

THE ARCHAIC CHINESE PRONOUNS

by A. C. GRAHAM

- I. The Theories of Karlgren and Kennedy
- II. The Problem of Phrase Intonation
- III. The Problem of Stress
- IV. The Evolution of the Pronoun System

LIST OF REFERENCES

- CH'EN Meng-chia 陳夢家, *Yin-hsü pu-tz'ü tsung-shu* 殷虛卜辭綜述
Peking 1956
- CHOU Fa-kao 周法高 (1) *A Historical Grammar of Ancient Chinese* 中國
古代語法.
Part 3. *Substitution* 稱代編 Taipei, 1959.
(2) *Chung-kuo yü-wen lun-ts'ung* 中國語文論叢 Taipei, 1963.
- DOBSON, W. A. C. H. (1) *Late Archaic Chinese*, University of Toronto Press,
1959
(2) *Early Archaic Chinese*, University of Toronto Press, 1962.
(3) *The Language of the Book of Songs*, University of Toronto Press,
1968.
(4) *The Origin and Development of Prosody in Early Chinese Poetry*,
T'oung Pao 54 (1968), 231-250.
- GABELENTZ, G. von der, *Chinesische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1881.
- GRAHAM, A. C. (1) *Observations on a new Classical Chinese grammar*,
BSOAS 22/3 (1959), 556-571.
(2) *The Date and Composition of Liehtzyy*, *AM(NS)* 8/2 (1961) 139-198.
(3) *The prosody of the sao poems in the Ch'u tz'ü*, *AM(NS)* 10/2 (1963),
119-161.
(4) *Some basic Problems of Classical Chinese Syntax*, *AM(NS)* 14/2
(1969), 192-216.
- HAWKES, David, *Ch'u Tz'ü: The Songs of the South*, Oxford 1959.
- HENDERSON, Eugénie J. A. *Prosodies in Siamese*, *AM(NS)* 1 (1948), 189-215.
- HU Shih 胡適, *Hu Shih wen-ts'un* 胡適文存, (1st series) Shanghai 1925.
- JUNG Keng 容庚, *The use of pronouns in inscriptions of the Chou dynasty*,
Yenching Journal 6 (1929), 1041-1046.

- KAO Ming-k'ai 高名凱, *A study of personal pronouns in the Chinese language*, Yenching Journal 30 (1946), 1-26.
- KARLGREN, B. (1) *Le proto-chinois, langue flexionnelle*, Journal Asiatique 15 (1920), 205-233.
 (2) *The Book of Odes*, Stockholm 1950.
 (3) *The Book of Documents*, Stockholm 1950.
 (4) *Grammata serica recensa*, Stockholm 1957.
 (5) *Tones in archaic Chinese*, BMFEA 32 (1960) 113-142.
- KENNEDY, George A. (1) *Equation No. 5 (Chinese Fusion Words)*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, 67/1 (1947), 56-59.
 (2) *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, edited Tien-yi Li, Yale University 1964.
- KUAN Hsieh-ch'u 管燮初, *Yin-hsü chia-ku k'o-tz'ü-ti yü-fa yen-chiu* 殷虛甲骨刻辭的語法研究 Shanghai 1953.
- MA Chien-chung 馬建忠, *Ma-shih wen-t'ung chiao-chu* 馬氏文通校注 edited Chang Hsi-ch'en 章錫琛 Peking 1954.
- PIKE, Kenneth L. *Tone Languages*, University of Michigan Press, 1948.
- PULLEYBLANK, E. G. (1) *Studies in early Chinese grammar*, Part 1, AM(NS) 8/1 (1960), 36-67.
 (2) *The consonantal system of old Chinese* Part 2, AM(NS) 9/2 (1963), 206-265.
- WANG Li 王力 *Han-yü shih-kao* 漢語史稿, 3 vols, Peking 1957-8.
- YANG, Po-chün 楊伯峻, *Lun-yü yi-chu* 論語譯注, Peking, 1958.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AM(NS) Asia Major (New Series)
 BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.
 BMFEA Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.
 CC Chiu chang 九章
 HY Harvard-Yenching Institute sinological index series.
 LS Li sao 離騷
 SPTK Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an 四部叢刊

References to poems of the *Ch'u tz'ü* are to verses as numbered by Hawkes.

The Archaic readings are those of Karlgren's *Grammata serica recensa*, with the Ancient tones indicated where relevant (-level, 'rising, 'falling).

I. The Theories of Karlgren and Kennedy

The Classical Chinese pronoun system has twice been the subject of revolutionary studies which have changed our whole conception of the early history of the language. In 1920 Karlgren in *Le proto-chinois, langue flexionnelle* pointed out correlations between the terminations of the pronouns and their grammatical functions. In 1956 Kennedy took a second

decisive forward step in *The Classical Pronoun Forms NGO and NGA*, by introducing several new factors into discussion of the problem, tone, stress and position in relation to the pause. In the present paper I shall try to assess the implications of this second crucial contribution, and in particular to distinguish Kennedy's discoveries about tone, which have a firm basis and possibilities of further development, from his much more questionable theories about stress.

The starting-point of Karlgren's inquiry was the fact, already noticed by Gabelentz, Ma Chien-chung and Hu Shih¹, that several pronouns show limitations of distribution which at that time it was natural to interpret in terms of grammatical case. In the terminology in which we describe Indo-European languages we may say that in the 3rd person *ch'i* 其 is genitive and *chih* 之 accusative, and in the 1st person *wu* 吾 is nominative and genitive but never accusative except in front of the verb in negative sentences (which we may explain by assimilation to the nominative case). Karlgren pointed out that in the *Analects* and *Mencius* there are two main pronouns in both the 1st and the 2nd persons, that in each pair we seem to find a single root with the terminations -O and -A, and that the terminations show some correlation with grammatical function. In classifying grammatical functions Karlgren made several choices which fifty years later most would recognize as mistaken, treating the possessive position in front of *so* 所 as nominative and confusing the conjunction *yü* 與 between subjects with the preposition before an object.² The following table presents his figures of distribution, adding in brackets corrections by Chou Fa-kao³ for the *Analects* supplemented by corrections of my own for *Mencius*. I replace his readings for the pronouns by the Archaic readings as later reconstructed in his *Grammata serica*.

1st Person		Nominative	Genitive	Accusative
(<i>Analects</i>)	* NGO 吾	95	12	3 (pre-verbal)
	* NGÂ 我	16 (of which 12 are emphatic)	4	26
(<i>Mencius</i>)	* NGO	76	47	—
	* NGÂ	68	14	53
2nd Person				
(<i>Analects</i>)	* NIO 汝	14 (13)	—	2 (4)
	* NIA 爾	9 (6)	3 (7)	6 (5)
(<i>Mencius</i>)	* NIO	3 (—)	2 (4)	— (1)
	* NIA	5 (4)	2 (3)	3

¹ Gabelentz 411, Ma 38, Hu 2/722.

² Chou (1), 28f.

³ Chou (1), as n. 2.

From these figures Karlgren inferred that the pronouns preserve the traces of a case system, with the ending -O marking the nominative and genitive and -A the accusative. He believed that this system was still almost intact for the -O forms in both persons. Although Karlgren seriously underestimated the frequency of accusative *NIO it may be noticed that this pronoun even as object only once follows the main verb,⁴ a fact compatible with the explanation by assimilation to the subject which he offers for *NGO as inverted object. In the case of the -A form Karlgren has to assume encroachment by the accusative on other cases (a process for which he adduces Indo-European parallels). But in the older text, the *Analepts*, this encroachment has scarcely begun in the 1st person; *NGA is beginning to supersede the nominative when the subject is emphasized (for this too he finds Indo-European parallels), but otherwise is still generally accusative. Karlgren concludes that Chinese was originally an inflected language, and that declension survived in the pronouns just as Indo-European declension survives in the pronouns of English and French.

Karlgren was well aware of a very obvious objection to his theory. In texts earlier than the *Analepts*, in the *Documents* and the *Odes*, we do not find even the imperfect evidence of a proto-Chinese case system which he found in the *Analepts*. Indeed we now know that on the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions *wo* is already freely used as subject and possessive and *ju* as object (*erh* has not been found).⁵ But Karlgren did not regard this objection as decisive. The *Analepts* and *Mencius* reflect the earliest form of living language to be written down, the dialect of Lu; the *Documents* and *Odes* represent literary languages, documentary-oratorical and poetic respectively, which continued to be used for their own purposes long after the living dialects were being written. It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that the Lu dialect preserved features of proto-Chinese already lost in the literary languages.

The importance of Karlgren's contribution is that it uncovered correlations between morphology and grammar which discredited the assumption that Classical Chinese was always a purely isolating language. His theory of an inflected proto-Chinese never won much support among sinologists, and his description of the pronouns on the analogy of the Indo-European case system is now obsolete; but his example led to the discovery of other morphological and syntactic groupings among the pronouns and particles. By now sinologists have at their disposal a great deal of puzzling and conflicting information about the many pre-classical and classical pronouns, most of it conveniently assembled in the volume on *Substitution* in Chou Fa-kao's *Historical Grammar of Ancient Chinese*. It has become clear that the

problem is much more complicated than it seemed when Karlgren first called attention to it, and that if an overall pattern emerges it will be one in which the distribution of four pronouns in the *Analepts* and *Mencius* occupies only a small corner. The following examples will show how little is explained by a theory based on these texts alone:

(1) *ju* "you", classed by Karlgren as nominative and genitive, is four times in possessive positions in *Mencius* but never in the *Analepts*, where on the other hand *erh* is possessive seven times. Chou Fa-kao⁶ has shown that the exclusion of *ju* from possessive positions, far from being fortuitous, is the one constant feature of its distribution, from the bronze inscriptions and *Documents* down to the *Analepts* and even the *Tso-chuan*. It is in *Mencius* that this limitation on its distribution is first abandoned.

(2) Karlgren's figures, even after Chou Fa-kao's corrections, do suggest some tendency to confine *ju* to the subject and possessive, like *wu* "I, my". Other texts show a similar tendency to confine one pronoun to these positions while allowing another in all positions. But in *Chuang-tzū*, for example, the former pronoun is *erh*/*NĭəG 而 and the latter *ju*; in the *Tso-chuan*, as Dobson⁷ has pointed out, they are respectively *erh*/*NĭA and *ju*, so that the relationship noticed by Karlgren is exactly reversed.

(3) In the *Li sao* 離騷 and *Chiu ko* 九歌 of the *Ch'u tz'ü* we find *wo* exclusively as object. The pronoun system of the *Ch'u* poetry has very ancient features; not only does it use the pre-classical pronouns, in the case of *chen* 朕 "my" it preserves the limitation to possessive positions which is observed in the bronze inscriptions but already lost in the *Documents*.⁸ At first sight this evidence seems to support Karlgren's theory that *wo* was originally accusative. But again we find a curious anomaly. *Wo* is always final, except once as inverted object where it is penultimate; neither *wu* nor *wo* is used as object earlier in the line, the gap being filled by another pronoun, *yü* 余.⁹

There is however one objection raised against Karlgren by Kennedy¹⁰ which seems to be baseless. In the pre-classical language of the inscriptions and the *Documents* and even the transitional language of the *Odes* we find *wo* but not *wu*, except for a couple of instances of *wu* in the *Documents*. This suggests that *wo* was always the standard pronoun and that *wu* originated comparatively late as a special form with limited distribution. But the objection overlooks the relevance of a 1st person pronoun *yü*/*NGIO 魚, 虞 found on the bronze inscriptions, already exclusively subject and possessive

⁴ Cf. 42 below.

⁵ Kuan 31-33. Ch'en 94-97.

⁶ Chou (1) 31.

⁷ Dobson (1) 229f. But the figures in his table for *erh* cover less than two-thirds of the instances and do not include any of the exceptions with *erh* as object (Graham (1) 557, n. 2).

⁸ Chou (1) 52-54.

⁹ Cf. 12-15 below.

¹⁰ Kennedy (2) 440.

and undoubtedly the ancestor of *wu*/*NGO.¹¹ In the two occurrences of *wu* in a genuine and a spurious book of the *Documents* the reading *yü* (written without the radical) has early manuscript authority.¹² We may even suspect that the absence of *yü* in the classical texts as we now have them is the effect of graphic standardization. In *Lieh-tzû* 列子 (c.300AD), which borrows many passages from the lost longer version of *Chuang-tzû* 莊子,¹³ we once find *yü* where the present text of *Chuang-tzû* reads *wu*.¹⁴ It may be noticed that the reading *NGIO improves the phonetic symmetry of the four pronouns, and that there is even a minute scrap of evidence that *wo*/*NGÄ is descended from a *yi*/*NGIA 宜, which would make the symmetry perfect except in tone (*NGIO-/*NGIA-, *NIO'/*NIA'):

Ode 223/5 如食宜饌.

"If they are served food they insist on being gorged" (Karlgren)

Ching-tien shih-wen 經典釋文 SPTK, Odes 中 34B/9, on 宜 (*NGIA-): 本作「儀」。……韓詩云,儀我也。

"Some copies read 儀 (*NGIA-) ... The *Han Odes* says: *NGIA- is 'I'."

