

Gaps in Parts of Speech in Chinese and Why?

Marie-Claude Paris

6.1 Introduction

When trying to elicit how different parts of speech function in Chinese, the first general question to be answered is: how is the list of parts of speech established in a given language? Here I will neither adopt the generativist point of view¹ nor adopt a point of view shared by cognitive typologists and neuroscientists.² I will simply compare some sets of facts in Chinese and French or English and try to provide a functional explanation of the data within a general linguistics framework.

In the generative paradigm, the study of parts of speech has been reduced to four categories, namely N(oun), V(erb), A(djective) and P(reposition), represented by means of the following binary features: [+/-N] and [+/-V]. For typologists, lexical categories are prototype notions with fuzzy boundaries, established conceptually by characterizing language particular semantic maps across universal conceptual spaces. Hence the parts of speech they obtain are 'notional'. Objects/entity-denoting elements are associated with nouns, actions/event-denoting elements are associated with verbs, and properties with adjectives. In my view, this tri-partition does not take into account the fine-grained behavior of word classes, because it deliberately refuses to use distributional tests. It makes use of an

¹ I use this term in a very broad fashion. I do not work in the formal paradigm used by Abney (1987), who sets a parallelism between the heads of NPs and that of CPs. Bošković (2008, 2009) contrasts NP and DP languages in a fruitful way. He shows that NP languages like Chinese manifest interesting syntactic/semantic properties when set in contrast with DP languages, like English. Being an article-less language, as a consequence Chinese is a C⁰-less language. Here are the eight properties that Bošković (2008) attributes to languages which have and do not have articles: (a) languages *without* articles may allow: (i) left branch extraction, (ii) adjunct extraction from noun phrases, (iii) scrambling, and (iv) island sensitivity in head-internal relatives; but they do not allow (v) clitic doubling or (vi) transitive nominals with two genitives; (vii) if multiple *wh*-fronting is possible, they do not show superiority effects; (b) languages *with* articles may allow clitic doubling. More tests are provided in Bošković and Gajewski (2011) as well as in Bošković and Hsieh (2013).

² See, for instance, Croft (2001) and Kemmerer (2014).

intuitive/coarse-grainedly, in cognition

I believe that even that only distributional evidence, across languages, is similar. Some classes in one language may be different from another or may be the same. Some classes should be different (L₁), noted Ø, show related constructions with redundancy than in another system is based on speech in the noun sentences.³

This chapter is about the aspects of the question compared to French and possessive pronouns correlates with the NPs and show that relative clauses are portmanteau relative marking⁴ in Chinese of counterfactuals on the verbs. In Section 6.2 that of clausal complement in Chinese to the lack of the presence of a complementizer in the coordination. I describe how VP is the first verb. Verbs are prohibited in Chinese, verbal anaphora, verbs and have same marking and whose

The absence of a simple and in compounds, as well as. Added to the lack of that some parts of speech I will try to show.

³ Due to lack of space, I cannot adopt Lin's (2003, 2006, 2011)

The Cambridge Handbook of Chinese Linguistics
ed. by Chomun Huang, Ye-Hwei Lin, I-Hsuan Chen, Yu-Yin Hsu.

Cambridge University Press, 2022. 114-134.

intuitive/coarse-grained semantics, seeking universals of language *externally*, in cognition and in discourse.

I believe that explanation in linguistics should be based *internally* and that only distributional criteria are valid for establishing categories. For sure, across languages categories are not identical: they are (partially) similar. Some classes which exist (overtly) in a given language do not in another or may exist, *but covertly*. Moreover subclasses within major classes should be differentiated. The absence of a category in one language (L_1), noted \emptyset , should find its *raison d'être* by comparing it to a functionally related construction in another language (L_2). As Chinese shows much less redundancy than French, I would like to show that this (very) economical system is based on (the same abstract) syntax. I will first study some parts of speech in the noun phrase, then in the verb phrase, and finally in complex sentences.³

This chapter is structured as follows: in Section 6.2, I first study some aspects of the quantification of the simple noun phrase in Chinese as compared to French or English. Then, I describe the paradigms of personal and possessive pronouns. The absence of subject-verb agreement in Chinese correlates with the absence of dummy pronouns. I then turn to complex NPs and show that Chinese uses a unique marker of nominalization in relative clauses and noun complements, when French and English use portmanteau relative pronouns. In Section 6.3, the absence of tense marking⁴ in Chinese is correlated to the existence of a specific paradigm of counterfactual subordinate markers and to an absence of voice marking on the verbs. In Section 6.4, I first oppose the behavior of noun phrases to that of clausal complements and then link the absence of complementizers in Chinese to the lack of subject-verb agreement. This explains why, even in the presence of a subject and a verb carrying an aspect marker, a complementizer never appears in clausal objects. In Section 6.5, I study the coordination of sentences containing identical verb phrases and describe how VP ellipsis is sensitive to both the syntax and semantics of the first verb. Verbal anaphors must be full verbs; hence verb gapping is prohibited in Chinese. According to their scope and their semantic properties, verbal anaphors take two different forms: they are either (i) lexical verbs and have small scope or (ii) proxy predicates which take no aspectual marking and whose scope is wide.

The absence of agreement in Chinese is a phenomenon that applies (i) in simple and in complex noun phrases, (ii) in simple and complex verb phrases, as well as (iii) across (subject) noun phrases and verb phrases. Added to the lack of syncretic or fused forms, this gives the impression that some parts of speech are 'lacking' in Chinese, but this is not the case, as I will try to show.

³ Due to lack of space, I cannot treat other parts of speech, such as, for example, adjectives.

⁴ I adopt Lin's (2003, 2006, 2010) viewpoint.

6.2 The Striking Absence of Some Categories in the Noun Phrase

6.2.1 In the Simple Noun Phrase

In Chinese, the absence of articles, of focal, oblique, and dummy pronouns as well as that of a specific paradigm of pronominal possessive expressions are studied here.

6.2.1.1 Absence of Articles, Presence of Classifiers, and Lack of Agreement Features within the Noun Phrase in Chinese

Chinese lacks the opposition between definite and indefinite articles; moreover, neither gender nor number agreement is found between the noun and its determiners. Hence the difference between the French masculine *un* and feminine *une* singular indefinite articles, as in (1), is not attested, because *yi* 'one' does not mark gender, cf. (2a–b):

- (1) *un livre/une table*
a__book/a__table

- (2a) 一本书
yi__ben__shu
one__CL__book
alone book
un livre

- (2b) 一张桌子
yi__zhang__zhuozi
one__CL__table
alone table
une table

The plural indefinite French article *des* agrees in number with its following noun, as in (3).

