

Main Clause Phenomena in Subordinate Clauses: Evidence from Mandarin Chinese

Victor Junnan Pan, LLF-UMR 7110, CNRS & Université Paris 7

Base on previous studies (Pan 2015, Paul 2015, Pan & Paul 2016, Paul & Pan 2016) on the left periphery of Mandarin Chinese, a general hierarchy that orders sentence-final particles and functional projections is the following: AttP1 (Speaker's attitude) > SQP (Special questions) > iForceP (illocutionary force) > *Only*P (Sentential *only*-type focus items) > S.AspectP (sentential aspects) > TP... This talk examines the possibility for those items to appear in subordinate clauses: relatives and complement clauses on the one hand and the adverbial clauses on the other. The result is shown in the following table for the former types of clauses.

Split-CP	Sentential AspectP	<i>Only</i> P	iForceP	Rhetorical questionP	SDQP	AttitudeP
Discourse Function	Sentence aspect	Sentential focus	Illocutionary force	Force + Attitude	Force + Attitude	Speaker's attitude
Embedded context	OK (cf. 1)	OK	OK for some (cf. 2)	No	No (cf. 3)	No (cf. 4)

Two different types of embeddabilities are examined. Syntactic embeddability is to check if an element can appear syntactically in an embedded clause. For instance, the discourse attitude particles can never occur in an embedded clause; therefore, they cannot be embedded syntactically (cf. 4). On the contrary, sentential aspect elements and *only* focus can appear in an embedded clause (cf. 1); thus, they can be embedded syntactically. Semantic embeddability is to check whether an embedded element has exactly the same interpretation or the same pragmatic function in an embedded clause as in a matrix clause. For instance, the sentential aspect elements like *le* (inchoative), *ne* (progressive) and *laizhe* (recent past) have the same interpretation in an embedded clause and in a matrix clause; therefore, they are considered as elements that can be semantically embedded (cf. 1). A perfective *yes-no* question marker *meiyou* 'have not' can appear in an embedded clause to construct an indirect *yes-no* question; however, it does not have the same interpretation in an embedded question as in a root question. A root question is different from an indirect question in that a root question bears an illocutionary force. Since an illocutionary force cannot be embedded, the *yes-no* question force of *meiyou* can only be realized in a root question but not in an embedded question. As a result, *meiyou* can only be embedded syntactically but not semantically (cf. 2). By contrast, the "standard" *yes-no* question particle *ma* and the "confirmation request" *yes-no* question particle *ba* cannot be embedded at all, neither syntactically nor semantically. In a general way, the discourse particles that express the speaker's subjective attitude or mood cannot be embedded semantically either and these elements show 'root phenomena' (cf. 4). It is very important to note that there are two different particles *laizhe*: the lower one indicates the temporal-related "recent past" interpretation which can be embedded both syntactically and semantically and the higher one strongly related to the speaker's attitude, paraphrased roughly as "by the way" (cf. 4) cannot be embedded syntactically or semantically. In fact, the lower progressive aspect particle *ne* also has a higher attitude-related counterpart which cannot be embedded. This study confirms that for the core projections in the periphery, the higher a projection is, the more subjective its interpretation is and the harder it can be embedded. The observation on Syntax is that the functional projections below ForceP can appear in the non-root/embedded contexts; while, those above ForceP cannot. I will argue that such a root/non-root distinction on Syntax is mostly determined by the discourse nature of those projections. Namely, the functional projections which are linked directly to the speaker's attitude can hardly be embedded, those not linked to the speaker's attitude, such as sentence aspects can be embedded. Thus, the more a functional projection is linked to the

Speaker's attitude the less likely it can be embedded. S.AspP (cf. 1) and *Only*P are not linked directly to the speaker's attitude; therefore, they can be embedded syntactically and semantically. As for the elements at iForceP (cf. 2), some of them can be embedded syntactically, and others cannot; none of them can be embedded semantically. SQP (cf. 3) and AttP (cf. 4) strongly express the speaker's mood, interjection and attitude and therefore, they cannot be embedded semantically or syntactically. The embeddability test based on the Main Clause Phenomena (MCP) is considered as an indirect argument in favor of the proposed hierarchy for the functional projections. The degree of the difficulty of the semantic embeddability of a functional element is correlated to the relevant height of the functional projection that hosts such an element in the left periphery.

- (1) a. [_{S.AspP} [_{TP} Zhangsan gangcai zai zher [_{S.AspP}° laizhe]]].
 Zhangsan just-now at here Recent.Past
 'Zhangsan was here just now.'
- b. [_{S.AspP} [_{TP} gangcai zai zher da dianhua [_{S.AspP}° laizhe]]] de na-ge ren
 just-now at here make call Recent.Past C that-Cl person
 'the person who [was making a phone call here just now].'
- (2) a. [_{iForceP} [_{TP} Ta qu-guo Lundun [_{iForceP}° meiyou]]]?
 he go-Exp London Q_{yes/no}
 'Has he ever been in London?'
- b. [_{iForceP} [_{TP} Ta qu-guo Lundun [_{ForceP}° meiyou]]] bing bu zhongyao.
 he go-Exp. London Q_{yes/no} really Neg important
 '[Whether he has been in London before] is not important.'
- (3) a. [_{SDQP} Ni zou-shenme]?! b. * Ta wen wo/ xiang-zhidao [_{SDQP} ni zou-shenme].
 you leave-what he ask me wonder you leave-what
 'Why are you leaving?! ('He asks me/wonders why you are leaving.')
- = You should not leave!'
- (4) a. [_{AttP} [_{iForceP} Q-wh [_{TP} Tamen lia shenme shihou jiehun]] [_{AttP}° laizhe]]?
 they both what time marry b.t.w
 'By the way, when will they get married?'
- b. * [_{AttP} [_{iForceP} Q-wh [_{TP} Tamen lia shenme shihou jiehun]] [_{AttP}° laizhe]]
 they both what time marry b.t.w
 de wenti bing bu qingchu.
 C question really Neg clear
 ('The question (*by the way,) when they will get married is not totally clear.')

MCP are also observed for Attitude-related particles embedded within adverbial clauses. Both TP-external and TP-internal adverbial clauses exist in Chinese and I will argue that they should be uniformly analyzed as adjuncts. However, the distinction between them does not really coincide with the distinction between the peripheral vs. central adverbial clauses in the sense of Haegeman (2012). I will argue against the analysis of TP-external adverbial clause as sentential Topic occupying the TopicP. Analyzing the TP-external adverbial clause as an adjunct to TP could raise problems with regard to the Labeling Algorithm since they form an unlabelable pair {XP, YP}. I will adopt the idea of Cecchetto & Donati (2015) that the function of Labels is to guide the derivation. When the derivation reaches the root (i.e. the end), labels are no long necessary, which is why the resulting structure involving a sentential adjunct to TP can remain unlabeled.

Selected references: HAEGEMAN, L. 2012. *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena and the composition of the left periphery: the cartography of syntactic structures*. OUP. PAN, V.-J. 2015. Mandarin Peripheral Construals at Syntax-Discourse Interface, *The Linguistic Review*, Volume 32, Issue 4, p. 819-868. PAUL, W. (2015). *New perspectives on Chinese syntax*. [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 271]. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.