Karlgren's grammatical categories, when he wrote his essay on proto-Chinese in 1920, were those of Indo-European languages, from which more recent investigators of Chinese grammar have tried to free themselves. It is now apparent that *wu* and *wo*, unlike the 2nd person pronouns, are clearly distinguished from the bronze inscriptions down to the early Han, but that the distinction can be stated in simpler terms if we discard the Indo-European category of case. One basic choice in devising a Classical Chinese grammar is whether to include the subject with the object inside the sentence-core or rather to treat it as subordinate to the whole core, according to the principle that the subordinate precedes the superordinate. I have recently argued that we cannot lay down a consistent procedure for eliminating subordinates from the sentence-core without classing the subject among subordinates.¹⁵ Dobson, who also chose this alternative, saw that it allows a very simple description of *wu* and *wo*: *wu* "I, my" is confined to subordinate positions, *wo* is not (in his own terminology *wu* is "determinant" while *wo* is "pregnant").¹⁶ This explains why *wu* appears as subject and possessive but not as object after the verb, or as complement, directive or after prepositions. It also partially explains the use of *wu* as inverted object. The inversion of pronoun objects in a negative sentence is a pre-classical feature

surviving in the classical language which cannot be explained either by the sequence of positions in the sentence-core or by the rule that subordinates precede superordinates. A consequence of this anomaly is a dilemma as to whether to treat the pronoun as object (although it precedes the verb as though subordinate to it) or as subordinate (although like the object it is uneliminable from the core). This leaves freedom of choice between *wu* and *wo*: *Analepts* 11/26 不吾知 "not know me" *Mencius* 5A/1 不我愛 "not love me".

Let us describe *wu* and *wo* as the "dependent" and "independent" forms of the 1st person pronoun. Are there other pronouns with dependent forms? Among the near demonstratives there are forms which occur as adjunct but not as head, *chih* 之 and in *Mencius* *ssü*/*SĪĒG 斯. The former is already attested on the oracle bones, the latter is exclusively adjunct in *Mencius* but not in the *Odes* and the *Analepts*. But these are not dependent forms comparable with *wu* "I, my", since we do not find them as subject. On the other hand among the far demonstratives, which are not attested until the classical period,¹⁷ we do find a dependent form which occurs as subject, *fu*/*B'ĪWO 夫, cognate to *pi*/*PIA 彼. It is well known that *fu* is not exclusively adjunct; among the fifteen exceptions noted by Chou Fa-kao¹⁸ it is subject except in one *Tso-chuan* passage where the first of its two appearances follows a causative verb:

Tso-chuan 336 Hsiang 31 fu 8 使夫往而學焉,夫亦愈知治矣.

"If you send him (*fu*) to go and learn from it, he (*fu*) will after all know more about how to govern."

This exception is not serious, since among the exceptions to the pre-Han rule that *wu* is never object is the *Tso-chuan* practice of occasionally allowing *wu* as object early in the sentence:

Tso-chuan 421/Chao 26/5 賂吾以天下.

"bribe me with the Empire."

We may say then that *wu* and *fu* are the dependent forms of *wo* "I" and *pi* "that", and it becomes all the stranger that in the 2nd person we cannot sustain Karlgren's claim to have found the same relation between *ju* and *erh*. We are faced by five puzzling and apparently disconnected facts:

(1) *ju* is phonetically similar to dependent *wu* and *fu*, and *erh* to independent *wo* and *pi*.

(2) Down to the 4th century BC *ju* like *wu* and *pi* is limited in distribution while *erh* like *wo* and *pi* is not.

On the other hand:

(3) Far from being exclusively dependent, *ju* can serve as object but is excluded from one subordinate position, the possessive.

¹¹ Chou (1) 60 n. 2. Jung 1043. Kuan 32. Cf. 36 below.

¹² Chou (1), as n. 11.

¹³ Graham (2) 156-158.

¹⁴ *Lieh-tzû*, SPTK 2/2B/13.

¹⁵ Graham (4), 206-208.

¹⁶ Dobson (1) 2.6.4.1, 6.2.1. For a criticism of Dobson's extension of his "determinant/pregnant" distinction to the 2nd person and anaphoric pronouns, cf. Graham (1), 557-560.

¹⁷ Cf. 38 below.

¹⁸ Chou (1), 137f.

(4) In the *Analepts* *ju* does show some tendency to resemble *wu* and *fu* in being generally dependent, yet the one position in which we do not find it at all is still the possessive.

(5) In some other texts there is a 2nd person pronoun which is mainly subordinate, but it is not *ju* but *erh* 爾 itself (*Tso-chuan*) or *erh* 而 (*Chuang-tzu*).

In IV we shall try to show that these difficulties are related and disappear when we widen the inquiry to the whole range of early pronouns.

Kennedy's paper *The Classical Pronoun Forms NGO and NGA*, published in Chinese in 1956, introduces more new ideas in eight pages than one finds in most books. He connects *wu* and *wo* with other pairs of cognates within which one word occurs as final in a phrase while the other does not. He points out that if we credit the words with their traditional tones (admittedly unattested before the Ancient Chinese of A.D. 600) we find in each pair the same contrast of level and deflected:

Level-tone, never phrase-final	Deflected-tone, sometimes phrase-final
吾 <i>wu</i> /*NGO-	我 <i>wo</i> /*NGA'
不 <i>pu</i> /*PIUG-	否 <i>fou</i> /*PIUG'
斯 <i>ssü</i> /*SIËG-	此 <i>ts'ü</i> /*TS'IA' 是 <i>shih</i> /*DIËG'
夫 <i>fu</i> /*B'IWO-	彼 <i>pi</i> /*PIA'

Among final particles we find the same tone contrast between interrogative particles and the rest. Now although interrogative particles are final they have something in common with words found only in mid-phrase; unlike the other final particles they point forward to the answer which will complete the discourse. A phonological resemblance between the uncompleted sentence and the question may be seen in other languages; in English for example (although Kennedy does not himself appeal to this analogy) an ordinary sentence ends with a fall in pitch and any rise in pitch like that of a question is a sign that the sentence is not yet complete.

Level-tone, inviting continuation: *yü*/*ZIO- 與 *hu*/*G'O- 乎 *fu*/*B'IWO- 夫 *yeh*/*ZIA- 邪.

Deflected-tone, marking completion: *yeh*/*DIA' 也 *yi*/*ZIG' *che*/*TIA' 者 *erh*/*NIG' 耳 *erh*/*NIAR' 爾.

The tone contrasts observed by Kennedy are very striking, especially since the deflected-tone examples are all on the rising tone in the Ancient Chinese system (including *shih* 是, which later shifted to the falling tone). The relevance of the contrasts would not be discredited if it turned out that Archaic Chinese was not a tonal language, that a final -S was the source of the falling and a glottal stop of the rising tone.¹⁹ Kennedy himself had shown elsewhere²⁰ that the rhymes of the *Odes* tend to conform with the tone

differences of the later tradition, so that we have no reason to doubt that the level/rising contrast of the Ancient readings reflects some distinction in Archaic phonology whether tonal or not. But we may question Kennedy's assumption that the significance of the tone contrast is wholly independent of other phonetic features. His examples would be much less convincing if we did not notice the recurrence of level-tone -O forms contrasting with rising-tone -A. Of the two level-tone examples without the -O termination one is unconvincing, the demonstrative *ssü*. Admittedly this is never phrase-final in *Mencius*, but the limitation is a peculiarity of this text, not shared, for example, by the *Odes* and the *Analepts*. Indeed the *Analepts* gives *ssü* the full range of distribution of the rising-tone demonstrative *ts'ü*, which it does not use. In any case *ssü*/*SIËG- phonetically resembles the pronouns *tsü*/*TSIG- 茲, *shih*/*DIG- 時 and *chih*/*TIG- 之, all level-tone and all attested as phrase-final. If *ssü* is rejected from the list all the level-tone words end in -O except the negative *pu*, the tone of which has been unstable throughout the history of the language.²¹ One's doubts increase when one notices that the three prepositions found at the penultimate particle position all agree with Kennedy's theory in being level-tone, but again share the -O termination: *yü*/*IO- 於, *yü*/*GIWO- 于, *hu*/*G'O- 乎. We may notice also that the connexion which Kennedy finds between his two series depends on including no level-tone words in the second except purely interrogative particles and *fu* "n'est-ce pas?". But the level tone is equally characteristic of the exclamatory particles (*wu*/*O- 於, *wu-hu*/*O- 嗚乎, *tsai*/*TSIG- 哉, *hsi*/*YIEI- 兮), among which the ones which accord with Kennedy's theory by standing at the head of the sentence instead of at the end are precisely the ones which have -O. The behaviour of *hu* is also significant in this connexion; it is exclamatory in mid-phrase (善乎問 "Good, your question!") but when final becomes interrogative.

There is less reason to doubt that the rising tone is significant even without the -A termination, which seems to appear when there is a cognate level-tone -O form: *NGO-/NGA', *B'IWO-/PIA', *ZIO-/DIA'. Another possible pair is the collective prefix *chu*/*TIO- 諸 and the phrase-final *che*/*TIA' 者 (The latter graph represents *chu* in the bronze inscriptions; with the appearance of *che* and its borrowing of the graph, *chu* was distinguished by the added radical.) We shall later consider a further pair, *ju*/*NIO- 如 "like" and the suffix *erh*/*NIAR' 爾.²²

As far as the pronouns are concerned, the most obvious advantage of Kennedy's scheme is that it explains the phonetic differentiation of *wu* and *wo*. But Kennedy claims much more for it than this; he wishes to treat the two as a single word which changes in pronunciation according to position

¹⁹ Pulleyblank (2), 216f, 225f.

²⁰ Kennedy (2), 135-150.

²¹ The problem of the Archaic reading of *pu* is discussed in Kennedy (2), 125-129.

²² Cf. 17, 18 below.

in relation to the pause, and denies any need to distinguish them on a grammatical basis. In his opinion the fact to which we point when we say that *wu* is never object except when inverted in a negative sentence is simply the phonological fact that the pronoun could not be pronounced *NGO- before a pause; the fact behind the claim that *wo* is generally either object or emphasized subject is the phonological fact that the pronoun was pronounced *NGA' at the end of a clause and before the pause which may be postulated after the subject when stressed. At this stage in his argument Kennedy begins to treat stress as the primary factor, a step for which nothing has so far prepared us:

「吾」「我」實爲同一字之「重讀」與「非重讀」之別。「吾」字之後無「句讀暫歇」，故與其後隨之字有密切關係。「我」字之後則常有「句讀暫歇」。

"The real difference between *wu* and *wo* is that they are the same word as it is stressed and as it is unstressed. After *wu* there is no pause, therefore it is in close junction with the succeeding words. As for *wo*, it regularly has a pause after it."²³

In this description there are three elements, pause, tone and stress, the relation between which is not fully worked out. There is no obvious reason why a stressed pronoun should precede a pause or an unstressed pronoun should not. Here Kennedy assumes the background of his later work, of which unfortunately the only document is his uncompleted *Word-classes in Classical Chinese*, an exploration of the grammar of *Mencius* in which we see the centre of his interest shifting from word-classes to stress-patterns. In this provisional study Kennedy tries out the experiment of postulating without proof three basic stress-patterns, adjunct-head with the stress on adjunct (君事 "the prince's affairs"), verb-object with the stress on object (事君 "serve the prince") and conjuncts with equal stress (二三 "two or three"), after the analogy of the Wu dialect Tangsü, his study of which had convinced him that syntax is likely to have interacted with tone and stress in the spoken language behind the written texts.²⁴ In the verb-object pattern we find the rising-tone forms such as *wo* at the stressed position but not the level-tone forms such as *wu*, which suggests to him that they were the stressed and the unstressed forms respectively. A difficulty here is that it is the level-tone forms which are commoner as adjuncts, which according to the postulates are stressed. However he observes that we should expect that the normal stress pattern (是心 "this heart") would not be rigid, and would be reversed if the speaker wished to give prominence to the head (吾心 "my heart"). All this of course is a purely speculative construction, of interest only as a suggestive experiment.

²³ Kennedy (2), 439.

²⁴ Kennedy (2), 213-225.

A very obvious objection is that if the adjunct-head stress pattern was variable we should not expect the verb-object pattern to be rigid either. The 1st person pronoun object after the verb is always *wo*, therefore according to Kennedy always stressed. But can one really conceive a language in which one is bound to say "She loves me" (愛我), forbidden to say "She loves me" (愛吾)?

Kennedy's attempt to eliminate the need of a syntactic distinction between *wu* and *wo* rests on a claim which is not only presented without proof but seems scarcely intelligible, that *wo* always stands before a pause. The plain fact is that we find the rising-tone pronouns at any nominal position in the sentence, and that one of the main uses of the rising-tone demonstratives is as adjuncts, so that Kennedy's claim would oblige us to assume a pause between adjunct and head. The claim that while *wu* never precedes a pause *wo* always does seems indeed quite gratuitous even in terms of his theory. Granted that the level tone implies that the sentence is either incomplete or interrogative, and that if not interrogative it is completed on the rising tone, it by no means follows that the rising-tone form is exclusively final. To take the analogy of English, a rise in pitch implies a question or an incomplete utterance, and the latter on completion will fall in pitch; but nothing forbids falls in pitch earlier in the sentence. The starting-point of Kennedy's whole argument was the fact that *wu* and other level-tone forms are never final in any phrase entered in the Harvard-Yenching concordances to several texts. But the *Mencius* concordance records *wo* itself as final in only eight out of 144 phrases. To maintain Kennedy's position we should have to assume pauses inside most of the 144 examples, and then prove over again that *wu* never precedes such pauses.

At first sight it might seem possible to establish subdivisions in which *wo* is always and *wu* is never final. *Wo* as object always concludes some syntactic sub-unit (except when inverted in negative sentences); by assuming pauses in speech after such sub-units, and a pause after the subject whenever and only when it was stressed, it would seem that Kennedy's thesis might be sustained. But in the first place it is quite arbitrary to assume that there was always a pause after the emphasized subject. This seems no more necessary in Chinese 爾爲爾，我爲我 (our examples will be taken from the *Mencius* concordance) than in the English "You are you, I am I". What is one to make of cases where *wo* is subject of a nominalized clause (熊掌亦我所欲也 "Bear's paws too are something that I desire")? Moreover *wo* is common as possessive (我心 "my heart") and as inverted object (父母之不我愛 "my parents not loving me"). Even when *wo* follows a preposition or verb, and so does conclude a syntactic sub-unit, it is often quite implausible to assume a pause: 罪我者 "that which condemns me", 以我爲簡 "think me simple", 謂我愛也 "call me stingy", 夫何使我至於此極也 "Why has he let us arrive at this extremity?" These last

instances are the crucial ones since they display *wo* in positions where we do not find *wu*; if we cannot admit pauses after these positions we are thrown back on a syntactic explanation of why *wu* is excluded from them.

