

**Part One**

Mandarin demonstrates behaviors considerably different than English. Consider the following sentences:

(1) Zhangsan zuotian zai xuexiao kanjian-le Lisi

Where *kanjian-le* “see-ASP” is modified by its left-neighboring elements *zuotian zai xuexiao* “yesterday at school.” The entire verb phrase must then be *zu otian zai xuexiao*, where both *yesterday* and *at school* are adjuncts as they do not provide information crucial maintaining grammaticality. Note than *Lisi* and *ta*, occurring in the sentence below, are seen as a right-neighbor to the verb:

(2) Zhangsan piping-le ta.

Where *ta* “he” seems to be a complement to *piping-le* “criticize-ASP,” much like *Lisi* seems to be a complement to *kanjian-le*; it is *ta* being criticized, and *Lisi* being seen. This holds true for sentence (3), where it is *fan* “rice” being eaten up:

(3) Ta neng chiwan neiwan fan

## Two

Now consider Mandarin's treatment of wh-elements:

- (4) Shei xihuan ta?
- (5) Ni kanjian-le shei?
- (7) Ni mai-le shei de meiben shu?

Where *shei* corresponds to wh-word “who.” Compare these sentences to their English counterparts:

- (4) Who likes him?
- (5) Who did you see?
- (7) Whose every book did you buy?

Notice that the wh-element has moved from its originating position. This is especially apparent in sentences (5) and (6), where *see* and *buy* subcategorize for a DP. Thus, the wh-element has moved from these positions. In Mandarin, they remain unmoved, as the wh-elements are still seen after the verbs *kanjian-le* and *mai-le*. This may be further seen in:

- (6) Zhangsan keneng mai sheme?
- (6) What might Zhangsan buy?

Where *sheme*, corresponding to “what,” has not moved from being a complement to the verb *mai*, unlike in English where it has left *buy*.

This can also be seen in embedded clauses:

- (11) Ni shuo Lisi zai nali zuoshi?
- (11) Where do you say Lisi worked?
- (14) Wo xiang-zhidao Lisi mai-le sheme
- (14) I what what Lisi bought
- (15) Wo xiang-zhidao shei mai-le shu
- (15) I wonder who bought books

Where *nali* corresponds to “where” and remains in the embedded CP subcategorized by *shuo* unlike English's *say*, where *where* are moved to raise out of the embedded clause. The same occurs in (14) and (15), where *sheme* and *shei* have not moved even within the embedded clause.

As the wh-elements in the original Mandarin have not moved from their place of origination, it is clear to see their role in the meaning of a sentence. Consider the following two sentences:

- (11) Ni shuo Lisi zai nali zuoshi?
- (12) Ni zai nali shuo Lisi zuoshi?

Where *nali* occurs in two distinct positions. It is thus clear what is being questioned: in sentence (11), it is the whereabouts of Lisi's workplace, denoted by the position of *nali*; in sentence (12), it is the whereabouts of the utterance, as denoted by the position of *nali* in a left adjunct that modifies verb *shuo* (as was seen in **Part One**). This distinction is lost in English as the wh-word *where* is moved to the left-edge of the sentence no matter where it originates:

- (11) Where do you say Lisi worked \_\_?
- (12) Where did you say \_\_ Lisi worked?

Mandarin does not seem to undergo any sort of movement in wh-questions.

### Three

Mandarin also exhibits certain behaviors not seen in English. Recall, as seen in **Part One**, adjuncts are left-handed. Compare:

- (1) Zhangsan zuotian zai xuexiao kanjian-le Lisi
- (2) Zhangsan saw Lisi at school yesterday
- (32) The guy who everyone hates is from Antarctica
- (33) The guy is from Antarctica

While Mandarin exhibits behaviors differently than English, they are not surprising:

- (17) Ni xihuan wo piping shei de wenzhang?
- (17) You like I criticize who DE article?

Much like the adjuncts in (32) is an entire CPs in its own right, so is *wo piping shei* (seen remapped as I criticize who). Again, the wh-word *shei* has not moved as it would have to in English:

- (17) \*Who do you like the articles in which I criticize \_\_?

The English translation is ungrammatical as it has violated an island boundary. But notice the echo question is grammatical:

- (17') You like the articles in which I criticize who?

Also see:

- (18) Lisi da-le shei shi ni hen bugaoxing?
- (18) Lisi hit-ASP who make you very unhappy?
- (18) \*Who did that Lisi hit make you very unhappy?

Where it is the identity of the person hit by Lisi that is being asked about. The hitting of that person was an unhappy event.

Also note:

(16) Ni mai-le shei xie de shu

(18) Lisi da-le shei shi ni hen bugaoxing

Where, within the complementizer phrase of (16) *shei xie de*, the verb “write,” *xie*, has no additional argument. The same is true for (18), where “hit,” *da-le*, has no additional argument. It could be that these Mandarin verbs do not require a complement like English does, or a complement is elided to avoid redundancy with information already given elsewhere in the sentence.