-16:15	**Snigdha Medhi and Anindita Sahoo** Split and Optionality in Ergative Constructions	**Charles Lok, Jonathan Him Nok Lee, Stephen Matthews and Virginia Yip** Responses to A-not-A questions in monolingual and bilingual children
16:15-16:40	**Yenan Sun** Main clause phenomena and discourse moves: Mandarin incompleteness	**Nanxi Bian** A Study of the Meaning and Distribution of In/definite Noun Phrases and Terminology in Academic English Written Discourse
16:40-17:05	**Sally Wong** Peculiar Mandarin Binding Pattern in the clausal complements of Zi-Verbs	**林茵茵** 粵語學習網站的設計與創新——"翻轉粵語教室"
Closing: End of ARF 2022		

A Study of the Meaning and Distribution of In/definite Noun Phrases and Terminology in Academic English Written Discourse

Nanxi BIAN

This corpus-based study focuses on the terminology and phenomena of in/definiteness of complex noun phrases in L2 academic English writing from a form-meaning-distribution perspective. The study intends to draw a descriptive picture for in/definite NP categories in academic writing, and add typical facts to the existing typology (i.e. the phenomenon of Associative Use II, a combination of contextual uses and predicative) from register and genre-based aspect. Four main research questions are articulated. Firstly, are the situations of definite noun phrases use in academic written discourse different from the ones in conversation? This leads to both a typological analysis and a register-based thinking. The compositional analysis is conducted on the observed NPs. Secondly, the study observes the frequency of definite NPs and indefinite NPs in the corpus and looks into the proportion of contextualized and de-contextualized definite NPs, indefinite specific NPs, and indefinite non-specific NPs. Thirdly, we focus on the interactions of definiteness with information structure. Definite expressions can carry new aspects of knowledge of prominence in academic writing. Fourthly, the terminology is examined from the aspects of frequency, definiteness, and form.

This study observes that the definite article "the" not necessarily marks the definite reading, and the indefinite article "a" not necessarily predicts the indefinite reading. The NPs occurring in the adverbial tend to be of definite reading, followed by indefinite non-specific reading, and indefinite specific reading. The disciplinary difference is shown in the distribution of definite NPs in the position of subject and object, but not obvious in the distribution of indefinite specific NPs and indefinite non-specific NPs. The frequency of definite NPs holding the position of subject and object shows a disciplinary difference. The distributional differences caused by writing quality are not obvious in the study.

The results will help us get an overview of the pattern of in/definite and non/specific NPs in L2 academic English writing and are expected to shed light on the pedagogy of L2 writing, contribute a descriptive view to the in/definiteness of complex NPs. The investigation will help stakeholders better understand the balance between "clarity" and "economy or conciseness" in academic writing. Moreover, terminology in academic writing contains pre-modifiers much more frequently than containing post-modifiers (*of* phrase), and the frequency of NP forms [Adj+N] and [N+N] are ranked higher than the form [V+N]. The awareness of the structural differences within NPs should be noted. In this light, the study can help reduce the potential misleading and ambiguity to the readers. The results can also provide reference for discipline-specific writing course design. Linguistically, the results will concretize and categorize common situations of in/definite and non/specific noun phrases within the register of academic writing, and deepen both L2 writing teachers' and learners' understanding of the in/definite expressions. Practically, the parameters derived from the study can help the computational linguistic programs become more precise in article correction and provide explanations and feedback properly.

Changes in Changle Dialect - From the Perspective of Kinship Terms

Chuwen CHEN
The University of Hong Kong

This paper explores recent changes which have occurred in Changle dialect, a variant of Fuzhou spoken in Changle area. The focus of the study is on vocabulary changes of kinship terms across three generations in two families from Changle district. Both of the families are native to this area, originating from different villages, one is Xinchi (northern part of Changle), and the other is Sanxi (southern part of Changle), and later moving to the urban area. The three generations consist of three age groups: 20-30 years old (the young group), 40-50 years old (the middle-aged group), and 65-75 years old (the elder group).

The research starts with the recording of seven citation tones and using Praat to quantify pitch parameters for further analysis of citation tones as well as tone description later used in kinship terms. Some discussion is devoted to tone variations between Fuzhou and Changle dialects, specifically for the checked tone, commonly described as "陽入" (high checked tone), which showed distinctive differences between two variants as the tone is pronounced with a clear mid-rise tone by Changle speakers participating in this research. Focusing on changes in kinship terms across generations, the research found a trend of dropping the prefix '依' /i55/ , a prefix commonly used for kinship terms in Fuzhou, as in '依媽' /i55-42 ma33/（grandma）,'依公' /i55 kuŋ55/（grandpa）, '依姆' /i55-42 mu33 /（the wife of the elder uncle）and replacing it with '阿' /a55/, for instance '依公' being transformed to '阿公'/a55 kuŋ55 /, or doubling the lexical roots, such as '依媽' being replaced with '媽媽'/ma33-42 ma33/, and '依姆' being replaced with '姆姆'/mu33-42 mu33/. These changes are observed in young generations in both families. The factors behind such changes will be discussed, mainly focusing on the role of Mandarin influence in the past two to three decades.

This paper also explores the etymology of the kinship term prefix '依'. In most existing dictionaries of Fuzhou, '依' is written differently from the third person pronoun '伊', however, the etymology behind the two morphemes and why they are differently written is not explained or well-illustrated. Based on the hypothesis initially proposed by Tan and Wu (2011) that the prefix '依' is derived from the third person pronoun '伊' in Fuzhou to express a sense of intimacy and closeness in kinship terms, this paper further supports this hypothesis and proposes two possible explanations. The first is to suggest that the prefix '依' is the third person pronoun '伊' in Fuzhou and the common kinship lexicon structure is a phenomenon of 'pronoun doubling'. The second hypothesis is that the morphological structure of kinship terms involves a prefix '依' , which combines the third person pronoun '伊' with the lexicon roots and gradually forms the current structure.

To examine these two hypotheses, data of possessive pronouns are also collected. It is found that Changle speakers would combine the first and second person singular pronouns directly with kinship roots and drop the prefix '依', resulting in expressions such as '我媽'/ŋui55-213 ma33/ (my grandma), '汝公' /ny33-42 kuŋ55 / (your grandpa), while for third person singular possessive pronouns, morphological differences between speakers from two villages have been identified. For speakers from Xinchi, they would use the expression /i55-42 nuoŋ33 ma33/ (his grandma), which shows affixation by adding the affix /nuoŋ/; for speakers from Sanxi village, their use of the possessive pronoun indicates a form of suppletion as they express 'his grandma' as /ɦia42 ma33/, which replaces the pronoun "伊" with a morpheme pronounced as /ɦia42 /. These two forms of transformation appear to be solutions to the hiatus problem as to avoid pronouncing two vowels /i/ in succession.

Language practices and linguistic vitality in Nubri

Cathryn Donohue
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Nubri Valley is located in Northern-Central Nepal and home to ~2000 people. Nubri refers to the people, the place, the language creating a complex set of identities in the region. This paper presents results from a recent sociolinguistic survey that establishes internal variation as well as external pressures on the language. As a community of ethnic Tibetans in Nepal, crossing the border has slowly resulted in a shift of focus towards Kathmandu in many ways. Changing attitudes and evolving social practices are resulting in a marked shift in language use in the younger generations. Superficially, the Nubri language appears quite vital within the valley. However, I show how an examination of different borders in the sociolinguistic landscape helps leads us to a much clearer understanding of the actual linguistic vitality, revealing a serious threat to its continued survival.

The Use of *lia* 倆 and *sa* 仨 as Numeral + Classifier in Mandarin

Fay Zhuozhuo HAN and Mingxing LI

Classifier is an important aspect of Mandarin grammar. Different nouns are usually preceded by different classifiers when counting is involved, e.g., *liang pi ma* 兩匹馬 'two horses' [two classifier horse]; while *ge* 個 in Mandarin is a widely used classifier, the construction of 'numeral *ge* noun' is not always acceptable (Li, 2013). In spoken Mandarin, *lia* 倆 and *sa* 仨 are usually recognized as the contracted forms of 'numeral + *ge*' (Ōta, 1987; Feng, 2002), e.g.,

(1) *lia ren* 倆人 = *liang ge ren* 兩個人 'two persons' [two classifier person];

sa ren 仨人 = *san ge ren* 三個人 'three persons' [three classifier person].

Despite the recognition of (1), Mandarin *lia* and *sa* are observed to be able to precede nouns/noun phrases that do not typically follow the classifier *ge*, as below, suggesting a possibility of *lia/sa* 倆/仨 as an equivalent of 'numeral plus a classifier', in which the classifier is more general than *ge*.

(2) *lia mao* 倆貓 'two cats'

liang zhi mao 兩隻貓 [two classifier cat]

*/? *liang ge mao* 兩個貓

This study investigates the usage of *lia* and *sa* in Mandarin by eliciting data from young Mandarin speakers, focusing on three questions: (i) To what extent can *lia/sa* combine with nouns/noun phrases that do not typically follow the classifier *ge*? (ii) Are *lia* and *sa* equally (in)compatible with nouns/noun phrases that do not typically follow the classifier *ge*? (iii) Does the length of nouns/noun phrases influence their compatibility with *lia/sa*?

Native Mandarin speakers were invited to rate the acceptability of combinations such as *lia niu* 倆牛 'two bulls', on a scale from 1 to 5, with a higher number indicating a higher acceptability. The stimuli were constructions in which *lia* and *sa* precede nouns/noun phrases in two types: (a) those generally considered to be incompatible with the classifier *ge,* e.g., *hua* 畫 'picture', vs. (b) those compatible with *ge*, e.g., *ren* 人 'person'. The nouns/noun phrases also differ in their length, e.g., one syllable, two syllables, or three syllables.

