The grammaticalization of Chinese *ba*: grammaticalization, 'lateral' grammaticalization and case theory

In this paper, I propose to analyse the grammaticalization of Chinese co-verbs within Minimalism using Roberts and Roussou (R & R) (1999, 2003), Roberts (2010) and van Gelderen (2011) as my theoretical models. There have been proposals that Chinese co-verbs should be analysed as case-markers (Feng (2000, 2005), van Gelderen (2011)), which are morphological spell-outs of *K*case in generative syntax, given that they are markers of subcategorization and are hence equivalent to morphological case (Bittner and Hale (1996:4), van Kempen and Vincent (1997:18f), Anderson (2006:51-53, 211), Butt (2009:39), Moravcsik (2005:211, 212)) when morphological case is the original characterisation of *K*case (Lamontagne and Travis (L & T) (1986, 1987, 1992)). The grammaticalization of *K*case constitutes a new functional category for testing the Minimalist hypotheses on grammaticalization, since R & R (2003) only analyse the grammaticalization of auxiliary verbs (T), complementisers (C) and determiners (D). Moreover, the grammaticalization of Chinese co-verbs is in this paper argued to be related to Simpson and Wu (S & W) (2002) and Wu’s (2004) ‘lateral’ grammaticalization, which has important consequences on modern case theory. It is possible to analyse all Chinese co-verbs, and so I shall focus on Chinese *ba*.

In Tse (2012a, b, c, 2013a, b, in review), it has been argued that ‘lateral’ grammaticalization, analysed by S & W (2002) and Wu (2004) in Minimalism, is a similar yet different phenomenon compared to grammaticalization, R & R (2003:2-4) and van Gelderen (2011:4) argue that grammaticalization involves ‘structural simplification’ where ‘simplicity’ is defined by the former as the reduction of ‘feature syncretisms’ (i.e. ‘the presence of more than one formal feature in a given structural position: H+[F-, F+]’ (R & R (2003:210), Roberts (2010:49)) and by the latter as the presence of uninterpretable features in lieu of interpretable ones (van Gelderen (2011:4, 16-17, 20-21, 41-43)). This explains why grammaticalization is so common in language typology (see e.g. Heine and Kuteva (2002)), since ‘structural simplification’ is argued to be a natural mechanism in language acquisition and hence in language change (R & R (2003:2-3, 15-17)).

Moreover, R & R (2003:200) argue that grammaticalization always involves an ‘upward shift of features’. ‘Lateral’ grammaticalization is coined by S & W (2002:198-202) to describe a change where one functional category (e.g. D) is re-analysed ‘laterally’ as another (e.g. T) with no ‘upward shift of features’ e.g. Chinese *de in� de* constructions (S & W (2002:169), Wu (2004:120):

1) wo shi zuotian mai piao de I be yesterday buy ticket DE
2) wo shi zuotian mai de piao I be yesterday buy DE ticket

‘It was yesterday that I bought the ticket.’

Such D > T re-analysis has cross-linguistic counterparts (S & W (2002:199-200), Wu (2004:149-153)), namely determiners (D) > copula verbs (T), which is a strong cross-linguistic trend (Heine and Kuteva (2002:108-109), van Gelderen (2011:chapter 4)) e.g. Chinese *shi*:

3) qian li er jian wang thousand mile then see king
shi wo shuo thus I NOMINALISE desire DECLARATIVE.PARTICLE

‘To see the king after travelling a thousand miles, this (is) what I want.’ (3a)

OR ‘To see the king after travelling a thousand miles is what I want’. (3b) (Mencius, 4th century BC)

