



# What you see is what you get: Chinese sentence-final particles as head-final complementisers

Waltraud Paul, Victor Junnan Pan

## ► To cite this version:

Waltraud Paul, Victor Junnan Pan. What you see is what you get: Chinese sentence-final particles as head-final complementisers. Discourse Particles – Formal Approaches to their Syntax and Semantics, 564, De Gruyter Mouton, pp.49-77, 2017, Linguistische Arbeiten, 9783110497151. 10.1515/9783110497151-003 . halshs-01425413

**HAL Id: halshs-01425413**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01425413>**

Submitted on 3 Jan 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# What you see is what you get: Chinese sentence-final particles as head-final complementizers\*

Waltraud Paul, CRLAO, CNRS-EHESS-INALCO, Paris  
Victor Junnan Pan, LLF, CNRS & University Paris 7

## Abstract

The present article presents an in-depth analysis of the head-final three-layered split CP realized by sentence-final particles (SFPs) in the SVO language Mandarin Chinese. These SFPs are shown to be fully-fledged functional heads with a complex feature make-up, on a par with C elements in e.g. Indo-European languages. Chinese SFPs select and project, as evidenced by the strict hierarchy for co-occurring SFPs in the split CP. This structure must be merged as such and cannot be derived by postulating movement from a head-initial CP. It straightforwardly invalidates empirically superficial statements that attempt to turn Chinese SFPs into a grammatical *quantité négligeable* in order to uphold problematic word order generalizations such as the Final-over-Final Constraint.

**Keywords:** Sentence-final particle; CP; left-periphery, Mandarin Chinese

## 1. Introduction

In Chinese, *zhùcí* ‘particle’ has been used as a cover term for (mostly, but not exclusively monosyllabic) items whose categorial status is unclear. However, already in the 1980s, Zhu (1982) identified *sentence-final particles* (SFP) (*yǔqì zhùcí* ‘mood particles’) as a closed set of items, which he characterized as combining with the sentence as a whole and constituting three distributional classes. He obtained these classes by determining the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations among SFPs: mutually exclusive SFPs were assigned to the same class, while co-occurring SFPs were assigned to different classes in terms of their strict ordering restrictions. Zhu’s (1982) three-partite division can be easily recast into a split CP à la Rizzi (1997, 2004), *modulo* the addition of an additional speaker/hearer-related projection (Attitude Phrase) above Rizzi’s ForceP. As in the languages examined by Rizzi (1997, 2004), the strict relative order observed in the Chinese split CP results from the fixed hierarchy among its subprojections.

The present article presents an in-depth analysis of the three-layered split CP realized by SFPs in Mandarin Chinese. It provides extensive evidence for their status as projecting and selecting C-heads, on a par with the C-heads in e.g. Romance and Germanic languages. This straightforwardly invalidates the various recurring statements by Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2007, 2008, 2010, 2014) - based on a superficial discussion of the two Chinese SFPs *ma* and *ne*- that SFPs are basically “acategorial” and therefore a *quantité négligeable* that does not “count” for grammar.

---

\* This article has greatly benefited from the comments by anonymous reviewers and by the editors, Josef Bayer and Voker Struckmeier.

The organization of the article is as follows. Section 2 introduces the basic structure of the split CP in Chinese. Section 3 corrects some of the major misconceptions commonly encountered in the literature, among them the alleged optionality of SFPs. Section 4 begins with an examination of the “innermost” SFPs nearest to TP, labelled Low C here. Even though the SFPs realizing Low C are often described as tense/aspect-related, they are clearly located above TP. Section 5 turns to the second-highest level, i.e. ForceP. Section 6 discusses the topmost level, *viz.* the speaker/hearer-related AttitudeP. As in other languages, the exact semantic contribution of these SFPs is the most difficult to describe. Section 7 illustrates the strict order for co-occurring SFPs and shows it to reflect the hierarchy of the respective layers. Importantly, the resulting split CP is observed in root-contexts only. Section 8 examines the issue of SFPs from a typological perspective and invalidates current proposals claiming the non-existence of head-final CPs in VO languages. Section 9 concludes the article.

## 2. The three-layered split CP in Mandarin Chinese

Extending Thomas Hun-tak Lee’s (1986) analysis of the *yes/no* question SFP *ma* as C to all SFPs, Paul (2008, 2014, 2015) established a three-layered CP for Chinese: Low C < Force < Attitude. This split CP replicates Zhu Dexi’s (1982: 207–213) division of the SFPs into three distributional classes, based on their rigid relative ordering. As to be argued for in this article, this split CP needs to be refined insofar as Low CP and AttitudeP can be further divided into two subprojections.

### (1) The three layers in the split root CP

C <sub>1</sub> (Low C)		C <sub>2</sub> (Force)	C <sub>3</sub> (Attitude)	
<i>le</i> currently relevant state	<i>éryǐ</i> ‘only’	<i>ba</i> <sub>Imp</sub> (advisative <i>ba</i> )	<i>a</i> softening	
<i>láizhe</i> recent past		<i>ba</i> <sub>Oconfirmation</sub>	<i>ei</i> gentle reminder	
		<i>ma</i> yes/no question .....	<i>ou</i> impatience, surprise	
			<i>ma</i> dogmatic assertion	
			<i>zhene</i> intensifier .....	
			<i>ne</i> <sub>3</sub> exaggeration	<i>ba</i> probability

(N.B. The semantic values indicated for each SFP can give a rough approximation only.)

The first class of SFPs (corresponding to our Low C) occurs nearest to the sentence (TP) and is claimed to express “tense” by Zhu (1982: 9); it comprises SFPs such as *le* and *láizhe* (cf. (2-3) below). The SFP *éryǐ* (not discussed by Zhu 1982) also belongs to Low CP, but in a subprojection higher than the one hosting *láizhe* and *le* (cf. section 3 below). The SFPs of the second class (Force) convey notions such as *yes/no* question (*ma*), confirmation-seeking question (*ba*<sub>Qconf</sub>) and imperative (*ba*<sub>imp</sub>) (cf. (4) below). The third, “outermost” class of SFPs (Attitude), finally, is explicitly stated to be different from the two other classes, because it involves the speaker’s attitude or feelings; SFPs belonging to this class are e.g. *a*, *ei* etc. (cf. (5) below). Zhu Dexi (1982: 208) emphasizes that co-

occurring SFPs belong to hierarchically different levels. SFPs of the same class are mutually exclusive, such as e.g. *le* and *láiizhe*, which both belong to the innermost class (cf. (3) below).

- (2) *Tā gāngcái hái zài bàngōngshì láiizhe.*<sup>1</sup>  
 3SG just.now still at office LOWC  
 ‘He was in his office just now.’
- (3) *Zuótiān xià yǔ le /láiizhe / { \*le láiizhe / \*láiizhe le }.*  
 yesterday fall rain LOWC/LOWC LOWC LOWC/ LOWC LOWC  
 ‘It rained yesterday.’
- (4a) *Nǐ míngnián qù Běijīng ma ?*  
 2SG next.year go Beijing FORCE  
 ‘Will you go to Beijing next year ?’
- (4b) *Nǐ jīntiān xiàwǔ zài lái ba.*  
 2SG today afternoon again come FORCE  
 ‘Please come again this afternoon.’
- (5) [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Jīntiān xīngqīsān ei ! Nǐ bié wàngle xiàwǔ děi shàngkè* ] *ei!*]  
 today Wednesday ATT 2SG NEG forget afternoon must attend class ATT  
 ‘Today is Wednesday (mind you)! Don’t forget you have classes in the afternoon!’  
 (slightly changed example from Zhu Dexi 1982: 213)

The highest layer established for Mandarin Chinese, AttitudeP, is absent from Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) original hierarchy, but is attested in other languages as well (cf. among others Munaro & Poletto (2006) for discourse-related SFPs in the Italian dialects Pagotto and Veneto and Haegeman’s (2014) DiscourseP postulated for West-Flemish). In Mandarin Chinese, the Attitude head *ei* e.g. indicates that the speaker assumes the co-speaker to be up to date concerning the matter at hand, but nevertheless issues a reminder. This is reminiscent of German *ja* and *doch* as well as the particle *to* in Bangla and Hindi<sup>2</sup>. As already observed by Zhu Dexi (1982), the SFPs realizing low C (as “innermost” SFPs) are sensitive to the properties of the TP-internal predicate (cf. section 3 below for further discussion) and in that respect are comparable to Rizzi’s FiniteP, which entertains a close relationship with the [ $\pm$  finite] nature of the extended verbal projection within TP. Given the controversial nature of the [ $\pm$  finite] distinction in Chinese, the more neutral label “Low C” has been chosen for this layer.

