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2. Positional markedness of adverbial clauses

• Generalization: the sentence-initial position ("adverbial-main") is unmarked (or "canonical", "default"), and "main-adverbial" is the marked clause order in Chinese.

• Why?
Exhibit 1: intuitive judgment with given grammatical conditions
Exhibit 2: frequency in corpus data
2.1 Discursive functions & grammatical conditions

a. *Discourse-organizing*: linking back to the preceding discourse, and providing background information for the main clause.

b. *Local function*: specifying the circumstance of the state of affairs described in the main clause.

• **Initial adverbial clauses** are thematically associated with the preceding discourse; they serve as background for the main clause; they function as a discursive “bridge” between the preceding discourse and the following discourse;

• they are outside the scope of the main clause, and they are restrictor of quantifiers (*when*-clause and *if*-clause)

• they are taken as adjunction at or above the IP-level;

• **Final adverbial clauses** are ‘local’ in the sense that they are associated with the main clause and specify the time, reason, or condition under which the state of affair in the main clause holds.

• they are within the scope of quantifiers (e.g. negation, modal, and question operator), i.e. ‘focal’.

• they are analyzed as %P/VP-level adjunction;

(1) What will you do if I give you the money?
   a1. If you give me the money, I’ll buy this house.
   a2. % I’ll buy this house if you give me the money.

(2) Under what conditions will you buy this house?
   b1. I’ll buy this house if you give the money.
   b2. % If you give me the money I’ll buy this house.  

In (1), the initial position is preferred. The if-clause is background material (in the sense of having been present in the question).
In (2), the final position is preferred when the if-clause is foregrounded (containing new information).

• “The topic-focus status of a conditional is a factor in determining its initial or final positioning.”  
  (von Fintel 1994: 82)
a. When he’s in the shower, John usually SHAves.
b. John usually shaves when he’s in the SHOwer.

(Rooth 1985: 100)

Initial *when*-clause in (a) is the restrictor of ‘usually’. Final *when*-clause in (b) is in the scope of the quantifier.
TABLE 1  Four types of adverbial clauses in English (modified based on Verstraete 2004, Table 6: 844)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Intonation break</th>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: + inside the scope of the quantificational element in the main clause

For intonation break (presence/absence of comma), see Quirk et al. 1985: 1626-1628.
**Turn to the two marked types...**

(1) What will you do if I give you the money?

a1. If you give me the money, I’ll buy this house.

a2. % I’ll buy this **house** if you give me the money. ➔ **Type 3**

(2) Under what conditions will you buy this house?

b1. I’ll buy this house if you give the money.

b2. % If you give me the money I’ll buy this house. ➔ **Type 2**

Stress shifting makes (a2) ok.

- “These kinds of data are very fragile. In fact, the answer in (a2) becomes acceptable when there is focus on the verb phrase [buy this HOUSE]$_F$ and the if-clause is de-accented. Crucially though, similar intonational manipulation is harder with the answer in (b2), where the if-clause is focal since it constitutes the informative part of the answer.” (von Fintel 1994: 81)

Also for *when*-clause

a. When he’s in the shower, John usually **SHAves**.  \(\rightarrow\) **Type 1**
b. John usually shaves when he’s in the **SHOwer**.  \(\rightarrow\) **Type 4**
c. John usually **SHAves** when he’s in the shower.  \(\rightarrow\) **Type 3**

(Rooth 1985: 100)

Final *when*-clause can be in the scope of the quantifier (b), or the restrictor of ‘usually’ (c), i.e. synonymous with (a).

“**No intonational manipulation** can make (a) be synonymous with (b)” (von Fintel 1994).

That is, no intonation manipulation can make a type 1 initial *when*-clause (background, topic) become a type 2 initial *when*-clause (foreground, focal).

Does type 2 *when*-clause possible in English?
But other grammatical marking seems feasible:

Type 2 (claimed)

It is better for me to go ahead slowly and carry everyone with me than to hurry along and cause dissension. *Especially* when I speak in public I must show that I love all my sheep, like a good shepherd.

