

Predication in disguise: *which*-constructions in Hong Kong Cantonese code-mixing speech

Tommy Tsz-Ming Lee

City University of Hong Kong

International Workshop on the Syntax of Predication and Modification 2024 (IWSPM)

November 16-17, 2024, at Nihon University



Link to handout:

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 Conclusions

Introduction

- Nominal modification in (Hong Kong) Cantonese is in most cases pre-nominal. (Green boxes indicate the heads.)

- (1) a. [liksi (ge)] **gaaufosyu** Nominal modifier
 history GE textbook
 ‘History textbooks’
- b. [Ginhong ge] **sailou** Adjectival modifier
 healthy GE kid
 ‘Heathly kids’
- c. [Ngo hou zungji Δ ge] **syu** Relative clause
 I very like GE book
 ‘The books that I like’

Introduction

- In code-mixing speeches, there appear to be exceptional cases (Chan 1993; T. C. Leung 2001; K. W. Leung 2010).

(2) Sailou faangung zau jau munzukungam [which keoidei fannhok
Kid work then have satisfaction WHICH 3PL study
jatzik dak-m-dou Δ].

straight gain-not-able

‘The young people at work usually get a sense of satisfaction, which they don’t get any at school.’

- The signature property of these clausal structures is the usage of the English relative pronoun *which*.

Introduction

- One more example:

- (3) Keoi zihau sau-dou dai-jat fung seon, [**which** Δ hai seonjungkaat 3SG then receive first CL letter WHICH be credit.card gongsi geilei jiu keoi waan cin].
- company send request 3SG pay.back money
- ‘Then s/he received the first letter, which is sent from the credit card company to request payment.’

- I call this emerging type of constructions **which-RCs**.

Introduction

- Earlier characterizations suggest that *which*-RCs involve a postmodifying structure (Chan 1993).
- K. W. Leung (2010) explicitly argues that

“The relative construction follows English grammar, forming a post-modifying relative clause with an English relative pronoun which pre-posed to the beginning of the clause” (p.63; emphases mine)
- It has been taken as an instance of **lexicosyntactic transference** (Li 1999; K. W. Leung 2010; Chan 2022).
 - Lexical borrowing of the relative pronoun *which*
 - Syntactic borrowing of the post-modifying relative structures of English

Introduction

- A **modification** account gains some support from a set of restricted cases where post-nominal modification is allowed in Cantonese, when the head is an indefinite NP (Luke 1998, p.48).

(4) Post-nominal modification in Cantonese

a. Ngo soeng wan go saimanzai [feifei-dei ge].

I want find CL kid chubby GE

‘I want to find a kid who is chubby’

b. Ngo tai-gwo jat-bun syu [gong ni-go mantai ge].

I see-EXP one-CL book talk this-CL question GE

‘I have read a book which talks about this question.’

- One may suggest that *which*-RCs represent an extended usage of post-nominal modification.

Introduction

The goals of this talk:

- However, I argue that *which*-RCs do not serve as a post-nominal modifier.
- Rather, *which*-RCs are best regarded as **clausal parentheticals**, a standalone clause syntactically independent of the matrix clause.
- The expression *which* is lexically borrowed into Cantonese and serves as a functional morpheme, introducing **predication** on a null topic.

Road map

- To develop an understanding of *which*-RCs, I will focus on the following two properties of *which*-RCs:
 - ① Non-restrictive (in terms of interpretation)
 - ② Non-integrated (in terms of syntactic status)

- I sketch a clausal parenthetical analysis on *which*-RCs.
 - I take *which* to be a functional morpheme that introduces predication on a null topic.
 - the predication introduced by *which*-RCs enjoys a special epistemic status (i.e., conventional implicature *à la* Potts (2005, 2007))
 - Appendix: *Which*-RCs more similar to clausal parenticals, rather than appositive RCs.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds**
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 Conclusions

Backgrounds of *which*-RCs

- *Which*-RCs receive very limited attention in the literature.
- But examples have been noticed no later than 1990s.

- (5) a. Ngo m-tungji keoi ge jigin, [**which** does not mean
I not-agree 3SG GE opinion WHICH DOES NOT MEAN
ngo zang keoi].
I hate 3SG

'I do not agree to his opinions, which does not mean I hate him.'

(Chan (1993), p.9)

- b. Keoi gin-dou bou **dinwaa** [**which** keoi waa soeng mai] wo5.
3SG see-ASP CL telephone WHICH 3SG say want buy SFP
'He has seen a telephone, which he says he wants to buy.'