### 3. Against the so-called optionality of SFPs

As will become clear in the remainder of this article, whenever one intends to express the meaning encoded by a given SFP, this SFP is obligatory. For example, the “optionality” of the *yes/no* question Force head *ma* only exists insofar as a sentence remains acceptable without it, *modulo* the associated interpretational difference between a declarative and an interrogative sentence. The same observation

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in glossing examples: CL classifier; EXP experiential aspect; NEG negation; PERF perfective aspect; PL plural (e.g. 3PL = 3rd person plural); SG singular; SUB subordinator.

<sup>2</sup> Sentence (5) can be roughly translated into German as follows: *Heute ist doch Mittwoch! Vergiss ja nicht, dass du heute nachmittag zum Unterricht musst!*

holds for all SFPs in any given language, including those realizing AttitudeP. As pointed out by Biberauer, Haegeman and van Kemenade (2014: 9) it is misleading to characterize discourse particles as “optional”, given that the absence of such a particle inevitably leads to a different interpretation. Accordingly, it does not make much sense to talk about “optionality” as a general feature of SFPs, as Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014: 200) do: “In a survey of about 80 VO languages with final question particles, Bailey (2010, 2012) observed that these particles are very often optional (this is true of Mandarin *ne* and *ma*, for example).” [emphasis ours, VJP, WP].<sup>3</sup> Importantly, the alleged optionality of *ne* and *ma* is precisely not true, as well-known by everybody working on Chinese.

This is not meant to gloss over *yes/no* questions formed by a rising intonation alone (6c) (cf. Lu Jianming 1985: 236; Victor Junnan Pan 2011: 67), which do exist in Chinese, in addition to *yes/no* questions formed by adding the *yes/no* question SFP *ma* to a declarative sentence (cf. (6a-b)).

- (6a) *Tā huì shuō bāfǎliànyǔ.*  
 3SG can speak Bavarian  
 ‘He can speak Bavarian.’
- (6b) *Tā huì shuō bāfǎliànyǔ ma?*  
 3SG can speak Bavarian FORCE  
 ‘Can he can speak Bavarian?’
- (6c) *Tā huì shuō bāfǎliànyǔ↑?*  
 3SG can speak Bavarian  
 ‘Can he speak Bavarian?’

However, in many syntactic contexts the option of using intonation to encode a question is excluded.

In tag questions with *bù shì ma* ‘isn’t it (so)?’, the SFP *ma* is obligatory and cannot be “replaced” by a rising intonation.

- (7) *Nǐ zài Sītújiātè jiāo shū, bú shì \*(ma) ?*  
 2SG at Stuttgart teach book not be FORCE  
 ‘You teach in Stuttgart, don’t you?’

Similarly, in the presence of *wh*-indefinite construals ‘something, someone’, a *yes/no* question requires the presence of *ma*, because otherwise the sentence - due to the rising intonation - is analysed as a *wh* question (cf. Victor Junnan Pan 2011: chapter 5):

- (8a) *Nǐ xiǎng chī diǎn shénme ↑?*  
 2SG want eat a.bit what

---

<sup>3</sup> While Biberauer et al. (2014) refer to Bailey’s doctoral dissertation as Bailey (2012), elsewhere it is cited as Bailey (2013) (2013 being the year of submission). In the following, we settle for Bailey (2012/2013) in order to indicate that we refer to the same work as Biberauer et al. (2014). Note that Bailey’s (2012/2013) starting point is that SFPs in VO languages such as Chinese only superficially violate the Final-over-Final Constraint postulated in Biberauer et al. (2010, 2014). Cf. section 5 below for further discussion.

‘What do you want to eat?’

- (8b) *Nǐ xiǎng chī diǎn shénme ma ?*  
2SG want eat a.bit what FORCE  
‘Do you want to eat a little something?’

- (9a) *Tā pà shéi huì dǎ tā ↑ ?*  
3SG fear who will beat 3SG  
‘Who does he fear will beat him?’

- (9b) *Tā pà shéi huì dǎ tā ma ?*  
3SG fear who will beat 3SG FORCE  
‘Does he fear that someone will beat him?’

In this respect, Chinese is on a par with English and many other languages, where a *yes/no* question can be either formed by subject-auxiliary inversion or by a rising intonation. Evidently, this does not imply that they are equivalent, or that the existence of rising intonation renders SAI “optional”. Negative Polarity Items, for example, are licensed in SAI only, not in *yes/no* questions formed by rising intonation:

- (10a) \**You saw anyone↑?*

- (10b) *Did you see anyone?*

Furthermore, as in Chinese, in English as well tag questions cannot be formed by a rising intonation, but require SAI instead:

- (11) *You teach in Stuttgart, don’t you / \*you don’t ↑?*

Concerning the second allegedly optional SFP mentioned by Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014: 200), i.e. *ne*, note first of all that it is not a question particle on a par with *ma* (pace Lisa L.-S. Cheng 1991), a fact again well-documented in the literature (cf. among others Hu Mingyang 1981: 418, Paris 1981: 389, Li and Thompson 1981: 305, Lin William C. 1984: 220).<sup>4</sup> In other words, in a *wh*-question (cf. (12)) or in an A-not-A polar question (formed by the juxtaposition of the predicate in its positive and negative form; cf. (13)), the Attitude head *ne* is not obligatory, for the simple reason that *ne* does not encode the interrogative force. However, if one wants to signal the discourse function associated with *ne*, which *inter alia* is to solicit the co-speaker’s attention, rendered here by “listen, and you...”, *ne* is evidently obligatory (cf. among others Wu Guo 2005, Li Boya 2006, V.-J. Pan 2007, 2011):

---

<sup>4</sup> Given that *ne* is not a *wh*-question typing particle à la Cheng (1991), it does not qualify as an interrogative Force head and can therefore not be analysed as the overt realization of the null operator present in *wh* questions, either (*contra* Aoun and Li 1993). For a critical appraisal of Cheng’s (1991) *Clause typing hypothesis* in general, cf. Bruening (2007).

(12a) *Nǐ zuì xǐhuān hē nǎ ge páizi de déguó píjiǔ?*  
 2SG most like drink which CI brand SUB German beer  
 ‘Which brand of German beer do you like most?’

(12b) *Nǐ zuì xǐhuān hē nǎ ge páizi de déguó píjiǔ ne?*  
 2SG most like drink which CI brand SUB German beer ATT  
 ‘Listen, and you, which brand of German beer do you like most?’

(13a) *Tā huì bù huì shuō bāfǎlìyànyǔ?*  
 3SG can NEG can speak Bavarian  
 ‘Can he speak Bavarian?’

(13b) *Tā huì bù huì shuō bāfǎlìyànyǔ ne?*  
 3SG can NEG can speak Bavarian ATT  
 ‘And he, can he speak Bavarian?’

Being a head realizing AttitudeP, *ne* can also select a non-interrogative complement (cf. section 6 below for further discussion):

(14) *Déguó yǔyánxuéjiā kě duō \*(ne)!*  
 German linguist really many ATT  
 ‘There really are a lot of German linguists!’

As indicated, *ne* is obligatory in the presence of the speaker-oriented emphatic adverb *kě* ‘really’.

Finally, to round off this discussion of the alleged optionality of SFPs, the Low C *le* is often required in order to syntactically “close off” a sentence (in the absence of any clearly definable meaning associated with it), the sentence in question simply being unacceptable without it. This is another well-known and broadly documented fact, as evidenced by e.g. the sixty pages in Li and Thompson (1981) devoted to the SFP *le* alone(also cf. section 4 below).