(Verstraete 2004: 834)
But other grammatical marking seems feasible:

Do you wanna ... erm go for a q\uick one # before it cl\oses # . y\eah # . before it cl\oses #.

(\: nuclear accent; #: boundary of intonation unit; Verstraete 2004 : 832) ➔ Type 3

It is better for me to go ahead slowly and carry everyone with me than to hurry along and cause dissension. Especially when I speak in public I must show that I love all my sheep, like a good shepherd.

(ibid.: 834) ➔ Type 2
Type 1

While you were a senior officer in the federal government, did these things occur?

≠ “was that the time [focus] when these things happened [presupposition]?”

(Verstraete 2004: 833)

Type 4

I think it’s very important to measure when and where things occurred. Did they occur when you’re a young person, in your formative years, or did they occur while you were a senior official in the federal government?

= “was that the time [focus] when these things happened [presupposition]?” (ibid.: 833)
To recap...

**TABLE 1** Four types of adverbial clauses in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Intonation break</th>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two grammatical conditions:
- Topic; [-scope]; discourse-organizing function;
- Focus; [+scope]; local function;
2.2 The initial position as unmarked in Chinese

- Exhibit 1: Both grammatical conditions favor adverbial clauses in the initial position (preceeding the main predicate).

- Exhibit 2: Frequency.
Discourse-organizing function: initial position preferred

A: Wǒ yìhuí qù xuéxiào.
   I later go school
   ‘I will go to school later.’

B1: Nǐ yào chūmén dehuà, shùnbiàn bā lājī dài-chūqù.
   you will go out if by.the.way BA trash take-out
   ‘If you are going outside, take the trash out on your way.’

B2: % Shùnbiànǎ ba lājī dài chūqù, nǐ yào chūmén dehuà.
   by.the.way BA trash take out you will go.outside if
   ‘Take the trash out on your way, if you are going out.’

The conditional in the examples can be replaced by a temporal adjunct, and the judgment is the same.

   nǐ chūmén de shíhòu
   you go.out DE time
   ‘when you go out’
Local function: initial position preferred

A: Zài shénme tiáojiàn xià, nǐ huì mǎi zhè-gè fángzi?
at what condition under you will buy this-cl house
‘Under what conditions will you buy this house?’

B1: Rúguǒ nǐ gěi wǒ qián, wǒ jiù huì mǎi tā.
if you give me money I then will buy it
‘If you give me the money, I’ll buy the house.’ (% for English)

B2: % Wǒ (*jiù) huì mǎi tā, rúguǒ nǐ gěi wǒ qián.
I then will buy it if you give me money
‘I’ll buy the house if you give me the money.’
Another example with local function; initial position preferred

A: Jīntiān xiàyǔ, Mǎlì bù huì qù pǎobù
today rain Mary not will go jogging
‘It’s raining today. Mary won’t go jogging.’

right if weather good she only will go
‘Right. Only if the weather is good, she will go.’ (% for English)

B1: %Duì. Tā (*cáī) huì qù rúguǒ tiānqì hǎo
right she only will go if weather good
‘She will go only if the weather is good.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Intonation break</th>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Frequency in corpus-data

**TABLE 3: distribution of adverbial clauses by word order**  (Wong 2006: 239)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position /type</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Concessive</th>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>65(84.4%)</td>
<td>50(82%)</td>
<td>9(81.8%)</td>
<td>29(22%)</td>
<td>151(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>11(14.3%)</td>
<td>4(6.6%)</td>
<td>1(9.1%)</td>
<td>80(65%) *</td>
<td>96(32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1(1.3%)</td>
<td>7(11.5%)</td>
<td>1(9.1%)</td>
<td>16(13%)</td>
<td>25(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: In the final causal clauses, 60 out of 80 follow the ending intonation
Table 4: statistics of the different uses of *yīnwèi* ‘because’ (Wang & Huang, 2006: 996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Numbers of Token</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• causal connective (initial adverbial clause)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• causal connective (final adverbial clause)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• final adverbial clause following ending intonation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• joint production by the other speaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some final causal clauses are *reason* clauses, which explains why the speaker has made the preceding assertion.
a. Mǎlì bú zài zhèlǐ, yǐnwèi wǒ méi kànjiàn tā.
  Mary not at here because I not see her
  ‘(I make the assertion that) Mary is not here, because I don’t see her.’