The results mainly showed three aspects. First, for (a) vs. (b), the ratings to (a) were generally lower than those to (b) (means = 3.47 vs. 4.07 respectively). Second, within group (a), the average rating of *lia* (3.63) was higher than that of *sa* (3.31), indicating a higher compatibility of *lia* with nouns/noun phrases. Third, within group (a), the ratings of *lia/sa*'s combinations with monosyllabic nouns (2.67) were lower than those of disyllabic nouns/noun phrases (3.89) and trisyllabic nouns/noun phrases (3.88).

In general, the results confirm the recognition of *lia/sa* as 'numeral + *ge*'; at the same time, the relatively small difference between groups (a) and (b) indicates a tendency for *lia/sa* to be recognized as 'numeral plus a classifier, which is more general than *ge*'. The difference between *lia* and *sa* and the difference between constructions of different lengths indicate that the grammar of *lia* and *sa* may involve the subtle interaction between multiple factors, which awaits further research.

Keywords: Mandarin, Classifier, Numeral, Noun, Acceptability

References

Feng, C. (2022). On the contracted numeral-classifier forms lia and sa. *Yuyan Yanjiu*, 2, 38-44

Li, X. (2013). *Numeral classifiers in Chinese: the syntax-semantics interface*. De Gruyter, Inc.

Ōta, T., Jiang, S., & Xu, C. (2003). *A historical grammar of modern Chinese*. Peking University Press.

作者姓名：林茵茵

工作單位：香港理工大學中國語文教學中心

電郵地址：yan.yan.lam@polyu.edu.hk

粵語學習網站的設計與創新——"翻轉粵語教室"

粵語是香港最常用的語言。來自世界各地的學生可透過學習粵語，認識生活中常用的粵語詞句，應付日常溝通需要，從中更好地了解香港，融入香港。為此，各院校研發了不同的學習粵語的網站，供學生自學粵語。

目前各院校的網站，多為協助內地生學習粵語而開發，網站使用中文為自學媒介。內容包括粵語語音、粵普對應、常用句子、對話等。各網站的自學重點、篇幅長短、解說詳略各有不同。也有個別院校開發了以英語為媒介的粵語語音學習網站，供各地學生學習粵語語音。自學練習方面，語音學習以選擇題為主，題目一般是聽辨粵語字詞，完成後網站會顯示正確答案；有部分網站設有粵拼輸入練習。說話方面，基本上是跟讀練習，學生在聆聽自學教材後，自行朗讀。

去年，香港理工大學開發了一個多功能的粵語學習網站，同時兼顧課程的教學與學生的自學。網站一方面是一個量身定制的在線粵語學習平台，按香港理工大學課程，製作相關的多媒體自習材料，學生可於上課前，課間或課後利用網絡、智能手機等學習工具預習、學習、複習各單元的學習內容，提升學習成效。除此以外，網站可同時供校內、校外人士使用，讓較難安排固定時間以課堂學習形式的學生學習，透過互聯網提供學習支援，供學生於課餘時間自學粵語，應付溝通的需要。

網站內容包括粵語語音知識及日常傳意，以循序漸進、有系統的方式協助學生學習粵語。網站設有初、中、高階等不同程度的語音、詞彙、句子的互動練習，學生可按自己的學習需要、個人的學習節奏學習粵語。創新之處是網站提供了大量的粵語口語練習，學生可在網頁記錄自己的發音，網頁會即時反饋，讓學生了解發音是否正確。此外，網站可為學生開設戶口，讓老師了解學生在學前、學後的差異、當前的學習情況等，學生也可以查閱自己的成績，了解學習進度。網站設中英雙語版本，各地學生可根據自己的語言背景，選用中文版或英文版。

網站截圖：

聲母：認識聲母

Flipped Classroom
翻 轉 粵語教室

聲母

有女聲和男聲　女聲　男聲

b	baa1	爸
p	paa4	爬
m	maa1	媽
f	faa1	花
d	daa2	打
t	taa1	他
n	naa4	拿
l	laa1	啦

看嘴型

聆聽聲母練習/高階練習（填充題）

理大地標

詞義練習（選擇題）

詞義

aan3 zau3	ting1 jat6	gau6 nin4/2
上午	今天	明年
下午	明天	今年
晚上	昨天	去年

朗讀聲母練習/中階、高階練習（可顯示對錯）

提交錄音後，
會顯示發音是否正確。↑

句子朗讀練習

你個名點樣寫？（你的名字怎樣寫）
nei5 go3 meng2 dim2 joeng2 se2

提問／朗讀句子／成績表
你答對了1/3題

提交錄音後，會顯示發音是否正確。↓

題號	題目	所選答案	正確答案
1	你個名點樣寫？（你的名字怎樣寫）	你個名點樣寫 ✓	你個名點樣寫

句子小測試（重組句子）

你 是 誰？

尚餘 3:56

我搭小巴去旺角。
daap3
wong6 gok3
siu2 baa1
ngo5
heoi3

句法—語用介面：官話動量詞「一下」再探

Hoi Hin Timothy Lee

National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu

摘要

　　本文旨在探究官話中「一下」的語用與句法之間的關係。在現代官話中，「一下」常被用作動量詞(Verbal classifier)使用，但是「一下」亦對緩和語氣有一定的作用，即作為減弱語(Downtoner)使用(Jiang 2012; Hsieh 2007; König & Li 2018)。在語用方面，Shan & Qi (2014)提及官話的[V+一下]結構的功能在於緩和語氣，是基於「一下」中「最小數量」的語義。從以下的例子的對比顯示，當說話者在請求聽話者時使用「一下」時，表示說話人不想浪費聽者的時間和精力，並以最小的精力幫助說話者，從而使聽話者好受。

1) （語氣緩和）你能幫我一下嗎？

2) （直接）你能幫我嗎？

　　基於生成語法及製圖理論(Cartographic approach)的精神，不少研究都認為語氣、說話者態度等語用功能都位於左緣(Left periphery)。如 Huang & Ochi (2004)對官話*到底*的研究、Lau & Tsai (2021)對台灣閩南語的「極端態度」(Attitude of extremity/ferocity)、以及 Yang (2017)對官話的驚嘆句(Exclamative)都主張，語氣或態度元素是位於 AttP(AttitudeP)，然透過不同的方式，使句子中的特定字詞乘載語氣或態度的功能。由於「一下」乘載著緩和語氣的功能，因此我認為「一下」也跟 AttP 有關，這個主張的證據是「一下」不能跟同樣佔據 AttP 的元素共現。

　　然而，在表層結構上，只有動後的「一下」有緩和語氣的功能，但表面上它並不是在左緣結構之中。我們需要解決的問題是「一下」在句法上如何乘載其語用功能。在此，我提議「一下」是被一個在 AttP 的算子(Att-operator)，以約束(Binding)的方式得到緩和語氣的功能。提倡約束而不提倡移位(movement)的原因有二：1) 沒有 island effect；2) 移位至左緣時沒有偵測到 RM effect (Relativized Minimality; Rizzi 2004)。

參考文獻

Jiang, X.-p. 2012. A pragmatic analysis of V + yixia in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1888–1901.

Lau, S.-H. & Tsai, W.-T.D. 2021. Attitudinal Applicative in Action. In Luigi Rizzi and Fuzhen Si (eds.), Current Issues in Syntactic Cartography: A Cross-linguistic Perspective, with Special Reference to Chinese, 243-259. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yang. C, -Y. H. 2017. Exclamatives in Mandarin Chinese: The syntax-Semantics Interface. Doctoral dissertation, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

A structural account on the non-uniform information structure of right dislocation Synopsis

Tommy Tsz-Ming Lee

University of Southern California

Right dislocation (RD) is used as a cover term to describe postposing effects on word order in matrix clauses. Despite surface similarities, the information structural status of the RD-ed elements vary cross-linguistically. While it is agreed that the RD-ed elements are typically less important, topicalized or defocused (Kuno 1978; Takami 1995; Takano 2014; Lee 2017, 2020), languages are reported to vary w.r.t. whether they can also receive focus interpretation (Nakawaga, Asao, and Nagaya 2008; Ko 2015; Abe 2019; Lee 2022). I propose a structural account on the variation of information structure of RD, resting on the parametric differences of the licensing condition of the Focus Projection in these languages.

Two types of right dislocation. I show that RD in Cantonese and Japanese differ in the information structural status of the right dislocated elements. This suggestion can be illustrated with **focus particles and their associates** in (1) and (2). Only Japanese, but not Cantonese, allows an 'only'-phrase to be RD-ed. This contrast is replicated with other focused elements: (i) **focus intonation**, (ii) **contrastive focus**, (iii) **'even'-focus**, and (iv) ***wh*-NPIs**, these observations suggest that RD languages come in two types, given in (3).

(1) Cantonese RD cannot target 'only'-focus

    ??Δ_i maai-zo ni-bun syu zaa3 **zinghai ngo$_i$**
        buy-PERF this-CL book SFP only 1SG
    'Only me bought this book.'

