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Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to account in a generalized way for two facts about negation in Chinese. One is that the Chinese negative marker *bu* cannot co-occur with the perfective aspect marker *le*; the other is that the Chinese negative marker *bu* is incompatible with the manner phrase in the V-de construction. We claim that the functional category NegP postulated by Pollock (1989) can be extended to Chinese and that NegP analysis can account better for the syntactic distribution of the Chinese negative marker *bu*. The negative marker *bu* is placed in the specifier of NegP, while the head of NegP is left empty; and the complement of NegP is usually an AspP, which is headed by an Aspect marker, or an AUXP when there is an auxiliary occupying AUX. Chinese is an Asp-lowering language. Its perfective aspect marker *le* is lowered from Asp onto V, and the trace left behind in the Asp node by the moved head should be properly head governed. This can be satisfied when there are auxiliary verbs, but when there are no auxiliary verbs, (because the head of NegP is empty) nothing properly head governs the trace, an ECP violation will arise. Since the postverbal adjunct marker -de originated from the Asp of AspP, the incompatibility between *bu* and the manner phrase in the V-de construction can also be explained.
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1 Introduction
Negation has challenged many scholars to explore its properties and specifically its relationship to many other categories. Sentential negation, particularly, has been the subject of heated discussions. A proper understanding of the expression of sentential negation is central to our understanding of grammar (Zanuttini 2001:511). Therefore, it is of great importance to examine sentential negation in Chinese, for this can not only testify language universal, but also help us understand many other phenomena in this language.
Superficially, negation in Chinese is quite different from many other languages. Here we will compare Chinese and English sentential negation to see some differences.

First, Chinese has more sentential negative markers than English. Anyone who speaks English can tell that English has few (if there are more than one) sentential negative makers, and only not is common in use. In contrast, Chinese has many, including bu, fei, wu, fou, wei, mei, etc; bu and mei(you) are the most commonly used in standard modern Chinese.

Second, the positions of Chinese negative markers are different from those in English. Generally speaking, English negative markers have a relatively fixed place in sentences, usually before main verbs and/or after auxiliary verbs. as shown below:

(1) He is not Jim.
(2) He does not speak Chinese.
(3) He has not finished the work.
(4) I cannot tell you the truth.
(5) I can not tell you the truth.
(6) I will not tell you the truth.

It seems that Chinese negative markers, in contrast, do not have such a fixed place in sentences. For example, in (7) bu precedes a main verb; in (8) bu follows a main verb; in (9) bu precedes an auxiliary verb; and in (10) bu follows an auxiliary verb.

(7) wo bu chi pingguo.
I not eat apple
“I do not eat apple.”
(8) wo chi bu xia pingguo.
I eat not down apple
“I can’t eat apple.”
(9) wo bu keyi hui jia.
I not can go home
“I can’t go home.”
(10) wo keyi bu hui jia.
I can not return home
“It is possible that I do not go home.”

Third, Chinese negative markers seem to be sensitive to aspectual distinctions as well as to the manner phrase. This is shown in (11-13) (PERF stands for perfective marker, PRO for progressive marker, and DE is a postverbal adjunct marker):

(11) a. wo chi le pingguo.
I eat PERF apple
“I ate apple.”
b. *wo bu chi le pingguo.
I not eat PERF apple
Intended reading: “I do not eat apple.”

(12) a. ta dai zhe maozi.
he wear PRO cap
“He was wearing a cap.”
b. *ta bu dai zhe maozi.
he not wear PRO cap
Intended reading: “He was not wearing a cap.”

(13) a. ta pao de kuai.
he run DE fast
“He runs fast.”
b. *ta bu pao de kuai.
he not run DE fast
Intended reading: “He does not run fast.”

From above it can be concluded that sentential negation in Chinese is more complex than that of English. Many scholars, therefore, endeavor to explore its properties and specifically its relationship to other categories. They explain the syntactic distribution of the negative markers in Chinese from different perspectives. However, their explanations either are confronted with many problems or are based on some rules specific to Chinese. It is very necessary, therefore, to explain the syntactic distribution of the negative markers in Chinese in terms of recognized language universal principles, to testify language universals and to understand many related phenomena.

Since it is impossible for us to make a thorough study of Chinese negation, we discuss only some of the many phenomena. The issues we discuss center mainly on the syntactic distribution of the negative marker bu in negative statements.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In §2, the Negation Phrase (NegP) hypothesis will be presented and extended to Chinese. §3 is a functional projection analysis of Chinese clause structure, especially its Tense Phrase (TP) and Aspect Phrase (AspP). Chinese is argued to be an Asp(ect)-lowering language rather than a V(erb)-raising language, based on an investigation of Chinese clause structure, namely, the hierarchy among TP, AspP and NegP. §4 deals with the interaction between bu and Aspect. §2 to §4 focus mainly on bu, while §5 deals with mei(you) exclusively. In §5, the occurrence of mei and its interaction with Aspect and other auxiliary verbs will be discussed. §6 deals with the interaction between negation and postverbal adjuncts. On the assumption that -de’s in both Descriptive Complement Constructions and Resultative Complement Constructions
originate in the Asp of AspP, a natural explanation to the incompatibility between *bu* and the V-de construction are given. The last section is a conclusion of the present study.

2 NegP Hypothesis and the Chinese Negative Marker *bu*

As is claimed in Zanuttini (2001), in recent studies of the syntactic expression of sentential negation, the proposals in Pollock (1989) have been extremely influential. One major empirical contribution of Pollock (1989) is the proposal that the syntactic distribution of negative markers which follow the verb in I(nflectional) and precede the Verb Phrase (VP) is not identical to that of the class of VP-adverbs. “This proposal has proven to be extremely fruitful in analyzing negative markers in many languages, including but also going beyond Germanic and Romance” (Zanuttini 2001:523).

In this section, the NegP analysis will be presented and extended to Chinese. It is demonstrated that the Chinese negative marker *bu* should not be placed in the head of NegP, but in the specifier of NegP (Spec,NegP).

2.1 The English Negative Marker *not* and NegP Hypothesis

Traditionally, the English negative marker *not* is treated as an adverb. This view had dominated the linguistic field until 1989, when some generative syntacticians began to challenge it. They argue that, syntactically, the negative marker *not* is quite different from adverbs. Two frequently cited examples are repeated below:

(14) John often kisses Mary.
(15) John does not like Mary.

It is obvious that *often* and *not*, both of which are traditionally treated as adverbs, have different syntactic properties. In (14), Tense combines with the verb *kiss*, while in (15), Tense is separated from the verb by the sentential negative marker *not*. It seems that *not* is not of the same class as *often*. If it is, sentence (15) should be like (16):

(16) *John not likes Mary.

Therefore, it is reasonable to say that we need to rethink the analysis of negation: *not* should not be treated as an adverb. One alternative analysis proposed by Pollock (1989) is that *not* is contained within a separate Negation Phrase (NegP) projection, which is situated between I and VP, as shown in (17):
How can his proposal account for the ungrammaticality of (16)? According to Chomsky (1991), in English, I is weak (Chomsky’s terms weak and strong correspond to Pollock’s poor and rich) and cannot attract the main verb to move up and adjoin to I; instead, Affix Hopping applies, that is, I is lowered onto the main verb. This creates a trace, but the trace is not c-commanded by the moved element, as in (18c). A starred trace is therefore created. What must happen later in the derivation, then, is that the whole V moves up to the position where the trace is, as in (18d). When the whole [V+I] complex moves up into the position of the starred trace, the latter is somehow obliterated (DS: D-structure; SS: S-structure; LF: Logic Form).

(18) a. John often kisses Mary.
    b. DS: *[[IP John [I' I [VP often [VP kiss Mary]]]]]
    c. SS: *[[IP John [I' tI [VP often [V [V kiss [I] Mary]]]]]]
    d. LF: [[IP John [I' [V [V kiss [I] [VP often [VP tV_v kiss [I] Mary]]]]]]]

This explanation is based on the assumption that often is an adverb, an adjunct adjoined to VP. Adjuncts have a special status with respect to the categories they adjoin to. According to Ouhalla (1999:280), “An adjunct is both a sister to and a daughter of the categories it is adjoined to.” In other words, adjuncts are not full members of the categories they are adjoined to, although they are constituent members of them. For clarification, the adjoined category is often called an “associate member”. “Maximal projections are assumed to be barriers only for their full members, [while] associate members are governed by different regulations” (Ouhalla 1999:280). Therefore, often is not a barrier for the whole [V+I] complex to move back to obliterate the offending trace.

The English negative marker not is assumed not to be an adverb (if it is, (16) should be
acceptable), but a functional category, heading its own maximal projection. (16), therefore, is excluded by the blocking effect it shows, as is shown below:

(19) a. *John not likes Mary.
   b. DS: [IP John [I [NegP [Neg not [VP like Mary]]]]]
   c. SS: *[IP John [I [NegP [Neg not [VP [V like [I] Mary]]]]]]
   d. LF: *[IP John [I [V like [I] [NegP [Neg not [VP t[V like [I]] Mary]]]]]]

We can see from above that, even if lowering of I is possible (though it seems not permitted), the corrective covert raising of [V [V I]] back to I must be blocked. The reason it is blocked is now made explicit in the LF representation (19d). Raising [V [V I]] to I skips over the intervening head category Neg, a violation of the HMC. Neg creates a Minimality effect that prevents the raised [V [V I]] from antecedent governing its trace inside VP.

In view of the fact that neither overt V-raising to I (due to the weakness of T) nor overt I-lowering followed by covert raising (due to the blocking effect of NegP) is possible in negative sentences with a main verb, I in English is left before the negative marker alone. English makes use of a language specific rule do-support\(^1\) as a last resort to salvage the “stranded”\(^2\) tense. (15), therefore, is derived. The derivation is shown in (20), where DoS stands for Do-support:

(20) a. John does not like Mary.
   b. DS: [IP John [I [NegP [Neg not [VP like Mary]]]]]
   c. DoS: [IP John [I [do [NegP [Neg not [VP like Mary]]]]]]
   d. SS: [IP John [I [do [NegP [Neg not [VP like Mary]]]]]]

The diagram in (17) shows that “not” is contained within a separate NegP projection, which is situated between I and VP. This assumption provides a reasonable explanation for the ungrammaticality of (16), but it is still very far from a solution. Consider the raising of verbs in (21) and (22) that are excluded by HMC violation:

(21) a. John is not reading a book.
   b. SS: *[IP John [I [V be I [NegP [Neg not [VP t[be] reading a book]]]]]]

(22) a. John has not read this book.
   b. SS: *[IP John [I [V have I [NegP [Neg not [VP t[have] read this book]]]]]]

If auxiliary verbs originate from VP, then it seems that Auxiliary verbs can move across not into I. Recall that it is assumed in the previous section that not projects its own maximal projection, NegP, with not as the head. The movement through Neg should therefore give

---

1 According to Chomsky (1991), the use of language-specific rules such as do-support is subject to economy conditions. Radford (2004, p.174) provides a definition for it, from minimalist perspective.

2 By “stranded” we mean that Affix-hopping and V-raising fail to apply and Tense is left under I alone.
rise to a violation of the HMC, resulting in ungrammaticality. However, (21a) and (22a) are perfect. That is to say, the movement through Neg does not give rise to a violation of the HMC. How can we account for this?