b. %Yǐnwèi wǒ méi kànjiàn tā, Mǎlì bú zài zhèlǐ.
  because I not see her Mary not at here
  ‘Because I don’t see her, Mary is not here.’

The final reason clause in (a) is not including in the content of the speech act expressed by the preceding clause. (b) is odd because it imposes a causal relation between two events.
### Table 2: Four types of adverbial clauses in Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Intonation break</th>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalization: final adverbial clauses are marked in Chinese

Question: can final adverbial clauses be divided as type 3 and type 4?
4. Sentence-final adverbial clauses: reasoning, materials, and methodology

In general, a pattern is considered “marked” if it only occurs when some special *condition* is met (cf. König & Van Der Auwera 1988, 109-110).

Are the conditions *systematic* in the sense that they are rule-governed to which we can apply formal analyses, or are they just *idiosyncratic* (e.g. influenced by the grammars of individuals’ foreign languages (“Europeanized Chinese”, Chao 1968: 133)?
• There are different reasons why a marked pattern (word order specifically) occurs. One could be related to idiosyncratic language use, like poets, lyricists, second language learners, or Master Yoda, etc.

• Another trigger for a marked pattern could be discourse-driven, such as *marking focus* or *expressing emphasis*.

→ The answers (conditions) lie in the discourse context.
On another note...

- There have been studies with long history and ongoing discussion on **right-dislocation** and **afterthought** in the phrasal forms, such as DP, PP, VP, AdjP, AdvP, and complement CP, across-linguistically.

The analytical methodology I will use...

The model of communication as continuous change of the common ground (CG)

Common ground (CG) includes

• (i) a set of propositions and discourse referents that are known to the interlocutors and continuously modified in communication (CG content), and

• (ii) information guiding the direction into which communication should develop (CG management).

The use of focus is divided into semantic use and pragmatic use (Krifka 2007).

The semantic use of focus has truth-conditional impact and thus is relevant to CG content.

The pragmatic uses of focus belong to CG management, including contradiction, correction, confirmation, delimitation, and highlighting the part of an answer in correspondence to a wh-question

→ “highlighting”? Trigger of the intension to highlight?
Here’s the I think why…

The speaker assumes that the information in the answer is likely to be unexpected by the addressee. Thus, the speaker uses grammatical markings to highlight the answer.

• Grammatical markings:
  Phonological (intonation)
  Morphological
  Syntactic (adverbs, displacement)
• Repetition

→ Contrastive focus
Contrastive focus (definition)

• Contrastive focus $\alpha$ is a focus $\alpha$ that is contrastively marked.

• Contrastive marking on a focus constituent $\alpha$ expresses the speaker’s assumption that the hearer will not consider the content $\alpha$ or the speech act containing $\alpha$ likely to be(come) common ground.

(cf. Zimmermann 2007: 154; also see Zimmermann & Onéa 2011)
## 5. Type 3 adverbial clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Intonation break</th>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Discourse-organizing</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Argument:
The marked word order is a syntactic marking (displacement) on contrastive focus.
Generalization:
In the contexts where type 3 occurs, the main clause carries the information that the speaker emphasizes, while the information in the adverbial clauses is backgrounded. The emphasis is observed up in:
- adverbial modification
- clause type (rhetorical question)
- expanded pitch range and syllable duration
- the pragmatic use of focus: confirmation, correction, and contradiction.

