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On the hierarchical structure of Cantonese sentence-final particles

Sze-Wing Tang (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Insights of Ross (1970), who proposes that sentences are derived from a deep structure that contains an explicit performative verb, have been revived under the cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997, 2004, Cinque 1999, among many others), particularly in the works by Speas (2004), Tenny (2006), Hill (2007), Miyagawa (2012, 2017), Wiltschko and Heim (2016), and Wiltschko (2017). The sentence-final particles (“SFPs”) in Chinese have attracted a lot of attention in the literature in the study of the clausal periphery. The frequently used Mandarin SFPs are approximately six. To accommodate these six SFPs, Tang (2010) proposes 4 functional heads whereas Paul (2014) and Pan and Paul (2014) propose 3. Considering the dialects that have a rich system of SFPs like Cantonese, in which there are more than forty SFPs, the syntax of the clausal periphery definitely needs to be enriched. To accommodate these forty Cantonese SFPs, Tang (2015) proposes 5 functional heads and Sybesma and Li (2007) even propose 10. In this paper, a unified cartographic analysis of SFPs in both Mandarin and Cantonese is proposed. Assuming that SFPs are classified into the inner type and the outer type (Tang 1998), it is argued that the inner SFPs are in the propositional layer CP associated with the proposition whereas the outer SFPs are in the clausal periphery beyond CP associated with the speech act that can further be decomposed into two layers, namely the grounding layer and the responding layer (cf. Wiltschko and Heim 2016). Mandarin and Cantonese should have the same hierarchical structure of the clausal periphery although they differ in the number of SFPs. A unified fine grained structure of SFPs is proposed for both Mandarin and Cantonese, which I hope may be extended to other Chinese dialects as well as other languages, shedding light on the dialectal grammar in Chinese and the syntax of speech act cross-linguistically.
Proposing the syntax of Cantonese particles on a universal spine

John Wakefield (Hong Kong Baptist University)

This paper adopts a modified version of Rizzi’s (2001) proposal for the structure of the left periphery, changing it from (1a) to (1b):

(1) a. Force > (*Top) > Inter > (*Top) > Foc > (*Top) > Fin > TP
   b. SAS > SAH > Force > (*Top) > Inter > (*Top) > Foc > (*Top) > Deik > Fin > TP

Three functional projections have been added. Two of these are speech act phrases (SAP) that lie above ForceP (cf. Haegeman & Hill 2013; Haegeman 2014)—the higher one is speaker oriented (SAPs), and the lower one is hearer oriented (SAPh). The third projection added is a diectic phrase (DeikP) directly above FinP (cf. Sybesma & Li 2007).

I will propose how the various types of Cantonese particles fit onto this hypothesized universal structure. To this end, a distinction is made between an interrogative and a question; the former is strictly a syntactic category while the latter is a speech act with semantic content. Kwok (1984: 86-7) said that the Cantonese question particles aa4 and me1 (pg. 86-7) are not semantically neutral and likened them to intonation questions, which imply some belief about the proposition. This relates to Gunlogson (2003: 5), who referred to English intonation questions as rising declaratives (i.e. not interrogatives) and argued that they “express a bias that is absent with the use of interrogatives; they cannot be used as neutral questions.” The following examples from Hirst (1983: 176) further support the view that rising declaratives are not interrogatives.

(2) a. Did he buy something?
   b. Did he buy anything?

(3) a. He bought something.
   b. *He bought anything.

(4) a. He bought something?
   b. *He bought anything?

The question marks in (4a-b) represent rising intonation. The two ungrammatical sentences in (3b) and (4b) pair together because the rising intonation of (4a-b) does not
change those declarative sentences into interrogatives.

Based on these arguments, rising tone questions in both English and Cantonese are analyzed as declarative clauses so long as they are not otherwise marked as interrogatives. *Me1- and aa4-suffixed questions are likewise assumed to be declaratives based on the assumption that these question particles are equivalent to rising tones both functionally and semantically (cf. Wakefield 2014). Tang (2006) supported this conclusion by comparing *me1 to the Cantonese rising question tone and arguing that both *me1 and this rising tone occupy the same syntactic slot. Such an analysis contrasts with other authors (e.g. Law 2004; Sybesma & Lee 2007) who did not appear to distinguish questions from interogatives (i.e., making no distinction between [+Q] and [+Inter]), and therefore placed *me1 and aa4 together with *maa3 in ForceP, based on the assumption that they all have the feature [+Q] and type the clause as an interrogative.

I propose the structure shown below in (5). For polar interrogatives, InterP is headed by *maa3, which has the feature [+Inter]. Question particles, such as *me1, aa4, ne1, etc. are assumed to head SAP_{H}, along with the majority of what have traditionally been referred to as sentence-final particles (SFP_{S}). SAP_{S} is assumed to be headed by sentence-initial particles that can potentially function as interjections (cf. Tang 2011; Haegeman 2014), plus particles such as mirative *mat1. Lower phrases raise to the SPEC positions of higher projections for purposes of interpretation, resulting in a sentence-final word order, but no projections raise to SPEC of SAP_{S}, as SAP_{S} particles always appear sentence initially.

(5)
References:
How syntactic can Cantonese interjections be?
Tommi Leung (United Arab Emirates University)

Main claim: We propose that Cantonese interjections are syntactic objects which lie on the leftmost fringe of syntactic structure, and can be described by postulating various functional projections within the interjection field at the syntax-pragmatic/discourse interface.