(2) Japanese RD can target 'only'-focus

    Taroo-ga Δ_i yom-ana-katta-yo, **LGB-sika$_i$**
    Taroo-NOM read-NEG-PST-SFP LGB-only
    '(lit.) Taroo read Δ_i, only LGB$_i$.' (Takita 2011)

(3) a. Cantonese-type RD *cannot* target focused elements   *also for Mandarin RD* (Chiang 2017)

    b. Japanese-type RD *can* target focused elements   *also for Mongolian RD* (Lee 2022)

A structural account. The analysis relies on the assumption that Cantonese and Japanese employ different syntactic structure in RD sentences, which has been extensively researched and defended in the past decades.

(4) A mono-clausal analysis on Cantonese RD (e.g. Cheung 2009; Lee 2017; Lai 2019, i.a.)

    [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TP}$ Subj V] SFP [$_{XP}$ Obj [$_{TP}$ Subj Obj V]]]

(5) A bi-clausal analysis on Japanese RD (e.g. Abe 1999; Tanaka 2001; Takita 2011, i.a.)

    [$_{TP}$ Subj *pro$_i$* V] [$_{XP}$ Obj$_i$ [$_{TP}$ Subj Obj V]]

Both analyses can handle the topic/defocus nature of RD-ed elements by suggesting that XP is Topic Projection (or the like). However, while XP in (5) can also be Focus Projection (suggested in Abe 2019), the unacceptability of (1) suggests that XP in (4) cannot be the same, or we would predict (1) to be acceptable. I suggest that the difference as observed in (1)-(2) lies *not* in a mono-/bi-clausal analysis of RD, but in *the licensing condition of the Focus Projection*. Substantially, I suggest the following parametric difference between Cantonese and Japanese. In effect, (6) suggests the configurations in (7a) are accepted by Japanese but not Cantonese. This explains why XP in (5) can be FocusP, but XP in (4) cannot be so, hence the difference in (1)-(2).

(6) The licensing parameter on the Focus Projection

    a. A FocusP is only licensed by *overt* complement   e.g., Cantonese

    b. A FocusP is only licensed by *covert* complement   e.g., Japanese

(7) The licit and illicit FocusP in Cantonese and Japanese

    a. ... [$_{FocusP}$ Spec FOC [$_{TP}$ ...]] : *Cantonese, [OK]Japanese

    b. ... [$_{FocusP}$ Spec FOC [$_{TP}$ ...]] : [OK]Cantonese, *Japanese

Two predictions. (i) (7a) further predicts the **lack of sluicing in Cantonese**, provided that sluicing involves Focus movement followed by TP deletion (Merchant 2001). This is in line with the base generation analysis of (pseudo-)sluicing in Chinese, as defended in Wei (2004, 2011) and Adams and Tomioka (2012). (ii) (7b) predicts the **lack of focus reading in Japanese scrambling**. Abe (2019) suggests that Japanese scrambling cannot be Focus movement as in (7b), given its semantic vacuity (instead, it involves adjunction (Saito 1985)).

Implications. Ultimately, the findings of this paper strengthen a non-uniform approach to RD in natural languages, despite their surface similarities, in both syntactic structure and information structure.

An aspectual system without perfective and imperfective: in the case of Meiba Bai

Xuan LI

The institute of ethonology and anthropology, CASS

Abstract: With a careful investigation of aspect markers' distribution, this study reanalyzed the aspectual system of Meiba Bai, and argue that there are no perfective and imperfective aspects in Meiba Bai. Meiba Bai has seven aspect markers in total: (i) perspectival aspect: experiential *kuo42*, prospective *khɔ42*; (ii) phasal aspect: inchoative *khɯ44/xɯ44*, continuous *tɕiɛ31*, resultative *tɯ44*, completive *xɯ55*; (iii)quantificational aspect: delimitative *ka44*. The terms like 'perspective aspect' and 'quantificational aspect' are from Dik (1997), where aspect are divided into five subareas.

Perfective and imperfective are two highly grammaticalized aspects, while so-called perfective aspect marker in Meiba Bai is in early stage of grammaticalization. In previous study, *xɯ55* was defined as perfective aspect marker, but it is lexically restricted in Meiba Bai, i.e., incompatible with [+acquire] verbs. Moreover, *xɯ55* can freely occur in different syntactic contexts, including matrix clause and various non-matrix clauses, which indicates that *xɯ55* does not have a certain type of grammatical meaning and a low degree of grammaticalization. *tɕiɛ31* of Meiba Bai expresses part of imperfective meaning, i.e., continuous aspect. *tɕiɛ31* can be used with dynamic or stative verbs that are durative to express progressive and non-progressive meaning respectively. However, not all durative verbs can be used with *tɕiɛ31*. The constructions like ??*sɔ31 tɕiɛ31* 'laugh- tɕiɛ31'and ??*tɛ44 tɕiɛ31*'hit- tɕiɛ31' sound very unnatural. The reason is that *tɕiɛ31* is a newly developed aspect marker under the influence of Chinese. Since *tɕiɛ31* is newly developed, it has not been widely used with all durative verbs, and to some extent its distribution is unpredictable. Therefore, as Bybee et al. (1994) called newly developed anterior as young anterior, we call *tɕiɛ31* in Meiba Bai as the young continuous aspect marker. Apparently, tɕiɛ31 is not fully grammaticalized. As similar to the distribution of xɯ55, *tɕiɛ31* is freely used in matrix clause and various non-matrix clauses, which suggests that *tɕiɛ31* is less grammaticalized.

Moreover, this paper examines the co-occurance of different aspect markers and the co-occurance of aspect markers with modal markers in Meiba Bai. Due to semantic contradictory, the young continuous *tɕiɛ31* cannot be used with any other aspect markers in Meiba Bai. When used with perspectival aspect, *xɯ55* must precede experiential *kuo42* and prospective *khɔ42*, which indicates that *xɯ55* occupies a lower syntactic position than perspectival aspect. There are two markers to express modality in Meiba Bai, i.e., *tsɯ53* and *tɛ33* (its negative form is *tuo33*). *tsɯ53* is used to express epistemic modality, while *tɛ33* is to express dynamic and deontic modality. Both completive *xɯ55* and the young continuous *tɕiɛ31* can be used with epistemic modal *tsɯ53*. When used with *tsɯ53*, *xɯ55, tɕiɛ31* and any other aspect markers in Meiba Bai all precede modals. When used with *tɛ33*, completive *xɯ55* and the young continuous *tɕiɛ31* precede the modal marker, but prospective *khɔ42* must follow the modal marker. The co-occurance of different aspect markers and the co-occurance of aspect markers with modal markers indicate that the syntactic position of aspect markers and modal markers in Meiba Bai are different. It is assumed that the higher the syntactic position, the higher the degree of grammaticalization, then we may get a grammaticalization hierarchy in Meiba Bai: epistemic modal *tsɯ53* >prospective aspect *khɔ42* >dynamic modal *tɛ33* >completive aspect *xɯ55* and the young continuous *tɕiɛ31* ('>' means 'more grammaticalized than/syntactically higher than'). It once again shows that *xɯ55* and *tɕiɛ31* are not fully grammaticalized, thus they should not be defined as perfective and imperfective aspect markers in Meiba Bai.

Key words: Aspect; Meiba Bai; Phasal aspect; xɯ55; tɕiɛ31

The Typology of [n] vs. [l] Contrasts Across Chinese Dialects

Pauline Bolin Liu and Mingxing Li
Hong Kong Baptist University

The alveolar sonorants [n] and [l], as onsets across Chinese dialects, have been extensively studied in their historical developments (Chen, 1967), contrast/neutralization, and relevant acoustic properties in Chinese dialects (Shi, 2015; Shi & Liang, 2017; Cheng & Jongman, 2019). In terms of phonological contrasts, previous studies have observed that the same consonantal contrast may exist in one vowel context but neutralized in another (Lee-Kim, 2014; Li, 2021; Zhang & Li, forthcoming). The current study examines the typology of [n] vs. [l] across Chinese dialects, focusing on their contrast patterns (i) in different vowel contexts, e.g., [_i] vs. [_a], and (ii) when tone is considered, e.g., [ni] vs. [li] both bearing a HH tone.

The materials for the typological survey were 201 articles from the journal Fangyan 方言 [Dialects] 1979 – 2020, which provides the inventories of consonants, vowels, and syllables in each dialect. From these dialects, 146 were identified, whose onsets include both [n] and [l] and whose rimes include both [i] and [a] (or a vowel close to [a] when [a] is not available). In terms of segmental combinations alone, the results showed two patterns: (i) the [ni-li] contrast exists in 88 Chinese dialects (approximately 60.3% of the total 146), which is less frequent than the [na-la] contrast in 130 Chinese dialects (around 89.0% of the total), (ii) with four exceptions, the existence of a [ni-li] contrast implies the existence of a [na-la] contrast in a dialect. This echoes the observation in the literature about fricatives that their place contrasts are generally less frequent in the [_i] context than in the [_a] context (Zhang & Li, forthcoming).

A further examination was given to the dialects that allow both the [ni-li] contrast and the [na-la] contrast, adding tone to the consideration of phonological contrasts. For example, a pair of [ni-li] syllables is considered to be contrastive only when the two syllables bearing the same tone indicate different lexical items, e.g., ni-HH 日 'sun' vs. li-HH 俐 'smart' in Fenghuang (Li, 2011). Under this analysis, a [ni-li] contrast bearing the same tone turned out to be more frequently observed (224 cases) as compared with a [na-la] contrast (148 cases).

The results partially supported the observation in the literature that the [_a] context may allow more consonant place contrasts than the [_i] context. On the other hand, the reverse pattern when considering tone suggests that, for tonal languages such as Chinese dialects, tone should be seriously considered when evaluating phonological contrasts.

