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Abstract
Biberauer et al. (2009) claim that clause-final particles are categorially deficient. This move is motivated by the fact that a number of VO languages - among them Mandarin Chinese - display sentence-final particles (SFPs), which - when analysed as complementisers - violate the purportedly universal Final-Over-Final Constraint (FOFC). The FOFC excludes structures where a head-final projection dominates a head-initial one. In contrast, the present article argues that SFP in Chinese instantiate C in a three-layered split CP à la Rizzi (1997, 2004) and hence are “visible” for the FOFC. Furthermore, to equate WALS’ label adverbial subordinator with complementiser as Biberauer et al. (2008, 2009) do is shown to be problematic, given that it turns out to be a cover term for different categories. Accordingly, WALS’ results for the distribution of adverbial subordinator cannot be mechanically used as testing ground for the predictions made by the FOFC for the category C.

1. Introduction
Biberauer et al. (2009) claim that sentence-final particles (SFP) are categorially deficient. The motivation for this claim is that SFPs seem to be the major, if not the only source of exceptions to the FOFC prohibiting the combination of SFP with VO order. If accordingly SFP are excluded, the data from WALS for the distribution of “adverbial subordinators” neatly patterns with the FOFC, because with the exception of three cases, no VO language shows an “adverbial subordinator” in sentence-final position. The fact that Greenberg (1963:66) did not include particles in his typological studies, either, is adduced as an additional argument in favour of this approach (cf. Biberauer et al. 2009: 712).

This approach, however, is not without problems. First, it is generally understood that particle is just a cover term resorted to precisely when no satisfying analysis of a particular item can be provided. This was probably the reason why Greenberg (1963/66) excluded them, the more so as the concept of functional categories was only introduced much later; not being able to assign a categorial identity to the items called particles made it impossible for him to take them into account for his word order typology.

Second, to use data and figures from The World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS; cf. Haspelmath et al. (eds.) 2008) as evidence for the FOFC is anything but straightforward. In particular, the reinterpretation of WALS’ term “adverbial subordinator” as complementiser by Biberauer et al. (2009) is not self-evident at all. For “adverbial subordinator” clearly encompasses more categories than just C. This will be illustrated for Chinese where potential candidates for “adverbial subordinator” also instantiate the category of sentence-level adverbs, i.e. non-heads (cf. section 5 below).

Furthermore, equating adverbial subordinator with C amounts to excluding C in non-embedded contexts. In the light of the prolific research on the split root CP inspired by Rizzi
(1997), this is an odd move, because it dismisses as irrelevant the studies covering a large number of typologically different languages over the last two decades (Aboh 2006, Munaro & Poletto 2006, Endo 2007, Haegeman 2009, this volume). With respect to a language such as Chinese where complementisers are in general restricted to root contexts (cf. Paul 2007, 2009), the exclusive focus on embedding Cs leads to ignoring it completely. This is, however, highly unsatisfactory given that the traditional division of SFP into three distributional classes (cf. a.o. Chao Yuen Ren 1968: ch. 8.5, Zhu Dexi 1982, Hu Mingyang 1981) displaying a rigid relative order can be successfully recast as a split CP à la Rizzi (1997) (cf. Paul 2005, 2009), modulo some changes to be discussed below:

(1) **Attitude > Force > C(low) > TP**

Importantly, this three-layered CP has existed since the 6th c. B.C. (cf. Djamouri, Meisterernst & Paul 2009), against the background of constant SVO order attested since the earliest documents dating from the 13th c. B.C. (Djamouri 1987; Djamouri, Paul & Whitman 2008, 2012). Consequently, Chinese has been violating the FOFC for most of its history displaying - at least at the surface - a head-final CP dominating a head-initial (TP and) VP.

Whether this violation is apparent only because ultimately derivable from an underlying head-initial CP as in Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry approach, is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, my main purpose here is to argue in favour of SFP as complementisers and against their being dismissed as “categorically deficient” in the sense of Biberauer et al (2009), i.e. as items neither associated with [+V] nor with [+N]. This also requires a comparison of SFP with the Chinese equivalents of conjunctions such as *because, if, although* etc. whose status is still under debate.

What I do hope to convince the reader of is that SFP are full-fledged functional elements of the category C and as thus part of the grammar. Accordingly, they have to be taken into account by a constraint such as the FOFC and cannot be treated as *quantité négligeable* somehow falling beyond its scope.

The article is organized as follows. Section two subjects the conclusions that can be drawn from the data in WALS and Dryer (1992, 2009) to a brief scrutiny. Section three argues in favour of the C status of the SFP in Chinese and gives a short overview of the three classes of root complementisers implementing the subprojections Low CP, ForceP and AttitudeP in the split CP represented in table (1). Section four provides evidence for the root vs. non-root asymmetry at work in the Chinese C system and introduces the so far neglected non-root C *de* and *dehya*. Section five briefly discusses the equivalents in Chinese of English subordinating conjunctions such *although, because, if* etc. and demonstrates that they do not form a homogeneous group, but must be further subdivided into sentence-level adverbs, on the one hand, and prepositions with clausal complements, on the other.


**2.1. The World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS)**

The data from WALS are presented as the crucial empirical basis underlying the claim made by the FOFC that VO languages lack sentence-final subordinating conjunctions, the sheer number of the languages included in the WALS database, i.e. - 2650 - seemingly vouching for

---

1 Note that (1) abstracts away from linear order.

2 For an implementation of the Kaynean approach, cf. Munaro & Poletto (2006); for evidence that some SFP in West-Flemish are merged in sentence-final position, cf. Haegeman (2009, this volume).
the solidity of this claim. Accordingly, a careful study of feature 94 “Order of adverbial subordinator and clause” is called for.\(^3\)

According to Dryer (2008b), “adverbial subordinators” that are separate words correspond to the “subordinating conjunctions” of traditional grammar and are exemplified by items such as because, although, when, while, if in English. Dryer (2008b: 10) also mentions the case where these adverbial subordinators “are formally adpositions combining with nominalized forms of verbs”. This is the case for the preposition kârrt in Kongo (Kugali, Sudan) rendered as ‘behind’ when in combination with a (genitive) NP, and as ‘after’ when occurring with the the nominalized form of a verb in the genitive case (‘after drinking tea’). Among the clause-internal adverbial subordinators, one also finds enclitics attached to the first constituent in the subordinate clause as in the Australian language Yukulta (Tangkic, Queensland). Concerning cases of suffixal adverbial subordinators, Dryer includes case suffixes here, such as the instrumental -inda combining with gerunds to form ‘because’ clauses in Kannada (Dravidian, India).\(^4\)

This is quite a heterogeneous group. It is true, though, that in the table combining word order types with the (clause-initial, -medial, or -final) position of the adverbial subordinator, subordinators with word status are distinguished from those with suffix status.\(^5\) No distinction ‘word vs. suffix’, however, is made for the mixed order type.

Let us assume then - for the sake of the argument - that only adverbial subordinators with word status are considered to be complementisers by Biberauer et al. (2009), at least in those cases where the word status is explicitly mentioned.\(^6\) For VO languages we obtain 279 cases of initial subordinator, and only 2 with final subordinator (Buduma and Guajajara). Note, however, the 30 VO languages displaying mixed order for their subordinator where it is impossible to know whether the subordinator is a word or an affix. Interestingly, Cantonese figures among the (S)VO languages with mixed order, while Mandarin Chinese is not included in the sample of languages examined for feature 94.\(^7\)

2.2. Dryer (1992, 2009) on the distribution of $C$

Since WALS does not have a feature examining the category complementiser as such, let us turn to Dryer (1992, 2009) where the correlation between word order and the position of C is addressed explicitly. Referring to his own work (Dryer 1980) as well as Hawkins (1990: 225), Dryer (1992: 102) concludes that “[…] in fact it may be an exceptionless universal that final complementizers are found only in OV languages. […] complementizers are therefore verb

---

\(^3\) Upon examination, the number of languages examined for feature 94 turns out to be 611, still impressive enough, but only a fourth of the total number of languages (i.e. 2650) included in the WALS database. It is thus not correct to state - as an anonymous reviewer does - that the lack of sentence-final subordinating conjunctions in VO languages has been confirmed for as many as 2650 languages. Whether in the light of this somewhat reduced number the correlation still counts as a quasi-incontestable robust empirical fact (as claimed by the same reviewer) remains for the reader to decide.

\(^4\) (i) Kannada (Sridhar 1990: 74) (example 12 of feature 94 by Dryer in WALS)
   Bisilu heca: giruvudar-inda
   ‘since it’s very hot’

\(^5\) Only subordinating suffixes are mentioned, to the exclusion of other affixal forms.

\(^6\) Note that Biberauer et al. (2009) do not mention the further distinction made within that group by Kayne (1991) between conjunctions instantiating C such as if, that and conjunctions analysed as NPs located in Spec, CP such as whether and when.

\(^7\) This contrasts with Dryer’s (2008: 12) statement that “Clause-final subordinators that are separate words are common in (i) an area in Asia stretching from India northeast through Myanmar and China into northeastern Asia […]”. (emphasis mine).
patterns, while the Ss they combine with are object patterners.” This is confirmed by Dryer (2009) where explicit reference is made to English *that* as illustrating a clause-initial C and to Japanese *to* as illustrating a clause-final C, respectively. Unfortunately, Dryer (2009) only indicates language genera; accordingly, there is no way to know whether Mandarin Chinese or any other Sinitic language was among the 140 VO languages included in the survey and which all show a clause-initial C.

When examining polar question particles, Dryer (1992: 103) draws an explicit parallel with English *whether* and discusses the possibility of analyzing polar question particles in peripheral (sentence-initial or sentence-final) position as complementizers. Here he likewise concludes to their status as verb patterners. Interestingly, Dryer’s (1992) example from the Australian language Mokilese displays a root question with a sentence-initial question particle, i.e. the mirror image of Chinese where the question particle is at the end of the sentence. (Note that Dryer 1992 does not include Chinese in his database).