Inference:
The marked “main-adverbial” word order is triggered by the emphasis.
Example 1

*Context:*

Recently (end of 2016), there have been discussions on social media that people in Shandong province likes to use “inverted sentences” (*dǎozhuāng jù*) in conversation. The general opinion is that such a communicative style is different, very characteristic of Shandongese, and might even be considered strange.

A news program in Shandong conducted a street interview, asking Shandongese themselves how they view the use of “inverted sentences” and what they think of the opinions online.
Preceding utterances:

“It is said that us people in Shandong like to use inverted sentences. It is not the case, I think. As for the style of talking, it varies with individuals, right?”

Anyway, I’ve been talking like this, all these years. ’

In fact it is very cute, it sounds, if you are used to it.’
Chao (1968: 132): some final adverbial clauses “tend to have the same likelihood of faster tempo as interpolation. ... (on interpolation) ...there is not only no pause, but the break is marked by a faster tempo, a *piu mosso* on the interpolated part.
Recall the previous English example and intuition...

(1) What will you do if I give you the money?
a1. If you give me the money, I’ll buy this house.
a2. % I’ll buy this house if you give me the money.  ➔ Type 3

• “These kinds of data are very fragile. In fact, the answer in (a2) becomes acceptable when there is focus on the verb phrase [buy this HOUSE]$_F$ and the if-clause is de-accented.”  (von Fintel 1994: 81)
Example 2

Context:
• *Dong* is the host of the talk show, and *Ming* is an high school student.
• One of Ming’s achievements is being the sole representative of China at an international Model U.N. event.
• In this segment, Ming mentioned that she organized the model U.N. in her city (*Nanjing*) last summer. The host Dong is asking Ming about her experience.
When you were participating the activity, are you nervous at first?

At the beginning of this activity, it was in the school.

In the school meeting, at the beginning, I was very nervous.

because I must state my standpoint in front of all the people.

So at the beginning (I was) indeed very nervous, very nervous.

my hands just couldn’t stop like shaking, when I was holding the notes.

Then later I gradually overcame it and then it was much better.

The temporal adjunct has linguistic antecedent, and is thus contextually given.

Several emphasis markings are observed in the preceding clause.

Repetition (M4), adverbs (M5), syllable lengthening (M5)
**Figure 2** F0 diagram of the line M5
Example 3
(From the novel Mílàn; CCL.)
Zhanglin’s dark eyes stared at her. They looked at each other for a few seconds. Then Zhanglin shook her head and said:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Z1: Nǐ yǐdīng yào zhǎo tā, wǒ yě bù huì lán nǐ.} \\
&\quad \text{you absolutely want go.for he I Attitude not will stop you} \\
&\quad \text{‘(If) you absolutely want to go for him, then I will not stop you.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Su Xiaohui (=S) sneered,

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{S1: Nǐ lán-dé.zhù wǒ ma, rúguǒ nǐ xiǎng lán?} \\
&\quad \text{you stop-be.able.to I yes-no if you want stop} \\
&\quad \text{‘Are you able to stop me, if you want to stop (me)? ’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{S2: Wǒ-de fùmǔ dōu bù néng lán wǒ.} \\
&\quad \text{my parents even not can stop I} \\
&\quad \text{‘Even my parents could not stop me.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{S3: Dāng nián jié.hūn shí, tāmen lán-de duō qǐjìn, yǒu yòng ma?} \\
&\quad \text{that year get.married time they stop so strongly have use yes-no} \\
&\quad \text{‘They tried so hard to stop me when I got married that year. Did that work?’}
\end{align*}
\]

Her tone was full of provocation beyond her own control.
(From the novel Milàn; CCL.)

Zhanglin’s dark eyes stared at her. They looked at each other for a few seconds. Then Zhanglin shook her head and said:

Z1: Nǐ yīdìng yào zhǎo tā, wǒ yě bù huì lán nǐ.
you absolutely want go for he I Attitude not will stop you
‘(If) you absolutely want to go for him, then I will not stop you.’