In any case what is the point of trying to imagine pauses after a word which can occupy any nominal position? Pulleyblank runs into the same difficulties when he assumes that *shih* 是, as one of Kennedy's deflected-tone pronouns, must originally have occurred "finally or in exposed position in front".²⁵ He has the courage not to shrink from the suggestion that in lines of the *Odes* such as 正是四國²⁶ the *shih* is not attributive but in apposition: "He corrects these, the countries of the four quarters". Yet the most obvious fact about the distribution of this rising-tone pronoun in the *Odes* is that in 125 lines it is never final, while on the other hand *tzü*/*TSIəG-茲 is final 5 times out of 13 (a point which we have noticed²⁷ as evidence that the level tone is relevant only in words ending in -O). Since in the *Odes* *shih* as object precedes instead of following the verb, Pulleyblank's procedure forces us sometimes to make pauses between every syllable in a line (*Ode* 164 是究是圖 "look into this, ponder this").

There is however one remarkable example of a text in which rising-forms certainly are confined to final positions, not in subdivisions of the clause but in the clause itself. In most pre-Han texts the 1st person pronoun *yü*/*DIO- is written with a single graph, either 余 or 予, but the *Li sao* and *Chiu ko* in the *Ch'u tz'u* use both. In a conversation some years ago in which he convinced me for the first time of the importance of Kennedy's new approach Prof. Pulleyblank pointed out to me that in both poems *yü* 予 and *wo* appear only at the end of the line or before the medial exclamation *hsi* 兮, except in a couple of cases where they are penultimate as inverted object; earlier in the line we always find *yü* 余 or *wu*. Moreover *yü* 予 regularly rhymes with rising-tone words, so that if we ascribe to *yü* 余 the traditional level-tone reading there is an exact parallel with level-tone *wu* and rising-tone *wo*. In the following table the pause is assumed to be the end of the line or the medial *hsi*, except in the one instance where the *hsi* interrupts a continuous sentence (*Chiu ko* (f)¹⁰ 忽獨與余兮目成. "Suddenly his eyes meet mine alone", where the level-tone *yü* is used).

	<i>Li sao</i>				<i>Chiu ko</i>			
	*NGO-	*NGĀ'	*DIO-	*DIO'	*NGO-	*NGĀ'	*DIO-	*DIO'
Subject	22		16		2			1
Possessive	2		22		3			11
Object at final position		1		3		2		7

²⁵ Pulleyblank (1), 66.

²⁶ Pulleyblank (1), 34.

²⁷ Cf. 9 above.

	<i>Li sao</i>				<i>Chiu ko</i>			
	*NGO-	*NGĀ'	*DIO-	*DIO'	*NGO-	*NGĀ'	*DIO-	*DIO'
Inverted object at penultimate position	1	1		1				
Inverted object earlier in line	1							
Other object earlier in line			13			3		
	26	2	51	4	5	2	15	7

We may summarize the results in this form:

	Level-tone		Rising-tone	
	*NGO-	*DIO-	*NGĀ'	*DIO'
Final			3	10
Penultimate	1		1	1
Earlier	30	66		
	31	66	4	11

In the *Odes* *yü* is written with only one graph, but there too regularly rhymes with words on the rising tone. We may therefore take it as certain that *yü* was pronounced on the rising tone at the end of the line, in perfect accordance with Kennedy's theory. Were there other words which shared this tone change? An obvious candidate is *ju*/*ŃIO' which has the -O termination of *DIO- and no less than ten other level-tone pronouns and particles already noticed, as well as the cognate -A' form (*erh*/*NIA' 爾) which accompanies five of the ten.²⁸ In the *Li sao* the word appears twice, once initial and once final, in the latter case written without the radical.²⁹ But unfortunately the *Chiu ko* omits the radical whether the word is final or not, and since the traditional reading is rising-tone we cannot confirm the speculation by the rhymes. The evidence of rhyme, although not unequivocal³⁰ fails to confirm a rising-tone reading in the case of the pronouns *shih*/*DIO- 時, *tzü*/*TSIəG- 茲 and *chih*/*TIO- 之, all level-tone but without the -O termination. But although *chih* is often final in the *Odes* it is interesting that there is also a final word *chih*/*TIO- 止, regarded by

²⁸ Cf. 8, 9 above.

²⁹ LS 68, 133.

³⁰ For an interesting example of final level-tone demonstratives in a pair of rhetorical questions (*Ode* 265/5), cf. Pulleyblank (1), 37.

Kennedy as a fusion of *T₁əG- Z₁əG' 之矣, but by Dobson as simply another form of *T₁əG-.³¹

The *Li sao* and *Chiu ko* are the only texts so far noticed by scholars in which *wo* is confined to the last two positions before the pause. We may suspect that the confinement of rising-tone *yü* to the same positions was just as unusual, although the absence of the graphic distinction in other texts deprives us of direct evidence on this point. Indeed we can hardly account for the graphic distinction itself on any other assumption: we can appreciate that poets might need to mark the changing pronunciation of the word, but the need would not arise if it was a recognized rule that *yü* changed from the level to the rising tone only at the end of the sentence. The question arises whether the restriction imposed on rising-tone forms belongs to the living language, perhaps as a survival from an earlier stage in the evolution of the pronouns, or whether it merely reflects a convention of verse chanting. It might well be a principle of recitation that the intonation on which the line ends is avoided earlier, although in the fluctuations of ordinary speech one could pass in and out of it any number of times before returning to it at the end of the sentence. The possibility of a linguistic survival which would throw light on the earlier history of *wo*, and which could be used to support either Karlgren's theory that *wo* was originally accusative or Kennedy's that it belongs in front of the pause, is attractive but does not seem tenable. From their first appearance, which in the case of *wo* at least is in the Shang inscriptions, *wo* is used freely in all positions while *yü*/*NGIO- (ancestor of *wu*/*NGO-)³² is exclusively subordinate. If we wish to reconstruct a still earlier stage in their development we can hardly do so on the evidence of two poems of about 300BC. In any case the precise correspondences in our tables between the distributions of *wo* and rising-tone *yü*, both bound by the pause, do not extend to *wu* and level-tone *yü*. *Wu* is bound not by the pause but by syntax, and is as exclusively subject, possessive and inverted object as elsewhere in pre-Han literature; consequently in most positions neither *wu* nor *wo* can serve as object and the gap has to be filled by level-tone *yü* (sixteen times object in positions before the penultimate). Such a divergence of *wu* and *wo*, leaving positions unfillable by either, is hardly conceivable in the living language. It is explicable only by the interaction of two factors, the ordinary syntactic limitation on *wu* and a stylistic preference for the level-tone -O forms in some way connected with the chanting of the verse. This preference is common to most poems in the *Ch'u tz'ü*, although none of the others indulges it to the same degree. *Wo* is subject in the *T'ien wen* 天文, object in the middle of the line in the *Chiu Chang* 九章.³³ The only other poem which makes extensive use of

both graphs for *yü* is very late, the *Ch'i chien* 七諫 (c. 130BC); there none of the five occurrences of level-tone *yü* is final, but the rising-tone form is final only twice out of four times.³⁴

We may also consider the treatment of the demonstratives, first the cognate far demonstratives:

	<i>fu</i> /*B' IWO-		<i>pi</i> /*PIA'	
	<i>Li sao</i>	<i>Chiu ko</i>	<i>Li sao</i>	<i>Chiu ko</i>
Final	—	—	—	—
Non-final	21	3	1	—

Here we find the same preference for the level-tone form, although the single rising-tone example is not in front of the pause.³⁵

There are no near demonstratives in the *Chiu ko*, but several in the *Li sao*:

	<i>ts'ü</i> /*TS' IÄR'	<i>ts'ü</i> /*TSIəG-	<i>shih</i> /*ŠIĒG'
Final	—	3	—
Non-final	14	1	1

Here the distribution is the reverse of the one which Kennedy's hypothesis would lead us to expect. But the near demonstratives differ from the others we have considered in having no -O- form. Once again we find reason to suspect that Kennedy's conclusions apply to level-tone words only when they have a final -O, and that even in the *Ch'u* poems it is not the rising-tone pronoun as such which is bound to the pause. The principle of verse recitation which we have suggested would affect the choice of words only when there are alternatives with tones adapted to different positions in intonation patterns. But the near demonstrative *ts'ü* has no regular alternative at all, let alone one with an appropriate tone difference; *ts'ü* is an archaism, *shih* is anaphoric ("the aforementioned, the one in question") while *ts'ü* is deictic ("the one here"). There is consequently no reason why the poet should not use it freely anywhere in the line, as he would use any ordinary rising-tone noun.

II. The Problem of Phrase Intonation

How do our revisions affect Kennedy's interpretation of the tone difference? Kennedy lays down two principles:

A deflected tone (which in all his examples is a rising tone) implies completion.

A level tone implies incompleteness.

³¹ Kennedy (1). Dobson (3), 3.8.

³² Cf. 36 below.

³³ *T'ien wen* 183. CC (f) 13.

³⁴ Cf. Graham (3), 138, n. 39.

³⁵ LS 15.

These are presumably features of phrase intonation, like the fall in pitch which ends an English sentence and the rise in pitch which implies that it is either incomplete or a question. Intonation patterns are important in tone languages as in other languages, and modify the inherent tones of some syllables.³⁶ We can easily conceive that in Archaic Chinese phrase intonation affected the morphology of particles and pronouns bound to fixed positions in the phrase and established the inherent tone of the word or, if Archaic Chinese was not yet a tone language, whatever phonetic feature preceded tone. (Although we shall continue to speak quite simply of the level and rising tone, we are not of course concerned with the actual nature of the phonological difference.) The best demonstration that this actually happened would be to lay down principles with the full scope of laws, valid for every word to which they are relevant. Kennedy's generalizations, in the form in which he states them, only account for a small number of particles and pronouns; we have noticed some level-tone words which are often final,³⁷ to which *yen*/*GI₁AN 焉 is an obvious addition, and there are also rising-tone words which cannot be final (*ch'ieh*/*TS'IA 且, *nai*/*N₂G 乃, *so*/*SI₁O 所, *kou*/*KU 苟). The question now arises whether we can dispose of these exceptions by adjusting Kennedy's formulation to the criticisms we have made.

In the first place we decided that the case for regarding the level tone as a sign of incompleteness is secure only for words ending in -O.³⁸ Does the rising tone also require something further to establish it as a sign of completion? We have noticed that Kennedy's assumption that a rising-tone pronoun requires a succeeding pause involves both theoretical confusion and defiance of the facts.³⁹ We may add that even among final particles a pause is required no more or less by rising-tone *DIA' 也 than by its interrogative counterpart the level-tone *ZIO- 與. The difference between them is in the significance of the pause; in the former case it marks a conclusion, in the latter merely an interruption between question and answer. The rising tone requires a succeeding pause only in the sense that without it the tone does not assume significance. We may therefore rephrase both of Kennedy's principles:

Rising tone plus pause implies completion.

Level tone plus -O implies incompleteness.

It will now be seen that the function of -O- is to signal continuation by ending one word with an overt vocal preparation for the next. It is the start of the expulsion of breath, most clearly identified in the interjection *O 於, 嗚 at the head of a sentence. The opposition is between rounding

off an utterance on the rising tone and keeping it in suspension by uttering on the level tone the start of a new sound.

In order to test the scope of the new formula let us take the vocabularies in Dobson's *Early Archaic Chinese* and *Late Archaic Chinese* and list every instance of (1) rising-tone words which regularly precede a pause (these will generally be final particles) and (2) level-tone words with final -O. The purpose is to discover whether the former will in every case turn out to be completive (that is, not interrogative or exclamatory) and the latter to be excluded from the final position unless they are interrogative. Dobson's vocabularies include some examples of nouns used adverbially or as status pronouns, the tone of which would have been fixed before their exposure to influence by sentence intonation; we shall note even these, but bracket them at the end:

Rising-tone plus pause

Phrase-finals (not interrogative nor exclamatory): *DIA 也, *ZIOG 矣, *TIA 者, *ZIOG 已, *NIOG 耳, *NIA 爾, *PIUG 否.

Level-tone plus -O

(1) Interrogative final particles: *GO 乎, *ZIO 與, *B'WO 夫.

(2) Interjections (head of sentence) *O 於 *O-XO 嗚呼.

(3) Excluded from final position:

(i) Pronouns: *NGO 吾, *DIO 余, *B'WO 夫.

(ii) Prepositions: *IO 於, *GIWO 于, *GO 乎.

(iii) Pre-nominal: *TIO 諸.

(iv) Pre-verbal: *D'O 徒, *KO 姑, *G'O 胡, *MIWO 毋, *SIO 胥.

(4) Still to be established: *NIO 如, *MIWO 無 (初, 孤)

(The vocabulary of Dobson's *Language of the Book of Songs* contains five more relevant final words: *TIOG' 止, *TIEG' 只, *SIO- 胥, *TSIO- 且, *TIO- 諸. Since the functions and in some cases the tones are in dispute, and the distinction between statement and question tends to fade in the highly exclamatory language of the *Odes*, we shall ignore these examples.)

