

On the development of sentence final particles (and utterance tags) in Chinese

Foong Ha YAP, Ying YANG and Tak-Sum WONG
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Abstract

This paper examines six restructuring processes that have contributed to the development of pragmatic markers at the right periphery—more specifically, sentence final particles (as well as utterance tags)—in Chinese. We first discuss how verb serialization can give rise to an expansion in semantic scope and syntactic recategorization at the right periphery, using Mandarin *le* as an example.¹ We then consider the process of clausal integration, as illustrated by mitigative and adhortative sentence final particles *er yi yi*, *bale* and *haole* in Mandarin. We next examine the role of right-dislocation in the emergence of utterance tags such as Mandarin epistemic marker *kongpa*, followed by an analysis of the combined effects of both right-dislocation and clausal integration in the emergence of sentence final particles such as the Cantonese *wo*-type evidential markers. We also look into ‘main-clause ellipsis’ which leaves behind connectives that develop into sentence final particles such as Mandarin *buguo*, a phenomenon that is not as robust in Chinese, but is common in neighbouring verb-final languages. Finally, we discuss the insubordination of nominalization constructions as ‘stand-alone’ finite structures (e.g. Watters 2008; DeLancey 2011; Yap, Grunow-Hårsta & Wrona 2011; inter alia), whereby nominalizers are reinterpreted as sentence final particles with temporal, modal and attitudinal values. This paper also compares the similarities and differences in the way each of these morphosyntactic strategies are used in Chinese and neighbouring languages such as Japanese and Korean, the former a predominantly verb-medial (SVO) language, while the latter two are verb final (SOV) languages.

Key words: sentence final particles, utterance tags, verb serialization, clausal integration, right-dislocation, main-clause ellipsis, stand-alone nominalization, insubordination

1. Introduction: pathways in the development of sentence final particles in Chinese

While it is not uncommon for verb-final (SOV) languages such as Japanese and Korean to deploy a wide range of sentence final particles, given the frequent reanalysis of their (post)verbal elements at the right periphery (RP) into grammatical and pragmatic markers in clause-final position, similar developments which give rise to right-periphery pragmatic markers are less typical among verb-medial (SVO) languages. In this respect, however, Chinese is typologically rather different. Despite its predominantly SVO word order, it is rich in sentence final particles with epistemic, evidential and attitudinal nuances, particularly among the Sinitic varieties spoken in the south (e.g. Cantonese). An interesting question is how sentence final particles emerge in Chinese. A related question is how and to what extent the grammaticalization pathways in Chinese

¹ Other terms used in the literature for syntactic recategorization include syntactic relabeling (Whitman 2001).

are similar to or different from those of verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean.

As we shall see in this paper, an important clue to the typological ‘oddity’ of the Chinese language lies in its preference for VO matrix clauses but head-final subordinate clauses. To elaborate further, much like English, Chinese makes frequent use of (S)VO word order for its matrix clauses (e.g. *tamen bu xihuan zhege ren* ‘they don’t like this person’), yet at the same time relies heavily on head-final subordinate constructions, as in the case of its relative clauses (e.g. *zuotian lai de ren* lit. ‘**yesterday come ones**, (those) people’ > ‘yesterday came REL people’. This head-final relativization strategy is similar to that found in verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean, and is a mirror image of the head-initial relativization strategy in verb-medial languages such as English (cf. *the people, the ones who came yesterday* > *the people who came yesterday*).

Similar to verb-medial languages such as English, complement-taking predicates in Chinese (e.g. Cantonese *jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶* ‘People say’ and Mandarin *wo juede* ‘I feel/think’) can also develop into evidential and epistemic markers, first at the left periphery preceding the insubordinated complement clause (e.g. **People say** EVIDENTIAL MARKER / **I think** EPISTEMIC MARKER [*she will dump him*] NEW MAIN CLAUSE), as in (1a) and (2a), and subsequently at the right periphery after the insubordinated complement clause, via right-dislocation (e.g. [*She will dump him*] MAIN CLAUSE, **people say** EVIDENTIAL MARKER + SPEAKER’S DISCLAIMER / **I think** EPISTEMIC MARKER + SPEAKER’S DISCLAIMER), as in (1b) and (2b).

(1) Cantonese hearsay evidential *jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶* ‘people say’

a. 人哋話佢會飛起佢個男朋友

jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶ keoi⁵ wui⁵ fei¹hei² keoi⁵ go³ naam⁴pang⁴jau⁵
 people say 3SG will dump 3SG CL boyfriend
 ‘People say she will dump her boyfriend.’

b. 佢會飛起佢個男朋友，人哋話

keoi⁵ wui⁵ fei¹hei² keoi⁵ go³ naam⁴pang⁴jau⁵, jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶
 3SG will dump 3SG CL boyfriend people say
 ‘She will dump her boyfriend, people say.’

(2) Mandarin epistemic parenthetical *wo juede* ‘I think’

a. 我覺得他會拋棄他的男朋友

wo juede ta hui paoqi ta de nanpengyou
 1SG think 3SG will dump 3SG GEN boyfriend
 ‘I think she will dump her boyfriend.’

b. 他會拋棄他的男朋友，我覺得

ta hui paoqi ta de nanpengyou, wo juede
 3SG will dump 3SG GEN boyfriend 1SG think
 ‘She will dump her boyfriend, I think.’

On the other hand, similar to verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean, the Chinese language deploys numerous other strategies whereby pragmatic markers emerge in sentence final position without recourse to right dislocation from the left periphery to the right. One highly productive strategy in Mandarin

involves the reanalysis of complementation structures (essentially a form of relativized or nominalized clauses) as stand-alone finite structures. For example, Mandarin *shi ... de* focus constructions, which comprise of the copula focus particle *shi* and a complementation clause marked by nominalizer *de*, can have its focus particle elided to yield a *shi*-less assertion that is amenable to a wide range of pragmatic interpretations, often still with strong assertive force that gives rise to its use as a marker of speaker's reassurance to the addressee (e.g. *ta shi xihuan ni de* 'It's (true) that he likes you' > *ta xihuan ni de* 'He likes you (I assure you)').

An intriguing follow-up question is whether new strategies not found in either predominantly verb-medial (VO) languages such as English or predominantly verb-final (OV) languages such as Japanese and Korean have emerged in Chinese, which show mixed characteristics involving head-initial (e.g. VO) and head-final (e.g. complement clause + head noun) structures. The quick answer is, yes we do find some such structures. Recall the example of the Cantonese hearsay evidential marker *jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶* 'people say' from (1a) and (1b) above. Note, in particular, that subject omission is common in Chinese. This allows right-dislocated hearsay evidential markers to develop into subject-less evidential markers, often accompanied by other sentence final particles. In Cantonese, as seen in (3) below, the subject-less hearsay evidential marker *waa⁶* can combine with the emphatic sentence final particle *o³* to form a hearsay evidential sentence final particle *wo³* with pragmatic nuances such as counterexpectation marking (mirative reading) (see Leung 2006). In other words, we see the following development: hearsay evidential utterance tag *jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶* + emphatic particle *o³* > subjectless hearsay evidential marker *waa⁶* + emphatic particle *o³* > hearsay evidential sentence final particle *wo³* (often with mirative meaning).

- (3) Cantonese hearsay evidential *jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶* 'people say'
 佢會飛起佢個男朋友㗎
keoi⁵ wui⁵ fei¹hei² keoi⁵ go³ naam⁴pang⁴jau⁵ wo³
 3SG will dump 3SG CL boyfriend EVID_{MIRATIVE READING POSSIBLE}
 'She will dump her boyfriend, *they say*(!)'

What is interesting is that not all utterance tags readily merge with the preceding clause that they modulate. There is asymmetry in frequency not only across languages (e.g. unlike Cantonese, English tends to resist reanalyzing their utterance tags—such as hearsay evidential *people say* or epistemic marker *it seems*—into sentence final evidential particles), but also there is asymmetry across pragmatic markers within the same language (e.g. in Cantonese, speakers prefer to retain the first person subject *ngo⁵* 'I' in the epistemic utterance tag *ngo⁵ gok³dak¹* 'I think', which then impedes the emergence of *gok³dak¹* as a subjectless epistemic sentence final particle).

Clearly, various strategies are used in the development of pragmatic markers across languages, and various factors contribute to variation not only across but also within languages. In this paper, we will identify six major restructuring processes that contribute to the rise of sentence final particles—i.e. pragmatic markers at the right periphery—in Chinese. More specifically, we will examine the following six processes: verb serialization that gives rise to syntactic relabeling (§2), clausal integration (§3), right-dislocation (§4), a combination of right-dislocation and clausal integration (§5), main-clause ellipsis (§6), and

insubordination in the form of ‘stand-alone’ nominalization (§7). We will then conclude with some observations on the similarities and differences in the strategies used in Chinese, a somewhat atypical verb-medial language, and some verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean (§8). In this way, we hope our analyses of the diachronic development of various types of Chinese pragmatic markers at the right periphery will contribute to a better understanding of functional overlaps at the left and right peripheries, which nevertheless often differ in meaningful ways, either in terms of frequency or in terms of subtle pragmatic nuances, or both.

2. Verb serialization and syntactic relabeling: semantic scope expansion, syntactic restructuring, and the rise of sentence final *le*

Semantic extension is a ubiquitous phenomenon that is endemic to human cognition, and extensions that result in scope expansion will then trigger syntactic restructuring, sometimes very subtle and covert, within the language system. In this section, we will briefly discuss the development of Mandarin *le* to illustrate how such semantic scope expansion and syntactic restructuring works in Chinese as a result of verb serialization.

The exact etymology of *le* remains somewhat controversial. One hypothesis (e.g. Cao 1995) is that *le* is derived from a lexical verb *liao* meaning ‘finish’, attested in both Early as well as Late Middle Chinese as seen in (4a) and (4b) respectively.² In serial verb (i.e. V₁ V₂) constructions such as *shai liao* (‘dry up’, lit. ‘dry finish’), *liao* in V₂ position was reinterpreted as a completive aspect marker, as in (4c).³ As a completive aspect marker arising from a serial verb construction, *liao* in Middle Chinese was still interchangeable with other aspect markers with completive marking functions such as *jing* 竟, *bi* 畢, *qi* 訖, and *yi* 已. In Late Middle Chinese and increasingly from Early Modern Chinese, within a sequential-type biclausal construction, i.e. (NP) VP-*liao*, (NP) VP, where the completion of the first event is crucial to the realization of the second event, *liao* (or its reduced phonological variant *le*) came to be reinterpreted as an anterior or perfect tense-aspect marker, as in (4d). As an anterior or perfect marker, *liao* ~ *le* marks not only completion of an event but also a change of state with current relevance to the speech situation (CRS).⁴ Ellipsis of the subsequent clause still allowed for the retention of the anterior or perfect marker interpretation of *liao* ~ *le*, as in (4e), (4f) and (4g). With phonological reduction (*liao* > *le*), particularly in Early Modern Chinese, postverbal completive aspect marker *le* came to be reanalysed as a perfective suffix (i.e. VO *le* > V-*le* O). By the 15th century, the V-*le* (O) construction has become the dominant perfective structure (Sun 1996: 85). In Modern Chinese, the phonologically reduced tense-aspect marker *le* can thus either be suffixed to

² Another hypothesis is that *le* as a perfect marker is derived from *lai* ‘come’ (Chao 1968; see also Sun 1996).