2.3. The problem of descriptive adequacy in WALS

WALS also examines the position of polar question particles (cf. feature 92). When correlating it with word order, SOV and SVO languages in fact behave more or less alike, insofar as for both word orders the sentence-initial position is much rarer (24 and 40 languages, respectively) than the sentence-final position (106 and 110, respectively). While this time Chinese is included among the languages with the question particle in sentence-final position, no analysis as C of polar question particles (when in peripheral position) is evoked anymore. On the contrary, an extremely well-studied and easily accessible language such as French sees itself classified among languages marking polar questions with sentence-initial “particles”, e.g. the Australian language Mokilese just mentioned or !Xóõ (Southern Khoisan, Bhotswana), and hence as the mirror image of Chinese. The “particle” alluded to is *est-ce que* (cf. Dryer 2008a), whose analysis as a particle is maintained despite Dryer’s acknowledging the composite status of *est-ce que* (‘verb plus demonstrative plus complementiser’). This analysis can, however, not be correct given the existence of the corresponding negated form ‘*n’est-ce pas que* + sentence’, which indicates that the copula in *est-ce que* is clearly identifiable as such. The sequence *est-ce que* can therefore not be analysed as a particle, i.e. as an *X°* whose sub-components are opaque to syntactic operations. Furthermore, *est-ce que* also occurs in *wh*-question and is then preceded by the *wh*-phrase, in other words, the alleged particle *est-ce que* is neither always sentence-initial nor does it exclusively serve to form yes/no questions. Accordingly, its description as a sentence-initial polar question particle appears patently inadequate. (For an in-depth discussion of *est-ce que*, cf. Munaro & Pollock 2005.) The fact that such a misleading analysis is proposed for a well-known language such as French is quite disturbing and casts doubt on the appropriateness of analyses in the case of languages where only second hand knowledge via consulting grammars is available. This is evidently the case for the majority of languages: WALS is dependent on the adequacy and exhaustiveness of the grammars used and must fail where the respective grammars fail.

This caveat might at first sight seem trivial and is easily acknowledged by everyone working with results from WALS, notwithstanding a certain schizophrenia observed when a generalization finds itself confirmed by the majority of languages in WALS’s database; in such a case the temptation of dismissing counterexamples as irrelevant in the face of the statistical predominance often is just too strong. However, the role played by WALS as an

---

8 Dryer (1992) does not provide any example of what he refers to as C. He contends himself with the following statement: “I will not cite data on the order of complementizer and S of the sort presented for other pairs of elements in this paper, but there seems to be little question that this is a correlation pair.” (Dryer 1992: 101.)
implicit typological standard of comparison influencing language-specific analyses is neglected, although it leads to a considerable bias in the language descriptions. Let us again illustrate this with Chinese, which is said to only have prepositions, and no postpositions (cf. WALS feature 85). At first sight, this seems plausible enough because in accordance with our “expectations” that VO languages have prepositions, but no postpositions. However, this claim is straightforwardly invalidated by Ernst (1988) who has clearly established the postpositional status for at least three items in their use as spatial locatives, i.e. shang ‘on’, xia ‘below’, and li ‘in’ (For further evidence in favour of the existence of postpositions in Chinese along with prepositions, cf. Djamouri, Paul & Whitman 2009, to appear). The fact that Ernst’s work was not taken up by further studies and as a result is not included in the description of Chinese by WALS in turn then serves as confirming evidence for those reluctant to admit the existence of pre- and postpositions, a situation conceived of as a typological “oddity”, albeit attested for other languages, e.g. German (which according to WALS, though, has prepositions only).9

To summarize, the language descriptions in WALS do not constitute “raw” data and consequently cannot be taken at face value. For they have gone through a filter consisting of our preconceived – and for that matter not always correct - ideas what pattern combinations to expect in languages. This “filter” either finds itself already incorporated into the analysis proposed by the specialist of the language at hand or is imposed subsequently by the way the language-specific analysis is processed in WALS.

3. The internal architecture of the split CP in Chinese

Traditionally, Chinese linguists (cf. a.o. Zhu Dexi 1982, ch. 16) identify three distributional classes of SFP, whose relative order is fixed: [[TP C₁] C₂] C₃. These three classes can be recast as a split CP in the spirit of Rizzi (1997), as reflected in the labels assigned to each class in table 1. Note that the SFP within a given class are mutually exclusive.

![Table 1](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C₂ (force)</th>
<th>C₃ (attitude)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le currently relevant state</td>
<td>ma interrogative</td>
<td>ou warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāi zhe recent past</td>
<td>ba imperative</td>
<td>(y)a astonishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne₁ continued state</td>
<td>ne₂ follow-up question</td>
<td>ne₃ exaggeration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C₁ (low C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ne₂ follow-up question</td>
<td>C₁ (low C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 It is the concept of cross-categorial harmony that assigns languages with both pre- and postpositions a “marked”, “exceptional” status. For in such a case, one type of adposition will be “disharmonious” with the main word order. In the case of Chinese, only prepositions are expected, because showing the same head-complement order as that displayed by verb and object. Ernst (1988: 231) himself discusses the tension between his own result of postulating postpositions and the predictions made by a parametric word order theory for a VO language such as Chinese, the same direction of Case assignment being expected for verbs and adpositions. This tension can be solved within the radically different view of the concept of cross-categorial harmony provided by Whitman (2008). Whitman (2008) argues in detail that cross-categorial generalizations are the result from well-documented patterns of language change, hence statistical in nature, but not part of UG. Exceptions to “harmonious” situations are therefore precisely what we expect; they arise when the historical origin of an item is different from the one observed in the languages having served as the basis for the generalization. Adpositions are a case in point; if they result from the reanalysis of V, as in the case of Chinese prepositions, they pattern with V, contrary to adpositions with a non-verbal origin, as in the case of Chinese postpositions. Note that in the new perspective provided by Whitman (2008), the statistical pre-dominance of certain correlations (e.g. VO and head-initial CP) is basically a matter of contingency and can therefore not be adduced as evidence for constraints of a grammatical nature such as FOFC.
In order to provide evidence for the C-status of SFP, a brief overview of the syntax and semantics of SFP is necessary. This overview can only give a general idea of the complementisers and their hierarchy in Chinese and is by no means meant to be exhaustive nor to render the exact semantic import of each SFP. While the semantic import is the clearest in the case of SFP instantiating Force, it is much less straightforward to determine for the two other classes. Evidently, this only illustrates our insufficiency of comprehending the SFP and does in no way entail that the C₁ and C₃ classes are intrinsically “vague” or exclusively context dependent. In reality, the meaning of the SFP itself, the propositional content, the intonational contour and the extralinguistic context interact in a complex way which still needs to be analysed.¹⁰ (For a descriptive overview of SFPs, cf. a.o. Chao Yuen Ren 1986: ch. 5; Li & Thompson 1981, ch. 7.)

Before starting the discussion of SFP as such, some preliminary remarks concerning the phrase structure of Chinese are called for. Huang C.-T. James (1982, ch. 2) demonstrated in detail that IP as well as the lexical categories are head-initial (with the exception of the head-final NP), resulting in a uniformly right-branching structure for the IP/TP. Accordingly, any element after the object(s) of the verb must occupy a position outside the vP and by extension outside the IP/TP (given that the projections above vP up to TP such as AspP and AuxP are also head-initial).¹¹ This is precisely the case for SFP. In fact, their position outside the (core) sentence has long been known in the Chinese literature where they have always been described as being in relation with the entire sentence. Accordingly, SFP are formally equivalent qua their being located in (the different subprojections of) the sentence periphery above TP. With respect to their semantic import, however, they are not homogeneous at all, as can be easily deduced from the descriptions of the SFPs figuring in table 1 and from the discussion in the remainder of this section.

The analysis of SFP as complementisers goes back to Lee Hun-tak Thomas (1986) who was the first to claim C-status for the yes/no question particle ma. The analysis of ma as C has become standard since and has been substantiated by subsequent studies (cf. inter alia Tang Ting-chi 1989, Cheng Lisa 1991, Li Yen-Hui Audrey 1992). My proposal is to extend this analysis in terms of C to all SFP in Mandarin, drawing on research within the split CP approach of Rizzi (also cf. Li Boya 2006, Hsieh & Sybesma 2008 for Mandarin, and Sybesma & Li Boya 2007 for Cantonese).¹² We will see that SFP are not categorially deficient, as claimed by Biberauer et al. (2009). Their view of SFP seems to be partly motivated by the lack of phonetic substance and the clitic nature of SFP. However, similarly phonetically “weak” or “light” elements such as the article the in English are not refused categorial status (D⁰) for that reason. In Chinese grammar as well, quite a number of monosyllabic items have been accorded full-fledged categorial status “inspite” of their surface clitic properties, such as

¹⁰ In the vast Chinese descriptive literature on SFP, more recent case studies of individual SFP start taking into account this complex interaction and include e.g. the role of sentence intonation, cf. a.o. Jiang (2008).

¹¹ This is somewhat simplified insofar as a (secondary) predication on the matrix object occupies a vP-internal position (cf. Huang C.-T. James 1984: 568ff; Paul 1988, ch. 7):

(i)  Zhăngsān mǎi-le yì-dōng fāngzǐ, [wǒ hén xīhuān e,]  (= Huang’s 1984: 569, (95))
Zhāngsan buy-PERF 1-CL house 1SG very like
‘Zhangsan bought a house, which I really like.’

Such an analysis is evidently excluded for SFP, confirming their position above TP. Note that SFP were not discussed in Huang C.-T. James (1982).

¹² Strangely enough, the yes/no question particle ma is not considered as realizing the head Force by Li Boya (2006), although Rizzi’s split CP approach serves as the basis of her dissertation. Quite on the contrary, Li Boya (2006) goes as far as claiming that the clause-typing heads, i.e. Force and Mood in her work, always remain covert in Mandarin and Cantonese (whereas they may be realized overtly in Wenzhou). Like other studies on the Chinese SFP subsequent to Lee Hun-tak (1986) and Tang Ting-chi (1989), she takes the C-status of SFP for granted and does not attempt to demonstrate it explicitly.
the aspectual suffix -le (cf. (5) below) “leaning on” to the verb and the general classifier ge forming an intonational unit with the preceding numeral.

