The encoding of finiteness in Chinese[*]

Waltraud PAUL   wpaul@ehess.fr
Website: http://crlao.ehess.fr/index.php?177
Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l'Asie orientale (CRLAO), CNRS-EHESS-INALCO, Paris

1. Introduction

Since the *Panel on tense and finiteness in Chinese* at *The 11th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics* (TEAL-11, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, June 3-4, 2017), the controversial issue whether and how Chinese encodes Tense and whether Chinese has a finite/non-finite distinction (cf. a.o. Tang Ting-chi 2000, Hu et al. 2001, Lin Jo-wang 2010, Law 2017) has been revived (cf. Niina Zhang to appear). Based on Paul (2017b, 2018), the present talk discusses the different factors that need to be taken into account when examining finiteness in Chinese, concentrating on <u>root clauses</u> (something rarely done). For a critical overview of numerous studies on finiteness in <u>clausal complements</u>, cf. the appendix.

My claim for Mandarin Chinese, a language with a large array of C-heads in <u>root</u> contexts:
Chinese is basically like English, *modulo* the lack of tense-related morphology. A sentence is finite when it is tensed (also cf. Audrey Li (2017b). In case the temporal interpretation cannot be determined TP-internally, SFPs realizing (the lower subprojection of) Low C (*le, ne, láizhe*) in Chinese may check the [tense] feature in TP, resulting in a finite sentence.

(1)   Split CP (head-final) in Chinese (Paul 2009, 2014; updated as in Paul & Pan 2017)
        TP < [$_{LowC}$ {*le, ne$_1$, láizhe*} / {*éryǐ* 'only'}] < Force < Attitude

(2a)   Rizzi's (1997) split CP (updated as in Rizzi & Bocci 2017)
        [Force [Top* [Int [Top* [Foc [Top* [Mod [Top* [Q$_{emb}$ [**Fin** [$_{IP}$ …..]]]]]]]]]]].

(2b)   Italian: Force *che* 'that' ….. (TopP) Q$_{emb}$ *se* 'if'….(TopP) … Fin *di*

However, the reverse is NOT true, i.e. an overt low C is *not* obligatory for a sentence to be finite, given the many root and non-root clauses that are well-formed <u>without</u> any SFP, showing that the [tense] feature can be checked TP-internally (*pace* N. Zhang (to appear) who concludes from the unacceptability of low C in complement clauses to their non-finite nature). Following Pan & Paul (2016), Paul & Pan (2017), SFPs *qua* C-heads are directly merged in the periphery, not raised from T° to C (*contra* Tang Sze-Wing 1998).

2. Short digression: Valuation of Infl by Comp in English (Ritter & Wiltschko 2014)

The imperative in English is characterized by the obligatory absence of morphological tense:
(3)   (You) be/*are quiet! (Ritter & Wiltschko 2014: 1367ff.)
The presence of structure (SpecIP for subject) in the absence of an overt realization of Infl confirms the Universal Spine hypothesis that is independent of the presence of overt material. Imperative force in Comp values Infl as [+coincidence], <u>a temporal content</u>: imperatives instruct the addressee to make it the case that the event situation coincides with the plan set (represented as an abstract argument in SpecCP). This relation is mediated by the pronomonal situation argument *Pro-Sit* in SpecIP which takes as its antecedent the plan set in CP.
        The past tense marking in English counterfactuals is an instance of *fake* marking, i.e. it is not associated with temporal force:

---

[*] Many thanks to Horst Lohnstein, Mai Ziyin, Victor Junnan Pan and Sun Hongyuan for discussion and data.

(4a)   If I had a car, I would drive to the store
(4b) $[_{CP}$ COMP $_{[Count.Fact.]}$ $[_{IP}$ INFL$_{[-coin]}$ $[_{VP}$ ev-sit   V$]]]$
(5a)   If I had a car right now, I would drive to the store.
(5b)   *I had a car right now.   (R & W 2014: 1370ff.)

The absence of *temporal* force in counterfactuals follows from the assumption that past tense marking on the verb does <u>not</u> value Infl here. Instead, Infl is valued by Comp as [-coin], more precisely by the abstract evaluation situation argument. In counterfactuals, the event situation is asserted to not coincide with the evaluation situation. Given that Infl is valued by C in counterfactuals, the auxiliary may rise to C (cf. (6)), a movement excluded in *realis* conditionals with past marking (cf. (7b)), where the past marking does have temporal force. In *realis* contexts, the (same) C *if* does not value Infl, but Infl is valued by the verb morphology.

(6)   <u>Had</u> she arrived, I would not have left.   (R & W's (63))
(7a)   If she really arrived last night, she will be here today.
(7b)   *<u>Has</u> she really arrived, she will be here today.
(7c)   *If she really arrived <u>right now</u>, she will be here today.   (R & W's (64a-c))

In the absence of substantive content in Infl (as in the English imperative), Infl may be valued by the substantive content associated with Comp. This is important for my purpose here because it shows that the same C may differ in whether it values Infl for [±coin] or not. I would like to extend this to Chinese where the same low C *le* differs in whether it values Infl for [±coin] or not. This valuation by temporal content, hence by *tense*, in turn is taken as making the sentence finite, as in Indo-European languages.
This is different from Wiltschko's (2017) own proposal for Chinese: Mandarin SFPs are the functional equivalent of finiteness marking in Indo-European languages. More precisely, Chinese finiteness is said to be construed in the topmost GroundP involving the speech act participants. This can, however, not be correct, given that the SFPs realizing this GroundP correspond to the SFPs realizing AttP in the split CP (cf. (1) above), which - along with Force SFPs - are excluded from non-root contexts, including finite embedded clauses (cf. a.o. Pan & Paul 2016, Paul & Pan 2017). In other words, Chinese associates *temporal* content with Infl/T°, like English (also cf. Y.-H. Audrey Li 2017b), not *participant* content, like Blackfoot.