In solving this kind of problem, two versions of the NegP hypothesis have been put forward. In the first version, the negative marker heads its own NegP, taking a complement phrase. In the second one, there is a NegP, but its head is empty and the negative marker is in the Spec.

Radford (2004) follows the first. He assumes that not does not head NegP but serves as the specifier of NegP, so that the head Neg position is null. Thus the null Neg constituent opens up to the possibility that V moves through it into I (a detailed discussion, see Radford 2004, pp. 171-3).

The second version is defended by Ouhalla (1991). He maintains that not occupies the head of NegP, but (English) auxiliaries originate in a position which is higher than that of Neg. The present study will adopt this view and assume that not heads its own maximal projection. We will discuss this later.

The NegP hypothesis has succeeded in accounting for the negative structures in a wide range of Indo-European languages, such as English, French, Romance, Turkish, Swedish, Italian, Piedmontese, among others (Pollock 1989; Ouhalla 1990; Chomsky 1991; Belletti 1990; Haegeman 1995; Kayne 1989; Zanuttini 1996).

This hypothesis is also extended to Chinese by some scholars (e.g., Cheng and Li 1991; Chiu 1993; Xu 1997; Hsieh 2001; Hsiao 2002) with great success.

2.2 The Chinese Negative Marker bu

Chinese Grammarians have identified quite a few negative markers, but only two are common in use: bu and mei. Bu may precede all predicates with the exception of the item you, which, as a lexical and an aspectual auxiliary, is exclusively negated by the negative marker mei. Following Wang (1965), we treat mei as the alternant of bu before you.

The study of Chinese negative markers can be traced back to Ma Shi Wen Tong (Ma 1998), the first edition of which was published in 1898, more than one hundred years ago. In this work, negative markers are treated as adverbs. This view has been followed by most Chinese grammarians until today. Generative linguists had already begun to study negation in Chinese since 1960s (e.g. Wang 1965; Teng 1973, 1974; Huang 1988; Cheng & Li 1991; Ernst 1994, 1995; Chiu 1993; Chao 1994; Xu 1997; Chao & Mui 1998; Lee & Pan 1999 2001; Hsieh 2001; Hsiao 2002; Lin 2003; Hu 2007; Li 1999, 2007). Many of them have attempted to extend the NegP hypothesis to Chinese after its proposal in 1989 (Cheng & Li
Most of them hold the idea that *bu* is an X° head projecting a NegP. This is shown in (23):

\[
\text{NegP} \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{Neg'} \\
\text{Neg} \quad \ldots \\
\text{bu}
\]

This analysis, as noted by Ernst (1995), makes it possible to use the “blocking effect” of the Neg head on the lowering of -le onto V. This is essentially the analysis of Cheng and Li (1991) and Chiu (1993). Cheng and Li (1991) propose that -le is the head of Aspect Phrase (AspP), which is base-generated higher in the structure than NegP, while in Chiu (1993), -le implies past tense, base-generated in T. We will discuss this in detail in §4.

This kind of analysis seems very appealing, but it runs into difficulty in both theoretical and practical explanations. In practice, this kind of analysis can explain the inability of *bu* to occur with the perfective aspect marker -le, but at the same time it excludes grammatical sentences like (24):

\[
\text{ni} \quad \text{bu} \quad \text{yinggai} \quad \text{chi} \quad \text{le} \quad \text{pingguo}.
\]

“You shouldn’t have had apple.”

In theory, as Ting (2006:81) notes, in his argument based on the clitic *suo* as applied to negative markers in Mandarin Chinese, “If negative particles in Romance are heads of NegP, those in Mandarin Chinese should not be.”

According to Ting (2006), *suo* is supposed to be base-generated as the head of the DP in the complement of the Verb position, and to be bound by a null operator base-generated in Spec,CP. So it is suggested that *suo* undergoes movement out of the DP it heads and adjoins to I°. If this assumption is correct, then the ordering between *suo* and the negative marker *bu* indicates that *bu* is not the head of NegP. Consider (25):

\[
\text{a. Zhangsan} \quad \text{suo} \quad \text{bu} \quad \text{xihuan} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{ren}.
\]

"The person that Zhangsan does not like"

\[
\text{b. *Zhangsan} \quad \text{bu} \quad \text{suo} \quad \text{xihuan} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{ren}.
\]

\[
\text{Zhangsan} \quad \text{not} \quad \text{Suo} \quad \text{like} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{person}
\]

Some scholars have a different view, for example, Hsieh (2001:60) proposes that “Mei(you) heads a NegP, while *bu* does not.”
Intended reading: “The person that Zhangsan does not like”

If the negative marker *bu* projects an independent functional category, the structure which underlies (25) would be like (26) (Cited from Ting (2001:80)):

(26)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{OP} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{Neg} \\
\text{D} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ren}_1 \\
\text{su}_1 \\
\text{i} \\
\text{bu} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{bu} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{xihuan} \\
\text{D}_1 \\
\end{array}
\]

According to Ting, if *suo* moves onto Neg first, then excorporating from it is banned because the non-L-related head does not allow excorporation to take place. The only choice is that the Neg head must be crossed. However, it gives rise to an HMC/ECP violation.

This implies, theoretically, that the negative marker *bu* should be put in the specifier of NegP. This is the approach taken by Belletti (1990) for the English *not*, Rizzi (1990), Belletti (1990) and Zanuttini (1991) for the French post-verbal negative marker *pas*, Ouhalla (1990) for the Swedish *inte*, Haegeman (1995) for the West Flemish *nie*, and Zanuttini (1997) for some negative markers in certain northern Italian dialects. Therefore, it appears logically possible that the Chinese negative marker *bu* can be analyzed in this way.

As pointed out by Ting (2006:81), “for such an approach to hold for deriving the occurrence of *suo* before negative particles, we have to allow an empty head (of a NegP) to be crossed.”

In the present study, we propose that the negative marker *bu* be in the specifier of NegP (Spec,NegP), and the head position of NegP be empty (marked as Ø).

\[\text{Unfortunately, J. Ting did not go into detailed discussion of this approach.}\]
Then the negative structure in Chinese would be:

(27)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{bu} \\
\text{Neg} \\
\text{…} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\emptyset\]

In the literature, we did not find any previous works putting the negative marker \textit{bu} in the specifier of NegP (Of course, many studies are still beyond our reach), but we did find many works in favor of this analysis. For example, Law (2001), in accounting for the syntax of A-not-A questions in Cantonese, a dialect of the Chinese language, proposes that “the sentential negative morpheme \textit{m} is, as generally assumed for pure negators, generated in [Spec,NegP] and is in spec-head agreement with the [neg] feature on the \textit{Neg} head.” Li (2007:66) also holds the idea that “[If NegP hypothesis can be extended to Chinese,] The adverb \textit{bu} would have to be in Spec NegP,” and she did try to extend NegP to Chinese with \textit{bu} in Spec,NeP, though she holds a negative view from the beginning to the end.

Before we end this argument for the position of \textit{bu}, it is necessary to review some interesting arguments for \textit{bu} heading its projection NegP given by Xu (1997). First, Xu notes that \textit{bu} can merge with some modals, forming words like \textit{bie} “not (imperative)” and \textit{beng} “not have to”. Xu argues that for this merging process to be possible, \textit{bu} must be an X0 element since only heads may incorporate onto another head. It is necessary to note that this reasoning is not very convincing. Whether this merging process is an incorporating process is still a pending question, because we have many “merging processes” in English that is obviously not head to head, such as “I’m”, “you’d”, “he’ll”, etc. which are formed by pronouns occupying Spec,TP merging with modals. Furthermore, Xu notes that quantifiers such as \textit{shei} “who”, \textit{shenme} “what” and \textit{nar} “where” in (28) can move out of the VP and across the negative marker \textit{bu}.

(28) a. \textit{wo} \textit{shei} \textit{dou} \textit{bu} \textit{xian} \textit{jian}.
    I who all not want see
    “I want to see no one.”

b. \textit{Zhangsan} \textit{shenme} \textit{dou} \textit{bu} \textit{chi}.
    Zhangsan what all not eat
    “Zhangsan eats nothing.”

\footnote{Attention should be paid to \textit{nar} “where” in Chinese which is treated as a pronoun (\textit{An Applied Chinese Dictionary} (edited by Dictionaries Research Center of Commercial Press) Beijing: Commercial Press, 2000: 895); this is different from its equivalent in English, \textit{where}, which is treated as an adverb.}
Xu then argues that given the XP status of these moved quantifiers, (28) shows that *bu* is not in the specifier position of NegP; otherwise, relativized minimality effects would arise. This account, however, is not very convincing. We would like to discuss it from two aspects. First, if the fact that *bu* is in the specifier position of NegP does give rise to relativized minimality effects, it must mean that the wh-traces in VP, namely, traces of *shei*, *sheme* and *nar*, can only satisfy the ECP via antecedent-government. However, according to Ouhalla (1999:274), “object wh-phrases can satisfy proper government via antecedent-government or \( \theta \)-government or both...” That is to say, since the traces of *shei*, *sheme* and *nar* in (28) can satisfy proper government or \( \theta \)-government, the fact given by Xu in (28) cannot show that *bu* is not located in the specifier of NegP. Besides, even if traces of *shei*, *sheme* and *nar* in (28) could only satisfy proper government via antecedent-government, we still cannot say that *bu* is not in the specifier position of NegP. The negative element *bu* occupies a position which is an A’-position, to be specific, A’-specifier (see Hsiao 2002). However, according to Ting (2006), the preposing in (28) involves A-movement in nature.6 Being not of the same type, *bu* does not qualify as a typical potential antecedent governor for the traces.

3 Functional Projections TP and AspP

In the previous section, we revisited one major empirical contribution of Pollock (1989). He proposes that the syntactic distribution of negative markers which follow the verb in I and precede the VP is not identical to that of the class of VP-adverbs. This observation leads to a major theoretical innovation, namely the proposal that negative markers be viewed as elements heading an independent syntactic category, whose semantic properties can be characterized as contributing an instance of negation to the clause. In this section, we will go on to discuss several other functional projections postulated later, and attempt to extend them to the analysis of Chinese syntactic structure.

3.1 TP

Ever since the advent of the influential split-INFL hypothesis (Pollock 1989), numerous

---

6 “Notice that the three wh-words are all preposed in the *dou* construction. Under a well-adopted approach, e.g. Shyu, Shu-ing (1995), this is A-movement.”—Jen Ting, personal correspondence to the author, May 18, 2008.
functional projections have been proposed (Belletti 1990; Ouhalla 1991; Chomsky 1991; etc.). Among them the three most important are TP, NegP and AspP.\footnote{Note that there are many others, such as AgrP, AgrP, MoodP, AuxP, etc. and there are even some that are Chinese-specific such as SuoP, DouP, BaP, etc. The reason I chose these three is in accordance with Zanuttini (2001, p.511), “Negative markers tend to occur in the same part of the structure as realizes other types of grammatical information, standard considered to be nucleus of the clause (e.g., tense and aspect).”}

Tense, which used to be a part of inflectional projection, has been generally recognized as heading its own projection TP under the split-INFL hypothesis (Pollock 1989; Belletti 1990; Chomsky 1991; Chiu 1993; Haegeman 1994; Bobaljik & Jones 1996; Radford 1997; Li 1999, 2007). Radford (2004:327) claims, in his simple model of clause structure, that “canonical clauses are CP + TP + VP structures.” Examples (27) and (28) in §2 have the derivation shown in (29) and (30) below respectively.

