Semantic and Pragmatic Function Analysis of Sentence-Final Particle Combinations:

the Cases of Japanese *yone* and Cantonese *gaa3-wo3*

1. Introduction

Sentence-final particle (SFP) is a distinctive feature in various languages, including Japanese and Cantonese. The particle's usages and syntactic properties have been receiving ample attention in the linguistic studies in both languages.

The importance of SFP to the two languages can be reflected on its pragmatic functions. Matthews and Yip (1994) summarise that the functions of Cantonese SFP are 'indicating speech-act types', giving 'evidentiality' and adding 'affective and emotional colouring'. By suffixing SFP, a declarative sentence will become an interrogative (Japanese SFP *ka* in example (1)) or carry certain emotions (Cantonese SFP *tim1* in example (2)).

(1) nyuusu o mimashita ka
news ACC watched SFP
Did you watch the news?

(2) keoi5 zung6 sik1 faat3-man2 tim1
he/she even know French SFP
And he/she even knows French!

Other than suffixing a sentence, some linguists suggest that SFP should be named 'utterance particles', given that they are more relevant to the utterance under particular speech contexts rather than the sentence itself, and that their interpretations depend largely on contexts. In the thesis, I will focus on the usage and analysis of the particles that come after the utterance, yet the argument of these linguists is also noteworthy, as it manifests the close relationship between SFP and speech contexts, which is an essential assumption in my analysis.

The presence of SFP combinations is a similarity between the two languages. In Japanese, most SFP are used individually, while some of them can be used in combinations, e.g. *kana* and *yone*; most Cantonese SFP can be used in combinations, like *zaa3-gwaa3* and *gaa3-laa3-bo3*, while the combinations may even consist of as many as 4 individual SFP (Matthews & Yip, 1994). According to McCready & Davis (in press), SFP combinations impose even more complex pragmatic functions based on their components.

(3) (Said by passenger in car)
nei5 sik1 heoi3 ge3-laa1-maa3
you know go SFP
You do know the way, don't you?

(Matthews & Yip 1994:344)

Example (3) is suffixed with three Cantonese SFP, *ge3*, *laa1* and *maa3*. Each of the three particles carries different functions, and if they are used individually or in different combinations, they will impose different effects to the utterance. For instance, if only *maa3* follows the utterance, it will be expressing the speaker's concern about whether the hearer knows the way; if *ge3-laa1-maa3* is used, as in (3), the utterance indicates that the speaker has certain belief on the hearer's state of knowledge of the way, and the question is merely to confirm the speaker's belief with the hearer.

Despite their similarities in functions and usages, very few studies examine SFP in Japanese and Cantonese together. In the thesis, I will study the semantic and pragmatic functions of the SFP combinations in the two languages. The aim is to answer the following question: what are the differences in semantic and pragmatic effects between SFP combinations and their individual component particles? This may help to find properties shared by SFP of both languages, which is perhaps also applicable to SFP in other languages.

Among various SFP combinations, I will focus on and closely study two of them: *yone* in Japanese and *gaa3-wo3* in Cantonese.[1] The research question will be further elaborated with these two combinations in the next section. In chapter 2, I will look into the previous studies on the combinations. The methodology used in the analysis will be explained in chapter 3. Chapter 4 will be the analysis of the two SFP combinations, and the additional usages that are not covered will be elaborated in chapter 5. The analysis and findings will be concluded in the last chapter of the thesis.

1.1. The cases of Japanese *yone* and Cantonese *gaa3-wo3*

The Japanese particle *yone* has received perhaps the most attention among the Japanese SFP combinations. One of its components *yo* is often deemed as suggesting that the proposition of the utterance is known to the speaker exclusively (Kamio, 1994; McCready & Davis, in press).

(4) Kyoto no jinkou wa 150-man gurai desu yo
Kyoto of population TM 150.ten-thousand about is SFP
The population of Kyoto is about 1,500,000.

(Kamio 1994:73)

On the contrary, another component *ne* is often used to seek confirmation from the hearer (McCready & Davis, in press).

(5) anata wa kibun ga warui-mitai desu ne
you TM feeling NM bad.look is SFP
It looks like you are feeling sick, aren't you?

(Kamio 1994:93)

As the combination of the two particles, *yone* has a seemingly 'contradictory' semantics, for that *yo* suggests the proposition is known to the speaker exclusively, and that *ne* suggests the proposition is known to the hearer. While the semantic composition is still debatable, the combined particle *yone* seems to at least inherit some semantic and pragmatic functions from both component particles.

(6) aitsu to isshoni iku yone
he with together go SFP
(You will) go with him, right?

(McCready & Davis in-press:23)

The speaker in example (6) knows about the proposition that the hearer will go with 'him'. Meanwhile, he/she intends to confirm this proposition with the hearer. The functions of individual *yo* and *ne* can be seen here, yet those of the combination *yone* are somehow distinct from either *yo* or *ne*: if *yone* at the end of (6) is replaced by *yo*, the utterance is no longer used to ask for confirmation from the hearer, but to provide information; if it is replaced by *ne*, it becomes a question simply confirming the proposition

[1] There are several variations of *gaa3-wo3*, including *ge3-wo3*, *ge3-bo3*, *go3-bo3* and *gaa3-bo3*. They are all treated as *gaa3-wo3* in this thesis, unless in the cases where *wo3* and *bo3* are not interchangeable in certain contexts (Matthews & Yip, 1994; Sybesma & Li, 2007). The phonetic modifications of *gaa3* are caused by other sounds in the particle combination (Kwok, 1984).

with the hearer, without suggesting that the speaker has certain level of knowledge initially regarding the proposition. Therefore, the use of *yone* seems to have properties different from *yo* and *ne*.

As for the Cantonese SFP combination *gaa3-wo3*, there are relatively fewer specific studies on it comparing to *yone*. Nevertheless, just as the Japanese combination, the Cantonese SFP *gaa3-wo3* also appears to have richer semantic and pragmatic functions than its individual component particles.

Fung (2000) suggests *gaa3* 'assumes that the hearer has no knowledge of a situation that should have been known and is a given (as opposed to a new) situation', as in the below example from a leaflet about health and safety of courier service staff.

(7) gung1-si1 tai4-gung1-ge3 seon3-gin2-doi6 dou1 hou2 zung6-jiu3 gaa3
company provided.by mailbag also very important SFP
The mail bag provided by the company is important too.

Wo3 is often deemed to be used as a reminder, in which the hearer knows the proposition, which is 'to drive carefully' in example (8). The speaker yet brings it up in case the hearer forgets about it.

(8) lei5 siu2-sam1 za1-ce1 wo3
you careful drive.car SFP
Drive carefully!

(Matthews & Yip 1994:354)

Like *yone*, the Cantonese SFP combination *gaa3-wo3* has more semantic and pragmatic functions than its components, *gaa3* and *wo3*, when they are used individually.

(9) lei1 sau2 go1 m4-ji6 coeng3 gaa3-wo3
this CL song not.easy sing SFP
This is not an easy song to sing! (Are you sure you're going to sing it?)

If *gaa3-wo3* in example (9) is replaced by *gaa3*, the utterance will emphasise the speaker's opinion on the song (Matthews & Yip, 1994).[2] If *wo3* is used instead, the utterance will function as a reminder, and show the urge for the hearer to accept the proposition. However, *gaa3-wo3* in (9) emphasises its relationship with the hearer's decision or action, and implies the speaker's doubt of such decision or action. This can be seen as beyond the functions of individual *gaa3* and *wo3*.

From the two examples, it appears that the semantic and pragmatic functions of SFP combinations may not be simply a mix of its components' functions, as suggested in Matthews & Yip (1994). Rather, there seems to be unique functions that are not inherited from the components, but belongs exclusively to the combination itself.

[2] In Matthews & Yip (1994), *gaa3* is regarded as a combination of *ge3* and *aa3*. This will be further elaborated in the next section.

2. Literature reviews

To study the differences in functions between combined SFP and their individual components, it is essential to first examine their functions individually and in combinations. In this chapter, I will review the previous studies of the four individual SFP, *yo*, *ne*, *gaa3* and *wo3*, and of the two combinations.

2.1. Japanese SFP: *yo*, *ne* and *yone*

2.1.1. Kamio (1994)

Kamio proposes the theory of 'territory of information' regarding the natures of several Japanese SFPs. Individual SFP *yo* and *ne* are two of them.[3]

For declarative sentence that ends with a main predicate and is followed by *yo*, Kamio defines the information carried by the utterance as 1 = Speaker > Hearer = 0, where 1 and 0 indicate how close the information in the propositional content is in the speaker's or hearer's territories of information, i.e. the information is known more by the speaker or the hearer. In *yo*-attached utterance, the information is completely in the speaker's territory of information, while not, in any way, in the hearer's territory, meaning that it is known by the speaker only. The following is one of the examples.[4]

(10) watasi, atama ga itai yo
I head NM ache SFP
I have a headache.

(Kamio 1994:87)

As for declarative sentence followed by *ne*, the nature of the information was defined as $n <$ Speaker $\leq$ Hearer = 1, where *n* is the 'threshold value for the speaker's/hearer's territory'. Kamio further divides *ne*-utterance into two subcases:

(i) the information is completely in both speaker's and hearer's territories, and;

(ii) the information is completely in hearer's territory, but only partially in speaker's territory.

The two subcases are illustrated below respectively:

(11) ii tenki da ne
nice weather is SFP
It's a beautiful day!

(Kamio 1994:88)

(12) kimi, sukosi yaseta ne
you a.little lost-weight SFP
You have lost a little weight, haven't you?

(Kamio 1994:89)

In his theory, Kamio suggests that the particle *yo* can be added to the end of utterance in direct form by option, yet does not further explain *yo*'s usages and effects to the utterance. If we take (10) as an example, what would be the change in semantic and pragmatic effects if *yo* is dropped? To Kamio, there seems to be no rules governing the use of *yo*, as he suggests that it can be randomly added to any

[3] This thesis will focus on the use of *yo* and *ne* in, as proposed by Kamio, direct form of utterance, namely that 'expresses the information in a direct and definite form', without presumption or hearsay.