3.1. Low C: le, laizhe, ne₁

Let us start with the SFP instantiating the lowest subprojection of C above TP. ¹³

3.1.1. Low C le

The semantic import of the low C le is difficult to determine and still subject of ongoing research.¹⁴ There seems to exist no common denominator for all the different cases where le appears other than that it closes off the sentence and relates the event to the speech time indicating that it obtains as a new situation (whence Li & Thompson’s (1981) description of le as signaling “currently relevant state”).

(2) [CP [TP Wǒ zuótiān dào Zhāng jiā chī fàn ] le] ¹⁵
    1SG yesterday go Zhang home eat food Clow
    ‘I went to the Zhangs for dinner yesterday.’ (Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 798)

(3) Āiyā , [shíyī diǎn bàn ] le! ¹⁶
    oh 11 o’clock half Clow
    ‘Goodness, it’s (as late as) half past eleven!’

(4) [CPlow[TopP[TP Wǒ yī ān mén-líng] [Top’ [TP tā jiù lái kāi mén le ]]]
    1SG once ring door-bell 3SG then come open door Clow
    ‘As soon as I rang the door bell, he came and opened the door.’
    (slightly modified example from Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 799)

In (2), le signals that the proposition is presented by the speaker as her/his contribution relevant to the conversation at hand and can be paraphrased as ‘here is what I have to say’. Example (3) illustrates that a situation can be new with respect to the subjective perception of the speaker. (4) finally shows that when an explicit reference time is provided (‘as soon as I rang the bell’), le relates the event to that time.

Even though the semantic contribution of le often remains elusive, its presence imposes grammatical constraints. As already observed by Teng Shou-hsin (1973: 26), le interacts with material inside TP and in that respect is different from the SFP in the C₂ and C₃ positions. (This also holds for the low Cs laizhe and ne; cf. sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3. below.)

¹³ Given the differences between Rizzi’s hierarchy and the one proposed here for Chinese, the lowest subprojection is not labeled Fin as in Rizzi (1997), but Clow (cf. Paul 2005 for further discussion).
¹⁴ Li Yen-hui Audrey (1992: 153, note 16) tentatively suggests Infl-status for the sentence-final particle le. Given its unacceptability in relative clauses (cf. (39a) below), this cannot be correct, though. The same comment applies to Tang Sze-Wing (1998: 39 ff) who locates the SFP le and laizhe in T (and stipulates T-to-C movement in Chinese). Li Boya (2006: 171) - without further explanation - analyses le as the category Deik. The only other passage discussing le is p. 125 where it is likened to the SFP le in Cantonese “mark[ing] realization” and illustrated by example (i) (her glosses and translation):

(i) Wo xin -lì bian de gaoxing he qingsong de duō le
    1S heart-inside become DE happy and relieved DE much PRT
    ‘My heart has become much happier and more relieved.’ (Li Boya’s (3b), p. 125)
(5) a. \([\text{CPlow} \ [\text{TP} \, \text{Tā} \, \text{chī}-\text{le} \, \text{fàn} \, \text{le}\,]\].\, \)  
   3SG eat-PERF food Clow  
   ‘He has eaten.’

b. *\([\text{CPlow} \ [\text{TP} \, \text{Tā} \, \text{méi} \, \text{chī} \, \text{fàn} \, \text{le}\,]\].\, \)  
   3SG NEG eat food Clow

c. \([\text{CPlow} \ [\text{TP} \, \text{Tā} \, \text{méi} \, \text{chī} \, \text{fàn}\,]\].\, \)  
   3SG NEG eat food  
   ‘He hasn’t eaten.’

(6) \([\text{CPlow} \ [\text{TopP} \, \text{Nà} \, \text{in.that.case} \, \text{[Top’} \, \text{TP} \, \text{wǒ} \, \text{jiù} \, \text{bù} \, \text{děng} \, \text{tā} \, \text{le}\,]\,]]\).\, \)  
   1SG then NEG wait 3SG Clow  
   ‘In that case I won’t wait for him any longer.’

Let us first look at (6) with the “neutral” negation \(bù\), compatible with stative and activity verbs (cf. inter alia Teng Shou-hsin 1973, Li & Thompson 1981, Ernst 1995, Hsieh Miao-Ling 2001, Lin Jo-wang 2003). The meaning of this sentence is derived in a straightforward compositional way which nicely reflects that \(le\) as C has scope over the entire sentence: \(le\) signaling that the proposition ‘I won’t wait for him’ obtains at the speech time (in the absence of any other reference time), we obtain ‘I won’t wait for him any longer’. (5b), by contrast, is unacceptable because there is a contradiction between the negation of the completion of an event mediated by \(méi\) and the requirement of \(le\) to relate this state of affairs to the speech time and present it as a newly obtained situation (also cf. Sybesma 1999: 64)

3.1.2. Low C láizhe

\(láizhe\) usually indicates that the event time is recent past (7), but “recent past” can also apply to the speech time of a preceding utterance or refer to a former state of knowledge as in (8b) (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 810):

(7) \([\text{CP} \, \text{[TP} \, \text{Nà} \, \text{màozi} \, \text{zài nàr} \, \text{guà}-\text{zhe}\,]\, \text{láizhe}\), \,[\text{CP} \, \text{[TP} \, \text{zěnme} \, \text{bù} \, \text{jiàn} \, \text{le}\,]\,]]\).  
   that hat at there hang-DUR Clow how NEG see Clow  
   ‘The hat was hanging there, how come it's no longer here?’
   (slightly modified example from Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 810)

(8) a. Nǐ xìng shénme?  
   2SG call what  
   ‘What’s your family name?’

b. \([\text{CP} \, \text{[TP} \, \text{Nǐ} \, \text{xìng} \, \text{shénme}\,]\, \text{láizhe}]\).  
   (Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 810)  
   2SG call what Clow  
   ‘What (did you just say) is your family name?’
   ‘What was your family name?’ (I forgot.)

---

\(^{15}\) Note that the verbal suffix \(-\text{le}\) indicating perfective aspect is distinct from the homophonous SFP \(\text{le}\), “although” both behave as clitics on the surface and form a phonetic unit with the preceding word (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968, Teng Shou-hsin 1973). Unlike the SFP \(\text{le}\) realizing C, the perfective \(-\text{le}\) instantiates the head \(\text{Asp}^\circ\) situated above \(\text{vP}\) and attracting V (cf. Lin Tzong-Hong 2001; Paul & Whitman 2010).
Like le, láizhe has access to material inside TP. It is incompatible with negation (both bù and méi), because in addition to locating the event in the recent past it also asserts its having taken place (cf. Song Yuzhu 1981: 275, Lü Shuxuang et al. (eds.) 2000: 348-349):  

(9)  
(a) Nǐ gāngcái shuō shénme láizhe?  
2SG just say what Clow  
‘What did you just say?’  
(b) Wǒ méiyǒu shuō shénme (*láizhe).  
1SG NEG say what Clow  
‘I didn’t say anything.’  

(10) Wǒ (*méi) qù Tiānjīn láizhe.  
1SG NEG go Tianjin Clow  
‘I have (not) been to Tianjin.’

The event assertion component of láizhe also accounts for the fact that only wh- questions are compatible with láizhe (cf. 9a), to the exclusion of yes/no questions formed by adding méi yòu ‘not have’:

(11) *Tā shuō huà méi yòu láizhe?  
3SG speak word NEG have Clow  
(‘Did he talk?’)  
(Lü Shuxiang et al. (eds.) 2000: 349)

Consequently, a yes/no question can only be followed by láizhe when an interpretation as a rhetorical question is possible, thus reinforcing the assertion. This is the case with shì bù shì ‘is it the case or not’ questions implying that the speaker presupposes a positive answer:

(12) Zuótiān nǐ shì bù shì qù xiāngshān láizhe?  
yesterday 2SG be NEG be go see Xiangshan Clow  
‘Didn’t you go to see the Xiangshan yesterday?’  
(Lü et al. (eds.) 2000: 349)

3.1.3 Low C ne₁

The low C ne₁ requires a TP complement containing a stative predicate (e.g. an adjective or a verb in the durative aspect):

(13) [Cₜₜₜlow [TP Wàibiàn xià-zhe yǔ ] ne ].  
outside fall-DUR rain Clow  
‘It is still raining outside.’

---

16 Being realizations of the same C-subprojection, le and láizhe cannot co-occur in the same sentence (cf. (i)):
   (i) Ta shuō shénme le / láizhe?  
      3SG say what Clow/ Clow  
      ‘What did he say?’
   (ii) *Ta shuō shénme {le láizhe} / {láizhe le}?  
      3SG say what Clow Clow / Clow Clow

17 The low C ne is noted as ne₁ in order to distinguish it from the Force head ne₂ and the Attitude head ne₃ (cf. the three instances of ne in Table 1 above).
To summarize, the low C heads *le*, *lái*he* and *ne* have in common that they impose restrictions on their TP complement in terms of the properties of its extended VP. In other words, the low C heads in Chinese have as close a relationship with T as the C elements in Indo-European languages and must therefore access the features of the T head, instead of only looking at the TP label (*contra* Cecchetto to appear).