(15) *Wǒ tài kāixīn \*(le)!<sup>5</sup>*  
 1SG too happy LOWC  
 ‘I’m too happy!’

To sum up, the alleged “optionality” of SFPs invoked by Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014) is not only incorrect for *ne* and *ma*, but for SFPs in Chinese in general, as to be amply documented in the remainder of this article. In order for the associated semantics to be encoded, the SFP must evidently be present.

---

<sup>5</sup> The low C *le* in sentences such as (15) is obligatory, whereas it is unacceptable in (i). This pair with nearly identical lexical material provides additional evidence to show that the absence/presence of *le* is constrained by syntax, not by prosody. Thanks to a reviewer for asking us to be more precise on this point.

(i) *Wǒ hěn kāixīn (\*le)!*  
 1SG very happy LOWC  
 ‘I am happy!’



- (19) [LowCP [TP *Tā* [*méi* [*qù Bāilí*]] [LowC *le* ]]  
           3SG NEG go Paris                   LOWC  
           ‘He doesn’t go to Paris anymore.’ (LE > ¬)  
           NOT: ‘He hasn’t been to Paris.’ (# → LE)

The position of *le* above TP is also confirmed by (20b). Here *le* signals that previously, unlike the situation this year, he worked during minor holidays only and did take a few days off for Christmas. This is made explicit by the acceptability of *kāishǐ* ‘start’ in (20b), and its unacceptability in (20a):

- (20a) *Tā jīnnián lián shèngdànjiē dōu (\*kāishǐ) bù fàng jià.*  
       3SG this.year even Christmas all start NEG take holiday  
       ‘He doesn’t even take holidays on Christmas this year.’  
       (20b) *Tā jīnnián lián shèngdànjiē dōu (kāishǐ) bù fàng jià le.*  
       3SG this.year even Christmas all start NEG take holiday LOWC  
       ‘He doesn’t even take holidays on Christmas (starting from) this year.’

Besides these data clearly showing the position of the Low C above TP, there are also principled objections against locating low C in T° (and stipulating obligatory T-to-C movement). Given that Chinese lacks *v*-to-T movement (C.-T. James Huang 1994), it is rather *ad hoc* to postulate obligatory T-to-C movement; moreover, it must be excluded that after the verb has raised to Asp° (cf. (21a)), it further moves on to T°, picks up the SFP and raises as a complex head to C itself (cf. (21b)):

- (21a) [TP *Tā yǐjīng* [AspP [Asp° *qù-guò*] [<sub>VP</sub> *t<sub>qu</sub> déguó*]]] *le*.  
           3SG already go-EXP Germany LOWC  
           ‘He has been to Germany before.’  
       (21b) \*[LowCP [TP *tā yǐjīng* [AspP *t<sub>qu</sub>-guò* [<sub>VP</sub> *t<sub>qu</sub> déguó*]]] [C° *qù-guò-le* ]].  
           3SG already Germany go-EXP-LOWC

In any case, as soon as one takes into account the Low C *éryǐ*, which can roughly be translated as ‘only; this is all I have to contribute’ and which is clearly not “tense-related”, the location of Low C in Tense is completely implausible.

- (22) [LowCP [TP *Wǒ zhībúguò shuō shuo*] *éryǐ* ].  
           1SG merely say say LOWC  
           ‘I’m just talking. (Don’t take me serious.)’

More precisely, as illustrated in table (1) above, *éryǐ* is located in the subprojection of Low CP that is higher than the one hosting *le* and *láizhe*, as evidenced by their co-occurrence in the order ‘{*le/láizhe*}+ *éryǐ*’ (the opposite order being excluded).

- (23) [LowC2P[LowC1P[TP *Tāmen gāngcái zhǐbùguò chǎo jià* ] [LowC1 *lái zhe*]] [LowC2 *éryǐ*].  
 3PL just.now merely quarrel fight LOWC1 LOWC2  
 ‘They were only quarrelling right now (not fighting.), that’s all.’

While Low Cs clearly occupy a TP-external position in the left periphery, there is nevertheless an interaction with TP-internal material including temporal adverbs such as *gāngcái* ‘just now’:

- (24) *Tā gāngcái hái zài bàngōngshì láizhe* /\**le*.  
3SG just.now still at office LOWC/ LOWC  
'He was in his office just now.'

There is a conflict between *gāngcái* ‘just now, a moment ago’ and *le*. *Gāngcái* explicitly locates the event in the past, whereas *le* relates the very same event to the speech time. However, this is not the case for *lǎizhe*, which does not establish such a relation.

## 5. ForceP

The particles typing the clause belong to ForceP: *yes/no* question *ma*, confirmation seeking question *ba*<sub>Qconf</sub> and imperative *ba*<sub>imp</sub>. Note that a Force head not only *can*, but *must* determine the nature of the resulting sentence in terms of its respective clause typing features.

The presence of *ma* is obligatory for question formation, on a par with SAI in English, *modulo* the constrained possibility of forming questions by rising intonation discussed in section 3 above.<sup>7</sup>

- (25a) [<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ shì déguórén*].  
 2SG be German  
 ‘You are German.’
- (25b) [<sub>ForceP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ shì déguórén*] [<sub>Force</sub><sup>o</sup>\*(*ma*)]]?  
 2SG be German FORCE  
 ‘Are you German?’

As illustrated in (26), the confirmation seeking Force head *ba* neatly contrasts with the *yes/no* Force head *ma*, as evidenced by the different answering possibilities.

- (26a) [ForceP[TP *Nǐ shì déguórén*] [Force° *ba<sub>Qconf</sub>*]]?  
2SG be German FORCE  
‘You are German, aren’t you?’
- (26b) *Nǐ shì zěnmē zhīdào de?*  
2SG be how know DE  
‘How come you know that?’

<sup>7</sup> As illustrated in (13) above, polar questions can also be in the form of A-not-A questions. For the numerous differences between the latter and the *yes/no*-question with *ma*, cf. Hagstrom (2006).

Contrary to the information seeking question Force head *ma*, *ba*<sub>Qconf</sub> is compatible with adverbs of the type *dàgàì* ‘probably’. Note that without *ba*, (27) would be a declarative sentence.

- The data above nicely confirm the contrast between these two types of question SFPs and highlight the different constraints at work for each SFP.

(30) *Bié chàng {le ba }/{\*ba le }!* (Hu Mingyang 1981: 416)  
 NEG sing LOWC FORCE/ FORCE LOWC  
 ‘Better stop singing.’

Note the rigid ordering between the Low C *le* and the Force head *ba*<sub>IMP</sub>, illustrating the hierarchy ‘LowCP < ForceP’.

Let us return now to the *yes/no* question Force head *ma*. Its analysis as Force head in a head-final CP dominating a head-initial TP and a likewise head-initial extended verbal projection challenges Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts' (2014 and earlier versions) *Final-Over-Final constraint* (FOFC), which excludes the structure where a head-final XP immediately dominates a head-initial YP. (This echoes Dryer's (1992, 2009) "near-absolute" universal that SFPs are excluded from VO languages such as Chinese.) In their attempt to maintain the FOFC notwithstanding languages such as Chinese, Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014: 200-201) implement Bailey's (2012/2013) analysis which they summarize as follows: "[...] at least some of the apparently FOFC-violating final question particles may actually be initial negative disjunctions of an elided disjunct clause. The structure of these *yes/no* questions would be [Q [TP [OR-NOT TP]]], where ellipsis of the second TP, identical with the first TP, leaves the negative disjunction as an apparently clause-final particle" (Biberauer,

Holmberg and Roberts 2014: 200-201).<sup>8</sup> However, putting aside the initial motivation for Bailey’s analysis, viz. to save the FOFC, several problems arise immediately.