3. Temporal interpretation in Chinese
Each sentence in Mandarin Chinese can be assigned a temporal interpretation. In order to tease out the contributing factors, Lin Jo-wang (2006, 2012), on the one hand, and Sybesma (2007), Sun Hongyuan (2014), on the other, examine sentences with bare predicates, i.e. sentences without any temporal adverbs, aspect marking, SFPs. (Note that these studies do neither explicitly state the absence of SFPs in their definition of bare predicates nor do they address the role SFPs might play in the temporal interpretation of bare predicates. Cf. Lin Jo-wang (2003: §4.3) for an attempt to determine the temporal semantics of the low C *le*.)
For the purpose of the present talk, Sun Hongyuan's (2014) approach based on the dichotomy *stative* vs *eventive* predicates is adopted here (although it is not without problems, either). (S.Y. Chen (2017), S.Y. Chen & Husband (2018)) confirm the future/non-future distinction.)
        According to Sun Hongyuan (2014, 2017) Mandarin has a TP projection. It has a covert tense NONFUT restricting the temporal reference of bare root clauses to present tense (including generic reading) and past tense. By contrast, future tense requires a modal auxiliary (e.g. *huì* 'will'). Note that *bare* sentences with a future interpretation are no counterexamples, for they do not assert future *eventualities*, but a *plan* (as evidenced by required agent control, cf. (10a) vs (10b)):

(8)   ({Xiànzài/ qùnián}) Lùlu zhù zài jiānádà.
       now   / last.year Lulu live in Canada
      'Lulu lives in Canada now / Lulu lived in Canada last year.'

(9a) {(Jīntiān/ zuótiān)} Lùlu hěn jǔsàng.
        today / yesterday   Lulu very frustrated
      'Lulu is frustrated today/ was frustrated yesterday.'

(9b) Míngtiān Lùlu *(jiānghuì) hěn jǔsàng.   (9c)   Xiàzhōu   Lùlu hěn máng
      tomorrow Lulu   will   very frustrated   next.week Lulu very busy
      'Lulu will be frustrated tomorrow.'   'Next week, Lulu will be very busy.'

(10a) Zhongguó duì   míngtiān *({huì/néng}) yíng.
      China   team tomorrow   will/can   win
      'The Chinese team {will/can} win/*wins tomorrow.'

(10b) Zhongguó duì   míngtiān bǐsài.
      China   team tomorrow play
      'The Chinese team plays tomorrow.'

<u>Temporal interpretation</u> of bare predicates is a function of the predicate's semantic type:
state vs *eventive* predicate (activity, achievement, accomplishment) (Sun 2014: 54-55):

(i) Sentences with a bare <u>state</u> yield present tense stative readings: no overt aspect marking is
required for a past tense interpretation in the presence of a temporal adverb (cf. (9a) above))

(ii) Sentences with a bare <u>eventive</u> predicate only allow a habitual reading:

(11) Tā dǎ wǎngqiú / chōu yān.
      3SG hit tennis   / inhale smoke
      'She plays tennis/smokes.' (habitual reading, not: 'She is playing tennis/smoking.')

For the *episodic* reading of *eventive* predicates, an overt aspect is required, the presence of a
temporal adverb on its own is not sufficient:

(12a) Cǐ-shí-cǐ-kè   tā *(zài) dǎ wǎngqiú/ chōu yān.
      this-time-this moment 3SG PROGR hit tennis   / inhale smoke
      'Right now, she is playing tennis/smoking.'

(12b) Shàng ge yuè   tā kàn*(-le) "sān guó   yǎnyì".
      last   CL month 3SG see -PERF 3 kingdom romance
      'Last month, he read the *Romance of the three kingdoms*.'   (Sun Hongyuan 2014: 50)

(12c) Wǒ jiàndào Lìchuān de shíhou, tā *(zài)   huà yī fú huà.
      1SG see   Lichuan SUB time   3SG PROGR paint 1 CL picture
      'When I saw Lichuan, she was painting a picture.'   (Sun Hongyuan 2014: 254)

Accordingly, aspect needs to be *explicitly* marked in Chinese, except for stative predicates.
Cf. already Kong Lingda (1994: 436; III) who made this observation for psych predicates
(*xǐhuān* 'like', *tǎoyàn* 'hate, dislike') and for equative sentences with the copula *shì* 'be':

(13a) Tā xǐhuān yóuyǒng.   (13b) Wǒ shì lǎoshī.
       3SG like   swim   1SG be teacher
       'She likes swimming.'   'I'm a teacher.'

4. Finite sentences without any low C in Chinese

Chinese being a language *with* (covert) tense, the finite/non-finite nature of a clause can be associated with tense, as is the standard assumption for Indo-European languages.