³ Note that the second *liao*, which forms the reverend’s reply, is a lexical verb usage of *liao* in the sense of ‘finish’, similar to (4a). Hence the reverend’s reply *liao ye* simply means ‘It’s finished’ / ‘It’s done.’

⁴ See Comrie (1976, 1985) for helpful discussions on the distinctions between the different types of tense-aspect markers within the perfect(ive) domain, and see also Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994: 51–105) for a diachronic development perspective.

the preceding verb as a perfective aspect marker, with scope over the predicate, as in (4h), or it can be used as a clause-final perfect marker with sentential scope and pragmatic import, as in (4i) and (4j).⁵

(4) a. 官事未易了也

guan-shi wei yi liao ye
 official-matter NEG easy complete PRT
 ‘The government business is not easy to finish.’
 (*Jinshu Fuxian zhuan*; Tang period, 648 AD)

b. 事了矣

shi liao yi
 thing finish ASP
 ‘The thing is done.’
 (*Da Tang Xin Yu*, Vol. 4, Tang period, 807 AD)

c. 問僧：曬了也未？

wen seng , shai liao ye wei?
 ask monk dry finish PRT NEG
 (Someone) asked the monk, ‘Have you finished drying (it) in the sun?’

僧云：了也。

⁵ Roughly speaking, previous studies identified two types of *le*: *le*₁ (which functions as a perfective aspect suffix, i.e. a verbal aspect marker) and *le*₂ (which functions as a perfect marker, and often as a sentence final particle (Chao 1968; Li & Thompson 1981; Sun 1996). Crucially for our present study, in terms of pragmatic function, this sentence final particle *le*₂ can convey an implicit message that the speaker is done with his/her turn and now invites the addressee to take up the conversational floor (Lu & Su, 2009). In their quantitative analysis of Taiwanese Mandarin conversational data, 71.56% of sentence final *le*₂ tokens are followed by a floor change from speaker to hearer, which suggests that the addressee responds to *le*₂ as an indicator that the speaker has completed his turn. This turn-completion marking function of *le*₂ in sentence final position is illustrated below, Note that the interviewer (IR) completes her speech turn with sentence final *le*, and this is followed by an enthusiastic uptake by the hearer, as seen in his effusive agreement with the reduplicated affirmative expression *dui dui* ‘yes, yes’. This type of solidarity-marking uptake following *le*₂ occurs with sufficient and significant frequency, as reported in Lu & Su (2009), to be identified as a turn-completion and turn-transition marker in Mandarin conversations.

IR: 就它現在，反正現在我們就另一個眼光看它了。

jiu ta xianzai, fanzheng xianzai women jiu yong ling yi ge
 just 3SG now anyway now 1PL just use another one CL
yanguang kan ta le.
 viewpoint see 3SG CRS
 ‘Now it’s ... we just look at it from another perspective anyway.’

IE: 對對，也，也是，也是記錄那個，那段兒嘛。

dui dui, ye, ye shi, ye shi jilu nage, na duanr ma.
 yes yes also also COP also COP record DEM DEM CL SFP
 ‘Yeah yeah, also, (it) also, also represents that, that period of history.’

(Data from the Mandarin corpus of the project “Stance Marking in Asian Languages: Linguistic and Cultural Perspectives” <<http://www.engl.polyu.edu.hk/research/stance/>>)

seng yun, liao ye.
monk say finish PRT
The monk replied, 'It's done.'
(*Yunmen Kuangzhenshanshi Guanglu*, Tang period, 9th century)

- d. 理會得這箇了，他日若有材料，
lihui-de zhe-ge liao, tari ruo you cailiao,
understand-POT DEM-CL complete future if have material
却依此起將去，只此一箇道理
que yi ci qi jiang qu, zhi ci yi ge daoli.
then according.to this build PRT go only this one CL principle
'Once (one) has understood this, one can erect (a house) on this
(foundation) when materials are ready. It's just this very (simple)
principle.' (*Zhuzi Yulei 14/250*; Southern Song period, 1270 AD)
- e. 喫飯了也
chi fan liao ye
eat food complete CRS
'(One) had finished eating the meal.'
(*Zutangji 1/166/7*; Five Dynasties period, 952 AD; cited in Liu 1985: 132,
and Sun 1996: 88)
- f. 作此語了
zuo ci yu liao
make DEM words complete
'(He) finished making this statement.'
(*Dunhuang Bianwen*, Tang period, 7th –10th century; cited in Sun 1996:
88)⁶
- g. 皆變壞了
jie bian huai liao
all turn bad CRS
'All (of them) have turned bad.'
(*Zhuzi Yulei*, Southern Song period, 1270 AD)
- h. 喫了酒也
chi liao jiu ye
eat PFV wine CRS
'(One) has drunk (some) wine.'
(*Laoqida A/58/7*, Ming period, 15th century; cited in Sun 1996: 99)
- i. 季子之罪，不在放走了慶父，
jizi zhi zui, bu zai fangzou liao qingfu,
PN ATTR crime NEG at release PFV PN

⁶ *Dunhuang Bianwen* is a collection of manuscripts from the Tang period that were discovered in the Mogao Caves of Dunhuang in 1899; the exact dates of these texts are unknown.

先已自有罪過了。

xian yi zi you zuiguo liao.

before already self have error CRS

'Jizi's crime is not that he has released Qingfu, but that he has already committed an error before.'

(*Zhuzi Yulei*, Southern Song period, 1270 AD)

j. 我早做完了

wo zao zuo wan le

1SG early do finish CRS

'I've finished (it) a long time ago.'

(with the implication 'so now I can or should be able to do X')

(Contemporary Chinese)

Liu (1985) noted that prior to the 10th century, *le* was not used in sentence final position; there had to be either another clause following the *le*-clause, or *le* had to be followed by a sentence final perfect marker such as *ye* or *yi*. This suggests that prior to the 10th century, *le* was still lexical (hence pronounced as *liao*), as in (4a), or *le* was a completive aspect marker (still pronounced as *liao*) and could be accompanied by a perfect marker, as in (4c), not unlike modern Mandarin *zuo wan le* (lit. 'do finish already' > 'have finished doing'), where *wan* and *le* are the contemporary completive and perfect markers respectively.

In terms of semantic scope expansion, we see an extended use of a lexical verb *liao* 'finish' being reanalyzed as a tense-aspect marker with perfective or perfect (i.e. anterior aspect) meaning, and subsequently further used as a pragmatic marker to signal the completion of the speaker's turn and an invitation to solicit the addressee's involvement (Lu & Su 2009).⁷ In functional terms, this is an extension from the propositional domain to grammatical and interpersonal domains (*a la* Traugott 1989; 1995; 2003).⁸ In syntactic terms, we see a series of restructuring and relabeling arising from verb serialization as in Figure 1 below. Crucially, we see scope expansion of *liao* ~ *le* from the VP (verbal) domain to the TP (tense-aspect) domain and ultimately to the CP (speaker stance) domain, where sentence final particles typically reside. Such expansions, which Roberts and Roussou (2003) discuss in terms of V>v>(T)>C movements, are widespread across the languages of the world.⁹

⁷ In earlier work, van den Berg & Wu (2006) have shown that *le* is also used as a 'common ground coordinator' between discourse participants.

⁸ Recent work on sentence final particle *liao* in Singapore Mandarin reveals a wider range of pragmatic uses than seen for Standard Mandarin *le*. Among the functions are the speaker's expression of seriousness, surprise, hopelessness and frustration (Lee & Cheong 1999).

⁹ The term 'V>v>(T)>C movement' refers to semantic and syntactic scope expansions involving structural reanalyses whereby verbal elements (V) are sometimes reinterpreted as aspectual markers (v), with the possibility of further being reinterpreted as tense markers (T) and complementizers (C). Extensions to T are optional in languages such as Chinese, which are often referred to as 'tenseless' languages, given the lack of obligatory inflectional tense marking in the language, unlike tensed languages such as English.

Figure 1. Stages in the syntactic restructuring and relabeling of Mandarin interactional particle *le*

Stage 1	(main verb)	[_{TP} NP [_{VP} <i>liao</i>]]
Stage 2	(sequential verb)	[_{TP} NP ₁ [_{VP} V (NP ₂)]], [_{TP} [_{VP} <i>liao</i>]]
Stage 3a	(completive aspect ¹⁰)	[_{TP} NP ₁ [_{AspP} [_{VP} V] <i>liao</i> (NP ₂)]]
Stage 3b	(perfect aspect ¹¹)	[_{TP} NP ₁ [_{AspP} [_{VP} V (NP ₂)] <i>liao ~ le</i>]]
Stage 4a	(perfective aspect)	[_{TP} NP ₁ [_{AspP} [_{VP} V] <i>liao ~ le</i> (NP ₂)]]
Stage 4b	(sentence final particle)	[_{CP} [_{TP} NP ₁ [_{AspP} [_{VP} V (NP ₂)]]] <i>le</i>]

Semantic scope expansion and syntactic restructuring are part and parcel of the grammaticalization of all sentence final particles, not only in Chinese but also in other languages. In verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean, semantic scope expansion and syntactic restructuring readily take place at the right periphery, as illustrated with Japanese adversity marker *-te shimatta* (and its phonologically reduced variant *chatta*), with examples shown in (5a-f).¹² As seen in (5a), *shimau* is a lexical verb meaning ‘to put away’. It can occur in a converbal V₁-*te* V₂ construction, e.g. *yatte shimaimashoo* ‘let’s finish doing (this)’ in (5b). In realis contexts, the past form *-te shimatta* can be used as a completive and perfective aspect marker, as in (5c) and (5d). As seen in (5e) and (5f), V-*te shimatta* constructions are often phonologically reduced to V-*chatta*, and both forms are often used to mark non-volitional, unexpected or inadvertent outcomes.

- (5) a. *kodomo ga omocha o shimatteiru.*
 child TOP toy ACC put.away.PROG
 ‘The child is clearing his/her toys away.’
- b. A: *nokori wa ashita shimashoo ka.*
 rest TOP tomorrow do.ADHORT Q
 ‘Shall we do the rest of (the work) tomorrow?’
 B: *demo, kore dake yatte shimaimashoo.*
 but this only do.CONV finish.ADHORT
 ‘But, let’s just finish doing this one.’
- c. *moo, kaite shimatta no!?*
 already write.CONV finish.PFV SFP
 ‘You have already finished writing (it), haven’t you?’

¹⁰ Completive aspect marker *le* can be suffixed to the verb to form perfective *le* as shown in (i) to (ii) below.

- (i) [_{TP} NP₁ [_{AspP} [_{VP} V] *liao/le* (NP₂)]]
- (ii) [_{TP} NP₁ [_{AspP} V-*le* (NP₂)]]

¹¹ Note that the perfect tense-aspect marker is widely recognized as a ‘relative tense marker’ (see Comrie 1985). That is, its deictic reference point need not be the moment of speaking, but can be a designated point in the past, present or future within a narrative or other type of discourse.

¹² See Strauss (2003) for a fuller discussion of the near-parallel developments of Japanese *-te shimau* and Korean *-a/e pelita* as subjectivity markers (see also Ono & Suzuki 1992). Strauss and Sohn (1998) and Yoshida (1994, 1995) have also identified Japanese *chau* as a social dialect and group identity marker. Note that *-te shimau* and *chau* are the non-past forms of *-te shimatta* and *chatta*.