Details: Interjections are widely considered as peripheral to language (Leech, Deuchar, and Hoogenraad 1982; Quirk et al. 1985). Syntacticians are not keen on analyzing interjections (e.g. oh, gosh, wow, etc) as syntactic objects given their phonological anomalies, heterogeneous class of pragmatic functions, and independence at the sentence/discourse level. Though syntacticians consider interjections as closed class items and deserve more serious analyzes (Carnie 2013; Corver 2015). Chomsky (2008) explicitly claimed that interjections lack an edge feature. The ancillary role of interjection extends to Cantonese as a ‘particle-rich’ language (Matthews and Yip 2011; Tang 2015, 2018), a claim which we argue against. We start from Ameka's (1992a, 1992b, 1999) proposal that interjections can be primary and secondary. Primary interjections (PIs) are utterances themselves and do not combine with other word classes, whereas secondary interjections (SIs) have a lexical meaning and sometimes a morphological/syntactic structure. PIs can be expressive (indicative of the speaker's mental state) (1), conative (demanding the auditor's reaction/response) (2), and phatic (establishment and maintenance of communicative contact) (3). All these functions can be expressed by a segment or a syllable (see figure 1 for a shortlist):

(1)a. tst, gam caa gaa! (segmental)
   TST that bad PRT [impatient]
   b. wa3, hou saiei wo! (syllabic)
   WAA very incredible SFP [surprised]

(2)a. sh, mhou cou laa! (segmental)
   SH don’t noisy PRT [request]
   b. wai2, a-ming aa? (syllabic)
   WAI Ah-Ming SFP [telephone greeting]

(3)a. m4, ngo ming laa. (segmental)
   M I understand SFP [new understanding]
   b. laa4, haidou lo! (syllabic)
Cantonese interjections can also express modality, e.g. mat1 and gam2 (cf. Tang 2008):

(4)a. **mat1** keoi lei me?
    MAT  he    come  SFP  [surprised]
    ‘(Surprised) If I come, you will leave?’

b. **gam2** nei jau lei?
    GAM  you    also    come    [doubt]
    ‘If I come you will leave?’

We claim that Cantonese interjections are syntactic objects and moreover differ from sentence-final particles. First, interjections can be crossed over by other constituents, while SFPs cannot be (5):

(5)a. **<tst>**, tiu mantai, **<tst>**, gam dou m sik? **<tst>**
    CL question that also not know if I FP
    ‘(Impatient) This question, (you) don’t understand?’

b. **<mat>** jyugwo ngo lai, **<mat>** nei wui zau me? **<mat>**
    if I come you will leave SFP
    ‘(Surprised) If I come, you will leave?’

Second, interjections follow a strict linear order (6):

(6)a. **tsp**, taizyu, haumin jau jan aa! (*taizyu>tsp)[expressive>conative]
    watch out back have people SFP
    ‘(Impatient) Watch out! There are people on your back!’

b. **sh**, **hou**, **gam** daaigaa zung jau mou mantai aa? (*hou>sh>gam)
    [conative>phatic>modal]
    everyone still have not question SFP ‘(request for silence) anyone has questions?’

Third, interjections are positioned higher than exclamatives and left-dislocation (7):

(7)a. **<gei leng>waa**, **<gei leng>** tai-haa keoi tiu kwan **<gei leng>**!
    how beautiful see-asp she CL dress
    ‘(Surprised) See how beautiful her dress is!’

b. **<gei joengseoi>ce**, **<gei joengseoi>** tai-haa keoi **<gei joengseoi>**!
    how disgusting see-asp he
    ‘(Contempt) See how disgusting he is!’
Lastly, if interjections become sentence-final, they always follow SFPs (8):

\[(8)a. \text{keoi sengjat lam-maai di seoije gaa mat!/mat gaa!}\\He\text{ always think-asp CL bad.stuff SFP}\\'(Surprised) He always thinks of bad stuffs!'\]

\[b. \text{Ngo tingjat heoi wan keoi lo gam!/gam lo!}\\I\text{ tomorrow go find he SFP}\\'(Vocative) I will go to find him tomorrow.'\]

Generalizing over these facts, it seems plausible to postulate interjections as constituting a grammatical field which interfaces with the discourse. Adopting the functional hierarchy (Cinque 1999), such field consists (at least) of a fixed order of functional projections, i.e. INT\text{expressive}, INT\text{conative}, INT\text{phatic} and INT\text{modal}.

**Figure 1**

**Expressive interjection**
- Emotive: waa (surprise), coi (disgust), ch/ce (contempt), ji (disgust), haa (surprise), ch (despair), s↓ (pain)
- Cognitive: tsk/tsk-tsk-tsk (contempt), tsp (impatient)

**Conative interjection**
- sh (request for silence), wai (seeking attention), taizyu (seeking attention), mgoi (asking for favor)

**Phatic interjection**
- h (receiving information with surprise), wai (phone greeting), mgoi ‘thank you’ (starting a conversation), mhoujisi (starting a conversation), m (approval), o5 (new understanding), m/o6 (receiving an order), mat (surprised), gam (indexical question)
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How syntactic can Cantonese interjections be? We propose that Cantonese interjections are syntactic objects which lie on the leftmost fringe of syntactic structure, and can be described by postulating various functional projections within the interjection field at the syntax-pragmatic/discourse level. Though syntacticians consider interjections as closed class items and deserve more serious analyzes (Carnie 2013; Corver 2015). Chomsky (2008) explicitly claimed that interjections lack an edge feature. The ancillary role of interjection items and deserve more serious analyzes (Carnie 2013; Corver 2015). Chomsky (2008) extends to Cantonese as a 'particle-rich' language (Matthews and Yip 2011; Tang 2015, 2018), a claim which we argue against. We start from Ameka’s (1992a, 1992b, 1999) analysis that interjections are peripheral to language (Leech, Deuchar, and Hoogenraad 1982) and lack an edge feature. They do not participate in the minimalutterances themselves and do not combine with other word classes, whereas secondary interjections (e.g. oh, gosh, wow) do combine with other word classes.