[4] *Yo* is not in the original example given by Kamio and is only added in this thesis for explanation purpose, based on Kamio's view that *yo* can be added to direct form of utterance by option.

utterance in direct form, but has not further explained how or whether the utterance will be affected by the use of *yo*.

(The husband looks out of the window and tells his wife)

(13) ame ga futtekita yo
rain NM fall-come SFP
It's raining, you know.

(Katoh 2001:44)

In the above example, the use of *yo* does not necessarily manifest that the information is completely in the speaker's territory of information. Rather, the weather can be easily observed by the hearer, thus such information can be in the hearer's territory as well. The use of *yo* here is more likely to draw the hearer's attention to the current weather, yet such effect imposed by *yo* was not considered in Kamio's theory.

(14) kyou wa samui ne
today TM cold SFP
It's cold today, right?

(Katoh 2001:47)

Also, it is debatable whether a piece of information can be quantified. Even if, as proposed by Kamio, information can be quantified to determine whether it is closer to the speaker's or the hearer's territory of information, the result produced may not be significant enough to make comparison possible. For example, it is hard to tell whether the 'cold weather' is more 'known' to the speaker or the hearer of (14), if both parties are experiencing the cold weather at the same time.

2.1.2.McCready & Davis (in press)

Kamio's theory is somehow echoed in McCready & Davis, where *yo* and *ne* are deemed to have a rather oppositional nature. According to them, *yo* is a speaker-oriented particle which is 'focused on information possessed by the speaker'. It expresses the speaker's desire for the hearer to accept such information in the propositional content.

(15a) A: saki John ga kaetta
just.now John NM went.home
John just went home.

(15b) B: uso
lie
No way!

(15c) A: kaetta yo
went.home SFP
He did go home!

(McCready & Davis in-press:8)

In (15c), the declarative utterance is used to seek hearer's acceptance of the proposition. Receiving denial from the hearer, the speaker adds *yo* to the original utterance (15a) so as to make his desire for the hearer to accept the proposition more explicit.

McCready & Davis consider *ne* as a hearer-oriented particle which has a function different from *yo*. *Ne* is usually used to ask for confirmation or agreement from the hearer.

(16) miitingu wa sanji kara desu ne
meeting TM 3:00 from is SFP
The meeting is at 3, right?

(McCready & Davis in-press:15)

However, they also pointed out that *ne* possesses some speaker-oriented nature.

(17) koko no gyouza wa umai ne, yappari
here of dumplings TM good SFP as.expected
The dumplings here are good right, like I thought.

(McCready & Davis in-press:15)

(18) kono hon ashita mottekimasu ne
this book tomorrow take-bring SFP
I'll bring this book tomorrow, OK?

(McCready & Davis in-press:15)

In (17), the proposition of the utterance is known to the speaker. As an expression of realisation, it is not used by the speaker to seek confirmation from the hearer, even though *ne* is used. Also, in (18), the proposition is, again, known to the speaker. Moreover, it is very likely that the hearer does not know it before it is uttered by the speaker. In other words, the proposition is not known to the hearer.

McCready and Davis therefore argue that instead of defining *ne* as hearer-oriented, *ne* should be regarded as a marker of utterance whose proposition is known to the hearer, and in some cases, the speaker. They suggest that *ne* with a rising intonation indicates hearer orientation by asking for hearer confirmation. However, the relationship between *ne*'s intonations and speaker/hearer orientations is not applicable to all situations, e.g. interrogatives, and more comprehensive studies should be done to construct a more concrete theory.

2.1.3.Davis (2009)

Davis argues that the particle *yo* has different semantic effects depending on its intonation: the rising *yo* (*yo*↑) and the falling *yo* (*yo*↓). In both cases, *yo* encodes an update to the hearer's belief with the information in the propositional content provided by the speaker. The distinction between the two variations is that the use of *yo*↓ has an additional condition: the speaker assumes the hearer had a prior belief inconsistent with the proposition, whether such belief is explicitly manifested or inferred from the context.

(19a) A: sooridaijin ga nakunatta
prime.minister NM died
The prime minister died.
(19b) B: shinde nai yo↓
die NEG SFP
(No,) He did not die.

(Davis 2009:336)

(20a) A: gohan mou tabetta
rice already ate
Did you eat already?
(20b) B: tabetta yo↑
ate SFP
(Yeah,) I ate.

(Davis 2009:336)

In (19b), the use of *yo*↓ is based on speaker B's assumption that speaker A had a public belief which contradicts the proposition in speaker B's utterance, i.e. the prime minister did not die, and reflects the need that the hearer must 'downdate' such contradicting belief before updating it with the new information provided by speaker B. As for *yo*↑ in (20b), it is based on speaker B's assumption, from the context or other evidence, that speaker A did not hold a contradicting public belief. The *yo*↑ simply indicates an update to such belief.

The speaker's assumption of the hearer's belief on the proposition proposed by Davis seems to be a more observable, thus testable theory, comparing to information ownership proposed in Kamio and McCready & Davis. However, Davis' theory is not applicable to SFP combinations, as the intonation of *yo* is much less obvious when it is used in combinations, including *yone*.

(21) aitsu to isshoni iku yone
he with together go SFP
(You will) go with him, right?

(=(6))

Yo in the combination *yone* in (21) is difficult to be determined as having either a rising or a falling intonation. It is thus not easy to tell what the speaker's assumption of the hearer's belief is by applying Davis' theory. Although applicable to individual *yo*, Davis' theory cannot explain the semantics of *yo* when it is a component of SFP combinations. Focusing on the use of *yo*, he did not provide further analysis on the use of *ne* either.

2.1.4.Katagiri (2007)

Apart from the more widely accepted semantics of *ne* that is said to be seeking confirmation, Katagiri proposes that *ne* can also be used in assertions, indicating the proposition it follows is not 'wholeheartedly accepted' by the speaker yet, in contrast to *yo* which indicates it is accepted by the speaker. The incomplete acceptability may be due to information source not yet verified by the speaker, thus he/she uses *ne* to clarify that he/she 'is not yet committed to the truth of the information content'.

(22a) kaigi wa 6-gou-shitsu desu yo
meeting TM room.6 is SFP
The meeting will be held in Room 6.
(22b) kaigi wa 6-gou-shitsu desu ne
meeting TM room.6 is SFP
(I think) The meeting will be held in Room 6.

(Katagiri 2007:1314, modified)

The speaker in (22a) uses *yo* to show that he/she is certain about the truth of the proposition. A possible context can be that he is in charge of holding the meeting, which makes him a reliable source of the information about where the meeting will take place. In (22b), using *ne* manifests the speaker's uncertainty of the proposition. Although he is providing information about the meeting location, which he has knowledge of, he may have learned it from an outside source (e.g. notice of the meeting) that makes him less certain about the truth of the proposition. He then uses *ne* to ask for the hearer's input, so as to 'make [the information in the propositional content] a reliable and mutually believed fact'.

Similar to Davis' theory, Katagiri proposes that intonation also contributes to *ne*'s semantics effects. According to him, *ne* with a rising intonation (*ne*↑) is used to ask for confirmation, while falling *ne* (*ne*↓) indicates an assertion with incomplete speaker's certainty.

(23a) kaigi wa 6-gou-shitsu desu ne↑
meeting TM room.6 is SFP
The meeting will be held in Room 6, right?
(23b) kaigi wa 6-gou-shitsu desu ne↓
meeting TM room.6 is SFP
(I think) The meeting will be held in Room 6.

With *ne*↑, the speaker of (23a) is asking for confirmation from the hearer on the proposition of the meeting location. The *ne*↓ in (23b) does not refer to a question, but a statement made by the speaker, even though the speaker is not absolutely sure about the truth of the proposition. However, as in Davis' theory, Katagiri's analysis of *ne* may not be applicable to *yone*, as it is difficult to determine whether *ne* has a rising or falling intonation in the SFP combination. His analyses of *yo* and *ne* regarding certainty of the proposition also contradict each other, and cannot explain why the two particles may be used as a combination.

2.1.5.Katoh (2001)

The view that the use of *yo* and *ne* are determined by whether the proposition is the speaker's or hearer's knowledge is not accepted by Katoh. He explains this with the following example:

(A and B are eating in a restaurant)
(24a) A: kono ryouri, sugoku oishii yo / ne
this dish very tasty SFP
This dish is really good. / This dish is really good, right?
(24b) B: souda ne. oishii ne / *yo
yes ne tasty SFP
Yeah, it's good.

(Katoh 2001:40)

In (24), both speakers A and B have knowledge of a mutual experience. When talking about the shared experience, speaker A can use either *yo* or *ne* in his/her utterance, yet speaker B can only use *ne*, while using *yo* will be unnatural. It appears that there is inconsistency between the use of *yo*/*ne* in this scenario and such information being in the speaker's/hearer's territory of information, despite their relationship claimed by Kamio.

Instead, Katoh argues that *yo* and *ne* are related to the pragmatic function 'exclusive knowledge management'. Since only the speaker has the priority in accessing the information within the utterance, he/she has the responsibility to perform knowledge management of the authenticity and acceptance of the proposition, and to recognise the unnecessity of discussion about the proposition.

According to Katoh, *yo* acts as a discourse marker which indicates that the speaker is ready to perform exclusive knowledge management to the proposition, while *ne* indicates that the speaker has no intention to do so. Speaker A in example (24) starts the conversation, thus he/she is deemed to have the priority in accessing the information 'the dish is good' and he/she can use *yo* to indicate the intention to perform exclusive knowledge management, or *ne* to show the lack of such intention. On the contrary, speaker B does not have such priority, given that it is speaker A's opinion on the dish. Therefore, he can only use *ne* to express his agreement to the proposition.

(25) kyou wa samui yone
today TM cold SFP
It's cold today, isn't it?