While it is true that not many sentences in Mandarin Chinese consist of a bare predicate only, there is a large array of well-formed sentences displaying aspect marking, temporal adverbs, auxiliaries, negation etc. *without* any overt low C. These sentences will show that finiteness often does not involve any <u>overt head</u> in the CP of root clauses, on a par with e.g. English.

Selection of cases based on Kong Lingda (1994) (partly illustrated with additional data)
<u>(I) Stative predicates can be bare:</u> they have a present tense interpretation by default, and a past tense interpretation in the presence of a past time adverb (cf. section 3 above, (8), (9a)).
(II) <u>Eventive predicates (activites, accomplishments and achievements)</u>
Eventive predicates may be bare only under a habitual reading (cf. (11) above). Otherwise, they require overt aspect marking and/or auxiliaries, temporal adverbs, negation. (Depending on the semantics of the predicate, adverbs may be required for a habitual reading.)

(14a) Mǎlì {hěn shǎo/jīngcháng} {kū /xiào}.
       Mary   very little/ often   cry/smile
       'Mary rarely/often cries/smiles.'

(14b) Zhōngguó duì   zǒng   shū/yìng.
       China   team always lose/win
       'The Chinese team loses/wins all the time.'   (Sun Hongyuan 2014: 51)

(14c) Tā [yī -tiān-dào -wǎn] kàn   diànyǐng.   (Kong 1994: 436)
       3SG 1 -day-arrive-late watch movie
       'He watches films from dawn to night.'

(14d) Tā jīngcháng kàn diànyǐng/mǎi zázhì   / xǐ yīfú.
       3SG often   watch movie/ buy magazine/ wash clothes
       'He often watches movies/buys magazines/does the laundry.'

Auxiliaries:

(15a) Tā yīnggāi mǎi zázhì   / xǐ   yīfú.
       3SG must   buy magazine/ wash clothes
       'He must buy magazines/do the laundry.'

(15b) Ta zài   kàn   diànyǐng/ mǎi zázhì   / xǐ   yīfú   / chī fàn.
       3SG PROGR watch movie   / buy magazine/ wash clothes/ eat food
       'He is watching a movie/buying magazines/doing the laundry/eating.'

Aspect suffixes:
(16)   Tā chī-le   dúyào / làn   píngguǒ/ liǎng wǎn miàn.
       3SG eat-PERF poison/ rotten apple   / 2   bowl noodles
       'She took poison/ate rotten apples/ate 2 bowls of noodles.'

(17a) Tāmen lí   -le   hūn.   (17b) Tā pò   -le   chǎn.
       3SG   separate-PERF marriage   3SG break-PERF product
       'They got divorced.'   'He went bankrupt.'

(18)   Tā chū-guo   chāi.
       3SG go.out-EXP errand
       'She has been on business trips before.'

(19)   Tā yī -dà -zǎo jiù hē -le chá.   (Kong 1994: 437)
       3SG 1 -big-early then drink-PERF tea
       'She has already had tea very early in the morning.'

Negation:

(20)   Wǒ bù jìdé   tā.
       1SG NEG remember 3SG
       'I don't remember him.'

(21)   Tā bù chū   chāi / bù hē   kāfēi.
       3SG NEG go.out errand / NEG drink coffee
       'He doesn't (want to) go on business trips/ drink coffee.'

(22)   Tā méi chū   chāi / méi hē   kāfēi / xǐ   yīfú.
       3SG NEG go.out errand/ NEG drink coffee/ wash clothes
       'She didn't go on a business trip/drink coffee/do the laundry.'

(23)   Tāmen méi xiào / méi shū / méi dào.
       3PL   NEG laugh/ NEG lose / NEG arrive
       'They didn't laugh/lose/arrive.'

5. Sentences with a bare predicate and with our without C
So far, there exists no satisfying analysis for the semantic import of the low C *le*, for which Li & Thompson (1981: 238-318) provide 60 pages of examples. (This wealth of data directly challenges the reductive claims made in Tsai (2008), Tang & Lee (2009), Soh Hooi-ling (2009) a.o.) Li & Thompson's (1981: 238) label "currently relevant state" is adopted here, for it captures best the admittedly very minimal common denominator for the different cases of *le*, i.e. the fact that *le* is often required to "close off" the sentence and that (in the absence of any other explicit reference time) it relates the event to the speech time, which might, but need not, induce an interpretation of the situation as new, i.e. as not having hold prior to the utterance time. (Also cf. Lin 2003 and the brief overview plus references in Paul 2015: 7.2.1.2).

5.1. *Cases where the low C* le *is required to "close off" a sentence with a bare predicate*
It is well-known that the low C *le* may be required to render a sentence "complete", i.e. to make it acceptable as an independent sentence (cf. a.o. Kong Lingda 1994, Huang Nansong 1994, Tang & Lee 2000, Tsai 2008). Based on Kong Lingda and supplemented by additional data, the "obligatoriness" of *le* as the semantically most "neutral" low C is examined here, taking into account the possible temporal interpretations of the bare predicate.
       Recall that eventive predicates can be bare only under a habitual reading. In the absence of any *overt* TP-internal marking (aspect, negation, auxiliaries etc.), the low C *le* is obligatory to obtain a well-formed independent sentence with a past tense interpretation:

5

(24a) Tā bì yè *(le).   (24b) Tā jié hūn *(le).
       3SG finish studies SFP   3SG link marriage SFP
       'She has graduated.'   'He got married.'