Su Xiaohui (=S) sneered,

S1: Nǐ lán-dé.zhù wǒ ma, rúguǒ nǐ xiǎng lán?
you stop-able.to I yes-no if you want stop
‘Are you able to stop me, if you want to stop (me)?’

S2: Wǒ-de fùmǔ dōu bù néng lán wǒ.

CG content (output) of line Z1
a. Zhang believes she has the ability to stop Su.
b. **Zhang wants to stop Su.**
c. Zhang do not stop Su only because Su is so strong-willed to go for the guy.

S3: Wǒ yào zhǐ yào dài xīng fù gōng zuó ma?

‘Do you want just want to give up at work?’

Her tone was full of provocation beyond her own control.
Generalization:

In the contexts where type 3 occurs, the main clause carries the information that the speaker **emphasizes**, while the information in the adverbial clauses is **backgrounded**.

*The emphasis is observed up in:*

- adverbial modification
- clause type (rhetorical question)
- expanded pitch range and syllable duration
- the pragmatic use of focus: confirmation, correction, and contradiction.

**Inference:**

The marked “main-adverbial” word order is triggered by the **emphasis**.
Syntactic-based analysis of type 3

The generalization we want to capture:

The marked “main-adverbial” word order is triggered by the *emphasis*.

The prerequisite for a syntactic-based analysis:
• The adverbial clauses are generated and merged with the main clause in syntax, *as opposed to* the “orphanage analysis” (Haegeman 2009) where the main and adverbial clauses are unattached in the syntax, and only interpreted “at the level of utterance interpretation” (post-LF).
• Any adjustment to the structure or word order occurs in narrow syntax, *as opposed to* the PF movement proposal (Gasde & Paul 1996).
Syntactic-based analysis of type 3

The generalization we want to capture:
The marked “main-adverbial” word order is triggered by the emphasis.

Assume a syntactic-discourse feature [emphasis]?

- What is [emphasis]? (contrastive focus)
- How to detect [emphasis]?
Contrastive focus has [emphasis] feature. It can be on a phrase, or a clause.

Contrastive focus (definition)

• Contrastive focus $\alpha$ is a focus $\alpha$ that is contrastively marked.

• Contrastive marking on a focus constituent $\alpha$ expresses the speaker’s assumption that the hearer will not consider the content $\alpha$ or the speech act containing $\alpha$ likely to be(come) common ground.

(cf. Zimmermann 2007: 154; also see Zimmermann & Onéa 2011)
Some further explanation:

Contrastive focus encodes the contrast between the information $\alpha$ expressed by the speaker and the assumed expectation state of the addressee from the speaker’s perspective. If, according to the speaker, some information $\alpha$ is likely to be unexpected by the hearer, the speaker marks the information $\alpha$ as contrastive by formal means available in her language inventory.

The reason for the contrastive marking is pragmatic and related to *CG management*: the speaker intends to guide the conversation towards his own interest by ensuring a swift update of the common ground “in situations of (assumed) differences in the assumptions of speaker and hearer” (Zimmermann 2007: 157).
To *diagnose* the status of contrastive foci, we need to examine “not only information on the state of the linguistic and non-linguistic context as such, but also on the background assumptions of speaker and hearer”. (Zimmermann 2007: 149).
Analysis of Example 1

a. Speaker’s belief:
   \( \alpha = \) The style of structural inversion in speech is very cute.

b. Hearer’s belief in speaker’s mind:
   Only Shandongese uses structural inversion in their speech, which is different and strange.

c. Speaker’s assumption:
   \( \alpha \) is likely to be unexpected by the hearer.
Analysis of Example 2

a. Speaker’s belief:
   \( \alpha = \text{My hands were shaking due to nervousness}. \)

b. Hearer’s belief in speaker’s mind:
   She is outstanding and confident, so it must be the case that she is not nervous.

c. Speaker’s assumption:
   \( \alpha \) is likely to be unexpected by the hearer.
To recap...