The two words classed as "still to be established" are verbs, and would not necessarily come under our rules; they might have too much of the mobility of verbs for their tones to be imposed by the intonation pattern. *ju*/*NIO- is in fact final sixteen times in the *Changes* as an adjectival suffix. However outside this text it is hardly ever final throughout the concordanced pre-Han literature except in such phrases as *ho ju* 何如, admissible on our principles because they are interrogative. The negative *wu*/*MIWO- is also rarely final, although there are sporadic instances in most texts. In order to check the possibility that both words were originally excluded from the final position let us examine their distribution in the earlier texts, adding the figures for *jo*/*NIAK 若 and *yu*/*GIUG' 有 for purposes of comparison. The number of occurrences of the word in the text will be added in brackets,

³⁶ Cf. Pike, *op. cit.*, Henderson, 205-211.

³⁷ Cf. 9 above.

³⁸ Cf. 9, 15 above.

³⁹ Cf. 11, 12 above.

except when neither of a pair is ever final. Cases of *ju* or *jo* in such phrases as *ho ju* will not be classed as final.

	Final <i>ju</i>	Final <i>jo</i>
<i>Documents</i> (genuine books)	— (22)	16 (148)
<i>Odes</i>	— (199)	6 (9)
<i>Analects</i>	—	—
<i>Mo-tzu</i> ch. 1-39	—	—
<i>Mencius</i>	— (140)	4 (100)
	Final <i>wu</i>	Final <i>yu</i>
<i>Documents</i>	— (121)	1 (287)
<i>Odes</i>	— (243)	10 (249)
<i>Analects</i>	2 (126)	10 (171)
<i>Mo-tzu</i> ch. 1-39	1 (222)	19 (393)
<i>Mencius</i>	— (250)	6 (403)

In the case of *ju* the evidence of the distribution in the *Odes* seems decisive by itself. Even the use of *ju* and *jo* as adjectival suffixes, which we noticed as an embarrassment in the *Changes*, provides corroboration in other texts. The *Odes* use both, but only *jo* at the end of the line (*Ode* 58/3 其葉沃若 "Its leaves are glossy". 94/2 婉如清揚 "Beautiful is the clear forehead".) The *Analects* has *ju* as suffix 24 times, always at the end of the clause, but always followed by *DĪA' 也. It contrasts in a very interesting way with *erh*/*NĪĀR' 爾 (not yet used in the *Documents* and *Odes*), found three times as suffix, also each time at the end of a clause, but without *DĪA':

Analects 10/1 孔子於鄉黨，恂恂如也，似不能言者。其在宗廟朝廷，便便言，唯謹爾。

"When Confucius was in his native district he was *hsün-hsün-ish*, and seemed like a man incapable of speech. When in the shrine or in court he spoke *pĕn-pĕn*, except that he was *chĭn-ish*."

The oldest of these cognates is *NĪAK, the one used on the bronze inscriptions; we may infer that *NĪO- is its level-tone -O form, which when as suffix it was forced to the end of the sentence was at first rounded off by rising-tone *DĪA', later generated its own rising-tone form *NĪĀR', with the same vowel change to be observed in pronouns (*NGO-/*NGĀ', *B'ĪWO-/*PIA') and particles (*ZĪO-/*DĪA'). Later still the adjective with *NĪĀR as suffix began to be used adverbially (*Mencius* 5B/6 僕僕爾暇拜 "accept *p'ū-p'ū-ishly* fast"). This example shows how complex the interplay of syntax and intonation might be, in the case of a suffix to words with freedom of movement inside the sentence.

Turning now to *wu*, it was noticed by Yang Po-chün that in the *Analects* there is nearly always an object after *wu* but never after *wang*/*MĪWANG 亡:⁴⁰

Analects 3/5 夷狄之有君不如諸夏之亡也。

"Barbarians who have a ruler are not as good as Chinese who do not."

In the *Odes*, where *wu* is never final, there is a case where an opposite of *yu* is required at the end of the line, and *wang* is used (*Ode* 35/4 何有何亡 "What is to be had, what not to be had?"). In the *Analects* *wang* is final four times out of eight. In *Mo-tzu* ch. 1-39, in spite of the single example of *wu* at the end of a phrase, the tendency to avoid it is especially clear:

	Final
<i>wu</i>	1
<i>wang</i>	6
<i>wu yu</i>	4
<i>wang yu</i>	3

We may infer that *wu* was originally a level-tone -O form, possibly of *wang* itself, which in the *Documents* is almost equally common, and is used freely with a succeeding object. In the course of its supersession by *wu* it was forced to the end of the sentence, to which *wu* only gradually penetrated. There is some doubt as to the tone of *wang* at different stages of its development, since the graphs with which it was written have different traditional readings: 岡 *MĪWANG' (*Documents*) 亡 *MĪWANG- (inscriptions and classical texts); in any case it was itself read *wu* from the Later Han onwards.⁴¹ But since it never became exclusively final its tone is irrelevant to the present hypothesis.

III. The Problem of Stress

We have seen that, while Kennedy's observations about the tones of *wu* and *wo* are very impressive, his theory that *wu* is unstressed and *wo* stressed appears to have little behind it except a decision to experiment on the assumption that Archaic Chinese had stress patterns similar to those of the modern dialect in which he was especially interested, Tangsĭc.⁴² We may notice also that Kennedy overlooked, or at any rate did not mention, a footnote in Karlgren's original article in which the stress hypothesis is anticipated and rejected.⁴³ Karlgren, noticing that *wo* as subject seems generally to be emphasized, had considered the possibility that "le contraste entre 吾 et 我 tient non à une différence de *cas*, mais à une différence d'*accent*: que 我 a été la forme accentuée." To dispose of this possibility he appealed to several examples in which *wu* seemed to him to be stressed and *wo* unstressed. He raised the further objection that we can hardly suppose that the 1st person pronoun, although in such a text as the *Analects* generally unstressed as subject, was invariably stressed as object after the verb.

⁴¹ Graham (2), 176.

⁴² Cf. 10 above.

⁴³ Karlgren (1), 213, n. 1.

⁴⁰ Yang 26. Cf. Graham (2), 174-176.

This is an argument of considerable weight which we have already considered;⁴⁴ even on Kennedy's postulates that adjunct and object were normally stressed we should expect *wu* as object shifting the stress to the verb as often as we find it as adjunct shifting the stress to the head. Kennedy ignores both this objection and Karlgren's examples of stressed *wu* and unstressed *wo*, and offers nothing in support of his own case except fourteen quotations in which he feels that the stresses fall where he wants them to fall. Karlgren has since replied with a further series of examples in which he thinks the stresses fall the other way.⁴⁵ Since the stressing of words in speech involves such complex factors, a high proportion of which will not show up at all in a written record, one is left wondering whether one has learned anything from this unsatisfactory debate except information about how two great sinologists pronounce Archaic Chinese inside their heads. This raises the fundamental problem of how one is to attack the problem of stress in a long dead language.

The question deserves to be treated at some length since stress hypotheses have recently become important in studies of Archaic Chinese. Pulleyblank has given his support to Kennedy's theory and himself proposed that the demonstratives 是 *shih*/* $\hat{D}i\acute{E}G'$ and 實 *shih*/* $\hat{D}i\acute{E}T$ originated as stressed forms of the old demonstrative 時 *shih*/* $\hat{D}i\acute{E}G$.⁴⁶ Dobson asserts that the negatives 弗 *fu*/* $PiW\acute{a}T$ and 勿 *wu*/* $MiW\acute{a}T$ are stressed forms of 不 *pu*/* $PiUG$ and 毋 *wu*/* $MiWO$, and that the final 矣 *yi* puts the stress on the penultimate and 也 *yeh* on the ultimate word.⁴⁷ These suggestions are symptoms of an undeniably healthy desire to get as near as possible to the spoken language which lies hidden behind the graphs of Classical Chinese. But there remains the problem of how one is supposed to test them. However important we may suspect stress to have been it is possible that it may be undiscoverable; we have no right to make assertions about it without offering criteria by which they may be verified or refuted. The old definitions of so many Chinese particles as "emphatic" or "euphonic" were frankly pre-scientific; a definition which displays the trappings of scientific linguistics but lacks the testability which is its essence would be something much worse, it would be pseudo-scientific.

Let us begin by distinguishing between syntactic "prominence", of which there may be clear evidence in a written text, and phonetic "stress". We shall shun words such as "emphasis" which embrace both, and confine "stress" strictly to phonology. If stress was important in the archaic language (as in modern Pekingese although not in such dialects as Cantonese), it is reasonable to postulate, in the light of our general experience

of languages, that prominent words were appreciably stressed in speech. But the only possible source of direct information about stress will be verse prosody, which might reveal patterns resembling those of stress rather than those of tone or quantity. The strongest evidence of stress in Archaic Chinese would be a correlation between syntactic prominence and verse prosody.

The problem of syntactic prominence is very complicated, but two varieties are clearly distinguished in Archaic Chinese:

(1) The prominent as the "new" not the "given". Although the traditional subject-predicate terminology invites us to assume that the subject is given and the predicate supplies the new information, in both English and Chinese the new information may be conveyed by the subject or object or their adjuncts. In spoken English these will be stressed.

Mencius 1A/7 孰勝¹曰, '楚人勝¹

"... which will win?" 'The men of *Ch'u* will win.'

6A/5 誰敬¹。... '敬弟¹。

"... which will he respect more?" 'He will respect the *brother* more.'

Since context often shows plainly which elements are new and which given there is no great difficulty in showing from written texts that a particular construction serves to mark the subject or object as new. The most familiar is the inversion of the object and its resumption by the pronoun *chih* 之 or *shih* 是:

Tso-chuan, 302 Duke of Hsiang 24/fu 1 非無賄之患而無令名之難。

"It is not the lack of bribes that he sees as the trouble, it is the lack of a good name which he is concerned about."

(2) The prominent as the "given but contrasted". This too is stressed in spoken English:

Mencius 3A/1 彼丈夫也, 我丈夫也。

"He is a plain man, I am a plain man."

In English we may distinguish the two kinds of prominence by such constructions as "It is X that..." for the first and "As far as X is concerned..." for the second. In Chinese the inverted construction used for the first is sometimes used for the second, in some contexts at least:

Analects 17/16 古者民有三疾, 今也或是之亡也。

"In ancient times the people had three failings. Nowadays, as far as these are concerned, to some extent they are free from them."

But the given but contrasted is also specially distinguished by such devices as exposure with a preceding *jo fu* 若夫 or succeeding *tse* 則. The following example illustrates both this and the inverted construction:

Kuo yü 國語 (Chin 晉) SPTK 12/1A/4

華則榮矣, 實之不知。

⁴⁴ Cf. 11 above.

⁴⁵ Karlgren (5), 141f.

⁴⁶ Pulleyblank (1).

⁴⁷ Dobson (1), 3.3.1.1., 3.12.

"As far as the outward show is concerned, it is splendid: it is the substance that I am not sure about."

Now discourse allows any number of intersecting relations of contrast, many of them with things not explicitly mentioned; which contrasts are significant for the speaker and exhibited in his stresses will depend partly on his own interests, mood and temperament. In English this is especially obvious in the case of such words as "I" and "not", a fact which makes it a little suspicious that the stressed forms proposed in Archaic Chinese should include a 1st person pronoun and a negative. It is inherent in the word "I" to imply some degree of contrast with others, but the frequency with which it is stressed varies from person to person and is commonly taken as a reliable measure of a man's modesty or self-importance. Similarly the word "not" contrasts accepted and rejected alternatives, but in many contexts whether someone says "It isn't" or "It is *not*" will depend on his reaction to the alternative he repudiates, on whether he is shocked or contemptuous or roused to combat. Consequently it is necessary to make a clear distinction between contrasts established in a written text (in which literary Chinese is fortunately rich because of its tendency to parallelism) and the almost infinite possibilities of contrast which affect the stresses of speech. If we start an inquiry into an archaic word by collecting sentences which clearly identify the new, or the given but contrasted, we can prove or disprove that the word is confined to prominent positions inside them. But if instead we start from an impression about the sound of the word as we read to ourselves we are unlikely ever to find a sentence in which we cannot stress it and appeal to an implicit contrast which accounts for the stress.

From this point of view there is a profound difference between Pulleyblank's theory of the demonstratives, which is based on an analysis of their syntactic functions, and Kennedy's about the pronouns and Dobson's about the negatives and final particles, which are supported only by random illustrations. Pulleyblank starts from a long series of examples showing that 實 *D'ĪĒT is a demonstrative which resumes and "emphasizes" the subject, as 是 *D'ĪĒG' resumes and emphasizes the inverted object. What makes these examples very convincing, although Pulleyblank does not bring out this point himself, is that the subject in most cases is not given but new, like the inverted object in the more familiar construction:

Tso-chuan, Hsi 24/2 我實使狄, 狄其怨我。

"It was we who procured the employment of the Tih; their resentment will fall on us." (Legge).

The behaviour of the resumed subject is not at all like that of *wo* in the examples which will be listed later,⁴⁸ where the pronoun is in each case given but contrasted. Since the prominence in question is mainly of one

type, which is the type more easily verified by context, it is much more easily demonstrated than it would be if *D'ĪĒT followed any subject stressed in speech. But it is necessary to distinguish Pulleyblank's brilliant demonstration that the resumed subject is syntactically prominent from his interesting speculation that *D'ĪĒT and *D'ĪĒG' originated as stressed forms. In the case of *D'ĪĒG', never confined to the inverted construction, proof is hardly even attempted; it is apparently taken for granted that Kennedy, by his fourteen examples of *wu* and *wo*, has shown that all rising-tone pronouns were stressed forms. Even in the case of *D'ĪĒT there is an unexplained jump from the prominence of the subject to the stressing of the pronoun which resumes it. Here however it may be possible to build a bridge. As long as *D'ĪĒT preserved its full force as a demonstrative it would itself be the subject with the preceding unit as exposed element: "As for X, it is this which . . ." At this stage the exposed element would be given and the demonstrative new, and it is reasonable to postulate that the latter was stressed. Later a backward shift of stress might be expected to accompany the transformation of the exposed element into the subject. The same would apply to *D'ĪĒG' in the inverted construction, although there seems to be no reason to suppose that it was ever stressed in all positions. On this assumption we may doubt whether even in these constructions either demonstrative was still stressed during the classical period.^{48a} We should in any case have to assume that *D'ĪĒG' at least was already unstressed, since their common ancestor *D'ĪG- did not survive to take care of positions requiring an unstressed demonstrative of this type. If we clearly distinguish Pulleyblank's stress hypothesis from his observations about syntactic distribution we see that the former applies solely to the history of the words, to the origins of their phonology and syntax. It is different in kind from the claims of Kennedy and Dobson that the *wo* and *wu*, *fu* and *pu* of the classical literature are sufficiently defined as the stressed and unstressed forms of the 1st person pronoun and indicative negative.