(T. C. Leung 2001, p.58)

Backgrounds of *which*-RCs

- K. W. Leung (2010) is the first attempt to document *which*-RCs.
 - 8 spoken sentences of *which*-RCs are judged as 2.24/4 by 22 college students.
 - 20 spontaneous/naturalistic examples in a diary kept for three months.
- Admittedly, there are speaker variations, and *which*-RCs are most acceptable among college students.
- They may be “rated with low scores in acceptability judgment task even by participants who use this construction” (p.23)
 - probably due to “conformity to a prescriptive norm or a prestigious register, or on degree of semantic or pragmatic plausibility”

Backgrounds of *which*-RCs

- However, recent internet searches reveal that the prevalence of *which*-RCs are underestimated.
 - More than 200 instances are collected in Nov-Dec, 2022,
 - from the internet of different sources, including forums, social network services, blogs, interviews, etc.
- Most of the reported data today are based on these instances, with or without slight modifications.
 - Unacceptable cases are based on three native speakers who self-identify themselves as users of *which*-RCs.
- (Note: somewhat surprisingly, *which*-RCs are equally common in Mandarin, where code-mixing is thought to be less common.)

Backgrounds of *which*-RCs

- Two basic properties are worth mentioning.
- **Medial positions** (suggested to be unattested in K. W. Leung (2010))

- (6) Janwai haa-ci [which jatding wui jau haa-ci], moujan zi
 because next-time WHICH for.sure will have next-time no.one know
 zung wui-m-wui gam gaandan.
 still will-not-will so simple
 ‘Because next time – (I am) sure that there will be next time – no one
 knows if it will still be simple.’

Backgrounds of *which*-RCs

- **Separation between the antecedent and the *which*-RC**

(strictly disallowed in Chinese RCs)

- (7) [Loeng Seoi] gaunin zoudak hou sanfu, [which] ngo gokdak
 ‘Leong Seoi’ last.year work very exhausting WHICH I think
 Δ hoji zoi zou houdi].
 can again do better

‘Last year it was very exhausting to work on the project “Loeng Seoi”,
 which I think (we) could have done better.’ (K. W. Leung 2010, p.74)

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive**
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 Conclusions

Non-restrictive

- *Which*-RCs behave similarly to non-restrictive RCs rather than restrictive RCs in English.
 - 1 Proper names
 - 2 Non-nominal relativization
 - 3 Exhaustivity
 - 4 Internal heads

① Proper names

- Proper names can serve as the antecedent in *which*-RCs.

(8) Ngo m-mingbak dinggai jaujiu coeng dou-ci

I not-understand why again sing once.more

“Dinjingjyun Laijikuk” **which** nei jiging waan-gwo.

“ITS TIME TO ENJOY THE SHOW” WHICH you already sing-EXP

‘I don’t understnad why (you) sang “ITS TIME TO ENJOY THE SHOW” again, which you have already sung.’

- It patterns with non-restrictive RCs in English.

(9) a. * John Smith [that grows peaches] (Baker 1996)

b. Ronald Reagan, who began his career as a radio announcer, came to hold the nation’s highest office. (Baker 1996)

② Clausal/predicate relativization

- *Which*-RCs can be associated with non-nominals, e.g., adjectives and VPs.

(10) Ceoifei zanhai housik, **which** sap-gan dou mou jat-gap Δ,
 unless really delicious WHICH 10-CL DOU not.have 1-CL

fauzak douhai zoinaan
 otherwise be disaster

(Lit.) ‘Unless (the dish is) really delicious (which there is none in 10 restaurants), it would be a disaster.’

(11) Gokdak dongjat go joeng m-houtai, [**which** houdo jan
 think that.day CL face not-look.good WHICH many person
 dou wui Δ].

all will

(Lit.) ‘(One may) think that (s/he) doesn’t look good that day, which many people will (think so).’

② Clausal/predicate relativization

- Non-restrictive RCs in English allow clausal/predicate relativization.

- (12) a. At least Robert is considerate , [which none of his friends seem to be Δ]. (Baker 1996)
- b. John helped me move , which Mary avoided despite promising to Δ .
(p.c. Adam Woodnutt)
- c. No one showed up on time , [which Alex didnt like Δ very much].
(Baker 1996)

③ Exhaustivity

- *Which*-RCs give rise to an exhaustive reading.
- A canonical RC restricts the NP and weakens the meaning of the sentence.

