NOMINAL FUNCTIONS AND NOMINALISATION IN CLASSICAL CHINESE

BY

JERZY FREUNDLICH

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

1988

ProQuest Number: 10672786

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest 10672786

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.
This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

20526844

Abstract

The present study is concerned with the identification and analysis of the major syntactic functions occurring in the classical Chinese sentence. Of these, it concentrates on those functions which exhibit one of the following two characteristics: that of initiating discourse or predication (e.g., SUBJECT); or that of being governed (e.g., OBJECT). The generic term assigned to these functions is 'nominal', and is employed not because they are always performed by members of the lexical category 'noun' (the syntactic unpredictability of classical Chinese word-classes is notorious), but because they are predominantly so performed and, significantly, because proper names, which are nouns *par excellence*, occur almost without exception in these functions.

Although the study deals mainly with the functions described above, it is inevitable that considerable attention is also paid to other, 'verbal' functions with which the nominal functions are inextricably bound, either through governing the latter, or by forming the basis of the predication which the latter initiate. In this way it is hoped that an overall view of classical Chinese sentence structure may be presented. Known and established nominal functions such as SUBJECT and OBJECT are analysed so as to illustrate their special properties with regard to classical Chinese; hitherto unidentified functions such as CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT and COMPLEMENT OF PLACE receive somewhat fuller treatment to establish their status as nominal functions. In addition, the function TOPIC is treated in some detail.

The question of nominalisation also comes in for scrutiny. Qualifying under this head are those constituents which perform nominal functions but are not nouns or noun phrases. Separate chapters are devoted to both non-finite verb phrases and embedded sentences.

The corpus under examination consists of concordanced pre-Han texts of the period c.500–c.250 BC, with occasional reference to earlier texts where a diachronic view is desirable.

Acknowledgements

My thanks must first of all go to the British taxpayer who, albeit unwittingly, supported my research for three years in the form of a British Academy Scholarship. This project would not have been possible without such assistance.

Secondly, I should like to express my gratitude to all those who taught me in my undergraduate and postgraduate studies. Of particular value has been the instruction received from Professor A.C. Graham, who not only stimulated my interest in the subject of classical Chinese grammar during my undergraduate days, but also took the time and trouble to provide detailed criticisms of my work even after his official retirement. I have benefitted greatly from the depth and breadth of his knowledge, for which I am most grateful.

In a very important sense this thesis would not have been written without the help of Lillian Chia and David Aspinall, both involved in the Chinese Computer Project being conducted at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. They were kind enough to allow me to use their Chinese word-processing facilities. David Aspinall prepared and formatted the final version of the thesis for printing and Lillian Chia gave me much valuable assistance with inputting and proof-reading. I extend my sincere thanks to them both.

The greatest debt is, of course, due to my supervisor Dr. Paul Thompson. He has patiently sat through my often too fervent outpourings and has quietly but firmly moderated my too extravagant ideas. When I lacked direction or coherence he provided it and his broad view has helped give this study form and shape. As if this were not enough, he it was who designed the Chinese word-processing software which enabled this thesis to be produced with machine-written characters.

Those mentioned above have contributed significantly to anything of value in this study; the responsibility for errors and shortcomings rests, of course, entirely with the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
Some Notable Previous Studies in Classical Chinese Syntax 1
The Nature of the Problem 2
Premises and Methodology 4
The Corpus 12
CHAPTER 1: SUBJECT AND OBJECT 15
SUBJECT and PREDICATE 15
The SUBJECT-FINITE VERB Relationship 18
Are SUBJECTS Absolutely Necessary in CC Sentences? 20
Grammatical SUBJECT vs. Logical SUBJECT 26
OBJECT 28
CO-VERBS and their Complements 30
Are CO-VERBS Transitive? 32
CHAPTER 2: LOCATION AND RELATION 34
Location in a Place 34
Yu 于/於 in Expressions of Location and Relation 35
Yu 于/於 as Marker of Place 38
Yu with Stative Verbs and Ergative Verbs 43
The Directive Uses of *yu* 44
COMPLEMENT OF PLACE vs. OBJECT 48
CHAPTER 3: CLASSIFICATORY VERBS AND CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS 52
Classificatory Verbs 52
Similarity and Analogy 54
ru 如/*ruo* 若 54
si 似 60
you 猶 62
MARKER OF COMPARISON 64
Some Distinctions between Similarity and Analogy 65
Naming and Calling 66
Capacity and Role 72
A Note on the *yi* 以... *wei* 為 Pattern 75
Class-Membership and Identity 80
Differentiation between Identity and Class-Membership 87
B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS Expressing Reason or Cause 89
CHAPTER 4: TOPICS 92
Topicalisation 92
Deletion of the Resumptive Pronoun 98
REAL TOPICS 100
REAL TOPICS and Quantification 103
Existential *you* 有 106
The Status of 'Possessive' *you* 有 115
A Note on Existential Quantification 117

Particle Marking for Contrastive Focus . . . 120
The Particle *ze* 則 . . . 121
Infixing for Contrastive Focus . . . 127
Infixed REAL TOPICS . . . 127
Infixed OBJECTS . . . 128
CHAPTER 5: DERIVED NOUN PHRASES . . . 129
Derivations with SUBJECT Substitutes . . . 130
Derivations with COMPLEMENT OF PLACE Substitutes . . . 131
Derivations with OBJECT Substitutes . . . 133
Derivations with Substitutes for OBJECT of CO-VERB . . . 135
Derivations Involving Existential Quantification in the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 Pattern . . . 137
Derivations with A-term SUBJECT Substitutes . . . 140
The Particle *ye* 也 as a Marker of Sentence-Initial Constituents . . . 141
Morphological Ambiguities . . . 144
CHAPTER 6: NOMINALISATION 1: NON-FINITE VERB PHRASES . . . 146
Verb Phrases . . . 146
Non-Finite VPs Functioning as SUBJECT . . . 148
As OBJECT . . . 149
As OBJECT of CO-VERB . . . 150
As COMPLEMENT OF PLACE . . . 150
As CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT . . . 150
As TOPIC . . . 152
Non-Finite VP vs. Abstract Noun . . . 153
CHAPTER 7: NOMINALISATION 2: EMBEDDED SENTENCES . . . 164
Embedded Sentences as SUBJECT . . . 166
Embedded Sentences as OBJECT . . . 166
Embedded Sentences as OBJECT of CO-VERB . . . 169
Embedded Sentences as COMPLEMENT OF PLACE . . . 169
Embedded Sentences as CLASSFICATORY COMPLEMENT . . . 169
The Affirmation and Denial of Propositions . . . 171
Embedded Sentences as REAL TOPICS . . . 175
'Neutral' Subordinate Clauses . . . 177
Marked Subordinate Clauses . . . 178
ze 則 . . . 179
Is *zhe* 者 a Particle of Subordination? . . . 181
Stacking . . . 184
Embedded Sentences Implying Manner . . . 185
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . 189

Introduction

Some Notable Previous Studies in Classical Chinese Syntax

When one looks to previous Western grammatical studies of classical Chinese (CC), certain works stand out as beacons along what is often a dim and hazardous path. CC is woefully lacking in general grammars by Western scholars, and even to this day there is only Gabelentz's *Chinesische Grammatik*[1] that deserves to wear that particular mantle with justification. Although this work was first published in 1881 when the science of linguistics was in its infancy, so accomplished a linguist and so far ahead of his time was Gabelentz that his grammar still serves as an extremely useful guide to this very day.

However, despite the sad lack of a successor to Gabelentz by way of a general grammar, recent years have witnessed the appearance of a number of studies, some of them of substantial length, which have considerably deepened our knowledge of a notoriously elusive and confounding grammar. The two full-length studies which stand out for particular citation are John Cikoski's unpublished doctoral thesis *Classical Chinese Word-Classes*[2] and Christoph Harbsmeier's *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax.*[3] The qualities of the former are generally to pin-point and attempt to resolve the antagonisms between word-classes and syntactic functions in CC, and more specifically to document the phenomenon of ergativity as it appears in certain CC

1 Georg von der Gabelentz, *Chinesische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1881; reprint ed., Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaft, 1953).

2 John S. Cikoski, *Classical Chinese Word-Classes* (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1970).

3 Christoph Harbsmeier, *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax* (London & Malmo: Curzon Press, 1981).

verbs. The special contribution provided by Harbsmeier's work is, in my view, detailed semantic differentiation in two very important areas of the language: quantification and subordinate clauses.

Of the shorter studies to have been written in recent years, many of the most significant have come from the pen of A.C. Graham. I should like to draw attention to two of his articles in particular: "Some Basic Problems of Classical Chinese Syntax",[4] and "Relating Categories to Question Forms in Pre-Han Chinese Thought."[5] Both these papers offer much incisive observation on difficult areas of CC syntax. I have been especially struck by the former, which seeks to establish some fundamental rules concerning CC sentence structure. The task that Graham set himself, to "define nominal and verbal units in terms of their functions in the sentence as a whole, descending from a higher level to unit and sub-unit instead of ascending from below",[6] I would agree is one which demands our immediate attention, and one without whose proper execution much further work on the language might be seriously hampered. Therefore, it is also the task which I have set myself in this study.

The Nature of the Problem

There is a fundamental problem in classical Chinese which is well known to all sinologists who have grappled with it: that of relating lexical categories (traditionally referred to as 'parts of speech') to syntactic functions in CC. Shchutskii has said of CC:

> It is known that parts of speech are not formally distinguished, but are only a function of the syntactic structure.[7]

4 A.C. Graham, "Some Basic Problems of Classical Chinese Syntax", *Asia Major* (New Series), 14, 1969, pp. 192–216.

5 A.C. Graham, "Relating Categories to Question Forms in Pre-Han Chinese Thought", in *Studies in Chinese Philosophy & Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986), pp. 360–411.

6 Graham, 1969, p. 193.

7 Iulian K. Shchutskii, *Researches on the I Ching* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p. 174.

Kennedy, it appears, is forced by bitter experience to endorse this view when documenting his attempt at a grammar of the Mencius:

> The project had proceeded on the assumption that word-classes can and must be defined before the relation between words can be grammatically treated. It has now reached the conclusion that in the final analysis word-classes cannot be defined, hence that Chinese grammar must start from different premises.[8]

Further on in the same article he indicates what these "different premises" might be:

> It has been said of Chinese that any given word may perform any desired function. This is not inconceivable, as somewhat the same thing might to a considerable degree be said of English. And even if it were entirely true, it would not mean that these languages have no grammar, but simply that they have no mutually exclusive word-classes. The grammarian would then have to pass up the demarcation of word-classes as an unprofitable activity, and go on to the more complex problem of classifying functions, which is in the end the most important part of the job.[9]

Cikoski, on the other hand, considered the establishment of CC lexical categories a sufficiently profitable activity to warrant a doctoral thesis on the subject. There is no doubt that this work represents a valuable contribution to our present understanding of CC, yet the question must be asked to what extent is this a study of lexical categories, and to what extent is it a study of syntactic functions? Of the eight chapters, three are clearly concerned with the latter.[10] And even where his investigation is directed towards determining the word-class, the criteria adhered to in observing the behaviour of words are, more often than not, syntactic. As a typical example, his exposition of ergative verbs relies on the alternation of the syntactic function of the logical patient between subject and object.

8 George A. Kennedy, "Word-Classes in Classical Chinese", in *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Tien-yi Li (New Haven: Far Eastern Publications Yale University, 1964), p. 323.

9 Ibid., p. 335.

10 Cikoski, 1970:
Chapter Two: Simple Sentence Structure (pp. 28–35).
Chapter Three: Factors and Objects (pp. 36–53).
Chapter Five: Adjuncts and Heads (pp. 72–88).

It appears from this that, even if the determining of CC word-classes were to be deemed a profitable activity, the establishment of syntactic functions would be a prior requirement. Indeed, Cikoski made an implicit recognition of this fact in commencing his analysis proper with a chapter on sentence structure. This short chapter was obviously considered by Cikoski to meet his own requirements in this area, but it must be said to fall markedly short of providing anything like an analytical framework of syntactic functions. For example, one particular area of the language which I have long considered something of a quagmire is the confusion over the status of the sentence-initial constituent; is it a subject or a topic, and what is the difference between the two? Obviously, there was no way of finding out until both functions had been characterised in detail. In his chapter on sentence structure Cikoski offered a section of two pages on "Topics and Subjects", which is barely sufficient to scratch the surface of the problem.[11] And yet, it is an astonishing fact that, if one surveys the existing literature, one would be hard pressed to find much that is more informative on this question.

Indeed, the more I enquired, the more apparent it became that although a great deal of important research had been conducted into CC, comparatively little of it had concerned itself with the fundamental question of establishing its syntactic functions, and it was this realisation that led to the present study.

Premises and Methodology

The process of establishing syntactic functions inevitably requires an 'all-or-nothing' approach; that is, syntactic functions by their very nature are interdependent upon each other, and it is therefore impossible for an investigation of this nature to ignore any particular functions. At the same time, it would be impossibly daunting to attempt to deal with them all in the same depth and detail. In determining which functions to concentrate my efforts on, I was influenced by

[11] Cikoski, 1970, pp. 30–32

having had my attention drawn to a particular problem in CC grammar, that of nominalisation. Since it is the case, as the earlier quotations make clear, that CC words are not formally distinguished as between lexical categories, in what sense can we speak of nominalisation in CC? In English, for example, a system of derivational morphology frequently makes it plain that a word has undergone a process of nominalisation and become a noun whereas the form from which it has derived is not. Moreover, the functions which the related words may perform are mutually exclusive. Thus, *mystify* is deemed a verb and may function as a predicate but not as a subject (except in citation form), while *mystification* is deemed a noun and may function as subject but may not stand alone as the predicate.

Although this kind of morphological variation is by no means universal in English, there is no corresponding system at all in CC. Therefore, any discussion of nominalisation in CC must proceed from entirely different premises. To speak of nominalisation in CC in any meaningful way requires two presuppositions. Firstly, that certain constituents may, by behavioural criteria, be deemed to be other than nominal; and secondly, that their behaviour, which allowed them to be characterised as non-nominal in the first place, allows sufficient variation for them to enjoy the sort of distribution which would charactarise a constituent as being nominal. Basically, what is meant by behaviour here is occurrence in certain syntactic functions. It obviously follows from this that the question of nominalisation can be decided only when syntactic functions have been not merely determined, but also when their properties have been analysed sufficiently for them to be divided into two different types of function: one type which would deem the behaviour of a constituent which occurred in it nominal; and another type which would be indicative of non-nominal behaviour. Although both types of function would need to be examined, I decided to concentrate my efforts on those which suggested nominal behaviour, and these functions would be referred to as *nominal* functions, the other type being designated *verbal* functions.

Some might wish to point out that it is a circular argument to claim that the investigation of syntactic functions should be conducted without regard to lexical considerations, and then to speak of functions as being either 'nominal' or 'verbal'. It should be made clear that although the two types of function are labelled after lexical categories, these are merely tags of convenience and their use should not be taken to imply that the analysis has been based on word-classes; on the contrary this study will seek to establish syntactic functions without reliance on lexical categories. However, one interesting observation made during the course of this research is that the group of functions which are called *nominal* are justified in their designation in that it is in these functions alone that proper nouns occur. Now, proper nouns are the one lexical category of whose status as nouns we can be sure; we need no behavioural criteria to assert that these are nouns. Therefore, it would in no way be a circular argument to claim that those functions which are performed by proper nouns may be called nominal, since the inclusion of proper nouns within the word-class 'noun' in no way relies on behavioural (i.e., syntactic) criteria: proper nouns are nouns *per se* and *par excellence.*

All syntactic enquiry should commence with the one totally independent syntactic form. Bloomfield has said:

> In any utterance, a linguistic form appears either as a constituent of some larger form...or else as an independent form not included in any larger (complex) linguistic form... When a linguistic form appears as part of a larger form, it is said to be in *included position*; otherwise it is said to be in *absolute position* and to constitute a *sentence.*
>
> It is evident that the sentences in any utterance are marked off by the mere fact that each sentence is an independent linguistic term, not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form.[12]

Accordingly, in addressing the question of syntactic functions, I start from the premise that the sentence constitutes the largest syntactic unit and the only independent one. The direction

[12] Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (Rev. British ed., London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935), p. 170.

of the analysis proceeds downward, and as it does so, discusses the syntactic functions which constitute sentence structure through its various strata.

This approach is similar to that reflected in the rewrite rules used by many modern grammarians, especially those of the Transformationalist school. According to this convention, the immediate constituents of a sentence are represented by phrases denoting word-class, the rewrite rule for a basic English sentence being: S -> NP + VP, meaning that the immediate constituents of a basic sentence in English may be analysed as being a noun phrase followed by a verb phrase. It is debatable whether such a characterisation of immediate constituents lends itself favourably to the analysis of English syntax; however, the inflectional and derivational morphology present in English, while not as pronounced as in many other Indo-European languages, is sufficient to allow for the possibility of identifying structural positions in the English sentence using word-class tags since such morphological variation will also consign the word thus affected to a particular structural position, that is to say, to a particular syntactic function. In CC, on the other hand, no corresponding system exists, and while it is not absolutely true that "any given word may perform any desired function", the situation is not far removed from that. Therefore, rewrite rules which mark structural positions by word-class are not acceptable for CC, and if one is to conduct a 'top-down' analysis of CC sentence structure, the structural positions must be marked by syntactic functions.

The relationships between constituents examined in this study are of two kinds, both of which are characterised by an inherent antagonism, yet complementariness; in short, all these relationships may be described as 'dualistic'. The first kind of syntactic relationship is the one typified by the immediate constituents of the BASIC SENTENCE, which are argued in the first chapter to be SUBJECT and PREDICATE.[13] In the nature of this relationship lies the key to the status of the sentence as being the only independent syntactic unit. The reason why the sentence

[13] The convention will be adopted in this study of writing the syntactic functions of CC in block capitals.

enjoys this unique status is that, unlike the syntactic functions which make up sentence structure, the sentence represents the whole point of language: to make *finite* statements about the infinite universe. The way in which this is achieved is by selecting something known to the participants in the communicative process, and then saying something about it. This, of course, has been said many times before, as is documented in the citations given in chapter one. Thus, one rather important aspect of the nature of the relationship between SUBJECT and PREDICATE is a communicative one. In the structure of CC sentences there exists one other relationship which enjoys the same characteristics, that of TOPIC and COMMENT, which will be dealt with in chapter four. In both these structures, it is the function which has the characteristic of providing the 'subject of discourse' which is included among those functions tagged nominal.

I make no apology for characterising a syntactic function on the basis of its cognitive role. In the discussion on SUBJECT other characteristics will be examined, but these are more specifically concerned with its relationship not with the PREDICATE, but with the dominant function within the PREDICATE, that of FINITE VERB. On the whole, my position regarding the status of SUBJECT is close to that of Chafe's:

> So far as I can see at present, the best way to characterize the subject function is not very different from the ancient statement that the subject is what we are talking about.[14]

Similarly, when we come to characterise TOPIC, an important property it has as an immediate constituent of a sentence of TOPIC/COMMENT structure is also that of being the 'subject of discourse'.

The second kind of relationship between constituents which is of interest to us is that of government. Phrases featuring government are exocentric constructions which occur within the PREDICATE and necessarily contain two constituents, the first performing a governing function,

[14] Wallace C. Chafe, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View", in *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li (New York: Academic Press, 1975), p. 43.

the second a governed one. It is the function performed by the second, governed constituent which is included among those classified as nominal, the governing function being deemed 'verbal'. Of the governed functions the most common one is OBJECT. But according to a fairly widely accepted definition of OBJECT in CC, it is clear that not all governed constituents function in this capacity, and it is necessary to differentiate between OBJECT and other governed functions, namely COMPLEMENT OF PLACE and CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT.

The first four chapters, then, are devoted to establishing the five nominal functions and describing their characteristics. The fifth chapter is something of a brief interlude between this first part of the study and the second part, which looks in some detail at the appearance in nominal functions of constituents whose more representative distribution is in non-nominal functions; that is to say, it deals with nominalisation. The purpose of this fifth chapter is twofold: firstly, it traces some common transformations involving, for the most part, the substitution of constituents performing certain nominal functions; and in so doing it introduces particular morphological patterns which are common to, but to be distinguished from, nominalised forms appearing in the sixth and seventh chapters. Although it might be argued that the derived forms discussed in chapter five are themselves instances of nominalisation, they are structurally quite different from the non-finite VPs and embedded sentences encountered in chapters six and seven. These latter I would describe as examples of true nominalisation in that such constituents are nominalised in virtue of the fact that they perform a nominal function. Although they may be marked with a nominalising morpheme it is often omitted, leaving a form which could easily function as PREDICATE or BASIC SENTENCE; whereas the derived forms of chapter five are in effect complex noun phrases which could only occur in a nominal function. Another point of difference is that the nominalising morphemes, when present in non-finite VPs and embedded sentences, do not play any part in the internal structure of the constituent, as is the case with the HEAD substitutes figuring in the transformations dealt with in chapter five. Therefore, while acknowl-

edging the strong case for including these transformations as instances of nominalisation, for the purposes of this study, which seeks to determine such matters on the basis of syntactic functions, I shall not treat them as such.

With the mention of transformations it might be supposed that this study proposes a Transformationalist interpretation of CC syntax. The fact of the matter is that, while I am in agreeement with certain tenets and some of the methodology of the Transformationalist school, I have in no way set out to write a Transformationalist grammar of CC. It seems to me that much of the finer detail of that school's theories is inevitably determined by the language upon which the research has been carried out and, even then, is often controversial. Moreover, some earlier theories are now being called into question by the new standard bearers, whose own theories may well meet with a similar fate in years to come. My approach has been to apply a Transformationalist interpretation where this appears to provide a natural and convincing explanation for the facts as observed; but I hope I have managed to avoid 'arranging' the facts in order to have them conform to any part of the theory.

This brings us to an interesting question in syntactic analysis: should syntactic rules be determined purely by the surface form of utterances, or is it necessary to go beyond this and consider whether there are syntactic laws which are not always evident from the utterance itself. What is being intimated here is, of course, the difficult theory of underlying or deep-structure syntax. Perhaps my own position might best be expressed using an analogy. Every schoolboy knows that the theory of gravity was first postulated by Isaac Newton after witnessing the fall of an apple. Now, gravity is considered by modern physicists as being one of the fundamental forces which govern the cosmos. However, not every apple fell from that tree and bombarded the great man; most of them stayed exactly where they were. Furthermore, aeroplanes fly and 'defy' gravity. Do we conclude that in such cases gravity is not present? Of course not! The force of gravity is acting upon those objects all the time, and yet the additional presence of certain local

conditions results in the effects of gravity not being evidenced. What is crucial is that the formulation of the theory of gravity was precipitated not by those apples that remained on the tree and showed no outward sign of being subject to the law of gravity, but precisely by that particular apple which did show it and fell.

Similarly, when it comes to the laws governing the syntax of the CC sentence, if we merely observe the surface structure of utterances we cannot always be certain that we are seeing manifested all the laws which are present. Language, like flying objects, is also subject to local conditions which allow forms to be expressed on the surface which may override underlying laws. For example, in the first chapter it is argued that the two syntactic functions *indispensable* to a sentence are SUBJECT and PREDICATE. It is clear that not all CC sentences contain a surface SUBJECT. While some grammarians have built their theory of CC sentence structure on a form lacking a surface SUBJECT, this study argues that the absence of a surface SUBJECT is caused by the presence of certain local conditions affecting the communication of the utterance. It takes as the constant law that which gives rise to a SUBJECT, and regards as a 'local' condition that which allows for its deletion. As the law of gravity *appears* not to operate on those apples which remain on the tree, although in reality it never ceases to do so, just so the syntactic laws determining the requirements of a sentence do not cease to operate, although this might appear to be the case in the surface structure.

For this reason, the present study will argue in favour of the distinction between deep and surface structure in the syntax of CC. And it does so, not in order to comply with the theories of some school of grammar, but because having seen some apples fall from the tree, as it were, it seeks to discover what law brought that about, and what local conditions stand in the way of it bringing the other apples down.

The Corpus

By classical Chinese is meant the language of texts which are believed to date from the period approximately 500 B.C. to 200 B.C. For my primary sources I have drawn from the texts of this period which are available in the Harvard-Yenching concordance series, namely:

The Analects
Zuo Zhuan
Mozi
Mencius
Zhuangzi
Xunzi

Outside the Harvard-Yenching series I have also quoted from the concordance to the *Han Feizi* compiled by Zhou Zhongling and others, published by the Zhonghua Book Company in Peking, 1982. Where I have felt a diachronic view would be helpful to the analysis, I have also quoted from three earlier texts, the Odes, the Documents and the Spring and Autumn annals, again using the Harvard-Yenching concordances. All quotations are referenced according to their respective concordances. In the case of the *Zuo Zhuan*, in order to facilitate the finding of references, I have also supplied the page number of the concordance and the line number of that page, counting only the lines of the *Zuo Zhuan* text. In this I am following Cikoski's precedent.[15]

While on the subject of the *Zuo Zhuan*, this being the only one of the texts cited above which consists largely of narrative, I have used proportionately more examples from this text than from others to act as a foil to the more discursive philosophical texts. In particular, I have made substantial use of the *Zuo Zhuan* in the early chapters where it provides a rich source for simple declarative sentences of the type called for at that stage of the study.

I am aware that opinions vary as to the optimum size or scope of the corpus in linguistic research. I think that an important determining factor as to one's choice in this regard is the nature of the subject matter at hand. In the case of this study, what is at issue is the rather broad area of

[15] Cikoski, 1970, p. 16.

the syntactic functions which may occur in the CC sentence, and it did not seem appropriate to attempt to reach conclusions on this question using a comparatively narrow corpus restricted, say, to a single text. During the course of my research, I felt vindicated in this approach by the unexpectedly high degree of syntactic consistency encountered among the texts under examination, although I do admit that there were occasions when the greater opportunities for exhaustive research possible with a more limited corpus caused me to feel a little regret at my decision. At the same time, those inconsistencies between texts which do exist might also suggest that a broadening of the scope of the corpus would be in order. For example, in the chapter dealing with classificatory verbs we shall see that, had I restricted myself to the *Zuo Zhuan*, I would have been forced to the conclusion that the function of a constituent governed by *ru* 如 and *ruo* 若 was OBJECT, whereas the evidence from other texts suggests that it is not.

It hardly requires comment that the language of the period under discussion here is a quite different animal from modern standard Chinese. However, despite the obvious differences, there are certain areas in both languages where important and fundamental similarities may be discerned. Since the grammar of modern Chinese (MC) has been far more extensively researched than that of CC, I have not hesitated to include in the analysis corroborating evidence from the established findings of grammarians of MC where the correspondences between the two languages seem too apparent to ignore and where such comparison was deemed beneficial to the analysis. In particular I have found Zhao Yuanren's *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*[16] a rich seam of information. Time and again his insights into MC have shed light on similar areas of CC; I am much in his debt.

In addition, I have occasionally referred to other languages to adduce evidence in support of an argument in respect of CC. I have discovered that this is a practice fraught with difficulties

16 Zhao Yuanren, *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968).

and have attempted to confine my exercise of it to cases where I think the parallels are clearly discernible and not harmful to the analysis. The reader must judge to what extent my intentions in this regard have been successful.

This study uses the *Pinyin* system of romanisation.

1

SUBJECT and OBJECT

SUBJECT and PREDICATE

The starting point for any investigation into the syntactic functions of classical Chinese (CC) is the sentence; more specifically the barest minimum required for an utterance to count as sentence at all. A sentence conforming to these requirements may be described as the minimum or BASIC SENTENCE. What are the views of theoretical linguists concerning what is fundamental to a sentence? In his *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* Lyons opens his chapter on grammatical functions as follows:

> It is a fundamental principle of traditional grammar, and also of much modern syntactic theory, that every simple declarative sentence consists of two obligatory constituents, a *subject* and a *predicate*.[1]

This is a position which Crystal appears to take for granted in discussing sentence types:

> Most analyses also recognise some such classification of 'sentence patterns' into simple vs. complex or compound types, i.e., consisting of one SUBJECT-PREDICATE unit, as opposed to more than one. Whether one calls this subject-predicate unit a CLAUSE, a 'simple sentence' or uses some other term depends on one's model of analysis.[2]

And Sandmann, who has devoted a whole book to the SUBJECT- PREDICATE relationship, confirms its central and fundamental importance to syntactic analysis:

> It is perhaps worth noting that the immediate interest of the grammarian, whose task it is to analyse sentences, consists in possessing some sort of criterion for the distinction of S and P which allows him to proceed with his analysis.[3]

1 John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 334.

2 David Crystal, *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1980), p. 320.

3 Manfred Sandmann, *Subject and Predicate* (Edinburgh, 1954; 2nd rev. and enl. ed., Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979), 2nd ed., p. 99.

The evidence, then, of these linguists, which is not untypical, is that in its minimal form a sentence consists of two elements, each performing a necessary syntactic function. Traditional grammar has used the words SUBJECT and PREDICATE to refer to these functions and we shall first of all endeavour to reveal the nature of and establish working definitions for these terms as applied to CC. In order to do this it will be necessary to introduce some CC sentences whose immediate constituents are separated by a vertical line:

(1) 犬 | 斃。 左/僖 4/附 (93/12)
The dog | died.

(2) 子鮮 | 在。 左/襄 26/3 (309/16)
Zi Xian | is present.

(3) 陳 | 亂。 左/桓 5/6 (30/4)
Chen | is in disorder.

(4) 公 | 田。 左/僖 4/附 (93/11)
The duke | was hunting.

(5) 季孫 | 喜。 左/襄 23/11 (300/5)
Ji Sun | was pleased.

How are the functions of these immediate constituents to be characterised? Lyons, quoting Sapir, offers a certain opinion:

> Sapir was merely repeating the traditional view when he said, 'There must be something to talk about and something must be said about this subject of discourse.'[4]

On this basis we may now attempt definitions for these two functions:

SUBJECT: the subject of discourse.

PREDICATE: that which is said about a SUBJECT.

Applying these criteria to examples (1)–(5) it is evident that in every case the first constituent is the SUBJECT and the second is the PREDICATE. Can we then absolutely rely

4 Lyons, 1968, p. 334.

on these definitions to identify the SUBJECT and PREDICATE in every sentence? Unfortunately we cannot, as our analysis breaks down when confronted with a comparison of the following two sentences:

(6) 人 | 皆有不忍人之心。 孟子 2A/6
All men have a sense of not being able to bear the suffering of others.

(7) 惻隱之心 | 人皆有之。 孟子 6A/6
A sense of compassion all men have.

At first sight it appears that both sentences are of identical structure in that they are analysable into two constituents, the first providing the subject of discourse, and the second going on to say something about it. Although this is true as far it goes, it will be noticed that the 'PREDICATE' in (7) is itself a sentence which is identical in its basic structure with (6) and which may be analysed in the same manner:

(7a) 人 | 皆有之
All men have it.

On the basis of our existing criteria, (7) would appear to have two constituents, 惻隱之心 and 人, which may each be characterised as 'SUBJECT'. Common sense precludes these two constituents sharing the same function because it is clear that 惻隱之心 (which is the antecedent of the pronoun *zhi* 之 'it') and 人 stand in an entirely different relationship to the only verb in the sentence, *you* 有 'have'.

The preceding analysis shows that the essential difference between sentences of the type represented by examples (1)–(6) (which will be referred to as BASIC SENTENCES), and that evidenced in example (7) is that the latter contains an additional stratum in the sentence structure which takes the form of a sentence-initial constituent which precedes a BASIC SENTENCE. This study will adhere to Hockett's use of the term TOPIC for such a constituent.[5] Therefore, whereas both SUBJECT and TOPIC may be said to provide the 'subject of discourse', they are in fact

5 Charles F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 201–203.

entirely separate functions. A detailed enquiry into the nature of the CC TOPIC will be conducted in chapter four; the purpose of mentioning it at this point is to contrast it with SUBJECT. We shall now seek to identify some further characteristics of SUBJECT.

The SUBJECT-FINITE VERB Relationship

Sentences (1)–(5) have been analysed as being formed of a SUBJECT and PREDICATE. Here the PREDICATE consists of a single lexical item, while in (6) it is a complex phrase. Therefore, if we are to establish what is fundamental and minimally necessary to a PREDICATE we should consider examples such as (1)–(5). The PREDICATE in these cases consists of a single word which, semantically, describes an action, process or state.[6] This study does not include among its objectives the systematic establishment of word-classes; therefore, let us rely on the traditional view that such words are verbs. Is it therefore correct to conclude that the *sine qua non* of a PREDICATE, the minimal syntactic function it may contain is 'verb'? Since 'verb' describes a word-class, so long as one is seeking to differentiate between lexical categories and syntactic functions such a position would be untenable. A more fruitful line of enquiry would be to examine the properties of a verb finding itself in this function, and the particular quality of the verb which interests us here is *finiteness*.

In English finite and non-finite forms are morphologically distinguished: finite forms are susceptible to variation in number, person and tense while non-finite forms are not. Thus, *are running* is recognisable as a finite form, and *running* or *to run* as non-finite forms. In addition to the differences in morphology there is also the important distinction that a finite verb may be sufficient to constitute a PREDICATE, while a non-finite verb may not:

(a) They are running.
(b) *They running.

6 In chapter three I shall address the question of 'nominal' PREDICATES. It will be argued that in deep structure these do not constitute the entire PREDICATE and therefore do not concern us at this juncture.

The converse of this rule is that a finite form of the verb cannot perform any function other than this, for example SUBJECT; this must be performed by a non-finite form:

(c) Running is good for you.
(d) *Are running is good for you.

The principles inherent in these observations of English may be extrapolated to formulate the rule that any PREDICATE, however complex, must contain a finite verb. We may therefore conclude that the *minimal* syntactic function necessary to a PREDICATE is FINITE VERB.

An important point to grasp from this analysis is the intimate and inviolable syntactic relationship which exists between the SUBJECT and the FINITE VERB. A SUBJECT does not merely provide the 'subject of discourse' (in a BASIC SENTENCE) but is also necessarily in construction with a FINITE VERB, which itself is necessarily finite *in respect of* the SUBJECT. Herein lies the peculiar syntactic (as opposed to communicative) property of a SUBJECT and one by which it may be distinguished from TOPIC, which does not share this syntactic relationship with the FINITE VERB.

Is there any reason to suppose that these principles do not apply to CC? The morphology of Chinese verbs does not allow for explicit distinction between finite and non-finite forms: the difference is in the function performed. However, if we return to (1)–(5) it may be shown that the second constituent in each case is a FINITE VERB. In the first place, upon rendering any of these sentences into a language like English which does distinguish morphologically, the form of the verb used in translation is always finite. Moreover, the only analysis to which examples such as these will conform, the only relationship between the constituents which enables the utterance to be intelligible as a sentence at all, is that whatever is described in the second (verbal) constituent relates solely and specifically to the first constituent and is thus rendered finite by that constituent. The relationship is obviously that of a SUBJECT and a FINITE VERB, one which is logically, semantically and syntactically apparent if not morphologically so. Therefore, whether a CC verb is finite or non-finite depends not on its morphology but purely on the syntactic function it

performs; indeed, we shall discover in chapter five that there is great scope for the use of non-finite verbs in CC, but *never* enjoying the kind of relationship that a FINITE VERB has with a SUBJECT, but rather *themselves* occurring as SUBJECT or other nominal functions.

Are SUBJECTS Absolutely Necessary in CC Sentences?

It is along the line of reasoning postulated above that I now wish to address the claims made by some sinologists that SUBJECT is not an indispensable function in CC sentence structure. The fact that Graham does not include SUBJECT as part of his "sentence core" (to all intents and purposes identical with the term PREDICATE as employed in this study), but relegates it to a sentence position which he describes as "core-subordinate", implies that he does not consider it essential to a sentence.[7] In answering this view it is necessary to introduce the linguistic phenomena of *deletion* and *elimination* and point out the difference between the two, which will in turn cause us to consider the underlying, or deep structure of a sentence rather than merely observing its surface characteristics.

It is a universal of syntactic principles that subordinating elements are eliminable constituents in subordinating endocentric structures. Lyons provides the following definition for endocentricity:

> An endocentric construction is one whose distribution is identical with that of one or more of its constituents.[8]

It therefore follows that in a subordinating endocentric construction, the HEAD is that constituent whose distribution is identical with that of the whole and unaffected by the elimination of any subordinating (or modifying) constituent(s). To say that a constituent is eliminable means that it may be eliminated from the structure *as though it had never existed* with the remaining

7 Graham, 1969, p. 206.

8 Lyons, 1968, pp. 231–232.

phrase and its distribution being an acceptable *ab initio* form. Therefore, in the sentence, *The black cat sat on the mat*, the SUBJECT NP *The black cat* is an endocentric structure whose subordinating constituent *black* may be eliminated leaving the distribution of the head of the phrase unaffected. Notice that in the case of an *exocentric* structure, such as the prepositional phrase *on the mat*, there is no possibility of elimination since the distribution of the remainder, if either constituent is withdrawn, is no longer the same as the original entire constituent:

*The black cat sat on.
*The black cat sat the mat.

So much for eliminability. Deletability is a rather different animal. Consider this trivial exchange:

A: The black cat sat on the mat.
B: It did what?!
A: Sat on the mat!

A's second speech consists of nothing but a PREDICATE which, within the context of the dialogue, is an acceptable sentence form. However, had he initiated the dialogue with these words (i.e., if the SUBJECT were *eliminated* as though it had never been), the utterance would have been meaningless to his interlocutor. Thus, it is only acceptable as an intelligible sentence as we find it above because a SUBJECT for it has already been established in B's mind in the opening speech and, given the pragmatics of the dialogue, may be *deleted*. This is the crucial point: a surface string consisting of a PREDICATE counts as a sentence precisely because at the underlying level of structure there is a SUBJECT understood for it; otherwise it would not be intelligible. This is why one cannot ignore the underlying syntax or dissociate the surface syntax from it.

The pragmatic conditions for the deletion of SUBJECTS are far more readily satisfied in CC than they are in English, and Graham's examples of sentences 'lacking' a SUBJECT and containing only a "core" (i.e., PREDICATE) are all cases of surface deletion of the SUBJECT; indeed, in each case he supplies a SUBJECT in his rendering which is without question understood from the

context.[9] Thus, at the level of the underlying structure of CC it is inconceivable for a PREDICATE to predicate of nothing or for a FINITE VERB to lack a SUBJECT to make it finite. The impossibility of entertaining such an alarming paradox was recognised by Gabelentz long ago:

> What is syntactically most important is the frequent deletion (Literally: 'suppression') of the grammatical subject, in which case this or that personal pronoun is to be supplied according to the circumstances. It is clear that in such cases what we are presented with is logically a sentence but syntactically only part of a sentence, and from this contradiction difficulties sometimes arise.[10]

Of course, Gabelentz was writing at a time when the terms 'underlying' or 'deep structure' and 'surface structure' were unheard of; however, I have little hesitation in interpreting his remarks such that for "logically a sentence" read "a sentence at the underlying level of syntax", and for "syntactically only part of a sentence" read "at the level of the surface syntax only part of a sentence".

The foregoing being largely a theoretical discussion of the problem, let us now attempt to identify the pragmatic conditions which give rise to SUBJECT deletion in CC. The tendency of CC towards economy of expression is well known. One of the ways in which this manifests itself in continuous discourse is in the deletion of the SUBJECT when it is clearly known from the context, in other words, under precisely those pragmatic conditions where English would express the SUBJECT by means of a pronoun. In the case of a first- or second- person pronoun such deletion is optional, but fairly frequent:

(8) 或問禘之說。子曰：不知也。 論語 3/11
Someone asked about the explanation of the *Di* sacrifice. The Master said, "(I) do not know."

(9) 季路問事鬼神。子曰：未能事人。
焉能事鬼。 論語 11/12
Ji Lu asked about serving ghosts and spirits. The master said, "(You) are not yet able to serve men, how could (you) serve ghosts?"

9 Graham, 1969, pp. 206–207.

10 Gabelentz, 1953, p. 118.

However, when it comes to the third person, the question of an option does not arise. In fact, there is no pronoun available for a third-person SUBJECT of a FINITE VERB in an independent clause in CC, and this inevitably leads to widespread deletion of SUBJECTS in this person, as in the following example:

(10) 沈同以其私問曰：燕可伐與。
孟子曰：可。 孟子 2B/8
Shen Tong asked in a private question, "May Yan be attacked?"
Mencius said, "(It) may."

SUBJECT-deletion is not confined to NPs: it is common with non-finite VP SUBJECTS:

(11) 子般怒，使鞭之。公曰：不如殺之。 左/莊 32/5 (79/9)
Zi Ban was angry and had him flogged. The duke said, "(It, i.e., flogging him) is not as good as killing him."

And also with sentential SUBJECTS:

(12) 謂平子曰：三命踰父兄非禮也。
平子曰：然。 左/昭 12/8 (378/5)
He said to Ping Zi, "For a thrice-ordained noble to exceed his father or elder brother in rank is not a case of the proper rites." Ping Zi said, "(It, i.e., everything you've just said) is so."

What is important to grasp in all these examples is that the PREDICATES *do* predicate of SUBJECTS which are clearly discernible from the context and which have been deleted for precisely this reason. Therefore, we may conclude that the above are all cases of SUBJECT-deletion under appropriate pragmatic conditions.

Harbsmeier has identified two sentence types which he describes as "inherently subjectless sentences". These are existential sentences and sentences describing meteorological phenomena.[11] Since Harbsmeier later gives examples of sentences with deleted SUBJECTS one assumes that what is meant by "inherently subjectless" is the complete and utter lack of a SUBJECT *even* at an underlying level of syntactic analysis. As existential sentences will be

[11] Christoph Harbsmeier, *Wilhelm von Humboldts Brief an Abel Remusat und die philosophischer Grammatik des Altchinesischen* (Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1979), pp. 220–226.

examined in some detail in chapter four, I shall not comment on Harbsmeier's position here, save to say that my analysis will not agree that existential sentences are "inherently subjectless".

In his analysis of sentences describing meteorological phenomena Harbsmeier concentrates on the verb *yu* 雨 'to rain'. Although he gives examples of *yu* without a surface SUBJECT, it is interesting that he also includes examples with *tian* 天 'heaven' or *yun* 雲 'clouds' as explicit SUBJECTS.[12] At the very least this shows that even in the surface structure the verb *yu* may predicate of some SUBJECT, quite apart from what may or may not be taking place in the deep structure. It is clear that a verb describing a meteorological phenomenon, such as *yu*, is severely limited as to possible words which may function as its SUBJECT; in fact, it is difficult to envisage any other than the two mentioned above. Therefore, if the process of H_2O being condensed and released down to the earth from clouds in the sky is described in the verb 'to rain' or *yu*, then whenever it happens it is obvious that one does not need to say of what SUBJECT it is true. This may be regarded as SUBJECT-deletion on *semantic* rather than pragmatic grounds.

Moreover, if a sentence on the surface may consist of a single verb *yu* 雨, are we to understand this as a finite or non-finite verb? Harbsmeier gives examples of the sentence 'It is raining.' in several different languages.[13] Of these he says:

> In all these sentences the event of raining is described through a subject/predicate structure.[14]

In fact, the Latin example he gives *Pluit* is clearly *not* a SUBJECT/PREDICATE structure on the surface; it merely contains a verb. In this respect it is no different from the Chinese example which follows it, 雨. Indeed, we might say that Latin no more requires a surface SUBJECT than does CC. Latin being a language highly susceptible to inflectional morphology, it is immediately

12 Ibid., p. 223, examples (6) and (7).

13 Ibid., pp. 220–221.

14 Ibid., p. 221.

ascertainable that 'pluit' is a FINITE VERB (third-person singular, present tense). Is *yu* also to be understood as a FINITE VERB in such sentences? I think the answer to this question is in the affirmative, and for the following reasons.

Firstly, it is not without significance that, so far as I am aware, the equivalent of the English sentence *It is raining* in any language which morphologically indicates finiteness in its verbs requires the presence of a FINITE VERB in that sentence, regardless of whether or not it requires a surface SUBJECT or uses a dummy SUBJECT.

My second piece of evidence necessitates an excursion into areas which go beyond the merely linguistic, for which I request the reader's indulgence. The reason why every sentence requires a FINITE VERB (which, in turn, causes it to require a SUBJECT, at least in the underlying structure) is clear so long as we accept that the sentence, as the only fully independent syntactic form, is the linguistic counterpart of a self-contained, independent unit of communicable information and is the vehicle for its expression. A moment's reflection makes it plain that communicable information must result from *finite* cognition with respect to the world around us. A non-finite verb embodies an action, process or state in its essence, without any reference to a specific event. Here is the point: if such an action, process or state relates to nothing specific or *finite*, it is worthless as communicable information. A statement of the process of precipitation without finite parameters (English: 'to rain') is not a sentence because the kind of cognitive act it reflects is not sufficient to warrant communication. In any case, such a statement hardly describes the "event of raining" (to use Harbsmeier's words) since an event is something restricted by finite parameters in the world. Thus, finiteness in cognition is essential for a self-contained unit of communicable information; finiteness in a verb merely reflects that fact. My contention on the basis of this theory is that a FINITE VERB is essential to every sentence, and therefore, by necessity, a SUBJECT must be understood at least in the underlying structure.

Both English and CC (and Latin too, for that matter) are reluctant to make mention of a SUBJECT which, I have argued, is obvious in the case of a verb such as 'rain'. It has been pointed out that the conditions for SUBJECT deletion are more easily satisfied in CC than in English. This, I would suggest, is the reason why CC allows 雨 as a surface sentence form, while English requires the 'dummy' SUBJECT *it* to occupy SUBJECT position in the sentence *It is raining*.[15]

Grammatical SUBJECT vs. Logical SUBJECT

This analysis deliberately steers clear of the use of such terms as 'agent', 'actor', 'doer' in characterising the syntactic function SUBJECT. The definition of SUBJECT as being 'that of which a PREDICATE predicates' or 'that which renders a verb finite' is one which appeals to syntax in that it identifies as SUBJECT that function with which the syntactic functions of PREDICATE and FINITE VERB are in construction. Thus we are relieved of the task of deciding whether any particular constituent 'is the agent', 'performs the action' or conforms to some such other logical criterion.

The usefulness of such a definition becomes the clearer when we consider the high frequency of ergative verbs in CC, as Cikoski was the first to generally establish. Let us here restate his definition of ergativity:

> A word X is ergative if whenever it functions as factor of a following object Y (where Y is not a pronoun), the phrase YX in which Y is subject and X is nucleus may be generated by a transformation from the phrase XY, and the derived phrase YX is then always a valid assertion which is logically implied by the original assertion XY; however, the converse does not necessarily hold: XY is not necessarily implied by YX.[16]

[15] A discussion as to why English requires 'dummy' SUBJECTS while Chinese does not is to be found in: Charles N. Li and Sandra A. Thompson, "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language", in Charles N. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic* (New York: Academic Press, 1976), p. 467.

[16] Cikoski, 1970, p. 54.

For example:

(13) 秦師又敗吳師。 左/定 5/附(ii) (447/4)
The Qin army again defeated the Wu army.

(14) 吳師敗。 左/定 5/附(ii) (447/6)
The Wu army was defeated.

In both (13) and (14) the *logical* relationship of *Wushi* 吳師 'the Wu army' to the ergative verb *bai* 敗 'defeat' is the same: it is the patient of the action. It may thus be said to perform the same logical function in both sentences. Does it, however, perform the same syntactic function? According to the terms of the above definition, the SUBJECT of (13) is *Qinshi* 秦師 'the Qin army', while in (14) the SUBJECT is *Wushi* 吳師 'the Wu army'. Thus, while the logical function of *Wushi* is constant in both examples, its syntactic function varies. This apparent contradiction is explained by the properties of the ergative verb as described in Cikoski's definition and is an appropriate illustration of the identification of a SUBJECT without reference to its logical relationship with the FINITE VERB.

Precisely the same properties are also evident in the CC modal auxiliaries *ke* 可 'may'; *zu* 足 'sufficient', 'worth'; *yi* 易 'easy'; *nan* 難'difficult', whose SUBJECTS are always the logical *patients* of the ensuing verb:

(15) 子孔曰：晉師可擊也。 左/襄 9/5 (268/14)
Zi Kong said, "The Jin army may be attacked."

(16) 晉不足與也。 左/宣 1/12 (179/2)
Jin is not worth allying with.

(17) 其惡易覯。 左/成 6/附(ii)(222/16)
Their filth will be easy to chance upon.

(18) 夫大國難測也。 左/莊 10/1 (57/8)
A large state is difficult to fathom.

OBJECT

Our analysis thus far has not had a great deal to say about the internal structure of the PREDICATE, except to say that the function of FINITE VERB is indispensable to it. We shall now begin to consider syntactic relationships which occur entirely within the confines of the PREDICATE. Several different kinds of exocentric constructions may occur in the PREDICATE. In all cases we may say that the first constituent governs the second. (The one exception to this is *secondary predication*, which we shall meet in chapter three.) The obvious starting point is the most common type of relationship a FINITE VERB may have with its directly governed complement, namely OBJECT.

One description of an OBJECT is that it is the complement of a transitive verb. Broadly speaking, grammarians have approached the question of transitivity and OBJECTS in one of two ways. The first, and more traditional method is grounded on semantic considerations: it understands transitivity as being a property of those verbs whose action 'passes across' from the SUBJECT to the OBJECT, and the latter is understood as the 'object' of the action. This traditional view has been found wanting by recent grammarians, who have tended to favour a more formally syntactic approach.[17] Just such an approach is evidenced in Cikoski's definition of OBJECT:

> *Object*: the function of a proper name whenever it may be replaced by *tqiug* (i.e., *zhi* 之); by extension, the function of any phrase which may be replaced by *tqiug*; also, the function of the head word of such a phrase if the phrase is endocentric.[18]

Since such a definition makes no appeal to semantic considerations, strictly speaking there is no binding reason for calling this function OBJECT as we are not thinking of it as being the 'object' of the action. All the definition tells us is that there exists in CC a certain function which, when the constituent which occurs in it is a third-person pronoun, is performed by *zhi* 之.

[17] Lyons, 1968, pp 350–351.

[18] Cikoski, 1970. p. 36.

However, since the term OBJECT already exists, this study will use it and adhere to Cikoski's definition, which means that the function is *not* to be understood in the traditional, semantically oriented manner.

Those verbs which are capable of governing *zhi* 之 may be classified as *transitive* (those which are not will require a different classification). But again, it will be remembered that an existing term is used for convenience *without* regard for whatever semantic connotations the term may have traditionally implied. Of course, there are many verbs which do comply with the traditional notion of transitivity, *sha* 殺 'kill', *ji* 擊 'strike' and *shi* 食 'eat' being examples *par excellence*:

(19) 蔡人殺之。 左/襄 20/6 (292/1)
The men of Cai killed him.

(20) 公以戈擊之。 左/襄 18/4 (286/11)
The duke struck him with his halberd.

(21) 君子食之。 左/昭 20/附(vi)(403/3)
The superior man eats it.

But there are also verbs which take *zhi* 之 and yet do not convey the idea of action 'passing over' from the SUBJECT to the OBJECT:

(22) 王從之。 左/莊 32/附 (79/4)
The king went along with this.

(23) 國家之敝恆必由之。 左/襄 13/附(i)(277/5)
The ruin of a state usually derives from this.

It is interesting to note that it is often possible to render *zhi* 之 using the demonstrative pronoun 'this' rather that 'it'. Before we too readily dismiss this as an idiosyncracy of the language into which we are translating, it would be salutary to take cognisance of the opinion of Zhou Fagao with regard to the development of *zhi* 之 as an OBJECT pronoun: namely, that it derived from a demonstrative pronoun.[19] This is a consideration to which we shall return later.

[19] Zhou Fagao 周法高, "'Zhi', 'Jue', 'Qi' Yongfa Zhi Yanbian." "'之', '厥', '其' 用法之演變。", *Zhongguo Yuwen Luncong* 中國語文論叢 (Taipei: Zhengzhong Shuju, 1963), pp. 84, 87.

CO-VERBS and their Complements

FINITE VERB may be described as the major 'verbal' function within a PREDICATE, but there are several other 'verbal' functions. An obvious characteristic of FINITE VERB is that it may directly govern a complement and this is a characteristic of all 'verbal' functions. Of course, the FINITE VERB position may be occupied by an intransitive verb in which case government does not take place, as in examples (1)–(5). However, the other 'verbal' functions *always* govern a complement.

The first of these to be considered is CO-VERB. As the name implies, CO-VERB performs a function ancillary to that of FINITE VERB. The customary position of the CO-VERB phrase is adverbial, that is, immediately prior to the FINITE VERB, and its syntactic relationship with the latter is that of MODIFIER to a HEAD. That a CO-VERB phrase forms a subordinating endocentric structure with the FINITE VERB phrase is evidenced in the fact that in each of the following examples elimination of the CO-VERB phrase leaves a FINITE VERB phrase enjoying the same distribution as the original structure.

The number of lexical verbs which may function as CO-VERB is highly restricted, the following constituting those which do so with any regularity: *yi* 以 'use'; *wei* 為 'be for'; *yu* 與 'be with', 'associate with'; *wei* 謂 'tell', 'inform'; *zi* 自 'proceed from'. The linguistic role of the CO-VERB is to introduce the kind of phrase which in English would be characterised by a prepositional phrase; thus, government by CO-VERB may be considered analagous to government by preposition. The semantic area covered by a CO-VERB is an extension of its meaning when it occurs as FINITE VERB:

Yi 以 'use':

(24) 小大之獄雖不能察必以情。 左/莊 10/1 (57/4)
As for lawsuits both great and small, even though I am not able to carry out detailed investigations, I am sure to go by (Literally: 'use') the true facts.

As CO-VERB *yi* indicates the instrument:

(24a) 以戈殺之。 左/文 11/6 (162/6)
He killed him with his halberd.

Although we usually see CO-VERB phrases governed by *yi* 以 prior to the FINITE VERB phrase, it is not all that rare to find them following it:

(24b) 吾懼君以兵。 左/莊 19/附(i)(65/4)
I frightened my ruler with a weapon.

Wei 為 'be for', 'be on behalf of':

(25) 夫子為衛君乎。 論語 7/15
Is the Master for the Lord of Wei?

As CO-VERB *wei* 為 means 'for', 'on behalf of':

(25a) 冉子為其母請粟。 論語 6/4
Ran Zi requested grain for his (i.e., Zi Hua's) mother.

Yu 與 'be with', 'associate with':

(16) 晉不足與也。 左/宣 1/12 (179/2)
Jin is not worth allying with.

As CO-VERB *yu* 與 means '(together) with':

(26) 祭仲與宋人盟。 左/宣 11/6 (38/5)
Ji Zhong concluded an alliance with the people of Song.

Wei 謂 'tell', 'inform':

(27) 或謂大子。 左/僖 4/附 (93/13)
Somebody told the Crown Prince.

As CO-VERB *wei* 謂 governs the person addressed in speech. The FINITE VERB in such cases is *yue* 曰 'say':

(27a) 或謂子舟曰： 左/文 10/7 (161/11)
Someone said to Zi Zhou:

The preceding CO-VERBS may all be said to discharge linguistic (*not* syntactic) functions similar to those of non-spatial prepositions in English. The remaining CO-VERB is different in that its linguistic function may be compared to that of a spatial prepostion in English.

Zi 自 'proceed from':

(28) 凱風自南。 詩經 32/1
The Kai wind proceeds from the south.

As CO-VERB *zi* 自 means 'from':

(28a) 有朋自遠方來不亦樂乎。 論語 1/1
Is it not a joy to have a friend come from afar?

The phrase governed by *zi* may follow the FINITE VERB:

(28b) 齊侯還自晉。 左/襄 23/13 (301/5)
The Marquis of Qi returned from Jin.

Are CO-VERBS Transitive?

On the existing criteria four out of five (*wei* 為, *yu* 與, *wei* 謂, *zi* 自) may immediately be deemed to be transitive and thus take an OBJECT since the third-person pronominal complement they govern is *zhi* 之:

(29) 請為之焚書。 左/襄 10/8 (271/11)
He requested to burn the agreement for their sakes.

(30) 吾欲與之從政。 左/定 1/5 (438/2)
I wish to govern with him.

(31) 王使謂之曰： 左/僖 28/6 (133/13)
The king's emissary said to him:

(32) 政自之出久矣。 左/昭 25/8 (417/15)
Government has proceeded from him for a long time now.

The case of *yi* is less straightforward since the combination *yi zhi* 以之 is virtually unheard of. However, what also becomes quite clear upon examination is that no other third-person pronoun is available as the complement of *yi*. This much is quite clear when one considers the use of *yi* in the common '*yi...wei*' pattern:[20]

[20] This pattern, in which the syntactic configuration is different from that in the CO-VERB pattern, will be dealt with in detail in chapter three.

yi 以 X *wei* 為 Y
(Literally) 'using/taking X to be Y'
= 'to consider X as Y', 'to take X as Y'

(33) 百姓皆以王為愛也。 孟子 1A/7
All the common people took Your Majesty to be stingy.

When a third-person X term has an antecedent, and would therefore be expected to be the pronoun *zhi*, the pronominal X term is simply deleted:

(34) 寡人之囿方四十里，人猶以為大。 孟子 1B/2
My royal park is (only) forty *li* square, but the people still consider it big.

One can only speculate about the reason for this deletion but it may be a phonological one, since in Karlgren's reconstructed readings *yi* 以 and *zhi* 之 are identical save for the initial, being ziəg and tiəg respectively. It might well be the case that deletion was opted for to avoid having to articulate such a mouthful; or it may even be the case that the two fused and that the resulting fusion word, having the same initial and final as *yi* 以, was written with the graph for the latter. Therefore, it is quite possible that for phonological reasons there is deletion of the OBJECT pronoun *zhi* 之after *yi* 以, or fusion with it. It would not be unreasonable to assume this when one takes into consideration the fact that all the other CO-VERBS which share the pattern with *yi* 以 are transitive and that a synonym of *yi* 以, namely *yong* 用 'use', is also transitive:

(35) 雖眾無所用之。 左/僖 4/4 (92/10)
Although they were many there was nowhere to use them.

2

Location and Relation

Location in a Place

It was suggested in the previous chapter that, with the exception of *zi* 自, CO-VERBS discharged a function in CC analagous to that of non-spatial prepositions in English; that is to say, they govern a constituent which falls within the PREDICATE as a whole, but whose relationship with the FINITE VERB which dominates that PREDICATE is other than being its directly governed OBJECT. The nature of that relationship is expressed through the semantic properties of the individual CO-VERB: instrumental, associative, and so on. We shall now turn our attention to the government of constituents in the PREDICATE which typically, but not exclusively, indicate a place, and which are associated with the FINITE VERB in a *spatial* or *relational* manner.

Probably the most fundamental notion in spatial semantics is that of location in a place. For the mere expression of this in CC the locative verb *zai* 在 'be located in' functions as FINITE VERB. *Zai*, it will be remembered, may indicate presence without reference to location:

[Ch.1 (2)] 子鮮在。 左/襄 26/3 (309/16)
Zi Xian is present.

But much more commonly *zai* 在 takes a complement to indicate location:

(1) 郜鼎在廟。 左/桓 2/6 (26/4)
The Gao 'ding' is in the ancestral temple.

(2) 隨會在秦。 左/文 13/附(ii)(165/1)
Sui Hui is in Qin.

The sense of location may be somewhat figurative:

(3) 罪在雍子。 左/昭 14/附(iv)(387/9)
The blame lay with Yong Zi.

Yu 于/於 in Expressions of Location and Relation

The usual practice is for the complement of location to follow directly after *zai* 在. Occasionally, however, we find *yu* 于 or *yu* 於 intervening between the two:

(4) 魚在于沼。 詩經 192/11
The fish are in the pond.

(5) 聞廣成子在於空同之上。 莊子 11/29
(5) 聞廣成子在於空同之上。 莊
I've heard that Guang Cheng Zi is up on Kongtong mountain.

(6) 故治亂在於心之所可。 荀子 22/62
Thus, order and chaos lie within the domain of the mind's possibilities.

Let us allow this intrusion to precipitate an enquiry into the nature and properties of *yu* 于/於. In the preceding examples *yu* stands between a FINITE VERB expressing location and a constituent expressing a place. In these cases the constituent expressing a place, which performs the function COMPLEMENT OF PLACE, is governed not by the FINITE VERB, but by the post-verbal MARKER OF PLACE *yu* 于/ 於.

The government by *yu* of a locative term in this manner has led some sinologists to call it a preposition. Although one has some sympathy with Pulleyblank's complaint that:

> In recent years there has been some rather futile argument as to whether they (CC 'prepositions') are "really" prepositions or "really" verbs.[1]

I take the view that CO-VERB and MARKER OF PLACE are both *minor* (as compared with the dominant function within the PREDICATE, namely FINITE VERB) 'verbal' functions. (It was noticed in the previous chapter that a verb's relationship with the OBJECT it governs is no different whether it functions as CO-VERB or FINITE VERB. We shall similarly see that *yu* is consistent in the form of government it engenders whether functioning, however rarely, as FINITE VERB or, more commonly, as MARKER OF PLACE.)

1 E.G. Pulleyblank, "The Locative Particles *Yu* 于, *Yu* 於 and *Hu* 乎", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 106, No 1, 1986, p. 1.

Although it is rare for *yu* to function as FINITE VERB, there are examples. These are of importance to an analysis of *yu* for two reasons: firstly, they add support to the theory that MARKER OF PLACE is a 'verbal' function (rather than an Indo-European style preposition); and secondly, since any lexical item functioning as FINITE VERB must be possessed of a definite semantic value, once this is established one might be in a position to comment with a degree more confidence on the semantic content of *yu* in its role as MARKER OF PLACE.

As FINITE VERB in an independent clause *yu* may indicate location in a place in the same way as *zai* 在. This use is extremely limited and I have been able to find no more than the following examples, all from comparatively early texts:

(7) (7) 大事于大廟。
The great sacrifice was in the grand ancestral temple. 春秋/文 2/6
The great sacrifice was in the grand ancestral temple.

(8) 兩於前，伍於後。 左/昭 1/6 (343/7)
Detachments of two were in the van, detachments of five in the rear.

(9) 孔子於鄉黨恂恂如也。 論語 10/1
When Confucius was in his native village he was very respectful.

(10) 人之過也各於其黨。 論語 4/7
A man's transgressions are each true to type.
(Literally, '...*lie in* his type.')

More commonly, one encounters *yu* as the FINITE VERB in subordinate clauses functioning as TOPIC. In such cases *yu* indicates a relationship between two entities: syntactically, between the SUBJECT of *yu* and the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE it governs; semantically, indicating a *position* on the part of the SUBJECT *with respect to* the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE:

(11) 魯之於晉也職貢不乏。 左/襄 29/附(vi)(325/19)
As for the state of Lu's position with respect to the state of Jin, there was never any shortage in its tribute.

(12) 寡人之於國也盡心焉耳矣。 孟子 1A/3
As for where I stand towards my state, I simply do my best for it.

(13) 始吾於人也聽其言而信其行。
今吾於人也聽其言而觀其行。 論語 5/10
At first my attitude towards men was such that, having listened to their words I had implicit faith in how they act. Now, having listened to their words I observe how they act.

(14) 父母於子東西南北唯命之從。
陰陽於人不翅於父母。 莊子 6/56
As for the relationship between parents and child, be it go east, west, north or south it is their command alone that it follows. As for the relationship between Yin and Yang and human beings, it is no different from (that between) the parents (and the child).

On the strength of the above examples it is not unreasonable to conclude that *yu* 于/於 signifies two basic semantic ideas: that of location in a place, and that of a relationship with respect to some entity.[2] (It is noticeable that in each example of the latter usage, the graph used is 於. The distinction between the two graphs 于 and 於 will be taken up later in this chapter.)

It appears to me that there is a clear semantic connection between these two meanings. As to whether the one is derived from the other, it is possible to argue from two different points of view. On the one hand, location in a place is a statement of a spatial relationship, and as such could be deemed to constitute a subset in the larger set of possible relationships; on the other hand, it could be argued that more abstract relational notions are themselves a development of an antecedent notion of location. Since I subscribe to the view that there is a general etymological tendency for the abstract and figurative to follow the concrete and literal, I favour the latter analysis and have attempted to bring this out in the choice of English idiom in my rendering of the phrase 寡人之於國也 in (12). And it is for this reason that I use the term MARKER OF PLACE

[2] One way of bringing out this latter meaning is to consider the etymology of the MC word which comes closest to meaning 'in respect of', 'with regard to', namely *dui* 對, as in:

我對下棋不感興趣。
I'm not interested in chess.

An early meaning for 對 is as a verb 'to face', a meaning which still survives in the modern language in such phrases as 對坐 'to sit facing each other'. This idea of 'facing' conveys in a more vivid way the somewhat abstract concept of 'with regard to'. And what could be more natural than for 對 in certain circumstances being augmented to 對于!

to describe the syntactic function performed by *yu* in post-verbal position, and that of COMPLEMENT OF PLACE to describe that function performed by its complement, regardless of whether the latter is a place or location in the strict sense. Interestingly enough, Pulleyblank also gives the phrase just cited his attention, interpreting it as: "My in my country" = "My behaviour towards my country, my government of the country."[3] He thus seems to postulate a single, coherent theory for *yu* 於 meaning 'in', 'at'. Although it is true that Pulleyblank has differentiated semantically between the two graphs 于 and 於 (which will be discussed later), concluding that the meaning 'in' is original only with the graph 於, I find it difficult to accept his position with regard to this usage of *yu* 於; namely, that it retains its 'basic' meaning of 'in'. It may happen to provide an acceptable underlying semantic framework in (12), but I fear it would not do so in any of the other examples given above.

Yu 于/於 as MARKER OF PLACE

Thus far I have referred to the graphs 于 and 於 indiscriminately, but there is convincing phonological evidence for these originally being two separate lexical items.[4] It is also clear that in earlier texts, such as the Odes and the Documents, 于 is common and 於 rare, while in the philosophical texts from the Analects to the *Han Feizi* the reverse is the case. In the following analysis I shall endeavour to identify the different usages of *yu* 于/於 as MARKER OF PLACE in the context of the relative decline and rise of the two graphs, and bearing in mind the two basic meanings *yu* has as FINITE VERB.

3 Pulleyblank, 1986, p. 4.

4 Bernhard Karlgren, "On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan", *Göteborgs Högskolas Arsskrift*, 33, 1926:3, p. 42. Also, Pulleyblank, 1986, p. 1.

Pulleyblank has argued that in the Odes the basic meaning of 于 is 'go to'.[5] An important strand of his argument is drawn from those occurrences of 于 where it immediately precedes a FINITE VERB. There seems little doubt that its purpose in such cases is to indicate that the FINITE VERB is in the durative aspect:

(15) 黃鳥于飛。 詩經 2/1
The yellow bird is on the wing.

(16) 君子于役。 詩經 66/1
My husband is on military duty.

(17) 王于出征。 詩經 177/1
The king is out on a campaign.

(18) 周王于邁。 詩經 238/3
The king of Zhou is on the march.

Pulleyblank takes the inherent semantic force of *yu* 于 in such examples to be 'go to'.[6] I cannot think of any semantic connection between the idea of 'going to' and the durative aspect, but the connection between being located in, at or on a place and being engaged, in, at or on some activity seems perfectly obvious. And it is a connection apparently made by speakers of disparate tongues. Maurice Grévisse in his celebrated manual of French grammar gives examples of *en* (basic meaning 'in', 'on') used with verbs whose aspect is durative:

> Je regarde en revant les murs de ton jardin.[7]

The Oxford English Dictionary lists the following definitions for *at* and *in*, and in each case I quote one of its illustrative examples:

> *At* (Def. 16) With actions in or with which one is engaged. 'The case is still at hearing.'[8]
>
> *In* (Def. 11b) In the process of, in the act of. 'He was drowned in crossing the river.'[9]

5 Pulleyblank, 1986, p. 1.

6 Ibid., pp. 2–3.

7 Maurice Grévisse, *Le Bon Usage*, 10th ed., (Gembloux: Editions J. Duclot, 1975), p. 815.

8 James A. H. Murray et al. edd., *Oxford English Dictionary*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), vol. 1, p. 530.

9 Ibid., vol. 5, "I", p. 126.

Closer to home, as it were, we find that the same tendency is also a feature of modern Chinese. The *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞 gives as definition of *zai* 在:

> Indicates the location or position of a person or thing.[10]

It goes on to describe a further use of *zai* as being synonymous with *zhengzai* 正在,[11] for which it provides the following definition:

> Indicates that an action is in progress or that a state of affairs is continued.[12]

In my view these examples from other languages provide strong supporting evidence that the inherent semantic quality of *yu* 于 when used as a marker of the durative aspect in the Odes is that of location in a place. This, of course, is entirely in keeping with our earlier observation that location in a place is one of the two basic ideas conveyed by *yu* in limited use as FINITE VERB. But perhaps the most convincing evidence comes in the fact that in both the Odes and the authentic portions of the Documents *yu* 于 enjoys widespread use as a MARKER OF PLACE in post-verbal position indicating location *in* a place:

(19) 賓于四門。 尚書 02/0047
He received the guests at the four gates.

(20) 左不攻于左汝不恭命。 尚書 07/0047
If those on the left do not do their duty on the left, then you are not respectful of my command.

(21) 大戰于甘。 尚書 07/0003
They fought a great battle in Gan.

(22) 有杕之杜生于道左。 詩經 123/1
There was a solitary birch-leaf pear tree growing on the left of the path.

10 Lü Shuxiang, 呂叔湘, ed., *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞 (Peking: Commercial Press, 1980), p. 572.

11 Ibid., p. 572.

12 Ibid., p. 598.

Although Zhou Fagao sees a parallel between this use of 于 in the Odes and the use of 在 as a marker of the durative aspect in MC (Zhou Fagao 周法高, *Zhongguo Gudai Yufa: Gouci Bian* 中國古代語 法：构詞編, Taipei, 1962, p. 261), Pulleyblank rejects this view, citing as his authority Zhao Yuanren (*A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*, Berkeley, 1968, p. 333). Zhao's view is that 在 is a shortened form of 在那兒, and is thus part of a locative phrase. The view of my native informant, whose own dialect is Peking mandarin, is that although pre-verbal 在那兒 is common, it is confined to northern dialects and that there is a definite implication of location when it is

(23) 獻于公所。 詩經 78/1
He presents it at the prince's place.

(24) 劬勞于野。 詩經 181/1
They labour in the open country.

Although rare in the Odes and Documents, *yu* 於 does appear in both texts as post-verbal MARKER OF PLACE indicating location in a place:

(25) 候我於城隅。 詩經 42/1
She waits for me at the corner of the city wall.

(26) 為壇於南方。 尚書 26/0043
He made an altar on the south side.

This evidence does little to support Pulleyblank's assertion that in the Odes it is 於 rather than 于 that is to be thought of as meaning 'in', and that the latter means '(go) to'. We shall examine later whether or not 'to' is an appropriate meaning for 于 when following verbs with inherent directionality. What may be said here is that the location in which the predication takes place is regularly introduced by post-verbal 于 in those texts in which it is frequent.

In the Analects and the philosophical texts of the Warring States Period, the marking of location in a place is performed almost exclusively by 於, 于 having virtually disappeared:

(27) 天生德於予。 論語 7/23
Heaven has created virtue in me.

(28) 董安于死而陳於市。 韓非子 3/2/49
Dong An Yu died and (his corpse) was displayed in the market.

used, quite apart from any implication of durative aspect. It would thus appear that in such cases 在那兒 is executing two operations: expressing location and duration. This tallies with the independent findings of William Chin-Juong Lin (*A Descriptive Semantic Analysis of the Mandarin Aspect-Tense System*, Phd dissertation, Cornell University, 1979, p. 128):

> *Zai* in *zai* + place word + V is used as both a preposition and a progressive aspect marker.

It is clear, therefore, that where the implication of location is not required, the use of 在那兒 would be inappropriate, as in:

> 風在吹，雨在下。
> The wind is blowing, the rain is falling.
> 時代在前進。
> The times are moving forward.

Thus it would appear that 在 and 在那兒 are not interchangeable in the expression of the durative aspect in MC and that Zhou Fagao's observations might well be valid.

(29) 今有璞玉於此。 孟子 1B/9
Now, say there was a piece of uncut jade here.

The dialect of the *Zuo Zhuan* seems to preserve more archaisms than any other Warring States Period text, and here both 于 and 於 are widely used to express location in a place.

The other FINITE VERB meaning of *yu* is 'with respect to', 'in relation to'. We find that the patterns involving this meaning do not come into their own until the Warring States Period texts, where they appear to be restricted to execution by the character 於. But it is interesting to note that when one goes back to the Odes and Documents it is possible to find a small number of examples of both 于 and 於 in post-verbal MARKER OF PLACE position, where the correct semantic interpretation would be, so it seems to me, 'with respect to', 'in relation to':

(30) 公將不利於孺子。 尚書 26/0275
The duke will be of no benefit to the child.

(31) 無射於人斯。 詩經 266/1
Do not be resentful of others.

(32) 不愧于人，不畏于天。 詩經 199/3
He does not feel shame before men; he is not in awe of Heaven.

In the later texts this meaning for post-verbal *yu* is far more common, and the graph 於 is normally adhered to. Regardless of the particular English preposition used, the underlying semantics are in each case 'in respect of', 'with regard to', 'in relation to':

(33) 陳近於楚。 左/襄 5/11 (260/9)
Chen is close to Chu.

(34) 不亦遠於禮乎。 左/文 15/4 (170/6)
Is it not far removed from proper behaviour?

(35) 敏於事而慎於言。 論語 1/14
(The superior man) is vigilant in his affairs and prudent in his speech.

(36) 君請擇於斯二者。 孟子 1B/15
May Your Lordship please choose between these two.

(37) 爾何曾比予於管仲。 孟子 2A/1
How could you compare me with Guan Zhong?

Yu with Stative Verbs and Ergative Verbs

The nuance of meaning evident in the MARKER OF PLACE in (30)–(37) enables CC to express the comparative degree in conjunction with stative verbs in the following pattern:

SUBJECT	FIN VB	MARKER OF PLACE	COMP. OF PLACE
A	Stative verb	*yu* 於	B

Thus, if A is, say, *weak in respect of, or in relation to B*, then in terms of English A is *weaker than B*:

(38) 楚弱於晉。 左/襄 11/3 (273/6)
Chu is weaker than Jin.

(39) 王如知此則無望民之多於鄰國也。 孟子 1A/3
If Your Majesty realises this, do not expect Your subjects to be more numerous than those of neighbouring states.

(Note: It would appear that, taken out of context, example (33) might possibly mean 'Chen is *closer* than Chu.' That this meaning is not intended in this particular extract is quite clear; however, this does seem to be an area of potential ambiguity in the language which would be resolved by addressing the context.)

There is one other noteworthy use of the above pattern, with the variation that the FINITE VERB is not stative but ergative.[13] We have already seen that the singular property of the ergative verb is that it may have a SUBJECT which is either the agent or the patient of the verb. If the SUBJECT is the agent, the patient *must* appear in OBJECT position (see pp. 26–27). But when it is considered desirable to make the patient the SUBJECT of the sentence, in the absence of any

[13] This usage has already been commented on by Cikoski in John S. Cikoski, "An Analysis of some Idioms commonly called 'Passive' in Classical Chinese", *Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages*, 9, 1978, pp. 198–202.

further embellishments in the syntax of the sentence, there is no position available for the agent if its expression is deemed necessary. It is precisely this facility — of introducing the agent of an ergative verb which has its patient as SUBJECT — which is provided by *yu* 於, and is done so strictly within the semantic range and syntactic pattern already observed for *yu* with stative verbs. Thus, if A is at the receiving end of some action *in respect of* B, A is the patient and B is the agent:

(40) 衛人不保。 左/成 6/4 (222/11)
The people of Wei were not protected.

(40a) 民保於信。 左/定 14/9 (463/5)
The people are protected by trust.

(41) 大敗。 孟子 7B/1
He suffered a heavy defeat.

(41a) 東敗於齊。 孟子 1A/5
In the east we were defeated by Qi.

(42) 君子役物，小人役於物。 荀子 2/20
The superior man makes objects work for him, whereas the petty man is enslaved by them.

The Directive Uses of *yu*

We now pass to a use of *yu* which has prompted Graham to refer to it as a "directive particle":

> In Classical Chinese the directive particle, and the corresponding interrogative substitutes, take their direction from the verb itself: 出於 "come out *from*", 入於 "go in *to*", 立於 "stand *at*".[14]
>
> In spite of the variety of uses of the directive particle, it seems possible to reduce them all to the relations of process to a path, in which the characteristic question is not the static "Where?", nor the forward looking "whither?", but the search for origins "Whence?".[15]

14 Graham, 1986, p. 401.

15 Ibid., p. 402.

> If we bear in mind that direction to or from is inherent in certain verbs and types of verb, it becomes plain that wherever the directive particle is translatable by "by" or "than" the verb has established direction *from*.[16]

According to the preceding analysis the meaning of *yu* which gives rise to the English renderings 'by' and 'than' (i.e., in conjunction with stative and ergative verbs) is not 'from' but 'in respect of', 'in relation to'. I am therefore not able to agree with Graham that there is an inherent or ultimately "reducible" meaning of 'from' for *yu*. In any case, Graham does not make any differentiation between the graphs 于 and 於 in the type of directionality, as Pulleyblank does. Furthermore, location 'in' or 'at' a place, which is the case in his example of 立於, does not imply direction of any kind. However, where I think he has hit upon an important point is in asserting that some verbs carry with them the implication of a certain direction. This is, of course, immediately evident with verbs of motion:

(43) 姜入于室。 左/襄 25/2 (304/16)
Jiang entered into the chamber.

(44) 出於五鹿。 左/僖 23/附(ii)(121/14)
He went out from Wu Lu.

But it is not only verbs of motion which indicate direction: encapsulated within the semantics of a number of other verbs is a clearly discernible implication of direction, for example:

(45) 小國受命於大國。 左/文 3/6 (150/3)
A small state is subservient to (Literally: 'receives its orders *from*') a large state.

(46) 天子能薦人於天，不能使天與之天下。 孟子 5A/5
The emperor can recommend another to Heaven, but he cannot make Heaven give him the empire.

(47) 周桓公言於王曰： 左/隱 6/附(iv)(15/3)
Duke Huan of Zhou said to the king:

(48) 子生三年然後免於父母之懷。 論語 17/19
Only when a child is three years old does it free itself from the embrace of its parents.

16 Ibid., p. 402.

(49) (49) 乞食於野人。 左/僖 23/附(ii)(121/15)
He begged food from a peasant.

What is striking in all the examples involving direction is that *yu* is semantically neutral in each case; one might say it acts merely as a 'conductor' to transmit the directional force inherent in the FINITE VERB to the complement of *yu*. With regard to the above use of *yu* one would certainly not object to Graham's term "directive particle"; but it is also clear that this would not be appropriate in the other uses observed for *yu*, uses in which it *does* have a definite semantic value.

It is clear that in the later texts, whatever the nature of the direction, 於 is used indiscriminately.

(50) 故曰: 彼出於此。 莊子 2/27
Therefore it is said: "That" comes out from "this".

(51) 故不足以滑和，不可入於靈府。 莊子 5/44
Therefore they do not warrant the disturbing of one's equilibrium and must not be allowed into the spiritual storehouse.

Although one would agree with Pulleyblank that in the Odes 于 is used with verbs whose inherent directionality is *to* rather than *from*, it is not the case that it never accompanies verbs of the latter type:

(52) 云不可使得罪于天子。 詩經 194/6
If you cannot be entrusted with a task you will have offended your ruler.

Pulleyblank does not address himself to an interesting question which we might ask at this point. If 于 is hardly ever used in the expression of direction *from*, what is? In the previous chapter we noticed that *zi* 自 as CO-VERB indicated direction *from*, sometimes in a post-verbal position. Thus we find that there was already available a word which could be used in post-verbal position to express direction *from*, and this, indeed, is the practice in the Odes:

(53) 日居月諸出自東方。 詩經 29/3
Oh sun, oh moon, you come out from the East.

(54) 亂匪降自天生自婦人。 詩經 264/3
If disorder does not descend from Heaven it arises from a woman.

The same is true of the Documents:

(55) 昔朕來自奄予大降爾四國民命。 尚書 34/0417
When I previously came from Yan, I issued wide-ranging orders to the people in your four states.

The evidence from the *Zuo Zhuan* is rather interesting. It is a text which tends to preserve archaisms more than any of its contemporaries, and one must agree with Pulleyblank's findings that, when 于 is used after verbs with implied direction in this text, it is more often direction *to* than *from*.[17] But unlike the earlier texts, the use of *zi* 自 as a post-verbal particle with verbs implying direction *from* is vastly curtailed. If we consider a verb such as *chu* 出 'come out', whose semantics obviously imply motion from, we find that the combination 出自 'come out from', which from our experience of the earlier texts we might have expected to be common, actually occurs only four times in the entire text. 出于 is also rare, occurring three times; 出於, however, which does not appear at all in the Odes and Documents, occurs fourteen times. We might surmise, therefore, that this shift from 自 to 於 with direction *from* in the *Zuo Zhuan* reflects the general rise of the latter character during the Warring States Period which resulted in its supplanting of 于 in all its uses. This is certainly reflected in its appearance in the patterns involving ergative and stative verbs, patterns which do not appear to have established themselves in the Odes and Documents. Although I have not conducted an exhaustive study, it seems that the *Zuo Zhuan* always employs the character 於 when either pattern is required:

(56) 君富於季氏而大於魯國。 左/定 9/附(iii)(454/8)
Your Lordship is wealthier than Ji and greater than the state of Lu.

(40a) 民保於信。 左/定 14/9 (463/5)
The people are protected by trust.

[17] Pulleyblank, 1986, p. 7.

It was argued above that in these patterns the semantic value for *yu* is 'in respect of', 'with regard to', just as it is in those instances where *yu* functions as FINITE VERB in TOPIC sentences (see (11)–(14)). The increase in intellectual activity and philosophical debate which began with Confucius and continued unabated throughout the Warring States Period would have necessitated the development of more sophisticated lines of argument depending on increasingly abstract notions. It is clear that such notions, in their turn, would exert certain evolutionary pressures on the language to allow for their expression. It is precisely in this context that the relative decline of 于 and rise of 於 took place. We might not consider the comparative degree or a passive equivalent to be particularly sophisticated linguistic types; however, their manner of expression in Warring States Period CC (bearing in mind the particular semantics attributable to *yu* 於) might well suggest evidence of linguistic refinement in line with intellectual and philosophical development. The frequency in Warring States texts of the three major patterns (i.e., TOPIC clauses, comparative degree with stative verbs and marker of the agent with ergative verbs) already met with which make use of the semantic coefficient 'in respect of', 'with regard to' for *yu* constitute a new development in the language compared with earlier texts such as the Odes and the Documents. What I find of particular interest in the *Zuo Zhuan*, alone among Warring States Period texts in observing formal distinctions between the graphs 于 and 於, is that the latter graph is used for these three structures. One can only speculate about the reason why 於 virtually eclipsed 于 in all usages in the other Warring States Period texts, but it may not be without significance that the graph used to express comparatively fresh linguistic developments (as witnessed in the *Zuo Zhuan*) was that which eventually won the day.

COMPLEMENT OF PLACE vs. OBJECT

I have described the syntactic function performed by *yu* in post-verbal position as MARKER OF PLACE, and that of the complement which it governs as COMPLEMENT OF PLACE.

It is clear from the foregoing that the word or phrase with which *yu* is in preconstruction is not necessarily a place. However, since I deem all uses of *yu* to be derived from a basic meaning of location in a place I find the general terms more or less appropriate.

But whatever name we might wish to assign to the function performed by its complement, it is imperative that we distinguish it from that of OBJECT. It will be remembered that Cikoski's criterion, which this study has adopted, requires that for a function to qualify as OBJECT it must allow for third-person substitution by the pronoun *zhi* 之. However, the one word that *never* follows *yu* 于/於 is *zhi* 之. Yet this has not prevented even Cikoski himself from positing that *yu* may govern an OBJECT. He classifies 于 as a transitive verb,[18] and 於 as an ergative verb,[19] which means that either one is capable of taking an OBJECT. On the crucial point of third-person substitution by *zhi* 之, I fear that he fudges the issue when he states:

> ... .IO (於) can indeed function as factor (i.e., govern an OBJECT), but the test phrase **.io tqiug* (於之) exists only at the morphemic level; whenever **.io tqiug* is generated it is automatically replaced by *gian* (焉) by a mandatory morphophonemic rule.[20]

Cikoski here provides a footnote which cites the authority for asserting this rule; it is a reference to Kennedy's study of *yan* which merely states:

> ...this combination (i.e., 於之) never occurs, but its place is taken by *yen* (i.e., 焉).[21]

In fact we shall see that Kennedy postulates a totally different pronoun from *zhi* as being that which is governed by *yu*. As he has stated, when it does govern a third-person pronominal complement, *yu* together with its complement are replaced by *yan* 焉, as the following examples show:

(57) 楚子問於子産曰： 左/昭 4/附(i)(352/9)
The Viscount of Chu asked Zi Chan:

18 Cikoski, 1970, p. 159.

19 Ibid., p. 161.

20 Ibid., p. 61.

21 George A. Kennedy, "A Study of the Particle *yen*", in *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Tien-yi Li (New Haven: Far Eastern Publications Yale University, 1964), p. 40.

(57a) 叔向問焉。 左/昭 1/附(vii)(344/1)
Shu Xiang asked him.

(58) 公及邾師戰于升陘。 左/僖 22/3 (118/18)
The Duke fought with the Zhu army at Sheng Xing.

(58a) (58) 公及邾師戰于升陘。 左/桓 12/9 (39/2)
The Duke fought with the Zhu army at Sheng Xing.
They fought a battle there.

Few would disagree with Kennedy's conclusion that *yan* is a fusion of *yu* with a hypothetical pronoun *an*.[22] The phonological features of this fusion exclude any possibility of *zhi*/ **tiəg* 之 having any involvement in it. The position could not be plainer: *yu* does not take *zhi* 之 when governing a third-person pronominal complement and therefore its complement is *not* OBJECT. For this reason the complement of *yu* must be distinguished as COMPLEMENT OF PLACE.

There remains one aspect of the fusion *yan* 焉 worthy of discussion, concerning which Pulleyblank has raised some interesting points. He argues that in the Odes *yan* 焉 is a fusion whose first element is *yu* 於, while the fusion which is initiated by *yu* 于 is *yuan* 爰.[23] Much of his argument is based on phonological considerations, and on Karlgren's reconstructions for the four graphs this reasoning would appear to be very sound: 于 = **giwo*; 爰= **giwan*; 於 = **io*; 焉 = **ian*. However, it is noteworthy that Karlgren's reconstructions provide a variant reconstruction for 焉, **gian*, and that this reading is given for the graph in the Odes precisely when it occurs as a sentence-final particle.[24] This makes the phonological grounds for Pulleyblank's distinction at least open to discussion.

Upon enquiring into the structural distribution of 于, 於, 爰 and 焉 in the Odes, we find that, contrary to what one would expect from Pulleyblank's position, the similarities lie

22 Ibid., p. 78.

23 Pulleyblank, 1986, p. 5.

24 Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa* (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1957), p. 71.

between 於 and 爰 on the one hand, and between 于 and 焉 on the other: 於 and 爰 are mostly pre-verbal, while it is 于 and 焉 which are post-verbal with any regularity.

Neither is there any objection on semantic grounds for positing that 于 enters into the fusion 焉. Pulleyblank proposes the meaning 'in it' for 焉, and we have documented several instances of 于 meaning 'in' in the Odes (see (22)–(24)). Moreover, in the *Zuo Zhuan*, which Pulleyblank obviously regards as something of a test case in his differentiation of 于 and 於, it is clear that the final particle 焉is used indiscriminately in circumstances where either 于 or 於 would be expected to function as the MARKER OF PLACE:

(58) 公及邾師戰于升陘。 左/僖 22/3 (118/18)
The Duke fought with the Zhu army at Sheng Xing.

(58a) 戰焉。 左/桓 12/9 (39/2)
They fought a battle there.

(56) 君富於季氏而大於魯國。 左/定 9/附(iii)(454/8)
Your Lordship is wealthier than Ji and greater than the state of Lu.

(59) 罪莫大焉。 左/莊 19/附(i)(65/5)
No crime is greater than that.

Therefore, the position is not quite as clear-cut as Pulleyblank has intimated. It would appear that even in the Odes and Documents whatever distinctions may have obtained between 于 and 於 were already beginning to break down, and the most one can say with any degree of certainty about the final particle 焉 in these texts is that it is a fusion of the MARKER OF PLACE *yu* 于/於 and its third-person pronominal complement.

3

Classificatory Verbs and CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS

Classificatory Verbs

In the previous chapter it was argued that the function of a constituent immediately governed by *yu* 于/於 was not an OBJECT. In so doing it was hoped to establish the general principle that not all complements of CC verbs are OBJECTS. This chapter explores a further embodiment of that general principle, what shall be referred to as the CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT.

The general rule is that a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT is governed by a lexically realised classificatory verb. There are two exceptions: the so-called 'Nominal Sentence'; and a certain pattern involving the verb *wei* 謂. In both cases it will be argued that a classificatory verb has been deleted in the surface structure.

To my knowledge, this category of verb has never been treated as such by grammarians of CC, although its existence in MC has been acknowledged for some time by Zhao Yuanren, who identifies the class as follows:

> Classificatory verbs form a short list, whose semantic property is that of classifying what is expressed by the subject as being the same or in some way classed under that of the object.[1]

From this it seems fairly clear that the classificatory verb provides the medium for the logical operation of expressing one entity A in terms of another entity B, the SUBJECT of the classificatory verb corresponding to A and its complement (however that function is to be characterised) corresponding to B.

[1] Zhao, 1968, p. 711.

Zhao refers to the "object" of the classificatory verb. So far as I am aware he does not give a definition for OBJECT and so we do not know on what grounds he includes the complement of a classificatory verb as such.[2] With regard to CC we do have Cikoski's definition and it will play an important role in categorising the syntactic function of the complements of classificatory verbs.

What is a classificatory verb and why should its syntactic ramifications merit investigation? These questions cannot be answered initially by using syntactic criteria, but by appealing to largely semantic considerations; that is, a classificatory verb must be endowed with the kind of semantic quality which would render it capable of executing the kind of classificatory operation described above by Zhao. Consider, for example, this pair of sentences:

(a) These carpenters make wonderful picnic tables.
(b) These tree stumps make wonderful picnic tables.

Without any recourse to syntactic analysis it is felt that the relationship between the verb 'make' and the noun phrase it governs, 'picnic tables', is quite different in each case. That differentiation is triggered by semantic cognition: in (a) we understand 'make' to mean 'manufacture'; in (b) it means 'to serve as', 'to perform the role of'. Not many grammarians would hesitate to call the verb *make* in (a) transitive and the noun phrase *picnic tables* an OBJECT. But how many, I wonder, would feel comfortable about dealing with these same constituents as they appear in (b) in exactly the same manner? Having reached this point we must examine the syntactic evidence, but it is clear that it is the semantic value of particular verbs which has prompted us to seek certain types of evidence in certain areas of the language. The purpose of this chapter is to identify those verbs which express a classificatory relationship and examine the nature of the government they exert over their complements.

[2] Ibid., p. 301:

> The verbal expression is sometimes said to govern the object, and the relation betwen verb and object is sometimes known as government.

From this it seems that Zhao uses the term 'object' indiscriminately to cover any governed function.

Zhao refers to eight classificatory verbs for MC,[3] which I adjudge to fall into four semantic areas:

(i) Similarity and Analogy
(ii) Naming and Calling
(iii) Capacity and Role
(iv) Class Membership and Identity (i.e., the copula).

CC classificatory verbs also fall into these groups, with the difference that for the fourth no such verb apparently exists in the period of the language under discussion. However, even in this case I shall argue that the underlying or deep syntactic structure corresponds to the same logical operation as is evident in the other three.

Similarity and Analogy

ru 如/*ruo* 若

Let us commence with the related pair *ru*/*NIO 如 and *ruo*/*NIAK 若, 'be like':

(1) 仁者固如此乎。 孟子 6B/6
Is a benevolent man really like this?

(2) 子在川上曰：逝者如斯夫。 論語 9/17
While on the riverside the Master said, 'Is not that which passes away like this?'

(3) 盜跖凶貪，名聲若日月。 荀子 3/4
The Robber Shi was fierce and voracious, his fame was like (that of) the sun and moon.

(4) 其翼若垂天之云。 莊子 1/2
Its wings are like clouds hanging in the sky.

Verbs of similarity and analogy present a particularly thorny problem in that there are instances in the concordanced pre-Han literature where they present conflicting evidence

[3] Ibid., pp. 712–716. I have included *shi* 是 to make up the eight.

on the question of transitivity, that is, on whether they may take *zhi* 之 as a third person pronominal complement. By far the most common form for *ru*/*NIO 如 and *ruo*/*NIAK 若 + third-person pronominal complement is the fusion word *ran*/*NIAN 然 'like it', 'so', 'thus'. The phonological basis for *ran* 然 being a fusion of *ru/ruo* 如/若 + hypothetical pronoun *AN has been established by Kennedy on the same lines as for the fusion word *yan* 焉.[4] The semantic evidence is clearly discernible in examples such as the following:

(5) 譬之如醫之攻人之病者，然。 墨子 14/2
Comparing it, it's like a doctor attacking a person's illness, like that.

(6) 予豈若是小丈夫，然哉。 孟子 2B/12
How can I be like these petty men, like them?

(7) 無若宋人，然。 孟子 2A/2
Don't be like the man from Song, like him.

As I have suggested when dealing with *yan* 焉 in the previous chapter, whatever else it may be, hypothetical *AN is not *zhi* 之, and thus on the evidence of *ran* 然 we cannot say that *ru* 如 and *ruo* 若 are transitive verbs. And yet, Cikoski refers to these two verbs as transitive,[5] and it is not difficult to see the reason why: both verbs appear, on occasion, to be able to take the third-person object pronoun *zhi* 之. However, when we come to examine this phenomenon, some interesting facts come to light.

If we set aside for the moment the *Zuo Zhuan*, in other concordanced pre-Han texts the occurrence of *ru* 如 or *ruo* 若 + *zhi* 之 is as follows:

尚書	One case of the idiom	如之何
詩經	Some cases of the idiom	如之何
論語	Some cases of the idiom	如之何
墨子	Some cases of the idiom	若之何
孟子	Some cases of the idiom	如之何, plus:

4 Kennedy, 1964, p. 78.

5 Cikoski, 1970, p. 170.

(8) (8) 雖與之俱學弗若之矣。 孟子6.
Even if he studies together with him he will not be as good as him.
Even if he studies together with him he will not be as good as him.

莊子 Some cases of the idiom 若之何

荀子 Two cases:

(9) 天下莫之若也。 荀子22/66
Nothing in the world is as good as this.

(10) 知道之莫之若也而不從道者無之有也。 荀子22/67
There is no one who does not pursue the Way knowing that nothing is as good as it.

And finally, in the *Han Feizi* there are no cases of 如/若 + 之 of any kind.

Thus, apart from the idioms 如/若之何, in the eight texts cited above there are only three examples which have *ruo* taking the OBJECT pronoun *zhi*. What is of significance is that in each case *ruo* is negated. Now, it is known that when *ru* and *ruo* are negated they undergo a semantic shift and do not mean 'not be like', but rather 'not come up to', 'not be as good as'. It is possible that both values are derived from the early meaning of *ru* 如 'go to', but there is a clear divergence in the extended meanings as between affirmative and negative usage: the former classifies one entity A as being similar to another entity B; the latter makes no statement regarding classification, but rather asserts a value judgment to the effect that A is not as good as B. This state of affairs is well documented by Graham in the following observations:

> *Jo* (若) provides a striking example of disputation imposing a consistent use of words regardless of accidents of idiom. In ordinary pre-Han usage *jo* is negatable only when degree is implied (*pu jo*, 'not as much as, not as good as') but in the dialectical chapters negative is completely assimilated to affirmative usage (*pu jo*, 'not like'...). We can understand that it would have been very inconvenient for the Mohist dialecticians to have to switch from *jo* to some other word such as *ssu* 似 'resemble' (which they never in fact use) whenever they wished to negate it. It is interesting that the only other pre-Han example I have noticed uses the animal illustrations and therefore perhaps the language conventions of the dialecticians:
>
> *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* ch. 23/5 (Hsu 23, 14A/2) 牛之性 不若羊，羊之性不若豚。 "The ox's nature is not like the sheep's nor the sheep's like the pig's."[6]

6 A.C. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1978), pp 137–138.

What is remarkable is that this semantic divergence is accompanied by a syntactic differentiation regarding government that seems to be more than mere coincidence: the fact is that *ru/ruo* can only ever be negated and retain the classificatory meaning 'be like' precisely when they take a third-person pronominal complement other than *zhi* 之; that is to say when they are fused into *ran* 然:

bu ran 不然 — 'not like this' = 'not so' (*never* 'not as good as it, him, etc.')

It would seem, therefore, that *ru/ruo* may be classified as two separate lexical items:

(i) *ru* 如/*ruo* 若 — classificatory verb 'be like'
Negative usage: *bu ran* 不然 'not like it', 'not so'.
(ii) NEG + *ru* 如/*ruo* 若 — transitive verb 'not be as good as'.
(Exception: *bu ran* 不然 'not like it', 'not so'.)

Turning now to the *Zuo Zhuan*, we are presented with a somewhat different picture. As we might expect, we find some cases of the idioms 如/若之何 and one example of NEG + 如:

(11) 民苟利矣遷也吉莫如之。 左/文 13/3 (165/12)
If the people would really be benefitted, nothing would be as auspicious as moving.

But we also encounter the following other patterns in which the phrase 如之 appears:

(i) A 亦 如之 — 'A is also like this' (18 cases)
(ii) 何 X 如之 — 'What X is like this?' (6 cases)

plus the following four examples:

(12) 陳將如之。 左/昭 8/9 (369/12)
The State of Chen will be like this.

(13) 使如之。 左/定 10/7 (456/17)
He was instructed to do so.

(14) 乃如之。 左/定 13/7 (460/3)
Thereupon he did so.

(15) 如之。 左/哀 11/1 (481/15)
He did so.

There is no doubt that in these 28 instances *ru* 如 is used as a classificatory verb 'be like' and yet takes the object pronoun *zhi* 之. Our analysis reveals, however, that this is the only

concordanced pre-Han text to contain this feature. We might be tempted to conclude that in the dialect of the *Zuo Zhuan* the verb *ru* 'be like' is transitive and there was an end to the matter, were it not for some interesting historical data concerning the pronoun *zhi*.

In a study of the development of the character *zhi*, Zhou Fagao states that the earliest recorded meanings for it as found in oracle bone inscriptions are of two kinds. One meaning is a verb 'go to', which does not concern us here, while the other is a demonstrative pronoun 'this', which was related in meaning to the standard CC demonstrative pronoun *shi* 是 'this'. He goes on to say that the use of *zhi* as a third-person OBJECT pronoun was a comparatively late phenomenon, occurring after the Western Zhou. And he is in no doubt that this later use was derived from the earlier one of a demonstrative pronoun.[7]

We might speculate that this derivation was precipitated in considerable measure by a particular syntactic form involving the use of *zhi* as a demonstrative pronoun resuming an OBJECT, a form which had attained something of the status of an archaism by the time of the Warring States Period. It is known that a high degree of contrastive focus may be conferred upon an OBJECT by preposing it before the FINITE VERB and resuming it with a pronoun, not in the customary post-verbal OBJECT position but also in a pre-verbal position following the preposed constituent:[8]

(16) 孟武伯問孝。子曰：父母唯其疾之憂。 論語 2/6
Meng Wu Bo asked about being filial. The Master said, '(One can be described as being filial when) it's only one's falling ill that one's parents are anxious about.'

A more literal translation of Confucius' answer would run thus: 'As for one's father and mother, only one's falling ill *this* they are anxious about.' *Zhi* is translated as a demonstrative because, in this usage, that is undoubtedly what it is, as the following example establishes:

(17) 君亡之不恤而群臣是憂。 左/僖 15/14 (110/8)
It is not exile that the Lord is worried about but rather his subjects.

7 Zhou Fagao, 1963, pp. 84, 87.

8 This phenomenon is discussed in chapter four where I describe it as an infixed OBJECT.

This sentence confirms the interchangeability of *zhi* 之 and *shi* 是 in this pattern, and such information is of interest to us because anyone who conducts a survey of the third-person pronominal complements of *ru* and *ruo* in pre-Han texts cannot but be struck by the frequency with which the demonstrative pronoun *shi* is found in this capacity, its synonym *ci* 此 also being not uncommonly encountered. For example, in the *Xunzi* alone there are over 100 cases of 如/若 + 是. However, in the *Zuo Zhuan*, a much larger text, there are barely over 30 such cases while, untypically for texts of a similar vintage, there are a number of occurrences of the phrase 如之.

Graham has pointed out the difference between "hard" and "soft" resumptive pronouns, the former corresponding to what might more traditionally be termed a *demonstrative* pronoun 'this'. In the case of *ruo* 若, he is quite clearly of the opinion that *ruo shi* 若是 counts as the former and *ran* 然 as the latter.[9] In Graham's system *zhi* 之 is deemed an OBJECT pronoun only in the capacity of a "soft" resumptive. Therefore, assuming Graham's tacit acceptance of Cikoski's definition for OBJECT, one would have to infer that in his system *ruo* is not transitive, and this view is undoubtedly supported by the evidence in CC texts other than the *Zuo Zhuan*. One might feel inclined to speculate that in the *Zuo Zhuan zhi* 之 was used interchangeably with *shi* 是 as a "hard" resumptive when governed by *ru* 如, possibly maintaining an earlier demonstrative use of *zhi*. (In the previous chapter it was seen that, in respect of the MARKER OF PLACE *yu* 于/於, the dialect of the *Zuo Zhuan* was more susceptible than other Warring States Period texts to the retention of features more typical of an earlier stage in the development of the language.) If one does not accept this hypothesis the only alternative position is to conclude that *ru* is transitive in the *Zuo Zhuan*, but in no other pre-Han text under examination.

The meaning of the idiom 如/若 NP/之 何 is revealed in this extract from the *Zuo Zhuan*:

(18) 子若國何。 左/僖 23/3 (120/15)
What (can you do) about the State?

[9] Graham, 1986, p. 372.

Since the idiom is already well established in the Book of Songs we can assume that it has a fairly long history, and, on Zhou Fagao's findings, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that it dates from a time when *zhi* 之was still a demonstrative pronoun. In any case, the idiom would not appear to offer counter-evidence to the claim that the classificatory verbs *ru* and *ruo* are not transitive because it is clear that in this idiom they are semantically not verbs of analogy at all!

si 似

When examining the third-person pronominal complements of the classificatory verb *si* 似, a similar problem confronts us. Used much less widely than *ru/ruo*, the meaning of *si* 似 is 'seem like', 'seem to be':

(19) 公謂行父曰：征舒似女。 左/宣 10/9 (192/3)
The Duke said to Xing Fu: "Zheng Shu looks like a woman."

(20) 望之不似人君。 孟子 1A/6
When I looked at him from a distance he did not seem like a ruler of men.

(21) 是似景也。 墨子 49/33
This seems like a shadow.

In the concordanced pre-Han texts there are four examples of the combination *si zhi* 似之.[10] Three of these are from the outer chapters of the *Zhuangzi*:

(22) 周將處乎材與不材之間。材與不材之間
似之而非也。 莊子 20/5
I should be inclined to settle midway between being good for something and being good for nothing. That seems the thing to do and yet is not. (Graham's translation)[11]

10 There are also two cases of *si zhi* 似之 in the Odes: in 196/3 *zhi* 之is taken by various commentators to be a second person pronoun; in 214/4 *si* 似 is glossed as *si* 嗣 'to inherit, carry on'.

11 A.C. Graham, *Chuang Tzu: The Seven Inner Chapters and other writings from the book Chuang Tzu* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981), p. 121.

(23) 其孰是邪。黃帝曰：彼無為謂真是也，
狂屈似之，我與汝終不近也。 莊子 22/6
'Which of us are on to it?' (The Yellow Emperor said,) 'That Donothing Saynothing is truly on to it, Scatterbrain seems to be, you and I have never been anywhere near it.' (Graham's translation)[12]

(24) 彼其真是也以其不知也。
此其似之以忘之也。 莊子 22/15
That the first of them was truly on to it was because he didn't know. That the next one seemed to be was because he forgot. (Graham's translation)[13]

Graham appears to have identified a special usage of *shi* 是 in the *Zhuangzi* which he translates as 'be on to it', which one takes to mean something like 'having a direct, intuitive grasp of the reality pertaining to a given matter'. In (23) and (24) we see *shi* 是 being used exactly like this, and in both extracts the whole argument revolves around the contrast between *zhen shi* 真是 'truly being on to it' and *si zhi* 似之, which I take as 'seeming to be on to it'. Thus when it comes to being the complement of *si* 似, *zhi* 之 is used instead of *shi* 是. It is also worth noting that a few lines earlier in this portion of text (which Graham deems to form a single, continuous passage)[14] we have:

(25) 知以之言也問乎狂屈。 莊子 22/3
Knowledge asked Scatterbrain using these words.

where *zhi* 之 is quite clearly a demonstrative attributive.

Reverting now to (22), Graham has translated *si zhi* as 'seems the thing to do'. I suggest that it would be entirely in keeping with the spirit of what is being said to translate the sentence: 材與不材之間似之而非也 as: '(Settling) midway between being good for something and good for nothing seems to be on to it and yet is not.' Moreover, it is difficult to understand *zhi* as a resumptive OBJECT pronoun in this instance since there seems to be nothing in the text which could be taken as its antecedent.

12 Ibid., p. 159.

13 Ibid., p. 160.

14 Ibid., pp. 159–160. I rely implicitly on Graham's textual reading, which takes 22/1–16 as a continuous passage.

The fourth occurrence of *si zhi* is to be found in the *Xunzi*:

(26) 信陵君似之矣。 荀子 13/46
The Lord of Xin Ling seemed like this.

Of course, it suits my argument to translate 之 as 'this' in this sentence, but I must admit I can offer no supporting evidence here. One interesting observation that can be made concerning 似 is that in the concordanced literature there is not a single instance of 是 being the complement of 似, even though it commonly is with other verbs of similarity and analogy: *ru* 如, *ruo* 若 and *you* 猶 (see below).

you 猶

In the semantic area of similarity and analogy, there remains one other classificatory verb to consider, and that is *you* 猶. Previous attempts at classifying it lexically leave its status in some confusion. Cikoski lists it as a transitive verb,[15] while Graham holds it to be a particle.[16] Let us examine the validity of both claims.

The text used by Cikoski in determining the lexical classifications of CC words is the *Zuo Zhuan*, and it so happens that in the entire text there is just one example of the combination *you zhi* 猶之:

(27) 猶之未遠。 左/成 8/1 (226/1)
You have not gone far in your plans.

In fact, this is a quotation from the Book of Songs (254/1), and the Chinese commentators of the Odes gloss this instance of *you* as *mou* 謀 'to plan'. Therefore Cikoski's classification must be called into question. Indeed, I have failed to find a single case of *you* being used in analogy and taking *zhi* as its complement.[17]

15 Cikoski, 1970, p. 182.

16 Graham, 1978, p. 138.

17 Graham makes reference (in respect of the later Mohist writings) to the combination *you zhi* 猶之 as being an adverbial phrase meaning 'still', which is "common in other pre-Han texts" (Graham, 1978, p.139). There is

Next we consider Graham's position. The rationale for it is as follows:

> *Yu* 猶 is not negatable, and must therefore be classed not as a verb but as a particle...[18]

Interestingly enough, although this statement is true for texts from the Analects to the *Han Feizi*, there are examples of negated *you* in the Odes:

(28) 寔命不猶。 詩經 21/2
Truly our fate is not like (others').

(29) 之子不猶。 詩經 229/2
You are not like (the white clouds).

Some commentators take the phrase *bu you* 不猶 to mean the same as *bu ru/ruo* 不如/若, that is, 'not as good as'. If they are correct, it would indeed suggest a remarkable correspondence between *you* and *ru/ruo* as verbs. Furthermore, the fact that in later pre-Han texts *you* is not negatable in analogies is not irrefutable evidence that it may not be deemed to be a classificatory verb; has Graham not already pointed out that in normal pre-Han usage the verbs *ru* and *ruo* may not be negated and retain the meaning 'be like'?

Behavioural similarities between *you* and *ru/ruo* add further weight to the proposition that these words share the same lexical category. Comparing the following examples there does not seem to be any significant difference in pattern usage:

(30) 其性亦猶是也。 孟子 6A/2
Their natures are also like this.

(30a) 有為者亦若是。 孟子 3A/1
If there is anyone who acts (thus) he will also be like this.

(31) 是猶食脯也。 墨子 42/30
This is like eating dried meat.

(31a) 是若慶忌無去之心。 墨子 5/20
This is like Qing Ji not having any thoughts about departing.

also an interesting occurrence of the phrase 猶之 in the Analects (20/12) which is variously glossed by commentators; never, so far as I am aware, meaning 'like it'.

18 Graham, 1978, p. 138.

(32) 夫兵猶火也。 左/隱 4/4 (10/8)
Warfare is like fire.

(32a) 背若太山。 莊子 1/14
Its back is like Mount Tai.

MARKER OF COMPARISON

There is a further observation regarding the pattern usage of *you* and *ru/ruo* which points to them being remarkably similar creatures. Classificatory verbs of similarity and analogy do not only function as FINITE VERB: they may also perform a minor 'verbal' function within the PREDICATE, like CO-VERB or MARKER OF PLACE. In fact, this particular function is quite similar to MARKER OF PLACE in that it occurs after the FINITE VERB together with any directly governed complement of that verb, and its purpose is to introduce a simile or analogy with which to *compare* whatever is expressed in the FINITE VERB + complement. This function will be referred to as MARKER OF COMPARISON. Although it appears that *ru* and *ruo* occur rather more commonly in this function than does *you*, it is significant that when it does so function *you* has identical properties to *ru/ruo*:

(33) 君之視臣如犬馬則臣視君如國人。 孟子 4B/3
If a ruler regards his ministers as dogs or horses they will regard him as a common citizen.

(34) 子曰：回也視予猶父也，
予不得視猶子也。 論語 11/11
The Master said, 'Hui regarded me as his father, but I did not manage to regard him as a son.'

It has already been seen that the other minor 'verbal' functions of CO-VERB and MARKER OF PLACE are performed by words which may also function as FINITE VERB, and I believe this requirement is also made of those words which may function as MARKER OF COMPARISON. The MARKER OF COMPARISON, being a classificatory verb of similarity or analogy, governs a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT.

Some Distinctions between Similarity and Analogy

In the preceding analysis I have dwelt on those features which *you* and *ru/ruo* have in common in order to demonstrate that they all belong to the same lexical class, namely *verb*. However, it is undeniably the case that *you* and *ru/ruo* are not always put to the same use. While *ru* and *ruo* are used to effect simple statements of similarity in which the CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT is often a noun phrase, *you* comes into its own in philosophical discussion when analogy is used to make clear or reinforce a particular point in argumentation. Thus it is not by chance that in a text the size of the *Zuo Zhuan*, which is predominantly in narrative form and in which philosophical argumentation is scarce, there are only a handful of instances where *you* is used to strike an analogy. In pre-Han texts generally its CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT tends not to be a simple NP but rather a complex VP or embedded sentence:

(35) 辟之是猶立直木而求其景之枉也。 荀子 11/116
Comparing it, this is like planting a straight tree and seeking its shadow to be crooked.

(36) 人性之無分於善不善也，
猶水之無分於東西也。 孟子 6A/2
Man's nature not differentiating between good and evil is like water not differentiating between east and west.

(37) 此譬之猶馬駕而不稅。 墨子 7/3
Comparing it, this is like a horse being harnessed and never unharnessed.

The use of *you* in analogies is usually accompanied by the presence of a sentence-final *ye* 也. As a result one might be tempted to conclude that the structure is that of a nominal sentence, which in turn might add weight to the argument that *you* is a particle rather than a verb. However, as we shall see in chapter seven, the presence of a sentence-final *ye* is not evidence of the lack of a FINITE VERB in the sentence; *ye* is commonly used in argumentation as a sentence-final particle to emphatically affirm the validity of a particular proposition even when that proposition is expressed

through the medium of a sentence containing a FINITE VERB. Since it is clear that *you* is generally used precisely in such contexts, the additional presence of sentence-final *ye* should not surprise us unduly.

To summarise this section, it must be admitted that the evidence concerning the nature of the syntactic function of the complements of verbs of similarity and analogy is somewhat conflicting and I am not in a position where I could consider my findings to be conclusive. My intuition, which I feel is reasonably supported by the evidence, is that they are not a sub-class of OBJECT, and I have attempted to put up a case which makes this position tenable even in that minority of cases when the pronominal complement of such verbs is *zhi* 之. Therefore, I reach the following conclusions regarding verbs of similarity and analogy:

(i) *Ru* 如, *ruo* 若, *si* 似 and *you* 猶 are all classificatory verbs of similarity and analogy. In normal pre-Han usage *ru*, *ruo* and *you* are not negatable when describing similarity or executing analogies.

(ii) The above verbs function freely as FINITE VERB and *ru*, *ruo* and *you* may function as MARKER OF COMPARISON, although only *ru* and *ruo* do so with any frequency.

(iii) Whether these verbs appear as FINITE VERB or MARKER OF COMPARISON, the function of the complements which they govern is CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT.

Naming and Calling

Being possessed of a certain appellation or designation is a phenomenon which involves a classificatory relationship between an entity and the name it has. The relationship is executed by means of the verb *yue* 曰 'be called'. I have found no instances of *yue* in this usage followed *zhi* 之. Therefore *yue* cannot be considered to be a transitive verb; rather, it is a classificatory verb.

Whatever is being named functions as the SUBJECT of *yue*, and its name as the CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT:

(38) 凡火，人火曰火，天火曰災。 左/宣 16/2 (206/7)
Generally when one refers to fires, the fire of men is called fire; the fire of Heaven is called a conflagration.

(39) 天子曰兆民，諸侯曰萬民。 左/閔 1/附 (81/15)
The Emperor is called 'the billion people'; a feudal lord is called 'the ten thousand people'.

(40) 其名曰牛。 左/昭 5/1 (357/3)
His name is (called) 'ox'.

(41) 凡勝國曰滅之。 左/文 15/7 (170/12)
Generally speaking, defeating a state is called destroying it.

When anything is named by some agent, the agent functions as the (sometimes deleted) SUBJECT and a *transitive* verb of naming is required (e.g., *cheng* 稱, *ming* 命 'call'), whose OBJECT is the thing being named. However, the actual designation conferred is again a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT governed by *yue* 曰:

(42) 名之曰蘭。 左/宣 3/9 (183/6)
He named him 'orchid'.

(43) 君稱之曰夫人。 論語 16/14
The lord calls her his lady.

(44) 命之曰災人。 莊子 4/8
I call it 'besetting others'.

(45) 名之曰益多。 莊子 4/11
I call it 'going from bad to worse'.

(46) 謂其臺曰靈臺，謂其沼曰靈沼。 孟子 1A/2
They called his tower 'spirit tower'; they called his pool 'spirit pool'.

Examples (42)–(46) are syntactically interesting in that in each case *yue* 曰 together with its complement are predicated of what is in fact the OBJECT of the (transitive) FINITE VERB; thus we have, in effect, two instances of predication within a single main clause. Taking (43) as an example for closer scrutiny, the immediate constituents of the sentence may be analysed into a

SUBJECT and PREDICATE, being 君 and 稱之曰夫人 respectively. The PREDICATE phrase in turn comprises a transitive FINITE VERB (稱), an OBJECT (之) and a verb phrase (曰夫人). Now, what is important to grasp in all this is that the phrase曰夫人 is not a non-finite VP but is predicated of the antecedent of the pronoun 之. Therefore, we have a *pivotal* structure in which the OBJECT of what is strictly the *principal* FINITE VERB is 'turned around' to form that of which the ensuing VP (containing a *secondary* FINITE VERB) is predicated, a phenomenon which may aptly be described as *secondary predication*. Verbs which in the function of (principal) FINITE VERB are able to engender secondary predication are very few. Apart from those associated with classificatory operations, the only other substantial occurrences of the phenomenon are in conjunction with verbs of causation (see chapter seven) and with *you* 有, in the pattern:

(47) 有朋自遠方來不亦樂乎。 論語 1/1
Is it not pleasurable to have a friend come from afar?

Let us return to (46), for it introduces us to a most noteworthy verb in *wei* 謂. In fact (46) turns out to be something of an exception because the customary practice with *wei* is to delete the *yue* in the secondary predication, leaving, on the surface, only a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT following the OBJECT of *wei*:

(48) 殘賊之人謂之一夫。 孟子 1B/8
A man who injures and harms I call 'an outcast'.

(49) 孔文子何以謂之文也。 論語 5/15
As for Kong Wen Zi, why did they call him 'Wen'?

(50) 晉人謂之二五耦。 左/莊 28/附 (74/10)
The people of Jin called them 'the two Wu ploughmen'.

In (48)–(50) we appear to have translated *wei* as 'call', meaning 'give a name to'; but we must not make the mistake of believing that it actually means that, a temptation easily succumbed to because in these sentences the verb which really means 'be called', namely *yue*, has been deleted (cf. (42)–(46)). In fact, of itself *wei* rather means something like 'refer to', 'speak of'.

This much is quite evident when we encounter it only with its OBJECT, without any secondary predication:

(51) 子謂韶：盡美矣，又盡善也。 論語 3/25
The Master made reference to/said of the Shao, "It is utterly beautiful and utterly good."

(52) 兩木之間謂其無木者也。 墨子 42/24
('Empty'): of the interval between the two pieces of wood, it refers to where there is no wood. (Graham's translation)[19]

(53) 其言謂何哉。 莊子 1/28
What did his words refer to?
(= What did he mean?)

(54) 此言何謂也。 孟子 3A/5
What do these words refer to?
(= What does this mean?)

And the ubiquitous:

(55) 此/是之謂也。
It is this that is referred to.

In much of the pre-Han corpus, *wei* 謂 covers a meaning which is an extension of that of 'refer to (as)'; namely, 'consider (as)'. In this usage also *wei* gives rise to secondary predication involving a variety of verbs:

(56) 孰謂鄹人之子知禮乎。 論語 3/15
Who considers that the son of the man of Zou understood the Rites?

(57) 宜乎百姓之謂我愛也。 孟子 1A/7
How fitting that the common people should think me parsimonious!

(58) 以是觀之人謂子産不仁，吾不信也。 左/襄 31/附(vii)(336/14)
Looking at it from this point of view, people will think that Zi Chan was not benevolent, but I don't believe it.

The FINITE VPs 知禮, 愛 and 不仁 are predicated respectively of 鄹人之子, 我 and 子産, all of which are the OBJECTS of *wei* 謂 in the sentences in which they occur.

It was seen in (48)–(50) that *wei* 謂 may give rise to secondary predication in which the secondary FINITE VERB — which in these three examples was deemed to be the classificatory

[19] Ibid., p. 311.

verb *yue* 曰, 'be called' — is deleted. In those examples it was a fairly straightforward matter to demonstrate deletion because of the existence of examples such as (46) which do not have the secondary FINITE VERB *yue* deleted. The classificatory relationship contained within the secondary predication in such examples is one of 'being named'. I now wish to address those cases where *wei* is used in its extended meaning of 'consider (as)', and where there is no secondary FINITE VERB present in the surface structure of the secondary PREDICATE. In such instances we are faced with two terms following *wei*, just as we had in (48)–(50). The first of these terms is the OBJECT of *wei*, but what function is performed by the second? Let us consider the following examples:

(59) 義而行之謂之德禮。 左/文 7/附 (157/11)
Carrying them out with a sense of duty I consider to be (instances of) virtue and propriety.

(60) 彼是莫得其偶謂之道樞。 莊子 2/30
When 'that' and 'this' fail to find their counterparts I call it the hub of the Way.

(61) 以善先人者謂之教。 荀子 2/11
To guide others using goodness I call teaching.

It is clear that these sentences are only intelligible when a classificatory relationship of identity or class-membership is understood to exist between the two terms, thus the pattern *wei* 謂 X Y is interpreted as 'consider X to be Y' (identity), or 'consider X to be a case of Y' (class-membership). Identity and class-membership are precisely those operations which are performed by a copula verb in English; however, in Warring States Period Chinese there is normally no *affirmative* copula verb available. I shall argue in a subsequent section of this chapter that there are grounds for accepting a deep-structure copula in sentences involving identity and class-membership in the Chinese of this period. Therefore I propose that, as with the deletion of the classificatory verb *yue* 曰 in secondary predication engendered by *wei* 謂, there is also deletion of a classificatory copula verb under similar conditions. Furthermore, this proposition is

not entirely undemonstrable because, although there is usually no affirmative copula available in CC, a *negative* copula is always expressed in the surface structure in the form of *fei* 非:

(62) 君子謂羊斟非人也。 左/宣 2/1 (180/3)
The superior man considers Yang Zhen to be less than a man.

This example makes it clear that a copula verb, deleted in the affirmative, provides the secondary FINITE VERB in this structure. As a matter of interest, this kind of deletion is much opted for in English surface structure, albeit using the non-finite form of the copula:

(a) I consider him a very lucky man.
= (b) I consider him *to be* a very lucky man.

It is clear that, although *wei* 謂 gives rise to classificatory relationships through secondary predication, it is not a classificatory verb itself. Its frequent government of the third-person OBJECT pronoun *zhi* 之 confirms it as transitive. Cikoski lists it as ergative.[20] If this were the case one would expect to meet the pattern: SUBJECT *wei* 謂, meaning 'The SUBJECT is referred to.' However, this pattern does not exist. Alternatively, we might expect to encounter the pattern: SUBJECT *wei* 謂 X, meaning 'The SUBJECT is referred to/considered as X.' Now this pattern is seen, but strangely enough only when the SUBJECT is a demonstrative pronoun:

(63) 此謂三法也。 墨子 37/4
These are referred to as the three standards.

(64) 此謂坐忘。 莊子 6/93
This is referred to as sitting and forgetting.

These examples appear to support Cikoski's position. However, it is perhaps significant that no other ergative verb is restricted to demonstrative pronouns functioning as its patient/ SUBJECT. It might be, therefore, that this is a contracted form of the more common formula 此/是之謂:

(65) 是之謂直人。 莊子 6/9
It is this that one refers to as a straight man.

(66) 此之謂同床。 韓非子 9/1/15
It is this that one refers to as bed-sharing.

20 Cikoski, 1970, p. 160.

The semantic property relevant here is often described as: 'act as', or 'serve in the capacity of', 'perform the role of'. The above definitions imply that the 'capacity' or 'role' is something 'taken on' temporarily by some entity rather than being that which the entity unchangingly and essentially is. Graham says:

> In order to deal with temporary roles, classical Chinese used the verb *wei* 為 "make". *Wei* can hardly be called a copula: it has the flavour of an active verb "to act as"...為君 "be ruler", 為臣 "be minister".[21]

In fact we shall see that, while this statement holds good in a great number of cases, there are instances of *wei* 為 where something other than a "temporary role" is expressed; and there are even occasions when it comes rather close to denoting class-membership or identity; that is, to being a copula.

(68) 人皆為之。
Everybody does it.

Earlier in this chapter I introduced the notion of classificatory verbs and their complements by means of some examples using the English verb *make*. I suggested that the transitivity of its basic meaning 'do', 'make' was lost when it underwent the semantic transformation to mean 'serve as', 'perform the role of'. By a striking parallel the same semantic transformation occurs with the Chinese verb *wei* 為. In its basic meaning it certainly is a transitive v

(67) 百工為方以矩，為圓以規。 墨子
The various craftsmen make squares with a set-square and make circles with a compass.

(67) The various craftsmen make squares with a set-square and make circles with a compass.

(68) 人皆為之。 莊子 4/20
Everybody does it.

(69) 定為三年之喪。 孟子 3A/2
(The Crown Prince) stipulated the carrying out of three years' mourning.

[21] A.C. Graham, "'Being' in Western Philosophy compared with *Shih/Fei* and *Yu/Wu* in Chinese Philosophy", *Asia Major* (New Series), 7, 1959, p. 83.

(70) 子為政焉用殺。 論語 12/19
When you carry on government, what use is there for killing?

Cikoski lists the verb *wei* 為, with the definitions of 'be', 'act as', as transitive.[22] However, he is foiled by his own definition of a transitive verb: nowhere do we see *wei* in these meanings governing the OBJECT pronoun *zhi* 之.[23] Therefore, when *wei* undergoes its shift in meaning I suggest it should be treated as a separate lexical item and be reclassified as a classificatory verb which governs a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT.

First of all, some undisputed examples of 'temporary roles':

(71) 敬叔父乎，敬弟乎。彼將曰：敬叔父。曰：弟為尸則誰敬。彼將曰：敬弟。 孟子 6A/5
(Ask him) whom he respects more: his uncle or his younger brother. He will say, 'My uncle.' Then you say, 'If your younger brother plays the role of ancestor at a sacrifice whom would you then respect?' He will say, 'My younger brother.'

(72) 王子狐為質於鄭。 左/隱 3/附 (i)(7/5)
Wang Zi Hu was a hostage in Zheng.

(73) 故三王者皆貴為天子。 墨子 25/63
Thus, the three kings all served as emperor with honour.

(74) 求也為季氏宰。 孟子 4A/15
Qiu was steward to the Ji family.

But consider now the following:

(75) 楚不為患。 左/昭 1/2 (339/10)
The state of Chu does not constitute a problem.

22 Cikoski, 1970, p. 161.

23 There is an apparent counter-example in the Analects 7/12, which runs thus:

子曰：富而可求也雖執鞭之士吾亦為之。

Taking the text as it stands, the tendency would be to understand *wei* 為as meaning 'act as' because the word *shi* 士 implies some position in the employ of the authorities; thus, we might render: '...even the officer who holds the whip at market I would act as.' The same passage, however, is also quoted in the 'Poverty and Riches' chapter of the 'Discourses on Salt and Iron' (鹽鐵 論：貧富篇). Here, the crucial part runs thus:

雖執鞭之事吾亦為之。

Zhang Qiyun 張其昀 ed. *Zhongwen Da Cidian* (中文大辭典). 40 vols. (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1962–1968), gives as its first definition for 士: 事也(vol. 8, (1963) p. 3133), and it cites as its authority the *Shuo Wen*. It appears, then, that "士" is a loan for "事". This being the case, 為 should be understood in its basic meaning as a transitive verb: 'If wealth may be pursued, even the job of holding the whip at market I would *do*.'

(76) 內直者與天為徒。 莊子 4/18
He who is inwardly straight is considered a fellow-traveller with Heaven.

(77) 若孔子主癰疽與侍人瘠環何以為孔子。 孟子 5A/8
If Confucius had chosen Yong Ju and the attendant Ji Huan as his hosts, on what grounds would he have been Confucius?

(78) 遂為母子如初。 左/隱 1/3 (3/14)
In the end they were mother and son as before.

(79) 孰不為事。 孟子 4A/20
What does not constitute a duty?

(80) 先配而後祖。鍼子曰：是不為夫婦。 左/隱 8/附(ii)(17/1)
They mated first and announced the marriage in the ancestral hall afterwards. Zhen Zi said, 'These do not count as man and wife.'

In these cases it is virtually impossible to understand *wei* 為 as implying a temporary role or to render it as 'serve as'. In such examples *wei* expresses a *subjective* judgment regarding the identity or class-membership of the SUBJECT, and this indeed is the nature of the relationship between the SUBJECT and CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT of *wei*; hence the use of such renderings as 'be considered/deemed to be', 'count as'. However, it is precisely the subjective quality inherent in such usage of *wei* which prevents us from plainly calling it a copula: in (80) it is the moral premises of the speaker, rather than the facts, which lead to his denial of the relationship between the two partners.

The uses of the classificatory verb *wei* 為 which we have considered thus far have all been with a NP CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT. It is also possible for *wei* to govern a non-finite VP, and in such cases the meaning for *wei* given immediately above is always the correct one. The subjective judgment inherent in such sentences frequently implies the comparative or superlative degree:

(81) 漢東之國隨為大。 左/桓 6/附(i)(31/5)
Of the states to the east of the Han river, Sui is deemed to be the greatest. (i.e., 'Sui meets the (subjective) requirement of being big.')

(82) 孟子曰：民為貴，社稷次之，君為輕。 孟子 7B/14
Mencius said, "The people constitute what is most valuable; the altars to the gods of soil and grain come next; and the ruler counts as being the least valuable."

(83) 父子為親矣。 荀子 3/32
(The relationship between) father and son is deemed to be the most intimate.

(84) 天下莫大於秋毫之末而大山為小。
莫壽於殤子而彭祖為夭。 莊子 2/51
Nothing is as big as the tip of an autumn hair and a great mountain counts as being small. No one is longer lived than he who dies as a child and Peng Zu counts as having died young.

(85) 哀公問：弟子孰為好學。 論語 6/3
Duke Ai asked, "Which of your disciples is deemed to love learning (the most)?"

(86) 辭十萬而受萬是為欲富乎。 孟子 2B/10
To forego a hundred thousand and accept ten thousand, does this constitute desiring wealth?

Although I do not think it proper to call this use of *wei* 為 an out-and-out copula because of the element of imputation involved, there are occasions when that does appear to be its function, and these will be discussed in the section dealing with identity and class-membership.

A Note on the *yi* 以 ... *wei* 為 Pattern

In the semantic area of subjective judgments regarding identity and class-membership it is clear that there is a connection between the use of *wei* 謂 and that of *wei* 為. The former is used when the agent of the imputation is expressed or implied, the latter when it is not. Syntactically, that towards which the imputation is directed is the OBJECT of 謂 and the SUBJECT of 為. However, this does not tell the whole story because there appears to be a limitation concerning this use of 謂.

We have seen that the classificatory relationship of identity or class-membership which may occur in the secondary predication engendered by 謂 is not marked by an explicit copula

verb when that relationship is in the affirmative. In such cases the verb 謂 is simply followed by two terms; the pivotal OBJECT of 謂 and the CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT of the deleted classificatory verb. The limitation is that CC does not feel comfortable about having two terms following 謂 in this way *unless* the OBJECT of 謂 is expressed pronominally by *zhi* 之. If a non-pronominal constituent which would otherwise function as the OBJECT of 謂 is to have something imputed of it, one expedient resorted to is to use the modal auxiliary *ke* 可 which enables the logical patient of the imputation to stand as the SUBJECT (see p. 27):

(87) 能近取譬可謂仁之方也已。 論語 6/30
The ability to draw analogies from things close at hand may be considered to be a method of benevolence.

(88) 無別不可謂禮。 左/僖 22/附(vi)(120/10)
Failing to maintain any distinction between the sexes cannot be considered to be (an example of) propriety.

Another expedient is to move such a constituent to sentence-initial position, i.e., topicalise it, and resume it with *zhi* 之 in OBJECT position.[24] In such cases the SUBJECT tends to be deleted:

(59) 義而行之謂之德禮。 左/文 7/附 (157/11)
Carrying them out with a sense of duty I consider to be (instances of) virtue and propriety.

However, in cases where the imputation requires both agent and patient to be lexically realised, that is, when the syntactic pattern, *SUBJECT considers OBJECT to be (a case of) CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT* is called for, CC usually employs the *yi* 以 ... *wei* 為 pattern. This is a very common pattern, but one in need of syntactic analysis and elucidation since it is often confused with the CO-VERB pattern, in which *yi* 以 is extremely common as CO-VERB. The CO-VERB pattern is as follows:

(SUBJECT) – CO-VERB + OBJECT – (NON-)FINITE VERB + COMPLEMENTS

[24] A detailed discussion of topicalisation in CC will follow in chapter four.

It is possible for the whole string to constitute a non-finite VP. This occurs when the verb following the CO-VERB phrase is not finite in respect of any SUBJECT, explicit or deleted:

(89) 是以火救火，以水救水。名之曰益多。 莊子 4/10
This is a case of putting out a fire with fire or relieving a flood with water. One calls it 'going from bad to worse'.

But when the verb is finite, it is always so in respect of the SUBJECT of the clause: never in respect of the OBJECT of the CO-VERB; in other words, there is no secondary predication with the OBJECT of the CO-VERB as pivot:

(90) 君子不以其所以養人者害人。 孟子 1B/15
The superior man does not use the means by which he cares for others to harm them.

The above requirements for the CO-VERB pattern are met in examples such as the following, which are deliberately included here because superficially they suggest, quite falsely, that the *yi* ... *wei* pattern is present:

(91) 不能以禮讓為國如禮何。 論語 4/13
If you are incapable of governing a state with propriety and deference, of what consequence is propriety?

(92) 不道禮憲，以詩書為之，
譬之猶以指測河也。 荀子 1/38
Failing to go by the rules of propriety and doing it (i.e., seeking sagehood) by means of the 'Odes' and 'Documents' (alone) may be compared to fathoming the depth of a river with one's finger.

(93) 文王以民力為臺為沼。 孟子 1A/2
King Wen built a tower and a pool by means of the people's efforts.

(94) 南方有鳥焉，名曰蒙鳩。以羽為巢。 荀子 1/9
In the south there is a bird called the Meng dove. It makes its nest out of feathers.

(92) is a particularly useful example because the 'CO-VERB pattern' is immediately identifiable in the phrase 以指測河, which is syntactically and logically (with respect to the analogy) exactly parallel to the phrase 以詩書為之. What is also important to notice is that in all such cases *wei* 為 is a transitive verb with the meaning 'do', 'make'.

The *yi* ... *wei* pattern, on the other hand, takes the following form:

(SUBJECT) *yi* 以 OBJECT *wei* 為 CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT

which maps to:

(SUBJECT) consider(s) OBJECT to be (a member of the class) CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT

The distinguishing syntactic features of the *yi* ... *wei* pattern are as follows:

(i) *Yi* 以 is the *principal* verb, and if it is finite it is so in respect of the SUBJECT of the sentence as a whole.

(ii) *Wei* 為 has no direct syntactic relationship with the SUBJECT of the sentence (if there is one), but is always finite in respect of the OBJECT of *yi*. Thus, *yi* gives rise to secondary predication and *wei* functions as secondary FINITE VERB.

As with the CO-VERB pattern, the entire string may constitute a non-finite VP, but with the crucial difference that this is so only when *yi* is non-finite; *wei* is *always* finite in respect of the OBJECT of *yi*, regardless of whether the string as a whole is finite or non-finite. Moreover, in this pattern *wei* is a classificatory verb meaning 'consider as', 'deem to be', as opposed to being transitive and meaning 'do', 'make', as we saw in the CO-VERB pattern examples (91)–(94). Thus, the *yi* 以 ... *wei* 為 pattern completes the jigsaw of the expression of imputed identity and class-membership in CC:

(95) 吾以夫子為天地。 莊子 5/26
I took you to be (like) Heaven and earth.[d] earth.

(96) 以從俗為善，以貨財為寶，
以養生為己至道，是民德也。 荀子 8/56
To regard compliance with custom as a fine thing, goods and riches as a treasure and the sustaining of life as one's supreme criterion, this is the 'virtue' of the ordinary people. (With non-finite *yi* 以)

(97) 諸侯以字為謚。 左/隱 8/10 (18/2)
The feudal lords regard their 'style' as their posthumous title.

(98) 且不能知，吾獨且奈何哉。
'This is a case of regarding non-existence as existence. If 且不能知，吾獨且奈何哉。 莊子 2/22
This is a case of regarding non-existence as existence. If non-existence counts as existence even the blessed Yu would be unable to understand, let alone me! (With non-finite *yi*)

A useful way of understanding the *yi* 以 ... *wei* 為 pattern is to fix one's attention on the sub-pattern X *wei* 為 Y, 'X is considered to be (a case of) Y (with which we are already familiar), and see it as being accommodated intact[25] in the larger pattern *yi* 以 X *wei* 為 Y in such a way that X is pivotal between the transitive verb *yi* and the classificatory verb *wei*. This is quite clearly demonstrated in the following examples:

(99) 寡人之囿方四十里民猶以為大，何也。 孟子 1B/2
My park is (only) forty li square and the people still consider it big. Why is that?

(99a) 不孝有三，無後為大。 孟子 4A/26
There are three ways of being unfilial: being without issue is considered the greatest.

(100) 人皆以見侮為辱，故鬥也。
知見侮之為不辱則不鬥矣。 荀子 18/93
Everyone considers being insulted as being disgraced, so they come to blows. If they realise that being insulted constitutes no disgrace they would no longer come to blows.

Before I leave the *yi* 以 ... *wei* 為 pattern, I would like to take this opportunity to pre-empt a possible objection to my analysis, which is that the string X *wei* 為 Y is an embedded sentence OBJECT of *yi* 以. There is a simple and clear rebuttal to this objection. The usual form for an embedded sentence in CC is that of a subordinating endocentric construction in the pattern MODIFIER 之 HEAD, where the MODIFIER and HEAD may be construed to correspond to SUBJECT and PREDICATE respectively (see chapter seven for an exposition of CC embedded sentences). This may be seen in (100) where 見侮之為不辱 is the sentential OBJECT of 知 'know'. In fact, the combination **yi* 以 X *zhi* 之 *wei* 為 Y is never encountered. Although it is

[25] Not quite intact in every case, however. Because the OBJECT pronoun *zhi* 之 is always deleted when it is governed by *yi* 以, the pivotal element never appears in the surface structure when it is a 'soft' resumptive pronoun. Such a case is illustrated in (99)).

true that the *zhi* 之 in embedded sentences may occasionally be deleted, this occurs only in a minority of cases. To *never* see the above combination is sufficient evidence that we are dealing not with an embedded sentence OBJECT of *yi* 以, but with secondary predication with X as a pivot. In chapter seven a similar observation is made with respect to verbs of causation.

Class-Membership and Identity

Before proceeding, let us review the ground covered so far in this chapter. It will be remembered that the generic logical operation under analysis is the expression of one entity, A, in terms of another entity, B, such that entity A is syntactically the SUBJECT (or, in cases of secondary predication, an OBJECT-SUBJECT pivot) of a classificatory FINITE VERB which governs entity B, syntactically a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT. Semantically, the nature of the possible relationships commenced with similarity or analogy (A is like B), progressed to naming and calling (A is called B), the performing of temporary roles (A serves as B), and finally to the imputation of a relationship of identity (A is considered to be B) or class-membership (A is considered to be a instance of B). We now pass to identity and class-membership as an objective fact, without the qualification of imputation. There is a reason for taking the semantic range of classificatory relationships in this order: it reveals a progression from a less intimate kind of relationship between two entities (similarity) to the most intimate kind (class-membership and identity), and it is to the latter that the remainder of this chapter is devoted.

What are the ramifications of the previous paragraph? Firstly, the classification of one entity in terms of another necessarily gives rise to a *classificatory relationship* between the two. Secondly, whatever the precise nature of that relationship, it has a semantic value: analogy, designation, etc. So long as the relationship is not of the most intimate sort, an explicit classificatory verb is usually required to indicate the semantics involved (the exceptions

encountered hitherto being the deletion of *yue* 曰 and that of an affirmative copula in secondary predication following *wei* 謂). However, when class-membership and identity are being expressed, the relationship is so intimate and so fundamental that it may be deemed unnecessary to use an explicit classificatory verb, and it is the standard procedure in texts of the period under examination to do without one:

(101) 滕小國也。 孟子 1B/15
Teng is a small state.

(102) 汝鄙人也。 莊子 7/8
You are a base fellow.

(103) 君子之德風，小人之德草。 論語 12/19
The superior man's virtue is the wind. The lesser man's virtue is the grass.

It must be emphasised that, although in their surface structures these sentences consist of nothing more than two consecutive NPs, they are only intelligible as utterances when something more than the mere reference to two NPs is understood. In fact, they make sense precisely when that which is deleted in the surface structure is perceived as being present in the deep structure; that is, a *classificatory relationship* between the first term, A, and the second term, B, such that A is classified as being either a member of the class B ((101), (102)), or (in this case figuratively speaking) one and the same as B (103).

This chapter has argued consistently that classificatory relationships are executed by means of classificatory verbs, but has also demonstrated that such verbs may be deleted in surface structure. On these premises, if there is to be consistency in the deep-structure syntax of classificatory relationships, it would be necessary to assume the surface-structure deletion of a copula verb with the semantic implication of class-membership or identity. Hu Shih implies as much in this comment:

> ...a Chinese proposition differs from its occidental counterpart in that the copula, which has played so important a role in occidental logic, is *omitted*

(my italics) in the Chinese proposition, its place being indicated only by a short pause. Thus, "Socrates is a man" becomes "Socrates, man."[26]

Hu Shih himself quotes Hobbes as follows:

> But there are, or certainly may be, some nations that have no word which answers to our verb is, who nevertheless form propositions by the position only of one name after another, as if instead of man is a living creature, it should be said, man a living creature; for the very order of the names may sufficiently show their connection; and they are as apt and useful in philosophy as if they were copulated by the verb is.[27]

From Hobbes' remarks I should like to focus on one particular statement: "...for the very order of the names may sufficiently show their connection;". First of all, this implies the presence of a "connection" (I would call it 'classificatory relationship') even in the absence of a copula in the surface structure; secondly, the "order of the names" is also of significance: it is the first item (the SUBJECT) which is to undergo classification, and the second (the CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT) which is to provide the basis or reference for its classification. In the course of this study the 'nominal' sentence will occasionally be referred to as the AB 也 sentence, with the first term referred to as the A-term (or A-term SUBJECT) and the second term as the B-term (or B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT).

Further support for the view that there is deletion of the copula comes from Hong Cheng, who has made a detailed study of the copula in CC.[28] Although I do not find convincing his argument that the Chinese copula is not a verb, I am, however, in complete agreement with his assertion that deletability is a distinguishing feature of the copula:

> (He quotes first from Wang Li's *Zhongguo Wenfaxue Chutan*) "In the classical language it was usual to dispense with the copula, but then again, it was not absolutely dispensed with in every case." It is precisely in virtue of

[26] Hu Shih, *The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China*, (Shanghai, 1922; reprint ed., New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp., 1968), reprint ed., p. 41.

[27] Ibid., p. 41.

[28] Hong Cheng 洪誠, "Lun Nanbeichao Yiqian Hanyuzhong De Xici" 論南北朝以前漢語中的繫詞, *Yuyan Yanjiu* 語言研究 1957, pp. 1–22.

> the fact that it may be dispensed with that one distinguishes the essential difference between it and verbs.[29]

Since the copula is not always deleted, what appears in copula position (i.e., between the two nominal terms) when it is not? Both Hong and Graham state that it is *wei* 為; however, there is disagreement between them as to its status when it does. Graham seems reluctant to accept *wei* as a fully-fledged copula:

> In the affirmative form position N (i.e., the copula position) is sometimes occupied by *wei* "constitute, act as, fill the role of".[30]

Hong, on the other hand, seems quite content to regard *wei* as a copula:

> Before the pure copula *shih* 是 appeared, it (*wei* 為) responded to the needs of the language and assumed the duties (later) assumed by 是.[31]

Hong suggests some ground rules for the use of *wei* 為:

> In two circumstances an (explicit) copula absolutely must be used. One is where the subject and the predicate are exactly the same, like 爾為爾 (you are you)... The other is where the subject and predicate are both nouns and where there is no marker at the end of the sentence to indicate that the sentence is a judgmental one.[32]

Sadly, Hong fails to say what circumstances give rise to the absence of a sentence-final marker; one might just as well take the completely opposite view and conclude that when *wei* 為

[29] Ibid., p. 2.
The fact that it can be deleted is not, in my view, evidence that the copula is not a verb. I agree with Zhao's description of *shi* 是 as a verb (Zhao, 1968, p. 716), and yet we know that it has considerable scope for deletion in MC, e.g.:

a. 他是北京人。
b. 他北京人。

In his analysis of the status of the copula Hong starts off impressively enough:

> If one does not conduct the analysis from syntactic considerations, it is very difficult to elucidate matters.(p. 2)

Unfortunately, it is to considerations which are decidedly *not* syntactic that he subsequently appeals:

> It (the copula) is not an action which proceeds from the subject; it has not the least nature of an action, (thus) it is not a verb.(p. 2)

One is at a loss to know how this kind of analysis would deal with the syntax of ergative verbs, which can have their patient as SUBJECT. In any case, verbs do not only admit of actions but of states also, and a classificatory verb certainly describes a state.

[30] Graham, 1969, p. 202.

[31] Hong, 1957, p. 12.

[32] Ibid., p. 16.

is used as a copula, there is no need for a sentence-final marker! In any case, some doubt must be cast on the validity of his second condition since there are always those occasional cases when one encounters nominal sentences lacking a sentence-final marker:

(104) 是以無有為有。 莊子 2/22
This is a case of regarding non-existence as existence.

(105) 冀之北土馬之所生。 左/昭 4/附(i)(352/1)
The northern territory of Ji is the place where horses

(106) 此四者天下之窮民而無告者。
These four (groups) are the most wretched in the world and the ones who have nowhere to appeal.

(106) 此四者天下之窮民而無告者。 孟子 1B/5
These four (groups) are the most wretched in the world and the ones who have nowhere to appeal.

Having said this, however, Hong's point that the inclusion of the final particle is necessary has general validity and throws some light on the nature and function of the particle *ye* 也; and at this juncture I should like to make a brief comment on the use of the particle *ye*. It seems to me that its function in CC is nothing more than to provide a pause (a point to which I shall return in chapter five). In my view its appearance in sentence-final position in the vast majority of statements of class-membership and identity is made necessary in order to inform the listener/reader that the two terms just mentioned form a self-contained and independent utterance (that is, a sentence), after which a pause would be proper. Without the pause, the two terms might be taken as representing the mere listing of items in juxtaposition as part of a sentence, rather than the expression of a classificatory relationship between two entities. I would consider it entirely erroneous to suggest that *ye* discharges any functions proper to the copula.

Until the matter has been thoroughly researched, we are not in a position to lay down exactly when or why *wei* 為 is used as a copula. Although Hong's first condition seems to be borne out by (107), such examples are too rare to enable a rule to be established. What we can say with certainty is that *wei* is occasionally used as a copula expressing class-membership and identity in a range of pre-Han texts, as the following examples testify:

(107) 爾為爾，我為我，雖袒裼裸裎於我側
爾焉能浼我哉。 孟子 2A/9
You are you and I am me. Even if you were to take off all your clothes right beside me, how would you be able to contaminate me?

(108) 明之為聖人。 荀子 8/103
If you are clear about it you are a sage.

(108a) 知之聖人也。 荀子 8/40
If you realise it you are a sage.

(109) 長沮曰：夫執輿者為誰。
子路曰：為孔丘。 論語 18/6
Chang Ju said, "Who is the person taking charge of the carriage?"
Zi Lu said, "It is Confucius."

(110) 上其手曰：夫子為王子圍，
寡君之貴介弟也。下其手曰：
此子為穿封戌，方城外之縣尹也。 左/襄 26/附(iv)(310/21)
He raised his hand and said, "That man is Wang Zi Wei; he is our lord's esteemed younger brother." He lowered his hand and said, "This fellow is Chuan Feng Shu; he is the governor of the area beyond Fang Cheng."
(An interesting observation in this example is that, what might be considered instances of role-filling are executed by the AB也 structure, while the statements concerning identity in fact use *wei*.)

One might also wish to consider the common formula *qi wei ren* 其為人 'the kind of person one is' an example of *wei* being used as a copula. (See p. 185 for further observations concerning this formula.)

By taking a diachronic view, the phenomenon of copula deletion may be placed in its proper historical perspective: it was only during the Spring and Autumn and Warring States Periods that it was the norm. The development is traced by Hong and Pulleyblank respectively:

> From the Spring and Autumn period, sentences which dispensed with a copula used a sentence-final *ye* 也 to indicate a judgment. Prior to the Spring and Autumn period..., there was no option but to use the character *wei* 惟 to indicate a judgment. Otherwise it would cause the nouns acting as subject and predicate to be (merely) piled up one after the other. ...This *wei* was necessary.[33]

[33] Ibid., p. 16.

> We thus see that in the archaic language *fei* (非) is to be regarded as the negative of *wei* (惟). In later Chinese *wei* was, in general, restricted to the meaning 'only' and, at the same time, noun predication according to the formula X *yeh*(也), *fei* X *yeh* developed; so that the symmetry between the use of *fei* and *wei* disappeared.[34]

Seen in this light, it is clear that it was the deletion of the copula *wei* 惟 that resulted in the nominal sentence. There is no evidence to suggest that *wei* 為 was used as a copula before the advent of copula deletion; thereafter, it had something of the status of a 'stop-gap', drafted in whenever an explicit copula was deemed necessary simply in virtue of the fact that it was the classificatory verb which came closest to expressing class-membership and identity.

However, copula deletion as the norm was evidently a state of affairs about which the Chinese language felt somewhat uneasy, and it held sway for only a relatively short period of time. Graham gives a convincing analysis as to the reason for its decline:

> A grammatical description which postulates a position which cannot be filled at all may seem artificial, but it has the advantage of locating what in relation to the history of the language we have reason to regard as an area of tension in the system, resolved by the evolution of *shih* (是) "this" into the copulative verb *shih* of the colloquial language. Even in Classical Chinese *shih* is noticeably attracted towards the vacuum at N (i.e., copula position).[35]
> ...Mencius itself seems to have an example of shih actually at N:
>
> Ex. 29, M.6A/15 N O P
> 鈞 是 人 也
> "They are equally men."[36]

So important were the Spring and Autumn and Warring States Periods to Chinese intellectual history that the texts of that time provided the syntactic and stylistic model for most didactic, historiographical and official writing throughout the dynastic period. The nominal sentence, being one of the most distinctive features of this model, thus continued to enjoy widespread patronage in such writing. When examining the development of a language, only that

[34] E.G. Pulleyblank, "Fei 非, Wei 惟 and Certain Related Words", in *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata*, ed. S. Egerod and E. Glahn (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1959), p. 180.

[35] Although Graham does not actually refer to 'copula deletion', is not the notion strongly implied by his choice of words in the foregoing analysis? In any case, I find the inference irresistible!

[36] Graham, 1969, p. 202.

which of itself is dynamic and susceptible to change may be deemed to 'evolve': an anachronistic style maintained in an inevitably artificial manner by a literate elite may be elegant and refined but, in terms of the evolution of the language, it is a long extinct species. On this basis, the nominal sentence was certainly giving way to the copula *shi* 是 from the early Han.[37]

Differentiation between Identity and Class-Membership

Although there is certainly a semantic difference between class-membership and identity, formally there is none. In the absence of an explicit classificatory verb, let us strip the logical operation bare of any specific semantic connotations. At its very core the classificatory relationship consists of nothing more than the assertion that:

A (SUBJECT) is classified as B (CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT)

At this level, considerations of class-membership or identity do not enter into it. Now let us assume a constant A-term and observe its classificatory relationship with different B-terms:

(111) 晉大國也。 公羊/宣 12/3
Jin is a large state.

(112) 晉吾仇敵也。 左/昭 5/附(i)(358/5)
Jin is our enemy.

(113) 晉盟主也。 左/哀 1/附(iii)(466/2)
Jin is the principal party in the alliance.

(111) is a case of class-membership; (113) is a case of identity. In (112) the B-term NP is amiguous as between class-membership ('...is one of our enemies') and identity ('...is our enemy' (i.e., the only one we have)). The structure is identical in all three cases and yet gives rise to two different kinds of relationship. If the A-term is constant throughout and the classificatory relationship is not made explicit by the presence of a classificatory verb, the determining factor must be the B-term. But what quality of the B-term makes the crucial difference? The English

[37] Hong (1957, pp. 4–6), supports this view with a wealth of examples.

renderings give us a clue. Notice that in (111) the B-term has indefinite reference, while in (113) it has definite reference; in (112) it is modified by a personal pronoun and has ambiguous reference.[38] A term which is accorded definite reference is specific and individual. That is why it is impossible to express class-membership by means of a classifying NP which has definite reference, a fact easily proved using examples from English, where the article clearly denotes the nature of the reference:

a. He's a thief. (class-membership)
b. He's the thief! (identity)

A term with indefinite reference, on the other hand, must by definition be a member of a more or less homogeneous class; if this were not the case, in what sense could it be understood to be 'indefinite'?

Thus, a CC nominal sentence (i.e., with copula deletion) presents classification of the most fundamental kind, the precise nature of which depends solely on the reference of the classifying NP, the B-term: indefinite reference gives rise to class-membership; definite reference gives rise to identity. Since CC lacks any explicit indicator of NP reference such as the English article, the *logical* distinction between identity and class-membership is *syntactically* unmarked, and may only be gleaned from contexual and semantic information. However, there are some useful guidelines which may be adhered to fairly safely.

A proper noun always has definite reference and, as a B-term, always gives rise to identity:

(114) 為湯武區民者桀與紂也。 孟子 4A/10
Those who drove the people to Tang and Wu are Jie and Zhou.

[38] Establishing the reference of a NP modified by a personal pronoun is not always a straightforward matter. Of course, there are many cases where it is clear:

(Said by a monarch) "He is my subject." (= class-membership)
(In a monogamous society) "This is my wife." (= identity)

However, the statement "He's my son." does not preclude the possiblility that the speaker has other sons. It is, of course, possible to make an explicit statement of class-membership by saying: "He's one of my sons." What appears uppermost in the speaker's mind in examples such as (114) is the establishment of the *immediate* identity of the SUBJECT without regard for the logical niceties of whether the SUBJECT constitutes a subset of the B-term or comprises the B-term itself in its entirety.

Secondly, certain NPs are generic by nature and, when appearing as B-term, always give rise to class-membership. Common examples are *shengren* 聖人 'sage'; *junzi* 君子 'superior man'; *xiaoren* 小人 'petty man':

(115) 此二人者皆聖人也。 韓非子 12/5/4
Both these two men were sages.

(116) 楚囚君子也。 左/成 9/附(ii)(229/1)
The prisoner of Chu is a superior man.

(117) 士誠小人也。 孟子 2B/12
I am indeed a petty man.

The B-terms in the following examples are semantically restricted to a set containing one member only; therefore reference must be definite, a statement of identity being the result:

(118) 聖人人倫之至也。 孟子 4A/2
The sage is the pinnacle of humanity.

(119) 君子小人之反也。 荀子 3/16
The superior man is the opposite of the petty man.

B-Term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS Expressing Reason or Cause

To conclude this discussion of the 'nominal' sentence, let us consider one rather particular use of the B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT, that of expressing reason or cause:

(120) 人死則曰：非我也，歲也。 孟子 1A/3
When people die you say, "It's not (because of) me; it's (due to) the harvest."

(121) 子曰：回也視予猶父也。
予不得視猶子也。非我也，
夫二三子也。 論語 11/11
The Master said, "Hui regarded me as his father. I was not able to regard him as a son. It was not because of me, but because of these fellows.

(122) 蟪蛄不知春秋。此小年也。 莊子 1/11
The cricket does not know spring or autumn. This is due to its short life.

In our previous discussion of B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS, it was noticed that the nature of the classificatory relationship expressed by a B-term is either that of identity (A= B), or class-membership (A is a member of the class B). It would appear difficult for any of these three examples to be construed as expressions of identity. They may, however, be considered to be instances of class-membership of a rather special type. It is an interesting comment on the Chinese thought of the period that the concept of causality is connected with the idea of class-membership; that a given fact or state of affairs (A-term) is seen as belonging to a category of consequences thrown up by the B-term. Thus, if we extend the semantic area of class-membership to include such notions as 'A is a matter/question of B', or 'A is something which arises from or proceeds from B', we are able to capture something of the implication of such utterances. Some further examples:

(123) 夫戰勇氣也。 左/莊 10/1 (57/7)
War is a matter of bravery.

(124) 吾之不遇魯侯天也。 孟子 1B/16
My not meeting the Marquis of Lu is due to Heaven.

(125) 治亂天邪。 荀子 17/19
Are order and chaos down to Heaven?

(126) 大德滅小怨道也。 左/定 5/附(iv)(447/16)
That great virtue obliterates petty enmity is due to the Way.

It is not uncommon to find the interrogative pronoun *he* 何 'what' occurring as a B-term in CC. With a sentential SUBJECT A-term, a B-term *he* 何 has this extended idea of class-membership; 'is a case/matter/question of what' = 'why?':

(127) 士之不託諸侯何也。 孟子 5B/6
Why is it that the scholars do not entrust themselves to the feudal lords?

(128) 男女辨姓。子不辟宗何也。 左/襄 28/6 (321/11)
Man and wife should be of different surnames. Why is it that you did not avoid the same ancestral lineage?

However, it is interesting to note that when the A-term is a NP (in this case a complex NP with the HEAD substitute *zhe* 者) rather than an embedded sentence, the relationship betweeen it and a B-term *he* 何 is usually one of identity rather than class-membership, and the B-term is understood as 'what' rather than 'why':

(129) 人之所不欲者何也。曰：病疾禍祟也。 墨子 27/27
What is it that people do not desire? I say it is illness and calamity.

4

TOPICS

Topicalisation

Thus far we have identified the following nominal functions in CC: SUBJECT; OBJECT (including OBJECT of CO-VERB); COMPLEMENT OF PLACE; CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT. There is an important syntactic reason why we should consider SUBJECT to be the 'odd man out' of these: it is the only function which is not governed by another (verbal) function. Syntactically, a SUBJECT is that of which a PREDICATE is predicated and, more specifically, that in respect of which a FINITE VERB is finite. SUBJECT is also the only one of these nominal functions to have its normal position not within the PREDICATE but preceding it. However, this chapter will examine the processes whereby constituents performing other nominal functions may be moved out of the PREDICATE and into sentence-initial position, and, as a result, also provide the 'subject of discourse' of a sentence. The syntactic function of a sentence-initial constituent which is *not* a SUBJECT and which, in effect, adds a further stratum to the BASIC SENTENCE will be referred to as TOPIC. As well as those constituents which are moved into TOPIC position, or 'topicalised', we shall also discuss those TOPICS which do not follow as the result of topicalisation.

There is another respect in which SUBJECT differs from the other nominal functions, which derives from its sentence-initial position in a BASIC SENTENCE: it serves a communicative or discourse function as well as a syntactic one. Chafe has described SUBJECT in the following manner:

> So far as I can see at present, the best way to characterize the subject function is not very different from the ancient statement that the the subject is what we are talking about. Human knowledge appears to consist, among other things, of a large number of cognitive units which are our knowledge of particular

> individuals and events. And concerning each of these particulars we know certain things. We might like to imagine the knowledge we have about a particular as if it were connected by arrows to other parts of our knowledge, or as if it were imagery that might be activated in association with the particular, or both. But in any case it is likely that one of the main ways in which new knowledge is communicated — perhaps even the only way — is by identifying some particular as a starting point and adding to the addressee's knowledge about it. Thus, if I tell you *John broke his arm yesterday*, or if I tell you *John got knocked over by a bicycle yesterday*, I am in both cases taking the particular expressed as *John* as a starting point, and providing you with new knowledge about that particular. John is the hitching post for the new knowledge. It follows that the primary result of your hearing these sentences is that you know something more about John. It is true that you also know something about John's arm and about a particular bicycle, but it may be that such additional knowledge about these other particulars is secondarily derived from what these sentences communicated in the first instance. These sentences package the information in such a way that it is communicated as knowledge about John. Once the package is unwrapped other things may be found inside, but knowledge directly attached to the subject may be the most immediately accessible.
>
> We might call this the "adding-knowledge-about" hypothesis regarding the functioning of subjects.[1]

The notion of "identifying some particular as a starting point and adding to the addressee's knowledge about it" is, of course, a rewording of Sapir's statement, "There must be something to talk about and something must be said about this subject of discourse." (See p. 16). If we take Chafe's observations a little further it is clear that "identifying some particular" involves a process of selection: one particular among, potentially, many is chosen to initiate the utterance. The mere exercising of the speaker's powers of selection in this way in itself ascribes a degree of contrastive focus to the constituent chosen as the "particular": it involves establishing that one's discourse is initiated with and is about this SUBJECT and no other, and that this is the *given* information for the particular utterance. This is contrastive focus of a comparatively low level and it might be referred to as the natural contrastive focus always present in a SUBJECT by virtue of its sentence-initial position in any BASIC SENTENCE:

(1) 晉師從齊師。 左/成 2/4 (214/5)
The Jin army pursued the Qi army.

[1] Chafe, 1976, pp. 43–44.

But there are occasions when the constituent functioning as SUBJECT requires a greater degree of contrastive focus to be placed on it. In English this may be achieved through stress, or through the use of a cleft sentence. One expedient available to CC is to move the SUBJECT to a still anterior (i.e., leftward) position, and to resume it in SUBJECT position with a demonstrative pronoun, usually *shi* 是 'this'. The function position which accommodates the moved constituent is TOPIC. The following example illustrates quite clearly the use of this device to accentuate explicitly contrasted elements:

(2) 有狗彘之勇者；有賈盜之勇者；
有小人之勇者；有士君子之勇者。
爭飲食，無廉恥，不知是非，不辟死傷，
不畏眾強，悍悍然唯利飲食之見，
是狗彘之勇也。為事利，爭貨財，無辭讓，
果敢而振，猛貪而戾，悍悍然唯利之見，
是賈盜之勇也。輕死而暴，是小人之勇。
義之所在，不傾於權，不顧其利，
舉國而與之不為改俎，重死持義而不橈，
是士君子之勇也。 荀子 4/16

There is the courage of dogs and swine; the courage of merchants and robbers; the courage of the petty man; and the courage of the superior man. Fighting over food and drink, lacking a conscience, not knowing the difference between right and wrong, not fearing the strength of numbers, with covetous eyes seeing only food and drink, *this* is the courage of dogs and swine. Seeking profit from his activities, fighting over goods and wealth, not giving the slightest ground, resolute and fierce, voracious and violent, with covetous eyes seeing only profit, *this* is the courage of the merchant and robber. Regarding death lightly and being violent, *this* is the courage of the petty man. Where righteousness is at stake not bending to authority, having no regard for his own profit, even if the whole state were given him not changing his views on account of it, regarding death with due gravity, adhering to righteousness without flinching, *this* is the courage of the superior man.

In the above example the contrastive focus is quite explicit in the four different topicalised SUBJECTS. However, an explicit contrast with other constituents is not an essential prerequisite for topicalisation, which may be employed when there is only an *implied* contrast with another item:

(3) 如使予欲富，辭十萬而受萬，
是為欲富乎。 孟子 2B/10
Supposing I desired wealth, does rejecting a hundred thousand and accepting ten thousand constitute desiring wealth?

(4) 以從俗為善，以貨財為寶，
以養生為己至道，是民德也。 荀子 8/56
To regard compliance with custom as a fine thing, goods and riches as a treasure and the sustaining of life as one's supreme criterion, this is the 'virtue' of the ordinary people.

(5) 德之不脩，學之不講，聞義不能徙，
不善不能改，是吾憂也。 論語 7/3
Virtue not being cultivated, learning not being pursued, when hearing what is right not being able to move to it, when one is bad not being able to change, these are what give me cause for concern.

Although topicalisation of the SUBJECT is not uncommon, in practice it tends to be restricted to lengthy constituents (often non-finite VPs or embedded sentences) involved in classificatory relationships. In fact there is another, more common procedure adopted by CC to mark a SUBJECT for contrastive focus which shall be discussed later in this chapter: the use of the particle *ze* 則. However, the phenomenon observed above establishes some important principles concerning topicalisation:

(i) In CC sentence structure there exists a position to the left of SUBJECT position which may accommodate a constituent moved there. This will be called TOPIC position.

(ii) Any constituent moved from its usual position to TOPIC position must be resumed in its normal position by a pronoun. (We shall see that this rule nevertheless allows some scope for deletion of the resuming pronoun.)

(iii) The effect of moving a constituent into TOPIC position may be to afford it a degree of contrastive focus greater than that which it would possess in its customary position. Alternatively, it may simply be to establish it as *given* information (which requires to be sentence-initial), whereas a sentence position within the PREDICATE would consign it to being *new* information.

(iv) A TOPIC/COMMENT structure is an endocentric one: the syntactic relationship between a TOPIC and the remainder of the sentence is that of MODIFIER to a HEAD. Thus a CC TOPIC is an eliminable constituent. In this respect it differs from a SUBJECT which, as was seen in chapter one, although deletable, is not eliminable.

It was pointed out that, since it already enjoys sentence-initial position in a BASIC SENTENCE, a constituent functioning as SUBJECT already has some degree of focal prominence. This is not true of any constituent performing a nominal function found *within* the PREDICATE. Therefore, topicalisation is an extremely important device in CC for affording contrastive focus to such a constituent. OBJECTS are frequently topicalised. In some cases the process is occasioned by an explicit contrast between OBJECT constituents:

(6) 惻隱之心人皆有之。
羞惡之心人皆有之。
恭敬之心人皆有之。
是非之心人皆有之。 孟子 6A/6
A sense of compassion all men have.
A sense of shame all men have.
A sense of respect all men have.
A sense of right and wrong all men have.

In each of these four parallel sentences a constituent has been topicalised and resumed in OBJECT position by the pronoun *zhi* 之: this is the rule with the topicalisation of OBJECTS.

In many cases, however, the contrastive focus in a topicalised OBJECT is not explicit (that is, explicitly contrasted with other *topicalised* constituents of the same class) but strongly implied:

(7) 子曰：聖人吾不得而見之矣。
得見君子者斯可矣。 論語 7/26
The Master said, "A sage I have not managed to see. Getting to see a superior man is quite possible."

The topicalised OBJECT of a verb which is negated is still resumed by *zhi* 之, but in the form of the fusion word *fu* 弗:[2]

2 A.C. Graham, "A Probable Fusion Word: 勿 wuh = 毋 wu + 之 jy", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 14, 1952, p. 139.

(8) 法之所加智者弗能辭，勇者弗敢爭。 韓非子 6/5/35
What the law provides the wise are not able to dismiss, the brave do not dare to contest.

(9) 衣食之安弗敢專也，必以分人。 左/莊 10/1 (57/2)
The comforts of clothing and food I dare not monopolise: I am sure to share them with others.

In the case of a negative imperative, the fusion word *wu* 勿 is used:[3]

(10) 問楛者勿告也。 荀子 1/39
Anyone who asks about what is improper do not inform.

(11) 己所不欲勿施於人。 論語 15/24
What you yourself do not desire do not inflict upon others.

Another function in which constituents frequently undergo topicalisation is COMPLEMENT OF PLACE. The MARKER OF PLACE *yu* 于/於 fuses into *yan* 焉, as one would expect when it governs a pronoun. The majority of such cases are in existential sentences:

(12) 藐姑射之山有神人居焉。 莊子 1/28
On the distant mountain of Gu Ye there is a holy man.

(13) 王若隱其無罪而就死地則牛羊何擇焉。 孟子 1A/7
If Your Majesty felt sorry about the fact that it was going to the execution ground innocent then, an ox or a sheep, what is there to choose between them?

(14) 亡國之廷無人焉。 韓非子 6/2/51
In the court of a doomed state there are no men.

(15) 鄭有人焉。 左/莊 28/4 (75/4)
In Zheng there are men.

The reason for topicalising a COMPLEMENT OF PLACE does not seem to be for applying contrastive focus, but for establishing the locative phrase as *given* information. However, there are a couple of interesting examples from the Mencius where not only the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE but also its governing MARKER OF PLACE are topicalised. Here, there does appear to be some implication of contrastive focus on the constituent:

[3] Ibid., p. 140 and passim.

(16) 昔者孟子嘗與我言於宋。於心終不忘。 孟子 3A/2
Once Mencius spoke with me in Song. In my heart I shall never forget it.

(17) 齊宣王問曰：文王之囿方七十里，有諸。
孟子對曰: 於傳有之。 孟子 1B/2
King Xuan of Qi asked, "Is it true that King Wen's park was seventy li square?" Mencius replied, "According to the records it is true." (Literally: "In the records it exists.")

Topicalised CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS are not frequently encountered and seem to be confined to B-terms in nominal sentences in the following pattern, in which the resuming pronoun is the demonstrative form *shi* 是：

(18) 故為不善以得禍者桀、紂、幽、厲是也。
愛人利人以得福者禹、湯、文、武是也。 墨子 4/21
Therefore, as for those who perpetrated evil and thereby brought disaster upon themselves, Jie, Zhou, You and Li are cases of this. As for those who loved and benefitted others and thereby brought blessings upon themselves, Yu, Tang, Wen and Wu are cases of this.

(19) 處勝人之埶，行勝人之道天下莫忿，
湯、武是也。 荀子 16/23
(19) 處勝人之埶，行勝人之道天下莫忿，
湯、武是也。 荀nt of
To occupy a position of dominance over others and pursue the path appropriate thereto without incurring the resentment of anyone, Tang and Wu are cases of this.

Deletion of the Resumptive Pronoun

TOPICS moved from certain functions may have their resumptive pronouns deleted, while in other functions this is impossible. A topicalised SUBJECT always has its resumptive pronoun present in the surface structure for the simple reason that if it were deleted the sentence structure would no longer be that of TOPIC/COMMENT but SUBJECT/PREDICATE, thus defeating the whole purpose of topicalising the SUBJECT. Similarly, a topicalised B-term in the pattern of examples (18) and (19) cannot have its resuming pronoun deleted because this would result in the inversion of the A- and B-terms, thus completely reversing the classificatory relationship.

However, the deletion of a pronoun resuming an OBJECT or COMPLEMENT OF PLACE can be accommodated without altering the properties of the sentence and is thus allowable. Examples of OBJECT pronoun deletion are:

(20) 諂諛者親。諫爭者疏。 荀子 2/5
Those who flatter he keeps close to. Those who remonstrate he keeps away from.
Those who flatter he keeps close to. Those who remonstrate
he keeps away from.

(21) 語云：盛德之士君不得而臣，
父不得而子。 孟子 5A/4
The saying goes: The man of great virtue a ruler cannot have as a minister, a father cannot have as a son.

The deletion of the resuming pronoun in COMPLEMENT OF PLACE position, i.e., *yan* 焉, is a common occurrence, but seemingly confined to those sentences where the FINITE VERB is existential *you* 有. Since we are dealing here with a fusion word, it is not only the resumptive pronoun but also its governing MARKER OF PLACE that is deleted:

(22) 北冥有魚。 莊子 1/1
In the Northern Sea there is a fish.

(22a) 南方有鳥焉。 荀子 1/9
In the south there is a bird.

(23) 宋有富人。 韓非子 12/6/19
In Song there was a wealthy man.

(24) 柩有聲如牛。 左/僖 32/5 (140/8)
In the coffin there was a sound like an ox.

Determining the syntactic functions of constituents associated with existential *you* 有is a complex question and one to which I shall return later in this chapter. The important point I wish to make here, which will have a bearing on the analysis to follow, is that any sentence-initial constituent denoting a place in a sentence containing existential *you* 有 as FINITE VERB is syntactically a topicalised COMPLEMENT OF PLACE (with resuming pronoun frequently deleted) and *not* a SUBJECT.

REAL TOPICS

So far in this chapter we have examined TOPIC/COMMENT structures which are so purely by virtue of their sentence-initial constituent having been moved out of its usual position in what, without such topicalisation, would have remained a BASIC SENTENCE; that is, of SUBJECT/ PREDICATE structure. However, there is a category of TOPIC which is represented by a constituent which is always sentence-initial and is never moved out of and resumed at some point in the SUBJECT/PREDICATE framework. This sort of TOPIC falls entirely outside the BASIC SENTENCE structure and has no syntactic relationship with any constituent in it. Chafe has this kind of TOPIC in mind (as the examples he provides make clear) when he makes the following remarks concerning the same phenomenon as it appears in modern Chinese:

> In Chinese it (a TOPIC) may have to do with the establishment of a spatial, temporal or personal frame or domain for an assertion which follows.[4]
>
> In brief, "real" topics (in topic-prominent languages) are not so much "what the sentence is about" as "the frame within which the sentence holds".[5]

Such TOPICS will be referred to as REAL TOPICS, after Chafe.

Chafe's phrase "the frame within which the sentence holds" seems particularly apposite. Such a TOPIC is *given* information *par excellence*, and is not intended to carry any particular contrastive focus over and above the sort of low-level, natural contrastive focus which was earlier ascribed to a SUBJECT by dint of its sentence-initial position in a BASIC SENTENCE. It is interesting that Chafe includes locative phrases under this head ("spatial domain"). Locative TOPICS are something of a hybrid in the sense that syntactically they are the result of topicalisation and are resumed by a (deletable) *yan* 焉 in COMPLEMENT OF PLACE position. However, unlike other topicalised TOPICS, the *raison d'etre* for this transformation is to posit the locative phrase as *given* information, and therefore, while one would not include a sentence-initial

4 Chafe, 1976, p. 55.

5 Ibid., p. 51.

locative phrase in CC as a REAL TOPIC according to the letter of the syntactic law, one has considerable sympathy with Chafe's view that REAL TOPICS also "have to do with the establishment of a spatial domain", so far as the spirit of the law is concerned.

One of the most obvious kinds of constituent which stands as a REAL TOPIC is a temporal expression. Unlike locative expressions these only ever occur in sentence-initial position:

(25) 昔者大王居邠。 孟子 1B/15
Formerly the great king lived in Bin.

(26) 冬鄭穆公卒。 左/宣 3/9 (183/4)
In the winter Duke Mu of Zheng died.

(27) 酣戰之時司馬子反渴而求飲。 韓非子 10/2/5
At the height of the battle General Zi Fan felt thirsty and wanted a drink.

In English we are quite used to a temporal phrase in sentence-initial position. But in CC almost any NP may stand as REAL TOPIC and provide the "frame" or "domain" for the sentence. If a NP ever does modify an English sentence in this way it is nearly always governed by a preposition or prepositional phrase. In CC this expedient is not necessary and usually dispensed with:

(28) 先王之制大都不過參國之一。 左/隱 1/3 (2/7)
According to the statutes of the former kings a large city should not exceed one third the size of the capital city.

(29) 富歲子弟多賴。凶歲子弟多暴。 孟子 6A/7
In the event of a bumper harvest the young men are, for the most part, indolent. In the event of a bad harvest they are mostly violent.

(30) 禮之用和為貴。先王之道斯為美。 論語 1/12
Of the functions of the Rites harmony is deemed the most valuable. Of the ways of the former kings this is deemed the most excellent.

(31) 漢東之國隨為大。 左/桓 6/附(i) (31/5)
Of the states east of the Han River, Sui is deemed to be the greatest.

(35) 鯤之大不知其幾千里也。 莊
As for the size of the Kun, I do not know how many thousand
REAL TC *li* it is. which is not

found in topicalised TOPICS, will be referred to as 'stacking'. Some examples:

(32) 元年，春，公即位。 左/桓 1/4 (23/1)
In the spring of the first year the duke assumed the throne.

(33) 治世之臣，功多者位尊；力極者賞厚；
情盡者名立。 韓非子 26/1/5
As for the ministers of an ordered age, in the case of those whose achievements are many, their status is respected; in the case of those whose efforts are extreme, the rewards are copious; as for those whose loyalty goes all the way, their reputations are established.

In our discussion of topicalised TOPICS we dwelt on those constituents which are resumed in nominal functions. Some TOPICS, however, are resumed as MODIFIERS to HEADS in phrases occurring in nominal functions, the resuming pronoun being the third-person pronoun of adnominal modification *qi* 其:

(34) 古之君子其過也如日月之食，
民皆見之。
As for the superior man of old, his transgressions were like an eclipse of the sun or moon; everyone saw them. 孟子 2B/9
As for the superior man of old, his transgressions were like an eclipse of the sun or moon; everyone saw them.

(35) 鯤之大不知其幾千里也。 莊子 1/1
As for the size of the Kun, I do not know how many thousand *li* it is.

(36) 古之真人，其寢不夢，其覺無憂，其食不甘，
其息深深。 莊子 6/6
As for the true man of old, he slept without dreaming, woke without cares, ate without regard to savour, and breathed deeply.

(37) 彼其於世未數數然也。 莊子 1/19
As for him, his attitude to the world was never one of anxiety.

(38) 樂民之樂者民亦樂其樂。
憂民之憂者民亦憂其憂。 孟子 1B/4
As for someone who delights in the happiness of the people, the people will also delight in his happiness. As for someone who is concerned about the anxieties of the people, the people will also be concerned about his anxieties.

In the following example the TOPIC is resumed as the MODIFIER of a HEAD which is the SUBJECT of an embedded sentence:

(39) 凡同類同情者其天官之意物也同。 荀子 22/16
As regards all those whose category and essential characteristics are the same, their senses' perception of things will be the same.

The TOPICS in the above sentences have the characteristics of REAL TOPICS in that they provide the "frame" or "domain" for the sentence without being preposed from a nominal function (i.e., as the HEAD of a constituent functioning as such). At the same time, however, they share the property of a topicalised item in that they are resumed in the BASIC SENTENCE. In most cases of this type one suspects that an important reason for employing this particular configuration is that the language probably feels uncomfortable about having extended phrases (which these kinds of TOPICS usually are) as MODIFIERS (or SUBJECTS of embedded sentences) 'cluttering up' the BASIC SENTENCE, and would rather have them out of the way as TOPIC; to resume such a phrase with a single pronoun is far neater.

REAL TOPICS and Quantification

Our understanding of quantification in CC has been greatly enhanced by Harbsmeier's contribution on this subject.[6] Among other things, he successfully distinguished between quantifiers of the SUBJECT and the OBJECT. One aspect he appears not to have entered into, however, is the comparative syntax of SUBJECT and OBJECT quantification. Taking universal OBJECT quantifiers, it seems fairly clear that in this case quantification of the OBJECT is achieved syntactically by the 'quantifier' *adverbially* modifying the verb. To use one of Harbsmeier's own examples:

周人兼用之。
The Zhou people used both these things.
LiJi I.169[7]

6 Harbsmeier, 1981, pp. 49–175.

7 Ibid., p. 51.

It is the modification of the verb *yong* 用 by *jian* 兼, which, as Harbsmeier points out, is basically a verb, that executes the quantification.[8] Another of Harbsmeier's examples gives even clearer evidence of OBJECT 'quantifiers' being adverbial MODIFIERS, as it has the quantifier marked by the particle of FINITE VERB modification *er* 而:

> 然而禮兼而用之。
> And Ritual uses both these things.
> Xun 19.64[9]

Thus, it may be concluded that OBJECT quantification in CC is achieved by modification of the FINITE VERB by a word, usually a verb, whose semantic coefficients are extended to determine the nature of the quantification. However, the syntax of SUBJECT quantification is based, at least for a certain group of 'quantifiers', on very different syntactic principles, although, at first glance, the surface-structure alignment of elements seems identical to that encountered in OBJECT quantification.

The group of quantifiers with which I wish to deal in this section is a set of four which are related phonologically (all having final -k) as well as through their functional properties, plus one other which, for the pattern under consideration here, should also be included. The related set of four are: *ge*/*KLAK 各; *mo*/*MAK 莫; *huo*/*GIWEK 或; *shu*/*DIOK 孰. To these four I shall add *shei*/*DIWER 誰.

Harbsmeier says that *huo* 或 and *mo* 莫 work "like an adverbial subject-quantifier",[10] the implication being that these are adverbs to the FINITE VERB in the same way as OBJECT quantifiers. However, unlike OBJECT quantifiers and some other SUBJECT quantifiers, the five words listed above are not lexically verbs but pronouns. I take the view that their relationship to the FINITE VERB is not that of (adverbial) MODIFIER to a HEAD, but that of SUBJECT to FINITE VERB, and that the constituent which may precede one of these five is syntactically a REAL TOPIC

8 Ibid., p. 50.

9 Ibid., p. 51.

10 Ibid., p. 88.

and not a SUBJECT. In order to illustrate this, let us consider first some sentences which are of TOPIC/COMMENT structure, the TOPIC being a REAL TOPIC:

(30) 禮之用和為貴。先王之道斯為美。 論語 1/12
Of the functions of the Rites harmony is deemed the most valuable. Of the ways of the former kings this is deemed the most excellent.

(31) 漢東之國隨為大。 左/桓 6/附(i)(31/5)
Of the states east of the Han River, Sui is deemed to be the greatest.

(40) 由湯至於武丁，賢聖之君六七作。 孟子 2A/1
From Tang to Wu Ding, six or seven virtuous and sagely rulers arose.

Here, the syntactic relationship of REAL TOPIC to SUBJECT maps to a logical relationship of *set* to *subset*: the REAL TOPIC, in providing the "frame" or "domain" for the sentence, represents a universal set; whereas the SUBJECT refers to members of the set for which the following predication is appropriate. Returning to the group of five listed above, we shall see that the syntactic relationship between them and the set they quantify is likewise that of SUBJECT to REAL TOPIC respectively. In fact, each of these pronouns may stand as SUBJECT *without* requiring an antecedent set functioning as REAL TOPIC:

(41) 人各有以事君。 左/襄 28/6 (321/16)
Each person has the means to serve his ruler.

(41a) 各知其極。 左/成 16/7 (241/2)
Everyone knew how far he could go.

(42) 姦莫大焉。 左/僖 7/4 (98/8)
No treachery is greater than this.

(42a) 莫不盡力以從上命。 左/成 16/7 (241/3)
Nobody failed to do his utmost to obey orders from his superiors.

(42b) 莫非命也。 孟子 7A/2
Everything is decreed.
(Literally, 'Nothing is not a decree.')

(43) 宋人或得玉。 左/襄 15/附(iii)(283/4)
Someone from Song acquired a piece of jade.

(43a) 及北門或遇之曰： 左/哀 16/附(iii)(494/7)
When he reached the north gate someone encountered him and said:

(44) 仁孰大焉。 左/僖 8/附(ii)(100/3)
What benevolence is greater than this?

(44a) 孰可以代之。 左/襄 3/附(ii)(255/15)
Who can replace him.

(44b) 孰知死生存亡之一體者，吾與之友矣。 莊子 6/46
Whoever understands that life and death, survival and extinction are two sides of the same coin, him I shall befriend.

(45) 人誰不死。 左/昭 2/3 (347/7)
Who does not die?

(45a) 淫刑以逞誰則無罪。 左/僖 23/附(i)(121/4)
If you abuse punishments for your own pleasure who will be without fault?

To wind up this section I should like to include an analysis by Li and Thompson of a sentence in MC where *shei* 誰 functions in the same way as our five SUBJECT quantifiers:

Tamen shei dou bu lai
they anyone all not come
"They (topic) none of them are coming."[11]

I find it significant that the initial constituent is regarded as a TOPIC. It would surely not be an unreasonable extrapolation to infer that this analysis would regard *shei* 誰 'who' as a SUBJECT.

Existential *you* 有

The verb *you* 有 is understood in two semantic domains:

1. *you* 有 = have; possess.
2. *you* 有 = exist; there is/are.

[11] Li and Thompson, 1976, p. 481.

Chinese is not the only language in which there is semantic proximity, not to mention overlap, between the notions of 'possessing' and 'existing'. French, of course, uses *il y a* to indicate existence, while in English the verb *have* figures in existential sentences.[12] We might be tempted to the conclusion that the idea of possession is always anterior to that of existence. However, Japanese offers an interesting counter-example. In that language the verb in question is *aru*. We may conclude that its basic meaning is 'exist' because when occurring with a single term in a BASIC SENTENCE that is its meaning:

A ga	aru.
A	exists.

To express *B has A* one would have to say:

B ni/ga	A ga	aru.
In respect of B	A	exists. = B has A.

In Japanese it seems that the notion of existence is anterior to that of possession, a fact which may not be without significance since basic semantic values are more likely to be similar between two east Asian languages than between an east Asian and a European language.

Can we say that in CC *you* may be listed as two separate lexical items? Graham apparently thinks not. He says:

> Classical Chinese has one word for "have" and "there is", *yu* 有, negative *wu* 無.
>
> 我有大樹。
> "I have a big tree."
>
> 宋有富人。
> "There was a rich man of Song." (Song had a rich man.)
>
> 廄有肥馬。
> "There are fat horses in the stables." (The stables have fat horses.)
>
> 有人於此。"There is a man here."
>
> When existence is affirmed, *yu* generally has no subject, as in the last example. But a Chinese sentence does not necessarily have a subject, and

[12] Randolph Quirk et al., *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, (London, 1972), p. 961.

> even in these cases we need not hesitate to say that *yu* is a transitive verb followed by its object. There are two words in classical Chinese which always function as object, *chih* 之 (him, her, it) and *so* 所 (him of her whom, that which). Both are often found with *yu*, 有之 (have it, there is this), 所有 (what one has, what there is).[13]

Even from the four examples Graham cites it is possible to glean some interesting data concerning the use of *you* in CC. Let us assume a basic pattern for sentences containing *you*:

sentence-initial constituent	*you* 有	complement of *you* 有

The four examples shall be referred to as A, B, C and D. A, B and C fall into the basic pattern; D lacks an initial constituent. A is rendered into English with *you* signifying possession. An alternative rendering with *you* taken to express existence is not attempted. B and C are each supplied with two renderings; the first existential and the second, given in parentheses, possessive. In each case the first, existential interpretation is undoubtedly the more acceptable in English (to my ears, the secondary renderings sound somewhat forced and unnatural); we must therefore assume that the additional rendering is not so much intended as an alternative translation as to offer a 'more literal' rendering, suggesting that even in 'existential' sentences, *you* is ultimately reducible to a basic meaning of 'have'. Apart from offering secondary translations, there is another respect in which B and C are different from A: the sentence-initial constituent in A is a person, in B and C it is a place. Example D is conspicuous for the absence of two features: firstly, a sentence-initial constituent; and secondly, any attempt to provide a paraphrase with *you* as possessive.

On the assumption that the variation in the English renderings betrays more than merely a tendency for that language to distinguish lexically the semantic difference between existence and possession and actually reflects semantic differences not made lexically explicit in CC, the processing of the data arising from these four examples leads us to make the following interesting

[13] A.C. Graham, "'Being' in Western Philosophy compared with Shih/Fei and Yu/Wu in Chinese Philosophy", *Asia Major* (New Series), 7, 1959, pp. 80–81.

observation: if the initial constituent is a locative phrase, or if there is no initial constituent, *you* signifies existence; otherwise, possession is understood.

If it is the case that *you* only has one meaning in CC and that rendering it as possessive or existential in English merely reflects a distinction in that language which is entirely absent in CC, then it would not be unreasonable to infer that Graham takes that meaning to be 'have'. The following analysis will attempt to answer the questions of whether or not there is only one basic meaning for *you* and, if so, what that meaning might be, through an investigation of the syntactic and communicative properties of sentences containing *you*.

From the parenthetical renderings he supplies for examples B and C, Graham seems to be of the opinion that a locative phrase in sentence-initial position in a sentence containing *you* is the SUBJECT of a verb meaning 'have'. However, it has already been noticed earlier in this chapter that constituents denoting place in sentence-initial position are topicalised COMPLEMENTS OF PLACE, and *not* SUBJECTS. That the resumptive pronoun *yan* 焉 is very often deleted does not alter that basic fact:

(46) 衛有惡人焉，曰哀駘它。 莊子 5/31
In Wei there was an ugly man called Ai Tai Tuo.

(47) 鄭有神巫，曰季咸。 莊子 7/51
In Zheng there was a shaman called Ji Xian.

The 'possessive' argument for existential sentences may also be challenged in cases when there is absolutely no constituent preceding *you* (and therefore no possessing agent) and the context makes it perfectly clear that this is not the result of SUBJECT deletion on pragmatic grounds:

(48) 有以為未始有物者。 莊子 2/40
There were some who believed that there had not yet begun to be things.

This sentence is similar to example D, which Graham made no attempt to paraphrase using the semantics of possession. It will be noted that the absence of an initial constituent does

not always mean that a possessing agent is ruled out in English translation. In the following example, the context makes it clear that there is merely deletion of the 'possessor':

(49) 及齊齊桓公妻之，有馬二十乘。 左/僖 23/附(ii)(121/16)
When he arrived in Qi, Duke Huan of Qi gave him a woman in marriage, and *he had* twenty teams of horses.

Quite simply, although the constituent is deleted, we must understand there to be a specific possessor, and the context makes it quite clear that it is Prince Chong Er of Jin. Incidentally, it would seem quite inappropriate to attempt a paraphrase here: '...and there were twenty teams of horses.' Herein lies an important property of possessive sentences in CC: an identifiable, *specific* possessing agent must always be present in initial position , or be understood to have been deleted for pragmatic reasons, for the semantics of possession to be felt.

I have heard the argument from those who insist on *you* always being possessive that sentences such as (48) are to be understood to have some all-embracing spatial domain as the SUBJECT-possessor, such as 'the universe' or the 'the world', so that the literal meaning of (48) would be something on the lines of: 'The world has some who...'. This theory is easily refuted by the existence of those sentences which lack any constituent preceding *you* but do have an explicit spatial domain expressed in a COMPLEMENT OF PLACE in its usual post-FINITE VERB position, thus rendering utterly impossible any imputation of an all-embracing place as SUBJECT:

(50) 有楚大夫於此。 孟子 3B/6
Suppose there were a grandee of Chu here.

(51) 有鶖在梁，有鶴在林。 詩經 229/6
There is a pelican on the dam, a crane in the wood.

(52) 窮髮之北有冥海者。天池也。有魚焉。 莊子 1/13
In the barren and desolate north there is a sea. It is the Lake of Heaven. There is a fish in it.

(53) (自)*迄今無有代其君任患者。
有一於此將為戮乎。 左/成 2/4 (213/21)
Until now there has been nobody who has accepted risk in place of his lord. If there is such a one here will you put him to death?

I would suggest, therefore, that when *you* appears in an existential sentence, a preceding constituent denoting the location of existence cannot be the SUBJECT of *you*, but is a TOPIC (topicalised COMPLEMENT OF PLACE with resuming 焉 frequently deleted). In support of this argument I would like to adduce the analysis of existential sentences in MC by the authors of the *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞. Few will disagree that the use of *you* in MC is very similar to that in CC. This work classifies existential sentences as a special type and analyses their structure as being essentially:

LOCATIVE/TEMPORAL TERM	VERB	NOUN
處所(時間)詞語	動詞	名詞[14]

The form of this analysis is important because in the case of those sentence-types it considers appropriate, it explicitly calls the initial constituent a SUBJECT.[15] The fact that this authority does not accord the initial constituent of an existential sentence the status of SUBJECT is not, I would suggest, without significance for CC.

On the strength of the above analysis, it is possible to confirm and expand the initial observation made concerning sentences featuring *you*. Where the initial constituent is a locative phrase, or where there is no initial constituent and it is clear that this is not the result of deletion as in (49), there are no grounds for understanding *you* to mean 'have': the semantics are decidedly existential. The function performed by a locative phrase in initial position is TOPIC (topicalised COMPLEMENT OF PLACE).

If this is true, is it the case that existential sentences lack a SUBJECT? So far as the surface structure of such sentences is concerned the answer is in the affirmative. However, as this study has consistently sought to demonstrate, all CC sentences require a SUBJECT in their deep structure, and existential sentences are no exception. Indeed, one might say that, by its very nature, existence is one of the semantic notions most subject to finite parameters (if the pun be excused):

[14] Lü, 1980, sentence type 11, p. 31.

[15] Ibid., sentence types 1–4, pp. 25–27.

existential sentences never merely posit non-finite existence; rather, they necessarily speak of existence *with respect to* something or someone. When the verb *you* means 'exist', 'there is', it simply must be *finite* in respect of some SUBJECT. I do not think there is any escaping this necessary requirement in the deep structure of existential sentences.

In order to discover what transformations are undergone by the deep structure of existential sentences to form their surface-structure equivalents, let us consider this example of an existential sentence which lacks an initial constituent:

(54) 有大人之事。 孟子 3A/4
There are affairs of great men.

The immediate constituents of this sentence are 有 and 大人之事. Unlike possessive sentences which may have the possessing agent deleted, there is no question of deleted constituents here: everything that is conveyed by this statement is contained in what appears before us. The first constituent 有 is a verb signifying existence; the second constituent 大人之事 is a complex NP, 'affairs of great men'. The intention of this utterance is to assert the existence of 'affairs of great men'. The verb signifying existence is obviously finite in respect of the NP which follows it, and this reflects the deep-structure relationship between the two constituents. However, in the surface structure the phrase 大人之事 does not function as SUBJECT since a CC SUBJECT must *precede* the FINITE VERB. The function performed by the complement of existential *you* is, in fact, OBJECT (we may wish to refer to it more specifically as EXISTENTIAL OBJECT), since it is substitutable by the pronoun *zhi* 之:

(55) 齊宣王問曰：文王之囿方七十里，有諸。
孟子對曰：於傳有之。 孟子 1B/2
King Xuan of Qi asked, "Is it true that King Wen's park was seventy li square?" Mencius replied, "According to the records it is true." (Literally: "In the records it exists.")

(56) 臣弒其君者有之。 孟子 3B/9
It does happen that a minister assassinates his ruler.
Or: Ministers who assassinate their ruler do exist.

The fact that existential *you* is transitive should not be allowed to draw us into believing that, even in the light of evidence to the contrary, existential *you* is, after all, merely possessive *you*. It is an understandable temptation because it is easy to think of a word meaning 'have' taking an OBJECT, but not so easy with a word meaning 'there is'. Nevertheless, let us recall that the CC definition of transitivity adopted in this study is purely formal and makes no appeal to semantic considerations of action 'passing across' from SUBJECT to OBJECT (see pp. 28–29); OBJECT is merely the *usual* function for a constituent governed by a FINITE VERB (as opposed to more *specialised* functions such as CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT). Therefore, the fact that, in existential sentences, *you* is transitive in no way forces us to understand it as possessive.

Our analysis has brought us to the point of assuming a transformation generated by existential sentences whereby a deep-structure SUBJECT turns into a surface-structure OBJECT. Put another way, it is the transformation of a constituent from sentence-initial or, at any rate, pre-verbal position to post-verbal position. When we examine the communicative properties of the existential sentence the reasons for this transformation become clear. A standard work on English grammar has this to say about the English existential sentence:

> ...one may see a common function for the existential *there*, which is as a device for leaving the subject position (which is also generally the theme position) vacant of content; *there*, that is, may be regarded as an empty 'slot-filler'. The point of this device becomes clearer when it is recalled that the initial element or theme of a clause typically contains given information, and is the point of departure for the introduction of new information later in the clause. However, when the subject of a sentence is an indefinite noun phrase, this means that, contrary to general practice, the subject introduces new information, an indefinite expression being by definition a reference to something that has not been previously mentioned or specified. Hence, in sentences like *Plenty of us are going* or *Some books are in the cupboard*, there is sensed a certain awkwardness, which may be avoided by the introduction of *there*, and the consequent postponement of the 'notional subject' to a later, non-thematic position.[16]

The *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞 recognises the very same properties to be present in the complement of existential *you* in modern Chinese:

16 Quirk et al., 1972, pp. 958–959.

The noun following the verb generally represents something indefinite.[17]

Thus, the *notional* (I would prefer to call it *deep-structure*) SUBJECT of an existential verb normally having indefinite reference and therefore representing new information, there is a reluctance on the part of both English and Chinese to have such a constituent in sentence-initial position. CC, of course, does not require to fill the empty SUBJECT slot. And when a CC existential sentence has an initial constituent such a constituent is a TOPIC, not a SUBJECT.

It should, perhaps, be made clear that transformations moving a deep-structure SUBJECT with indefinite reference into a post-verbal position are not normally required in either English or CC. Thus the surface string 'A strange man came up to me the other day' is perfectly acceptable in English, while in CC the following sentence is also quite normal:

(57) 或問其故。 左/襄 17/附(ii)(286/5)
Someone asked the reason for this.

The reason why the transformation is required for indefinite SUBJECTS in existential sentences but not otherwise becomes clear when one considers the communicative priorities of the existential sentence. In a sentence like (57), although the SUBJECT obviously has indefinite reference and is therefore new information, the remainder of the sentence, namely, the PREDICATE, also represents new information and, indeed, carries the main weight of new information in the sentence; thus, there is no need to tamper with the usual order of SUBJECT-PREDICATE which normally corresponds, as Chafe has pointed out, to a given-new ordering as regards packaging of information. In the case of the existential sentence, however, this is not the case. In such sentences the FINITE VERB is nothing more than the mere statement of existence. Now, existence is the most basic type of predication that may be made; it is, to quote Sandmann, an "elementary statement".[18] To say of a thing that it exists is the very least one can say about it; indeed to mention a thing at all implies its existence (with the exception of

[17] Lü, 1980, p 31, note 4:
動詞後邊的名詞一般代表無定事物。
'The noun following the verb usually represents something indefinite.'

[18] Sandmann, 1979, p. 111.

sentences containing a negated existential verb). Therefore, a simple existential verb in an existential sentence clearly does not carry the main weight of new information; this is borne by the complement of the existential verb, the deep-structure SUBJECT.

One further point regarding the communicative properties of existential sentences. There must obviously be instances when one wants to posit the existence of a deep-structure SUBJECT which represents given information, which would therefore necessitate the use of sentence-initial position for its expression. One is entitled to ask how CC, or English for that matter, would deal with such cases. English uses the verb 'exist', with the deep-structure SUBJECT as surface SUBJECT, e.g., *God exists*. CC uses the device of topicalising the EXISTENTIAL OBJECT, resuming it with *zhi* 之:

(56) 臣弑其君者有之。 孟子 3B/9
It does happen that a minister assassinates his ruler.
Or: Ministers who assassinate their ruler do exist.

The Status of 'Possessive' *you* 有

The preceding analysis has attempted to demonstrate the semantic, syntactic and communicative properties of existential sentences featuring *you*. There remains to analyse the syntax of those instances where *you* is deemed to signify possession. It appears to me that there are two possible paths one could take: one involves treating possessive *you* as a separate lexical item, with semantic and syntactic properties different from existential *you*; the other regards *you* as consistently existential and makes it possible to give a unified account of *you*. Let us commence with a typical possessive sentence:

(58) 吾有命。 墨子 27/61
I have the mandate.

Here, the initial constituent is not a locative phrase and cannot be resumed in post-verbal position by *yan* 焉. The traditional way of understanding the syntax of such an utterance is to take the initial constituent as the SUBJECT of *you*. But notice that in order to do this, one must not only depart from the syntactic rules for *you* in existential sentences; one must also argue different semantics for this kind of *you*, since if *you* is finite in respect of the possessing agent as its SUBJECT it must mean 'have'. Thus, the traditional way of understanding sentences such as the one above necessitates the listing of *you* as two separate lexical items, with different semantic and syntactic ramifications.

One might ask at this point what alternative theory might be available. After all, if the initial constituent is not a topicalised TOPIC and not a SUBJECT, what function *does* it perform? There is, in fact, only one other function that a CC sentence-initial constituent can perform, and that is REAL TOPIC. REAL TOPICS, it will be remembered, stand entirely outside the SUBJECT/ PREDICATE framework and are never resumed within it; similarly, we know that the initial constituent in a 'possessive' sentence cannot be resumed by *yan* 焉 or any other pronoun. Furthermore, if it is remembered that a REAL TOPIC provides the "frame or domain for an assertion which follows", it becomes possible to offer an integrated theory for *you* as existential. With a locative term as TOPIC, the "frame or domain" for the sentence is obviously spatial. But in the case of a REAL TOPIC the domain is of a different order. It may be temporal:

(59) 古者有語曰： 墨子 18/39
In antiquity there was a saying that went thus:

(60) 古有萬國。今有十數焉。 荀子 10/106
In ancient times there were ten thousand states; now there are ten-odd from among them.

When a TOPIC of an existential sentence expresses neither a spatial nor a temporal domain, then the domain for existence of something allows for an interpretation of *possession* by that entity. Thus, the statement: *As regards B, A exists* may be interpreted as: *B has A*. Of course, we have returned to the Japanese model for existential/possessive sentences, namely that the basic

semantic property is that of existence, possession being expressed through existence in the domain of a non-spatial, non-temporal TOPIC. I believe the evidence presented previously against the claim that *you* is possessive in existential sentences means that, if one wants a single, integrated theory for *you*, the only contender is one based on an overall semantic value for *you* of existence.

A Note on Existential Quantification

It was seen that the group of words, *ge* 各, *mo* 莫, *huo* 或, *shu* 孰, *shei* 誰 functioning as SUBJECT quantify a constituent functioning as TOPIC:

(43) 宋人 或 得玉。 左/襄 15/附(iii)(283/4)
TOPIC SUBJECT PREDICATE
(As regards) someone acquired a
men of Song piece of jade.

This pattern maps to the following logical proposition:

As for the a member did Y.
class X of it

In this pattern the quantified member is delimited by the attributes contingent in its case: syntactically, the member, as SUBJECT, is delimited by what is said of it in the PREDICATE.

Consider now the following sentence:

(61) 宋人有耕田者。 韓非子 49/1/33
There was a man of Song who was ploughing his field.

This pattern may be analysed as follows:

宋人 有 耕田者。
TOPIC FINITE VERB EXISTENTIAL OBJECT
(As regards) there was one who was ploughing his field.
men of Song
As for the there exists a member (or members)
class X who did Y.

In the syntax representative of this type the quantified member is delimited again by the attributes contingent in its case; but now the predication 耕田 'plough a field' has been subsumed

into the endocentric NP 耕田者 in which it modifies the HEAD substitute *zhe* 者,[19] while the main predication merely asserts that a member with the attributes described in the subsumed predication exists.

These two patterns convey very similar information; nevertheless, it is still possible to discern a difference, albeit slight, in their communicative properties in narrative writing, which is the usual environment in which such patterns find themselves. Both quantify a member (or members) of a class with specific attributes. In the pattern using *huo* 或, the main weight of new information is borne by the PREDICATE, which is a *verb phrase*; in the pattern involving *you* 有, the main weight of new information falls on the EXISTENTIAL OBJECT, which is a *noun phrase.* Thus the former pattern is used to introduce an episode in the narrative, while the latter serves to introduce an actor in it.

Harbsmeier has also examined these patterns. He does not differentiate between them as to their narrative functions, but as being indefinite existential quantification in the former case and definite existential quantification in the latter.[20] I would disagree with the proposition that in the latter pattern the existential quantification is definite. I have argued that the complement of existential *you* 有 is a deep-structure SUBJECT which follows that verb precisely because it has *indefinite* reference (see p. 114). Moreover, in his discussion on the notion of definiteness, Chafe has this to say:

> It is therefore of some interest in the communicative situation whether I think you already know and can identify the particular referent I have in mind. If I think you can, I will give this item the status of definite. The assumption in this case is not just "I assume you already know this referent," but also "I assume you can pick out, from all the referents that might be characterized in this way, the one I have in mind."[21]

It is my view that these requirements are simply not met in the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 pattern. Thus in (61) (and in all cases of the pattern), the NP marked off by *zhe* 者 cannot be assumed to

19 A discussion of the HEAD substitute *zhe* 者 is provided in chapter five.

20 Harbsmeier, 1981, pp. 88–95.

21 Chafe, 1976, p. 39.

be known to the listener: indeed, if it were, we would have to render not '*one/someone* who was ploughing' but '*the one* (I know you know who I mean) who was ploughing'. This kind of definiteness appears to be entirely absent from the pragmatics of the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 pattern.

A further word on the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 pattern. On the surface it might seem reasonable to argue that the syntactic structure of this pattern is:

After all, to say that a set contains members is surely an example of possession. Unfortunately, this argument does not conform to the syntactic principles already observed. As a basic syntactic rule, SUBJECTS, although deletable, are not eliminable. In particular, it has been demonstrated that for *you* 有 to be understood as possessive, an identifiable, *specific* possessing agent is required which is deletable but not eliminable. If we translate these syntactic requirements into logical and communicative parameters, it would make it impossible for a CC sentence to state that a subset exists without any regard, so far as the pragmatics of the utterance are concerned, to the 'possessing' set. And yet we have already encountered just such an example:

(48) 有以為未始有物者。 莊子 2/40
There were some who believed that there had not yet begun to be things.

Here the pattern is similar to that in (61) above, except that the initial constituent is lacking. Again, there is no question of it being deleted: all the information that is conveyed in this sentence is contained in the surface string. It is clear, then, that the pattern for (61) represents an endocentric structure in which the initial constituent stands as MODIFIER to the remainder and is eliminable, and that the syntactic arrangement which conforms to this kind of sentence is TOPIC/COMMENT, *not* SUBJECT/PREDICATE.

While examining quantification with existential *you* 有, we may consider one further pattern:

TOPIC	FINITE VERB	EXISTENTIAL OBJECT
Y	(*you* 有)	(NUMBER)
(As regards) the class Y	there are	X number of members.

The logical proposition being put here is that of inclusive numerical quantification: it is a statement of the total number of members countable within a particular class:

(62) 不孝有三。 孟子 4A/26
There are three kinds of unfilial behaviour.

(63) 凡劫有三。 韓非子 16/2/1
Generally speaking there are three ways of usurping power.

(64) 師術有四。 荀子 14/23
The methods of the teacher are four.

Particle Marking for Contrastive Focus

Much of the discussion in this chapter has concerned itself with the communicative properties of sentence-initial constituents, and an attempt has been made to show that there is a direct relationship between two particular properties of such constituents: that they provide the 'subject of discourse' by representing the *given information* in an utterance; and may also be imbued with a degree of contrastive focus. It has further been argued that the degree of contrastive focus present is greater in the case of a topicalised constituent than in the case of one performing a function which is inherently sentence-initial, namely SUBJECT or REAL TOPIC, with the exception of topicalised COMPLEMENTS OF PLACE; these generally occur in existential sentences to provide a "hitching post for the new knowledge" represented by the deep-structure or "notional" SUBJECT appearing in the surface structure as the EXISTENTIAL OBJECT. We shall now consider another means by which CC is able to enhance the contrastive focus of certain constituents, especially those functioning as SUBJECT or REAL TOPIC, that is, by particle marking.

The Particle *ze* 則

It can probably be stated without fear of contradiction that the common view among sinologists concerning the function of the particle *ze* 則is that it is a conjunction marking off a subordinate, typically a conditional clause. Thus, the pattern: X *ze* 則 Y is normally taken to mean: If X then Y. While this seems to work reasonably well in rendering a large number of cases, it is my view that such an understanding of *ze* 則 is inadequate and not founded on sound principles. Its inadequacy is evidenced in this appeal by Harbsmeier:

> Saying that *ze* 則 sometimes seems to occur between subject and predicate will *not* do: we want an *explanation* for these kinds of *ze* 則.[22]

The purpose of this section is to propose a coherent theory for all occurrences of the particle *ze* 則 based on considerations of the syntactic functions and communicative properties of the constituents with which it is associated.

Apart from its more common function as a particle, *ze* 則 was originally a lexical item, a noun meaning 'law', 'rule', 'pattern'. In a famous quotation from the Odes we see it used precisely thus:

(65) 有物有則。 詩經 260/1
For each thing there is a law.

Transferring this lexical meaning to the particle, we may formulate an initial logical interpretation of the pattern X *ze* 則 Y, which we might more properly rewrite as:

X *ze* 則 Y (where Y = RULE X)
In the case of X, the rule is that appropriate to X.

Taking the argument a stage further, since it is the case that 'for each thing there is a rule', it must follow that if the 'thing' is different, then the rule for it must also be different. Thus,

[22] Harbsmeier, 1981, p. 211:

logically speaking, that which follows *ze* depends entirely on what precedes it: alter the preceding element and the succeeding element no longer necessarily holds good.

Applying this principle to the syntactic forms of SUBJECT/ PREDICATE and TOPIC/ COMMENT, whenever either of the above patterns have their two immediate constituents separated by *ze*, stress is laid on the fact that the latter constituent is regarded as the 'rule' for the former, with the implication that for any other SUBJECT or TOPIC the 'rule' will be different. The overall effect on the communicative properties is to place a high degree of contrastive focus on the constituent preceding *ze*. Dobson seems to have noticed this essential property of the particle:

> The conjunction of sequential connection tzer (則) *tsək, occurring as a copula, is both contrastive and restrictive, "A rather than, or in contrast to B, is of the class C." [23]

And he gives the following example:

> 吾今則可以見矣。 "As far as my circumstances today are concerned [in contrast to those of yesterday] I could see him." (lit: my-today-copula-could see him.) (Mencius 3A.5.13) [24]

Although I believe Dobson is mistaken in regarding *ze* as a copula, I have no doubt that in identifying its contrastive properties he has spotted something fundamental concerning its use as a particle.

SUBJECT NPs are commonly marked off by *ze*. As with any illustration of contrastive focus, the effect is more clearly felt when there is an explicit comparison between two NPs. But even when this is not the case an implied contrast is always felt between the marked NP and some other, for which the 'rule' would be different:

(66) 晉之乘、楚之檮杌、魯之春秋一也。
其事則齊桓、晉文。其文則史。 孟子 4B/21
The Sheng of Jin, the Dao Wu of Chu, the Spring and Autumn annals of Lu are all one. Their subject matter concerns Duke Huan of Qi and Duke Wen of Jin. Their written style is historiographical.

[23] W.A.C. Dobson, *Late Archaic Chinese*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), p. 112.

[24] Ibid., p. 112.

(67) 先生之志則大矣。
先生之號則不可。 孟子 6B/4
Your aspirations are certainly lofty; it's your mode of presentation that's unacceptable.

(68) 敬人有道：賢者則貴而敬之。
不肖者則畏而敬之。 荀子 13/39
There are ways of respecting others: someone who is able and virtuous respects them out of esteem; someone who is not respects them out of fear.

(69) 故百事廢財物詘而禍亂起。
王公則病不足於上。
庶人則凍餒羸瘠於下。 荀子 18/87
Therefore, when affairs are neglected material things are used up, and disaster and chaos arise. The aristocracy worry about insufficiency above, while the masses suffer cold, hunger and penury below.

(70) 小人恐矣。君子則否。 左/僖 26/4 (128/2)
The petty man is afraid; the superior man is not.

(71) 此則知者之道也，先王之所以有天下者也。
今王公大人天下之諸侯則不然。 墨子 19/10
This is the way of wise men and the means by which the former kings possessed the empire. The rulers of today, on the other hand, are not like this.

(72) 今我則已有謂矣。 莊子 2/51
Now, for my part I have already referred to something. (Graham's translation)[25]

(73) 惡之來也己則取之。 左/宣 13/4 (201/4)
When evil comes it is oneself who has brought it on.

(74) 傳曰：君者舟也。庶人者水也。
水則載舟，水則覆舟。 荀子 9/21
The saying goes: the ruler is the boat, the people are the water. It's the water that supports the boat; it's the water that overturns it.

(75) 鳥則擇木。木豈能擇鳥。 左/哀 11/6 (483/12)
It's the bird that chooses the tree; how could the tree choose the bird?

[25] Graham, 1981, p. 55.

(76) 今夫水博而躍之可使過顙；激而行之
可使在山。是豈水之性哉。其埶則然也。 孟子 6A/2
Water, if you strike it and make it splash up, can be made to go up above your forehead; if you dam it up and channel it, it can be made to remain up on a hill. How can this be the nature of water? It is its circumstances that are like that.

REAL TOPIC NPs marked off by *ze* are not so frequently encountered as SUBJECTS, but are still not uncommon:

(77) 勞苦之事則爭先。
饒樂之事則能讓。 荀子 2/22
In the case of an arduous and unpleasant matter he (the superior man) strives to be first; in the case of an enriching or pleasant matter he is able to give way.

(78) 冬日則飲湯。夏日則飲水。 孟子 6A/5
In the winter I drink soup; in the summer I drink water.

(79) 泠風則小和。飄風則大和。 莊子 2/7
In a gentle breeze they (the hollows) answer faintly; but in a howling gale the chorus is gigantic. (Watson's translation)[26]

(80) 始吾有虞於子。今則已矣。 左/昭 6/附(i)(360/11)
At first I had expectations of you. Now they are no more.

Topicalised OBJECTS are marked off by *ze* 則 only very rarely. This, I believe, is due to the fact that, as we have seen, the moving of an OBJECT to sentence-initial position is sufficient to ascribe to it contrastive focus of a substantial degree, the addition of a *ze* 則 having little further effect. Another reason is that there is also the expedient of the infixing of an OBJECT for contrastive focus, which I shall discuss later in this chapter. I shall include the only three cases I have been able to find, all of which, perhaps significantly, display explicit contrast between pairs of topicalised OBJECTS:

(81) 吾弟則愛之。秦人之弟則不愛也。 孟子 6A/4
My own younger brother I love; the younger brother of a man of Qin I do not love.

[26] Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), pp. 36–37.

(82) 所惡則能得之其主而罪之。
所愛則能得之其主而賞之。 韓非子 7/1/13
Those whom they (the treacherous ministers of the age) hate they are able to penalise by getting it (the ruler's prerogative to punish) from their ruler; those whom they love they are able to reward by getting it (the ruler's prerogative to reward) from their ruler.

(83) 凡公女嫁于敵國，姨妹則上卿送之以禮於先君。
公子則下卿送之。 左/宣 3/6 (28/2)
As a general rule when a woman of a ducal house is married to a state of equal rank, if it is a sister (of a ruling duke), a senior minister escorts her , so as to show respect for their late father. Daughters of the duke, a junior minister escorts.

Sentence-initial COMPLEMENTS OF PLACE marked off by *ze* seem to be even rarer: I have found only the following two examples, the second of which also has the governing MARKER OF PLACE moved in the topicalisation:

(84) 北海則有走馬吠狗焉。 荀子 9/57
南海則有羽翮齒革曾青丹乾焉。 荀子 9/58
In the far north there are fleet-footed horses and howling dogs. In the far south there are feathers, tusks, hides, pure copper and cinnabar.

(85) 於大國雖公子亦上卿送之。
天子則諸卿皆行。公不自送。
於小國則上大夫送之。 左/宣 3/6 (28/3)
(This passage continues immediately from (83) above.) If she is married to a greater state, then even if she is (only) the duke's daughter a senior minister will escort her. If it is to the emperor, all the ministers go; the duke does not personally escort her. If it is to a smaller state, a senior grandee will escort her.

Ze 則 is also occasionally used in conjunction with the particle *ruo* 若 (sometimes *ruofu* 若夫 or *nairuo* 乃若) in phrase-initial position, and most instances of this phenomenon seem to be found in two texts, the Mencius and the *Xunzi*:

(86) 學惡乎始，惡乎終。曰：
其數則始乎誦經，終乎讀禮。
其義則始乎為士，終乎為聖人。
真積力久則入。學至乎沒而後止也。
故學數有終。若其義則不可須臾舍。 荀子 1/26

Where does learning begin and where does it end? I say, as to its schedule, it begins with reciting the classics and ends with the reading of the ritual texts. As to its objective, it begins with being a scholar and ends with being a sage. If one truly accumulates one's efforts over a long period one will enter (into sagehood). Learning only stops when one reaches death. Therefore, the schedule of learning has an end to it; its objective, on the other hand, cannot be relinquished for a single moment.

(87) 由堯舜至於湯五百餘歲。
若禹皋陶則見而知之。
若湯則聞而知之。 孟子 7B/38
From Yao and Shun to Tang there are over five hundred years. Yu and Gao Yao knew it (i.e., the Way of Yao and Shun) from seeing it; Tang knew it from hearing about it.

To render "Those like Yu and Gao Yao ..." would be mistaken: when Mencius wishes to express that he uses the HEAD substitute *zhe* 者:

(88) 若寡人者可以保民乎哉。 孟子 1A/7
Might someone like me protect the people?

There is an example from *Mozi* which seems to have *ru* 如 in the same capacity:

(89) 如彼則大厚。
如此則大薄。 墨子 25/82
That one is too munificent; this one too paltry.

The appearance of *fu* 夫 as part of a formula marking contrastive focus leads one to speculate about its use when it precedes a constituent in nominal function on its own. This phenomenon has not yet been properly investigated and unfortunately I am not able to do so here; but there do seem to be instances where *fu* 夫 is present when contrastive focus is implied:

(90) 夫是之謂德操。 荀子 1/50
It is this that is referred to as virtue.

(91) 夫我乃行之，反而求之不得吾心。
夫子言之，於我心有戚戚然。 孟子 1A/7
It was *me* who did it, and when I turned within myself to seek out (the reason) I could not grasp my own mind. But when *you* mentioned it there was sadness in my heart.

In the above example *nai* 乃 is used to reinforce the contrast, its function being somewhat reminiscent of *ze* 則. (Incidentally, the second *fu* 夫 is not contrastive but forms part of *fuzi* 夫子 'you'.)

Finally, I offer D.C. Lau's translation of this passage from the Analects since he regards, rightly in my view, the two constituents marked off by *fu* 夫 as contrastive:

(92) 是聞也，非達也。夫達也者質直而好義，
察言而觀色，慮以下人。在邦必達，在家必達。
夫聞也者色取仁而行違，居之不疑。
在邦必聞，在家必聞。 論語 12/20
That is being known, not getting through. Now the term "getting through" describes a man who is straight by nature and fond of what is right, sensitive to other people's words and observant of the expression on their faces, and always mindful of being modest. Such a man is bound to get through whether he serves in a state or a noble family. On the other hand, the term "being known" describes a man who has no misgivings about his own claim to benevolence when all he is doing is putting up a facade of benevolence which is belied by his deeds. Such a man is sure to be known, whether he serves in a state or in a noble family.[27]

Infixing for Contrastive Focus

This chapter has discussed the communicative properties of moved constituents. To close it we shall look at a special type of transformation which involves the movement to an INFIX position which is situated between the SUBJECT and FINITE VERB.

Infixed REAL TOPICS

Occasionally the following pattern occurs:

SUBJECT REAL TOPIC PREDICATE

where the TOPIC is infixed between the SUBJECT and PREDICATE. The effect is to place extra emphasis on the TOPIC, usually to heighten its contrastive focus:

[27] D.C. Lau, *Confucius: The Analects*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979), p. 116.

(93) 故君子居必擇鄉，游必就士。 荀子 1/12
Thus, the superior man, as regards his place of residence, is sure to select a village community. As regards those with whom he consorts, he is sure to select men of learning.

(94) 君子食無求飽，居無求安。 論語 1/14
The superior man, as regards his food, does not seek any satiation. As regards his dwelling, he does not seek any comfort.

Infixed OBJECTS

It has already been observed that the topicalisation of an OBJECT is used to effect contrastive focus. In that pattern a constituent is moved into TOPIC position and is resumed in OBJECT position by the third-person OBJECT pronoun *zhi* 之.

There is another pattern in which the OBJECT is moved for contrastive focus (arguably of an even greater degree) not into TOPIC position but into the INFIX position. Again, the moved constituent is resumed pronominally, but with a difference: the resuming pronoun, instead of occurring in OBJECT position, follows immediately after the moved constituent and is also pre-verbal. A further difference is that the resuming pronoun is not restricted to being *zhi* 之; it may also be the demonstrative pronoun *shi* 是:

(95) 吾斯之未能信。 論語 5/6
This I have not been able to believe.

(96) 齊侯陳諸侯之師，與屈完乘而觀之。
齊侯曰：豈不穀是為。先君之好是繼。 左/僖 4/4 (92/7)
The Marquis of Qi arrayed the armies of the feudal lords in battle formation, and he surveyed them from a chariot with Qu Wan. He said, "How can it be on my account? It's the friendship of the former rulers that we are continuing."

The infixed quality of 不穀 and 先君之好 is not immediately apparent because of the deletion of the SUBJECT. However, the pattern is identical with that of (95).

5

Derived Noun Phrases

This chapter will chiefly examine certain transformations whereby a complex NP is derived from a sentence or non-finite verb phrase, involving a process where a constituent performing a nominal function in the original or 'source' form is pronominally substituted in the derived form. Transformations which are similar in type but do not involve substitution in the derived form will also be considered. Apart from investigating an interesting feature of the language with regard to constituents in nominal functions, the secondary purpose of charting these transformations and demonstrating their morphological forms — in particular those involving the HEAD substitute *zhe* 者 in phrase-final position — is to differentiate constituents which arise from these transformations from those which share the same morphological traits but are in fact non-finite VPs or embedded sentences, which will be discussed in the following two chapters.

The main difficulty in conducting such an analysis with a dead language lies in finding an appropriate source sentence from which the MODIFIER-HEAD structure may be said to be derived. Since one does not have the luxury of a native informant to provide any number of authentic examples demonstrating the derivation, one is forced to rely on the limited number of possibilities which exist in the (preferably concordanced) texts of the period. Consequently, it is not always possible to provide the depth and variety of examples one would like; neither is it always possible to select perfectly matching examples.

Derivations with SUBJECT Substitutes

SUBJECT[A] + PREDICATE[B]

⟶ derived NP (taking one of the following two forms:)
MODIFIER[B] + 之 + HEAD[A]
MODIFIER[B] + HEAD substitute[者]

SOURCE SUBJECT – *chen* 臣 'minister'
PREDICATE – *you/wu gong* 有/無攻 'have/lack achievement'

(1) 故明主之畜臣，臣不得越官而有功。 韓非子 7/2/35
Thus, when an intelligent ruler trains his ministers they will not be able to gain achievement by exceeding their office.

DERIVATION

(2) 故雖有賢君不愛無功之臣。 墨子 1/13
Thus, even a competent ruler will not favour a minister who lacks achievement.

The above derivation maintains the full lexical form of the SUBJECT NP *chen* 臣. However, certain derivations have a HEAD substitute, and the resultant structure is the equivalent of the English 'headless' relative clause, introduced by 'he who', 'that which', etc. In such cases the HEAD, together with the preceding particle of adnominal modification *zhi* 之, are replaced by *zhe* 者:

(3) 無功者受賞則財匱而民望。 韓非子 19/3/29
If those who lack achievement receive rewards, wealth will be lacking and the people will be hopeful (of receiving rewards).

(4) 當魏之方明立辟從憲令之時，有功者必賞，
有罪者必誅。 韓非子 19/5/1
At the time when Wei clarified and established laws and followed statutes and ordinances, those with achievement were sure to be rewarded, those who were at fault were sure to be executed.

It is clear that in this usage *zhe* 者 is a HEAD substitute which replaces a SUBJECT in the source.[1]

[1] Cikoski has referred to this use of *zhe* 者 as a "Nominalizing Head Substitute" in Cikoski, 1970, p. 83.

Derivations with COMPLEMENT OF PLACE Substitutes

For reasons which will become apparent, it is necessary to depart from the customary order adopted hitherto of examining nominal functions by considering COMPLEMENT OF PLACE before OBJECT.

Derivations from sources with COMPLEMENT OF PLACE are seemingly restricted to those with a pronominal substitute. This substitute does not come at the end of the phrase, as was seen in the case of the SUBJECT substitute *zhe*; instead, the substitute *suo* 所 (literally: 'place') is inverted to effectively 'split' the SUBJECT/FINITE VERB phrase complex from the source.

If we assume a source sentence 罪在X 'the blame lies with X' where 罪 is the SUBJECT and X is a COMPLEMENT OF PLACE, then the derived form with the pronoun *suo* 所 substituting for and derived from the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE is 罪所在 'the place where the blame lies':

SOURCE

(5) 罪在楚也。 左/昭 1/附(v)(342/3)
The blame lies with Chu.

DERIVATION

(6) 先王之命唯罪所在各致其辟。 左/襄 25/附(ii)(307/6)
As for the ordinances of the former kings, so long as guilt was present (Literally: 'be it only somewhere where guilt was present), each (ordinance) would bring its punishment to bear.

Rather than take *suo* alone as the HEAD of the derived phrase (which one is loath to do given that it does not occur in phrase-final position), it may be more acceptable to argue that *suo* combines in pre-construction with the FINITE VERB phrase (in the source) to form a noun phrase. Where the SUBJECT in the source requires to be expressed in the derived form, it functions as MODIFIER to the derived *suo*-phrase, and is frequently marked with the particle of adnominal modification *zhi* 之; this is a feature it has in common with SUBJECTS of embedded sentences (see chapter 7). The transformation may be traced thus:

(SUBJECT[A]) + (locative)FINITE VERB[B] + COMPLEMENT OF PLACE

⟶ (MODIFIER[A]) (+ 之) + derived NP [所 + [B]]

Whenever *suo* features in derived forms it always follows this pattern of pre-construction with a verb phrase.

In the above transformation the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE is governed by a FINITE VERB (the locative verb *zai* 在). In fact, COMPLEMENTS OF PLACE are far more frequently governed by the PLACE MARKERS *yu* 于/於. However, the combination *suoyu* 所于/於 is hardly ever met, and the transformation typically results in the deletion of *yu*. (The source sentences make it plain that the graph in question is usually 於).

(SUBJECT[A]) + (FINITE) VERB+COMPLEMENTS[B] + 於 + COMPLEMENT OF PLACE

⟶ (MODIFIER[A]) (+ 之) + derived NP[所 + [B]]

The examples below clearly illustrate the deletion of 於 in the transformation. This requires us to be alert to the possibility that any occurrence of 所 may stand for 所於.

SOURCE

(7) 喜生於好。怒生於惡。 左/昭 25/2 (414/20)
Gladness arises out of loving. Anger arises out of hating.

DERIVATION

(8) 冀之北土馬之所生。 左/昭 4/附(i)(352/1)
The northern lands of Ji are where horses are born.

SOURCE

(9) 謂汶陽之田敝邑之舊也而用師於齊
使歸諸敝邑。 左/成 8/1 (225/13)
(Ji Wen Zi) said, "The lands of Wen Yang being the former territory of Bi Yi, you used your army on Qi and brought about its return to Bi Yi".

DERIVATION

(10) 君若以力，楚國方城以為城，漢水以為池。
雖眾無所用之。 左/僖 4/4 (92/10)
If you use your forces, the state of Chu will use Fang Cheng as its ramparts and the Han River as its moat. Although

(your forces) are numerous, there is nothing on which you could use them.

SOURCE

(11) 今也小國師大國而恥受命焉。
是猶弟子而恥受命於先師。 孟子 4A/8
These days a small state regards a large state as its teacher and yet is ashamed to accept commands from it. This is like a disciple being ashamed to accept commands from his teacher.

DERIVATION

(12) 夫有所受之也。 孟子 7A/35
He had received it from somewhere. (Literally, 'He had somewhere whence he had received it.')

SOURCE

(13) 蔡侯獲罪於其君。 左/昭 11/4 (374/6)
The Marquis of Cai offended his ruler.

DERIVATION

(14) 河非所獲罪也。 左/哀 6/6 (474/14)
It's not the Yellow River that I have offended.

SOURCE

(15) 及其至於王所，與王同筐床，
食芻豢而後悔其泣也。 莊子 2/80
Only when she arrived at the king's palace, shared with him his square couch and ate the flesh of animals fed on hay and grain did she regret her tears.

DERIVATION

(16) 古之人其知有所至矣。 莊子 2/40
The knowledge of the men of old reached somewhere.

Derivations with OBJECT Substitutes

In derivations with OBJECT substitutes the transformation is as follows:

(SUBJECT[A]) + transitive (FINITE) VERB[B] + OBJECT

⟶ (MODIFIER[A]) (+ 之) + derived NP[所 + [B] (+ 者)]

SOURCE

(17) 彼惡知之。 孟子 1A/7
How could they understand?

DERIVATION

(18) 是非汝所知也。
This is not something you understand.

(18) 是非汝所知也。 孟子 4B/31
This is not something you understand.

The above pattern shows an interesting development in the use of *suo* 所 from transformations involving COMPLEMENT OF PLACE to those involving OBJECT. Since *suo* as a lexical item means 'place', there can be little doubt that the development was in this direction. Although it may be argued convincingly that in transformations involving COMPLEMENT OF PLACE, the function of *suo* is that of a pronominal substitute for the COMPLEMENT OF PLACE (bearing in mind its lexical meaning), it is not so easy to conclude that in transformations involving OBJECT *suo* is a pronominal OBJECT substitute. Earlier we saw the use of *zhe* 者 as a HEAD substitute in SUBJECT transformations. It is perhaps significant that, unlike PLACE transformations, where it is not common, one frequently encounters *zhe* in phrase-final position in OBJECT transformations:

(19) 其所待者特未定也。 莊子 6/3
It's just that what it relies on has never been fixed.

(20) 君子所貴乎道者三。 論語 8/4
That which the superior man esteems in the Way is three-fold.

(21) 易牙先得我口之所嗜者也。 孟子 6A/7
Yi Ya was the first to grasp what our palates delight in.

However, phrase-final *zhe* 者 with PLACE transformations is not impossible:

(22) 所立者然也。 荀子 1/11
The place where it stands is like that.

Traditionally, *suo* 所 has been regarded as a relative pronoun standing for an OBJECT. It would appear that the only thing one can say with any degree of certainty concerning *suo* as an element in derived forms is that it may function as a pronoun substituting for a COMPLEMENT OF

PLACE. As for OBJECT transformations, it would not be unreasonable to posit that the *full* morphological form of the transformation includes phrase-final *zhe* 者 as the OBJECT substitute. However, it must be admitted that any hard and fast morphological distinction between OBJECT and PLACE transformations is made more difficult by the existence of examples such as (22). That *suo* probably does not substitute for the OBJECT may be deduced from examples such as the following where the HEAD of the derived phrase is a full noun which is derived from an OBJECT in the source; here *suo* still manages to creep in:

(23) 故將大有為之君必有所不召之臣。 孟子 2B/2
Therefore, a ruler who has much to accomplish is sure to have those ministers whom he does not summon.

(23) 故將大有為之君必有所不召之臣。 孟
Therefore, a ruler who has much to accomplish is sure to have those ministers whom he does not summon.

but quite why it should have found its way into OBJECT transformations from PLACE transformations is a question for which I can supply no satisfactory answer at present.

Derivations with Substitutes for OBJECT of CO-VERB

(SUBJECT[A]) + CO-VERB+OBJECT + (FINITE) VERB+COMPLEMENTS[B]

⟶ (MODIFIER[A]) (+ 之) + derived NP [所 + CO-VERB + [B] (+ 者)]

With substitutes for the OBJECTS of CO-VERBS, a similar process occurs as with OBJECT substitutes generally: *suo* comes immediately before the CO-VERB in the derived form. It is significant that such transformations are also frequently marked with phrase-final *zhe* which, again, one might reasonably wish to regard as the OBJECT substitute. Those involving the CO-VERB *yi* 以 are especially common, the derived phrase meaning 'that by means of which', 'that because of which':

(24) 此心之所以合於王者何也。 孟子 1A/7
What is the reason why such an attitude conforms to being a true king?

(25) 凡禹之所以為禹者以其為仁義法正也。 荀子 23/61
Generally speaking, the reason why Yu was Yu, was because he maintained kindness, righteousness, proper standards and uprightness.

(26) 二者凶器，非所以盡行也。 莊子 4/6
These two are evil tools, they are not the means by which one perfects one's conduct.

One occasionally finds that the *yi* 以 following *suo* has been deleted in the transformation:

(27) 明主之所導制其臣者二柄而已矣。 韓非子 7/1/1
The means by which the wise ruler guides and curbs his ministers is nothing more than the two handles.

(28) 其所取之者義乎不義乎。 孟子 5B/4
Was the means by which he obtained it righteous or not?

(29) 臣之所不弒其君者黨與不具也。 韓非子 8/8/23
The reason why ministers do not assassinate their ruler is because factions are not formed.

Suo is also found, less commonly, in transformations with the CO-VERBS *wei* 為, *yu* 與 and *zi* 自:

(30) 此所為有名也。 荀子 22/15
This is the purpose for which there are names.

(31) 何哉，君所為輕身以先於匹夫者。 孟子 1B/16
What is it, that on account of which Your Lordship demeans Himself to pay deference to a commoner?

(32) 其妻問所與飲食者。 孟子 4B/33
His wife asked with whom he had been drinking and eating.

(33) 聖人以治天下為事者也，
必知亂之所自起。 墨子 14/1
The sage is the person who considers it his duty to bring order to the empire. He necessarily knows whence disorder arises.

Derivations involving Existential Quantification in the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 Pattern

This is a transformation which is not easily illustrated because of the absence of well matched pairs. Perhaps its particular quality might be felt through a comparison of the following examples from Han Feizi:

(34) 奈臣有圖國者何。 韓非子 10/8/7
What can be done if there is a minister who is plotting to take over your state?

(35) 此其臣有姦者必知。 韓非子 47/5/44
In this way, if there is a traitor among his ministers, (the ruler) is sure to know about it.

(36) 然則臣有盡死力以為其主者，
管仲將弗用也。 韓非子 36/6/9
Consequently, if there were ministers who would exert themselves to the utmost for the sake of their ruler, Guan Zhong would not employ them.

(37) 此八人者臣之弒其君者也。 韓非子 44/9/88
These eight men were ministers who assassinated their rulers.

(38) 人臣之爭事而亡其國者皆虺類也。 韓非子 23/17/6
Ministers who lead the state to perdition through quarrelling over affairs are like vipers.

(39) 人臣之欲得官者，
其脩士且以精絜固身；
其智士且以治辯進業。 韓非子 11/5/15
As for those subjects who wish to gain office, the more cultivated among them will consolidate their position by not defiling themselves; the more intellectual among them will advance their careers by being competent and efficient.

Let us now concentrate on the pertinent parts of the above sentences in isolation:

SOURCES

A. 臣有圖國者。
There is a minister who is plotting to take over the state.

B. 其臣有姦者。
There is a minister who is treacherous.

C. 臣有盡死力以為君者。
There are ministers who exert themselves to the utmost for the sake of their ruler.

DERIVATIONS

D. 臣之弒其君者
Ministers who assassinated their rulers

E. 人臣之爭事而亡其國者
Ministers who lead the state to perdition through quarrelling over affairs

F. 人臣之欲得官者
Those subjects who wish to gain office

As we saw earlier, the *you* 有 ... *zhe* 者 pattern is used to assert the existence of a member or members of a class, which members have specific attributes not common to all members of the class (see pp. 117–118). The class in question in all these examples is that of 'ministers' or, in one case, 'subjects', which is expressed using the same word *chen* 臣. Although they do not so function in the sentences from which they are drawn, all three source examples are capable of standing as independent clauses positing the existence of 'ministers', who have certain attributes not common to the class as a whole. In this transformation the EXISTENTIAL OBJECT, which takes the form of VP + *zhe* 者 (itself a derived form with SUBJECT substitution), is made the HEAD of a complex noun phrase, and is modified by what was the TOPIC. The transformation may be represented thus:

TOPIC[A] + 有 + EXISTENTIAL OBJECT(= VP + 者)[B]

⟶ derived NP (which takes the form:)
MODIFIER[A] (+ 之) + HEAD[B]

As for the class X there exist members who do Y.

⟶ The members of the class X who do Y

The examples given as derivations are all complex endocentric NPs whose HEAD is represented by members of a class, and whose MODIFIER is the class itself. Although

it is regrettable that no examples have been found where the lexical items in source and derivation are similar enough to be presented as matching pairs, there is no doubt, in my view, that the pattern in D, E and F is the transformation as described of the pattern in A, B and C. Some further examples of the derived pattern:

(40) 鳥獸之害人者消。 孟子 3B/9
Those birds and beasts which harmed men disappeared.

(41) 其設心以為不若是，是則罪之大者。 孟子 4B/30
He supposed that if he had not acted in this way, that would have been the greatest of all sins.

(42) 是散名之在人者也。 荀子 22/6
These are the common names which apply to people.

(43) 不如鄉人之善者好之，
其不善者惡之。 論語 13/24
It is better if the good men of his village love him and the evil men hate him.

Occasionally the particle *zhi* 之 is deleted from the pattern:

(44) 故群臣其言大而功小者則罰。 韓非子 7/2/14
Therefore, those ministers whose achievemnets do not match up to their words are punished.

(45) 今者王公大人為政於國家者皆欲國家之富，
人民之眾，刑政之治。 墨子 8/1
Nowadays, all those kings, dukes and grandees who govern their respective states desire that their states be prosperous, their people plentiful and their sanctions and administration in good order.

The derived pattern as illustrated above is a fairly common one. However, we must be on our guard when dealing with the general pattern *NP* 之 *VP* 者; we shall see in chapter seven that this surface structure is also used for embedded sentences and not transformations of the type argued here. Furthermore, there are other instances where the pattern is not derived from existential quantification and neither is it an embedded sentence:

(46) 王之為都者臣知五人焉。 孟子 2B/4
Of Your Majesty's city governors I am familiar with five.

The phrase at issue, 王之為都者, definitely does *not* mean 'those kings who are city governors'. If one wants to speculate about the derivation of such a phrase, it might possibly be a transformation from 王有為都者 'Your Majesty *has* city governors.' This would provide an important distinction between possessive and existential *you* 有.

Derivations with A-term SUBJECT Substitutes

In the foregoing analysis we have seen the use of *zhe* 者 as a HEAD substitute in transformations. The phrase in pre-construction with *zhe* in the derived form may be traced back to performing a verbal function in the source form. However, it is possible to find examples of *zhe* in post-construction with constituents which would appear more likely to be performing a nominal function in any conceivable source; indeed, such constituents are often proper nouns:

(47) 二柄者刑德也。 韓非子 7/1/3
The 'two handles' are punishment and favour.

(48) 夫明堂者王者之堂也。 孟子 1B/5
The Hall of Brightness is the hall of a true king.

(49) 南冥者天池也。 莊子 1/2
The Southern Darkness is the Lake of Heaven.

This form is occasionally amplified by the insertion of the particle *ye* 也 between the noun and *zhe*:

(50) 名也者相軋也。知也者爭之器也。 莊子 4/6
A reputation is a matter of striving. Knowledge is a tool for contention.

If one considers the latter form as the complete one and the more common form without *ye* as having that particle deleted (just as it may be deleted after a B-term), we may well be dealing here with a transformation in which the nominal term would have functioned as a B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT in the source (an AB也 sentence indicating a statement of

identity) and what would have been the A-term SUBJECT is replaced by the HEAD substitute *zhe*, as follows:

SUBJECT + PREDICATE[A](=deleted classificatory copula verb
+ B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT + (也))

⟶ derived NP (which takes the form:)
MODIFIER[A] + HEAD substitute 者

This would give a literal meaning for the derived form of something like: 'That which is the Hall of Brightness', 'That which is the Southern Darkness'. Of the full form including *ye* Graham says:

> The particle combination *yeh che* 也者 is equivalent to 'unquote', implying that what is under discussion is the meaning of the preceding word or phrase.[2]

In other words, the phrase marked by (也)者 is being defined.[3] This would not be inconsistent with the above analysis, since of the methods a language might adopt to introduce a term for a definition, the use of a derived phrase having a literal meaning as suggested above would be an acceptable semantic form. It is interesting to note that such phrases nearly always function as A-term SUBJECT in an AB(也) sentence, the very syntactic environment in which one would expect a statement of definition to be made.

The Particle *ye* 也 as a Marker of Sentence-Initial Constituents

We have just been discussing sentence-initial constituents with phrase-final *(ye) zhe* (也)者. As a sequel to that discussion it would be worth looking at a pattern which seems quite similar on the surface, that of a sentence-initial constituent with phrase-final *ye* 也. In the process, we shall also attempt to shed further light on the nature of the particle *ye*.

2 Graham, 1978, p. 140.

3 Gassmann has called this "definitorisches *zhe* 者" in Robert H. Gassmann, *Zur Syntax von Einbettungsstrukturen im Klassischen Chinesisch* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1982), p. 102.

It was suggested in chapter three that *ye* 也 is essentially a pause marker in CC. So far as I am able to tell there is no evidence to suggest that it is anything other than this. The distribution of *ye* in CC is as follows: in sentence-final position, typically marking the termination of a classificatory sentence with copula deleted, but also not infrequently helping to effect the emphatic affirmation (or, with the negative copula *fei* 非, the denial) of a proposition which takes the form of a sentence containing a surface FINITE VERB (see chapter seven); or in phrase-final position marking a constituent functioning as SUBJECT or TOPIC. The reason why CC should require a pause marker following a B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT has already been discussed in chapter three; essentially, the pause makes it clear that the A-term and B-term constitute a sentence and are not simply two juxtaposed terms (see p. 84). We shall now examine the use of *ye* as a pause marker after sentence-initial constituents.

If we consider Zhao's observations concerning certain particles in MC we find a striking similarity between their possible sentence positions and those of *ye* in CC:

> *Pause Particles and Interrogative Particles.* When we examine the four pause particles *a*, *ne*, *me* and *ba* which can occur after a subject, we find that they all occur at the end of questions...[4]

Of course, I am not suggesting that *ye* is an interrogative particle in CC. However, the ability of certain MC particles to either be phrase-final for a sentence-initial constituent or sentence-final must surely alert us to the possibility that this might be a trait inherited from particles in early Chinese.

If we also take into account phonological data further comparisons are possible. In Karlgren's reconstructions the archaic reading of *ye* is *DIA. This particle would then have the same final as two of the MC particles commented upon by Zhao, namely *a* 啊 and *ba* 吧. If we agree with Zhao's view that the pause particle *ba* is a fusion of *bu* 不 and *a* 啊,[5] this leaves *a* as the basic MC particle which shares the same final as *ye*/*DIA and the enjoys the same kind of

4 Zhao, 1968, p. 81.

5 Ibid., p. 81.

distribution. Now *a* is of further interest in that when it occurs as a sentence-final particle it is not restricted to interrogatives; from the various usages attributed to it by Zhao[6] it may also provide exclamatory or affirmative emphasis, just as *ye*/*DIA is involved in the pattern used for the affirmation and denial of propositions in CC (see chapter seven).

The purpose of all this comparison between CC *ye*/*DIA 也 and MC *a* 啊has been to suggest a reason for the use of *ye*/*DIA as a pause particle after sentence-initial constituents in CC. Zhao suggests that an important function of *a* as a pause particle is:

> ...to give the hearer time to let what is said sink in...[7]

Turning now to CC it is interesting that this seems to be the very reason for *ye*/*DIA occurring after a sentence-initial constituent. It is, for example, found after proper nouns to cement in the listener's consciousness the identity of the SUBJECT or TOPIC:

(51) 回也視予猶父也，予不得視猶子也。 論語 11/11
Hui regarded me as a father, but I failed to regard him as my son.

But perhaps the most common use of *ye*/*DIA with sentence-initial constituents in CC is to mark off complex phrases or embedded sentences. How appropriate that these comparatively lengthy constituents should be marked off by a pause particle to allow the speaker to gather his breath and the listener to separate and fix in his mind the initial constituent:

(52) 人性之無分於善不善也
猶水之無分於東西也。 孟子 6A/2
Man's nature not making distinction between good and evil is like water not making any distinction between east and west.

(53) 白馬之白也無以異於白人之白也。 孟子 6A/4
The whiteness of a white horse is in no way different from the whiteness of a white man.

(54) 天下之無道也久矣。 論語 3/24
The empire has long been without the Way.

6 Ibid., pp. 803–806.

7 Ibid., p. 806.

(55) 其自視也亦若此矣。 莊子 1/17
The way he regards himself is also like this.

(56) 昭文之鼓琴也，師曠之枝策也，惠子之據梧也，
三子之知幾乎。 莊子 2/43
Zhao Wen plucking the zither, Music Master Kuang beating time with his baton, Hui Zi leaning on the parasol tree, was not the knowledge of these three men very near the mark?

(57) 晉侯之入也秦穆姬屬賈君焉。 左/僖 15/14 (109/1)
When the Marquis of Jin entered, Qin Mu Ji entrusted the Lord of Jia to him.

(58) 聖王之立法也其賞足以勸善，其威足以勝暴，
其備足以完法。 韓非子 26/1/1
When a sage-king establishes laws, his rewards are sufficient to encourage goodness, his authority is sufficient to overwhelm violence, his provisions sufficient to keep the laws intact.

It is noticeable that unlike the sentence-initial constituents marked off by *zhe* 者, those marked off by *ye* are by no means confined to being A-term SUBJECTS in statements of definition.

Morphological Ambiguities

At the beginning of this chapter it was pointed out that one of its stated aims was to identify the provenance of certain morphological forms involving phrase-final *zhe* 者 in order to anticipate possible confusion with forms whose surface morphological traits are identical. Of the patterns discussed above, two are of particular interest in this regard. The first is the transformation of a SUBJECT into the HEAD substitute *zhe* in a complex NP whose MODIFIER acted as PREDICATE in the source and which is represented by a VP in the derived form, as in examples (3) and (4). In the following chapter we shall discuss the use of non-finite VPs and these will be seen to be frequently marked off by phrase-final *zhe*, thus giving an identical surface form of VP + 者. However, apart from some genuinely ambiguous examples, such phrases may not be rendered by using the formulae 'he who', 'those who', 'that which'. As will hopefully be

demonstrated, the purpose of *zhe* in such cases is not to represent a constituent from a source structure but merely to indicate that the phrase which it terminates, a VP which under other circumstances might function as a PREDICATE, is in this instance performing a nominal function.

The second form which might cause some difficulty is that engendered in derivations involving existential quantification, met in examples (37)–(45). Embedded sentences not uncommonly appear in this form, either with or without the particle *zhi* 之 (cf., (44), (45)). We shall see in chapter seven that the form NP (之) VP 者 may indicate an embedded sentence. Again, there is no possibility of rendering the structure using a formula such as 'those who', and *zhe* cannot be traced back to some constituent in a source structure.

6

Nominalisation 1: Non-finite Verb Phrases

Verb Phrases

What is meant by a verb phrase (VP)? The term has been defined by Crystal as follows:

> In GENERATIVE grammar, the verb phrase (VP) has a much broader definition, being equivalent to the whole of the predicate of a sentence, as is clear from the expansion of S as NP + VP in PHRASE STRUCTURE grammar.[1]

According to this understanding of a VP it would be impossible for such a thing as a non-finite VP to exist since a PREDICATE must, by necessity, be finite. Because the morphology of English does not allow a VP which functions as PREDICATE to also function as, say, a SUBJECT it is sensible, at least in the case of English, to restrict the use of the term VP to a PREDICATE phrase, as the definition above does. The morphological demands of English in this respect are easily illustrated. In the sentence *John collects stamps* the PREDICATE phrase is *collects stamps.* Now, this VP could not stand as a SUBJECT in English (except in citation form) without first undergoing morphological change; either by being prefixed by the infinitive morpheme *to*, or, as is more appropriate in this case, by attaching to the verb the suffix *-ing*: *Collecting stamps is John's hobby.*

In Chinese no corresponding morphological variation is necessary, although it may occur. Therefore, for our purposes we shall extend the definition as given above so that in CC a VP is taken to mean any constituent which may *potentially* function as PREDICATE.[2]

1 Crystal, 1980, p. 374.

2 Since a CC PREDICATE may consist of a single lexical item (see chapter one, (1)–(5)), it is clear that the term 'verb phrase' extends to constituents consisting of a single lexical item, and is not restricted to 'phrases' in the strict sense of that word.

Consider the following examples:

(1) 違命不孝。 左/閔 2/附(ii)(84/20)
To disobey orders is unfilial.

(2) 為人子者患不孝。 左/襄 23/11 (300/3)
He who is a son is concerned about being unfilial.

(3) 宋公違命。 左/文 10/7 (161/11)
The Duke of Song disobeyed the order.

In (1) the VP *bu xiao* 不孝 'be unfilial' is the PREDICATE, the SUBJECT being the phrase *wei ming* 違命 'disobey orders'. In (2) 不孝 is not the PREDICATE but is the OBJECT of *huan* 患 'be concerned about'. Furthermore, the SUBJECT of (1) 違命 is itself a VP which functions as PREDICATE in (3).

These observations may be processed to formulate the following rules concerning VPs in CC:

1. Any constituent which may function as a PREDICATE is deemed a VP.
2. Any VP which, in a given occurrence, is not finite in respect of some SUBJECT does not function as a PREDICATE, but performs one of the established nominal functions.

There has to be some qualification to these rules, made necessary by the exceptional characteristics of the 'minor' verbal functions. We have seen that apart from FINITE VERB (which is the function that dominates a PREDICATE) there are other verbal functions to be found within a PREDICATE. These are CO-VERB, MARKER OF PLACE, MARKER OF COMPARISON and SECONDARY FINITE VERB. It is obvious that, of these, SECONDARY FINITE VERB cannot be non-finite; the others may all be said to form non-finite VPs in conjunction with their governed complements. However, none of these phrases performs any of our established nominal functions.

The above qualifications apart, the general rule which I shall attempt to demonstrate is that non-finite VPs occur in nominal functions and, in so doing, may be regarded as being *nominalised.*

Let us now examine the occurrence of non-finite VPs in nominal functions. To accompany several of the examples of non-finite VPs in nominal functions I shall also give examples of the same or comparable VPs functioning as PREDICATE following immediately. We shall see that the only morphological concession CC makes to the identifying of a VP as non-finite is to occasionally mark it with a phrase-final *zhe* 者. Any VP so marked is explicitly nominalised and lacks the potential to function as PREDICATE. It will be remembered that there is a transformation which also results in the surface string VP + *zhe* 者 (see p. 130). In such phrases the phrase-final *zhe* is the pronominal HEAD of an endocentric NP, substituting for a constituent functioning as SUBJECT in the source for the derivation, meaning 'he who', 'that which', etc. Care must be taken not to confuse such a phrase with a non-finite VP marked off by *zhe*. Occasionally there might be some ambiguity as to how to take such a phrase, but the context will generally make clear what kind of phrase is intended.

Non-finite VPs Functioning as SUBJECT

(4) 喜生於好。怒生於惡。 左/昭 25/2 (414/20)
Gladness arises out of loving. Anger arises out of hating.

(4a) 子產喜。 左/襄 25/附(v)(308/7)
Zi Chan was pleased.

(4b) 鄭人怒。 左/桓 10/4 (36/10)
The people of Zheng were angry.

(5) 事親若曾子者可也。 孟子 4A/20
To serve one's parents like Zeng Zi is acceptable.

(5a) 文王事昆夷。 孟子 1B/3
King Wen served the Kun barbarians.

(6) 行小忠則大忠之賊也。 韓非子 10/2/41
Practising petty loyalty is damaging to greater loyalty.

(6a) 為人臣者散公財以說民人，
行小惠以取百姓。 韓非子 9/1/63
Those who are ministers distribute public funds to sway the people, they practise petty generosity to win over the common people.

(7) 子張問仁於孔子。孔子曰：
能行五者於天下為仁也。 論語 17/5
Zi Zhang asked Confucius about being benevolent. Confucius said, "Being able to put 'the five' into practice in the empire counts as being benevolent."

As OBJECT:

(8) 是故文、武興則民好善。
幽、厲興則民好暴。 孟子 6A/6
For this reason, when Kings Wen and Wu arose the people loved goodness; when Kings You and Li arose the people loved violence.

(8a) 有性善，有性不善。 孟子 6A/6
There are natures which are good and natures which are bad.

(8b) 凶歲子弟多暴。 孟子 6A/7
In the event of an unfavourable harvest the young men are mostly violent.

(9) 不知無害為君子。知之無損為小人。 荀子 8/35
Not knowing does not stand in the way of being a superior man. Knowing does not stand in the way of being a petty man.

(9a) 故人知謹注錯慎習俗，大積靡則為君子矣。
縱性情而不足問學則為小人矣。 荀子 8/116
Therefore, if a man knows how to be prudent in his dealings and customs, and magnifies traditions of long standing, he is deemed a gentleman. If he indulges his natural inclinations and does not attach importance to learning, he is deemed a petty man.

(10) 季路問事鬼神。 論語 11/12
Ji Lu asked about serving ghosts and spirits.
(cf., (5a))

As OBJECT of CO-VERB:

(11) 政者正也。子帥以正孰敢不正。 論語 12/17
Good government is a matter of being upright. If you lead by being upright who would dare not to be upright.

(12) 是以為之起禮義制法度，
以矯飾人之情性而正之。 荀子 23/7
For this reason, they initiated the principles of the Rites and instituted regulations for them and corrected people by straightening and refining their natures.

As COMPLEMENT OF PLACE:

(4) 喜生於好，怒生於惡。 左/昭 25/2 (414/20)
Gladness arises out of loving. Anger arises out of hating.

(13) 道在不可見。用在不可知。 韓非子 5/2/1
The Way lies in being impossible to see. Its use lies in being impossible to know.

(13a) 其形可見。 韓非子 2/8/10
Its form may be seen.

(13b) 韓則居中國，展轉不可知。 韓非子 2/7/27
Han is situated among the central states. Which way it might turn cannot be known.

(14) 人之患在好為人師。 孟子 4A/23
The problems of mankind lie in liking to be a teacher of men.

(15) 至於無別然後止。 荀子 22/25
One only stops when one reaches the point where there are no distinctions.

As CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT:

(16) 故王之不王不為也，非不能也。 孟子 1A/7
Therefore, the fact that Your Majesty does not rule as a true king is a case of 'not doing'; it's not a case of 'not being able'.

(16a) 狹太山以超北海，語人曰：我不能，
是誠不能也。 孟子 1A/7
As for tucking Mount Tai under your arm and bestriding the Northern Sea, to say to someone, "I cannot," this is truly a case of not being able.

(17) 予惡乎知說生之非惑邪。
予惡乎知惡死之非弱喪而不知歸者邪。 莊子 2/78
How do I know that taking pleasure in life is not a case of being deluded? How do I know that hating death is not a case of losing one's way when young and not knowing the way back?

(18) 百發失一不足謂善射。 荀子 1/43
To shoot a hundred arrows and miss once is not enough to be referred to as 'being good at archery'.

(18a) 其為人也善射以好思。 荀子 21/61
As for the kind of person he is, he is skilled at conjecture and is fond of reflection.

(19) 譬若欲眾其國之善射御之士者。 墨子 8/5
It's like wanting to increase the state's fine archers and charioteers.

(20) 此匹夫之勇，敵一人也。 孟子 1B/3
This is run-of-the-mill valour, it's standing up to a single man.

(21) 譬之是猶舍己之君而事人之君也。 荀子 5/30
This is like abandoning one's ruler and serving someone else's.

(22) 治天下之國若治一家。 墨子 13/44
Governing the states under Heaven is like governing a single family.

(22a) 今大者治天下，其次治大國。 墨子 4/4
Now, the very greatest govern the empire, those who come next govern large states.

(23) 今惡辱而居不仁是猶惡濕而居下也。 孟子 2A/4
Now, hating shame and abiding in unkindness is like hating the damp and abiding in a low-lying spot.

(23a) 北宮錡問曰：周室班爵祿也如之何。
孟子曰：其詳不可得聞也。
諸侯惡害己也而皆去其籍。 孟子 5B/2
Bei Gong Qi asked, "What was the arrangement for ranks and emoluments of the House of Zhou?" Mencius said, "The details cannot be learned. The feudal lords hated (the possibility of) their being harmful to them and did away with all their records."

(24) 是以無有為有。 莊子 2/22
This is regarding non-existence as existence.

(24a) 齊宣王問曰：交鄰國有道乎。
孟子曰：有。 孟子 1B/3
King Xuan of Qi asked, "Is there a proper way of diplomacy?" Mencius replied, "There is."

As TOPIC:

(25) 終其天年而不中道夭者是知之盛也。 莊子 6/2
To live out one's full span without dying prematurely along the way, this is the full flowering of knowledge.

(26) 聖人吾不得而見之矣。
得見君子者斯可矣。 論語 7/26
Sages I do not get to see; getting to see a superior man is possible. (PREDICATE and TOPIC respectively)

(27) 是以夫事其親者不擇地而安之孝之至也。 莊子 4/41
Therefore, when it comes to serving one's parents, making them feel at ease without being able to choose the place where they live is the height of filial piety. (cf., (5a))

(28) 然則能不能與可不可其不同遠矣。 荀子 23/74
Consequently, capability and possibility are far removed from each other.

(The above example is worthy of comment since the non-finite VPs functioning as TOPIC are conjoined using *yu* 與, which is generally thought of as a coordinating conjunction of nouns in CC. Since it is clear that in this case it conjoins VPs, *yu* might more accurately be described as a coordinating conjunction of constituents in nominal functions.)

(29) 故矯上之失，詰下之邪，治亂，決繆，絀羨，
齊非，一民之軌，莫如法。 韓非子 6/5/40
Therefore, when it comes to correcting the mistakes of superiors, bringing subordinates to account for their misdeeds, restoring order, eliminating error, doing away with excess, ironing out what is wrong and unifying the people's standards, nothing is as good as laws.

(29a) 能法之士勁直；聽用，
且矯重人之姦行。 韓非子 11/1/21
A man who is capable of upholding the law is steadfast and straight; if listened to and employed, he will correct the treacherous behaviour of people of importance.

Non-finite VP vs. Abstract Noun

I defined a VP as any constituent which may potentially stand as PREDICATE. Although the term 'verb phrase' makes mention of the word-class 'verb', the definition avoids any reliance on lexical categories. It would be useful, however, to consider what tests one could apply to determine whether or not a word may be classified as a verb. Cikoski offers these criteria:

> *Verb*: any full word which is not a concrete noun and which has one of the four traits of transitivity, intransitivity, ergativity or directness.[3]

Cikoski's approach to defining word-classes is based on their behavioural characteristics and what we see above is no exception. His definitions of the four traits given above are all based on observations concerning their syntactic behaviour.[4] We must assume that concrete nouns, even though Cikoski shows them to clearly exhibit certain of these traits,[5] have been excluded on grounds of common sense. The definition is still not satisfactory because it does not exclude another lexical class which he lists, that of "abstract noun", even though Cikoski himself gives copious examples of "abstract nouns" behaving transitively.[6] Are we to regard this class as nouns or verbs?

3 Cikoski, 1970, p. 54.
4 Ibid., p. 54.
5 Ibid., pp. 108–110.
6 Ibid., pp. 116–117.

Cikoski lists 99 "abstract nouns" in his glossary and separates them as a definite lexical class according to certain behavioural criteria. First of all, they are differentiated from concrete nouns in that they are not "countable with a measure".[7] This much is certainly true, although we must remember that the counting of concrete nouns in CC does not necessarily involve the use of measures and, more often than not, dispenses with them.[8] However, verbs are also not countable with a measure (unlike modern Chinese), so Cikoski seeks to prove that there are behavioural differences between verbs and abstract nouns. Here I shall examine two of the tests which he applies and, in the process, propose two alternative tests, not for identifying "abstract nouns", but verbs; and on the basis of these tests I shall offer the counter-theory that much of the job of abstract nouns in English is in CC performed by verbs in nominal functions,[9] and that a number of Cikoski's "abstract nouns" are really nothing more than verbs occurring in nominal functions.

His first test is the pattern *you* 有/*wu* 無 + VERB. In this pattern *you* 有 and *wu* 無 are used to effect OBJECT quantification, *you* 有 = 'something', *wu* 無 = 'nothing', this being arrived at by understanding a deleted *suo* 所 occurring between 有/無 and the verb.[10] According to Cikoski, 有/無 + abstract noun "cannot in any way be construed as fitting this pattern."[11] However, this cannot be regarded as a watertight test for distinguishing between verbs and "abstract nouns" because it is possible to find examples of words which Cikoski classifies as ergative verbs also not fitting into this pattern, such as *gui* 貴 and *jian* 賤:[12]

7 Ibid., p. 95.

8 Ibid., p. 97. The observations of Wang Li to this effect which Cikoski quotes here are nowhere rebutted by the latter.

9 The question of "abstract nouns", whatever they might turn out to be, is especially pertinent to the discussion of non-finite VPs in CC. English abstract nouns, if we exclude foreign words such as 'music', 'science' and 'peace', are generally derived from verbs (including adjectives) : some have the same form as the verb, e.g., 'fear', 'love', 'work', 'hope', 'praise'; others are derived from the addition of certain suffixes, for example -ness and -hood, e.g., 'glad' → 'gladness', 'false' → 'falsehood'; some have undergone a somewhat less regular process of derivation, e.g., 'die' → 'death', 'weigh' → 'weight', 'dry' → 'drought'; and others still are simply a non-finite form of the verb, e.g., 'lean' →'leaning'. Of course, Chinese lacks this kind of derivational morphology, but we should ask ourselves whether it is possible that at least some of Cikoski's "abstract nouns" are nothing more than verbs appearing in nominal function.

10 Cikoski, 1970, p. 42.

11 Ibid., p. 116.

12 Ibid., p. 164; p 156 respectively.

(30) 故官無常貴而民無終賤。 墨子 8/20
Thus, officials did not enjoy permanent high rank, while the ordinary people were not consigned to low rank forever.
(*Not*: '...officials did not always esteem something,' etc.)

What confuses matters even more is that *gui* may occasionally fit the pattern:

(31) 人人有貴於己者。 孟子 6A/17
Everyone values something in themselves.

Thus, according to this test, we would have to class *gui* and *jian* as "abstract nouns", something which Cikoski has failed to do. Is there any test we might want to apply to determine that a word like *gui* is a verb? A word such as *gui* describes a quality or state, and one might instinctively want to regard *gui* as an adjective, or in terms of Chinese word-classes, a stative verb. Since Cikoski has listed *gui* as an ergative verb, it would be useful to examine whether the properties of a word like *gui* differ in any way from those which have already been observed of ergative verbs and, if so, to establish a test for distinguishing stative verbs from ergative verbs.

Ergative verbs are notable for the fact that their patients function as OBJECT when the agent functions as SUBJECT, *or*, function as SUBJECT when the agent does not so function. It is important to note that no putative or factitive element is ever present in the semantics of such verbs in their unadorned state:

(32) 秦師又敗吳師。 左/定 5/附(ii)(447/4)
The Qin army again defeated the Wu army.

(33) 吳師敗。 左/定 5/附(ii)(447/6)
The Wu army was defeated.

Now, a verb such as *gui* 貴, whose basic meaning is 'be valuable', hence, 'be noble, of high rank', may be transitive; but when it is so, it is necessarily putative or factitive:

(34) 人莫不貴之。 荀子 8/15
Everyone would respect him.
(Literally: '...would consider him noble.')

When *gui* is intransitive, the meaning is not 'be considered valuable' (as one would expect if it really were ergative), but 'be of value', 'be noble':

(35) 人不貴則輿不售，人不死則棺不買。 韓非子 17/2/45
If people were not of high rank, carriages would not be sold.
If people did not die, coffins would not be bought.

If a putative quality is required to be expressed when *gui* is intransitive, this must be done using the classificatory verb *wei* 為:

(36) 民為貴；社稷次之；君為輕。 孟子 7B/14
The people are considered (most) valuable; the altars to the gods of the soil and grain come next; the ruler is deemed to be of meagre importance.

Herein we see an important difference between ergative verbs and verbs such as *gui*: with the true ergative verb, variation between transitive and intransitive use does not involve any putative implication; with a verb like *gui*, this is necessarily the case. Verbs which share the characteristics of *gui* in this respect should be considered as stative verbs.

A further test which may be applied to differentiate between ergative verbs and stative verbs is to examine the different ways in which they combine with *yu* 於. As was illustrated in chapter two, when *yu* immediately follows an ergative verb the constituent governed by *yu* is the agent of that verb, allowing the use of the passive voice in the English rendering:

(37) 東敗於齊。 孟子 1A/5
In the east we were defeated by Qi.

When a stative verb is immediately followed by *yu*, the complement of *yu* is a standard of comparison, allowing for an English rendering using the comparative degree:

(38) 吾以此知天之重且貴於天子也。 墨子 28/16
Because of this I know that Heaven is more important and of higher value than the emperor.

(39) 夫三旌之位吾知其貴於屠羊之肆也。 莊子 28/42
A position with three banners is, I know, more valuable than a mutton butcher's shop.

Words which, like *gui*, imply the comparative degree when immediately followed by *yu* will be deemed stative verbs. When such verbs appear in nominal function we may often render with an English abstract noun; their lexical category, however, remains as stative verb:

(40) 富與貴是人之所欲也。 論語 4/5
Wealth and high rank, these are what men desire.

(41) 見二疏非所以強於諸侯也。 韓非子 2/3/33
Exposing these two oversights is not the means by which you will be more powerful than the feudal lords.

(41a) 安危在是非，不在於強弱。 韓非子 25/5/1
Safety and danger lie in right and wrong, not in strength and weakness.

We shall now move on to another test proposed by Cikoski for distinguishing "abstract nouns" from verbs: that *wei* 為 + ergative verb approximates the MC idiom *suanshi* 算是 'count as', 'be considered as'; but that *wei* + "abstract noun" is not required to be interpreted as such.[13] The implication, which is borne out in the examples given at this point, is that in the combination *wei* 為 + "abstract noun", *wei* is understood as a transitive verb, 'do', 'make'. However, again we find the test not always reliable. *Shi* 事 is classed as an "abstract noun",[14] and yet we find:

(42) 孰不為事。 孟子 4A/20
What does not count as a duty?

On the other hand, *shan* 善 is classed as an ergative verb,[15] but it is possible to find 為善 meaning not 'be considered good' but rather 'do good':

(43) 子為善誰敢不勉。 左/襄 21/4 (294/13)
If you practise being good who will dare not make the effort?

In order to underline the unreliability of this second of Cikoski's tests, let us consider the following two sentences from the same section of the Analects involving *ren* 仁, which is classed as an "abstract noun" meaning 'benevolence'.[16] In the first, the combination 為仁 means 'be considered as benevolence', while in the second it means 'do, practise benevolence':

(44) 克己復禮為仁。 論語 12/1
Overcoming oneself and returning to propriety is considered to be benevolence.

13 Ibid., p. 118.
14 Ibid., p. 157.
15 Ibid., p. 154.
16 Ibid., p. 170.

(45) 為仁由己而由人乎哉。 論語 12/1
Practising benevolence stems from oneself; could it ever stem from another?

It should be clear, then, that there is cause to question Cikoski's classification of "abstract nouns", especially in the manner of their being distinguished from verbs. I should like at this point, to introduce a further test for the word-class verb (more specifically for intransitive verbs); that of the single-word PREDICATE.

It is known that CC words which, by whatever lexical criteria, we might consider as nouns may be transitive in a putative or factitive sense, and to this extent they are able to function as FINITE VERB:

(46) 楚不為患。 左/昭 1/2 (339/10)
Chu does not constitute a problem.

(46a) 陳人患楚。 左/襄 7/10 (264/1)
The people of Chen were concerned about Chu.
(Literally: '...considered Chu a problem.')

It is interesting to note that, since such words are always transitive when functioning as FINITE VERB, they cannot function as the entire PREDICATE when this consists of a single word functioning as FINITE VERB.[17] It will be remembered that, according to my analysis of the 'nominal sentence' the B-term does not function as a FINITE VERB but as a CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT of a deleted classificatory, copula verb. Therefore B-terms are not admissible as single-word PREDICATES. The only cases I have found where a noun may function as a single-word PREDICATE are in these extracts from the Analects:

(47) 齊景公問政於孔子。
孔子對曰：君君，臣臣，父父，子子。 論語 12/11
Duke Jing of Qi asked Confucius about government. Confucius replied, "A ruler should act as a ruler, a minister as a minister, a father as a father and a son as a son."

[17] The presence of the particle of negation, *bu* 不, or a modal particle such as *bi* 必, or any other *eliminable* constituent does not detract from the PREDICATE consisting of a single *full* word.

(47a) 其爭也君子。 論語 3/7
(Even) the way they contend is appropriate to being a superior man.

The five nouns which provide the predication in the above examples contain within them semantic elements beyond that which they have as nouns. It cannot be denied that the use to which these predicating nouns are put is fairly exceptional and quite different from what one would expect of them from reading the pre-Han corpus; indeed, these instances may be considered as the exceptions which prove the rule that nouns do not function as single-word PREDICATE.

Words which may stand as single-word PREDICATE will be classified as verbs. From among Cikoski's "abstract nouns", let us contrast a word that does function as single-word PREDICATE, *ren* 仁, with two which do not, *li* 禮 and *zui* 罪.[18] *Ren* often functions as PREDICATE:

(48) 楚瓦不仁。 左/定 4/16 (445/2)
Wa of Chu is not benevolent.

(49) 君仁莫不仁。 孟子 4A/21
If the ruler is benevolent everyone else will be.

(50) 虎狼仁也。 莊子 14/6
Tigers and wolves are benevolent.

(51) 王太仁。 韓非子 30/26/2
Your Majesty is too benevolent.

Li 禮 and *zui* 罪, on the other hand, do not function as single-word PREDICATE.[19] If the quality they describe is to be imputed to some SUBJECT, these words must function as the OBJECT of *you* 有 (or *wu* 無) and the quality is thus, literally, one of which the SUBJECT is (or is not) possessed:

(52) 賓有禮。 左/隱 11/1 (20/9)
The guest has manners.

18 Cikoski, p. 170; p. 167; p. 157 respectively.

19 In the *Zuo Zhuan* there are several occurrences of the phrase *liyu* 禮於 'show propriety towards' which always takes a complement, frequently pronominal, 禮焉 'show propriety to him':

齊侯之出也過譚。譚不禮焉。 左/莊 10/7 (58/4)
When the Marquis of Qi left he passed through Tan. Tan did not accord him propriety.

While *li* 禮 certainly functions as FINITE VERB in such instances, it still does not satisfy the requirement for functioning as the entire PREDICATE. Indeed, since in this meaning 禮 is always followed by 於, the verb in

(53) 秦則無禮。 左/僖 33/3 (142/3)
Qin lacks propriety.

(54) 凡我同盟，小國有罪大國致討。 左/襄 11/10 (274/10)
Among those of us who have entered into an alliance, the rule is: if a small state is at fault a large state delivers a punitive strike.

The difference in behaviour between *ren* 仁 and *li* 禮 is clearly evident in this passage from the Mencius:

(55) 有人於此，其待我以橫逆則君子必自反也。
我必不仁也，必無禮也，此物奚宜至哉。
其自反而仁矣，自反而有禮矣，
其橫逆由是也，君子必自反也，
我必不忠。 孟子 4B/28
If there is a man here who treats one in a thoroughly unreasonable manner, the superior man is certain to examine himself (thinking), "I am surely not benevolent, I surely lack propriety; (otherwise) how could it be fitting for such a thing to happen?" If one examines oneself and one is benevolent and has propriety, and the other's unreasonableness persists, the superior man is certain to examine himself (thinking), "I am surely not conscientious."

When *ren* 仁 appears in a nominal function it is nothing other than a non-finite VP. We might find it desirable to render in English using the abstract noun 'benevolence', but the use of a non-finite form of the corresponding English verb 'be benevolent' often provides an equally acceptable translation and is faithful to the lexico-syntactic reality of the Chinese. The following examples have *ren* as B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT and nicely bring out the difference between a *real* single-word PREDICATE (as in (48)–(51)) and a 'nominal predicate':

question might more properly be regarded as 禮於. Thus in the *Zuo Zhuan* the possibilities involving *li* 禮 would appear to be as follows:

A. (Of persons, states, etc.,) 'be polite, proper, in accord with due propriety (or not)': X 有/無禮:
冬齊師滅譚。譚無禮也。 左/莊 10/7 (58/4)
In the winter the Qi army destroyed Tan. It was because Tan had lacked propriety.

B. (Of actions, etc.,) 'be polite, proper, in accordance with due propriety (or not)': X (非) 禮也:
臣待君宴過三爵非禮也。 左/宣 2/4 (181/7)
For a minister waiting upon his ruler when he is feasting to exceed three cups of wine is not in accordance with propriety.

C. 'To treat with propriety': (see *liyu* 禮於 above).

(56) 貴賢仁也。賤不肖亦仁也。 荀子 6/21
To honour the worthy is to be benevolent. To disparage the unworthy is also to be benevolent. (Literally: '...is a case of being benevolent.'; *not* '...is benevolent.')

(57) 大所以保小仁也。 左/哀 7/4 (476/13)
The means by which the great protects the small is (by) being benevolent. (*not* '...is benevolent.')[20]

Therefore, words such as *ren* 仁 should be regarded as verbs, which, in their non-finite occurrences, may be rendered by English abstract nouns; but we should not let this confuse us into believing them to belong to a Chinese lexical class "abstract noun". Words such as *li* 禮 and *zui* 罪 may well turn out to be members of a CC lexical class for which the designation "abstract noun" might not be inappropriate; this, however, is not my brief here, which is to illustrate the non-finite use of VPs in nominal functions.

The following are words which Cikoski has listed as "abstract nouns" and which, on the basis of the alternative tests proposed above, should be re-classified as verbs:

An 安 'be safe'

(58) 用雅儒則千乘之國安。 荀子 8/100
If it employs scholars of refinement a state of a thousand chariots will be safe.

(58a) 國安於盤石。 荀子 10/114
The state will be safer than a rock.

(58b) 以危為安。 荀子 26/35
He regards danger as safety. (Literally '...as being safe.')
(安 as CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT)

E 惡 'be evil'

(59) 人之性惡。 荀子 23/1
Human nature is evil.

[20] In a recent article, Harbsmeier has discussed the question of words such as *ren* 仁, specifically, "whether one is to take *ren* verbally or nominally" (Christoph Harbsmeier, "Where do Classical Chinese Nouns Come From", *Early China*, 9–10, 1983–1985, p. 80). The analysis of *ren* which I have provided takes syntactic functions as its starting point, rather than lexical categories and semantic values (important as these aspects are), making it possible to provide an explanation for the behaviour of *ren* in all its functions using one consistent lexical category, verb, and one consistent semantic value, 'be benevolent'.

(59a) 殺人者不死而傷人者不刑，
是謂專暴而寬賊也。非惡惡也。 荀子 18/38
If a murderer is not put to death and someone who inflicts injury goes unpunished, this is referred to as showing favour to cruelty and being magnanimous to violence. It is not hating evil. (惡 as OBJECT)

Hui 惠 'be generous'

(60) 君子惠而不費。 論語 20/2
The superior man is generous without using anything up.

(60a) 小人懷惠。 論語 4/11
The petty man hankers after (receiving) generosity. (惠 as OBJECT)

Luan 亂 'be in disorder'

(61) 衛亂。 左/隱 5/2 (12/7)
Wei is in disorder.

(61a) 二子作亂。 左/文 14/附(iv)(168/2)
The two of them were stirring up trouble. (亂 as OBJECT)

Si 死 'die'

(62) 我死。 左/僖 7/3 (98/1)
I am dying.

(62a) 臣免於死。 左/文 10/3 (161/4)
I escaped death. (死 as COMPLEMENT OF PLACE)

Xiao 孝 'be filial'

(63) 弟子入則孝，出則悌。 論語 1/6
When a young man is at home he is filial, when outside he is respectful to his elders.

(63a) 子游問孝。 論語 2/7
Zi You asked about being filial. (孝 as OBJECT)

Xin 信 'be truthful'

(64) 言必信，行必果。 論語 13/20
His words are sure to be truthful, his actions sure to be fruitful.

(64a) 上好信則民莫敢不用情。 論語 13/4
If those in power love truthfulness, none of the people will dare not to tell the truth. (信 as OBJECT)

Yi 義 'be righteous'

(65) 君義莫不義。 孟子 4A/21
If the ruler is righteous, every one else will be.

(65a) 義外也。 孟子 6A/4
Righteousness is external. (義 as SUBJECT)

Yin 淫 'be licentious'

(66) 其俗淫。 荀子 20/49
Their customs are licentious.

(66a) ...防淫除邪... 司寇之事也。 荀子 9/92
...to guard against licentiousness and to eradicate evil... is the duty of the Minister of Justice. (淫 as OBJECT)

7

Nominalisation 2: Embedded Sentences

The previous chapter considered nominalisation in the form of non-finite VPs occurring in nominal functions. This chapter will focus on the occurrence of sentential constituents in nominal function.

The basic and most frequently encountered morphological form for an embedded sentence in CC is that for a subordinating endocentric phrase:

MODIFIER *zhi* 之 HEAD

such that if the particle *zhi* were deleted, the phrase could stand as an independent clause (i.e., BASIC SENTENCE) in which the constituents functioning as MODIFIER and HEAD would function as SUBJECT and PREDICATE respectively. (For ease of reference in discussing the internal structure of embedded sentences, the terms SUBJECT and PREDICATE will occasionally be used for MODIFIER and HEAD.) At the same time, the absence of the particle does not prevent a phrase, which in a different context might form a BASIC SENTENCE, from being a dependent clause performing a nominal function; indeed, this is one of the two variations of the basic form of the embedded sentence as described above. The other involves the addition of a phrase-final *zhe* 者 which may occur with or without the deletion of *zhi*. (This results in a morphological form NP (之) VP 者 identical with that derived from a sentence with existential quantification, which was introduced in chapter five.) When the SUBJECT of the embedded sentence is a third-person pronoun, it always takes the form of the third-person pronominal particle of adnominal modification, *qi* 其. Thus, *qi* stands for a hypothetical third-person SUBJECT pronoun + *zhi* 之; indeed, there is phonological evidence in Karlgren's reconstructions that *qi* is a fusion with *zhi* as its second element, since both words share the same final, -iəg.

The basic configuration for an embedded sentence sheds interesting light on the use of *zhi* 之. One is accustomed to regarding it as the particle of adnominal modification: that is, as a particle standing between a HEAD noun (which follows it) and a modifying element (which precedes it). This is, of course, absolutely correct; however, in embedded sentences the constituent which follows it is invariably a *verb phrase*, not a noun. Are we to say, then, that *zhi* is a particle of modification for verbs as well as nouns? The answer to this question, as to so many others in CC syntax, lies in a proper understanding of syntactic functions. When a VP functions as PREDICATE, it is *never* modified through the use of *zhi*; the proper particle for this task is *er* 而. However, when a VP occurs not as PREDICATE but as the HEAD of a phrase performing a nominal function, the proper particle for its modification is *zhi*. Therefore, in view of this phenomenon, although 'particle of adnominal modification' will do as a handy reference for *zhi*, we must bear in mind that, strictly, it is a particle occurring between the MODIFIER and HEAD in subordinating endocentric structures in nominal functions.[1]

At this point mention should be made of one particular type of embedded sentence: that used in the affirmation and denial of propositions, which is never in the form of a subordinating endocentric construction. There would appear to be some question as to whether its structure is actually endocentric since the first constituent seems not to be eliminable. A more detailed discussion of this kind of embedded sentence follows later in this chapter.

1 With regard to my analysis here, two points require elucidation.

Firstly, although *zhi* 之 is without doubt the standard particle used between SUBJECT and PREDICATE in embedded sentences, the appearance of *er* 而 in such circumstances is not unknown.

Secondly, what I have to say in respect of the MODIFIER in an embedded sentence corresponding to a SUBJECT in an independent clause does not contradict the case I made in chapter one for CC SUBJECTS *not* being eliminable in the BASIC SENTENCE. There is a crucial difference between the status of the SUBJECT as an immediate constituent of a BASIC SENTENCE, and that of the MODIFIER of an embedded sentence. The previous chapter demonstrated that in CC a non-finite VP may stand alone in a nominal function. Therefore, in the case of an embedded sentence, the constituent acting as MODIFIER is certainly eliminable, since the form remaining, a non-finite VP, still performs the same nominal function and therefore enjoys the same distribution as the embedded sentence did, thus proving that the embedded sentence is indeed an endocentric construction. However, it is clear that the SUBJECT/PREDICATE structure cannot be an endocentric one, since *elimination* (as opposed to deletion) of the SUBJECT would merely

Embedded Sentences as SUBJECT

The first three examples are in the standard morphological type. These are followed by variant forms:

(1) 履之相似天下之足同也。 孟子 6A/7
The fact that shoes resemble each other is because all the feet in the world are similar.

(2) 子之愛親命也。... 臣之事君義也。 莊子 4/40
That a son should love his parents is a matter of fate. That a subject should serve his ruler is a matter of duty.

(3) 死生命也。其有夜旦之常天也。 莊子 6/20
Death and life are ordained. That they have the regularity of night and morning is due to Heaven.

(4) 故塗之人可以為禹則然。
塗之人能為禹未必然也。 荀子 23/72
Therefore, it is the case that the man in the street *may* become a 'Yu'. It is not necessarily the case that he *can*.
(Deleted *zhi* 之)

(5) 政自之出久矣。 左/昭 28/5 (417/15)
The government has proceeded from him for a long time now.
(Deleted *zhi* 之)

(6) 故無分者人之大害也。 荀子 10/23
Therefore, there not being distinctions is a source of great harm to the people. (Phrase-final *zhe* 者)

(7) 人之有德慧術知者恆存乎疢疾。 孟子 7A/18
The fact that men acquire virtue, wisdom, skill and knowledge frequently comes through (Literally: 'lies in') adversity.
(Phrase-final *zhe* 者)

Embedded Sentences as OBJECT

(8) 何以知尚賢之為政之本。 墨子 9/2
How do I know that honouring the worthy is the foundation of government?

leave a non-finite VP which could not function as an independent clause (since it would go utterly against the communicative *raison d'etre* of the sentence) and therefore cannot have the same distribution as the BASIC SENTENCE prior to the elimination of the SUBJECT.

(9) 如知其非義斯速已矣，何等來年。 孟子 3B/8
If you know it's wrong, stop quickly. Why wait until next year?

(10) 子曰：惡紫之奪朱也。 論語 17/16
The Master said, "I resent the fact that purple has usurped the place of vermillion".

(11) 辟之是猶立直木而求其景之枉也。 荀子 11/116
This is like planting a straight tree and expecting its shadow to be crooked.

(12) 察此何自起皆起於不相愛。 墨子 14/12
If one investigates whence this arises, in all cases it arises out of not loving each other.

Mullie argues that there are two kinds of sentential OBJECT in CC: one following "les verbes d'action indifferente"; the other following "les verbes d'action efficace". The former type refers to verbs describing mental processes, which may be called *zhi* 知-type verbs; the latter type refers to verbs of causation, which may be referred to as *shi* 使-type verbs. Mullie shows with great clarity that the two types may be distinguished in that:

1. *Zhi* 知-type verbs normally require the embedded sentence which they govern to be in the standard morphological form with *zhi* 之 intervening between SUBJECT and PREDICATE. Complements of *shi* 使-type verbs never take this form.

2. A third-person pronominal SUBJECT of an embedded sentence governed by a *zhi* 知-type verb is always *qi* 其. A similar SUBJECT within any clause governed by a *shi* 使-type verb is always *zhi* 之.[2]

This latter point is borne out in the following examples:

(13) 子謂薛居州善士也，使之居於王所。 孟子 3B/6
You thought Xue Ju Zhou was a fine man and you had him live in the king's palace.

[2] J. Mullie, "Le Mot-Particule 之 Tche", *T'oung Pao*, 36, 1942, pp. 335–360. My resumé of Mullie's findings is condensed from his extended analysis over the pages cited.

(14) 馬不出者助之鞭之。
In the case of those whose horses refused to go out, they helped them whip them. 左/哀 27/附(iii)(501/22)
In the case of those whose horses refused to go out, they
helped them whip them.

(15) 公許之立武孟。 左/僖 17/5 (113/6)
The duke allowed him to install Wu Meng.

How is this pattern to be analysed? It is clear that the pronoun *zhi* 之 is the immediately governed OBJECT of the *shi* 使-type verb; but what of the ensuing VP? Mullie says that it "is not used personally but, as we would say for our own languages, in the infinitive".[3] Gassmann says virtually the same thing.[4] The problem with this analysis is finding a syntactic role for the so-called "infinitive" verb. Mullie and Gassmann both keep silent on this question. The previous chapter demonstrated that a non-finite VP may only occur in a nominal function; but there is no nominal function that the VP in such patterns could possibly be performing. There is no morphological evidence to suggest that such VPs are non-finite (we never appear to see them marked off by *zhe* 者), and CC does not tolerate a non-finite VP dangling, as it were, at the end of a sentence performing no syntactic function at all. The solution to the problem is hinted at by a celebrated grammarian of modern Chinese, Zhao Yuanren:

> A pivotal construction consists of a verbal expression V1, a nominal expression, and another verbal expression V2, with the nominal expression serving at once as object of V1 and subject of V2.[5]
>
> In general, pre-pivotal verbs, or link verbs, are of the 'cause to' type, whereas verbs with clauses as objects, or think verbs, are of the 'think, say' type.[6]

It will be remembered that in our discussion of the classificatory relationships involving naming and calling, and also in the *yi* 以...*wei* 為 pattern, we noticed the phenomenon of secondary predication, where two instances of predication occur within a single main clause, activated by a limited number of verbs which give rise to a pivotal structure (see pp. 68, 78 above). The peculiar quality of *shi* 使-type verbs is that they engender a pivotal structure in their

3 Ibid., p. 349.

4 Gassmann, 1982, p. 126.

5 Zhao, 1968, p. 124.

6 Ibid., p. 125.

complement (giving rise to secondary predication), and the following VP is not, therefore, a non-finite form but is a secondary FINITE VERB, predicated of the OBJECT of the *shi* 使-type verb. In view of the fact that the third-person pronoun in complements of *shi* 使-type verbs is always *zhi* and never *qi*, it is clear that such complements, like all pivotal structures, form an exocentric rather than an endocentric construction.

Embedded Sentences as OBJECT of CO-VERB

(16) 何以知之。以其處家者知之。 墨子 26/1
How do I know it? I know it by the way they live at home.

(17) 禮與其奢也寧儉。
喪與其易也寧戚。 論語 3/4
As for the Rites, compared with their being extravagant, one would rather they be frugal. As for mourning, compared with its being correct in every detail, one would rather it be deeply sorrowful.

Embedded Sentences as COMPLEMENT OF PLACE

(18) 王無異於百姓之以王為愛也。 孟子 1A/7
Don't be surprised at the fact that the people took you to be parsimonious.

Embedded Sentences as CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT

Embedded sentences appear as CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT with considerable frequency in two patterns: as the complement of a classificatory verb of similarity or analogy; or as the B-term of a sentence with deleted copula verb. First of all, with verbs of similarity and analogy:

(19) 人性之無分於善不善也
猶水之無分於東西也。 孟子 6A/2
Human nature making no distinction between good and evil is like water making no distinction between east and west.

are also like this.

(20) 此譬之猶馬駕而不(稅)*脫。 墨子 7/3
This is like a horse being harnessed and never unharnessed.

(21) 以德服人者，中心悅而誠服也，
如七十子之服孔子也。 孟子 2A/3
If you cause others to submit through virtue, they will
submit sincerely, glad with all their heart, just as the
seventy disciples submitted to Confucius.

(22) 為國家者見惡如衣夫之務去草焉。 左/隱 6/附(ii)(14/9)
He who runs a state or family regards evil in the same way
that a farmer applies himself to removing weeds.

(23) 如智者若禹之行水也則無惡於智矣。 孟子 4B/26
If intelligence were like Yu's channelling of the waters
there would be nothing to despise in intelligence.

(24) 化聲之相待若其不相待。 莊子 2/91
The voices of transformation depending on each other is like
their not doing so.

In chapter three we discussed the expression of a reason or cause through a B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT. We now come to consider embedded sentences as B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENTS, and find that, generally speaking, the B-term expresses reason or cause as an extension of class-membership on the lines postulated previously (see pp. 89–91 above). In such cases, the A-term SUBJECT, if expressed, is usually also an embedded sentence:

(1) 履之相似天下之足同也。 孟子 6A/7
That shoes resemble each other is because all feet in the
world are similar.

(25) 天之蒼蒼其正色邪；其遠而無所至極邪。 莊子 1/4
Is the azure of the sky its true colour; or is it a case of
it being far away and never coming to an end?

(26) 人之可使為不善其性亦猶是也。 孟子 6A/2
That people may be made to do evil is because their natures
are also like this.

(27) 勍敵之人隘而不列天贊我也。 左/僖 22/4 (120/2)
The men of a powerful enemy being in a confined position and
not formed in ranks is a matter of Heaven assisting us.

(28) 置杯焉則膠。水淺而舟大也。 莊子 1/6
If you set a cup down there it will stick. It's a case of the water being shallow and the boat being big.

The Affirmation and Denial of Propositions

In any language a speaker will occasionally desire to affirm or deny a proposition . In English we use some such formula as 'The fact is (that)...', 'The truth (of the matter) is (that)...', 'It is the case that...', etc., when affirming; while when denying a statement, something on the lines of 'It's not the case that...', 'It's not true that...', or simply 'It's not that...' would probably be employed. It is worth noting that in English the structure of such sentences embeds the actual proposition to be affirmed or denied as a complement clause (usually a complement of the copula), introduced by the complementiser *that*.

Turning to CC, there is little difficulty in identifying the form which equivalent utterances assume. As a rule, a proposition which takes the form of a sentence containing a FINITE VERB is affirmed by adding the particle *ye* 也 in sentence-final position; it is denied either by inserting the negative copula *fei* 非 between the SUBJECT and PREDICATE or by placing the *fei* at the beginning of the sentence. Sentence-final *ye* 也 is also usually present. Although it is more common for *fei* to be inserted, it should be understood that its scope in such cases is the whole of the statement (just as when the conditional marker *ruo* 若 is inserted in a similar manner its scope is the whole of the subordinate clause):

(29) 仁內也，非外也。義外也，非內也。 孟子 6A/4
The fact is, benevolence is internal and not external; duty is external and not internal.

(30) 夫大國難測也。 左/莊 10/1 (57/8)
The fact is, a large state is difficult to fathom.

(31) 白馬之白也無以異於白人之白也。
不識長馬之長也無以異於長人之長與。 孟子 6A/4
It's true that the whiteness of a white horse is in no way different from the whiteness of a white man. But I don't know whether it's the case that the respect one accords to an elderly horse is in no way different from the respect one accords to an elderly man.

(32) 予豈好辯哉。予不得已也。 孟子 3B/9
How can it be that I love disputation? The fact is, I have no alternative.

(33) 子治天下，天下既已治也。 莊子 1/24
The fact of the matter is, with you running the empire it will already be in good order.

(34) 夫知有所待而後當。其所待者特未定也。 莊子 6/3
Knowledge depends on something before it is applicable. It's just that what it depends on has not been established.

(35) 獲罪於天無所禱也。 論語 3/13
The thing is, once you have offended against Heaven there is nowhere to seek help.

(36) 信不由中質無益也。 左/隱 3/附(i)(7/6)
The fact is, unless trust comes from within, there is nothing to be gained from exchanging hostages.

(37) 我非愛其財而易之以羊也。 孟子 1A/7
It's not true that I begrudged its value and changed it for a sheep.

(38) 以力服人者非心服也。力不贍也。 孟子 2A/3
As regards causing men to submit through force, it's not that they submit from the heart; the fact is, their strength is insufficient.

(39) 非天之降才爾殊也。
其所以陷溺其心者然也。 孟子 6A/7
It's not that the talents which Heaven sends down are so different; the fact is, the way they ensnare their own hearts is like this.

(40) 非唯小國之君為然也。
雖大國之君亦有之。 孟子 5B/3
It isn't only the ruler of a small state that is deemed to be like that. The same is true even of the ruler of a large state.

While it is true that the examples given above allow an English rendering which makes the affirmation or denial explicit, it is not the case that every verbal sentence containing a sentence-final *ye* 也 deserves this kind of treatment in translation. It would appear that the explicit affirmation of statements is something entered into with greater abandon in CC than in English, especially in philosophical (rather than narrative) texts, and includes instances where the degree of affirmation is so slight as to constitute little more than a certain emphasis. Such cases do not usually require a full account of the final *ye* 也 in translation:

(41) 或問禘之說。子曰：不知也。 論語 3/11
Someone asked about the explanation of the Di sacrifice. The Master said, "I don't know."
(To translate, 'The fact is, I don't know.' would, perhaps, be overdoing it somewhat.)

From a perusal of the above examples, there can be little doubt that the method employed by CC to effect the affirmation or denial of a proposition is to make the proposition in question the B-term CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT of a copula verb (deleted when positive), *where the A-term is always deleted.* This presents an interesting parallel with English, where virtually the same method is used in the pattern 'It's (not) that', using a dummy SUBJECT for the copula. But there exists an even more interesting parallel. When we consider how modern Chinese goes about the same operation, we find a remarkable consistency in the development of the language in this respect; and since MC does not normally delete the copula, the syntactic structure involved is displayed with great clarity.

According to the *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞, the copula *shi* 是 (*bushi* 不是) is used "to emphasise the truthfulness of a fact".[7] It gives the following examples, among others:

(42) 不是我講錯了，是他記錯了。
It's not that I said it wrong; (the fact is) he remembered it incorrectly.[8]

7 Lü, 1980, p. 437 (section 6).

8 Ibid., p. 438 (section 6).

(43) 不是衣服太瘦，是你太胖了。
It's not that the clothes are too tight; you're too fat.[9]

Interestingly enough, just as in CC *fei* 非 may be inserted between the SUBJECT and PREDICATE, so in MC *shi/bushi* may also be located thus:

(44) 我是問問，沒有別的意思。
I was only asking; I didn't mean anything else.[10]

Another MC expedient is the use of the (*shi* 是) ... *de* 的 construction, often referred to as 'situational' *de* 的. Zhao says:

> Sometimes the *de* refers to the whole situation with the meaning of 'such is the case', 'this is the kind of situation' and no particular noun is understood or can be supplied rather than some other noun. For example: 他是跟你開玩笑的. ... 'He was just joking with you that-was-what-he-was-doing.' ... 你不能走了就算完事的. ... 'You can't just go away and consider the business done that's-the-situation.', where no noun could be supplied after *de* that would fit the construction. Because this *de* is in construction with the whole preceding clause, it is properly a sentence particle.[11]

These remarks of Zhao's are of considerable assistance in our efforts to understand the CC structure. Statements of affirmation and denial are not made in a discoursal vacuum: they are always a response to some situation or ideological stance. Thus, broadly speaking, there must be some situational context for which the statement is true or false. This explains why, for pragmatic reasons, the A-term is always deleted: it is none other than the situation under discussion. In fact, the deletion of the A-term when it refers to some situation or state of affairs is not uncommon in CC even with simple nominal B-terms:

(45) 人死則曰：非我也，歲也。 孟子 1A/3
When people die you say, "It's not (because of) me; it's (due to) the harvest."

9 Ibid., p. 438 (section 6).

10 Ibid., p. 437 (section 4(d)).

11 Zhao, 1968, p. 296.

Therefore, the deep structure of such utterances may be explained thus:

A-term (deleted)	copula	B-term
Ø	Ø/*fei* 非	proposition to be affirmed or denied.
The fact/situation/ truth of the matter	is (not)	(that) ...

It is interesting that such propositions never require the particle *zhi* 之 betweeen the SUBJECT and PREDICATE. One possible reason for this may lie in the fact that a proposition to be affirmed or denied is of necessity a finite statement. This means that the SUBJECTS of such sentences are *never* eliminable, since the remaining form could not stand as a proposition, and could not therefore be subject to affirmation or denial. Unlike the other occurrences of embedded sentences, whose SUBJECTS are eliminable (leaving a non-finite VP which may equally well perform the nominal function concerned), the affirmed or denied propostion *must* be a finite statement, resulting in an embedded sentence which is exocentric in structure. This, I believe, is the reason why such propositions do not contain the particle *zhi* 之.

Embedded Sentences as REAL TOPICS

Let us remind ourselves of the properties of REAL TOPICS. They have no syntactic relationship with any constituent in the BASIC SENTENCE (i.e., the SUBJECT-PREDICATE complex). Furthermore, they "have to do with the establishment of a spatial, temporal, or personal frame or domain for an assertion which follows" (see p. 100). Should the REAL TOPIC take the form of an embedded sentence, it is clear that, having the above properties, it would correspond to what is traditionally referred to as a subordinate clause, be it conditional, temporal, concessive or any other, and this indeed turns out to be the case.

It is clear that the morphological types of embedded sentence we have considered hitherto contain no semantic indication as to the kind of subordinate clause they might constitute when

appearing as REAL TOPIC; to this extent they may be referred to as *unmarked* subordinate clauses. In practice, however, there is little difficulty in identifying the semantic type of subordinate clause. The possible types are: the temporal; the concessive; the conditional; and the neutral.

When the modifying clause provides the temporal frame for the main clause it is, naturally enough, a *temporal* clause:

(46) 晉侯之入也秦穆姬屬賈君焉。 左/僖 15/14 (109/1)
When the Marquis of Jin entered, Qin Mu Ji entrusted the Lord of Jia to him.

(47) 鄭共叔之亂公孫滑出奔衛。 左/隱 1/附(vi)(4/9)
When Zheng Gong Shu rebelled, Gong Sun Hua left and fled to Wei.

(48) 晉國之始得之也涕沾襟。 莊子 2/79
When the state of Jin first took her, her tears soaked the front of her dress.

(49) 昔者文王之治岐也耕者九一。 孟子 1B/5
Formerly, when King Wen brought Qi under control, he levied one-ninth of the tillers' produce.

(50) 天與之者諄諄然命之乎。 孟子 5A/5
When Heaven gave it to him, did it decree it sincerely?

(51) 鳥之將死其鳴也哀。
人之將死其言也善。 論語 8/4
When a bird is about to die its cry is sad. When a man is about to die his words are good.

(52) 是故古者聖王之為政也言曰： 墨子 8/8
For this reason, in ancient times, when the sage kings practised government, they would say:

A subordinate clause is understood as *concessive* when the semantics of the subordinate clause are in some way adversative to those of the main clause:

(53) 其折骨絕筋終身不可以相及也。 荀子 2/28
The fact is, even if you break your bones and snap your sinews, to the end of your days you will not find it possible to get there.

(54) 不知足而為履我知其不為賫也。 孟子 6A/7
Even if you make a pair of sandals without knowing the feet (that will wear it) I know you won't make a straw basket.

When the subordinate clause is not temporal or concessive, it is most likely that the sort of frame which the REAL TOPIC provides is the *condition* under which the main clause holds good:

(55) 君不能者其國亂。 荀子 15/21
If a ruler is not capable his state wil be in disorder.

(56) 其若是孰能御之。 孟子 1A/7
If he were like this who would be able to withstand him?

(57) 父母在不遠游。 論語 4/19
If one's parents are alive one does not travel far.
(The subordinate clause in this case might also be taken to be temporal: 'While one's parents are alive ...' This demonstrates the 'grey area' between the temporal and conditional)

'Neutral' Subordinate Clauses

I suggested earlier that if a REAL TOPIC clause was neither temporal nor concessive it is likely to be conditional. The reason why one cannot say it would always be so is because there exists a further category of REAL TOPIC clause which cannot be categorised as providing a temporal, concessive or conditional frame, but rather a *semantically neutral* one for the following assertion. One fairly common pattern which displays this characteristic is the embedded sentence whose FINITE VERB is *yu* 於 'stand in relation to' ⟶ 'strike an attitude towards' (see p. 36):

(58) 口之於味有同嗜也。 孟子 6A/7
As for the palate's attitude to tastes, there are similar preferences.

(59) 父母於子東西南北唯命之從。 莊子 6/56
As for what parents are to a child, be it to go east, west, south or north it is their command alone that he follows.

However, the neutral subordinate clause is not confined to the above pattern:

(60) 昭文之鼓琴也，師曠之技策也，惠子之據梧也，
三子之知幾乎。 莊子 2/43
Zhao Wen plucking the zither, Music Master Kuang beating time with his baton, Hui Zi leaning on the parasol tree, was not the knowledge of these three men very near the mark?

(61) 君子養心莫善於誠。 荀子 3/26
As for the superior man's nurturing of his heart, nothing is as good as sincerity.

(62) 楹之摶也見之其於意也不易。 墨子 43/63
"In the case of a pillar being round, when we see it, its place in the idea is unchanged." (Graham's translation)[12]

Marked Subordinate Clauses

We shall now turn our attention to those subordinate clauses whose semantic properties are made explicit in the particle employed. What must be remembered and what, I hope, the preceding analysis has demonstrated, is that the syntactic properties of subordinate clauses are determined through their functioning as REAL TOPIC; *not* because they are marked by some particle or other. The job of the latter is purely to make the semantic domain of the subordinate clause clear. Where REAL TOPIC clauses are marked with semantically pregnant particles, there is clearly no necessity to indicate that they cannot stand as independent clauses. In such circumstances, therefore, the use of the particle *zhi* 之 is not required and is usually dispensed with.

The particles used to mark subordinate clauses in CC and their semantic implications are well known and well expounded; conditional and concessive clauses, in particular, have recently received quite thorough treatment from Harbsmeier.[13] Therefore I shall restrict myself here to some observations concerning *ze* 則 and *zhe* 者.

12 Graham, 1978, p. 154.

13 Harbsmeier, 1981, pp. 229–287.

ze 則

We saw that *ze* 則 marks SUBJECT and TOPIC NPs for contrastive focus (see pp. 121–126). When it comes to embedded sentences, however, *ze* is used almost exclusively with REAL TOPICS which usually provide a conditional (occasionally also a temporal) frame. The communicative property of applying contrastive focus is just as true of *ze* with a clause as with a NP:

(63) 天下有道則見。無道則隱。 論語 8/13
When the Way exists in the world he is to be seen. When it does not he is hidden from view.

(64) 國危則無樂君。
國安則無憂民。 荀子 11/44
When a state is in danger it lacks a happy ruler. When it is secure it lacks anxious citizens.

(65) 是故國有賢良之士眾則國家之治厚。
賢良之士寡則國家之治薄。 墨子 8/3
For this reason, when the state's competent and good rulers are many, it will be in abundant good order. If they are few, it will be scant of good order.

(66) 功當其事，事當其言則賞。
功不當其事，事不當其言則罰。 韓非子 7/2/8
If the accomplishment matches the matter in hand and this matches (the minister's) words, he is rewarded. If not, he is punished.

(67) 覆杯水於坳堂之上則芥為之舟。
置杯焉則膠。 莊子 1/6
Overturn a cup of water over a dip in the floor and a piece of straw will provide a boat for it. Set the cup down on it and it will stick fast.

(68) 性猶湍水也。決諸東方則東流。
決諸西方則西流。 孟子 6A/2
Human nature is like a torrent. If you open a channel for it to the east it will flow to the east. If you open a channel for it to the west it will flow to the west.

(69) 是故文武興則民好善。
幽厲興則民好暴。 孟子 6A/6
For this reason, when Kings Wen and Wu arose the people loved goodness. When Kings You and Li arose the people loved violence.

And a rare example of *ze* 則 marking a sentential SUBJECT for obvious contrastive effect:

(4) 故塗之人可以為禹則然。
塗之人能為禹未必然也。 荀子 23/72
Therefore, it is the case that the man in the street *may* become a 'Yu'. It is not necessarily the case that he *can*.

From the above examples it is clear that *ze* 則 frequently marks a protasis for contrastive focus in the presence of another protasis. We saw NPs marked by *ze* in this way, but also marked when there was no explicitly contrasting NP (see p. 123). Similarly, *ze* marks a protasis for *implied* contrast even when no other is present with which it could form an explicit contrast. If we recall that the basic lexical meaning of *ze* is 'law', 'rule', 'pattern' (see p. 121) it follows that, if for any given REAL TOPIC clause the *rule* is the main clause, the implication is that for a different REAL TOPIC clause the rule would be different:[14]

(70) 敬叔父乎敬弟乎。彼將曰：敬叔父。
曰：弟為尸則誰敬。彼將曰：敬弟。 孟子 6A/5
(Ask him) whom he respects more: his uncle or his younger brother. He will say, 'My uncle.' Then you say, 'If your younger brother plays the role of ancestor at a sacrifice whom would you then respect?' He will say, 'My younger brother.'

(71) 他日君出則必命有司所之。 孟子 1B/16
When you go out on any other day, you are sure to instruct your officials as to where you are going.

Incidentally, it is not only with conditional clauses that *ze* 則 is associated. As Harbsmeier has noticed,[15] temporal clauses are also the object of its attentions. Again, its contrastive properties are in evidence:

(69) 是故文武興則民好善。
幽厲興則民好暴。 孟子 6A/6
For this reason, when Kings Wen and Wu arose the people loved goodness. When Kings You and Li arose the people loved violence.

14 See also Harbsmeier's observations on this point in Harbsmeier, 1981, p. 252.

15 Harbsmeier, 1981, pp. 246–247.

Is *zhe* 者 a Particle of Subordination?

Harbsmeier has also noticed that subordinate clauses, usually conditional, may have a clause-final *zhe* 者, and on the basis of this evidence he has constructed a theory to the effect that *zhe* functions as a subordinating particle.[16] Now, there is no doubt that REAL TOPIC clauses may take a clause-final *zhe*, as we have already seen:

(50) 天與之者諄諄然命之乎。 孟子 5A/5
When Heaven gave it to him, did it decree it sincerely?

(55) 君不能者其國亂。 荀子 15/21
If a ruler is not capable his state will be in disorder.

However, the preceding analysis has, I hope, made clear that it is not the presence of *zhe* or any other clausal particle that makes a clause subordinate, it is its *syntactic function*, namely that of REAL TOPIC. We do not refer to *zhi* 之 as a 'subordinating particle' simply because it appears between SUBJECT and PREDICATE in REAL TOPIC clauses; indeed, it would be most ill-advised to do so because it does exactly the same job in clauses performing other nominal functions, such as SUBJECT and OBJECT. Similarly, clauses with final *zhe* also appear in functions other than REAL TOPIC:

(7) 人之有德慧術知者恆存乎疢疾。 孟子 7A/18
The fact that men acquire virtue, wisdom, skill and knowledge often comes through (Literally: 'lies in') adversity. (SUBJECT)

(72) 或相倍蓰而無算者不能盡其才者也。 孟子 6A/6
The fact that some are two, five or innumerable times as good is a case of not fulfilling one's potential. (SUBJECT)

(16) 何以知之。以其處家者知之。 墨子 26/1
How do I know it? I know it by the way they live at home. (OBJECT)

(73) 諸侯多謀伐寡人者何以待之。 孟子 1B/11
How should I deal with the fact that many of the feudal lords are planning to attack me? (TOPIC)

16 Ibid., pp. 210–228.

(74) 譬之如醫之攻人之疾者，然。 墨子 14/2
Comparing it, it's like a doctor attacking a person's illness, like that. (CLASSIFICATORY COMPLEMENT)

It is unlikely that one would wish to call the clauses marked off by *zhe* in the above examples subordinate; and yet there is no morphological difference between them and those in examples (50) and (55) which one certainly would wish to call subordinate. What is different is the *syntactic function* performed by the respective constituents: in (50) and (55) it is the fact that the constituents concerned function as REAL TOPIC that makes them subordinate clauses, *not* the use of the particle *zhe*, of which no more can be said than that it marks an embedded sentence in nominal function in exactly the same way as we saw it mark non-finite VPs in nominal function in the previous chapter; example (72) is particularly apposite in this respect, containing an embedded sentence and a non-finite VP both marked with *zhe*.

Therefore, we may conclude that this kind of *zhe* does nothing more than mark constituents which occur in a nominal function; if that function happens to be REAL TOPIC, the clause may be taken as subordinate. Such use of *zhe* is, in my view, entirely different from the HEAD substitute use which was observed in chapter five and should not be confused with it. How, then, is one to deal with Harbsmeier's analysis of sentences such as the following:

順者錯之。
Those who obeyed he left alone. Xun 16.59
Why not translate literally 'If anyone obeyed he left them alone.'? [17]

賢者則貴而敬之。
If someone is talented, he will respect them out of genuine esteem. Xun 13.39 [18]

言者不知。
If someone speaks he does not know. Zhuang 13.68 [19]

[17] Ibid., p. 212, Ex. (10).
[18] Ibid., p. 212, Ex. (11).
[19] Ibid., p. 219, Ex. (53).

I select the foregoing as a representative sample of certain renderings offered by Harbsmeier in support of his theory that *zhe* 者 is in widespread use as a 'subordinating particle'. In my view there is little doubt that examples such as these are cases of *zhe* functioning as a HEAD substitute. By applying certain syntactic rules with which we are already familiar it may be possible to show that this is indeed the case, and that the issue has been confounded by the existence of an English linguistic device which we may refer to as the 'pseudo-conditional'.

We are aware that CC subordinate clauses are REAL TOPIC clauses, and that REAL TOPICS have the particular syntactic quality that they have no syntactic relationship with any constituent in the SUBJECT/ PREDICATE complex. Is this property discernible in the constituents marked by *zhe* in our selection? I shall ask the reader to set aside for the moment Harbsmeier's renderings (we shall return to these presently) and concentrate on the Chinese in each of these examples. In the first, is not 順者 ('those who obeyed') the topicalised OBJECT of 錯, resumed by *zhi* 之; otherwise what is? In the second, is not 賢者 ('He who is talented') the SUBJECT of the PREDICATE 貴而敬之; otherwise what is? In the third, is not 言者 ('those who speak') the SUBJECT of the PREDICATE 不知; otherwise what is?

If these constituents do, as I believe, function as SUBJECT or TOPIC (topicalised from OBJECT), it is impossible for them to function as REAL TOPIC and to be taken as subordinate clauses. How, then, has it been possible to render these sentences using an English conditional clause? This is where the English 'pseudo-conditional' enters in. Compare the following:

(a) Someone who works hard will succeed.

(b) If someone works hard he will succeed.

(c) If John works hard he will succeed.

It is clear that (a) and (b) are paraphrases of each other, but which is to be taken as the deep-structure and which as the surface-structure transformation? Both sentences share the same PREDICATE, *will succeed*. In the first it predicates of *Someone who works hard*, in the second of

he. But *he* is a pronoun which must resume some NP or other, which in this case can only be *Someone (who works hard)*. It is clear, then, that (b) is a surface-structure transformation of (a), whereby a 'pseudo-conditional' clause is generated. The acid test for identifying an English 'pseudo-conditional' clause is two-fold: its SUBJECT is always an indefinite pronoun like 'someone' or 'one'; and the whole clause is capable of being converted back to a complex NP in which an indefinite HEAD ('he', 'one') is modified by a relative clause, and which may function as an argument of the FINITE VERB. Thus, 'If someone is talented, he...' may revert to 'Someone who is talented...'; 'If someone speaks, he...' may revert to 'Someone who speaks...'. Notice that such 'reconversion' is utterly out of the question in the case of a true conditional clause like (c), whose SUBJECT has definite reference.

Stacking

It was seen that NP REAL TOPICS may be stacked in series (see p. 102). Sentential REAL TOPICS are also prone to this tendency, stacking not only with other embedded sentences but also with NPs and non-finite VPs functioning as REAL TOPIC:

(75) 故王者之制名，名定而actualized辨，道行而志通
則慎率民而一焉。 荀子 22/6
Therefore, when a true king establishes names, names having been fixed and objects differentiated, the Way put into practice and his will freed from obstructions, he prudently leads the people and they are united to him.

(76) 始，吾於人也聽其言而信其行。
今，吾於人也聽其言而觀其行。 論語 5/10
At first my attitude towards men was such that, having listened to their words I had implicit faith in how they would act. Now, having listened to their words I observe how they act.

(77) 民之為道者，有恆產者有恆心。 孟子 3A/3
As for the manner in which the common people pursue the Way, if they have a constant supply of material goods they will have a constant attitude.

Embedded Sentences Implying Manner

Before concluding our examination of embedded sentences, let us consider the peculiar property they frequently possess; that of implying manner. This property appears to be restricted to embedded sentences in the basic form of a subordinating endocentric construction (MODIFIER *zhi* 之 HEAD), occasionally with phrase-final *zhe* 者 added. Thus the pattern A 之 B is taken not as 'The fact that A does B' but rather 'The *manner in which* A does B.' Although there is no special morphological device employed to indicate that manner is implied, the context usually makes it clear enough.

The best place to start is probably with a fairly common formula, *qi wei ren* 其為人 'the kind of man one is', 'one's character'; literally, '(the manner of) one's being a man':

(78) 其為人也多暇日者其出人也不遠矣。 荀子 2/35
If one is the sort of person who takes a lot of time off, one will not stand out from others by much.

(79) 其為人也孝弟而好犯上者鮮矣。 論語 1/2
It is rare for one's character to be such that one is filial and obedient and yet likes to transgress against one's superiors.

(80) 孔子為人何如。 墨子 39/35
What kind of man was Confucius?

Indeed, there is a definite tendency for embedded sentences whose FINITE VERB is the classificatory verb *wei* 為 ('count as', 'be deemed to be', 'constitute') to imply manner:

(81) 中庸之為德也其至矣乎。 論語 6/29
Is not the kind of virtue which the 'Mean' constitutes supreme?

(82) 大哉堯之為君也。 論語 8/19
Great indeed, the kind of ruler Yao was!

(83) 瞽瞍底豫而天下之為父子者定。 孟子 4A/28
When the 'Blind Man' (Shun's father) was made happy, the manner in which all fathers and sons in the world should relate was fixed.

(84) 今夫弈之為數小數也。 孟子 6A/9
Now, the kind of skill that playing chess constitutes is a small one.

If we consider the scope of this phenomenon we find that it extends beyond embedded sentences containing *wei* 為:

(16) 何以知之。以其處家者知之。 墨子 26/1
How do I know it? I know it by the way they live at home.

(85) 其自視也亦若此矣。 莊子 1/17
The way he regards himself is also like this.

(86) 是後王之成名也。 荀子 22/6
This is the manner in which the later kings established names.

(87) 善之生如春。惡之死如秋。 韓非子 26/1/9
The way the good flourish is like the spring. The way the evil perish is like the autumn.

(88) 人之有道也飽食煖衣逸居而無教
則近於禽獸。 孟子 3A/4
If the kind of way men follow is to eat their fill, be warmly clad and live in comfort without receiving instruction, they are well-nigh animals.

(89) 故古者聖人之為政若此。 墨子 9/21
Therefore, the way in which the sages carried on government in ancient times was like this.

(90) 子曰：君子無所爭。必也射乎。
揖讓而升，下而飲。其爭也君子。 論語 3/7
The Master said, 'There is no contention between gentlemen. The nearest to it is, perhaps, archery. In archery they bow and make way for each other as they go up, and on coming down they drink together. Even the way they contend is gentlemanly.' (Lau's translation)[20]

Notice this idiom involving *you* 有:

(91) 子墨子之有天志辟(人)*之無以異乎
輪人之有規。 墨子 27/63
The will of Heaven is to Mozi what the compass is to the wheelwright.

[20] Lau, 1979, p. 68.

(92) 夫虞之有虢也如車之有輔。 韓非子 10/3/28
The relationship of Yu to Guo is like that of a cart to its side-shafts.

Where an embedded sentence SUBJECT has this implication of manner it seems that one special function that is discharged by the pattern, sentential SUBJECT + stative verb PREDICATE, is to modify what would otherwise be the FINITE VERB in a simple sentence. The tendency in CC is not to directly modify the verb by placing a stative verb in adverbial position, i.e., immediately preceding the verb, but to embed as SUBJECT the sentence containing the verb to be modified, and to predicate it with the appropriate stative verb:

(93) 故民之從之也輕。 孟子 1A/7
Therefore, the people easily obeyed him.

(94) 天下之無道也久矣。 論語 3/24
The empire has long been without the Way.

(95) 天之棄商久矣。 左/僖 22/4 (119/2)
Heaven abandoned the Shang long ago.

(96) 君子之求利也略。
其遠害也早。
其避辱也懼。
其行道理也勇。 荀子 2/45
The superior man is neglectful of seeking profit.
He is quick to distance himself from harm.
He is fearful in his avoidance of disgrace.
He is courageous in his practice of the Way and reason.

(97) 且夫水之積也不厚則其負大舟也無力。 莊子 1/5
風之積也不厚則其負大翼也無力。 莊子 1/6
If water does not accumulate in abundance it is powerless to support a large boat. If wind does not accumulate in abundance it is powerless to support great wings.

It appears to me that manner is also implied in the common formula *X* 之於 *Y*, which was discussed in chapter two in some detail. There it was argued that this use of *yu* 於 has the semantic value of 'stand with regard to, in relation to'. It would not, I believe, be inappropriate to construe the implication of manner in occurrences of this formula:

(98) 魯之於晉也職貢不乏。 左/襄 29/附(vi)(325/19)
As for the state of Lu's position with respect to the state of Jin, there was never any shortage in its tribute.

The following literal translation would appear to capture the semantics of the pattern: 'As for the manner in which the state of Lu stood with regard to the state of Jin...'

Bibliography

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. Rev. British ed., London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935.

Chafe, Wallace C. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View". In *Subject and Topic*, pp. 27–55. Edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Cikoski, John S. *Classical Chinese Word-Classes*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1970.

————. "An Analysis of some Idioms commonly called 'Passive' in Classical Chinese", *Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages*, 9, 1978, pp. 133–208.

Crystal, David. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1980.

Dobson, W.A.C. *Late Archaic Chinese*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Gabelentz, Georg von der. *Chinesische Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1881; reprint ed., Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1953.

Gassmann, Robert H. *Zur Syntax von Einbettungsstrukturen im Klassischen Chinesisch*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1982.

Graham, A.C. "A Probable Fusion Word: 勿 wuh = 毋 wu + 之 jy", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 14, 1952, pp. 139–148.

————. "'Being' in Western Philosophy compared with *Shih/Fei* and *Yu/Wu* in Chinese Philosophy", *Asia Major* (New Series), 7, 1959, pp. 79–112.

————. "Some Basic Problems of Classical Chinese Syntax", *Asia Major* (New Series), 14, 1969, pp. 192–216.

————. *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1978.

————. *Chuang Tzu: The Seven Inner Chapters and other Writings from the Book Chuang Tzu*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

————. "Relating Categories to Question Forms in Pre-Han Chinese Thought". In *Studies in Chinese Philosophy & Philosophical Literature*, pp. 360–411. Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986.

Grévisse, Maurice. *Le Bon Usage*. 10th ed., Gembloux: Editions J. Duclot, S.A., 1975.

Harbsmeier, Christoph. *Wilhelm von Humboldts Brief an Abel Remusat und die philosophischer Grammatik des Altchinesischen*. Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1979.

————. *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax*. London & Malmo: Curzon Press, 1981.

————. "Where do Classical Chinese Nouns Come From", *Early China*, 9–10, 1983–1985, pp. 77–163.

Hockett, Charles F. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Hong Cheng 洪誠. "Lun Nanbeichao Yiqian Hanyuzhong De Xici" "論南北朝以前漢語中的繫詞", *Yuyan Yanjiu* 語言研究, 1957, pp. 1–22.

Hu Shih. *The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China*. Shanghai, 1922; reprint ed., New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp., 1968.

Karlgren, Bernhard. "On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan", *Göteborgs Hogskolas Arsskrift*, 33, 1926:3, pp. 3–65.

————. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1957.

Kennedy, George A. "A Study of the Particle *yen*". In *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, pp. 27–78. Edited by Li Tien-yi. New Haven: Far Eastern Publications Yale University, 1964.

————. "Word-Classes in Classical Chinese". In *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, pp. 323–433. Edited by Li Tien-yi. New Haven: Far Eastern Publications Yale University, 1964.

Lau, D.C. *Confucius: The Analects*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979.

Li, Charles N., ed. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Li, Charles N. and Thompson, Sandra A. "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language". In Charles N. Li ed., *Subject and Topic*, pp. 459–489. Edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Lin, William Chin-Juong. *A Descriptive Semantic Analysis of the Mandarin Aspect-Tense System*. Unpublished Phd Dissertation, Cornell University, 1979.

Lü Shuxiang, 呂叔湘 ed. *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 現代漢語八百詞. Peking: Commercial Press, 1980.

Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Mullie, J. "Le Mot-Particule 之 Tche", *T'oung Pao*, 36, 1942, pp. 181–400.

Murray, James A.H. et al. ed. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 13 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Pulleyblank, E.G. "Fei 非, Wei 唯 and Certain Related Words." In *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata*, pp. 178-189. Edited by S. Egerod and E. Glahn. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1959.

————. "The Locative Particles *Yu* 于, *Yu* 於 and *Hu* 乎", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 106, No 1, 1986, pp. 1–11.

Quirk, Randolph et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman, 1972.

Sandmann, Manfred. *Subject and Predicate*. Edinburgh, 1954; 2nd rev. and enl. ed., Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979.

Shchutskii, Iulian K. *Researches on the I Ching*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Watson, Burton. *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Zhang Qiyun 張其昀 ed. *Zhongwen Da Cidian* 中文大辭典. 40 vols., Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1962–1968.

Zhao Yuanren. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

Zhou Fagao 周法高. *Zhongguo Gudai Yufa: Chengdai Bian* 中國古代語法：稱代編. Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1959.

————. *Zhongguo Gudai Yufa: Gouci Bian* 中國古代語法：构詞編. Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1962.

————. "'Zhi', 'Jue', 'Qi' Yongfa Zhi Bianyan" "'之', '厥', '其' 用法之演變". In *Zhongguo Yuwen Luncong* 中國語文論叢, pp 84–98. Taipei: Zhengzhong Shuju, 1963.