PREFACE

**STANCE PHENOMENA IN CHINESE:
DIACHRONIC, DISCOURSE AND PROCESSING PERSPECTIVES**

Foong Ha Yap and Caesar Suen Lun

As has often been noted in the literature, every utterance encodes a speaker's stance, and knowing how to recognize each intended stance is important for effective communication. A speaker's stance includes subjective expressions such as speaker's mood, attitude, assessment, and perspective, and is reflected at various levels (e.g. lexical, phrasal, and clausal, as noted for example in Xing 2006), as well as manifested through various morphosyntactic and pragmatic strategies. Previous works on 'stance'—note that other terms such as *mood* and *modality*, *mirativity* (surprise), *evidentiality*, *footing*, (self-)*positioning* vs. (other-)*attribution*, *perspectivization*, etc. have been used as well—have often focused on adverbials (e.g. intensifiers), epistemic modals, discourse markers, and sentence final particles.

Research on stance has greatly benefited from the contributions of scholars from many inter-related frameworks. For example, Langacker's cognitive model provides us with a schematic means of analyzing the relationship between ground (context), speaker perspective and subjectification (i.e. the lexical or grammatical marking of a speaker's stance). Traugott's semantic-pragmatic model helps to explain, from a diachronic perspective, how and why non-subjective referential and propositional constructions frequently develop into subjective (speaker-based) expressions, as well as intersubjective (socially and interactionally cued) expressions. Goffman's ethnographic framework on footing helps to shed light on interlocutor stance (in the sense of alignment) in face-to-face interactions. Sociolinguistic approaches dealing with 'insider vs. outsider' likewise address issues on speaker alignments—more specifically, in terms of proximal vs. distal affective stances (e.g. Suzuki 2006; Hasegawa 2006; Horie, Shimura & Pradeshi

2006). Other sociolinguistic approaches to stance, among them Clayman & Heritage's analysis of adversarial stance in political and media discourse, have also provided us with a clearer understanding of power relations and 'face and footing' in public and workplace domains. Somewhat lacking are stance studies using empirical approaches. While we now have begun to pay increasing attention to stance marking strategies in discourse, we have yet to see a significant increase in studies on the relationship between the morphosyntactic realizations of stance constructions and cognitive processing constraints.

In this special TJL issue on "Stance Phenomena in Chinese: Diachronic, Discourse and Processing Perspectives", we bring together six papers that shed light on speaker stance phenomena via different frameworks. The studies reported in all six papers use a combination of discourse and corpus data, and three of them include diachronic analyses. All adopt one or more of the frameworks noted above, except for the sixth paper (Kwan, this volume), which adopts a processing approach to examine the relationship between word order, structural complexity, phonological bulk and topicality. It is included within this special issue because it can help us better understand how processing factors influence speaker's decisions of which type of specifying information gets to be topicalized, with implications for what type of information is accorded the privilege of 'staging' (i.e. managing and focalizing) selective information for the attention of the addressee.

These six papers expand on earlier work on stance in Chinese, many of which have focused on sentence final particles. Representative works include descriptive studies such as Yau (1965), Kwok (1984) and Leung (1992), formal morphosyntactic analyses such as Law (1990), Z. Wu (2004) and Tang (2009), semantic and pragmatic analyses such as Chan (1996), Fung (2000) and Lu (2005), and discourse studies such as Luke (1990), Lee-Wong (1998), Li (1999), Yiu (2001), R. Wu (2004), Van den Berg & Wu (2006) and Lu & Su (2009).

There have also been efforts to trace the grammaticalization pathways that give rise to sentence final particles. Among the pathways identified are the 'say' verb pathway (Chiu 1994; Matthews 1998; Simpson & Wu 2002; Wang, Katz & Chen 2003; Yeung 2006; Leung 2006), the psych-verb pathway (Yap, Wang & Chor 2010), the negator *bu* pathway (Wang & Yap 2009), and the nominalizer pathway (Yap & Matthews 2008; Yap, Choi & Cheung 2010; Jiang 2010; Xu & Matthews in press; Yap & Wang in press), in addition to the clausal integration

pathway discussed in this special issue (Yap, Wang & Lam, this volume).