Given the past tense reading in the presence of the low C *le*, the juxtaposition in (25a-b) below must be analysed as a coordination, not as a complex sentence 'when ……then…'

(25a) Tā bì yè le , wǒ yě bì yè le.
       3SG finish studies SFP 3SG also finish studies SFP
       'She has graduated, I have graduated, too.'

(25b) Tā bì yè *(le), wǒ hái méiyǒu.
       3SG finish studies SFP 3SG still NEG
       'She has graduated, I have not graduated yet.'

(26a) [Force [LowC [TP Tā bì yè] le] ma]?   (26b) Bì yè *(le).
              3SG finish studies SFP SFP   finish studies SFP
       'Has she graduated? She has.'

The obligatoriness of *le* (for the past tense reading) likewise holds in the answer to a preceding question. This fact plus the presence of *le* in the conjoined structures (25a-b) is noteworthy, because Tang & Lee (2000) present occurrence in a coordination as a way of "anchoring tense", thus rendering the "closing off" by e.g. *le* superfluous. (A bare predicate is marginally acceptable with a future plan interpretation, to the exclusion of a past tense interpretation: ?? *Tā bì yè, wǒ yě bì yè* 'When he graduates, I'll graduate as well.')

    The lexical meaning of the predicate plays an important role in determining the temporal interpretation and hence the (non-)obligatoriness of the low C *le*. When a present tense (including future plan) or a habitual reading is possible and intended, *le* is not present (cf. (29a-b)); for a past tense reading, by contrast, *le* is required (cf. (27b), (28a-b)):

(27a) Lǎobǎn zěnme bù zài?   (27b) Tā chū chāi *(le).
       boss   how   NEG be.present   3SG go.out errand SFP
       'How come the boss is not in? She has gone on a business trip.'

(28a) [Force [LowC [TP Tā chū chāi] le] ma] ? (28b) Chū chāi *(le).
               3SG go.out errand SFP SFP   go.out errand SFP
       'Has she gone on a business trip? She has.'

(29a) [Force [TP Tā chū chāi] ma] ?   (29b) Tā chū chāi.
               3SG go.out errand SFP   3SG go.out errand
       (i) 'Will she go on a business trip?'   '(Yes), she will/she does.'
       (ii) 'Does she go on business trips?' (habitual)

(30) ?Tā xǐ yifu le.   (31) Tā mǎi shū le.
        3SG wash clothes SFP   3SG buy book SFP
        'He did the laundry'.   'She bought books.'
        (??) 'He now does the laundry.'   (??) 'She now buys books.'
The past interpretation obtains by default in the presence of *le*, an inceptive action interpretation is eventually possible (subject to variation); *inter alia* it depends on whether the predicate allows for a habitual reading.

(N.B. <u>Bare</u> activity predicates are acceptable under a progressive reading when answering a question such as 'What are you doing? I'm doing the laundry/writing letters' etc.)

Interim summary: The obligatory presence of the low C *le* (for a sentence with a bare predicate) holds for the past tense interpretation, not for the habitual or (future) plan interpretation. In the absence of any overt marking (aspect, auxiliaries, negation, temporal adverbs), the low C *le* values [tense] and makes the sentence finite.

5.2. *Low C* le *is not obligatory (TP is independently well-formed)*
First illustrated for stative predicates (acceptable in their bare form, cf. section 3 above):
(32)   Tā yǐqián   shì shùxué lǎoshī , xiànzài shi yīngwén lǎoshī   (le).
        3SG formerly be math   teacher now   be English   teacher SFP
        'He used to be a math teacher, now he is an English teacher.'

(33)   Tā yǐqián xìng   Zhāng, xiànzài xìng   Lǐ (le).
        3SG formerly call.by.surname Zhang now   call.by.surname Li SFP
        'Her family name used to be Zhang, now it is Li.'

Second, illustrated for atelic predicates with overt aspect marking:
(34a)   Wǒ zài zhèr zhù-<u>le</u>   wǔ nián.
        1SG at here live-PERF 5   year
        'I lived here for 5 years.'

(34b)   Wǒ zài zhèr zhù-<u>le</u>   wǔ nián <u>le</u>.
        1SG at here live-PERF 5   year SFP
        'I have lived here for 5 years.'

According to Zhu Dexi (1982: 209), (34a) implies my no longer living here; he states explicitly that (34a) means the same as *Wǒ zài zhèr zhù-<u>guo</u> wǔ nián*. (By contrast, Lin Jo-wang (2003: 280) notes two interpretations for (34a), the living here either still holding or not.) With the low C *le* present as in (34b), there is only one reading for Zhu Dexi, i.e. 'living here' still holds at speech time (*idem* for Lin Jo-wang 2003).

6. Conclusion
Chinese is not a tenseless language, but it has (covert) *Tense* with a [non-future] value, resulting in past or present tense interpretation (including habitual reading) for bare predicates in root clauses. The subject is hosted by TP/IP, i.e. a separate projection *above* negation and AspP. The majority of clauses are tensed, hence finite, *without* a low C.
Whether a low C is obligatory for the finiteness of a sentence i.e. whether it is required for checking the [tense] feature depends on whether the intended temporal interpretation can be obtained TP-internally. This in turn depends on *inter alia* the (semantic) type of the predicate (stative vs eventive) and its telic vs atelic nature.
When a C-head is present, the sentence is necessarily finite. For higher Cs (Force and Attitude) this is simply a matter of s-selection; for low Cs, we have seen that the matter is more complicated and depends on the TP itself. Importantly, the relation between the presence of a C and the finiteness of the proposition involved only works one way, i.e. the unacceptability of an overt low C does <u>not</u> allow to deduce the non-finite character of the sentence at hand.
Concerning the finiteness of embedded clauses, an overt subject is only permitted in a finite clause, i.e. the presence of an overt subject signals finiteness (*contra* Hu et al. 2001, Niina Zhang (to appear), among others, see appendix).