(29) a. John often kisses Mary.
   b. DS: *[TP John [T' T [VP often [VP kiss Mary]]]]
   c. SS: *[TP John [T' tI [VP often [VP [V [V kiss [T]] Mary]]]]]
   d. LF: [TP John [T' [V [V kiss [T]]] [VP often [VP t[,v,kiss[T]] Mary]]]]

(30) a. John does not like Mary.
   b. DS: [TP John [T' T [NegP [Neg' not [VP like Mary]]]]]
   c. DoS: [TP John [T' [T] [do] [NegP [Neg' not [VP like Mary]]]]]
   d. SS: [TP John [T' [T] [do] [NegP [Neg' not [VP like Mary]]]]]

Though TP has been widely assumed to exist cross-linguistically, whether there is tense category in Chinese is still a pending question. The traditional view is that Chinese has no tense category (e.g. Wang 1943; Gao 1986; Li & Thompson 1981; C-T. Huang 1982; Lü 1999; etc.). However, many scholars advocate the existence of tense in Chinese (e.g. Zhang 1957; Dragonov 1958; Tsang 1981; Chiu 1993; Zhang 1998a-b). Although clauses in Chinese are not always overtly marked with tense, there are cases where overt markers are clearly present. As Li (2007:12) notices, “although overt tense markers can hardly be found in present or past tense, there does appear to be an element that serves to mark future events.” She proposes that the element jiang indicates future tense, and argues, “In spite of the fact that jiang does not normally appear in colloquial style to indicate a future event, it is used frequently to mark future tense in the formal register” (Li 2007:12). The following is an example cited from Li (2007:12):

(31) zongtong jiang yu mingnian fang hua.
President will at next year visit China

Following her, we therefore argue that there is TP in Chinese, with the subject in the position Spec, TP.
3.2 AspP

In this subsection we will deal with AspP. The existence of AspP has been demonstrated in many languages, e.g., in English (Ernst 1994) and Chinese (Chiu 1993; Li 1999, 2007; among others). However, many issues about Aspect still have much controversial. For instance, where are aspecltal markers base-generated? How do they combine with the verb? In this subsection we will first look at the AspP in English, and then extend it to Chinese.

3.2.1 AspP in English

Derivation in (29) and (30) involves only two functional categories, TP and NegP, but not AspP. Taking AspP into consideration, we will have a structure outlined in (33). We have NegP in parentheses to accommodate constructions which do not contain negative markers.

(33)

```
TP
  Spec  T'
    T     (NegP)
      Spec  Neg'
        Neg  AspP
           Spec  Asp'
             Asp  VP
                Spec  V'
                  V    ...
```
According to the tree diagram above, aspectual markers are base-generated under Aspect which heads AspP. That is to say, aspectual markers are base-generated higher than Verb. However, the proposal that aspectual markers are base-generated in the Asp node raises the question of how the aspectual markers which appear as suffixes of the verbs can be accounted for. Or how do the aspectual markers combine with the verb which is lower in the tree diagram?

Ouhalla (1991) distinguishes between progressive Asp and perfective Asp. The progressive Asp is formed by the verb in the lower position moving up to the higher Asp node to attach to the -ing form, forming a derived complex [V+Asp]. He suggests that the -ing form is a nominal element, [V-ing] complex is indeed nominal in nature, while be is inserted directly under T to support the stranded element occupying it, as shown below:

(34)

Assuming this to be the case, the structure and derivation of (21) in §2 will be outlined as in (35) below, where VR stands for Verb-raising, and BeI stands for Be-Insertion:

(35) a. John is not reading a book.
   b. DS: \[TP] \[T \[NegP \[Neg' not \[AspP \[Asp \[VP \text{read a book}]]\]]\]]
   c. VR: \[TP] \[T \[NegP \[Neg' not \[AspP \[Asp \[VP \text{read a book}]]\]]\]]
   d. BeI: \[TP] \[T \[Be \[T \[NegP \[Neg' not \[AspP \[Asp \[VP \text{read a book}]]\]]\]]\]]
   e. SS: \[TP] \[T \[Be \[T \[NegP \[Neg' not \[AspP \[Asp \[VP \text{read a book}]]\]]\]]\]]
For the perfective Asp, Ouhalla (1991) assumes that *have*, which itself is an Asp element, is a verbal element base-generated under the Asp node. It moves to T, whereas the main verb remains in its D-structure position inside VP as in (36):

(36)  
```
TP
  Spec  T'  
    T  (NegP)
      Spec  Neg'  
        Neg  AspP  
          Spec  Asp'  
            Asp  VP  
              have  Spec  V'  
                V  ...
```

Then, the structure and derivation of (22) in §2 will be outlined as in (37) below, where HR stands for the have-raising:

(37)  
```
a. John has not read this book.
  b. DS: [TP John [T [NegP [Neg' not [AspP [Asp have] [VP read a book]]]]]]
  c. HR: [TP John [T [Have] [T] [NegP [Neg' not [AspP [Asp thave] [VP read a book]]]]]]
  d. SS: [TP John [T [Have] [T] [NegP [Neg' not [AspP [Asp thave] [VP read a book]]]]]]
```

### 3.2.2 AspP in Chinese

Compared with Tense, the postulation of the functional category of Aspect in Chinese is much less controversial. One strong empirical argument is that aspect is overtly expressed in Chinese. This subsection is divided into two. In the first one, we will discuss AspP in Chinese; and the second deals mainly with Chinese Asp-lowering.

#### 3.2.2.1 Aspects in Chinese

With respect to aspect, Chinese has a rich system of aspect. According to Lü Shuxiang
(1999:16), five aspects exist in Chinese: (a) progressive: *shuo* *zhe* *hua*; (b) perfective: *shuo* *le* *sangezi*; (c) experiential: *shuogu* *zhe* *juhua* (d) deliminative: *ni* *shuoshuo, wo* *tingting*; (e) potential: *shuo* *de* *qing, ting* *bu* *dong*. The *Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (Beijing: Encyclopedia of China Publishing House) (1994:145) holds the same view. Li and Thompson (1981), however, proposes that Chinese has four verbal aspects: (a) deliminative: reduplication of verb; (b) imperfective (duratives): *zai*, -*zhe*; (c) experiential: -*guo*; (d) perfective: -*le*8. In this section we will focus on Li and Thompson’s four aspectual markers, namely, -*le*, -*guo*, *zai* and -*zhe*.

These four aspectual makers, according to Li (1999, 2007), are different in nature. Some examples from Li (2007:15-17) can make it clear (EXP: Experiential marker).

(38) a. *Lifan* he *le* yi bei cha
   Lifan drink PERF a cup tea
   “Lifan has had a cup of tea.”
   b. *Lifan* he yi bei cha *le*
   Lifan drink a cup tea PERF
   Intended reading: “Lifan has had a cup of tea.”

(39) a. *Lifan* kan *guo* zhe ben shu
   Lifan read EXP this CL book
   “Lifan has read this book.”
   b. *Lifan* kan zhe ben shu *guo*
   Lifan read this CL book EXP
   Intended reading: “Lifan has read this book.”

(40) a. *ta* tou shang dai zhe yi ding hong maozi
   he head top wear PRO one CL red hat
   “He was wearing a red hat on his head.”
   b. *ta* tou shang dai yi ding hong maozi *zhe*
   he head top wear one CL red hat PRO
   Intended reading: “He was wearing a red hat on his head.”

Examples (38-40) illustrate the fact that the three aspectual markers in Chinese, -*le*, -*guo* and -*zhe*, are required to follow the host verb immediately, with no intervening elements. This non-detachability of the aspectual markers from their host verbs suggests that they are suffixes. However, *zai*, is different, as in (41):

(41) a. *Lifan* zai da dianhua
   Lifan PRO call telephone

8 In this thesis, unless otherwise expressly noted, *le* refers to the verbal *le*, (or *le*), which is almost undisputedly treated as the perfective aspect marker.
“Lifan is making a telephone call.”

b. *Lifan zai gei ta mama da dianhua*
   Lifan PRO to his mother call telephone
   “Lifan is making a telephone call to his mother.”

c. *Lifan zai yibian da dianhua yibian jilu*
   Lifan PRO meanwhile call telephone meanwhile take notes
   “Lifan was taking notes as he was making the phone call.”

(41) shows that *zai* precedes the verb, but it is not required to precede the verb immediately (*gei ta mama* “to his mother” is analyzed as an adjunct by Li). This indicates that *zai* should be treated as a particle. Following Chiu (1993) and Ernst (1995), we propose that AspP exists in Chinese. Aspectual markers are base-generated in the Head, Asp which selects VP as its complement. This can be represented as in the tree diagram below (Li 2007:18):

(42) $\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{Asp'} \\
\hspace{1cm} \text{Asp} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{-le} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{-guo} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{-zhe} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{zai}
\end{array}$

3.2.2.2 V-raising or Asp-lowering?

We suggested that the Chinese aspectual marker *zai* is a particle while the other three aspectual markers in Chinese, i.e., *-le*, *-guo* and *-zhe*, are suffixes; *zai* precedes the verb, while the other three follow immediately the host verb. However, the proposal that aspectual markers are base-generated in the Asp node raises the question of how the three aspectual markers, namely the perfective *-le* and *-guo* and the progressive *-zhe*, end up as suffixes of the verbs. Is that in the same as English?

In § 3.1, we assumed that English progressive Asp is formed by the verb in the lower position moving up to the higher Asp node to derive a complex [V+ing]. Does Chinese have the same mechanism? It seems that this is not the case; this is demonstrated when we take the following data (cited from Li (2007:20)) into consideration (De stands for the NP (or VP) modification marker).
According to Tang (1990) and Ernst (1994), Chinese adverbs like zixi de in (43) are adjoined to V'. Assuming this proposal is on the right lines, (43) must be derived by V-raising process, that is, the verb in the lower position moves up to the higher Asp node to form a derived complex [V+Asp], as is shown in diagram (44) (cited from Li (2007:20)):

Therefore, we conclude that V-raising (to Asp) is not applicable in Chinese. Then how can we account for the fact that the perfective -le and -guo and the progressive -zhe appear as suffixes of the verbs? Following Chiu (1993, Chapter 2) and Cheng (1997, Chapter 1), we assume that in Chinese, aspectual markers in the Asp head are lowered and right-adjoined to the verb at SS, deriving sentences in (45).