(Katoh 2001:46)

In the case of (25), the feeling of cold is the speaker's own judgement, and the judgements of other people do not affect what the speaker feels. As the information belongs exclusively to the speaker, *yo* in the utterance indicates that the speaker is performing exclusive knowledge management. However, it is still possible for others to disagree to the proposition 'it is cold today', even though the speaker has exclusive information of his own judgement. With the use of *ne*, the speaker shows that he/she has no intention to perform exclusive knowledge management to the proposition, also recognises that there may be different judgements from others. According to Katoh, the particle *yo* follows the proposition as a marker of the speaker performing exclusive knowledge management on the proposition. The *yo*-attached proposition is then followed by *ne* which acts as a marker of the utterance's function, i.e. to seek hearer's agreement.

However, Katoh's theory seems to suggest that *ne* can be added to any utterance of which the speaker has exclusive information, especially on his/her own judgement. If so, *yone* and *ne* appear to function similarly and are interchangeable, yet this is not the case under certain circumstances.

(Hearer is wearing a blouse)

(26a)	kireina	burausu	desu	ne
	pretty	blouse	is	SFP
	What a pretty blouse!			
(26b)	*kireina	burausu	desu	yone
	pretty	blouse	is	SFP
	*What a pretty blouse, right?			

(Noda 1993:13)

The proposition in (26) is apparently the speaker's judgement on the hearer's garment. The speaker has exclusive information on the judgement, yet using *yone* is infelicitous here, while *ne* is acceptable. This is because what matters here is the hearer's judgement of what he/she is wearing, rather than the speaker's (Noda, 1993). From this example, we can see that although *yone* and *ne* may have similar functions, they still impose different effects to the utterance and are not interchangeable in all contexts. It is thus necessary to distinguish the differences between them.

2.1.6.Noda (1993)

Noda argues that the use of *yo* is not a necessary condition for the speaker to indicate that he/she assumes the hearer does not possess the knowledge already.

(27)	watashino	tanjoubi	wa	shigatsu	mikka	desu	yo
	my	birthday	TM	April	third.day	is	SFP
	My birthday is on the 3rd of April, you know.						

(Noda 1993:12)

As a declarative sentence, example (27) clearly indicates the speaker's assumption, which is the hearer does not know the proposition. *Yo* makes such assumption more explicit, yet it does not mean that there will be no such assumption even if *yo* is not used. Therefore, the use of *yo* in *yone* is to manifest clearly that the speaker has the knowledge.

(28)	konoaida	umi	e	ikimashita	yone.	Oboetemasu	ka
	lately	seaside	to	went	SFP	remember	SFP
	(We) went to seaside lately, right? Do you remember?							

(Noda 1993:13)

From the second half of (28), where the speaker confirms a past experience, we can assume that going to the seaside is something the speaker assumes that the hearer has knowledge of. The utterance is still felicitous if *yone* is replaced by *ne*, and indicates that the speaker simply intends to confirm the

information with the hearer. The use of *yone* here emphasises the knowledge of the hearer went to the seaside is one that originally known to the speaker.

(29a) A: honbano karei wa karai ne
authentic curry TM spicy SFP
Real curry is spicy, right?
(29b) B: karai desu yone
spicy is SFP
It is spicy, indeed.

(Noda 1993:14)

The utterance in (29b) is also acceptable if it is followed by *ne*, instead of *yone*. While *ne* itself already fulfils the function of agreeing to speaker A, *yone* emphasises that such knowledge is known to speaker B. The use of *yone* indicates such agreement made by speaker B is based on his/her own knowledge, and he/she may have tasted real curry. His/her agreement is based on direct experience or knowledge with certainty, rather than knowledge obtained from, for instance, hearsay. Therefore, Noda suggests that *yo* in *yone* acts as a marker of the speaker's knowledge, and that *yo* emphasises such possession of knowledge in the utterance.

2.1.7. Conclusion on the Japanese particles

Simply by reviewing the function of individual *yo* and *ne*, the two particles have properties that are not compatible with each other. For example, in Kamio's theory, *ne* indicates that the knowledge is completely in the speaker's territory of information, yet partially under certain circumstances. It is therefore necessary to understand which of these functions are applicable when the particles are used in combinations.

2.2. Cantonese SFP: *gaa3, wo3* and *gaa3-wo3*

2.2.1.Kwok (1984)

Kwok's studies explain some usages and give examples of SFP found in Cantonese utterance corpus. She considers the semantics of a particle combination should be the sum of the component particles. As many other linguists do, she suggests that *gaa3* is the combination of individual particles *ge3* and *aa3*.

Ge3 acts as an assertion marker in declarative sentences, which the speaker uses to indicate that he/she believes the statement to be true, as well as 'strengthen the force of the assertion'.

(30) hok6 zung1-man2 m4-hai6 ji6 ge3
learn Chinese not.be easy SFP
Learning Chinese is not easy, and that is fact.

(Kwok 1984:43)

Ge3 in (30) is not necessary for conveying the proposition to the hearer. However, it stresses the speaker's certainty on the proposition, which means he/she believes that it is indeed not easy to learn Chinese.

As for *aa3*, Kwok points out that it does not seem to have much semantic effect imposed on the declarative sentence it is following, but just to soften the utterance.

(31) keoi5 hou2-paa3 heoi3 jat6-bun2 aa3
he very.afraid go Japan SFP
He's really scared of going to Japan.

(Kwok 1984:46)

In other words, to Kwok, the semantics of *gaa3* is the combination of those of *ge3* and *aa3*, i.e. manifesting the speaker's certainty on the proposition, while softening the utterance so as to make it less abrupt.

(32) keoi5 lou5-gung1 maai6 ce1 ge3-aa3 (=gaa3)
her husband sell car SFP
Her husband sells cars.

(Kwok 1984:46)

The declarative sentence in (32) refers to the information that her husband sells car, which the speaker believes to be true.

From telephone conversations, Kwok observes that *bo3*, *wo3*'s variation, can be used to 'remind the hearer to take something into special consideration'.

(33) keoi5 bat1-zo2-jip6-hau6 jau5-cin2 sin1 waan4-dak1 bo3
he graduated.after have.money only.then return.can SFP
You must take into consideration the fact that you have to wait until he graduates and is able to make some money before he is able to pay you back.

(Kwok 1984:64)

Rather than a plain statement, the particle *bo3* in (33) imposes the effect of reminding to the utterance. It shows the speaker's intention to ask the hearer to take into account the situation that 'he' can only pay the hearer back after a while, instead of simply stating the situation without particular concerns.

Although Kwok gives brief accounts on the uses of both *gaa3* and *wo3*, and provides utterance examples where *ge3* and *bo3* are combined to form *ge3-bo3* (a variation of *gaa3-wo3*), she does not explain much on why it is regarded as a combination of the two particles, instead of an independent particle consisting of two components. Moreover, she proposes that the semantics of an SFP combination is the sum those of its component, yet does not further elaborate on the proposal.

2.2.2.Sybesma & Li (2007)

Sybesma & Li regard *ge3* as an 'actuality marker', the use of which gives the utterance a higher relevance to the context concerned.

(34) go2 di1 syu1, aa3-ji6-suk1 wui5 luk6-zuk6 gei3-faan1-lei4 ge3
that CL book second.uncle will continue send-back-come SFP
As to those books, Second Uncle will continue to send them to us – for sure, don't worry about it.

(Sybesma & Li 2007:1744)

Without *ge3*, (34) is simply a declarative sentence stating the proposition of how the books will be dealt with. Using *ge3*, the utterance 'addresses reassuringly, some concern expressed in the preceding part of the conversation'. The particle makes the utterance more relevant to the current context.

As for *gaa3*, they consider it as a softened *ge3* with the same effects imposed on the utterance. While making the utterance more relevant to the context, *gaa3* gives it a sense of reminding. They also take that view that *gaa3* is the combination of *ge3* and *aa3*, and the effect of *aa3* is then added to that of *ge3*.

As the use of *aa3* alerts the hearer about the information in the utterance, *gaa3* is a 'smooth-alert' that gives relevant information to the hearer.

(35) go2 di1 syu1, aa3-ji6-suk1 wui5 luk6-zuk6 gei3-faan1-lei4 gaa3
that CL book 2nd.uncle will continue send-back-come SFP
You know, as to those books, Second Uncle will surely continue to send them to us.
(Sybesma & Li 2007:1745)

Instead of *ge3*, example (35) uses *gaa3*, which gives the utterance the effect of reminding the hearer about how the books will be dealt with, no matter whether the hearer is aware of such information before he/she is reminded.

For the use of *wo3*, Sybesma & Li agree with Matthews & Yip (1994) and Luke (1990) that it is for 'reminding' (see (8)) as well as indicating 'noteworthiness'.

(36) mei5-gam1 sing1-zo2 wo3
US-dollar rose SFP
Look, the US dollar has gone up!
(Matthews & Yip 1994:353)

The utterance in (36) was originally a declarative sentence of a fact observed by the speaker, while the particle *wo3* gives it a sense of urging the hearer to be aware of the information.

2.2.3.Luke (1990)

Based on conversation analysis, Luke gives detailed accounts for seven usages of *wo3*. Due to the length of the section, it is not possible to discuss all usages here. Instead, I will review those most relevant to the analysis in the coming sections – 'reportings and story-tellings' and 'dispreferred turns'.

One of the usages of *wo3* suggested by Luke, 'reportings and story-tellings', is that it reports or tells circumstances which are out of the speaker's expectation. The use of *wo3* constructs a contrast, either explicitly or implicitly, between what ought to happen and what actually happens.

(The speaker tells a rumour about people getting sick after swimming in a pond)
(37) dim2-zi1 dai6-jat6 le1 go3-go3 dou1 beng6-saai3 wo3
it.turned.out next.day SFP everyone all fell.ill SFP
It turned out everyone became ill the next day, all of them.
(Luke 1990:208, modified)

Under normal circumstances, swimming in a pond will not make people sick, yet it happened in the story. On top of that, not only one person, but everyone who swam in the pond fell ill – although getting sick ought not to be the consequence of swimming in a pond, it did happen. The use of *wo3* here expresses the unusualness of the event when being compared to what normally happens.