Responses to A-not-A questions in monolingual and bilingual children

Charles LOK, Jonathan Him Nok LEE, Stephen Matthews and Virginia YIP

This paper investigates the acquisition of the responses to A-not-A questions in monolingual and bilingual children. We will compare longitudinal data from monolingual Cantonese-speaking children (Lee et al., 1996), Cantonese-English bilingual children (Yip & Matthews, 2007), and heritage Chinese children (Mai et al., 2017). Here's an example (1) showing mismatch in a bilingual child's response to an A-not-A question.

(1) Adult: Gam2 nei5 zung1-m4-zung1ji3 tai2 aa3?
    so you like-not-like watch SFP
    'So do you like to watch it?'
  Child: Hai6 aa3
    be SFP
    'yes'   (Llywelyn, 2;06;20)

The child's response to the adult's A-not-A question shows affirmation using *hai6* 'yes' instead of the target response *zung1ji3* 'like'.

Our research questions are as follows:

1) To what extent are monolingual and bilingual children able to produce target responses to A-not-A questions? What are the non-target types of mismatches produced by the children?

2) What are the differences in the pattern of mismatch in monolingual and bilingual children and how can they be accounted for?

We will discuss four main types of mismatches: 1) responding with the verb within the scope of A-not-A, 2) overgeneralizing A-not-A responses, 3) using *jau5* 'have' or *mou5* 'not have' to answer non-*jau5 mou5* A-not-A questions, and 4) using *hai6* 'yes' or *m4 hai6* 'no' to answer non-*hai6-m4-hai6* A-not-A questions. The results show that type 1, type 3, and type 4 mismatches appeared in the production of all children. Type 2 mismatches were produced by both bilingual and monolingual children. A quantitative difference is found between bilingual and monolingual children: bilingual and heritage children produced 11.8% and 4.7% type 4 mismatches respectively in their total responses to A-not-A questions whereas monolingual children only produced 1% such responses. Given that there are no A-not-A questions in English and *hai6* and *m4 hai6* in Cantonese are the closest counterparts to "yes" and "no" in English, the high production rates of type 4 mismatches in bilingual and heritage children can be attributed to cross-linguistic influence from the highly productive and invariable yes or no response from Yes/No questions in English to A-not-A questions in Cantonese/Mandarin.

Reference

Lee, T. H.T., Wong, C. H., Leung, S., Man. P., Cheung, A., Szeto, K., and Wong, C. S. P. (1996). The Development of Grammatical Competence in Cantonese-speaking Children, Report of RGC earmarked grant 1991-94.

Mai, Z. & Yip, V. (2017). Acquiring Chinese as a Heritage Language in English-speaking Countries and the Child Heritage Chinese Corpus. Paper presented at *the International Conference on Bilingualism: Language and Heritage*, Dec 18, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2007). The bilingual child: Early development and language contact. Cambridge University Press.

From 'No, I guess' to 'I guess not' and more: An interactional linguistic analysis of the pragmatic uses of *gwaa3* Cantonese

Yingxin LU and Tiantian HE
Chinese University of Hong Kong, ShenZhen

Previous studies have generally identified *gwaa3* (啩) as a combination of a mental verb meaning 'guess' and sentence final particle *aa1*. Chao (1947) posited the following development: *kwux* (估) + *ah* (呀) > *kwah*. In terms of functions, *gwaa3* is often used as a sentence final particle to express the speaker's conjecture (Cheung, 2007), uncertainty (Leung, 2005), or doubt (Fang, 2003). The present study will further examine the uses of *gwaa3* as an interpersonal pragmatic marker in Cantonese that mitigates face threats to the speaker and others. We adopt an interactional linguistic analysis framework. Data for our analysis consist of interactive conversations from talkshows in Hong Kong, e.g., *Gam1 Je6 Bat1 Cit3 Fong4* ("Celebrity Talk Show") and *Zi3 Wan4 Faan6 Guk6* ("Be My Guest"). Our analysis reveals that *gwaa3* is often used as a face-threat mitigator in the following three contexts: (i) hedging when talking about sensitive topics (=showing reluctance), as in (1); (ii) hedging when compromising to avoid potential conflict (=showing harmony), as in (2); (iii) hedging in a teasing way in response to praise from others, as in (3). Findings from this study shed light on the extended uses of mental verb *gwaa3* as a pragmatic marker that helps to mitigate face threats and contribute to politeness strategies in Cantonese interactional talk.

Examples

(1)

A: 佢哋……　　喺度　　　嚇　　　你　　話　　要　　強姦　　　你
　　keoi5dei6　hai2dou6　haak3　nei5　waa6　jiu3　koeng4gaan1　nei5
　　有冇　　　啲　　咁　　嘅　　事　　啊
　　jau5mou5　di1　gam2　ge3　si6　aa1

("They… and said they would rape you to scare you. Is there such a thing?")

B: 好　　　耐　　　啦　　　　("It has been a long time.")
　　hou2　noi6　laa1

A: 講講　　　　嗰　件　事　嚟　聽　吓　得　唔得　先
　　gong2gong2　go2　gin6　si6　lai4　teng1　haa5　dak1　m4dak1　sin1

("Can you talk about it?")

B: 唔好　　　**啩**　　　　('I guess I'd rather not.')
　　m4hou2　**GWAA**

(Gam1 Je6 Bat1 Cit3 Fong4)

(2)

A: 點樣　　　　令到　　　女性　　　　感覺　　　你　　係　　溫柔　　　呢
　　dim2joeng2　ling6dou3　neoi5sing3　gam2gok3　nei5　hai6　wan1jau4　ne1
　　動作　　　　慢　　　啲　　　啊　　定　　點　　啊
　　dung6zok3　maan6　di1　aa1　ding6　dim2　aa1

("How to make women feel that you are gentle? Slower movement or what else?")

B: 唔係　　　即係　　　好多　　　時　　好　　細心　　　噶嘛
　　m4hai6　zik1hai6　hou2do1　si4　hou2　sai3sam1　gaa1maa4

頭髮	亂	咗	啊	凍	唔凍	啊
tau4faat3	lyun6	zo2	aa1	dung3	m4dung3	aa1

("Not really. Actually most of the time it's a matter of paying attention to the little things, such as noticing that her hair is ruffled or she feels cold.")

C:	即係	唔好	一	去	呢	就	去到	要害
	zik1hai6	m4hou2	jat1	heoi3	ne1	zau6	heoi3dou3	jiu3hoi6

係	唔係	啊	("That means don't go for the vital part (sexual connotation) directly, right?")
hai6	m4hai6	aa1	

B:	唔係	我我我	講	嗰樣	你	又	我	唔
	m4hai6	ngo5ngo5ngo5	gong2	go2joeng6	nei5	jau6	ngo5	m4

或者	係	㗎
waak6ze2	hai6	**GWAA**

("Not really. What I, I, I am talking about is … But you…I'm not …Well, I guess so.")

(Gam1 Je6 Bat1 Cit3 Fong4)

(3)

A:	喂	恭喜	你	先	("Hey! Congratulations!")
	wai3	gung1hei2	nei5	sin1	

B:	恭喜	我	咩	啊	("Congratulations on what?")
	gung1hei2	ngo5	me1	aa1	

A:	三萬	本	寫真集	一個	禮拜	賣	晒	喎……
	saam1maan6	bun2	se2zan1zaap6	jat1go3	lai5baai3	maai6	saai3	wo3…
	因為	我	嗰日	走去	報攤	問	呢	
	jan1wai6	ngo5	go2jat6	zau2heoi3	bou3taan1	man6	ne1	
	就	嗰個	人	話	攞	咗	五本	
	zau6	go2go3	jan2	waa6	lo2	zo2	ng5bun2	
	佢	話	兩日	就	賣	晒	喇	
	keoi5	waa6	loeng5jat6	zau6	maai6	saai3	laa3	

("Thirty thousand photo albums of yours sold out within a week… When I went to the news-stand and asked, the news-stand owner said that he had stocked five albums which sold out in two days.")

B:	可能	我	身材	好	㗎
	ho2nang4	ngo5	san1coi4	hou2	**GWAA**

("Probably, I am sexy and attractive, I guess.")

(Gam1 Je6 Bat1 Cit3 Fong4)

Selected References

Chao, Y. R. (1947). *Cantonese Primer.* New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers.

Cheung, H. N. (2007). *Xianggang Yueyu Yufa de Yanjiu (Zengding Ban)* [*A Grammar of Cantonese as Spoken in Hong Kong, Revised Edition*]. The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press.

Fang, X. Y. (2003). Guangzhou Fangyan Jumo Yuqi Zhuci (Sentence-final Mood-helping Words in Guangzhou Dialect). JiNan University Press.

Leung, C. S. (2005). *Dangdai Yueyu Yuzhuci de Yanjiu* [*A study of the utterance particles in Cantonese as spoken in Hong Kong*]. Hong Kong: Language Information Science Research Centre. City University of Hong Kong.