- d. *watashi wa moo ronbun o kaite shimaimashita.*
 1SG TOP already thesis ACC write.CONV finish.PFV
 'I have already written the thesis.'
- e. *sukkari ookikunatte, michigaete shimatta/michigae chatta wa*
 quite grow.up look.different.CONV.NON-VOL.PFV SFP
 'You have grown up and look so different (that I hardly recognize you).'
- f. *okiniiri no kappu ga warete shimatta/ware-chatta.*
 favorite GEN cup TOP break.CONV.ADVERS
 '(My) favorite cup has been broken.' (expressing sadness/regret)

Note that the verb concatenation process that we earlier discussed in terms of verb serialization, which is a crucial intermediate stage in the development of Mandarin sentence final particle *le*, is more commonly referred to as converb-linking in verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean (see the use of *-te* linkage for Japanese *-te shimau* and *-a/e* linkage for Korean *-a/e pelita* sentence enders).

The grammaticalization of *-te shimau* as an adversity marker is summarized in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2. Stages in the syntactic restructuring and relabeling of Japanese lexical verb *shimau* to adversity marker *-te shimau/chatta*

Stage 1 (main verb)	[TP (NP ₁) [VP NP ₂ <i>shimau</i>]]
Stage 2 (converbal construction)	[TP (NP ₁) [VP (NP ₂) V- <i>te</i> _{LNK} <i>shimau</i>]]
Stage 3 (completive aspect)	[TP (NP ₁) [VP (NP ₂) V- <i>te shimatta/chatta</i>]]
Stage 4 (perfect(ive) aspect)	[TP (NP ₁) [VP (NP ₂) V- <i>te shimatta/chatta</i>]]
Stage 5 (non-volitional marker)	[CP [TP (NP ₁) [VP (NP ₂) V]- <i>te shimatta/chatta</i>]]
Stage 6 (adversity marker)	[CP [TOP (NP ₂)] [TP [VP V]]- <i>te shimatta/chatta</i>]

With the exception of a converbal use of *-te shimau* in Japanese where Chinese uses a serial verb construction for *liao ~ le*, and the reanalysis of *-te shimau/-te shimatta* as a sentence final pragmatic particle (often reduced to *chau/chatta*) with non-volitional and adversity readings, the development from verbal to aspectual to (inter)subjective use (i.e. V > v > C trajectory) is remarkably similar for the two languages. This development, is also attested in neighbouring languages such as Korean, and indeed is crosslinguistically robust and attested in other language families as well (e.g. Greek and Italian; see Roberts & Roussou 2003).

In the case of Chinese, as seen in Figure 1 above, there is sometimes a postverbal object NP that may intervene between V₁ and V₂ in a multi-clausal construction, which may reduce the amount and rate of V₂ being reanalyzed as a grammatical or pragmatic marker at the right periphery (RP). Nevertheless, there is still ample syntactic relabeling activity involving V > v > (T) > C movements in Chinese, particularly in the southern Sinitic varieties, that makes Chinese well-known as a language rich in sentence final particles.

3. Clausal integration: the rise of mitigative and adhortative particles *er yi yi*, *bale* and *haole*

Another fairly productive syntactic restructuring process that contributes to the rise of sentence final particles in Chinese is clausal integration. This strategy was attested in Old Chinese and continues to be used in Modern Chinese. It is also crosslinguistically robust, and is more commonly referred to in the literature as ‘clause-combining’ (e.g. Laury, 2008; Givón 1985, 2001; Haiman & Thompson, 1988). Here we use the term ‘clausal integration’ because of our special interest in the development of sentence final particles, which deals with a late phase in the grammaticalization process, and which involves the merging of clauses in which highly subjective (i.e. evaluative or emotive) constituents in the second clause have themselves already undergone substantial semantic and syntactic reanalyses such that they can readily be reinterpreted as pragmatic markers that scope over the preceding clause.

We illustrate this type of development here with mitigative and adhortative particles from Classical and Modern Chinese. In Classical Chinese, a propositional clause is sometimes followed by an evaluative clause such as *er yi yi*, which means ‘and that’s all’, with *er* conveying a connective or anaphoric meaning and *yi yi* conveying a double perfective aspectual reading, which contributes to the reanalysis of *er yi yi* as a complex sentence final particle (Yap, Wang & Lam 2010), often with a mitigative reading, as in (6) and (7).

- (6) 學問之道無他，求其放心而已矣。

xuewen zhi dao wu ta, qiu qi fang xin
learn.ask GEN way not.have others seek 3SG missing heart

er yi yi.

SFP

‘The great end of learning is **nothing else but** to seek for the lost mind.’

(*Mencius 11/11*, late Warring States period, 2nd – 3rd century BC;

translated by James Legge 1960)

- (7) 我竭力耕田，共為子職而已矣。

wo jie li geng tian, gong wei zi zhi er yi yi.
1SG exhaust strength cultivate field all for son duty SFP

‘I toil in the fields and all this **simply** as my duty as a son.’

(The speaker intends to make the point that he has no ulterior motive.)

(*Mencius 9/1*, Warring States period; cited in Yap, Wang & Lam 2010: 69)

Figure 3 captures the syntactic restructuring which leads to clausal integration (see also Yap, Wang & Lam 2010). Note that *er yi yi* originated as an evaluative terminal clause in a multi-clausal construction, and was then reanalyzed as a mitigative marker that combined with the preceding clause to form a complex sentence final particle. In other words, clausal integration with *er yi yi* resulted in the restructuring of a biclausal construction into a monoclausal one, as seen in the transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2 in Figure 3 below. Crucially,

this merger results in semantic scope expansion where a propositional clause is now expanded to also encode the speaker's subjective evaluation.

Figure 3. Clausal integration involving mitigative sentence final particle *er yi yi*

Stage 1 (multi-clausal):	Clause-1, Clause-2., [<i>er yi yi</i>]., [CONN finish ASP], [and that's it!]
Stage 2 (monoclausal):	Clause-1 + SFP _{mitigative marker}

A similar development involving clausal integration can be seen in the rise of mitigative marker *bale* in Early Modern Chinese, as seen in (8). Originating in a verb meaning 'stop', *ba* followed by the perfect(ive) aspect marker *le* likewise developed into a mitigative 'and that's it' reading (see Yap, Wang & Lam 2010). High frequency usage triggered phonological compression that gave rise to *bale*, which then merged with the preceding clause to become its mitigative sentence final particle.

- (8) 這不過是個田單火牛之計罷了
zhe buguo shi ge tiandan huo niu zhi ji bale
 DEM just COP CL PN fire cattle GEN strategy SFP
 'It's **just** Tian Dan's Fire Cattle Columns tactic (which has been used two thousand years ago).
 (*San Bao Tai Jian Xi Yang Ji*, Ming period, 16th century)

Clausal integration can also be seen in the grammaticalization of *haole* as an adhortative (i.e. urging, nudging or encouraging) marker in Contemporary Chinese, as seen in (9). Note that clausal reduction often precedes clausal integration. In this particular case, (*jiu hao le* '(then) it'd be good' is reduced simply to *haole* 'just'. The former, as part of a biclausal conditional construction as seen in (9a), functions as a weak adhortative expression, while the latter (i.e. *haole*), now merged as a sentence final particle in a monoclausal construction as in (9b), has a more direct and insistent adhortative quality.

- (9) a. 你明天走就好了
ni mingtian zou jiu hao le.
 2SG tomorrow walk then good SFP
 Lit. 'If you leave tomorrow, then it'd be good.'
 'It would be good if you leave tomorrow.'
- b. 明天走好了
mingtian zou haole
 tomorrow walk SFP
 '**Just** leave tomorrow (then).' (often uttered in a suggestive manner)

In terms of semantic scope expansion and syntactic restructuring, clausal integration facilitates the rise of *haole* from the predicational domain (AspP) to

the pragmatic domain (CP).¹³ Here we see an extension from the subjective (evaluative predicate *hao le*) domain to the intersubjective (adhortative and interpersonal utterance) domain that involves a larger constituent than single morphemes such as the completive verb *le* discussed in section 2 earlier.

As seen in Figure 4, we see a clausal integration process whereby the evaluative *haole* clause is integrated *with* (rather than simply *to*) the preceding clause. That is, Propositional clause 1 + Evaluative *haole* clause 2 > Subjective clause with *haole* as a mitigative marker. In structural terms, we see a development within the second clause where evaluative adjective *hao* ‘good’ merges with sentence final particle *le* to form an evaluative utterance tag *haole* (Stage 2). This utterance tag in turn interacts with the sentence final evaluative prosody of the preceding clause to form an adhortative sentence final particle *haole* that scopes over the entire preceding clause (Stage 3). In this way, sentence final adhortative particle *haole* overtly manifests the speaker’s stance within a monoclausal structure.

Figure 4. Stages in the clausal integration of Mandarin adhortative *haole*

Stage 1 (evaluative Adj + SFP)	$[_{CP1} [_{TP} NP [_{VP} \textit{mingtian qu}]]] (.) [_{CP2} \textit{jiu} [_{AdjP} \textit{hao}] \textit{le}]$
Stage 2 (evaluative utterance tag)	$[_{CP1} [_{TP} NP [_{VP} \textit{mingtian qu}]]] (.) [_{CP2} \textit{jiu haole}]$
	$\Rightarrow [_{CP1} [_{TP} NP [_{VP} \textit{mingtian qu}]]] (.) [_{CP2} \textit{haole}]$
Stage 3 (adhortative particle)	$[_{CP2} [_{TP} NP [_{VP} \textit{mingtian qu}]] \textit{haole}]$

The same developmental stages can be seen for a number of other sentence final adhortative particles in Mandarin Chinese such as *dele* and *suanle*. While all three adhortative markers (*haole*, *dele* and *suanle*) can convey impatience, *haole* is more often mildly suggestive, as seen in (9b) above, while the use of *dele* tends to convey impatience often accompanied by a subtle sense of imposition, as seen in (10) below, and the use of *suanle* often conveys not only a sense of impatience but also a sense of resignation, as seen in (11).

(10) a. 你明天走就得了
ni mingtian zou jiu de le
 2SG tomorrow walk then be.fine (< be.able) SFP
 Lit. ‘If you leave tomorrow, then that’s fine.’
 ‘It’s fine if you leave tomorrow.’

b. 明天走得了
mingtian zou dele
 tomorrow walk SFP
 ‘Just leave tomorrow (then).’
 (often uttered with imposition and impatience)

(11) a. 他不去就算了
ta bu qu jiu suan le

¹³ We indicate the AspP predicational domain rather than just the AdjP predicational domain because *haole* comprises not only of adjective *hao* but also perfect aspect marker *le*.

3SG NEG go then be.settled (< count) SFP
'(If) he doesn't go, then (we) just forget it.'

b. 不去算了

bu qu suanle

NEG go SFP

'Forget it if he doesn't go.' (uttered with resignation and impatience)

Clausal integration is attested in other neighbouring languages as well. In Modern Japanese, for example, *sureba* 'if' conditional clauses are typically followed by their consequent clauses, as in (12a). However, the conditional clause is sometimes followed by the deontic-evaluative predicate *ii*, meaning '(it should be) good', as in (12b). High frequency usage of this evaluative main-clause predicate has resulted in its integration with the preceding clause, and the concomitant reanalysis of *sureba ii* as a deontic-evaluative sentence final particle, as in (12c).

(12) a. *benkyoo sureba, tesuto ni gookaku suru yo*
study do.COND test ACC pass do SFP
'(If) you study (hard), (then you will) pass the test.'

b. *benkyoo sureba, ii*
study do.COND be.good
'(If) you study (hard), (then it should) be good.'

c. *benkyoo sureba ii*
study SFP
'You should study (hard).'