---

9 In the literature, VP-adverbs are commonly used as a diagnostic for V-raising. It is also possible that zixi de is adjoined to VP, but here this makes no syntactical difference.
(45) a. ta zixi de kan le zhe feng xin.
   he carefully De read PERF this CL letter
   “He has read the letter carefully.”

b. ta zixi de kan guo zhe feng xin.
   he careful De read EXP this CL letter
   “He read the letter carefully.”

c. ta zixi de kan zhe zhe feng xin.
   he careful De read PRO this CL letter
   “He was reading the letter carefully.” (Li 2007:19)

This lowering process is shown in (46):

\[
\text{AspP} \\
| \text{Spec} \quad \text{Asp'} \\
| \quad \text{Asp} \quad \text{VP} \\
| \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{V'} \\
| \quad \text{ADV} \quad \text{V'} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
| \quad t_{le} \quad zixi de kan-le zhe feng xin \\
| \quad t_{guo} \quad zixi de kan-guo zhe feng xin \\
| \quad t_{zhe} \quad zixi de kan-zhe zhe feng xin 
\]

Li (2007:21) points out:

The lowering process provides an explicit account both for the facts observed above concerning the postverbal occurrences of the aspectual suffixes and importantly for the facts observed … where preverbal adjuncts are present. Unfortunately, the lowering account faces conceptual problems: the trace left behind in the Asp node by the moved head fails to be properly governed due to the lack of c-command, thus giving rise to a potential ECP violation.\(^\text{10}\)

How can we account for this? We will go in detail into this question in §3.3.2.

\(^\text{10}\) Some readers would argue that if we use the same method to test, we would have to draw a conclusion that English is an Asp-lowering language, too. It seems that is true. The proper head government we use to account for Chinese Asp-lowering in § 3.3.2 can also be used to explain that of English. However, we do not have space to have a detailed discussion of this.
3.3  Hierarchy among TP, AspP and NegP and an account for the Asp-lowering

3.3.1  Hierarchy among TP, AspP and NegP

Three functional projections have been postulated in Chinese until now. They are TP, AspP and NegP. We argue that the hierarchy among them is in (47) below:

\[(47)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\leftarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow T' \\
\leftarrow T \rightarrow (\text{NegP}) \\
\leftarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Neg'} \\
\leftarrow \text{Neg} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \\
\leftarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Asp'} \\
\leftarrow \text{Asp} \rightarrow \text{VP} \\
\leftarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow V' \\
\leftarrow V \rightarrow \ldots
\end{array}
\]

We propose that T heads its own projection and selects AspP as its complement when there is no negative marker \textit{bu}. However, when there is the negative marker \textit{bu}, T should select NegP (with the negative marker \textit{bu} as its specifier) as its complement. This proposal is based on two empirical reasons: One is that the future tense marker \textit{jiang} which fills the head position of TP is structurally higher than the negative marker \textit{bu} which serves as the specifier of NegP, as in (48) from Li (2007:67); The other is that the negative marker \textit{bu} is higher than aspectual marker \textit{zai} which fills the head position of AspP, as in (49) From Li (2007:67). Their structures are shown in (50):

\[(48)\] \textit{a. jingcha jiang bu qisu ta.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
police & will & not & accuse & him \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
“The police will not accuse him.”
\end{tabular}

\[(49)\] \textit{a. Wangli bu zai kan dianshi}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Wangli & not & PRO & watch & TV \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
“We Wangli is not watching TV.”
\end{tabular}
3.3.2 An account for the Asp-lowering

In §3.2.2.2, we proposed that aspectual markers in the Asp head are lowered and right-adjointed to the verb at SS. This gives rise to a potential ECP violation. How can we account for this? Recalling that in §2.1 and §3.1, we assumed that the ECP violation is obliterated through moving the whole [V+I] complex (to be more specific, [V+T] complex) up into the position of the starred trace at LF. The example is reproduced as (50).

(50) a. John often kisses Mary.
   b. DS: *[TP John [T' T [VP often [VP kiss Mary]]]]
   c. SS: *[TP John [T' tI [VP often [VP [V [V kiss [T] Mary]]]]]]
   d. LF: [TP John [T' [V [V kiss [T]] [VP often [VP t[V kiss [T] Mary]]]]]]

Can we propose, in the same vein, the ECP violation be circumvented through moving the inflectional verbal complex [V+Asp] up into the position of the starred trace at LF? It seems that we cannot, because, as pointed out in Speas (1991), Ernst (1995) and Li (1999, 2007), such an approach, which allows lowering coupled with raising, reduces Baker’s

Confronted with this problem, Li (1999, 2007) retreats and resorts to Minimalist approach, proposing that verbs are generated fully fledged with aspectual suffixes, which are then get checked off at LF. This sounds appealing, but, as we decided at the beginning, we need to carry out our study in the framework of Government and Binding. We must, therefore, find a feasible approach to account for it. We will reconsider the ECP.

Empty Category Principle was not unchangeable. Many revisions have been provided ever since it was proposed, and different versions have been put forward. It seems that the one Li (1999, 2007) applies is from Chomsky (1986:17), “ECP states that a non-pronominal empty category must be properly governed,” where “proper government” is defined as, “β is properly governed by α if it is governed by α and a certain kind of connection holds between α and β.” Chomsky understands this connection as “α properly governs β iff α ∈-governs or antecedent-governs β”. Because the movement of Asp is a lowering movement, the trace left behind in the Asp node can’t be antecedent-governed. While the ∈-government that Chomsky (1986:70) proposes is “α ∈-governs β iff α is a zero-level category that ∈-marks β, and α, β are sisters.” According to this definition, the trace can’t be ∈-governed, either.

Since the trace left behind in the Asp node cannot satisfy ECP via neither ∈-government nor antecedent-government, the version of ECP proposed by Chomsky (1986) should be abandoned in the present study. However, we find, in the literature, that the version of ECP put forward by Rizzi (1990) is just the one we are looking for. It is stated as (Rizzi 1990:32):

(51) ECP: A non-pronominal empty category must be:
   (i) properly head-governed
   (ii) antecedent-governed or Theta-governed

Proper head-government is the first part that involves formal licensing, whereas the second part has to do with identification. This definition of the ECP thus can be simplified in such a way that only the first part is included, as in (52) (Rizzi 1990:87):

(52) A non-pronominal empty category must be properly head governed.

How can we understand the proper head government? Rizzi (1990:31) defines proper government as “governed by X° within X°,” making a distinction between specifiers and complements. The head-government, according to Anagnostopoulou and Fox (2007:6), can be defined as in (53):

(53) X head-governs Y iff
   (i) X ∈ {Adj, N, P, V, Agr, T}
   (ii) X m-commands Y
(iii) no barrier intervenes
(iv) Relativized Minimality is respected
Kosmeijer (1992:93) interprets the idea of Rizzi’s (1990) proper head-government, and defines it as in (54):
\[
\alpha \text{ properly head-governs } \beta \text{ in } g \{XP \beta \text{ if}
\]
(i) \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) are heads
(ii) \(\beta\) is head of XP
Therefore, it is by no means venturesome now to say that, in affirmative sentences, the trace left behind in the Asp node by the moved head is properly head governed. The governor should be \(T\), which heads its own projection TP and selects AspP as its complement. However, in negative sentences, when there is an intervening NegP, which is higher than AspP and lower than TP, nothing will properly head govern the trace left behind in the Asp node. As discussed in §2.2, the negative marker \(bu\) serves as the specifier of NegP (Spec,NegP), leaving the head Neg position of NegP null. Therefore, there is nothing head-governing the trace left behind in the Asp node. An ECP violation thus arises. We will discuss this in next section.

4 The Negative Marker \(bu\) and Aspect

The relationship between Chinese negation and Aspect has long been of interest to Chinese linguists. Almost all the previous studies have unavoidably touched upon one fact, that is, the inability of the negative marker \(bu\) to occur with the perfective aspect marker -\(le\). A relevant example is given in (55) (cited from Ernst (1995:666)):
\[
\text{(55) a. Wo chi le mugua. I eat PERF papaya} \\
\text{“I ate papaya.”} \\
\text{b. Wo bu chi mugua. I not eat papaya} \\
\text{“I do not eat papaya.”} \\
\text{c. *Wo bu chi-le mugua.} \\
\text{d. Wo mei-you chi mugua. I not-PERF eat papaya} \\
\text{“I didn't eat papaya.”}
\]
In the literature, various proposals have been put forward to account for this. Careful study shows that none of them are very satisfactory. In this section, we first review the previous analyses, and then we will proceed to present our own explanation.
4.1 Previous Analyses

All the studies of Chinese negation within the generative framework can all be divided into two types, namely, those with a non-NegP based approach and those with a NegP based approach. In the following subsection, six analyses will be reviewed, namely, Wang (1965), Huang (1988), Ernst (1995) and Lee and Pan (1999, 2001), from the first type, and Cheng and Li (1991) and Chiu (1993), from the second type.

4.1.1 Non-NegP Based Approaches

Wang (1965) was the first one to analyze the pattern in (55) within the generative framework. He, in his well-known you/-le alternation transformational analysis, proposes an aspect marker you which precedes the verb in DS and the negative marker bu which precedes the aspect marker you. Rules are formulated to derive sentences marked with perfective -le and their negative counterparts. The two relevant transformation rules may be expressed informally as: (i) you is transposed to follow the verb and then changed to its alternate -le in the case of affirmative clauses, a movement later known as ‘affix-hopping’; (ii) Bu is changed to its allomorphic form mei in the case of negative clauses. These two transformation rules correspond to Wang’s T5 and T4, which are repeated here for those who are not familiar with the arguments.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T5: Condition: } & X \cdot you \ (-guo) \ Y \text{ Verb } Z \\
\text{(-you (-guo) shift)} \\
\text{and: (i) } & 1 \neq BU \text{ and } 3 \neq BU; \ (ii) \ 3 \text{ does not contain Verb}; \ (iii) \text{ if } 5 = le \text{ (sentence particle), then (A), otherwise (B).} \\
\text{Change: } & (A) \ 1 \ 3 \ 4 \ (-guo) \ -le; \ (B) \ 1 \ 3 \ 4 \ -le \ 5 \\
\text{T4: Condition: } & BU \cdot you \ X \\
\text{(mei change)} \\
\text{and: (i) If } & 3 = \# \text{ (sentence boundary), then only Change (A) is possible.} \\
\text{Change: } & (A) \ mei \ 2 \ 3 \\
\text{(B) mei } & 3
\end{align*}
\]

As is pointed by Huang (1988), “Wang’s treatment seems to be an accurate description of an important pattern in Chinese grammar, though the very existence of this pattern remains to be explained.”

As a step toward a possible explanation of the ungrammaticality as (55c) illustrated,
Huang (1988) proposes Principle P. This has been the most influential principle until today (for discussions of it, see Ernst, 1995; Wible & Chen 2000; Lee & Pan, 1999, 2001; Lin 2003; Lin 2006; Li 1999, 2007; just to mention a few).

(56) Principle P

The negative morpheme bu forms an immediate construction with the first V⁰ element following it.

According to Huang, “bu is locally (Chomsky)-adjoined to V⁰,” creating a negated V.

Therefore, the relevant portion of the structure of (55c) is as follows:

(57) [[V⁰ bu [V⁰ chi]] le]

not eat PERF

This structure shows that bu is first attached to the verb chi, forming the negated V complex [bu-chi] to which the perfective -le is then attached. However, such a structure is bound to be ill-formed for semantic reasons: “it is absurd to assign the perfective -le to a negated verb, just as it is contradictory to assert the completion of some event that one says does not happen” (Huang 1988:284).