Production and Perception of the Korean Obstruents by Cantonese Speakers

Ka Lai Mak and Wai Sum Lee
City University of Hong Kong

This study investigates the production and perception of Korean obstruents, including stops, affricates, and fricatives, by Cantonese speakers. It is well-known that in Korean, stops and affricates are classified into three laryngeal categories, namely 'tense' /p', t', k', ts'/ (ㅃ-ㄸ-ㄲ-ㅉ), 'lenis' /p, t, k, ts/ (ㅂ-ㄷ-ㄱ-ㅈ), and 'aspirated' /pʰ, tʰ, kʰ, tsʰ/ (ㅍ-ㅌ-ㅋ-ㅊ), and the alveolar fricatives include the 'tense' /s'/ (ㅆ) and 'lenis' /s/ (ㅅ). Acoustically, the laryngeal contrast of the Korean obstruents lies in the voice onset time (VOT) and the fundamental frequency (F0) at the onset of the following vowel (Kim, 2004). By contrast, in Cantonese, the stops and affricates are only in two laryngeal categories, i.e., 'unaspirated' /p, t, k, ts/ and 'aspirated' /pʰ, tʰ, kʰ, tsʰ/, and there is one alveolar fricative /s/. The acoustic difference between the Cantonese 'unaspirated' and 'aspirated' obstruents is mainly in VOT (Chao and Chen, 2008; Ng and Wong, 2008). According to the Attention to Dimension (A2D) model (Francis and Nusbaum, 2002), learners of a second language (L2) are unable to direct perceptual attention to a new or unfamiliar phonetic contrast in L2 without training. Hence, Cantonese speakers are expected to have difficulty in producing and perceiving the Korean obstruents of different laryngeal categories, in particular those in the unfamiliar category absent in their first language (L1).

In the present study, eight Cantonese speakers, four males and four females, who have completed and passed a beginner course in Korean, were invited to take part in an audio recording and a listening test. Results of acoustic analysis of the Korean obstruents produced in the test CV syllables by the Cantonese speakers show that all the speakers clearly produce a VOT contrast between the 'tense' and 'aspirated' Korean stops/affricates. However, they fail to produce a distinctive VOT pattern for the 'lenis' ones. The Cantonese speakers also fail to produce a difference in F0 at the onset of the vowels that follow the three different laryngeal categories of Korean obstruents. The data show the L1 (Cantonese) interference on the production of L2 (Korean) sounds. In the listening test, the performance of the Cantonese speakers is better. Some Cantonese speakers can differentiate the Korean stops/affricates in all the three laryngeal categories, 'tense', 'lenis' and 'aspirated', and almost all the Cantonese speakers (except one) can distinguish between the Korean 'lenis' and 'tense' fricatives. In general, the misperception by the Cantonese speakers is due to the confusion between the Korean 'lenis' and 'aspirated' obstruents.

To conclude, the data of the present study indicate that Cantonese speakers are able to distinguish the three Korean laryngeal categories perceptually, while they are less successful in producing the three categories differently. This is especially for producing the unfamiliar L2 laryngeal categories which are not occurring in L1. The findings shed light on the discrepancy between the production and perception of the L2 sounds.

References:
Chao, Kuan-Yi, & Chen, Li-mei (2008). A cross-linguistic study of voice onset time in stop consonant productions. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics & Chinese Language Processing, 13*(2), 215-232.
Francis, Alexander L., & Nusbaum, Howard C. (2002). Selective attention and the acquisition of new phonetic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 28*(2), 349-366.
Kim, Midam (2004). Correlation between VOT and F0 in the perception of Korean stops and affricates. In the *Proceedings of INTERSPEECH-2004 - ICSLP, 8th International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, Korea, October 4-8, 2004, 49-52.
Ng, Manwa Lawrence, & Wong, Juliana (2008). Voice onset time characteristics of esophageal, tracheoesophageal, and laryngeal speech of Cantonese. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research 52*(3), 780-789.

Split and Optionality in Ergative Constructions

Snigdha Medhi and Anindita Sahoo

This paper explores the variations in ergativity in Assamese, an Indo-Aryan language spoken in the eastern state of Assam, and explains why the split ergativity is indigenous to this language whereas optional ergativity is a borrowed phenomenon.

Ergativity, both optional and split, is a morphosyntactic feature that occurs when an intransitive subject is treated in the same manner as the transitive object, but is treated differently when compared with the transitive subject (Dixon 1994). Assamese, an ergative language (Saha & Patgiri 2013) also has both optional and split ergativity. The find out whether the split ergativity or the optional ergativity is indigenous to Assamese, we explored two domains, i.e. finding evidences through the natural conversation data from different varieties and diachronic data from the literary sources. Upon observing the data carefully, we notice that only the Standard variety of Assamese (SA) shows both split and optionality in ergative domain (1a-b ; 2a-b), whereas the other varieties such as Bajali, Anchali, Nalbariya, Barama Uzna Bhakha, Xorobhogiya have only split ergativity. For the brevity of the abstract we have considered only the Bajali example as the representative of this group (3a-b).

To further understand this difference, we explore data from other languages such as Hindi and Bodo which are spoken in the vicinity. Upon further investigation, we observe that the variety of Hindi spoken in and around Assam, shows optionality in its ergative system, and Bodo shows in its nominative system (Pipers 2016). This helps us to contend that split exclusivity in the varieties of Assamese, and the availability of optional reading in the Standard Assamese are the result of prolonged linguistic contact. More evidence of split ergativity being indigenous to Assamese comes from the diachronic data from the 14th and 19th century that show high frequency occurrence of split ergativity (4-5), but there's no evidence of optionality in ergative system found in these texts.

This leads to the claim that while split ergativity is indigenous to Assamese, optionality is a feature that has been borrowed from other neighboring languages such as Hindi and Bodo, that are spoken in and around Assam.

Examples:

1(a) *rahʊl-*e   zanıbʊzı   gʰɔr - ɔlɔı   gɔl*   (SA split)
    Rahul-NOM/*ERG   deliberately   house-DAT   go-PERF
    'Rahul went home deliberately.'

(b) *pʊlıs -e   zanıbʊzı   andʊlɔnkarı-bʊr -ɔk   mar -ıl   -e*
    police-ERG   deliberately   protestors-PL-ACC   kill -PERF-3AGR
    'The police killed the protestors deliberately.'

2(a) *manʊh-tʊ   dɔʊrı as-e*   (SA optionality)
    Manuh-CLF-NOM run   be-3AGR
    'The man is running.'

(b) *manʊh-tʊ-e   dɔʊrı as-e*
    Man-CLF-ERG run   be-3AGR
    'The man is running.'

3(a) *manʋh-tʋ -ɪ   daʋrɪ as-e*   (Bajali Variety)
   Man-M.CLF-ERG   run   be-3AGR
   'The man is running.'
 (b)* *manʋh-tʋ   daʋrɪ as-e*
   Man -M.CLF   run   be-3AGR
   'The man is running.'

(4) *Prohlad-e   eidore-i   bisnubhokti ayotto kor-il   -e*
   Prahlad-ERG like-EMPH   vishnubhakti learn   do -PERF-3AGR
   'Prahlad learned about the devotions of Krisna like this.'

                                         (*Prahlad Charit*, 14th Century Text)

(5) *Tejimola-i   mahiyek-or   kotha mote paator-riha-mekhela pindibole ulai lole*
    Tejimola-ERG aunt-GEN   talk   as   mekhela chadar   wear   take out-3AGR
    'Tejimola took out her aunt's clothes to wear.'

                                         (*Buri Aair Xadhu*, 19th Centrury Text)

Keywords: Ergativity, Optionality, Split, Standard Assamese, Language Varieties

References

De Lancey, S. 2011. *"Optional" "ergativity" in Tibeto-Burman languages.* Linguistics of the
        Tibeto-Burman Area Volume 34.2.
Dixon, R. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Piepers, J. 2016. *Optional ergative case marking in Hindi*. Radboud University.
Saha, A; Patgiri, B. 2013. Ergativity in Axomiya*. Language in India*. Volume 13:12.

粵語祈使句的特點

吳伊婷, 陳曉彤 and 劉蘊怡

祈使句一般表現為要對方做或不做某事、帶有命令語氣的句子，譬如：「我叫你坐上係嗰張凳到呀！」祈使句在日常對話中經常出現，主語可以是第二人稱代詞「你」、「您」、「你們」或第一人稱代詞複數式「咱們」、「我們」（袁毓林1993）。然而這些主語皆可省去，例子包括「食飯啦」、「快啲啦」、「借過啦」等等。這種方式在西方人看來似乎是直接的（Matthews & Yip 2011）。本文提議將粵語祈使句按語用功能細分為五類：**要求、命令、勸阻、禁止及提議**。本報告就以口頭報的內容為基礎，從結構（句子成分）、各類祈使句對動詞要求、語氣助詞搭配、語用情況和要求、粵普對比等幾方面詳細分析粵語祈使句的特點。

文獻回顧：過往研究不乏對祈使句作出的分析（包括袁毓林1993；方小燕2003；張洪年2007；范建華、白雲 2009；Matthews & Yip 2011；鄧思穎 2009，2015 等），當中袁毓林（1993）將祈使句分為命令、希望、懇求三類、並對於祈使句中的動詞的類作出分析，當中大部分述人動詞和自主動詞（除了貶義之外）皆可進入祈使句（例：*別尊重別人!）；范建華、白雲 （2009）認為光杆動詞形式的命令形式最強（例：下去！）不斷添加其他成分（如時間狀語、介賓短語、能願動詞、句末語氣詞等）語氣就會有減弱的趨勢。由無主句變為有主語的命令句也會呈現這個趨勢。鄧思穎（2015）一書中提到能出現於建議類和命令類的祈使句的語氣助詞，例如「罷啦」帶有提議性質的祈使意義，且具委婉的語氣，例如：「你不如傾少兩句偈罷啦。」（詳見鄧思穎2009）。