Many of the previous studies on the uses of *wo3* suggest that it is used to express disagreement of the speaker, yet Luke considers it not accurate. Instead, he suggests it should be called 'dispreferred turns'. According to him, *wo3* indicates a mismatch between what is considered as a norm or rule, and '(real or hypothetical) situations or aspects of a situation to which the proposed rule or norm fails to apply', by either providing evidence or pointing out what was overlooked.

(The counsellor told the speaker that it is normal for her son, a teenage boy, to be energetic)

(38) keoi5 jau6-m4-hai6 hou2-wut6-joek6 wo3. ngo5-dei6 daai3 keoi5 ceot1-heoi3
he really.not.be very.energetic SFP we bring he out
waan2 le1, keoi5 jau6 sei2-se4-laan6-sin6 gam2 m4-jyun6 juk1
play SFP he then dead.snake.rotten.eel like not.willing move
Well, but he isn't really very energetic. When we take him out to play, he's like a dead snake and wouldn't move.

(Luke 1990:217, modified)

Despite what the counsellor told the speaker, the mother of a teenage boy, that it is normal for her son to be energetic, the mother gives evidence and situation that 'undermine the validity of the rule'. Although being a teenage boy, her son is not energetic as normal boys are, and does not want to move when his parents take him out to play. What is deemed as the norm does not apply to this situation, thus what the speaker said was not preferred and *wo3* is used to give the 'dispreferred turn'.

(The hearer, who speaks Cantonese, tells the speaker that Cantonese speaker should be able to understand Mandarin to some extent)

(39) daan6-hai6 jyu4-gwo2 nei5 zan1-hai6 jyun4-cyun4 mei6-hok6-gwo3 gwok3-jyu5
but if you really completely not.learned Mandarin
le1, dou1 gei2-naan4-haa5 wo3
SFP also quite.difficult SFP
But if you really haven't learned Mandarin at all before, it's quite difficult too.

(Luke 1990:222, modified)

What the speaker in (39) said challenges the rule proposed in the previous part of the conversation. Even though she may agree with the rule that a Cantonese speaker can understand Mandarin to some extent, she suggests a situation where such rule cannot be applied to as it usually can. This unusual situation might have been overlooked when the rule was proposed. With the *wo3*-suffixed utterance, the speaker gives a 'dispreferred turn' that challenges what was regarded as true before.

Despite the detailed analysis of the particle *wo3*, Luke's studies do not directly address the issue of SFP combinations. In the conversation data he analysed, many of the occurrences of *wo3* appear together with one or even more individual particles, including *lo3-wo3*, *gaa3-wo3* and *gaa3-laa3-wo3*.[5] The uses of *wo3* in these combinations are analysed individually, yet Luke does not explain whether *wo3* being in a particle combination will affect the semantic or pragmatic effects of the combination, or being affected by other component particles.

2.2.4. Conclusion on the Cantonese particles

The individual particles *gaa3* and *wo3* have been studied extensively, and most of the studies give similar explanations on their properties and usages. *Gaa3* is viewed as a combination of *ge3* and *aa3*, thus its use is similar to that of *ge3*, which is to give certainty to an assertion and enhance relevance to the context, yet with a softened force. *Wo3* is regarded as being used for reminding and pointing out noteworthy information.

However, compared to the individual particles, relatively fewer studies are specifically focused on the use of the combination *gaa3-wo3*. In general, the semantic and pragmatic effects of an SFP combination are deemed to be those of its components, yet, as shown in example (9), such view is not comprehensive to explain why different effects are produced when particles are used in a combination.

[5] *Gaa3* in the conversations is transcribed as *go3*, a variation of *gaa3*.

3. Methodology

From the previous sections, it seems possible that not all of the semantic and pragmatic effects of an individual particle are applicable to the SFP combinations consisting of it.

In the next chapter, I will first give descriptions, as comprehensive as possible, of the various usages of the four individual particles under study. For each particle, the functions as well as the necessary use conditions will be dissected based on the existing theories, so as to give a precise description for each of the usages. Each usage will then be grouped to give all possible options of the SFP combinations, which allow us to find out which of these usages are applicable to the combinations.

For example, if *yo* and *ne* have two usages each, namely yo_A, yo_B, ne_A and ne_B, there will be four possible combinations of *yone*'s usages – yo_A & ne_A, yo_B & ne_A, yo_A & ne_B, and yo_B & ne_B.

Individual particle:	*yo*		*ne*	
Possible usages:	yo_A	yo_B	ne_A	ne_B

Possible combinations of usages:

1. yo_A & ne_A
2. yo_B & ne_A
3. yo_A & ne_B
4. yo_B & ne_B

All these possible options will then be examined with utterances containing the SFP combinations *yone* and *gaa3-wo3*. As mentioned earlier, the effects of the SFP depend largely on the speech contexts. Therefore, detailed contexts for each utterance will be constructed based on the functions and conditions of each usage of the particles. If the utterance is found felicitous in the context created, it can be deemed that it is a valid combination of usages, and those usages of the individual particles are applicable to the SFP combination. If there are contradictions between the usages of different particle components, thus no contexts or utterances can satisfy all functions and conditions concerned, it can be deemed that such combination of usages is invalid and they cannot be applied to the SFP combination.

Furthermore, the analysis should be able to 'screen out' the usages that are not inherited from the individual component particles. These additional usages will then be reviewed with utterances in various contexts. As they are not directly derived from the component particles, these usages can only be pointed out based on intuition. If there are any doubts, informants who are native in Japanese or Cantonese will be consulted for confirmation.

4. Analysis – usages of individual and combined SFP

In this section, the usages of each of the four individual particles, including their functions (marked with F) and necessary use conditions (marked with C), will be detailed. These usages will then be grouped into combinations of *yone* and *gaa3-wo3*, and be examined if they are valid, which means they are a possible combination of usages that are applicable to the SFP combination.

4.1. Japanese SFP: *yo*, *ne* and *yone*

4.1.1. Usages of individual SFP

Usage of yo_A:

(F1) To manifest the speaker's desire for the hearer to accept the proposition
(F2) To update the hearer's public belief
(C1) The speaker assumes that there is conflict or incompatibility in his/her understanding of the proposition and other belief salient to him/her

While it is pointed out in McCready & Davis (in press) that the use of *yo* makes the speaker's desire for the hearer to accept the proposition to be 'fully explicit', Davis (2009) also suggests that *yo* is used in an utterance to update the hearer's public belief. What he proposes is that the use of *yo* with a falling intonation indicates that there is some kind of incompatibility in the speaker's and the hearer's understanding of the proposition, requiring a downdate of the hearer's public belief before the said update. However, the incompatibility is not limited to be between the speaker and the hearer; rather, it can be what is made known to the speaker, for example from a person other than the speaker and the hearer, or an article on the newspaper.

Usage of yo_B:

(F1) To manifest the speaker's desire for the hearer to accept the proposition
(F2) To update the hearer's public belief
(F3) The speaker intends to guide the hearer in decision making by providing relevant information
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer does not have knowledge of the proposition

(F1) and (F2) of yo_B is the same as yo_A. The additional function (F3) is the function of *yo* with a rising intonation: via giving information to the hearer, the speaker intends to guide the hearer in decision making (Davis, 2009). By the act of providing information under such circumstance, the speaker assumes the hearer does not have the necessary information in the proposition to solve a problem or a dilemma he/she is currently facing.

Usage of ne_A:

(F1) To seek agreement from or confirm information with the hearer
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer has the same or more concrete knowledge of the proposition

The function (F1) of ne_A is generally agreed by most linguists. *Ne*-suffixed utterances are used to seek hearer's agreement on the proposition made by the speaker, or to confirm the proposition with the hearer. It is therefore necessary for the speaker to assume the hearer has the same or more concrete knowledge

of the proposition as he/she does, or else he/she cannot expect to receive agreement or confirmation from the hearer.

Usage of *ne*$_B$:

(F1) To provide information to the hearer
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer does not know the proposition
(C2) The speaker has not fully accepted the proposition

This is another usage of *ne* as mentioned in McCready & Davis (in press) and Katagiri (2007). *Ne* is not only used to seek confirmation, but also to provide information that is unknown to the hearer.

(40) kaigi wa 6-gou-shitsu desu ne.
meeting TM room.6 is SFP
(I think) The meeting will be held in Room 6.

(=(22b))

When being asked where the meeting will be held, the speaker of (40) uses *ne*$_B$ to provide the information to the hearer. From the act of asking about the meeting location, the speaker assumes that the hearer does not know the meeting will be held in Room 6, i.e. the proposition. The usage of *ne*$_B$ may seem similar to *yo*$_B$, but the difference is that *ne*$_B$ indicates that the speaker has not fully accepted the proposition yet, likely because the knowledge of it was from an outside source that the speaker is uncertain about (Katagiri, 2007). In the scenario of (40), the speaker may have read about the location on a meeting notice, yet he is not absolutely certain if the information is correct. The use of *ne*$_B$ shows that he is not fully committed to the truth of the proposition at this point.

4.1.2. Individual SFP in combinations

Combination *yo*$_A$ and *ne*$_A$:

(A colleague said the meeting is at 1, so the speaker turns to the hearer, who he believes to think it starts at 3 as he does, for confirmation)
(41) miitingu wa sanji kara desu yone
meeting TM 3:00 from is SFP
The meeting is at 3, isn't it?

(McCready & Davis in-press:15, modified)

The combination of *yo*$_A$ and *ne*$_A$ is valid when the speaker intends to confirm the proposition with the hearer, when there is a belief that is incompatible with the speaker's. In (41), the speaker uses *yo*$_A$ to show that he desires the hearer to accept the proposition of the meeting starts at 3, and to update the hearer's belief in the starting time. Using *yo*$_A$, the speaker believes that his understanding of the proposition is different from what is told by the third person, i.e. the meeting starts at 3 and at 1. He assumes that the hearer believes the same as he does, so he turns to the hearer to seek confirmation.

This leads us to the function of *ne*$_A$. Due to the incompatibility of understanding and his assumption of the hearer's belief, the speaker uses *ne*$_A$ in his utterance to confirm the proposition with the hearer. This is based on the assumption that the hearer has the same knowledge of the proposition as he does, which is the meeting is at 3.