Ex-situ wh—phrases in Cantonese  
Cindy Wan Yee Lau (Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Introduction: Cantonese is a wh-in-situ language in which a wh-phrase remains in the canonical position. However, some studies have found that wh-phrases may also appear in a sentence-initial position, which they call the ‘Wh-fronting construction’ (Cheung 2010, 2012, 2015; Matthews & Yip 2011). Cheung (2010, 2012, 2015) suggested that the fronted wh-phrase is derived by movement from its canonical position and is optionally preceded by a copula hai6 ‘be’ to form a cleft construction. Matthews & Yip (2011) described that the fronted wh-phrase must be D(iscourse)-linked and usually contains bin ‘which’, see (1) as an example.

Objectives and Main Arguments: This paper investigates ex-situ wh-phrase lying in the TP external position. First, I argue that an ex-situ wh-phrase can be analyzed as a topic which can be further divided into movement derived or base-generated topic. Evidence comes from (i) insertion of topic marker (2); (ii) resumption (3) and (iii) violation of island constraint in stable contexts (4); Second, the copula hai6 ‘be’ is not optional. A question of ex-situ wh-phrase preceded by hai ‘be’ only allows a unique answer, while the one without hai6 ‘be’ allows list answer (5) & (6). Thus, I suggest that an ex-situ wh-phrase is a wh-Topic if it is not preceded by the copula hai6 ‘be’, otherwise, it is a wh-Focus.

Method: A grammaticality judgment task adopting 5-point scale (5 = very acceptable; 1 = totally unacceptable) was conducted with 38 native Cantonese speakers (N = 38; Male = 21; Female = 17, aging from 15 to 35) on 28 questions of seven ex-situ wh-phrases including bin1-classifier ‘which’, bin1go3 ‘who’, bin1dou6 ‘where’, mat1je5 ‘what’, dim2joeng2 ‘how’, dim2gaai2 ‘why’ and gei2si4 ‘when’, and 12 fillers (28 ex-situ wh-questions + 12 fillers = 40 questions). Two factors were tested: (i) with/ without the copula hai6 ‘be’; (ii) with/ without context provided.

Result: (I) The average score of accepting an ex-situ wh-question preceded by hai6 ‘(be)’ or not has shown a significant difference (for example the score of ex-situ bin1dou6 ‘where’-question is 3.605 (acceptable) while the one preceded by hai6 ‘be’ is 2.868 (unacceptable) See Table 2 & 4). This suggests that ex-situ wh-phrases preceded by hai6 ‘be’ are tended to be unacceptable by native speakers. (II) An ex-situ wh-phrase is not necessarily to be discourse-related. In the grammaticality judgment task, participants were asked to score on their acceptability on questions of ex-situ wh-phrases with and without context provided. Even though the acceptability increases for wh-Focus with context provided (Table 3 & 4), similar results are drawn for wh-Topic with and without context provided (Table 1 & 2). The result of this study may shed light on investigation of
ex-situ *wh*-phrase and also left periphery in Cantonese and other languages.

1. (Hai6) bin1 gaa3 paau2ce1, nei5 gok3dak1 zeoi3 jing4 aa3? (Matthews & Yip 2011)
   is which CL run-car you think most cool SFP
   ‘Which sports car is it that you find most stylish?’
2. Bin1 go3 gwok3 gaa3 **ne1**, syu2gaa3 zeoi3 do1 jan4 heoi3 gaa3?
   which CL country Top° summer-holiday most many person go SFP
   ‘Which country (is the one that) many people go there during summer holiday?’
3. [Bin1 go3 ming4sing1], nei5 zeoi3 soeng2 tung4 **keoi5**, jing2 soeng2 aa3?
   which CL celebrity you most want with **him/her** shoot photo SFP
   ‘Which celebrity x is (is the one that) you want to take pictures with **him/her**, most?’
4. [Bin1 tou3 hei3], [[tai2gwo3 ti] ge3 jan4] m4 do1?
   which CL film watch-Perf LP person NEG many
   ‘Which film x is the one that [the people who had watched x] were not many?’
5. Q: **Hai6** mat1je5 sung3 nei5 maa5zo2?
   is what food you buy-ASP
   ‘What food was it that you bought?’

A1: Gai1.
   chicken
   ‘Chicken’
A2: ‘Hai6 gai1 hai6 jyu4 tim1.
   is chicken is fish SFP
   ‘It was chicken. It was fish, too.’

6. Q: Bin1 bun2 syu1, ming4zai2 tai2gwo3?
   which CL book Ming read-Exp
   ‘Which book, Ming has read (it)´?

A: Siu2wong4zi2 lou5fu1zi2 tung4maai4 hoi2kaak3wong4.
The Little Prince Old Master Q and One-piece
   ‘(He had read) Little Prince, Old Master Q and One-piece.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (with context)</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Topic (without context)</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>1.736842</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>2.105263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>3.710526</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>3.605263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>3.815789</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>3.657895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>2.289474</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>2.368421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>3.578947</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>3.289474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td>4.131579</td>
<td>why</td>
<td>4.078947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td>2.026316</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>2.105263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A devil of a question in Cantonese
Michael Barrie (Sogang University)

Nutshell: I examine wh-expressions in Cantonese with negative attitudes (what-the-hell, etc., hereafter WTH questions). WTH questions in Cantonese differ significantly from their counterparts in both English and in Mandarin. Cantonese WTH questions require a single answer, making them incompatible with multiple-wh-questions, which require a pair-list answer. A solution involving an iota operator within Hamblin semantics is suggested.

Background: Many languages possess some form of modifying wh-expressions to encode a strong negative attitude, akin to English what the hell versus simple what, (1). Mandarin possesses an analytic version of this construction in which the element that expresses the strong negative attitude (glossed as THE.HELL) appears in a left-peripheral position, (2) (Huang and Ochi, 2004; Chou, 2012). A Cantonese example is shown in (3) in which gwai (lit. 'devil') is infixed to the wh-word to give rise to this meaning.

(1) a. What the hell did you buy tǐ?
    b. *What did you buy tǐ the hell?

(2) Ta daodi xihuan shenme?
    he THE.HELL like what 'What the hell does he like?'