A number of recent studies on stance have also focused on discourse markers, particularly those found in clause-initial position as extensions of connective particles and stance adverbials, *a la* Schiffrin (1987) and Fischer (2005), among others (e.g. Wang & Tsai 2005; Wang, Tsai & Yang 2007; Wang, Tsai & Ling 2007). While studies on clause-medial particles have started to appear (Cai 2010; Chor 2010), those which examine clause-medial particles from the perspective of subjectivity and subjectification are still lacking. However, see Chor (this volume) for recent trends in grammaticalization studies that trace the extended uses of directional particles that develop into postverbal quantifiers (often with aspectual nuances), and further reinterpreted as attitudinal markers, among them Cantonese *maai* ('approach or come together') which often conveys negative speaker evaluation, and *faan* ('return') which tend instead to convey positive speaker evaluation (see Chor to appear). More work is needed that similarly provides a diachronic perspective to discourse studies to further enhance our understanding of how utterances in Chinese extend from non-subjective to subjective and intersubjective uses, *a la* Traugott (1995, 2003; see also Englebretson 2003, 2007).

Despite the wealth of research undertaken thus far, more work is still needed to investigate the diverse range of stance particles in Chinese; in particular, attention also need to be given to other stance strategies, including macro-level studies that look at footing and alignment among individuals, within and across age, gender and social class, as well as within/between institutions and nations. Stance positioning between those who govern and are governed is also becoming an increasingly important area of research, as modern nations grapple with issues of democratic governance and human rights. Likewise, issues related to territorial conflicts and competitions for natural, human and technological resources beg for more research into the discourse of diplomacy, mediation, negotiation, and rhetorics of war and peace. We are pleased to see that studies on stance in Chinese discourse have begun to blossom, with the papers in this volume representing a subset of the diversity of topics and frameworks we can expect from fellow scholars in the months and years to come. Below we briefly summarize these six papers and show their relation to stance phenomena and their relevance to meaningful communication and intercultural understanding.

The first paper—on "The meaning extension of *xiang* and its polysemy network" by Mei-hsiu Chen and Jung-hsing Chang—approaches stance from a cognitive perspective. Using a semasiological (form-to-function mapping) approach, Chen and Chang highlight two robust strategies in the development of stance, namely semantic extension and perspectivization. In terms of semantic extension, they show how a lexical noun *xiang* 向 meaning 'window facing north' in Old Chinese extends its usage from static spatial domains (e.g. 'something facing north') to dynamic spatial domains (e.g. 'something or someone moving toward a goal'), then to dynamic temporal domains (e.g. 'seasons approaching their appointed ends'), and further to psychological domains (e.g. 'some person(s) advocating for someone or some philosophy or course of action'). The latter development of *xiang* (i.e. its psychological use in the sense of 'advocate' or 'favor'), which prevails to this day, is an example of subjectification at the lexical level, where the speaker evaluates his own attitude or the attitude of others via lexical choice (see also Xing 2006). Chen and Chang also show, through the strategy of perspectivization, how *xiang* comes to express opposite meanings. More specifically, they show that as we change the speaker's vantage point, or footing *a la* Goffman, *xiang* can be used either as a goal marker ('to + NP') or as a source marker ('from + NP'), the former highlighting the progress of something or someone towards a goal or endpoint 'away from the speaker' (as viewed from the vantage point of the speaker situated at the starting point of an event schema), and the latter highlighting something or someone leaving a starting point and 'approaching the speaker' (as viewed instead from the vantage point of the speaker situated at the endpoint). It is important to note here that the perspectivization (or footing) discussed in relation to *xiang* need not involve strong subjective overtones in an evaluative or judgmental sense (for example, it is not always necessary to invoke a scale of values between 'good' and 'bad', or between 'positive' or 'negative'). Stance nevertheless is evident in the sense that the speaker's viewpoint comes to be explicitly encoded in utterances that involve the use of *xiang* as an adposition or case marker, and the addressee thus is able to deictically track the speaker's point of view in the course of their dyadic (or conversational) interaction.