When using *yo*$_A$ and *ne*$_A$ together, the speaker assumes there is a different understanding of the proposition being presented to him, which justifies the use of *yo*$_A$. The conflicting understanding does not necessarily come from the hearer, but other sources; meanwhile, the speaker assumes the hearer has

the same understanding as him, which satisfies the use condition of *ne*$_{A}$ for seeking confirmation from the hearer. Therefore, this is a valid combination of the usage of *yone*.

Combination *yo*$_{B}$ and *ne*$_{A}$:

There is conflict between the use conditions of *yo*$_{B}$ and *ne*$_{A}$. When using *yo*$_{B}$, the speaker assumes the hearer does not have knowledge of the proposition, and intends to provide the propositional content to help the hearer to make decisions. On the contrary, the use of *ne*$_{A}$ is based on the speaker's assumption that the hearer has the same or more concrete knowledge of the proposition than the speaker himself/herself. Due to this fundamental incompatibility in conditions, *yo*$_{B}$ and *ne*$_{A}$ cannot be used together, hence an invalid combination.

Combination *yo*$_{A}$ and *ne*$_{B}$:

(The speaker stayed at home the day before, while the hearer went hiking, and told the speaker that the weather was nice)

(42)	kinou,	ame	ga	futteita	yone
	yesterday	rain	NM	was.falling	SFP
	It was raining yesterday, wasn't it?				

The speaker and hearer in (42) have different believes of the weather of the day before. The speaker stayed indoors and thinks it was raining, yet the hearer who went hiking tells a different story of experiencing nice weather. Because of the difference, the speaker uses *yo*$_{A}$ to manifest that he desires the hearer to accept his proposition, and to agree with him that it was raining the day before. He also intends to update the hearer's belief by telling the hearer that it was raining, as the hearer believes the opposite. Although the speaker believes it was raining the day before, the hearer told him that the weather was nice. Therefore, the speaker assumes both parties have incompatible understandings of the proposition, and such assumption is manifested in the use of *yo*$_{A}$.

The speaker intends to provide information on yesterday's weather to the hearer, since the hearer apparently does not know that it was raining, thus so assumes the speaker. These can be reflected on the use of *ne*$_{B}$. However, as the speaker stayed indoors yesterday, it is possible that his belief may be wrong, so he is not fully committed to the truth of the proposition. This satisfied another use condition of *ne*$_{B}$.

To to use *yo*$_{A}$ and *ne*$_{B}$ together, the speaker has to assume that there is a belief incompatible to his understanding to the proposition, and that the hearer does not know the proposition. The former is derived from what was told by the hearer in the previous conversation, 'the weather was nice yesterday', which contradicts the speaker's belief. The speaker is also aware that the hearer does not know about the proposition 'it was raining yesterday', or else he would not have had an opposite belief. Based on these assumptions of the speaker, *yo*$_{A}$ and *ne*$_{B}$ have compatible use conditions, thus the validity of the combination.

Combination *yo*$_B$ and *ne*$_B$:

(When giving directions to taxi driver)

(43) asoko-ni yuubin-posuto ga miemasu yone. sono-sugusakino kado wo
at.over.there mailbox NM can.see SFP immediately.that corner ACC
migi-ni magatte kudasai
to.right turn please
You can see the mailbox over there, right? Please turn right at that corner.

(Izuhara 2003:4)

When the speaker in (43) is giving directions to the taxi driver riding in the same vehicle, the speaker uses *yo*$_B$ to show his intention to urge the hearer to accept the proposition, namely the visibility of the mailbox at the corner, which is the information that helps the hearer to reach the destination. The speaker also intends to use *yo*$_B$ to update the hearer's belief by showing him a mailbox on the route, as the hearer is not familiar with the route and does not already know about the mailbox at the corner where he should take the turn. Also, due to the lack of necessary information, the hearer was not able to reach the destination by taking the right route. The speaker thus intends to provide the directions, so that the hearer can have sufficient information which helps him decide which route to take. Besides all these functions, the act of pointing out the mailbox on the route manifests that the speaker assumes the hearer does not have knowledge of the proposition before it is uttered, and this satisfies the condition of using *yo*$_B$.

With the use of *ne*$_B$, the speaker intends to provide information on the route to the hearer. This is based on his assumption that the hearer does not know the way, thus does not know that there will be a mailbox in view on the way. However, as the visibility of the mailbox also relies on the hearer, the speaker has not yet fully accepted the proposition of the hearer being able to see the mailbox over there, before the hearer can confirm so. As another use condition, the reservation on the truth of the proposition justifies the use of *ne*$_B$ in the utterance. Since all conditions are met, *yo*$_B$ and *ne*$_B$ is a valid combination of the usage of *yone*.

4.1.3. Conclusion on combination *yone*

From the analysis and examples above, the possible usages of *yone* can be those of the combinations *yo*$_A$ and *ne*$_A$, *yo*$_A$ and *ne*$_B$, and *yo*$_B$ and *ne*$_B$. The functions and use conditions, including the speaker's intentions and his/her assumptions of the hearer's knowledge, of using the component particles in combinations are compatible and do not cause conflicts when being used together. It can thus be concluded that *yone* at least inherits the usages of these combinations of *yo* and *ne* usages, though the SFP combination may contain more usages beyond its components.

As for *yo*$_B$ and *ne*$_A$, they cannot be combined due to contradiction in their conditions. Since the speaker cannot make assumptions of the hearer for not having knowledge of the proposition, while having the same or even more concrete knowledge of the proposition than the speaker, such combination is regarded as invalid. This means that the combination of their usages cannot be applied to *yone*.

4.2. Cantonese SFP: *gaa3, wo3* and *gaa3-wo3*

4.2.1. Usages of individual SFP

Usage of *gaa3*$_{A}$:

(F1) To make the utterance relevant to the current context
(F2) To give 'smooth-alert'
(C1) The speaker assumes the proposition is true
(C2) The speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of a proposition, which should have been known and is a given (as opposed to a new) situation, but may have been overlooked or neglected by the hearer

According to Sybesma & Li (2007), *gaa3* is used to make the utterance more relevant to the current context. Also, as a softened *ge3*, *gaa3* has a weaker force of assertion, accompanied by a hint of 'reminding', to give 'smooth-alert' to the hearer. The use of *gaa3* is based on the speaker's assumption that he/she believes the proposition to be true (Kwok, 1984), and is often used to assert fact or proposition without doubt to the speaker (Matthews & Yip, 1994; Fung, 2000). The speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of a proposition, as supposedly it is not a new one, yet the hearer may happen to overlook or neglect it, about which the speaker intends to remind him/her (Fung, 2000).

Usage of *gaa3*$_{B}$:

(F1) To make the utterance relevant to the current context
(F2) To give 'smooth-alert'
(C1) The speaker assumes the proposition is true
(C2) The speaker assumes the hearer has no knowledge of the proposition

The usages (F1), (F2) and (C1) of *gaa3*$_{B}$ are the same as *gaa3*$_{A}$. The only difference between the two is the speaker's assumption of the hearer's knowledge. When using *gaa3*$_{A}$, the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the situation (although it might have been overlooked), yet he/she assumes the hearer has no knowledge of the proposition at all when using *gaa3*$_{B}$.

(The hearer is wondering how a friend can find his way around when travelling to Berlin)
(44) keoi5 sik1 dak1- man2 gaa3
he/she know German SFP
Don't worry, he knows German.

(Sybesma 2004:177, modified)

In (44), the speaker assumes the hearer did not know that their friend knows German, or else he/she would not have had such concern about how the friend is going to find the way around when travelling to a strange place. *Gaa3*$_{B}$ is used in this case to provide the information to the hearer, who did not have such knowledge before.

Usage of *wo3*$_{A}$:

(F1) To provide noteworthy information
(F2) To remind the hearer to take something into special consideration
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition

Usage of *wo3*$_{B}$:

(F1) To provide noteworthy information
(F2) To inform the hearer about something that should be taken into special consideration
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer does not have knowledge of the proposition

Luke (1990) points out that one of the main usages of *wo3* is to provide noteworthy information to the hearer. This is regarded as one of the functions of *wo3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{B}$. The two particles only differ in the speaker's assumption of the hearer's knowledge. When *wo3*$_{A}$ is used, the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, and he/she simply reminds or helps the hearer remember about such knowledge. The opposite is assumed when *wo3*$_{B}$ is used, where the speaker intends to utter proposition unknown to the hearer. Although Luke suggests it is not important to distinguish between 'reminding' and 'informing' when analysing conversations, it will be one of the key properties that helps identify which usages of *wo3* are applicable to the SFP combination.

Usage of *wo3*$_{C}$:

(F1) To point out noteworthy event or state-of-affairs presented in the previous conversation
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer has more concrete knowledge of the proposition

Another usage of *wo3* is to point out what the speaker finds noteworthy in the previous part of the conversation (Luke, 1990).

(The hearer told the speaker about the food she had in a restaurant the day before)

(45)	waa1	hoi2-sin1	wo3,	gam3	gwai3	wo3	di1-je5
	wow	seafood	SFP	so	expensive	SFP	the.things

Wow, seafood, that must be expensive.

(Luke 1990:246)

The hearer in example (45) told the speaker about the food she had the day before. In the hearer's report, the speaker noticed about the food and the possible price the hearer had to pay for it. To the speaker, it is expensive to order seafood in a restaurant, so she uses *wo3*$_{C}$ in the first half of the utterance to point out the noteworthiness of the food. Also, as the hearer was the one who had the food, the speaker assumes she has more concrete knowledge of the proposition, hence the use of *wo3*$_{C}$ to ask for confirmation of the noteworthy event from the hearer.