APPENDIX: *Previous studies on finiteness in embedded clauses and on tense*

1. Lin Jo-wang (2003, 2006, 2012, 2017) on Tense (also cf. Smith & Erbaugh 2005)

For a critical appraisal of Lin Jo-wang (2006), cf. a.o. Li Nan (2016: sections 2.1. and 2.2)

There is no TP in Chinese and Aspect plays the role that Tense plays in a tensed language; every sentence is headed by (imperfective or perfective) Aspect (Lin Jo-W. 2017; 2012: 681). The temporal interpretation of Chinese sentences can be determined by default aspect (for bare predicates), overt aspectual markers, temporal adverbs, and pragmatic reasoning.

Homogeneous situations (atelic predicates: states and activities) have a default *imperfective* aspect and *present* time interpretation (unless overridden by a temporal adverb or a contextual topic time)

Heterogeneous situations (achievements and accomplishments) have a default *perfective* aspect and the *past* interpretation.

Problems: A sentence cannot be an AspP. Irrespective of the label chosen (TP, IP), there is ample evidence for a distinct projection with an always covert head (cf. Ernst 1994, Law & Ndayiragije 2017) *above* AspP, ModalP and negation hosting the subject DP. The claimed Spec-Head relation between subject DP and (any) highest head in the extended verbal projection is invalidated by the position of sentential and VP-level adverbs (e.g. *xiǎnrán* 'evidently', *hái* 'still') below the subject and above negation, auxiliaries etc. and by the internal TopP below the subject and above negation, auxiliaries etc. (cf. Paul (2015: 20-25) for further discussion). (Lin (2006: 3) still assumes: [CP**..**[IP [ModalP …[AspP …. [VP….]]]]].)

Lin's default aspect approach predicts an *ongoing* (present) reading for a bare activity verb, but in general only the habitual (present) reading is available here (cf. (11) above).

Bare achievement predicates such as *dǎpò* 'break' are predicted by Lin to yield a past tense interpretation, but many speakers require an *overt* perfective aspect suffix *-le* here:

(i)　　Ta　dǎpò*(-le)　yī ge huāpíng/ wǒ de huāpíng/nèi ge huāpíng.
　　　　3SG break-PERF　1 CL vase　/ 1SG SUB vase　　that CL vase
　　　　'He broke a vase/my vase/that vase.'

2. Tang & Lee (2000: 17) posit the SFP *le* as an overt past tense marker in *Tense* (plus T-to-C movement in a head-initial CP followed by movement of TP to SpecCP to derive the correct linear order; cf. Pan & Paul (2016) for problems with this Kaynean derivation). In the absence of *le*, they posit a covert element in T° which is either bound by a tense or a by focus operator [sic!] in C, as stated in their *Generalized Anchoring Principle*: "Every sentence must be either tensed or focused at the LF interface level".

Problems: A general equation between *le* and past tense is *not* borne out by the data (e.g. *Xià yǔ* *(*le*)). The well-formedness of bare predicates in root clauses is glossed over, the conditions for covert T° are not spelt out. No precise model capturing the temporal interpretation in Chinese is proposed, and nothing is said about the link between tense and finiteness.

3. Tsai (2008: 675): "Based on an insight from S[hizhe]. Huang's (2005) plurality analysis of eventuality predicates, we propose to analyze tense-anchoring as a process of spelling out an underlying event argument by a variety of morphosyntactic means. This process may involve event coordination, event subordination, event modification, event quantification, or verb raising to *v*/T." As for the SFP *le*, it is "an inchoative/evidential marker in the left periphery in Rizzi's (1997) sense." (Tsai 2008: 687).

Main problem in Tsai (2008): his demonstration is based on the "incompleteness" of the root clauses 'S V-*zhe* (DP)', with -*zhe* as alleged overt "aspect". However, -*zhe* is precisely *not* an aspectual suffix ("durative") on a par with -*le*, -*guo*, but -*zhe* encodes the *dependent* nature of the verbal projection (cf. Djamouri & Paul (2011; 2018); hence its preponderance in *non*-root contexts (e.g. as adjunct or as complement of a higher head, which can be an *aspectual* head).

3. Huang (2017) on Hu et al. (2001)

Hu, Jianhua/Pan, Haihua/Xu, Liejiong (2001) question the existence of a finiteness distinction in Chinese *inter alia* by providing examples of overt subjects in controlled complements. However, Huang (2017) convincingly invalidates Hu et al. (2001) and shows that if acceptable at all, overt subjects are only permitted in the case of verbs that besides selecting non-finite control complements can likewise select a finite proposition (also cf. Ussery/Ding/Liu 2016): *zhǔnbèi* 'to prepare', *jìhuà* 'to plan', *juédìng* 'to decide', *quàn* 'to persu ade, urge', *bīpò* 'force'). Exclusive control verbs never allow for an overt subject: *kāishǐ* 'to begin', *jìxù* 'to continue', *tíngzhǐ* 'to stop', *shèfǎ* 'try'.