3.1.4. Some remarks on the feature make-up of C

A brief digression into the feature make-up of C, an issue so far not addressed in the Chinese literature, seems indicated here. The interaction of Clow with properties of the extended VP projection (aktivart of the verb, presence/absence of negation etc.) suggests that Clow bears a verbal feature. If this turns out to be correct, Clow need to be taken into account by the FOFC, because CP will then be categorially identical with TP (in terms of the features [±V], [±N]) (cf. Biberauer et al. 2007) and/or on the same projection line as TP (cf. Biberauer et al. 2009), these being the conditions imposed on heads/projections having to obey the FOFC. In other words, the FOFC allows a “nominal”, but not a “verbal” head-final CP to dominate a head-initial TP. While the precise feature make-up of the C elements must be strictly determined within the synchronic grammar of Mandarin, let us nevertheless venture into the origin of the low C heads, notwithstanding the well-known fact that this kind of knowledge cannot be part of the native speaker’s linguistic competence. *Le* in general is linked etymologically to the verb *lái* ‘come’ (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 246, footnote 31). *Lái*he* can probably be decomposed into the verb *lái* ‘come’ and the locative verb *zháo* ‘adhere to, be in the proximity of’ (Redouane Djamouri, p.c.); the origin of the SFP remains nevertheless unclear (cf. Chen Qianrui 2005). Note, however, that well-established etymologies such as *le* < *lái* ‘come’ are proposed for the items taken in isolation and completely abstract away from the syntactic position of the items under investigation. Accordingly, they are of limited interest only, because very probably the SFP was simply homophonous with the verb proposed as its “source” and therefore written in the same way. (For a diachronic approach which does take into account the syntactic structures involved, cf. Aldridge 2010.) Finally, as to be expected, some SFPs are first attested as such, i.e. as SFPs, although with a different pronunciation due to subsequent sound changes. This is the case for *ne*: *ne* < *nî* < *lî* (cf. Pan 2007: 81ff).  

---

18 Cecchetto (to appear) claims that Chinese C does not access the features of the T head, unlike C in Indo-European languages. He postulates this difference concerning the relationship of C with T precisely in order to account for the FOFC violating configuration present in Chinese, where a head-final CP dominates a head-initial TP.

19 Biberauer et al. (2008) attribute to Li Boya (2006) the view that C in Chinese is nominal. However, my own reading as well as an electronic search of her thesis produced no result for such a statement. To my knowledge, the question as to the feature make-up of C has so far not been addressed in Chinese linguistics, and at that point is certainly not backed up by any independent evidence going beyond the general parallel postulated between CP and the nominal domain.

20 The “source” itself might also present a dilemma with respect to its verbal or nominal nature, as in the case of SFP in the Italian dialects Pagotto and Veneto from the North-Eastern area, examined by Munaro & Poletto (2006). They retrace personal pronouns as source for the SFP *ti* and *lu*, but temporal adverbs for the SFP *mo* and *po*. As in the case of C, for adverbs it is not evident, either, how to determine their nominal vs. verbal nature. Also note that irrespective of their different etymologies, these particles are all sentence-final and restricted to main non-declarative sentences.
3.2. $C_2$ heads expressing the sentence type (Force): ma, ne$_2$, ba

As already mentioned above, the SFP ma indicating the yes/no question status of a sentence (cf. (15b)) was the first SFP to be analysed as C (cf. Lee Hun-tak Thomas 1986, Tang Ting-chi 1989):

(15) a. Tā huì shuō zhōngwén.
   3SG can speak Chinese
   ‘He can speak Chinese.’

   b. [CP$_{\text{force}}$ [TP Tā huì shuō zhōngwén] ma ]?
      3SG can speak Chinese  FORCE
      ‘Can he speak Chinese?’

Since ma turns a (declarative) sentence into a yes/no question, it must have scope over the entire sentence, whence the analysis of ma as a C-head taking a TP complement. The complement status of TP and the head status of ma are confirmed by the fact that ma imposes selectional restrictions: it can only select a non-interrogative TP and is therefore incompatible with TP-internal yes/no questions in the ‘A-not-A’ form and wh-questions (for ‘A-not-A’ questions, cf. Huang C. -T. James 1982):

(16) a. [CP$_{\text{force}}$ [TP Nǐ wèn-le shéi ] (*ma)]?
      2SG ask -PERF who  FORCE
      ‘Whom did you ask?’

   b. [CP$_{\text{force}}$ [TP Shéi wèn-le nǐ ] (*ma)]?
      who ask -PERF 2SG  FORCE
      ‘Who asked you?’

(17) [CP$_{\text{force}}$ [TP Tā dŏng bù dŏng wèntí ] (*ma)] ?
     3SG understand NEG understand problem  FORCE
     ‘Does he understand the problem?’

As for the SFP ne$_2$, it is familiar to scholars in general linguistics because it has been claimed to play a crucial role in typing a sentence as question in wh in-situ languages such as Chinese (cf. ChengLisa Lai-Shen 1991). This is, however, invalidated by the well-known optionality of ne$_2$ in wh-questions (cf. (18)) and A-not-A questions (cf. (19)),$^{21}$ (For a detailed study of ne$_2$, cf. Pan 2007)

(18) Nǐ wèn-le shéi (ne) ?
     2SG ask -PERF who  FORCE
     ‘(So) whom have you asked?’

(19) Tā dŏng bù dŏng wèntí (ne) ?
     3SG understand NEG understand problem  FORCE
     ‘(So) does he understand the problem?’

Ne thus contrasts clearly with ma which is incompatible with wh-questions and A-not-A questions (cf. (16) - (17) above).

Instead, ne₂ indicates that the question is not one asked “out of the blue”, but is a follow-up of the preceding (linguistic or extra-linguistic) context, as indicated in (20) and (21):

(20) Nǐ dǒng le. [CP\text{force} [TP Tā dǒng bù dǒng ] ne ]?
2SG understand Clow 3SG understand NEG understand FORCE
“You understand. (But) does he understand?”

(21) Wǒ wèn-le Zhāngsān. [CP\text{force} [TP Nǐ wèn-le shéi] ne ]?
1SG ask -PERF Zhangsan 2SG ask -PERF who FORCE
“I have asked Zhangsan. (And) whom have you asked?”

Ne₂ clearly instantiates a Force head C₃, as witnessed by its co-occurrence with the low C le in the order ‘le ne₂’ (the opposite order ‘ne₂ le’ being excluded as expected):

(22) [CP\text{force} [ClowP [TopP Nà [TP Nǐ wèn shéi ]]le ] ne ]?
in.that.case 2SG ask who Clow FORCE
“So whom have you asked?”

To summarize, ne₂ is a Force head indicating the ‘follow-up’ nature of the question at hand and selects interrogative TPs (wh-questions and yes/no questions in the A-not-A form). Ma, by contrast, exclusively selects declarative TPs.

The imperative SFP ba is called “advisative” by Chao Yuen Ren (1968: 807) because of its “softening” effect. Accordingly, an imperative containing ba is understood as less harsh an order than the corresponding imperative sentence without ba:

(23) [Kuài diǎnr zǒu] ba !
fast a.bit go FORCE
‘Better hurry up and go!’

(24) [Zánmen jiù zhème bàn] ba!
1PL then so do FORCE
‘Let’s just do it that way!’

Again, the rigid ordering with respect to the low C le indicates ba’s status of a Force head above the low CP:

(25) [CP\text{force} [Clow [TP Nǐ bù yòng gěi qián ] le ] ba ] / *le ba.
2SG NEG need give money Clow FORCE / Clow FORCE
‘Then you won’t need to pay!’ (Chao Yuen Ren 1968:807; example slightly changed)

3.3. C₃ heads expressing the speaker/hearer’s attitude

The outermost, i.e. highest C elements encode the speaker/hearer’s attitude, such as ou ‘warning reminder’ and a ‘astonishment’ (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968: 803 ; 808). Consisting of a single vowel, these SFP are phonetically fused with a preceding SFP.
As can be seen from the examples, the exact meaning of these SFP in AttitudeP is difficult to pin down and strongly depends on the context and intonation. This is typical of particles relating to the discourse; evidently, it is not incompatible at all with their analysis as heads in a split CP à la Rizzi (1997 (cf. inter alia Munaro & Poletto 2006, Haegeman this volume and references therein).

3.4. SFP as selecting and projecting heads

As already mentioned above, it is the the rigid relative ordering among SFPs which provides evidence for the analysis of a given SFP as either \( C_1 \), \( C_2 \), or \( C_3 \) in the split CP configuration ‘Attitude > Force > Clow. Below are some additional examples illustrating this point.

The Force heads \( ma, ne_2 \) and \( ba \) can only follow, but not precede the low \( C_1 \) le.

\[
\text{(29) } [\text{CP}_\text{force} [\text{CP}_\text{low} [\text{TP} Tā fā yán ] le ] ma ] ?
\]
\[
\text{3SG issue speech Clow FORCE}
\]
\['Has he given a speech?\]

\[
\text{(30) } [\text{CP}_\text{force} [\text{CP}_\text{low} [\text{TP} Tā dào nǎr qù ] le ] ne ] (*le )?]
\]
\[
\text{3SG to where go Clow FORCE Clow}
\]
\['So where has he gone?\]

\[
\text{(31) } [\text{CP}_\text{force} [\text{CP}_\text{low} [\text{TP} Nǐ bù yòng gěi qián ] le ] ba ] / *le ba !}
\]
\[
\text{2SG NEG need give money Clow FORCE Clow FORCE}
\]
\['Then you won’t need to pay!\]

Finally, the SFP realizing the highest sub-projection in the split CP, \( \text{viz.} \) AttP, have to follow the Force heads:

\[
\text{(32) } Kuài zǒu b’ou [=ba + ou ] / *ou ba !}
\]
\[
\text{fast go PART (fusion) FORCE+ATT / ATT FORCE}
\]
\['Hurry up and go!\]
particles in turn confirms their “outlier” status and hence their not “counting” as counterevidence when violating the FOFC.\(^{22}\)

The selectional restrictions imposed by an SFP are also visible in the choice operated among the different heads of an appropriate subprojection. For example, the interrogative Force head \(ma\) in general cannot select a CP headed by the low C \(láizhe\) (in contrast to a CP headed by the low C \(le\), cf. (29) above), given that \(láizhe\) asserts the event in addition to locating it in the recent past:

\[(33) \quad ^{*}[\text{ForceP} [\text{Clow} \quad [\text{TP} \quad Tā \quad fā \quad yán \quad láizhe] \quad ma \quad ]] \quad (Lü \ et \ al. \ (eds.) \ 2000: \ 349)\]

\(Ma\) can only combine with \(láizhe\) if the resulting question can be interpreted as a rhetoric one and thus yields an interpretation compatible with the assertion mediated by \(láizhe\) (also cf. (12) above):

\[(34) \quad [Tā \quad gāngcái \quad bù \quad shì \quad hái \quad zài \quad zhèr \quad láizhe] \quad ma \quad ]?
\quad 3SG \quad just.now \quad NEG \quad be \quad still \quad be \quad here \quad Clow \quad FORCE
\quad ‘Wasn’t he still here a moment ago?’\]

We thus obtain the following architecture for the split CP in Mandarin (abstracting away from linear ordering):\(^{23}\)

\[(35) \quad \text{Attitude} \quad > \quad \text{Force} \quad > \quad \text{C(low)} \quad > \quad \text{TP} \quad \quad (\text{cf. Paul 2006, 2008, 2009})\]

The main difference with respect to Rizzi’s (1997) hierarchy:

\[(36) \quad \text{Force} \quad > \quad \text{Fin} \quad > \quad \text{TP} \quad \quad (\text{cf. Rizzi 1997})\]

lies in the presence of the additional head \(\text{Attitude above Force}\). Accordingly, the SFP indicating the sentence type (Force) are not hosted by the highest C head available.