(3) a. Keoi sik zo matye a?
    he eat PERF what SFP 'What did he eat?'
    b. Keoi sik zo mat<gwai>ye a?
    he eat PERF <THE.HELL>what SFP 'What the hell did he eat?'

Properties: WTH questions in Cantonese are not available in multiple-wh-questions, unlike English, (4). Cantonese is also unlike Mandarin and English in that the THE.HELL morpheme does not obligatorily appear in the left periphery. Compare the English translations in (4).

(4) a. *Bingo sik-zo mat<gwai>ye a?
    who eat-PERF <THE.HELL>what SFP ("Who ate what the hell?")
Furthermore, like English, multiple-wh-questions require a pair-list answer. WTH questions in Cantonese, however, can only have a single answer (data not shown for lack of space).

**Discussion:** Speakers resist a pair-list answer with WTH questions in Cantonese since the THE.HELL morpheme requires a unique answer. I assume that the THE.HELL morpheme in Cantonese has an iota operator (in addition to the the negative attitude). Following Hamblin (1973), Hagstrom (1998) assumes that pair-list answers arise by subjecting the lower wh-phrase to a choice function, generating a set of sets of propositions. The iota operator cannot generate a unique entity if the choice function introduced by the multiple-wh-question forces a variety of possibilities.

**Summary:** In addition to describing the basic properties of WTH questions in Cantonese (which differ significantly from WTH questions in Mandarin), this paper proposes that the THE.HELL morpheme in Cantonese is an iota operator, making it incompatible with pair-list answers, hence incompatible with multiple-wh-questions.

**References:**


A double-headed analysis of the Chinese relative clause
Bahareh Samimi (Université de Genève) and Fuqiang Li (Beijing Language and Culture University, China)

The fact that the Chinese relative clause is prenominal is quite uncontroversial.

(1) Wo mai de shu
I buy DE book
‘the book I bought’

This image might suggest a right-adjunction analysis of the Chinese relative clause. However, the position of the Relative Clause (RC) with respect to other nominal modifiers casts doubt on the possibility of such an approach. Several authors such as Huang, Li, & Li (2009:381) observe the following positions occupied by the Chinese RC. They choose to exclude the unnatural occurrence of RC in the second position.

(RC) Demonstrative (?RC) Numeral+classifier (RC) Noun

With the Relative clause sandwiched between the Numeral and the Noun, right adjunction is no longer a plausible account. Adding the Adjective to the list of nominal modifiers in a survey conducted with eight Beijing consultants, we observed four word-order possibilities for the sentence in (2).


(2) Chuanzhe xizhuang de na liangwei shuaiqi-de xiansheng (qingguolai yixia)
Wear-Prog. suit DE that two-CL handsome sir (please come here)
‘Those two handsome men, who wear the suit, could you please come here?’

At this level, we aim to propose an analysis of the Chinese Relative Clause which is compatible on the one hand with all the positions that the Chinese RC occupies among Nominal Modifiers, and on the other hand with the position of RC in other languages. Cinque’s (2003, 2008, to appear) Double-Headed analysis of Relative Clauses takes the Relative Clause to be merged right below strong determiners (as per Milsarik 1977), followed by the external Head dP₁ which contains the Numeral, Adjective and the Noun¹. The internal Head dP₂ in the argument position of the verb of the RC contains the same three elements. The postnominal occurrence of RC in Chinese, as well as island sensitivity and reconstruction effects observed in this language result from extraction of the

¹ Head refers to the Head of the Relative Clause, independently of the notion of Head vs. Phrase.
internal dP₂ to a higher projection c-commanding and deleting the external dp₁, followed by further extraction of the emptied RC to an even higher projection (Cinque 2013:175). Dem is merged at the last step. Although this analysis allows for the Chinese RC to be studied within Cinque (2005) universal hierarchy of nominal modifiers, it has two drawbacks. Firstly, it fails to account for word orders other than Dem-RC-Num-A-N. Moreover, in order to extract dP₂ at the first step of the derivation, it resorts to “extraction out of a left branch”, an independently illegitimate movement.²

After detailing the drawbacks of Cinque’s analysis of Chinese RC, we put forth our model. Our account stays faithful to the double-headed model of Cinque (2008), as well as the universal hierarchy of Cinque (2005). However, it accounts for variable positions of RC by assuming the Merge of only one modifier in the position of dP₂ at a time. This modifier invariably moves to the SpecCP of the RC (whereby the island sensitivity), making of the whole RC a modifier of the external Head. When the internal dP₂ is an Adjective, RC is an adjectival modifier and appears in SpecAdjP on the external dP₁. This gives the word order Dem>Num>A-RC>N. Similarly, the order Dem>Num-RC>A>N surfaces when the Numeral is in SpecCP of the RC. Relative de is the realization of the head that hosts the whole RC in its specifier. The head na is analyzed as a determiner in Simpson (2002), presumably a weak one, in any case a head and not a phrase. It therefore cannot move to SpecCP of RC, rendering implausible the order Dem-RC>Num>A>N. In sum, the Chinese RC, as a modifier, is always prenominal. The ungrammaticality of a postnominal RC in Chinese follows automatically.

Diagrams: Fully detailed syntactic trees.
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² Thanks to Hagit Borer for mentioning this drawback.
0. Introduction: Cantonese (like most Sinitic languages) exhibits an atypical mismatch: a head-initial VP and a head-final NP. Under such circumstances, in relative clause (RC) the subject gap is linearly more remote from the head than the object gap, but structurally closer. This makes the language a very interesting ground to study subject/object asymmetries in distance dependencies. Furthermore, the strategies of relativization in Cantonese are diverse, with one even superficially isomorphic to a matrix clause. How do they derive? How does their distribution correlates with subject/object dependencies? This presentation aims at introducing some empirical observations based on a number of experiments and discussing the possible syntactic derivation of the three main constructions of RCs in Cantonese.