- (3) *des tables*
(some) tables

The bare noun (4), 桌子 *zhuozi* 'table' in Chinese, which corresponds to the French determiner + noun expression 'la/une/les/des table(s)' in (3), can be written as (5):

- (4) 桌子
zhuozi
alone table; (some) tables

- (5) Ø桌子(-Ø)
Ø *zhuozi*(-Ø)
alone table; (some) tables

Notice that there is no change in form between the singular and the plural forms of the noun in Chinese (no -s). Hence, compared to the indefinite article *des* and the plural suffix -s in (3), there exist in Chinese neither a plural article nor a plural nominal suffix on common nouns.⁵

⁵ Contrary to inanimate nouns, which evidence no singular/plural distinction in Chinese, personal pronouns, as well as some animate nouns do: (i) *wo//women* 'I//we', *ni//ni(men)* 'you//you', *ta//ta(men)*, 'he/she//they'; (ii) *xuesheng//xuesheng(men)* 'students'. The suffix *-men* occurs only with animate nouns. See, among others, Bošković and Hsieh (2013).

The comparison
and Chinese exan

- (i) There is a gap
morpheme *yi*
the unspecific
cardinal num
distribution i
and the quan
can be option

- (6) 他想要
ta__xia
3SG__v
He want

- (7) 两个人
liang__
two__C
Two per

- (ii) The absence of
the following
must be marked
numeral, as in
and (9):

- (8) three books
(9) *three books

The equivalent of (i)
cf. (10).

- (10) 三本书
san ben shu
three__CL__
three books

The Chinese noun
classifier *ben* is obligatory
can be (partly) explained

⁶ Here the term 'gap' refers to
article *a* and quantifier *one*.
The reduplication of classifier
Reduplication is not treated in
Zhang (2014).

⁷ The mutual exclusion between
M. Sanchez, quoted in Green
and a classifier, is a counterexample

The comparison between the simple noun phrases in the French, English, and Chinese examples provided below manifest interesting phenomena:

- (i) There is a gap⁶ in the determiner system in Chinese, because only one morpheme *yi* presents two readings 'a' or 'one' corresponding either to the unspecific determiner – English indefinite article *a* – or to the cardinal number *one*. But *yi*'s semantic vagueness is only apparent. Its distribution in postverbal position shows that the indefinite reading and the quantity reading are distributionally different: indefinite *yi* 'a' can be optional, as in (6), but quantifying *yi* 'one' cannot, cf. (7):

- (6) 他想买(一)本书。
 ta_xiang_mai_(yi)_ben_shu
 3SG_want_buy_(a/one)_CL_book
He wants to buy a book.
- (7) 两个人睡一张床。
 liang_ge_ren_shui_*(yi)_zhang_chuang
 two_CL_person_sleep_one_CL_bed
Two persons sleep in (only) one bed.

- (ii) The absence of agreement marking between plural determiners and the following noun in Chinese has already been mentioned above. *-s* must be marked on the noun in English in the presence of a plural numeral, as evidenced by the contrast in grammaticality between (8) and (9):

- (8) three books
 (9) *three book

The equivalent of (8) in Chinese is more complex than in English or French, cf. (10).

- (10) 三本书
 san ben shu
 three_CL_book
three books

The Chinese noun is not marked for plurality,⁷ and the presence of the classifier *ben* is obligatory in (10). The necessary presence of the classifier can be (partly) explained by the quantifying function of the classifier,⁸

⁶ Here the term 'gap' refers to the non-existence of a linguistic element. To the two English parts of speech 'indefinite article *a*' and 'quantifier *one*', there corresponds only one morpheme in Chinese, namely *yi*.

⁷ The reduplication of classifiers and/or of nouns conveys the meaning of (distributive or collective) plurality. Reduplication is not treated here because it is a morphological phenomenon; see, among others, Paris (2007) and Zhang (2014).

⁸ The mutual exclusion between plural marking and the presence of a (nominal) classifier has first been noticed by M. Sanches, quoted in Greenberg (1972). But Vietnamese, which allows for the cooccurrence of both a plural marker and a classifier, is a counterexample to Greenberg's claim, cf. Nguyễn (1997: 141).

which makes the noun countable or measurable. But it is worth noting that the classes of nouns preceded by classifiers are not restricted to that of individual 'objects' in Croft's sense, as in (11). Nouns can just as well be abstract or eventive nouns,⁹ cf. (12)–(13). Thus, nouns in Mandarin, just like verbs, can be temporally anchored, and this semantic property is indicated by the classifier. The classifiers 通 *tong* and 场 *chang* in (12)–(13) indicate a duration:

- (11) 三部电话
 san_ju_dianhua
 three_CL_telephone
 three telephone sets

- (12) 一通电话
 yi_tong_dianhua
 one_CL_telephone
 a phone call

- (13) 下一场表演
 xia_yi_chang_biaoyan
 next_one_CL_show
 the next show

6.2.1.2 The Absence of Case Variations (or Oblique Forms) in Chinese Pronouns Is Correlated to the Absence of Emphatic Forms (i.e., Oblique Forms), Too

Pronouns which occupy different semantic roles in different syntactic positions present a case difference in English (*she/her*), as in (14):

- (14) *She_i saw her_j.*

She occupies the preverbal subject position and *her* the postverbal object position. Contrary to what is the case in English, the Chinese (pro-)nominal system does not mark any case difference between different case forms, because word order suffices to indicate the difference in syntactic functions between *ta_i* 'she' and *ta_j* 'her', cf. (15).

- (15) 她看见了她。
 ta_i_kanjian-le_ta_j
 3SG_see_PPV_3SG
 She_i saw her_j.

The absence of case-marked forms in Chinese explains why the equivalent of English (16) is (17). In (16), the two coreferential pronouns (*him_i* and *he_j*) present a formal distinction, because they play two different (syntactic and) informational roles. *Him_i* is stressed, because the prepositional phrase 'as for *him*' occupies a contrastive position. Moreover this pronoun has to be oblique, because the complex preposition 'as for' licenses an oblique form. The (nominative) subject *he* agrees with the tensed auxiliary *did*.

⁹ Huang and Ahrens (2003) are the first to have shown that eventive nouns allow classifiers in Chinese. In the Chinese 'tradition', classifiers which modify events are labeled 'verbal classifiers', but, in fact, they modify *both* verb and noun. Paris (1981: 105–117) studies the different distribution of nominal and verbal classifiers in postverbal position.

In (17), both pronouns have different stress.

- (16) As for *him_i*, *he_j* ...
 (17) 他呀, 他昨天
 ta_i_ya, ta_j_
 3SG_PART_
 As for *him_i*, *he_j* ...

Note that, in French pronouns. They are oblique forms, cf. (18)

- (18) *il-même
 3SG-self
 *he-self

As is expected because possessive/oblique *il* derived from the preposition *ta* 'he/him' vs. (21) *ti* the Chinese, English

- (20) 他
 ta
 he/him

6.2.1.3 Adjectival a Because Chinese forms compositionally and their syntactic functions 'mine'/'le mien' in Taiwan, whether their forms, which are built on distinct paradigms (adjectives) or are indicated in Table 6.2.