Note that this situation is not unique to Chinese, but also observable for e.g. West Flemish (cf. Haegeman 2009, this volume). Analysing sentence-final and sentence-initial discourse markers as C heads, Haegeman introduces the projection DiscourseP (above ForceP), comparable to the AttitudeP postulated here for Chinese. As in Chinese, the particles instantiating DiscourseP occur in root contexts only. They are analysed as heads by Haegeman because they may select a particular ForceP and display a rigid order when co-occurring with other particles.

To summarize this section, SFP have been argued to realize a three layered split CP, thereby adding Chinese to the languages displaying a highly articulated sentence periphery (along with e.g. Japanese, cf. Endo 2007). In contrast to Rizzi (1997, 2004), but in accordance with an anonymous reviewer, particles are explicitly noted as a “recurring”, i.e. “predictable” type of exception to the FOFC by Biberauer et al. (2009) and are accordingly assumed to differ in crucial ways from FOFC-respecting complementisers. I fail to see, though, why an exception would count as less of an exception and counterevidence when of a recurring type.

\(^{22}\) The hierarchy does not include the projections TopicP and \(lián\) ‘even’ FocusP also present in the sentence periphery (for a detailed discussion, cf. Paul 2002, 2005 and references therein).

\[(i) \quad [\text{TopP} \quad Zhè-ge \quad wài-guórén \quad (\text{FocP} \quad lián \quad gōuròu)] \quad [\text{TP} \quad Tā \quad (\text{FocP} \quad lián \quad gōuròu) \quad dōu \quad gǎn \quad chī \quad ]]
\quad \text{this-Cl. \ \text{foreigner \ \ \ \ even \ \text{dog.meat} \ \ 3SG \ \ \ \ even \ \text{dog.meat all \ \ dare \ \ eat}}
\quad ‘This foreigner (even dog meat) he dares to eat (even dog meat).’\]

Note that in Mandarin Chinese focus with ‘even’ is acceptable both within and outside TP, whereas focus cleft is limited to the TP (cf. Paul & Whitman 2008).
with later work by i.a. Haegeman 2009 and Munaro & Poletto (2006), the existence of a speaker/hearer-related projection above ForceP (DiscourseP or AttitudeP) needs to be postulated in Chinese as well. Selectional restrictions imposed by the SFP (on their TP or C-subprojection complement) as well as the rigid ordering observed when they co-occur clearly indicate the head status of SFP as well as their ability to project. Accordingly, SFP are full-fledged functional categories located in the sentence periphery. They are not “categorically deficient” as claimed by Biberauer et al. (2009), notwithstanding their surface behaviour as clitics. SFP in Chinese are thus not comparable - neither functionally nor syntactically - to tag-like or afterthought-like elements such as hey, ok, right conveying the speaker/hearer’s involvement illustrated in You want to be careful, hey/right/ok (as suggested by an anonymous reviewer). First, to convey the speaker/hearer’s attitude is the function of only one of the three classes of SFP, viz. the outermost class C3. Second, the particles in English do not impose selectional restrictions on the TP they combine with and are not sensitive to TP-internal material such as the type of negation. Third, items such as hey, right, ok very probably are adverbs, i.e. XPs, not heads, and do not need to respect a rigid order. Last, but not least, note that SFP (both low C such as le and ne1 and Force heads such as ma and ba) are acquired well before the age of two years (cf. Lee Hun-tak Thomas et al. 2005).24

4. The root vs. non-root asymmetry in the Chinese CP

As mentioned at the beginning of this article, the analysis of the SFP in Chinese as complementisers proposed here is an extension of the analysis of the yes/no-question marker ma as a complementiser (cf. Lee Huntak Thomas 1986, Tang Ting-chi 1988). It is also with respect to the interrogative ma that the limitation to root contexts was explicitly stated for the first time (cf. Li & Thompson 1981: 557, Tang Ting-chi 1988: 363ff). Note that so far the literature on the Chinese C system (from Cheng Lisa Lai-Shen 1991 up to the most recent studies by Li Boya 2006, Xiong Zhongrui 2007, Hsieh & Sybesma 2008 a.o.) has not acknowledged the systematic character of the root/non-root asymmetry and has at best stated the root-only distribution as the idiosyncrasy of an individual SFP (as in the case of ne, cf. Cheng Lisa Lai-Shen 1991, Li Yen-Hui Audrey 1992: 153), although some of the data underpinning that generalization were observed in earlier work (cf. Li & Thompson 1981, Tang Ting-chi 1988, Ross 1983). As to be discussed in this section, there are a few cases of SFPs occurring in non-root contexts. However, the basic asymmetry between root and non-root remains valid insofar as there is no split CP in embedded contexts, where not more than one C head is licit, if any.

4.1. Root only complementisers

As noted by Li & Thompson (1981:556–7) and (Tang 1988:363) the yes/no question particle ma cannot be part of an embedded clause, but must always be construed as belonging to the matrix sentence. This is straightforward in (37a): a sentential subject cannot contain ma; instead, the ‘A-not-A’ question form must be used here (37b):

24 Importantly, the children never used the yes/no question C ma in wh-questions (cf. (16a-b) above), thus indicating that they had perfectly grasped the selectional restrictions imposed by ma. Incidentally, the early acquisition of SFP against the background of SVO order also challenges the allegedly "marked" character of so-called “mixed”, “disharmonious” languages and confirms the views expressed by Newmeyer (2005) and Whitman (2008) that considerations of “harmony” are not part of UG, hence not accessible to the child learner.
(37) (a) *[Ākiū lái ma] méi yǒu guānxi.
Akiu come PART NEG have relation

(b) [Ākiū lái bù lái] méi yǒu guānxi.
Akiu come NEG come NEG have relation
‘Whether or not Akiu comes doesn’t matter.’

In (38a), where the final position of the root clause coincides with the final position of the clausal complement, this ‘root only’ constraint must be deduced from the interpretational possibilities. As indicated, ma can only question the root clause, not the clausal complement, although zhīdào ‘know’ can also select an interrogative clause (38b). In the case of an embedded interrogative clause (cf. (37b), (38b)), only the ‘A-not-A’ question is possible.

(38) (a) [[Tā bù zhīdào [Ākiū lái] ] ma ]?
3SG NEG know Akiu come FORCE
‘Doesn’t she know that Akiu is coming?’
[Excluded: ‘She doesn’t know whether or not Akiu is coming.’]

(b) Tā bù zhūdào [Ākiū lái bù lái].
3SG NEG know Akiu come NEG come
‘She doesn’t know whether or not Akiu is coming.’

As argued for in Paul (2007, 2009), the limitation to root contexts illustrated for the interrogative C ma holds for SFPs in general. Accordingly, they are excluded from relative clauses (39a) and noun complement clauses (40a) which are both subordinated to the head noun by de (itself one of the few [-root] C to be discussed immediately below): 25

yesterday eat fish CLOW SUB person all ill -PERF
‘The people who ate fish yesterday are all sick.’
(slightly changed example from Ross 1983: 235)

b. Wǒmen zuótiān chī yúròu le .
1PL yesterday eat fish CLOW
‘We ate fish yesterday.’

(40) a. [DP [TP Xià yǔ (*le) ] de xiāoxi].
fall rain CLOW SUB news
‘The news that it was raining’

25 The allegedly acceptable cases of the SFP le in relative clauses and noun complement clauses provided by an anonymous reviewer (cf. (i) and (ii)) were clearly rejected by my informants:

(i) [DP[CP-root] Juédìng bù mǎi fángzi (*le ) de ] naxie rén ] dōu zǒu -le
decide NEG buy house CLOW SUB those people all leave -PERF
‘Those people who have changed their mind and will not buy the house have all left.’

(ii) [DP[CP-root] Lǎobǎn yào mà i gùpiào (*le) de ] xiāoxi] shi jià de
boss want sell share CLOW SUB news be false DE
‘The news that the boss will sell his shares is false.’
(Translation as provided by the reviewer, glosses slightly adapted.)
b. Xià yŭ le.
fall rain CLOW
'It is raining.'

In general, SFPs are also banned from clausal complements of verbs (41a) and sentential subjects (cf. (37a) above). Note that Mandarin Chinese lacks a C comparable to *that* in English heading clausal complements of verbs (42) and sentential subjects (43).26

(41) a. Tā gāngcái gāosū wǒ [Ākiū yǐjīng likāi Bĕijīng (*le )].
3SG just tell 1SG Akiu already leave Beijing CLOW
‘He just told me that Akiu had already left Beijing.’

b. Ākiū yǐjīng likāi Bĕijīng le.
Akiu already leave Beijing CLOW
‘Akiu had already left Beijing.’