First, in her attempt to defend the conjunction scenario for *ma*, Bailey (2012/2013) glosses over the existence of true disjunctive questions with *háishi* ‘or’ in Chinese, where the second TP can never be elided (whether it is identical with the first TP or not), “stranding” *háishi* with or without *bù*:

(31a) *Míngtiān tā lái wǒ jiā háishi (tā) bù lái wǒ jiā /\*háishi (bù)?*  
 tomorrow 3SG come my home or 3SG NEG come my home/ or NEG  
 ‘Will he come to my place or will he not come to my place tomorrow?’

(31b) *Míngtiān nǐ lái wǒ jiā háishi wǒ qù nǐ jiā?*  
 tomorrow 2SG come my home or 1SG go your home  
 ‘Will you come to my place or shall I go to your place tomorrow?’

Importantly, *ma* in such a disjunctive question is completely ungrammatical.

(32a) \**Nǐ lái wǒ jiā háishi wǒ qù nǐ jiā ma?*  
 2SG come my home or 1SG go your home FORCE

(32b) \**Nǐ lái wǒ jiā ma háishi wǒ qù nǐ jiā ma?*  
 2SG come my home FORCE or 1SG go your home FORCE

This ungrammaticality holds irrespective of whether there is one *ma* per clause or one *ma* for the entire disjunctive structure. Both (32a) and (32b) are excluded because the *yes/no* question force is in conflict with the disjunctive question force inherent in *háishi* ‘or’ (cf. the discussion immediately below). In turn, this shows that *yes/no* questions with *ma* and disjunctive questions must be distinguished and cannot be analysed uniformly (cf. Huang 1982, Huang, Li and Li 2009). As a result, the *yes/no* question with *ma* cannot be derived from a disjunctive structure as postulated by Bailey (2012/2013).

Furthermore, in addition to the interrogative disjunctive *háishi* ‘or’, Chinese also has the declarative disjunctive *huòzhě* ‘or’.

(33a) *Nǐ lái wǒ jiā huòzhě wǒ qù nǐ jiā.*  
 2SG come my home or 1SG go your home  
 ‘Either you come to my place or I go to your place.’

(33b) *Nǐ lái wǒ jiā háishi wǒ qù nǐ jiā?*  
 2SG come my home or 1SG go your home  
 ‘Will you come to my place or shall I go to your place?’

<sup>8</sup> As indicated by the position of the Q-operator in the structure [Q [TP [OR-NOT TP]]], the Force head is assumed to take a disjunction of two TPs as complement. As we will show below (cf. 34), this is not the case in Chinese. By contrast, it is the disjunctive operator *háishi* ‘or’ itself that scopes over the respective propositions.

As illustrated in (33b), with *háishì* ‘or’ instead of *huòzhě* ‘or’ we automatically obtain a disjunctive *question*. This is different from English and German where the formation of a disjunctive question not only requires ‘or’, but in addition requires SAI. In other words, *háishì* in Chinese involves both a disjunction and an interrogative operator. This is the reason for the incompatibility between a disjunctive question and the *yes/no* question SFP *ma* observed in (32) above.

Finally, Bailey’s (2012/2013) conjunction scenario fails completely in the case of disjunctions where each conjunct bears a sentence final particle, such as the Attitude head *ne* (discussed in detail in section 6 below). Also note that the very presence of *háishì* ‘or’ itself is surprising in her account, given that the SFPs themselves are considered to be disjunctors.

- (34) *Nǐ qù Bólin ne háishì bù qù Bólin ne?*  
 2SG go Berlin ATT or NEG go Berlin ATT  
 ‘Listen, will you go to Berlin or not?’

Bailey (2012/2013) would have to postulate an underlying disjunction per SFP *ne* in order to account for its presence on each clause in a disjunction. She also wrongly predicts the acceptability of (35) where *háishì* ‘or’ - with or without *bù* ‘not’ - is “stranded” after deletion of the second TP conjunct:

- (35) \**Nǐ qù Bólin ne háishì (bù)?*  
 2SG go Berlin ATT or NEG

In addition, the status of the “negative disjunction” OR-NOT in the structure [Q [TP [OR-NOT TP]]] is not clear. If it stands for a conjunction followed by negation after the deletion of the TP, *háishì* ‘or’ and *bù* ‘not’ will be stranded, which leads to the ungrammaticality of the sentence (cf. 35); if OR-NOT stands for a conjunction with negation incorporated, which seems to be taken to correspond to the semantics of the *yes/no* question Force head *ma*, the sentence is ungrammatical as well (cf. 36).

- (36b) \**Nǐ qù Bólin ne háishi/ ma?*  
 2SG go Berlin ATT or / FORCE

As already mentioned in the discussion of examples (12) - (14) above, the SFP *ne* is not a *wh*-question “typing particle” à la Cheng (1991). Instead, *ne* is an Attitude head; it can select different types of questions, such as disjunctive questions (cf. (34) above), polar A-*bù*-A questions (cf. (37)), rhetorical questions (cf. (39) as well as declaratives (cf. section 6 immediately below).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Interestingly enough, Petrova (2016) observes and corrects a similar misanalysis for the Old High German particles *inu* and *ia*. These are in general considered to encode interrogative force, notwithstanding their occurrence in declarative sentences and their optionality in *yes/no* questions and *wh* questions. In fact, already in OHG question formation involved verb fronting and *wh* fronting.

(37a) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ qù bú qù Fǎlánkèfú*]]?  
 2SG go NEG go Frankfurt  
 ‘Do you go to Frankfurt or not?’

(37b) [<sub>AttP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ qù bú qù Fǎlánkèfú*]] [<sub>Att°</sub> *ne*]]?  
 2SG go NEG go Frankfurt ATT  
 ‘Listen, do you go to Frankfurt or not?’

If *ne* were a *wh*-question typing particle in the sense of Cheng (1991), i.e. obligatory for *wh*-in-situ languages, its presence in polar A-*bù*-A questions would force us to treat the latter as a type of *wh*-questions as well, clearly an undesired result. In addition, as is well known, the question interpretation obtains in the absence of *ne*, both in polar A-*bù*-A questions (cf. (37a)) and *wh*-questions (cf. (38a)):

(38a) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force°</sub> Op] [<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ xǐhuān nǎ zuò chéngshì*]]?  
 2SG like which CL city  
 ‘Which city do you like?’

(38b) [<sub>AttP</sub> [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force°</sub> Op] [<sub>TP</sub> *Nǐ xǐhuān nǎ zuò chéngshì*]] [<sub>Att°</sub> *ne*]]?  
 2SG like which CL city ATT  
 ‘Listen, which city do you like?’

The discourse-related semantics associated with *ne* can approximately be rendered by ‘listen, look’. Its alleged “clause typing” function is also invalidated by its compatibility with rhetorical questions, which are standardly assumed to have a null negative operator as the head of ForceP (cf. Han 1996).

(39a) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force°</sub>  $\neg$ ] [<sub>TP</sub> *Tā nǎr huì shuō déyǔ*]]?!  
 3SG where can speak German  
 ‘In which world can he speak German?!’ = ‘He cannot speak German at all!’

(39b) [<sub>AttP</sub> [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force°</sub>  $\neg$ ] [<sub>TP</sub> *Tā nǎr huì shuō déyǔ*]] [<sub>Att°</sub> *ne*]]?!  
 3SG where can speak German ATT  
 ‘Oh, come on, he cannot speak German at all!’

Even though the exact semantic contribution of *ne* is difficult to capture, a problem typical of Attitude heads (cf. section 6 immediately below), it is evident that *ne* is obligatory if the associated meaning is to be expressed.

