In Mandarin Chinese, there are two types of cleft (shi-de) constructions, namely sentence-final de (VOde), which is pan-dialectal, and verb-adjacent de (VdeO), which is restricted to northern dialects. Simpson and Wu (S&W) (2002:171-175) argue on comparative-historical assumptions that VdeO is derived from VOde via clitic repositioning of de (V de O t:i). Furthermore, as S&W (2002:186-190) argue that sentence-final de is a determiner and verb-adjacent de a past-tense marker, de is argued to undergo ‘lateral’ reanalysis from one functional category to another (D > T(past)) which involves ‘structural simplification’ (D_{Agree} > T_{Merge}) (Tse (2013), cf Roberts and Roussou (R&R (2003:209-213)). Recent historical analyses (Han (2012), Zhan (2012), Long and Xiao (2009, 2011), Long (2013)) have shown that VOde and VdeO are derived independently from two different types of relative clauses. In this paper, I propose to analyse the formation of shi-de constructions (VOde/VdeO) and revise S&W’s hypothesis in light of new historical evidence.

Synchronic comparisons show that while VOde allows for narrow/broad focus and all tense, aspect and mood (TAM) values, VdeO only allows for narrow focus, necessarily denotes past tense and disallows other TAM markers, negators and quantificational dou (Lee (2005:175-186), Paul and Whitman (2008:430-431), Hole (2011:1710-1712)). It can be argued that sentence-final de is a sentence-final particle (C) selecting a clausal complement (TP) in which there may be TAM markers, negators and dou as well as A’-movement for specific constituents in the embedded clause or for the entire clause itself (cf Hole (2011:1724-1727), Meng (2014:107-115)), whereas verb-adjacent de is a past-tense marker (T(past)) suffixed onto the verb via V-to-v movement which pre-empt other TAM markers, negators (Neg) and dou and only permits A’-movement for specific constituents in the embedded clause (Paul and Whitman (2008:430-436)). The empirical differences between VOde and VdeO, therefore, lie in the scope of de (C/T(past)). As de is argued to originate from classical Chinese zhe and hence instantiate a nominalizer category (n) which becomes a determiner (D) when it begins to select nominal complements (Aldridge (2008:243-249), Yap et al (2010:64-72, 2011:62-72)), sentence-final de is reanalyzed from being a nominalizer (n) to sentence-final particle (C) whereas verbal suffix de from being a determiner (D) to past-tense marker (T(past)), which shows ‘structural simplication’ since D-n movement is lost in the former (D_{Move} > C_{Merge}) and XP-movement is replaced by head-to-head movement in the latter (D_{XP-Move} > v_{Move}) (cf R&R (2003:209-213)). Furthermore, de shows ‘lateral’ reanalysis from being nominal (D/n) to clausal (C/T(past)), which, interestingly, reveals an inverse structural correlation between the nominal and clausal domains, since lower nominal heads are reanalyzed as higher clausal heads ((n > C, D > T).
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