(42) Tā shuō [Ākiū dé -le jiăng].
3SG say  Akiu obtain-PERF award
‘She told me that Akiu had won a prize.’

(43) [Ākiū dé -le jiăng] shǐ wŏmen hěn gāoxìng.
Akiu obtain-PERF award make 1PL very happy
‘The fact that Akiu won a prize made us very happy.’

Interestingly, there exist cases where the SFP *le* is acceptable within a propositional complement and a sentential subject:27

(44) Nǐ wèishénme méi gāosù wǒ [xiào zhǎng bù qù Běijīng le ]?
2SG why NEG tell 1SG school-president NEG go Beijing CLOW
‘Why didn’t you tell me that the president doesn’t want
to go to Beijing any more?’

26 An anonymous reviewer contests this view and refers to the current claim in the literature that a grammaticalized form of the verb shuo ‘speak’ instantiates such a complementiser (cf. Hsieh & Sybesma 2008 among many others):

(i) Wŏ zŏngshì juéde shuō, shēnghuó lĭ quē -le diǎn shénme
1SG always feel SHUO life in miss-PERF a.bit something
‘I have always had the feeling that something is missing in life.’

However, if *shuo* were really a complementiser it would be expected to form a constituent with its following TP complement and remain as a block in the case of an afterthought construction, a prediction not borne out by the data. Also note that it is likewise impossible for *shuo* to follow the verb in (ii):

(ii) [(*Shuo) shēnghuó lĭ quē -le diǎn shénme ], wŏ zŏngshì juéde (*shuo)
shuo life in miss-PERF a.bit something 1SG always feel SHUO
‘That something is missing in life, I have always thought so.’

Also note that a pause (indicated by a comma) is natural after *shuo* in (i), but not between *shuo* and the preceding verb.

Last, but not least, in the Chinese literature, none of the numerous papers on *shuo* or its equivalent in other Sinitic languages has ever provided well-formed examples where the alleged C *shuo* heads a sentential subject:

(iii) (*shuo) shēnghuó lĭ quē -le diǎn shénme ] zhēn kěxi
*shuo* life in miss-PERF a.bit something really pity
‘That something is missing in my life is really a pity.’

27 Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for providing this type of data. Her/his examples were modified in order to render them more natural.
Without *le*, we would obtain a different interpretation for the embedded clause, namely ‘that the president doesn’t want to go to Beijing’. Accordingly, *le* seems to be a C which is acceptable not only in root contexts, but also in non-root contexts, provided no other non-root C is present (cf. (39a), (40a) above). Let us now turn to the exclusively non-root C *de* and *dehuà*.

### 4.2. The exclusively non-root C *de* and *dehuà*

#### 4.2.1. *De* in complex DPs vs. *de* in the propositional assertion construction

*De* closing off the relative clause (cf. (39a) above) was analysed as C by Cheng (1986). She fails, though, to note the systematic difference between the non-root-only nature of *de* in opposition to the other root-only C elements (cf. Paul 2007 for further discussion).

*De* in the propositional assertion construction is another instance of a non-root C (cf. Paul & Whitman 2008): the copula *shì* ‘be’ selects a complement headed by *de* which in turn takes as its complement a non-finite TP. As indicated by the translation ‘it is the case that…’ this construction is used in order to strengthen the assertion of the sentence as a whole:

(46)  Wǒ shì [CP(-root) [cónglái bù chōu yān ] de].  
1SG be ever NEG inhale smoke C(-root)  
‘(It is the case that) I have never smoked.’

(47)  Wǒ shì [CP(-root) [dào sǐ dōu huì xiǎng-zhe nǐ ] de ].  
1SG be until death all will think -DUR 2SG C(-root)  
‘(It is the case that) I will think of you until I die.’

(based on example (10) by Li et al. 1998: 95)

(48)  Tā shì [CP(-root) [yīdìng hui [PP dui nǐ ] hǎo yī-bèizi ] de ].  
3SG be certain will towards 2SG good 1-generation C(-root)  
‘(It is the case that) he will certainly be good to you for an entire lifetime.’

(Li et al. 1998: 94, (C))

(49)  [TopP [DP Zhèi-ge dōngxī] [TP tā shì [CP(-root) [yǐnggāi bān -de -dòng tDP] de ]]].
     this-CL thing 3SG be must remove-able-move C(-root)
     ‘This thing, he should indeed be able to move it.’

The *de* in the propositional assertion construction selects a non-finite TP, as witnessed by the obligatory raising of the subject to the matrix subject position, whereas the non-root C closing off the relative clause selects a finite TP complement. Furthermore, extraction from the complement of *de* in the propositional assertion construction is possible (cf. (50)) and clearly contrasts with the non-extractability from a relative clause (cf. (51b)). (For further discussion, cf. Paul & Whitman 2008: section 6.3):

---

28 As can be seen from the gloss ‘able’, the *de* in the verbal compound *bān-de-dòng* ‘be able to move’ is a completely different word, not to be confounded with the non-root C *de*.  

(Xiao -zhang bu qu BeiJing le] bu suan shenme xinwen.  
school-president NEG go Beijing LOW NEG count what news  
‘That the president doesn’t want to go to Beijing any more is no real news.’

(50) \[ \text{TopP [PP Dùi nǐ] [TP tā shì [CP(-root) [yīdīng hùi tpp hāo yī-bèizi ] de ]]}\]
towards 2SG 3SG be certainly will good 1-generation C(-root)
‘(It is the case that) he will certainly be good to you for an entire lifetime.’

3SG hate towards 2SG will good 1-lifetime C(-root) people
‘He hates people/those who will be good to you for an entire lifetime.’

b. *[PP Dùi nǐ ], [TP tā hên [DP [ tǐ hui tpp hāo yī-bèizi de ] (rén) ]].
towards 2SG 3SG hate will good 1-lifetime C(-root) people
(*[To you], he hates people/those who will be good to you, an entire lifetime.’)

Last, but not least, de in complex DPs not only subordinates relative and complement clauses to the head noun, but any kind of modifier XP (PP, NP, QP, AP, adverbs) (cf. Paul 2007 for further discussion). This indicates that de in the complex DP ‘XP de NP’ and the de in the propositional assertion construction are different heads imposing different selectional constraints on their complements, while sharing the non-root C status. They visibly differ in their feature make-up and should perhaps be treated as homophonous items in the synchronic grammar of Chinese.29

Analysing de in the propositional assertion construction as the head of the projection selected by the matrix verb shì ‘be’ allows us to correctly predict the unacceptability of SFPs within DeP (cf. (52)). Being the clausal complement of the matrix verb shì ‘be’, DeP represents an embedded context, whence the ban on SFP. This ban is absolute due to the presence of a non-root C, i.e. de; in this respect, the propositional assertion construction behaves on a par with relative clauses (cf. (39a), (40a) above).

(52) \[ \text{TopP[Zhèi-ge dōngxī], [TP tā shì [CP(-root) [yīnggāi bān -de -dòng tǐ (*le) ] de ]]}\]
this-CL thing 3SG be must remove-able-move Clow C(-root)
‘This thing, he should indeed be able to move it.’

Once we acknowledge that de in the propositional assertion construction heads the complement embedded under the matrix verb, we can account for the co-occurrence of this non-root C de with a low root C (e.g. le), construed with the matrix clause, in the order ‘de le’:

(53) \[ \text{CPlow [TP Wèntí xiànzài shì [C(-root) néng jiējùé de ] le ]}\]
problem now be can solve C(-root) Clow
‘The problem can certainly be solved now.’

29 Given this characterization of the two de’s, I fail to understand why “de in the cited examples clearly doesn’t function as a typical clausal subordinator”, as stated by an anonymous reviewer. Assuming that that is considered as the prototypical example of a clausal subordinator, because it indicates both the non-root nature of its projection as well as the sentence type (Force), then the de in the propositional assertion construction, conveying assertive force and heading the projection selected as complement by the verb shì ‘be’, certainly qualifies as such a clausal subordinator, too. As for the de in a complex DP, it is perhaps its “non-selective” nature as witnessed by the fact that all kinds of XPs are subordinated to the head noun by de that underlies the reviewer’s reluctance to accept an analysis of de as C. Note that this selective freedom of de has so far not been given a satisfying analysis. Cheng Lisa Lai-Shen (1986:319) e.g. simply states that “a complementizer, being a head, may or may not select a particular type of complement or specifier. English is an example of a complementizer selecting only 1” as its complement. […] de, if it is a complementizer in Mandarin, places no restrictions on the category of its complement.”(p. 319). She contends herself with this reformulation of the facts and does not pursue it any further. For a detailed discussion of this de, cf. Paul (2007) and references therein.
The co-occurrence of the low C le with de would not be possible if de were a low root C on a par with le and likewise construed with the matrix clause, because SFP instantiating the same head (C₁, C₂ or C₃) are in a paradigmatic relation to each other and mutually exclusive (cf. table 1 above). Given that le instantiates the lowest C sub-projection within the split CP it cannot be preceded by another root C.

4.2.2. Non-root C dehùà

Dehùà heading conditional clauses is another non-root C. Following Gasde & Paul (1996), conditional clauses are analysed as clausal topics located in Spec, TopP:

(55) \[
\text{[CP}\text{low [TopP [Ci-root] Ākiū jīntiān lìkāi Běijīng (*le) dehùà]}} \\
\text{Akiu today leave Beijing C(-root) \text{low C(-root)}} \\
\text{[TP tā hěn kuài jiù yào dào ] le ].} \\
\text{3SG very fast then will arrive \text{low C(-root)}} \\
\text{‘If Akiu has left Beijing today, then he should be here very soon.’}
\]

(56) \[
\text{[CP}\text{low [TopP [Ci-root] Rúguō xià yǔ (*le) dehùà] [TP wǒ jiù bù qù]].} \\
\text{if fall rain C(-root) 1SG then NEG go} \\
\text{‘If it rains, then I won’t go.’}
\]

Again, no SFP are allowed within the projection headed by dehùà, exactly as in the case of the projections headed by de (both in a complex DP and the propositional assertion construction).