Contemporary Japanese also has a related expression *benkyoo sure-ba?* as shown in (13) below, where sentence final particle *sure-ba* functions as a deontic-adhortative marker. This construction, however, emerged via another strategy, namely 'main-clause ellipsis', which we will examine later in section 6.

(13) *benkyoo sureba?*
study SFP
'Why don't you study (hard)?'

4. Right-dislocation: emergence of epistemic utterance tag *kongpa*

A more common process that gives rise to utterance tags and sentence final particles in Chinese is right-dislocation (see Cheung 2009; Lin 2008). This process is not necessary for verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean, whose evaluative, expressive and attitudinal verbal complexes at the right periphery can be more directly recruited to form sentence-final pragmatic markers. However, right-dislocation is often necessary for verb-medial languages such as English and Chinese, giving rise to utterance tags in post-predicate position. Well-known examples in English include the epistemic marker *I think* (Thompson & Mulac

1991; Kärkkäinen 2003), with parallel studies in other languages (see for example Lim 2011 and Endo 2013 on Mandarin *wo juede* ‘I think’ as epistemic and pragmatic markers). In this section we will focus on the process of right-dislocation in Chinese. We illustrate with Mandarin epistemic marker *kongpa*.

Diachronically, *kongpa* emerged from a combination of two ‘fear’ verbs *kong* and *pa* in Late Middle Chinese, during the Tang and Song periods, to express the speaker’s anxiety. In Early Modern Chinese, *kongpa* developed into an epistemic marker meaning ‘probably’ that is typically used in clause-initial position and sometimes used parenthetically in clause-medial position (see Yap, Chor & Wang 2012; see also Endo 2006 for the development of Mandarin ‘fear’ verb *pa* on its own as a pragmatic marker). Epistemic marker *kongpa* is also sometimes used as an utterance tag with a pragmatic hedging function in clause-final position, where it helps to soften an epistemic claim, or to attend to the face-needs of the interlocutors (either the speaker or the addressee, or both) when the speaker may be certain or confident about the veracity of his/her claim yet for pragmatic reasons considers it best to downgrade the strength of their epistemic claim.

Consider the uses of *kongpa* in (14) below (see also Yap, Chor & Wang 2012). In (14a), we see *wo kongpa* yielding an ambiguous interpretation: it can either express anxiety or epistemic probability, both anchored in the speaker’s subjective stance. The epistemic interpretation emerges via semantic extensions whereby the speaker’s anxiety comes to reflect his/her concern about the likelihood of impending negative outcomes, which facilitates the reanalysis of *kongpa* as an epistemic marker meaning ‘possibly’ or ‘probably’. This development contributes to the insubordination of the complement clause *ta bu xihuan wo le* ‘he doesn’t like me’ as an independent ‘main clause’ construction as in (14b), with *kongpa* as its epistemic stance marker at the left-periphery. As an epistemic adverbial, *kongpa* can now also occur parenthetically in clause-medial position, as in (14c). While epistemic adverbial *kongpa* favors the clause-initial and clause-medial position, it can also occur as an utterance tag in clause-final position, as in (14d).

- (14) a. 我恐怕他不喜歡我了
wo kongpa ta bu xihuan wo le
 1SG fear 3SG NEG like 1SG SFP
 ‘I’m afraid/Probably he doesn’t like me anymore.’
- b. 恐怕他不喜歡我了
kongpa ta bu xihuan wo le
 fear 3SG NEG like 1SG SFP
 ‘Probably he doesn’t like me anymore.’
- c. 他恐怕不喜歡我了
ta kongpa bu xihuan wo le
 3SG fear NEG like 1SG SFP
 ‘He probably doesn’t like me anymore.’
- d. 他不喜歡我了，恐怕。
ta bu xihuan wo le, kongpa.
 3SG NEG like 1SG SFP fear

‘He doesn’t like me anymore, **probably** (< I’m afraid).’

Figure 5 below highlights the stages in the development of *kongpa* from a lexical verb to an epistemic marker and a right-dislocated utterance tag with a pragmatic hedging function.

Figure 5. Stages in the right-dislocation of Mandarin pragmatic hedger *kongpa*

Stage 1 (lexical verb)	[_{CP2} [_{IP2} (<i>wo</i>) [_{VP} <i>kongpa</i> [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>ta bu xihuan wo</i>] <i>le</i>]]]]
Stage 2 (epistemic marker)	[_{CP2} (<i>wo</i>) <i>kongpa</i> [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>ta bu xihuan wo</i>] <i>le</i>]]
Stage 3 (right-dislocated epistemic marker)	
⇒ utterance tag pragmatic hedger)	[_{CP2} [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>ta bu xihuan wo</i>] <i>le</i>], <i>kongpa</i>]

Right-dislocation is not uncommon in other languages either, and in some varieties of Malay (e.g. Perak Malay and Kedah Malay, which are spoken in the northwestern part of peninsular Malaysia), the epistemic marker *kot*, which is derived from the ‘fear’ verb *takut*, has developed into a sentence final particle (Yap, Chor & Wang 2012). While Mandarin *kongpa* has not grammaticalized beyond the utterance tag stage to become an epistemic sentence final particle, arguably because of its relatively low usage frequency, there are examples of Chinese utterance tags at the right periphery that have developed into sentence-final particles. We explore this in the next section, using sentence final evidential particles in Cantonese as examples.

5. Right-dislocation and clausal integration: emergence of *wo*-type sentence final evidentials in Cantonese

Mandarin Chinese does not make productive use of grammaticalized evidential markers at the right periphery, but as noted earlier in the introduction (see §1), a number of Chinese varieties spoken in the south have developed some highly grammaticalized evidential sentence final particles via a combination of right-dislocation and clausal integration. We will here examine this more elaborate process with examples involving the development of Cantonese hearsay evidential *wo*³ and *wo*⁵.

The Cantonese lexical verb *waa*⁶ ‘say’ is known to have developed evidential markers at both the left and right periphery, with the latter type further developing into a wide range of pragmatic sentence final particles (Matthews 1998; Leung 2006, 2010; Yeung 2006; Yap & Ahn 2012). At the left periphery, hearsay evidential uses of the matrix clause *jan*⁴ *waa*⁶ ‘people say’ were attested in early 17th century opera lyrics, with the plural form *jan*⁴*dei*⁶ *waa*⁶ ‘people say’ attested in early 19th century song lyrics (Jiu 1828). More elaborate forms such as *ngo*⁵ *teng*¹*gin*³ *jan*⁴ *waa*⁶ ‘I hear people say’ and *ngo*⁵ *teng*¹*gin*³ *waa*⁶ ‘I hear say’ were both attested in the late 19th century (*The Forty Exercises*, Anonymous 1877). *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Chinese Topolects* (Xu & Miyata 1999) includes *teng*¹*waa*⁶ ‘hearsay’, undated but probably from an early 20th century text. Contemporary Cantonese now favours *teng*¹*gong*² (also ‘hearsay’) as its left-

periphery evidential marker. Movies from the 1960's provide us with examples of both *teng¹gong²waa⁶* (lit. 'hear.say say') and *teng¹gong²* (lit. 'hear.say'). Examples of hearsay evidential *jan⁴dei⁶waa⁶* 'people say' and *teng¹waa⁶* 'hearsay' (> 'It's said') at the left periphery is shown in (15) and (16) below (see Yap & Ahn 2012 for more detailed diachronic discussion).

- (15) 人話天孫今夜會牛郎
jan⁴ waa⁶ tin¹syun¹ gam¹je⁶ wui⁶ ngau⁴long⁴
 people say PN tonight meet PN
 Lit. '(People say) Tin-Syun (goddess of fertility) will meet Ngau-Long (the cowherd).'
 'For to night, it is said, heaven's bride and bridegroom unite.'
 (From the opera lyric *Faa¹Zin¹Gei³* "The Flower Scroll", early 17th century, translated by Peter Perring Thoms 1824: 1)

- (16) 聽話好熱鬧，
teng¹waa⁶ hou² jit⁶naau⁶,
 hear.say INT exciting
 點解咁高興你都唔去呀？
dim²gaai² gam³ gou¹hing³ nei⁵ dou¹ m⁴ heoi³ aa³?
 why (<how.explain) such cheerful 2SG FOC NEG go SFP
 'It is said (< 'I) hear say') (the event is) very exciting.
 It is such a cheerful activity. Why don't you go join?'
 (From the drama *Hyut³Dik¹Gaa³Fan³* "Lessons from Past Sufferings", undated, cited in *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Chinese Topolects*, p. 2629, published in 1999)

Cantonese *waa⁶* 'say' has grammaticalized even more vigorously at the right periphery (see Yap & Ahn 2012). Hearsay evidential uses of *waa⁶* and its phonological variants were attested in utterance tag position in 19th century texts via a process of right-dislocation. The emergence of the phonological variants for *waa⁶* necessarily involves the use of higher tones, with high-rising tone *waa²* attested in the mid-19th century (Williams 1856), and mid-tone *waa³* and low-rising *waa⁵* attested in the late 19th century (Ball 1883). As noted by previous scholars (e.g. Law 1990; Matthews & Yip 1994; Sybesma & Li 2007), high tones are more closely associated with tentativeness and a lower epistemic commitment on the part of the speaker to his/her utterance. It is not surprising therefore that these phonological variants *waa²*, *waa³* and *waa⁵* which had incorporated the higher tones came to be associated with evidential readings, as seen in (17) and (18) below.¹⁴

- (17) 話佢少佢銀嚟
waa⁶ keoi⁵ siu² keoi⁵ ngan⁴ waa²
 say 3SG less 3SG money EVID
 'They said each had the other's money.' (Williams 1856: 652)

¹⁴ Tone 2 is a high-rising tone and tone 5 is a low-rising tone, while tone 3 is a mid-tone. All these three tones are higher than tone 6, which is the original tone used for *waa⁶* 'say'.

- (18) 好多賊嘍
hou² do¹ caak⁶ waa²
 INT many thief EVID
 ‘They say there are many robbers.’ (Williams 1856: 652)

Phonological variants of the *wo*-type evidentials developed throughout the 19th and the early 20th century. As illustrated in (19) below, hearsay evidential *wo³* was already attested in the early 19th century (Morrison 1828).¹⁵ Chao (1947: 121) suggests that sentence final evidential *wo³* may have emerged as a result of the combination between utterance tag *waa⁶* and emphatic sentence final particle *o³* (i.e. *waa⁶ + o³ > wo³*). This would involve phonological changes that include segment reduction and syllable fusion. Note that this process also involves tone-rising changes, more specifically from low-tone *waa⁶* to mid-tone *wo³*. The shift to a higher tone favours the expression of tentativeness and lower epistemic commitment, and is more compatible with evidential uses. Hearsay evidential *wo⁴* was attested as a phonological variant in the late 19th century (Ball 1888), and hearsay evidential *wo⁵* was attested slightly later in the early 20th century (Ball 1912), as shown in (20), and continues to be used to this day, as seen in (21). It is worth noting that *wo⁵* (with the rising tone) is the one that is favoured to carry on as the evidentiality marker in Contemporary Cantonese.