6.2.1.4 Absence of I In languages like English a dummy pronoun – it is obligatorily used with

¹⁰ Here the distinction between *il* and *de* is absent.

In (17), both pronouns *ta*_i are morphologically identical, but they receive a different stress.

(16) As for *him*_i, *he*_i did not show up yesterday.

(17) 他呀, 他昨天没来。
*ta*_i ya, *ta*_i zuotian mei lai
 3SG PART 3SG yesterday NEG arrive
 As for *him*_i, *he*_i did not show up yesterday.

Note that, in French, reflexive pronouns also belong to the class of emphatic pronouns. They are not built on the subject personal forms, cf. (18) but on oblique forms, cf. (19).

(18)	*il-même	(19)	lui-même
	3SG-self		3SG-self
	*he-self		him-self

As is expected because of the absence of differentiation between personal/possessive/oblique forms in Chinese, reflexive/emphatic pronouns are derived from the personal forms by concatenation with *ziji* 'self', cf. (20) *ta* 'he/him' vs. (21) *taziji* 'himself'; see Table 6.1 for a comparison between the Chinese, English, and French [+/- focus] personal forms.

(20)	他	(21)	他自己
	ta		ta ziji
	he/him		(he) himself

6.2.1.3 Adjectival and Possessive Pronouns in Chinese

Because Chinese forms are not morphologically complex and syncretic, but compositionally and syntactically formed, they do not vary according to their syntactic functions; see $NP[wo-de N]_{NP}$ ¹⁰ 'my'/'mon' and $NP[wo-de \emptyset]_{NP}$ 'mine'/'le mien' in Table 6.2. These modifying phrases are invariably nominal, whether their heads are present or absent. In English, possessive forms, which are built on the personal pronoun forms too, constitute two distinct paradigms according to whether they are modifiers of a noun (like adjectives) or are independent forms, cf. *my* N vs. *mine*, lines 5 and 6 in Table 6.2.

6.2.1.4 Absence of Dummy or Expletive Pronouns in Chinese

In languages like English where the subject must agree with the verb, a dummy pronoun – *it* in (22) or *there* in locative/existential sentences in (23) – is obligatorily used when the subject carries no thematic/semantic role.

¹⁰ Here the distinction between alienable and inalienable possession is not made. In inalienable possession, the linker *de* is absent.

Table 6.1. *Variability of forms between English and French personal [+ focus] and [- focus] pronouns*

Chinese personal pronouns [+/- focus]	<i>wo</i> 我	<i>ni</i> 你	<i>ta/ta/ta</i> 他/她/它	<i>women</i> 我们	<i>nimen</i> 你们	<i>tamen/tamen/tamen</i> 他们/她们/它们
[+ focus reflexive]	<i>wo ziji</i> 我自己	<i>ni ziji</i> 你自己	<i>ta/ta ziji</i> 他/她自己	<i>women ziji</i> 我们自己	<i>nimen ziji</i> 你们自己	<i>tamen/tamen ziji</i> 他们/她们自己
English personal pronouns						
[+ Subject, - focus]	<i>I</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>he/she/it</i>	<i>we</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>they</i>
[- Subject, + focus]	<i>Me</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>him/her/it</i>	<i>us</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>them</i>
[+ focus reflexive]	<i>Myself</i>	<i>your-self</i>	<i>him/her/itself</i>	<i>ourselves</i>	<i>yourselves</i>	<i>themselves</i>
French personal pronouns						
[+ Subject, - focus]	<i>Je</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>il/elle/il</i>	<i>nous</i>	<i>vous</i>	<i>ils/elles</i>
[- Subject, + focus]	<i>Moi</i>	<i>toi</i>	<i>lui/elle</i>	<i>nous</i>	<i>vous</i>	<i>eux</i>
[+ focus reflexive]	<i>moi-même/</i> <i>me</i>	<i>toi-même/</i> <i>te</i>	<i>lui-même/</i> <i>elle-même</i> <i>se</i>	<i>nous-mêmes</i> <i>nous</i>	<i>vous-mêmes</i> <i>vous</i>	<i>eux-mêmes</i> <i>se</i>

Table 6.2. *Invariability of forms between Chinese personal [+ focus] and [- focus] pronouns*

Chinese personal pronouns	<i>wo</i> 我	<i>ni</i> 你	<i>ta</i> 他	<i>women</i> 我们	<i>nimen</i> 你们	<i>tamen</i> 他们	1
possessive determiner	<i>wo-de N</i> 我的 N	<i>ni-de N</i> 你的 N	<i>ta-de N</i> 他的 N	<i>women-de N</i> 我们的 N	<i>nimen-de N</i> 你们的 N	<i>tamen-de N</i> 他们的 N	2
possessive pronoun	<i>wo-de Ø</i> 我的	<i>ni-de Ø</i> 你的	<i>ta-de Ø</i> 他的	<i>women-de Ø</i> 我们的	<i>nimen-de Ø</i> 你们的	<i>tamen-de Ø</i> 他们的	3
English personal pronouns	<i>I</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>he/she/it</i>	<i>we</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>they</i>	4
possessive modifier	<i>my N</i>	<i>your N</i>	<i>his/her/its N</i>	<i>our N</i>	<i>your N</i>	<i>their N</i>	5
pronominal form	<i>mine</i>	<i>yours</i>	<i>his/hers/its</i>	<i>ours</i>	<i>yours</i>	<i>theirs</i>	6

The function of the dummy pronouns (always in subject position)¹¹ only resides in triggering the agreement between the subject and verb. As there is no agreement between the subject and the verb in Chinese, consequently there is no 'dummy subject' part of speech, cf. (24)–(25). The first constituents in bold in (22) and (23) 今天 *jintian* 'today' and 外面 *waimian* 'outside' are time and locative adverbials, respectively.

¹¹ The absence of dummy pronouns in Chinese allows us to predict that cleft sentences using *it* (in the *it* ... is pattern) in English or *c'est* (in the *c'est* ... *que/qui* pattern) in French cannot be built in a similar fashion. Chinese cleft sentences use the copula 是 *shi* 'to be' without a dummy subject. Moreover, the cleft constituent is not moved in sentence initial position, as is the case in French or English. As a consequence of the lack of dummy pronouns, extraposition does not exist in Chinese. Compare (i) [*That the earth is round*] is well known with (ii) *It is well known* [*that the earth is round*]. The sentential subject in brackets in (i) appears in preverbal position. When it occupies the postverbal position, the subject position is left empty in English. To render the utterance acceptable, the subject position must be filled by *it*, cf. (ii).