(ii)   Wǒ jiào Zhāngsan [jīntiān xiàwǔ   tā   wúlùnrúhé dōu yào lái]
        1SG tell Zhangsan today afternoon 3SG in.any.case all need come
        'I told Zhangsan <u>that</u> <u>he</u> must come this afternoon whatever happens.'

(iii)   Wǒ dǎsuàn [[tiān hēi   yǐhòu] <u>wǒmen</u> yīqǐ   qù]
        1SG plan   sky black after 1PL   together go
        'I plan <u>that</u> <u>we</u> go together after it gets dark.'
        (Hu et al. 2001: 1132, (32a-b); their translations (!), emphasis mine)

The residual data by Hu et al. (2001) do not bear further scrutiny; they are either rejected as unacceptable by other native speakers or at best marginally accepted with a <u>different</u> parsing, where the alleged subject NP *wǒ/ nǐ yīgerén* 'I/you alone' in fact is an adjunct NP:

(iv)   ??Wǒ zhǔnbèi   (Hu et al. (2001 : 1131, (30a), their translation, bracketing mine)
           1SG prepare
        [PRO [FP[AdjNP míngtiān xiàwǔ] [FP[adjPostP tiān hēi yǐhòu] [vP[AdjNP wǒ yīgerén] [vP lái]]]]]
                tomorrow aftern.   sky black after   1SG alone   come
        'I plan to come <u>alone</u> tomorrow afternoon after it gets dark.'
        (judged as marginal in Ussery et al. (2016) and rejected by many native speakers)

(v)   Ni zuihao shèfǎ   (He Yuyin (2017))
        2SG best   try
        [PRO [jintian xiàwu] [….] [vP AdjNP { nǐ   yigerén/ yigerén}/*<u>nǐ</u>   lái]]]
              today aftern.   2SG alone / alone   2SG come
        'You had better try to come by yourself this afternoon.'

(vi)   *Xuéshēng zhǔnbèi [míngtiān xiàwǔ tiān hēi   yǐhòu] <u>tāmen</u> lái]
        student   prepare tomorrow aftern. sky black after 3PL   come
        (Intended: 'The students plan to come tomorrow afternoon after it gets dark.')

4. Grano (2012, 2015, 2017)

Grano (2012, 2015) tries to argue against a finiteness distinction in Chinese; his stand is less clear in Grano (2017: 259): "[…] the contrasts identified by Lin [Tzong-hong] can all be adequately accounted for without appealing to Tense. The primary conclusion then is that finiteness contrasts do not constitute evidence for Tense in Mandarin."
(N.B. Lin Tzong-hong Jonah (2011, 2015) is in favour of a finiteness distinction and a TP node in Chinese, but uses unsound arguments; cf. Pan & Paul (2014) for discussion).

    Grano claims that the differences in size (*v*P for controlled complements vs CP elsewhere) can account for differences so far attributed to non-finite vs. finite clausal complements. However, Ussery et al. (2016) and Audrey Y.-H. Li (2017b) demonstrate that

this distinction in mere size is not sufficient. Finally, Grano bases his claims on the controversial data provided in Hu et al. (2001), invalidated by C.-T. J. Huang (2017).

5. *Niina Zhang* (to appear in *Linguistics)*
Niina Zhang concentrates on the finiteness issue of complement clauses and argues in favour of a [+finite] distinction in Chinese. She confirms (i) the C status of SFPs and (ii) the interaction of Low C with TP-internal material (as described in Paul (2009) and later works, some with Victor Junnan Pan). She does not take into account the issue of [+tense].
<u>Her claim</u>: When a clause does not allow for a low C *ne, le, láizhe*, then it is [-finite].
(Note that she uses the label "sentence-final <u>aspect</u> particles" (SFAP) for low C.)
"I advocate the view that finite clauses exhibit speaker-oriented properties, whereas non-finite ones do not; instead, non-finite clauses exhibit higher-clause-oriented properties. The contrast leads us to see the crucial role of the speaker in finite clauses. Since the role of speaker in language is universal, the finiteness distinction is universal." (p. 4-5)
<u>Main problem</u> (also visible in the citation above):
Niina Zhang does not control for properties related to <u>non-root</u> status of clausal complements vs properties related to <u>non-finite</u> status: speaker-oriented properties e.g. are typically absent from embedded, non-root clauses, despite their eventual finiteness. For example, no speaker-oriented adverbs such as *bùxìng* 'unfortunately', *kě* 'really' etc. in (finite) relative clauses.
        Some of her analyses do not bear further scrutiny and/or do not tie in with the overall syntax of Chinese. Her analysis of (vii) as involving a small clause (SC) is not warranted. The data provided show full-fledged complement clauses (with an overt subject) selected by verbs such as *tǎoyàn* 'dislike', *zànxǔ* 'appreciate', *chéngrèn* 'admit', which Zhang <u>translates</u> as ECM verbs, except for *zànxǔ* 'appreciate'. (Cf. Paul (2017a) for the non-existence of SC and ECM verbs in Chinese, extending early observations by Audrey Li (1985, 1990).)