## 6. AttitudeP

The SFPs realizing AttitudeP involve the speaker/hearer’s point of view and subjective judgements; this type of SFP is very widespread across language families. As illustrated in the examples below, the exact meaning of the SFPs in AttitudeP is difficult to pin down and strongly depends on the intonation and the context. This is typical of particles relating to the discourse, as *inter alia* observed for the SFPs in the dialects Pagotto and Veneto from the North-Eastern area of Italy (cf. Munaro & Poletto 2006) and in West-Flemish (cf. Haegeman 2014). In this respect, Chinese is not “exotic” at all (*pace*

Biberauer and Sheehan 2011: 391), but clearly patterns with other well-studied languages.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, the characteristics of SFPs realizing DiscourseP (the equivalent of AttitudeP) established by Haegeman and Hill (2013) also hold for Attitude SFPs in Chinese. First, AttitudeP does not concern nor affect the truth value of the proposition at hand. This contrasts with the SFPs instantiating ForceP, where as we have seen, *ba*<sub>Qconfirmation</sub> conveys the speaker's belief that the proposition is true, and *ma* is a request as to the truth value (*yes/no*) of the proposition. Attitude SFPs are thus fundamentally distinct from both Low C and Force heads, an observation already made by Zhu (1982: 208), although not elaborated upon. Second, Attitude SFPs indicate the speaker's commitment to the sentence content; they are interactional and imply the obligatory presence of a hearer. Third, Attitude SFPs are deictic, i.e. they are directly correlated with the speech act, but do not require a preceding utterance as “trigger”. Finally, Haegeman and Hill (2013) concede that it is difficult to determine the precise interpretive properties of Attitude SFPs, even though their semantic import is clearly discernible when comparing sentences with and without them.

Starting with the Attitude head *ne* discussed in the preceding section, its compatibility with a declarative clause is an additional argument against its alleged role as a *wh*-question clause typer:

- (40) [<sub>AttP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Mùníhēi jīnnián dōngtiān méi xià xuě*] *ne*]!  
Munich this.year winter NEG fall snow ATT  
‘Surprisingly, it didn’t snow in Munich this winter!’

The Attitude head *ma* (henceforth *ma*<sub>Att</sub>) implies that the speaker presupposes the hearer not to be up to date and provides a correction of the hearer’s belief, conveying something like ‘this is self-evident’, ‘you should know’, ‘don’t you see?’ (cf. Chao Yuen Ren’s 1968: 801 term “dogmatic assertion”):

- (41) *Tā bù shì Lǎolǐ ma? Ràng tā jìnlái ma*<sub>Att</sub> (Lü Shuxiang et al. 2000: 375)  
3SG NEG be Laoli FORCE let 3SG come.in ATT  
‘Isn’t that Laoli? Let him come in. (Why do I have to tell you ?)’
- (42) *Wǒ shuō jīntiān shì xīngqīsān ma*<sub>Att</sub>! *Nǐ shuō bù shì!* (Zhu Dexi 1982: 213)  
1SG say today be Wednesday ATT 2SG say NEG be  
‘I say it’s Wednesday today! You say it isn’t!’

The Attitude head *ma*<sub>Att</sub> is clearly distinct from the Force head *ma* encoding *yes/no* questions, as generally acknowledged in the literature (cf. among others Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 800–801, Zhu Dexi 1982: 211–213, Lü Shuxiang et al. 2000: 375–376) and neatly illustrated by (41), where both SFPs occur in successive sentences. Whereas in the *yes/no* question, the intonation rises at the end of the

<sup>10</sup> “[...] Cantonese and Mandarin have an exotic range of sentence-final discourse-particles (SFP) that can be combined to express subtly nuanced (and notoriously difficult to translate) meanings [...]” (Biberauer and Sheehan 2011: 391).

sentence and *ma* cannot be stressed, the second sentence is pronounced with a falling intonation towards the end and *ma<sub>ATT</sub>* can, but need not be stressed. (*Contra* Li Boya (2006: 64–65) who postulates a single *ma* “mark[ing] a high degree of the strength of the assertive or directive force”).<sup>11</sup>

The Attitude head *a* has a rather complicated morphophonemics depending on the preceding word, which is often reflected in different transliterations: *ia*, *(u)a*, *(n)a*, *(ng)a* etc. (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 803, Zhu Dexi 1982: 212, Yang-Drocourt 2007: 192–195 for detailed discussion). For ease of exposition, we gloss over these phonological alternations and use the transliteration *a* throughout. The Attitude head *a* is rather ubiquitous and occurs with all kinds of sentence types (declaratives, questions, imperatives, exclamatives), which makes its semantic characterization very difficult. Scholars agree that *a* conveys the personal implication of the speaker and has a general softening effect; the different interpretations observed for *a* are then due to the different sentence types it combines with (cf. among others Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 803–806; Zhu Dexi 1982: 212, Li and Thompson 1981: 313–317, Beutel 1988). For example, Chao Yuen Ren (1968: 804) observes that a question with the SFP *a* is less blunt than one without it, an effect which can be paraphrased as ‘by the way’ or ‘excuse me’ etc.

- (43) *Nǐ míngtiān chūqù bù chūqù a?*  
 2SG tomorrow go.out NEG go.out ATT  
 ‘(By the way) are you going out tomorrow?’

Likewise, an imperative with the Attitude head *a* has less the flavour of a command than an imperative without it:

- (44) *Shuō a , bié hàipà a!*  
 say ATT NEG be.afraid ATT  
 ‘Come on, say it, don’t be afraid!’

In an exclamative, *a* expresses the emotion of the speaker, which, depending on the sentence meaning, can be anger, astonishment, enthusiasm etc.:

- (45) *Nǐ kàn a , biànhuà duō dà a!* (Yang-Drocourt 2007: 311)  
 2SG see ATT change much big ATT  
 ‘Look, how much everything has changed!’

---

<sup>11</sup> Chao Yuen Ren (1968: 801) explicitly addresses the distinction Force head *ma* vs Attitude head *ma* and notes the latter as *me*: “Because particles are in the neutral tone and unstressed, the low vowel *a* and the midvowel *e* are indistinguishable. However, in questions ending in *ma* [i.e. the Force head; VJP & WP], the sentence intonation is usually fairly high and ends in a slight drawl. It is therefore distinguishable from P5 *me* [i.e. the Attitude head; VJP & WP] below, which is always short.” Since nowadays the Attitude head is pronounced *ma*, we do not follow Chao Yuen Ren (1968), but note it as *ma<sub>Att</sub>*. Also note that for reasons poorly understood, the *yes/no* question force head *ma*, unlike the imperative force head *ba* (cf. (51) below), is incompatible with any Attitude head.

- (46) *Nǐ yě yào qù a?!*  
 2SG also want go ATT  
 ‘Oh, you are going, too?!’

*Zhene* is another Attitude head. It does not only convey an exaggeration by the speaker, but also corrects the presupposition of the co-speaker who underestimates the degree of the property in question.

- (47) *Tā (\*fēicháng) piāoliang zhene !*  
 3SG extremely pretty ATT  
 ‘She is really pretty!’

- (48) *Tā kě gāo zhene !*  
 2SG unmistakably tall ATT  
 ‘He is tall indeed!’

Given that *zhene* already indicates a maximal degree, the presence of a degree adverb such as *fēicháng* ‘extremely’ is excluded; by contrast, speaker-oriented adverbs such as *kě* ‘unmistakably’ are acceptable. This sensitivity of the Attitude head *zhene* to TP-internal material such as adverbs indicates that in the absence of intervening projections, the TP is accessible to a high C-head such as AttitudeP.

In addition to the two Force heads *ba<sub>Qconf</sub>* and *ba<sub>Imp</sub>*, there is a third *ba* realizing AttitudeP:

- (49) *Wàimiàn zài xià yǔ ba.*  
 outside PROG fall rain ATT  
 ‘Probably, it is raining outside.’

*Ba<sub>Att</sub>* indicates probability; thus (49) would be felicitous when uttered in a room without any windows where the speaker makes a guess based on the noise of the falling rain.

Finally, like Low CP, AttP must be further divided into two subprojections.

- (50) [<sub>Att2P</sub> [<sub>Att1P</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Sānshí nián qián hái méi yǒu shǔbīāo*] *ne*] *ba*].  
 30 year before still NEG have mouse ATT1 ATT2  
 ‘Thirty years ago, very probably there didn’t even exist anything like a computer mouse.’