(22) 今天下雨
jintian_xie
today_fa
It is raining

(24) It's raining

I have tried to sh
three strategies, v

(i) repeats an
person/nun

(26) They

(ii) does not co
(3rd person

(iii) does not i
different fu
derived pos:

The same types of

6.2.2 In the Con Pronouns

Relative clauses an
are head-final and
to the preceding co
coreference betwee
which can be a null
head noun. In (27),
not preceded by a p

(27) 在写字的那个
[Ø_i zai_xie-
Ø_i PROG_w
the person who

In (28), the [+Ani
preposition gen 'wit
because preposition
prepositional constit

(28) 王五跟他说话
[Wangwu_ge
Wangwu_wit
the student to/w

- (22) 今天下雨。 (23) 外面有一只猫。
 jintian_xia_yu waimian_you_yi_zhi_mao
 today_fall_rain outside_have_one_CL_cat
 It is raining today. There is a cat outside.
- (24) It's raining today. (25) There is a cat outside.

I have tried to show above how, in the simple noun phrase, English uses three strategies, which differ from those used by Chinese. In sum, English

- (i) repeats an identical semantic/morphological component such as person/number in bound pronouns, cf. (26):
 (26) *They are by themselves.*
- (ii) does not conflate in a single form two different syntactic features (3rd person singular + a case form), cf. (15) above,
- (iii) does not indicate in the same fashion parts of speech having different functions, such as a personal pronoun (*she/her*) and a derived possessive noun (**shes lhers*).

The same types of strategies are used in the complex noun phrases.

6.2.2 In the Complex Noun Phrase: The Absence of Relative Pronouns in Chinese

Relative clauses and noun complements are treated alike in Chinese: they are head-final and the *same* modification marker 的 *de* links the head noun to the preceding constituent. In a relative clause, there is a relationship of coreference between an internal nominal argument in the relative clause – which can be a null element or a gap, noted \emptyset , as in (27) – and the external head noun. In (27), as the relativized noun is in subject position, and thus is not preceded by a preposition, it is elided.

- (27) 在写字的那个人 ...
 [\emptyset zai_xie-zi_de] nei_ge_ren_i
 \emptyset _i PROG_write_character_DE_that_CL_person_i
 the person who is writing ...

In (28), the [+Animate] noun relativized in the complement of the preposition *gen* 'with'/'to' appears as a pronoun *ta* 'him', but not as \emptyset , because prepositions cannot be stranded in Chinese. Hence the whole prepositional constituent *gen ta* 'to him' is kept in the embedded clause.

- (28) 王五跟他说话的那个学生 ...
 [Wangwu_gen_ta_shuo-hua_de] nei_ge_xuesheng_i
 Wangwu_with_3SG_talk_DE_that_CL_student
 the student to/with whom Wangwu is talking ...

In a noun complement, like *ta xie zi de fangfa* 'the way he writes', which is in subject position in (29), coreference applies between an (implicit) adjunct in the complement and the head noun: hence there is no gap¹² in the complement clause.

(29) 他写字的方法有问题。

[ta xie-zi de] fangfa you wenti

3SG write character DE fashion have problem

The way he writes is problematical.

In English or standard French different relative pronouns mark the (different) relationships between the head nouns and their subsequent relative clauses. A relative pronoun is a *portmanteau* word, a syncretic form: it coalesces (i) a marker of embedding with (ii) a case form which varies according to the grammatical function of the gap and (iii) some semantic features of the head noun. Thus *wh-o-m* fuses the syntactic feature of embedding *wh-* with a semantic feature of [+animacy] together with the morphological object case form *-m*. In Chinese, *de* is not a relative pronoun: it is only an invariable marker of nominal modification whose form does not co-vary with the syntactic status of the gap. While three markers of embedding – *zero*, *that*, or *which* – are available in English¹³ to indicate that a gap is built on an object position, cf. (30), only one, *de*, is available in Chinese, cf. (31).

- (30) a. the apple, [which he ate Ø ...]
b. the apple [that he ate Ø ...]
c. the apple [Ø he ate Ø ...]

(31) 他吃的苹果 ...
[ta chi de] pingguo ...
3SG eat DE apple
the apple(s) that/which/Ø he ate ...

If standard French¹⁴ and English differ from Chinese in the presence of a full-fledged paradigm of relative pronouns versus that of a single 'pure' nominalizer, they also differ in another important typological aspect. As far as relativization and verb complementation are concerned, French and

¹² Note that the word 'gap' is not used here with the same meaning as in note 6 above. Here 'gap' does not mean the non-existence of something. It refers to a null element, an element which has been elided.

¹³ *Which*, *that*, and *zero* are not semantically interchangeable: *which* is only attested in descriptive relative clauses, while *that* and *zero* mark restrictive relatives, cf. (30). Hence one can predict that the clear semantic difference between restrictive and descriptive relative clauses in English, which is also formally marked, will not be as easily identified in Chinese. Some linguists claim that the difference between restrictive and descriptive relative clauses simply does not exist in Chinese, as for example Teng (1987), while others claim it does Paris (1977). See Lin and Tsai (2015) for a formal study of relative clauses modifying a proper name. Hsieh (2008: 113–133) offers a thorough description of the syntax and semantics of modifiers inside a nominal.

¹⁴ Relative clauses in substandard French behave in the same way as in Mandarin, as far as the coreferential NPs contained in PPs are concerned. There is only one single marker of embedding (*que*) and a pronominal copy of the head noun is present in the relative clause. Hence the French equivalent of (28) is 'l'étudiant *que* Wangwu parle avec lui ...'. Its translation in English is ill-formed: *the student that Wangwu speaks with him ...

English are consist head nouns and verbs. Hence in be the complementize In terms of its type language as far as guage in terms of cannot and will no complement. In suc appear in sentence i

6.3 The Gaps in

As already mentioned agree, i.e., do not co-subjects in Chinese. voices they indicate.

6.3.1 The Absence in Chinese

Aspect, but not tense. Hence when a *tense* for in French – are used conditional subordinat verbal means to indic syntactically and a serr nator. While *ruguo* 'if' subordination 要不是 (32). Note in passing th phenomenon of sequer verbs in the main and marking.

- (32) 要不是他告诉我我
yaobushi ta ga
if 3SG tell 1st
If he had not told m

6.3.2 The Absence of of an Auxiliary in Chinese does not indicat voices by means of verb

¹⁵ See Eifring (1995: 283) and Jiang (20

English are consistently head-initial languages: relative clauses follow their head nouns and sentential object complements follow their governing verbs. Hence in both languages, the relative clause marker in a NP and the complementizer in a sentential complement appear in initial position. In terms of its typology, Chinese is not a consistent language. It is an OV language as far as nominal complementation is concerned, but a VO language in terms of verbal complementation. Hence we can predict that *de* cannot and will not appear in the final position of a sentential object complement. In such a construction, the complementizer, if any, should appear in sentence initially.

6.3 The Gaps in the Verb Phrase

As already mentioned above (see Section 6.2.1.4), the verb forms do not agree, i.e., do not co-vary in number/person/gender (ϕ features) with their subjects in Chinese. They do not co-vary either according to the different voices they indicate.