Huang also observes that there exist cases where bu can occur with perfective -le. The first case is illustrated in (58):

(58) [S tamen [INFL bushi][VP pian-le Lisi]].

they not-be cheat-PERF Lisi

“It is not the case that they cheated Lisi.” (Huang 1988:285)

In (58) the insertion of shi keeps the bu in INFL, and the result is a negated shi having scope over the entire VP containing -le. The use of preverbal shi thus has the effect of “do-support”, in preventing bu from being cliticized to the main verb in cases where this would lead to absurdity.

Huang’s account looks appealing as a possible explanation for the fact that the negative marker bu does not co-occur with the perfective marker -le as illustrated above. However, it has conceptual weakness as well as empirical problems.

First, as Lee and Pan (1999) argue, Huang’s proposal is based on a clitic assumption, which is conceptually problematic. “There is no strong evidence showing that clitics exist in Chinese.”

Second, as Ernst (1995) points out, bu may occur separated from the verb, as is shown in (59). This is against the cliticization in Huang’s proposal: bu is base-generated as a bound form in the INFL node, required to be attached to an element in INFL or V⁰.

We believe that clitics exist in Chinese. However, bu should not be treated as a clitic. According to Hu (2007:110), “generally speaking, clitics cannot be stressed.” It is clear that bu can be stressed on many occasions.
Huibin Zhuang, Zhenqian Liu

(59) a. Jinrong bu mashang huida.
  “Jinrong doesn’t answer immediately.”
b. Tamen bu huxiang bang mang.
  “They don’t help each other.” (Ernst 1995:672)

Last, as Ernst argues, Huang’s analysis depends crucially on *bu* being “forced by cliticization to take narrow scope with respect to perfective aspect since in the structure [v *bu* V] -le the negator and the verb must combine semantically before they combine with the aspect marker” (1995). That is to say, *bu* cannot extend its scope over -le. However, evidence shows that *bu* clearly takes scope over not just the verb but also other constituents:

(60) ta bu xihuan shenme.
  “He does not like anything.” (Ernst 1995:647)

In (60), *shenme* ‘anything’ must be in the scope of negation in order to be licensed as a negative polarity item, thus the scope of *bu* cannot be restricted to the verbs as Huang’s analysis assumes.

Ernst (1995) suggests that the Chinese negative marker *bu* is an adverb in Spec,AUXP (i.e. Auxiliary Phrase) or Spec,VP. In order to exclude sentences like (55c), he claims that *bu* is a proclitic on the following word rather than a verbal clitic; and it aspectually requires an unbounded situation as its complement. This can be stated as in (61):

(61) a. *Bu* is a proclitic on the following adjacent word.

b. *Bu* requires aspectually an unbounded situation.

(61a) is put forward because there exist sentences that allow adverbials to appear between *bu* and verbs, as is shown in (59).

In line with Ernst’s proposal, the incompatibility between *bu* and -le results from a conflict between the unboundness requirement of *bu* and the boundness requirement of -le. That is to say, semantically, the aspectual situation signaled by the perfective -le is not compatible with the aspectual situation required by *bu*. Although Ernst’s analysis above seems reasonable, it has empirical problems:

First, *bu* should not be treated as a clitic as we discussed above.

Second, Ernst’s account for the syntactic distribution of Chinese negative markers is very complex, and its aspectual requirement is difficult to operate. For example, Lin (2003) argues that it fails to explain why the following unbounded situation marked with the progressive -zhe cannot be negated by *bu*.
If we judge in accordance with (61b), (62) should be grammatical since the aspect marker -zhe semantically means unboundness, but the fact is that it is unacceptable.

Given the above problems with Huang’s and Ernst’s analyses, Lee and Pan (1999, 2001) suggest that the negative marker bu is a focus-sensitive operator and an unselective binder, while the perfective -le is a selective binder of event or situation variables. They claim that within the negation domain of bu, there actually exist two tendencies in negation; namely, association with focus and the adjacency tendency, as in (63):

(63) Two Tendencies of Negation

Tendency 1: Negation of focus
The negator bu associates with the focus of the sentence.

Tendency 2: Adjacency tendency
The negator bu tends to negate the following word.

The two tendencies act complementarily to each other and which tendency comes into play is governed by an interpretation condition (IC), as stated below:

(64) The Interpretation Condition (IC)

The negator bu associates with the focus if there is one to its right, and thus introduces a tripartite structure; otherwise it negates the adjacent word.

The ill-formedness of sentence (55c) can then be explained by IC and the scope interaction between perfective -le and bu. As there is no focus in (55c), bu will negate the adjacent verb chi ‘eat’. Thus, bu takes a narrow scope with respect to perfective -le, as shown in (65), and the semantic representation of (65) is (66).

(65) *-le (bu-chi mugua)
(66) Le [Bu_e [Chi (e) Λ Subject (e, wo) Λ Object (e, mugua)]]

From the representation shown in (66), we can see that bu, being an unselective binder, binds the event variable e. Since e is already bound by bu, there is no free event variable for –le to bind. Hence, this would lead to a violation of the Prohibition against Vacuous Binding, “an operator or a quantifier must bind a variable”.

Lee and Pan provide a better explanation for the ill-formedness of (55c) than Huang’s and Ernst’s analyses. However, some scholars argue against the two tendencies. For example, Hu (2007) argues that the two tendencies run into difficulty in explaining the

12 Notice that in Lee & Pan, most examples allowing the co-occurrence of bu and the perfective aspect marker -le or the manner phrase are conditional sentences, which are beyond the scope of the present study.
following sentences:  
(67) *ta bu [zai xuexiao] du le xiaoshuo.  
he not at school read PERF novel
(68) *ta bu zai xuexiao du le [xiaoshuo].  
he not at school read PERF novel (Hu 2007:103)
In (67), *bu negates the adjacent word, and in (68), *bu negates xiaoshuo “novel”. Both of the two sentences should be grammatical, but in fact they are not.

4.1.2 NegP Based Approaches

As is mentioned above, ever since the proposal of the NegP hypothesis by Pollock (1989), many scholars also have extended this hypothesis to Chinese negation. Of them, the most frequently cited ones are Cheng and Li (1991) and Chiu (1993). They also show much interest in providing an explanation for the ill-formedness illustrated by (55c).

Cheng and Li (1991) were the first to extend the NegP hypothesis to Chinese. They suggest that the Neg morphemes *bu and mei in Chinese are heads of NegP, projecting a structure essentially, and selecting either a VP or AUXP complement. This is shown in (69):

(69) NegP
    Neg    AUXP/VP

Their main arguments for this structure are based on the syntactic distribution between the negative elements *bu and mei (you), and the apparent non-occurrence of *bu/mei (you) and the perfective marker -le. The discussion goes like this: -le is the head of AspP, which is generated higher in the structure than NegP, while you, which often follows mei, is the head of an AUXP generated under NegP. The structure can be shown like (70):

(70) IP (AspP)
    NP I (Asp‘)
    I(Asp) NegP
    -le Neg AUXP/VP
    bu/mei

To explain the example shown in (55c), they use “blocking effect” of the Neg head on the

13 In fact, Hu argues against the two tendencies put forward in Lee and Pan (2005), but it is obvious that his argument also applies to argue against the two tendencies in Lee and Pan (1999, 2001).
lowering of -le onto V. -le is analyzed as the head of AspP, which is generated higher in the structure than NegP. Being a suffix, -le must be lowered down onto the verb, while the presence of Neg provides an intervening head, which blocks the lowering of the aspect marker (due to HMC).

This approach can explain the inability of bu to occur with the perfective aspect marker -le. However, it introduces many problems.

First, as argued in §2.2, it does explain the inability of bu to occur with the perfective aspect marker -le, but at the same time it excludes grammatical sentences like (71):

(71) ni bu yinggai chi lepingguo.
    you not should eat PERF apple
    “You shouldn’t have had an/the apple.”

Second, as noted by Ernst (1995), it fails to account for the experiential aspect illustrated in (72):

(72) a. wo mei-you chi guo mugua.
    I not-PERF eat EXP papaya
    “I haven’t eaten papaya.”

b. *wo bu chi guo mugua.
    I not eat EXP papaya

Intended reading: “I have not eaten papaya.” (Ernst 1995:688)

Besides, Chao (1994) criticizes of Cheng and Li’s (1991) approach, too. He argues:

(i) There is a conceptual problem in putting Aspect above the projection for modal auxiliaries such as hui ‘will’. In languages that distinguish between tense and aspect elements morphologically, it is generally found that tense and modals are structurally higher than aspectual elements. However, -le is not a past tense marker, but an aspect marker. It should not be positioned higher than modal auxiliaries.

(ii) Empirically, if -le is base-generated higher than auxiliaries, then as a kind of head movement, -le lowering should respect the locality condition; however, the examples below show that this is not the case.

(73) a. *ta e yinggai le yijing lai.
    he e should PERF already come

b. ta yinggai yijing lai le.
    he should already come PERF
    “he should already have come.” (Chao 1994)

Based on the interaction of -le, -guo and negative marker bu, Chiu (1993) suggests that bu is used when a non-past event or state is negated, while mei(you) is used to negate a past event. Non-past tense is not morphologically marked. Past tense is realized as -le, which is
base-generated in T, whereas -guo is base-generated in Asp. As to the explanation of the example shown in (55c), she also uses the “blocking effect” of the Neg head on the lowering of -le onto V. Assuming that -le is in the Tense node, the ill-formedness in (55c) is accounted for naturally.

This analysis, as observed by Li (1999, 2007), though appeals at the outset, involves many problems. First, it is obvious that -le, which is widely accepted as a perfect aspect marker, should be treated as past tense marker. This is especially true when we take (74) into consideration.

\[ (74) \text{mingtian wo jiu kaichu le ta.} \]
\[ \text{tomorrow I then expel PAST him} \]
\[ \text{“I will expel him tomorrow.”} \]  \hspace{1cm} (Li, 2007: 11)

Furthermore, in her analysis, Chiu claims that bu is used when a non-past event or state is negated, while mei(you) is used to negate a past event. This is obviously problematic, as illustrated in (75a) and (75b) respectively:

\[ (75) \text{a. qunian wo bu hui jiang yingyu.} \]
\[ \text{last year I not can speak English} \]
\[ \text{“I could not speak English last year.”} \]

\[ (75) \text{b. mingtian zhe shihou wo hai mei xiaban.} \]
\[ \text{tomorrow this time I yet not finish working} \]
\[ \text{“I will not have finished work this time tomorrow.”} \]

According to Chiu, the temporal adjunct qunian “last year” in (75a) indicates past time and it should exclude the appearance of bu. While future time mingtian “tomorrow” in (75b) is semantically incompatible with mei. The two sentences are grammatical.

Some other important works account for the syntactic distribution of bu in terms of its aspectual selection, such as Lin (2003), Su (2007) and Li (1999, 2007). It is a pity that due to the limitation of space, we have to stop at this point to present our own explanation.