This sentence contains two Attitude heads, *ne* and *ba*; it is part of a conversation about video games found on the web (and double-checked by native speakers for its acceptability). The order of *ne* and *ba* is fixed, the sequence *\*ba ne* being ungrammatical. Their exact semantic contribution is difficult to tease apart here; however, the import of *ba* can be rendered by “very probably”.

## 7. The hierarchy of co-occurring SFPs and the root vs non-root asymmetry in the Chinese CP

Having described the three layers, Low CP, ForceP and AttP, we can now proceed to examples where several SFPs co-occur in the same sentence and obey the strict order corresponding to the hierarchy of their respective subprojections. Note that for semantic reasons, it is quasi-impossible to find examples where each of the three layers (LowCP, ForceP and AttP) is realized. In fact, Zhu Dexi (1982: 208) was well aware of this problem. Accordingly, when establishing the relative order between several SFPs, he applied the notion of *transitivity*: if a given SFP *A* is shown to precede the SFP *B* and SFP *B* precedes the SFP *C*, then necessarily SFP *A* likewise must precede *C*. This same notion of transitivity also underlies Zhu Dexi's (1982: 208) statement that the relative order always holds, i.e. also when a given SFP position remains empty, as in the combination of the Low C *le* with the Attitude head *ou*:

- (51) *Bù zǎo l'ou [= le + ou], kuài zou b'ou [= ba + ou]* (Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 808)  
 NEG early SFP(fusion) fast go SFP (fusion)  
 'It's getting late! Hurry up and go!'

Given that the Attitude head *ou* (expressing the speaker's impatience) consists of a single vowel, it fuses phonetically with the preceding SFP (*le* and *ba*) into a single syllable, resulting in *l'ou* and *b'ou*.

The examples below illustrate the split LowCP followed by either an Attitude or a Force head:

- (52) *Wǒ zhībùguò chū chāi le éryǐ a!*  
 1SG merely go.out business.trip LOWC<sub>1</sub> LOWC<sub>2</sub> ATT  
 'I only went on a business trip (i.e. it is not that I wouldn't come back)!'
- (53) *Tā jǐnjǐn dǎ -cuò zì le éryǐ ma?*  
 3SG only type-wrong character LOWC<sub>1</sub> LOWC<sub>2</sub> FORCE  
 'Did he only make spelling mistakes?'

Note that the combinations *\*éryǐ le ma*, *\*le ma éryǐ*, *\*ma le éryǐ*, and *\*éryǐ ma le* are all excluded and thus confirm the requirement of a rigid ordering.

As illustrated in example (48) above with only one SFP realizing Attitude, in the absence of an intervening projection, the highest C can select the TP directly as its complement. On the other hand, when projections are spelt out, it is always the leftmost SFP which s-selects the complement (TP or CP) to its left, not the next highest SFP.

- (54a) *Nǐ míngtiān chī xīcān ma?*  
 2SG tomorrow eat western.food FORCE  
 'Will you eat western food tomorrow?'
- (54b) *\*Nǐ míngtiān chī xīcān láizhe*  
 2SG tomorrow eat western.food LOWC
- (54c) *\*Nǐ míngtiān chī xīcān láizhe ma?*  
 2SG tomorrow eat western.food LOWC FORCE

As indicated in (54b), *láizhe* is incompatible with a TP containing the adverb *míngtiān* ‘tomorrow’, and the same incompatibility is observed in (54c); accordingly, this unacceptable Low CP cannot serve as the complement for *ma*. The fact that *ma* itself allows for a TP complement with *míngtiān* (cf. 54a) cannot save (54c).

So far we have limited our discussion to SFPs occurring in matrix sentences, i.e. root contexts. This is important because most C-elements in Chinese are prohibited in embedded, non-root contexts.<sup>12</sup> More precisely, only Low Cs are acceptable in embedded contexts (cf. (55) - (57)), whereas Force and Attitude heads (cf. (58) - (60)) are completely excluded here and only acceptable in root contexts (cf. Paul 2014; 2015, ch. 7 for further discussion). Accordingly, the three-layered split CP ‘Low CP < ForceP < AttitudeP’ exclusively holds for root contexts.

- (55) *Tā méi gàosù wǒ [C<sub>lowP</sub> [TP Lǐsì bù qù Bólín] le ]*  
 3SG NEG tell 1SG Lisi NEG go Berlin LOWC  
 ‘He didn’t tell me that Lisi no longer wants to go to Berlin.’

- (56) *[DP[C<sub>lowP</sub>[TP Gāngcái dǎ diànhuà ] láizhe] de rén ] dàodǐ shì shéi?*  
 just strike phone CLOW SUB person in.fact be who  
 ‘Who on earth was the person that called just now?’ (Pan 2012, ex. [41])

- (57) *[TP Wǒ shì [CP [TP[-fin] t<sub>wo</sub> cónglái bù chōu yān ] de ]]*  
 1SG be ever Neg smoke cigarette [-root]C  
 ‘(It is the case that) I have never smoked.’

While the complement of *gàosù* ‘tell’ in (55) and the relative clause in (56) can either be a CP or a TP, in the propositional assertion construction (57) the copula *shì* ‘be’ requires a projection headed by the non-root C *de* as complement (cf. Paul and Whitman 2008). Accordingly, *de*, which in turn selects a non-finite TP (hence the obligatory subject raising to the matrix TP), can be considered a subordinating C on a par with e.g. *that*.

- (58a) *Wǒmen yīqǐ qù ba<sub>IMP</sub>*  
 1PL together go FORCE  
 ‘Let’s go there together.’

- (58b) *Tā yào wǒmen [pro yīqǐ qù (\*ba<sub>IMP</sub>)]*  
 3SG ask 1PL together go FORCE  
 ‘He asked us to go there together.’

<sup>12</sup> The literature on the Chinese C-system, from Cheng (1991) up to the more recent studies by Li Boya (2006), Xiong Zhongru (2007), Hsieh & Sybesma (2008), Huang, Li and Li (2009: 34–35), among others, has so far not acknowledged the *systematic* character of the root/non-root asymmetry and has at best stated the root-only distribution as the idiosyncrasy of individual SFPs (cf. Li & Thompson 1981:557, Tang Ting-chi 1988: 363ff. for *ma* and Cheng 1991, Y.-H. Audrey Li 1992:153 for *ne*). Whether Chinese has embedded root phenomena is still an open question. For first attempts to address this issue, cf. Lu Peng (2008), Pan (2012), Paul (2011).

- (59) {\*[<sub>ForceP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub> *Ākiū lái* ] *ma* ]/[<sub>TP</sub> *Ākiū lái* *bù lái* ]} *méi yǒu guānxi*  
 Akiu come FORCE Akiu come NEG come NEG have relation  
 ‘Whether or not Akiu comes doesn’t matter.’

- (60) *Tā bù zhīdao* [*Ākiū lái* *bù lái*] (\**ne*)  
 3SG NEG know Akiu come NEG come ATT  
 ‘She doesn’t know whether Akiu will come or not.’

(59) illustrates the impossibility for a CP headed by the *yes/no* question *ma* to occur in an embedded context; by contrast, the polar A-not-A question is acceptable here.

Note finally that Force heads were not always banned from non-root contexts in the history of Chinese. The *yes/no* question Force head *hū* was acceptable in matrix and embedded questions:<sup>13</sup>

- (61) [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *Lǚ kě qǔ* ] *hū* ]? *Duì-yuè* [pro *bù kě*]. (*Zuozhuan*, Min 1; 4th c. BC)  
 Lu can take FORCE answer NEG can  
 ‘Can the state Lu be annexed? He answered: No, it cannot.’

- (62) *Bù zhī* [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *tiān qì Lǚ* ] *hū* ]. (*Shǐjì* 33; 1542 2nd c. BC)  
 NEG know heaven abandon Lu FORCE  
 ‘I do not know whether Heaven has abandoned the state of Lu.’

Apparently, the ban on Force and Attitude heads in non-root contexts is a rather recent development in the history of Chinese.

This section has illustrated the well-known rigid ordering among SFPs in the three layers as well as within the subprojections of low CP and AttitudeP. SFPs are thus not “reorderable” at all (*contra* Biberauer and Hu 2015).