- (19) 佢聽日至黎和
keoi⁵ ting¹ jat⁶ zi³ lai⁴ wo³
 3SG tomorrow only.then come EVID
 ‘He’ll come tomorrow.’ (Morrison 1828: Part III, Section X, “Friendship”)

- (20) A: 佢話有乜野錯呢
keoi⁵ waa⁶ jau⁵ mi¹ je⁵ co³ ni¹
 3SG say exist what.thing wrong SFP
 Lit. ‘He said have what thing wrong, eh?’
 ‘What fault did he find with it?’
- B: 乜野都錯啫
mi¹ je⁵ dou¹ co³ wo⁵
 what.thing also wrong EVID
 Lit. ‘Everything even wrong, **so-he-says**.’
 ‘Everything is wrong about it.’ (Ball 1912: 66, 67)

- (21) (聽講) 佢唔嚟嗰
(teng¹ gong²) keoi⁵ m⁴ lai⁴ wo⁵
 hear.say 3SG NEG come EVID
 ‘He’s not coming, I hear (< ‘people say’).’ (Contemporary Cantonese)

Leung (2006: 66) noted that an example with utterance tag *waa¹* in Ball (1888), as shown in (22) below, was later reproduced with sentence final particle

¹⁵ Note that we are using the Jyutping Romanization system for the Cantonese examples.

*wo*⁵ in his later 1924 edition. This suggests a strong link between *waa*-type and *wo*-type evidentials, which we suggest is derivational in nature.

- (22) 佢打我啱 (later replaced by 啱 in Ball's 1924 edition)
*keoi*⁵ *daa*² *ngo*⁵ ***waa*¹** (> ***wo*⁵**)
 3SG hit 1SG EVID EVID
 'He said he would strike me.' (Ball 1888: 90)

Interestingly, while rising-tone *wo*⁵ has developed into the dominant hearsay evidential in Contemporary Cantonese, mid-tone hearsay evidential *wo*³ developed instead into a counter-expectation marker (Yap, Chor & Wang 2012), as illustrated in (23). There are also phonological variants, depending on sentence final prosody, with Cantonese movies from the 1960's providing examples of low-tone counter-expectation marker *wo*⁴. Previous scholars have observed that, in contrast to the high tones, which convey a sense that "the speaker is not fully committed to what s/he just said" (Sybesma & Li 2007:1768), the low tones function instead as pragmatic strengtheners (ibid; see also Law 1990; Matthews & Yip 1994). It is therefore not surprising then that mirative and counter-expectation readings come to be associated with low-tone *wo*⁴.

- (23) (係啱!) 你唔講我都唔知啱!
*(hai*⁶ *wo*^{3!}) *nei*⁵ *m*⁴ *gong*² *ngo*⁵ *dou*¹ *m*⁴ *zi*¹ ***wo*^{3!}**
 yes CE 2SG NEG say 1SG also NEG know CE
 'Oh yes/right!? If you didn't tell me, I wouldn't have known!'
 (Contemporary Cantonese)

Essentially, two major types of phonological changes were involved in the grammaticalization of *waa*⁶ 'say' evidentials at the right periphery. One type involved segment reduction and syllable fusion when *waa*-type evidentials combined with sentence final particles such as *o*³ to form *wo*-type evidentials (e.g. *waa*⁶ + *o*³ > *wo*³). Another type involved tone changes as both *waa*-type and *wo*-type evidentials combined with higher tones to form a wider range of evidentials. This development points to an important role for speaker's sentence final prosody in the grammaticalization of 'say' evidential markers at the right periphery.¹⁶ These observations are consistent with the findings of previous studies, in particular Sybesma and Li (2007: 1768; citing Law 1990), which suggest that "tonal SFPs are highly localized intonation."

From a structural perspective, as highlighted in Figure 6 below, using the utterance *jan*⁴*dei*⁶ *waa*⁶ *keoi*⁵ *sat*¹-*zo*²-*zung*¹ 'people say he's gone missing' as a point of departure, we see a process of insubordination in which the subject and predicate-taking verb of the matrix clause (namely, *jan*⁴*dei*⁶ *waa*⁶ 'people say') is first grammaticalized into a left-periphery evidential marker, triggering reanalysis of the complement clause as an insubordinate 'main clause'. That is, the

¹⁶ It is also interesting to note the use of different Chinese characters over time, from 話 *waa*⁶ 'say' to 啱 *waa*-type utterance tags and 啱 or 啱 *wo*-type sentence final particles. As discussed elsewhere (e.g. Yap & Ahn 2012), it is worth further noting that the Chinese characters for the utterance-final variants of *waa*⁶ (話) are written with an additional semantic radical meaning 'mouth' (口) to indicate its colloquial usage as well as its sentence final particle (SFP) status.

complement clause *keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹* ‘he’s gone missing’ now becomes an in subordinate (i.e. independent) construction. Right-dislocation, on the other hand, gives rise to utterance tags and sentence final particles at the right periphery, both for the *waa*-type and *wo*-type evidentials. Combinations of *waa*-type and *wo*-type evidentials with other sentence final particles (e.g. emphatic particle *o³*) and with the speaker’s sentence final prosody give rise to phonological variants with subtle shades of attitudinal and other pragmatic functions such as confirmation-seeking, reminding and counterexpectation marking. Phonological reduction of these *waa*-type and *wo*-type ‘say’ sentence final particles facilitates clausal integration, whereby the evidential utterance tag at the right periphery of the in subordinate complement clause is reanalyzed as its sentence final particle. In this way, the hearsay evidential particle comes to explicitly mark the in subordinate (i.e. independent and finite) status of the erstwhile complement clause.

Figure 6. Stages in the right-dislocation and clausal integration of Cantonese hearsay evidential sentence final particle *wo³* and *wo⁵*

Stage 1 (lexical verb)	[_{IP2} <i>jan⁴dei⁶</i> [_{VP} <i>waa⁶</i> [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>]]]]]
Stage 2 (hearsay EVID at LP)	[_{CP2-EVID} <i>jan⁴dei⁶ waa⁶</i> [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>]]]
Stage 3 (hearsay EVID at RP)	[_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>], [_{EVID} (<i>jan⁴dei⁶</i>) <i>waa⁶</i>]]]
Stage 4 (attitudinal EVID ‘so it’s said’)	[_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>], [_{CP2} (<i>jan⁴dei⁶</i>) <i>gam² waa⁶ o³</i>]]]
Stage 5 (hearsay EVID at RP)	[_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>] [_{EVID} <i>waa⁶ + o³</i>]]]
Stage 6 (sentence-final EVID <i>wo³</i>)	[_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>] <i>wo³</i>]
Stage 7a (sentence-final EVID <i>wo⁵</i>)	⇒ [_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>] <i>wo⁵</i>] (+ tone change)
Stage 7b (sentence-final CE <i>wo³</i>)	[_{CP2-EVID} [_{IP1} <i>keoi⁵ sat¹-zo²-zung¹</i>] <i>wo³</i>] (+ mirativity)

As seen in Figure 6 above, the later stages in the development of the *waa*-type and *wo*-type ‘say’ constructions include a strong pragmatic interpretation (e.g. confirmation-seeking, reminding, counterexpectation marking). The development of these pragmatically-nuanced ‘say’ constructions from *waa*-type utterance tags to *wo*-type sentence final particles is consistent with cross-linguistic tendencies which, in the words of Hunston and Thompson (2000: 143; paraphrasing Martin 2000), show that “the expression of attitude is not, as is often claimed, simply a personal matter—the speaker ‘commenting’ on the world—but a truly interpersonal matter in that the basic reason for advancing an opinion is to elicit a response of solidarity from the addressee” (see also Kärkkäinen 2003:185).

From a crosslinguistic perspective, it is worth noting that numerous other languages—particularly verb-final languages—have also developed sentence-final evidentials from ‘say’ verbs (see Aikhenvald 2004; Aikhenvald & LaPolla 2007; Grunow-Hårsta 2007; *inter alia*). An interesting difference is that the syntactic mechanism of right-dislocation is not necessary for verb-final languages; they simply rely on verb-serialization or converbal construction to achieve similar semantic and syntactic scope expansions.

Despite the apparent greater ease with which verb-final languages form their ‘say’ evidential constructions at the right periphery, it is also interesting to note that the development of ‘say’ constructions into sentence-final evidential and

pragmatic particles in verb-final languages such as Japanese and Korean also undergo many phonological reduction processes similar to the ones we have identified for Cantonese, including segment reduction and syllable fusion (e.g. Cantonese *waa6 + o3 > wo3*; Japanese *to itteiru > tte*; Korean *tako hanta > tanta*) (see S. Suzuki 1998 and R. Suzuki 2007 on the development of Japanese *tte*, and Ahn & Yap 2012 on the development of Korean *tanta* and other ‘say’ evidentials such as *tako*, *tamye*, *tamyense* and *tanun*).

6. Main-clause ellipsis and right-dislocation: emergence of concessive utterance tag *buguo*

Recent work on Japanese and Korean sentence final particles have revealed extensive use of ‘main-clause ellipsis’ in the formation of pragmatically-laden sentence final particles, often derived from elliptical processes that reanalyze connectives at the right periphery of subordinate clauses as sentence final particles of ‘stand-alone’ insubordinated clauses (e.g. Ohori 1998; Higashiizumi 2006, 2012; Shibasaki 2007, in press; Shinzato 2007, 2011; Rhee 2012). Such elliptical processes are more restricted in Chinese, partly because many connectives in Modern Chinese are typically found at the left (rather than right) periphery of subordinate clauses.¹⁷ The main clauses of concessive constructions tend to be highly amenable to ellipsis, particularly in conversational discourse contexts where the concessive connective is being right-dislocated for pragmatic reasons and thus appears at the right-periphery of the subordinate clause to attenuate the epistemic claims of the prior speaker, as seen in the Mandarin Chinese example in (24) and the Cantonese Chinese example in (25).

(24) A: 明天問問他。
mingtian wen-wen ta.
 tomorrow ask-ask 3SG
 ‘(We’ll) just ask him tomorrow.’

B: 他不會來不過。
ta bu hui lai buguo.
 3SG NEG FUT come however
 ‘He won’t be coming here *though*.’

(25) A: 佢次次都遲到架啦。
keoi⁵ ci³ci³ dou¹ ci⁴dou³ ga³laa¹.
 3SG always also late SFP
 ‘As we all know, he’s always late.’

B: 係呀。但係佢今次早到 (喎)
hai⁶ aa³. daan⁶hai⁶ keoi⁵ gam¹ci³ zou² dou³ (wo³)

¹⁷ Clause-final (i.e. right periphery) connectives were not uncommon in Old Chinese, with clause-final conditional *zhe* (‘when/if’) subordinate clauses attested in Classical Chinese texts (see Yap & Wang 2011). This clause-final conditional subordinator structure is still retained in Modern Chinese (e.g. Mandarin *dehua* (‘if’) conditional clauses). Note that these clause-final connectives are derived from clause-final nominalizers *zhe* and *di* (>*de*) in Old Chinese and Late Middle Chinese respectively).

yes SFP however 3SG this.time early arrive CE

不過。

bat¹gwo³.

however

'Yes, but this time he's early *though*.'