6.3.1 The Absence of Verb Morphology: No Tense Markers in Chinese

Aspect, but not tense, is marked by suffixes attached to the verb in Chinese. Hence when a *tense* form – such as the preterit in English or the ‘imparfait’ in French – are used not to indicate tense but to convey *mood*, as in conditional subordinate contexts, the Chinese verb has no morphologically verbal means to indicate non-veridicality. So, it indicates it by way of a syntactically and a semantically different part of speech, i.e., by a subordinator. While *ruguo* ‘if’ indicates a general condition, the clausal marker of subordination 要不是 (*yaobu(shi)*)¹⁵ ‘if’ is restricted to counterfactuality, cf. (32). Note in passing that the absence of tense in Chinese entails that the phenomenon of sequence of tenses cannot exist. In (32) below both the verbs in the main and in the subordinate clauses do not take any verbal marking.

- (32) 要不是他告诉我我就不知道。
 yaobushi ta gaosu wo, wo jiu bu zhidao
 if 3SG tell 1SG 1SG then NEG know
 If he had not told me, I would not have known.

6.3.2 The Absence of Voice Marking on the Verb Form by Means of an Auxiliary in Chinese

Chinese does not indicate the difference between the active and passive voices by means of verb auxiliiation followed by a participial form of the

¹⁵ See Liang (1995: 283) and Jiang (2017).

lexical verb together with a concomitant change in the word order, as English and French do. It only uses a syntactic means, i.e., a difference in word order. The verb forms 扔 *reng-le* 'threw'/'has been thrown' are identical in (33)–(34), but the respective word orders of the agent/subject in the active voice and the agent/prepositional complement in the passive voice as well as their markers vary. The agent *Zhangsan* is marked by \emptyset in the active voice in (33) and by the prepositions/case markers 叫 *jiao*, 让 *rang*, or 被 *bei* in the passive example (34).

- (33) 张三扔了烟盒。
Zhangsan reng-le yanhe
Zhangsan throw PFV inkpot
Zhangsan threw the inkpot.
- (34) 烟盒叫、让、被张三扔了。
*Yanhe jiao, rang, bei Zhangsan reng-le*¹⁶
inkpot by/by/by Zhangsan throw PFV
The inkpot has been thrown by Zhangsan.

6.3.2.1 Some Prepositional Markers of the Passive Voice

As the verb form, as such, does not indicate any voice opposition in Chinese, there exist numerous markers of the external arguments whose semantic role consists in indicating the degree of transitivity¹⁷ of the verb. Thus, verbs of creation do not indicate the agent in the same way as verbs of destruction do, because they carry different presuppositions. In (35) 建造 *jianzao* 'to build' co-occurs with 由 *you* 'from', but in (36) 被 *bei* 'by' co-occurs with 吹倒 *chuidao* 'to blow down'. These two prepositions cannot be interchanged.

- (35) 这间房子是由(*被)建筑师建造的。
Zhe jian fangzi shi you/(bei) jianzhushi jianzao de
this CL house be by architect build DE
This house has been built by an architect.
- (36) 这间房子被(*由)飓风吹倒了。
Zhe jian fangzi bei/(you) jufeng chuidao-le
this CL house by hurricane blow-down PFV
This house has been blown down by a hurricane.

¹⁶ If *jiao* or *rang* or *bei* 'by' are not used, as in (34') in this note, the sentence displays an active meaning. This proves that *jiao/rang/bei* 'by' are voice markers. See Paris (1998).

(34') 烟盒(叫、让、被)张三扔了。
Yanhe, Zhangsan reng-le
inkpot Zhangsan throw PFV
The inkpot, Zhangsan threw it.

¹⁷ See Hopper and Thompson (1980).

6.3.2.2 Agent and A

Since the passive voice consequence the part difference between the (37), and 'verbal past

- (37) The door is open

But two predicative components mentioned above are a aspect marker 了 *-le*, as retrieved. When marked rive/stative and agentle

- (39) 花瓶破了。
Huaping po-le
vase break P
The vase has been

I will now turn to the coordinate clauses.

6.4 The Gap in the

6.4.1 Chinese CPs are

In Chinese, neither sentence a complementizer, i.e., to *que* in French, cf. (41) in (42) the object is a cl

- (41) 他没能来真可惜。
[Ta mei neng
3SG NEG can
It is real pity [that
C'est vraiment dom
- (42) 大家都知道哥伦布
Dajia dou zhida
everybody all k
Everybody knows [(t
Tout le monde sait [(t

Though some tests show that their semantic function separate categories. An N or a proposition. This is st

¹⁸ See Paris (1979: 75–81).

6.3.2.2 Agent and Agentless Resultative Passives

Since the passive voice is not indicated by auxiliation in Chinese, as a consequence the part of speech 'past participle' does not exist. Hence the difference between the two English forms, 'adjectival past participle', as in (37), and 'verbal past participle', as in (38), cannot exist either.

(37) *The door is open.*

(38) *The door is opened.*

But two predicative constructions corresponding to the semantic difference mentioned above are attested, cf. (39)–(40). When the verb is suffixed by the aspect marker 了 *-le*, as in (39), the predication is existential: an agent can be retrieved. When marked by 是...的 *shi ... de*,¹⁸ the predication is resultative/stative and agentless, as in (40).

(39) 花瓶破了。
Huaping __po-le
vase __break __PFV
The vase has been broken.

(40) 花瓶是破的。
Huaping __shi __po de
vase __be __break __DE
The vase is broken.

I will now turn to the study of complex sentences in subordinate and coordinate clauses.

6.4 The Gap in the Presence of Sentential Complementizers

6.4.1 Chinese CPs and NPs

In Chinese, neither sentential subjects nor sentential objects are marked by a complementizer, i.e., a functional marker equivalent to *that* in English or to *que* in French, cf. (41)–(42). In (41) the subject is a sentential subject and in (42) the object is a clausal object.

(41) 他没能来真可惜。
[Ta __mei __neng __lai] __zhen __kexi
3SG __NEG __can __come __really __pitiful
It is real pity [that [he could not come]].
C'est vraiment dommage qu'il n'ait pas pu venir.

(42) 大家都知道哥伦布现了美洲。
Dajia __dou __zhidao [Gelunbu __faxian-le __Meizhou]
everybody __all __know __Columbus __discover __PFV __America
Everybody knows [(that) [Columbus discovered America]].
Tout le monde sait [que [Colomb a découvert l'Amérique]].

Though some tests show that NPs and CPs behave alike in syntax, the fact that their semantic functions are different allows us to place them in separate categories. An NP refers to an object, while a CP refers to an event or a proposition. This is shown in French by the fact that the coordination of

¹⁸ See Paris (1979: 75–81).

two NPs obligatorily entails a plural form, whereas the coordination of two CPs does not. Compare the nominal pair *une pomme et une orange* 'an apple and an orange' in (43)–(44) with the clausal pair *qu'il pleuve et que tu ne puisses pas venir* 'that it is raining and that you cannot make it' in (45)–(46). The grammatical plural verb form of the verb *être* 'to be' is *sont* 'are' in (44) and (46). In (44) it is acceptable, because two NPs are coordinated, but it is not in (46), because two clauses are coordinated. In (45) the two CPs must be coordinated by means of the singular verbal form *est* 'is'.