4.2 Our Analysis

In §4.1, we reviewed various explanations of the incompatibility of bu and -le. Although a number of principles have been put forward to account for this incompatibility, but none of them seem very satisfactory. In this subsection, we will argue that the TG framework also provides an explanation, which can better explain this incompatibility.

As discussed in §3, Chinese is a language allowing Asp-lowering. The trace left behind in the Asp node by the moved head is properly head governed by T when there is no NegP intervening. However, when there is a NegP intervening, an ECP violation will arise.
Because the Chinese negative marker *bu* serves as the specifier of NegP (Spec,NegP), leaving the head Neg position of NegP null, nothing therefore head-governs the trace left behind in the Asp node. Assuming this analysis to be on the right lines, how can we account for the ill-formedness shown in (55c)? To make our explanation more explicit, we will represent (55c) in a tree diagram, as in (76):

(76) a. *Wo bu chi le mugua.

I not eat PERF papaya

As the tree diagram shows, the perfect aspect marker -le is base-generated in the head position of AspP, which is higher than the VP containing chi, onto which -le is lowered. The lowering process leaves a trace behind in the Asp node. This trace must be licensed, i.e., must satisfy ECP. In affirmative sentences, it can satisfy ECP via proper head government by T, which is essential\(^{14}\). However, in negative sentences, there is a NegP intervening between TP and AspP. Because the Chinese negative marker *bu* serves as the specifier of NegP, as is shown in §2.2, its head Neg is left empty\(^{15}\). Nothing head-governs the trace left

\(^{14}\) According to Chomsky (2000), the core functional categories are C, T and v, and in note 6 of Chomsky (1999) he indicates that for expository purposes he use T and C as cover terms for a richer array of functional categories, as in MI. Zanuttini (2001) also considers T to be nucleus of the clause.

\(^{15}\) We must emphasize that the emptiness of Neg here should be of a different nature from that of T. T is not empty in fact; it is covert; while Neg is empty overtly and covertly, otherwise, it can be crossed
behind in the Asp node, and ECP violation thus arises. Therefore (55c) is excluded.

It seems that the ill-formedness arises only when the trace left behind in the Asp node is not properly head governed. Assuming this assumption to be on the right line, the question we still need to answer is: Can we avoid the problems involved in the previous analyses? To answer this, we will examine all the other relevant facts mentioned above, namely, example (49) from §3, examples (62), (71), (72b) in the present section. They are reproduced in (77-80).

(77) \textit{Wangli bu zai kan dianshi}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{Wangli not PRO watch TV}  
\hspace{1cm} “Wangli is not watching TV.” \hspace{1cm} (Li 2007: 67)

(78) * \textit{Ta bu tui zhe yi liang jiaotache}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{he not push Asp one CL bicycle}  
\hspace{1cm} Intended reading: “He is not pushing a bicycle.” \hspace{1cm} (Lin 2003:431)

(79) \textit{ni bu yinggai chi le pingguo}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{you not should eat PERF apple}  
\hspace{1cm} “You shouldn’t have had apple.”

(80) * \textit{wo bu chi guo mugua}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{I not eat EXP papaya}  
\hspace{1cm} “I have not eaten papaya.” \hspace{1cm} (Ernst 1995:688)

Since the Chinese negative marker \textit{bu} is in Spec,NegP, the explanations for (77), (78) and (80) are very simple now. (77) does not involve Asp-lowering (\textit{zai} is a particle, §3.2.2.1), and there is no ECP violation involved at all. (78) and (80) are excluded on the same grounds as (76): lack of proper head government leads to ECP violation. (79), however, seems different. It involves an AUXP which we have not discussed until now. We need to consider AUXP first before we can give an explanation. First look at two sentences:

(81) a. She may not be enjoying syntax. \hspace{1cm} (Radford 2004:167)

b. She is not enjoying syntax.

In (81a), \textit{not} occupies the head position of NegP, and the modal auxiliary \textit{may}, which is higher than \textit{not}, should occupy the head position of TP. We assumed that in English the verb raises from V to the higher Asp node to derive a complex [V+ing] (§3.2.1). That is to say, \textit{enjoying} occupies the head position of AspP; \textit{be} therefore must occupy some intermediate position between the NegP and AspP. Since \textit{be} is an auxiliary verb, we suppose that \textit{be} in (81a) occupies the head position of an AUXP. Then (81b) can be analyzed as follows: \textit{be} originates as the head of AUXP, but moves from AUX to T. This is by the \textit{suo} (Ting 2006; see also the discussion in §2.2). However, the T cannot be crossed like that although it is covert.
shown in (82-83) below:

\[(82) \left[ CP \left[C \emptyset \right] \left[ TP \left[ T \text{may} \right] \right] \right. \left. \left[ AUXP \left[ AUX \text{be} \right] \left[ AspP \left[ Asp \text{enjoying} \left[ VP \left[ V \text{enjoy} \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \r

With this assumption, the phenomena illustrated be (77-84) can be explained naturally. As a
This analysis also enables us to predict that if there is a modal auxiliary verb in AUX properly head governing the trace left behind in the Asp node, the sentence should be well-formed. The following examples demonstrate that our prediction is right.

(86) ta bu yinggai tui zhe yi liang jiaotache.
    he not should push Asp one CL bicycle
    “He should not be pushing a bicycle.”

(87) wo bu yinggai chi guo mugua.
    I not should eat EXP papaya
    “I have not eaten papaya.”

(88) Wangli bu yinggai zai kan dianshi
    Wangli not should PRO watch TV
    “Wangli should not be watching TV.”

Some readers may argue that to place AUXP lower than NegP will run into difficulty in explaining sentences such as the following (from Li 2007:280):

(89) ta yinggai bu qu faguo
    he should NEG go France
    “It should be obligatory for him not to go to France.”

(90) ta hui bu qu faguo
    he will NEG go France
    “It is possible that he will not go to France.”

(91) ta keyi bu qu faguo
    he may NEG go France
    “It is permissible for him not to go to France.”

(92) ta neng bu qu faguo
    he can NEG go France
    “It is permissible for him not to go to France.”

(93) ta bixu bu qu faguo.
    he must not go France

---

16 There has been no standard list of modal auxiliary verbs in Chinese. According to Yuen-Ren Chao (1968), Li & Thompson (1981), Tsang (1981), etc., there are at least five. They are yinggai “should”, hui “will”, keyi “may”, neng “can”, bixu “must”.

“He must not go to France.”

The modals in (89-93) obviously have wide scope with respect to negation whereas yinggai in (85-88) has narrow scope with respect to negation. How can we account for that? According to Roberts (1998), wide-scope modals (like must in English) are directly generated in T, whereas narrow-scoped modals (like need in English) are initially generated in some position below T (perhaps the head position of AUXP). In accordance with his proposal, we argue that yinggai, hui, keyi, neng and bixu in (89-93) should be base-generated in T, while yinggai in (85) is base-generated in AUX. With this assumption, we can easily explain the properties of (89-93), both syntactic and semantic. For lack of evidence, we will not go on to pursue this question here. 17

5 Understanding meiyou

As is mentioned previously, Chinese Grammarians have identified quite a number of negative markers. Primarily, only two are in common use, bu and mei. Bu, as is shown, may precede all predicates with the exception of the item you, which, as a lexical and an aspectual auxiliary, is exclusively negated by the negative marker mei. In contemporary Chinese, mei and meiyou have hardly any difference in meaning. From §2 to §5, we focus mainly on bu. This section deals with meiyou exclusively. We will first review the previous analysis, and then we present our own analysis.

5.1 Previous Analyses of meiyou

In the literature, meiyou has been discussed by many scholars. The most well-known discussion is Wang (1965)’s you/-le alternation transformational analysis, which we discussed in §4.1.1.1.

Some other proposals have been put forward by other scholars. For example, Cheng and Li (1991) suggest that meiyou heads NegP, and mei is an alternant of bu; Chiu (1993) argues that NegP is headed by bu and mei; Ernst (1995) treats mei as a prefix realizing [+NEG] on you; Li (1999, 2007) proposes that mei is a prefix to you, which is base-generated under Asp⁹. Since Cheng and Li (1991) and Chiu (1993)’s analyses are much the same as Wang’s, which we discussed in §4.1.1.1, here we will discuss only Li’s.

17 Actually, an anonymous expert has pointed that the claim that modals are located in T position will be considered a stipulation and this inconsistency weakens the argument of this paper. He/She suggests that the authors take into account the cartographic approach (Rizzi1997, 2004, Cinque 1999, Bulter 2003, etc.).

18 Following tradition, we put you in brackets to indicate that you can be either overt or covert. In this thesis, we assume that the covert you is only covert phonetically, but not syntactically.
Li (1999, 2007) treats *you* as an aspectual marker, and *mei* as a prefix base-generated on *you* under Asp. This is shown in (94) from Li (2007:281) (PrP stands for Predicate Phrase):

(94)

```
TP
  Spec T
  T'   AspP
    Spec Asp'
    Asp  ModP
    Ø     Spec Mod'
    Mod   PrP
    Pr    Spec Pr'
    VP
      Spec V'
      V ...
```

However, she proposes that *zai* is also under Asp (Li 2007:18). If her assumption is right, (95) must be problematic.

(95) *wo mei*(you) *zai* *kan* dianshi.

*I not (have) PRO watch TV
“I was not watching TV.”

A even worse problem may also arise from her proposal that modals occur below AspP (Li 2007:281). This gives rise to the wrong prediction illustrated by (96):

(96) *ta* *zai* keneng *kan* dianshi.

*He PRO may watch TV
Intended reading: “He may be watching TV.”

In order to avoid the problem (95) illustrates, we should not treat *you* as an aspect marker;
and to avoid problem in (96), modals should be higher than AspP.

### 5.2 Our Analysis of mei(you)

We follow Wang (1965), treating mei as the alternant of bu before you. This view has been accepted widely (e.g. Huang (1988), Cheng and Li (1991), Chiu (1993), Liu (2005)).

In order to thoroughly understand mei(you), we have to discuss you. Two types of you can be distinguished. First you can act as a lexical verb conveying both possessive and existential meanings. This is shown in the following examples (cited from Li (2007:48)):

(97) **Weifang you qian.**

Weifang has money.

“Weifang has money.”

(98) **zhuozi shang you yi ben shu.**

table surface have one CL book.

“There is a book on the table.”

Second, you acts as an auxiliary verb. The occurrence of you as an auxiliary is restricted to negative clauses in standard modern Chinese where it is obligatorily negated by the negative item mei.

A further distinction should be made between two kinds of you as auxiliary verb: The first type is you as an aspectual auxiliary verb, with aspectual meaning, as in (99), where there are no aspectual markers such as -le, -guo, -zhe and zai; the second type is you as a pure auxiliary verb (or structural auxiliary verb), without aspectual meaning, as in (100), (101) and (102), where there are aspectual markers such as -guo, -zhe and zai, but not -le.

(99) **wo mei(you) kan dianshi.**

I not (have) watch TV

“I did not watch TV.”

(100) **wo mei(you) kan guo dianshi.**

I not (have) watch PERF TV

“I have not watched TV.”

(101) **wo mei(you) kan zhe dianshi.**

I not (have) watch PRO TV

“I was not watching TV.”