1. Empirical observation: A production study showed evidence for a structural distance-based processing: in an elicited production experiment targeting RCs with full-NPs arguments, an overwhelming subject preference was observed. Another clue for a structural distance-based processing is that intervention effects were also observed in object RCs in Cantonese: the dissimilarity of the features of arguments is known to facilitate the production of object RCs cross-linguistically in postnominal RCs (Friedmann, Belleti et Rizzi 2009). In a corpus study based on a TV series, where the features of arguments displayed various kinds of mismatches (e.g. (in)animacy, NP restriction, etc.), a significant object preference was observed. This means that object RCs are difficult and dispreferred in Cantonese only insofar the subject matches in features with the object gap. Crucially, this presupposes that the subject acts as an intervener even in prenominal RCs, even if it intervenes only structurally and not linearly. A second elicited production experiment with 4 different configurations of arguments confirmed the existence of this intervention effect.

Concerning the constructions of RCs, a correlation between the subject/object asymmetry and the type of construction was observed in the experiments and the corpus study: in the elicited experiments where subject RCs (including passivized ones) were predominant, a preference for the construction with demonstrative and classifier (1b) was observed; whereas in the corpus study where object RCs were favoured, a preference for the construction with the relativizer ge3 (1a) was observed. It is certainly possible that other factors might be held responsible for this difference between the corpus and the experiments, but this prima facie correlation does indeed encourage a syntactic analysis.
2. **Syntactic derivation of RCs:** Variation is one of the characteristics of RCs in Cantonese: six constructions were observed in our previous study, the two most common constructions being the one with relativizer ge3 (1a) and the one with demonstrative and classifier preceding the head noun (1b), a mix construction with both markers (1c) in the third place.

Concerning their syntactic derivation, whether RCs are derived by raising or matching is the subject of a long debate in the literature (Bianchi 2000, Borsley 1997, Chomsky 1965, 1977, Kayne 1994; Sportiche 2017). The key argument for the raising analysis (2b) is whether the head can be reconstructed inside the relative: if it originates inside the relative, as in the raising analysis, it should be able to do so. If not, this is negative evidence for the head being externally merged, (as in the matching analysis (2a). The various constructions of RCs in Cantonese will be carefully scrutinized as far as reconstruction is concerned: we shall test in particular whether idioms can hold between the head and some material inside the RC (5) and whether the different types of RCs exhibit any Condition C effect presupposing reconstruction (3-4). As far as constituency is concerned, we shall show that although all the relative markers in Cantonese are nominal, the relativizer ge3 sits within the relative clause, whereas demonstrative and classifier are external to it. Are they derived differently? What about the mix structure? These are the main issues we are going to discuss in the presentation.
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**Appendix:**

(1)a. construction with *ge3*

\[ [\text{RC} \text{ siu1fong4jyun4} \text{ ziu3-zyu6} \underline{____ ge3}] \text{ hung1ze2} \]

fire fighter light-ASP REL stewardess

‘(the) stewardess that the firefighter is lighting’

b. construction with demonstrative and classifier

\[ [\text{RC} \text{ siu1fong4jyun4} \text{ ziu3-zyu6} \underline{____} \text{ go2 go3 hung1ze2}] \]
fire fighter light-ASP Dem Cl stewardess
‘the stewardess (that) the firefighter is lighting’
c. construction with both
\[ \text{[RC siu1fong4jyun4 ziu3-zyu6 \_ \_ \_ ge3]} \ \text{go2 go3 hung1ze2} \]
fire fighter light-ASP REL Dem Cl stewardess
‘the stewardess that the firefighter is lighting’

(2)a. Matching: The \[ \text{[yp pictures of Picasso]} \ [XP he displays XP] \]
Match (YP, XP) Move (XP, XP) (p.6, Sportiche 2007)

b. Raising: The \[ \text{[yp pictures of Picasso]} \ [\text{[xp Op YP]} \ he displays XP] \]
Move (YP, YP) Move (XP, XP)

Relative clause under Condition C:

(3) \[ *[\text{RC keoi5i coeng3 \_ \_ k ge3]} \ /\text{go2 sau2 Zoeng1Hok6Jau5i ge3 go1k} \]
3SG sing REL Dem Cl Jacky Cheung GEN.'s song
‘the song of Jacky Cheung that he sings’ (Jacky Cheung = he)
→ reconstruction effect in both constructions

(4) \[ [\text{RC Zoeng1Hok6Jau5i coeng3 \_ \_ k ge3]} \ /\text{go2 sau2 keoi5i ge3 go1k} \]
Jacky Cheung sing REL Dem Cl 3SG GEN.'s song
‘the song that Jacky Cheung sings’ (Jacky Cheung = he)
→ reconstruction effect in both construction

Relative clause with an idiom:

(5) \[ [\text{RC May dik-gwo \_ \_ ge3]} \ / \ ? \text{go2 di1 ngaan5geng2} \]
May drop-ASP REL Dem Cl.pl glasses
Literally: ‘the glasses that May has dropped’ (‘drop glasses’ means to be disillusioned)
‘the disillusions that May has had’
→ reconstruction only with \text{ge3} construction.
A Cantonese perspective on the head and the tail of the structure of the verbal domain

Rint Sybesma (Leiden University Centre for Linguistics and Leiden Institute for Area Studies)

Over the past years I have been developing ideas on the structure of the verbal spine in Sinitic, informed by work on varieties of Mandarin, Xiang and Wu. In this paper I continue this project by including Cantonese, with special attention to the top of the structure as well as its tail. With respect to the top, I entertain the hypothesis that in Cantonese, Voice and v are always bundled, and go over a number of predictions that follow from this hypothesis. As to the tail, the realization that Cantonese is quite consistent in structurally distinguishing change of state resultative from change of location resultatives, much more so than Mandarin, leads to a more elaborated structure for the different types of resultatives, both for Cantonese and Mandarin. Mandarin seems to “functionalize” things more than Cantonese, with the result that more is taken care of in the inner aspectual domain in the former than in the latter.
Verb-stranding Ellipsis: evidence from Cantonese
Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng (Leiden University)