(13) Restrictive interpretation; non-exhaustive

Keoi sau-gwo m-dou-gwo m-fung [jung jingman se ge] **seon**.
 3SG get-EXP no-more-than five-CL use English write GE letter
 ‘S/he got no more than five letters that are written in English.’

(14) Non-restrictive interpretation; exhaustive

Keoi sau-gwo m-dou-gwo m-fung **seon**, [**which** hai jung
 3SG get-EXP no-more-than five-CL letter WHICH be use
 jingman se ge].
 English write GE
 ‘S/he got no more than five letters, which are all written in English.’

- Only (b) entails that *all* the letter s/he received are written in English.

④ Internal heads

- “Gap”-less *which*-RCs are attested (e.g., resumptive pronouns, demonstratives)
- Furthermore, they may contain an internal head.

(15) Keoi giu ngodei tai album, [**which** go album zijau sap-gei
 3SG ask us look.at album WHICH CL album only ten-several
 zoeng soeng].
 CL photo

‘S/he asked us to look at the album, which the album contained only several photos.’

Non-restrictive

- This is reminiscent of a property of non-restrictive clauses in English, where they can contain CP-internal heads (Fabb 1990; Citko 2008).

- (16) a. The LAGB, which organization meets tomorrow, is based here.
 b. *The LAGB which organization meets tomorrow is based here.
- (17) Oxygen and fire are related, which fact I long ago pointed out.

Interim summary

- As such, *which*-RCs exhibit parallel behaviors as English non-restrictive RCs.
 - ① Proper names
 - ② Non-nominal relativization
 - ③ Exhaustivity
 - ④ Internal heads
- But as we will see below, *which*-RCs indeed have the syntax of root clauses, and shows no dependencies on the host clause.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated**
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 Conclusions

Non-integrated

- In spite of a number of surface similarities with relative structures, and the use of *which*, *which*-RCs indeed also show properties that are different from canonical RCs.
- I argue that *which*-RCs are root clauses on their own.
 - ① *which* for all antecedents
 - ② Genuine “gap”-less structures
 - ③ Island insensitivity
 - ④ Cross-sentential association
 - ⑤ The occurrence of SFPs

① *which* for all antecedents

- No relative pronoun other than *which* is allowed in *which*-RCs.

(18) Ngo sik Lei-lousi [***who**/^{ok}**which** Δ jicin hai ngo ge
 I know Lee-teacher WHO/WHICH former be ngo GE
 mentor].
 mentor
 ‘I know Mr. Lee, who is my former mentor.’

① *which* for all antecedents

- Even the antecedent refers to human beings, *which* is allowed.

(19) Keoidei jiu ceotsin dak B/C loeng-zou honang dai-fan gwo
 they need promote only B/C two-group may low-mark than

keoidei [**which** keoidei gamjat dou daa].

them, WHICH they today also attend

‘If they want promotion (in the match), only Group B and C may have lower marks than them, but they will also attend a match today.’

- The use of *which* is insensitive to the antecedent in the matrix clause, and is free from the grammatical requirement observed in English.

② Genuine “gap”-less relative structures

- We have seen that *which*-RCs can be used without a gap (e.g., with internal heads).
- Indeed, *which*-RCs allow the head and the RC to be semantically associated.

(20) Heoi hok coenggo zangkoeng zigei coenggo ge nanglik [**which**
 go learn singing improve self singing GE ability WHICH
go singgwo zanhai hou minghin].

CL outcome really very significant

(Lit.) ‘(I) go learn singing to improve my singing ability, which the outcome is really significant.’

② Non-canonical “gap”-less structures

- More importantly, there are cases where the host clause and *which*-RC are merely discourse-related, as if two separate clauses.

(21) a. Keoi m-hai hou sik cyulei ni-di si [**which** keoi wui
 3SG not-be very know handle this-CL thing WHICH 3SG will
 gei sitdai].
 quite disadvantaged
 (Lit.) ‘S/he doesn’t handle these things well, which s/he would be
 quite disadvantaged.’

- Such cases are not found in English RCs, nor in Cantonese RCs.
- *Which*-constructions develop usages that are not typical of relative structures.

③ Island insensitivity

- *Which*-RCs allows a gap to be associated with the head noun from within a syntactic island.
- (i) Complex NP islands

(22) Ngo tung keoi dou zungji sik **laaulin** [**which** ngo jatzou zau
 I and 3SG also like eat durian WHICH I already then
 teng-gwo [_{NP} keoi bei ngo gang zungji Δ ge gongfat]].
 hear-EXP 3SG than I more like GE saying.
 (Lit.) ‘We both like eating durians, which I already heard the saying that
 he like (durians) more than me.’