## 8. The head-final CP in VO languages from a typological perspective

The root vs non-root asymmetry holding for the Chinese C system just discussed is important in two respects. First, it demonstrates that in addition to their s- and c-selectional features, SFPs qua C-heads have to be specified for the feature [ $\pm$ root] as well. The SFP *ma* e.g. at least has the features [polar question force] and [+root] and c-selects a declarative TP only. The comparison with the SFP *ba*<sub>Qconfirmation</sub> (cf. (27) above) shows that the feature [polar question] needs to be further refined in order to distinguish the true information seeking question encoded by *ma* from the confirmation seeking question with *ba*, the other features being shared by both SFPs. With respect to their featural make up, Chinese SFPs are therefore on a par with complementizers such as English *that* and *if*, which besides the features for Force (declarative or interrogative, respectively) and [+finite] also encode [-root]. This

<sup>13</sup> Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2014: 192) deplore “the paucity of long-term attestation of most of the world’s languages”. While this observation is correct, this is no reason to neglect Chinese with its more than 3000 years of documented history, which shows that the three-layered head-final CP has been attested since the 6th c. B.C., against the backdrop of constant VO order (cf. Djamouri, Meisterernst and Paul 2009; Paul 2008, 2014 and references therein).

challenges Huang, Li and Li's (2009: 35) view that such complex feature bundles are a characteristic of functional categories in Indo-European languages, but not in Chinese.

Second, this "syncretic" character makes it impossible to dismiss Chinese SFPs as "categorially deficient", "syncategorematic" or "acategorial" (cf. Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2007, 2008, 2010, 2014; Biberauer, Newton and Sheehan 2009).<sup>14</sup> The dismissal is motivated by the intention to maintain the cross-categorical generalization associating the sentence-final position of C with OV languages only (cf. Dryer 1992: 102; 2009).<sup>15</sup> This generalization is important for Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts because it states the non-existence of structures violating the *Final-over-Final-Constraint*, which precisely excludes the configuration where a head-final phrase dominates a head-initial one. The different attempts by Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts over the past to come to terms with the head-final CP in the VO-language Chinese, illustrated by their successive reformulations of the FOFC, all have in common that SFPs are likened to "extra-metrical" elements in phonology, i.e. elements not counting for rules, in this case the FOFC. Whether this type of "extra-metrical" element can indeed exist in syntax is not discussed, notwithstanding the far-reaching nature of this claim. Last but not least, the issue of how to account then for the rigid ordering among the different layers within the split CP, the intricate semantics of SFPs and their s- and c-selectional features is never addressed. Nor do Biberauer, Holmberg, and Roberts explain how overt elements that are invisible for constraints of UG, among which the FOFC, can be correctly acquired by the child.

In any case, the at first sight solid-looking empirical basis for Dryer's (1992, 2009) claim shrinks considerably under a more careful scrutiny. When correlating the feature 92a "polar question particle" in the *World Atlas of Languages* (wals.info) (the category C not being searchable) with word order, OV and VO languages behave in fact more or less alike, insofar as for both word orders the sentence-initial position (observed for 37 OV and 82 VO languages, respectively) is much rarer than the sentence-final position (observed for 140 OV and 154 VO languages, respectively). Since against the backdrop of Rizzi's (1997) split CP approach it is likely that many of the question particles can be analysed as complementizers, this considerably weakens Dryer's (1992: 102; 2009, table [24]) claim that complementizers are verb patterners and that accordingly final complementizers are found only in OV languages. As a result, Chinese is very probably just one example among many where a VO language has a head-final (interrogative) CP.

Concerning the position of SFPs in general, going beyond those encoding polar question Force, one has to fall back on the distribution given for *adverbial subordinator* in WALS (cf. feature 94): 279 VO-languages with a sentence-initial adverbial subordinator vs 2 with a sentence-final subordinator.

---

<sup>14</sup> In fact, C heads in Mandarin Chinese turn out to be more "syncretic" than Cs in e.g. German, where according to Struckmeier (2014), TP-internal modal particles spell out "surplus" features of C. In Chinese, by contrast, all these features are located on C alone.

<sup>15</sup> Dryer (1992: 102) states that "[...] in fact it may be an exceptionless universal that final complementizers are found only in OV languages. [...] complementizers are therefore verb patterners, while the Ss they combine with are object patterners." In Dryer (2009), the 140 VO languages examined are all said to have a sentence-initial C.

However, as discussed by Dryer (2008) himself, the label *adverbial subordinator* is a cover term for different categories, among them adpositions and case suffixes. Accordingly, the results in WALS cannot be uncritically used as testing ground for the predictions made by the FOFC for the functional category C in embedded contexts (*pace* Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2014 and preceding publications). Also note that there are 30 VO languages with mixed order, among them Cantonese (a fact not mentioned in Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts' (2014: 183) discussion of the figures in WALS). This is noteworthy insofar as the potential candidates in Mandarin Chinese falling under the label *adverbial subordinator* can be shown to include sentence-level adverbs and clause-selecting prepositions (cf. Paul 2014, 2015, ch. 8), i.e. elements preceding the following clause, in addition to the sentence-final non-root C *de* in the propositional assertion construction (cf. section 7 above). It is therefore not excluded that these “mixed” order languages precisely illustrate the Chinese case.

In the face of the well-established existence of the FOFC violating configuration  $[[V\ O]\ C]$ , the only way out to reconcile SFPs qua Cs in Chinese with the FOFC is an analysis à la Kayne (1994) where a head-final CP is derived from a head-initial CP by movement of the complement TP into the specifier position. However, this account does not work, either, because it shows a number of serious shortcomings, discussed in detail by Bayer (1999, section 3) (also cf. Abels and Neeleman 2012). The most obvious problem for a Kayne-style analysis is the impossibility of the SFP to c-command its raised complement. This is clearly an undesirable result, because as demonstrated above, the construal of *wh*-indefinites ‘something, someone’, crucially depends on the c-command of the TP by the *yes/no* question Force head *ma*:

(62a) *Nǐ xiǎng chī diǎn shénme?* (= (8a-b) above)

2SG want eat a.bit what  
‘What do you want to eat?’

(62b) *Nǐ xiǎng chī diǎn shénme ma?*

2SG want eat a.bit what Force  
‘Do you want to eat a little something?’

Furthermore, as pointed out by Bayer (1999) it remains entirely stipulative that it is the entire TP that must move in order to check the movement triggering feature of C, for such a feature could very well be checked by moving a subconstituent of TP, e.g. the object or the subject. This requirement also runs counter the generally observed non-movability of TP to the left (including local movement). Bayer (1999) therefore concludes that head-final Cs should not be analyzed as attractors of TP and that head-final CPs are indeed merged as such.

## 9. Conclusion

The present article has provided extensive evidence to show that SFPs in Chinese are fully-fledged functional heads with a complex feature make-up, on a par with C elements in e.g. Indo-European

languages. Chinese SFPs select and project, as evidenced by the strict hierarchy for co-occurring SFPs in the split CP. Structures with a head-final CP and VO order are not only attested in Chinese, but also in other languages (Vietnamese, Niger-Congo languages, etc.). This structure must be merged as such and cannot be derived by postulating movement from a head-initial CP. As a result, the FOFC, which precisely excludes the configuration [[V O] C], cannot be a principle of UG, but instead illustrates a statistical observation (cf. Whitman 2008; Paul 2015, chapter 8 for further discussion).