Usage of *wo3*$_{D}$:

(F1) To report unexpected circumstances in story-tellings
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer has no knowledge of the proposition
(C2) The speaker assumes the hearer believes the opposite, which is a rule or a norm that is generally valid

In reportings and story-tellings, the speaker can use *wo3*$_{D}$ to indicate what is unexpected in the experience (Luke, 1990). In example (37), the speaker believes a person does not get sick after swimming in a pond, yet it happened and is out of the speaker's expectation. When reporting or telling a story, the speaker believes that the hearer has not heard about it before and has no knowledge of it. What is unexpected to the speaker also implies that he/she assumes the hearer should believe what is considered 'normal' would have happened, given that it is a rule or a norm for the 'normal' to take place, yet it turned out to be what ought not to happen.

Usage of *wo3*$_{E}$:

(F1) To give 'dispreferred turn' which challenges the validity of the hearer's belief
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer believes the opposite, which is a rule or a norm that is generally valid
(C2) The speaker assumes the hearer was expecting confirmation on or agreement to what is presented in the previous conversation

Wo3 is also used to give 'dispreferred turn' to the hearer. Luke (1990) suggests that dispreferred turn includes the usages in challenging a position, reply to contact-establishment and disconfirmation. In all these scenarios, the speaker assumes, as in *wo3*$_{D}$, that the hearer has certain belief of what ought to happen under normal circumstances, and that the hearer was expecting confirmation on or agreement to his/her belief of what is presented in the previous conversation. By using *wo3*$_{D}$, the speaker gives dispreferred turn that challenges the hearer's belief. For instance, the speaker in example (38) gives evidence on his son's behaviour, which does not complied with what the hearer believes to be true about a teenager.

4.2.2. Individual SFP in combinations

Combination *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$:

(The hearer decides to go visit a friend living in the US in January, and this is not his first time visiting the country)

(46)	nei5	jat1-jyut6	heoi3	dung1-ngon6,	hou2	dung3	gaa3-wo3
	you	first.month	go	east.coast	very	cold	SFP

If you're going to the East Coast in January, it's going to be very cold!

(Matthews & Yip 1994:344, modified)

The speaker in (46) uses *gaa3*$_{A}$ to make the utterance more relevant to the context by pointing out what the hearer should concern about his decision to go to the East Coast in January, as well as to give the hearer a 'smooth-alert' about what he should be expecting. The use of *gaa3*$_{A}$ is based on the assumption that the speaker deems what he said is true, that it will be very cold in the East Coast in January.

Meanwhile, the speaker assumes the hearer knows about the weather in the East Coast in January, since it is not the first time he visits the US. However, he still decides to go there despite the cold weather, which makes the speaker consider that he may have overlooked the fact that it will be cold then. This, thus, explains the use of *wo3*$_{A}$ in (46). Although the speaker assumes the proposition may have been temporarily overlooked by the hearer, he still considers the hearer to have such knowledge. The conditions of using *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$ can be satisfied at the same time, making it a valid combination.

Combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$:

Gaa3$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$ is an invalid combination due to the incompatible conditions of using the two particles together. To use *gaa3*$_{B}$ in an utterance, it requires the speaker's assumption of the hearer having no knowledge of the proposition, yet the use of *wo3*$_{A}$, on the other hand, requires the speaker to assume the hearer to have knowledge of it. Given that it is not possible to assume the hearer not having such knowledge while having the knowledge at the same time, these two conditions contradict each other, hence the invalidity of the combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$.

Combination *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{B}$:

Similar to the combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$, *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{B}$ is an invalid combination because of the contradicting speaker's assumptions on the hearer's knowledge. One of the conditions of using *gaa3*$_{A}$ is that the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, even though it might have been overlooked. However, the condition of using *wo3*$_{B}$ is that the speaker has to assume the hearer does not have knowledge of the proposition. Since it is impossible for the speaker to make such contradicting assumptions about the hearer's knowledge, the two particles are incompatible with each other, making the combination an invalid one.

Combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{B}$:

(On an information leaflet about occupational safety and health)

(47)	lou4-gung1-cyu5	dou1	jau5	tai4-gung1	zik1-jip6	gin6-hong1	gong2-zo6
	labour.department	also	have	provide	occupation	health	seminar
	bei2	gung1-zung3,	cyun4-bou6-dou1	hai6	min5-fai3	gaa3-wo3	
	to	public	all	be	free.charge	SFP	

The Labour Department also provides seminars on occupational health to the public, and these are all free of charge!

Extracted from an information leaflet to promote occupational safety and health, the use of *gaa3*$_{B}$ in (47) makes the utterance more relevant to the context by providing information about free seminars on occupational health. It also gives 'smooth-alert' to the hearer, or the reader in this case, about these seminars that very likely the hearer wants to know about. In order to provide this information, it is necessary for the speaker to assume the proposition to be true, which means he/she truly believes that the department does provide seminars to the public, and these seminars are free of charge. With *gaa3*$_{B}$, the speaker also assumes the hearer has no knowledge about the seminars, and intends to provide this new information in the proposition to the hearer.

This is also a function shared by *wo3*$_{B}$. By mentioning the seminars, the speaker provides this noteworthy information to the hearer, as they concern about occupational health, and the related information will be provided on the seminars. In addition, the use of *wo3*$_{B}$ allows the speaker to inform the hearer about these free seminars, so that the hearer can take this into consideration if they concern about occupational health. The act of providing new information to the hearer is based on the speaker's assumption that the hearer does not have knowledge about it, thus satisfies the condition of using *wo3*$_{B}$.

Combination *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$:

(Speaker B was talking about having his first puff of heroin in the prison)

(48) A: zik1-hai6 hai2 gaam1-juk6 jap6-bin6 sik6 gaa3-wo3
that.means at prison inside smoke SFP
So you smoked it inside the prison (which is an unusual situation).
B: Yeah.
A: So there was a supply of those drugs.

(Luke 1990:244, modified)

Speaker A in (48) uses *gaa3*$_{A}$ to make the utterance more relevant to the context, where speaker B was talking about his experience of having heroin in the prison. *Gaa3*$_{A}$ is also used to give 'smooth-alert' to the hearer. The availability of drugs inside prison is not common, and the speaker intends to draw the hearer's attention on this unusual situation. This is based on speaker A's assumption that 'smoking heroin in prison is unusual', which satisfies the condition of using *gaa3*$_{A}$ in the utterance. Speaker A also assumes speaker B knows that it is an unusual incident. However, as it is reported plainly by speaker B without emphasising or elaborating the abnormal situation, speaker A assumes the proposition, 'it is unusual to smoke heroin inside the prison', may have been overlooked by speaker B.

The use of *wo3*$_{C}$ points out such unusualness. In the previous part of the conversation, speaker B mentioned having his first puff of heroin in the prison, yet the event was brought up as a 'normal' circumstance without emphasis or elaboration. Speaker A thus points out this event with *wo3*$_{C}$, so as to raise awareness of the unusualness of heroin being available in prison. As it is a story told by speaker B about his own experience, speaker A assumes speaker B has more concrete knowledge about the proposition. The condition of using *wo3*$_{C}$ is thus satisfied.

Combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$:

Gaa3$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$ is not a valid combination, due to the incompatible use conditions of the two particles. To use *gaa3*$_{B}$ in an utterance, the speaker has to assume the hearer has no knowledge of the proposition. However, if *wo3*$_{C}$ is used, it is necessary for the speaker to assume the hearer has knowledge of the proposition even more concrete than the speaker does. As the speaker cannot assume the hearer has no knowledge of the proposition, while having more concrete knowledge, there is conflict between the conditions of using *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$ together. Therefore, the combination of *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$ is invalid.

Combination *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$:

Gaa3$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$ is an invalid combination. The use of *gaa3*$_{A}$ requires the speaker to assume the hearer knows the proposition, although it might have been overlooked. On the other hand, it is necessary for the speaker to assume the hearer does not know the proposition in order to use *wo3*$_{D}$ in story-tellings. Given that it is impossible for the speaker to assume the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, and have no knowledge of it at all, the conditions of using *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$ as a combination contradict each other, which explains the invalidity of the combination.

Combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$:

(The speaker is telling a mysterious incident he encountered on a pool table)

(49)	hau6-min6	ming4-ming4	mou4-jan4,	daan6	zi1	gwan3	jau6-wui6
	back	obviously	no.one	but	CL	cue	but
	dat6-jin4-gaan1	hoeng3-cin4	zong6-jat1-zong6	go3	bo1	gaa3-wo3	
	suddenly	forward	hit	CL	ball	SFP	

There was really no one at the back, but the cue suddenly hit the ball.

One of the functions of *gaa3*$_{B}$ in (49) is to make the utterance more relevant to the context. The speaker is talking about a mysterious incident he encountered, and the unexplainable event of the cue hitting the ball by itself is highlighted here, indicating that this is the event that 'bothers' the speaker. *Gaa3*$_{B}$ is also used to highlight this event, as supposedly, a cue does not hit a ball on the table itself if no one is holding it. However, it did happen, and the speaker uses *gaa3*$_{B}$ to alert the hearer to this mysterious happening.

The use of *gaa3*$_{B}$ is based on two conditions. Firstly, the speaker assumes what he said is true, for that he is talking about what he witnessed with his own eyes, so there is no way he will assume the proposition to be not true. Secondly, he assumes the hearer does not know the proposition in story-telling. The speaker assumes the hearer does not know the content, or else he would not have to tell the hearer a story that was already known.

The use of *wo3*$_{D}$ in this utterance is to report an unexpected circumstance. Normally, a cue can only hit a ball if someone is holding it, yet such 'normal circumstances' do not apply to what the speaker witnessed – the ball on the table was hit by a cue held by no one, and this is out of the speaker's expectation. The use of *wo3*$_{D}$ also satisfies two conditions. The first condition is that the speaker assumes the hearer does not know the proposition. This is easily satisfied in story-tellings, since when the speaker tells a story of his own experience, he expects the hearer does not already know about it, as in (49). The second condition is that the speaker assumes the hearer believes what should be a norm is generally valid, yet the speaker tells the opposite. A cue must be held by someone so that it can hit a ball on a pool table. This is a general rule applicable to most situations with physically-existing, tangible things. It is thus normal for the hearer to believe that a cue cannot hit a ball without anyone holding it, until the unexplainable event happened. Therefore, there is no contradiction between the usages of *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$, making them a valid combination.