Kennedy and Dobson assert simply that pronoun *wo* and negative *fu* were stressed in speech, and by way of evidence offer us a handful of examples in which we are invited to read the words with a strong beat inside our heads. In a few cases Kennedy points out a possible contrast between *wo* and another word in the context. Otherwise the only guidance afforded, in the studies written in English, is the English translation, with the corresponding word written in italics. What are we expected to do with these sentences? The assumption is apparently that in reading the Chinese we shall discover that we can distribute the stresses in only one way, with *wo* or *fu* falling just where we are required to put the stress by the speech

^{48a} The pronoun *chih* resuming the inverted object, which by Pulleyblank's argument should also originally have been stressed, seems to have been stressless by 300 B.C., since it is an uncounted syllable in the prosody of the *Li sao* (Graham (3) 126).

⁴⁸ Cf. 27 below.

habits of our native English. But all the series of examples involve so many imponderables that we are left with nothing but the unanalysable impression that some are more convincing than others. No criteria are offered; and, as I hope to show shortly,⁴⁹ if we do establish such criteria we find exceptions even among the few examples on which the hypothesis is founded.

Even if we were convinced in every instance what would be proved? Since the choice of examples is arbitrary they can at best persuade us that there are sentences in which *wu* or *fu* is stressed and also sentences in which *wu* or *pu* is not, a claim which we should be ready to concede of any pair of near-synonyms which one might choose at random. The proposal that a word is regularly stressed is treated as though it were like pointing out for example that the pronoun *chih* 之 is exclusively object, an observation which grammarians are content to illustrate with a few examples in the confidence that anyone whose attention is called to it will find it confirmed every time he meets the pronoun. But in the case of *chih* exceptions would be easily identified, while in the case of a stress hypothesis proposed without criteria we would not know how to recognize an exception. This fact will be appreciated by anyone who can remember learning and unlearning a definition of a Chinese word as an "emphatic particle". It may help to release memories of this sort in some readers if I mention that I was myself once taught, by a no longer living teacher, that the difference between the negatives *pu* 不 and *fei* 非 is that the latter is more emphatic. I was saved from this delusion when someone pointed out to me that *pu* is pre-verbal and *fei* the negative copula; but I do not remember that I ever noticed an exception. The danger with such irrefutable and therefore meaningless formulations is that one may be hypnotized into reading the word with a strong beat every time one meets it, as an incurable tic which will persist for the rest of one's life.

The point, it may be necessary to insist, is not that Kennedy and Dobson offer us insufficient evidence, but that the illustrations which are all that they provide are not evidence at all. They convey to us that they have strong personal impressions about a word, and give us some examples in which the impression is especially vivid for them, like the old dictionary-makers noting an emphatic particle. Of course we are not entitled to neglect this kind of hunch, which might turn out to have something in it if we could find means to test it; but it is surely the business of a modern grammarian to provide the criteria himself. That stress hypotheses presented in this fashion are meaningless is clearest in the case of one of Dobson's, that final *yi* 矣 puts the stress on the penultimate word:

Dobson (1), 8.3.11 國危矣. "State/endangered/(stress)"

"It is (your) state that is endangered."

This proposal looks as though it is testable, and refuted by cases of *yi* with only one preceding word (*Mencius* 4A/20 亡矣. "There isn't any more"). But it turns out that Dobson cannot be pinned down in this way. He describes *yi* as "imposing the stress $\acute{x}$ y/yii or $\acute{z}\acute{e}r\acute{o}$ y/yii"⁵⁰

Dobson (1), 8.11.12 兵之設久矣. "Arms/(determination)/establish/(<is>/ of long-standing/(stress))"

It is hard to know what to make of the invitation to stress a zero syllable, which might well launch a Zen adept into instant *satori*. But the important point is that the refutability of the claim is being treated as an embarrassment rather than as a prerequisite of any meaningful hypothesis.

To illustrate the difference between starting from patterns of prominence established by context, which may be fruitful, and starting from impressions of how the stresses fall when we read to ourselves, which is always sterile, we may take a passage in *Mencius* containing both the negatives *pu* and *fu*. In three cases out of four the use of *fu* conflicts with the rule-of-thumb that it is to be read as though it were *pu chih* 不之 (still the only usable rule in the case of *fu*, although the theory that it originated in a phonetic fusion of *pu chih* seems to be no longer tenable). This may be the result of textual corruption, since parallel passages in the *Chung Yung* and *Huai-nan-tzū* read *pu* throughout,⁵¹ but it would certainly be a point in favour of a stress hypothesis that it accounted for these exceptions. In the accompanying translation the purpose of italicizing certain phrases is not, God forbid, to tell the reader how they were pronounced by Mencius, but to mark the relevant phrases which provide new information:

Mencius 4A/13 獲於上有道，不信於友，弗獲於上矣。信於友有道，事親弗悅，弗信於友矣。悅親有道，反身不誠，不悅於親矣。誠身有道，不明乎善，不誠其身矣。

"There is a way to win the confidence of superiors; if you aren't *trusted* by your friends you will *not* win the confidence of superiors. There is a way to become trusted by your friends; if in the service of your parents you don't *please* them you will *not* be trusted by your friends. There is a way to please your parents; if on self-examination you haven't been *sincere* you will *not* please your parents. There is a way to make yourself sincere; if you don't *understand* the good you will *not* make yourself sincere."

Here we have four parallel sequences of three clauses each, in which the repetitions make it easy to sort out the new from the given. Each sequence has negatives in the second and third clauses; in the second the whole verbal phrase is new, in the third only the negative. In the first sequence we do find that the negative which gives new information is *fu*. But any expectations which the first sequence may arouse are disappointed by the next

⁴⁹ Cf. 27-32 below.

⁵⁰ Dobson (1), 3.12.

⁵¹ *Chung yung* 中庸, 20, *Huai-nan-tzū* 淮南子 SPTK 9/23A/4f.

three; it turns out that both negatives stand in either position. The evidence of this passage, such as it is, therefore tells against the stress hypothesis. We may concede that factors outweighing the pattern of prominence visible in the text may have affected Mencius's pronunciation, but these are undiscoverable.

On the other hand if we make the mistake of starting from the sound of the words inside our heads we find that nothing prevents us from stressing *fu* and unstressing *pu* as we read the passage to ourselves. We have only to let the stresses put us in a mood of rising vehemence which flags with the disappearance of *fu* half way through the discourse. A reader who has got into the habit of stressing *fu* will not be deterred by the thought that such carefully balanced periods are unlikely to reflect the living speech in which emotion affects the stresses from moment to moment, or that the elaborately devised parallelism is spoiled if we refuse to give every sequence the same stress pattern. He may even be so convinced that the stresses in his mind are actually in the text in front of him that he will produce the passage as evidence of the stressing of *fu*. Dobson does in fact include the first two sequences among his examples, omitting the last two, in which *pu* is used throughout:

Dobson(1), 3.3.1.1 note 6. "There is a teaching upon the subject of 'being acceptable to one's superiors'. If one is *not trusted* by one's friends, one *will not* be acceptable to one's superiors. There is a teaching on the subject of 'being trusted by one's friends'. If in serving one's parents one is *not* pleasing to them, then one *will not be trusted* by one's friends."

Here mistakes in the italicization obscure the supposed contrast between "If one is not (*pu*) *trusted* ..." and "then one will *not* (*fu*) be trusted ..." to which Dobson appeals, observing that "the non-emphatic form occurs in the protasis and the emphatic form occurs in the apodosis." The omission of the rest of the passage hides the fact that at the next step in the progression we have *fu* in the protasis ("if ... one is *not* pleasing to them") but *pu* in the apodosis (translating on this analogy, "then one will not be *pleasing to one's parents*"). By a slip of Dobson or his printer the italicizations are out of accord with the Chinese negatives throughout his seven examples. To my ear however the proposed stresses are no more plausible or implausible when the italicisation is correct than when it is defective.

After this long digression let us return to the problem of *wu* and *wo*. *Wo* as subject, unlike the subject resumed by *shih* 實, is rarely the new element in the sentence; we can seldom translate by "It is I who ..." But the impression that when the subject is contrasted it is generally *wo* is probably shared by most experienced readers of pre-Han Chinese and deserves close consideration. Now contrast is least disputable where there is word-for-word parallelism, and it is quite easy to collect all examples in a concordanced text of *wu* and of *wo* in parallel phrases. This procedure

would save us from the subjectivity involved in the random choice of examples by Karlgren, Kennedy and Dobson. Let us then take the text of *Mencius* and examine all pairs of phrases containing one or other pronoun as subject or possessive where there is parallelism without identity.

Our procedure will be to italicize in the translation the English equivalents of different words in the same positions. This will display all contrasts which are inside the parallel phrases. But there remains the difficulty that internal contrast may be outweighed by explicit or implicit contrast with something in the context. External contrast may itself be manifested by verbal parallelism (Ex.8 below), in which case it is easily identified. It may on the other hand be no more than a contrast of self and others which one suspects because of evidence of arrogance or selfishness in the speaker (Ex.11, 18). Something which may be taken as a strong sign of this is the repetition of the 1st person subject in short parallel phrases (Ex.8, 11). But in order to draw a clear line between the ponderable internal contrasts and the imponderables which plague this inquiry, we shall in each case exhibit the internal contrasts first and afterwards consider other factors where they seem to be relevant.

In the case of sequences of parallel clauses we give only the first two.

1/1 Subject (internally contrasted)

Ex.1 (*Mencius* 2A/9) 爾爲爾，我爲我。

"You are you, I am I".

2 (2B/2) 彼以其富，我以吾仁。

"He with his wealth, I with my benevolence."

3 (3A/1) 彼丈夫也，我丈夫也。

"He is a plain fellow, I am a plain fellow."

Ex.4 (4B/28) 舜人也，我亦人也。

"Shun was a man, I too am a man".

Ex.5 (5B/7) 子君也，我臣也。

"You are the lord, I am the minister."

Ex.6 (6A/4) 彼長而我長之。

"If he is the elder and I treat him as elder ..."

1/2 Subject (not internally contrasted)

Ex.7 (2A/2) 自反而不縮，雖褐寬博，吾不慚焉。自反而縮，雖千萬人，吾往矣。

"If on self-examination I do not prove upright, even in the meanest enemy I will inspire no fear; if I do prove upright I go ahead even against a thousand or ten thousand men."

Ex.8 (2B/5) [有官守者 ... 有言責者 ...] 我無官守，我無言責也。

"(A man who has official responsibility ... A man who has the duty

to criticize) . . . If I do not have *official responsibility*, if I do not have the *duty to criticize* . . ."

External contrast: " . . . If in my case I do *not* have official responsibility, if in my case I do *not* have the duty to criticize . . ."

(Here the internally contrasted words are repeated from earlier sentences, while of the internally uncontrasted words "I" contrasts with "a man who . . .", "do not have" with "has". The contrasting of "I" is confirmed by its repetition as subject of short parallel clauses.)

Ex.9 (5A/7) 吾豈若使是君爲堯舜之君哉, 吾豈若使是民爲堯舜之民哉。

"What better course have I than to make this *ruler* become a *ruler* like Yao or Shun, what better course have I than to make this *people* become a *people* like Yao and Shun's?"

Ex.10 (5B/3) 吾於子思則師之矣,
吾於顏般則友之矣。

"In the case of *Tzū-ssū* I take him as *teacher*, in the case of *Yen Pan* I take him as *friend*."

Ex.11 (7B/4) 我善爲陳, 我善爲戰。

"I am good at *marshalling troops*, I am good at *making war*."

External contrast: "I am good at marshalling troops, I am good at making war."

(The self-assertion of the speaker is clear in the context, and is in any case expressed in the repetition of the subject as in Ex.8)

2/1 Possessive (internally contrasted)

Ex.12 (1A/7) 老吾老以及人之老。

"If we treat as befits the old *our own* old people, and from there go on to *other people's* old people . . ."

Ex.13. As Ex.2 above.

(Kennedy quotes this as an example of *wo* contrasted as subject without noticing that possessive *wu* is contrasted as well. But it may be admitted in his favour that the "his/my" opposition may not be significant since it is implicit in the preceding 'He/I')

Ex.14 (3A/2) 吾宗國魯先君莫之行, 吾先君亦莫之行也。

"None of the former rulers of *our ancestor state Lu* did it, none of *our own* former rulers did it either."

(Here the first *wu* is irrelevant to the present argument since it is not involved in the parallelism)

Ex.15 (6A/4) 吾弟則愛之, 秦人之弟則不愛也。

"In the case of *my own* younger brother I love him, in the case of a *man of Ch'in's* younger brother I do *not*."

Ex.16 (6A/4) 長楚人之長, 亦長吾之長。

"I treat as befits an elder an elder of the men of *Ch'u*, and also treat as befits an elder an elder of *my own*."

Ex.17 (6A/4) 耆秦人之炙無以異於耆吾炙。

"To enjoy a *man of Ch'in's* roast meat is no different from enjoying *my own* roast meat."