研究問題：本研究主要探討若粵語祈使句可分為請求（1）、命令（2）、勸告（3）、禁止（4）及提議（5）五類，它們各自的語法特點有何差異之處？

(1) 要求：語氣溫和，態度誠懇（例：唔該你幫幫我吖！）

(2) 命令：說話者對後輩/晚輩直接下命令，語氣強硬（例：你同我食晒佢！）

(3) 勸告：語調委婉，說話者提示對方該/不該做什麼（例：你以後要記得帶口罩喇。）

(4) 禁止：言辭強硬，明確表示禁止對方做某些事情（例：唔准食煙！）

(5) 提議：可以與「不如」連用，建議內容不一定要即時進行（例：不如等我問吓佢先啦。）

研究方法：研究員以網上形式徵集了三十位母語為粵語的使用者，以問卷形式進行了語法判斷測試。另外，研究員亦搜尋了網上語料庫及網上平台短片進行語料分析。

研究貢獻：本研究為粵語祈使句進行了全面的研究，有助學者深入了解粵語祈使句的特點，有利進行其他語言的祈使句的研究；研究結果也可以助粵語教師及粵語學習者厘清祈使句的各種用法和特點，於粵語教學方面有所貢獻。

（部分）參考資料：鄧思穎，2015，粵語語法講義。香港: 商務印書館（香港）有限公司。
袁毓林。1993. 《現代漢語祈使句研究》。北京：北京大學出版社。

On the relationship between middle and passive constructions: Analysis of *jibaa* 'go' constructions in Odia, an Indo-Aryan language

Anindita Sahoo and Foong Ha YAP

Abstract

Previous studies have noted a fairly robust drift across various languages whereby voice markers often extend their range of functions and reach into other voice domains (see, for example, Siewierska 1984; Keenan 1985; Shibatani 1985; Washio 1993; Kemmer 1993; Fox & Hopper 1994; Kulikov 2011; Zuñiga & Kittilä 2019). This paper examines the relationship between middle and passive voice constructions in Indo-Aryan languages that are formed using 'go' light verb constructions. Illustrative data for our analysis focus on *jibaa* 'go' constructions in Odia, an eastern Indo-Aryan language, with some parallel examples from Hindi. Our database consists of texts from Old Odia, Middle Odia, and Modern Odia. Our analysis reveals the emergence of three types of *jibaa* 'go' middle constructions: spontaneous (Old Odia), inchoative (Late Old Odia) and facilitative (Modern Odia), as shown in (1a-c). Passive constructions with implicit agents (often referred to as 'agentless passives') were also attested in Old Odia, as in (2a), while those with overtly expressed agents are attested more recently in formal registers of Modern Odia, as in (2b).

Our analysis reveals that, whereas *jibaa* passive constructions are bivalent or trivalent (i.e,. transitive or ditransitive), with affected patient and defocused/elided agent as core arguments (plus recipient, if ditransitive), a distinctive feature of *jibaa* middle constructions is their monovalent syntax but bivalent semantics. That is, *jibaa* middle constructions have two semantic roles (agent/instrument as Initiator and patient/theme as Endpoint) occupying a single syntactic position (i.e., the grammatical subject position). From a diachronic perspective, the prevalence of middle and 'agentless' passives in Old Odia indicate a strong association of *jibaa* with monovalent (1-place predicate) or 'monovalent-like' constructions. The late emergence of *jibaa* in passive constructions with explicit agents in Modern Odia support the view that *jibaa* is a detransitivizing device. Hence its usefulness as a middle and 'agentless' voice marker.

From a pragmatic perspective, our analysis also reveals that the detransitivizing function of *jibaa* also serves a vital role as an implicit stance marker, often marking the speaker's subjective evaluation of the event as a whole (i.e., perfective viewpoint) and also subtly identifying the speaker as a detransitivized argument or covertly expressed 'phantom evaluator' of the event). In spontaneous and inchoative middle constructions (e.g., 'some paddy *fell off* from the haystack' in (1a)), the perfective (aspectual) and subjective (evaluative) perspective from the *jibaa* voice marker contribute to the vividness, emphasis or speaker affectedness reading of the event being described by the verbal predicated. In the case of facilitative middles, the speaker's subjective evaluation extends from the inherent properties of core (e.g. agent/patient) arguments to non-core (e.g., instrument) arguments, such as *kaagaja dangaa* 'paper boats' in (1c), hence the much later emergence of *jibaa* facilitative middles.

Our analysis does not go far enough back in time to resolve the question of whether *jibaa* middles emerged earlier than *jibaa* passives, since both uses were already attested in the Old Odia texts in our database. Further research is needed, involving older texts (if available) as well as ancient inscriptions. However, our analysis reveals an interesting role for causative light verb *daai* 'give' in the emergence of passive voice constructions with explicit agents, providing evidence of interaction among voice categories as shown below:

(i) 'Agentless' passive: $NP_{PATIENT} + V_{intranstive} + jibaa\ _{PASSIVE}$

(ii) Passive with overt agent: $NP_{AGENT} + NP_{PATIENT} + V_{intranstive} + daai_{CAUSATIVE} + jibaa_{PASSIVE}$

Findings from this study contribute to a fuller understanding of voice systems in the languages of the world, including the extended functions of voice markers within the same domains (e.g., middles) and interactions among voice markers across domains (e.g., causatives and passives). Our findings also draw attention to the pragmatic effects of voice markers, whereby they help to convey the speaker's subjective stance.

<u>Examples</u>

Spontaneous middle (Old Odia)

(1) a. *kebaLa   dhaana   khaLaa-ru   thode   **padi   ga-l-aa***
    only   paddy   field-from   some   fall   go-PST-3SG.NH (> MM)
    'Just a little bit of paddy from the paddy field fell off (from the haystack).'
                                        (*Prastaaba ChintaamaNi*, 18th century)

Inchoative middle (Old Odia)

   b. ***bruddha   hoi   ga-l-e***   *byaadhi   ghaarai*
    old   be   go-PST-3SG.HH (> MM)   disease   attack-PRES-3SG.NH
    'Once you have become old, diseases attack you.'
                                        (*Rudra Sudhaanidhi*, 16th century)

Facilitative middle (Modern Odia)

   c. *kaagaja   dangaa   sahajare   paaNi-re   **bhaasi   jaa-e/*hue***
    paper   boat   easily   water-in   float   go-PRES-3SG.NH (> MM)
    'Paper boats float easily on water.'

Passive with implicit agent (Old Odia)

(2) a. *ehi   hari   bidyadhara   mahapatrañ-ku   minaketana   chinha   kaTaari*
    this Hari Bidyadhara Mahapatran-DAT   fish.and.flag sign   knife
    *pagadi   madhya   sañtaka   **diaa   ga-l-aa***
    turban   also   badge   give.ASP   go-PST-3SG.NH (> PASS)
    'This Hari Bidyadhara Mahapatra was given a knife with a fish-and-flag engraving, a turban and also a badge.'
                                        (*MaadaLaa Paanji*, 14th century)

Passive with explicit agent (formal registers of Modern Odia)

   b. *ehi   kamiti-ra   addhyakhya   purbatana   krushi   sachiba   sanjay*
    this committee-POSS chief   former   agricultural secretary Sanjay
    agrawal-nka   dwaaraa   tino-Ti   krushi   aain   prastuta   karaa   ja-i-chh-i
    Agrawal-HON   by   three   agricultural law   prepare   do   go.PASS-PFV-PRES-SG
    'The three agricultural laws are prepared by the chief of this committee, Sanjay. Agrawal, the former Secretary of Agriculture.'
                                        (*News18 Odia Digital;* accessed on July 20, 2022)

References

Fox, Barbara and Paul J. Hopper (eds.). 1994. *Voice: form and function*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Passive in the world's languages. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1, 243-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The middle voice*. [Typological Studies in Language 23]. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kulikov, Leonid. 2011. Voice typology. In *The Oxford handbook of language typology,* ed. JJ son, pp. 368-39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passive and related constructions: a prototype analysis. *Language* 61: 821-48.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The passive: a contrastive linguistic analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

Washio, Ryuchi. 1993. When causatives mean passive: a cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2(1): 45-90.

Zúñiga, Fernando and Seppo Kittilä. 2019. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Main clause phenomena and discourse moves: Mandarin incompleteness

Yenan SUN
Chinese University of Hong Kong

Main clause phenomena (MCP) is a set of constructions such as Topicalization (in English, [5]), V-2 (in Swedish, German, [1]) etc which typically occur in root clauses but according to [11] also in certain subordinate clauses as long as they can serve as *assertions* like root clauses. This paper identifies a phenomena in Mandarin called incompleteness [12, 18, 9, 17] as a potential MCP based on its distribution in various kinds of subordinate clauses and then proposes that Mandarin incompleteness supports [4]'s claim that MCP can be related to the more general conventional discourse effects associated with root clauses such as putting an issue on the Discourse Table [7, 6].

Mandarin incompleteness. For Mandarin root clauses that express the instantiation of an event in the actual world (i.e. episodic meaning), overt aspect marking (AspM) is often required; otherwise, the unmarked sentence sounds *incomplete* (even with past-oriented adverbs), as in (1).

(1) 昨天病人吃%(了) 生醃蟹。 ("%" is used to mark incompleteness)

It has been observed that incompleteness does not apply to some subordinate clauses such as relative clauses [18, 13, 15] but a systematic examination of this property in subordinate clauses is lacking.

Incompleteness persists in *asserted* subordinate clauses. There is a striking overlapping between subordinate clauses where incompleteness persists and those that admit MCP such as topicalization and VP Preposing reported in [11]. Firstly, sentential complements selected by verbs that can have parenthetical uses (e.g. *say, think, hear*) tend to cause incompleteness as in (2), while those selected by verbs that must contribute to the main assertion (e.g. *deny, be shocked*) do not (or cause mild degradedness), as in (3).