Landau (2018) argues that object gaps in Hebrew are not results of Verb-stranding VP Ellipsis. He further suggests that X-stranding XP-ellipsis is very limited cross-linguistically. In this talk, I examine data from Cantonese, putting forth new arguments for Verb-stranding ellipsis, and discussing what it means for Landau’s theory. I consider both VP ellipsis and verbal echo answers. After establishing that there is verb-stranding ellipsis in Cantonese, I discuss how verb-stranding ellipsis can be realized if the verb does not move out of the verb phrase. In the case of verbal echo answers, I consider further what verbal answers to polarity questions tell us about different polarity questions in Cantonese.
Morpho-syntax of non-VO separable compound verbs in Cantonese
Sheila S.L. Chan and Lawrence Cheung (both Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Past studies on Separable Compound Verbs (SCVs 離合詞) in Chinese focus on the lexical vs phrasal status of Verb-Object (VO) compounds, e.g. jié-le-hūn 結了婚 ‘got married’ and xī -guō-zōo 洗過澡 ‘took a bath’. This study investigates the lesser-studied morpho-syntax of non-VO SCVs in Cantonese. Unlike Huang’s (1984) phrasal analysis of VO SCVs, we argue that non-VO SCVs are underlyingly lexical verbs and their phrasal properties are due to lexical category coercion.

Background: Since Chao (1968), it is well-known that VO SCVs seem to display the dual status of being lexical and phrasal. Many SCVs are semantically non-compositional and are considered lexical verbs. Nevertheless, V and O can be manipulated syntactically and separated. For example, elements like aspect markers can occur between V and O; O can be topicalized. Huang (1984) also notes that like regular V and O, SCVs are also subject to Phrase Structure Condition (PSC), which states that a verb in Chinese can be followed by at most one constituent. However, there are conflicting views about whether VO SCVs are lexical or phrasal underlingly (Chao, 1968; Huang, 1984; Packard, 2000). That VO compounds are always separable makes it harder to tell which form is primary and which one derived. Interestingly, Cantonese allows a subset of non-VO compounds to be separable (e.g. dei6-gwo3-zan3 地過震 ‘had earthquake’ and daai6-zo2-tou5 大咗肚 ‘became pregnant’). Though non-VO SCVs were mentioned in past studies, they said little about how they should be analyzed and how they shed light to VO SCVs.

Research questions: How are non-VO SCVs compared with VO SCVs morpho-syntactically in Cantonese? Why are some non-VO compounds separable? Are Cantonese non-VO SCVs underlingly lexical or phrasal?

Analysis: 445 compounds verbs are examined, in which five non-VO morphological structures, namely, Verb-Complement (VR), Subject-Predicate (SP), Coordinative (CO), Subordinative (SB) and Unclassified (UN) are included and subject to seven tests sensitive to VO verbs as shown in Table 1. We found that only 28.5% of the non-VO compounds are separable. Unlike VO SCVs, Cantonese non-VO SCVs show much variation with respect to the diagnostics for separability. For example, VR SCVs generally cannot accept the insertion of aspect markers unlike SP/CO/SB/UN SCVs; VR/SP SCVs do not admit an intervening frequency phrase but the others can. We argue that the superficially messy results can be explained to a significant degree by coercively
reinterpreting a compound's first morpheme as a predicate and final morpheme as an object. This explains why though VR/SP SCVs can admit aspect or modal markers, they disallow an intervening frequency phrase (*放咗一次鬆; *日本地過兩次震) or topicalization (*鬆，已經放咗; *震，日本地過) because both final morphemes are hard to be reinterpreted as a noun-like morpheme. In contrast, examples of CO/SB SCVs such as jing2jan3 影印 ‘photocopy’ and daai6tou5 大肚 ‘pregnant’ can allow an intervening frequency phrase (影幾次印’photocopied a few times’) or even topicalization (肚，佢都大過 ‘she has been pregnant’). jing2/daai6 is or can be reinterpreted as a verb and jan3/tou5 can be or is originally a noun, which make them easier to be reanalyzed as VO compounds. If the analysis is correct, the findings suggest that non-VO SCVs are underlyingly lexical because not all non-VO compounds can have a phrasal counterpart. The phrasal properties are derived due to reanalysis of the relationship between the two morphemes.

Selected References:
Main claims: This study argues for a syntactic analysis of the V-one-V construction, as opposed to morphological treatments often prescribed to reduplicative constructions. The V-one-V construction in (1), in which the verb is preceded by jat1 ‘one’ and a duplant of the verb, is only compatible with perfect aspects zo2 or gwo3 but not imperfective/progressive aspect gan2.

```
(1) keoi5 tai2 {zo2 / gwo3 / *gan2} jat1 tai2 go2 zoeng1 soeng2
```

3sg look Perf Exp Prog one look that CL photo

‘S/he has taken a look at that photo.’ / Intended: ‘She is taking a look at that photo.’

The inclusion of an object ‘that photo’ shows that example (1) should not be analyzed on a pair with the cognate object construction (Hale & Keyser, 1993), since the reduplicated verb cannot come from the object in V-one-V. Given that the same construction allows only jat1 ‘one’, loeng5 ‘two’ or gei2 ‘several’, I propose that the numeral is not always interpreted literally and the V-one-V construction should best be analyzed as a layer of aspect in additional to grammatical and lexical aspects.