As seen in (24) and (25) above, the interactive nature of conversational talk lends itself to the formation of elliptical constructions, as dyadic talk often makes repetition of the prior speaker's claims unnecessary. As such, ellipsis can serve as a politeness strategy in that it can signal to the prior speaker that the current speaker is tacitly acknowledging what has been said, and crucially ellipsis then allows the current speaker to focus on making his/her point and deftly adding a pragmatic touch, by conceding that what the prior speaker has proposed may be a possible solution, as in (24) above, or may be true, as in (25), but at the same time ellipsis of the main clause allows the current speaker to draw attention to the particular semantics of the connective and the assertion in the subordinate clause. In the Mandarin example in (24), through the ellipsis of the main clause, Speaker B tacitly agrees with Speaker A that it would be a good idea to confirm the facts with a certain *ta* 'he' who is in a position to provide the answer to their question. By subsequently adding concessive connective *buguo* 'however' as a right-dislocated utterance tag to his reply, Speaker B is able to also point out a potential problem, namely that the person who is in a position to provide the relevant information unfortunately will not be available for questioning. In the Cantonese example in (25), by eliding the main clause, Speaker B tacitly accepts Speaker A's assessment that a certain person they have been talking about is often late, and by subsequently adding concessive markers *daan⁶hai⁶* 'however' in clause-initial position and *bat¹gwo³* in clause-final (right-dislocated) position, both of which happen to be optional, Speaker B is at the same time able to refute the relevance of the prior information provided by Speaker A.

The combined use of main-clause ellipsis and the right-dislocated concessive utterance tag *buguo/bat¹gwo³* thus allows the current speaker (B) to engage in dispreferred moves, such as disagreeing with the prior speaker, in a more subtle and less face-threatening manner. Figure 7 highlights the stages in the development of Mandarin sentence final concessive *buguo*.

Figure 7. Stages in main-clause ellipsis of Mandarin concessive *buguo*

Stage 1 (bi-clausal concessive):	Main clause + <i>buguo</i> subordinate clause
Stage 2 (main-clause ellipsis):	<i>Buguo</i> subordinate clause
Stage 3 (right-dislocation of concessive connective ⇒ insubordinated clause with utterance tag):	Insubordinate clause <i>buguo</i>

As is often the case in Japanese and Korean (as well as other languages), main-clause ellipsis is thus used in Chinese as a face-saving device to avoid undue

attention to a point of contention.¹⁸ At the same time, grammatical devices such as the concessive connectives *buguo* in Mandarin and *bat¹gwo³* in Cantonese are often right-dislocated to serve as sentence final pragmatic markers that allow the speaker to pragmatically hedge his/her counter-claims or alternative proposals. There has not been as much work done in Chinese conversational discourse on these connective-type sentence-final particles that emerge as a result of main-clause ellipsis and right-dislocation, and more studies are clearly welcome. From a typological perspective, main-clause ellipsis is known to be far more productive in verb-final languages with abundant clause-final connectives, both in terms of usage frequency and structural types, as seen in numerous studies on Japanese and Korean. This is largely because right-dislocation of clause-final connectives is not even an option for these verb-final languages, which means that Stage 3 in Figure 7 above is altogether unnecessary, thereby reducing (for these languages) the number of steps required for the development of sentence final particles derived from clausal connectives.

7. Insubordination of nominalization constructions: reanalysis of nominalizers as tense-aspect-mood and attitude markers

In this section we will examine how versatile nominalizers are reinterpreted as sentence final particles. This phenomenon is robust crosslinguistically among verb-final languages (for Tibeto-Burman languages, see Matisoff 1972, Noonan 1997, 2008 & 2011, Simpson 2008, Grunow-Hårsta 2011, *inter alia*; for Japanese, see Horie 2011; for Korean, see Ahn & Yap 2013, Rhee 2008, 2011; for a crosslinguistic perspective across Asian languages, see Yap & Grunow-Hårsta 2010; *inter alia*). Interestingly, as briefly noted in §1 earlier, although Modern Chinese is essentially a verb-medial language (SVO), some of its nominalization constructions are head-final, which structurally enables some of its nominalizers to also develop into sentence final particles. A case in point is Middle Chinese nominalizer *di*, as seen in (26a), which has undergone phonological reduction and character substitution and now is realized as *de*, as seen in (26b). Nominalizer *di* or *de* often occurs at the right periphery of an utterance or sentence, which over time facilitates its reanalysis into a sentence final particle, in large part mediated by *shi ... di~de* cleft constructions, as seen in (27) and (28) (see Yap, Choi & Cheung 2010).

- (26) a. 人人盡有底
ren ren jin you di
 people people all have NMLZ
 ‘that which everyone has’¹⁹
 (*Zutangji*, Five Dynasties period, 10th century)
- b. 對於這個問題，
duiyu zhe ge wenti,

¹⁸ For studies of ‘main clause omission’ and the rise of negative attitude markers in Korean, see Rhee (2012).

¹⁹ This refers to one’s character, which in this discussion between two monks is referred to as one’s skin, and metaphorically symbolized by one’s garment.

as.for this CL question

我知道的很有限

wo zhidao de hen youxian
1SG know NMLZ very limited

'As for this question, what I know is very limited.'

(Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese)

(27) a. 上下兩輪月，若個是真底？

shang xia liang lun yue, ruo ge shi zhen di?

up down two CL moon which CL COP real NMLZ/SFP

'The moon up (in the sky) and the moon down (in the water), which one is the real one / which one is real?'

(*Xia Ye Wan Yue*, Southern Song period, 12th – 13th century)

b. 此寺是則天皇后蓋造的，

ci si shi zetian huanghou gaizao di,
this temple FOC PN queen build SFP

後來崩損，又是崔相國重修的。

houlai bengsun, you shi cui xiangguo chongxiu di.

later collapse INT FOC PN prime.minister rebuild SFP

'This temple was built by Queen Zetian. Later it collapsed. It was Prime Minister Cui who rebuilt it.'

(*Xixiangji*, Yuan period, 13th – 14th century)

(28) a. 是我先找到這個答案的

shi wo xian zhaodao zhe-ge daan de

FOC 1SG first find.out this-CL answer SFP (< NMLZ)

'It was I who found the answer first.' (Modern Chinese)

b. 這個答案（，）是我先找到的

zhege daan (,) shi wo xian zhaodao de

this.CL answer FOC 1SG first find.out SFP

'It was I who found the answer first.' (Modern Chinese)

c. 這個答案（，）我先找到的

zhege daan (,) wo xian zhaodao de

this.CL answer 1SG first find.out SFP

'I found the answer first.' (Modern Chinese)

At the right periphery, as seen in (27) and (28) above, *de* is in an ideal position to serve as the landing site for the speaker's illocutionary force as conveyed through the sentence final prosody. The interpretation typically associated with sentence final particle *de* is one of assertion. This is partly because the emergence of sentence final particle *de* is mediated by the use of *de* nominalization constructions in cleft constructions, as highlighted in (27b). However, given that nominalization constructions can also serve as complement constructions in interrogative, mirative and other contexts, sentence final *de* can also host other

types of sentence final prosodic features, ranging from dubitative to sceptical, hesitant or even playful, and not just assertive ones (see Yap, Choi & Cheung 2010). Sentence final *de* can also combine with other sentence final particles such as *ba*, *ne* and *ma* to form complex sentence final particles such as *deba*, *dene* and *dema*, as shown in (29) below.

- (29) a. 他們挺像的吧
tamen ting xiang deba
 3PL INT be.like SFP
 ‘They are quite alike.’ (conveying some hesitation)
- b. 他們挺像的呢
tamen ting xiang dene
 3PL INT be.like SFP
 ‘They are quite alike.’ (conveying some assurance)
- c. 他們挺像的嗎？
tamen ting xiang dema ?
 3PL INT be.like SFP
 ‘They are quite alike?’ (conveying some query, doubt, or scepticism)

Figure 8 highlights the various stages in the development of *di~de* from nominalizer to sentence final particle. The cleft construction, involving focus particle *shi* and a complement clause headed by nominalizer *di~de*, facilitated the emergence of sentence final particle *di~de* (Stage 3), particularly since nominalizer *di~de* is conveniently positioned at the right periphery within the *shi ... di~de* cleft construction, which makes it ideally situated to host the speaker’s sentence final prosody. In much the same way that sentence final *di~de* is able to combine with other sentence final particles to convey a wide range of speaker’s mood, evaluation and attitude, sentence-final *di~de* is also able to merge with various types of sentence final prosody cues to serve a wide range of pragmatic functions.

Figure 8. Stages in the reanalysis of Mandarin *di~de* from nominalizer to sentence final particle

Stage 1 (nominalizer <i>di</i>)	[_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>wo zhidao</i>] <i>di</i>]
Stage 2 (nominalizer <i>di</i> in cleft)	[_{CP2} <i>shi</i> [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>wo xian zhaodao zhege daan</i>] <i>di</i>]]
⇒ (sentence final <i>di</i> in cleft)	[_{CP2} <i>shi</i> [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>wo xian zhaodao zhege daan</i>]]] <i>di</i>]
Stage 3 (sentence final <i>di</i>)	[_{CP2} [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>wo xian zhaodao zhege daan</i>]]] <i>di</i>]
or (sentence final <i>di</i> + topicalization)	[_{TOP} <i>zhege daan</i>], [_{CP2} [_{CP1} [_{IP1} <i>wo zhidao</i>]]] <i>di</i>]

8. Some crosslinguistic observations: strategies in the development of sentence final particles (and utterance tags) in Chinese, Japanese and Korean

We have thus far identified six pathways in the development of sentence final particles (and utterance tags) in Chinese. These pathways are by no means exhaustive, nor are the phonological and morphosyntactic processes involved unique to the Chinese language. We have noted that the use of sentence final particles is particularly prominent among verb-final languages, such as Japanese and Korean for example. Regardless of their canonical word order (VO vs. OV), verb concatenation (e.g. verb serialization and converb-linking) and clausal integration are common strategies in the formation of grammatical and pragmatic markers, some of which develop into sentence final particles such as Mandarin *le*, Japanese *-te shimau* Korean *-a/e pelita*.

What is also noteworthy is that syntactic restructuring mechanisms such as right-dislocation are essentially superfluous and thus absent in verb-final languages. As such, whereas verb-medial languages such as Chinese (and English) sometimes resort to right-dislocation to convey speaker moods such as epistemic uncertainty, counter-expectation marking, speaker detachment, solidarity marking, or a combination of these, as in the case of Mandarin *kongpa* and Cantonese *wo*, verb-final languages can dispense with right-dislocation and simply rely on converb-linking (along with the necessary phonological changes such as segment reduction and syllable fusion) to give rise to sentence final particles. As noted earlier, this simpler grammaticalization process has given rise to numerous evidential markers, including Japanese *-tte* and Korean *tako*, *tamye*, *tamyense*, *tanun* and *tanta*. In this respect, the development of some types of sentence final particles is structurally more costly for verb-medial languages such as Chinese. This also explains why, depending on the degree of grammaticalization of a right-dislocated constituent, we see utterance tags that have not (yet) gone the full length of clausal integration to become sentence final particles in verb-medial languages such as English and Chinese. As discussed in section 7 above, some utterance tags are phonologically and morphosyntactically further integrated with the preceding clause to form sentence final particles, as attested in southern Chinese dialects that are rich in sentence final particles (e.g. Cantonese *wo*-type evidentials), but the reanalysis of utterance tags as sentence final particles is rare in languages such as English that are impoverished in sentence final particles. This suggests the possibility that an environment rich in sentence final particles, with a strong predilection for clausal integration at the right periphery, facilitates the reanalysis of utterance tags into sentence final particles, when supported by high usage frequency.