(vii)   Wǒ tǎoyàn [Ājié zài bàngōngshì lǐ chī liúlián (*láizhe)]   (=her (25b))
        I   dislike Ajie at office   -in eat durian   SFAP
        'I dislike Ajie's eating of a durian in the office.'   (N. Zhang's glosses and translation)

(viii) Wǒ zànxǔ   [Ājié chéngrèn zìjǐ de   cuò (*le)] (= her (26b))
        1SG appreciate Ajie admit   self SUB fault SFP
        'I appreciate that Ajie has admitted his fault.'
BUT:
(ix)   Wǒmen zànxǔ   [zhè liǎng ge guójiā zhōngyú dáchéng yīzhì   de yìjiàn ***(le)]**
        1PL   appreciate this 2   CL country finally   reach   identical SUB opinion SFP
        'We appreciate that these two countries have finally reached a consensus.'

(ix) illustrates a general problem (not mentioned by Niina Zhang): given that the sentence-final position of the complement clause to the right of the matrix verb coincides with the sentence-final position of the matrix sentence, additional evidence is needed in order to decide whether an SFP is to be construed with the complement clause or the matrix sentence.
<u>Unsolved central issues</u> (raised, but left without an answer):
a) N. Zhang mentions in passing (p. 32, §4.3) the question "whether Chinese has IP, which is also a locus of finiteness (cf. Ernst 1994)", but in the end eschews a real answer. Instead, she brings in the fact that SFPs "select certain aspect features of the predicate" (p. 33 top). Note, though, that Ernst (1994) has convincingly argued that Infl is <u>not</u> the locus of aspect.
b) The existence of acceptable finite sentences <u>without</u> SFPs; they represent the majority of cases and are not restricted to sentences with adjectives, the only type discussed by Zhang:

6. *Law & Ndayiragije (2017)*

L&N argue in favour of *syntactic* Tense, contra Lin Jo-wang (2010). But like Lin Jo-wang (2010: 317), they incorrectly locate modal auxiliaries as well as the copula *shì* 'be' and the verb *yǒu* 'have' in Infl/T°, with the subject in SpecTP, despite the well-known fact that adverbs and negation precede <u>all</u> verbs (including *shì* and *yǒu*) and follow the subject; accordingly, a spec-head relation between subject and highest head in the extended verbal projection is excluded:

(xa) Tā (yě) bù shì yīngguórén   vs.   (xb) *Tā shì (yě) bù yīngguōrén
      3SG also NEG be English   3SG be also NEG English
      'He (also) is not English.'/ *He (also) not is English.'

L&N (2017: 693) nevertheless claim that T° "has no morphological expression". The latter claim is indeed correct and was already argued for in Ernst (1994), not mentioned by L&N.

References

Adger, David (2007). Three domains of finiteness: A Minimalist perspective. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.). *Theoretical and empirical foundations*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 23-58.

Bianchi, Valentina (2003). On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. In: Jacqueline Guéron & Liliane Tasmovski (eds.). *Temps et point de vue / tense and point of view*. Nanterre: Université Paris X.

Chen, Sherry Yong 2017. *Processing tenses for the living and the dead: A psycholinguistic investigation of Lifetime effects in tensed and "tenseless" languages*. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford MPhil thesis.

Chen, Sherry Yong & E. Matthew Husband (2018). Contradictory (forward) lifetime effects and the non-future tense in Mandarin Chinese. *Proc Ling Soc Amer* 3. 6:1-14. https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v3i1.4296.

Cowper, Elizabeth (2016). Finiteness and pseudofiniteness. In: *Finiteness matters: On finiteness related phenomena in natural languages*, ed. Kristin Melum Eide, 47-77. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Djamouri, Redouane & W. Paul (2011). A new approach to *-zhe*. Paper presented at the *19th meeting of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics* (IACL-19), Nankai University, Tianjin, June 11-13, 2011.

Djamouri, R. & W. Paul (2018). A new approach to *-zhe* in Mandarin Chinese. In: McClure & Vovin (eds.), *Studies in Japanese and Korean historical and theoretical linguistics and beyond*. Leiden: Brill, 110-123.

Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka (2017). Low sentence-final particles in Mandarin Chinese and the Final-over-Final Constraint. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26, 1: 37-75.

Ernst, Thomas (1994). Functional categories and the Chinese *Infl. Linguistics* 32, 2: 191-212.

Grano, Thomas (2015). *Control and restructuring*. Oxford: OUP.

Grano, Thomas (2017). Finiteness contrasts without tense? A view from Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26: 259–299.

He, Yuyin (2017). A glimpse of Mandarin obligatory control. Poster presented at *11th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics* (TEAL-11), Taipei, Taiwan; June 3-4, 2017.

Hu, Jianhua/ Haihua Pan/ Liejiong Xu (2001). Is there a finite vs non-finite distinction in Chinese? *Linguistics* 39, 6: 1117-1148.

Huang, C.-T. James (2017). On finiteness and the architecture of complements in the verbal and nominal domain. *11th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics*, Taipei, Taiwan; June 3-4, 2017.

Huáng, Nánsōng (1994). Shìlùn duǎnyǔ zìzhǔ chéng jù suǒ yīng jùbèi de ruògān yǔfǎ fànchóu. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1994, nr. 6: 441-447.

Kǒng, Lìngdá (1994). Yǐngxiǎng hànyǔ jùzi zìzú de yǔyán xíngshì [Linguistic forms that affect sentence completeness in Chinese]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1994, nr. 6: 434-440.