---

19 Attention should be paid that mei and bu have different origins, according to Shi (2001).

20 Almost all the previous studies distinguish only the lexical verb you and the aspectual auxiliary verb you. This will mislead the reader to take you in (7), (8) and (9) as an aspectual marker. Actually, the aspects of (7), (8) and (9) are not determined by you (which is a perfective aspect marker), but by guo, zhe and zai respectively. This is especially true in (8) and (9), where the aspectual markers zhe and zai do not co-occur with perfective aspectual marker le.
Obviously, the first type of \textit{you} is simple, because here \textit{you} is just a common verb, occupying the head of VP in the tree diagram. However, the second type of \textit{you} is complex, because \textit{you} here is an auxiliary verb, occupying the head of AUXP. A structural analysis of \textit{mei(you)} (when \textit{you} is an auxiliary verb) is shown as in (103):

This structure can explain (99-102) naturally. In (99) and (102), no Asp-lowering is involved, and no ECP violation arises. (100) and (101) involve Asp-lowering, but the traces left behind in the Asp node are properly head governed by \textit{you} in AUX.

We may notice that the perfective aspect marker -\textit{le} is not only incompatible with \textit{bu}, but also with \textit{mei(you)}. This is shown in (104).

\begin{itemize}
  \item (102) \textit{wo mei(you) zai kan dianshi.}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item I not (have) PRO watch TV
    \item “I was not watching TV.”
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item (104) *ta mei(you) kan le dianshi.
  \begin{itemize}
    \item he not (have) watch PERF TV
    \item Intended reading: “He did not watch TV.”
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
How can we account for this? According to Cinque (1999)’s UBH\textsuperscript{21}, the functional head can be realized in several possible ways, at least two. For example, tense can be realized as the bound affix on the verb, or as the independent tense element (like the auxiliary). Then we can assume, in accordance with the usual practice of traditional linguists, that \textit{-le} is the bound affix form expressing perfective aspect and \textit{you} is the auxiliary form expressing perfective aspect. In one sentence we cannot have two candidates to be the potential realization for one functional head.\textsuperscript{22}

5.3 \textit{mei(you)} and Modals

It seems that \textit{mei(you)} is incompatible with modals.\textsuperscript{23} Consider the following examples (Cited from Li (2007:278-9)):

(105) *\textit{ta mei yinggai qu faguo}
\hspace{1cm} he not should go France
Intended reading: “He shouldn’t go to France.”

(106) *\textit{ta mei hui qu faguo}
\hspace{1cm} he not will go France
Intended reading: “He will not go to France.”

(107) *\textit{ta mei keyi qu faguo}
\hspace{1cm} he not may go France
Intended reading: “He may not go to France.”

(108) *\textit{ta mei bixu qu faguo}
\hspace{1cm} he not must go France
Intended reading: “He must not go to France.”

With our structural analysis of \textit{mei(you)} in (103), \textit{mei} is placed at Spec, NegP, and the auxiliary verb \textit{you} heads AUXP. The ungrammaticality of these examples is easy to explain. Since the head of AUXP is occupied by \textit{you}, it is impossible for other auxiliaries to appear in the AUX. However, if we consider more sentences, we find some counterexamples. One

\textsuperscript{21} Universal Base Hypothesis, that is, all languages have the same fundamental hierarchical structure at the clausal level, and that every clausal projection in this hierarchy is necessarily associated with a semantic interpretation. This proposal is consistent with the view that the syntactic level of LF is itself universal in nature, since it provides systematic input to a universal interpretive component. In its weakest formulation, this view is based on the plausible assumption that the formal aspects of grammatically-encoded semantic interpretation are universal in nature.

\textsuperscript{22} This fact is accounted for by Wang (1965) in terms of “affix-hopping”, which obligatorily shifts a base-generated \textit{you} to a postverbal position in affirmative contexts (followed by a morphophonemic rule of \textit{you} \texttt{$\rightarrow$}-\textit{le}) but is blocked otherwise.

\textsuperscript{23} Here we limit our discussion to the modals that follow negation. There are still occasions where the modals precede negation. We do not discuss this here. See some explanation in §4.2.
example from Li (2007:279) is reproduced in (109):

(109) \textit{ta mei neng qu faguo}

\hspace{1cm} he not can go France

“He was not able to go to France.”

As illustrated in (109), \textit{mei(you)} is found to be compatible with the modal \textit{neng}. The problem presented in (109) seems to have aroused little attention in the research field of Chinese linguistics. There is a mention without discussion of the compatibility of \textit{mei(you)} with \textit{neng} as an exceptional case in Cheng, Huang and Tang (1996:46, (iii) of Footnote. 3), as well as in Li (2007:279). We do not pursue this question here, either.

6 The Negative Marker \textit{bu} and Postverbal Adjuncts

Concerning the negative marker \textit{bu}, two facts are in focus. They are:

(i) inability of the negative marker \textit{bu} to occur with the perfective aspect marker \textit{-le}.

(ii) incompatibility of \textit{bu} and the manner phrase in the \textit{V-de} construction.

As is explained, the first one can be explained simply by proper-head government in the framework of GB. In this section, we will go on to discuss the second fact.

6.1 Previous Analyses

Consider two sentences from Huang (1988:274):

(110) \textit{wo pao de hen kuai}.

\hspace{1cm} I run DE very fast

“I run very fast.”

(111) \textit{tamen tiao de hen lei}.

\hspace{1cm} they jump DE very tired

“They jumped till they got very tired.”

According to Huang, sentences like (110) are traditionally referred to as Descriptive Complement Constructions, and those like (111) are Resultative Complement Constructions. Negative forms of these kinds of sentences are shown in (112) (Huang 1988:278):

(112) a. \textit{tamen pao de bu kuai}.

\hspace{1cm} they run DE not fast

“They don’t run fast.”

b. *\textit{tamen bu pao de kuai}.

\hspace{1cm} they not run DE fast

As is shown, \textit{bu} is incompatible with the manner phrase in the \textit{V-de} construction. Therefore,
the negative form of these kinds of sentences must be constituent negation\textsuperscript{24}, as shown in (112a), in contrast with sentential negation. Why do these kinds of sentences permit (112a), but not (112b)? In other words, why is the negative marker \textit{bu} incompatible with the manner phrase? Previous studies have put forward many hypotheses. In this subsection, we will review some of these studies.

Huang (1988) proposed Principle P (§4.1.1.2) to account for the incompatibility of the negative marker \textit{bu} and postverbal adjuncts. When Principle P is applied to (112b) above, it would be analyzed as having the structure in (113):

\[(113) \; *\text{ta} \; [\text{[bu} \; \text{pao} \; \text{de} \; \text{hen} \; \text{kuai]} \]

The structure in (113) shows that \textit{bu} is adjoined to the verb, but at the same time the descriptive expression has wide scope over the negative verb. However, this structure results in a semantic anomaly: someone is slow with respect to some event, but, at the same time, the sentence presupposes the non-existence of the relevant event. Therefore, the sentence is ruled out for semantic reasons (Huang 1988, p284).

In Huang’s analysis, \textit{bu} is assumed to be base-generated in an INFL node. When \textit{bu} is adjoined to an element in INFL before the verb, the negated element in INFL may have wide scope over the entire VP, shown as follows (cited from Huang (1988:285)):

\[(114) \; \text{a. ta} \; \text{mei-you} \; \text{pao} \; \text{de} \; \text{hen} \; \text{kuai}. \]

\hspace{1cm} he not-have run DE very fast.

\hspace{1cm} “He did not run fast.”

\hspace{1cm} b. \text{ta} \; \text{bu-shi} \; \text{pao} \; \text{de} \; \text{hen} \; \text{kuai}.

\hspace{1cm} he not-be run DE very fast

\hspace{1cm} “It is not the case that he runs fast.”

\hspace{1cm} c. \text{ta} \; \text{bu-hui} \; \text{pao} \; \text{de} \; \text{hen} \; \text{kuai}.

\hspace{1cm} he not-will run DE very fast

\hspace{1cm} “He will not run fast.”

As observed by Ernst (1995) and Li (1999, 2007), Huang’s account appears to be attractive as a possible solution for the question under discussion, but it runs into several problems, both empirically and conceptually.

First, in Huang’s theory, \textit{bu} is a negative morpheme in INFL, which must be attached to an element in INFL or V\textsuperscript{o}. However, (115) provides a counterexample:

\[(115) \; \text{wo} \; \text{bu} \; \text{zongshi} \; \text{pao} \; \text{de} \; \text{kuai}. \]

\hspace{1cm} I not always run DE fast

\textsuperscript{24} In accordance with Teng (1974), sentential negation is generated through phrase structure rules, whereas constituent negation is specified in the lexicon. Here, we made this judgment simply because \textit{bu} in (3a) is not contained within NegP (if it is, \textit{bu} should be placed before \textit{pao} as in (3b).
“I do not always run fast.”

Second, it is assumed that when $bu$ is adjoined to $V$, it has narrow scope over $V$ only. In the same vein, when $bu$ is attached to an element in INFL, we would expect it also to have narrow scope over the element in INFL only; but it does not. Consider example (116):

(116) $wo$ cong $bu$ deng $hen$ jiu.
I ever not wait very long

“I never wait for long.”

In (116), clearly $bu$ cannot just take narrow scope over $V$, because what is negated is not the verb itself, but the VP $deng$ $hen$ jiu “wait for long”.

Ernst (1995) proposes that “$bu$ is a proclitic on the following word” to account for the second fact. Consider the following sentences from Ernst (1995:666)

(118) a. $ta$ jiang de (hen) qingchu.
he speak DE very clear

“He speaks clearly.”

b. *$ta$ bu jiang de (hen) qingchu.
he not speak DE very clear

Intended reading: “He does not speak very clearly.”

c. $ta$ jiang de bu (hen) qingchu.
he speak DE not very clear

“He doesn’t speak clearly.”

Ernst assumes that “at DS while preverbal manner expressions are of the form [AP de], their postverbal variety is of the form [de AP]” (Ernst 1995:677). Since de in [AP de] is cliticized to the preceding AP, thus satisfying the morphological requirement, no movement is necessary. On the contrary, since de in [de AP] is not yet cliticized to a preceding element, it must postpone to meet its morphological requirement. Based on this assumption, Ernst (1995:667) explains the ill-formedness of (118b) by proposing that “the manner adverbial can only be generated between $bu$ and the verb and must move to postverbal position, leaving a trace.” Therefore, this trace blocks cliticization, violating (118b).

Ernst’s morphological approach looks appealing. However, serious problems exist. The main problem with Ernst’s approach lies with the assumption of the base position of adjuncts. In Ernst’s proposal, preverbal manner expressions are of the form [AP de] and their postverbal counterparts are of the form [de AP], but both of them are generated to the left of the verb. In fact, they are fundamentally distinct. Consider (119):

(119) a. $ta$ pao de hen man. $\rightarrow$ $ta$ hen man de pao.
he run DE very slow he very slow De run
“He runs very slowly.”  “He runs very slowly.”

b. yifu xi de hen ganjing. \( \rightarrow \) *hen ganjing de xi yifu.
clothes wash DE very clean  very clean  De wash clothes
“The clothes come clean after the wash”

Semantically, as reflected by the English glosses, in (119a), the preverbal manner expression states the manner in which the actor has performed the action, while the postverbal counterpart indicates the speed of the action. What's more, as is shown in (119b), all the structures with a preverbal manner expressions do not have postverbal counterparts.