Elliptical constructions that involve the elision of main clauses and the subsequent insubordination of subordinate clauses, and the concomitant reanalysis of their connectives as sentence final particles, are highly productive in verb-final languages (see for example discussions of ‘suspended clauses’ in Ohori (1995), as well as Japanese *kara* and *node* utterance-final particles in Higashiizumi (2006, 2012) and various Korean pragmatic sentence enders such as *tanikka* in Rhee (2012)). The use of ‘main-clause ellipsis’ in this fashion that gives rise to connective-based sentence final particles is much more restricted in verb-medial languages such as English (but see Mulder, Thompson & Williams (2009) for a discussion of recent developments of sentence-final *but* in Australian, New Zealand and Falkland Islands English), and it is also quite restricted in Chinese, with concessive sentence final particle *buguo* and negator-turned-interrogative sentence final particle *bu* among the few examples.

In this paper, as we examined various pathways by which sentence final particles emerge in Chinese, we frequently saw a progression in which constructions evolve over time from propositional to subjective and intersubjective uses, consistent with Traugott's observations (e.g. Traugott 1989, 1995, 2003, 2010).²⁰ One important observation that keeps converging across the various pathways we have examined is the formation of 'finite' structures, either in the form of monoclausal subjective constructions derived from biclausal or multi-clausal constructions (e.g. Mandarin *le*, *bale*, *haole*, *dele*), or in subordinate 'suspended' constructions from subordinate complements (e.g. Mandarin sentence final *buguo* and *kongpa*, and Cantonese *wo*-type evidentials), or in subordinate 'main-clause predicates' from stand-alone nominalized complement clauses (e.g. Mandarin sentence-final *de* constructions). In all these cases, we obtain 'finite' structures, where the term 'finite' is to be understood in a broad sense to include various strategies by which clauses become semantically, phonologically and morphosyntactically independent structures (see Nikolaeva 2007 and papers therein, in particular Evans 2007; see also Nikolaeva 2010). Within the cognitive linguistic tradition, such 'finiteness' is construable in terms of 'clausal grounding' or 'clausal anchoring' (Taylor 2003). What we have shown thus far, then, is that Chinese sentence final evidentials and other pragmatic markers are 'finiteness markers' or 'clausal grounders' in that they contribute to the formation of independent clauses. This helps to explain *how* 'tenseless' languages such as Chinese form 'finite' (or independent) clauses. Whereas English relies heavily on inflectional tense markers and modals, in addition to remnants of a once-robust case and agreement system, Chinese deploys a variety of strategies that include not only the use of sentence-final aspect markers, modal auxiliaries, intensifiers or degree adverbials (e.g. *hen* 'very') and comparative markers (e.g. *bijiao* 'in comparison'), among others, it also uses a wide array of sentence final particles.

The 'finite' sentence final particles that we have identified in the preceding sections include: (i) Mandarin perfect and conversation turn-transition marker *le*; (ii) Classical Chinese mitigative marker *er yi yi*, and Mandarin mitigative and hortative particles *bale*, *haole*, *dele* and *suanle*; (iii) Mandarin concessive marker *buguo* in 'main-clause ellipsis' constructions, (iv) Cantonese evidential and counterexpectation marker *wo*³, and (v) Mandarin nominalizer and default assertive marker *de*. These 'finite' particles are grounded not only in terms of temporal deictic information but also in terms of the speaker's illocutionary force. As discussed in section 4, Mandarin epistemic marker and pragmatic hedger *kongpa* has developed into an utterance tag but not (yet) into a sentence final marker; nevertheless, it can be said to indirectly contribute to the finiteness of its host predicate, which previously was its erstwhile complement clause that is now in subordinated via a right-dislocation process that has back-shifted (or postpositioned) *kongpa* from the matrix verb position to the adjunct-like

²⁰ (Inter)subjectivity refers to the process by which speakers express their personal and interpersonal feelings, views, evaluations and attitudes in the course of human interaction and communication, while (inter)subjectification focuses on the language change processes that give rise to markers of speakers' (inter)subjective stances. Research within Traugott's framework has provided us with a diachronic and typological perspective to (inter)subjectivity phenomena, while Langacker (1989) provides us with a cognitive linguistic model to conceptualize these (inter)subjective phenomena.

utterance tag position. Crucially, utterance tag *kongpa* retains its subjective epistemic ‘probably, I’m afraid to say’ reading. This provides a means whereby the insubordinated complement clause can be grounded in the discourse, not so much via temporal deixis by means of tense marking, but more by means of anchoring onto the speaker’s subjective epistemic mood—in other words, by relying on pragmatic deixis. Not surprisingly, this broader definition of finiteness, which can rely on a wide range of sentence final particles to serve as temporal and pragmatic indexicals (i.e. deictic elements) that can ground a clause as independent structures within discourse, is attested in other languages too, including Japanese and Korean, many of whose sentence final particles are marked for tense while simultaneously engaging in pragmatic functions.

9. Conclusion

In this paper, we have examined how sentence final particles emerged in Chinese. More specifically, we identified a number of morphosyntactic and phonological processes that contribute to the rise of pragmatic markers at the right periphery, many of which are also found in other languages. One type of morphosyntactic process is verb concatenation in the form of verb serialization, which is then followed by a form of clause combining. In Chinese, this process gives rise to a wide range of temporal aspect markers at the right periphery, which go on to develop into pragmatic markers with (inter)subjective functions, as seen in the use of Mandarin *le* to signal the completion of the speaker’s turn and by implicature invite the addressee to take up the next conversational turn (Lu & Su 2009).

Clausal combining can involve constructions larger than serial verb constructions. In Chinese, evaluative expressions—whether phrasal or clausal—often occur at the end of a series of prior clauses (thus operating at the level of discourse rather than syntax), and these expressions often undergo phonological reduction and subsequent clausal integration to form evaluative sentence final particles, such as Classical Chinese *er yi yi* and Mandarin *bale*, *haole*, *dele* and *suanle*.

Evaluative and other (inter)subjective speaker stances are often expressed in matrix predicates, as in Mandarin epistemic (*wo*) *kongpa* expressions, which are roughly equivalent to English *I think* epistemic phrases. These (inter)subjective expressions often grammaticalize into epistemic adverbials that occur in clause-initial and clause-medial (parenthetical) positions, but they are also sometimes found in clause-final position. In the case of Mandarin *kongpa* and English *I think*, these epistemic expressions occur as utterance tags that have been right-dislocated (or ‘backshifted’) to serve pragmatic functions as well, often as hedges that serve to protect the face-needs of the speaker or the addressee, or both.

In Chinese, utterance tags derived via right-dislocation often further merge with the preceding clause, via a process of clausal integration, to form sentence final particles. This is facilitated by the extensive use of subject NP and object NP omission in Chinese in cases where these referents are easily retrievable from context. Examples of this type of development can be seen in the semantic-pragmatic extension of Cantonese *waa*-type evidential utterance tags which undergo phonological changes and structural reanalysis to form *wo*-type sentence

final particles that also serve (inter)subjective pragmatic functions such as counter-expectation marking.

Sentence final particles also often emerge when subordinate or embedded clauses undergo insubordination and are reanalyzed as finite and independent ‘main-clause predicates’. In this paper, we have discussed two types of insubordination processes for Chinese. One involves a ‘main-clause ellipsis’ phenomenon that gives rise to the reanalysis of concessive connective *buguo* as a concessive sentence final particle. Another one involves the reinterpretation of *de*-nominalization constructions as ‘stand-alone’ finite structures; this type of insubordination process has been documented in numerous other languages (e.g. Noonan 1997, DeLancey 2011; Rhee 2008, 2011; Simpson 2008; Horie 2011; Yap, Grunow-Hårsta & Wrona 2011; *inter alia*). Crucially, this process involves the reanalysis of erstwhile nominalizers as sentence final particles. Typically, these particles at the right periphery convey assertive force. However, because they are highly bleached semantically, they can also serve as the landing site for a relatively wide range of sentence final prosodic cues, and can also combine with other sentence final particles, to yield numerous shades of speaker moods, evaluations and attitudes, including surprise, disbelief, doubt, hesitation and ridicule.

In addition to identifying the different processes that give rise to sentence final particles in Chinese, and comparing these processes with those found in other languages such as Japanese and Korean, we have also probed the question of whether sentence final particles are ‘finiteness markers’. We adopt a broad definition of finiteness, *a la* Nikolaeva (2007, 2010), and in this paper we have argued that sentence final particles either develop within the context of pre-existing finite structures, or contribute to the formation of finite structures. In this regard, we show that tense-aspect-mood (TAM) markers at the right periphery not only serve as temporal markers but also as pragmatic markers; at the same time, we also show that non-TAM markers such as evidential markers and nominalizers can also develop extended pragmatic uses with ‘finitizing’ or ‘clausal grounding’ functions, since these pragmatic markers also contribute to the formation of independent clauses that can stand alone semantically, prosodically and morphosyntactically.

List of Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	DEM	demonstrative
1PL	first person plural	EVID	evidential marker
2SG	second person singular	FOC	focus particle
3SG	third person singular	FUT	future marker
3PL	third person plural	GEN	genitive
ACC	accusative	INT	intensifier
ADHORT	adhortative	NEG	negator
ADVERS	adversity marker	NMLZ	nominalizer
ASP	aspect marker	NON-VOL	non-volition marker
ATTR	attributive	PFV	perfective
CE	counterexpectation marker	PN	person’s name
CL	classifier	POT	potential
COMPL	completive	PROG	progressive
COND	conditional marker	PRT	particle

CONV	converb linker	Q	question marker
COP	copula	SFP	sentence final particle
CRS	current relevant state; also anterior/perfect marker	TOP	topic marker