The second paper, entitled "Inclusion of the outsider" by Winnie Chor, focuses on the grammaticalization of verbal particle *maai4* in Cantonese. Using diachronic data extending back over a period of about

200 years, Chor shows how directional verb *maai* ('to approach or get close to a reference point)' developed into an additive quantificational particle ('also, as well') as in *keoi5 maai5 maai4 go2 fuk1 waa2* '(S)he bought *maai4* that painting', often yielding an aspectual value associated with closure or completion of action ('to V *as well* some remaining entity'). Crucially, with respect to stance, Chor shows how *maai* further develops into a marker signaling the speaker's negative evaluation. Chor suggests that the perjorative uses of *maai4* emerges as an extension of the additive and completive pathway, where the perjorative sense associated with 'the remaining or residual elements of a category' gets included, and frequent assessments of these residual elements as 'second-rate', 'unexpected' and often 'unwanted' elements contributes to a negative interpretation, as illustrated in *keoi5 sik1 maai4 di1 gam2 ge3 pang4jau5* '(S)he got to know *maai4* such (terrible) friends'. Worth noting is that the presence of *maai* adds to the quantifier reading a perjorative sense such as 'friends she wasn't really supposed to know'. Chor's analysis of post-verbal particle *maai4* provides a much-needed semantic account of how subjectification arises in utterance-medial positions, and is interesting because it complements previous works on discourse markers and sentence final particles, which occupy utterance-initial and utterance-final positions respectively.

The third paper, on "Clausal integration in the emergence of mitigative and adhortative sentence final particles in Chinese" by Foong Ha Yap, Jiao Wang and Charles Tsz-Kwan Lam, likewise approaches the development of stance markers from a diachronic perspective. Recent studies on sentence final particles in Chinese such as Taiwanese *kong* and Mandarin *shuo* (derived from 'say' verbs; see Simpson & Wu 2002 and Lin 2005) argue that these speaker stance particles originate in the left periphery, and ends up at the right periphery via COMP-to-SPEC raising. In their paper on clausal integration, Yap et al. provide evidence of additional pathways for the derivation of sentence final mood particles, suggesting that at least some particles do not arise from the left periphery. Specifically, they show how evaluative 'terminal' clauses (i.e. final clauses that convey the speaker's mood, attitude, subjective assessments, personal viewpoints, etc.) often easily become integrated into the preceding clause. This phenomenon, in which two clauses merge into a single intonation unit, is not uncommon crosslinguistically, with many languages manifesting these compressed constructions as 'parenthetical' constructions (e.g. English *She missed three classes; no big deal, she'll*

*get a B instead of a B+, **that's all***). As Yap et al. show in their clausal integration paper, languages such as Chinese often grammaticalize these parenthetical constructions a step further by reanalyzing them as sentence final particles of the preceding clause (compare Chinese mitigative mood particle *er yi* in *ba ba bu xiang chi **er yi*** and its English equivalent *that's all* in 'Father doesn't like to eat, **that's all***'). Yap et al. argue that the high frequency of null subjects and lack of verbal inflections in Chinese facilitate the reanalysis of parenthetical stance constructions as sentence final mood particles in Chinese.

The fourth paper—"More than person deixis" by Zheng Song—traces the semantic extensions of pronominal *ya* (丫) in native and non-native Beijingers' talk from a sociolinguistic perspective using both production and perception data. Song shows that *ya*, originally derived from a lexical noun referring to 'a child of a humble maid servant', was initially recruited as a third person pronoun with derogratory meaning, but this later extended to second person in native Beijinger talk. Non-native speakers began to use it for first person reference as well. Interestingly, this non-native use of *ya* has also begun to spread among native Beijingers, largely as a consequence of its popularization on the internet. Song's analysis highlights however that there is still asymmetry in native and non-native usage, mainly as a result of differences in semantic sensitivity. For example, whereas native speakers can use first person *ya* only in self-mockery, and whereas their use of *ya* for second person and first person reference is 'affixal' in nature (i.e. *ni ya* 'you *ya*' and *wo ya* 'me *ya*' respectively, with *ya* never expressed in the stand-alone *ya* form), non-native speakers on the other hand use *ya* as a general pronoun in a wider range of syntactic environments—including, for example, third person *ta ya* '(s)he *ya*', a case of double marking which is indicative that *ya* is more semantically bleached in the mind of non-native speakers. Non-native speakers also allow word order reversal, yielding variants such as *ni ya* 'you *ya*' and *ya ni* '*ya* you' for second person reference. Non-native uses of *ya* also include the extension of stand-alone *ya* from third person to second person. What is interesting is that these extensions and shifts in referential deixis also allow for shifts in the speaker's footing or positioning. Indeed, these realignments in speaker stance facilitate the subjective uses of *ya* to extend from derogatory (negative) uses to solidarity (positive) uses as well, as when speakers refer to the addressee or even to themselves in a derogatory way as a means of marking

familiarity and in-group solidarity.