## References

- Abels, Klaus and Neeleman, Ad. 2012. Linear asymmetries and the LCA. *Syntax* 15(1). 25-74.
- Aoun, Joseph and Li, Y.-H. Audrey. 1993. *Essays on the representational and derivational nature of grammar. The diversity of wh-constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bailey, Laura. 2012/2013. *The syntax of question particles*. Newcastle University. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Bayer, Josef. 1999. Final complementizers in hybrid languages. *Journal of Linguistics* 35(2). 233-271.
- Beutel, Helga. 1988. Zur Spezifikation der Satzmodi durch Satzendpartikeln im modernen Chinesisch [On the expression of sentence modes by sentence-final particles in Mandarin]. In Lang, Ewald (ed.), *Studien zum Satzmodus* [Studies on sentence mode], 134–175. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für Sprachen.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Haegeman, Liliane & van Kemenade, Ans. 2014. Putting our heads together: Towards a syntax of particles. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 1-15.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Holmberg, Anders & Roberts, Ian. 2007. Disharmonic word order systems and the Final-over-Final Constraint (FOFC). In Bisetto, Antonietta & Barbieri, Francisco (eds.), *Proceedings of XXXIII Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 86-105. Bologna: Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere Moderne.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Holmberg, Anders & Roberts, Ian. 2008. Structure and linearization in disharmonic word orders. In Chang, Charles B. & Haynie Hannah J., *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. eds. 96-104. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Holmberg, Anders & Roberts, Ian. 2010. A syntactic universal and its consequences. Unpublished ms., University of Cambridge, March 2010.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Holmberg, Anders & Roberts, Ian. 2014. A syntactic universal and its consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2). 169-225.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Hu, Xuhui. 2015. The lexical-functional distinction revisited: Insights from Chinese particles. (Abstract accepted for the Sixth International Conference on Formal Linguistics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 8-9 November 2014.)
- Biberauer, Theresa & Newton, Glenda & Sheehan, Michelle. 2009. Limiting synchronic and diachronic variation and change: The Final-over-Final Constraint. *Language and Linguistics* 10(4). 701-743.
- Bruening, Benjamin 2007. *Wh*-in-situ does not correlate with *wh*-indefinites or question particles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(1). 139-166.
- Chao, Yuen Ren 1968. *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Los Angeles: California University Press.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen 1991. *On the typology of wh-questions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Djamouri, Redouane & Meisterernst, Barbara & Paul, Waltraud. 2009. Particles in Classical Chinese: complementizers and topic markers. (Paper presented at the 29th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Radboud University, Nijmegen; 10-14 August 2009.)

- Dryer, Matthew S. 1992. The Greenbergian word order universals. *Language* 68(1). 81-138.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2008. Order of adverbial subordinator and clause. In Haspelmath, Martin & Dryer, Matthew S. & Gil, David & Comrie, Bernard (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, chapter 94. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. [Available online at <http://wals.info/feature/94>. Accessed on 24.02.2010].
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2009. The branching direction theory revisited. In Scalise, Sergio & Magni, Elisabetta & Bisetto, Antonietta (eds.), *Universals of Language today*, 185-207. Berlin: Springer.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Hill, Virginia. 2013. The syntacticization of discourse. In Folli, Raffaella Sevdali, Christina & Truswell, Robert (eds.), *Syntax and its limits*, 370-390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2014. West Flemish verb-based discourse markers and the articulation of the speech act layer. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 116-139.
- Han, Chung-hye. 1996. NPI licensing in adjunct *wh*-questions, *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 147-158. Berkeley, Ca: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Hsieh, Feng-fan & Rint, Sybesma. 2008. Shēngchéng yǔfǎ lǐlùn hé Hànyǔ yǔqì yánjiū [Generative grammar and the study of sentence final particles in Chinese]. In Shen, Yang & Feng, Shengli (eds.), *Dāngdài yǔyánxué lǐlùn hé Hànyǔ yánjiū* [Contemporary linguistic theories and related studies on Chinese], 364–374. Beijing: Shangwu.
- Hu, Mingyang 1981. Beijinghua de yuqì zhuci he tanci [Mood particles and interjections in the Beijing dialect]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* nr. 5, 347-350; nr. 6, 416-423.
- Huang, C.-T. James 1982. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT (Doctoral dissertation) [published 1998 by Garland, New York].
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1994. More on parametric word order and parametric theory. In Lust, Barbara & Suñer, Margarita & Whitman, John (eds.), *Syntactic theory and first language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives*. Vol. 1, *Heads, projections and learnability*, 15–35. Hillsdale, N.J. : Erlbaum.
- Huang, C.-T. James & Li, Y.-H. Audrey & Li, Yafei. 2009. *The Syntax of Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lee, Hun-tak Thomas 1986. *Studies on quantification in Chinese*. Los Angeles: University of California. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Li, Boya 2006. *Chinese final particles and the syntax of the periphery*. University of Leiden. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Li, Charles N. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar*. Los Angeles: California University Press.
- Li, Yen-Hui Audrey 1992. Indefinite *wh* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 1(2). 125-155.
- Lin, William C. 1984. What does the Mandarin particle *ne* communicate? *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie orientale* 13(2). 217-240.
- Lu, Jianming. 1985. Guānyú xiàndài hànyǔ lǐ de yíwèn yǔqì [On question particles in contemporary Chinese]. *Yufa yanjiu he tansuo* 3. 233–246.
- Lu, Peng. 2008. *Les phrases complexes en chinois*. Beijing: Waiwen chubanshe ([www.flp.com.cn](http://www.flp.com.cn)). [Revised version of Lu Peng (2003). *La subordination adverbiale en chinois contemporain*. University Paris 7. (Doctoral dissertation.)]
- Lü, Shuxiang (ed.). 2000. *Xiàndài hànyǔ bābǎicí* [Eight hundred words of modern Mandarin]. Beijing: Shangwu.
- Munaro, Nicola & Poletto, Cecilia. 2006. The diachronic path towards particles in the North-Eastern dialects. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28.2, 247–268.
- Pan, Victor Junnan. 2007. *Interrogation et quantification : le rôle et la fonction des particules et des syntagmes interrogatifs en chinois mandarin*. University of Nantes. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Pan, Victor Junnan. 2011. *Interrogatives et quantification en chinois mandarin : une approche générative*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

- Pan, Victor Junnan. 2012. Syntactic representation of discourse-configurationality in Mandarin. (Paper presented at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Stockholm University, 29 August - 1 September 2012.)
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1981. *Problèmes de syntaxe et de sémantique en linguistique chinoise*. Paris: Collège de France.
- Paul, Waltraud. 2008. Consistent disharmony: Sentence-final particles in Chinese. (Paper presented at the Workshop on particles, Dept. of Linguistics, organized by the research project Structure and linearization in disharmonic word orders, University of Cambridge, 30-31 October 2008.)
- Paul, Waltraud. 2011. Are there embedded root phenomena in Mandarin Chinese? (Paper presented at the 44th Annual SLE Meeting, Universidad de la Rioja, Logroño, 8-11 September 2011.)
- Paul, Waltraud. 2014. Why particles are not particular: Sentence-final particles in Chinese as heads of a split CP. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 77-115. [Special issue on *The syntax of particles*, edited by T. Biberauer, L. Haegeman and A. van Kemenade.] Preprint available since 2010 at: <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001076>.
- Paul, Waltraud. 2015. *New perspectives on Chinese syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Petrova, Svetlana. 2016. On the status of the left-peripheral sentence particles *inu* and *ia* in Old High German. In Byer, Josef & Struckmeier, Volker (eds.), *discourse particles: Formal approaches to their syntax and semantics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Structures and beyond. The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 3, 104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Struckmeier, Volker. 2014. Ja doch wohl C? Modal particles in German. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 16-48.
- Tang, Sze-Wing. 1998. *Parametrization of features in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Irvine.
- Tang, Ting-chi. 1988. *Hanyu cifa jufa lunji* [Studies on Chinese Morphology and Syntax], vol. 1. Taipei: Student Book Co.
- Whitman, John. 2008. The classification of constituent order generalizations and diachronic explanation. In Jeff Good (ed.), *Linguistic universals and language change*, 233-252. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wu, Guo. 2005. The discourse function of the Chinese particle *ne* in statements. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association* 40(1): 47-81.
- Xiong, Zhongru. 2007. *Shi...de de goujian fēnxī* [Syntactic analysis of the construction *shi...de*]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 2007, nr. 4, 321-330.
- Yang-Drocourt, Zhitang. 2007. *Parlons chinois*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Zhu, Dexi. 1982. *Yufa jiangyi* [On grammar]. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan.