The Syntactic Category of 把 (ba)

Luca Cavasso Simon Fraser University

Mandarin Chinese \nexists (*ba*) participates in several frequently discussed grammatical constructions. However, the syntactic category of *ba* is controversial. This paper evaluates previous proposals for *ba* as a preposition, verb, or functional head. I claim that *ba* can be a causative verb or a topic marker, depending on the construction it is a part of.

Ba constructions all follow one of the two surface forms given in (1-2), with the X representing a resultative complement or an aspect particle – for example, the perfective aspect particle *le* in (3b) or the complement *na ge yang* ('that way') in (4) (Li 2006). The most prevalent *ba* construction, exemplified by (3b), is semantically interchangeable with an unmarked sentence such as (3a) (Li 2006). However, not all *ba* constructions have non-*ba* counterparts. In (4) a *ba*-less sentence would need a causative verb to replace *ba* (Zou 1995).

(1) NP1 ba NP2 V X

(2) NP1 ba NP2 X V

- (3) a. wo wang-le yaoshi le forget-PF PF I kev b. wo ba vaoshi wang-le forget-PF I ha key 'I forgot the key.'
- (4) zhe jian shi zenme ba ni pacheng-le na ge yang this CL matter how ba you fear-PF that CL way 'How did this matter make you fear like that?'

Superficially, *ba* could easily be categorized as a preposition or a verb (Li and Thompson 1974). Yet a prepositional account of *ba* has two major flaws. The subject of the unaccusative verb *pacheng* 'fear' is *ni* 'you,' resulting in case assignment issues. A prepositional analysis also cannot account for the fact that the X of schema (1-2) is obligatory.

A verbal analysis of *ba* as a control verb largely resolves this issue. However, this approach fails to properly account for (3b), in which *ba*'s subject and object would be the same as those of *wang-le* 'forgot,' due to the implausibility of a dual subject- and object-control verb. Ding attempts to resolve this by positing a *pro* ('little pro') in addition to the PRO ('big pro') introduced by control. However any construction with *pro* must also allow an overt pronoun in the same position (Huang 2016), which is impermissible in *ba* constructions (Li 2016). Thus, an account of *ba* as a verb can explain causative *ba* constructions, but not others.

Zou (1995) bridges this gap by arguing for *ba* as the head of its own functional projection which selects for an aspect phrase or resultative complement phrase, illustrated in (5), a representation of (3b). The "*ba* phrase" occupies the same position in a clausal hierarchy as AgrP (Zou 1995). This implies that the overt ba marker prevents movement from V to Ba (parallel with Agr) and thus causes the change in word order from SVO to SOV (ibid.). Zou (1995) assumes that Case checking happens in a Spec-head relationship, that ba gives nominative case to its specifier, that

ASP gives accusative case to its specifier, and that a verb moves to Asp in order to check its aspectual features. These assumptions motivate the movement resulting in the surface form (3b). Unlike other analyses, Zou's account motivates a mandatory X as per schema (1-2) because *ba* selects for an appropriate phrase and can be extended to all *ba* constructions.

 $(5) \begin{bmatrix} BaP [NP WO]_i \begin{bmatrix} Ba' [Ba ba] \\ Ba' [Ba ba] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} AspP [NP yaoshi]_k \begin{bmatrix} Asp' [Asp wang-le]_j \begin{bmatrix} VP [NP t]_i \begin{bmatrix} V' [V t]_j [NP t]_k \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

Counter to Zou's (1995) analysis, v assigns accusative case according to the standard Minimalist Program (Adger 2012). However, since the NP after *ba* seems to be an embedded topic, the movement of this NP can be motivated by checking an embedded topic feature on *ba* rather than by case, allowing v to assign accusative case as usual.

Another problem with Zou's (1995) analysis is its interpretation of causative *ba* constructions. It relies upon an implausible CausP verb shell and does not attempt to disprove a verbal analysis. This suggests that *ba* is a verb in causative constructions. This is supported by the fact that *ba* can be replaced by causative verbs in these constructions. Additionally, as *ba* was historically a lexical verb (Bender 2000, Ding 1993, Zou 1995), it makes sense to suggest that causative *ba* has been retained as a less grammatical form than *ba* in other constructions. This is more economical in terms of historical change as well.

This paper clarifies the question of *ba*'s syntactic category: it is a verb in causative constructions and a topic marker elsewhere. This can in turn help contextualize studies on other work related to *ba* constructions, such as the sorts of resultative complements it can require.

References

Adger, D. (2012). Core Syntax: A Minimalist Approach. Oxford University Press.

- Bender, E. (2000). The Syntax of Mandarin Bă: Reconsidering the Verbal Analysis. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 9(2), 105–145.
- Ding, S. (1993). *The Bă Resultative Construction: A Comprehensive Study of Mandarin Ba Sentences*. Simon Fraser University. Retrieved from http://troy.lib.sfu.ca/record=b1519704~S1a
- Jing-Schmidt, Z. (2016). The Syntax of Ba-construction. In *Dramatized Discourse; Mandarin Chinese Ba-construction* (pp. 17–66). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1974). Co-Verbs in Mandarin Chinese: Verbs or Prepositions? *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 2(3), 257–278.
- Li, Y. A. (2006). Chinese Ba. In M. Everaert & H. Van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (Vol. 1, pp. 374–468). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huang, C.-T. J. (2016). On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *15*(4), 531–574.
- Zou, K. (1995). The Syntax of Chinese Ba-Constructions and Verb Compounds: A Morpho-Syntactic Analysis. University of Southern California. Retrieved from http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/cdm/ref/collection/p15799coll17/id/481164