The fifth paper—entitled "Adversarial questioning and answering strategies in Chinese official press conferences" by Tingting Sun—adopts a macro discourse perspective to stance, shedding light on footing strategies among interlocutors in aggressive and sometimes hostile contexts. Following Clayman and Heritage (2002a, 2002b), Sun examines the strategies used by journalists and political figures, the former often exerting pressure with aggressive questions, while the latter frequently attempts instead to minimize potential damage from face-threatening questions and at the same time seeking ways to advance their political agendas. Sun's analysis allows for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison between American (foreign) and Chinese (local) questioning and answering patterns, which allows us to further investigate the relationship between stance-taking and cultural differences. A significant finding in Sun's study is that contemporary Chinese journalists "do ask challenging questions" but they often do so somewhat differently, "by using complex and target-oriented question designs", which by virtue of their indirectness are less face-threatening to the addressee.

The sixth and final paper—on "The placement of locative prepositional phrases in Cantonese" by Stella Wing-Man Kwan—offers an iconicity and processing analysis to account for word order preferences in Chinese, which though not elaborated in the paper itself, helps to shed light on the relationship between topicalization, discourse structure and speaker stance. Kwan makes the interesting observation that Cantonese frequently opts for [[$_{PP}$ P NP] V] order to conform to iconicity constraints, even though such word order has been argued to be costly in terms of processing efficiency (see in particular Hawkins' (1994) *Early Immediate Constituents (EIC) Model* on language processing). More importantly, Kwan provides quantitative evidence to show that Cantonese has in fact managed to satisfy both iconicity and processing constraints by relying on topicalization strategies, particularly as the PP constituents get 'heavier' (i.e. as the length or number of words of a PP increases). Kwan's findings for preverbal PPs are consistent with those from studies on prenominal RCs (i.e. relative clauses) in Cantonese (see Matthews & Yeung 2001; Cheung 2006). Given what we now know about topicalization strategies as mental staging devices (e.g. Langacker 1991), or in other words as linguistic means by which speakers profile (i.e. situate or ground) focal participants in a given discourse, Kwan's

analysis which shows a strong relationship between topicalization and processing constraints provides suggestive empirical evidence that what speakers choose to perspectivize is often also rooted in cognitive processing preferences.

Numerous other studies are currently under way that will contribute further to research on stance phenomena. A number of workshops are currently taking a closer look at stance-related issues. This includes, among many others, workshops at the 12th International Pragmatics Conference (e.g. "Disentangling Modal Particles and Discourse Markers") and at the 44th Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europeae (e.g. "Covert Patterns of Modality"). Among the issues being addressed are questions on whether, and if so in what manner and to what extent, discourse markers at the left periphery (LP) and sentence final particles at the right periphery (RP) are different from each other. Another question is what stance strategies are available to a given language other than overt expressions such as mood and modality markers; for example, is 'silence' (or more appropriately, 'elision') a robust strategy for the covert expression of speaker stance, as often seen in languages such as Japanese and Korean (e.g. Higashiizumi 2006; Shibasaki 2009; Rhee 2010). These are questions for which research on stance phenomena in Chinese and neighboring languages can clearly provide some good answers, and we look forward to seeing many more studies on stance in Chinese and related languages in subsequent publications.

REFERENCES

Cai, Xiao-Chun. 2010. Sentence-medial particles in Shantou dialect. M.A. thesis, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
Chan, Marjorie K.M. 1996. Gender-marked speech in Cantonese: the case of sentence-final particles *je* and *jek*. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 26.1/2: 1-38.
Cheung, Antonio Ki-Shun. 2006. *Processing Factors in Language Comprehension and Production: the Case of Cantonese Dative Constructions*. MPhil thesis, University of Hong Kong.
Chor, Winnie Oi-Wan. 2010. *Grammaticalization of Directional Particles in Cantonese*. PhD thesis. University of Sydney.

Chor, Winnie Oi-Wan. To appear. From non-subjective to subjective to inter-subjective – a pathway of semantic change in grammaticalization: the case of *faan* in Cantonese. In *Grammar in cross-linguistic perspectives: the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of Japanese, Chinese and English*, ed. by T. Ishiguro and K.K. Luke. Peter Lang.

Chui, Ka-Wai. 1994. Grammaticalization of the saying verb *waa* in Cantonese. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 5, 1-12.