Law, Paul & Juvénal Ndayiragije (2017). Syntactic tense from a comparative syntax perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48, 4: 679-696.

Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson (1981). *Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Li, Nan (2016). *Tense in Mandarin Chinese : Form and meaning.* Doct.diss., Cornell University.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey (1985). *Abstract case in Chinese.* Doct. diss., USC, Los Angeles.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey (1990). *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey (2017a). Argument ellipsis and structures of noun phrases. Talk presented at the *53rd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, May 25-27, 2017.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey (2017b). On Grano's "Finiteness contrasts without Tense in Mandarin Chinese". *11th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics,* Taipei, Taiwan; June 3-4, 2017.

Lin, Jo-Wang (2003). Temporal reference in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12: 259-311.

Lin, Jo-Wang (2006). Time in a language without Tense: The case of Chinese. *Journal of Semantics* 23: 1-23.

Lin, Jo-Wang (2010). A tenseless analysis of Mandarin Chinese revisited: A response to Sybesma 2007. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41, 2: 305-329.

Lin, Jo-Wang (2012). Tenselessness. In: Binnick, Robert I. (ed.). *The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 669-695.

Lin, Jo-Wang (2017). Comments on Hongyuan Sun's "A non-future tense for Mandarin." (TEAL-11), June 2017.

Lin, Tzong-Hong J. (2011). Finiteness of clauses and raising of arguments in Mandarin Chinese. *Syntax* 14.

Lin, Tzong-Hong Jonah (2015). Tense in Mandarin Chinese sentences. *Syntax* 18: 320-342.

Pan, Victor Junnan & W. Paul (2016). Why Chinese SFPs are neither optional nor disjunctors. *Lingua* 170.

Pan, V. & W. Paul (2014). Finiteness in Mandarin Chinese and the basic syntax of *kěnéng.* Unpublished ms., available at: crlao.ehess.fr/docannexe/file/1708/keneng_squib.pdf; http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002329.

Paul, W. (2009). Consistent disharmony: Sentence-final particles in Chinese. Unpublished ms., Paris. Downloadable at: lodel.ehess.fr/crlao/docannexe.php?id=1323.

Paul, W. (2014). Why particles are not particular: SFPs in Chinese as heads of a split CP. *Studia Linguistica* 68.

Paul, W. (2015). *New perspectives on Chinese syntax.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Paul, W. (2017a). Are there small clauses in Chinese? No! Poster presented at the *11th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics* (TEAL-11), Taipei, Taiwan; June 3-4, 2017.

Paul, W. (2017b). Finiteness in Chinese: A peripheral matter? Talk presented at *The second workshop on syntactic cartography*, Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing; October 28-29, 2017.

Paul, W. (2018). Finiteness in Chinese. Talk presented at the *Wuppertaler Linguistisches Forum*, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, April 26, 2018.

Paul, W. & V. Pan (2017). What you see is what you get: Chinese SFPs as head-final Cs. In: *Discourse particles. Formal approaches to their syntax and semantics*. Bayer, J. & V. Struckmeier (eds.). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rizzi, Luigi & Giuliano Bocci (2017). The left periphery of the clause - primarily illustrated for Italian. In: M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom104.

Ritter, Elizabeth & Wiltschko, Martina (2014). The composition of Infl. An exploration of *tense, tenseless* languages and *tenseless* constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 1331-1386.

Smith, C.S. & Erbaugh, M. (2005). Temporal interpretation in Mandarin. *Linguistics* 43, 3: 713-756.

Soh, Hooi Ling (2009). Speaker presupposition and Mandarin Chinese sentence final -*le*: A unified analysis of the "change of state" and the "contrary to expectation" reading. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 3: 623-657.

Stowell, T. (1996). The phrase structure of tense. In: Rooryck & Zaring (eds.) *Phrase structure and the lexicon.*

Sun, Hongyuan (2014). *Temporal construals of Bare predicates in Mandarin Chinese.* Doct. diss., Leiden. https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/29991.

Sybesma, Rint (2007). Whether we Tense-agree overtly or not. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 3: 580-587.

Tang, Sze-Wing & Thomas Hun-tak Lee (2000). Focus as an anchoring condition. *International symposium on topic and focus in Chinese*, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, June 21-22, 2000.

Tang, Ting-chi (2000). Hànyǔ de "xiàndìng zìjù" yǔ "fēi-xiàndìng zìjù" [Finite and non-finite clauses in Chinese]. *Language & Linguistics* 1,1: 191- 214.

Tsai, Wei-tian Dylan (2008). Tense anchoring in Chinese. *Lingua* 118: 675-686.

Ussery, Cherlon/ Ding, Lydia/ Liu, Yining Rebecca (2016). The typology of Mandarin infinitives. http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v1i0.3727.

Wiltschko, Martina (2014). *The universal structure of categories. Towards a formal typology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiltschko, Martina (2017). Temporality across categories; Talk presented at TEAL-11, Taipei; June 3-4, 2017.

Zhang, Niina N. (2017). Sentence-final aspect particles as finite markers in Mandarin Chinese. lingbuzz/003519.

Zhang, Niina N. (to appear in *Linguistics*). Sentence-final aspect particles as finite markers in Mandarin Chinese.

Zhu, Dexi (1982). *Yǔfǎ jiǎngyì* [On grammar]. Beijing: Shangwu.