(2) 醫生{說/認爲/聽說了} [昨天病人吃%(了)生醃蟹]。

(3) 醫生{否認了/很震驚} [昨天病人吃?(了)生醃蟹]。

Secondly, incompleteness does not apply to noun complements as their content is presupposed (/given), as in (4).

(4) 醫生{聽說了/否認了} [昨天病人吃(了)生醃蟹]這件事。

Thirdly, incompleteness arises in a relative clause with an indefinite head noun but NOT a definite one, and according to [11] the content of the former is asserted while the latter is presupposed:

(5) 醫生搶救了一些[昨天吃%(了)生醃蟹]的病人。

(6) 醫生搶救了那些[昨天吃(了)生醃蟹]的病人。

Fourthly, a familiar contrast between restrictive (presupposed) *because*-clauses (7) and non-restrictive (asserted) ones (8) for MCP arises in Mandarin with regard to incompleteness as well.

(7) 小莉會在外面吃飯，因爲她媽媽剛才煮(了)生醃蟹。

(8) 小莉會在外面吃飯，因爲我剛才在飯店門口碰到%(了)她。

Lastly, for adverbial clauses headed by *before* and *after* such as (9), [16] reports that incompleteness does not arise and the content of those clauses are exactly claimed to be presupposed in [11].

(9) 昨天，在小王吃(了)生醃蟹{之前/之後}，我們都很緊張。

Proposal. Given the clear correlation between the arising of incompleteness in a clause and that clause's being part of the main assertion (which groups only certain kinds of subordinate clauses with root clauses like (1)), this paper argues that incompleteness is a MCP and a main clause should be characterized by its conventional discourse effect of putting an issue on the Discourse Table (following [11, 3, 4]). In particular, I propose that while the default way of expressing the episodic meaning in Mandarin is to use overt AspM such as the perfective -*le*, it is possible to express this meaning with the bare form in Mandarin when the clause is NOT asserted. Since the bare form is dedicated to express imperfective readings such as habitual readings in Mandarin [14, 10], I follow [16] in treating such bare form as the imperfective form. When the episodic reading is intended, the choice between the unmarked form (IMPF) vs. marked form (PERF) is decided by the discourse status of the clause, namely whether it puts an issue on the table or not. The analysis is supported by a similar use of imperfective in English: the simple present form (which involves imperfective, see [2, 8]) normally cannot express episodic readings as in (10a) but it can do so in restricted contexts such as the parenthetical use in (10b).

(10) a. The doctor {*discovers /discovered} a secret yesterday. (PRES.IMPF in an asserted clause)
  b. John ate poisonous mushrooms, the doctor discovers. (PRES.IMPF in a parenthetical clause)

References

[1] Lars-Gunnar Andersson. *Form and function of subordinate clauses*. PhD thesis, University of Göteborg, 1975.

[2] Ashwini Deo. Unifying the imperfective and the progressive: partitions as quantificational domains. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 32(5):475–521, 2009.

[3] Kajsa Djärv. *Factive And Assertive Attitude Reports*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2019.

[4] Kajsa Djärv. On the interpretation and distribution of embedded main clause syntax: new perspectives on complex discourse moves. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 7(1):1–39, 2022.

[5] Joseph Embley Emonds. *Root and structure-preserving transformations*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1970.

[6] Donka F Farkas and Kim B Bruce. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics*, 27(1):81–118, 2010.

[7] Donka F Farkas and Floris Roelofsen. Division of labor in the interpretation of declaratives and interrogatives. *Journal of Semantics*, 34(2):237–289, 2017.

[8] Marcelo Ferreira. The semantic ingredients of imperfectivity in progressives, habituals, and counterfactuals. *Natural Language Semantics*, 24(4):353–397, 2016.

[9] Yang Gu. Shitai, shizhi lilun yu hanyu shijian canzhao [studies of tense, aspect and chinese time reference]. *Yuyan kexue [Linguistic Sciences]*, pages 22–38, 2007.

[10] Yuyin He. *Time in Mandarin: The Fingerprints of Tense and Finiteness*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2020.

[11] Joan B Hooper and Sandra A Thompson. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic inquiry*, 4(4):465–497, 1973.

[12] Lingda Kong. Yingxiang Hanyu juzi zizu de yuyanxingshi [Linguistic forms that affect sentence completeness in Chinese]. *Zhongguo Yuwen*, 6:434–440, 1994.

[13] Jo-Wang Lin. Time in a language without tense: The case of Chinese. *Journal of Semantics*, 23(1):1–53, 2006.

[14] Hongyuan Sun. *Temporal construals of bare predicates in Mandarin Chinese*. PhD thesis, Leiden University dissertation, 2014.

[15] Hongyuan Sun. Evidence against a scope analysis of temporally free readings of relative clauses in mandarin. In *Taming the TAME systems*, pages 59–77. Brill, 2015.

[16] Yenan Sun. *Incompleteness Under Discussion*. PhD thesis, The University of Chicago, 2022.

[17] Rint Sybesma. Xiandingxing he hanyu zhuju [Finiteness and Chinese main clauses]. *International Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 6(2):325–344, 2019.

[18] Sze-Wing Tang and Thomas Hun-tak Lee. Focus as an anchoring condition. In *International Symposium on Topic and Focus in Chinese, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University*, 2000.

Peculiar Mandarin Binding Pattern in the clausal complements of Zi-Verbs

Sally Wong

Unlike general 'simplex' assumption, Mandarin zi-ji is complex consisting of a verbal prefix zi- and a defective pronominal –ji (Liu 2016). Zi-ji can be locally and non-locally bound.

Zi- is a reflexivizing operator on predicates, bundling their thematic roles (Reinhart&Siloni 2005, Dimitriadis&Everaert 2014).

There is a class of verbs that allow construal with zi-, namely verbs taking a clausal complement as in (1):

(1)   Zhangsan zi-jue   conghui.
       Zhangsan self-considers smart

I will focus on these *zi*-verbs which allow fully expanded clausal complements containing anaphors and pronominals. Interestingly, an occurrence of *zi-ji*, in the domain of *zi*-verb obligatorily takes the subject of the latter as its antecedent (unless blocking applies). See the contrasts between the following sentences:

(2) a. Zhangsan$_1$ shuo Lisi$_2$ renwei Lisa$_3$ xihuan ziji$_{1/2/3}$.
       Zhangsan says Lisi   think Lisa like self
    b. Zhangsan$_1$ shuo Lisi$_2$ *zi*-ren   Lisa$_3$ xihuan ziji$_{*1/2/*3}$
       Zhangsan says Lisi REFL-think Lisa like self

The complements of non-*zi* verbs lack such a restriction. A pronominal *ta* in the position of *zi-ji*, also must be bound the subject of that verb:

(3)   Lisi$_1$ zi-ren   Lisa$_2$ xihuan ta$_{1/*2/*3}$.   (index *3* represents discourse entity)
       Lisi REFL-think Lisa   like pron

This pattern will be accounted for using the reflexivizing property of *zi* integrated with the approaches to binding in Reuland (2011) and Giblin (2016).

Selected References:

Giblin 2016. Agreement Restrictions in Mandarin Long-distance Binding. Diss-MIT.
Liu 2016. Chinese *zi*: Linking Reflexivization and Binding, MAthesis-Utrecht
Reinhart&Siloni 2005. The lexicon-syntax parameter: *LI*-36.

"Is it homonymy or polyfunctionality?"—A preliminary analysis of Korean suffix *-i* from referential to predicational domains.

Foongha YAP[1] and Mikyung AHN[2]
[1]Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
[2]Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea

Abstract

Korean has a highly versatile suffix *-i* found in both referential and non-referential domains. In nominal constructions, suffix *-i* can be used as a nominative case marker as well as a nominalizer (Rhee 2008), as in (1) and (2) respectively. It remains a question whether genitive *-uy*, as seen in (3), could be related to suffix *-i* with */u/* deployed epenthetically. Within the predicational domain, *-i* is used as a copula (4). Suffix *-i* is also found as voice marker, with diachronic evidence suggesting that it was first attested in Old Korean and then became productive in Middle Korean as a causative suffix (5), with spontaneous middle uses emerging in Middle Korean (6) followed later with potential/facilitative uses in Contemporary Korean (7); further, in Middle Korean, suffix *-i* has also developed into a passive marker (8) (see Yap & Ahn 2019). An interesting question that arises is whether these various functions of suffix *-i* represent instances of homophony or polyfuctionality? In this paper, we examine the various grammaticalization pathways of Korean suffix *-i*, with special attention to the relationship of case marker *-i* in the referential domain and voice marker *-i* in the predicational domain. Our analysis suggests a common source, with proximal demonstrative *i* as their lexical origin, and further reveals a pivotal chiasmatic and facilitative stage where suffix *-i* functions as a copula for predicate nominals but as a voice marker for adjectival and verbal predicates. Data for our analysis come primarily from the *Sejong* historical corpus and also the *Sejong* corpus of contemporary Korean. Findings of this study contribute to our better understanding of how grammatical constructions extend across nominal and predicational domains, and pragmatically drift from referential to non-referential (including pragmatic) uses.