Clayman, Steven E. & John C. Heritage. 2002a. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, Steven E. & John C. Heritage. 2002b. Questioning presidents: journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of U.S. presidents Eisenhower and Reagan, *Journal of Communication* 52.4: 749-775.

Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for Structure: the Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Englebretson, Robert (ed.). 2007. *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdamn: John Benjamins.

Fischer, Kerstin. 2005. *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fung, Rosanna Suk-Yee. 2000. *Final Particles in Standard Cantonese: Semantic Extension and Pragmatic Inference*. PhD Dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. Footing. In *Forms of talk*, 124-159. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hasegawa, Yoko. 2006. Embedded soliloquy and affective stances in Japanese. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, ed. by Satoko Suzuki, pp. 209-229.

Hawkins, John A. 1994. *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2006. *From a Subordinate Clause to an Independent Clause*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.

Horie, Kaoru, Miya Shimura & Prashant Pardeshi. 2006. Overt anaphoric expressions, empathy, and the uchi-soto distinction: A contrastive perspective. In *Emotivec Communication in Japanese*, ed. by Satoko Suzuki, 173-190.

Jiang, Hao-Wen. 2010. Appearances are not skin deep: a preliminary study of *de yangzhi* in Chinese. Paper presented at the 1st International Symposium on Chinese Language and Discourse, University of California, Los Angeles, October 29-30.

Kwok, Helen. 1984. *Sentence Particles in Cantonese*. Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol. 2*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Law, Sam-Po. 1990. *The Syntax and Phonology of Cantonese Sentence-Final Particles*. Ph.D dissertation. Boston University.

Lee-Wong, Song-Mei. 1998. Face support – Chinese particles as mitigators: a study of *ba*, *a/ya* and *ne*. Pragmatics 8.3: 387-404.

Leung, Chung-Sum. 1992. *A Study of the Utterance Particles in Cantonese as Spoken in Hong Kong*. M.Phil thesis. Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Leung, Wai-Mun. 2006. *On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Sentence Final Particles: the Case of WO in Cantonese*. PhD thesis. University of Hong Kong.

Li, Cherry Ing. 1999. *Utterance-Final Particles in Taiwanese: A Discourse-Pragmatic Analysis*. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Corporation.

Lin, Jonah T.H.. 2005. *Complement-to-Specifier Movement in Mandarin Chinese*. Ms. Graduate Institute of Linguistics, National Tsing Hua University.

Lu, Wen-Ying. 2005. *Sentence-Final Particles as Attitude Markers in Mandarin Chinese*. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Lu, Louis Wei-Lun & Lily I-wen Su. 2009. Speech in interaction: Mandarin particle *le* as a marker of intersubjectivity. Manuscript, National Taiwan University, Taipei.

Luke, Kang-Kwong. 1990. *Utterance Particles in Cantonese Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matthews, Stephen. 1998. Evidentiality and mirativity in Cantonese: wo3, wo4, wo5! In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics*. Academia Sinica.

Matthews, Stephen. & Louisa Y.Y. Yeung. 2001. Processing motivations for topicalization in Cantonese. In *Cognitive-Functional Linguistics in an East Asian Context*, ed. by Kaoru Horie & Shigeru Sato, 81-102. Tokyo: Kurosio. (Chinese version in New Ideas About Topic and Focus. 2003. Ed. by X. Liejiong and L. Danqing, 145-63. Shanghai Educational Publishing.)

Rhee, Seongha. 2010. Silence as ellipsis: On the emergence of Korean markers of consensus. Manuscript, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shibasaki, Reijirou. 2009. On the grammaticalization of unexpectedness in the languages of Japan. In *Current Issues in Linguistic Interfaces, Vol.* 1, ed. by Young-Se Kang, 193-207. Seoul: Hankook Munhwasa.

Simpson, Andrew & Zoe Xiu-Zhi Wu. 2002. IP-raising, tone sandhi and the creation of particles: Evidence for cyclic spell-out. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11.1: 1-45.

Suzuki, Satoko. 2006. Emotive communication in Japanese: An introduction. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, ed. by Satoko Suzuki, 1-13.