The speaker, based on the information in CG content, draws the assumption that the information she/he is about to convey is likely to be unexpected by the hearer. In order to direct the hearer’s attention, and direct the development of conversation in accordance with $\alpha$, the speaker uses multiple grammatical markings to contrastively mark $\alpha$.

A syntax-discourse feature of contrastive focus:

[emphasis]
The marked “main-adverbial” word order is triggered by the presence of [emphasis] feature on the main clause.

Two options

a. Base-generated right-adjunction structure
b. Leftward movement of the main clause from the “adverbial-main” order

Diagram:

- **a.** Base-generated right-adjunction structure
  - CP1
    - Main
  - CP2
    - Adverbial
  - CP3

- **b.** Leftward movement of the main clause
  - FP
    - CP2
      - Main
    - F'
      - Functional head
      - CP1
        - Adverbial
    - CP3
      - CP2
        - Main
Right-adjunction is the marked structure in Chinese, which is invoked only with specific trigger. (This might be plausible since in Chinese, except the domain within $vP$, adverbial modifiers are not right-adjoined (cf. Ernst 2002).

However, it is just a description of the order reversal.
b. Leftward movement of the main clause from the “adverbial-main” order

The “emphasis”, if formalized as a feature, has the strong or EPP-like property to trigger the movement.

⇒ Another ad hoc stipulation?
Here’s the motivation for the stipulation

The grammatical markings that realize emphasis linguistically are all “local”.

Suppose an XP is intended to be. Phonological marking (e.g. pitch accent and lengthening) operates on XP or part of XP; morphological markings affix to the XP; repetition makes a copy of the XP; clefts structurally displace the XP. And naturally, licensing by a functional head requires a local Spec-head relation, hence movement.
What if [emphasis] feature is on a phrase not a clause? “Right-dislocation”

a. Tā mǎi-le yī-tái diànnǎo ya. he buy- PERF one-CL laptop SFP
   ‘He bought a laptop SFP.’

b. Yī-tái diànnǎo ya, tā mǎi-le.
   one- CL laptop SFP he buy- PERFP
   ‘A laptop SFP, he bought.’

Cheung 2009:
SFPs are head of the head-initial FP: ForceP. Leftward movement of the object is triggered by its information focus status.
Question
a. Zhāngsān mǎi-le shénme?  
    Zhangsan buy-PERF what  
    ‘What did Zhangsan buy?’

Answer:
b. Tā mǎi-le yī-tái diànnǎo.  
    he buy-PERF one-CL laptop  
    ‘He bought a laptop.’

c. % [Yī-tái diànnǎo] tā mǎi-le ti.  
    one-CL laptop he buy-PERF  
    ‘A laptop, he bought.’

Problem with Cheung’s proposal:
The informational focus status of an XP does not justify its movement (cf. Gao 1994; Paul 2005; Badan & Del Gobbo 2011).
More elaboration:

• The **focus set** members of a sentence are defined as the constituents that contain the most deeply embedded word.

• In English, the focus set is associated with the nuclear stress on the most embedded word (Cinque 1993; Zubizarreta 1998; Reinhart 1995, 2006, a.o.).

• In Chinese, the *sentence-final position* is the default position for **informational focus** (He 1992, Xu 2004).

• “Chinese can **highlight** the constituents of the focus set by moving them syntactically” (Cheung 2009).

→ Recall our previous question: why “highlight”?
The SFP *ne* implicates that the speaker believes buying a computer is something worth emphasize. The answer can be pragmatically odd as an "overstatement" as an answer to the attitude-neutral question.
• Skopeteas and Fanselow’s (2011) experimental study shows that in German, Spanish, and Greek (but not Hungarian), the fronting of an object with informational or identificational focus depends on the property of the context, and is further sensitive to discourse factors, such as the predictability of the information.

• Frey (2010) argues for an A’-movement to the left periphery driven by emphasis in German.
Context: A and B know that John went shopping.

A: John is so poor. What could he possibly afford going shopping?