2/2 Possessive (not internally contrasted)

Ex.18 (1A/1) 王曰 '何以利吾國', 大夫曰, '何以利吾家' . . .

"If the *king* says 'How to profit my *country*?', the *grandee* says 'How to profit my *family*?' . . ."

(Kennedy uses this example, depending on the "country/family/. . ." contrast. But it may be objected that if he is entitled to ignore the "his/my" contrast in Ex.13 (=Ex.2) because it is anticipated in the "He/I" contrast he should follow the precedent here; the "country/family/. . ." opposition is already implicit in "king/grandee/. . ." Since the point of the passage is that the king is being selfish one might even claim an external contrast, "How to profit *my* country?"; but it is unnecessary to insist on a significant contrast at either position.)

Ex.19 (4A/9) 滄浪之水清兮, 可以濯我纓。

滄浪之水濁兮, 可以濯我足。

"When the water of the Ts'ang-lang is *clean* I can wash my *throat-band*, when the water of the Ts'ang-lang is *dirty* I can wash my *feet*."

Ex.20 (6A/7) 故理義之悅我心, 猶芻豢之悅我口。

"Therefore *principle and duty* please my *heart* as *fine meats* please my *mouth*."

Ex.21 (7B/37) 過我門而不入我室。

"Pass my *door* and not enter my *house*."

Kennedy quoted Exs. 1, 2, 3, 5 as evidence that *wo* is stressed and Ex. 18 as evidence that *wu* is unstressed. But if we look at the series as a whole we are driven to quite a different conclusion. Whenever there is an indisputable contrast (that is, an internal contrast) between the pronoun and another unit, the pronoun if subject is *wo* (Ex. 1-6), but if possessive is *wu* (Ex. 12-17). The choice of pronoun depends on whether the contrast is with a possessive unit (*wu* with 'X *chih* 之') or with a unit in the position of subject (*wo* with "X"). The difference is especially plain in examples from a single passage, Exs. 6, 15-17. Surprising as the result may seem at first sight, on reflection we see that it is just what we should have expected in the light of the syntactic difference between *wu* and *wo* together with the rigour of Chinese parallelism. To contrast the pronoun with a unit subordinated by *chih* it is necessary to use the form which most nearly coincides, the dependent form *wu*; but even *wu* does not coincide exactly since it may be subject as well as possessive, therefore in Ex. 16 it is expanded to *wu chih*. On the other hand

to contrast the pronoun subject with a noun or an independent pronoun such as *pi* 彼 "that man, he" it is necessary to use the form with a scope as wide as theirs, which is *wo*. It turns out then that a syntactic description of the pronouns, which allows both *wu* and *wo* as both subject and possessive and seems to leave the choice between them unexplained, does in these cases explain why *wu* or *wo* is chosen as subject or possessive. Where contrast is involved the choice depends, not on whether the pronoun is phonetically stressed, but on the syntactic status of the unit with which it is contrasted. For example in Ex.4 the status of 'Shun', as a proper name usable in any nominal position, requires *wo* as the contrasting pronoun. Very probably the contrast was reflected in the stresses of the speaker, yet we have no reason to take it for granted that the *wo* itself would be stressed, any more than the "I" of the translation (which italicized in terms of English stress would read: "*Shun* was a man, I *too* am a man.")

In several examples there is no significance in a contrast, because it is anticipated (Ex.13), or in a repetition, because of the lack of a significant adjacent contrast (Ex.9, 18). In these the pronoun is *wu*, whether it is subject or possessive. *Wu* as the form which serves in the two dependent positions is the neutral word (a point accidentally illustrated by the first *wu* of Ex. 14). It is only when the pronoun is either contrasted or in conjunction with contrasted words that the use of *wo* becomes possible and the choice of *wu* significant. Thus *wu men* 吾門 "my gate" would be structurally parallel with either *ch'i men* 其門 "his gate" or *wu shih* 吾室 "my house". When in Ex.21 *wo men* "my gate" is presented instead of *wu men* parallels of the former type are immediately excluded and it is established in advance that any coming phrase which contrasts with it will be of the type *wo shih* "my house."

This explanation does not account for the possessive *wo* of such phrases as *wo shih* 我師 "our army" and *wo chün* 我君 "our lord" in the *Ch'un-ch'iu*, which led Hu Shih to claim that possessive *wo* is generally plural.⁵² But the *Ch'un-ch'iu* does not use *wu* at all, in this respect, like the *Odes*, continuing the pre-classical usage of the inscriptions and *Documents*, where *wo* is used freely as possessive while *wu* (or its ancestor *yü*/*NGIO) is absent or sporadic. In the *Tso-chuan* this usage belongs to sections in the chronicle style of the *Ch'un-ch'iu* and to communications between states in the language of the *Documents*; in dialogue on the other hand we find only one case of *wo shih* and four of *wo chün* to one of *wu shih* and no less than ten of *wu chün*. The three examples in parallel phrases confirm that the difference is the same as in *Mencius*:

Tso-chuan 234/Ch'eng 13/4 蔑死我君，寡我襄公，迭我穀地，奸絕我好.....

⁵² Hu 2/21.

"He scorns as a dead man our lord, slights our Duke Hsiang, attacks our Hsiao lands, violates and disrupts our friendship . . ."

377/Chao 12/4 齊君弱吾君。

"The lord of Ch'i thinks our lord weak"

389/Chao 15/5 鼓人能事其君，我亦能事吾君。

"The men of Ku are able to serve their lord, we too are able to serve our lord."

(Here the "their/our" contrast is not anticipated in "men of Ku/we", the point being that the men of Ku owe loyalty to their own lord and not to ours.)

It would seem then that the theory of stressed *wo* and unstressed *wu* is partly the effect of a historical accident, that the difference when they are subject was noticed before the difference when they are possessive. Hu Shih⁵³ already recognized the use of *wo* as emphatic subject, and reported it as an isolated fact independent of the case distinctions between the pronouns. The observation naturally suggested the possibility of achieving a unified explanation in terms of stress alone, considered and rejected by Karlgren, later taken up by Kennedy. Kennedy, the pioneer in the study of archaic stress, fell victim to what we may hope will prove to have been an infantile disease of the study which he brought to birth; finding that *wo* could be stressed and *wu* left unstressed wherever he read them, he let himself be caught in the trap of the irrefutable and self-confirming hypothesis. We can illustrate this point by an example to which Kennedy appeals as crucial in both the articles in which he discussed *wu* and *wo*:

Mencius 7A/36 守者曰，「此非吾君也。何其聲之似我君也。」¹

"The keeper said 'This is not our lord. Why is it that his voice is so like our lord's?'" (The italicisation assumes that the difference between *wu chün* and *wo chün* is as in the *Tso chuan*.)

Kennedy notes the interesting shift from *wu* to *wo*, and comments:⁵⁴

"... some difference in meaning is probably intended, and this can only be a difference in emphasis. One may try to guess the difference through an English analogy:

"The keeper said, 'This is not milord. How is it that his voice is so like that of my lord?'"

Since Kennedy introduces this example before deciding which is the stressed form one wonders why he assumes that it is in the second sentence that the pronoun is stressed. One might have supposed that here Kennedy had indeed chanced on that rarest of discoveries, a passage which even when quoted in isolation allows one to stress the pronouns in only one way; it seems hardly possible to conceive a situation in which the fact that the

⁵³ Hu 2/21f.

⁵⁴ Kennedy (2), 399.

visitor is not the keeper's *own* lord, passed over lightly in the first sentence, becomes important in the second. Here Kennedy displays both his problem-solver's genius for picking the crucial example and the self-hypnotizing effect of falling into the habit of stressing a Chinese word consistently. Once the habit is formed there is no possibility of recognizing an exception (one has stressed the word oneself, so obviously it can be stressed), hardly even of finding an example which does not seem to tell in one's favour.

Let us now turn to the prosody of Chinese verse, in which one might hope to find direct evidence of phonetic stress. The present criticism of arbitrary and subjective stress hypotheses in no way discredits Kennedy's achievement in making in 1939 the first significant contribution on this topic, his *Metrical 'Irregularity' in the Shih Ching*.⁵⁵ In this paper he makes three main points:

(1) Lines in the *Odes* which exceed the norm of four syllables often contain a syllable which one may suspect was unstressed, such as *chih* in the phrase *ju chih ho* 如之何 recurrent in elongated lines. This opens up a prospect of inquiry which has not been pursued. For example it has not to my knowledge been noticed that the preposition *hu* 乎 is found 18 times out of 19 in lines of five or more syllables, although lines containing *yü* 于 are generally of normal length.

(2) Rhymes are often on the penultimate syllable, in pairs with the same word following both. This word is often a final particle, *hsi* 兮, *yeh* 也, *yi* 矣, or the pronoun *chih* 之. Presumably it was unstressed.

(3) If we test the possibility that lines with penultimate rhyme were trochaic and with ultimate rhyme iambic we find certain words (especially particles) predominantly in the unstressed positions. When a word is common in either position we can sometimes correlate the imputed stress with syntax. For example Kennedy claims that in his sample the pronoun *wo* (from which *wu* may not have been graphically distinguished, since the graph 吾 is not found in the *Odes*) when in unstressed positions tends to be possessive but is always object in the stressed. This hypothesis of a regular metre would, if established, put the whole stress system of the language of the *Odes* at our disposal. It is remarkable that thirty years later, in spite of growing interest in stress, the possibility remains unexplored. Nothing has been done which could expose us to the danger that stress hypotheses may be lost to the free world of the creative imagination and reduced to testable terms. Dobson in his recent study of the versification of the *Odes*⁵⁶ still confines himself to pointing out that if we treat all full words as stressed and all empty words as unstressed we observe definite although irregular patterns.

⁵⁵ Kennedy (2), 10-26.

⁵⁶ Dobson (4), 244-6.

As Kennedy recognized, his first observation is explicable in terms of quantity or tone, but the second points definitely to stress. It removes any lingering suspicion that there may never have been any significant stressing of contrasted words in speech. But it happens that among the words found after penultimate rhymes we find the pronouns *wo* "me" and *ju* "you". (Since the position is post-verbal there is no danger that the graph 我 represents *wu*.)

Ode 165/3 有酒湑我，無酒酤我，坎坎鼓我，蹲蹲舞我。

"If there is wine they strain it for us, if there is no wine they buy it for us, *K'a m-k'a m* they drum to us, moving in rounds they dance to us." (Karlgren)

(Penultimate rhymes *SIO, *G'O, *KO, *MIWO. There are other examples of *wo* after the rhyme in *Ode* 40/2, 3 202/4 and of *ju* in *Ode* 85. *Wo* is itself rhymed in 123/1, 199/2.)

An important feature of penultimate rhyming is that in each pair of lines the rhyming words contrast while the final word is repeated: "strain it for us . . . buy it for us . . ." We therefore have the exact correlation of versification and a pattern of prominence already proposed⁵⁷ as the most satisfying proof of phonetic stress. The consideration that the verb when more prominent than its object *wo* should be stressed at its expense has so far been merely theoretical;⁵⁸ the evidence of the *Odes*, in which *wo* is rhymed in two poems but follows the rhyme in three, suggests that this was at least as common as the stressing of *wo* itself.

In all poetry down to the Former Han we notice irregular length of line and placing of rhyme combined with regular placing of particles, suggesting the influence of stress. The shift from this kind of versification to a purely syllabic measure during the Later Han, and the appearance of tone patterns at the beginning of the T'ang, represent two revolutions in prosody which we may suspect followed important events in the history of Chinese phonology. The evidence of versification suggests that until the Former Han stress was as important as Kennedy, Pulleyblank and Dobson have supposed, but the material has still scarcely been touched. I have myself attacked the most easily analysable of the early verse forms, the *sao* 騷 of the *Ch'u tz'u*.⁵⁹ In this there is generally one of about a dozen particles or pronouns at the middle of the line, and by working on the postulate that words found at this "key" position were uncountried elsewhere when in the same syntactic constructions one can reduce the lines to a consistent length. When uncountried syllables are excluded the lines of pre-Han poems have three syllables before the key, which may be increased or reduced by one, and two syllables after the key, which are invariable. In the

⁵⁷ Cf. 21 above.

⁵⁸ Cf. 11, 19 above.

⁵⁹ Graham (3).

case of the pronouns it can be shown that they were counted in some syntactic patterns and uncounted in others, according to principles which seem to be constant for the commoner pronouns at least (*wu* 吾 *yü* 余 *ch'i* 其 *chih* 之 *fu* 夫 *ts'ü* 此). The following generalizations apply with rare exceptions to all the material assembled in my article. (In illustrations key syllables will be underlined and other uncounted syllables bracketed):

(1) A pronoun as subject is counted immediately before the verb (LS 94, 174 夕余至乎... 176 忽吾行此...), uncounted if there is an intervening word (LS 2... 吾以降 97 [吾] 將上下而... 118... 余乃下 25 [余] 既不難夫 CC(a) 38... 汝何之). Examples of *wo* as subject are unfortunately too rare and late for comparison.⁶⁰

(2) As possessive or adjunct a pronoun is uncounted before a bisyllabic unit (LS 57... 吾初服 3... 余初度 12... 夫先路 176... 此流沙) but at least in the case of *wu* and *yü* is counted before a monosyllable (LS 18 豈余身之... 172 邇吾道夫.... The evidence is sparse for other pronouns).

(3) All pronouns are uncounted after prepositions *wei* "on behalf of" and *yü* "together with" (LS 131... 爲余... 129... 與此... 151... 爲之...), not excluding *wo* CC(f) 13... 爲我....