The syntactic position of the relative clauses

- (ii) Adjunct islands

(23) Sailou faangung zau jau munzukgam [which [Adj janwai
youth at.work then have satisfaction WHICH because
keoidei faanhok jatzik dak-m-dou Δ], soji keoidei tungsoeng
they at.school long gain-not-able so they usually
dou hou jau dunglik].

DOU very have motivation

(Lit.) ‘The young people at work usually get a sense of satisfaction, which because they cannot obtain (it) at school, they are usually self-motivated.’

- These observations support a base generation of *which*-RCs, and the gap inside is not syntactically dependent on the host clause.

④ Cross-sentential association

- K. W. Leung (2010) (p.35) reports a case of co-construction, allowing cross-sentential *whcih*-RCs.

- (24) a. A: Ngo teng-gwo nei jung-gwo jatci wo3.
 I hear-EXP you use-EXP once SFP
 ‘I heard you using (it) once...’
- b. B: [**which** is Δ mou honeng ge].
 WHICH IS not possible SFP
 ‘which is impossible.’

④ Cross-sentential association

- Also, clausal intervention is tolerated.

(25) Keoi sik saangcoi si hou ginghei, man ngo dimgaai han
 3SG eat lettuce time very surprised ask me why will
lok gam-dou jau ge, [**which** keoi gokdak Δ houhousik].
 use that-much oil WHICH 3SG think delicious
 ‘S/he was surprised when s/he ate lettuce, and asked me why I will
use that much oil, which s/he thinks (it is) very delicious.’

- Which*-RCs are far more syntactically independent than canonical RCs.

5 The occurrence of SFPs

- *Which*-RCs can occur after SFPs. Also, they can contain a different SFP.

(26) Nei di sausai m-gongzeng wo5 [**which** nei zigei jiging
 You CL skill not-clean SFP WHICH you self already
 singjing-zo Δ laa1].
 admit-PFV SFP

(Lit.) ‘Your skills are not good enough. Which you also admitted already.’

(27) Keoi zanhai hou zungsi keoi ge sijip lo1 [**which** is Δ hai
 3SG really very treasure 3SG GE career SFP WHICH IS be
 ngo hou jansoeng ge2].
 I very praise SFP

(Lit.) ‘S/he really treasures his/her career. Which is I really praise.’

- *Which*-RCs should thus be regarded as independent utterances.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis**
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 Conclusions

Clausal parentheticals

- The desiderata
 - Non-restrictive meaning
 - Non-integrated syntax

- *Which*-RCs involve borrowing of a particular lexical item, rather than a whole paradigm of relative pronouns in English.
 - Admittedly, there are some variants in *whcih*-RCs.
 - E.g., *in which, which is*
 - But all of them contain *which*, and appear to be lexicalized as one item.
 - E.g. **by which, *which are*

Clausal parentheticals

- All these observations speak against a (post-nominal) modification account (K. W. Leung 2010; Chan 1993, 2022).
 - The *which*-RCs bear minimal relations to their antecedents (if any).
 - The *which* does not function as a relative pronoun.
- I propose that *which*-RCs are indeed **clausal parentheticals**.
 - See Appendix for reasons of not treating them as conjoined clauses (T. C. Leung 2001) or appositive RCs (Schlenker 2023).
- *Which* in *which*-RCs is lexically borrowed from English, but it is semantically bleached, and is used as **a functional morpheme that introduce predication**.

Clausal parentheticals

- An illustration:

(28) Keoi gin-dou bou dinwaa [which keoi waa soeng mai] wo5.
 3SG see-ASP CL telephone WHICH 3SG say want buy SFP
 ‘He has seen a telephone which he says he wants to buy.’

(29) a. ✗ Modification:
 He has seen [_{NP} a telephone [_{CP} OP_i **which** he says he want Δ_i]].

b. ✓ Predication:
 He has seen a telephone_i [_{TOPP} *pro*_i [**which** [he says he want \emptyset_i]]].

- *Which* can be regarded as (i) a topic head or (ii) a relator (den Dikken 2006).
- The “gap” (if any) can be another *pro* or derived via Argument Ellipsis.