Combination *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$:

(The hearer, who speaks Cantonese, tells the speaker that Cantonese speaker should be able to understand Mandarin to some extent)

(50)	daan6-hai6	jyu4-gwo2	nei5	zan1-hai6	jyun4-cyun4	mei6-hok6-gwo3	gwok3-jyu5
	but	if	you	really	completely	not.learned	Mandarin
	le1,	dou1	gei2-naan4-haa5	gaa3-wo3			
	SFP	also	quite.difficult	SFP			

But if you really haven't learned Mandarin at all before, it's quite difficult too, you know.

The use of *gaa3*$_{A}$ in (50) is to make the utterance more relevant to the context. In the previous conversation, the speaker and hearer were discussing how Cantonese speaker can understand Mandarin. The speaker mentions a special situation, that it can be quite difficult for some Cantonese speakers to understand Mandarin, which the hearer may have overlooked. The *gaa3*$_{A}$ is used to make the proposition about this special situation more relevant to what is discussed.

Another function of *gaa3*$_{A}$ is to give 'smooth-alert' to the hearer. As the hearer is certain that Cantonese speaker is able to understand Mandarin, the speaker considers that the hearer is not aware of or overlooks the fact that not all Cantonese speakers are able to do that easily. By stating the special situation of not having learned Mandarin, the speaker intends to draw the hearer's attention to it and convince her to take it into account.

Using *gaa3*$_{A}$ in (50) is based on two conditions. One of them is that the speaker assumes the proposition to be true. This is satisfied as the speaker does not absolutely agree with the hearer's belief, and she does believe that it can be difficult for a Cantonese speaker to understand Mandarin if the speaker has not learned it ever. Another condition is that the speaker assumes the hearer may have overlooked the proposition of a special situation of what the hearer believes to be true does not apply. Being a Cantonese speaker, the hearer should know that it may not be easy for a fellow Cantonese speaker to understand Mandarin if he/she has not learned it before, yet from what the hearer said in the previous conversation, the speaker believes the hearer may have overlooked the proposition, and thought that all Cantonese speakers could understand Mandarin. This condition of using *gaa3*$_{A}$ is thus satisfied.

Using *wo3*$_{E}$ in (50) gives 'dispreferred turn' to the what the hearer believes. She believes that Cantonese speakers certainly can understand Mandarin to some extent, yet what the speaker mentions challenges such belief. The use of this particle is based on the condition that the speaker assumes the hearer believes in the 'norm'. Since Cantonese and Mandarin are both varieties under the Chinese language, it is considered normal for Cantonese speakers to understand certain level of Mandarin. This is valid in normal situations and was said explicitly by the hearer in the previous conversation, so the speaker assumes this is what the hearer believes. Also, from the hearer's certainty, the speaker assumes that she intends to convince the speaker to believe the same, and expects agreement from the speaker. This condition of using *wo3*$_{E}$ is satisfied as well, making *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$ a valid combination of *gaa3*-*wo3* usages.

Combination *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$:

(The counsellor told the speaker she was sure that it is normal for her son, a teenage boy, to be energetic)

(51) keoi5 jau6-m4-hai6 hou2-wut6-joek6 wo3. Ngo5-dei6 daai3 keoi5
he really.not.be very.energetic SFP we bring he
ceot1-heoi3 waan2 le1, keoi5 jau6 sei2-se4-laan6-sin6 gam2 m4-jyun6
out play SFP he then dead.snake.rotten.eel like not.willing
juk1 gaa3-wo3
move SFP
Well, but in fact, he isn't really very energetic. When we take him out to play, he's like a dead snake and wouldn't move.

(Luke 1990:217, modified)

In example (51), *gaa3*$_{B}$ makes the utterance more relevant to the context. In the conversation, the two parties are discussing the behaviour of a teenage boy, the son of the speaker. The counsellor told the speaker that it is normal for her son to be energetic, yet the speaker has an opposite view with evidence. Such 'evidence' is uttered with *gaa3*$_{B}$ to make it more relevant to what is discussed. Another function of *gaa3*$_{B}$ is to give 'smooth-alert' to the hearer and draw the hearer's attention to what the speaker considers as not compatible to what the hearer believes. The speaker mentions how her son is unwilling to move when he is taken out to play, a situation that is not compatible to the hearer's belief of 'all teenage boys are energetic'.

The use of *gaa3*$_{B}$ is based on the speaker's assumption that what she said is true. Since she witnessed her son's behaviour, there is no doubt that she believes in her first-hand experience. Another assumption

is that the hearer does not know about the behaviour of the son – as the counsellor was trying to convince the speaker that teenage boys are energetic, the speaker assumes the hearer was not aware about the abnormal behaviour of her son, and very likely, the counsellor did not know how her son behaves when the parents are taking him out to play. Therefore, both conditions of using *gaa3*$_{B}$ are satisfied.

The use of *wo3*$_{E}$ in the example is to give 'dispreferred turn' to the hearer's belief. In the previous conversation, the hearer was certain and intended to convince the speaker that all teenage boys are energetic, so does her son. However, such belief is challenged by the speaker, with evidence of the son being unwilling to move when he has chance to play. The particle is used based on two conditions related to the speaker's assumptions. Firstly, the speaker assumes the hearer believes what is regarded as the norm, yet the opposite to the proposition. Normal teenage boys should be energetic and outgoing, and do not miss any chance where they are allowed to play. This is usually valid and applicable to most boys, and the hearer believes so, or else she would not have intended to convince the speaker to believe the same. Secondly, the speaker assumes the hearer was expecting agreement on this norm. Given that the hearer was certain about this norm and intended to convince the speaker to believe so, the speaker assumes the hearer was expecting her agreement to the belief, that all boys are energetic. As the conditions of using the two particles are compatible, the combination of *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$ is a valid one.

4.2.3. Conclusion on combination *gaa3-wo3*

From the above analysis, the possible usage of *gaa3-wo3* are those of the following six combinations: *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{A}$, *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{B}$, *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{C}$, *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{D}$, *gaa3*$_{A}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$, and *gaa3*$_{B}$ and *wo3*$_{E}$. Similar to *yone*, the validity of the combination greatly depends on the compatibility of the speaker's assumptions when the individual particles are used together. If there is any contradiction in these conditions, the combination cannot be a valid option for explaining the usages of the SFP combination. It can also be concluded that the *gaa3-wo3* inherits the usages of *gaa3* and *wo3* of the valid combinations. However, as mentioned in the previous chapters, there are still more usages which are not included in the combinations, and these usages will be discussed in the next chapter.

5. Additional usages of SFP combinations

In the previous chapter, we can see that while some of the usages of the SFP combinations inherit their functions and use conditions from the individual particles, the combinations still possess some usages exclusively to themselves, as briefly discussed in examples (6) and (9).

I propose that the additional usage of *yone* and *gaa3-wo3* is the following.

(F1) To express the speaker's uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition
(C1) The speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, but the speaker is not fully committed to this assumption

In the following, I will revisit some utterance examples in the previous sections to analyse the proposed additional usage of both SFP combinations.

5.1. Japanese SFP *yone*

(The speaker stayed at home yesterday, while the hearer went hiking, and told the speaker that the weather was nice)

(52) kinou, ame ga futteita yone
yesterday rain NM was.falling SFP
It was raining yesterday, wasn't it?

(=(42))

The speaker and hearer of (52) has incompatible understandings of the proposition 'it was raining yesterday'. The hearer went outdoors the day before, thus the speaker thought that he should know about the weather and had the same belief as the speaker does. However, out of the speaker's expectation, the hearer disagreed with him. The speaker is then uncertain about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition, and uses *yone* to express such uncertainty.

As the hearer was outdoor the day before, the speaker assumes that he has knowledge of the proposition. But from the previous conversation, it appears to the speaker that it is not the case – the hearer does not know that it was raining the day before. From the hearer's words, the speaker is not certain if his assumption of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition is absolutely true, and he is not fully committed to it.

(When giving directions to taxi driver)

(53) asoko-ni yuubin-posuto ga miemasu yone. sono-sugusakino kado wo
at.over.there mailbox NM can.see SFP immediately.that corner ACC
migi-ni magatte kudasai
to.right turn please
You can see the mailbox over there, right? Please turn right at that corner.

(=(43))

When sitting in the taxi, facing the same direction, it is natural for the speaker of (53) to think that the hearer can, as he does, see the mailbox at the corner in front of the vehicle. However, the speaker cannot know if the hearer is able to see it. After all, only the hearer knows what is visible in his own sight. The speaker uses *yone* to express the uncertainty about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition, which is 'the hearer can see the mailbox over there'.

Since the two parties are facing the same direction, and the mailbox is visible to the speaker, the speaker assumes the hearer should be able to see that mailbox. Yet, only the hearer knows whether he is able to see the mailbox, so the speaker still has doubt about this assumption and is not fully committed to it.

This additional usage belongs solely to the SFP combination *yone*, and is not derived from the mere usage combination of individual *yo* and *ne*.

(54a) kinou, ame ga futteita yo
yesterday rain NM was.falling SFP
It was raining yesterday, you know.

(54b) kinou, ame ga futteita ne
yesterday rain NM was.falling SFP
It was raining yesterday, right?

If *yone* in (52) is replaced with individual *yo* and *ne*, neither of the new utterances directly tells that the speaker is uncertain about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition. The use of *yo* in (54a) simply intends to update the hearer's knowledge. Whether it is yo_A or yo_B, the utterance does not show that the speaker is not clear about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition. The use of yo_B even requires the speaker to be certain that the hearer does not know about the proposition. The use condition of the

additional usage, that the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, is not required by any of the individual *yo* usages either.

In (54b), whether *ne* has the usage of ne_A or ne_B, it does not reflect the speaker's doubt about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition. In addition, both of the usages require the speaker to have clear assumption of such knowledge, either same or more concrete knowledge, or none at all. Although ne_A can be used when the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, which is partly in alignment with the use condition of the *yone* additional usage, the function, to express the speaker's uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge, apparently has no relation to the two *yo* usages.