- (43) **Une pomme et une orange est deux fruits.*
 *An apple and an orange is a fruit.
- (44) *Une pomme et une orange sont deux fruits (différents).*
 An apple and an orange are two (different) fruits.
- (45) *Qu'il pleuve et que tu ne puisses pas venir ici, (c')est dommage.*
 That is raining and that you cannot come here is a pity.
- (46) **Qu'il pleuve et que tu ne puisses pas venir ici, (ce) sont dommage.*
 *That is raining and that you cannot come here are a pity.

As shown by Li (2013: 227–228), in Mandarin two (bare) conjoined CPs by means of *erqie* 'and' can allow neither an adverbial plural marking, such as *dou* 'all' in (47), nor a plural nominal apposed noun phrase, such as *zhei liang ge wenti* 'these two questions' in (48).

- (47) 张三不来而且李四也不来 (*都) 是问题。
 [Zhangsan bu lai] erqie [Lisi ye bu lai] (*dou)
 shi wenti
 Zhangsan NEG come and Lisi also NEG come (*all)
 be problem
 That Zhangsan cannot come and Lisi cannot also come is a problem.
- (48) 我对张三不来而且李四也不来这个问题 (*这两个问题) 很担心。
 wo dui [Zhangsan bu lai] erqie [Lisi ye bu lai] zhe
 ge wenti/*zhe-liang-ge wenti hen danxin
 1SG to Z. NEG come and L. also NEG come this
 CL problem/*this two CL problem/very worried
 I am worried about the problem/*the two problems/ that Zhangsan cannot
 come and Lisi cannot come either.

In contrast, CPs which are NPs can be conjoined by means of *he* 'and' or *gen* 'and'. They also allow *dou* 'all', cf. (49).

- (49) 张三能不能来和/跟李四 能不能来都不是问题。
 [Zhangsan neng bu neng lai] he/gen [Lisi neng
 bu neng lai] dou bu shi wenti
 Zhangsan can NEG can come and/and Lisi can
 NEG can come all be problem
 Whether Zhangsan can come and whether Lisi can come are not problems.

These facts run parallel to the facts in French. Plurality is not required by the distribution of the complementizer *que*, differently.

6.4.2 The Absence of the Complementizer *que*

In this subsection, we discuss the complementizer *que* that heads clausal complements. *que* agrees with the tense of the matrix verb.

In (50) the *que* clause is a complementizer 'to think' whose subject is *il* 'he'. The complementizer *que* is ill-formed. Only (53) shows agreement in the subject with the verb *avoir oublié*. Such agreement with the complementizer, the direct consequence of its subject, as in (50) agreement, the sentence shows that *que* requires agreeing verb in the complement. The verb cannot agree with the sentence.

- (50) *Jean pense qu'il a oublié son livre.*
 John thinks that he has forgotten his book.
- (51) **Jean pense qu'il a oublié son livre.*
 *John thinks that he has forgotten his book.
- (52) **Jean pense Ø₁ il a oublié son livre.*
 John thinks Ø₁ he has forgotten his book.
- (53) *Jean pense Ø₁ Ø₂ a oublié son livre.*
 Jean thinks Ø₁ Ø₂ has forgotten his book.
- (54) **Jean pense Ø₁ il a oublié son livre.*
 *Jean thinks Ø₁ he has forgotten his book.
- (55) **Jean pense que Ø₁ a oublié son livre.*
 *Jean thinks that Ø₁ has forgotten his book.

These facts run parallel to those in French, though they are marked differently. Plurality is not indicated by means of agreement in Chinese, but it is by the distribution of *dou* 'all'. In both languages nominal and propositional constituents, which differ in both syntax and in semantics, behave differently.

6.4.2 The Absence of Subject-Verb Agreement in Chinese and the Absence of a C(OMP)

In this subsection, I will show that the presence of the clausal complementizer *que* in French is due to the fact that the subordinate clause that *que* heads contains a subject (*il*). Moreover, this subject obligatorily agrees with the tensed verb it is in construction with.

In (50) the *que* clause, which is embedded in object position under the matrix verb *penser* 'to think', contains a tensed verb *a oublié* 'has forgotten' whose subject is *il* 'he'. In (51) the subject *il* 'he' (noted \emptyset_2) and in (52) the complementizer *que* 'that' (noted \emptyset_1) have been deleted: both sentences are ill-formed. Only (53) is well-formed, because the lack of subject-verb agreement in the subordinate clause triggers the infinitival form of the verb *avoir oublié*. Such a lack of agreement entails the obligatory absence of the complementizer. Put in other words, the mandatory presence of *que* is the direct consequence of the mandatory agreement between the verb and its subject, as in (50). If a subject co-occurs with a verb form taking no agreement, the sentence is ill-formed, cf. (54). The ungrammaticality of (55) shows that *que* requires the presence of a subject and its inflected and agreeing verb in the embedded clause. In (55), as the subject *il* 'he' is absent, the verb cannot agree with it, thus causing the unacceptability of the sentence.

- (50) *Jean pense qu'il a oublié un livre.*
John thinks that he has forgotten a book.
- (51) **Jean pense qu' \emptyset_2 a oublié un livre.*
*John thinks that \emptyset_2 has forgotten a book.
- (52) **Jean pense \emptyset_1 il a oublié un livre.*
John thinks \emptyset_1 he has forgotten a book.
- (53) *Jean pense \emptyset_1 \emptyset_2 avoir oublié un livre.*
Jean thinks \emptyset_1 \emptyset_2 that he has forgotten a book.
- (54) **Jean pense \emptyset_1 il avoir oublié un livre.*
*Jean thinks \emptyset_1 he have forgotten a book.
- (55) **Jean pense que \emptyset_2 avoir oublié un livre.*
*Jean thinks that \emptyset_2 have forgotten a book.

Following this line of reasoning, the non-existence of complementizers similar to *que* in French and to *that* in English can be accounted for by the lack of subject-verb agreement in Chinese.¹⁹

In the next section, I will deal with sentential coordination. I will try to explain why the verb cannot be gapped in Mandarin.

6.5 Sentential Coordination and the Absence of Verb Gapping

6.5.1 Absence of Verb Gapping in Coordinate Sentences in Chinese

Due to the absence of the category of 'tense' in Chinese, which correlates with the absence of subject-verb agreement, it can be predicted that the equivalents of the English *do*, *do it*, and *do so* verbal anaphors will not find direct equivalents in Chinese. As is well known, in such anaphoric, contrastive, and parallel constructions, *do*²⁰ is a semantically (quasi) empty verbal place filler whose syntactic function consists in bearing a tense marker in the elliptical clause, which is identical to that of its correlate sentence, as in (56). The first clause in (56) is labeled 'correlate sentence' and the second one 'elliptical clause' or 'remnant clause'.²¹ Because of the necessity of tense sequencing, both clauses use the same preterit tense in English.