Clausal parentheticals

- This suggestion finds support from the **clausal size** of *which*-RCs.
- Given the root clause syntax of *which*-RCs and the peripheral status of *which*, we expect that they can accommodate various CP-level elements.
- E.g., Focus projection

- (30) Haa jat-bou zauhai maai **daancong**, [**which** [FocusP
Next one-step be buy jumping.bed WHICH
lin daancong dou jau review]] .
even jumping.bed also have review
(Lit.) ‘The next step is to buy jumping bed, which even jimping bed has reviews.’

Clausal parentheticals

- Speaker-oriented adverbs, presumably in the EvalP, can appear within *which*-RCs as well.

(31) Di namjan ciudaai dungzok fing sau, [**which** [EvalP houzoi
 CL.PL man great.extent motion wave hand WHICH luckily
 keoidei mou lo-zyu penlight]] .
 they not.have holding penlight
 (Lit.) ‘The men are waving their hands at full, which luckily they are not
 holding any penlight.’

- Both Focus and subject-oriented adverbs can appear after canonical topics in Cantonese.

Clausal parentheticals

- The Topic-head-initial utterance might seem implausible, but it is indeed attested in some languages.
- **Particle Stranding Ellipsis** in Japanese (Sato 2012; Sato and Maeda 2019).

- (32) a. A: John-wa kyoo nani-o siteiru-no?
 John-TOP today what-ACC doing-Q
 ‘What is John doing today?’
- b. B: \emptyset -wa, Mary-ni daigaku-de atteiru-ne.
 TOP Mary-DAT university-LOC meeting-TAG
 ‘Intended: (John) is meeting Mary at a university.’

- Both *wa* in Japanese and *which* in Cantonese must (i) be sentence-initial, (ii) be in root clause, and (iii) occur only once.

Clausal parentheticals

- Loose ends
 - The native topic marker *ne* in Cantonese does not serve this purpose;
 - The null topic can never be overt, unlike the Japanese case;
 - T. C. Leung (2001) suggests that the closest translation of *which* is *ji* ‘and’.

(33) Keoi gin-dou bou dinwaa [ji keoi waa soeng mai] wo5.
 3SG see-ASP CL telephone and 3SG say want buy SFP
 ‘He has seen a telephone and he says he wants to buy.’

- In the appendix, I suggest that *which* differs from *ji* ‘and’ in that the former expresses *non-at-issue* content.
- I further speculate that the other restrictions are linked to the epistemic status of the predication introduced by *which*.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status**
- 7 Conclusions

Epistemic status

- I argue that the role of *which* is to introduce semantic content best characterized as conventional implicatures (Potts 2005, 2007).
 - This function is also noted in Chan (2022).
 - *Which*-RCs “[introduce] a personal assessment on a situation or entity expressed in the first/matrix clause”
- The content so introduced displays the following three properties.
 - 1 Not-at-issue
 - 2 Scope-less properties
 - 3 Triviality condition

① Not-at-issue

- The proposition introduced in a *which*-RC is non-at-issue in discourse.
- It shows non-deniability. Only the proposition in the host clause can be felicitously negated.

(34) A: Cyun-coeng dak jat-zoeng toi hai ji-jan-toi, [which
 whole-venue only one-CL table be two-person-table WHICH
 keoidei zung sik-gan zyucoi.
 they still eating main.course

(Lit.) A: 'There is only one table for two people in the venue, which they are still having the main course.'

(35) (Im)possible continuations

- a. # B: No, they are having deserts.
- b. B: No, there are two such tables.

② Scope-less properties

- When embedded under intensional contexts with a epistemic agent, *which*-RCs are still **oriented to the speaker**, but not the matrix subject.

(36) Aaming daamsam jyugwo Peter zou-zo **wuizoeng**, [**which** keoi
 Aaming worry if Peter be-PFV president WHICH 3SG
 m-wui syun-dou], wui ling go zouzik mou-saai zicize
 not-will elect-able will make CL group lose-all supporter
 ‘Aaming worries that if Peter is elected president, which he will not be
 elected, will make the group lose all its supporters.’

- It still indicates that the speaker thinks that Peter won’t be elected as chairperson.
- The *which*-RC is interpreted beyond the scope of *daamsam* ‘worry’.

② Scope-less properties

- *Which*-relatives also find a subtle difference with *ji* ‘and’ conjunction when embedded in **counterfactuals**.