(55a)	asoko-ni	yuubin-posuto	ga	miemasu	yo
	at.over.there	mailbox	NM	can.see	SFP
	You can see the mailbox over there, you know.				
(55b)	asoko-ni	yuubin-posuto	ga	miemasu	ne
	at.over.there	mailbox	NM	can.see	SFP
	You can see the mailbox over there, right?				

Examples (55a) and (55b) shows that the function of expressing the speaker's uncertainty about the hearer's knowledge of the proposition is not applicable to individual *yo* or *ne*. The function of (55a) is to provide information to the hearer, while addressing the hearer's knowledge is not the main concern here. The use condition of yo_A does not require speaker's assumption of the hearer's knowledge, and that of yo_B even requires the speaker to assume the hearer does not know the proposition at all. Thus, the additional usage is not applicable to individual *yo*.

The use of *ne* in (55b) is not directly related to the additional usage of *yone* either. Both ne_A and ne_B have functions different from expressing uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition. As for their use conditions, ne_B requires the speaker's assumption of the hearer having no knowledge of the proposition, which is the opposite to the additional usage; using ne_A requires the speaker to assume that the hearer has certain level of knowledge, which may be said that it contributes to the usage of *yone*. However, the remaining function are not complemented by any usages of *yo*. Therefore, it can be concluded that this is an exclusive usage which belongs to the combination *yone*, and does not simply inherit from the components *yo* and *ne*.

5.2. Cantonese SFP *gaa3-wo3*

(The hearer decides to go visit a friend living in the US in January, and this is not his first time visiting the country)

(56)	nei5	jat1-jyut6	heoi3	dung1-ngon6,	hou2	dung3	gaa3-wo3
	you	first.month	go	east.coast	very	cold	SFP
	If you're going to the East Coast in January, it's going to be very cold!						

(=(46))

Learning that the hearer plans to go to the East Coast in January, the speaker of (56) intends to ask the hearer to think twice, as the speaker knows that the weather then will be cold and it may not be the best time to visit there. Since it is not the first time the hearer visits the country, the speaker considers that he should have known about the weather in January. However, from the hearer's plan, it seems the hearer does not know about that. The speaker thus uses *gaa3-wo3* to express his uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition, 'it will be cold in the East Coast in January'.

The use of the combination is based on the speaker's assumption on the hearer's knowledge. As elaborated, the speaker thought the hearer knew about the weather in January, given that the hearer has been to the country and has certain knowledge about it. However, the hearer's plan appears to tell the

opposite. This is why the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the proposition, yet he is not fully committed to such assumption due to the hearer's decision of visiting the East Coast despite the cold weather.

(The hearer, who speaks Cantonese, tells the speaker that Cantonese speaker should be able to understand Mandarin to some extent)

(57) daan6-hai6 jyu4-gwo2 nei5 zan1-hai6 jyun4-cyun4 mei6-hok6-gwo3 gwok3-jyu5
but if you really completely not.learned Mandarin
le1, dou1 gei2-naan4-haa5 gaa3-wo3
SFP also quite.difficult SFP
But if you really haven't learned Mandarin at all before, it's quite difficult too.

(=(50))

When the hearer told the speaker that Cantonese speaker can understand Mandarin to some extent, the speaker uses *gaa3-wo3* to express her uncertainty about whether the hearer knows the proposition. The speaker deems that Cantonese speaker may not understand Mandarin easily if he/she has not learned it before. Also a Cantonese speaker, the hearer should know about it in the speaker's view. From the hearer's opinion, however, it seems she does not know the proposition. The speaker is thus uncertain about the hearer's knowledge of it, and uses *gaa3-wo3* to show her doubt.

Being a Cantonese speaker, the speaker assumes the hearer knows that it can be quite difficult for Cantonese speaker to understand Mandarin, as the speaker herself does. The hearer's opinion yet shows that she has not considered this, which weakens the speaker's assumption. Being unsure about the hearer's knowledge, the speaker is not fully committed to her assumption that the hearer has knowledge of the proposition.

This additional usage of *gaa3-wo3* is one that only applicable to the SFP itself, rather than a combination of the usages of the components *gaa3* and *wo3*.

(58a) nei5 jat1-jyut6 heoi3 dung1-ngon6, hou2 dung3 gaa3
you first.month go east.coast very cold SFP
If you're going to the East Coast in January, it's going to be very cold!

(58b) nei5 jat1-jyut6 heoi3 dung1-ngon6, hou2 dung3 wo3
you first.month go east.coast very cold SFP
If you're going to the East Coast in January, it's going to be very cold. Isn't it?

The use of *gaa3* in (58a) is to, mainly, make the utterance more relevant to the context and let the hearer be aware of the propositional content. The individual particle has no function directly related to the additional usage of *gaa3-wo3*. As for the use condition of the additional usage, although $gaa3_{A}$ has a similar condition, which is the speaker's assumption of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition that has been possibly overlooked, the function of expressing the speaker's uncertainty is not complemented by any usages of *wo3*. In other words, the additional usage may inherit some properties of *gaa3*, but *wo3* does not contribute to it, making it an independent usage of the SFP combination.

Example (58b) suffixed with *wo3* does not express directly the speaker's uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge either. It is used to remind the hearer to consider certain situation, regardless whether the hearer knows the proposition already. Some usages of *wo3* contain conditions where the speaker assumes the hearer to have knowledge of the proposition, which is somehow aligned with the additional usage. However, *yo* plays no role in fulfilling the remaining properties of such usage.

(59a) daan6-hai6 jyu4-gwo2 nei5 zan1-hai6 jyun4-cyun4 mei6-hok6-gwo3 gwok3-jyu5
but if you really completely not.learned Mandarin
le1, dou1 gei2-naan4-haa5 gaa3
SFP also quite.difficult SFP
But if you really haven't learned Mandarin at all before, it's quite difficult too.

(59b) daan6-hai6 jyu4-gwo2 nei5 zan1-hai6 jyun4-cyun4 mei6-hok6-gwo3 gwok3-jyu5
but if you really completely not.learned Mandarin
le1, dou1 gei2-naan4-haa5 wo3
SFP also quite.difficult SFP
But if you really haven't learned Mandarin at all before, it's quite difficult too, right?

By using *gaa3* in (59a), the speaker intends to suggest a situation the hearer may not know. The use of *gaa3* here does not address the speaker's doubt on the hearer's knowledge of the proposition directly. The use condition of $gaa3_{A}$ somehow resembles that of the additional usage of *gaa3-wo3* by requiring the speaker to assume the hearer has knowledge of the proposition overlooked, yet the usages of *wo3* does not contribute to what is left, i.e. the function of the additional usage.

The speaker of (59b) uses *wo3* to remind or inform the hearer about the situation she may have not considered, but she does not intend to express the uncertainty of the hearer's knowledge of the proposition. Although some of the usages of *wo3* requires the speaker to assume the hearer knows the proposition, the function of *gaa3-wo3*'s additional usage is not fulfilled by that of *gaa3*. Therefore, the additional usage should be regarded as one exclusively belongs to the combination *gaa3-wo3*, rather than a compositional one contributed by both *gaa3* and *wo3*.

5.3. Conclusion on additional usages

Besides the usages as combinations of the individual particles, both *yone* and *gaa3-wo3* have an additional usage that is not completely made up by their components. In this section, the additional usage is analysed with several utterance examples, and it is found that although the additional usage contains certain properties that may be considered as given by the components, the remaining properties cannot be fully complemented by applying the usages of the individual particles. The additional usage is thus not a combination of these particles, but a usage that only applicable to the two SFP combinations themselves.

6. Conclusion

In the thesis, the usages of *yone* and *gaa3-wo3* was dissected and analysed. It is found that the particle combinations consist of the usages of the individual components. However, not all of these usages of the individual particles are applicable in the combinations; only those with compatible use conditions can be combined.

Although clearly some of the usages of the combinations inherit from the components, there is still usage that cannot be explained by simply combining the individual particles. This additional usage is pinpointed with various utterances and contexts in both Japanese and Cantonese. More research could be done in the future to other SFP combinations for usages which are not a mere composite of the component particles.

Bibliography

Davis, C. (2009). Decisions, dynamics and the Japanese particle yo. *Journal of semantics, 26*(4), 329-366.

Fung, R. S.-Y. (2000). *Final particles in standard Cantonese: semantic extension and pragmatic inference*. Ohio State University.

Izuhara, E. (2003). Shuujoshi 'yo' 'yone' 'ne' saikou [Rethinking sentence-final particles 'yo' 'yone' and 'ne']. *Aichi gakuin daigaku kyouyoubu kiyou, 51(2),* 1-15.

Kamio, A. (1994). The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21*(1), 67-100.

Katagiri, Y. (2007). Dialogue functions of Japanese sentence-final particles 'yo' and 'ne'. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(7), 1313-1323.

Katoh, S. (2001). Bunmatsu joshi 'ne' 'yo' no danwa kousei kinou [The discourse constructing functions of sentence-final particles 'ne' and 'yo']. *Toyama daigaku jinbun gakubu kiyou, 35,* 31-48.

Kwok, H. (1984). *Sentence particles in Cantonese.* Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Luke, K.-K. (1990). *Utterance Particles in Cantonese Conversation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Matthews, S., & Yip, V. (1994). *Cantonese: A comprehensive grammar.* London: Routledge.

McCready, E., & Davis, C. (in press). Sentence-final Particles in Japanese. In W. M. Jacobsen, & Y. Takubo (Eds.), *Handbook of Japanese Semantics and pragmatics.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Noda, E. (1993). Shuujoshi 'ne' to 'yo' no kinou: 'yone' to kasanaru baai [Functions of sentence-final particles 'ne' and 'yo': the case of 'yone']. *Gengo bunka to nihongo kyouiku, 6,* 10-21.

Sybesma, R. (2004). Exploring Cantonese tense. *Linguistics in the Netherlands, 21*(1), 169-180.

Sybesma, R., & Li, B. (2007). The dissection and structural mapping of Cantonese sentence final particles. *Lingua, 117*(10), 1739-1783.