B1: [Yī-tái diànnǎo] ne tā mǎi-le. O ne S V
   one-cl laptop SFP he buy-perf
   ‘A laptop, he bought’

B2: Tā mǎi-le yī-tái diànnǎo. S V O
   he buy-PERF one-cl laptop
   ‘He bought a laptop.’

Adding an SFP ne (S V O ne) and/or stress on diànnǎo ‘laptop’ makes B1 pragmatically felicitous as B1. The object is contrastively marked.

a. Speaker (=B)’s belief:
   α = Zhangsan bought a laptop.

b. Hearer (=A)’s belief in speaker’s mind:
   Zhangsan is so poor and he can’t buy anything.

c. Speaker’s assumption:
   α is likely to be unexpected by the hearer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>my proposal</th>
<th>Cheung 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trigger of movement</td>
<td>Contrastive focus (Zimmermann 2007)</td>
<td>Informational focus (É.Kiss 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing site</td>
<td>Specifier of DiscourseP</td>
<td>Specifier of FocusP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Type 4: “afterthought”

- The adverbial clause is in the scope of the quantificational element of the main clause (local/focal).
- The adverbial clause does not have a discourse antecedent, and is new information to the hearer from the speaker’s perspective.
- This type does not have the prosodic properties of type 3. Instead, they have sentential stress.

To preview: the preceding clause is actually an independent clause. The final adverbial clause is an “afterthought” or a “fragment” which is intended to be interpreted within the scope of the preceding clause (i.e. having the preceding clause as the main clause).
Xu (=X) is the host of the talk show, and Li (=L), a play writer and director is the guest.

X1 So what can people get from watching Li Guoxiu’s play?
X2 This is also the question that the woman who was considering to spend 500 yuan on the ticket wanted to ask you, right?

L1 Duì (+) wǒ zài zhè ge hào xiàng shì yīnggāi shì 1988 nián ba l yuè 27 hào. right I at this probably be should be 1988 year sp January 27th ‘Right. I was on, probably, January 27th, 1988.’

L2 (+) Nǐ bù néng gēn mó jié zuò liào tiān a:. you not can with Capricorn chat SFP ‘You can’t chat with a Capricorn person.’

L3 (+) yǐnwèi wǒ men dōu jì nián.yuè.rì de. ((laugh++)) because we all remember date DE ‘because us Capricorn people have a good memory about date.’

L4 wǒ zài 1 yuè 27 hào nà [tiān]— I at January 27th that day ‘I was on January 27th—’
also remember grudge right yes-no if offend-PERF you if
‘(Catricorn people) also hold grudges, right? If someone has offended you.’

L5 [Eh: >cuò cuò cuò<]. (++)
eh wrong wrong wrong
‘Wrong, wrong, wrong’.

L6 mójiézuò shì jì zhàng bú jì chóu.
Capricorn be remember debt not remember grudge
‘Capricorn people remember debts but do not hold grudges.’

a. The woman was impolite and offensive. (Xu’s presupposition)
c. Li can recall the exact date when he encountered the woman. (CG content)
d. Therefore, he might have been holding a grudge against the woman. (Xu’s assumption)
Dash (̀pòzhéhào)

*General Rules of Punctuation (GB/T15834, 2011)*, the first use of a dash is to mark the content following the dash as an explanation or supplement to the preceding text (phrase or sentence).

Wǒ zhème yìzhí jiānchí fènfā dúshū
I such all.the.time persist exert.hardwork study
‘I persist on studying hard all the time like this’

yě xiǎng jiè cǐ huànqǐ dì.mèi men rèài shēnghuó de xīwàng
also want use this riase younger.sibling PL passion life DE hope
‘(I) also want to use this to raise *my sibling’s hope for the passion in life*’

—–wúlùn huánjìng duōme kùnnán.
no.matter situation how difficult
‘no matter how difficult the situation is.’
Analysis for type 4

Type 4 is different from type 3 in that:

• type 4 adverbials have different discursive functions;

• the preceding clause is emphasized with type 3, but not necessarily with type 4;

• type 3 can have a faster tempo, no sentence stress, and low contour, none of which is observed for type 4.