Semantically, V-one-V typically denotes brief occurrence of an event, similar to Mandarin (Arcodia, Basciano & Melloni, 2015). This explains how V-one-V is compatible with dynamic predicates: V-one-V is acceptable with activities (e.g. tai2 jat1 tai2 ‘to take a brief look’), achievements (e.g. bou3 jat1 bou3dou3 ‘to quickly sign in’) and accomplishments (e.g. tai2 jat1 tai2 go2 bun2 siu2syut3 ‘to read a little bit of the novel’) are acceptable. Expectedly, static predicates like *ming4 jat1 ming4 Intended: ‘to understand for a short while’ is not acceptable, due to the non-dynamic nature of the predicate ming4 ‘understand’.

Figure 1 adopts Ramchand (2008)’s decomposed verbal predicate structure for V-one-V in Cantonese, assuming measure phrases to occupy the specifier of VP (Corver, 2009). Given that V-one-V allows dynamic VPs that are telic or atelic, I argue that the verb in V-one-V is first base-generated at the head of the procP, then moves to init0 (which plays a similar role to the little-v), and further undergoes copying to the head of Asp0 (cf. Nunes, 1995).

Implications: First, the syntactic approach to V-one-V reduplication helps explain its combination with aspect markers and which markers may co-occur. This approach bear more explanatory power than morphology alone and may be extended to other types of productive reduplications. Second, this analysis also explains the compositional nature of V-one-V reduplication. The delimitation meaning is a direct consequence of the quantifying terms jat1 ‘one’, loeng5 ‘two’ or gei2 ‘several’. The terms loeng5 and gei2 may also
be considered delimitation, as they are often interpreted as ‘few’ in daily conversations. Lastly, given the present analysis, the fact that V-one-V resists postverbal modification of frequency (e.g. jat1 ci3 lit: ‘one time’ or jat1 haa5 lit: ‘one stroke’) can also be explained in terms of its delimitation/counting of the number of events via the measure phrase jat1 in V-one-V. This cannot be otherwise explained if all V-one-V constructions simply denote delimitation of the temporal span of a single event.
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Some aspect & related markings in Nanning Cantonese & Nanning Pinghua

Hilario de Sousa (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics)

Since the First Opium War in the middle of the nineteenth century, there have been massive waves of Cantonese migrants moving away from the core of the Pearl River Delta. Many Cantonese-speaking enclaves now exist in Far Southern China and overseas. These enclave Cantonese varieties, while still recognisably Cantonese phonologically, diverged from Standard Cantonese as spoken in the core of the Pearl River Delta to different levels, and in different ways. In this talk we will look at some grammaticalised aspectual and modal markings in one such enclave Cantonese variety: Nanning Cantonese. We will compare and contrast some of these markers in Nanning Cantonese with those in Standard Cantonese on one hand, and those in Nanning Pinghua, the oldest Sinitic variety in the Nanning area, on the other hand.

One curious case is with the posterior and prospective markings (cf., e.g., Chen & Saillard 2011 for Mandarin, Jendraschek 2014 for Basque, Turkish, and latmul, Schroeder 2011 for English ‘be going to’). For instance, in Nanning Pinghua, there are no grammaticalised means for expressing posteriority (the modal ‘will’); in contrast to 会 wui\textsuperscript{33} ‘will’ in Cantonese, 會 ho\textsuperscript{22} in Nanning Pinghua only has the deontic modal meaning (i.e. the ‘ability’ meaning of ‘can’). There is simply no grammatical means of expressing, e.g., ‘I will do it’ in Nanning Pinghua. As for prospectivity (‘is about to’), Nanning Pinghua has a grammaticalised marker 要 iu\textsuperscript{55} similar to Mandarin 要 yào.

Standard Cantonese has no (or has recently lost?) grammaticalised prospective marker, but Nanning Cantonese has a prospective marker in the form of 想 fœn\textsuperscript{25}. This usage in Nanning Cantonese can sound odd to speakers of Standard Cantonese, as 想 soen\textsuperscript{25} in Standard Cantonese only has the lexical meaning of ‘to want to’, while in Nanning Cantonese, 想 fœn\textsuperscript{25}, as a proceptive marker, is often used for inanimate or involuntary situations, e.g. 天想落雨 t'in fœn\textsuperscript{25} bk\textsuperscript{2} jy\textsuperscript{13} (sky PROS drop rain) ‘it is about to rain’ (which sounds like ‘the sky desires to rain’ in Standard Cantonese). In this talk we will discuss the semantic and grammatical differences between the posterior and prospective markers, and how they relate to other similar grammatical markings.
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The two types of post-verbal can1 in Cantonese
Joanna Ut-Seong Sio (Palacký University, the Czech Republic)

This paper discusses the syntactic and semantic properties of the Cantonese verbal particle can1, which has two different senses, ‘adversative’ and ‘habitual’, as shown in (1) and (2) (Matthews and Yip 2011).

Adversative can1: Gu and Yip (2004) observe that the adversative can1 provides a non-specific result and V-can1 predicates behave like achievements. Sio (2015), adopting Beavers’ (2011, 2013) affectedness hierarchy, observes that the adversative can1 is only compatible with dynamic verbs indicating a non-quantized change (e.g. cut) and potential for change (e.g. hit). Change is inherently a relationship between three entities: the event, a scale that defines the change, and a theme that undergoes it, and can be analyzed as some theme transitioning to a new value along a separate property scale (Hay, Kennedy and Levin 1999). An example is given in (3). In the case of the adversative can1, the affected verb has an ‘injury’ scale. We suggest that the so-called non-specific result for can1 means can1 can point to anywhere in that scale.