(37) Jyugwo ngo tengjat daa-zo bei Aatau, [#**which**/^{OK}**ji** keoi
 If I tomorrow call-PFV to Head WHICH and he
 ganzyu daa-zo bei Loubaan], gamzau daaiginsi.
 then call-PFV to Boss then in.trouble.
 (Lit.) ‘If I called the Head tomorrow, #which/^{OK}and he then called the
 Boss, then (we are) in trouble.’

- The embeddability is reminiscent of the contrast between clausal parentheticals and appositive RCs in English (Schlenker 2023).

③ Triviality condition

- *Which*-RCs obey a triviality condition, unlike presupposition.
- Presupposition allows the presupposition to be trivially true.

(38) [*Context: The speaker said that Mr. Wong is a linguist.*]

Ji tunghok dou zidou Wong Lousi hai jat-go jyujinhokze.
 and student all know Mr. Wong be one-CL linguist
 ‘And all students know that Mr. Wong is a linguist.’

- Although the presupposition is trivially true in (a), it is still felicitous.

③ Triviality condition

- However, when the proposition introduced by *which*-RCs is trivially true in, it results in infelicity/redundancy.

(39) [Context: The speaker said that Mr. Wong is a linguist.]

#Dong geize fongman Wong Lousi, [**which** hai jat-go
 when repoerter interview Mr. Wong WHICH be one-CL
 jyujinhokge], geize ge taidou hou jausin.
 linguist reporter GE attitude very friendly

(Lit.) ‘When the reporter interviewed Mr. Wong, which is a linguist, the attitude of the reporter is pretty firendly.’

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Backgrounds
- 3 Non-restrictive
- 4 Non-integrated
- 5 Analysis
- 6 Appendix: Epistemic status
- 7 **Conclusions**

Conclusions

- Non-restrictive meaning
 - ① Proper names
 - ② Non-nominal relativization
 - ③ Exhaustivity
 - ④ Internal heads
- Non-integrated syntax
 - ① *which* for all antecedents
 - ② Genuine “gap”-less structures
 - ③ Island insensitivity
 - ④ Cross-sentential association
 - ⑤ The occurrence of SFPs
- I argued for a clausal parenthetical analysis on *which*-RCs
 - they are standalone clauses;
 - they do not involve modification, but predication;
 - *which* is lexically borrowed as an overt functional head, introducing not-at-issue content.

Conclusions

Implications

- On predication. The apparent post-nominal modifier is indeed a standalone clause involving predication.
- On borrowing. There is no syntactic borrowing at all. The relative pronoun *which* is lexically borrowed as a functional morpheme that introduce predication. (*pace* K. W. Leung 2010; Chan 2022).
- On code-switching. Neither English-style relative structures nor post-modification gets into Cantonese grammar. It does not defy the Matrix Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton (1993, 2002)), contra Chan (2022).

References I

- Baker, C L. 1996. *English Syntax, Second Edition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chan, Brian Hok-Shing. 1993. “Code-Mixing in Hongkong Cantonese-English Bilinguals: Constraints and Processes.” *CUHK Papers in Linguistics* 4:1–24.
- Chan, Brian Hok-Shing. 2022. “Constructional Borrowing From English in Hong Kong Cantonese.” *Frontiers in Communication* 7 (May): 1–13.
- Citko, Barbara. 2008. “An Argument against Assimilating Appositive Relatives to Coordinate Structures.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 39 (4): 633–655.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and Linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fabb, Nigel. 1990. “The Difference between English Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses.” *Journal of Linguistics* 26 (1): 57–77.

References II

- Leung, King Wui. 2010. *Lexicosyntactic transference in Cantonese-English code-switching: the case of which-relatives*. MA thesis, University of Hong Kong.
- Leung, Tsz Cheung. 2001. *An optimality-theoretic approach to Cantonese/English code switching*. MPhil thesis, The University of Hong Kong.
- Li, David C.S. 1999. "Linguistic convergence: Impact of english on Hong Kong cantonese." *Asian Englishes* 2 (1): 5–36.
- Luke, Kang-kwong. 1998. "Post-modification in Cantonese noun phrases." *Fangyan [Dialect]* 1:48–52.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

References III

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Potts, Christopher. 2007. “The expressive dimension.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 33 (2): 165–198.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2012. “Particle-Stranding Ellipsis in Japanese, Phase Theory, and the Privilege of the Root.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 43 (3): 495–504.
- Sato, Yosuke, and Masako Maeda. 2019. “Particle stranding ellipsis involves PF-deletion.” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37 (1): 357–388.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2023. “Supplements without Bidimensionality.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 54 (2): 251–297.