(4) All pronouns are counted as object after the verb (LS 66... 其言予 123... 之先我 120 鳩告余以... 133... 而釋女). This applies even to *chih*, which often follows a penultimate rhyme in the *Odes* and which as particle in *sao* poetry is uncounted (LS 131... 而慕之 Contrast LS 32 非余心之所急).

(5) When the pronoun object is inverted one syllable is uncounted. This is presumably the pronoun, but since it is never at the key position this cannot be proved (LS 7... 之不[吾] 與 71... 而不[予] 聽 CC(a) 13... 其莫[我] 忠). There are occasional variations in this pattern which may be connected with the relative prominence of negative and pronoun.⁶¹

Except in the last case the patterns are rigid and rarely if ever affected by the relative prominence of words in a particular sentence. Consequently we do not, as in the *Odes*, find the correlation of versification and patterns of prominence which we have accepted as the final test for identifying unstressed syllables. However the phonetic patterns reflected in the prosody may reasonably be ascribed to stress in the absence of any plausible alternative, although we may wonder to what extent they are distorted by the needs of versification. It seems clear from their evidence that for most pronouns, including *wu* and *wo*, stress was not inherent in the word but varied with syntactic position.

We should expect the intonation pattern discovered by Kennedy to

correlate in some way with stress patterns which may be discoverable through versification, but it seems that the Chinese language is not going to make things easy for us by presenting us with anything as simple as a pronoun represented by one graph when it is stressed and by another when it is not. Indeed there is something very suspicious about the whole assumption that a pair of Chinese graphs might represent stressed and unstressed forms of one word. There is of course no objection in principle to historical hypotheses about the role of stress in the evolution of one word from another, but is it really in the least likely that the effects of stress on the pronunciation of a single word would be marked by the use of different graphs? Even in writing colloquial English we positively avoid marking such distinctions unless one word fuses into another. In "You shouldn't have done it", for example, the unstressed "not" has a separate spelling but not the unstressed "have", which would be written "of" by a schoolboy spelling by ear. What concerns us, unless we are novelists interested in the niceties of living speech, is not to distinguish shades of pronunciation but on the contrary to identify a word through its changes of pronunciation. If this is the case when writing in an alphabet what should we expect of the logographic script of Chinese? One would be happier if Kennedy and Dobson had disposed of this preliminary doubt by offering us modern examples of graphically distinguished stressed and unstressed forms, like the modern fusions (such as *pie* 別 for *pu-yao* 不要 "don't") which justify the search for fusions in the archaic language.

IV. The Evolution of the Pronoun System

The complexity of the relationships between the early Chinese pronouns is the effect of an evolution, already beginning in the language of the Shang inscriptions, from a coherent system to another which never achieved full coherence. We may call these two systems the "pre-classical" (represented in the oracle-bone and bronze inscriptions and in the *Documents*) and the "classical" (that of the language of literary texts from the *Analepts* downwards), although there is some risk that the two names may obscure the gradualness of the process. The basic difference between the two systems is syntactic: the older system contrasts possessive forms with non-possessive (subject and object), the later contrasts dependent forms (subject and adjunct) with independent. Let us begin by listing and briefly describing the words which we hope to reduce to order.

In the Shang inscriptions Ch'en Meng-chia and Kuan Hsieh-ch'u identify the following pronouns:

(1) *yü*/**DIO* 余, 予 "I, me" (The former graph is used on the Shang and Chou inscriptions, the latter in the *Documents*). This remains exclusively subject and object in the Chou inscriptions; a single example of

⁶⁰ *Hsi shih* 惜誓 17, *Ch'i chien* 七諫, (f) 18.

⁶¹ Graham (3), 130f.

possessive *yü* claimed by Jung Keng (Jung 1042) is rejected by Chou Fa-kao (Chou(1) 49 n.3). It is only occasionally possessive in the *Documents*, and throughout pre-Han literature is the one pronoun which is frequently followed by *chih* 之 when possessive, a point already noticed by Ma Chien-chung (Ma 39).

(2) *chen*/*D'IəM 朕 "my". Exclusively possessive on both Shang and Chou inscriptions, it comes to be used also as subject in the *Documents* and then disappears, to be revived as the Imperial "we" under the Ch'in dynasty.

(3) *ju*/*NIO 女, 汝 "thou, thee". One case of possessive *ju* is reported on a Shang inscription (Chou 69, Ch'en 95f, Kuan 32), and Chou Fa-kao acknowledges with reservations three cases in the *Documents*; otherwise according to Chou *ju* is exclusively subject and object down to the *Analects* and *Tso-chuan* (Chou(1) 31) and begins to be used as possessive only in *Mencius*.

(4) *nai*/*NəG 乃 "thy". Exclusively possessive in the Shang and Chou inscriptions, it is occasionally also subject in the *Documents* (Chou 74f).

(5) *wo*/*NGĀ 我, collective 1st person, of unrestricted distribution but especially common as possessive: 我田 "our fields" 我祖 "our ancestors" (Ch'en 95). According to Ch'en Meng-chia, the distinction between individual *yü* and *chen* (the king divining) and collective *wo* (the royal house) is quite clear in the Shang inscriptions, and in Western Chou inscriptions is only partially obscured by a tendency for *wo* to encroach on *yü* (Ch'en 96f). That *yü* is the pronoun likely to be used when the speaker is calling attention to himself as an individual remains true in the *Documents* (as in the recurrent 予一人 "I the one man") and even in the classical literature, where it is the pronoun with which Confucius says "Heaven gave birth to the virtue in me, what is Huan T'ui to me?" (*Analects* 7/23 天生德於予, 桓魋其如予何) and someone in *Mencius* says "How dare you compare me to Kuan Chung?" (*Mencius* 2A/1 爾何曾比予於管仲). *Wo* on the other hand remains the pronoun for an impersonal "oneself" (*Mencius* 7A/4 萬物皆備於我矣 "The myriad things are all complete inside us"). It would seem that the original 1st person pronoun was driven out by the more modest, less aggressive *wo*, with which one speaks as a representative of the collectivity.

(6) *yü*/*NGIO 魚, 虞, ancestor of *wu*/*NGO 吾 "I, my". *Yü* as subject, illustrated by a single instance, is reported on the Shang inscriptions by Kuan Hsieh-ch'u (Kuan 32) but not by Ch'en Meng-chia. It appears sporadically in Chou inscriptions as subject and possessive (Jung 1043). *Yü* 魚 appears in a Tun-huang MS for the only example of *wu* in the genuine *Documents*, and in a Japanese MS for the only example in the spurious *Documents* (Jung 1043). *Wu*, which is never found in the *Odes*, emerges as a major pronoun by the side of *wo* only in the classical period.

(7) *chih*/*T'İəG 之 and (8) *tzü*/*TSİəG 茲, near demonstratives, both independent (Ch'en 97f 若茲 "like this" 予之 "here") and as adjuncts (Ch'en 113 茲邑 "this city"). *Chih* as adjunct is rare except in time expressions, for which Ch'en notes a difference between, for example, 之月 "this (the past) month" and 茲月 "this (the present) month" (Ch'en 114-119). The development of *chih* into a personal pronoun ("him, her, it") is first attested in the Western Chou inscriptions (Chou (1) 5, (2) 84-99). The reason for its confinement to the object is no doubt that in pre-classical as in classical Chinese a near demonstrative (unlike the far demonstrative *pi* 彼) is rarely subject of the verb. *Tzü* remains the characteristic near demonstrative until superseded in the classical period by *tsü* (No. 18).

Many personal pronouns emerged after the end of the Shang; for the early history of these I depend primarily on the great historical grammar of Chou Fa-kao:

(9) *chüeh*/*KIWĀT 厥 (Western Chou inscriptions) and (10) *ch'i*/*G'İəG 其 (Western Chou inscriptions) (Chou (1) 5), "his, her, its". Although the modal particle *ch'i* is already found on the oracle-bones, the pronoun is first attested on the bronzes; it supersedes *chüeh* in the classical period and alone among the pronouns continues to be purely possessive.

(11) *yi*/*D'İəG 台 "my" (Eastern Chou inscriptions). In the literary texts it survives only in two examples in the *Documents*, in one of them as subject (Karlgren (3) 19, *T'ang shi* 1); but it is purely possessive on the inscriptions (Chou (1) 51f).

(12) *erh*/*N'İəG 而 "thy" (Eastern Chou inscriptions). It survives in some classical texts, where it encroaches on the subject occasionally in the *Tso-chuan* (Graham (1) 558 n.3) and often in *Chuang-tzü*.

(13) *erh*/*N'IA 爾 (Eastern Chou inscriptions) and (14) *jo*/*N'IAK 若 (*Mo-tzü* 墨子, *Chuang-tzü*), 2nd person pronouns of unrestricted distribution. The former abruptly falls into disuse towards 300 BC; it is rare or absent (except for quotations) in *Mo-tzü* and *Chuang-tzü*, which are the texts in which *jo* first appears, if we dismiss a disputed case in a Western Chou inscription (Chou (1) 73. *Jo* is taken as "thus" in Dobson (2) 51). However *erh* cannot have disappeared from the spoken language if colloquial 爾 (爾) is its descendant, as the graph implies. We may suspect that it became vulgar, and that the acquisition of a final -K had something to do with the vulgarization. *Jo* seems characteristic of very familiar talk, as in the stories in *Chuang-tzü*; among the stories in the *Shuo lin* 說林 of *Han Fei* 韓非子 it is in a conversation between three lice that we find *jo* (*Han Fei* 韓非子 SPTK 8/2B/10).

(15) *ang*/*NGĀNG 昂, 1st person (*Documents* and *Odes* only).

(16) *yang*/*D'İANG 陽, 1st person, attested solely in a line from the Lu *Odes* (魯詩) quoted in the commentary of Kuo P'u 郭璞 (c.AD 300) on the *Erh ya* 爾雅 (SPTK 上 3A/4).

(17) *jung*/*NĪONG 戎, 2nd person (*Odes* only).

To this list we shall add three of the demonstratives:

(18) *ts'ü*/*TS'ĪAR 此 (Eastern Chou inscriptions), near demonstrative which supersedes No. 8 in the classical period.

(19) *pi*/*PIA 彼, far demonstrative (one Eastern Chou inscription) (Chou (1) 132f). Dobson classes it as an Early Archaic pronoun (Dobson (2) 6.4), but on the strength of a single example in the *Documents* (Karlgren (3) 50, *Lo kao* 13).

(20) *fu*/*B'ĪWO 夫, far demonstrative which is exclusively subject or adjunct (*Analects*). This is unattested in the inscriptions, *Documents* and *Odes*.

Among these twenty pronouns are three rare ones which belong to the language of the *Odes* and which are formed out of familiar pronouns by the addition of a final -NG:

No. 15 *NGĀNG- cf.	No. 5 *NGĀ
No. 16 *DIANG-	No. 1 *DĪO
No. 17 *NĪONG-	No. 3 *NĪO

Having dismissed these, and No. 14 which is a late modification of No. 13, we are left with sixteen pronouns to distribute between the pre-classical and classical systems. In order to avoid the risk of obscuring the significance of phonological similarities we shall not admit phonological grounds for putting a word in one or other category. Instead we shall appeal to a purely syntactic test, that pre-classical pronouns are either possessive or non-possessive (subject and object), classical either independent or dependent (subject and possessive). By this criterion *wo* (No. 5) behaves as a classical pronoun even on Shang inscriptions, while *ju* (No. 3) behaves as a pre-classical pronoun even in the *Analects*. The only words not open to the syntactic test are the near demonstratives (Nos. 7, 8, 18), but these are easily distributed on chronological grounds.

Pre-classical system

	Subject and object	Possessive
1st person	1. *DĪO-	Earlier series 2. *D'ĪM'
2nd	3. *NĪO'	Later series 11. *DĪəG-
3rd	—	12. *NĪəG-
Demonstratives:	7. *TĪəG-, 8. *TSĪəG-	9. *KIWAT 10. *G'ĪəG-

Classical system

	Independent	Dependent
1st person	5. *NGĀ'	6. *NGO-
2nd	13. *NĪA'	—
Demonstratives:	19. *PIA'	20. *B'ĪWO-
	18. *TS'ĪAR'	—

The most striking feature of the pre-classical system is the remarkable symmetry of the non-possessive and late possessive series, which suggests declension much more strongly than the uniformity on which Karlgren's theory of Proto-Chinese was based. Yet it can hardly be a Proto-Chinese survival, since the older possessive series displays not symmetry but tantalizing irregularities the reasons for which must be lost in the prehistory of the language. Chou Fa-kao is no doubt right in explaining the later possessive series by fusion with the possessive particle *chih*/*TĪəG 之.⁶² Since the particle is presumably descended from the demonstrative *chih* this accounts for possessives and particles sharing the ending -əG. In favour of the theory one may point to some evidence in the *sao* prosody that *DĪəG "my" survived in the classical period and that since its graph 台 failed to establish itself and it was still recognized as a fusion it continued to be written with the graphs 余之 (which explains why the combination is so common). In seven out of nine cases in the *Li sao* and *Chiu chang* the combination as a whole occupies the "key" position in the line as though representing a single unstressed syllable, a fact all the more remarkable since *DĪO by itself is generally a counted syllable.⁶³

LS 20 荃不察余之中情兮。

"But the Fragrant One refused to examine my true feelings." (Hawkes)

Chou Fa-kao notices that if extended to the 3rd person the theory of fusion implies a missing pronoun *G'ĪO-, and that a 3rd person pronoun with this reading (written 渠) does sporadically enter literature from the colloquial language from the 3rd century AD onwards.⁶⁴ In support of this speculation one may notice:

(1) The sound is unique; no other graph in Karlgren's *Grammata serica recensita* has the same reading on the same tone.

(2) The existence of a 3rd person pronoun in speech, as in modern dialects, is inherently likely. Such a pronoun is unnecessary in writing, which can assure continuity of discourse after a thing is first mentioned, but one may doubt whether Chinese ever lacked a 3rd person pronoun to deal with the discontinuities of living speech.