In the original constructions (1a), de and shi are analysed as determiners (D) (S & W (2002:169-170), Wu (2004:120-121), Li and Thompson (L & T) (1977:420), Feng (1993:284, 2003:31-32)), whereas in 2) and 3b) they are re-analysed as T elements, since de in 2) is suffixed to the verb (mao) and expresses past tense (To past) (S & W (2002:170, 175), Wu (2004:127)) whereas shi in 3b) is a copula verb (L & T (1977:427), Feng (1993:301, 303-34)). This D > T re-analysis conforms to R & R’s ‘reduction of feature syncretisms’, since as determiners Chinese *de and shi* hold an *Agree* relation with an (empty) nominal complement and therefore incur an extra feature placeholder (S & W (2002:189), Wu (2004:140-142), L & T (1977:422-423)), whereas as T elements this *Agree* relation is lost (S & W (2002:190), Wu (2004:140-142)). Furthermore, as T elements they hold interpretable phi-features ([i-phi]), whereas as T elements they hold uninterpretable phi-features ([\-phi]), which conforms to van Gelderen’s ‘simplicity’. This explains the cross-linguistic distribution of D > T re-analysis. However, de and shi end up holding T features that are not re-analysed from below but from pragmatic implicature: *shi-de* constructions (1) imply that the embedded action (*mai piao* ‘to buy ticket’) has already occurred, which gives rise to T(past) in 2) (S & W (2002:175-177)), and the implied identity between the apportioned constituents in 3a) gives rise to the copula verb in 3b).

Tse (2012a, b, 2013a, b, in review) argues that these formal differences explain the empirical differences between grammaticalization and ‘lateral’ grammaticalization, since while ‘phonological weakening’ and ‘univerbation’ are regularly displayed by the former (R & R (2003:218-232)), they do not seem to occur in the latter: Chinese *de* is toneless both as a D and as a T element with no perceptible phonetic difference (S & W (2002:173-174, 190-194)), and there is no evidence for copula verbs derived from determiners undergoing ‘phonological weakening’ or ‘univerbation’ either (Chinese *shi* is still phonologically and syntactically fully (toned) in modern Mandarin). ‘Phonological weakening’ and ‘univerbation’ in grammaticalization are argued to be caused by ‘upward feature analysis’, which is intuitively sound since ‘upward feature analysis’ necessarily causes ‘syntactic compression’ and ‘phonological weakening’/univerbation. The T elements in ‘lateral’ grammaticalization hold features that are derived from pragmatics and hence in language change, not only to undergo ‘compression’.

Modern Chinese *ba* is analysed as a functional element in little *v* by Li (2006:408-413) and Huang, Li, Li (2009:175-178), and Feng (2005:7, 10) argue that Chinese co-verbs are case-markers (K) merged under little *v*, since there is a thematic relationship between the co-verb and the main verb, namely *K*(accusative) in the case of *ba*, as it marks the object of the main verb (4b):

4) xian chang ba qin nong leisure often BA lute play

‘In my leisure, I often take a lute and play it.’ (4a)

‘In my leisure, I often play a lute.’ (4b) (Ji Du Shi Yi, 8th century AD)

Feng (2002:127-129) argues that *ba* is originally a lexical verb in a serial verb construction (4a), and when it is re-analysed as a case-marker (K) (4b), it undergoes ‘structural simplification’, since it loses its verbal argument structure and the VP that it heads (*ba qin*) is re-analysed as a KP with the result that there is only one lexical verb left (nomal) (4b). Furthermore, as a case-marker (*ba* holds features that are not re-analysed from a lower position, since *K*case is postulated to represent morphological case (L & T (1986:57-58, 1992:159-161)), and given that Chinese has never had morphological case, it should not have *K*case in the first place. The *K*case features held by *ba* are instead derived from pragmatic implicature, namely the possibility to interpret *ba*, an originally lexical verb (4a), as an accusative case-marker for the second (main) (4b) verb. The grammaticalization of *ba* as a case-marker (K) therefore conforms not only to R & R’s ‘structural simplification’ but also to Tse’s characterisation of ‘lateral’ grammaticalization, which is supported by its cross-linguistic distribution (Zou (1995:79-80), Heine and Kuteva (2002:289-290)) as well as its lack of ‘phonological weakening’ and ‘univerbation’, since all Chinese co-verbs are still phonologically and syntactically strong (toned) in modern Chinese. This analysis suggests that *K*case (as a functional category) does not exist universally for all languages and should not be postulated for languages that do not have morphological case (e.g. Chinese), since *K*case seems to be ‘latterly’ inferred from pragmatics in the grammaticalization of case-markers in a language that does not have morphological case to various extents in a radical revision to extract case and give it universal status (L & T (1986:51-52, 1992:157, 166), Weerman (1997:441-448)). Diachronic syntax, such as grammaticalization and ‘lateral’ grammaticalization’, can shed light on synchronic syntax, namely case theory.