Examples

(1) **nominative case marker –*i***
    *sinlyek-**i**   ili   sey-si-lssAy   hAnpen sso-si-n   sal-**i***
    divine.power-**NOM** like.this be.strong-HON-since once   shoot-HON-ADN arrow-**NOM**
    ney nilkwup pwuphi pskey-yet-ini
    four seven   volume penetrate-PST-as
    'The divine power of the crown prince was so strong that the arrow he shot once penetrated 28 stacked drums.'
                                                    (1447, *welinchenkangcikok txt* 131)

(2) **nominalizer –*i***
    *seng ssa-o   sal-**i**-lAl   sicakhA-nila.*
    castle build-NFIN live-**NMLZ**-ACC   begin-SFP
    'He built the castle and began living (there).'
                                        (1458, *Welinsekpo* 1:44; Hong 1983:43; Rhee 2008:243)

(3) **genitive –*uy***
    *ku nwunsmwul-un mayapwuin-s   nwunsmwul-kwa sacwung-**uy** nwunsmwul-un*

the tear-TOP　　　　　Buddha's mother-GEN tear-with　　　　　monk-**GEN**　tear-TOP
talu-ta
be.different-DEC
'The tears, the tears of Buddha's mother are different from those of monks'

(1447, *sekposangcel* 06-24.*txt* 776)

(4) **copula *-i* for nominal predicate**
thayca-s　　　　　pep-un　　pep-un　kecusmal-Al　ani　　hA-si-non　　　kes-i-ni
crown prince-GEN law-TOP　lie-ACC　　　NEG　do-HON-ADN　**NMLZ**-COP-as
kwuchye　phAlA-si-liita.
inevitably　sell-HON-SFP
'As crown prince's law is not to lie, (you=crown prince) should sell (the hill).'

(1447, *Sekposangcel* 6: 24)

(5) **causative *-i***
(*Thayco-y*)　　　　　*sekpyek-ey　　　mAl-Al　　ol-**i**-s(i)-ya*
(name.of.king-NOM)　stone.wall-DAT　horse-ACC　climb-**CAUS**-HON-CONN
'King Thayco Yi had a horse climb onto a stone wall.'

(1447, *yongpiechenka* 48; cited in Yap & Ahn 2019, ex.(8b))

(6) **spontaneous middle *-i***
*tong-mwun-i　　tolo　tat-**hi**-ko*
east-gate-NOM　again　close-**MM**-CONN
'The East Gate closed again.'

(1459, *welinsekpo* 23:80; cited in Yap & Ahn 2019, ex. (20a))

(7) **potential middle *-i***
*pay-ka　　　po-**i**-n-ta*
ship-NOM　see-**MM**-PRES-DEC
'The ship is visible'

(Yap & Ahn 2019, ex.22)

(8) **passive *-i***
*yuceng-tAl-hi　　　　　motin　cyungsAyng　mul-**y**-e*
every.person-PL-NOM　brutal　beast　　　　bite-**PASS**-SEQ
hoyngsaha-l　　　　　ssi-o
die.accidental.death-ADN　NMLZ-CONN
'Every person was bitten by the brutal beast, and died an accidental death ...'

(1459, *welinsekpo* 9: 58; Yap & Ahn 2019, ex.24)

References

Rhee, Seongha. 2008. On the rise and fall of nominalizers in Korean. In: *Rethinking grammaticalization: new perspectives*, Maria Jose Lopez-Couso & Elena Seoane (eds), pp. 239-264. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Yap, Foong Ha and Mikyung Ahn. 2019. Development of grammatical voice marking in Korean: on the causative, middle and passive uses of suffix *-i*. *Lingua* 219: 1-23.

<h1 style="text-align:center">Doubling exclusive particles in Cantonese</h1>

Ka Fai YIP

Yale University

Introduction. Cross-linguistically, exclusive particles 'only' may be doubled with a single focus association, posing a problem for the Principle of Compositionality (*Dutch*: Barbiers 2014; *German*: Hole 2015; *Korean*: Lee 2005; *Mandarin*: Hole 2017, Sun 2021; *Vietnamese*: Hole 2017, Erlewine 2017; *i.a.*). Previous accounts mainly attempt to explain doubling of *adverbial* and *adfocus* particles by treating the latter as semantically vacuous concord markers (e.g. operator-particle account, Quek & Hirsch's 2017, Erlewine 2020). Doubling of other kinds of particles, however, is rarely discussed. In this study, I focus on an understudied case of doubling of *adverbial* and *sentence-final particles* (SFPs) in Cantonese, where a multiple-'only' analysis (alluded to in Law 2004, Lee 2019) faces challenges from compositionality. While I follow Quek & Hirsch's (2017) in assuming a syntactic AGREE relation between particles, I pursue a different route in **two-dimensional semantics** concerning AT-ISSUENESS. I argue that none of the particles is semantically vacuous, and their focus-sensitive contributions are in different meaning dimensions. I also provide novel arguments for the AGREE relation from unnoticed behavior of exclusive particles in doubling.

Data. #1 Cantonese adverbial *zinghai* 'only' and SFP *zaa3* in (1)-(2) express non-scalar, at-issue exclusiveness (can be directly dissented by (4)). Crucially, they may be doubled in (3) with the same truth condition. A **compositionality** problem arises: only one (but not two) exclusive operator is interpreted in the doubling cases.

(1) Aaming **zinghai** maai-zo lunghaa$_F$
Ming only buy-PERF lobsters
'Ming only bought lobsters.' = $\neg\Phi_b \wedge \neg\Phi_p$

(2) Aaming maai-zo lunghaa$_F$ **zaa3**
Ming buy-PERF lobsters SFP.only
'Ming only bought lobsters.' = $\neg\Phi_b \wedge \neg\Phi_p$

(3) Aaming **zinghai** maai-zo lunghaa$_F$ **zaa3**
Ming only buy-PERF lobsters SFP.only
'Ming only bought lobsters.' = $\neg\Phi_b \wedge \neg\Phi_p$

(4) No. (Ming also bought beef and pork.)
(can be a direct dissent to (1),(2) and (3))

#2 While sentences with *zinghai* or *zaa3* share same truth conditions, their felicity conditions differ. *Zaa3* can only be used when excluded alternatives are **contextually salient** such that participants are *aware of* them, e.g. 'beef' in (5)b (vs. (5)a). The same requirement does not hold for *zinghai*.

(5) [a. You are a cashier in a meat/seafood market. You just served a customer, and your colleague asks what (s)he bought.] [b. You are a cashier in a meat/seafood market. Beef is newly arrived and is really good. You just served a customer, and your colleague asks whether (s)he bought beef.]

c. Go haak **zinghai** maai-zo lunghaa$_F$ $^{\{a.\#/b.OK\}}$**zaa3**)
CL customer only buy-PERF lobsters SFP.only 'The customer only bought lobsters.'

Proposal. First, I propose that only *zinghai* (but not *zaa3*) denotes an exclusive operator on the **AT-ISSUE (AI) level**, as in (6). Following the classic analysis of *only* (Horn 1969, Rooth 1992), (6) excludes all the focus alternatives not entailed by the prejacent and presupposes the prejacent (i.e. contained in the Common Ground, Stalnaker 2002). I also assume a null counterpart of *zinghai*, EXCL, with the same semantics (*cf.* EXH in Chierchia 2006, Fox 2007, Chierchia et al. 2012).

(6) $[\![zinghai/\text{EXCL}]\!]^c =$ AI $\lambda p \lambda w. \forall p'[(p' \in \text{ALT}_c \wedge p'(w)) \rightarrow p \subseteq p']$ | NAI $p \in \text{CG}_c$ (c = context)

I adopt Portner's (2007, 2009) Common Proposition Space (CPS) in (7) to formulate *zaa3*'s contextual saliency requirement. I propose that *zaa3* is a partial identity function which takes and returns an exclusive proposition p (after *zinghai*/EXCL applied), and, on the **NOT-AT-ISSUE (NAI) level**, requires at least one alternative proposition q (inconsistent with p due to the exclusion) to be in the CPS, given in (8). Contextual saliency follows from the participants' awareness of q. Importantly, *zaa3* is not an exclusive operator (*contra.* Law 2004, Lee 2019) – but it is still sensitive to focus on the NAI level, hence not a semantically vacuous concord marker.

(7) CPS: The set of propositions of which the participants in the conversation are mutually aware (A is aware of φ, B is aware of φ, A is aware that B is aware of φ, B is aware that A is aware of φ, etc.).

(8) $[\![zaa3]\!]^c =$ AI $\lambda p \lambda w. p(w)$ | NAI $\exists q[q \in \text{ALT}_c \wedge (p \cap q = \emptyset) \wedge q \in \text{CPS}_c]$

Second, syntactically, I suggest that *zaa3* carries an uninterpretable [uEXCL] feature and must AGREE with an exclusive operator carrying the interpretable counterpart [iEXCL]. The features have a morphological correlate: the onset *z*, related to "restrictiveness" in SFPs (*zaa3*, *ze1* & variants, Sybesma & Li 2007), is shared by exclusive morphemes in Cantonese (*zing6*, *zaai1* & *zi2*; except *dak1* whose origin is 'acquire'). This AGREE relation resonates with the bipartite analysis of adverbial and adfocus particles (Quek & Hirsch 2017, Sun 2021). Besides *zinghai*, the null EXCL can also value *zaa3*, serving as the source of AI exclusivity in singleton *zaa3* cases like (2).

(9) [$_{CP}$ zaa3$_{[uEXCL]}$ [$_{TP}$ zinghai/EXCL$_{[iEXCL]}$ [$_{vP}$ the customer [$_{v'}$ bought [$_{DP}$ lobsters$_F$]]]]] (subj. & TP mvt. omitted)
(Agree)