(3) At the period when *G'ĪO- appears we also find in folk poetry the 1st person pronoun *nung*/*NŌNG 儂, with the final -NG shared by several pronouns in the *Odes* (Nos. 15-17 above) but unattested through the intervening thousand years.⁶⁵

What of the final -O shared by the non-possessives? Like -əG it does not seem to be a case ending; *DĪO-, *NĪO' and the late attested *G'ĪO- are presumably the independent pronouns, limited in distribution only in

⁶² Chou (1), 13, (2), 67-83.

⁶³ Graham (3), 134f.

⁶⁴ Chou (1), 14, 112f.

⁶⁵ Chou (1), 63f.

that they are forced out of the possessive position by the wealth of possessive forms. At first sight the phonological symmetry seems not quite perfect, since *NĪO is traditionally read on the rising and the others on the level tone. But we have seen⁶⁶ that in the Ch'u poetry *DĪO is rising-tone at the end of the line although level-tone elsewhere, and inferred that it was regularly rising-tone when final (as the rhymes in the *Odes* confirm), although perhaps allowed some latitude earlier in the phrase. By analogy we should expect the same tone change for *NĪO. The question now arises whether the forms of the non-possessive pronouns may be explained by our rules that "Level tone plus -O implies incompleteness" and "Rising tone plus pause implies completion".

Here we may call attention to a change in sentence-structure in the course of the transition from pre-classical to classical. The older language, as recorded in the script, is almost without final particles. Although this may be partly a matter of graphic convention, as Dobson suggests,⁶⁷ much of the work later done by final particles is performed by words located early in the sentence, the modal *ch'i* 其, the *wei* 唯 which has much the same scope as final *yeh* 也, or, to take a less common word, the pre-verbal *yüan* 爰 which resembles the classical directive *yen* 焉. In the passage to Classical Chinese there is a shift of weight from before to after the verb which is visible in the treatment of the pronouns:

(1) As Dobson notices⁶⁸, in "Early Archaic" pronoun objects are used very sparingly. I am not equipped to explore the inscriptions, but as far as my observations reach in texts transcribed in standard script, the pronoun object is rare unless followed by a second object, or directive, or commanded action, or noun in apposition. One consequence is that pronouns are uncommon at the end of the phrase. In the *Documents*, where this is true in the 1st although not in the 2nd person, *DĪO is never final except for two cases in the *Lo kao* 洛誥.⁶⁹

(2) In negative sentences the pronoun object precedes the verb, a practice which continues with decreasing rigour into the classical period. Wang Li notes a few instances of the same word-order in affirmative sentences, as evidence that originally the regular position of the pronoun object was pre-verbal.⁷⁰

But if at the earliest known phase the pronouns were rarely final, and earlier still were perhaps never final at all, our rules fully explain the phonology of *DĪO and its analogues. At the time when we first meet them, they have assumed the -O- of words pronounced only in mid-phrase. Later,

with the shift from pre-classical to classical, pronouns are needed more and more at the end of the phrase, and this imposes a change to the rising-tone.

Thus at the crisis we are postulating, the standard pronouns were -O- forms easily utterable only in mid-phrase, but the new sentence-structure required pronouns which could be pronounced at any position. We can now account for nearly all the classical forms on the assumption that the tone change affected the vowel so that final -O on the rising tone tended to shift to -A. New forms would then evolve in the same way that the suffix *NĪĀR' 爾 developed out of *NĪO- 如, which had been usable as a suffix only in mid-phrase.⁷¹ The -A' form, also exhibited by the final particle *DĪA' 也 and, with a slight variation, by phrase-final *TĪĀ' 者, is characteristic of the independent classical pronouns, whether new (*NGĀ' "I", *PIA' "that") or adapted from a pre-classical word (*NĪA' from *NĪO "you", *TSĪĀR' from *TSĪG "this"; there could be no *DĪA' from *DĪO "I" because it would be indistinguishable from the final particle). It will be seen that an explanation on these lines does not oblige us to suppose with Kennedy that the rising-tone pronouns were exclusively final even at the beginning. All that we need to claim is that pronouns which were formed from older -O- pronouns or on the same analogy would become available at all positions only if they shifted to the rising tone in order to be usable in front of the pause.

At this stage -O' is changing to -A' but -O- continues unaltered, so that level and rising tone forms are becoming separate words. *DĪO on level and rising tone remains a single word as pronounced at different positions in the phrase; no graphic distinction is made until the Ch'u poetry of about 300BC, and then no doubt only for the purpose of establishing the pronunciation for readers of the verse. But *NGO- and *NGĀ', *B'ĪWO- and *PIA', are separate words distinguished by different graphs. This differentiation has a further consequence. Once *NGO- is recognized as a word distinct from *NGĀ', its tone and final become part of its morphology; the ending -O- which is a vocal preparation for the next word now implies, not that a particular utterance containing the word *NG is still incomplete, but that the word *NGO- cannot be final in any sentence in which it is used. But this amounts to saying that *NGO- syntactically requires words which it precedes, and so that it is a dependent form, either possessive (requiring a succeeding noun) or subject or inverted object (requiring a succeeding verb). Thus the old -O- form, which had no syntactic significance in itself but was in practice confined to subject and object by the abundance of possessive forms, both retreats from the object and spreads to the possessive. The main line of distinction is now between dependent and independent pronouns, and the old possessive forms lose most

⁶⁶ Cf. 12 above.

⁶⁷ Dobson (2), Appendix 1, n. 35.

⁶⁸ Dobson (2), 3.5.2, n. 31.

⁶⁹ Karlgren (3), 50, *Lo kao* 10, 13.

⁷⁰ Wang, 357.

⁷¹ Cf. 18 above.

of their value. Those in the 1st and 2nd persons which survive tend to be assimilated to dependent forms by the spread to subject (but not to object) which we have noted for Nos. 2, 4, 11 and 12.

The full differentiation of dependent -O- forms and independent -A' forms is achieved only in the wholly new pronouns, *NGO-/ *NGĀ' and *B'ĪWO-/ *PIA'. In the 2nd person, where a pre-classical -O- form already exists, its past history hinders full assimilation to *NGO- and *B'ĪWO-. We are now in a position to offer an answer to the questions about the 2nd person which we raised in I.⁷² On the present hypothesis the original 2nd person pronoun was the presumed level-tone *NĪO-, with possessive forms *NāG and *NĪāG which kept it confined to the subject and object. Later *NĪO being required at the end of the phrase began to be pronounced on the rising tone, and then by a change of vowel generated the new word *NĪA'. At this stage a full assimilation of 2nd to 1st person would be possible if

(1) *NĪO' was completely ousted by *NĪA'.

(2) *NĪO- surviving at non-final positions withdrew from the object and extended to the possessive.

Now it would seem that the first of these conditions is fulfilled in the *Analects* and the second partially fulfilled in *Mencius*, which explains why these texts of the Lu dialect almost bear out Karlgren's theory of a nominative and genitive *NĪO. Although it is true that *NĪO is object more often than Karlgren recognised, it is remarkable that in such cases it is generally in front of the main verb while *NĪA as object generally comes after it. This suggests that even as object it is excluded from the final position, like the level-tone *DĪO in the Ch'u poems:⁷³

Analects 2/17 由，誨女知之乎。“Yu, shall I teach you to know it?”

11/23 吾以女爲死矣。“I thought you were dead”

17/21 於女安乎。“Would you feel at ease?”

Mencius 3B/1. 我使掌與女乘 “I will make him always drive the chariot for you” (Legge)

Analects 7/24 吾無隱乎爾。“I hide nothing from you”

11/26 以吾一日長乎爾。“Because I am a day older than you . . .”

11/26 如或知爾。“If someone knows you . . .”

Mencius 1B/12. 出乎爾者，反乎爾者也。“What goes out from you is what comes back to you.”

2A/9 爾爲爾 “You are you”.

7B/4 寧爾也 “It is for the sake of giving you peace”.

There is one example of *NĪA as object earlier in the phrase (*Analects* 17/1 來，子與爾言。“Come, I have something to say to you”, cf. also 7/35, a quotation), but the only serious exception is in the case of *NĪO:

⁷² Cf. 7, 8 above.

⁷³ Cf. 12, 13 above.

Analects 17/8 居，吾語女。“Sit down, I will tell you”.

This is a common formula about which we may make two points:

(1) It often has a further object (*Chuang-tzū* HY27/11/35 來，吾語女至道。“Come, I will tell you of the utmost Way”). We may suspect that even without a further object it is felt to lead on to the statement it introduces.

(2) Every syllable in the formula rhymes: *KĪO, NGO NGĪO NĪO. The introductory word is variable and does not necessary rhyme; in *Chuang-tzū* for example we find 居 “Sit down” 來 “Come” and 進 “Come forwards”. But in the rest of the formula the only variation allowed is the pronoun *DĪO, which does not break the rhyme (*Chuang-tzū* 48/19/9 居，予語女。27/11/40 來，余語女。). Another pronoun is allowable only when the four-syllable sequence is otherwise broken (9/4/24 齋。吾將語若。“Fast, I am going to tell you”. 29 盡矣。吾語若。“That is all there is to it. I will tell you”).

As subject there is a still closer assimilation of 2nd person to 1st: *NĪA' like *NGĀ' is contrastive, *NĪO like *NGO unconstrative. We have already noticed one example from *Mencius*.⁷⁴ In the *Analects* it is clear in every case that *NĪA as subject is contrastive or is the new element:

Analects 3/17 爾愛其羊，我愛其禮。

“You care about the sheep, I care about the rite.”

7/11 惟我與爾有是夫。

“It is only you and I it is not, who have this?” (Here the word *wei* 惟 “only” establishes that the speaker and his audience are contrasted with others. Cf. 5/9 吾與女弗如也 “You and I are not as good as him”, where there is no such contrast).

11/26 爾何如。

“What about you?” (repeated three times to different disciples, so that the “you” of each utterance contrasts with the “you” of the others).

16/1 求，無乃爾是過與。

“Ch'iu, is it not you who is at fault?”

(This is grammatically obscure, but if the pronoun is subject the demonstrative must be marking the subject as the new element in the same way as *shih* 實 in the *Tso chuan*. The *Analects* does not use the latter demonstrative; but Pulleyblank classes the *Analects* with some hesitation among the texts which use *shih* 是 after the subject in this way.⁷⁵)

In the *Analects* *NĪO does not yet encroach on the possessive, but in *Mencius*, where it is possessive four times, the only point at which it falls short of complete assimilation to *NGO is its continued availability as object in mid-phrase. But the process of assimilation does not quite reach

⁷⁴ Ex. 1, 27 above.

⁷⁵ Pulleyblank (1), 50f.

completion even in the Lu dialect, and in other dialects seems never to have started. We can see why if we consider which pronouns were available for use at which syntactic positions:

Subject	Possessive	Object
*N ₁ O	*N ₁ əG	*N ₁ O
*N ₁ A	*N ₁ A	*N ₁ A

It is clear that if a dependent form was to be developed parallel to *NGO the claim of *N₁O to be chosen is no better than those of two other pronouns. Instead of excluding *N₁O from the object and extending it to the possessive it would be possible to adapt for the purpose either

- (1) *N₁əG, by extending it to the subject,
or (2) *N₁A, by excluding it from the object.

We now see how it was possible for *Chuang-tzū* and for the *Tso chuan* to distribute these pronouns according to principles so different from each other's and from those of the Lu dialect. *Chuang-tzū* chooses the first course, the *Tso chuan* chooses the second. In either case *N₁O becomes the independent pronoun, to be left without a rival when *N₁A falls out of sight late in the 4th century BC. On our hypothesis the pre-verbal *N₁O of the Lu dialect was level-tone, but the independent pronoun victorious by 300 BC would have to be rising-tone. This explains why in the case of *N₁O it is the rising-tone reading which survives, although the reading of *D₁O which survives is the one on the level tone.

Why is there no near demonstrative *TS₁O- to serve as subject and adjunct like the far demonstrative *B₁IWO? The reason is probably an asymmetry of near and far demonstratives which also accounts for the confinement of the pronoun *chih* to the object.⁷⁶ In *Mencius*, where *pi* "that, he" is subject of a verb 15 times out of 34 (*Mencius* 1A/7 彼惡知之 "How should they know it?"), *tz'ü* "this" is never in 96 examples subject except in "X is Y" sentences (*Mencius* 1B/3 此文王之勇也 "This is the courage of King Wen."), apart from three instances of the formula 此無他 "There is no other reason for this." But the use of dependent pronouns as subject is limited to verbal sentences, in *Mencius* at any rate, and in "X is Y" sentences could cause confusion (*Mencius* 5A/6 吾君之子也 "He is the son of our lord", not "I am son of the lord"). Consequently a dependent form of *tz'ü*/*TS₁ÄR would have no function.

What would have a function would be a near demonstrative which was exclusively adjunct, but this would have no reason to take the -O- ending. Such words did appear in some forms of the language. The pre-classical *chih* 之 became exclusively adjunct as a demonstrative when in independent positions it turned into the personal pronoun ("him, her, it"). In the dialectal chapters of *Mo-tzū*, which in spite of their obscurity for modern

⁷⁶ Cf. 37 above.

readers show signs that their authors especially cultivated grammatical clarity and consistency, the near demonstrative is regularly *chih* when adjunct and *tz'ü* when independent. A similar distinction appears in the Lu dialect when *tz'ü* enters and competes with the *ssü*/*S₁ĒG- 斯 which is the only near demonstrative in the *Analects*. In *Mencius* *ssü* has been forced out of independent positions but is still employed as adjunct, the usage which misled Kennedy into introducing it into his scheme as the level-tone near demonstrative which is never final.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Cf. 9 above.