The analysis of dehùà as a non-root C is confirmed by its behaviour in so-called “afterthought construction” (cf. Chao Yuen Ren 1968, Lu Jianming 1980):³⁰

(57) a. \[
\text{[CP Lái -le ma ]}, \text{nǐ gēge (*ma) ?} \\
\text{come-PERF FORCE 2SG brother FORCE} \\
\text{‘Has he come, your brother?’}
\]

b. \[
\text{[TP Nǐ gēge lái -le ] ma ?} \\
\text{2SG brother come-PERF FORCE} \\
\text{‘Has your brother come?’}
\]

As evidenced by the position of ma in (57a), the constituent representing the “afterthought” part is adjoined to the right of the CP.

When the clause headed by dehùà plays the role of such an afterthought (cf. (58b)), crucially, dehùà is retained, confirming that rúguō tā lái dehùà forms a constituent (CP):³¹

³⁰ As observed by Chao Yuen Ren (1968: 132), the afterthought part is likely to be read in a faster tempo, the preceding part constituting the main clause.

³¹ Incidentally, the unacceptability of the adverb jiù ‘then’ in the main clause in (58b), repeated in (i), argues against a derivation of the afterthought construction via right dislocation and confirms the adjunction to CP analysis proposed here. (For further discussion, cf. Gasde & Paul 1996, Paul 2009.)
The non-root C dehuà must therefore be distinguished from particles (optionally) heading TopicP such as me, ne etc.:32

A particle such as ne instantiating the head Topic selects a TP-complement to its right (or another TopicP, giving rise to multiple topics), whence the observed unacceptability of these topic particles in the afterthought part.

This analysis is confirmed by the co-occurrence of dehuà with a Top°, which would be impossible if dehuà were a Top° itself. For a topic XP can only be followed by one particle realizing Top° at a time (cf. Paul 2006 for further discussion):

Last, but not least, note that extraction of arguments from the conditional clause headed by dehuà is allowed:

(i) Wŏ (*jiù) bù cānjiā huìyì le, rúguŏ tā lái dehuà
1SG NEG attend meeting CLOW if 3SG then NEG attend meeting CLOW
‘I won’t attend the meeting, if he comes.’

32 The co-occurrence of the topic head ne and Clow ne in the same sentence confirms their distinct categorial status:

‘And me, who will listen to what I say?’

This illustrates that there are several homophonous items ne realizing different categories.
Dehuà is thus on a par with the non-root C de in the propositional assertion construction where extraction is also allowed (cf. (50) above). It contrasts sharply with the non-root C de in relative clauses, from which extraction is barred (irrespective of the presence/absence of the head noun, i.e. huà ‘words’):

(62) a. Wǒ méi tīngdào [DP [CP(root) [TP tā dui nǐ shuō] de] (huà)].
    1SG NEG hear 3SG towards 2SG say C(root) word
    ‘I haven’t heard the words he spoke to you/what he said to you.’

b. *[PP Dui nǐ] [TP wǒ méi tīngdào [DP [CP(root) [TP tā tPP shuō] de] (huà)].
    towards 2SG 1SG NEG hear 3SG say C(-root) word

Given that a complex DP headed by huà ‘words’ and containing a relative clause can probably be postulated as the source structure for the non-root C dehuà, the contrast between (62) and (61) illustrates that the reanalyzed item does not automatically retain the features of its source.

To summarize, this section has introduced the sofar neglected, exclusively non-root Cs de and dehuà. They contrast with the other C heads, which are limited to root contexts. Only the low C le seems to be acceptable in an embedded context as well. Crucially, this is only possible in the absence of any other non-root C; as soon as either de or dehuà are present, no other C is allowed. In other words, non-root contexts do not display a split CP, but only one C layer, as opposed to the three-layered split CP in root contexts. This illustrates the fundamental root vs. non-root asymmetry at work in the Chinese C system.

Just one brief remark on the FOFC. Given that in more recent work (cf. Biberauer et al. 2010: 82), this constraint is supposed to hold for C in embedded clauses only, the existence of the non-root C de and dehuà is important, because contradicting the predictions made by the FOFC. Note in this context that in earlier stages of Chinese, the interrogative clause-final C ḥū for yes/no questions occurred both in root and embedded questions (cf. (63a-b), again giving rise to the structure precisely excluded by the FOFC:

(63) a. Wǒ bù shì [CP(root) [TP pro néng zhì fǒu] ḥū].
    1SG NEG know can arrive not.be FORCE 4th-3rd c. BC
    ‘I don’t know whether he will be able to go there or not.’

b. Bù zhī [CP(root) [TP tiān qì Lŭ] ḥū].
    NEG know heaven abandon Lu FORCE 2nd c. BC
    ‘I do not know whether Heaven has abandoned [the state of] Lu.

Furthermore, other SFP at that period might likewise turn out to be able to occur both in matrix and embedded contexts (cf. Djamouri, Meisterernst & Paul 2009), suggesting that the root vs. non-root asymmetry observed for Modern Mandarin is a more recent phenomenon.
5. Subordinating conjunctions in Chinese

So far I have concentrated on providing evidence for the C status of SFP in Chinese and on exploring the syntactic and semantic constraints in the split CP. In this section, I turn to the equivalents in Chinese of English subordinating conjunctions such as although, because, if, whose status is still controversial. It is beyond the scope of this article to solve this problem; instead, I will only discuss those issues that allow to demonstrate that SFP and conjunctions in Chinese belong to different syntactic categories.

5.1. The categorial heterogeneity of so-called subordinating conjunctions

The attentive reader may have noticed the items rúguō and yàoshi glossed as ‘if’ in examples (56), (58) and (60) above and may have wondered whether these are not precisely clause-initial subordinating conjunctions complying with the FOFC:

\[
\text{[C\text{low} [\text{TP} \text{Rúguo tā lái} \text{ dehuà} [wǒ jiù bù cānjiā huìyì ]] le ]}. \\
\text{if 3SG come C(-root) 1SG then NEG attend meeting C\text{low}} \\
\text{‘If he comes, then I won’t attend the meeting.’} \\
\text{(= (58a))}
\]

Furthermore, this type of example where both rúguō ‘if’ and the non-root C dehuà are present seems at first sight to confirm a reviewer’s view that SFP are just the particle counterpart of a “full” element expressing a similar meaning, where this full element obeys the FOFC (cf. Biberauer et al. 2010, p. 53ff for a similar view). However, a closer examination reveals a quite different picture.

First, the “doubling” observed in the case of conditional clauses is unique, and there are no “corresponding full” counterparts for the numerous C heads discussed in section three above.

Second, a conditional clause is also acceptable with either the non-root C dehuà or yàoshi/rúguō ‘if’ on their own:

\[
\text{a. Tā lái dehuà, wǒ jiù bù cānjiā huìyì le.} \\
\text{3SG come C(-root) 1SG then NEG attend meeting C\text{low}}
\]

\[
\text{b. Rúguo tā lái , wǒ jiù bù cānjiā huìyì le.} \\
\text{if 3SG come 1SG then NEG attend meeting C\text{low}}
\]

‘If he comes, then I won’t attend the meeting.’

In fact, conditional clauses are special insofar as they do not need any overt marking, but are identifiable as such qua their position in Spec, TopP:

\[
\text{[TopP [TP Tā lái ] [TP(root) wǒ bù lái ]].} \\
\text{3SG come 1SG NEG come} \\
\text{‘If he comes, I will not come.’}
\]

Third, besides yàoshi and rúguō, the Chinese equivalents for English subordinating conjunctions such as suīrán ‘although’, jírán ‘since’, yīnwèi ‘because’, zìcóng ‘since (temporal)’ do not have an SFP as “counterpart”. Importantly, this group is not homogeneous,
but in fact comprises (sentence-level) adverbs, on the one hand, and heads (prepositions), on
the other.33

As Lu Peng (2003, 2008) has argued for in great detail, rúguō/yàoshi ‘if’, suīrán
‘although’, and jìrán ‘since’ are sentence-level adverbs on a par with e.g. xiànrán ‘obviously,
naturally’, xìnghào ‘fortunately’, kěxī ‘unfortunately’ etc. Note that in Chinese, sentence-level
adverbs can occur to the left or to the right of the subject. More precisely, they pattern with
(DP) topics occupying the external or the TP-internal topic position (Spec, TopP) (cf. Paul
2002, 2005). For reasons of space, this will be shown only for the pair xìnghào ‘fortunately’
and rúguō ‘if’ (for further discussion, cf. Lu Peng 2003, 2008 §3.2):

\[(67)\]

a. \[
\text{[ext.TopP} \text{xìnghào [TP wǒ [int.TopP nà-fù huà [AspP mái-le ge gāo jià]].]}
\]

\text{Fortunately, I sold that painting at a high price.} (Lu Peng 2008: 164)

b. \[
\text{[TP Wǒ [int.TopP xìnghào [int.TopP nà-fù huà [AspP mái-le ge gāo jià]]].]}
\]

1SG \text{fortunately that-CL painting sell-PERF CL high price}

c. \[
\text{[TP Wǒ [int.TopP nà-fù huà [int.TopP xìnghào [AspP mái-le ge gāo jià]].]}
\]

1SG \text{that-CL painting fortunately sell-PERF CL high price}

As illustrated in (67b-c), the DP nà-fù huà ‘that painting’ and the sentence-level adverb
xìnghào ‘fortunately’ are interchangeable, both being internal topics. (68) below shows rúguō
‘if’ to have the same distribution as xìnghào ‘fortunately’:

\[(68)\]

a. \[
\text{Rúguō [TP nǐ [int.TopP yīngyǔ kāoshi [AuxP néng kǎo ge diyi]].]}
\]

\text{if 2SG English exam can pass CL first}

\text{wǒ jiù jiǎnglì nǐ 1-CL new bicycle}

\text{‘If in the English exam you can pass as first, I’ll reward you with a bicycle.’}

b. \[
\text{Nǐ rúguō yīngyǔ kāoshi néng kǎo ge diyi …}
\]

2SG \text{if English exam can pass CL first}

c. \[
\text{Nǐ yīngyǔ kāoshi rúguō néng kǎo ge diyi …}
\]

2SG \text{English exam if can pass CL first}

Accordingly, rúguō ‘if’ is not a head and the following clause is not its complement. Instead,
rúguō is a sentence-level adverb which shows the same distribution as DP topics, viz. it
occupies the specifier of the TP-external or TP-internal TopP.34

33 With respect to the P vs. C status of subordinating conjunctions, I follow the general consensus that items with
lexical content such as ‘because’, ‘since’ etc. are analysed as P. In English, these prepositions behave differently
from C such as that, if in that they allow sluicing:

(i) \text{I left before Bill left, but Jane left after [e]}

(ii) \text{*I know that/if Bill left, but Jane doesn’t know that/if [e]}

Thanks to John Whitman for discussion of this point.