- (56) *He arrived in a hurry and she did (so) too.*

6.5.2 Gapping in Different Types of Predications

I will first study the absence of verb gapping in intransitive predications, and then in transitive predications in Chinese.

6.5.2.1 Intransitive Predications

Stative and eventive intransitive predications can be anaphorized differently in Chinese, as seen in the contrast between the two pairs (57)–(58) and (59)–(60). As verb gapping is not allowed in Chinese,²² the predicate in the elliptical clause can either be copied, as in (57) and (59), or replaced by the non-finite copula 是 *shì* 'to be' or by the stative predicate 一样 *yiyang* 'to be identical', cf. (58). Stative predications allow both strategies, whereas

¹⁹ This phenomenon has been noticed by Tsai (1995: 304) for Chinese and by Kuroda (1988) for Japanese. See Huang's (1984) dichotomy between 'hot' and 'cool' languages.

²⁰ Or another auxiliary verb, if the correlate sentence contains one. The auxiliary is *be* in (i) and *have* in (ii).

- (i) *John is early and Bill is too.*
(ii) *John has already done that and Bill has too.*

²¹ As in Konietzko and Winkler (2010).

²² This statement is too strong. Verb gapping is allowed in transitive constructions, but it is subject to syntactic/semantic and pragmatic factors, see Tang (2001) and Wei (2017).

eventive ones do not.
the verb 来 *lai* 'to come

- (57) 他很高兴, 我也
Ta_hen_gaox
3SG_very_haj
He is happy and
Il est heureux et j

- (58) 他很高兴, 我也
Ta_hen_gaoxing,
3SG_very_hap
He is happy and I
Il est heureux et n

- (59) 他来了, 我也来了
Ta_lai-le, wo_j
3SG_come-PFV_
He came and I car

- (60) *他来了, 我也是
*Ta_lai-le, wo_ye:
3SG_come_PFV

Both English and French is the case in Chinese, 1 (57) above and (61) below. In the second case, because the subject of the elliptical clause, it cannot take a form and contrastive information me 'moi' (see Table

- (61) He is tired and I am
Il est fatigué et je

- (62) He is tired and me t
Il est fatigué et m

²³ In (57) – *Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye_hen* – the predicate is copied, because an adverb must always

(i) **Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye.*
By the same token, parallel contrastive constructions require the negative marker *bu* 'not', which is in (ii).

(ii) 他知道, 可是你不*(知道).
ta_zhidao, keshi_ni_bu_*(zhidao).
3SG_know_but_2SG_NEQ
He knows, but you don't

eventive ones do not. 是 *Shi* and 一样 *yiyang* are not accepted in (60), hence the verb 来 *lai* 'to come' must be copied, as in (59).

- (57) 他很高兴, 我也很高兴。
 Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye_hen_gaoxing²³
 3SG_very_happy_1SG_also_very_happy
He is happy and I am happy too.
Il est heureux et je le suis aussi.
- (58) 他很高兴, 我也是/一样。
 Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye_shi/yiyang
 3SG_very_happy_1SG_also_be/be identical
He is happy and I am too.
Il est heureux et moi aussi.
- (59) 他来了, 我也来了。
 Ta_lai-le, wo_ye_lai-le
 3sg_come-PFV_1SG_also_come_PFV
He came and I came too.
- (60) *他来了, 我也是/一样。
 *Ta_lai-le, wo_ye_shi/yiyang
 3sg_come_PFV_1SG_also_be/be identical

Both English and French have recourse to two (similar) strategies. Either, as is the case in Chinese, the auxiliary or the remnant verb is copied – as in (57) above and (61) below – or, in contrast to Chinese, it is elided, as in (62). In the second case, because the verb is gapped in the remnant clause, the subject of the elliptical sentence has no verb to agree with: as a consequence, it cannot take a subject/nominative form *I* 'je'. As it carries new and contrastive information, the subject is marked by an emphatic/oblique form *me* 'moi' (see Table 6.1).

- (61) *He is tired and I am too.*
Il est fatigué et je le suis aussi.
- (62) *He is tired and me too.*
Il est fatigué et moi aussi.

²³ In (57) – *Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye_hen_gaoxing* 'He is happy and I am too' – verb gapping is not permitted in the elliptical clause, because an adverb must always be followed by a verb and have scope on it in Mandarin. Hence (i) is ill-formed:

(i) **Ta_hen_gaoxing, wo_ye.*

By the same token, parallel contrastive constructions which involve a negated verb in the remnant clause will not allow the negative marker *bu* 'not', which is an adverb, to stand alone and be scopeless. *Bu* has to be followed by a verb, as in (ii):

(ii) 他知道, 可是你不*(知道)。
 ta_zhidao, keshi ni_bu_*(zhidao)
 3sg_know_but_2sg_NEG_know
He knows, but you don't.

6.5.2.2 Transitive Predications

Now I will study some aspects of VP ellipsis when the verb is transitive.

Transitive predications with nominal objects

In SVO constructions – cf. the pair (63)–(64) – the second object in the remnant clause can either be copied or deleted under identity with the object in the correlate clause. Moreover the verb in the elliptical clause is either copied or anaphorized by means of the copula, cf. (64).²⁴ Hence the same verb elision rules apply in both intransitive and transitive constructions.

- (63) 他喝了酒,我们也喝了酒。
 ta he-le jiu, women ye he-le jiu.
 3SG_drink_PFV_wine_1PL_also_drink_PFV_wine
 He drank wine and we drank wine too.
- (64) 他喝了酒,我们也喝了/我们也是。
 Ta he-le jiu, women ye he-le Ø/ women ye shi²⁵
 3SG_drink_PFV_wine_1PL_also_drink_PFV/1PL_also_be
 He drank wine and we did too.

What is at stake in Chinese here is that there is no verb gapping, but only argument gapping.

Transitive Predications with Coreferential Nominal Objects

In Chinese, when the object contains a reflexive pronoun such as *ziji* 'self', as in (65), the remnant sentence is ambiguous. (66) has two readings: the gapped object can be read either as coreferential with *wo* 'I', providing a sloppy identity reading to 'my child(ren)', or coreferential with *ta* 'he', providing a strict identity reading to 'his child(ren)'.

- (65) 他遇到了自己的孩子。
 ta_i_yudao-le_ziji_i de_haizi
 3SG_run-into_PFV_own_DE_child
 He ran into his (own) children.
- (66) 他遇到了自己的孩子,我也遇到了。
 ta_i_yudao-le_ziji de_haizi,wo_ye_yudao-le Ø_{ij}²⁵
 3SG_run-into_PFV_own_DE_child_1SG_also_run-into_PFV
 He ran into his_i children and I ran into mine_j (too).
 He ran into his_i children and I ran into them_i (too).