Acknowledgements

We wish to gratefully acknowledge generous research funding support from the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong (General Research Fund, PolyU 5513/10H) to the first author for the project “Stance Marking in Asian Languages: Linguistic and Cultural Perspectives”. We also wish to thank the Faculty of Humanities Dean’s Reserve for their generous support through the research project “Clause-medial Particles in Chinese” (HKPU 1-ZV8A). We further wish to thank Professor Samuel Hung-nin Cheung for access to his *Early Canton Dialect Database* and to Dr Andy Chi-on Chin for access to *A Linguistic Corpus of Mid-20th Century Hong Kong Cantonese Movies*. We would also like to express our thanks to the editors and two anonymous reviewers, and to Mikyung Ahn, Ariel Chan, Weirong Chen, Lawrence Cheung, Winnie Oi-wan Chor, Lily He, Yuko Higashiizumi, Kathy Lin, Stephen Matthews, Mizuho Tamaji, Jiao Wang, and Brian Wai for their valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- Ahn, Mikyung and Foong Ha Yap. 2013. Negotiating common ground in discourse: A diachronic and discourse analysis of *maliya* in Korean. *Language Sciences*. 37: 36-51.
- Ahn, Mikyung and Foong Ha Yap. 2012. On the extended uses of evidential markers in Korean: Diachronic and discourse perspectives. Paper presented at the Conference on the *Nature of Evidentiality*, Leiden University, June 13-14.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Randy J. LaPolla. 2007. New perspectives on evidentials: A view from Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*. 30/2, *Special issue on Evidentiality*.
- Anonymous. 1824 [1996]. *Chinese Courtship: in Verse*, translated by Peter Perring Thoms. Macao: The Honorable East.
- Anonymous. 1877. *The Forty Exercises*. Unknown publishing details.
- Ball, J. Dyer. 1883. *Cantonese Made Easy: a Book of Simple Sentences in the Cantonese Dialect with Free and Literal Translations, and Directions for the Rendering of English Grammatical Forms in Chinese*. Hong Kong: China Mail Office.
- Ball, J. Dyer. 1888. *Cantonese Made Easy: A Book on Simple Sentences in the Canton Dialect*. 2nd ed. Hong Kong: China Mail Office.
- Ball, J. Dyer. 1912. *How to Speak Cantonese: Fifty Conversations in Cantonese Colloquial: with the Chinese character, free and literal English translations, and romanised spelling with tonic and diacritical marks, etc.* 4th ed. Hong Kong: Kelly & Walsh.
- Ball, J. Dyer. 1924. *Cantonese Made Easy: A book on Simple Sentences in the Canton Dialect, with free literal translations, and directions for the rendering of English grammatical forms in Chinese*. Revised and enlarged. 4th ed. Hong Kong: Kelly & Walsh.
- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cao, Guangshun. 1995. *Jindai Hanyu Zhuci*. Beijing: Yuwen Chubanshe.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1947. *Cantonese Primer*. New York: Greenwood.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cheung, Lawrence. 2009. Dislocation focus construction in Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*. 18/3: 197-232.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2011. "Finite structures from clausal nominalization in Tibeto-Burman". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 343-360.
- Endo, Tomoko. 2006. "Experiencer defocusing and the grammaticalization of emotion predicates: The case of love and fear in Mandarin Chinese". In: *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Japanese Cognitive Linguistics Association*, 75-84.
- Endo, Tomoko. 2013. "Epistemic stance in Mandarin conversation: The positions and functions of *wo juede*(I feel/think)". In: Yuling Pan and Daniel Kádár (eds.) *Chinese Discourse and Interaction: Theory and Practice*. London: Equinox, 12-34.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. "Insubordination and its uses". In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.) *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University, 366-431.
- Givón, Talmy. 1985. "Iconicity, isomorphism and non-arbitrary coding in syntax". In John Haiman (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 187-220.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax*, Volumes 1 & 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen. 2007. Mirativity and evidentiality in Magar. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*. 30/2: 151-194.
- Grunow-Hårsta, Karen. 2011. "Innovation in nominalization in Magar: A Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 215-254.
- Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). 1988. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2006. *From a Subordinate Clause to an Independent Clause: A History of English Because-clause and Japanese Kara-clause*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2012. Ellipsis and stance-taking in Japanese. Paper presented at the Workshop on Epistemicity, Evidentiality and Attitude in Asian Languages: Typological, Diachronic and Discourse Perspectives, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, September 3-5.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2011. "Versatility of nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean contrast". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 473-496.
- Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds.). 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Jiu, Ji-yung. 1828. *Yue-ou*. Canton: Dengyunge.
- Jiu, Ji-yung. 1992 [1828]. *Cantonese Love Songs: An English Translation of Jiu Ji-yung's Cantonese Songs of the Early 19th Century*, translated by Peter T. Morris. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Laury, Ritva (ed.). 2008. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Law, Sam-po. 1990. *The Syntax and Phonology of Cantonese Sentence Final Particles*. PhD dissertation, Boston University.
- Lee, Cher Leng and Zheng-yin Agnes Cheong. 1999. Pragmatics of *liao* in Singapore Mandarin. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics, CRLAO-EHESS, Paris.
- Legge, James. 1960. *The Chinese Classics: With a Translation, Critical and Exegetical Notes, Prolegomena, and Copious Indexes*. Hong Kong: Hong University Press.
- Leung, Wai-mun. 2006. *On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Sentence Final Particles: The Case of WO in Cantonese*. PhD dissertation, University of Hong Kong.
- Leung, Wai-mun. 2010. *On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Sentence-Final Particles: The Case of WO in Cantonese*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Lim, Ni Eng. 2011. "From subjectivity to intersubjectivity: Epistemic marker *wo jue* in Chinese". In: Yun Xiao, Liang Tao and Hooi Ling Soh (eds.) *Current Issues in Chinese Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press, 265-300.
- Lin, Tzong-Hong Jonah. 2008. Complement-to-specifier movement in Mandarin Chinese. Manuscript, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.
- Liu, Xunning. 1985. Xiandai hanyu juwei "le" de lai yuan [The origin of the sentence final LE in Modern Mandarin]. *Fangyan*. 2: 128-33.
- Lu, Louis Wei-lun and Lily I-wen Su. 2009. Speech in interaction: Mandarin particle *le* as a marker of intersubjectivity. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*. 14/1: 155-168. <http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-14-1/beitrag/Lu_Su.pdf>
- Martin, James Robert. 2000. "Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English". In Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University, 142-175.
- Matisoff, James. 1972. "Lahu nominalization, relativization, and genitivation". In John Kimball (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 1*. Studies in Language Series. New York: Seminar, 237-57.
- Matthews, Stephen. 1998. Evidentiality and mirativity in Cantonese: *wo3, wo4, wo5*. Manuscript, University of Hong Kong.
- Matthews, Stephen and Virginia Yip. 1994. *Cantonese: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Morrison, Robert D. D. 1828 [2001]. *Vocabulary of the Canton Dialect*. London: Ganesha. [First ed. published in Macao: East India Company.]
- Mulder, Jean, Sandra A. Thompson and Cara Penry Williams. 2009. "Final *but* in Australian English conversation". In Pam Peters, Peter Collins and Adam Smith (eds.) *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 337-358.
- Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.). 2007. *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2010. Typology of finiteness. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. 4/12: 1176-1189.
- Noonan, Michael. 1997. "Versatile nominalizations". In Talmy Givón, Joan Bybee, John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Essays on Language Function and Language Type*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 373-394.
- Noonan, Michael. 2008. "Nominalization in Bodic languages". In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego, *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 2011. "Aspects of the Historical Development of Nominalizers in the Tamangic Languages". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 195-214.
- Ohuri, Toshio. 1995. "Remarks on suspended clauses: A contribution to Japanese phraseology". In Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics: In Honor of Charles J. Fillmore*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 201-218.
- Ohuri, Toshio (ed.). 1998. *Studies in Japanese Grammaticalization: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi and Ryoko Suzuki. 1992. "The development of a marker of speaker's attitude: The pragmatic use of the Japanese grammaticized verb *shimau* in conversation". In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on The Place of Morphology in a Grammar (BLS 18)*, 204-213.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2008. "On the rise and fall of Korean nominalizers". In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego, *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 239-264.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2011. "Nominalization and stance marking in Korean". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 393-422.

- Rhee, Seongha. 2012. Context-induced reinterpretation and (inter)subjectification: The case of grammaticalization of sentence-final particles. *Language Sciences*. 34/3: 284-300.
- Roberts, Ian and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou. 2007. Ellipsis and discourse-syntactic structures in Japanese interview discourse: The emergence of the evidential marker *to*. *Language and Linguistics*. 8/4: 939-966.
- Shibasaki, Reijirou. (in press). "From relativization to nominalization and more: Evidence from the history of Okinawan". In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society (BLS 36)*.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2007. (Inter)subjectification, Japanese syntax and syntactic scope increase. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*. 8/2: 171-206.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2011. "Nominalization in Okinawan: From a diachronic and comparative perspective". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 445-472.
- Simpson, Andrew. 2008. The grammaticalization of nominalizers in Burmese. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego, *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 265-288.
- Strauss, Susan. 2003. Completive aspect, emotion, and the dynamic eventive: Korean *V-a/e pelita*, Japanese *V-te shimau*, and Spanish *se*. *Linguistics*. 41/4: 653-679.
- Strauss, Susan and Sung-Ock Sohn. 1998. "Grammaticalization, aspect, and emotion: The case of Japanese *-te shimau* and Korean *-a/e pelita*". In David J. Silva (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, volume 8. Stanford: CSLI.
- Sun, Chaofen. 1996. *Word Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese*. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 2007. (Inter)subjectification in the quotative *tte* in Japanese conversation: Local change, utterance-ness and verb-ness. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*. 8/2: 207-237.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1998. *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 29: 429-462.
- Sybesma, Rint and Boya Li. 2007. The dissection and structural mapping of Cantonese sentence final particles. *Lingua*. 117: 1739-1783.
- Taylor, John R. 2003. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony Mulac. 1991. "A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English". In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Volume 2: Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 313-327.
- Thoms, Peter Perring (translated). 1824 [1996]. *Chinese Courtship: In Verse*. Macao: The Honorable East.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language*. 65/1: 33-65.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995. "Subjectification in grammaticalization". In Stein Dieter and Susan Wright (eds.) *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 37-54.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2003. "From subjectification to intersubjectification". In Raymond Hickey (ed.) *Motives for Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 124-139.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010. Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification. In Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 29-70.
- Van den Berg, Marinus and Guo Wu. 2006. *The Chinese Particle le: Discourse Construction and Pragmatic Marking in Chinese*. New York: Routledge.
- Watters, David E. 2008. Nominalization in the Kiranti and central Himalayish languages of Nepal. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*. 31/2: 1-44.
- Whitman, John. 2001. "Relabeling". In Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas and Anthony Warner (eds.) *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 220-240.

- Xu, Baohua and Ichiro Miyata (eds.). 1999. *Hanyu Fangyan Da Cidian* [A Comprehensive Dictionary of Chinese Topolects]. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuzhu.
- Yap, Foong Ha and Mikyung Ahn. 2012. On the development of evidentiality in Cantonese and Korean. Revised manuscript of paper presented at the Workshop on Evidentiality and Mood, National Seoul University, October 20, 2011.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Pik-ling Choi and Kam Siu Cheung. 2010. "De-lexicalizing *di3*: How a Chinese locative noun has evolved into an attitudinal nominalizers". In An Van linden, Jean-Christophe Verstraete and Kristin Davidse (eds.), in collaboration with Hubert Cuyckens. *Formal Evidence in Grammaticalization Research*. Typological Studies in Language 94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 220-240.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Winnie Chor and Jiao Wang. 2012. "On the development of epistemic 'fear' markers: An analysis of Mandarin *kongpa* and Cantonese *taipaa*". In Werner Abraham and Elisabeth Leiss (eds.) *Covert Patterns of Modality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Yap, Foong Ha and Karen Grunow-Hårsta. 2010. Non-referential uses of nominalization constructions: Asian perspectives. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. 3/1: 1-21.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona. 2011. "Nominalization strategies in Asian languages". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Typological Studies in Language 96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-57.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Jiao Wang. 2011. "From light noun to nominalizer and more: The grammaticalization of *zhe* and *suo* in Old and Middle Chinese". In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona (eds.) *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Typological Studies in Language 96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 61-107.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Jiao Wang and Charles Tsz-Kwan Lam. 2010. Clausal integration and the emergence of mitigative and adhoratative sentence-final particles in Chinese. Special Issue on Stance Phenomena in Chinese: Diachronic, Discourse and Processing Perspectives. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*. 8/2: 63-84.
- Yeung, Ka-Wai. 2006. On the status of the complementizer *waa6* in Cantonese. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*. 4/1: 1-48.
- Yoshida, Eri. 1994. "Expectation motivating the use of the auxiliary *shimau* in Japanese spoken narratives". In Shoichi Iwasaki, Tsuyoshi Ono, Hongyin Tao and Hyo Sang Lee (eds.) *University of Santa Barbara Working Papers in Linguistics, Volume 5: East Asian Linguistics*. Santa Barbara: Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara, 245-263.
- Yoshida, Eri. 1995. Speaker's subjectivity and the use of *shimau* in Japanese spoken narratives. In Noriko Akatsuka (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, volume 4. Stanford, CA: CLSI Publications, 183-199.