Tang, Sze-Wing. 2009. 粵語句末助詞「罷啦」及其框式結構 [The sentence final particle baalaa and its discontinuous construction in Cantonese]. 《粵語跨學科研究：第十三屆國際粵方言研討會論文集》[*Multi-Disciplinary Approaches to Cantonese Studies: Papers from the 13th International Conference on Cantonese and Yue Dialects*]. Hong Kong: Language Information Sciences Research Centre, City University of Hong Kong, 415-427.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. In *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, ed. by Dieter Stein & Susan Wright, pp. 31-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From Subjectification to intersubjectification. In *Motives for Language Change*, ed. by Raymond Hickey, 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Berg, Marinus & Guo Wu. 2006. *The Chinese Particle le: Discourse Construction and Pragmatic Marking in Chinese* [Routledge Studies in Asian Linguistics]. London: Routledge.

Wang, Jiao & Foong-Ha Yap. 2009. A study of negator *bu* (不) as interrogative sentence final particle in Chinese. Paper presented at the 42nd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Payap University, Chiang Mai, November 2-4.

Wang, Yu-Fang, Aya Katz & Chih-Hua Chen. 2003. Thinking as saying: s*huo* ('say') in Taiwan Mandarin conversation and BBS talk. *Language Sciences* 25.5: 457-488.

Wang, Yu-Fang & Pi-Hua Tsai. 2005. *Hao* in spoken Chinese discourse: Relevance and coherence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 215-243.

Wang, Yu-Fang, Pi-Hua Tsai & Ya-Ting Yang. 2007. Objectivity, subjectivity and intersubjectivity: Evidence from *qishi* ('actually') and *shishishang* ('in fact') in spoken Chinese. *Language Sciences* 27: 705-727.

Wang, Yu-Fang, Pi-Hua Tsai and Meng-Ying Ling. 2007. From emotional to emotive use: *meiyou* ('no') as a discourse marker in Taiwan Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Studies* 9.5: 677-701.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan Regina. 2004. *Stanace in Talk: A Conversation Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wu, Xiu-Zhi Zoe. 2004. *Grammaticalization and Language Change in Chinese: A Formal View* [Routledge Studies in Asian Linguistics]. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Xing, Zhiqun Janet. 2006. Mechanism of semantic change in Chinese. *Studies in Language* 30.3: 461-483.

Xu Hui-Ling & Stephen Matthews. In press. On the polyfunctionality and grammaticalization of the morpheme KAI in the Chaozhou dialect. In *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives,* ed. by Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, & Janick Wrona. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yap, Foong Ha & Stephen Matthews. 2008. The development of nominalizers in East Asian and Tibeto-Burman languages. In *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives* [Typological Studies in Language 76], 309-341, ed. by López-Couso, María José & Elena Seoane, ed. in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yap, Foong-Ha, Pik-ling Choi & Kam-Siu Cheung. 2010. De-lexicalizing *di3*: How a Chinese locative noun has evolved into an attitudinal nominalizer. In *Formal Evidence in Grammaticalization Research.* [Typological Studies in Language 94], ed. by An Van linden, Jean-Christophe Verstraete & Kristin Davidse, in collaboration with Hubert Cuyckens. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yap, Foong-Ha, Jiao Wang & Winnie Oi-Wan Chor. 2010. From lexical verb 'fear' to epistemic adverbial 'perhaps, maybe, possibly': On the grammaticalization of Malay *kut* (< *takut* 'fear'), Mandarin *kong3 pa4* (恐怕) and Cantonese *tai2 pa3* (睇怕). Paper presented at the 2010 Annual Research Forum of the Linguistic Society of Hong Kong, Chinese University of Hong Kong, December 4.

Yap, Foong-Ha & Jiao Wang. In press. From light noun to nominalizer: The grammaticalization of zhe and suo in Old and Middle Chinese. In *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives.* [Typological Studies in Language 96], ed. by Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yau, Shun-Chiu. 1965. *A Study of the Functions and of the Presentation of Cantonese Sentence Particles*. M.A. thesis. The University of Hong

Yeung, Kawaii Ka-Wai. 2006. On the status of the complementizer *waa6* in Cantonese. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 4.1: 1-48.

Yiu, Carine Yuk-Man. 2001. *Cantonese Final Particles 'LEI', 'ZYU' and 'LAA': an Aspectual Study*. MPhil thesis. University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong.

Foong Ha Yap
Hong Kong Polytechnic University
egyapfh@inet.polyu.edu.hk

Caesar Suen Lun
City University of Hong Kong
ctslun@cityu.edu.hk