The differences above indicate different analyses.
Generalizations for type 4:

a. The preceding clause is an independent root sentence when type 4 occurs.

b. Type 4 is connected to the preceding clause in interpretation as if it is a type 2 (sentence-initial, unmarked, local, and focal).

c. Type 4 is generally a marked clause order but acceptable as afterthought.

d. The differences between type 4 and type 3 are as listed above.
• The biclausal plus PF-deletion analysis, a proposal for phrasal afterthought in German (cf. Frey and Truckenbrodt 2015; Ott & de Vries 2016; a.o.), can be extended to the type 4 adverbial clauses.
Phrasal afterthought in Chinese

a. Wǒ mǎi-le [A dǐng màozǐ], A[nizǐ-de].
   I buy-PERF CL hat woolen
   ‘I bought a hat, woolen.’

Analysis

b. [CP1 Wǒ mǎi-le dǐng màozǐ], [CP2 pro shì nizǐ-de]
   I buy-PERF CL hat be woolen
   ‘I bought a hat; (it is) woolen.’

c. Wǒ mǎi-le [A dǐng màozǐ], A[nizǐ-de ne].
   I buy-PERF CL hat woolen SFP

d. *Nizǐ-de, wǒ mǎi-le dǐng màozǐ.
   woolen I buy-PERF CL hat
Biclausal plus PF-deletion analysis

• Type 4 adverbial clauses can be analyzed as having the structure and derivation as: [CP1] [CP2], where CP1 is what has been labeled as the main clause. CP2 is a complex sentence, containing the adverbial clause in the sentence-initial position followed by the main clause identical to CP1. The main clause in CP2 undergoes deletion.
I truly be willing to if say have to this better job DE time
7. Potential challenges for the derivational analysis

- ok: \([rúguǒ \text{ ‘if’...XP...}][...jiù \text{ ‘then’...}]\)

- *: \([...jiù \text{ ‘then’...}][rúguǒ \text{ ‘if’...XP...}]\)
Wǒ zǎoshang tōngcháng qù pǎobù, dàn
I morning usually go jogging but
‘I usually go jogging in the morning. However…’

ok:
rúguǒ xiàyǔ, wǒ jiù bú huì qù.
if rain I not will go
‘If it rains, I won’t go.’

*:
wǒ jiù bú huì qù, rúguǒ xiàyǔ.
I not will go if rain
‘I won’t go if it rains.’
Jíshǐ xiàyuǔ Zhāngsān yě huì qù pǎobù.
even.if rain Zhangsan still will go jogging
“John will go jogging even if it is raining. However, ...”

ok:
rúguǒ xiàyǔ, wǒ jiù bú huì qù.
if rain I not will go
‘If it rains, I won’t go.’

also ok:
wǒ jiù bú huì qù, rúguǒ xiàyǔ.
I not will go if rain
‘I won’t go if it rains.’
‘I usually go jogging in the morning. However...’
ok: rúguǒ xiàyǔ, wǒ jìù bú huì qù.
   if rain I not will go
   ‘If it rains, I won’t go.’

*: wǒ jìù bú huì qù, rúguǒ xiàyǔ.
   I not will go if rain
   ‘I won’t go if it rains.’

“John will go jogging even if it is raining. However, ...”
ok: rúguǒ xiàyǔ, wǒ jìù bú huì qù.
   if rain I not will go
   ‘If it rains, I won’t go.’

ok: wǒ jìù bú huì qù, rúguǒ xiàyǔ.
   I not will go if rain
   ‘I won’t go if it rains.’

Are they the same jìù?
jiù is a contrastive marking adverb which is associated with a focus or contrastive topic (cf. Hole 2004). *jiù and its associate must be in the same CP (root clause).

ok: [rúguǒ ‘if’...XP_i...] [...jiù_i ‘then’...]
*: [...jiù_i ‘then’...] [rúguǒ ‘if’...XP_i...]
8. Conclusion