²⁴ The difference between verb copying and the use of *shi* might be linked to an areal difference. Speakers from mainland China sometimes do not accept 是 *shi* in this context, while speakers from Taiwan do. See Paris (1995: 182).

²⁵ The first interpretation, also called 'sloppy identity', is accepted by all the native speakers I have consulted. The second one (labelled 'strict identity') is accepted less readily. To avoid ambiguity, the use of the coreferential pronoun *tamen* 'them' is preferred.

Transitive Predication
 Clausal objects at
 (64) and (67).

- (67) 他拒绝发表
 ta_jujue_
 3SG_refus
 He refuses to

6.5.3 Why Is the

As illustrated above, the ellipsis does. The pair 'question-answer' (69): both remain in the res

- (68) 你买了书没
 ni_mai-le
 2SG_buy_
 Did you buy

As mentioned repeatedly in Chinese because of the absence of the subject syntactic rule.²⁶ This leads to a constraint on carry any information be gapped.

6.6 Conclusion

Though there is more in Chinese than in English play in Chinese grammar. Functional categories – as, for verbal domains – are redundant. Analytical Chinese.²⁷

The gaps in parallelism correspond to categories because they are:

²⁶ See Simpson et al. (2016).
²⁷ See Huang's (2015) characterization.

Transitive Predications with Clausal Objects

Clausal objects are elided in the same way as object noun phrases are, cf. (64) and (67).

- (67) 他拒绝发表意见，我们也拒绝。/我们也是。
 ta_jujue_fabiao_yijian, _women_ ye_jujue/women_ ye_shi
 3SG_refuse_express_opinion_1PL_also_refuse/1PL_also_be
 He refuses to make any comment, and we do too.

6.5.3 Why Is the Absence of Verb Gapping Necessary in Chinese?

As illustrated above, verb gapping does not exist in Chinese; only argument elision does. The fact that the verb cannot be deleted is related to the way the pair 'question-answer' functions in Chinese. To (68), one can only answer (69): both the arguments of the verbs are elided, but the verb must remain in the response: it cannot be gapped.

- | | |
|---|--|
| (68) 你买了书没有？
ni_mai-le_shu_mei-you?
2SG_buy_PFV_book_NEG_have
Did you buy (the) books? | (69) 买了
mai-le
buy_PFV
I did. |
|---|--|

As mentioned repeatedly above, the presence of the subject is not mandatory in Chinese because subject-verb agreement is not at play. Hence the absence of the subject in (69) is due not to a discourse constraint but to a syntactic rule.²⁶ The absence of the object, on the contrary, can be ascribed to a constraint on information structure: as redundant constituents do not carry any informational weight, they are useless in the discourse: they can be gapped.

6.6 Conclusion

Though there is more covert syntax and much less inflectional morphology in Chinese than in English/French, I would like to claim that the rules at play in Chinese grammar are those of comparative (universal?) grammar. Functional categories which copy the same features across different domains – as, for example, redundant agreement in the nominal and the verbal domains – are not represented in Chinese, *precisely* because they are redundant. Analyticity is preferred to syntheticity across the board in Chinese.²⁷

The gaps in parts of speech in Chinese that I have tried to describe correspond to categories which are not embodied openly in the language because they are silent. But, seen in the perspective of general linguistics,

²⁶ See Simpson et al. (2016). For argument ellipsis, see Li (2014) and Wei (2017).

²⁷ See Huang's (2015) characterization of modern Chinese as an analytic language.

- Kemmerer, David. 2014. Word classes in the brain: Implications of linguistic typology for cognitive neuroscience. *Cortex* 58:27–51.
- Konietzko, Andreas, and Susanne Winkler. 2010. Contrastive ellipsis: Mapping between syntax and information structure. *Lingua* 120:1436–1457.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1988. Whether we agree or not. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12:1–47.
- Li, Y.-H. Audrey. 2013. Case, tense and clauses. In *Breaking down the barriers: Interdisciplinary studies in Chinese linguistics and beyond. A Festschrift for Professor Alain Peyraube*, ed. Cao Guangshun, H. Chappell, R. Djamouri, and T. Wiebusch, 205–235. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Li, Y.-H. Audrey. 2014. Born empty. *Lingua* 151:43–68.
- 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* 23:1–53.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 2010. A tenseless analysis of Mandarin revisited: A response to Sybesma 2007. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:305–329.
- Lin, Jo-Wang, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai. 2015. Restricting non-restrictive relatives in Mandarin Chinese. In *Chinese syntax in a cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. Audrey Li, Andrew Simpson, and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai, 100–127. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nguyễn, Đình-Hoà. 1997. *Vietnamese*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1977. Le morphème *de* et la relativation en mandarin. *Cahiers de linguistique Asie Orientale* 2:65–76.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1979. Nominalization in Mandarin Chinese. *The morpheme de and the shi de constructions*. Paris: D. R. L., Université Paris VII.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1981. *Problèmes de syntaxe et de sémantique en linguistique chinoise. Mémoires de l'Institut des hautes Etudes Chinoises XX*. Paris: Collège de France.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1995. Type de prédication et copie du verbe en chinois standard. In *Langues et langage: problèmes et raisonnement en linguistique. Mélanges offerts à Antoine Culioli*, 173–184. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 1998. Syntaxe et sémantique de quatre marqueurs de transitivité en chinois standard: *ba*, *bei*, *jiao* et *rang*. *Colloque sur "La transitivité"*. Université de Lille III, 15–17 Novembre 1995, 355–370. Lille: Presses du Septentrion.
- Paris, Marie-Claude. 2007. Un aperçu de la reduplication nominale et verbale en mandarin. *Faits de Langue* 29:65–76.
- Simpson, Andrew, Zoe Wu, and Yan Li. 2016. Grammatical roles, coherence relations and the interpretation of pronouns in Chinese. *Lingua Sinica* 2(1):1–20.
- Tang, Sze-Wing. 2001. The (non)existence of gapping in Chinese and its implications for the theory of gapping. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 10(3):201–224.

- Teng, Shou-hsin. 1987. Relative clause in Chinese. In *Wang Li memorial volumes*, ed. The Chinese Language Society of Hong Kong, 423–434. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing.
- Tsai, Wei-tien Dylan. 1995. Visibility, complement selection and the case requirement of CP. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4(4):281–312.
- Wei, Ting-Chi. 2017. Ellipsis and gapping. *Encyclopedia of Chinese language and linguistics (vol. II)*, ed. Rint Sybesma, 159–165. Leiden: Brill.
- Zhang, Niing. 2014. Expressing number productively in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics* 52(1):1–34.

7

Deriva Inflect Chine Morph Prope

7.1 Morpher

It has long been inflectional affixes believe that there lyzed in terms of extreme, there ha tion, all double- (morphological de morpheme as the that has independ syntactic unit, the Chinese can be des to morphological)

Some Chinese r do so, and they are ively, following Bl affixes, but most (formation process roots in the sense different relations 1996). Whether th affixes is a theory formation processe