Huang C.-T. James (1982: 85) left open the P vs. C status of items such as yīnwèi ‘because’, concentrating on the
head-initial character of their projection. Note that he analysed rúguō ‘if’ and suīrán ‘although’ as P/C-heads on
a par with yīnwèi ‘because’, an analysis which remained unchallenged up to Lu Peng’s (2003) dissertation to be
discussed immediately below.


In contrast, *yìnwèi* ‘because’, *zìcóng* ‘since (temporal)’ etc. are heads and accordingly restricted to the position preceding their complement clause:

(69)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [PP \text{ Yīnwèi } [TP \text{ Zhang Sān zuótiān méi shōudào nà -fēng xìn } ]] \\
& \text{because } \text{ Zhang San yesterday NEG receive that-CL letter} \\
& \text{wǒ jīntiān gěi tā fā -le fēn chuánzhēn} \\
& \text{1SG today for 3SG send-PERF CL fax.} \\
& \text{‘Since Zhang San didn’t receive the letter yesterday, I sent him a fax today.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \ast [PP \text{ yuanwèi } [TP \text{ zuótiān méi shōudào nà -fēng xìn } ]] \\
& \text{Zhang San because } \text{ yesterday NEG receive that-CL letter} \\
& \text{wǒ jīntiān gěi tā fā -le fēn chuánzhēn.} \\
& \text{1SG today for 3SG send-PERF CL fax}
\end{align*}
\]

(Lu Peng 2008: 131)

The fact that constituents to the left of the P-heads *yìnwèi* ‘because’, *zìcóng* ‘since (temporal)’ etc. are clearly outside the causal/temporal clause is further illustrated in (70):

(70)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\ast \text{Zuótiān } & [PP \text{ yīnwèi } [TP \text{ Zhang Sān méi shōudào nà -fēng xìn } ]] \\
& \text{yesterday because } \text{ Zhang San NEG receive that-CL letter} \\
& \text{wǒ jīntiān gěi tā fā -le fēn chuánzhēn.} \\
& \text{1SG today for 3SG send-PERF CL fax}
\end{align*}
\]

(Lu Peng 2008: 182)

\[Zuótiān ‘yesterday’ can only be construed as matrix topic here and is then in contradiction with jīntiān ‘today’ in the matrix TP.

(70) thus contrasts sharply with (71a) where *míngtiān* ‘tomorrow’ to the left of *rúguō* is part of the conditional clause (in Spec, TopP), as shown by its compatibility with hòutiān ‘the day after tomorrow’ in the matrix TP:

(71)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [Míngtiān rúguō \text{ Zhang Sān hái méi shōudào nà -fēng xìn } ] \\
& \text{tomorrow if } \text{ Zhang San yet NEG receive that-CL letter} \\
& \text{wǒ hòutiān gěi tā fā fēn chuánzhēn.} \\
& \text{1SG day.after.tomorrow for 3SG send CL fax} \\
& \text{‘If tomorrow Zhang San still hasn’t received the letter, I’ll send him a fax the day after tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & [Rúguō \text{ Zhang Sān míngtiān hái méi shōudào nà -fēng xìn } ] \\
& \text{if } \text{ Zhang San tomorrow yet NEG receive that-CL letter} \\
& \text{wǒ hòutiān gěi tā fā fēn chuánzhēn.} \\
& \text{1SG day.after.tomorrow for 3SG send CL fax} \\
& \text{‘If tomorrow Zhang San still hasn’t received the letter, I’ll send him a fax the day after tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(Lu Peng 2008: 183)

The acceptability of (71a) is thus on par with that of (71b) where *míngtiān* occurs to the right of *rúguō* and the subject DP.

\[34\text{While semantically the sentence-level adverb } rúguō ‘if’ may fulfill a function similar to that of the non-root C } děihuà, \text{ it clearly belongs to a different syntactic category. To talk about ‘particle and non-particle counterparts of ‘the same’ category of element’ as Biberauer et al. (2010: 54) do therefore does not seem appropriate.}\]
5.2. Chinese “subordinating conjunctions” and WALS’ “adverbial subordinator”

We have seen that the Chinese equivalents for English subordinating conjunctions are not a homogeneous group, but instantiate different categories, i.e. sentence-level adverbs (e.g. rúguŏ ‘if’, suírán ‘although’, jírán ‘since’), on the one hand, and prepositions (e.g. yīnwèi ‘because’, zícóng ‘since (temporal)’), on the other. Incidentally, the latter comply with the FOFC, taking their (TP) complement to the right, while the former are simply not relevant, because not being heads.

Importantly, the heterogeneous nature of “conjunctions” in Chinese again highlights the problematic character of the re-interpretation of WALS’ term adverbial subordinator as C by Biberauer et al. (2009). While for the conjunctions with head status such as yīnwèi ‘because’ a C-status rather than P-status does admittedly not make much difference with respect to the parameter examined, i.e. the relative order between head and complement, an analysis in terms of C (or any other functional head) can in no way be extended to the sentence-level adverbs such as rúguŏ ‘if’. However, both classes would certainly be considered as “adverbial subordinator” by WALS if Chinese were included in their data base for the relevant feature 94. And the cases where these adverbs occupy the external topic position to the left of the subject (cf. (65b) above) would then incorrectly count as instances of the order ‘adverbial subordinator - clause’, with the adverbial subordinator assigned the status of a head.35

Given these problems which emerge within a single language, here Mandarin Chinese, it does not need much fantasy in order to realize that difficulties of this kind increase exponentially when including more languages. As a consequence, the results for the distribution of adverbial subordinator in WALS cannot serve as a testing ground for the FOFC. Because upon closer examination of each of the more than 600 languages included for feature 94, there will probably be quite a number of cases which will have to be crossed off the list of potential C elements, thus weakening the at first sight statistically solid empirical basis for FOFC. (Recall Dryer’s inventory of rather disparate items considered as adverbial subordinator in WALS as discussed in section 2.1 above.)

To summarize this section, we have seen that the equivalents of subordinating conjunctions such as because, since, if etc. in Chinese turn out to be either sentence-level adverbs or prepositional heads, and thus differ from the SFP instantiating the heads of the subprojections in the split CP. Even if the conjunctions with head status such as yīnwèi ‘because’, zícóng ‘since (temporal)’ were analysed as C rather than P, they would still have to be distinguished from the class of C elements realized by SFP, given the differences in selectional restrictions for each class. For instance, yīnwèi ‘because’, zícóng ‘since (temporal)’ do not seem to impose contraints on the extended VP in their complement clause (in terms of type of negation, aktionsart etc.), in contrast to what we have observed for the low Cs le, láizhe, ne (cf. section 3.1 above). We would then simply obtain two classes of C with different (surface) head directionality, parallel to the two classes of adpositions (pre- and postpositions) present in Chinese (cf. Djamouri, Paul & Whitman 2009, to appear). Importantly, such a scenario would in no way challenge the status of SFP as selecting and projecting C heads defended here.

---

35 Probably, Mandarin would then count as a language displaying “mixed order” for adverbial subordinator and clause, on a par with Cantonese, which - unlike Mandarin - is included in the database for feature 94.
6. Conclusion

SFP in Chinese have been analysed as heads of the subprojections in a three-layered split CP: Attitude > Force > C_low > TP. The C system in Chinese is characterized by a root vs. non-root asymmetry, because the large majority of C are limited to root contexts. In non-root contexts, only dehùa heading conditional clauses, de in the propositional assertion construction and de in complex DPs subordinating clauses to the head noun are attested. Crucially, there is no split CP in non-root contexts, where not more than one C is licit, if any.

Being projecting and selecting heads, SFP are clearly not “categorically deficient” (cf. Biberauer et al. 2009) or “syncategorematic” (cf. Biberauer et al. 2010, pp.81, § 5.1.2). Nor are they unable to be “syncretic” as e.g. English if, which indicates both subordination and interrogativity (cf. Biberauer et al. 2010, p. 55). Quite on the contrary, in addition to an obligatory value for [± root] (parallel to the component ‘subordination’ in if), SFP always involve other specifications: làizhe expresses both ‘recent past’ and ‘event assertion’, ne interrogativity and the fact that this is a follow-up question, ma interrogativity and (optionally) a bias what answer to expect (in contrast to the exclusively neutral ‘A-not A’ question); last, but not least, dehùa is compatible with conditions of all kinds except the necessary and sufficient condition ‘iff’ (cf. Lu Peng 2008: 30).

It is precisely the “syncretic nature” (to use Biberauer et al.’s (2010) term) of SFPs, i.e. the fact that an SFP is characterized by a complex bundle of semantico-syntactic features that makes it difficult to determine the precise feature make-up for each SFP, although its effects in terms of syntactic constraints and felicity conditions are clearly observable.
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