Habitual can1: The habitual can1 can appear in habitual sentences (4,5) and conditional sentences (6), but not episodic sentences. The habitual can1 is lexically deficient. It has to appear either with dou1 ‘all’ or zau6 ‘then’. (4) but not (5) is compatible with caa1m4do1 ‘almost’, which requires a collective reading (Giannakidou and Cheng 2006). There is a semantically identical variant of (4) and (5) where can1, instead of appearing in the post-verbal position, appear with fung4 ‘encounter/come upon’ (fung4 can1 ‘whenever/every time’) between the subject and the verb, suggesting that can1 might have higher scope. The distribution restriction and interpretation of the habitual can1 suggest that it could be analyzed a free choice item (FCI), à la Giannakidou and Cheng (2006).
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The two types of post-verbal *can1* in Cantonese

Joanna Ut-Seong Sio (Palacký University, the Czech Republic)

This paper discusses the syntactic and semantic properties of the Cantonese verbal particle *can1*, which has two different senses, 'adversative' and 'habitual', as shown in (1) and (2) (Matthews and Yip 2011).

**Adversative can1:**

Gu and Yip (2004) observe that the adversative *can1* provides a non-specific result and V-*can1* predicates behave like achievements. Sio (2015), adopting Beavers' (2011, 2013) affectedness hierarchy, observes that the adversative *can1* is only compatible with dynamic verbs indicating a non-quantized change (e.g. *cut*) and potential for change (e.g. *hit*). Change is inherently a relationship between three entities: the event, a scale that defines the change, and a theme that undergoes it, and can be analyzed as some theme transitioning to a new value along a separate property scale (Hay, Kennedy and Levin 1999). An example is given in (3). In the case of the adversative *can1*, the affected verb has an 'injury' scale. We suggest that the so-called non-specific result for *can1* means *can1* can point to anywhere in that scale.

**Habitual can1:**

The habitual *can1* can appear in habitual sentences (4,5) and conditional sentences (6), but not episodic sentences. The habitual *can1* is lexically deficient. It has to appear either with *dou1* 'all' or *zau6* 'then'. (4) but not (5) is compatible with *caa1 m4 do1* 'almost', which requires a collective reading (Giannakidou and Cheng 2006). There is a semantically identical variant of (4) and (5) where *can1*, instead of appearing in the post-verbal position, appear with *fung4* 'encounter/come upon' (*fung4 can1* 'whenever/every time') between the subject and the verb, suggesting that *can1* might have higher scope. The distribution restriction and interpretation of the habitual *can1* suggest that it could be analyzed a free choice item (FCI), à la Giannakidou and Cheng (2006).
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(1) 我撞親隻貓呀

*Ngo5 zong6-can1 zek3 maau1 aa3* (adversative)

1SG bump.into-CAN CL cat SFP

'I bumped into the cat (and as a result the cat was mildly hurt).'

(2) 佢唱親歌都喚嚟

*Keoi5 coeng3-can1 go1 dou1 ham3 gaa3* (habitual)

3SG sing-CAN song DOU cry SFP

'S/He cries whenever s/he sings.'

(3) John scrubbed the bathtub clean.

$e$ss [scrubbing’ (j, b, s, e) - result’ (s, clean, e) (s is a cleanliness scale of the bathtub)

(4) 我（差唔多）食親芒果都肚痛嘅

*Ngo5 (caa1 m4 do1) sik6-can1 mong1gwo2 dou1 tou5-tung3 gaa3* (almost)

1SG almost eat-CAN mango DOU stomach-hurt SFP

'(Almost) Every time I eat mango, my stomach hurts.'

(5) 我(*差唔多)食親芒果就肚痛喺

*Ngo5 (*caa1 m4 do1) sik6-can1 mong1gwo2 zau6 tou5-tung3 gaa3 laa3* (almost)

1SG almost eat-CAN mango then stomach-hurt SFP

'S/He cries whenever s/he sings.'

(6) 喺親都/就打

*Juk1-can1 dou1/zau6 daa2*

move-CAN DOU/then hit

'If you move, I will hit you.'
The verb-suffix \textit{saai3} in Cantonese behaves like a universal quantifier operating on the subject, the object or other constituents of the sentence, subject to a number of restrictions that have been studied by various scholars (Cheung 1972 [2007]; Mo 1993; Lee 1994, 1995, 2001; Tang 1996a, 1996b; Teng 1996; Auyeung 1998; Pan and Man 1998; P. Lee 2004, 2012; Wong 2008; Lei 2017). The list of logical properties that have been attributed to the verbal suffix include: (a) the DP quantified by \textit{saai3} must be plural and definite; (b) the verb or adjective that \textit{saai3} suffixes to must be non-stative and telic; (c) the suffix can only apply to internal arguments; (d) the association of \textit{saai3} with the subject is blocked by other logical operators such as negation and modals; (e) \textit{saai3} overlaps in meaning with verbal particles such as the perfective aspect marker \textit{zo2} or the verbal particle \textit{jyun4} ‘finish’; and (f) the quantifier is non-distributive. In view of its multi-faceted and often disputed properties, the exact nature of the suffix has been elusive, being analyzed as a nominal quantifier, an event quantifier, an aspectual element, a universal quantifier that operates on part structures, or a maximality operator.

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{Keoi tai saai go saam bun syu} \\
        s/he read all that three CL book \\
        “S/he read all the three books”
    \item \textit{Keoidei gaan saai zyugulik} \\
        they choose all chocolate \\
        “All of them chose chocolate”
    \item \textit{Wong Sir hai ni gei dou mun soengmin tip saai hoibou} \\
        Wong teacher at this several CL door above paste all poster \\
        “Teacher Wong put up posters on all these doors”
\end{itemize}

The last three decades of research have seen advances in our understanding of a wide range of phenomena in Chinese syntax and semantics: referentiality of numeral phrases and bare NPs; count/mass distinction and classifier; tense, finiteness and anchoring;
event types and Vendler categories; the unaccusative vs. unergative distinction; the nature of A-quantifiers; and the link between nominal and verbal quantification. We will demonstrate how these advances, in addition to language acquisition research and adult judgment test we have conducted, help clarify confounding factors in the analysis of saai3 and pave way for a more precise characterization of the verbal suffix, which behaves at a descriptive level like a selective universal A-quantifier which attaches to a [+V] category and operates on both nominals and predicates.
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