Li (1999, 2007) argues that the incompatibility of \( bu \) and postverbal adjuncts arises in some cases from semantic anomaly. In order to explain this, she proposes \( Bu \)-Requirement:

(120) \( Bu \)-Requirement: \( bu \) places a semantic requirement of non-completion upon its co-occurrence situation.

Now consider the following examples from Li (2007:167-8):

(121) *
\( ta \ bu \ lai \ san \ ci. \)
he not come three times
Intended reading: “He did not come here three times.”

(122) *
\( ta \ bu \ ku \ liang \ xiaoshi. \)
she not cry two hour
Intended reading: “She did not cry for two hours.”

(123) *
\( ta \ bu \ pao \ de \ hen \ man. \)
he not run DE very slow
Intended reading: “He did not run very slowly.”

(124) *
\( ta \ bu \ zou \ de \ hen \ lei. \)
he not walk DE very tired
Intended reading: “He did not feel tired from walking.”

(125) *
\( ta \ bu \ tiao \ zai \ chuang \ shang. \)
he not jump onto bed surface
Intended reading: “He did not jump onto the bed.”

With the \( Bu \)-Requirement, it becomes easy to account for the ill-formedness of (121) to (125). They are not acceptable because the semantic requirement of the non-completion of the situations co-occurring with the negative marker \( bu \) is not satisfied: the VPs in these examples all denote events that are completed, which is in conflict with the semantics of \( bu \). Therefore the sentences are ruled out on the grounds of semantic anomaly.

Her explanation is very interesting, but the data based on which she proposes her \( Bu \)-Requirement are more interesting. We will just discuss (121) (122) and (125), and leave
(123) and (124) to be discussed later. First let us reconsider (121) (122) and (125), and think about what their affirmative forms are. If we simply take out the negative marker *bu*, we will get (126-128):

(126) ?*ta lai san ci.
   he come three times
   “He comes here three times.”

(127) ?*ta ku liang xiaoshi.
   she cry two hour
   “She cries for two hours.”

(128) ?ta tiao zai chuang shang.
   he jump onto bed surface.
   “He jumped on the bed.”

Obviously, (126-128) do not sound very natural. In the literature, these sentences are regarded as incomplete sentences, meaning sentences that cannot stand alone as independent utterances (Tang & Lee 2000). A serious question arises now: if the base on which a theory is built not so solid enough, how can we say that the theory is sound? We will come back to discuss this question later.

6.2 Our Analysis

In §4.2, we assumed that ill-formedness arises when the trace left behind in the Asp node is not properly head governed. In this subsection, we will stick to this principle and try to account for the incompatibility between *bu* and the V-de construction in a formal and simple way. To make our analysis easy to follow, let us first analyze an example with the V-de structure. The negative form of (129) should be (130a), but not (130b).

(129) wo ting de dong yingyu.
   I listen DE understand English
   “I can understand English.”

(130) a. wo ting bu dong yingyu.
   I listen not understand English
   “I cannot understand English.”

b. *wo bu ting de dong yingyu.
   I not listen DE understand English
   Intended reading: “I cannot understand English.”

Why is (130b) ruled out? This can be explained via ECP. According to Lü (1999:16), -de in (129) is a potential aspect marker. As discussed in §3.2.2, an aspect marker is supposed to
originate in the Asp of AspP, and then be lowered onto V. This is shown in (131):

(131)

As (131) shows, the potential aspect marker -de is lowered from Asp onto V, leaving a trace behind in the Asp node, which must be properly head governed. However, the negative marker bu serves as the specifier of NegP, leaving the head Neg null (§2.2). Nothing properly head governs the trace left in the Asp. ECP violation therefore arises.25

Now we come to the discussion of the incompatibility between bu and the V-de construction in (110) and (111). According to Huang (1988), “[-de] has been historically derived from the verb de “obtain”. Phonologically, de is attached to the preceding verb, either as a suffix or a clitic, depending on one’s theory….” Let us assume that -de is a suffix. In the framework of GB, suffixes are supposed to be generated under I, and lowered down onto V. -de, of course, is not an exception. However, recall that we have split the INFL into TP, NegP and AspP in §3.1 and AUXP in §4.2. Then, where exactly is -de generated?

25 According to Wang (1989, p.214), in some dialects, the word order bu ting de dong is possible. This is beyond the scope of this paper.
It is obvious that -de is not generated in T. If it is, we cannot explain (132):

(132) 跑得很快.
I will run very fast.

“I will run very fast.”

In (132), “will” has already occupied the position T of TP. It is impossible for -de to be generated in the head position of TP. Then the only two options are Asp and AUX. Some scholars, for example, Chao (1968), Fan (1992) and Chen (2001), tend to treat -de as an auxiliary, but the auxiliary does not mean the AUX here. Since we treated the -de in (129) as a potential aspect marker originating in Asp of AspP, for the reasons of uniformity and consistency, we assume that -de’s in Descriptive Complement Constructions and Resultative Complement Constructions also originate in the Asp of AspP. We would argue for our assumption from three aspects.

First, it seems not possible for -de to be generated in the position AUX: for one thing, this involves lowering, but none of the auxiliaries we have discussed lower; for another thing, if they do originate from AUX, it is hard to handle the lowering process, because it must cross the Asp.

Second, in the literature, Gao (1986, pp.194-6) treats -de as a resultative aspect.26 Yang (1998) also holds the idea that -de has many similarities with aspect markers.

Third, it is very possible that -de is an aspect marker. Whenever -de is attached to a verb, no aspectual markers will appear in the sentence, either before or after the -de. This is shown in the examples below:

(133) a. 跑得很快.
I run very fast

“I run very fast.”

b. *跑得le/guo/zhe很快.
I run PERF/EXP/PRO very fast
c. *我在跑得很快.
I PRO run very fast

Intended reading: “I am running fast”
d. *跑得le/guo/zhe很快.
I run PERF/EXP/PRO DE very fast

Our conclusion, therefore, is that -de should be treated as suffix that originates in Asp. Assuming this analysis to be on the right lines, The explanation to the incompatibility of bu and the V-de construction in (110) and (111) becomes simple: the aspect marker -de is

26 The examples about -de Gao cited are all from ancient Chinese. His attitude to -de in modern Chinese should be the same.
lowered from Asp onto V, leaving a trace behind in the Asp node, which must be properly head governed. However, the negative marker bu serves as the specifier of NegP, leaving the head Neg null. Nothing properly head governs the trace left in the Asp, therefore ECP violation arises. Therefore these kinds of sentences permit only constituent negation, as in (112a). However, if there is an auxiliary verb in AUX, the trace left behind in the Asp can be properly head governed, and we will then have sentential negation, as in (134):

(134) a. wo mei-you pao de hen kuai.
    I not-have run DE very fast.
    “I did not run fast.”

b. wo bu-hui pao de hen kuai.
    I not-will run DE very fast
    “I will not run fast.”

c. 

Let us now give some consideration to the ungrammaticality of (121), (122) and (125).
Obviously, no ECP violation is involved in these examples. Why are they unacceptable? We pointed out that their affirmative equivalents are incomplete sentences, as is shown in (126-128), if they are not considered ungrammatical. According to Generalized Anchoring Principle (GAP), “Every sentence must be either tensed or focused at the LF interface level” (Tang 2001). (126-128), obviously, violate this principle. However, if we read them in certain way, they can be acceptable, as shown in (135-137):

(135) *ta bu lai san ci, ta lai si ci.*
    he not come three times, he come four times

“He does not come here three times, but four times.”

(136) *ta bu ku liang xiaoshi, ta ku san xiaoshi.*
    she not cry two hour, she cry three hours

“She does not cry for two hours, but three hours.”

(137) *ta bu tiao zai chuang shang, ta tiao zai di shang.*
    he not jump onto bed surface, he jump onto ground surface.

“He does not jump onto the bed, but ground.”

(135-137) are acceptable, for two reasons: first and the most important is that no ECP violation arises; furthermore they are focused, in accordance with GAP.

Let us step forward to examine whether they are acceptable if they are tensed. We will consider their complete forms of their affirmative equivalents, which are in (138-140):

(138) *ta lai le/guo san ci.*
    he come PERF/EXP three times

“He has come here three times.”

(139) *ta ku le liang xiaoshi.*
    she cry PERF two hour

“She has cried for two hours.”

(140) *ta tiao zai le chuang shang.*
    he jump onto PERF bed surface.

“He jumped onto the bed.”

(138-140) obviously cannot be negated simply through adding the negative marker *bu* for the reason we discussed in §4.2, the perfective aspect marker *-le* is lowered from Asp onto V, leaving a trace behind in the Asp node, which must be properly head governed. However, the negative marker *bu* serves as the specifier of NegP, leaving the head Neg null. Nothing properly head governs the trace left in the Asp. ECP violation therefore arises.

Like all the other sentences with perfective aspect or experiential aspect, (138-140) can be negated by *mei*(you). This is shown in (141-143):
(141) a. ta mei(you) lai san ci.
   he not-have come three times
   “He did not come here three times.”
b. ta mei(you) lai guo san ci.
   he not-have come EXP three times
   “He did not come here three times.”

(142) ta mei(you) ku liang xiaoshi.
   she not-have cry two hour
   “She did not cry for two hours.”

(143) ta meiyou tiao zai chuang shang.
   he not-have jump onto bed surface
   “He did not jump onto the bed.”

7 Conclusion

Based on this assumption that that the NegP hypothesis can be extended to Chinese and the
negative marker bu is placed in Spec,NegP and the head Neg is left empty, we explained the
facts that the negative marker bu does not occur with the perfective aspect marker -le and
postverbal adjuncts, in accordance with Rizzi’s (1990) proper head government.

The head of NegP, being empty, cannot properly head govern the trace left behind in
the Asp node by the moved head. Therefore, bu cannot co-occur with those aspect markers
which behave like a suffix, lowering to V, such as -le, -zhe, -guo, but not zai, which behaves
like a particle, not lowering to V. However, when there are auxiliary verbs, which head
AUXP, this will be different, because the head of AUXP can properly head governs the
trace left behind in the Asp node by the moved head. Another negative marker in Chinese,
mei, which occurs exclusively before you, is treated as an alternant of bu. By dividing you
into two types, the lexical verb you and the auxiliary verb you, we succeed in explaining
many phenomena associated with mei(you).

In explaining the interaction between the negative marker bu and postverbal adjuncts,
we strictly abided by the principle of proper head government, and suggested that the
negative marker bu cannot co-occur with postverbal adjuncts for the same reason that it
cannot co-occur with suffix-like aspect markers. This explanation is based on the
assumption that the Chinese postverbal adjunct marker -de originates in the Asp of AspP,
and lowers onto V.

Our analysis is both theoretically and empirically desirable. It succeeds in providing a
principled analysis for a wide range of data concerning the syntactic distribution of the
negative marker *bu*. In particular, our analysis presents a formal solution which solves a number of long-term controversies over negation in Chinese.
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